# Appendix

## Water Resources Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very worthwhile speech by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEW YORK STATE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION IN NEW YORK CITY, ON FEBRUARY 27, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, I am indebted to President Wright for inviting me to speak before your annual meeting of the New York State Waterways Association.

I prize this invitation, since it comes from an organization which, although far removed in miles from my home State of Louisiana, is shoulder to shoulder with us in purpose—the protection and development of one of our most precious resources, water.

My interest in water resources development goes back a long way. I was born at Montegut, La., a small village located about 30 miles from the Gulf of Mexico, and some 16 miles south of my present home at Houma.

Houma, a city of about 25,000 inhabitants, is located about 50 miles southwest of the great port at New Orleans, at the junction of Bayou Terrebonne, a navigable stream which carries a great deal of freight, and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, with which all of you are doubtless familiar. The great Mississippi is less than 20 miles away, as the crow flies.

Having been born and reared in this area, I know at first hand the hazards of uncontrolled water, and, conversely, the benefits of wise development of this resource. With such a background the importance of a well-regulated and maintained system of waterways was impressed upon me at an early age. Through the 22 years I have served in the U.S. Senate, that interest has not only been maintained, but it has grown.

In those years I have devoted much time and energy in helping formulate and develop a long-range, well-planned program of our water and land resources. In all humility, but with some pride, I feel that I have achieved some slight degree of success in these long-range plans.

With your indulgence, I would like to expand my remarks to include a birdseye view of the great Mississippi, with the city of New Orleans as the gateway between the Mississippi Valley and the fabulous riches to the south of us.

Some 41 percent of the area of the United States is drained through the Mississippi River. In the last major flood on the Mississippi—that of 1927—an area of 23,000 square miles was inundated. This is about the combined area of the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut.

Cities, towns, and farms were flooded, destroying crops and paralyzing industry. Scores of lives were lost. Property damage ran into hundreds of millions of dollars; rail transportation suffered heavily, with only one rail line operating for a time east and west below Cairo, Ill.; highways and bridges were unstable for weeks; and thousands of people were left homeless and destitute.

The havoc that would result from a repetition of such a flood today, with the increase in population and the growth of industry in this area, is impossible to conceive. Fortunately, a comprehensive plan for the development of the Mississippi River and its tributaries was authorized in 1928, the year following this great flood. Since that time work has progressed steadily, although after 31 years this project is only 72 percent complete. Yet, the benefits from this project already exceed the costs by a benefit-to-cost ratio of 5 to 1.

One of the prime inland waterways of this area, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which passes Houma, was authorized on the basis of developing 400,000 tons of commerce a year, but the tonnage on that waterway now exceeds 13 million tons. More important, however, is the fact that the development of this waterway was a major factor in creating the vast industrial complex of the Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coastal area.

Thus my interest in the beneficial development of water resources of the Nation stems from a personal conviction that such developments were an important factor in achieving our present high standards of living, not only in the area of my home State but all across this great Nation of ours.

I believe that unless a well-planned and aggressive program of water resource development is carried forward, our children and grandchildren will not have an opportunity to enjoy the many advantages that today we take for granted.

My convictions in this have been strengthened by my recent travels through Europe and Asia. I believe that unless we protect our greatest resource, water, unless we keep it inland and do not let it flow to the sea unused, some day many parts of our great country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as the lands which I have seen on my travels in old Persia. Our history books tell us that about 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia was capable of sustaining the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it adequately can care for less than 14 million.

Consider the great Valley of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. At one time that area could produce food and fiber for 15 million people. Today that great valley can hardly supply the needs of 2 million people. And why? Because of the neglect of a great natural resource—water. If it had been possible to retain the waters upstream on those great rivers, and not permit them to steal the rich topsoil and float it into the interior of the country and into the sea, the chances are that that great valley would still be very productive.

The fact is, that those rivers carried millions of tons of earth down the streams and clogged the small tributaries and rivers in Mesopotamia. Today that land is not suitable for much cultivation. It is sour. It cannot be farmed. Certainly we cannot afford to let that happen in our great country.

Two years ago I visited various portions of the Soviet Union for well over a month. This was my third trip to this country in as many years. I have the opportunity of visiting cities never before seen by an American Government official; cities in the far reaches of Siberia, an area which had been pictured to me before my visit as wastelands of snow and ice—as a vast prison camp. But that was not what I found. To my great surprise, I saw a virgin land being awakened, a land that promises to make Siberia the granary of Russia. Industry was flourishing to a surprising degree. One of the principal tools the Russians were employing in this development was a well planned utilization of its waterways system, both for navigation and the development of power from falling water. I saw several hydroelectric power stations that were larger than our biggest and one that was almost twice as large as any we have in this country. I saw foundations poured for turbines and generators which will have a rated capacity of 300,000 kw. each—almost three times larger than anything we have. And these projects, gentlemen, were designed, constructed, and had all component parts built within the Soviet Union. In fact, much of the work on the large turbines was being done at Novosibirsk, a place which was a small trading post in 1905, but is now a city of almost 1 million.

As a result of my inspection of installations in Russia, I am convinced that in water transportation and hydroelectric power development the Russians are inching ahead of us.

In any comparison of time, money and effort expended on resource development in Soviet Russia and the United States, there is, of course, absolutely nothing that we can do about the rate of such developments in Russia. They are proceeding with their own resources to meet the needs of their own economy. We must direct our attention to what we can do to satisfy our own needs.

There have been many studies of resource developments by presidential committees. One of the most recent was the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy, dated December 22, 1955. In that report it was stated that the estimated use of water in the United States in 1950 was 185 billion gallons per day and that, based on an estimated population of 200 million by 1975, the requirements would be 350 billion gallons per day.

However, the November 28, 1958, issue of the U.S. News & World Report contained a very penetrating article by Dr. Philip M. Hauser on the so-called explosion of population in the United States, which sheds more light on this problem of expanding population.

Dr. Hauser is head of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, and has been Deputy Director of U.S. Census. He points out that the newest projections of the Census Bureau place the population of the United States in 1975 at between 216 and 244 million.

That is an increase in the predictions of from 8 to 20 percent in the past 3 years.



AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Putting it another way, taking a mean of the projections, a population of 230 million by 1975 would mean a 30-percent increase in our population in the next 16 years. Think of the tremendous increase in demand on all elements of our resources, including water. In terms of water demand, we will require about 400 billion gallons per day. In other words, during the quarter century period from 1950 to 1975 we will more than double our water requirement.

Thus it should be apparent that plans must be made now to meet these increased needs.

When you consider the time required to develop a major project—3 years or more for planning, then 8 to 10 years for construction—it is evident that it is none too early to start projects needed and justified now. They will become critically urgent long before they can be completed on an economical program. Crash programs should be avoided if at all possible, since they are always more expensive than necessary, and frequently do not provide for the optimum use of the site.

And yet, in the face of all this data, how is the present administration meeting the known demand for resource development? It has not only failed to recommend funds to start surveys, plans, or new projects that are needed now, but last year built into the budget a planned slowdown which would delay the benefits of the projects underway as well as increase their ultimate cost.

As you all know, last year when the Congress added some new starts for planning and construction, there was a terrific blast from the White House.

On September 2, 1958, the President reluctantly signed the public works appropriation bill. At that time he issued the following statement:

"In the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1959, the Congress has included approximately $39 million in funds to initiate construction on 65 unbudgeted new project starts that will ultimately cost almost $700 million. Adding nearly $700 million to the already heavy future commitments for Federal water resource projects is but another instance of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds. I am compelled to approve the act, however, because it appropriates essential funds for continuing work on river and harbor, flood control, and reclamation projects that were started in previous years."

When you consider that the appropriation for construction in the 1959 act was approximately $870 million, was it really an act of irresponsibility in the expenditure of public funds to start new projects which will ultimately cost nearly $700 million? That is adding less than 1 year's future commitment at the present rate of construction.

Unless it is the desire of the administration that the water resource program wither and die on the vine—and that may be the underlying reason—a fair number of new starts should be added each year.

Perhaps those shortsighted planners in the Budget Bureau believe that the Federal Government is spending too large a portion of its budget in developing the water resources of this Nation. Let us examine the facts.

Between 1950 and 1956 our national population increased 11.2 percent. Between 1950 and 1956 the national income increased 42 percent. During the same period the expenditures for rivers and harbors and flood control decreased 14.9 percent.

I believe those figures are very significant.

As all of you know, construction costs have increased on an average of 5 percent a year. If that average is applied to the 1950 expenditure of $627 million, we should be spending about $908 million in 1959 on the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers in order to maintain the same level of operations as in 1950. In contrast, the appropriation was just under $814 million. This comparison disregards the increased need for these public works resulting from our expanding population.

What is the situation in your own backyard—the Middle Atlantic Division of the Corps of Engineers?

The 1960 budget requests $37,448,000 for the continuation of construction on 13 projects. Of these 13 projects, 7 would be completed with the funds requested in 1960. If the budget were to follow its usual course, the 1961 request would be for approximately $24,294,000 for the continuation of six projects, of which three would be completed with the funds requested. By 1962 the budget request would be $21,511,000 for three projects, of which two would be completed with the funds requested. Thereafter you could expect about $13.75 million for the next 2 years to complete the Delaware River Channel.

Had it not been for the new starts added by the Congress, or had the President been granted the item veto he requests, the picture would be even more bleak.

I believe that one of the most vital interests of your association is the improvement and betterment of the 525 miles of the New York State Barge Canal System. This is probably the largest State-owned canal system in the United States. The foresight of the people of the great State of New York in the early 1800's in building this canal has always had my admiration. The part it played in the development of your Empire State and the rest of the United States, particularly the Middle West, cannot be overestimated.

I am aware that efforts are being made to amend the constitution of New York State to permit the legislature to lease or transfer the barge canal to the Federal Government. As I understand the situation, legislation authorizing such transfer passed the legislature in 1958 and similar legislation, now pending, must be adopted this year in order that the proposal may be submitted to the voters in a referendum. Certainly there is a real need for a modern barge canal system, and I am pleased to note that the State legislators are studying the problem of the future of this waterway. It certainly demonstrates a healthy interest by the State of New York in waterway improvements.

The thought expressed in certain quarters as to the reduced future need or role of this system in the overall transportation requirements of the Middle West and Northeastern United States, in view of the early opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, may be giving some of you apprehension as to the continued interest of the United States in its improvement. While initially there may be some minor traffic for overseas destinations that will be diverted to the new seaway, the system will continue to be a vital artery of commerce to serve the large number of industrial centers which the existence of the barge canal itself helped to create and expand. The seaway will doubtless generate new enterprises and activities which may make your canal system even more vital to the continued growth of the State of New York and the Nation at large.

I can assure you that many Members of the Congress are aware of the continued importance of this system to the welfare of the Nation. This is evidenced by the Federal participation in its modernization as authorized in the River and Harbor Acts of 1935 and again in 1945. It is regretted that the national crisis of the Second World War and the Korean situation made necessary a slowdown of this improvement. I was pleased that last year, through the efforts of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, we were able to give this project a boost by providing an additional unbudgeted $800,000 to the budget estimate of $110,000 in order that a start could be made on replacing a pair of guard gates at Waterford.

In 1935 deepening between locks and the raising of bridges were authorized. Of the 65 bridges to be raised, 42 have been or are being raised and the deepening was completed in 1941 with only some widening at structures remaining to be done. The 1945 act approved deepening through the locks. The sills of 18 locks have been or are in the process of being lowered with 9 locks or structures still remaining to be done.

The Corps of Enginers has been directed to restudy the project with a view of eliminating the restriction in the 1935 act on overall expenditure by the Federal Government and to determine what further improvement might be justified.

Under the present Federal project, the responsibility for preparing specifications and designs rests with the Department of Public Works of the State of New York. Such plans must then be approved by the Corps of Engineers. Contracts are then let by the Department of Public Works of New York and finally, disbursement of Federal funds is authorized by the Corps of Engineers when the work is completed to reimburse the State for expenditures under the contract. Due to the fact that the organization responsible for planning and construction of the project is not the agency that supports the budget request, I fear that the importance of early obligation and expenditure of funds is not fully appreciated.

I recall several occasions when it was impossible to obtain even the budget estimate for this project because funds for the previous year had not been obligated at the time of the hearings.

Your State officials have demonstrated their faith and confidence in the future of their canal system in proceeding with the improvement with State funds pending future appropriation by the Congress.

For years, New York Harbor has had two unique river and harbor activities: the supervision of New York Harbor function and the collection of drift, with which I have become familiar during appropriation hearings. The vast quantity of waste materials generated here surely needs adequate surveillance to insure its proper and legal disposal. The hazard of drift and its damaging effect on boat operation is known to me. I trust our appropriations for these activities have been adequate. If not—show us why.

You have many other interesting and important projects in this area, which are sometimes difficult to follow, since New York Harbor is not included as a whole in one Federal project, but is made up of about 35 projects. Your Kills, or New York and New Jersey Channels project, now nearing completion and again being studied for further improvement; the Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers area, largely completed except for the Hackensack, but needing further study due to your Port of New York Authority's development at Newark and Elizabeth; the Buttermilk Channel that needs completion; the Pierhead Channel in upper bay; and the many smaller channels and harbors. You are truly a series of ports within ports, any one of which in itself warrants the concern, interest and attention of the Federal Government. However, all of these features suffer by reason of the no-new-start policy of the administration.

Unless some of the review studies for modernization of these waterways are permitted to be started, you may have to wait 4 or 5 years before you can start some of the improvements that are needed today.

Another important project in this area is the deepening of the Hudson River, from 27 to 32 feet up to Albany, N.Y. Last year the Senate, following the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee, approved funds to initiate this important modernization of the Hudson River. Unfortunately,

this appropriation did not survive the House-Senate conference. I am hopeful that this project can be started in fiscal year 1960.

There are many other projects I could discuss, but those mentioned are vastly important—important not only to the people of New York, but to those of the entire Nation as well.

To plagiarize a phrase often used, I believe that what is good for New York is good for the country, just as I also believe that what is good for Louisiana is also good for the country.

That is why my temper rises and my blood boils when I hear the all too familiar label of "pork barrel" placed on public works projects. These shortsighted mudslingers have no conception of the good that flows to our entire Nation as a result of such pragrams.

A channel in New York is deepened, and as a result, increased trade pours into Pennsylvania. A harbor in Louisiana is completed and there is an increased demand for Iowa corn, Pittsburgh steel, and so on.

These are the true end results of public work programs—increased trade and activity which will continue to keep our country great and at the forefront of nations.

That is why I cannot understand the position of the present administration. It is not possible for me to accept the thesis that the American economy cannot afford the expenditure of funds for projects which will eventually produce more wealth for all of us.

Efforts to cut down our public works programs are merely shortsighted attempts to curtail spending that in the long run will just cost the American people more money. If the administration is so eager to cut down Federal spending I invite its attention to the trimming of our foreign aid program.

As you are aware, the Congress has been asked to cut back of public works expenditures for next year, while in the next breath, the administration has requested a 26 percent increase in our foreign aid programs.

Perhaps one way to obtain adequate public works programs—and I might add, without the benefit of justification and the close watch of the Corps of Engineers over projects—is to secede from the Union and ask for foreign aid.

If this situation were not so serious it would be farcical. We have an administration that on the one hand is attempting to slowly stifle the progress made in recent years in the development of our waterways, and on th other hand, willingly pours money with both hands into foreign countries.

I repeat, our public works programs are investments in the future of America, and I for one, know of no better place to invest our money, our faith, and our efforts.

I believe the time has come for the Members of Congress—and the entire Nation as well—to stand up and demand that the administration take a new look at its public works policy—or else prepare for the entrance of a new administration that will.

## The Massive Irresponsibility of the Spenderc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks I made before the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers on February 26, entitled "The Massive Irresponsibility of the Spenders," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MASSIVE IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE SPENDERS

(Address by U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, before the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers, Columbus, Ohio, February 26, 1959)

Just a few days ago we Americans observed the birthday of the Father of our Country, George Washington. I am frequently amazed at how the words of really great men ring true generations after their time. Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Thomas Jefferson—even today their philosophies serve us as a guiding light.

So it is with George Washington. I sometimes think that his Farewell Address should be framed and hung in the office of every Senator and Congressman in Washington, for it offers some very sound advice.

Among his words in that address were these: "As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit."

He admonished the Nation to use credit as sparingly as possible and to avoid the accumulation of debt not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

Now, that's a fairly simple formula. The following of it is what takes courage. Political courage.

I am sadly reminded of those words as I observe the spending orgy now underway in Congress. The budget-busters are going at it hammer and tongs, determined to spend more and more of your tax dollars on the theory that a little bit of inflation is good for the country.

Some observers have expressed the opinion that Congress has reflected the views of the people by approving increased domestic expenditures. They believe the people generally have taken the attitude that if the United States can afford to spend billions for military and economic aid to foreign countries, then they, as taxpayers, want to get as many benefits as possible under domestic programs.

Whether this was a correct estimate of the opinion held by a majority of the people or not, one is entitled to suspect that it was the basis on which the 2d session of the Democratic-controlled 85th Congress permitted:

1. A deficit of $12.9 billion;

2. The public debt limit to be raised from $275 billion to $288 billion temporarily and to $283 billion permanently; and

3. Nondefense spending for fiscal 1959 to be increased by $5.3 billion against an increase of $2 billion for defense purposes.

The fact is that total national defense spending planned for fiscal 1959 will be $4.3 billion under fiscal 1953's defense budget of $52.6 billion. On the other hand, nondefense expenditures in 1959 are estimated at $9.2 billion above the 1953 level of $21.7 billion.

In the face of the growing public debt, such extravagance has no place in the budget of a prudent government any more than it would fit into the budget of a prudent family.

Let's consider the Federal budget in everyday terms.

A family budget, operated in the same manner as the Federal budget, would mean that the family started out fiscal 1959 with a debt of more than four times its annual income. Following the Federal trend that family would face its financial situation by obligating itself to spend more than $1.08 for every $1 income received during the year. No sound financial institution would accept a note signed by a member of a family in such a condition.

As a matter of fact no family and no business or industry could ever get into such a dire financial situation with private financing. They would be considered broke long before ever reaching such a status.

In the light of such a situation we currently have before us the even sorrier spectacle of certain leaders in Congress practically hand tooling an economic disaster.

If the budget is unbalanced the result will be higher taxes for everyone. And if the revenues to balance the spending are not collected by the Government then the people of this country are in for a period of inflation that could push the cost of living upward and make your dollar worth less and less.

There are several bills coming up for consideration in Congress that involve spending more billions than the budget provides. Those behind this legislation seem to feel that the country doesn't care and the sky's the limit on public spending as long as you hang a "welfare" tag on it.

I can't think of many things that would please the Kremlin gang more than to see the economy of this country weakened from within by irresponsible fiscal policies. Deficit spending and lending, if continued, will lead us straight into the Russian trap envisaged by Lenin, who said: "We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

A nation can hang itself on the gallows of excessive public debt—and we are no exception.

Some people would have us believe that the Federal Treasury is a bottomless grab-bag which never needs to be conserved or replenished. Because of this attitude we have seen the national debt soar to dizzying heights. The Federal debt in December 1958, was $283 billion—about $7,000 per family in the United States.

In about 25 years our expanding Federal Government has boosted the average family's tax bill from $120 to $1,600 a year.

We don't often hear these facts.

As I mentioned earlier, this current fiscal year the Federal deficit is estimated at nearly $13 billion—the Government is spending nearly $13 billion more than its receipts. For the coming fiscal year the President has presented a budget of $77 billion. It is a balanced budget, even though it is the biggest peacetime budget in our history.

Yet some critics have called it a skinflint budget. Actually, as the President himself said, it will "help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, an outstanding authority on fiscal policy, has said: "Our free-enterprise democracy is the greatest economic system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and it must never be overlooked. The system is based on solvent government and sound money. It is in this requirement that we have allowed ourselves to become weak." To those words I say "Amen."

We cannot spend our way into prosperity. Nor can we preserve our prosperity and our free-enterprise system by following a reckless policy of spending beyond our income in peacetime.

The vital necessity of sound fiscal policy is illustrated by the constantly increasing prices of military equipment. Even allowing for the obvious fact that the new weapons and equipment are much more sensitive, powerful, effective, and, therefore, more expensive than the items they are replacing, the truth is that a good deal of inflation is already built into their extremely high costs.

Let me give you a few examples of the rising prices of what is known as military hardware. The B–29 heavy bomber at the end of World War II cost about $600,000. The all-jet B–52 intercontinental bomber of today costs about $8 million.

During World War II, a submarine cost about $4.7 million. The Polaris submarine will cost about $90 million.

Rockets and missiles are expensive, too. It is estimated that the cost of developing

ballistic missiles to an operational state will be a good deal more than twice the cost of developing the first atom bomb.

Does this mean that unlimited Federal spending is inevitable? Should we just give up in our attempts to keep the budget within reasonable bounds? If that were so, then we would already have lost the battle to stay free.

But it is not so. Most of our problem thus far has been that the great majority of our people have not been aware of the dangers they face from even bigger Government and irresponsible fiscal planning.

We must wake up. We must alert the various forces in our citizenry to make sure of two things:

First, whatever funds are needed for defense, for space exploration, and for other essential military and civilian purposes must be provided, and provided soundly.

Second, waste, duplication, continuation of governmental services no longer needed must be eliminated and eliminated promptly.

We must live within our income. We must keep our economy sound. It cannot be done by going further into debt. We must maintain fiscal integrity.

This is the road to commonsense, the road to a sound defense—a sound defense against the enemies of freedom, both at home and abroad.

The Federal debt is only a part of the whole U.S. fiscal picture. When we add up our total debt—the net debt owed by Federal, State, and local governments, by business and by individuals—the sum is staggering—$758 billion. It has almost doubled since the end of World War II.

Personal income after taxes is the highest it has ever been. Yet, both mortgage debt and consumer debt have been increasing. In 1958 alone, mortgage debt outstanding went up nearly $15 billion.

At the end of 1958, consumer, or personal, debt totaled nearly $45 billion—seven times what it was 20 years ago. A few years ago only one family out of three had any consumer debt. Now more than half have such obligations.

Worse still, the majority of persons with such personal debt have no liquid assets to fall back on.

We can readily see what a terrible thing inflation is by what it has done to the people of France. In that country the cost of living today is 37 times what it was about 30 years ago.

A pound of butter that cost 10 francs in 1927 is 410 francs today.

Men who put aside savings for substantial annuities find that their pensions are worth only 15 percent of what they were in 1940.

The pensions of French veterans of World War I—pensions once considered adequate—have depreciated to a value of 70 cents a month.

Don't say it can't happen here. The people of France never thought it would happen there.

I do not mean to say that all debt is bad. Of course not. Sound business debt is one of the elements of growth. Sound mortgage credit is a real help to a family that must borrow for a farm or a home.

But is it not apparent that in the areas of both public and personal debt these limitations of soundness are being disregarded by all too many of our citizens?

This matter is of vital concern to all of us, but especially to our younger citizens. They will live under the hysteria of inflation throughout the rest of their lives—if it is not checked now.

They will carry the load of our rising debt, and its growing interest payments—if we go on spending beyond our income.

They and their children will pay the bill that will inevitably be rendered by a continuing fiscal irresponsibility—and it will, I fear, be a bill compounded in hardship and heartache.

Inflation has already robbed our dollar, savings, pensions, annuities, insurance policies, social security, etc., of more than one-half of their purchasing power and real value. It has increased the cost of Government more than 100 percent, thereby raising taxes more than 100 percent. As the dollar buys less and less each year, the cost of national defense rises more and more, thereby seriously crippling this country and the free world in their life-and-death struggle for survival against the disciplined forces of communism.

Since our Government has gone in debt more than all the other governments in the world and since Congress continues to spend more money than it takes in, the money obligations of our Government have been falling in value year by year for a long time.

If this keeps up for a few more years our money will be worthless and the savings of our people for old age, sickness and for their children will be wiped out. It is a certainty—if Congress continues its spending spree. If there is any doubt about this, I suggest reading the history of nations in ancient and modern times. The handwriting is on the wall for all to see but the blind.

This is a period in the early stages of inflation when the owners of equities such as stocks, land, and commodities appear to either hold their own or profit from inflation. This doesn't last long. As history shows, the owners of such equities are finally wiped out.

Under inflation, stocks earn less and less dividends and ultimately their value is based on dividends. Taxes on real property mount ever higher because of inflation until it makes ownership of real property unprofitable. In France and Germany, where inflation was unchecked, the people vainly sought refuge through every type of investment. They all came to the same end—bankruptcy.

Our country is at peace. The economists predict one of the best business years ever. We're all going to make more money, there will be longer fishtails on our automobiles, bigger screens on our television sets, and more chrome-plated gadgets in the kitchen for the little woman.

It sounds just dandy, but I think it would be wise in these times to take a hard look at just where we're headed and see if we are not living in some sort of fool's paradise. Perhaps, as the Chinese say, it is only temporary.

I do know one thing for sure—the massive irresponsibility now being displayed in Congress is definitely not the answer. I think it's about time those elected to high office thought less about winning popularity contests back home and faced up to the responsibility of doing—and voting for—what is best for the country as a whole.

This country faces a challenge greater than any it has ever known. For a nation with so marvelous a heritage to destroy itself by robbing Peter to pay Paul is unthinkable.

We must keep America free and strong—economically, socially, and spiritually—so that our way of life may endure. There is no other way. This is your challenge and mine—a challenge to every American no matter who or what he may be.

---

## In Defense of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of Mrs. Frank S. Phillips, vice president of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, delivered before the board on February 18, 1959, in refuting the half-truths and glaring omissions found in the South volume of the "Life in America" textbook series. Mrs. Phillips is to be commended for the courage and forthrightness with which she sets the record straight.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MRS. ARCADIA NEAR PHILLIPS BOARD MEETING, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

I direct my remarks to the "Life in America" series which, according to the typewritten notes pasted in the front of each book, are to be used "to interest the class in exploring this section of the United States—in learning more about its people." I hope, Mr. Superintendent, that the policy is not to select a series of books without examining the merits of each member of the series.

On the flyleaf of the New England book the author is described as writing of his native New England with authority. Most of the books seem to be written in a sympathetic and enthusiastic vein. Certainly if the pupil is to be inspired, the author must be inspired.

However, the flyleaf of the book on the South describes this author as associated with a small college in the Midwest and known as an authority on Indiana writers. The writer shows little enthusiasm and has a stilted and uninteresting style. His report contains certain half-truths and glaring omissions which certainly does not serve to stimulate interest in this section of our country. I will mention a few.

On page 24, he refers to conditions after the Civil War. I quote: "Many white southerners had never worked at all. Thirty years passed before new factories and improved farming brought better days to the South." He does not mention the poverty and destitution left in the wake of the war.

John Spencer Bassett, professor of American History at Smith College in a "Short History of the United States," page 469, says "* * * four-fifths of the heads of families were not slaveholders * * *. The South had no more shiftless and lazy men than other communities * * * The industry and resourcefulness with which these people restored their fortunes * * * shows that they were of the genuine American stock, and were sound in mind and morals".

On page 78 of the book on the South the author says, speaking of the old South: * * * Some of her colleges were great; but there were not enough of them, and only the wealthy could attend * * *."

Professor Bassett says on page 479: "It was in this period that the State university took form. * * *

"The process was first seen in the founding of State universities, in North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and South Carolina and in the reorganization of the University of Pennsylvania on a State basis, all of which occurred between 1779 and 1815[1] * * *.

"During the period of western and southern expansion, the older institutions of the Northeast developed hardly as much as might have been expected. Largely devoted to preparing men for the professions, most of their students came from the leisure class in the North and South. * * * The rapid growth of the eastern seats of learning, with which the present generation is so familiar, came after the Civil War."

So why not give the old South its due. In some aspects, it was ahead of other areas; certainly its faults were not unique.

---

[1] North Carolina, 1795; Tennessee, 1794; Georgia, 1801; South Carolina, 1801.

I will make this further point: Though there is strong emphasis in the books on New England and the Northeast on the matter of educational facilities, New York particularly being pointed out as leading the Nation in the number of institutions of higher learning, I want the record to show that 8 of the 11 States of the South have more colleges in relation to their size than any of the 6 States of the Northeast group.

Also, though 9 of the first 12 Presidents of the United States were from the South (7 were from Virginia and 2 were from North Carolina), no mention of this was made in the book.

The book dismisses the contributions of the South to literature by saying "Before the Civil War the greatest writings the South produced about the Government especially the writing of Thomas Jefferson." Nothing further is said about literature. But Reuben Post Halleck, in "History of American Literature," page 335, says: "In modern southern fiction there is to be found some of the most imaginative, artistic and romantic work of the entire country in the latter quarter of the 19th century." No one need apologize for the literary efforts of Edgar Allen Poe, Sidney Lanier, Thomas Nelson Page, Joel Chandler Harris, O'Henry, William Faulkner, Frank L. Stanton ("Just a Wearyin' For You" and "Mighty Lak' a Rose") or Margaret Mitchell ("Gone With the Wind").

| Colleges | Number | Population | Ratio: 1 college to— |
|---|---|---|---|
| NORTHEAST | | | |
| New York | 146 | 16, 195, 000 | 110, 000 |
| Pennsylvania | 115 | 10, 964, 000 | 95, 000 |
| New Jersey | 38 | 5, 403, 000 | 142, 000 |
| Delaware | 4 | 402, 000 | 100, 000 |
| Maryland | 33 | 2, 812, 000 | 85, 000 |
| West Virginia | 22 | 1, 983, 000 | 90, 000 |
| NEW ENGLAND | | | |
| Connecticut | 29 | 2, 232, 000 | 77, 000 |
| Rhode Island | 11 | 828, 000 | 75, 000 |
| Massachusetts | 70 | 4, 812, 000 | 68, 000 |
| Vermont | 14 | 370, 000 | 26, 000 |
| New Hampshire | 8 | 560, 000 | 70, 000 |
| Maine | 15 | 910, 000 | 60, 000 |
| SOUTH | | | |
| Virginia | 45 | 3, 651, 000 | 80, 000 |
| North Carolina | 57 | 4, 423, 000 | 77, 000 |
| South Carolina | 30 | 2, 353, 000 | 78, 000 |
| Georgia | 48 | 3, 712, 000 | 77, 000 |
| Florida | 23 | 3, 770, 000 | 164, 000 |
| Alabama | 27 | 3, 135, 000 | 116, 000 |
| Mississippi | 38 | 2, 124, 000 | 55, 000 |
| Louisiana | 20 | 3, 004, 000 | 150, 000 |
| Kentucky | 37 | 3, 017, 000 | 81, 000 |
| Tennessee | 45 | 3, 466, 000 | 77, 000 |
| Arkansas | 22 | 1, 815, 000 | 82, 000 |

Source: "Life in America." All figures are latest available from U.S. Government sources. Ratio computed by Arcadia Near Phillips.

## We Believe in Prayer—It's Impossible To Overestimate the Value of Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith some extracts from a recently published book "We Believe in Prayer," a compilation of personal statements by American and world leaders about the value and efficacy of prayer, by Lawrence M. Brings, president of T. S. Denison & Co., book publishers of Minneapolis, Minn. Quoted in full is a statement by a constituent of mine, Comdr. Wendell Phillips Dodge, an explorer-ethnologist who has spent a lifetime studying the religious systems of the world at their fountainheads, especially in the Holy Land as we know it, in the Near East.

Exploring extensively there, and studying the Arabs, Syrians, Jews, Persians, and Egyptians, Commander Dodge has written extensively of these peoples and their lands, history, religion and customs. In some of his scientific reports he proves that man's first religion goes back much, much further than we are accustomed to think about. He has stated that when primitive man used a symbol it did not mean to him the object in sight, but what it represented in his mind. Symbols on the walls of the Temple of Sacred Mysteries at Uxmal, Yucatan; among the fallen ruins of some of the South Sea Islands; sacred writings carved by the Naacals—Holy Brothers—some 70,000 years ago, provide a better perspective of thought. The bases of an extremely early religion was the love and adoration of the Creator as the Heavenly Father among these ancient symbolic prayers offered up to only one Creator or Deity worshipped long before our usually recorded history mentions. Prayer symbols have been found on a stone arch on the island of Tonga-Tabu in the Pacific Ocean, on Alaskan totem poles, the House of Taga on Tinian Island, the Mariana group; the Pyramid at Xochicalco; at Anghor Vat and Ankor Thom, the great Monolith at Tiahuanaco; on a road-cut on Capital Hill, Smyrna, Asia Minor, where three civilizations 500 feet above the sea level existed before mountains were raised; yes, says Commander Dodge, symbolic stones at Anarajapura, Ceylon, and many other places in the world all clearly indicate the universality of symbols in religion and prayer.

To Commander Dodge one of the most beautiful of all is the statement of the Prophet Mohammed:

Angels come amongst you both night and day; then those of the night ascend to heaven, and God asketh them how they left His creatures: They say, "We left them at prayer, and we found them at prayer."

The statement follows:

WE BELIEVE IN PRAYER

(Compiled by Lawrence M. Brings, including "It's Impossible To Overestimate the Value of Prayer," by Wendell Phillips Dodge, F.R.G.S., explorer and ethnologist)

The object of prayer is God alone, and we should supplicate the Divine Being for the blessings we stand in need of, to enjoy fellowship with God. It does not consist in the elevation of the voice, the posture of the body, the use of a form, or the extemporary use of words, nor anything of an exterior nature; but simply the offering up of our desires to God. (Matthew 15:8): "This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me."

Secret or closet prayer is recommended by Christ (Matthew 6:6): "But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." He, himself, set us an example of it in Luke 6:12: "And it came to pass in those days, that He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God."

Prayer in the Bible is the uplifting of the heart to God. It includes supplication, intercession, thanksgiving. As an example we have Christ's prayer in Gethsemane (Mark 14:35): "And He went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible the hour might pass from Him," and (Mark 14:38): "Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit is ready, but the flesh is weak." He was wont to visit the Mount of Olives.

Among the different kinds of prayer is the ejaculatory, by which the mind is directed to God. Derived from the word ejacular, to dart or shoot out suddenly, therefore appropriate to describe this kind of prayer which is made up of short sentences, spontaneously springing from the mind. The Scriptures give us many instances of ejaculatory prayer, which may be practiced at all times and in all places. It has a tendency to support the mind and keep it in a happy frame. It fortifies us against the temptations of the world, elevates our affections to God, and directs the mind into a spirtual channel.

In one of his celebrated lectures on "Life and Religion," Max Müller said: "What can we pray for? Not for special gifts, but only for God's mercy. We do not know what is good for us, and for others. What would become of the world if all our prayers were granted? And yet it is good to pray—that is, to live in all our joys and sorrows with God, with whom we cannot reason, but whom we can love and trust. Human misery, outward and inward, is certainly a great problem, and yet one knows from one's own life how just the heaviest burdens have been blessings. The soul must be furrowed if it is to bear fruit."

The dying words of Tennyson's Arthur, "More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of," clearly shows that it is not possible to overestimate the value of prayer. Prayer is efficacious. It has power with God. It brings great blessings. Nothing that men can do has so vast an influence.

"O Lord, my God. Assist Thy loved ones to be firm in Thy faith, to walk in Thy ways, to be steadfast in Thy cause. Give them Thy grace to withstand the onslaught of self and passion, to follow the light of divine guidance. Thou art the powerful, the gracious, the self-subsisting, the bestower, the compassionate, the Almighty, the all-bountiful. —Abdul Baha.

INTRODUCTION

In his introduction, Lawrence M. Brings writes, in part:

"Civilized man has always engaged in the practice of prayer. Practically every religion of the world recognizes the existence of a Supreme Being to whom its adherents pay homage and offer prayers of thankfulness and supplication. For man realizes that he is a finite being and that he needs the guidance and help of God if he is to live his earthly existence in the sight and glory of God. That this attitude of prayer has become engrained in his very nature is evidenced by the utterance of such simple expressions in daily conversation as 'I wish' or 'I hope.' These phrases are little prayers and indicate how dependent we are upon a power beyond ourselves.

"With advances made in scientific and industrial development, with an emphasis being placed on material things, with a guarantee given by government to every citizen for a security from the cradle to the grave, is it necessary any longer for man to feel dependent upon God? Since it is apparent

in many instances that he has forgotten the fact that God still rules the universe, I became curious to discover to what extent people believe in prayer today.

"I decided to poll certain leaders of America and of the world, asking them to express their views about the value and efficacy of prayer based upon their own experience and observation. No attempt was made to ascertain their religious or denominational background, or even to select individuals from whom I might expect a favorable reply.

"Letters were sent to hundreds of topflight people in many diversified areas of human endeavor. The response was overwhelming. I was surprised that so many persons occupying positions of achievement and responsibility would take the time to write a special statement for this book, giving their personal testimony about the power of prayer as experienced by them. In this book you will find proof that prayer is a potent force in the lives of thousands of our leaders."

## The Objectives of International Economic Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered last week here in Washington by Ambassador B. K. Nehru, the Commissioner-General for Economic Affairs of India. This is a most thoughtful and suggestive public statement which places in realistic perspective the common opportunities which exist for a more effective international assistance program. This statement deserves the attention of all persons who with Ambassador Nehru share both a professional and humane concern for the economic need of less developed nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OBJECTIVES OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

(Speech by His Excellency B. K. Nehru, Commissioner-General for Economic Affairs, India, before the first annual international conference of the Society for International Development, Washington, D.C., February 27, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, I feel greatly honored that the Society for International Development should have invited me to speak to its members at this their first annual conference. It is not often that a representative of a government gets the opportunity of being able to speak as a professional to fellow professionals without being hemmed in by considerations of governmental attitudes or fears of intergovernmental complications. And yet, it is only natural that those of us who are actively associated with the day-to-day problems of international development should wish to compare notes among ourselves. It is not possible to work for long in any field of human endeavor without developing some thoughts and ideas as to how existing institutions, practices and approaches could be improved. And I take it that it is precisely for providing a forum for exchanging such ideas that the Society for International Development has been established. I, therefore, particularly welcome this opportunity of placing before you a few thoughts and ideas on foreign economic assistance, shedding for the moment my diplomatic and representative capacity and talking professionally in plain, simple and nondiplomatic language.

One of the most remarkable developments in recent times, Mr. Chairman, is the growth of an international approach to the problem of poverty and want in the world at large. All too often we tend to forget that even at a national level it is only during the last 50 years or so that governments have explicitly accepted it as their duty to abolish poverty within the limits of their jurisdictions. It is only since the beginning of the present century that the major preoccupation of national states has been increasing with the material welfare of all their citizens. Policies have been followed leading to the deliberate transference of wealth from the richer sections of the population to the poorer and from the richer areas to the poorer and to the deliberate development of depressed areas in preference to developed areas. It is not surprising, therefore, that it is only since the end of the Second World War, that the same reasoning which led to the welfare activities of nation states has been recognized as equally valid on the international plane. The realization that the world owes to its citizens freedom from want, that prosperity like peace is indivisible, and that only by the deliberate cooperation and assistance of the richer nations can others less fortunate succeed in guaranteeing quickly to their citizens a decent level of living, is exceedingly new. And yet, it is quite amazing how quickly the conscience of humanity has been struck by the anomaly of extreme, grinding and miserable poverty in the midst of luxurious plenty and how in this very short period foreign aid programs of various kinds have developed with the object of ameliorating and curing this position. I should like at this point, if I may, to pay a genuine tribute to the part that your country has played in the awakening of the human conscience in this regard. The fact that U.S. assistance to foreign countries has far out-distanced similar assistance given by other countries can perhaps be explained in part by the comparative prosperity of this country. But the tribute I should like to pay is to the attitudes which motivate American action in this field; for nowhere as I wander around the earth do I find the intense interest and generous and selfless dedication to this cause as I find in this country.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, the conception that the richer parts of the world should help the poorer in order to enable them to develop their economies is a very new one; and what I would wish to suggest is that the time has now come to formulate clearly the objectives of foreign economic assistance and to define the manner in which these objectives can be most quickly achieved. These are questions to which, not at all surprisingly, enough thought has not been given. Foreign economic assistance is administered at present through a number of agencies, both national and international, and it takes time before even a single institution acquires a clear perception of its own rationale. There has been the general feeling that there are vast areas where human misery is so great that it requires immediate amelioration; there has also been the feeling that the resources which the richer societies are willing to spare for this task are so small that the task cannot be adequately performed. When demand outruns the supply and there is no market mechanism to bring the two into equilibrium, the rational method of allocating supply is through a system of priorities. Foreign aid has been given to almost every country in the world for a variety of complicated reasons and it is never clear why one country has received more and another less except that the pull of a number of conflicting forces at the centers from which foreign aid emanates has at a particular moment resulted in that particular resultant. I would submit that it is high time to work out a rationale for these aid programs, to be clear about what we want to achieve with them and to decide in the light of these objectives what is the best possible use for the limited funds that may be available for the purpose.

The question I have just raised would, of course, be answered most readily by those who believe that economic development should be left entirely as the responsibility of private capital and enterprise. It is an article of faith in some quarters in the United States as in other countries that the creation of wealth is the function of private enterprise and it follows from this belief that resources should flow from the richer to the poorer countries in such amount and direction as are dictated by considerations of private profit alone. I have no doubt in my mind that private enterprise has an important role to play in the development of less developed regions and that it is the duty of countries wanting capital from abroad to get as much of it as they possibly can from the stocks of the capital available in private hands. But I think it is equally obvious that the needs of underdeveloped countries cannot be met by private capital alone. What is wanted in these countries at this moment is the development of the infrastructure of economic growth, the development of roads and railways and power, of irrigation and agriculture in none of which fields does present day private foreign enterprise have any interest. Furthermore, the conditions in which private foreign enterprise is willing to work are not generally available in the underdeveloped world. Neither absolute security nor large profits nor their transferability can generally be assured by underdeveloped countries. If they could, these countries would hardly be underdeveloped and the whole problem would not exist.

For the same reason, I think, it is equally clear that we cannot rely on normal concepts of creditworthiness for defining the priorities to be observed in foreign aid programs. The concept of bankable projects and the mobilization of capital for financing such projects through international and national institutions have played a valuable part in promoting the development of less developed countries in recent years. But the existence of a number of programs for assistance on a government-to-government level and the search for institutions to make "soft" loans are, I think, reminders enough of the fact that the problem of priorities to which I have referred cannot be solved in terms of some precise calculations of creditworthiness of different countries even if such calculations were possible.

Does this mean then that in the administration of foreign aid programs we should deviate completely from the criterion of economic ability or ability to make profitable use of aid and rely solely on the measurement of the needs of the developing countries? Many of you will recall that some years ago the United Nations established an expert committee to make recommendations for the special U.N. Fund for Economic Development and that the committee approached their task in terms of the needs of the underdeveloped countries as a whole. The committee argued that given the savings potential of underdeveloped countries and the need of these countries to develop at a certain rate, the transfer of resources from the richer to the poorer countries must proceed at a certain pace. The figure of the capital required was so shockingly high that it became the fashion in polite society not even to mention

it for fear that those who were willing to help in the task of economic development might be frightened away by its enormity. I do not presume to question the figures which these eminent experts put into their reports; but it is clear that their approach begs the whole question of priorities in that it fails to take into account the real limits on the funds which the richer countries are willing or able to put at the disposal of the poorer countries.

What is even more important, the approach of the U.N. experts misses the fundamental point that even if the richer countries were willing to spare the sums they had in mind, it would be wholly impossible for the underdeveloped world today to absorb in productive enterprise even a fraction of that money. The term "underdeveloped country," it has to be recognized, is a wide generic term covering a vast variety of different conditions each of which requires separate treatment. The limitations to economic growth differ from country to country and area to area, and it is by no means always shortage of capital which restricts economic growth. Before capital can be usefully employed, there has to be a certain political stability, the presence of a stable and reasonably efficient administration, managerial and technical know-how, and organizational capacity and it is only when these factors are available that capital can usefully be invested in any area. As one looks around the underdeveloped world, one finds that in large parts of it the basic factors requisite for rapid economic growth unfortunately do not exist and, therefore, the first thing that the outside world can do is to help in their creation. It is only after these conditions have emerged or at least have begun to emerge that injections of outside capital can be of use.

This realization was, of course, the basis for the establishment of technical assistance programs. But the tendency to equate one underdeveloped country with another has caused it often to be assumed that the provision of technical assistance, perhaps with a certain moderate degree of capital assistance, is the right recipe for all underdeveloped countries. The basic point I wish to place before you is that the failure to take into account the different needs of countries at different stages of development is the root cause of a great deal of irrationality in foreign aid programs and that the recognition of the divergent needs of different countries contains the key to the solution of the problem of priorities about which I spoke a moment ago. Once it is recognized that each underdeveloped country has problems of its own which are not wholly duplicated anywhere else, it would follow that foreign aid programs should be tailormade and not mass produced, that certain countries should get, because they need it, very much more technical assistance than others and that others, because they can use it, should get very much more capital. I should imagine that if it were a prerequisite of capital assistance that the conditions precedent for its productive use had already been established and also that the country concerned had taken all possible measures to mobilize its own capital resources, there would be few countries in the world today who could usefully absorb large sums of foreign capital while there would be some whose legitimate demands would be very substantial indeed. The distribution of technical and capital assistance in relation to the absorptive capacity of the countries concerned would at once direct aid where it could produce the best results without neglecting the claims of any region and without involving any waste of resources.

At present, both capital assistance and technical assistance, particularly the former, are spread so thinly over so wide a field that their effects though not negligible tend to get lost in the vast desert of need. One cannot today foresee the end of any foreign-aid program; while an indefinite continuation of aid is both unpleasant to the donor and harmful to the recipient. We must guard against the creation of a class of perpetual pensioners and, above all, prevent the growth of a mentality which looks forever to the outside world for help. It seems to me that the objective of any foreign-aid program should be to enable the economy which is receiving the aid to become self-supporting and to make its further growth self-generating in the shortest practicable time. Once the point has been reached at which the economy can by its own efforts develop itself, foreign capital assistance should stop and be diverted to economies where conditions may be ready for this stage of economic development. What I urge in short is that instead of distributing the resources that are available for this purpose on an arbitrary ad hoc unplanned basis, or even on the basis of the existence or nonexistence of projects, the whole of the foreign assistance programs should be so arranged as to enable economy after economy to be brought to what my friend Professor Rostow calls the point of takeoff into self-sustained growth. This would mean a change in the system of allocation of foreign-aid funds for it would involve massive capital assistance to some countries for a comparatively short period of time, with the possibility of ending that assistance very much in sight.

The approach to foreign-aid programs that I have just outlined is essentially the same as was embodied in the Marshall plan for European recovery. The diversion of massive American assistance to Europe during 1948–52 was justified, not in terms of the urgency of Europe's needs relatively to the needs of other regions, but in view of the quick results expected therefrom in Europe and the possibility of Europe being able to dispense with further aid in a comparatively short period. I think it is no exaggeration to say that the prestige and growing acceptance of foreign-aid programs in recent years owes not a little to the impressive demonstration given by the Marshall plan of what such programs can actually do. Foreign-aid programs designed primarily to launch an increasing number of countries on to the orbit of self-sustained growth have also the added advantage that they make it possible for more and more countries to contribute toward the development of less developed countries so that the progress of the latter becomes cumulatively more rapid. The European countries assisted by the Marshall plan are already playing a significant role in providing developmental resources to the rest of the world and it should, I think, be the responsibility of all countries who have succeeded in achieving a satisfactory rate of growth to set apart some of their own resources for furthering the progress of others. Indeed, even those underdeveloped countries which are at a somewhat higher stage of development by virtue of their political stability or administrative and organizational ability are in an excellent position to render technical assistance to those at a different stage of development for want of those facilities. This has been the most promising aspect of the Colombo plan which has shown how widespread the scope is for exchange of technical—and even capital—assistance among the underdeveloped countries themselves. The advocacy of a more pinpointed program for foreign aid should not, therefore, be construed as hampering the growth of any particular group of countries. It is intended only to avoid the misdirection and even waste of scarce resources that result from the failure to distinguish between the different needs of countries at different stages of development so that the economic progress of the underdeveloped world as a whole is as rapid as it possibly can be over a period of time.

I should perhaps also make it quite clear at this stage that in emphasizing the need for a more rational use of the available funds for international economic assistance, I do not wish to minimize the paramount importance of increasing the overall flow of these funds. My contention only is that, while the underdeveloped world as a whole can certainly absorb productively far more sums than are available at present, the most decisive push forward in the development of the less developed countries can be given by an allocation of the available funds on the lines I have indicated.

If I may refer here to yet another result of lumping all underdeveloped countries together, it seems to me that it produces an altogether undesirable degree of rigidity in the laws governing foreign aid and in its administration. Once you begin to treat all underdeveloped countries as being made in the same image, it is only natural to apply the same uniform laws and administrative practices to all of them. But this raises, particularly with those countries which have well-established forms of government, wholly unnecessary administrative and even political problems and takes away in a measure from the good will that programs of foreign aid should generate. It would be of very great advantage all around if the administration of foreign aid could be made flexible enough to suit the varied conditions in which these programs operate, instead of everybody having to conform to regulations which are necessarily conceived to fit the least desirable conditions.

I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to take any more of your valuable time by dwelling any further on my central thesis. I hope I have succeeded in placing before you some of the questions that have often crossed my mind in regard to foreign economic assistance. If in doing so I have appeared critical of some of the present practices it is, I am sure you will appreciate, not out of lack of recognition of the real and remarkable achievement of these programs in recent years, but out of a desire to place before you some of my doubts and misgivings for your expert scrutiny in the hope that it might help in putting foreign economic assistance on an even more rational and fruitful basis in future so that the developed as well as the less developed countries can get even greater returns from their cooperative efforts to eliminate poverty and want from this world.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---

## A Suggestion for a National Floral Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the suggestions for a national flower for the United States is the rose.

A large number of very beautiful roses are grown in my own home State in the area around Tyler, Tex., and that city is known as the Rose capital of America.

Mr. Clark Kidd, a committee chairman of the Tyler Chamber of Commerce, has sent me an editorial which I now request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The edi-

torial appeared in the Tyler Morning Telegraph for Monday, February 16, 1959, under the heading "Corn, Grass, Roses."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORN, GRASS, ROSES

We were afraid something like this would happen—sex has got into the national fight over what flower—or vegetation—to adopt as the national emblem of the 49 States.

The new issue entered the controversy when the Kentucky Bankers Association recently tried to beat down the efforts of Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and other corn-State Senators to get Congress to designate the corn tassel as the national emblem.

The Kentucky group retorted that an easy way to bring the argument to a close would be simply to adopt grass as the official flower of the union. In furtherance of that suggestion, the Kentucky bankers fired in a telegram to Kentucky Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, glorifying grass and condemning the corn tassel as a symbol.

The telegram declared the corn tassel not only falls flat as a flower, but it is also nothing to brag about as the male portion of the corn plant. "For only a few days it "(the tassel) is virile, then, in its last wild rampage, it scatters its pollen to the wide ranges of the compass—then fades and dies and is gone forever."

Fortunately for the great cause of east Texans in the growing controversy, the Kentuckians have said no great evil against the rose, which remains as one of the top contenders for the national honor. The only objection against the queen of flowers the blue grass group could think of was to remind their Senator that the rose already is the chosen flower of several States and some foreign countries. From the east Texas point of view, that widespread popularity of the rose is another argument in favor of naming the rose as the national floral emblem.

The Kentuckians argue well, we believe, against the marigold, by saying simply that it smells bad.

The Kentucky bankers almost attain to Churchillian majesty of language in extolling grass for the national honor. Historically, they say, grass sustained the buffalo and deer that provided the American Indian and pioneer palefaces with food and hides, and even now it is the basic food for beef, dairy cattle, and sheep. All cereal grains—corn, wheat, oats, and barley—belong to the grass family. And, say the Kentuckians, there's nothing more beautiful and satisfying than lush, green pastures.

It's agreed here that green pastures, like mother love, are things of great beauty. If there's anything more beautiful than a green pasture, it is a field of east Texas roses glowing with every hue of the rainbow.

Vote for the rose.

## Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to participate in ceremonies conducted by the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This stirring commemoration took place in Webster Hall, New York City, and was attended by a large group of Lithuanian-Americans dedicated to the freeing of their homeland.

In my remarks on that occasion I paid tribute to the indomitable courage of the Lithuanian people and to those noble Lithuanians now enchained behind the Iron Curtain who have not allowed the flame of freedom to die. I urged all to join in a rededication to work and pray for the day when Lithuania will once more take its rightful place among the family of free nations.

At this meeting, an eloquent resolution was adopted which codifies the strong sentiments and heartfelt views of those in attendance. Because this is a document deserving of wide circulation, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 15, 1959

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, loyal citizens and residents of the United States, gathered on February 15 of this year of grace 1959 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state after a prolonged eclipse of its liberty;

Voicing once again our indignation at and our protest against the brutal suppression by the Government of the Soviet Union of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation, perpetrated at a time when Lithuania was living in peace with the U.S.S.R. and was bound to her by a peace treaty and a nonaggression pact;

Stating that the present Soviet challenge to the West, with Berlin as its direct objective, is aimed at the settlement on Soviet terms of the political problems resulting from World War II, namely, at the legalization and consolidation of Soviet criminal conquests in Europe and at creating conditions for further Communist expansion in Europe and elsewhere;

Considering that the present abnormal and dangerous situation in Europe, characterized by the division of Germany, the subjugation of nine formerly sovereign states of Central and Eastern Europe, including Lithuania, and by the division of the continent, requires an urgent and global settlement in conformity with the wartime and postwar commitments and pledges of the great powers;

Stressing the indivisibility of the problem of Central and Eastern Europe, of which the restoration of Lithuania's independence is an integral part, and of that of Germany and the European security system—these problems being the major cause of the present international tension;

*Resolve*—

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to pursue and vigorously to promote their repeatedly declared policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania and other captive countries of Central and Eastern Europe through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet Armed Forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;

2. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combat Communist aggression and Soviet Russian imperialism;

3. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom;

4. Actively to support the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing.

Dr. EUGENIJUS NOAKAS,
*President.*
J. DZIKAS, *Secretary.*

## Pennsylvania's Future: Prosperity and Big Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Harrisburg Sunday Patriot of February 8, 1959. It is the final and summation article of an excellent 27-part series on the economic future of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It has been hailed one of the best series of articles of its kind. The author of this series is George Draut, of Camp Hill, Pa. Mr. Draut is chief editorial writer for the Harrisburg Patriot and Evening News. And I might say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that with a few rare exceptions, such as when they endorse my opponent, I believe the Patriot-News' editorial pages to be one of the best in the Commonwealth.

I commend this article to the Members, and their reading of it will make them better aware of Pennsylvania's problems and its future.

PENNSYLVANIA'S FUTURE: PROSPERITY AND BIG PROBLEMS—JOBLESS AMIDST PLENTY STILL STATE'S HERITAGE FOR "GOLDEN SIXTIES"

(By George Draut)

Maybe three pieces of paper best symbolize Pennsylvania's economic past, present and future.

Maybe they best point up our Commonwealth's great big problems and its great big hopes, too, for what a lot of people say will be the "Golden Sixties."

They're legislative bills, awaiting action with more than 300 others in our general assembly.

One calls for a deficiency appropriation of $9½ million for public assistance. Before the current budget runs out at the end of May, the State wil run out of money for the flat-broke Pennsylvanians on relief.

Another one will authorize a $50 million loan from the Federal Government to bail out the State's unemployment compensation fund, so badly depleted by the long lines of laid-off Pennsylvanians during the months of the 1958 recession.

The third one calls for an additional appropriation of $1½ million in State mortgage money for industrial development. Here is one of the greatest hopes for the future and one of the brightest developments of the

present: The State ran out of loan money to help finance new industries and new jobs in the depressed areas. And there's a waiting list of new job projects, ready to go.

Here is Pennsylvania's great big problem of the present. There were still 508,000 out of work in the middle of last month. That's 11 percent of the total labor force. That's not quite double the national average.

And here still will be Pennsylvania's great big problem as the golden sixties begin. If most economists and Government brass hats are right, 1960 will be the best year the United States has ever known. Times will be good in Pennsylvania, too. This dominantly heavy industrial State rises or falls, and fast, with the national economic times.

But this boom of the first years of what may be a golden decade won't be spread fully and evenly over Pennsylvania's 45,333 square miles.

That's because of our chronically depressed areas. We have more of them, with our hard-hit coal communities, than any other State in the Nation.

And there'll be this, too, when the State and Nation are setting new economic records right and left. One of those records will be more Pennsylvanians jobless in the midst of prosperity than ever before.

And yet more Pennsylvanians working than ever before.

Along with everybody else, we're in the midst of great economic and industrial change. Exactly what is going on, or what will probably happen, depends upon which economist or Government official or industrialist or labor leader you ask. They'll give you all kinds of appraisals and answers.

But most of them agree the great technological changes that started right after the war and continue today are exerting one of the major forces in the change. More and more, the jobs of our highly technical, scientific, and complex political age demand men and women with higher levels of skills and better education.

Mixed up in this, industries are geared up for more production per worker than ever before. If a company is to survive in the tough competition here at home and face up to that ever-increasing economic challenge of so many other industrially exploding countries, friend or foe, this is an absolute necessity. So many industrial leaders tell you this. And one prominent Pennsylvania economist tells you that if the old industry in this old State is to stay alive, it can find its salvation only in drastic modernization.

Mixed up in this, there is our increasing population; more young men and women entering the labor market every year. This adds to the great big problem of more jobs needed and yet helps solve it at the same time. They're also new consumers of goods and services.

One official Government projection for the early sixties: Total employment of 4¼ million, an alltime Pennsylvania record. Total unemployment of more than 300,000, around 6 percent of our labor force, and another alltime Pennsylvania record, too, for good times.

This will confront Government at every level—in every community, in Harrisburg, in Washington—with major continuing pressures and problems, topped by that massively familiar one: higher costs and higher taxes.

For better or for worse, Pennsylvania's future is becoming increasingly tied to Big Government—State and Federal. And big companies and big unions.

In town after town the familiar family name on the factory disappears and the name of the nationally known company goes up.

Place after place, the small local union increasingly loses its identity in the great big labor organization of which it is a part.

You find chapter and verse to back up these observations. You have notebooks full of names and places.

The impact of Big Government is extraordinarily evident here in the two-county Harrisburg area, where one in every 4 workers calls Federal, State, or local government his boss.

But the impact doesn't stop there.

Big Government, especially at Washington, bedrocks so many of Pennsylvania's jobs. On direct or subcontract with someone else, private industry in plant after plant and the Pennsylvanians who work there are making and selling something to Government—from fancy electronic gizmos to chairs and desks to cans of beans.

The argument over whether this is real good or real bad for the future you'll leave to someone else. This is just pointing up the reality.

Everywhere you turn when you try to look at Pennsylvania's future you run into more Government.

More highways—not just to move the ever-increasing traffic, but as economic lifelines of trucking transportation in every area and every community of the State. Here's a big hassle for a long time.

More people, so many more people coming along in the future. They're already using up the land, right and left. One town ends and another one begins, and you never know which is which as you drive through. Massive new strip cities are building up on opposite ends of the Commonwealth. And many Pennsylvanians worry about and work for regional planning and eventually to come regional government.

More people, more jobs, more of everything?

If you tour all through the State and talk to people, so many of them over a period of long weeks, you find the guesses for the future fall into one pattern of opposing points of view. What two mid-State men say sums it up:

"You can only be optimistic. More population means more of everything—more homes, more automobiles on highways, and that means more highways."

That's Gene Gurkoff talking. He's the president of Capitol Products, the fast-growing company that came out of nowhere less than 7 years ago.

"I think to call them 'the Golden Sixties' is ridiculous. The population increase can be a liability instead of an asset if it isn't in balance with our production. * * * Our problem is money. Where will we get the money to meet the threat of Russia on the world market and at the same time achieve growth at home? It's a double-barreled headache. I don't see the answer."

That's Frank E. Masland, Jr., talking. He's the president of C. H. Masland & Sons, one of the country's major carpetmakers.

MORE PEOPLE, MORE JOBS

Industrial development is a way of life in the depressed areas. You search all available records. You make a lot of calls in the coal counties. You come up with a pinned-down great big total—$20.8 million.

That's the rockbottom amount of money Pennsylvania's depressed communities have raised on their own, among their own people, since the end of World War II.

You add on the $8,173,000 loaned out in 26 months by the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority.

And you list 223 new plants and 42,944 new jobs created just in the chronically depressed areas, overwhelmingly by community effort with a little State help.

This has been a race to stay even, finding new jobs even as more old ones evaporate in large numbers through the coalfields.

There is every indication, and hope, that in "the Golden Sixties" many a depressed community will move from minus or just even into plus, chipping away the unemployment that ran as high as one in every four of their workers last year.

These are summaries and conclusions of a reporting study that began last year.

But when more than 60,000 words have been written in 27 long stories and you are done with the immense stacks of notes and statistics and other information piled all over your desk, this isn't what you remember.

You remember people—perverse, proud, tenacious, hardworking, hard-hoping, wonderful people.

The great big executive of the great big company who walked over to his window and watched the hundreds of workers pour in and out the wide gatet at shift time. He is a stern, closemouthed, no-nonsense man. The only time his face softened in all of the time you were there was when he looked out upon his people.

The obscure, ordinary man who talked to you in the real-small, rundown town almost surrounded by forgotten, dirty, culm banks and an abandoned mine mountain. He said: "I don't know how, but we'll pull through and find jobs for our young people so they can stay here."

So many others.

They are making Pennsylvania's future far more one of prosperity and far less one of big problems.

## Democratic Victory Dinner Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made at the Democratic victory dinner in Washington, D.C., on February 28.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT, OF MONTANA, AT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 28, 1959

The automobile industry is often described as the pace setter of American industry. In other words, it occupies a position in the American economy like the Democratic Party in American politics. There's one difference. Last year the American people didn't go too well for the new cars. Last November they went, with real enthusiasm, for the Democrats.

So, tonight, we are having a victory dinner. You know, there are some people who think you can have too much of a good thing. They say, for example, "There's too many Democrats in the Senate. What's LYNDON going to do with them all?" Well, so far as I know, we don't have any Democratic unemployment in the Senate. The distinguished majority leader has put all the Democratic Members to work, and they are beginning to produce. There's no such thing as an "acceptable" level of unemployment in the Democratic Senate, just as there oughtn't to be in the Nation.

Personally, I don't think you can ever have too many Democrats at work—in the Senate or anywhere else. As a matter of fact, there's a shortage of Democrats. The country could use a lot more of them over in the other branch of the Government. I don't know about the market for automobiles. But, as far as Democrats are concerned, it won't be until 1960 that the supply will begin to catch up with the demand.

In the last few weeks we've been seeing the new automobiles on the streets of this city. They have clean, fresh lines. Some of the cars are conservative-looking. Others show liberal style changes. A few even have that futuristic look.

Not to be outdone by the automobile industry, we have our own display of 1959 Democratic models tonight. We've got four lines with us—not Fords, General Motors, Chryslers, and Ramblers. What we do have are Democratic Governors, Senators, Representatives, and Democratic presidential possibilities. We've even done something which Detroit hasn't been able to do for years. We've brought in a successful new producer—Alaska—with three new Democratic designs—all fully equipped with snowshoes.

Some of us have had an opportunity to preview the new 1959 Democratic models in the Senate. We've already looked under the hoods and tried the steering-gear and the brakes. Take it from us, the new automobiles have nothing on them. These new Democratic models may not handle as easily—take, for example, the one produced in Wisconsin—but they all do have plenty of power. As a matter of fact, some of us older rattletraps, the Model A's are beginning to wonder what the influx of these bright and shining new additions to the Senate is going to do to the used car market.

Nevertheless, we strongly commend them—all of them—to you. We urge you to take them to your hearts as we have done. They add luster drive, safety and countless new extras to the Democratic Party and to the Nation.

That is why I am delighted to participate in this victory dinner. It is true we are celebrating, in a general sense, the triumph of the Democratic Party in the 1958 elections. But in a special sense we are celebrating the victory of these new Senators, new Representatives and new Governors. It is they who add up to the difference between an ordinary election and the great Democratic victory at the polls last November. Through them, the Nation has made clear what it expects of all of us.

I am very glad that the great leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, is here tonight to help us interpret the meaning of this victory. I can tell you that his reputation as a skilled craftsman and mechanic in this trade is fully warranted. He knows his political automobiles. And out of his warm and responsive heart and his clear-thinking head, he knows something much more important. He knows that the function of the Democratic Party is to go; not to seem to go. It is to go, not in starts and stops, not in bursts of power and sputtering stalls, but to go firmly and steadily in the direction which the American people, by giving us this great victory, have commanded us to go.

The late Senator Robert Taft said that the function of the opposition is to oppose. With all due respect to that great Republican leader, I want to say that for Democrats, opposition alone is not enough. We Democrats will oppose when it is necessary to oppose. But we shall oppose responsibly and we shall try to contribute constructively to the security and progress of the Nation whenever and wherever we can.

To do that, we have got to have clearly in mind what we cannot do, as well as what we can do, under our constitutional system. The administration, alone, can lead in this country. True, it is a fact that is going to change in 1960. It is going to change, however, only if we do what the American people have commanded us to do; it is going to change only if we do what we can do, not what each of us thinks he would like to do. What Democrats can do, what they must do, is to point out a constructive path for the Republican administration to follow. We have got to keep it working when it would prefer to relax. For the sake of the American people we must hold the hand of this Republican administration when it is perplexed. We must try to guide it when it loses the way. We owe that to the people who have entrusted us with a large share of the responsibility for running this Government.

In specifics, we have got to try, as we have been trying, to get it started on the road to policies which may lead to a more durable peace. We have got to improve the administration of foreign aid and restore the decent image of the United States in so many parts of the world. We have got to see to it that this Republican administration keeps its nose to the grindstone of the social and economic problems which plague large parts of the Nation. You know those problems—inadequate education and other unequal opportunities for millions, a disgracefully wasteful agricultural policy which sees mountains of decaying surpluses side by side with millions of people without enough to eat, high prices, millions of unemployed, the decay of urban centers, a lagging science, an antiquated and inequitable tax system and a neglect of our older citizens. These are similar matters are the problems which confront us. To boot, we have to try to deal with them within the framework of a sleight-of-hand budget from an administration which last year gave us another such budget along with policies that helped to produce a $12 billion deficit in it.

We Democrats have a duty to try to make this administration work, not for the benefit of one, but for all sections of the Nation and for peace. We have a duty to try to make this administration work, not for the benefit of the few but for the welfare of the many.

That is the meaning of November 1958. That is what the American people have asked the Democratic Party to try to do. I do not know whether we shall succeed. It is a monumental task to try to do anything with a Republican administration. Speaking for those of us who are in the Senate, however, I can assure you that we shall try our best.

---

## Centenary of the Weekly Arizonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the small community of Tubac, which was the first community in modern Arizona in which a newspaper was printed, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUBAC

The State of Arizona proudly looks forward to continued years of progressive journalism and a free press after pausing March 3 to honor the centenary of the State's first newspaper, the Weekly Arizonian, which published its first edition on March 3, 1859, at historic Tubac—one of the New World's oldest communities and now the site of Arizona's first State park.

Two outstanding Arizona civic-minded organizations—the Valley of the Sun chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national journalistic fraternity, and the Phoenix Philatelic Association, a chapter member of the American Philatelic Society and Society of Philatelic Americans—arranged as a joint project the ceremonies honoring the centenary of Arizona journalism.

Members of the joint centennial committee include Art Matula, Arizona State University, chairman; James M. Chemi, the Phoenix Gazette, vice chairman; Orien W. Fifer, Jr., managing editor of the Arizona Republic; Lloyd Clark, the Phoenix Gazette; William McFarland, bureau manager of United Press International; Merle Nott, Mrs. Emma O'Brien, Debs Metzong, and Robert Corless.

Some of the most colorful history in American journalism has its origin in those earlier days of pioneering in the Southwestern States and in the heavily Indian-populated territories of New Mexico and Arizona. Historical highlights from newspaper articles reporting the Arizona journalism centennial are herewith published.

Receiving a friendly boost from the U.S. Post Office Department in approving their request for a limited postal facility at Tubac, Ariz., the Valley of the Sun Sigma Delta Chi chapter and the Phoenix Philatelic Association have arranged elaborate ceremonies for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Arizona journalism on March 3, 1959.

Highlight of the program at the ruins of the old Presidio de Tubac will be a reenactment of the famous newspapermen's duel. The long-defunct Tubac post office will be reopened for 1 day in the building now housing the Arizonian to service souvenir mail deposited by the general public.

A special pictorial cancellation, drawn by Harry Wood of the Arizona State University's art faculty, will be hand stamped on all mail posted at the 1-day postal facility. The cancellation has a line drawing of a century plant, symbolizing the centenary celebration. Wording within the pictorial portion of the hand canceling stamp reads: "Century of Arizona Journalism 1859—Tubac—1959."

The Sigma Delta Chi chapter and the Phoenix Philatelic Association made available to the public a set of three casheted covers (envelopes). Two of the designs depict an editor of a century ago armed with a shooting iron, ready to defend a free press by force if necessary.

The legend on the cachets read: "In Arizona Territory, Editors Fought With Gun and Press." The artists who sketched the unique cachets were Kearney Egerton, of the Arizona Republic, and Wood.

The idea for the militant editor cachet theme was drawn from the historic account of a duel fought by Arizona's first editor, Edward Ephraim Cross, who launched the Weekly Arizonian at Tubac on March 3, 1859.

The story relates how Editor Cross quarreled in print with Lt. Sylvester Mowry, who wanted Territorial status for Arizona, which until 1863 was the western half of the Territory of New Mexico.

Cross asserted that Mowry's reports on Arizona's population in articles published in St. Louis, Mo., and Washington, D.C., newspapers were exaggerated. The two men kept up a crossfire through their articles in the Missouri and district dailies.

When Cross opened the Weekly Arizonian, he took advantage of his publication to editorially attack Mowry in the State's only newspaper. These written tirades led to a duel in July 1859. Both men, armed with Burnside rifles, fired at 40 paces, 2 shots each. Neither newspaperman hit the other, but they declared their honor was satisfied and the ruckus ended.

Soon after that July duel, Mowry purchased the Tubac weekly from its owner, a mining company, and Cross relinquished his editorship.

Other pioneer Arizona editors also had to defend their editorial stands with guns.

TUBAC—THE TOWN WITH NINE LIVES

Tubac, the Arizona town with nine lives, will be the subject of an extensive postal history study by the Phoenix Philatelic Association, which is cooperating with the Valley of the Sun chapter of Sigma Delta Chi in honoring the centennial of Arizona journalism.

Tubac's history, dating back many centuries to the days of the Spanish conquistadors, even played a role in the founding of San Francisco.

Frank and Gay Griffin, present publishers of the Weekly Arizonian (now a quarterly), informed the PPA that they will issue a special centennial edition of the State's oldest newspaper on March 3—the date that Arizona's first editor, Edward Ephriam Cross, put the initial edition of the Arizonian to bed in 1859.

The PPA and the Sigma Delta Chi chapter here will release a set of three cacheted covers (envelops) on the March 3 centennial date at Tubac. The U.S. Post Office Department has authorized the defunct Tubac post office to be reopened for 1 day to permit the servicing of the historic philatelic mail. An estimated 10,000 pieces of philatelic mail is expected to be handled at the Tubac post office, which will be set up in the restored office of the Weekly Arizonian.

Editor Griffin asserts that Tubac has been dead eight times since 1695. He writes:

"Tombstone may be known as the town too tough to die, but the establishment of Tubac as Arizona's first State park will publicize Tubac as the town that wouldn't stay dead.

"Tubac was first a Pima Indian village and then came the Spanish explorers. No one knows how many times this rich agricultural settlement was burned or wiped out in the earliest days. But, since 1695, it has been populated eight times.

"In 1695 there was a revolt of Pima Indians and the town abandoned. A second revolt of the Pimas against the Spanish came in 1751.

"In 1761 the garrison abandoned the fort when ghosts, believed to be Indians in disguise, invaded the area.

"In 1777 the Spanish abandoned it and, when it was reoccupied, the Apaches closed it down twice—in 1840 and 1849.

"After the Gadsden Purchase, Tubac was again abandoned and in 1862 more Apache and Mexican bandit raids forced another Tubac evacuation.

"Tubac, with 200 residents, was withering away—within sight of the Nogales Highway—when it was declared Arizona's first State park.

"Now, this town that wouldn't stay dead is going on to make Arizona postal history on March 3, 1959."

## The Fight With Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association at Philadelphia, on Tuesday, February 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT WITH INFLATION: ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALLACE F. BENNETT, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, AT PHILADELPHIA, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1959

It is always a great inspiration to have the privilege of speaking to an audience of manufacturers, because to me it is like coming home. For 30 years, before I went to the Senate, I was part of the management of a small manufacturing plant in Utah and, like you, I am proud of it. American manufacturers can be proud of their accomplishment, the great heritage of capital they have produced for our country, the millions of jobs they have provided, and the value and variety of the products they supply for our everexpanding pattern of living. To do this has required the use of all the kays to success—initiative, imagination, great drive and vigor, high integrity and sound judgment.

The very fact that we have done all this makes it hard for me to understand why we are so blind to the forces that, unless we wake up, will destroy both our freedom and our wealth. For 20 years now, a thief has been preying on us and, rather than catching and exposing him, we have helped him rob everybody, including ourselves. Maybe this is true because he is the world's most accomplished confidence man whose hand is much quicker than the eye. He blinds us with promises of something for nothing. He drains our capital away, falsifies our records, dries up our markets, and finally squeezes us dry in our old age. And we applaud him and call for more.

Inflation is a thief that can steal the substance of our wealth without altering its outward appearance. Christ said, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Inflation preserves the letter of economic values, but kills the spirit.

So real is inflation's illusion that many hardheaded businessmen—who can spot a phony business deal a mile away—not only think that a little inflation is either natural, inevitable, or desirable, but that it offers a real opportunity for growth and profit to a shrewd and daring operator.

Perhaps all this is possible because without realizing it, most of us have become addicted to a powerful narcotic. We reach eagerly for increasing doses of economic "happy dust" because it brings illusions of greater success and well-being, easier and faster progress, and greater profit.

Or perhaps even though we are wracked with the pain of economic cancer, we mistake fever for the glow of health and puffy swelling for expanding muscle. If this is so, then we are using the narcotic to disguise the pain.

No matter in what terms you describe it, there is a force abroad in our economy that has already taken a fearful toll from every American company, family or individual—an evil that must be exposed, faced, and conquered.

What is its awesome name? Inflation.

LET US WAKE UP TO THE DANGER

Fortunately, many Americans are beginning to wake up to the danger, to recognize inflation for what it is—thief, cancer, and narcotic. President Eisenhower is one of these and in his recent messages to Congress and the people has called for, "Action to meet these challenges by all groups in our society, and by all units of Government."

Specifically, he has challenged consumers, government, labor leaders, and businessmen to meet the particular challenge that inflation presents to them.

Being human, as well as being businessmen, we could generate a great glow of self-righteousness by pointing out to government and labor both the extent of their particular responsibility for the present inflation and the things they should do to correct their faults. But there has already been too much finger pointing and blaming of one group by another. Tonight, I propose that we businessmen look our own weaknesses squarely in the eye and see what we can do to cure them.

WHY SHOULD WE BE CONCERNED?

There are two basic reasons why we should be concerned with inflation—one humanitarian, and the other based on enlightened self-interest.

If we have any active sense of social responsibility, we will fight inflation for the sake of those who are most vulnerable to its damages and least able to protect themselves. These include all who live on fixed incomes and pensions, the aged, the widowed, and the disabled. Not much better off are the schoolteachers and the civil servants at all levels of government. If any man profits by inflation—even temporarily—it is eventually from these people on pensions and fixed income that his profit comes—a cruel story of Robin Hood in reverse.

But if a few of us are indifferent to the fate of these victims of inflation, none of us should ignore its damage to ourselves—in the context of the well being of business and industry, both in general, and in our own particular company. In this respect, let me point out four specific ways in which we can be hurt.

*1. Inflation discourages the accumulation of capital*

By eating away purchasing power year after year, it penalizes thrift and discourages investment. Oh, I know that the smart boys think that investment in common stocks or real estate is a safe hedge, but as more and more people crowd into that escape hatch, they create and accelerate the very force from which they fled until the whole structure of inflated values collapses, as it did in 1929.

*2. Inflation destroys capital already accumulated*

That this is already going on is demonstrated to every businessman who finds that his allowable accumulation of depreciation reserves will not replace his depreciated assets. As prices rise more rapidly, this erosion shows up in inventory too—while accounts receivable are settled at a discount. The end is bankruptcy, as the Germans found in the twenties.

*3. Inflation distorts figures, destroys accurate comparison and forces uneconomic decisions*

Speculation replaces sound merchandising, and investments intended to replace money as a device for the dead storage of value are substituted for investments in productive industry to produce more value. Thus we reverse the lesson of the parable, and emulate the man who buried his one talent, rather than the one who put his talents to use and doubled them.

*4. Inflation narrows our markets—both at home and abroad*

As true purchasing power shrinks, more and more people must use more and more of their remaining purchasing power for basic necessities, and more and more products are in danger of being priced out of the market. This is true for services too, as the great do-it-yourself movement in America demonstrates.

But even more dramatically, inflation dries up our foreign trade. In 1957 we sold $19.5 billion worth of American products abroad. In 1958 it dropped to $16 billion. While our commodity balance of trade is still on the plus side, our balance of payments shifted from plus to minus. In that year we had to pay out $2.3 billion in gold plus $1 billion in dollar balances held by foreigners in U.S. banks to fill the gap. In the past, the effects of our inflation have been balanced by greater inflation abroad, but lately, and by heroic efforts, our chief customers in

Europe—finally including even France—have moved to greater stability. The new European Common Market will protect that stability and unless we solve our problem too, our own price policies will be even more responsible than their tariff barriers for shutting us out. And when we can't export goods, we will export capital and know-how behind the European wall, and there will be fewer American industrial jobs. Then our inflated wage scales will be a statistical mockery—victims of inflation. This mockery has already begun.

*Inflation effects on the purchasing power of the dollar*

These, then, are among the ways in which inflation is hurting both people and business But when we come to measure the actual reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar since 1939, we become truly alarmed.

The most frequent measurement is in terms of a weighted average of consumer prices—the so-called cost of living index. On this scale the 1939 dollar has shrunk in 20 years to 48 cents.

But there have been other serious shrinkages in purchasing power. When we measure it as income, we have to consider also the increased tax bite before we can translate it into a consumer's dollar. A gross income of $3,000 in 1939 would need to have risen to $6,457 today for a man to pay his taxes and buy the same goods he bought in the year 1939. If a man made $10,000 in 1939 he would have to be making nearly $24,000 today to hold his own. In other words, his spendable dollar is worth only 43 cents. And if a man was in the $25,000 bracket in 1939 he would have to be making $70,000 in 1959 dollars to have the same available purchasing power. His spendable dollar then has shrunk to 36 cents.

And this is not all. Some dollars have shrunk faster than others. Looking at price indexes again, while the average 1939 consumer dollar is now worth 48 cents, the dollar you spend on some other products today is worth even less than 48 cents. Take these examples:

The dollar you spend for prime industrial products is worth 45 cents.

Your commercial and factory construction dollar is worth 37 cents.

If you build a new house, your construction dollar is worth 36 cents.

If you buy a house today which was constructed in 1939, you are spending a 33 cents dollar.

If you have your car repaired, you use 30 cent dollars.

These are samples of the damage inflation has done in 20 years. Unfortunately, history—even recent history—shows that once inflation is accepted as inevitable or desirable its rate always accelerates. When we begin to build a factor for inflation into our personal and business decisions, we give it an extra push. Unless we make a stand soon, it can pass the point of no return, beyond which there will be no question as to whether we will have an economic collapse—only when it will come. To argue that we can live with inflation and control its rate is to forget that it is an economic cancer, and that if we can really control it, we can, in fact, eliminate it.

HOW SHALL WE CONTROL IT?

Up to this point I have been pointing out why inflation must be stopped. Now it's time to try to answer the more difficult question—How? As businessmen and managers of industry, what can and must we do to meet President Eisenhower's special challenge to us, and win the fight against inflation in our special and particular area?

I have four concrete suggestions.

First, we must face the problem and prepare to solve it. This requires the same process that we use to solve any other business problem—plus a little extra spiritual strength. We must wipe out from our own thinking the illusions that inflation has created and replace them with the hard facts. Among these illusions are several false ideas.

*1. That we have always had inflation*

The fact is that until the thirties, the price levels went up and down, but the long term level remained fairly stable. Wholesale prices in 1930 were about the same as in 1790.

*2. That inflation is necessary to growth; that without its artificial stimulation men will not work harder or invest more*

The same thing can be said about a narcotic, but here we recognize that the effect is temporary and the price for it is too high. Actually, in most periods of great growth like the twenties, prices were slowly falling. Inflation distorts figures to counterfeit growth, as you will easily see when you measure the rate of increase in your business in tons or gallons and then compare this with the rate in dollars.

*3. That inflation can be profitable, because it produces something out of nothing*

This is the oldest confidence come-on in human experience and always conceals a clever larceny.

*4. That even if inflation is inevitable, a shrewd man can outsmart it by clever investment*

This is both stupid and cowardly, the action of a soldier who runs from the fight—or a strong man who pushes the helpless out of the lifeboat. In the end, when the inevitable crash comes, even the smart boys get it.

*5. That even if it is bad, it's someone else's fault—and that there is nothing we can do about it*

This dims and rejects the very spirit of American free enterprise and makes hollow mockeries of all our great technical and productive achievements. If we approach inflation as another business problem, which it is, and develop an understanding of its effects, we can master it. The first job then is to straighten out our own thinking and accept our share of the responsibility.

TEACH THE TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

The second suggestion in our fight against inflation is to help others—and specifically our own employees—to get the same understanding of the truth. This will not be easy, because while the official union line on inflation is essentially wrong, it is very appealing. Because their basic approach of more pay for less work is obviously inflationary, they support it with the idea that if wages can be raised faster, new markets will be created, and enough new production will come in to control inflation. What they must ignore is that wages are always the predominant element of cost, and that wages that rise faster than productivity are engines of inflation. When price rises inevitably follow such wages increases, they blame it onto exhorbitant profits. The true effect can easily be shown by such figures as these from manufacturing. While physical productivity increased only 31 percent between 1947 and 1957, average hourly wages in manufacturing increased 67 percent. Some have referred to this spread between wages and productivity as the "inflationary gap." It is interesting to compare this spread of 36 percentage points with the 32 percent increase in industrial prices over the same period.

Because employees are being fed misinformation regarding the relationship of wages, profits and prices, they too have illusions about inflation. Through patient planned programs of education, these false ideas must be replaced with truth. For obvious reasons the unions will not undertake this, and if work is to be done, we must do it.

In making this suggestion I know it is another case of calling for education in solving specific problems. This need is always with us and always will be. This job will never be finished. But with respect to inflation, it has a special urgency because there is a definite educational process going on through unions intended to produce the wrong results, and this must be offset, and soon.

ADOPT SOUND OPERATING POLICIES

There is a third area in which we can move against inflation, that of our own operating policies. From now on we must think in terms of stable values and force ourselves to face our operating records and our balance sheet after we have wrung out the water of inflation. We should adopt some stable benchmarks for comparison and tie our planning and evaluating to them. From time to time we should make a report to our stockholders and the public in which we spotlight the effects of inflation on our typical dollar figures.

We should always face the problem of inflation in our dealings with our employees and, specifically, fight to keep wage increases well within the total rate of increase in productivity. If we do this, we will leave some share of the benefits of increased productivity for the stockholders whose investment in new equipment really makes most of it possible. But most important of all, we will thus preserve some part of this for the consumer.

In many ways the consumer is the real key to the control of inflation. He is the one who is robbed when prices rise and only when prices fall—ever so slightly—does he, or more properly, she, have a sure share in our progress. When we provide a share of the added benefits of increased productivity to those on the productive side of our two-part economic cycle, it comes in the form of increases, and it means increased wages to the worker and greater profits to the investor. But if the consumer is to have a share, it must be expressed in decreases in price. This has largely been forgotten in the current era of inflation. Forgotten, too, is the once commonly accepted business axiom that mass production produces lower prices. When we in industry begin to plan to give the consumer his share of the progress we make, prices will stabilize or drop, and inflation in consumer prices will disappear. It's just that simple.

REMOVE GOVERNMENT INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

Fourth, and finally, we must work to remove the inflationary pressures that originate in government. These take many forms.

1. Pressures to increase the supply of money to provide easy bank credit at low interest. This is inflationary by definition.

2. Pressures for nonproductive, non self-liquidating Government programs that either increase taxes or pile up more public debt. As a Senator, I am appalled to find that many Americans, including businessmen, are economic schizophrenics where Government finances are concerned. They keep their concepts of Government expenditures and Government income in two thought-tight compartments. They want more local programs, more loans and grants, but lower taxes. They fight increases in the debt ceiling and are piously for economy but only if it does not affect them. If we are to control or eliminate inflation, we must move into a sustained period of balanced budgets, and this inevitably involves the control of expenditures for procurement and services at the local level—in your town or State and in mine. So long as we insist on more for any reason we will face the threat of inflation.

ELECT NONINFLATIONISTS TO CONGRESS

Since ours is a representative form of government run by men and women chosen through popular elections following campaigns conducted by political parties, we who want to cure inflation and other weaknesses in government must devote enough time and effort in political activity to first select, and then elect, representatives who understand the dangers of inflation—and will resist its temptations. The union leaders, who are essentially inflationists by philosophy, have moved into this field with great success and the representatives they have sponsored and elected are too often inflationists. In my opinion, this has made inflation, direct or disguised, our greatest nationwide economic issue.

Well, this is my story. Inflation is a great and vicious evil, a form of larceny, a cancer, a destructive narcotic. There are many reasons, social and selfish, why we must conquer it. This is true for all of us, and particularly for the managers of business and industrial enterprise. But there is one final and particular reason why this is especially true for you, the members of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association. One of the chief functions of your association is to supply casualty insurance. In this field, inflation has been especially destructive. Costs of settling claims have skyrocketed. General figures that demonstrate this are hard to get, but your association officials know that in the field of casualty insurance inflation is a real burden.

INFLATION MUST BE STOPPED

Inflation must be stopped, and we must do it as citizens and businessmen. If we leave this fight entirely to the power of Government, it can only be done by increasing Government interference with our own right to manage our own business, even to the possible imposition in peacetime of price and wage controls. There are men in Congress now who favor that step if inflation continues. Our own experiences with controls occurred so recently that they should still be convicing enough to make us realize that this step should mean the disappearance of freedom and free enterprise—and the end of our way of life.

Shall we continue to drift blindly into economic destruction—or wake up and live? Regardless of what others may do, I think the real challenge is to the leaders of business and industry. Have we the courage and faith with which to meet it? I believe we have, but we must act now to be effective.

## This Defense Fallacy Costly to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret the apparent decision of this administration to cut back the Reserve forces of our country at a time when the Regular forces are also being reduced. It seems logical to me that when the Regular—active duty—Establishment is being reduced that there should be a buildup and increase in the Reserve forces rather than a decrease. A few years ago when similar reductions were occurring the excuse was the so-called new look at our defense needs. All I was able to ascertain in the new look at that point was a reduction based upon budgetary matters rather than defense requirements. A similar line of reasoning by the administration is being pushed at this point to indicate that our Armed Forces can be smaller because of some great change that has occurred in warfare. Even assuming that a change has occurred in the type of warfare making obsolete present methods, which is quite an assumption, the technical advice of the military leaders of our country does not justify the assumption that either our Regular forces or our Reserve forces should be cut from their present strength.

I include here a thought-provoking editorial from the February 24 Florida Times Union, Jacksonville, Fla., which reads as follows and presents the matter in the particular focus of the situation as it is seen in Florida by an able writer:

THIS DEFENSE FALLACY COSTLY TO FLORIDA

Only the most specious brand of reasoning can justify a reduction of Army Reserve forces, in which Florida will lose 31 units, in the wake of secret testimony by Gen. Maxwell Taylor before a Senate committee in which he recommended mobilization of the entire Nation.

It was in a dispatch of February 18 from IV U.S. Army Corps at Birmingham that an announcement was made that Florida and other States in the South would have their civilian-soldier units pared. Sixteen days prior to that the Army Chief of Staff had told the solons that the United States would not be properly prepared for a Berlin emergency on May 27 unless the necessary force was brought into being. He stressed Russia's superior capability in ground troops.

As is customary, the order for a reduction was accompanied by a statement about how the realinement would make for greater strength and efficiency. Reservists know better, of course, and realize that they are just witnessing one of many such cynical procedures which have occurred since the end of World War II.

It was ever thus, even prior to that conflict, and only a person of great patience and endurance can retain his voluntary affiliation under those circumstances.

The Military Establishment is built on the principle of a small Regular force, buttressed by a large, well-trained Ready Reserve. Yet the units of the latter organization are the ones which suffer most from cuts.

The Army undoubtedly is compelled to make these adjustments in Florida and elsewhere because of the niggardly attitude of those who hold the pursestrings toward ground troops.

That is the fallacy for which the American people ultimately are going to pay in blood. How soon the payment will be exacted no one knows, but the "due bill" most certainly will come when we are least expecting it.

## Labor's Privileged Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, entitled "Labor's Privileged Position," which was published in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR'S PRIVILEGED POSITION—FEDERAL LAWS PLACE RESTRICTIONS ON BUSINESS THAT DO NOT APPLY TO LABOR UNIONS

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

Is sauce for the goose sauce for the gander? This is the question at the heart of the current debate on legislation to curb labor abuses. Traditionally, the American public takes a strict view of corruption and special privilege. In the 1920's and 1930's the Seabury investigation forced the resignation of New York's popular Mayor Jimmy Walker, while the Teapot Dome oil scandals sent a Secretary of the Interior to jail.

RECENT SCANDALS

More recently, the Internal Revenue Department scandals under President Truman led to jail sentences for high Government officials, and in this administration, Presidential Aid Sherman Adams left under a cloud after it was learned that he had accepted financial favors from Boston Industrialist Bernard Goldfine.

Why, then, the big stick for punishment of wrongdoers in business and Government alone?

Although a Senate committee under Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN has unearthed shocking evidence of corruption and gangsterism in eight major unions, there is considerable doubt whether Congress will pass the tough and comprehensive legislation needed to curb the autocratic powers of the lords of labor. Why, then, this double standard?

One reason why the public has been slow to anger is that they have accepted as final some Supreme Court decisions and legislative acts by past Congresses giving labor a privileged position.

In many instances local police have tolerated physical and economic reprisals against those who suggest labor reform.

In the Kohler strike in Wisconsin, law-enforcement authorities permitted sabotage and mob violence, while Michigan's Governor refused for more than 3 years to extradite John Gunaca, a goon who is charged with breaking the neck of William Bersch, a screw-machine operator in the company's brass division.

When an individual is shot crossing a picket line some local judges seem to prefer to regard the killing as an accident arising out of class warfare, rather than for what it really is—murder.

The rank and file of workers are powerless to halt the unruly doings of certain union elements. In most cases elections are not by secret ballot, nor are they subject to review.

Some workers are opposed to joining the union altogether. It is a flagrant example of the double standard that while the majority of States hold it is legal to compel employees to join a union against their will, the yellow-dog contract prohibiting employees from joining a union is almost universally illegal.

NO CEILING ON DEMANDS

Another example of biased labor legislation is that while there are the minimum-wage and maximum-hour law, there is no ceiling over labor demands. This inequality could have grave consequences if repeated and ever-increasing demands by labor succeed in raising prices to such a high point that we price ourselves out of the world markets.

How, then, can we correct labor's lack of self-discipline? The only way is to make labor unions equal under the law with business, Government, and private citizens.

Why shouldn't antitrust laws be applied to unions as well as to big business?

The Justice Department has hauled General Motors before a grand jury on allegations of monopoly. Yet General Motors, as everybody knows, has the strongest kind of competition from Ford, Chrysler, and other companies. The industrywide, nationwide United Automobile Workers' Union—an obvious monopoly—has no competition. Nevertheless, the UAW and other big monopolistic unions enjoy immunity under the Clayton Antitrust Act, which exempts labor unions from its provisions.

The words of our Constitution, "liberty and justice for all," mean the equality of all Americans before the law. This does not mean special favors for labor pressure groups at the expense of the public at large.

## Surplus Commodities for the Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, there have been introduced a number of proposed measures which would broaden the scope and increase the amount of surplus agricultural commodities presently being distributed to needy persons in areas of high unemployment. Recently, I obtained from the Department of Agriculture a summary listing the counties to which these commodities are most heavily distributed, and I am submitting this list for publication in the RECORD in the hope that it will clarify the picture for my colleagues.

Briefly, this summary lists every county in the United States in which 15 percent or more of the population is receiving surplus commodities. There are 210 such counties in 24 States, spread through districts served by 75 Members of this House. These counties constitute the hard core of the persistent unemployment problem which has given rise to the demand for economic redevelopment legislation.

In the coming weeks there will be a great deal more said on this general topic, so there is no need to discuss it now, but for the information of the Members generally I would like to have this summary printed and I hope they will give it close attention in preparation for the debates to come:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE
Washington, D.C.

*Direct distribution of commodities to needy persons in family units, counties, by State, in which recipients are 15 percent or more of population*

| State and county | Population (1950) | Total number of recipients (November (1958) | Number of recipients as a percent of population |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama: | | | |
| Colbert | 39,561 | 6,312 | 16 |
| Cullman | 49,046 | 8,759 | 18 |
| Dale | 20,828 | 3,467 | 17 |
| Fayette | 19,388 | 4,130 | 21 |

*Direct distribution of commodities to needy persons in family units, counties, by State, in which recipients are 15 percent or more of population*—Continued

| State and county | Population (1950) | Total number of recipients (November (1958) | Number of recipients as a percent of population |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama:—Continued | | | |
| Franklin | 25,705 | 5,422 | 21 |
| Geneva | 25,899 | 5,139 | 20 |
| Lamar | 16,441 | 4,253 | 26 |
| Limestone | 35,766 | 10,494 | 29 |
| Marion | 27,264 | 4,717 | 17 |
| Marshall | 45,090 | 6,659 | 15 |
| Talladega | 63,639 | 14,194 | 22 |
| Winston | 18,250 | 3,551 | 19 |
| Arkansas: | | | |
| Ashley | 25,660 | 5,745 | 22 |
| Chicot | 22,306 | 7,829 | 35 |
| Clay | 26,674 | 5,428 | 20 |
| Conway | 18,137 | 4,103 | 23 |
| Desha | 25,155 | 4,327 | 17 |
| Franklin | 12,358 | 1,939 | 16 |
| Fulton | 9,187 | 2,000 | 22 |
| Howard | 13,342 | 1,969 | 15 |
| Independence | 23,488 | 4,279 | 18 |
| Johnson | 16,133 | 2,403 | 15 |
| Lawrence | 21,303 | 4,003 | 19 |
| Little River | 11,620 | 2,512 | 21 |
| Logan | 20,260 | 3,009 | 15 |
| Madison | 11,734 | 2,636 | 22 |
| Mississippi | 82,375 | 18,601 | 23 |
| Montgomery | 6,650 | 1,161 | 17 |
| Ouachita | 33,051 | 6,362 | 19 |
| Perry | 5,978 | 1,311 | 22 |
| Searcy | 10,424 | 2,245 | 22 |
| Sharp | 8,999 | 1,370 | 15 |
| Stone | 7,602 | 2,187 | 29 |
| Van Buren | 9,687 | 1,485 | 15 |
| Colorado: | | | |
| Saguache | 5,634 | 881 | 16 |
| Georgia: | | | |
| Cook | 12,201 | 2,291 | 19 |
| Dade | 7,364 | 1,427 | 19 |
| Dodge | 17,935 | 4,882 | 27 |
| Pike | 8,459 | 2,798 | 33 |
| Stephens | 16,647 | 2,461 | 15 |
| Illinois: | | | |
| Franklin | 48,685 | 7,298 | 15 |
| Gallatin | 9,818 | 1,449 | 15 |
| Pulaski | 13,639 | 2,793 | 20 |
| Saline | 33,420 | 5,164 | 15 |
| Kentucky: | | | |
| Bell | 47,602 | 9,639 | 20 |
| Breathitt | 19,964 | 8,106 | 41 |
| Butler | 11,309 | 2,392 | 21 |
| Carlisle | 6,206 | 952 | 14 |
| Clay | 23,116 | 9,021 | 39 |
| Clinton | 10,605 | 2,598 | 24 |
| Edmonson | 9,376 | 1,517 | 16 |
| Estill | 14,677 | 3,763 | 26 |
| Floyd | 53,500 | 11,207 | 21 |
| Fulton | 13,668 | 2,682 | 20 |
| Harlan | 71,751 | 11,966 | 17 |
| Hancock | 6,009 | 1,039 | 17 |
| Hickman | 7,778 | 1,522 | 20 |
| Jackson | 13,101 | 5,780 | 44 |
| Johnson | 23,846 | 5,805 | 24 |
| Knox | 30,409 | 11,373 | 37 |
| Laurel | 25,797 | 6,850 | 27 |
| Lawrence | 14,418 | 3,614 | 25 |
| Lee | 8,739 | 2,733 | 31 |
| Letcher | 39,522 | 8,704 | 22 |
| Lincoln | 18,668 | 3,111 | 17 |
| Livingston | 7,184 | 1,189 | 17 |
| Logan | 22,335 | 4,608 | 21 |
| Magoffin | 13,839 | 5,678 | 41 |
| Marion | 17,212 | 2,717 | 16 |
| Martin | 11,677 | 3,735 | 32 |
| McCreary | 16,660 | 5,542 | 33 |
| Ohio | 20,840 | 3,588 | 17 |
| Perry | 45,566 | 14,702 | 32 |
| Pike | 81,154 | 16,058 | 20 |
| Rockcastle | 13,925 | 3,891 | 28 |
| Todd | 12,890 | 2,017 | 16 |
| Wayne | 16,475 | 3,430 | 21 |
| Whitley | 31,940 | 7,539 | 24 |
| Louisiana: | | | |
| Allen | 18,835 | 2,788 | 15 |
| Avoyelles | 38,031 | 10,082 | 26 |
| Catahoula | 11,834 | 4,080 | 34 |
| Evangeline | 31,629 | 7,698 | 24 |
| Franklin | 29,376 | 13,104 | 45 |
| Richland | 26,672 | 9,273 | 35 |
| Saint Landry | 78,476 | 19,945 | 25 |
| Saint Martin | 26,353 | 5,593 | 21 |
| Tensas | 13,209 | 5,477 | 41 |
| Maine: | | | |
| Aroostook | 96,039 | 15,905 | 17 |
| Michigan: | | | |
| Antrim | 10,721 | 1,632 | 15 |
| Baraga | 8,037 | 1,428 | 18 |
| Kalkaska | 4,597 | 894 | 19 |
| Lake | 5,257 | 1,256 | 24 |
| Macomb | 184,961 | 31,613 | 17 |
| Minnesota: | | | |
| Mahnomen | 7,059 | 1,055 | 15 |
| Mississippi: | | | |
| Choctaw | 11,009 | 1,625 | 15 |
| Clay | 17,757 | 2,637 | 15 |

*Direct distribution of commodities to needy persons in family units, counties, by State, in which recipients are 15 percent or more of population*—Continued

| State and county | Population (1950) | Total number of recipients (November (1958) | Number of recipients as a percent of population |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mississippi—Continued | | | |
| Greene | 8,215 | 1,354 | 16 |
| Hancock | 11,891 | 2,401 | 20 |
| Holmes | 33,301 | 7,520 | 23 |
| Jackson | 31,401 | 4,716 | 15 |
| Pontotoc | 10,994 | 2,035 | 19 |
| Webster | 11,607 | 1,724 | 15 |
| Wilkinson | 14,116 | 3,069 | 22 |
| Missouri: | | | |
| Stoddard | 33,463 | 5,931 | 18 |
| Montana: | | | |
| Glacier | 9,645 | 3,991 | 41 |
| Roosevelt | 9,580 | 2,548 | 27 |
| New Mexico: | | | |
| Rio Arriba | 24,997 | 3,882 | 16 |
| Taos | 17,146 | 3,781 | 22 |
| Oklahoma: | | | |
| Adair | 14,918 | 6,485 | 43 |
| Atoka | 14,269 | 3,136 | 22 |
| Bryan | 28,999 | 5,789 | 20 |
| Caddo | 34,913 | 5,068 | 15 |
| Carter | 36,455 | 5,462 | 15 |
| Cherokee | 18,989 | 4,085 | 22 |
| Choctaw | 20,405 | 4,894 | 24 |
| Coal | 8,056 | 1,940 | 24 |
| Delaware | 14,734 | 3,674 | 25 |
| Haskell | 13,313 | 2,700 | 21 |
| Hughes | 20,664 | 4,047 | 20 |
| Jefferson | 11,122 | 1,641 | 15 |
| Johnston | 10,608 | 2,952 | 28 |
| Latimer | 9,690 | 3,234 | 33 |
| Le Flore | 35,276 | 8,334 | 24 |
| Love | 7,721 | 1,213 | 16 |
| McCurtain | 31,588 | 6,927 | 22 |
| McIntosh | 17,829 | 5,217 | 29 |
| Marshall | 8,177 | 1,742 | 21 |
| Mayes | 19,743 | 3,074 | 16 |
| Murray | 10,775 | 1,774 | 16 |
| Muskogee | 65,573 | 10,016 | 15 |
| Ofuskee | 16,948 | 5,908 | 35 |
| Okmulgee | 44,561 | 7,457 | 17 |
| Payne | 13,616 | 2,367 | 17 |
| Pittsburg | 41,031 | 6,719 | 16 |
| Pushmataha | 12,001 | 3,851 | 32 |
| Roger Mills | 7,395 | 1,342 | 18 |
| Sequoyah | 19,773 | 6,857 | 35 |
| Tillman | 17,598 | 3,012 | 17 |
| Wagoner | 16,741 | 3,745 | 22 |
| North Dakota: | | | |
| Rolette | 11,102 | 2,005 | 18 |
| Pennsylvania: | | | |
| Armstrong | 80,842 | 18,182 | 22 |
| Bedford | 40,775 | 9,121 | 22 |
| Blair | 139,514 | 29,192 | 21 |
| Cambria | 209,541 | 36,700 | 18 |
| Clearfield | 85,957 | 19,301 | 22 |
| Fayette | 189,809 | 36,810 | 19 |
| Fulton | 10,387 | 2,417 | 23 |
| Greene | 45,394 | 9,040 | 20 |
| Huntingdon | 40,872 | 8,834 | 22 |
| Indiana | 77,106 | 11,942 | 15 |
| Mifflin | 43,691 | 8,259 | 19 |
| Potter | 16,810 | 3,667 | 22 |
| Schuylkill | 200,577 | 35,891 | 18 |
| Somerset | 81,813 | 17,931 | 22 |
| Sullivan | 6,745 | 1,846 | 27 |
| Susquehanna | 31,970 | 4,647 | 15 |
| Tioga | 35,474 | 6,752 | 19 |
| South Dakota: | | | |
| Hand | 7,149 | 1,172 | 16 |
| Hyde | 2,811 | 504 | 18 |
| Tennessee: | | | |
| Campbell | 34,369 | 10,248 | 30 |
| Cocke | 22,991 | 3,555 | 15 |
| Cumberland | 18,877 | 3,175 | 17 |
| Decatur | 9,442 | 2,403 | 25 |
| Dyer | 33,473 | 8,320 | 25 |
| Fentress | 14,917 | 4,191 | 28 |
| Grundy | 12,558 | 3,105 | 25 |
| Hancock | 9,116 | 2,299 | 25 |
| Hardin | 16,908 | 6,856 | 41 |
| Lauderdale | 25,047 | 12,786 | 51 |
| Lincoln | 25,624 | 5,601 | 22 |
| McNairy | 20,390 | 7,049 | 35 |
| Marion | 20,529 | 4,624 | 23 |
| Morgan | 15,727 | 3,462 | 22 |
| Putnam | 20,869 | 4,408 | 15 |
| Scott | 17,362 | 5,238 | 30 |
| Union | 8,670 | 1,649 | 19 |
| Texas: | | | |
| Brooks | 9,195 | 1,336 | 15 |
| Camp | 8,740 | 2,305 | 26 |
| Duval | 15,643 | 3,492 | 22 |
| Jim Hogg | 5,389 | 1,686 | 31 |
| Morris | 9,433 | 2,301 | 24 |
| Starr | 13,948 | 3,345 | 24 |
| Upshur | 20,822 | 3,966 | 19 |
| Webb | 56,141 | 13,309 | 24 |
| Utah: | | | |
| Grand-San Juan | 7,218 | 1,218 | 17 |
| Virginia: | | | |
| Buchanan | 12,288 | 35,018 | 16 |
| Dickenson | 23,393 | 4,658 | 20 |

*Direct distribution of commodities to needy persons in family units, counties, by State, in which recipients are 15 percent or more of population*—Continued

| State and county | Population (1950) | Total number of recipients (November (1958) | Number of recipients as a percent of population |
|---|---|---|---|
| West Virginia: | | | |
| Barbour | 19,745 | 4,706 | 24 |
| Boone | 33,173 | 8,823 | 27 |
| Braxton | 18,082 | 4,018 | 22 |
| Clay | 14,961 | 3,828 | 26 |
| Fayette | 82,443 | 21,811 | 26 |
| Grant | 8,756 | 1,397 | 16 |
| Greenbrier | 39,295 | 6,194 | 16 |
| Hampshire | 12,577 | 2,180 | 17 |
| Lincoln | 22,466 | 5,121 | 23 |
| Logan | 77,391 | 20,434 | 26 |
| Mercer | 75,613 | 13,724 | 18 |
| Mingo | 47,469 | 19,202 | 41 |
| McDowell | 98,887 | 31,881 | 32 |
| Nicholas | 27,696 | 5,516 | 20 |
| Preston | 31,399 | 7,324 | 23 |
| Raleigh | 96,273 | 23,518 | 24 |
| Summers | 19,183 | 3,536 | 18 |
| Upshur | 19,242 | 3,515 | 18 |
| Webster | 17,888 | 4,093 | 23 |
| Wyoming | 37,540 | 7,782 | 21 |
| Wisconsin: | | | |
| Florence | 3,756 | 692 | 18 |
| Sawyer | 10,323 | 1,675 | 16 |
| Washburn | 11,665 | 1,973 | 17 |

NOTES

Total population, 8,947,036.
Total recipients of commodities, 1,298,201.
Total counties, 210 in 24 States.
Average percent recipients, 21.8 percent for 210 counties

## Statement of Secretary of Agriculture on Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 15 there was published as an editorial in the Washington Evening Star Secretary Benson's own condensation of his statement made before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, there are some who dislike the Secretary, some who dislike his actions and doubt his sincerity. I am not one of those. I have the utmost respect for Mr. Benson. I consider him to be one of the finest men ever to occupy a position in public life at such a high level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement, which was published as an editorial, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENSON ON FARM SURPLUSES

The question of what to do about our farm surpluses is before Congress once more. This year the question pretty much gets down to what we do about wheat-support prices. The major part of our surplus is now concentrated in wheat. Certainly, if you add cotton and corn to wheat, you have represented 85 percent of the crops in Government hands or under loan, and they presently total above $7.5 billion, and rising. Surpluses will soon cost us about $1 billion annually in storage and interest charges alone.

We had a great year for wheat in 1958, by far the biggest crop in history. It amounted to 1.2 billion bushels, yet we can consume at home and sell abroad only about 900 million bushels. The rest goes into expensive storage. This does not have a wide benefit for our farmers. As a matter of fact, the bulk of the payments go to less than 10 percent of those who grow wheat.

Actually, farmers generally are doing fairly well. Farm ownership is at the highest level in history, and so are net equities. The condition of life on the farm has improved immensely and there is no longer that old sharp economic, cultural and educational dividing line between life on the farm and life in the city. Transportation, television, electricity have worked wonders. True, there are hardship areas and the cost-price squeeze is especially harmful to farmers, but unrealistic wheat support prices offer no way to alleviate them. There are other means and we are now pursuing them.

What we need now in the Department of Agriculture is congressional authority to set wheat supports at levels that will lead to sales, not storage bins. In this way, we can retain and build our foreign markets and still produce all that our domestic consumers care to buy. This would save us billions yearly, help to revitalize our agriculture at home and abroad.

The above is Secretary of Agriculture Benson's own condensation of his statement to the Senate Agriculture Committee. We thought it worthy of reproduction in this form. It makes a good editorial.

## Pacific Gas & Electric Lineman Wins Lifesaving Citation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in this permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD this article which appeared in the Neighborhood Journal, Oakland, Calif., for February 18, 1959.

It details how Thomas J. Peters, of Castro Valley, through his quick thinking and fine training, saved the life of a fellow worker who had inadvertently come in contact with a live wire while they both were working on top of a 50-foot power pole.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has awarded Thomas J. Peters its John A. Britton Award, named after the first president of that company and awarded to those who have distinguished themselves in some way within or without the company.

To me, Mr. Peters acted above and beyond the call of duty, because I can think of many more pleasant places to be than on top of a 50-foot pole with an unconscious man slumped in his safety harness by a live transmission power-his presence of mind and for the trainline.

I want to congratulate Mr. Peters for ing he has acquired that inspired him to do the right thing at the right time under very serious conditions.

The article follows:

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC LINEMAN'S LIFESAVING ACT WINS CITATION

A citation by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for distinguished service has been given to Thomas J. Peters, of Castro Valley, for his quick action last year in saving the life of a fellow lineman.

Peters, 43, who lives at 18801 Madison Avenue in Castro Valley, received the award from Raymond W. White, manager of the claims and safety department of the company, during a district accident-prevention meeting in Hayward Tuesday.

Peters and Carl H. Seigfried, 44, of 3657 Lester Avenue, Hayward, were working atop a 50-foot power pole on April 24 when Seigfried accidentally touched the exposed end of an energized wire. He lost consciousness and slumped in his safety belt. Peters immediately prepared to administer first aid.

Seigfried regained consciousness and was quickly lowered to the ground, treated for shock, and rushed to a hospital within 6 minutes.

According to the citation, Peters' calm actions prevented further injury to Seigfried and brought prompt medical treatment.

Peters' citation was made under terms of the John A. Britton Award, named in honor of the company's first president, for distinguished service in an emergency. Peters has been with Pacific Gas & Electric since 1946.

## Security: The Great Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the February 23 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer reprinted the editorial by the distinguished editor and journalist, Walter H. Annenberg, which received the George Washington Honor Medal award of Freedoms Foundation. The award was made at the Valley Forge ceremonies on February 22.

The editorial, entitled "Security: The Great Illusion," challenges our complacency in the face of rapidly changing world concepts and threats to what we have called the "American way of life." It deserves the widest possible attention and comment.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Annenberg's editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITY: THE GREAT ILLUSION

(By Walter H. Annenberg)

We, the people of the United States, are engaged in a struggle not only to maintain our position as a great democracy but for our survival as well.

We have been challenged before by autocratic governments but never in our history have we been in competition with a society in such deadly earnest as Communist Russia.

Let us make no mistake about it. The leaders of the Soviet Union are determined to conquer us by overwhelming superiority in every field of human endeavor.

Most of us feel that we possess security because we have beaten down our challengers in the past. But this concept of security has created in many of us an attitude of our being impregnable and this has led to a dangerous degree of overconfidence.

Permanence of national position simply does not and cannot exist. The relative po-

sition of any nation is subject to the ambitions and policies of other nations.

To prepare as carefully and thoroughly as possible for every conceivable emergency is the sensible, logical answer to what we must do to maintain the supremacy we enjoy, to protect our freedoms and to safeguard peace.

The U.S. Government, in properly making monumental appropriations available for defense and offense, is doing only part of the job that has to be done. Every citizen must be awakened to his or her responsibility in this total struggle.

Have we the national character to measure up to this responsibility?

Too many of our people are soft, smug, spoiled, addicted to pleasure-seeking and easy living.

Too many are more concerned with a future 4-day workweek than with a 7-day-a-week survival.

Organized labor in instances is carrying on much as capital in instances did half a century ago—taking every advantage without thought of equity or of fairness to others.

Far too many of our citizens are becoming such devotees of the cult of individualism that they regard their rights and privileges as paramount and ignore their duties in behalf of the common welfare.

Our greatest natural resource, the youth of our country, needs as never before the sober supervision and wise counsel of their experienced elders. But the current training of youth is too frequently concerned with academic credits in archery or fencing.

We must organize and direct these young people into educational channels that will best fit them to meet the emergencies of the future. The sputnik age brought in by Russia's scientific achievements demands a serious reappraisal of our entire educational system.

Each citizen must feel an awareness of this grave responsibility to those who will inherit the United States. If we fail in this, we will not have met the Soviet threat.

The ideas here expressed have been written and uttered many times in the last few years, but they have to be reiterated and underscored. It is much later than we think.

Let us not fall behind the timetable of the Kremlin.

Important Western leaders with whom the writer recently discussed this broad subject in London, Paris, Brussels, and Spain's summer capital, San Sebastian, are as gravely concerned as our own leaders. These influential persons overseas are keenly aware of the job to be done by every citizen if Khrushchev and company are to be contained. It is a problem not too complex to understand, but the mechanics of meeting it are extraordinarily difficult to set in motion.

Consider, as a small-scale example, the dedication of Russian workers to the stupendous tasks to which they have been committed by their leaders.

In the United States pavilion at the Brussels World's Fair the personnel was, as could be expected, pleasant, calm, and courteous. But in the Russian pavilion the attendants displayed an intensely aggressive eagerness to explain the exhibit and to make a favorable impression upon the visitor, particularly if he was an American.

In the Russian pavilion restaurant the waiter was persistent and enthusiastic in describing the many dishes, the borscht and chicken Kiev, the caviar, and, of course, the vodka. When he had successfully sold the order, with an air of individual accomplishment, he literally ran to the kitchen to fetch and serve it.

We dare not delude ourselves. On all fronts—military, scientific, industrial, agricultural, scholastic, intellectual—the Russians are resolved to master us and the arts and skills in which we have long enjoyed leadership. They are dedicated to this goal. We cannot afford softness or complacency. We cannot afford laggardness. We cannot afford mediocrity in our thinking or in our doing.

Have we what it will take to make and keep our Nation secure in our time? Have we the willingness to work and to accept the disciplines required?

I repeat, have we the national character to meet the challenge?

---

## Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, Before Vanderbilt University Law School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech I made on the problems of inflation and antitrust before the Vanderbilt University Law School on February 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER BEFORE VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 25, 1959

Vanderbilt University is one of the great educational institutions of the South. It has traditionally sought for and taught truth. This is one of the reasons why Vanderbilt men and women have always been able to contribute so much to the building of America. I am indeed honored to be here today and for this opportunity to address the law school. The theme of my talk today presents the choice that must be made if we are to preserve our free, competitive system.

I firmly believe that the high cost of living is our No. 1 domestic problem. This has been increasingly emphasized in recent weeks as we have heard more and more from all sides expressions of alarm over high prices and inflation. The President, in his economic report to the Congress of January 20, 1959, also recognized this problem.

For several years I have served as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. As chairman, in the spring of 1957, I announced that the subcommittee would conduct an investigation and hold public hearings on administered price industries. As I explained at that time, "The high cost of living is due in no small part to the upward manipulation of prices by big companies in administered price industries." The subcommittee began by hearing from some of the country's leading economists who have specialized in administered prices. From the testimony of these experts, an administered price may be defined as one having two characteristics: (a) it is set by administrative actions and (b) it is maintained for a period of time. With respect to the first characteristics, it is the seller as a matter of individual choice who establishes the price at which he will make sales, whereas in competitive industries, it is the impersonal market which establishes the price. With respect to the second characteristic, there is no generally accepted period of time during which a price must remain unchanged before it can be regarded as an administered price. What is significant here is not so much the frequency of change, but the responsiveness of a price to changes in the market. Prices which are administratively set and maintained are insensitive to changes in the market; that is, they are increased and maintained at the same time that demand is falling off by decreasing output. Dr. Edwin Nourse, a former economic adviser to the President, in his definition of an administered price industry, emphasized that the essential point is that they can maintain a predetermined price by restricting production. These are the administered prices having the potential for economic distress with which the subcommittee is concerned in its inquiry.

Following the testimony of the economic experts, the subcommittee conducted extensive hearings in the steel and automobile industries, two of the most basic in our economy. It was found in these industries that there existed a kind of upside-down competition. This describes the situation where prices continue to go up even when demand decreases. These high prices are put into effect by the largest company in the industry, with their so-called competitors following almost identically. Apparently this is accomplished without any express agreement.

In the steel industry since World War II, the hearings revealed that prices have moved on a number of occasions in the opposite direction to that which was indicated by the changes in demand. The steel price index continued its virtually unbroken rise even when demand and production declined, as they did in 1949, 1954, and 1957. It also continued its climb when unit labor costs declined, as they did in 1950 and 1955. No matter what the change in cost or in demand, steel prices since 1947 have moved steadily and regularly in only one direction, upward. The subcommittee found that in 1957 steel price increases substantially exceeded cost increases. It was also clear at the time the 1957 price increases were made there was nothing in the information available to the industry to suggest a forthcoming increase in demand that would have supported higher prices. The fact that these price increases were made and maintained despite such underlying adverse economic conditions illustrates how, through price administration by the leader in the steel industry, upside-down competition can result.

In some industries such price behavior possibly would not have caused substantial injury to the public interest, but this is not true of the steel industry which is the very underpinning of our entire economy. Every time the price of steel goes up, it is inevitable that steel consuming industries raise their prices. This has a tendency to cause price increases in many other lines.

When the subcommittee began its hearings in 1957, I think it fair to state that it was the preponderate opinion that the inflation which our country was experiencing was the product of excess demand. It will be remembered that this opinion was so strongly held that the Federal Reserve Board tightened its money policy in an effort to contract demand. In the opinion of many this policy was based on a false analysis and contributed substantially to the recession from which we have not yet fully recovered. Even during this recession period prices continued to rise in most of the administered price industries, such as steel. Dr. Gardiner C. Means, an eminent economist who is the pioneer in the field of administered prices, appearing before the subcommittee on January 24, 1959, said: "Today, after experiencing inflation and depression at the same time, there are few who still think that this inflation has been the product of too much demand. Clearly, the inflation has not been of the old-fashioned, classical kind with all prices going up more or less together. Also, it is now generally

understood that the new type of inflation is associated with administered prices and wage rates. For bringing about this understanding, I believe your committee is in large measure responsible. Indeed, we are fortunate that your chairman and your committee had the imagination to see the relation between these two things and the courage to focus attention on them."

In this recent appearance before the subcommittee, Dr. Means also presented wholesale price changes by product groups for the periods 1942–53, 1942–47, 1953–57, and 1953–October 1958.

In the 1942–53 period the wholesale price changes for all commodity groups generally rose in price and by not too different amounts. During some of this period prices were controlled by OPA and OPS.

In the period 1942–47, demand was far in excess of supply and prices in all commodity groups rose. However, prices in the competitive groups far outrose prices in the administered price groups.

In the period 1953–57, there was an entirely different picture. Price increases were practically entirely in the administered price groups. In some market price groups, prices rose very slightly; in other, they actually went down.

The fourth period 1953–October 1958 extending the third period to October 1958, showed generally the same picture as the period from 1953 through 1957, namely, higher prices in administered price groups with little increases or declines in the competitive groups.

Dr. Means made one point clear: administered steel prices had the dominant role in the 1953–58 inflation. Not only did steel prices rise the most in that period, but prices in the steel and steel using groups also rose more than those of any other groups and accounted for two-thirds of the gross increase in prices. It is significant that, as Dr. Means pointed out, the administered price groups accounted for 85 percent of the gross increase in the wholesale price index. Moreover, he stated that if prices in these administered price groups had not gone up, the wholesale price index would have risen less than 1 percent and that so far as the wholesale price index is concerned, there would have been no inflation.

The result of inflation is strikingly shown in the recent Economic Report of the President. The table on page 142 of that report reveals that in current prices, the total gross national product increased from $397.5 billion in 1955 to $436.7 in 1958. However, when expressed in 1958 prices, the total gross national product only increased from $435.4 billion in 1955 to $436.7 in 1958. Thus it is shown that during this period gross national product has increased only $1.3 billion in terms of 1958 prices. Hence when inflation is milked out of the large increase in dollar values, we have only enjoyed a slight increase in gross national product.

The seriousness of the cost of inflation to the American people is further revealed in the Economic Report of the President. In a chart which appears on page 155 of that report, it is shown that the per capita disposable personal income, using current prices, increased from $1,661 in 1955 to $1,784 in 1958. In contrast, however, when 1958 prices are used, per capita disposable personal income actually declined from $1,790 in 1955 to $1,784 in 1958. Thus we reach the remarkable conclusion that every person in the United States was $6 worse off in 1958 than they were in 1955.

Because the automobile industry is so pivotal in the overall economy, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee also inquired into the pricing practice of that industry. It is claimed that one out of every seven workers in this country is dependent, directly or indirectly, on the automobile industry for his livelihood. This study reveals that General Motors today commands approximately 50 percent of the automobile market in the United States. During the past 10 years this company's average profit, after taxes, has been an impressive 25 percent of net worth. This compares with a national average of 11 percent for all manufacturing corporations. In 1947 General Motors' profit was only 17 percent, but in 1950 its profits reached 37.5 percent, which was higher than its profits of 36.2 percent in the boom year of 1929. These figures are all the more impressive when the income tax rise is taken into consideration. In 1929 General Motors' profit margin before taxes was 38.5 percent, while in 1950 its before taxes earnings reached 77.4 percent.

Mr. Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, in his appearance before the subcommittee, stated that he and three other executives determined the prices for all divisions of the corporation and that such prices were fixed so as to return 15 to 20 percent profit after taxes on total investment. It would appear that General Motors sets prices by a formula method, the first ingredient of which is the fixed 15 to 20 percent profit after taxes. To this is added the cost of materials, labor, overhead, taxes, and fixed costs based on a standard volume of 80 percent of production capacity. It is easy to see that if volume exceeds 80 percent of capacity, which is has in many years, profits are bound to rise above the 20 percent goal. The hearings showed that after these prices have been so fixed by General Motors, they become the prices of the industry. A comparison of comparable models of the major producers reveals little or no price differences.

Except for public utilities, our economy is not regulated. Ours has traditionally been a free, competitive enterprise system. But competition is fast disappearing among our basic industries because price competition is disappearing. In almost every industry we now find a big one, two, three, or four where the leader establishes prices and the others immediately follow suit. The problem of high prices and inflation also grows increasingly worse with the decline of price competition.

Almost 70 years ago the first of the antitrust laws, the Sherman Act, was passed by the Congress. This act has been supplemented by a number of others. We refer to these laws as the charter of our economic freedom. We early elected not to force companies to compete. Our antitrust laws seek to remove illegal restraints and monopolistic abuses so that they could compete. Hard core evidence is necessary to prove illegality.

In the past such evidence was forthcoming and many successful cases were brought against giant combinations of economic power. However, evidence of collusion is often lacking today because companies simply do not have to get together to set prices. As I have said, they simply follow the price pattern set by the leader. The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have told the subcommittee that they are helpless against such pricing practices unless direct evidence of collusion can be produced.

In this unhappy state of affairs the people are caught in a price inflation and the Government, under present laws, appears powerless to do anything about it. The day of decision is here. America must decide, and decide now, whether it wants a free, competitive economic system—not in fancy words, but in reality. It is up to Congress to discover how to exercise its constitutional responsibility of regulating commerce. Today, it appears that more and more of that power is being exercised by a relatively few managers in key industries.

The time has also come for the public interest to be put ahead of the private interests of either management or labor. During this time of high prices, I don't believe labor should demand or receive any wage increases in basic industries which management could justifiably use as the basis for necessary price increases.

Since the end of World War II our economy has been on a wild merry-go-round. As the cost of living increased, labor asked for wage increases as compensation. When wage increases were granted, prices were raised and the cost of living increased again. This, in turn, led to additional wage demands and so on. High prices and inflation obviously affect every group in America. Many U.S. businessmen believe the danger of the United States pricing itself out of foreign markets is an immediate one. In the President's economic message to Congress was the insistence that high prices here at home could lower our capability to compete in world markets. Labor has likewise been harmed. During this same period, we have seen great increases in unemployment. This problem is still with us today.

We now stand at the fork in the road. We must choose either Government regulation of business or the improvement of our antitrust laws. We must restore the climate where competition can be expected. The choice for me is easy. Regulation except in times of extreme emergency is undesirable.

Specifically what legislation might be passed to strengthen the antitrust laws? I would suggest three basic supplements to existing law. First, the test of section 7 of the Clayton Act, with respect to mergers, should be made to apply to section 2 of the Sherman Act. Under this section of the Clayton Act, the evidence need support only a finding of substantial lessening of competition or tendency toward monoply in order to make a merger illegal. This change in section 2 of the Sherman Act would afford the Government greater power to destroy monopolies.

Second, I would suggest that unfair methods of competition and unfair acts and practices in commerce which are unlawful under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act should be declared illegal under section 1 of the Sherman Act. This would enable the Department of Justice to attack all trade restraining evils.

Third, I would suggest that there be enacted into law my bill S. 716 authorizing the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Not having this power today, the Department is unable to gather evidence on which to base a suit except by use of grand juries in criminal investigations.

Together with the staff of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I am presently working on bills to amend section 1 and section 2 of the Sherman Act in the manner in which I have just suggested. When these bills are drafted, I shall introduce them in the Senate.

Although I believe the principal problem in our economy is the undue concentration of economic power, I also suggest that the antitrust laws be strengthened in respect to other problems. For example, I have tried for several years to secure the enactment of legislation which would partially change the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case in 1951. This bill designated for several Congresses as S. 11 would, contrary to the decision in the Standard Oil case, make illegal under section 2(a) of the Clayton Act price discriminations which may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly, even where they are made in good faith.

In 1950, when the Kefauver-Celler amendment to the antimerger section of the Clayton Act was enacted, I was hopeful that the amendment would arrest the great merger movement which was then in progress. However, the enforcement efforts of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice of the antimerger law even as so

amended has been most disappointing. Under the amended law only one case, the Bethlehem-Youngstown proposed merger, has been finally adjudicated in the courts, and this case was not appealed. I have again joined with Senator O'MAHONEY in sponsoring S. 442 requiring in specific instances that premerger notification be given to the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, with the hope that such amendment might add stimulus to the enforcement program of the antimerger law.

Standing at the forks in the road, I have indicated that answer to our basic economic problems of today lies in an improvement in our antitrust laws rather than in Government regulation. I have made some suggestions as to what some of these improvements should be. I believe that given an understanding of the problem and the choice of remedies, the public would support congressional action along the lines I have indicated.

History teaches us that when a nation loses its economic freedom, it also loses its political freedom. Germany, under Hitler, and Italy, under Mussolini, went through this experience. We must not have it happen in the United States. Keeping competitive may not be popular. To insist upon price competition may work temporary hardships on present concentrations of power, but in the long run, it is the only way a democracy can survive. The accomplishment of this purpose is the joint responsibility of business, labor, and Government and one in which lawyers must play a major part.

## Livermore Lions Look Back Over 35-Year History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Livermore Lions Club has a proud history of over a third of a century.

It has made a great contribution to the life of a community that has undergone a metamorphosis in that time. The city, named after the beautiful valley in which it is located, was once the scene of a cattle raising industry. The Livermore Valley has long, too, been recognized as the home of the finest dry wines produced in the United States.

Shortly after the outbreak of the war, the Navy established a flying center in Livermore. The property was later taken over by the Atomic Energy Commission for its giant Livermore Laboratory, the home of the hydrogen bomb.

The Livermore Laboratory attracted industry to serve it. A few years ago the General Electric Co., in looking for a place to establish a laboratory for the adaption of atomic energy to useful and peaceful purposes, selected Vallecitos not far from Livermore and its sister city, Pleasanton. Later the Sandia Co. established a branch in the Livermore Valley so that this once typically rural, cattle growing, wine producing section has become the center around which revolves the atomic energy research and development on the Pacific coast.

Naturally, the whole character of the community has changed but life goes on and it is such things as the Lions Club that ties the old with the new.

It has been my privilege to address the Lions Club in Livermore on many occasions. I remember distinctly the last time I was there one of those present was none other than Dr. Herbert York, one of the world's foremost scientists, who is now Director of Research and Engineering for the Department of Defense.

I am making part of these remarks an article that appeared in the Livermore News February 17, 1959.

The article follows:

LIONS LOOK BACK OVER 35-YEAR HISTORY

Newcomers were filled in on historical phases of the Livermore Lions Club, and older members enjoyed an evening of reminiscing, when a past president's plaque was presented to President Ed Hawkins at the ladies night banquet held at the Castlewood Country Club Thursday night.

The plaque was prepared by and given to the club by Harold Moore, while the nameplates of the past presidents were prepared by a special committee, for which Judge Joseph A. Schenone acted when he made the presentation.

"Our club is dedicated to community service," Judge Schenone said. "All you have to do is to read the list of the various presidents of the Lions through the 35 years of our club's history, and you have 35 names of civic leaders through that period. Each contributed in some way to our community life and to our club."

First name, for the year 1924–25, was that of Charles A. Smith, who was manager of the Bank of Italy, which occupied a building at the corner of Livermore Avenue and First, which later was supplanted by the present building at the same location—now the city hall.

Smith, "Mike" Callaghan, and Jack Hock, father of City Clerk Dorothy Hock, were named as three of the club's founders. The club met at Croce's, and now annually makes a pilgrimmage to Lodi to Croce's restaurant.

Dr. Chesley Bush, still active member of the club, was president in 1925–26; Dr. Paul E. Dolan, who recently passed away, in 1926–27; Manley J. Clark, 1927–28; J. O. McKown, 1928–29; E. J. Lawless, 1929–30; Dr. Frank Savage, 1930–31; M. R. Henry, 1931–32; William Rees, 1932–33; Earl E. Johnson, 1933–34; P. E. Jones, 1934–35; Al Bonne, 1935–36; Lee R. Staiger, 1936–37; Charles Turner, 1937–38; Frank Gill, 1938–39; Harvey Saunders, 1939–40; Walter Motta, 1940–41; Lewis Wright, 1941–42; Everett Miller, 1942–43; Warren Davison, 1943–44; Dr. Don Fraser, 1944–45.

Lloyd Beebe, 1945–46; Joe Michell, 1946–47; Dr. W. A. Cassidy, 1947–48; Elliott Dopking, 1948–49; Earl Ising, 1949–50; Dr. Robert Jeffrey, 1950–51; Henry Windhusen, 1951–52; Manuel Medeiros, 1952–53; Harold Ryman, 1953–54; Manuel Duarte, 1954–55; Judge Schenone, 1955–56; Charles Francisco, 1956–57; G. R. McLeod, 1957–58; and Ed Hawkins, 1958–59.

Funniest incident related by Judge Schenone was when President Bill Rees was chosen a delegate to the Lions convention, which required him to board a train in Oakland and ride to a convention several thousand miles away. "It was his first train trip, and the first time he had left this area," Judge Schenone said. "It so impressed him that when he went to give his report on the convention he began telling about getting on the train. And believe it or not we never did hear about the convention because Bill made three consecutive talks at three consecutive meetings and just got as far as from Oakland to the Nebraska * * * the train impressed him so."

Duarte, zone chairman, awarded 100 percent attendance pins for the year to Ray Centoni, Dr. Hawkins, William McKinnon, Medeiros, Moore, Windhusen, Fracisco, William Kelly, McLeod, Larry Mongeau, Judge Schenone and President Hawkins awarded one to Duarte.

Don Witham, Community Concerts agent, was the guest of Mr. and Mrs. McLeod.

## Almost Everything Is Cheaper, Union Finds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much talk these days about what a dollar will buy but some of the economic jargon is difficult to understand. Not everyone knows the meaning of "weighted averages," "median," and so forth, but here is an article that really comes down to earth in making its point.

I thought these were very interesting figures. However, this shows it is cheaper to the person who has a job but unfortunately, more expensive for the one who does not.

The article follows:

ALMOST EVERYTHING IS CHEAPER, UNION FINDS

The Machinist, official weekly publication of the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, published in its February 12 issue a detailed piece of research designed to answer the question: "Are we really any better off financially than we were 10 or 20 years ago?" The answer was a resounding, "Yes."

The newspaper compared prices in 1938, 1948, and 1958 with the amount of time an American had to work in those years in order to earn enough to buy 28 items. The verdict: Almost everything is cheaper (in 1958) when you translate the price into minutes of the average hourly wage rate. The publication added that "except for apples, cotton blouses and cotton dresses, the record shows that it doesn't take nearly as long to earn the necessities as it did 20 years ago. We lost ground on a couple of items since 1948, notably new cars and Blue Cross hospitalization."

Prices have about doubled since 1938, the Machinist noted, but at the same time average 1958 wages have increased 336 percent over 1938 wages and 157 percent over 1948 wages. Here is what that means in terms of specific examples of higher purchasing power, the union newspaper said (that period of work required in each of the years to earn the purchase price):

| Item | 1938 | 1948 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Loaf of bread | 8.5 minutes | 5.75 minutes | 5.5 minutes. |
| Quart of milk | 12 minutes | 8.5 minutes | 7.25 minutes. |
| 10 pounds of potatoes | 20 minutes | 23 minutes | 16 minutes. |
| 1 pound of apples | 4.5 minutes | 5.25 minutes | 4.75 minutes. |
| 1 pound bacon | 35 minutes | 34 minutes | 21.5 minutes. |
| 1 pound chuckroast | 21.75 minutes | 28.5 minutes | 16 minutes. |
| Haircut | 47.5 minutes | 55.5 minutes | 42.5 minutes. |
| Movie ticket | 57 minutes | 44 minutes | 35.5 minutes. |
| 2 packs cigarettes | 24 minutes | 17.75 minutes | 12 minutes. |
| Monthly Blue Cross | 69 minutes | 49 minutes | 67.5 minutes. |
| Ford sedan | 1,015 hours | 892.5 hours | 945 hours. |
| 4-ply tire | 12.25 hours | 9.75 hours | 8.5 hours. |
| 100-mile train trip | 6 hours | 3.5 hours | 2.75 hours. |
| New York-Chicago flight | 71.33 hours | 32.66 hours | 22.66 hours. |
| 5-room house | 7,860.25 hours | 6,486 hours | 6,369.75 hours. |
| Portable sewing machine | 188.75 hours | 92.5 hours | 70.25 hours. |
| Vacuum cleaner | 55.5 hours | 37 hours | 30.5 hours. |
| Electric iron | 5.5 hours | 4 hours | 2.75 hours. |
| Refrigerator | 147.25 hours | 178.5 hours | 71 hours. |
| Wringer washer | 59 hours | 80 hours | 49.5 hours. |
| 100 kilowatt-hours electricity | 6.25 hours | 2.5 hours | 1.75 hours. |
| Man's wool suit | 28.5 hours | 26 hours | 23 hours. |
| Men's work shoes | 4 hours | 4.25 hours | 3.5 hours. |
| Boys' shoes | 2 hours | 2.5 hours | 1.75 hours. |
| Dungarees | 1.25 hours | 1.5 hours | 1 hour. |
| Ladies rayon shirt | 1.5 hours | 2.5 hours | 1.75 hours. |
| Ladies cotton dress | 1.5 hours | 2.25 hours | 1.75 hours. |
| Ladies house slippers | 1.5 hours | 1.75 hours | 1.25 hours. |

## Alameda County Grand Jurors Named

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Alameda Times-Star of February 21, 1959:

COUNTY'S GRAND JURORS NAMED

An Alameda man and 14 other men and 4 women were chosen members of the 1959 Alameda County Grand Jury yesterday in the court of Superior Judge James R. Agee.

James Wilkins Pearson, Alameda hardware merchant, of 1364 Pearl Street, is the only Alamedan on the grand jury.

Walter S. Ries, of Oakland, retired real estate broker, was appointed jury foreman by Judge Agee.

Selected to serve with the Alamedan were seven residents of Oakland, five Piedmonters, four Berkeleyans, and one resident each of Pleasanton and San Leandro.

NAMED TO SERVE

Members of the 1959 grand jury are Fred E. Anderson, of Oakland, printing firm executive; Mrs. Anita Baum, of Oakland, wife of a pharmacy owner; Donald A. Breed, of Piedmont, real estate broker; Dunlap C. Clark, of Piedmont, banker; T. C. Drennan, of Oakland, mortuary executive; Mrs. Ruth A. Gotzenberg, of Berkeley, wife of a landscape architect; Harry H. Hicks, of Oakland, retired insurance broker; Edgar B. Jessup, of Piedmont, business machine firm executive; Roy A. Legge, of Piedmont, retired sales executive; J. Elwin Le Tendre, of Berkeley, educator; Mrs. Ruth Logan, of Piedmont, civic leader.

A. Lee Oder, of Berkeley, mortuary owner; Ernest W. Schween, of Pleasanton, insurance broker; Alva G. Starr, of Oakland, retired educator; Fred W. Swain, of Berkeley, retired rubber company executive; Mrs. Gladys Valley, San Leandro, civic leader; and Charles Vegod, of Oakland, women's wear store executive.

Within the next few weeks, the panel is scheduled to tour county institutions, including the county jail, hospital, and juvenile hall.

In addition to returning indictments, the grand jury is empowered to make a complete annual examination of county financial and governmental records.

At the end of its 1-year term the grand jury submits a detailed report on its action during the year and suggestions for improvement in governmental efficiency.

## Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio broadcast on February 23, 1959, by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF FEBRUARY 23, 1959

If the social experts and the population prognosticators are correct, the quiet of the countryside is due to be disrupted by many strange sounds and happenings. Maybe not next year, or even 10 years from now, but farmers are warned that it is coming. It is the result—of the combination of the technological revolution in farming, and the irresistible bursting at the seams that is going on in the cities.

Kenneth L. Bachman, who is in the Research Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, tells us that the U.S. population will grow rapidly until 1975, and that the revolution in farming will continue. City incomes will keep on going up. We'll have neither war nor depression to cause a setback in this headlong race to bigger and better things, Bachman predicts, and let's hope that he's right.

Bachman gives us an idea of what's happening, and is likely to happen, by saying: "The old distinctions between farm and city are disappearing rapidly. Many a farm community is now a veritable melting pot of people of diverse occupations. These developments carry with them important community problems. There surely will be rises in farm property taxes to pay for schools, water, and sewage, for example.

"The growth of our industrial economy has had far-reaching effects on the rural community. Rural people who do not live on farms outnumber those who do by a five to one ratio. In addition, more than one-third of the farm operators work off their farms 100 days a year or more. In 1957, 40 percent of the net income of farm families was from nonfarm sources."

And Mr. Bachman says that by 1975 we'll have a population of 230 million people (we have 175 million now), and the trend toward more non-farm people living in rural areas appears to be inevitable.

But how about the farmers themselves. Bachman predicts that we'll have only two million commercial farms by 1975, compared to a little more than three million now. "Agriculture," he says, "appears to be in the very middle of revolutionary changes in size and capital structure."

Well, you people on the farms don't have to be told about that. But we doubt that a lot of farm areas will ever be homesites for city people. While it is true that millions of acres of farmland are being swallowed up each year by housing developments, highways, and so forth, this is mostly limited to areas not too far from urban centers.

In all this high-speed mechanical and modernization splurge we ought not to lose sight of our most efficient food and fiber producers, the family farmers. True, their farms will grow larger, but we need to preserve the family character of the farm for the good of everybody in the Nation.

Your co-ops, like GTA, are preparing themselves to serve the farm families of the future. It is a co-op responsibility to expand into new fields, and build up abilities to cope with the future. It is only sensible to look ahead, and that's what the farm families who own and control GTA are doing.

## The Shrine's Position on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate, A.A.O.N.M.S. of East Orange, N.J., entitled "The Shrine's Position on Communism."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHRINE'S POSITION ON COMMUNISM: AN ADDRESS BY IMPERIAL SIR GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, IMPERIAL POTENTATE, A.A.O.N.M.S. OF EAST ORANGE, N.J.

There is so much confusion in the world today as to who stands where and for what in reference to communism. I think it is appropriate to tell you where the Shrine stands.

Speaking as our imperial potentate in 1947, the Honorable George E. Rowe, member of the Supreme Court of New York,

warned us of the serious inroads communism was then making in America. The judge said: "Fraternalism and religion will cease if communism breaks down our form of government * * * the Shrine has taken the lead among the Nation's fraternal orders in turning the spotlight on Red communism, its identity, its aims, and its purposes." Continued the judge: "World leaders have commended the Shrine for its fearlessness, its forthrightness, and its knowledge of America's red menace."

Speaking as our imperial potentate in 1949, Imperial Sir Galloway Calhoun, currently president and chairman of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, said: "Communism is a godless philosophy * * * to accomplish its purpose, it would overthrow our Government by force."

Speaking as our imperial potentate in 1950, Imperial Sir Harold Lloyd, currently a member of the board of trustees, Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children said: "One cannot be both an American and a Communist. * * * We oppose any philosophy that * * * would invade the secret sanctuary of man's conscience where only God may enter as judge."

The foregoing statements made by three of our most eminent imperial potentates were approved by the imperial council sessions in which they were made, and are, therefore, in effect our fraternity's position on communism. A position which I support.

There are those who profess to believe that communism and capitalism or communism and freedom or communism and Christianity can coexist in the same world. The architects of this diabolical movement deny this. For example, in his book Problems of Leninism, Stalin said, "Communism and capitalism cannot exist in the same world. Sooner or later one or the other must conquer." He said that religion, belief in God, must be exterminated everywhere before communism is safe anywhere, and that religion is an opiate of the people. Lenin, the principal architect of communism, a few years before his death said: "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like overripe fruit into our hands. We have never concealed the fact that our (Russian) revolution is only the beginning, that it will lead to a victorious ending only when we shall have inflamed the whole world with its revolutionary fires." Communists hold implements of war in one hand and the dove of peace in the other. Out of one side of their mouths they plead for peace and out of the other they threaten world war. They thrive on revolution. They love to fish in troubled water of their own making. Communists tell us that war can be avoided if we submit to their demands which would be worse than war since we would lose our precious liberties and demonstrate that we are not worthy of the great sacrifices made for us by our Founding Fathers.

There are two basic threats to our way of life, and our people are becoming apathetic to both, thus playing into the hands of the Communists. Those threats are: communism and inflation. The latter grows out of the former. Communists hope to destroy our way of life through inflation. Inflation feeds on itself and when it gets out of control, as it did in Germany and Italy, chaos reigns. It is from chaos that communism grows. An illustration of the degree to which inflation has taken root in our country is that balanced budget are becoming nasty words in America. To avoid inflation and the resultant dictatorship, we must keep our expenditures within our income. We must expose the Communists for what they are: leeches that destroy liberty. Because of the apathy of the people and the alertness of the Communists, it is dangerous to fight communism in America. History does not reveal the name of a single American who fought communism without being smeared, beginning with Martin Dies of Texas. The men who are currently bearing the brunt of communistic smears are the Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and J. Edgar Hoover. Every red-blooded American, regardless of politics, will rally behind and support their efforts.

You will doubtless recall that more than half of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Masons, more than half of the signers of the Constitution were Masons. Our Masonic forefathers believed in the dignity of the individual. Many of them gave their lives that we might live in liberty. I, therefore, feel that we Shriners and Masons have a greater responsibility to keep America American than any other group of citizens. If the time ever comes when we are afraid to speak our minds then, indeed, will we have lost our way of life.

## Joseph Mekota Letter on Election Day, a Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, 66 years ago, Joseph Mekota opened a law office in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Since that time, he has engaged in the general practice of law in that city. He is now 93 years of age, and still carries on duties pertaining to his profession.

It has been my distinct honor to know this gentleman very well over the course of the last 30 years. In fact, it is my very good fortune to be able to meet and visit with him three or four times a year, since he is general counsel of the Western Bohemian Fraternal Association, in which I am active as an officer. Quarterly, we attend together meetings of the board of directors.

Thus, I know that, at his age of 93, this venerable practitioner and highly respected citizen still possesses much energy and much interest in all such activities, as he has been accustomed to do for many, many years.

By way of a personal light, I should like to say, Mr. President, that one of the former Members of this body was a law partner of Mr. Mekota many, many years ago. This former partner was the one-time Senator from the State of Missouri, James A. Reed, who represented his State in the U.S. Senate from 1911 to 1929. Senator Reed later moved from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, to Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. President, Mr. Mekota is not a member of the same political party to which I belong; but I do not know of anyone for whom I have greater respect, or whom I would honor more as a lawyer, as a gentleman, and as a citizen of the Republic.

He has gathered wisdom. His patriotism and his concern for the continued well-being and advancement of our Republic have deepened as the years have gone on.

The suggestion he wrote to me the other day—to make election day a holiday—is one of notable merit in any event. It is the more so because it is proposed by one with such a splendid background, history, and achievement of American citizenship in his own right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.

ELECTION DAY, A HOLIDAY

The American people have many fine qualities. They are intelligent, industrious, religious, patriotic, fraternal, tolerant, sociable, and progressive, with many other good qualities. But they have one weakness. They do not appreciate and exercise their right to vote. In the presidential elections about two-thirds of the electorate cast their ballots. In elections other than presidential, only about one-half do so. This is not a healthy situation. In some future day, some subversive element might get control of our Government.

Recently there has been some suggestions in the press in order to solve this problem, to hold elections on Sunday. To this suggestion many objections have been made by numerous religious denominations.

Why not declare and constitute our election day as a national holiday, the same as Decoration Day and Labor Day? Locally our banks, courthouse, and city hall are closed on election day. Why not close all business, commercial and industrial activities for one more national holiday? Our country has not very many holidays and one more would be acceptable to the people. Election holiday would arouse interest in elections and would cause a much higher percentage of voters to exercise one of the highest and most important privileges of American citizenship. Such holiday should apply only to National and State elections.

JOSEPH MEKOTA.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.

## Reinstatement of National Service Life Insurance Supported by Insurance Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have joined with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] in sponsoring a bill which would allow a 1-year period in which veterans of World War II and the Korean war would be allowed to reinstate those national service life insurance policies which they either failed to take out on leaving the service or allowed to lapse after leaving the service.

I recently received a letter from a constituent who is in the insurance business, in which he informed me that he was in favor of this bill.

I request unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRANK M. JONES ESTATE SERVICE,
*Birmingham, Ala., February 9, 1959.*

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
*U.S. Senator,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SPARKMAN: On Saturday night, January 31, I had the opportunity to listen on my automobile radio to your commentaries regarding the introduction of your bill to make it possible for ex-servicemen to recover their forfeited national service life insurance.

My experience in the life insurance business dates from April 14, 1925. During World War II, and while serving in the U.S. Coast Guard, I handled the sale of national service life insurance; so there has been no interruption of continuous life insurance experience for almost 34 full years.

Since my return from the war I have assisted many ex-servicemen to reinstate and/or to convert their Government insurance to permanent plans. As of the moment we are helping them to include the increased total disability coverage in their policies.

And while no one has ever paid us one dollar for services rendered in connection with their Government insurance, I can tell you for sure that we have sold large and substantial amounts of insurance in the various companies with whom we do business to these same veterans. It was for these personal reasons I regretted very much the passing of legislation April 25, 1951, to preclude "the boys" from picking up their lapsed policies.

No one need explain to me if every ex-serviceman reinstated and retained his national service life insurance that its presence in the amount of $10,000 would mean a reduced ability to buy new insurance to the extent of the premiums paid for the Government policy. But, if the people in the life insurance would view the matter as I do, then they would recognize the fact that ownership of the Government policy, with the substantial dividends thereon, would give millions of men an enlightened perspective of insurance with subsequent desire on their part to own more.

You veterans of War I had until April 25, 1951 to pick up your lapsed insurance. I consider it only equitable and fair that veterans of War II and the Korean police action should be given a restored opportunity to recover their Government policies. And it is for these personal reasons (if you wish to so consider them) that I am 100 percent in favor of your bill.

Sincere regards,

FRANK M. JONES.

## Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the truly impressive and challenging tasks confronting the American people is a research program which will finally get at the causes and possible cures for cancer. An excellent and thoughtful article was contributed to the Klamath Falls Herald and News, of Klamath Falls, Oreg., on this subject by Florence Jenkins, a member of the staff of that daily newspaper. This article appeared on October 26, 1958, under the title of "Cancer Education."

In her editorial article, Mrs. Jenkins describes the dedicated and capable people in Klamath Falls who have been working in the cause of cancer research through the program of the Oregon division of the American Cancer Society. Because this is a national and international problem, I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Jenkins' article from the Klamath Falls Herald and News of October 26, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANCER EDUCATION

(By Florence Jenkins)

"Guard the ones you love" is the slogan of the American Cancer Society.

It is refreshing to have the executive secretary of an organization or campaign present her case without saying, somewhere in the story, how much money is needed.

Grace Reymers, formerly of Klamath Falls and now of Ashland, is executive secretary of the Jackson County chapter of the Oregon division of the American Cancer Society. She came to Klamath Falls on Friday with Mrs. Jack James and Mrs. Ray Frisbie, crusade chairman and service chairman, respectively, for Jackson County.

Through arrangements made by Dr. S. M. Kerron, Klamath County Public Health Department head, they held a meeting with interested local women to reorganize a Klamath Falls chapter. Mrs. Francis Skinner has accepted chairmanship of the public service committee. Mrs. Harold Cloake, Mrs. Don Anderson, and Mrs. Harold L. Catmull will head the educational program here.

"Through education alone, 80,000 lives can be saved in the coming year by acquainting the public with the seven danger signals which may mean cancer," Mrs. Reymers states.

"Cancer will strike one out of four persons," she declared. "One out of three cases can be cured. Half of the remaining cases can be arrested and the other half could have been saved had they gotten to their doctor in time for diagnosis and proper treatment," she added.

The wonderful part about the program is the fact that the information is free. There are pamphlets already printed with concisely stated facts ready for distribution. Much authentic additional information is available from members of the committee or from the Klamath County Public Health Department.

The American Cancer Society puts the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the individual person. Be on the alert for any of the danger signals which may indicate the present of cancer and seek medical assistance at once.

The society advises a physical checkup, if you are 35 or older, at least once a year. The society's service program seeks to save life and ease pain through a better informed and alert public.

Volunteers are sorely needed in the crusade to save lives from cancer.

## Case of the Fugitive Treasure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the December 28, 1958, issue of Time magazine entitled the "Case of the Fugitive Treasure."

This article illustrates one of the aspects of Swiss banking under a system of numbered and secret bank accounts protected by secrecy laws. It shows the danger to the economy of a nation when the identity of deposits and clients are kept in secret. It also brings to mind that these banks can act as agents for others whose true identity cannot be determined.

The subcommittee on the Trading With the Enemy Act will be interested in this aspect of banking in its consideration of the question of General Aniline & Film Co. Recently a number of Swiss banks acquired control of the claimant to the GAF shares which were seized by the United States. Also, I. G. Farben in Germany filed a suit claiming an interest in General Aniline.

These questions must be resolved prior to legislation dealing with the subject to determine the best course to follow in the interest of the United States.

I have introduced a bill to provide for full return of the seized properties because I believe in the principle of respect for private property. Others have introduced bills for the sale of such properties. The course to be followed will depend on the results of investigation into all of the aspects. I hope this can be done as early as possible in the present session of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPAIN—CASE OF THE FUGITIVE TREASURE

"If Franco could afford it politically," said an American businessman last summer, "he could throw a scandal that would make vicuña coats look tawdry." Last week Franco decided he had to afford it. A mass police roundup hit Spain, and this time the victims were not radical opponents, but some of the nation's biggest and richest names—bankers, industrialists, cabinet ministers, even members of Franco's own family. Though details were carefully concealed from the public, the roundup was the climax of the most sensational financial scandal in the history of the regime. The crime common to all: Setting up secret accounts overseas, mounting to at least $280 million in Switzerland and to millions more in banks elsewhere.

The practice of banking hard money outside is an old one, and the Spanish Government had tended to wink at the practice. Businessmen swore that they could not operate without external balances, and even some government agencies had undeclared accounts of their own. But Spain's sick

economy has been going from bad to worse. In the first 9 months of 1958 the country suffered a trade deficit of $263 million. Its exports of citrus fruits are down more than 60 percent. It has so little left in gold reserves ($57 million) that it cannot even scrape up enough money to pay for the crude petroleum it needs each year. Desperate for hard currency, and shocked by the size of the sums involved, Franco decided to get the fugitive capital back, no matter who might get hurt in the process.

## Samuel I. Parker, Citizen-Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on December 21, 1958, the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N.C., carried an article on Col. Samuel I. Parker, of Concord, N.C., our greatest citizen-soldier of the First World War. Colonel Parker returned to active duty during the Second World War and distinguished himself by training small units for their proper role in combat.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the Greensboro Daily News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAR HEEL IS FIRST MAN TO RECEIVE TOP THREE U.S. WAR DECORATIONS

(By Helen C. Arthur)

CONCORD.—It took a modest, reserved North Carolinian to become the first man in history to receive America's three highest awards for heroism in battle.

S. I. "Si" Parker, a native of Monroe and now of Concord, does not appear the stern military man.

But during World War I, his actions won him the Congressional Medal, the Distinguished Service Cross, and two Silver Stars.

These are only a few of the honors and medals bestowed on this quietly forceful man with the iron-gray hair, brother of the late Judge John J. Parker.

His also are two Purple Hearts, the Legion of Merit (from World War II), the French Fourragere in colors of the French Croix de Guerre (which he can wear as an individual), the Victory Medal from World War I with five battle clasps.

WON MANY OTHERS

In fact, Parker was awarded many lesser medals—including a number of foreign decorations for which he has never applied.

Only twice in all the years since has he worn his medals. Until only recently they were packed away. Close friends talked him into framing them.

What were these deeds that made Parker the first man in American history to hold all these awards?

The Army citation puts it in dry, matter-of-fact phrases. It does not describe the dirt and grime and blood and noise and fear of war.

Here is what the then lieutenant did in 1918:

The 2d and 3d Battalions of the 28th Infantry merged after several hours of severe fighting near Soissons, France, finally establishing a front-line position. In doing so, a gap was left between the right flank of a French colonial division and the left flank of the 28th, exposed the 28th to terrific enemy machinegun fire from a nest located on a rock quarry on high ground.

Observing the situation, young Lieutenant Parker ordered his depleted platoon to follow him in an attack on the strongpoint. Needing more help, the lieutenant happened on a group of leaderless, disorganized French colonials and talked them into following him.

They fought their way through enemy rifle and machinegun fire to the crest of the hill, rushed it and took the quarry by storm, capturing 6 machineguns and about 40 prisoners.

The next day, the assault continuing, Parker was hit in the leg. As there were few officers left, he refused to be evacuated and stayed with his command.

Again, he led the attack, crawling on his hands and knees to do it because of his wound, until the objective was reached.

For this, the lieutenant won the Congressional Medal. This is a five-pointed gold satr, surrounded by a green laurel wreath and suspended from a bronze bar on which the word "valor" is inscribed. It is the highest award for heroism America has to offer.

STILL MORE

But there's more.

In France, July, 1918, with General Pershing ordering this citation, Parker "With total disregard for his own personal danger, advanced directly on a machinegun 150 yards away while the enemy was firing directly at him, and killed the gunner with his pistol. In the town of Exermont, his platoon was almost surrounded after having taken several prisoners and inflicted heavy losses on the enemy, but despite the fact that only a few men of the platoon were left, continued to fight until other troops came to their aid."

For this, Lieutenant Parker was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

Again, in October 1918, the young lieutenant, "whose great spirit and courage were most stimulating to his men * * * in conjunction with another officer working with two squads, successfully repulsed a strong German counterattack and, singlehanded, captured a German machine gunner."

You would never know of these things about this man.

"The good Lord just let me live through it. I just happened to get where things had to be done.

"In all honesty, it is as difficult for me today as it was in 1918 to piece together in my own mind all that happened."

NEVER REGULAR

A big man, Parker was never a Regular Army officer, but was active in the Reserve between wars. In World War II he was called on to help by lecturing officers and officer candidates on mental preparation for the battlefield.

In fact, he wrote his own textbook, and it was used at West Point Military Academy. For this work he won the Legion of Merit.

Between wars, until his retirement last year, Parker and his family lived in South Orange, N. J. He worked with a pharmaceutical manufacturing firm of New York, becoming a vice president.

As a youth, he left the University of North Carolina in his senior year to enlist in 1917, and attended the first officer training camp at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga. From there he was sent overseas, where for some time he was attached to the British Army.

Now, he and his wife, the former Miss Mary Lou Morris, of Concord, live in a spacious white house high on a hill near Concord. Parker enjoys his retirement and visits from his daughter and two grandsons.

## The Changeable Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the Midwest's outstanding agricultural writers is Al Stedman of the St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch.

He has effectively called attention to the inconsistencies of the administration in relation to wheat and corn.

On the one hand, the administration professes to be against controls in telling farmers to produce all they can and then it expresses concern about surpluses and insists on tighter controls.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article which was published in the February 15 issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, by Al Stedman, entitled "Uncle Capriccio," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE CAPRICCIO

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

A benevolent old gentleman but changeable is Uncle Sam. Some folks affectionately call him Uncle Santa Claus. His payments arriving in any season are welcome as the flowers of spring.

The mystery is as to why he is target for so many brickbats. Down on the farm he should be as popular as sender of payments—soil bank payments, conservation payments, wool payments, sugar payments, etc. Instead, he gets blamed for everything: low prices, high prices, even bad weather being ascribed to H-bomb tests or something done by Uncle Sam.

Oh, there could be a lot of reasons, factual and fictitious. When Government, regardless of party in power, takes credit for prosperity, it has a hard time ducking blame for reverses. It's human nature to cuss Uncle Sam when things go haywire. No matter how much the Government may do for somebody, the beneficiary can always squirm with envy of others who, in truth or imagination, have been treated even better.

But more than platitudes are needed to solve the mystery. Could Uncle Sam's own conduct be a source of his troubles? It's a hunch to explore. Maybe it's Uncle's changeability that has some folks buffaloed.

For instance, there's his split personality toward those two monarchs of the countryside—wheat and corn. True they're different. Wheat is the king of the bread grains. Corn is the king of feed grains. So Uncle can hardly be expected to treat them exactly alike, though he does vow more price equality between them, so farmers can afford to feed flocks on surplus wheat.

Uncle Sam's mien is a bit brusk as he rides the plains with bad news for the wheat farmers.

"Boys," he says, "much as we hate it we'll have to ask you from now on to control your wheat production. You'll have to slash acreage allotments, tighten up quotas, ban exemptions and loopholes, and hike penalties for overplanting. If, that is, you want wheat price supports kept up."

But as he travels over into the Corn Belt, Uncle Sam's mood changes. Government bins and surplus potentials seem no longer to bother him. The worry lines leave his brow. His whiskers quiver with optimism.

He is an altered ego with no chip any longer on his shoulder.

"Boys," he chuckles, "grow all the corn you want. No production controls for you. No allotments, no quotas, no penalties. The sky's the limit. All that and Government price supports too."

Mostly the home folks think simple and straight. They think of a spade as a spade, a cow as a cow, and of sauce for the goose as permissible sauce for the gander.

They think that if a U.S. plan of supplementing free prices with Government payments is right for one crop, it shouldn't be banned on principles from another crop. But as to this, Uncle undergoes another change of personality. He smiles on the plan as fine for wool and sugar. He scowls on it as socialism for wheat or butter.

Earnestly your Uncle talks for constitutional guarantees of freedom of markets for farmers and housewives. This he calls healthy American competition that leaves producers free to sell and consumers free to buy where each can do best. That's for some foods and areas.

But as to Midwest milk and cream, Uncle Sam's mood shifts again. Now he drops his talk about freedom of prices and markets, erects a wall around the District of Columbia, lifts prices inside that wall, and says to Midwest milk, "we do not want you to enter here."

Perhaps that's how Uncle Sam gets to be a magnet for barbs from the back country. Home folks are puzzled by his trait of changing mien as he shifts his farm plans from region to region and from crop to crop. Maybe that's why they shy a verbal, shillelagh now and then in the changeable gentleman's direction.

## The Place of the American Indian in Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a guest editorial, written by Peter Homer, Sr., a Mohave Indian, chairman of the Colorado River Tribal Council, and published in a recent issue of the Amerindian, the American Indian Review.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Contributed by Peter Homer, Sr.)

For the past 130 years or more the Government has handled the affairs of the various Indian tribes in this country. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was created in 1824 for the express purpose of civilizing and Christianizing the Indians and fitting them to take their place as citizens of the United States. This was the outgrowth of the program which Congress had adopted toward the Indians at the very inception of this Government and was in accordance with the policy of the first settlers in this country.

The Indians, to some extent, have taken their place in society, but the numbers are small in comparison with other minority groups which do not get educational and other benefits from the Government. Many people have questioned why the Indians have not advanced more rapidly. Most answers dwell on culture, custom, language, and background as reasons for the difficulty.

Place any class of people in a state of complacency through paternalistic care, protection, and other benefits for over a period of time and see what happens. Place these same activities under a division of Government which soon becomes a bureaucracy with all its policies, rules, regulations, and legal entanglements; let it become a political football and see where it goes and what it does to the very people it is supposed to benefit.

The failure has been that it was not realized that Indians would have to grow up. Policies and objectives should prepare Indians to a point of self-sufficiency so that they can take their place in society without jeopardy to, or loss of, land holdings, rights, and other property. Indians must realize, too, that there is a goal for which they must strive and, if they are to survive, they must do their part in attaining that goal.

## The Cyprus Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials on the accord reached in London this week on the Cyprus problem. This remarkable accord, restoring friendly relations among estranged allies, deserves wide acclaim and approval by the free world.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 20, 1959]

WELL DONE ON CYPRUS

The accord signed in London on the Cyprus problem represents a negotiated compromise of many valid interests. As such, it may not be an instrument of perfection in the eyes of any one party. It is doubtful, if not impossible, that any such instrument could be devised without so offending less-favored interests that continued strife on the island would be assured, and that such a structure of western unity as the NATO would be dangerously weakened.

Precise details of the compact are to be released at a later date. Salient points, however, are those negotiated at Zurich earlier this month by Prime Ministers Karamanlis, of Greece, and Menderes, of Turkey—and concurred in now by Prime Minister Macmillan, of Great Britain, Archbishop Makarios, and Dr. Fazil Kutchuk. The latter two are leaders of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot factions, respectively. In brief, the terms would give Cyprus a status of independence and would create an island government headed by a Greek Cypriot and with an assembly divided 70 to 30 percent between Greek and Turkish representation. Political union with Greece, a long-standing aspiration, would be banned. So would partition, an alternative favored more recently by Turkey. Britain would retain military base rights, still considered vital to the Commonwealth and to NATO as well.

There is credit enough in this solution for all to share. Mr. Karamanlis, in particular, deserves an extra tribute for persuading Archbishop Makarios to modify his last-minute objections, and the Greek Parliament should applaud the strong statesmanship displayed by their chief of government. Ankara should be comparably approving of the contribution made by Prime Minister Menderes, especially against the background of the air tragedy which cost the lives of so many of his associates on this mission of statesmanship. For Mr. Macmillan, about to leave for Moscow, the agreement reflects once again the British capacity for honorable and responsible adjustment to the changing times.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 20, 1959]

BLESSED EVENT FOR CYPRUS

Good news is a precious commodity in these days of grim international outlook, and the Greek, Turkish, British, and Cypriot representatives meeting in London have produced some really good news by settling the Cyprus dispute. The accord is the more welcome because of the fears that last-minute objections from the Greek Cypriot leader, Archbishop Makarios, might snarl the agreement reached between Greece and Turkey last week. The settlement was possible because each of the principals—Greek Prime Minister Karamanlis, Turkish Prime Minister Menderes from his hospital bed after his narrow escape in an air tragedy, British Prime Minister Macmillan, and Archbishop Makarios himself—joined in a genuine compromise to end 4 years of ugly strife.

Of all the concessions the Greek Government and Greek Cypriots appear to have given the most in forswearing their long dream of union, or enosis; this took real statesmanship. But it would be unworthy to qualify the credit. The Turkish Government and Turkish Cypriots renounced their demand for partition; and the British Government modified its own plans for the beleaguered Mediterranean island in return for continued sovereignty over military bases. Assuredly the soon-to-be-formed independent Republic of Cyprus, with carefully weighted representation and checks for the respective Greek and Turkish communities, will have difficulties of its own. But these can be met with good will.

What is especially remarkable is that this represents an agreed solution of a vexing problem. In too many of the world's grievances solutions prove difficult and are therefore evaded through temporizing and expediency. As Mr. Karamanlis said, the people of Cyprus are the victors; but not the least of the benefits is the restoration of friendly relations among estranged allies. That makes the accord the more rare—and it deserves to be applauded accordingly.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Hellenic Chronicle, Feb. 12, 1959]

CYPRUS SOLUTION

We've had an agreement on Cyprus. Ironically, the negotiations that brought this accord were accompanied by far less fanfare than were many that had fizzled.

Premiers Karamanlis and Menderes, deserve rich plaudits. Though the accord now must go to London, we feel that the Macmillan government will leap at the chance to put its stamp of approval on an agreement that will spell finis for the long-festering sore.

What's more the agreement is an honorable one and one which most will agree will not harm the prestige of either of three parties. What's more important, the agreement leaves the Cypriot people themselves with a working arrangement that should not create any difficulties.

Though propaganda was lacking, the meeting at Zurich did not go unnoticed. The mere fact that the Greek and Turkish

premiers had come together at a meeting table was most noteworthy. It was proof positive that a tremendous amount of progress in dissolving the impasse had been made since the end of the recent U.N. General Assembly session in New York.

At the conclusion of the U.N. session, Greece and Turkey were poles apart. A compromise resolution on Cyprus had been adopted, urging continued negotiations toward resolving the crisis. Few felt that anything would be forthcoming before another U.N. meeting, let alone within 2 months.

Yet here it is, a solution. Although both sides kept cautioning against optimism, it was hard to hide the general feeling of accord that seemed to be permeating from Zurich, where Premier Karamanlis and Premier Menderes were smiling at each other instead of seeking to rip each other apart from across the table.

Archbishop Makarios is still a key figure in the final decision. He has stated that the issue is still primarily one between Cypriot and Briton; but it is hard to visualize him refusing to accept a mutual agreement between Turk and Greek, especially when it means an end to bloodshedding and bitterness.

Cyprus has for too long suffered from the internal warfare. The struggle has been costly in life, in property and in good will. Some of the sores it opened may never be completely healed. Demagogs may reopen them again some day. There is no time to waste on pat agreements. Everyone stands to gain from an end to the strife.

Greece has given up on Enosis. The battle for annexation has long since been lost. Britain has given up on retaining its colony in subjective status. Its compromising proved the worst of approaches. Turkey found a late toehold in the issue and almost wrecked the NATO allies with its demands. Its latest demands for partition were given up grudgingly, but they went.

Let us praise God for guiding the hands of the negotiators to that long-sought end that will let Cypriots gain that long-sought freedom.

Sacrificing Enosis is well worth the price of life and it was necessary in the case of Cyprus. Let us wish them well on the map of free nations.

---

## Georgia Firsts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by Hon. DuPree Jordan, Jr., editor and publisher of the West End Star of Atlanta, Ga., enumerating the various firsts which the State of Georgia can claim. Mr. Jordan's column was written in conjunction with the observance on February 12 of the 226th anniversary of the founding of the colony of Georgia.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JORDAN'S JOTTINGS

(By DuPree Jordan, Jr.)

This column has never run as long as 70 paragraphs, or even half that number, but this week we would like to pass on that number of short items received from Georgia's new secretary of commerce, Abit Massey. Since today is the anniversary of our State's beginning, this information certainly is appropriate.

Possibly no other State has taken the leadership in so many varied fields of endeavor as has Georgia, whose rich and colorful history dates back to February 12, 1733, when General Oglethorpe landed at Savannah. Among the many firsts which Georgia claims, and which you might want to help bring to the attention of its citizens, on the 226th anniversary of the colony's founding on February 12, are the following:

The steamship, the *Savannah*, was the first steamship to cross the Atlantic Ocean, leaving Savannah on May 20, 1819, en route to Liverpool, England.

The University of Georgia at Athens, chartered in 1785, was the first State-chartered University in America.

Georgia was the first State to have a chartered college for women, Wesleyan College at Macon being founded in 1839. Georgia was also the first State in which a college degree was granted to a woman.

A Georgia Indian, Sequoyah, of the Cherokee tribe was first to codify the Indian alphabet in 1821.

The first Indian newspaper, the Cherokee Phoenix, was published in Georgia in 1828.

Georgia was the first State to establish a school for Negro nurses, and the first to grant a certificate to a Negro nurse. (Spelman College, Atlanta, 1881.)

The first women's secret society was organized at Wesleyan College, Macon, May 15, 1851.

The first school of forestry in the South was established at the University of Georgia in 1906.

Georgia was the first State to declare that married women should have full property rights. (The Married Women's Act, 1863).

The first State agricultural experiment station was established at Savannah in 1735.

The first American orphanage was established in Savannah by George Whitfield in 1741.

On March 2, 1912, the Girl Scouts of America was formed in Savannah, Ga., by Julliette Lowe.

The first Protestant Sunday School in America was founded in Savannah in 1736.

The first Moravian Church in the United States was established in Georgia in 1735.

The first Negro Baptist Church was established at Silver Bluff, Ga., in 1733.

The first Negro hospital in the United States was built in Georgia in 1832.

A Georgian, Dr. Crawford W. Long, first discovered and demonstrated the use of ether in surgical operations in 1842.

The Ladies' Garden Club of Athens, organized in 1891, was the first such organization to name permanent officers, adopt a constitution and by-laws and be conducted according to parliamentary law.

Georgia was the first colony, while under England's rule, to abolish slavery and outlaw the sale of rum.

The first silk exported from the colonies was sent from Savannah and made into a dress for the Queen of England in 1735.

The first sea-going vessel made of iron, the *John Randolph*, was built in Savannah in 1834.

Georgia was the first State to charter a railroad, the Mexican-Atlantic, in December of 1827.

The first sewing machine was conceived and perfected by Dr. Francis Goulding, a Georgian.

The Nation's first county-owned hydroelectric plant was built in Crisp County, Ga.

Gold was first discovered in Georgia in 1828 and first mined at Dahlonega.

The first machine for manufacturing ice was made in Columbus and patented in 1844.

The first woman U.S. Senator was Mrs. Rebecca Felton of Cartersville, Ga., who took office in 1922.

The first discovery of bauxite (aluminum ore) was made in Floyd County, Ga., in 1887.

Georgia was the first State to lower the legal voting age to 18.

Georgia was the first State to require birth registration.

A Georgian first organized a memorial association and planned a Confederate Memorial Day.

Poppy Day was first inaugurated by a Georgian, Moina Michael.

The first cotton gin was invented in 1793 by a Georgian, Eli Whitney, and placed in operation near Washington, Ga.

The first successfully operated cotton mill in the South, the Bolton factory, was built in Wilkes County, Ga.

The first process by which cottonseed oil could be made from the previously discarded cottonseed was discovered by Launcelot Johnstone, a Georgian.

Cotton was first planted for commercial use in Georgia.

Georgia is first in producing 75 percent of all the tire cord and fabric used in automobile tires in this country.

Georgia was the first State to organize an agricultural department in 1874.

The largest State farmers' market of its kind in the United States is located in Atlanta.

Cairo, Ga., is the largest producing and shipping point for pure sugarcane sirup in the United States.

Cairo, Ga., leads the world in producing collard seed for market.

Georgia leads the Nation in the production of these agricultural products: pimento peppers, pecans, peanuts, watermelons, velvet beans, and cow beans.

Georgia is first in the production of gum turpentine.

Valdosta, Ga., is the largest naval stores market in the world.

Georgia is first in producing 74.4 percent of gum naval stores produced in the United States and 50 percent of the world's production.

Georgia leads the Nation in production of commercial broilers.

The first exportation of cattle from America was from Savannah, Ga., in 1755.

The largest solid granite body in the world is Stone Mountain, located 16 miles east of Atlanta.

A Georgian, William Longstreet, in 1790, was the first to apply the steam principle to navigation.

The rural delivery system of the United States is the evolution of a plan of a Georgian, proposed in Congress by Thomas E. Watson.

The first motion picture theater in the world was operated in Atlanta in 1895 by C. Francis Jenkins at the Cotton States Exposition.

Coca-Cola was first made and sold in Georgia.

Georgia was the first State to send a schooner against the British in the American Revolution.

The first hymn book in the United States was written by Charles Wesley in 1737.

Georgia was the first State to adopt a vagrancy law in 1813.

A Sunday School established by John Wesley in 1735 at Savannah, was the first in America.

The first Christian baptism in America occurred in 1540 in the Ocmulgee River.

Georgia, in 1774, was the first to ordain a Negro preacher.

Georgia was the first colony to ship a bale of cotton to England.

Georgia was the first State to have a woman own and edit a newspaper, the Washington Gazette, in 1802 with Mrs. Hillhouse as editor.

Georgia was the first colony to cultivate grapes in 1735.

Georgia was the first State to establish a free high school, Richmond Academy, in August, 1783.

Georgia was the first State to have a passenger railroad which ran from Augusta to Charleston.

A Georgian, Dr. Charles Herty, first designed the cup used in the turpentine industry.

Georgia was the first State to have a woman's foreign missionary society, at Athens in 1819.

Georgia was the first State to send troops to the Confederate service, the Oglethorpe Light Infantry, of Savannah.

The circular saw was invented by a Georgian, Mr. Cox, in 1795 and the original design is still used.

A Georgian, Thomas R. R. Cobb, was the first to codify the English law as to principles of equity.

Georgia was the first State to have a railroad commission established in 1877.

Georgia was the first southern State to sign the United States Constitution.

Now, honestly, how many of those facts did you already know?

## I Speak for Democracy: Speech by Leslie Rothenberg, West Virginia Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Wednesday, February 25, in the Nation's Capital, we were again stimulated in our concept of citizenship. This strength came into being through our association, as Senators, with the winners of the I Speak for Democracy contest.

These young men and young women, representing 49 States and the District of Columbia, came to Washington for a nationwide program embraced in the 12th annual voice of democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest.

It was my privilege to talk with Leslie Rothenberg, of Wheeling, the winner from among more than 200 youths of West Virginia who participated in our State.

This lad is a senior at Linsly Military Institute in his home community. He is editor in chief of his school newspaper. Cadet Captain Rothenberg plans on entering college this fall as a prelaw student.

At the national awards luncheon I counseled with this young man. He spoke to me of religious liberty. I reminded him that Roger Williams was banished from the Colonies because he preached religious liberty. He expressed his thoughts on tolerance. I joined him in hoping for that time, which must come, when humankind will live together in closer understanding and more wholesome mutual respect.

Mr. President, I was so impressed with this fine youngster's objective thinking that I requested a copy of the script which had won for him the West Virginia award.

Robert W. Ferguson, of Wheeling, the president of the West Virginia Broadcasters Association, accompanied Cadet Rothenberg. I congratulate Mr. Ferguson, and his associates in our State, for their sponsorship of the contest. We do well when encouragement is given to such a cooperative effort for our youth.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Why do I speak for democracy? How can I, a first generation American in my family, realize the values of the democratic way of life in the United States of America? How can I know the meanings of such words as liberty, equality, tolerance, justice, and the rule of law? These words are mere abstract nouns until you relate them to such nouns as Concord and Bunker Hill, Corregidor, and Okinawa. I would like to relate these qualities of our democracy to myself.

First, liberty means the right to choose something by yourself without any outside force making the choice for you. My parents have helped guide me—not force me—in my exercising the right of free choice. One example of this ideal was the fact that I could choose the type of school that I wanted. The fact that I may select my own college or career field is still another sign of liberty at work.

The second point that I would like to develop is equality. This word carries with it the key to the togetherness of the millions of people that make up America. The heterogeneous backgrounds of this myriad of human beings have merged into a vibrant force of activity and cooperation in which everyone plays his or her part. Men such as Jackie Robinson and Dr. Ralph Bunche have successfully reaffirmed the equality of opportunity for all people, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Next and closest to my heart is the ideal of tolerance. In this country of ours each man may practice the religion of his own choice. Taking into consideration the large number of religious sects, it is not difficult to understand why ours is a country which has enjoyed religious freedom since its inception.

Men like my grandfather suffered the horrors and brutalities of countless concentration camps and detention centers simply because they believed in God. Although my grandmother died in one of these wretched pestholes, my grandfather lived long enough to enjoy the privilege of worshiping, here in America with his family and his grandson, the religion of his ancestors.

Lastly, let us consider justice and the rule of law together. In order to prevent chaos and to maintain an orderly management of daily life. we have created a code of laws and regulations which promote and guide our actions in a peaceful and sensible manner for the common good of all. The men who impartially interpret this code of law have wisely molded the principles into a strong foundation for the preservation of our rights and privileges. We can look for examples of this in our everyday life. A simple piece of paper called a driver's license, which means so much to me personally, is assurance to society that I am a qualified driver. The policeman on the corner, the judge in the courtroom, and the investigating Congressman are all concerned with the protection of all people from the invasion of their rights as American citizens.

We can now see that these words—liberty, equality, tolerance, justice, and the rule of law—are more than just abstract terms for they are alive in America; they are functioning in America; they are democracy in action.

Elias Lieberman, a Russian immigrant, expresses so vividly the sentiments of all freedom-loving Americans in his poem, "I Am an American," when, pointing to the flag of our Nation, he says, "That flag of stars and stripes is yours; it is the emblem of the promised land. It means, my son, the home of humanity. Live for it * * * died for it. * * * I am proud of my future. I am an American."

## Position and Plight of the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 27, 1959, Mr. Halbert M. Jones, of Laurinburg, N.C., the president of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute, made a most illuminating address to a meeting of that organization in Washington, D.C., on the present position and plight of the American textile industry. Since Mr. Jones possesses expert knowledge of this subject, this address should be made available to all Members of the Congress. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distinguished guests and gentlemen, we are grateful for your attendance upon this occasion. We recognize the heavy demands which you have on your time in Washington, and we are honored by your presence here which bespeaks your deep interest in and concern for the textile industry. This is an occasion when the textile industry gathers to honor you, the Senators and Representatives of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, and so well represent the folks of the southeastern area.

As we review the political and ideological tides of the past 25 years, we are doubly grateful for the courageous leadership of the Senators and Representatives from the South. Except for you and your predecessors, we would be much further along the road to socialism and centralization of government authority in this country. Southern delegations have been tagged with the conservative labels in Congress, and the liberal tag has been applied to the free spenders and those who want to see Government assume an ever-increasing responsibility for and control over the lives of our citizens. Historically, a liberal has been one who has stood for freedom and liberty and who has resisted the encroachments of centralized government authority upon the rights of individuals. By this definition, our southern delegations and those who believe as you do are the true liberals, and it is time that we claimed again the label. We salute you who are standing so stanchly in defense of the great liberal principles upon which our Nation was founded.

In the last session of Congress, there was probably more legislation directly affecting textiles than during any session in recent years. You will recall, of course, the wide range of legislation involving world trade, foreign aid, agricultural policy, particularly as related to cotton, labeling, States rights,

regulation of labor activities, taxation, budgets, and many other subjects. As a result, industry people were more active in Washington than ever before, and I expect that the multitude of our calls upon you, the varied pleas for support, were at times confusing, sometimes, perhaps, contradictory, and occasionally so regular as to be wearisome. We appreciate your patience with us and your deep concern for the needs of our industry. This experience emphasized anew the need for the textile industry to develop an overall program which could be presented to you and into which could be fitted the various legislative matters which come before you.

The action of the Senate in appointing a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to study the textile industry has proved to be most significant for our industry. Under the able chairmanship of Senator PASTORE, the hearings of this committee have provided a public forum for the full presentation of the story of the textile industry and for the development of a comprehensive program which, we believe, will be quite helpful to the Members of Congress and to the industry. Senator THURMOND has served with distinction on this committee, and we are grateful for his devotion to the task of the committee and for the sympathetic hearing which all of the committee members have given the spokesmen for the industry. We believe that the report of this committee and the record of these hearings will be most constructive.

Certain facts regarding the industry have emerged from the full study we wish to call briefly to your attention tonight. These facts are, of course, not new and are familiar to you:

First. The textile industry, producing materials essential to the very survival of our people and second only to foodstuffs for human security, is a vital segment of our total national economy. It is not necessary, of course, for me to dwell on the importance of textiles in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. In these areas, textiles account for a major share of all manufacturing employment. For our Nation as a whole, textile manufacturing ranks sixth in employment, ninth in assets, and ninth in sales among all industry. Together with apparel manufacturing, our sister, the textile industry employs over 2,300,000 persons directly and is the largest of all the manufacturing segments. Indirect employment required in the production of cotton, wool, manmade fibers, textile machinery, textile chemicals, dyestuffs, starch, and the thousands of other items consumed by textile mills adds many hundreds of thousands to those who are dependent upon textiles for their livelihood. By any standard of measurement, textiles are essential to our Nation's total economy.

Second. In times of national emergency, textiles are second only to steel in our Nation's military security. If, at any time, this country comes to depend upon foreign supplies of textiles to any important degree, at that time will its security be in jeopardy. Textiles are contributing importantly to the rush into the space age and are essential to our military strength. The continued erosion of the textile industry can only impair our military security.

Third. The cost structures of our Nation, reflecting the inflationary pressures of the past 20 years, have put textiles along with many other industries in a position where domestic costs are no longer competitive with those of foreign producers, not because of productivity, for our productivity is the highest in the world, but because wage and raw material costs abroad are far lower than our own levels here. Unrestricted imports of low-wage foreign textiles can destroy our textile industry and present tariff schedules do not afford adequate protection for our textile jobs. Not only do these cost structures open our domestic markets to foreign production but also they have had the effect of reducing our exports by nearly 1 billion yards during the past 10 years.

Fourth. The textile industry has been subjected to a combination of government policies and programs which have weighed heavily and, we believe, unfairly on the textile industry. If only one policy were the problem, the ingenuity of our industry could overcome it, but, in combination, these programs have resulted in a recession in textiles, in declining employment, in very low earnings on investment, and in a long list of mill liquidations.

Our problems include, of course, internal ones of serious nature which require continuing solution, but our internal problems are aggravated by the extra burden of government policy in many areas. These government policies and programs include the following:

(a) An agricultural policy as related to cotton which has restricted the ability of cotton to compete and has made cotton available to our foreign competitors at prices 6 to 8 cents below our domestic cost. During the past 2 years, 13 million bales of raw cotton were exported at prices far below the price to domestic mills. This year another 3 million to 3,500,000 bales will go abroad. Thus, the foreign textile manufacturers are handed a handsome subsidy, and the effects are, of course, keenly felt when their textiles vie with our products in the market place both here and abroad. We understand the very complex nature of the cotton problems, but we do believe firmly that only a competitive one-price system can again make cotton the fiber of growing usefulness and consumption in the United States.

(b) Tariff reduction and foreign trade policies which have stimulated the importation of both greige textiles and made-up goods into the United States to the great damage of our textile markets. Perhaps if the influx of Japanese textiles constituted our only sore spot, we could meet the difficulty. But it must be noted that for the past 2 years the Japanese industry has been regulating its exports to the United States under a so-called voluntary agreement, made by the Japanese Government with our Government. This agreement demonstrates the inadequacy of our foreign trade policy, and voluntary agreements which place the United States in a position of weakness cannot be a long-term solution to this problem. Temporary control of the Japanese situation has only resulted in the breaking out of other problems from other sources. Hong Kong stepped up its production aimed at the U.S. markets taking advantage of the relief afforded by the Japanese. For example, from January through September of 1958, apparel imports, consisting of shirts and other wearing apparel, alone bore a value of something more than $11 million as compared with $2,500,000 the year previous. It comes as no surprise that the Japanese want to review the terms of their agreement. It is little wonder that they want to increase their exports to our market. Our industry is firm in its conviction that any upward revision in the Japanese quotas at this time would be interpreted as evidence of a policy of further liquidation of the domestc textile industry on the part of our Federal Government.

(c) Foreign aid programs which have stimulated and financed foreign textile plant construction in an industry which already had excess capacity in the free world. As an illustration, recently the ICA predicted that there would be 29 textile manufacturing enterprises operating very shortly in the Philippines, where in 1955 there was only 1 firm. Nothing was said about what effect this expansion would have on American exporters of textiles to Manila, which has, for a long time, been a major market for us, nor the effect upon the Japanese mills, which also have been major suppliers of textiles to Southeast Asia. What do these newly founded textile industries abroad do with their output? Are they content merely to meet their own domestic needs, needs once filled by the U.S. industry and the industry of our friends in the free world? The answer is no. They begin as soon as possible producing for export and for the U.S. market. Can our State Department require these beneficiaries of our tax dollars to confine their textile output to their own lands? "No," say the diplomats, "that's the way the Soviets operate. We dare not put any strings on our assistance." That may be, but it seems certain that more harm than good will be done in the long run if this situation is not reevaluated. What will be the result when our needy friends find themselves competing with one another, plus those nationalized industries which care naught for profits? A program of our Government which seeks to expand textile production abroad is most illogical when it takes away our own export markets, closes export markets for our textile manufacturing friends in the free world, increases pressure on our domestic markets to take an increasing volume of imports, and puts our friends abroad in a position to be severely damaged in this highly competitive field. We are surely leading our friends along a course which will lead to bitter disappointment in textile production.

(d) The ICA purchase program for textiles which has resulted in buying nearly 90 percent of its requirements during the past 2 years from foreign producers. These purchases made with U.S. dollars are used to stimulate production and provide undergirding for textile industries abroad at a time when textile employment in this country has been declining and mills have been liquidated by the hundreds.

(e) Depreciation schedules currently in effect and completely inadequate to reflect the obsolescence of textile equipment and the operating schedules which are customary in the industry. A revision of bulletin F is surely sorely needed by the textile industry.

Perhaps, as an industry, we might be able to cope with any one of these problems, each created by Government policies, but we are required to deal with the combined and interrelated effects of all these troublemakers. To put it as simply as I can, the total impact of these conditions is more than our industry, or any industry, can bear. Is it any wonder that we look toward our Government for help? These problems are Government created; they can be corrected only by Government action. Considering all of the facts which have been presented, there is good reason to believe that the extraordinary influence of Government to which this industry is subjected represent that small shade of difference between a dynamic growing industry and an industry which for some years has been contracting.

As you, of course, know, the Communists have launched a new trade offensive against the free world, and they have chosen as major weapons textiles and raw cotton. Their primary battleground is the Far East, with Red China leading the attack. The Chinese Communists say that they will have a cotton crop of about 14 million bales ready for market by 1961. They also claim that they will be able to produce 7 billion square yards

of cotton cloth annually, which is twice as much cloth as manufactured in Japan in 1957. Already textiles from Red China are pouring into Indonesia, Singapore, Malaya, Burma, Pakistan, markets supplied traditionally by Japan, and the Red Chinese goods are priced about 10 percent below the Japanese price. Now our Government has indicated that it will help Japan find a way to meet such competition. We appreciate the enormity of the problem for those who fashion our policies on international relations. We are certain that this is going to pose difficulties for the Congress. The complexities will be many, and our industry wants to be of any possible assistance to you as these problems come before you.

Most of you know something about another uncertainty which looms ahead for us. There is a greater emphasis being placed upon the need for lowering the export price of cotton. The farm law requires the Secretary to set the price of U.S. cotton at a level which will enable it to compete in the world market. The offshore demand for our cotton is declining at an alarming rate at current price levels. Once Red China begins flooding the world markets with its fiber without regard to production costs or profits, the situation will be critical. Any lowering of export prices for cotton without providing some offsetting equalization to domestic industry could be disastrous.

To us, an import quota system on textile yarns and fabrics appears to be the only practical solution in sight. Our friends in Japan and elsewhere in the free world should not be led down a blind alley. The U.S. marketplace, despite the population growth, despite a dynamic expansion of our economy, cannot support the ever-expanding production of the world. Only a well-developed quota system can provide some definite assurance of a future for our domestic industry and a reasonable share of our markets for our friends abroad.

Our industry is truly faced with many problems. But let me comment, just briefly, upon some of the great strengths which this industry has. It is my own conviction that the textile industry today is potentially in the strongest position on its history. Through painful years of contraction, the excess productive capacity of the industry in relation to domestic markets has, in large degree, been liquidated. The financial strength of the industry as a whole has never been greater. Research, which has already produced dramatic results, is expanding rapidly, stimulated by and producing new fibers, new finishes, new fabrics, and new processes. Sound merchandising and sales promotion techniques and practices are employed more extensively than ever. The productive efficiency of the industry has been growing at a rapid rate and, in the use of material and man-hours, the industry must be considered as one of our most effective. The increasing income and the population of the United States certainly provide an expanding market for this industry which supplies fundamental and basic needs of our people. The textile industry, because of these fundamental strengths, possesses the potential for a vigorous and a dynamic future in the United States provided (1) our raw materials, including cotton, can be made available to us under a one-price system at a level truly competitive, and (2) that our domestic markets are protected from a flood of imports from low wage foreign countries.

Thank you for honoring us by being our guests this evening. We look forward to the close association which we will have with you in this session of Congress, and we are grateful for the true liberal leadership which you bring to the Congress.

## Dr. Howard A. Rusk Salutes Valor of Roy Campanella

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a truly inspiring article in tribute to the fighting spirit and courage of Roy Campanella was published in the New York Times of Sunday, March 1, 1959. It came not from the pen of a sportswriter or leader of Campanella's Negro race, but from the distinguished medical editor of the Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk.

Dr. Rusk is one of the world's great medical authorities on human rehabilitation. He has been a consultant and doctor in the rehabilitation process of Roy Campanella himself, and he knows Campanella's valiant qualities of heart and mind and soul.

As we consider funds for the National Institutes of Health, it is well for us to keep human beings in mind, human beings like the brave Campy of Dodger fame, who need the findings of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and of the other institutes, too, as they struggle to regain health and a normal life. We cannot scrimp on funds so vital to humankind and health.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk in the New York Times entitled "New Life for Campy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LIFE FOR CAMPY—DODGER STAR REJOINS TEAM AS COACH SADDENED BY PLIGHT OF HIS YOUNG SON

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

One day early last May, Roy Campanella lay flat an his back on a Stryker frame with his head held rigid and motionless in a neck brace.

He was watching a telecast, through an overhead mirror, of his teammates, the Dodgers. But the Dodgers were in a disastrous losing streak and his old friend, Charlie Neal, had gone hitless for days.

When the game ended, Campy immediately placed a long-distance call to Neal and said: "Charlie, I've been watching the game. You're never gonna start hittin' again unless you pull that right foot back about 6 inches. Do that and you're gonna be back in the ball game."

Neal followed Campy's advice and his batting slump was over.

Watching a baseball game on television with Campy last season in the early days of his convalescence from injuries he received in an auto crash was a real experience. His ability to call the balls and strikes and predict which ball would be hit and where was a revelation to an average baseball fan.

A NEW MILESTONE

This weekend marked a new milestone in Roy Campanella's rehabilitation. Yesterday he flew to Vero Beach, Fla., to take up coaching duties with his former team, now the Los Angeles Dodgers.

Mr. Campanella's neurological status remains about the same. He is paralyzed from the chest down and partially paralyzed in both hands.

But he has made tremendous functional progress. He can feed himself, assist in his dressing, type a little, and even write surprisingly well.

He whizzes around his Glen Cove home in an electric wheelchair—backing, turning, going between obstacles, traveling anywhere he wants to go. He has a specifically modified chair for outdoor use in which he will do his coaching.

HE IS HURT AGAIN

Last week Roy Campanella was hurt again—this time in the heart. The entire country joined him in sadness at the plight of his 15-year-old son, David, who was released last Wednesday in $3,500 bail on a charge of breaking into a Queens drugstore and stealing money and cigarettes.

The charge came just after the boy had been convicted of juvenile delinquency following a gang fight.

In judging David Campanella, both the courts and the public must remember that the youth had been under severe emotional stress for more than a year. In addition to his anguish and worry, he has been deprived of his father's counsel and guidance.

Roy Campanella met this new tragedy with the same courage that characterized his life as a quadriplegic since January 1958.

Paradoxical as it seems, the increased strength Roy Campanella has gained from conquering his own physical disability will give him greater depth of understanding and depth of spirit in confronting this new problem.

UNBROKEN IN SPIRIT

Fine china is not made by putting clay in the sun. It comes only from the white heat of the kiln. In the process of firing, some pieces are broken. Those that come through have qualities that can be obtained only through the firing process.

Roy Campanella has come through the white heat of a personal experience unbroken in spirit, courage, and understanding. In those qualities he has grown immeasurably.

Campy has been a very busy man these last 9 months with his radio program, his magazine articles, his return to his family, and his participation in a U.S. Information Service film for oversea distribution.

At Vero Beach, the spring training camp of the Los Angeles Dodgers, his rehabilitation will be complete. He will be back at work at the job he knows and loves—baseball.

If Campanella follows the pattern of most disabled persons who go back to their jobs after rehabilitation, he will not only be as good as before, but better. While he will never play baseball again, he can combine his baseball skills with the wisdom that comes only with experience. His tasks will be to develop young players.

There has never been a more beloved figure in baseball than Roy Campanella. As in baseball, his courage and character have also left an indelible mark on rehabilitation.

Managing a baseball team is considered the toughest assignment in the sport. It requires courage, leadership, respect for and by fellow players and fans, and a knowledge of and devotion to the game.

If any baseball club is looking for those qualities in a manager, they can forget about Campanella's wheelchair and remember the adage of rehabilitation: It's ability, not disability, that counts.

## Men Who Live in Glass Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, because of its relevancy to current discussions as to whether physical afflictions should disqualify important Americans from public service I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most penetrating article on the subject by George E. Sokolsky, a respected American columnist who speaks out of an abundance of personal experience on the subject.

To the illustrations listed by Sokolsky, one might well call attention to the fact that physical setbacks have not curtailed the services of such colleagues as our distinguished majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, or of Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, who is back on the job with his energy and enthusiasm undiminished.

I suggest to our colleagues who are inclined to call for the undertaker or to suggest resignations every time an important public official suffers a physical setback that they display greater confidence in the modern-day techniques of the medical profession and that they give heed to the fact that even those who enjoy the best of health today may at any early date find themselves victims of some of the very disabilities now endured by the men they criticize so freely.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR AILING OFFICIALS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The tremendous advances that have been made in the medical and biochemical sciences would be purposeless if life were not prolonged by them and if those who are stricken by serious illnerses cou'd not continue to work. The man who suffers what used to be called a fatal heart attack may have many years of life and work ahead of him, if he obeys dietary and other instructions. His major problem is to ration his time and to avoid fatigue. He need not give up his career to accomplish either.

Cancer is a bit more difficult, but the word, cancer, is a generic term for a number of related illnesses which may, in the not too distant future, become unrelated as the cause for some of them is fixed. However, many forms of cancer are handleable in certain stages and then one-can go back to work.

I have had a coronary occlusion which is a fancy name for one form of heart attack, two other incidents, one of which was heart failure, and a cancer of one kidney. I am doing as much work as ever but my time is more carefully rationed and my diet is both small and unpleasant because it is saltless. But apart from a few inconveniences, such as not dancing after a day of hard work or walking my dog, Joe, or smoking big, black cigars, there is hardly a change of routine.

I give this personal testimony because Senator STUART SYMINGTON and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY are making so sharp a point of appointing a new Secretary of State while John Foster Dulles is in the hospital taking treatment. His presence in the hospital interferes with his work less than if he were hunting quail or traveling about in distant parts of Missouri or Minnesota looking for votes. A telephone is at hand; he is no distance from the State Department; he can be in touch with all the world.

Of course, there are those who are so egotistic that if anything is wrong with them they become so preoccupied with themselves that they can think of nothing else. There are others who find work a form of therapy, who reject themselves as problems, even when they feel pain, and become so absorbed in their duties that their will to live is stimulated.

Some people are afraid to die and the scratch of a pin will send them into paroxysms of fear; there are others who fully belive in the life eternal and to whom life and death are stages in the fulfillment of the destiny of the soul. John Foster Dulles, for instance, was raised as a Presbyterian, a faith to which he has been devoted. He surely believes that God's will be done which is a cornerstone of the Calvinistic philosophy which his father preached from the pulpit. Such a man moves through life fearlessly and when he faces death, he does not flinch, for it will come when it comes and is one of the facts of eternal living that needs to be faced.

At this moment, Dulles is valuable to this Nation. I do not say indispensable, because we should indeed be a weak and poor nation if any man were indispensable. However, Dulles is useful and needed and as long as his services are available, they are of value. Let them therefore be used up to the last moment.

A word needs to be said about Christian Herter, the Acting Secretary of State. He has some form of arthritis and uses canes or crutches, or a wheelchair to get around. So what? Can he exercise his mind? Does he know what he is doing? Is he a man of ability and experience? Does his arthritis interfere with his ability to work? It would seem that some Americans believe that an official of the United States must be physically perfect. George Washington had bad teeth and Franklin D. Roosevelt was a cripple. Maybe we ought to elect Jayne Mansfield's husband President because he is supposed to be physically perfect—I believe the peepholers call him a muscle man.

It is brains, not muscles of the shank, that we need in the men who do our work. If we find our best brains in cripples, let us use what we find and not be too particular.

## Statement of Secretary of the Interior Seaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs invited Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to discuss the operation and plans of his Department as they related to the 86th Congress. In his usual precise manner, Secretary Seaton delivered the following statement, the reading of which I commend to our colleagues:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON, BEFORE THE HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to appear again before this committee. My understanding is that you are interested today in discussing the operations and plans of the Department of the Interior as they relate to consideration by, and possible action of, your committee.

Before commencing this discussion, permit me to present to you the members of my staff who are here.

First is Under Secretary Elmer F. Bennett. Many of you, I know, are acquainted with his background. For the information of your new members and the record, however, let me say that Mr. Bennett came to the Department of the Interior from the office of Senator Eugene Millikan, of Colorado. He is an attorney with 17 years' experience in the Federal Government. He has successively served in the Department as legislative counsel, as my personal assistant, as solicitor, and since September 20, 1958, as Under Secretary.

Another gentleman whom most of the members of this committee know is Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl. A former Governor of North Dakota, he also served as a member of this committee when he was Member of the 82d Congress. Secretary Aandahl's responsibility in the Department is in the joint field of water and power. The Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southeastern Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, Office of Saline Water, report to him.

Our Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife is Ross L. Leffler. Secretary Leffler came to Interior with a lifetime record of devotion to conservation. He served 29 years with the Pennsylvania Fish and Game Department. While jurisdiction over a great part of the activities of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, all of which report to Secretary Leffler, rests with another committee of the Congress; there is a definite relationship between public lands legislation and action and fish and wildlife conservation.

Roger C. Ernst, our Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, supervises the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, and the Office of Territories. Formerly the Land and Water Commissioner of the State of Arizona, Secretary Ernst also has a full background of experience in the fields of reclamation and conservation.

Another area of our Department, that of Mineral Resources, is supervised by Assistant Secretary Royce A. Hardy. It includes the Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, Office of Oil and Gas, Office of Geography, Office of Minerals Mobilization and the Office of Minerals Exploration. Secretary Hardy, a graduate of the University of Nevada in mining engineering, is a registered professional mining and metallurgical engineer. Before joining the Department, he was vice president and general manager of Manganese, Inc., of Henderson, Nev.

The next member of our staff needs little introduction here. George W. Abbott, our solicitor, was counsel for this committee from 1953 to 1957. He is now our chief legal officer. Earlier he served as my assistant.

The Department's administrative management activities are the responsibility of D. Otis Beasley, our Administrative Assistant Secretary. Secretary Beasley, who began his career in Government in 1928, now has the top career position in our Department. He is responsible for Administrative Services, Budget and Finance, Inspection, Management Research, Personnel Management, Property Management, and Security.

The last member of my staff with me today is Ted Stevens, one of my assistants who also serves as legislative counsel. He came to the Department of the Interior from Fairbanks, Alaska, where he had served as U.S. Attorney.

Mr. Chairman, as you requested, I am here today to discuss the program of our

Department—particularly the budget and legislative aspects of it.

We have completed our hearings before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, in which we supported a request for $344,564,400, exclusive of the Reclamation and power agencies. In all, our total budget request for fiscal 1960 is $633,775,400. This amount reflects our recognition of two facts.

First, our programs—in conservation, in science and technology, and in the advancement of human welfare—are of such importance to the Nation as a whole that we must continue to carry them on at a high level of efficiency and intensity.

Second, if we overexpand these programs and thus require excessive cash outlays, we shall necessarily contribute to inflationary pressures, decreasing the value of the dollar, and ultimately hobble the very programs we were trying to aid.

It is of great interest to this committee, I believe, that we are not requesting funds for new reclamation construction starts for fiscal year 1960.

One reason, largely, is that there are 11 new starts in the current fiscal year. During the next few years, these 11 projects, added to the large list we already had underway, will pyramid the fund requirements for the Bureau of Reclamation. The following tabulation lists the totals of fund requirements for construction and rehabilitation from regular funds and from the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, for fiscal years 1959 to 1965 inclusive, with and without the new starts for which funds were appropriated for the fiscal year 1959.

*Fund requirements for Bureau of Reclamation construction and rehabilitation, regular funds and Upper Colorado River Basin Fund, fiscal years 1959–65*

FUNDS REQUIRED

| Fiscal year | With 11 new starts provided for in the 1959 Appropriation Act | Without 11 new starts | Increase required by new starts |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1959 | $214,048,335 | $207,828,335 | $6,220,000 |
| 1960 | 212,445,000 | 195,060,000 | 17,385,000 |
| 1961 | 267,172,000 | 227,671,000 | 39,501,000 |
| 1962 | 263,276,000 | 211,181,000 | 52,095,000 |
| 1963 | 203,182,000 | 157,763,000 | 45,419,000 |
| 1964 | 127,950,000 | 100,735,000 | 27,215,000 |
| 1965 | 84,058,000 | 70,631,000 | 13,422,000 |

While the new starts included in the 1959 appropriation act raised the fund requirements of the Bureau only about $6 million in 1959, they increased these requirements $17 million for 1960, $39 million for 1961, and $52 million for 1962. More new starts in 1960 would mean more pyramiding in the 2 or 3 years ahead.

The no-new-starts policy for water resources projects is governmentwide; the administration is seeking no funds for starting new projects for flood control, navigation, and related activities of the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. Nevertheless, the total activities of these two agencies in 1960 are expected to reach an all-time high of $1.1 billion.

If the 11 new starts had not been added last year but rather commenced this year, our schedule through 1965, exclusive of additional new starts, would have looked like this:

| Fiscal year: | *With 11 new starts in 1960 appropriation act* |
|---|---|
| 1960 | $201,280,000 |
| 1961 | 245,056,000 |
| 1962 | 250,682,000 |
| 1963 | 209,858,000 |
| 1964 | 146,154,000 |
| 1965 | 97,846,000 |

The peak demand would have occurred in 1962 rather than 1961 and would have been almost $17 million less. When we recall that Congress over the past 12 years has appropriated an average of $188,940,480 for reclamation construction, the point becomes clear. It does seem to me that a further pyramiding of reclamation fund requirements might result in disaster. The surest way to destroy the reclamation program, in my opinion, is to extend the fund requirements beyond hope of realization.

In preliminary legislative studies before the convening of this Congress, the Department reviewed approximately 300 pieces of legislation, a large majority which are within the area of interest to this committee. Some of them have already been sent to you, or similar bills have been introduced by Members of Congress, and referred to your committee.

Foremost of all the items under consideration is, of course, Hawaii statehood. We are grateful to this committee for the privilege extended to me to present my views on the Hawaii bill and for the fact that you have already favorably reported it. To me, few bills to be considered by this Congress will have the national—yes, even the international—attention that will follow action upon the Hawaii statehood bill. And I know, Mr. Chairman, that you will call upon me or any member of my staff, if there is anything more we can do to further its prompt passage.

Next in importance, to me, is our proposal to establish an effective helium conservation program. As you, of course, all know, helium is a unique resource. Its use is essential to our most vital defense and nuclear programs and of growing importance to medicine and industry. Our annual consumption of helium has increased fivefold since 1950, yet no major new source of this gas has been discovered in the natural gases being produced from a relatively small area in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. This helium constitutes a minor percentage of these natural gases. Helium, which will not burn, if wasted into the atmosphere through millions of gas stoves and furnaces.

Our conservation program envisions the construction of up to 12 new recovery plants, to be located on certain pipelines, transporing helium-bearing natural gases to commercial markets. This helium would be stored underground until needed.

Since we submitted our legislative proposal to the Congress in the final weeks of the last session, we have reviewed this proposal in its entirety and made some changes in it. As soon as these have been cleared through the executive branch, we shall resubmit our proposal to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we have many other items which we consider important. We will again urge favorable consideration of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, the San Luis project in California, the Burns Creek Dam in Idaho, and several other projects for possible initiation of construction after 1960 when our fiscal situation permits. Of course, my recommendations for joint development of the Trinity River Division of the Central Valley project are still before you.

One of the important problems in the mineral resources field is that of coal research. We have previously reported our views to your committee on bills which call for the creation of a Coal Research Commission. We have noted a bill introduced in this Congress which would give contract authority to the Bureau of Mines for research. Our experts have predicted a phenomenal growth in national demand for energy in the next two decades. Increased emphasis on the development and more efficient use of our vast coal reserves should result from research programs conducted by both industry and Government. We hope to have our report on this legislation completed and cleared soon.

Meanwhile the Bureau of Mines is continuing its research program on the production, use, and conservation of coal. Recognizing the need for greater emphasis on shorter range problems, the Bureau has programed research work for the next fiscal year on hydraulic mining and transportation of coal, on degasifying coal beds to eliminate hazards that exist in gassy mines, and on the performance characteristics of commercial coal-cleaning equipment.

Generally, the resurgence in the economy has materially improved employment and the outlook for the major metals and minerals industries. For example, already, copper, aluminum and steel have enjoyed a significant recovery. And there are signs of strength in other mineral markets that were giving us concern in the recent past. For example, the import quotas established by the President, 5 months ago, have had the effect of tending to firm the U.S. price for lead and zinc. Despite the recent drop in lead, U.S. prices still exceed the prices when quotas were imposed. We believe that the general economic recovery will stimulate additional consumption of these commodities.

The work of the Bureau of Mines and the Geologic Survey of our Department is also essential to the continued health and vigor of our minerals industries. Through geologic and mineral resource surveys, investigations and research, both agencies provide the public and industry with basic data, which stimulates exploration for and development of new sources of mineral raw materials.

Through research in geology, geochemistry, and geophysics, the Geological Survey is developing new and more definite knowledge concerning the occurrence and origin of mineral deposits. It is vigorously pursuing the development of new prospecting techniques to provide the key to the discovery of new mineral deposits, particularly those not obvious to surface exploration. Through research in mining methods and metallurgical techniques, the Bureau of Mines is making major contributions to fuller and more efficient utilization of the Nation's mineral resources.

Our Office of Minerals Mobilization is constantly reviewing the mineral mobilization situation of various segments of the American mineral and solid fuels industries, and revising program to conform with changing defense requirements. In carrying out this function, OMM provides the staff work for the Department under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, the Defense Production Act, the Trade Agreements Act, and Public Law 480—known as the agricultural barter program.

We are also just initiating the program of the Office of Minerals Exploration designed to stimulate exploration for new domestic mineral reserves. We have already had more than 600 requests for information on this new program.

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for approximately 475 million acres of the Nation's public lands, including 298 million in the new State of Alaska. Most of the remaining 177 million are in the other 11 westernmost States. The Bureau also has responsibilities in connection with more than 300 million additional acres and for mineral leasing on the submerged lands of the outer continental shelf.

As principal custodian of the public lands, BLM's primary purpose is the wise administration, selective disposal, conservation, and management of the Nation's public lands and resources. These resources include the land itself, minerals (including oil and gas), forests, and range vegetation. Some idea of the scope of the Bureau's responsibilities may be seen in the fact that about 174 million acres are administered under the Taylor Grazing Act and almost 100 million acres are under oil and gas leases. During the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1958, the BLM took in gross receipts for $127,385,000, to

increase the total of receipts since the BLM was formed in 1946 from union of the General Land Office and the Grazing Service to nearly $1,077 million.

Among the significant items of legislation we propose to submit to the Congress in this field will be bills to regulate and control the activities and effect of land locators and promoters on the public domain.

We are faced today with a serious situation, resulting from the entrance into the land locating business of a number of promoters, some of whom are not qualified and may be unethical in their practices. They prey upon the desire of people to own land and upon the ignorance of the general public concerning the requirements of the public land laws. Advertising widely, executing contracts which actually promise nothing more than to file an application with the land office, and holding out great expectations of gain, they have induced people by the thousands to file applications—sometimes for substantial fees—under various public land laws.

By and large, these applications have been filed upon lands without respect to the acceptability of the application under the regulations or the availability of the lands under the law. This practice costs the public many thousands of dollars in wasted money and tends to paralyze the land offices by the very numbers of applications and by the conflicts with other applications that result.

We hope to have legislative proposals in this area.

We also believe that the present public land laws do not provide a convenient means by which public lands can be made available for needed developments. We are considering a proposal to permit the sale of public lands chiefly valuable for business and urban purposes. The chief features of this proposal would authorize the sale of such lands to States and local governments at their appraised fair market value and also, where appropriate, sales at public auction to private individuals, associations, and corporations. This proposal, we believe, might facilitate needed commercial, industrial, and suburban developments in the public land areas.

Section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act establishes a minimum rental for non-competitive oil and gas leases of 25 cents per acre per annum, with a waiver of all rentals for the second and third years. By regulation we have raised the rental for the first year and for the 6th through 10th years to 50 cents. We cannot, however, alter the waiver provision by administrative action. We have found that the low rental and the waiver of 2 years' rental may have encouraged speculation and have in reality been detrimental to oil and gas development. By the payment of a very small sum a party may hold a lease for a number of years with no intention of developing the leasehold but with the hope of selling the lease for a profit. If annual rentals are increased, and there is no longer a waiver of any year's rental, the mere holding of a lease for possible resale will be less attractive, and the speculating leaseholders will, we believe, be replaced by leaseholders interested in the active development of the oil and gas potentialities of the leasehold. The proposed legislation which we have prepared, H.R. 3263, would increase the minimum annual rental per acre to 50 cents and would eliminate the waiver provision. This amendment would have the added advantages of bringing Federal rentals more into line with the prices charged on State and privately owned lands and of recognizing the changes which have occurred in the value of money since this rental provision was first enacted in 1935.

One of the significant legislative proposals affecting the National Park Service is contained in legislation pending before you to authorize the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and Parkway. Originally it was thought that a parkway road should be constructed along the canal between Washington and Cumberland. Further studies have demonstrated that the canal and adjoining lands should be set aside as a park with emphasis on the preservation of its historic, scenic, and recreational values. We, of course, subscribe to the general objectives of this legislation. Specific details will be discussed in our report, which has not yet been cleared with other interested executive agencies.

We are considering whether we need additional authority to enable the National Park Service to utilize land acquisition funds to pay for options in the acquisition of lands, and to utilize Federal lands adjoining park areas for park facilities—with the concurrence of affected Federal agencies—without including these lands within boundaries of the park. Moreover, the Park Service should be given authority to avail itself of nongovernmental architectural and engineering services. This is particularly necessary if we are to avoid the necessity of large, temporary increases in our professional and technical staff while Mission 66 is under way. This new authority will make possible a more efficient execution of our Mission 66 program.

In the field of Indian affairs, several controversial subjects will require the consideration of Congress. Unfortunately, there are no easy answers. This is a field in which opinions frequently differ and in which emotional reactions are sometimes strong.

One of the problems that need congressional consideration is the disposition to be made of the submarginal lands that were acquired by the United States during the depression in the middle 1930's and that were transferred by Executive order to the Department of the Interior for administration for the benefit of various Indian tribes. Approximately 326,000 acres are involved. Title has been in the United States now for more than 20 years, and a decision needs to be made regarding the conditions under which the lands may be acquired by the Indians. The problem has been faced on a piecemeal basis in two instances (with the Seminoles in Florida and the Pueblos in New Mexico).

Another problem involving Indian lands that need attention is the heirship problem. After tribal lands were broken up and allotted (i.e., conveyed) in separate parcels to individual Indians, the original owners have died, and the inheritance process has resulted in the creation of almost unbelievable numbers of undivided fractional interests in the lands. In many instances this process has virtually frozen the title in a manner that makes it difficult for the individual owners to use the land themselves or to dispose of it. The problem is to determine the conditions under which the land may be sold by the individual Indian owners when some of them do not agree or cannot be located, and the conditions under which the tribes may, if they wish, acquire the lands that are offered for sale. In the latter case the big problem is how tribal acquisitions should be financed.

The Department's study of these subjects is also proceeding—and we shall work closely with your Indian Affairs Subcommittee in regard to specific recommendations in these areas.

The policy of terminating Federal supervision over the affairs of the various tribes as they become ready for that action has received much attention in the past. The Department expects to submit to this Congress a few termination bills, but as I have previously announced and emphasized, the Department will submit a proposal in this field only if it is fully understood and concurred in by a majority of the Indian group affected. The groups under consideration are small ones and will not present the complex issues that were involved in the Klamath and Menominee legislation.

The major item of legislation we shall submit to your committee in the fish and wildlife field will be our proposal to establish the Arctic Wildlife Range in Alaska. This area of approximately 9 million acres is located in the extreme northwest corner of our new State. Over 5 million acres of the area was formerly withdrawn as part of Public Land Order 82. As a refuge for caribou, grizzly and polar bears, Dall sheep, and wolverine, plus countless flocks of migratory birds of over 100 species, this wildlife range will provide a working laboratory for the study of Arctic life.

Our proposal for this area will seek authorization to permit metalliferous mining under a permit system and to open the area to mineral leasing. We will, however, seek to limit access to the area in order to prohibit appropriation of the surface title under the public land laws. We are currently working with the Department of Defense to eliminate their objections to our original draft bill. We are in substantial agreement now, and as soon as the technical drafting is completed and clearance has been given by the Bureau of the Budget, we shall submit this proposal to Congress.

Of primary interest to this committee is our saline water program. As you know, we recently had an independent board of consultants make a study of the needs of the Office of Saline Water in light of our expanded responsibilities under the demonstration plant authority enacted by Congress last year. This survey resulted in a series of recommendations, mostly administrative in character, which will be put into effect as the program progresses.

Interest in the contemplated demonstration plant activity has been intense. We are approaching the date for the selection of the first process to be demonstrated under this program. Selection of the process will precede and influence selection of the site.

Our budget request for fiscal year 1960 for this portion of our saline water program is $300,000. This amount includes funds for the selection of processes and for the engineering plans for the first conversion plants.

Of course, our basic activity in research and development is continuing.

The development activity is in the areas of three major processes—distillation, membrane, and freezing. In distillation small pilot plant work is underway on rotary vapor-compression stills, long-tube vertical multiple-effect systems, and solar stills of several types. The LTV distillation and the multistage flash distillation cycles continue to look very promising.

Two membrane processes are in commercial use, and a number of small plants are in operation on brackish water treatment. Improvement in equipment and membranes is continuing.

A small pilot plant using freezing as a separation process is now being built. It is based upon successful laboratory research and development recently completed.

Research is being carried out on these major processes, including the reverse osmosis and osmionic processes, and on others, such as solvent extraction. Some of these will be going into small pilot plant development.

In closing, let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, the comments I made to some of the members of this committee recently. It has been a matter of continuing pride to those of us now serving in the Department of the Interior that our relationships over the years with your committee and its members have been most satisfactory and pleasant. We have disagreed—at times—but our disagreement has normally been as to the means we should adopt to accomplish a mutually

agreed upon objective. Partisanship has not impeded the important work of the committee (and I like to believe has not impeded the important work of the Department), and the people we all serve have benefited thereby.

I make these comments again to give me the opportunity to assure you, Mr. Chairman, on the record, that it is our intention to do our part in continuing, in every way possible, this outstanding record of cooperation.

We stand ready to assist this committee in any way. And it is my feeling that any disagreements arising during this Congress between any of us will be eventually resolved as they always can be by reasonable and sincere men. If our relationships continue in the future as they have in the past, and I feel confident they will, we will continue to build sound and wise programs for the development, wise use, and conservation of our precious natural resources.

## Future Role of Cooperatives in Farm Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the Nation, faced with a wide number of problems, particularly in agriculture, still must find ways and means for dealing more effectively with the complex problems which confront it.

At this time, I want to refer briefly to a program that, over the years, has performed an outstanding service for the American farmer—that is, the cooperative movement.

In Wisconsin, we stand second in the number of cooperatives in the Nation, with a total membership of over 415,000.

According to a recent farm review by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, cooperatives, during the 1956–57 period, did a net business of $10.4 billion. This included $8 billion for farm products marketed, more than $2.1 billion for farm supplies, and $235 million for services performed for the patrons. The survey reveals that about 63 percent of all market cooperatives handled at least some production supplies, 59 percent furnished specialized or general services for their patrons, 22 percent of the farm supply cooperatives marketed farm products, and 42 percent performed other various services for their members.

Nationally, the latest survey shows 9,872 marketing, purchasing, and related service cooperatives for that period; returning millions of dollars to their patrons.

Over the years, however, we recognize that these cooperatives have been of substantial assistance to the American farmer by helping to improve income, have tided the farmers over downtrends in prices, and generally have brightened the outlook by providing better marketing, supply procurement, and other services for the farmers.

We are aware, of course, that consideration is being given to the relative size, the scope of operations, and other aspects of cooperative functions and their effects in our economy.

We recognize that these questions must be resolved, both in the interests of the farmer and of the general public.

The February 21 edition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer, a splendid publication that has served Wisconsin farm families for 110 years, carried a fine article by the columnist and farm authority, Bill Groves, on "Cooperatives of the Future Must Be Strong." Very pertinent questions are raised as to the role which cooperatives will play in our farm economy. To give my colleagues the benefit of the thinking in this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CO-OPS OF THE FUTURE MUST BE STRONG

(By William F. Groves)

I received a letter the other day from Peter May which is both stimulating and challenging. Mr. May is a member of the Equity Cooperative Livestock Sales Association staff. His letter comments on my column of January 17. I believe it merits quoting:

"What you have done (in your column) is to open up a vastly important field of thought. I agree that farmers should choose the middle road rather than go to the extreme right or left. I agree that some form of self-help is the desired objective.

"But the pertinent questions are these: How can farmers travel the middle road working as individuals? How can farmers become businessmen? How can they do anything about self-help until they learn how to work together?

"This column of yours becomes a natural opening wedge for a followup on the way farmer cooperatives can help make businessmen out of what have been merely producers."

Assuredly Mr. May's questions are fair and pertinent. They are important questions that should be answered and I accept his challenge.

Let us survey the inevitable steps a farmer must take if he is to become a businessman in fact as well as in name.

First, he must assume his proper responsibility in the marketplace. Second, he must put a price tag on his commodity. Third, he must effectively control his output. All of these are a part and parcel of every true business operation.

NEED GROUP ACTION

The farmer can achieve none of these legitimate goals by operating as an individual. If he is to enter the sphere of business and assume his proper responsibility in the marketplace, it must be done by group action. In the past the cooperative has been the farmer's most potent tool for achieving joint endeavor. It is natural, therefore, that the farmer should turn to his cooperative for a solution.

Cooperatives have an old and an honorable history. In the course of my lifetime I have witnessed the birth and the death of many farm organizations. Most of these cooperatives, whether living or dead, have rendered valuable service to their farmer members. They have returned millions of dollars to their patrons which would otherwise be found in the pockets of the processor or dealer.

In spite of their great success, cooperatives have failed to solve the farm problem. In my opinion, the reasons for this are three:

First, the cooperative has failed to speak with a voice of real authority in the marketplace. The voice of the industrialist rather than the farmer is dominant there.

Second, the cooperative has never been able to place a price tag on its finished product and make the price stick. I do not know of a single cooperative in the United States which is large enough to make even a dent in agriculture's price structure.

Third, no cooperative, to my knowledge, has ever made a conscientious effort to control the productive output of its members. Farmers and cooperatives alike have been content to shift all three of these important functions onto the shoulders of the Government.

No organization is stronger than its component parts. This is especially true of cooperatives. The reason why the cooperatives have never accomplished a full measure of success can be traced to the attitude of their farmer members. Farmers have been loathe to surrender a portion of their individual freedom for the common good.

CAN CO-OPS DO THE JOB?

The cardinal principle of all business is that production must be in approximate balance with consumer demand. No business which produces a surplus of goods year after year can prosper. In agriculture this means the imposition of production controls. Do the cooperatives possess the courage and the leadership to perform this important and inevitable task? Only the future can answer this question.

The cooperatives of the future must be strong. They must be large enough to make a deep impression in the marketplace and strong enough to impose their price. Above all, they must possess the courage to tackle the problem of farm surpluses and eventually solve it.

## Our New Atomic Boss Is Confident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 1, 1959, written by Frank Carey and entitled "Our New Atomic Boss Is Confident."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NEW ATOMIC BOSS IS CONFIDENT

(By Frank Carey)

When John Alex McCone became Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission last summer, he vowed to follow the advice of a priest: "When your knees begin to buckle, just kneel."

But today, looking back at his first half-year in one of the Nation's toughest jobs, Mr. McCone says his knees have yet to buckle. Modestly, he gives the credit to:

1. His fellow Commissioners.

2. A close and friendly relationship with Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, and other members of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee.

3. To his embattled predecessor, Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, who "left things in remarkably good shape."

As boss of the AEC, Mr. McCone runs an agency that has offices and laboratories scattered from Brooklyn to Japan. It budgets $2 billion a year, maintains facilities worth $7 billion, and employs 105,000. It builds

bombs, prospects for uranium, probes the secrets of cancer, builds powerplants, operates cyclotrons, studies mice and men, and conducts research literally from the depth of the earth to the far reaches of space.

"The problems have been perplexing and difficult," says Mr. McCone, "but they haven't caused my knees to shake." He came to the AEC from a distinguished career that included liberal doses of business, industry, and Government. Though a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, he won his public servant spurs as a Truman appointee.

HIS ATTITUDE ON CRITICISM

Public criticism of the AEC in the past has been partly justified, says Mr. McCone.

"There has been criticism because actions by the AEC have taken too long. Some of this has been due to uncertainties as to policy objectives and some due to uncertainties about the relative responsibilities of the commission and of the joint Senate-House Atomic Committee.

"Some of the delay has been due to the fact that development had to await basic scientific advances—and that has not been clearly understood by the public."

The originally quiet-spoken McCone adds with vigor: "But there's one thing on which there has been no criticism—and that's the nuclear weapons field.

"As a nation we've wrung our hands over lack of planes, lack of missiles and even, in the case of the Korean war, lack of conventional ammunition. But never has there been a time when we were worried about a lack of nuclear weapons capability."

The 56-year-old chairman, whose rimless glasses give him a scholarly look, has built ships, machinery, oil refineries, and powerplants. As an undergraduate at the University of California, he worked the swing-shift at a shipyard and later was a riveter and boiler maker.

With that background, he is immune to most noises.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

But he says there has been altogether too much ruckus over whether economical nuclear power could best be developed by public utilities or private enterprise.

"I believe the public-versus-private power issue in the nuclear field has been unnecessarily and erroneously emphasized by industry, by public, and private power groups and their Washington spokesmen, and by people within Government," he says. "To some extent, it has delayed development."

With nuclear power still more expensive than conventional power, the important thing is to find a way to cut costs, Mr. McCone says. "If we continue to follow a policy in the AEC of making research information available to all, then it shouldn't make a great deal of difference who does the development work."

After the technique has been made economical, says Mr. McCone, there might be some basis for arguing the merits of public versus private power—but not now.

The AEC Chairman believes nuclear power plants capable of competing with conventional powerplants can be built by the mid-1960's. And he agrees with the recommendation of a special advisory committee that emphasic should be placed on developing pilot-plant reactors instead of full-scale plants.

"This country could build big reactors right now," he says. "Obviously they would have to be built on the basis of known technology. They would not produce competitive power. The power would be more costly than if we went thrugh a little more development period—and that calls for prototypes (pilot plants)."

HELD DEFENSE JOBS

However, Mr. McCone isn't a foot dragger. He proved that in previous Government jobs—as a member of former President Truman's Air Policy Commission in 1947, as Deputy Secretary of Defense in 1948, and as Air Force Under Secretary from 1950 to 1951.

He likes to recall that as early as 1950 he recommended that the Nation's infant guided missile program be conducted by an official with absolute power over the entire effort.

"In August 1950," he says, "I pointed out to my boss (then Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter), and it eventually got up to President Truman, that while we were then spending $100 million a year on missiles, we should spend $2 billion a year or more.

"I also said we should have a project like the Manhattan project that produced the atomic bomb, with all the services working on missiles under a directorate, and with the primary responsibility in the hands of an individual—a czar type thing, if you will."

The idea was accepted in modified form, he says, with K. T. Keller as coordinator. "He did a superb job, but he could have done a better job if he had actually controlled the whole project," says McCone.

Mr. McCone, who reportedly was an unofficial adviser to President Eisenhower on missiles before he took the AEC job, says he thinks the missiles program is progressing very well. "I think we are going to see spectacular progress—in fact, we're seeing it right now."

He adds, "I think we have to do enough to be sure that anybody who would launch a surprise attack of any magnitude would get back a counterattack so massive that they wouldn't attempt to put the idea into action in the first place."

"In my Air Force days," Mr. McCone recalls, "I was devoted to the concept of massive retaliation, and I still am."

TRIES FOR CONCILIATION

When he moved into the AEC Chairman's office, Mr. McCone made no mention of Admiral Strauss' periodic tiffs with the Joint Atomic Committee. He said only that his aim would be to bring about a conciliation of views between the AEC and the committee.

Still, there was a flareup last week between Mr. McCone and Representative HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, at a hearing on the administration's latest program in the development of electric power from atomic energy. The words exchanged—while sharp—were the result of a misunderstanding, both men agreed at a resumption of the hearing on Friday.

Mr. McCone is a handsome, silvery-gray man of medium build. He plays golf in the low 80's, but has managed only a couple of rounds in recent months, what with learning the ropes of his new job and making four trips to Europe. A Catholic, he attended the funeral of Pope Pius XII.

He says he has made no attempt to become a nuclear whiz-kid, other than to get a general feeling for the technicalities. He gets advice on the technical stuff from staff members, a policy that allows him wider range "to judge problems from the standpoint of the businesslike approach."

He divides his time between the AEC's new headquarters in Germantown, Md., and a branch office downtown.

Mr. McCone says he doesn't mind the long jaunt to Germantown—"it gives me a chance to keep up on the reading that's required on his job." His car is equipped with a radio telephone in case there's some change of schedule while he's on the road.

The Chairman and his wife, Rosemary, lived in hotels until recently when they found a house suitable for themselves and three servants. They had just moved into a new home in San Marino, Calif., when he was named AEC Chairman.

When Mr. McCone was in business in Los Angeles—his shipbuilding firm turned out about $1 billion worth of ships during World War II—employees said he outdid Hollywood's version of big businessmen, handling several phone conversations at the same time. But one of his secretaries there says "he was never too busy to say 'please,' 'thank you' and 'my, you did a nice job on that.'"

Though usually mild-mannered, one of his AEC staffers says "he's impatient with delay or sloppy work—he's interested in results, not excuses."

## Famous American Criticizes Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the editorial entitled "Worst Supreme Court," which was published in the February 19, 1959, issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle in comment upon the remarks of a famous American, Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., upon the unveiling of a plaque honoring him and Mrs. Wood in Augusta.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORST SUPREME COURT

"The worst in 100 years."

This caustic but apt description of the U.S. Supreme Court and other critical comments thereon, voiced by a nationally known northerner, a straight-voting Republican, should by all means be disseminated throughout the whole country, for it is almost certain that "nary a word" of it will get through the Paper Curtain set up by the anti-South press.

Northern newspapers generally will ignore the remarks, although they come from a famous American whose opinions have always carried considerable weight.

We refer, of course, to the speech of Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., delivered while he was in Augusta for the unveiling of a plaque honoring him and his Augusta-born wife in connection with the opening of Sears' new store.

"This racial problem," declared the veteran Chicago military chieftain and noted business leader, "could have been settled—given time and patience—by the South itself."

Noteworthy also, and of good cheer for the South in its fight for constitutional rights, was his statement that "hundreds of thousands of northerners feel the Court's desegregation decision was a mistake."

General Wood's castigation of Chief Earl Warren as "the worst appointment ever made by President Eisenhower," and his statement that "I resent the interference into States' rights by this Supreme Court," were likewise pleasing to the South.

Incidentally, General Wood lauded both of Georgia's U.S. Senators—HERMAN TALMADGE and RICHARD RUSSELL—as "two of the best in the U.S. Senate today."

Although General Wood is not a southerner, he knows the South, especially Georgia where, in Columbia County, he is an extensive landowner.

It is tragic, indeed, that more northerners are not equally familiar with the South and its problems, and that nonsoutherners

generally fail to realize that government by judicial decree is potentially as dangerous to them as to the southern people themselves.

General Wood knows that the Supreme Court has gone too far, and doesn't hesitate to say so.

He knows too—although some lethargic southerners apparently don't—that the following words, once uttered by Thomas E. Watson, a noted Georgia statesman, are true:

"Democratic institutions exist by reason of their virtue. If ever they perish, it will be when you have forgotten the past, become indifferent to the present, and utterly reckless as to the future."

## Hon. Lister Hill of Alabama Recognized for Contribution to Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there appeared in today's Washington Post and Times Herald a fine editorial paying tribute to the eminent leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] in our efforts to encourage effective international cooperation in medical research. Senator HILL is now conducting hearings on his bill to create an Institute for International Medical Research within the National Institutes of Health. I am happy to be a cosponsor of this important measure, which could be instrumental in laying the groundwork for an International Medical Year such as proposed by many of us here in the Senate, including the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has done so much to promote this vital concept.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "International Killer," from the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 2, 1959.

The editorial makes clear why Senator LISTER HILL will rank high in our history among the lay and nonscientific people who have contributed greatly to the advancement of medical research and the alleviation of human suffering.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL KILLERS

Senator HILL's International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959, introduced with the sponsorship of a long list of both Democratic and Republican Senators, comes as a reminder of how little the United States has done to promote health on an international scale. Disease is truly, as Mr. HILL noted, an international problem. Contagion arising in any country may sweep over the globe. Such major killers as cancer and heart disease continue their slaughter year after year with no regard for international boundaries. Far too little has been done to internationalize the assault on these universal human foes.

Last year Congress invited the World Health Organization to initiate studies looking toward the strengthening of research into diseases common to all mankind. The Hill bill is a followup to the policy thus enunciated. It would set up a National Institute for International Medical Research and authorize the spending of up to $50 million a year to encourage medical research abroad, to train technicians, to improve facilities and to reduce wasteful duplication of efforts in different countries. If the program did nothing more than acquaint scientists in all countries with the findings of other researchers in the medical field it would give a powerful impetus to the conquest of disease.

Senator HILL estimated, with the aid of experts, that the advance of medical science since 1900 has saved 23 million lives in this country. A comparable advance no doubt is possible abroad with sanitation, hospital treatment and medical care. Of course, a mere increase in longevity would not necessarily be a boon to mankind—as can be seen now in some underdeveloped countries—unless there were accompanying economic efforts to provide new oportunity and increase living standards. Nevertheless, the research which Senator HILL's measure would provide is fundamental to the problem. Even more acute is the need for medical supplies, hospitals and medical training.

Senators HILL and HUMPHREY are unquestionably right in saying that international cooperation in this sphere may have a potent influence on peace. Of course the resources that may be devoted to this vital work are limited because of the multiplicity of demands upon the Government. But its value should be recognized. Congress must also remember that the Soviet Union is winning the gratitude of many free peoples by giving them medical aid while in this country it is still largely in the discussion stage.

## Commercial Use of the Word "Government"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Probing Use of 'Government' in Store Names," published in the New York Times of February 20, 1959, dealing with the commercial use of the word "Government."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBING USE OF "GOVERNMENT" IN STORE NAMES—CLAIM DECEPTION IN SOME TITLES

WASHINGTON, February 19.—The Federal Trade Commission has turned over to its Bureau of Investigation complaints about discount house operations in St. Louis and elsewhere using "Government" in their names, it was learned today.

The Commission has, on several occasions, issued complaints against private business firms using names suggesting that they operated as Government agencies.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican of North Dakota, also has introduced legislation (S. 355) to bar collection agencies from using any names, emblems or insignia which create the impression they are Federal agencies.

The latest complaints to FTC involve Government Employees Mart, 10,900 Page Boulevard, St. Louis, recently opened discount-type store.

A similar GEM store wil be opened soon in nearby Alexandria, Va.

FTC now has a complaint outstanding against Federal Employees Distributing Co., Los Angeles. The agency charged last November 20 the company, selling appliances, apparel and other goods, misrepresented itself as a nonprofit organization connected with the Federal Government. FTC also charged that, contrary to corporate name and advertising, is a profit-making retail business—even though chartered under California's nonprofit corporation law.

The latest complaint about the St. Louis Government Employees Mart, and related discount enterprises which are to be opened in California, Colorado, Minnesota, and Honolulu was made by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

In a letter to FTC chairman John Gwynne, Mr. Burger said "where the name of the Federal Government is used, directly or indirectly, it is misleading and deceiving, and we trust appropriate action will be taken * * * to allow these subterfuges to continue will eventually mean elimination of independent retail establishments in many areas * * * again, we repeat, these are nothing but private business corporations and the Government's name should not be used to mislead."

## Community Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD news reports from the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and the Washington Post regarding junior colleges, as well as an article from the February issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "With a Barnful of Students and a Countyful of Faith."

The growing interest in community, or junior, colleges is an indication that Americans have recognized this type of institution has a real potential for helping meet the problems created by an increasing demand for admission to colleges. As a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have urged that hearings be held on a bill which I have introduced to provide Federal assistance for construction of community public colleges. I feel that this would help encourage the development of these facilities.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1959]

EDUCATORS ARGUE JUNIOR COLLEGES—JOINING THEM TO HIGH SCHOOL IS DEBATED AT MEETING IN ATLANTIC CITY

(By Loren B. Pope)

ATLANTIC CITY, February 17.—School administrators disagreed strongly here today on a proposal that 2-year junior colleges be made part of the public high school system.

The issue was debated at the 91st annual meeting of the American Association of Administrators. The group met in the Atlantic City Auditorium. Twenty thousand school officials are attending the 5-day session, which ends tomorrow.

President Eisenhower in December advocated adding 1 or 2 more years to the public school system. He said that the present 12 years were not enough to equip students to live in today's world. He said the 2 additional years might be something like junior college.

In today's discussion, the administrators agreed that the opportunity to attend junior college should be widely available. They also agreed attendance should be voluntary. But they were divided on whether it should be part of the school system.

James H. Corson, superintendent of schools in Modesto, Calif., said the 63 public junior colleges in his State were able to provide terminal education or preparation for transfer to college.

ABILITY TO DO IT DOUBTED

Lawrence Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology in New York City, replied that only the larger urban areas could support adequate junior colleges.

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., New York Commissioner of Education, disagreed. He said, "As I look ahead, the lines of demarcation between the various parts of the educational structure are going to get thinner and thinner. * * *

"If the junior college is not an appendage of the public school system, I don't see how we're going to achieve articulation of the system all the way through, so it will serve all the people all the way."

In another session Dr. James B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University, said too many of the highly gifted children, the top 2 or 3 percent, were getting too narrow an education.

Dr. Conant also said that, following his 2-year study of the American high school, he would embark this year on a study of the elementary schools.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 18, 1959]

JUNIOR COLLEGES PUT IN LIMELIGHT

(By Millicent Taylor)

ATLANTIC CITY.—Is extending the public school system upward to include the junior college the next step in American education?

School leaders meeting here for the national convention of the American Association of School Administrators, a department of the National Education Association, say it can't be stopped.

In a heavily attended section meeting, the need for systems of junior or community colleges all across the Nation was readily conceded. The point at issue was what the setup should be.

This discussion was only one of nearly two-score section meetings dealing simultaneously with all kinds of school problems, ranging from identifying the gifted and stepping up foreign languages to teacher certification and the training of school custodians.

PATTERN OUTLINED

Presenting the California pattern of public junior colleges as a successful one, James H. Corson, superintendent of schools, Modesto, described such colleges as (1) voluntarily initiated by local communities; (2) tuition free; (3) public supported and distributing the cost between State and local levels; (4) serving an existing high school area or combined areas; and (5) administered by a locally elected or appointed board of lay citizens, with the State responsible for accredited standards, and a liaison between its programs and the university providing professional consultative service and the like.

Dr. Corson sees the public junior colleges as providing, beyond high school, education at less cost to the family and to the State. He also sees these colleges as offering real encouragement in an increasingly complex society to those who can benefit by going on with formal education. In addition, they relieve the strain on the senior colleges—large numbers entering senior colleges in the third year.

Able students that are enrolled in them are challenged, and go on to professional degrees and to positions of leadership.

STRONG GUIDANCE NOTED

At the same time guidance is stronger in the junior college than in the early years of the larger senior colleges and universities, and many a young person is enabled to find himself.

It is the experience in California, too, that the junior colleges iron out student problems and relieve the senior colleges of remedial work, although the junior college is not by any means just a salvage shop.

Close cooperation with the community, Dr. Corson emphasized, enables the junior college to offer advanced technical, semiprofessional, terminal business, and trade training in direct response to community, area, State, and national needs.

The public junior college has also proved the best center for serving adults locally in special, refresher, and retraining programs. It brings into the community at low cost, he added, many cultural advantages and interests formerly restricted to the "oasis" of the college town.

"As the Nation faces the rising tide of college students during the next decade, heavy reliance must be placed upon the junior college," Dr. Corson stressed.

"It is probable that they will continue and extend their important role in the democratization of higher education and will bring educational opportunity within commuting distance to scattered student populations throughout the State and Nation. We advocate the principle of local control. If local school districts feel shortage of funds, as they probably will, the State can increase its support with a much lower outlay than it could provide another brand of higher education."

And he added that to do nothing to meet the already urgent need is to place our heads in the sand.

Lawrence Bethel, president of the Fashion Institute of Technology, a higher education institution of New York public schools, declared himself in favor of public junior colleges. But he warned the school heads against merely adding two grades to the high school. The junior college must have administrative and educational freedom to develop as a separate institution of college character, he stressed.

Formation of a junior college in an area must be voluntary, meeting a felt need of the community with the full support of the community and with ready aid from the State.

This was an opinion expressed by many other school heads present.

FAST GROWTH RECORDED

Dr. Bethel also questioned the practicability of forming junior colleges in any but the more heavily populated districts. Where high school graduating classes are small and distances too great to combine high school areas, the junior college classes would be too small to provide courses diverse enough of quality high enough to meet the interests, need, and abilities of all the students.

In the light of the present 50 percent dropout or failures in some of the better colleges, too, he suggested that we are not reaching the interests and abilities of half our present registration. He therefore urged that before the schools add a network of public junior colleges and encourage more students to go beyond high school, that they improve their present programs.

"The junior college is now the most rapidly developing phase of education in the United States," he summarized. "It is estimated that by the end of the next decade it will register more than 50 percent of the freshmen of all collegiate institutions. This proportion already has been exceeded in California. It is becoming the undergraduate collegiate institution of our modern educational structure.

"Let us not impede its progress by trying to make it an appendage of a totally different phase of the structure. Rather, let us assist it to grow and develop in its own right."

---

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1959]

TWO-YEAR COLLEGE CALLED BOON TO INDIGENT

ATLANTIC CITY, February 17.—The nationwide trend toward publicly supported junior colleges is placing higher education within the reach of many who could not or would not have gone to college before, school administrators were told here today.

A California educator, whose State has pioneered in the development of the 2-year schools, said this is a major reason for supporting junior colleges as part of public school systems.

"Evidence exists aplenty that many late bloomers, early goofers or slow starters have finally come through," said School Superintendent James H. Corson of Modesto, Calif.

But junior college is "not just a salvage shop," he added.

"Able students enroll, are challenged and go on to masters' and doctorate degrees and positions of leadership," Corson told a session of the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators.

PUBLICLY SUPPORTED

Corson said the junior colleges should be "tuition-free and publicly supported—preferably distributing the cost between State and local levels."

(Recently established junior colleges in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties operate on a tuition basis. The District School Board has proposed setting up a junior college as part of an expanded program at District Teachers College.)

Corson said the "rising tide of college students during the next decade" will make junior colleges increasingly important.

"If local school districts feel a shortage of funds, as they probably will," he added, "the State can increase its support of junior colleges with a much lower outlay than it could provide another brand of higher education supported entirely by State funds."

DILUTION OF COURSES

Some educators here voiced concern that establishment of junior colleges as appendages to public school systems would divert funds from elementary and secondary programs and dilute the content of high school courses.

"The junior college has a meaning and a distinctiveness in its own right and demands separation from other levels of education," said President Lawrence L. Bethel of the Fashion Institute of Technology in New York City.

Bethel challenged the thesis that all high school graduates should be admitted to free junior colleges, regardless of ability or financial need.

---

[From Reader's Digest]

WITH A BARNFUL OF STUDENTS AND A COUNTYFUL OF FAITH

(By Elizabeth Fagg)

In their flowing black robes and cocked mortarboards, the class of 1952 looked like any other college graduating class: the same fresh faces; the same ripple of laughter at

the prexy's jokes; the same pride in accepting the diplomas.

But to thoughtful observers this first commencement at Orange County Community College in Middletown, N.Y., was no ordinary June graduation. It was a heartening symbol of new opportunities which are opening to thousands of U.S. youngsters. For Orange County Community College is one of the 2-year, low-cost community colleges now springing up in many parts of the country, offering an educational chance to thousands who might otherwise never get to college.

Take Joe Loomis (not his actual name), a recent OCCC graduate. With neither cash nor precedent for a college education in his family, Joe had drifted through high school. His highest ambition had been to become a garage mechanic. Then in his senior year classmates began talking of going to OCCC. They could live at home and work part time to pay the modest yearly tuition of $200. Practical vocational courses were available to prepare them for specific jobs in the region. For the first time Joe began to see a chance—and the need—for more education.

That fall, with summer earnings in his pocket, he enrolled at OCCC. His below-C average would have barred him from many colleges, but now he was eager to learn, and aptitude tests indicated that he had a strong potential in science. So he was accepted—on probation. Joe worked hard, made up his deficiencies, graduated with honors. He has now gone on to study engineering in a 4-year college.

Joe's story is typical in many ways of OCCC students. Not all the applicants present such poor high-school records; they range from honor students to bottom man on the totem pole. But they possess two common denominators: a short pocketbook and a hunger for higher education.

Junior colleges, supplementing the senior institutions, are not new in this country, but since World War II their number has soared. Today there are 652 of them, located in every State, with a total enrollment of nearly a million students. The most striking recent version is the community college, operated by a city or county, often with State support. Says Ralph Fields, of Columbia University Teachers College, "The present rapid spread of 2-year community colleges may well parallel the growth of public high schools 50 years ago."

OCCC is an outstanding example of this kind of home-grown institution. It got its start 13 years ago, when a survey disclosed that Orange County, a low-income farming area, sent a smaller proportion of its high-school graduates to college than any other county in New York State. Shocked by this fact, Fred Germain, secretary of the Middletown Chamber of Commerce, organized a committee on higher education, which held meetings all over the county to discuss setting up a local college.

The most practical and economical kind of school, Germain decided after some research, would be a 2-year community college. It would be less expensive to run than a 4-year school, because lower-division work is less specialized: class sizes can be larger, teaching staff smaller, buildings and equipment simpler. And with a nonresident campus there would be no need for dormitories.

First step was to qualify for State aid. New York State would match in capital investment whatever the community put up in funds or real estate. After that, operating costs could be split three ways between the State, a local sponsor, and students' tuition.

The committee approached Mrs. John H. Morrison, widow of a Middletown businessman, and made a bold request: Would she move out of her 40-room mansion and 16-acre estate and give them to the county for a college? She generously consented. Market value of the property was about $60,000. Later, however, the educational value was appraised at $242,000, a sum which the State matched.

At this point the Orange County Board of Supervisors, asked to become sponsor, hesitated at accepting the financial obligation. "County College Appears Doomed," a local newspaper headlined. Promptly, Fred Germain got on the radio, pleaded with local citizens: "If your property is valued at $2,000 for tax purposes, a community college would cost you the colossal sum of 50 cents a year. Fifty cents to guarantee you son and daughter the opportunity of a college education."

Citizen pressure on the board grew strong. It was clear that the people wanted a college, and in June 1950, the board of supervisors voted for it. Four years of hard work had triumphed.

At the commitee's victory celebration someone asked, "What do we do next?" There was a silence. In the intense effort to get official backing, no one had had time to plot out the nuts and bolts of getting a college started.

"One thing's sure," one member remarked. "We can't possibly open this fall."

This aroused Germain. "We'll open this fall or not at all," he said. "We can't afford to lose a whole year."

Under Germain's leadership, work began immediately on the Morrison place. Horses and hay were moved out of the stone carriage house, and carpenters, electricians, and plumbers set about turning the building into a science laboratory. Germain borrowed from the Middletown Chamber of Commerce to pay bills until State funds became available. Since many of the workmen had youngsters of their own who wanted to go to the new college, a miracle of energy went into the renovations that summer.

Edwin H. Miner, an experienced professor and former Associate Commissioner of Education in the U.S. Office of Education, was chosen dean (and, a few months later, president). He at once began engaging a teaching staff. And that October, with a barnful of students and a countyful of faith, the new college opened.

There were 165 students in that first group. Today there are 3,023 at OCCC, drawn from a 30-mile radius. There are 57 full-time faculty members, 14 part-time. The Morrison mansion has become a classroom and office building; the former carriagehouse now holds an auditorium and a chemistry laboratory. Three new buildings have gone up: A library, a student center, more classrooms. Where the quiet of private gardens once reigned, today there is a great bustle of purposeful people.

"This is your college," the administration tells the public. "Come use it." For the concept of a community college embodies the ideal of serving the whole community, of offering learning to all individuals who sincerely want it.

OCCC has three major programs, each of which bears the special community college stamp. First obligation is to the undergraduate. For students who plan to go on and get B.A. or B.S. degrees, the college give 2 years of undergraduate work paralleling that of 4-year institutions. Some 40 percent of OCCC students have gone on to other colleges and universities, transferring with full recognition of credits.

As to those for whom these 2 years may be the beginning and end of college education, OCCC must not only make them better citizens but good job candidates as well. Vocational training is offered in business management, engineering, secretarial work, agriculture, retail selling, electrical technology. "To us, curriculum is anything but a rigid thing," President Miner says. "We're constantly looking for new ideas useful to our region."

A striking illustration of this is the training program offered to meet the critical shortage of nurses in the community. The usual registered nurse's course requires 3 years. OCCC became one of the first colleges to turn out registered nurses in 2 years. Under the watchful eye of the state department of education, OCCC streamlined the usual course, retaining all essential but drastically trimming the repetitious hospital chores that occupy much of the student nurse's time. OCCC's graduates passed the licensing exams, quickly acquired manual dexterity in the routine chores which their training had not given them. Today OCCC's 2-year registered nurses are able to find jobs in any hospital they wish—local or metropolitan.

A second major program of the at home college is adult education, so popular at OCCC that it has threatened to swamp the facilities. Some 2,500 men and women from the surrounding countryside are enrolled yearly in evening classes or extension courses. Nearly 200 courses are given including all the regular curriculum subjects as well as special occupational courses. Approximately 75 percent of the adults study for college credit.

OCCC's third major role is as a public-service agency, a consultation and planning center. The college helped create a county mental-health program, and is working to start a county library system. A project to improve grade-school instruction of gifted children began last fall. OCCC's counseling center provides educational, vocational, and psychological guidance to any who want it.

Small wonder that Orange County citizens feel this is truly their college. The taxi driver, the farmer, the elevator operator and the waitress all speak of it with pride. They know an important new influence has entered their community, and their lives.

## Address by Charles H. Silver at Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to call to the attention of this body a fine speech recently delivered by Hon. Charles H. Silver, president of the Board of Education of the city of New York, at the annual dinner of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation. Dr. Silver, who served as chairman of the dinner, spoke out eloquently on civil rights, civil liberties, and the sanctity of man's innate dignity. His words deserve the thoughtful reflection of all of us.

It is fitting that these remarks should be voiced before a group which perpetuates the memory of that great American, Al Smith. It is equally fitting that a foundation devoted to the alleviation of human suffering should bear the name of the "Happy Warrior." In this connection, I think this body should take note of the efforts of that outstanding churchman and world leader, Francis Cardinal Spellman, in behalf of the wonderful work of the Smith Foundation. He has labored untiringly to make the foundation's program a success.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Silver's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HONORABLE CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, AS CHAIRMAN OF THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL FOUNDATION DINNER, HELD AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1958

It is my very great pleasure as chairman to welcome you this evening. May I express my heartfelt gratitude to you and to all our honored guests who have gathered together to mark the progress of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation. I rejoice again in the presence of so many faithful friends. In our established custom, I wish to explore with you the climate of this trouble time.

Long ago, when man made his way through a wilderness he determined his direction from the stars. He knew that if he looked into God's heaven at the eternal pattern of creation, his path would become plain.

But sometimes the night was clouded over or the jungle closed above his head. Then, he would wait for the light to come so he could see where he was, how far he had come, and where he was going.

When men and nations become lost in a wilderness of opposing ideologies and conflicting ambitions, even the stars can fail us. They are there, all that hung in the sky since the beginning, and even a few that we have put there to confuse us further. But the darkness has gathered over many lands and we must seek the light to find the way.

That is why, even today, the soul and mind of man must seek a high place from which to judge his position in a troubled world and learn the path he should take. We, who come to these dinners devoted to the precious remembrance of one who walked nobly in the American way, have gathered to climb together this annual watchtower of the world.

Gazing from here on all that God has given our beloved country, we give thanks for the peace and freedom we still enjoy. And we must firmly resolve, in an hour when the dignity of man and the rights of some of our people are being debased in our own land, that we will not sit idly by with do not disturb signs on our hearts and hands while the miracle of America is ground in the dust of apathy, weakness or regional self-interest.

There are others on this evening's program, more qualified than I to give counsel in these matters of tremendous decision. We can well take confidence in their leadership in national and international affairs.

But in a climate of uncertainty and doubt, when men cry peace and there is no peace, we need more than the physical trappings of power. We must draw on our deepest spiritual resources. We must gain strength from the fervent conviction that the history of our country is a tremendous adventure in freedom.

We need to realize that when our country was founded, man's finest dream and noblest thoughts were inscribed on parchment. To insure that human rights, human liberty, human dignity would ever be paramount, our Bill of Rights and subsequent amendments were added for all to observe and obey. These wise pioneers of our liberty provided for a judicial guardian of our sacred words.

As we approach more closely to fulfillment of our dream, a desperate band of little men would have us becloud those guiding stars of our history, would have us denounce a Supreme Court that refuses to join them in subverting our laws and principles. They would plunge our people into ignorance at a time when man stands on the threshold of his greatest triumph, through knowledge, and would have us governed by men, not laws.

If ever there were need to rally throughout this Nation those men who truly believe in America and all for which it stands, there is need now. How can we look at the rest of the world and say, "Believe in me for my way is the way of freedom, liberty, brotherhood and peace", if we cannot look at ourselves and say it. How can we seek the privileges if we fail the responsibilities given us by the great men who framed the destiny of this God-loved land?

We must know, as they knew and pledge our lives and sacred honor—as they did theirs—that no state's rights transcend human rights.

We must pledge ourselves to the sacred cause of human dignity, and preserve our Union with its principles unshaken.

The explosion of the rocket to the moon—as man's mind soars to the heights—must not be debased by the explosion of the bomb in the synagogue basement—as man's mind plunges to the depths.

The American commonwealth is the product of thousands of years of man's yearning for freedom. We have emerged as the strongest, healthiest, most prosperous people on earth. Yet, in our very success, and, until now, unchallenged supremacy, lie the seeds of our own destruction.

That is our world today. Let us make sure it is not our world of tomorrow. Indeed, let us make sure there is a world tomorrow; more than that, a world free of the torment and tension which have tortured our times.

The strongest ally of communism is a new type of traitor. He stanchly protests his love of our Nation's liberties, but does everything in his power to undermine our Nation by denying those liberties to men, women, or children of a color or creed other than his own.

That is where the jungle is growing right over our own heads. That is the wilderness through which we must grope our way to peace.

Let us be ever alert, with our guard up against the guns aimed at our heads from other shores. But let us not ignore the gun we are aiming at our own while we fumble with this trigger of delay on the march to mankind's emancipation. Freedom cannot survive as a monopoly.

We each have an individual opportunity—and it may be for the last time as we balance between utter chaos or universal good will—to build a better world, based on the wisdom which can lift men's minds and hearts to new heights and is more powerful, more worth the price, than ever before.

This should be the way we seek as we stand together on a high place. "Happy Warriors" for a holy purpose, resolved to give our children a future more secure, a life more rewarding.

---

## The State of Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 31, 1959, at the Roosevelt Day dinner in Washington, D.C., the noted economist John Kenneth Galbraith delivered an address entitled "The State of Liberalism."

Dr. Galbraith is not only one of our country's finest economists, but he also stands out as a great and articulate liberal. When he writes or makes a speech, it is certain not only to be of great interest, but even more important it is certain to be thought provoking. In the tradition of the outstanding liberals throughout the years, Dr. Galbraith does not hesitate to take a bold and critical look at our society and at our thinking, and to come forth with new, imaginative ideas and constructive proposals.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent speech by one of our finest liberal spokesmen be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF LIBERALISM

(Address by John Kenneth Galbraith at the annual Roosevelt Day dinner, Shoreham Hotel, Saturday, January 31, 1959)

I

My subject this evening, the state of liberalism, will suggest a somewhat introspective mood, and this is most appropriate in such a gathering as this. It is one of the maxims of our political life that while conservatives worry about liberals, liberals worry about themselves.

Perhaps that is the nature of that curious political being called the liberal. He would like to leave well enough alone. Like everyone else he prefers the familiar ideas, the established faith. But he is not quite content. The nagging habit of reflection, like the gnawing desire for a cigarette, or for reelection, is something he cannot quite suppress.

Here, I think, is one of the claims we can make—and in this confessedly nonpartisan gathering no such opportunity should be overlooked—for the Eisenhower administration. It would seem to have avoided, perhaps more effectively than any other administration of modern times, the pain, uncertainty and discomfort that are associated with the pursuit of ideas.

II

Indeed, while we are paying tribute to this administration, I wonder if a further word might be said on this point. There are those—some are my friends—who think that this administration will be more celebrated by historians for its foreign policy—for devising, for the first time, a foreign policy that is at once frozen and unpredictable. This is based on an intelligence system which functions perfectly on the inner aims of the Kremlin (so that Mr. Dulles can issue a daily commnique on them) but which provides no knowledge of what is about to happen in the Caribbean.

Others, also thoughtful men and women, argue that it is the economic policy of this administration which bears the mark of destiny. They cite the touching faith in the magic of the interest rate and the magic faith in the power of words. This is coupled with the reverent belief that recessions are an act of God and that recovery is the reward of those who only stand and wait. To an economist this view has its fascination. Adlai Stevenson once referred to the Old Guard Republicans who had to be hauled, kicking and screaming, into the 20th century. The modern Republicans come along tractably enough but bring the 19th century with them.

But I think it wrong to suggest that either foreign or economic policy will be the enduring monument of the modern Republicans. The Eisenhower administration will endure in memory because of its unparalleled dreariness. On the reasonable assumption that it can avoid exertion for another 23 months, it will have gone 8 years without introducing a single interesting, novel or ex-

citing departure in the field either of foreign policy or domestic government. It will have contributed nothing to set beside point 4, the Marshall plan, the Wagner Act, TVA and the hundred other ventures into the needed and the unknown which marked the preceding 20 years. As its most ardent critics have complained, the administration has even succeeded in being uninspired in its efforts at reaction.

Only in the field of what may perhaps be called administrative semantics has there been a certain type of pioneering. I refer, of course, to the way words have become divorced from action during these last 6 years. This separation is now nearly total. A declaration that the Government will promote recovery, raise farm incomes, prevent inflation, or promote higher living standards abroad is now a portent of nothing whatever. The words have replaced the action. Indeed, they are more than a substitute. A statement of deep concern for the well-being of other peoples now means that there will soon be a cut in foreign aid. A declaration that we will surely outstrip the Russians in space exploration means that the administration is contemplating a reduction in appropriations for research.

Like you, I have been fascinated to note that this divorce of speech from action has even invaded Republican Party affairs. A week or two ago, President Eisenhower received from Chairman Meade Alcorn a thoughtful report calling on members of the party to loosen the embrace of big business and to preach and practice a militant republicanism 365 days a year. The President warmly endorsed and applauded this report. Then he left for a vacation, taking with him a couple of the country's outstanding entrepreneurs.

Let me say that a closely related administrative accomplishment of these last 6 years has been the divorce of responsible officers from responsibility. This has long been noticed in the case of the President. He stands above the battle, anyhow, whenever the battle is going badly. But I wonder if we have fully realized how completely his subordinates have copied his technique. The Dulles paper pacts are Mr. Dulles' monument. But when things go from bad to much worse in Baghdad or Manila, this is never the fault of Mr. Dulles. Or to come closer to home, there is the tragic and sickening case of Cuba. Our recent Ambassador there—he was the appointee of the President and Mr. Dulles—was described last year in State Department syntax as doing a very outstanding job in one of the most difficult spots imaginable. This outstanding job included open support for the corrupt and brutal tyranny of Fulgencio Batista. Now Batista has gone and so has Smith, the outstanding Ambassador. We are reaping the whirlwind of the policy precisely as observers predicted we would. But there has been not the slightest suggestion that Mr. Dulles feels in any way responsible.

Similarly when the Soviets seize scientific or technical leadership, it is no one's fault. No one is to blame when prices rise, or income drops, or unemployment grows, or fallout falls. Even Ezra Benson has been able after 6 years to maintain a remarkable detachment from his mountainous surpluses and his astronomic expenditures. He is a good man. He does the right thing. It just produces the wrong results. But someday virtue will have its reward. I wonder what would have happened to a liberal Secretary of Agriculture who had managed things as Secretary Benson has and at similar cost. The press would, I think, have been a trifle waspish.

III

But, in a more philosophic mood, perhaps we would temper our criticism. We have survived 6 years of this negativism. With luck—we may of course need quite a lot of luck—we will survive 2 more. And one is tempted to wonder if these periods of interruption and hesitation are not part of a deeper historical process. The twenties and early thirties of this century were years of minimal action or postponement. Then as now there was the conviction that providence was irrevocably on the side of sound business judgment, the status quo and the balanced budget. This being so, neither thought nor energy was needed.

Because so little was done then, much was done in the years that followed. Coolidge and Hoover accumulated the tasks that Franklin D. Roosevelt performed. The unfinished business of one decade became the opportunity of the next. So perhaps progress does not come by smooth advance. I must avoid saying that we too have our great leaps forward.

As problems accumulate in certain periods, so we may hope does understanding and the perception of needed action. Here perhaps we have the simplest statement of the division of labor between conservatives and liberals. Conservatives accumulate the unsolved problems. The task of liberals is to keep pace with the solutions.

No one can doubt that the Eisenhower administration is nobly performing the historic mission of conservatives.

IV

Meanwhile, there are a number of things on which it seems to me the liberal position is now very poorly prepared. Perhaps this is inevitable. As a people we are not very good at settling on courses of action in the abstract. We work best under the whiplash of necessity. Moreover, we are often reluctant to see that not all problems have an equal priority and that on occasion first things must be put first. Yet perhaps we could do better. There are three things which seem to me of particular importance. Let me give you my list.

V

First, there is the problem of the massive role of our military expenditures in the economy and the question of the alternatives. That rational man will triumph must be a tenet of the liberal faith. So we must expect to find a way through the morass of our age without war. But increasingly we encounter the conviction—it is common at home and epidemic abroad—that if we cannot afford war, neither can we afford peace. To withdraw some forty billions of military spending from the economy would surely write finis to the economic system. Many firms, numerous industries and some whole communities would be devastated. So, a few voices like HUBERT HUMPHREY's apart, we treat the problem with an embarrassed silence.

No doubt a drastic reduction in military spending would involve problems. But I hazard the view that with some exercise of foresight, planning and imagination, these problems would be far from insuperable. The global totals of expenditure could be readily offset by other outlays—even without throwing Ezra Benson into the breach. Thus, immediately on reduction of military spending, there should be generous payments to individuals and families left jobless by the change. Tax reduction for families in the low income brackets—families which reliably spend their entire income—would readily offset several billions of military outlay. Urban redevelopment, housing and urban and suburban transportation; education and school construction; and a solid increase in economic aid would offset another substantial chunk. In the slightly longer run, always given the determination and the willingness to free our minds from the slavery of the past, we could make highly effective use of these resources in a direct attack on poverty. Of this I will say a word in a moment. The harder question seems to me less economic than social and psychological. It would concern the declining urgency of work itself. As this happens, can leisure be made more rewarding? And work too? In short, how, as we solve the economic problem—that Old Man of the Sea which humanity has always carried—can life be given not less but more meaning?

One reason that liberals have been reluctant to discuss these questions is that they seem to imply a willingness to disarm unilaterally. And, of course, such discussion invites the angry riposte of the hardheaded and practical men who have flourished these last years—the men who think it idle to imagine that humanity has a future of any kind. The American people are far more to be trusted than the hardheaded men—those who use the head as a blunt instrument.

The best way to have no future is to cease thinking about it.

So we must look at the alternatives to the arms race and get them into solid form. Everyone must know that we are not committed by economic necessity to that venture. We must be able to embrace alternatives easily and quickly and immediately the opportunity arises.

VI

Our second priority task, or so it seems to me, is to find out how we may mount a new and final attack on poverty. No one I imagine denies that in the 22 years since, in January 1937, Franklin Roosevelt saw one-third of a Nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished, there has been much progress in the reduction of privation and want. Much of it has been the result of specific action directed to the specific goal of popular well-being—to the development of a stronger trade-union movement, of social security, minimum-wage legislation, improved health and other welfare services. Much more has been the result of the general advance in income and output in the war and postwar years. We must look to future expansion to rescue more of our people from their misery and to help others climb the ladder to more satisfactory incomes.

But, I would urge, we cannot much longer be satisfied with this general progress—important though it is. Both the statistics and the evidence of our eyes must tell us that it is leaving too many people behind. (In 1956, between two and three million households still had income of less than a thousand dollars; 7.5 million had incomes below $2,000.) These are the urban slum dwellers, the minorities, the bypassed rural areas and the Nation's truly forgotten men, women and children—those who do hard ill-paid farm labor and have not, in many cases, even the minimal amenity of a place to live.

We need to know who our poor are, where they are, and why they remain excluded from the richer current of our economic life. And we need a solid design for seeing that they, and above all their children, are rescued from what is now anachronistic privation.

Nor should we be bound by ancient notions as to how this may be done or what can be afforded. The problem must be attacked in a large and generous frame of mind. It means much better schools and health and welfare services. It means help for communities that do not have these in adequate quality and quantity and which cannot afford them. Almost certainly it means supplementary cash income for families that cannot afford proper care and education for their children. We will hear of the corrupting effect of such help. It would be well were it compared to the corrupting effect of ignorance and starvation. But our greatest need is for a plan—a design—for the final elimination of poverty.

VII

Third and most immediately we must find a way of reconciling full employment and economic growth with price stability. If not, our hard-won social gains and our hard-won public services will be subject to the con-

stant erosion of inflation. Let there be no mistake: Inflation is a highly reactionary phenomenon. It rewards most those who are best skilled at serving themselves. It encourages precisely the behavior which in every society is the most plentiful. With equal precision, it penalizes those services—education, health, welfare—which the civilized community has the most need to encourage.

Inflation is also the relentless enemy of a strong and effective labor movement. Unions will rarely be as effective in winning wage advances as the employing corporations are in offsetting them with price increases. And in the competition to explain who is really responsible for the price advances, unions will always come off second best.

If I read the economic policy of the present administration correctly, it holds that inflation can be solved by a three-part policy, the three parts being, in equal measure, prayer, incantation, and William McChesney Martin. The present liberal position is, if anything, less specific. Liberals rightly reject monetary policy—the tight money crusade—as inequitable to the extent that it is not unworkable. They reasonably conclude that full employment and growth are preferable to the kind of astringent tax and spending policy which would provide price stability. But we do not say what we are for.

There is only one thing we can be for. In the big industries where the basic wage and price patterns are set, we must have a national price and wage policy that is consistent with price stability. This will unquestionably take some kind of public mechanism. Just what kind is uncertain—one hopes that it can be simple, and certainly it must safeguard the vital democratic interests of all parties. But clearly it is time that we began to find out what is required.

VIII

As I suggested, this is a list of problems, not a platform. These three things—price stability, poverty, and the peacetime economy—are the matters on which we most need answers. There are other tasks of equal urgency—full citizenship and civil rights, education, economic growth. But on these, I think you will agree, the liberal vision is clearer and our course far more clearly marked. On the things of which I have spoken we have yet to take the measure of the task.

And, of course, my list has had to do only with our domestic life. In domestic policy in recent times, we have, at worst, stood still while the world has moved on. In foreign policy, while the world has moved ahead, we have tried with a determination unmatched in other matters to march backward. It was the nature of the Roosevelt diplomacy that it identified itself with people. People, as Roosevelt's superb political instinct told him, were in this century the enduring foundation of influence and ultimately of power. People were the ultimate basis of reliable association and alliance. If we respected and supported popular aspirations, we would be strong and we would be respected. But if we supposed that political liberty and economic well-being were objects for exclusively American consumption, we would invite the mistrust, suspicion, and even the dislike of the less fortunate peoples of the world. The Roosevelt foreign policy was never perfectly articulated. I do not wish to idealize it unduly. But all will recognize these broad lineaments. Its identification with people was brilliantly continued in UNRRA, the Marshall plan, and point 4 under Harry Truman. And none can doubt the success of these policies. Whatever else the thirties and forties may have been, they were the American years.

I need scarcely remind you how diligently we have sought to reverse the Roosevelt policy. Foreign policy at the level of its leadership has become a matter of narrow strategic calculation. Idealism is idiotic; compassion is soft-headed. Dictators are excellent allies, if, in addition to being against their own people, they are also against communism. Latin Americans are no longer neighbors but occupants of a safe rear area. Indians are not men and women but inhabitants of a bastion. Economic aid is not an expression of our will to help others. It is a counter in the cold war. Narrow self-interest is the only test of policy.

Is it so surprising that this higher diplomacy—so much of which passes for deep guile and craftiness—has not been very ingratiating? Is it so astonishing that literate and intelligent people the world around should have seen it and seen through it? I think not. It is more surprising that quite a few Americans still feel that they can leave their political convictions at the water's edge—that they can be men of good will and compassion at home but hard-headed friends of dictators, rascals and reactionaries once they cross a border.

Liberalism is, in fact, an indivisible faith. It has never been satisfactorily established that hunger is less painful for a Pakistani than for a man from Pennsylvania. Liberty is as important in Caracas as in Kansas City. Compassion is not indecent. Generosity is not subversive. An intricate calculation of self-interest is not always the mark of wise statesmanship.

This is the liberal faith. But it is also the only practical faith. Our foreign policy has failed in these last years less because of mismanagement than because it has been hopelessly conservative, hopelesly out of date.

Its leaders have supposed that we could have it one way at home and another way abroad—that expert inconsistency could be a substitute for political conviction. One needn't dwell on the morality of this for the practical consequences are sufficiently evident.

Foreign policy, like domestic policy, must be abreast of the popular revolution of our age. If it isn't, no matter how superficially clever it may seem, history will overtake it—and in a very few months. Those responsible, if they want to escape from Washington with their reputations intact, must not stay too long.

This, if I may conclude on a philosophic note, has been another mistake of the present administration.

---

## Community Spirit Still Abounds in Lykens and Williamstown Area in Pennsylvania

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, these indeed are changing times and they say that man does shape his own future.

Well, up around Lykens and Williamstown, Pa., the people are proud enough to want to keep their communities going in the face of adversity and they are doing something about it. Actions speak louder than words, and that is what is going on up there.

Here is an article from the Harrisburg Evening News that tells the story of how they are going about trying to help themselves with a fine community spirit in their drive to bring industry into their area to take up the slack.

UP IN THE VALLEY LOYALISTS REFUSE TO GIVE UP GHOST

(By George Draut)

The lights start going on at 5 o'clock in the morning in hundreds of homes in the Lykens-Williams Valley.

This northern Dauphin County valley used to be one of the biggest anthracite coal areas in the country.

But that was long ago.

The mines closed down years ago.

Now it is a valley of car pools and commuters, maybe as many as 5,000 of them if you range back from Millersburg on the river through the long-dead coal industry towns into the Tower City area of Schuylkill County.

They chip in around $5 apiece a week to pay for gasoline and oil, and they spend 3 hours a day in an automobile every working day of their lives just to get to jobs and paychecks and back home again.

If they live in Williamstown, the center of this coal ghost area where once the biggest mine in the United States went full blast, they're driving or riding 100 miles or more a day to and from work. If it's winter and the roads are icy, this can be rough. This is mountain country.

Most of them are men.

There are precious few jobs for men in the valley.

So they work in the complex of industries and offices and government centered around Harrisburg * * * at one of the three big Federal installations, or in one of the State government departments, or at the Bethdehem steel mill in Steelton, or someplace else.

Or they are the men who leave Williamstown and the valley every day and drive over the Gold Mine Trail to jobs at Indiantown Gap. Or the 11 people from this same small town who work at the Dauphin County Home—room, board, and $180 a month. And just weekends home with their families.

Back in the valley, 2,200 women—wives, daughters, and widows—are going to work, too. There are 2 textile plants, 16 apparel plants and 5 shoe factories. Just about every town in the valley has one or more of them. And some of this also involves commuting. A car pool of women who live in Williamstown may drive to jobs in a Millersburg factory. Or Lykens women may drive the few miles to jobs in a neighboring town.

This is a valley of older people, of old age assistance and miners' and widows' pension checks. Every year, a few more of the young people leave. That shows up in the declining school enrollments.

But with the fierce family and community affection and loyalty that you can find only in a Pennsylvania coal town, many of them just will not think of leaving. And some, who do, come back homesick to stay. That's why there are 5,000 men and women battling fatigue and traffic every day so they can make a living. There's this intangible, deep feeling of belonging in the towns of the Lykens-Williams Valley and all of the other Pennsylvania coal communities that just doesn't exist in the big, fat, prosperous cities and their well-groomed suburbs.

Once 4,000 miners worked in the valley. The last big mine closed down at Williamstown in 1941 just a few months before Pearl Harbor. It was owned by Susquehanna Collieries, a subsidiary of giant M. A. Hanna Corp. Earlier it had closed down its big mine at Lykens. And along the way the two mines of Reading Coal and Iron closed at Tower City. Today there are only 400 miners in Dauphin County on the official jobs count of the Pennsylvania State Em-

ployment Service. And most of them are small operators, maybe working over the culm banks or dredging coal out of the river. Back in the hey-day of the early-twenties, 50 railroad cars and 1,500 tons of coal left Williamstown every day.

The 1950 census says there are 2,332 people in Williamstown. Once there were twice as many.

What keeps a town like this going when just about everything is gone? This was a mine town, period. Founded by a mine company, surveyed and laid out by a mine company, once owned by the mine company—lock, stock, houses, and culm bank.

For one thing, there's the big hosiery mill that has been there a half century. And there's the dress factory, and the small blouse-making plant.

But most of all, there are the people who just won't give up the ghost and let their community become a ghost town.

Perhaps it started back in 1942 in the Williamstown Post of the American Legion.

How many Pennsylvania communities were thinking about industrial development then, this going after a new industry and its new jobs?

They were at Williamstown. The Legion post had $25,000 in the bank accumulated over the years. And it had been like Harry Steites, Joseph Graham, George Uhler, James Noel, and Dr. G. H. Barndt. World War II was raging. Just the year before the last mine had closed. "We've got to have something for our boys to come back to. They've got to have jobs," these men decided.

Burgess Arthur J. Grubb tells about it today. He and the man who was then supervising principal of Williamstown's school, John W. Kopp, were added to the Legion's Industrial Development Association.

They went out and borrowed $90,000 along the way, put up a modern factory building, finished it in 1944 and got the Clement Ball Shoe Co. of Baltimore to come in. Clement Ball and its 160 jobs, half of them men, lasted for 4 years. Then it moved out.

The long, hard search for a new company began all over. Finally the Triple Novelty Footware Co. of New York set up a subsidiary, Williamstown Shoe Co., and moved in. Again there were jobs. But the parent company went bankrupt and carried the Williamstown company with it. Worse than that, there was an involved contract that tied up the building.

The Legion's committee went to work again. They borrowed more money to get back their building, and went after another company—and new jobs for Williamstown men.

Finally they got one in 1952, a blue chip company—American Marine Products, Inc. There was more remodeling, a parking lot was built, and AMP moved in and began production. Eighty-seven men work there today, about half of them from right in the Williamstown area. AMP put up a hiring sign for six more workers one day last week. Ninety men showed up and filled out applications.

Along the way, the Legion bought the old Geist Hotel and remodeled it into apartments. "We figured any company we could get would want housing for the people it would bring in," says C. Raymond Machamer who now heads the Legion's industrial development group. The Legion also remodeled the first floor of the hotel and leased it to the State. An office of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service now is there. It's one of the busiest places in town.

Along the way, the Legion bought an old hosiery mill, fixed it up and gave it to the Williamstown Dress Co. Here were a few jobs for men and 70 jobs for women. Some of them make $20 a day on piecework, you're told.

Along the way, the Legion bought and gave to the State another plot of ground. The armory of the 722d Trucking Company, National Guard, is there now. And men come from all over the valley to put in their time and effort and get their pay as guardsmen.

Along the way, there was the wonderful prospect, great big Philco, but this one blew up at the last minute.

Along the way, when the Air Force announced it was looking for a site for a big jet runway and air installation, Williamstown joined in the Williams Valley Industrial Association. There were Dr. D. H. Evans, of Tower City; the Reverend Joseph Crowley, Williamstown priest; Clarence Otto, a Tower City merchant; and many others. They campaigned like blazes to get the big air installation for one of several promising sites in their valley. They even wrangled a meeting with then Defense Secretary Charles Wilson at Washington.

A lot of other towns in Pennsylvania and New Jersey were in this act, too. And the Air Force wound up by keeping its big installation at Middletown and building the big jet runway there.

All of this and more, you're told by Raymond Machamer, James J. Smith, Ben J. Warlow, Herman L. Carl, Carl Machamer, Robert Thomas, Earl Fetterhoff, and Burgess Grubb. They're the Legion's industry-seeking board now.

Then they drive you around the area.

"There's a good site," one of them says.

It is.

"Maybe one day we can get a new plant there."

"Commuting is our big problem," they say. "Eight hundred to 900 of our people commute to work every day. What do we need here? Employment, that's all."

You stop on Division Street. This is the Williamstown Recreation Center. There's a beautiful new swimming pool, a big bath house and other buildings. "And there'll be playground equipment next year."

First, the Hometown Liberty Volunteer Firemen and then the Williamstown Rotary Club knocked themselves out, raising money and building up this park in the last 3 years. The borough and Williams Township helped out.

"This is a wonderful park," you say, and mean every word of it. You know of many big and prosperous cities that don't have a public swimming pool.

There's silence. Then Burgess Grubb says: "We wanted our children to have it."

You stand beside the swimming pool and look off not too far away at the gray-dross culm banks piled around the base of Bear Mountain, towering over this little town.

A thin plume of white smoke winds into the winter sky. This culm bank fire has been burning "for as long as we can remember—more than 50 years."

Somehow the fire that won't go out, the thin plume of smoke seems to symbolize a lot more than the mine that'll never open again.

---

## Compulsory Unionism in Its Modern Setting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 19, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 19 I asked unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent treatise on "Compulsory Unionism in Its Modern Setting," written by Father Edward A. Keller, of the faculty of Notre Dame, which was published in the magazine Extension of September 1958. The cost of printing the article exceeded the amount allowed under customary unanimous consent requests. According to the printer, it will make approximately 2⅓ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will cost $189.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPULSORY UNIONISM IN ITS MODERN SETTING

(By Edward A. Keller, C.S.C.)

Delegates to the Catholic Press Association's 48th annual convention held in May (1958) at Richmond, Va., adopted five resolutions, one of which noted "a healthy increase in controversy in the Catholic press of late. Legitimate disputation sharpens awareness of problems and leads to a fuller grasp of their complexities, said the resolution." (Our Sunday Visitor, June 1, 1958.)

The main controversy in the Catholic press has been over right-to-work laws. The legitimate disputation about this controversial topic has indeed led to a clarification of the main issue involved, the morality of right-to-work laws. Due largely to the wide discussion in the Catholic press of this question, the basic morality of right-to-work laws is now seldom challenged. However, the controversy continues and, unfortunately, too much of the argument against right-to-work laws still takes the form of invective, accusation of bad motivation and especially of deliberate dishonesty in use of the term "right to work" by supporters of right to work. An associate editor of a Catholic magazine states:

"One's suspicion grows when the drive against traditional forms of union security proceeds under a slogan that seems to have been cleverly chosen to deceive. No doubt, many people who favor right-to-work laws are sincere. * * * Such people owe it to themselves to disavow the misleading banner under which they march or quit the parade. They should honestly say that right-to-work laws guarantee nobody's right to work."

No responsible defender of right to work has even intimated that right to work laws guarantee a right to a specific job with a specific employer. I, and many others, including the National Right to Work Committee, have repeated often, openly and honestly that right to work laws do not guarantee a right to a job. The United States Supreme Court would stand charged of "proceeding under a slogan cleverly chosen to deceive" because the Court has used the term "right to work" long before the present controversy without explaining that "right to work" does not guarantee anybody a job. These same critics are strangely silent about the deceit of certain opponents to right to work in classifying right to work laws "right-to-wreck" laws, without offering one bit of evidence to prove that any right to work law wrecked or even weakened a single union.

A sample of the emotionalism generated over this controversial topic is that of an editor of a Catholic magazine who accused supporters of right to work of being "schizophrenic" Catholics. The Webster Dictionary defines schizophrenia as "a type of psychosis characterized by loss of contact with environment and by disintegration of personality"—in less technical language, we are

accused of being "space men" with "bats in the belfry." Another sample is gleaned from an article, attacking right to work laws, written by a priest-professor. He characterized right to work laws as "public frauds," as having been "conceived in deceit and born in the sin of fraud," as "a fraud so heinous that to be hated, it needs only to be seen," as "unconscionable distortion of the whole truth" and as "frauds, worse than wolves in sheep's clothing" (I somehow get the impression, he slightly dislikes right to work laws). A prominent Protestant clergyman uses just as picturesque language. He states right to work laws were "conceived in hypocrisy, and proclaimed in Pharasaic deceit."

Such slap-happy journalism may all be good, clean intellectual fun but it makes for a sensationalism that is somewhat startling, not to say a bit scandalizing, to lay readers.

Such emotional attacks, insinuations, and "ad hominem" arguments, however, merely prove the weakness of the case for compulsory unionism. The oldest trick in debate, when you can't answer your opponent's argument, is to call him dirty names—accuse him of having a disintegrated personality. One expects such tactics in the political arena and in the tabloid press but hardly in the Catholic press. The importance of this topic demands charitable, calm and dispassionate discussion. It is easy to understand the uncritical, emotional antagonism of the union worker in an open shop toward what he considers to be a free loading nonunion worker who refuses to join the union and pull his freight. It is difficult to understand, however, the use of such emotionalism as a substitute for rational argument by scholars of the subject. Their task and obligation are to cut through the confusing fog of emotionalism and lay clear the fundamental issue involved in right to work, namely, voluntary unionism vs. compulsory unionism.

Despite emotional arguments to the contrary, unions and union security are in no way threatened by right-to-work laws because union security is not merely protected by law (the Railway and Taft-Hartley Acts) but overprotected by legal immunities not granted to any other private association. Prior to national labor legislation, beginning with the Railway Labor Act of 1926, for railroad workers, and the Wagner Act of 1935, for most other workers, union security was not legally protected. Today, the basic right of self-organization, without any interference from an employer, is guaranteed in the Taft-Hartley Act and has in no way been legally weakened in States with right-to-work laws by that act.

All that right-to-work laws do is to grant to workers the right voluntarily to join or not join a union, thereby effectively protecting their freedom of association and freedom of conscience, as guaranteed them in the first amendment to the Bill of Rights. The opponents of right-to-work are long on vituperative adjectives but short on their knowledge of labor law.

The obvious error made by opponents of right-to-work is their refusal to see that the pendulum of economic and political power has swung in completely the opposite direction from where it was 25 or 50 years ago. They refuse to see that unionism in its modern setting is not the weak unionism of a generation ago. The problem today is not union security, overprotected by law, but the protection of the moral and legal security of workers against a union economic and political power which apparently neither Government, union members nor business can counterbalance or control. The problem is how to prevent the basic freedoms guaranteed under the first amendment of the Bill of Rights from being destroyed by the legally protected monopoly of modern unionism. Donald R. Richberg, author of the Railway Labor Act, maintains that "Americans are more out-of-date and ill-informed concerning the realities of the labor movement in the United States than they are in any area of public interest." He contends that to portray modern unions as weak, downtrodden organizations "is willfully or ignorantly untruthful." He further contends that the "labor movement has now become a political movement with the objective of establishing a social labor government in control of the economic and social life of the Nation." ("Labor Union Monopoly," Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1957.)

How far modern unionism has gone in reaching that objective can be seen in the capture of all the State offices of the State of Michigan by the UAW-CIO. Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn, New York, maintains that "labor dominates the House of Representatives . . . that 176 members of the House have benefited from labor campaign contributions, free political campaign assistance, such as radio and TV time, extensive publicity in the labor press, scores of voluntary workers, doorbell ringers, telephone workers, etc." Mr. Gwinn estimates that unions spend $62 million yearly for activities of a political character.

The merger of the AFL and the CIO brought about the merger also of the political committees of the AFL and CIO into a new committee, called the Committee on Political Education (COPE). The national codirector of COPE, James L. McDevitt, indicates the extent to which unions would go to force political conformity, when at a Virginia State AFL–CIO convention, he said:

"There are some labor leaders who have helped in Senator BYRD's election and they are 'traitors.' He added that if they had been in the Army they would have been lined up against a wall and shot." (Washington Star, May 20, 1958.)

Under modern unionism, the national and State legislatures have been more and more substituted for the "bargaining table." George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, stated that "the scene of battle is no longer the company plant and picket line. It has moved into the legislative halls of Congress and the State legislatures." To the modern union leader, political activity is essential to unionism. Mr. Dallas Sells, chairman of the merged Indiana AFL–CIO, even goes so far as to contend that "political activity is life blood of a labor organization." (Indianapolis Star, Jan. 31, 1957.)

There is nothing secret or "hush hush" about union political activity. The UAW–CIO subsidized two books on the subject: "The CIO and the Democratic Party" by Fay Calkins (University of Chicago Press, 1952) and "When Labor Votes" by three professors of Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan (University Books, Inc., New York). The late Philip Murray, when president of the CIO made a deliberate test, *U.S. v. CIO*, 335 U.S. 106 [1948], of the Corrupt Practices Act, which prohibits contributions or expenditures in connection with any Federal election. Mr. Murray won the test in the U.S. Supreme Court. In a more recent case (*U.S. v. UAW*, 352 U.S. 567 (1957)), brought under the Corrupt Practices Act, the Department of Justice prevailed upon the Supreme Court to adopt its construction and statute, but lost when the case was sent back to the District Court for trial, and a jury returned a verdict of acquittal in favor of the UAW. This case involved the use of union funds and union dues to pay for TV broadcasts favoring the election in Michigan of candidates for Congress in 1954. These legal decisions throw a cloud over the chances of successful prosecution and conviction of unions under the Corrupt Practices Act. The unions interpreted them as leaving the legal gates wide open for political activity on their part.

To accomplish their ultimate objective of political control, unions have substituted compulsion for persuasion for an obvious reason—to carry on effective political activity, unions must have the funds the apparatus of modern politics require. Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, attorney for the UAW, when pleading the case of the UAW (*U.S. v. UAW*) before the U.S. Supreme Court (December 4, 1956) openly stated in his oral argument that "the only funds available (for political activity) to the union are those that come from dues for the purpose of buying radio time, television time, and newspaper advertising." Mr. Rauh argued that "a union man thinks he has paid, when he pays his dues, for political activity. He doesn't feel he should pay a second time for political activity. That is why it is so hard to raise voluntary contributions."

The almost hysterical opposition to right to work laws by union leaders seemingly stems from the fact that these laws can frustrate the political ambitions of union leaders which so far have not been hindered by the Corrupt Practices Act. If union members, who object to union political activity or object to the use of their dues for political activity, can withdraw both their presons and their money from the union, then there is an effective escape from a political captivity created by compulsory unionism. The pushing of the agency shop in certain right-to-work States, as Indiana, when a union shop agreement legally cannot be entered into, is another indication of the use of every means to get money to carry on political activity. Under the agency shop a nonunion worker is compelled to pay the usual fees, dues, and assessments paid by union members, supposedly to pay for his share of the cost of collective bargaining. This is the heart of the free-rider argument.

This argument takes on an entirely different aspect when viewed in light of the political objectives of modern unionism. It is one thing to argue that those who benefit from representation by the union, should pay their share of the cost of collective bargaining but it is an entirely different matter to argue free rider when general funds of unions are used for political and other purposes that bear little or no necessary relationship to collective bargaining.

Because the free-rider argument is seemingly so plausible and because it is, currently, the main argument against right-to-work laws, it should be carefully examined. It is argued that it is unfair for a nonunion employee working in the open shop demanded by right-to-work laws, to receive the benefits of collective bargaining without paying his share of the cost of such bargaining. This becomes doubly unfair, they argue, when the unions are compelled by the Taft-Hartley Act to represent nonunion employees.

The legal requirement of representation of nonunion workers by the union is called "exclusive" representation. It was originally incorporated in the Wagner Act and was continued in the Taft-Hartley Act. The Wagner Act in section 9(a) states:

"Collective bargaining representatives selected by the majority in the unit shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in the unit for purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment provided, that any individual employee or group of employees shall have the right at any time to present grievances to their employer."

This passage of the Wagner Act was retained bodily in section 9(a) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The legislative history of the Wagner Act shows that the representation by the union of nonunion employees was put into the law because of the strong demand by unions for "exclusive" representation of all em-

ployees. If there were a serious threat to repeal "exclusive representation," unions would just as strenuously oppose repeal as they had originally demanded adoption. Therefore, the legal obligation of unions to represent nonunion employees can hardly be classified as unfair, much less immoral. It is misrepresentation to argue that, what is in reality a much sought after and prized legal privilege granted to unions, is an unfair, burdensome and costly legal obligation.

No one can object to unions engaging in political activity so long as their members agree to it and the funds to finance it are obtained from strictly voluntary contributions. What is highly objectionable is the use of general union funds for such a purpose when these funds are obtained under the compulsion of either a "union shop" or "agency shop."

The compulsory exaction of funds for purposes other than collective bargaining is a violation of the personal rights of free American workers. Because compulsory membership in a Communist union best demonstrates this point, the following case study of Larue I. Berfield as reported in the Wanderer, a national Catholic weekly is cited:

"For the Catholic labor priest, who this week labeled right-to-work-laws as a hoax and an antiunion measure, we cite the following staff memorandum sent to us last Thursday by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. This memorandum, which we quote without comment reads:

" 'WASHINGTON, D.C., May 29, 1958.—A Pennsylvania electronics worker told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee today that he will be forced to resign a job he has held for 19 years if he does not join a Communist dominated labor union.

" 'Larue I. Berfield, 38, of Sinnamahoning, Pa., contended that the situation is a violation of his constitutional right of freedom of association, and asked the subcommittee to help solve his dilemma. * * * "If there is a constitutional right of freedom of association with Communists, then I feel I should have the same right not to associate with Communists," Berfield said. * * *

" 'Following an election in January, Berfield said the UE was certified by the National Labor Relations Board as bargaining agent for employees in his plant. Eight years ago the UE was expelled by the CIO because of Communist domination'."

Mr. Berfield was fired from his job in July. According to the Chicago Tribune "Members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee agreed he was a martyr to a legal system which protects those who associate with Communists, but not those who oppose such association." This martyr to compulsory unionism said "I was advised that I might have paid dues to the union under protest and held my job. But I will not contribute a dollar to support the Communist conspiracy. * * * I am a member of my local school board and a member of the civil defense organization. I would have to resign from those posts because I took loyalty oaths in both cases, swearing that I had never been and would not be a member of an organization advocating overthrow of the Government. It was a choice between keeping a job and betraying those oaths, and I chose not to violate the oaths." The Berfield case demonstrates the need for right-to-work laws to protect the consciences of loyal Americans from Communist oppression into which they are legally forced by compulsory unionism.

No one could dispute that a worker's personal rights and conscience are oppressed when he is compelled to belong to or support a Communist dominated union and come under the "formative" influence of such an association. But is there not oppression of personal rights under any kind of existing compulsory unionism when a worker is forced to pay union fees, dues, and assessments, most of which are used, not to pay the cost of collective bargaining, but for purposes that have little or no reasonable relationship to collective bargaining? This important point goes to the heart of the right-to-work controversy but is almost completely ignored by opponents of right-to-work, who for some reason, do not see that modern unionism is radically different in its objectives, policies, and programs from what it was a generation ago.

Since it unlikely that protection against the misuse of general union funds for political purposes, obtained under compulsory unionism, will be given by the Corrupt Practices Act: and since it seems even more unlikely that a national right-to-work law, which could give such protection can be passed for some time to come, the main hope for immediate relief rests with the courts—in a declaration of unconstitutionality by the United States Supreme Court, of the exaction of funds for political purposes, under compulsory unionism, in a case involving right-to-work laws. To understand this, a short summary of the pertinent court cases involved must be given.

The constitutionality of the railway union shop was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in 1956 in the Hanson case (*Railway Employees Department, AFL* v. *Hanson et al*). The Railway Labor Act was passed in 1926, and amended in 1934, at the request of the unions, to prohibit union shop agreements. This was in effect a railway right-to-work clause. The clause was amended in 1951 to specifically permit union shop agreements to be entered into between the railroads and the railway brotherhoods, State right-to-work laws notwithstanding. The railway unions then began to negotiate for union shop agreements and by 1953, with an assist from the Federal Government, had forced most of the major railroads, including the Union Pacific, the employer of Mr. Hanson, to sign such contracts. Mr. Hanson and other employees of the Union Pacific refused to join the union and brought suit against the union, contending their constitutional rights under the first amendment and fifth amendment had been violated. Since Mr. Hanson lived in Nebraska, which has a right-to-work law, he pleaded protection under that law against being compelled to join the union. His case went to the Nebraska Supreme Court which ruled in his favor. The case was then appealed to the United States Supreme Court which overruled the Nebraska Supreme Court primarily on the grounds that the Federal Railway Labor Act preempted the field and, therefore, superseded the Nebraska right-to-work law and that since the unions bargain collectively for all employees, both union and nonunion, it is not a deprivation of employees' constitutional rights to force all employees to pay dues, fees and assessments to cover the cost of collective bargaining. However, the Court ruled very narrowly on what the statute required, holding that the Railway Labor Act permitted only a modified union shop, according to which an employee could be bound only to financial support of the union but not to full membership in it. The Court ruled that the record before it (in the Hanson case) did not raise the issue of whether the union shop "forces men into ideological and political associations which violate their right to freedom of conscience, freedom of association and freedom of thought, protected by the Bill of Rights." The Court stated that if it should later be proved that "exaction of dues, initiation fees or assessments is used as a cover for forcing ideological conformity or other action in contravention of the first amendment, this judgment will not prejudice the decision in that case." This has been interpreted to mean that if an actual case were brought before the Court that did prove the use of dues money for political purposes, the Court might well render the union shop contract unconstitutional.

Just such a test may go to the Supreme Court in the case of *Allen et al.* v. *Southern Railway Company, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, et al.* This case, tried in the superior court of Mecklenberg County, N.C., is significant because it is the first case in labor litigation history in which a jury made "a finding of fact" regarding the political activity of unions. The jury, composed of six men and six women (two of the jurymen being members of a union), handed down a verdict on April 25, 1958, and found that the defendant railway unions had used ordinary union dues, fees and assessments, collected under union shop agreements, to influence votes in elections to public office and to make financial contributions to political candidates and political committees which were not necessary or reasonably related to collective bargaining.

The judge on the case, Judge J. Will Pless, upheld the jury finding and continued the temporary injunction against compelling the nonunion plaintiffs either to join the unions or to pay dues to them. However, he included a provision in his court order that if the unions would prove what portion of the periodic dues, fees and assessments were necessary and reasonably related to collective bargaining, he might modify his order to compel the nonunion plaintiffs to pay this share of the cost of collective bargaining. This ruling could pose a problem for the unions because it might be embarrassing to them to disclose the proportion of total union expenditures that go to pay for the actual cost of collective bargaining and how large a portion of union funds go for purposes not necessarily or even reasonably related to collective bargaining. Immediately upon ruling of the judge the case was appealed by the unions to the North Carolina Supreme Court. If this court upholds the jury verdict, the case will, most likely be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is difficult to see upon what ground supporters of compulsory unionism can base their case that workers be compelled, at the expense of their jobs, to financially support political, economic and ideological causes and programs, to which they are opposed. They must face up to the fact that compulsory unionism, today, can make political captives out of free Americans. Opponents of right to work are blind to the fact that modern unions seek and are winning complete political and economic control, using the plea of "union security" to cloak their drive for power.

The opponents of right to work should heed the warning of the Pope that:

"Such discriminations are indicative of a wrong concept of the proper function of labor unions and of their essential purpose, which is the protection of the interests of the wage earner within modern society. How, therefore, can they consider it normal that the protection of the personal rights of the worker be more and more in the hands of an anonymous group, working through the agency of immense organizations which are of their very nature monopolies? The worker, thus wronged in the exercise of his personal rights, will surely find especially painful the oppression of his liberty and of his conscience, caught as he is in the wheels of a gigantic social machine." (Christmas Message, 1952.)

The American worker's personal rights, liberty and conscience are oppressed in this country by compulsory unionism caught as he is in the wheels of a gigantic social machine of modern compulsory unionism. Since all other suggested means have been proved ineffectual in protecting the personal rights of the worker, right to work laws

plead for adoption as the most effective way to suppress this oppression.

Since voluntary unionism can meet all the demands of the social nature of man, those who accuse supporters of right-to-work laws of being influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by a condemned and outmoded social philosophy of laissez faire individualism simply because they seek to protect by right to work legislation the personal rights, liberty and conscience of the worker from oppression by modern compulsory unionism, would do well to mediate on the above words of the Holy Father.

## Dare To Be Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the weekly Sunday supplement, This Week, carried an article in its March 1, 1959, issue entitled "Dare To Be Different" which I am today submitting for publication in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask that this article by Adm. Hyman G. Rickover be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it so graphically and daringly discusses one of the great problems confronting America today. That problem is a growing trend toward the cult of conformity.

The fact that Admiral Rickover, the father of Americas' atomic powered submarine, has had the courage to speak out on this subject is a refreshing interlude in an era when more and more great men of this Nation are being forced into conformity.

It is significant that Admiral Rickover should make his thoughts known to the public for he symbolizes the very essence of this problem. His personal struggle to persuade the Nation that an atomic powered submarine was feasible and his unselfish determination to prove this point is perhaps one of the great examples of an individual who refused to be a conformist.

The right to disagree; the right to speak out against overwhelming odds; the right to have courage to present new ideas is the very dynamics on which this wonderful Nation of ours was born.

Admiral Rickover grew up in Chicago. His patriotic parents still live in that great city. I am proud to be able today to call attention to his dramatic article and hope that his sober thoughts will be an inspiration to other Americans who are tragically slipping into the limbo of conformity.

Admiral Rickover's challenging article follows:

DARE TO BE DIFFERENT

(By Adm. Hyman G. Rickover)

"Whoso would be a man must be a nonconformist"—Emerson.

The ancient Locrians in Greece gave freedom of speech to all citizens—though at a cost which many must have considered too high. At public meetings, anyone could stand up and argue for changes in law or custom, on one condition. A rope was placed around his neck before he began to speak and if what he said did not meet with public approval, he was forthwith hanged.

Here in America, it would indeed be tragic if democracy deteriorated into mass tyranny over the unconventional individual. Democracy and equality do not require that we deny to the minority of people with creative minds the right to use them in their own way and to their fullest potential. People who use their minds successfully ought not to be expected to pretend they are just like everybody else.

We should then lose the diversity from which spring all great ideas; we should rob ourselves of the precious quality that distinguishes man from all other orders—his determination to think for himself, to be different.

## Fighting Encephalitis With Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, encephalitis is a major public-health problem in many parts of the Nation. In my State, according to records of the State of California Department of Public Health, the average yearly number of human infectious encephalitis cases reported from 1949 through 1958 was 447, of which an average of 93 were proven to be of mosquito-borne origin, and a great many more were suspected to be. In the three-county district of the San Joaquin Valley that I represent, the annual number of cases averaged 55, including 21 of mosquito-borne origin, during the same period.

Many victims of this dreaded disease died or suffered permanent brain damage.

An excellent report by Nate Haseltine on work done by Federal agencies in fighting encephalitis on an emergency basis was printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 23, 1959.

However, we should remember that a key part of the public-health effort to suppress and eradicate encephalitis is the day-to-day control work done by mosquito abatement districts throughout the country. In a sense, this work might be called preventive medicine.

In California, almost $4 million a year is spent in this work by the State public-health department and more than 50 local operating mosquito abatement agencies.

I believe such districts should be aided in their assault on the carriers of this horrible disease when it is possible and practical to do so. One of the ways to help mosquito abatement districts would be to make them eligible to receive donable surplus Federal property. I can think of no better way in which certain equipment could be used in protecting human lives.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the part of Mr. Haseltine's article dealing with encephalitis:

U.S. DISEASE FIGHTERS—WHEN NATIONAL CENTER TACKLES A DEADLY EPIDEMIC

(By Nate Haseltine)

ATLANTA, GA., February 22.—Life here at the Communicable Disease Center, they tell you, is never dull. But it can become pretty routine for long stretches.

So Dr. Rudolf Donath, epidemic fighter, was not unhappy last August 22 when one such stretch ended with orders to pack up and travel. An outbreak of encephalitis had hit four counties in the Salt Lake Valleys of Utah.

Within an hour the epidemiologist was aboard a Utah-bound plane, mentally mapping out the work ahead of him.

On reaching Ogden, Utah, he learned there already had been 20 suspected cases; four victims had died, and fear nearing panic was gripping the populations in the counties north of Salt Lake City.

Infectious encephalitis is a fearsome malady.

SPREAD BY MOSQUITOES

Its virus kept alive in the bodies of many wild birds, is carried to horses and humans by infected mosquitoes. Wherever it breaks out populations cringe and withdraw from each other. The Utah epidemic was, as laboratory tests later confirmed, Western equine encephalitis.

This is not passed from the sick to the well; mosquitoes must be the virus carriers—but who knew then?

Like polio, the malady starts with high fever, chills, muscle aches and weakness, and stiffening of back and neck muscles. Stricken infants develop raging fevers and may go into convulsions. Some die, or may survive with damaged brains.

In adults the onset is more gradual but by the second or third day sleepiness sets in, a sleepiness that may progress to coma, disorientation and delirium.

Some call infectious encephalitis America's sleeping sickness. It is unrelated however, to that ailment transmitted to humans in Africa by the tsetse fly.

DOCTOR'S ASSIGNMENT

Dr. Donath knew the work ahead of him. His job was to find the source, the breeding area for the mosquitoes. His job was to calm the people and enlist their help. He was to interview the patients and their physicians, and with the help of State and local health department staff members, break the chain of the disease's transmission.

The Control Center here in Atlanta also routed entomologists to the scene. Experts in the ways of mosquitoes, their job was to trap the insects in the fields to find out which were the virus carriers and to find their breeding sources.

The CDC also dispatched engineers with special spraying equipment from its Greeley, Colo., field station. Their task was to spread mosquito-killing fogs across the fields where standing pools of irrigation water in the warm days released clouds of insects.

The engineers also directed draining procedures, and mapped out a more healthful irrigation system for future seasons.

PATIENTS CHECKED

Dr. Donath, for his part, visited the sick in the Ogden hospital. He checked the records of those already dicharged and he went to their homes with their physicians to take blood samples. He looked for unreported cases and checked the suggestive ones.

Before his work was done he was able to confirm positively 40 cases of encephalitis out of data on 120 clinically suspect cases in 4 counties. About 100 horses, particularly vulnerable to western equine encephalitis, also had died before the outbreak's end in mid-September.

Did Dr. Donath stop this epidemic? No one will ever know. Back at work here today, wrapped up in routine, he said, only:

"What we did may help that area far more in the seasons to come than it did last summer. The people now know what to look for, what to do."

Today the Utah battle scene is just a numbered pin on a large map on the wall of an office here at the communicable disease center.

TEXAS DISEASE AREA

Another pin marks Hidalgo County, Tex., where the St. Louis variety of infectious encephalitis struck in 1954. This mosquito-borne virus does not sicken horses. It is even more dreaded than eastern or western equine encephalitis and can pass from human to human after the first bite of the first infected mosquito.

The puzzler in this epidemic was to identify the carrier mosquito. Authorities had known for some years that the mosquito Culex tarsalis was a vector (disease transmitting agent) for St. Louis encephalitis. But the disease detectives couldn't blame that species.

Until then the common house mosquito, Culex pipiens quinquefasciatus, was considered innocent. Studies of the Hidalgo County brood showed that the house mosquitoes were transmitting the infections.

Though these mosquitoes are built for long distance flying, the entomologists said, they don't have the inclination for it, preferring to stay close to habitations. This habit may have broken the back of the Hidalgo outbreak. Sprayers worked in from the canebreaks to the houses, in all-out, but localized, mosquito extermination campaigns.

THREE HUNDRED CASES REPORTED

Before the outbreaks end, however, 300 cases of encephalitis were recorded. The health authorities, however, said the actual number was more likely about 1,000.

The communicable disease center here is the nerve center of the Nation for disease surveillance. It is here that the disease detectives keep track of appearances and outbreaks of influenze, polio, encephalitis, diphtheria, malaria, hepatitis, diarrheal diseases, and hospital-bred staphylococcus.

## Labor's Civil Rights Program Called a Dismal Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a news release calling attention to the article which appeared in the March edition of Fortune magazine. I believe, however, that my colleagues would derive much benefit from reading the entire article. In this connection I also would like to have them refer to the editorial on the same subject which I placed in the RECORD on February 23, 1959, which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The news release follows:

LABOR'S CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM CALLED A DISMAL FAILURE

NEW YORK, N.Y., February 24.—Labor's ambitious plans for improving the lot of the Negro union member have been a dismal failure, Fortune magazine said today.

Fortune called the AFL–CIO civil rights program, first propounded 3 years ago, a fiasco in both the North and the South.

Despite a federation ruling that all discriminatory provisions must be deleted from member union constitutions, and an AFL–CIO committee to investigate abuses, Fortune reported that Negro workers are today largely excluded from some of the largest unions including the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Plumbers, and the Locomotive Firemen.

In many other unions, the magazine said, there is a mixed pattern: exclusion in some areas, free acceptance in some, and acceptance in segregated locals in others. Some such mixture characterizes the Bricklayers, Painters, Plasterers, Operating Engineers, Sheet Metal Workers, Railway Clerks, Telegraphers, Maintenance of Way Employees, Railway Carmen, Tobacco Workers, Pulp and Sulphite Workers.

Negroes do best in the big northern cities. In New York, even the Electrical Workers accept them freely. In Chicago, the Plumbers can point to a Negro business agent. However, Negro organizations have been complaining bitterly about one situation involving the Railway Clerks. All over the United States the Clerks have segregated locals. The practice is institutionalized to the point that all Negro local numbers begin with "6." In New York City, for example, Negroes belong to Local 6118, the "Friendship Lodge," while whites belong to Local 783, the "George M. Harrison Lodge." Harrison is the international president of the Clerks.

## New President of St. David's Society of Wyoming Valley, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 24, 1959:

ST. DAVID'S NEW PRESIDENT

The elevation of John Griffiths of Wilkes-Barre to the presidency of the St. David's Society of Wyoming Valley is recognition of his service to the organization as an officer and member.

Mr. Griffiths is one of the most active members of the society. Currently, in the role of chairman, he is occupied with the preparations for the annual St. David's dinner at Irem Temple on Saturday night. He also is a former vice president and financial secretary. For 24 years he has been affiliated with the Heights St. David's Society.

Mr. Griffiths has devoted a great deal of time and energy to the St. David's Society. He is capable of vast enthusiasm and has a capacity for friendship and leadership that should redound to the benefit of the organization.

A native of the Heights, Mr. Griffiths lives in the house where he was born more than a half-century ago. His father, the late John Griffiths, immigrated to Wilkes-Barre from south Wales 71 years ago. His mother was born here of old Welsh stock, so he comes naturally by his interest in St. David's Society.

As treasurer of First Welsh Presbyterian Church for a quarter century, Mr. Griffiths has played a leading role in its affairs. He and his wife are advisors to the youth fellowship.

Mr. Griffiths also has been interested in education, serving as president of the Custer and G.A.R. Parent-Teacher Associations. He was treasurer of the Man-Cite Club for years and is a member of Fidelity Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons.

As assistant mining engineer for Luzerne County, he is widely known in courthouse circles. Before that he was with the city engineering department. Years ago he was employed by Lehigh Valley Coal Co.

It is no small distinction for a resident of the community to head the St. David's Society and carry on the traditions of 13 centuries. The responsibility is a heavy one, but with his experience he would seem to be well equipped to undertake the assignment.

## A Definite Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in today's RECORD I have inserted an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 2, 1959, entitled, "Challenge in Science." A summary of the article is in the first paragraph as follows:

Considering Russia's accelerating pace in research and the Russians' intense motivation to overtake Americans on all fronts, the United States is in danger of losing its overall science leadership within 10 years.

This is, indeed, a sobering statement and so is a statement dated February 26, 1959, of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming. His statement may be summarized as follows:

I have learned, with considerable disappointment, that many schools across the country, for one reason or another, are failing to take advantage of a virtually cost-free opportunity to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.

Government surplus equipment suitable for use in teaching science and mathematics is currently declared surplus at the rate of about $100 million in initial value each year.

Although the equipment is available to colleges and universities and to public, parochial and nonprofit private schools throughout the country, only about 20 percent of the scientific items actually find their way into educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, the implication of the Secretary's statement seems to be that the schools in the United States are at fault in failing to get valuable scientific equipment virtually free. As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property of the House Government Operations Committee and as sponsor of Public Law 61 which made surplus property available to educational activities it is my considered judgment that the failure of the educational institutions to make 100 percent use of the surplus equipment is due to lack of leadership and coordination in the executive branch of the Government. I regret that it is necessary to make this statement but since the passage of Public Law 61 in the spring of 1955 there have been numerous examples of lack of cooperation and coordination between the several executive

agencies which are responsible for the execution of the program which was unanimously passed by the Congress.

It is a serious matter, Mr. Speaker, to state on the one hand that the Russians are challenging our leadership in the overall scientific fields and at the same time admitting that useful and necessary scientific items which are surplus to the requirements of the Federal Government are utilized only to the extent of 20 percent for purposes which involve our survival. I urge that Secretary Flemming utilize his authority either directly or through higher echelons and do what is now possible under existing legislation to insure that surplus property when useful and necessary for purposes of education health and civil defense are so employed and at the earliest possible moment.

Last calendar year surplus property at initial cost of $334,109,167 was transferred to the States for purposes of education, health, and civil defense. However, the 1960 budget statement indicates that there will be a total of $8 billion in surplus property declared in fiscal 1959 and a total of $10 billion in fiscal 1960.

Why there is so much surplus property is a serious matter upon which I have often spoken and, of course, involves the necessary organization of the Department of Defense which generates more than 90 percent of all surplus property.

The full statement of Secretary Flemming follows:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I have learned, with considerable disappointment, that many schools across the country, for one reason or another, are failing to take advtange of a virtually cost-free opportunity to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.

Government surplus equipment suitable for use in teaching science and mathematics is currently declared surplus at the rate of about $100 million in initial value each year.

Although the equipment is available to colleges and universities and to public, parochial, and nonprofit private schools throughout the country, only about 20 percent of the scientific items actually find their way into educational institutions.

Schools that have picked up scientific surplus property have put it to good use in science and mathematics teaching; but there are many more schools that apparently are unaware of the kinds of equipment that they can obtain simply by paying warehousing and transportation costs.

This equipment ranges all the way from push buttons for second graders to jet airplanes for engineering students. It includes nautical and navigation instruments; radio and radar equipment; electric motors and generators; photographic equipment; spectrometers; laboratory items and supplies, including chemicals; lenses, and electronic items and components.

A large part of this equipment comes from the Department of Defense, where it has been used in research laboratories, in training personnel, or in actual operations throughout the country. Other items come from the Atomic Energy Commission, from the laboratories of the Department of Agriculture, from the Veterans' Administration, and from other Federal agencies. Many of the items are in the original packing cases.

The spotty demand for scientific surplus equipment is in sharp contrast to the speed with which other surplus items, such as building supplies for school maintenance and machine tools and materials for vocational education programs, are picked up.

That scientific equipment could be equally valuable to schools and colleges generally—if they know of its existence—is shown by the fact that it is constantly being bought up by dealers, after it has gone begging for a sufficient length of time, and then is resold to schools.

Once property has been determined surplus—that is, its usefulness to the Government has ceased—the Surplus Property Division of this Department assumes responsibility for getting as much of it as possible where it can do the most good. State surplus property agencies—and every State and the District of Columbia has one—let the Department know how much they think will be requested, and the property is transferred to State warehouses. Representatives of schools may visit these State warehouses and select the items they require. Some States also circulate lists of available materials and accept orders by mail.

Real and personal property which is not disposed of in this way is advertised for sale to the public. About a year ago, for example, 100 instruments which record direction and velocity of the wind were declared surplus property, but educational institutions did not ask for them. They were sold to surplus dealers who in turn sold them to schools. Electrical measuring instruments have been sold by the thousands for as little as a few cents each and later resold to schools.

Where real efforts have been made to inform the schools, the results have been extremely gratifying. The North Carolina State agency, for example, has circularized every school in the State with a list of scientific items available, and established a Saturday warehouse open house for science teachers. The State agency now accepts all the scientific equipment it can get, knowing that the schools will put it to good use. In Nebraska the State agency worked with the University of Nebraska in preparing guide sheets for science teachers, to show how available equipment can be modified or adapted. The Texas agency has on its staff a specialist whose chief concern is to see that available scientific equipment is put to maximum use in Texas schools.

I am convinced that all that is needed is more information about what is available in the surplus property warehouses and greater initiative on the part of the schools themselves.

A school can obtain much useful equipment for its science and mathematics courses simply by:

1. Getting in touch with the State surplus property agency and establishing the school's eligibility.

2. Sending the appropriate personnel to the warehouse to see what is actually available or likely to be coming in.

3. Informing each science or mathematics teacher what is available and at the same time obtaining a list of items that each teacher would like to have for his classes.

4. Providing the State agency with a list of desired items so that the State agency can be on the lookout for them as they become surplus.

In many instances it is simply a matter of backing the school bus or station wagon up to the loading platform of the warehouse, picking up previously selected items and driving off with them.

Valuable scientific equipment constantly comes on this market. Within a few weeks 19 unused dynamometers for checking engine efficiency are likely to be available in the New Orleans area, left over from the Michaud ordnance plant, which formerly built tanks. Each has an acquisition cost of more than $11,000. These dynamometers will—I hope—find their way into engineering schools which need them.

A large number of secondary schools, colleges, and universities have taken advantage of the opportunity to obtain valuable equipment at little or no cost. Just last week $4 million worth of radar units were allocated to universities and colleges. Last fall a $1,300,000 aerial navigation trainer was given to the University of Pennsylvania, which will use its components in building a nuclear reactor. Electronic computors have been given to the University of New Mexico, the Louisiana Polytechnic Institution, the University of Kansas, and George Washington University in Washington, D.C. Students in a Kentucky high school operate a "ham" radio station put together with surplus property—and students in a Virginia technical school operate their own TV station—also assembled from surplus property. The Aeronautical Engineering Department of the University of Maryland has constructed a supersonic wind tunnel from parts of a former Japanese wind tunnel and two large steel tanks formerly used by the Navy in conducting a diving school.

The surplus property utilization program as a whole has made major contributions to our schools, and our public health and civil defense agencies since its establishment in 1946.

During the past 13 years 84,522 acres of land and 6,871 buildings have been conveyed to colleges, universities, and junior colleges. These represent an acquisition and improvement cost of over $296 million.

Over 20,000 buildings have been transferred to elementary and high schools, mostly for use as shops and classrooms. The facilities given to public schools through surplus property are worth more than $500 million.

Early in 1958 vocational and trade schools—and colleges and universities—reported an urgent need for machine tools to expand training facilities and replace obsolete equipment. For this reason, increased emphasis was given this phase of the surplus property program. During 1958, 7,476 machine tools were allocated, with an acquisition cost of nearly $13½ million. This represents an increase over 1957 of 339 percent in the number of machine tools donated, and a 312-percent increase in their acquisition cost. Additional thousands of components, accessories and supplies for these machines, as well as related testing and measuring equipment, were also given to schools. As patterns of defense production continue to change, even more machines are expected to be available in the tools-for-schools program. These machine tools should be in especial demand by area vocational educational programs now being established or expanded under title VIII of the National Defense Education Act.

During the past year, about 80 percent of all surplus personal property was distributed to schools, about 10 percent to hospital and health facilities, and 10 percent for civil defense purposes.

Since the inception of the surplus property utilization program in 1946, personal property with a Government acquisition cost of $1,590,835,673 had been made available to State agencies for donation for health, education, and civil defense purposes. Real property with an acquisition cost of $742,373,674 has been transferred to health and educational institutions.

---

## Hon. Latham Castle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 16, 1959*

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower is to be congratulated for nominating the present attorney general of the State of Illinois, Latham

Castle, to become a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit—Illinois—to succeed the late Judge Philip J. Finnegan.

Latham Castle is of old Illinois pioneer stock. His grandfather, Miles Beach Castle, an early settler in De Kalb County, founded the Sandwich State Bank in 1856. Latham, after service in World War I, was graduated from Northwestern University Law School in 1924. He became city attorney of Sandwich, Ill., in 1926; and in 1928 was elected States attorney of De Kalb County, reelected in 1932 and 1936. His future in the law continued in 1942 until 1952 as county judge. In 1952 he was elected attorney general of the State of Illinois and reelected in 1956.

Latham Castle is a legal scholar as well as a brilliant lawyer. He represents the highest ideals in his profession. He has never forgotten his loyalties to friendship. His career as a public servant has been marked with a real sense of high integrity. He has a fine mind, and life's experience has mellowed his judgment and understanding. His judicial training, together with a high quality of the understanding of law enforcement, both as States attorney and attorney general, have prepared him for the responsibility of this high office.

I congratulate him, his lovely mate, Georgiana, and his son, John, for this merited honor. The court of appeals will welcome such an illustrious son of the law.

## Eric Allen, Jr., Discusses Individual Liberties and Wins a George Washington Honor Medal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in February, Eric W. Allen, Jr., managing editor of the Medford Mail Tribune, won a Freedoms Foundation award for his December 4, 1957, editorial "Liberty Versus License."

In his fine editorial Eric Allen wrote:

In determining the principles which govern human relationships, one must go back to those which have been proven, time and time again, and are the only ones which will work. They stem, actually, from the Golden Rule.

And in a democracy they can be embodied in the idea of the greatest good for the greatest number, and the belief that there should be the greatest possible liberty for all—but license for none.

His words pertain to the Bill of Rights and individual liberties under our form of constitutional Government. His editorial was 1 of 33 selected from throughout the United States.

I am proud to have Eric as a friend and, on occasion, as a helpful and thoughtful critic.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news story from the February 23, 1959, edition of the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune announcing the Oregon winners of Freedoms Foundation awards and Eric Allen's prize-winning editorial, "Liberty Versus License":

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune, Feb. 23, 1959]

ERIC ALLEN, JR., RECEIVES FREEDOM GROUP'S AWARD

VALLEY FORGE, PA.—Four Oregon individuals and 4 Salem schools were announced today as recipients of 1958 Freedom awards by the Freedoms Foundation here.

The awards are made annually to individuals, organizations, and schools throughout the country for their contributions toward a better understanding of the American way of life during 1958.

Individual awards winners for Oregon included:

Eric W. Allen, Jr., managing editor of the Medford Mail-Tribune, a George Washington honor medal for an editorial, "Liberty Versus License."

Henry Slater, Burns, an honor medal for an essay, "Let's Stand Up and Be Counted."

Judy McKenzie, McMinnville, honor medal award for youth public address, "What the Flag Means To Me."

Dr. Mark A. Talney, Portland, a second place award of $50 and George Washington honor medal, for a sermon, "George Washington: Example of True Greatness."

The Salem schools honored were Englewood, Leslie Junior High, Morningside, and Richmond.

LIBERTY VERSUS LICENSE

Americans are rightly jealous of their freedom—their liberty to do as they will without hinderance.

This historic trait, which has grown for a longer time that the Nation has existed, is an admirable one. But, like every other good trait, it can be overextended.

In the democratic philosophy, liberty should extend just so far as the liberty of the next man. In other words, one can do anything he wants unless it harms another.

That is the test of when liberty becomes license.

One sees examples of this on all sides, and at all levels, in big things and small.

It was true when the early timber barons cut off the forests of Michigan and the Dakotas, leaving infertile and flood-producing hills for future generations.

It is true of the reckless driver. No one cares particularly if he gets hurt—it is the lives and property of the others he endangers that require traffic law enforcement.

It is true of the obnoxious couple in the theater, who loudly munch popcorn or converse freely without thought of the discomfort or inconvenience to others.

One of the classic examples was the judicial ruling that freedom of speech does not give anyone a right to yell "Fire!" in a crowded theater.

There are other examples, close to home both in time and distance.

Does one man's enjoyment of a fishing stream entitle him to oppose, on any basis, measures designed to control floods for the protection of the lives and property of others?

Does one family's desire to own a home without restrictions grant them the right to construct a septic tank the overflow from which threatens the health of their neighbor's children?

Does a logger's right to harvest timber carry with it the right to do so in a way which creates stream pollution and the danger of erosion?

Does a man's right to do business grant him the authority to destroy property values of another, perhaps by building a wrecking yard or slaughterhouse next door to an attractive home?

These are questions which any growing community must face, and think about, and answer.

For they are questions which continually arise as more and more people settle in an area. And if they are not settled, in principle, they will result in bitterness and acrimony. And then it will be too late. In some instances, it is already too late.

In determining the principles which govern human relationships, one must go back to those which have been proven, time and time again, and are the only ones which will work. They stem, actually, from the Golden Rule.

And in a democracy they can be embodied in the idea of the greatest good for the greatest number, and the belief that there should be the greatest possible liberty for all—but license for none.—E.A.

## Why Municipalities Oppose Bill To Amend Natural Gas Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, several days ago a group of the Alabama League of Municipalities, under the able leadership of executive director Ed E. Reid, met in Washington with members of the Alabama congressional delegation.

Along with other mayors, Hon. H. H. Dees, mayor of Atmore and past president of the organization, made a report which I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHY MUNICIPALITIES OPPOSE BILL TO AMEND NATURAL GAS ACT

(By H. H. Dees, mayor of Atmore)

Gentlemen, one of the bills under consideration of the 86th Congress would, if enacted, work serious detriment to the municipalities and the people of Alabama, as well as to the entire Nation.

I refer to the bill known as H.R. 366—the Harris bill—to amend the Natural Gas Act so as to remove some of the regulation of the Federal Power Commission over the producers of natural gas.

This is a reoccurring issue in Congress, and it has an unsavory history. The bill of the 84th Congress, which would have exempted natural gas producers completely from Federal regulation, was passed by Congress over the objections of many Congressmen, including our own KENNETH ROBERTS of the Fourth Alabama District, who is a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which handles natural gas legislation. Congressman ROBERTS has fought this legislation every time it was proposed, and he is actively opposing the present measure.

When the 84th Congress sent that Natural Gas bill to the President, he returned it without approval. The President explained that he was distressed over efforts of certain private persons to press passage of this bill to further their own interests by highly questionable activities.

COMPROMISE BILL DROPPED LAST YEAR

Of course, those people who fostered that bill would not let it die, and another compromise bill came up in the 85th Congress. This one was reported out of committee,

but it was also killed in questionable circumstances. Some Texas Republicans held a big dinner to try to raise money to influence Congressmen to vote for their bill; and when the political blunder was uncovered, the bill was never even mentioned again during that session.

Now there is a new bill, substantially the same as that of the 85th Congress, which is called a compromise bill because it gives the FPC certain regulatory authority. However, the power to regulate is so circumscribed that it does not in any measure serve to protect the consuming areas of Alabama and the rest of the Nation from unjustified increases in the price of natural gas. The exploitation of the consumer is assured in the provisions of this bill.

This bill specifically prohibits the Federal Power Commission from considering costs or from using the public utility rate base cost-of-service concept or formula in determining what is nebulously called the "reasonable market price." Determination of this price in accurate degree would appear near impossible. For the Commission is called upon to set up a reasonable market price through consideration of a number of factors, including the last sale, highest price, lowest price, weighted highest price, average field price or other price, as well as other things. One of the things the Commission is directed to consider in arriving at the vague reasonable market price is whether the contract price was arrived at competitively and in arm's length bargaining. This is to be done, presumably, despite the frequent close community of interest between pipeline companies and producers through mutual ownership, in whole or in part.

COST FINDING SHOULD BE PART OF REGULATORY PROCESS

Admitting that costs not always are easy to obtain, it is nonetheless true that their use is imperative in making a determination of a fair price. A staff member of the Philadelphia Gas Works has stated, and I quote:

"We believe that cost finding is and will continue to be an essential part of the regulatory process; that new approaches are necessary; and that it will be possible to develop procedures by which the Federal Power Commission can determine fair cost levels, against which it can evaluate rates for natural gas in the field as they may be proposed. We believe that the end result can mean an economically healthy and expanding producing industry, while at the same time affording protection to the consumer against unnecessary price increases."

Departure from the cost principle coupled with the involved and weak regulatory power of the FPC as prescribed in this bill foreshadows a serious hike in the price of natural gas to 22 million householders and 2 million industrial establishments in the United States. Proponents of the bill themselves concede that prices of natural gas will rise if the reasonable market price yardstick is applied. It has been estimated that a price increase of 5 cents per thousand cubic feet of natural gas would increase the field price to consumers in Alabama alone by $7 million a year. A 10-cent-per-thousand-cubic-feet increase would boost the annual field price in my home State by $14.7 million. Over the Nation, a 10-cent-per-thousand-cubic-foot raise would mean $633 million more in consumer costs. It is possible that natural-gas consumers could expect an ultimate 15-cent increase, at a new cost to the Nation's consumers of more than $950 million a year. Not only is there this direct cost to natural-gas users, but there is an accompanying hike in the cost of electricity whenever natural gas field prices are allowed to jump upward. According to a study made by Energy Research Associates, each 5-cent-per-thousand-cubic-foot increase in the field price of gas would raise the cost of producing electricity in the United States by $58,176,307 a year. A full 15-cent field-price increase would mean a $174,528,923 boost in the cost to gas-consuming electricity producers each year. This increase would mean Alabama consumers of natural gas to generate electricity would pay $3,278,030 a year more for their electricity than they now pay, and this cost increase would be passed along to the thousands of Alabamians who use electricity from these sources.

PRICE INCREASES WOULD HIT HOMEOWNERS

It is pertinent to note that these price increases will, for the major part, be borne by the homeowner. It is the private citizen who will pay the bulk of costs—including the profit—while the industries pay little more than the actual cost of the gas plus transportation. These consumers are captive users of natural gas inasmuch as they are tied to the ends of pipelines and have invested more than $12 billion in gas-burning equipment. This fact negates another argument of the proponents of this bill that natural gas is a commodity like oil and coal and is the only commodity subject to utility-type regulation. This is a false look at the situation. Natural gas is not transported like coal or oil by motor, rail or water. Natural gas must be transported through an expensive pipeline extending from source to consumer. Natural gas thus acquires the characteristics of a utility—of a monopoly, if you will—and thus makes it a seller's market. Once a pipeline is built, it cannot simply be picked up and cast about like a garden hose in search of a cheaper, more economical gas. Neither is it economically feasible for the consumer faced with rising natural gas prices to discontinue his use of gas and switch over to coal, oil or some other fuel.

DEVELOPMENT OF GAS SOURCES NOT IMPEDED

When the proponents of this legislation concede to the fact that this disturbing rise in costs of natural gas to consumers is inherent in this bill, they attempt to justify this by claiming that there must be a change in present Federal regulations to stimulate the drilling of new wells and further exploration by gas and oil companies. There has been no convincing evidence that development of gas resources is being impeded by the kind of regulation permisisble under existing law. Nor is there evidence that the industry has not prospered, nor will continue to prosper, under the current regulations.

Since the Phillips Petroleum Co. case of June 1954 when the Supreme Court held that the Natural Gas Act applies also to the sales of natural gas by independent producers who are engaged in interstate commerce for resale, the natural gas companies have fared quite well. According to Federal Power Commission reports, the net income of natural gas pipeline companies which file statements with FPC has risen steadily since the Phillips decision. The 1954 net income was up to $166,163,000, or 7.4 percent more than in 1953, when it was slightly over $154.6 million. In 1955, it was $219.3 million and in 1956 it was $241.4 million. The pipeline firms under FPC jurisdiction obtained Commission authorization to add more than 2.25 billion cubic feet of daily delivery capacity during the year ending June 30, 1956. That was some half-billion cubic feet more than in the preceding 12 months. Do these figures indicate the need for a mass giveaway that would benefit a small special interest group of less than 200 big gas producers? Even if there did exist the necessity to modify present controls to encourage natural gas development, there would need to be retained some manner of formula for setting prices. Not to do so, to use the words of an editorial in the Washington Post of last June "would make a mockery of the regulation under local laws of gas distributing companies, placing local regulation completely at the mercy of a vague concept of fair wholesale values administered without legal guidance."

THE FPC MUST HAVE AUTHORITY TO REGULATE

The Federal Power Commission must have the authority to regulate gas at the wellhead if the consumer is to be protected from exploitation by excessive costs. The only way to protect the unorganized, unrepresented consumer from being overcharged by a few powerful gas and oil concerns is to regulate the field price of natural gas. That regulation must be one defined in specific terms and not so circumscribed as to be impossible to impose. Defeat of the Harris bill would mean continued FPC authority which would result in a satisfactory balance between production and profits, and consumption at a reasonable price.

---

## Mayor Luther Kniffer of Wilkes-Barre Plans To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 19, 1959.

END OF POLITICAL ERA—RETIREMENT OF MAYOR KNIFFEN

While the decision of Mayor Luther Kniffen to retire from public life was not a surprise because of his health and advancing years, nevertheless it will have widespread repercussions at City Hall and in county as well as in city politics.

Although he will not be a candidate for a fourth term, it is inevitable that he will continue in the public eye because of his prominence and influence as well as his role as a leading funeral director in the community. Men like Mayor Kniffen just don't drop from sight when they sever official ties.

The city's chief executive has been honored as few men have in the history of the community. As mayor, councilman and school director, he held three key posts in his native city, evidence of the high esteem in which he was held. Luzerne County added to this impressive record with the offices of sheriff and coroner.

But it was as mayor of Wilkes-Barre that he unquestionably derived his greatest satisfaction. The office, in the first place, had for him sentimental attachment because it was held by his colorful father, the late Lewis Kniffen. But it was not as his father's son that he was elected three times, but on the basis of his own record as an official, citizen, and neighbor.

As he starts down the home stretch, Mayor Kniffen can look back on 11 hectic years. The office has not been a sinecure during the past decade. Wilkes-Barre, like the world at large, has been through troubled times and the end is not in sight for either.

As mayor, Mr. Kniffen has had far more to do than to greet distinguished visitors, sign proclamations and attend dinners. The office itself made him chief executive and principal law enforcement officer. By statute, he has been head of the Department of Public Affairs which includes the Bureau of Police, the Bureau of Law and the Bureau of Weights and Measures. He has been chair-

man of the Board of Revision of Taxes and Appeals, the Flood Control Committee, the Sinking Fund Committee and the Traffic Committee. As head of City Council, he perhaps wielded his greatest influence, since his authority extended into every sphere of municipal government, directly or indirectly.

Few people realize what is involved in such an office. Mayor Kniffen, like President Eisenhower, has been living in a figurative fish bowl and his chores are never done, for he is subject to duty around the clock. Sometimes, it is difficult, under these circumstances, to understand the fascination of the White House and City Hall unless it is the glamor, the prestige and the challenge of public service.

Mayor Kniffen's success as a civic and fraternal leader has been no less outstanding than his career as a public official. It has been no accident that he won recognition in so many fields.

With 10 months of his fiscal term ahead of him and countless years in private life, Wilkes-Barre, of necessity, must delay its farewells, but this newspaper will take the liberty, on behalf of a grateful public, to extend best wishes.

## Federal Meat Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a joint statement supporting meat inspection appropriations contained in the budget request. I urgently request my colleagues to support the budget request of $21,475,000 for the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture.

The statement follows:

A JOINT STATEMENT SUPPORTING MEAT INSPECTION APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. Homemaker demands assurance that the meat she buys for her family's dinner table is clean and wholesome. Congress, more than a half century ago, decided that she has the right to this guarantee. It, therefore, established a meat inspection agency.

We, the officers of consumer, public health, farm, livestock, producer, labor and management organizations, agree that Mrs. Homemaker and her family must be fully and effectively protected. We are, therefore, anxious that the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture obtain sufficient funds to employ an adequate staff of inspectors.

For a period, which fortunately ended last year, the Meat Inspection Division was inadequately supported. It could not increase its staff of inspectors to meet the steadily rising demands, which resulted from the meat industry's decentralization and growth. The increase in funds in the appropriation and supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1959 have, we are glad to say, again put the division on the road to full effectiveness.

The $21,475,000 budget request for the Meat Inspection Division for fiscal year 1960, although hardly generous, does promise to continue to permit the hiring of new and needed inspectors. We, frankly, would have liked to have seen a somewhat higher request, but we hope this amount will prove adequate.

We, therefore, urge Congress to approve the budget request of $21,475,000 for the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture. We believe it is the minimum amount necessary to permit the division to keep an adequate staff of inspectors, who must provide the consumer protection so necessary to our Nation's health.

Thomas J. Lloyd and Patrick E. Gorman, President and Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO); Radford Hall, Executive Secretary, American National Cattlemen's Association; Homer R. Davison, President, American Meat Institute; A. Z. Baker, President, American Stock Yards Association; James G. Patton, President, The National Farmers Union; Herschel D. Newsom; Master, The National Grange; John A. Killick, Executive Secretary, National Independent Meat Packers Association; Dr. R. A. Hendershott, Secrtary, United States Livestock Sanitary Association; E. F. Forbes, President and General Manager, Western States Meat Packers Association.

## Lincoln: Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, just over 150 years ago, in a small log cabin with a packed dirt floor, young Dennis Hanks held a new born baby. As he returned the babe to its mother, he remarked, "He'll never come to much."

Just a little over half a century later, Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton stood by the death bed of a President and, in an emotion-filled voice, pronounced a benediction on that same child, now the American martyr: "Now he belongs to the ages," Stanton said.

In the magnificent lifetime between those two statements, the hard-working, self-educated rail splitter from Kentucky earned for himself the nickname of "Honest Abe" and the reputation of a wise and just man. Monuments made of stone have fallen, but the monument contained in the name and reputation of Abraham Lincoln will endure for thousands of years, just as the reputations of the greatest of the ancient Greeks live today.

Lincoln freed the slaves, saved the Union, and, but for his assassination, would have saved the South and the Nation the horrors of reconstruction. He loved all mankind. His triumph over personal obstacles is one of the greatest chapters in human history.

I do not see how anyone can visit the beautiful quiet of the Lincoln Memorial here, with its classic statue, or come to these congressional halls without hearing softly re-echoing the proud words: "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

On a Sunday in February I went to the old Ford's Theater here where President Lincoln was assassinated. There, as a member of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, and its observance of the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth, I heard an address by Professor Earl W. Wiley of Ohio State University. He is chairman of the Ohio Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

Mr. President, I felt the address, entitled, "Abraham Lincoln: Lest We Forget," worthy of the Nation's attention. I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: LEST WE FORGET

I am genuinely happy of the opportunity to be here today. I know of no other place where I would rather be on this sequicentennial Sabbath than in this memorial that knew Lincoln's presence. I know of no other subject so pertinent to the national hour as that of Abraham Lincoln. I know of no other duty more urgent on our citizens as that of paying homage to the memory of this man whose ideals are being flouted in many places. I know of no other of our honored dead more worthy of our prayers and acclaim, and whose memory holds more for us, the living, than him we come here to honor.

I leave to the historians the task of revealing anything new about Lincoln. In the few minutes I am privileged to address you, I turn to Lincoln's own words for my theme. Words as you know are important. They make you laugh. They make you cry. They make you love. They make you hate. They make you happy. They make you sad. But it is so easy to get them out of place. This was shown by an incident that occurred at an important dinner party. The host, giving last minute instructions, reminded the cook not to serve the salad dressed, but to serve it undressed, since he wanted to take care of that detail himself. At the salad course he was horrified to see the cook, clad only in her slip, come through the door carrying the salad bowl. "What's the meaning of this?" he asked. "You said undressed," she retorted, "but this is as far as I go!" Lincoln, too, utilized humor for his purpose. But today I would keep Lincoln, the man of laughter, in context with his overall development as one who grew eloquent on the subject of human rights. The day came when he spoke immortal words at Gettysburg. It is the story of that development I would share with you today.

Six months following Lincoln's arrival in Illinois from Indiana, he made his first political address. He was 21 years of age. Accompanied by John Hanks, his cousin, he attended an open air rally held near Decatur, and not far from the spot where the oxcart conveying the worldly possessions of the Hankses, the Johnstons, and the Lincolns, jolted to its final stop in the long trek from Pigeon Creek. When John F. Posey, a local character, completed his remarks, Hanks openly declared the address a poor effort and boasted that young Lincoln could make a better speech.

Without the slightest show of stage fright, Abe mounted the box Hanks turned down for him, and declared a program of internal improvements essential to Illinois' economic progress. He wore a light blue jeans coat, short in the sleeves, trousers that failed to reach the tops of his lowcut shoes, and a broadbrimmed hat. The journey to Gettysburg had begun.

In the summer of 1831 Lincoln took up residence in New Salem, a frontier community located on a high bluff overlooking the Sangamon River. He was fortified with a disarming gift of gab, a fondness for the fanfare of the crowd, a liking for people, boundless ambition, a fund of droll stories, and an

empty purse. He chatted nimbly with people as he had done in the past—at the mill, at an election booth, in Rutledge's tavern, or on the village green. His stock of tall tales, his feats of mimicry, his pranks of ventriloquism joined with gay satire, all recited with a merry twinkle of the eye and tuned to the soft cadence of a Kentucky drawl, threw the Clary Grove boys into fits of laughter, and amused his mates banked around the mosquito-ridden bivouacs of the Black Hawk uprising. Lincoln became the genial Oliver Goldsmith of New Salem Hill.

But he was something more than the village wag. He proved himself able to hold his own in the forensic contests sponsored by the New Salem Literary Society. He analyzed and debated such questions as, Are the pioneers of the West entitled to a pension? What is dearer to man, life or liberty? Which is the greater evil, slavery or intemperance, in the United States? Supposing a law be passed freeing the Negroes, which would be the more politic in the United States, to educate them and make them equal citizens with us or colonize them in another land and hold them as other allies?

Young Lincoln exchanged the coin of words for the good will of his New Salem associates. The roistering lads of Clary Grove put their mark of approval on him, and more substantial residents, like James Rutledge, set him apart as a youth of promise. Denton Offutt predicted a bright future for his young clerk. Mentor Graham tutored him in the rudiments of grammar. Jack Kelso read poetry to him. John Calhoun encouraged him to study the elements of surveying. Bowling Green taught him the procedures of the squire's court. So it went, and when Lincoln recruited a company of volunteers for the Black Hawk war, the men elected him captain.

Geniality was paying off for Lincoln. It was an easy step from here to politics, for a democratic society entertains the credo that a popular man makes an able public officer. Presently he became a candidate for the general assembly, encouraged by friends to take the step. This was in 1832. He lost the election, standing 7th among the 13 candidates, 4 of whom were chosen. Yet he polled more than half of the votes cast in the entire county, and of the 208 votes cast in his home precinct, he received 205.

Politics were personal on the frontier. The color of a candidate's hair, the size of his nose, the fit of his coat, would sometimes assume an importance out of all proportion to the issues of the campaign. To survive in pioneer politics, accordingly, Lincoln must cultivate an ad hominem style of argument. He proved an apt student, as shown by the following attack he made on no other than President Van Buren. A member of the opposition in the Illinois House declared that results of the late elections in the States indicated that every State in the Union would vote for Mr. Van Buren in the next presidential election:

"Address that argument to cowards and knaves; with the free and the brave it will effect nothing. It may be true, if it must, let it. * * * I know that the great volcano at Washington, aroused and directed by the evil spirit that reigns there, is belching forth the lava of political corruption, in a current broad and deep, which is sweeping with frightful velocity over the whole length and breadth of the land, bidding fair to leave unscathed no green spot or living things, while on its bosom are riding like demons on the waves of Hell, the imps of that evil spirit, and fiendishly taunting all those who dare resist its destroying course, with the helplessness of their effort; and knowing this, I cannot deny that all may be swept away. Broken by it, I, too, may be; bow to it I never will."

That represented Lincoln's invective in December 1839. It marked the voice of youth, defiant, vehement, rash, insolent, positive, high-minded. A decade later, he turned his partisan eloquence on General Cass. He was now Congressman Lincoln, speaking in the Hall of Representatives:

"By the way, Mr. Speaker, did you know I am a military hero. Yes, sir; in the days of the Black Hawk war I fought, bled, and came away. Speaking of General Cass' career reminds me of my own. I was not at Stillman's defeat, but I was about as near to it as Cass was to Hull's surrender; and, like him, I saw the place afterward. It is quite certain I did not break my sword, for I had none to break; but I beat a musket pretty badly on one occasion. If Cass broke his sword, the idea is he broke it in desperation; I bent the musket by accident. If General Cass went in advance of me in picking blueberries, I guess I surpassed him in charges upon the wild onions. If he saw any live, fighting Indians, it was more than I did; but I had a good many bloody struggles with the mosquitoes, and although I never fainted from loss of blood, I can truly say I was often very hungry. Mr. Speaker, if I should ever conclude to doff whatever our Democratic friends may suppose there is of black-cockade federalism about me, and therefore they shall take me up as their candidate for the presidency, I protest they shall not make fun of me, as they have of General Cass, by attempting to write me into a military hero."

In 1850, President Zachary Taylor died, and Lincoln eulogized him in memorial services in Chicago. He again showed a fondness for the sophomoric word and swelling phrase in portions of his address:

"And now the din of battle nears the fort and sweeps obliquely by; a gleam of hope flies through the half imprisoned few; they fly to the wall; every eye is strained—it is—it is—the stars and stripes are still aloft. Anon the anxious brethren meet; and while hand strikes hand, the heavens are rent with a loud, long, glorious, gushing cry of victory, victory, victory."

The serenity of the Gettysburg Address still lay far beyond Lincoln's power of expression, and he now was in his forty-second year. But grave issues were in the making that called for restraint, for the calm and deliberative treatment that comes only with maturity. In 1854 the Senate of the United States passed the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and the ageless subject of slavery again commanded the headlines. It was the eve of a political hurly-burly that carried sickening implications. But even revolutions must be defined. Some one among the controversialists must state terms and specify objectives. When that man speaks the crowd pauses in its confusion and looks to him for guidance, inclined to follow one who can phrase what lies beyond their own poor gift of expression.

The man to whom the anti-Nebraskans presently turned in their uncertaintly was Abraham Lincoln. He established his claim to authority on the afternoon of October 4, 1854, in the Hall of Representatives, in Springfield, Ill. An audience representing all shades of opinion on the new legislation heard him speak. Among them was Senator Stephen A. Douglas, author of the repeal measure.

That day Lincoln shed his Whig coat. He was something more than the rough-and-ready partisan who had carried the party torch for 20 years. This day he was the nationalist. He planted himself squarely on the Declaration of Independence. He was gracious and tolerant toward the South. He made no thrusts toward Douglas. He stood on high moral ground, on the thesis that slavery was wrong in principle, and being wrong in principle, its extension into free territory was immoral. He summed up his position in a passage that foreshadowed his eloquence at Gettysburg:

"This declared indifference, but, as I must think, covert real zeal, for the spread of slavery, I cannot but hate. I hate it because of the monstrous injustice of slavery itself. I hate it because it deprives our republican example of its influence in the world; enables the enemies of free institutions with plausibility to taunt us as hypocrites; causes the real friends of freedom to doubt our sincerity and especially because it forces so many good men among ouselves into an open war with the very fundamental principles of civil liberty, criticizing the Declaration of Independence, and insisting that there is no right principle of action but self-interest."

During the following months the political situation intensified. Then at candlelight, June 16, 1858, a tired group of delegates and alternates and spectators assembled in the same Hall of Representatives in Springfield where Lincoln spoke the words just quoted. That day the Illinois Republicans had met in convention, deliberated on the problems confronting such a body, drafted the customary resolutions of purpose, and designated Abraham Lincoln as their first and only choice to oppose Senator Douglas for his seat in the Senate.

A burst of applause announced the arrival of Abraham Lincoln, and all eyes turned to the rear door of the hall. The tall solemn-faced man elbowed his way down an aisle, as a thousand throats thundered out a noisy greeting. Men in shirtsleeves jumped to their feet and waved their arms. Lincoln calmly mounted the platform and sat down. The formalities completed, he walked forward on the stand, holding a manuscript in his hand. He paused, surveyed his audience, and in a deliberate and distinct voice read:

"If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do, and how to do it.

"We are now far into the fifth year, since a policy was initiated, with the avowed object, and confident promise, of putting an end to slavery agitation.

"Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only, not ceased, but has constantly augmented.

"In my opinion, it will not cease, until a crisis shall have been reached, and passed.

"'A house divided against itself cannot stand.'

"I believe this Government cannot endure; permanently half slave and half free.

"I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided.

"It will become all one thing, or all the other.

"Either the opponents of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.

"Have we no tendency to the latter condition?"

Lincoln summed up the answer to his query in an allegory. He was too seasoned a speaker to discuss at length the historical implications of the repeal of the Missouri compromise, as he had done in 1854. But he mentioned the repeal policy. He mentioned the Dred Scott decision, and he referred to the apparent studied indifference that men in high places had shown toward the spread of slavery into free territory. He likened Democratic leadership since 1852 to the building of a house:

"We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different proportions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make

the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places * * * we find it impossible to not believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first lick was struck."

The men of the prairies brought up on the parables of the Bible and the fables of Aesop could understand that language. The address constituted the starting point of Lincoln's national recognition. The New York Tribune, June 24, 1858, reproduced the speech in full, and editorially paid high tribute to Lincoln. Several Illinois newspapers printed the text of the speech. Country journals quoted parts of it. Theodore Parker, in Boston, considered the address excellent. The daring aspersions in the speech led to the joint meetings between Lincoln and Douglas later in the year, when Lincoln seized on the opportunity to express himself on the great issues disturbing his generation. One result of these contests took Lincoln into Ohio, Wisconsin, Kansas, and the East, there to continue his brilliant analysis of political principles that would have a bearing on the Presidential election of 1860.

Lincoln made his greatest political argument at Cooper Institute, February 27, 1880, in New York City. He addressed a brimming audience of 12 to 15 hundred people. William Cullen Bryant introduced him to the audience. Henry Ward Beecher, George William Curtis, and Horace Greeley, were among the celebrities in attendance. But the majority of those present were working men. This was a rare opportunity for a man politically ambitious.

Lincoln found his text in an argument Senator Douglas had contributed to the Harper's Magazine, published in September 1859. Lincoln's old rival there sought to show, using historical evidence, that the founders of the Republic intended that each political unit of the Nation had the authority to decide for itself its disposition of the slavery institution. It all led up to the conclusion that popular sovereignty had been the guiding principle of the men who founded the Republic.

Through the years from 1854 Lincoln, also, had approached the much-bandied question on historical grounds. But not in Cooper Institute. He had grown more objective in his thinking. So he approached the problem statistically. The founders of the Government were, he defined, the 39 men eligible to vote on the adoption of the Constitution in Convention. By actual count, he represented, showing studied investigation of the evidence, 21 of these. "A clear majority of the whole—certainly understood no proper division of local from Federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution (that), forbade the Federal Government to control slavery in the Federal Territories."

Lincoln, the tall, guant guest speaker in the ill-fitting clothes, took the floor at Cooper Institute as a backwoods orator from the unwashed West, and left it as a potential nominee of the Republican Party for President. He placed himself closer to Seward. He placated the fears of Greeley, and won the respect of men like Beecher. Publication of his address added to his prestige. There were those who read into his remarks something of the insight of Crittenden and Calhoun, something of the spirit of compromise of Clay, something of the eloquence of Webster, as when Lincoln remarked in conclusion, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

A few minutes before 8 o'clock on the gloomy morning of February 11, 1861, Lincoln stood inside the dingy waiting room of the Great Western Railroad in Springfield, Ill., chatting with friends. He was on his way to Washington to assume the duties of President. Foot beats of late arrivals echoed on the wet pavements outside; a thin sheet of rain and sleet lashed the station windows and the engine bell clanged noisily. A final clasp of the hand, a hurried word, and the President-elect mounted the steps of the rear coach and disappeared within.

Presently, in response to calls from the crowd gathered at the station, Lincoln again stood on the car platform. He removed his tall hat from his head, leaned against the brake wheel, and spoke. He relived for a fleeting moment the days when, as a penniless and untaught youth, he came to Springfield to make his home. He referred to his marriage there, to the coming of his children, and to the trials he faced. He mentioned a little mound in the local cemetery where one of his boys lay buried. Then he faced the future. Was he, the humble railsplitter, big enough for the great task that lay before him? The grinding of wheels, the banging of the bell, the hiss of steam, the bumping of car against car, announced the departure. Yet, in unforgettable words he had described the bitter sweet of sorrow that touches the heart of the traveler who turns his back on the old hometown. He was getting nearer to Gettysburg.

Inaugural morning in 1861 clear and cool in the National Capital. A sharp wind ruffled the waters of the Potomac and lashed the flags flung out bravely in Pennsylvania Avenue. The city swarmed with life, youngbloods half eager that the threatened gage of battle be cast and their elders, mindful of fever-stricken camps in Mexico, deprecating the thought of war. Squads of soldiers appeared on the streets and as quickly disappeared. The aged figure of Gen. Winfield Scott on horse left no doubt of that hero's loyalty to the colors he held so high at Lundy's Lane. The click of rifle hammers, the sharp blasts of artillery, the tart smell of smoke and powder, were reminders of what men thought that day.

The bearded Lincoln stood on a rickety platform and sought to maintain the public dignity. He had only words with which to pacify determined men who already had moved into action. He pleaded and argued his case. The note of firmness recalled Jackson. The tone of compromise suggested Clay. The hint of self-government reflected Douglas, and the high sense of tenderness marked Seward. But it was all of no use. The President had an oath in heaven to uphold the Constitution. The Union would be maintained. Yet, in closing, he held out the friendly hand:

"I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passions may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, assuredly they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

War came, and months later came Gettysburg. The gaunt man slowly arose from a rocking chair and shuffled forward on the wooden stand. It was the same man who 30 years before mounted a box turned down for him by John Hanks and made his first public address. "Down in front" a dozen voices chorused. The weary figure in black paused, lowered his head slightly, and waited for the rumble of the crowd to cease. Adjusting his steel-rimmed spectacles, pressing out his sheets of manuscripts, he lifted his shrill tenor tones over new-made graves.

Lincoln spoke calmly, deliberately, as if he addressed his Cabinet around a table in the White House. Following Edward Everett's polished elocutionary performance his delivery seemed in contrast. There were no studied gestures; yet the speaker was the same man who once went up and down the aisle of the national hall of Representatives with coattails flying. Occasionally he would emphasize a word or phrase as when he urged the people to rededicate themselves to the restoration of civil rights in the Union for which men had just died. He suddenly dropped his arms and was gone. With startling brevity a classic had been added to the rolls of history. In lyrical rhythms he had captured the universal significance of a particular event. That is the ultimate of effective speech.

The road to Gettysburg was long. Forty years earlier the speaker was a lad at Pigeon Creek, Ind., using a gift of gab to satisfy his craving for recognition among his fellows. He next became the trusted partisan, ready to defend his party against all attacks. He then became the nationalist, and defended the principles of the founders of the Republic. Now, he was the humanist, concerned with men the world over. Lincoln had grown tall. He was 7 feet tall at Gettysburg. He had ascended to the pinnacle where the better angels of our nature reach down to assist struggling men.

---

## Remarks by Gov. Ernest F. Hollings Before the Washington Light Infantry Annual Banquet, Charleston, S.C., February 23, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address by His Excellency Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of South Carolina, delivered before the Washington Light Infantry, Charleston, S.C., one of the oldest and most distinguished organizations of its kind in the entire country:

REMARKS BY GOV. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON LIGHT INFANTRY ANNUAL BANQUET, CHARLESTON, S.C., FEBRUARY 23, 1959

It is truly inspiring to join in this memorable anniversary of an organization so closely enmeshed with the history and the hopes of our great Nation. Born in the trying infancy of a new Union, the Washington Light Infantry has since marched through the crucibles of war and the quiet testing of peace. If any member of that first unit in 1807 could have lived through all the decades since, he would have a vivid story to tell of the ebb and flow of our national defense. In 1812 the Nation met its first military test after union and the Washington Light Infantry was mustered into service. In 1847 came the Mexican War and Washington Light Infantry members formed the nucleus for the gallant Company A from Charleston in the famous Palmetto Regiment. In 1843 the Washington Light Infantry took part in the opening of the Citadel after striving diligently to help achieve the military college for the education of our young men, and in 1882 it was again the Washington Light Infantry which came to the aid of the Citadel in getting the institution reopened after the holocaust of civil war. During that war Washington Light Infantry officers and men

formed three companies and fought for the South with courageous distinction. In 1916 came service on the Mexican border and in 1917 the Washington Light Infantry was again called to active duty and rendered distinctive service in some of the greatest battles of World War I. After the war came reorganization as Company B, 118th Infantry, South Carolina National Guard, and in World War II the call to active duty came again for overseas service while the Reserve company took over duties at home. Today this splendid unit, still flying the historic Eutaw flag, stands in readiness for whatever challenges may come.

Details of military organization may differ with the times, but the type of our military institution was determined in the earliest days of our Government. It has not changed since General Washington's day. It recognizes that in a democracy it is the duty of every citizen to defend those things which we all hold dear. The real measure of our national strength is the devotion of the individual American to the well being of America, and the preservation of the human values for which America stands.

This is the philosophy upon which our National Guard, of which the Washington Light Infantry is so vibrant a part, is built. The philosophy of the citizen soldier must always stand at the heart of our defense planning in a democracy such as ours. The second section of the Bill of Rights as contained in the original 10 amendments states:

"A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

That short but all-important section is the foundation on which our entire National Guard structure rests. Its referral to the people is particularly significant in this matter of moral core strength for a successful military force. It again relates the military to the people from which it springs.

We have seen events at times which threatened the strength of the Guard, but the Guard has stood fast in resisting these challenges and remains today as the Nation's largest and most active military reserve. As your Governor, I look forward to my associations with our South Carolina National Guard and pledge my efforts in its behalf wherever needed.

Often here at these Washington Light Infantry occasions we have heard described the tremendous military budgets we face today. These facts are but strong reminders of the total, global nature of the struggle in which we are now engaged, transcending the economic, psychological, and political as well as the military. National leaders have warned us well of the dangers involved—of the need and great cost of adequate military posture. They continually warn us also of the dangers of losing by default through economic collapse.

These things are true. It is well that our people be alerted to these dangers. However, there is another field of just as vital importance which normally goes unheralded. This is the will to win in the heart of the individual citizen, both in and out of uniform. Call it patriotism, moral courage, or call it what you will—if we ever have this quality shaken we may well fear the worse. It is this vital element which I would like to discuss with you tonight.

When Minuteman Joseph Smith grabbed his rifle from the wall and leveled it at approaching redcoats in 1776, there was no question as to why he was there. He was protecting his very home from a hated invader. It was as simple as that.

But down the long march of history as warfare and reasons for warfare have broadened in scope the question of why we fight has become more and more complex, and more and more difficult to comprehend. It was our own Gen. Charles P. Summerall, late president of The Citadel and revered friend of the Washington Light Infantry, who once said while serving as Army Chief of Staff, "The average mind is such that it does not analyze abstract causes or even the great principle over which wars are fought. Men are elemental and practical and cling to real things." World War II veterans, for example, remember well the great lengths to which the Government went in informing them of why we fight. The average soldier, sailor, airman, and marine still sometimes found it hard to answer that question. As one of the generals in charge of this indoctrination expressed it, "In common with too many of their fellow citizens, these young men had little knowledge of the human values at issue in the world arena, values that they would soon be called upon to preserve at the ultimate price of their lives. Was it not the poet, Vachel Lindsay, who passionately cried, 'Not that they die, O Lord, but that they die like sheep'?" Before World War II we paid no attention to such indoctrination—we had always taken for granted the ancient virtues of our people, but in 1941 these complacent assumptions came down like a house of cards. For in that year we found young men in the Armed Forces divided and confused, ignorant of world events. Since they saw no danger, they saw no compelling reason why they should be made to serve.

The long-range, postwar, need for military streng h was also obviously not grasped by our people as tremendous pressure was brought to bear to bring the boys home, resulting in the quick destruction of what had been the greatest fighting force in history. This occurred while our eventual enemy, Soviet Russia, was holding firm and preparing for the struggle she saw ahead.

Then we come to Korea and the question of why we fight became even more complex and remote from the man on the firing line. The tempo of indoctrination to answer that question had to be stepped up, and still the answer was not clear. Views among our top military and political leaders were so conflicting and dissension so serious among our citizens that the will to win for the first time came in jeopardy. This was climaxed by the introduction into the annals of the American soldier of a character known as turncoat.

I do not make this as a treasonous observation. Certainly, it is not my intent to degrade the character, ability and courage of the Korean soldier. Never has America fielded a more courageous soldier and yet never with less purpose. He was the civilian yanked from the peacetime summer of 1950, with no warning, and placed in a land very few of us had ever heard of before. There was no sinking of a Lusitania. There was no Pearl Harbor. These United States had not been invaded, and no country we had promised to defend had been trespassed.

Yet, while everyone was talking peace and taking summer vacations, there he was, thousands of miles from home, told to kill or be killed; to sweat and die; to freeze and die; to suffer hardships beyond comprehension; and do everything else but one thing—be victorious. He was told he could not win. Yet he fought on more bravely than ever. He gave blood to his fellowman because the people at home would not contribute blood. He gave to the Korean homeless because the people at home would not contribute to the Korean homeless. For us, we ashamedly call it a conflict, and without shame signed an armistice, leaving him on the battlefield and in the enemy's prison camps.

Gen. Mark Clark, the United Nations commander at the time of the armistice and the greatest patriot of our time, has reported that several hundred American prisoners known to be held by the Communists were left behind. Although the United Nations has since obtained the release of some, General Clark knows, and others in authority know, that there are tonight American soldiers languishing in Communists prisons. These same soldiers were told in 1950 "Home by Christmas." Tonight as we celebrate we hear their parents' plaintive plea, "Which Christmas?" Will our moral courage withstand the pressures which plague us as we try to justify the fact that several years after the armistice, the greatest freedom-loving Nation on earth still has not obtained freedom for these of its sons? What effect does this have on the will to win?

Finally, here in democracy's supposed great bastion, we see internal discord and conflicts which further cloud the vision of the individual citizen in his sense of moral duty to his country. We see U.S. troops thrown into the capital of a sovereign State to enforce measures perpetrated by an increasingly powerful Federal Government. We see troops committed to decimate rights and responsibilities carefully reserved for the States by those who fought for freedom in the 1770's. Though it does not affect our basic loyalty, what about our enthusiasm for the Federal Government? What damage has been done to the soldier's will to win?

When we see a U.S. Supreme Court seemingly intent on using its own interpretation of our Constitution to upset the basic source of our governmental strength—its balance of powers—we rightfully fear some shaking of allegiance to rulings of that Court. The same is true of the instruments of the Court—troops—and the allegiance of the troops.

When we see rights of minorities suppressed before the will of highly organized, powerful pressure groups, we rightfully fear some degree of damage to the system that permits such a tragedy. President Washington, for whom your own illustrious group was named, was careful in his Farewell Address to warn against the dangers of small but artful minorities. He said: "However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely in the course of time and things to become potent engines by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engine which lifted them to unjust dominion."

When we know that all these things are aided and encouraged by foreign ideologies toward an ultimate goal of a divided America, we have cause for worry and concern.

All these things add to the complexity of building and holding a national defense posture of sufficient strength to guard us militarily, ensure economic solvency and marshal the moral courage of our citizens in the face of the greatest threat we have ever faced.

No matter how far we may move in achieving spectacular new space age weapons of war, we must never forget the finest asset we have ever had or ever will have is the moral strength and courage of the individual citizen—whether he be manning a weapon or holding firm at home. Repeatedly the great captains of history warn that the critical factor in war lies in the moral field. From Bonaparte to MacArthur, the chain of testimony is unbroken—there is no substitute for the will to win. An Army derives its moral strength from the people it defends—from their confidence, their institutions, their beliefs. There is no substitute for this. The nation's will is the soldier's will; the nation's faith is the soldier's faith; the nation's virtues are the soldier's virtues. No army is stronger than its beliefs. Around a hard and enduring moral core we must build our military strength. To do otherwise is to build a colossus of straw.

These are times that demand the best in all of us. No mere outlay of money or

physical resources will bring a day, an hour, or a moment of freedom. Its price is vigilance, sacrifice, and service on the part of each individual American. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, former Army Chief of Staff, put it well when he said, "The most important element of armies has always been men imbued with the will to win. And today the strength of nations is still measured by their ability to produce such men."

National defense is no longer the simple matter of grabbing a gun and taking the nearest cover. It is rather now so complex that it challenges us to the utmost to maintain strength and unity in the hearts of our people, in the fiber of our national economy and in our weapons of war. And, as we well know, it is much more difficult to keep one's guard up in times of relative peace than when the enemy is standing across the firing line.

In our preoccupation with weapons and dollars we must never forget that greatest armament of all—a diligent, courageous, united, and loyal citizenry which knows in its soul that the American way of life is worth any sacrifice to maintain and protect.

It was not the power of the barbarian hordes at the gates of Rome that brought to its knees that civilization which had stood for 10 centuries. Rome was finished long before the enemy finally attacked. It was finished because the character of its people had deteriorated. In their quest for pleasure they had lost their ideal of courage, industry, morality, and national unity which had made Rome master of the known world. It failed because the individual Roman citizen lost his own personal identification with respect to the defense of the state, not only on the battlefield but in every aspect of life. And in more recent years, we witnessed military collapse in France and the Netherlands following moral collapse in the face of the Nazis.

It is fallacy to think that since you are a superior civilization you will always be victorious in world conflict. The oppressed Chinese overthrew Genghis Kahn and the Huns defeated superior Rome because of guts, the will to win. Civilizations survive only when their people have faith and courage in their system. Here in America we feel we are a superior people, and so we are in many respects. But the question of our survival depends on whether we can hold fast to that superiority of spirit which has marked our past victories.

Let us remember that in any future war, whether it be limited or total geographically, it must be total in our human effort if we are to be successful. All who are called must go. All who are called must fight. All who survive must be allowed to come home. All of us—at home or in the field—must stand united if we are to be victorious.

In the sweep of history our military bulwarks will not protect us if we as individuals fail to accept our individual responsibilities with total dedication. May God help us if we ever waiver in our faith in America and our unity as Americans, for therein lies our future safety as a nation.

## New Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of February 24, 1959:

POLICE HEAD CONFIRMED

Confirmation by the senate of the appointment of Frank G. McCartney of Lanford as commissioner of the Pennsylvania State police was long overdue.

In the first place, Governor Lawrence is entitled to pick his own subordinates. Commissioner McCartney, a member of the State police for two decades as well as a State investigator and a coal company police chief, was the first and only police commissioner choice of the State's new chief executive. He quite properly rejected a suggestion to designate another for the post or to consider a compromise since he is responsible for his cabinet members.

The only objection, raised to Commissioner McCartney, was a matter of speculation about his executive ability. He had not been commissioned in the State police and this was the sole basis for the opposition to him. His record as an officer was excellent and his experience broad.

Former associates in the State police, who should be good judges, privately expressed the belief Mr. McCartney would be a capable leader. This expression of confidence, in itself, was reassuring, since it constituted a high compliment to the nominee.

It is only logical to assume a man, who was a member of the force so long and who is familiar with the problems of law enforcement in the Commonwealth, ought to be able to handle the job. To be sure, it is a heavy responsibility, but the new Commissioner has a background that indicates he will measure up to the challenges in the 4 years ahead.

## The Wild Redtape Yonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial appearing in the Boston Herald of February 19, 1959, entitled "The Wild Redtape Yonder," where a resident of California received a bill from the Air Force for $13.94 and the invoice was 28 pages long and bore the signatures of 2 lieutenant colonels, 3 majors, 1 captain, a first lieutenant, and 15 civilian department heads.

Conditions of this kind, wherever they exist in any department or agency, should be eliminated and done by the department or agency itself, and if not, the appropriate congressional committees should make a thorough study of this matter because it is apparent that tremendous sums of money could be saved.

THE WILD REDTAPE YONDER

A California man has received a $13.94 bill from the Air Force. The invoice is 28 pages long and bears the signatures of 2 lieutenant colonels, 3 majors, 1 captain, a first lieutenant, and 15 civilian department heads.

The recipient of this awesome document, it seems, cracked a radiator on a forklift truck he was operating as a civilian employee at an airfield in 1957. He's willing to pay, having in mind that payment will defray, at least in part, the cost of billing.

We salute this man for his concern for his Government. And we recommend that the diligent officials concerned be awarded, forthwith, the distinguished filing cross, with paper clip cluster.

## First Washington Jazz Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 17, 1959*

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, an exhibition entitled "Seven Ages of Jazz" will be opened this afternoon in the Library of Congress, where Americans may glimpse a little of their musical past during March while the Congressional Circle of Friendship House is sponsoring the first Washington Jazz Jubilee. A large group of congressional wives—many of whom live or have lived in Southeast Washington—has planned this jazz jubilee for the benefit of Friendship House, a settlement that has served the Southeast community for more than half a century. Culturally, however, it will benefit all jazz admirers in the Capital, who may participate in one aspect or another of this unusual celebration.

A jubilee can be either "a season or an occasion for general joy," Webster says, and this jubilee promises to be both. Its season will be the month of March; its occasions will be various. The Washington Jazz Jubilee began March 1, with last night's lecture on jazz at the National Gallery of Art by Prof. Marshall Stearns of Hunter College, who is executive director of the Institute of Jazz Studies. The next event will be the opening of the Library of Congress exhibit at 4 p.m. today, when the Library and the Congressional Circle will hold a preview of "Seven Ages of Jazz." On March 12, the Gres Gallery at 1729 20th Street NW., will open a special exhibit of primitive African sculpture entitled "Rhythms in Form and Music." The celebration will reach its climax on March 16 with a unique concert by outstanding jazz musicians at a fund-raising benefit for Friendship House.

Throughout March the Library of Congress exhibition may be viewed in the North Gallery on the ground floor of the Main Library Building. There you may see music manuscripts, published music, books, recordings, and photographs selected from the Library's collections to recall some of the story of jazz. The display illustrates the seeds of jazz in folk music; its early appearance and development in New Orleans, Memphis, Los Angeles, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Kansas City; its flourishing in the "big time" of Chicago and New York; and its spread to nearly every corner of the world.

Many famous performers and composers have created and developed the fabric of jazz and its countless styles. They have made it a vital stream in 20th century creative effort, and they have given stimulus to the popular song, the

musical comedy, and the music of the opera house and concert hall. Many of these figures of the jazz world will be featured in the Library's exhibit. A number of their works will be performed at the Washington Jazz Jubilee on March 16.

This jazz concert, to be held in Sheraton Hall at the Sheraton-Park Hotel on Monday evening, March 16, is the first program of its kind to be presented in the Nation's Capital. Mrs. Richard Bolling, the wife of my colleague from Kansas City and a well-versed authority on jazz, is general chairman of this benefit.

Because of the excellent talent and program proposed, I understand it is attracting nationwide attention. Mrs. Bolling and her committees have planned the production in two parts. In the first half of the evening, top-ranking jazz artist will present a fast-paced and colorful history of jazz by performing its music from such early forms as old spirituals, work songs, and New Orleans funeral marches to the contemporary "cool" school of modern jazz. Musicians brought to Washington for this event will illustrate the best in jazz from Congo Square to Carnegie Hall. After an intermission, the performers will break loose in a swinging "jam session" for jazz aficionados in the audience.

Some 1,500 guests wil join in this benefit for Friendship House, which at the present time faces new challenges and even greater responsibilities because of urban redevelopment in its area. Tickets may be obtained by telephoning Friendship House. The Jubilee is fortunate in having Mrs. Eisenhower and Mrs. Nixon as its ranking patrons among many members of official Washington and of the diplomatic corps, as well as other prominent Washingtonians.

The Congressional Circle of Friendship House has had advice from members of the Newport Jazz Festival in planning its benefit program, and its producer is Willis Conover, maestro of the Voice of America's popular "Music USA," a daily 45-minute program broadcast around the world. With "The World of Jazz," another program of the Voice, it is among our most popular broadcasts overseas. I need not remind my colleagues of the universal appeal of American jazz, nor of the fact that our jazz musicians have served us as excellent emissaries abroad, even in Iron Curtain countries.

## Hon. Sid Simpson

SPEECH
OF
## HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, no one could have a closer friend, nor a better one, than I had in SID SIMPSON. We consulted with each other on many matters, each of us well knowing that we could always rely upon an utterly frank expression of opinion. Whether he agreed with you or not, SID was one of those individuals that said exactly what he thought. I always found in him a man of convictions with the courage of his convictions to express them frankly.

SID was an outstanding Member of this body. He served his district well. This is attested to by the number of years he served with us. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, he contributed much to the farm area he represented and contributed much to our deliberations on various farm problems.

He had a keen sense of humor. Often his humor in stories and anecdotes were not solely to amuse but to make a point. With an anecdote he could say more pointedly and more emphatically than many of us could say with many words.

With the passing of SID SIMPSON there is indeed a void in this House. I miss him not only as a colleague. I miss him as a personal friend of long standing.

His lovely wife is serving here in his place. I extend to her, and to his two wonderful daughters my sincere sympathy. Theirs is a great loss. We share that loss with them.

## The Library of Congress Looks at Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 5, 1959*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in November 1957, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, of which I was then chairman, requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare an objective and factual report on the Federal Reclamation program. The report was furnished the committee on December 1958, and has since been printed as committee print No. 1 of the 86th Congress. This impartial and unbiased study by the Legislative Reference Service indicates that the Federal reclamation program is clearly an important element in our national economy. The report contains valuable material and statistics relating to the program and I commend it to all of my colleagues in the Congress as an excellent professional treatment of the subject.

This report has received favorable editorial comment throughout the West. As an example, I am including an editorial from the February 18 issue of the Sacramento Bee.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS LOOKS AT RECLAMATION

The Library of Congress, through its legislative research service, has compiled an appraisal of the national reclamation program and one can assume it to be a document without bias.

It reports among many other things that during 1957 the Federal Internal Revenue Service collected $341,607,000 in taxes, mostly on incomes, from areas served by the Federal reclamation projects.

Since many of these undertakings have been built in areas which otherwise were in large part unproductive, it can be assumed the IRS collections largely represented money it otherwise would not have received.

Over the period of years these projects have been in existence these collections have totaled $3,218 million, or some $300 million more than the sum the Government has spent on all the reclamation works.

This, of course, has no bearing on the fact earnings from these projects, from the sale of water and power, have returned $355,514,171 to the Federal Treasury. Nor does it take into consideration the hundreds of millions of dollars in nonreimbursable benefits such as flood control, navigation improvement, recreation, etc.

Well over half of the repayments, $189,134,119, have come from the sale of power. In the case of the Central Valleys project, $66,864,658 of $68,785,061 in repayments has accrued from electric energy.

In numerous other ways the report reveals how the reclamation program has made direct contributions to the national economy moneywise. In additional benefits, such as in the production of crops and of power for the aluminum industry so vital during wartime, the projects have been of inestimable national value.

All of this exposes the nonsense of claiming the people in the States of the South and East are subsidizing the western reclamation projects. If anything it is the other way around.

And in large measure the success of the projects has been due to the generation of low cost public power which the private power lobby would abolish.

## Barricades of Freedom—Life Line Radio Broadcast by Wayne Poucher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the text of an address by Wayne Poucher, radio minister of Life Line Foundation, Inc., a religious and patriotic educational movement.

Life Line broadcasts are heard daily, 6 days a week, over a large number of radio stations throughout the Nation.

The address follows:

If I were one of my own forefathers, I think I would disclaim me. As a matter of fact, I think our forefathers, if they could see us today, might give serious consideration to disclaiming the lot of us for the simple reason that we have given such a poor account of ourselves in handling the things which they left us. We have demonstrated miserable stewardship in many respects in preserving the heritage they founded and delivered into our hands.

It is not my belief that Americans as a people have lost their love for freedom. But it is my conviction that we are falling down on the all-important job of defending our freedom against those who seek to destroy it. In fact, most of us are not even aware, perhaps not even interested enough to realize that there are efforts being made to destroy our freedom. A freedom which has come down to us at awful cost. We are just as certain that once Americans wake up to the danger, this country will be safe, and so long as America is free, enslaved people everywhere will continue to have hope.

In this effort against the mistaken enemies of freedom, we have the greatest fortification to stand behind that any force has ever had. That is simple faith in God. The history of mankind reveals that the courage to be free has always sprung from a deep abiding faith. Sadly the history of mankind also reveals that every time man has lost his freedom was when his faith had grown cold. So long as we maintain a strong, wholesome, vigorous faith in God, we are well equipped for the struggle against godlessness, the philosophy of the mistaken. If there ever was a natural enemy to atheistic communism, it is faith. This is our main fortification, it may be our last hope.

The second barricade behind which America can stand in our fight for freedom is American business—the most vigorous economic institution ever built on any foundation. It so happens that our foundation is free enterprise, the opportunity system.

But American business, which spends billions of dollars a year for advertising, is not pulling its weight in the hard struggle against freedom's enemies. As a matter of fact, you have only to turn on your radio or television set to find out to what an amazing extent American business will pay for the sponsorship of programs containing subtle propaganda designed to destroy the very system that makes business possible.

There is virtually no end to the influence of advertising on the thinking of Americans. Advertising tells us what kind of toothpaste to use, what kind of clothes to wear, what kind of food to eat and where to buy it, what kind of paint to use on our house, what kind of automobile to drive. Why can't advertising be used to tell of the threats to our freedom and how we can meet those threats?

Don't you agree that the vast majority of Americans will walk an extra block or drive an extra mile to spend their merchandise dollars with a patriotic American merchant who has the courage to say, "I believe in my own country?" Wouldn't you do it? This can be our second greatest fortification, working alongside the tremendous force of a faith-inspired love of freedom.

New, Jesus Christ did not teach any one form of government as a political entity. His emphasis was on the soul. But He taught the dignity of every individual soul. Jesus taught men to love freedom and to be free. Jesus taught that each individual is a sovereignty. When men and women belong to God, they do not fear what man is able to do to them. They have courage to stand for right. It is this torch which has given light to the efforts of man to be free ever since. When the last of His apostles admonished those in whose hands the welfare of the cause of Christ would be left, He said: "Look to yourselves that you lose not those things which we have wrought." Look to yourselves—you must not depend on the other fellow to do it. This is an individual matter. You can't leave it to George. You've got to do it yourself.

Right now, the mighty combined voice of seven generations of our forefathers is echoing down through the corridors of time to tell us, "Look to yourselves that you lose not those things which we have wrought."

This is not a struggle for one man or for a small group of men. It has to be a nationwide undertaking. It calls for knowledge about the objectives of the mistaken. It calls for courage, and it calls for a willingness on the part of Americans everywhere to let the world know that we love our country and our freedom.

Americans have never been lacking in resourcefulness. We need in this hour to summon up determination equal to our resourcefulness—determination not to let freedom's enemies win by default. Determination to make our faith a vital, deep, abiding guide in our every thought and deed. Determination to make our free enterprise system work for freedom as well as for profits. If we can summon up the determination demanded by the necessity that exists, then America will be free for as long as we are disposed to defend it. God willing, freedom-loving Americans will never permit the mistaken to enslave our land.

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 3, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 28, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)

George Washington's Farewell Address, of September 17, 1796, is read yearly in the House and Senate on his birthday. Though his principles are timeless and enduring, it is ironic to recognize how we moderns seem determined to shut our eyes to the great abiding truths. His admonitions include:

1. The importance of the Federal union of States, and strict observance of the Constitution and its proper amendment process (no amendment by reinterpretation);

2. Government by separated divisions is good, each checking the other (no usurpation of power by one branch or of State powers by the Federal Government);

3. There can be no national morality if the sense of religious obligation and principle fails in us. (How do we measure up here?)

4. Preserve public credit, be selective in tax, avoid debt, do not burden posterity (and now even our Government bonds are considered less desirable as investments because Congress has depreciated the value of our money by profligate spending);

5. No entangling alliances or favored treatment of any nation, but rather commerce and enlightened self-interest (check our foreign aid, trade programs, and alliances against this).

The payroll of a Representative is public information, and should be (although this is not so in practice in the Senate). Who is hired and what is paid, within limits, is left largely to the discretion of the individual Congressman. Some hire kinfolks, and some pay higher than others. The judgment of the Congressman is the deciding factor and is, of course, subject to approval or disapproval by the voters every 2 years. For my part, I believe in running my office like a business, with incentive pay the factor—pay well as it's earned but only for equivalent performance, value received. On this basis, my staff measures up. No secrets either; the pay records will always stand public scrutiny.

The criticism of the Senate leadership leveled by Wisconsin Democrat WILLIAM PROXMIRE points up a problem of concern to all Congressmen in both parties. Under our setup, Congressmen are elected to represent specific areas, not parties. But just as power has gravitated from the States and localities to Washington, power in the Congress has tended to concentrate in the hands of the majority party's leadership. When as at present a party's majority is somewhat lopsided, and there's even a modicum of party discipline, the power of the leadership can be rather considerable. Particularly is this so at present when Democrats in both Houses are led by men from the same area who have long worked in close cahoots. Representative government may not be very representative. A legislative program may depend on a party line and how that line is determined can be vitally important. If it's arrived at by political masterminding at the top rather than from the bottom up, defections are inevitable among Congressmen really trying to be representative of their states or districts, rather than just acquiescent cogs in a party machine over which they have no control.

Debt retirement by the Federal Government received some attention this week, with several Texans proposing that a yearly payment on our debt be included in the budget. Many, including myself, applaud the idea, and I want to help in such a worthy effort. But here's the rub: How can we retire the debt by any amount when the Congress continues to spend more than is taken in? We must cut waste and welfare programs so that there is a balance of cash on had in the Treasury to pay down the debt. Isn't this so? The irony of this debt retirement proposal is that some of those sponsoring it are among those regularly voting for bigger Federal spending. For example, one gentleman now voicing support for debt reduction voted only 14 percent for economy and 86 percent for big spending last year; another voted 70 percent of the time for big spending last year. Perhaps this inconsistency was the reason for the exhortation of the public to request less of the Federal Government, and this certainly makes sense. However, I hold that a constitutional democracy in a republic demands that our representatives exercise judgment and self-discipline, be leaders, not followers. Therefore, it is up to Congress to vote "No" to big spending proposals and seek to eliminate waste, and to prevent raids on the Treasury by organized pressure groups.

The battle of the budget (and debt retirement) has become a battle of survival for our type of society and human freedom, as I see it. Surely, it is important for each Member to be more concerned with preserving the fiscal health of this great Nation (through the self-discipline of reduced spending) than with his seat in Congress. It's a simple matter of which comes first. Believing this, I intend to press this viewpoint, questioning no one's motives or integrity. If I must, disagree—but without being disagreeable, disliking only the ideas, not the people involved.

## The Low-Rent Housing Program Is Vital to Community Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I recently was privileged, along with other Members of the Alabama congressional delegation, to attend a meeting here in Washington of the Alabama League of Municipalities.

Reports were made by members of the league, among these being that of Hon. Frank Sikes, mayor of Luverne, Ala. I am privileged to insert his report for the RECORD.

THE LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM IS VITAL TO COMMUNITY GROWTH
(By Frank Sikes, Mayor of Luverne)

First, I would like to talk about Alabama's need for public housing and then delve into

the reasons why an expansion of the program is necessary. I would like to say that the member cities and towns of the Alabama League of Municipalities appreciate—in fact we are proud of—the support the Alabama delegation has given to the low-rent public housing program and urban renewal through the years. It is largely by virtue of your interest and support that these programs have moved forward. I predict that Alabama will be second among all States in the Nation in the number of localities participating in the public housing program before the end of the fiscal year. We had 125 towns participating on January 1, compared to 112 municipalities at the close of 1957. (Georgia is first with 197 towns and cities enrolled and Texas was second at last account on June 30, 1958, with 125 communities.)

The need for more public housing in Alabama is twofold. First, there is the normal or voluntary need. This is supported by the number of applications that may be expected from municipalities which have public housing and will require more units such as Demopolis and Opp, for example, and communities such as Clanton, Atmore, and Fiomaton, which have applied, or are expected to apply, for public housing for the first time.

ENFORCED NEED FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

Second, there is the enforced need. This need is imperative. You are familiar, of course, with the necessity for public housing to house families displaced by urban renewal. In Alabama and the southeast 75 percent of all families to be displaced by urban renewal will be eligible on an income basis for public housing. (See testimony Walter E. Keyes, Regional Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, before Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mobile, Ala., Dec. 30–31, 1957, p. 9.)

I am told that estimates given the housing subcommittee of the Senate and House disclose that half of the families to be displaced by urban renewal in the United States are within the public housing income brackets. We are convinced that we cannot have urban renewal without public housing, because the Housing Act makes it mandatory that standard housing accommodations must be provided for families to be relocated under the urban renewal program. We could, of course, have urban renewal for a time. Time, it has been said, is the servant of all bureaucrats. We can plan and plan and file a carload of blueprints. But there will come a day when the families will have to move and their homes will be razed. I hope to be around at that time.

But let's forget urban renewal for a minute. That subject will be discussed more fully by another mayor this morning. There is a need that is more compelling. That need is for the rehousing of families displaced by the new highway program. The law does not require the rehousing in standard homes of families displaced by superhighways and expressways. It is the moral obligation of the cities, and that is all. Highway construction is let to contractors. Time is money to the contractors. They are going to move in with their bulldozers and road building equipment on schedule. They aren't in the housing business. These superhighways are going to uproot thousands of families in Alabama. There is no surplus of housing in any city in our State. Some of the families perhaps can buy homes under section 221, but those on the public housing income level have neither the credit nor the income to buy a section 221 house. They do well to feed and clothe their families.

HOUSING FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Gentlemen, the average annual net income of families moving into public housing in the United States during 1957 was only $2,138. In the Southeast the average annual net income for the same period was $1,988.

We must have public housing ready for them, even if the law doesn't require it, because it is the right thing to do and because there is no other way they can be rehoused.

Let me cite an example of preparedness for this highway program. The housing authority of the city of Mobile has just applied for an additional 2,180 low-rent public housing dwellings to rehouse families to be displaced by the new highway program. Mobile has 3,776 low-rent housing dwellings already in operation. Mobile also has an urban renewal program and in time will undoubtedly need more units because of urban renewal pressure. Birmingham has 4,262 public housing dwellings in operation or under construction and has an additional 1,500 dwellings reserved. Mayor Jimmy Morgan tells us that he hopes these 1,500 units will be enough to take care of the low-income families to be displaced by highway construction. Birmingham also has an urban renewal program. Montgomery has 2,049 public housing homes in operation and a backlog of only 72 reserved. They will probably need additional units as forerunners to the highway building. Again there is no estimate of the number that will be required for urban renewal.

STATUS OF PROGRAM AS OF JANUARY 1, 1959

Our able executive director Ed E. Reid has forwarded to you an official summary of the status of the low-rent public housing program in Alabama as of January 1. This summary showed that there was a backlog of 2,610 dwellings in the program reservation stage and 16 municipalities have recently applied and were awaiting program reservations. The units reserved represent the voluntary reservation reservoir and do not include the 2,180 Mobile has requested. The State has an additional 3,118 units under annual contributions contract and awating construction, while 19,918 dwellings are currently in operation or under construction in the State.

Gentlemen, few things have happened in our cities that have meant as much as the low-rent public housing program. Public housing has given families an opportunity to live comfortably and to rear their children with due regard for privacy and decency because overcrowding of families is not permitted. We think that it is doing the job it is supposed to do. These homes are assets in our communities to which the people point with pride. We, too, would like to find some alternative for the housing of low-income families but we know there is no alternative. It hasn't been found in 20 years and you know and we know that we aren't likely to find a substitute for a sound subsidized program. We appeal to you to continue your support of an adequate public housing program in the interest of our growing communities and their low-income families.

## Economic Ills of the American Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago HOMER E. CAPEHART, the senior Senator from Indiana, made an address in Miami, Fla. In the course of his remarks, he warned both big business and big labor of their responsibility to the American farming community. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I herewith include excerpts from his remarks:

MIAMI, FLA., February 27.—U.S. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART tonight warned big business and big labor that each has a grave responsibility to become concerned with and help to solve, wherever possible, the economic ills of the American farmer.

"Too many of you have been ignoring for too long the problems which beset our farmers periodically" Senator CAPEHART told a group of bankers and businessmen from throughout the Nation in a luncheon speech at the fifth anniversary ceremonies of the Community National Bank.

"I foresee the possibility that if something isn't done to stabilize the agricultural situation at a sound level within the next 24 months, the entire economy will be in for a severe shock—a shock that would do us much damage, perhaps more, to business and labor than it would to farmers themselves.

"It is just commonsense that when the farm economy goes to pot everybody is going to suffer. The economy is bound to suffer because everything the farmer produces comes from Mother Earth, the only real source of the new wealth required to keep our economy well fed and healthy.

"It follows that when the farmer suffers everybody suffers. Business falls off. That means that eventually jobs for workers fall off. And if you let this process go on long enough, you end up with a serious, serious economic situation.

"That, of course, we must avoid. And what I am saying to you gentlemen—to big business and big labor because we have both in this country—is that for your own good and the good of the American economy generally you had better get busy and study this farm problem and try to do something about it.

"The economic interests of the 6 million farms in this country are your interests too."

## The Late Hon. Herman P. Eberharter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 5, 1959*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, once I read a short and not very well written bit of verse by an unknown author. Despite its grammatical shortcomings, the message it carries is most evident. It reads:

A man of greatness is he
Who lives to serve his neighbor.
No matter how tough the going may be
He continues to give his best.

I knew the late Hon. Herman P. Eberharter, Representative from the 28th District of Pennsylvania, well and intimately throughout the period of my service in Congress. Somehow I feel that a little bit of verse could well be applied to him.

Its simple words by no means define the many contributions to mankind that Herman Eberharter gave through his untiring devotion to his duty and through his effective and capable leadership. He was solid, sound and substantial. His death is indeed a great loss to all of us and I join with his friends in expressing the deepest regrets to his

family. I take comfort, however, in the fact that his accomplishments during his lifetime and his fine spirit will be remembered as an example for others to follow.

## Two Strikes on Warren Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that Congress failed to take corrective action last year in the most important field of preemption of legislative prerogatives by the Supreme Court of the United States. During the 1958 campaign, I had occasion to "feel the pulse" of the people in my district on the question of legislation to correct certain decisions of the Court which have clearly encroached upon the legislative prerogatives of the Congress. I have found that the people expect action by Congress in this field. I trust that we will be able to deal with this problem in the not too distant future for it is most necessary that we do so, particularly in the present time of crisis which once again demonstrates the futility of expecting anything but duplicity on the part of the Communist regime.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from today's edition of the New York Daily News which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

TWO STRIKES ON WARREN COURT

The Earl Warren Supreme Court now has two strikes against it, pitched by those who know the Warren court best.

Some months ago, the association of the States' supreme court chief justices issued a long, detailed and strongly worded statement about this tribunal.

It was charged with frequently going outside its proper field of law interpretation, and was earnestly urged to try using some self-restraint for a change.

Last week in Chicago, the American Bar Association's 246-member house of delegates—the ABA's ruling body—overwhelmingly adopted and made official a report on the Warren court's pro-Communist leanings turned in by the ABA's special committee on Communist tactics, strategy and objectives.

This blast summed up in detail the court's 23 worst pro-Red decisions, plus one case still not finally disposed of, and recommended congressional action to undo these rulings' damage to the Nation insofar as it can be undone.

Such action would include laws enabling the States to enact and enforce statutes against sedition * * * restoring to the Smith Antisubversive Act of 1940 its original provision that it is a crime to advocate the U.S. Government's violent overthrow * * * cracking the Warren court's handcuffs off the House Committee on Un-American Activities * * * and in other ways beefing up the Governments' power to fight the criminal Red conspiracy.

The next pitch, we'd say, is up to Congress. The object would be, not to strike the Supreme Court out (after all, we've got to have courts, including this one), but to shove it back into its own domain.

That domain is the field of interpretation of laws, whereas this Court has time and again bulged over into Congress' field of making laws.

Congress, we believe, should have acted long ago to beat back these invasions of its territory. It came within an ace of doing so last year, but was stopped by its liberals with the aid of the curious Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas.

Now that the Warren court has been indicted, so to speak, by a grand jury of State supreme court justices and by another grand jury of eminent and responsible lawyers, what excuse can there be for Congress' putting off appropriate action any longer?

## More Convenient Care for Alaskan Mental Patients Comes Through Efforts of Oregon's Congresswoman Edith Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding role in providing more convenient care for mental patients in Alaska was played by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN of Oregon. She worked actively to change the existing program whereby the mentally ill of the then Territory had to be sent thousands of miles away from family and friends to a private hospital in Oregon.

Today a new State hospital is being constructed in Alaska. The patients will go there.

EDITH GREEN and others who worked for this logical improvement were condemned by unthinking people, but their humanitarian efforts were not silenced. The picture today is vastly improved.

It is my privilege, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, to include an editorial from Labor entitled "Her Courage Paid Off," which comments on this matter. Labor has given deserved written tribute to my friend and senior colleague from Oregon:

HER COURAGE PAID OFF

It's worth while to recall a courageous battle fought by Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, and to report the outcome. The story is as follows:

Several years ago, Mrs. GREEN pointed out to the House that there was not a single mental hospital in Alaska to serve its people. They had to send their mentally ill loved ones thousands of miles away to a private hospital in Oregon, which had a contract with the Federal Government.

Moreover, under an old, outworn and cruel law, to get even this distant care an unfortunate man, woman, or child had to be "convicted" in an Alaska court, just as though he or she had committed a crime by becoming mentally ill.

A bill to modernize and humanize that law, and to establish a public hospital in Alaska, was introduced by Mrs. GREEN, though the private hospital which was profiting from the old system was in her district and much local pressure was put on her to stop her fight for the voteless Alaskans.

Also, as Labor reported at the time, a weird but powerful nationwide lobby spread vicious propaganda calling the proposed Alaska hospital, and the public land with which it would be endowed under the bill, a "New Siberia, U.S.A." to which opponents of the Eisenhower administration would be "exiled" under some dark and devious plot.

Now, to bring the story up to date: The Oregon Congresswoman continued her fight despite the odds which seemed to be piling up against her, and she finally won. The hospital she advocated is being constructed and has been taken over by the new State government of Alaska. The proprietors of the private profit hospital in Oregon are being investigated on income tax charges. The malicious propaganda campaign against Mrs. GREEN and her bill has "gone with the wind." Her courage paid off.

## A Tribute to Andrija Stampar, M.D., 1888–1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation to the 10th World Health Assembly, which met in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1957, I had the privilege of getting to know Dr. Andrija Stampar, of Yugoslavia, who was one of the founders of the World Health Organization and who, in 1957, was still a vigorous leader in world health. I share the sense of loss that was felt by the public health professions at his death last year. We can all be grateful for his part in building an organization that provides such a splendid medium through which our medical and health leaders can work toward the common good in a spirit of friendship with their colleagues from all parts of the world.

Dr. Henry van Zile Hyde, of the Public Health Service, who worked closely with Dr. Stampar for many years, has written a tribute to him which was published in the December 1958 issue of the American Journal of Public Health. This tribute gives us a picture of an unusual man who contributed greatly to public health in his own country and in the world at large. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Dr. Hyde entitled "A Tribute to Andrija Stampar, M.D.":

A TRIBUTE TO ANDRIJA STAMPAR, M.D., 1888–1958

(By Henry van Zile Hyde, M.D., F.A.P.H.A.)

It was the spring of 1946, the third day of the session of the Technical Preparatory Committee of the World Health Organization at the Palais d'Orsay Hotel in Paris. Down the long corridors stomped a broad-shouldered storm cloud with a rounded head. As he approached us, standing outside the door of the gilded room serving as the secretariat office, he broke into a staccato outburst of expressive English, unembroidered by articles and connectives. His wrath was justified. It had taken him 7 days to traverse the distance from Zagreb to Paris, with interminable interruptions in unexpected and inconvenient places for inspection of his documentation. It was postwar Europe.

Thus, some of us met Andrija Stampar, a man whose name we had known and whose force we had already felt, the man known to

many in a seriocomic vein as the Bear of the Balkans. It was to be our privilege to know him and work with him for the next 12 years. His death is a personal loss and a loss to public health, for he was indeed one of the great men of our profession.

Andrija Stampar—as he unfolded his tale bit by bit over the years—was the son of an itinerant pedagog in Croatia, itinerant not because he loved to wander but because of his liberalism. Soon, in any village, he would test the mettle of the conservatives with his views on life and society, and would in due course be asked to leave forthwith. Packing wife and worldly goods into a donkey cart with children trailing along, he would move to another village where his expanding reputation had not yet penetrated. In due course, the story repeated itself. I learned this from Andrija Stampar, one of the boys who trudged behind—only to march forward in later life proclaiming on a world stage the liberalism learned in such a hard school.

In the course of this tenuous existence, one dear lady recognized the potentialities latent in her son's playmate and took Andrija under her wing. In due course she made it possible for him to go to Vienna for an education. He told me once of this trek. His mother provided him with a ham to sustain him on his long walk north. On arrival in Vienna, the young, lone wanderer found a boardinghouse and moved in. Very shortly a crisis developed. He had finished his ham bone and disposed of it in that new wonder—new to him, that is—the inside flush toilet. He said, and doubtless quite rightly, that the result was catastrophic for the plumbing and led to altercations with his new-found hosts. Thus began the education of a great sanitarian.

On his return to Yugoslavia, he rejoined his family, now in better circumstances. His education had been intensive and he was an intense man. And he was profoundly shy. When his sister had friends visiting her, he would repair to his room and lose himself in his books. On one occasion his sister created a crisis by inviting a friend to spend the weekend with her. Before dinner she went to her brother's room and told him that he must make an appearance and must also join in the family activities throughout the weekend. There was no escape for Andrija. So, having combed his hair well and dressed appropriately for the ordeal, he went to the living room, stood in the door, and surveyed the group. His eyes lit upon his sister's friend across the room; he stood transfixed, and then pointing at her blurted out, "I'm going to marry you." During the succeeding months he trudged over the fields in the moonlight to sit enraptured outside her house, eventually gathering sufficient courage to call upon her. In due course, yes, he married her. The clarity of vision, the decisiveness, and, indeed, the shyness persisted through the years as hallmarks of his character and personality.

This doctor of medicine became progressively a doctor of public health, but never lost touch with the science of medicine. When his country, Yugoslavia, was created at Versailles, he became its first director of health. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that in this new country, new and amorphous, he gave leadership to the development of what became its public health service. It was characterized by quality, breadth of coverage, and the spirit of service. It reflected the intensity and the quality of the man himself and soon became a model health service on which the eyes of the world were focused through the League of Nations, which he was called to serve for 6 years, from 1931 to 1937. Later, his influence spread through his activity as a teacher, as visiting professor of public health at the University of California, and as professor and later rector of the University of Zagreb.

Then came the collapse and destruction of World War II. He was captured when the Germans moved into Zagreb. Again he had a story to tell. He was at first imprisoned in his hometown. His first wife had died some years before and he had married a lovely, gracious physician who had been a member of his public health staff. He liked to tell, jokingly, that he had married her because she brought so many problems to him that he decided the best solution was to take her out of public health. This was his shy way of covering up with a jest one of the tenderest and most delightful marriages it has ever been my joy to witness. But to get back to the prison story, Mrs. Stampar nightly made rounds of the prison walls hoping to catch a glimpse of her husbands at one of the windows. Night after night she did this with no luck. One night she noted a cluster of women standing in front of the great main gate. It appeared that they were to be admitted into the prison for some reason that was not apparent. She took a chance and joined the group. In due course, the German prison guard threw wide the huge iron gates and waved the group of women in. They were then conducted in a direction which Mrs. Stampar, as a physician who had attended patients in the prison on occasion, recognized as the route to the clinic. Then it suddenly struck her that she was in the midst of a group of prostitutes headed for inspection. On arrival at the clinic, she was recognized by the physician in charge, a Zagreb colleague. He beckoned her aside and ushered her into a side room without comment. He then summoned Dr. Stampar to report to the clinic and ushered him into the same room. Every night thereafter Mrs. Stampar visited her husband until he was whisked away into a prison in Austria. When she next saw him, she did not recognize him. An emaciated shadow of himself, he walked unheralded and unrecognized up the sidewalk to the porch of his home, where the family was sitting.

Andrija Stampar recuperated quickly from his grim years in prison, and emerged rapidly into world leadership. When he appeared in Paris on that day in 1946, he was not just the competent health expert of Yugoslavia, he was also vice president of the Economic and Social Council of the newly formed United Nations. It was under his acting chairmanship of that council, in fact, that the Technical Preparatory Committee for the World Health Organization had been organized and convened. He was again a world leader. During the weeks in Paris, those of us who worked with him soon overcame our trepidation and found that the bear of the Balkans was a very friendly bruin indeed—a friend of all mankind.

The next time that many of us saw Dr. Stampar was at the International Health Conference in New York a few months later when the constitution of the World Health Organization was drawn up and adopted. He called that unique conference of Nations to order, turning the gravel over to Dr. Thomas Parran when the latter was elected its president. Stampar continued to take a leading role in the conference as chairman of the Yugoslav delegation and a member of the steering committee. His prestige, the force of his personality, and the general aura of wisdom that surrounded him made him one of its most effective participants. Probably his major contribution to the constitution of the World Health Organization, as one looks back on the Paris and New York meetings that developed it, was the broad vision incorporated in its oft-quoted preamble.

At New York an Interim Commission of 18 nations was established and Stampar was elected its chairman, presiding over the commission at its meetings, which took place quarterly during the succeeding two years. This was not an easy task. There were knotty, emotionally charged problems to be decided that would shape the long future of the World Health Organization. Divisive forces were at work. Cultural backgrounds varied widely. Experience in international cooperation was limited, but faith and hope were high. Disparate basic objectives split East and West. There was great imbalance in national strength, both technical, and financial. Different interpretations, even of the workings of the democratic process, intruded themselves. The validity of the vote, which we accept so instinctively as a useful and welcome device to settle controversial points, was even open to question.

Over this complex situation Stampar presided with skill, charm, and effectiveness, becoming, as Time magazine once pointed out, a crusader for unanimity. The decisions taken during the two years of the life of the Interim Commission brought organization into the disordered international health scene, fused existing agencies into the new structure, launched new programs, and set the pattern for even bigger things in the WHO itself.

Then in 1948 came at last the First World Health Assembly—commemorated this year on its 10th anniversary—at which the road had to be laid out for the long future of the WHO. Basic decisions on organizational structure, administration, budget, program had to be made. There was a tussle over the question whether the organization should be a technical one providing technical services, or a supply organization on the pattern of UNRRA. There were other questions that would determine the very nature of this new world enterprise. Over all this Andrija Stampar presided.

Stampar sat high on the podium of the great Assembly Hall of the Palais des Nations, known to diplomats and sightseers the world over, at the moment of greatest crisis in the affairs of WHO. In accepting the WHO constitution, the United States had reserved the right to withdraw. In the nature of things diplomatic, it is necessary that all parties to an international agreement accept any reservation made by a ratifying nation. Normally this is done through the long, slow, and cumbersome methods of age-old diplomacy. In this case, however, the Secretary General of the United Nations, with whom the treaty had been deposited, rules he would accept the U.S. ratification as valid if the Assembly, representative of the full membership of WHO, made a unanimous request that he do so. Here was a great moment in the life of WHO. Would any single nation oppose U.S. membership? The members of the Soviet bloc, no longer allies of the West, were in the Assembly Hall, duly accredited. A Yugoslav was in the chair. It was June, 1948, and within days Yugoslavia was to be unceremoniously booted out of the Cominform. Things were tense among nations. Friends of the United States moved to the rostrum, expressing confidence, praise, and support. Then the vice minister of health of the Soviet Union took the rostrum. Tension filled the hall and Stampar's grim visage reflected the mood of all who wondered and feared at this moment of crisis for the future of that which had been so carefully constructed for the welfare of all mankind. In the Palais in those days there was no simultaneous translation, but we knew that Dr. Stampar understood Russian and so watched his face keenly for an answer to our fears.

As the Russian spoke with force and vigor, and at what seemed interminable length, Stampar's face remained grimly set. There was no look of hope. The Russian, as we discovered later, was giving no quarter but was criticizing the United States for talking of death at a time of birth. Then—a final

sentence, and a beam of joy erupted on Stampar's face, telling all of us electrically that the Soviet Union had supported the admission of the United States to the World Health Organization. Our Russian colleague had grudgingly stated that, despite our bad behavior, we were perforce essential to the WHO. It was this message that Stampar transmitted to us and to the delegations throughout that great assembly hall without a spoken word. Throughout his life he had had many tense moments, many moments of doubt and fear, yet one can believe that perhaps this was his greatest moment, because it involved not only himself and his family but his great concern for the world and the people in it. And it had come out right for him and for mankind.

Stampar was a man of force and conviction. There were times when we would have been glad to skin the bear of the Balkans and hang his hide high on a tree. But there existed always the underlying affection and the deep-seated respect that made us realize that when he was not right he certainly meant to be. Our contacts with him were deep rooted in friendship and affection.

At home as well as abroad Stampar continued as a leader to the moment of his final illness and death. He had worked effectively under the monarchy and under the Tito regime. No one seemed quite to know his politics because perhaps his politics were only people and their needs. His country and his colleagues recognized his worth and his greatness, signalizing it by electing him president of the Yugoslav Academy of Science—which is one of the highest distinctions that can come to a man of his country.

Those of us who knew Andrija Stampar have been saddened to learn of his death. Untold millions who have never heard of him have lost a friend who worked for them incessantly and stubbornly, who fought for them valiantly. His name will live in the history of public health.

## Hon. Daniel Alden Reed

SPEECH
OF
## HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 19, 1959*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of representing the people of the Third District of Florida since my election to the 77th Congress on November 5, 1940. When I compare these few years with the years of service by the late Honorable DANIEL ALDEN REED, Representative of the 43d District of New York, I realize even more the vast storehouse of knowledge and experience of which we are deprived today.

One has only to take a glance at a biographical sketch of this outstanding servant of the people to understand the greatness of his works and the leadership which he so unselfishly gave throughout his life. His honors, his accomplishments, and his many unpublicized moments of counsel, advice, and assistance to his colleagues establish DAN REED, as he was so affectionately known, as a member of that rare group of truly outstanding leaders our country has produced.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sincere sympathies to the family and friends of DAN REED. At the same time, I hope that others may follow the good examples and works of DAN REED, a great leader in Congress for a period which embraced nearly one-fourth of the life of the Republic.

## American Bar Association Supports House-Passed Bill To Free the Federal Payroll of Communists and Fellow Travelers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I share the deep concern expressed by the American Bar Association in its resolution recommending prompt enactment of legislation to close loopholes in the law which permit Communists and fellow travelers in many Federal positions.

After full and complete consideration of individual rights as well as national security requirements, the American Bar Association has strongly endorsed legislation to prevent Federal employment of Communists and subversives—S. 1411—as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and passed by an overwhelming vote in the House last year.

Unfortunately, this urgently needed legislation was not acted on by the other body when we could not obtain conference agreement on the House-passed bill.

I agree wholeheartedly with the action of the American Bar Association in thus squarely endorsing the action taken last year by the House of Representatives. The resolution once more confirms the determination made by this House, that a security system for Federal employment, to be really effective, should be spelled out clearly in the law rather than left to the whims and caprices of administrative officials.

As far back as 1946 I secured the adoption of a resolution to investigate reports of malfunctioning of the Federal employees' loyalty program. Investigation disclosed extreme laxity in certain parts of the executive branch concerning infiltration of subversive elements. Based on these findings, a Federal employees' loyalty program was established—but soon proved inadequate because not based on law. The House of Representatives in 1948 approved my bill to establish an effective loyalty program, but there again the other body did not act. Finally, the House passed a bill in the 81st Congress which was approved by the other body and became Public Law 733, providing for summary removal of Federal employees whose actions jeopardize national security.

Public Law 733 was seriously weakened, as a measure to protect national security, by the Supreme Court decision in Cole against Young. The Court decision invalidated a portion of the Executive order on securities issued in 1953 and thereby opened the door for many known security risks to force their way back on the Federal payroll. Also, under this and later decisions, the Government has been required to give over $450,000 in back pay to persons who had been removed from Federal positions as security risks. This came about, not because these persons are not security risks but solely because of the technicality that their positions had not been specifically designated as "sensitive."

The real issue is simply this: Should any individual who is a Communist, fellow traveler, or subversive hold any public office or position in the Government of the United States? The American Bar Association now has joined with the House of Representatives in answering "No." After full deliberation, and with proper consideration of the protection of individual rights in the light of the national interest, they strongly urge enactment of Federal employees' security legislation approved by the House last year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I can assure the Members that one of the first bills to be brought to the floor by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in this session will be the bill to close existing loopholes and provide a permanent, fair, and effective security program for Federal employment. These are the major provisions of such legislation:

First. The head of any department or agency may suspend any employee when deemed necessary in the interest of national security.

Second. Within 30 days, after such suspension, the employee shall have an opportunity to reply.

Third. After complete review of investigation the department or agency head may separate the employee if he determines it necessary in the interest of national security.

Fourth. The suspended employee is entitled to a written statement of charges, reasonable opportunity to answer, a hearing, review by the department head, and a written decision.

Fifth. The term "national security" means all Government activities of the United States involving national safety and security, and every Government employee is deemed to be engaged in an activity involving national security.

Sixth. Any reinstated employee shall be paid for time improperly off the payroll in an amount not to exceed the amount he would have earned had he not been separated, less any earnings during the separation.

Seventh. Procedures under the Lloyd-Lafollette Act of 1912 or the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as applicable, must be followed in any suspension or separation, to the extent consistent with national security.

Eighth. Any employee separated under the security provisions is entitled to appeal to the Civil Service Commission for complete review and the Commission's decision is final and must be followed by the department or agency.

This legislation, as was the case with S. 1411 last year, reaffirms the intent of

Public Law 733 as enacted by the 81st Congress. It gives every proper measure of protection to the loyal employee, and at the same time will help keep the Federal payroll clear of Communists and fellow travelers. It will place in effect most of the recommendations of the Wright Commission on Federal employees' security. This Commission, appointed by the President several years ago, submitted a report of nearly 1,000 pages and recommended even stronger Federal employees' security legislation. Mr. Wright, chairman of the Commission, in testimony before our committee, endorsed this legislation and added:

It is a tragedy, indeed, that we need any loyalty or security programs, and I fervently hope that the day will hasten when we can abolish them. Until that day, however, we dare not forget that the threat is not only real but formidable.

The discerning and forthright resolution of the American Bar Association is in the highest public service tradition of this great professional association. Its report and resolution are of great value in bringing to public attention the crucial importance of early legislation providing the means to deal permanently and effectively with the problem of subversive infiltration in our more than 2 million Federal positions. I commend this report and resolution to the attention of all Members of the 86th Congress.

## Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 17, 1959*

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert an article on the subject of "Freedom," eloquently written by Mr. George W. Schroeder, editor of the Southern Baptist Brotherhood Journal, and as this article appeared in the quarterly issue of April 1959 of that publication. Mr. Schroeder is one of the great religious leaders among Southern Baptists and he is certainly interested in the future welfare of our country and in the preservation of its freedom at all times. The article is as follows:

FREEDOM

(By George W. Schroeder)

Freedom—what a glorious word. It vibrates with all that man values in this world in which he lives. Embodied in it are all the basic elements that give life purpose and meaning. With it, and if properly used, man can achieve new heights—prove his worth. Without it, man loses his individuality. Truthfully, freedom is something man does not fully appreciate until it is lost. Then, having lost it, he will give his very life to once again attain it.

We who live in the United States have been given the priceless heritage of freedom. Because of the concern, convictions, and determination of our forefathers, we have been endowed with a way of life that enables us to be free men in a free society, a goal toward which many nations of people strive but few attain.

Consider, however, the kind of a nation of people we would be if we were deprived of the freedoms we are privileged to enjoy. What if those in high office took from us the rights of freedom of assemblage, worship, speech, press, the ballot, fair trial, and pursuit of happiness? If we were deprived of such freedoms overnight, then undoubtedly this Nation would quickly be in civil war. Yet, and understandably so, those who would seek to destroy such freedoms within our Nation would be foolish to endeavor to take from us such cherished possessions overnight. Rather, their strategy would be to take small privileges from us constantly, striving continually to the end of complete domination. Such procedure would achieve selfish ends without being conspicuous.

The time has come in our Nation's history when every thinking individual needs to look about him to see what is happening in this matter of freedom. Slowly but surely many of our basic freedoms are being taken from us. At the time they seem to be small freedoms without deep significance. Yet, an analysis will show that embodied in these deprived rights are the very taproots that can ultimately take from us all our basic freedoms. If one doubts the truth of this statement let him look, if no further, at least into the matter of what is happening in this Nation concerning freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, all of which are involved in the matter of separation of church and state. If one will honestly seek to analyze the meaning behind some of the events that have come to pass in these areas, he will become alarmed with what has been done and what can be the ultimate end if such a pattern is not checked immediately.

The writer is not an alarmist. He does, however, believe that he is a realist. As such, he suggests that we take a deep look at our freedoms in this Nation, and then silently but determinedly resolve that under God we are going to preserve our basic freedoms to the end that we may pass on to those who follow this glorious heritage of being a free man in a free society.

## Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for many years there has arisen, from time to time, a movement to make October 12, Columbus Day, a national holiday. It is true that nearly all the States today observe it in one form or another, either as a legal or a public holiday. My purpose, however, in introducing this bill is to make October 12 a truly national holiday, sponsored by the Federal Government. There has, properly speaking, been but one occasion when Congress has purported to declare a national holiday throughout the United States, and that was by the act of March 2, 1889, which used the expression with reference to the following April 30, the "Centennial Anniversary of the Inauguration of the First President of the United States."

I submit that it is time to break the precedent again and the purpose of this bill—H.R. 418—is to declare October 12 a permanent national holiday. No anniversary, surely, could be more basic nor fundamental than that which marks that day in the year 1492 when the eyes of Christopher Columbus first beheld an outpost of the New World. Although he did not know it was a new world, believing it to be merely the western Indies, and died in that belief, it was nonetheless the faith and persistence of this one man, in the face of almost inconceivable obstacles and heartbreaking humiliation and delay, which threw open a new hemisphere for the settlement of mankind and the eventual emergence of a great republic founded on democracy and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Surely this epochal day merits a yearly observance, both in tribute to the man himself and to an event which forever changed the face of the earth and altered the destiny of the human race.

## Investigations Stymied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 2, 1959*

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to a very timely and aptly worded editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Journal, Shreveport, La., under date of February 26, 1957:

INVESTIGATIONS STYMIED

"I decline to answer on the grounds my answer may tend to incriminate me" might well be the death sentence of congressional investigating committee.

Recent months have seen virtually every witness summoned before legislative committees looking into such vitally important topics as Teamster gangsterism, coin machine industry terrorism by organized hoodlums—and various other examples of the invasion of many areas of the economy by the most vicious thugs, leeches, and racketeers—hide his record under the Bill of Rights, and with complete immunity.

In over-zealous efforts to protect the rights of the individual, Federal courts have almost unanimously thrown out contempt citations against recalcitrant congressional witnesses. Despite the fact that many witnesses refuse to answer any of as many as 50 questions (including "What is your name?") on the grounds of possible incrimination—and with the obvious intention of using the fifth amendment to the Constitution solely as a means of refusing to testify—the courts refuse to honor congressional contempt citations against them.

The record for the past 9 years is sufficient to cause lawmakers to wonder just what authority they have remaining to force witnesses to testify. Since 1950, of all the witnesses cited for contempt by Congress, 78 were indicted, 28 convicted, 15 of these convictions were reversed, 9 are pending on appeal, 2 were fined, and 2 served jail sentences. Those two who managed to slip by the courts into jail served only 90 days each.

Constitutional guarantees formerly were invoked by witnesses only as a last resort, and then only for a particularly incriminat-

ing question. Now witnesses will not even answer a question about the weather, except to say, "I decline to answer, etc."

Congress might as well save its time and the taxpayers' money in its racket investigations. Shorn of the strong weapon of contempt of Congress by the courts, congressional investigators are virtually powerless to force revelation of underworld tactics.

## The Federal Law of Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the law of conspiracy has had a tremendous development in our Federal courts. Public prosecutors are using it more and more to reach out to net persons accused of crime when the statute barring prosecution has long since passed and also to bring into the trial hearsay testimony which even though uncorroborated is sufficient to convict the accused.

Bar associations and practitioners of criminal law are complaining today as to the use of the law of conspiracy in our Federal courts. They feel that lawyers, bar associations, and people interested in civil and individual liberties should be alerted to the dangers inherent in the present rules governing trials of conspiracy indictments.

One of the outstanding members of the New York Bar, with extensive experience in defending the many accused in Federal courts, has made a keen analysis of the outstanding cases of the law of conspiracy, its dangers, and its unfair application. I believe that people interested in individual liberties and in the maintenance of fair trials will find an article entitled "The Federal Law of Conspiracy" to be of inestimable value and of great interest.

The following is an article written on the Federal law of conspiracy by Menahem Stim, a member of the New York Bar:

THE FEDERAL LAW OF CONSPIRACY

(By Menahem Stim, member of the New York Bar)

The practitioner in the criminal parts of the Federal district courts, when defending a client charged with a violation of a Federal criminal statute, is generally confronted with an indictment which invariably contains in addition to the count charging the substantive offense, a separate count charging a conspiracy to commit the substantive offense.

The usual inclusion of a conspiracy count in Federal indictments makes the defense of persons charged with Federal criminal violations a very difficult task indeed. Difficult as it is to defend one accused in a Federal criminal court of a substantive offense only, because of the Federal rule, which unlike the State rule, permits a conviction based solely on the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice (see *Poliafico* v. *U.S.*, 237 F. 2d 97, certiorari denied 77 S. Ct. 590, 352 U.S. 1025, 1 L. ed. 2d 597, rehearing denied, 77 S. Ct. 718, 353 U.S. 931, 1 L. ed. 2d 725) such a task becomes almost hopeless, when the indictment contains the usual count charging the defendant, in addition to the substantive offense, with a conspiracy to commit the substantive offense.

The prosecution then has the unfair advantage because of the peculiar Federal law of conspiracy, which permits the introduction of clearly hearsay evidence admitted subject to connection, thus in effect permitting the jury to hear hearsay evidence which while ostensibly offered only in support of the conspiracy charge, in practice is used to support a jury's finding of guilt on the substantive charge as well. While the trial courts invariably admonish the juries and point out to them the limitation on the admissibility of this type of evidence, it is a known fact that it would require an extremely intelligent jury to sift and separate the evidence which is hearsay under all circumstances as to the substantive charge but which on the theory that it was connected by other evidence becomes competent as to the conspiracy charge. The result of this practice of combining a substantive charge in an indictment with a count charging conspiracy is generally responsible for many verdicts of guilty based primarily on evidence, which even under the broad Federal rules as to the admission of uncorroborated accomplice testimony, could not have been admitted if the indictment contained a substantive charge only. Is it any wonder that statistics issued by the Attorney General of the United States showing a percentage of convictions of nearly 90 in all criminal cases tried in Federal courts, read like election returns from one-party countries?

Let us consider the Federal statute which defines a conspiracy and provides punishment for a violation thereof. Section 371 of chapter 19 of title 18 of United States Code, annotated, reads as follows:

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States or any agent thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to affect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both. If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor, June 25, 1948, c. 645, 62 Stat. 701."

The general conspiracy statute as quoted in section 371, supra, embraces every type of Federal criminal conspiracy except certain specific conspiracies covered by special statutes and relating to specific offenses such as a conspiracy to: cast away or destroy a vessel (sec. 2271, title 18); to gather defense information (sec. 794, title 18); to injure property of a foreign government (sec. 956, title 18); to kidnap (sec. 1201, title 18); and a seditious conspiracy (sec. 2384, title 18).

In order to make out a prima facie case in a conspiracy indictment, the Government must allege and prove that two or more persons conspired to commit the unlawful act. It is sufficient to name only one person as a defendant, providing another person or persons are listed as co-conspirators. The Government must also allege and prove at least one overt act by the defendant or a co-conspirator made in pursuance of the conspiracy. The overt act need not be an illegal one. It may even be an innocent act but it must be done in pursuance of the conspiracy.

To prove the conspiracy, the Government is permitted under the very broad rules of evidence as applicable to proof of a conspiracy, to introduce testimony by witnesses to conversations or acts by one or more of the conspirators (who need not necessarily be named as defendants) had or done not in the presence of or with the knowledge of the defendant or defendants named in the indictment. This testimony, which under ordinary rules of evidence would be inadmissible in a trial of an indictment containing substantive charge only is nevertheless admissible "subject to connection" in the trial of an indictment which in addition to the substantive charge contains also a count charging a conspiracy, although such admission is received presumably only in support of the conspiracy charge alone. As long as these conversations or acts testified to occurred during the period of the conspiracy charged in the indictment and providing the particular defendant's participation in the alleged conspiracy is proven by evidence however slight of an independent nature, either circumstantial or direct, the patently hearsay evidence admitted as against a particular defendant "subject to connection" becomes binding upon him on the theory that the conversations or acts were those of agents in the unlawful combination.

Nor is there any legal bar to the introduction by the prosecution of incriminating evidence covering a period antedating a particular defendant's joining the alleged conspiracy providing such evidence covers acts or conversations by other coconspirators during the life of the conspiracy. This evidence becomes binding on the particular defendant on the theory that upon joining the conspiracy, he ratified all of the acts of the other conspirators performed in pursuance of the conspiracy although occurring prior to that defendant's joining of the conspiracy.

It is only when the conspiracy is completed, and that is generally on the date when the indictment is returned, that any evidence concerning conversations or acts by a particular defendant occurring after that date is binding on that defendant alone and cannot be admitted as against the other defendants charged with the conspiracy.

The law presumes that a conspiracy is terminated when its object is accomplished by success or is defeated by failure. The arrest of the conspirators would of course indicate the end of the conspiracy unless as the prosecution contended in *U.S.* v. *Reina, et al.*, 242 F. 2d 302, the conspiracy continued even after one of the conspirators was arrested. As to any particular defendant his participation in the conspiracy ends when he abandons the conspiracy and when he does so, he cannot be charged with any acts of the other conspirators occurring after his abandonment of the conspiracy. But again it is almost impossible for such a defendant to prove the abandonment, as the law requires an affirmative act on the part of the defendant claiming that he disassociated himself from the conspiracy at a certain time.

The conspiracy law became a potent factor in the prosecution of Federal crimes. It can be said without any fear of contradiction, at least as far as observed by the author's experience of almost 30 years of practice in the local Federal courts, that the vast majority of the Federal indictments in the southern and eastern districts of New York contain conspiracy charges in addition to the substantive offenses charged and were successfully prosecuted primarily because of the inclusion of conspiracy charges in the indictments.

The appellate courts generally affirm such convictions. As long as the record shows the necessary minimum evidence legally sufficient to sustain the conviction unaffected by error, the conviction is affirmed. The appellate courts were and still are influenced by the Federal harmless-error statute (sec. 269 of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. sec. 391). The general policy of these courts is that a Federal appellate court under the harmless-error statute should permit a judgment to stand notwithstanding error where the court is satisfied that the error did not influence the jury or had but very slight effect on it, except perhaps where the departure is from a constitutional norm or a specific command of Congress. As the Supreme Court said in

*Kotteakos* v. *United States*, 328 U.S. 750 at p. 763:

"Thus it is not the appellate court's function to determine guilt or innocence * * * nor is it to speculate upon probable reconviction and decide according to how the speculation comes out. Appellate judges cannot escape such impressions. But they may not make them sole criteria for reversal or affirmance. Those judgments are exclusively for the jury, given always the necessary minimum evidence legally sufficient to sustain the conviction unaffected by the error." See also *Weiler* v. *U.S.*, 323 U.S. at 611, 89 L. ed. 499, 65 S. Ct. 548; *Bollenbach* v. *U.S.*, 326 U.S. 607, 612, 613, ante 350, 354, 355, 66 S. Ct. 402.

Lately, however, the Federal appellate courts, while still adhering to the doctrine of the harmless-error statute, have begun to scrutinize the conspiracy convictions more carefully as they begin to realize that justice is not always done in these cases, especially when under the guise of the conspiracy law and the wide latitude permitted in the offer of proof, that this law gives to prosecutors, indictments are being returned against numerous defendants grouped together in one overall conspiracy, because of the possibility, if not certainty, that juries will sweep all into the conspiracy charged because of their association with each other, especially when a proper climate is created through wide newspaper publicity prior to the trials. That was especially true in cases where the defendants were accused of a conspiracy to violate the Smith Act and is now true in indictments charging a conspiracy to violate the Federal narcotic laws. Whether we care to admit it or not, guilt by association plays an important part in jury verdicts in cases of this type.

This tendency by ambitious and overzealous Federal prosecutors to use the conspiracy law to bring about mass trials, where numerous defendants are charged with one overall conspiracy although the proof at the trial shows several distinct and not related conspiracies was condemned by the Supreme Court of the United States as early as 1946 in the leading case of *Kotteakos* v. *U.S.*, cited, supra.

In that case 32 persons were named in the indictment. Only 19 defendants were brought to trial and 13 were submitted to the jury. The jury convicted 7, acquitted 2, and disagreed as to 4. The only question raised before the Supreme Court was whether the petitioner-defendants suffered substantial prejudice from being convicted on a single general conspiracy by evidence which the Government admitted proved not one conspiracy but some eight or more different ones of the same sort, executed through a common key figure, one Simon Brown.

The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the Judgments of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York (151 F. 2d 170). The court of appeals conceded that the trial judge "was plainly wrong in supposing that upon the evidence there could be a single conspiracy; and in the view which he took of the law, he should have dismissed the indictment" (151 F. 2d at 172) but it nevertheless affirmed the conviction, saying among other things, that "especially since guilt was so manifest, it was 'proper' to join the conspiracies, and to reverse the conviction would be a miscarriage of justice." The Supreme Court granted certiorari "because of the importance of the question for the administration of criminal justice in the Federal Courts" (326 U.S. 711, ante 420, 68 S. Ct. 169).

In reversing the conviction (328 U.S. 750–780, the Court by Mr. Justice Rutledge said inter alia:

"There are times when of necessity, because of the nature and scope of the particular federation, large numbers of persons taking part must be tried together or perhaps not at all, at any rate as respects some. When many conspire, they invite mass trial by their conduct. Even so, the proceedings are exceptional to our tradition and call for use of every safeguard to individualize each defendant in his relation to the mass. Wholly different is it with those who join together with only a few, though many others may be doing the same and though some of them may line up with more than one group.

"Criminal they may be, but it is not the criminality of mass conspiracy. They do not invite the mass trial by their conduct. Nor does our system tolerate it. That way lies the drift toward totalitarian institutions. True, this may be inconvenient for prosecution. But our Government is not one of mere convenience or efficiency. It, too, has a stake, with every cititzen, in his being afforded our historic individual protections, including those surrounding criminal trials. About them we dare not become careless or complacent when that fashion has become rampant over the earth."

Kotteakos while a landmark in the decisional law regarding this subject did not, however, serve any real practical purpose. The Federal prosecutors, while a little shaken up by the Supreme Court's decision, quickly disregarded the admonitions of the High Court and mass conspiracy trials in which a single overall conspiracy is charged although the proof indicates separate and distinct conspiracies and where most of the defendants are unknown to each other, are the vogue again. While lip service is being paid to the letter of the Supreme Court's decision in that trial courts, when that issue is raised by the defense, charge the juries that they must find as a fact that a single conspiracy, as charged in the indictment exists, before they can convict, the spirit of the decision is not really being observed. Juries, in the opinion of the author, are not competent or capable to pass upon the intricate question of what is or is not a single or a multiple conspiracy. This issue should have been left to the trial courts to decide as a matter of law. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court, by its decision, made this issue a question of fact to be decided by the jury on a proper charge by the trial court.

The appellate courts are, however, beginning to take notice of conspiracy convictions based on the patently hearsay evidence of declarations of other conspirators, not made in the presence of the appellant-defenders, but admitted "subject to connection." Another phase of conspiracy convictions which does not meet with approval of the Federal appellate courts is the one based on prosecutors' tendency to spell out a conspiracy merely by the act of an attempted substantive offense, thus enabling the prosecutor to avail himself of the latitude allowed by the conspiracy law to bring about a conviction of what is essentially a substantive offense.

In *U.S.* v. *Reina et al.*, 242 F. 2d 302, decided March 19, 1957, the court of appeals of this circuit reversed a conviction of the defendant, Valachi, one of the several defendants on trial, who had been convicted in the district court of the crime of conspiracy to import, sell, etc., narcotics. While the court of appeals based its main reason for reversal on the ground that the statute of limitations had run as to the appellant Valachi, the court stated in its opinion at page 306 as follows:

"The only 'overt acts' after that date that the judge left to the jury, were two, one in June 1952, and the other in August 1952, and both were after the sale by Valachi to Pocoroba on July 2, 1951. Valachi was not connected with either of them. The prosecution answers that this was unnecessary, because, once it is shown that a person has become a party to a conspiracy the law presumes that he remains a party while it continues, unless he shows that he has left it. Therefore, since Valachi did not show that he had broken off his connection with Shillitani, he remained a party until after September 1, 1951, and the 'overt acts' will serve. We should accept this reasoning, if we thought that Valachi's sale of the parcel to Pocoroba was evidence that he knew it was in execution of the larger venture; that is, that he was cooperating in the series of importations that made up the conspiracy charged. His sale was indeed not inconsistent with that knowledge; but it was equally consistent, so far as we can see, with his being an independent peddler of narcotics, whom Shillitani selected as the most immediately available source of supply for Pocoroba's needs. In deciding that there was no evidence forbidding this second possibility, we may not consider any declarations of the proved conspirators, such as Orsini or Shillitani, for these were hearsay until Valachi's connection with the conspiracy was proved by other evidence. His own declaration was of course competent against him, but it was altogether equivocal as to the source of his supply. Indeed, were we to speculate, we should incline to read it as indicating that he bought at random."

In another decision by the court of appeals of this circuit rendered on February 20, 1957, in *U.S.* v. *Kee Eng et al.*, 241 F. 2d 157, the displeasure of the court of appeals with the apparent tendency by the Government prosecuting agencies to use conspiracy indictments indiscriminately because of the loose rules of evidence permissible in such types of charges, is clearly evident. That indictment involved a charge of conspiracy with others to violate, among others, section 174 of title 21, U.S.C.A. The court in reversing the conviction, stated inter alia:

"There was no agreement to advance any joint interest or for Eng to do anything more than pay money upon receipt of the heroin. The evidence had to do with an isolated transaction, a purchaser of five packages for $1,000. The facts are somewhat similar to those disclosed in *United States* v. *Koch*, 113 F. 2d 982 (2 Cir., 1940). There we held that even where a single purchase had actually been made that, without more, was insufficient evidence to connect the purchaser with the conspiracy to import and sell drugs in violation of law (see cases cited in *United States* v. *Koch*, and also *United States* v. *Di Re*, 159 F. 2d 818 (2 Cir., 1947), affirmed 332 U.S. 581 (1948)). Had Eng received the heroin and paid the money he would have been guilty of illegal possession and illegal purchase of heroin. The premature action of the customs agent apparently prevented Eng from going through with the transaction which he had discussed with Lee. In any event, what might have resulted in a simple case of purchase and possession, had the purchase been consummated, cannot be tortured into a conspiracy to import and sell because evidence of a substantive crime is lacking. * * *

"Having failed to adduce any evidence of Eng's knowledge of the conspiracy and willingness to join such a conspiracy, all the other evidence was improperly admitted."

The experience of the last decade proves that decisions by Federal appellate courts, sound and salutary as they are, do not act as a deterrent to the promiscuous use of the conspiracy law by ambitious and overzealous Federal prosecutors. The conspiracy law, involving the permissive use of patently hearsay evidence together with testimony of accomplices which need not be corroborated, is a proceeding exceptional to our traditions and is similar to a fashion of trial rampant over a great space of our globe today. Mass trials, as conspiracy trials have now become, give no safeguard to the individual and are repulsive to our sense of justice. To paraphrase the Supreme Court, "in such mass trials lies the drift towards totalitarian institutions."

The present rules of evidence permitted in conspiracy trials which allow convictions based entirely on the uncorroborated testimony of accomplices, make justice a mockery. In a recent trial involving 19 defendants had in the District Court for the Southern District of New York, the principal if not sole witness for the Government was an individual, named as coconspirator, whose criminal record extended for most of his adult life and included such crimes as desertion in time of war to peddling narcotics. The trial evidence developed while this witness was working with the Government, he actually engaged in sales of narcotics apparently in the belief that his association with Government agencies gave him the right to violate the law. Yet on that witness' uncorroborated evidence, proven on cross-examination to be inaccurate in many respects, a jury convicted.

It is the duty of our bar associations, together with the members of the Federal bench, to alert Congress to the dangers to our individual liberties, inherent in the present rules governing trials of conspiracy indictments. We must make every effort to bring about a change in these rules, more consonant with our ideas of justice and our dignity as a people governed by just laws. To that task we the members of the bar charged with the duty to defend causes, no matter how unpopular, must dedicate ourselves.

## The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there being no legislation scheduled for floor action, I spent most of last week in my district in Illinois. This gave me opportunity to talk with many, many people. The one thing uppermost in their minds and of grave concern to them as to our domestic problems is our Federal budget. They repeatedly emphasize how important it is that we do not enter upon a spending spree and that we keep the budget balanced. The people are deeply concerned about the extravagant spending bills that have been proposed.

The following editorial, entitled "Twenty-eight Billion New Spending Offered," which appeared in the Daily Pantagraph of Bloomington, Ill., on February 25, expresses, I am convinced, the thinking of the people I am privileged to represent."

TWENTY-EIGHT BILLION NEW SPENDING OFFERED

Advocates of spending are rushing ahead with bill after bill in Congress despite the need for a balanced budget and a stabilized dollar.

David Lawrence in his column on this page February 24 cited the delays in industrial plant expansion, the difficulties of Treasury financing, the flight from fixed investments and the general threat to our economic security.

A balanced budget would do more than anything else to correct this dangerous situation. Yet what do we see taking place in the Democratic majority in Congress?

For example, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS has introduced S. 722 calling for expenditure of $380 million in area development. Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, has offered S. 1 an airport construction bill, for $575 million.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico, has introduced a public works bill with a $2 billion price tag: Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama has offered a housing bill, S. 57, which would cost $2.5 billion over 6 years.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, are cosponsoring a bill providing urban renewal grants of $6 billion over a 10-year period. Senator JAMES MURRAY and Representative LEE METCALF have offered a Federal school construction bill, S. 2, which would cost $11.4 billion in 4 years.

Representative THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, has offered a public works bill in the House calling for expenditure of $3 billion. Representative EARL HOGAN, of Indiana is author of H.R. 102, which would give pensions to World War I veterans at a cost of $2.25 billion.

This totals about $28 billion in spending, most of which apparently would have to be deficit financed since no additional taxes have been proposed to cover the cost of these projects.

The President has proposed some projects in many of these areas but calling for smaller amounts.

Some Democratic leaders are trying to counter President Eisenhower's charge of "spenders" by proposing some cuts in foreign aid. The President only asked for $3.93 billion. If they were to cut it all out they still couldn't make a dent in the huge deficit they are proposing.

Of course foreign aid projects should be examined carefully before being cut at all. This is part of our cold war against Russia. It would be futile to spend billions on arms at home unless we also help underdeveloped countries to improve their standards of living without being subverted by the Communists.

The approach being made by individual Democrats in the current Congress represents irresponsibility unworthy of a major political party in a time of crisis. We urge the responsible party leaderships and the citizens at large to place country above selfish interest and curb this unwarranted deficit spending.

Those who propose new projects should have the courage to propose new taxes as well to cover the cost.

## Hon. Sid Simpson

SPEECH
OF
## HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with immeasurable sadness that we return to the contemplation of the untimely passing of our esteemed friend and colleague who left this life at the very peak of his career and at a time when his contributions to his State and the Nation had reached impressive proportions.

It was my great privilege to sit at his side on the Committee on Agriculture and it was a rich experience to have the benefit of his down-to-earth philosophy which was always permeated with a compelling sense of humor. In the day-to-day interchange between the members and in interrogating witnesses he displayed a firm grasp of the economics of our farm problem but never pressed his views to the point where he departed from those gentlemanly characteristics which were the hallmark of his legislative career.

This path we tread is all too short and we are made better when in the course of our journey we are permitted to travel in company with a generous, lighthearted companion such as was the one we mourn. We shall always cherish his memory and we shall remember in our devotions his charming wife and children who have carried on in his absence in a manner that would have delighted his soul. To them goes our heartfelt sympathy and the assurance that their loss has also been very real to those of us who have been honored to call him friend.

## Junior Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unusual and effective programs through which young people are given the opportunity to grow into mature young citizens is junior achievement.

As many of our colleagues are aware, junior achievement is made possible by the cooperation of public-spirited businessmen who, by means of their unselfish devotion of time, interest, and business know-how, enable young men and women between the ages of 15 and 19 to participate in actual business operations of their own.

The experience, of course, has been invaluable. The assumption of real responsibility by these young people, together with the practical knowledge achieved by handling the functions of business and finance, have added a new dimension to their educations.

Junior achievement, therefore, has proven itself an important means of finding and developing young people of exceptional ability. By providing an unusually challenging way of bringing out the best in our youth and by creating opportunities for developing a sense of responsibility and a talent for leadership, junior achievement is accomplishing a great deal in our national effort to lift standards of education and to implant in our youth the desire for excellence.

Of all the junior achievement organizations in the country, Mr. Speaker, I know of no other which has shown the imagination and displayed the productive zeal of the Union County-Carteret organization in New Jersey. For their achievements, a great deal of the credit must go to Mr. Philip C. Osterman, junior achievement president, and Mr. J. Kenneth Roden, executive vice president.

A mark of their imaginative leadership was the recent tour of Puerto Rico sponsored by Junior Achievement of Union County-Carteret. Twenty-eight

boys and girls, truly good-will ambassadors, flew to Puerto Rico to study the economy and industrial development of the Commonwealth. During their brief stay they were guests of Puerto Rican businessmen and their families. They met with government officials, including Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, and industrial leaders and visited museums, art galleries and universities. Altogether, they obtained an invaluable inside view of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico in the fields of government, education, culture, agriculture, and business.

This unique junior achievement venture, Operation Puerto Rico, recalled an earlier trip to Canada, where similar valuable experience was obtained.

The 28 junior achievers who participated in the trip, together with the names of their firms, follow:

Kenneth C. Bradshaw, 136 Chilton Hall, Elizabeth, Hy-Co.

William E. Brandt, 305 Waite Avenue, Rahway, Ja-Chem.

Ray S. Ciemniecki, 607 Clinton Street, Linden, Esco Co.

Elaine A. Downey, 95 New York Avenue, Clark, Gemco.

John Erdreich, 352 McLean Place, Hillside, Hillco.

Joseph M. Gutauckis, 154 South Park Street, Elizabeth, Typco, Inc.

William J. Hornyak, 1410 Hussa Street, Linden, Scher-Craft.

Frank W. Huber, 508 Livingston Street, Elizabeth, Westjac.

Andrew K. Hughes, 1211 Prospect Avenue, Plainfield, Javid Unlimited, Inc.

Barbara A. Jacek, 228 Atlantic Street, Elizabeth, Rol-O-Lator Co.

Ronald Jarka, 24 Mary Street, Carteret, Kleenco.

Joan Kates, 29 Decker Avenue, Elizabeth, Corac.

Alexander J. Kersis, 742 Morses Mill Road, Elizabeth, Achievalite.

Donald G. Kulibas, 1300 Deerfield Terrace, Linden, Jun-A-Crest.

Robert G. Konecny, 145 Union Avenue, Linden, Traco Products Co.

Elaine J. Kratson, 227 Marshall Street, Elizabeth, Jasco.

Geraldine Krysiak, 525 Garfield Street, Linden, Gafco.

Pamela L. Newman, 702 Westfield Avenue, Elizabeth, Copper Art Products Co.

Roberta J. Nolan, 853 Washington Avenue, Linden, Jalso Products.

Janet E. Powers, 1812 Caroline Avenue, Linden, Best Co.

Janet G. Rey, 15 Dartmouth Road, Cranford, JA Pont.

Sandra J. Rosenblum, 87 Fitch Street, Carteret, Jamco.

Donald L. Stuart, 200 Vine Street, Roselle, Printco, Inc.

John D. Tohlman, 149 West Grand Street, Elizabeth, Calcraft.

Richard Toth, 552 Birchwood Road, Linden, Kismif Co.

Alexander H. Vannauker, 53 South 18th Street, Kenilworth, Ken-Co Labs.

Marilyn Walter, 1213 Summit Terrace, Linden, Dayton Co.

Arline D. Wright, 300 W. Webster Avenue, Roselle Park, Jasew.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I also include an editorial from the February 10 issue of the Elizabeth Daily Journal, which articulately sets forth the purpose and accomplishments of junior achievement:

TESTING JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT

Junior achievement normally is recognized and accepted as a movement devised to inculcate business principles and the basic elements of good citizenship in young Americans in the 15-19-year range. In many areas it has adhered to and expanded in those fields. The Union County-Carteret segment of the movement has been outstanding for years and few units are better known.

Accomplishment in business in the 28 member groups is leading toward interest and participation in broader attributes of citizenship. This is consistent with the policy of the movement. Good businessmen look beyond their production and distribution areas, not necessarily or exclusively in pursuit of fresh material or more sales, but in search of sounder comprehension of their fellowmen.

Broadening of view toward other men in the far corners of our own Republic and in the distant lands overseas may boost trade incidentally, but it has other fruits. It diminishes the tensions that brew conflicts, it betters the lot of backward peoples, it lifts every nation toward finer standards in living and in thought.

The venture of the Union County-Carteret Junior Achievers in visiting Puerto Rico is a step in the pathway toward international amity directed by the sponsors. Puerto Rico is more distant in language and customs and economics than some other far places, despite its ties to the United States. Its proximity and the convenience of contact make it ideal for this experiment in studying another people, which the local Junior Achievers now are concluding.

A previous jaunt into Canada served the same end, but much of the provinces are too akin to the United States to yield the contrasts and the comparisons to be derived from the current junket. The flight to the commonwealth offered the teenagers practically all the aspects of a real trip to a far land, a strange market, another people, a different philosophy.

This is a testing of the real abilities of these boys and girls. It measures their power to learn and absorb by observation; it defines their capacity for rapid appraisal of conditions about them. They have had and benefit from cogent counseling in matters of production and distribution, but no coaching can be substituted for the exercise of their own talents in meeting and estimating their fellowmen. Their success in this computes the highest yield of junior achievement.

---

## The Most Important Thing in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, inflation is recognized as one of the greatest dangers facing this country. I wish to include in my remarks a speech delivered by Mr. William E. Carraway before the Northside Rotary Club of Colorado Springs on January 29, 1959. Mr. Carraway retired as a brigadier general in the U.S. Army in 1955 after a brilliant military career. He served in the Pentagon from 1948 to 1951 as the Chief of the Plans Branch of the Army's Budget Division. During 1950 he served as Secretary to the Program and Budget Advisers to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. From 1951 to 1953 he fought inflation in Korea as the deputy commander of the United Nations Civil Assistance Command, and as the U.S. Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Combined Economic Board, which was established to coordinate economic policies in the Republic of Korea. I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in this timely speech, which follows:

THE MOST IMPORTANT THING IN THE WORLD

Ever since serving in China from 1933 to 1936, I have believed that civilizations grow stronger and greater as long as their basic principles are simple enough to be understood and followed by the people and their leaders. When life in a country becomes so complicated that these essentials are forgotten or ignored, then that civilization begins to decline.

Whether our American civilization has begun to deteriorate in this way is debatable, but there can be no doubt at all that our Government, our very life is becoming more and more complicated. This in turn is causing the great majority of citizens, particularly political leaders, to be somewhat confused concerning the basic principles which should guide our individual and collective conduct.

Therefore, from time to time, all groups of Americans should consider what is most important to them, to their country, and to their way of life. Such analyses will assist materially in developing a proper understanding of the relative priorities of both our problems and our loyalties and will thereby prepare us to make decisions as citizens with a firm basis for putting first things first.

To all Americans, the most important thing in the world is our country, the United States of America. That we, as individuals, owe all that we are or hope to be to our country is self-evident to any open-minded person. Nothing proves this supreme loyalty more than the fact that many Americans of the past have given their lives for their country and that today this is the only cause for which the large majority of young Americans would make a similar sacrifice.

But what lies behind our country? What above all else must be guarded as the chief cornerstone of both our national health and our individual happiness?

We have many problems and programs which may from time to time appear to be most important from various points of view. Military defense, full employment, control of labor unions, education, juvenile delinquency, religion, the growing power of Government, increasing taxes, and many other related matters certainly require collective action if we as a nation are to progress in the future as we have in the past.

However, the most important things in life may not always be apparent as problems. Such is the freedom of choice with which each American makes his own character, lives where he wishes, works as he chooses, and enjoys his many rights and privileges. Even though our highly integrated economy is making it increasingly difficult for individuals to change about as they might wish, the privilege is still there and can be exercised by the overwhelming majority of citizens at any time.

But what lies at the basis of this freedom of choice? What has caused our economy to expand as it has in the past as the result of the cumulative effect of individual actions

rather than from governmental direction and control?

The one essential to our past success is the individual incentive resulting from the freedom of choice and a good sound money system. It is the dollar that causes Americans to enter upon work that pays better wages and to move to other locations where they can make better profits or get more for their earnings.

Too many Americans do not realize that there are two fundamental systems for securing the proper distribution of labor throughout the economy of a nation such as ours. These systems vary principally in the manner by which citizens are directed into various types of employment. Our system is based on payments of dollars which are increased as may be required to insure that the supply of labor in any specialty or in any area is sufficient to meet the needs of the Nation. The Communistic system substitutes force for dollars, leaves little choice to its citizens, and will always be compelled to use slave labor for the most disagreeable tasks that must be performed.

The Communists sacrifice the freedom of choice of the individual to the good of the State as dictators decide what this good may be. Accordingly, the individual citizen under communism cannot develop in breadth of character, in power of independent action, in overall worth as a man, but nevertheless the nation may be far more quickly changed to a war economy or develop missiles than is possible in a democracy such as ours. Similarly, by holding to a minimum the production of consumer goods, a Communist nation can quickly develop the funds needed to expand heavy industry and to support special programs of any kind.

The above comparative facts are fairly well known to Americans but it is much less generally known that any material loss in the attractiveness of the dollar or in the incentives or rewards encouraging freedom of choice might cause our people to refuse to move voluntarily to less rewarding or more disagreeable employment. Were this inertia to appear, national survival might require that our Nation institute conscription of labor with the attendant loss of freedom of choice concerning place and mode of labor. We would then for all practical purposes have adopted the basic principle of communism.

Sound money instead of force is accordingly the lifeblood of our American economy and of our American way of life. Money provides the basis upon which the individual develops independence of thought and character and by which the supply of labor is adjusted to changing demands throughout the Nation.

I first suspected that sound money is therefore the pinpoint of conflict between the United States and Soviet Russia in 1936, when I returned home from service in China by the Trans-Siberian Railway and stopped in Moscow for a few days. While there a young Russian was very helpful in guiding me around. Accordingly, just before leaving I asked him what I might do in return.

"Buy me some clothes in London and send them to me," was his immediate answer. Somewhat taken aback, I agreed to accept $25 in U.S. currency to purchase shoes for himself and a raincoat, a hat, and other articles for his sweetheart. But I could not understand the reasons which caused him to ask the favor.

"You will have to pay a very high duty, will you not?" I asked.

"Oh, yes," he replied. "But I can get as many rubles as I want."

I have never forgotten his reply. It still seems to present the fundamental difference between the United States and Soviet Russia, between capitalism and communism, and between democracy and totalitarianism. Has anyone ever heard an American say, "I can get as many dollars as I want?"

Americans all want money, more and more of it, with the power and the privileges which it offers, particularly the wonderful goods, services, and possessions which it provides. In America, money talks, is the objective of nearly all our labors, and is the direct means by which our economy and our lives are welded together and managed.

Under Soviet communism, however, money has been reduced to comparative insignificance. There is little to buy, distribution is closely controlled, and, on the whole, personal property is limited to articles of almost insignificant value. Position, not money, determines both power and scale of living under the Soviets. Money under communism has become a mere method of exchange and accounting.

This lack of true value of money in Russia is well illustrated by a story which Time magazine published about 1935. The first Soviet millionaire, a composer, had accumulated a million rubles, but there was nothing of consequence that he could do with his money except use a small portion for living expenses and deposit the remainder with the government. He could buy but a limited quantity of clothes and food which were rationed; he could not buy a house or a car, change his work, or set himself up in business. He could not travel, take a vacation, or even retire on his money. The Russian millionaire was therefore designated as a ward of the state which took over his fortune and allowed him only a very small amount thereof as an allowance each month.

The subordination of money is an absolute essential in a communistic nation. All power must be centralized in the hands of the nation's rulers, so that complete day-by-day control of all citizens can be exercised. Therefore, communism must outlaw completely wealth of any kind which can be saved or freely exchanged in such a way as to permit economic independence, just as personal religion, which encourages moral independence must also be eliminated.

For the primary obstacles to the spread of communism are religion, property, and money. And of these three, money may well be the most important, for when its value is lost, both religion and property will very likely go down in the wreck which follows.

In the so-called capitalist nations, particularly in the United States, money provides the means by which each individual can obtain his heart's desires, whether it be the raising of his family, buying a home or a car, quitting his job, retiring on an income, or adding to his property. The chief characteristic of the dollar accordingly is its attractiveness which is intimately bound up with what it will buy, with the large stocks of goods in the United States, the ownership of property, the freedom to travel and to change employment, and the like. Freedom rings not only from every mountainside, but from every transaction involving the American dollar.

When money loses its value in wild inflation or by other less spectacular means, confidence in government and in economic systems is gradually destroyed, stresses and strains develop between classes as changes occur in the value of their comparative economic rewards, and standards of moral conduct quickly deteriorate to an alarming degree.

Now the most interesting commentary on this situation is that the Communists, who have relegated money to a comparatively minor role, are very alert concerning its importance and seem to understand its management, while the average American citizen appears to know little concerning the importance of sound money as the fundamental principle upon which our way of life depends.

The Communists have demonstrated in many ways that they understand that the value of money must be destroyed as a prelude to the adoption of communism. The first history of the Soviet revolution which I read many years ago was a translation of a book by Soviet authors who stated that the revolution succeeded more by gaining control of the printing presses than by all the bullets fired in the field. For the Communists then proceeded to further wild inflation and to abolish private property and religion, so that every Russian became completely dependent upon the Communist government. Two Soviet writers even dedicated a book to the printing press in recognition of the part it played in inflating the currency of capitalist nations.

During and after World War II, the Soviets deliberately furthered wild inflation in all satellite areas as a preliminary to drawing them completely under the control of Moscow. The so-called Iron Curtain is really a money curtain, as is well illustrated by the fact that the introduction of the currency of West Germany into Berlin gave the Russians such alarm that they instituted the blockade. Stalin himself stated the currency had to be settled before the blockade would be lifted, but we refused to change our position.

The Soviet leaders believe in direct action against money systems of other nations. In 1921, Lenin wrote: "When we conquer on a world scale I think we shall use gold for the purpose of building lavatories in the streets of the large cities of the world." He then went on to say that the Soviet Union should save gold, however, for use against capitalist nations. If the Russians had the goods, you may be sure that we would see again many charges that Soviet Russia was dumping products of slave labor on the countries of the free world. With the credits gained in these and other ways and the gold, dope and other valuables which can be easily transported, they have long been financing the propaganda and subversive campaigns which local Communist parties conduct in nearly every country around the world.

The Communists understand clearly that the one sure way to eliminate the middle class is by wild inflation. This makes the rich richer and the middle class poorer, thus preparing the way for the acceptance of communism not only by the direct elimination of opposition but also by the discrediting of the former economic system. Furthermore, inflation undermines, if it does not destroy, the high standards of individual honesty and conduct which are fundamental to the development of the individual and to the mutual confidence necessary for the proper functioning of a democracy.

The Communist leaders also seem to realize fully the supreme importance of money to the capitalist world. And they know that war or near war is an almost sure means of causing the inflation of the money of their enemies, thereby weakening resistance to communism. Strong armed forces and occasional wars of limited nature are therefore welcomed not only to cause the fearful, both at home and abroad, to become more amenable to Communist control, but also to keep the free world in turmoil so great as to undermine the value of money and the basic strength of the various national economies.

Unfortunately, American leaders have neither demonstrated sufficient awareness of the importance of sound money nor have developed techniques necessary for maintaining it. China furnishes a classic example of how a financial policy of the United States actually assisted in the defeat of the national policy which it purported to serve. In 1934, the United States raised the price of silver in dollars. One of the chief reasons advanced for this action was that it would increase the purchasing power of the Orient, particularly China which had a silver (Mex) currency that had continued in use for many years as wars and warlords waxed and

waned. Chinese purchasing power did increase with the rise in price of silver, but only at the cost of sending the silver dollars to the United States. The increased value of silver, as well as the loss of currency, caused prices in China to fall which in turn brought on an immediate economic depression. China was accordingly forced off the silver standard in 1935 and thereafter had little backing for its currency other than public confidence in the integrity of the Nationalist government. During and after World War II, inflation of paper currency came on to undermine the Chinese economy, increase dishonesty, and facilitate enormously the acceptance of the Chinese Communists.

Thus a chief cause for the communization of China was the loss of the Chinese silver currency and its replacement by paper currency of an ever-diminishing value.

The lack of knowledge of American leaders concerning money matters is clearly indicated by the story of allied military currency which all allied forces used immediately after the end of hostilities. Our wartime officials sent the original plates for this currency to Russia where enormous quantities of bills were printed. This money, identical to that paid American soldiers, was then used to pay many months of backpay to Soviet soldiers in occupied areas who were not permitted to send the money home in the form of rubles. Soviet personnel therefore used the currency lavishly to purchase watches and other desirable articles, particularly from Americans who had a wealth of things of rare value in Russia.

American personnel, however, were permitted initially to exchange this allied military currency for dollars which could be returned to the United States. When our finances officers finally were forced to survey their situation, they found themselves with some 360 million more allied currency than they had issued. By that time, this had been exchanged for dollars by American soldiers and sent to the United States, so that an actual deficit of this amount of dollars had been created. In early 1949, however, the United States eliminated this deficit by the simple expedient of keeping for itself the dollars earned by the economies of Germany, Austria, and Japan. The Russians nevertheless had outsmarted the United States to the tune of $360 million.

Perhaps the most serious international problem our Nation faces is how to give economic and military aid to allied nations and yet require them to use this aid without furthering inflation. China is a classic example of this, as mentioned above. All during the Korean war, the Republic of Korea Government was unable to stop the serious inflation of their national currency. Nor was the United States able to remedy the situation, with the result that while our American soldiers were giving their lives in the defense of South Korea, behind the front inflation was destroying the economy of the nation which we were fighting to defend, and compelling the ROK leadership to adopt dictatorial measures far more appropriate to communism than to democracy.

President Eisenhower recognized the disadvantages of both inflation and inflationary controls when he recently stated: "If reasonable stability of prices cannot be reached • • • the alternatives are either inflation, which would damage our economy and work hardships on millions of Americans, or controls, which are alien to our traditional way of life, and which would be an obstacle to the Nation's economic growth and improvement."

The President, like many other thinking Americans, has become increasingly disturbed at the creeping inflation which has characterized our economy since the early days of the New Deal in 1933. Since that time our Nation has operated within its income in only 4 years. Our national debt has risen in this period to over $280 billion. During the present fiscal year it is anticipated that we will have a deficit of nearly $13 billion.

These figures serve to emphasize that creeping inflation, like strong drink and narcotics, cannot be taken without great danger that it will become so habitual that the patient will either eventually be destroyed or the cure itself will take all the patient's energies and will incapitate him for other activities during the period of his treatment.

Inflation is necessary to a degree in time of war; in such an emergency taxes and borrowings simply cannot provide all the revenue required to finance operations. We have experienced two resulting periods of such inflation in the last 20 years.

Politicians have learned the ease with which funds can be appropriated even when the money required cannot be obtained by noninflationary methods. Labor unions in successive round of wage increases both use past inflation as the basis of their demands and cause the inflation to continue. Proponents of national defense, welfare programs, foreign aid, and other less important projects advocate their objectives as being far more necessary than a balanced budget.

Some economists even advocate controlled inflation as the best way to obtain continued prosperity and to avoid occasional depressions; one such view pinpoints the required amount of inflation as 2 percent per year, a view which is alarmingly like advocating that everyone take two drinks of whisky each night. While there may be some stalwart individuals who could always use both inflation and whisky in moderation, there are countless others who do not have the judgment or fortitude to do so where either the one or the other is concerned. Inflation, like whisky, is a strong medicine that may be necessary in real emergencies but cannot be recommended for a steady diet.

The various checks and balances built into the American system of government actually are a handicap to the exercise of proper control over inflationary tendencies. At least some governmental agencies look narrowly at their own interests, advocate policies that further inflation, and support similar excess requests from other sources in order to obtain a wider support for their own programs. If the Communists are right in teaching that capitalism contains the seeds of its own destruction, these seeds will surely feed chiefly on the resulting inability of our government to limit expenditures to the funds that are known to be available.

The management of money is far more difficut in the United States than it is in Russia. Both countries use money, as the great and only common denominator, for integrating the many national programs in annual budgets. But in the United States money takes various forms such as stocks, bonds, and credits, is scarcely distinguishable from personal property, and in controlled by officials who feel responsible for obeying the mandates of the people, while the electorate on the whole understands neither the importance nor the techniques for the maintenance of financial health.

In Russia, however, the dictators do what they wish, in apparent disregard for public opinion, as occurred in 1947 when they issued a new currency on the basis of one new ruble for ten old ones, with a more favorable rate on a very limited basis. This action was a true "capital levy," an action which was intended to eliminate inflationary effects brought on during World War II. Such a course would prove practically impossible for fair application here in the United States. As a matter of fact the Soviet action was widely misunderstood by Americans, as is well indicated by the New York Times which headlined that the action was a devaluation when it was just the opposite.

Another interesting comment is that both the United States and the Soviet Union have abandoned the theoretical principles of their own system and have moved toward the system of the other. Soviet Russia has turned its back on a moneyless society as was originally planned and has increased the importance as well as the value of its money. Americans have abandoned the gold standard and have placed gold and silver in the ground where it is used only to make international payments.

There are many who believe that a return to the gold standard would provide a safety valve that would make the value of the dollar independent of the combined inflationary effects of governmental decisions, or at least, would offer a sound and solid basis for the maintenance of public confidence in gold-backed currency. There are others who believe that Soviet Russia has accumulated tremendous stocks of gold to use against our currency when the occasion is ripe. If neither of these conclusions is true, it is nevertheless correct to say that all indications point to the fact that Soviet Russia, where money means little, has concentrated on producing gold, while the United States, where money means everything, has for 25 years done much to discourage and to reduce the production of gold.

The events of recent months have emphasized the seriousness of our gold situation. We have in the past year been forced to ship a large amount of gold overseas to settle accounts with other nations and are in danger of losing a great deal more if foreigners become worried about the declining value of the dollar. This situation makes clearcut the fact that our Nation is actually on the gold standard in international fields but refuses both to extend this privilege to our own citizens in domestic matters and to take normal action to build up our own stocks of gold to meet all possible emergencies.

The restoration of the gold standard in the United States would require a change in the price of gold which is arbitrarily set by the Government. The price presently effective was set in 1933, so that the mining of gold is steadily decreasing as this is far from being a profitable operation at the high costs of today. It would therefore be necessary to raise its price with a return to the gold standard, so as to insure increased production.

Those of us who live in the Pikes Peak region should be particularly concerned about a return to the gold standard, the existing price of gold, and the stocks of the precious metal available to our Government. We owe much to the gold of Cripple Creek—and would profit much more in the future if the price of gold were raised—or even if it were permitted to seek its own price in a free market.

The difficulty in our present situation is that most Americans do not understand money matters so that it is a fertile field for the activities of misguided idealists who seek full control over matters economic and accordingly object to the strict honesty imposed by the gold standard. I once heard an outstanding economist, who became quite well known in the New Deal, say that we might as well take all our gold and sink it at sea—a solution which is very near the same as that proposed by Lenin but much less practical. The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury who took a leading role in sending to Russia the plates for occupational currency was later accused of being a Communist and after the war killed himself under conditions which suggested that he had either a conscience that was very guilty indeed or a knowledge of Communist subversion that could not be disclosed.

All of the above considerations lead to the inescapable conclusion that the most im-

portant thing in the American world is the nature of the decisions which come out of governmental agencies in Washington. If these decisions undermine the basic principles and incentives which have caused our national growth and strength, we can expect a corresponding decline in our power as a Nation and our worth as individuals. In order to prevent such retrograde action, we must in particular maintain the value of our money by balancing expenditures and revenues and by avoiding the many evils of creeping inflation.

In the sayings of Confucius, as translated by Lionel Giles, the Chinese Solomon is quoted in answering a question as to the essentials of good government. The only one of five such essentials which Confucius repeated for emphasis was. "The wise man and good ruler is benevolent without expending treasure." Interpreted somewhat freely, this means, "Keep your welfare and giveaway programs within the limits of available income so that proper incentives may be maintained to encourage every citizen to reach ever high standards of living, efficiency, and production, as a matter of his own choice, rather than from compulsion."

The struggle in the world today is basically between two economic systems, capitalism and communism. While we must keep our national economy and our Armed Forces strong, the issue will be decided entirely by the thoughts and motivations which exist in the hearts of our people. Not only will too much Government welfare and charity inevitably undermine the self-respect and independence of recipients, but lack of a sound money will also lessen their incentive for hard work.

It is no exaggeration to state that the greatest danger to the United States of America is not in the possibility of unlimited or limited war. Our greatest danger is that we may fail to follow those policies which are best calculated to maintain the psychological and financial health of our great Nation.

To the extent that the American dollar loses its value and its attractiveness, no matter how slowly, to the same extent there occurs a weakening in the strength of our economy, in the mutual confidence among our citizens, and in our adherence to the basic principles of Americanism. Should the dollar ever lose its position as the fundamental incentive for individual initiative and effort, in its place must come domination of the individual by the State. May the day never come when ordinary Americans will say, "I can get as many dollars as I want."

---

## Statement of James F. Daniel, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to education would be a terrible blow to the concepts, heritages, and traditions upon which America was founded. The following statement by James F. Daniel, Jr. of Greenville, S.C., was recently made before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Mr. Daniel has been chairman of the Americanism Commission of the American Legion for many years. He has devoted much time to a study of communism and dictatorships in general. He is well aware of the totalitarian state's control of education and the minds of youth.

Mr. Daniel is a great American and in this statement is representing the American Legion. I commend this statement and principles adopted by the American Legion to every Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF JAMES F. DANIEL, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, IN CONNECTION WITH HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE ON BILLS RELATIVE TO PROPOSED FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

My name is James F. Daniel, Jr. I reside at Greenville, S.C., and I am the chairman of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion.

I wish first to thank you on behalf of the American Legion for permitting me to submit this statement in connection with your hearings on the bills pertaining to Federal aid to education.

On the basis of its record of performance in the field of education, I respectfully submit that the American Legion is qualified to speak on this matter and that its views are worthy of serious consideration.

At the 1958 national convention of the American Legion held at Chicago, Ill., September 1 through September 4, the accredited delegates representing every State in the Union and our Territories and possessions, unanimously adopted Resolution No. 567, containing the following restatement of principles with respect to the relationship of the National Government to public education:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States is a compact between sovereign States joining together for limited purposes, with the predominant intent of reserving unto the several States and to the people thereof all power, save and except those which were expressly granted to the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the American Legion has always strongly adhered to the philosophy of broad, popular education for citizenship and has vigorously supported a universal, publicly supported system of primary, secondary, and higher education under the complete control, authority, direction, and responsibility of the respective States and school districts therein, so as to insure that every American child has the opportunity for an adequate education; and

"Whereas broad, permanent programs of Federal financial appropriations for general educational purposes to State elementary or secondary schools or institutions of higher learning or, for their use or benefit, would inevitably result in loss of local and State control and the establishment of supervision, direction, and control by Federal agencies over the expenditure of such funds; and

"Whereas such Federal domination and intervention would make possible centralized thought control, propagandized and collective captives of our children, and the ultimate destruction of our constitutional form of government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the 40th national convention of the American Legion, assembled at Chicago, Ill., these 1st to 4th days of September, 1958,* That it does hereby adopt the following restatement of principles and policies with respect to intervention in or financial assistance to general public education in the elementary, secondary schools or State institutions of higher learning:

"1. The State and local governments ought to, can and should assume and adequately take care of all needs of public elementary and secondary schools and State public institutions of higher education;

"2. The States and local communities have the financial capacity to meet the proper requirements of general public education in the respective States;

"3. The National Government should avoid interference, control, supervision, or direction in the educational processes, programs, activities, or systems of the respective States or local school districts, either directly or indirectly, by grants-in-aid, appropriations, gifts, or loans for construction of schools, buildings or facilities, teachers' salaries, general student scholarships, equipment or other purposes; by curriculum or program control, or by action of any officer, agency, branch, or department of the U.S. Government;

"4 Under our Constitution each State is, and should be, vested with complete, sole and final power, authority, direction, supervision, and control of every facet of public education within its borders, with the largest possible measure of home rule and autonomy delegated to the local communities;

"5. It is recognized that in certain specialized or restricted programs or projects of a temporary duration, or during time of war or grave national emergency, or where it is directly necessary for the support of operational programs of Federal agencies, the Federal Government has the authority to maintain or operate its own educational institutions or programs, to appropriate funds therefor, to use grants-in-aid, or to make contracts with State or private institutions; provided, however, that no such action should infringe upon the rights or powers of the States or local communities, nor should any department, agency, branch, officer, or employee of the United States in an official capacity ever exercise any direction, supervision, control, or authority over the personnel, curriculum, property, facilities, or programs of any State or local school or school system or agency or State institution of higher learning; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the national commander and the national legislative director are hereby mandated to present the position of the American Legion, as above set forth, to the Congress of the United States and to vigorously oppose all legislation which violates these principles."

GENERAL STATEMENT

The American Legion believes that the real vitality of our country lies in decentralization of the powers of government. We have an abiding faith in private enterprise and local initiative. We are convinced of the necessity to allow each community to decide its own educational policies and programs.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

1. With the Federal budget already heavily burdened, additional appropriations of millions of dollars for services which are the responsibility of States and local communities, cannot be justified.

2. Dr. James B. Conant, one of America's best informed authorities in the field of education, concluded from a recent personal survey made on educational needs, that a large number of secondary schools should be consolidated to provide better educational facilities and opportunities for our youth. At the same time this would reduce costs of operation thereby eliminating any need for Federal funds. In a recent address before the National School Board Association in San Francisco, Dr. Conant stated that he favors leaving it up to each community to determine what it is willing to expend for public schools.

3. In view of the many and varied educational bills being introduced for consideration by the 86th Congress, it seems evident that the proponents of Federal aid to education are more concerned with obtaining large sums of money to spend indiscriminately rather than to first determine need and value of the grants provided by the 85th Congress.

CONCLUSION

Any objective analysis of the educational system in the United States will inevitably lead to the conclusion that the pending proposals for Federal aid to education are unnecessary, unreasonable, unsound, and dangerous to the preservation of local initiative and vitality. The ultimate net result of Federal aid to education is to transfer a portion of the total educational costs to the Federal budget, and to restrict local freedom of decision and action. This the American Legion definitely opposes.

## Hon. Daniel A. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, although the late Representative Dan Reed had been missing from the House of Representatives ever since the 86th Congress began, it is still difficult to realize that his friendly counsel and constructive leadership will not be returning.

I feel a personal loss in Mr. Reed's death. When I first came to Washington 2 years ago, I could always count on Mr. Reed's patience in listening to my problems and his wonderful practical advice based on his many years of honorable service in the Congress. He always went out of his way to help newcomers and I know many a freshman representative has been grateful for his interest and suggestions.

But the late Representative Dan Reed, who represented New York's 43d Congressional District, also belonged in a very special way to my State of Michigan, and to the sixth district which I represent.

The Flint Journal of February 22 devoted a substantial portion of their editorial page to an article by William Pyper describing the loss which Dan Reed's death was to the State of Michigan. This was in addition to a news story carried in the paper on February 19.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely share these comments, and would like to submit these articles of tribute for inclusion in the RECORD:

WOLVERINES IN WASHINGTON—REED'S DEATH LOSS FOR MICHIGAN

(By William F. Pyper)

WASHINGTON.—When Daniel Alden Reed died the other day, Michigan suffered a significant loss.

Although he represented New York's 43d Congressional District and was a native of New York State, he often told his colleagues that he regarded Michigan as his home State. There are few around Washington who can remember back in 1918 when Mr. Reed was elected to Congress, but he was an official of the Flint Chamber of Commerce at the time.

They say he did not even have to return to his district for the campaign, and he has been reelected easily in 20 subsequent biennial elections.

He was widely known around Michigan at the time of his residence there. In addition to the oldsters who remember his actual service in Flint, there will be people all over the State who have made his acquaintance during the 42 years he has served in Congress.

In Dan Reed they always found a kindly man who was willing to listen to their problems, and one, in recent years at least, who was able to be of service. He had been in the House longer than any Republican, and was outranked in seniority only by two Democrats. He was top Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, where all tax and tariff legislation originates. He was chairman during the 83d Congress, in 1953–54.

Mr. Reed was a special friend of the late Representative Roy O. Woodruff of Bay City, who served with him many years on the Ways and Means Committee. In their day, up to Mr. Woodruff's retirement in 1952, they often teamed up to push through some tax provision which was of primary interest to Michigan industry and business.

In those days, when Michigan Congressmen held five House committee chairmanships, Representative Reed was virtually a member of the State's delegation. Woodruff, then chairman of the House Republican conference; the late Earl C. Michener, of Adrian, then chairman of Judiciary; Jesse P. Wolcott, of Port Huron, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee; George A. Dondero, of Royal Oak, chairman of the Public Works Committee; and the late Fred Bradley, of Rogers City, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, all were closely associated with him.

Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Allegan, who came to Congress later but by that time was chairman of the Government Operations Committee, is about the only Michigan lawmaker remaining who was a member of that class, which certainly included the late Representative Carl Mapes, of Grand Rapids. Mr. HOFFMAN recalls particularly how Mr. REED always referred to Michigan as his home State, and how closely he worked with the Michigan delegation in getting the St. Lawrence Seaway authorization through Congress.

Younger Michigan Members of Congress soon came to know that DAN REED was a ready and able source of advice and counsel. Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Grand Rapids, for instance, found a kindred soul. Both had played football and had done a little coaching—a generation apart.

Representative REED never forgot his association with the automobile industry in Michigan back in the days just after World War I. In his position in Washington he had seen the industry grow to become a giant factor in the Nation's economy, and he was always ready to listen when it had a problem.

For that reason, he was involved in the numerous attempts in recent years to reduce or eliminate the manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles. Numerous Michigan Congressmen have worked with him on the project. The efforts will continue, doubtlessly, but without the tax and legislative know-how of Mr. REED they will be handicapped.

One Wolverine in Washington who did remember was Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield. Then a real-estate dealer in Flint, Summerfield recalls that DAN REED was secretary of the Flint Chamber of Commerce when he joined.

"He was there at the first meeting I ever attended," the Postmaster General said. "To me, he always has been a model of what a public servant should be. We've lost a symbol of integrity in government."

STARTED BOARD OF COMMERCE—REPRESENTATIVE DAN REED, BOOSTER OF FLINT, DIES

Flint lost an ardent supporter and one of its outstanding leaders of World War I days with the death today in Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, of Representative DANIEL A. REED, New York Republican.

He was a former managing director of the Flint Chamber of Commerce. The formal "DANIEL" soon became "DAN" to everyone who knew him.

Mr. REED, characterized as an outstanding leader in Flint during the first World War period, came here from his native Dunkirk, N.Y., in the winter of 1916–17. The city then was just beginning to feel its strength as an automotive center.

Representing the American City Bureau, his assignment here was to conduct a membership drive and put into successful operation the then board of commerce. It became the chamber of commerce in 1920.

The task was considered ideal for Mr. Reed—such was his reputation as a spellbinder and civic booster. That he quickly was named managing director of the board attests to the success he achieved.

During the war, Mr. Reed was called to Washington several times to help in the work of the Government. He was placed in charge in the central western area during a $100 million campaign for the Red Cross. He also helped in a second drive.

Later he was sent to England and France as special representative of the Federal War Food Administration.

He described the experiences of that trip to overflow audiences at St. Paul's Episcopal and Court Street Methodist Churches here in February 1918.

Mr. Reed left his board of commerce post here in 1918, after he was elected to the House of Representatives from the 43d New York District. He took his seat in Congress the following spring and had retained it ever since.

Mr. Reed's attachment for Flint was marked by a number of return visits and his continued popularity was demonstrated by the enthusiasm accorded his talks.

"Cooperation has made Flint a model city," he told his colleagues in the House.

An appeal he made in a speech here in 1938 gives him a clue to his own philosophy and the deep concern he had for Flint's well-being.

At that time he asked Flint's businessmen, factory workers, professional men and all others to drop their personal feelings in favor of a constructive, energetic drive to make Flint known as one of America's outstanding cities.

"Nothing can be accomplished by inaction, dissension or a defeatist attitude," he always insisted.

Mr. Reed once described Flint as "A community of generous, courageous, stalwart citizens, setting progressive examples for all America."

A theory he expounded here about cities in 1918 seems no less apropos today.

"If a city," he said then, "does not have stamina enough to live up to her reputation it should not aequire one.

"Flint is in the championship class," he declared. He warned that "a city that fights its way into the championship class and declines to defend its title is pretty apt to be termed a quitter."

## That Youthful Spirit of 1898

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues may recall, the gentleman from Illinois has never overlooked

an opportunity to work in some reference to the Spanish-American war and to suggest, with due deference, of course, to other veterans, that the world never has seen better soldiers and sailors than the volunteers that toppled Spain from her pedestal six-and-more decades ago. It is to Miss Dorothy Taylor that I am indebted for a clipping from the January 14, 1959, number of Medical News that seems to furnish conclusive proof that the Spanish-American War veterans still are leading the pack. They are doing it now by outliving other people, and instead of getting bent and wrinkled actually looking 20 to 25 years younger than their years.

Miss Taylor, when working with the Congress as a member of the staff of the Representative from Illinois Second District, was recognized as one of the keenest brains on the Hill as well as one of its charming personalities. The number of her friends here is legion. She is now associated with Billings Hospital in Chicago, and so valuable are her services that if I were to suggest even in a whisper that her country needs her again in Washington it would be at the risk of losing permanently the votes of the eminent physicians and surgeons at that great and famous hospital. They would be willing to give most anything to their country, but not Dorothy Taylor.

The article from Medical News follows:

OLD SOLDIERS

Eleven hundred Massachusetts veterans of the Spanish-American War have succeeded in putting out of joint the current actuarial predictions on life span. They are living too long.

According to estimates based on mortality tables, only about 500 of these veterans should be alive today in Massachusetts. The fact is there are 1,600.

The Veterans' Administration outpatient clinic in Boston is making a detailed study of their physical and emotional condition, diet, and history to help explain their longevity and find out why some look 20 to 25 years younger than their actual ages.

## Khrushchev's Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carroll Kilpatrick, which appeared on February 14, 1959, in the Washington Post and Times Herald:

U.S. ECONOMIC SUPREMACY IS PUT TO TEST

Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's economic challenge to the United States is regarded by experts in Government and private circles here as exaggerated in detail but nevertheless a serious long-range threat.

Some officials go so far as to say that this economic challenge has now become greater even than the military challenge, and that Russia and China combined eventually will outproduce the free industrial countries.

President Eisenhower, however, told his last press conference that he did not believe an expanded Federal program was necessary or desirable as an answer to the Soviet 7-year plan.

In Khrushchev's speech last month at the 21st Communist Party Congress, the Soviet leader extolled the complete superiority of socialism over capitalism and said that by 1970 Russia will attain the world's highest standard of living.

Khrushchev told the assembled party delegates that the Soviet's fundamental economic task is to overtake the most highly developed capitalist countries in per capita production.

"If we calculate on a per capita basis," the Soviet Premier said in the course of his lengthy discourse, "we will probably need, after the fulfillment of the 7-year plan (in 1965), about 5 more years to catch up with and outstrip the United States in industrial output.

"Thus by that time (1970), or perhaps sooner, the Soviet Union will advance to world leadership both in absolute volume of production and in per capita production."

Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, in a speech Wednesday in Chicago, dismissed Khrushchev's claims as boasting, and pointed out that in 1958 the gross national product in the United States was $437 billion compared with about $180 billion in Russia if you want to believe their statistics.

Nevertheless, Strauss warned that Russia's foreign trade offensive is a serious menace which the general public does not yet appreciate.

Russia is not in business for business, but for economic warfare, the Secretary said.

It is this new trade potential that bothers experts more than Khrushchev's grandiose claims of beating the United States in total and per capita production.

With its growing economic power, Moscow will be strong enough to use trade more and more as a weapon of the cold war, directing trade with one hand where it will do the most good from the Communist viewpoint and withholding trade with another hand if it decides to crack down on a country that is not toeing the line.

Even more disastrous for the West would be a demonstration of Soviet economic progress at a time of economic recession in the leading capitalist country.

If Moscow is able to conduct its economic offensive on the basis of greatly expanded production at home, and if the United States decides it cannot afford to promote certain economic programs either at home or abroad, the lesson would quickly be apparent to all the uncommitted countries as well as to America's friends.

Some experts argue that the statistical race between the United States and Russia is not too significant. They quote Paul Henri Spaak, Secretary General of NATO, who recently said, "I feel that a rich Communist is probably less to be feared than a poor Communist."

"What we must realize," Spaak said, "is that the Communist goal is not merely an economic or a social threat; it is much wider; the ambition of communism is to be the wellspring of a new civilization, in which the essential foundations of our spiritual, intellectual, moral, and political life will be challenged."

One expert summarized the issue this way: "For us to say we cannot afford aid to India or cannot afford adequate schools, or cannot afford a proper defense, is to admit failure.

"We must maintain a satisfactory rate of growth—not to postpone the time the U.S.S.R. matches our productive capacity but to demonstrate for ourselves and the rest of the world that our system works."

The rate of progress could be more important, particularly in the eyes of the underdeveloped countries, than the absolute difference between the United States and Russia. Russia's rate is now between 6 and 8 percent a year and China's is reportedly as high as 10 percent. The U.S. rate, which dropped considerably last year, averaged 4 percent between 1947 and 1956.

It is conceded that Russia's rate of growth will continue to be about twice that of the United States, but even so, gross national product in the United States in 1970 will be almost twice Russia's. Not until the turn of the century, according to American experts, will Russia equal America in total output.

As one indication of Russia's more formidable economic base is the substantial industrial progress that has been made in the Eastern European satellites. To the surprise of most observers, postwar development in the satellites has been impressive, and Poland, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia are now in the vanguard of the Soviet bloc in seeking trade contacts with the Afro-Asian countries and Latin America.

Jan Wszelaki, prewar economic adviser to the Polish Government and specialist in Eastern European economics, shows in a new study for the National Planning Association that the satellites have obtained impressive economic footholds in a number of underdeveloped countries. The Eastern European countries and Russia need raw-material imports which the underdeveloped countries are all too eager to sell.

In return, the satellites are increasingly able to "supply the kinds of industrial goods the developing countries can use," Wszelaki says, adding that Moscow has assigned this trade "high political priority."

Instead of being a burden on the Soviet Union, the satellites have become of great value, particularly in the last year or two, he writes.

Wszelaki declares that "control over East-Central Europe continues to be more than marginally important to Soviet economic development and * * * is of at least equal value in the Soviet trade-and-aid offensive."

He further notes, as part of Communist economic development, that Moscow soon will establish an international bank to finance economic projects in uncommitted countries.

Russia now is a poor second to the United States in total industrial production. In the reasonably near future it will be a strong second—a fact that will make a great impression on the rest of the world unless—all experts agree—the United States makes the best possible use of its machinery and resources to strengthen itself and its associates in the free world.

## Sino-Russian Clash for Trade Visioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carroll Kilpatrick appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald, February 20, 1959:

SINO-RUSSIAN CLASH FOR TRADE VISIONED

Both Moscow and Peking have been at pains in recent weeks to deny that there is any rift between them. Nevertheless, there is a growing belief here that the relationship is not an easy one and that there are now the first faint signs of a rivalry that could have a profound effect on the world's future.

The most substantial evidence for this belief is found in the latest trade agreement

between Communist China and Soviet Russia.

With much fanfare, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai earlier this month signed in Moscow a new agreement that is notable mainly because of its modest size.

It provides for a 5-billion-ruble exchange of goods over a period of 9 years. At the official exchange rate, that is $1¼ billion, or about $140 million a year. At the unofficial rate, it would be considerably less.

But even a trade of $140 million a year is not much between 2 major countries. In 1957, for example, the United States exported more than $4 billion worth of goods to Canada. This country's exports to Turkey in 1957 reached almost exactly $140 million and nearly $150 million to Yugoslavia.

The trade between the two greatest Communist countries will be on a strictly pay-as-you-go basis. Despite the protestations of friendship, there are no credits or gifts from Moscow to Peking.

Tass, the official Soviet news agency, said that Russia will deliver materials and equipment designed to build China's industry and that China will pay for the goods by delivering to the U.S.S.R. goods on conditions already determined in the existing Soviet-Chinese trade agreements.

These will include mainly food and agricultural materials and some manufactured consumer goods sorely needed in China. It may be that China does not want credit. In any event, for the last 2½ years China has exported more to Russia than it has imported from Russia—which certainly leads to the impression that Peking isn't eager to become dependent on Moscow.

Earlier this month, Khrushchev savagely denounced Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), because he wrote that the Soviet Premier had spoken to him critically of the Chinese Communists. The outburst, HUMPHREY said, "indicates a high degree of insecurity in the relationships between Soviet Russia and the Communist Chinese."

Moscow may already be disturbed by China's claims of economic development. The progress has been substantial, and the Chinese claim a faster rate of growth than the Russians.

With its huge population, there is no reason why China eventually may not outproduce Soviet Russia or the United States.

A study by the Research Institute of America, a private organization, on "Communism's New Economic Challenge," says that "Peking's staggering goal is nothing less than the transformation of China's primitive economy into a modern industrial heavyweight capable of competing with either or both the Soviet Union and the United States within 10 years."

Whether the goal can be reached is by no means certain, but the study warns the West not to be lulled by China's difficulties into underestimating the progress and eventual accomplishments of the Peking regime. In the last 6 or 7 years China has more than tripled its production of iron and steel and more than doubled its production of coal and electricity.

Of course, its production must be multiplied many times before it can meet the needs of 600 million Chinese, much less engage in a large foreign trade.

But like Russia it can carry on selective trading that could cause much confusion in the world's markets to China's advantage. The research institute study points out that China already is attempting to make its economic influence felt in south Asia and even in the Middle East, long a goal of Russian policy. If China could arrange an oil deal with Iraq, for example, it could end its dependence upon the Soviet Union for petroleum.

"Mao and not Khrushchev stands as the champion of the future for multitudes in these pivotal areas," the study says.

It concludes that friction between Moscow and Peking is almost certain, if it does not already exist. This friction and rivalry suggests, it says, that Russia may desire closer relations with the United States to help it offset China's growing power.

"It is probably not an accident," the report says, "that the highest priority of the new (Soviet) 7-year plan is the industrial development and population of the Soviet Far East, the area north of China whose untapped rich raw materials and lack of population make it the most attractive future goal of Chinese expansionism."

## Farmers Union: A Record of 25 Years of Service to Wisconsin Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, Kenneth Hones, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., retired after 29 years of service to the farmers of my State. Back in the late 1920's, as the operator of a family-sized farm near Colfax in my home district, he recognized the need for farmers to work together to help themselves out of the catastrophic depression in which they were caught. After working long hours on his farm, he put more long hours into the organization of the Wisconsin Farmers Union. This accomplished, he served on its board of directors for 29 years. During the past 25 years, he has been state president of the Farmers Union, which now numbers 10,721 Wisconsin farmer families in its ranks.

I first met Mr. Hones in 1935, when I was chief clerk of the State assembly, and he came to our capital city of Madison on behalf of his fellow farmers. I found him sincerely dedicated to the Farmers Union principle of the security of the farm family on the family-type farm through cooperation, legislation and a better understanding of the economic processes of this country.

When the Wisconsin Farmers Union celebrated its 25th anniversary in 1955, Mr. Hones paid tribute to the accomplishments of its members. Although he didn't intend his message that way, it is in reality also a tribute to Kenneth Hones and the part he played as leader of a group which came so far and did so much in such a relatively short period of time. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include parts of Mr. Hones' silver anniversary message in the RECORD:

FARMERS UNION: A RECORD OF 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO WISCONSIN AGRICULTURE

The Wisconsin Farmers Union came into existence during the hectic days of farm turmoil of the late 1920's. The great financial boom was on in 1927 when organization work was started in Wisconsin by the Northwest Committee for the National Farmers Union. However, even as the stock market boomed, the depression on the Nation's farms was deepening—but its effects had not yet reached the cities. Finally, in 1929 and 1930, the farm crisis toppled the whole economy.

Toward the end, 1930, the Northwest Committee had a substantial amount of membership work done, and the State organization received its charter from the National Farmers Union on November 6, 1930.

Young as it was, the Farmers Union immediately faced up to the problem of grappling with the farm depression, which by that time was in full bloom. Hundreds of farm protest meetings were held, and County Farmers Union presidents went to Washington to tell their story for the first time.

As a result of these protest meetings, a farm mortgage moratorium law was passed by the State and Federal Governments. Another result of the rural revolt was the Agriculture Domestic Allotment Act, which was later replaced by the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Another highlight of the early days was the successful merger of the American Society of Equity and the Farmers Union. This merger welded the two liberal forces of Wisconsin agriculture into one effective group.

During Governor Phil LaFollette's administration, the Governor commissioned me on two occasions to represent him on legislative matters in Washington. The first assignment was on legislation to secure Federal aid to farmers who had lost cattle through the Bangs' testing program. The second was to make the lime and fertilizer program a part of the Triple A. Both of these Farmers Union projects were enacted into law.

There were other legislative successes. During the drought days, the Farmers Union fought for and secured the emergency seed and feed program. And in the midst of the depression, it was the Farmers Union which obtained the reduction of interest rates on Federal farm and chattel mortgages.

In the early days of the rural electrification program, the Farmers Union fought for greater recognition for the cooperative development of rural power. The first co-op generating plant in the United States was built north of Chippewa Falls.

When World War II broke out, the Farmers Union swung into action for greater farm production to feed our armies, our allies and our civilian population. We were about the only farm group which struggled to hold-the-line on prices to keep them from going war-time crazy. Had that line been held, we would all be in much better financial shape today.

The Farmers Union has battled against the sales tax, fought for Federal aid to schools and supported larger aids to rural schools. Our organization could well be called "the father of social security for farmers". We have supported our great university, our College of Agriculture, the vocational-agriculture program in our high schools and our State program of vocational and adult education. We have supported our Wisconsin Department of Agriculture in its great work.

For a quarter of a century, the Farmers Union has enjoyed the finest relationship with organized labor. We know that the industrial workers are our best market, and their daily income is an index of the price we can ask for the fruits of our labors.

All that we ask and all that we seek is equality of parity with labor, industry and the other segments of our society so that we may enjoy security on our farms.

Throughout the years, our Junior program has been one of our strongest assets. Many of our finest adult leaders in Wisconsin Farmers Union received their basic training in our youth program. The need for a permanent training center was so urgent

that plans for a membership-owned camp were started in the early 1940's. With the cooperation of hundreds of our members, Kamp Kenwood was built and has been in use since 1952.

Yes, the Farmers Union in Wisconsin has served agriculture and served it well during the 25 years since the organization came into being. What it will do in the next quarter century depends on the increasing cooperation of farm people and a better understanding by all people of the aims, purposes and program of the Farmers Union.

## A New Approach to Labor-Management Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 4, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article by the well-known labor columnist Victor Riesel which was published in the New York Daily Mirror of February 27, 1959. The article is entitled "Hatters Aid Bosses To Make Jobs Profit," and deals with some very interesting phases of union activities by the Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers Union headed by Alex Rose.

I commend this article to the attention of all my colleagues because I consider the ideas contained therein as one of the soundest and most progressive manifestations of labor-management relationship. I believe that this should be held out to all industries as a great example of labor-management cooperation for all to follow. If we could succeed in establishing the same or similar approach and a willingness to cooperate on the part of both labor and management, we could avoid a great deal of unnecessary strife, needless strikes, loss of work and income. It would not only serve as a great boon to our continued economic growth, but it would help guarantee and strengthen our democratic system in the world's struggle for survival.

Mr. Speaker, only a profound statesman and a man of vision of the caliber of Alex Rose could think up and develop such an idea. This is a great innovation in the field of labor-management relations which should be explored and adopted by other unions and business enterprises which are seriously concerned with the welfare of our people and the growth of our economy. Alex Rose has once again shown himself to be one of our most able and respected union leaders. I salute him as a veteran and a pioneer in his chosen field.

The article reads as follows:

HATTERS AID BOSSES TO MAKE JOBS PROFIT
(By Victor Riesel)

There are hatters who aren't mad at anyone—least of all their bosses. These are union hatters.

Theirs is a small union of 40,000. Quietly they prove daily that it doesn't take size—it takes guts, imagination and daring to keep their industry a flourishing one.

They have invested some $5,000,000 to help the boss. They have fought off the mobs. They have battled slave labor Iron Curtain competition. They recognize that the class struggle is for undergraduates and that the bigger the profit, the higher the wage and the steadier the job.

For such principles, for example, this Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers Union (AFL-CIO) has now decided to yield what it could have taken as a wage increase. This it does so the union and the employers can raise a half a million dollar kitty to promote the sale of headgear in a nation which is much too bareheaded.

This union—led by tall, bantering Alex Rose, once an infantryman in Gen. Allenby's desert army of World War I—has just joined the bosses in launching something called the National Cap and Cloth Hat Institute. Rose and the manufacturers want to revive the popularity of caps—really one of the first victims of the big time mobs.

Back in the Twenties, when the cap went with knickers like leaning tower with Pisa, this headgear became the symbol of the mob. Later the hoods turned to snap brims. But it was too late. From 55,000,000 the sale of caps slid off to 27,000,000. Union members and employers alike suffered.

They were saved by the Ivy League and convertibles. But now the institute—made up of labor and management directors—really wants to make the cap a steady and lucrative manufacturing field. At a moment when the noise of rackets, shakedowns, violence and hatred flares through some other fields, Alex Rose's union shows how it can happen here—a rational labor-management, live-and-let-live society, I mean.

The Cap Institute is just one instance in the life of a crusading union. Last year, for example, the labor chiefs learned that the owners of the most famous hat manufacturers' building in the land, 65 West 39th Street, in New York's garment area, were about to raise rents. They needed financing.

Rose sought out the realtors. He offered to loan them $2 million of the union's funds at a very modest interest rate. In return, he wanted a contract guaranteeing that the rents of the hat manufacturing lofts would not be raised for 5 years. Rose did not want the employers hit by higher costs. Nor did he want them dispersed from the center of hat fashions.

The realtors took the money and signed the contract—and the hat manufacturers stayed in business in a building easily accessible to the union's skilled workers.

There was a similar crisis at another building, 49 West 37th Street. The union had to buy the 22-story $1,500,000 structure which is jammed with hat manufacturers. Now the union is the landlord. And it is keeping rents low, so its employers can make a good enough profit to keep wages and the number of jobs high. The hatters have also put several million dollars in housing projects.

In 1954, when bankruptcy threatened the Charles H. Kartiganer Co., of West Upton, Mass., Rose's organization dug up $200,000, lent it to the company and kept it in business. Today the Kartiganer Co. flourishes—and so do the 650 New Englanders working there.

More recently, the Merrimac Hat Co., of Amesbury, Mass., was hit hard by competition from Communist Czechoslovakia. It was about to liquidate. Some 325 jobs would have been lost. The union actually bought the company by throwing $300,000 into it. Union officials were placed on the board of directors. But despite the controlling interest, the union decided to take no management role. The company is doing good business, my latest check shows.

Imagination? When the union itself needed money 5 years ago, it floated its own bond issue among its members at full interest rates. The money has all been repaid.

Guts? When the mobs moved in and ran racket shops which chiseled the Government on millions of dollars in military orders, the union had two of its people probe, expose, and wipe out the looting. How's it done?

"The answer," says Alex Rose, "is to do a constructive job. We stay away from the evil of corruption and the evil of fantasy and junk abstract, outmoded ancient labor philosophies. Serve the community as well as the workers and the men who employ us. Then labor and management can't go wrong."

Like I said, those are glad hatters.

## Lesson of Korea Quickly Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Marine Corps is our highly mobile force in readiness. The Congress has repeatedly expressed the determination that it be maintained at an effective combat strength. We have not forgotten Korea and the heavy price we paid for not being prepared.

The primary responsibility for the kind of defense we shall have, the nature and size of our military organization, is vested in the Congress. But the Pentagon continues to ignore our expressed will.

I call your attention to the following editorial, entitled "Lesson of Korea Quickly Forgotten," which appeared in the Daily Pantagraph, Bloomington, Ill., on February 16:

LESSON OF KOREA QUICKLY FORGOTTEN

The U.S. Marine Corps had a strength of 442,796 men in June of 1944. This had dwindled to 67,000 when the Korean war broke out. It was hurriedly doubled in 6 months but was far below strength and made up of men with inadequate training because of the urgency of the need in combat.

Many lives were lost in Korea because boys with inadequate training had to be rushed into the firing lines.

One would think that this lesson would not be easily forgotten. Congress has not forgotten it. However, the administration appears to have had a lapse of memory for repeatedly the administration has failed to keep the Marine Corps at the strength prescribed by Congress.

Congress appropriated sufficient funds to maintain the corps at 215,000 men in fiscal 1956. The Pentagon set aside $37 million of the money and cut the corps down to 200,000.

For the fiscal year of 1958 Congress appropriated funds to keep the corps at 200,000. This would enable the Marine Corps to maintain not less than three combat divisions and three air wings, as required by law. But the Pentagon allocated funds for only 190,000 men.

For fiscal year 1959 Congress again provided enough funds for 200,000 men despite the Pentagon's announced intention of cutting the corps to 175,000 men.

The Senate Appropriations Committee was explicit in its action. It said "This decision to appropriate the funds necessary for

a 200,000-man Marine Corps was made with full consideration of the fiscal and military limitations. The committee desires that it be clearly understood by appropriate agencies in the executive branch of Government that it is the clear-cut intent of the committee, and of the proposed appropriating legislation, that the Marine Corps be maintained at the strength of 200,000."

Both House and Senate have made it clear that it is the desire of Congress that the Marine Corps be maintained at not less than 200,000 men so that, in the words of the House Appropriations Committee, it can "fulfill its traditional role in the national defense posture of this country as the Nation's force in readiness."

The administration, through the Pentagon, is thwarting the will of Congress, which has the constitutional right to provide for the Nation's defense. We do not believe that there is a desire of the President to cultivate dictatorship, but this is what is happening. When Congress is ignored the people have no effective voice in Government.

## California Assembly Urges Equalization of Military Retirement Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of Members of Congress to a joint resolution recently introduced in the Assembly of the State of California by a group of 49 members of that body.

The resolution points to the failure of the Military Pay Act of 1958 to assure retirement benefits to military personnel on an equal basis and urges that the resulting inequity be corrected. A number of bills have been introduced here to do just that and among them is H.R. 3284 which I introduced January 26.

Joint Resolution 13 of the California Assembly reads as follows:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States legislation concerning the improvement of benefits for retired members of the U.S. Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958; and

Whereas there appears to be no basis for the gross discrimination against retired personnel who retired before June 1, 1958, as they are, by reason of past meritorious services, equally entitled to the increased benefits granted personnel who retire, or have retired after such date; and

Whereas this false distinction violates the basic precepts of fair play, and the circumstances of retirement should not penalize these honorable members of our society, who must meet the present ever-increasing cost of living the same as personnel that retired after June 1, 1958: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the retirement benefits of the retired personnel who retired prior to June 1, 1958, so that they will be treated equally with personnel who retire, or have retired, after such date.

California State assemblymen who joined in introducing this resolution February 5, 1959, were: Messrs. Mulford, Crawford, Luckel, Chapel, Bruce F. Allen, Bane, Beaver, Bee, Belotti, Biddick, Britschgi, George E. Brown, Ralph M. Brown, Burton, Busterud, Collier, Cooledge, Crown, Cunningham, Cusanovich, Mrs. Davis, Messrs. Elliott, Francis, Frew, Gaffney, Garrigus, Samuel Geddes, Hanna, Hawkins, Holmes, House, Kilpatrick, Lunardi, MacBride, Marks, Masterson, Meyers, Miller, O'Connell, Petris, Reagan, Rumford, Schrade, Sumner, Waldie, Williamson, George A. Willson, Charles H. Wilson, and Z'berg.

## Record of Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 17, 1959*

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I think it very pertinent to call to the attention of all Americans a clipping in the New York Times under date of February 18, 1959, entitled "Record of Soviets," by Col. Augustin G. Rudd.

The clipping follows:

RECORD OF SOVIETS—THEIR BROKEN PROMISES STRESSED, OUR INDIFFERENT ATTITUDE SCORED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The shocking revelations of the slaughter of American flyers by the Soviet Union and the proved mendacity of Mikoyan and other high Communist officials in concealing this uncivilized act once more emphasize the futility of expecting the Soviet Union to live up to any accepted standards of conduct among nations. In fact, the most solemn agreements to them are ignored at will.

Of course this is nothing new. The record of perfidy dates from the tragic day in November, 1933, when the United States recognized the Soviet Union. Although bitterly opposed by realists at that time, this recognition of a tottering regime that could hardly have lasted 6 months without our help has proved to be the greatest diplomatic blunder in modern times, if not in history. For it saved a ruthless system of slavery which has since engulfed 17 nations and has for its avowed aim the destruction of freedom in the remainder of the world.

This record of the Soviet Union, too little known, is laid bare in a report (1955) by the United States Senate of "nearly 1,000 treaties and agreements involving peace accord and fraternities entered into by the Soviet Union." The document stated: "The staff found that in the thirty-eight short years since the Soviet Union came into existence its Government had broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. * * * It keeps no international promises at all unless doing so is clearly advantageous to the Soviet Union."

PAST ACTIONS

No one has yet developed a sounder formula for dealing with men than to consider the record of their past. And yet important and intelligent Americans, particularly the liberals, act as if they never had heard of this grisly Soviet record still being duplicated daily. For instance, the recent visit here of Mikoyan.

Although his lies about the fate of our American flyers were not known to the public, his part in the betrayal and execution of the Hungarian leaders was public knowledge. This was the man selected by the Kremlin to go to Hungary and direct the suppression of the revolt. And this was the man who got the leaders to surrender on the promise of immunity and then promptly turned them over, with thousands of other Hungarian patriots, to the firing squads.

That the Communist-fronters and leftist-liberals would fawn at him was to be expected. But on what possible pretext could others welcome Mikoyan?

Everyone knows that the free world has been engaged in a cold war with the Communists since 1945. During World War II we saved them from Hitler with loans of $11 billion. Even Stalin admitted this. The cold war and the refusal to even partially repay this loan were our thanks. That the Communists are steadily winning this war is apparent.

PROPAGANDA ACCEPTED

And why are they winning? One cause is illustrated in the Mikoyan incident. We are no match whatsoever for the Communists in diplomacy, propaganda and other weapons of the cold war.

And so we accept the Mikoyans and their propaganda or other nefarious schemes. We never seem to learn.

What has happened to our sense of righteous indignation? Since the Boston Tea Party and before, a rising tide of public wrath over injustices of various kinds always has been a wholesome and invaluable characteristic of the American people. But this tendency is fast disappearing. An attitude of indifference or adjusting to an intolerable condition is taking its place.

Except for war against us, I can recall few instances better calculated to cause the blood of Americans to boil than the Soviet's wanton attack on our unarmed plane. And yet most of our people had almost forgotten the incident until the recent State Department revelations. Are we no longer capable of becoming "fighting mad" at outrages against our ideals and liberties?

AUGUSTIN G. RUDD,
*Colonel, U.S. Army (Retired).*
GARDEN CITY, N.Y., *February 10, 1959.*

## TVA Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution calling upon the TVA, the O.C.D.M., and other departments and agencies of government to reconsider the contract awarded to Parsons of England, for electrical equipment never before purchased outside the continental United States.

This order would have given much-needed labor to the many unemployed in my district, and other districts in western and eastern Pennsylvania.

In introducing this resolution I had the full support and cosponsorship of the following Members of Congress: Congressman ELMER HOLLAND, Congressman FRANK CLARK, Congressman MORGAN, Congressman MOORHEAD, and Congressman MILLIKEN, of Pennsylvania.

You will note, sir, that this effort is bipartisan. I have since been informed by the following Members of Congress of their full support in this endeavor: Congressman SAYLOR, Congressman VAN

ZANDT, Congressman GAVIN, Congressman KEARNS, Congressman RICHARD SIMPSON, and Congressman STANLEY PROKOP, of Pennsylvania.

I am sure that other Pennsylvania Members would join me if the opportunity presents itself to present a joint plea to bring this work to the workmen and industry of Pennsylvania.

## Residual Oil Threatens the Coal Industry in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a news development which occurred over the weekend may soon prove heartening and encouraging to my home State of West Virginia.

It now appears possible that, at last, the Eisenhower administration is going to take steps to limit the vast imports of residual oil products which have flooded our shores from abroad. This residual oil has had a disastrous effect upon domestic coal markets in this country, and upon the economy of West Virginia—which is in the midst of a harrowing economic downturn.

I am hopeful that our President at last is recognizing the wisdom and accuracy of the viewpoint long expressed by the late Senator M. M. Neely, of West Virginia, who served ably and faithfully in both Houses of the Congress for many years.

The distinguished Senator Neely was one of the first to point out that unfettered residual oil importation could wreck the State's economy, which has been based upon coal markets. But his voice went unheeded, and the administration instituted a so-called voluntary program of oil importation limits.

This "jawbone" program has proved a miserable failure, and its lack of effectiveness has worked great hardship on the people of West Virginia.

This program has also had an undermining effect upon the national security, and it is upon this basis that mandatory curbs will be levied.

Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks all the members of the West Virginia congressional delegation, led by Senators BYRD and RANDOLPH, have spent many hours meeting with Leo Leogh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; Lewis Strauss, Secretary of Commerce; and top officials of the Department of Defense, Department of State, and Department of the Interior. We have worked long and hard to bring the facts forcibly to the attention of the responsible officials of our Government. We are convinced that the facts indicate conclusively that unless large-scale imports of residual oil are checked, the coal industry and the national security will be seriously impaired.

Mr. Speaker, America is the showcase of democracy in the free world. If a great industry and the economy of a great section of the country suffer, it hurts America's position in the free world. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, as long as we have millions of unemployed and many on the verge of starvation we cannot expect to maintain the national morale necessary for a strong defense. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is in serious economic trouble. My people cry out for help. We need action and action now to end this threat to our great coal industry.

I should like to commend to your attention the following article by Richard E. Mooney, of the New York Times. This article, published yesterday, explains fully the deleterious impact which the voluntary program has inflicted upon the Nation, and particularly the coal-producing States:

PRESIDENT SCANS RIGID OIL QUOTAS—EXTENDS VOLUNTARY PROGRAM—A MANDATORY PLAN IS SEEN AS ASSURED

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—President Eisenhower postponed the establishment of rigid oil import controls today to give himself time to study a report that the imports threatened national security.

The Government 20-month-old noncompulsory curbs program was scheduled to expire at midnight tonight. In preparation for the creation of a successor program, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was directed to make a quick examination of the question: Do oil imports threaten security?

The agency submitted its answer to the President late yesterday afternoon, and the answer was Yes.

According to one authority, the findings were sufficiently broad to be construed as a recommendation for restriction of imports of residual oil.

USED AS INDUSTRIAL FUEL

Residual oil is left over after various products have been refined from crude. It is used in large quantities as industrial fuel.

It is not subject to import regulation at this time and the question of whether it will be is the biggest unknown in the whole proposition.

It seems virtually certain that the current noncompulsory ceiling on crude and semirefined products—1,113,600 a day—will be replaced by a mandatory ceiling of 1,025,000 barrels a day. If controls also are applied to residual oil, the ceiling might be higher.

The role of national security as a ban to imports rests on a clause inserted in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1954. It was a compromise substitute for a specific restriction on oil imports that was proposed by a coal-State Senator.

The argument is that oil imports discourage exploration for the development of domestic sources, which would be needed in the event of an emergency.

The coal industry argues that its ability to perform in an emergency also is hurt by oil imports.

When the President establishes the assumed mandatory curbs on oil he will have done what the Senator—the late Matthew M. Neely, Democrat of West Virginia—wanted in the first place, except that it will not be written into law.

The President tried to do something less inflexible when he established the voluntary curbs on crude in mid-1956, but those curbs have not been fully effective. The clearest evidence of their less-than-full effectiveness was the fact that last spring they were expanded to include semirefined products.

Some importers had been dodging the spirit of the restrictions by partially refining their crude oil in foreign refineries so that it would not be crude oil and would not be subject to regulation. Imports of semirefined products soared until a ceiling was imposed.

FLOOD OF APPLICATIONS

Then the program was shaken by a flood of applications for larger import allowances, or for new allowances for companies that had none.

The decision on these applications was postponed while the program was reexamined and the forthcoming mandatory controls are the result.

The new controls, it is understood, will not cover all oil products, but most.

Asphalt, not regulated now, is considered less likely to be regulated than residual oil. However, the report to the President was described as broad enough to cover both products.

It has been reported that the new program will make special provision for Canadian oil, though not the exception that Canada would like.

Canada has argued, vigorously, that her oil will be just as available to a United States war effort as Texas oil; not dependent on ocean shipping that could be cut off by enemy action.

VENEZUELA PROBLEM

The U.S. Government feels that, however sound the Canadian argument might be, it is not practical to except one hemisphere ally and not another—Venezuela in this case.

Under the new program, it is understood that the Government plans to make special allowances for a certain amount of oil to be imported into the north central region of this country. That oil comes from Canada. Thus, the special provision is a bow in Canada's direction.

Aside from this, the basic formula for the new controls turns on the amount of refining activity that an importing company did during 6 months, March through August, of last year.

## Corn, Corn, Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Lincoln Star, February 21, 1959, on corn production in the Midwest. We are all aware of the vast surplus of cereal grains at present but these storage bins will be molehills compared with the bushels and bushels that will be on hand as a result of the unrestricted number of acres a farmer may place in production as a result of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recent announcement regarding controls:

CORN, CORN, CORN

(By William O. Dobler)

Chances are that you have never seen any corn compared to what you will see this summer in fields across Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, and other States in the Midwest. Everything is pointing to corn yields in 1959 that will make past years look like the drought of the 1930's.

SOON COMES THE RECKONING

The situation is the brainstorm of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. It is beyond us to figure out just what it is that Benson has in mind in connection with his farm program but its results could be disastrous for both the farmer and the country. The disaster is not likely to hit the farmer, at least the corn farmer, this year but it could catch him quick enough. What might well happen is a fantastic rise in the cost of the Federal Government's farm program.

It takes no brilliant economist to see what is happening today on the corn front. Farmers voted late last year to do away with acreage controls and high, rigid price supports. They asked, instead, for lower supports and freedom to plant at will. The latter program is the one to be followed this summer.

It has just been announced that support prices on the 1959 crop will be $1.12 per bushel, 9 cents per bushel higher than it was last year on noncompliance corn and about 20 cents per bushel lower than it was on corn grown under acreage controls. Ironically, the change in support price will cause all farmers to boost production to its physical limit.

The grower last year who was getting only $1.03 on noncompliance corn will see a bigger profit this year in added production. The man who got $1.32 last year on corn grown in compliance will see that he is forced to grow more this year in order to make as much as he did last year. His profit will be found in volume.

Thus, whatever a farmer got last year, he has a good reason for growing more corn this year. And grow it he will unless weather conditions take an unexpected hand in things. And even the weather is getting to be less and less of a factor. A speaker in Lincoln this week noted that there are now some 2.5 million acres of land in Nebraska under irrigation by either dams and diversion channels or deep wells.

Nebraska is rapidly becoming an evernormal grain belt wherein rainfall is a relatively unimportant thing from year to year. So long as there is sufficient moisture during a total period of 10 or 15 years, there will be guaranteed moisture during any single year by the process of open storage and pumping from underground supplies.

With such a vast supply of corn as is likely to be poured upon the market this year, the Government might well end up with a corner on the corn business. The regular market will be unable to absorb a great part of the 1959 crop. The Government, then, will fall heir to this surplus—adding it to the stockpile now in Government storage across the land.

ALL POINTED TO MORE CORN

Benson talks about a free enterprise system in agriculture but what he seems headed for is nationalization of agriculture in crop production. It is simply impossible to understand how Benson figures his program will work. To further complicate the picture, he has announced support prices for other grains generally lower than they were for 1958. This will tend to drive farmers away from these grains and into corn production. In addition to the jump in costs to the Government that this program will bring about, there will be many storage and transportation problems.

Some farmers were faced last year with no place for their new crop because the Government failed to pick up the 1957 crop that was in storage under Government loan. Any way you want to look at it, the corn program this year promises to bring on nothing but headaches. And the farmers, in the future, are likely to pay dearly for today's mistakes.

## Medical Care for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I submit the following editorial from the February 27, issue of the Des Moines Register which sets forth a new program of low-cost medical insurance for persons over 65 who find it a hardship to pay medical bills.

Proposed by the Iowa State Medical Society this program was presented to the Iowa delegation of Senators and Representatives here in Washington today by officials of the society. I am sure that we are all aware of the growing numbers of senior citizens in America today. Our life span has been steadily lengthened through the miracles of modern medicine. But this too has its problems. One big problem is medical care since the incidence of sickness increases with age. A higher rate of sickness coupled with higher costs of improved medical care indeed creates a grave problem for our elders which should concern us all.

The editorial follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, February 27, 1959]

MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED

The Iowa State Medical Society deserves congratulations for its new program of low cost medical insurance for persons over 65 who find it a hardship to pay medical bills.

The society is taking the lead in attempting to solve one of the country's most vital health problems. The plan calls for some financial sacrifice on the part of doctors. It's an experiment which, if successful in Iowa, probably would be adopted in many other States.

The plan was approved Sunday at a special meeting of the house of delegates of the medical society. Some details remain to be worked out, but the program is expected to be put into effect by April.

The insurance will be written by Blue Shield, the nonprofit insurance plan of the medical society, and will be available to persons over 65 years of age. If the combined income of a man and his wife is less than $3,000 a year, the couple will be entitled to full-service coverage. An individual can qualify if his income is under $2,000.

The cost to the insured will be about $2.25 to $2.75 per person per month. Income from insurance charges would not be sufficient to pay in full the medical fees which doctors ordinarily charge. So the doctors will accept lower fees to be set by Blue Shield. The fees are expected to cover only overhead costs.

Blue Shield is working with Blue Cross to provide insurance which will cover both hospital and doctor expenses for the elderly at a cost of $6.50 to $7 a person a month. Blue Cross insurance, sponsored by the Iowa Hospital Association, covers hospital costs.

The elderly, who have retired from jobs that paid them a regular income, have less ability to pay medical and hospital expenses than people of working age. But they are more likely to incur heavy medical expenses. It's tragic if they don't get medical care because they can't afford it or if they are forced to become charity patients.

It is estimated that 210,000 of the 300,000 Iowans over 65 years of age will be eligible to take part in the new Blue Shield program. A high percentage of them now have no protection against heavy medical and hospital costs that may come at any time. A 1957 survey made by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago showed that nationally five out of every eight persons 65 and over had no health insurance protection.

A nation as prosperous as the United States, with highly skilled medical doctors and splendid hospitals, will not just "do nothing" about the problem of health care for its senior citizens in low income brackets.

Unless programs of the kind the Iowa society plans can be made truly effective, the Government will sooner or later take over the problem in response to general public demand. This is what the American Medical Association fears and why it recommended last December that doctors reduce fees to persons over 65 who have low incomes.

The A.M.A. is bitterly opposed to the Forand bill in Congress. This calls for the Government to provide free hospital, surgical and nursing home insurance for everyone eligible for social security benefits. It would cost $835 million a year. The A.M.A. fears it would lead to free health care for everyone and Government control of medicine.

The Iowa society is taking the best way to fight socialized medicine. It recognizes the gravity of the problem of providing health care to the elderly at costs they can afford and is attempting to do something about this.

## South Names 14 More to Living Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 2, 1959*

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, an interesting item appeared in the business section of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution on February 15, 1959. I should like to bring it to the attention of the readers of the RECORD. The news item concerns the latest additions to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living. The naming of the South's Hall of Fame for men and women is sponsored by a monthly publication called Dixie Business, edited by Mr. Hubert F. Lee, of Decatur, Ga.

From the ranks of the South's Hall of Fame, the man or woman of the South is elected each year by the editors of the magazine, together with its readers and friends.

Under unanimous consent of the House previously granted, I therefore take pleasure in inserting this clipping herewith:

SOUTH NAMES 14 MORE TO LIVING HALL OF FAME

Fourteen leading southerners have been named to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, an honor group from which the Man of the South is elected each year. The nominations were announced by Hubert F.

Lee, editor of Dixie Business, the sponsoring magazine.

The group is limited to 200 living southerners. The 1959 additions include:

Dr. O. C. Aderhold, president, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.; Harllee Branch, Jr., Atlanta, president, The Southern Co.; David Tennant Bryan, Richmond, publisher, Richmond Times-Dispatch, News Leader; Norman Cocke, Charlotte, chairman, board of trustees, Duke University; H. McKinley Conway, Jr., Atlanta, publisher, Manufacturers Record; Mr. Ralph Draughon, president, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; Ben S. Gilmer, Atlanta, president, Southern Bell Telephone Co.; Clarence Haverty, Atlanta, chairman, Haverty Furniture Companies; George M. Ivey, Sr., Charlotte, president, J. B. Ivey & Co.; Dr. James A. Jones, Richmond, president, Union Theological Seminary; Ben M McKelway, Washington, D.C., editor, the Washington Star and president of the Associated Press; Dr. John L. Plyler, president of Furman University, Greenville, S.C.; Dr. Clarence Poe, Raleigh, editor, the Progressive Farmer; Nelson Poynter, publisher, the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times.

## How We Should Arm To Meet the Soviet Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of every Member of this body who has not already read it excerpts from a recent speech delivered at Charleston, S.C., by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations. The Washington Sunday Star on March 1 did a real service to the American people by carrying excerpts from Admiral Burke's speech which urge a reappraisal of our entire national posture—military, economic, and morale. It affirms the point I was trying to make when I testified before the House Armed Services Committee on January 29 in connection with the extension of the draft. I urged a complete study of our military manpower requirements, to determine whether the draft is the best possible way to meet our responsibilities and to overcome the Soviet challenge. Admiral Burke goes even further and urges a review of every line of our national human endeavor to see whether we are now measuring up and whether we will continue to measure up to the challenges presented to us by Communist competition.

The article follows:

ADMIRAL BURKE SPEAKS OUT—HOW WE SHOULD ARM TO MEET THE SOVIET MENACE

How the United States should expend its money and energy to make the strongest possible defense in the face of Soviet threats has been a lively controversy in Washington for a long time. Most of the criticism has originated at the Capitol.

Last week two high officials spoke out on the problem. The first was Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, in a speech at Charleston, S.C.

The second was President Eisenhower who stressed the need for balance in remarks at his press conference and cited Admiral Burke's speech on the same subject as "indeed good." This is the text of the parts of the admiral's speech dealing with the subject:

"We must make sure that Russia knows we have enough to destroy the Soviet Union, and that we will use it if she launches a nuclear attack.

"There is no point trying to equate our requirements and capabilities with the enemy's. Our requirements are entirely different and our capabilities must be developed around our own needs. We do not need to engage in an endless arms race with the Soviets in ballistic missiles, any more than we have attempted to race them in numbers of submarines or army divisions.

"The really important thing about a deterrent force is not numbers but invulnerability, not total numbers built, but numbers we will be able to use. In making our retaliatory forces secure from enemy attack, we do not need great numbers of missiles and bombers.

"Whether the U.S.S.R. has one-half or as many or several times as many missiles as the United States, is really academic as long as we have the assured capability of destroying Russia, and as long as the Soviets know it, and are really convinced of it.

"There is, in fact, far greater psychological advantage for the United States in having this capability than in allowing ourselves to be drawn into a fruitless and unnecessary race on Soviet terms."

THE ELEMENT OF SECRECY

"Hiding behind the Iron Curtain the Kremlin can tell us what they want us to know, and they are able to conceal fairly effectively that which they don't want us to know.

"If they had a particular capability, would they make such statements as to cause us to build an appropriate response to that particular threat?

"If the Kremlin really intends to exploit an advantage, would it not be better for them to remain quiet and surprise us with deeds rather than words?

"The United States is embarked upon a defense program aimed at meeting our security needs. By not entering a numbers race with the Soviets on their terms, we also avoid the limitless economic drain which such a race would involve.

"We can afford what we have to afford for U.S. security, but also we must spend our funds for what we need. We must apportion our funds carefully to meet all the contingencies facing us.

"A general nuclear war deterrent will deter mainly that, little else. Our powerful retaliatory capability has not always deterred lesser assaults in the past, and it will not in the future."

PRECISION FORCES

"We know that the Soviet expansionist policy is continuing. There have been local aggressions, local uprisings, local crises in the past, which could not be dealt with by the use of mass destruction capabilities.

"These will continue to face us in the future, and we will be able to deal with them effectively only by measures which fit the local circumstances.

"This means controlled, precision forces which can be operated with discrimination and finesse, forces armed with conventional weapons and small atomic weapons, forces which can apply the right degree of power with pinpoint accuracy.

"Our military requirements cover a very wide spectrum of possible situations. But even this is not enough. Military measures, by themselves, are not enough.

"Let us look for a moment at what the Communists themselves have been telling us.

"We can debate at length among ourselves on what proper military measures to take in our own defenses. We can discuss budgets, military posture, and the various forms of modern warfare. We can examine our weapons systems, and our progress in research and development.

"But we can lose the entire stamina and integrity of our civilization if we do not recognize the challenge presented to us by a nation sworn to take us over.

"Distinguished American visitors to the Soviet Union in recent weeks have told me that the most dangerous thing they saw in Russia is the look on the faces of the people.

"What Americans have seen in their visits to Russia is the grim look of determination, the cool and deliberate confidence of people who are going places, who know they are missing a lot of life, who know they are being forced to sacrifice both tangible and intangible human values, but who are resolute in their aim to beat the United States in everything."

SOVIET PEOPLE SEEK PRESTIGE

"And what do they expect to gain by this? Simply this, they expect to gain prestige in the eyes of the rest of the world. They expect to gain greater respectability in the world. They expect to demonstrate that their way is the way of the future. How better can they prove all this than by beating the United States in everything—in athletics, in the arts, in scientific achievement, in industry, political maneuver, and everything else.

"This is the challenge which faces the United States. The Soviets have not said they were going to take the world through general nuclear war. What they have said is that communism is the wave of the future, and will make over the world.

"Fifteen years ago we thought the Soviet Union would build a massive force of long-range aircraft. They certainly had the capability of doing it. But they did not build many.

"Two years ago we were given a jolt with their unveiling of a new and powerful long-range jet bomber, the Bison. But the Soviets did not build many of these either.

"Today their space achievements are impressive. Their objective is twofold. First they want to be really able to develop the military capability which is implied by such achievements. They need not necessarily do it, but they want to be able to do so if they think they have to.

"Their second objective is to demonstrate to the world the technological proficiency of the U.S.S.R.; they want to show the world that they can do it.

"Both of these have their roots in Soviet psychological pressure on us, on our allies, and on the rest of the world, both within and outside the Sino-Soviet bloc."

DANGER OF PREOCCUPATION

"We fall into their mousetrap when we ourselves become so obsessed or preoccupied with these worthy accomplishments as to ignore all the other things they are doing to undermine freedom, to upset the stability of independent nations, and to insinuate their philosophy into the thinking of free men everywhere.

"Let us not underestimate the capabilities of the Soviets. Their scientific achievements along certain lines have been superior. But let this not blind us to all the other much less spectacular things they are doing, the many little, devious, conspiratorial inroads they are making everywhere.

"We have many problems before us in facing up to this Communist challenge. We must not become enchanted with the prospects of military power in the space age at the expense of the many other demands upon us. The competition covers a far wider range of effort than military effort alone. The range now extends to include everybody, not just the military.

"Our country has grown strong in an environment of personal liberty in which the

spirit of competition runs strong among us. The United States has become a world leader as a result of the effort of many hard-working people to whom the concepts of private enterprise and individual initiative have real meaning.

"But today we run the grave risk of becoming complacent in our position of world leadership, and of becoming indifferent to the hard realities of the competition we face as a nation."

THE CHALLENGE WE FACE

"This is the challenge which faces the entire Nation today. It is the challenge of facing Communist competition in every line of human endeavor. It is a challenge which will not be met with slogans, gimmicks and simple answers.

"It is a challenge which summons all Americans once again to reaffirm our purpose in the world community of nations, and to pursue that purpose with vigor, and not be deflected by the cold winds of communism.

"Let us take a hard look at what is happening in the world, a hard look at what is happening to our markets in the world, and let us look at the Soviet economic offensive and determine how well we are responding to it.

"Let us take a hard look at what we need in military hardware.

"The answers will not be found in mathematical equations or with master-stroke answers. We are talking about the whole spectrum of human endeavor, for which there is not single or simple formula.

"The United States is ahead today, but we will stay ahead only by the dint of hard work, by higher standards of individual achievement, by the exercise of free initiative and by placing our personal comforts and interests second to the interests of a strong, virile and dynamic United States.

"This is not a one-man job. It is not a 100-man job, nor a job only for a million men. It is a challenge to 170 million Americans. It is a job for you and for me, for all of us, for your children, and your children's children, for as long as they live they will live in competition."

## Federal Minimum Benefit Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under clause 4 of rule XXII of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the attached resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas, expressing opposition to legislation which would establish Federal minimum benefit standards and which would compel the States to take similar action:

SENATE RESOLUTION 112

Whereas there is unemployment compensation pending in the Congress of the United States, which legislation seeks to establish certain minimum benefit standards and would thereby remove from the States many of the powers now vested therein, which legislation is coercive upon the legislatures of the various States in that if they fail to comply with the proposed standards, drastic penalties would be imposed upon the taxpayers in such States; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Texas recently, in recognition of unemployment problems, increased the maximum weekly benefit amount by 40 percent, and is even now in the current session considering legislation which would provide further increases; and

Whereas the people of Texas are firmly dedicated to the proposition that matters relating to the amount and duration of unemployment benefits should be left to the discretion of the various State governments due to the widely varying economic and other conditions that prevail among the States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas*, That it opposes legislation which would establish Federal minimum benefit standards and which would compel the States to take similar action, thus depriving the legislature of its rightful authority in such matters; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor of the United States, Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, Speaker Sam Rayburn, and all members of the House of Representatives from Texas.

BEN RAMSEY,
*President of the Senate.*

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the Senate on February 23, 1959.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

## Law for Outer Space Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines Register of December 28, 1958, carried an excellent editorial pointing up the urgent need for the adoption through international agreements of space laws to settle questions of ownership and to govern traffic in outer space. The Des Moines Register is to be commended for its far-sightedness in this connection. The editorial, which follows, is even more timely today than when it was written 6 weeks ago:

LAW FOR OUTER SPACE NEEDED

Who owns outer space? Who makes the law there? Since sputnik, these are no longer theoretical questions but highly practical ones.

Sputnik, by circling the globe in less than 2 hours, and traversing practically every country in the world repeatedly, vaporized the early hypothesis that each nation owned and had jurisdiction over its airspace—at least as high as man made devices could fly.

Long-distance missiles, meanwhile, vaporized the other chief hypothesis, that the higher air (and nonair) was like the high seas—open to all as a matter of right.

Bright young law students have been filling the law journals with ideas on the subject, and responsible statesmen and scientists have been prayerfully considering it.

A staff report for the Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the U.S. House of Representatives recently called for advance notice of flight plans of satellites and missiles so they would not be mistaken for a hostile missile attack and trigger an accidental war.

The staff report discussed the legal theories advanced so far and urged creating some space law by international agreement. It suggested starting cautiously with the most pressing problems: restriction to peaceful uses; defining that term carefully; settling the liability for reentry accidents and the ownership of reentering spacecraft.

President Eisenhower's recorded peace message from the 4-ton Atlas satellite is a dramatic reminder of the U.S. Government's willingness to get started.

## Century 21 Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, January 29, 1959*

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1961 an international exposition of great importance to the world will open in Seattle, Wash. This exposition is being called the Century 21 Exposition because it will be a showcase of how the scientific knowledge of today, developed by free men within the framework of democratic forms of government, will give us a better world during the next century.

Pursuant to provisions of law passed by the 85th Congress, the Department of Commerce currently is working with other agencies of the Federal Government in an investigation of the ways in which the United States can put its best foot forward in its participation in this significant exposition.

The United States had during recent years displayed its scientific and industrial accomplishments at various shows and fairs throughout the world. The Century 21 Exposition will be an opportunity for our own people as well as those in other parts of the world to see what we are accomplishing in the field of science and industrial development.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a recent story from the New York Times which outlines how some of the leading scientists in the country are participating in the planning for this exposition.

SCIENTIST TO AID FAIR IN SEATTLE—CENTURY 21 EXPOSITION SET TO OPEN IN MAY 1961—SOVIET TO PARTICIPATE

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

SEATTLE.—A group of leaders in American science has agreed to come here next month to help develop plans for a world fair—the Century 21 Exposition. It is to open in Seattle in May, 1961, and is scheduled for a second year's run in 1962.

Major emphasis is to be placed on science and its relationship to the development of man. The unity of science among nations is to be demonstrated through the expected participation of the Soviet Union, Italy, Japan, and many other countries.

The fair has been in the initial planning stage since 1955. Seattle and Washington State have made a total of $15 million available as a starter.

The scientific theme evolved through a visit to Washington by exposition officials last February. They found science leaders

in the East casting about for a means of putting on a science exposition in 1961.

That was the first year in which results of the International Geophysical Year, now in progress, could be dramatized, said Ewen C. Dingwall, vice president and general manager of the World Fair Corporation.

PLANNING BOARD FORMED

The result has been the setting up of a national science planning board of twenty members.

"Our aim is a compact, high quality show," Mr. Dingwall asserted. "We have the opportunity to do a very significant job of the type that never has been done before. It is true there is a science pavilion at the Brussels world's fair—a first effort—but we should capitalize on its errors and do a better job in Seattle."

He and James Faber, the fair's publicity manager, noted that many millions of dollars were to be gambled on the belief that science is box office. The job ahead, they added, was providing an educational show that is entertaining.

The Stanford Research Institute has estimated that the exposition will draw 8 million to 12 million visitors from May to September, 1961. A second year, it says, would attract 4 million to 6 million persons.

A 74-acre site in the vicinity of the Seattle Civic Auditorium has been chosen for the exposition. Land around the auditorium willl be cleared of buildings, mostly dwellings. The shell of the auditorium will provide a nucleus for construction of a 3,000-seat concert hall with a sixty-foot stage. At least one permanent state buildings, perhaps a combined convention hall and sports center, is to be erected.

Negotiations are under way for construction of a five-mile suspended rail system to carry fair visitors to and from the site to defeat the parking problem.

Besides providing opportunity for the world of science to answer the question, "Where is science going during the next hundred years?" the exposition is to embrace a Pan-Pacific section. Seattle does the bulk of its export trade with nations rimming the Pacific Ocean.

MUSIC FESTIVALS SOUGHT

Committees are going to work to bid for international music festivals and art events for the exposition period, as well as to try to develop a significant sports calendar.

Despite the science theme underlying the fair, 1961 was selected in the first place partly to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the final fixing of the United States-Canadian border. The World Fair Commission notes that the final monument of the border was put in place in 1861 at Point Roberts, Wash., "thus creating the longest unfortified frontier."

The exposition also will feature the University of Washington's centennial year and give recognition to Alaska statehood.

Members of the national science planning board for the fair are:

Dr. Frederick Seitz, University, of Illinois; Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president; Dr. Paul Weiss of the Rockefeller Institution; Dr. Leonard Carmichael, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Dr. Harold J. Coolidge of the National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Frank Fremont-Smith, medical director of the Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation; Dr. Harry F. Harlow of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Donald Loughridge of General Motors Technical Center; Dr. Donald H. McLaughlin of Homestake Mining Company; Dr. Donald H. Menzel, director of Harvard Observatory; Dr. J. C. Morris, vice president of Tulane University; Dr. Hans Neurath of the University of Washington; Dr. Gerard Piel, president and publisher of the Scientific American; Dr. Froelich Rainey, director of the University of Pennsylvania Museum; Dr. Henry Bradford Washburn Jr., director of the Boston Museum of Science; Dr. Dael Wolfle, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; D. V. Astin, director, National Bureau of Standards, and Dr. Homer Newell, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg of the University of California, and Dr. Herman F. Marck, Polymer Research Institute.

## Taxpayers' Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a long predicted and long overdue taxpayers' revolt against excessive Government spending and high taxes has started in the State of Washington.

Tens of thousands of Washington State citizens are signing petitions and writing letters to State legislators and Members of Congress urging less spending on new programs and demanding that these legislators "hold the line against increasing Government expenditures" and refrain from levying any new and additional State or Federal taxes.

Washington State's two U.S. Senators are quoted in the press as saying that each of them already has received petitions or letters from Washington State bearing more than 1,000 signatures.

The Aberdeen World of Aberdeen, Wash., in my home county—population 55,000—reports leaders of the taxpayers' revolt claim they will obtain petitions or letters to Congressmen and State legislators bearing at least 5,000 signatures.

I received 344 taxpayers' revolt letters from my own county Monday morning and the drive there for a curb on extravagant governmental spending appears to be only at its beginning.

This taxpayers' revolt, newspapers report, is nonpartisan and has the endorsement of leaders in both political parties.

The petitions bear the following heading:

A renewed declaration of independence to the Governor, State of Washington:

We, the undersigned citizens, knowing that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and believing that man is best governed who is least governed, and that government should be held to the same financial responsibility as that to which we are held—namely, to live within its means—do hereby pledge that we shall not require more services of our Government than such as are already being rendered.

We therefore demand that no increased taxes be enacted and that Government, both State and Federal, confine their expenditures to existing sources and limits of revenue.

We further declare that any elected representative of the people who does not subscribe to these views is not worthy of our support at the polls.

Other petitions are addressed to Members of Congress and to State legislators.

Signers of the petitions are following up their petition signing by writing letters to Members of Congress and to State legislators. A typical letter of this kind follows:

I have signed a petition addressed to the Governor, our representatives in the National Congress and our State representatives, in which I have pledged that I will not request any increased governmental services and demanding that no increased taxes of any kind be levied.

You will shortly receive this petition, which it is expected will have the signatures of at least 5,000 citizens of Grays Harbor County, Wash., most of whom will write you a similar letter.

This position is endorsed by leaders and members of both political parties.

I urge that you exert every effort to prevent any additional taxation whatsoever.

Here is a taxpayers' revolt that may become nationwide. If it does become nationwide, it may contribute greatly to Congress and State legislatures obtaining balanced budgets this year.

If the revolting taxpayers accomplish that goal, they will put a brake on the continued rising prices of inflation which are reducing the living standards of millions of American citizens, especially pensioners, retired persons, and others who are on fixed incomes.

## Dr. Godfrey Lowell Cabot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like publicly to congratulate Dr. Godfrey L. Cabot of 242 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., on the occasion of his 98th birthday on February 26, 1959.

Dr. Cabot is a businessman, a philanthropist, and a citizen who all his life has devoted himself to public service and better government.

Graduating with high honors from Harvard in 1882, Dr. Cabot undertook graduate study in geology and then established the highly successful Godfrey L. Cabot, Inc., in Boston with branches in many parts of the country.

One of his lifetime special interests has been aviation. Dr. Cabot learned to fly at the age of 55, an age when many men are thinking of retiring, by winning his Navy wings at Pensacola in 1918. He then completed a successful experiment of picking up cargo from the water in a moving plane, much to the astonishment of authorities in the Navy Department who were less than enthusiastic, at that time, about aviation. Subsequently, Dr. Cabot has been president of the National Aeronautical Association; one of the original directors of the Aviation Research Foundation, and remains honorary president of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale (FAI) which keeps the official worldwide records for aviation achievements by all countries.

Dr. Cabot in his 90's retains a modern view of the great future possibilities for aviation and in a recent letter to Professor Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., he made this prophecy:

I predict that the time will come when the freight traffic through the air will greatly

exceed passenger traffic through the air, and the receipts for carrying their goods through the air will be greater than for carrying passengers through the air. I predict that the time will come when the passenger and freight traffic through the air will be to a great extent separated, and most of the freight carried by planes that are built specially for that purpose.

It is a source of inspiration to all of us to contemplate the active intelligence of Dr. Cabot, and his many friends join with me in wishing congratulations on his 98th birthday and best wishes for many more birthdays to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a letter from the President to Dr. Cabot and join in the President's congratulations:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 24, 1958.*
DOCTOR GODFREY L. CABOT,
*Boston, Mass.*

DEAR DR. CABOT: I am reminded that February 26 brings around your 97th birthday anniversary. I am sure that as you look back upon America's tremendous progress during your lifetime you have the same feeling of pride as do I, and I hope that you will share in the immense possibilities that seem to be just around the corner for us—and for all peoples.

From my friends I know that you are as keen an observor of the passing scene as ever, and I do hope that I shall have the privilege of sending you my warmest felicitations, as I do now, for many future years.

With best wishes and warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

## Congress Should Quiz the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 5, 1959*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, written by Ross Valentine, and which was reprinted in the February 23, 1959, issue of the Florida Times-Union. The article entitled "Congress Should Quiz the Court" follows:

[Reprinted in Florida Times-Union, Feb. 23, 1959]

CONGRESS SHOULD QUIZ THE COURT

(By Ross Valentine, in Richmond Times-Dispatch)

Love is blind. And that goes for those in love with the proposition—that equal education will not be equal, until one race is permitted to force its way into the schools of another.

To such as these the Supreme Court can do no wrong, though its dictum, pit race against race, North against South, and divide a Nation against itself.

But wrath, like hate, is also blind.

The Court's critics (including this one) at first saw in the Court's unanimous decision a political motive—i.e., appeasement of the Negro vote, a fractional minority wielding balance of power because of its concentration in big cities of electorally determinant States.

The absurdity of this suspicion became evident, however, after more dispassionate deliberation. It simply doesn't make sense. Life tenure protects the Court against the whims of political weather.

What, then could have been the reason for unanimity in so reckless a blunder? On an issue which, since the decision of 1896, had been settled, repeatedly affirmed, and considered valid, with no protest from any of the States, and no attempt by Congress to upset the principle of equal, but separate schools, in States where this was deemed best for all concerned.

There must have been a reason for this revolutionary reversal in the concept of the constitutional relationship between the States and the Central Government.

Does the Court expect the people to accept its Delphic decision on faith?

That attitude might be justified, if the clock could be turned back to the days of absolute monarchy, based on the premise that a divinely anointed king can do no wrong. But will freemen concede divine right to Frankfurter, Warren, et al?

The High Court is the creature of presidential prerogative. It will not be questioned by the White House.

It can be investigated, however, by the Congress, whose Members, collectively, personify the concept of consent of the governed.

Congress, if only because its function has been usurped by the judiciary, should consider itself dutybound to demand an explanation for usurpation of legislative power.

The Supreme Court, and the lower Federal courts do not represent the people. Their members are Presidentially handipicked to conform to political ideology. Surely, the inexcusable elevation of the utterly inexperienced Mr. Warren to Chief Justice—the world's most powerful position on the sunny side of the Iron Curtain, is a case in point.

None but the ignorant, superstitious, timid or the servile will attribute to the nine Justices the quality of infallibility and omnipotence. Yet the members of that Supreme Bench are entrenched for life, for all practical purposes. They cannot be removed except by impeachment, and then only if found guilty of a criminal charge, such as treason, murder, rape, arson, embezzlement or acceptance of bribes.

The Court's flouting of article X, was plainly a trespass on the legislative and amendatory powers vested solely in Congress and the people. But under the Constitution, this usurpation in no way renders the Justices liable to impeachment.

Our only recourse therefore rests in the House of Representatives which does represent the people, and in the Senate, which represents the several states.

Needless to say any proposal to investigate the Court's decision will be dismissed either as "naive," or damned as an unwarrantable intrusion on the "rights," powers and immunity of the judiciary. Only under totalitarianism are government officials considered immune.

Unless the people, via Congress, exercise their right of inquiry, the people will henceforth be defenseless in the face of future attempts at "judicial legislation."

Exposure of the Adams-Goldfine scandal by a congressional subcommittee was a dramatic example of the exercise of that power. The White House was not immune. Are the Justices to be granted greater powers of immunity than the President?

The Warren decision gave no valid reasons for violation of article X.

The fallacy and weakness of its reasoning was exposed by that fatal footnote—"and see, generally, Myrdal," the reference being to a book on civil rights of the Negro, written by staff members of the plaintiff NAACP, with the assistance of sundry leftwingers, and edited by a Swedish sociologist imported for the purpose, whose knowledge of American constitutional law may be comparable to Mr. Warren's.

Basing its opinion generally upon the findings of this foreign Socialist, the court ignored Article X—and distorted the 14th amendment to fit Myrdal's frankly Marxist theories.

The "constitutional philosophy" of Mr. Chief Justice Warren may be relegated to the realm of political myth—but this cannot be said of the dominant intellect on the high bench—Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who had formerly acted as counsel for the plaintiff NAACP, and may be presumed to have been partial to his former clients.

Unless we accept the humiliating assumption that the Court acted on sociological theory, the only alternative explanation for the decision is that the Frankfuter-Warren court considered the Constitution of the United States to have been superseded by the United Nations Charter, and therefore felt called upon to "interpret" the 14th amendment so as to coincide with "international policy" as set forth in the UN Charter and its UNESCO appendix.

Was this the reason the Supreme Court unanimously disregarded the constitutionally fixed limitations of the Federal Government?

The people of the United States—sorely bewildered in this crisis—have a right to an honest answer to that question—a question not answered in the Warren decision of May 1954.

One worlders may conceivably argue that judicial recognition of interdependence with other free world nations was long overdue—that the court's school decision was needed to implement Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy and defeat Soviet propaganda among the colored multi-millions.

If this was, indeed, the reason for the court's revolutionary reversal of the established relationship between States and nation—then the people should be told frankly.

They should not be compelled to accept judicial revision of the Constitution simply because it is being touted as "the law of the land" by a noisy minority. The Court's members are not "supreme beings." They are, like all men, in or our of office, fallible.

They are hired—and their salaries paid—by the taxpaying citizens.

The Court is not immune to interrogation by Congress.

## Washington Impressed With Achievements of Julius Madey, a Clark, N.J., Boy Who Made Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal lately about the need for improving our educational system in the face of Soviet gains in scientific and engineering education.

We recognize, I believe, that in general we have not insisted upon the highest standards of excellence and achievement of which our young people are capable. We have failed in many instances to recognize talented boys and girls early enough to guide them into areas where their natural abilities and interests could best be developed.

In recent months, however, an unprecedented degree of public awareness of our educational deficiencies has been

growing. In response to this awareness, Congress last year passed the National Defense Education Act, a landmark in our educational history. And we are already beginning to reap the harvest of this farsighted legislation.

Similar developments are occurring at the State and local level throughout the country. Our people realize that we need good teachers, adequately paid, and good schools, adequately equipped, if we are to give our children the opportunity to make the most of their God-given abilities.

It is in this context of our increasing determination to improve our system of education, Mr. Speaker, that I call the attention of our colleagues to an example of the kind of talented and responsible young man our American system can produce at its best. I do so not in any spirit of complacency about past accomplishments, but in the hope that this one young man may serve as a model for the kind of excellence we should be producing more of.

Beyond this, however, I believe that Julius Madey of Clark, N.J., deserves recognition on his own merits.

Julius Madey is 18 years old. He graduated from Johnson Regional High School last year, and plans to enter Rutgers University next year to begin a 5-year course in medical electronics.

Despite his youth, he has made a remarkable record for himself—so remarkable, in fact, that he has just been awarded the 1958 Edison Radio Amateur Award for public service, a cherished honor he richly deserved.

Consider, for instance, that at his early age, Julius Madey has already been an important factor in the success of Operation Deepfreeze and of our International Geophysical Year research teams in the Antarctic; he has provided an essential channel of communication with American personnel at Arctic weather stations, at military bases in the Pacific and DEW line support bases in Alaska; and he has been a one-man good will mission to people throughout Europe.

The top national Edison Award was not the first recognition accorded young Madey. Previously, he had received a special citation from the Edison Award Committee as well as an Edison commendation certificate, and a public service award from the U.S. Navy. He also won student science fair honors several years ago for inventing an ultrasonic drill, and has excelled in oratorical and other academic activities.

Julius Madey received his award—a trophy and $500—at ceremonies held in Washington's Sheraton-Carlton Hotel on Thursday evening, February 26, 1959. It was one of the most impressive such ceremonies I have ever been privileged to witness.

More than 150 people were present for the dinner, including some of the top Government, military, and private communications officials and four Federal Communications Commissioners. Mr. L. Berkley Davis, chairman of the award committee, made the presentation on behalf of the General Electric Co., sponsors of the award. Mr. J. S. Parker, vice president of General Electric for employee and public relations, was master of ceremonies.

The principal speaker for the occasion was the Reverend Daniel Linehan, S. J., head of the geophysics department at Boston College and one of the best known geophysicists in the world. It seems that Father Linehan and Julius Madey were already well acquainted. When Father Linehan was in the Antarctic in connection with the International Geophysical Year, his plane crashed. It was through young Madey's radio station—K2KGJ, which he and his brother, John, 16, operate from their home in Clark—that Father Linehan was able to assure his family in the United States that he was uninjured.

The story of Julius Madey came from all these men and others. It is a story of tireless and selfless service to people. Despite a full high school schedule, he has manned his station up to 90 hours a that evening was a tape-recorded messages annually, both important official calls and personal messages between the men on the fringes of civilization and their families at home.

One of the most moving testimonials that evening wes a tape-recorded message made in the wastes of the Antarctic by a group of American servicemen and scientists for the express purpose of telling Julius on this great occasion how much his work and help has meant to them.

During the 1958 Christmas season, for example, he relayed for these isolated service personnel orders for more than $2,000 worth of flowers to be sent to their families in the United States.

Once, through his station, a young mother announced the birth of her child directly from her hospital bed to her husband near the South Pole.

Among the evidence submitted to the award committee was a personal letter of appreciation to Julius Madey from Rear Adm. George Dufek, Commander, U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctica.

For hours at a time, Julius has been the sole contact between civilization and the men still pushing ahead the frontiers of scientific knowledge in some of the most desolate parts of the world.

But his service has been appreciated. The Edison Award judges—FCC Commissioner Rosel Hyde, E. Roland Harriman, chairman of the board of the American National Red Cross, and G. L. Dosland, president of the American Radio Relay League—chose him from among nearly 200,000 licensed radio amateurs to receive this coveted award.

In every sense of the word, Julius Madey was the star of the evening. He acknowledged his award in a 15-minute speech, which he delivered without notes, and which was a model of its kind. He was relaxed and gracious and genuinely modest. He held the entire room spellbound as he told his story and thanked all those who in the past have helped make his accomplishments possible.

Washington, Mr. Speaker, has seen many stars glitter for a while and quickly fade away. But this boy is the real thing. He is a credit to his family—who have obviously meant so much in his young life—to his schools and his community. He is an outstanding example to the youth of America—and to us, the adults—of the potential riches of talent and of personal service that exist in the youth of America, awaiting only the opportunity to grow and develop and be used for the welfare of our country and our people.

Clark Township and Union County would have been especially proud of Julius Madey that Thursday evening.

I certainly was.

---

## A Malayan Exchange Fellow Looks at the Prospects for Asian Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the American Political Science Association, which for some years has enabled American political scientists and journalists to spend time on Capitol Hill in the offices of Congressmen and Senators, has this year broadened its program to include three young men from Asia. I have been fortunate in having with me since the session began Ahmad Roose, of the city of Kuala Lumpur, Malaya. Mr. Roose came for his months in Washington from his civil service post in the Ministry of the Interior and Justice of the Federation of Malaya.

Mr. Roose has participated in all the activities of my office: committee meetings, floor sessions, administrative work. He has been of great help to us, and has won the friendship of everyone he has met. I hope in return he can take with him next summer some case-studies of democracy in action. Mr. Roose believes deeply in democracy, but recognizes the difficulties it faces in many of the countries which have recently found national existence. He explores the question in a talk today sponsored by the department of government and arranged by Prof. Charles R. Foster, of the historic College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va. I believe that his remarks have meaning for our own policy in emerging areas. Successful political democracy, in the sense of responsible governments peacefully elected by a wide suffrage, may be long delayed. Lack of responsible opposition, apathy on the part of the voters, and impatience to get ahead economically—these factors, Mr. Roose points out, may make democracy elusive. Naturally, we would like nothing better than that the true political democracy of our own tradition became the heritage of mankind everywhere. But where emerging peoples have not yet attained it, is it not equally important that their governments be humane, and that they work in the direction of democracy?

I commend Mr. Roose's remarks to all who are interested in the problems of emerging peoples:

IS DEMOCRACY FEASIBLE IN ASIA?

The question posed above is a vital one as on its answer depends the fate of the

nations in Asia. The same question has in fact often been asked in many other ways, but the underlying factor is the same, and that is, whether or not the newly gained independence in some of the Asian countries will lead them to adopt democracy as the form of government, that is to say, the principle of popular elections to determine the government. There seems to be a consensus of opinions that, given time, education to reduce the high rate of illiteracy, and guidance, democracy will prevail in Asia in some form or other. Such democratic government system will, however, to some extent, differ from that found in the West and America. This is to be expected, considering that the development of the type of government will naturally be governed by the forces prevalent in any particular country.

Asians as a people have only known authoritarian rule, either foreign or domestic. Now most of them have loudly proclaimed their independence status and have accepted to some extent the principle of democracy. As such, democracy is a new notion. Before the two world wars, the principle of self-determination was never extended to the people living in Asia, as they were mostly governed by western colonial powers. However, the two world wars had changed this concept, and it is now believed that the principle of self-determination must also be extended to the Asians. This change in attitude may have arisen as a result of the general exhaustion of the western colonial powers as a result of the world wars; consequently, colonies no longer became an asset. They have in fact become increasingly more expensive and morally unjustified to maintain; in short, colonial territories are a great liability. So, in such circumstances, the inevitable was bound to happen. Britain, perhaps with foresight, took the initiative in granting independence for India in 1947, and so India became the first colonial territory to achieve independence. The grant of independence in this case was without bloodshed, and was of course urged on by the independence movement in India which began back in the 1930's. This was followed by Indonesia, the Philippines, Burma, and so on. The last of the Southeast Asian countries to join the fold of newly independent countries is Malaya, which received her new status in 1957. Thus we see that, apart from Japan, only the former colonial territories which have obtained their independence have proclaimed themselves to be democratic governments. Of course, it is a debatable point whether democracy, as it is understood in the West and here in America, will ever be successful in the short run, considering that the period of training for self-rule was relatively short. Under such circumstances one perhaps may be forgiven for thinking that democracy in southeast Asia is indeed a fragile plant, with an uncertain future and requires naturally a lot of attention and grooming before it comes to maturity. It must be remembered that there are far too many social, economic, and other factors which may prevent democracy from being practicable in Asia.

Democracy in this context is defined as a government by the people, for the people, and of the people; one in which the people is given the choice to elect the government, and the choice to change an unpopular one by balloting and not through violence. Now let us examine the factors which can contribute to make democracy practicable in Asia. In this connection, perhaps it is easier to discuss the question from another angle, and that is to examine the factors, nonexistent in Asia, which make democracy such a success in the west and in America.

One of the most important factors which is at the moment absent in all the countries of Asia is undoubtedly an effective, enlightened and responsible opposition party which will hold the government responsible for their actions. It is no exaggeration to say that in Asia there is no such responsible opposition. There are of course many political parties in direct opposition to the government, but they are not what I would call responsible opposition in the sense that they are not in the least trying to aid the government to become effective. Parties tend to become mere tools for some political leaders to come to power, and they are often involved in intrigues and shady tactics to bring down the government, so that they in turn can have the opportunity to make easy money. We have often heard the accusation of corruption leveled at some, if not all, of the recently established democratic governments in this area, and that the easiest way to make money is of course by being a member of a cabinet. This accusation may be true. But the question that one should ask is, why is there no effective opposition in spite of the presence of many political parties?

In the newly formed democracies of southeast Asia, the party system is not yet a healthy one. In the political atmosphere of Asia where the party system, as can be seen, is not functioning well; where parties prior to independence had little opportunity to develop or to perform the customary roles; and where a large majority of the masses is illiterate, it is hardly surprising that political parties are viewed with a rather jaundiced eye by the educated and economically well off. An independence movement is not the best breeding ground for political parties in the Western sense. In the search for unity in opposition to the colonial power, Asian nationalist movements exerted every effort to bring all factions together into one independence-bound organization, and there was a common slogan acceptable to all. Such slogans range from "freedom," "independence," or, as in Indonesia and Malaya, "Merdeka." After independence, as was natural, these movements tended to break down, as groups with minority views left the parent body to form new political groupings.

Asian political parties may be divided into four main groups: (a) The Nationalist Party (which is often the parent party), (b) the Communalist Party, (c) the Socialist Party, and lastly (d) the Communist Party. Besides these groupings there are other numerous political parties which are influential either at state level or regional level but not at national level, and also the innumerable so-called parties which center around individual leaders. This is partly caused by the absence of any clear divisions of political forces by long traditions or by differences on major policies. Therefore such break is due to conflicts of personality.

Communalism is one of the most powerful and most divisive forces in Asian life, but so far no "communal" party has had any success in national politics. What is the reason for the growth of communal parties? The answer is simple. Asia is a plural society with peoples of different races, customs, traditions and religious background living side by side. Communalism comes to the fore when foreign rule is withdrawn. Peoples who have more or less got along well with each other suddenly found old antagonisms toward neighbors of another race. For under foreign rules, some kind of neutrality could be imposed from above. If neither group ruled itself, it had not to worry about being ruled by its neighbors. But if these same neighbors were on the way to being the ruling class, then the prospect of being ruled by local foreign rulers becomes intolerable. Thus we saw how the Indian Muslims revolted against the Indian Hindus in India in 1947, the Sinhalese in Ceylon against the Tamils.

Now, under the circumstances, what is the possibility of the emergence of a responsible opposition? The possibility does not appear at all bright. There is apparently no common factor on which the various political parties could combine to form an opposition. Thus, neither the rightwing nor the leftwing parties, either separately or together, can become an effective opposition. If at all a coalition may be formed for other less complex purposes, such as to fight an election, but not because of common political ideals. However, this is not strictly true of Malaya.

Thus it is apparent that one of the most important components of democracy is lacking in Asia. However, I believe that in the long run, the emergence of an active opposition is certain, as the so-called leaders of the community may come to the realization that it would be better for everybody if they were to bury their differences and work for the nation as a whole. All that is required in this connection is, I think, a concerted effort to insure that the period of waiting for such an effective opposition is considerably shortened.

The other important factor necessary for democracy to be practicable is the presence of social consciousness, and the realization of their responsibility by the citizens. In the highly developed countries, social consciousness might, of course, be the result of the typical Western or American way of life, with its many kinds of public institutions, its public school system, its personal freedom vis-a-vis the security of the state. For instance, the British people believe that to aspire for political leadership, the personal character and the integrity of the aspirant must be aboveboard. This sort of consciousness is absent in Asia, where you often find that the so-called leaders of the community or party are more often than not the acknowledged failures in life. The thing that really bothers one is the fact that such men can and did win their elections to responsible positions either at State or even the national level. This is only possible due to the prevalent political apathy among a large majority of the people. Suitable and well-qualified candidates refuse to come forward to stand for elections, as they know full well the great responsibility that they, as leaders, would shoulder should they be elected. Consequently, political opportunists often come forward to fill the gap, and as there is no opposition (if any, it would be people of the same caliber), little choice is left for the electorate. Lack of suitable candidates for elections may be due to the absence of a leisure class. However, I do not believe that political apathy is the direct result solely of illiteracy of the masses. The voter turnout seems to be higher in the rural areas than in the urban. If this political apathy were to prevail for long, one fears that southeast Asia will get the kind of government which will by no means be democratic, but one which we dislike: authoritarian, short of communism.

Quite recently several Asian countries, namely Pakistan, Burma, and Thailand, in their despair have turned to authoritarian systems of government of one form or other. Burma is under what is called direct democracy, while it is guided democracy in Indonesia, and perhaps disciplined democracy in Thailand. It cannot be denied that this is an ominous trend. However, India, the biggest democracy on earth, is showing no signs of losing faith in its democratic ideals. Thus one can conclude that the feasibility of democracy in Asia is entirely dependent on the people's awareness of their responsibility. I have no doubt that the people of Asia have enough good sense to decide for their own betterment.

At present social consciousness is not entirely absent, but the degree of awareness is not encouraging enough for one to think that the chances of democracy to succeed are bright. To increase the awareness is by no

means formidable. But no one will deny that it will take a long time. Two things are required: education and time.

One can of course provide education and institutions which will foster the growth of social consciousness. But the process is necessarily a slow one. I admit, however, that we have not the time to do so considering the existence of other voices, the Communists, promising better things in quicker time than democracy can offer. The competition is therefore very stiff indeed and I think time is, in this case, not on our side.

## Southern Regional Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a sense of fairness impels me to insert the following editorials from two respected southern papers. These editorials from the Richmond Times-Dispatch and the Chattanooga Times discuss certain attacks on the good name of the Southern Regional Council and deserve the careful attention of every fair-minded citizen regardless of his views:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Aug. 21, 1958]

A RACE AGENCY AND THE FACTS

Inaccurate statements as to its origins of the Southern Regional Council of Atlanta appeared recently in the Times-Dispatch, and should be corrected. They appeared—inadvertently, we are sure—in one of the series of articles by Edward B. Simmons, of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, concerning Communist efforts to incite racial strife in the United States.

Mr. Simmons stated in the article appearing in our paper on August 5 that the Southern Regional Council, established in Atlanta in 1944 was an "offshoot of the old Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which was dissolved in 1948 after twice being described by the Federal Government as Communist front." He also said: "The Communist Daily Worker openly boasted that James E. Jackson, chief of the southern branch of the U.S. Communist Party, was a cofounder of the regional council."

Taking these two charges in order, the Southern Regional Council was not an offshoot of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. It was established in response to an appear from respected southern Negro leaders, who met at Durham, N.C., in October 1942, on the call of Dr. Gordon B. Hancock, of the Virginia Union faculty here, and Dr. P. B. Young, of Norfolk, publisher of the Norfolk Journal and Guide. These Negro leaders did not ask for the elimination of segregation in the schools or anywhere else; they asked that separate but equal be made a reality.

Responding to their appeal, a group of white leaders met in Atlanta in the spring of 1943, and expressed a desire to cooperate. Out of this grew the Southern Regional Council. The council was the successor to the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, founded in 1919 by leading churchmen. To repeat, it not only was no offshoot of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare; it was criticized in some quarters because it was more conservative than that organization and suspected of being in competition with it.

We must remember, too, that when the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was established in 1938, it was not suspected of having any Communist connections, and many well intentioned and patriotic southerners participated in its early meetings. A number of these later joined the Southern Regional Council when they discovered the true purposes of the Conference for Human Welfare.

As to the allegation of the Communist Daily Workers that James E. Jackson, chief of the southern branch of the U.S. Communist Party, was a cofounder of the Southern Regional Council, there is nothing to support this.

A James E. Jackson is listed as having attended the Durham meeting of Negro leaders in October 1942, but is not mentioned by the Norfolk Journal and Guide as having been on the committee which drew up the statement then issued. Jackson did not participate in the meetings of white and Negro leaders in 1943 and 1944 which led to the establishment of the Southern Regional Council, and he was not at any time an officer, director, or member of that agency. The Daily Worker's statement that he was a founder is as unreliable and inaccurate as nearly everything else in that Communist sheet.

The late Dr. Howard W. Odum, noted and respected member of the University of North Carolina faculty, was the first president of the council. He was succeeded in 1945 by Paul D. Williams, prominent Catholic layman of Richmond and cofounder of the Catholic Committee of the South, who served until 1951. Mr. Williams was succeeded in that year by Marion A. Wright, South Carolina attoreny, former chairman of the South Carolina Library Board and past president of the University of South Carolina Alumni Association.

It should be emphasized that SRC worked within the framework of separate but equal for 7 years, and did not announce for integration until 1951.

While we disagree strongly and completely with its present position on this issue, we feel obligated to point out, in fairness, that it was in no sense Communist in its origins. The Southern Regional Council was established because of a sincere desire on the part of white and Negro leaders in the South to eliminate many of the disabilities and discriminations from which Negroes were suffering.

It was hoped that if these could be substantially lessened, the colored South would not look to the colored North for leadership. Insufficient progress was made, unfortunately, and the NAACP moved in and launched its drive for the complete elimination of segregation—sooner than it probably would have done if SRC's accomplishments had been larger.

That is where we stand today.

[From the Chattanoga (Tenn.) Times, Dec. 20, 1958]

MATTHEWS AND THE SRC

The Arkansas Legislative Council, concluding that a Communist plot is substantially responsible for the Little Rock desegregation crisis, has aired some charges so grossly unjust as to recall the McCarthyist nightmare.

There was J. B. Matthews, himself a former Communist-front leader, declaring that the Southern Regional Council had Red sympathizers in its ranks.

Just 20 years ago, Mr. Matthews was accusing Shirley Temple of aiding the Bolsheviks. The former chief counsel of the Dies committee is primarily remembered, however, for his July 1953 article in the American Mercury labeling "at least 7,000 Protestant clergymen" as "party members, fellow travelers, espionage agents, partyline adherents, and unwilling dupes." The protest, from President Eisenhower and others, was so strong that Senator Joe McCarthy, who by then had carried his campaign of vilification directly to the White House, was forced to fire Mathews, whom he had just hired as executive director of his subcommittee.

In the Little Rock hearings, other familiar names in the business of smear were trotted out. The Southern Regional Council was a frequent target, though no one dared go so far as to impugn its motives as a whole.

The SRC, as is well known, is made up of foremost southern educators, clergymen, business, labor, and professional leaders. A discussion and research group, it was organized in 1943, as a result of Negro leaders' efforts to see that the "separate but equal" doctrine in southern education be made a reality. It grew also out of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, founded in 1919 by leading churchmen.

Since then it has favored gradual compliance with the Supreme Court's decision, but even so staunchly segregationist a newspaper as the Richmond Times-Dispatch recently said: "The Southern Regional Council was established because of a sincere desire on the part of white and Negro leaders in the South to eliminate many of the disabilities and discriminations from which Negroes were suffering."

Now the Arkansas Legislative Council, with never a peep about the role of its own Governor Faubus, concludes on the word of former Communists, who are professional name-callers, and others, most of them from out of the region, that little more than a Red plot is the cause of their difficulties.

## A Statement on Pending Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a letter I received from the Lancaster, S.C., Chamber of Commerce, and while I do not necessarily agree with all their views, I am grateful that a group of men in my district are making such a fine study and are trying to be helpful to their Congressman in making decisions on these matters:

STATEMENT ON PENDING LABOR LEGISLATION PREPARED FOR MEMBERS OF THE SENATE LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE AND THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

The legislative action committee of the Lancaster Chamber of Commerce has made a study of pending labor legislation and the recommendations of this committee have been approved by the board of directors.

Our members have been concerned, as has the rest of the Nation, about the revelations of the McClellan committee and we feel that some positive action should be taken by the Congress to protect the rights of union members, management, and honest union leaders.

We have studied the two primary bills now under consideration and prefer the administration bill, S. 748, over the Kennedy-Ervin bill, S. 505. The Kennedy-Ervin bill is a weak piece of legislation which we believe will not effectively deal with the corruption that has been uncovered in the organized labor movement. It also carries certain provisions which labor leaders say they must

have if they are to support the bill. We cannot see the necessity for bribing the public on this legislation. An antiracketeering measure is needed and the people should not have to bargain for it.

The administration bill, S. 748, comes nearer to an effective answer to this need. Provision is not made for bringing unions under antitrust laws or controlling the use of union funds for political purposes but the bill is otherwise an acceptable answer to the problem. S. 748 is already an example of compromise and we feel that it is the least that the American people can be asked to accept.

We are now at a turning point in the control of labor racketeering. Either something effective must be done this year or the racketeers will know that they have a clear field. The working men and women of this country deserve more than that.

Our committee is not able to study legislation in this field and obtain approval as fast as the various bills are being introduced.

However, we believe that S. 748 is a bill with which labor and management can both live and we urge the members of this committee to support this type of labor bill.

Respectfully submitted,

J. REECE FUNDERBURK, JR., D.D.S.
*Chairman, Legislative Action Committee, Lancaster Chamber of Commerce, Lancaster, S.C.*

## Don't Kill the Goose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the attched article from the March 9 issue of the U.S. News & World Report. This article in my opinion makes perfectly clear why we must not only talk about economy and fiscal responsibility but practice it as well:

"DON'T KILL THE GOOSE—"

(By David Lawrence)

The Government of the United States is a 52 percent partner in every American business.

Partners share the losses as well as the profits.

But the Government is a silent partner in private enterprise—it has to sit by while pressures of various kinds curtail or wipe out profits. Yet profits are necessary not only to furnish tax money to the Government but to replenish wornout tools and to pay the wages of the investors.

Nationwide labor unions lately have become the outspoken foe of bigger profits. Every time statistics are published showing that some companies in an industry are making somewhat larger profits than in the preceding year, union leaders demand higher wages. Unless these are granted, costly strikes ensue. This has little to do with whether the worker is going to produce more. The modern labor union doctrine holds that the worker is entitled to more wages, irrespective of efficiency or productivity.

But if this trend continues, where will the Government wind up?

Thus, in the current fiscal year, as a result of the business recession, the estimated tax receipts from the profits of corporations have gone down from $20.1 billion to $17 billion.

If labor unions insist that they have a right to a bigger and bigger share of the income of corporations, the Government will lose in two ways:

First, every wage expense is a deduction on which the Government suffers a 52-percent loss of revenue.

Second, the increased revenue from individual income taxes does not make up for all the losses suffered by the Treasury from a drop in corporation profits. In the current fiscal year, for instance, individual income tax receipts, as estimated by the Treasury, have gone up by $2.2 billion at the same time that the corporation taxes have declined by $3.1 billion.

The dependence of the Federal Treasury on the profits of business is not fully appreciated or realized throughout this country. President Eisenhower said on this point at his press conference last week:

"We shouldn't be so prone, I think, to talk about and decry profits in our economy.

"You must remember that the people now expect all sorts of services from the Federal Government, starting with that of national defense and go right on down to the last item that you want to find in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"We tax largely profits. We don't tax industrial activity as such—we tax profits. That is what the income tax is. So if you are trying to get profits down to zero, you are going to have to find some other way of finding Federal revenue, if we are going to this Government, I assure you."

America has achieved her greatest progress under the system of private initiative. Experience proves that Government operation of business projects is wasteful. Also, a big volume of tax dollars that would otherwise be collected is lost to the Treasury.

President Eisenhower has stated the issue plainly: How can there be appropriations for social welfare unless the Government takes in enouhg money from taxes to pay its bills? The President said last week in a speech to the U.S. Savings Bond Conference:

"Now, we have among us those who are calling for heavier and heavier expenditures, saying that these heavier expenditures on the part of the Federal Government would mean and, in effect, would cause, economic expansion. I cannot think of any doctrine or statement that is so false as this one. * * *

"When the Government spends more money than it is getting in the form of taxes, the Treasury must do just exactly what a family or a business would have to do, under similar circumstances: It must go out and borrow whatever is needed to finish paying the bills. When part of the borrowing it must undertake comes from commercial banks, the money supply is increased and the conditions are created for an inflationary price rise.

"Inflation weakens the economy. It brings serious hardships to those of our citizens who are living on pensions or other fixed incomes, and works against those who are unable to bargain effectively for higher wages. Most dangerous of all, inflation weakens the incentive to save. It gives rise to a fear that the dollar will continue to decline in value and that speculation will be the only way to keep ahead of the game."

What is the answer? It is to be found in one word—self-restraint. Business must restrain itself on prices. Labor must restrain itself on wages. The spenders in Congress must restrain themselves on appropriations for social welfare.

Steady growth and a stable dollar are certain to result from such restraint.

But what must be borne in mind above all else is that profits derived from private business are necessary to support the Government. We must never kill the goose that lays the golden egg."

## Curtailing Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as usual, opposition to the present administration on reciprocal trades and the Buy American Act, draws editorial comment, as well as a batch of misinformation, which serves to further confuse the minds of the public as to the realities of the situation. I am submitting for the RECORD today two editorials appearing in local papers which would appear to cover the subject to the uninformed, but to those of us who have made a thorough study of the situation the answer is not so simple. I submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, my reply to these editors and their editorials:

OPEN LETTER TO THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

FEBRUARY 27, 1959.

To the EDITOR.

DEAR SIR: I don't write Letters to the Editor very often. When I do, it's because either the information is in error, or I am badly informed.

On Wednesday, February 25, your editorial appears to put my fight for the awarding of large contracts to foreign governments in a bad light.

Personally, I've been an advocate for liberal trade policies. However, I always felt that the promises of every President, every Secretary of State, and every Secretary of Commerce—since the passage of the original reciprocal trade bills and the foreign aid legislation—were being kept.

Every assurance was and is still being given that no arguments on trade would be made that would prove to be injurious to any American industry.

The facts do not bear out these assurances:

Most of our troubles are of recent vintage, the Buy American Act has been openly and flagrantly abused since the Presidential order of December 1954, decreasing the American differential allowance from 25 percent to 6 percent.

The escape clause has been invoked 60 times by industry and minor relief has been granted only 19 times and no relief in the other 41 cases.

This record was compiled in spite of the fact that in 31 cases the Tariff Commission ruled unanimously in favor of tariff relief for the injured industries.

Two classic examples are the binocular and watch industries. After many protests against the competition from abroad, they closed shop and are no longer producing in the United States. The prediction is that all the watch industry will fold unless something is done.

These are not isolated cases, they are the rule, and not the exception.

Insofar as your figures for export and import of electrical equipment, the testimony given us is that of all the export business done by American producers all but $200,000 worth was paid for by our own money under mutual aid, ICA, and other Government spending and lending agencies.

Even this market is now threatened by new regulations being put into effect.

I believe a trade agreement has to be mutually beneficial and mutually respected.

In the case of British selling our Government generators and other power-producing

equipment, the testimony shows that the British do not permit any foreign country to sell any item of this nature to their entire power industry.

In the case of the Jeannette Elliott plant, the differential was approximately 12 percent and this, according to the President's order, should have given the business to our local company.

However, they invoked a new item into the calculations by giving credit to the Swiss company for the 13 percent ad valorem duty charged on the import.

Needless to say, the Jeannette company, nor their workers, were given credit for the taxes, Federal, State and local, paid.

I don't want to appear to be an isolationist or a high tariff advocate. I do, however, recognize our higher standards of pay, fringe benefits, personal and corporate taxes.

I also recognize that we need friends everywhere. Somehow, I can't believe we make friends by taking over their production facilities with our investments and our markets.

I may be a little short on the economics of the situation, but I can't figure how it will help the American workman and the American businessman by making it more attractive profitwise, and taxwise for an American manufacturer to close his plants here to make investments abroad and to be allowed to take his foreign profits tax free, if he reinvests in other foreign enterprises. The promotion also calls for limiting American investors in foreign enterprise taxes to the limit of the taxes paid through foreign corporation earnings and investments to the taxes assessed by the foreign country.

One example given shows where a steel producer pays a limit of 30 percent on net income compared to 52 percent here. This may be all right if we can afford it, however, I doubt if we can with the debt and budget greater than all the rest of the world combined.

In closing, and to make a point, I refer back to my statement that agreements have to be mutually beneficial and respected.

Let's take the auto industry. We give concessions to foreign cars that permit the following comparative prices in New York City and other places:

New York, United States of America: American Ford $350 more than British Consul, $900 more than German Volkswagon.

London, England: Ford $3,850 more than Consul, $3,800 more than Volkswagon.

Cologne, Germany: Ford $1,900 more than Consul, $3,800 more than Volkswagon.

Copenhagen, Denmark: Ford $2,800 more than Consul, $3,700 more than Volkswagon.

Caracas, Venezuela: Ford, $2,800; Consul, $2,050; Volkswagon, $1,750.

South Africa: Ford, $3,350; Consul, $2,250; Volkswagon, $1,800.

Mexico: Puts a 100 percent tariff on all American cars.

The formula shifts in its application in Brazil, Japan, the Philippines, and other markets, but in every case the heaviest duties apply to American cars.

This is known as market rigging and this is the reason we have lost our foreign market and about 13 percent of our home market.

When we can't keep our production lines at full capacity, it adds to the cost of the item produced and with the loss of foreign markets we are necessarily put into a position where we can't compete successfully with imports.

This doesn't alibi our big cars and luxury items but how do we explain the fact that Nash has all of its "Metropolitan," their cheap, small, unadorned car, made exclusively in England and it's the same car formerly produced here.

I know that both sides of an argument has logic and sincerity on their side. I can't, however, as a public servant, be choosy in the matter of whose job I shall try to save.

To me a worker in the glass plants, rubber works, bicycle shops, coal mines, electrical or any other endeavor is equally distressed if he is unemployed.

I shall never knowingly vote to create conditions that will cause any American worker to lose his job or any American business, including your journalistic enterprise to lose its earnings on its investments and services.

I know this is a long "letter" but believe me, I haven't scratched the surface of the problem.

I hope we can find a solution that will help us keep both our friends, our jobs, and our standard of living.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT,
*Member of Congress.*

---

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Feb. 25, 1959]

HOW TO PROTECT JOBS

Before Congressmen—and Jeanette's Representative JOHN DENT notably among them—take action to curtail the American importation of such goods as electrical generators, they should be reminded that foreign trade is a two-way street on which this country enjoys a preponderance of the traffic.

The current debate has arisen because Swiss and British firms have underbid American firms on electric generators contracted for by agencies of the Federal Government. Mr. DENT and others have complained that this would deprive American workmen of jobs. While Mr. Dent certainly can't be blamed for protecting what he believes to be the best interests of his constituents, he should take a look at the other side of the street.

Pittsburgh Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD has pointed out that this country exports far more electrical equipment than it imports. State Department figures for 1957 show that the United States exported $1 billion worth of electric machinery and apparatus while importing the same sort of material valued at only $145 million. In the field of electrical generators alone, American exports totaled $175 million as compared with imports of only $13 million.

When renewal of the reciprocal trade program was up for congressional consideration last year, it was estimated by Government officials that world trade makes jobs for at least 4½ million American workers. Closer to home, exports bring $793.2 million yearly to Pennsylvania, $164.7 million annually to Allegheny County alone. This trade represents full-time jobs for more than 9,400 workers in the Pittsburgh area's five principal industries.

The jobs of these and other workers would be jeopardized, and this Nation's unemployment problem would be aggravated, if Congress supported a program aimed at protecting American workers through higher tariffs or subterfuges in the name of national security. That would invite reprisal by foreign countries which could cost more American jobs than would be protected. If we are to continue to sell our products abroad, we must encourage conditions under which foreign countries can do business with us.

---

MR. HARRY PORE, JR.,
*Editor, the Monessen Daily Independent, Monessen, Pa.*

MY DEAR HARRY: Your story and editorial again demonstrate your technique of telling half-truths.

Where did you get the story that Congressman MOORHEAD "hits" DENT on Buy American?

Mr. MOORHEAD has never once argued with me on my position of fighting for the Government orders for Westinghouse and Elliott Co., of Jeannette.

In fact, he was one of the cosponsors of my resolution asking that the orders be given to the American concerns.

The only difference between my thinking and some of the others is that I can't see any difference between my unemployed glass workers, steelworkers, and others because of our trade policy than an electrical worker.

There is no change in the position of my congressional district, since my predecessor, Congressman Kelley, fought and voted against reciprocal trade agreements.

Our district happens to be one of the areas that has been sacrificed to the sacred cow of cotton and other low man-hour production exports.

I am not now, nor have ever been, a Smoot-Hawley high-tariff advocate.

I am now, and have always been, a believer in fair trade and believed what every President and every Secretary of State and every Secretary of Commerce of the United States have said time and time again for the record, "That no reciprocal trade agreement will be made that will cause undue hardship or injury to any American industry."

I believe in that, and I believe also that if we made concessions we should receive same.

I know you would like to be fair, so I'll give you some facts that are compelling, at least to a Representative of the 21st Congressional District of Pennsylvania, with its heavy unemployment. I've just received the latest figures on our trade balance with Japan, and I believe it tells the story that I'm trying to emphasize. We trade payrolls and raw materials for consumer goods and unemployment.

We sell Japan: Cotton, wheat, soya beans, metal working machinery, heavy oil, crude petroleum, bituminous coal for steel producing, iron and steel scrap, barley, cotton mill waste and pulp, hides and skins, beef tallow, corn, miscellaneous.

We buy from Japan: Processed and canned fish products, iron and steel, pottery, silk fabrics, sewing machines, optical instruments, cotton fabrics, wool and worsted fabrics, pearls, cotton clothing, railway sleepers, glassware, cooking utensils, miscellaneous.

Although there is a slight trade balance in dollars in our favor, the indisputable fact remains that the things we sell are used to make products to sell back to us.

We have 38 million tons of steel capacity idle, yet the U.S. Navy buys 5,700 tons of steel plate from Japan. Last week we ordered $9 million worth of radar equipment from Canada and Westinghouse and General Electric are on short workweeks with thousands unemployed.

It isn't an easy matter to know the answer but one thing is sure, we can't operate without employment and when the State Department decides which jobs to sacrifice and which jobs are to be protected, let us hope that our district factory workers get as much consideration in the future as oil, wheat and corn planters.

I am not against trades—all I want is reciprocal trades that are reciprocal.

I am attaching a letter with more details of interest which I have sent to the Post Gazette.

Hoping we can work together, at least for our district, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
JOHN H. DENT, *Member of Congress.*

---

FULL CIRCLE

Representative JOHN H. DENT, of Westmoreland County, is engaged in a strange campaign for a Democratic Congressman of the New Deal persuasion. He is promoting so-called buy American legislation to protect U.S. manufacturers against foreign competition.

It has been a good quarter-century since a Congressman from this area adopted such a position. The last one from Westmoreland County was classified by the Democrats, if memory serves us, as a reactionary.

So apparently we have come full circle on the question of free trade vs. protective tariffs. Representative DENT'S position is indistinguishable from that of the blackest Republican of the Smoot-Hawley era.

It is hard to avoid the impression that Mr. DENT is more interested in votes than in finding the right answers to problems of foreign competition and world trade. Some industries in his district are feeling the effects of foreign imports; so he proposes the simplest possible remedy—shut out the imports, buy American.

What it pleases him to overlook is that the United States by and large is an exporting country. Take Europe, from where come the products that are bothering Mr. DENT. In 1957 the United States shipped to Europe nearly $6 billion worth of products; we imported from Europe about $3 billion worth.

Does anyone seriously believe that if the United States reverts to a high tariff policy, it will continue to find the world's markets open to it?

## The Leopard's Spots Come Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Leopard's Spots Come Back" which appeared on February 14, 1959, in the Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz.:

THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS COME BACK

Some time ago, the Fund for the Republic got its tax-free tail in a crack by blatantly propagandizing the pseudo-liberal line. Congress began to look as if it might do something unpleasant about tax exemptions, but the rumbles subsided when by coincidence the fund switched signals. Henceforth, it announced, it would devote itself to a scholarly study of the basic issues underlying a free society. And the fund wouldn't even be responsible for the findings of its scholars.

Responsible or not, the fund has spent a great deal of tax-free money first financing, and now distributing a thoroughly biased, lopsided report on "Right to Work in Practice." The object of the report's author appears to be to discredit right to work laws everywhere on the basis of one badly chosen example. We find it hard to believe that officials of the fund did not know the author's feelings before they commissioned him to make the so-called study.

Frederic Meyers is the author. The fund in its introduction to his report says he has taught at the University of Texas, the University of Illinois and, currently, the University of California at Los Angeles. For his right-to-work guinea pig he chose Texas, which has barred compulsory unionism for the last 11 years.

What any purely objective reporter who knew his subject would have pointed out—but Meyers does not—is that Texas is not a typical right-to-work State. Most such States, like Arizona, have laws which do no more than declare that no one shall be deprived of a job for joining a union, or for refusing to join one. That's all. But the Texas law tries to upset collective bargaining by a majority unit, which makes it uniquely undesirable. Yet Meyers tries to tar us all with Texas' fault.

Aside from his fatal error of fact, Meyers appears to adopt as his basic theory the professional unionist's dogma that right to work laws represent a struggle between labor and management. On such a false assumption, it is inevitable that he should reach the conclusion he does, that right to work laws haven't changed much of anything in industrial relations. Unions have continued to grow and employers have continued to deal with them. Considering that most right to work advocates have always predicted this would be the case, it is strange to find Meyers labeling the laws ineffective.

That even the faulty Texas law has been effective in protecting the right of individuals to live up to their own moral principles, which is the object of the right to work movement, is demonstrated by Meyers's own findings. In interviewing persons who had used the law to reject union membership while keeping their jobs, he found some who felt that the union had become too strong and overrode both the employer and the employee. Others complained that the particular union was undemocratic. Some were opposed to the principle of unionism. One said his religious conviction made it impossible for him to join a union.

One would think America should applaud a law which makes it possible for individuals to live up to their moral principles without suffering economic reprisal. Meyers does not think so. He tips his hat politely to the idea that minority rights should not be disregarded, but then creates something he calls an industrial citizen—that is someone who works for a living—and remarks that this industrial citizen can reasonably be required to assume the responsibility of citizenship. In case you hadn't guessed, he means union membership when he says citizenship. In other words, Meyers thinks it is reasonable to force workers to join a union.

His entire report is little more than an argument trying to justify this belief. He speaks of the duty of participation in unions. He even indicates that those who abstain from union membership are infringing the rights of others—although what rights these are, he does not specify. And at the end he makes the flat statement—a dead giveaway of his own approach—that those who support right to work proposals wish essentially to make a public demonstration of the power to defeat the labor movement in the political arena. Nuts. Right to work laws are intended to permit the individual, even if he is one out of a thousand, to exercise his liberty if he wants to. The U.S. Constitution strives in the same direction.

Meyers is entitled to his views, just as we are entitled to disagree with them. But whether the fund for the republic is entitled to tax-exempt status while financing such propaganda under the guise of a scholarly study is another question entirely. We think not.

## ORT Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable and constructive programs in the field of human welfare is the Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training or, briefly, ORT. On March 4, 1959, members and friends of ORT will celebrate the 79 years of service to displaced and underprivileged Jews throughout the free world.

ORT Day has become a traditional observance in those hundreds of communities throughout the country where dedicated ORT members work for the rehabilitation of their fellow Jews wherever they may be in need.

Through its 400 vocational training installations in 20 countries, the ORT program offers youths and adults both the opportunity to learn the industrial skills which will make them self-supporting. Through this process of rehabilitation of individuals who would otherwise live out their lives in idleness without practical utilization of their talents and abilities, ORT also contributes to the economic development of free-world nations by training productive citizens.

ORT Day, 1959, will have special significance for the 50,000 members of the Women's American ORT, since it marks the 32d year of service by the organization to a total of several million people. On March 4, in my own city of Elizabeth, N.J., as in cities from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the 100,000 members of other American ORT federation affiliates and many thousands of friends of the ORT program will join in special celebrations.

It is a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of our colleagues to this important occasion in the history of man's humanity to man.

## Soil Conservation Program in St. Clair County, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the 1958 annual report of the St. Clair County, Ill., Soil Conservation District. This marks the 20th year of operation by the oldest conservation district in Illinois. The officers of the district are: Verlan Kamper, chairman; Arnold Mauck, vice chairman; Melvin Wagner, secretary-treasurer; Harvey Teberend and Ralph J. Weilbacher.

TWENTIETH ANNUAL REPORT, ST. CLAIR COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

The St. Clair County Soil Conservation District held 12 regular meetings and one special meeting during the year 1958. We met on the third Tuesday evening of every month. We had good attendance at our meetings throughout the year by board members. Others who attended our meetings included: Soil conservationist, Ray Irwin; farm advisor, Clarence Clark; assistant directors, Herman G. Heberer and Oscar Weber.

Other visitors during the year included Howard Turner, area conservationist; and past directors, William J. Pfeffer, Ralph Emge, Jr., Hugo Haertling, and Elmer Bertelsmann.

The terms of three directors terminated in February this year. They were Verlan Kamper, Ralph Emge, Jr., and Melvin Henss. Those elected at the annual meeting to fill these vacancies were: Verlan Kamper, reelected, Ralph J. Weilbacher from Millstadt, and Arnold Mauck from Lebanon.

Following the election the board organized at the February meeting as follows: Chairman, Verlan Kamper; vice chairman, Arnold Mauck; secretary-treasurer, Melvin Wagner.

At this meeting Mr. Heberer and Mr. Weber were appointed as assistant directors.

In order to have a good active board, it is always necessary for members to take part in area and State meetings. It is only through these activities that a board member learns of his responsibility to the people in the district. We had good activity in this field as shown in the next paragraph.

There were four Lower-Kaskaskia Land Use Council meetings this year. We were host to the council meeting in April at which time Melvin Wagner was elected secretary-treasurer and also he was elected to represent the council on the Board of the Association of Illinois Soil Conservation Districts. All these meetings were well attended by our board. Kamper and Wagner attended the State convention of the Association of Illinois Soil Conservation Districts at Jacksonville. Wagner participated in the program whereby recognition was given to the 20 years of service to districts.

The watershed program has developed interest in this county. The Richland Creek watershed application was approved by the State of Illinois and Washington, D.C. for planning. Another group made application during the year. Representatives of the Mascoutah surface water protection district met with the board this year and asked the District to cosponsor an application for assistance in planning and conducting the improvement on the Hog River-Pig Creek watershed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566. This application has been approved by the State of Illinois and is now in Washington, D.C. for consideration. There were two watershed hearings in the county at which time the district presented statements offering their cooperation. These were on Richland Creek at Belleville and Silver Creek at Mascoutah.

We sent copies of the "Soil Stewardship Sunday" booklet to all the churches in the district. Many churches observed the Sunday. We also purchased the booklet "The Wonder of Water" for distribution in the schools at the fifth grade level. During the year Ray Irwin and Herman Heberer conducted 426 children of the Belleville fifth grades on a soil conservation tour over Heberer's farm.

We had a pond demonstration field day at the Kamper farm in August. Pond location, construction methods, and management of weeds and fish were discussed. Spraying weeds and shocking fish were demonstrated. This was a successful and interesting meeting with an attendance of about 100.

Last spring we offered a $50 scholarship toward tuition for the teachers training school in Springfield but no one took advantage of it.

Three ball-point pens were given to 4-H Club members who completed 4-H soil conservation projects this year. We expect this participation to increase.

During the year the board approved 56 new cooperators and there were 11 cancellations due to sale, death, etc. Farmers are beginning to take advantage of their soil conservation district and it appears that the workload will increase this coming year This brings up an important point for our soil conservation office, because it is definitely short of assistance. We are carrying on a good program but with some additional help our district could do so much more towards getting soil conservation on the land.

We wish to extend our thanks to all who have had any part in expanding our soil conservation work in the district. We wish to thank the extension service and the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for their cooperation in selling and putting into operation our well-developed program. Especially we wish to thank Clarence Clark, farm advisor, and Ray Irwin, soil conservationist and his coworkers, Howard Limestall and Orville Dickhaut.

We also want to give credit to the ASC committee for their cooperation through the ACP cost-share program whereby many farmers are encouraged and assisted financially towards installing soil conservation practices. Special thanks go to Office Manager, Robert Olsen and to Mrs. Deloros Grimmer who handles all ACP participation.

We also want to thank the Illinois State Department of Conservation for their technical assistance in biology, fisheries, and forestry. Also the Illinois State Department of Agriculture for the help furnished us through the State board. A vote of thanks also goes to the St. Clair County Board of Supervisors for their financial assistance to the district. And finally we want to thank all our district cooperators who are taking advantage of the soil conservation program and are using all these services to get more soil conservation on the land. This is our only measure of success. All this cooperation toward one objective will improve and secure the greatest natural resource in St. Clair County—namely the soil.

The past 2 years we have had an excess amount of rainfall during certain seasons. This makes me think we should practice more soil conservation to keep this soil and hold this water for the drier seasons of the year. To hold the water longer on the rolling land will also prevent a larger number of drainage problems on our level and low lands.

I would like to close with a quotation used on the memos of the auxiliary of the Association of Illinois Soil Conservation Districts at the 1958 meeting:

It took brawn to conquer the land; it will take brains to keep it.

VERLAN KAMPER,
*Chairman.*

1958 PROGRESS REPORT

| | |
|---|---|
| Total cooperators approved by district, July 22, 1938 through December 31, 1957 | 869 |
| Cooperators approved this year | 56 |
| Total cooperators approved by district | 925 |
| Less cooperators cancelled by death, sale, etc | 175 |
| Total active cooperators to date | 750 |
| Total basic plans prepared through December 31, 1957 | 771 |
| Basic plans prepared this year | 17 |
| Total Basic plans prepared to date | 788 |
| Less cooperators cancelled to date by death, sale, etc | 175 |
| Total active Basic plans to date | 613 |
| Total Basic plans applied this year | 37 |
| Total Basic plans applied to date | 230 |
| Cooperators serviced by SCS during the year | 282 |
| Cooperators completing one or more practices on their farm | 215 |

Amount of field work reported by the Soil Conservation Service is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Pasture seeding | 170 acres |
| Natural reforestation | 101 acres |
| Tree planting | 32 acres |
| Fish pond improvement | 52 each |
| Hedge planting | 1296 rods |
| Wildlife area improvement | 102.7 acres |
| Ditch construction | 6.1 miles |
| Diversion construction | 1.8 miles |
| Drainage | 420 acres |
| Drop inlet construction | 12 each |
| Drop spillway construction | 14 each |
| Pond construction | 26 each |
| Terracing | 2 miles |
| Waterway development | 33.5 acres |

FINANCIAL REPORT

| | |
|---|---|
| Balance on hand January 1, 1958 | $599.90 |
| Deposits: | |
| State of Illinois | 74.35 |
| St. Clair County Board of Supervisors | 480.75 |
| Total | $1,155.00 |
| Expenditures: | |
| Annual meeting expense | $22.50 |
| Secretarial work, office supplies | 107.55 |
| Field supplies | 22.87 |
| Dues—Friends of the Land | 8.00 |
| Dues—NASCD | 65.00 |
| Dues—Assoc. Ill. SCD | 70.00 |
| Dues—Lower-Kaskaskia Land Use Council | 1.25 |
| Soil Stewardship Sunday | 25.00 |
| Mileage for directors | 78.20 |
| National Convention Expenses | 15.00 |
| Telephone | 6.00 |
| Photo supplies | 3.10 |
| Educational supplies | 56.10 |
| Total | 480.57 |
| Balance on hand December 31, 1958 | 674.43 |

## Castro's Cuban Justice on Trial Before the Cleveland City Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered last Saturday, February 28, 1959, before a luncheon meeting of the Cleveland City Club in Cleveland, Ohio:

Before I speak about a nation whose new government is barely 2 months old today, please let me say a word about a State whose 100th birthday was February 14, 1959, Oregon, my State, that is. In the Pacific Northwest we are having a big centennial celebration out there this spring and summer. You are all invited. I personally invited Fidel Castro earlier this week, pointing out to him that he would feel at home because many of the men are sporting outrageous beards and our mountains would please any rebel band. We have many other attractions. Do plan to visit this newer northwest territory. I guarantee that you will enjoy yourselves.

Here is a proposition I trust you will concede without argument: A Member of Con-

gress becomes an authority in any area, physical or abstract, by any contact—be it ever so slight. I hope to demonstrate this to you today.

According to the title of my remarks today I am an "eye-witness" and as such I am supposed to report to you on Castro's Cuban justice. In a moment I shall lay a foundation for my testimony. First, let us consider the issues on which I shall testify:

1. Does the quality of Castro's justice indicate that Cuba is now a police state or soon will be?

2. Does it show Communist influence and anti-U.S. sentiments, existing and potential?

3. Does it mean that Castro intends to bring revolution to other lands?

4. What can we do, officially and personally, to improve the qualities of Castro's justice and our relationships with Castro's Cuba?

JUSTICE IN THE BROADER SENSE

I make no apology for using justice in the broader sense. I do not confine it to the cases of the accused war criminals. Justice as I use it in these remarks represents the purpose of government. In other words, what does Castro's treatment of accused war criminals tell us about the nature of Castro's government?

Now, as to my qualifications as a witness, a few words so you who have questions for me won't be too hard on me when your turn comes. I don't speak Spanish. I have never had a formal course relating to Latin America. Within the last 2 years I have made two short visits to Puerto Rico, two to Venezuela, one each to Costa Rica, Colombia, Honduras, and Panama. I have visited Cuba three times, the first on my way back from Honduras in December of 1957 for about 3 hours between planes. My wife and I took a taxi into Havana and discovered that we couldn't get within four blocks of the presidential palace because of police barricades. The second time was last month for 2 days and the third time was a week ago for 3 days. Exactly a week ago at this time I was making a speech in Santiago de Cuba at a meeting sponsored by the Santiago Committee for Industrialization and Progress. The Lions Club, the Rotary Club, the Twenty-Thirty Club, and the chamber of commerce were all there. Last Monday I again talked with Fidel Castro, this time for 45 minutes.

Now, if you'll bear with me, just one more flashback:

Shortly after I arrived in Washington, in December of 1956, I learned that a constituent of mine, Gerald Lester Murphy, had disappeared in the Dominican (so-called) Republic. In the course of trying to find out what happened to him I discovered that our official policy was to be kind to dictators. I didn't like this. I said so. Not only did I believe our treating Trujillo as though he were respectable had made him think he could get away with murdering Gerry Murphy, but it was plain to me that our policy conflicted with our Nation's deepest traditions and played into the hands of Communists.

HOW THE BATTLE WAS JOINED

In the course of my expressing my protests about our official policies I naturally included other dictators Perez Jimenez, of Venezuela; Stroesner of Paraguay; Somoza, of Nicaragua; and Batista, of Cuba. In my office and in my travels I met many of the antidictator nationals of these countries. I received many letters from them. I learned a great deal from persons who had been in this fight much longer than I, such people as Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times editorial board; Gov. Munoz Marin, of Puerto Rico; Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica; Alberto Lleras Camargo, now President of Colombia; Romulo Betancourt, now President of Venezeula; and many others. I found that my strongest allies were the Inter-American Press Association and newspapermen who knew the area, and also organized labor, particularly the AFL–CIO vice president, Serafino Romualdi.

I am still ignorant in many respects, but not quite so much so, thanks to my friends. My distinguished colleague, Mr. BRAZILLA CARROLL REECE of Tennessee, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, disagrees with me about Castro's justice. On February 9, in an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he calls me his irrepressible colleague (which in this connection will doubtless continue to be true), and he also calls me one of the principal apologists for Castro. He thinks Castro is encouraging communism. He doesn't want us "to condemn in word or action any government with whom we are in free alliance," but he thinks we "owe it to mankind" to protest the "obvious and proven disregard of the basic elements of justice and fair play" by the Castro government.

THE QUESTION OF A POLICE STATE

This brings us to the first issue on which I shall testify as an eyewitness. Is Cuba now a police state?

It is true that Castro is the strong man in Cuba today. It is true that military tribunals are trying accused war criminals and that some 300 have been executed upon being found guilty. It is true that the procedures do not involve the use of a jury nor of many of the procedural safeguards we deem essential in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. It is true there are no freely elected officials in the executive or legislative branches.

It is also true that Fidel Castro, President Manuel Urrutia, Ambassador Dihigo, his Cabinet Ministers, and the barbudos, or "bearded ones" in the 26th of July movement are not the kind of people who countenance "blood baths," much less arrange them. The Cuban people love the barbudos. They greet them and wave to them. What a difference from the way they felt about Batista's soldiers and police.

I think the beards mislead many people in our country. For example, a week ago in Santiago de Cuba, the capital of Oriente Providence where the revolution began, I met Manuel Pinero, the commandant of Castro's forces there. He has the most magnificient red beard and locks I've ever seen. Until you talk with him and unless you had known other Castro men, you might think, "What a screwball this guy must be." In fact, though, Commander Pinero is a capable, sensitive and decent man. He studied economics at Columbia University. His wife, Lorna, who has an M.A. in psychology, comes from New London, Conn. At midnight last Saturday he escorted me on a tour of the Moncada, the military barracks in Santiago, where Castro made his famous attack on the 26th of July and where Masferrer, Batista's terrorist-in-chief, had his headquarters and where many boys and men were horribly tortured.

"We don't like this place," Pinero told me. They plan to destroy the buildings where the atrocities were committed and to make a school out of the rest. The weather was excellent that night. Many people were on the streets at 1 a.m. Under Batista, my hosts told me, the streets were deserted after 9 o'clock.

A LESSON IN HUMILITY

On the following day, Sunday, Pinero told me they were going to have a degradation ceremony. His wife thought at first he meant to say "decoration" but he didn't. Some noncom had made a mistake and he was being stripped of his rank in a public ceremony. The Castro men never looted, they never raped, they never tortured or killed prisoners. They don't drink whisky. I have met many of them. Never have I seen one who swaggered or was loud-spoken. They are not a rabble in arms. They are disciplined and restrained, dedicated but not fanatical—because of a humility they all possess. Major is their highest rank. One captain told me they had just been paid for January. His salary after deductions was $208.

I asked Commander Pinero how they were able to indoctrinate the new recruits who joined them in great numbers when they left the mountains last December to march toward Havana. He told me that, in addition to giving them examples of conduct and specific instructions, they shot one new man who stole a can of milk. They are very serious about maintaining the high morality of their revolution, but not to the point of setting up their own terror.

A REBEL IN SUNDAY SCHOOL

As I left Santiago the man across the aisle in the airplane was a Baptist minister from Park Forrest, Ill., by the name of Joseph L. Hughes. He and several other Baptist ministers had just spent 2 days in Santiago. "We hadn't been here 10 minutes," he told me, "until we had a different picture than the press had given us." He said they had just left one of Castro's top men teaching a Sunday school class. He shared my admiration for these man and said he and his colleagues would be speaking up on their side when they returned to the United States.

Yes, an army is in control of Cuba, the rebel army. But there are civil liberities, including freedom of the press, and there is a promise of free and honest elections in less than 2 years. The men who are in command are decent men worthy of our support and sympathy in their struggle to establish democracy in Cuba.

After my talk in Santiago last Saturday the Castro men flew me about 50 miles north to the Sagua de Tanamo, a town of about 6,000 inhabitants, which had been cruelly damaged by Batista's air force. Nearly 300 civilians were killed there. This was the first time I had seen a bombed city in this hemisphere. Whether or not it was a war crime is not clear. The evidence is conflicting. The 21-year-old captain who escorted me, owner of a sugar cane farm and student of chemistry who intends to enter politics someday, a softspoken athletic lad by the name of Caleb de Quesada, told me he had been informed that there was no resistance, but barbudos in the village told me they did fight back. Both could be correct. The assault extended over 10 days. The resistance probably developed after repeated attacks. The invariable Castro tactic was to come into a town at night, take all the guns and retire to the hills before dawn. All air attacks were in the daytime. This young captain, by the way was Castros heavy weapons expert.

WHAT IS A WAR CRIME?

The point here of course is which, if any, of the 40 or more Batista pilots now on trial in Santiago are war criminals. I talked this over with Pinero and with Castro. They agreed that the burden of proof was on the prosecution to show that the accused man knew he was shooting or bombing only to terrorize civilians and not as part of an attack on enemy forces.

This testimnoy of mine adds up to the finding that Castro and his men are as decent as Batista and his men were indecent.

But, you might ask, because in many instances their procedures were summary and they have executed many men, how do we know that they haven't killed innocent men? I attended no trials. I relied on a free press to tell me about them. The press has been free and wide-ranging since Batista left, yet I have to date seen not even one allegation that an innocent person has been executed or that any one of those condemned had no opportunity to defend himself. This does

not mean I endorse the procedures. I do not. From the first I have urged their improvement.

The persons being executed are not shot because they are Batista supporters as one news story stated, but because they were murderers of defenseless men, women, and children. Castro can predict that about 400 will be executed because he knows very well the files on the notorious murderers in the police and in Masferrer's "tiger" army. These files were carefully prepared by thousands of spies. Batista's men helped by not trying to hide many of their atrocities, thinking to intimidate the Cubans. Pinero made available to me pictures taken by Masferrer and his sadistic underlings. They are beyond description. What man can do to man is incredible. The Nazis did no worse.

THE HIGH COST OF WORDS

I knew about these atrocities and I blamed Batista for them while he was in office. Many Cubans and others sent me stories and photographs. Why didn't the Nation know? One reason is that Batista corrupted the press, even some of our own. He bought good words or, at least, silence. The Associated Press, a fine organization with high ideals, fired one of its employees in Havana, Arroyo Maldonado, a Cuban citizen, about a year ago when it found he was receiving money from Batista.

An Associated Press staff writer, Robert Berrellez, one member of the entirely new AP American contingent in Havana, finished his recent series on the Batista atrocities with this paragraph, referring to the 400 (out of 2,000 detained) who Castro said would probably die:

"It could have been more, some quarters say, were it not for the strength of criticism outside Cuba—much of it probably growing out of a lack of information on what had happened here."

The Cuban revolution was not a change of the palace guard. It may not achieve all its noble ends. It may even degenerate into a police state of the left or the right. I don't think it will. The determination in the Cuban heart to establish an honest and democratic government is too intense and too universal.

THE PROS AND CONS

This brings us to the next question, what about pro-communism and anti-U.S. feeling in the Castro government? Every enemy of a Latin American dictator is called a Communist and worse. Many Catholics supported Castro and most of his men are of that faith. One cannot be a Catholic and a Communist. Furthermore, Castro and his leaders are middle class people with a social and economic reform program which is not Communistic. Of course the Communists are on the scene, with money and know-how, to take advantage if they can of disorganization and to fire up, as best they can, anti-U.S. sentiments.

A Cuban can be anti-United States without being pro-Communist. Historically there has been very little anti-U.S. feeling in Cuba compared to other Latin American countries. I have found no such feelings. I asked Castro last Monday why, in a telecast a few nights previously, he had put out an anti-U.S. version of Cuban-U.S. history. He replied that he had to be honest, but that he was not anti-United States. I believe him. The best proof is the kind of men he has put in high places and the kind of government Cuba now has.

THE NERVOUS NEIGHBOR POLICY

Both Commander Pinero and Premier Castro assured me that they did not intend to sponsor aggression against their nervous neighbor, Rafael Trujillo, the senile dictator of the Dominican Republic. They know that such action would inevitably invoke the organized action of the Organization of American States against them. This brings us to the third issue: Is Castro's government planning to take the lead in igniting the overthrow of other tyrants in Latin America? "Exiles from any land can come here," Castro told me Monday, "and I will not allow the police to bother them." He makes no secret of his dislike for Trujillo.

Trujillo tried to help Batista. He tried to help Dictator Perez Jimenez, of Venezuela. Now he has, in his capital city, two deposed dictators, Peron and Batista, as living reminders to his long-suffering people that a day of reckoning for such men eventually comes. No wonder Trujillo wishes they would go away.

The shoe is now on the other foot in Latin America. Not long ago the lovers of freedom were running and hiding from torture and death. Now the forces of decency and democracy are strong and becoming stronger. They control Cuba and Venezuela, both potentially wealthy countries. Their leaders speak out against Trujillo. They are only justied in doing so. I think this is in keeping with the most sacred traditions of the United States, a country which was born out of revolution against a tyrant, a country whose citizens know that democracy once attained must be maintained.

THE PROMISE—NOT THE THREAT

Vice President NIXON, with whom I sometimes do not agree, said in Oregon week before last in my presence that "we should concern ourselves more with our faith in freedom, more with the promise of the American Revolution and less with the threat of the Russian Revolution." I say amen to that.

My observations in Cuba lead me to conclude that the Cuban leaders do not intend any rash Bolivar-like expeditions against the declining dictators, but that they will join with Venezuela and other countries in condemning all governments based on terror and tribute and that they will carry this policy into the Organization of American States and other international organizations. Such expressions, in my opinion, particularly if joined in by the United States, will be quite sufficient to insure the early downfall of Trujillo by internal forces which heretofore have been frustrated by the respectability misguidedly accorded to this despotic regime. An invasion of attitude in these circumstances can be more readily effective than an invasion of barbudos.

THERE'S A DIFFERENCE

What about Castro's Cuba in its relationships with the United States? I think we will be more friendly than ever, now that our administration has endorsed a policy of differentiating between democracies and dictatorships, now that Cuba is an emerging democracy, and now that we have an outstanding Ambassador in Havana, a career man, Philip Wilson Bonsal, whose opposition to dictators needs no further demonstration. The two political appointees who preceded Bonsal made a sorry mess of our official standing in Cuba by identifying themselves with the dictator and his minions. Our refusal to withdraw our military missions from the Batista government was an error of immense proportions, yet we are now sending Marines to Haiti to repeat that mistake.

A free, uncorrupted press will do much to help reestablish our good relations with Cuba. Cuba's own struggle as it becomes better known here will enlist support and sympathy. I predict brighter days and closer ties between this fair country and our own, ties based on our common devotion to human freedom. Its government is taking hold. Castro appeared more severe and assured when we spoke Monday. Sunday he and the cabinet spent on a yacht out at sea where they could confer without telephones. I found this out because I was to have had dinner with the brilliant young secretary of the treasury, Lopez Fresquet. His U.S.-born wife explained where he was and why.

I conclude by listing a few of the features I feel we must include in our Latin American policy:

A GOLDEN RULE OF DIPLOMACY

First, and foremost, we must speak up for freedom and against tyranny. This goes beyond our American revolution and back to a manger in Bethlehem. Our ambassadors and military men must be instructed not to identify themselves with tyrants but to be particularly friendly in countries striving for the establishment of human freedom.

Second, we should cut off all foreign aid, both military and technical assistance, to Latin American nations whose governments are based on fraud and force. We should increase such aid to democracies.

Third, we should encourage the exchange of information and citizens. When I was in Santiago I found the local businessmen were eager that the American sailors be allowed to come there again on leave, this not having happened for almost 2 years. State Department officials in Cuba favored it. So did Fidel Castro and the U.S. Navy when I asked them. It is now up to the Department of State, and I hope they decide affirmatively without delay.

Fourth, we must work toward commodity controls, particularly with respect to coffee, along the lines of the sugar agreements which have worked so well.

Fifth, we must make more capital loan funds available through the Development Loan Fund and the Inter-American Bank.

Sixth, and this applies to me, there should be more study of the Spanish language in the United States. We should insist that our foreign service personnel in Latin America and elsewhere maintain a continuing and intense interest in the language of the country in which they serve.

No doubt there are many other policies we need to adopt or to improve, some perhaps more vital than several I have listed. The most hopeful sign, however, in my opinion as a peripatetic eyewitness of part of this hemisphere, is the greatly increased interest shown by the American people in Latin America in the last year. There is no question where the American people stand with respect to democracy and tyranny, but I know Fidel Castro in his lonely mountain hideout often had cause to wonder why the United States Government didn't reflect more accurately the sentiments of its citizens.

In sum, this eyewitness, on the basis of what he has seen in Cuba and elsewhere, reports to you that Fidel Castro, his barbudos and the people of Cuba are doing their utmost to establish an honest and Democratic government in Cuba. The nightmare of the Batista terror is at last ended. The notorious criminals are being punished. Castro told me Monday that all the trials would probably be finished in a month and that many of those convicted would receive only jail sentences. It was my impression that he too will be glad when this phase of the revolution is finished.

I close with an observation made recently by my friend Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica and an outstanding leader of democracy. For many years in this hemisphere, Figueres pointed out, no partisan of Democratic government was safe in Latin America. The dictators, through their thugs, penetrated everywhere, even into the United States. The Cuban war crimes trials, Figueres believes, offer a fitting occasion to show that the hemisphere is a little less safe for the men who do a dictator's dirty work.

Thank you very much.

# Appendix

## Is Inflation the Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of our colleagues to an article by Dr. Leon Keyserling which appeared in the New Republic magazine of February 9, 1959.

Dr. Keyserling, president of the Conference on Economic Progress and a consulting economist and attorney, was formerly—1950 to 1953—chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

The article follows:

IS INFLATION THE PROBLEM?

(By Leon Keyserling)

There has now been time for the Congress and the citizens to reflect upon the President's State of the Union Message, Budget Message, and Economic Report. Thus far, although critics of the Administration's accent on retrenchment in the space age are profoundly disturbed, they have yet to offer an adequate alternative course of action. They know we must do more of many things, and that perhaps the most important of these requires an expanded budget and other expansions of Federal responsibility. They also know that ultimately Government is supported by the economy and the people, and that therefore a high rate of economic growth or expansion would help to meet our domestic needs and is essential to meet the Soviet challenge.

However, the President insists that programs directed toward these ends would be inflationary, would reduce the purchasing power of the dollar, and would do more harm than good. And the sincere opposition, including those in the Congress who must decide upon the budget and other legislation, is not confident enough of its own economic ground to be sure whether the President is right or wrong. Precisely how to get growth without inflation is our supreme economic problem. But our economic thinking is not yet readjusted to this purpose.

If we are to think straight on this problem, which has become increasingly urgent since the first Sputnik, we must begin by determining the fundamental purposes of the modern U.S. economy. While a stable price level is highly desirable, a static society may have a stable price level and go down to defeat on many or all fronts. Moreover, a stable price level without more, as during 1922–1929, can lead up to a depression. The great aims of our economy in these times are not to achieve any particular price trend as a be-all and end-all in itself. Instead, our fundamental economic purposes are these:

1. We must call forth the full use of our productive capabilities, including manpower and brains, technology and science, and natural resources. In the current state of our technology, this requires an annual overall growth rate of about 5 percent after we take up fully the current economic slack. Until then, we need to grow much faster. The faster a nation increases total production, the stronger it becomes in an economic sense, and the better able to do what it needs to do, unless it is burning itself out by going so fast that it depletes its resources. We are in no danger of following the latter course.

2. We must apportion our total national production wisely, in accord with relative priorities of needs, so that we do not get what we need least at the expense of what we need most: for example, more gimcrack gadgets and less defense, international economic cooperation, schools.

3. We must combine economic progress and efficient use of resources with economic justice. To illustrate the first two great purposes might be attained, even while the farm population lived by eating the income crumbs.

Broadly speaking, the significance of price and wage and farm income and profit trends in the private economy, and of public finance and monetary policy in the public area, is whether they facilitate or impede these three fundamental purposes. They are means, not ends. And if the machinery is tooled to produce these ends, we get less inflation to boot.

In order to put the President's entire program in perspective, let us look for a moment at how far we have fallen short of our three fundamental purposes since the Korean war.

First, we have failed to use America's full productive powers. The figures which follow are all based upon uniform 1957 dollars, to make the comparisons exact. During the 6-year period 1953–1958 inclusive, with recessions more than half of the time and with an inadequate growth rate the rest of the time, the U.S. average annual overall growth rate was only about 1.3 percent. However, an annual growth rate of about 4.5 percent was needed during that period to absorb our increasing capabilities to produce, in view of a growing labor force and an advancing technology. In consequence, we lost more than $150 billion in potential national production, and furnished about 10 million man-years less of employment opportunity than we should have.

Second, pressing national needs have been grossly neglected. Over the 6-year period, tax revenues at all levels derived from a repressed economy were $30 billion to $40 billion lower than they would have been in a fully productive economy. Thus, we could not afford what we most need.

Third, these trends worked against economic justice. They bore down disproportionately upon all vulnerable groups: the unemployed, the farmer, the low-income family generally, the small businessman. They hurt the old people, because we could not afford to provide them with enough social security. And these damaging effects of low economic growth were compounded, because a price inflation which fed the fat and stripped the lean was taking place at the same time. Any housewife who does the shopping can testify to that.

Now let us look at the causes of this triple default in order to see what went wrong and learn what corrective measures to take. For the 6-year period 1953–58 as a whole, the more than $150 billion deficiency in total production resulted from a deficiency of about $17.5 billion in public consumption through public programs, a deficiency of about $96 billion in private consumption through private spending, and a deficiency of less than $40 billion in private investment caused when the other two deficiencies made it futile to continue investment in the expansion of productive facilities.

Despite its seemingly small relative size, the deficiency in public programs of about $17.5 billion really accounted in addition for about $35 billion to $50 billion of the deficiency in private consumption and private investment, because public outlays evoke other outlays. And this default in public outlays was practically entirely on the part of the Federal Government, because the States and localities were expanding their outlays up to, or in excess of, their limited power to obtain revenues. This must be borne in mind constantly, as one reads the administration's repeated pleas to turn public programs back to the States and localities.

The deficiency in private consumption did not come about because consumers as a whole spent too little of their incomes and saved too much. On the contrary, the $96 billion deficiency in private consumer spending during the period 1953–58 resulted from a deficiency of more than $130 billion in consumer income before taxes. Out of this, more than $30 billion was a deficiency in net farm operators' income, and more than $100 billion was a deficiency in the consumer income before taxes of other groups, made up practically entirely of a deficiency in wages.

These deficiencies in private buying power resulted from both governmental and private actions. The inadequate outlays by the Federal Government for essential public services had an adverse effect upon the whole private economy. Regressive and inequitable tax and monetary policies had similar results. The deficiency in farm income has been attributable to falling farm prices in contrast with rising nonfarm prices, due primarily to a national farm policy which has abandoned the farmer to the free market, while other markets were not free.

This analysis is essential to an understanding of the cause and cure of the kind of inflation with which we have been plagued in recent years. For it has not been an inflation like that of wartime; it has not happened because of intense pressure against our productive capabilities, or shortages, or a hectic rate of economic growth, or civilian purchasing power in excess of civilian supplies. The new inflation of recent years has occurred paradoxically in the face of high economic slack. And moreover, it has been a selective inflation, with some prices and incomes rising too rapidly, while others were falling too fast, or (in the case of incomes) not rising fast enough.

Now, what has caused this selective inflation—for we have had it—since excessive demand was not a factor? The President has more than implied that the inflation has occurred in large measure because wages have gone up faster than productivity thus increasing production costs per unit and requiring price increases—the cost-push theory. This theory misses the real point: the lag in productivity behind wage increase in some instances was not technological, but was due instead to the inefficiencies of operating far below full capacity. And low-capacity operation was certainly not due to excessive wages; if wages had gone up less, even relative to productivity, we would have had a still bigger recession. Therefore, the correct remedy for the alleged inflationary gap between productivity and wages would have been—and is—to lift actual productivity to its technological potential by expand-

ing the economy, not to contract the economy further by holding down wages.

Moreover, in most cases price increases were not due to cost-push wages or otherwise, but to excessive price increases relative to costs. The compelling evidence of this is that the excessive advances of prices compared with wages yielded a level of profits feeding an investment boom in plant and equipment recurrently outrunning private and public buying combined. The extraordinarily high profits in 1957 of some of our major industries which were operating far below full production, and their exceedingly high profits again now while even further short of full production, are much in point. This applies not only to industrial prices but also to many consumer prices, because the former affect the later, and because increasing portions of our consumer-service industries are now huge and administer their prices.

These excessive price increases have in part reflected management's over-excited appetite for capital investment funds in the form of profits. But this hunger was not entirely the fault of industry. In part, industry feared with good reason that the spasmodic periods of high-level production would not be sustained in the absence of a nationwide full employment policy, and that industry needed to store up reserves against trouble.

In short, just as an automobile burns more gas per mile when racing at 80 miles an hour or when dawdling at 13 miles an hour than when running smoothly at 50, so our economy costs more to operate per unit of production either at the racing 8-percent growth rate of wartime or at the 1.3-percent average growth rate of recent years rather than at a 5-percent growth rate. The higher costs of too great or too little speed are both inflationary.

THE SPURIOUS CRUSADE

Despite these terribly costly lessons, the Economic Report of the President again expresses a determination to check economic growth by the same budgetary and tax and tight-money policies which have done so much damage on all scores thus far. The spurious crusade against inflation remains a crusade, not in the public interest but against adequate outlays for defense, international cooperation, and domestic well-being. What are the implications of a continuation of these policies?

While the President's Economic Report hails the speed of our economic recovery, we are recovering at a rate insufficient to take up the accumulated slack, or to make full use of the continuing growth in our labor force and in productivity. Thus, some of our bellwether industries, while expanding their production and sales, are not reemploying many people. Unemployment in 1959 may well be nearly as high as in 1958. Looking further ahead, we are likely to recover from the most recent recession only to average an annual overall growth rate in real terms of perhaps 2 percent.

What would this mean, compared with what would happen if we take up the economic slack more rapidly and thereafter maintain a 5-percent annual growth rate? For the 7-year period from the beginning of 1958 through the end of 1964, it would mean a difference of about $400 billion in total national production, and a difference of about 16.5 million man-years in job opportunity. With respect to our national needs, the higher growth rate (in contrast with the lower growth rate) would yield at existing tax rates about $70 billion more, or an average of about $10 billion a year more, by way of public revenues at all levels for domestic and international purposes. This is the road to a balanced Federal budget, accompanied by high enough public outlays to do at home and abroad what needs to be done and to induce a balanced national economy. And for reasons already given, the low growth rate would be more inflationary than the high growth rate.

Specifically, how can we assure the high growth rate and attention to our top national needs, instead of acquiescing in the neglect of both? We are not now in a total war. But we are in a dangerous period, far from total peace. And if we apply with appropriate variations some of the lessons which World War II taught us about how to mobilize our resources effectively, we shall be more likely to avoid another total war, and at the same time achieve some enormously beneficial domestic results.

In World War II—

1. The Government set quantitative goals for total production and employment, based upon absolutely maximum use of resources and subdivided into many types of products and jobs. It set goals for consumption or use, both private and public, to match these production goals. It set goals for the flow of income or purchasing power, to help maintain balance between production (supply) and consumption or use (demand).

2. To make sure that use was in accord with the relative urgency of our national requirements, there was a very detailed priorities system covering thousands of items.

3. The whole machinery of national public policy was coordinated and directed toward achievement of these fundamental goals or purposes. The Federal budget, including both spending and taxation, was used as the major public instrument in guiding both production and use toward achievement of these fundamentals. Specific ad hoc machinery was also used to expand some types of production by incentives toward private expansion of plant or output (or by direct public investment), and to restrain other types of production and use.

4. In fighting inflation, we did not neglect the fundamental production and priority objectives essential in winning the war. Some said that inflation was a greater danger to the United States than Hitler (during the Korean war they said a greater danger than Stalin), but providentially the administration did not listen to them. Nonetheless, anti-inflation controls included not only high taxation, but also savings programs and direct controls. These were successful, insofar as we did not look at price and wage and profit trends as ends in themselves, but rather as means for achieving full production and simultaneously providing the Nation with what was needed most.

5. The Government was chary of monetary policy to control inflation, because its excessive use defeats fundamental purposes before it checks inflation.

6. The difference between sacrifice and inequity was understood. The Government was not placed on the side of those who wanted the people to respond patriotically to the austere challenge but sought to batten at the public's expense.

7. While all essential freedoms were maintained, we did not suffer the delusion that freedom and Government were antithetical, or that the great problem of the Nation and the world could be solved by having the President tell the farmer, the storekeeper, and the laborer that they in their individual capacities had the most to contribute. Instead, representatives of our functioning economic groups were consulted in national policymaking.

SPACE AGE ECONOMICS

Now, how much of this should we do today and tomorrow? If we are successful in avoiding war, there would obviously be no draft, no breakup of families, no bloodshed. Nor, short of total war, do I see need for the burdens and vexation of direct price and wage controls, detailed priorities systems, allocations or rationing, or (with some possible exceptions) special incentive and prohibitory programs.

But while we are not at war entirely, we are most certainly in the space age, or at least the Russians are. Consequently, our economic policies do need to be as realistic and purposeful, though not as strenuous, as in wartime.

First and foremost, we still need national goals to guide our efforts, although why it takes another presidential commission to define them is beyond me. Such a committee cannot take the place of the executive branch. The Economic Reports of the President, as categorically required by the Employment Act of 1946, should state specific quantitative short- and long-range balanced goals for maximum production, employment, and purchasing power (geared to consumption or use goals), less detailed as to components than in wartime because the pressures on our resources are less, and more can be left to private adjustments. These goals should point toward national economic growth averaging 5 percent a year after the current economic slack is taken up.

It is equally essential that the Economic Reports define what portion of our growing total production and consumption at full resource use should be devoted to those progams which mean most of us as a nation. This does not mean that the Federal Government would do the whole job in all of these priority areas. In national defense, it would do practically the whole job (aside from civilian defense). In education, for example, the Economic Report should appraise how much of the job others can do, what part of the balance the Federal Government can help others to do, and how much the Federal Government itself needs to do to fill in the gap.

In this framework the Federal budget should be an instrument toward what a full economy can afford and needs by way of public consumption or use, instead of being adjusted to what a repressed or stricken economy cannot afford. Federal outlays for calendar 1960, so devised, would be about $10 billion higher than in the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1960, and by calendar 1964 should be about $23 billion higher than the President's proposed 1960 budget, all expressed in comparable dollars. The budget, like goals for the national economy, should be projected over several years in the Economic Report, even if the Congress approves the budget only yearly.

The tax program should be so devised as to help keep private purchasing power in line with the amount of production available for private consumption. It should also impose the tax burden equitably, which really means to improve the distribution of total private purchasing power. If production and consumption goals were properly qualified in the Economic Reports of the President, and if the expenditure side of the budget were framed accordingly, the appropriate tax program would be clear. Such a tax program would result in a balanced budget whenever our resources were being reasonably fully employed, which should be always.

The tight money policy should be abandoned, because it prevents adequate economic growth, contributes to inflation, and redistributes income unjustly. Monetary policy should be adjusted to the goals in the Economic Report. Essential Federal legislative programs include the farm program, basic resources development, social security, housing, and protective legislation dealing with such matters as minimum wages, education, and health. Foreign economic assistance needs immense expansion.

How should the size of these programs be determined? Not by accident, nor by special-interest pressures, but rather by fitting them into their proper place in a consistent

Economic Report and budget which balance our total economic capabilities at full production and employment with a corresponding amount of private and public consumption or use, and with servicing of our needs in the order of their importance.

There remains the pressing question of how adjustments within the private economy, as distinguished from direct public action, can best make their needed contribution to the three fundamental purposes I have listed. Price trends and income flows within the price economy are machinery toward these ends. Probably a fairly stable price level makes it easier to manage the other parts of the machinery and to maintain a workable balance among its parts, but this may not be true at all times, nor true of all prices at any time. As already indicated, I do not believe that it is now desirable to invoke the direct governmental controls. But if the current neglect should make the direct controls essential to enable us to serve our great purposes in the context of the world challenge, then, unfortunately, we would need the direct controls.

But I believe that the most useful treatment of this problem would be for the Economic Reports of the President, in addition to setting goals for maximum production, employment, and purchasing power—consumption or use—to include also careful short- and long-range analyses of what kinds of income flow in general to the various segments of the economy would be conducive to these fundamental purposes, and what kinds of price-wage-profit policies in general would be consistent with this kind of income flow. The Employment Act of 1946 calls for this now, when it says that the Economic Reports should set "needed levels of purchasing power." But the act is being honored in the breach.

It is particularly important that this identification of "needed levels of purchasing power" (the very words of the Employment Act), as well as of "needed levels of production and employment" (also the words of the act), be undertaken in consultation with private economic leadership. In fact, this consultation is envisaged by the Employment Act; and if not only the will but also the instrumentalities to do this are now lacking, then proper instrumentalities should be devised. For example, the kind of committee proposed in the President's state of the Union message might be made an advisory committee to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and thus involved in the preparation of the President's economic reports or at least the goals therein.

If sufficient attention were directed toward wage-price-profit relationships, and if business were not fearful of alternative periods of boom and bust, i.e., if the Government were to carry out its share in the purposes of the Employment Act, private investment would be likely to be regularized at desirable rates of growth. Appropriate tax policies can be helpful toward this end. The broad definition of needed levels of private investment should be included in the maximum production goals under the Employment Act.

To accomplish these purposes, the economic reports of the President cannot remain, as they are now, merely another set of pro forma and superficial essays on the state of the economy. This is competently done in many other private and public reports. The economic reports are intended to be great state papers on the economic program of the Government attuned to the full economic needs and capabilities of the United States. Instead of the Economic Report being written to support a President's budget and legislative program derived in a vacuum, the President's budget and his entire legislative program should be derived from an Economic Report which properly quantifies our goals and productive capabilities, identifies for achievement the great priorities of our national needs, and responds to the basic requirements of economic and social justice.

HOW CAN IT BE DONE?

The reader at this point may ask how we are going to get these things done if the President and his administration will not do them. One answer is that the Economic Reports of the President and his other basic programs are mainly recommendations to the Congress. The President initiates; the Congress decides. If sufficient initiative does not come from the White House, then more initiative is required of the Congress. If the President and his administration persist in not doing what the Employment Act requires, the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress should do it.

I assume that clarifying the economic issues will be helpful to many well-intentioned men and women in leadership positions who have a sense of urgency, who want to do what is best for the country, but who have been misled by some of the astigmatism about inflation which has so blinded the administration.

An economy functioning satisfactorily, one that serves the three great fundamentals, is less inflationary than an economy responding to repressive and regressive policies which neglect these fundamentals.

Above all, if we now become prey to the notion that inflation is a greater danger to us than Khrushchev, we shall continue to lose more and more ground in the current world struggle. For, in its essence, the administration's crusade against inflation is a campaign against the positive things we need to do. It plays upon illegitimate fears instead of raising legitimate hopes. It tells us that we are weak instead of rallying our strength. It sets up economic Maginot Lines instead of developing new economic weapons. It fails to recognize that in our economic policies just as in our international policies, we cannot have safety or stability by standing still.

## Tax Exemption of Public Housing Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members of the House read the newspaper accounts on March 2 of the tax windfall which results from the issuance of tax exempt federally guaranteed public housing bonds.

In the 85th Congress I raised this issue with the introduction of H.R. 7000 which would end this type of hidden subsidy for public housing.

I am grateful that the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] has again raised this issue with his introduction of H.R. 5096, which would terminate this tax exemption. The gentleman from California is a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and is therefore well qualified to speak on the subject of public housing and the tremendous burden which it places on the taxpaying public.

When the 1949 public housing bill was under consideration by the Congress, the then Housing and Home Finance Administrator testified for public housing but against the tax exemption of the bonds to be issued to finance these projects. He premised the Administration's opposition to tax exemption by the simple statement that he believed the American people had the right to know what public housing would cost them, and that the cost would be completely distorted or hidden by exempting the income from the bonds from Federal taxation.

I am inserting in the RECORD the statement made by Housing Administrator Raymond M. Foley in February 1949 before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing in opposition to the tax exemption of public housing bonds.

I hope that the Members of the House will read carefully the reasons why the Housing Administrator in 1949 opposed the tax exemption of public housing bonds. He lists five reasons, any one of which is important enough to justify repealing the tax exemption.

Unfortunately, the 81st Congress did not heed the advice of Administrator Raymond M. Foley, and the strange alliance of the proponents of public housing and the Wall Street bond houses prevailed.

In 1954 the House Ways and Means Committee tentatively approved a measure which would remove this tax exemption. This action resulted in a deluge of letter and telegrams from mayors and others complaining that this action of the committee threatened the traditional tax-exempt status of municipal and State obligations. I regret that the committee thereupon reconsidered its previous action and retained the tax-exempt privilege for these public-housing bonds.

These public-housing bonds are local obligations in name only. For all practical purposes they are Federal obligations because the full faith and credit of the United States has been pledged to their payment. They are thus the only federally guaranteed obligations which are issued which are exempt from Federal taxation.

No wonder there is such active competition for these bonds. Recently $68 million of these were acquired by Chase Manhattan Bank for a group of wealthy investors at 3.4 percent. This means a yield of from 14 percent to 26 percent for persons having annual incomes of from $50,000 to $100,000. No wonder the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] refers to this as a tax windfall for the wealthy.

On February 6, 1952, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board expressed concern over the tax haven which these bonds provided for high-income taxpayers. On that date, in his testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., voiced his opposition to this tax exemption in these words:

One important new factor in the market which is very disturbing to us at the Federal Reserve is the tax-exempt bonds which are being issued to finance public housing. Not only do such issues absorb some of the funds that would otherwise supply a market for Government bonds or for mortgages generated by new private construction, but they

afford an opportunity for wealthy individuals and corporations to reduce legally their income tax payments in a period when it is essential that tax revenues be as large as possible.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress decides that we must have public housing—and I for one am opposed to the program—then the Congress owes it to the people—to the taxpayers—to inform them what it costs in dollars, not in hidden subsidies which provide a tax haven for the wealthy.

I am also introducing legislation to remove this tax exemption, and I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will give it early and favorable consideration.

EXCERPT FROM TESTIMONY OF RAYMOND M. FOLEY, ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, BEFORE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, ON BILLS PERTAINING TO GENERAL HOUSING LEGISLATION, FEBRUARY 1949

First, the present exemption from Federal income taxes of interest on obligations issued by local public agencies, in connection with the federally aided slum-clearance program and in connection with the federally aided low-rent public-housing program, has the undesirable result that part of the necessary subsidy cost of such programs cannot be measured. It is a better public policy in such necessary subsidy operations to provide that the whole subsidy shall be a direct and measurable subsidy.

Although removal of tax exemption would increase the borrowing costs of the local housing authorities and thus increase Federal expenditures for annual contributions to them to cover their deficits, it would also cause investors in these securities to pay taxes on income which would formerly have been tax-exempt and thereby increase Federal revenues.

It is reasonably certain that most investors would not purchase tax-exempt local housing authority obligations if they did not expect to save more in taxes than they lose in interest by so doing. Removal of this opportunity for tax saving should, therefore, result in a greater increase in tax receipts than in budget expenditures.

Second, since by reason of the tax exemption, obligation issued by local public agencies in connection with these programs can be sold at a lower rate of interest than the rate of interest borne by direct obligations of the Federal Government, the interest on which is not exempt from Federal income taxes, it is apparent that such obligations of local public agencies are more attractive as investments to relatively high income-tax bracket investors.

An investor with a 50-percent marginal income-tax rate, for example, would get twice as high a net yield after taxes from local housing authority obligations as from Federal Government securities bearing the same rate of interest.

While yields on such securities therefore tend to fall well below yields on comparable Federal taxable issues, no purchasers will knowingly buy such obligations, if their interest loss exceeds their tax savings, and investors with the highest incomes will save substantially more in taxes than they lose in interest.

The larger the volume of tax-exempt securities, the less the reduction in yield and hence the greater the benefit obtained by high-tax-bracket investors.

Third, under the provisions of S. 138 relating to the manner in which Federal assistance for these programs may be extended, the obligations issued by local public agencies are, to all practical extents and purposes, the equivalent, in terms of security for repayment, of Federal obligations. They are generally so regarded by the financial community. Since in terms of security for repayment, such obligations are the equivalent of direct obligations of the Federal Government, the basic security being Federal credit, not local credit, except for the fact that technically they are obligations of local political subdivisions, it seemed entirely proper to provide for a withdrawal of the tax exemption from this type of obligation.

Fourth, the volume of obligations of this character which would be placed upon the market within the next few years, as a result of a program authorized by S. 138, would be quite substantial. It might amount to as much as 50 percent of the outstanding obligations, both long and short term, issued by States and political subdivisions thereof for all purposes.

Taking into consideration the fact that over the next several years the States and the political subdivisions thereof will be issuing substantial amounts of their tax-exempt obligations, backed by their own local credit and in no sense the equivalent of direct Federal obligations, as are the obligations issued by local public agencies in connection with the slum clearance and low-rent public housing programs, it would certainly appear that a substantial number of lower-tax-bracket investors will have to be relied upon to supply the necessary market for forthcoming State and local issues.

In order to attract a large enough investment in total, the yield on tax-exempt issues would have to rise enough to attract investors whose incomes are not as high as those who benefit from the present levels of yield. Obviously the larger the supply of tax-exempt securities, the larger the share of benefit received by high-tax-bracket investors and the smaller the share received by the States and their political subdivisions.

The result would therefore be that, not only would the interest costs in connection with the federally aided programs of slum clearance and low-rent public housing authorized by S. 138 be increased, but the cost to the States and political subdivisions of obtaining funds for necessary public purposes by the issuance of their own obligations backed by their own local credit would be increased.

In short, the tax exemption in connection with obligations issued by local public agencies for these slum-clearance and low-rent public-housing programs will not only cost the Federal Government more money, it will also cost the cities more money.

Fifth, as indicated above, such tax-exempt securities are attractive investments principally to high-income-tax bracket investors. Accordingly, these federally aided slum-clearance and public-housing programs will furnish to such investors a sizable and most attractive outlet for their funds, for not only are such obligations exempt from Federal income taxes, but they are relatively riskless investments.

Yet it is the very investors who find these securities attractive as tax-exempt riskless investments who are best able to supply the venture capital needed by business enterprise. Thus it makes it more difficult for new or expanding business enterprises to obtain necessary venture capital. (Pp. 128–129, hearings.)

## Americans Imprisoned by Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the following House Joint Resolution 47, concerning the release of Americans imprisoned by Red China, introduced by Mr. Hogan, of Bristol, Conn., was read and adopted by the House of Representatives of the Connecticut State General Assembly:

*Resolved by this assembly*—

Whereas on November 23, 1954, the Peiping government in China sentenced the following-named Americans on alleged charges of espionage: John Thomas Downey, of New Britain, life imprisonment; Richard G. Fecteau, 10 years; Col. John Knox Arnold, Jr., 10 years; Maj. William H. Baumer, 8 years; Eugene John Vaadi, 6 years; Capt. Elmer F. Llewellyn, 5 years; Lt. Wallace L. Brown, 5 years; Lt. John Buck, 4 years; Airman Steve E. Kaba, Jr., 4 years; Airman Harry M. Bergaman, 4 years; Airman John W. Thomas, 4 years; Airman Daniel C. Schmidt, 4 years; Sgt. Howard W. Brown, 4 years; and

Whereas no foundation of proof of such charges has been established and said charges have been denied by the U.S. Government: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the 1959 General Assembly of the State of Connecticut recommend that President Dwight D. Eisenhower use all the prestige and authority vested in his office as President of the United States to enact the immediate release of John Downey, of New Britain, Conn., and all other American prisoners now being held by the Communist government; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the clerks of the House and Senate cause copies of the resolution to be sent to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives from Connecticut.

## Address of Samuel S. Stratton, of New York, at the Democratic National Victory Dinner, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 28, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, February 28, 1959 there was held at the Sheraton Park Hotel a tremendous Democratic national victory dinner, which dinner was a great success. Among those who spoke at the dinner was our distinguished colleague, from New York, Mr. STRATTON, who made an outstanding address, which address was received with great enthusiasm.

Congressman STRATTON well said:

And yet the astounding fact is that last fall, in district after district, for all of our individual differences, people who never voted for a Democrat before in their lives, helped to elect Democratic Congressmen, Senators, and Governors. Why? Well, I think it was because people in all walks of life, people in both major political parties, big people as well as little people, even the farmers and small businessmen and workers of traditionally Republican upstate New York, turned to the Democratic candidates, not just because of a party label, but because all these people were desperately hungry, in such dark and critical days, for dynamic, energetic, creative, courageous and fresh political leadership in America. Disheartened, disillusioned, and disappointed with the past, they turned last fall almost as one to the candidates and the party that

seemed to them to speak directly to their personal need.

His broad national outlook is also evidenced by the following nonpartisan remarks:

There can be no room today for narrow partisanship or for doctrinaire dogma. Ours must be a fresh, positive program that believes in the future of our land—one that is not tired, not discouraged, not obsessed with false shadows from the past—one which refuses to let America settle weakly for second place in the race for world survival but which is determined instead to see America grow into an even greater and a stronger land, where all may live together in freedom and in peace.

Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include the able address made by the gentleman from New York, Mr. STRATTON.

Commissioner Donohue, Bishop Hannan, Rabbi Siegel, Speaker Rayburn, distinguished guests, fellow Democrats, and those discriminating and farsighted Republicans you brought with you, you may recall that when Winston Churchill addressed a joint session of Congress in the early days of World War II he remarked, "If my father had been an American and my mother a Britisher, instead of the other way around, I might have made it into these halls on my own."

I know I speak for all my freshman colleagues in the House when I say that the possibility of making it into Congress on ones own is indeed one of the more magnificent features of the heritage of every American citizen. Those of us who were lucky enough to make it here last fall, not on our own exactly but with all kinds of help from all kinds of wonderful people, are already beginning to wonder just how we did it. Some of us may even be wondering how we are going to be able to do it again.

No one freshman Congressman, of course, can presume to speak for all of us. Each of our races was unique. People have asked me how, as the Democratic mayor of a Republican city that hadn't sent a Democrat to Congress in 42 years, I ever got elected. Well, the answer, I tell them, is very simple: I made myself so objectionable, they had to send me to Congress to get me out of town.

"Don't you miss being a big frog in a small puddle?" some have said, "now that you're such a small frog in such a big puddle?" Well, that's an easy one to answer too. Frankly, a mayor's job is all right, but I think it's wonderful just to be in the majority for a change. And such a big majority too.

You know, as mayor of Schenectady, I couldn't even promote myself a place to park in around city hall. So you can imagine the thrill I had the first day I arrived down here to see those signs around the House Office Building, "Reserved for Members of Congress." I drove right up there and parked, even before we had on our special tags. "Hey, you can't park here," the cop told me, "those are for Members of Congress." "Well," I said, "I'm a Member of Congress." "Oh, yeah," the cop said. You know, for a moment, I felt right at home.

And yet the astounding fact is that last fall, in district after district, for all of our individual differences, people who never voted for a Democrat before in their lives, helped to elect Democratic Congressmen, Senators, and Governors. Why? Well, I think it was because people in all walks of life, people in both major political parties, big people as well as little people, even the farmers and small businessmen and workers of traditionally Republican upstate New York, turned to the Democratic candidates, not just because of a party label, but because all these people were desperately hungry, in such dark and critical days, for dynamic, energetic, creative, courageous, and fresh political leadership in America. Disheartened, disillusioned, and disappointed with the past, they turned last fall almost as one to the candidates and the party that seemed to them to speak directly to their personal need.

And so tonight as we gather, quite properly, to celebrate our amazing victories of 1958, let us Democrats not lose sight of the fact that in our triumph we have also inherited a profound and far-reaching and solemn challenge.

For I am deeply convinced that the American people turned to Democratic leadership last fall because they realized that in Speaker SAM RAYBURN and in Senator LYNDON JOHNSON was embodied the kind of sober, responsible, forthright, and forward-looking and energetic national leadership that they were seeking.

So it is for us, the rank and file members of the 86th Congress, working together in the days ahead, to bring the promise of that new leadership to real fulfillment in a constructive legislative program designed for all America.

There can be no room today for narrow partisanship or for doctrinaire dogma. Ours must be a fresh, positive program that believes in the future of our land—one that is not tired, not discouraged, not obsessed with false shadows from the past—one which refuses to let America settle weakly for second place in the race for world survival but which is determined instead to see America grow into an even greater and a stronger land, where all may live together in freedom and in peace.

If, as I believe, we Democrats of the 86th Congress do move forward to build just that kind of courageous and dynamic program, then we as a party need have no doubts that we will elect both a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President in 1960.

And when that happens—you and I will have won victory again, not just for ourselves, not just for our glorious party, but—what is even more important—for the future of the American people and for all who love liberty, wherever they may be.

## Tax Relief for Retired People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that one of the most serious threats to the security of the retired people of our country has been the inflationary trends that have melted away their retirement equities, and which have driven taxes to new high levels on their little homes, creating a situation which is admittedly serious.

In the February 26 issue of the Mankato Free Press, of Mankato, Minn., a column written by Franklin Rogers, editor, proposes a plan which has merit and in inserting this into the RECORD it is my hope that it will stimulate some thought in the direction proposed in the article. I realize that to a great extent this will be an approach which must be treated by local and State authorities, but the matter deserves attention and examination at this level.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

TAX RELIEF FOR RETIRED PEOPLE
(By Franklin Rogers)

Now that things have quieted down a bit in the commotion over real estate taxes, we have another idea to toss into the hopper. Isn't it time we considered giving a special tax reduction to older homeowners?

When you get down to the most pertinent facts, it's the people living on pensions and fixed income who are hurt the most by both taxes and inflation. They're practically helpless against a growing threat to their financial security.

The man who has reached retirement age—probably 65—and has been told by his employer that he now will be obliged to go on social security is the fellow who can't stand a sharp tax boost. In many cases he has worked long years to get his home paid for, and it's just about the only thing he has—except for his pension—to protect him.

But then comes a 10 percent increase in his tax load, probably followed by another 10 percent—or perhaps even 20 or 30 percent—in the next year or two. His income, which was none too robust at the start of his retirement, stays the same.

It's just about like taking food off his table.

To add to his feeling of helplessness, in many cases he may not feel physically up to the task of going before the assessor, or the equalization board, in an effort to get relief. He is virtually forced to stand still and take it.

If he sells his home, where will he go? He has battled through his productive years for the security a home provides, and then finds his well-being threatened by something for which he isn't responsible. The new generation tells him he's too old to work, but young enough to pay for the things that ostensibly are going to bring better streets, new schools, paved highways and recreation facilities for the lengthening hours of leisure time.

He is caught in the maelstrom of economic progress while trying to live on a modest income.

Take, for example, a man and wife who retire and plan on perhaps $12 a month for real estate taxes. What happens when it goes to $15 a month, or possibly $20? It takes $3 to 8 a month away from the food money. In the case of an older couple, that will buy a pretty sizable percentage of their grocery needs.

How to avoid this may be a problem. But it might not be a bad idea to freeze the taxes on a home as soon as the owner retires. Then, as long as he lives there and continues to own the home, there will be no increase. In that way he can be sure of at least the size of his taxload when he works out his retirement budget.

The total cost to any community wouldn't be great, and the good it would do for the retired generation would be well worth whatever the outlay totaled for the younger people. It is hardly fair to go on boosting the taxload for people whose income, through no fault of their own, remains unchanged.

## A Fine Address by Governor Underwood, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest and finest newspapers in West

Virginia, the Charleston Gazette, has an editorial which I commend to the attention of all Members. I intend to stick to my guns and on every possible occasion call attention to the accomplishments, developments, and problems of West Virginia, so that more people will get to know my home State better. I am proud of West Virginia and intend to be an active and not an inactive Congressman on behalf of my State and the welfare of our great country. At advertising rates, the following able editorial would have cost me $43.88:

THE RECORD: HOT AIR ALONG THE POTOMAC

U.S. Representative KEN HECHLER apparently is determined to establish some sort of freshman record for inserting editorials, speeches, and just plain nonsense in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is an honor we'd just as soon see our Congressmen and Senators avoid. If what they have to say or to repeat is worthy, the chances are that the basic news media will give full and ample coverage at considerable saving to the taxpayer.

We've found that the public servants who act let their actions speak for themselves, while the windbags and the professional hacks can usually be spotted in the RECORD under "Extemporaneous remarks." Having nothing better to do or to offer, they serve their constituents only on paper in the pages of a manual which is tiresome, expensive, and, more often than not, meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have printed an outstanding message to the West Virginia State Legislature by Gov. Cecil Underwood. The Governor has performed a great service in analyzing the economic situation which we face in West Virginia, and I commend him for his vigorous statement, which indicates that West Virginians are united in their determination to solve our economic problems.

SPECIAL MESSAGE OF GOV. CECIL H. UNDERWOOD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO A JOINT SESSION OF THE 54TH LEGISLATURE ON FEBRUARY 25, 1949

Six weeks ago this very afternoon, I addressed your opening session. Today I appear before you in the solemnity cast by the lengthening shadow of West Virginia's economic crisis.

I have not come to talk about passing pleasantries or suggest easy answers. I will take little of your time. But I am compelled to speak again about the dire need of many of our citizens and suggest again something for their good.

All of you remember the old story of the little boy who cried wolf so often that, when the wolf actually came, he was ignored. The crisis in West Virginia has been many years coming to this crucial point. During these years, many people have recognized and warned of this impending danger. Inadvertently, we have become accustomed to these warnings. I sincerely hope these repeated cries of wolf—the wolf which was just over the hill—will not now obscure the clear and present danger we face. For now the wolf is literally at our door.

Here in the State capitol, in the legislative chambers, or in the hotel rooms, the situation perhaps seems less desperate. But we have only to drive past the employment office on Kanawha Boulevard to see hundreds of people daily standing in line waiting for employment benefits or, hopefully, a new job. We have only to go into counties nearby to see families who are hungry and cold—living in despair about the future.

We who hold responsible positions in the State government must contemplate the aftermath of these conditions on our future. In some areas of our State, the entire economy is almost at a standstill; in others, it will shortly come to such an impasse—unless we take immediate and positive action.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Each week you have been in session, the unemployment statistics have become more alarming. On January 14, I spoke about 42,000 workers who had exhausted their regular unemployment benefits; today, that number is 50,000. Six weeks ago, 32,000 had qualified for temporary unemployment benefits; now the number exceeds 36,000. In the same 6 weeks, another 4,000 have exhausted these extended funds, and on March 31 the TUC benefits all expire.

During the month of January 1959, 12,225 workers filed initial claims and drew their first unemployment payments. These disturbing numbers reflect the continuing efforts of industry to reduce employment. This is not a depression, it is an industrial revolution unless we heed these warnings, we may soon have other revolutionary problems on our hands. The fear of starvation can drive hungry people to desperate actions.

Last month, I emphasized two lines of attack on this problem: Immediate jobs for the unemployed, and long-range planning to rehabilitate our State economy. To me, these factors are still self-evident. We must give these people help—not by dole, but by work; we must improve our economy—not by haphazard spasms, but by planned development.

Earlier, I recommended several measures to provide immediate relief to our distressed conditions. I am not here to criticize the legislature; but I am here to be plain spoken. In 6 weeks, not a single bill has reached my desk which will produce a single job for a single unemployed person or provide any measure of relief for the economy.

IMMEDIATE JOBS

Frankly, I know of no other way in which the State can produce substantial numbers of jobs than through an extensive highway construction program. How better can we prime our economic pump than to provide the funds to match the approximately $130 million of unused Federal aid cash which is available for highway use in West Virginia. Federal aid does us no good as long as it lies in the Federal Treasury.

We must also remember that virtually all of our vast secondary road system is not included in the Federal aid program. These roads are our responsibility. We can put thousands of people to work now if we will undertake to do what is needed on the secondary roads alone. West Virginia needs these roads, our people need work—so, I ask you, what better service can we perform than to meet this need?

I understand the senate has passed and the house of delegates is now considering measures to raise approximately $8 million in road revenue. This is a commendable and splendid start—but it will not solve the problem. It will provide scarcely more revenue than was available last year. In 1958, the State sold $10 million of revolving road bonds, this source will be much less in 1959. If we are to do what needs to be done, greater efforts must be exerted. I know you have been confronted with countless problems, and I know these halls and corridors echo with cries of poverty from every vested interest.

May I remind you of what our senior U.S. Senator, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, said in Charleston only a week ago tonight? He told his audience, "Our Nation did not achieve its present greatness by saying 'we can't afford it'."

You have my program for producing jobs and improving the State's economy. I am not insisting that this is the only program or that it is perfect. I do say the time has come for you to pass this or some program to save our State.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AGENCY

As important as these measures are, they meet only part of our need. We cannot expect forever to maintain an economy on public works.

We must restore our economic health over a longer period of time through the proper utilization of our natural and human resources, through the development of our industrial potential, through the wise use of our natural advantages, and through the attraction of industry and tourists. The economy of West Virginia must be built on a sound, natural basis, not an inflated, artificial edifice.

To meet this need, comprehensive, long-range planning is a must requirement. Accordingly, in my first message, I recommended the creation of an economic recovery agency, staffed with outstanding leaders of West Virginia and provided with permanent facilities to do comprehensive planning.

I said then that Federal aid would probably be available for some of this work. Purposely, I have delayed presenting the final draft of this legislation until I could be more specific about Federal participation. I am happy to advise you that at least two departments of the Federal Government will support certain phases of these studies.

On your desks this afternoon is a copy of a bill to create an economic recovery agency. You may wonder why this name has been used. As I indicated in my earlier message, I hope that the remaining 4 years of our State's first century will be the time when we can recover from the present economic illness and find the way to stabilize our future against this kind of threat. It is my hope that this agency will be so effective in the next 4 years that it can then be renamed and that we will no longer need to refer to the word "recovery."

This proposal contemplates the creation of a nine-member board to succeed our present State planning board, which has been only a paper organization for more than a decade. It will be my devoted purpose to bring the State's best brains and talent to the membership of this agency. I have in mind the caliber of people comparable to those who have served the Nation on such important task forces as the Hoover Commission.

The agency will be empowered to employ an executive director who is qualified in the fields of State, local, and national economic planning and community development. This director and his staff will coordinate and supervise the research and study of many unrelated groups and individuals in other agencies, departments, and organizations of government.

The primary duty of the agency will be to prepare and maintain a master plan for the physical, social, and economic development of West Virginia. Let me make it clear that I do not propose to replace or supplant the work of any department of the State government with this agency. On the contrary, its work will serve the other departments and provide them with valuable and useful information for their particular responsibilities.

This agency will be able to serve many private industrial and economic development groups. It can also provide much needed service to counties and cities.

Considerable Federal aid is currently available to our smaller municipalities which undertake projects in urban renewal and city planning. This aid, however, must be received by a State agency working with these local governments. Already two West Virginia cities have lost this Federal aid because the existing planning board could not function. Even without funds for its operation, the State planning board has now

processed an application for the city of Keyser with the Federal housing authorities. The proposed economic recovery agency can immediately serve in this capacity and help many other cities to obtain this kind of aid.

The Congress now has many bills under consideration to provide economic aid for distressed areas. No one can say with certainty what bill may ultimately pass the Congress. I am advised by competent Federal authorities that the proposed draft of this bill is sufficiently broad to serve as a receiving agency for any of the measures now before Congress. All of these proposals provide Federal aid of some kind, but require in every instance that it be matched from State or local sources and that the Federal money be channeled through a State agency. Adoption of this measure at this session could easily avoid the necessity of an extraordinary session if Congress later enacts a depressed-area measure.

Immediately it will be possible for the agency to begin two important and vital studies, manpower skills and land use. In my opinion, these are basic to any long-range planning. I am assured that the Department of Labor and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization will jointly support the manpower skills study to the extent of $100,000. Our best current estimates indicate that both of these studies will require in excess of $200,000 of additional State money. I therefore recommend that this agency be given an appropriation of $250,000 to carry on its work and support our share of these studies. It will be futile to undertake this important work unless it is adequately financed.

I know the Federal Government will help us wherever it can. But I must warn you, the Federal Government will not solve all of our problems for us. Our economic ills are not peculiar to West Virginia alone. To mention only a few others—the State of Michigan is collecting taxes in advance in order to pay its current bills; the State of Pennsylvania has bankrupted its employment security reserve fund; the Governor of Massachusetts has called upon the President to send a factfinding commission to survey his State's economic distress. Compared with us, these are big and powerful States.

Let us act while there is yet time. I recommend these measures today with a strong sense of urgency. I recommend them for your constituents who are victims of economic adjustment and industrial revolution—who are cold, hungry, and poor. I earnestly feel we can do no less for them and for our State.

## The Facts of Life in a Distressed Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Michael Schoonjans, Biddeford-Saco, Maine, regional representative of the Textile Workers Union of America, recently testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in support of Senator DOUGLAS' bill to provide aid for the Nation's distressed areas.

I commend Mr. Schoonjans for the relentless efforts he has made to solve the unemployment problem which has paralyzed the Biddeford region since 1954. I am proud to be associated with him in the struggle to provide a means of livelihood for those so grieviously affected by the economic recession.

The text of Mr. Schoonjans' testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY MICHAEL SCHOONJANS, DIRECTOR, BIDDEFORD-SACO JOINT BOARD, TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF S. 722

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Senators of the Banking and Currency Committee, my presentation today concerns the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach, Maine, area.

The men and women in the textile mills of Maine whom I represent are suffering. But they are today, and have been for years, actively and untiringly trying to help themselves. We appeal for governmental assistance. Meanwhile, we are doing everything possible to alleviate the continued chronic unemployment situation in this part of Maine.

Over these years, since our economic decline began, thousands of words have been written and presented at various hearings before State and Federal Government committees. Up to this day, all we have received in return is more words but no action. I have copies with me here of some of our communications and testimony. The entire package of all our communications and testimony would be too bulky to go through at this hearing; suffice it to say that I have most of the pertinent material with me and I will be very happy to leave this with the committee for their consideration.

The Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area has been a serious and chronic unemployment area for many, many years and now it's at its lowest point. I have with me the employment and payroll figures for December 1956–1957–1958, that I will leave with the secretary of this committee. Please note that the weekly payroll has dropped from a high of over $414,280.54 per week in 1956 to $164,000 on week ending December 26, 1958; a loss of over a quarter of a million dollars per week.

While the rest of the Nation is reported in the press to be enjoying a rapid recovery from the recent nationwide recession, the unemployed worker in the State of Maine is worse off than he ever was. Unemployment during the period from May 1958, until the present time, in the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area, has risen tremendously. The number of jobs available in the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area is at its lowest point since July 1, 1948, when there were 8 major industrial concerns in these neighboring cities employing 10,027 workers. On December 28, 1956, there were 6,739 jobs in 8 industrial concerns, but on week ending December 27, 1957, there were 4,814 jobs. However, on December 26, 1958, there were 2,893 jobs in 7 industrial concerns, a loss since July 1, 1948, of 7,134 jobs.

When jobs are eliminated, payroll income in the community declines. On July 1, 1948, the weekly payroll in the Biddeford-Saco area was $581,892.73 from 8 industrial concerns. For week ending December 26, 1958, the weekly payroll from 7 industrial concerns was $164,099.64, a loss of $417,792.91 in the weekly payroll of these communities.

For week ending January 24, 1959, 7,673 State of Maine workers who had exhausted their unemployment checks of which 1,366 are in the Biddeford-Saco area. Incidentally, the total amount of funds available in the State reserves for unemployment benefits at the end of December 1958, was $35,207,704.83.

As of the 28th day of January 1959, there were 3,604 workers registered for work at the Biddeford Employment Security Office. This figure does not include the small army of workers and families who have been forced to move to other parts of the Nation as a direct result of the prolonged depression. According to a census taken by the clergy of this area, in their respective parishes, of up to and including April 1958, but not including families who have moved since this census was taken—both Catholic and Protestants—show that 595 affiliated families had, up to that time, been forced to seek employment elsewhere. When you consider that the average family consists of 4, this means that 2,380 people have moved out of the area up to and including April 1958. These are, for the most part, the younger, highly skilled workers who only wait for the day when this area will be the industrial area it once was and will be again greater than ever before to return to the State of Maine.

There are presently, in the city of Biddeford, 3,712 persons eligible for general and surplus food relief. In 1956, there were 421 persons on general and surplus relief in this city. In the city of Saco, for the month of December, the number of persons on general and surplus food relief was 1,439. In the town of Old Orchard, a very small community, the number of people on general and surplus food relief is approximately 600.

We have been trying to get an increase in the variety of surplus food for these unfortunate people, but we have not succeeded. In fact, one day the welfare departments received a notice stating that the present allotment per person would be increased, and then the very same welfare department heads were told shortly afterward that the cheese allocation would be eliminated.

I want to talk for a minute now about what I feel is a ray of light in the gloomy situation confronting us in our area. This is the determined effort everyone concerned is making to find a way to replace the liquidated jobs. The entire community is seeking new industries to replace those jobs that have been liquidated. There is presently a local campaign to purchase the now empty Saco-Lowell Biddeford properties consisting of approximately 1 million square feet of manufacturing space. The main business of this company has been the manufacture of textile machinery.

To obtain this space we need:

| | |
|---|---|
| Proposed purchase price | $300,000 |
| Cost of 3 years' operating expense | 140,000 |
| Capital improvements | 75,000 |
| Total requirement | 525,000 |
| First mortgage (4 local banks) | 200,000 |
| Second mortgage (standby credit) | 75,000 |
| Public subcription to development fund (of which Saco-Lowell will take $100,000) | 250,000 |
| Total | 525,000 |

My own union to date has contributed $1,500 to this cause. This proves that we are willing to help ourselves; but if the area redevelopment bill, S. 722, as proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, were adopted by both branches of Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States, it would hasten the day when the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area would again be the prosperous communities they once were.

It is the opinion of many of our unemployed workers that our present administration in Washington is more concerned with the economic conditions of foreign countries than the economic conditions of some areas in the United States.

It is quite difficult to explain to hungry unemployed workers, heads of families, the position that our own Government takes in helping to improve the economic conditions of foreign countries. While the Maine textile workers are willing to have our Govern-

ment help out the free nations of the world, they cannot understand our Federal Government handing out another $130 million to the dictator of Yugoslavia, Marshal Tito, to improve the economic climate in his country. This $130 million is in addition to the $1,600 million that has been given to this communistic dictator.

All our past efforts to bring the suffering of our unemployed American workers to the attention of our administration in Washington seems to have fallen on deaf ears. It isn't that we haven't tried to help ourselves or that these workers haven't made any sacrifices. The facts are that these workers have cooperated in the past and are continuing to cooperate at present with industry.

COOPERATION WITH EMPLOYERS

In the case of the liquidated Bates Manufacturing Co., York division, the workers who were employed in this plant cooperated to the tune of $395,574.40 labor-costs savings between collective-bargaining agreements. At the Pepperell Manufacturing Co., a cotton mill employing 2,000 workers and still in operation, these workers without the benefit of modern machinery have increased their workloads to a backbreaking point. We are now saving this company $853,199.36 in labor costs per year. All these sacrifices have been made without the benefit of technological improvements and has been through additional efforts on the part of the employees themselves. We ask, How much longer can they continue to sacrifice for the pitiful wages being paid? The Maine industrial straight-time average hourly earnings are $1.67; the national straight-time average hourly earnings are $2.17 an hour, yet the average straight-time hourly earnings of the textile workers are only $1.41 an hour.

With these low wages, it takes a husband and wife, and sometimes grown children, to become wage earners so that the family may realize a little bit of our American standard of living. The husband works for the food of his family and the wife works on the third shift in order to meet payments on a secondhand automobile, a television, a refrigerator, and in some cases a washing machine. I am merely bringing this out to you, honorable gentlemen of the committee, to show you that when these workers become unemployed they have very little or nothing to fall back on.

The Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach area has been a chronic unemployment area for many, many years, and while these people would appreciate any help given them by our Federal Government they are first proud people and want an opportunity to work rather than being given a handout.

Many of these families are broken up for weeks on end with many heads of families commuting many miles from home to seek employment. Some have been successful in other areas of our Nation, but many more have moved their entire families to other sections. There are many whose roots are deep and continue to commute to these distant places with the hope that some day they will have job opportunities in their own area and will be able to live a normal American life with their families. The adoption of S. 722 would, we are sure, help to bring a better future for these unfortunate workers.

Our working forces are highly skilled, conscientious workers, and this can be proven because in the case of the Saco-Lowell Shops, makers of the world's best textile machinery and formerly the largest employer in our community, at one time employing over 5,000 workers now reduced to less than 300 workers. We hereby list sample of nontextile products manufactured by this company since World War II:

1. Magneto rotors for B–29 bombers.
2. Firing control units for 90-mm. antiaircraft guns.
3. Ford universal carriers.
4. Parts for proximity fuses.
5. Rocket projectiles for planes.
6. Twisters for rayon heavy-duty fibers used on bombers, trucks, etc.
7. M–3 50-cal. machinegun.
8. M–1919A6 30-cal. machinegun.
9. M–37 30-cal. machinegun.
10. Operating rod for Garand rifle.
11. Universal joint for Ford Motor Co.
12. Exhaust control valve for Ford Motor Co.
13. Rear axle shaft and differential gear cases (Ford).
14. Oil pumps for Ford Motor Co.
15. Miscellaneous service parts for Chrysler Corp.
16. Miscellaneous service parts for General Motors.
17. Drive shaft flanges for Ford Motor Co.
18. Elliott addressing machines (2 models).
19. Canopener parts for Edlund Co.
20. Miscellaneous gears for Boston Gear Works.
21. Filter caps for Commercial Filter Co.
22. Miter gear and rail-raising brackets and miscellaneous parts for Bullard Co.
23. Automatics gear housings for Jones and Lamson Co.
24. Automotive muffler (18 basic models).

The reputation of the Saco-Lowell Shops in producing the M–3 .50-caliber machinegun, the M–919A6 .30-caliber machinegun, the M–37 .30-caliber machinegun, the operating rod for Garand rifle is well known to the Ordnance Procurement Department of our Federal Government. This company is presently awaiting a decision by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Frank Higgins, the results of their recent bid on the M–60 machinegun prime contract which as we understand it is now on Mr. Higgins' desk. The awarding of any ordnance work to this deserving company would bring hope instead of despair to the residents of our distressed communities. This company has the know-how, the ability, and the energy. We can supply the workers to produce and manufacture much of our defense requirements. This company has a modern plant located in Saco; a one-story building and presently using only 40 percent of the 282,000 square feet of manufacturing space.

This piece of legislation before you would certainly be a great help to this chronically distressed area. We, the people of Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard, are deeply grateful for the untiring efforts of Senator DOUGLAS and his colleagues in pressing for this legislation. When the President of the United States vetoed the distressed area bill last fall, the people of the Biddeford-Saco-Old Orchard Beach communities were stunned and shocked. However, hope springs eternal in the breast of the human being and we are now saying to ourselves that this year when the Congress adopts S. 722 the President of the United States will see fit to sign it.

*Employment and payrolls, Biddeford and Saco*

SEVEN INDUSTRIAL CONCERNS

| | Number employed | Payrolls |
|---|---|---|
| Week ending Dec. 5, 1958 | 2,921 | $216,715.26 |
| Previous week | 3,096 | 242,797.23 |
| Year ago | 4,807 | 325,558.41 |
| Week ending Dec. 12, 1958 | 2,864 | 208,389.32 |
| Previous week | 2,921 | 216,715.26 |
| Year ago | 4,797 | 328,261.39 |
| Week ending Dec. 19, 1958 | 2,847 | 188,282.01 |
| Previous week | 2,864 | 208,389.32 |
| Year ago | 4,719 | 318,542.13 |
| Week ending Dec. 26, 1958 | 2,893 | 164,099.82 |
| Previous week | 2,847 | 188,282.01 |
| Year ago | 4,814 | 279,651.09 |
| Week ending Dec. 6, 1957 | 4,807 | 325,558.41 |
| Previous week | 4,866 | 322,773.14 |
| Year ago | 6,746 | 489,303.22 |
| Week ending Dec. 13, 1957 | 4,797 | 328,261.39 |
| Previous week | 4,807 | 325,558.41 |
| Year ago | 6,805 | 484,997.05 |

*Employment and payrolls, Biddeford and Saco*—Continued

SEVEN INDUSTRIAL CONCERNS

| | Number employed | Payrolls |
|---|---|---|
| Week ending Dec. 20, 1957 | 4,719 | 318,542.13 |
| Previous week | 4,797 | 328,261.39 |
| Year ago | 6,789 | 478,992.13 |
| Week ending Dec. 27, 1957 | 4,814 | 279,651.09 |
| Previous week | 4,719 | 318,542.13 |
| Year ago | 6,739 | 414,280.54 |

EIGHT INDUSTRIAL CONCERNS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Week ending Dec. 7, 1956 | 6,746 | $489,303.22 |
| Previous week | 6,853 | 493,944.81 |
| Year ago | 6,881 | 482,712.75 |
| Week ending Dec. 14, 1956 | 6,805 | 484,997.05 |
| Previous week | 6,746 | 489,303.22 |
| Year ago | 6,906 | 485,534.77 |
| Week ending Dec. 21, 1956 | 6,789 | 478,992.13 |
| Previous week | 6,805 | 484,997.05 |
| Year ago | 6,898 | 451,780.12 |
| Week ending Dec. 28, 1956 | 6,739 | 414,280.54 |
| Previous week | 6,789 | 478,992.13 |
| Year ago | 6,903 | 447,299.85 |

## Outstanding Federal Administrator and Federal Employee for the Year 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Business Association of Detroit grants annual awards to the outstanding Federal administrator and the Federal employee of the year.

On February 24, 1959, at the Veterans Memorial Building in Detroit, awards for the year 1958 were made to William T. Hunt, an outstanding Federal administrator and to Herbert S. Hubbs as outstanding Federal employee for the year 1958.

I believe this practice of the Federal Business Association of Detroit to be a very worthy one and conducive to the promotion of higher standards in Federal service. I congratulate the association on its practice and also the recipients on the honor bestowed upon them.

Mr. Hunt, manager, Michigan field office, U.S. Department of Commerce, at Detroit, was born in Arkansas and reared in Indian Territory, now Oklahoma. He enlisted in the Army in June 1917 and served 2 years overseas. Mr. Hunt was American Vice Consul in Barbados, West Indies, from 1920 to 1923. From 1924 to 1945 he had responsible domestic and foreign positions in private industry, including domestic production and sales management, and establishment of distribution and plants throughout Europe.

Joining the Department of Commerce in 1945 as assistant manager of the Detroit office, he was promoted to manager in 1946. His office has been most active in serving all business and the public in development and promotion of domestic and foreign trade.

During the Korean war, the National Production Authority under Commerce controlled the production, distribution, and use of strategic materials and promoted conservation. Mr. Hunt organ-

ized and directed this important and complicated operation in Michigan.

Mr. Hunt was sent to Thailand by his Department from 1954 to 1955 on the first official marketing mission ever sent to a foreign nation in connection with an International Trade Fair. He is very active in many business and civic organizations, and holds and has held major offices in such groups.

Mr. Hubbs, shop superintendent, post ordnance, Fort Wayne, was born April 16, 1902, at Knoxville, Tenn. He has been a resident of the Detroit area since 1926.

He entered military service in February 1942 and immediately following his discharge in May 1945 he entered civilian Government service as an auto mechanic at Fort Wayne. Mr. Hubb's ability was immediately recognized and within a short time he was promoted to the position of shop superintendent.

Mr. Hubbs established and carried through a safety program which resulted in the Ordnance Division receiving the Fort Wayne merit award for safety performance.

As area fire marshall he earned for the Ordnance Division the award for outstanding performance in fire prevention and protection for both 1957 and 1958. In addition, he has personally received several outstanding performance ratings and several commendations from officers under whose commands he served.

## Ruble-Dollar War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Forwarder of Monday, February 23, 1959:

It is fairly common knowledge that in the ruble-dollar war the United States is taking it on the chin because of our foreign economic policy of peace by procrastination—in short, no discernible policy at all.

Because of their internal totalitarian organization, the Communists can manipulate various markets to suit their immediate and long-range purposes as opportunity presents. For example, according to S. J. Rundt, a specialist in the field, the Soviets have sold f.o.b. Russian port, cement to Portugal at 43 rubles a ton, but at 117 rubles to Red China. Belgium bought cellulose from the U.S.S.R. at 440 rubles per ton, but for the same product, Red China paid 1,275 rubles. This makes for tough competition, especially since the U.S.S.R. contrary to popular opinion, delivers promptly and pays for purchases on the dot.

There are many men in this country with plans aplenty on how to take the incentive in the trade war and make it stick. We cannot match Soviet financial machinations and still remain a democracy. But we have a weapon the Communists cannot match and still remain totalitarian. We have private enterprise and initiative, and all it needs is for us to get off our procrastinating "buts" and turn it loose.

We have huge financial organizations for overseas operations, such as the Eximbank, the World Bank, the Development Loan Fund and so on, but these are unwieldy giants incapable of swift movement and individual action in a fast breaking market.

In our opinion, H.R. 5 provides the answer.

H.R. 5 is a measure sponsored by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, to liberalize tax treatment of foreign-investment income.

Recently at a New York Board of Trade, International section, luncheon, Mr. BOGGS said that a major aim of the measure is to encourage the addition, or substitution of, private investment for foreign aid. It would permit freer transfer and reinvestment of capital in operations abroad and defer taxes on earnings until repatriated in dividends.

Chief tax benefit under the will would be a 14-point reduction in the corporation tax rate on income of foreign-based corporations. This is nothing startling since it is merely a worldwide extension of the similar benefit provided since 1942 to Western Hemisphere corporations.

In the face of the Soviet ruble offensive it is difficult to understand why this has not been done long since.

## Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following proclamation recites a tragic situation that has existed for years. Three million people have long been deprived of their freedom and liberty by force.

I am proud to submit this proclamation in hopes that Lithuanian independence will soon be a reality.

During the 41st commemoration of the reinstatement declaration of Lithuanian's independence, sponsored by the Detroit Lithuanian Organization Center, held at Western High School, 1500 Scotten Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on February 15, 1959, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas in June 1940, Soviet Russia did invade the sovereign independent Republic of Lithuania with armed forces to "protect" Lithuanian independence and, against the will of the people, annex her to the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the armed forces of the Soviet Union are still presently residing in Lithuania in complete and total disregard of the agreements, policies, and treaties which existed between the Soviet Union and other allies of World War II; and

"Whereas Russian Communists are still currently perpetrating deportations and exterminations of whole ethnic groups, plundering people and institutions, and separating the members of family, one from another: Therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That on this 41st anniversary, we express our deep gratitude to the Government of the United States for nonacknowledgment of the fabricated incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union and for allowing the many thousands of refugees to find new homes in this country; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That we respectfully recommend that our U.S. Government abstain from entrance into any alliance, pact, or agreement which would in any way whatsoever recognize the present day Russian Empire; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That our Government of the United States be urged to use all possible means to protect enslaved peoples from genocidal destruction and preserve their hope of eventual liberation; and be it finally

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution signed by the presiding officers, be transmitted to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Michigan State Governor, and U.S. Senators and Congressmen from the State of Michigan."

DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATION CENTER.
ALFONSAS NAKAS, *President.*
JONAS GAIZUTIS, *Secretary.*

## The Federal-Aid Highway Program and the Municipalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by the Honorable Joseph N. Langan, Commissioner of the city of Mobile, Ala., at a meeting on February 17 of the members of the legislative committee of the Alabama League of Municipalities with our Alabama congressional delegation. This meeting was called to discuss municipal problems, and Commissioner Langan's subject was "The Federal-Aid Highway Program and the Municipalities." Commissioner Langan is one of our outstanding municipal leaders in the State of Alabama. He has visited Washington several times in recent years in connection with the Federal super highway program as it affects the city of Mobile. I feel that our meeting was most beneficial and it was a real pleasure to have had these fine officials here in Washington with us:

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM AND THE MUNICIPALITIES

(By Joseph N. Langan, commissioner of Mobile, Ala.)

As far as I know there is no major highway legislation pending at this time before the Congress, but we do want to appear before you and restate our thinking and views on the overall highway program of the Nation as it affects the urban areas.

In adopting last year Public Law 85–767, Congress has set up a new and expanded highway law known as title 23, United States Code, highways. It is a codification and restatement of the Federal-aid and other highway laws. We commend you gentlemen for the part you played in the development of this more concise highway code.

HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

In enacting the Highway Act of 1958, you approved major provisions that made possible:

1. An additional $400 million for fiscal 1959 for the immediate apportionment for projects to be undertaken on contracts awarded by the States before December 1, 1958, which provide for completion before December 1, 1959. While the $400 million was allocated to the States on the basis of 45 percent for the primary, 30 percent for

secondary, and 25 percent for urban extension of these systems, the States themselves were authorized to spend their share without limitation as to the percentage to be utilized on any one of these systems. The project costs were to be shared on a two-thirds Federal, one-third State basis.

2. In addition the bill provided for $150 million for loan purposes to the States to help them meet their share of the project costs. The amount loaned cannot exceed two-thirds of the State's share of the cost of the project and is to be repaid from future Federal aid allotments.

3. For the ABC systems (primary, secondary, and urban extensions) the 1958 bill provided $900 million for fiscal year 1960 and $925 million for fiscal 1961 on the basis of 50–50 matching.

4. For the Interstate System the law provides authorization for fiscal year 1959 of $2,200 million and for fiscal 1960 $2,500 million and fiscal 1961 $2,500 million.

5. The 1958 legislation suspended for fiscal year 1959 and fiscal 1960 section 209(g) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (Byrd amendment), so that expenditures for highway purposes are not, during those 2 years, limited by the amount of money available to the highway trust fund.

6. The new law also established a new national policy "that it is in the public interest to encourage and assist the States to control the use of and improve the areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling outdoor advertising in those areas." Portions of the Interstate System which pass through municipalities are excluded from this provision. The Federal share of payment on the Interstate System is increased from 90 percent to 90.5 percent in those States participating in billboard control.

7. The new law amends the Federal Highway Act of 1956 by increasing from 5 to 7 years the period within which construction must commence on rights-of-way which are to be or have been acquired in anticipation of use with funds advanced for any of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the Interstate System.

In closing our summary of the highway legislation developments in 1958, let me point out that for the first time in 40 years all the Federal laws pertaining to Federal-aid highways are now available in one act. Since the passage of the first Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916, 40 separate highway laws have been enacted excluding appropriation bills.

It is to the everlasting credit of the 85th Congress that now all the many provisions of law are arranged in an orderly and logical sequence. While in the process it was necessary, in many instances, to make changes from the exact language used in prior enactments, with certain minor exceptions no substantive changes of law have been made.

PROGRESS SINCE PASSAGE OF 1956 LAW

You gentlemen will be interested in progress that has been made toward the goals anticipated in roadbuilding under the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act. I am happy to report to you that during the first 2 years of the accelerated program—July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1958—progress matched the schedules set annually. The 2-year goal of obligating $3,100 million of Federal funds for the Interstate System was surpassed by 5 percent; the goal of obligating nearly $1,700 million of the ABC funds (for primary, secondary, and urban connecting link roads) was exceeded by 3 percent. During the 2 years, construction contracts were completed on 1,771 miles of the Interstate System at a cost of $439 million and by June 30, 1958, construction estimated to cost $1,700 million was underway on 3,167 miles. In addition, nearly $1,500 million had been authorized or spent for preliminary engineering work and acquisition of rights-of-way.

In the regular ABC Federal-aid program, 42,491 miles of construction costing $2,500 million was completed in the 2 years mentioned and by June 30, 1958, a total of 23,330 more miles of construction, estimated to cost $2,200 million, was underway. The Federal-Aid Highway Act approved April 16, 1958, authorized, as I have already pointed out, a special $400 million for use on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems to accelerate the program and stimulate employment. By the end of the last fiscal year $159 million of this fund was obligated and 358 miles of construction, estimated to cost $25 million, was underway.

WHAT FEDERAL AID MEANS TO THE MUNICIPALITIES

The cities and towns of Alabama and the balance of the Nation have, of course, a tremendous stake in Federal highway legislation. It has been said—and well said—that no other Federal-aid program can have, or has had, such a pervasive effect on the growth and development of the Nation's urban areas. The inadequacies of existing urban thoroughfares have become increasingly apparent as more and more rubber-tired vehicles have invaded municipal traffic ways. As the expanding urban population has settled in sprawling suburbs, municipal streets have had to absorb traffic originating well beyond the limits of the cities themselves. To an alarming extent, these traffic problems have ceased to be those of the municipalities alone and have more and more become areawide problems. They defy solution by the municipal governments alone. Congress has been constantly aware of this and has done something about it. The States have failed miserably to recognize the plight these problems develop for our municipalities. Had Congress not acted as wisely as it has in recent years, we simply would be years behind in modernization of our highway system; and the resulting economic losses to our cities, towns, States, and Nation would have been incalculable.

Problems of coordinating urban, suburban, semirural and intercity highway facilities daily become more acute. Increasing population migration into urban areas and the concurrent increase in the number of motor vehicles in use in these areas make it mandatory that Federal resources—both technical and financial—reflect the growing seriousness and immediacy of the overall transportation problem facing the municipalities and the Nation. As I have already intimated, in our judgment the most formidable and immediate of our transportation difficulties exist in and around our urban areas. And let me point out to you gentlemen, in speaking of transportation we are speaking of the movement of both people and goods. In urban areas the movement or goods is as important or perhaps in some instances more important than the movement of people. Our city, town, county, State, and Federal economy depends, to a very great extent, on the efficient movement of goods and people through our heavily populated town and city areas. It is our firm belief that the Federal Government and the respective States must devote a larger share of their efforts and resources to the solution of urban transportation problems. Our present Federal highway program is a good start from the Federal Government level. If our States will make as serious an effort to help solve the problem, we will in a few short years be well on our way to a brighter situation—and our cities and towns will be even more important as centers of trade, industry, and comfortable living.

In closing, let me thank this congressional delegation for its vision and its action in supporting legislation always designed to improve the well-being and the programs of our city and town governments.

## Twaddle of a Far Different Kind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 1, 1959:

TWADDLE OF A FAR DIFFERENT KIND

(By Joseph Alsop)

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, OMAHA, NEBR.—This is a place no thinking American can visit without strong national feeling. Simply as a place it is dreary. Until just the other day, it had no role in history. But now it is the nerve center of the proudest, most powerful, most complex, and most efficient fighting force this Republic has ever brought together.

It may seem very odd indeed to use the word "beautiful" in connection with Strategic Air Command. But although great aircraft have replaced the lances and the gonfalons, this SAC has something of the beauty of an army with banners. It has another beauty, too, as a vast, marvelous, superbly functional product of men's minds, as perfect as it is terrible. And it has still another beauty, as the sword and buckler of the imperiled cause of freedom.

It is necessary to say these things because it is also necessary to face an ugly fact concerning SAC. The fault does not belong to the men of SAC. But the ugly fact remains: The once-sure power of the American deterrent is now quite rapidly declining.

The causes of this decline, and the remedies which can be applied, will be examined in subsequent reports in this series. What must first be done is to try to dispose of the false and self-serving argument that is being used to justify the decline in SAC's deterrent power.

The argument is often heard nowadays in the highest quarters in the Pentagon and at the National Security Council. It takes the form of what is called the theory of minimum deterrence. This theory is based upon a cruelly ironical feature of modern strategic weapons systems. In brief, a few big dirty bombs will kill a great many millions of the enemy. But very considerable numbers of bombs, extremely precisely laid down, are needed to destroy the complex, many-targeted structure of the enemy's nuclear striking power.

It is easier, in other words, to massacre half the population of another nation than it is to prevent that nation from striking back in its agony. Many fewer aircraft or missiles are needed for the first purpose than for the second. It is cheaper, more budget-balancing, and in every way more attractive to the peculiar cast of mind that regards the richest nation in history as too poor to defend itself.

Such, then, are the fairly macabre origins of this theory of "minimum deterrence." The theory itself may be briefly stated. If the enemy strikes first with his rapidly growing power, he will destroy most of the SAC. But he cannot count on destroying all of SAC. The SAC remnant will be too small to touch the still-intact structure of the enemy's striking power, but this remnant can still be directed at what are euphemistically called "political and demographic targets." If the enemy knows the SAC remnant

will be used in this manner, he will not dare to strike first. Thus, minimum deterrence will be achieved at minimum cost.

There are two fatal defects in this grisly theory. In the first place, it glosses over what may be called the problem of Marshal Biriusov, the artillery officer who heads the Soviet Air Defense Command. For 13 years, this separate Soviet command has absorbed between 18 and 20 percent of the gigantic Soviet defense budget. What, then, can Marshal Biriusov reply if he is told, "Our first strike will kill all but a remnant of SAC, and your only task is to repel the wretched remnant."

He must surely reply that the assignment will be easy. The SAC commander himself, Gen. T. S. Power, has rightly pointed out that the effectiveness of our deterrence depends upon what the enemy thinks about it, and not on what we think about it.

Yet the theory's second defect is even more fatal. To see what this defect is, you must imagine the position of the President of the United States after the enemy's imagined first strike. The President's own structure of retaliatory striking power will lie in ruins. The remnant that remains will not be enough to cripple the enemy's structure of striking power, which will still be untouched and ready to strike again. But his remnant will still be able (if Marshal Biriusov is wrong) to kill several millions of the Russian people.

Will the President then use his remnant, as the much touted minimum deterrence theory would require him to do? Or rather, how could he use his remnant in this manner, unless he was both irrational and inhuman?

There would be no means to halt the enemy's second and third strikes. Most of our people, remember, would still be alive and healthy and in no danger after an enemy first strike solely aimed at military targets. The price to be paid for a few million Russian deaths would therefore be many more millions of American deaths. Would any but a madman order such an exchange, with no true military purpose?

The answer is obvious. The theory of minimum deterrence is not common, everyday twaddle. It is poisonous, desperately dangerous twaddle. It is time to stop twaddling, and to start talking in hard terms about the hard requirements of true national security.

## Resolution on Lithuanian Independence by Pittston, Pa., Lodge of Lithuanian Alliance of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution on the independence of Lithuania:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

Whereas February 16, 1959, citizens of Lithuanian ancestry, during their program in observance of the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the people of Lithuania have time and again fought aggression to defend her freedom, have shed their blood to prove to the world that Lithuania is worthy of independence; and

"Whereas Lithuania during her two decades of independence demonstrated her ability to advance and prosper in all fields of endeavor, social, cultural, economic, and political; and

"Whereas Soviet Russia has enslaved Lithuania subjecting her people to brutal terror and oppression; and

"Whereas the indomitable spirit of the people and their great love of freedom still live despite terrible oppression, and the forced exile of hundreds of thousands of peoples: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Americans of Lithuanian descent appeal to the conscience of the free world begging for their help in the name of justice and freedom; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution, sponsored by the Lithuanian Alliance of America, lodge 7, Pittston, Pa., be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Congressmen and Senators of the United States from Pennsylvania."

MRS. JOHN T. BAYORAS,
*Secretary.*

## The Roots for Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, March 2, 1959:

THE ROOTS FOR GROWTH

Chairman Saulnier, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has coupled optimism about the Nation's economic future with some sound reminders of what is needed to make the bright prospects a reality. Speaking at the National Press Club, Dr. Saulnier not only saw good times this year and next, but a period of "very, very great economic growth" in the decades immediately ahead. He emphasized, however, that this growth is not going to come automatically, and assuredly not if the proinflationary thesis is accepted in governmental policy making.

It is a basic requirement of growth that there must be a steady expansion and improvement in the Nation's productive facilities. In a private enterprise system, at least, this requirement can be met only through a continuing heavy investment of capital. Capital itself is not something that can be legislated into existence or that may be found under a rock. It has to be created by encouraging the pyramiding of savings by individuals and corporations, safe from the fear that a dollar put into reserves today will be worth substantially less tomorrow.

"If we are going to increase our growth rate from the historic 3 percent to the magic 5 percent there must be very big capital growth, and you get it out of savings," Dr. Saulnier said. "If you create conditions which are not conducive to savings, you won't get the capital accumulation."

Certainly acceptance of the doctrine that creeping inflation is unavoidable, or even somehow healthy, is a condition not conducive to savings. It is, instead a condition that encourages the exact opposite—making debts and deficits attractive today in the belief that they may be offset in cheaper dollars tomorrow. Treasury Secretary Anderson recently summed up the grim implications of this philosophy when he told a congressional committee that "if we ever reach the point where people believe that * * * to save is to gamble then we are indeed in trouble."

Unfortunately, this point of danger may not be far away.

## A Thought-Provoking Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we get the impression that demands for a balanced budget and economy in Government come only from people in the upper income tax brackets. I am inserting in the RECORD today one of the finest letters I have ever received. It is from a wage earner in my district. I commend it to my colleagues as an example of good, sound American thinking:

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., *February 19, 1959.*
Hon. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Mrs. Danenhower and I read your Washington Report with considerable interest and appreciate it very much.

There are several issues currently which we feel and believe strongly about. We fear we are in a minority in our thinking, nevertheless, we are remiss if we continue to think and talk about the issues, but do nothing else. Thus, this expression to our Representative in the Federal Government.

We despise the continuing effects of inflation, and right or wrong, we believe Federal Government deficit spending is the major culprit as a cause. We work hard, my wife at home, and I at work, to keep our little world centering around 4 young children afloat without indebtedness, and there is actually money only for the basic essentials. We actually live very simply and in some respects frugally, and we are distressed at the never-ending prospect of having to continue to do the same. The news carries stories of fabulous spending proposals, increased taxes, etc. When are we to have some of our own money to spend for something we want beyond necessary housing and food? (We drive a 12-year-old car, do not have TV, a freezer, clothes washer and dryer, hi-fi, etc., etc.). My income as a wage earner is well above the national average, I have an excellent job, yet we do not have money above the costs of very simple living.

We are also distressed at the disproportionate part of the proposed budget allocated to the Farm Program and to Veterans. Eleven percent of 77 billion is planned for these two programs. That seems preposterous. It is not only out of proportion in terms of the budget, it is way out of proportion in terms of the percentage of population served. I say this, being a veteran of 4 years service in the Army in World War II. I also make these statements having a brother who is a farmer (chickens and cattle, and my father, while living, a cattle rancher, and a colleague whose father is a dairyman.) All three have stated independently that they are hurt, and have been for years, by the Farm Program. Then, indeed, the existence of, and the problem of surpluses is something just unacceptable by any kind of rationalization.

Probably more distressing than any of these specific issues is the fact that there is

no evidence apparent to the people anymore, of Government by the people, for the people, and of the people based on the principles upon which this declaration was made. This declaration didn't state by, of, or for part of the people, nor did it say that part which has a vested interest here or there and lobbies most ardently, nor did it say that part which could contribute amply to a political party campaign chest, or respond to politician's techniques for running popularity contests at election time.

When only 10 percent of the population are farmers, and of that group, only 13 percent of those farmers who grow wheat, approved the initial farm support program, for which we all are paying year after year, how can that be justified by any reasonable explanation as of, by, and for the people? For which people? I resent paying for it. The same is true of the Veterans program. I served my country so that it could continue to serve me by guaranteeing freedom and liberty in a certain pattern of life. That has been accomplished. My country does not have an obligation thereby to support me for the remainder of my life! I'm every bit as capable of that, as before I went into the service. Ah, for a Congress that legislates from basic principles rather than ulterior motive.

I feel just as strongly about legislation to control abuses in the labor union movement (I am a member of and officer in a local union). This legislation is necessary for the well being of 177 million people. How many people are honestly represented by those lobbying for or against. It was disgraceful that the last Congress failed to pass such legislation. Only a few basic changes will do the trick: secret ballot in union elections, publication of financial status, strong control of and time limitations (6 months) on union trusteeships, and outlaw with no exceptions the secondary boycott. Pass Federal laws that will be possible to prosecute without exception. Use the F.B.I. Don't leave the problem to local district attorneys. They now fail to bring racketeers to trial and exclusion from society. I can't understand why we are so fearful of Communists and their dangers to us, yet we permit mobsters and gangsters to function in places of power over great parts of the population, to our serious detriment, and find we have a Congress sensitive about passing effective legislation, presumably for fear of not being reelected. It makes one wonder who is electing our Congress?

These are some of our thoughts about which we ask your considertion, and the exercise of your influence in accomplishing sound legislation based on principles of integrity and equity.

Very sincerely yours,

HAROLD S. DANENHOWER.

## Hon. Harry McGregor

SPEECH

OF

### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, when one has served 18 years here in this great legislative body, the bonds welded are strong and they go deep. Between HARRY MCGREGOR and myself there was an even closer tie than most because we shared a special election on February 27, 1940.

A pleasant companion and a good friend—a hard-working Congressman and a loyal citizen—such was HARRY MCGREGOR. One could disagree with him as, I confess, I often did, but disagreement interfered not at all with our friendship. As Ohio whip he served the Republican Party and the Ohio Republican delegation well.

Tireless in his efforts to serve his constituents he gave himself with enthusiasm to work in their behalf, keeping in close touch with their hopes, their fears, their concrete desires, and their needs. The 17th District will miss his heartful service, Ohio will miss his constant watchful work in her interests and the United States a faithful worker in these Halls.

To his fine children and grandchildren I do extend my warmest sympathy and the hope that they know with deep certainty that—

They have not died
They live and breathe with you
They walk now, here at your side
They tell you things are true.
They live, they know, they see
They shout with every breath
All is Eternal Life.
There is no death.

## "Up Came Hill"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, too often the stress and strain of current events distort and exaggerate the geographical differences among our people of the North, South, East, and West.

In the broader area of national understanding, however, there are frequent and encouraging signs that ancient prejudices and hatreds are being buried beneath a recognition of the fact that a man's worth should not be measured by the geographical accident of place of birth or by the manner in which he approaches the pronunciation of certain syllables.

Recently, Congress in joint session heard a moving tribute to Abraham Lincoln. Countless people from the North think with affection of the gentle Robert E. Lee.

Any man who contributes to true historical perspective, recognizing ability and merit without respect to the Mason-Dixon line, deserves commendation.

That is why, today, I call attention to a great new book, "Up Came Hill," which brings to life a Confederate general, A. P. Hill, whose deeds too long have been hidden from the true light of history.

This book was written by a distinguished resident of my home city, Judge Martin Schenck. I know something of the monumental labor which went into this lively and readable book.

Most significant to me, however, is the fact that a busy northern gentleman should give so much of himself to provide full measure of historical right to a man who fought in the Confederate Army.

It is one more indication that we are, despite surface signs, a united nation.

## Need for Curbing the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, a recent commentary by Mr. J. Wayne Poucher, radio minister for Life Line Foundation, Inc., a religious and patriotic educational movement, summed up forthrightly the case in favor of curbing the unconstitutional power the Supreme Court has assumed for itself.

Mr. Poucher's address, broadcast over a large number of radio stations throughout the country, deserves wide circulation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place its text in the RECORD.

Last December the American Farm Bureau Federation, meeting in convention in Boston, joined the list of organizations that have called on Congress to place limitations on the power of the Supreme Court of the United States. In a resolution adopted without opposition, the convention said it was "seriously concerned over the present tendency of the Supreme Court to legislate with the acquiescence of the executive branch."

The resolution, adopted by the Farm Bureau Federation, stated:

"The framers of our Constitution never intended that there should be vested in the Supreme Court of the United States power to legislate, power to distort the plain language of the Constitution, or power to interfere with matters of purely State and local concern where the constitutional privileges and immunities of citizens are in no way abridged."

The Farm Bureau Federation recommended, as other respected organizations have recommended, that Congress lay down proper limitations upon the appellate jurisdiction of the Court and that Congress use its powers to enact corrective legislation in those fields where the Supreme Court has invaded the legislative area.

Now, why is it that urgent calls for curbing the Supreme Court are coming from such groups as the Farm Bureau Federation and the Conference of State Chief Justices and the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives?

The answer is not hard to find.

The answer lies in such Supreme Court decisions as those—

That threw out the convictions of 14 California Communists;

That ruled against firing a Federal Government employee suspected of being a security risk;

That decreed the FBI files must be opened to criminals or Communists when the contents of those files were being used to prosecute the criminals or Communists;

That held past membership in the Communist Party is not a bar to the practice of law;

That destroyed the right of States to try Communists under sedition laws;

That held the State Department cannot deny American passports to persons with known records in support of the international Communist conspiracy.

No, it is not surprising that so many sound organizations and so many patriotic Americans are demanding that a halt be called to the way the Supreme Court is encroaching on the powers of the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

In ancient days it was held that the king could do no wrong. But this is the year 1959, and the Supreme Court is not—and was never designed by our Constitution to be—a holy, final, supreme authority.

The word "supreme" in the phrase "Supreme Court" means only that the Court is the highest tribunal in the Federal court system. It does not mean, and was never intended to mean, that members of the Court are supreme over the Congress, the President, the States, and the people.

The United States Constitution established the Supreme Court as a judicial body to say what the law is. But the Supreme Court as now constituted makes law—yes, and unmakes law.

Since 1932 the Supreme Court has departed on no less than 35 occasions from decisions previously rendered. In all our national history before 1932, there had been only 29 such reversals.

All over the United States, lawyers and judges are forced to fumble around to try to determine just what the law may happen to be at the moment. That has happened because the Supreme Court has abandoned, in so many decisions, the Constitution and the written law.

The Court not only has caused chaos in the matter of interpretation of the law. It also has created serious gaps in our internal security system. It has gravely hampered the continuing effort to protect our American freedom from the insidious and never-ceasing attacks of the mistaken who hate freedom.

These are serious indictments, but they are justified by the facts. They are indictments drawn by men who know the law and also by other men who, without legal training, nevertheless understand our Constitution and know that document established a Federal Government composed of three separate and distinct branches—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive.

When the Supreme Court steps over the line drawn for it by the Constitution, the people have both the right and the duty to protest. The people are protesting, and they should be heard.

Indeed, they must be heard—for the sake of America and for the sake of freedom.

## Walter, Hoover Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. E. F. Hutton which appeared in the Palm Beach Post of February 25, 1959:

TWO MEN
(By E. F. Hutton)

The country owes much to two men, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, the courageous chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the unflinching head of the F.B.I.

These two men have been subjected to more sinister and malignant abuse than any other public officials of our time. Most of this is cooked in a Moscow pot and served by both those who know, and do not know, the cook.

The sad part is that so many well-meaning but simple minded innocents scatter as Christian food what is actually Communist poison. Many such innocents are church and college officials.

Every time a new Congress convenes, a determined effort is made to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. This year the chosen spokesman was Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California.

As Congressman WALTER said of him, "He is the only person I know who has no criticism of the committee but wants to abolish it."

Mr. ROOSEVELT's mother is a longtime enemy of the committee, and added her name to a newspaper advertisement in a Washington paper demanding its abolition.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover expressed his approval of the committee. It was not abolished.

This was only part of the Communist campaign to conquer our country from within. That business, labor and Hollywood celebrities fawned on the smiling murderer, Mikoyan, shows the importance of the House committee and the F.B.I.

## Address by the Honorable Clifford Davis Before the Fire Department Instructors Conference, in Memphis, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include an excellent address by our colleague, the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, before the Fire Department Instructors Conference, in Memphis, Tenn., on Tuesday, February 24, 1959.

CLIFFORD DAVIS is a brilliant speaker and I am sure the people attending the conference appreciated him taking the time out of his busy schedule to speak to them. The address should be read by every person interested in fire prevention and fire fighting. It follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I acknowledge with genuine gratitude the honor which you have accorded me today. This is the second time that I have had the pleasure of speaking on an occasion of this character. Six years ago we met on the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Fire Department Instructors Conference, and now I am grateful for the opportunity to discuss with you briefly the past 25 years in Memphis.

On this occasion it is natural for me to give you the unusual history of these many annual meetings in our city of Memphis. Soon after I assumed the office of fire and police commissioner I was able to name the late Irby Klinck, chief. He was one of the most beloved and finished firemen I have known anything about. A man of courage, ability and high character, he became my genuine, devoted friend and a loyal worker in the truest description of the term.

I shall never forget the chief coming to me one morning 25 years ago and stating that we had an opportunity to entertain this conference. In those days we were making every effort to make more efficient a fire department which had already shown fine progress.

Chief Klinck was a natural-born firefighter. For the first time in the history of our department he recognized as chief the value of training, fire prevention, and the development of more scientific methods in combating fire.

Recognizing the possibilities of such a meeting, I went to work enthusiastically as fire commissioner to support him.

In that first Memphis meeting only 106 men registered from 18 States, but it did not take me long to see the extreme value of the organization to the Memphis Fire Department and to the Nation. In those days our dear friend, Richard Vernor, who has since gone to his reward, was the dynamic originator and leader in this whole program. He was truly a dedicated man.

On the concluding day of the conference I took the platform and urged him to bring the conference back to Memphis the next year and was even so bold as to suggest that this should be the permanent meeting place of the meeting. He and his associates considered the invitation and returned. Originally we met in the fire headquarters, a rather antiquated building even in those days.

It was our idea that the department serve a daily complimentary luncheon. My warm friend, Mayor Overton, who is now deceased, fairly hit the ceiling when he signed the voucher covering a payment for onions, potatoes, and coffee, for the fire department. I know that you are still eating at noon and that the department is participating in those luncheons. Who pays for the 2,500 odd plates represented by the fantastic increase in attendance last year, I do not know, but if the city of Memphis is taking care of the entire cost, it is still ahead.

To me it is inspiring to know that John Klinck, now the chief officer of this department, is following in the footsteps of his splendid father in his recognition of the dividends which come from this conference, and is giving his best as co-chairman of this meeting.

I had the pleasure to give John Klinck his first employment. He came to the service upon completing his high school work. His father and I thought it would be temporary. Possessed of all the fine attributes of that father, he brought to this place of responsibility a scholastic education not possessed by his father. In addition he had the vision of youth and an amazing ability for organization.

I am delighted to know that my successors in the office of fire and police commissioner have supported the department and this conference, but I am simply delighted and thrilled with the accomplishments made under the direction of Commissioner Claude Armour.

To my mind, he is one of the best informed, most industrious fire commissioners in all of this country. His knowledge of firefighting organization, his vision for the future are outstanding.

On Sunday when I went through the Claude Armour Training and Communications Center, so appropriately named in recognition of his service to Memphis and the Mid-South, I could not help but think that this building and everything that goes within it shall ever stand as a lasting monument to his effectiveness and worth in this field.

I could not help but be just a little envious when I learned that already a million dollars had been expended in this center, and when completed its value should approximate $2½

million. When I left the city as fire and police commissioner, 19 years ago, our fire department budget for all purposes was only a million dollars.

But in these last 19 years this city has just about doubled in size, populationwise. In industry, manufacturing, finance, and in all other segments of the economy, it has grown even more amazingly. With the additional area more men, fire stations, and equipment have been required. It has taken very careful planning on the part of the commissioner to provide all of this, as he has done so well.

So it is quite natural today that I should tell you that the spirit of this department, its development, its growth, is acceptance of scientific and specialized techniques, must relate itself directly to the very spirit of this Fire Department Instructors Conference.

Memphis is proud of the finest firefighting equipment in the country, and the department is composed of intelligent, well-trained, and high-spirited men from top to bottom. Memphis has gone on to win fire awards too numerous to mention. Your conference has brought to Memphis, the South, and to the Nation, a clinic so valuable that no one will know the number of lives saved, the property conserved, and the scientific gains accomplished.

This conference is unique in that there is no promotion, no politics, and no organizational difficulties. The annual attendance has grown fantastically.

Represented by a group of serious-minded people in exchanging ideas and experiences to be mutually helpful, this organization has grown without promotion on its own through a real job of program development by the Western Actuarial Bureau, and superb planning by the Memphis Fire Department and the cooperation of intelligent, experienced, and wise officers and instructors from fire departments throughout the land.

Unselfish appearances of learned professors and scientific minds from the colleges and universities along with the appearance of governmental officials and representatives of industry and business have made this conference outstanding.

It was in this very city that the first demonstration of a civil defense municipal control center was demonstrated. It was here at this meeting that 50 industries sent their people in 1952, as did over 50 bases of the Armed Forces.

During World War II, the chiefs of 105 explosive ordnance plants were in attendance. While many of you return from year to year, there is still a turnover of 40 percent which denotes the permanency of the organization on the one hand and the opportunity to sow the seed of ambitious progress on the other.

Fire is as old as the world itself. We have but to go back to history to see the damage that it has wrought.

In Rome, about the year 46 B.C., Julius Caesar had nearly completed the construction of the Basilica Julia, a magnificent law courts building, when it was almost destroyed by fire. After the assassination of Caesar 2 years later, Augustus completed the structure as Caesar had intended. Even after all these years, the platform still remains a relic of architectural antiquity and of a serious fire of ancient history.

In the year 64 years after Christ, Rome was nearly destroyed by a fire that burned for several days.

Passing on to 1666 history records the great London fire which consumed the ancient Cathedral of St. Paul, 86 churches, the royal exchange, customs-house, hospitals, libraries, and prisons.

Previous to the year 1795, the town of Boston, then such a flourishing city of science, culture, and enterprise, was visited by a score of fires extensive in their destruction and frightful in desolation. The distressing calamities which had come to Boston from destructive fires induced the people to make the prevention of fire and the relief of sufferers one of their firts objects of charity and philanthropy. The National Fire Protection Association, so ably directed to Percy Bugbee, today has its headquarters in that city of Boston, which appreciated the importance of early fire improvements.

I could go on to mention the New York City fire of 1835 and many others. Perhaps the most spectacular fire in all history, which turned the thoughts of the Nation more vividly and intelligently to improving building ordinances and the beginning of firefighting techniques, was the great Chicago fire which began on Sunday evening, October 8, 1871, in the O'Leary stable.

Would that I had time to review again the dramatics and the serious consequences of this conflagration, but suffice to say that in its fury demon fire knows not wealth, nor creed, nor race, nor station in life. When the last glowing ember had been extinguished, in that Chicago fire, 17,000 homes were in ruins, 90,000 were homeless, 300 lives had been lost. Property, valued even in those days of values, reflected a loss of more than $200 million, and five square miles lay a smouldering waste.

But one may say, "Those fires occurred many years ago. Haven't our improved firefighting equipment, our more drastic fire laws, and better-trained firemen made such holocausts impossible?" The answer is "No."

Every year we have some 40 major fire catastrophies in which large areas of cities, towns, and forest lands are burned and hundreds of lives are lost.

We have but to remember the tragic Cocoanut Grove fire in Boston, in 1942, and the Rhythm Club in Natchez, Miss., a year before. Except for the number of fatalities, it was the same ghastly story as its successor in Boston—a crowd beyond capacity, insufficient eixts, flimsy drapes and decorations that burned like gunpowder, frantic guests fighting for their lives and falling unconscious.

Then there was the Winecoff Hotel fire in Atlanta. The terrible Bar Harbor, Maine, destruction, and we remember afresh, vividly and with sadness the unfortunate school fire in Chicago last year.

All of these fires which I have mentioned made headlines because they reeked with tragedy, drama, and sensationalism. Yet these great conflagrations are but a fraction of our fire losses. For every great fire that is broadly publicized, thousands of American homes are burned without mention in current news.

The flame of a gas stove, the burning match, the lighted cigarette, the electric iron, the toaster on the breakfast table all become symbols of disaster.

A fire breaks out in the United States every 20 seconds. A human life is sacrificed every 44 minutes.

It is a well-established and accepted fact that the power of ignition inherent in animal and vegetable substances is often the cause of spontaneous combustion. Cotton, shavings and sawdust, hemp, flax, oily and greasy rags or rubbish, charcoal, turpentine, paint materials, tarred rope, felt and sulphur are susceptible to low degrees of heat and are often the cause of fire.

There is nothing more frightful than the onrush of a blaze. The hurtling speed, the roaring motors of pumpers, of ladders, and hose trucks, the chorus of bellowing sirens, the grim faces of firemen precariously hanging on the hand rails, the opening furrow in traffic ahead as the right-of-way is given to fire fighters, the first glimpse of the lurid blaze and billowing smoke, the throbbing of the pumping engines, the clatter and thud of rising ladders, the orderly tangle of hose lines, hoarse shouts of command, the impassioned calls, "Water! Water!" the hissing streams from nozzles gleaming in the glare of searchlights, the hideous crackling and grumbling of flames, the heroism of unselfish men, the back-breaking drudgery, the discipline and orderly procedure, the skill and the knowledge gained from experience and at fire school, the complexity of the fire equipment, the drama, the tragedy, the heartbreak, the terror of victims, and the horror on the faces of an assembled crowd found at every fire make for a common understanding of the role that the fireman plays in our everyday life.

As we have seen gains in our march to improved pumping machinery, safety devices, water systems, we must not lose sight of the value of education. We must recognize the importance of the school program with its fire drills. The lessons learned by the young ones will be taken home to parents.

Fire Prevention Week, so effective in so many places, must be strengthened and encouraged. We must never overlook an opportunity to encourage civic and luncheon clubs in the consideration of fire problems.

Newspapers have always been effective and willing to dramatize the spectacular. We must ever be alert to give them short, effective and readable stories on how to prevent the smallest fire.

The night watchman, who for centuries has smoked a pipe and pulled his clock, must be taught the simple rudiments and later advanced by degrees to a better understanding of his tremendous task.

The radio and television may be used to inform and enlighten the people. The chief officer of the fire department today may well use a television film of actual fires for post mortem material, study, and improvement.

We know today that effective apparatus must be used and speed attained in conveying it to the scene of action. It has long been axiomatic that you can never make up on the road for the time you lost in the firehouse.

A smart fire officer encourages the utmost assistance from representatives of light, gas, telephone, and water utilities. Often these men go unnoticed and unrecognized, but it is they who cut electric lines, remove the danger of high power systems, and add to the sum total of safety.

It is the endeavor of all firemen to find every arrangement that will insure the application of water or chemical on a fire in its early stage. The wooden shingle has gone but new problems in construction are with us. Old hazards may have passed away. Gas is no longer used for illumination, but electricity has changed the construction of mercantile establishments and air-conditioning systems close many buildings tightly, leaving no easy places for ventilation. Plastics and chemicals have come a long way, as has television, the use of natural gas and now, atomic energy.

The Claude Armour Training and Communications Center, and all of our educational programs must advance to meet the requirements of specialization.

Uppermost in the minds of all the people at this moment is the conservation of our resources, the conservation of health, education, and opportunity. Water is short in many parts of the country. No longer can fire departments waste this valuable asset. Indeed, so-called wet water and chemicals and scientific use of this powerful weapon must be continually improved.

Communities that have put forth extraordinary effort in teaching fire prevention and the enforcement of fire laws have been rewarded by a substantial decrease in the number of fires, the number of lives saved, and the amount of property destroyed or damaged.

In this short period of a luncheon talk, I have tried to cover a lot of ground. But I am the first to admit that much more should have been said. If a description of the be-

ginning of this conference in Memphis, the long historical background of the fire department profession, the need for applied specialization, training, prevention, and the necessity for public cooperation, along with the plea for continued application to high principle, be of any value, my hope is that my presence with you today may have been of some little worth.

## Low Bid Effects $6 Million Saving in TVA Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment on this floor and in the RECORD about the award by the TVA of a contract for a turbogenerator to A. C. Parsons, Ltd., of England. I appreciate that these discussions by my colleagues have been motivated by the interests of their constituents and a high sense of patriotism. But some of the discussion has not taken full cognizance of all the factors and facts in regard to this award. In order to present all the facts I requested the Board of Directors of the TVA to supply me with a statement on this award and I am inserting this statement in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, the statement speaks for itself. However, I might point out a few salient facts in brief summary.

First. The TVA is required by statute to purchase by competitive bidding whenever possible and practicable.

Second. The bid of A. C. Parson, Ltd., was the only bid that was responsive and legally acceptable.

Third. The Executive order of December 17, 1954, prescribing the operation of the Buy American Act provides that purchases shall be made from competing foreign sources if the domestic price exceeds the amount of a foreign bid by 6 percent, or, if the domestic bidder is in an area of substantial unemployment, by 12 percent. In its invitation for bids, the TVA announced that it would accept the lowest domestic bid if it did not exceed the lowest bid by 20 percent. This was in addition to the import duty differential.

Fourth. The bids of the domestic concerns were in fact 50 percent higher than that of A. C. Parsons.

Fifth. The Parsons bid was firm, whereas the domestic bids were subject to escalation clauses. Furthermore, the Parsons bid was the only one which met the invitational requirement for payment of damage in the event of delay in delivery.

Sixth. The contention that the differential in the bids was the result in differentials in wages here and abroad is not supported by facts. The TVA computes that the wage differential would account for no more than $1.5 million, which is less than the import duty.

Seventh. It has been implied that this purchase will be paid for by tax funds. Actually, the funds to pay for this equipment will come from the TVA's power revenues—contributed by TVA's customers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in my desire to protect and encourage our own American industry and I doubt that any single agency or institution has contributed as much to the development and growth of our American electrical industry as has the TVA. The statement of the TVA makes it clear that the TVA went far beyond all legal requirements to give our domestic manufacturers an advantage in the bidding. As pointed out by Chairman Vogel of the TVA Board over the years the TVA has purchased $348,918,170 worth of equipment from Pennsylvania; this amounts to almost one-sixth of all the money the TVA has spent since it was started. The TVA purchases from New York State have amounted to $189,965,956, or nearly one-tenth of all TVA purchases. Most of this has gone to the two manufacturers who now complain of the loss of the contract on which a $6 million savings was effected.

I commend the attention of my colleagues to the TVA statement so that there may be a full knowledge of all the facts and circumstances and with fairness to all concerned. The letter and statement follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
*Knoxville, Tenn., February 26, 1959.*

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. EVINS: We are glad to respond to your request for detailed information on the award by TVA of a contract to C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England, for a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator to be installed at the Colbert steam plant near Tuscumbia, Ala.

We enclose a full statement of the facts concerning this award to the Parsons firm. Underlying the consideration of all factors involved in this award is the saving to TVA of more than $6 million. The effects upon national defense and domestic employment are detailed in the statement.

It may interest you, in addition, to know that TVA purchases, to date, from New York State amount to $189,965,956 and from Pennsylvania, $348,918,170. These are the States in which this country's principal turbogenerator manufacturing plants are located.

Sincerely,

HERBERT D. VOGEL,
*Chairman of the Board.*

STATEMENT BY TVA ON PURCHASE OF TURBOGENERATOR FROM C. A. PARSONS & CO., LTD., ENGLAND

On February 6, 1959, TVA purchased a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator, to be installed at the Colbert steam plant near Tuscumbia, Ala., from C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England. The delivered price will be $12,095,800.

The purchase, made under competitive bidding procedures required by the TVA Act, was based on the following considerations:

1. The evaluated Parsons bid was more than $6 million lower than the evaluated bids of the only other bidders—Westinghouse Electric Corp. and General Electric Co.—both American firms.

2. Full compliance with the provisions of the Buy American Act and established national policy on foreign purchases.

3. A determination that Parsons is qualified, technically competent and adequately equipped to build and deliver the turbogenerator on schedule.

4. Assurance that Parsons is able to provide promptly, any repair service and replacement parts which may be necessary during the life of the machine.

Prior to the final action by the TVA Board in purchasing the turbogenerator from C. A. Parsons, all the factors involved, including such considerations as national security, were subjected to a detailed and intensive study.

Some subsequent public comment indicates a lack of understanding or of facts on the matter. This statement has been prepared to provide those facts.

WHY DID TVA SEEK FOREIGN BIDS?

For some time TVA has been disturbed by the rising prices of turbogenerators. There are only three American firms which manufacture large turbogenerators. Since 1951 the prices charged by these manufacturers for such equipment have increased by more than 50 percent, while the average wholesale price of all commodities has increased only about 5 percent.

It was this history of price increases by the only U.S. suppliers which led TVA to invite bids from qualified foreign manufacturers as well as domestic ones.

WHO WAS INVITED TO BID?

TVA invited bids from the three U.S. manufacturers and the two leading British manufacturers of large steam power generating equipment. Bids were received from three companies: the Westinghouse Corp., the General Electric Co., and C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd.

In its invitation to bidders TVA set forth certain factors that would be taken into account in comparing bids. These included differences in guaranteed efficiency of the machine, differences in escalation of prices, and willingness of the manufacturer to pay specified damages if the machines were not delivered on time.

COMPARISON OF THE BIDS

Before reflecting the evaluation factors just referred to, the base bids received were as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Parsons (including duty) | $12,095,800 |
| General Electric | 17,563,000 |
| Westinghouse | 17,633,000 |

The Parsons price was firm, while the bids from General Electric and Westinghouse were subject to escalation clauses. After adjustments for efficiency and escalation, the evaluated bids compared as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Parsons | $13,140,700 |
| Westinghouse | 19,453,725 |
| General Electric | 19,673,780 |

The evaluated General Electric and Westinghouse bid were thus nearly 50 percent higher than the Parsons bid.

Moreover, of the three bidders only Parsons indicated a willingness to accept a contract containing the provision specified in the invitation for payment of damages in the event of delay in delivery. General Electric and Westinghouse both took specific exception to the provision. This exception constituted a material deviation from the terms of the invitation which rendered their bids unresponsive and unacceptable even if one of them had been a low bidder.

This provision for liquidated damages is a very important one. A number of the large generating units which TVA has bought in recent years have been delivered late, and TVA has had to incur substantial additional costs as a result. Inclusion of a liquidated damages provision in the final contract gives TVA added assurance that Parsons will give its full attention to making delivery within the time necessary to meet TVA's requirements as specified in the invitation.

NATIONAL POLICY ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN BIDS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

National policy governing purchases of foreign equipment has been established by the Congress in the Buy American Act and by the President, in Executive Order 10582 of December 17, 1954, prescribing the manner in which all Federal agencies shall apply the Buy American Act. The act provides generally for purchase of domestic articles, materials and supplies, unless their cost is determined to be unreasonable as compared to foreign goods. The Executive order provides that ordinarily the offered price of materials of domestic origin shall be deemed to be unreasonable and purchase shall be made from competing foreign source if the domestic price exceeds the amount of a foreign bid by more than 6 percent. If the low domestic bidder is in an area of substantial unemployment, a 12 percent differential is used in accordance with a recommendation of the Council of Foreign Economic Policy.

TVA'S INVITATION FAVORED DOMESTIC MANUFACTURERS

TVA stated in its invitation for bids on the 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator that it would accept the lowest bid from a U.S. manufacturer if it did not exceed the lowest foreign bid by more than 20 percent. (Such an increase in the price advantage for domestic manufacturers is permitted under the Executive order if the Government agency involved determines that it has sufficient reason to increase the differential. If, under these conditions, purchase is made from a domestic manufacturer the agency is required to submit a special report on the matter to the President.)

This price advantage given to U.S. manufacturers was in addition to the import duty which would have to be paid by the foreign manufacturer.

The import duty which will be paid by Parsons amounts to about $1.5 million. The additional 20 percent advantage provided for domestic manufacturers, based on Parsons' evaluated bid, was over $2.6 million. Therefore, the total price advantage enjoyed by domestic bidders as a result of these two items alone amounted to over $4 million. Further, foreign bidders had other added costs for such items as transocean shipping and marine insurance.

DO LOW FOREIGN WAGES ACCOUNT FOR THE DIFFERENCE IN BIDS?

One explanation which has been offered for the inability of American manufacturers to meet the foreign price competition in this field, is the difference in wages paid in this country and abroad.

Wages paid to workers in the electrical industry in England are lower than those paid by domestic manufacturers. Westinghouse says that British labor receives only 37 percent of the hourly rate paid to the electrical workers here. General Electric has suggested that the ratio is 40 percent.

Westinghouse has told TVA that 1,080,000 man-hours of work in its shops would have been involved in building the turbogenerator. General Electric is quoted as saying that 600 man-years of work, which is closely comparable to the Westinghouse man-hour estimate, would have been required. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the average hourly wage rate in the electrical manufacturing industry for October 1958 was $2.28.

The foregoing figures suggest that differences in labor costs would be in the neighborhood of $1.5 million, and this does not allow for any greater manufacturing efficiency in the larger U.S. plants of General Electric and Westinghouse. This computed difference is less than half the price advantage provided for domestic manufacturers. In fact, it appears that the import duty is adequate to protect U.S. turbogenerator manufacturers against differences in labor costs.

THE COMPETENCE OF C. A. PARSONS & CO., LTD.

C. A. Parsons was a pioneer in steam turbines. Outside of the United States the Parsons Co. is the largest manufacturer of such equipment in the free world. Half of the turbogenerators it builds are exported. For example, it has built most of the steam power generating equipment that is operating in Canada. It has an English order for a 550,000-kilowatt unit. In fact, Parsons & Co. and General Electric are the only two companies in the world known to be building units as large as 500,000 kilowatts, General Electric now being engaged in building one such unit, which TVA ordered from it in the fall of 1957.

Before any supplier, whether domestic or foreign, is invited to submit bids on large power equipment, TVA first satisfies itself as to the company's ability to meet high standards of quality and efficiency. Further, TVA must be satisfied with the ability of the supplier to provide repairs and replacement parts with reasonable speed. In the case of the Parsons Co., as with other approved bidders, TVA appraised these qualifications by an inspection of the company's facilities and detailed discussions with its responsible officials and engineers. TVA has determined to its full satisfaction that this British firm has the plant, equipment, skills, and manpower necessary to build and service an efficient and reliable machine. Further, Parsons maintains service facilities and personnel in Canada, which are as favorably located as the corresponding facilities of the U.S. firms.

NATIONAL SECURITY

All the foregoing has a bearing on the effect on national security of this purchase from a British firm. The Parsons Co. has a good record of delivery on schedule and its guarantee is backed up by a penalty clause in the contract. There are similar assurances that the machine will be highly efficient.

Fears that competition by foreign firms will result in all or most large turbogenerators being manufactured abroad, thereby eliminating American productive capacity as a supply source in defense emergencies, are unfounded. It appears that the total capacity in the entire free world for producing such equipment is so limited that all of it, both in Europe and the United States, will normally be required to supply the large turbogenerators necessary to meet the rapidly increasing demands of this Nation and others for electric energy.

In the event of total war, the problem of repair or replacement of generating units would be about the same, whether they had been manufactured domestically or abroad. Any realistic contemplation of such a war must assume that American turbogenerator manufacturing plants could be destroyed or damaged in the same attack which might damage or destroy the unit installed in the Colbert steamplant. Early repair or replacement would seem unlikely, no matter where the unit had been built.

In event of a less-extensive attack or acts of sabotage, it should be recognized that generating units manufactured by all the major American suppliers are incorporated in the TVA system. Widespread damage to the system could result in heavy demands on all these suppliers, both by TVA and by utilities in other sections of the country. Addition of the Parsons unit to the TVA system increases the number of suppliers who can be called on in the event of such an emergency and thereby reduces the risk of delay in getting maximum capacity back into service.

Economical operation of the TVA power system, to which the saving of more than $6 million contributes, is important in the national defense budget, since half of the power from the TVA system goes to Federal defense installations. Introduction of real price competition into the turbogenerator manufacturing field makes a contribution to combating inflation. At the same time, purchase of the unit from Parsons strengthens the economic position of our ally, Great Britain.

For national security, strong allies, a healthy world trade, essential industries strengthened by stimulation of competition, are likely to be at least as important as the location of specific powerplant repair facilities. These basic purposes are served by the award of the contract under discussion to Parsons of England.

IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT AND NATIONAL ECONOMY

TVA would regret any real net loss of employment for American workers from its purchase of an English turbogenerator. However, it seems more likely that there will a net benefit to American labor. TVA will make payment in dollars for its purchase from Parsons. It can reasonably be assumed that these dollars will be used to finance British purchases of other goods either in the United States or in third countries which will in turn use the dollars to make purchases in the United States. Those dollars can be expected to create and pay for as many man-hours of work in the United States as would have resulted from domestic manufacture of the turbogenerator.

In addition, the saving of over $6 million affects TVA's ability to provide low-cost power to farms, homes, and industrial concerns within its power service area. The availability of ample power at the lowest cost stimulates industrial employment, and enables the home consumers of this power to continue to provide the best market in the Nation for electrical appliances. The money TVA invests in generating equipment is exceeded by the purchases by consumers of TVA power of electrical appliances and equipment—more than $2 billion worth since the end of World War II—of which General Electric and Westinghouse are leading suppliers.

THE TURBOGENERATOR WILL BE PAID FOR BY THE USERS OF TVA POWER

Contrary to the impression that prevails in some quarters, the money to be spent for the turbogenerator will not come from taxes. The cost will be met from power revenues paid by the users of TVA power.

---

## The Late Honorable J. Harry McGregor

SPEECH

OF

## HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join today in the eulogies for our late departed colleague, HARRY MCGREGOR, with whom I was privileged to serve as a member of the minority on the Public Works Committee, having been a member of that committee since I was elected to Congress some 5 years ago.

HARRY MCGREGOR was a great public servant; HARRY MCGREGOR was an outstanding American; HARRY MCGREGOR was the ranking minority member of the Roads Subcommittee of the Public

Works Committee, and through his sponsorship of legislation the great interstate and other Federal-aid highway systems came closer to fruition than at any time previously. It was through his efforts and sponsorship of legislation that the forerunners of the great 1956 Interstate and Defense Highway Act came into being. It was his bill, his sponsorship of legislation in the Republican 83d Congress that resulted in the passage of the forerunner of the great highway system act in the 84th and the 85th Congresses. This great Interstate and Defense Highway System is a monument and a tribute to HARRY MCGREGOR. He was more interested and qualified in this subject, I venture to say, than any other Member of the House has been in recent years.

It was indeed a pleasure to serve with him, and it was my great pleasure and privilege to come to know of his ability and dedication on the Public Works Committee. He succeeded as ranking Republican member the Honorable George Dondero who in his turn served with equal ability and distinction.

J. HARRY MCGREGOR was a man of deep conviction, he was a man of sound judgment. He was a man who did not hesitate to get up on the floor and present those principles in which he believed and to fight for them. He was a hard-working and aggressive man, and as a freshman and since I have deemed it a high privilege to serve with him. He gave the greatest leadership and encouragement to me as a member of the Public Works Committee. His understanding of the problems faced by new Members, and his helpfulness to them will linger long not only in my memory but also in the memory of many others in the Congress who came to know him and seek his wise counsel in recent years. It is a high honor for me to join in these eulogies of our departed colleague. He was a great man, an outstanding American J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

## What the State of Virginia Plans To Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, in preparation for the forthcoming observance of the Civil War centennial, we have now functioning in the State of Virginia an active program looking toward what we hope to be one of the most significant commemorations in our history. We have established what is known as the Virginia Civil War Commission, which is now planning Virginia's observance of the centennial, and extensive preparations are being made in various parts of our State in connection with this event. Virginia's points of interest are well known to people throughout the country, but we are hoping during this observance to enlarge upon what has already been done and to better publicize the fine historical points which have connection with the Civil War period.

Mr. James J. Geary, executive director of the Virginia Civil War Commission, has been most active in this connection, and recently he made a very splendid address before the Civil War Centennial Conference, held at Chapel Hill, N.C. His address was entitled "What the State of Virginia Plans To Do," and I wish to include herein the text of his address, as I feel that it will be of interest to those who are looking forward to this event:

WHAT THE STATE OF VIRGINIA PLANS TO DO

(Address by Mr. James J. Geary, executive director of the Virginia Civil War Commission, before the Civil War centennial conference, Chapel Hill, N.C., February 28, 1959.)

Dr. Crittenden, ladies and gentlemen, it is a sincere pleasure for me to be here with this group, interested in the Civil War centennial and meeting at this fine university, of Virginia's great neighboring State of North Carolina. I bring you greetings from the Virginia Civil War Commission.

One of the developments for which our Virginia commission is most eager is for North Carolina and all of our sister States of the South to join with us in actively planning for this momentous 4-year Civil War centennial. One member of our commisison has spent a lot of his own time writing to friends in Southern States attempting to stimulate the formation of State centennial commissions. We feel the time so needed for making plans is slipping away, and that we Southern States must not let someone else do all the running with the ball.

Recently at our request Virginia's Governor Almond wrote to the Governors of the other Southern States. He urged that they use their good offices in the interest of legislation creating centennial commissions within their States and appropriating the necessary funds for their use. The response was gratifying. ome said that commissions already had been appointed—though without funds to work with. Others said legislation was pending, either for the creation of commissions, for appropriations of funds, or for both. I believe Virginia is still the only Southern State with a legislatively created centennial commission and money to work with. We sincerely hope that there will soon be active commissions in all the Southern States. We need you, and we want your help.

I'm to talk on "What the State of Virginia Plans To Do." I've been in this job full time for almost 4 months. I've been thinking about it night and day. I seek all the advice I can get. Most people just shake their heads and say, "It is a big job." It's been like driving along on a foggy morning. Sometimes the fog clears a little and you catch a glimpse of something, and then its all cloudy again. And so you keep on driving, hoping that in time the fog will lift, and you will be able to see clearly the road ahead.

Suppose you suddenly found yourself with an office and a secretary and this assignment: plan and coordinate for 4 years the centennial of the American Civil War; plan and coordinate, over a 4-year period, the 100th anniversary of a national emotional convulsion so profound and so extensive that no one today really understands it.

Well, we're driving ahead through the fog in Virginia—feeling our way. And we've accomplished a few things. We've gotten some publicity; we believe we've started some people to thinking about the centennial; and we're laying the groundwork for an organization. I have traveled over much of the State, attending meetings, being introduced, letting people know that we are in business. And invariably I've told them that in the final analysis it is they—the people of the individual localities—who must be responsible for much of the observance of this centennial. We cannot do it in Richmond. We can only help. Last Monday, at a meeting of our executive committee, a delegation from a certain area of the State, interested in the centennial, showed up to ask what we are going to do. I think one of the members of our committee gave a very apt answer. He said: "We are going to try to stimulate you to do whatever you want to do." No State commission by itself can put on a 4-year centennial program. It couldn't do it if it had the money—and it won't have the money.

In Virginia we have welcomed with open arms all qualified groups who have come forward and volunteered to do a job. The Richmond Academy of Medicine, long interested in medical history, offered its services, and our commission designated it as the organization in Virginia to portray the medical aspects of the war. At Newport News there is a wonderful privately endowed institution dedicated to preserving the history of man's conquest of the sea. It is called the Mariners Museum, and it has come forward with plans for a centennial exhibit on the "Effect of Sea Power on the Outcome of the War." We have designated this institution as the organization in Virginia to portray the war at sea.

A local committee at Manassas has great plans for a reenactment of the First Battle of Manassas in July of 1961. And while we certainly do not see the centennial as one reenactment after another, we have caught some of the enthusiasm of this group and the commission has given its hearty endorsement to their plans. So we will go all out for First Manassas, the first great battle of the war, in the hopes that it will focus attention on the whole centennial.

We've had some conversations about a possible reenactment of the *Merrimac-Monitor* encounter. There are some who feel it would be preferable to have an indoor exhibit of this great sea battle, with models, so that hundreds of thousands or millions of persons could see it over 4 years instead of simply a few thousand on 2 or 3 or 4 days.

But what are some of the things that can be done in those communities well removed from any major engagements? Recently a wonderful, simple suggestion came from a Richmond man who probably knows more about the Richmond battlefields than any man alive, Mr. J. Ambler Johnston, a distinguished architect. Why not, he said, have rededications of the monuments that stand in virtually every county courthouse square in memory of the men who served from that county. Have a speech by the son or the grandson of the man who made the original dedicatory speech when the monument was erected 50 or 75 years ago. Have a local group get together the names of all who served from that county, along with the names of the regiments or corps. Get people thinking and organizing on the grass roots level, and half the battle is won.

Now, of course, many things can be done on the State level—depending on how much money you have. You can have State exhibits, educational programs, radio, television and outdoor drama, publications, documentary films, contests, scholarships, fellowships. You can mark the sites of engagements, rename highways, purchase property, acquire valuable documents and artifacts. And you can encourage scholarly research.

In Virginia we are already at work on a commemorative one-volume selection of the wartime papers and letters of Gen. Robert E. Lee. Strangely enough, General Lee's papers have never been gathered in a single publication, though many of them are scattered through various published books.

This is an expensive project. Even though a publishing house has agreed to underwrite the manufacturing and promotion of the book, the editorial costs to the State will probably be in the neighborhood of $25,000.

I am glad that we are doing this, for it will be a permanent contribution to scholarship and the history of the Civil War. And the sterling character of Robert E. Lee can be an inspiration to all young people. We hope this book will be sufficiently readable that it will command a relatively good sale.

For my part, however, I would not like to see our program, or yours, topheavy with projects of a scholarly nature, which must appeal to a very limited audience—and to an audience which already is interested in the Civil War. No one do we need so much as the historian, and the history-minded student. With their help, let us make the centennial program one that will appeal to the other 99 percent of the people. Let us stimulate—however briefly—in the man or woman, the boy or girl, who does not normally think much about these things, an understanding and a reverence for the American spirit and heroism that was shown on both sides in that epic struggle—that American tragedy—of 100 years ago.

## Some Facts About the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in my newsletter last week I called the attention of the people of the great Fourth District of Tennessee, which I have the honor to represent, to some facts about the President's budget which have not received as much discussion and consideration as, in my view, they deserve.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting this newsletter in the Appendix of the RECORD. The newsletter follows:

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE BUDGET

The Appropriations Committee of the House is continuing its hearings, studies, and consideration of all aspects of the President's budget proposals.

Everybody wants economy in Government and everyone wants a balanced budget for the Nation. These are the objectives to be desired. However, in the widespread discussions and debates about the limit and extent of the budget, there are certain facts that have not received much discussion.

For example, we hear much talk about "the wild spending in the Congress." What many sometimes do not realize is that much of this so-called wild spending comes about by the recommendations of the President, his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the members of the executive departments. In this connection, it should be pointed out that since 1952 the Federal budget has increased from $60 billion to $80 billion. This year the President is proposing an overall budget of $77 billion. Every year since 1952, the President has presented to the Congress larger budgets, calling for increased Federal expenditures. Every year—with the exception of last year when we were threatened with an economic depression—the Congress has reduced the budget by several billions of dollars and in 1957 by some $5 billion.

Members of the Appropriations Committee, during the current hearings, have been somewhat startled—and certainly it has been revealing—to note that every head of each executive agency, without exception, is asking for increased personnel, increased appropriations and a larger budget for their own departments. This includes the Budget Bureau itself, which is asking for an increase of 5 percent in new appropriations; and the White House where the budget has been increased by 33 percent in the past 2 years, and even the Secretary of the Treasury.

After making this closer look at the President's budget, it is apparent that the President is not recommending that spending be reduced in certain areas but rather increased. The proposed economies in the budget are almost entirely in the field of investments in new assets for the Nation, such as public works projects, the development of our own resources and loans that are repayable. In other words, the President's budget calls for cuts in capital assets and investments in the Nation and for increased expenditures in other departments. This means more spending and less investment.

Some news reports have indicated and great claims are made that the proposed budget is a balanced budget. There are several contingencies which are not realized and in all probability will not be realized. Therefore, the budget is not in reality balanced. These contingencies include again raising the postal rates to the people of the Nation—to which the Congress is not likely to give its approval—(2) increasing again gasoline taxes—(3) not considering supplemental appropriations requests, of which there are annually several in number, and (4) the sale of national mortgages and securities held by the Treasury, which would bring in some income to the Government if sold at reduced rates and with profit to private investors. In considering these contingencies and on second examination, the proposed budget is not in fact balanced because these contingencies are not likely to materialize.

The Congress will address itself to the merits of the various proposals and no doubt will approve some of the recommendations, alter and amend others and substitute, in several instances, the collective judgment of the elected Representatives of the people in substitution for departmental recommendations. Keeping in mind previous action of the Congress, it is very likely that the final budget, after all these adjustments, will come closer in reality to being balanced than the budget presented to the Congress and now under consideration.

## Bank Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter written by Donald Havens, Jr., of New York City, to the editor of the Wall Street Journal. The letter appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 19, 1959. I believe it reflects the feeling of most depositors.

BANK MERGERS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The current rash of bank mergers in New York strikes this observer as unnecessary and wasteful. I do not mean to make a wholesale condemnation of all the recent mergers. However, it seems that many of the combinations contemplated have been arranged solely on the grounds that increased size gives increased prestige with "national" customers. The banks have argued that they need greater capital in order to serve their customers better. Actually, there are only a few billion-dollar corporations in the whole country that are able to borrow the legal limit of any of the existing billion-dollar banks in New York. Therefore, it would seem that the main reason for these mergers is simply jockeying for prestige based on size, and a result is that service may suffer, particularly the service every bank owes to the community in which it is located.

In many cases the mergers have resulted in unwieldly operations at first and an overlap of departments and branches. The expense of consolidating can be excessive. The cumbersome operations hurt customer relations and some valuable accounts are lost in the fast shuffle. Lastly, uncertainty of position also generally causes at these times some losses of key personnel whom the banks have spent both time and money to train.

DONALD HAVENS, Jr.

NEW YORK CITY.

## He Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I had the pleasure of attending an impressive lunch in the presidential room of the Hotel Statler. This meeting honored the 50 winners—from the 49 States and the District of Columbia—in the Voice of Democracy contest. From this fine group of young men and women, four finalists were picked. Among these four finalists was an articulate and personable young man, Derek L. Booth, from Boonton, N.J., in my congressional district.

In a short speech, which I am including below, Derek expressed his views on democracy:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Derek L. Booth)

It is interesting to note in our modern society the many and varied interpretations people put on the word "democracy." One may call to mind several ideas simultaneously, and this is natural, for democracy is a broad and occasionally deep subject. It involves the myriad facets of the republican form of government as practiced in our country. It includes relationships between ourselves and others, no matter what the circumstances. It also encompasses material wealth and advancement, and all which these terms connote. Therefore, democracy as Americans know it is a way of life, inextricably bound into our every activity. But let us make clear at the outset that true American democracy is also an ideal, as yet unattained by any people. It is a thing of the spirit; which spirit must be felt by the people before it is of any value. And if it is sensed by the citizens of the country, they cannot help but strive for the fulfillment of the standard—constantly—fervently.

What does this ideal mean? What is the principal application of this cherished heritage? I believe that to live democratically is to practice an art, to learn a lesson. Someone has said that we use people and love things, in contrast to our intended behavior.

It is my feeling that democracy is the art—the lesson—of loving people and using things, to the best interests of all. That is my definition.

This statement must be translated and applied to the phases of our living, in order that we may see more clearly our proper course of action. In the international scene, the word for democracy is "peace." Its realization calls for distribution of power so that no people shall have control over another without the other's consent. It is common thought that the United Nations has accomplished this task since its inception. I am convinced, however, that the U.N. has not yet achieved this ideal state of harmonious cooperation. Its charter speaks of "living together in peace as good neighbors"; and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights deals with the concepts of human worth, equality, opportunity, liberty, and so on; but does not every one of the five great powers still insist on the right of veto in the Security Council? Agitation continues, and will continue, for the abolition of veto and the submitting of decisions to the whole body. This is merely one manifestation of the ongoing movement for perfection of democracy.

Domestically, democracy's synonym consists in proportionate sharing. This is to say that all who work partake to the fullest extent of the material advantages which they help to create. Our economy would be a mutual enterprise, with even the humblest laborer assured of earning enough to maintain dignity and family. Here is the place of arbitration, industrial unionism, and other devices now being used to impart a full measure of justice to the apportionment of authority in our mammoth trade organizations.

So we have come to realize that democracy means these four things: First, the recognition of the dignity and worth of the human personality; second, the right of the individual to achieve up to his capacities; third, the right of the individual to share in the determination of his own welfare; and fourth, the development of liberty, not license, and of cooperative citizenship. Only as we set ourselves to pursuing these goals, and to performing their corresponding duties cheerfully, will our struggle culminate in the perfection of truth, revealed in dynamic democracy.

## Statement of Ed E. Reid in Support of Area Redevelopment Bill—S. 722

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Ed E. Reid, executive director of the Alabama League of Municipalities, appeared before the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in support of the area redevelopment bill.

As director of the Alabama organization, Mr. Reid spoke in behalf of 255 member municipalities in Alabama. His statement also represented the American Municipal Association's position in regard to this legislation and this national group includes some 13,000 cities and towns in its membership.

I submit Mr. Reid's statement in support of the area redevelopment bill for the benefit of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF ED E. REID, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALABAMA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES, BEFORE THE PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 26, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Ed E. Reid, executive director of the Alabama League of Municipalities. I am testifying before you today in that capacity and also on behalf of the American Municipal Association on whose executive committee I serve.

The Alabama League of Municipalities is a voluntary association of the city and town governments of our State. It was organized in 1935 and has been representing our State's cities and towns before the State legislature and here in Washington ever since. The league is also a service, information, and research organization and has as its sole objective the betterment of municipal government in Alabama. I have had the honor of serving the organization as its executive director from its inception—since 1935.

The league has 255 member municipalities ranging from the smallest, Detroit (population 75), to the largest, Birmingham (population 326,000).

The American Municipal Association, through memberships of its affiliate leagues, represents something like 13,000 towns and cities in the United States and Puerto Rico. In other words, the American Municipal Association is the national federation of the 45 State municipal leagues—of which Alabama is one.

At its last annual American Municipal Congress the membership of AMA approved the following policy resolution pertaining to area redevelopment legislation:

"DEPRESSED URBAN AREAS

"Congress should assist those communities which suffer persistent unemployment due to underdevelopment or decline to achieve economic health. Such communities should include the city even if the labor market area in which it is located is not depressed. The older core city has special problems with its obsolescent industrial facilities.

"To be successful, however, Federal aid must cope with basic problems and not confine itself to a stepped-up letting of defense contracts in the depressed community. AMA recognizes that such Federal aid without initiative and active participation by the municipality will not bring about the desired revitalization."

Specifically, AMA recommends:

1. Supplementary unemployment benefits, especially for workers taking vocational training courses.

2. Loans for construction or rehabilitation of industrial plants.

3. Assistance for public works plans.

4. Special tax amortization benefits for new defense facilities.

5. Placing Government contracts as far as practicable in surplus labor areas.

The area redevelopment bill (S. 3683) as vetoed by the President would have achieved most of those objectives. We urge the Congress to again pass the important legislation and we again ask the President to accept appropriate authority under which the communities with basic problems of persistent unemployment can be assisted toward their solution.

The Alabama League of Municipalities, through action of its committee on Federal legislation which was confirmed by delegates to its annual convention, approved the principle of last year's proposed legislation on this subject. That policy remains in effect today.

Mr. Chairman, preparatory to writing this statement I referred to the record of the hearings conducted by this committee and its counterpart in the House of Representatives during the past 4 years on area redevelopment legislation. I also very carefully read the statement you made at the time you introduced S. 722 in the Senate this year. My conclusion was that there was very little I could add to the record in support of this important legislation beyond reiterating the wholehearted endorsement of the measure on the part of the Alabama League of Municipalities and the American Municipal Association, plus a few general observations and some brief comments on the depressed area situation as it relates to communities in Alabama.

There are several reasons why we welcome and support area redevelopment legislation at the Federal level. For one thing, the kind of resources needed to do an adequate job are well beyond the capacity of the State and local governments to support alone, and this is particularly true in the case of our smaller cities. For another, State governments have generally been disinterested and unwilling to undertake any remedial action. Finally, we welcome Federal involvment because we feel it is proper and legitimate and long overdue.

For example, unemployment has been recognized as a matter of Federal concern for some time now, but measures to counter it have been limited very largely to participation in the payment of unemployment compensation, statistics gathering, and the placement of defense contracts. Never before to our knowledge has the kind of research been undertaken to discover the specific causes of unemployment that can be attributed solely to local factors as we believe will be required for the successful operation of the program proposed in S. 722.

Furthermore, the role of the town or city in the national economy also should be of considerably greater concern to the Federal Government than it has been heretofore. S. 722 establishes the framework for doing some long overdue research work on what makes local economies tick, and what their relationship is to the economy of the whole region, the economy of the State, and to that of the Nation itself.

One of the most encouraging things about the area redevelopment proposal is that it will necessarily get the Federal Government involved in an analysis of the basic building block of the national economy—the economic base of the local community.

We have reviewed the proposed bill—S. 722—in some detail and we are convinced that it offers a sound and comprehensive approach to the solution of what we know to be an exceedingly complex and vexing problem.

We believe that the kind of program proposed by S. 722 offers distressed areas a range of aids which, if coupled with energetic local leadership and a realistic appreciation of the total problem, should prove effective in stimulating the kind of action necessary to put the community on the road to economic recovery.

We believe that Federal action is long overdue and that area assistance legislation as covered by S. 722 ought to be approved by the Congress.

We further believe that once we have had an opportunity to study the program in action we will be in a much better position to assess its strong points and its weaknesses, and then to make whatever perfecting amendments which appear necessary to make it an even more effective effort on the part of public and private agencies.

In our own State, the State government has done practically nothing to help repair the injury done to our economy brought on by underemployment or unemployment, and the counties and municipalities simply do not have the resources to tackle such a problem alone. The areas listed as depressed areas in Alabama as in other States, I am sure, cover more than the few cities listed by the Department of Labor as having a surplus of labor. Many of the cities listed are

the economic centers of much wider areas and their failure to provide employment and job opportunities for their city people affects the whole area for miles around in all directions. So, seven or eight communities listed as depressed areas may actually be wide geographic areas reaching out in all directions for many, many miles.

I cannot, gentlemen, emphasize too strongly the importance of this legislation. We hope it wins your approval and that of the entire Congress. Moreover, we hope this year that if your bill is passed by the Congress the President will have the good judgment this time to sign it into law.

## Letter Re Price Support Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced that the Department of Agriculture has on a number of occasions rendered the farmers of this Nation a great disservice by providing misleading information which has tended to turn the consumer against the farmer. A recent case in point was the issuance of a list of the recipients of the 1957 price support payments.

Apparently what the Secretary of Agriculture has done is to list all Commodity Credit Corporation loans as if they represented total cost to the taxpayer. This is simply not the case, for in many instances these loans were repaid prior to the Government takeover date and thus did not represent an actual Government expenditure.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a particular case in which I believe this misinformation has resulted in a grave injustice. A constituent of mine in the Second District of Oregon, Mrs. Amanda Duvall, was reported as receiving $104,944 on her 1957 wheat and barley crop. What was not included in the report was the fact that Mrs. Duvall redeemed 26,195 bushels of wheat under loan prior to the Government takeover date at a cost to her of $47,736.96. This sum was paid to the Commodity Credit Corporation as payment of principal and interest plus loan charges by Mrs. Duvall who then marketed the 26,195 bushels of wheat through a local cooperative.

I think this is a matter which deserves to be clarified and in order to provide full information, I ask that the following letter by the manager of the Morrow County Grain Growers be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MORROW COUNTY GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
*Lexington, Oreg., February 26, 1959.*

HON. AL ULLMAN,
*Member of Congress,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. ULLMAN: I feel the recent Associated Press report, quoting Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, reference 1957 price support payments to Mrs. Amanda Duvall of Heppner does an injustice by way of not giving the full story.

Actually Mrs. Duvall took CCC loans amounting to $104,944 on her 1957 crop wheat and barley. What isn't reported is that Mrs. Duvall redeemed 26,195 bushels of her wheat under loan prior to the Government takeover date at a cost to her of $47,736.96. This sum was paid CCC as payment of principal and interest plus loan charges by Mrs. Duvall who then marketed the 26,195 bushels through this cooperative.

The above-mentioned payment of almost $50,000 reduces the total cash benefits by this figure. In addition the CCC took full title to the balance of her 1957 crop wheat amounting to 10,912 bushels stored in our elevators plus her full harvested crop of barley. The wheat she redeemed and sold was in her own farm storage and carried a later loan date, hence lower interest charges.

The market value of the commodities taken over by the Government amounted to very nearly the loan price plus interest and charges. Reducing the total cash received by the amount paid back by Mrs. Duvall, plus the value of the grain surrendered certainly pares the net benefits received to a very low figure.

Very truly yours,

AL LAMB,
*Manager, Morrow County Grain Growers, Inc.*

## What People Should Know About Cancer and the Place of Krebiozen in the Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I attended a testimonial dinner in honor of Dr. Andrew Conway Ivy, the champion of the scientific doctrine of freedom of research, which has suffered in recent years through the falsity of certain politico-physician leaders of the American Medical Association, who faked reports, suppressed honest information, brutally slugged the opposition, both physically and through pressures, used to prevent the truth about Krebiozen reaching the American people.

His speech, made to 1,200 persons attending, in his honor, among whom were numbered many outstanding business, civic, scientific, religious, and industrial leaders, was a masterpiece in its treatment of fundamental truths touching upon the subject of cancer and, in its simplicity of language, was readily understood by the layman mind.

The subject matter of the speech follows:

WHAT PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW ABOUT CANCER AND THE PLACE OF KREBIOZEN IN THE PICTURE

(By Dr. A. C. Ivy)

In speaking on this subject I do not desire to create an abnormal fear of cancer or an irrational concern about cancer. I desire, however, to create an informed and rational concern about cancer.

I

Why should everyone have a rational concern about cancer? The answer is: Because approximately one out of six persons today die of cancer. And, if something is not done to prevent or cure cancer in its early stage one out of four persons now living will die of cancer.

Some people say: "I do not want to know anything about cancer. But, I want my doctor to know everything about it."

But the sad and tragic fact is that people who know nothing about cancer go to see their doctor too late for the doctor to help. Because of their ignorance they do not give the doctor a fair chance to help them, and they have done themselves and loved ones an injury. This is especially true of internal cancer, or when the cancer starts deep in the body where it can only be seen by X-ray examination. When a cancer is deep in the body where there are not many pain nerves, the cancer spreads beyond the reach of the surgeon and radiologist.

There are signs and symptoms which indicate that cancer is starting or is present. You should know and remember these signs and symptoms.

II

First, let me tell you about a precancerous sore or abnormality, an abnormality or a sore which is known to indicate that a cancer might occur or that a cancer is already present in its early stages. A precancerous or an early cancer can be cured by either surgery or cautery and some can be cured by X-ray or radium.

To emphasize this I shall cite my own case as exhibit A. From 1919 to 1946, I smoked a pipe. Tobacco smoke contains a cancer-producing tar. It also contains arsenic in a cancer-producing form, because sprays containing arsenic are used to kill tobacco-plant worms and other parasites. I quit smoking in 1946 because I found that tobacco smoke and nicotine are harmful to the body of suspectible persons, and about 20 percent of people are susceptible. I quit for two reasons: First, because I did not desire to harm my own body; and, second, I did not desire to be a bad example to young people, inducing those who were susceptible to smoke and to harm their body.

Even though I quit smoking in 1946, the prior effect of the smoking on my lips and tongue persisted. And, one Monday morning in September 1958, I woke up and felt a painful spot on the edge of my tongue. I thought I had bitten my tongue and proceeded to forget about it. But the sore spot was still present the following Friday morning; so, I looked at it in the mirror. I saw that the sore spot was a "white spot," which in Greek and medical terminology is called a leukoplakia, because "leuko" means white and "plakia" an elevated spot or plate.

A leukoplakia is a precancerous type of abnormality or sore. I did not know, of course, whether cancer cells had already developed in the white spot. If they were present or should develop, I knew that they would invade or grow into the surrounding normal tissues, including the blood vessels and lymphatic vessels. This extension of the cancer cells into local tissues is called invasion. I knew, furthermore, that if cancer cells were present and had invaded into the lymphatic vessels, the cancer cells could then spread into the local lymph glands in my mouth, throat, and neck. I knew that if they had grown into the local blood vessels, they could spread to my lungs and grow there.

So, what did I do? I put into practice what I had been teaching and preaching for 25 years. That is, you should not delay taking care of a precancerous or an early cancerous abnormality or sore. I called my physician and made an appointment to have the condition cared for the following Monday.

What was done regarding treatment? First, I took injections of Krebiozen, because Krebiozen (hypothetically) builds up the natural defenses of the body against cancer, and because if there were some cancer cells in the local blood or lymphatic vessels and if they were dislodged by the operation I was to have, the cancer cells would not grow

in the lymph glands or lungs. If the body resistance against cancer was high, then cancer cells when they arrived at the local lymph glands or lungs would not grow; they would die. After taking Krebiozen, my physician cut out the white spot so that it could be examined under a microscope for cancer cells. He then cauterized the tissue around the incision to destroy any cells that might remain behind. I then continued to take Krebiozen for 1 week to keep my body defenses high.

Instead of using Krebiozen to build up body defenses against cancer cells which may get into the blood during an operation, many surgeons inject nitrogen mustard into the blood of the patient. Nitrogen mustard is a poison—a war gas—which kills cancer cells; but at the same time it kills normal cells and makes the patient sick.

I am not condemning the use of nitrogen mustard, because it is of value. I am just telling you the facts.

A physician wrote me and asked the following question: "Dr. Ivy, if you really believe that Krebiozen is a cure for cancer why did you have surgery used in the treatment of your cancer?" I replied: "Your question is like asking me if I had stopped beating Mrs. Ivy. I have never started beating Mrs. Ivy, and I have never claimed that Krebiozen is a cure for cancer." I have only claimed that it is of value in the treatment of some cancer patients; and, if further developed, it may turn out to be more effective and provide a key to finding the cure of all cancers.

III

What are the precancerous or early cancer signs and symptoms everyone should know?

1. Skin, a chronic sore any place; a wart or a mole which becomes irritated; or a lump in the breast or elsewhere under the skin.

2. Bleeding from a body orifice: (a) the nose, when it is not an ordinary nose bleed; (b) coughing up or spitting or vomiting blood; (c) blood in the urine or the stool; (d) blood from the vagina when not due to the menses.

3. Pain: persistent, recurring. The patient usually sees the physican for severe pain, but does not when the pain is not severe.

4. Headache, persistent, with or without vomiting.

5. Hoarseness, persistent.

6. Chronic cough.

7. Indigestion: stomach distress, burning, much belching; and a change in bowel habit.

IV

There are two general types of cancer. One type develops in cells covering the inside and outside the body, or the epithelial cells. This type of cancer usually occurs between the age of 40 and 65; such cancers are called carcinoma. The other type develops from the cells which are located between the internal and external covering cells of the body. This type occurs at any age and is called sarcoma.

V

Cause of cancer? There are two interrelated causes. One is heredity and the other is irritation.

Physiologically cancer may be described as representing an abnormal repair of injury to cells.

First, there is a hereditary susceptibility or low resistance to cancer which is generally confined to one or more organs, such as the stomach or lungs. This susceptibility to cancer has been established in animals. It has not been proved categorically to exist in man; but most students of cancer believe that it exists in man.

Second, irritation of a group of cells as occurs in a chronic sore which does not heal may be responsible, or a specific cancer-causing substance (carcinogen) such as the tar in soot or in tobacco smoke, or in certain dyes used for coloring things people use.

VI

There are two types or theories of treatment. One uses artificial means and the other uses natural means.

The artificial means consist of surgery, cautery, X-rays, radium, and the cobalt bomb, and the use of chemicals which are poisonous to cancer cells. If the cancer is in an early stage and is localized to one place, then surgery and cautery is the only absolute or categorical way to cure the cancer. But unless the operation is done gently and skillfully, the cancer may be spread throughout the body. In the case of certain cancers which are sensitive to X-rays, X-rays or radiant energy will destroy the cancer. There is no artificial chemical now known which will kill all cancer cells and not normal cells. There are some five or six artificial chemicals which are of value in the treatment of cancer. But all of these depress the reticuloendothelial cells which are the cells which naturally give the body resistance to disease and parasites and are concerned with the normal repair of the body. There are some patients, however, who respond dramatically to some of these artificial chemicals, and they should be tried in certain patients.

The natural means consist of the use of chemical substances produced by the body. Those chemical substances in the body which regulate growth and repair.

The natural means of controlling or curing cancer has not been studied extensively, not nearly as much as it merits. In fact, the only real reason or basis for the hope that we may be able to discover a chemical substance which will prevent and destroy cancer, is the observation that in 1 out of 100,000 cancer patients the body cures itself of cancer. In other words, there is a natural way for the cure of cancer, and we should intensively search for the chemical substance or substances which the body uses to occasionally cure itself of cancer.

The use of male hormone for cancer of the breast and of female hormone for cancer of the prostate are examples of the use of natural chemical substances in the body. The same is true of cortisone and perhaps metacortin.

But, these hormones are not sufficiently concerned with the regulation of growth and the repair of injury of cells. To obtain the primitive chemicals associated with repair of injury and the regulation of growth, we must study the fluids in inflammation and the secretions of the reticuloendothelial cells; that is, we must study the fluids and the cells which are naturally primarily concerned with the regulation of growth and repair of injury.

This is where Krebiozen enters the picture. Hypothetically it represents a secretion of the reticuloendothelial cells which are concerned in the regulation of growth. As pointed out previously, it is very probably present in inflammatory fluids.

This is not a wild idea. For example, Dr. Paul Ehrlich worked on it for a short time. It remained relatively dormant until Krebiozen was publicized, primarily by its enemies. From a scientific point of view, I and others consider the theory to be established. For example, in the June 1958, report of the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Institute of New York City you will find the following quotation: "There is reason now to believe that natural defenses against cancer exist. It has proved possible, by manipulating and enhancing these defenses, to cure laboratory animals with some types of transplanted cancer." In this connection, I have pointed out to the American Cancer Society, that one of the substances used by the Sloan-Kettering group to manipulate and enhance natural defenses against cancer was an extract of a yeast—a mold-like organism distantly related to actinomyces bovis which was used by Dr. Durovic to produce Krebiozen. I further pointed out that if they would inject their substance, Zymosan, into horses making them them slightly ill, and then properly extract the blood of the horses, they would obtain Krebiozen.

VII

How is Krebiozen made? The scientific steps for the production of Krebiozen were published in October 1951, again in 1952, and still again in 1953, 1956, and 1959. The manufacturing details have not been published. But, a patent was applied for in October 1951. When the patent is granted the details will, of course, be published. For those who are not familiar with the policies of industrial organizations, manufacturing details are not disclosed. That is where the principle of competition which lowers the price to the consumer comes into operation in a free enterprise system.

I have informed Dr. Durovic, the Duga Laboratories since 1949, that I must have the basic scientific steps but not the manufacturing details. And, since private money rather than public money was used to produce Krebiozen, they should not disclose the manufacturing details. This is a basic American principle, a difference between our way of life and the communistic or national socialistic way of life. And, I believe in this principle just as firmly as any other basic American principle.

Without knowledge of the manufacturing details and about 2 years ago, I made some Krebiozen from 46 horses. A research foundation defrayed the expenses. The Krebiozen I made was active.

In newspapers you have read that Krebiozen is a secret remedy. That statement is as false as the suspicion and medical politics which first fathered it. I say this because I believe without being egotistical I can qualify as an expert on the subject of medical ethics, since it is known that I represented World Medicine at the Nurenberg trials on the subject of medical ethics and medical science. The canon against promoting a secret remedy is to prevent fraudulent avarice. There is no fraud because the Duga Laboratory has never made a claim for Krebiozen. I have claimed on the basis of evidence submitted that it merits a serious study and has merit in the treatment of some cancer patients. It is distributed without claims to physicians for use under the regulations of the Federal Food and Drug Administration. It is not secret in the sense that it cannot be made on the basis of information disclosed. I have made it. So far as avarice is concerned no one has made any money out of Krebiozen. Everyone associated with it has spent much of their own money on it. I have testified under oath that neither I nor my relatives shall ever make or accept any money for work on and activities related to Krebiozen, except expenses when and if money becomes available. Yet, the papers have repeated, and repeated the false charge that Krebiozen is a secret remedy, until some of my friends have started to believe it. But, do not misinterpret me; I am not complaining.

VIII

All sorts of false charges against me and Krebiozen have been made.

One of the most recent is that Krebiozen is nothing more than mineral oil. Here is a story regarding that point. A patient living near Los Angeles developed cancer of the body of the uterus. It was removed; but the cancer recurred lower down in the cervix. It was bleeding a lot. The patient refused X-ray and radium and surgery. She requested Krebiozen, but it was denied. Since she was the wife of a veteran her case was reviewed by a tumor board and surgery was urged. The patient refused. Finally, her physician obtained some Krebiozen and gave it to her. The bleeding stopped and 4 months later there was only a scar where the

cancer had been. The patient's doctor met a doctor friend of mine and said to him: "What am I to do? Advanced cancer was diagnosed by three biopsies and a tumor board. It was undoubtedly a cancer. Now after giving Krebiozen, it is gone, and only a scar is left. What am I to do since the California Medical Society has said that Krebiozen is only mineral oil?" My doctor friend replied: "It may be that the medical society analyzed the wrong grade of mineral oil."

We have chemists, too, and they have reported and we have very briefly published their findings.

I have requested that the charge that Krebiozen is only mineral oil be brought before a grand jury. It will probably not be brought before a grand jury, because I have the facts and can prove my case.

It has been rumored around among physicians in the U.S.A. and abroad that I am off my rocker and have had a minor stroke. When Mrs. Ivy heard this rumor she stated: "If Dr. Ivy is off his rocker, he has been off of it ever since I have known him." During the first day I testified at the hearings of the commission of the State legislature on Krebiozen, the opposition had a psychiatrist present to observe me. At the end of the day he reported that "if Dr. Ivy is senile, it would be good if everyone else were senile." During the period I was supposed to be off my rocker I published 65 articles in scientific medical journals including the Journal of the AMA, and was instrumental in raising $45 million worth of buildings for the West Side Medical Center. So I agree with Mrs. Ivy. If I am off my rocker, I have always been off of it.

It has been said even by some of my fair-weather friends that Ivy has been duped. Of course, I feel positive that the opponents of Krebiozen and their followers have been duped by premeditated dishonest tactics. In fact, I have proved this by categorical evidence given under oath. And my evidence and charges have never been denied under oath, although the opposition was urged to take the stand and do so.

If I have been duped, then I have been duped only by the unyielding honesty of the natural law of the cancerous process. If all the improvements I have seen have not been due to Krebiozen but to natural causes, then I have been duped and the profession has been duped because there is no published evidence showing improvement with the frequency I have seen it. That is one reason why a "fair test" is necessary. I am from Missouri and have to be shown by strictly honest evidence that what I have been seeing is not due to Krebiozen.

What have we seen after the use of Krebiozen?

IX

Results following the use of Krebiozen.

The results can only be briefly summarized. It should be pointed out that percentage-wise the results have remained approximately the same after the first 2 years of our study, which started in August 1949. It must be recalled that 99 percent of our patients had advanced cancer and in most cases had received all that the physician had to offer.

1. Approximately 1,000 patients have been treated sufficiently to include in a general summary.

2. Approximately 68 percent of patients reported relief of pain to a variable extent and for a variable period. It was abolished or markedly relieved in approximately 30 percent. The average time the relief appeared after the start of therapy was 7 days, the range being from 1 to 30 days. The use of narcotics for pain was abolished in about 25 percent.

In a control study on pain, 72 percent of those who knew they were receiving Krebiozen had less pain and 68 percent of those who did not know that they were receiving Krebiozen had less pain.

With the relief in pain there was generally an improvement in appetite. An increase in weight occurred in approximately 56 percent.

3. The size of the tumor was measurably decreased for a variable period in approximately 50 percent of cases.

4. Ambulatory life has been prolonged in approximately 25 percent of patients who were bedridden or only up some of the time.

5. There are alive today 51 patients out of approximately 500 who from 4 to 8 years ago had advanced cancer and are apparently free of cancer today. Percentage of approximately 10 percent has persisted for the last 4 years. Some patients who had lived with inactive cancer for 2 to 8 years have died from causes other than cancer.

6. In four patients whose abdomen was opened and then closed immediately because the cancer was so advanced that it could not be operated, the abdomen has been opened later and no cancer has been found.

7. Most of our long-term patients still receive Krebiozen. In three patients the tumor has disappeared on giving Krebiozen and returned on withdrawing it and disappeared on starting Krebiozen again. This cycle was repeated four times in one patient, three times in a second, and two times in a third. We now have five patients free of active cancer who have not taken Krebiozen for from 2 to 4 years.

You may be surprised to learn that not only some 200 physicians have confirmed our observations, i.e., those of Phillips, Pick, and Ivy but there are 2 physicians both of whom in the past have treated many cancer patients who have obtained approximately the same results we have. One has treated over 80 patients with advanced cancer and 12 of these are free from active cancer for from 1 to 4 years. The other physician treated 40 patients and except for the percentage of relief of pain obtained about the same results we did. This latter physician has desired to publish his results, but pressure to date has prevented him from doing so.

The only evidence submitted against Krebiozen is the 100-case report of the council on pharmacy of the AMA. This report was proven under oath to contain 23 falsified cases and most of the other cases were so close to death that they lived only long enough to receive an average of 3 doses of Krebiozen. This situation has never been denied under oath because the evidence showing dishonesty and superficiality cannot be denied.

X

What are the next steps required? Two things must be done. One is to obtain a fair test and the other is to make a new batch of Krebiozen.

XI

The fair test.

We have repeatedly proposed a fair test since 1952. The Commission on Krebiozen of the Illinois Legislature tried to persuade the AMA to conduct such a test.

Our proposal and that of the commission was that an arbitration type of committee conduct a double-blind test under conditions where bias or prejudice could not even be suspected of operating so as to subvert the objectivity of the test.

The American Cancer Society invited the Krebiozen Foundation to submit a proposal for a fair test. The foundation did. The proposal was rejected because they did not like the arbitration type of committee, the double-blind type of test and they wanted to look over our files to see if a test were warranted. In other words, they first asked for an opportunity to discredit Krebiozen without performing a test, and then wanted a type of test which could obviously be suspected of being conducted by a loaded committee.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS in August 1958, proposed on the floor of the Senate a fair test for Krebiozen. We accepted his proposal immediately because it contained the basic principles of a fair test, one in which bias and prejudice could not be suspected of operating.

The National Cancer Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service made an alternative proposal and their alternative proposal has been discussed since October 5, 1958. It has turned out that their proposal is considerably better than that of the American Cancer Society. But, in its present form it is not acceptable to us because the proposed committee is not of the arbitration type, and hence not above suspicion, and because the committee is given the right to discredit Krebiozen without doing the test.

So, we have requested the National Cancer Institute to discuss Senator DOUGLAS' proposal with us. Sufficient time has not elapsed to hear from the Institute.

Since suspicion exists on both sides, the only type of committee that can be above suspicion is an arbitration type. Since suspicion exists, the only experimental design which is above suspicion is one where the physicians giving the treatment will not know whether mineral oil, or mineral oil with Krebiozen in it is being given, and only one person will know which set of ampules contains Krebiozen. Third, I must be a party to giving the treatment, as a consultant, and must have the responsibility of deciding on the basis of the clinical results of the test which ampules contain Krebiozen. Otherwise, the project would not be a test; it would be just another experiment undertaken by novices in giving the Krebiozen treatment.

If the fair test is conducted, and the results turn out favorable to Krebiozen, the controversy regarding the activity of Krebiozen is ended, and an important scientific fact will have been established. If the results are negative, Krebiozen will be buried scientifically and ethically, and nothing will be lost because valuable information about the natural history of cancer will have been obtained.

If we cannot get a fair test under the auspices of the National Cancer Institute under existing legislation, then new legislation will be sought.

XII

The need for another batch of Krebiozen.

A new batch of Krebiozen is needed for several reasons:

1. At the present rate of usage, all the Krebiozen now available will be used up next summer, and those patients now dependent on it will be left without it. Who then will be responsible for the consequences of taking away their Krebiozen?

Not me, because I am going to work and appeal to others to help make a new batch. So will Mr. Davis, Miss Ross and a lot of other people in addition to those present here tonight.

2. More chemical study of Krebiozen is sorely needed. This is expensive and more material is required.

3. It is very important to establish the fact that another large batch of Krebiozen can be made.

4. Since extract I, which is Krebiozen or a substance closely related to it chemically, clears the opacity of the lens in canine cataract, we now have a biological or animal assay method for new batches of Krebiozen. This has been a handicap in the past. In the past, the assay has had to be made on a human patient with an untreated breast cancer.

5. Furthermore, the development of this potentially very important medical treatment of early cataract in man is urgent.

In this connection it should be pointed out that from 70 to 90 percent of persons over 60 years of age have opacities in the lens

of their eyes, and that 25 percent of all blindness in the United States of America is due to cataract.

We now have no money and soon will have no Krebiozen to pursue this study on cataract, which represents the first step toward the solution of another one of the medical impossibilities.

In view of this discovery can the funds for the production of another batch of Krebiozen be found?

The answer should be "Yes; the funds will be found." This answer should be so forceful that it will rumble and reverberate so loudly and so long that no one will be able to rest in peace until the necessary funds are available.

A minimum of $350,000 is required.

A committee is being formed to make another batch of Krebiozen. It will be a tax-exempt type of organization. I know that everyone here is interested and I know some of you will be able to help. Those who are able to help should write to Mr. John M. Davis, president of the LaSalle Construction Co., Chicago.

## Remarks of Mayor John J. Buckley, of Lawrence, Mass., on the Area Redevelopment Bill S. 722, Before the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to extend the remarks of Mayor John J. Buckley of my hometown of Lawrence, Mass., when he appeared on February 27 before the Senate committee considering S. 722, the area redevelopment bill:

REMARKS BY MAYOR JOHN J. BUCKLEY, OF LAWRENCE, MASS., ON THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL S. 722, BEFORE THE PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, FEBRUARY 27, 1959

The exodus of the textile industry, which for about 100 years had dominated the economy of Lawrence and had provided employment for its citizens, set off a chain reaction of adverse factors from which the city of Lawrence has not fully recovered.

The loss, over a period of several years, of approximately 20,000 textile jobs and the abandonment of millions of square feet of textile manufacturing space had two general results upon the community life.

First, the individual person or family suffered a prolonged loss of income which ultimately caused considerable direct economic distress and this was undoubtedly accompanied by deleterious effects in the health, education, and general morale of the community's citizens.

Second, it resulted in considerable loss of income to the municipal government through decreased assessed valuations of vacant industrial buildings and the inability of the unemployed homeowner to pay his taxes when due.

Unemployment in Lawrence resulted in what, I imagine, must be a typical or classical chain reaction of adverse economic factors.

Lack of income to its industrial workers sharply reduced their purchasing power, and our retail business district which bears almost 40 percent of the city's assessed valuation began to feel the effect of reduced sales. The weaker sections of the business section were unable to ride out the sustained decline in sales, and vacancies in retail stores and in office buildings were soon forcing the owners thereof to forego the proper maintenance of their properties and to subsequently seek tax abatements and lowered assessments. This same condition resulted in further unemployment in the service personnel of our city. In many instances employers in both the manufacturing and retail industries were inclined to reduce the wages or working hours of remaining employees.

The municipal government, faced with reduced income and continuing increased costs of government, was forced to refuse increases in wages to its municipal employees despite the fact that other communities were granting such increases to meet the rising costs of living. The city was forced also to defer needed maintenance of its public buildings and replacement of worn-out equipment to avoid increasing the burden on its unemployed homeowners and generally to maintain only the bare essentials of municipal services.

Owners of the vacant industrial buildings immediately sought to dispose of them and sales were at far below the assessed valuation. Such sales formed a basis for reassessment and reduced valuations. During that period the city lost valuation, through reassessment of just five industrial properties, in the approximate amount of $3 million.

A comparison of Lawrence's assessed valuation with that of every industrial city in Massachusetts reveals that we've had the lowest increase in valuation in the past 15 years (see exhibit A). Such a condition, an increase of only 7 percent in valuation in the past 15 years, is a direct result of the exodus and liquidation of the textile industry.

The real casualties of Lawrence's recession were those workers who were 45 years of age or older and who had spent 20 or more years developing skills peculiar to the textile industry. They were unable to compete for jobs in other industries with the younger groups of unemployed who were naturally the choice of any new industry in fields other than textiles.

The laws of the Commonwealth did not permit financial assistance from the Commonwealth for the training or retraining of these older workers unless they were employed in the particular trade for which they sought training. Our efforts to exempt Lawrence from such provisions of law were unsuccessful. In fact our representatives have a bill before the State legislature again seeking exemption from that restrictive provision (see exhibit B).

Many of these older workers were required to seek public assistance to meet the ordinary everyday costs of living which placed an additional burden upon our city's finances.

Many of our unemployed sought employment in other cities, some quite removed from Lawrence. Some of our people eventually and reluctantly severed their long association with friends and relatives and moved away from the Greater Lawrence area.

Vacant industrial plants and loss of job opportunities therefore created an ever deepening and widening area of adversities in the form of decreased valuations (see exhibit C), increased taxes, loss of individual ownership of homes, loss of population. All of these have caused a general cutback in municipal services and a gradual and general deterioration of the physical resources and assets of the community.

It is difficult to measure the social and psychological effects of such an unhappy situation but, undoubtedly, it is a contributing cause in the separation of families, in bringing about divorces, in promoting juvenile delinquency, and destroying the initiative and ambition of the individual citizens of the community.

It is quite apparent to me that local communities need outside assistance to soften the blow of loss of industries and heavy unemployment and to stem the tide of unhappy conditions that usually follow in their wake.

I am of the opinion that the area redevelopment bill provides considerable assistance in that direction and will enable a community such as Lawrence to overcome many of the difficulties involved in attempting further economic and industrial recovery.

I am particularly interested in and favorably inclined toward the provisions of the bill as contained in sections 14 and 15 which would permit a community to secure the benefits of the Federal urban renewal program for the purpose of redeveloping blighted commercial and industrial areas. I think that this would be particularly beneficial to our New England cities where old industrial buildings have become outmoded and have a limited attraction to industrialists. Many of these buildings become a drag on the industrial space market and are given little consideration by the newer, expanding industries. In some cases it has been our experience that industrial developers and investment institutions do not want to pour new capital into decaying properties or communities. Many former textile buildings in Lawrence have been rehabilitated and presently provide inexpensive manufacturing space for those industries which have replaced textiles. However, in some situations we have concluded that we are virtually powerless to reach a full solution for the redevelopment of some of these properties without some type of economic assistance. I am convinced that the opportunity to redevelop industrial space under the provisions of the urban renewal program would speed up the full economic recovery of any area.

The opportunity to develop blighted open areas for commercial and industrial uses would also be a great asset in effecting such a recovery. Our industrial development committee in Lawrence is of the opinion that it lost out on several excellent industrial prospects interested in new modern buildings, primarily because the forces of private enterprise have been unable to assemble large tracts of land due to various reasons such as diversity of land ownership, legal obstacles, etc. Proper engineering and development, therefore, has not taken place so that new building programs could go forward. By broadening this urban renewal provision of the act the city of Lawrence through its proper public agency could take the necessary steps to plan and develop these blighted open areas. I feel sure that the broadening of the urban redevelopment law to include commercial and industrial blight will be a progressive step toward developing new industrial and commercial building programs.

Federal assistance in vocational training as provided in sections 16 and 17 is sorely needed. This is particularly true for the older worker who is unemployed and who is presented with little or no opportunity for reemployment in the particular industry in which he has developed certain skills.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell has continually advocated the retraining of older industrial workers who have been displaced as in the case of the textile liquidation from Lawrence. The productivity of these workers is unquestionable. The city has continually tried to subsidize the retraining of these former textile workers through payment of tuition to other institutions outside of the community.

For instance, Lynn, Haverhill, or Lowell. This has been a drain on the returns from our local tax revenue, which has been decreasing over the past years because of depressed economic conditions. Vocational training should only be undertaken provided it is based on the factual needs of the industrial community. We can show specifically that the Lawrence community is in dire need of specific training programs for skilled technicians and mechanics.

We do not have the necssary institutional training programs now. We know that industrial firms, through on-the-job training programs, are supplementing to some extent, this need. A retraining program with Federal assistance, since the depressed community is usually hard pressed financially, would give the older worker, and particularly the one with ambition and initiative, an asset to offset the natural handicap of age. I am confident that industry as a whole, would look with favor upon older workers if they were armed with the needed skills.

Section 6 of the act is vitally important to cities such as Lawrence. I feel that this part of the program could stimulate modernization and new construction in our area. We in Lawrence have been fortunate in acquiring many diversified industries, but I feel sure over the past number of years, with additional help and liberal financing program as outlined in this bill, we could have secured additional industries which would subsequently provide more job opportunities besides a broader tax base.

Industrial development from a competitive standpoint, today necessitates that new manufacturing plant construction be provided with 100 percent financing. In a great number of cases, adequate local financing has been provided, for which we are thankful. However, due to various inequities throughout the Nation, a State such as Massachusetts cannot provide bonded indebtedness for loans for new construction, which some States can. Furthermore, many firms cannot contemplate new building construction because they are not prime risks and consequently they must retain adequate working capital. If these problems could be overcome, I feel sure some new industrial building could take place in Lawrence and other depressed areas.

I feel sure this program, if put into effect, would back up our already existing local and State financial organizations and would effect a greater opportunity for new jobs and subsequent new tax base.

Lawrence has borne the slings and arrows of outrageous economic fortune, but to the eternal credit of its people whose courage persisted during our darkest days, our city has regained a place in the industrial sun. The Lawrence story is the story of its fighting people. We have gained considerable publicity throughout the State and Nation on our fight for industrial recovery. Lest we be deluded by all the inspiring and stirring words describing Lawrence's recovery it is vitally important that we keep one sobering fact in mind. Lawrence is a labor surplus area and it has been in this category ever since the liquidation of the textile industry. We have remained a pocket of economic difficulty in periods of apparent national prosperity. This has been the most frustrating aspect of our efforts during the past few years.

I am convinced that the area redevelopment bill will provide a substantial assist to industrial cities like Lawrence and I respectfully urge this subcommittee to file a favorable report on S. 722.

I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you so that I could present the needs of the city of Lawrence based on its experience as one of our older industrial cities.

EXHIBIT A

*Assessed valuations, real and personal property*

[Millions of dollars]

| | 1940 | 1953 | Percent increase | 1957 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Lawrence | 85.3 | 90.7 | 6.3 | 91.5 |
| 2. Lynn | 130.8 | 140.7 | 7.6 | 144.0 |
| 3. Somerville | 114.1 | 130.7 | 14.5 | 133.5 |
| 4. Brockton | 72.3 | 83.7 | 15.9 | 99.5 |
| 5. Holyoke | 72.7 | 85.4 | 17.5 | 94.0 |
| 6. Lowell | 93.7 | 110.3 | 17.7 | 121.0 |
| 7. Medford | 78.4 | 97.4 | 24.2 | 101.5 |
| 8. Springfield | 261.1 | 327.4 | 25.4 | 357.5 |
| 9. Quincy | 121.4 | 155.0 | 27.7 | 168.5 |
| 10. Cambridge | 170.6 | 218.3 | 28.0 | 231.0 |
| 11. Fall River | 92.9 | 124.4 | 33.9 | 125.0 |
| 12. New Bedford | 96.3 | 129.9 | 34.9 | 147.5 |
| 13. Everett | 72.9 | 101.1 | 38.7 | 105.0 |
| 14. Haverhill | 50.3 | 70.6 | 40.3 | 73.5 |
| 15. Salem | 54.0 | 77.2 | 43.1 | 83.5 |

Source: "Financial Statistics of Massachusetts," publisher, Tyler & Co., Inc., Boston, Mass.

EXHIBIT B

HOUSE NO. 1483

An act exempting the city of Lawrence from certain restrictions in the law relative to evening classes in industrial and occupational schools

*Be it enacted by the senate and house of representatives, in general court assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows:*

SECTION 1. The restriction in-the definition of "Evening class" in section 1 of chapter 74 of the general laws upon evening classes in independent industrial schools or independent distributive occupations schools, according to which instruction in such classes shall be given only to pupils employed during the day in work to which the instruction so given applies, shall not apply to industrial or occupational schools maintained by the city of Lawrence, for a period of 3 years from the beginning of the school year following the effective date of this act.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its passage.

EXHIBIT C

*Loss of valuation, industrial properties* [1]

| Property site | 1951 valuation | 1958 valuation | Loss |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ayer Mill | $1,001,900 | $501,400 | $500,500 |
| Arlington Mill | 1,587,800 | 1,315,900 | 271,900 |
| Pacific Mill | 1,883,000 | 1,510,800 | 372,200 |
| Patchogue-Plymouth Corp. | 185,800 | 154,800 | 31,000 |
| Wood Mill | 2,927,000 | 1,382,000 | 1,545,000 |
| Total | | | 2,720,600 |

NOTE.—1951: Total valuation of city of Lawrence, $90,260,000. 1958: Total valuation of city of Lawrence, $92,200,800.

[1] Source: Board of assessors, city of Lawrence, Mass.

## Annual Brooklyn Convocation for Scouts of Protestant Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America is this year celebrating its 49th anniversary and the Borough of Brooklyn is doing its part for the worthy cause. I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report of an important event which took place in the Borough of Brooklyn. The annual Brooklyn Protestant Boy Scout convocation was held at the Hanson Place Central Methodist Church on February 1, 1959. Former Supreme Court Justice Lewis W. Olliffe, chairman of the Protestant Committee on Scouting, presided. The program was commenced by the massing of the colors; pledge of allegiance and Scout oath; invocation by the Reverend Dr. Floyd E. George, pastor, Hanson Place Central Methodist Church; welcome by the Honorable Lewis W. Olliffe; presentation of the 1959 scouter award was made to William W. Wallace by Vincent H. Jensen, president of the Federation of Protestant Men; greetings from Henry Q. Middendorf, dean of Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, and Rev. Dr. David M. Cory, executive secretary, Brooklyn division—Portestant Council of the city of New York; presentation of God and country awards was made by the Honorable Lewis W. Olliffe, assisted by Rev. Charles Coker, Rev. Walter F. Jacobs, Rev. Kenneth Lee Rowe, Rev. Dr. S. Soto-Fontanez, Arturo F. Yrizarry, Robert Morris Hubbard, public relations director, Brooklyn Division, Protestant Council of New York, and John J. Hargash, Scout executive.

An inspiring address was delivered by Dr. Robert Fisher Oxnam, president of Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, N.Y. The text of the address was as follows:

AN EXPLORER IN THE CITY

(Address by Dr. Robert Fisher Oxnam)

I

Judge Olliffe, reverend clergy, parents, Scouts, and explorers, it is an honor indeed to participate in this ceremony in what may well be the high point of your scouting career. Just 2 years ago my oldest boy received the God and Country Award. No awards in scouting are come by easily, perhaps, though, this is the most demanding of time, energy, and dedication. This is certainly a time of satisfaction on the part of these young men and, I am confident, a time of justifiable pride on the part of parents.

"To do my best to do my duty to God and my country * * *." In a large city many miles from here and many years ago I became a Scout. I would walk about 4 blocks from my house, get on a subway, and go downtown to a Protestant church where our troop met. Knot tying and signaling, first aid and mapmaking—whole new worlds opened for me—hikes, visits to museums and historical places.

II. THE HARD, LEAN MEN

I believe that it was in Boy's Life that Henry Van Dyke, Presbyterian minister and Princeton professor, wrote:

"Life is an arrow. Therefore, you must know what mark to aim at, how to use the bow, then draw it to the head and let it go."

Early man depended on the bow for food and the defense of his home. The terrible mounted archer of Genghis Khan and later of Tamerlane controlled Asia from the Pacific to the Baltic and from India to the Arctic Circle. The legendary skill of Robin Hood, Chaucer's Yeoman, and Shakespeare's Old Double stir the imagination of Anglo-Saxons and their descendants. Today Robin

stars in a television program and, as usual, the films outdo the literary license of the medieval chronicler.

Robin would have given much for a modern bow, recurved as it is and laminated of glass and wood, using latest engineering techniques. No longer is flax used for the string, but rather a manmade fiber called dacron. The long bow has changed and the gray goose shaft, too. Now, except for hunting, aluminum has replaced wood in the arrow and plastic fletching the feather of the gray goose. Techniques, though, are the same.

Three times during the Hundred Years' War English archers overcame the finest of French chivalry and in each case the archers were outnumbered from four to one to even seven to one. The steadiness of the English archer was unbelievable. This was not only the development of a new form of warfare, but, as a student of government, I like to believe that it had some influence on the political philosophy we revere—democracy. For in it we see the rise of the common man. This archer was no duke, no earl, but an ordinary man, a free man for the most part, a farmer or laborer called by his first name alone. He had beaten the best of European chivalry with the odds many times against him. There was demonstration of the terrible efficiency of massed missile weapons. It hastened the decay of the feudal system and with it the concept of chivalry belonging to the manor born.

There is a kinship between those hard, lean men and the men of Lexington and Concord. There was similar confidence in their weapon, themselves, and the rightness of their task.

There is, too, a parallel between the men of Henry V, of the Black Prince, of Conan Doyle's "The White Company" and the men in the westward movement of our country, the Lewises and Clarks, the Frémonts, as well as the Matt Dillons, the Wyatt Earps of more recent television fame.

Physically our people were strong and hardy. Spiritually they were sure. Intellectually they had a driving desire for more learning, certain that through knowledge combined with freedom and guided by faith would come wisdom. They believed that with freedom and wisdom would come the strength of this great land and its people. Manifest destiny, some called it. "Our place in the sun," others said. This was a young nation growing up. Brash, to be sure; uncultured, perhaps; undirected, not at all.

III. THE GREAT, GRAY CITY

One of our American poets referred to the "great, gray city" as the ideal place for the university. I wonder if it may not be the ideal place for scouting.

As a boy walks across the uneven cobblestone streets in Brooklyn does his mind think that on those same cobblestones once trod Washington, Lincoln, Henry Ward Beecher, Walt Whitman, and S. Parkes Cadman? The history of this city, of our borough, is fascinating, indeed. A portion of the Revolutionary War was fought over the ground on which this church stands.

A boy walks down to the esplanade here in Brooklyn. He cannot help but be excited by what he sees. There on Brooklyn Heights a farmhouse stood. It served as George Washington's headquarters during the Battle of Long Island. There he watched his forces driven before the British. At the foot of the Heights he embarked his men, saving both them and his cause. Just a few blocks farther on is the church of Henry Ward Beecher. From his pulpit came the demand for freedom for all men regardless of color; even today, 100 years later, not fully answered. Abraham Lincoln sat in that church. Just a bit from where we meet, during the Civil War the *Monitor* sailed out to revolutionize naval warfare.

As you look out across the harbor, just off to the left is a statue, the symbol of freedom and liberty. Millions have been heartened by the sight of her as they came to this land in search of freedom. There to the right is the financial capital of the world, the center of industrial responsibility. Farther up the river is the heart of developing international government, our real hope for future peace. Here are colleges, universities, and institutions; galleries and museums, gardens and academies; music, art, theater. Here is knowledge. Here is wisdom. Here is beauty. Here is a laboratory for learning unmatched. These are yours to use, if you wish, as you see fit.

Certainly we have problems. There is ugliness here, too. Here are painfully demonstrated the difficulties of modern urban culture. Beauty in views, in great buildings, in gardens and yet there is unbelievable crowding in cold-water walkups. Where one family lived decently a few years ago, now five families live in the same space. A fantastic influx of people, representing different ways of life, different backgrounds, cast together in a great, sometimes harsh city. From this matrix of diverse races, various faiths, and unlike backgrounds has come the strength of our American culture.

It is healthy indeed for a person to learn and study in this alive atmosphere. Students work harder here than in most localities. Because they must, students quickly learn to concentrate fully on the task at hand. Certainly students are more highly motivated at Pratt Institute than I have seem them anywhere before. Possibly this is as a result of the programs of professional education there. They come with goals clearly selected, whether in engineering or art or architecture or at any of the schools on our campus.

And in scouting, too, there are opportunities for growth, for study, for exploration and for service unequaled here in the city. It was through the courtesy and desire to help of a British Boy Scout in the city of London that the Boy Scouts of America was organized.

IV. "* * * AND LET IT GO"

Dr. Van Dyke said, "Life is an arrow. Therefore you must know what mark to aim at, how to use the bow, then draw it to the head and let it go."

The bower chose the best yew log he could find, split a stave from it, cut it, to form a rough bow. There were hours of shaping, scraping, tillering and careful finishing. Ultimately a fine weapon appeared in his hands. Is there parallel here with education, scouting and a boy?

The arrow too was as carefully made as the bow. Fletchers had the responsibility of selecting shafts, matching them in weight and spine, then affixing the feathers or fletching to be sure the shaft would fly truly. Does this bring to mind the straightness, trueness, the guilding force of our Christian heritage?

Aiming occupies much of the literature of the bow, whether from the pen of medieval or modern writers. One problem each of us has is to identify his own mission. You will certainly accomplish no more than you set yourself to do. You must know what mark to aim at, and then aim with real care.

Van Dyke continued, "Draw it to the head and let it go." Well, the process is a bit more complicated.

It is not just a matter of letting go but rather of releasing cleanly and crisply. Then in this sport as in any other followthrough is vital. True too in life the selection of the goal, the preparation and training—but without the followthrough of determination and persistence, the goal is never reached. I believe that Mr. Van Dyke had this in mind when he used the phrase "and let it go."

V. TODAY'S EXPLORER

No longer are we concerned with arrows as massed missiles in war, but through the unreliable musket to the rifle. We continued to use missiles. And today the era of gunpowder is dying, to be replaced by entirely new weapons systems. It is a long distance from the flint arrowhead of our Indians or the bodkin of the English archer to the atomic or hydrogen warhead of the intercontinental ballistics missile. We have moved far in the development of killing each other more effectively. Have we moved as far in the teaching of the Carpenter of Galilee? Perhaps we have come along the road farther than we think. It makes little difference to the recipient whether it is explosion or implosion. We pray that a situation has been created in which these weapons will never be used; that the consequences of a decision to fire are so disastrous that the decision will never be reached.

A boy stands on the Esplanade and watches ferryboats scuttling back and forth, powerful tugs berthing liners and freighters. Ships stream out to all ports of the world. His eye is caught by a helicopter slowly making its way across the city skyline. He hears the unmistakable sound of a turbo-prop. And his mind turns to jets and then to space. Here is today's explorer.

Mr. Roger Blough, the chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., said some time ago:

"The future is not for little men with little minds. It is not for men without vision who fear progress. It is not for timid men. * * * No. The future is for men who dare to have great expectations; and who * * * will also have the courage, the persistence, the wisdom, the patience to transform those expectations into realities."

Today's frontiersman, pioneer, explorer is no longer a man with a long rifle over one arm, or the fast gun. He is a boy curious and critical, dreaming great dreams. He may have a microscope on the table in front of him or a slide rule in his hand. Today the frontiers are more vast and the demands on the explorer greater. Today we must have education for rapid adapation to an exploding universe. These frontiers are gigantic. And no longer are they confined to the people of one nation expanding westward. These explorations will benefit mankind. We need answers to the problem of shelter, warmth, and food for all men. We must know how to use fully all of our natural resources to aid man. There are discoveries in health, in communication, in science, and engineering. And these discoveries will be made. Perhaps even more important though will be progress in the humanities, in man learning to live together and enjoying the abundance which can be his.

Who are these pioneers, these explorers, these lean, hard men of the future? You are.

Mr. Speaker, presentation of the God and Country Award was made to the following recipients: Alfred Dee, William Barg, Charles Arnold, William Rivera, Miguel Rivera, Rafael Sanchez, Emilio Sella, and Ruben D. Cruz.

Rev. Kenneth Lee Rowe, pastor, Boro Park Baptist Church, announced the benediction.

## The Byrd Antarctic Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 26, 1959*

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission, in order to promote a more effective pol-

icy and to better protect our country's interests in the antarctic.

A similar bill has been introduced in the other House by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for himself and for a number of other Senators.

I am delighted to sponsor this legislation in the House of Representatives. Our Government has been actively interested in the south polar region for over a century. As early as 1838, our Government sent its ships on an expedition led by Lt. Charles Wilkes, of the U.S. Navy, to explore Antarctica. Our interest in the exploration of that vital region has continued and grown in importance to this very day. Today, further exploration and potential utilization of Antarctica is of immediate concern to our Nation.

The proposal embodied in the Wiley-Zablocki bill calls for the establishment of a Commission—appropriately named the "Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission" in honor of the great explorer whose name symbolizes man's search into the unknown—which would plan, develop, organize, coordinate, and direct antarctic activities among agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions so as to promote our national and civil objectives.

The specific duties and major purposes of the Commission would be as follows:

First. To collect, coordinate, and better utilize the available data on the south polar region.

Second. To reevaluate this data in the light of current needs, and, so far as possible, make recommendations for clearer, more effective policies.

Third. To conduct field and laboratory studies to further knowledge of science, commerce, and related activities.

Fourth. To conduct research, investigation, and experimentation in antarctic matters relating to the national defense and other interests of the United States.

Fifth. To assist, and, as necessary, direct plans by other U.S. agencies for operations or expeditions into the antarctic, for military, scientific, or other purposes.

Sixth. To establish a depository of information relating to the antarctic.

It is my sincere hope that this legislation will receive prompt and favorable consideration in this House.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have the text of the Wiley-Zablocki bill printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

H.R. 5222

A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the United States Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer United States Antarctic programs in the national interest

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission Act of 1959."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act:

(1) "Commission" means the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission.

(2) "Director" means the Director of the Commission.

(3) "Board" means the Board of Governors.

(4) "Commissioned officer" means a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces of the United States.

THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. There is established in the executive branch of the Government, the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission. The Commission shall consist of a Director, two Deputy Directors, and a Board of Governors.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall—

(1) maintain a depository of information relating to the Antarctic including: (A) all records of the Commission, (B) originals or copies of records within the executive branch relating to the Antarctic, (C) books, pamphlets, periodicals, and articles dealing with the Antarctic, and (D) such other information as the Commission considers desirable;

(2) conduct such field and laboratory studies and evaluations as it considers advisable to further the knowledge of the Antarctic in science, commerce, and related activities, which shall include, but shall not be limited to gathering, evaluating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research and other mediums, relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information;

(3) publish or arrange for the publication of scientific, technical, historical, and general information so as to further the dissemination of information about the Antarctic, when the dissemination is consistent with the interests of national security and the public interest (publication may be made without regard to section 87 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (ch. 23, 28 Stat. 622), and section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (ch. 86, 40 Stat. 1270; 44 U.S.C. 111));

(4) with the concurrence and approval of the Board, perform, at the request of the head of any executive agency, specific research, investigation, or experimentation in connection with matters relating to the national defense and/or the interests of the United States;

(5) approve the plans for and supervise Antarctic operations or expeditions conducted by, or supported by, other agencies of the United States except for operations or expeditions or parts thereof which are military in character;

(6) assist private Antarctic expeditions or research programs when such assistance is in the best interests of the United States;

(7) accept and utilize the service of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (ch. 744, 60 Stat. 808), as amended (5. U.S.C. 73b-2), for persons serving without compensation; and

(8) acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and hold or dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real or personal property necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority under this Act;

(9) receive and use funds donated to the Commission if such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used to carry out the general purposes of this Act;

(10) report to the President before September 16 of each year, summarizing the activities of the Commission and making such recommendations as it considers appropriate. The report shall include the recommendation of the Board.

THE DIRECTOR OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period of six years and shall be paid at the rate prescribed in section 107(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act, 1956 (70 Stat.). He may be a person appointed from civilian life or a commissioned officer in an active or retired status.

(b) The Director shall—

(1) manage the affairs of the Commission;

(2) issue such regulations as he considers necessary to carry out this Act;

(3) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out this Act; and

(4) be a member of the Board of Governors ex officio.

(c) The appointments made and the compensation fixed shall be in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 and the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. However, the Director may employ such technical and professional personnel, and fix their compensation, as he considers necessary, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949 or the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. The Director may terminate the employment of any officers or employees, except the Deputy Directors, whenever he considers that termination to be in the best interests of the United States, except that no person in the classified service may be removed or suspended without pay unless it is accomplished under the Act of August 24, 1912 (ch. 389, 37 Stat. 555), as amended (5 U.S.C. 652).

DEPUTY DIRECTORS

SEC. 6. (a) The Deputy Directors shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such duties as he may prescribe.

(b) The Deputy Directors may be appointed from civilian life or may be commissioned officers in an active or retired status. However, if the Director is appointed from civilian life, only one Deputy Director may be a commissioned officer. If the Director is a commissioned officer, both Deputy Directors shall be appointed from civilian life.

(c) The Deputy Directors shall be paid $ a year.

MILITARY STATUS OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTORS

SEC. 7. (a) When a commissioned officer is appointed as Director or Deputy Director, he is not subject to military authority and may not exercise command over any members of the Armed Forces of the United States except as the President may prescribe.

(b) The appointment of a commissioned officer as Director or Deputy Director does not affect his status or rank or the pay and allowances incident to his status or rank. He is entitled to receive the pay and allowances payable to an officer of his rank and length of service, for which the appropriate department shall be reimbursed from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Commission. He is also entitled to be paid by the Commission the amount by which the compensation provided for the Director or Deputy Director exceeds his annual military pay and allowances.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

SEC. 8. (a) The Board—consisting of eleven members—shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Board shall consist of the President of the National Academy of Sciences; Director of the National Science Foundation; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of State; Secretary of Interior; Secretary of Commerce, or their designees, plus four selected from civil life who are eminently qualified in their professions so as to provide, in addition to Federal administration, a broad field of knowledge and experience

which will properly relate the activities of the Commission to the national welfare.

(b) The members of the Board, in addition to the President of the National Academy of Sciences; Director of the National Science Foundation; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of State; Secretary of Interior; Secretary of Commerce, or their designees, shall be appointed for a period of six years, except that, (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of the term; (2) the term of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, one at the end of two years, one at the end of four years, and two at the end of six years, and (3) a member may be reappointed to the Board for not more than one additional term; and (4) the members of the Board who are Cabinet members shall be members of that Board during the tenure of office as Cabinet members.

(c) Members of the Board shall be paid at the rate of $50 per day—for each day—except members of the President's Cabinet during their services as members of the Board, and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (ch. 744, 60 Stat. 808), as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(d) The Board shall—

(1) meet annually on the first Monday in November and at such other times as the Chairman determines;

(2) elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman, at the regular annual meeting, to serve for the following year;

(3) review and assess the research and exploration activities relating to the Antarctic; and

(4) make such recommendations to the Commission as they consider appropriate for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge of the Antarctic.

RESEARCH CENTERS

SEC. 9. (a) Under the provisions of this Act there shall be established a minimum of five, and not more than eight, research centers at academic and/or research institutions having special competences or interests in scientific aspects of polar research.

The Commission shall determine that each such center shall meet criteria prescribed by the Commission under the policy guidance provided by the Board of Governors, and the Commission shall be responsible for the overall development and coordination of programs of research which may be approved for development within the research centers in, and related to the Antarctic region. Such programs of research as may be initiated at the research centers with the approval of the Commission shall be supported by Federal or private funds.

(b) Due to the unique requirements of polar research, a designated number of fellowships shall be provided to permit qualified students to conduct studies at the research centers and also in Antarctica. The Commission shall be authorized to grant funds in support of fellowships specifically associated with polar research, recommended by the Director of the Commission and approved by the Board of Governors.

SERVICES AND FUNDS OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission may, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize on a reimbursable basis the officers, employees, services, facilities, and information of any agency of the United States. However, such services and facilities may be furnished only if it does not interfere with the performance of the primary mission of the agency concerned. An agency having custody of data relating to the matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission shall, upon request of the Director, make that data available to the Commission without reimbursement.

(b) Funds available to any agency of the United States for scientific or technical research, educational, or other public service are available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency concerned, to the Commission for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which those funds were provided. Funds so transferred shall be spent by the Commission for the purposes for which the transfer was made or for general administrative expenses until such time as an appropriation is made available to the Commission.

ACTS AMENDED

SEC. 11. Subsection 107(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 is amended by adding the following after clause (22):

"(23) Director of the Antarctic Commission."

SEC. 12. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (70 Stat. 762; 5 U.S.C. 1105), is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(f) The Director of the Antarctic Commission is authorized, without regard to any other provision of this section, to place a total of seven positions in the Antarctic Commission in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by subsection (b)."

## Adjudication of General Kosciuszko's Wills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very interesting article entitled, "Adjudication of General Kosciuszko's Wills" written by a very close and personal friend of mine of many years, Mr. Anthony O. Shallna, A.B., LL.B., which informative article appeared in the Massachusetts Law Society Journal, vol. XX, December 1949:

ADJUDICATION OF GENERAL KOSCIUSZKO'S WILLS

(By Anthony O. Shallna [1])

A testator's last will and testament should reflect his aims, character, and nature. Very often for one reason or another that is not accomplishment. A person may be an expert in several vocations yet fall short of drawing a will that puts into effect his desires and wishes after he passes on. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko's four wills may illustrate beyond a doubt that the drawing of a will is a highly technical document to be executed with a great deal of care and skill.

Among the foreign officers in the American Revolutionary War like Lafayette, Von Steuben, and DeKalb, there was a young colonel who landed here in 1776 from Paris with a letter of introduction from Benjamin Franklin to George Washington. In time he became General Washington's aide-de-camp and terminated his services for our country with the rank of brigadier general. Having received a substantial grant of land and money from Congress, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko before departing for Europe drew a will on May 5, 1798, in which he expressed him humanitarian views:

"I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own or any other and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers, and mothers, husands, and wives, in their duty as citizens; teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful."

After some unfortunate experiences with Russia in trying to liberate the Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania (beginning with 1386, supplemented by several treaties, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland were united under the Commonwealth of Poland until the third partition in 1795) he located in Paris and drew his second will or perhaps a codicil on June 28, 1806. In this will he makes reference to the aims expressed in his first will and he makes a special bequest to Kosciusko Armstrong, a son of his friend General Armstrong. From a photostatic copy of the original will and affidavit of proof, which are historical documents, one may read General Kosciuszko's fondest thoughts and history correcting data, namely:

"Know all men by these presents that I Thaedo Kosciusko formerly an officer of the United States of America in their Revolutionary War against Great Britain, and a native of Lithuania in Poland, at present residing at Paris, do hereby will and direct that at my decease the sum of Three thousand seven hundred and four dollars currency of the aforesaid United States shall of right be possessed by and delivered over to the full enjoyment and use of Kosciusko Armstrong the son of General John Armstrong Minister Plenipotentiary of said States at Paris, for the security and performance whereof, I do hereby instruct and authorize my only lawful Executor in the said United States, Thomas Jefferson President thereof to reserve in trust for that special purpose, of the Funds he already holds belonging to me, the aforeseaid sum of Three thousand seven hundred and four dollars in principal to be paid by him the said Thomas Jefferson immediately after my decease, to him the aforesaid Kosciusko Armstrong and in case of his death to the use and benefit of his surviving Brothers.

"Given under my hand and seal at Paris this 28th day of June 1806.

"THADE KOSCIUSZKO.

"In presence of Charles Carter and James M. Morris."

"COMMERCIAL AGENCY
OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Paris.*

"On this 28th day of June in the year of our Lord 1806 and of the Independence of the United States of America the thirtieth, before the undersigned, commercial Agent and Agent of Prize-Causes for the United States of America at Paris, personally appeared Thade' Kosciuszko, late officer of the said United States, who in his presence signed and sealed the foregoing Transfer in favor of Kosciuszko Armstrong, the son of General John Armstrong, Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Paris, and in case of his Death to the use and benefit of his surviving Brothers, and did acknowledge it as his own act and deed for the purposes therein specified.—

[1] Member of the Boston Bar and a vice president of the Law Society.

"In testimony whereof he the said undersigned as aforesaid has hereunto signed his name and affixed his seal of office at Paris the day and year above written.

"FULWAR SKIPWITH."

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
"*Washington County, to Wit:*

"The 19th day of November 1828, James M. Morris, one of the subscribing witnesses to the aforegoing instrument of writing, purporting to be the late will and testament of Thadeus Kosciusko, deceased, made oath on the Holy Evangels of Almighty God that he did see the testator therein named sign that this will—that he published, pronounced and declared the same to be his last will and testament—that, at the time of his so doing he was, to the best of his apprehension, of sound and disposing mind, memory, and understanding—and that he, together with Charles Carter, the other subscribing witness, respectively subscribed their names as witnesses to this will, in the presence and at the request of the testator, and in the presence of each other.

"Sworn in open court.

"Testator HENRY C. NEALE. *Rg. Wills.*"

On June 4, 1816, he drew an olographic will as his third will, apparently revoking the prior wills. In this will, made at Soleure, Switzerland, he used this language: "I, the undersigned Thaddeus Kosciuszko, residing at Berville, in the township Genevrage, of the Department of Seine and Marne (being now) or at present at Soleure, in Switzerland."

His fourth will was drawn October 10, 1817, and in this will nothing is said as to his residence.

General Kosciuszko was more than a good general. He was an outstanding humanitarian—a forerunner of the abolishment of slavery. He preceded President Lincoln by about 65 years in taking steps to abolish slavery both in this country and in Europe.

Biographers, historians, and others who have tried to present General Kosciuszko to us have made use of his will of 1798, but have not even made a reference to his second and other wills. Any degree of research should have brought forth the existence of these other wills. It was the will of 1806 that was analyzed and substantiated by our Supreme Court.

The record in the administration of Kosciuszko's estate has been correct but not all of us have been apprized of it. Since this case had been considered at length by the U.S. Supreme Court and the documents and proofs in this cause from the orphans' court, the genealogy of the Kosciusko family and the collateral relatives of the persons entitled to a decree, and also the wills of Kosciuszko are properly in evidence in this suit and the record from Grodno is judicial, not a judgment inter parties, but a foreign judgment in rem, "which is evidence of the facts adjudicated against all the world," we might state the essential and interesting parts of the Court's opinion.

With the will of 1816 revoking the wills of 1798 and 1806 and no disposition having been made in it or in the will of 1817 of the funds in controversy, as to which General Kosciuszko died intestate it became necessary to find out which relatives may be entitled to inherit from him according to the law of his domicile at the time of his death.

In proceedings to the question of domicile the Court said, "In the will of 1806 he describes himself as 'an officer of the United States of America in their Revolutionary War against Great Britain, and a native of Lithuania in Poland, at present residing in Paris.'"

In the will of 1816 he refers to his residence in Switzerland. And in the will of 1817 nothing is said as to his residence. There was no proof that he was not in France continuously until 1815 when he went to Vienna.

The Court also observed that "Kosciuszko's domicile of origin was Lithuania in Poland." The presumption of law is that the domicile was retained unless the change is proved and the burden of proving it is upon him who alleges the change. The Court ruled that from his own declarations and other proofs in the record that he was domiciled in France at the time of his death.

The Court then ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the legal domicile at the time of his death in 1817 was in France, that the will of October 10, 1817, had not disposed of the funds in this country; that the fund in this country is to be distributed according to the law of France, the place of his domicile at the time of his death, and that the said fund belongs to the lineal descendants of the two sisters of Kosciuszko.

In fairness and justice to a man who had tried to be so helpful to the country of his adoption, to his native land and humanity it should be stated that he was a great engineer and the founder of West Point Military Academy.

## The Ultimate Consumer Pays the Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I insert therewith two articles from the February issue of that popular magazine Nation's Business. These articles are timely and good, and, in my opinion, they express the feeling of every American who reads and thinks for himself, and who is not swayed by political expediency.

Modern liberals, both in and out of Congress, vigorously—yes, blindly—support most every request for public spending, regardless of its need, on the theory it will help the little fellow and the wage earner. They forget to tell you that the ultimate consumers of goods and food—you—pay all the taxes brought on by the spending of every public spending body—municipal, county, State, and Federal—and that the so-called little fellows and the wage earners are by far, as a whole, the greatest consuming group in America.

However, our farmers are the greatest per person taxpayers, since our farmers buy and consume, on an average, over twice as many dollars' worth of manufactured goods when their dollar is worth 100 cents at the counter, than do our other average consumers per person when their dollar is on par value with the farmer's dollar.

These modern liberals forget to explain that privately owned taxpaying industry—from the peanut vendor to the corner grocer, to the privately owned partnerships, large and small companies and corporations—must add every and all taxes to the cost of the goods they sell in order to make a reasonable profit, or they would very soon be out of business. Remember, you are already paying 30 cents in taxes in every dollar you spend for food and goods.

So, when every taxing body—including the United States Congress—appropriates the people's money, your money, you so-called little people must pay the greater part of the bill, for, as I said before, you are our greatest consumers.

History records that every nation on earth who embarked too long on a reckless spending spree full speed ahead—such as our reckless spenders have done for years and years—has lost its liberties and has suffered every known misery for its folly.

For this reason, I plead with you who read and think through to join with those of us who are trying our very best to avoid national bankruptcy and all of its attending sufferings, by not only holding our President's budget, but to reduce it wherever it is safe and proper to do so.

The articles follow:

OUR TIRED LIBERALS

The most abused word in political use today is "liberal."

Originally it identified men who brought new and refreshing thinking to the art of government. These men dared to challenge the idea that those to whom birth or votes had given authority were necessarily all-wise and therefore deserved to be all-powerful. They fought to win for the individual the privilege of proving his own capacity to meet the buffetings of life.

Now the word "liberal" has been perverted to cover those of a completely opposite philosophy. Today we are asked to believe that the liberal government is that which most persistently undertakes to meet the people's needs. What the people need is a matter that the new liberals have felt free to decide among themselves. The right of individual achievement is not included.

Those who push this philosophy today find themselves in an awkward straddle. To fulfill their dream of security for everybody would require money that the Federal Treasury doesn't have and has little chance of getting. To give their goals a semblance of soundness, the liberals must first prove that temporary insolvency is a governmental virtue, because it will lead to a glorious new day.

They are trying frantically to do this by insisting that any effort to hold the government's debt in line, to counteract inflation, to reduce the size of monumental expenditures is fiscal irresponsibility.

The President's budget which attempts to do these things, is, they tell us, a tired budget, the product of old-fashioned thinking which cannot recognize future tax potentials and new concepts of Federal service and achievement.

This argument compels attention.

Certainly we cannot afford tired thinking. Let us listen to the new concepts and examine the financial legerdemain that makes them possible to attain without bankruptcy.

At this point, the liberal promises turn to ashes. We can pay for their schemes, they tell us, because the country is entering on such a period of expansion that tax revenues soon will be sufficient to cover any sort of government extravagance.

This rosy prediction overlooks the truth that both expansion and taxes come from profits and, in the liberal philosophy, profits are wicked. Congressional committees are already hectoring or preparing to hector every major industry. A half dozen bills introduced or proposed would complicate or cripple the procedures by which business and industry expand operations, open job oppor-

tunities and introduce better products more cheaply.

If expansion actually does bring the increased revenues for which the liberals hope, it will come in spite of them rather than because they planned it that way.

But with expansion or without it we still have no room for tired thinking. We need new ideas, new concepts, new vision in government.

What do the liberals bring of these?

The list is tragically disappointing: Federal intervention in schools; subsidies for depressed areas; minimum wage legislation; a housing program; veterans' programs; a farm subsidy program—all tired old ideas.

Some have been tried with doubtful success. Others the American people, through their Congress, have rejected in the past as unsound and undesirable.

Compared to this reiteration of political cliches the President's proposal for a balanced budget has the brilliance of sheer originality.

The tired thinking of the pseudoliberals offers little temptation to upset it.

---

WHAT'S AT STAKE IN WASHINGTON

Congressional action in coming weeks will have a far-reaching effect on the climate in which you operate as a businessman.

Votes cast by the Nation's lawmakers will affect the taxes you pay, the freedom with which you can make business decisions, your relations with labor—even the nature of the competition you face from other businesses.

The central, dominating issue before Congress is the soundness of the American economy. The shadow of this issue will fall across a universe of smaller issues, for the majority of bills already introduced in the 86th Congress would require spending of additional billions of tax dollars. Such expenditures, fiscal authorities say, could capsize the administration's hopes for a balanced budget, add to the already huge Federal deficit, and send the inflationary spiral soaring to even more dangerous heights.

Following are concise reports on the major business-related issues facing Congress. Covered are proposals concerning social security, Government restrictions on business, labor legislation, taxation, defense spending, and other issues.

Included with the individual summaries you will find a statement of the position which the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, as spokesman for organized business, has taken on each of the key issues.

INFLATION

*The issue*

Considering the current state of the economy and probable economic trends during fiscal 1960 (which starts July 1, 1959):

1. What can be done to prevent inflation from lowering the value of the dollar?

2. What should be the proper relationship between revenues and expenditures in the Federal budget for fiscal 1960?

3. How much can be saved by reducing less essential Federal activities and improving efficiency in Federal operations?

The Federal Government is running a deficit of almost $13 billion. It is having difficulty financing its debt. It has strained existing tax resources to the limit. It is faced with mounting national and international pressures for more spending.

*The solution*

The U.S. Chamber will review the President's budget and make recommendations for economy and efficiency to congressional committees.

It will urge legislation to curb the monopoly power of unions.

It will suggest to Congress the establishment of an impartial study group to devise a new tax structure that will stimulate economic growth. It will urge amendment of the Employment Act of 1946 to provide that the Government shall be responsible for controlling inflation as well as promoting maximum levels of employment and production.

The chamber will continue to develop public support for Federal Reserve Board efforts to hold down inflation.

DEFENSE

*The issue*

Whether President Eisenhower's $40.9 billion defense budget is adequate or whether the administration program fails to meet the threat of Russia's military might.

*The solution*

Though in a situation so complicated no single recommendation is possible, the chamber's objectives are to have an adequate national security at a minimum cost; a simplified defense appropriation structure for better control of funds; improved defense organization and management; and curtailment of commercial-industrial activities of the Department of Defense.

Dollars alone will not buy security. Devoting energies and resources to the point of weakening our economic system will defeat the effort to build a strong, well-rounded defense system.

The chamber will analyze the 1960 defense budget: It will urge Congress to restrict military programs to those of a compelling necessity; close unnecessary facilities; set a deadline for curtailing unnecessary commercial-industrial activities and use the new powers under the Defense Reorganization Act.

PROCUREMENT

*The issue*

Many provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are obsolete and contribute to delays and unnecessary expenses. The act governs how more than $22 billion of the annual defense budget is spent.

Because of legislative and administrative restrictions, our defense procurement system does not make full use of the vast industrial ingenuity and resourcefulness that has put the United States ahead of the rest of the world in the production of top-quality, low-cost, nondefense products and services.

The law still stresses a highly formalized type of procurement that is impractical and uneconomical in buying some complex military equipment, and discourages use of the method of procurement that experience has demonstrated is the most efficient and economical for 90 percent of the dollar volume of such purchasing.

At a time when our security could be threatened by a month's delay in procuring a new weapon, the United States is taking twice as long as Russia in converting many of its ideas for new weapons into finished products.

*The solution*

The chamber will support the major objectives of legislation which Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, has reintroduced to overhaul the Armed Services Act.

Also, the chamber will urge that the Renegotiation Act be allowed to expire next June 30, and that defense contractors be indemnified against unusual hazards.

MILITARY MANPOWER

*The issue*

Congress must decide for how long and in what form to extend the draft law in the light of rapidly changing military manpower requirements and the increased importance of expanding our scientific and technical education programs.

Manpower is much more than a military problem. We have one labor force and the demands on it, particularly in time of national emergency, must be well coordinated.

Although our military manpower requirements have dropped to 2.5 million, a much larger percentage of the active forces must be technical and skilled.

*The solution*

Extension of the draft law in some form is generally accepted as necessary.

Previous extensions have been for 4 years. Congress should consider manpower problems more frequently than that.

The chamber urges a 2-year extension because:

A quality career force is being developed.

Reenlistment rates are continuing to increase.

Secretary McElroy anticipates further reductions in manpower strength.

The problem of obtaining inductions at an age lower than 23 should be dealt with either by amendment or administrative action.

LABOR RELATIONS

*The issue*

What laws are needed in the labor-management field to bring fair play to the public, to employees and to employers?

The issue is important to the businessman because labor costs and other labor problems are among the most worrisome matters with which businessmen have to deal. The entire future of our economy depends in great measure on the skill with which these questions are handled.

Only if there is a greatly aroused public opinion on the question will Congress seriously undertake to do anything about it. With a growing number of Members of Congress beholden to labor because of campaign contributions and other support, there is a hard core who are against action which would go to the heart of this important matter. In fact, there is likelihood that efforts will be made to give labor still more power.

*The solution*

The chamber recommends equal treatment under law as a means of solving the problem. Such treatment would mean curbing the monopolistic abuses by unions and compelling fair play on their part, just as such requirements have long been imposed upon employers.

The argument most frequently used against the chamber's position is that the businessmen's basic purpose is to destroy unions.

The principal arguments for the chamber position are that Federal and State protection of the right to organize has placed tremendous power in the hands of a few labor leaders. This power has resulted in corruption and abuses. The victims have been the public, employees and employers.

Business long ago was brought under the antitrust laws, the fair trade laws, the Securities Exchange Act, and other laws which compel fair play. Unless we are to have a harmful imbalance in our society, big labor's activities must likewise be regulated.

EDUCATION

*The issue*

Shall Federal spending and decision making further direct the adjustment of American education to the space age, or shall school needs be met by State and local resources?

More Federal intervention means:

1. Increased Federal taxes for education, and Federal intervention in school systems and colleges.

2. The transfer of decisions affecting public schools from local and State governments to the Federal Government.

3. The loss of autonomy by private schools and colleges, as they become more dependent on Federal grants, or loans, or contract programs.

Members responsible for the National Defense Education Act urge that Congress increase the areas covered and the amount of

Federal intervention into education. Many indicated at the end of the 85th Congress that the National Defense Education Act was "but a step along the road we must travel in Federal financing of education." Likely further proposals are grants for school construction and to improve teacher salaries.

Those favoring more Federal intervention in schools argue that the space age has created demands for trained manpower which State and local school improvements cannot meet.

On the other hand, no manpower emergency has been demonstrated, beyond the chronic need for scientists. State and local school authorities are providing dynamic leadership toward the solution of space-age curriculum requirements. At the same time, school construction, except in rapidly growing suburban areas, has more than kept up with enrollments.

*The solution*

The chamber recommends that school needs be assessed by local and State leaders—both educators and laymen—and that their resources be fully used to provide educational support and to increase the efficiency with which school revenues are spent. Only when an emergency exists which is clearly beyond the resources of a State and its communities should any program of Federal intervention be considered, even on a temporary basis.

Local chamber education committees and congressional action committees should help educators assess their school needs and find the resources to meet them.

The controversies over curriculums and teaching methods cannot be satisfactorily resolved through national legislation or administrative decrees, but must be left to a diversity of experiment in the thousands of school systems where local initiative can better adapt schools to the needs of the communities they serve.

TAXATION

*The issue*

Through our Federal system of taxation we pay for our freedom as well as for the goods and services of national government.

The demands and pressures for revenue are high.

The Communist threat dictates a continuing national policy of heavy defense spending. More than half of Government outlays are for protection.

Pressures to commit the balance of Federal tax money for more services, grants, benefits, aids, and projects are growing at a rate that now exceeds that of the income produced under our tax laws.

Unwise taxation will ultimately destroy the incentive to produce and the ability to invest in economic growth.

Investment is necessary to provide the jobs for our expanding labor force and for our national defense.

During this session of Congress hundreds of bills will be introduced to change either our tax rates or our tax system. Most of these will receive scant consideration. Representative WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has indicated that the committee will limit itself to technical and administrative changes. However, he has called for eventual uniformity, simplification, and broadened tax base.

*The solution*

We must choose between a tax system which by its nature retards our potential economic growth through destruction of traditional sources of investment capital or development of a tax system which will permit individual savings and resultant investment.

If we are to maintain Federal budgets at or above this level without doing irreparable harm to the economy, it is essential that we so stimulate the tax base as to create an economy that is sufficiently healthy to withstand this continuing drain.

Basic to our need is an impartial study group which will take a keen look at the strengths and weaknesses of our present tax system, investigate the tax systems of others nations, and devise a tax structure which will stimulate our national economic growth.

This period of huge Federal deficit, with its prospect of more to come, is ideal for this type of effort.

CONTROL OF BUSINESS

*The issue*

Fundamental to the American way of life is the principle of minimum Government interference in citizens' activities. The foundation is being laid, however, to substitute Government controls for freedom of economic activity in:

Mergers: Legislation under consideration would require certain companies to wait until a Government review period expired before merging.

Mergers are a normal part of business operations and help stimulate the Nation's growth and development. The proposed legislation would result in frustrating delays and discourage beneficial mergers.

Pricing: Some members of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly are accusing large firms in key industries of setting so-called administered prices.

In our free society, what is produced and its price are regulated by the market. Administered prices are not a contributing cause to inflation, but rather tend to reflect costs—predominately wage-pushed costs.

Minimum wage coverage: It is proposed to extend Federal minimum wage and premium overtime pay regulations to employees of retail and service trades who have always been exempted from coverage because of the local character of retailing and services.

Such extension would interfere with the mainenance of a proper balance between Federal and State authority in interstate and local commerce. Extending coverage would also add to the inflationary spiral by setting wage levels without regard to productivity and causing employees earning more than the minimum to demand more pay to protect established differentials. It would hurt small business most.

*The solution*

Government should not control beneficial mergers. Those few mergers which might adversely affect competition can and should be dealt with by proper application of antitrust laws.

There is no justification, either, for Federal interference with normal price-making procedures. Prices adjust to changes in supply and demand.

Exemption of retail and service trades employees, which has existed for good reason since the wage-hour law was passed more than 20 years ago, should be continued.

SOCIAL SECURITY

*The issue*

Should social security pay benefits large enough to live on comfortably? Should costly new benefits be established?

The present schedule of benefits promised by Congress to the aged person, to his dependents, to family survivors requires virtually doubling the tax rate by 1969, and an increase in the taxable wage base now in effect from $4,200 to $4,800. This means more than doubling the current tax burden upon many employers and employees.

Under the present law a higher taxable wage base has become effective in 1959, and the taxes on employers and on covered workers will be increased in 1960—and 1963, 1966, 1969.

*The solution*

The chamber recommends that social security pay monthly cash benefits sufficient to prevent want and destitution to people who, because of age, are unable to support themselves.

It is argued that benefits should be made sufficient for a person to live in decency and self-respect. Another argument is that benefits should be increased because of the higher cost of living and to reflect higher levels of pay and rising productivity. Labor leaders contend that workers are willing to pay their fair share toward higher benefits and for new kinds of benefits.

The facts are, however, that the financial soundness of social security must be preserved. This financial soundness depends in large part upon a continued willingness of workers to pay the necessary social taxes. Since the full tax burden of the presently scheduled benefits will not be fully felt until 1969, bigger and new kinds of benefits should not be put into the law until we know for certain that the covered workers in 1969 will be willing to carry twice as large a tax burden as at present.

Moreover, each person is expected to build additional old-age income through his own efforts.

URBAN RENEWAL

*The issue*

Can cities revitalize their blighted areas, or is permanent and increasing Federal assistance needed?

The 86th Congress has been asked to authorize a 10-year urban renewal program of $600 million annually. This has been coupled with proposals to increase the Federal share in this program from the current 66⅔ percent to as high as 90 percent. Added to measures already introduced are requests to expand the program to include substantial financing for renewal of areas for commercial and industrial development. The program now is predominantly residential.

The commercial and industrial renewal feature will be sought through normal housing legislation, and will probably be a significant point in any depressed area legislation as it was during the last Congress.

*The solution*

The chamber recommends a gradual reduction of the Federal share in this type of activity to a point where it can ultimately be phased out completely. The chamber has suggested means by which cities can approach their individual problems without seeking substantial Federal assistance.

The chamber points out that many cities have already accomplished much on their own initiative. Pittsburgh; Flint, Mich.; Baltimore, and Indianapolis, to name a few, have shown that they can do a tremendous job on their own.

Moreover, the whole of the $1.4 billion urban renewal capital grant fund has been tied up by a mere 3 percent of America's more than 17,000 communities. Assuming that many more cities will want urban renewal funds, and that existing participants will request increases, the program could become unmanageable.

DEPRESSED AREAS

*The issue*

Must all taxpayers be compelled to subsidize a relatively few areas with chronic unemployment, or can this problem be met by States and localities, helped by business organizations, without Federal aid?

A new area redevelopment bill, going far beyond the $279 million measure pocket-vetoed last September comes before the new Congress. It is a major goal of labor unions and will have the support of many newly elected Congressmen. Proponents of this legislation argue that Federal aid to depressed areas is long overdue; that relief of chronic unemployment is beyond State, local, and private resources.

Depressed areas are generally described as those with 6 percent or more unemployment.

*The solution*

The national chamber believes that the real problem is to determine exactly what industries can succeed in these areas, what changes must be made to attract them. Healthy economic recovery depends on finding productive job opportunities. It can best be brought about by aggressive, local industrial development organizations, backed where necessary by privately financed statewide credit corporations. This approach stimulates local initiative. It is also clear that a Federal-aid program might well use your community's tax money to help finance industrial development for a competitive community.

A Federal subsidy program often continues and expands, even though the original need has been met. Pressures to extend aid on looser terms would be difficult to withstand. More money would be requested.

PUBLIC HOUSING

*The issue*

The basic issue here is whether housing for special segments of the population should be subsidized by tax funds.

Begun on a small scale in the 1930's, the subsidizing of housing has grown until the Federal Government now materially supports more than 500,000 units.

The program lost sight of its original low-income character when Congress, in 1957, revised the formula for determining net income for residence in public housing so that a family earning $9,800 a year could live in some projects.

In many communities public housing has invaded the private market and the community is deprived of necessary taxes.

As of June 30, 1957, the Government was committed to annual contributions of nearly $200 million to cover subsidies to local public housing authorities, and the program showed a net deficit of more than $600 million.

In more than 20 years of operation the program has failed to upgrade housing to any extent.

*The solution*

The chamber has recommended continuing enforcement of local housing codes as a means of halting the growth of substandard housing from which public housing residents supposedly come.

The provision of decent, safe and sanitary shelter is a local responsibility and should be met according to local requirements through a combination of private enterprise and local welfare action.

## Nepotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Greenville (S.C.) News:

FAVORS TO KIN—NEPOTISM NOT FOUND AMONG STATE SOLONS

(By W. D. Workman, Jr.)

COLUMBIA.—With the Washington spotlight focused on the congressional habit of putting wives, sons, and relatives on the official payroll, the time is ripe for a look at South Carolina laws on nepotism.

Section 50-101 of the State code of laws has this to say on the subject:

"It shall be unlawful for any person at the head of any department of this government to appoint to any office or position of trust or emolument under his control or management any person related or connected with him by consanguinity or affinity within the sixth degree."

ACT SETS POLICY

That act establishes a State policy which frowns on nepotism, but the law leaves all sorts of loopholes for placing relatives on payrolls so long as the favored person is not related to the department head himself. And then, there is the question of just who is the head of the legislative department of the State government, for members of the general assembly frequently succeed in having sons or other relatives appointed as pages or other legislative attachés.

No thoroughgoing inquiry has been made in recent years, but there has been little complaint of any undue nepotism in South Carolina.

## Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the sixth of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia:

DEBTOR'S DILEMMA: NEW BILL WOULD ENABLE MAN TO PAY DEBTS, FEED FAMILY

(By Morton Mintz)

(Sixth in a series)

In cookery the word "garnish" has a gentle, pleasant ring. In District law the same word is like the screech of a braked tire.

The District Bar Association is trying to take the terror and tragedy out of garnishment and put it under the wing of justice.

The bar proposal for reform has been introduced in House by Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina).

A bar director, James A. Willey, is leading the fight for adoption. He is a member and past chairman of the bar's municipal court committee.

The bar proposal recognizes the principle of ability to pay. It sets a sliding scale of garnishments based on a debtor's earnings, as follows: On gross pay up to $200 a month, 10 percent could be attached; $200 to $500, 20 percent; more than $500, 50 percent.

The bar measure would allow only one attachment to be effective at one time. Only after one creditor's debt is satisfied could other attachments take effect, in the order received. The employer would forward the creditor's money once a month.

CALLS FOR CLOSE LOOK

These two provisions say to the easy creditor: Collection from bad risks via attachment can take you a long, long time, and you have an incentive to withhold credit from persons who are bad risks.

It is chiefly in this way that the bar proposal attacks a root trouble in the present situation, the indiscriminate extension of credit. The message of the existing law is caveat emptor—let the buyer beware. The bar proposal would add a large dose of caveat venditor—let the seller beware.

The bar says that if its proposal becomes law, the seller might well beware, for example, of the man whose pay is already being attached.

The proposal would make it impossible for attachment to strip a man of his entire pay.

Neither he nor his employer would have to go to municipal court to prove his eligibility for exemption, for he would get an exemption automatically. The trip to municipal court now must be made for each attachment on which an exemption is sought. Debtors sometimes get worn down by this procedure and lose vital time from work. So they accept a settlement under which they agree to buy more.

Because an employed debtor could not be left penniless by attachments, the incentive (in the present law) for an impoverished husband to desert his family would be removed. As explained in Tuesday's article, he risks imprisonment and/or a fine when he deserts. However, he also assures that, once a court support order is issued, his family will be able to eat and pay the rent.

SEE LESS OPPORTUNITY

Willey says the delayed-collection provisions would curb the present practice of making innocent persons responsible for easy credit debts they did not incur. He says there would be fewer of them because they would be less inviting targets, and they would not be hit so hard.

Other major features of the bar proposal provide that:

A court order to a man to support his wife, former wife, and/or children would have priority over any attachment. There is more caveat venditor here, for a debt for clothing, jewelry, or a car, for example, could not come ahead of family needs.

Wage exemptions would be extended to nonresidents of the District on the same basis as to District residents—automatically. Nonresidents get no exemption under existing law.

Last year the House passed an earlier bill sponsored by the bar that would have limited attachments to a flat 10 percent of gross pay and MCMILLAN has reintroduced a similar bill. Also in 1958, the Senate passed a bill which, while setting a sliding scale of attachments based on earnings, flatly exempted the first $50 of weekly income. Both bills were passed so late in the session that a House-Senate compromise could not be worked out.

Backers of the Senate bill contend the flat $50 exemption is both necessary and a more potent caveat venditor. They also argue that the bar bill and the other measure reintroduced in the House by MCMILLAN would take away from the debtor the exemption he can claim now, forcing him to pay 10 percent of his income though he can ill afford it.

Backers of the two House bills center their rebuttal on these points:

1. The present exemption provision, however reasonable it sounds, does not work most of the time in the way Congress intended. (The reasons for this have been explained previously.)

2. A flat-amount exemption leaves no recourse for collection of legitimate debts from a large segment of the population, and payment of debts is a responsibility that all citizens should bear.

3. Garnishment should be continued as a legitimate, last-resort method of collection from deadbeats.

The Senate bill would have forbidden attachment of a nonresident's pay unless he incurred the debt in the District or unless a judgment was rendered against him elsewhere. The two House bills would allow partial attachments of a nonresident's pay if his employer has an office in the District, no matter where he lives, works, or buys.

Some employers object to the procedure in the Bar bill requiring them to forward to the creditor each month a fraction of an attached person's wage until the debt is satisfied. This, they fear, would make their

garnishment-handling costs even greater than at present.

Willey disagrees. His contention is that there would be so many fewer garnishments that overall employer costs would be lower.

Another employer group strongly favors the bar bill. Agreeing with Willey, these employers foresee lower personnel turnover and replacement training costs, fewer demands on executive time, and an end to the nuisance of multiple attachments. At present, many employers fire a man when he has been attached two or more times.

NOT SEEN AS CURE-ALL

The bar does not claim its proopsal is a cure-all. Its position is that it would wipe out intolerabe evis, and that every contingency cannot possiby be provided for.

The bar bill, or a measure like it, is considered to have the best chance of enactment. It has the unanimous support of the District Merchants and Manufacturers Association with its membership of 400 leading retail merchants, and it is expected to have the backing of the District Commissioners.

So far as the municipal court is concerned, Chief Judge Leonard P. Walsh said the major abuses of the court as a collection agency for a few easy credit firms would be ended by the bar bill, by the other bill introduced by MCMILLAN, by the expected Senate bill or by the Dowdy bill.

Other pending garnishment legislation:

The Dowdy bill: Representative JOHN DOWDY, Democrat, of Texas, has reintroduced a measure to prohibit attachment of earnings.

The Curtis bill: Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, has reintroduced his bill to permit attachment of the wages of all Federal employees.

The Curtis bill would exempt from attachment $200 earned in a 2-month period by a head of a household and $120 by a single person.

## A Farm Program That Would Cost Less—Help Those Who Need It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when Secretary Ezra Benson took over the Agriculture Department in 1953, the cost of the farm program was under heavy fire. But during the Truman administration, the total cost of subsidies to farmers never exceeded $1,250 million. On the other hand, Secretary Benson has managed to accumulate $9 billion worth of farm surpluses, which will cost about $1 billion just to store and handle. Under his management, administrative costs in his department have also risen by close to 900 percent. I have just read a column by Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post which brings out these facts. He also reviews the provisions of a farm bill being prepared by four Senators. This bill would cut the cost of subsidies to half the amount requested by Secretary Benson, while giving the assistance to those who need it—our independent, family-type farmers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Mr. Alsop's column in the RECORD:

BENSON PROGRAM'S COST IS OUT OF HAND
(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—"Let's not be coming up with our scheme, Herman, until we have had a chance to operate on Ezra."

The maker of this cheerfully bloodthirsty remark was Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota, in council with his new ally, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia. The Ezra destined for the operating table was Secretary of Agriculture Benson. Hatchets will be the instruments employed.

Benson is ripe for the operating table because his farm program has finally got absolutely out of hand. A few comparisons tell the story.

When conservative persons were aroused by the extravagant farm subsidies paid by the Truman spenders, the total cost of the subsidies never passed $1,250 million. The Brannan plan was expected to strangle American agriculture in the embrace of creeping socialism and bankrupt the Treasury in the same breath. But the Brannan plan's total estimated cost was no more than about $2 billion.

In contrast, the conservative, sound-dollar, free enterprise policies of Benson have produced a request for just under $7 billion of agricultural appropriations next year. The $9 billion worth of surpluses the Utah free enterpriser has managed to accumulate will cost about $1 billion in mere storage and handling charges—a larger sum than the spender, Truman, ever paid out to the farmers themselves. Since the spenders were driven out of the Agriculture Department in 1953, administrative costs have also risen by close to 900 percent. And the Utah free enterpriser's bill for farm subsidies next year is in the neighborhood of $4 billion, or about twice the estimated cost of the Brennan plan.

Even the farm State Senators, never before accustomed to be tender in their dealings with the public purse, have begun to be alarmed by this monstrous inflation of the expense of the farm program. So they are not merely preparing to "operate on Ezra"; they are also getting ready a substitute program of their own.

The groundwork is being done by the administrative assistants of Senators TALMADGE, HUMPHREY, SYMINGTON, of Missouri, and PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin. TALMADGE, one of the sharpest intellects in the modern Senate, is the main director and inspirer of the effort. Since the Congress is rarely able to impose brandnew major policies on the executive branch, it is doubtful whether the effort of the four Senators will bear immediate legislative fruit. But even if the bill they are preparing does not pass, it is virtually certain to become the Democratic farm plank in 1960.

Omitting the technicalities, the four-Senator scheme is simple enough. Existing special schemes for tobacco, wool, and other special crops, will be retained. But all other crop controls will be jettisoned, and all the main crops will be sold on the free market, at home and abroad. Subsidies in the form of parity payments will then be given to producers of wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, corn, and milk. But only on that share of their crop consumed in this country.

If our wheat output is a billion bushels, and America consumes half a billion bushels of this output, a farmer who produces 1,000 bushels of wheat will receive subsidies to bring the price of half his crop up to 100 percent of the sacred and mythical parity price. Special arrangements are provided to liquidate the Utah free enterpriser's staggering surplus stores in a gradual manner. Above all, it is provided that no individual farmer may receive a subsidy payment in excess of $12,500. Mainly because the big farmers are left to shift for themselves, the whole scheme is estimated to cost only about $2 billion at present prices, or half the cost of subsidies requested by Benson.

The scheme's real interest lies in its single-mindedness. It is solely designed to preserve and assist a sorely endangered American asset, our independent farming population. Socially, biologically, historically, this is a name well worth national investment. All previous farm programs, having no limitation on the subsidy check, have instead mainly assisted the big, semi-industrial farmers. This one is shaped to aid only the family sized farm. Whether or not the scheme's machinery is well designed, its principle is surely correct.

## Berlin and the Balance of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by the Assembly of Captive European Nations, dated February 6, 1959, with headquarters in New York City. A letter of transmittal accompanies the editorial.

The letter and editorial follow:

ASSEMBLY OF
CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS,
*New York, N.Y., February 27, 1958.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: We have read with interest the article by Drew Pearson, on the balance of power, which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Knowing of your interest in this important problem, I take the liberty of enclosing herewith an ACEN editorial on "Berlin and the Balance of Power." The editorial expresses ACEN views on the theory so eagerly advanced by the Kremlin that the balance of power is already tipped in favor of the Soviets.

We would certainly appreciate your comments.

With best regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
VACLOVAS SIDZIKAUSKAS,
*Acting Chairman.*

BERLIN AND THE BALANCE OF POWER

An editorial analyzing the situation created by the Soviet-instigated Berlin crisis will appear shortly in the next issue of ACEN News, the monthly review of activities of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. The editorial warns the West to shed its illusion "that ultimate defeat can be staved off by such easy means as cultural exchanges, economic assistance, and the power of example. The West must learn fast that in the political war that is raging now its main problem is not to demonstrate that it is right, but that it has a strong purpose and will, and the determination to win." The full text reads:

"The most recent actions of the Soviet Union, particularly their challenge to the West on Berlin and Germany, and the statements made in recent days at the 21st Congress of the Communist Party, clearly indicate that the Soviet rulers want the world to believe that the balance of power is now tilted in their favor. They are out to persuade the Western Powers that unless they bow to the Soviet demands expressed in quasi-ultimative terms—they will be phys-

ically forced out of Berlin first and Western Germany next. It is obvious that the Soviet rulers would like to world to believe that American power of nuclear retaliation—the basic element of Western European defense—has already been neutralized. The inference is that the Western Powers can no longer risk an all-out war—which, given their inadequate conventional forces, remains the only way in which they could attempt to maintain themselves in Berlin and in Germany. This was quite pointedly expressed on January 29 by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko before the 21st Party Congress in Moscow. 'The growing might of the Soviet Union and the countries of the Socialist camp makes it risky and even impossible to unleash a new world war.'

"Here we have the most significant illustration of the Soviet use of the balance of power concept in order to further their ends painlessly, by classical cold war methods. For the Soviet claim that the balance of power is already tipped in their favor can, at best, be called premature. As they have done so often in the past, the Soviets exploit their future achievements in advance and, because of the secrecy in which they can veil their actions, frequently succeed in getting the outside world to credit them with strength which sometimes is still in the drawing board stage.

"Our point is that in spite of these Soviet claims, the balance of power still favors the West. However, unless western military and political policy is radically invigorated now, the advantage will be lost within the next few years. From then on the balance of power will tilt increasingly in favor of the Soviet Union—to the point where the Soviets, and their Chinese partners, might succeed in gradually gaining control over the whole Eurasian landmass without war, by a combination of lures, pressures and blackmail.

"To understand the tremendous problems with which the free world is confronted today, we must remember that, as a result of World War II, only two important power centers were left in the world: the United States and the Soviet Union. We must further bear in mind that, because of a purely military, nonpolitical approach to warfare on the part of the United States, because of insufficient understanding of Communist aims and methods and because of the premature disarmament of the West, the Soviet Union succeeded in gaining control over the eastern half of the European Continent and, eventually, in carrying communism to power in China. Only insular positions and fringes of the Continents of Europe and Asia escaped Soviet control. Despite many praiseworthy efforts, these fringes never succeeded in placing their defense on a self-supporting basis to any substantial degree. Confronted with the powerful conventional military machine of the Soviet Union, poised in a central position, and enjoying the advantages of a landmass, the free nations of the European and Asian fringes succeeded in conserving their freedom only because of the protective umbrella which American power has extended over them. This protective umbrella consisted almost exclusively of the American power of nuclear retaliation and its deterrent effect.

"It should have been obvious to the free nations that this source of their security was bound one day to dry up. Sooner or later the Soviets would develop a nuclear striking power sufficient to neutralize the American power of nuclear retaliation, and then the Soviet Union would be able, at small risk, to use its vastly superior conventional power to pressure the European and Asian fringe countries into submission.

"Still, the free nations of Europe and Asia acted as if the American nuclear umbrella would protect them forever. They did not take advantage of the time this protection afforded them to build up adequate local forces would counterbalance the nonnuclear striking power of the Soviets. And during the period of American nuclear supremacy, they failed to roll back Soviet power by the joint pressures of internal and external forces. Basking in their newly found prosperity and, more recently, in the comfort of improved internal political conditions, they took their security for granted, and continue to do so.

"It must be stressed that, in order to upset the balance of power, the Soviet Union does not need to outstrip the United States in technology or in nonconventional military power. All they need do is to develop their nuclear striking capability to the point necessary to blow up all essential American targets. The obvious reasoning of the Soviet rulers is that, once they have this capability, it will become too costly for the United States to rescue its allies by the only effective means at its disposal: nuclear retaliation. American nonconventional power will be neutralized, and, once this main deterrent is nullified, conventional power will be too weak to save any ally. Once this dawns upon the allies of the United States they will be ripe for a gradual take-over by political means.

"By its Berlin challenge the Soviet Union would like to suggest that the neutralization of American striking power is already a fact. For this purpose what is really a probing operation is represented as a deliberate showdown. The hope of Moscow seems to be that if it acts with determination and is prepared to go as far as some local shooting, the United States and its allies will realize that they can maintain themselves in Berlin only at the price of an all-out war. Moscow calculates that the West will shy away from this. A compromise, embodying the Soviet terms and some face-saving features would end the incident. The main Soviet purpose would have been achieved: to prove to the nations of Europe and Asia that they can no longer depend on American power, and to thereby pave the way for their step-by-step surrender—via various neutrality and disengagement schemes.

"This is why Berlin has become a transcendental issue. Not the fate of a city, not even of a country or a continent, but the whole future of freedom is at stake. Hence the decision of the Western governments to stand on their rights at whatever risk. It is our strong conviction that this firmness is the only way to prevent the disintegration of the Western camp, with all its inevitable consequences in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. But none should delude himself with the thought that a firm stand now will solve the problem of the balance of power for good. Time will continue to work for the Soviets unless revolutionary changes take place in the thinking and the actions of the West.

"The West must shed the illusion that ultimate defeat can be staved off by such easy means as cultural exchanges, economic assistance, and the power of example. The West must learn fast that in the political war that is raging now its main problem is not to demonstrate that it is right, but that it has a strong purpose and will, and the determination to win. It must learn how to avoid the trap of Soviet softening devices calculated to prepare the mood for more western flexibility—that is, surrender—or for such invitations to complacency as the idea that evolution of the Communist regimes toward freedom and imaginary Soviet-Chinese antagonism will in time solve all problems.

"The West must realize that the time to look to its salvation is today, not tomorrow, and that this requires an unprecedented all-out effort to build local strength in Europe and Asia; an all-out attack on the causes of the coming imbalance of power; an all-out effort of political warfare behind the Soviet lines. For instance, the drive for communes in Red China has created revolutionary conditions which beg to be turned to the advantage of the worldwide cause of freedom.

"The question is: Will the West ever learn to measure risk taking not only in terms of the peril involved but also in terms of opportunity to escape the dire alternatives of war or surrender."

## Growing Popular Support for Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since the President announced his balanced budget, I have received hundreds of letters approving the President's determination to fight inflation and reckless Government spending.

Representatives of 23 taxpayer groups in Wisconsin held a conference in the city of Fond du Lac on February 18 and adopted the following resolutions which I would like to insert as an example of the growing popular support for economy in Government:

FEDERAL BUDGET

Whereas in what is generally one of the most prosperous eras in our country's history there seems to be no valid reason why the Government should not be able to pay its own way; and

Whereas a balanced Federal budget for the 1960 fiscal year has been proposed by President Eisenhower; and

Whereas a balanced budget can put a halt to the inflationary trend which is reducing the purchasing power of the dollar; and

Whereas a balanced budget should also lead to reducing the Federal debt; and

Whereas the proposed 1960 Federal budget calls for strengthened fiscal controls which can lead to continuing balanced Federal spending programs; and

Whereas the budget proposes a decrease in Federal participation in areas of State and local responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this conference of taxpayers' associations in the interest of better and lower-cost Government with control maintained closer to the people, does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to reduce Federal spending, pass a Federal budget that is balanced, and support efforts to reduce Federal financial participation in activities of the State and local governments; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Members of the U.S. Congress be urged particularly to work unceasingly for these objectives.

(Adopted, Fond du Lac, Wis., February 18, 1959.)

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Whereas repeated attempts to inject the National Government into the financing of public education have been made over the past few years and efforts in that direction again are being urged before Congress in the form of bills to subsidize teachers' salaries and the construction of school buildings; and

Whereas the States in general, and Wisconsin in particular, have sufficient resources to

pay both for the construction of new school buildings and adequately compensate the teachers; and

Whereas the State of Wisconsin has, for example, using its own tax resources, increased its school spending since 1946 by 225 percent while enrollments have increased only 29 percent, and increased the portion of individual personal income spent on education from 2.20 to 3.58 percent during this same period; and

Whereas Federal reports show Wisconsin has done the best job in the Nation in providing school buildings as evidenced by the fact that 44 percent of the 1956–57 school enrollment could be placed in classrooms built since 1951 and has increased local debt for school purposes to provide these classrooms from $10.3 million in 1947 to $235.9 million in 1957; and

Whereas the field of public education has been traditionally a responsibility of the State and local governments and Federal participation or control is neither needed nor desired: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the taxpayer associations jointly assembled in Fond du Lac on February 18, 1959, do make known their opposition to Federal financial aid to the public schools and do further resolve to oppose all such proposals to the maximum extent possible.

(Adopted Fond du Lac, Wis., February 18, 1959.)

Signers of resolutions: W. B. Wigton, Taxpayers Association of Fond du Lac; Robert Jenkins, Portage County Taxpayers Association; Walter G. Rose, La Crosse County Taxpayers Association; Robert K. Steele, Kenosha Taxpayers, Inc.; L. E. Plettner, Brown County Tax Survey; Herbert W. Clark, Racine Taxpayers Association; John W. Thorne, Waupaca County Taxpayers Association; R. S. Washburn, Beloit Taxpayers League; J. P. Duskey, Wausau Taxpayers League; Kenneth E. Pinkerton, Waupaca County Taxpayers Association; Jacob S. Disch, Green County Governmental Affairs Committee; Wesley M. Kolbe, Appleton Taxpayers Association; Elmer C. Dickerson, Sheboygan County Taxpayers Association; Donald A. Johnson, Clark County Taxpayers Association; J. C. Batzner, Winnebago County Taxpayers; D. H. Wischer, Northwest Taxpayers League of Milwaukee; H. A. Haberstroh, Southwest Taxpayers League of Milwaukee; Louis Hess, Oak Creek Property Owners' Association; Gilbert T. Backes, South Milwaukee Taxpayers League; Wm. C. Dietrich, Beaver Dam Committee on Governmental Affairs; Robert J. Cunningham, North Shore Tax Association; S. O. Donkle, Jefferson County Taxpayers Association; George DeBruin, Janesville Taxpayers League.

## Tax Relief for Retirement Plans for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most cherished principles of constitutional government is equality under the law. As Members of Congress we have a special responsibility to see that the legislation which appears on the statute books affords equal treatment to all classes of people in America. Today I would like to raise my voice in support of legislation which is intended to achieve greater equality of tax treatment for those of the self-employed in this country who have the wisdom and the initiative to plan for their retirement years.

I refer, of course, to H.R. 10, introduced by our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH, which was recently reported out of the Ways and Means Committee. This measure was passed overwhelmingly by this body last session but died in the Senate Finance Committee. I wish to congratulate the Ways and Means Committee for their speedy handling of the bill this session. The Congress over the years has studied the Keogh-Simpson-Reed-Jenkins bills with a thoroughness which can be matched by its consideration of very few legislative proposals.

The purpose of H.R. 10 is to reduce the inequity of tax treatment between employees under qualified pension plans and the self-employed. Under pension arrangements which meet the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code, an employee is not taxed on the amount of the retirement contribution paid on his behalf until his retirement benefit is actually paid. This means, in most instances, that this amount will be taxable to the employee at a time when his income is much lower, because he has retired, than it was when the contribution was paid during his working life. Moreover, the employer can deduct the amount of this contribution to the employee's pension as a part of his cost of doing business. The self-employed individual, on the other hand, can get no deductions for the annuity contracts he purchases or the retirement investments he makes and his income is fully taxed at the time of his highest earnings.

H.R. 10 would modify this discriminatory situation by allowing self-employed individuals to take a tax deduction for a limited amount of investment in certain types of retirement annuities, or retirement trusts: The bill would make this deduction available to all self-employed individuals who fall within the meaning of this term as it is defined under the Social Security Act. It would also include doctors and certain ministers who are not self-employed for social-security coverage purposes. The allowable tax deduction would generally be limited to 10 percent of earnings with a deduction ceiling of $2,500 for a year and $50,000 for a lifetime. So that older persons who would have to build up their retirement plans within a shorter period of time would not be disadvantaged, the bill provides that the annual deduction ceiling could be higher for persons over 50 years of age on January 1, 1959.

The deductions would not be applicable to just any annuity contract or retirement trust fund. The annuity policy would have to provide for the starting of payments not later than the time the individual reaches the age of 70, the policy would have to be nonassignable, and if the policy includes a life insurance provision the premium on this portion could not be used for deduction purposes. Similar restrictions are put on the retirement funds authorized under the act. Amounts received by the individual from restricted retirement funds or policies will generally be treated as ordinary taxable income at the time they are received during his retirement years.

To prevent a person from withdrawing the funds invested under one of these restricted plans before the age of 65, a penalty provision is incorporated which, in most cases, would provide that the withdrawals would be taxed at 110 percent of the liability otherwise resulting from including such sums as taxable income.

The legislation presented has been accepted by a substantial segment of the English-speaking world. Great Britain's law on this subject in 1956 was based on the distinguished white paper of the Committee on the Taxation Treatment of Provisions for Retirement headed by Sir James Millard Tucker. Canada followed with legislation in 1957 and the proposal has been under active consideration in Australia and New Zealand. The bill in this country has undergone many revisions and the product we have here today has been modified to answer many of the objections that have previously been raised.

Most of the revisions that have been incorporated into the legislation since it was first considered by the 82d Congress in 1951 have been aimed at reducing the loss of tax revenue by the Federal Government if the bill is enacted. The present administration, although admitting "that the present law does not give self-employed people tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed plans," nevertheless has felt compelled to oppose this bill at this time because of the revenue loss. The Treasury Department in its report has estimated that the revenue loss for fiscal 1960 would be $320 million and for the first full year of operation, $365 million.

Testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, however, has questioned the validity of some aspects of the Treasury Department estimate. For instance, some individuals who have studied the provision, believe that the revenue loss would be less than one half the Treasury estimate for the first full year of operation. These people maintain that the experience of Canada and Great Britain has been that the use of the deduction has started on a small scale and has grown slowly.

The fact that there will be revenue loss is axiomatic, of course, with a bill that affords tax relief. I think one is entitled to ask, however, whether this aspect alone can justify the further postponement of this legislation. The equities, in my view, are controlling in this situation and, therefore I urge the passage of H.R. 10 at the earliest opportunity.

## New Tax Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 2, 1959*

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think the article of February 26, 1959, from

the Pittsburgh Press, by Jack Steele, entitled "House Ready To O. K. New Tax Loophole," should be brought to the attention of every Congressman.

This contemplated tax legislation would only create new loopholes for people to avoid paying taxes and would serve as a means for other professionals and those not covered by social security to come in and ask for the same thing:

HOUSE READY TO OK NEW TAX LOOPHOLE—DOCTORS, LAWYERS, PROFESSIONALS WOULD BENEFIT IF BILL IS APPROVED

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—A bill which would open a new loophole in the tax laws and give substantial tax benefits to doctors, lawyers, dentists, and a few businessmen is expected to sail through the House soon.

The measure—reported to the House yesterday by the House Ways and Means Committee—would permit this select group of self-employed taxpayers to avoid paying taxes on up to $2,500 a year they put aside in retirement funds.

But it would grant no similar tax benefits to some 30 million other taxpayers who are employees and who are not covered by pension or retirement plans.

IN HIGH-INCOME BRACKETS

The self-employed taxpayers who would get special tax advantages under this bill are largely in the middle and upper income brackets. Doctors and lawyers have led in the intensive lobbying for the measure.

The average net—or taxable—income of the Nation's doctors is estimated at more than $18,000 a year. The Department of Commerce estimates that the average net income of all self-employed professional and technical workers in 1956 was $10,490.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that increases in the fees of doctors and dentists in the last decade have materially raised the cost of living. Since 1949, doctors have increased their fees 37.5 percent and dentists 32.5 percent, while the cost of living generally has gone up 27.5 percent.

Physicians are one of the few self-employed groups which have refused to participate in the social security program.

TREASURY OPPOSES IT

The Treasury, which is opposed to the retirement-income bill, estimates that it would save these taxpayers $365 million in its first year of operation. This revenue loss to the Government would insure an unbalanced budget for fiscal 1960.

The Treasury also estimates that if the same tax break was given all taxpayers—as it probably will be eventually if this bill is enacted—the annual revenue loss would run to $3 billion a year.

The bill, formerly known as the Jenkins-Keogh bill, cleared the House last year, but died in the session-end logjam in the Senate. It is jointly sponsored this year by Representatives EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York Democrat, and RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Huntington, Pa., Republican.

The bill, by granting a new special tax exemption, runs counter to the avowed aim of Democratic leaders to close loopholes in the revenue code.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY VOTES LINED UP

But its sponsors reportedly have lined up at least 350 votes in the House—including those of many Democrats—to insure its passage.

The bill's enactment would more than wipe out the additional revenues provided by a bill increasing the tax on life insurance companies by 70 percent which cleared the House last week.

The major reason advanced for the retirement income bill is that it would give the self-employed equality with employees who are covered by pension, profit-sharing, or stock-bonus plans.

But the Keogh-Simpson bill would grant a similar benefit only to the self-employed without extending it to others who are not covered by pension plans.

## For Humanity's Sake—Faith in the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Detroit, Mich., Jewish News of January 30, 1959, by its distinguished author and publisher, Mr. Philip Slomovitz.

The editorial does much to make clear what could and should be done for a solution of the problem of the Arab refugees which is now being used by Arabs for political purposes:

"FOR HUMANITY'S SAKE"—FAITH IN THE U.N.

Defying logic and reality, Israel's enemies appear determined to utilize the tragic position of the Arab refugees to such an extent that it should serve to undermine Israel's none-too-secure position.

Regrettably, United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold appears to be in so helpless a position that, in his report on his recent Middle Eastern trip, he stated that Arab-Israel tensions remain serious due, in part, to Israel's refusal to cooperate with U.N. armistice machinery. His opinion of Israel-Arab relations was described as "somber" and while he said there is a "will to peace," he stated:

"I am sorry to note that the armistice agreements and armistice machinery are just as much under a cloud as they have been in the past few years. The mixed armistice commissions are not functioning in the way they should function. One of the parties (Israel) does not participate, and there are also other elements which are unsatisfactory in the picture."

Why is Israel not cooperating with some of the U.N. commissions? The U.N. Secretary General could not offer explanations, and he probably would not, as it would have opened up another controversy. But there were occasions when mixed armistice commission decisions were so prejudicial to Israel that it would have been suicidal to continue to cooperate with biased functionaries. On at least two occasions, Commission members returned to their countries and wrote books in which they revealed their antagonism to Israel. Under such conditions, the Israelis felt compelled to withdraw.

"There are also other elements which are unsatisfactory—in the picture," Hammarskjold said. Of course there are such elements. Israel had offered a plan of action to solve the Arab refugee problem, which is the major stumbling block to peace and cooperation. But the Arabs are adamant in their determination to use the refugees as a weapon against Israel, and they therefore refuse to abandon the weapon by solving the refugees' plight.

In an editorial on "Mr. Hammarskjold's Travels," the New York Times indicated that "what is mainly wrong in a large general way, as everybody knows, is that the Arab states have not yet accepted the continued existence of Israel, and that in spite of the U.N. emergency force some border troubles still occur." The Times editorial proceeded to state:

"A solution might be had if the problem of some 900,000 Arab refugees could be equitably solved. Israel has promised to take back a few of these refugees and to compensate those of the remainder who once had land in what is now Israeli territory. Since half of the refugees are under 16 years of age, it is clear that many of them never lived in Israel, or lived there only as very young children. But the Arabs have rejected an Israeli offer made at last fall's session of the General Assembly. The refugees continue to need aid from the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine. They subsist on a total of about $25 a year per capita, of which we pay about 70 percent, Britain about 20 percent, and Russia nothing.

"The UNRWA's mandate expires in 1960. The United States is on record in favor of some more satisfactory means of dealing with the refugee problem than the mere continuance of the present system. Our spokesmen have not spelled out what they really mean.

"It is Mr. Hammarskjold's exacting task to come up with some proposal, or some new facts, that will not irritate anybody concerned. For humanity's sake we must wish him luck."

The wish "for humanity's sake" should be shared by all responsible people. But there are too many irresponsible elements standing in the way of peace and genuine cooperation to assure a speedy solution in the Middle Eastern problem. On top of it, to refer again to the New York Times editorial, "our spokesmen have not spelled out what they really mean."

Instead of improving, the situation appears to be getting worse. Its aggravation has made Mr. Hammarskjold's position more difficult. It is to be hoped that faith placed in the U.N. and in the leaders among its members will not prove fruitless—for humanity sake.

## Madison County, Ark., Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE**
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the youth of this Nation are its greatest asset. We hear this statement repeated often. Unfortunately, it is not always accompanied by concrete recommendations to assist our youth in realizing their great potential.

For this reason, I take great pride in calling the attention of my colleagues to the work of a group in Madison County, in the district which I am honored to represent. They know that their young people are their county's greatest resource. But they have gone one step further and are doing something positive and effective about it.

Madison County is participating in the Arkansas rural development program. Soon after organization of the work, a committee on youth opportunities was formed to develop and spearhead new programs that would serve young people.

The group faced formidable problems. There were few, if any, opportunities for

training in industrial skills; a large number of school dropouts; and lack of supervised entertainment, among other problems.

In the face of many obstacles, the Madison County Youth Committee moved forward. Working with such agencies as the extension service, school board, and county government, they prepared a detailed, long-range plan of operation. Some of their objectives, I am happy to report, have already been reached after only a few short months of operation. A pilot program of career counseling was introduced in the schools. A youth center has been established in the county. Job development for young people has become a countywide campaign.

I congratulate the people of Madison County on their determination to help young people in the area meet the challenges of the future. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the plan prepared by the youth committee in the county:

OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH, MADISON COUNTY, ARK.

This program is being developed by the Madison County Rural Development subcommittee on youth opportunities. Its purpose is to serve as a guide in initiating greater opportunities for the youth of Madison County.

SITUATION

Madison County is completely rural with approximately 70 percent of its area in forest land. There are approximately 9,000 people in the county, and approximately one-third of these are under 20 years of age. The major source of income is from agriculture, in which the opportunities for young people are rather limited.

Madison County has three high schools. Two of the schools offer vocational agriculture and home economics training. One offers some special work in chemistry and one offers trades and industry training. All three high schools offer courses in typing and shorthand.

Approximately 110 students graduate from high school each year. Approximately 85 percent of these leave the county and 45 percent leave the State after graduation. Of the approximate 200 students that enter the first grade, 40 percent drop out before graduating from high school. There is no record of where the dropouts go to or what they are doing for employment and use of their time. All indications point to the fact that most of these leave the county for employment after they have reached the age for employment.

In connection with the use of leisure time or recreation and entertainment phase of this program, the opportunities for fishing and outings are good. Play grounds, including ball parks, tennis courts, golf courses, etc. are rather limited or nonexistant. No amusement parks are available. No up-to-date swimming holes are available. No supervised recreation and entertainment for the youth is available. Movies are available three times weekly. There are no recreation facilities for private clubs or groups.

Far too few high school graduates attend higher educational institutions.

PROBLEMS

1. Need of supervised recreation and entertainment.
2. Need for a safe and sanitary swimming hole.
3. Need for organized intramural sports, with competition between classes and schools during school terms.
4. Need for organized sports activities.
5. Need for training young people in trades and industry.
6. Need for counseling in the high schools.
7. Need for career days in the high schools.
8. Need for creating atmosphere to make the youth want to be counseled and guided.
9. Need for listing graduates according to their capabilities with the employment office.
10. Need for more youth to take advantage of FFA, FHA, 4-H, and Boy and Girl Scout work.
11. Need for creating more jobs and employing more young people locally.
12. Need for more high school graduates to take advantage of higher educational institutions.

OBJECTIVES

The youth of today are the citizens of tomorrow. The future of Madison County is dependent on its youth. It is all important that we (1) create situations whereby the youth can be developed into strong young men and women to shoulder responsibility of the county for the future; (2) help them to help themselves; (3) lead the youth to take the right road for a better chance of happiness and financial security; (4) help the youth to make a life as well as to make a living.

GOALS

1. To establish a youth center.
2. Create intramural sport competition between classes and between schools.
3. Develop the sidewalk swimming hole.
4. Establish career sections in each high school library.
5. To have career days in each high school.
6. List high school graduates according to capabilities with employment agencies.
7. Establish counseling services in the high schools.
8. Double the number of graduates attending higher educational institutions.
9. Encourage job opportunities for youth in the county that keeps them in county.
10. Make it convenient for the youth to take advantage of trades and industry training.
11. Conduct first aid and swimming classes. (Including water safety.)

WORK PLAN

This program involves the Agricultural Extension Service; the public school, and particularly the vocational agriculture and home economics departments in the high schools; PTA; the churches; the county and city government; local, civic, and social, and service organizations; the county rural development committee and particularly the youth opportunities subcommittee and education subcommittee.

Primary responsibility for planning and carrying out the program will be at the county level by the rural development subcommittee on youth opportunities. Representatives of all agencies and organizations in the county, State, and on the Federal level, will upon request, provide advisory service, help develop plans, and give on-the-ground assistance when necessary.

1. The subcommittee will meet when necessary to make plans to carry out each goal that is listed.
2. Members of the committee will be assigned to various tasks in working out these plans.
3. Contacts will be made with possible sponsoring agencies in the county.
4. Trips will be made to observe ways and means of carrying out various projects.
5. Information for establishing career libraries will be sought through various Government departments, insurance companies, as well as business and manufacturing companies.
6. Encouragement will be given to setting up counseling services in the schools.
7. Contacts will be made with national organizations such as the National Recreation Association, American Campers Association, and civic organizations in seeking guidance information.
8. Contacts will be made through the county, State rural development committee, etc. in an attempt to get a trade school established for the convenience of Madison County youth.
9. Encouragement will be given to all youth to take advantage of 4-H, FFA, FHA, and scout work.
10. Schools will be encouraged to list graduates according to capabilities with the employment service.
11. Encouragement will be given to the youth to attend higher educational institutions.
12. Seek means of financing youth by loan or scholarship to do higher education.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. Conducted youth opportunities survey.
2. Established Madison County Youth Center.
3. Established career sections in the three high school libraries.
4. Completed water safety class of 25 students.
5. Started counseling on small scale in two high schools.

## Labor, Management—Both Must Fight Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Pilot on February 28, 1959:

LABOR, MANAGEMENT—BOTH MUST FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Msgr. George G. Higgins)

The U.S. Government officially reported that unemployment rose to 4,724,000 during the month of January, an increase of 616,000 over December and the largest January total since 1941.

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, issued a public statement on these official unemployment statistics. He pointed out that the January total of 4,724,000 "indicates clearly that joblessness is still America's No. 1 problem, in spite of other signs that we are pulling out of this recession," and warned, in conclusion, "that the persistence and seriousness of the unemployment situation cannot take a back seat to any other issue."

Columnist David Lawrence also commented on the subject of unemployment. In the opening paragraph of his syndicated column for February 10, Mr. Lawrence said "that the paradox of continuing unemployment on a large scale during a period of steadily progressing recovery is something that should begin to worry the labor leaders of America. It already has produced anxiety among many businessmen."

On the face of it, this statement would seem to mean that, in Mr. Lawrence's opinion, labor leaders (in contrast to many businessmen) are not at all worried about unemployment. Frankly, however, I seriously doubt that that is what Mr. Lawrence really intended to say, for it is perfectly obvious to anyone who even casually scans the headlines of the daily press that labor leaders, by and large, have been seriously worried about unemployment for many months.

I take it, then, that what Mr. Lawrence really meant to say in the opening paragraph of his column for February 10 was not that labor leaders are unconcerned about unemployment, but rather that they are unwilling to admit that they and they alone are responsible for unemployment.

"The latest figures show," Mr. Lawrence wrote, "that perhaps labor is pricing itself out of the market and that laborsaving machinery is being forced on industry at an unprecedented rate." This, then, is the problem—the problem of labor's alleged responsibility for unemployment—about which labor leaders, in the opinion of Mr. Lawrence, "should begin to worry."

Mr. Lawrence has a good point there, as far as it goes, but I wonder if it really goes far enough. He is definitely on the side of the angels when he says that labor leaders ought to be concerned about the impact of their wage decisions on employment levels, but he should have hastened to add that businessmen ought to be equally concerned about the impact of their price and profit decisions on the economy as a whole.

The chances are that management and labor are more or less equally worried about unemployment. Moreover, it is clear that they are mutual partners in a common enterprise and that they share a great number of interrelated problems and responsibilities. The trouble is, however, that they have no way of getting together at the present time even to discuss these mutual problems and responsibilities.

It seems to me that instead of pinning the blame for unemployment and/or inflation on either labor or management, all of us, including Mr. Lawrence, would be better advised to encourage them to come together periodically in a national labor management assembly for the express purpose of solving (instead of merely worrying about) the problems of unemployment and inflation and the many related problems for which they are, to a large extent, jointly responsible and which they must somehow or other jointly resolve.

## The Late Representative Daniel A. Reed Who Served Our Nation Long and Faithfully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Representative Daniel A. Reed was a direct descendant of John and Priscilla Alden.

In everything that he said or did, he lived up to this inspiring heritage.

He was independent, courageous, and possessed of an integrity that was eternal.

His constituents had a high regard for his ability and his conscience. From the time he was first elected to Congress in 1918, he served continuously over a period of 40 years until death terminated his career at the age of 83.

As the dean of the Republican membership in this House, and as an outstanding expert in the complex and difficult field of taxation, he had established a reputation as guardian of the public purse that won the respect of all his colleagues.

There were times when his opinions represented the minority viewpoint within his own party, but even then, no one dared to contest Dan Reed on the facts. With his encyclopedic knowledge as a veteran member of the Ways and Means Committee, he was more than a match for any Representative who had only given 10 or 20 or 30 years of intensive study to the subject that Dan knew inside and out.

We shall always treasure the memory of his patriotism that was summed up during the debate on his bill to increase tariff protection for those American industries in need of it. In reply to an opponent of his bill, he said: "As long as I stand on the floor of Congress, I shall fight for my own country first, last and always."

That he did, with sincerity and wholehearted devotion during his long and honorable career, and right up to the end.

To his widow, Georgia, to his son, William T., and to his grandchild and to his great grandchildren, we extend our sympathy.

He has bequeated to them the greatest heritage of all, because Representative Daniel Alden Reed gave his best in the service of the United States and its people.

## Women's Role in Advancing the Ideals of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 19, 1959, at the 30th Anniversary Brotherhood Dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, held in Washington, D.C., Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle was presented the conference's brotherhood award for outstanding achievement.

Mrs. Doyle, the wife of Dean Doyle, is one of the truly great citizens of our Nation's Capital and of our country. She has devoted her life to the advancement of all that is good in our society, promoting mutual understanding and helping to make the Nation's Capital a better community, a better neighborhood, and a better place in which the Nation's Government can conduct its role of national guidance and leadership.

It was most fitting that the audience of over 1,000 persons who gathered to witness the presentation of the conference's brotherhood award to Mrs. Doyle included Members of Congress, the Supreme Court, the President's Cabinet, Ambassadors, and other representatives of many foreign nations, and numerous leaders of our country in many walks of life.

Mrs. Doyle accepted the conference's brotherhood award with the characteristic humility of one who is truly elevated in spirit. She expressed her feeling that the many tributes to her are colored with generosity, and even with charity, and said that she accepted the award as a symbol of what women have achieved and can achieve in advancing the ideals of brotherhood.

Her brief remarks on the special role of women in advancing these ideals were Lincolnesque in their simplicity, felicity of expression, and perception. I was deeply moved by her emphasis on women's opportunities in teaching children the meaning of human dignity, and in exemplifying the spirit of sympathy and understanding, patience, steadfastness, and prayer. I believe they will be of interest to every Member of Congress and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I, therefore, request unanimous consent to insert her remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF MRS. HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE IN ACCEPTING THE BROTHERHOOD AWARD OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON FEBRUARY 19, 1959

What are the special ways in which women can help to advance understanding among the religions, races, and cultures of the world? There two, I think.

First, in teaching little children. Women, as mothers and teachers of the very small child, have practically exclusive jurisdiction in this field. Children are born without prejudices, as we all know, but to keep them that way is something else again. This is a constant everyday task, not accomplished by lessons, but rather through creating an atmosphere in the home or nursery school where the common denominators of love, laughter, play, and comradeship are emphasized.

Whether rich or poor, whether quick or not so quick, whether black or white, whether Christian or Jew, each little one has his dignity, and at the first sign of belittlement, for any reason, a woman, mother or teacher, has the opportunity to say just the right word, and just when it is needed.

And how we must keep at it. Our actions, our words, our attitudes with little children will help them to remain on the broad highway of tolerance, rather than to lose their way in the mean, narrow, murky, byways of intolerance.

Second, we women can, I think, make a contribution to brotherhood by our example as women. From babyhood we women have been told that we must always give a good example. Human frailty being what it is, we don't always do so. But within us all, I think, is a feeling of responsibility to do our part in our own way to help our fellow man by exemplifying the characteristics that are usually identified with womanliness. Among these, I would include:

(a) Sympathy and understanding: Women have made their greatest contributions in the teaching and nursing professions, both of which call for understanding and sympathy in a high degree. We, as women, can strive always to understand those who seem different, who look different, whose background is different, and in our own way get through the barriers of religion or nationality. We can try, too, to understand those who today resist social change. The human wall of resistance to social improvement must have many chinks and already some rays of understanding seem to be filtering through.

(b) Patience: We must have patience and not despair as we watch the slow and stumbling feet of progress. We women know full well how slow any social change is, as we tread our way toward professional achievement in this world—which is still a man's

world in spite of the nearly 40 years that have elapsed since the passage of the 19th amendment to the Constitution granting women the right to vote.

(c) Steadfastness is a thoughtful approach to the goal of brotherhood, not to be swayed by hysteria or panic. We have all been revolted by pictures in the papers or on television that have shown the faces of men and women distorted by snarling hatred just because they were looking at human beings of another race or religion. It is bad enough to see the face of a man so marked with unreasoning hatred, but a woman's face twisted into loathing because of her deep-seated intolerance seems to me to be a degradation of the human race.

(d) Prayer: My own conviction is that brotherhood will be achieved through the efforts of individuals who are morally and spiritually motivated. Because I believe this, I believe that every woman in her own way should consciously pray for understanding among peoples.

We women have learned the comfort of prayer in our moments of loneliness: having a baby is a lonely business, even with a devoted husband close by; a sick baby at night is terrifyingly lonely; and the traditional loneliness of women when their loved ones are at war has always inspired them to ask for help from God.

In all humility, then, I accept this award as a tribute to women's efforts toward brotherhood. I hope that by our guidance of small children; by understanding, by patience, by example, by prayer, we, as women, can help push this turbulent world of ours a little further onward toward God's precept: "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

## Russia's Hostility Toward Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit, Mich., Jewish News of December 19, 1958, carried an article by its distinguished editor and publisher, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, entitled "Russia's Hostility Toward Israel."

That excellent article chronicled how the Russian Communist dictatorship is no different in its attitude toward Jews and minority groups than was the vicious anti-semitism practiced by the Nazis under Hitler.

I think the insight into this matter is well worth consideration and will help thinking Americans to realize the real nature of the enemy all freemen face:

RUSSIA'S HOSTILITY TOWARD ISRAEL

Multiplication of tensions between East and West continues to throw additional light on the sad status of Russian Jewry and on the increasing unfriendliness on the part of the Communist rulers toward Israel and the Jewish state's supporters.

One of the latest manifestations of hostility on the part of Russia is contained in a new Soviet-published book, by two authors, one of them Jewish, under the title "The State of Israel, Its Position and Its Policy." It is revealed by Kol Israel, the Israeli radio, that this book completely disregards the fact that Russia was among the countries at the U.N. which supported the 1947 resolution calling for the creation of the State of Israel. Similarly, all mention is omitted of the Russian declarations during 1947 and 1948 about the moral duty of the world to provide the remnants of European Jewry with a national home in Palestine.

This revelation is minor compared with other reports, from United Nations and other sources, which indicate that the anti-Jewish campaign has been intensified in Russia. Marop Rossi, the U.N. correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, states that "news that Jews in the U.S.S.R. were being persecuted could not be hidden from the outside world"; that the Kremlin has set up a special propaganda office to deal with the Jewish question; that through this new office the Communist rulers have undertaken a vast campaign at home in order to destroy Jewish nationalism and that this campaign at the moment is aimed at defaming Israel and disrupting Soviet Jewry as a people.

Soviet Jewish tourists to Israel were enlisted, upon their return to Russia, to address compulsory mass meetings at which they spoke with antagonism of Israel. According to Rossi, "members of the Moscow Synagogue were made to sign spontaneous letters to the chief rabbinate in Jerusalem requesting that Israeli representatives should not appear in the synagogue since their behavior is unbecoming and they violate the Sabbath."

While this reveals a grave situation, some reports state that the new actions of U.S.S.R. leaders serve to inspire new interest in Israel among Russians. But that's small consolation in view of the dangers that are being imposed upon Russian Jews by their masters.

In a signed article in the New York Times, Harrison E. Salisbury, who, by virtue of his experiences in Russia as a correspondent for his newspaper, is looked upon as a well-informed person on occurrences behind the Iron Curtain, stated that "the Jews are 21 times worse off in regard to facilities for worship than the Baptists and 13 times more poorly provided for than Russian Orthodox believers. He pointed out that "no Hebrew Bible has been permitted in Russia since 1917," that "the Jews have been permitted only to issue a photocopy edition of a handwritten calendar," that while Orthodox, Baptists, and Moslems are permitted to have nationwide organizations to represent their religious and lay communities "similar organization for the Jews is forbidden."

Such is the status of Jews in Russia about whom Milt Freudenheim wrote to the Chicago Daily News from the United Nations that "a new crisis for the estimated 3 million Jews living in the Soviet Union is expected in a few weeks when the first Soviet census since 1939 is slated," and he adds: "Soviet Jews have been required to state their nationality as Jewish on identity cards which (since 1948) have singled them out for discrimination in jobs, schools, and the Communist Party."

Communist tactics on the world scene are disturbing enough to make the democratic world suspicious of everything that emanates from the Kremlin. But the Russian anti-Semitic tactics are much more shocking. They represent a reversion to medievalism and are indications of an inheritance from czarism that even many extreme leftists have been unable to shake off.

What the Russian Communists are doing today is merely a reenactment of Nazi tactics. Russian identity cards carried by Jews must carry the designation "Yevrei"—"Jew." That is how the clock is being turned back, and the yellow badge is being reinstituted in another form.

In a study made by Moshe Decter for the ADL of the position of Soviet Jews under Khrushchev, we learned that accomplishments by Jews were kept from the record of the Soviet regime's achievements in the past 40 years, and that there was deliberate concealment of facts about Jewish attainments. One of the revealing facts is that in listing the publications in 124 languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union as well as of foreign countries, Yiddish was omitted and was not considered even as deserving as "Tat," the language of a small Daghestan tribe, which boasted the publication of a single item in 1956 with a circulation of 1,000 copies. Of course, no Yiddish work has been published in the U.S.S.R. since 1948. But in 1913, literally hundreds of Jewish publications appeared in Yiddish (and Hebrew), for it was the springtide of the Jewish cultural renascence in Russia."

It is a matter of record that in the early days of Bolshevism, and even now, some Jewish writers, especially Sholem Aleichem and J. L. Peretz, were among the heroes in the Russian literary spheres, and Yiddish was encouraged. But Yiddish newspapers now are banned, anything related to Jews and to Jewry is taboo, and the only explanation for the newest actions is anti-Semitism.

Evidence of Soviet anti-Semitism is mounting. Decter reveals the existence of "a tacit quota system for Jewish students in Soviet universities and advanced technical and academic institutes." Also, "for more than a year now, official Soviet newspapers and periodicals have been regularly publishing fictionalized articles of an unmistakable anti-Semitic nature."

What better proof of the latter point than the missionary and self-hating expressions in the Nobel Prize winning novel "Doctor Zhivago," by its author, Boris Pasternak, a Jew who was converted to the Greek Orthodox faith—Boris Pasternak who now is himself the victim of Soviet persecution?

This is an almost insoluble problem—for the present, at least—in the midst of a world crisis which has not yet reached its peak. As long as the world East-West tensions continue—and the West Berlin situation points to a prolongation rather than a speedy solution of the problem—the position of Russian Jewry, and the issues emanating from Soviet hostility toward Israel, will remain very grave. All of it is part of the threat to the peace of the world, for which the U.S.S.R. must be held responsible.

## Dedication of New Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following introduction by Justice Gerald Nolan and the invocation by the Right Reverend James Pernette DeWolfe made at the dedication ceremonies of the New Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, N.Y., on January 5, 1959:

Presiding Justice NOLAN. Judge Keogh, reverend clergy, my distinguished companions who will participate in these ceremonies, my brethren of the bench, bar, ladies and gentlemen, for your chairman of the judges' committee on arrangements I have always had nothing but the highest regard and the warmest affection, and that introduction has not changed my mind one iota.

I have known him for many years as an able and distinguished judge, but it was not until he was gracious enough to send me a few days ago a copy of this program that I also discovered that he is a great executive and a diplomat of the highest order.

Somewhere, somehow, and I cannot imagine how or where, Judge Keogh has discovered that elderly judges, if given their heads, on occasions like this are apt to wax oratorical. In other words, they speak too much and too long.

With that thought in mind, I am quite sure, he wrote me a very short but very pointed letter enclosing the program of the day. He suggested very tactfully that he agreed with my opinion that brevity should be the order of the occasion.

He suggested, quite frankly again, that my introduction should be short and to the point. It was not until I examined the program carefully that I appreciated to the full the extent of this man's executive ability, because I found out when I looked at the program that without the aid of any suggestion or instruction from Judge Keogh that what had been suggested in the letter had been accomplished when the program had been arranged, because the function of your presiding justice is clearly defined: He is to preside and not to talk.

I have only one reseravtion and that is to bring to Judge Keogh and his associates a very brief message from our court, and all of the judges of the appellate division bring today, of course, their congratulations and their very best wishes. They have asked me to say to Judge Keogh and his associates that they are very proud to be present on this happy and historic occasion.

And, having delivered that brief message, I shall now without reservation attempt to conduct the ceremonies according to the plans and specifications so ably prepared by your chairman.

It is my first privilege to announce—and it is a privilege because we are all honored by his presence here today—that the invocation will be pronounced by the Right Reverend James Pernette DeWolfe, bishop of the Diocese of Long Island. Bishop DeWolfe.

(All arose during the invocation.)

The Right Reverend JAMES PERNETTE DEWOLFE. Let us pray. Almighty Father, from whom all good things come, grant we beseech Thee Thy blessing upon this building that will be the seat of the supreme court of this State.

May those who sit here in judgment be moved to promote and improve the conditions of society so that they shall make such transactions of man with man liberal, unselfish and brotherly.

Help those who sit here in these chambers and those who plead before the court to set their faces and influence against violated trusts, unhallowed dealing and all injustice. Give them grace to withstand every wrong and to be exponents in the state of truth, justice, and righteousness.

Grant that all who practice here may constantly acknowledge the supremacy of divine justice, so that in all covenants they may seek truth and not victory, and that their own lives may be purified by the divine law and the remembrance of the strict account which they must one day give of every thought, word, and deed before Thy judgment seat.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

## Tribute to the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, many times in the history of its indispensable and patriotic service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, have been the target of vicious attacks by criminal and subversive elements.

Another such campaign of smear and defamation is currently underway.

As long as the American people are vigilant and informed of the facts, this present campaign will meet with no more success than those in the past.

In a recent editorial in the NAM News, published by the National Association of Manufacturers, attention has been ably called to the outstanding work of the FBI and Director Hoover.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the editorial from the NAM News:

BULWARK AGAINST CRIME AND SUBVERSION

The business world in America had long been proud of the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover. This agency is one of the most efficient, well-run, and businesslike agencies in the Government. Time after time Mr. Hoover has been a forerunner in adapting new business techniques to the operations of the FBI. He and his staff are always alert to procedures which will enhance efficiency and morale and reduce costs.

The operating efficiency of the FBI, in fact, could serve as a model not only for other governmental agencies but also for private business firms. In the FBI, as it has operated since Mr. Hoover became Director in 1924, are found the basic factors which make for a successful business operation: excellent administrative control; thrift; good budgetary and accounting procedures; careful planning.

Another important factor is the high morale of the FBI's employees—so important to any successful business. The FBI is famous for its esprit de corps. The term "G men" is synonymous with integrity, initiative, loyalty, bravery and fidelity. Special agents and clerks are all proud of being on the team. This arises, in large measure, from the modern, realistic personnel policies of Mr. Hoover.

The final proof of any business firm's success, however, is the quality of its product—and in this the FBI excels. During fiscal year 1958, for example, of persons brought to trial in FBI cases, 96.8 percent were convicted. This is indeed a great accomplishment, reflecting the high quality of FBI investigations. Moreover, time after time the FBI, from its effective work, actually brings back to the Government more money than is spent for its operations. In fiscal year 1958, for example, the FBI effected over $132 million in savings and recoveries to the Government in comparison with a total of $105,500,000 in direct appropriations approved by the Congress for this agency.

This is a fact of great importance to every taxpayer in the Nation.

Unfortunately, this efficient, business-type organization is today the object of a vicious smear campaign. The purpose is to destroy the effectiveness of the FBI as a bulwark of our internal security.

In the forefront, as could be expected, is the Communist Party. Time after time the party and its press have attacked the FBI. The party knows that it will never have any success until the FBI is destroyed or badly crippled.

It is disconcerting, however, to find the Communist Party aided and abetted in its efforts by other influential elements which profess to deplore communism. In its October 18, 1958, issue, a well-know magazine of the intellectual left devoted an entire issue to a deceitful attack on the FBI by a newspaperman who is notorious as an apologist for Alger Hiss. In this combination of falsehoods, innuendos and misinterpretations designed to mislead the unwary reader, the FBI is falsely charged with just about every possible wrong that can be imagined.

A New York newspaper long noted for its propensity to slant and distort information concerning law enforcement against subversive organizations and individuals also is joining in the attack on Mr. Hoover and the FBI. Under the guise of objective reporting, this newspaper has announced it will publish a series of artiles concerning the FBI and its director. It begins to look as if a concerted campaign is afoot among those who always seem to deplore efforts to deal effectively with subversion and subversives to get J. Edgar Hoover's scalp and curb the activities of the agency he heads.

This has been tried a number of times before with conspiculous lack of success. The effort will fail again if the American people know the truth and are not misled by the sly propaganda of the anti-anti-Communists.

## After 6 Years of Nasser: Promises—and Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 4, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by John Law, which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of December 19, 1958:

AFTER 6 YEARS OF NASSER: PROMISES—AND POVERTY

CAIRO.—Egyptians, in their sixth year of a Nasser dictatorship, are still waiting in vain for the great day promised them by their ruler.

As a matter of fact, most of them are worse off now than they were when Gamal Abdel Nasser took charge.

One of my first impressions upon returning to Egypt after a year's absence is that times are a bit harder now than they were a year ago. There seem to be more beggars in Cairo, and just as many diseased-looking people as ever. The streets look dirtier. Shops are less plentifully stocked.

When I went beyond this surface impression for a closer look, I found this situation:

There were shortages of all kinds. At the time I arrived, there had been no tea available for 3 weeks. Rice, sugar, and coffee were scarce. Coffee was not available even at a coffeehouse I visited.

Kerosene, used by most Egyptians for cooking, was rationed. Razor blades were hard to get. It was impossible to find any brushless shaving cream. There were rows and rows of empty shelves that used to be stocked with cosmetics. A housewife said she went to 10 Cairo drugstores before she found a bottle of ordinary aspirin tablets.

There is a growing scarcity of housing. Private construction of homes and office buildings is now banned by the Government because it wants to force private capital into industry. The Government is building low-cost living units, but not fast enough to meet the needs. About 25,000 units have been built throughout Egypt since Nasser came to power. But Cairo alone needs 30,000 new dwellings every year. More than 65 percent of its people live in slums.

Costs of goods and services are higher than ever. Reliable estimates place the increase in the cost of living since the Suez war in 1956 at anywhere from 20 percent for the poorer people to 35 percent for wealthier Egyptians.

Prices of some staples are fixed low by the Government, but supplies are so limited that people are forced to turn to the black market and pay prices 50 percent above the legal rate. Imported suit material costs more than $25 a yard. An imported nightgown sells for $100.

FROM REDS, POOR GOODS

The country just can't afford to import many of the things it used to, and Egyptian substitutes for the imports—cigarettes, for example—are of poor quality. Because of the shift in trade toward Soviet-bloc countries, the average Egyptian has had to get accustomed to a lot of things he regards as shoddy merchandise.

Take tea, for example. Practically all of Egypt's tea used to come from Ceylon and India. Now most of it comes from Communist China. Egyptians will tell you they don't like the China tea, but there's nothing they can do about it because the Government has a monopoly on tea imports, and buys from China because it is cheaper.

Services are on the downgrade, too, because skilled foreigners are disappearing. Because of Nasser's policy of Egyptianization, thousands of foreign craftsmen who had lived in Egypt all their lives have had to leave the country. Native Egyptians have not yet developed the skill and experience needed to replace the foreigners.

A TIGHTENING SQUEEZE

The overall result is an austere life for most people. What has brought on this austerity is that Nasser has failed to solve age-old problems that he inherited from the ousted King Farouk. Egypt does not grow enough to feed itself, it has little in the way of natural resources, and its population keeps getting bigger and bigger. Consequently, the squeeze on the supply of food and other products keeps getting tighter and tighter.

The road Nasser is now choosing to find his way out of his troubles at home is one of massive industrialization. He dreams of making Egypt the manufacturing center of the Arab world—the supplier of goods for the entire area. With the profits, he hopes to be able to buy abroad the food and other products that his own country needs.

Actually, Nasser has made big strides in raising industrial production, particularly in such fields as fabrics, fertilizers, cement, raw sugar, and electric power. And he could go much faster if he were not manufacturing so much military equipment. But, in some fields, he is building production up way beyond the ability of local consumers to buy, and he may have trouble getting rid of resulting surpluses.

Even the Government-owned National Bank of Egypt, in a recent report, criticized the establishment of a new weaving plant for rayon fabrics and of a spinning mill because marketing is becoming a serious problem. The Bank also said marketing of cement will become a big problem later this year when a new plant brings Egypt's annual capacity to well over 2 million tons.

BROTHERHOOD VERSUS COMPETITION

Economists are asking where Egypt expects to sell the thousands of sewing machines that will be produced annually by a new plant soon to be completed. They point out that, in the sale of most manufactured products, there is intense competition from more experienced producers in the United States, in Europe, and Japan. Nasser, however, is said to be counting on the spirit of Arab brotherhood to prompt his neighbors to buy Egyptian. If they don't, he'll be in trouble.

Nasser is putting Egypt heavily in debt to finance his industrialization program. Already he has borrowed nearly half a billion dollars abroad, not counting what he owes for Soviet-supplied arms. He has been using up his foreign earnings—including income from the Suez Canal—just as fast as they come in.

One reason he is in such a hole is that he isn't getting as much from Iron Curtain countries as he had hoped. Half his exports go to the Communists, but the Reds supply only a quarter of his imports. The result is that Nasser has to turn to Western producers and spend money he can ill afford. One high-ranking Egyptian financier recently described this continued imbalance of trade as untenable for much longer.

The attempt to industrialize has produced a great deal of Government planning and Government control. More than 87 percent of the capital that went into the economy last year was Government capital. The law gives the Government the right to take control of any company in which it holds 25 percent of the shares. A Government license has to be obtained before any new plant can be established.

JOBS FOR NASSER'S PALS

Critics say that Nasser has had a tendency to appoint personal friends—often old army colleagues—to planning and administrative jobs, and the results have not always been happy. They cite examples such as these:

In Liberation Province—an irrigated area of desert that was supposed to be a showplace of what Nasser's Government could do—a citrus-canning plant was built long before the orange trees in the area were old enough to bear fruit.

Numbers of factories were created. They began turning out goods no one could afford to buy. They have now been closed down.

A whole village was built before it occurred to anybody that no water supply was available for it.

One department of the Government has gone ahead with a scheme to establish more than 30 refrigeration depots around the country. But there is no transportation adequate to move imported frozen foods from ports to these depots. And, at present, there are no facilities at the ports to store quantities of food prior to distribution.

WHAT ABOUT LAND REFORM?

The Cairo Government hasn't had much better luck with its farm program—a land-reform system started in Nasser's first year of power as a means of boosting farm production. Actually, only about 10 percent of the land was affected, and yields on this acreage have gone up only slightly.

Great numbers of peasants who received small parcels of land from big estates that were divided up feel that they are not much better off, if at all, than they were as sharecroppers. In those days, they were given tools, fertilizer, and other equipment needed to till the land. Now they have to supply their own. They have to sell their produce at fixed prices.

The Government has no provision for taking care of the peasant-farmer in years of poor harvests. In the old days, landlords might exploit their tenants in good years, but they found it to their own interest to take care of the sharecroppers during lean periods.

Many farmers also find they are unable to cope with the mass of paperwork—filling of production forms, tax forms, etc.—that goes with running a farm. And the former landowners whose land was requisitioned haven't come off well. They were to be paid in 3-percent Government bonds, redeemable in 30 years. Many of them have never received the bonds.

Even if all of Nasser's planning went off without a hitch, chances of raising Egypt's standard of living still would be very poor. The average Egyptian's income is less than $120 a year, and, on the basis of the present outlook, is more likely to go down than up. A United Nations agency has estimated that, if all the schemes ever drawn up by Egypt to raise its standard of living were put in operation, the nation would be no better off in 1975 than it is now.

LITERACY AT A STANDSTILL

As if all these economic problems were not enough, Nasser has had trouble fulfilling other promises of his revolution. Education is a case in point. More than 80 percent of Egyptians were illiterate when Nasser took over—and the percentage has not changed since.

The Government has built thousands of schools and spends as large a percentage of the national income on education as does the United States. Yet it has barely been able to provide enough school facilities for the increased number of children reaching school age each year.

There is accommodation for less than half the children who should be in elementary schools. At the higher levels, education has been available to many more students, but educators say the result has been to lower standards. In Cairo University, as many as 800 students are enrolled in some classes.

In the field of health, there are problems, too. For one example: Out of every four babies born, one dies. Another example: Many hospitals have been built, but there are only 7,000 beds for 300,000 tubercular patients. In the Egyptian countryside, there is only 1 doctor for every 12,000 people.

BRIBES: FOR RICH ONLY

Another of Nasser's problems is official corruption. He cracked down hard when he first came in. Lately corruption has been on the increase. It still isn't as bad as in the days of King Farouk, but it is bad enough to produce such remarks as this from Egyptians:

"The difference between corruption under King Farouk and corruption now is that now you have to go higher and pay more. All that's happened is that bribery has been taken out of the range of the little man's pocket."

Nobody questions Nasser's desire to wipe out corruption, but they say he has a tendency toward cronyism that prompts him to go easy on any revolutionary colleague who may be accused of corrupt practice.

All these problems, still unsolved, are beginning to cause a certain amount of disillusionment. You hear more grumbling than you did a year ago. There is a growing awareness that eloquent speeches and imaginative new laws have not been enough to wipe out old evils. Many improvements exist only on paper.

PRIDE—AND DOUBTS

There are few, if any, signs that the dictatorship is in any serious danger. Nasser's control is quite tight. And Egyptians as a whole admire him for what he has done in international affairs, for the place he has given their country in the world spotlight.

Yet, there are more and more Egyptians who are beginning to wonder if they will ever achieve prosperity as well as self-respect. More and more are pessimistic. Many who once forecast a bright future will now tell you they don't really think things are going to change very much.

There is little room for doubt any more that Nasser's record at home is falling far short of the glowing promises that were made with his rise to power 6 years ago.

## Extinction by Throughway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 2, 1959*

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following article which is a reprint from the Reader's Digest. This is an ably worded article and worthy of serious consideration:

EXTINCTION BY THROUGHWAY: THE FIGHT TO SAVE A TOWN
(By Polly Praeger)

It began inconspicuously—just a brief legal notice in the newspaper announcing a public hearing to be held on January 9, 1957, in regard to the route of a Federal superhighway through Broome County, N.Y. Most people had been too busy with Christmas to see the notice, but a few of us in Hillcrest, a quiet suburb of Binghamton, were among the hundred or so who turned out to listen to the district engineer's technical description of the beautiful expressway that was to cost at least a million dollars a mile.

Hillcrest was not even marked on the map he displayed. When he called for statements from the town of Fenton (in which Hillcrest is located), both our supervisor and the town attorney declared they could say nothing unless they knew where the route was to go in relation to Hillcrest. Clayton Axtell, Jr., our schoolboard attorney, pressed the point: "This hearing is inadequate by law. The route does not deal with specific localities."

Three or four others tried to get specific information on the route. But the district engineer was adamant: "Details cannot be given now. The route could go one way or the other."

Since Hillcrest (population 3,000) is only about a mile long and a half mile wide, a mile could mean the difference between bisecting and by-passing. We left the hearing feeling helpless. "What chance do we have against the State department of public works and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads?"

A lot of Americans are going to feel this same bewilderment and frustration during the next few years, as the huge Federal highway program gets under way. Perhaps our experience, local though it is, may prove useful to others in a similar fix.

At the next meeting of the Hillcrest Community Association I suggested that we write to John W. Johnson, State superintendent of public works, protesting the conduct of the hearing and requesting permission to have a statement from Hillcrest made part of the record. That's how the fight began.

In reply Johnson said: "We would request that you file your statement as soon as possible. The department of public works will attempt to consider such changes in alinement as may be possible, in order to minimize destruction of property and still maintain an economical route for the project."

The State's willingness to restudy the route made us feel that we must do a thorough job of presenting facts in our behalf. An appointment was made for me, as chairman of our community association committee at the public works department's offices in Albany. An assistant deputy engineer spread a large-scale map of Hillcrest before me. The worst rumors we had heard were true. You cannot superimpose a six-lane highway with 4 access roads and 4 traffic circles on an already developed community the size of ours without making mincemeat of it. A more thorough job could hardly have been done, in terms of destroying water wells, taking a third of the new elementary-school property and knocking out over 100 new houses, the loss of which would take at least half a million dollars in assessed valuation from the town tax rolls. There was also an estimated loss of a million dollars in assessed valuation to the board of education.

Worst of all, the community as a community would be destroyed. All available land was developed and displaced people could not move from one section to another. Those who remained would be separated into little islands by the expressway, and they would be faced with a much heavier tax burden.

Next, our committee had a session in the district office in Binghamton. On the map we spotted a line called Alternate A, which bypassed Hillcrest.

"Why can't Alternate A be used?" we asked.

"The State never really considered that, because it is too far from Binghamton," the district engineer explained. "No one would use it."

We studied the two possibilities. We had interviews with civil defense authorities on the location of defense highways (preferably 12 miles outside critical target areas like Binghamton). We had interviews with bankers on increased interest rates and the difficulty of getting mortgages; we held a conference with the director of the Broome County Planning Board; we studied highway law. And ceaselessly we kept Albany and the Washington Bureau of Public Roads and our legislators apprised of what we were doing.

Now the battlefront widened. Every possible group joined with us in a committee that included Rotary and Kiwanis, churches, the American Legion, PTA, town board, board of education, garden clubs. We also organized a subcommittee of prominent engineers who live in Hillcrest and work for such companies as General Electric, Ansco, and Link Aviation.

Not all our local newspaper publicity was favorable; we were accused of delaying progress. But an editorial in the Binghamton Sun summarized my own feeling about the whole problem: Offer of organized citizens of Hillcrest to withdraw their opopsition to the expressway if it can be shown that the alternative they have proposed would be less direct, more expensive, or impractical for any other reason, reflects a genuine regard for the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number. The State agreed to restudy the route and hold an informational meeting at which their decision would be announced to the people of Hillcrest.

Eight hundred citizens gathered to hear the outcome. Hillcrest was still the recommended route—because it would be cheaper than Alternate A by $9,500,000. This because Alternate A would require an additional $5 million bridge, and would entail additional costs to road users which would amount to $4,500,000 over a 20-year period.

Our committee, having had advance notice of the engineers' decision, had prepared a statement in rebuttal. We denied the need of an additional bridge, and we claimed that road users' costs were not properly costs to the taxpayers as such. We thought it only fair, if the State was going to include social costs, that it should also admit all other social and economic costs which would have to be paid by the people of Hillcrest, residents of the town, and the school district. We estimated them in dollars over the 20-year period and found they greatly outweighed users' costs. After reading the statement aloud, I turned to the audience and said, "It is the recommendation of our committee that we continue to seek a genuine consideration of all factors. We will appreciate an expression of your opinion."

Nearly everyone in that huge group stood up and applauded. We had our answer.

The committee decided to secure the services of an impartial expert to assess the validity of our position. Since the issue was not the engineering feasibility of one route over the other but the social and economic costs to the area, we approached Dr. Seymour Z. Mann, professor of political science at Harpur, the State's liberal-arts college in nearby Endicott, who had been active in community and county planning. He refused to accept unless he would be free to draw his own conclusions. To this we agreed.

In a preliminary discussion with the district engineer, Dr. Mann was asked, "How can you deal with these emotional people who run to their elected representatives in Albany and Washington?"

Dr. Mann replied: "If people feel strongly about a problem that requires political action, then they should use all legitimate means at their disposal. It is part of the representative process."

Our State senator, Warren M. Anderson, after attending a meeting of the Hillcrest committee, decided that our objections were valid and arranged a meeting between committee members and Superintendent Johnson in Albany. Dr. Mann's excellent analysis—which upheld our position—was presented at this meeting in May. Johnson ordered the full review we wanted, and the committee rested its case.

From January 9 until late October is a long time when you are waiting to know the fate of your home or community. But on October 20, 1957, came the report, "Hillcrest bypassed," and headlines announced a totally new concept for two major routes. We read for the first time of a proposed common route for several miles through Binghamton and Johnson City of both the expressway and Route 17—the East-West State highway. This confluence was to make the area a transportation crossroads and bring great economic prosperity.

We in Hillcrest will never know how much our stand had to do with the new plan. But what happened in our community almost certainly will occur elsewhere.

A network of superhighways across the face of America will be an empty achievement if it kills democratic processes and ignores long-range community planning. Our experience has convinced me that Congress was wise in providing citizens with the opportunity to be heard on a program that deeply affects so many lives.

---

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

## REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3606 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

# Appendix

## Address by Gov. Sam Houston Jones, of Louisiana, Praising Andre Olivier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS**
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 12 last, in my hometown of St. Martinville, the descendants of the Acadians and many other prominent citizens from throughout the State of Louisiana gave a testimonial banquet for an illustrious gentleman and a scholar, the Honorable Andre Olivier.

Andre, as he is popularly called, is a proud, native son of St. Martinville. A large segment of the original settlers of this second oldest town in Louisiana came directly from France, as did the ancestors of Mr. Olivier. It was natural, therefore, that the French Acadians should settle in this general area when they were banished from Nova Scotia by the British in 1755. Still later more people from France and especially from Paris migrated to St. Martinville during the French Revolution in the 1790's, and it is because of this French background that St. Martinville is frequently referred to as the Little Paris of America. The mass exodus of the Acadians was made immortal by Longfellow's poem, "Evangeline," one of America's great classics. Longfellow's "Evangeline," Emmeline LaBiche in real life, met her long-separated lover under the Evangeline Oak on the banks of the charming Bayou Teche in St. Martinville, and is buried in the rear of the town's ancient Catholic church.

Andre is recognized locally and from far and wide as the official historian of the land of Evangeline. He has devoted a lifetime to the preservation and perpetuation of the culture, traditions, customs and folklore of the Acadians. He is not a man of means, but a good name is better than riches. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the great use of a life is to spend it for something that outlasts it, and such has been the goal of Mr. Andre Olivier.

The principal speaker at the banquet, where Andre's legions of friends met to do him honor, was the former Governor of Louisiana, the Honorable Sam Houston Jones. His address deserves a place in the permanent archives of our history, and for that reason I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to my colleagues as worthwhile reading and useful research material.

Governor Jones' address follows:

When he had reached the age of threescore years and ten my father wrote what has been termed "A History of Beauregard Parish." Strictly speaking it is not a history but a collection of memories and stories of the early pioneers and peoples of that west Louisiana section where both he and I were born. Today, 20 years after his death, that little manuscript is the most prized historical source record in existence treating of that locality.

I have been intrigued by the concluding portion of his treatise when he said:

"If there is anything else you wish to know about old times and oldtimers in this vicinity, see me privately and I will tell you if I know, and if I do not you might see my good colored friend, John Towner, an ex-slave, who is the best informed person now living, as to the pioneers of this country. If neither John nor I can tell you, you will not likely ever secure the information."

And no truer words were ever spoken. Yet there is pathos and sadness in them. For with him, and his contemporaries, died the major portion of the history of my people. No one else had taken the trouble to preserve, or reduce to writing, the history of a frontier civilization occupying a portion of what was once known as the neutral territory. It has been fought over by France and Spain. It had been contended for by the United States and Mexico. Far up in its northern hills one may search and find the crude evidences which mark the first capitol of the Spanish Province of Texas—the Presidio de los Adaes.

And because there were no histories to record the events of those early days, we are left largely to imagination and guesswork and legend as to how people lived, and who did what, and what forces worked to bring the evolution of modern civilization to the frontiersman who lived largely by his gun and his dog and his fishing rod.

And thus, with few exceptions, it has always been. Great civilizations lie buried forever beneath the sands of the Sahara and below the rocky soil of Asia Minor. One of the great mysteries is the disappearance of the glories of the Mayan civilization of the Yucatan and Guatemala, the slaughter of their intellectual aristocracy, and the utter destruction of their once fertile lands.

Only today are we beginning to discover a few of the fragmentary keys to the early history of the Vikings and their unbelievable exploits and travels to the ends of the earth. And what you can say of these you can multiply scores of times over about many civilizations which have risen and flourished and been sunk from history without a trace.

It is one thing to make history. But, for posterity, it is much more important to preserve it. And that points up, not only the wisdom and advisability, but the absolute necessity of historians, and of collectors and preservers of objects and things which give posterity an insight into the ways of life of days gone by. Occasionally fortuitous circumstances will uncover historic relics of priceless value, such as the now famous Dead Sea scrolls. Then once in a thousand years there will come upon the earthly scene an Arnold Toynbee with a searching will and inquisitive mind who can, within limits, assemble and reconstruct the history of a millennium.

I shudder to think what would have been the effect on the Christian church had not the beloved physician, St. Luke, not only taken time to write the Gospel that bears his name, and the Acts of the Apostles, but also to encourage others, including St. Paul, both to collect and assemble, and to write down the historic events of the early New Testament days.

The Roman Empire was far more fortunate than most in the preservation of its far-reaching history. Not only was it blessed with contemporary historians and those who, in the perspective of time, wrote, analyzed, and appraised the vast influence of that civilization on humanity. It had something else equally as important. The Romans built enduring works, wherever they went, that remind us of their way of life. Those works are there today, some preserved and some in ruins—all the way from the British Isles on the west to the borders of Asia on the east—all the way from north Africa on the south to the North Sea on the north. And they are mute, but impressive, testimony of the grandeur and glory of a civilization seldom, if ever, equaled since the beginning of time.

We were more fortunate in America. We began our existence in modern days when it was easier to record and preserve the important events of passing time. But even here we have our examples of the importance of preserving contemporary things. And, again, I shudder to think, how great our loss would have been had not Alexander Hamilton and James Madison and John Jay taken the time to write the "Federalist Papers," which are the key to the political philosophy that gave birth to a new concept of government, and to a new way of life.

Here in the State of Louisiana the job of our forebears was more difficult. This land for decades was a pawn in the hands of the great powers. It was later to be acquired and absorbed by a new nation whose people and language were then strange to your forebears, and whose interest in the then territory of Orleans was more incidental than real. True we had the chronicles of Napoleon and Talleyrand, and the dissertations of Jefferson and the vivid accounts of Robert Livingston, but they were incidental to other areas and other peoples.

The Frenchmen who came to this land were destined to play one of the most brilliant, romantic, and important parts in the genesis of America. They were to merge the fervor of the democracy born in France with the solidity of that which was born of English forebears.

And your ancestors who settled here among the Attakapas were not unlike those other Pilgrims who landed a century and a half before at Plymouth Rock. They both came for reasons now embedded in the basic philosophy of the American people: freedom of religion, the right of democracy, and the opportunity of economic advancement. Your ancestors were to become the connecting link between the two great western democracies, and to help in cementing a friendship which has existed from the time of Lafayette down to this day.

But there had to be those to tell the thrilling stories and to preserve the evidence of the great contributions to be made to America by the great French people, a people who had defeated the tyrants of France, who had torn down the Bastille, and who gave to us the Marsellaise. A people who penned the immortal slogan: "Liberty, equality, and fraternity," and made those words live and have meaning down through the generations to our own time.

There had to be those who could assemble and tell the story of that momentous pil-

grimage of your ancestors from far off Nova Scotia to the land of the Teche. For how else could Longfellow have written his immortal and never-to-be-forgotten words: "Beautiful is the land, with its prairies and forests of fruit trees." And his poetic description of your locale when he wrote:

"Near to the bank of the river, o'er shadowed
by oaks, from whose branches
Garlands of Spanish moss and of mystic
mistletoe flaunted,
Such as the druids cut down with golden
hatchets at yule-tide."

There had to be those who could tell and preserve the heroic exploits of your military heroes, of Beauregard and Mouton and Count de Polignac, and of John A. Lejeune and Claire Chennault; those to record and preserve the distinguished accomplishments of St. Denis, and of the Lemoyne brothers, Iberville and Bienville; of the agriculturists and scientists, like Valcour Aime and Etienne De Bore; of physicians like Chaille and Delery of yellow fever fame, and of Trudeau and Souchon and Matas.

There are always those, of course, to tell of the great public figures such as Pierre Derbigny and Villerie and Roman and Alexandre Mouton; and the illustrious "Cousin" Bob Broussard; somewhat fewer to tell of the respected jurists such as Martin and Prevost and Caillouette and Leblanc, still fewer to tell of the educators and the clergymen; and practically none to tell of the accomplishments of the merchants and traders and architects and financiers.

This grand old State of ours has gone through the most fantastic metamorpheses and revolutions. It has been French and Spanish and British and American. It has lived through success and failure. It has been the richest State in the Union and one of the poorest. It built up a civilization and a culture surpassed by none in the Nation. Yet it fell from its dizzy heights; was ravished and laid waste like a conquered province.

It has lived through wars and floods and disasters and panics and plagues. Yet phoenixlike it has risen again and is now on its way toward becoming economically one of the top 10 States of the Union.

It has a remarkable personality—a remarkable individuality. It defies classification and stands alone as the most unique State of all. It is not typically southern; it is not western. Through a part of the great Mississippi Valley it is not a midcontinent State. It is typically American—yet it is international in its mentality and philosophy.

One of its most unique contributions to American history was the Acadian migration, and the great series of events that momentous pilgrimage set in motion. It has enriched a State and a Nation. It has broadened the concept of a great people. It has immortalized one of the basic tenets of the American dream, freedom of religion.

No man who knows these things can fail to be proud of Louisiana. So far as I know I have not a drop of French blood in my veins. But the story of your people and their historic migration never fails to thrill me, no matter how many times told. The contributions of your people have made of our State a better, finer, and greater State. And the fact that the Latins and Anglo-Saxons of Louisiana, with diverse manners and customs and religions, have been able to live together in peace and harmony and understanding is one of the foremost examples of the success of the American dream.

I think much of our success has been due to the breadth of character of your people, best exemplified by what happened in the third gubernatorial election under the American flag. The time was 1820. The candidates were Thomas Bolling Robertson and Pierre Derbigny. There was a preferential election in which all the voters participated. But the legal election then was by the legislature. Robertson got the highest number of votes at the polls; but Pierre Derbigny's friends were in the majority in the legislature. They were ready to elect Derbigny, and they had a perfect legal right to do so.

But what happened? Pierre Derbigny's representative rose from his seat in the legislature and declared that he had too much respect for the will of the people to wish to be considered as a candidate for Governor, and asked that his friends vote for Robertson. And as Chambers said in his History of Louisiana, "This one act of Derbigny's * * * was more eloquent than all the resources of oratory or the skill in arraying written words could muster."

Derbigny gave up the governorship which was his for the asking, but he won for the French people of Louisiana a position of honor and integrity and leadership that has continued to this day. And, as the historian said: "As a citizen respectful of the people's will, as a believer in the right of the majority to rule, he was a success from the start."

And that is the beginning of the harmony between your people and mine. But be it remembered that the hand of friendship and understanding was first extended by the Frenchman.

But what we know about your people and mine was not given to us by the politicians and the public officials. It was given to us by the historians, by the Gayarres, by the Martins and by the Fortiers. These plodding, meticulous, methodical zealots saw other people make the history, but they wrote it and they passed it on to us, and we are the wiser, not because of those who made the history, but because of those who gathered the facts, recorded them, and passed them on to posterity.

And so, too, the beautiful story of Evangeline came to us from the poets and the historians, from Longfellow and Voorhies, and the others who took the time and the trouble to assemble, compile, record, and preserve those facts and events which have become an inspiration to untold multitudes of people, born many years after the death of those who made our history in those early years.

And there are today those who work on, and spend their lifetimes, that both contemporaries and posterity may know of the glories of the past; that it may not be dissipated with the passing of the years; that it may not be buried beneath the sands of the delta, and lost forever.

Such a man, "the historian of the Teche" and "the guide of the Attakapas country" we honor today. It has been said "that a prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house," but our friend is the exception that proves the rule, as is witnessed by this gathering today.

For more than 30 years this man has devoted his life to the perpetuation of the story of the Acadians. The world has beaten a path to his door, the great as well as the lowly. They have come by the thousands from every State in the Union, from Canada and Mexico, from Europe and Australia, from Japan and China, from Egypt and the Belgian Congo, literally from the four corners of the earth.

His museum, his collections, his knowledge has been shared by governors, by Senators, by great judges, by officials and functionaries of foreign countries, by the Armed Forces, and by the great mass of the American people who want to stand on sacred soil and bask in bright sunshine of history and have their faith restored.

That, my friends, is really the greatest tribute that can be paid to a man, and to the cause for which he works. And in the light of this our efforts to add to what these multitudes have, by their actions, said, seems puny, indeed. Perhaps it has been best said by Colonel Landers, of the historical section of the Army War College, when he said to our friend:

"You are doing more than any other person to make others see your fair land with sympathetic and understanding eyes. It is difficult always to be able to impress the casual and ignorant observer with the significance of a building, a stream, a grave, or a tradition. A pioneer worker must bear the load. In your field you are working with a concentration of romance and history not excelled in beauty anywhere in our country."

To what the colonel has said I could add only this: Our friend is perpetuating for us and American posterity one of the finest and most inspiring events in the Nation's history. He is retelling, with infinite patience and infinite dedication, the great epic of a great people, the inspiring saga of a courageous band of pioneers.

You have many great and illustrious people here in the parish of St. Martin. I imagine most of you would place someone else at the top of your list of distinguished citizens, because of what that person has done, or by reason or the fact that he is making contemporary history. But I say that, viewed in the perspecitve of time, and considering the good that he will do for the education and edification of the multitudes yet unborn, Andre Olivier takes first rank among the residents of your parish.

He has been a useful citizen to his community, his State and the Nation. It is his kind who collect and preserve and disseminate the knowledge and information that influences the direction of peoples and of nations. It is his kind who leave their imprint on the thinking of people for generations to come. And when I think of men like him I am reminded of that poem which I memorized as a boy:

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime:
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

We can rest, in quite assurance, that Andre Olivier's influence will be felt down the generations, and that his footprints will be firmly planted on the sands of time.

I have read and heard it said that Andre Olivier is the descendant of an illustrious nobleman of France. That, and his heritage from Grandpré, go far to explain the greatness of the man and his selfless service. But I think what is more important than the fact of his descent from a nobleman of France, is the fact that he is a noble man himself, and in his own right. And when you honor him you honor all that immortal band of Acadians who gave us the memorable story of Evangeline and its inspiring lesson to Americans everywhere.

## Never Underestimate the Power of a Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as one who never underestimates the truth of the slogan "Never underestimate the power of a woman," I am most pleased that the General Federation of Women's Clubs has embarked upon a nationwide program called passport to safety. The

campaign is well described in the following letter from Mrs. W. J. Jennings, corresponding secretary of the West Orange, N.J., Women's Club. The traffic accident problem is of ever growing concern for all our States, and the federation is to be congratulated for its safety program. Highway safety—attainable through enforcement, education, and engineering—is an area in which the Federal Government should participate in cutting the appalling casualty lists.

I commend Mrs. Jennings' letter to my colleagues' attention:

WEST ORANGE WOMEN'S CLUB,
*West Orange, N.J., February 20, 1959.*

Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
*11th District, New Jersey, Representative, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. ADDONIZIO: The members of the West Orange Women's Club are earnestly concerned about the traffic accident problem in our State and the open disregard for the law demonstrated by so many of our motorists.

Because of this condition, we wish to go on record as endorsing improved driver licensing standards and procedures which will permit on our roads only those who prove themselves competent drivers, who follow the rules of the road, who respect the rights of others, and who thereby earn the privilege to drive.

As a member of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, with 7 million members nationally, we are active in a nationwide program called passport to safety. Our members are emphasizing their concern by signing a ballot for better driving licensing, which is being brought to the attention of our State and public officials.

Action must be prompt and there must be an efficient screening system. Be assured that we stand behind you in your effort to revise our present laws where necessary and to enact every needed additional legislation, as well as to provide adequate funds to achieve a strict, impartial, and realistic licensing program for our State.

We feel that the time has come when each driver must meet definite standards of performance to earn and to retain his driving privilege. We stand ready to give you our active support in your efforts on behalf of better driver licensing.

Very truly yours,

RUTH L. JENNINGS
Mrs. W. J. Jennings,
*Corresponding Secretary.*

## Maryland Voluntary Weather Observers Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce recently issued a special edition of the Weather Bureau's daily weather map in honor of 21 veterans of the nationwide corps of about 7,000 cooperative volunteer weather observers who take and record weather observations every day of the year without compensation.

Among the 21 veteran volunteers—those who have taken weather observations daily for more than 50 years—Maryland is the only State in the Union that can claim two of these distinguished citizens as her sons. And, it happens that the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland is the only congressional district in which two of these honored volunteers reside. I refer to Mr. D. Paul Oswald, of Hagerstown, Md., who has been a weather observer for 57 years, and Mr. Ralph E. Weber, of Oakland, Md., who has served for 56 years.

Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the Weather Bureau, in praising the work of these remarkable senior citizens said that without the daily records of these cooperative observers our knowledge of the climate of the United States would be meager. He added that this weather work is an outstanding example of people serving their Government without pay, and he thought their daily but unsung efforts merited the applause of their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my comments at this point a brief background statement on both Maryland veteran volunteer weather observers which was included in the Weather Bureau citation:

D. Paul Oswald was born March 15, 1886, on the family farm in Chewsville, Md. In May of 1898 his father consented to the establishment of a weather station at his home as a hobby and education for his sons. D. Paul Oswald began sending in weather observations in February 1902. In January 1948 he moved to Hagerstown, Md., where he still makes his daily observations at the weather station called Chewsville-Bridgeport, a combined name of the two stations he has operated. He was recently on the Science Program closed circuit television for Washington County schools, and has for decades provided weather facts to local newspapers and radio stations.

Ralph E. Weber, cooperative observer at Oakland, Md., since September 1903, has the second longest period of service of any present Maryland observer. He was born in March 1887 in Oakland, and has lived all his life on the family farm. Here he makes his daily weather observations, and here he read the lowest surface temperature ever recorded south of the Mason-Dixon line, 40 degrees below zero, on January 13, 1912.

And I want to add my own sincere congratulations and best wishes to these two distinguished gentlemen, on behalf of myself and the entire Nation. Their citation for special merit by the Weather Bureau is a great tribute to their dedicated and unselfish public service. They perform an invaluable and indispensable service to industry, commerce, agriculture, and national defense without fanfare and without sufficient public recognition of their service to the community.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my comments part of a statement released by the Weather Bureau on February 26, 1959, which illustrates the kind of important function that these volunteer observers fulfill:

The help of cooperative weather observers to record the Nation's climate was started early in the last century, even before the Weather Bureau was established in 1891. Dozens of individuals who had been taking observations at scattered locations were urged by the new Weather Bureau to continue, and hundreds of additional citizens in all parts of the country and from all walks of life soon volunteered to make local weather observations and keep records of climatological data. More than 7,000 citizens now are taking weather observations without pay. The Weather Bureau furnishes observation instruments, such as rain gages and thermometers, and also supplies the record forms on which the observations are logged at least once daily. Observers are drawn from all ranks of life, and by their constant and faithful service have made available to all users an invaluable storehouse of weather data.

Each observer gives an average of about 15 minutes a day to take and record the observations, to answer numerous questions from neighbors in the community about the local weather, and to complete and mail the regular monthly reports. It is estimated that the total time contributed by each observer to the Government over a 50-year period amounts to about 600 8-hour workdays. The daily services of the thousands of voluntary observers would add up to about 80,000 full 8-hour days of work each year provided our citizens without cost.

In addition to the basic job of weather reporting, cooperative observers are occasionally invited to perform a wide variety of special reporting jobs. Some of these jobs in recent years include (a) reporting dates of the stages of development of various plants to assist in special agricultural studies, (b) telephoning special reports to designated collection centers to assist research work on the development and forecasting of tornadoes, and (c) reporting on the accuracy of weather forecasts.

I think we can take renewed inspiration from the high-minded and public-spirited contribution to the Nation that is being made every day by Mr. Oswald and Mr. Weber and by the some 7,000 other Americans who make this important contribution to our knowledge of the weather.

## The "Politics" of the Arab Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include for the interest and information of my colleagues, and others interested in a solution to the emotion-packed Arab refugee problem, an article entitled "Political Ambitions Above Human Needs."

This article appears in the 1959 winter-spring issue of a magazine entitled "Prevent World War III." It is published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

The article exposes the tactics of some Arab leaders in blocking an equitable and just solution of the Arab refugee problem to further their own political ambitions.

Another pertinent article on the Aswan Dam appears in this issue of the magazine and in the very near future I plan to insert the full text of this article for the perusal of those interested in this matter.

The aforementioned article follows:

POLITICAL AMBITIONS ABOVE HUMAN NEEDS

Ten years ago thousands of Arabs streamed out of Israel pushed on by the propaganda and threats of the Arab States which were attacking the Israelis. Thus, the Arab refugees problem was born. It is a tragedy which continues to plague the conscience of all men of good will.

The Arabs who found themselves part of the mass exodus were promised many things by the leaders of the Arab aggression. They soon found out that it was all a mirage, as they were left stranded in conditions of extreme destitution.

The plight of the Arab refugees has not been ignored by the United Nations. Through the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine (UNRWA) hundreds of thousands of refugees have been shielded from the horror of starvation. Each year a relatively handful of UN member states contribute financial aid to the operations of UNRWA. It is estimated that 70 percent of UNRWA's budget is made up of U.S. funds which have averaged about $22 million for the last 2 years.

While immediate relief is of the utmost necessity, its perpetuation indefinitely would doom the refugees to a life of stagnation. It is not as though there is no way out of this dilemma. Indeed, there are excellent and practical plans to rehabilitate these people so that they can make a positive contribution to the overall development of the Middle East.

There are many areas in the Middle East that could easily absorb the majority of these people and benefit from their labors. One would think that the Arab governments would be first to support these plans which would be a boon to their economies. Yet, it is precisely the Arab States which have shown an uncompromising hostility to every reasonable project.

It is a shocking fact—perhaps little known to most people including the refugees themselves—that the Arab States do not contribute 1 cent to UNRWA. On the contrary, the Arab States try to discredit and sabotage the workings of this United Nations agency which was specifically created to help the refugees. For example, in UNRWA's latest report, made by Mr. Leslie J. Carver, acting director of the UN agency, it is revealed that operations have been hampered by the continued withholding of permits to allow his international staff to enter the Gaza strip. The strip contains many Arab refugees, but their welfare is at the mercy of the Nasser regime which controls it and is responsible for the impeding of UNRWA's operations there.

The report discloses that redtape and restrictive regulations on the transport of relief goods between Lebanon, Jordan and the United Arab Republic have not only caused inexcusable delay but also an extra cost of more than $650,000. As reported by the New York Times (Oct. 23, 1958): "The acting director said no critical situation had arisen, but he maintained that the incidents constituted a challenge to the principles governing the operations of the United Nations agency and on occasion had hindered its effective functioning."

One would think that the objectivity of the report, its concern for the welfare of the refugees, and its plea for further financial help would evoke a measure of sympathy from the Arab leaders. The contrary seems to be the case. Indeed, in the United Arab Republic the report is derided. Radio Cairo seems almost gleeful when it noted that attempts to reabsorb the refugees in the economic life of the Middle East had not achieved any success. After sneering at UNRWA's efforts, the broadcast states: "Any attempt to limit the refugee problem to economic or social aspects is bound to have a hollow basis and can never attain any practical and useful results." And why not? What is more practical and useful than to afford these people the opportunity to participate in productive labor, to contribute to the building of the Arab countries, and to renew their spiritual and cultural lives? Radio Cairo evades this challenge by pretending that the refugee problem is "political."

Unquestionably a lasting solution of the refugee problem is tied up with the prospects for a political settlement in the Middle East. But such a settlement, if it is to bring peace and stability, must be on the basis of mutual respect for the sovereignty of all Arab States and Israel. This is exactly what the present Arab leadership wishes to avoid at all costs. To them, political settlement of the refugee problem is equivalent to the destruction of the State of Israel. This was emphasized by the U.N. spokesman for Saudi Arabia, Ahmed Shukairy. Mr. Shukairy bluntly told the U.N. Committee on Refugees that the U.N. had failed in its responsibilities toward the refugees. Therefore, he said, the only alternative was for "unilateral sanctions to be taken against Israel." These sanctions, he cried, would bring Israel "on her knees." To make clear what he meant by sanctions, Shukairy warned: "We are on the march, drawing nearer and nearer to our goals. All the fortresses left behind the retreating forces of imperialism are falling, one after the other, and Zionism is no exception.

"It shall surrender too, and the refugees shall return to their homeland and their homeland shall return to them."

This is not the first time that Shukairy has sounded the war cry against Israel and the West in the United Nations; but, beyond and above the attitude toward Israel, the so-called political solution, as defined by Mr. Shukairy, is nothing more than a plot to launch war in the Midle East with all its dire consequences for world peace. In the No. 51 issue of Prevent World War III we published an analysis entitled "The Tragedy of the Arab Refugees." The conclusion of the article deserves repeating: "From the foregoing it should be obvious that the Arab refugee problem is capable of solution provided that there is a sincere desire on the part of all concerned to reach agreement. But what shall we say when some who claim to speak for the refugees refuse to sit at the conference table and prefer to dedicate statues of soldiers pointing machineguns toward Israel? Only the combined efforts and good will of Arabs and Jews can put an end to this tragedy. The Israeli have always expressed a willingness to help in untangling this complex problem. It is clearly up to the Arab governments to show a similar attitude by word and by deed and to renounce the policy of exploiting these unfortunate people as pawns in their efforts to prevent peace in the Middle East."

The more we study the refugee problem the more we are convinced that the chief victims of the Arab invasion of Israel in 1948 turned out to be the Arabs who were induced to leave. They will remain the chief victims as long as Mr. Shukairy and his mentors continue to exploit their misery in the interest of selfish ambitions.

---

## Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute on the second anniversary of the independence of Ghana, March 6, the Prime Minister, His Excellency Kwame Nkrumah, and the country's Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Daniel Chapman. There is added pride for us in the United States of America in the 2-year accomplishments of Ghana coast and more particularly to the command post of present-day Ghana. Although Ghana's population is little more than 5 million, inhabiting roughly only 91,843 square miles, its richness and its people have figured most prominently in the direction of the modern world. From the 15th century to the present, Ghana's gold or cocoa or bauxite or people have enriched the coffers of others. Ghana's gold and her human resources, beginning in the 16th century, laid the foundation of, first, the Portuguese, later the Dutch, English, Swedes, Danes, and still later the American economy. The influence of the Guinea coast and its impact upon America is seen every day in virtually one-tenth of the population of this great country. Add today to Ghana's continuing contribution of mineral resources and cocoa, and the impact of her descendants throughout the West, and a new story of Ghana's influence begins to unfold. In the span of 2 years Ghana has hostessed two major conferences where convened representatives from all parts of Africa in an effort to light the torch of liberation throughout Africa. Moreover, the leadership, the solidarity, the consciousness of the combined strength of all Africans for continent welfare and international peace has been asserted with such force that the whole universe world may experience the constructive impact of this small country a disordered world.

During Mr. Nkrumah's recent tour of India, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, the chancellor of Delhi University, when presenting the scroll of the university said:

I wish to assure you that you have our full support and sympathy in our attempts to build up a new United States of Africa.

To which Dr. Nkrumah responded:

Since Ghana became independent we have grown increasingly conscious that the responsibility for determining our own evolution as a community rests fully on our own shoulders. We are particularly aware of the need to develop our physical, intellectual, and spiritual resources in such a way that the contribution made by our generation and by our country is for the general progress of mankind.

We believe this contribution must be not only distinctly African in character but also international in its approach.

In an address to the Indian Council of World Affairs, Dr. Nkrumah said he had doubt that Africa would involve forms of government rather different from the traditional western pattern but no less democratic in their protection of the individual and his inalienable right.

To the criticism that Ghana has not proceeded in precisely the same way as old Western democracies, the Prime Minister informed the Indians that: "First, Ghana society is by its own form and tradition fundamentally democratic in character." And, he explained, that in time their present form of parliamentary democracy may be expected to conform more closely to their own national and traditional methods of government.

To the criticism by a section of the western press for so-called undemocratic methods Nkrumah retorted:

It would have been more helpful in creating better understanding if these critics had first carefully considered the reality of the situation. As a new and young Government, our first responsibility has been to preserve independence and the security of our state.

Commenting on the African liberalism movement and Ghana's role in it, Nkrumah explained that never before had so many African leaders from all parts of the continent come together to find a solution for their common problems as assembled in Accra when political and trade union leaders met there recently. And, he added, that the process for the total liberation of Africa has begun; the union of Ghana and Guinea, representing the first step along the momentous road toward African union. In this regard, the Prime Minister concluded:

We realize that our union may involve many difficult issues but the basic and decisive fact is that we are determined in spirit and endeavor to unite in order to form the nucleus for a union of African states or republics.

The recent meeting of Nkrumah with Indian leaders has added significance for it symbolizes the realization of Asian and African struggle for a common cause. It denotes a breaking through of African nationalism and a seeking of unity and solidarity with others for international good will. For, as the Prime Minister stated, Ghana shares India's own ideals and aspirations and looks forward to working on solutions for their basic problems. This is continuation of the true meaning of the spirit born in Bandung at the Afro-Asian conference in 1955.

As the whole world totters on the brink of disaster, it is well that the big powers lend a greater ear to the misgivings of the little powers. Maybe there can be found in some cases where we have gone wrong. As for Americans, Dr. William Appleman Williams in his new book, "The Tragedy of American Diplomacy," contends that "the idea that other people ought to copy America contradicts the humanitarian urge to help them and the idea that they have the right to make such key decisions for themselves * * * in some cases the American way does not work for other people." Bearing in mind Dr. Williams conclusion that other societies come to feel that American policy causes them to lose their economic as well as their political right of self-determination, we must periodically take time to understand the motivations and aspirations of others especially the members of the popularly known Asian-African bloc. Time thus spent can be highly rewarding in terms of good will and human survival. We must listen and hear with sympathy what the smaller countries are trying to tell us for they wish like us to be spared an atomic holocaust.

In conclusion, a message from the African tradition, a proverb, which Prime Minister Nkrumah included in the foreword to Barbara Ward's new book, "Five Ideas That Change the World," is appropriate:

When the bull elephants fight, the grass is trampled down and pleads with the small and uncommitted nations to make their voices heard constructively while there is still time, for in this age of the ultimate weapon the bull elephants would disappear with the grass.

ACHIEVEMENT IN GHANA SINCE THE CELEBRATION OF FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE, 1958

POLITICAL

1. Opening of new diplomatic missions abroad and in Ghana by other countries.
2. Represented at:
(a) Geneva International Conference on the Law of the Sea.
(b) Second Geneva Atoms for Peace Conference.
(c) U.N. Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.
(d) Inauguration of West Indies Federal Legislature.
3. Visits by Prime Minister to:
(a) Independent African States.
(b) Canada and the United States.
(c) India.
(d) Nigeria.
4. His Excellency Ambassador D. A. Chapman elected first Vice Chairman of Governing Council of new U.N. Special Fund.
5. Establishment of:
(a) Regional assemblies.
(b) Houses of chiefs primarily concerned with questions of customary law.
6. Arranged:
(a) Conference of Independent African States.
(b) All-African People's Conference.
7. Union with Guinea to form basis of Union of West African States.
8. Contribution of $3,000 to the programs of the United Nations High Commissioner for refugees.
9. Presentation of a Speaker's chair to the National Assembly by the British House of Commons.

ECONOMIC

1. Venue of First Regional Conference of Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations.
2. Trade and goodwill missions to Britain and Western Europe.
3. Trade missions from:
(a) The Netherlands.
(b) Czechoslovakia.
(c) Italy.
(d) West and East Germany.
(e) Poland.
4. Establishment of state lotteries.
5. Issue of own coinage to replace former West African currency.
6. Article of agreement signed with International Finance Corporation.
7. Establishment of:
(a) Tourist bureau.
(b) Committee on Aid to Ghanaian Business.
(c) Insecticide factory.
(d) Commercial vehicles assembly plant.
(e) Nautical college for training of ships' officers and ratings; Ghanaians also being trained as seamen.
(f) Investment promotion board.
(g) Food and Agricultural Organization Regional Office for Africa.
(h) ICA operation mission.
(f) Rockefeller Brothers' Fund to help obtain investment funds and financial assistance for economic development.
(j) Bankers' clearinghouse.
8. Plan to develop Accra Airport to international standards.
9. Formation of iron and steel mill.
10. Modernization of fishing industry.
11. Formal inauguration of Ghana airways, and plans for creation of completely jet-powered airfleet.
12. Training of Ghanaians to become air hostesses.
13. Visit by team of experts from Henry J. Kaiser Co. to make survey and bring up-to-date engineering report on Volta River project. Maine factors of scheme: Dam the Volta, produce 600,000 kilowatts capacity and smelt 210,000 tons of aluminum yearly from Ghana bauxite.
14. Revision of company law for speedy development.
15. Signing of investment guarantee agreement to attract private American capital to Ghana.
16. Scheme for establishment of oil mill factory.
17. Represented at:
(a) First session of U.N. Economic Commission for Africa at Addis Ababa.
(b) Forty-first (Maritime) session of International Labor Conference in Geneva.
(c) Conference of International Federation of Agricultural Producers in Brussels.
(d) Montreal Commonwealth Trade and Economic Conference.
(e) New Delhi talks of World Bank and International Monetary Fund.
18. Formation of Ghana National Construction Co. for building factories, carrying out construction works, and training of Ghanaians.
19. Study progress of Tema Harbor, one of the major harbors of Africa.
20. New trade union structure to (a) help develop the country, (b) train the workers to contribute to this development.
21. Preparation of a second development plan which will mark an important step forward in the further development and consolidation of the independence of the country.

SOCIAL

1. Represented at (a) Commonwealth games in Montreal, (b) Conference of Afro-Asian writers in Tashkent in Soviet Union, (c) World Assembly of Youth in New Delhi.
2. Debut of (a) Ghana Times (daily newspaper), (b) the Ghanaian (monthly magazine).
3. Increased operations of Ghana News Agency which receives and distributes domestic and overseas news to various news organizations in Ghana.
4. Opening of (a) police college for advanced training for police officers, (b) law school, (c) school of journalism.
5. Admission to (a) full membership of UNESCO, (b) membership of International Criminal Police Organization.
6. Arts and crafts exhibitions to develop distinctive Ghanaian culture.
7. Agricultural shows to increase number and variety of crops and the flourish of livestock industry.
8. Training of Ghanaians to become officers in Ghana's Army.
9. Plans (a) to enable Radio-Ghana to cover the whole of Africa, (b) for establishment of medical school, (c) for inauguration of television service, (d) to establish an arts council.
10. More towns connected by new VHF radio-telephone link.
11. Visits by Ghanaians to the United States under various forms of grants.
12. Statue of Prime Minister added to others in Madame Tussaud's exhibition in London.
13. Installation of new automatic street lights.
14. Represented at:
(a) World Health Assembly in Minneapolis.
(b) Sixth International Congress on Tropical Medicine and Malaria in Lisbon.
(c) International Conference on Organization of Community Development in Tripoli.
(d) Sixth Meeting of International Scientific Committee for Trypanosomiasis Research in Brussels.
(e) Eighth International Students' Conference in Peru.
15. Ghana Film Unit Productions shown at Film Festival in Russia.
16. Issue of special stamps commemorating 150th birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

17. Assistance by WHO and UNICEF in battle against diseases.
18. Opening of new blind vocational training center.
19. Extension to supplies of water, electricity, railways, telephone, medical supplies, and other services to many parts of the country.
20. Construction of bridges, trunk and feeder roads.
21. Venue of International Rally of Girl Scouts.
22. New policy to enable more people to own houses.
23. Provision of primary schooling for all who wanted it.
24. Expansion of middle (similar to junior high) school system.
25. Increase in enrollments in secondary schools.
26. Improvement in existing teacher training colleges.
27. New buildings at university college and college of technology.
28. Award of local and overseas scholarships.
29. Receipt of several offers of scholarships from other countries to commemorate attainment of independence.
30. Recognition of Ghana Red Cross Society by International Committee of Red Cross Societies in Geneva.
31. Furthering of new and better ways of rural life in raising of living standards through community development.

## Address by Charles Abrams Upon Presentation of the Queens County Jewish War Veterans Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year I was privileged to share a speakers platform with two distinguished Americans, Mr. Charles Abrams, then chairman of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, and Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The occasion was the presentation of an award to Mr. Wilkins by the Queens County Jewish War Veterans, a truly American organization completely dedicated to the interests of all our citizens.

Commissioner Abrams delivered a stirring and inspiring speech in making the formal presentation to Mr. Wilkins which I commend for reading to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY CHARLES ABRAMS, CHAIRMAN OF THE NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION, UPON PRESENTATION OF THE QUEENS COUNTY JEWISH WAR VETERANS AWARD TO ROY WILKENS ON APRIL 19, 1958

The man whom we have assembled here to honor is unique. He is what is called a crusader. A crusader is not a popular creature. For a crusader has a cross to bear. Not with the sword today, but with the word. And a crusader is not popular in our time or at any time because he carries a message which many people do not like and in which they do not yet believe.

His, moreover, is a peculiar crusade because what he preaches is not treason, but reason; not heresy but truth; not iconoclasm but justice; not conformity under force but equality under law. Yet it is one of the anomalies of our time that democracy is still a heresy in many parts of America and that his crusade still is unpopular in many parts of America.

The gospel of equality rooted in Christian antiquity is still denied by many who insist that the equality must remain an abstraction. Some States have in fact actually nullified it by statute. They reject the courts that have reaffirmed the principle and defy the Government to implement it. In the process a land of the law finds it difficult to carry out the law of the land. The force of law has too often had to yield to the law of force. Neither persuasion nor judicial mandate have as yet been able to fulfill the Constitution under which we live. Equality in America thus continues to remain a visionary notion, a goal of some rather than a reality for all. It is, therefore, important that we understand what his crusade is about. For it is not only the Negro for whom he carries the torch, but for us. In our time intolerance has reaped its toll in many forms—against 6 million Jewish lives in Germany in the form of anti-Semitic intolerance; against a million Moslem and Hindu lives in Pakistan and India because of religious intolerance; against millions of Russian farmers lives because of political intolerance; against African majorities and white minorities because of color intolerance.

Unless intolerance disappears from the world no minority is safe; no members of the majority today can feel secure against being segmented into victimized minorities tomorrow. For intolerance is epidemic and once loosed, may spread to embrace an increasing area of victims.

We have lived and felt secure in our time only because we know that the law which protects the gentile protects the Jew, that the courts that shield the white shield the black. But morality and law must be linked if democracy is to function. For once the morality which undergirds the law is compromised, then tyranny takes over, whether it be the tyranny of a numerical majority or of a political minority. The Jew in Germany was not the victim of lawlessness for it was lawful to kill him, he was the victim of immorality under law. The Moslem and Hindu on the other hand were the victims of lawlessness though in their own way they thought they were simply carrying out what they saw as a moral principle of indiscriminately taking eyes for eyes and lives for lives. Law and morality are therefore indivisible. And the crusade this man wages is for both. It is a crusade for the preservation of the Judaic-Christian faith and justice as well as for moral law under a moral constitution.

When we honor him here, it is not for the service he renders to himself or to his race but to mankind. And his must remain a lonely course through the ever-winding abyss of bigotry and ignorance. I know the pains and the heartaches of his struggle. I know its dangers, for the resistance is not met only with grimaces but sometimes with burning crosses and dynamite. I know too that the crusader's greatest frustrations occur when he knows that those who should be standing at his side remain aloof and indifferent.

And so when we lift our eyes to the fighter for justice, when we give him our hand and our tribute, it is with renewed courage that he moves on with his work and with fresh faith renews his efforts toward the horizons under which we want our children to live.

It is because we know that his is our battle too and our stake that we give him this our humble tribute, as a token of our affection, a symbol of our respect, and in grateful recognition of the great task to which he has dedicated his life.

## Maritime Unions Seek Destruction of Our Merchant Marine Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the National Maritime Union, headed by Joseph Curran, and the International Seafarers Union, headed by Paul Hall, are waging a propaganda campaign designed to destroy a vital portion of our merchant marine fleet.

Our citizens now have approximately 1,500 oil tankers, ore carriers, and tramp steamers flying the flags of Panama, Liberia, and Honduras. These are American-owned ships and they receive no subsidy from the United States Government. These ships are called flags of necessity ships; that is, it is necessary to fly under these flags if they are to survive. They simply could not fly under the American flag where seamen would be organized and receive wages 3 and even 4 times higher than wages paid to seamen flying under the flags of Western European maritime countries.

The Federal Government already is spending $130 million in annual subsidies to seamen who sail under the American flag. American ship owners do not get a dime out of this. I certainly have no quarrel with this expenditure. It is money well spent and necessary if we want any kind of a healthy and strong merchant marine.

Messrs. Curran and Hall want the flags of necessity ships returned to the American flag. They have a selfish motive in pressing for this radical change in our merchant marine policy. They want more dues-paying members in their unions.

Flags of necessity ships have received the enthusiastic endorsement of the Congress through passage of the Shipping Act of 1916, the Defense Department, and Federal Maritime Administrator Clarence G. Morse. The Congress gave Mr. Morse the authority to transfer these ships to the flags of Panama, Honduras, and Liberia, and only the Congress can take away that authority.

If, perchance, we changed our merchant marine policy and returned these flags of necessity ships to the United States flag, the Federal Government would be saddled with an additional four or five hundred million dollars in annual subsidies to these seamen, because, as I said, these ships cannot possibly compete with low-paid Western European seamen without the subsidy.

We have effective control over these flags of necessity ships. They are doing a great job and they are not asking a dime from the Federal Government. They came to our rescue during the Korean conflict, and they will be available to our Government tomorrow if an emergency should arise.

Of course, if Mr. Curran and Mr. Hall persist in their violent and unfounded attacks on the flags of necessity ship

owners, the owners will sell these ships to Great Britain, Norway, or the Dutch. That would be disastrous to our national security. I am not concerned one bit about the profits or losses of these ships, but I am concerned about our national defense and the added burden to the taxpayer if these ships ever should be returned to the American flag.

If flags of necessity ships were sold abroad I do not see how Mr. Curran or Mr. Hall would gain anything. I strongly doubt that these men are thinking in terms of the consequences of their propaganda campaign. They would gain nothing and the United States would lose a lot along the national security and economy front.

## Freedom of the Press Does Not Mean License To Brainwash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press is one of our cherished rights but, like all of our rights, it carries a responsibility. The printed word is a powerful weapon. It should not be used to brainwash the public.

Through misleading and downright slanderous advertising in national magazines, the public service electric companies are attempting to brainwash the people of the United States. These ads use pictures of children and even the Holy Bible in a campaign of vilification against two programs that have proven their worth to this country—the public power program and the rural electrification movement. Such advertising is a disgrace to America and to American journalism.

I have just received a letter from Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association. In his letter, Mr. Radin takes the latest of these power company ads and refutes its statements, one by one. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this letter in the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON: For the past few years we have noted with concern the false or misleading advertising which has been carried in a number of national magazines and other media under the sponsorship of the Electric Power Companies Advertising Program (ECAP). One of the most recent ads in this series was so outrageous that we feel it should not stand without a reply.

The advertisement says, "The promoters of Federal Government public power are trying to get their hands on more of your tax money." This characterization of Federal power programs is completely contrary to fact; under the laws written by Congress, every cent invested in Federal power projects is being repaid, with interest or equivalent.

In the same vein, the advertisement charges that $5.5 billion is "the amount of tax money already spent on Federal public power." It is patently ridiculous to label the Nation's investment over several decades in the development of electric power facilities in conjunction with natural resource development programs as money spent. This failure to distinguish between moneys spent and invested comes with ill grace from an industry financed by billions of dollars of invested capital.

The figure of $5.5 billion is not substantiated in any way in the advertisement, nor does it appear susceptible to any factual explanation. The total investment in Federal power programs is reliably estimated at closer to $3 billion.

The advertisement continues: "The lobbyists and pressure groups who promote public power are pushing the idea that Congress should spend $10 billion more on this costly program, to be collected from you and other Americans, of course. (This $10 billion must be assumed to be another Madison Avenue straw man.)

The reference to "lobbyists and pressure groups who promote public power" is an insult not only to groups such as the American Public Power Association, which advocate orderly Federal development of our natural resources including power, but also to millions of Americans of both major political parties, who over the past half century have supported Federal programs for resource development.

No less insulting is the implication that the Congress authorizes such programs at the insistence of "lobbyists and pressure groups." Savings of lives and millions of dollars from flood control and the economic gains from thousands of miles of navigable streams, irrigation, countless recreational opportunities and the production of billions of kilowatt-hours of electric energy—the fruits of our Federal water resources development program—are a tribute to the wisdom and foresight of many Members of the Congress. To suggest that great Americans of the past and present—Norris, McNary, Rayburn, and Hill, for example—fought for maximum comprehensive and beneficial development of water resources because of the urgings of lobbyists and pressure groups not only taxes credulity but represents the grossest sort of slander.

The advertisement contends that investments in Federal power are "all so unnecessary" because "America's many independent electric companies are able—and ready—to supply all the electricity the Nation needs—without your tax money."

That many of the greatest power developments in the country would not have been developed if the Federal Government had not done the job is a matter of record. The power companies once thought it all so unnecessary when the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers were harnessed by the Federal Government, yet projects constructed over the protests of the power companies were crucial factors in our national strength during the blackest hours of World War II. History demonstrates that complete reliance upon private monopoly to develop our power resources will jeopardize orderly progress—and perhaps even survival.

That the electric companies function without your tax money is open to serious question. Under sections 167 and 168 of the Internal Revenue Act of 1954, the privately owned electric utilities collect each year from their ratepayers millions of dollars in the name of taxes which are not paid as taxes. These funds, according to the Federal Power Commission, are equivalent to interest-free loans; their benefits will run into billions of dollars.

This advertisement is only one flagrant example of the campaign being waged against the public interest by the power companies with the electric consumers' dollars. Pictures of children and even of the Holy Bible have been invoked in advertising attacking Federal power programs.

We do not believe that such calumny is proper for public utilities. The Public Utilities Holding Company Act of 1935 was enacted by the Congress following revelations that related not only to financial abuses by power companies and utility holding companies but also to "educational" programs of the utilities and their efforts to "mold public opinion." (The latter phrase has been used by one medium to describe the purpose of the ECAP advertisements.)

While we do not question the right of private power companies to express opinions and oppose public power programs, we cannot believe that this freedom offers any license for a mass conspiracy by monopoly to brainwash the American people on the facts about an essential service.

The nature of these advertisements is such that, in our opinion, the Congress should inquire into their propriety. The present ECAP advertising is reminiscent of the propaganda campaigns which were exposed in the utility investigations by Congress and the Federal Trade Commission a quarter of a century ago. We urge the Congress to launch a new investigation, reviewing the effectiveness of the Holding Company Act in dealing with monopoly abuses in the electric power field and inquiring into the need for additional legislation to protect the public from what Theodore Roosevelt aptly described as "a monopoly far more powerful * * * than anything known to our experience."

Sincerely,

ALEX RADIN.

## Challenge in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am including herein an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 2, 1959 entitled "Challenge in Science." This article forcefully indicates the danger of the United States in losing its overall scientific leadership within the next decade. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1959, page A-1611, Mr. Speaker, I included a statement of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare indicating the failure of our agencies to utilize useful, necessary and available scientific items for the furtherance of scientific programs in our educational institutions. This situation to my mind is indefensible and calls for speedy remedy by those charged with responsibility under existing law.

The article follows:

CHALLENGE IN SCIENCE—RUSSIA SPURS RESEARCH, THREATENS TO SURPASS THE UNITED STATES IN 10 YEARS—SCIENTISTS SAY RACE IS CLOSE IN MATH, PHYSICS BUT REDS LAG IN MEDICINE, CHEMISTRY—MONEY HELPS, MARXISM HURTS

(By John D. Williams)

Despite Russia's eye-catching space feats, the United States, on balance, still ranks No. 1 in science. But the Reds, who got a late start, are advancing rapidly. In some limited areas, their scientific research tops that of the United States—in quality as well as in quantity. In the key fields of mathematics and physics the race is close. Considering Russia's accelerating pace in research and the Russians' intense motivation

to overtake Americans on all fronts, the United States is in danger of losing its overall science leadership within 10 years.

This sobering balance sheet and outlook on the comparative status of scientific progress in Russia and the United States summarizes interviews with nearly 50 top U.S. scientists, along with the findings of several private and Government scientific groups. Most of the scientists recently have visited Russian laboratories and are acquainted, through first-hand observations or the studying of Soviet scientific journals, with the work of their Russian counterparts.

It should be noted quickly that most scientists are reluctant to give any overall scorecard rating of science on a nationalistic basis. "We're not engaged in a world series of science," snaps one physicist. Dr. Norbert Wiener, a leading U.S. mathematician, says, "I don't like the word 'lead.' It's not a game, after all. It's a matter of individuals."

SCIENCE SUPREMACY AT STAKE

Despite these reservations, however, there's no doubt that the United States and the U.S.S.R. are engaged in a race for supremacy in science. The competition is as real as that on other cold war fronts, whether economic, military or propaganda. And the stakes are as high, if not higher, because advances in science are basic to progress on other fronts. Whether for good or for evil, the fortunes of people in most countries nowadays are closely linked with research in everything from astronomy and atomic physics to meteorology and zoology.

Sputniks, Mechta, and Khrushchev's missile-rattling notwithstanding, Russian scientists are not 10 feet tall, nor have they already relegated the United States to a position as a second-rate scientific power. "We oscillate in our thinking of them as either peasants or supermen," says Anthony Oettinger, assistant professor of linguistics and applied mathematics at Harvard University. Nearly all U.S. scientists interviewed agreed the Russians are good—but so are U.S. scientists. American researchers caution that secrecy and a lack of complete information makes an overall appraisal difficult. "There is a difficulty in knowing, but everybody is convinced it's better not to underestimate these guys," says one researcher.

"My impression is that when it comes to specific items of technology where the Russians decide to go all out, they can give us some good competition, and in isolated areas can surpass us," says a top Washington scientist. "But overall," he adds, "the quality of their work doesn't measure up to ours. I haven't seen or read anything that makes me say, 'Gee whiz.'"

ALARMED AT SOVIET PACE

But many U.S. scientists are amazed, and somewhat alarmed, by the quickening pace of Russian research, the intense drive of Soviet scientists and the Kremlin's lid-off-the-money-box approach to wresting leadership in science from the United States and the West. Unless the United States greatly accelerates its efforts, they argue, Russia's present pace could give Moscow overall supremacy in science by 1970 or earlier. And recent history shows Russia is capable of turning basic research into working hardware with amazing speed; for example, the U.S.S.R. came up with the hydrogen bomb, supersonic aircraft, ballistic missiles and space vehicles much sooner than had been expected by many U.S. scientists.

"The scary thing is the Russians' big interest in science now," says John D. Turkevich, a Princeton University chemistry professor who has translated scores of Russian scientific works. Although Professor Turkevich doesn't know of any major scientific field where Russia now leads, he adds: "Where they are ahead is in planning and in utilizing the scientific results obtained in the West more efficiently than we do. And they have a higher appreciation of the role of science for their future development than we do. They've got drive."

"They've been coming up faster than we have," says Prof. John Chipman, head of the department of metallurgy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.). "The point about the future is that they are turning out more scientists than we and you can draw your own conclusions from that." After a 3-week visit in Russia, Dr. Leon Trilling, associate professor of aeronautical engineering at M.I.T., was "impressed by the dedicated way they work at their jobs. It makes one stop and worry a bit. I feel sure from what we've seen that they are able to do anything they set out to do."

SCIENTISTS, NOT POLITICIANS, HOLD SWAY

Since the first sputnik soared aloft (October 4, 1957), Government officials and American scientists, often supported financially by the National Science Foundation, have been trying busily to learn how good Russian science is and what accounts for its high and low spots. Among other things, they're impressed that the top administrators in Russian research institutes and in the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences are scientists, not politicians. These leaders, called academicians, eye the whole broad terrain of science and have much to say about where research money will be spent and where scientific manpower will be concentrated.

American scientists also are impressed by Russia's lavish spending on research and development and the country's huge education program in science and engineering. Russia's new 7-year plan calls for a 90 percent increase in the number of engineering graduates alone. The U.S.S.R. already claims to be graduating about 80,000 engineers annually, compared with about 30,000 yearly in the United States.

HARD TEAM TO BEAT

"They have talented scientists and unlimited funds—a hard team to beat. I feel that we have the talent but not the money," says a California scientist. Speaking of his own field, Dr. Maurice Ewing, an eminent geophysicist at Columbia University, says: "They're catching up at a tremendous rate and their national effort is six times ours. They find funds more readily available. I spend 85 percent of my time trying to get funds."

Soviet advances in science reflect, on part, the single-mindedness which a monolithic state such as Russia can bring to bear in any area. Like all other endeavors in the Soviet Union, science has its own state plans which muster great resources to work on specific problems. Major assignment for the next 7 years: Finding ways to control thermonuclear reactions to harness the power of the hydrogen bomb for peaceful energy. Says an American scientist who has visited Russian science centers: "You get the impression that everything over there is either a priority project or a no-priority project." Of course, state control of science can boomerang. For example, some sciences, especially biology, have been hamstrung in Russia by the necessity of squaring them with Marxist dogma which implies that man is capable of being made perfect.

Here is how Russia and the United States compare in many fields of science and technology:

*Astronomy*

"The Russians remain weaker than we are in astronomy because they don't have the equipment we do," hays Dr. Fred L. Whipple, Harvard astronomy professor who visited the U.S.S.R. not long ago. We have about 40 observatories, double Russia's total. Russia's largest telescope is a 50-inch reflector model taken from the Germans after World War II. The United States has at least three telescopes over 100 inches in diameter. But this year the Soviet Union will complete a 104-inch reflector for the Crimean Astrophysical Observatory at Partizanskoye. And there are reports they have a 15-year project for a 236-inch telescope, larger than our giant 200-inch Mount Palomar instrument in California.

U.S. astronomers discover more celestial bodies, thanks in large part to their superior and more plentiful facilities. Their Russian colleagues appear to spend more time recording motions and positions of stars, the sort of routine astronomy that occupied Western astronomers a good deal more in the 19th century than today. The Russian concentration in celestial mechanics pays off with information needed to chart rocket courses to the moon and planets. U.S. space researchers, jarred by such Soviet space feats as Mechta, fret at our lag in this currently important field.

The United States is stronger in astrophysics—studies that delve into the very nature of stars and stimulate advances in atomic physics. In the relatively new field of radio astronomy, which the United States pioneered, both countries are spurring work to catch up to Britain. Radio telescopes "see" further into the universe than do optical instruments because they detect radiations of wavelengths far greater than those of visible light. Thus, radio astronomy promises important discoveries about the universe.

Concludes Dr. Harlow Shapley at the Harvard College observatory: "There is no question that we lead in astronomy. But you have to put Russia down as second. They are good, ambitious, and enthusiastic, and they feel we are to be caught up with."

*Biology*

The United States has a commanding lead in most branches of this science dealing with all living organisms. Politics have poisoned much Russian work. Take genetics, the branch dealing with heredity, and the current darling of the biological field. The politics of Marxism pressured Red scientists to ignore Mendel's laws of genetics, which, in simple terms, show that such physical characteristics as height and color of eyes depend on the combination of elementary cell units that has been inherited. Trofin Lysenko, a Red plant breeder, with Stalin's backing, led the repression of the valid proofs of such laws in addition to resisting Darwin's evolution theory.

Lysenko proclaimed—wrongly, according to most Western scientists—that acquired characteristics can be passed on through succeeding generations. That is, a dexterous juggler spawns another dexterous juggler and—most important to Marxism—a "good" Communist spawns a "good" Communist. Anti-Lysenko geneticists long were persecuted and purged in Russia, the climax coming in 1948. In the post-Stalin era of Soviet science, Lysenko was thought to be discredited. But Lysenkoism apparently is resurgent. Last August the Soviet Government canceled, at the last minute, visas of a group of anti-Lysenko scientists who had planned to attend the International Congress of Geneticists at Montreal.

In general, U.S. biologists are not greatly impressed by known Russian work in botany (plants), zoology (animals), paleontology (fosils), and entomology (insects). But there are increasing signs Soviet researchers are stepping up studies of flora and fauna.

In zoology, contends one American scientist, Soviet scientists have been too little influenced by Darwin and too much influenced by Ivan Pavlov, a Russian Nobel prize winner who did original work on conditioned reflexes in animals. (In Pavlov's famed experiment a dog was trained to secrete saliva when a bell rang, even though food, which had been presented when the bell rang in the early part of the experiment, was absent.) Says the U.S. scientist: "If I were to write

a book on evolution, I'm sure there wouldn't be a single Russian in the bibliography."

*Chemistry*

Overall, the United States holds a clear lead. Russian researchers were slow in realizing the value of petroleum and natural gas in compounding new industrial chemicals; they leaned too long on alcohol as the prime source.

But in the hottest current chemical research—on polymers from which new plastics and fibers are being made—"they've come up with the same type of material on the same time schedule as we have," says a chemist. On a recent trip to Russia, one U.S. chemist saw "tubs full" of polypropylene, a plastic material only recently introduced to the U.S. market and first developed in Italy. Russian research reportedly concentrates more than ours on polymers for plastics to withstand extremely high temperatures.

In the vast domain of chemistry, Russia has other specialties. For example, they lead in work on chemical reactions in explosions.

In biochemistry—dealing with living organisms—Russia is well behind the United States and other western nations in the development of drugs. Not one major antibiotic, hormone, or vitamin developed in the past 15 years carries a Russian credit line. "The reason is quite simple," says John T. Connor, president of Merck & Co., Inc., a major U.S. drugmaker. "Moscow found that it was far less costly to pirate western drugs than to discover and develop their own." One U.S. scientist relates how, he recently sent a diabetic Russian colleague the latest type of insulin, which has not yet been compounded in Russia.

A team of U.S. medical observers which visited Russian drug research centers last year noted that the quality of U.S.S.R drug synthesis was equal to the West's but added that quantitatively, the Russians are considerably behind us. For example, while in the West a single medicinal chemical laboratory might synthesize 50 or 100 compounds for evaluation to find the optimal therapeutic agent, a comparable Russian pharmaceutical research institute will synthesize only 5 or 10.

Russian scientists were slow in getting around to vaccines, but their work since World War II generally is considered good—and in some applications, ahead of U.S. efforts. Within the past 2 years Russia has begun using live virus vaccines to help prevent such diseases as mumps, influenza, and measles, as well as polio. Live virus vaccines give longer lasting immunity than the dead types. We have only a live virus polio vaccine under test and we have no live virus vaccines for mumps or influenza. However, in production of polio vaccine, Russia is estimated to be 3 years behind the United States.

*Medicine*

Russia may trail the United States by as much as 10 years in medical research, claim knowledgable Americans. But a team of medical observers, reporting in the Journal of the American Medical Association, says Russia is making a determined effort to bring its medical research up to the level of its programs in the physical sciences.

Russia has more doctors than the United States but, in general, they're not as good. For the past 15 years Russia has been adding roughly 10,000 new physicians a year, about double the U.S. total. They have some 16 doctors per 10,000 people, compared with our 13. Three out of four of their doctors are women, hardly startling when one considers that nearly half of all Soviet workers are female. Russian doctors receive less training and are backed by poorer facilities and fewer drugs. Nevertheless, they can claim much credit for cutting Russia's mortality rate about 75 percent since the 1917 revolution. Kremlin health officials in 1956 claimed a Russian had a life expectancy at birth of 67 years, compared with 69.5 years for an American.

Mentally disturbed Russians have a tougher time getting therapy than do Americans. There are fewer hospital beds for Russian mental patients and they have only about 4,500 psychiatrists, compared with 10,000 in the United States. "The Russians claim they have less mental illness than we do, but there is no proof of this," says a U.S. authority. "They claim their world outlook is better than ours because they do not have competition which, they feel, erroneously, drives men mad." But Russians use more tranquilizers than Americans, chiefly because they are used as general pain killers.

One top Government expert in infectious diseases believes that Russia may surpass the United States in preventive medicine by pirating and applying on a wide scale our basic research. Other American researchers content that Western science owes it to itself to pay more attention to Russian experimentation. Among Red experiments that intrigue U.S. scientists are those in primate biology and in transplanting a dog's head from one body to another. And they have claimed that transplants of human hearts are theoretically possible, although U.S. researchers say crucial problems have yet to be solved in this field.

*Mathematics*

The United States still has a tenuous overall leadership, but Russians have made more major contributions to this basic science than to any other and their challenge is serious. American mathematicians claim our work is tops in such branches as pure algebra, algebraic geometry, statistics, the calculus of variations and topology, the qualitative study of geometric figures.

But in some other important fields of math, we can learn from the Russians. Take the field of nonlinear differential equations—a branch of advanced mathematics essential in controlling the guidance of a space vehicle. It would take us years to catch up to Russia in this complex field, argues one U.S. mathematician.

Alarmed by Soviet space guidance feats, which rely heavily on such advanced mathematics, 15 top U.S. mathematicians are investigating the state of this field in the United States at a research subsidiary of Martin Co. in Baltimore. Undoubtedly on the agenda is a study of 10 Soviet books on advanced differential equations; the United States has published only a couple.

"The Russians have an old mathematical tradition going back to the end of the 18th century," explains Dr. Wiener, an M.I.T. mathematician. "The quality of their work in those days was good. Now they have more men and the quality is still very good. And their secondary school mathematics education is better than ours." Moscow is considered the most important single center for mathematics in the world, although the United States has a greater number of mathematics research centers.

To help keep abreast of Soviet mathematics, a group at the University of Michigan is compiling a Russian-English mathematics dictionary. "Russian has overtaken French and is crowding German as the scientific language, particularly in theoretical applied mathematics," says Dr. A. J. Lohwater, director of the project.

In applied mathematics, the United States leads in such areas as automatic language translating, using high-speed computers. Electronic translation equipment can greatly speed scientific research. At least six U.S. universities are now using computers for translating, including Russian into English. Although this work is described as still rather crude, researchers expect it to be very useful within 5 years. Russia's theoretical work on machine translations is considered excellent, but its scientists have done far less actual electronic translating.

The main reason for Russia's lag in this work lies in their computers (BESM and Stela), which do not equal the capacity (operations per second) of U.S. machines.

In the field of measurement, Soviet activities are intense and their claims are many. Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards in Washington, has given an example of Russia's challenge in this field:

"Their national standardizing organization has claimed an ability to make regular calibration of temperature-measuring devices up to 6,000 degrees centigrade and their scientific plans call for increasing this calibration competence so that by 1960 they will provide this calibration service up to 12,000 degrees. At the National Bureau of Standards, our regular practice in making direct high-temperature calibrations extends to 2,800 degrees which we usually certify to an accuracy of 8 degrees. On a very limited basis we are able to extrapolate our high-temperature calibrations to 4,000 degrees centigrade, but with some sacrifice of accuracy," reports Dr. Astin.

*Physics*

"Everything they know we know. They have good men, but not as many as we do," sums up a leading U.S. physicist. Despite the overall leadership of the United States, the race is fierce in certain areas, such as nuclear research. Russians have made some remarkable additions to world knowledge in physics. For example, last year Russian physicists Pavel A. Cherenkov, Igor I. Tamm and Ilya M. Frank were awarded Nobel prizes for their work on certain radiation waves. (Since 1904 only six Russians have won Nobel prizes in physics, chemistry, medicine and physiology, while 47 U.S. citizens have won these coveted awards.)

To advance its studies of matter, Russia has a 10-billion-volt accelerator cyclotron, the world's largest atom smasher. The biggest machine now operating in the United States is the 6-billion-volt synchrotron at the University of California. But a battle of bigness is raging in atom smashers, because larger machines allow scientists to probe deeper into the atom. The United States may step ahead next year upon completion of a 25-billion-volt machine at Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island. And the Government's science advisers are urging expenditure of $127 million for a giant atom smasher that could achieve extremely high energies ranging up to 45 billion volts. Not to be outdone, the Russians are talking of a 50-billion-volt machine.

There is no evidence that the Russians have been working any longer—or any more successfully—than the United States and Britain in controlling thermonuclear reactions in the laboratory. Sir John Cockcroft, research chief of Britain's Atomic Energy Authority, figures there is "level pegging" in fusion control work as between the West and Russia. Both sides have expended great efforts to score a major breakthrough on this front. Scientific papers presented at the United Nations' international conference on atomic energy at Geneva last fall showed that scientists of both countries are pursuing similar paths toward fusion control.

Russia has lagged in nuclear research reactors, but recently has been spurring work in this field. Many scientists now believe that little if any difference now exists between Russia and the West in the state of nuclear reactor art.

Soviet experiments in low-temperature research stack up well with those in the United States say many scientists who have visited Russia. In another specialized field, crystallography, Russia has made many major contributions. Because many solid

substances are made up of crystals, this science is important in discovering how to strengthen everything from electronic circuits to airplane components. "We don't come up to Russia in the numbers of men in the field," says Prof. Martin J. Buerger, a noted crystallographer at M.I.T. Another U.S. scientist claims: "Unless remedial action is taken now, American students of the coming generation who will ask their honest adviser, 'Where can I get the best crystallographic training?' may have to be told the sad truth, 'In the U.S.S.R.' "

Other American authorities believe the United States may be in danger of falling far behind Russia in work on thermoelectric conversion and in acoustics. In a report underwritten by the National Science Foundation, Uno Ingard, associate professor of physics at M.I.T., predicted that if the present rate of progress is maintained, the application of acoustical techniques in liquid and solid state physics, as well as applications of ultrasound in industrial processing, will be much further advanced in the U.S.S.R. than elsewhere within the next few years.

*Metallurgy*

Russia is challenging U.S. supremacy in this field that is vital to the development of better rocket and jet engines. "It's close—we may be a little ahead of them," says one cautious authority. Reports another metallurgist: "They're one up on us in the development of tungsten rhenium (a very heavy high-temperature alloy), but on the titanium alloys we're ahead of them."

Biggest worry: Russia turns out 4,000 new metallurgists yearly, compared with 600 in the United States. American metallurgists are impressed by Russia's ability to speed basic research findings into acutal production and they admire their equipment. "I saw some equipment in their labs which I would like to buy for our labs, such as a microprobe analyzer which costs $125,000," says a U.S. scientist. This device can determine the composition of metal, using only a dustlike particle of the substance.

*Geophysics*

In this broad field, which includes the study of the earth, the oceans, and the atmosphere, the quantity of Russian research exceeds that in the United States. The quality of their work, however, is erratic; but in some branches, such as earthquake seismology, U.S. scientists concede the Russians are first-rate.

"Geophysics is a science which the Russians have chosen to emphasize, with massive Government support. They're doing experiments in fields we simply can't afford," says Frank Press, a leading geophysicist at California Institute of Technology and a recent visitor to Russian science centers.

Professor Press cites oceanography as a case in point. "They're going strong on oceanographic work," he says. Other geophysicists report that in seismic crustal studies at sea, the United States and the United Kingdom have had a monopoly until recently, but this leadership is now being threatened. Russia has a much larger oceanographic fleet and its research ships, such as the *Vitjaz* and *Ob*, are up to seven times the size of our biggest research ship, the *Chain*. However, some U.S. scientists insist instruments aboard these Red ships are crude in comparison to ours, and that so far they have added little new to knowledge of waves, marine life, and the ships of the ocean floor. And they stress that bigness is not synonomous with excellence.

The findings of oceanographers are not merely of academic interest; their research is of utmost military importance in such fields as the detection and navigation of submarines. Recognizing this, a committee of the National Academy of Sciences recently declared that the United States runs the risk of serious military and political dangers unless deep-sea research is doubled during the next decade.

Russia also is leading the United States in the use of explosions within the earth. Such work is valuable in discovering more about the earth's crust and can be useful in locating oil. In addition, Russia has 100 seismology stations using uniform equipment and with at least 5 persons manning each station. The United States has about 40 such stations, with varied equipment and staffed by only one man each on a part-time basis.

In meteorology, both countries are busily working for a breakthrough in long-range weather forecasting. "We may possibly lead in this research work, but it's a wide open race," says a Tufts University scientist. Another authority claims, "Judged on our present position we are somewhat ahead of our Russian colleagues in cloud physics and theoretical meteorology. But if we continue as we are, within 5 years we'll be neck and neck."

Most meteorologists agree that we still know little of the basic reasons weather behaves as it does. Fourteen U.S. universities hope to discover some of the secrets by setting up a National Institute for Atmospheric Research, supported by Federal funds but managed by the educators. The university planners note that Russia has a Central Meteorological Institute in Leningrad. The nearest thing we have to this is the considerably smaller Air Force Geophysical Research Center at Bedford, Mass.

Russia's scientific resurgence was obvious during the International Geophysical Year which ended at the turn of the year. "My impression is that the Russian contributions to IGY have certainly been commensurate with these of other major nations participating. The quality of their collected data compares favorably with ours," says Professor Henry Houghton, head of MIT's meteorology department. He and some other U.S. scientists believe that Russia leads in Arctic research, partly because the area is closer to their country. Professor Houghton terms Antarctic research a standoff between the countries.

## Reds Have Failed Miserably in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

[From the Washington Daily News, March 3, 1959]

NO ROOM FOR TOTALITARIANS—REDS HAVE FAILED MISERABLY IN CUBA

HAVANA, March 3.—Communists are trying to convince the Cuban people that the hammer and sickle deserve a place in the new government. So far, they have failed miserably.

The Communists were stopped cold in their tracks, in Cuba. On January 1, they came out shouting about all they had done to help Fidel Castro and the rebels oust one of the cruelest dictatorships ever imposed on human beings anywhere. Their arguments were acceptable to a few radicals in the revolutionary movement who dislike Uncle Sam intensely.

NO SALE

However, with responsible officials from Fidel Castro and his cabinet down to minor officers, the Reds struck out.

Castro knew that the Reds, strong in certain Havana unions, could have helped bring on a general strike but they rejected his call last year.

In one of Castro's first statements after his miraculous defeat of Batista's modern army he made it clear what his views on communism were.

"I am not a Communist," he told a nationwide television audience. He emphasized that there could be no room in his government for totalitarian ideas.

His foreign minister, Robert Agramonte, told the press in the first days of January: "Cuba will not recognize the Soviet Union."

However the Communist Party in Cuba (it is called the Cuban Socialist Party) will be allowed to take part in elections, operate its own newspaper, and, in general, make a nuisance of itself.

A WARNING

Communists have been warned they must abide by the Cuban Constitution. Any evidence that they are using their position for subversive activity will subject them to prosecution for committing crimes against the State.

Castro, Cuban President Manuel Urrutia, and the cabinet, have taken their cue from such democracies as France, the United States, and England, in their attitude towards communism. The Cuban leaders believe if given enough rope, the Communists will hang themselves.

They point out that there is room in a democracy for social justice without having to turn to socialism and communism. The revolution was fought, to obtain social justice Castro has said.

PRESS SOLID

The Cuban Communists' strongest enemies, however, are the Cuban press, and the Roman Catholic Church, to which most Cubans belong. From the very beginning all of Havana's newspapers, including the most liberal, Prensa Libre, have repeatedly attacked the Communists.

Most of the bearded rebels who come from peasant stock will tell you they could never be Communists. However, they are quick to point out that they are sorry the U.S. Government sent military equipment to Batista. But surprisingly enough, most of the bearded veterans who average third and fourth grade educations understand the difference between U.S. Government policy and the feelings of the American people in general.

"I know the Americans were sympathetic to our cause," one 2-year veteran said. "But the people in Washington made a bad mistake."

## Any American Can Be an Unoffical Ambassador of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Sheer, chairman of the legislative committee of the Anselm Forum, Inc., of Gary, Ind., has forwarded the following article to me by Oliver Starr, Jr., from the Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune. I am submitting the same for consideration of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If the movement originated by Harry Plissner, of New York, and now spon-

sored by the Anselm Forum, Inc., of Gary Ind., becomes national, it could develop into our greatest accomplishment in promoting international good will with people of all nations and contribute greatly to prevent future wars:

PLEASE SEND ME AN AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

(By Oliver Starr, Jr.)

Do you want to become an unofficial ambassador of the United States?

Reuben Olson, 4456 Jackson, of the Anselm Forum, can arrange it. All you need is some old magazines and a desire to write to a friend of America across the seas. You may get a letter like the one received in Gary recently which said: "Please send me an American friendship."

These words written by a Chinese letter-writer tell the impact of a new people-to-people program started only 6 months ago by a New York businessman.

How one man has released a great tidal wave of friendship for America from all corners of the earth is another remarkable testimonial to the power of an idea. As a result people from such far off places as India, China, South Africa, Australia, Germany, and Denmark are writing letters to people in Gary, Ind., to tell of their eagerness for friendship with America. The people of Gary in turn are spreading the story of democracy to all points of the globe.

The New Yorker's name is Harry Plissner who one day last spring while reading the news of Little Rock and other racial tension areas decided the rest of the world probably was getting the wrong impression of America. He made up his mind to try to do something about it. He found out that Americans throw away about 30 million magazines a month while millions of persons in other lands are thirsting for knowledge of all kinds. It gave him an idea. He dashed off 20 letters to leading newspapers all over the world, telling readers that he had American friends who were willing to send them magazines free. (The cost to the sender is only from 7 to 14 cents postage, depending upon the size of the magazine.)

The response literally swamped Plissner. In one month more than 14,500 letters poured in. He had to quit his business of running a trailer court to manage his magazine friendship campaign. By advertising in U.S. newspapers, radio and television, Plissner got 20,000 American volunteers to help him. Letters are coming to him now at the rate of 1,000 a day.

In Gary, Reuben Olson heard about Plissner's program. He wrote for a supply of letters and a short time later his mailbox was brimful with letters from all over the world.

By contacting individuals and organizations, Olson so far has located 205 correspondents in northwest Indiana for overseas letter writers. He feels the program has a tremendous potential for improving world relations.

"We're talking about exploring outer space," Olson points out, and then adds: "We're not satisfied with our own little world."

"This new program is exploring inner space. People are just aching to reach across the pond and shake hands. When brother meets brother across the sea it makes the tensions of today's world a little easier to bear."

Another reason why this program is having such impact is because many of the people who are writing to America are people in high places, holding important positions in business, education, and government.

COLLEGE STUDENT

Mrs. Martin Schwegel 3810 Johnson, found her correspondence with a Taiwan University college student one of the most stimulating experiences in her life.

The college girl, Yun Ching (which means Blue Cloud in English), writes that she is taking 13 subjects and has 34 hours of studying each week. During the period when the Communist Chinese were shelling Formosa she wrote that every student was called upon to give aid to a little village of Kinman which was undergoing bombardment.

A special week was observed called Give Your Best Regards to Kinman. The students gave food, money, and their blood to beleaguered Kinman.

Yun Ching in one letter tells of the Chinese legend of the moon-cake and how the Chinese threw off their oppressors, the Mongols, partly by means of inserting instructions in the moon-cakes for the revolutionaries.

STEELWORKERS

A Hobart steelworker who has been corresponding with a Chinese seminary student scoured this region in December to find a Chinese Bible for his friend for Christmas. The Chinese religious student was overjoyed with the gift and now can't wait for the opportunity to come to America to meet his benefactor. Here are a few excerpts from the current batch of letters received in Gary by Olson for distribution: A graduate of a Chinese Naval Academy on Formosa writes: "Get interesting in international affairs so that I wish I could have some papers of the New York Times to read. Luck will be mine and at last I give my best wishes to you."

BANK EMPLOYEE

A bank employee in the Central Bank of India writes: "I would like to contact people in banks and know more about banking done in your country."

An employee of the Central Broadcasting Station at Taipei, Formosa, requests old American magazines as, "It is indeed very difficult to buy or to read magazines concerning mechanical engineering such as radio, TV, electric power, engineering electronics, rocket, radar, car, etc."

A student in the Political Staff Officers College of Free China on Formosa writes that he has read of Plissner's offer and says: "Indeed it's not only strength the friendship between the Americans and Chinese, but also urge exchange in culture in each other. Now I am studying in the Political Staff Officers College. I would like to appreciate on the efforts it will be made by you. I am wishing you have a good time."

A man writes from Kongandoor in Kerala, India, of the beauty of his city: "I am extremely glad to take advantage of this rare opportunity so generously offered to the people of India. I may tell you in this connection that Kerala although smallest of the Indian States is a beauty spot and it is remarkable for its natural scenery. I am living in a village whose beauty attracts many people. It is on the banks of a river and it is noted for its fertility and luxuriant growth of vegetation. I always welcome visitors to this part of Kerala."

LEPER

A man from Penang, Malaya, writes: "I am a leper, and this island is a leper settlement, separated by a channel about a mile wide from Penang. As I am a leper and an amputee, and unable to work, I cannot afford to buy reading materials. I need these magazines to pass my time as well as improve my English. I will share them with my English-speaking friends here."

CLERGYMAN

An English pastor from the Unitarian Church in Ipswich, England, writes: "I am a firm believer in the need to foster Anglo-American understanding, and if you can kindly arrange ot have some of these magazines sent to me, I will be very glad to pass them on to others when I am finished."

A communication from Mahatma Ghandi Memorial College in India says: "Surplus, hard-cover books that have to do with medicine, engineering, architecture, etc., are sorely needed by Mahatma Ghandi Memorial College. Students are very poor and cannot afford to buy textbooks essential to their studies. They must use the limited volumes in the college library and must wait many days before the books are available."

Another breakthrough in world understanding is going on in the medium of sound. A new organization called World Tape Pals is promoting the exchange of sound tapes between people of all nations. Anselm Forum has had its own tape exchange program going for several years but is also joining World Tape Pals to get new leads. On its own Anselm took part in recording tapes with the representative from Ghana, an attaché from the Israeli Embassy and a religious leader from Johannesburg, South Africa. The tapes were sent to each of the respective countries.

COUNCILMAN AND TEACHER

A Roman Catholic steel mill open hearth operator, a Negro city councilman and a Jewish school principal plan to make a tape during Brotherhood Week which will be sent to points around the world to show how brotherhood as practiced in Gary is more typical of America than some of the articles on racial tension which they might have read.

A Gary schoolteacher plans next week to make a tape with the children in her class for exchange with an English class of the same grade.

"The oversea friendship program," said Olson, "is not only an opportunity to foster good relations with people in other nations but also a chance to learn and broaden our culture, for there is not a single nation on the face of the globe whose citizens have not made a definite contribution to the progress of mankind."

Olson said that the people-to-people program once more illustrates the truth of the words of Rev. F. W. Backmeyer, minister emeritus of the First Presbyterian Church, who said: "We no longer live in a place smaller than the world."

## Proposed Reduction of National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, several of us in this Chamber, notably including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. LOSER], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BROCK], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HARGIS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], and others, have urged the adoption of a systematic program of national debt retirement.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a chart of proposed amortization based upon a total national debt of $280 billion, with annual payments of $2.8 billion upon the principal amount and interest payments estimated at 3.5 percent:

*National debt of $280 billion*

[In billions of dollars]

| Year end | Total debt | Payment on principal | Interest at 3.5 percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 280.0 | 2.8 | 9.800 |
| 1 | 277.2 | 2.8 | 9.702 |
| 2 | 274.4 | 2.8 | 9.604 |
| 3 | 271.6 | 2.8 | 9.506 |
| 4 | 268.8 | 2.8 | 9.408 |
| 5 | 266.0 | 2.8 | 9.310 |
| 6 | 263.2 | 2.8 | 9.212 |
| 7 | 260.4 | 2.8 | 9.114 |
| 8 | 257.6 | 2.8 | 9.016 |
| 9 | 254.8 | 2.8 | 8.918 |
| 10 | 252.0 | 2.8 | 8.820 |
| 11 | 249.2 | 2.8 | 8.722 |
| 12 | 246.4 | 2.8 | 8.624 |
| 13 | 243.6 | 2.8 | 8.526 |
| 14 | 240.8 | 2.8 | 8.428 |
| 15 | 238.0 | 2.8 | 8.330 |
| 16 | 235.2 | 2.8 | 8.232 |
| 17 | 232.4 | 2.8 | 8.134 |
| 18 | 229.6 | 2.8 | 8.036 |
| 19 | 226.8 | 2.8 | 7.938 |
| 20 | 224.0 | 2.8 | 7.840 |
| 21 | 221.2 | 2.8 | 7.742 |
| 22 | 218.4 | 2.8 | 7.644 |
| 23 | 215.6 | 2.8 | 7.546 |
| 24 | 212.8 | 2.8 | 7.448 |
| 25 | 210.0 | 2.8 | 7.350 |
| 26 | 207.2 | 2.8 | 7.252 |
| 27 | 204.4 | 2.8 | 7.154 |
| 28 | 201.6 | 2.8 | 7.056 |
| 29 [1] | 198.8 | 2.8 | 6.958 |
| 30 | 196.0 | 2.8 | 6.860 |
| 31 | 193.2 | 2.8 | 6.762 |
| 32 | 190.4 | 2.8 | 6.664 |
| 33 | 187.6 | 2.8 | 6.566 |
| 34 | 184.8 | 2.8 | 6.468 |
| 35 | 182.0 | 2.8 | 6.370 |
| 36 | 179.2 | 2.8 | 6.272 |
| 37 | 176.4 | 2.8 | 6.174 |
| 38 | 173.6 | 2.8 | 6.076 |
| 39 | 170.8 | 2.8 | 5.978 |
| 40 | 168.0 | 2.8 | 5.880 |
| 41 | 165.2 | 2.8 | 5.782 |
| 42 | 162.4 | 2.8 | 5.684 |
| 43 | 159.6 | 2.8 | 5.586 |
| 44 | 156.8 | 2.8 | 5.488 |
| 45 | 154.0 | 2.8 | 5.390 |
| 46 | 151.2 | 2.8 | 5.292 |
| 47 | 148.4 | 2.8 | 5.194 |
| 48 | 145.6 | 2.8 | 5.096 |
| 49 | 142.8 | 2.8 | 4.998 |
| 50 | 140.0 | 2.8 | 4.900 |
| 51 | 137.2 | 2.8 | 4.802 |
| 52 | 134.4 | 2.8 | 4.704 |
| 53 | 131.6 | 2.8 | 4.606 |
| 54 | 128.8 | 2.8 | 4.508 |
| 55 | 126.0 | 2.8 | 4.410 |
| 56 | 123.2 | 2.8 | 4.312 |
| 57 | 120.4 | 2.8 | 4.214 |
| 58 | 117.6 | 2.8 | 4.116 |
| 59 | 114.8 | 2.8 | 4.018 |
| 60 | 112.0 | 2.8 | 3.920 |
| 61 | 109.2 | 2.8 | 3.822 |
| 62 | 106.4 | 2.8 | 3.724 |
| 63 | 103.6 | 2.8 | 3.626 |
| 64 | 100.8 | 2.8 | 3.528 |
| 65 | 98.0 | 2.8 | 3.430 |
| 66 | 95.2 | 2.8 | 3.332 |
| 67 | 92.4 | 2.8 | 3.234 |
| 68 | 89.6 | 2.8 | 3.136 |
| 69 | 86.8 | 2.8 | 3.038 |
| 70 | 84.0 | 2.8 | 2.940 |
| 71 | 81.2 | 2.8 | 2.842 |
| 72 | 78.4 | 2.8 | 2.744 |
| 73 | 75.6 | 2.8 | 2.646 |
| 74 | 72.8 | 2.8 | 2.548 |
| 75 | 70.0 | 2.8 | 2.450 |
| 76 | 67.2 | 2.8 | 2.352 |
| 77 | 64.4 | 2.8 | 2.254 |
| 78 | 61.6 | 2.8 | 2.156 |
| 79 | 58.8 | 2.8 | 2.058 |
| 80 | 56.0 | 2.8 | 1.960 |
| 81 | 53.2 | 2.8 | 1.862 |
| 82 | 50.4 | 2.8 | 1.764 |
| 83 | 47.6 | 2.8 | 1.666 |
| 84 | 44.8 | 2.8 | 1.568 |
| 85 | 42.0 | 2.8 | 1.470 |
| 86 | 39.2 | 2.8 | 1.372 |
| 87 | 36.4 | 2.8 | 1.274 |
| 88 | 33.6 | 2.8 | 1.176 |
| 89 | 30.8 | 2.8 | 1.078 |
| 90 | 28.0 | 2.8 | .980 |
| 91 | 25.2 | 2.8 | .882 |
| 92 | 22.4 | 2.8 | .784 |
| 93 | 19.6 | 2.8 | .686 |
| 94 | 16.8 | 2.8 | .588 |
| 95 | 14.0 | 2.8 | .490 |
| 96 | 11.2 | 2.8 | .392 |
| 97 | 8.4 | 2.8 | .294 |
| 98 | 5.6 | 2.8 | .196 |
| 99 | 2.8 | 2.8 | .098 |
| 100 | 0 | 2.8 | .000 |
| | | 280.0 | 494.900 |

[1] At the 29th year, the total paid for the payment on the principal and the interest amounts to 9.758 billion, this is 0.042 billion less than the 9.8 billion we are paying per year at the present time, and will continue to pay on our present program.

On the above program, we will have paid out 494.9 billion in interest, and 280.0 billion in principal, or a total of 774.9 billion. If we just keep on paying interest, we will have paid 980 billion, and still have the 280 billion debt left, or a total of 1,260 billion. The difference is 485.1 billion to the good, and our debt is paid.

## Address Delivered by Henry Ford II Before the Student Body of Yale University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very timely address delivered by Henry Ford II, president of the Ford Motor Co., to the student body of Yale University in Woolsey Hall at New Haven, Conn., on Thursday evening, February 19, 1959:

I must say that I'm surprised to find myself at a podium I had always regarded as the special domain of a small, select, and austere group known as brains. My unsuitability for that role is evident in that I find myself billed as speaking in answer to the comments made here in November by Mr. Walter Reuther—a spot no real brain would be trapped into.

As a matter of fact, I am sure I would have to agree with Mr. Reuther on many of the broad goals and aspirations that he describes so eloquently.

When we consider what we as a people want out of life, the kind of world we would like for our children, most of us would come up with substantially the same answers.

Most of us would agree that we want a society that offers the greatest possible opportunity for freedom and for individual growth and self-fulfillment. Samuel Gompers had a simpler way of putting it when he said that what labor wanted was more. He might have said more and better. In purely material terms, we all want more and better—more income, more security, more independence, more freedom, more and better education, better medical care, more leisure to do the things we want to do. As a nation, we have vast unfulfilled social needs. A substantial number of American families still do not earn enough to support a decent American standard of living. Millions are still crowded into big city slums. Our whole educational system falls too far short both in quality and quantity of the attainable ideal for a society of such resources. Our facilities for caring for the aged, for the mentally ill, and for combating crime and juvenile deliquency are inadequate.

I'm sure that most of us also are concerned with those peculiarly difficult moral and spiritual problems that arise in an economy of plenty. We are concerned about the human consequences of bigness in government, industry, and labor, of the impact of mass communications on our cultural life, and the effects of increasingly scientific organization of people for economic purposes—the total effect which has been described as the society of the bland leading the bland.

I'm sure we are all deeply concerned with the problem of peace and the exceedingly difficult questions posed by the new Communist economic cold war.

As you know, Mr. Khrushchev has lately taken to predicting the ultimate triumph of his system through economic conquest. There will be no war, he says, because communism will bury us in the competition between its system and ours.

This is no empty threat. We can no longer hide behind the comforting thought that communism is inherently unworkable as an economic system. We have been sharply challenged in basic science and industrial technology. We see evidence of swift growth in both the Soviet Union and Red China—growth under forced draft, admittedly, and at a terrible human cost—but growth that nevertheless must be impressive to people in nearby underdeveloped areas.

Quite apparently Mr. Khrushchev thinks it is only a matter of time until the resources of most of Asia and Africa fall to Communist hands. If the Communist sphere, through the forced development of vast raw material and manpower resources, can flood the world markets with low-priced goods, it could isolate America and Western Europe politically and economically, and at the very least reduce the free world to relative impotence.

And today many intelligent observers are predicting that, if present trends continue, the balance of world power may shift radically to Asia, within the lifetime of this audience. They suggest that, certainly within the lifetime of our children, we could be surpassed in economic power by both China and the Soviet Union.

I don't mean to suggest that our future survival depends on matching either Russia or Red China, or both, in the rate of productive growth in the near future. One reason they are moving ahead so fast is that they have so much farther to go than we. For us to carry on an all-out economic race, comparable to the arms race, would be foolish. And it is quite possible, furthermore, that if these countries reached their goals, the result would be a great lessening of world tensions and a substantial watering down of Marxist dogma.

Nor would I suggest that we can solve all our domestic social problems and meet the challenge of Communist economic competition merely by increasing our own wealth and economic power at a faster rate. More material wealth is by no means the sole or even the primary cure for all our problems.

I do believe we must continue to demonstrate that our kind of economic system can maintain its dynamism and bring ever greater social benefits without infringing on our personal, political, or economic freedoms. And I think it is obvious that we cannot achieve the greater social benefits we all desire, nor can we do the kind of job we ought to be doing in the free world, without spending money.

Some people argue that we could make a much better showing right now if we would merely be a little wiser and a little less selfish, if taxpayers would stop fighting tax increases, if farmers would give up some of their subsidies, and veterans some of their benefits, and if Congressmen would stop pork-barreling. That may be. But it hardly seems realistic to suppose that we are suddenly going to be transformed into a nation of saints or hair-shirt addicts. It's a pretty good bet that we will go right on being the frail and fallible human beings that we are.

To be realistic, our best chance of acting wisely and well as a nation is to make it easier for all of us to do the things that we know we ought to do.

The trick is to arrange things so we can do more and more without having to sacrifice more and more. And the way to do that is to expand our economic base as rapidly as we can soundly do so. If we are able to do that, we can and will have more of everything: higher living standards; more tax revenues; more social benefits; a more effective foreign economic program.

On the whole, of course, this country has done exceptionally well, better than any other, in terms of dynamic economic growth.

But I think it is a reasonable proposition that we can and should do better than we have done in the past by increasing our rate of growth.

How do we go about doing that? I suppose we might start by trying to define exactly the things we would like to achieve in order to maximize our progress.

Ideally, we want the fastest possible continuing increase in the productivity of manufacturing, agriculture, and services. Productivity, of course, is not the same thing as production. Increasing productivity means increasing the amount of goods or services produced with available resources—labor, capital, management, and materials. The more efficient use of all these elements determines the increase in productivity.

Then we would want to increase production to utilize as fully as possible our industrial capacity and to maintain consistently high levels of employment.

We would of course also want continuing high levels of consumption necessary to absorb and sustain a rapid increase in the production of goods. We would want to find ways to decrease the costs and inefficiencies of distributing goods.

And while doing all these things, we would want a stable economy—one that is not subject to sharp business cycles, chronic deficit financing, chronic inflation, or a combination of the three.

These are all eminently desirable objectives. In a relatively primitive economy, under the iron whip of a dictatorship, it should not be difficult to do some or all of these things, for a time at least.

In a more complex and delicately balanced free economy, it's not quite so easy. If you succeed, for example, in increasing sharply your productivity performance, you may displace people from jobs in substantial numbers. If you try artificially to sustain high levels of employment and production, you wind up with surplus goods, and you will almost certainly resist the kind of action that would give you the increased productivity you want.

That is not to say that we cannot by intelligent, sound planning and action increase our rate of economic progress. It can be done. But there is, in my opinion, a right way and a wrong way to go about doing it.

The right way, to put it very simply, is to provide the best possible conditions for the economy, industry, agriculture, and the various services to grow in a natural and balanced manner, and to use the powers of government intelligently to abet this natural process. I have a number of ideas on this subject. Before I go into them, I'd like to take a good searching look at what I consider a very wrong approach to the problem.

I have in mind the approach espoused by certain elements in our society who advocate what I would call the galloper treatment.

Now a galloper is a little cotton stocking filled with powdered carbon. It was used back in prohibition days to hasten the aging of whiskey in the barrel at a time when it was not considered practical to let it mellow and ripen in the natural order of things.

The advocates of giving the economy the galloper treatment are do-it-now men. They want sweeping social measures and they want them now, and all at once. They are frustrated by the perverse contradictions of the economy that keep us from achieving all the things we want now. They appear to feel quite earnestly that the issues facing this country are so grave that we cannot entrust our future to the imperfect and relatively uncontrolled movements of the free market economy.

And though they say, and indeed may believe, that they are in favor of the profit incentive and private enterprise, they say it with a great and obvious lack of conviction.

For they also like to charge that business is inherently morally inferior because it is motivated by the desire for personal gain, that it is greedy, that it lacks constructive social imagination.

The galloper viewpoint is a crisis viewpoint. It sees our national life as a series of cataclysmic happenings and unlimited desperate needs, each one calling for immediate action—usually involving a total mobilization of our resources under strong, central guidance.

This, of course, is a fair approximation of what might be called the traditional extreme leftwing economic viewpoint in our society. I discuss it at such length because this viewpoint once again appears to have politically powerful advocates, after a long period in which it could make no significant headway in either political party.

While it will be disavowed, I am convinced, and I believe that objective study demonstrates, that this is the view held by the single most influential element in the American labor movement. I do not join my deeper-dyed colleagues in viewing the galloper advocates as cynical, Machiavellian demagogs driven by personal ambition or by alien philosophies. I have no reason to doubt that they are honestly and earnestly concerned with promoting the well-being of society.

But I take very strong issue with many of their basic ideas and with many of their methods. I don't know of anybody or any group of people smart enough to mastermind and manipulate artificially our economy without doing much more harm than good. And I am concerned today because I believe that this group has a very good chance of imposing its basic views upon our society.

In terms of unfettered power, big labor is the strongest single center in the American economy. There is broad agreement today, except perhaps among labor-oriented economists, that the big union today is in a position of unrestricted monopoly power. It is using that power not to increase the growth of the American pie, but to cut out a larger share for its constituents. In the process, it is unquestionably thwarting the very improvement in productivity and the increased economic growth that it says it wants.

There can be no question that the unions today are politically powerful and effective. In a growing number of States, unions have achieved increasing influence if not practical control over legislatures, courts and administrative agencies. I have in mind, for example, the recent Michigan Supreme Court decision which, in effect, would force industry to finance strikes against itself.

These gains enable some unions not only to tighten the screws on management, but also to advance broad social and political goals of their leadership.

I believe, in fact, that the giant AFL–CIO is functioning less and less as a primarily economic organism. Today, it takes care of labor's traditional economic concerns with its left hand, while its right arm is plunged up to the elbow in politics. It is, by its own admission, using political action to achieve economic and other ends that it cannot achieve across the bargaining table. And in a time of relative political apathy it is, I think, the most aggressive, ascendant force in American politics.

And, finally, I believe that this economically powerful, politically powerful force has among its leaders a few men who, in their zeal to accomplish their own brand of social ends, have been careless about means, to put it as gently as I can. Either they are very poor economists or they are not willing to let objective economic truth stand in their way.

They are masters of the righteous slogan, the thinly veiled appeal to selfish interest, the glib response to the serious and complex problem. They answer the important and valid generalization with the fast, flashy and often false particular. Because they are politically adroit and highly persuasive publicists, economic understanding is being done a measurable harm, misinformation is multiplied, and the democratic process itself is impaired. As Adlai Stevenson used to say: "It is better to lose than to mislead the people."

Now I realize that such methods are the traditional methods of political oratory. I don't mean to condemn them as such; I do think they should be recognized for what they are.

For all these reasons, the giant unions, their economic monopoly power, their political influence, their methods and their motivating philosophies deserve the most earnest scrutiny by all thoughtful Americans, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, who are seriously concerned about preserving important fundamental values of our economic and political system.

I have made a number of flat and broad assertions here and I will make more, because there are a lot of things I want to say and just not enough time to document them all. I would like to point out one or two major areas wherein what union leaders say and what they do offer particularly sharp contrasts. It is perhaps extraneous to mention, by the way, that what the fellows at the top say in public often has precious little resemblance to what they say at the grassroots to the rank and file.

The politically vocal group in labor have lately been beating the drums for a substantial increase in national productivity. Some would like to see us move from the historical average annual growth of about 2.3 percent to something more like 5 percent.

If union leadership seriously wants increased productivity, I can think of no better place for it to start than with its own bargaining philosophy and demands. It is common knowledge that many trade unions have traditionally and strongly resisted new methods and tools leading to productive increases. Certain unions in the construction trades, for example, have stubbornly and effectively held back progress at a cost of untold billions of dollars to homeowners and to the whole economy.

The old trade union psychology has carried over into the newer industrial unions, though I must say in fairness that most of our present industrial labor leaders have not seriously attempted to block the introduction of new and more productive machinery—despite their outcries against automation. Nevertheless, many of the barriers to increased productivity are union made.

The labor contracts of various industries contain provisions that seriously hamper progress in efficiency, including featherbedding, union participation in determining work standards, extreme seniority rules, and actual disincentives to outstanding performance. On the latter point, in our 1958 negotiations, the UAW seriously proposed that promotion should be based exclusively on seniority, and that merit should not be considered—a proposal to which we did not agree.

In view of all this, incidentally, I am always puzzled to find union leaders speaking of increased worker productivity, as though workers must sweat harder in order to produce more. Improved productivity means less human sweat, not more. Industrial productivity generally is increased through investment in better, more efficient plant, better machinery, better methods and processes, better scheduling, and so on.

In this sense "management productivity" is a more appropriate term than "labor productivity."

The union leaders who say they want more productivity—while steadfastly resisting it—also say a lot of other things. They say they believe in profits and the incentive system. They say they want all groups in the society, including business, to share in the produc-

tive growth of the economy. They say they do not want wage gains that are inflationary, and that they don't want to redistribute the pie, but merely to share in a growing pie. The fact that so often they do the exact opposite of what they say does not necessarily mean that they are insincere. It may just mean that they feel they must do a lot of things they don't really want to do in order to hold their jobs.

Take the wage-price inflation dispute. In the years following World War II, labor hourly wage rates had climbed at a faster rate than in any like period in our history. In 1956 and continuing well into 1958, we had a series of even sharper increases in hourly wages and fringe benefits in major manufacturing industries. These averaged from 5 to 6 percent a year, or from two to three times the longrun average annual growth in productivity for the economy. Since about 80 percent of the final cost of manufactured products is attributable to labor content, we found ourselves in a full-scale wage inflation. Higher wages in industry brought demands for higher wages and salaries throughout the economy, and the inflationary pressures spread.

Of course, industrial labor—and it alone—was insulated against the inflationary effects of its own wage increases. Many labor contracts contain escalator provisions, known as cost-of-living allowances, which provide automatic wage increases equal to the rise in consumer prices. They also have additional guaranteed annual wage increases in the form of an annual improvement factor. Negotiations for wage increases usually start from on top of this base.

In 1958 people began to wake up to these facts, and the public reaction to rising living costs put the big unions on something of a spot. Union leaders are always under pressure to get regular and bigger wage and benefit increases for their membership. However, a point had been reached where they could not get those increases out of the normal productive growth, wage costs forced prices upward, and the added wages that went into the unionized worker's pocket inevitably came out of somebody else's pocket—mainly from the pocket of the farmer, the teacher, the preacher, the Government worker, and retired people on fixed incomes, who did not have the economic power to protect themselves.

In the face of this pressure, union leaders came up with the theory that what we had was not wage-caused inflation but profit-caused inflation, that industries with monopolistically administered prices were pricing their products in such a way as to extort bloated profits from a helpless public.

As a matter of fact, the aggregate statistics for the movements of prices, profits, and wages over a substantial period of time directly contradicted this thesis.

Of all major components in the economy, business profits alone have failed to share in the exceptional growth of the past decade. Compensation of corporate employees increased from $90 billion in 1948 to $160 billion in 1957. Increases both in total employment and rates of pay contributed to this rise. For example, average hourly wage rates in manufacturing industry increased about 50 percent in this 10-year period. Corporate net profits, by contrast, stayed at about $17 to $18 billion a year despite greatly increased investment and sales. The return on capital invested in manufacturing declined from 16.3 percent to 11.1 percent, or about one-third, over the same period.

I have no idea whether the rise in compensation and wage rates is just and fair on an abstract moral basis. But I do think we must ask whether the failure of profits to keep pace with economic growth is healthy for this country and its people. Each year it takes more and more capital investment merely to sustain a consistent level of profits. If our labor leaders want dynamic growth, they should be concerned that industry gets enough profit both to create and to lure substantially greater capital investment.

The fact is that when the statistical evidence failed to support the union's price-inflation theory, they ignored the facts that did not fit their thesis. They indulged in highly selective statistical argument. For 3 years, they made great capital of the fact that General Motors made some very substantial profits in 1955.

During our own 1958 negotiations, we were constantly beaten over the head with GM's 1955 profits and Harlow Curtice's 1955 paycheck. About our own profits, which were worse than nonexistent at the time, we heard nothing. So if anybody happens to give you an argument based on Harlow Curtice's pay or the number of times United States Steel has increased its prices, I hope you will ask him to open the book a little wider and let you see the rest of the figures.

Now of course the insidious thing about wage-cost inflation is that it cannot be stopped by any normal economic procedure. We have here an absolutely unlimited appetite with virtually unlimited power to gratify itself.

Taking at face value the statements of union leaders that they do not want inflationary wage increases, that they want to encourage increased productivity and the capital formation necessary to achieve it, it is most unrealistic to assume that they will match their actions to their words under the present circumstances.

Our big unions need help. The first step is to relieve them of the burden of monopoly power so that once again they will meet management on a basis of real power equality, and competitive market forces can work to keep profits, prices, and wages in balance. To do this requires sound action limiting monopoly power of unions. Such action would also help to correct the abuses that unrestricted power has made possible in certain unions. Another advantage in limiting union power would be to relieve some of the growing union pressure on government—including the administrative, legislative, and judicial authorities, both State and national—so that Government may continue impartially to balance the conflicting powers of labor and management, and not act as a partisan of one group or the other.

At the same time, there must be effective political action to oppose the political action of unions. I can assure you that finding the vitality to match the political vitality of the union movement will be no easy task. It is a fact of life that the great majority of our voting population is not in the entrepreneurial group and is largely indifferent, if not actively hostile, to industry. People generally do not recognize their personal stake in the business corporation.

People seeking direct social benefits from Government know what they want and are willing to work to get it. The recent political triumphs of unions in such States as Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and California are the result largely of active participation in politics by the whole union organization and many of its members.

While business has been politically active, it has not been effective because of its failure to generate broad participation by people in local politics. I suspect also that it has erred in identifying itself and its causes too exclusively with the extreme conservative political viewpoint. It spends most of its time trying to convert the faithful; it has notably failed to appeal effectively to the large mass of independent voters and has almost totally defaulted in terms of making its influence felt within the more moderate elements in both political parties.

It seems to me that the best hope for stopping the present political drift toward a Government-controlled economy, and for opening the door to exuberant economic growth, lies in the political activation of a large, moderate, politically inactive middle-income group in our society. This group amounts, by one estimate, to 30 percent of the electorate. It is the fastest-growing group in the country, composed substantially of white collar and middle management employees. It could be playing a dominant role in politics. If it can be mobilized, it would provide a solid and very wholesome buffer to extremes of either the right or the left.

Today business is actively seeking to organize this latent political power and to regain the ground it has lost as a result of its own indifference and blindness. We need not and indeed must not think of this job in negative, stop-union terms.

Let me assure you that, despite my remarks about certain aspects of union activities, I am not in favor of union busting.

I appreciate fully the valuable contributions of organized labor to our society. I believe that over the long run, in a free enterprise economy, industrial workers need good unions with intelligent and honest leadership to represent them. We might never have had today's overly powerful unions if it were not for the bad, unwise, irresponsible behavior of many businesses of an earlier era.

But I am opposed to unrestricted power. I am against it in business. I am against it in government. I am against it in labor. Monopoly, unrestricted power in any form, is inconsistent with the values and effective functioning of our kind of society.

Though unions argue that they are not a proper subject for monopoly control because they represent human beings, rather than commodities, the fact is that unions can and do restrict trade just as effectively as any other economic force.

I do believe that bringing labor's economic and political power within reasonable bounds will have valuable consequences for the whole country. It will temper one particularly insidious form of inflation, and that will mean greater stability throughout the economy. It will stop the constant squeezing of profits between the pincers of rising costs and price resistance, and that will mean increased incentive to invest in new products, new plant and equipment.

It will be one important step toward building a more dynamic economy along the sound and healthy lines that I mentioned earlier—that is, by providing the best possible conditions for the whole economy, including industry, the services and agriculture, to grow in a natural and balanced manner.

Now let me admit that up to this point I have not said much that the boys down at the Union League Club would not applaud. Clamp down on the unions? Resist direct Government interference in business? By all means, they would say. They might take issue with me, of course, for not having proposed a reduction of Federal Government activities and the Federal budget to the levels of the Harding administration.

But if business can't come up with anything better than merely negative proposals, if it can't come up with a positive and workable program for a stronger and more dynamic economy, then it will certainly lose out in the political race with those who paint a more brilliant picture of the future, who offer action now—however ill-conceived it might be—and who appeal directly not only to the desire for more, but to commonly held, deep-seated American ideals—the ideal of caring and caring well for our sick and aged, our helpless and indigent; the ideal of giving our young the best we can give them of sound health and good education; the ideal of helping to the best of our ability less fortunate people in other lands, not merely because it is to our advantage to do

so, but because we are part of a common humanity, and we cannot say: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

This is the kind of appeal that stirs the minds and hearts of the American people, as it does those of people everywhere. Before such an appeal, the dry dissertations of many businessmen on the virtues of the private enterprise system blow away like dust in the wind.

Certainly I believe in the private-enterprise system. I believe it can go on giving us the great benefits of economic and social progress it has given us in the past. I believe in it, not because I think it is divinely ordained, but because it works better than any other system yet devised. It works because it effectively harnesses aggressive human drives to broadly constructive purposes. It works because it provides incentives that seem to stimulate masses of people to vigorous effort and a constant restless search for greater efficiency.

But I recognize also that the private-enterprise system is not really a system at all. What we have is a loose and tremendously varied array of private and public enterprises, held together by the cohesive force of certain underlying principles—free incentive and a degree of freedom of choice and action established by law and by custom. We have three to four million centers of initiative in this country versus one in Russia.

Again, I recognize, as all of us must, that as our society has grown more complex, Government has had to play an ever greater role, direct and indirect, in our economy. Realistically, over the years ahead that trend is not likely to be reversed.

Our problem as businessmen is not to dig in our heels and resist any and all kinds of governmental activity. Our problem is to try to see to it that Government does the right kind of things, that it avoids those measures that are economically harmful—the subsidies that perpetuate marginal industries and marginal agriculture, or that try to sustain marginal industrial areas, for example—and that it provides more of the services and facilities that promote genuinely worthwhile economic purposes without shackling economic freedom.

In that context, I would like to suggest several general areas of action that I believe hold great potential for a new productive explosion in the American economy.

First, I would suggest an attack by all elements of our society on the existing barriers to increasing productivity in industry, agriculture, and services. Let's try harder to get rid of the old-world craft guild psychology that has no place in our dynamic, fast-changing economy—the psychology that locks people into marginal jobs and obsolescent skills.

Second, I suggest that we make possible greatly increased business capital investment by permitting business profits to share reasonably in our economic growth, and by wiser taxation, particularly in terms of more realistic and faster depreciation allowances for writing off plant and equipment and encouraging the building of new.

Third, we must try to stimulate greater consumption of goods and services. The way to do this effectively is to intensify sharply our development of new or greatly improved products that will persuade people to get out their wallets and buy. Industry must utilize much better the latent creativity of the people it employs, and venture more in introducing new products. We should develop better incentives to encourage new product ideas; publicize and commend originality in product design; and use the resources of government, trade organizations, and the like to anticipate needs for new kinds of products and to exploit more fully the vast potential of recent scientific discoveries and new technologies.

Fourth, we should use the resources of industry and government more effectively to maintain high and stable levels of employment and income.

I think we would all agree that the one single factor in the private enterprise economy that leads to great political pressures toward the welfare state is its cylical nature and its need for mobility within the work force.

While we can minimize cycles in the free enterprise economy, there is no way of eliminating them entirely. Buying habits change. Excessive inventories of certain goods accumulate from time to time. Plants shut down and people are laid off. At times whole industries become obsolete, and their employees are forced to find new jobs and learn new skills.

Again, technological advances in industry and agriculture displace people from farms, from factories, from special labor skills.

All of these things create worry, unhappiness, and economic problems for the people involved. Ultimately they turn to the State to solve their problems.

Now the fact is that a remarkable and wonderful thing has been happening in our country. In the postwar period there has been a great increase in nonfarm and non-industrial employment—in the Government, in education and other social services, in recreation and tourism, in business services. A whole new and greatly varied world of opportunity has opened up for millions of Americans. Because of this change in type of employment most people went right on working through the postwar recessions.

We ought to be concentrating hard on accelerating this trend by increasing greatly the educational opportunities open to our whole populace. We should be upgrading people and skills at the fastest rate possible. We need better-educated people in vast numbers throughout our society. Right now it is estimated that only about half of our brightest high-school students are receiving the higher education that would enable them to realize their full potential. We are prodigally wasting our most vital single resource.

In the mid-sixties, we will have a great influx of young people into the job market. Many people of superior talents will be competing for routine jobs, of which there may not be enough to go around. We ought to be planning right now to help provide these young people all the higher education they can profitably use.

I am sure many things can be done to help people meet technological and economic change more readily. Today there are many public and private measures that protect people against the excessive economic hardship that was common in an earlier day. There is a certain inflexibility in many of these measures. They tend sometimes to tie people to skills that are no longer in demand and often to hold them in communities where the jobs they held no longer exist.

Business in general has not given the earnest attention it might to the solution of this problem and its own stake in that solution.

In fairness to the businessman who is often charged with a lack of social imagination, I must point out that the unions provide a potent disincentive to the exercise of such imagination. Unions tend to view social awareness as their private domain and to resent sharply any poaching by business on that domain. The hapless businessman who publicly explores a novel economic idea risks having it hurled back at him across the bargaining table, doubled in spades and scarcely recognizable. If he then demurs, he stands publicly revealed as a welsher who won't put his money where his mouth is.

It's awfully hard to be farsighted with that big union thumb in your eye.

But I, for one would like to see business and industry give serious and systematic thought to finding ways in which both private and public resources can be used more intelligently to stabilize employment and income in ways consistent with broad national growth in productive efficiency.

I know that in American management there are many men with the broad vision and the sense of social justice needed to break through the barriers that block the fullest development and growth of our society. I think that the talent, the imagination, and the sound practical judgment of business must be marshaled more effectively to attack these problems.

The American business system has created a great reserve of national wealth out of which we have already established an unheard-of degree of security and prosperity for the American home. We have shored it up with broad public and private social measures—measures which in themselves have strengthened our economy and have contributed to our prosperity. It follows that we businessmen should not allow label-thinking to scare us away from examining fairly and without fear all future means which, consistent with economic and political freedom, will enhance our future prosperity and security as a nation, and encourage people to accept willingly the marginal uncertainties characteristic of any system where initiative is not centered in the Government.

In material terms, our future prospect is breathtaking. The new technologies which have already so vastly altered our lives—atomic energy, electronics, the new chemical, and the new metallurgical advances—are in their infancy. We have had a scientific explosion that has yet to be translated into an economic explosion of like magnitude.

In the face of vast opportunities and the economic challenge of world communism, we simply can't afford to play two-bit poker with protective tariffs and unimaginative foreign policies. Nor can we afford, at home, to sit around haggling about how we will carve up our pie instead of doing the things necessary to free our economic machine and make that pie grow as it has never grown before.

America's potential is more than equal to the stirring challenge we face. By doing promptly and thoroughly the things we know we must do, we can reaffirm in the minds and hearts of men everywhere the deep conviction that human progress—social and spiritual, as well as economic—can best be achieved through freedom and individual initiative.

---

## Cambodia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to salute the March 6 independence day of the people of the monarchy of Cambodia, His Majesty Prince Norodom Shanouk, and His Excellency Nong Kimny, Ambassador to the United States.

Cambodia is a country of 6 million inhabitants, 400,000 of whom are Vietnamese and 350,000 Chinese. The Cambodian economy is essentially agricultural with rice as a principal crop and source of wealth and rubber a close second. Large-scale industry is virtually nonexistent. Most manufacturing con-

sists of agricultural processing in rubber plants, rice mills, oil mills, with limited industries producing lumber, tile, brick, woven goods, rope, baskets, pottery, jewelry, and skins for local needs. Investigations have not revealed substantial mineral resources, but an adequate geological survey has not yet been made of Cambodia. However, some deposits of iron ore, copper, manganese, gold, coal, zircons, and phosphates have been revealed.

Private capital investment has been little utilized in Cambodia in its economic development largely for the fact that emphasis is on projects which are of the basic type frequently carried on by governments. But, says the report of the U.S. Department of Commerce, it also derives from obstacles to private capital investment. Among obstacles to private capital investment are lack of managerial, technical, and mechanical skills and relatively limited domestic capital. Private enterprise has been slow to invest in Cambodia in response to a climate of economic nationalism which inclines the Government toward close supervision of private economic activity. Thus the Government requires prior authorization of new investments by the Minister of Finance who together may decide which proposed activities are useful to the economy of Cambodia. Moreover, the law requires some Cambodian capital participation and the employment of Cambodian personnel, but it also adheres to the principle of a just and equitable indemnity in case of nationalization, and offers the possibility of a 10- and 30-year guarantee against the risk of nationalization.

Cambodia achieved real and complete independence from France on November 9, 1953. The freedom to determine her future which she now enjoys is jealously guarded. The Cambodians, so Prince Noradom Sihanouk has written, will be lackeys of no foreign powers and their policy will be suited to their national needs.

In their foreign relations, the Prince explains, they are favoring neutrality which neutrality, he asserts, has been imposed on them by necessity—a position forced upon Cambodia by its geographical position, lying as it does between the Western bloc and Eastern bloc countries of North Vietnam and the vast Peoples' Republic of China. What choice have the Cambodians but to try to maintain an equal balance between these blocs?

Morever, the Prince inquires, how could their neutrality be taken seriously is Cambodia maintained diplomatic, commercial and other relations exclusively with the Western bloc? Prince Sihanouk revealed that although China has given, with no strings attached, $25 million in economic aid, they do not forget that American economic and military aid to Cambodia amounted to $40 million for the 1957 and 1959 budgetary year and that it also was offered unconditionally, as is the aid offered by France, for equipment. But, the Prince explains, he wishes aid would be less rigid, particularly American aid since its purpose is to provide the Cambodians with the framework of a modern state.

Finally, the Prince wishes Americans to clearly understand they are not Communist inclined nor flirting with the Reds; certainly Americans must know that the first concern of the Communists is to get rid of the King and the natural elite of any country they succeed in laying hands on.

I would like to close this salute to Cambodia on this 6th day of March 1959, by giving expression in the Congress of the United States to the words of Prince Noradom Sihanouk which appeared in Foreign Affairs, July 1958, for I am convinced the explanation of their policy and the wisdom which undergirds it should be at our fingertips hereafter when we discuss our relations with the Afro-Asian bloc countries:

> If I have no particular liking for communism, neither have I any cause or means to join a crusade, even a moral one, against the nations that have adopted that ideology and which since 1954 have not given my country sufficient grounds for complaint. It would be absurd to suppose that a tiny country like mine, geographically situated as it is, would risk provoking the Chinese and Soviet colossi now that planes fly so fast and rockets so far.
>
> We are not a breach in the Western bloc merely because we cannot be a rampart. In the event of a world conflict, we might very well become one of the first victims of a harsh occupation. In that case, the free world would have other things to do besides undertaking our liberation, or rather the liberation of what little remained of us.
>
> Are we selfish or wrong-minded in thinking as we do? I maintain that we are merely being realistic. By practicing a genuine neutrality which eliminates any pretext for aggression we have a chance of not bringing down a storm on our heads; and a storm can be dangerous where there is no lightning conductor.
>
> Our precautions may be to no avail and we may one day be invaded notwithstanding them. (I am not afraid of internal subversion which stands no chance here). If, in spite of our manifest good intentions and our utter propriety in respect to the blocs, one of these should attack us, then I would be the first to advocate reconsidering our policy and invoking aid from the opponents of our aggressors. I profoundly hope that our country will never have to take such a step.

I have quoted here at length the expressions of an Asian country, friendly disposed toward the West but with a mind of its own; with a program for survival that is consistent with its strategic relationship and the aspirations and needs of its people. They are loud and clear enough for all to hear with the force of determination and maturity. It is important that we of the United States listen, comprehend, and react intelligently to the rising expectation unleased in this world and gage our actions accordingly. We must lower our anchors and prepare to ride the tide on an equal surface with justice and humility toward all.

## Presidential Commission on the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary Presidential Commission to study the potentialities, problems, and needs of blind persons in the United States in relation to the various federally supported services and programs designed to assist them. The need for a comprehensive, authoritative, and objective study of this type has become increasingly apparent during the past several years. The rapid growth and development of service programs as a result of legislation enacted during and since World War II; changing concepts in rehabilitation, education of the handicapped, social insurance, and social welfare in general; changing public attitudes toward the blind; the steadily increasing population of blind persons—all of these factors emphasize the necessity for a high-level study of programs and services for blind persons in order to objectively determine the adequacy of existing services and to recommend improvement in the light of present and future needs.

My bill would provide for such a study of services and programs supported to any extent by Federal funds with the exception of medical research. As my colleagues know, I have been an advocate of increasing Federal support for medical research as the best hope for eliminating the killing and disabling diseases of mankind; and I will continue to be a strong advocate of effective medical research. However, our concern in this bill is for those persons who must make their way in life without sight—the several thousand premature babies of a few years ago—now of grade-school age—who lost their sight because of excessive oxygen in incubators before the cause was discovered and eliminated, the men and women who are blinded each year in industrial and other accidents, and those who lost and continue to lose their sight through diseases whose cure and cause are not yet known. We are interested in learning how we can better assist such people to become full participants in the economic and social life of the Nation.

My bill calls for a Study Commission consisting of nine members to be appointed by the President from among prominent persons in public and private life and the pertinent professions. It authorizes the employment of a full-time staff and permits the utilization of specialists from voluntary agencies for short periods of time without compensation except for expenses. The duration of the study would be 2½ years, and a total appropriation of $450,000 would be authorized to carry it out. This

amount would cover a per diem allowance of $50 and travel expenses for members of the Commission, salaries and travel expenses of the staff, printing of the final report and staff background documents, office supplies, and the like, for the entire 2½-year period.

The Commission is charged with studying existing Federal laws which provide services or benefits to blind persons; with studying and evaluating the standards of these services; and with formulating and recommending standards where none exist, in addition to any other recommendations it may make for improvement of services. Thus, programs and benefits for blind persons administered by several Federal agencies would be covered as would State programs in which the Federal Government participates financially. Only those voluntary agencies which participate in Federal programs through the purchase of products, such as workshops for the blind, or through the purchase of services would be included.

I know that the study provided for in this bill will result in improving services to blind people and make it possible for many more of them to take their rightful places in the productive life of our Nation.

## National Safety Council Award to the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I think it is indeed fitting, in view of the fact that National Boy Scout Week has just passed, that I include herein the remarks of Maj. Gen. George C. Stewart—retired—executive vice president of the National Safety Council, in presenting the National Safety Council Award of Honor to the Boy Scouts of America at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D.C., on February 10, 1959:

REMARKS BY GEN. GEORGE C. STEWART, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

This is one of the most pleasant duties I have ever performed.

Like all Americans, I have always had the highest admiration for the Boy Scouts of America. I feel strongly that they are unsurpassed as a powerful force for a better citizenry. I can't imagine this country without the Boy Scouts.

You can imagine, then, how delighted I was, how delighted all of us were, when the Boy Scouts chose safety for their good turn program for 1958.

I am told that all 535 councils of the National Boy Scout organization participated in the program for a total of 28,728 traffic, 20,824 outdoor, and 48,225 home safety projects. These 97,800 projects represented 17,312,000 boy-hours of Scout activity.

This tremendous impetus to a safer America seemed to the National Safety Council to dramatically typify and demonstrate the power of the Boy Scouts and of youth in general to lead the way to a better life in this country.

No one can reckon the results of what the Boy Scouts did for safety in 1958. But the facts are that the traffic death toll came down 1,700 in 1958 from the preceding year, that deaths from home accidents came down 1,000, and that outdoor accidental deaths also came down 1,000—a total in those 3 categories of 3,700.

The National Safety Council sincerely believes that the safety efforts of the Boy Scouts played an important and essential part in achieving that substantial saving in human life.

Certainly there is no more direct or effective way to emphasize safety within the family circle than by having it presented by the boy of the house.

Believing as we do that the headquarters of the nationwide war on accidents is the American home, and that the supreme command in that war is the family circle, we naturally regard the Boy Scout Safety Good Turn program as a major development in this war.

It is a perfect example of two public service organizations working together in the public interest, the council utilizing its technical knowledge and experience in accident prevention, and the Boy Scouts devoting their huge membership and prestige to turning that knowledge and experience into action to prevent accidents.

The Board of Directors of the National Safety Council have unanimously and enthusiastically voted to confer the council's top award—the Award of Honor—upon the Boy Scouts of America for their great contribution to a safer America, the most significant contribution to accident prevention ever made by a youth organization.

It is my great honor to present this award to Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, chief scout executive.

## The Turbine Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article by Mr. Charles Hannan entitled "The Turbine Mess," which appeared in the February 27, 1959, issue of Electrical Union News, Local 201, IUE, AFL–CIO, published in Lynn, Mass.

THE TURBINE MESS

(By Charles Hannan)

Why are turbine contracts, for which the U.S. Government puts up the money, going to foreign firms rather than to American companies?

Why? Because U.S. Congressmen and American firms, like the General Electric Co., Westinghouse, etc., have failed to press for a change in a law that both the Congressmen and the industrialists know is out of date.

Back in 1938, Congress passed a law on work contracts for which Government agencies put up the money through loans. This law said that if the bid of an American firm was within 6 percent of the bid of a foreign firm, preference should be given to the American firm.

This was a good law in 1938. The 6 percent reflected the actual differences in economies, wages, and living conditions between this country and foreign countries.

But everyone with a half a brain knows that the American standard of living is now much higher than the standards prevailing in Europe. The difference has been growing all the time.

The leeway on bidding today should be about 40 percent at least. The Congress, which passed the first law in 1938, knows this. So do the officials of big companies like GE and Westinghouse, who must offer bids in competition with these foreign firms—and with only a 6-percent leeway.

Why haven't the Members of Congress done something about this? The fact that the difference is much greater than 6 percent has been apparent for years. Why haven't the American firms that have to bid in competition with the foreign firms done some shouting about the antiquated law? Don't they really want business?

Representatives of Local 201, the International IUE–AFL–CIO, Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, some GE representatives, and the Congressional Action Committee of the Greater Lynn Chamber of Commerce have been the only ones to protest this situation, which is leading to the destruction of our turbine business.

Why haven't our Representatives in Congress screamed for a change that would prevent this outrage on the American public?

This is a fight for survival, and we're all in it—like it or not. How about a fight like that put up by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania?

In the Baldwin locomotive contract fiasco, when work was being given to foreign bidders, Senator SCOTT hollered, screamed, and banged away until the award was reversed.

From whence come the pressures that leave such obvious loopholes through which foreign companies enter to destroy us?

You are in the position of paying taxes, losing your job, and then paying some foreign company to do your work.

So how come there isnt a big, big noise being made by our elected representatives? And here, my friend and fellow worker, is the $64 question: How come companies like GE, Westinghouse, Delaval, Allis-Chalmers, etc., have so little concern for business and their own people as to remain mum until the contracts were awarded to Brown-Boveri of Switzerland and Parsons, Ltd.?

Manufacturers who bid on contracts such as these know what other companies are bidding. Why haven't American firms blown the whistle on the unfair law, when they knew Brown-Boveri and Parsons submitted bids?

Why didn't they come out and say to you and me: "We have a problem, a serious problem. This is a battle for survival. We have to do something, and fast, and we need your help."

No. They wait until "the chickens have flown the coop." Then they start crying about what they lost.

The minute that GE, Westinghouse, et al. knew that these foreign firms were bidding, they knew immediately, that due to the existence of the antiquated law, they had no chance whatsoever of getting the contract awards.

What chance is there in the future of competing with these foreign companies, as long as the bids of American firms can be only 6 percent over those submitted by foreign firms.

Brown-Boveri underbid GE by 40 percent, and Parsons underbid by 60 percent. These foreign companies are making profits even with bids this far below ours.

Even if we (by some miracle) were able to cut our bids by 60 percent, the foreign firms could reduce their bids by 10 or 15 percent and still make a profit.

By the time that automation, cost reduction, job combinations and other corner

cuttings are instituted, our work here in Lynn and in Schenectady will be long gone.

Until the law is changed, I humbly suggest that the Government issue a stop order on contracts awarded to foreign turbine manufacturers at once.

## Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1959, Burma celebrated her 11th year of independence. Today I wish to congratulate its leaders, Prime Minister General Ne Win, and His Excellency U Win, Ambassador of Burma, for their leadership and for the good will which exists between the United States and their country.

Although Burma, as an independent country, is only 11 years old the country has made great strides forward in developing its own Government and in advancing democratic administration. In that short period of time the Burmese people have moved far ahead economically as well as in external relations.

While eager to share in the greater material well-being which modern technology affords, the Burmese hasten to explain they will not go overboard for industrialization. Moreover, they have announced their determination to resist the building of uneconomic industrial facilities which would have to be protected by high import duties because they believe in a liberal foreign-trade policy. In fact, they explain they intend to actively explore ways of stabilizing markets and expanding trade with all countries. In all, the Burmese have managed to maintain a balanced economic and social development, while carrying on an extensive program in the training of professional people, technicians, and administrators, including civil servants. The Burmese are a thrifty people determined to protect their newly won economic and political freedom and to preserve their spiritual heritage.

Burma is a natural democracy; a man's birth counts for so little that there are no family names. Women enjoy full equality and marriage and divorce are easier to obtain than in most parts of the United States.

Judge Nadine Lane Gallagher, formerly of municipal court of the District of Columbia, was reported recently as giving credit to the Burmese women along with other women of Asia for being their countries' active forces on social reform.

The Burmese are dedicated to parliamentary democracy and an aversion to totalitarianism which characterizes the approach of the Burmese leaders both to national and international problems. His Excellency U Thant, Ambassador of Burma to the United Nations, stated recently that the Burmese see the world as plagued by age-old tensions, political, social, and economic and the people of Burma are convinced that the safety and survival of free political institutions depend upon resolving these tensions before they become intolerable. Though Burma herself subscribes to democratic principles and supports democratic institutions, she declines to pass judgment on the international affairs of other countries subscribing instead to policies based on peaceful coexistence.

Mr. Thant's contribution to American thinking is of greatest significance to our present purpose when he seeks to explain the common cause that is the peoples of the Afro-Asian bloc countries follows in the quote taken from an article which appeared last July in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science:

> Victory will come to the side which understands and takes into account the most important phenomenon of the 20th century—nationalism. The problem is, in essence, the problem of equality of opportunity.
>
> Let me touch briefly on this.
>
> There are millions of people in the world who do not have enough to eat and enough to cover themselves with, and whose children cannot go even to the primary schools.
>
> It seems comic to talk to them about the virtues of democratic ideals and the dignity of man. During the last war there was a great deal of talk of the imperative need for democracy to triumph over fascism. Mr. Churchill had then invited the Burmese people to take part in that war for democracy. Young Burmese nationalists had said then that Burma would not fight for democracy when she herself was enchained in slavery. And for that answer democracy did not hesitate to shut up a number of young Burmese leaders in prison.
>
> Is the situation different today? Take Africa for instance. Over a hundred million people are being ruled today by the free nations of the world. What does the fight against totalitarianism mean to these millions of people? When France, for instance, proudly proclaims to the world that her soldiers are killing 4,000 Algerians every month, is the cause of the democracies enhanced? The white settlers of South Africa, who treat the colored people as worse than lepers, are greater enemies of democracy than the Communists. They are generating tensions much more ruthlessly than the cold war tactics allegedly employed by the Communists.
>
> Let us not delude ourselves with the oversimplification of the world issue. The issue today is not only that of communism versus democracy. The more essential issue is the division of the word into the weak and the strong, the prosperous and the abject poor, the ruler and the ruled, the master race and the subhuman.
>
> Therefore, if the war for democracy has any meaning, it is necessary that we all sit together and create here and now the conditions that will guarantee freedom, justice, well-being, and equality to all.

In all our discussions of the excolonial and colonial world it is well for us to bear in mind the driving determination of the progressive leadership with the support of the overwhelming masses for national solidarity and for advancing and welding of Pan Asian-Pan African as a prerequisite of economic viability and international peace. In the words of Judge Gallagher in all of this, "Our most potent weapon is friendship."

## Teenage Driving Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared recently in the Selma Times Journal, one of the outstanding newspapers of my district. This article deals with the traffic safety problems of our young drivers.

For the past 2½ years, I have had the honor of serving as chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety. At the present time I am serving as chairman of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In both these capacities, I have heard many witnesses testify to the great need for expanding our driver training programs, and to that end I have introduced a bill which would provide some assistance for research in this tremendously important area.

I believe the editorial which follows does a splendid job of summarizing this problem and pointing out the urgent need for action:

> YOUTH ON WHEELS
>
> Relentless though it be, the campaign for safer driving often seems to produce too few encouraging results. Consequently, we can't afford to overlook opportunities to make substantial inroads on the problem.
>
> One place this prospect may exist is among our youthful drivers. As a group they are more inclined than their elders either to become involved in or to be responsible for automobile accidents.
>
> According to the Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, young men under 25, from coast to coast, have the worst driving records. Though they represent just 15 percent of all drivers, they account for some 25 percent of all the accidents.
>
> Within the younger age brackets, differences are less clear, but some studies tend to show that the youngest drivers are the poorest. A Connecticut motor vehicle bureau survey showed that the percentage of 16-year-olds involved in accidents and the percentage held at fault were both twice as great as the percentages for 17-year-olds.
>
> Figures indicate further that the younger drivers tend to become involved in the more serious accidents.
>
> Most studies by official State agencies, safety organizations, and insurance companies usually support these general findings.
>
> The accident statistics, incidentally, do not yield the same conclusions for young girl drivers, whose record is as good as that of adults.
>
> More and better driver training is, of course, one big and obvious answer. Many schools offer it now, but many do not. Opinions vary as to whether it should be a school function, though no one questions the need for the instruction.
>
> Possibly we need more uniformity in State laws on the licensing of young drivers. There is wide disparity in this field, with 16 years the minimum in some places despite the evidence of high accident rates at that level.

Maybe, too, Americans as parents need to reconsider the wisdom of allowing their youngsters to have cars at school. A study made by a Rexburg, Idaho, high school found no "A" students driving cars to school, just 15 percent of "B" students doing it, but 41 percent of the "C's" with cars, 71 percent of the "D's" and 83 percent of the "E's."

It's become quite the accepted thing to let the lad of 16 or a bit older get behind the wheel of a car—yours or his. The question, growing more acute is: "Should it be so readily accepted?"

## Public Not Told the Facts on Russian Atomic Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a most important article recently carried in the Hartford Times, a highly respected newspaper in my home State.

The author of the article is Prof. Josef Kalvoda, an instructor in political science and history at St. Joseph's College, West Hartford, who is also chairman of the Czech Christian Democratic Movement. He is the author of the book, "Titoism and Masters of Imposture."

Professor Kalvoda's article declares that the American public has not been told the facts about Soviet Russia's great advances in the atomic field. It sounds an urgent warning that the free world is in danger unless we close the gap which now exists between Soviet technology and ours.

Following is the text of Professor Kalvoda's article in the Hartford Times of February 21, 1959:

PUBLIC NOT TOLD THE FACTS ON RUSSIAN ATOMIC ADVANCE

(By Josef Kalvoda)

In these days congressional committees are busy investigating America's falling behind Soviets in the space program. Catching up with the Soviet Union and overtaking her in this field vital for our defense is one of the urging problems our country faces. It is clear to congressional leaders that we are in the life-or-death space race; and that the post-Sputnik events have changed the course of world history.

On the one hand several congressional leaders warn the American people that the gap between Soviet advance in the space race is widening. They point out that no amount of money will buy back the time later, and, therefore, the research programs should not be neglected in order to save moderate amount of money.

On the other hand, some Government officials and journalists deny the charges of our being considerably behind the Russians in the field of intercontinental ballistic missiles and the space program.

These two views are characteristic of discussions which are going on since 1957. In the summer of that year Senator SYMINGTON called a special press conference at which he stated that the Soviet Union was ahead of the United States in production of transcontinental ballistic missiles and long-range bombers. He asked the administration to tell the American people the truth.

Some leading newspapers published his pronouncements, others did not. One of the country's leading newspaper columnists, shortly afterward, disputed the charges made by Senator SYMINGTON point by point. Soviet Union was said not to be ahead of this country in any of those fields.

A few weeks later, however, Sputnik I proved beyond any doubt correctness of Senator SYMINGTON'S information, and untruthfulness of some respected gullible journalists.

Recently, Senator SYMINGTON came out with a pronouncement charging that this country is behind the Soviet Union in the space program, and that it will take at least 5 years to close the gap. His pronouncements were again disputed.

National defense lies within the sphere of congressional responsibility. On the part of the Congress there seems to be no longer willingness to leave defense to the President.

One may ask, however, how Congress has been discharging its responsibility for national defense, and whether everything possible has been done to prevent a national disaster. The latest Soviet lunar satellite stands out as a warning that the unbalance of terror is already a fact.

In January, of last year, the Senatorial chieftains were informed that (a) the Soviet scientists had solved the problem of production of antiproton energy; (b) Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party boss, had established three teams of scientists and technicians whose tasks were, in brief as follows:

Team A: To fire a sputnik weighing 1,500 kilograms into intergravitation space.

Team B: To make installations in the Sputnik X for regulating and directing energy of nuclear parts (antiproton energy) against targets on the earth.

Team C: To make electronic installations of all kinds (guidance system) in connection with the space program.

The three teams of scientists and technicians signed a Socialist obligation to fulfill their tasks before January 1959. This and other information were published by the writer of these lines in the postscript of his book "Titoism and Masters of Imposture" (Vantage, New York, 1958).

Today, 1 year later, one can evaluate correctness of these informations by showing that:

1. The first team has carried out its Socialist obligation. A satellite was sent beyond the borderline of earth's gravitation. Sputnik III (May 1958) weighed 1,500 kilograms, and was, undoubtedly, a test satellite. Lunik is about 500,000–750,000 kilometers from the earth.

2. The second team has not fulfilled the assigned task yet. However, a tremendous progress has been made by the Soviet scientists and technicians. Russians have built a synchrotron accelerating subatomic particles up to 10 billion electrovolts (Ev.).

Before 1958, the largest U.S. synchrotron produced, and probably still does, only 2 billion electrovolts. The Soviet achievement means that they are already producing cosmic rays (the hardest cosmic rays have 20 billion electrovolts).

As soon as they will have 25–30 billion electrovolts at their disposal, they will have real rays of death; i.e., energy of antiproton capable of destroying anything that is in its way.

This energy may be directed, by the use of an intricate guidance system, against any target on earth, and it may destroy the surface of the globe. A year ago the congressional leaders were told of the second team's work and objectives. The information has proven to be correct.

3. The third team obviously has accomplished its task. The proof of it is the sending of Lunik in the distance of about 750,000 kilometers from the earth orbiting around the sun. The guidance system has worked well.

In view of these Soviet achievements we may ask: Have our congressional leaders and our administration discharged all their obligations they owe our Nation? Have they done everything that was in their power to resolve the underlying political problems which are the source of the current crisis in the world? Have they made a realistic decision concerning the ever more aggressive communism?

Beside the above-quoted data which was published in this writer's book, the State Department was informed, through diplomatic channels, of Khrushchev's founding a fourth team whose task was the construction of a hydrogen superbomb of 50 megaton (50 million tons of TNT).

This superbomb would be transported by a submarine boat, *Suicider*, and the bomb might explode somewhere near America's Atlantic coast. The expected results: Half of the United States under water.

This report was disbelieved and discounted, as usual. It was said that Nikita S. Khrushchev was a "good boy," and after all, it was not possible to manufacture a bomb of 50 megaton.

United States and British teams had tried it also, but it was impossible to overstep the margin of one megaton (1 million tons of TNT).

Some weeks ago, however, all newspapers reported that Khrushchev told Senator HUMPHREY of Soviet's having an H-bomb of five megaton. One cannot assert that the Soviets will succeed in producing a superbomb of 50 megatons, but one thing is certain: They are working on it.

Furthermore, the statement made by Khrushchev to Senator HUMPHREY indicated clearly that the information concerning the task of the fourth team was correct again.

In the postsputnik era an enormous fraud has been practiced upon the American people by an increase of defense publicity. Incorrect data were published in order to conceal the truth that the military balance was tilting in Soviet favor.

The Soviet stand on Berlin has been, undoubtedly, influenced by their knowledge of this fact. Complacency and fraud are not doing us any service.

Our people are mature and intelligent enough to be able to hear and stand the truth without becoming panicky. We must be prepared for the possibility of the Communists forcing a showdown on their own terms sometime in the not too distant future. In order to prevent our destruction and the Communist victory the Congress must do something about our national defense, and about the realistic solution of political problems on the international scene before it is too late.

## The Farm Export Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials from the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal, for Monday, February 23, 1959, relating to "The Farm Export Picture," and to "The Big Squeeze on Futures Markets."

These editorials were brought to my attention by George Kirkpatrick, a good

friend, who for many years served as the Republican State representative to the Ohio General Assembly from my home district in Ohio. The information in these editorials, Mr. Speaker, is quite significant and worthy of the consideration of my colleagues, who this year must do some hard thinking about the agricultural problems which face the Nation.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal, Feb. 23, 1959]

THE FARM EXPORT PICTURE

Exports of agricultural products from this country in the year ending next June 30 will show a decline of about 5 percent from the level of the preceding fiscal year, estimates the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, which lists stronger competition for world markets from other countries, the increasing farm production of nations which import farm goods and the reduced demand for cotton as prime factors in the expected export decline.

However, says the bank, some lift for shipments of farm products abroad may come later as a result of recent currency changes overseas and the opening of the new St. Lawrence Seaway between this country and Canada to the Atlantic Ocean this spring.

Pointing out that the decline in shipments abroad will add to the mounting problem of surplus disposal by the U.S. Government, the bank says that "the prospect of expanding exports to accommodate the increasing supply of farm commodities is not encouraging even with the aid of large subsidies."

Aggravating the problem somewhat is the fact that the biggest gains in crop production this past year were in key export commodities, with wheat production up 50 percent, soybean output up 20 percent and corn and other feed grain production up more than 10 percent. Even cotton production increased 5 percent in spite of a 20 percent decline in acreage.

Last year's agricultural exports were valued at about $4 billion, but the bank estimates that at least one-third of this business was transacted through Government programs in the form of exchange for foreign currencies, barter or outright grants. Our farm exports during the 1957–58 year represented the output of about 50 million acres of crop land, or 1 acre out of every 6 harvested. In fiscal 1957, the total was a record of 60 million acres.

Production of agricultural export goods in other countries, expanding under the support price umbrella provided by the United States, is adding to the competition for the world agricultural import dollar, the bank continues. "While foreign demand for most imports has remained relatively strong, except for cotton where the recession in foreign textiles has been felt, competition from other exporting countries continues to strengthen."

The bank says, however, that the relaxation of restrictions on foreign exchange resulting from several European nations making their currencies convertible could enable traders in these countries to expand imports from the United States. Also, the bank feels that the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway will reduce the cost of shipment abroad, strengthening the competitive position of Midwest farm goods in world markets.

---

[From the Chicago Daily Growers Journal, Feb. 23, 1959]

THE BIG SQUEEZE ON FUTURES MARKETS

It is far more than a coincidence that the beginning of the big decrease in commodity futures trading dates back to the beginning of Government experiments in supporting commodity prices through loan and storage. In fact, the two are so closely linked as to provide convincing evidence that the domination of the grain industry by CCC and other operations is the biggest single threat to the continuation of a free and independent grain futures market as we have known it in this country.

Board of trade officials point to specific instances in which Government actions definitely influenced futures trading. Take cottonseed oil as an example. After a Government support program was begun in 1951, trade in oil futures dropped 80 percent over the next 4 years. But when the Government abandoned this program in the 1955–56 crop year, volume of trading quickly climbed back to its former level—and has remained there ever since.

This is typical of other commodities and other markets. Another example is soybeans. With beans going into Government storage in large volume for the first time this year, trading in soybean futures has dropped sharply—30 percent on the Chicago Board of Trade alone.

The cause of the drop is obvious. When the Government moves in to take over large quantities of any commodity in a loan and price-supporting program, normal functioning of the free market is impeded and thrown out of balance. That this can have serious repercussions on the free market is shown by the fact that futures trading has declined from the high point reached in 1925 until today it is on a smaller scale even than in the depression years of the 1930's.

All of which is added reason for hoping that Congress will come to grips with the farm program problem in a realistic way that will take the Government out of the grain business for good.

---

## The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the national farm price support programs are being closely scrutinized, and rightly so. These programs have failed to fulfill their purpose.

Price support and acreage control had their beginnings more than 20 years ago. Despite some changes, the basic legislatioin governing these programs is still the Agricultural Act of 1938. No wonder these programs are now outmoded. They have been rendered obsolete by the technological revolution in agriculture.

These outmoded programs have piled surplus on surplus and cost on cost until the Government investment in farm commodities will shortly be $10 billion or more. In the coming fiscal year the cost of storage, transportation, and interest on our Government holdings of surplus farm commodities, accumulated under the old outmoded programs, will exceed $1 billion.

Despite these huge expenditures, agriculture has been harmed not helped by the operations of these programs. Farmers have lost markets for cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, peanuts, rice, and some dairy products. Dislocations have been caused in the whole agricultural economy. Producers have been subjected to increasing controls and regimentation. As Government has interfered more and more in agriculture, the farmer has had less and less to say about what, where, and how he shall plant.

These defects in the programs have become more and more apparent in recent years. But what has been less apparent—though perhaps most damaging in the long run—has been the extent to which the old outmoded, costly, and harmful farm programs have discriminated against the vast majority of our farmers in favor of producers of a few crops on a comparatively few big farms.

Yes; the old farm programs, whether by design or accident, have been unfair to the great majority of American family farmers. They have channeled most of the vast expenditure of Federal funds in the direction of the big farms, including the corporation farms, the factory farms.

And it is high time that the blame for this sad situation be placed where it belongs.

These programs stem back to the 1930's—and the leadership of the 1930's. They have been changed by various amendments over the past 20 years—but the amendments did not remove the fundamental discrimination against the majority of farmers that is inherent in the programs. On the contrary, efforts to remedy defects in the programs have met the tooth-and-nail opposition of the same political leadership that sponsored these programs more than 30 years ago.

The irony of it is that this same political leadership poses as the friend of agriculture—and in particular as the friend of the small farmer. How their hearts bleed for the low-income farmer—but how they drag their heels and struggle and kick and fight when they are asked to do anything practical to help him.

Let me cite chapter and verse.

In his agricultural message of January 11, 1954, President Eisenhower said:

No single program can apply uniformly to the whole farm industry. Some farm products are perishable, some are not; some farms consume the products of other farms; some foods and fibers we export, some we import. A comprehensive farm program must be adaptable to these and other differences, and yet not penalize one group of farmers in order to benefit another.

Then, turning specifically to the problems of those families on small farms, the President said:

The chief beneficiaries of our price support policies have been the 2 million larger, highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. The individual production of the remaining farms, numbering about 3,500,000, is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports. During 1954 the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, will give further special attention to the problems peculiar to small farmers.

As a result of that recommendation the rural development program was inaugurated 1 year later. It was the first attempt of this nature in the history of the Nation to make a broad attack on the problems of the small farmer, the farmer who had been largely passed over not only by the technological revolution but by the price support programs.

Yes; it was the first real attempt to do something about the forgotten man in American agriculture.

After careful study, clear-cut recommendations for attacking the problems of low income farm families were submitted to the Congress. Although these recommendations for legislation and appropriations were extremely modest, they were adopted only in part. And they were even ridiculed by some who pose as saviors of agriculture.

In his agricultural message of January 9, 1956, the President included a strong plea for adoption of the full rural development program. He concluded this plea with these words:

Not only the welfare of these families but also of the people as a whole require that this program go forward. Once again, therefore, I urge the Congress to enact the full program recommended in my message of April 26, 1955.

The budget requested at that time for the rural development program for the upcoming fiscal year was less than $4 million. The amount appropriated was less than $2.6 million.

Here is a program of practical aid to underemployed farmers who desire to continue in agriculture. In cooperation with States and localities, the rural development program offers research, education, supervised credit, and cost-sharing by the Federal Government in improving land, timber, and water resources. Farm and home improvements are a major part of the program.

For those who wish to supplement or replace limited farm incomes with greater income from nonfarm sources, the program helps to establish vocational training in trades and skills. It helps set up additional industries in farming areas where more employment and higher incomes are needed. Under this program farm families are informed of job opportunities in other segments of the economy.

Yet, even to this day the rural development program has not received the support in expression of interest and appropriations from the majority party in the Congress that the program so richly deserves. This is the fundamental reason why the rural development program is now going forward in only about 100 counties out of approximately 3,000 counties in the entire country. If the desire of the majority party is really to improve the lot of small family farmers, why is there not greater support of the rural development program?

And why is there such last ditch opposition to needed changes in the old, outmoded, costly, unfair, and harmful farm programs?

In his agricultural message of January 16, 1958, President Eisenhower pressed these issues again:

There are millions of rural people—

He said—

who, for reasons of small farms, poor soils, limited resources, age, inadequate credit, lack of education, poor health, or insufficient managerial ability, have been unable to make the adjustments called for by modern technology.

Few of the dollars spent on agricultural programs have been of appreciable help to this group.

Price supports have scant meaning to a farmer with little to sell.

Reductions in acreage to support higher prices are contrary to the needs of a farmer whose production is already too small to give him a proper livelihood.

The majority party responded by passing a bill to freeze agriculture in the mold of the old discriminatory programs.

The President vetoed this freeze bill—this bonanza to the few at the expense of the many.

And now this year, on January 29, he pointed out the discriminatory nature of the old programs more clearly than ever before.

There are produced, in the United States, some 250 farm commodities. The law requires that prices of 12 of these be supported. Three of the 12—wheat, corn, and cotton—account for 85 percent of the Government inventory of price-supported commodities, but they produce only 20 percent of the total cash farm income.

Is such a program fair to producers of other commodities? Obviously it is not.

But this is only part of the discrimination. Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat. Ninety percent of the dollars spent for price support on wheat go to two-fifths of these farms—the largest ones. Actually 140,000 wheat producers account for more of the price-support cost than all the other 1¼ million combined.

Nearly a million farms produce cotton. Seventy-five percent of the dollars spent for cotton price support go to about one-fourth of these farms—the largest ones.

For rice producers it is the same story—one-fourth of the growers have three-fourths of the allotment.

For corn—28 percent of the growers have 65 percent of the allotment.

About 900,000 producers of wheat, corn, cotton, and rice—out of 4½ million farmers—account for most of the price support expenditures.

For wheat producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, the net budgetary expenditures for price support this fiscal year average about $7,000 per farm.

For cotton producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, expenditures average $10,000 per farm.

For rice producers who have allotments of 100 acres or more, expenditures also average $10,000 per farm.

Where is the principle of fairness in such a program? How does this help the small producer—the man and his family who really need help?

We are spending in price support programs of various kinds over $5 billion this fiscal year—to subsidize production by comparatively few farm operators—the operators of the larger farms, the more productive farms, the more prosperous farms.

Relatively small numbers of farms—usually those with the highest income—account for the greatest proportion of these Government price support outlays.

In his message of January 29, 1959, President Eisenhower recommended changes in the price support programs—changes that would make the level of supports more realistic—changes that would recognize the existence of the technological revolution—changes that would serve the best interests of agriculture and the whole Nation.

He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 25 years old, but to a percentage of the average market price during the previous 3 years.

He recognized that the Congress might still prefer to relate price supports to parity standards. If so, he urged that discretion be provided for establishing the level of support in accordance with guidelines fixed by law. This is what is now done for all commodities except the few for which supports are mandatory.

The recommended program would give growers more freedom to produce and compete for markets.

It would eliminate some of the unfairness of the present programs.

Let us remember that the majority of farm families have received little or no benefit from these programs. Most of agriculture is operated without price supports. There are no supports on cattle, hogs, poultry, eggs, fruits, and vegetables. Producers want no supports on these products.

We need more freedom in agriculture. The commercial farmers of the United States will do a better job of shifting production in answer to economic conditions than the Government can do for them under rigid formulas.

Our problems are difficult, but they are not impossible to solve.

Adoption of the President's recommendations will result in sounder price and acreage programs.

Expansion of the rural development program will help low-income producers make the adjustments necessary to sound permanent progress.

The interest of this administration in the family farmer and our efforts to improve opportunities for a higher standard of living on the small farms of the Nation is indicated by many other actions.

Loan programs have been substantially improved and expanded. This has enabled many more farmers to acquire family sized farms and to make needed improvements in their farms and their homes. Family type farms received loans totaling $170 million in fiscal 1958, compared to $130 million in fiscal 1953. Farm ownership loans totaled more than $50 million in fiscal 1958, compared to less than $30 million in fiscal 1953.

After being out in the cold 19 years, farm families and farm workers were made eligible for the benefits of social-security protection.

More loans for the expansion and improvement of rural electrification and telephones have been made available, and at a faster rate, than ever before.

Conservation has been speeded up and streamlined. More conservation has been applied in the past few years than at any time in history. Limitations are

in effect on the total conservation payments that can be earned on a single farm.

These actions indicate who has the interest of the family farmers at heart—and which party is actually the party of the big farm, the corporate farm, the factory farm.

Let us pin the tail where it belongs.

## Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to salute the Republic of the Sudan as it moves into its third year of independence.

After 56 years under the flag of Codomini of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan this state became the sixth sovereign independent state of Africa. On January 1, 1956 the green, yellow, and blue flag of the Republic of the Sudan was flown for the first time.

His Excellency, Sayed Abdulla Bey Khalil, the former Premier, stated on its second anniversary, "When we celebrate Independence Day, we honor the struggle of the present generation of Sudanese who have by their sincerity, patriotism and patience cast out colonialism from our country. Thus we close that chapter in our history when our country was dominated by foreigners and we entered new era of freedom and progress."

Sudan, a country situated on an immense plateau of 967,500 square miles in the northeast corner of the African continent, lies astride the middle reaches of the Nile River. Its 12 million population reflects culturally and racially an admixture hardly duplicated in any other African country. While its citizens of the North may be primarily conditioned by Moslem culture, those of the South are essentially pagan and Christian; though there are on their color chart some who are caucasian in skin texture and physiononic features, the vast majority are brown to black. Though the anxieties which beset the Arab world have their political tremors in the Sudan, that state likewise absorb and show grave concern for the independence and welfare of dependent African territories to the south of her.

The Sudan is in the main, a corporate part of the Arab world which accounts for the fact that they hasten to join the Arab League.

The outstanding characteristics of the newly independent Government of the Sudan is its intense desire to remain independent of the influence of other nations. Although they have been eager to attract foreign capital and particularly American industries and are undertaking measures to make such investments appealing, they exercise greater caution in requesting other forms of aid and technical assistance or help from other countries. The Sudan has become a member of the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund as a necessary measure to complete their major development projects.

The Sudanese are very proud of the government which they believe they are laying down a foundation of a sound and durable basis both internally and externally. Moreover, they believe the government's foreign policy has been such as to gain for the country the confidence and admiration of other governments, which constructive progress of the Khalil government has been successfully taken over into the government of General Ibrahim Abhoud. In spite of numerous speculations to the contrary, the enlightened administration of the previous regime and more precisely its relations to the West remains today constructive.

The Sudan is a country with a bright economic future and their leaders are determined to insure that its people are contented and in time overcome ignorance, poverty, and disease.

Cotton production is the basis of their economy and that one crop brings in nearly half the country's annual revenue. The backbone of which production and thus mainstay of the nation's finances is the British initiated Geira Scheme which is largest agricultural scheme under one management in the world. The scheme's uniqueness is derived not alone for its economic significance but for its social impact upon every aspect of citizen life. This western inspired economic and social experiment is a major factor in developing cooperation and social progress, avoiding the disasters of the feudal system, yet it has maintained individual liberty while achieving a unique combination of collective work. Of this scheme Dr. Mohammed Afzal, Director of Research, Pakistan Central Committee, noted it as "one of those outstanding experiments in socio-economic problems of the current century." The scheme is today the property of the people of the Sudan and a source of annual income not to capitalism or feudal lords but to the 25,000 tenants who work on it and in an indirect way it belongs to all the people of the Sudan.

In the economic sphere they have issued their own currency and are able to conclude satisfactory agreements with the former Republic of Egypt now a part of the United Arab Republic and the United Kingdom in this respect.

The Sudan is the world's principal exporter of gum arabic accounting for 80 to 90 percent of the total supply. The United States is the second largest importer of gum arabic, a product used for making sweets and as an adhesive for stamps and envelopes.

The Sudanese people remember affectionately the western world for its impact on its educational system and its agricultural development plan—the Gezira canalization scheme and we of the West are indebted to the Sudan for their all out support when we were fighting for our democratic lives for freedom against the Italian invasion of World War II. For the Sudanese volunteers responded from all parts of the country for military duty assisting to their utmost in our war effort. Their industry, though limited, produced an amazing variety of war materials. The leaders of that noble country are to be commended for the nation's movement from virtual British control to complete independence with such marked and exceptional foresight, patience, and peaceful negotiation. We today rejoice at the progress in welding together which is consistently being made in Moslem Christian relations and the good will which it is exhibiting toward all the people of the world with equal determination that the rule of law shall prevail in its provinces and in international relations.

This third anniversary in the words of our Department of State, "We applaud the tenacious desire of the Sudanese people to guarantee their national sovereignty against usurpation from any quarter."

## Development of Coosa River Big Reason for South's Claim to Last Half of Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Sylacauga News in Sylacauga, Ala., published by Mr. Jep Greer, recently had a very fine editorial pointing up some of the potential benefits to be derived from complete development of the Coosa-Alabama River.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD this editorial:

THE LAST HALF OF THE CENTURY BELONGS TO US

It is being generally admitted now that the last half of the 20th century belongs to the South. One of the major supporting reasons for this admission is the Coosa River development project which is expected to cost $109 million.

In simplified form, some of the potential benefits to be derived by development of the Coosa-Alabama River are as follows:

Lower transportation rates on bulk materials such as petroleum products, nonmetallic minerals, metal products, chemical and fertilizer materials, and many other miscellaneous bulk commodities. Stabilization of transportation rates throughout the river basin.

Expansion of present and location of additional industries that require ample power and water for processing and low transportation rates on bulk materials. (The American Waterways Operators record a total of 404 waterside industrial locations for the first 9 months of 1958. They have also tabulated a total of 2,808 waterside industrial development projects in a period of 6¾ years for which figures have been kept.)

(The Ohio River Valley Association recently released information that the Ohio River and its tributaries had secured industry record $13,500 million since 1950. Also the record indicates that between Baton Rouge and New Orleans, both cities included, a total of $3,500 million in expansion and new industries have been obtained.) Press releases definitely indicate that industry is seeking sites along navigable waterways.

Employment of surplus labor. (Recent records of the State of Alabama indicate that approximately 226,000 persons are employed in industry in the State of Alabama, approximately one-third of this number are employed in the tributary area of the Coosa-Alabama River. However, records of industrial relations department in September 1957 indicated that approximately 45,000 persons had made application for full-time or part-time employment. It was assumed that a majority of these were small farmers seeking supplemental income. In all probability the same situation would prevail in north Georgia.)

(The economy of the area primarily has been based on agriculture in prior years, however the major crop, cotton, has had the acreage in production reduced approximately 50 percent within a period of 6 years.)

Provide abundant recreational facilities, additional businesses, homes, etc.

Utilization of electric power in the area of production would increase the economy of the States of Alabama and Georgia.

Development of this great waterway for navigation will definitely create a great industrial section, improving materially the economic status of the States of Alabama and Georgia, and thereby strengthening the economy of the Nation.

It is estimated that within a 20-year period the tributary area of the rivers will secure additional industry that will involve the expenditure of millions of dollars, the population will increase an estimated 65 percent, requiring 120,000 additional housing units costing in excess of $1 billion, and industrial employment will increase by more than 55,000 with annual payrolls of approximately $150 million.

The potential benefits to be derived exceed the imagination.

## Communism, Hawaii, Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion is an organization that is known for its patriotic devotion to the principles of the human freedom expressed in our Constitution.

The American Legion has been in the forefront in recognizing the serious threat that the Communist worldwide conspiracy offers to our freedoms and to the safety of this Nation.

The U.S. Senate Internal Securities Subcommittee, the Commission on Subversive Activities for Hawaii, the Hawaiian Residents' Association, Inc., and other responsible agencies have repeatedly investigated and exposed the extensive Communist infiltrations in the political and economic life of Hawaii.

Mr. Harry Bridges is one of the leading agents in the Communist international apparatus. His International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—ILWU—and the United Public Workers Union—UPW—are a most potent factor in the election of public officials in Hawaii.

It is a certainty that Harry Bridges and the Communist apparatus in Hawaii will continue to influence the public elections in Hawaii and to exert considerable influence upon the actions of public officials.

Under statehood, Hawaii will send two U.S. Senators to the U.S. Senate and two U.S. Representatives to the U.S. House of Representatives. These men will necessarily be influenced by the Communist atmosphere of the electorate in Hawaii. They will necessarily be part of a "fifth column" in our Congress. Statehood for Hawaii is an expressed objective of the Communist Party of Hawaii and the Communist Party of the United States.

I am pleased to insert a statement from the Miller-Rankin Post No. 636, American Legion, Foxburg, Pa., which recognizes the extensive Communist influence within Hawaii. This statement also, logically, opposes the grant of statehood to Hawaii on the ground that statehood will permit the Communist Party to translate its power into effective political action within the Congress of the United States:

"Whereas the American Legion has, for many years, opposed any form of communism; and

"Whereas, it is a well known fact that Harry Bridges, and his International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union plus Henry Epstein and his United Public Workers Union are Communist dominated and controlled; and

"Whereas we feel that these two Communist dominated labor unions control the vote and the thinking of a large part of the Territory of Hawaii: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Miller-Rankin Post No. 636 of the American Legion, Foxburg, Pa., oppose the entrance of the Territory of Hawaii as a State in these United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be brought to the attention of the American Legion, Department of Pennsylvania for further action."

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed by the Miller-Rankin Post No. 636, American Legion of Foxburg, Pa. on the 3d day of February A.D. 1959.

BOYD W. FULK,
*Adjutant, Miller-Rankin Post 636, American Legion.*

Attest:

BRYAN J. WHITLING, Jr.,
*Commander.*

## Science Talent Search

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to speak a few words in tribute to a young man from my congressional district who has shown unusual aptitude in mathematics. I also want to draw attention to Ohio's achievements in the realm of youthful scientists. And, in whatever way I can, I hope to stimulate other young men and women who have a natural bent toward science to press on toward higher goals.

As we all know, the Nation needs technical know-how as never before, in order to maintain and increase our position as industrial and scientific leader of the free world.

The young man to whom I draw particular attention today is Kenneth E. Kloss, the son of Mr. and Mrs. James D. Kloss, of Loudonville. It is worthy of note, I think, that of the 40 students chosen to come to Washington to the Science Talent Institute, there were high schools with graduating classes ranging in size from 76 to 1,384. It is a tribute to Kenneth, I think, that he came from the school whose graduating class was 76—indicating that even in the smaller high schools of the Nation, it is possible for ability to be nurtured and to develop into ability of national worth.

Kenneth comes from the same area that gave the world Charles F. Kettering, who died last fall. There is a sign on the town limits of Loudonville, drawing attention to the fact that it is the birthplace of Mr. Kettering, whose achievements in the scientific world need no elaboration by me.

I would like to speak a work of praise, too, for the sponsors of the annual Westinghouse science scholarships, for if we make the progress we can and should make as a nation, it will be due to the stimulus of such organizations as this one, working with local and State and Federal Governments, to encourage young people who have the talents we need to develop these talents.

Kenneth was given a 5-day all-expense trip to Washington as one of the winners of the Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s science talent search winners. As is characteristic of him, he paid tribute to Noel Shaffer, science teacher at Loudonville High School, in these words:

Mr. Shaffer has done more than anyone else to help me win this honor.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that R. F. McMullen, one of the grand men of that area of Ohio, was superintendent of the Loudonville High School for 29 years. Although Mr. McMullen comes from one of the least-populated areas, he wanted to serve his State, and, last fall, he ran for the Ohio General Assembly and was successful in being elected.

Kenneth is to be honored by the Loudonville Rotary Club as guest of honor next Tuesday, March 10. I would like to pay tribute to these Rotarians for encouraging their budding scientist, and other youngsters who show evidence of achieving greatly. I strongly believe that we should encourage genius to flower, to seek and nurture the growth of intelligence and knowledge, for knowledge is power. If we retain our world leadership, it will be through our superior knowledge in every field of science, from engineering to economics. We must encourage intelligence, never discourage it in any way.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, two newspaper articles relating to Kenneth and his winning of the prize. The first is an article by Joan Lemon, carried in the Ashland, Ohio, Times-Gazette on February 26, 1950, and the second is from the

Mansfield, Ohio, News-Journal for February 26, 1959:

[From the Ashland (Ohio) Times-Gazette, Feb. 26, 1959]

LOUDONVILLE YOUTH IN COMPETITION: KENNY KLOSS OFF FOR BIG PRIZE

(By Joan Lemon)

LOUDONVILLE.—Kenneth Kloss, 17, Loudonville High School senior and one of 40 winners of the 18th annual science talent search for Westinghouse science scholarships and awards left for Washington, D.C., Wednesday evening, via train from Mansfield at 9:22.

Upon his arrival Thursday morning he joined 30 boys and 9 girls who will participate in the Science Talent Institute, competing for five 4-year scholarships of $7,500; $6,000; $5,000; $4,000; $3,000; and 35 science awards of $250 which will be given to the winners in recognition of their outstanding ability and promise.

Excitement and good humor were runing at a high peak in Kenny's home on North Union Street, Tuesday evening, the eve prior to his departure. The train tickets were being fingered (he'll have a roomette and money for tips was also included along with the tickets); his exhibit, which will be of posters, pictures and a special demonstration unit which will show how his digital computer called Alpha works, still required further preparation.

Since Kenny was announced as one of the 40 winners January 29, leisure hours have been few. Along with regular schoolwork, preparations for attending the institute were always apparent. There was the need for a dark suit for the formal award banquet and among other material needs the somewhat "awesome feeling of responsibility to live up to the honor" which has been bestowed upon him.

At the institute the 40 will be honored guests during 5 unique days in the Nation's Capital. In addition to opportunities to meet with world-famous scientists and visit top-level laboratories by special arrangement, there will be interviews with the board of judges.

These highly talented 15–17-year-olds come from large and small schools. Their graduating classes range in size from 76 to 1,384. Kenny's graduating class represents the 1 with 76.

Throughout this 5-day visit he will visit the National Bureau of Standards which, incidentally, is the place Kenny wishes to work as a mathematics assistant during the summer; visit and lunch at the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory; meet leading scientists to discuss projects and plans; and on Friday evening will have as his guests at the congressional dinner the 17th District Congressman ROBERT LEVERING and his wife.

The climactic evening will be Monday, March 2, with an address by John R. McCone, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, and the presentations of the awards.

After school closed Wednesday afternoon, a group of his classmates honored Kenny at a farewell party in his home.

---

[From the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal, Feb. 26, 1959]

YOUTHFUL SCIENTIST GOES TO WASHINGTON

(By Margaret Mattox)

Four adults and a group of high-school students watched proudly last night as Kenneth E. Kloss, 17, of Loudonville, boarded a train for Washington, D.C., at the Pennsylvania Railroad station.

The youth was starting on a 5-day expense-paid trip to the Nation's Capital as one of the winners of the Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s science talent search winners.

Filled with pride at his achievement were his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James D. Kloss, and Noel Shaffer, science teacher at Loudonville High School, to whom the young man paid high tribute when he said: "Mr. Shaffer had done more than anyone else to help me win this honor."

There were others in the sendoff party who watched his departure with pleasure. Eight of his classmates from Loudonville drove to the station to bid him goodby, and also on hand to wish him success in his scientific endeavors was Harold W. Arlin, works manager of the Mansfield Westinghouse plant.

Earlier in the day the Loudonville youth had been pleasantly surprised when a group of Loudonville High School students and band members gathered at his home to serenade him in advance of his trip.

Originally all members of the band, fellow students and members of the school's science club had planned a sendoff party at the railroad station but the arrangements had to be called off when it was learned the band would be playing at the Loudonville-Waynedale tournament basketball game in Wooster last night.

The Loudonville senior was one of only three Ohioans named as winners in the science talent search.

In Washington, Kenneth will attend the Science Talent Institute at the close of which each of the 40 winners from all sections of the Nation will be the recipient of a cash award or college scholarship. The awards include 35 cash prizes of $250 each and 5 scholarships.

In the group, named as the Nation's most promising young scientists will be 9 girls and 31 boys, winners from an original field of 28,195 students who took the tests. The search is conducted by Science Clubs of America, an activity of Science Service and Westinghouse Educational Foundation which is supported by the Westinghouse Electrical Corp. The firm provides the awards and finances the search program.

The awards banquet on Monday night will climax the 5-day institute, with John A. McCone, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, as principal speaker.

---

## Small Town's Trouble Is Hiring Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, here is an editorial from rural America. It is true there has been some unemployment in certain sections of America. Many citizen workers have taken advantage of this unemployment to return to the small communities of America—and live there while drawing their months of unemployment compensation—paid for from taxpayers' pockets.

In many of the small communities—hired help is out of the question—because men who have been drawing $2.50 an hour will not work for a dollar an hour.

I commend this editorial by Dwight Peyton in his Overbrook paper—he very pointedly portrays the small town's difficulty in hiring help:

REAL NEED IN MARCHING

"Help wanted: Men and women to take just ordinary jobs in towns and cities across the Nation at wages businessmen can afford to pay."

The above advertisement can be run in this town, or any other across the Nation and hundreds of thousands to millions of people needing help will be overjoyed to take applications and hire those who can qualify.

Union leaders who talk of unemployment today are not using the right term—the word is unemployables. It is one of the silly parts of unionism that labor organizations hang a tag on workers, labeling this one a bricklayer, that one a truckdriver, and the next a toolmaker, so that, forever after, each can do nothing but that one specific task. If Walter Reuther wants to get up his big parade of nonworking workers to march somewhere, he might aim his caravan out across the Nation with instructions to take work where they can find it—and brother they will find plenty.

The man or woman who loses a job then sits back and rides unemployment compensation and government doles and crybabies around because just exactly the right wage and working conditions aren't delivered on the doorstep deserves no sympathy from anyone. The self-respecting, self-reliant, the American way is for said individual to hustle out and take any kind of work he or she can find to hold on with until something better can be found.

Anyone who talks unemployment when there is a shortage of teachers and preachers, doctors and dentists, storekeepers, printers and barbers, mechanics and meatcutters, a shortage of men and women willing to work worth their hire at any and everything—talk of unemployment in view of this national picture is surely classed with George Gobel's gag lines and should be put on the market for comedy. And no mention has been made of one of the biggest job opportunities of all—for men of decency and sound moral character, men whose ideals are shaped from the American pattern of individual liberty, self-reliance and the Golden Rule to head up union labor.

In light of the McClellan committee revelations of terror tactics take over and a whole catalog of criminal procedures in the big unions, it is obvious that the great need of the day is for Washington to march on Walter Reuther and company and restore union labor to responsible citizenship status.

---

## Tomorrow's Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the 18th annual science talent search for the Westinghouse science scholarships and awards has ended and I am very proud to say that five young men from the Second Congressional District of New York, which I represent, were chosen for the honors group. Of these, Jeffrey Alan Greenhouse, 16, of 158 Emery Street, Hempstead, was 1 of 40 chosen as winners of the Washington trip.

The other boys from my congressional district in the honors group are: Glenn Own Myers, Jr., 16, of 2017 Dutch Broadway, Elmont; Virgil Dixon Bogert, 17, of 62 Brixton Road, Garden City; Jeremiah Morris, 17, of 5 Grace Court, North, Great Neck; and Michael Adamowicz, 17, of 80 Urban Avenue, Westbury.

These boys were chosen from more than 28,000 candidates on the basis of scientific potential, measured by intricate aptitude tests, by their original

science project, and by their all-around record.

I had dinner with Jeff Greenhouse, Monday evening. He's a fine youngster—top student in Uniondale High's graduating class of 285, captain of the math team, editor of the yearbook, and an aspiring chemist. He told me his interest in science is due to the fact that he was taught science from the first grade of school.

For his science search project, Jeff prepared and tested extracts from 32 flowers to determine if the flowers contained acid base indicators. He found that all of them contained a substance that can be used to show the acidity of solutions.

Last summer, Jeff was 1 of 12 high-school seniors in New York State chosen to attend the 2-week summer science institute at the New Paltz State Teachers College. Following graduation, he plans to study chemistry at Syracuse University. His proud parents are Mr. and Mrs. Bernard D. Greenhouse.

Jeff and all the boys and girls who participated in the science talent search will determine the future progress of our country and its position in the world tomorrow. The science talent search banquet, when 40 of them were the guests of honor, was a memorable occasion for me.

## Our Schools—Local Versus Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared in the March number of Nation's Agriculture.

Mr. Shuman's clear and intelligent reasoning on Federal aid to education is well expressed and seems to many of us, especially in the State of New York, unanswerable:

OUR SCHOOLS—LOCAL VERSUS FEDERAL CONTROL

Stimulated by the fear of sputniks, guided missiles and other Russian scientific advances, the citizens of the United States have been taking a critical look at their educational system. Some so-called experts have added to the confusion and hysteria by pointing to mistakes and weaknesses as evidence that local people cannot successfully run the schools. Those who favor centralization of control of most government functions at the national level have moved in with proposals for increased Federal aid to local schools. Several teachers' organizations and other well meaning groups have teamed up with the big spenders to push for Federal appropriations for school building, scholarships and teachers' salaries. They point out that we have a classroom shortage, that good teachers are scarce and underpaid and that there is a wide difference between the States in their ability to support schools. What are the facts?

We should not assume that our schools are bad—on the contrary, our educational system is the best in the world. We spend a higher percentage of our total national income on education than any other nation, and this proportion has increased from 4 percent in 1890 to 6 percent in 1958. There is a classroom shortage caused by a rapid postwar population expansion and a period of restricted building construction during the depression and World War II. However, we are rapidly catching up with the needs by building 70,000 new classrooms each year as against an annual need estimated at 60,000.

What about the equalization of support for schools between the States? It is true that some States have a higher income per capita than others. However, these differences have narrowed very rapidly during recent years. There is no magic in sending money to Washington and then having some of it come back. The cost of the Federal bureaucracy that would result plus the disadvantages of Federal control would more than offset any equalization advantages.

Proponents of Federal aid to education contend that control of the schools would continue at the local level. After many years of experience with Federal subsidies and controls, farmers will not swallow this argument. The Supreme Court of the United States recognized the inseparability of Federal aid and controls when it said, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." Those who would be taxed more than they receive under a Federal aid to schools plan would certainly insist on Federal supervision over the spending of their money.

The success of our public school system is largely due to the responsibility placed upon local citizens and the school boards they elect. Any plan which further reduces their authority and responsibility will inevitably result in weakening our schools. Yes, there are many needed improvements in our educational system. We need a broadened base of support to relieve tax inequities. We need to return to a merit system for teacher advancement so that salaries will become more adequate, for the best qualified instructors. We need to place greater emphasis on fundamentals and be less concerned with educational frills. These needs will be met more certainly by local people than by a vast Federal bureaucracy.

Federal aid to education might be the first step toward a uniform and regimented citizenry, the basis for dictatorship—not freedom.

## Dr. Mason W. Gross, 16th President of Rutgers University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in New Jersey are very proud of our State university, Rutgers, located in New Brunswick, with excellent extension courses in Newark, and we feel that the institution has fully met the high standards that the people of New Jersey demand from its educational facilities. I am certain that our citizens are thankful that its future plans call for progress.

Recently Dr. Mason W. Gross was selected to be the 16th president of this great university, and I wish to congratulate him on behalf of his many friends and admirers, on his preferment. At the same time, the university is equally fortunate in securing a man of his stature and ability, especially since it is on the threshold of a large expansion program. I believe that it is contemplated that a bond issue to provide funds for this expansion will be on the ballot in New Jersey in November, and it is to be hoped that the citizens will recognize the need for greatly increased facilities that these funds would provide for the youth of New Jersey.

One of our leading newspapers, the Newark Star Ledger, of Newark, N.J., commented on the choice of Dr. Gross in the issue of March 2, and I commend this very well written article to the attention of those who follow with great interest the expansion of our educational program.

[From the Newark Star Ledger, Mar. 2, 1959]

EXCELLENT CHOICE

The choice of Dr. Mason W. Gross as the 16th president of Rutgers University will be applauded by the students, the faculty, and by all interested in higher education in New Jersey.

Dr. Gross, who has been filling in since the resignation of Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, has a record as one of the most popular professors and administrators on the campus. Part of his popularity may be due to his stint on television. It was Dr. Gross' job on the TV program to decide—in a split second—whether answers given to a quiz were correct. In this role he revealed the kind of erudition which was astounding to the TV audience.

Many educators would have shied away from tangling with TV. But it is greatly to Dr. Gross' credit that he was willing to assume this role in a popular medium. In so doing he helped raise the stature of at least one quiz program. Too many people are quick to decry the lack of elevated standards on TV—and reluctant to make any personal contribution toward trying to raise them.

As president of Rutgers, perhaps it would be slightly undignified for Dr. Gross to participate in such a program again. But TV's loss will be Rutgers' gain. At any rate, Dr. Gross probably will be too busy in the coming years even to consider taking another excursion of this kind.

Rutgers is on the threshold of an expansion program of vast proportions. In all probability a bond issue to provide funds for higher education expansion in the State will be on the ballot in November. If this issue is passed—as it should be—Rutgers, as the State university, will be expected to provide greatly increased opportunities for the students of New Jersey.

The State is fortunate in having Dr. Gross as president of Rutgers as it embarks on what may be its most ambitious expansion program.

## A Lawyer Objects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the bar in North Dakota, I wish to advise my colleagues that I disassociate myself with certain resolutions adopted by members of my profession at the recent American Bar Association meeting in Chicago.

It is inconceivable that lawyers, being actual members of the judicial system,

would openly criticize and attempt to weaken one of the bulwarks of freedom in this country. The Supreme Court is one of the three great pillars which support a democratic house. Men with legal training should know the vital importance of the judicial branch of Government and know, or ought to know, the dire results that follow a subservient Court, a Court made responsive to the political climate of the moment.

I cannot believe that the resolutions adopted in Chicago speak the minds of the great majority of lawers in this Nation. I believe that most lawyers want a free and untrammeled judicial. I believe this is the time to strengthen, not weaken, our judicial institutions.

In an article by Max Lerner appearing in the New York Post of February 27, 1959, the following observations are made:

THE DECLINE OF THE LAWYER

(By Max Lerner)

The lawyers of America, in convention assembled, have declared their strong suspicion that the U.S. Supreme Court is soft on Communists, and their conviction that the way to keep it from further serious mischief is for Congress to rewrite the laws so that any fool—including the Supreme Court fools—can understand their intent.

Doubtless the committee chairman, Peter Campbell Brown, and the other framers of the American Bar Association resolutions will regard my summary as too crude and brass-knuckled. To be sure, I have not reprinted any of their nice-nellyisms, such as hailing the judges as "the ultimate guardians of the Bill of Rights and the protectors of our freedom." But these silken words are woven into a mask, and our business as thinkers is to strike through the mask.

I have struggled through the "whereases" and the "therefores" and the "be it resolveds"—over a thousand tortured words of them—and I can only report that they add up to a slap in the face for the Court.

Chief Justice Warren, who resigned from the bar association last fall and has rebuffed all pleas to reconsider, knew the temper and outlook of these lawyers. I care much more for his commentary on them than for their commentary on him.

He might have fobbed them off with hypocrisies, but the same forthright quality that he has shown in his great civil liberties and civil rights decisions, he shows in this particular gesture.

There are some who feel that the resolutions might have been much worse. They cite two scores on which the lawyers pulled their punches—first, in disapproving any proposals to strip the Supreme Court of its jurisdiction over certain cases; second, in striking out a clause about "technicalities" which are "invoked against the protection of our Nation." It would have been curious indeed if a profession which has grown rich on technicalities should dismiss the procedural protections of due process and the Bill of Rights as "technicalities" to be swept away in the urgency to punish hated men.

This may have been in Chief Justice Warren's mind when, after the lawyers assigned as counsel for the Communist spy, Rudolph Abel, had completed their appeal argument based on a procedural "technicality," he thanked them for their public service in undertaking a case "which normally would be offensive" to them. Trust Justice Warren not to miss the revealing gesture.

Obviously not all American lawyers have turned into hunters after dangerous thoughts. There seems to have been a sizable and even surprising minority at the bar association meeting that fought the resolutions.

But what has come over the rest of our Amerian lawyers? Here is a profession which has played a great and creative role in American history. Almost half the signers of the Declaration of Independence, and more than half the members of the Constitutional Convention, were lawyers. Jefferson was a self-trained lawyer. Andrew Jackson served a brief apprenticeship to the law, Abe Lincoln read law and rode circuit. Woodrow Wilson was a lawyer before he became a professor, and Franklin Roosevelt was one before he became a politician.

Even in colonial times, as Daniel Boorstin tells us in his new book, "The Americans: The Colonial Experience" (Random House), lawyers were effective in the making of the new American society because most laymen knew law and most lawyers had not grown so specialized as to cease to be men. Politics and law were fused: lawyers had a sense of statecraft, and politicians had a feeling for logic and intellectual order.

What has caused the decline of the American lawyer, as witness the spectacle of a convention full of leaders of their profession who have been playing G-man in Chicago?

Partly, I think, the lawyers have identified themselves with the corporate managers from whom their lushest business and their biggest fees come. Partly also, and more recently, many lawyers have identified themselves with the prosecution phase of the law and have come to see themselves as stern inquisitors who are not to be swerved from the pursuit of politically hated men. It is interesting that Mr. Brown, who headed the committee in Chicago, had served as counsel for one of the inquisitorial groups in Washington.

Thus while some lawyers have acquired a Wall Street mind, others have acquired a G-man mind, and some have combined the two. Is it heresy for me to suggest that neither of these mental frames will help the legal profession to fulfill its best role in our society?

Obviously I am speaking only about some lawyers, not all. I have no way of telling how representative the group in Chicago was of the profession as a whole, or what the vote would have been if each member had a chance to vote by secret ballot, rather than to "stand up and be counted" in open convention as one truculent delegate urged. For him, evidently, the vote was not a canvass of conviction but a testing of patriotism.

One thing that has happened to the profession is that a liberal elite—perhaps even a civil liberties elite—has been separated from the profession as a whole, leaving a big gap between the best lawyers and judges and the general run of them.

## Prayer by Msgr. Francis M. Juras, of Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the prayer offered by the Very Reverend Monsignor Francis M. Juras, pastor of St. Francis Parish in Lawrence, Mass., who was the guest chaplain of the Massachusetts Senate on February 16, 1959, the anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day:

Almighty and Eternal God, Master of the Universe, we reaffirm our belief that Thou are the Father of all men, the Ruler of all lands, and we thank Thee for Thy abundant graces poured upon this Nation.

We pray Thee to assist, by Thy spirit of counsel and fortitude, the members of the Massachusetts Senate, and enable them to carry on their deliberations and enactments with wisdom, sincerity, honesty, and courage.

Teach and guide us in these perilous times to preserve peace and freedom from the continued ruthless aggression of atheistic communism in this country, and make us to be worthy instruments in extending the same peace, freedom and security to the oppressed people that are under the bondage of the heartless communistic regime.

On this day, we especially pray Thee to restore the blessings of freedom and independence of the Republic of Lithuania and other enslaved countries.

Enlighten the minds and inflame the hearts of all people with Thy love and make us to be of one mind in the truth, and of one heart in charity, so that every nation and every tongue may acknowledge and glorify the Saviour of mankind.

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

## Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, here is another editorial from the Moran Sentinel, of Moran, Kans., written by R. L. Thompson.

He expresses some ideas about liberty that are most revealing. Today, we have a great many persons who want to get us as a Nation back on the track from our mad rush down the welfare-state road. Some of those who cry the loudest, when the final test comes—"Look out the window," "crawl under the bed"—or simply say, "My company is made up of a thousand stockholders. I must think of their interests." And then there are many men wearing cloths of some governmental job, simply using political expediency as their guiding light in the fields of Government action; and these same men in government say, "I can't be tagged as a conservative; too many of our people think that is a dirty word."

Here is Thompson's editorial:

LIBERTY

That so-called human convenience we call liberty which all Americans profess publicly to cherish is actually of little moment to the lower third of our society. Complete liberty places the incompetent man upon his own and thus exposes him to the consequences of his lack of talent. Security seems to constitute his only desideratum, and it is hard to think of a liberty that he will not readily relinquish for shelter, side meat, and rum.

Liberty, as we used to know it in the years before Roosevelt II introduced the more abundant life, was a mode of existence thrust upon the masses by a minority group. The soldiers who fought in the Revolution certainly displayed no great yearning for it. Desertions were commonplace throughout the war and those who did fight fought badly. At times it was virtually impossible to get them out of their foxholes, and more than

once George Washington came near giving up in despair.

Even many members of the minority group who howled the loudest for liberty were never seized with the inspiration to fight for it. After writing the Declaration of Independence, Jefferson went into hiding and was never heard from until after Yorktown. George Washington often asked where he was, and always with a sneer. Sam Adams remained home and got rich; and Patrick Henry, who howled even louder than Jefferson, found it convenient to remain out of uniform. Independence was achieved through the sound and inspired leadership of such men as Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and Aaron Burr, all of them commanders and leaders of the very highest skill.

Thus the right of self-determination was thrust upon the colonists without their especially desiring it. Since then the people have sought, sometimes quite assiduously, to supplant their hard-won democracy with some form of socialism which calls for less self-reliance. The politicians who have promised more security for the price of liberty have always stood in better favor than the Hoovers or the Clevelands. Roosevelt II, while curtailing liberty and promising more security, was reelected three times, and his two successors were equally successful in advancing the same doctrine. They should not be criticised for it. It is precisely what the people want.

## Free Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural price support controversy usually resolves itself down to an argument as to whether big producers, little producers, or middle-sized producers are getting enough or too much out of the program. The consumers, although not organized, are heard on occasion, albeit not often enough. Only a little consideration is given to the consumers, and I should like to point out today that no consideration is given to other facets of our complex economy which are vitally affected by the price support programs. They have had little or no chance for a day in court and in those instances when they have been heard they have been casually dismissed after presenting their story.

One of the groups vitally affected by agricultural legislation are those people who actually deal in the commodities. They are a vital part in our agricultural economy—as vital indeed, as the actual producer of the crops. The effect of our present price support program has been disastrous to them. They have pleaded for a return to normalcy for years, but with no success.

All of which points up the urgency of getting Government out of the commodities market and the speedy return to that normal relationship that has always existed between product and consumer, with an important assist from the futures trade whose role has historically been that of a stabilizing agent.

This problem was well described recently in an editorial in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal of Monday, February 23. I would command a careful perusal of this article to all who have a concern over the delay of our return to a free enterprise operation:

THE BIG SQUEEZE ON FUTURES MARKETS

It is far more than a coincidence that the beginning of the big decrease in commodity futures trading dates back to the beginning of Government experiments in supporting commodity prices through loan and storage. In fact, the two are so closely linked as to provide convincing evidence that the domination of the grain industry by CCC and other operations is the biggest single threat to the continuation of a free and independent grain futures market as we have known it in this country.

Board of Trade officials point to specific instances in which Government actions definitely influenced futures trading. Take cottonseed oil as an example. After a Government-support program was begun in 1951, trade in oil futures dropped 80 percent over the next 4 years. But when the Government abandoned this program in the 1955–56 crop year, volume of trading quickly climbed back to its former level—and has remained there ever since.

This is typical of other commodities and other markets. Another example is soybeans. With beans going into Government storage in large volume for the first time this year, trading in soybean futures has dropped sharply—30 percent on the Chicago Board of Trade alone.

The cause of the drop is obvious. When the Government moves in to take over large quantities of any commodity in a loan and price-supporting program, normal functioning of the free market is impeded and thrown out of balance. That this can have serious repercussions on the free market is shown by the fact that futures trading has declined from the high point reached in 1925 until today it is on a smaller scale even than in the depression years of the thirties.

All of which is added reason for hoping that Congress will come to grips with the farm program problem in a realistic way that will take the Government out of the grain business for good.

## Misbehavin' Wabash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the February 1959 issue of the Hoosier Farmer publication an article titled "Misbehavin' Wabash." The story, written by Mr. William E. Prather, executive vice president of the Wabash Valley Association, sets forth the association's proposals to harness the resources of the Wabash Valley, thereby raising the income of the entire area, and brings into sharp focus the distressing flood control problems which constantly beset the Wabash Valley region by pointedly recognizing water as one of our richest resources and, at the same time, one of our greatest problems.

The article begins:

A refreshing drink of cold water to a thirsty man is an undisguised blessing. Multiply it by many billions, turn it loose over farmland and it becomes a curse.

Disastrous floods in the Wabash Valley during 1957 and 1958, which damaged crops $40 million and highways and bridges another $2 million, started people to looking for an answer to their problem. In addition to the physical damage done, many lives were also lost in the rampaging waters. Surely there is a solution, residents concluded.

Action to solve the problem of floodwaters was instigated at Terre Haute. Some of the persons active in the early formation of the new study dreamed of a return to the water traffic days of the Wabash & Erie Canal. Some hoped to see the valley developed for industry to give employment to their people.

There has been a constant migration toward industrial areas outside the State or to other parts of the State. In fact, from 1950 until 1957, 48,700 persons from southern Indiana picked up their belongings and moved to more promising areas. At the same time, northern Indiana gained 120,000.

Mr. Prather continues:

The Wabash Valley includes the river of that name and all its tributaries—an area that includes two-thirds of Indiana and one-seventh of Illinois. It covers 33,000 square miles and encircles 2½ million people.

To attack the entire problem, the Wabash Valley Association was organized more than 2 years ago. It is a nonprofit, nonstock organization of citizens in the valley. The objectives are: To develop the Wabash Valley through a comprehensive study of flood control, water and soil conservation, navigation, stream pollution abatement, development of industrial, recreational, and agricultural interests and thereby to promote and advance standards of the Wabash Valley. The association has cooperated with the University of Illinois and Indiana University in its study. A preliminary survey is being conducted by Army engineers in order to map the overall plan for the entire valley—its flood control, soil and water conservation, and navigation.

The Council of State Governments in Chicago, upon request of the association's leaders, helped prepare the bill permitting an interstate compact, which would establish a commission between the two States involved. Governor Handley and Governor Stratton appointed a joint committee, representing their respective States, to help draft this compact. This bill was presented to the two State legislatures last month.

The Indiana Farm Bureau at its November convention passed a resolution asking that a comprehensive study be made of the needs of the valley and that necessary legislation be passed to allow Indiana and Illinois to work jointly on the problem.

The joint authority would be expected to recommend action to the two State governments and the Federal Government.

The Wabash Valley Association made arrangements for a meeting last November in Louisville, Ky., with the Corps of Engineers to discuss future plans and to seek their advice along with the advice from the Flood Control and Water Resources Commission of Indiana. Attending this meeting were Senators CAPEHART and HARTKE; Congressmen BRAY, DENTON, ROUSH, BARR, and WAMPLER from Indiana along with State senators and representatives and other influential people of the valley. All of them pledged their full support to needed legislation and necessary appropriations to speed the development of the Wabash Valley.

There has been little recent new industry or major industrial expansion in the valley, with the exception of the Lafayette and Indianapolis areas. Yet to the south of us,

the Ohio River Valley has seen $15 billion invested industrially in that area since 1950. The transportation on the Ohio has been multiplied 11 times since 1930 and has doubled since 1950.[1]

LONG RANGE PROJECT

We feel the Wabash Valley can grow and develop if we control its floods, conserve its waters and soils, and develop river transportation. This is not a short-term project but may take many years to complete. The St. Lawrence Seaway has caused many of our people to revise their thinking. We now have ocean-going vessels loading and unloading cargo in the Great Lakes region, which is the heart of America.

Water transportation is making a comeback which could easily change the marketing patterns of the Midwest.

The board of directors of the Wabash Valley Association recognizes water as one of our richest resources. Yet, in the past, it has been one of our greatest problems. Time and talent are being dedicated to harness this water to develop and conserve other natural resources such as coal, limestone, wood, sand, gravel, clay, gas, oil, and farmland, in order that the people living in the area may have a better life.

[1] Figures from Ohio Valley Association Report, Oct. 3, 1958.

## Lithuanians Undaunted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the February 14 issue of the Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa., under the caption "Lithuanians Undaunted."

This fine editorial typifies the hope of free men and women everywhere that the day of judgment and decision is not too far distant when the yoke of Communist tyranny will be removed and the independence of Lithuania restored. The light keeps burning in the hearts of these great people whose spirits remain undaunted, and their courage should be an inspiration to all of us to do everything possible to help reestablish the liberty of these freedom-loving people.

LITHUANIANS UNDAUNTED

Special prayers will be offered Sunday in St. George's Church and by congregations at Frackville, Girardville and other regional communities for the eventual restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Throughout this country on Monday, millions of freedom-loving Americans, whether or not of Lithuanian descent, will commemorate the 41st anniversary of this gallant little Republic, held under the cruel yoke of Communist tyranny since June 1940.

Because so many living in and around Shenandoah have close ties with Lithuania, celebration of its declaration of independence holds special significance. Needless to say, there won't be any joyful exercises in the "old country" on February 16. Stern visaged armed soldiers and the secret police stand ready to nip in the bud the least outward sign of patriotism. However, as has been the case during these long years of bondage, loyal Lithuanians behind locked doors are certain to again recall brighter years when the Republic of Lithuania enjoyed full sovereignty among the nations of the world. And family groups with muted voices are apt to sing the old songs, including the national anthem.

Information reaching Shenendoah via a dauntless underground in Lithuania is that conditions in that land of bondage haven't changed to any great extent. Resistance continues, and some of the luckless are captured. Penalties are harsh and swift.

In one respect, though, Communist authorities are becoming more devilishly subtle. No longer are there forcible mass deportations to Siberia. A man's job suddenly terminates. Then comes the "suggestion" to move the family to Siberia for "special work." Since last fall, we are advised, at least 800 have been removed from Vilna to the barren wastes of Siberia. To remain alive, one simply does not refuse to sign for this special work."

Since the time Lithuania and adjoining Latvia and Estonia were first occupied by Russian troops, hundreds of thousands of innocent people have been sent to Soviet labor camps. It is estimated that Lithuania's population has been depleted from more than 3 million to about 1,500,000. Importation of Russian families explains the country's present population of 2,700,000.

Indicative of the fortitude and determined resolution of the Lithuanian people is the remarkable presentation of their language and culture. As long as 900 years back in time, Lithuaunia was an independent state. Her valiant warriors saved European civilization by turning back the savage Tartar tribes. It was Goethe who wrote: "If you wish to hear how our ancestors spoke, listen to the Lithuanians."

It galls the Reds to witness celebration of Lithuania's Independence Day in the United States. At the same time, the flood of proclamations by State Governors, mayors, national officials, and the like, giving renewed recognition of the Republic of Lithuania serves as glowing encouragement to its own loyal people suffering under Communist oppression.

When self-government and freedom are ultimately restored, a wicked wrong shall have been righted. Those who cherish human liberty meanwhile hope and pray this will come to pass in the not-too-distant future.

## Objective Reports on Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Albert Parreno, of the Cuban Chamber of Commerce, and the two articles he refers to:

CUBAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
IN THE UNITED STATES, INC.,
*New York, N.Y., February 24, 1959.*

DEAR SIR: The chamber has followed with interest the many newspaper and magazine articles reporting the events in Cuba since January 1, 1959, and noted with some dismay that many reporters have set forth half-truths in some cases and in a few cases have reported untruths.

Two recent articles are, in our opinion, examples of objective reporting and significantly they have appeared in responsible Protestant and Roman Catholic publications. Since they have a somewhat limited circulation, the chamber with the permission of the respective publications has made reprints of the two articles. You will find enclosed herewith a copy of the February 20 article published in the Commonweal, entitled "Castro's Operación Verdad," by James Finn, associate editor of that Roman Catholic publication, and an article entitled "Cuban-American Relations," which was published in the February 16 issue of Christianity and Crisis, which is a Protestant publication edited by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr and Mr. John C. Bennett.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT J. PARRENO,
*President.*

[From the Commonweal, Feb. 20, 1959]

CASTRO'S OPERATION VERDAD

(By James Finn)

About 50 journalists and newsmen boarded the plane which was to take us to Cuba. The island of Manhattan, which at night can look like a sparkling, multicolored jewel and whose towering landmarks are not soon lost to sight, melted swiftly into the haze as the plane lifted into the air on the initial step of what was to bear the label "Operacion Verdad" (Operation Truth).

No one was in doubt about why the invitation, issued in the name of Fidel Castro and Dr. Jorge Quintana, Dean of the College of Newspapers, bore the label it did. After the long and arduous struggle which finally resulted in the overthrow of the dictator Fulgencio Batista, the revolutionary rebels and the Cuban people were smarting under the criticism directed against the Cuban war trials. In many countries, and notably in the United States, the trials and subsequent executions had been termed bloodlettings and blood baths and a reversal of expected justice. This criticism, the Cubans said, was unjust, not because it was ill-intentioned but because it was misinformed. If the truth were made known, the criticism would surely reverse itself. And so the invitation was extended to hundreds of reporters from North and South America, from England and the U.S.S.R.: come, observe, and judge for yourselves.

Although Cuban time was clearly devised for people who naturally procrastinate—almost no event, regardless of its importance, was held on time—the days were crowded and there was much to observe. The several spectacular events which have been most widely reported could not be most decisive in forming any judgment, but they were, in different ways, impressive.

The great rally that took place our first day in Cuba set the stage. The huge crowd that gathered before the presidential palace to hear Castro explain and defend the actions of the revolutionary government began to stream in from all parts of the city early in the day. Trucks, cars and taxis were pressed into service and many people looked as if they had walked the many miles they claimed. But there was no weariness evident, only jubilant energy, and the bright sun-washed streets were made more colorful by the ever-present red and black, the colors of the revolutionary movement of July 26, and by the many signs and banners in both Spanish and English which demanded "punishment for the guilty" and asserted that "we reject Yankee intervention."

Members of the press were to have been admitted to the palace before the ceremonies got underway, but no one had foreseen the crowd which filled every space within a mile of the palace. After several unsuccessful attempts to approach it, I managed to reach it with the help of one of the barbudos, the bearded rebels. With his rifle held high above his head, both to protect it and to gain attention, he made a way through the crowd where others would have been helpless, for

the Cubans responded to the barbudos with evident affection and admiration.

After short addresses by President Manuel Urrutia, other dignitaries and rebel leaders, Fidel Castro appeared. He was calm and patient as he motioned for the cheering crowd to be quiet. After some words about the eloquent testimony provided by the presence of so many Cubans, estimated by him at over a million, Castro launched into his main theme—the justification for the execution of those who were termed war criminals. No explanation was due the United States, he said, but only to the Cuban people. The United States had forfeited the right to criticize by being silent in the face of the atrocities of the Batista regime, and of the present rulers of Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. As for those who were being executed, they were guilty of the most shocking crimes and revolutionary justice would be thwarted if they went unpunished. The will of the people was being followed.

As he spoke, the terms "truth" and "revolutionary justice," "revolutionary justice" and "truth," threaded through his address like motifs picked up, repeated and elaborated. And as he spoke it become increasingly clear that some real intention of his talk ran counter to his declarations. For even as he asserted the independence of Cuba and denied the need to offer explanations to foreign powers he presented to them his concept of revolutionary justice and asked that their false reports be replaced by true. Even while he denied the influence of criticism issuing from the United States, his speech was being fashioned to answer it. Much like a person trying to deny what he implicitly acknowledges, his actions contradicted what his words asserted. He appeared, this acclaimed leader of the Cubans, intelligent and vigorous, independent, sensitive and immature. If his address alone would not persuade a critic that "revolutionary justice" was necessarily just—and I think it would not—it might well convince him that Castro was sincere and determined. And to judge only by a single incident, he is long-suffering; after his speech he allowed himself without complaint to be patted and poked, prodded and pulled by an encircling group of admirers.

Similar confusion was evident at Castro's press conference. Scheduled for 9 o'clock, it typically enough started after eleven and lasted for about 5 hours. About the whole procedure there was an amiable air of disconcerted informality. For some time Cuban officials, newsmen, rebels and interlopers mingled in easy confusion, so that the room looked much as if an unrehearsed crowd scene were being directed by amateurs. But out of this emerged a valuable exchange. The actual questions-and-answers were preceded by slides of the atrocities which were perpetrated and cataloged under Batista's regime. They were truly horrifying and repulsive, the acts, one had to think, of sick minds. And as image after flashed image assaulted the emotions, one wanted to call a halt to this accumulation of horror. But one was forced to be impressed, once again, with the reign of terror under which the Cubans had lived for some years. And it can be called nothing less, for these people lived with the knowledge that those who were even suspected of being critics of Batista were open to unspeakable tortures; they might be brutally beaten, have their nails torn loose, their eyes pierced, their hands and feet ruinously burned; they might be castrated and painfully wounded before they were finally killed.

In the conference which followed the slides, which were intended as background for his remarks, Castro again asserted principles of the new regime. The Cuban revolution could face the world honestly; the evidence was in the willingness to face criticism and to open all doors of information to the newspapers, a powerful weapon for truth. No; we are not Communists; we believe in social justice. We will never oppose the people; the day the majority is against us we will go. Our revolution has been most orderly; the Red Cross will testify that we did not kill prisoners, as did Batista's men, but treated them well and frequently released them without weapons. There is no example to equal this. We insist upon the "dignity of the person"; we want not vengeance but just reprisals.

Castro patiently awaited each question and tirelessly responded, while President Urrutia, who sat on the elevated stage behind him, interjected only one or two comments. It was evident that Castro felt alienated from and critical of U.S. officialdom and that a bond existed between him and other South Americans. And there was a vague but enthusiastic response when Castro spoke of "the dream in one's heart," of seeing the American countries bound in closer unity—meaning, of course, Latin American.

The conference ended not long before the start of the first Havana war trial in the huge Sports Coliseum. This trial, which brought a death sentence to Maj. Jesús Sosa Blanca, was witnessed by almost 18,000 spectators and lasted almost 13 hours. In the course of those hours approximately 50 witnesses streamed before the tribunal, and the TV cameras, while Sosa Blanca sat quietly, his only movement a steady gnawing at his upper lip. When asked if he had anything to say Sosa Blanca replied, "No one will hear me, for I am in the Coliseum of Rome." The comparison was almost inevitable and, once made, seemed irresistible to many writers who developed it at some length in North American newspapers. But a comparison of what actually took place that night with the representation which appeared in many publications should be enlightening.

The trial was held in the Sports Coliseum with the obvious intention of displaying before the world the method of the Cuban courts martial. For this purpose one of the most notorious prisoners was called. And, although witness after witness was dismissed for offering only hearsay evidence, the evidence against him mounted throughout the afternoon, evening, and early morning. Many people criticized the proceedings, of course, saying that under such circumstances, apart from the calm and quiet of orderly procedure, justice could not be accomplished.

But such a judgment, made with no allowance for the present temper of the Cuban people, does less than justice to the proceedings. That it was probably a mistake to hold this trial under such pitiless publicity was acknowledged by the fact that no other trial was thus held. But it was a mistake made by a regime that is still new and uncertain and, therefore, oscillates between assertive independence and righteous self-justification, a government that can scarcely be expected to have settled down into the ordered routine of normal life. And to say that the choice of circumstances was a mistake is not to say that justice therefore miscarried. Within the limitations which the circumstances imposed upon them, circumstances which were hardly to be resisted, the court proceedings were orderly and correct. Any valuation of Sosa Blanca's trial that is made outside the frame of these considerations would be at least questionable.

More extensive and incisive criticisms, of course, have been levied against the earlier summary trials. They could only be held because the constitution, which forbade capital punishment, was overridden. The trials were not civil but military, and the tribunals were composed entirely of rebels, frequently very young and without training. Further, the defendants had little time to prepare a defense. The safeguards that are necessary to ensure a fair trial were obviously lacking, it is charged, and justice necessarily gave way to vengeful expedient.

These are serious charges and cannot be overlooked. But they must be seen in the context of recent Cuban history. So common and so vicious were the executions under the reign of Batista that the capital punishment clause of the constitution was rendered farcical. Ideally it might have been reestablished by the rebels when they took over. Practically, one doubts that this would have been possible. The rebels did take prisoners during the war and did treat them properly. Further, they brought with them into the cities a surprising order and discipline. These are tokens, not to be lightly dismissed, that the rebels consciously act with a respect for law and order. The prisoners whom they try are soldiers and properly come under the military code. And, though here there is conflicting testimony, the trials which received so much criticism in the United States followed a general pattern which could compare favorably with military trials in the States.

The impressions I received from these several events—the large rally, the press conference, and the trial—were reinforced by talks I had with priests, professional people, rebels, students, Cuban newsmen, prisoners, and the wives and widows of rebel fighters. Only among the prisoners were there frequent criticisms of Fidel, and even here he had some supporters. One grants that neither the testimony of all these people nor their overwhelming approval of Castro and the executions could make right something that is intrinsically wrong. But their strong feelings should make one face the probable alternative to the trials. There is little in the history of any revolution to make one believe that it could have been more orderly and restrained. There is, indeed, strong reason to think that the remarkable self-control of the Cuban people, everywhere evidenced, depends upon their belief that the present Government will see that the criminals are fairly but swiftly tried.

There is a matter of emphasis here which may make a crucial difference in one's own attitude to the continuing trials. The larger context of the trials has been lost to most Americans, and the responsibility rests primarily upon the wire services and newspapers which, with notable exceptions, served their readers in the United States less well than did their counterparts in Europe and South America.

Apart from the handling of the war trials, on which no final judgment can yet be made, there are other large questions about the direction Cuba is to take. Is the economy sufficiently stable to recover itself and offer jobs to the many unemployed? What political life will now emerge in this country imbued with democratic ideas but so long subjected to tyrannies? And what part will be played by the labor unions, which provided little support to Castro and in which the Communists are most active? And, of great importance to our foreign policy, what relations will Cuba establish with her South and North American neighbors?

Many of the answers to these questions will depend upon the program of the Fidelistas who are now united only in their allegiance to Castro and who still look to him for a program. Other answers will depend upon President Urrutia and the Cabinet, which now contains experienced, responsible men. As for the Communists, there seems to be no group in the Cuban labor movement that is equally trained and dedicated. Their main opposition may yet come from a small but highly select group of young Catholics trained in Agrupacion Catolica Universitaria. Much will also depend upon what political and economic ties the Unied States now forms with Cuba.

The United States is too powerful and too involved with Cuba's economy not to have strong influence. But much of this influence will be dissipated if not actually reversed unless there is more understanding when the need arrives. At present there is misunderstanding on both sides, but if our country is as mature and responsible as it asserts itself to be, it should be the more willing to extend itself for a government which is coming under heavy criticism before it gets fairly under way. Operacion Verdad may not have accomplished all that its designers intended, but it should cause many Americans to realize that their knowledge was too limited for them to rest easy in flat criticisms of the revolutionary government.

[From Christianity and Crisis, Feb. 16, 1959]

CUBAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Recriminations flung back and forth across the Caribbean between Cuba and the United States in the early weeks of the new year have produced some rather turbulent diplomatic seas. Large segments of the American populace, from Congress on down, have indignantly protested the wave of executions that followed in the wake of the overthrow of the dictator Batista. Meanwhile, revolutionary leader Fidel Castro, shocked and hurt by this criticism, indicated that he had ideas of his own and suggested strongly that the United States mind its own business.

A certain amount of the right kind of protest is both justified and necessary. We must certainly welcome the establishment of more judicial procedures, operative not in spectacular amphitheaters where thrill-seekers scream for blood, but in proper judicial settings where the rights of those who are almost certainly guilty are respected until they have been so proven.

Much of this protest, however, has been out of place. It reflects the unhealthy tendency of Americans to make hasty judgments of the actions of others in sharply black and white terms. Furthermore, it is detrimental to the best interests of all concerned because it only obscures complexities not immediately apparent.

The cause of Castro, while largely unknown to most Americans, was looked upon with a certain amount of favor because American standards generally favor rebellion against dictators. But when the victory was won, some were offended by the revolutionists' program to punish those held responsible for the brutal reign of terror under which Cubans were tortured and killed in great numbers during the last 7 years. Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times, a close observer of the rebellion for the last 2 years, has estimated that there is hardly a Cuban family that did not have a member at least arrested and at worst tortured and killed by the Batista regime.

It would be difficult to imagine that Americans could emerge from a brutal reign of terror such as this with the capacity to meet the standards now held for the Cuban rebels. We need to be reminded that our forefathers rebelled against the principle of tyranny without having brutally suffered from its effects. Never having experienced real oppression, we tend to react along ideological lines that virtually separate us from the almost universal experience of mankind. We are, thereby, ill-equipped to comprehend and cope with the dynamic and often violent actions of those peoples in search of a sense of well-being that includes a full stomach as well as freedom. The naive expectation that there would be an immediate move to democratic institutions, with which the Cubans have had relatively little experience, is therefore a bit farfetched.

Furthermore, in their protest Americans have ignored the degree to which their Government lent support and prestige to the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista. In line with a narrow-minded policy that supports a dictatorship as long as it says it is opposed to communism, U.S. supplies continued to be sent to Cuba as late as last spring. Is it any wonder that Castro's feelings toward the United States are tempered by the remembrance that planes, tanks, and guns supplied by our Government were used to search out and destroy his forces? Have we a right to expect more from him?

Granting that there are grounds for certain misgivings in the news that there will be no immediate elections and that Cuba will be governed by decree for the next 18 months, there are still many signs of sane government. To cite a few:

1. From past performance we have knowledge of Castro's ideals. The 26th of July movement was known to be scrupulous in paying for all food and supplies taken from peasants and shopkeepers. Even in the worst periods, when Batista's troops were torturing and killing their prisoners, the rebel treatment of prisoners was humane.

2. American standards to the contrary, the discipline of the rebels prevented what had been taken for granted—fearful mob violence, growing from bitterness and hatred toward the tormentors. There has been an admirable, if inadequate, attempt to mete out justice in some orderly fashion and to prevent lynch law that might bring vengeance on the innocent. Present U.S. criticism is inconsistent with our failure to criticize the terror practiced by the rebel patriots on a Communist foe in the Hungarian uprising.

3. The new cabinet consists largely of men described as economically and politically conservative. Castro has attracted more than reckless young revolutionaries; from its earliest days his movement was supported by a surprising number of wealthy, older Cubans with wide experience in business, banking, and the professions.

The apointment of a career diplomat as Ambassador to Cuba is encouraging. We hope that this second outbreak of anti-American feeling in Latin America within less than a year will not be a lesson lost on the American people and Government.

W. H. C.

## Sunflower Ordnance Plant

SPEECH
OF
## HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

(Mr. GEORGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include a resolution introduced by him today.)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, at Sunflower, Kans., there is an ordnance plant that has many buildings. The equipment is up to date and ready to go on solid propellants. For some reason the military is not taking advantage of this plant. There is much unemployment in the area and the people are anxious to go to work. There is no reason why that plant and plants located at Lake City in Kansas City, Mo., and the facility at Parsons, Kans., should not be utilized and we should like to find out why.

It is my belief that many millions of dollars are being wasted because of the failure to utilize existing facilities and that our military ordnance people are spending literally billions of dollars for private plants.

Just how economy minded is this national administration and which is the party of spendthrifts and wasters? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The resolution is as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 192

Whereas the Sunflower ordnance plant located near Eudora, Kans., has been shut down for a considerable period of time; and

Whereas such plant, consisting of 2,887 structures and equipment, covering 10,474 acres, is not today being utilized, although such plant is now equipped to produce solid propellants; and

Whereas billions of dollars are being spent for the construction of private facilities which duplicate the facilities located at such plant which are already in being and would cost $474,312,147 to replace; and

Whereas unemployment in eastern Kansas is at a high level, and an ample supply of labor is available to resume operations at such plant; and

Whereas the operation of such plant would save large sums for the United States which are now being spent for facilities which duplicate facilities at such plant: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of ascertaining the reasons why the Sunflower ordnance plant, near Eudora, Kans., and other similar facilities in the Midwest area are not now being utilized, with a view to recommending to the House such action as may be appropriate with respect to the operation of such plant.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Territory, Commonwealth, or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

## Massive Humiliation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I enclose a letter and article which my constituent, Lester Lichter, Esq., has forwarded with a request that it be printed

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter and article follow:

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN,
*Congress of the United States,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLTZMAN: I send you the enclosed article with shame in my heart for our Government. I have preached loyalty to our Government to the thousands of men I have had under my command for the past 18 years as an officer in the U.S. Army, Active and Reserve. I have served in World War II and in Korea, my last duty assignment (active) having been that of ordnance officer with the 187th Regimental Combat Team (Airborne).

In Korea, the 187th had the task of bringing order into the chaos that was U.N. Prisoner of War Camp No. 1, Koje-Do Island. The prisoners had virtually taken control of the POW enclosures to the extent of flying the flags of North Korea and Communist China. In an effort to bring the prisoners into smaller enclosures where they could be better policed, General Boatner of the Infantry reminded the prisoners of their obligations under international law; he spoke Chinese. They booed and ridiculed him. General Boatner turned to General Trapnell, of the 187th, and turned the matter over to him. Within one-half hour, using only few troops, the entire island was quickly brought under control. There were only 42 prisoners dead, many of them anti-Communists, killed by their Communist brethren in arms to prevent their following General Trapnell's orders. The only language Communists understand is that of force. We thereafter had the cooperation and respect of the almost 100,000 prisoners. We were also able to protect the North Korean and Chinese anti-Communists from the Communists.

Communists have the same mentality as had the Nazis. Timidity breeds contempt and insolence on their part. Unless we become men, we may have to fight a general war encouraged by our own half measures.

Please cause this letter and enclosure to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it may be read by people who are willing to arrest a deteriorating situation.

Very truly yours,

LESTER LICHTER.

---

MASSIVE HUMILIATION: THE STORY OF AMERICA'S MURDERED AVIATORS

(By M. Stanton Evans and W. B. Hicks, Jr.)

Early this month, the State Department revealed that it didn't have to guess about the causes behind the crash of a U.S. Air Force transport plane on the Russo-Turkish border last September 2; the facts of the incident, which caused the deaths of at least six American fliers had been known instantly—when a recording was made of the voices of the four Red pilots closing in on a single, lumbering aircraft that was unable to fire back at its killers.

Following the disclosure, a ripple of indignation crossed the usually placid surface of the American press, but the SAC and MATS pilots in the readyrooms of U.S. airbases around the world may have taken the matter more resignedly—for they have grown used to such things. The loss of 17 American fighting men in this headline-catching episode is only the latest of a long string of such incidents. Here are some of the more recent cases:

In December 1957, Communist Albania forced down an American jet trainer; the Communists released the pilot, but kept the plane. In February 1958, North Korean Communists hijacked a plane with two Americans aboard. In June 1958, an Army helicopter with nine men aboard was forced down in East Germany; the men were held for 6 weeks. In June 1958, a U.S. cargo plane was shot down near the Russo-Turkish border; the crewmen were held for 10 days. In June 1958, a group of American sailors and marines were kidnaped by Cuban rebels under the command of Fidel Castro. In November 1958, four Red fighters made simulated attacks endangering an American RB–47 (reconnaissance plane) over the Sea of Japan. In November 1958, Soviet fighters fired on another RB–47 over the Baltic Sea. In December 1958, an American flier was imprisoned by East Germans after the light plane he was flying crashed in Red territory.

None of these incidents has evoked a reprisal. Through indifference or fear, our Government has tiptoed softly in the presence of the Soviet enemy, allowing American servicemen to be mishandled and killed by Communist regimes. And the trend toward massive humiliation has not stopped with the Soviet Union; we also turn our citizens over to foreign courts in allied countries, without recourse to our own Constitution, in the name of good foreign relations. The celebrated Girard case of 1957 served to highlight the fact that the United States has a vast network of status-of-forces agreements which consign U.S. servicemen to the mercies of alien systems of justice.

Nowhere has the erosion of American honor been made more plain than in the case of the U.S. servicemen who remain imprisoned, today, behind the bars of Red Chinese jails. While the State Department has sought to focus public attention on U.S. civilians held by the Communists, variously represented as 13, or 4, or some other number of that magnitude, U.S. authorities know that the actual number of prisoners is in the hundreds. At the close of the Korean war, a list of captured personnel was submitted to the Reds, along with a demand that they be accounted for. Included were 944 Americans who were known, by various means, to be in Communist hands.

When the Reds defiantly refused to yield up any information about these men, the administration did nothing to force their return. Instead, trying to persuade the Communists to be more reasonable, the United States unilaterally reduced the number from 944 to 450—thus arbitrarily consigning 400 American servicemen to the oblivion of Red captivity.

Meanwhile, administration inaction has also contributed to the work of erasing these men from official memory. As the years elapsed, the Missing Persons Act came into effect. Under this law, once enough months have intervened, the bureaucrats are permitted to make a finding of death for missing personnel; thus our soldiers are not only abandoned, but are systematically written off as dead and expunged from the lists of the missing.

The system today amounts to this: the soldier is required to be loyal to his country, but his country is not loyal to him. If some civilian bureaucrat finds his well-being inconsistent with international harmony, or with State Department yearnings toward appeasement, then he is simply sacrificed. This renders meaningless the very concept of citizenship, which is supposed to be a matter of two-way—not one-way—allegiance. (Webster defines a "citizen" as "a person owing allegiance to and entitled to the protection of a sovereign state.") [1]

All of this stands in stark and incredible contrast to what was once considered respectable behavior for great nations. The protection conferred upon its citizens has always been a rough measure of a country's integrity and power. As the protection declines, so do the other attributes. When St. Paul traveled among foreigners preaching the Christian gospel, his universal protection was the fact that he was a Roman citizen. No one could mistreat him without having to answer to the Roman Government.

Similarly, in the day of its national vigor, the United States was jealous of the rights of its citizens abroad, and considered the treatment accorded them a reflection on its own national honor. At the very ebb of American military strength in the 18 century, at the time of the XYZ affair with France, American pride gave birth to the motto: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." The weak American nation of the post-revolutionary era would not stand still for unlimited mishandling of its citizens, even by the foremost powers of the world. Thus we fought the War of 1812 to end British impressment of our sailors to serve on their ships.

Perhaps the most famous incident involving American protection of an imprisoned national was that occurring in 1904, when Theodore Roosevelt was President. A Moroccan bandit named Raisuli captured an American citizen, a merchant named Perdicaris, and held him for ransom. The American Consul General in Tangier received a terse note from Washington: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead." Perdicaris was released forthwith.

A less famous but equally significant incident involved a man named Martin Kaszta, a Hungarian who had fled to America following the 1848 revolt against the Austrian overlordship of Hungary. In America, Koszta had filed a declaration of intention to become an American citizen, and taken out naturalization papers. But on a trip to Turkey in 1853, he was kidnaped and taken aboard an Austrian ship. When his friends appealed to the American authorities, help was instantaneously forthcoming.

An American corvette, the U.S.S. *St. Louis*, confronted three Austrian warships off Smyrna, Turkey. Capt. Duncan Ingraham, commander of the American gunboat, interviewed Koszta on board the Austrian ship, the *Hussar*. Koszta said he had lived in America almost 2 years, and that he intended to settle there.

"Do you demand the protection of the American flag?" He did. "Then," said Ingraham, "you shall have it."

Ingraham returned to his own ship, and dispatched this note:

"I have been directed by the American charge at Constantinople to demand the person of Martin Koszta, a citizen of the United States, taken by force on Turkish soil and now confined on board the brig, *Hussar*, and if a refusal is given to take him by force.

"An answer to this demand must be delivered by 4 o'clock p.m."

As the day wore on, the crew of the *St. Louis* made preparations for battle against the three Austrian ships. But at 10 minutes of 4, a small boat was lowered from the *Hussar*. In it was Martin Koszta.

With the release of the tape concerning the destruction of our C–130, a sense of shock has spread across the Nation. But why should we be shocked at this performance by the Soviet Union? As the most treacherous nation in recorded history, it is only conforming to its known pattern of behavior. No informed person can be surprised at such a disclosure.

No, the outrage and indignation should be focused elsewhere—on Washington. For the important thing about the recent disclosure is that the tape, showing that our fliers were shot down in cold blood, has been in the hands of our State Department ever since the time of the incident early in September. It was not released until the first week in February, a gap of 5 months. In the interval Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and

---

[1] John Noble, an American imprisoned for years in a Soviet slave camp, reports that Communist guards taunted their American prisoners by saying: "If you had a government in America, they'd get you out."

columnist Walter Lippmann have journeyed to the Kremlin, to imbibe wisdom at Khrushchev's knee. And, in this country, Anastas Mikoyan has come and gone, unembarrassed by public notice of the fact that his Government has fresh American blood on its hands.

That the tape was withheld for the purpose of promoting Mikoyan's peace of mind, and appeasement sentiment along with it, is suggested by reports that are now flying around the Capital. One of them, which was noted in the Human Events news section for February 4, 1959, involves a similar action by our State Department in connection with the burial, in Arlington National Cemetery, of two of the bodies recovered from the crash.

These two airmen were scheduled to be buried, with full military honors, during Mikoyan's visit. But, runs the report, the State Department pressured the Air Force into postponing the ceremonies until after Mikoyan left. Thus, the Soviet official departed without having a distasteful burial spoil his convivial sojourn, and an American wife was allowed to wait 3 weeks before she could weep over the grave of a charred body she believed to be her husband.

We have slid a long way from the days of the Founding Fathers, of Martin Koszta, or of Theodore Roosevelt. And before it is too late, we ought to take a long look at ourselves in a mirror supplied by one of America's most ardent lovers of freedom, Robert Ingersoll. "The nation that cannot protect its citizens," Ingersoll said, "at home and abroad, ought to be swept from the map of the world."

America today must return to the stern imperatives of the first President Roosevelt. "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead" should be the formula that protects our citizens around the globe.

## Report of the Committee on World Economic Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a report released yesterday by the White House. The report was submitted by a committee of businessmen whom President Eisenhower asked early in 1958 to explore new ways in which the Government and the private sector of our economy could effectively join together to combat the Sino-Soviet economic offensive and promote free world economic growth.

The report recognizes that we cannot win the cold war contest on the economic front unless we draw on the resources of private enterprise to expand trade and investment throughout the free world. It was with this overriding consideration in mind that I introduced on the first day of this Congress a bill, H.R. 5, designed to promote private foreign investment.

I draw particular attention to Appendix 1 of the report which contains the committee's recommendations for amendment of the internal revenue laws to encourage private foreign investment. The committee's recommendations are almost as one with the provisions of H.R. 5. I welcome the ssupport which the President's committee has thus given to the provisions of H.R. 5. With increasing awareness of the need for developing adequate policy to meet the Soviet trade-aid threat in the free world, I trust that we will see the early enactment of legislation such as H.R. 5.

The text of the report of the Committee on World Economic Practices follows:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORLD ECONOMIC PRACTICES

I. INTRODUCTION

This committee has been asked to recommend a combined governmental and private enterprise program to counter the mounting Sino-Soviet bloc offensive by the development of a sound expanding free world economic system.

In formulating its recommendations, in response to this request, the committee has agreed upon the following guidelines:

A. The problem: The problem arises from the remarkable increase in Communist economic capacity and the new uses to which it is put. The Communists are using their power to influence and control such countries as they can. Communist designs and maneuvers, playing upon the cravings of increasing numbers of people for more and better things, pose a long-term problem of the first magnitude.

B. Use of private enterprise: It is of the utmost importance that new and greater use be made by the resources and initiative of private enterprise. In this report, therefore, the committee has indicated ways in which private energies of the United States and its allies can be more effectively mobilized in the free world's economic programs, and through which the private sectors of the less developed countries can be strengthened.

C. A positive program: The Soviet threat cannot be met by attempts to counter each and every move in the bloc offensive. An effective free world program should encourage balanced economic growth in the less developed areas. The program should also be carefully tailored to the needs, institutions, and traditions of individual countries and adaptable to different and changing situations.

D. Clear objectives: Existing U.S. programs reflect mixed purposes—military, economic, agricultural, humanitarian, and cultural. Objectives should be clearly determined and stronger central policy direction established.

E. Essential continuity: Federal aid, it is hoped, will not be of indefinite duration. It is important, however, as long as foreign aid is necessary, that it should have continuity. It should not be on a year-by-year basis. Preferably, funds should be appropriated without the requirement that they be expended within any fixed time period.

F. Quality of personnel: In operations abroad, both public and private, the quality and preparation of personnel are all important.

G. Magnitude of aid: The magnitude and character of free world economic assistance to less-developed countries should be such as will have the desired political and psychological impact and make a meaningful contribution to sound economic growth. Assistance should also be related to the capacity and disposition of the recipient country to use is effectively. The amount of such assitance should be measured against the importance of maintaining a strong U.S. economy, which is basic to the development of a strong free world economy.

The security of the United States and the freedom of the individual throughout the world are at stake. The forces of the free nations must be joined in a common cause.

II. PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN FOREIGN DEVELOPMENT

Private enterprise has played a major role in the development of large areas of the world and will play a greater role in the future if given the opportunity.

In many of the less-developed countries, however, which are today the main targets of the Sino-Soviet economic offensive, conditions are on the whole not attractive to private investment. Aside from the extractive industries, the flow of private capital to those areas is extremely small. A greater volume of private capital can be induced to flow into these critical areas if appropriate techniques and incentives are employed by the U.S. Government.

Despite inducement, the flow of private capital to many politically critical countries may still be inadequate and U.S. Government financing will continue to be required. However, the initiative and know-how of industry, universities, and foundations should be fully utilized in Government-financed programs.

To these ends a private enterprise-Government partnership should be forged. The result will be far more effective than under programs managed and directed solely by our own or other governments.

To achieve the best results, greater emphasis in country programs should wherever possible be on project assistance rather than on budget and balance of payments support. The resources of private enterprise can most effectively be brought to bear on tangible projects. Projects must be identified in collaboration with the host countries with regard for timeliness and the needs of the countries so as to make a visible and lasting contribution to development ad have the greatest psychological impact.

To stimulate the investment of private capital and to encourage the participation of private enterprise in U.S. Government programs, the committee has certain recommendations.

A. Government support of private enterprise:

Where a United States or free world private organization is prepared to invest in and competent to build a development project, the U.S. Government should not provide assistance to a foreign government to build or operate such facilities on its own unless political considerations or the nature of the project are controlling.

The Development Loan Fund and other agencies of the U.S. Government should make greater use of their powers and resources to stimulate private capital to invest in priority development projects.

1. Loans: While the Development Loan Fund is authorized to make loans (hard and soft) to both private concerns and governments, loans thus far approved for private interests have been considerably less than for governments, both in number and in total dollar amount. This no doubt reflects, at least in part, the nature of the original applications. Of the 300-odd pending applications about half are private and half public. The U.S. Government should use Development Loan Fund loans more actively to stimulate private investment in identified development projects. This is contemplated by the statute and applies to both U.S. and foreign private concerns. It is recommended:

(a) Where necessary to induce private investors to invest in and undertake foreign development projects, the Development Loan Fund should make greater use of loans of dollars in combination, where required, with loans of soft currencies from Public Law 480 and other sources.

(b) While loans should not be extended when funds are available on reasonable commercial terms, they should not be denied simply because the applicant may have

ample credit. It is a matter of willingness to risk—not merely of ability to borrow.

(c) The policy under which the Development Loan Fund finances only up to 50 percent of a private project should be materially relaxed.

(d) The Development Loan Fund policy of insisting upon maintenance of value should be relaxed on loans to private borrowers.

(e) The Development Loan Fund is prohibited by statute from acquiring outright equity investments. It is, however, authorized to acquire obligations having convertible or other similar features. When such instruments can be used in combination with private U.S. or foreign capital to stimulate private investment, these legally authorized securities should be employed.

2. Guarantees:

(a) The Development Loan Fund should use guarantees to stimulate private investment in preference to direct loans. It should use its broad powers to guarantee hard dollar loans, possibly even up to the full amount of the investment where appropriate. However, some sharing of the risk by the private financial institution providing the funds is to be preferred. Consideration should be given to covering these guarantees on a fractional reserve basis.

(b) Restrictions imposed on the Development Loan Fund limiting the rates of interest that may be charged by private creditors on guaranteed loans should be relaxed.

(c) The present ICA program of investment guarantees against specific risks should be expanded to cover the risk of loss attributable to revolution, insurrection and other civil disorders. Such guarantees should also be made available for modification, expansion or improvement of existing investments as well as new investments.

(d) The State Department should continue to press for treaty agreements with countries which have not yet joined the guarantee program, and to this end should consider reducing some of the requirements and conditions currently being imposed which are found objectionable by the foreign countries.

(e) In the administration of loans and loan guarantees, care must be taken to insure that the amount of Government assistance given to a private organization is no greater than is required to induce the desired investment in priority development projects. Loans and guarantees should mainly be limited to countries where unusual political and economic risks outweigh the normal incentives for the establishment of operations by U.S. private enterprise.

3. Taxes: The tax laws should be amended to permit corporations to defer tax on foreign income until it is brought back into the United States and then, at the corporation's election, subject it to a tax of 7.8 percent, the present rate on intercorporate dividends; permit investment companies to pass through to stockholders the foreign tax credit; increase the flexibility of the use of the foreign tax credit; and permit individuals to deduct from ordinary income losses on certain investments in foreign business. (See Appendix 1 for details.)

4. Antitrust: The antitrust laws should be amended to exempt arrangements, entered into with the approval of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, which are important to the foreign aid program. Pending such legislation, the Department of Justice should adopt the policy of expediting the issuance of rulings which would in a measure protect persons entering into any such arrangements which are not clearly in violation of the antitrust laws. (See Appendix 2 for details.)

B. Private enterprise in Government operations: Where private enterprise will not undertake a project or where political considerations or the nature of the project require government-to-government assistance, the managerial and technical talents of the private sector of our economy should nevertheless be employed more extensively in Government projects and technical assistance programs.

It is recommended:

1. Rather than giving money to the foreign government to build a project (e.g., a fertilizer plant or dam) on its own, the United States should, wherever possible, require that a private operator be retained (e.g., a U.S. chemical or construction company) to build the project, turning it over on a turn-key basis to the local government after it has been fully put into operation. Such operators should be given freedom to select engineers and contractors, and should be encouraged to utilize local subcontractors and workmen whenever they are available and competent.

In planning for each development project, specific contractual arrangements should be included for the training of the managerial and technical personnel necessary to man the facility. Normally, the operating contractor should arrange for such training.

2. The degree of control by ICA and Development Loan Fund over the projects should vary, depending upon competence of direction and management and upon the country and type of project involved. Program and project review and implementation procedures must be made a expeditious as possible. Long delays, multiple reviews and time consuming procedures between conception of a project and its execution have produced negative political and economic results from otherwise desirable activities. There is need for greater speed of decision and action.

3. Likewise, in dealing with private organizations and individuals, appropriate agencies of Government should adopt simplified, speedy and direct procedures. Clearances of personnel and subcontractors and the preauditing of expenditures should be replaced by fixing broad responsibility in key governmental officials. They would determine the best manner of choosing private contractors and would then rely on such contractors for performance.

4. Technical assistance programs, wherever feasible, should also be contracted to nongovernmental organizations, institutions, firms and individuals on a long-term basis in order to secure continuity of effort and able personnel. Companies, universities, and other institutions should be given broader responsibility and authority to carry out technical assistance programs under contract or by the grant-in-aid technique. They should be expected to select and assign qualified personnel to the projects they undertake, and to acquaint them as fully as reasonably possible with the language, culture, history, and economics of the country to which they are assigned.

5. In the formulation of national programs and in the implementation of new public-private development projects, emphasis should be given to the training of local managers, professionals, and technicians—the leaders, public and private, of the less developed countries. The training of nationals of the less developed countries should be adapted to the equipment available and the operations which they are to perform in their respective countries.

6. Substantially greater assistance should be provided for the technical schools, schools of business administration and other competent and well directed training facilities in the less developed countries, particularly for institutions sponsored by U.S. organizations. An effort to expand the teaching and use of English would greatly assist in strengthening the bonds among free-world nations. At the same time an effort should be made to expand the training of Americans in foreign languages.

To the extent that local currency funds are acquired under Public Law 480 and other programs, they should be made fully available for these activities by changes in legislation and in international agreements if necessary.

C. Local free enterprise: The dimensions of the development task are so great that foreign aid alone cannot be expected to suffice. Its role must be to furnish support for local efforts and to stimulate self-help. The development of a free enterprise system in the less developed countries is the best hope for economic progress in those countries. To assist such efforts within the countries themselves it is recommended:

1. Properly run local development banks should continue to be encouraged. Depending upon the quality of their management, they should be eligible for grants or loans, especially of local currencies, for relending to local enterprises.

2. Consideration should be given to utilizing the Development Loan Fund's guarantee powers in order to induce United States commercial banks to make loans to local free enterprise directly or through their branches or through local banks.

3. Since local development banks are in a better position to scrutinize the creditworthiness of the smaller development projects, such banks should also be authorized and encouraged to participate with U.S. agencies in making loans and guarantees.

4. U.S. missions in the less developed countries should make recommendations, as needs are evidenced, for the establishment of other new savings and investment institutions to serve particular ends, such as agricultural credit, home financing, personal loans, etc. Private or mixed ownership is preferable to wholly owned Government institutions. Where appropriate, U.S. owned local currencies should be made available.

### III. ORGANIZATION FOR PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

A. U.S. Government organization:

1. Centralization: Private resources can be effectively enlisted in the attainment of our political and economic objectives only as part of a bold and skillfully executed program designed to capture the imagination of people both at home and abroad. It is, therefore, essential that our foreign economic programs have vigorous and unencumbered leadership.

Our efforts to date have suffered from fragmentation and division of responsibility among many departments, agencies, and committees of the Government—State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, ICA, DLF, Export-Import Bank, NAC, CFEP, etc. Inefficiency, ineffectiveness and delay have resulted.

The Committee strongly recommends that an individual or a single agency or department be charged with the responsibility and given authority to provide leadership, to determine policy and coordinate the administration of the program.

The Committee at this time makes no specific suggestion for the implementation of this recommendation.

2. Personnel: It is important that the U.S. Government constantly endeavor to improve the quality of its representation in the less developed countries. Personnel systems should be improved to facilitate the recruitment and advancement of capable and promising young men and women. Language and area training should be provided to develop an adequate corps of competent personnel.

At the same time personnel should be drawn from business and industry for temporary service with the Government. In this connection not only should governmental administrative road blocks be removed, but private concerns themselves must make it attractive for their personnel to render

public service without loss of status upon return to their business positions.

3. Commercial attachés: Every effort should be made to improve the position of the commercial attachés and to establish a closer relationship between them and the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce should play a greater role in their selection and training. Their rank in the foreign service should be substantially advanced and be commensurate with the importance of their role. Their contacts with American business through the Department of Commerce should be firmly established and developed. Effective administrative arrangements should be made by the Departments of State and Commerce to this end.

B. Office of Private Participation: An Office of Private Participation should be established under the authority of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs wherever he may deem appropriate.

It is recommended that this Office be staffed by a combination of highly qualified career Government employees and others drawn from private business. Those from private business should be men of recognized stature who will command the respect and enlist the assistance of the industrial, commercial, and financial community.

This Office should serve as the central point in Government concerned with assuring that private enterprise is used as fully as possible in accordance with the recommendations in section II. Its function would be threefold: It would plan for the maximum use of private capital resources on each project and in each country program. It would seek ways and means of utilizing individuals, industrial companies, financial institutions, universities and foundations to provide engineering and management skills as well as capital and technical know-how for specific development projects. It would endeavor to work out appropriate arrangements between private interests and Government agencies in situations which suggest such teamwork.

The Office should avoid duplicating the activities of other departments and agencies and should make full use of their reports and resources, particularly those of the Department of Commerce.

C. Advisory group: An advisory group from industry should be formed to serve as a channel of direct and speedy communication between the business community and the proposed Office of Private Participation. This group should be composed of outstanding representatives of U.S. business and finance.

The industry advisory group would serve two main purposes:

1. To assist the Office of Private Participation in finding and selecting the best suited organizations or individuals for particular foreign development projects.

2. To mobilize the resources of industry in carrying on a improved program of public relations in foreign countries as proposed in section VI.

IV. GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS

Section II dealt with private enterprise in foreign development. In this section the committee makes certain additional suggestions regarding government al programs, national and international.

A. Forms and conditions of U.S. aid:

1. Grants and soft loans: In principle there is much to be said for extending financial aid to governments in the form of either hard loans or grants, rather than soft loans, i.e., dollar loans repayable in local currencies. The grant reflects the facts of the transaction whereas a soft loan assumes repayment of value which, in terms of dollars, is not likely to be realized.

The committee understands, however, that both the Congress and the administration consider that the advantages of soft loans outweigh their disadvantages. In view of this, the committee recommends the following:

(a) Every effort should be made to administer loans, both hard and soft, along sound banking lines, once they have been made. This applies to the service of both interest and principal.

(b) Future utilization of repayment proceeds should be a factor in considering the merits of each soft loan. Forward planning for such utilization is desirable in order to avoid large-scale accumulation of U.S.-owned local currencies. Repayment proceeds should be utilized as promptly as possible (taking into account monetary conditions in the recipient country) by the U.S. Government, U.S. industry, or by local industry, either directly or through local development banks.

(c) Restrictions with regard to the use of repayment proceeds should be relaxed so that the funds may be available for a wide range of constructive purposes. This may involve legislation or renegotiation of agreements.

(d) The Development Loan Fund should reconsider continuing the provision requiring maintenance of value on loans to governments.

(e) The present "no year" appropriations for the Development Loan Fund are conducive to continuity and sound project development and should be continued.

2. Agricultural surpluses and local currencies: The disposal of agricultural surpluses should be better coordinated with our other foreign aid programs and should not be allowed to conflict with basic U.S. foreign economic policies. In principle, it would be more realistic to make outright grants of these surpluses rather than sales. If our Government continues to make sales, however, it is important to plan for the utilization of local currencies as soon as reasonably possible, again taking into account monetary conditions in the recipient country. To reduce the excessive amounts of local currencies accruing to the United States from agricultural disposals, grants should be made in appropriate instances for development, educational, and other worthwhile purposes.

Every effort should be made to reserve local currencies under the Cooley Amendment for loans to American private firms, and also a portion of United States owned local currencies generated under other programs in countries where sufficient Cooley funds are not available.

The requirement for maintenance of value of local currencies received from Public Law 480 sales should be eliminated.

3. Easy-term loans repayable in dollars: An alternative to both soft loans and grants would be loans repayable in dollars but carrying easier interest and repayment terms than World Bank or Export-Import Bank financing. Assuming the centralized organization recommended in section III–A, such easy-term loans to governments repayable in dollars should not be flatly banned but might be used judiciously.

4. Conditions and restrictions: Favorable political or psychological effects in recipient countries and long-term economic values should be both considered in project assistance. Therefore, whatever conditions and restrictions are imposed should not be such as to detract from those effects and values.

To assure proper use of U.S. assistance, special attention should be given to the manner in which the recipient country uses its total resources, as demonstrated by such factors as monetary and fiscal policies and the quality of administration.

The United States should eliminate or minimize the numerous existing restrictions on the uses of aid that are designed to subsidize or protect particular economic groups in the United States but run counter to the basic purposes of the aid program (e.g., prohibitions on the use of aid funds to develop industries or crops which might at some time compete with U.S. exports).

5. Military and economic aid: Purely military assistance, i.e., hardware and training, should be separated from the foreign-aid program and incorporated in the Department of Defense budget.

B. International institutions:

1. World Bank and Monetary Fund: The committee supports the U.S. Government's proposal for an increase in the authorized capital of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and in the qoutas assigned to member governments of the International Monetary Fund. To the extent that the World Bank or the International Finance Corporation require local currencies (not otherwise available to them) for package lending, arrangements should be worked out (including amendments to international agreements and legislation) through which part of the local currencies owned by the United States and not needed for its own purposes can be channeled on proper terms to these organizations.

2. International Development Association: If the U.S. Government should join in the creation of an International Development Association, the committee recommends:

(a) The administration of the Association should be under the auspices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(b) Member countries should make contributions in reasonable relationship to that of the United States.

(c) The United States should have a voice proportionate to its financial contributions.

(d) The loans of the Association, whether hard or soft, should be administered as far as possible on sound banking principles.

3. Regional lending institutions: If the U.S. Government decides to participate in regional banks or lending associations, the committee urges that such participation be conditioned on other countries' making proportionate contributions. As in the case of the International Development Association, the United States should have a voice proportionate to its financial contributions.

4. International consultation: The committee favors increased use of consultation and agreement by this country with its free world allies among the industrialized countries for the purpose of coordinating assistance to specific critical countries. In view of the recent strengthening of the reserve positions of other industrialized free world countries, the committee heartily endorses the efforts which are being made to induce them to provide a greater share of financial aid on their own or through package arrangements.

V. TRADE AND TRANSPORTATION

A. World trade and economic stability:

1. The expansion of trade between the industrialized and the less developed countries of the free world should be recognized as one of the principal means of promoting economic development. It is recommended:

(a) These countries should make further efforts to reduce barriers and to facilitate multilateral trade. With regard to the less developed countries, attention should be paid to improving their export position and thereby their capacity to import and their internal economies. Advantage should be taken of reciprocal trade agreements and of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) for these purposes.

(b) The committee welcomes the recent liberalization of European currency restrictions as a step in the right direction. The increased convertibility of currencies, particularly sterling, will facilitate the interchange of goods and services and financial transactions arising out of them.

(c) Commercial attaches in the various capitals should devote increased attention to U.S. business and investment opportunities and to imports as well as to U.S. exports.

2. When economic distress in raw material countries occurs through major price fluctuations, the United States, being the world's principal consumer of many commodities, has a particular interest. It is recommended:

(a) Where there is demonstrated need, the United States should take steps in cooperation with producing and consuming countries to assist in reducing fluctuations of certain major commodity prices (e.g., by international study groups). The aim should be to bring production and consumption more nearly in line and to insure more orderly markets, but to avoid underwriting fixed prices, which tend to perpetuate excessive production.

(b) When the United States participates in international commodity study groups or discussions, or when it is asked to make balance of payment loans arising out of declining commodity prices, it should exert its influence in support of realistic plans and diversified economies in the producer countries rather than temporary relief by palliatives.

3. The United States and other free-world countries should recognize that the Soviet bloc countries under their economy, can and do underprice their competitors to any degree they consider useful to their aims. It should be recognized, however, that not all Soviet bloc trade activities are inimical to the interests of the free world. In some cases they may represent normal international commercial transactions.

The United States should be forehanded and should now work out understandings with other free-world countries for combined action against Communist bloc monopolistic trading activities.

B. East-West trade:

1. U.S.S.R. satellites: As long as the cold war continues, it is proper that some degree of control should be exercised by the free world on trade with the U.S.S.R. and the satellites. The so-called COCOM list was considerably liberalized in August, 1958, probably to a sufficient degree for the present. It is recommended:

(a) On the assumption that the COCOM list now contains all militarily important items, the U.S. positive list should be limited to those additional items as to which U.S. equipment and technology are clearly superior to the other COCOM countries.

(b) The United States should consider possible promotion of certain kinds of nonstrategic trade with the Soviet bloc. If additional consumption of consumer goods could be stimulated, the result might be to produce pressures within the bloc, tending to divert resources from war potential to consumer goods.

(c) Advanced technical and technological information not generally available in published form should be treated in the same way as goods and equipment. No restriction, however, should be put on ordinary published and freely circulated scientific or technological data, patent specifications or other information.

(d) The United States should not extend government credit or loans to the Soviet bloc for trade purposes unless highly advantageous political gains are to be anticipated. At an appropriate time, however, consideration might be given to the relaxation of controls over private capital (Johnson Act).

(c) The United States should abandon its efforts to control exports of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies.

2. Communist China: The committee makes no recommendation on trade with Red China other than that the subject should be kept under review.

C. Civil aviation:

1. The Communist nations control a great land mass over which air rights are now denied to Free World airlines. This will give the Soviet airline, Aeroflot, in future years a tremendous strategic advantage in serving most of the less developed countries of Asia. To counter this strategic advantage, the U.S. Government should encourage all countries to obtain adequate reciprocal air rights from the U.S.S.R. in return for those which they give.

2. The Soviet bloc countries are now seeking by technical aid and the contribution of flight equipment to infiltrate the civil air operations of the less developed countries.

Internal and regional air transport operations, if kept free from Soviet infiltration, will make a major contribution to the economy, security and continued independence of largely uncommitted countries.

U.S. airlines and the other airlines of the free world should be encouraged to provide technical and managerial assistance in the development of civil aviation in these areas. The U.S. Government should make available flight equipment and related facilities on a basis competitive with Soviet proposals. With such equipment, U.S. airlines could negotiate arrangements with those countries for sound and orderly development of internal and regional air services. The necessary financial support to implement such programs should be given high priority.

VI. THE U.S. IMAGE ABROAD

In the less developed countries, it is important that we improve the understanding of the United States, its institutions and its aims. This is as important as economic assistance. The behavior and attitude of our people at home and abroad often have greater effect than grants or loans. Actions speak louder than words.

It is recommended:

(a) The image in less developed countries which we should seek to create is that of a United States whose own long-term interests are linked with the freedom and economic advancement of other countries. The peoples and leaders of each country must be convinced that the U.S. economic program is a part of a two-way cooperative effort. We must make clear that, contrary to Communist and other propaganda, there is a fundamental community of interest between the United States and the recipient country.

(b) The activities of private business abroad as well as those of Government must be related to the image which we wish to establish so that both contribute to its realization. The achievement of a favorable image is essential to the continued success not only of Government policies but of foreign private business as well.

(c) Government agencies should exercise leadership in projecting this image. They should keep this objective uppermost in mind in the administration of aid programs.

(d) Jurisdiction over the operations of the U.S. Government in this field and responsibility for enlisting the cooperation of private enterprise should lie with the Department of State. The USIA should report to the Department of State.

(e) Greater efforts must be made to ascertain the views and attitudes of the peoples of the less developed countries toward the United States and its institutions. To this end opinion research surveys by USIA should be substantially expanded.

(f) The present Government and private leadership programs for developing among the opinion leaders abroad an understanding of and support for the United States, its objectives, and its institutions should be expanded and made more effective.

1. Leadership programs should be developed primarily by agencies and persons for whom the relationships are most natural and enduring; i.e., engineer to engineer, educator to educator, business manager to business manager.

2. Government, foundations, and corporations should give substantially greater encouragement and support to the various trade and professional organizations for which there are counterpart groups abroad so as to enable them to sponsor more exchanges of individuals and information.

3. Overseas educational institutions sponsored from the United States should be used to improve international understanding of this country's principles and ideals. This would be an effective way of using Public Law 480 funds.

(g) The efforts of the private sector and Government must be better related so that both may contribute to the establishment of the image we seek to create.

1. The aid of publishers, broadcasters, and others active in public information should be enlisted. This should go beyond what the USIA is currently doing.

2. Business cooperation should be obtained in a substantially increased trade fair program designed to contribute to the United States imagine.

3. Business concerns operating overseas should be urged to participate in a joint effort to project this country's image abroad, possibly through an organization such as that suggested in section III–C. Through consultation, Government and business leaders should:

(A) Pool the public relations knowledge of the more experienced companies and make it available to other U.S. companies planning to work abroad.

(B) Use the prestige and influence of the general business community to encourage a high standard of ethical behavior on the part of the U.S. businesses.

(C) Encourage consultation between U.S. business leaders and Ambassadors and their staffs in the capitals of foreign countries.

4. The U.S. Government should provide facilities for short-course training and indoctrination of representatives of private industry who are going abroad for the first time. This might be accomplished through the Foreign Service Institute. The companies concerned should bear the expense.

VII. THE CHALLENGE

A great challenge confronts the United States and the entire Free World. A new power bloc has risen based on an ideology and a political-economic system alien to free ideals and principles. Its avowed intention is to dominate the world.

To combat it, a public-private partnership is essential. Success cannot be achieved by Government action alone; it requires understanding, effort, and sacrifice by all our people.

---

APPENDIX 1—CWEP RECOMMENDATIONS RESPECTING AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS TO ENCOURAGE FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

1. The following amendments are suggested to encourage investments in corporations that engage in business abroad:

(a) Define a new tax entity to be known as a Foreign Business Corporation: A domestic or foreign corporation could qualify as a Foreign Business Corporation if a specified percentage of its assets, employees, or sales were located abroad.

(b) Provide that a U.S. corporation that is a Foreign Business Corporation may elect to be taxed as a foreign corporation. Such corporation would then be subject to U.S. tax only on its income from U.S. sources. This amendment will eliminate the discrimination of present laws, which encourage incorporation abroad.

(c) Provide that dividends from a Foreign Business Corporation shall be subject to the 85 percent dividends received deduction to the same extent as dividends from a regular domestic corporation. To prevent double deductions, provide that a taxpayer may not claim the dividend received deduction with respect to a dividend where it claims the foreign tax credit with respect to such dividend. (The foreign tax credit will be more advantageous where the foreign corporate

tax rate is high.) Any dividend declared by the parent company would of course be subject to regular U.S. tax, notwithstanding that it represents income earned by a foreign subsidiary.

(d) Limit section 367 so that it is inapplicable to the transfer of assets or stock to a foreign corporation if either (a) the transfer is part of the transfer of all of the assets of a foreign branch to such a corporation; or (b) the property transferred consists of section 1231 assets (real estate and depreciable property) that are to be used by the foreign corporation in its business; or (c) the property transferred consists of stock of a Foreign Business Corporation. This limitation of section 367 should be subject to such safeguards as are necessary to prevent abuse, particularly some requirement that the assets and stock transferred continue to be held by the transferee foreign corporation.

(e) Permit all regulated investment companies to pass through to their stockholders the foreign tax credit on dividends and interest received from foreign corporations.

2. The following proposals are made with respect to the taxation of foreign income received by U.S. citizens, partnerships, and corporations that do not qualify as Foreign Business Corporations:

(a) A foreign branch which maintains separate accounts, and which would qualify as a Foreign Business Corporation if separately incorporated, should be permitted to elect to be taxed as a Foreign Business Corporation. Proper safeguards should be provided against abuse, particularly with respect to the tax consequences at the time the branch is permitted to revoke its election.

(b) Permit individuals to deduct as ordinary deductions losses on certain investments in foreign businesses that would now be treated as capital losses.

(c) The United States should conclude treaties like the originally proposed Pakistan treaty that allow a credit for foreign taxes waived by the foreign country; there would be no loss of U.S. tax to the extent that the foreign country would not otherwise waive such taxes.

(d) The limitations on the foreign tax credit should be amended to permit a taxpayer to elect each year between an overall limitation and the per-country limitation.

---

APPENDIX 2—CWEP RECOMMENDATIONS RESPECTING ANTITRUST

Certain statutory and administrative changes in the application of the antitrust laws to selected foreign transactions should provide substantial stimulus to the investment abroad by American industry, of its capital, industrial techniques, patents, etc., particularly in cooperation with other American or foreign companies. The business risks to be undertaken in making foreign investments, particularly in underedeveloped countries, are often such that individual companies feel impelled to share such risks and burdens with others. Assurance that any such cooperative ventures would not run afoul the antitrust laws should greatly encourage such investments. Accordingly, this subcommitee makes the following recommendations:

1. In order to bar civil or criminal antitrust prosecution and treble damage claims, a provision should be added to the Mutual Security Act which would exempt from the antitrust laws arrangements made in furtherance of the foreign-aid program. Such a provision would be in substantial conformity with the antitrust exemption enacted as section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 818), except that subsection (c) thereof should be revised to delineate the responsibilities of the various officials concerned with the granting of any such exemption, and subsection (d) thereof should be modified to prevent prosecution or claims for continuing acts or omissions commenced in reliance upon a previously granted exemption. (See attachment X.)

2. Pending legislative action of the type recommended above, present practices of the Department of Justice in the issuance of rulings to industry members as to whether proposed foreign transactions may violate the antitrust laws should be revised by administrative action, as follows:

(a) Adopt a policy of approving for antitrust clearance applications which are important to the foreign-aid program, unless it appears probable that a substantial violation of the antitrust laws will be incurred thereby.

(b) Establish procedures for expeditious review, in the light of public interest, of applications previously certified as important to the foreign-aid program.

(c) Provide for prompt issuance of rulings after such minimum investigation as may be reasonably necessary; and avoid, to the extent possible, investigations which might prove burdensome to the applicant in its business.

(d) Rulings should contain an undertaking that, if subsequent action should conform with proposals presented, the Government would refrain from subsequent attack under the antitrust laws.

The actual restraint on the interstate or foreign commerce of the United States in the case of an investment in an underdeveloped country would, in most instances, be so insignificant as not to violate either the spirit or language of the antitrust laws. Liberalization of the administrative procedures of the Department of Justice in applying the antitrust laws to desirable foreign investments by private enterprise could greatly reduce the hazards of subsequent litigation.

---

ATTACHMENT X—PROPOSED AMEDMENNTS TO THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954: ANTITRUST EXEMPTION

(a) The President is authorized to consult with representatives of industry, business, financing, agriculture, labor, and other interests, with a view to encouraging the making by such persons with the approval by the President of voluntary agreements and arrangements to further the objectives of this act.

(b) No act or omission to act pursuant to this act, if requested by the President pursuant to a voluntary agreement or arrangement approved under subsection (a) and found by the President to be in the public interest as contributing to the objectives of this act shall be construed to be within the prohibitions of the antitrust laws of the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States. A copy of each such request intended to be within the coverage of this section, and any modification or withdrawal thereof, shall be furnished to the Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission when made, and it shall be published in the Federal Register unless publication thereof would, in the opinion of the President, endanger the national security.

(c) The authority granted in subsection (b) shall be delegated only (1) to an official appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that such official may be appointed by the President without the advice and consent of the Senate if such official has been previously appointed to any office by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) upon the condition that such official shall make a finding that any proposed request thereunder would promote the objectives of this act, and (3) upon the condition that, not less than 10 days before making any request thereunder, such finding and the proposed request be forwarded to the Attorney General and that such official consult with the Attorney General respecting the competitive effects likely to result from the making of such request, and (4) upon the condition that the Attorney General concur with such official's approval of any request thereunder before such request is made; provided, however, that the Attorney General shall concur with such official's approval unless he shall find that the direct effect of such request would be to eliminate competitive conditions in the United States in the industry to which such request relates, or render ineffectual enforcement in the United States of laws respecting the maintenance of competitive conditions in such industry.

(d) Any exemption granted pursuant to subsection (b) hereof shall be applicable to any course of conduct taken in reliance thereon and shall survive the repeal of this act, or any amendment or modification hereof.

(e) The Attorney General is directed to make, or request the Federal Trade Commission to make for him, surveys for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power in the course of the administration of this act. The Attorney General shall submit to the Congress and the President within 90 days after the approval of this act, and at such times thereafter as he deems desirable, reports setting forth the results of such surveys and including such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Harold Boeschenstein, chairman; Henry C. Alexander; S. C. Allyn; S. D. Bechtel; R. G. Follis; Eugene Holman; Philip D. Reed; Frank Stanton; A. Thomas Taylor.

---

## Oregon, the Beaver State, Host to the World in 1959

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article about the Valentine State of Oregon written by one of Oregon's outstanding native sons—Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. The story appeared in the February 1959 issue of Retirement Life.

THE STORY OF A "FRONTIER OF THE FUTURE"—THE BEAVER STATE—HOST TO THE WORLD IN 1959

The first Americans to journey westward to Oregon were on the payroll of the Federal Government. They were a pair of Army captains named Meriwether Lewis and William Clark—the most famous exploring team in all history.

The pay of this redoubtable pair was skimp. Each collected only $1,228 for a pilgrimage which lasted two and a half years. Nor was there any National Association of Retired Civil Employees in 1805 to assure them of a steady Government annuity when the epochal trek was over, although a grateful Congress did vote the exploring leaders 1,600 acres of choice homestead land apiece.

Oregon, which lay at the sunset end of the trail of Lewis and Clark, this year celebrates its first century of statehood. Oregon was admitted to the Union on Valentine's Day

of 1859, just about half a century after Lewis and Clark had brought our flag down to tidewater on the Pacific Coast.

SUPERLATIVES STUD STATE

Meriwether Lewis had been private secretary to President Thomas Jefferson. He sent to his illustrious superior fabulous reports about the realm called Oregon—its swift rivers, towering mountains, deep harbors, and riches in timber, pelts and fisheries. Oregon still makes this enduring and vivid impression on residents and visitors alike. Superlatives stud the State like raisins in a pudding.

On its eastern boundary, Oregon is bordered by Hells Canyon of the Snake River, deepest chasm on the continent. In some places, it measures over 7,000 feet from rim to river. The western boundary of Oregon is the Pacific Ocean, which caresses beaches of white sand or sends jets of spray against rocky capes and headlands. I once heard a photographer for Life magazine say he had taken pictures of virtually all of the great seacoasts of the world, but the Oregon seacoast was by far the most picturesque and beautiful of any of them.

OREGON CLIMATE MILD

Oregon's northern border is the Columbia River. In its surging reaches lurks nearly one-third of the entire hydroelectric power potential of North America. The Columbia, second in size only to the Mississippi among the rivers of the Nation, drops 2,700 feet from its distant source in the Canadian Rockies to its union with the sea near Astoria, where Lewis and Clark put in the first winter ever spent by Americans along the Pacific seaboard. In addition, the prodigious Chinook and Blueback salmon runs of the Columbia are among the most valuable fisheries on earth—worth almost $20 million annually.

Because of the mild climate which dominates its western slope, Oregon is particularly popular with retired people. Many members of NARCE in Oregon are men and women who came to the State after retirement, liked what they saw—and stayed. My wife and I understand this feeling. We are natives of Oregon, born and bred. The instant Congress adjourns each session, we rush to Oregon, and we never return to the National Capital until just when Congress is ready to resume. We extract every last possible minute in our beloved Oregon.

Besides its awesome topography, which culminates in the 11,225-foot glacial summit of Mount Hood, Oregon has made striking contributions to Government during its 100 years of statehood.

INITIATED GOVERNMENT REFORMS

Oregon was the first State to enact laws setting maximum hours and minimum pay to protect women and children in industry. This set the pace for similar social legislation all over the Nation. Oregon also pioneered in adopting the initiative and referendum. Indeed, these reforms have become commonly known as the "Oregon system." Under them, citizens may circulate petitions on street corners or along country roads collecting signatures to place any proposal on the ballot. Such petitions have been used to enact statutes safeguarding natural resources or providing higher standards of old age assistance.

Furthermore, Oregon led all other States in bringing about the direct election of U.S. Senators. Until Oregon elected a Senator by popular vote, Members of the Senate were appointed by State legislatures. This often encouraged corruption, deals and the supremacy of special interests. After Oregon had made the breakthrough, the 17th amendment to the Federal Constitution soon followed, making mandatory the election of all Senators at the ballot box. The famed Senator William E. Borah of Idaho said Oregon's people were entitled to principal credit for this major reform.

Oregon is noted for its educational attainments. During the mass aptitude tests given our GI's during the Korean hostilities, soldiers from Oregon ranked second in the United States, exceeded only by those from Minnesota. Oregon spends more per pupil on its students than any State where school districts operate the public schools. The University of Oregon Medical School, the forestry department of Oregon State College and other specialized categories are outstanding in the Nation.

PEAKS COMPARED WITH ALPS

Yet, despite Oregon's leadership in the realm of government, it is the vast outdoor amphitheater of the State which characterizes Oregon most predominantly.

Awesome scenery abounds in Oregon. The Wallowa Mountain Range, with its granite spires and upland meadows, has been compared to the Swiss Alps. Justice William O. Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court actually insists that the Wallowas are the more magnificent. Crater Lake National Park throws a protective stockade around the bluest lake in all the world—a lake formed when a prehistoric volcano blew off its summit in a mighty cataclysm. The lake fills the ancient crater, where icy water has replaced molten lava.

The quiet tree-shaded trails which thread the Coast and Cascade Mountain ranges offer an unparalleled opportunity to view the magnificent stands of virgin timber which constitute one of Oregon's major resources. Many of the giant Douglas-fir seen today were standing when Lewis and Clark traveled through this country 150 years ago.

Oregon Caves National Monument, the John Day fossil beds, and the lava formations of the Deschutes and Crooked River gorges provide both entertainment and education for those interested in the history of the earth's crust.

RECREATION AVAILABLE TO ALL

Portland, the metropolis of Oregon, has long, cool spring seasons which are ideal for the growing of majestic roses. This culminates every June in the Portland Rose Festival, where some of earth's loveliest flowers are on display. Portland also has more evergreen trees growing within its city limits than any other community, even including Vienna with its vernal groves which Johann Strauss immortalized in Tales From the Vienna Woods. Forest Park is a primeval solitude almost within mashie shot of downtown skyscrapers.

Oregon has made a determined effort to insure that all its citizens, and their guests, may enjoy the recreational benefits inherent in the State's scenic grandeur.

Oregon was the first State to levy a gasoline tax to pay for its roads, also the first State to paint a center stripe down the highway to promote safety in fog and night conditions. The efficient highway system reflects this leadership. U.S. 30, the Columbia River Highway, is one of the world's most scenic drives. It has been compared with journeys along the Rhine, the Hudson, and the St. Lawrence, but with the Columbia offering by far the grandest dimensions. U.S. 101 clings to the headlands above the Pacific Ocean like a lariat. This road alternately presents vistas of mountain and sea. Its restaurants and hotels feature meals which highlight a wide variety of seafoods and fresh fish, because the waters off Oregon teem with aquatic life.

HAS MOST STATE PARKS

All the beaches of Oregon belong to the State, thanks to a progressive program instituted by Gov. Oswald West in 1912. No beach can be fenced off. The gleaming sands are a public playground for over 300 miles.

Oregon has more State parks than any other State in the Union. Some combine timbered uplands with ocean bathing. Others are located in the evergreen-shrouded interior mountain ranges, near clear snow-fed lakes or rushing rivers with picturesque names such as Rogue, Siuslaw, and Metolius. For the vacationer, free camping sites are available. For the weekend visitor, roadside picnic facilities are provided. Boating, swimming, fishing, and hiking are accessible to all. These recreation areas are in addition to the myriad of forest camps to be found in Oregon's 12 national forests.

DEER, ELK ATTRACT NIMRODS

Each year over half a million hunters and fishermen find the Beaver State's woodlands, fields, and streams a sportsman's mecca. Deer and elk seasons lure thousands of hunters to the woods in Oregon. Lewis and Clark actually located their historic Fort Clatsop within the present boundaries of Oregon because they glimpsed so many elk, as a source both of food and of replenishing their tattered garments. Oregon ranks second (to California) in the number of mule deer among the States, and second (to Idaho) in its elk population. Mule deer are the biggest of all the deer species.

Pheasant, quail, grouse, and partridge offer fine bird shooting, and for the benefit of waterfowl hunters there exist several public shooting grounds on wildlife management areas.

The State is justly famous for its fine trout and salmon. Deep-sea fishing, a living for many Oregon residents, is an avocation to thousands more who find invigorating sport in landing sea bass, halibut, perch, and other game fish indigenous to Oregon waters.

In all fish and wildlife matters, conservation is the keynote of State policy, thus insuring that future generations will enjoy the same privileges available to sportsmen today.

MUSIC, ART SUPPORTED

Portland maintains one of the finest symphony orchestras in the Nation, and also supports a symphonic choir. The Civic Theater stages numerous contemporary and classic productions with both local and Broadway casts. Regional and internationally known art is displayed in the Portland Art Museum. An extensive free public library system serves the city.

While Oregon's bountiful heritage of natural beauty and outdoor recreational opportunity has drawn thousands of Americans to this Northwest State, there are strong cultural and economic reasons for its popularity with our retired citizens.

ADULT EDUCATION CENTERS

Towns and cities which contain Oregon's 19 colleges and universities provide special advantages associated with the academic community, such as lectures, concerts, and sports events. Extension and adult education courses are accessible in all areas. In smaller communities, organizational events and local festivities provide a ready road to social contacts and congenial companionship.

In a time of generally rising prices, economics becomes more than an academic discipline for those dependent upon fixed incomes. Retirees living on unchanging annuities have no defense against this unfair tax. For this reason I was pleased to join with others in the last Congress to secure a 10-percent increase in the annuities of retired Federal employees. I regard few causes as more merited than that of providing fair upward adjustment of benefits for retired Federal employees and, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Retirement, I intend to continue my efforts in the 86th Congress to insure that retirement funds

available to former Government workers bear a reasonable relationship to living costs.

FEDERAL ACTION NEEDED

It is my hope that during the next 2 years Congress will delve deeply into the economic problems facing America's senior citizens. There are serious questions involving not only inflation but job discrimination, compulsory retirement, housing and medical care which demand immediate attention. The need for effective solutions grows more imperative each year as the proportion of our populace over 65 years of age continues to expand. In this connection, I plan to reintroduce in the Senate a proposal for a White House Conference on Aging—an approach suggested by a leader in matters of social welfare and humanitarian concerns, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

Major responsibility for the correction of injustices toward older persons belongs to the Federal Government, since only at this level can any substantial degree of uniformity be assured. However, I am proud that Oregon has taken countenance of some of the pressing needs of its senior citizens through effective State action. One example: During the 1957 session of the State legislature a bill was passed and signed by Governor Robert Holmes exempting annuities up to $2,400 from State income taxes.

Oregon has repeatedly resisted adoption of a sales tax, which so discriminates against those forced to subsist on small monthly pension payments. Oregon offers certain inbred economic advantages for retirees who desire to stretch a monthly annuity check.

Housing is readily available in both urban and rural communities. In urban areas apartment selection is broad, and numerous projects devoted entirely to elderly people are under way.

MONEYSAVING POSSIBILITIES

Individual vegetable gardens—a feature of thousands of Oregon suburban and rural homes—permit a money-saving method of supplementing food supplies. Oregon's climate permits the growing of nearly all fruits and vegetables.

Food processing, a major statewide industry, provides many older persons with an excellent source of supplementary income and a pleasant summer diversion.

Mild weather of western Oregon means low heat bills in winter. The Northwest's vast network of hydroelectric power sources keeps the cost of electricity low.

Perhaps the most persuasive argument attesting to Oregon's desirability as a retirement home is the simple fact that the percentage of people over 65 years in our State is increasing twice as rapidly as the total Oregon population—and an unexpectedly high percentage of the increase is due to migration. Recent statistics indicate that 9.2 percent of Oregon's population is in this age group; the figure is well above the national average.

CENTENNIAL TO ATTRACT 8 MILLION

This year an estimated 8 million persons will visit Oregon's 1959 Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair. It will be the largest such event held in the West since the San Francisco World's Fair in 1939. Special programs to celebrate Oregon's 100th birthday will be held in cities and towns throughout the State.

Oregon will be on display in 1959. I believe that many who come as interested viewers will eventually remain as enthusiastic residents. Oregon is like that.

## Retirement of National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Waco News-Tribune on Saturday, February 28. The editorial relates to the proposal a number of us in the House have advanced which is a plan of orderly and systematic retirement of the national debt.

The reasoning of the editorial is so astute, and the comments so cogent, that I commend it to the reading of the membership:

RESOLUTION ASKS DEBT RETIREMENT 1 PERCENT ANNUALLY

U.S. Representative JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, has introduced a concurrent resolution in Congress whose effect, if acted upon, would be to authorize a reduction of the national debt by not less than 1 percent of the total of that debt annually.

It provides that the Secretary of the Treasury should include that amount in any request for funds to pay any obligatory interest payments which become due and payable.

The resolution further states that the sense of Congress is that the plan should be implemented beginning with the fiscal year 1961, and continued annually without any interruption until the total national debt now outsanding is retired.

The national debt today stands at $281 billion. In the new fiscal year the taxpayers will be paying $8.1 billion in interest.

The trend toward higher interest rates, in Representative WRIGHT'S view, indicates clearly that the Federal Government soon will be paying 3.5 percent on all its obligations, or a total annual of $9.8 billion of the total debt that remains unchanged. Unchanged, that is, if we're lucky.

This means that of every dollar paid in Federal taxes about 11 cents must go for serving the national debt. It means also that if these interest payments go along exactly as they have been going, with no change in the national debt as of now and with the Federal Government having to pay 3.5 percent interest on its borrowings, then in 28 years we will have paid in interest the total amount of the national debt without having a penny of the principal discharged.

Our national debt is gnawing like a rat at our substance. We are paying a high price for the privilege of owing our national debt. So long as it is owned, then it must entail heavy interest charges.

Payment of $2.81 billions on the principal the first year, at 3.5 and subsequent 1 percent payments on the balance would be an almost painless procedure. It would be far better to reduce the public debt by this amount than to go further in hock through a system of yearly deficits of equal or greater amounts.

The national debt clutches at the back of the American economic system like the proverbial old man of the sea. If we had, in the past 12 years or so, made progress in reducing the national debt we would be in a far better position to meet the crisis created by Russia than we are now.

Moreover debt reduction, even in that low amount annually, would be psychological encouragement to our system of free enterprise. It would help to remove the ponderous doubt existing that it is to be carried and added to forever.

Since the end of World War II there has been only one brief period, during the Truman administration, when the Federal Government has made any reduction whatever in the national debt. Yet we have enjoyed the most prosperous years in our history in the past decade.

Representative WRIGHT'S resolution has much to commend it. But it requires more than a resolution favorable to the action it supports to get the machinery moving.

Congress should translate the resolution into real meaning.

## Private Enterprise and Public Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., who, on March 9, is to be awarded the gold medal for management from the Economic Club of New York for his excellence in management and the general contributions made by both Mr. Kappel and his company to the strength of our Nation and to the prosperity of our people.

As evidence of Mr. Kappel's keen perception and understanding of Government's obligation to industry and, conversely, industry's responsibilities to Government, I should like to set forth into the RECORD a recent address made by Mr. Kappel before the Bond Club of New York in which he dealt with some of the important factors bearing on the economic health of the Nation and the welfare of everybody in it. This speech, which might be properly referred to as a treatise, is entitled "Private Enterprise and Public Affairs":

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

(A talk by Frederick R. Kappel, president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., before the Bond Club of New York, November 20, 1958)

I am glad to report, naturally, that our business is on the way up. A year ago at this time our rate of growth was falling off, and last winter and spring we were adding telephones at a rate about 40 percent below 1957. Then things began to improve during the summer, and since August we have been running ahead of a year ago. Taking 1958 as a whole, we shall probably gain close to 2½ million telephones, compared with 2,800,000 in 1957. Long distance conversations this year will run about 5 percent ahead of last.

In 1959 we hope and expect to increase these figures considerably. We doubt that our growth next year will break any records. However we do look for a real rise in the public's wants for communication service and we are well prepared to handle this. For the fourth consecutive year, our construction expenditures to enlarge and modernize telephone facilities will exceed $2 billion.

I said we are well prepared. One reason for this is that we did not cut our 1958 construction program to the bone when our rate of growth, as I mentioned, began to slip off. We made some reduction, yes, in the amount budgeted to take care of future expansion. I think prudent judgment required this. However we did feel sure that renewed growth was coming a bit later on. So instead of cutting down drastically—which would only mean having to race the motor later in order to catch up—we went ahead with our financing and proceeded to build quite a lot of useful margin into our plant. Moreover, we kept virtually unchanged that portion of our total expenditures which was budgeted for modernizing our plant—I mean, for installing new dial systems and other equipment which makes telephone service more efficient and also more attractive to our customers.

Let me make a little comment here. I don't think we could have gone ahead with our 1958 construction as we did, if we had not been able in the last few years to improve our earnings and strengthen our financial position. I've said this before but I want to repeat it now because I hope the point will not go unnoticed. The plain fact is, we could do what was right for the long run because we were better able to afford it. And I'd like to point out too that in the process, we have been able to keep telephone employment at a higher level than would have been possible otherwise.

So often, people who are interested mainly in the labor side of the business picture will argue that improvement in profit is made at labor's expense. But the point here is that our somewhat better financial situation—which made it possible to carry on a better than $2 billion construction program notwithstanding the recession—has been much to the benefit of employees as well as to the rest of the community.

I don't mean we have been running a make-work program. We have not. We need everything we have built. However, our ability to continue building in orderly fashion, at a time when our rate of growth was going down, has kept a great many people usefully at work. So you see—and I believe labor leaders and our representatives in Government will also see—that profit serves the public good in more ways than one.

This leads me into stating briefly what I think are some of the most important factors bearing on the economic health of the country and the welfare of everybody in it.

The first is that any business must have the freedom to make itself financially strong if its products and services meet the test of competition in the market.

The second is that we must not and cannot let up in our efforts to bring about real gains in productivity. (I say real gains for a reason I'll explain in a moment.) In the years ahead we shall have a rising population, more young people and older people, and a relatively smaller working force. So if we fail to be more productive our standards of living will surely go down.

This means in my judgment that industry has a very real need to increase its research and development work, including basic research. We need to invent, develop, and design new and more efficient products and services. We need better plants, methods, and systems to produce them. Incidentally, I might mention that in 1959, at Bell Telephone Laboratories, we expect to be carrying on the largest research and development program we have ever undertaken.

Now let me explain why I spoke of real gains in productivity. I did so because it seems to me there is a tendency nowadays to rack up estimates of increased productivity without counting in all the costs of production. The costs that get left out are the added capital costs as investment increases. To my mind all the charts, graphs, estimates and forecasts that leave these out are just so many statistical fantasies.

This bears directly on my third point—namely, that the continuous hiking of wages beyond real gains in productivity is sure to intensify inflation. As industry makes such gains, everyone ought to share the benefits. However, if wage increases absorb them all, and more besides, not only is sharing impossible—we are living beyond our means and in the long run no one will benefit. In my judgment also, the practice of guaranteeing additional wages in future years tends to increase the danger even further.

Fourth on my list, we have this tremendous pressure for Government spending; and at the same time, a disposition on the part of many people in Government to put more and more restrictions on business. There may be better ways than this to commit fiscal suicide, but if there are I haven't heard about them. Added restrictions only make it harder for business to do what it ought to be doing—that is—take more risks, sell more goods and produce the earnings without which the tax collector can never find the money to pay the Government's bills.

As I read the news, the impulse or drift or drive—whatever you want to call it—toward more Government spending now seems stronger than ever. This disturbs me not a little, and I notice it also disturbs quite a few Members of Congress itself. In these circumstances the eventual danger seems to me to lie in the establishment of wage-price controls. I think such controls in peacetime would mean the end, at least to a large extent, of what we call our free enterprise system. And I believe we must find a way to bring the American people face to face with the question—is this what they want?

As I remember, it was Mark Twain who said that everybody talked about the weather but nobody ever did anything about it. Nowadays everybody talks about inflation, but few of the efforts to do something about it have had conspicuous success. Ideally, if inequities in taxation were eliminated or minimized, the overall tax burden on business reduced, and individual incentives restored, I think gains in productivty would accelerate, we would have much less inflation of prices, real wages would increase, business would do more business and Government revenues would be greater.

Maybe not every economist would agree with that statement, but I know some who do, because I asked them to read it before I said it and they gave me a green light. Moreover, my observation is that Government is just full of able, hard-working and reasonable men who have much the same fundamental thoughts. As a practical matter, however, circumstances press them hard. They must read the wishes and attitudes of their constituents—which they are in no position to ignore. It is difficult for them to act always as they would most deeply and personally desire. And I think we in business have added to their difficulties by failing to expose ourselves, our ideas and the facts at our command in ways that win widespread belief.

All of us hear more and more these days that business should throw off past restraints and "get into politics"—to put that phrase in quotes. It is a phrase that can be interpreted in different ways. One interpretation—and a good one—is that businessmen as individuals ought to be more active in public and political affairs. I'll say a word about that in a moment. First, however, let me comment briefly on another interpretation which seems to me dangerous. This is, that with labor already in there pitching to get candidates nominated and elected, business—as such—had better get going and do the same.

I think this idea can do great harm. In the long run I think it would fail even if it were to have some immediate success. The reason it would fail is that any time the people of this country decide that their elected representatives have been maneuvered into office by a particular group—be it organized business or organized labor—they will, and they should, vote them out. It may take a little time, but it will happen.

What then should we in business be doing about these things? How can we bring about better relations between ourselves and our representatives in government? What is our proper responsibility in public affairs? How shall we increase public understanding of the problems of industry, and confidence in our determination and ability to serve the public interest? Again I shall mention four points.

No. 1 in our business—and I would assume in any business—is that we simply must do the best possible job for the people we serve. I know that sounds obvious and I am sorry if you think I am being trite. But we can never, never forget this. In my humble opinion, it must always be the first thought in our minds.

The second point I tried to express when I was talking to a group of telephone people a couple of months ago. I said it this way:

Doing our best is not enough. We must also tell our story and tell it convincingly. We must do this in every community. We must see to it that the public really knows us, and that the public's representatives in government are directly and fully and honestly informed about what we are trying to do. If we are given treatment that we believe is wrong or shortsighted, we must say so and say why—and never stop working to get the situation corrected. When, on the other hand, regulators and legislators give us the means and encouragement to step up progress, then we must work to the limit to justify their confidence.

Just in passing, as an example of a situation that needs correcting I might mention the Federal excise tax on telephone service, which is paid directly by telephone users. This began as an emergency measure and is one of the most discriminatory of all taxes. In fact, the telephone is the only household utility that is so taxed. We realize well enough that now may not be the right time to reduce taxes. But the fact is that proposals have now been made, which if given legislative sanction, would embed telephone excise taxes permanently in both the Federal and State tax structures. This would perpetuate discrimination, and we shall oppose it by every proper means. I hope you will too.

However, I should also like to add—let us once and for all get over the habit of going to people in government when we need something, and ignoring them when we have nothing to ask for. Let's never ignore them—and I mean never. Let us rather, as their constituents, invite them on all suitable occasions to tell us what they have been doing. Let us invite them also to see what we have been doing. Let us tell them our plans, and take a sincere interest in theirs. Let us by all means increase our understanding of their problems, as we hope they will gain insight into ours.

To do this will not of itself settle anything. Nor do I think it should. But if we in business are the kind of people we ought to be, then it ought to be good for people in Government to know us as we are. In addition it ought to foster more interest in Govern-

ment on the part of more people in business.

This last is really my third point. You remember I said a few minutes ago that I thought business should be very wary of taking the same kind of leaps into politics that labor is taking. But I certainly did not mean that businessmen as citizens should lie down and play dead. On the contrary, business and especially big business has been criticized, and it seems to me with justice, for making it difficult for people in management to take part in public affairs. The net result, says the criticism, is that far too many of us—managers and employees alike—are politically inert: we have little or no idea of what democratic government is all about or of what the duties of citizenship are.

I am not talking about running for office and holding down a management job at the same time. Though there may be exceptional cases, generally the two do not mix. I think it might be difficult, for example, to be the mayor of a city and at the same time manager of the local telephone exchange. On the other hand, there will be situations where there is no possible conflict of interest, and one person can handle two jobs well. Circumstances alter cases. And quite apart from office-holding, I see every reason for encouraging people in business to engage in political affairs, as individual citizens, and no possible reason for discouraging it.

Now I'll come to my fourth and last point. Recently in an article on foreign affairs I read this thought—that today, 80 percent of the population of the world is having a brand new experience. For the first time in history, they are waking up to the fact that the price of rice is related to the kind of government they have.

I wonder how many men and women in American industry really understand how the price of rice is related to the kind of government they have and the kind of government they vote for.

Or to say what I mean in less figurative language—

Do they know that how well their industry can serve their interest depends on how well it can serve the interest of all?

Do they know that this depends, in turn, on the freedom their industry is given to prosper?

Do they know that a healthy economic climate depends on the political climate their votes establish?

As to any political plan or program: regardless of who proposes it, do they search out the answers to questions like these:

Will it benefit the whole community or just some people at the expense of others?

Is it good for the long run or will it pile up trouble later on?

Is it sincere or just smart politics?

I do not at all underestimate the intelligence of people in industry. I think they are well able to look at the evidence and decide.

But I think they have not always had all the evidence. In fact, sometimes the evidence about boils down to each party trying to promise more than the other. And while I am dead against corporations engaging in partisan support of candidates, I certainly think we should do the most we can—and that is more than we have been doing—to discuss policies and issues and call attention to their impact.

I hardly need to say how foolish it would be for any business to work along these lines on a merely self-serving basis. Only our own conviction that we speak the truth in the public interest will create conviction in others. But if we have this conviction, and speak that truth—voluntarily and with courage—I am confident we shall be performing a public service and that our efforts will be so recognized.

To come back, in conclusion, to the telephone, I have one more very brief comment. All the time I've been standing here, I have been conscious of facing an audience that includes quite a few of the Bell System's best and biggest customers. But whether you consider yourself a large customer or a small one, may I just say this:

We want all of you to like what you get from us. We want to make our service to you increasingly better. We shall never relax our efforts to bring that about.

I not only believe that the telephone will be more and more useful and valuable to you—I am certain that it will. And I assure you that from that result will come our greatest satisfaction.

## Rogers Faces the Frankenstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of including herewith a very thoughtful editorial which appeared in the News-Press of Fort Myers, Fla.

The editorial commends our able and respected colleague, PAUL G. ROGERS, on his efforts to promote a plan for the reduction and eventual retirement of our national debt.

I respectfully recommend it to the reading of all:

ROGERS FACES THE FRANKENSTEIN

Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, an upright citizen who pays his debts, is uncomfortable when he considers that the Government doesn't—as are a good many other citizens as well. So last week, with two Texas Congressmen, FRANK IKARD and JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., ROGERS introduced a resolution in the House to get something done about it. It looks at this stage like a hopeless cause, but that won't keep PAUL ROGERS from fighting for it.

What ROGERS and his two Texas colleagues propose is that each year the Government pay 1 percent on the national debt. Then, of course, in 100 years the debt would be paid. They would call upon the Secretary of the Treasury to include in his annual request for funds an amount sufficient to make this 1 percent payment.

"Suppose," ROGERS told the House in sponsoring the resolution, "that you or I or any person in this Chamber went to a bank to borrow $10,000. Suppose also that the terms set forth in the loan agreement made provision for interest payments on the loan to be paid at regular intervals but made no provision for repayment of the actual loan. Do we need a financial wizard to tell us that such a state of affairs could never exist in our well-ordered private business world? I think not. Just such a situation as I have mentioned does exist in the largest business of them all, the business of government."

Indeed it does. The national debt now stands at $285 billion. This year the Government will have to pay $8,100 million interest on it—just interest, without reducing the principal $1. With interest rates going up the Government soon will probably be paying $9,800 million a year on this debt, if the principal stays right where it is and we don't borrow any more. At this rate the three Congressmen point out that in 29 years we will have paid out in interest the amount of the debt but still owe every penny of it.

In proposing the resolution Representative WRIGHT pointed out that "in 100 years we could completely retire the debt by paying $495 billion in interest and $283 billion in principal, or a total of $778 billion. But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years will be 980 billion and we will still owe the debt of $283 billion, or a total of $1,263 billion."

While it may sound easy to pay 1 percent a year on the debt, what it would mean is that we would have to have a balanced budget every year for 100 years so as to create no new debt and then provide $2,850 million a year beyond all other expenditures to pay on the principal of the present debt. And that would mean, of course, either reduced spending or increased taxes or a combination of the two.

It doesn't seem likely that Congress will go for that. But then, it didn't seem likely either that Congress would pass the budgetary reform proposed by the Hoover Commission which ROGERS started fighting for soon after he went to Washington and which he finally saw enacted last year.

In any event ROGERS performs a highly valuable service in pushing his proposal by making Congress and the country aware of the debt and what it means. In speaking of the national debt he declared that "the fault lies not in the fact that we have created such a Frankenstein—it lies in our continued failure to face up to our creation." He is going to see to it that it is faced.

## Time Heals Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it has been said by many men in many places, many times that "time heals everything." This comes to mind today because of a set of circumstances that bring home this truth very forcibly.

We have three great Americans in three separate hospitals lying in critical condition. Their lives have been spent in the well-known "goldfish bowl" of the public press, radio, and television. Every magazine, every periodical, every writer, small or great, has at one time or another had something to say about each of them.

In one place we find an American Army general. A general during one of our greatest trials. One who not only led us to victory in war, but who gave of his vast knowledge of peoples and places to help establish what he hoped would be a permanent peace. Like all men in the public eye, Gen. George Marshall had his critics. No man can serve without them. But today, at death's door, all of this is gone and of the people who do watch his condition, all are praying for his recovery.

Next, we find one of our most controversial contemporary figures in public life fighting valiantly for his life against the dread disease, cancer. No man in recent years has had more abuse in some quarters than our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. However, the instant his condition became known to the public, all of us, friends and foe alike, joined in his praises and all of a sudden

we awaken to his real worth; or at least the press says we do. Without taking anything from Secretary Dulles, I do believe that if he recovers the critics will again be on his broad back. For the moment he is all perfect and that again proves that time, sickness, and death make the big difference in a man's standing in a community.

Last, but by no means least, we find sick and in serious condition a man of labor. In his prime, John L. Lewis was called more names and condemned more bitterly than the whole topflight of labor put together today. The abuse heaped upon John L. and his miners during the days of my childhood and early youth in the Pennsylvania coalfields would fill many books. And today, knowing that his day is passing we read of his great achievements. The men in his great miner's union always knew his worth, but it takes time, sickness, and death to bring the praises due him from the greats and near greats of our country.

In writing this, I am leading up to a point that sooner or later will be recognized by all of us, both friend and foe of labor and/or business. Critics are necessary, but sometimes they cause more harm, more pain, more embarrassment than they do good.

If some of the critics of these three great Americans had tempered their remarks and criticism with a little justice and personal consideration these men, collectively and individually, would not be held in such bad light by countless Americans who only knew them by what they read and hear. This, too, can be applied to the men who struggle for control of the labor of America. On one hand we have the union leaders and on the other we have the management leaders.

We have had more public print on this subject than any other for a decade. Many people have been stripped of power, position, reputation, and in some cases their liberty. No one condones the bad practices, but simple facts sometimes are lost in the great hue and cry of the more spectacular charges.

It goes without much argument to the contrary, that labor would not be the powerful unit it is in American life today without the Lewises, the Reuthers, the Bridges, the Hoffas, the Becks, the McDonalds, the Hutchensons, and the endless line from the living back to the dim memories of the past with their sometimes nameless graves, to the men and women who stood for what are now acknowledged as labor's rights.

This is not the first time labor has been over the coals in the public exposé of methods, means, and measures used to gain union power, membership, recognition, and working conditions. In fact, there are quite a few who know that without these methods, these same leaders, there would be nothing but second-rate company controlled unions anywhere in the country.

In time, labor — like industry — straightens itself out and gives to the country, to industry, and more important—to the American laborer, the kind of service that benefits all concerned.

Anyone who remembers the old coal and iron police, the early steel strikes, the abuse of the company store system, the black lists, and the yellow-dog contracts, watches the McClellan committee hearings unfold with a little more understanding than the publicity seeker, the politically ambitious, and the just plain citizen who does not know that this same shoe has been on many feet. Those of us who know the past, think about the present and worry about the future. The whole spectacle has outlived its usefulness. All the information needed has long ago been obtained—from now on it is like pushing the hanging body to watch it swing after the mob has gone home.

The people as a whole are tired of the whole mess. They have condemned the Becks and the Hoffas and many of them have come up with the conclusion that all labor is crooked, dishonest, and every other foul thing they can conjure.

Now, if the boys with the political balloons will pull in their strings and Congress will work out here what has to be done, the whole country will be better off.

The first thing that strikes me as a newcomer to Congress is that we are spending some $50 billion on foreign aid and defense and the vast majority of the Members of both Houses cannot name one incidence of waste, extravagance, or profiteering—and yet for every labor abuse I believe there are parallels in these programs that, insofar as the public's money is concerned, will make Beck look like a pauper.

I believe we would be much better off right now if we were to study the effects of automation and foreign aid and trade upon our economic life. The problem of chronic unemployment is more serious and more important than any other problem Congress is faced with right now.

These are the subjects to give the headline-hunters and our ambitious office-seekers to play with.

Anybody can call Hoffa names and get applause, but let them stand up and condemn Dulles and Marshall today for the Marshall plan and the Dulles trade and barter giveaways that have cost millions of American jobs and see then what kind of stuff fills their balloons.

Certainly it would be bad taste when both men are flat on their backs and mortally stricken to ever suggest that they were wrong. However, without condemnation and testimonial, I would like to include in my remarks at this time, a peculiar document—an address by Mr. J. P. Routh, chairman of the board of the Pittston Co. It is peculiar because it tells in simple language the story of automation and cooperation and condensation in the same short speech. It shows that automation has put coal production up to 45 tons per man per day in the United States as against 1½ tons per man per day in Europe. It shows that this was only possible because of union cooperation. It also shows that both automation and cooperation here at home can be useless if we continue our stupid policy of unrestricted importation of cheaper fuels produced with substandard wages and by underprivileged peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I present the speech by Mr. Routh in full because it gives some convincing facts on the future of the coal industry and again because it proves that in some cases, in labor particularly, the ends justify the means.

I heard John L. Lewis condemned for years; I am happy to hear him praised.

THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE OF THE BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY

(By J. P. Routh)

Mr. Toastmaster, Governor Almond, Phil Sporn, Tom Kennedy, distinguished guests, first, I want to thank Stu Saunders, the president of the Norfolk and Western Railroad, and his associates for this wonderful trip. From the moment we arrived in Roanoke, it has been outstanding in its southern hospitality and organization for the complete comfort and enjoyment of all their guests.

Second, I want to thank this distinguished group which has come here to help us dedicate our new Moss No. 3 Mine and the new electric plant of the American Electric Power Co. Today you have seen this mine, which will cost $30 million and took almost 3 years to build from the day it was blueprinted. You have heard about its phenomenal production of 45 tons per man per day as against 11 tons per man per day for the coal industry in this country and 1½ tons per man per day in Europe. You have inspected a cleaning plant that resembles a huge factory and cleans, dries, and sizes 25,000 tons of coal per day automatically and with push-button control. This plant, equipped with the most modern automatic and electronic devices, compares with the great modern manufacturing plants of America. In a word, you have seen the newest and, we believe, finest coal mine in the world. Then also you have seen, practically alongside this mine, a great new electric plant built by Mr. Sporn's American Electric Power Co., which I understand will be one of the lowest cost, if not the lowest cost producer of electricity in the world.

Well, what is the significance of all this? To me it is historical because it demonstrates the tremendous progress that has already been made in mechanization by the bituminous coal industry, and in my opinion there is much more to come. Today machines are being manufactured that will bore into the side of a hill or mountain for a thousand feet and literally pull out the coal. These machines will be operated electronically by remote control. There will also be many other revolutionary improvements in mining machinery over the coming years that will greatly improve the output of coal per man per day, which is notice to the industry of America that bituminous coal intends to be competitive with oil, natural gas, and atomic energy at all times.

While talking of mechanization I cannot fail to pay a word of tribute to John L. Lewis and his able associate Tom Kennedy, for without their cooperation this great coal mine and the tremendous progress of the industry in mechanization could not have been achieved. It is only because these great American leaders have the intellectual capacity and moral integrity to know and to say that it is only with increased productivity that labor can achieve a higher wage scale and a better standard of living.

Today you have also seen a great new electrical plant built literally on top of a coal mine. This may well be the beginning of a trend of bringing the electric plant to the coal rather than the coal to the electric plant. This should be a warning to my good friends in the railroad industry, for as coal freights go up, electricity can be transmitted by high voltage wires more economically greater and greater distances. Rather than constantly increasing coal freight rates the railroads are going to have to meet this situation realistically by putting in contract or special trainload rates for guaranteed tonnages or eventually lose a good part of this

very lucrative and very necessary freight revenue.

At the present time the bituminous coal industry is emerging from the depression that all industry experienced in 1958 and was particularly hard hit due to the low operations of the steel industry both here and abroad. It still has some problems to solve; however, I am very bullish about its future outlook. Indeed, I am greatly concerned as to whether there will be enough coal produced 5 to 10 years hence to take care of the demand.

A projection of how much bituminous coal will be needed within this period will amply demonstrate what I mean. The utility industry expects to double its kilowatt production within 10 years, and as it is using approximately 160 million tons of coal today, by that time it will require 320 million tons. The steel industry of America, if it were running at full capacity, would require 140 million tons today, and they have projected an increase of 35 million tons by 1970. Thus this industry would use 175 million tons within this period. The steel industry abroad requires today approximately 120 million tons annually and their projected increase within 10 years is an additional 50 million tons so that they will require 170 million tons, of which I would say one-third to one-half can only be obtained in this country due to shortages of metallurgical coal in the rest of the world. In addition with the expansion of general industry within the next 10 years in the free countries of the world, it is estimated that they would require at least 25 million tons of steam coal from this country so that our total exports, both metallurgical and steam coal, will be from 75 to 100 million tons. If the rest of industry in our country outside of utilities and the steel industry expands at the same rate within the next 10 years, it will require double what it is using today or 200 million tons. This all adds up to 750 million tons. As you know, present production is only approximately half of this, or 400 million tons, and 20 percent of this is nonunion coal produced in small mines literally from the outcrop, which will virtually disappear within 10 years.

The day is gone when a coal mine can be built overnight with a few sticks and a few thousand dollars. Today it requires time and money to build a modern mine, and unless the industry can obtain this money—and believe me they will never obtain it unless they are prosperous enough to show some earnings to attract capital—the coal just will not be available. So I say to my utility friends, if they want to keep coal as a source of competitive fuel along with oil and gas and agree that atomic energy on an honest economic basis may be 20 or 25 years away and even then will only be able to supply a fraction of the total energy requirements, then, and if only for self insurance, they should place long-term contracts at fair prices with these producers that have large reserves so that they in turn can obtain the financing that will be necessary to build the mines and assure them of an adequate future supply of high grade coal. This I feel should have the immediate attention and study of the leaders of the utility industry. I know that it is very difficult when present prices of imported residual oil, dump gas and nonunion coal are so attractive and so much lower than coal produced by the unionized bituminous industry. However, I think you will agree with me that this is a temporary condition and that in a relatively short period all the above-mentioned sources of cheap fuel will disappear from the market. Certainly it is inconceivable that the independent petroleum producers can limit (even though only by voluntary controls) the importation of cheap crude oil and its products with the one exception of residual oil (liquid coal) and the great bituminous coal industry operating in some twenty States will not soon obtain the all-out support of their Representatives and Senators to limit also the importation of this competitive product.

There is no question in my mind also that in a very short time the natural gas industry will be prevented from selling this valuable natural resource for boiler use during the summer months at uneconomic prices. In time, of course, as more nearby storage fields are built, this fuel will be available only for domestic heating purposes. Thus I believe that the leaders of the electric utility industry, who have had the foresight and who have done such magnificent planning to keep ahead of the tremendous growth of energy requirements of this country, will most certainly be interested in carefully studying this proposal.

Only recently some of the large steel companies have recognized that high grade metallurgical coal will become very scarce in perhaps 15 years' time and some of the companies in this industry have now made long-term contracts with coal companies having large reserves of metallurgical coal. These farseeing and able executives want their companies to be assured of a supply when the great portion of this high grade metallurgical coal will be depleted.

Incidentally, I should also like to sound a friendly warning to our Government leaders who have been neither sympathetic nor realistic to the problems of our bituminous coal industry. Should, God forbid, we have another war and the water transportation of oil be shut off or severely hampered as in World War II, coal would have to be the source of our power and energy. The industry in that case was able to increase its output quickly to approximately 650 million tons primarily by the use of road machinery and small stripping operations and by digging coal from outcrop seams. This method of increasing production is disappearing rapidly with the exhaustion of this type of coal, and in a few more years will no longer be available. It seems to me, therefore, that our responsible governmental leaders of both parties should realize this fact and not allow governmental laws or actions that are inimical to the bituminous coal industry—the excessive importation of cheap residual oil, the wasteful dumping of natural gas for boiler use, subsidizing at the taxpayers' expense the building of atomic energy plants both here and abroad to produce electricity at 10 to 15 times the cost of conventional fuels. Not only this, but the public should be clearly informed of the terrible dangers of radiation in building these plants so close to centers of population should an accident take place, and somehow accidents always happen. Our Government leaders should also realize that coal not only employs directly and indirectly hundreds of thousands of people, but it is one of the chief sources of revenue of the wavering and hard-pressed railroad industry.

Thank you for your kind attention, and I hope you all have enjoyed the trip.

## Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I shall prepare and include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my annual report to my constituents. The report covers legislative work done by the Congress, and my efforts in behalf of the people I represent.

## When Do We Face Up to This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am including here, under leave to extend my remarks, an editorial from the St. Louis Daily Livestock Reporter, February 25.

This editorial is a further contribution in the growing body of comment throughout the Nation on the need for a regular and systematic approach to repayment of the national debt:

[From the St. Louis Daily Livestock Reporter, Feb. 25, 1959]

WHEN DO WE FACE UP TO THIS?

We'd like to offer a rousing cheer for Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of Texas. He stood up in the House the other day and offered a concurrent resolution calling for beginning a systematic program of reducing the national debt. His suggestion is that we set aside a sum equivalent to 1 percent or more of the national debt each year to retire the principal. That would mean starting with $2.8 billion, since the debt amounts to $283 billion. At that rate, it would take something less than 100 years to pay it off. But in the process we taxpayers (and our children and their children) would be saved around $485 billion.

The Congressman should have a pat on the back for daring to propose such a thing. His plan, or something like it, ought to be implemented without delay, while the Nation is in a period of prosperity and can logically contemplate doing something about ridding itself of this monstrous debt which hangs over the heads of us all (as well as future generations yet unborn).

Some will ask why we should begin to retire this debt. There are many people who sincerely believe there is no point in worrying about it, since Uncle Sam is not broke and can get along as long as his assets and revenues are on such a tremendous scale. They argue that the need for spending is far greater as a stimulant and stabilizer than is the need for debt reduction.

Yes; probably the Nation can continue to live with the national debt. But commonsense cries out for a saner course. There may come a day when we can no longer live with it. Why shouldn't we begin at once to prepare for the possibility of such a day, which history tells us is almost certain to come? Why, we may also ask, should this debt with staggering principal and interest be carried along as a permanent burden, when none of us, in his personal or business life, considers such economics sound. As individuals we work, scrimp, and save feverishly to reduce the principal of any debt we contract, in order to get out from under at the earliest possible moment.

There are other reasons why it is logical to begin the reduction of this debt. One of them is cost. The interest charges on a debt of $283 billion cannot be minimized—they are immense. During the next fiscal year the interest on the debt will be $8.1 billion. And if the average rate increases to 3.5 percent as seems likely, it will climb to $9.9 billion. Assuming we make no move

to reduce the debt, in less than 30 years we will pay as much in interest as the debt is today but we will still owe all of it.

Another reason for concern over the debt is the eroding effect it has on the credit of the Federal Government. There appears to be a growing lack of enthusiasm for Government securities among investors. This is true of both those who buy Government notes and bonds in the Treasury's refinancing activities, and among the general public itself, which buys Government savings bonds.

Representative THOMAS PELLY, of Washington, urging the House to act favorably on the resolution, pointed out that a policy of balanced budgets, together with regular yearly payments on the debt, could restore confidence in Government securities and the interest rates on Treasury borrowing would decline almost enough to offset the amount of yearly debt reduction.

Isn't it about time we got our collective selves by the scruff of the neck and demand a definite answer as to what we are going to do about this debt?

## Federal Pupil Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 23 I introduced in the House a bill to amend Public Law 531 of the 83d Congress to prohibit use of Federal funds authorized under this law for federally conducted or contracted pupil-testing programs.

My action was prompted by the announcement of the U.S. Commissioner of Education that such a program, involving some 500,000 pupils in 1,400 high schools, is being launched through a contract with the University of Pittsburgh.

A warning that such a program was contemplated, together with a brilliant analysis of the pitfalls and fallacies of such a program, was delivered just 2 days before the Office of Education announcement by Dr. Frederick M. Raubinger, commissioner of education for the State of New Jersey.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address by Dr. Raubinger delivered at the meeting of the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, February 16:

To debate the question, "Resolved that the national systems of examinations are harmful to American schools," it is necessary to define what we are talking about. I assume that for the purpose of this debate we are talking about large-scale standardized testing of pupils in our elementary and secondary schools carried out with official sanction of the Federal Government. National programs of testing carried on without Government sanction could also be debated, but for the purpose of this discussion, perhaps it may be agreed to accept the definition I propose.

Such Federal sanction might be by action of Congress or it might be by an administrative agency such as the U.S. Office of Education. Legislative action is, in my opinion, a remote possibility. What is more likely is that an administrative agency without any mandate from the American people will lend support and sanction to those individuals and groups who, for reasons of their own, want to impose a national testing program on the school districts of this country. As one who is reasonably close to parents and other citizens as well as to school personnel, I must testify that I detect no clamor at all for national systems of examinations. Moreover, inquiry among those who are eminent in the testing field itself reveals a surprising number who express both concern and apprehension at the possibility of national testing.

I affirm that national programs of testing as here defined would be harmful to education generally, would lead specifically to a large degree of Federal control over the curriculum, methods of instruction and guidance services in local school districts, would inevitably lead to unfair and invidious comparisons among States, among districts within States, and among pupils in a school, and could easily result in controls over pupils' opportunities for continuing their education and for exercising choice in selecting an occupation. Finally, I submit that the arguments usually advanced for national testing, although they seem plausible, are, in fact, specious.

A national testing program would be harmful to education generally because it would tend to narrow, rigidify and freeze the curriculum. Anyone who constructs a test must decide a priori what he believes it is important to learn, for such an assumption underlies the choice of items to be included in a test as well as the relative importance given to any test item. Important objectives of education in general or of an individual school district in particular may not be reflected to any significant degree in what a test-maker chooses to include in a test. The deadening blight of uniformity would fall upon our schools. Conformity would become a virtue. Because of the importance attached to any testing program launched under the auspices or authority of the Federal Government and carried out on a broad scale, great prestige would be attached to whatever tests were selected. It is a matter of common observation by those of us experienced in school work that whenever high value is placed on successful performance on a standardized test or series of tests, teachers will teach for the test. Teachers feel that their own competence is measured by success of their pupils on such tests. This is absolutely true of tests which are oriented toward achievement. Contrary to arguments often advanced, it is also true of tests which are not achievement oriented because of the inclusion of vocabulary, reading comprehension and numerical type questions on standardized tests. Those who advocate large-scale testing programs invariably say "It is not our intention to influence the curriculum and teaching procedures and it is not our fault if that happens." This is a poor disclaimer, for the results are as I have described them, and for the reasons given. The curriculum is heavily coerced when high prestige is attached to tests, from which it follows that Federally-sanctioned tests open the door for Federal control of or strong influence upon the curriculum. There would be the clear temptation to tie Federal testing with Federal aid and federally recommended curricula. The full damage will thus be done. Education will be open to pressures of a contemporary Congress or by a few members of Congress or by administrative officials who have special concerns. If anyone wants to argue that this is desirable we'd better have a much broader forum than this one today, for this question cuts to the heart of our time-tested beliefs about keeping decisions about our children and their education close to home.

If there is to be a national testing program, you may predict with certainty that unfair and undesirable comparisons will be made among States, among school systems within States, and among schools in a district. We have experience to substantiate this conviction. Data collected by the American Council on Education on the general education development tests were, according to the council, misused in drawing comparisons between California and other States. The director of the commission on accreditation of service experiences of the council felt it necessary to write as follows: "The council is deeply concerned that it is being quoted in States political campaign speeches as having compared California schools with schools in other States on the basis of the GED tests. Data collected in the normative studies of the GED tests are not adequate for the purpose of providing a true level of achievement of schools in any State nor for drawing inferences about the educational programs of individual States." Nevertheless, comparisons were made * * * unfairly and with harmful effect.

The national merit examinations provide another case in point. How many superintendents have seen people in their communities swell with pride or point the accusing finger when merit winners are announced. It is so simple to fall into the easy fallacy that national merit examinations measure the quality of a school.

In spite of the overconfident claims of a few prominent persons in the testing field, testing is not an exact science, nor have final improvements been made in testing devices. Yet even now, short of a national testing program, decisions involving educational plans, entrance to college, occupational opportunities are being made in too many places by excessive reliance on standardized tests. It goes without saying how much this unfortunate development would be furthered by national testing. This is not intended as an indictment of tests. Tests are of great value when used as an aid to teacher, guidance officer, and administrator in helping an individual child assess his capabilities. They are valuable when a school system wishes to appraise some aspect of its educational program. They are best used when used locally, with local choice of test. Who knows better than local teachers, guidance officers, and administrators what tests best fit a particular purpose at a particular time?

Neither school people nor most testers want tests to become the tail that wags the educational dog. As the Rockefeller report cautions "Test data are one kind of data to be placed along side other kinds of data. No single test should become a basis for important decisions. The test score is not to be worshipped as a datum so decisive that it alone can be used to settle an individual's fate. The test score should be regarded as an aid in making, and not a device for evading complex and difficult decisions concerning the child. There are many kinds of talent which must go unmeasured because no adequate measuring instruments exist. Tests are effective on a limited front. We cannot measure the rare qualities of character that are a necessary ingredient of great performance. We cannot measure aspiration, purpose, courage, vitality, determination."

Dr. James Plant, famous psychiatrist with whom I worked for many years, and who worked with and tested thousands of pupils in our largest county, said that he had never been able to find any test that discovered social leadership. We must always remember that our future leaders will probably never be discovered with any accuracy by any test.

In short, beware. Tests alone cannot substitute for the wise and mature judgment of those who know children intimately as human beings and who refuse to regard children in terms of a series of data recorded on an IBM punch card.

National testing would pervert many of the legitimate uses which can be made of tests. No matter what tests were chosen

for inclusion in a national program, these would have conferred upon them a distinction not necessarily associated with their merit. Their prestige would be automatic and self-endowed. As an example, many competent persons in the testing field believe that the Army general classifications test did not reflect the psychometric advances made since 1920. But once AGCT was constructed and imposed, its use was no longer a matter of choice or judgment. I suspect that test experimentation would be slowed and testing procedures frozen as soon as national testing was imposed.

We are not debating an abstract issue. Dr. Flanagan himself has outlined and proposed a research project which, if adopted, lets the camel's nose into the tent. I do not ascribe ulterior motives to those who framed the proposal. Admittedly, the proposal does not fit all the specifications for a national testing program. But it does fit some. He has asked for, and is reportedly about to receive, a grant of more than $1 million through the U.S. Office of Education. U.S. Office of Education funds are to be supplemented by money from other administrative departments of the Federal Government. The proposal, if approved, meets the test of Federal sanction. Dr. Flanagan proposes that "students in grades 9, 10, 11, 12 will be tested in a random sample of 5 percent of secondary schools, which would include 1,400 schools and 500,000 children." It is proposed "that a comprehensive set of test scores and other documentative information regarding the student, his background, community and school be collected. To the sampling of students would be administered a series of aptitude, achievement, interest and personality tests along with biographical, socio-economic, motivational and personal plans data."

It is proposed that follow-up studies of students tested be made 1, 5, 10, and 20 years after graduation.

Dr. Flanagan says the proposal is feasible, among other reasons, because the Iowa Electronic Scoring Machines can now process the data pretty fast.

What a simple thing it will be to take the next easy steps to a complete national testing program encompassing not 500,000 but 35 million persons. All of our children can then be described and neatly sorted and their records preserved for posterity on magnetic tape, thanks to improvements in electronic computing.

Even though it is offered in the name of research, which incidentally is probably the tiredest word in our vocabulary, I think this proposal needs the closest scrutiny.

I come to my final assertion. Advocates of national testing often rest their case on the need to see that manpower is best and most fully utilized. They argue further that competition with Russia urgently demands that no power be left undeveloped. How many unwise proposals about education have already been advanced on those reasons. They have become the pegs on which to hang almost any pet project. I subscribe to the belief that opportunity for each to reach his full potential is an important aim of education. I believe that what each of us does or fails to do adds to or depletes our strength as a nation. However, I see no reason whatever to proceed from this reasonable premise to the erroneous conclusion that therefore we must have a national program of examinations. How specious can you get?

How innocently and blithely we move toward big brother and the brave new world. Twenty-five years ago Judge Learned Hand gave a commencement address at Bryn Mawr College. "Why," he asked ironically, "should science be limited to improvements in our countrol over nature, and exclude the most important part of our environment, our fellows? Adopt the high calling of manipulator and save the state." The temptation to do so calls with siren song to a few of our testing spokesmen. I implore them to yield no further to temptation.

There are some who look behind the curtain and shiver slightly at what they see. Professor Spearman, who is not unknown in the testing field, in writing about the development of mental testing uses certain words that seem to me to have a warning ring. "The success of mental tests," he writes, "can be regarded as amazing or even alarming." He speaks of their "invasion of military service." He refers to the proposal that "the sway of tests must be extended over the whole national manpower, womanpower, and childpower" of Britain, and goes on to say, "what this may mean, one scarcely dares to think. The tests appear to be promising," he continues, "but not free from danger. Their potency should be a warning to handle them with circumspection," he cautions.

As for me, I have deep misgivings about those who, no matter how high their motives, or how solemn their assurances, assume that they and a handful of others, must manage the rest of us and our children for our own and for the Nation's good. I retain the old-fashioned notion that the education of my children and my neighbor's children is a highly personal endeavor best controlled as close to home as possible. I do not want to see these children used according to someone else's notion, no matter how enlightened the someone else may claim to be.

We have already moved too far in this country toward a condition whereby critical decisions affecting our lives are made at great distance from us. Those who decide are so remote that communication with them is all but impossible. They cannot know us nor can we know them. I have been close enough to government to view this development at firsthand and with increasing concern.

Once national testing was imposed it would never be withdrawn. What we would lose by acting from a mistaker sense of urgency we could never again regain. Freedoms once surrendered, even voluntarily, are almost always beyond return.

## The Flemming Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, former president of Ohio Wesleyan University, and now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has a formula for the relief of the classroom shortage which is dependent upon constitutional amendments and repeal of debt limits in most States and fundamental changes in the internal tax structure of many of the States. But Dr. Flemming says with cooperation of the States, he can do the job.

In another Cabinet office, Secretary Benson has some problems. One of them is storage of surplus eggs. If eggs were square they would store much more compactly and there would be less breakage, and conserve space in the refrigerator, too. At this Easter season, a square egg would be especially utilitarian and would not roll off the table while the children were coloring it and it would stay where you hid it for the Easter egg hunt. One application of Dr. Flemming's formula would take care of this problem. Of course, it would mean some fundamental changes in the internal structure of the hen and depend on her cooperation but under the Flemming formula, those are minor obstacles.

## Ken Hicks Will Be Missed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 9, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last month Kenneth L. Hicks, editor of one of the leading newspapers in my district, died. His passing was unexpected.

We agreed on many things, disagreed on others. He did not support my bid for relection last fall, but his news coverage of my activities in Josephine County was full and fair. I always stopped by his office to talk with him. I will miss him. So will many others who also liked and respected him as an earnest, cheerful man. He was a tremendous asset as a citizen in a democracy that depends for its continuance on such men.

His friend and colleague, Gerry Acklen, wrote the following heartfelt editorial, "Ken Hicks Will Be Missed," which appeared in the Grants Pass Daily Courier, February 7, 1959, and which, under unanimous consent, I herewith append:

KEN HICKS WILL BE MISSED

There is a feeling of emptiness in the Daily Courier newsroom today as the staff members realize that the editor, Ken Hicks, won't be coming back to the desk he has had for nearly 2 years.

On his last day in the office he had been doing his accustomed duties in his usual jovial way—adding a jest when one was needed, but always doing his work in a sincere manner that won the respect of all who worked with him and all who had any dealings with him.

Late in the afternoon, however, sometime around 4 o'clock, he complained of feeling ill and decided to go home early. According to reports he had an uncomfortable night but had thought of coming down to the office as usual about 7 in the morning, but was urged to rest some more. His wife called to say that he would be a little late getting to the office. At 7:30, he was dead.

It happened that fast.

It was nearly 2 hours later that members of the Daily Courier staff were stunned by the news that Ken Hicks had died. Word was immediately flashed to the Associated Press, the United Press International and the radio stations. Messages of condolence and expressions of sympathy were soon keeping the telephone lines busy.

That was to be expected for Ken was that sort of a guy.

He had friends everywhere, and we mean that literally, for he was well known throughout the State, and in other States as well. His newspaper and real estate activities had been carried out in many different places, and wherever he worked he made lasting friends through his cheerfulness, his sincerity, and his desire to be fair in everything he did.

He liked people and people responded in like manner.

He was anxious to help others and was always ready to go the extra mile to do what he thought was right. Perhaps one of his best facets was his ability to listen to the other fellow's arguments and to keep a civil tongue despite any inclination to do otherwise.

And yet he was a man of firm convictions. He could listen to both sides of an issue and then do what he thought was right. If he found he had made a mistake, he was willing to admit it and make corrections. By his calm, reassuring manner, he was able to help many excited persons to straighten out their thinking.

He did a lot of reading and research for his writings because he wanted to help people to get the facts as a foundation from which to form their own opinions.

Yes; Ken gave good measure to whatever task he had. He did it in a quiet, unassuming manner that won him lots of admiration. There is no question but that he will be missed.

His presence will dominate those who have been his coworkers in each of the activities in which he participated. Theirs will be the task of carrying on as they think he would have wished.

We can only say that the lives of many have been made richer for knowing Ken.

G. G. A.

## Boston "Celtorama"—An Irish Museum and Hall of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include information on a very interesting project proposed by John B. Fisher, partner, Joyce and Fisher Associates, in Boston, and the reaction to it by the Providence Journal in its issue for February 7, 1959:

A Boston "Celtorama"—an Irish Museum and Hall of History—was proposed today as one of several great New England tourist attractions of the future by John B. Fisher, partner, Joyce and Fisher Associates, in an address before the New England hotel sales managers and others assembled at a luncheon at the Hotel Statler-Hilton.

Fisher, who represents several New England business and industrial interests in Washington, D.C., emphasized "the appeal such a 'Celtorama' would have for millions of Americans of Irish descent and, for that matter, residents of Eire itself."

"Picture an attractive, shamrock-shaped building in Boston—made possible perhaps by popular subscription—containing Irish art, handicraft, and industrial exhibits, a replica of the Blarney Castle battlement (including an authentic chip from the Blarney Stone itself), color photos of the beautiful Irish countryside, images and relics of Irish martyrs, a vast map of Eire inlaid in the floor (wth every town indicated for identification by visitors), Irish dishes served in a cafeteria, a model of a River Shannon power project, a booth for sending telegrams in Gaelic, an Irish library of books and records of John McCormack's songs, Curley's oratory, Cardinal Cushing's and Bishop Sheen's sermons, and the great Irish poets, photomurals of the Irish cities taken from the air and on the ground—and the grass plot leading to the 'Celtorama' actual turf from the 'Auld Sod' itself. Such an attraction alone would attract worldwide attention to Boston and New England, and countless thousands of tourists."

"This, however," continued Fisher, "is but one of many such enterprises that might—indeed, must—be set in motion if New England is to compete successfully with all other sections of the country for the attention—and the dollars—of American and foreign visitors.

"Consideration might be given, too, to: A 'New England Space Age Fair', a proposal to which our 'research row' along the Charles and elsewhere could give outstanding appeal;

"An 'Insurance Tower of Strength,' with life-sized anatomical figures, colorful displays and charts-in-motion, films and other visual aids illustrating in this great insurance center of the Nation the theme of 'Happiness in Health';

"A gigantic 'Marine Carnival' to be held annually in one of our great harbors such as Salem, with vessels of all types from all over the world dramatizing the maritime and fishing industries;

"A permanent 'Electronics Open House' for the spectacular public display and demonstration of those electronic marvels now being produced by outstanding New England firms;

"Having every hotel menu, every railroad timetable, every signboard and display advertisement contain some illustration of a New England tourist attraction.

"Do such things cost money? Of course they do. But New England's neglect of this golden tourist opportunity, our failure to invest in the future is costing far, far more, and the rest of the country is leaving us far, far behind," said Fisher.

"The impact of our exploding population nationally and of the new 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System with its multilane, nonstop highways crisscrossing the continent—the greatest public works program in all history—will revolutionize American travel patterns for years and years to come.

"Is New England to be bypassed on this new highroad to prosperity?

"The New England Council, the World Trade Center, the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, our labor unions, and all our chambers of commerce must ask themselves this question most seriously.

"Of what profit all our resources and attractions—of what profit this beautiful New England—if New England is a sleeping beauty?"

[From the Providence Journal, Feb. 7, 1959]

MR. FISHER IS FULL OF BLARNEY

A consultant's suggestion that Boston enhance its tourist attractions by importing a chip off the Blarney Stone and housing it in a Shamrock-shaped building has considerable merit, but there is one glaring flaw in the plan. Who, we would like to know, is going to volunteer to get the chip off the Blarney Stone?

The ambitious plan for improving things in Boston was tossed out by one John B. Fisher before a meeting of hotelmen in the predominately Irish city. Mr. Fisher suggested Boston build a "Celtorama," which he pictured as a Shamrock-shaped building housing Irish art, handicraft, industrial exhibits and a replica of Blarney Castle, "including a chip from the Blarney Stone itself."

Tradition has it that anyone who kisses the Blarney Stone is endowed with unusual ability to cajole and wheedle his fellow man. In short, that's where the Irish get their ability to talk.

Boston is full of hardy souls of Irish stock, but we doubt any of them are foolish enough to think they can walk up to Blarney Castle and knock a chip off the old block. We also doubt that any second or third generation Irish in Boston can talk an Irishman in the shadow of the Blarney Stone into handing over any part of the Emerald Isle's most precious possession.

Boston has enjoyed a favored spot in the eyes of Ireland over the years, mainly, of course, because so many of the sons of Erin have migrated to the Massachusetts city. But anyone who says Ireland will stand still while a second cousin walks off with even a splinter of her rich heritage is full of blarney, pure and simple.

## Attack on the FBI—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, while the current attacks by the Communists and some of their leftwing radical associates on the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, have prompted much vigorous and able editorial support for the FBI and Mr. Hoover, the Newark, N.J., Star-Ledger has gone a step further.

Because of its interest in the source of these attacks, this newspaper assigned its Pulitzer prize-winning reporter, Edward J. Mowery, to conduct an investigation. Mr. Mowery's findings have been published in a series of articles in the Newark Star-Ledger, starting February 1, 1959.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the first of this series of articles:

LEFTISTS OUT TO GET HOOVER AND THE FBI

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON—Americans are witnessing a brazen and unprecedented attack from a number of apparently diverse sources upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation and J. Edgar Hoover.

Friends of the FBI characterize the crusade as a carefully planned, concerted movement to smear—not merely discredit—Hoover and the internal security agency.

And it has two goals:

1. To capture the FBI when the 64-year-old Hoover steps down or render it impotent.

2. To harass or halt the FBI's current, around-the-clock investigation of subversion.

The campaign received its initial impetus on September 20, 1957, in New York when the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee launched a nationwide anti-FBI drive with a "barnstorming tour" earmarked for 22 major cities.

The committee has been cited by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as a Communist front.)

On May 4, 1958, Canadian-born industrialist Cyrus Eaton delivered a scathing denunciation of the FBI in ABC–TV.

(Eaton, who first attacked the FBI in 1954, was the star of the telecast sponsored by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic.)

The time was now ripe for a major contribution to the campaign. And it came on October 18.

The Nation, a leftist organ familiar in Capitol cloakrooms and on America's campuses, devoted a 60-page, special edition to a massive attack on Hoover and the FBI, illustrated with line drawings in a motif familiar to readers of left-wing periodicals.

Billed as a critical appraisal and written by Fred J. Cook of the (Scripps-Howard) New York World-Telegram, the 25,000-word opus (74 columns) presented 2 major themes:

1. The Communist menace in the United States is a myth and always has been.

2. Hoover has pulled a gigantic hoax in dreaming up such a menace and, in reality, the FBI is a secret police force dedicated to witch hunting, thought control, and curtailment of civil liberties.

In tortured chronology and assorted trivia, the article devotes 18 columns to unrelated cops-and-robbers tales (back to prohibition) and 40 columns to the Bureau of Investigation (back to 1908 when Hoover was 13). Hoover assertedly failed to nab criminal big shots, and he should be held responsible for all the alleged mistakes of the Bureau of Investigation then supervised by Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer.

(Hoover became a Justice Department clerk in 1917 at 22, a special assistant to the Attorney General in 1919 and Bureau of Investigation Director in 1924.)

Hoover and the FBI are mentioned 180 times in the rambling Bureau of Investigation segment (although the FBI didn't come into official existence until 1935).

To the Nation magazine, Hoover is a night-club detective, master of the FBI and a policeman (he holds both bachelor and master degrees in law).

The article is generously sprinkled with such phrases as "incipient fascism," "anti-labor" and "Gestapo." And its 10 chapter headings are intertwined with sketches of handcuffs.

But the Nation does have its heroes. Cyrus Eaton—the prototype of Horatio Alger and erstwhile waterboy from Pugwash, Nova Scotia—is the man of the hour. Eaton, whose name appears 33 times in 4 pages, is lauded for his repeated attacks on the FBI and for playing host to Russians and Chinese Communists at his farm.

The Nation salutes Eaton for his pro-Soviet pronouncements and his criticisms of American efforts to guard internal security.

Even the conservative New York Herald Tribune, the Nation says, bolstered Eaton's criticisms with a sort of "Go ahead, Cyrus" editorial.

Referring to Hoover's criticism that the Supreme Court decision in the Jencks case opened secret FBI files to suspected subversives, spies and traitors, the article accuses the FBI Chief of throwing down the gauntlet to the judiciary.

All this decision actually did, the article explains, was draw the line between police state methods that cloak and protect a favored accuser and the system of justice that prevails in a democracy.

Rabid sections of the ultra-conservative press are sinister forces, the Nation charges, for supporting Hoover's fight to keep ex-Communist informers and FBI undercover agents from exposure.

Parts 2, 3, and 4 of the article review the tedious ancient history of the Bureau of Investigation, its wholesale arrests of Bolsheviks, bombers, and radicals 40 years ago and controversial dragnet operations ordered by then Attorney General Palmer.

Paradoxically, the Nation inferentially damns Hoover, page after page, for the Palmer raids and then clears him of all responsibility with this observation:

"The Bureau of Investigation's early record * * * is far in the past and no longer matters. It * * * belongs to that other FBI, long before Hoover created the true FBI."

To add to the confusion, the Nation suggests that Hoover was to blame for the raids after all because his general intelligence unit in the Bureau of Investigation analyzed Red groups and radical theories and pressed the hunt for the bomb plotters. (No general intelligence division existed in the Bureau of Investigation.)

The Bureau of Investigation history permitted the Nation to introduce its second hero—Max Lowenthal—author of another critical study of the FBI in 1950. (Lowenthal's book has been termed by FBI supporters as a scurrilous attack on the agency.)

Whole sections of Lowenthal's treatise were lifted by the Nation. (Lowenthal, who held key jobs with many Federal agencies starting in 1917, was counsel for the Russian-American Industrial Corp. in 1923. His name appeared on a 1942 letterhead of the International Juridical Association, cited in 1944 by the House Un-American Activities Committee as a Communist front.)

After 24 pages of FBI criticisms, the Nation devotes part 6 to charges that Hoover shortchanges other enforcement agencies in apportioning credit in the capture of criminals.

He assertedly deprived Chicago cops of credit in the (1934) slaying of John Dillinger, failed to notify a Missouri sheriff of a trap set for an extortionist (1937), and ignored Topeka police in attempting to capture bank robbers (a Federal violation).

Hoover hogged full credit for nabbing the Stoll kidnaper in Pasadena (1936) and assertedly repeated this technique in the New York apprehension of Harry Brunette and Merle Vandenbush, suspected bank robbers.

As for the 1936 FBI arrest of Alvin Karpis, agents neglected to bring along handcuffs and the thug had to be trussed with a necktie. Then the Nation asks if Hoover admitted he never made an arrest prior to the capture of Karpis.

Concerning FBI statistics, the article cautions that their reliability must be weighed in terms of Hoover's almost insatiable appetite for praise largely supplied by a six-man FBI research staff which prepares his articles, etc.

The renowned FBI laboratory and National Police Academy receive faint praise from the Nation and the internationally famous fingerprint file may be fine even though a fingerprint record sometimes scars a man who has atoned.

But FBI claims of achieving up to 97 percent convictions run head on into 24-year-old findings of the Brookings Institution which pared this percentage to 72.5—trailing 5 other Federal enforcement agencies.

While the FBI improves its conviction percentage by robbing other cooperating agencies of credit, it can't make itself look too good.

"To justify a huge police bureaucracy, there must always be a menace," the periodical observes.

After a 44-page warmup, the Nation gets to the meat of its FBI appraisal under the chapter title "The FBI Hunts Spies."

Illegal searches to penetrate the Amerasia espionage ring jeopardized proceedings against its principals (Philip Jaffe and Emanel Larsen) who got off with mere fines. Even the Office of Strategic Services snooped around the (pro-Communist) Amerasia magazine offices without a (search) warrant.

As for Elizabeth Bentley, the FBI kept her waiting nearly 12 weeks before she got her story across on November 7, 1945. Both Miss Bentley and her boss, Jacob N. Golos, should have been apprehended 5 years previously.

Golos, extremely active in the American Communist Party, had been accused of military espionage in 1940 and was fined for failing to register as a (Russian) foreign agent. Miss Bentley was Golos' courier.

"The FBI," the Nation explains, "would seem to have been a most incompetent watchdog."

Miss Bentley, described by the Nation, as the "queen bee of the informer sect," duped Hoover into believing her tale, which had rough going before congressional committees.

But, as the Bentley exposé of intrigue failed to register with the Nation, the convictions of Alger Hiss and (the late) William Remington raised disturbing questions about the quality of justice.

The FBI's drowsiness in security precautions, the article charges, was also responsible for failure in grabbing Klaus Fuchs, Harry Gold, and David Greenglass.

Concerning Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, executed for allegedly stealing the A-bomb secret, the Nation comments:

"Doubt pivots * * * about whether they did, indeed, commit a crime of earthshaking magnitude."

Swinging to another spy saga, the magazine flatly acuses the FBI of wrecking its chances of convicting Judith Coplon via wiretaps and an illegal arrest.

(Miss Coplon, a Justice Department political analyst, was arrested on March 6, 1949, in New York with Valentin A. Gubitchev, third secretary of the U.S.S.R Foreign Affairs Ministry. She was twice convicted of spying for Russia.

(Tried alone in Washington, she received a maximum 10-year sentence. Tried with Gubitchev on conspiracy charges in New York, both were convicted and sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. The Russian was allowed to return to the U.S.S.R.

(The circuit court of appeals reversed Miss Coplon's New York conviction on grounds that her arrest was illegal although her guilt was plain. The circuit court in Washington held the same arrest to be legal but it ruled she was entitled to a new trial if she could show that the Government eavesdropped on phone conversations between her and her lawyer.

(The Government admitted to such wiretapping. The Justice Department, appealing for passage of wiretap legislation involving espionage, has had the possibility of a Coplon retrial under study ever since.)

The appeals court said no sudden emergency forced the hand of FBI agents and a warrant was the one condition making the Coplon arrest lawful.

The illegality of the Coplon arrest was bad enough, the Nation told its readers, but an even more important issue was wiretapping a suspected spy's phone. This, the periodical said soberly was contrary to ethics.

"Congress," the magazine explains, "* * * decided that the FBI shouldn't be bothered with such legal technicalities as warrants," and subsequently adopted legislation exempting the agency from normal statutory procedures concerning warrants in espionage cases.

Hoover, the magazine declares, has been selling the myth of a Communist menace to the people since 1920 when his analysis was something like finding one solid kernel in a moldy sack of wheat.

He has convinced large segments of the public that national security is still at stake and a menacing internal threat impends at the very hour of American communism's virtual demise.

FBI secret files? Dozens have been leaked to various Senators, the article explains. As for FBI infallibility, it's a phony. The FBI has been immune from criticism since 1940, and this shouldn't happen in a democracy.

The role of Hoover and the FBI, the Nation warns, will have to be assessed if the United States is ever again to see issues clearly.

The 60-page special issue contained eight 1-inch ads, a column ad sponsored by the Fund for the Republic, and a crossword puzzle. One of the small ads was sponsored by New Century Publishers to promote a dis-

cussion of the Communist Party program in political affairs.

Opposite the finale of the Nation's ponderous anti-FBI tome, one lonely advertiser promised prospective customers:

"We move you without tears."

## Need for Forest Service Research Funds Stressed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, when I appeared before the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Interior and related agencies, I stressed the need for additional funds for Forest Service research.

Oregon foresters meeting recently in Corvallis discussed such topics as "The Next 100 Years in Forestry." Among the conclusions were these by Mr. Robert W. Cowlin, director of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, U.S. Forest Service:

Existing forest resources—

He said—

are barely adequate, and current research programs are inadequate to meet growing demands.

Mr. Cowlin noted that about two-tenths of 1 percent of consumer expenditures are being spent on all forest research. He believes four times that amount is needed.

As I said in my testimony before the subcommittee on February 9, 1959:

I hope the proposed Forest Service budget figures for research can be maintained, expanded, and strengthened. I hope the deletion of $2½ million for forest research construction can be corrected and other areas expanded. Because of its particular value to the Northwest, I hope part of this money may be directed there.

The Fourth Congressional District of Oregon contains 15 percent of the Nation's total sawtimber supply and produces 12 percent of the Nation's annual saw-log harvest. Its seven counties include more than 12.5 million acres. Eighty percent is commercial forest land. More than one-half of this area is owned and managed by the Federal Government.

This vast storehouse of timber rules the economy of southwest Oregon. Full utilization is essential to southwestern Oregon's well-being.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following two articles from the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard of February 21, 1959, which concern forest research and its need:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 21, 1959]

THE NEXT 100 YEARS IN FORESTRY—FORESTERS STRESS NEED FOR RESEARCH

(By Dan Sellard)

CORVALLIS.—Research came in for considerable attention Friday when Oregon State College conducted the first day of a discussion on "the Next 100 Years in Forestry."

The conference, which will be climaxed by the annual Fernhoppers banquet Saturday night, is being conducted by the Oregon State College School of Forestry, and has attracted many big names in forestry from the United States and Canada.

Thursday's speakers concluded that the next 100 years in forestry will be good ones, if sufficient research is carried out in forest genetics, disease and insect control, uses of chemical to prevent disease and boost tree growth of trees and provide for adequate management of watershed and recreation values.

Future research program will be determined basically by three sets of major factors, according to Robert W. Cowlin, Director of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, U.S. Forest Service.

These factors, he said, are (1) the level of the future national economy and the comparative demand for products of the forest resource; (2) the status and trends of current forest management practices; and (3) the adequacy and trends of current forest research programs.

RESEARCH NOT ADEQUATE

Existing forest resources, he said, are barely adequate, and current research programs are inadequate to meet growing demands.

"It is estimated that we will need 95 billion board-feet of timber products each year in the year 2000," he said. "If this goal is attained, we will have to double the annual growth and greatly reduce losses from destructive agents."

On what he called the inadequacy of present research programs, Cowlin said that about two-tenths of 1 percent of consumer expenditures are being spent on all forest research, and four times this amount is needed, he said.

A. L. Strand, president of Oregon State College, who is an entomologist as well as an educator, pointed out that in the Northwest the money spent on forest research is a "mere pittance of a pittance" when compared to the expenditures on agricultural research, "yet the income from forest products is twice as much."

He injected a note of optimism, though, in saying that "although forest research started behind the others, it will accelerate and we will catch up."

Philip C. Johnson, entomologist with the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station at Missoula, Mont., told the foresters that, "research has already shown insects are one of the greatest single causes of tree mortality, reducing growth, causing stem deformity and seed destruction."

He said that while much is known about thousands of species of forest insect pests, "there is yet a vast amount of research needed before foresters can consistently grow insect-free trees and wood."

V. J. Nordin, associate chief of the Forest Biology Department of the Department of Agriculture, at Ottawa, Canada, said that "the most urgent need in forest pathology is for a greatly broadened program of basic research on the ecology, biology, and physiology of disease traits.

DISEASE SURVEYS

"Forest disease surveys, accurate damage appraisal assessments, studies of viruses in forest trees, and many more applications of management techniques are needed before research can make many more strides," he said.

V. H. Freed, of the agricultural experiment station at Oregon State College, said, "the potential of use of chemicals in forestry is immense. With these powerful tools we can protect our forests from the ravages of insects and disease or kill the weedy brush and trees that are engulfing our productive forest land."

At the Fernhopper banquet Saturday evening Ervin L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, will speak. Gov. Mark O. Hatfield will also be a guest.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 21, 1959]

FOREST NEEDS ESTIMATED AT MEETING

CORVALLIS.—The annual growth of forests must be doubled to meet estimated needs only 40 years from now, a special centennial conference on the next hundred years in forestry was told Friday.

How this can be done and how losses to destructive agents can be lessened, must be determined by research, the opening session of the 2-day meeting was told by Robert W. Cowling, Portland, director of the Forest Service's Northwest experiment station.

The meeting got underway with a look at the past, a discussion of research needs and a report on research at Oregon State College, sponsor of the meeting held at the end of Oregon's first 100 years of statehood.

In setting the stage for discussions of what is to come in the next hundred years, Thomas Vaughn, director of the Oregon Historical Society, said that within the past century the attitude toward forestry has been reversed.

Public policy has moved from one of "prodigal land clearing, through a middle position of no policy, to the improved position forestry enjoys today," he said.

Oregon legislation for forest care, reforestation, and conservation is a model for other States, Vaughn said, adding that this and the protection principles adopted by private industry in the early 1900's had preserved the forests.

Cowling told the meeting that despite some regional variation, the national demand for lumber now is close to the limits of "forest soil and growing stock, the existing forest resources."

Forecasts of a great population increase provide an estimate of 95 billion board feet of timber products needed annually by the year 2000, he said.

"If this goal is attained, we must double annual growth and greatly reduce losses from destructive agents," he said.

## Success for Dr. Hagen on the Vanguard Program—Who's Who in Space—A Gift From Canada to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John Peter Hagen joined NASA as Chief of the NASA Vanguard Division on October 1, 1958, when the Vanguard project he had headed at the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory was transferred to the new civilian space agency. He is 50 years old, born July 1, 1908.

The Nova Scotia-born scientist earned a bachelor of arts degree at Boston University in 1929; a master of arts degree at Wesleyan University in 1931 and a doctorate in astronomy at Georgetown University in 1949.

Dr. Hagen went to work at the Naval Research Laboratory in 1935. Much of his research there was directed to improving radar techniques. For his early

work in radar, he received a Presidential Certificate of Merit. At NRL, he also helped develop an automatic ground speed indicator for aircraft.

After World War II, he headed NRL's Radio Physics Research Group. This group developed, in 1950, the world's most precise radio telescope—the same one used to discover absorption of hydrogen clouds in our galaxy. Dr. Hagen also led eclipse studies of the sun, both optically and by radio.

In 1954, he supervised a broad program of upper atmosphere and astrophysical research as chief of NRL's Atmosphere and Astrophysics Division. A year later, he was named director of the Vanguard Earth Satellite Program, a phase of the U.S. contribution to the International Geophysical Year.

A former lecturer at Georgetown University, he is a fellow of the Institute of Radio Engineers and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a member of the American Astronomical Society, International Astronomical Union, Washington Academy of Sciences, International Radio Scientific Union and Sigma Xi fraternity.

Dr. and Mrs. Hagen, the former Edith Soderling, have two sons Peter, 17, and E. Christopher, 14. They live at 3001 North Second Street, Arlington, Va.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Dr. Hagen:

STATEMENT BY DR. JOHN P. HAGEN, DIRECTOR, NASA VANGUARD DIVISION, TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ASTRONAUTICS AND SPACE EXPLORATION, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

Gentlemen: Before giving you some of the technical background and statistics on yesterday's successful launching of the Vanguard II satellite, I would like to state for the record my deep respect for and admiration for the men and women who have been associated with me on the Vanguard team during the past 3 years. Their competence, loyalty and untiring efforts have allowed us to achieve the very difficult goal we set for this project not too many months ago. I am sure you join me in expressing these sentiments to the group. As a part of the NASA organization we will apply the same diligence to more advanced efforts that has been applied to the Vanguard program.

VITAL STATISTICS REGARDING THE VANGUARD II (1959 ALPHA) SATELLITE

I. Background: The Vanguard II Satellite 1959 Alpha, the fourth in the series of satellite launching vehicles of the Vanguard program, is the second Vanguard satellite to be placed in orbit. The first, Vanguard I, which was carried in the third in the series of three-stage test vehicles for this program, was launched on March 17, 1958, to become the highest, longest lived satellite yet placed in orbit. The present Vanguard II satellite carries a cloud cover experiment to record the cloud formation over the surface of the earth in the sunlight beneath its orbit, and to read out this recorded data upon command from one of the Minitrack tracking stations over which it passes. This data, in the form of magnetic tape, is then sent to the U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory at Fort Monmouth, N.J., where it is reduced to form a picture of the earth's surface over which the satellite has passed, showing the gross details of the cloud formations that existed at the time of satellite passage.

II. Launching vehicle: The launching vehicle for Vanguard II was the standard Vanguard vehicle, consisting of three stages and the satellite payload in a finless, bullet-shaped configuration about 72 feet long by 45 inches in diameter at the base. Gross takeoff weight, including first and second stage propellants, was 22,600 pounds. Total weight placed in orbit was over 75 pounds. This can be compared to the weights placed in orbit by previous satellites to understand the relative "fineness" of design exhibited by this vehicle. As an example, the Explorer satellites weighed about 50,000 pounds at launch to place a total of about 31 pounds in orbit. As an additional consideration, none of these satellites produced nearly as high and long lived an orbit as did Vanguard II.

Contractors: Martin Co. is the prime contractor for the vehicle. The first stage engine is manufactured by the General Electric Co., the second stage engine is manufactured by the Aerojet-General Corp., and the third stage engine is manufactured by the Grand Central Rocket Co., although a second company, Alleghany Ballistics Laboratory also has contracts for a third stage. The guidance components for the vehicle are provided by the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., air associates and designers for industry.

First stage: The first stage is a liquid propellent rocket, utilizing kerosene and liquid oxygen as propellents. This stage uses a gimballed engine controlled by the guidance system in the second stage to provide a guided boost for the second and third stages.

Second stage: The second stage is also a liquid propellent rocket, employing white fuming nitric acid and unsymmetrical dimethyl hydrazine. This stage contains the brains of the entire launching vehicle, the complete guidance and control system used during three periods of flight: (a) The first stage powered flight, (b) the second stage powered flight, and (c) the second stage coasting flight. It also carries the third stage and the satellite package within its nose, protected by a special nosecone that breaks away halfway through second stage powered flight, after the rocket has emerged from the denser layers of the earth's atmosphere. This stage also contains the mechanism for spinning the third stage prior to its ignition.

Third stage: The third stage is a solid propellent rocket, without any steering controls of its own. This stage was alined at the proper angle by the second-stage guidance system while it was still within the nose of the second stage at the conclusion of the coast of this stage to its peak height. At this peak height, the third stage was spun to about 50 revolutions per minute, and ignited. After about 30 seconds of thrust it burned out, and the satellite was separated from it with a separation velocity of perhaps 3 to 5 feet per second. This velocity is sufficient to cause the orbit of the empty third stage bottle and the satellite package to drift apart at a rate of about 60 miles per day. The total weight placed in orbit was thus over 75 pounds; over 23 pounds of satellite components consisting of 20.75 pounds for the cloud-cover satellite package, 1.1 pounds for the spin-retard mechanism, and 1.3 pounds for the separation mechanism, including the heat shield, plus about 54 pounds of empty third stage bottle.

III. Payload instrumentation: The satellite payload on Vanguard II is a 20-inch diameter, 20¾-pound sphere, with a highly reflective surface designed to provide a balance between the heat from the sunlight and the internal batteries and the radiation from the satellite that tends to cool it off. This package contains a cloud-cover experiment that is now measuring the distribution of the cloud cover over the daylight portion of the earth's surface over which the satellite is passing, plus a Minitrack radio transmitter that provides a radio signal to the Minitrack radio tracking network. The cloud-cover instrumentation package was developed by the U.S. Army Signal Research and Development Laboratory, Fort Monmouth, N.J.; the Minitrack transmitter, the command receiver, and the satellite shell by the Vanguard Division of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Radio characteristics and lifetime: The cloud cover experiment transmits its data to ground recording stations whenever it is interrogated from a ground station. Radio transmission of the cloud cover data is at 108.03 megacycles at a power level of 1 watt, modulated by signals from 2,500 to 12,500 cycles per second. Expected lifetime of the batteries for both the experiment and its radio transmitter are at least 2 weeks. The Minitrack transmitter transmits a continuous, unmodulated signal at 108 megacycles at a power level of one one-hundredth of a watt. The frequency of this transmitter is controlled by a quartz crystal that varies as a function of temperature, thereby permitting a ground determination of the internal package temperature by measurement of the received frequency. Estimated lifetime of the batteries for this transmitter is at least 4 weeks. Unlike the Vanguard I satellite, which is still transmitting a strong tracking signal after 11 months, no solar batteries are used to power the transmitters in this satellite.

Cloud cover experiment: The cloud cover experiment utilizes two photocells at the focus of two optical telescopes aimed diametrically opposite each other at an angle by 45° from the satellite spin axis. These photocells pick up the sunlight reflected from clouds, land masses, and ocean areas of the earth as the satellite passes over the earth's surface. The spin of the satellite—at about 50 r.p.m.—causes the axis of the photocells to scan the earth in successive lines as the satellite moves forward in its orbit, producing a lined picture not unlike a television picture. The signals from these photocells are stored on a tape recorder within the instrumentation package. By means of separate solar batteries, the recorder is turned on only when the earth underneath the satellite is in daylight, resulting in 50 minutes of data per orbit. Sufficient recording tape is provided—a 75-foot loop—so that all of the photocell scanning data obtained from the sun-lit part of a single orbit can be accommodated. Once each orbit a selected ground station is chosen to interrogate the satellite by means of a command receiver carried within the satellite, thereby causing the entire tape to be played back at a rate sufficient to read out all data in 60 seconds. At the ground station this data is recorded on a wide-band magnetic tape recorder, the tapes from which are immediately forwarded via air mail to the USASROL for analysis and conversion into cloud cover pictures.

Tracking and telemetry: Radio tracking for this satellite is provided by the Minitrack Network, including stations at Blossom Point, Md.; Fort Stewart, Ga.; Havana, Cuba; Quito, Ecuador; Lima, Peru; Antofagasta, Chile; Santiago, Chile; Antigua, British West Indies; San Diego, Calif.; Woomera, Australia; and Esselen Park, Union of South Africa.

These stations, in addition to their radio-tracking equipment, also are equipped with special telemetry receivers, recorders, and ground interrogation transmitters. For the special signals expected from this satellite, the Army Signal Corps has installed special FM subcarrier units at the stations selected to interrogate this satellite—Fort Stewart, San Diego, Lima, Antofagasta, Santiago, and Woomera.

The tracking data from the Minitrack stations are transmitted by teletype messages

to the Vanguard Control Center of NASA at the Naval Research Laboratory here in Washington, and thence to the NASA Vanguard Computing Center, where the orbital elements, station predictions, and ephemerides are produced. These reduced orbital data in turn are transmitted to the control center for distribution to the USASROL, to the tracking stations, and to the other user groups, including the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, which has the responsibility for the optical tracking of this satellite, and to the Spacetrack Center for distribution to various military groups. The functions of the integrated Minitrack Network/Vanguard Control Center/Vanguard Computing Center as applied to this satellite are typical of all such operations to be provided for all future NASA satellite operations.

VANGUARD II LAUNCHED 10:55 A.M. E.S.T., FEBRUARY 17, 1959—VEHICLE PERFORMANCE, TRAJECTORY, ORBIT—FACTS AND FIGURES

The Vanguard launching yesterday was a highly successful scientific operation. The launching vehicle itself performed extremely well—in excess of the minimum performance required to achieve a successful orbit, in fact, performance was above nominal (or predicted) performance and approached the maximum achievable. All three stages of the vehicle, guidance, retro and spin rockets, plus the satellite itself functioned in an optimum maner. The vital statistics below recount the sequence of events in the launching. Two sets of figures are given. The first column indicates the nominal or predicted performance. The second column shows the performance actually achieved. Although the figures are preliminary and therefore aprpoximate, it is evident from these figures that our expectations were exceeded.

VANGUARD SATELLITE LAUNCHING VEHICLE 4—LAUNCHING VEHICLE DATA (PRELIMINARY)

Time of lift-off: First stage propulsion period predicted, 142 seconds; achieved, 145 seconds.

First stage burnout velocity predicted, 5,938 feet per second; achieved, 6,150 feet per second.

First stage burnout altitude predicted, 38 statute miles; achieved, 40 statute miles.

Second stage burnout time predicted, 256 seconds; achieved 261 seconds.

Second stage velocity predicted, 13,066 feet per second; achieved, 13,650 feet per second.

Second stage burnout altitude predicted; 146 statute miles; achieved, 155 statute miles.

Second stage propulsion period predicted, 114 seconds; achieved, 116 seconds.

Second stage velocity increment predicted, 7,128 feet per second; achieved, 7,500 feet per second.

Second stage altitude increment predicted, 108 statute miles; achieved, 115 statute miles.

Projection velocity predicted, 26,505 feet per second; achieved, 26,954 feet per second.

Projection velocity direction deviation predicted, one-fourth degree; achieved, less than one-fourth degree.

Projection time, 11 hours, 4 minutes, 41 seconds.

VANGUARD II—1959 ALPHA I AND ALPHA II

Perigee predicted, 311 statute miles; achieved; 330 statute miles.

Apogee predicted, 1,548 statute miles; achieved, 2,085 statute miles.

Peroid or orbit predicted, 116 minutes; achieved, 126 minutes.

Perigee velocity achieved, 18,379 miles per hour.

Apogee velocity achieved, 13,040 miles per hour.

Inclination to equator achieved, 33 degrees.

## Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 4 marks the birth of one of the great heroes of the American Revolution, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. It is significant that we should call attention today to this noble son of Poland who, like defenders of freedom from many countries of Europe, came to America in 1777 and established an enviable record of heroism in the struggle for American independence.

I am enclosing a brief biography of this gallant hero of two continents. It is important that we pause in the tremendous world struggle today for the preservation of democratic principles and reflect briefly on the efforts of our forebears. I believe we, as Americans, can bolster our courage by recalling that the price of freedom has always required great sacrifices.

From this brief biography of General Pulaski, perhaps we can all understand better the firm belief that communism will never succeed in permanently enslaving the satellite nations of Europe. General Pulaski symbolizes the very tough fibers with which the spirit of freedom is interwoven into the Polish nation, and because of efforts like his own, this spirit of freedom has become such a deep-rooted tradition in our own country.

The article follows:

LIFE OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Casimir Pulaski was born on March 4, 1747 in the province of Podolia, Poland. He was brought up in the country squire tradition. As a boy he was taken to the court of Prince Charles of Courland at Mitau to act as page. In 1763 he suffered great privation during the siege of the castle by Russians, and probably his antipathy to them dates from that period. On June 13, 1768 he and fellow fighters fell into the hands of the Russians. There he heard of the massacre of Polish nobles by Ruthenian peasants, who had been aroused to this act by the Russians.

At one time Pulaski and his force of 200 hundred men were attacked by an army of 4,000. He led them out by night and passed with them across the swollen Dniester. Through the snow-covered Carpathians he reached Krakow. In the meantime his father had died in a Tartar prison, his brother, Anthony, was taken prisoner by the Russians, and he himself was unjustly suspected of having ambitious political designs. However, confidence in him grew, and he was elected marshal by the nobles at Ostroleka. He swore "to fight the country's enemies with all his strength" and "to persist faithfully and obstinately in this struggle until the Republic internally and externally is at peace."

PULASKI EXILED

Pulaski's brother, Francis, was killed in a battle in Lithuania, but he and a handful of men were able to escape over the Hungarian border. Not discouraged by this disaster, he occupied the Convent at Czestochowa in September 1770, for the establishment of a base for guerrila warfare. Three thousand Russians attacked the stronghold, held by much smaller forces, and expected easy victory. Much to their surprise they were routed. Though the Polish fortres bravely withstood attack, it could not be hoped that a handful of soldiers could defeat the regular army of Russia. In their despair the hatred of the nobles turned against King Poniatowski, who owned his position to the Tsarina, Catherine of Russia. A plan was made to abduct the king of November 3, 1771, but it failed. Though not taking part in the attempt Pulaski was looked on as a regicide and a criminal, and with other confederates took exile, along with constant threats of being given up to the Russians. On April 19, 1772 the new came that Austria had joined with Prussia and Russia to partition Poland.

On September 2, 1773, the sentence of death was passed by the High Criminal Court on the "regicide," though he had not taken actual part in the abduction plans. However he was not apprehended and continued the fight against the Russians from the Balkans with very small forces. At this time the Turks were celebrating victory in their campaign against the Russians, Pulaski, believing that the Turks would be friendly because of a common enemy, namely the Russians, sought refuge at the camp of the Grand Vizier with a handful of officers, but instead was robbed there of arms and valuables. He managed to escape to Marseilles, despondent over his plight, and in great financial straits.

PULASKI MEETS BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Silas Deane and Benjamin Franklin were recruiting volunteers in France for the war against the English in America. Awakening from the inertia of dejection, Casimir Pulaski offered his services "for your freedom and ours" to the American people. The idea of fighting against the English appealed to him, for it was the English who had encouraged the powers to partition Poland. Pulaski met Franklin personally, who recommended him to Washington with high praise for his valor and capabilities as a commander. Washington knew of Pulaski's military talents and of his heroic defense of the National Shrine at Czestochowa. In his own letter to George Washington, Pulaski asked for a detachment of cavalry, and that he should hold such rank that he would be under orders of the Commander-in-Chief alone. If that was impossible, he asked to join Lafayette. Washington recommended Casimir Pulaski to Congress for appointment in August, 1777.

Pulaski ever held the plight of his own country uppermost in his mind, and when he offered his youth and his very life to the American cause it was with the hope that by his deeds he could win a strong ally for the Polish cause, which was so similar in ideals to the American one.

Little did he dream how successful an emissary he was to become in this respect, for today, 182 years since Pulaski joined the American forces, he is acclaimed with warm affection by the entire Nation, and his memory celebrated annually, like an everlasting symbolic token of the spiritual ties binding his country and our Nation, though a great ocean lies between them.

HERO OF BATTLE OF BRANDYWINE

Pulaski's first fighting on foreign soil was at the Battle of Brandywine September 11, 1777. In the report of the battle it was written of him "exposed himself to great danger by riding close to the British lines and reconnoitering their position. At a critical moment, with Washington's permission, he gathered together Washington's bodyguard and made an unexpected charge on the British which stayed their advance." It was he who detected the approach of the British in such force as to menace the life of George Washington, himself, and by his

timely warning prevented further disaster. As a result of this praiseworthy conduct in battle, Congress awarded him a commission on September 15, 1777, as brigadier general in command of the entire cavalry of the American forces.

Pulaski soon learned that cavalry was considered by Americans only as an auxiliary support for infantry, incapable of carrying on alone. At Germantown when all the generals were for ceasing operations for the winter, the young general moved that they should be continued, but the Army went into winter quarters at Valley Forge. Fiery and enthusiastic, discouraged by the phlegmatism of American leaders, Pulaski asked permission to recruit a separate unit composed both of cavalry and infantry; the request granted, he retained the rank of brigadier general.

The Moravian Sisters of Bethlehem, Pa., presented Pulaski with a crimson banner, from which he never parted, and which was made famous by the beautiful poem written by Longfellow in 1825 under the title "Hymn of the Moravian Nuns of Bethlehem—at the Consecration of Pulaski's Banner."

PULASKI FALLS IN BATTLE AT SAVANNAH

On February 2, 1779, Pulaski was ordered to join General Lincoln, who was in command of the Southern Army stationed at Georgia and South Carolina. When he reached Charleston on May 11, 1779, after recruiting men along the way, the city was in great danger. On that very day the enemy forces demanded that the city fathers surrender the city. Pulaski made an immediate attack and pushed the enemy back in great disorder. Charleston was saved.

Military operations suspended during the summer months made Pulaski nervous and eager for action. The opportunity came sooner than expected. General Lincoln and the French Admiral, Count d'Estaing, planned a movement for the recapture of Savannah. Pulaski with his Legion was to attack British outposts and to effect juncture with the French troops on the coast. This he did most successfully, having joined Count d'Estaing on September 15. On September 16 the count called upon the enemy to surrender without result; and without realizing the strength of the British forces, the Americans started bombarding the city. The attack was minutely prepared to take the city by assault on the morning of October 9. The British turned withering fire on the attacking troops and d'Estaing fell wounded. Pulaski rushed forward to take command in the place of d'Estaing, and to raise the spirits of the soldiers by the example of his own courage, but he soon fell from his horse hit by grapeshot.

MEMORY OF PULASKI LIVES ON

The attack failed. Pulaski died in great agony on board the *Wasp*, on October 11. His body was consigned to a watery grave, and only after the arrival of the *Wasp* at Charleston did a solemn symbolic funeral service take place. The tragic death of this Polish and American hero did not erase his deeds from the memory of future generations, either in the old world or the new. By his undaunted courage and his unceasing zeal with which he incited thousands of others, he contributed to the preservation of the Polish spirit.

The heritage that Pulaski left to Americans was a noble one. His legion won the approval of Washington and was a model for the formation of others in subsequent campaigns. The cavalry which he organized became the nucleus for future squadrons; and Pulaski has been rightly called the Father of American Cavalry.

As early as 1779 Congress voted that a monument be erected to the memory of Casimir Pulaski, and this was done in 1910 in Washington. At Savannah a monument was erected in 1853, the cornerstone being laid as early as 1825 by Lafayette. There is hardly a State in the Union that does not have a county or town, street or square, monument or tablet, school or highway named in grateful memory of General Pulaski. Thus did Americans honor the memory of this soldier of liberty, the undaunted warrior who sacrificed his life in the cause of American independence.

## What About Nicaragua?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Luis Somoza, President of Nicaragua, claims he is misunderstood. Our Ambassador to Nicaragua, Thomas Whelan, tells me that Nicaragua is really a democracy, that there is government by consent of the governed, and there are full civil liberties for everyone. This is not the story you hear in Cuba, in Costa Rica, Venezuela, and elsewhere in Latin America.

I had the pleasure of conferring at length with Ambassador Whelan in my office the other day. I was impressed by his sincerity, although I am not convinced that his close relationship with the President of Nicaragua has been entirely good for our Nation. If, of course, Luis Somoza is not a dictator, but a democratic leader, then this close relationship is justified.

The Ambassador urged that I come and see for myself and one of these days I hope to do just that.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put the following article by Edward Scott entitled "Somoza and the Abrazo of Death," from the Havana Post for February 22, 1959, in the Appendix of the RECORD as one man's view of history and the present government of Nicaragua:

SOMOZA AND THE ABRAZO OF DEATH

These notes are being assembled on Saturday, February 21, that is to say yesterday, the 25th anniversary of the assassination of Augusto Cesar Sandino by Gen. Anastasio Somoza, then commander of the Nicaraguan National Guard. Shortly afterwards, Somoza took over the Republic of Nicaragua as his private property, and the family estate now is being administered by his two boys, Luis and Anastasio, Jr. The former succeeded his dad as President when the latter was shot to death by a lone assassin a couple of years ago.

I knew the late "Tacho" Somoza well, but not intimately—certainly not as well as Jules Dubois who was practically his blood brother. Once I played poker with him, and he had the courtesy to invite me to the wedding of his daughter. At that time I was a vice president of TACA Airways and we were all told discreetly in advance what type of gifts we should send, in addition to the cash, so that there would not be too many solid silver vessels of the same type.

Do not for one moment think that I am a great Sandinista. On the contrary, I know some things about the late Nicaragua rebel leader which would make your hair stand on end. He and his followers, for instance, had several special methods of chopping up a captive or nonconformist with a machete.

There was the simple corte de chaleco, which meant that the victim's arms and legs were slashed off and the bleeding stump of what used to be a man rolled and contorted on the ground to the amusement of the bystanders.

Then there was the corte de cumbia. This had several variations, but the essential procedure was to bind the one marked for death, and then slice off the top of his skull about half to three quarters of an inch deep. With the brain matter exposed, terribly injured and falling out on all sides, the poor creature bounced and flopped around in the most grotesque fashion, which nevertheless caused great laughter among the spectators.

I felt bound to make those preliminary observations, but there were terrible atrocities committed on both sides. Back in 1928, when I was a bush overseer for the United Fruit Co., we imported Sandino followers fleeing from the U.S. Marines and the Nicaraguan National Guard from Nicaragua to Chiriqui, Panama. I always had around 150 of them working for me in the felling of virgin jungle on the borders of Panama and Costa Rica. They were great axmen and very handy with a machete, both in chopping down the underbrush which was necessary before felling the giant trees, and in chopping each other to pieces when they were full of white rum on payday.

Around the campfires at night, they told me some stories which I found hard to believe, concerning their adventures when they marched with Sandino, but the weight of corrobation was heavily in their favor.

One of the things they told me also was that they were not so sure that the U.S. Marines were really all out after Sandino. It was not exactly that some of the Americans admired or favored the Nicaraguan bandit or patriot (you choose the term which fits your own political convictions) but there were a number of occasions, according to my informants when the Marines really had Sandino in a box, and they apparently let him go.

Of course, Sandino was no easy mark and he killed many of his enemies and also a lot of people he suspected of being informants, or who refused to collaborate with him and his outlaws. The killing of Sandino by Somoza's Nicaraguan National Guard, however, will endure as one of the most revolting crimes in history.

It is well known that President Sacasa was not particularly anxious to have Sandino eliminated because he represented a sort of balance of power, or an anchor to the windward against the growing ambitions of Somoza, who was a relative of his by marriage.

Shortly after Sacasa assumed the Presidency in 1933, the U.S. Marines were withdrawn from Nicaragua. It was then possible for Sandino to make peace with the Managua government and a great fiesta was given in his honor upon his arrival in the capital city. An arrangement was made whereby land would be given to Sandino's men, upon the disbanding of the army in the rich jungle along the banks of the Rio Coco.

Somoza was not pleased with this arrangement. There were still occasional skirmishes taking place, but the chief of the national guard started to play both ends against the middle. He suggested to one of Sandino's lieutenants that all of the boys should form an alliance against President Sacasa. "That old imbecile is ruining the country," he said. "He opposes me simply because he has Sandino. Together we could force him to name a new cabinet, with Sandino as Minister of War."

When the Sandino man refused to take the bait, Somoza then went to Sacasa with a story about an imminent attack by Sandino. Unimpressed, Sacasa went ahead and named one of Sadino's aides as governor of four

northern departments, thus throwing the gauntlet of defiance at Somoza.

Some weeks later, Sandino arrived at Managua with some ore samples to be assayed. He believed he had discovered gold near his headquarters at Wiwili, and he was anxious to have a cooperative mine in operation for the benefit of his old combatants.

On the night of their arrival, February 21, 1934, Sandino dined with President Sacasa, accompanied by his father, Gregorio Sandino, his brother, and two aides. Upon leaving the palace they were all taken prisoner by the National Guard and were informed that they had been sentenced to death.

Remembering the warm abrazos of his friend Somoza, Chief of the National Guard, Sandino asked for permission to talk to Don Tacho. Somoza said he was terribly sorry about what was going to happen, but he could not interfere with the orders of his subordinates.

Minutes later, the entire group, with the exception of old Gregorio Sandino, the father, was shot to death. And that same night, Somoza's National Guard descended on Sandino's headquarters at Wiwili and killed over 300 men, women, and children by machinegun and rifle fire.

An amnesty then was announced for all followers of Sandino, on condition that they presented themselves with their papers of identity at Jinotega. But upon leaving the township all of them were assassinated by Somoza's National Guard.

Ever since that time, Nicaragua has been the private domain of the Somoza family. Don Tacho stayed in the Presidency until he was shot down by some lonely youth at a fiesta, while his bodyguards fiddled and bibbled. His son Luis inherited the Presidency, a very democratic process indeed, and the other boy, Anastasio, took charge of the National Guard.

Not 3 days ago, Luis was crying his eyes out about how misunderstood the Somoza family is today. He claims everything is different, even though they own two-thirds of the country, including what they filched from the Axis citizens by misuse of the black list during World War II.

But the writing is on the wall, and the days of the Somoza dynasty are few indeed. Just keep reading the papers.

## Health Insurance for Our Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes.

The benefits provided by my bill would be allowed as part of our established social-security system; such benefits would be financed by adding one-quarter of 1 percent to the contribution rates of employers and employees and three-eighths of 1 percent to the contribution rates of the self-employed.

The protection afforded by my bill is vitally needed by those many thousands of our older people who now cannot afford necessary medical, nursing, or hospital care; they cannot obtain or afford private insurance and they cannot meet the expense of illness. Costs of such care continue to rise.

Many outstanding organizations have strongly endorsed health benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and it is generally conceded that health services for the aged are inadequate throughout the Nation.

It is incredible that, in our Nation of plenty, countless older persons are suffering pain and discomfort, jeopardizing their lives, because they cannot afford medical care; many are denied hospitalization and nursing care which are necessary for their recovery. Mounting evidence proves that present social-security benefits are still grossly inadequate to meet the barest necessities of life—there is nothing left over to pay for the high expenses of illness or medical aid.

I have received hundreds of letters describing pitiful circumstances and great hardships in this regard being suffered by older people in my district; petitions have been sent me bearing the names of thousands of those who need the help provided by my bill.

Numerous studies of the situation have been made. It is obvious that such a health program cannot be provided satisfactorily in any other way; the Federal Government must act. Our older citizens and others covered by the bill are in dire need of the assistance provided. It is unconscionable that their hardships continue.

It is the duty of Congress to take favorable action on legislation providing for an adequate health program for our aged without further delay; our older people rely upon us to give them the assistance and relief now denied them.

## Progress of Atomic Energy in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 5, 1959*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am well pleased with the progress being made toward the erection and operation of an atomic powerplant in Florida. Announcement has recently been made by the Atomic Energy Commission of the awarding of a contract to two combines of private utilities permitting them to build and operate an atomic powerplant in Florida. I take pleasure in placing the following summary report of the progress of atomic energy in Florida in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PROGRESS OF ATOMIC ENERGY IN FLORIDA

In December of 1957, Florida Power Corp. and Tampa Electric Co., collectively known as Florida West Coast Nuclear Group and herein referred to as FWCNG, together with 15 other companies, collectively known as East Central Nuclear Group, Inc., and herein referred to as ECNG (the names of said companies being listed below), filed a proposal with the Atomic Energy Commission, herein referred to as AEC, looking toward a contract with the Commission which is about to be concluded.

The contract is designed to further the purposes of the power demonstration reactor program established by the AEC for the development and operation of experimental nuclear power reactors.

The specific objective of the project is the development of an advanced high-temperature, gas-cooled, heavy water-moderated 50,000 ekw nuclear powerplant of the pressure tube type, to be fueled with slightly enriched uranium and to be designed as a prototype of a 200,000 ekw nuclear powerplant which could operate on natural uranium.

Substantial research and development is considered absolutely necessary if the anticipated potentialities of the project are to be realized. The contract contemplates (1) preoperational research and development to be administered by ECNG, (2) construction of the prototype nuclear powerplant by FWCNG, and (3) postoperational research and development to be administered by ECNG in connection with the operation of the prototype plant.

The expenses of preoperational research and development—estimated at $10,195,000 without including any amount for the use of AEC facilities or for the time spent by personnel of ECNG and FWCNG (administrative and assigned personnel) will be shared in approximately the following proportions:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| ECNG | 47½ |
| FWCNG | 2½ |
| AEC | 50 |

Such preoperational research and development would also entail the use of administrative and assigned personnel, involving estimated additional expenses of $1,915,000 to ECNG and FWCNG, as well as the use of certain AEC facilities at a cost to AEC estimated at $1 million.

Under the contract, if the preoperational research and development expenses (exclusive of administrative and assigned personnel and of AEC facilities) exceed or are reasonably expected to exceed the estimated $10,195,000, AEC will be authorized unilaterally to increase preoperational expenses by up to 50 percent thereof. Any such increase (overrun) would be shared by ECNG, FWCNG and the AEC in the same proportions as indicated above. The additional expenses to ECNG and FWCNG for the continued services of administrative and assigned personnel incident to an overrun, are estimated in the proposal at $958,000 for a 50 percent overrun.

The costs of constructing the prototype nuclear powerplant (estimated at $25,885,000) would be completely borne by FWCNG; and, on completion, the plant would be owned and operated by FWCNG as a part of their electric utility systems.

Certain conditions will have to be met before FWCNG will be required to proceed with the construction of the prototype nuclear powerplant. Construction will, among other things, be contingent on technical and economic feasibility of the reactor and a determination that power from the reactor would not be unreasonably excessive over conventional power in Florida at the time construction is begun.

The postoperational research and development expenses contemplated by the contract would extend over the first 5 years of operation of the prototype nuclear powerplant. These expenses—estimated at $5 million—would be borne 40 percent by ECNG and 60 percent by AEC. In addition, charges otherwise payable for heavy water and fuel used in the plant to the end of such 5-year period would be waived by AEC up to the maximum amounts set forth in the contract.

The General Nuclear Engineering Corp. of Dunedin, Fla., is expected to be the nuclear design agent and nuclear project engineer, and the American Electric Power Service Corp. is expected to be the principal design and construction engineer for the project.

Members of ECNG are as follows: Appalachian Power Co., the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co., the Dayton Power & Light Co., Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Louisville Gas & Electric Co., Monongahela Power Co., Ohio Edison Co., Ohio Power Co., Pennsylvania Power Co., the Potomac Edison Co., Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co., West Penn Power Co., American Electric Power Service Corp.

FEBRUARY 23, 1959.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 19

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Evansville, Ind., Courier on December 4, 1958, telling how "Poor Sewage Rated No. 1 Health Problem."

In this article the situation in Vanderburgh County is described, telling how untreated sewage by the double barrelful is running in virulent rivulets in almost every neighborhood in the county and in many in the city.

The article follows:

POOR SEWAGE RATED NO. 1 HEALTH PROBLEM

Vanderburgh County's deplorable sewage disposal system was called our most pressing health problem Wednesday night at a meeting of the Evansville-Vanderburgh County Advisory Health Council.

Two leaders in the health field stressed the disease potential of untreated sewage, and one of them showed colored slides to prove that untreated sewage by the double barrelful is running in virulent rivulets in almost every neighborhood in the county and in many in the city.

James Barringer of the health department, said that sewage disposal plants on the east and west sides of Evansville now serve about 75 percent of the city, and a trunkline in the northeast area is now under construction which will boost the percentage to 90—leaving only the extreme fringe areas unsewered.

On the other hand, he said, about 75 percent of the county beyond the city limits has no sewage disposal system, than open ditches and generally inadequate septic tanks.

And the situation probably will not improve much, he indicated, until laws are passed forcing residents of an area to abide by majority vote.

"There are very few, if any, workable laws," he said, "whereby residents outside the city can get a sewer system."

He cited the example of one 300-dwelling community where 30 "don't want" residents are keeping 270 other families from having a sewer system—"and there is nothing in the world can be done to force the 30 to go along with the majority"

A major accomplishment, he feels, is a 1957 city ordinance which blocks construction of any private sewage system which is not approved by Health Department officials.

It has caused some contractors to install sewage systems to serve their housing projects and has prevented residences being built in areas where a septic tank or other private installation would be unsatisfactory.

Stressing the disease-causing potential of untreated sewage, Dr. Joseph Coleman, president of the board of health, branded sewage disposal as the No. 1 concern and said that much of public health control depends on it.

Although he said a tremendous amount has been accomplished in the last 10 years, he added that much remains to be done before the problem is licked.

It is a little ridiculous, he said, for us to worry about building hospitals, rehabilitation centers, mental health clinics, and the like when we can't dispose of our basic filth.

He pointed out that raw sewage is the breeding ground of many diseases—typhoid, dysentery, various viruses—and merely because we have "gotten by" without an epidemic is not a valid argument for doing nothing about the problem.

He said the virulence (strength) of various germs appear to vary from time to time "and there may come a time when germs aren't so easy to get along with."

## Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Evening Star of March 2, 1959, indicates that mutual security could possibly be only another form of foreign aid.

The American people are shocked to find out their Representatives in Congress are often refused vital information concerning our money given away in foreign lands. I will support no program here or abroad when, as the Representative of my people, I am refused itemized accounts of where every dollar is spent and for what in our aid programs. This Congress should demand an accounting and auditing of every dollar given to these countries whether under mutual security or economic aid.

I congratulate Dr. MORGAN and the subcommittee. This article is most alarming:

AID LAXITY SHOCKS PROBERS—TROUBLE SEEN FOR PRESIDENT

A House subcommittee reports it is disturbed and shocked at waste it found in U.S. overseas arms aid programs.

The unanimous report by the foreign aid watchdog group headed by Representative MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, foreshadowed trouble for President Eisenhower's $3.9 billion aid program.

The subcommittee said yesterday it found one U.S. ally was building airplanes for the personal use of its officers with facilities America had provided to keep up military equipment.

It also reported finding:

A foreign motor pool got enough tires out of U.S. aid in 1 year to put 44 tires on each truck.

American materials intended for military construction were used to build apartment houses for foreign civilians.

Poor recordkeeping by natives who knew little English produced stock record cards which read "for so many cases of 'this side up'."

One U.S.-aided installation had a 185-year supply of a single ammunition item. In another case there was only one 2½-ton truck engine carburetor in stock for an entire army.

"There can be little question as to the facts," the subcommittee said in reporting that most of its evidence came from the Defense Department's own investigations.

The Congressmen held lengthy hearings behind closed doors on aid to countries such as Korea, the Indochina area, and Pakistan. But the Pentagon put such a tight secrecy lock on the information, the subcommittee said, that it was barred from issuing even a censored transcript of the testimony.

The Congressmen finally issued their own report which named no countries and was sparse on specifics. They said the State and Defense Departments imposed secrecy to keep details from the Communists and because the cases "reflect unfavorably on officials or policies of allied nations."

Arms aid has accounted for about half the U.S. overseas expenditure, which has been running roughly $4 billion a year. Mr. Eisenhower now has under way a military assistance survey by a special group headed by investment banker William H. Draper.

## Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the vitally important subject of civil rights is now under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; hearings were begun today.

I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the committee, in which I urged that a strong, effective civil rights bill be approved:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, the need for stronger, effective civil rights legislation is more apparent than ever. Since your committee last considered civil rights legislation, denials of such rights because of color, race, religion, and national origin, have been rampant. The time for moderation and compromise is past; we must end the unconscionable discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and other human indecencies which are being inflicted upon a vast segment of our population.

Civil rights, the denial of such rights, continue to be of great concern to me. I have again reintroduced my many bills dealing with various phases of the subject and I will not take the time to enumerate them, as your committee is fully cognizant of my efforts through the years. I do repeat, however, that we cannot claim to have true democracy in our country, equality of man, equality of opportunity, freedom as guaranteed by our Constitution, until every vestige of discrimination of race, color, or religion, is abolished.

One of my bills which you scheduled for hearing is H.R. 759, to provide further means of securing and protecting the right of persons within the jurisdiction of the several States to the equal protection of the laws and other civil rights guaranteed by the Constittution or laws of the United States. It enlists the powers and influence of the

Attorney General in a determined attack upon denials of civil rights. It perfects the procedure by which civil rights may be vindicated. My bill provides a workable solution to many serious problems. The Federal Government must act to assure persons discriminated against or denied their constitutional rights, the assistance and protection they need.

You also scheduled for hearing, my bill H.R. 1902, for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes. We need only recall the Little Rock incidents, the bombings of places of worship, the terrible threats against innocent persons and groups of persons, to recognize that the protection afforded by my bill is necessary, if innocent persons are to be saved from mob hysteria and unfounded hatred which have at their roots the evils of discrimination.

Your committee has before it many bills on civil rights. I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that you scheduled hearings early in this session of Congress, and I hope your prompt action presages passage of a strong civil rights bill during the present session. I wish to take this opportunity to state that I also favor your bill, Mr. Chairman, which would give Federal technical and financial help to communities that want to integrate their schools.

You have a grave responsibility and a great decision to make in this matter of civil rights. Every right-thinking American looks to you to discharge that responsibility fairly and wisely. I trust that you will vote out a bill of which we can be proud and which will restore, to some extent at least, the prestige which we have lost as a Nation because of our present undemocratic practices.

## Newly Modernized D.C. Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 the President and the Postmaster General dedicated the new modernized Washington, D.C., post office. A distinguished audience, including many Members of the Congress, were in attendance.

The introduction of mechanized mail-handling machinery and equipment and the resultant beneficial effects on better mail service are of such significance to the American people that I believe the comments made on that occasion should be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include President Eisenhower's and Mr. Summerfield's remarks in the RECORD:

COMMENTS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD AT DEDICATION OF THE MODERNIZED WASHINGTON, D.C., POST OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 3, 1959

Members of the Congress, distinguished guests, my colleagues in the postal service, ladies and gentlemen, today we add a most significant chapter to the long and honored traditions of the U.S. Post Office Department.

This official opening of the world's most mechanized post office—the showplace of the postal world—is a major breakthrough in our efforts to provide better, more efficient mail service for the American people.

The introduction of mechanized mail-handling devices here in the modernized Washington, D.C., post office opens a new era in the postal service, fully as important as the start of railroad service for mail in 1831, or the inauguration of regular air mail service in 1918.

This great advance we are witnessing today is the culmination of 6 years of intensive research and engineering work. It could not have occurred without the wholehearted, enthusiastic support of the President and the vision and cooperation of the Congress. Every American is indebted to our leaders for their support of this effort.

Would the Members of the Congress present here today please arise so we may give you a deserved round of applause?

Thanks are due also to the many industrial, business, and commercial groups whose technicians have worked so cooperatively with the Post Office Department's fine staff of engineers in developing and fitting this equipment so ingeniously and efficiently into floorspace not originally designed for such purposes.

Will these representatives of industry and our own engineers please stand so we may appropriately acknowledge your efforts?

The postal employees of this post office deserve particular praise for their fine efforts in continuing with normal delivery of mails, including holiday mail, during the most trying period while this building was being rehabilitated and this large amount of mechanical equipment installed. Let us give them a round of applause, too.

Will the employee association leaders here today arise so we may pay tribute to you?

Also, I would like to give special recognition to four of my close associates for their dedicated service in carrying this important project through to such a successful conclusion. They are Deputy Postmaster General Edson O. Sessions, who has charge of the entire modernization program for the postal service; Rollin Barnard, Acting Assistant Postmaster General of the Bureau of Facilities; the Director of the Office of Research and Engineering, Wade S. Plummer; and the Regional Director of the Washington Region, Malcolm Clarke.

I should like to also acknowledge the many fine contribtuions to this effort made by Assistant Postmasters General McKibbin, Siedle, Gillette, Lyons, and Chief Inspector Stephens. Will they please stand so that we may recognize their efforts?

Why have we mechanized this big city "gateway" post office?

Like many others, it has long been out-of-date. It's mail-handling methods were old-fashioned and had not changed much since Ben Franklin's day.

On its workroom floors mail was hand-pushed, hand-sorted, hand-moved in old-fashioned hampers. Working conditions were poor; the work tedious; the results costly to the taxpayers.

In short, the major bottleneck to better, faster mail service is the time now required to sort and distribute mail, to move it through the large "gateway" post offices of the United States.

The seriousness of this problem is highlighted by these facts.

The American people send and receive two-thirds of the world's mail.

This astonishing volume now totals 61 billion pieces of mail plus a billion parcels a year.

As the Nation grows and its economy expands, the number of pieces of mail per person per year, now averaging 350, is expected to double to 700 within the next 25 years.

Necessity, they say, is the mother of invention.

Faced with the facts I have just briefly mentioned, it was apparent your postal managment must speed mail sorting and distribution of mail in its present physical quarters with modern machines and new methods, some of which are commonly used in American industry.

The mechanization in this Washington, D.C., post office will move the mails continuously, make better use of the work floorspace, eliminate drudgery, and use the abilities of postal workers to better advantage. Most importantly, too, this mechanization will decrease the floor space needed to process the increased mail volume of the years ahead.

The modernization work in the Washington, D.C., post office will produce benefits for the entire Nation:

1. It will provide mechanization experience to convert other post offices.

2. It will be a testing ground for the mail processing equipment of tomorrow.

3. It will be close by for postal engineers to conduct tests on further development, and will serve as a national showcase so that visitors from everywhere may see what the Post Office Department is doing about their mail-handling problems. This is the first large office to be completed although many other large offices are now in the planning or construction stage and will be completed soon.

4. It will provide better working conditions for our employees.

An efficient modern postal service is essential to our national welfare.

That is why this Washington, D.C. post office, with its promise of better mail service, is so important. That is why the developments that will take place here, in this working postal laboratory, have great significance for every American.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would now like to introduce some of the distinguished guests on this platform today. They are:

Franklin G. Floete, Administrator, General Services Administration.

Mrs. Barbara Gunderson, Civil Service Commissioner.

Rowland Jones, Jr., president, American Retail Federation, and a member of the Post Office Department Advisory Board.

It is now my privilege to present the Assistant to the President, Gen. Wilton B. Persons, who is here today as the personal representative of the President. General Persons will join me in unveiling this plaque which will be permanently mounted in the lobby of this post office. General Persons.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we hear the band play "Hail to the Chief," it is my privilege to talk to President Eisenhower in the White House.

The President will press the button starting the machinery in this first modern post office in the United States.

Mr. President, we are just concluding our dedication ceremony. The distinguished guests and postal employees gathered here eagerly await a word from you.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

In a moment I shall press the button which will start the machinery rolling in the new mechanized Washington, D.C., post office.

This development, a banner one in the Post Office Department's modernization program, will benefit all Americans as their mail is handled more expeditiously and more economically.

The lessons learned in this working postal laboratory here in Washington will be used in post offices throughout the entire Nation.

It is a pleasure to congratulate Postmaster General Summerfield on this achievement and to now press the button which sets into motion the most newly mechanized postal facility in the world—the Washington, D.C. post office.

## Col. Michael de Kowats, Symbol of Hungarian Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN BRADEMAS**
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 17, 1959*

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege of introducing in Congress a resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to design and issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring a man who not only gave noble service to our country in the days of its struggle for independence, but who stands today as a symbol of the yearning for freedom of a brave people now held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain.

Col. Michael de Kowats was a Hungarian cavalry officer who volunteered his services to help the American Colonies win their independence in the Revolutionary War. One authority on Hungarian-American history declares Colonel Kowats to have been the only Hungarian who served in the Continental Army.

It is an instructive commentary on the forces that have molded the American Nation that Michael de Kowats was the Hungarian colonel and righthand man of Count Casimir Pulaski, the champion of Polish and American liberty. General Pulaski recommended, in a report to General Washington dated Trenton, January 9, 1778, the appointment of a master of exercise for the cavalry and urged that Colonel Kowats be named to the post. "I can recommend him," wrote Pulaski, "and assure your excellency will never have reason to repent your confidence in him. If this proposal should be agreeable to your excellency, the sooner I am informed the better, as he will be of infinite service to the cavalry this winter in quarters."

Colonel Michael de Kowats is one of thousands of Hungarians who have given their lives in defense of liberty. On March 15 Hungarians throughout the free world will pay homage to their forefathers who have died fighting tyranny. It was on that day in the middle of the 19th century that Hungary won its freedom from the Hapsburgs and it is on that day that free Hungarians renew their vows to return the blessings of liberty to their compatriots now in the chains of Soviet despotism.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in America will recall, I am sure, the valiant fight not too many months ago of the Hungarian people in the streets of Budapest against the onslaught of Soviet tanks and troops.

Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1959, the Hungarian-American community of South Bend, Ind., in the district I have the honor to represent, will celebrate Hungarian Independence Day in the William Penn Fraternal Association Hall. The meeting, which will be attended by a predicted 1,500 persons, is being held under the sponsorship of the Hungarian Veterans Club of which Mr. Joseph Farkas is president. The Honorable Edward F. Voorde, mayor of South Bend, will be master of cermonies. Albert Tellson, an American of Hungarian extraction, and a councilman at large of the city of South Bend and himself a fine example of the splendid civic service given by Hungarian-Americans in my district, will also take part in the ceremonies.

I join with these fine Americans in observation of Hungarian Independence Day by offering my resolution in honor of Colonel Michael de Kowats together with the hope that some day the people of Hungary will again be free.

The text of my resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Joint resolution providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Col. Michael de Kowats

Whereas the love of freedom and a hatred of tyranny has characterized the Hungarian peoples in their centuries-old fight against oppression and dictatorship; and

Whereas this spirit is exemplified in the conduct and service of Col. Michael de Kowats, who volunteered his services to General Washington's Continental Army and helped organize the cavalry of that Army into an effective fighting force and later died on the battlefield at Charlestown; and

Whereas Colonel Kowats' love of liberty was also present in the hearts of his countrymen who died fighting the forces of oppression in Hungary in 1956; and

Whereas Hungarians the world over celebrate March 15, the date of Hungarian independence from Hapsburg rule in 1849, as Hungarian Freedom Day, dedicated to the restoration of freedom in that land: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to design and issue a special commemorative postage stamp in honor of Col. Michael de Kowats. Such stamp shall be of such denomination and shall be issued in such quantity and for such period, beginning March 15, 1960, as the Postmaster-General shall determine.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking article appeared in the Pittsburgh, Pa., Sun-Telegraph on November 4, 1957, where Karl M. Mason, of the State health department, had some pungent words of warning to the people of the country. The article follows:

WATER WARNING

A thought-provoking statement on the stream purification campaign in western Pennsylvania has been issued by Karl M. Mason, of the State health department.

He warns that works for the abatement of pollution are not keeping pace with the increase of pollution caused by population growth and industrial growth. Mr. Mason says:

"It must be realized that demands for clean water are constantly pyramiding. Unless we conserve water, the supply of which does not increase, by treating that which we use to make it available for further use, those demands will not be met.

"Continued shortages of clean water will inevitably bring disaster."

Mr. Mason is particularly concerned with the pollution of the streams by paper mills. Notwithstanding all that has been done to abate the pollution of the Clarion River by paper mills, it still is contaminated for 55 miles to an extent which prevents its use for recreational purposes.

Warning is given to many western Pennsylvania communities to stop using the streams as sewers for domestic sewage.

Fifty-three municipalities at our end of the State recently have been ordered to construct sewage disposal plants and have them in operation not later than July 1, 1959.

Pittsburgh and 69 other municipalities in Allegheny County which are cooperating with the city in the construction of intercepting sewers and a great sewage disposal plant can take satisfaction that they are at least doing their duty.

Let us hope that the many laggard communities and industries which continue to contaminate the water will take a leaf from Pittsburgh's book and join in the good work of keeping the rivers clean.

## Mr. Kearns' Trip to Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN**
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns has just returned from a significant trip to the Far East. While in Japan and Hong Kong some of Mr. Kearns' statements were taken out of context which, of course, alarmed and shocked our textile employers and employees who are struggling to break even in this great essential industry.

I had a very pleasant and constructive conference with Mr. Kearns on Monday concerning this Far Eastern trip. I am happy to report to the House that at no time during his visit did Mr. Kearns advocate more Japanese textile imports into the United States. On the contrary he explained to the Japanese and Hong Kong manufacturers the detrimental effects of excessive imports on our American industry. He warned the Japanese that more exports to America could result in restrictive action by the U.S. Government. He pointed out that demands would rise in Congress for a lower quota and higher tariffs.

Mr. Kearns was not empowered to negotiate trade agreements but was on a factfinding trip to study the situation in the Far East and inform our friends of the difficult predicament of the American industry. After studying the facts, Mr. Speaker, I must say that Mr. Kearns did a fine job and very ably represented American business interests.

I do believe that in the coming negotiations for a voluntary Japanese quota America will be ably represented by our distinguished Acting Secretary Mr. Strauss, Mr. Kearns, and other dedi-

cated men in the executive branch of our Government.

I hope and trust that during these negotiations the Japanese quota will not be increased. I sincerely believe satisfactory negotiations will be held with our Japanese allies and another voluntary agreement worked out substantially along the lines of the present one. I am sure our Japanese friends are beginning to realize that the present voluntary quota is working to their advantage with the increasing threat of textiles flooding the world markets from Red China.

## Private Enterprise Honors Government Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that many people tend to regard Government agencies and private industry as strictly adversaries rather than partners in the job of promoting economic progress. Sometimes the opposite occurs. For example, the Greater St. Paul Home Builders Association has seen fit to honor the Minneapolis office of the Federal Housing Administration and its Director, Wallace E. Berg, for outstanding service to the industry and the community. Such an award clearly symbolizes how a Government agency and private enterprise can cooperate for service to the industry and the community. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter reporting this action:

GREATER ST. PAUL
HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION,
*St. Paul, Minn., February 2, 1959.*

Mr. WALLACE E. BERG,
*Director, Federal Housing Administration, Minneapolis, Minn.*

DEAR MR. BERG: I cannot recall any letter that has ever given me more pleasure to write than this one, Wally. It is my distinct privilege and pleasure to officially inform you and your staff members that the highest award that the St. Paul Home Builders Association bestows annually has been unanimously voted by our past president's council to be our FHA office and particularly you and your men, Mr. Berg.

This award is a sign of recognition and appreciation to the person or organization which in the honest opinion of our judges and past president's council has been the most helpful and cooperative and aided the industry and the community in the best possible manner. The inscription on the large trophy reads as follows: "St. Paul Home Builders Association Award for Outstanding Service to the Industry and Community."

This, I am sure, you can appreciate is an award that is given the utmost consideration and every year a goodly number of candidates are proposed for consideration. I am very pleased to tell you at this time that you personally, Wally, and your very capable staff were selected by unanimous vote as the recipient of this award for the year 1958.

This does not have any monetary value, free Florida trips, or any such prize attached to it. However, I am sure that you and the men in your office will appreciate that this selection carries with it the heartfelt thanks and recognition of the home builders of St. Paul for a job well done, as well as the biggest thank you possible for the unlimited cooperation and assistance that your office has continually given under your direction to the building industry in this area.

The awarding of these trophies take place at our all-industry meeting, Wednesday evening, February 11, in the main ballroom of the Commodore Hotel. It is my privilege to invite you, Wally, to receive this award on behalf of your office, and to ask you to please extend an invitation to your lieutenants to be our guests that evening, so that we might have the opportunity of recognizing them, and so that they can help you carry this big trophy home.

It is my honest opinion that this is the first time anywhere in the country that such an award has been given by builders to a Government agency office, and to tell you the truth, this gives us a very warm feeling to be able to show in some small way that the industry in St. Paul feels proud and happy to have wonderful guys such as yourselves working with us in a cooperative effort to do a better job of housing the many fine people in this area. We hope that this will show other builders and other FHA offices throughout the country that an FHA office under the proper direction, following the letter of the law, and extending their friendly hand of cooperation is appreciated by the home building contractors in their efforts to do a better job of housing and enabling them to provide homes for a larger number of people. May I also include my personal congratulations.

Best personal regards.

JOHN E. BOHMAN,
*Executive Director.*

## Foreign Aid Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 9, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to read about a foreign-aid program of which I thoroughly approved. Our U.S. consular representatives in Brazzaville, Congo Republic, have introduced the first baseball there and since January, when we opened our consulate, a league of six teams has been organized.

Apparently, the Americans give their time, but the program costs nothing—the players have no shoes, no gloves or any fancy equipment. Notwithstanding this, these barefoot youngsters and the citizens of this young Republic are developing a tie of friendship with the United States and more power to them.

Compare this with the attitude of Bolivians where our $129 million in aid, more per capita than to any other foreign people during a 6-year period, has resulted in our Embassy and the U.S. Information Service being attacked by mobs and our flag being burned.

An alleged remark of an American official as reported by Time magazine was taken by Bolivia as an insult to the dignity of a friendly nation.

Once under private ownership the tin mines of Bolivia made a profit and paid taxes. However, since these mines were nationalized they lose money and pay no taxes; but our financial assistance to the tune of about $25 million has contributed more than Bolivian income taxpayers toward their budget deficit.

In the interest of restoring good will, perhaps we should cut off sending dollars and also eliminate other sources of Bolivia's indignity. Instead, we could send some consular representatives who can organize a baseball league. I would suggest Jackie Robinson, Mickey Mantle, Joe DiMaggio, or any one of a dozen others, as foreign service diplomats. They would make friends with the people of other lands. I doubt if the good will sought by our mutual security program reaches much below the high official level of foreign governments.

## Twenty-fourth Annual Mass and Communion Breakfast of Shamrock Post, No. 120, Catholic War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent of the House, I take pleasure in making part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a résumé of the 24th annual mass and communion breakfast of the Shamrock Post, No. 120, Catholic War Veterans, which took place in the district which I have the honor to represent.

People of the 21st Congressional District of New York are extremely proud of the record of this great organization and of its individual members. The résumé was forwarded to me by its adjutant, George Lynch, Jr., and is as follows:

On Sunday, February 15, 1959, Shamrock Post No. 120 of the Catholic War Veterans, celebrated their 24th annual communion mass at Our Lady Queen of Martyrs Church. In attendance with our members at mass were Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, (Republican of New York), and our own Representative, HERBERT ZELENKO (Democrat of New York).

Breakfast followed at the Trocadero Ballroom. Chairman Joseph F. Reilly, Jr., introduced the chaplain of Shamrock, Rev. Francis P. Mannion, C.S.P., who delivered the opening prayers and blessing. Seated on the dais were City Councilman Thomas J. Cuite, past national commander of the Catholic War Veterans; National Treasurer Joseph F. Reilly; Teddy Moran, representing the Veterans' Administration; Rev. Thomas McEnroe, of Our Lady Queen of Martyrs Church; First Vice Commander Joseph F. Reilly, Jr.; U.S. Senator Kenneth B. Keating; U.S. track and field coach and coach of Manhattan College, George Eastment; first deputy clerk of the city of New York, county judge advocate and commander of Shamrock Post, the Honorable Thomas A. Lenane; Rev. Francis Mannion, C.S.P.; one of boxing's greats, and newly elected to the Boxing Hall of Fame, Tony Canzoneri; first deputy grand knight of St. Joseph's Council No. 443, Knights of Columbus, James R. O'Connell; Assemblyman John Walsh (Demo-

crat, 15th A.D.); Congressman Herbert Zelenko; Hon. James Mulcahy, justice of the New York City Court; Hon. Thomas Rohan, the chairman of the New York State Liquor Authority; New York State Senator Joseph Zaretzki; Hon. David A. Schulte, commissioner of the board of corrections and a patron of the Shamrock Post; State Commander Charles Shelley; County Commander James Mulroy; State First Vice Commander Francis Tucker; and Congressional Medal of Honor winner Thomas Kelly.

The occasion was highlighted by the presentation of Catholic War Veterans' highest award, the St. Sebastian Medal, by Past National Commander Thomas Cuite (representing the national commander) to National Treasurer Joseph F. Reilly, in recognition of his devotion and untiring efforts in promoting the Catholic War Veterans to an echelon of superlative respect in the community, State, and national scenes. An additional award, in the form of a Bible, was presented to Trustee Albert Sullivan as the Post Man of the Year.

We next heard an eloquent talk by Senator KEATING who discussed the danger our country faces today from the Communists. He was particularly critical of the overfriendly reception accorded to A. Mikoyan on his recent visit. The Senator stated that the Catholic War Veterans is a bulwark against the Communist menace here and abroad and pointed out that as long as there are organizations comparable in their beliefs, and joined solidly in their foundations, such as the Catholic War Veterans, America will be perserved. He regarded the Catholic War Veterans as the foremost foe of communism in this country.

Coach George Eastment, who was in charge of the U.S. track team in Moscow last summer, had the audience on the edge of their seats in giving a personal and first-hand report on conditions in the Soviet Republic and Soviet-dominated countries, pointing out the wrongful suppression of civil liberties of the unfortunate people in these troubled countries. He specifically warned of the impending disaster that could befall any country in which religious freedom, freedom of thought and speech do not exist. Because of our respect for democracy, however, Mr. Eastment stated that our country would continue to be a pioneer in the quest for freedom and the pursuit of happiness.

This most memorable communion breakfast was attended by some 300, all of whom received a pin of our Blessed Virgin.

The large attendance and the enthusiasm motivated by the outstanding program has set the stage for the silver anniversary breakfast to be held by our organization in 1960.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Dan Saults which appeared in the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch on May 17, 1958, entitled "Paradox of Cleanliness."

When the white man came to this country, American streams and rivers were deep and clear and full of water as pure and clean as the rain and dew.

In a matter of a few short years our streams have been turned into running cesspools full of filth, sewage, disease germs, and other things as bad or worse.

The article is as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, May 17, 1958]

PARADOX OF CLEANLINESS—CLEANEST PEOPLE IN WORLD POLLUTE THEIR NEIGHBORS' DRINKING WATER

(By Dan Saults)

Of all mankind's own nest fouling at which we have become scientifically adept—the variety that is easiest and hardest to understand is water pollution.

The simplest way to get rid of anything is to dump it into a river. Consider how many murderers dispose of their lethal weapons in that fashion, and where gangsters drop their last-ride remains. Toddling moppets love to fling into brooks all available rocks, twigs, and picnic sandwiches. (There is no deliberate attempt here to suggest that pouring garbage and chemicals into rivers is either infantile or criminal.)

Using a handy stream as private or public sewer is cheaper, too. And everyone believes in saving as much money as possible: you won't catch the U.S. public going for shiny gewgaws on their cars or demanding anything from their Government except the bare necessities of administration. The obligation to save money is particularly noticeable in big business expense accounts and Military Establishments.

So it's easy to understand why we—the individual, commercial, or metropolitan "we"—have a perfectly natural right to dump our bathroom wastes into our downstream neighbors' drinking water.

The difficulty comes in when we consider the highly sanitary standards of our professed mores and folkways. We USians are the cleanest people in the world; I heard it on television only last night. We support serials with soap, soak in suds, and smother in shampoo. The mere thought of underarm perspiration causes strong women and urbane announcers to swoon against the backdrops. Sweat and spit are horrid words; dentifrice manufacturers reap fortunes by stressing the need for clean teeth; our gargles slay baccilli invented by the ad agencies to leave our breath pure. We have, indeed, invented clean hydrogen bombs. (Wouldn't that killya?)

The world's cleanest people, using only purest oils and spices in exorcising grime witches, are drinking the garbage dump trickles of whatever town lies up the line. We bathe with scented fats—and drink a factory's slime. Of course, our water company cleans the liquid up for us—this same liquid in which not even hardy carp can live—by putting chemicals in it to kill other chemicals from upstream. The water is not, of course, cleaned up again before it is put back in the river; in fact, it is reenriched.

Yet we are history's most antiseptic culture, untouched by human hands.

That's what is hard to understand: how we talk (and buy) one way while performing so differently in terms of that precious necessity called water.

It isn't just a matter of fish, though the United States prizes its fishing; nor just a matter of swimming, boating, and picnicking, though we spend huge sums of money making these possible while we poison the medium in which they are practiced. It isn't just a matter of human health, or of ducks so gummed by oil wastes they can't fly off the river. These aren't the things that really bother me.

I just hate to see unguent advertisers and hygienic heralds made to look silly by the facts.

## Congress Weeps for Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the ceremonies in this room last month which commemorated the sesquicentennial of Lincoln's birth was surely one of the noble moments of this, or any other, Congress. Many journalists have attempted to capture the spirit of that occasion, and I believe none succeeded so poignantly as did Max Freedman, veteran correspondent for the Manchester Guardian.

Listen to these words:

Never in living memory has there been an occasion in Washington comparable to this, so moving in its contrasts, so memorable in its appeal, so majestic in its inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will be inspired by the eloquence with which Mr. Freedman described this tribute of which the Congress, and the country, can be proud:

CONGRESS WEEPS FOR LINCOLN

(By Max Freedman)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—With proud thanksgiving and noble grief the Nation today honored its martyred President. All over the United States there were ceremonies to mark the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth; but the supreme tribute was reserved for the Halls of Congress, where he once served and whose criticism so often fell like a scourge upon him in the agony of the Civil War.

Never in living memory has there been an occasion in Washington comparable to this, so moving in its contrasts, so memorable in its appeal, so majestic in its inspiration. The discords and debate which jangle through Congress were forgotten as the soul of America stood revealed for all the world to see.

A nation may be judged by its heroes; and no small people could have nurtured Lincoln or honored him in this matchless national tribute. Unforgettable were the contrasts. The scene was the great Chamber of the House of Representatives, to which had been invited the Members of the Senate for a joint session of Congress.

As the Senators came in it was impossible to forget that earlier scene, so heart-shaking in the intensity of its pathos, when the Southern Senators on the eve of the Civil War bade a solemn valedictory to Congress and departed for their homes and States to stand with their neighbors in armed defense of the South.

Directly in front of the Speaker's platform were seated Chief Justice Warren and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, all in their black robes, and visibly impressed by their ovation by Congress and the still more eager welcome extended by the crowded galleries.

In everyone's mind was the Court's work in completing the liberation of the Negro so nobly began by Lincoln as an act of military necessity but graced with a virtue that the years have widened and enriched. Lincoln wanted the Negro to come into his inheritance of freedom; he wanted him to vote; he wanted him to be fully educated; and he hoped the start in these tasks of freedom would be quickly made with the ablest and most intelligent Negroes.

These old dreams are now woven into the fabric of freedom—and are entangled, too, in the knotted cords of race hatred. But today there was a truce in the ancient quarrel as the spirit of Lincoln made a sanctuary out of Congress. In little things, as in great, the chivalry of idealism flashed its message.

But the greatest tribute of all was in seeing the emotion of Congress as tears stood in the eyes of many Senators and Congressmen. They listened with profound emotion to Mr. Fredric March read the Gettysburg address and gave three separate ovations to the cadenced, passionate eulogy of Lincoln spoken by Carl Sandburg, the poet-biographer.

Mr. Sandburg patted Mr. March's hand in encouragement as the actor arose to read the famous speech. "Not often in the story of mankind," Mr. Sandburg quietly began "does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm and peace unspeakable and perfect."

"In the time of April lilacs in the year 1865," came Mr. Sandburg's deep voice, "the casket with Lincoln's body was carried north and west a thousand miles; and the American people wept as never before—bells sobbed, cities wore crepe, people stood in tears, and with hats off as the railroad burial car paused in the leading cities of seven States, ending its journey at Springfield, Ill., the hometown."

Mr. Sandburg recalled that during the 4 years in which Lincoln was President he at times, especially in the first 3 months, took to himself the powers of a dictator. When Lincoln came to Gettysburg he spoke not of the brave union men but simply of "the brave men, living and dead, who struggled here." Did he have a purpose in omitting the word "Union"? No one knew for sure, but perhaps Lincoln was thinking of the Kentucky father whose two sons died in battle, one in Union blue, the other in Confederate grey, the father inscribing on the stone over the double grave, "God knows which was right."

"Now," Mr. Sandburg concluded, "the people of many other countries tok Lincoln for their own because he belongs to them. Lincoln stood for decency, honest dealing, plain talk, and funny stories. His most enduring memorial was in the hearts of lovers of liberty, men and women who understand that wherever there is freedom there have been those who fought and sacrificed for it."

The applause went on until it seemed as if it never would end. Several Justices of the Supreme Court cleared their eyes of tears; so did Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and Senator DIRKSEN, the two party leaders of the Senate. Finally Mr. Sandburg and Mr. March left the hall, stopping, appropriately enough, to salute the members of the Supreme Court and to shake hands for an instant with Chief Justice Warren, who symbolizes the victory of law for which Lincoln, even in the heat of battle, prayed and worked.

## Time To Share

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, we have heard and read much these past months about a program of food for peace. There is, in my opinion, a great realization sweeping across this Nation that America should share with her free but hungry neighbors a part of our bountiful harvests. I believe that there could be no greater force available to us for the crusade for peace than sharing our abundance of food with the undernourished, needy people of the free world. I further believe that we could, through a more energetic administration of the laws now on the books, as well as providing new legislation in this field, substantially increase the value of the surplus-disposal programs to us and to enhance the benefits to the people who want and need our food. Because of my interest in the food-for-peace program, it is heartwarming to know of the wonderful overseas relief programs being carried out by the religious and volunteer organizations in America. These various groups have done a most commendable job in person-to-person relief work and food distribution to people in need. As explained in the following editorial, March 8, next Sunday, has been designated as One Great Hour of Sharing as a highlight of the Protestant churches united appeal for overseas relief and reconstruction. Simultaneously the Bishops' Relief Fund of Catholic relief services and the United Jewish Appeal Special Fund will ask for special offerings to help the homeless, hungry, and destitute neighbors overseas. In 1958 these groups reached into more than 60 countries in all five continents with their relief programs which accounted for a preponderance of America's voluntary overseas effort. The editorial follows:

TIME TO SHARE

The appeals of our great religious faiths for funds with which to carry on their world-wide programs to relieve suffering among the overseas victims of aggression, poverty and disaster are traditional at this season.

Through these efforts, the greatest of America's voluntary ministries to need abroad, hundreds of millions of pounds of food, clothing and medicines—including U.S. surplus commodities—will be distributed free to the homeless, the hungry and the destitute during the coming year.

Programs of resettlement and constructive development for refugees will be maintained, orphanages, schools and hospitals will be supported and tuberculosis and other health projects carried on.

On Sunday, March 8, to sustain these programs which reach millions in more than 50 overseas areas of distress, thousands of our Protestant churches will observe "One Great Hour of Sharing," highlight of the United Appeal for overseas relief and reconstruction.

On the same day, special offerings for similar purposes will be made to "The Bishops' Relief Fund" of Catholic Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Meantime, our national Jewish community will be emphasizing the United Jewish Appeal Special Fund for programs to aid refugees and others in need abroad.

This is religious America's greatest time of sharing.

Keeping faith with those in need either at home or abroad—sharing our abundance with those less fortunate than ourselves—is a basic human Americanism.

Sharing with them through religious faith, the basic common denominator of all mankind—giving generously and gladly through our houses of worship—is a most effective witness of the sincerity of America's unselfishness in her efforts to spread peace and good will among all men.

## Max Factor Co. Celebrates 50th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of Max Factor & Co., which is located in my congressional district. During the past half-century, the names Max Factor and Hollywood have been synonymous. As an international figure, distributing his products to 106 foreign countries, he has been credited with being one of the most influential forces in creating goodwill for Hollywood and the United States throughout the world. He has done this with his pioneer work for the motion picture and television industries, his participation in community affairs, and his many philanthropic activities.

The first major Max Factor contribution to Hollywood dates back to 1914 with the creation of the first and only makeup for motion pictures, for which he received a special Academy Award in 1929. Television benefited from Mr. Factor's creative talents as early as 1930 when he began an extensive program of research and testing to develop a makeup for the new medium, and by 1932 a basic makeup was ready for use by the pioneer television performers. He continued exhaustive tests for the next dozen years in collaboration with an experimental television station in Hollywood, and by 1946 the first perfected television makeup was available to the industry. No other person in the cosmetic industry has created the number of makeup firsts as has Max Factor.

Max Factor's contributions have extended to other fields as well. The records show that his cosmetic laboratories have been available to industry and government alike for the solving of any problems within its scope. During World War II, he created a whole new array of materials to meet a rush order requested by the Battle Supply Command of the U.S. Marine Corps. These materials provided our fighting men's faces with near invisibility against such backgrounds as sand, jungle foliage, and mud which existed in the South Pacific theater of war. In addition, Max Factor, working with the U.S. Veterans' Administration, has helped many scarred war veterans face the world again by providing them with specially created materials and hairpieces to cover up their injuries.

Max Factor, along with many of his executives, has headed or served on committees for important community programs such as the Red Cross, Community Chest, bond drives, March of Dimes, et cetera. He is currently serving as vice president, and was formerly president, of the board of trustees of the Devereaux Foundation, an organization promoting the welfare of exceptional children by establishing a group of special schools which provide proper training and guidance for these children.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Factor's background depicts a typically American Horatio Alger success story. At the age of 8, living in humble circumstances, he began working after school and during vacations in his father's tiny makeup shop. To make extra money, he and his brother made false whiskers and moustaches from scraps in the shop. These were sold to merrymakers on the streets of downtown Los Angeles and Hollywood during holidays such as Halloween and New Year's Eve. In the years that followed, young Max spent long hours working to acquire the knowledge and skill that eventually earned him world fame and fortune. Hollywood has expressed the fact that it is indeed proud to claim Max Factor as one of its outstanding citizens.

The following is an article from the Los Angeles Times of Monday, March 2, 1959:

(By Richard Donovan)

Max Factor & Co., of Hollywood, the pioneer, chief innovator, and current third ranking best seller of the $1 billion world cosmetics industry, celebrated its 50th anniversary last week.

Few organizations anywhere appear to have spent half a century in more vitally constructive work.

"Singlehanded," says one excitable chain beauty salon executive, "Factor's has saved women from nature."

Extravagant as this claim may be, it is generally agreed that Factor & Co. was indeed the first to take lipstick, rouge, eye shadow, etc., out of the actress and fast-woman category after the turn of the century and put them on the face of the woman in the street.

MATRIMONIAL BETRAYAL

To give some idea of the magnitude of this accomplishment, we need only recall a piece of 17th century British legislation which urged that "all women, whether virgins, maids, or widows, who betray into matrimony any of His Majesty's subjects by the use of face paints, cosmetic washes * * * and the like, shall incur the penalty of the law in force against witchcraft, and such marriages shall be declared null and void.'

The company which was to make witchcraft general in the world got underway in 1908 when the late Max Factor, Sr., arrived in Los Angeles with his wife, four small children, and smaller capital, and started barbering and selling hair switches and wigs in a tiny shop—"Max Factor's Antiseptic Hair Store * * * Toupees made to order; high-grade work"—at 1210 Central Avenue.

VERY SOUND IDEA

Factor, an all-around body maintenance man who had cut the hair, pared the finger and toenails, pulled the teeth, and even leeched the blood of customers before coming to the United States from Russia, had a very sound idea. A former supplier of theatrical makeup, he reasoned that a quavery newcomer, the movies, might open up a new market for him.

The movies not only opened up a new market for Factor. By association, they made his name famous among uncounted millions of virgins, maids, and widows who yearned to look the way the movie stars looked.

FACE-REPAIR INDUSTRY

Once these women took it into their heads that the stars looked the way they did partly because they were privy to Factor beauty secrets, Factor & Co., followed by the whole giant U.S. face-repair industry, which last year cost this Nation some $967 million more than it paid for Alaska and the Louisiana Territory combined, was off on one of the great mass-rescue missions of history.

Getting started wasn't easy, of course. In 1908 the majority of American women ostracized the abandoned few who openly wore paint. Nevertheless, all the older Factors—father Max, mother Jenny, daughters Fred and Celia—went ahead anyhow, mashing up rice powder in hand-cranked basement machines that resembled coffee grinders and hand-fashioned wax and colored oils into theatrical greasepaint sticks which they sold to local players, visiting road companies, and the makers of early western movies.

WAR PAINT POPULAR

(The first big-selling Factor cosmetic was Indian war paint.)

While seeking ways to expand the cosmetic department, the family prospered in hair. By 1914 even 13-year-old Davis Factor, the present board chairman of the company, and 10-year-old Max Factor Jr., now company president and its principal creator, were pressed into service. (Two other brothers, Louis and Sidney, arrived later.)

After classes at the 14th Street grade school Davis and Max, Jr., were put to making transformations and wigs from imported European tresses and imported Chinese queues (cut off by the thousands after the Sun Yatsen revolution). Between times they learned to cut hair.

Since the family lived in a couple of rooms across the street from the shop and did all its own work, company overhead wasn't excessive. Neither were taxes.

"I have here the Factor Co.'s total tax bill for the year 1911," Davis Factor sighed nostalgically a while ago. "State and county taxes: 30 cents. Special school tax: 23 cents. Total: 53 cents. Heigh ho."

SEVEN FIGURES NOW

(Last year, the Factor tax bill crowded seven figures.)

As the movies grew, so did Factor's greasepaint and Indian wig business.

After moving to larger quarters in the old Pentages Theater at 7th and Hill Streets, Factor Sr. became so enmeshed in movie makeup work that his shop was constantly full of pioneer stars—Henry B. Walthall, Geraldine Farrar, Tom Mix, Theda Bara, Douglas Fairbanks, Sr., and Rudolph Valentino, to name a few.

But his eye was on larger matters. Ringing his sons in on policy decisions as well as the labor, Factor Sr. set out to convince the unsuspecting mass of everyday women that there was nothing inherently sinful in adding to one's physical gifts.

GREASEPAINT IN TUBES

The first step was the invention of a new, thin greasepaint in tubes to replace the old stage stick-greasepaint which had made early movie stars look either ill, dissipated or, in some cases, demented.

Then came new Factor eye-shadow products, makeup blender for the neck, shoulders, and arms and tints for what Mr. Factor called "brownettes," that great and apparently disgruntled majority of women who complained that their hair was neither blond nor brunet, but "mousey."

Mae Murray, who pioneered the bee-stung mouth in the movies, and Joan Crawford, who pioneered the big mouth, helped him rout the housewife's last prejudices against lipstick.

WHOLESALE SPRAYING

Stories of such Factor prodigies as the spray gunning of thousands of extras with 600 gallons of body makeup (for Ben Hur) and a record 10,000 gallons (for "The Ten Commandments") set thousands wondering what part of the anatomy would go next.

The answer, of course, was the whole works, Panchromatic film, the new 1928 movie negative which proved so sensitive to light and shadow that it demanded a thoroughly revised system of set illumination and an even more thoroughly revised system of head-to-toe makeup, settled that question.

Rising to the challenge, Factor and his sons developed a whole new line of panchromatic makeup in a hectic, 2-year grind that made their early labors look trifling. Panchromatic makeup was so natural looking, that for the first time actresses could wear toned-down facial versions of it in the street.

INDUSTRY IS BORN

When they proceded to do so, hundreds of women in Hollywood and Los Angeles not only stopped crossing the street when they saw painted creatures coming, but started demanding to know where they could get some of the paint.

No company to overadvertise at that time, Factor's nevertheless let the word get out. At that moment, the U.S. cosmetics industry, as we know it was born.

With the nimbleness of blooded campaigners Davis Factor, who was now running the business end of the company, and Max Factor, Jr., who was running the creative end, surprised even their father with the speed with which they exploited the final breakthrough.

MEN'S DEPARTMENT

When Jean Harlow started the platinum blond craze, Factor & Co. was there with several products to meet the worldwide color harmony snarl which ensued. In rapid succession, the company followed with a lipstick brush.

While all this was going on, the Factors did not neglect the men's toiletries department or that even more sought-after male decoration—head hair. Already one of the world's biggest suppliers of toupees, Factor's cornered the baldhead market outright by devising a method whereby customers could measure their heads and order hairpieces by mail.

At the moment, more than 70,000 U.S. men averaging 34 years of age wear Factor's mail-order hair, varying in appearance from crew cuts to Shetland shags.

Before his death in 1938, Max Factor, Sr., whose business ambition had begun to wane, saw his sons use advertising, exploitation, and laboratory enterprise to make his old paint and hair firm into a $2 million a year cosmetics manufacturer, famed to the hill passes of Tibet.

IN BELGIAN CONGO

Since his death, sons Davis and Max, Jr., assisted by sons Louis (production) and Sidney (exports), have seen Factor & Co. grow into a $47 million a year world industry with a $1 million office and laboratory building in Hollywood, seven manufacturing plants in the Hollywood area, a new $3 million plant under construction in Hawthorne, manufacturing branches in 14 foreign countries, and distributors in 106 others.

"Even in the heart of the Belgian Congo, we are now selling Electrique perfume, Crushed Rose lipstick, and Bubble Bath," says Board Chairman Davis uneasily.

The traditional bellwether of one of the world's most fiercely competitive businesses, Factor's, like its chief rivals, must now constantly seek new ways to intrigue all those virgins, maids, and widows Max, Sr., stirred up in the first place.

## Wisconsin Ports: Gateways to the Upper Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will mark the first day of distribution of a new booklet published by the State of Wisconsin, which describes the excellent port facilities in our State available to commerce and industry of the upper Midwest and of the entire free world.

The title of the booklet is "Wisconsin Ports: Gateways to the Upper Midwest." It was prepared by the State of Wisconsin Division of Industrial and Port Development, and it will be distributed internationally to ship lines, shippers, and manufacturers who are prospective users of Wisconsin port facilities and waterfront industrial sites.

The forthcoming completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project makes the publication of this booklet particularly significant. The seaway is expected to make possible dynamic industrial development of the entire Midwest. This development will be greatly aided by the Wisconsin ports which serve as convenient transfer points for a region extending a thousand miles to the west, and including all or part of 15 States and 3 Canadian Provinces.

I am proud of the fact that, among Wisconsin's 14 Great Lakes ports, the port of Milwaukee—located in my district—enjoys a particularly fine reputation. It is one of the most modern and best equipped ports on the Great Lakes. The port of Milwaukee is served by more than two dozen ship lines and, during the past decade, it has handled annual tonnage of 8,210,000 short tons on the average.

In the thought that it will prove of interest to the Members of this body, I want to include in the RECORD some facts about the port of Milwaukee which appear in the booklet "Wisconsin Ports: Gateways to the Upper Midwest":

MILWAUKEE

WATERBORNE COMMERCE

Average annual tonnage, 1948–57: 8,210,000 short tons.

Principal inbound commodities: Building cement, car ferry traffic, coal, crushed limestone, general cargo, grain, motor vehicles, newsprint, petroleum products, pig iron, sand, gravel and crushed rock.

Principal outbound commodities: Car ferry traffic, general cargo, grain, iron and steel scrap.

SHIP LINES SERVING PORT

Continental service (Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands): Fjell-Oranje Lines, French Line, Hapag Lloyd, A. & B., Hamburg Chicago Line, Nordlake Lines, Poseiden Lines, Swedish American Line, Wallenius Line.

Scandinavian service (Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden): Finlake Line, Fjell Line, Swedish American Line, Swedish-Chicago Line, Wallenius Lines.

United Kingdom service (Great Britain): Anchor Line, Ltd., Bristol City Line, Fjell-Oranje Lines, Furness Great Lakes Line, Head Line, Liverpool Liners, Ltd., Manchester Liners, Ltd., Nordlake Lines, Swedish Chicago Line.

Mediterranean service (Algeria, France, Greece, Israel, Morocco, Portugal, Spain, Turkey): Ellerman Great Lakes Line, Fabre Line, Montship Cape Line, Niagara Line, Zim-Israel-American Lines.

Caribbean service (Colombia, Curacao, Venezuela): Ahlmann Trans Caribbean Line, Inc., Grace Line, Inc. (pending service).

Great Lakes passenger lines: Wisconsin and Michigan Steamship Co., passenger and automobile ferry service to Muskegon, Mich.

Commercial barge lines: John I. Hay Co. Barge Line, Mississippi River and gulf coast ports service.

INLAND TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Railroads: The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., via car ferry to Ludington, Mich.; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad; Chicago North Shore & Milwaukee Railway; Chicago & North Western Railway Co.; Grand Trunk Railway System, via car ferry to Muskegon, Mich.; Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste, Marie Railroad Co.; both car ferries also carry passengers and automobiles.

Common carrier trucking companies: about 80.

Airport facilities and scheduled airlines: Continental Airport, American Airlines, Capitol Airlines, North Central Airlines, Northwest Orient Airlines, Ozark Air Lines and United Air Lines. In May 1958, a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner recommended that Eastern Airlines be certificated to serve Milwaukee. All the passenger airlines, except Nort Central Airlines, also have air freight service.

PORT FACILITIES

Terminals: Municipal Transit Shed No. 1, 60,000 square feet transit shed, 950-foot wharf, 27-foot water depth, railroad siding, apron tracks. Municipal Pier No. 1, 300,000 square feet open storage, 2,275-foot berthing space on sides and end, 27-foot water depth, railroad tracks on apron. Municipal South Pier No. 2 150,000 square feet transit sheds, 280,000 square feet open storage, 2,700 feet berthing space on sides and end, 27-foot water depth, railroad sidings, apron tracks. Now under construction, to be completed in 1960. Municipal Open Dock Terminal, heavy lift wharf, 85,000 square feet open storage, 1,600-foot wharf, 21-foot water depth, railroad siding, apron tracks. P. & V. Atlas Industrial Center Docks 3 and 5, 37,000 square feet transit shed-warehouse, 520-foot wharf, 22-foot water depth, railroad siding. P. & V. Atlas Washington Street Dock, 81,000 square feet transit shed-warehouse, open storage, 435-foot wharf, 19-foot water depth, railroad siding. P. & V. Atlas Chicago & Northwestern Railway Dock, 68,000 square feet transit shed-warehouse, 640-foot wharf, 20-foot water depth, railroad siding. Hansen Storage Co. wharf, 47,000 square feet transit shed-warehouse (first floor only), 840-foot wharf, 20-foot water depth, railroad siding. The Clipper Line Pier, 11,000 square feet transit shed-warehouse and passenger terminal. Municipal Passenger and Auto Pier, passenger terminal and vehicle parking 300,000 square feet new automobile storage, 1,450 foot berthing space on sides and end, 27-foot water depth on end, 22 feet on sides. Now under construction, to be completed in 1959.

Warehouses: American Warehouse Co., 87,000 square feet, adjacent to terminal facility. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, 135,000 square feet on north bank of Menomonee River. Hansen Storage Co., 405,000 square feet at or adjacent to terminal facilities. Lincoln Warehouse Co., 80,000 square feet. Milwaukee Cold Storage Co., 40,000 square feet, 517,000 cubic feet cold storage space. National Warehouse Corp., 214,000 square feet, adjacent to terminal facility. P. & V. Atlas Industrial Center, 186,000 square feet, at terminal facilities. Terminal Storage Co., 140,000 square feet, 1,000,000 cubic feet cold storage space. Wisconsin Cold Storage Co., 1,000,000 cubic feet cold storage space.

Grain elevators: Stratton Grain Co., 3,500,000-bushel capacity, marine leg and loading spouts, 765-foot wharf, 27-foot water depth, railroad siding. Cargill, Inc. (South Menomonee Canal), 2,500,000-bushel capacity, marine leg and loading spouts, 1,180-foot wharf, 21-foot water depth, railroad siding.

Heavy lift equipment: Municipal Open Dock Terminal, two gantry cranes with 90 tons and 15 tons capacity. Municipal South Pier No. 1, two gantry cranes with 15 tons capacity. Municipal Transit Shed No. 1, two semiportal cranes with 5 tons capacity. Throughout municipal terminal area, two locomotive cranes with 30 tons capacity and one truck crane with 20 tons capacity.

Marine repair facilities: Advance Boiler & Tank Co., Edward E. Gillen Co., Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., Mertes-Miller, Inc., Nordberg Manufacturing Co., Precision Tool Co. These facilities can undertake major and minor topside and machinery repairs.

U.S. GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Customs port of entry.

Immigration and Naturalization Service alien entry port.

Public Health Service out-patient officer care available.

WATERFRONT INDUSTRIAL SITES

(a) Twenty acres, 700-foot harbor frontage. Development must be associated with the harbor.

(b) On Menomonee River: 4 acres, 800-foot river frontage (500 feet on 21-foot channel).

There are several industrial parks under development and numerous industrial sites in the Milwaukee area, including several potentially available sites with channel frontage.

PORT AND INDUSTRIAL INFORMATION

Population (1950 census), 637,400; bank deposits (1958), $1,478,000,000.

For additional port and rate information, contact: Board of Harbor Commissioners, room 710, City Hall, Milwaukee 2, Wis.

For additional industrial location information, contact: Industrial Development Coordinator, mayor's office, City Hall, Milwaukee 2, Wis.; Board of Harbor Commissioners, room 710, City Hall, Milwaukee 2, Wis.; Industrial Division, Milwaukee Association of Commerce, 611 North Broadway, Milwaukee 2, Wis.; Division of Industrial and Port Development, Governor's office, Madison 2, Wis.

## Dangers of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to invite attention to an article appearing in the February 24 edition of the Idaho State Journal, published in Pocatello, Idaho. The article points up very strongly the dangers of inflation and the current trend toward checkbook money. The column, "Buzz of the Burg," is written by Mr. G. Nicholas Ifft under the pen name of ING.

The article follows:

BUZZ OF THE BURG

(By ING)

All of us should be worried about certain Democratic spending proposals in Congress which would throw the Government billions of more dollars in the red. But we don't suppose the American people will insist on Government economy and pay-as-we-go tax financing until the public clearly understands how inflation works in our modern checkbook money system. When a billion is raised by taxation, it is paid as-we-go, once and for all. The billion-dollar tax burden averages about $20 for each of our approximately 50 million households. (This assumes, as most economists do today, that the consumer pays, directly or indirectly, practically all taxes no matter on whom they are originally levied.) But when the Government borrows money from the banking system, it is an entirely different story. The Treasury signs promissory notes or bonds for the desired amount. Our commercial banks accept a Government bond or note as if it were a cash deposit. The Government then writes checks on such deposits, to pay, for example, a military plane manufacturer. The manufacturer deposits the Government checks in his company's bank account. In turn, he writes checks to pay his workers, and his bills for aluminum, electronic plane equipment, etc.

Unlike money collected in taxes, the borrowing process has created a billion dollars that did not exist before, and put it into circulation. This flow of new checkbook money inflates our total money supply just as surely as if the Government had printed a billion in paper "greenbacks" and spent that instead.

The borrowed billion is a comparatively modest dose of inflation, but it can milk the family pocketbook considerably in a year's time.

When a regular tax measure was proposed before Congress in 1775, to purchase some badly needed supplies for George Washington's army, a Congressman exclaimed:

"Do you think, gentlemen, that I will consent to load my constituents with taxes, when we can send to our printer and get a wagonload of money, two dozen sheets of which will pay the whole expense we are considering?"

So popular was this viewpoint among friends of the people in that and succeeding Congresses that wagonloads of money were printed; prices went skyward; by 1781 $5 in Continental currency was worth 1 copper penny; business chaos resigned for a while, and the phrase "Not worth a Continental" originated.

In the past 180 years we have learned better than to promote paper money inflation to escape taxes. Nowadays we do it with checkbook money.

---

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

---

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

# Appendix

## Jackson Day Dinner Address Delivered by Hon. Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 21, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] spoke at Springfield, Mo., on the occasion of our annual Jackson Day dinner.

We in Missouri were privileged to play host to Senator MUSKIE. We know him as a gracious gentleman and a true servant of the people.

His speech on that occasion was inspirational to all of us who had the opportunity to hear him.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE, OF MAINE, AT SPRINGFIELD, MO., FEBRUARY 21, 1959

I can think of a number of reasons why it is good to be in Missouri.

First of all, there was the cordial invitation extended to me by your distinguished Senators, STU SYMINGTON and TOM HENNINGS, and your able Congressman, CHARLIE BROWN. To my previous awareness of their impressive records of public service, I have been privileged to add the warmth and friendliness of personal association. The fact that outstanding Americans of this stature should welcome such a contribution as I can make to this great gathering is a compliment I could not ignore. Secondly, I have long had a healthy curiosity about the State which entered the Union at the same time as my own State of Maine. The compromise, which made possible that historic coincidence, reflected sharp differences in public opinion with respect to the great political issues which were involved; but, more important, it was symbolic of the fact that, in America, such differences can be resolved, given mutual respect, patience, understanding, and good will.

Thirdly, I have enjoyed my associations in the Governors' conference with your personable and capable Governor, Jim Blair, who has a commonsense knack of striking to the core of a problem which is familiar to one accustomed to dealing with practical, down-to-earth Maine Yankees.

Finally, this is the home of Harry Truman—the man who made great decisions with the sure touch and unhesitating courage of a man of clear vision—with an instinctive understanding of the importance of firm and positive leadership in his high office. Our times would be different and far more fearful but for this fact.

It is appropriate that Democrats should gather from time to time as you have here, tonigh. It is understandable that we should indulge in a little partisan rejoicing over the victories which swept the country from coast to coast—from Maine in September to Alaska in late November. It is proper that we take stock of yesterday's results and tomorrow's prospects—which have never looked brighter. It is an opportunity to gain inspiration and enthusiasm from each other's presence. More important, it provides an opportunity to reevaluate our party's meaning for ourselves, our neighbors, and our children.

There has never been a time in our country's history when such a reevaluation was so vital to our survival and our well-being as it is today. We love freedom. We believe in the dignity and the worth of the individual. We hold that a society which recognizes and implements these principles is best calculated to achieve happiness for each of us and for our neighbors. Today, all of this is in deadly danger, and can not survive unless we are alert to the danger and willing to mobilize all our resources to meet the threat—intelligently, effectively, and immediately.

Over the long years of its great history, the Democratic Party has demonstrated a sensitivity to the objectives of a free society, an alertness to the challenges and opportunities of each new day, and a willingness to move forward in the face of great obstacles and difficulties, which has been unmatched among political parties. This is not to say that every Democrat who ever lived has been, and is, more effective than any Republican who ever lived. We know this is not so. It is not to say the Democratic Party has always measured up fully to the responsibilities of any given day. We know this is not so. It is to say that, on the Record, the Democratic Party has been a party of great achievements and that it will continue to be if we, who are entrusted with the stewardship of its affairs, will fortify ourselves with the best of its traditions.

What is required today?

Let me give you some thoughts expressed by Thomas Jefferson in 1816 in a discussion of the relationship between men and their governments:

"I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with. But I know also that laws and institutions must go hand-in-hand with the progress of the human mind. As new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

Expressed and implicit in these words are some impressive beliefs:

1. That change, new and more difficult problems, unforseen circumstances, are inevitable in human affairs.

2. That the human mind and the human spirit are capable of recognizing and adjusting to them.

3. That society and governments must be so constructed as to give free play to this great potential for adaptability and change.

4. That our country has the resources—material, human and ideological—to meet any challenge, however great.

5. That our people, within the framework of a free society, have a capacity for growth which can carry them to even greater heights of achievement: but only if they are constantly stimulated by broad and wide-ranging thinking, and by imaginative and purposeful leadership.

I say these beliefs are impressive. This is so because, although they are as old as our country, they are a fresh and ever-flowing fountain of inspiration and reassurance at a time when confusion tends to blur our vision, when doubt tends to paralyze action, when timidity and fear of the unknown feature tends to blunt our instinctive urge to grapple with the problems of the day in their full dimensions.

At the age of 81, with his youth and vigor far behind him, Jefferson said, in a letter to a friend:

"Men by their constitution, are naturally divided into two parties. Those who fear and distrust the people—those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe depository of the public interest."

I don't know what kind of a program Jefferson would present to us if he were President today. I don't know what, specifically, he would have proposed to do about the budget, education, the Soviet menace, our military posture, labor-management relations, or any of the host of problems which beset us. There are those who indulge themselves in the game of speculating upon such things for the purpose of suggesting Jefferson's approval or disapproval of some point of view. Jefferson himself was not so presumptuous. Many times, he warned against those who ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment.

I do know that Jefferson's attention was always focused on the ultimate objective of a free society—the advancement and well-being of the people. I know that his versatile and searching mind was not restricted by the straitjacket of outmoded and outworn ideas and methods, however worthwhile they may have been yesterday. I am confident that he would have chosen means and methods suited to the dimensions of the tasks with which we are confronted. He would have believed today, as he believed in his own day, that there is a greater risk in standing still than in moving forward, that a problem is not solved by half measures, that a problem does not disappear because it is ignored: That, above all, the American people are willing, able, and eager to know the truth, to understand the truth, and to assume the burdens and sacrifices which the truth indicates they must assume. I believe this about Jefferson because he understood the nature and the responsibility of leadership in a free society—leadership as demonstrated by the Jacksons, the Lincolns, the Roosevelts, the Wilsons, the Trumans.

What is the truth?

The truth today is that our position in the world, by any standard of measurement we chose to use, is incomparably weaker than at any other time since the dark days of World War II. The truth today is that there is less than full realization of this fact, and that there should be and must be if we are to make the hard decisions which are indicated. The truth today is that we are not being called upon to make the supreme effort that those in a position to know the facts should realize must be made. The truth today is that there is a lack of faith among

too many that we have the resources, the stamina, and the guts to do all that must be done.

To these people of little faith, those who indulge in creative thinking are radicals.

To these people of little faith, those who honestly expose our weaknesses as a challenge to greater effort are purveyors of gloom and doom.

To these people of little faith, those who believe that a given problem cannot be solved without a greater effort are spenders.

To these people of little faith, our growth has stabilized at a level which holds little promise of greater things to come. In speaking of people, I am not thinking of individuals or of particular parties. I am, rather, personalizing an apathy, a complacency, and a stagnation in thinking which is seeping out into the country and which can destroy us before a foreign enemy can get the chance.

To point out this weakness is not to say that the alternatives are prodigal spending, wasteful effort, or a frenzy of activity to do everything which comes to mind. There are things which government must do. There are other things which government should not do. There is a great broad area of desirable activity as to which we must be discriminating and intelligent in assigning proper priorities. There is room in this area for differences of opinion—differences which can and ought to exist as between the executive and legislative branches of government—differences which can and ought to exist as between Members of the legislative branch. It is only by exposing these differences, by subjecting them to the crossfire of debate that we can work out sound and enduring answers.

The current concept that the Congress has no prerogative and no duty to think independently, to reach independent conclusions, and to act independently in its sphere of activity is destructive of the very vitality of our democratic process. It must not be allowed to prevail.

It is in the area of things that must be done, that we must give our concentrated and immediate attention.

This has to do with our national survival—not just as an independent, geographically identifiable state—but as a vital, meaningful force which, by its leadership and by its example, can lift the world upward to ever higher levels of social and economic progress for men and women everywhere. Unless we are the latter, we will not always be the former. This suggests, I hope, that we are concerned with more than Maginot line security. We are concerned with more than a retaliatory capability which can destroy our potential enemy. We are concerned with more—and I should say something far different—than political domination of other areas of the world. We are concerned with demonstrating here, at home, and to the peoples overseas that our way of life does give us strength, that it does enable us to prevail over those who would destroy us, and that it is the last best hope of little people everywhere who yearn for opportunity, dignity, and freedom.

I say that we are concerned with this—and I mean concern with an emotion that we have never had to feel before. Our policies and programs since our beginnings have been based on the assumption that we had resources to burn, that no other nation could match them, that our way of life and our institutions had an irresistible attraction for peoples not privileged to enjoy them—the assumption of manifest superiority.

This is asumption that is no longer valid. What we are, what we have, and what we offer, are being weighed on the balance against the supposed attractions of an alien system. We are being judged by peoples who are not advocates of either democracy or communism, but who are concerned as to their own status in life and its improvement. To these peoples, we are no longer manifestly superior.

To capture their minds and hearts—and there are more than a billion of them—it is necessary that we utilize to the maximum every resource at our disposal—material, human, and ideological. We must live our national life with a fire, and enthusiasm, and a confidence in ourselves that we have always found it possible to summon in times of national crisis.

What does maximum utilization require?

It requires, first of all, that we become a progressively stronger economic force in the world, gaining strength not only for ourselves, but for peoples everywhere who seek to develop an economic climate favorable to the recognition of the dignity and worth of the individual.

It requires, secondly, the establishment of a military posture which is dynamic, not static; which utilizes to the full the tools of scientific research; and which unhesitatingly and firmly seizes every advantage and makes maximum use of every new development which promises to strengthen our sinews. Such a posture is the shield behind which we can mobilize the economic and ideological strength which will give us the ultimate victory.

Thirdly, that we develop every resource here at home. Measured by the tasks to be performed, there is plenty of work for all our people and they must all be kept busy to the limit of their skills and their capacities. We do not have enough scientists. We do not have enough teachers. We do not have enough doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, technicians of all kinds. Everywhere we turn, we find shortages of skills. Who says there isn't enough work to keep all Americans employed? There is work begging to be done. How do we fit the square pegs in the round holes?

One great bridge between the man and the job is the educational process. This isn't to say that with the proper school we can train anyone to do anything. It isn't to say that the answer to current unemployment is to send everyone to school. It is to say that we have great unfilled needs in the field of human skills, that we are doing too little about it, and that we cannot retain the image of America as the strength and hope of the world unless we utilize every potential talent which we have wherever it may be found. It is time to deal with a national problem by providing a national answer to it.

These are the kind of great challenges to which the Democratic Party traditionally rises. These are the great crises of the kind which the Democratic Party has always been eager and willing to meet. These are the needs for great leadership of the kind which the Democratic Party has so often been able to provide.

We won't do it today, or tomorrow, by sitting on our hands. We will not do it today, or tomorrow, by smugly glorying in past victories. We will not do it today, or tomorrow, without thinking without taking the people into our confidence—without asserting the creative and productive capacity which lies in the hearts and minds of a free people.

Someone once said, "The road that stretches before the feet of a man is a challenge to his heart long before it tests the strength of his legs." What he was saying is that the heart is often capable of greater decisions than the mind. The heart of America is its secret weapon.

## The American Bar Association Has Failed the American Public, and Its Patriotic and Loyal Members Should Follow Chief Justice Earl Warren Out of This Organization

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by calling upon the Congress to modify the effect of key civil liberties decisions of the Supreme Court, the house of delegates of the American Bar Association seems to be saying that it is a better judge of the Constitution than the highest Court in the United States. Nothing, in fact, could be farther from the truth.

I include here an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, together with a letter to the New York Times written by Jefferson B. Fordham, dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 5, 1959]

BAR'S MORNING AFTER

No one can blame President Ross L. Malone of the American Bar Association for valiantly trying to prove that his organization's house of delegates was not in contempt of court last week. By calling upon Congress to modify the effect of key civil liberties decisions of the Supreme Court, the ABA's house of delegates seemed—to laymen, at least—to be saying that it was a better judge of the Constitution than the highest Court in the land. But President Malone, in a speech at Syracuse, N.Y., now assures us that the delegates were talking about some other fellow. The lawyers were "not in any sense attacking the Court," explains Mr. Malone, but were only suggesting improvements in the security laws. However, the action of the Philadelphia Bar Association in repudiating the implied criticisms of the Supreme Court suggests that Mr. Malone's colleagues know that the main target was hardly the Weather Bureau.

Mr. Malone, along with other high officials of the association, is a lawyer held in high esteem; his organization performs many important and salutary functions. Yet bar association members are not invested with infallibility in judging the Supreme Court. It ought to infuse some humility among the association's zealots to recall the instance on March 14, 1916, when seven former ABA presidents told a Senate committee that a nominee to the Supreme Court was not a fit person to hold that high office. The Justice in question was Louis D. Brandeis. That unhappy incident caused considerable blushing in later years, and perhaps the same will yet be true of the house of delegates' more recent attempt to place the Court before the bar.

---

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1959]

LAWYERS GROUP CRITICIZED—BAR ASSOCIATION SAID TO ALINE ITSELF WITH LAY CRITICS OF COURT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

By action of its house of delegates taken on February 24 the American Bar Associa-

tion failed the American public in interpreting for the citizens the work of the Supreme Court in our constitutional and legal system. What the bar association did, in short, was to aline itself with lay critics of the Court. I am grieved that this is so.

On that date the house of delegates adopted recommendations put forth by the association's special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. These recommendations began by declaring that it was the duty of members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks and expressed disapproval of proposals to limit Supreme Court jurisdiction.

They went on, however, to laud the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the House Un-American Activities Committee for their records and accomplishments and great service to the Nation and to recommend a number of changes in Federal legislation.

In calling for changes in Federal legislation the house of delegates has left a very strong impression that the reason it is considered to be needful is the bad job the Supreme Court is thought to have done in interpreting the Constitution and Federal statutes, the latter in particular. To suggest statutory change is one thing, to imply that it is needed due to bad work by the highest Court is another.

EFFECT ON SECURITY

I simply do not believe that any weakening effect on internal security has been shown or that the association's attack on the Court can be effectively sustained on a lawyer-like basis. The decisions that the Court has made in cases involving security problems have been supported by legal reasoning and methods of interpretation which are familiar to members of the legal profession and generally respected.

It is, for example, a well-understood and well-accepted doctrine in constitutional interpretation that a constitutional question is to be avoided in the interpretation of a statute if this can be done without violence to the measure examined in its totality. Yet when the Court followed this doctrine in the Yates case and thereby made it unnecessary to pass upon a serious question as to the constitutionality of the Smith Act, the critics of the Court seemed to be able to see nothing but the fact that the result in the case was not to their liking. The ABA would so change the Smith Act, as to present squarely the substantive constitutional question which, under the present language, the Court was able to avoid in the Yates case.

The action of the house of delegates discloses strong preoccupation with matters of internal security rather than with the protection of civil liberty. I do not suggest that lawyers have no proper concern with internal security. But I must say that I find a serious imbalance reflected in the action of the house of delegates. In my system of values, the preeminent concern of lawyers, as individuals and as a group, is with human liberty. Security does not mean much to me except as a means of preserve the conditions under which there will exist maximum freedom for individual human expression and fulfillment.

APPLAUSE FOR COURT

The bar association action has a Maginot Line psychology. For my part, I am glad to record the opinion that instead of being charged by the organized bar with reaching decisions inimical to our internal security, the Supreme Court should be warmly applauded by the profession for its fidelity to the substantive and procedural safeguards of the Bill of Rights and for its interpretation of statutes in keeping with the spirit of the Bill of Rights.

When it comes to recommendations for substantive legislation I think the A.B.A. should assert leadership in the realm of civil rights and civil liberties. For years the committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives has been very active and strongly supported, while the committee on the Bill of Rights has languished.

Considered as recommendations for legislative change the bar association proposals are vulnerable. I invite particular attention to the proposal that Congress specifically provide that State statutes forbidding sedition against the United States be enforceable concurrently with the Smith Act.

The Smith Act was interpreted in the Nelson case to supersede a Pennsylvania State sedition law so far as sedition against the United States was concerned The State supreme court had held that, as to sedition against the United States, the Smith Act superseded the State law The Supreme Court of the United States agreed with this.

Is not national security a national responsibility? How would it aid to leave each State free to have its own law and enforcement machinery on this subject? I can see in such a system ample grist for the mill of politically ambitious local prosecutors, with the attendant hazards to fair play and civil liberty, but I do not delude myself with the notion that the cause of national security would be served.

JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM.

PHILADELPHIA, *February 26, 1959.*

---

## Area Development—Address by Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in Detroit on Monday, March 2, the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency held a hearing on the necessity and nature of Federal assistance in area redevelopment in the several States. Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and WALLACE F. BENNETT of Utah sat as the subcommittee. I hope and believe much of value was developed during this hearing and I feel the statement of the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, reflects the view which I hope will prevail in our action in the field of area redevelopment.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This statement is given in support of the area redevelopment bill offered by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and others.

The bill is of interest to Michigan, and its passage is urged in the hope of returning to their regular employment the people of Michigan and the entire Nation.

A Michigan industrial building authority program which I have recommended to the State legislature complements the Douglas bill under consideration. It would permit Michigan to insure loans for construction of manufacturing or industrial research facilities up to 90 percent with a maximum of $1 million on any one project.

This program, in conjunction with our great banking and finance institutions, our excellent local industrial development groups, is not only an expression of confidence in our industrial future, it would, if passed, provide an actual instrument by which industry would be encouraged to begin or expand in Michigan. It would almost certainly mean the 35 percent of local financing required under the Douglas bill would be available in every deserving case.

Michigan has 21 areas where there is a substantial labor surplus. It is our objective that work be provided for these people so that Michigan's economy may return to normal.

Because Michigan is the Nation's outstanding industrial State, the effect of national conditions is felt here to a greater extent than in most States. Provisions contained in this bill would enable Michigan to advance its program of industrial development and diversification.

The automotive industry has introduced many innovations in its product, which is far different from what it was half a century ago. Engineers who pioneered improvements in the product have also made innovations in manufacture. The latest step in this direction is greater automation in our industrial plants.

Eventually, automation should bring greater employment in related industries and services, but at present, it is causing great dislocation of employment.

Provisions in this bill for technical assistance and vocational training would be of great benefit to Michigan in the transition period.

Michigan has the assets and advantages for industry. It could make ready use of the assistance mentioned in the bill under consideration.

There are potential manufacturers who could become small employers and grow to be large ones with the financial assistance provided in the bill. These types of manufacturing are of particular interest to us in Michigan because our State has the labor skills, management know-how, market, natural resources and other advantages which provide a healthful environment for industry, both new and established.

Some of our cities, such as Detroit, Grand Rapids, Muskegon, Flint, Pontiac, and others, have experienced high percentages of unemployment because of general national conditions, and the loss of defense contracts by Michigan firms when the Federal Government changed its emphasis from surface vehicles to airplanes and missiles following the Korean conflict.

In northern Michigan, which includes our Upper Peninsula and a portion of the Lower Peninsula, manufacturing employment reached a peak of 40,000 in World War II. It has now dropped to 35,000. Economists estimate it will not again reach its wartime peak until 1970, under present conditons. We cannot wait that long for the situation to rectify itself.

The same condition holds in other areas of Michigan, except that the numbers are greater.

These conditions point up the need for redevelopment in a number of our industrial areas. It is well known that the airplane and missile production was built up on our coasts, particularly in California, with Federal funds made available for new production facilities, equipment, and machinery. I am not urging nor suggesting that any other areas be robbed to build up Michigan. Rather, I urge greater consideration to Michigan in the awarding of defense contracts. This could be accomplished, in part, under this bill through providing assistance for the enlarging and expansion of research and development centers. Michigan has been a leader in certain of these fields, particularly in that of heavy metals. Greater work in this direction would expedite the space vehicle program.

Why is Michigan a fertile field for redevelopment projects as outlined in the bill under consideration?

Michigan has the human and natural resources which industry needs. It is the heart of the Great Lakes area, the Nation's largest and fastest growing consumer and industrial market. It has the world's greatest supply of fresh water and it has adequate transportation.

In Michigan's highly trained labor force are found 81 percent of all the skills listed by the Bureau of the Census. Those not found in Michigan are in industries generally unsuited basically to our State.

The need for area development and alleviation of underemployment on a long-range basis is probably more important in Michigan than elsewhere. This is because of a large population increase since the beginning of World War II and forecasts of even greater increases.

Since 1949, Michigan's population has increased 22 percent. In the Detroit suburban area, including Wayne County, outside the city of Detroit, Oakland, and Macomb Counties, there has been a population growth of 67.7 percent since 1950. That means the population of that area increased 727,161 from 1,074,474 in 1950 to 1,801,635 in 1958.

A large number of Michigan's additional people are children. In the last decade, the number of Michigan people under 20 years of age has increased by 854,000, about 42 percent. Estimates are that between 1957 and 1960 we will gain an additional 300,000 residents under the age of 20 years. While the general population increase since 1949 has been 22 percent, the number of children in our public schools has increased by 53 percent. This presents the need for a long-range industrial development program so that there will be employment opportunity for all Michigan boys and girls when they complete their education and are ready to enter the fields of business and industry.

When Michigan was the arsenal of democracy during the great conflicts in Europe, the Pacific, and Korea, workers from other States were attracted here to bring our work force to a level that would meet demands of the armed services. Many of them remained.

The Federal Bureau of the Census reports that Michigan is the fastest growing State in the Nation, with the exception of Florida and California.

Following Korea, there was some defense work, but with the shift from surface vehicles to airplanes, defense contracts awarded Michigan firms has decreased. Defense contracts in 1953, in terms of employment meant 200,000 jobs. At present, the number engaged in work on defense contracts is 50,000, a decrease of 150,000 workers or 75 percent of the work force of 5 years ago.

This condition, alone, without any population increase, necessitates area development programs planning to relieve long-range unemployment.

The State and local agencies are engaged in programs of industrial development. Their work would be greatly aided through the Federal program outlined in this bill.

Would area development programs, as outlined, succeed in Michigan? It is my opinion they would be successful and benefit our State economically.

They would succeed because Michigan has a force of productive workers including virtually every skill. It has management know-how and outstanding productive methods. Michigan workers have a vested interest in the well-being of their State. This is evidenced by the fact that in Michigan 67.5 percent of our homes are owner occupied, as compared with a national average of 55 percent.

Michigan has the world's largest limestone quarry. It is first in the Nation in production of salt and natural salines, gypsum and lime. It is second among all States in production of iron ore. It is second in sand, gravel and stone.

Michigan has 19 million acres of forest land that now produce close to 1 million cords of wood annually. This production is expected to be increased 10 times in the near future.

These human and natural resources would allow for area development in any section of Michigan where there is underemployment. A Federal area development program would be of material assistance.

Michigan's great universities and colleges are centers of extensive technological and scientific knowledge which would be available to new industry in Michigan. They provide opportunity for management and supervisory personnel to gain additional technical knowledge.

Michigan has adequate electric power and most areas have natural gas available. These are of great importance to industry.

The St. Lawrence Seaway will be opened this year, making ocean ports of some of our cities located on the Great Lakes. This will be a distinct advantage for industry engaged in foreign trade. It should hasten diversity, particularly if there is a Federal program available.

The area development bill under consideration could implement immediately, or at the latest in the near future, a program to bring back into proper focus our employment problem. It is a bill of particular interest to Michigan, but should be helpful to every State. I strongly recommend that the Congress adopt it.

## Think Anew, Act Anew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech I made before the San Francisco County Republican Central Committee last February 10 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINK ANEW, ACT ANEW

(Address by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the San Francisco County Republican Central Committee, Elks Club, San Francisco, Calif., February 10, 1959)

I suggest that a very special and fundamental responsibility devolves upon each of us who continues his basic Republican allegiance at Lincoln's natal celebration in 1959. For the strength of the traditionally American two-party system becomes pretty much of a question of what we Republicans now do and now say. That the system of two strong parties, not three or four or eight or ten—and God help us, not one—represents one of the greatest assurances for the maintenance of our free American political system no reasonable citizen can deny. The splinter parties of some Western nations which require patchwork coalition ministries do not fit the American pattern. And the one-party system—the "one party or else" doctrine of Russia and of communism generally—is as painfully clear an example as I know of why the American people will never, never embrace the Red ideologies of Moscow. Our conception of freedom includes freedom of choice at the ballot box. It is unquestionably true that the two-party system, American style, has effectively prevented the destruction of individual liberty which the one-party Communist system has enforced.

Thus, for us who constitute the presently remaining membership of the minority party in California and in much of the United States what we do, what we say, as partisans, will have a telling—perhaps I can fairly say a crucial—impact upon the future of our wonderfully unique kind of personal and political freedom which the Colonies of 1776 fought for and won and sought to preserve in constitutional guarantees, and for which Mr. Lincoln, one of the greatest leaders in the cause of freedom in all recorded history, gave almost all his adult years, and gave his life as well.

What then, my fellow Republicans, can we now do, or begin to do, to attract to our banner men and women who are registered in the Democratic Party or who are registered in neither party, or who—though registered Republicans—habitually stay at home or habitually vote against Republicans?

Can we not first agree that the Republican Party deserves to win only when it represents the better, or the best, means of assuring the maintenance of our free constitutional system? This must be true, and we recognize that, on many occasions, maybe almost all, that question is entirely a matter of opinion of the people. And on many, many occasions, let the record show, the people of our State and country have voted Republican. I predict they will again.

Is it not also true that the best means of assuring—or of honestly trying to assure—the maintenance of this free Republic, is to chart our course, our partisan and our political course, as Americans as well as Republicans, on one basis and one alone—the old textbook maxim, "the greatest good for the greatest number"?

Mr. Churchill said to the American Congress in the early days of the war that in his father's time in Great Britain, it was deemed that government was meant "for the few and for the very few." He and his political party overcame that special interest creed when they came into power in England in the early days of World War II. The exhilarating path for Republicans to travel in 1959 is the way of government for the many and for the very many.

Mr. Chairman, friends, Lincoln and his fellow Republicans were abused and denounced in their day, a century ago, as dreamers and political radicals. Is there not some basis here, now, in this new era of human life, for us to rededicate our party to the Lincoln role, the role of neither dreamers nor radicals, but the role of one group of fellow citizens whose love of man's freedom strengthens them and gives them courage to keep it and, beyond that, to share it with all humankind?

It is the people—the best interests of all the people—which our Republican Party must strive to serve. That is the Lincoln tradition. And that is the way, my fellow Republicans, by which I believe the rehabilitation of our honorable political party must surely come.

This great century-old, free Republican Party of ours came into existence by the courage of those Americans who were determinded to wipe out human bondage and to push on our frontier to the Pacific Ocean limits of this North American Continent. And it is in precisely that same spirit of man's freedom of opportunity and of life, and of a never-ending pioneering for new

hopes and aspirations for all humankind which must rekindle our partisan spirit as we look forward to the presidential and congressional election of 1960.

The Republican Party must, and ought to, attract to its cause men and women from every walk of life and from every creed and color and race. Thus Lincoln's philosophy will live on in our party. We are, and we should be, dedicated to human freedom. We are an American party, and thus eternally dedicated to America and America's welfare. We ought to gain our strength as our country gains her strength: from having among our members citizens of diverse religious and racial ancestry, and from every walk and segment of our national life.

We are not, and we do not intend to be, a party of extremists. We seek man's progress by avoiding the two opposing poles on the political spectrum. We believe that man is entitled to a reasonable compensation for his toil, and we respect the virtues of thrift and savings. Thus, we want to consider the problems of both the wage earner and the person living on a fixed income. Republicans believe in free enterprise, but we do not intend to permit any group to take advantage of the people as a whole. We believe there is a national interest in the health and the economic well-being of all our people without condemning them to the regimentation of a welfare state. We believe there is a national interest in the proper education of our youth, regardless of color, and we applaud the Federal Government's record of reclamation assistance to western America under a policy initiated by the Republican Roosevelt over 50 years ago. We accept the responsibility of leadership in the cause of a just peace in the world, and we extend our hand of friendship to free peoples all around the globe.

To be given the people's faith, the Republican Party cannot be antilabor, organized or unorganized, nor can it be prolabor either. Labor reform legislation, on a national level, is long overdue and Republicans need here to keep the public interest uppermost in mind. We have had, alas, Republicans who have almost genuflected before some labor leaders. Those Republicans are just as offensive to the public weal as those other Republicans who automatically say "No" to anything which organized labor through their leaders espouses. In this connection, I suggest that we cannot shift with the winds. We cannot in one election campaign exalt the right of labor to bargain collectively, and to enjoy job security, and then, in the next election, advocate legislation to destroy job security or to undermine collective bargaining.

With equal finality, we, the Republican Party, decline to act as the political advocate of any business organization or individual, or, for that matter, of any special interest group, as against the great unorganized body of people as a whole. To the contrary, we—Republicans—ought, I think, now to rededicate our party to the splendid theme: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest may repair."

Republicans, there is a tremendous record of constructive accomplishment by our party during these last 6 years. The earnest thanks of peace-loving Americans go to Dwight Eisenhower for helping to deter aggression and for fending off the terrible hazards of a red hot global conflict. America is waging peace. At home, in the early days of this administration, we banished wage controls and price controls when many of our Democratic colleagues demanded that they be continued as a part of what they called the needs of a planned economy in peacetime. The phony misnamed "excess profits" tax, with its unfair and uneven impact on business, was scrapped, as it ought to have been, over the anguished objections from the other side of the aisle. Excise taxes, on a Federal level, generally have been cut under this Administration. Small business has been given tax relief. I think Republicans brought back a decent measure of fiscal sanity.

In the Lincoln field of human dignity, we passed the first civil rights law since the Civil War, and we did it over frenetic Democratic objections.

My fellow Republicans, all problems confronting our Nation are minor when measured against the threat to our national life and the lives of our people posed by international communism, and the policies which Soviet Russia has consistently practiced for at least the last 25 years, and her growing potential to wage nuclear war. All of us now know that from the date of our official recognition of Russia down through the years of the Second World War, the Russian Government, although professedly an ally in the war, was unremittingly advancing its secret policies aimed at the destruction of all free institutions. Soviet policy has utilized the techniques of indoctrination and propaganda. Infiltration has been advanced by two groups: First, the professional espionage agents who successfully sought secret information of a military character, particularly with reference to the atomic bomb; and second, the followers organized into cells and carefully nurtured in the deadly teachings which already have caused infinite damage to Western civilization.

Ever since the Second World War, the Western Powers have sought to achieve a lasting peace rooted in international law and justice. The beginning of these efforts was the Atlantic Charter, and continued through innumerable war and post-war conferences of varying effectiveness but the most productive of which was in this beautiful city when the Charter of the United Nations came into being.

Long before the war was well underway, Soviet wrecking crews were busily engaged in their deadly work. In the end they broke up the wartime alliance, violated war and postwar agreements, virtually paralyzed the United Nations with its "Nyet" and thus far have prevented any successful agreement for effective control of atomic warfare. The so-called peace treaties signed by Russia with the former Balkan States were only a means to achieve complete political subjugation of them. Now, some 17 have gone down the drain.

Now the Soviets have offered a new challenge to the West. They have handed us an ultimatum with a time limit, telling us to get out of Berlin or risk an all-out atomic war.

This is no idle threat, and we cannot be lulled into any false appraisal of Soviet motives or intentions, despite Mr. Mikoyan's charming suggestion that we must forget the past and look to the future. The Kremlin has been able to exploit, periodically, the earnest desire of the West to discover reasonable motives in Soviet policies by launching policies of peaceful coexistence. "We will bury you," you will remember Nikita S. Khrushchev has said, speaking about us, while his Chinese counterpart, Mao Tse-tung has declared:

"Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. * * * Yes, we are advocates of the omnipotence of the revolutionary war, which * * * is good and is Marxist."

We have come to believe that dictators do mean what they say, a belief founded upon the painful experience of finally discovering that Hitler's "Mein Kampf" was a complete and factual statement of future Nazis' plans and actions.

Perhaps a fitting contemporary illustration of this thesis is furnished us by putting in juxtaposition the following news item which appeared in a recent wire service news story from the town of Presque Isle, Maine:

"The management of the Presque Isle Star-Herald has reason to believe there must be news of international interest in its columns. The Aroostook County weekly said the Washington Embassies of the Soviet Union and the Polish Peoples Republic recently have ordered 1-year subscriptions. Presque Isle is the site of the Air Force Base which soon will be one of the Nation's first operational Snark guided missile sites."

This is only one form of the Soviet threat. At the 21st Communist Party Congress in Moscow a few days ago, Soviet Premier Khrushchev predicted that the balance of world economic power will soon shift to the Communist bloc. And by 1970, Khrushchev argues that the Soviet Union will outstrip the United States in productive capacity.

Soviet successes in achieving the goals set in their new 7-year plan between now and 1965, will, according to the Soviet Premier, "attract millions of new adherents to socialism and bring about changes not only in our country, but in the whole world."

While we may doubt the validity of these assumptions, we cannot afford to be sanguine about this newest form of Soviet competition. For Khrushchev reiterated his confidence that it will be by success in this economic competition that Communism will triumph on the world scene.

The administration views these threats in their true dimensions. The President has declared our intention to maintain our defense forces in sufficient size to meet both the possibility of limited war and to retain their fundamental role of deterring all-out aggression. Unlike the Soviet's, our objectives are not conquest and control of other peoples. The President declared in his state of the Union message:

"We seek victory not over any nation or people but over the ancient enemies of us all: victory over ignorance, poverty, disease, and human degradation wherever they may be found.

"We march in the noblest of causes—human freedom.

"If we make ourselves worthy of America's ideals, if we do not forget that our Nation was founded on the premise that all men are creatures of God's making, the world will come to know that it is freemen who carry forward the true promise of human progress and dignity."

Now there has been considrable discussion abroad in the land which questions the adequacy of our Armed Forces and weapons systems to meet the continuous military pressures of the Soviets. Let me remind you how difficult it is to answer charges about our defense posture. The President must weigh, in the most delicate manner, the advantage to other nations of any military or defense information made available to the American public. His recommendations for defense spending are always based on what the military joint chiefs of staff themselves recommend and, of course, on what the civilian service Secretaries and the Secretary of Defense recommend to him.

Listen to what the Secretary of Defense said to me, in writing, a few days ago:

"As Secretary of Defense naturally I have complete access to the best intelligence information available to this Nation. I also have the help of the top military brains in the country interpreting this information and developing a program to meet the threat to our national security.

"I can say to you that our present and planned programs adequately meet the requirement of protecting this Nation's security."

"This country must be in a position of sufficient retaliatory strength to deter a potential enemy from launching general war. We must be prepared to handle limited war situations effectively, so that our obvious readiness will deter such wars or keep them

small and handle them quickly. We have need of maintaining the defenses of the continental United States. We must keep open the sea lanes which are essential to maintaining our commitments with allies throughout the world. All these needs have been carefully considered.

"It is my belief that the program provided in the new budget meets these needs adequately. This is not only my belief, it is also the view of the President.

"Moreover, it is shared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who have said to me in writing that they consider that the fiscal year 1960 proposed expenditure figure is adequate to provide for the essential programs necessary for the defense of the Nation for the period under consideration. The Chiefs state that they find no serious gaps in the key elements of the budget in its present form. While expressing these views as to the adequacy of the overall programs, each Chief does of course express some reservations regarding some of the program items of his own service."

A concomitant of our military policy which is designed to insure national survival, has been our mutual security program. Initiated shortly after the Second World War, it has continued to be of fundamental importance to the western alliance. As the President put it, "The need for economic growth among the underdeveloped countries continues to be of paramount importance to the enlightened self-interest of the economically developed nations, especially our own."

Since 1954, the Communists have seized upon the social and economic aspirations of the free world's less fortunate peoples, as fertile ground in which to extend Communist influence. Of the world's population, now estimated at 2,800 million people, 35 percent, or 950 million, are under the control of the Sino-Soviet bloc; 25 percent, or 700 million people, are located in newly independent countries like the Sudan, Libya, Ghana, and so on, with the remaining 40 percent located in the free world. The Sino-Soviet bloc, during the last year, applied more of its resources to expanding trade and credit ties with less developed countries than in any similar period since the start of its economic campaign.

Such aid is highly concentrated on selected targets, with 5 of the 17 countries which receive Soviet aid being recipients of 90 percent of the total. These five are Afghanistan, the United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria), India, Indonesia, and Yugoslavia.

You can appreciate the relative facility with which Soviet policy can be adjusted quickly to seize the initiative in a moment's notice, whenever an opportunity is presented. The Kremlin needs consult nobody but itself in deciding what to do. Consider the much greater difficulty involved in a governmental system like our own, where agreement must be worked out between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, and thereafter, where foreign policy is involved, discussed with our free allies abroad.

Much of our concern must be with international affairs and the security of the Nation; yet all our efforts in this direction are pointed to one end, the right of each of us to develop along our own lines to the full extent of our ability.

But what of other problems confronting us? What is the Republican answer to domestic questions? Here I think Lincoln expressed what our philosophy ought to be when he said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

It is in keeping with this philosophy that the administration proposes to abandon altogether the model T machinery for helping farmers gain a fair price for their products and gear farm price supports to the open market.

The New York Times described current farm legislation as a chronic festering sore on the economy since it was adopted as an emergency measure at the outbreak of World War II. This legislation has cost the Treasury a billion dollars a year just to maintain storage facilities for farm surplus and nearly $5½ billion a year to carry out the price support program. I submit to you that this is not a legitimate object of government. "The need to reduce the incentives for excess production has been explicit in the three special messages I have previously sent to Congress," the President contended, and it remains to be seen whether the Congress, under Democratic control, will go along—and go along for the benefit of all the people.

"The material foundation of our national safety is a strong and expanding economy," the President declared in his state of the Union message, and central to that material foundation is the employment of every American at a job of his choice, in a place of his choice, and at a wage commensurate with his responsibility. We Republicans must support, as a national policy, legislation designed to encourage high employment and to protect the jobs of all Americans.

By the same token, we as Republicans believe the public interest requires labor reform legislation. Such legislation on a national scale is very long overdue. In the last Congress, I voted for such things as democracy in unions, including provisions for the secret ballot and specified terms for all offices, complete disclosure of union receipts and expenditures, with subpena power in the Secretary of Labor, and fines and jail sentences for failure to comply. I regret no legislation was enacted. I hope it will be this year.

Also central to a material foundation is an educational system which will insure adequate schooling to all our people. This does not mean that Government should supersede the States in their control of this historic function. It does mean that Government must continue its support of research especially in the physical sciences, but in the social sciences and the humanities as well. It does mean that our Nation must recognize a real relationship between education and survival. You may ask how much Government support? To that question no definitive answer can be given. No blanket program of massive aid-to-education is likely to achieve the promises of its advocates, although the fact is that the Federal Government has supplied aid to education since at least the time of Lincoln when the Land Grant College Act came into being.

As a party, we have an obligation to see to it that the teaching profession at all levels be made a more attractive work. We must attract greater participation in our party of young people and the members of the academic community. Plans to implement this idea are currently being developed and have the warmest support of the President.

There are many urgent problems confronting us as a Nation and as a party. For example, the crisis over civil rights precipitated by the public officials of some States to refuse to obey the law. We may remind our Democratic friends that the solution to the school problem offered by some members of their party has been to close the schools altogether. The Republican Party has been in the vanguard of equality before the law since its very inception. The civil rights law of the last Congress is the result of Republican leadership, and we have a right to be proud of that accomplishment.

Our party has a rich heritage, the central theme of which has been the greatest freedom for the individual consistent with the basic needs of society. We hold to that noble idea even more strongly today. Let us then, as Lincoln said, "Think anew, and act anew" to strengthen our party and to merit and to receive the people's faith. Republicans in the next century must continue to hold high the banner of human freedom, as our party's first President so nobly envisioned.

---

## Education in America for the Next 25 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Education in America for the Next 25 Years," by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of College Heights, Ark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN AMERICA FOR THE NEXT 25 YEARS

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

In planning an adequate program of education for America in the next 25 years, it is important to begin in 1959 with an adequate foundational program for all American youth and to expand it through 1984. It is not sufficient to plan for tomorrow only, but now is the accepted time. A number of factors should thus be considered.

1. THERE WILL BE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL HELP FOR EDUCATION FROM WASHINGTON

Expenditures for education have grown during the years in all areas, but quite often the growth has been too little to take care of the increased demands, as well as the fact that the financial support has always been deficient in providing an adequate program for all the youth of America. In 1900, $137,637,746 went for teachers' salaries, as compared with $4,200,542,000 in 1954. The overall expenditures of government have been more rapid than this. $476 million was spent by the Federal Government in 1902 and this increased to $72,710 million in 1956. During the same period of time the State expenditures went from $179 million to $18,390 million, and the local expenditures increased from $909 million to $21,374 million. The one major difficulty has been that the expenditures for education have not increased at the same rate.

From a percentage point of view, the Federal Government increased from 30 percent of the total expenditures in 1902 to 65 percent in 1956. The States remained about steady, going from 11 percent in 1902 to 16 percent in 1956, but the local sources declined greatly, from 58 percent in 1902 to 19 percent in 1956. The number of dollars increased for each, as noted above, but this is not reflected percentagewise. This indicates that public education must look to the Federal Government for additional financial support since this is where the major amount of money is and there is little indication that the shift percentagewise will develop in the other direction in the next 25 years. Also, the Federal Government is the only party that can supply ample money to all sections of the Nation and thus insure

an adequate foundational program for all youth. Then, too, the dollar now buys less, hence more are needed.

2. THERE WILL BE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL BUILDINGS

Once again the major amount of money for additional buildings must come from the Federal Government. Various sections of America reflected different points of view, according to the votes of Congress in 1958, and Congress has yet to vote the necessary funds. The most favorable opinion came from the Democratic Party members as a group and the East as a section. There was more opposition in the South. The Catholics are slightly more in favor of these financial expenditures than the Protestants. These factors are important for the local voters to check so a converting can be possible to this cause.

This point is further emphasized when numbers are considered. It is also important to consider sex so that adequate consideration is given to various programs of the schools. In 1900, there were 38,075 boys and 58,808 girls, or a total of 94,883 who were graduated from American high schools. This number increased to 1,318,700 in 1956, with 634,300 classified as boys, and 684,400 as girls. The number is constantly increasing, hence the need for classrooms and buildings are falling further behind and will continue to do so during the next 25 years unless relief is forthcoming now. It is neither wise nor desirable to reduce the schoolday in order to serve more students in the same buildings.

The need is also critical in higher education. In 1900, there were 22,173 men students and 5,237 women, or a total of 27,410. This number increased in 1956 to 198,233 men and 110,579 women, or a total of 308,812. Expressed another way, using more recent data, there were 3,258,556 students enrolled for full-time and part-time in degree-credit institutions during the fall of 1958, with the division being 2,110,426 men and 1,148,130 women.

One desirable way to reflect the extra money from the Federal Government for this purpose would be to pay off all public school, college, and university debts first and to also allow those debt-free districts and/or institutions equal financial credit based on attendance figures. This would not only free all debt limits but take pressure off existing and future budgets and thus indirectly aid other schools funds.

3. THERE WILL BE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL TEACHERS AND EXPANDED CURRICULA

The increase in student population would reflect a need for additional teachers. This is even more important when considered in light of class size. Class size is important to the welfare of the teachers and the students and has too long been abused. Most authorities recommend not more than 25 as the desirable size for classes, hence additional teachers would be needed on the basis of the school population divided by 25, with the teacher shortage becoming more apparent yearly.

Dr. Conant has pointed out that there are 21,000 school districts (high), but only about 4,000 are large enough to have a minimum of 100 in each graduating class. Two-thirds of the school population is located in the 4,000 districts. Reorganization of school districts would thus place the existing teachers more wisely as to need and service and point to where the additional ones should be placed. Again, it was Dr. Conant who noted the teacher's efficiency. In large schools, there are now 52 percent of the teachers, as against 35 percent in small schools, who have 30 or more hours of training in mathematics, who teach these subjects. In science, the difference is 78 percent versus 50 percent, but again the emphasis is on larger school districts to use existing teachers better.

There is need for greater consideration of an even broader program in the years ahead to provide adequate training for the students in the space age that will reflect the scientific phase on one side and the humanities phase on the other. We need to have citizens who are thus well balanced between the two.

The need for additional teachers and expanded curricula will not be met without more money from the Federal Government for education. If the U.S.S.R. can give adequate salaries and status to teachers, with many getting as high as $18,000, if they are leaders in the field, America needs to arise to the challenge.

4. THERE MUST BE HIGHER PRIORITY FOR EDUCATION IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET

While there is little chance for tax reduction in the years ahead, there will be resistance for tax increases. There will probably be slight tax increases through the period, but public education must share more in the existing tax dollar now in order to receive the slight increases with the passing of time. Since American children are our first national resource, it is imperative that the Federal Government accept the additional responsibilities now to insure a sound and adequate foundational program for all American youth. At least 10 percent of the current Federal budget must be channeled into such a program now and kept at this percentage for the next 25 years if we arrive at 1984 with an adequate educational program. Since it is fairly common for individuals to give 10 percent of their incomes for charities and religious programs, how can we expect less from Uncle Sam? Are you doing your part now to insure such a plan?

## The Triumph of Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 12, the Lincoln Club of Los Angeles held its annual Lincoln birthday dinner at the California Club, Los Angeles. I was privileged to be a guest and to listen to an excellent and outstanding program on the Great Emancipator. I have just received the text of one of the addresses of the evening, that delivered by the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, governor of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that this splendid speech be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE CECIL H. UNDERWOOD, GOVERNOR OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT THE LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY DINNER, SPONSORED BY THE LINCOLN CLUB, HELD AT THE CALIFORNIA CLUB, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., ON FEBRUARY 12, 1959

In behalf of my fellow West Virginians, I extend our greetings to the great State of California.

As an American, as a West Virginian, as a Republican, I am honored to join with you in the observance of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Of all the States in the Union, West Virginia owes most to President Lincoln. If there had been no Lincoln, there would probably be no State of West Virginia today. West Virginia is the only State in the Union created without the consent of the parent State and without the sanction of the Constitution; it was a war measure. President Lincoln's personal influence created widespread support among Members of Congress and the leaders of the new State.

After he had signed the Statehood Act, the President issued a public statement which included these words: "We can scarcely dispense with the aid of West Virginia in this trouble; much less can we afford to have her against us in Congress and in the field. Her brave and good men regard her admission into the Union as a matter of life or death. They have been true to the Union under several trials. We have so acted as to justify their hopes and we cannot fully retain their confidence and cooperation if we seem to break faith with them.

"The division of the State is dreaded as a precedent. But a measure made expedient by war is no precedent for times of peace. It is said that the admission of West Virginia is secession. Well, if we call it by that name, there is still difference enough between secession against the Constitution and secession in favor of the Constitution. I believe the admission of West Virginia into the Union is expedient."

He thus made ours the 35th star in the American flag. Your invitation to the Governor of West Virginia, the war-born State godfathered by Lincoln, to speak to you as you honor Lincoln has a special meaning to me.

Men are very unpermanent creatures. For most men, neither their memories nor the histories of their earthly attainments endure very far beyond their graves.

But our memories of rustic Abraham Lincoln, one of America's most magnificent patriots, has survived the finality of the grave. Indeed, he lives today. This beloved President preserved our Nation and endowed it with an ideology. His doctrine that men shall be free has bridged both time and distance and today is silently impregnated in the oppressed souls of millions of the world's peoples.

Freedom, even in this advanced era, has its enemies and it is a condition which requires hard labor to earn, is casually enjoyed and it is easy to lose.

An associate of mine recently attended an elaborate ehibition of watercolor paintings by college students in Mandalay, Burma.

The subjects of most of the paintings portrayed scenes which were, naturally, indigenous to Burma; elephants nudging logs in a teak forest, a crop of rice being harvested by a farmer and the happy members of his family, and religious scenes near the Buddhist shrines and the traditional pagodas.

Distinguishing this vast array of Asian art, exhibited near the steamy jungles of central Burma, and only a few miles distant from the expansive frontier of Communist China, were two paintings of Abraham Lincoln, America's historic symbol of freedom and liberty. Perhaps some personalities have had greater tributes bestowed upon them but it is improbable that any man was ever the beneficiary of a tribute more sincere.

The attitude of these two paintings was traditional Lincolnesque. One was a profile portrait as displayed on some of our currency and the second painting depicted Mr. Lincoln as the railsplitter.

This exhibition was more than 12,000 miles and about 100 years removed from Springfield, Ill., but Mr. Lincoln was there. His stout character was—and is—helping to influence the politically uncommitted citizenship in southeast Asia. He is, in fact, continuing to serve this country, which he dearly loved with each cell of his body.

Often we independent Americans forget that the amenities of freedom are only re-

gional, and that millions of the world's peoples still reside in a painful, impoverished climate of uncivil servitude.

The passing of the years has bestowed upon President Lincoln the honors which have established him as really one of the world's great men. The biography of his melancholy life is common knowledge to many students in the schools of the neutral and pro-Western nations of Asia and many libraries possess books on his career.

Copies of his biography have, of course, been burned and banned in the countries dominated by the dictatorial rule of communism. The Communist kings hate freedoms, as advocated by President Lincoln.

One of the most dynamic forces today among the peoples of Asia is to be autonomous, independent, and free. The spirit of Abraham Lincoln is the motivating force which propels this movement. Sprawling India, with its 340 million people, leads the neutralist bloc of nations to spurn any agreement or alliance which might negate their ability to function freely and independently.

What emotional and intellectual meaning does Lincoln hold for these people in the silence of their memories? What are his American qualities which we should emphasize to all nations?

The image of America—in the free world, in the Communist world, and in the uncommitted world—becomes one of our greatest contemporary concerns. We are engaged in an ideological struggle with a totally different way of life; we compete with Russia for the friendship of the uncommitted and neutral nations.

This American ideal, represented by Lincoln, must be constantly reviewed and woven into the context of our foreign policy. Within the last decade, foreign policy has grown to increased proportions in American political affairs. In fact, it now occupies a dominant role in our national thought.

Today, American foreign policy is in the midst of a muted debate. We are faced with two alternatives:

1. Recognizing the existence of the ideological conflict, we must fight both hot and cold wars for indefinite periods into the long future, or

2. Recognizing this international disagreement, but at the same time, trying to live with it.

Communist philosophy is dedicated to the inevitable and violent downfall of our capitalistic system. All contemporary Soviet leaders preach this line with conviction and enthusiasm. In the face of such scornful inevitability, aggressive defense is our natural response.

At the same time, we are devoted to the advancement of our way among the peoples of the world. When we speak of the freedoms of democracy, we assume it is the best way and that it should and ultimately will prevail. True, the Russians may be more explicit and more aggressive in their assertions, but I doubt they are more sincere or devoted.

In this sense, the United States and Russia face the same dilemma, one as old as organized political society. Although human happiness is ostensibly our mutual aim, we have chosen different social systems to achieve this end. Being so different, each views the other with grave distrust.

I am sure the American people do not seek war. I doubt the Soviets really want a shooting war. Yet, we fear each other. Consequently, we both prepare for war while we talk about preventing war. It is from this kind of world chaos that humanity could be foolishly sacrificed.

In the forseeable future, I can see no choice for America, except to live in this divided world. To live in a world with communism is not to surrender to it. This international life will be fraught with anxiety and stress; even so, it is preferable to destruction and death.

As citizens of America, in this modern world, we have a moral and historic obligation to advance our philosophy of life and government. Ultimately, these battles will be won or lost in the minds of the world. Our success, then, will be measured by the practical devotion which we can demonstrate to our way of life.

In retrospect, we can read in Lincoln's life many things. His complexity simply indicates the complexity of the American experience. He was, first of all, the great emancipator—the father of freedom, and hope to the oppressed and downtrodden. The United States as a Nation was born in the cradle of revolution, and has always stood for these ideals.

As this Great Emancipator, Lincoln commands world admiration and captures world imagination—the very requisites for advancing our position in the world.

Yet, we find it difficult to convey this impression of our heritage and purpose. For too much of the world today, political freedom is abstract and meaningless. American freedom is more than simply the lack of restraint; it is a freedom of opportunity. Abstract political rights mean little, or nothing, to a nation whose people are hungry, cold, and sick. Our freedom has been supported by an expanding prosperity and growing economic security.

Communism has found many new advocates by appealing to their basic national needs. For the peoples of the underdeveloped nations, the most important motivation is to become developed, to advance, to progress—like the rest of the world. In these accelerated times, they feel compelled to advance rapidly and are willing to sacrifice for such advancement. In a short 30 years, Russia has moved from an agrarian, almost feudal society to a world industrial leader. China is making rapid strides in modern technology.

Russia and China have not hesitated to employ harsh and cruel means to achieve their ends. Thousands of people have died and many more will die before this transition is complete. But in the old days, thousands died from starvation in an outmoded and inadequate economy. Actually, it is not too difficult to understand why those people accepted communism, even though it meant the destruction of political and personal freedom. In reality, they had little to lose. Let us remember, their situation closely parallels that of many other people in the world today—people we need to win to our side of this global ideological conflict.

We must understand the aspirations of these peoples whose friendship and trust we are trying to gain. We must also understand the nature of our own experience while recognizing the posture of our current image.

Let me refer momentarily to another picture of Lincoln: the popular painting of young Abe lying prone on the floor before an open wood-burning fireplace. In the flicker of its flames, he is shown working arithmetic problems on the back of a shovel with a stick of charcoal.

This picture is a solemn inspiration which we modern patriots must embrace with enthusiasm and resolution. Contrast it, if you will, with the picture of Little Rock, flashed around the world.

In some few places in our abundant land, young Americans have been refused schooling because emotional frenzy overruled the validity of sound judgment. Such folly make us vulnerable to grave perils.

The character of Abraham Lincoln was resolute with an unshakeable conviction that either we obey the laws of our nation or we become the victims of anarchy. The strategy of circumvention, noted in our land today, does not solve our problems; it merely postpones the inevitable.

Above all else, Lincoln stood for decency, honest dealing and plain talk. His influence defies accurate description, as was so well written by Carl Sandburg: Millions there are who take Lincoln as a personal treasure. He had something they would like to see spread everywhere over the world. Democracy? We can't say exactly what it is, but he had it. In his blood and bones he carried it. In the breath of his speeches and writings it is there. Popular government? Republican institutions? Government where the people have the say-so, one way or another telling their rulers what they want? He had the idea. It's there in the lights and shadows of his personality, a mystery that can be lived but never fully spoken in words.

The ideals of our Nation are the ideals of a positive individual freedom. These must be reflected in our Government at home as well as in our foreign policy. We must remember that our goal is not a country but the individual. Nationalism nor sectionalism should never obscure the rights of man. Lincoln, himself, made no such mistake. He elevated a terrible conflict out of sectionalism to idealism. Had he survived the assassin's bullet, he undoubtedly would have elevated its aftermath to these same high levels.

Our ultimate goal should be that which Lincoln represents to us and to the world: Not the vindication of nationality, but the triumph of humanity.

## Address on Inflation by Hon. Don Paarlberg, Special Assistant to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the partial text of an address on inflation delivered by Hon. Don Paarlberg, special assistant to the President, before the National Council on Teacher Retirement of the National Education Association, Atlantic City, N.J., Friday, February 13, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS ON INFLATION, DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE DON PAARLBERG, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON TEACHER RETIREMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1959

I appear before you in a dual role, first as your guest and second as your client. My role as guest is clear enough; my role as client may need a word of explanation. Upon reaching age 65 I shall receive, through one of your member retirement systems, certain sums laid aside during my teaching experience at Purdue University. I gave up, some years ago, not altogether willingly, a certain share of my salary. The pain was offset by the hope that the dollars forgone would be available, in full value plus interest, at a later date of greater need.

In the years since these dollars were set aside, they have lost about 15 percent of their buying power.

This loss is mild as compared with the experience of others. A man who has taught for 30 years, recently retired, will find that the dollars he receives under his retirement

program have lost on the average, about one-third of their original buying power. Naturally, he is concerned that their value does not diminish further.

Inflation is not a cosmic force originating in outer space. It is manmade and is susceptible of being influenced by man.

In an economy with its productive plant intact, like our own, and operating at a high level inflation can be the result of any or all of three forces:

Unsound fiscal policy, failure of the Government to live within its means.

Unwise monetary policy, failure to exercise proper restraint in the creation of money.

The wage-cost-price spiral, newest member of the inflationary crew, through which labor and management apply an upward ratchet to the cost of goods and services.

I

I now raise some questions regarding inflation, to which I shall attempt answers.

*1. Is inflation a necessary condition for economic growth?*

The most frequent rationale for inflationary policies is that they are an acceptable consequence of Government programs proposed for the purpose of getting our economy to grow at a greater rate.

In thinking of a desirable rate of growth, some people look not so much at our own circumstances as at the growth rate which is reported to prevail in the Soviet Union. This borrowed objective overlooks differences between the two countries as to their relative stage of economic development, the composition of their respective production indexes, and their contrasting goals and economic systems.

Let us agree that a strong rate of growth is desirable. The next question is: how can we achieve it? Evidence refutes the contention that heavy Government intervention, with resulting inflationary policies, will bring it about. True, the economy grew during the generally rising prices and the substantial Government programs of the last two decades. But it also grew during the falling prices of the late 19th century. And it grew during the stable prices of the 1920's. During both of these periods Government intervention was at a low level.

Advocates of increased Government spending sometimes contend that these programs will lead to increased production and hence increased tax revenues. Thus, it is said, the net effect of the spending programs would be to put the Government in the black instead of in the red. As we emerged from the recession, this argument lost whatever validity it had. Deficit spending was used during the recent downturn. With recovery, it should no longer be used.

With the economic climate in prospect, deficit spending is far more likely to fan the flames of inflation than to add substantial increments to economic growth. Little good and much harm can come from a price rise which is the result of fiscal irresponsibility or a speculative orgy.

One suspects that the inflationists are making virtue of convenience. Unwilling to balance the budget, restrain credit, and curb abuses of economic power, they are confronted with the probability of a rising price level. It is human nature to search out and applaud the seeming benefits in what one lacks the courage to avoid.

Certain few of the deficit spenders presently say that big Government programs will increase production, lower production costs per unit and thus reduce prices. The opposite argument was used as a rationale for deficit spending during the thirties. It was then argued that big Government programs would pump out purchasing power and raise prices. The deficit spenders will have to decide which argument they mean; they cannot have it both ways.

The consistent proposals coming from certain quarters have been for Government spending in excess of revenues. The reasons quoted in support of these policies have varied in accordance with the temper of the times.

In the thirties, the need for overcoming depression.

In the forties, the need for armament production.

In the fifties, the need for economic growth.

One is reminded of the doctor who, despite his various diagnoses, always prescribes the same pills.

A gross error is made by those who pose the issue as simple choice between economic stagnation on the one hand and deficit spending on the other. This sets the problem up wrongly. Economic stagnation is not the prospect. Deficit spending should not be.

*2. Should we accept inflation as a way of life?*

Some people say that inflation is not desirable, it is merely inevitable. Therefore, we should stop resisting it, learn to live with it, and get as much enjoyment out of it as we can. After all, we are told, inflation at a rate of 2 or 3 or 4 percent per year isn't too bad. We've had price rises of this magnitude in the past, several years in succession, and made out rather well.

Those who look at history and conclude that a policy of deliberate continuous inflation is acceptable or advantageous are guilty of a grave error. In the past, the expectation generally was for relative price stability, and resources were allocated accordingly. If prices rose moderately, normal patterns of production, savings and investment were not greatly disturbed.

But if the expectation is for a price rise of 2 or 3 or 4 percent per year, then the pattern of human behavior becomes entirely different. If inflation should run at 4 percent per year, a savings bond would lose half its value in 17 years. We could then speak of the half-life of a Government bond as we now speak of the half-life of an irradiated particle. Anticipating this, who would lay aside savings? How would capital formation go forward if the people were to expect that the annual rate of capital erosion would exceed the annual rate of interest? And how to hold the rate of inflation that had been decided on as acceptable? The very act of naming an acceptable rate would set off strong pressures to exceed it.

The expectation of a given rise in prices will yield an entirely different and far less acceptable result than past experience with price increases of this same magnitude.

Some say that these problems can be overcome by investing in stocks and real estate instead of bonds and savings accounts. This solution may have some merit for a given individual, but little for the group. As the fight to equities would proceed, the fountains of saving would dry up, capital formation would be inhibited, and the price structure would be distorted.

Responsible people must look with misgiving on proposals which would make speculators out of people who want to be investors—proposals which shift the incentive from a return on invested capital to an unearned capital gain.

Some say that escalator clauses can be worked out, so as to keep everything in the right relationship. The policy of escalation is like standing up at the ball park so you can see the game better. It's fine so long as no one else does it. When all the people stand up they can't see as well as they could before, and the short fellow can't see at all.

People in various countries of the world have had to learn to live with inflation. For the greater part, they don't like what they've learned. One might ask whether this particular branch of learning should be pursued by a people who still have the opportunity to avoid it.

*3. Can inflation be overcome by keeping some of our resources unused?*

Some people attribute inflationary pressure to the strong economic position of management and labor. If employment is at a high level and consumer incomes are high, then labor is in a strong position to demand wage increases, and management finds it possible to jack up prices. So runs the argument. A corollary of this argument, more often inferred than stated, is that fiscal and monetary policies should be developed which deliberately would hold substantial quantities of our resources unused—quantities in excess of what reasonably might be considered frictional unemployment and appropriate reserve capacity. Thus the bargaining power of labor would be reduced and the capability of management to increase prices would likewise be inhibited. By this means inflation would be checked.

There are two faults with this argument. The first is that unused resources are no guarantee against inflation. Despite unemployment and idle plants during the decline of late 1957 and early 1958, wages and prices continued to move upward. The second fault is that even if this approach would check inflation, the cost in terms of idle manpower and reduced production would be too great. Few if any economic goals have such great merit as to condone a deliberate substantial slack in employment and output.

II

If, as has been said, we should not accept inflation as inevitable and if we cannot escape its problems through universal escalation, through deliberately keeping resources idle, or through a wage and price freeze, how then can we cope with this problem?

Basic to this question are the goals we seek and the standards of performance which would be considered acceptable.

Here the task becomes one of balance. It means avoiding, on the one hand, a doctrinaire position that strives for the last possible increment of economic growth, engages in deficit financing to achieve it, and accepts whatever inflationary result ensues. It means avoiding, on the other hand, the doctrinaire position that demands strict price stability and accepts whatever degree of economic growth—or stagnation—should result.

Between these extremes there is a rather broad range within which most reasonable people can agree.

The goal of an enterprise economy should be a rate of growth which makes as good use of resources as ingenuity and responsibility will permit. General price stability is a basic condition to reaching this goal.

By the very nature of things, prices of individual goods and services fluctuate rather than remain fixed. That the average of all prices should itself fluctuate is altogether reasonable. A departure of a few percentage points in the Consumer Price Index, up or down from the previous year's level, would lie within the range of what is acceptable, if it is not a trend.

Similarly with the rate of economic growth. In an enterprise economy, growth never proceeds at a uniform rate. We ask too much if we insist that each year not only establish a new record but that it exceed the previous year by a uniform and high percentage.

III

I shall now speak of the program of this administration, aimed at helping achieve relatively stable prices and a satisfactory rate of economic growth.

*1. Living within our means*

A balanced budget is only one of the tools which, during a time like that in prospect, is needed to help bring about reasonable price stability and a satisfactory rate of economic growth. But it is a very important tool.

If we cannot live within our means during a time of prosperity, then the prospect of fiscal stability and an honest dollar becomes remote indeed.

The public has come rather generally to accept the idea that budgets should be unbalanced in a time of recession. But some now say that they should be unbalanced also in time of prosperity.

If this idea should ever gain widespread acceptance, then, among other consequences, the school employee retirement system will become one of the least attractive services available to the American public.

Some say we need more public services than can be provided from present revenues. In an economic climate such as is in prospect, such a contention should be backed up by proposals for increased taxes. This would be a convincing way of demonstrating that the proposals are in earnest.

*2. Reasonable price stability an explicit goal of Government policy*

The Employment Act of 1946 now specifies a goal of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power. It should also specify reasonable price stability as an associated goal. This means resistance to the forces of inflation as well as deflation.

If such a goal is written into law, then legislative proposals and appropriations can be checked against this standard. With the establishment of such a goal, the Federal Government can apply more self-discipline than is presently the case. Individuals and organizations can ask, with greater influence than at present, that this goal be adhered to.

*3. Sound credit policy*

It is the responsibility of the Federal Reserve Board, an independent agency of Government, to adopt policies which result in providing appropriate quantities of money. The record here, as I read it, has been good. There is every reason to believe it will be good in the future. The Treasury of the United States, which is responsible for debt management, and other agencies which provide credit, are conducting themselves, within the limits set by law, in a manner conducive to general price stability.

The public appetite for a large volume of low-cost credit is very great. This appetite must be kept within prudent limits. There is every intention in the executive branch to do so.

*4. Self-discipline within the Federal Government*

The President is establishing two special committees, charged with so conducting the affairs of Government as to help create a proper climate for stable prices and increased output. One of these, a Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, will be concerned with prices, costs, productivity and public understanding of the causes and consequences of inflation.

The other, a Committee on Government Activities Affecting Prices and Costs, will be concerned with scrutinizing Government policies in the field of procurement, construction, stockpiling, commodity price support, and so on, for their effect on costs and prices. By keeping its own house in order, the Federal Government will set a good example for the private sector of the economy.

*5. Maintenance of competition*

Through the antitrustlaws and other actions intended to curb the exercise of concentrated economic power, the Federal Government strives to see that competitive forces operate in a manner consistent with the public interest. The purpose in these activities is not encroachment on the rights of private persons, but the improvement of competitive enterprise in behalf of the general good.

IV

If the necessary support is forthcoming from the Congress and from private citizens, the objectives of this program, namely a satisfactory rate of economic growth and relative price stability, can be attained. The consumer price index, often called the cost of living and widely accepted as a measure of general price behavior, has been virtually unchanged during the past 9 months.

The economy, which dipped during the recent recession, is surging forward and is expected to establish a new record in 1959. Further improvement is in prospect for 1960.

In short, the recovery which is now underway has been marked by general price stability and a sharp advance in the rate of growth. We seem to be traveling a middle course of recovery, avoiding the pitfalls of economic stagnation on the one hand and an inflationary boom on the other.

Yet the dangers are there. A general price rise could again occur if the public should conclude that Government is unwilling or unable to cope with the forces of inflation.

We can remain on course if private citizens, as well as Government, act in their own enlightened self-interest. Nothing more than this is necessary; nothing short of this will suffice.

## Good Feeling Among Senate Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Mr. Rowland Evans of the New York Herald Tribune, which was published in that newspaper on Sunday, March 1, 1959. Mr. Evans, one of the outstanding commentators on the congressional scene, has summarized very well the cooperative efforts of the Senate Republicans. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in both parties.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMONG THE SENATE REPUBLICANS: AN ATMOSPHERE OF GOOD FEELING

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—A strange atmosphere of good feeling has enveloped the two wings of the Republican Party in the Senate, filling in the harsh edges of disunity much as mist hides the contours of a valley.

The political and ideological differences between the modern Republicans and the Bridges-Goldwater-Mundt Republicans are still there, but the new mood of friendship and cooperation has submerged them.

In early January the revolt of the moderns failed and Senator BRIDGES' candidate for leader, Senator DIRKSEN, beat Senator COOPER, the choice of the moderate-liberal faction headed by Senator AIKEN, Senator CASE of New Jersey, and Senator BUSH.

Now, scarcely 2 months later, the majority controlled by Senator BRIDGES has virtually disarmed the moderns by a display of cooperation and conciliation that would not have seemed possible in the aftermath of party controversy over a new leader.

Senator DIRKSEN deserves much of the credit for the new unity—or perhaps it should be called an absence of disunity. It was Senator DIRKSEN who lobbied his senior colleagues to make room on the good Senate committees for the newer Republican Senators, men like JAVITS and KEATING, of New York. Senator DIRKSEN, it turned out, asked no more than he was willing to give. He set the difficult example by removing himself from the Appropriations Committee. This committee, above all others, is a coveted vantage point from which a Senator can exert great influence within his own State.

Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator HICKENLOOPER, and Senator MARTIN followed DIRKSEN's lead and also gave up committee assignments. Then the chairman of the Policy Committee, Senator BRIDGES, abruptly halted the flow of the incendiary policy memorandums, linking the Democrats to the Communist and any other convenient conspiracies, that have been coming off the Policy Committee assembly line for years. There hasn't been a single one so far this year.

These statements of alleged party policy hurt the liberal Republicans from the crowded eastern cities, the strongholds of the independent voter. They popped off the mimeograph machines and into the headlines without any attempt to provide an accurate reflection of the majority view of the Republicans in the Senate.

The regular weekly Republican policy papers, a different operation, are still a fixture, but the progressive Republicans are now getting as much space for their views as the old guard. The last issue, for example, carried an ABC on inflation, instead of, as one Republican liberal put it, "an attack on labor, all labor, as the chief cause of inflation, as would surely have happened last year."

But the most substantial change of all is that the liberals or anti-old guarders, are satisfied that their ambitions, hopes, and fears are taken into consideration by Senator BRIDGES and Senator DIRKSEN as they never were during the regime of former Senator KNOWLAND.

Strict accountability to a mythical party position on such a controversy as the President's budget, for example, seems to have disappeared as a technique of leadership.

At the weekly Policy Committee luncheons, following the leaders' conference with the President, the progressives have more freedom and time to state their positions. In the White House itself, Senator KUCHEL, the new whip, is the most persuasive spokesman the progressives have had there. There is not likely to be a repeat this year, for example, of Senator KNOWLAND's success last year in switching the President's position overnight on the question of aid to Yugoslavia. Unless he had full support of a majority of Republican Senators, Senator DIRKSEN would not be likely to make such a demand on the President, not simply because he is more flexible and adjustable than Senator KNOWLAND, but because he regards himself at least partly as the creature of his Republican colleagues.

The burr has even been extracted from the selection of Senator GOLDWATER, the archconservative, as chairman of the senatorial campaign committee. At an unpublicized meeting in his office recently, Senator GOLDWATER disarmed the liberals by a display of campaign knowhow and a promise to distribute the committee's facilities evenly among all the 1960 contenders.

The Republicans, at least today, have no Senator PROXMIRE. On the contrary, they are displaying an unusual satisfaction with the way their leaders are running things.

## Michigan and Its Governor Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Michigan and its distinguished six-term Governor recently have been the subject of increased national attention. Two distinguished on-the-scene observers of Michigan and its Governor have made interesting and enlightening observations, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 11, 1959]

THE COMMENTATOR

(By W. K. Kelsey)

DECADE OF MIRACLES

A Lincoln day dinner of the Young Republicans brought Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona to Saginaw, Monday, to orate. It has long been a mystery to the Commentator why supposedly sane people leave their radiator-sides to listen to dinner speakers, when they could just as well stay at home, an uncaptive audience, able to shift from one radio or TV station to another. It must be the food.

Apparently the Commentator has been under a delusion that Young Republicans belong to the progressive wing of the party. That can't be so, or they would not have chosen Mr. GOLDWATER, except for a laugh; Mr. GOLDWATER being the bellcow of the other side. But the reports of his speech do not indicate that his audience thought him funny.

The Commentator does, however. Of course politics is mostly funny, because it is the art of maneuvering, and is not tied to truth. Logic plays little part in political strategy, as the Commentator will now prove in the case of BARRY GOLDWATER.

Mr. GOLDWATER is quoted as saying that Walter Reuther is "the hidden hand behind the policies of the State of Michigan which brought this great industrial State to its knees, on the verge of bankruptcy," and that "the stranglehold of the labor politicians on the State of Michigan is a well-known fact to businessmen across the country."

Everybody familiar with the history of Michigan during the past decade knows that the hidden hand of Mr. Reuther and the stranglehold of the labor politicans have not controlled six Republican legislatures, which, with the connivance of stupid voters, have brought Michigan to its present condition of silly impotence.

Senator GOLDWATER doesn't know what he is talking about. He is merely the parrot of the critics of Governor Williams and haters of Mr. Reuther.

THE GOP IN CONTROL

Williams was first elected Governor in 1948. At the same time the people chose a legislature whose senate consisted of 9 Democrats and 23 Republicans, and whose house stood 39 Democrats to 61 Republicans.

The tale was repeated in 1950, except that the Democratic Governor had the backing of only 7 Democrats in the senate and 34 in the house. Again in 1952 the Democrats had little to say; they gained one senator, but no representatives.

Is anyone silly enough to believe that in those 6 years, when both houses were firmly held by the Republicans, Gov. Williams and Walter Reuther had their way with the legislature? If they did, theirs was one of the most remarkable conjuring tricks in all history.

In 1952 the people adopted a constitutional amendment which put into the fundamental law a provision to keep the senate forever Republican, but let the house become Democratic if rather more than a majority of the voters so desired. Governor Williams could not stop that amendment; he had no veto power over it. Walter Reuther couldn't either. Neither could the Commentator, who argued against it with such effect that the people carried it by a large majority.

Since the amendment was approved, three legislatures have been elected. In the first, the Republicans had a majority of 12 in the senate, 8 in the house. In the second, they kept their 23 senators out of 34, and their house majority was 12. Last November they lost one senator; the house was evenly divided, but is controlled by the Republicans, due to the illness of one Democrat and the death of another.

OH, SWEET MYSTERY

Richard Carle in one of his musical comedies asked someone to tell him kindly, explain to him the mystery of how he came to pick a lemon in the garden of love where they say only peaches grow.

Dear SENATOR GOLDWATER, will you be so good as to explain to a bemused Commentator how Governor Williams and Walter Reuther, in the course of 10 years during which a Republican majority in the legislature could, and often did, defeat anything those ogres wanted, succeeded in bringing the great State of Michigan into its present parlous condition?

The Commentator, of course, is not serious in making this request. He knows you are as ignorant about Michigan as he is about Arizona. He knows where you got your information; he has read and heard it himself, repeatedly. He knows that all's fair in love and politics. But he wonders if Abraham Lincoln would have made, in any circumstances, such a speech as yours in Saginaw.

---

[From the Detroit Times, Feb. 13, 1959]

MAY FAIL, BUT WON'T QUIT

(By John Manning)

It is possible G. Mennen Williams may be the Democratic presidential candidate next year.

It is possible (at longer odds, of course) he may be the next President of the United States.

It is fairly positive he would like to see both possibilities materialize. Without having talked about it at all to Governor Williams, it is reasonable to assume the White House is the one supreme goal of his life right now.

All available evidence confirms that assumption. Indeed, it would be extraordinary if Michigan's Governor were not aiming at the ultimate prize.

More than 20 years ago he deliberately chose public service as his career. Most people wrote it off as a fluke when he was first elected Governor. Before the end of his second term even the most fanatic Republicans admitted grudgingly he seemed to have a feel for politics.

The longer he stayed in office, the more apparent it became to friend and foe that here was a man endowed with amazing political sagacity; a keen-witted analyst of popular thought, an artful cajoler of public support.

Michigan Democrats, who had been starving more than a generation for dynamic leadership, flocked joyously to him as to a Messiah.

Michigan Republicans began to snarl his name through tight lips very much the way Union Leaguers used to mention "that man" in the White House during early New Deal years.

We have no idea whether our Governor consciously patterned his official conduct upon that of Franklin Roosevelt but he came, with year after successful year, to display many of the same traits.

He had, going in, a genuinely warm personality and a natural liking for people in the mass. He had and still has incredible physical energy, uncanny ability to resolve friction among his followers, a granite ruthlessness against the opposition, and that sheer daring in crises which is the stamp of the great gambler.

There was no Michigan Democratic Party to speak of when Williams invaded Lansing. It had become dissipated by too many years of malnutrition. The Michigan Republican party appeared healthy on the surface but it also had become weakened by too many years of fat living.

Today the Democrats are stronger than ever before in Michigan and the Republicans weaker. This double phenomenon is attributable directly to Mennen Williams and the political talents he so adroitly employed over the last decade.

Now serving his sixth consecutive term with no further local worlds to conquer, he would be an odd person indeed if he failed to train his sights on Washington.

We observed a few paragraphs above that Governor Williams has the daring of a gambler. It is a truism that all great politicians are gamblers. They have to be in our kind of government. To stay up, they must be in the forefront but not too far ahead of popular opinion.

They must constantly outguess their rivals as to what the masses want or think they want. They must gamble on the sharpness of their perception because it is as fatal to anticipate public yearnings too early as to lag behind them.

If Williams loses in the Democratic presidential shuffle he can validly lay it to the luck of the draw. Potentially, if you narrow the count to past performance, he boasts a more impressive record than any other current aspirant. He, single-handed, carried the Democratic Party from rags to riches in 10 years in as rock-ribbed a Republican State as there is in the Nation.

His lieutenants are reportedly worried today about possible deterioration of the Williams prestige. Michigan's bankrupt financial condition may hurt him at home and across the country.

Republicans are making the most of it. They have come out of their torpor and are attacking savagely, slugging him with everything but the ring posts.

They scream that Michigan's dollar plight is all his fault, disregarding conveniently that 20 other States are in as bad financial trouble as we and that Republican legislatures opposed him unswervingly through his entire tenure of office.

Attacks of this kind are dirty politics but Soapy can't complain. He and his boys play dirty politics, too. He probably won't use the alibi anyway. He's not the whining kind. He's an adroit actor but he's a realist.

We don't know whether the luck of the draw has abandoned him. We don't pretend to know what will happen in the 1960 primaries. In the event Governor Williams should be sidetracked it will be irony of majestic proportions.

We say so because we believe the Governor in this winter of everybody's discontent, is exhibiting more courage and statesmanship than at any previous time in his public life.

Look at the setup. Two years ago his associate strategists urged him not to run for a sixth term. They foresaw the State would be broke along about now and whoever was governor would get the blame. They wanted him to go for U.S. Senator. He would have been elected hands down.

He preferred to stay at Lansing, supposedly on the basis a six-time governor would command more national attention than a freshman Senator. We have taken exception to a lot of Mennen Williams' official acts but we nurse a sneaking hunch the idea of running from a storm was repugnant to him. As frequently and bluntly as we have disagreed with him we have a hunch he's not the type to quit under fire.

Along the same line we feel he gritted his teeth and championed a State income tax and the borrowing of the $50 million Veterans' Fund, knowing the stands would hurt him politically but were right and proper according to his lights.

It takes statesmanship to make such decisions. It takes personal integrity. It takes cold courage. Soapy showed those three qualities.

The luck of the draw would be zero should they combine to eliminate him.

## Modernizing Our Election Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, although the 1958 congressional elections set a record for offyear voting, less than 50 percent of those eligible to vote actually went to the polls. At no offyear election, on a national average, have more than half the electorate cast ballots. In Presidential years, the improvement is slight at best. In the record year of 1952, 62.7 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls, but 4 years later the percentage participating slipped to 60.4 percent. Thus, at a time when U.S. policies as formulated and put into effect by our elective officials have an unprecedented impact on the future of our Nation and the free world, about one-third of the eligible voters in this country can elect a President.

The American Heritage Foundation has long been interested in bringing about maximum participation by Americans at the polls. The foundation recently published a paper on suggested election reforms. I append the foundation's recommendations hereto as being an excellent and constructive contribution to the effort to broaden the base of participation by our citizens in their Government. Such participation strengthens our representative form of government and is most important in these days of stress when our traditional institutions are under ideological assault throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the paper recently published by the American Heritage Foundation.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTED ELECTION REFORMS

Some State election laws, many of them adopted in the last century, need revision for the purpose of making it easier for good citizens to exercise one of the most precious privileges of American citizenship—voting by secret ballot in free elections. It should be possible to modernize these laws to meet the needs of 20th century America and at the same time preserve our present safeguards against fraudulent voting.

The American Heritage Foundation estimates that outmoded election law requirements prevent or seriously discourage approximately 10 to 17 million Americans of voting age from casting their ballots. There is a close correlation between the voting rank of States and their election laws. Generally, States that make it easier to register and vote get more of their citizens to the polls.

The American Heritage Foundation believes that the following recommendations by eminent political scientists and election specialists deserve careful examination and discussion with the understanding that every possible precaution must be taken to insure against fraud and corruption:

1. Reduce State residence requirements to 6 months and county requirements to 60 days. The Bureau of Census reports 33 million Americans changed their place of residence in the year ending March 1956. At least 6 million moved across State lines.

2. Make it possible for absentees, away from the State for long periods, to register by mail—with careful precautions and safeguards against fraud and heavy penalties for violations.

3. Allow absentee voting by mail in both primary and general elections by all citizens of voting age away from their county or State of residence on election day. Should apply to civilians as well as members of the armed services. Civilian voters kept from the polls by business travel, estimated at 2,600,000. Ballots of different colors for military and civilians and careful checking of signatures and numbered ballots to prevent fraud (chain voting, etc.).

4. Make it possible for citizens of voting age outside the United States to obtain absentee ballots 45 days before each election so that the ballot may arrive at election board before election day, a request made by the Armed Forces voting assistance program.

5. Extend absentee voting privileges to the hospitalized and sick, estimated at 5 million by U.S. News & World Report.

6. Work for extending franchise to residents of District of Columbia. Meanwhile, States should make it as easy as possible for District of Columbia temporary residents to vote in State of permanent residence.

7. Stiff penalties, widely publicized, for fraudulent registration and voting with special emphasis on absentee registration and voting.

8. Provide central registration facilities throughout the year, closing about 6 weeks before election day. Also conduct a general registration period, 2 weeks long, with sufficient registration places, ending not earlier than 3 or 4 weeks before election day. A too-early cutoff date prevents many citizens from qualifying. On the other hand, there must be an adequate interval before election day to check the rolls for changes of residence, new registrants, deaths, etc. This, of course, would vary with population.

9. Registration and polling places should be adequately staffed by a sufficient number of trained personnel. Many voters are discouraged from registering and voting by needless waiting in line and inefficient or discourteous election personnel. Ohio requires all election clerks to attend an annual training and refresher course, a practice that other States might find worthwhile.

10. Facilities for mobile registration and special registration facilities in department stores, supermarkets, and other public places—a practice effectively followed in Philadelphia.

11. Statewide uniform system of permanent personal tax-free registration.

12. Election boards in large cities notify all citizens by mail and newspaper advertisements of exact location of registration and polling places.

13. Voting machines in all elections. Their use provides speedy counting and reduces possibility of fraud. Separate lever on machines for each candidate and item to be voted upon—so as to encourage thoughtful voting on each issue.

14. Instruction in use of voting machines in all high schools and through television and other media. Incorrect marking of ballots and misunderstanding of voting machines accounted for more than 500,000 invalid votes in the 1952 presidential elections.

15. Shorter ballot; long ballots confuse and discourage voting. For example, one ballot in a recent local election contained 169 names.

16. Newspaper publication of official ballots starting at least 1 week before election day. Distribution of sample ballots to schoolchildren to take home to parents. Their use enables the voter to make up his mind in advance and accelerates the voting process.

17. Literacy tests should be objective and corrected according to answer key provided by educators. Correction of tests should not require interpretation by examiners or allow possibility of discrimination.

18. Hold primary elections in late May or early June. Late June, July, and August are poor because many people take their vacations during this period. Many election officials oppose September primaries because of insufficient time for handling recounts, printing absentee ballots, etc.

19. Publication and widespread distribution by State election officials of a readable pamphlet simplifying election laws.

20. If possible, remove election law requirements and procedures from State constitutions. The difficulty of amending these constitutions is a serious obstacle to modernizing election laws.

21. A State law allowing employees sufficient time off to vote on election day.

22. An article in This Week magazine recommended Sunday voting, the practice in many European countries with a high voting turnout. The American Heritage Foundation believes that the approval of religious leaders in each State should be sought before taking any further steps on this matter.

## Development Policies for Middle Snake Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, policies for the management of the water resources of the Middle Snake River are of paramount interest among people of the Pacific Northwest because of the multitude of natural assets involved. In a speech last week in the Senate, I emphasized the necessity of conducting full-scale, long-range fishery research in the Columbia Basin as a prelude to further

development of this section of the river where future existence of migratory fish is involved. Further analysis of policies and programs affecting this resource is provided in a recent column in the Oregon Statesman by Charles A. Sprague, former Governor of our State and a knowledgeable contributor to water development projects in Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article written by former Governor Sprague, and published in the Oregon Statesman of February 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

A noteworthy change of policy over the development of the water resources of the Snake River and its tributaries has been made by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League.

Last year, it adopted a statement asking the Water Resources Board to withdraw the waters of the Imnaha River in northeastern Oregon from appropriation. A few days ago, the division wrote a letter to the board asking it to take no action at this time on this proposal. The board is scheduled to meet tomorrow.

The significance of the change lies in the preference of this organization, dedicated to conservation, to a high dam at Mountain Sheep site below the mouth of the Imnaha, as recommended by the Corps of Engineers in its revised "308" report, over a high Nez Perce downstream on the Snake, below the mouth of the Salmon River.

The Oregon IWL explains its new position thus:

"It is with reluctance that the Oregon division considers approving a project that will block the Imnaha River, but there is a recognition that the runs of salmonoids in this stream are minor compared to the Salmon River.

"The league would prefer that this stretch of the river be developed by dams located above the Imnaha, and would approve of such dams rather than high Mountain Sheep, should they be proposed."

The division in its letter makes its approval of the high Mountain Sheep Dam conditional on no inclusion of dams in Salmon River. It plans to ask Congress to make Salmon River a sanctuary for salmon, permitting no structures in the stream to interfere with fish migration.

Public power advocates have urged a high Hells Canyon Dam and a high Nez Perce Dam. Secretary Seaton wants a survey of a possible high Pleasant Valley Dam above the Imnaha, which would flood out Hells Canyon where Idaho Power now holds a license. Fish interests strongly oppose the Nez Perce Dam and would prefer no dam below the mouth of the Imnaha. Private power interests wanted a license for a relatively low dam at Pleasant Valley. When this was rejected they filed a new application for a site lower down on Snake River.

Into this conflict of opinion the Corps of Engineers stepped with its revision of old "308." It accepted the fact that the Federal Power Commission had granted a license to Idaho Power for a dam in Hells Canyon. It respected also the strong opposition of the Interior Department and fish interests to a high dam below the mouth of Salmon River. So it offered a compromise: A high dam at Mountain Sheep between the Salmon and the Imnaha. It also listed a possible dam on Salmon River, which is opposed by fishing interests and the Izaak Walton League.

A Senate committee has scheduled hearings in the Northwest on the "308" report. Local opinion may then be expressed. Senator MORSE already has denounced the corps report, clinging to his determination to revive high Hells Canyon and presumably to support the public power groups on a high dam at Nez Perce.

Unless views can be reconciled, this stretch of the river will be passed over for Federal development. This would leave the door open for the private power people to get a license for a dam at Mountain Sheep or perhaps at Nez Perce.

In this melee, the Oregon Water Resources Board might well reserve its judgment. Its order would not hold against a decision by the Congress or by the Federal Power Commission.

The corps program would insure ample flood storage, lack of which in Hells Canyon was bemoaned by advocates of the high dam there. It would utilize the power potential of the waters and still leave the entry to Salmon River open save for the dams below Lewiston.

There will have to be concessions or retreat by some interests, perhaps by several. Congress, we feel sure, will be inclined to accept the program of the corps, subject to modifications as to timing and further delay pending studies on fish passage.

## Principles Which Should Guide the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding speech by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at a recent meeting in New Jersey. His frank statements about the principles which should guide the Republican Party deserve the most thoughtful consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON, AT NEW JERSEY REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE FUND RAISING DINNER, ESSEX HOUSE, NEWARK, N.J., FEBRUARY 25, 1959

It is an honor and also a pleasure for me to be here with you tonight in the home State of your outstanding Senator, CLIFFORD CASE. He typifies the high quality Republican congressional delegation that New Jersey has sent to Washington. They're doing a good job for New Jersey and the Nation.

I'm happy that this district has continued its Republican representation in Congress with GEORGE WALLHAUSER hard at work in his first term. We all wish his predecessor, Bob Kean, were in the Senate. However, we're pleased that New Jersey is maintaining its healthy ratio of nearly 2 to 1 Republicans in Congress. I'm sure your goal is to improve even further this majority—meanwhile yours is an excellent example for Republicans throughout the Nation.

It is my privilege to bring to this meeting the greetings of our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. His leadership is a challenge to us all.

I want to pay tribute to Senator CASE and the able representation he is giving your State in the Senate.

Senator CASE has shown a keen understanding of agriculture. It would be easier to get constructive, sound farm legislation if we had a few more like him in Congress.

We need him there for many more years. He's setting a good example for all of us by having already started working for 1960. Senator CASE, we all pledge you our wholehearted support.

With such men as New Jersey Republicans have sent to Washington, I do not fear for the future of our party. I see no reason for any of us to fear the future as long as we face facts, stick to our principles and begin working now for victory in 1960 and beyond.

As Chairman Meade Alcorn said in Des Moines:

"We have a great party. Throughout its history of more than a century, the Republican Party has consistently risen to great challenges. Its greatest hours have often followed time of adversity and even defeat."

This is the first large Republican audience I've addressed formally since the election last November when we took a plain, out and out beating. We were licked pretty thoroughly from coast-to-coast with a few notable exceptions, some of which, I'm glad to say, were here in New Jersey.

But there are no alibis. From President Eisenhower on down, there have been no alibis. And I want to tell you tonight that I'm proud to be a Republican and I believe you are too. In the hour of our defeat is our greatest challenge.

It takes a defeat now and then to make us take a hard look at ourselves—and where we've been and where we're going.

It takes adversity sometimes to bring into focus the principles for which we stand—to recognize anew those ideals which have made republicanism a symbol of America since the days of the first great Republican President whose 150th year of birth we are currently observing.

Abraham Lincoln tasted defeat often in his rugged life. Don't forget that Lincoln's defeat of 1858 was transformed into the victory of 1860. His victories were few, though memorable. In virtually the very hour of his greatest victory tragic death overtook him. Yet even as he rose to become a greater and greater man from each of his life's defeats, he has risen in death to a degree of immortality accorded few men. He has achieved a permanent victory. He truly belongs to the ages. And as Republicans we are humbly proud it was Lincoln—100 years ago—who led our party to the White House.

Lincoln's party is made of much of the same stuff. Even before the final devastating vote total was tabulated last November, Republicans from coast to coast were saying: The 1960 campaign begins today.

Not for a moment have I seen any signs of defeatism. Ideas were immediately advanced toward strengthening the party for 1960. The Congress assembled with new and vigorous Republican leaders on both sides of the Capitol.

There were signs of fight and vitality at the party's conclave in Des Moines in late January. There is a strong feeling of strength within the administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON. I sense much of that same vigor here tonight.

This is an opportunity then for self-examination, for restating our principles, in this hour of uncommon challenge.

The Republican Party must be first of all a party of principle. It must stand as a rallying point for sincere, patriotic, and en-

thusiastic people who want good government in this blessed land.

As a great midwestern newspaper put it recently in an editorial entitled "First Principles," if the party "must compromise its character to win, the victory is better lost." I call your attention to this because character is the one thing we can build in this life and take with us into the next. The integrity of the Republican Party is dependent upon the character of its members and supporters. When you give freely of your money to a political party—as you have here tonight—you have a right to expect, and the party has a duty to reflect, character-building qualities. This means to formulate and adhere to sound basic principles.

The Republican Party must be more interested in preserving and strengthening the competitive system—more interested in real Americanism—than in winning the next election.

Here are some of the basic principles which I believe we as a party should adhere to religiously:

First. We should follow those courses of public action which seek to build character and integrity. We must hold tenaciously to those basic concepts which have built this great Nation. What is right. What is best for the Nation. These objectives should guide us. This is so basic a matter that I need not dwell further upon it, except to say that such a concern has motivated my every act during more than 6 years as Secretary of Agriculture. If a thing is right it should be done. And if a thing is right, in the long run, it will also be the best politics. If the time should ever come in this country when this is not true, it will be a sad day for America.

Second. We should pursue public policies which seek to keep men free. Free agency is an eternal God-given principle. The struggle for freedom is a never ending one. We have an obligation to unborn generations to leave this country in a state more conducive to freedom of individual action than we found it.

With respect to agriculture, one of the principal goals of this administration has been, is now, and will continue to be to unshackle the farmer from burdensome Government controls and to restore to him the ability to take his full part in the dynamic economy that has made this Nation the envy of the world. Our goal is a prosperous, expanding and free agriculture.

As the 1952 Republican platform stated so well, "the tending of the soil is a sacred responsibility. * * * Any program that will benefit farmers must serve the national welfare. And a prosperous agriculture with free and independent farmers is fundamental to the national interest."

The issue is clear indeed. Are the people in this country to manage their own economic affairs? Or, are they to be managed from Washington? Which better serves our individual interests and the Nation's welfare? Shall Government continue to subsidize the various segments of the economy, including agriculture, in such a manner that it also takes complete control? Or shall Government implement private decisions and actions in the role of a servant or partner?

Third. We must stand firmly and unequivocally for the free enterprise system. We enjoy many economic benefits today because great Republicans devoutly defended public policies which had as their aim the enhancement of a capitalistic economic system, with its emphasis upon private ownership and private management.

Our abundant blessings have come to us through an economic system which rests largely on three pillars:

1. Free enterprise, the right to venture, to choose.

2. Private property, the right to own.

3. A market economy, the right to exchange.

This means permitting—not preventing—the market forces of supply and demand to allocate resources into the most productive channels and to determine the rewards for hard work and honest endeavor.

Fourth. We must keep Government from trespassing on private initiative. Lincoln's precept, as emphasized by President Eisenhower, that the Government should do for citizens only that which they cannot do for themselves is the Republican philosophy of government. Republicans will continue to wage a hold-the-line battle on this threat.

This administration has made progress in getting the Government out of your business. The Government is in too many businesess now. It is not right for the Government to be in business in competition with its own taxpaying citizens.

Fifth. We must ever be mindful of our traditional Federal-State relationship. This administration has been determined to reverse the trend to bigger and bigger Federal Government. We will continue our fight to strengthen the States. The Federal Government did not create the States of this Republic. The States created the Federal Government.

State and local governments must accept the responsibility for problems that are essentially local and State problems. Inevitably, in centralized Federal programs the money is not as wisely spent as if the States participated financially. We believe that a larger proportion of our tax dollars should be spent at local and State levels.

Sixth. The Republican Party stands for the expansion of markets and the strengthening of our private marketing machinery—not Government handouts. Only in this way can we insure that honest economic effort will be amply rewarded.

As our most recent platform emphasizes, a sound program for agriculture, or for any other segment of the economy, must create the widest possible markets and highest attainable income for our people.

I refer to our platforms because we do not emphasize often enough just what we stand for as Republicans. Although expressions of differences of opinion during the drafting of a platform are healthy and desirable, once the party has decided upon a course of action, we should close ranks and stand firm. I mention this because, as you know, the administration's farm program, based upon the party platform, has experienced some damaging opposition from within the party. This is destructive, not helpful.

The 1956 platform makes it clear that the Republican farm program does not envision making farmers dependent upon direct governmental payments for their incomes. Rather it underscores the principle that our objective is the building and expansion of markets at home and abroad and the development of new uses for farm products. The platform recognizes, as this administration has asserted since the day it took office over 6 years ago, that a Government warehouse is not a market. Farmers want to produce for markets and not for Government bounty.

Capitalism—through our God-given freedom of choice—not government decree, creates markets. Capitalism not government decree can best reward productive effort. This the Republican Party should never forget else it fall by the wayside in its struggle for public support. What is true of agriculture is also true of other segments of our economy.

Our economic order is not perfect, because it is operated by imperfect human beings. But it has given us more of the good things of life than any other system. Let us admit the weaknesses that exist. Let us work aggressively to correct them. But let us never make the catastrophic blunder of putting the chains of big government on our basic economic freedom.

Seventh. The Republican Party stands for fiscal integrity.

Closely allied with the trend toward bigger and bigger government is the tendency toward loose fiscal policy. This is of the utmost concern to every citizen. A nation can hang itself on the gallows of excessive public debt, and we are no exception. The Republican Party believes in fiscal integrity, in living within our income especially in peacetime prosperity such as we enjoy today.

For the coming fiscal year, the President has presented a budget of $77 billion. It is a balanced budget, even though it is the biggest budget in our peacetime history. Yet some of our expert thrift opponents have called it a skinflint budget.

Actually, as the President stated, it will "help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

It has been truthfully said that our free enterprise democracy is the greatest economic system the world has ever evolved. But there is one controlling requirement, and it must never be overlooked. The system is based on solven government and sound money. It is in this requirement that we have allowed ourselves to become weak.

We cannot spend ourselves into higher prosperity but we can spend ourselves into real trouble. Nor can we preserve our prosperity and our free enterprise system by following a reckless policy of spneding beyond our income in peacetime. I hope and pray that the present Democratic leaders of Congress will act in a way to avoid the label of a spendthrift Congress which is already being attached to it by many of our right thinking citizens who have watched with deep concern its actions in recent weeks.

The great majority of our people need to become aware of the dangers they face from ever bigger government and loose fiscal policy.

We must wake up. We must alert the various forces in our citizenry to make sure of two things: First, whatever funds are really needed for defense, for space exploration, and for other essential military and civilian purposes must be provided, and provided soundly.

Second, we must continue our fight to eliminate waste, duplication, continuance of unsound governmental subsidies and services no longer needed. We must live within our income. We must keep our economy sound. It cannot be done by going further into debt. We must maintain fiscal integrity.

We know that our dollar toboganned in value to 52 cents from 1939 to 1952. Today it is worth about 48 cents. This has hit our farmers hard. From 1939 to 1952 farm costs more than doubled. Since 1958 farmers' costs have increased only 4 percent.

We know what inflation has done to the people of France where the cost of living today is 37 times what it was about 30 years ago.

I am told that a pound of butter that cost 10 francs in 1927 is 410 francs today.

Don't say it can't happen here. The people of France never thought it would happen there.

All of us as Americans have a patriotic responsibility not to contribute to the inflation danger by needlessly building still higher the mountain of total debt.

Here are some of the things we can do to meet President Eisenhower's objective of establishing a firm economic foundation for the months and years ahead:

First. We must live within our means, and that means to me a balanced Federal budget.

Second. We must strive for price stability as a national goal as proposed by the President in his economic report to the Congress.

Third. We must maintain a sound credit policy and guard against the danger of low-cost credit which can feed inflationary appetites.

Fourth. We in the Federal Government must set an example of stability for the whole economy. Certainly here President Eisenhower is exercising vigorous leadership. For example, he recently established a Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, of which I am privileged to be a member. We are already at work.

Fifth. We must see to it that fair competition operates in our economy. This we are doing through judicious application of the antitrust laws, for example.

Part of our overall responsibility is to do all in our power to make sure that our Government programs are sound and realistic. I am particularly interested that this be true of our farm programs.

What is the agricultural situation today? Presumably, in this audience, there are not many directly involved with farming as an occupation. But agricultural policy is of national import and is a concern of us all.

Most of you know we are plagued by large surpluses, but only in a very few crops. Remember, when you hear and read about our surpluses and their shocking cost, that most of agriculture is healthy today and that our farmers—the best in the world—are doing a wonderful job. Only 12 out of 250 farm products produced commercially are Government supported.

But bear in mind, also, that we should be thankful for the blessing of abundance. We should be grateful that our problems are are those of oversupply rather than scarcity. Not many peoples in the world can say this.

If we look at our agriculture over the broad scope, it is today a fairly bright picture.

Production is at the highest levels in history, so is gross and per capita farm income.

Farm ownership is at its highest level, and so is the farmer's net equities.

Transportation, telephones, television, electricity, and other aids to abundant living are more widely available than ever before.

The standard of living on our farms is the highest we have ever known.

There are still serious unsolved problems, including the cost-price squeeze, though we are making progress.

Farming is a hazardous occupation.

Farmers are not as highly organized as other groups in our economy. They have only limited control over the supply of their products. In other words, they lack adequate bargaining power. However, they are moving in the right direction through their farmer-owned and farmer-controlled organizations.

Most of agriculture is free of controls. And this free part, representing more than four-fifths of our agriculture, is doing fairly well. The problem narrows down to a few crops—only 5 of them controlled—for which outmoded programs have been too long continued in the mistaken belief they would serve farmers.

The legal requirement that the Federal Government support a few crops at unrealistic levels is pricing us out of world markets and may be doing irreparable harm to vital exports. For example, as is generally recognized, cotton has lost markets at home and abroad—to foreign producers and to manufacturers of synthetics. Tobacco is pricing itself out of markets at home and abroad also.

But at this moment the classic example of our mistake is in wheat. After the legislation enacted at the last session of Congress, wheat today comprises a very major part of the problem. If you combine wheat, corn and cotton you have represented 85 percent of the Government inventory of price supported commodities. But these three crops produce only 20 percent of the total cash farm income.

We are growing much more wheat than we can consume and sell abroad. Most of the costs under the wheat program result from the production of a comparatively few large growers; in fact, to less than 10 percent of those who grow wheat.

The obvious answer to this problem is to eliminate as rapidly as practicable ineffective controls and use price supports at levels that will preserve and build markets.

Price support programs of a realistic nature can be a valuable tool in helping to facilitate orderly marketing. This administration has so considered them and so used them, except where the law required their mandatory use at unrealistic levels.

On July 1, 1959, it is estimated that the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in commodities for which price support is mandatory will total $7.6 billion. All but $100 million—$7.5 billion—will consist of these crops for which price support is mandatory: corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco.

Yes, price supports are valuable, but they should not be used to destroy markets and fill warehouses.

But there are areas in which Government can provide permanent assistance to help the American farmers achieve adequate income. Important areas, for example, are through public research, education and market expansion.

During the past 6 years the budget for agricultural research has more than doubled. Any long-range farm policy which is going to serve agriculture and the Nation must give a prominent place to research, education and market expansion.

American agriculture—our farmers, ranchers, and their families—has been victimized during the past 10 years through the failure to make such needed changes in old, outmoded legislation. Many of our farm families will continue to reap the sad economic consequences of obsolete rigid programs unless recommended changes governing our price support laws are made without delay.

The President has pointed the way to necessary changes again this year. I have amplified them in appearances before both Senate and House Agriculture Committees. It is my hope that the Congress recognizes the urgency of the situation and will make the adjustment that only Congress can make.

Only in this way can we achieve the objective which we seek—a more prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture for all America.

As Republicans we must stand up and be counted for what we believe to be right. It is not too early to start, especially for you here in New Jersey. I understand you have a vital State election coming up in November.

The way to victory is through hard work. First, get the best possible candidates for the legislature, for if anything was proved last November it was that a sound and an appealing candidate is one of the basic ingredients of victory. Second, work hard for their election by dint of plugging away on a door-to-door basis.

We Republicans have a good story to tell. But we must sell that story, and go forth as missionaries of Republicanism. Thus, I was most pleased to note that plans for getting our story across to the American people that were developed at the recent meeting of the national committee.

We must continually be thankful for the blessings of good government, but, at the same time, be eternally mindful that this God-given blessing is ours only because there are those who fought and always will fight to preserve it.

Yet these very blessings could prove to be our undoing unless our perspective is right and our idealism more concerned with eternal standards and value than with material gain and worldly honors.

History tells the story again and again. As nations become wealthy and standards of living rise the tendency is to concentrate on preserving material security, not on keeping ever fresh and alive the basic concepts that made the Nation great. Security is too often sought as an end in itself. That is our mortal danger in this perilous age. Our Nation, established on great spiritual and moral principles, cannot afford to lose its sense of uprightness. We as a people must keep our sights raised above the dollar sign. We must look beyond material things.

In all this we must hold a proper regard for the importance of our political faith. I believe it no exaggeration to say that world peace and our national security depend directly on the maintenance of the free-enterprise system, which is the foundation stone of the Republican Party.

The maintenance of peace, of course, is the No. 1 goal of any God-fearing people. Thank God, this Nation under the unwavering leadership of President Eisenhower has maintained the peace.

The President would be the first to give high credit for our role as keeper of the peace to a courageous, brillant leader who has been stricken seriously ill. I refer, of course, to our great Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

Lincoln tasted defeat in 1858 but he led the Republican Party to victory in 1860. One hundred years later—in 1958—our party suffered defeat; so let us resolve to let Lincoln's example spur us on to victory in 1960.

With God's help, we will build a prosperous, expanding and free agriculture in a prosperous, expanding and free America—an America which is economically, socially and spiritually sound.

---

## Women Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Concord Daily Monitor of February 26, 1959, entitled "Women Legislators." We in New Hampshire have been proud of the fact that for many years the number of lady legislators in our general court has been greater than any other State.

As this article points out, New Hampshire now has 53 legislatcrs of the fairer sex. They have been responsible for a substantial amount of the constructive legislation which has been enacted in New Hampshire in recent years. Their diligence and hard work in the various committees to which they have been assigned has proven time and time again to be of inestimable value to their male counterparts. It is, therefore, particularly gratifying to me see they are receiving favorable recognition, through this editorial. I recommend its reading to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN LEGISLATORS

Curiously enough, it is in conservative New England that women made their greatest gains in the lawmaking bodies in the

November elections and topping the list in these gains is New Hampshire.

This state has 53 in the Legislature, with 43 Republicans and 10 Democrats. Vermont has 48, Connecticut 47, Maine 11, and Massachusetts 7.

A recently completed study of female representation in State legislatures shows only five States this year have no women solons, whereas 2 years ago seven were womanless. The five where men still reign supreme in legislative halls are Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin.

Throughout the country, including Puerto Rico, 341 women are sitting in legislatures and this is a gain of 16 over 1958. It also is a sign of a trend which smart politicians accept. Women are more and more powerful in the area of politics.

Politically the distaff sides of the legislatures are fairly evenly divided between the two major parties. Democrats have an edge in State senates, 19 to 15. In houses of representatives Republicans outnumber Democrats 157 to 145.

Although it was in New England that the Republicans generally suffered heaviest losses in the 1958 elections, it is in the legislatures of those States that Republican women have their greatest representation, 68 percent of their total woman power, in contrast to only 23 percent for the Democrats.

One reason for this is party representation of women in New Hampshire's Legislature and the division in Vermont of 43 Republicans to 5 Democrats.

The female legislator is not restricted to States. Congress has 17, but there is only 1 lone woman in the Senate, Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, a Republican.

Masculinity in Congress has been preserved in spite of the tremendous gains made by women in politics. But these gains have not been enough to seriously dent the armor of male officeseekers. They have failed in a large measure to meet optimistic predictions following election of Jeanette Rankin to Congress in 1916, the first of her sex to serve in the House of Representatives.

Women in this State's legislature proved their capabilities some time ago, but important committee chairmanships continue to go to men. Often these posts are political rewards, and some day there may be a grudging admission that women are equally deserving of these rewards.

## Parity Prices for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from Mr. Robert M. Harriss to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] under date of January 27, 1959. I understand that copies of this telegram were mailed to some of the other Senators, but I believe it is worthy of consideration by all of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PALM BEACH, *January 27, 1959.*

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Congratulations on your fight for the American farmer that he receive parity prices on that portion domestically consumed and leave him a free man to compete in foreign markets at world prices.

Our greatest asset and most powerful defense is agriculture. We are supposed to be a Christian and Godly country but the Benson-Wallace program of paying the farmers not to produce is anti-Christian and anti-God, and if continued will destroy America and our divine heritage of constitutional Government. On the other hand the diabolical atheistic anti-God Communist Russian Government is doing everything in their power to increase agricultural production, even to the extent of enslaving their women with manual labor to increase their agricultural production.

There is no overproduction of agriculture with the world hungry, starving, and naked. Therefore if these surplus Government commodities were made available on a long-term loan basis or an outright gift basis, it will be a hundredfold more effective in combatting communism than giving these foreign governments and their politicians our taxpayers' money.

In connection with this the Treasury Department permitted foreigners during the past year to take away more than $2,300 million of our gold while at the same time if any United States citizen was caught with possession of gold it would be a criminal offense.

This program of permitting foreigners to take our gold should be stopped immediately and the price of gold should be raised to a fair market price, in the neighborhood of $100 per ounce. This would be the most constructive thing we could do for agriculture, labor, industry, our economy, and for world recovery. This because, since the price of gold was arbitrarily fixed at $35 an ounce, the price level has risen approximately 300 percent.

Keep up the good fight for agriculture and America and please call upon me if I can help in any way.

I am sending a copy of this telegram to the other U.S. Senators, Representatives, Governors, and friends who I believe can be helpful in your fight.

Best regards,

ROBERT M. HARRISS.

## What We Must Know About Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the book, "What We Must Know About Communism" by the husband and wife team of Harry and Bonaro Overstreet has become known as the book which Secretary Dulles lent President Eisenhower. In a recent article in the New York Herald Tribune, columnist Roscoe Drummond stated that this is the very book he would invite every adult American, every Member of the Congress, and the highest policymaking officials to read. A public-spirited citizen of New York, Alfred B. Kastor, of Mount Kisco, was moved by the importance of this work and has sent a copy to each of the 533 Members of the Senate and House. I trust that my colleagues will be able to set aside sufficient time to read the book.

I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of Mr. Drummond's article printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVERSTREET BOOK ON REDS CALLED REQUIRED READING

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—If I had the opportunity to invite every adult American from 18 to 88, including every Senator and Congressman and the highest policymaking officials of the administration, to read one book in the next 30 days, I know the book I would name.

The effects of such a nationwide reading of this book would be:

To increase the mental preparedness of the whole Nation for whatever lies ahead in the cold war.

To help bring into being the private and public stamina and grasp of what we face so that we can see and support what needs to be done.

To enable us as a people and as a government to deal with the Soviet dictatorship more wisely and more productively—and to negotiate more securely—without losing the peace or loosing the bombs.

This is a book for layman and expert alike from which each, individually, will, I think, benefit profoundly.

The authors of this book have credentials. They have credentials of character and accomplishment. Each is a teacher and a distinguished psychologist. Both are good writers.

The authors are Harry Overstreet, who wrote the pioneering work, "The Mature Mind," and his wife, Bonaro Overstreet, who wrote "Understanding Fear." Now, after years of research they have for the first time turned to the new field of public policy. The result is incomparable insight and persuasiveness.

The book is "What We Must Know About Communism," published a few months ago by W. W. Norton and Company, N.Y.

It deals with more than communism, though it plumbs communism's roots, its appeal and its delusions as nothing you have ever likely read. It sheds such new shafts of light on Communist teaching and tactics that everyone who reads it will be better equipped to do his part in arresting its encroachments.

It deals with more than what we must know about communism. It deals with what we must do about communism in our minds, in our Nation and in our world.

I think it is a must for President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, for Lyndon Johnson, Adlai Stevenson, and Hubert Humphrey, for Richard Nixon and Governor Rockefeller—and for you and me.

* * * * *

Seven hundred words are inadequate to tell you what is in this book. But it is possible to indicate some of the searching questions which the Overstreets raise—and answer in a way which can make it possible for the free world to cope with Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Mikoyan in the arena of action and negotiation. Such questions as these:

Since Lenin and Khrushchev look upon peace as respite for another war, what do the Soviets mean when they preach "peaceful coexistence"?

What is the proof that the Communist world is engaged in a permanent revolution against every free society in the world?

What teaching of communism was Khrushchev carrying out when Kremlin arms shot down the workers of Hungary in 1956 as Kremlin arms had shot down the workers of Petrograd in 1921?

Since peace is only a temporary waypoint in the "permanent revolution," how can we

negotiate even small dependable agreements (and the Overstreets believe we can) without being trapped into pseudo-agreements which only magnify the danger?

Why has communism won so many adherents by its appeal and lost so many adherents by their disillusionment?

If there is a philanthropist who wants to do something special for his country, he could well buy a few thousand copies of "What We Must Know About Communism" and give them to the 533 Members of Congress, to the top policymaking executives in the Government, to high school principals, and to college political-science teachers. He couldn't spend a few dollars and do more good.

But I don't want you to give it to anybody. I hope you will read "What We Must Know About Communism" and ponder it—and keep it.

## Tributes to Stanley G. Jewett and William L. Finley at Malheur Wildlife Refuge, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, two of the greatest naturalists and advocates of wildlife conservation ever to live in the Pacific Northwest were the late Stanley G. Jewett and the late William L. Finley, both of whom I was proud to consider personal friends.

On October 24, 1958, a bronze plaque was dedicated to these two illustrious men amidst the grandeur of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge, which they helped to found and establish. The Oregon Division of the Izaak Walton League promoted this fitting tribute, under the leadership of Dr. Alfred J. Kreft, State president, and Mr. L. C. (Jack) Binford, one of its outstanding members. I commend them for their part in this appropriate honoring of two great personages.

Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson made the dedication speech when the plaque was unveiled. This, again, was appropriate because Dr. Gabrielson, not only worked closely with Stanley Jewett and Bill Finley but, as first director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, he was the man most responsible for the preservation of the Malheur's marshes and wetlands for wildlife propagation.

I ask unanimous consent that an informative and eloquent editorial published in the Oregon Daily Journal, of Portland, on October 26, 1958, describing the tribute to Messrs. Jewett and Finley, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Its title is "Lasting Tribute to Two Naturalists."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LASTING TRIBUTE TO TWO NATURALISTS

A rock from the bold rims of Blitzen Valley, with a bronze plaque bearing the names Stanley G. Jewett and William L. Finley, will be dedicated Saturday.

It's the setting, though, that's the perpetual tribute to these two men who have enriched the lives of all who enjoy our wildlife and outdoors.

Northward from the rock the Malheur marshland sweeps to the horizon. The wind carries the laughing clamor of snow geese, the high tinkle of teal, the growl of canvasback flashing white, and the bugle of swans as they course swiftly in file over the browning marsh.

Jewett was the last of our great pioneer field naturalists in this fertile Pacific coast region.

He helped make known the variety and complexity of living things. Our birds and mammals were his specialty. He had a curiosity about wild creatures that was insatiable.

Finley was the crusading naturalist whose movies, pictures, books, and lectures helped motivate the conservation movement that surged forward after President "Teddy" Roosevelt came into office.

As a direct result of Finley's publicity on the plight and slaughter of wildlife on the Malheur Marshes, Roosevelt first set aside the refuge there in 1908.

Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League has planned a daylong program starting with a tour of the refuge at 10 a.m.

Dr. Ira Gabrielson, close associate of both Jewett and Finley and president of the Wildlife Management Institute, will be the principal speaker.

So, on the 50th anniversary of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge, largest of all Federal refuges managed primarily for waterfowl, two men whose lives and works were closely tied to the Malheur Marshes are being honored on a site and at a time that would most please them.

## Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, one of this country's great leaders in the field of responsible labor-management relations, is a man of whom South Dakota is justly proud, Judge Boyd Leedom, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, and a native of Rapid City, S. Dak.

In a recent speech before the Industrial Relations Center Labor Conference at the University of Minnesota, Judge Leedom discussed the responsibilities of labor unions in the enactment of legislation to curb the evils and abuses disclosed in the operation of some unions.

Judge Leedom posed this burning question:

Will union leaders use their effective political strength, which was greatly enhanced in the latest elections, to prevent enactment of regulations that are tough enough really to cure existing evils?

The Washington Star saw fit to comment editorially on Judge Leedom's question.

I ask unanimous consent that both the speech and the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASPECTS OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION AND UNION RESPONSIBILITY

(Luncheon remarks of Boyd Leedon, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, before Industrial Relations Center Labor Conference, University of Minnesota)

A few months ago on a university platform in your neighboring State of Wisconsin, Mr. Arthur J. Goldberg, one of organized labor's most capable lawyers, made a speech which has given me a great deal of thought. He reported what he termed the recent occurrence of "a hardening of attitudes" between management and labor. He said in part:

"But in the recent past I see a hardening of attitudes, and retrogression rather than progress in understanding. Management is tougher, unions are tougher, and the end product is not necessarily good for either side."

Not long afterward, Prof. E. Wight Bakke, head of the Yale Labor and Management Center, brought in almost the same report. He was quoted as declaring that relations between the two seem to be forming "a pattern of fairly antagnostic foreign relations between two separate institutions."

STATE OF VASSALAGE

A. H. Raskin, writing in the New York Times, has said:

"Businessmen reproach themselves for having sunk into what they depict as a state of vassalage to monopolistic unions. * * * The collapse of the drive to outlaw the union shop in industrial States has shattered employers' hopes that they could put the brakes on labor through political action. Moreover, the victory of liberal Democrats and Republicans has convinced many ranking industrialists that both parties are union dominated. This sense of being political orphans in a laboristic society has strengthened the movement among major employers to find their own salvation by forming united fronts to slug it out with labor at the bargaining table."

Wherever I go I find evidence of increased antagonisms. Among union representatives I hear echoed Mr. Goldberg's comment. Among management representatives I see signs of preparation for strong resistance to unions in politics and at the bargaining table.

An excellent record of harmonious industrial relations during the past 6 years may be coming to an end. Under the moderate guidance of Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, chief architect of the labor policy of the Eisenhower administration, only one-fourth of 1 percent of available work time, approximately, was lost in strikes—a remarkable record. But the recent rash of shutdowns and strikes in the auto industry, in farm equipment, the air lines, and in newspapers, indicates this unusual period of industrial peace may be headed for hard going. These strikes also affirm the new harder attitudes which are bad for everybody—for industry, for organized labor, for the American consumer—but more especially this new antagonism is bad for the American worker. It is he who gets caught most directly through loss of pay when the great squeeze between management on one side and union leadership on the other increasingly slows down and sporadically stops the marvelous wheels of American industry.

LABOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES

That organized labor cannot escape a share of the blame for this new and deplorable condition is manifest. Of course, management is also to blame. But I talk about management's responsibilities when I talk to management groups as I did earlier this month. Today I speak to a meeting cosponsored by this university, the Minnesota AFL-CIO Federation of Labor, the Minneapolis Central Labor Union Council, and the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, and so I deal primarily with the responsibilities of

organized labor in the current industrial situation.

Some of the things that have happened and continue to occur in the labor movement and that have contributed to management's determination to get tough, are perfectly obvious. Others may be more questionable. I want to mention one, in passing, before I get to the most obvious cause—that is the revelation by the McClellan committee of widespread corruption in certain segments of organized labor and in industry.

Conduct that possibly bears on management's hardened attitude, is organized labor's indiscriminate use at times, of its tremendous power over the economy of our country. It is only the very insensitive union leader who does not see some possibility of further public regulation on the right to strike or picket. A contributing factor may be the widespread adverse public reaction to secondary boycotts, to the recent strategic airline strike at the peak of the Christmas season, and to the recent disputes that stopped all the presses of the New York City newspapers.

PEOPLE WILL SPEAK

The American people will not put up with labor lords any more than they did with the business barons of another era. And at that certain point when the public mind decides that the special rights of labor interfere too much with the general welfare, a powerful reaction will set in. It should not be inevitable that the pendulum swing too far. But when it does, those in whose favor it swings ultimately suffer most.

But the factor emanating from organized labor which has certainly created new management and public resistance to and suspicion of unions is the corruption brought to light within the labor movement by the Senate investigation. This wary attitude is not merely a matter of employers taking advantage of these sordid incidents to embarrass the whole union movement and thereby escape collective bargaining, although there is some of that going on. The impact of these revelations upon the public as well as upon management unquestionably tends to create a climate of distrust and suspicion which makes both sides stiffen. After all, the revelations of bribes and "sweetheart" agreements and phony unions touch both labor and management.

It is virtually certain that these conditions will result in Government regulation, and likely with this session of Congress. The Kennedy bill, the administration bill, introduced by Senator GOLDWATER and other Republicans, and the McClellan bill, that thus far has had little attention, would all require strict reporting and accounting of union funds, would increase the processes of democracy within unions and sharply restrict bossism. That legislation will pass is indicated by reason of this area of agreement between three well recognized political groupings within the Congress. These groups are the liberal Democrats of the North represented by Senator KENNEDY, the Republicans on the administration bill, and the conservative Democrats of the South represented by Senator MCCLELLAN. I think all respected labor leaders favor generally the kind of regulation I have just mentioned. But there are at least a couple of flies in the ointment that may prevent quick enactment of new legislation.

LABOR "SWEETENERS"

The Kennedy bill and the administration bill have provisions euphemistically called "sweeteners" for labor. A principal one would ease the difficulties the building trades encounter in the union security provisions of Taft-Hartley. Rumblings from responsible labor leaders indicate that unless these provisions are carried along with even the relatively mild restrictive measures enumerated, labor may oppose the legislation. The other difficulty lies in the fact that the administration bill goes beyond the Kennedy bill, providing further restrictions in the area of secondary boycotts and other forms of picketing. These provisions seem to be opposed by most if not all of organized labor's leadership.

In the face of revelations of widespread abuses, labor was confronted with a decision as to responsible action. Should they and could they clean their own house? This decision was made forthrightly and I think with great courage, but lesser effectiveness. The AFL–CIO made great efforts to do the job by itself, but there are circumscribed limits to the federation's reach, as its officers have often noted. Expulsions and rival organizing campaigns are about the most effective action, and under some circumstances these have had little effect.

BIG QUESTION

A second question of real magnitude now confronts the union leaders. Will they use their effective political strength, which paradoxically was greatly enhanced in the latest elections notwithstanding the full revelation of labor's abuses, to prevent enactment of regulations that are tough enough really to cure existing evils?

The responsible leaders are in an anomalous and difficult situation. They fear, and no doubt with some just cause, that certain elements would pass legislation under the guise of controlling admitted evil practices, but for the real purpose of using it to undermine unionism and collective bargaining. Therefore labor acquiesces in further regulation very cautiously. On the other hand, if through the political strength they thwart congressional action that really reaches the current abuses, their own institution might fall. For it is quite clear that some Government restraint must be put upon union officers and that the labor movement cannot cope with its own problem without such additional help. The federation has endorsed this idea, and so have nearly all the major unions. Then comes the question: Is restraint needed on certain kinds of concerted activity now protected under the present law? That is the decent labor leader's problem. If they decide restaint on such activity is not needed, and they are wrong, then certain of their own disruptive bodies will continue to damage the whole movement through ruthless union activity. Only the renegade unions take advantage of the loopholes in inadequate regulation and they alone stand to benefit from it.

PROMPT ACTION NEEDED

Thus the cancer will be permitted to grow through weak legislation, and the healthy body of labor will seriously suffer. There is no question that prompt action is necessary in this area of abuse if we are going to avoid a longtime damage to collective bargaining.

But the damage will not be forestalled by a statute which does not cure the evil; any worthwhile legislation must strike directly at the cancerous growth, and leave unharmed the organism that I deem vital to our economy—the legitimate trade union functions. The damage to collective bargaining will fall heaviest upon the union people whose organizations exist primarily for the purpose of collective bargaining. Great damage to our whole country can result, but clearly the heaviest immediate brunt would fall upon the people in unions. All of us, but especially the unions' responsible leaders, must examine each proposed law carefully to be sure it will do the proposed job adequately, no more and no less.

I wish to revert now to Arthur Goldberg's reference to hardening attitudes. He proposed that something be done about it, that a labor-management conference be established where in off-the-record sessions, free of Government interference and away from the immediate stakes of gain or loss that completely dominate the conferences of the bargaining table—good, solid, and wise representatives of labor and of management can get together periodically to work out their respective responsibilities to themselves, to each other, and to the public. Aspects of his proposal received appreciative words from the management side—the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and from Government, the Secretary of Labor. I am convinced that in this kind of approach toward improved understanding, rather than through Government regulation, necessary as the latter may be, the best soltuion of industrial problems will be found.

THREE SIDES TO QUESTION

I have a good friend by the name of Dick Halverson, formerly of Hollywood and now of Washington, D.C. In the extra time he has from his Presbyterian pastorate and a Christian ministry that physically reaches into all parts of the world, he issues a weekly letter throughout the Nation which is called Perspective. It contains many words of wisdom. In one issue of Perspective, Dick said this:

"There are three sides to every question! Not just two sides—three! Your side, the other fellow's side, and the right side!

"The only real cure for any problem is to discover and apply the right side!

"This is the crux of the matter. We're not really interested in the right side. We're interested in our side. Other fellow's interested in his side. Result: impasse—deadlock."

Management and labor really need to learn this lesson. The secret of course is to substitute for the prevailing mutual attitudes of suspicion and distrust, good will, and real concern for the other fellow's welfare, and the Goldberg plan might provide a proper starting place. Seems naive, doesn't it, to suggest to a hardheaded American business magnate that he be motivated by a real concern for the welfare of a tough, hard-hitting union leader—and vice versa?

MUTUAL CONCERN

That this does seem so naive to those who are the partisans in the great controversy is, of course, the cause of the present deterioration of industrial relations. In an atmosphere of genuine good will and real concern for the problems of the other side, there would be no limit to America's productive potential and the resulting benefits to businessmen, workers, and all the rest of us. Dick Halverson said this in Perspective:

"Management has its side—labor too. Each fights to maintain its 'rights,' Deadlock. Then they begin to whittle—jockey—conspire. Finally agreement—but with each side giving in as little as possible * * * cutting in on the other as much as possible.

"Both cherish the day they can regain what they lost in concessions granted out of sheer expediency.

"Problem's not solved—actually increased. In the long run the conflict is not settled—just postponed. Resentments burn quietly, deeply, explosively."

But I say to you, given a climate of real cooperation and attitudes of mutual concern, the problems are not impossible, can really be solved.

There is a fable in which, somewhat deeply hidden, you will find the point I want to make:

An eagle swooped down in a little community nestled in the mountains, snatched up a small baby and carried it away to the eagle's nest high on the crags of the mountainside. First a shepherd, then a mountain climber sought to rescue the child, and failed. Finally a peasant woman tried and brought the baby back to safety. She did the impossible through a real concern for the baby's welfare. You see, she was the baby's mother.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 4, 1959]

A QUESTION TO LABOR

Chairman Boyd Leedom of the National Labor Relations Board has posed a question

to union leadership that has a great bearing upon the American economic system, and possibly on the whole political and social structure of the country. It is, in short, whether labor—with its political strength greatly enhanced in last year's elections—will throw the balance of its power for or against the enactment of legislation that would help to eliminate some of the evils and abuses that have been disclosed in certain union practices.

In posing his question, Mr. Leedom was referring primarily to the evils and abuses revealed by the McClellan committee, to the racketeering and thievery within segments of organized labor and the consequent corrupting influence upon affected labor-management relations. He acknowledged, too, that some of labor, for example, the AFL–CIO, had made efforts "forthrightly and * * * with great courage" to do its own housecleaning, but with relatively little effectiveness. Remaining, then, is the core of the question, namely, whether responsible labor will support and welcome legislation to help in the housecleaning, or will retreat into a position of opposition to any corrective legislation unless it is sweetened to union tastes.

Unfortunately, labor—again, the AFL–CIO—already has given an initial answer. It has served notice it will oppose the Kennedy-Irvin bill if the one section it wants is deleted. Labor may, of course, prevail in preserving its sweeteners. One of these would permit replaced strikers to vote in representative elections. Another would allow building trades unions to obtain NLRB certification under certain conditions without any election or showing of majority status on a job.

But labor should bear in mind the point made by Mr. Leedom that there are "three well-recognized political groupings within Congress" pushing for corrective legislation. One group includes the liberal Northern Democrats backing the Kennedy bill, a second the Republicans supporting the administration bill and a third the conservative Democrats of the South supporting the McClellan bill. Combined, these three have the power to enact legislation, and they probably will. If labor, in turn, succeeds in weakening it to a point where it does not correct the abuses, then labor itself runs further risks.

It will, as Mr. Leedom says, be the "renegade unions" that will take advantage of the loopholes in inadequate regulation. They will be the beneficiaries, while the responsible labor movement is damaged. And at some date thereafter, "when the public mind decides that the special rights of labor interfere too much with the general welfare, a powerful reaction will set in." Labor's own uphill battle for political influence should be its best reminder that the pendulum of public sentiment in this country can and does swing, and that Mr. Leedom, for example, was only stating a fair warning when h said that "the American people will not put up with labor lords any more than they did with the business barons of another era."

## Tourism, a Two-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in reviewing our economic picture—as we often do today—a fact that is sometimes overlooked is that of the value of tourism to the eonomcy.

In recent years, the general conception of tourism has been, for the most part, that of U.S. citizens visiting nations abroad.

In time past, this was largely true. Touring in foreign countries was a luxury affordable only by the rich. By contrast, today's travelers, fortunately, include students, teachers, laborers, farmers, businessmen, artists, musicians, and others.

I am happy to note also that currently there is strong indication that international tourism is becoming more and more a two-way street; that is, that a substantial number of foreign visitors are now coming to our country.

According to the Immigration Service, more than 847,000 foreign travelers entered the United States in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. There were also more than 6 million Canadian visitors.

We recognize, of course, that the travel industry can—and in the future, I believe, will—make an ever-greater contribution to the educational, economic, political, and cultural progress of our country.

Fortunately, the increased number of travelers also offers new opportunities for development of tourism, not only to the Nation, but to the individual States.

In Wisconsin, for example, tourism is now one of our major industries—estimated to bring in about $500 million annually.

Featured among Wisconsin's attractions are: About 8,676 lakes and 10,000 miles of streams for excellent fishing; 7 State forests and 17 State parks, providing a great many wonderful opportunities for sightseeing, boating, camping out of doors, and traveling through our scenic countrysides; over 161 museums and other historical sites and places of interest. Last year, over 6 million travelers visited the State park and forest areas of our State.

With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway—scheduled for next month—we are also looking forward to an influx of more and more visitors to Wisconsin and the Great Lakes region, from Canada and all over the other parts of the World, as well as from many other States of the Union.

With our ever-expanding network of turnpikes, increased air transportation, and the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Wisconsin—as will other States—will continue to grow as a tourist attraction in this great country.

The March 3 edition of the Christian Science Monitor carries an informative article by Mr. Leavitt F. Morris, commenting on the upsurge in international tourism, as well as some of the problems to be dealt with to encourage an increase in traffic.

I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES WARMS WELCOME AS WORLD TRAVEL ENTERS TWO-WAY STREET

(By Leavitt F. Morris)

A two-way street in travel, long sought by United States leaders in the tourist industry, at last is becoming a profitable reality.

Pleasure visitors from abroad to the shores of the United States have risen sharply in the past year. For every business traveler there now are five tourists. This is a most encouraging trend for the American resort operator, who has seen many of his potential guests lured away to foreign lands without any immediate possibility of filling their places with visitors from overseas.

Figures supplied by the Immigration Service of the Department of Justice disclose that more than 847,000 foreign travelers (all classes of nonimmigrant arrivals) entered the United States in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958. There also were more than 6 million Canadian visitors. Pleasure visitor visas numbered 514,599 and business visitor visas 81,405.

HOST FACES CHALLENGE

When the United States eases its currency restrictions and requirements for admitting visitors—steps already are under way in Washington to do these things—the tourist tide from abroad should swell to unprecedented heights.

President Eisenhower has designated 1960 as "Visit the United States Year." In so doing he has called upon all segments of the tourist industry to develop attractive programs for visitors from overseas. The President urges that our foreign guests go to all parts of the Nation to see for themselves a land and people that stand for freedom and peace among all mankind.

Being hosts for foreign visitors will be a new experience for many American resort operators. It also will be a stimulating challenge. By being gracious hosts to persons from abroad—especially those seeing the United States for the first time—Americans can do much toward establishing a better understanding of this country's way of life.

OVERSEAS TRAVEL WINGS ON

There will be no slackening of travel by Americans to foreign shores. With the jet age a reality, more U.S. vacationists will be winging their way to London and Paris, from which points they will travel far and wide.

Those who have the time will be crowding aboard ocean liners for the leisurely and pleasant voyage to ports in Europe, South America, and other distant lands.

Festivals, fairs, musicals, and a host of other attractions have been scheduled in almost every European country to lure Americans for a week or for several months.

The one important thing to be remembered about this 2-way street of travel is: The dollars spent in foreign lands by Americans in turn are used by their counterparts to pay for vacation expenses while touring the United States.

The two-way street in travel is indeed long overdue, but now that it is here the world in general will be better for it—not only because of profitable financial gains to all concerned but for the richer and fuller understanding gained among those men and women who move over this broad highway.

## Shifts in Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an article in the January 31 issue of the Magazine of Wall Street, entitled "Firsthand Report on Shifts in Defense

Spending." The author, Allen M. Smythe, has specialized in defense procurement policies and practices and brings out some interesting facts about the President's attitude toward extravagant spending by the Defense Department.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRSTHAND REPORT ON SHIFTS IN DEFENSE SPENDING

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Military procurement in 1959 will be more directly affected by shifting emphasis on weapons systems, including the coming into production and operational status of those projects just emerging from intense development, than it will be by Federal economy or the outcome of the contest between the spenders and the savers.

Whatever happens to other budgetary items, national defense is not likely to suffer. It will be surprising, indeed, if the total outlay is not well over the aggregate spending of fiscal year 1958.

Some defense contractors will feel the pinch of developments. Some already have. On the other hand, there will be beneficiaries of technical breakthroughs and new scientific discoveries.

The President in press conferences and messages to Congress emphasized the need for the new missiles and the spaceships, and also stressed that they must be procured at the expense of less modern weapons. They must supplant, not supplement, other weapons, if the Nation is to remain solvent. The Pentagon has already started to carry out the President's orders.

THE PRESIDENT'S APPROACH

At this point it might be interesting to analyze the President's attitude on future defense spending. Under the law he is Commander in Chief of our armed services. His experience and background gives the Nation and our allies confidence in his viewpoints. Recently he has been giving detailed attention to our military problems and has stressed this point.

His chief goal is a dynamic national defense, thoughtfully and sensibly planned. His secondary aim is increased efficiency and the avoidance of waste. He has stressed that the cost of the new weapons is tremendous, even when compared with the marvelous resiliency and capacity of our country.

He states: "Such expenditures demand both balance and perspective in our planning for defense. At every turn we must weigh, judge, and select. Needless duplication of weapons and forces must be avoided. We must guard against feverish building of war armaments to meet glibly predicted moments of so-called maximum peril."

To the embarrassment of the Pentagon, the President has been inclined to accept the Treasury's figures on defense costs. The Treasury gives total expenditures and total estimated costs. The Pentagon is inclined to emphasize minimum production costs.

TOTAL COST VERSUS PART COST

An example occurred in the state of the Union address to Congress. The President stated that the overall cost of the Atlas ICBM would average $35 million per missile on the firing line. Last January the Air Force testified before Congress that the production cost of Atlas or Titan after the original order was completed would be $1.8 million per missile.

Incidentally, this figure released to newsmen for the first time the classified number of ballistic missiles on order. Previously given out was $3 billion for the total cost of the project. Simple arithmetic gives an answer of 90 Atlas, or sufficient for nine squadrons.

President also has stressed the importance of missile development. He estimated that a total of $7 billion would be spent on such projects. The Pentagon had disclosed that expenditures for missile hardware, i.e., contracts to military contractors, would be at half this amount. Research, construction of launching sites, transportation, and other costs make up the other half.

Pentagon consternation rose to great heights when they read the President's statement that "certain bombers cost their weight in gold." They thought the President might be referring to the Air Force B–58 medium bomber or the Navy A–3J carrier bomber.

Defense officials for the first time hastened to show high costs for their weapons. They pointed out that if all expenditures on the B–58 were charged to the planes so far produced, the cost would be $26.7 million per plane. However, with a flyaway weight of over 160,000 pounds, this does not approximate the $35 per ounce for gold.

North American Aviation has a contract for 25 A–3J Mach 2 carrier bombers for development and testing purposes. They weigh 31,000 pounds, and total costs would average $17 million per plane. However, Navy and company officials say the production price is $5 million per plane, which would make them cost about 11 times their weight in silver.

The President also in recent speeches and conferences has cautioned that ordinary submarines now cost $50 million and that those of the Polaris type cost over three times as much. He has often used the old analogy that modern fighter aircraft fly twice as high, over 3 times as fast, and cost 50 times as much as the fighters of World War II.

There is an implied threat that if Congress appropriates greater amounts than his budget request the President will again exercise his constitutional authority and not spend the money. All of this indicates that industry must expect some heavy shifting of funds from conventional armament to the new modern and scientific weapons of today.

## How Television Can Help Us Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the recent convention of the Radio-Television News Directors Association in Chicago, Ill., Edward R. Murrow, the distinguished radio-TV news columnist, delivered a provocative challenge regarding television's role in the United States today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Mr. Murrow, which was reprinted in the December 13–19 issue of TV Guide.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TV CAN HELP US SURVIVE

Our history will be what we make it. And if there are any historians about 50 or 100 years from now, and there should be preserved the kinescopes for 1 week of all three networks, they will find there recorded in black and white, or color, evidence of decadence, escapism, and insulation from the realities of the world in which we live. I invite your attention to the television schedules of all networks between the hours of 8 and 11 p.m. eastern time. Here you will find only fleeting and spasmodic reference to the fact that this Nation is in mortal danger. There are, it is true, occasional informative programs presented in that intellectual ghetto on Sunday afternoons. But during the daily peak viewing periods, television in the main insulates us from the realities of the world in which we live. If this state of affairs continues, we may alter an advertising slogan to read: "Look now, pay later." For surely we shall pay for using this most powerful instrument of communication to insulate citizenry from the hard and demanding realities which must be faced if we are to survive. I mean the word "survive" literally * * *.

I am entirely persuaded that the American public is more reasonable, restrained and more mature than most of our industry's program planners believe. Their fear of controversy is not warranted by the evidence. I have reason to know, as do many of you, that when the evidence on a controversial subject is fairly and calmly presented, the public recognizes it (as) an effort to illuminate, (not) agitate.

The oldest excuse of the networks for their timidity is their youth. There spokesmen say: "We are young; we have not developed the traditions, nor acquired the experience of the older media." If they but knew it, they are building those traditions, creating those precedents every day. Each time they yield to a voice from Washington or any political pressure, each time they eliminate something that might offend some section of the community, they are creating their own body of precedent and tradition. They are, in fact, not content to be "half safe."

Nowhere is this better illustrated than by the fact that the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission publicly prods broadcasters to engage in their legal right to editorialize. Of course, to undertake an editorial policy, overt and clearly labeled, and obviously unsponsored, requires a station or a network to be responsible. Most stations today do not have the manpower to assume this responsibility, but the manpower could be recruited. Editorials would not be profitable; if they had a cutting edge they might even offend. It is much easier, much less troublesome to use the money-making machine of television and radio merely as a conduit through which to channel anything that is not libelous, obscene or defamatory. In that way one has the illusion of power without responsibility.

In this kind of complex and confusing world, you can't tell very much about the why of the news in broadcast where only 3 minutes is available for news. The only man who used to do that was Elmer Davis, and his kind aren't around anymore. If radio news is to be regarded as a commodity, only accepted when salable, and only when packaged to fit the advertising appropriation of a sponsor, then I don't care what you call it—I say it isn't news.

My memory also goes back to the time when the fear of a slight reduction in business did not result in an immediate cutback in bodies in the news and public affairs department at a time when network profits had just reached an all time high. We would all agree, I think, that whether on a station or a network, the stapling machine is a poor substitute for a newsroom typewriter.

One of the minor tragedies of television news and information is that the networks will not even defend their vital interests. When my employer, CBS, through a combination of enterprise and good luck, did an interview with Nikita Khrushchev, the President utered a few ill-chosen, uninformed words on the subject, and the network practically apoligized. This produced a rarity. Many newspapers defended the

CBS right to produce the program and commended it for its initiative. But the other networks remained silent.

Upon occasion, economics and editorial judgement are in conflict. And there is no law which says that dollars will be defeated by duty. Not so long ago the President of the United States delivered a television address to the Nation. He was discoursing on the possibility or probability of war between this Nation and the Soviet Union and Communist China—a reasonably compelling subject. Two networks—CBS and NBC—delayed that broadcast for an hour and 15 minutes. If this decision was dictated by anything other than financial reasons, the networks didn't deign to explain those reasons. That hour and 15 minute delay, by the way, is about twice the time required for an ICBM to travel from the Soviet Union to major targets in the United States. It is difficult to believe that this decision was made by men who love, respect, and understand news.

So far I have been dealing largely with the deficit side of the ledger, and the items could be expanded. But I have said, and believe, that potentially we have in this country a free enterprise system of radio and television which is superior to any other. But to achieve its promise, it must be both free and enterprising. There is no suggestion here that networks or individual stations should operate as philanthropies. But I can find nothing in the Bill of Rights or the Communications Act which says that they must increase their net profit each year, less the Republic collapse. I do not suggest that news or information should be subsidized by foundations or private subscriptions. I am aware that the networks have expended and are expending very considerable sums of money on public affairs programs from which they cannot hope to receive any financial reward.

But we all know that you cannot reach the potential maximum audience in marginal time with a sustaining program. This is so because so many stations on the network—any network—will decline to carry it. Every licensee who applies for a grant to operate in the public interest, convenience and necessity, makes certain promises as to what he will do in terms of program content. Many recipients of licenses have, in blunt language, welshed on those promises. The moneymaking machine blunts their memories. The only remedy for this is closer inspection and punitive action by the FCC. But in the view of many this would come perilously close to supervision of program content.

What, then, is the answer? Do we merely stay in our comfortable nests, concluding that the obligation of these instruments has been discharged when we work at the job of informing the public for a minimum of time? Or do we believe that the preservation of the Republic is a 7-day week, demanding more awareness, better skills, and more perseverance that we have yet contemplated?

I am frightened by the imbalance, the constant striving to reach the largest possible audience for everything; by the absence of a sustained study of the state of the Nation. Heywood Broun once said: "No body politic is healthy until it begins to itch." I would like television to produce some itching pills rather than this endless outpouring of tranquillizers. It can be done. Maybe it won't be, but it could. Let us not shoot the wrong piano player. Do not be deluded into believing that the titular heads of the networks control what appears on their networks. They all have better taste. All are responsible to stockholders, all are honorable men. But they must schedule what they can sell in the public market. And this brings us to the nub of the question.

In one sense it rather revolves around the phrase heard frequently along Madison Avenue: "The Corporate Image." I am not precisely sure what this phrase means, but I would imagine that it reflects a desire on the part of the corporations who pay the advertising bills to have the public imagine, or believe, that they are not merely bodies with no souls, panting in pursuit of elusive dollars. They would like us to believe that they can distinguish between the public good and the private or corporate gain. So the question is this: Are the big corporations, who pay the freight for radio and television programs wise to use that time exclusively for the sale of goods and services?

Is it in their own interest and that of the stockholders so to do?

I refuse to believe that the presidents and chairmen of the boards of these big corporations want their "corporate image" to consist of exclusively a solemn voice in an echo chamber, or a pretty girl opening the door of a refrigerator, or a horse that talks. They want something better, and on occasion some of them have demonstrated it. But most of the men whose legal and moral responsibility it is to spend the stockholders money for advertising, are removed from the realities of the mass media by five, six or a dozen layers of vice presidents, public-relations counsel and advertising agencies. Their business is to sell goods, and the competition is pretty tough.

But this Nation is now in competition with malignant forces of evil who are using every instrument at their command to empty the minds of their subjects, and fill those minds with slogans, determination, and faith in the future. If we go on as we are, we are protecting the mind of the American public from any real contact with the menacing world that squeezes in upon us. We are engaged in a great experiment to discover whether a free public opinion can devise and direct methods of managing the affairs of the Nation. We may fail. But we are handicapping ourselves needlessly.

Let us have a little competition. Not only in selling soap, cigarettes, and automobiles, but in informing a troubled, apprehensive but receptive public. Why should not each of the 20 or 30 big corporations which dominate radio and television decide that they will give up one or two of their regularly scheduled programs each year, turn the time over to the network, and say in effect: "This is a tiny tithe, just a little bit of our profits. On this particluar night we aren't going to try to sell cigarettes or automobiles; this is merely a gesture to indicate our belief in the importance of ideas." The networks should, and I think would, pay for the cost of producing the program. The advertiser, the sponsor, would get name credit, but would have nothing to do with the content of the program. Would this blemish the corporate image? Would the stockholders object? I think not. For if the premise which our pluralistic society rests—which, as I understand it, is that if the people are given sufficient undiluted information, they will then somehow, even after long, sober, second thoughts, reach the right decision—if that premise is wrong then not only the corporate image but the corporations are done for.

It may be that the present system, with no modifications and no experiments, can survive. Perhaps the moneymaking machine has some kind of built-in perpetual motion, but I do not think so. To a very considerable extent the media of mass communications in a given country reflect the political, social, and economic climate in which they flourish. That is the reason ours differ from the British and French, or the Russian and Chinese. We are currently wealthy, fat, comfortable, and complacent. We have currently a built-in allergy to unpleasant or disturbing information. Our mass media reflect this. But unless we get up off our fat surpluses and recognize that television in the main is being used to distract, delude, amuse and insulate us, then television and those who finance it, those who look at it and those who work at it, may see a totally different picture too late.

To those who say: People wouldn't look, they wouldn't be interested, they're too complacent, indifferent and insulated, I can only reply: There is, in one reporter's opinion, considerable evidence against that contention. But even if they are right, what have they got to lose? Because if they are right, and this instrument is good for nothing but to entertain, and insulate, then the tube is flickering now and we soon see that the whole struggle is lost.

This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes, and it can even inspire. But it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise it is merely wires and lights in a box. There is a great and perhaps decisive battle to be fought against ignorance, intolerance and indifference. This weapon of television could be useful.

Stonewall Jackson, who knew something about the use of weapons, is reported to have said: "When war comes, you must draw the sword and throw away the scabbard." The trouble with television is that it is rusting in the scabbard—during a battle for survival.

---

## Foreign Aid Hurts People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely editorial "Foreign Aid Hurts People," which was recently printed in the Arkansas City Daily Traveler, Arkansas City, Kans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIALLY SPEAKING—FOREIGN AID HURTS PEOPLE

The Federal Government's policy of playing rich uncle to foreign nations is beginning to bring squeaks from the big wheel which is the people who see part of their paychecks go for taxes. They are beginning to complain.

For years the wage earner hasn't gotten his hands on all the money he earns. It is taken by the Government, and a good share of it is sent off to other nations. Some nations use it to improve their industries so they can compete with the people who gave the money.

Shortly after World War II this country began pouring money into foreign lands. Any complaints were quickly hushed up. The people were led to believe their money was making lasting friends abroad and communism was being contained in the world.

Once in a while news leaks out that a foreign nation accepts American money, walks hand-in-hand with Russia and looks down on Yankees. This desire to spend abroad isn't a mark of a particular political party. Instead both major parties have been at the helm during the spending spree.

The other day Congressman WINT SMITH of Kansas, said in th last 10 years the U.S. taxpayers have sent $1,375 million to India. Just the other day $350 million went to that nation. But when a gusher oil well came in, India sent to Russia to build refineries. Here is a case where more than a billion dollars went to a nation and when

it got one foot on the ground it leaned toward Russia.

Among the Senators who are interested in foreign affairs and the State Department something is wrong. They criticized Fidel Castro for his wholesale killings of alleged war criminals and Batista's henchmen in Cuba. It is now said that Batista's hands were bloody from similar killings attributed to his leaders and the news was guarded in this country.

In a letter to the folks back home Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL called attention to the mail he is getting from home folks. Many citizens want a balanced budget and curtailed foreign spending. Taxes, spending and the farm situation are getting attention from the private citizen.

Senator SCHOEPPEL said an Arkansas Cityan wrote: "I think the small farmer is very much in the dark because he does not know what steps to take to make things better. I think he wants it better and different but doesn't know what to do."

The expression, "but doesn't know what to do," is fitting for everyone. Government is vague on where this country is headed and all the citizen knows is that he is paying the bill.

The fellow with the tax-extracted paycheck as well as the industry that employs him have something to worry about. This spending isn't helping the cause. Here is an example cited by the Ralls, Tex., Banner:

"The Tennessee Valley Authority, a tax-fed power unit supported by the taxpayers of this Nation, has just bought three new 54,000-kilowatt hydroelectric generators at a cost of $2,637,135 of U.S. tax money—from a foreign manufacturer in Baden, Switzerland.

"Three American firms who bid on the generators were by-passed because they paid their workers so well they could not compete with foreign companies who pay their workers very little.

"The lowest American bidder was the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., of Milwaukee. Allis-Chalmers needed the business. It recently had to lay off 2,300 workers. These workers are among the citizens of Wisconsin who have, during the past 25 years, contributed almost $26 million of their paychecks to support TVA.

"This follows the announced and demonstrated policy of the U.S. Government. That is, simply—to give foreign nations the equipment and technical help to set up factories to compete with American factories; even while American factories pay minimum wages which make it economically sound to buy the cheaper foreign product than the American.

"This policy, and it is a policy of both political parties, can and will destroy American industry in the final analysis, and along with it the entire economic system of this country. And without American industry and without the American economic system, there can be no such thing as American freedom and independence."

## Oregon State College Professor Wins National Book Award in Fiction for 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am sure that many people in the State of Oregon, particularly those in literary pursuits, are extremely proud of the fact that Prof. Bernard Malamud, of Oregon State College, has received the National Book Award in fiction writing for 1958. The award stems from a collection of short stories written by Professor Malamud under the title of "The Magic Barrel."

There is a tendency in our country to think that all literary achievement centers either on Manhattan Island or in Hollywood. I think it is significant that all three major winners of the National Book Awards for 1958 are from the Pacific Coast, with Professor Malamud of Oregon State College among these. Other distinguished winners are from Stanford University at Palo Alto, Calif., and from the University of Seattle in Seattle, Wash. Oregon State College is located in the city of Corvallis, Oreg.

Further details about Professor Malamud's award are contained in an excellent article in the Washington Post and Times Herald for March 4, 1959, entitled "Award Author Got Post Start." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this dispatch by Glendy Culligan, book editor of the Washington Post, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARD AUTHOR GOT POST START

(By Glendy Culligan)

NEW YORK, March 3.—A former Government worker who did his first writing as a freelance columnist for the Washington Post today won one of the Nation's top literary awards.

Bernard Malamud received the National Book Award in fiction for his collection of compassionate and profound short stories, "The Magic Barrel." He shared honors with J. Christopher Herold, whose witty biography of Mme. de Stael, "Mistress to an Age," was named nonfiction winner, and with Theodore Roethke, poetry winner for his lyrics "Words for the Wind."

Now a college teacher, Malamud came to Washington from his native New York in 1939, worked as a clerk with the Census Bureau for a year, and experimented with the writing which has since won national acclaim. He contributed a dozen sketches of Washington life to the "Post-Impressionist" column, which was then a feature of the Post. Later he wrote two novels, "The Natural" and "The Assistant," as well as his winning stories.

EACH GETS $1,000

Like his fellow winners, Malamud received $1,000 and a scroll from the American book industry which sponsors the awards. Roethke, who is ill, accepted his prize by proxy.

All three of today's winners came from the west coast. Herold is editor of the Stanford University Press, Malamud teaches English at Oregon State College, and Roethke does the same at the University of Seattle.

Ranking author among more than 100 writers at the awards reception was Adlai Stevenson, whose book about Russia, "Friends and Enemies," will be published this month. Traffic was heavy at his end of the ballroom as guests stood in line to shake his hand.

Although all of this year's prizes went to representatives of the humanities, science had its inning on the program with the appearance of atomic physicist Arthur Holly Compton, who delivered the ceremonial address.

Compton called for an end of the military chain reaction which has grown out of the nuclear chain reaction he helped develop. He urged the assembled writers, publishers, and all others who influence public opinion to commit themselves to a new American dream, not a dream of motor cars and high wages, but of a better social order.

Scientists, he said, have learned to believe in miracles, but the miracle needed today must take place not in the realm of physics, but in the hearts and minds of men.

WASHINGTONIANS MISSING

Among the missing today were two Washington area eminences who played important roles in preaward speculation. J. R. Salamanca, of Washington Grove, Md., was a candidate for the top fiction award on the basis of his widely praised first novel, "The Lost Country." Huntington Cairns, secretary-treasurer of the National Gallery, who served on the nonfiction jury, was prevented from joining the judges on the platform by gallery business elsewhere.

Malamud's prize-winning fiction also nosed out the controversial novel "Lolita." This is the first time in the award's 10-year history that a volume of short stories has won. When the stories were published last May, the Washington Post commented: "Sad, tender, and funny as all life, they endow even the lowliest tenement dweller on New York's East Side with the essential dignity of manhood."

When Herold's prize-winning biography appeared in October, the Post called it a brilliant account of a brilliant, almost incredible personality.

## Farmington High Demonstrates Policy of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Farmington Valley Herald, a Connecticut paper, bearing the headline, "Farmington High Demonstrates Policy of George Washington," which was published in this Connecticut newspaper on February 26, 1959. It is a very interesting story of honesty. I am sure readers of the RECORD will enjoy seeing it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also ask that there be printed with it a guest editorial contributed by Louis E. Ball, Jr., editor of the Farmington Valley Herald.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Farmington Valley Herald, Feb. 26, 1959]

FARMINGTON HIGH DEMONSTRATES POLICY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

(By Harriette Calver)

FARMINGTON.—Farmington High School demonstrated to the National Freedoms Foundation last Monday morning that George Washington did leave a rich heritage of principle, which found expression on the holiday commemorating his anniversary. By refus-

ing an award that had been made by the directors of the Freedoms Foundation, the school and particularly the school newspaper, the Fairview Beacon, gave a concrete expression of Washington's long-held belief that "Honesty is the best policy."

Superintendent of Schools Robert E. Saunders had been notified Monday that the Freedoms Foundation was awarding Farmington High School's newspaper a George Washington honor medal and a prize of $100 for an editorial carried in the paper's annual brotherhood issue. Mr. Saunders said that accepting the award would be unethical, since the award was based on an article contributed by an adult, and not by a student, as required by the rules of the foundation.

"I assume that the judges in making the selection figured that it was written by a student, overlooking the credit line. To accept the award would be unethical, and I notified the foundation that because of this, we cannot accept it." He explained further that the paper had obtained statements and comments from a number of town officials and others on brotherhood for inclusion in the issue, and that the editorial noted by the foundation was actually a guest editorial written by the editor of the Farmington Valley Herald, Louis Ball.

Foundation Vice Chairman Felix Stump, in withdrawing the award, expressed appreciation for the forthright honesty of the school and its officials, and said that he hoped the foundation would get another nomination from the school next year.

BROTHERHOOD 1958

(By Louis E. Ball, Jr.)

Not long ago, a sociologist made the statement that the major social problem of the 19th century was the achievement of equality, while the major social problem of the 20th century is the retention of individuality. Historically, there can be little argument with the first premise. The second premise contains perhaps the greatest challenge that any of us will live to see.

You have but to stop a moment and consider life in the year 1958. Mass communications, limitless travel, and a universality of teaching have combined to give us what we like to call the highest standard of living ever known in the history of the world. Concurrently, it appears that each of us is caught in the crunching mesh of conformity. We must all look alike, talk alike, dress alike—yes, even think alike. Those who do not conform to the mode become outcasts, or worse. Yet, few of us are aware that the ultimate in conformity is communism. Sold under the false label of "peace, equality and brotherhood," it poses a grave threat to freedom and liberty, not only in Europe and Asia, but in our own America as well.

Experience has shown us the only effective means to halt its insidious growth is through brotherhood. Therein lies the greatest challenge that any of us will live to see, for true brotherhood is the recognition of individuality. Individual dignity, individual freedom, indivdual ability, and individual responsibility are the four cornerstones of true brotherhood. Further, all freedom and liberty hang from these tenets.

Every totalitarian form, every instance of tyranny, and every mass injustice has required denial or deprivation of true brotherhood. Conversely, the traditional home of freedom was born with the demand for individuality in its manifold forms, and will continue to exist only through preservation of brotherhood, according to its true definition.

Many years ago, when America was founded, it was relatively easier to practice brotherhood, and manifestly easier to preach that doctrine than to exemplify its principles. Today, in 1958, the very future of the United States—yes, even that of the world itself—lies in your very hands. The future will be decided on the degree of understanding of individual freedom, dignity, ability, and responsibility, and on the extent of our adherence to them in our daily lives.

The Fairview Beacon can review the past with pride. It can look about itself in the present with confidence. It must look into the future with resolve, as all of us must.

## Medical Insurance for Older Citizens Over 65

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 1 out of every 12 of our citizens is over 65 years of age. Their problems regarding adequate medical care are multiplying. Not only are the afflictions that beset the individual more prevalent with advancing years, it becomes increasingly difficult for the older citizen to obtain health insurance so he will be able to obtain the medical care he needs which is too often beyond his financial means. There have recently been announced interesting health-insurance plans for those over 65 which could well serve as an innovation and precedent. I append hereto a descriptive article from the New York Times which details these proposals:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Plan Insures Persons Over 65," published in the New York Times of February 2, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PLAN INSURES PERSONS OVER 65—CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COVERS HOSPITAL, SURGICAL COSTS WITHOUT EXAMINATION

(By James J. Nagle)

A novel insurance plan that pays hospital and surgical bills for persons over 65 years is attracting attention.

It is the Continental Casualty Co.'s 65-plus health insurance policy, which for the last 2½ weeks has been extensively promoted in New York and seven other States and the District of Columbia. The offer in these areas expires at midnight tomorrow.

In Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and California, where the plan had previously been offered, about 150,000 policies were sold. About 40 of the policyholders are 100 years old or more. Many are in their 80's and 90's.

NO CHECKUP REQUIRED

A new feature of the policy is that applicants do not take a physical examination. Coverage of new sickness and accidents begins on the final date of the offer. A condition for which the applicant has had previous medical treatment or advice is covered only after the policy is 6 months old, however.

The cost is relatively small, $6.50 a month, for benefits that range up to a maximum of $610 for each stay in a hospital. A policyholder can drop out of the plan at any time. But the company cannot cancel the policy of an individual unless it cancels all of its policies held in the policyholder's State.

Injuries or illnesses caused by war or covered by workmen's compensation or occupational disease law are not covered by the policy. Nor is confinement in veterans' hospitals and Government mental and tuberculosis hospitals.

Technically, the plan is not group insurance, but, in effect, it is. Under it, everybody signs at the same time and no one policy can be changed unless all of the policies in the State are changed.

How can the company afford to offer the plan? Continental has found that it costs less to issue the same policy in large volume with an I.B.M. 705 electronic machine. Thus, when it decides to enter an area, it sets a time limit on the length of the offer—2½ or 3 weeks. At the end of that time it processes all policies at once.

The plan is an outgrowth of an earlier hospitalization and surgical policy for retired schoolteachers in New York, according to Roy Tuchbreiter, president of Continental. In June of 1955, the company provided health insurance for 3,000 to 4,000 members of the New York State Retired Teachers Association.

This proved successful and led to a similar policy for 9,000 to 10,000 members of the National Retired Teachers Association in July 1956. But even then, the economic feasibility of health insurance for persons of retirement age had not been conclusively proved.

However, a year later, more than 30,000 members of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees came in under the same type of policy. After this Continental felt it had enough experience to promote health insurance for senior citizens in the public market.

In September 1957, the company offered a new policy based on what it had learned from its experience with the teachers and civil service employees. The first offer was made in Iowa through coupons in full page newspaper advertisements and through radio and television promotions. The enrollment period was 3 weeks. This proved so successful that it was decided to extend the offer to Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana. Thus, in addition to returning to Iowa for another short-term enrollment in the fall of 1958, the policy was introduced in the three other States.

On December 23, 1958, it was introduced in California and this month in this area.

Meanwhile, competition has appeared. The Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. and Mutual of Omaha are offering similar policies.

## The Origins of Shipbuilding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, shipbuilding as a profession in the United States had its origins on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay, and for Maryland's role in the development of this industry, so important to our national security and economic stability, I invite the attention of my colleague, to a very enlightening article which was published in the Baltimore, Md., American on Sunday, March 1, 1959, under the heading of "Chesapeake Vessels of Today Are Far Cry From Yesteryear."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent historical ac-

count of shipbuilding in the Chesapeake Bay area be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHESAPEAKE VESSELS OF TODAY ARE FAR CRY FROM YESTERYEAR

Baltimore's own inland sea, the Chesapeake Bay, has changed little in the 3½ centuries since English settlers first sailed in from the Atlantic. The same summer calms and winter chop alter its brown surface with the moving seasons, and seafood teems over its shallow, silty bottom.

But the vessels that ply the waters of the bay have changed. Pleasure craft and commercial carriers of 1959 would bewilder a turn-of-the-century fisherman. And the parade of unique watercraft developed here that brought growth and prestige to this port have vanished like bay ice in a thaw.

American shipbuilding as a profession had its origin on the shores of the Chesapeake. For over 150 years the bay carried more cargoes than the rest of the colonies combined. And since land travel around the perimeter was difficult due to the irregular shoreline, boats were a mainstay of existence.

The first craft built by the colonists was reportedly a barge brought disassembled from England. But the boating industry got off to a slow start. Oddly enough, most of the early shipwrights and carpenters seem to have died or returned home, and by the mid-1620's the Jamestown area had less than 50 boats. Tobacco was, however, the main crop, and since Europe was more than ready to supply vessels for shipment, there was little need for the construction of large ships locally.

Maryland's first shipyard was started on Kent Island in 1634 by William Paine, who turned out pinnaces and shallops for bay trading. Other yards sprang up, but by the end of the century small craft still predominated, even though a few vessels as large as 450 tons were built.

For the first 100 years of colony life, sailing vessel design remained static. But in the early 18th century the schooner became popular, both for bay and ocean, and ships began taking on a new look. Sail area increased lines became finer and longer, and topheavy, boxy shapes disappeared.

Ultimate development of this trend was the famous *Baltimore Clipper* of the middle 19th century, which raced down the tradewinds of the world, often sacrificing cargo space for speed, but building a legend of performance that can still evoke excitement and nostalgia.

By the 1850's orders were pouring in to such noted bay shipbuilders as Kennard & Williamson and Abrahams & Ashcraft, partly because Baltimore labor was cheaper than in the North, but also because the bay country was rich in the best white oak and pine for timbers. In 1828 the first drydock was built, and ships no longer had to be beached and rolled (careened) for bottom repairs. Chesapeake shipbuilding was a going concern.

The distinctive canoe-type bay boats evolved from Indian dugouts, and probably the best of the lot was the bugeye, which reached lengths up to 85 feet and was used for dredging oyster beds. Other memorable types once commonplace on the Chesapeake were the ram, brogan, pungy, clump, and scow. Last type of sailing vessel to be developed on the bay was the skipjack. Up to 60 feet long, it derived from the V-bottom skiff and is the only bay craft of any size to be built since World War I.

When metal construction entered the picture, many smaller boat companies went under from lack of capital, and most of the trademarks by which bay boats were identifiable slowly disappeared. The last large square rigger built here was the *Baltimore* (1889), but a four-masted schooner, the *Anandale*, was launched as late as 1919.

Pleasure boats, which today crisscross the byways of the bay with the prevalence of mosquitoes, had their origin in the slave-rowed barges of plantation owners in the late 1600's. By 1760 there were organized regattas and as early as 1824 the Baltimore American carried an ad about pleasure craft for hire. First yacht club was the Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club of Easton, established in 1885.

Motorboats put in an appearance about 1905 and were little more than stripped-down sailing canoes. The so-called Hooper's Island boat was a V-bottom type popular on the bay, but it was eventually replaced by the modern cabin cruiser.

Even now some of the oldtimers can still be seen about, but shipbuilding emphasis is on the small, comfortable family fun boat. And gone for good or bad are the days when you could tell a bay craft anywhere by the cut of her jib.

## Retirement of Frank E. Newton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS J. DODD**
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, every newspaper has its unsung heroes, men behind the scenes whose names the readers never hear.

In Connecticut, on the Hartford Times, we have a typical example of such a man, Frank Newton, who has just retired from his job after 66 years as a member of the newspaper's stereo department.

Frank Newton's job lacked the glamour and adventure that is found in the news department of a newspaper, but his devotion to his work was never lessened by this fact.

The truly creditable life which he has led symbolizes the group of men behind the scenes who day in and day out carry on tremendously important functions without receiving public acknowledgment.

At the age of 82, Frank Newton is retiring. The contribution which he has made to the American way of life is one which should not go by unnoticed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about Frank Newton which was published in the February 27 edition of the Hartford Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENDING 66-YEAR RECORD SERVICE WITH TIMES—NEWTON PROVED STURDY

Frank E. Newton retired today after 66 years with the Times. His is the longest record of employment.

He came to the Times in September 1893 when he was 17 and was hired because he looked sturdy enough to stand it.

"I guess I was," Mr. Newton said today. "I am the only one left who was working at the Times then."

So, Mr. Newton's retirement, in effect, marks the end of an era—an era that began when there were no automobiles and horse-cars were the principal means of transportation in Hartford. It was an era when much of the land west of Broad Street was used for farming.

Born in Portsmouth, Va., in 1876, Mr. Newton came to Hartford with his parents when he was 4. His father owned a farm and had a florist business around what is now Newton Street.

The building of Capitol Avenue cut the Newton farm in two and reduced the farm operation, too. Young Frank Newton, just 17, applied for an apprentice job in the Times stereo department. The paper was located on Main Street then and there were three men in the department. Now, the department has 14 men. Mr. Newton was assistant foreman.

Mr. Newton has been eligible for retirement for several years but he has continued because he liked his job and felt like working. He is retiring today, he says, because he guesses it is about time and because his wife wants him to.

"We're not going to Africa or anything," Mr. Newton explains. "But I'll do some gardening and we'll take short trips here and there." He raises flowers mostly these days because it doesn't pay to raise vegetables.

His marriage 58 years ago to the former Annie M. Spears, of Hartford, Mr. Newton still counts as his lucky day. He attributes his good health and ability to work so long mostly to the good care and help of his wife.

They have two sons, Leslie and Frank, Jr., both of whom came to the Times, too. Leslie still is a compositor, but Frank, Jr., is employed by the Government Printing Office in Washington, D. C. David Newton, a grandson, is an apprentice in the composing room but presently is doing a stint in the Army. There is a daughter, Mrs. James Thompson, six grandchildren, and a great grandchild.

Mr. Newton was vice president of local 27 of the Stereotypers Union for 11 years and its secretary-treasurer for 20. He resigned the last post in October.

A long-time member of Hartford Masonic Lodge 88, he was its master and was also deputy grand master of the Sixth Masonic District. He is a founder and past master of Philosophic Lodge of Research and holds the Pierpont Edwards Medal for distinguished service to Masonry. He is a life member of the Masters and Wardens Association of Hartford County and of the Masonic Charity Foundation in Wallingford.

He has been a member of West Hartford Baptist Church ever since he and his family moved in 1928 from the old farm on Newton Street to 15 Clifton Avenue, West Hartford. For years he was moderator of the church and is now one of its two lifetime honorary deacons.

At 82, does Mr. Newton have any good advice for young men just starting out? "No," was his answer, "nobody wants it."

Perhaps he is too modest. A coworker, now retired, who heard Mr. Newton was leaving, voiced an opinion that is pretty general throughout the Times:

"He's a good man. They don't make them any better than Frank."

## Arkansas' Experiment Station Provides Research Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT**
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article from the current issue of the Progressive Farmer entitled "A Helping Hand: Arkansas' Experiment Station."

This article points out some of the many contributions to the farmers of my State made by the university's experiment stations. As an example, cotton yields in Arkansas are now more than 147 pounds of lint per acre over the 1938–47 average. All of the farmers in Arkansas owe a debt of gratitude to the dedicated personnel at the experiment stations, and I am pleased that the organization's work has been recognized in a national agricultural magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HELPING HAND: ARKANSAS' EXPERIMENT STATION

(By J. Clayton Herman)

Across the State of Arkansas, farmers are setting new records. Yields per unit are rapidly increasing. Today's cotton yields are up 147 pounds of lint per acre over the 1938–47 average. Soybean yields have skyrocketed to 23.5 bushels per acre. Corn yields have almost doubled during the same period. We are experiencing similar strides in output per animal unit. Broiler growers are now marketing 3-pound birds that have eaten less than 7½ pounds of feed. And 4½- and 5-month-old pigs walk on the scales to tip it at 200 pounds.

Many of these gains can be attributed to agricultural research. Underway at the University of Arkansas' main experiment station and branch stations are 203 projects. A quick look at some of the projects points to further strides in the future.

COTTON

Rex cotton, devloped through cooperative research between the Arkansas station and the USDA, blanketed 50,000 acres in Arkansas last year. This set a record for use of a new cotton variety the first year after its release for commercial production.

Its virtues are early maturity, high yield potential, a good staple length and gin turnout, and a resistance to storm loss and certain diseases. Rex matures 10 days to 2 weeks ahead of full-season varieties. An earlier harvest season is possible on acreages planted to this new cotton. Thus harvest can be completed ahead of the inclement weather.

PREGINNING STORAGE

Annually, thousands of man-hours are lost while trailers and wagons wait their turn at gins. Can cotton be stored before it is ginned, and thus lengthen the ginning season? Arkansas researchers are now studying storing methods and their effect on lint and seed quality. Some lots of cotton are dried and cleaned before being subjected to the storage studies.

BUILT-IN RESISTANCE

In the laboratory and fields, Arkansas researchers are trying out chemicals and rotations and seeking new varieties that will reduce the annual losses caused by plant diseases. Soil- and seed- or plant-borne diseases attack field crops, fruits, and vegetables. They reduce yields and often require the shifting of production to new acreages or areas.

HOGS

Long before the term "meat-type hog" became popular, researchers at Arkansas' experiment station were developing inbred lines and doing crossbreeding. Big litters and fast-gaining pigs were the goals. These breeding projects have resulted in crosbreds which, when fed today's balanced rations, tip the scales at 200 pounds when 4 months of age.

BEEF

As part of its livestock program, the Arkansas station pioneered in performance testing of beef cattle. Bulls fed standard rations are checked for rates of gain and feed per pound of gain. These characteristics, the researchers say, are inheritable traits. During one recent test, a station-bred bull changed 537 pounds of feed into 100 pounds of beef.

BROILERS

Arkansas ranks second in broiler production. Only Georgia produces more broilers than Arkansas. Arkansas animal nutritionists are constantly checking rations and feed additives. Growers are now getting from 38 to 42 pounds of broiler from 100 pounds of feed. This is a feed saving of 13 cents per bird over a few years ago, when 9 pounds of feed were required to produce a 3-pound bird. Pelleting deserves some credit for this feed saving. Arkansas tests indicate pelleted rations increase growth rate by 7 percent and feed utilization by 5 percent over mash.

POULTRY DISEASE

While some staff members are checking sick chickens, others are mixing and feeding medicated rations to infected lots of chickens. These workers are looking for more effective ways to prevent and control costly disease losses. The use of chemicals to extend the effectiveness of certain antibiotics promises to give growers their first effective weapon against respiratory diseases.

DAIRY

Research in dairy nutrition emphasizes the full use of Arkansas-grown roughages. Digestion and feeding trials are pointing the way to greater profits from dairy herds.

Reguar calving intervals is the key to a uniform monthly production. The causes of reproductive failure are being studied. A new method of diluting semen has been developed and is now being used by the Arkansas Breeders Association. Its use gives dairymen a wider selection of sires and a stepped-up breeding efficiency in herds.

FOOD FOR PEOPLE

People afflicted with heart disease may someday benefit from research based on the theory that linoleic acid (a fatty acid in plant fats) might aid in reducing incidence of heart disease. This project, which is under contract with USDA, will disclose effects of linoleic acid on blood fat level.

Research on methods of handling and processing fruits and vegetables promises results that will benefit consumers, producers, and processors.

Scanning these projects gives you only a glimpse of the new wealth that results from agricultural research, if put to use on farms. Other examples are almost endless. The astounding return dwarfs the investment in research. The bumper harvest of dividends is too large for accurate measure.

## The Federal Airport Bill: A Doubtful Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the eternally rising cost of government and the malignancy of inflation are matters to which the administration and the Congress are giving precise attention, and properly so. I therefore believe that my colleagues will be very much interested in an editorial entitled, "Let's Cut Here" published in the Baltimore Sun on February 24, 1959, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S CUT HERE

The spenders were on top when the Senate passed its Federal-aid airport bill. Its measure calls for a 4-year program with grants to the sum of $465 million. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has done a little better. Under its proposal, aid to local governments would not exceed $365 million. But even this figure is far above the Eisenhower recommendation for a grand total of no more than $200 million and this with an accompanying provision for an end of this kind of spending.

From where the heavily burdened taxpayers sit, the only promising thing in the whole squabble is the idea of terminating this giveaway program. And this promise would be sweeter still if Congress should move to junk the program right here and now.

There is no reason why the Federal Government should be pouring millions into local airport projects. Take the case of our own Friendship International. It cost $14.7 million. The Federal Government chipped in $2.6 million. The other $12.1 million was raised through city bond issues. Can anyone in his right mind believe that if the Federal Government had not chipped in, the airport would not have been built?

We wanted an airport and we wanted a good one. This we have—one of the best in the country. And we would have built and could have built Friendship without Federal assistance. Other communities have funds to do likewise—that is, if they have the determination and the desire. If Congress wants to save money and ease the tax burden, there would be no better way to start than through the elimination of the airport giveaway program.

## Resolution of North Dakota Young Republicans Memorializing Congress To Adopt the Budget Policies of President Eisenhower and His Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Young Republicans, at their annual convention.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ADOPT THE BUDGET POLICIES OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND HIS ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the Young Republicans of the State of North Dakota are concerned with the increasingly great Federal expenditure; and

Whereas President Eisenhower and his Republican administration have proposed a

budget which will economically curtail excessive Government expenditures without loss of benefit to the people of the United States; and

Whereas that budget is now being opposed by the Democrat majority of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by this convention here assembled,* That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt the budget policies of President Eisenhower and his administration.

DAVE NETHING,
*Chairman, North Dakota Young Republicans.*

PHIL SCHAEFFER,
*Secretary, North Dakota Young Republicans.*

NORMA DALTON,
*Secretary of the 1959 State Convention, North Dakota Young Republicans.*

## Salute to United States Constitution on Its 170th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, 170 years ago, on March 4, 1789, the Constitution of the United States formally went into effect—after ratification by the requisite two-third of the Colonies.

During the intervening years, the Constitution—written by the practical and idealistic pens of our forefathers—has been subjected to the trials, to forces that would change or modify the structure, to the tests of time and experience.

All in all, we can be deeply grateful for the vision with which our forefathers wrote a Constitution for the country they loved—as we love it.

In its brief lifetime, the Constitution has been a sound foundation upon which we have been able to deal successfully with internal, economic, social, political, spiritual, and other problems. At the same time, the Constitution has provided the framework of freedom within which a free people could withstand threats to our sovereignty by outside powers.

The scope of forethought given by the creators of the Constitution to the future of this Nation has enabled us to deal effectively with these challenges.

Since its ratification, there have been only 22 amendments to this fundamentally sound Constitution during the 17 decades. Over this span of years there have been tremendous changes in this Nation. These include:

Expansion of 13 Colonies on the eastern seabord into a coast-to-coast Nation. Now it reaches up to the Arctic Circle with Alaska as a State, and probably before long, it will reach out into the Pacific Ocean to include Hawaii as a 50th star in our American flag.

The population has increased from 3 million to about 175 million.

The modes of transportation have changed from slow horseback and stagecoach to present-day jet, supersonic travel and to a Nation looking forward to outer space travel.

In almost every field—communication, agriculture, industry, culture, and others—these have been revolutionary changes.

Indeed, the world has changed as a place in which to live, work, and explore for new discoveries and frontiers.

The establishment of three coequal branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—of course, has remained one of the major safeguards of sound government.

At times, there have been circumstances which threatened this balance of power. However—and for this we can be eternally grateful—the ship of state has sailed forward to serve the Nation in the battles of this these past 170 years—as I believe it will continue to serve us in the future.

The March 4 edition of the Wall Street Journal carried an excellent article entitled, "Rugged Constitution," by William Henry Chamberlain, touching briefly upon the ways in which the Constitution—as America's political blueprint—has preserved the structural balance of a free government.

I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUGGED CONSTITUTION—AMERICA'S POLITICAL BLUEPRINT, TODAY JUST 170 YEARS OLD, HAS ENDURED BY PRESERVING THE STRUCTURAL BALANCE

(By William Henry Chamberlain)

Just 170 years ago, on March 4, 1789, the Constitution of the United States formally went into effect, ratified by the requisite two-thirds of the Colonies after long and sometimes bitter debate.

Two months later, on April 30, George Washington was inaugurated as the first President of the new Republic. The ensuing 17 decades have seen the 3 million Americans of colonial days, inhabiting the eastern Atlantic fringe of the country, swell to 175 million, filling up a land that stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

This period has also witnessed a tremendous revolution in the daily lives and working habits of the American people. Agriculture has given way to industry as the main source of livelihood. Transportation has advanced from the stagecoach to the jetplane with a new speed record set almost every year and travel into outer space now regarded seriously. The shrinking in time required for communication makes immediate headlines for events in foreign capitals which would have required weeks or months for transmission.

TEST OF TIME

But the Constitution has stood the test of time and sweeping economic and social change. It has remained the anchor of American political institutions and the shield of American liberties.

And it has measured up to the high test set by John Adams, one of its architects and one of its most learned and eloquent expounders: "The institutions now made in America will not wholly wear out for thousands of years. It is of the last importance, then, that they should begin right. If they set out wrong, they will never be able to return, unless it be by accident, to the right path."

The American Republic, in the inspired phrase of Abraham Lincoln, was conceived in liberty. This was the watchword of the patriot insurgents, sometimes ragged and hungry and ill-paid, often defeated but never crushed, who finally wore down the British determination to put down what was regarded as a colonial rebellion. The men who framed the Constitution knew that liberty is a tender plant which requires careful nurture and ample safeguards.

As Alexander Hamilton made clear in the first of the famous Federalist Papers, which set forth the political philosophy of the Constitution: "Of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career by paying obsequious court to the people, commencing demagogs and ending tyrants."

And James Madison, another influential shaper of the Constitution, made a similar point in Number 47 of the Federalist Papers: "The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

This definition of tyranny would admirably fit any contemporary dictatorship. The catch phrase "people's democracy" was not unknown in 1789; but the Founding Fathers, one may be sure, would have had none of it. For they were deeply convinced, both as scholars and as men of action, that even the best of men cannot safely be trusted with too much power over their fellows. John Adams summed up this conviction in an admirable epigram: "Power is always abused when unlimited and unbalanced."

Hence the delicate balance in the political provisions of the Constitution. So far as human wisdom could foresee dangers and provide safeguards, the individual was assured against oppression by the central government; the States were left in possession of all the functions which are not clearly the proper concern of the central Government. And the powers and limitations of the three coequal branches of the Government are so defined and delimited as to preclude the possibility that one of the three can become allpowerful and reduce the others to nullity.

The ultimate test of a written constitution is workability and the United States Constitution has worked so effectively that it stands extremely high in the esteem of the American people. Of course, the framers of the Constitution could not foresee all contingencies. The Constitution is silent on slavery, an accepted institution in the southern colonies. And it neither affirms nor denies the right of one or more States to secede. These two intertwined issues came to a devisive head a century ago and rent the country in what was fortunately its only great fratricidal schism.

There have been times when one or the other of the coequal branches tended to exceed its powers. Executive acts, especially in time of war or threatened war, have stretched the unspecified powers of the President, as Commander in Chief, to the limit. In the period after Lincoln's death it was Congress that threatened to substitute a party oligarchy for proper constitutional government. It is the judicial branch which has incurred most criticism in recent years. The American Bar Association has recently pronounced severe condemnation of Supreme Court rulings regarding Communists in this country. And predominant feeling in the South is certainly that the Court overstepped its proper bounds in denying the right of southern State legislatures to maintain the previous system of separate schools.

However, public opinion usually rights an unbalance in the distribution of powers. And there is one good reason why the Constitution has stood up well under the test of time and changing folkways.

BASIC FREEDOMS

This is that the Founding Fathers were too wise to go in for promises to make everyone healthy, wealthy and wise. The Constitution assures the citizen against State interference with his natural rights to worship as he sees fit, to express his ideas in print and by word of mouth, and to a fair, independent system of justice. Beyond these assurances, the individual is left pretty much to his own exertions, even though the general welfare clause in the Preamble to the Constitution has been stretched to extreme length in modern times. This may seem a negative conception of government to some who like to think of themselves as advanced liberals. But it has served Americans well and has helped to make the United States a magnet for immigrants from many parts of the world.

The Nation's second 170 years can be as happy as the first 170 if it continues to be guided by the principles of the Constitution.

## The U.S. Committee for the Atlantic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an announcement which has just been made of the formation of the U.S. Committee for the Atlantic Congress. A group of distinguished Americans will be under the honorary chairmanship of Lewis W. Douglas, former Ambassador to Great Britain.

The Atlantic Congress will be opened in London on June 5 by Queen Elizabeth. It is expected that all of the NATO countries will participate in the discussions.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC CONGRESS, JUNE 5–9, 1959

The formation of the U.S. Committee for the Atlantic Congress was announced today by Lewis W. Douglas, former Ambassador to the Court of St. James and now an Arizona and New York banker. Mr. Douglas is honorary chairman of the committee.

The congress will be opened in London, June 5, by Queen Elizabeth. It will continue for 5 days, and will be participated in by all the NATO countries. President Eisenhower and the heads of the other NATO nations will be patrons of the Congress.

One of the jobs of the U.S. Committee is the selection of 130 Americans from all over the country—to attend the congress as members of the U.S. delegation.

"There has never been anything exactly like this before," said Mr. Douglas. "It is not, however, unlike the Hague Congress of 1948, in which 800 leading citizens of a group of European countries met and made plans which resulted directly in the 17-nation Council of Europe and indirectly toward the Coal and Steel, Atomic Energy, and Economic Communities subsequently established by six European nations.

"Altogether there will be 650 delegates at the Atlantic Congress, including the 130 from the United States.

"Among the speakers and delegates will be the outstanding leaders of the Western World. But, more importantly, its delegations will represent a cross-section of the people of the Western World. Citizens drawn from civil life and a few Members of the Houses of our Congress will make up our delegation. The delegations from Great Britain, France, Canada, Western Germany, Luxembourg, and all the other members of the North Atlantic Alliance will be selected from similar groups within their countries.

"This will be one of the rare occasions when people who are not committed to an official policy, because of official positions, will have an opportunity to express their ideas and say their say about the steps we should take in the future in the confident hope of preventing future wars.

"The North Atlantic Treaty was the most striking novelty of the last century in international affairs. Now on its 10th anniversary, it is important that we should reexamine the work that NATO has done and attempt to define what it should do in the future."

In addition to Mr. Douglas, officers of the U.S. committee are:

Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, general chairman.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER (Democrat of Tennessee), Senator JACOB K. JAVITS (Republican of New York), and Representative WAYNE HAYS (Democrat of Ohio), cochairmen.

Adolph Schmidt, vice president of T. Mellon & Sons, treasurer.

Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association, general council.

Richard Wallace, formerly administrative assistant to Senator KEFAUVER, executive director.

A list of the 34-member board of directors is attached.

The Atlantic Congress was launched with the unanimous passage of a resolution by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, an organization composed of legislative delegates from all the NATO countries, at its third annual conference in Paris in November 1957. It will be held under the sponsorship of the NATO parliamentarians.

The purpose of the Atlantic Congress, as set forth in the report of the Political Committee of the Fourth Annual NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, held in Paris last November, is:

"To bring together the ablest and most distinguished citizens representative of the principal aspects of national life in the NATO countries to consider ways and means of further developing cooperation, particularly in economic and political affairs, between the North American and European member countries of NATO and between those countries and the underdeveloped countries outside the area of the North Atlantic Treaty."

The three cochairman—Senator KEFAUVER, Senator JAVITS, and Representative HAYS—said:

"We three—all members of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference—firmly believe that the United States can make a positive contribution to peace and freedom by a strong affirmative participation in the Atlantic Congress.

"As Mr. Douglas has said, the only precedent for the Atlantic Congress is the Hague Congress of 1948 which was sparked by those two great men of the Western World, Winston Churchill and Paul Henri-Spaak. Mr. Spaak, now Secretary General of NATO, indorses this Congress warmly.

"Today we are in need of new great ideas, and we are again turning to the people for them. This is the first time anyone from this side of the Atlantic Ocean—anyone from the United States and Canada—has participated in such a Congress. We are fortunate in having Eric Johnston as our general chairman and a fine group of officers and directors."

Mr. Johnston is presently in the Orient on business of the Motion Picture Association of America but will return this month.

The Atlantic Congress will divide itself into five committees: The Atlantic Spiritual and Cultural Committee, the Atlantic Political Committee, the Atlantic Economic Commitee, the Free World Committee, and Committee on Relations with the Communist Bloc. Each will thoroughly discuss and examine the common problems and policies of the entire Atlantic Community in each of those fields.

The Committee is now engaged in obtaining a broadly representative group of U.S. citizens to serve on the delegation. Invitations to those chosen will go out shortly all over the United States.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, U.S. COMMITTEE FOR THE ATLANTIC CONGRESS

Mrs. Eugenie Anderson, Red Wing, Minn., former Ambassador to Denmark; William Benton, New York, N.Y., former Senator and former Assistant Secretary of State; Jacob Blaustein, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. W. Randolph Burgess, Paris, France; Erwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.; Senator John Sherman Cooper, Washington, D.C.; Nathan Cummings, Chicago, Ill.; John Walton Dinkelspiel, San Francisco, Calif.; Lewis W. Douglas, Tucson, Ariz., former Ambassador to the United Kingdom; William H. Draper, Jr., New York, N.Y., Presidential adviser, former U.S. Ambasador to NATO, former Under Secretary of the Army; Thomas K. Finletter, New York, N.Y., former Secretary of the Air Force; Judge W. St. John Garwood, Austin, Tex., former justice, Texas Supreme Court; Ernest A. Gross, New York, N.Y., former Assistant Secretary of State; Albert J. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D.C.; Congressman Wayne Hays, Washington, D.C.; Senator Jacob K. Javits, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president, Howard University, Washington, D.C.; Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Washington, D.C.; Senator Estes Kefauver, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Clark Kerr, president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Mrs. Oswald Lord, New York, N.Y., member, U.S. delegation to General Assembly of the U.N.; Robert McKinney, editor and publisher, the New Mexican, Santa Fe, N. Mex., former Assistant Secretary of the Interior; Walden Moore, director, Declaration of Atlantic Unity, New York, N.Y.; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, editor, Western World, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.; Dr. Alfred C. Neal, president, Committee for Economic Development, New York, N.Y.; Paul Nitze, Washington, D.C., former Chief, State Department Planning Staff; Edmund Orgill, mayor, Memphis, Tenn.; Lithgow Osborne, New York, N.Y., former Ambassador to Norway; Mrs. Ogden Reid, New York, N.Y.; Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D.C., past president, American Bar Association; Elmo Roper, New York, N.Y.; Adolph W. Schmidt, vice president, T. Mellon & Sons, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Harold L. Zellerbach, San Francisco, Calif., industrialist and civic leader.

## The Tradition of New Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address given by the Honorable J. Howard Edmondson, Governor of Oklahoma, at the recent Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Boston, Mass. Governor Edmondson was the guest of honor at the largest Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner ever held in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and his speech produced the same impressive effect as did his speech given at the victory dinner in Washington last Saturday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRADITION OF NEW IDEAS

We meet here tonight to celebrate the great Democratic victories of 1958—and to begin laying the groundwork for an even greater nationwide victory in November of 1960.

There is good reason to begin working on that groundwork today—for the forces which already are lining up to continue Republican rule beyond 1960 are mighty and powerful forces indeed.

To the all-powerful entrenched interests who oppose change simply because it is change—who oppose new ideas, simply because they are new, there has been added a new partner—the vast and powerful Federal payroll accumulated for the past 6 years determined to preserve and perpetuate Republican rule in the White House.

Madison Avenue masters of propaganda have introduced new dimensions and horizons of public deception.

With new and skillful techniques, the GOP today beguiles and misleads the American public, working hard and even effectively to convince John Q. Citizen that unemployment of nearly 5 million is nothing to be disturbed about—that farm surpluses worth $7 billion in Government warehouses are the result of Democratic law rather than GOP mismanagement of law—that Communist gains in the Middle East and the Far East are nothing to be alarmed about. The mills of deception also work overtime to create the illusion that a man can spend every other day on the golf course, and still do a good job in the office—that another man can falsely and wrecklessly label our great party as the party of treason in a tough election year, and less than 1 year later become a mature and responsible bipartisan statesman.

The power and the influence of reactionary interests—expanded Federal payrolls insensitive to the needs of the American citizen—and the mastery of almost every technique of public confusion and deception—these are old and familiar enemies for all Democrats, but they are far more deadly and dangerous, in 1959 and 1960, than ever before in our Nation's history.

As we prepare tonight, for the battles that lie ahead, we have good reason to prepare for a tough and bitter fight—and a fight that is sure to demand the best that is in us.

Far more will be at stake in the campaigns that lie in the immediate future than mere political power and patronage.

Government today carries with it not only mighty and continuing forces that affect, in economic and social ways, the daily lives of all of us—but also an absolute power of life and death over humanity itself.

This is a power of life and death, in the use or misuse of the awful weapons of our time, that is total and complete in its awe-inspiring responsibility—permitting no casual or part-time attention, and tolerating no deception or misrepresentation in high places. Least of all, is there room for deception of our own people.

That is why the months that lie ahead—both for our party and our country—are critical months of decision.

That is why we who meet here tonight, both as Americans and as Democrats, are charged with ever-deepening responsibility.

How will we meet that responsibility in the next 18 months?

How can all of us who are gathered here tonight, as members of a great party with a grand tradition of national leadership and service, be most faithful and loyal to that grand tradition?

And what, in the final analysis, is the greatest tradition of the Democratic Party?

I am sure there are many here tonight with different ideas upon that subject.

There are also many in this room who are better qualified than I am to answer that question—by reason of long and honorable service, and much more varied experience, both in our party and in our Government.

There will be some who point to our noble tradition of fighting for the poor, and the weak, and the unfortunate—for the lame, the halt, and the blind—the forgotten men and woman in American society—and this indeed is a worthy and a great tradition of the Democratic Party.

There will be some who point with pride to the stalwart tradition of fighting against the selfish forces of special privilege and vested interest—of monopoly and merger against the public interest—and this also is a splendid and worthy tradition.

Others will identify the great and continuing effort of our party to promote and encourage sound and effective programs for international cooperation in the cause of world peace and justice—the historic programs we know as the good-neighbor policy, the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—all proud parts of another splendid Democratic Party tradition.

We are justly proud of these traditions, and we are loyal to the principles on which they are founded.

But I submit to you there is a greater tradition—and one that is vital and essential to the health of our party in this hour of national need.

Without it, we are lost in 1960—and our Nation may be lost also.

With it, we are a vital and dynamic force in every field of human interest and concern, in every place of world or domestic trouble, in every problem that today confounds and confuses our people and our leaders.

What is that tradition, and how can it best be described?

I would like to call it the tradition of new ideas.

Some people might call it the tradition of change, or the tradition of readiness to change.

For many generations, we have been blessed in this Democratic Party of ours with leaders—and with followers—who have had the boldness, and the imagination, and the initiative, to embrace new ideas and new programs to meet the problems of a growing nation and a changing society.

Is there any doubt about the Democratic record in this regard?

There was once a man named Thomas Jefferson, who was bold enough to suggest that our Federal Constitution ought to contain a prohibition against slavery. Jefferson lost that fight because the idea was called too radical for his day and his time—but is there any man today who will question that Jefferson was right, nearly two centuries ago?

There was another fight, that Jefferson won, to acquire by purchase a great tract of wilderness land—the Louisiana Purchase. This new idea was condemned and derided in Jefferson's time—but today we know that it made possible our Federal Union.

There was also a Democrat named Andrew Jackson, who was not afraid of a new idea in his time—even though his opponents predicted for his administration a period of "sackcloth and ashes" and "nothing but splendid ruin."

Jackson was denounced for delivering our Federal Government from the iron control of vested financial interest—but today we know that Jackson, with his new idea for a government with financial independence, was absolutely right.

We point with pride today to the new ideas of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt—new ideas that were the death knell for sweatshop labor, for completely unfair taxing methods, for poverty and complete loss of dignity in old age.

Yes, we have a great tradition of change in the Democratic Party, and a great combat history of joining together to fight for change and new ideas in every period of Democratic leadership.

And in that battle for change we have been able to unite all Democrats of good faith, both young and old in their party service, because we have all known, deep within us, that a party without new ideas is a party that no longer has usefulness to the people.

There are always many subjects on which parties are reluctant to take an aggressive position during campaign, because of their controversial nature—even though they involve problems that are known to be serious and long overdue in handling.

Several good examples in our State are found in obsolete apportionment of our State legislature—which has not been reapportioned since 1910, in the largely political employment of most State personnel, and in a county attorney's system of prosecution that no longer provides many smaller counties with competent prosecutors.

During the last campaign, our Democratic Party in Oklahoma reversed a policy of long standing and came out with a positive program of definite action for all three of these problems. We advocated a merit system for State employees. We advocated complete reapportionment of the legislature. We also advocated a district attorney's system, to take the place of the outmoded county attorney's system in Oklahoma. These were three in a series of reform proposals for which our entire Democratic ticket campaigned as a team during the months of September and October.

On November 1, the people voted, and our party was given the greatest vote of confidence we have ever received in Oklahoma. We won victories in some counties that have been voting with New Hampshire and Vermont for as long as the oldest Oklahomans can remember.

Of course, there was a nationwide trend in which Massachusetts was a leader, and there were other things that influenced the 1958 election.

But I am convinced, on the basis of public reaction—wherever I had the chance to hear our people talking, that one of the biggest factors of our victory was that we were not afraid to take a positive program, with many new proposals and new ideas, to the people of our State.

People everywhere, in my opinion, were hungry for a new and decisive program to meet the problems of Government today. I am sure that has been your experience in Massachusetts—and I am sure it is one of the big reasons for the popularity of leaders like Senator KENNEDY and Governor Furcolo, here in the Bay State.

There is a great and urgent need today, my friends of Massachuetts, for new ideas to meet th problems of our country.

We must be ready and even eager, as we always have been in the past during times of great trial, to open the doors of our party to new ideas—to new blood—and to new programs.

What is the answer to the crucial question of how to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and yet to control it and prevent its use for mankind's destruction?

What is the answer to the critical question of how far to negotiate with the Russians, and how to establish a peaceful understanding without a real danger to our security and our safety?

What is the answer to peacetime unemployment of nearly 5 million—and real distress in many factory and mining areas of our country.

What is the answer to the perils of inflation, to the dangers of fantastic increases in some stock market values, to some of the terrible diseases that take such heavy toll of human life today?

I do not come before you tonight with the answers to these questions. I do not claim to have the answers—although I know that every American here tonight is yearning for answers to these and other questions.

But there may be some of you, in this room, who do have an answer to some of these questions—and that answer may be a completely new idea for government policy tomorrow.

In your Boston College, there may be a young man studying tonight, with a new idea that provides an answer to the difficult problem of American relations with Soviet Russia.

Not far from where he studies, within the halls of MIT, there may be another young American who has an answer, and a new idea, for the riddle of atomic energy.

In the classroom of some elementary school in Massachusetts, there may be a young girl who will give us, some day, the answer to control of cancer, or prevention of heart disease.

We do not know where the new ideas of tomorrow will come from—and we do not know who will bring them forward.

This much, however, we do know: we do know that our party and our country have urgent need of these new ideas, and we do know that a great tradition of change and new ideas is the true lifeblood of the Democratic Party.

Let us always keep open the doors of the Democratic Party to the champions of change, and the men and women of imagination who bring us new ideas for tomorrow.

In our last national convention, one of our party's elder statesmen stood before us to issue a clarion call for recognition of the fact that the Democratic Party—while the oldest party in the history of our country—must always remain young and vigorous in its thinking and its program.

"Let us be proud of all our traditions," we were told at that time, but let us not lean upon them.

Let us take into account the advice of our elders, but let us also have the courage to look ahead and to face new problems with new solutions.

In the final analysis, America is still a land with a great yearning for the spirit of the pioneer—with a readiness on the part of the people to explore new frontiers, whether this involves a new State, like Alaska, or a new approach to the problems of foreign policy.

Let all of us, in the Democratic Party, remain faithful to the pioneering spirit and continue to chart the future of our country in the tradition of all those we honor—the tradition of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Roosevelt—the tradition of new ideas for a better American tomorrow.

## German Crisis Presents America With Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Lewistown Daily News, in my home State, is achieving widespread recognition for its aggressive and stimulating editorial policy.

The editor of the Lewistown News recently devoted a full column to the German crisis. I commend his comments to the entire membership of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial referred to, entitled "German Crisis Presents America With Opportunity," which appeared in the February 26 issue of the Lewistown Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMAN CRISIS PRESENTS AMERICA WITH OPPORTUNITY

The peace of the world and the fate of all humanity may hinge upon the outcome of the gathering crisis in Germany.

If the Communists gain control over Germany's mighty industrial and scientific resources along with her militant and gifted people, they will dominate all Europe and ultimately the whole earth. The organization of German genius with the vast material and human resources of the Communists could isolate and defeat us.

If the West can deny the Reds this tremendous, decisive prize in the struggle for the world in which we are now so desperately engaged, then there is hope that a cataclysmic world war can be avoided and that cancerous communism can be contained until, in good time, it becomes more civilized and less virulent.

Berlin is the key to Germany. Mr. Khrushchev knows this—thus the present squeeze play.

The United States has foolishly pursued a policy of maintaining, or attempting to maintain, the status quo in Germany and elsewhere in the world against mounting Communist pressures.

Containment has been the key word describing whatever policy it could be said that our country has undertaken against this Communist aggression.

This is no longer sufficient. To try merely to maintain the status quo around the world will not permanently work, as we are finding out.

In this connection, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD made a major policy address from the floor of the Senate 2 weeks ago, which has stirred international reverberations. He said that the prospect of maintaining the status quo of division in Germany is diminishing rapidly in the wake of the announced Soviet withdrawal from Berlin. He warned:

"The blunt fact is that soon either negotiations leading to German unification in peace shall begin in earnest or there shall begin in earnest the use of force to that end."

In short, Mr. Khrushchev and the Russians are not as content as we are to keep the status quo in Berlin and in Germany.

The lessons of history indicate that in this our enemy is more correct than we are. For, as Abraham Lincoln once observed, a house divided cannot stand. It will become either all one thing or all the other.

American policy in a nutshell must not only insure that Germany will not become all communistic, it must also strive to make Germany all democratic. It should strive also to release the millions of East Europeans enslaved by the Communists after World War II. Let the Berlin crisis become the touchstone for our broader aims.

So barren is our present policy, as Senator MANSFIELD has indicated, that we are even unprepared to see the Russians leave Berlin. Is this not strange? We are unprepared to deal with the East Germans, for fear that this will somehow imply recognition and sanction to the puppet East German regime.

Well, what should our policy be? How can we put the Russians on the defensive in Germany and in Europe instead of always being in that position ourselves?

In the first place we must recognize that, thanks to American diplomatic and military mistakes too numerous to mention during and following World War II, we are not now in a position to have things altogether our way in Germany. We must do some old-fashioned "hoss tradin'." Before we can undertake this we must first decide what we want and what we are prepared to pay in return.

Let us begin with the premise that we want a united, democratic, free Germany, free to stand guard with the West in central Europe against communism. Let us go further and bid for East as well as West German support by demanding that pre-World War II German borders be restored (with the possible exception of East Prussia) now occupied illegally without sanction of treaty by Poland at Soviet connivance. (Retention of East Prussia by Poland would give that country access to the sea and would represent compromise by both parties.) Moreover, history tells us we cannot look forward to any permanent peace so long as Poland retains a fifth of German territory as is now the case. In any event, our not sanctioning the Soviet-inspired Oder Neisse line and making a point of the return of German territory will put the Russians on the defensive with the Germans.

In considering what we are prepared to trade, we might contemplate with profit the various theories for "disengagement" which have been advanced, including the Kennan plan, the Rapacki plan, and the Eden plan. (Disengagement would create an insulating buffer area between Russia and the West.)

The development of intercontinental missiles, we must sooner or later acknowledge, has made obsolete and futile our elaborate and costly NATO system of defenses along with large standing armies. Accordingly, in return for Soviet agreement on our plan for a reunified Germany and for Soviet withdrawal from Eastern Europe, we could agree to withdraw our military forces, including air bases, from the continent of Europe retaining our bases in Britain. (These forces would be overrun and slaughtered in any major war with Russia anyway). We could agree to dissolve NATO and instead guarantee each member against aggression with individual treaties. We could propose German arms be limited to participation in United Nations forces which would be stationed in Germany both to guard against Russian aggression and to prevent a revival of German militarism. (The Germans certainly would be willing to agree to this in preference to their present occupation and division.) We could assure Russia by guaranteeing against future German aggression.

In all this we ought to seek more than the reunification of Germany. In return for the withdrawal of our military forces from Europe we could seek the withdrawal of Soviet forces from the occupied eastern Eu-

ropean nations such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

Russia with all its vast expanse of territory should not gag over these relatively minor European territorial adjustments. By now the Russians must know that they cannot permanently maintain their status quo in these restive, occupied, and unreliable satellite countries. Moreover, with over 600 million Chinese arming on their eastern borders, the Russians now should be concerned about stabilizing their western frontiers.

This or a similar plan would take us off the defensive. In any event we must go beyond permanently maintaining the status quo for in this we invite disastrous diplomatic retreat. To be sure there are dangers in this plan but are there not greater dangers in doing nothing? Unhappily the tragic illness of Secretary Dulles robs us of strength just when we need it most. In the meantime the May 27 deadline which the Soviets have arbitrarily announced for driving us out of Berlin draws ever closer.

Will Russia back down? Will we surrender Berlin and Germany? Or will we be forced to fight and thereby be plunged into unthinkable planetary destruction?

Or, can we come up with a plan offering advantages to both sides and some hope of permanent peace in Europe?

---

## Texas Schools Face Major Problems in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Committee of Governing Boards of Texas State-Supported Colleges and Universities recently conducted a study of higher education in the Lone Star State.

Their findings show that by 1970, 160,000 students are due to flood into State-supported colleges, which are already cramped today with only about half that number enrolled.

Everyone in our Nation is interested in education; our happiness, progress, and our very survival are dependent upon our proper development of education. The United States is coming to realize that we must provide for more and better training for the future scientists, statesmen, scholars, surgeons and others.

As a coauthor of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, I have tried to help meet this need. However, much more must be done to keep this Nation abreast and ahead of world conditions as it works for a better world.

T. V. Thompson, a staff writer of the Houston (Tex.) Press, recently wrote an article on the findings of the committee in that State. The figures and facts it reveals are extremely enlightening and, I feel, help to point up this problem and the immediate need for its solution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Problem of 1970: 160,000 Students," written by T. V. Thompson, and published in the Houston Press of February 20, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM OF 1970: 160,000 STUDENTS—EVERY PENNY STUDIED BEFORE SPENT, BUT THERE STILL IS NEVER ENOUGH

(By T. V. Thompson)

On the blackboard of Texas higher education is scrawled today a critical question of great significance:

What is the State going to do with the expected 160,000 students due to flood State-supported colleges by 1970?

Colleges are cramped to the limits of their ivy-covered walls today with only 86,000 students seeking diplomas.

Every precious penny freed by the legislature for education is carefully studied by the respective college boards to see where it can best be spent. There is never enough.

What to do?

NINE TEXANS STUDY PROBLEM

Sitting down to study this acute homework assignment several months ago were nine distinguished Texans, each a member of a State-supported college board, who formed the Committee of Governing Boards of Texas State-Supported Colleges and Universities.

The committee found that most Texans believe the 18 State schools to have oil-drenched endowments and swimming in money.

This, learned the committee, is a far cry from the truth. The truth: Every school in the State is financially ill.

The University of Texas, for example, cannot keep its top instructors and is crowded with 16,000 students. It will have 35,000 by 1975.

Lamar Tech in Beaumont has 5,556 students now, will have 10,000 in 15 years.

Even the State's smallest college, Sul Ross at Alpine with 874 students, is growing rapidly and will double its size in 15 years.

ISSUE AN ALARMING REPORT

The committee's exhaustive report, released this week, contains information that should alarm every Texan who believes in higher education.

Among their findings:

1. The quality of education now being offered the young men and women of Texas in State-supported colleges is falling behind other States and will continue to lose ground unless definite steps are taken to change the trend.

2. Top teaching and research talent are fleeing State colleges at a disturbing rate to find higher salaries in private industries and the colleges of other States.

3. The situation will get more critical by the year, because each State is faced with growing enrollment increases and competition for top teaching talent will be keen. Unless Texas has the money to compete, it will fall even further behind.

4. The future course of all public education, business and industrial development, and political stability in Texas are inevitably tied in with the course of State-supported higher education.

THREE HUNDRED AND SIX TEACHERS QUIT IN 2 YEARS

The committee's report reveals that 306 faculty members have resigned from Texas State-supported institutions in 2 years.

Of this number, 203 went to business and industry or private colleges for salaries ranging from $600 a year to more than $7,000 a year above what Texas schools were able to pay.

"The resultant constant turnover in staff and the steady downgrading of faculties, due to the inability of Texas institutions to compete in the open market for scarce talent for replacements, did serious damage to the quality of the educational opportunity they could offer," the report said.

The report quoted a recent survey of 96 State-supported colleges and universities which reveals that the average salary for all ranks of personnel in Texas State-supported colleges is far below the national average.

"Our top school ranked 19th on the list.

"The next ranked 36th, and 14 out of our 18 State-supported schools ranked below 40th.

"This would not be such a critical situation in a period when the supply of competent teachers and researchers was ample. In a period of scarcity, however, when all institutions must compete for top talent, it leaves Texas institutions with little opportunity for maintaining high standards of competence of their staffs."

LOW ON PER CAPITA SPENDING

Texas has the second largest number of State-supported schools in the Nation, and ranks seventh in the total number of dollars it appropriates for support of higher education.

Most important, it is in the lower half of all States in the percentage of per capita income going to higher education.

Providing more food for thought is a recent survey by the Texas Employment Commission which revealed:

1. Of 21 large industrial concerns in Texas employing 12,000 college graduates, only 50 percent of them were graduated from Texas colleges; the rest from out-of-state institutions.

2. Of these employees earning more than $10,000 a year, only 35 percent were graduates of Texas institutions.

3. One out of every three technical positions in Texas business and industry is filled by an out-of-state college graduate.

And the Texas Education Commission reports:

Forty-five percent of the technical jobs in Texas are filled by graduates from State colleges, and industry is worried about the caliber of teaching in State institutions.

REPORT MAKES TWO POINTS

What is the solution to the higher education dilemma?

The committee's report made two points:

1. The most effective use possible must be made of the funds now available.

2. Enough money must be made available for their proper development in pace with comparable institutions in other States.

The committee stressed this belief:

Competition between State colleges for money and attention must be stopped.

Every dollar must be allocated on the basis of the needs of Texas boys and girls, rather than on the basis of interschool or intersectional rivalry. We cannot afford useless duplication or waste in any segment of the State's system of colleges and universities.

The committee suggest a careful formula be worked out to split the total legislative educational appropriation between the 18 schools each year as fairly as possible.

This eliminates the wasteful process of a biennial appropriations "grab-bag" with each institution rallying its forces to secure as much of the total appropriation as possible.

The current State budget for the 18 schools is $38,720,936, which breaks down to $466.82 per each full-time student.

For 1959–60, the legislative budget board recommends $38,952,697, or $457.05 per student.

The Governor's executive budget office recommends $41,440,082, or $486.24 per student.

The Commission on Higher Education recommends $48,356,630, or $566.22 per student.

Unless the legislature substantially increases appropriations for higher education, the State will suffer, says the committee.

They point out every child in Texas is affected because two-thirds of the public schoolteachers are trained in the State schools. And unless they receive the best education from the best professors, the quality of teaching they in turn will provide for public school students will be poor.

---

## Statement by George J. Feldman Before House Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK**
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I am glad to include a well-considered, pointed, and most interesting statement made by George J. Feldman of New York City before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics on March 5, 1959. Mr. Feldman has a profound knowledge of his subject.

Mr. Feldman was director and chief counsel of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of last year, of which select committee I was chairman. Mr. Feldman played a most important part in the success of the select committee, and I am glad to publicly acknowledge the outstanding work done by Mr. Feldman. He is truly a dedicated American, willingly making personal sacrifices to serve, as he did, the House select committee.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. McCORMACK, members of the committee, I am gratified to have this opportunity of testifying before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, especially since I was privileged to play a part in its establishment last year when I served as director and chief counsel of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration.

Although the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was not given regulatory powers, the House and Senate committees contemplated that it would conduct research with a view to domestic legislation and that it would also participate directly in studies and proposals for international agreements governing the use of outer space. Section 205 of the act expressly authorizes the Space Administration to engage in a program of international cooperation in work done pursuant to this act. In addition, the act authorizes the administration to engage in "the establishment of long-range studies of the potential benefits to be gained from, the opportunities for, and the problems involved in the utilization of aeronautical and space activities for peaceful and scientific purposes." This language seems broad enough and was doubtless intended to include the legal problems of space.

The need for the positive pursuit of international agreement on uses of outer space is clear. It is spelled out at some length in the comprehensive and authoritative "Survey of Space Law," issued as a committee print and later as a House document by the select committee. Today this need is emphasized by the legal uncertainties which have arisen with expiration of the International Geophysical Year. It is becoming increasingly urgent with the passage of time in view of the increasing space capabilities not only of the United States and the Soviet Union but of Great Britain and soon other nations as well. Every member of this committee is fully aware of the military potentialities of missiles, satellites, and space vehicles and the risks of wrongly identifying objects moving through space. There is a danger that delay in establishing international space law may make later efforts increasingly difficult.

The positive law of outer space can be quickly summarized. Space flight is not expressly governed by existing international law. Most writers on the law of outer space have taken the position that the definition of "aircraft" contained in the Chicago convention, which is the only generally accepted international flight agreement, does not apply to space vehicles. The failure of nations to object to the passage of satellites above their territories from the launching of Sputnik I in 1957 until the end of 1958, has been explained as due to an implied international agreement based on the acquiescence of other governments in the announcement made by the United States and the Soviet Union that satellites would be launched in connection with the International Geophysical Year. I have repeatedly urged that this temporary and limited agreement be broadened into a magna carta for outer space. Such a broadening appears desirable, even necessary, both for reasons of national security and in order to establish reasonable uniformity in such matters as navigational aids and radio frequencies.

I know that many influential voices have been raised in the executive branch against any early, comprehensive, and explicit agreement. It seems to me, however, that none of the arguments which have been offered in opposition to a comprehensive code of space law would have any convincing application to limited agreements on the uses of outer space.

Before expressing my personal views as to the kinds of limited international agreement which should be sought in the near future, I should like to review briefly the present status of studies and negotiations looking toward the international legal control of outer space. Last November 13 our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, introduced in the General Assembly a resolution recommending space studies in four fields. One of these fields was described in the resolution as the nature of legal problems which may arise in the carrying out of programs to explore outer space. This resolution was approved by the General Assembly on December 12, 1958. Unfortunately, the establishment of a study committee to carry out the resolution has proceeded very slowly. Owing to a dispute over the membership of the study committee, the Soviet Union and other bloc countries have refused to participate. To the best of my knowledge no U.S. delegates or advisers have yet been appointed. It would seem to me to be a matter of interest to this committee, and well within its jurisdiction, to inquire what steps have been taken or planned by the United States in participating in the work of this United Nations study committee.

I should like to remind you also that section 201 of the Space Act established a National Aeronautics and Space Council, chaired by the President. One of the stated functions of the Council is to develop a comprehensive program of aeronautical and space activities to be carried out by the U.S. Government. Under this provision it would seem appropriate for the Council to consider and formulate a statement of the U.S. position on international collaboration in outer space, for presentation at the prper time in the United Nations study committee. While the proceedings of the Council are naturally kept secret, testimony given to this committee by administration witnesses indicates that ths subject has never been placed on the Council agenda.

A number of limited international agreements on the use of outer space have been proposed from time to time. At the 1958 Congress of the International Astronautical Federation I urged the continuation of the International Geophysical Year. Unfortunately, the IGY expired on December 31, 1958, and the arrangements for international scientific cooperation which took place under its auspices have continued on a very limited basis only. It should be possible to a greater extent than in the past to exchange tracking data and navigational and signal codes. In particular, international agreements must be made on radio frequencies for satellite and outer space communications. I understand that testimony on this subject has been heard by this committee in the past few days. Some international space projects, such as relay or postal satellites or missiles, could be undertaken jointly by several nations or under the aegis of the United Nations or some other international organization. Soviet legal writers themselves have suggested that international agreements would be possible and desirable on the identification of satellites and on liability for injuries or damages caused by manmade objects falling from space. The final step would be advance notice and coordination of launching schedules. The risks which may arise from the launching of new spacecraft where no notice is given of the launching are apparent to everyone. Ideally, prior notice of launchings should include information on flight plans and on the contents and proposed activities of the satellites or space vehicles. While this should be the ultimate objective, it is doubtless not immediately attainable because of the well-known views of the Soviet government on the issue of international inspection.

Going beyond particular international agreements to general principles, I would urge this committee to adhere publicly, as the select committee did, to the twin principles of freedom of outer space for nonexclusive peaceful purposes and the prohibition of hostile activities including the use of atomic and nuclear warheads. The administration has also concurred in these principles, judging from public statements made by the President and by the legal advisor of the Department of State.

Finally, how can this committee help to establish a rule of law in outer space? I suggest that it can help mainly by the vigilant performance of its watchdog functions over the National Aeronautics and Space Council and the international cooperation activities of the NASA and other executive agencies. It is also important for committee members and staff to participate in the space law organizations and activities of the Federal Bar Association, the American Rocket Society, the International Astronautical Federation, the American Bar Association, and similar groups. Such participation will not only keep the committee informed of developments and other points of view but will give these private organizations a much-needed feeling of official interest and encouragement. In particular, I am gratified to learn that a subcommittee, chaired by Congressman ANFUSO and composed of several members of this committee, will attend the March 20 meeting on space law and sociology to be held in New York by the American Rocket Society.

I should be happy to answer any questions members of the committee may have.

## Fallout Is Rising in Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH**
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a study by the West German Institute for Milk Research has recently been released which shows that radioactivity in foodstuffs has reached new high levels in a variety of edibles collected from different parts of the world.

The rise of these rates, some of which have been shown to be as high as the maximums permissible concentration—and occasionally higher—has been increasingly rapid.

This is a forerunner of a major danger to this Nation and the world. Every member of the human race is endangered by this increase, particularly in such rapid amounts.

This is a matter in which we cannot wait and later look back and say, "We should have taken steps." There may be no chance for hindsight.

Experience may be the best teacher, but the experience should be that which scientists have already had in the laboratories. Their experiments have shown us the danger and the urgent, pressing need for a remedy.

Mr. President, I strongly urge that steps be taken immediately to establish an international program to work toward the control of this menace. Leadership is vitally needed among the peoples of the world to stop this increase in the pollution of the atmosphere before it goes past the point of no return.

Mr. President, in support of my statements, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fallout Sets New Highs in Foods," written by Edward Gamarekian, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALLOUT SETS NEW HIGHS IN FOODS—WEST GERMAN DATA SHOWS BIG RISE FOR STRONTIUM 90

(By Edward Gamarekian)

A new study of radioactivity in foodstuffs shows that levels have reached new highs in a variety of edibles collected from different parts of the world.

In some cases, the levels of strontium 90 have exceeded the maximum permissible concentration recommended by the United States and International Committees on Radiation Protection.

IN AEC REPORT

The study, made by the West German Institute for Milk Research, was published in the quarterly strontium report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. This report also showed that strontium 90 has been accumulating in the soil at an increasingly rapid rate.

It came on the heels of the recent disclosure that the strontium 90 in Minnesota wheat has risen as high as the maximum permissible concentration and has gone 50 percent higher in one sample. There also have been reports that the milk in North Dakota has reached levels as high as 40 percent of the recommended maximum.

The maximum permissible concentration of strontium 90 in foodstuffs has been set at 80 micromicrocuries per kilogram. A kilogram is equal to 2.2 pounds. A micromicrocurie of radioactive material is the amount which undergoes 2.2 disintegrations per minute.

The figure of 80 was first advised for water, then applied to milk, and later, for lack of better information, to all edibles. It is based on continuous year-in and year-out consumption.

Of the 1957 and 1958 foods tested by the German group, cinnamon from China was the highest with a strontium 90 content of 380 units. This does not appear to represent any great danger since relatively little cinnamon is consumed.

The next highest on the list was a mixture of native-grown and imported rye which reached a level of 110 units in 1957. This was almost identical to the level of 113 reached by one of the sample of Minnesota wheat from the same year.

SEVENTY-TWO UNITS IN WHEAT

In German-United States wheat mixtures, the levels reached 72 units; in German oat flour, 65; in Chinese ginger, 50; in dried peas from Holland, 45; and in Ceylon rice, 41.

Levels in Norwegian and Tunis cheeses were up to 94 and 83 units of strontium 90. However, cheeses are rich in calcium and since the body does not seem to differentiate between the two chemically similar elements, the strontium-calcium ratio appears to be more important than the absolute amount of strontium.

In the cheeses measured, this ratio was 11.5 and 9.5, well below the limit of 80.

The least radioctive foods were the fruits, most of the vegetables, and the three kinds of fish obtained from the North Sea.

## The Letcher Family of Lexington, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON**
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in competition with 28,000 high school boys and girls, John S. Letcher, Jr., of Lexington won the highest prize offered by the Westinghouse Co. for science talent. That outstanding accomplishment is naturally a source of pride and gratification to me and the many other Lexington friends of the Letcher family.

John S. Letcher, Jr. comes of a Rockbridge family that has been distinguished in the military and political life of Virginia for more than a century. He is named for his great grandfather, Governor John Letcher, familiarly known to his friends and political supporters as "Honest John." Governor Letcher served on the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives from 1852 until 1860, assuming in January 1860 the duties of Governor of Virginia to which he had been elected the previous November. He was Virginia's wartime Governor and ranks high among the illustrious men who have held that office.

The grandfather of John S. Letcher, Jr., was Greenlee D. Letcher who graduated from VMI and the Law School of Washington and Lee and was elected a member of the Virginia Legislature from Rockbridge County when he was only 22 years of age. When he was 50 years of age he volunteered for service in World War I. He organized what was first known as the Rockbridge Battery, which later became Battery F of the 111th Field Artillery, 29th Virginia. Capt. Greenlee D. Letcher trained in Alabama with the 29th, went overseas with it in the early summer of 1918 and served with it throughout World War I.

The only child of Capt. Greenlee D. Letcher was named John S. Letcher and, like his father, he graduated from both VMI and the Law School of Washington and Lee and then decided on a military career. He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps, served with it in many parts of the world and throughout World War II, retiring a few years ago with the rank of brigadier general. General Letcher is entitled to wear the following campaign ribbons:

Second Nicaraguan Campaign Ribbon, 1928–29.

China Service Medal, 1937–39.

American Defense Service Citation with Base Clasp, 1939–41, for duty in China and Japan.

American Campaign Medal, 1941–43.

American Campaign Medal with four Bronze Stars, 1945–46, Asiatic Pacific area consolidated over Northern Solomons, Treasure-Bougainville operations, Marianas operations, and Iwo Jima.

Victory Medal for World War II, 1941–46.

For bravery and service beyond the call of duty he received the top decorations of the Marine Corps, including the following:

Navy Cross, 1928, Nicaragua.

Medal of Merit with Citation and Silver Star, 1928, Nicaragua.

Silver Star Medal, July 26, 1944, Guadalcanal-Marianas.

Legion of Merit, September 10, 1943, until regiment was withdrawn, Cape Torokina Beachhead, Bougainville, and Solomon Islands.

Gold Star (in lieu of second Legion of Merit), 1945, Iwo Jima Island.

Navy Unit Commendation (served with the 12th Marines, 3d Marine Division), 1943–44, Bougainville-Guam.

Navy Unit Commendation, Bronze Star, 1945, Iwo Jima Island (Iwo Jima support troops VAC).

John S. Letcher, Jr., the son of Gen. John S. Letcher, in winning the Westinghouse Science Talent Scholarship is carrying on the high traditions for public service which have characterized the Letcher family of Lexington, Va. for more than 100 years.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from the Roanoke Times of March 3 and 4 reporting the award to John S. Letcher, Jr., and telling of his family background.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Roanoke Times, Mar. 3, 1959]

LEXINGTON BOY WINS $7,500 SCIENCE TITLE

(By Frank Carey)

WASHINGTON, MARCH 2.—A 17-year-old Lexington, Va., boy with an eye on space travel research tonight was awarded top honors and a $7,500 scholarship in the 18th annual nationwide Westinghouse science talent search.

He's John S. Letcher, Jr., 6-foot 6-inch son of a retired brigadier general in the U.S. Marine Corps.

He was chosen from an original field of 28,000 high school contestants, including the 40 finalists—9 girls and 31 boys—who have been fighting it out intellectually for the past week for the top awards.

Heading for a career in nuclear or rocket research, young Letcher currently is attending the Baylor School, Chattanooga, Tenn., where he constructed an experimental linear electron accelerator atom smasher employing high frequency, high voltage induction. That was his search project in the competition and one of the reasons he won.

He says he feels his project could fill a gap in the equipment used in research on certain kinds of nuclear reactions.

The youth says he'd like some day to head a research team developing a nuclear propulsion system for interplanetary travel.

Next in order among the five winners were:

Frank Wayne Grimm, 17, of Catonsville, Md., whose search project involved a study of several species of land snails in an area of Maryland's Susquehanna Valley, including how they were introduced and how they survived. He was awarded a $6,000 scholarship.

Carl L. Lyngholm, 17, of San Diego, Calif., who received a $5,000 scholarship. His search project involved a treatise on Boolean Algebra—a branch of mathematics dealing with operating on sets of objects which are analogous to the ordinary operations of arithmetic on numbers.

Robert N. McDonnell, 18, of Park Ridge, Ill., who was awarded a $4,000 scholarship. His project involved a measurement of the minute amount of heat released when a solid, such as graphite, and a liquid are brought into contact. Bob converted the liberated heat into electricity and then metered the few millionths of a volt that resulted.

Peter Vajk (pronounced Voyk), 16, of Princeton Junction, N.J., who won a $3,000 scholarship. As part of the requirements that enabled him to win, he wrote a research paper from which he concludes that radioactive fallout from nuclear bomb tests will speed up the evolution of the human species.

The scholarship awards—along with 35 other cash awards to the rest of the finalists, for a total of $34,250—were presented at a banquet climaxing almost a week of activity by the contestants. Chairman John A. McCone of the Atomic Energy Commission was the main speaker on the program.

Earlier today, the finalists visited the White House where they were greeted by President Eisenhower.

Young Letcher, the top winner, already has made a good start toward a career in space research. He has been president of the Baylor Rocket Club for the past 2 years and has organized club members into groups working on improvements in rockets, rocket fuels, control devices, and launching systems.

Though a top-flight young scientist, he's also found time for sports, including varsity wrestling, soccer, and rifle team activity. He's also a captain in the junior ROTC unit at his school.

The 40 finalists got expense-paid trips to the Nation's Capital for the final competition. They had been selected on the basis of many tests, including a tough science aptitude quiz reports of their teachers, their high school grades, and their search projects. During the past week, they've been interviewed personally by a board of judges who selected the top winners.

The annual science talent search is conducted by science clubs of America, an activity of science service. The Westinghouse Educational Foundation, supported by the Westinghouse Electric Corp., provides the awards and finances the search program.

---

[From the Roanoke Times, Mar. 4, 1959]

JOHN, JR., IS FIRST SCIENTIST IN TALENTED LETCHER FAMILY

(By Ben Beagle)

LEXINGTON.—John S. Letcher, Jr., is the first scientist in a family which already includes a poet, a painter, a retired Marine Corps brigadier general, and twins.

Seventeen-year-old Johnnie is in the spotlight, even at the Letcher household, for winning a $7,500 scholarship in the 18th annual Westinghouse science talent search. Young Letcher won top honors for construction of an experimental linear electron accelerator atom smasher employing high voltage induction.

His mother, the painter, and his father, the retired general, are, in two words, simply overwhelmed by his award.

Although he was expected home today, he called to say that newspaper and magazine people were anxious to meet him and he wouldn't be home until Wednesday. The Letchers aren't worried. They figure their 6-foot, 6-inch son can find his way home all right.

When he does come home he'll be on spring vacation from the Baylor School at Chattanooga, Tenn.

Johnnie, the great-grandson of Virginia's Gov. John Letcher, was always making something when he was younger. "Milk bottles, string, and coat hangers, were some of the ingredients," his mother says.

His sister, Katie, is the poet. She's a senior at Hollins College and she has done rather well in her specialty, too.

The twins, Betsy and Peter, are busy just being 12 years old.

Young Letcher, though never what his father would like to call a "prodigy," has always been a scholar. When the family moved to Lexington in 1947 upon the general's retirement, he was several months too young to enter the first grade at the start of the school term.

So, guided by a private tutor, he took some private classes until he could get in the first grade. His arithmetic was something, his father says.

"He never saw anything new [in arithmetic] until he got to the fourth grade," the general says.

Confront Mrs. Letcher with her son's triumph and the talents of her daughter and she had a modest comment: "Isn't it amazing?"

Young Letcher's interest switched from chemistry to nuclear physics several years ago, his parents say. He is interested in rocketry and, along with several Lexington companions, put several working models together.

A chemistry lab in the basement has gone neglected for some time now.

But in the basement lab you find something that makes the youngsters big honors a little sweeter.

It's an exhibit—made for a science fair some years ago—on vanadium.

He took it to the fair and nobody noticed it.

"He was just crushed," says Mrs. Letcher.

Those science fair people should see John S. Letcher, Jr., now.

## The Republican Revival Has Started

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman ED DERWINSKI, of the Fourth District of Illinois, won an outstanding victory in November at a time when many Republicans were falling by the political wayside. Coming into the race as a latercomer after the death of Representative William E. McVey, Mr. DERWINSKI had to compete with a candidate who was well advertised and an outspoken advocate of the "spendthrift state." To analyze just how the DERWINSKI victory came about, I am pleased to include here with my remarks this editorial from the February 26 issue of the Harvey (Ill.) Tribune.

The editorial follows:

Last November the Republican Party fell flat on its face. Yet now, only a few short months later, we are witnessing a revival of Republican spirit and energy exceeding anything seen in recent years. Our party meetings have never been so well attended, our volunteer workers have never been more enthusiastic.

What happened? How did this come about? You can find the answer right here in the Fourth Illinois Congressional District.

After the November fiasco, political analysts from all over the country dug deep into the voting statistics. Their attention was quickly focused on the Fourth Congressional District. Here in a year of Democratic victories was one election that stood out as a resounding Republican success. How had ED DERWINSKI been elected? Why did so many people volunteer to work so hard and long for him in the precincts?

The highly respected and popular Congressman, William E. McVey, of Harvey, had passed away in August. DERWINSKI wasn't appointed as the Republican candidate until early in September. He was young, not widely known in the district, and he had only a short time in which to campaign.

By that time his opponent had been campaigning for many months. His posters were splashed all over the area. He himself was a personable, articulate candidate who advocated, without reservation, the Democratic philosophy of bigger government, bigger taxes, and bigger spending—the all-purpose spendthrift State.

DERWINSKI, on the other hand, was an outspoken advocate of private enterprise and competition. He vigorously stated his belief that the creative sources of America's wealth and strength is the citizenry, not the Government.

For once, the lines of Democrat and Republican disagreement were clearly drawn. DERWINSKI won a decisive victory, by a margin greater than McVey had won over his own opponent in the 1954 congressional election. The Illinois Fourth was the only congressional district in the Nation where a Republican won by a larger margin than in 1954.

Not only that, but DERWINSKI led the Republican State ticket by 20,000 votes.

The army of investigators who descended on the area to study this political miracle came up with one conclusion.

When the issues are clean-cut, when the voters have a choice between a candidate who wants the Government to do everything for and to everybody, and another who wants the Government to encourage people to do

things for themselves, then people will volunteer to work for and vote for their ideals.

The American voters have a right to be provided with this choice between statism and volunteerism. They are tired of seeing politicians of both parties trying to outpromise, out-spend, and out-tax each other.

The Republican Party has an obligation, sadly neglected in recent years, to provide the voters with an alternative to the New Deal, welfare state, Democrat philosophy.

The Democrats regard the Government as the center of all things, its bureaucracy the doer, the decision maker, the giver and the taker-away. In its extreme form this philosophy results in socialism, with the Government owning everything, including the people.

The Republicans believe that the dynamic force for growth and prosperity is in the people. The proper role of the Government is to encourage private investment, initiative, competition, and reward. Government spending which promotes inflation has historically been the means of wiping out private ownership and enslaving the people.

The power to tax and to compete with tax money taken from the people is the power to destroy. The price of liberty is still everlasting vigilance. Republicans must oppose monopoly in every form—whether in business, or labor unions, or the Government itself.

Is such a program based on private initiative and freedom politically practical? Can any Republican candidate hope to win by publicly resisting government expansion when his opponent promises more government subsidies, more government favors, and more government everything?

The victory of ED DERWINSKI is evidence that the ideals of the Republican Party still hold powerful appeal to the voters. The chance to work for those ideals inspired volunteers who would normally stay home if the choice had been between Spender Tweedle-de-de and Spender Tweedle-de-dum.

His victory gave heart to those who believe that our future is based on the initiative of men and women who individually and in voluntary association have built our industries, our commerce, our labor unions, our schools and our culture and who will lead us to a brave future of ever-increasing prosperity and strength.

It is the busines of everyone who believes that individual liberty and free enterprise are worth fighting for, to become a part of this revival. While there is still the will to resist the narcotic of socialism let the people demand the right to vote for National and State candidates who will preserve the American way of life.

This revival of the Republican Party is a spreading thing. It is a reaffirmation of America's belief in free men and women in a free society.

## The Late Honorable Daniel A. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution adopted at a meeting of the Jamestown, N.Y., Bar Association on February 26, 1959:

Hon. Daniel A. Reed, for 40 years the Representative of the 43d Congressional District in the U.S. Congress was, since 1900, a member of the bar of the county of Chautauqua.

Mr. Reed's long and distinguished career brought him activity and service in wide fields of endeavor. Following his graduation from Cornell University and his admission to the bar, his many and varied activities found him head coach of the Cornell football team and an advisory coach for many seasons; a secretary of a chamber of commerce and a distinguished record in chamber of commerce work; a member of a special mission to France on behalf of the U.S. Government; and a lawyer engaged in the active practice of the law in the neighboring city of Dunkirk where he was an honored member of the Northern Chautauqua County Bar. His election to Congress in November 1918 marked the commencement of a distinguished service in the House of Representatives which encompassed nearly 40 years and found him returned, by the people of this district, to the halls of Congress on 21 occasions. He was long a member of the House Ways and Means Committee where he performed able and conscientious service, and he was the ranking Republican member of the committee for a long period and chairman of the committee during the 83d Congress. It was during his service as chairman of that committee, and under his leadership, that the Congress enacted the thorough and extended revision of the tax laws and the enactment of a new U.S. tax code.

In addition to his other duties and services, he was a member of the Interparliamentary Union, of which he was at one time vice president, and in which he gave vigorously of his time and service.

We, as lawyers, found him ever a source of exceeding helpfulness in the many services which we as members of the bar sought of him if we had problems in the Nation's Capitol, and without his guidance would have found difficulty in steering our paths through the miriad of labyrinths in the complex structure of our Nation's Government in the Capitol at Washington. Many is the time that through his long familiarity with the departments and agencies of Government he facilitated the business which we were called upon to perform among the bureaus, the commissions, the departments, and all of the other intricate places to which a lawyer's assignments from his client might lead him.

His long experience in Washington and his kindliness and courtesy to the members of the bar and others who needed and asked his services, eased many a burden and saved many a weary footstep. He, as a, lawyer, knew our problems and our difficulties and his graciousness, his courtesy, his promptness and cooperation will long be remembered by many of us who came to him in our troubles and predicaments.

Had he had his way, many of the complexities of the Washington scene would have been eliminated and simplified, for he strongly supported the reports of the commission headed by Mr. Herbert Hoover which would result in increased efficiency, much needed economy, and a closer relationship between the public and its Government.

Daniel A. Reed was a creditable and honored lawyer, an able and conscientious servant of his district, and a distinguished and competent Member of Congress and of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives which he served long and faithfully. We, as lawyers, the members of the Jamestown Bar Association, desire to record our appreciation and gratitude to him for his many courtesies, his kindliness, his sound advice and his ever helping hand in all the multitude of services which he performed for us as individuals. We desire further to record the esteem in which we held him as both an attorney and counselor at law, and as a legislator in our National Government. His wide and varied activities and accomplishments brought him deserved honors from many places, groups, and individuals.

It is, therefore, that we, the members of the Jamestown Bar Association, record and spread upon our minutes, our sincere expressions of gratitude for his services to us, the esteem in which we held him, and our heartfelt sorrow to his gracious widow and to his son, in the great loss they have sustained. To Mrs. Reed and to Mr. William Reed, we extend our deepest sympathy, reminding them in their bereavement that they may look back with pride and satisfaction to the courageous and competent services which their husband and father had rendered to his fellows, his neighbors, his constituents and the people of this country of whim he felt so honored to be a part.

I move, Mr. President, the adoption of the foregoing as a memorial of our esteem and affection to Hon. Daniel A. Reed, and in memory of him as an honored member of our professison and a trustworthy and honored public servant.

CLARENCE G. PICKARD.

Seconded by:

MICHAEL D. LOMBARDO.

Adopted at a meeting of the Jamestown Bar Association on February 26, 1959.

ALLISON P. OLSON,
*President.*

## Marine Sgt. John A. Basilone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey paid tribute recently to a hero who belongs to the entire United States, Marine Sgt. John A. Basilone. To help others in the Nation recall once more the valor of this man, I wish to insert into the RECORD the following speech by William Kurtz, speaker of the New Jersey Assembly, as well as the newspaper account carried by the Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following speech by William Kurtz, speaker of the New Jersey Assembly, as well as the newspaper account carried by the Daily Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J.

There being no objection, the speech and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF ASSEMBLY SPEAKER WILLIAM KURTZ, FEBRUARY 22, AT BASILONE MONUMENT, RARITAN, N.J., HONORING WORLD WAR II HERO AND MARINE, JOHN A. BASILONE

I am profoundly honored to participate in the memorial service of Marine Sergt. John A. Basilone, one of America's greatest military heroes.

Gov. Robert B. Meyner regrets he could not attend today. He is attending the National Governors' Conference, in Mississippi. The governor, who is a commander in the Naval Reserve, shares the enormous respect, admiration, and affection all Americans have—and will always have—for the immortal marine we are honoring today.

Almost 600 men from this area served their country during World War II, but the brilliant record and heroism of John A. Basilone transcends all others. Many consider him the greatest hero of World War II.

His tremendous courage, efficiency, and leadership in the Lunga area on Guadal-

canal prevented the enemy from capturing a vital airfield in the early, but critical days of the war, when freedom was wounded by an enemy determined to subjugate the world.

Against a powerful Japanese force, he killed 38 soldiers, dismantling and repairing a defective machinegun during the battle, and also penetrating enemy lines to obtain ammunition for our gunners. This exceptional courage earned John A. Basilone the Congressional Medal of Honor, the first enlisted marine to receive the decoration.

Like all really great men, John A. Basilone was blessed with the quality of humility. Asked how he accomplished his incredible feat, he said: "I did what any other marine would have done in my position."

Returning to America, he was instrumental in selling $1,400,000 in war savings bonds and became a machinegun instructor. Because of his fame, he could have remained in the comparative comfort and safety of the United States.

But not John A. Basilone. He was anxious to return to active duty. Cowards may claim he was foolish to return to war, but cowards cause and lose wars. The courageous—men like John A. Basilone—prevent and win wars.

An article dated January 22, 1944, reveals the heart and soul of this remarkable young man, who was not only a great warrior, but a man of fine character:

The article read: "Tired of being placed on exhibit as a hero and chafing at comparative inactivity, Marine Sgt. John A. Basilone has talked himself into a fighting assignment again, requesting transfer to the front. 'There's still a big job to be done over there and I want to be in it at the finish.' "

When he returned to Raritan, a record crowd of 20,000 welcomed him on September 20, 1943, and 50,000 lined the streets to witness a huge parade in his honor. He was more than a famous marine and hero. He was loved by all Americans.

The military career that was born on July 11, 1940, ended on February 19, 1945, on the shores of Iwo Jima, where John A. Basilone led his men to victory.

He is one of America's most honored patriots. His painting hangs on one of your municipal office walls. He was selected one of America's outstanding young men of 1943. A Navy destroyer was named U.S.S. *Basilone*. The New Jersey Turnpike bridge over the Raritan River was named Basilone Memorial Bridge, in his memory. A resolution was recently introduced and passed in the New Jersey Assembly, designating February 19, as Sgt. John A. Basilone Day in the State of New Jersey.

On June 5, 1948, a crowd of 10,000 witnessed the unveiling of this magnificent and inspiring monument. This monument was praised in the National Publication of Sculptors and will endure for hundreds of years. But the achievements of John A. Basilone and what he represented, will live forever.

Lord Byron, poet-soldier, wrote that "they never fail who die in a great cause; their spirit walks abroad." Basilone's spirit was unconquerable and the cause he fought and died for was the greatest cause in life: Freedom. Today, when freedom again is threatened by tyranny wearing the mask of friendship, we appreciate his great sacrifice even more. May the life and death of John A. Basilone remind us that although life is precious, we must always be prepared to sacrifice it for freedom.

---

[From the Daily Home News, Feb. 23, 1959]

PAY TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT BASILONE, MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER

RARITAN.—About 700 area citizens and Army and Navy personnel turned out yesterday to pay tribute to the memory of John Basilone, Raritan Marine hero killed at Iwo Jima during World War II who won the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Heading the list of dignitaries at the ceremony at the Basilone Memorial Statue, Old York Road, was Brig. Gen. Herman L. Nickerson, Jr., special assistant to the physical director of the Marine Corps. In Washington, D.C., representing Marine Corps Commandant Randolph Mc. Pate.

BROUGHT MESSAGE

Nickerson brought a message from Pate, which said:

"Gunnery Sergeant Basilone will always be remembered as one whose extraordinary heroism, conspicuous gallantry in action and unselfish devotion to duty are a shining example to each of us. His memory will always be a source of inspiration to all Americans and it is most appropriate that his memory should be honored by the service which the Army and Navy Union and other veterans' organizations will conduct."

Representing Gov. Robert B. Meyner was Assembly Speaker William Kurtz of South Amboy.

PROFOUNDLY HONORED

Said Kurtz, "I am profoundly honored to participate in the memorial service of Marine Sgt. John A. Basilone, one of America's military heroes. Governor Meyner regrets that he could not attend today because he is at the national governor's conference in Mississippi.

"The Governor, who is a commander in the Naval Reserve, shares the enormous respect, admiration, and affection all Americans have and will always have for the immortal marine we are honoring today."

Kurtz also praised Basilone's courage, efficiency, and leadership in the Lunga area on Guadalcanal, which prevented the enemy from capturing a vital airfield in the critical early days of the war.

Against a powerful Japanese force, Basilone killed 38 soldiers, dismantling and repairing a defective machine gun during the battle. He also penetrated enemy lines to obtain ammunition for fellow gunners.

WON HIM MEDAL

Kurtz pointed out that this exceptional courage earned him the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Among those listening were members of Sergeant Basilone's family.

The citation for Sergeant Basilone was read by A. J. Troisi and wreaths were placed at the foot of the statue by numerous VFW groups, legion post representatives and women's auxiliaries.

Also participating in the service, which was sponsored by the local VFW, were elements of the 695th Air Force Artillery Battalion, Somerville; 50th Armored Division, N.J. National Guard; 5th Truck Company, Marine Corps League; VFW and Legion Post units, Spanish-American War Veterans and local clergymen.

Sergeant Basilone, who was 27 years old at the time of his death, was with the first assault troops to land on Iwo Jima and was killed by artillery fire from defending Japanese positions. He was posthumously awarded the Navy Cross.

Three years prior to his death, Sergeant Basilone had been awarded the Congressional Medal by Congress for gallantry in action on Guadalcanal in defense of Henderson Field.

SERVED IN ARMY

The Raritan hero was known as Manila John to his marine buddies because of a tour of duty in the Philippines while serving a 3-year hitch in the Army prior to joining the Marines.

In July 1943, following his heroic stand on Guadalcanal, Basilone was returned to this country and received the Congressional Medal from President Roosevelt. He then took part in bond selling drives but tired of this and asked to be returned to active duty.

His body lies in Arlington National Cemetery, Washington, in a plot which his father, Salvatore, selected while he was a guest of former President Harry S. Truman after the war.

Chairman of arrangements for the ceremony was John Auciello, commander of the Sante Moretti Post, VFW.

---

## Daily Radio Roundup of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the daily radio roundup of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Agribusiness Outlook is a newsletter published by Farm News Service in Washington, D.C. Here are some excerpts from it which should interest all farmers.

The Federal farm program, of all activities for which the Government spends money, is perhaps the least understood. In their anxiety to reduce farm-related spending, Government spokesmen sometimes emphasize certain facts and ignore others.

Then the newsletter explains what it means. For example, the statement that "most U.S. farm dollars are spent on the production of a relatively few large farmers. This is indisputable because 25 percent of the farmers produce 80 percent of all commercially marketed farm products.

But wholly ignored is the fact that program changes to provide lower supports as advocated by the Government would not change this situation. Even with lower supports—big producers would still get the lion's share. Also ignored is the fact that the Government is getting back 70 cents on each dollar invested in support commodities.

And another popular misconception, says Agribusiness Outlook, is that "the price support program is excessively expensive." The ignored fact is that only $1.1 billion qualifies as direct subsidy. "The biggest misunderstanding," the newsletter says, "is the common belief that farmers pocket $7 billion as a direct handout from Uncle Sam to Farmer Brown. Actually, $3.2 billion of this is not directly chargeable to farmers. It goes to foreign aid, public relief, and so forth. Another $400 million goes to consumers in the milk and school lunch programs. Another $600 million is for REA loans (repaid by farmers). Another $650 million is for research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, and other programs that benefit everyone." Summing up: Of the $7 billion spent on farm related programs, close to half—or $3.2 billion—benefits others more than it does farmers.

Another ignored fact is that lower farm prices are holding down the cost of living. Agribusiness Outlook says that the "only reason the cost of living is stable, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is that farm prices are lower. Living-index Chief Ewan Clague says this, but Agriculture Department officials ignore it."

Another ignored fact on the newsletter's list is that farm products sell at bargain

rates. All major farm commodities in 1958 sold at lower prices than they did in 1952. In terms of city wages, consumers now can buy more than twice as much food for an hour's pay as they could in 1929.

Agribusiness Outlook ends up its glossary of popular farm misconceptions by quoting a prominent farm leader who says: "The farm situation is serious—and new workable programs are desperately needed. But such programs cannot be developed unless the public gets the complete picture on exactly what is and what is not the problem."

And now just a footnote—Farmers Union GTA is one of the farm organizations working to get true facts and educational information to the public. GTA farmers sponsor this program on 20 radio stations in the upper Midwest, in addition to television programs on 13 TV stations. Join your neighbors—GTA the co-op way.

## The 1960 District of Columbia Budget: Statement by Morris Kanfer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Morris Kanfer on the 1960 District of Columbia budget. The statement was made before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE 1960 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET, BY MORRIS KANFER, CHAIRMAN, FISCAL RELATIONS AND TAXATION COMMITTEE, FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS

The Federation of Citizens' Associations, representing 55-member associations throughout the District of Columbia, desires to express its support in principle of the District of Columbia Commissioners proposed budget for fiscal year 1960, amounting to approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars.

The size of the budget reflects a growth of the area and increased cost of operations comparable to those experienced by municipalities throughout the Nation. Responsible congressional leaders recognize the need for larger appropriations in supplying the basic needs of our citizens who require and demand the high standard of living which is the blessing of our form of government, and the American people are willing to pay in form of taxes for the security, health, education, and welfare to which our Government generously contributes.

We earnestly hope that this year this committee will approve of the Commissioners' request for a $32 million Federal payment toward the one-quarter billion dollar budget the District of Columbia requires to meet its essential and basic needs. It is significant, I believe, that the economy minded Budget Bureau of the Federal Government has approved of the $32 million Federal payment.

It is regrettable that the citizens of the District of Columbia are deprived of the opportunity of presenting to their representative in Congress, the facts which they believe justify the request for the higher Federal payment. Our feeble effort to persuade this committee once a year that our cause is just has in the past proven to be ineffective.

It was for that reason that the Federation of Citizens' Associations has, on several previous occasions, urged the Commissioners to establish a full-time congressional liaison with the congressional committees concerned with the District of Columbia budget but we have been advised that the Members of Congress look to the Commissioners themselves to perform the function of liaison with members of congressional committees.

I respectfully suggest that the Commissioners are overburdened by the numerous details required of them in the performance of their duties under the District of Columbia system of government and that a full-time liaison officer, comparable to those employed by Federal departments, would perform a useful function in keeping members of congressional committees informed throughout the year on the needs of the District of Columbia government.

I hope that this committee, in its deliberations, would consider the advisability of allocating a small part of the $5,168,000 requested for the Department of General Administration toward employment of an experienced congressional liaison officer to perform this, one of the most useful functions of government.

The Federation has also recommended to the Commissioners the establishment of a new office responsible directly to the Commissioners for the purpose of investigating potential savings in the operation of the District government. A quarter of a billion dollar budget fully justifies an appropriation of about one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the proposed budget to establish the office of Commissioner of Investigation, whose function it would be, among others, to determine whether the departments of the District government are being operated strictly within the law and regulations with a view of closing possible loopholes and to bring to the Commissioners attention, any violations which result either in the loss of revenue or unnecessary or improper expenditure of funds. Other cities which have attained maturity and growth have found that the office of Commissioner of Investigation resulted in stopping losses and in some instances, recovery of substantial sums which have been improperly expended in those cities through either collusive bidding on contracts or other improper conduct.

The Federation has every confidence in the integrity of the District of Columbia government and its personnel. Our suggestion for the need of a Commissioner of Investigation should not create any inference of any impropriety or wrongdoing on the part of anyone, but just as Congress itself requires broad powers of investigation in conducting its affairs, I submit that the District Commissioners require and should exercise similar powers in the interest of efficiency and a possible deterrent to collusive or improper action upon those who may be doing or asking to do business with the District government. A system of internal audit is not sufficient to ferret out collusive bidding or other improper conduct. The internal audit merely verifies figures and directs attention to obvious errors or omissions.

We respectfully urge this committee to allocate and earmark $25,000 out of the sum of $660,000 requested for operating expense of the executive office, which represents an increase of $224,000 over the 1959 budget. We are hopeful that a Commissioner of Investigation will effect savings or prevent losses substantially in excess of the cost of operating the office for the first year.

A few of the items apparently in need of investigation are:

1. The extent to which nonresidents are utilizing our school systems without payment of tuition on the pretext that they are residents of the District. Under present procedure only a signed slip of paper stating that a child is a resident of the District is required, and no evidence of legal guardianship is required of children who do not reside with their parents.

2. The budget for welfare relief is proportionately greater in the District than in other cities of comparable size. No machinery exists to thoroughly investigate the eligibility of recipients of welfare relief.

The federation also urges this committee to restore in the capital outlay budget, the sum of $2,816,350 for replacement of the Hine Junior High School at Seventh and D Streets SE. This expenditure can be financed out of the Treasury loan for building program by increasing the Commissioners' loan request to the extent of an additional $3 million. Previous legislation authorized the Commissioners to borrow from the Treasury up to $75 million.

The Education Committee of the Federation of Citizens' Associations, in requesting the Commissioners to allocate funds for the replacement of the Hine Junior High School, which serves 700 youngsters, characterized the top floor of the school to be a firetrap. Consequently, that was closed and the school has no auditorium or shop facilities and the building is generally in a very low state of repair.

While we are on the subject of the need for fire protection measures, I direct the committee's attention to an editorial which appeared in the February 7 issue of the Evening Star, entitled "Young Lives at Stake." The editorial credits Representative AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, ranking minority member of the House District Committee, with the performance of a real service by disclosing a substantial number of inadequacies in fire protection measures in the public and private schools in Washington. You are undoubtedly familiar with Representative AUCHINCLOSS' speech to the House, which was based on a report by a District fire marshal, Raymond C. Roberts, after the December fire tragedy in Chicago which took the lives of 90 schoolchildren and 3 nuns. This report shows that 83 public and private schools in the District have neither telephones nor nearby alarm boxes to report a possible fire and that a number of schools are without fire extinguishers.

The federation wholeheartedly supports Representative AUCHINCLOSS' statement that these series of shortcomings should be remedied at once by administrative action where possible and by legislative action where new laws are needed. Your committee has this timely opportunity of taking affirmative action in eliminating one fire hazardous building by appropriating $2,816,350 to replace the Hine Junior High School and to do so without unbalancing the proposed budget. This cost, as previously stated, could and should be financed out of an increased Treasury loan under the building program.

The Board of Education requested $106,000 for exit lights, fire alarm system, and fireproofing of school buildings. The proposed budget allows only $21,000 and we are, therefore, assuming a terrific risk at the expense of the safety of our schoolchildren. We urge this committee to restore the full $106,000 requested by the Board of Education.

This committee is also urged to restore the sum of $250,000 to provide 50 counsellors, 1 for each of the 50 elementary schools as requested by the Board of Education. One counsellor for each of the elementary schools is not too much to request as an essential aid to an enlightened educational system. Teachers cannot possibly have the time to deal with the problems confronting children who lack normal home life. If a counsellor prevents one disturbed child in an entire elementary school from becoming a delinquent and possibly a criminal of tomorrow, he, or she, will have earned the silent gratitude of the residents of the District. Fifty counsellors for 50 elementary schools would be a long step in the right direction of preventing delinquency with which police seem to be unable to cope.

The Federation also respectfully requests this committee to restore $113,125 to provide for 25 librarians and remedial reading teachers for 2 vocational schools and 23 junior high schools. Each of the schools has a library but no one to take charge. These 25 librarians would perform dual functions.

This committee is also respectfully urged to restore $10,000 for additional teachers for summer teaching. The Board of Education requested $17,000 for additional teachers and supplies. The Commissioners included $7,000 for supplies but eliminated the $10,000 for the teachers.

The Federation again requests that the cost of operating the national zoo should be transferred to the Federal Government and it is thought that if this committee were to eliminate the entire amount of $1,150,000 from the D.C. budget, it would necessarily lead to some other agency or department of the Federal Government to assume the responsibility. The zoo belongs to the Federal Government. It serves millions of people from all parts of the world who visit the District and it should be maintained by the Federal Government.

And now for decreases of the proposed budget. The Federation recommends that the sum of $2,062,500 requested by the Highway Department for the extension of North Capitol Street from Hawaii Avenue to 16th Street, and Louisiana Avenue to Michigan Avenue, be eliminated from the capital budget, being unnecessary at this time. North Capitol Street does not appear to be an important arterial highway and a substantial amount of traffic presently using North Capitol Street may be diverted when the Maryland circumferential belt route is completed, which will connect the Jones Point Bridge in Alexandria and the National Pike, New 240, at Bethesda, Md. We also believe that before extraordinary commitments are made to complete the inner D.C. loop east of Connecticut Avenue, designed principally to divert downtown traffic, that traffic flow changes resulting from completion of the Maryland and Virginia circumferential route should be ascertained.

And finally, we urge this committee to recommend legislation to transfer excess funds from the Motor Vehicle Parking Fund to the General Fund. We note that the increased charge for street parking from 5 to 10 cents per hour will increase the Motor Vehicle Parking Fund beyond its requirements for maintenance and capital outlay. The excess should be transferred to the General Fund to provide the Commissioners with a cushion to meet extraordinary expense which may be required during the fiscal year.

In conclusion, permit me to thank this committee for the opportunity of expressing our views in a genuine effort to be helpful. I also desire to emphasize that any inferred criticism of the budget is not intended to reflect in any manner, upon the integrity of anyone. Our recommendations reflect our desire to retain Washington's reputation as one of the cleanest, most attractive and cultural cities in the country within which to live and visit.

## Problems Facing Privately Owned Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is so much misunderstanding and misapprehension concerning the Government's participation in commercial maritime activities that any contribution toward proper understanding of this rather complex matter deserves the widest possible dissemination.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the January 26th issue of the Forwarder marine magazine be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial clearly details the problems facing privately owned shipping, the purpose of subsidies received from the Government, and the price paid by the vessel operators in return for this Government assistance, without which there could be no American merchant marine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Scattered potshots are again being taken at the subsidy paid American shipping companies for building their vessels in American yards. "This is not to be confused with the subsidy for operating the ships," the article gasped.

Subsidies, this brief went on, are made paradoxes whereby people are paid to produce goods we don't want at a price we can't afford, and paying others to hold them for us or take them off our hands. To this we agree, in the case of most subsidies.

There must be something wrong in any economy when people are taxed to pay a subsidy to a producer whose product is then sold to the taxpayers at a price higher than that of a similar, and often better, foreign product forced to hurdle lofty tariffs or frozen out of the market altogether by the spiked wall of the tariff.

The merchant marine, however, is a seahorse of another color.

We can do as well without our merchant fleet as we could without our Army or Navy. When this is clearly understood everything falls into place. A time of emergency for us would be a time of emergency for all nations and we could no more depend on friendly foreign-flag carriers to transport our vital necessities than we could depend on them to send troops to defend us. They could not if they would.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, our standard of living is high. Seamen and shipyard workers, being Americans also, insist on wages commensurate with other industries of similar degrees of skill and danger. Material costs and everything else connected with ship construction and operation, keeping pace with the rest of our economy, are also inflated. However, we must have the ships.

They could be, and some are, built abroad. But on a wide scale, this would court serious danger. Skilled shipyard workers would drift away never to return—and the steel companies and other suppliers would scream to the heavens.

Therefore, needing the ships, our Government pays the difference between what the vessels would cost to build in an American yard and the cost in a Japanese yard. This is now running over 45 percent of the total price.

The result is that shipyards are kept productive, seamen are employed, our trade routes are served by crack new cargoliners which must be replaced within 20 years, and we have a constantly replenished fleet of troop or materiel transports, since special naval "features" are built into such vessels.

As for operating subsidies, steamship lines receiving them have virtually all held out to the last ditch before being forced by unequal competition into such an arrangement. The reason is that a line receiving a subsidy has the Government for a partner. The books are open, executive salaries have ceilings and profits are strictly limited, among other hedges ringing the companies. Also, of all the subsidies paid out by the Government the only one required to be paid back is the one to steamship companies.

Agreed that a subsidy is an unsatisfactory solution to the problem, but until all the economies of the world are equal, it will have to do until a better one is devised by economists and writers who demand congressional investigation of the present one.

## Economic Problems of Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from my constituent, Dr. August Helmbold, of Newport, Ky.

Dr. Helmbold's letter makes some interesting observations on the economic problems facing the dedicated members of the medical profession, especially the difficulties that the doctor encounters in his later years in providing for his own security and that of his family. I think these observations will prove of interest to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWPORT, KY.,
*February 21, 1959.*

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON,
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MORTON: Thank you for your letter of February 9, concerning your introduction into the Senate, bill S. 841. In my humble opinion, this is a step in the right direction, and I thank you for taking it.

I believe that the greatest concern today is for the mass of the people in the United States. As Kentucky advertises, "The Greatest asset in Kentucky is her people."

I wish I could recall where I read the sterling article by a Swiss physician who recently visited and studied the medical problem and present solution thereof in Russia. I recall that in the article he stated that in Russia now there is 1 physician for 500 people, as compared to the United States 1 to 800. In the Armed Forces in World War II, I believe we were supposed to have 6.5 per 1,000; Russia, 1.5 per 1,000.

He also stated that in Russia men entered the medical college after completing only 2 years of high school and that Russia graduates over 12,000 physicians a year, as compared to us at 5,000 or 6,000.

Now I am not questioning whether we are overstaffed, understaffed or normal. The Kentucky State Department of Health recently reported eight counties with only one physician—probably under there.

I believe in our capitalistic system and I believe that the medical problem of this country can be well and better solved by the application of capitalistic methods that are tried and true.

To improve any service one must improve incentive—to the physician more incentive can be stimulated by providing more income and this by providing him with more patients to see. This, in turn, provides more health and better working ability of the worker. Then, in turn, more work provides more taxable income to the Government, which of course is what Congress is

striving for and this is an easier way of getting it, and a happier way.

There is, however, to the doctor a drawback to this simple plan; more patients means more time; more time means more wear and tear on his system; and more money coming in to him means more taxes and an increase in taxes percentagewise.

Should this increase continue to its limit, the doctor would be paying 90 percent of his income to the Government at a cost of 90 percent of his health and a 90 percent reduction in longevity and in the overall plan, would not be rendering good service over many years.

There is in Congress no law to provide for the doctor who overworks himself for the benefit of the people and the country.

I believe that this incentive to do more work can be supplied by Congress by passing a reducing scale of income tax payments than an increasing one.

I would have a greater incentive to work and will treat more people if I am charged 25 percent for my first $10,000, 20 percent for the next, and then perhaps 15 percent of the next, than as it now is 25, 40, 50, and on up. Doesn't taxation finally come up to be confiscation? Isn't confiscation a cause for rebellion, for unrest, for readjustment? There is a value attached to everything, including citizenship.

The savings gained by the reducing scale to the physician can be put aside to provide for his care should he have a breakdown or reach that period of life when time stops his productivity. It would in a pleasant way provide him with that up to $2,500 you so wisely advocate.

I hope I have given you something to think about and that it may help you in the passage of your bill.

Very truly yours,

AUGUST HELMBOLD.

## Inventions and Small Industries in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, truly, necessity is the mother of invention. The latest proof of this axiom is contained in The Northwest, published by the Northern Pacific Railway Co. It contains an article telling how one of my enterprising constituents, Gerald E. Hersman, of Livingston, Mont., after spending a night in the woods without a fire, invented an ingenious fire lighter which I am pleased to report is now being produced by his small factory in Livingston. Thus another small industry comes to Montana.

Industrial development leaders have often pointed out that, while it is always fine to attract a new branch of an established industry, one of the best ways to create new jobs is simply to develop new industries at the hometown level. That is exactly what has been done by Mr. Hersman, of Livingston.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article referred to, entitled "Perilous Journey Gave Him an Idea for a New Industry."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERILOUS JOURNEY GAVE HIM AN IDEA FOR A NEW INDUSTRY—NIGHT IN THE WOODS, IN FREEZING COLD, SHAPED THIS MONTANA HUNTER'S FUTURE

Ten years ago, in November, Gerald E. Hersman, of Livingston, Mont., was trailing a huge bull elk high in the Montana Rockies.

The snow was deep and the temperature, which had stood at 10 degrees below zero during the day, was dropping. An experienced big game hunter and an ardent outdoor enthusiast, Hersman had followed the particularly fine specimen for several hours when, finally, late in the afternoon, the opportunity for a shot presented itself and the excellent trophy was secured.

Naturally, he didn't suspect then how this incident would influence his life in years to come—how, as a result, he would start a factory.

Hersman had no premonition, either, of what the product he later was to manufacture—a non-failing fire lighter—would mean to thousands of other persons bent on recreation in farflung outdoor regions.

In place of day dreaming about the future, the hunter hastily dressed his kill and prepared to leave it to "cool out" before returning the next day with pack horses to move it to the highway, where it would be hauled to his home.

When the job was completed and Hersman began to take stock of his location and map out his return route, he realized with dismay that darkness was falling rapidly and that he was more than eight miles over precipitous and rugger mountain terrain away from his car.

To make this trip after dark would be dangerous and foolhardy; so, he immediately decided to build a fire and spend the night there, rather than risk injury and possible death from a fall.

Hersman's first concern was to gather wood and get a fire started to make the long hours of darkness more bearable.

Unfortunately, due to a heavy covering of snow, he was unable to gather suitable firewood and all efforts to ignite the material at hand failed. When he realized that his last match was gone and that there was no hope left for a fire's warmth, he selected a huge pine tree and trod a path around it, an act almost of despair, which was done with the realization that he was going to have to keep moving all night or he might become drowsy and doze off, with the possibility of freezing to death.

As the long, cold hours dragged slowly by while he fought off weariness, Hersman began turning over in his mind the events leading up to his predicament. He tried to think of a solution to rely on if such an emergency were to occur again. He realized that had he been carrying material that would ignite easily and quickly and that would give off heat, his night in the woods would have been much safer and less an ordeal.

Strange though it may seem at a time such as this, he recalled experiments in his high school chemistry classes. Before daylight came, Hersman had convinced himself that he could make a safe and dependable material for starting fires under the most adverse conditions.

On his return home, he tackled the problem again and, after 3 or 4 years of experimentation, a fire lighter was developed that appears to be satisfactory from every angle and, with wide approval, it is meeting a demand.

Hersman's fire lighter is made by taking a three-fourths-of-an-ounce waxed paper cup, which is filled with sawdust and his now-patented chemical ingredients. Paraffin or wax melted at 200° Fahrenheit, then poured over the material in the cup, penetrates to the bottom.

In a machine which performs the above operations automatically, the temperature is quickly lowered to zero Fahrenheit to force the contents of the cup to harden or set. This entire operation takes just 1 minute and the finished product is ready for packaging.

To ignite the fire lighter one makes a slight tear in the rim of the paper cup, which acts as a wick and the flame of a match causes the ingredients to react with a controlled fire that creates its own energy as it burns. The small amount of material produces a flame 7 inches high for 30 or 40 minutes.

The sawdust used must be of definite age, moisture content and gage.

One of Hersman's baffling problems was the fact that there was no existing machinery which could be utilized to manufacture this product. However, with the aid of Lester Hall, of Livingston, he designed and successfully built equipment which now is in use in the little factory he established at Livingston, where 12 people are employed. He calls it the Hersman Manufacturing Co. The present setup will turn out 10,000 of the fire lighters per hour. Hersman named his product the Fire-Go-Starter.

Plans are underway to obtain another location and more machines so that eventually between 50 and 60 workers will be employed.

The last 2 seasons 1 million of the fire lighters were sold and use in Yellowstone National Park to light stoves in tourist cabins.

The fire lighters are in demand by campers, fishermen, hunters and many others. They can be used in fireplaces, wood and coal ranges and in charcoal burners or for igniting the popular sawdust logs.

"The product has proved to be safe, sure, easy to operate, nonexplosive and waterproof, making it ideal for commonplace use or for inclusion in a survival kit," Hersman says.

Other advantages are that the material will not deteriorate with age and it is always ready for use.

Retailers who handle the lighters generally set the price at 5 cents each. New outlets should develop as the product becomes better known.

In addition to the above business, Mr. Hersman operates a drycleaning establishment and has another specialty product that he manufactures. This is an elk caller, which will lure a bull elk to a hunter in the fall. The instrument is made of metal and is about 12 inches long, with air chambers to give it correct tone.

Whether it sounds like a love call to a gentleman elk looking for female companionship or is accepted as a challenge from another bull to fight, we don't know, but it works. These elk callers are made only on order for interested sportsmen.

## The Trail to Brotherly Love

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the greatness that is America is reflected in the annals of our history through the events and the people that have guided our destiny.

In times of crisis and peril—such as during World War II—the rich heritage of democracy comes forth in all its glory through the actions and deeds of our citizenry.

Today, as we look back on these events—World War II, World War I, and earlier times—when our Nation stood at the door of disaster, we tend to forget that although these were momentus engagements, the decisive turn of events was fully dependent upon the individual citizen.

How one such event, which is a story of personal courage and faith, will always stand as one of America's most superb moments in history, is told in a recent address given by George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America.

George Stringfellow is a dedicated American who exemplifies the finest qualities of good citizenship. He is a man of deep religious conviction and devoted patriotism, and he brings to the office of imperial potentate the outstanding traits of leadership that reflect the great principles upon which this country was founded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the introductory remarks by Dr. Daniel A. Poling and the address by Mr. Stringfellow.

There being no objection, the introduction and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION BY DR. DANIEL A. POLING, IMPERIAL CHAPLAIN OF THE ANCIENT ARABIC ORDER OF THE NOBLES OF THE MYSTIC SHRINE FOR NORTH AMERICA

In the Chapel of Four Chaplains, the unique interfaith memorial at the heart of Temple University in Philadelphia, on Sunday afternoon, February 15, George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, delivered a notable address. The message of the imperial potentate was a declaration of faith and freedom. He spoke in support of that unity which is not uniformity but which transcends all differences of faith and race, and which, at last, strengthens every worthy individual and group loyalty.

The chapel, which is a memorial to the four *Dorchester* chaplains—a Roman Catholic priest, a Jewish rabbi, and two Protestant ministers—is symbolic of the faith in which the *Dorchester* chaplains gave their lifebelts and their lives for their fellow men. On the occasion of the imperial potentate's address, the beautiful sanctuary with its many memorials and its three altars upon a revolving platform within the chancel arch was crowded with Shriners and their friends.

THE TRAIL TO BROTHERLY LOVE

(An address by George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate, A.A.O.N.MS., East Orange, N.J., Chapel of the Four Chaplains, Philadelphia, Pa., Feb. 15, 1959)

My friends, we are gathered here this afternoon to pay homage to a great American heritage. It is fitting that this be done in this chapel—erected to the memory of four American heroes—who loved their country and their God so devoutly that they gave up their lives that others might live.

The night of February 3, 1943, was cold, bitterly cold. Across the wide expanses of the North Atlantic, an American convoy of troops and the supplies of war moved silently to the rescue of embattled peoples, held in subjection by a maniac. The ships in the convoy were silhouetted against the faint light that glowed from out of the north across the Greenland sea.

One of the ships in the convoy was the *Dorchester*, carrying both troops and supplies. The men aboard the ship were young, red-blooded American boys. Facing death on the battlefields of strange lands, they were carefree as soldiers usually are. Most were asleep. Others were reading, talking or gaming under shielded lights.

Suddenly, there was an explosion on the starboard side of the ship and every man aboard knew what had happened. Torpedoed. Admiral Doenitz, the chief of the Germany Navy, had warned the world that his submarines would wage uncontrolled war against all shipping. On the afternoon of February 3, the men had been told of the admiral's warning. They were instructed that until further notice they must wear warm clothing and lifejackets at all times for their protection in the event of an attack which now had come.

But fearless young men do not always do what they know is best for themselves. When the German torpedo struck the *Dorchester* just after midnight on February 3, many of the troops were asleep and without their lifejackets.

Of course, there was confusion when the explosion came. There was a rush for the decks. The skipper told his men to proceed to their lifeboats. Before half of them reached their assigned stations the ship began to list. Within a matter of minutes, the ship was almost on its side. The lifeboats could not be lowered. Rafts were cut loose and men began dropping into the sea. In 27 minutes, the *Dorchester* went down.

Suddenly in the confusion four men appeared—four stalwart young men—and raised their voices in prayer. They were Alexander Goode, a Jewish rabbi; John P. Washington, a Catholic priest; and Clark V. Poling and George L. Fox, Protestant ministers.

As they prayed, they saw some of the young men had no lifejackets or warm clothing. And so, as if in some miraculous way it had been planned, the four men calmly unfastened their own lifejackets and buckled them around the shoulders of careless boys who had forgotten where they had placed theirs.

As minute by minute passed, these four men—a Jew, a Roman Catholic, and two Protestants—calmly locked their arms together and prayed to their God—in their own manner—until the *Dorchester* sank—into the icy waters off the tip of Greenland.

These men did not die. They will live as long as there is an America. Their glorious deed is written indelibly in the pages of history—alongside the minutemen at Concord and Lexington; beside a little group of Masons from St. Andrews Lodge in Boston who dumped tea into Boston Harbor; beside Washington, Patrick Henry, and Paul Revere; beside Lincoln, Grant, and Lee; beside Pershing, MacArthur and Rickenbacker; beside Patton, Halsey, and hundreds of others.

This is the heritage we have received.

This is the heritage that Russians cannot understand.

This is the heritage that Hitler forgot, that Stalin forgot, and that today's Kremlin is forgetting. And unfortunately, too many Americans are also forgetting. We spend too much time bickering in our petty disagreements that our memory fades. On the *Dorchester* that cold, bleak night four men rose above their petty differences in form and ceremony; to the glory of America, these men met their God.

In inviting me to speak you have conferred a great honor upon me and the fraternity I represent. As imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America, I assure you that 830,000 Shriners cherish the heritage bequeathed to them by the four chaplains. We will of course strive to be worthy of their sacrifice in our behalf.

The Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America is playing a vital function in our tragic, modern world. It provides fun and happiness for its membership.

It provides entertainment for the millions who witness our spectacular parades.

We Shriners are vigilant to protect our people from the machinations of the monsters who would enslave us.

The Shrine teaches religious toleration. One of the great tragedies of our time is the way in which minorities engage in warfare against each other—instead of uniting and fighting the forces of evil. Our initiates are taught that every man shall have the right to worship God as he chooses without interference from anyone.

Let us rededicate ourselves to the glory of our country.

Let us not be ashamed to point, with tear-dimmed eyes, to our flag and say, This is the symbol of my country which I will defend as the four chaplains whose memory we honor today.

Let us raise our eyes to heaven and in all humility say to the great Architect of the Universe that we will forever cherish the memory of the four chaplains who blazed the trail to brotherly love.

## New Ideas for Vessel Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there is an old adage to the effect that "The Lord helps those who help themselves." This might be paraphrased to suggest that the industries which most justifiably rate Government support are those which are making a real effort to solve their own problems. Under this heading should be included the privately owned commercial shipping industry, which presently is embarked on a program of vessel replacement, involving expenditures over the next 15 years running into several billion dollars of private funds.

Along with these expenditures, the vessel operators, in concert with the Maritime Administration, are engaged in a program of research and experimentation of great potential value to the country's future economy. An editorial that appeared in the January 19 issue of the Forwarder, gives a preview of some of the new ideas for vessel improvement in the years ahead. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If an oldtime round-the-horn windjammer sailor were to return today no one could estimate the amount of eye rubbing and soft swearing that would go on as he stared popeyed at such wonders of the sea as the *Queen Elizabeth, Queen Mary, United States*, and our new aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Independence* on the flight deck of which the liners *United States* and *America* could be placed side by side with room all around.

A glimpse into the immediate future, however, would have him convinced that either he or ourselves were mad.

Ships cruising the oceans for months without refueling; ships crossing the At-

lantic at 50 or 60 knots; thousands of tons of cargo transported in a rubber bag; ships traveling the trade routes of the world with only a small fraction of their bulk above the surface.

These, of course, are far from dreams. N.S. *Savannah*, now building, will be operating next year and the experience gained from its nuclear propulsion machinery will figure in all future marine engineering. Tests will soon be conducted with large, ocean-going hydrofoil ships in view. Many years ago S. B. Morse, inventor of the telegraph, developed a hydrofoil boat which goggle-eyed spectators watched streak across a northern lake at better than 70 knots. There is a hydrofoil ferry presently running between mainland Italy and Capri at speeds above 80 knots. So it is far from inconceivable that a really large ship could cross oceans at twice the present speed.

A British development shows it possible to move a large cargo of oil or other liquid in a huge specially treated bag towed like a sausage behind a smaller boat. After the cargo is delivered the bag is folded and carried as a deck load; thus eliminating possible long uneconomical return voyages of tankers.

One of the latest developments on the drawing boards is a massive, nuclear-powered submarine-type vessel. It would not be a true submarine because the bridge, living quarters, public rooms and so on would be carried in a relatively small streamlined structure high above the water, with the cargo and machinery riding in a huge, whale-like shape beneath the surface. These, and powerful submarines, towing large, blimp-shaped cargo barges far beneath the surface at high speeds, are definitely in our future.

These are exciting times we live in, restless and changing, and nowhere more than in the maritime fields. Romance of the sea dead? Nonsense, there will always be more than enough for all hands.

## Opposition to Merger Legislation Affecting International Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted on December 16, 1958, by the executive board of the International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO, expressing opposition to proposed merger legislation affecting international communications.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING MERGER LEGISLATION AFFECTING INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Whereas the major international radiotelegraph and cable communications companies have announced their intention of creating a monopoly in that industry and have caused to be introduced in the U.S. Senate a bill, S. 4231, which would exempt them from the prohibitions of the Sherman Antitrust Act; and

Whereas Congress has, as a matter of public policy over many years, refused to permit mergers in this vital communications field; and

Whereas the existence of competition in this industry has brought American communications development to the forefront of the world, has maintained reasonable rates and speedy and accurate service; and

Whereas a monopoly in this industry would be harmful to the business community, the national defense, to labor, and the public interest generally: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the executive board of the International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO, hereby expresses its opposition to any legislation that would permit mergers or the creation of a monopoly in the vital international communications industry.

Dated: December 16, 1958.

WILLIAM BOTKIN,
*International Secretary-Treasurer.*

## The REA and Trinity Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a speech which I made before the 17th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on February 9, 1959, in Washington, D.C., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REA AND TRINITY POWER

(Address by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, before the general session, 17th NRECA annual meeting, Washington, D.C., February 9, 1959)

President George, Mr. Ellis, members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and friends, I am delighted with this opportunity to exchange views with the organization which has brought millions of Americans one of the means of better living: electricity.

Much as the pioneers did who put the plow to our broad and fertile land in order that there might be a plenitude of food for the people and an ample supply of fibers for their needs, the rural electric cooperatives have blazed a trail through the wilderness of technological maladjustment so that the American farmer and his family might receive the benefits of this convenient form of energy at prices tolerant to their income. Thanks to the cooperatives, 19 out of 20 farmhouses today can command the assistance of electricity at the flick of a switch. Clean incandescent and fluorescent lighting has literally eclipsed the kerosene lamp. The electric motor has accepted the strains of human toil in the house and the shop and barn. Even the human hunger for entertainment is filled in part by devices utilizing the magic of electrokinetics. Indeed, the farmer who is a member of his electric cooperative may have today all the conveniences of city living—plus the joys of living in the country.

The banding together by neighbors for the purpose of obtaining electrical service is clearly in consonance with the philosophy of government expressed 100 years ago by Abraham Lincoln. This greatest of Americans said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities."

Your meeting is being held in a historic setting. Washington has been the seat of American Government for 169 years. In the old Supreme Court room of the Capitol, a mile or two from this armory, one of the most useful applications of electricity was accomplished when Samuel F. B. Morse demonstrated the first telegraph, sending his message, "What God hath wrought," over the wires instantaneously from Washington to Baltimore.

Northward, a couple of hours from here by automobile, lies Philadelphia, where Benjamin Franklin interested himself, among many other subjects, in the phenomenon of electricity. Franklin was a practicing scientist of government. He perceived, as Lincoln did later, that the people have to do jointly many things which they cannot accomplish as individuals; for it was Ben Franklin who established the Post Office Department in order that the public might have a far better mail service than they could supply for themselves. He carried out a legitimate object of government.

About 23 years ago, the Congress of the United States concluded that if rural America were to receive electric service, this would have to become a "legitimate object of Government" through Federal assistance to local cooperatives. The undertaking has been successful. A tremendous amount of new business has been developed, which benefits the total American economy; for when thousands upon thousands of farm families buy electrical appliances, industry hums in Schenectady and Chicago and all around the land. The cooperatives have had a magnificent record of financial soundness. They have served a legitimate object of government.

But now it is proposed to emasculate the foundation of the rural electric cooperatives. Other speakers during this meeting will discuss the attempts to exact higher fees for the money which cooperatives must borrow. They will remind the public that the rate of interest paid on REA loans in most of these past 23 years has exceeded the interest rates paid by the Government in the money market. They will note that under the "area covenants" which a cooperative undertakes when it accepts Federal assistance, that cooperative must give service to any farmer in the territory even if the individual account may not be profitable. This, of course, the private utilities cannot be compelled to do; and until the idea of rural electric cooperatives was born, many such farmers had to endure a standard of living which reflected the lack of electrical service.

These financial policies, as I say, are not within the scope of my remarks; but they interest me very much. In this connection, I hope you will permit me also to remind you that I am a coauthor in the U.S. Senate with Senators AIKEN, HUMPHREY, SPARKMAN, KENNEDY, MILTON YOUNG, COOPER, MANSFIELD, HILL, HENNINGS, CURTIS, MURRAY, LANGER, and CLARK on the resolution to clarify the lending authority of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The aspersions upon REA interest and loan policies constitute a threat to the magnificently successful rural electrification program. I want to discuss another, equally serious threat—the attack upon the governmental policy of giving preference to publicly owned and operated agencies when it disposes of federally generated power. By definition those agencies include military installations, irrigation districts, municipalities, and rural electric cooperatives.

The present battleground in the war upon the preference policy is my own State of California. Hydroelectric power is a feature of Federal multipurpose reclamation proj-

ects. Great dams are built to impound quantities of water for irrigation. As these waters fall over the dam, or, rather, go through a penstock, they turn electric generators. You are far more familiar with the process than I.

Revenues from the power sales have contributed substantially to project construction costs. The reclamation projects of the United States are not built for profit. Their purpose is to serve the needs of the people. They incidentally—and importantly—assist in controlling floods and in controlling salinity. They provide new recreational opportunities. And, utilizing the inevitable hydro head, they produce power.

Whenever we study these governmental projects, it must be borne in mind that the size of the dams is governed not by the output of the powerplant, but by the needs of irrigation. Irrigation is the primary purpose. These are reclamation projects. They are power projects only incidentally. The ability of the Government to receive income from the power has, of course, helped to guarantee a dependable and economical supply of water for crops.

Moreover, if the dams had been built simply for power, they would be small. Their capacity for irrigation needs would be irrelevant. There is an excellent example of this in my State. There, on the great Feather River, the private utility has built a series of dams. Each produces a hundred thousand kilowatts or so of electrical energy. But they do not hold back much water for summer irrigation. Their flood control values are negligible. In the disastrous flood of 1954–55 in the Sacramento Valley, it was not the Sacramento River which caused the loss of 70 lives and wreaked tremendous property loss, but the Feather and other streams, upon which there are no reclamation dams at the present time. On the Sacramento, the mighty Shasta Dam, a reclamation project of the United States, holds back more than 4 million acre-feet of water; if it had only to serve the needs of power production, it could be of a capacity of a relatively few thousand acre-feet.

Reclamation was found—under the administration of a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt—to be a legitimate object of the U. S. Government. No individual could possibly cope with a reclamation undertaking costing hundreds of millions of dollars; but it was both possible and practicable for the community of people, the Government to do so. And thus, in the best sense, it was in the Lincoln tradition.

The disposal of the water from these projects, and of the power, was dealt with on behalf of the community. A limitation was placed upon the number of acres an individual might own if he accepted the irrigation benefits; and, in order that its benefits might be shared by a maximum number of people without profit to any at the expense of the Government, the electric power was put at the disposal of Federal installations and public agencies.

This preference, with respect to power, constituted the forms of assistance which the Federal Government could make available for rural electric cooperatives. If the preference policy were to be eroded away, the Federal agencies would have to come to Congress for more money to cover the mounting costs of their power bills. The cities which have established municipal power distribution, and the electric cooperatives, would lose one of their principal means of helping to build America. With half of your systems directly dependent upon Federal projects for wholesale power, you have cause to be deeply concerned.

It is with respect to a great new Federal project in my State that such erosion is being attempted. If the private power industry succeeded in preventing the Government from making the electricity from the Trinity available to preference customers, I think it only logical to expect that a like attempt would be made with respect to all Federal reclamation projects, in being or in prospectus. The efforts of the community of people to accelerate the economy of rural America through electric cooperatives would suffer a disastrous reversal.

Congress authorized the Trinity division of the Central Valley project in July 1955. My former colleague, William F. Knowland and I coauthored the bill in the Senate. I was proud to have the opportunity of successfully presenting the necessary legislation in committee, and in the Senate as a whole. As finally approved, the Trinity bill was the version passed earlier by the House of Representatives.

By reason of the lateness of the season, Representative CLAIR ENGLE requested the Senate to take up his House-approved bill. It was similar to the Senate version, except that it provided also for a continuance of studies and a report to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior on proposals for power development through the purchase of falling water at Trinity by a non-Federal agency, the result of proposals made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The Trinity project is unique. It will take a million acre-feet of water annually from the Trinity River on the west side of the coast range of mountains in northwestern California, and dump it into the upper reaches of the Sacramento River on the other side. The transfer will be accomplished through several tunnels through the mountains. As the waters descend, they will develop electricity at three powerplants in a total of 330,000 kilowatts of firm power.

When the water has reached its destination, it will supplement the Central Valley project, and stabilize the Sacramento River. It will provide some flood protection on the Trinity and Klamath Rivers. It will have recreational values. And this multi-purpose project will generate power.

When they headed the administration of my State's government Earl Warren and Goodwin Knight both urged the Trinity project. Edmund Brown supported it as attorney general, and since becoming Governor, has stated his continuing approval for Federal construction of the power feature of the project. So in the Congress we have been carrying out the wishes of the State—which is as it should be.

In accordance with the reclamation laws, the power feature of the Trinity was included in the 1955 legislation. But as we worked for passage of the legislation, it became necessary in the House of Representatives to accept the amendment which I have described. This was the provision for a report by the Secretary of the Interior on the purchase of falling water at Trinity by a non-Federal agency. In plain English that would be the so-called partnership between the Government and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

I want to emphasize that Congress in authorizing Trinity was at great pains not to waive the national policy regarding public power and the preference principle. In fact, in reporting the Trinity bill, the Senate committee flatly declared it was its intention to preserve inviolate the preference clause sections of the reclamation laws. The committee went on to indicate that the study by the Interior Secretary was not to be interpreted as approving any departure from the traditional policy which goes back to Theodore Roosevelt's administration. That was certainly my intention in handling the bill. It was, I believe, the intention of the Senate in passing it.

The studies called for in the act were made by the Bureau of Reclamation. They were reported to Congress 2 years ago by the Secretary of the Interior, who recommended the so-called partnership. The Commissioner of Reclamation said in his report attached to the Secretary's recommendation, that:

"The all-Federal development assumes extending to the Trinity Division policies and reclamation law which provide for sale (1) of power to preference agencies, (2) at lowest rates to all customers consistent with the financial needs of the project.

Obviously, under the partnership, public preference would be emasculated. The Commissioner himself stated that under the partnership the power available from the Central Valley project, into which the Trinity Division has been incorporated would be curtailed. He calculated that 650,000 kilowatts would be available to nonprofit agencies under Federal development, contrasted with 400,000 kilowatts under private development. A later study by Samuel B. Morris, the distinguished Los Angeles engineer, found that the difference would be not 250,000 kilowatts, but 330,000 of firm power.

Using 250,000 kilowatts, the Secretary calculated that the excess cost to public agencies for their power needs would be $118 million, of which $71 million would be paid for by Federal installations, and $47 million by local preference customers. The report was sent to Congress on February 12, 1957. In June of the same year, after it had been discovered that the earlier figures were based on an obsolete rate schedule of the private utility, the Secretary revised his total figure upward to $150 million as increased costs to public agencies, including the proposed new San Luis Reservoir.

Mr. Morris calculated that with San Luis, the excess cost to preference customers would be $192 million—using the Secretary's figure of 250,000 kilowatts as the power output of the Trinity project. But Mr. Morris, as I have said, reckons the output at 330,000 kilowatts of firm power. He finds that the difference in cost to preference customers if they bought the larger amounts from the private utility, would be $257 million over the 50-year payout period of the Trinity project.

While it is extremely difficult to make precise calculations on a problem so complicated as this one, everyone concerned clearly understands that the excess cost to preference agencies under the partnership" proposal would run into millions of dollars. We know that the Federal installations which use Central Valley project power would find it necessary to budget for higher costs. Congress would have to provide the money for them. We would be selling the falling waters at Trinity at one level, and we would have to buy back the power at a higher level to pump water into the San Luis Reservoir, and for other Federal purposes.

Against the excess costs to Federal installations, municipalities, rural electric cooperatives, and irrigation districts, would be the offset of the amount the private utility would pay for the falling waters at Trinity. But even if the offset were 100 percent—which it is not—this would be nothing more than robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Beyond the fact that the partnership proposal violates by understanding of economics, I subscribe to the principle that the people of a community have the right to determine for themselves the kind of electric power service they want. This they do for water service, and transportation, and a number of other public objectives. Is it not abundantly true, my friends, that in this Republic of ours, it is the people whose right it is to decide what they want for themselves?

One does not need to be doctrinaire on power policies in order to recognize the right of people to determine the kind of electric service they desire for their community or district, under preferences given to them by Federal law on Federal reclamation projects. It is illogical to urge that the Fed-

eral Government build a $225 million project only to compel its own agencies and local nonprofit agencies to pay private rates for the electric energy produced by the waters stored therein. Indeed, it would be illegal under the existing Trinity authorizing law.

Congress will not consider repealing the preference clause. That was my judgment 2 years ago, which I expressed during a speech in the U.S. Senate. It is my judgment now.

The recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior for private power development at Trinity is fraught with many perils. The theory of California water law is one of beneficial consumptive use. Our semiarid State cannot afford to waste water. In a Federal reclamation project, the Bureau of Reclamation must determine what is the most efficient use of the water in the storage reservoir for both domestic and agricultural use. That is the basis upon which it must discharge its responsibility of administering reclamation projects. Beneficial consumptive use must have complete priority over using the water for the generation of electricity. Under the Secretary's proposed contract, the single responsibility of the company would be to produce hydroelectric power in a manner most efficiently to supply the needs of its own customers. In the proper functioning of the Central Valley project, I visualize a deadly serious problem if the needs of electricity by the customers of the private utility under the partnership proposal.

There is room in our Nation for both public power and private power to meet the growing needs of our expanding economy. Where facilities have been created through an investment of public moneys, as in the Central Valley project and its Trinity division, I believe the power produced by them should be distributed to public agencies, as has been done so successfully for many years. The Central Valley project was built to satisfy an urgent need among our people for reclamation assistance. Its benefits should be distributed on as wide a range as possible.

My decision as to Federal construction of the Trinity division power feature has not been lightly taken. It was recommended by both the Warren and the Knight administrations. It is endorsed by the Brown administration. It is the way Congress passed the bill and the way President Eisenhower signed it. Never in my life have I been subject to such contemptible pressures to change my position. But never in my life have I found a decision more inescapable, more logical, more right, than this one, and I give you my assurance that Trinity will be completed as a multipurpose Federal project, and that this latest assault on the preference clause of Federal reclamation law will go down to its well-earned defeat.

In this 86th Congress I will fight with all my resources for an appropriation to build the powerplant at Trinity. I call on the Secretary of the Interior 2 years ago to include an item in his budget for planning the generating equipment. I repeated that urgent suggestion last fall, but the budget does not include the necessary funds. Indeed, the Under Secretary of the Interior has made speeches in California asserting the intention of his Department to continue a "rear guard action" for approval of the partnership scheme. I shall not attempt to characterize the speeches; but some in my State have likened this approach to blackmail. If the generators are not ordered soon, they cannot be ready when the Trinity Dam is finished. The benefits of power production will be lost until the generators start turning.

Ladies and gentlemen, the rural electric cooperatives, in California and all across the land, have brought modern living to the American farmer. They are part of American life, and Federal law makes them so. And, in precisely this same category, Federal law and policy, for over a half century, provide for multipurpose reclamation projects whose byproduct of electricity shall be sold, first, to nonprofit agencies—Federal, State, or local. Federal reclamation has helped materially to build the West. It has been assaulted and condemned by selfish people who want no yardstick, and who resent what they sneeringly call socialism.

If when a community of people elect to produce or distribute electric power, that constitutes socialism, then the great city of Los Angeles practices socialism—because, like your REA's, it produces and sells electricity to its people. If that is true, then my own home city of Anaheim must plead guilty, too.

A generation or so ago, these selfish people objected to the Federal Government building any great dams. They lost. The dams, like Hoover Dam, which serves almost all of southern California, water and power, were built by the Federal Government to satisfy the people's needs. Now those same selfish people urge what they euphemistically call partnership. And I say to you, in dead earnest: They will lose again. With your help, we'll see that they do.

## Resolution Commemorating Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America, a national fraternal organization, with its headquarters in Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

RESOLUTION

Unanimously adopted at a meeting of Lithuanian Americans of the Wyoming Valley, gathered on the 15th day of February 1959, under the sponsorship of the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Alliance of America, a national fraternal organization, at its headquarters, 73 South Washington Street, City of Wilkes-Barre, State of Pennsylvania, to commemorate the 41st Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

Whereas Soviet Russia, spurred by her evil ambition to conquer the world, is applying a policy of vicious destruction against peoples which she thinks might stand in her way to future expansion of world communism;

Whereas the Lithuanians are strongly opposed to any foreign domination over their country and are waging an unequal life and death struggle to preserve their national entity and to regain freedom;

Whereas because of their manifest and unmistakable attitude toward international communism, the people of Lithuania, backed by their kinsmen in the free world, represent a reliable outpost in the present defense line of the free nations against Communist aggression;

Whereas the heroic Lithuanian underground, aided by Lithuanians abroad, plays an active part in today's struggle of the free world to resist Communist aggression, and therefore deserves every possible assistance and encouragement by all free nations;

Whereas the eyes of the unfortunate are set on the United States of America, which always has been looked upon as the strongest champion of the oppressed; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this meeting appeal to the Government of the United States and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, to respond to the demands of our times by giving intelligent and coordinate leadership to vast human forces in Europe and Asia aspiring to peace, justice, and freedom; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the liberation of Lithuania and other Russian occupied countries be included in the program of the American foreign policy; and that the existing underground movements behind the Iron Curtain be given direct and effective assistance in their unequal life and death struggle to freedom and independence; and be it finally

*Resolved*, That this meeting express gratitude to the Government of this country which has never recognized the fruits of Soviet aggression against Lithuania and the other Baltic States, and has always demonstrated a favorable attitude toward the cause of independent Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

EDWARD W. LOPATTO, *Chairman.*
FLOYD G. YOSKOSKI, *Secretary.*

## Restrictions on Imports of Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a telegram received from John P. Birmingham, president, White Fuel Corp., of Boston, Mass., protesting against the mandatory restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil and showing what an economic blow such action will be to New England. As Mr. Birmingham states, and he is well qualified to know, this will be particularly harmful and unnecessarily so, to New England, which means not only New England industry but the homeowners of New England. I have already vigorously protested against this action which, as Mr. Birmingham stated in his telegram, could seriously damage New England economy. I also include in my extension of remarks a letter on the same subject received from Mr. Thomas G. Dignan, president of the Boston Edison Co., of Boston, Mass., together with a copy of a letter which Mr. Dignan, on February 11, 1959, sent to Mr. Leo A. Hoegh, Director, Civil Defense Mobilization. Like Mr. Birmingham, Mr. Dignan is well qualified to express his opinions on the harmful effect that such action will have to New England—to New England and to New England homeowners.

The telegram and letters follow:

WELLESLEY, MASS., *March 4, 1959.*
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Understand White House presently considering mandatory restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil. At the least this will be an economic blow to New England due to increased fuel costs. One percent shortage in winter of 1947–48 drove New England fuel costs up at rate of at least $100 million annually. In addition with domestic oil industry incapable of making up artificially created shortages and oil burning equipment

unable to use substitute fuels parts of New England may be completely without suitable fuel. Urge your intervention to prevent this action which could seriously damage New England economy.

JOHN P. BIRMINGHAM,
*President, White Fuel Corp.*

BOSTON, MASS.

---

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
*Boston, Mass., March 2, 1959.*

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*Office of the Majority Leader,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed are copies of Boston Edison Co.'s statement concerning the importation of residual oil which have been submitted to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

This matter is being studied by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and is also the subject of a number of bills pending in the Senate and House. Restrictions on the importation of residual oil is, in my opinion, detrimental to national defense and is discriminatory to New England. There will be a severe economic impact to customers of this company and to many direct users of residual oil, such as hospitals, universities, and industrial concerns. Representatives of other areas of the country, particularly the coal industry, have been very active in support of legislation against the importation of residual oil.

I am sure that your office has been aware of this problem, and I thought that it would be desirable to keep you informed of our activity in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS G. DIGNAN.

---

BOSTON EDISON CO.,
*Boston, Mass., February 11, 1959.*

Mr. LEO A. HOEGH,
*Director, Civil and Defense Mobilization,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. HOEGH: Pursuant to notice which appeared in the FEDERAL REGISTER (Document 59-797) January 28, 1959, and in accordance with Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization Regulation No. 4 as amended January 27, 1959, Boston Edison Co. submits the following comments.

It is to be noted that these comments are confined to a discussion of the need to import residual fuel oil, and are submitted by an electric utility which is a large user of imported residual oil, a byproduct of crude oil remaining after other usable products have been removed.

Boston Edison Co. is an investor-owned utility which provides electric service to 475,000 customers in 40 cities and towns in the Greater Boston area and through bulk sales to other electric systems, to large numbers of consumers outside its own area. Its interest in this matter is to see that customers, including many vital national defense facilities, have a reliable supply of electricity available at all times and at the lowest possible cost.

Boston Edison Co. contends that no restrictions should be placed upon the importation of residual fuel oil. Importation of residual oil is a special problem and should be considered apart from the importation of other petroleum products. This has been recognized during the period of present voluntary controls, and it is urged that continued recognition be given to this point of view.

In the opinion of this company, no justifiable purpose will be accomplished by the restriction of residual oil imports, but rather many serious and undesirable economic consequences will result from such a restriction.

Residual oil is the scrap product of oil processing. In 1957, the amount of residual oil imported represented less than 5.1 percent of the total petroleum products used in the United States. Modern refinery design in the United States permits the distillation of many crudes, so that there is no residual oil produced in the refining process. Refiners of domestic oil have not produced sufficient quantities of residual oil. Users of residual oil have been forced to import. As the demand for other more valuable petroleum products increases and the production of residual oil decreases, the use of imported residuals is necessary to fill the gap between domestic production and domestic demand.

This company supplies power to a large metropolitan area which includes a large number of national defense facilities and producers of vital defense products. The use of natural gas on a firm basis is not economic and has been discouraged in recent cases by the Federal Power Commission. Substantial curtailment of the supply of residual oil would force this utility and others to rely on an uninterrupted supply of coal. For such a utility to be dependent upon a single fuel to produce its power is dangerous to the national defense.

Scarcity of residual oil as a fuel will increase the cost of electricity to customers, including military installations and suppliers. Other national defense considerations include the effect of import restrictions on the size of the tanker fleet which would exist for use in times of emergency. The Suez crisis indicated that the entire world oil supply and oil transportation facilities are of direct interest to the United States of America. Also, restriction of this type of fuel will have an adverse effect on the development and maintenance of very critical port facilities.

A further consideration, important to national defense, is that a large percentage of residual oil imports comes from Caribbean countries. It is a major and nearby source of oil and should be in established use for American needs rather than for other, possibly unfriendly, nations. Finally, the record of this investigation should indicate that the friendship of these Caribbean countries is of utmost importance to the national defense of the United States.

The east coast uses more than 50 percent of the residual oil consumed in the United States, and of this amount more than 55 percent is imported. Restrictions would severely disrupt the use of fuel in this area and would affect industrial heating, shipping, and public utilities, as well as other phases of industrial activity. A reduction in the supply of residual oil would increase substantially the cost of power in the east coast area.

This is critical in the entire northeastern area, which is already burdened by the high cost of fuel because of great distances over which such fuel must be transported. The charge for every kilowatt-hour this company sells includes a fuel adjustment which varies with the cost of fuel. On the basis of its present rates and actual fuel costs in December 1958, its customers would have been required to pay more than $1,500,000 additional for the energy they purchased in 1958 if this company had been unable to obtain residual oil.

The continued use of residual oil imports will aid and not impair national security. In addition, restrictions on importation of this product would threaten the ability of the electric industry to provide a reliable supply of electricity and would affect the price of electricity for a large number of users vital to the national security. Such a restriction is particularly onerous and discriminating to the very important northeastern section of this country. Boston Edison Co. urges that special consideration be given to the importation of residual oil and that no restrictions be placed thereon.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS G. DIGNAN.

## All-Out U.S. Effort To Combat Soviet Penetration of Asia, Africa, and the Mideast

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to be the guest speaker at the World Affairs Council meeting in Troy, N.Y., on Friday, December 12, 1958. The subject of my address was "America Needs a Constructive Program in Asia, Africa, and the Mideast."

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from that address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL, TROY, N.Y., DECEMBER 12, 1958

I want to talk to you tonight about the challenges to the United States on the world scene.

I will base my remarks to a considerable extent on my findings during my recent 3½ weeks' trip in Europe, particularly my week in the Soviet Union.

Europe's challenges are many—the crisis over Berlin, the question of atomic arms for West Germany, the problem of German reunification, the controversy over proposed disengagement in Central Europe, the disputes over free trade and the European common market, the Geneva talks on nuclear test suspension and surprise attack, and many other problems as well.

Most of these issues have been rather well publicized. But tonight I should like to turn to an even more crucial area, a less understood area, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

For one of the principal findings on my recent trip is confirmation of this fact—the Soviet Union is laying plans and executing plans on these developing areas to a degree that we of the United States have not begun to match.

Soviet agitation in these devoloping areas, Soviet propagandizing in them, has unfortunately long since begun to pay off in terms of rising Soviet influence and prestige there.

We need only look at the disturbing headlines in the United Arab Republic, in Iraq, in Yemen and elsewhere to see proof of that fact.

But most Americans regrettably do not yet perceive the overall dimensions of the Soviet threat in the underdeveloped part of the world.

In other words, in the years up ahead, unless we take immediate effective action, we are going to find that the grim problems which we now face, for example, in the Middle East, are multiplied manyfold in South Asia, Africa, and yes, in South America.

I, for one, believe that there is still time for us to maintain and strengthen freedom among the one-third of the world which is uncommitted.

As you know, it is my privilege to serve as chairman of the Middle East Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. In that capacity, I have noted the many facets of the Soviet offensive in this part of the globe: the economic facet, such as Soviet purchases of Egyptian cotton; the military facet, such as Soviet barter of arms for that cotton; the cultural facet, such as

artistic performers from Eastern Europe pouring in to the Middle East; the psychological facet, such as the playing on deep seated resentments, frustrations, and fears within the Middle East against Western Powers.

In all this, the Soviet Union is playing for enormous stakes. In the Middle East, it is playing for ultimate control of the billions of dollars of petroleum reserves lying beneath the hot desert sands. Indeed, everywhere, it is playing for access to raw material reserves upon which the Western World vitally depends, both for its factories and mills and for its earnings. Everywhere the target is people—discontented, disenfranchised, unhappy people—millions of them in the neutralist part of the globe.

The philosophy of the Kremlin is that the entire developing area of the world is in a state of revolution against present or past imperial ties with the West. The Kremlin believes, as Premier Khrushchev told interviewers, that the West has no right to seek to impose a status quo in the face of this anticolonial revolution. Premier Khrushchev has indicated without saying so that the Soviet Union has the right to advance this anticolonial revolution as it sees fit. But when he says "anticolonial" he means, of course, only Western colonialism; he does not include colonialism of Moscow or Peking.

By contrast, Premier Khrushchev denies the right of revolution in Central Europe. Here he insists that the status quo—meaning Soviet imperial occupation—continue. And he further insists that the West cease and desist from any effort to impair that status quo.

This, then, is the inconsistency of the Soviet position. It is not a logical position, it is self-contradictory, but as usual, that does not bother the Soviets. For one pattern which they always observe and reject is what they regard as their own raw self-interest.

And they feel that their self-interest requires the exploitation of the conditions of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East—the exploitation of south Asia, for example, where income per capita still averages only $50 per year, the exploitation of hunger, hopelessness, fear and misery, illiteracy, and disease.

While I was in Moscow, I could see certain passes of the Soviet Asian pattern developing.

Let me refer to three such evidences:

1. In the streets of Moscow, in the theaters, the auditoriums, the schools, I could see a tremenodus proportion of visitors from Asia. Many of these visitors were from the Central Asian Soviet Republics which are part of the U.S.S.R. itself.

But many were visitors from Asian countries. For example, I spoke with students from Hanoi—the Viet Minh capital. I encountered youngsters from mainland China and other Asian countries.

Always the emphasis of the Soviet is on youngsters—youngsters who are the leaders of tomorrow, youngsters on exchange programs, youngsters who will work in Russia, not just for a year, but for many years, and whom they hope will ultimately return as the leaders in the Communist world of tomorrow.

2. In addition to the Asians whom we encountered, Mrs. Humphrey and I recall very vividly a Soviet motion picture which we saw entitled "Panorama." It is basically the American Cinerama-type motion picture with three cameras projecting on a wide angular screen. Its subject was a travelog of the vastness of the Soviet Union.

But the most powerful part of the film was the sequence taken at a mammoth international student festival which was held in Moscow, attended by some 100,000 youngsters of whom around one-third came from abroad.

We cannot forget the sequence showing the students in particular from Asia and Africa, parading in the huge Moscow stadium, seating 110,000. The sequences were staged as a great propaganda spectacle, one which we know is designed for the eyes of Asia, as well as Europe.

3. And let me cite a third point now. The key theme of Soviet propaganda to the developing part of the world is:

"In 1917, we were relatively a primitive country. Now we are the second strongest industrial power on earth. What we have done you can do and just as fast. Follow our example."

This theme one could see throughout Soviet propaganda in Moscow. It has a powerful appeal to Asia-Africa. For these countries are experiencing what Prof. Arnold Toynbee has called a revolution of expectations.

These countries are impatient. They want to jump overnight from the age of kerosene oil lamps to the age of mammoth hydroelectric dams. They want steel mills and all the other symbols of western industry, and they may be attracted to the Soviet mirage that only a collectivist society can fulfill their overnight expectations.

FOUR POINT PROGRAM

What then must be our answer to Soviet action and propaganda in the developing areas? Let me suggest the following program:

1. We must greatly increase our program of exchanges and leader-grants with Asia, Africa and the Middle East. At present, for example, we have a total of 45,000 foreign students studying in the United States. This may seem like a large figure, but actually when you see the breakdown, country by country, you note how relatively thin is our coverage of some of the distant countries which are the principal Soviet targets.

We have a great many Latin American exchanges, for naturally we are interested in inter-American relations. I hope that we will increase the number of students from this hemisphere studying here and the number of Americans studying below the Rio Grande. But I also hope that we will greatly increase the number of youngsters from elsewhere in the world, in addition to sending many of our young people to heretofore larger unfamiliar countries in the East.

2. In the second place, we must greatly increase our overall familiarity with Asia, Africa and the Middle East. We Americans have tended to be Europe-oriented for many reasons. Most of us stem from European origins. Europe traditionally has been the seat of power in the world, the seat of culture, of economic strength.

But a new day is dawning. No longer can we afford to be ignorant of or indifferent to the economics, the culture, the religions and aspirations of the Asian-African-Middle East area.

Our universities must develop centers of familiarity with the heretofore exotic cultures of the East. Our newspapers and magazines, television and motion pictures must seek to give still greater emphasis to these regions—not simply to the headline crises but rather to the long-range developing trends.

3. The backbone of our policy must be to strengthen the capacity of the newly emerged nations to fulfill their aspiration for a better life for their own people. Loans at more favorable terms than presently available through the Development Loan Fund, through the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, must be provided if, for example, the second Indian 5-year plan and similar efforts are not to flounder.

And as I have repeatedly stressed, we must use the bounty of America's soil, our farm crops, through Public Law 480 sales to antidote the hunger and the shortage of capital in these regions.

4. A fourth essential point in our program is that we come face to face with reality on the big problem of Asia which occupies so much of the thinking of Asian peoples—namely, America's future relations with Mainland China.

As we are all aware, the question of recognition, as such, of Red China is one of tremendous complexity. It has moral, legal, political, economic, military, social, and other overtones, none of which can be ignored. The aggression committed by the Communist Chinese in Korea as confirmed by the indictment of the United Nations, still stands for all to see and remember.

What I am urging, however, is not any premature off-the-cuff approach to the complex problem of Red China. Instead, I am urging a factual reappraisal of U.S. Chinese relationships, so that we can carefully chart our future policy, based upon the best interests of our Nation and of mankind.

The minimum fact of the matter is that we cannot any longer permit a news blackout on Red China. We cannot afford to be as relatively ignorant as we are of precisely what is going on in that vast land mass of 600 million people.

We must have more facts about the Mainland.

While I was in Geneva visiting at the World Health Organization, I saw one particular phase of the serious consequences of our lack of information about the mainland.

You will recall that the Asian flu virus which struck the United States and the rest of the world was first reported via health listening and reporting posts in places like Hong Kong, Malaya, Japan, and other countries on the periphery of the mainland. Fortunately, we had this advance warning that the virus was on its way. And so we were able to prepare vaccine for our citizens. Even with that vaccine, our economy suffered a serious loss in working days because of Asian flu illness.

The important fact to remember, however, is that the first news about Asian flu virus originated inside the Chinese mainland, but it did not reach the outside world in time. The result is that 2 crucial months elapsed before the world learned that a new strain of type A virus with epidemic possibilities was on its way. Only subsequently when a letter arrived from the mainland to a WHO official was this fact confirmed: The virus could have been attacked 2 months ahead of time—if only there had been better communications with the mainland.

So the feeling among many health officials is that the world cannot afford to continue to be ignorant about even the most elementary health facts inside the Chinese land mass.

Even, however, if this health factor did not exist (and it does), the question is: How long can even the most elemental contacts between the West and mainland China be barred?

These are problems which cannot be ignored. The Peking government is, of course, seeking to exploit our interest in facts such as those I have mentioned above. We know that it has failed to date to fulfill its obligations as a member of the society of man. It has much to account for to the conscience of the world. These facts, too, must not be forgotten.

But above all, we must ask ourselves the question: How best can freedom be maintained and strengthened with all of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East? Closing our eyes or "sweeping issues under the rug" can hardly serve to satisfy the needs of our Nation.

## A Report to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as many Members of this House are aware, on Thursday, February 19, here in Washington, D.C., the National Heart Institute and the American Heart Association joined in presenting a report to the Nation on 10 years of progress against heart disease. This report was made by six of the most eminent physicians and medical scientists in the United States. I might add that it was at the suggestion of my colleague in the Senate, the Honorable LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and myself, that the Heart Association and the Heart Institute combined forces, as it were, to give the results of this 10-year war on diseases of the heart and blood vessels. Because this report was of such great significance and because it has proved to be a truly historic event, under unanimous consent, I include the entire report in the appendix of the RECORD.

The report follows:

A REPORT TO THE NATION PRESENTED BY AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION AND NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE ON "A DECADE OF PROGRESS AGAINST CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE"

(Participants: The Honorable Lister Hill, U.S. Senator, Alabama; the Honorable John E. Fogarty, U.S. Representative, Rhode Island; Leroy E. Burney, M.D., Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service; Francis L. Chamberlain, M.D., president, American Heart Association; and James Watt, M.D., director, National Heart Institute. Panelists: Howard B. Sprague, M.D., meeting chairman and panel moderator; Paul Dudley White, M.D.; Irvine H. Page, M.D.; Robert W. Wilkins, M.D.; Michael E. DeBakey, M.D.; and Robert W. Berliner, M.D.)

Dr. SPRAGUE. Senator HILL, Representative FOGARTY, distinguished guests, this is a unique meeting. So far as I know, it is the first report to the Nation to be given to the people on the advances made possible through their magnificent support of medical and scientific research.

This is a unique meeting also because it could not be held anywhere else in the world. In no other country do we find so highly developed the institution known as the independent voluntary health agency, through which physicians, scientists and laymen combine their efforts to advance the national interest in so vital a field as health.

In no other country does the phenomenon exist of such a voluntary association working side by side and in closest harmony with an official governmental agency dedicated to the same objective. Simply stated, this objective is the reduction of death and disability from heart and blood vessel disease.

Too, this meeting is unusual in that it comes at the invitation and suggestion of two eminent statesmen who have personally played leading roles in the creation and growth of the National Institutes of Health, of which the National Heart Institute is a part.

I do not know, Senator HILL and Representative FOGARTY, whether you and the other Congressmen here today are aware of it, but all of you have helped to make American physicians and scientists the envy of our colleagues throughout the world.

I do not say this on my own authority but on that of the distinguished British medical publication, the Lancet. In an editorial last September, the Lancet declared:

"Those who visit American medical schools are impressed by the amount of money at their disposal for medical research. * * * In the United States, all avenues into medical research are wide open. * * * Congress is putting into research 20 times the budget of our Medical Research Council. Last year the grant from Federal funds alone was $186 million. By full deployment of talent and by the effort of great numbers, an immensely rich soil is being developed from which new research ideas can be harvested. By contrast, medical research in this country (Britain) is undergoing relative attrition despite an expanding economy."

Through this report to the Nation, we seek to make two points clear. One is that the past 10 years have been a period of extraordinary advance, producing new knowledge through which thousands of lives have already been saved, prolonged or enriched, and giving this Nation a position of world leadership in the field of cardiovascular medicine.

The other is that these advances have brought us to the threshold of even greater developments, of decisive breakthroughs that will make possible the large-scale prevention of these diseases that now cut down so many people in the best years of their lives.

The bounty of our efforts extends not only to the people of this Nation but to those of other nations as well. The new knowledge we have brought to fruition—thanks to the accelerated and intensified research programs—should prove to be an export commodity of great usefulness in winning friends and influencing people in behalf of freedom and democracy.

Research results cannot be produced by fiat or timetable. By the same token, it is usually impossible to assign research gains to any one specific year. As someone has said, "Great discoveries are not made, they grow." Like the jigsaw puzzle to which it is sometimes compared, research usually develops new knowledge through the putting together of many small pieces by many people working in many places. Once the puzzle has been filled, it must then undergo the never-ending test of application and experience. Therefore, it is all the more remarkable that we can ascribe so many specific accomplishments in the cardiovascular field to the past decade. And it should be noted, in passing, that this 10-year period coincides with the lifespan of both the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute.

We have many advances to report. Yet, had there been no specific gains applicable to patients, the very fact that we have mounted a tremendous research effort would in itself deserve recognition as a major achievement. As we all know, the first need of any research effort is to mobilize human resources.

Today, there exists in the United States a corps of research workers in the cardiovascular field of unprecedented number and scientific capacity. Its creation has been very largely stimulated and nourished by the joint endeavor of the two agencies reporting here today: the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute.

Here, in a sense, is the greatest accomplishment of all, for in the hands and minds of these research workers are the keys to the future—a future already bright with promise of decisive victory over the cardiovascular diseases.

It is appropriate that we open our forum today with remarks from one of its spiritual architects—a statesman whose profound concern for the health and welfare of the American people has found expression, over the years, in his stanch support of progressive health legislation. We are proud and honored to have with us today the Honorable LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator from Alabama, Senator HILL.

Senator HILL. Dr. Sprague, distinguished guests, and my friends, Congressman FOGARTY and I requested the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute to have this meeting this morning that we might have reports on the progress that has been made in the attacks against cardiovascular diseases, diseases of the heart and of the blood vessels.

Due to the leadership of the Amrican Heart Association, the National Heart Institute, we have here this morning distinguished, outstanding doctors and scientists in the field of the heart and the cardiovascular diseases—I don't think it would be possible to bring together a more distinguished panel than we have here this morning—who will make their report on the progress that has been made during the past 10 years.

It is just ten years ago that the American Heart Association was reorganized to become a great national voluntary association of doctors and laymen. It is just 10 years ago that the Congress of the United States brought into being the National Heart Institute; and so on this tenth anniversary of the Heart Association, of the National Heart Institute, we will have these reports. I'm sure they will be not only tremendously gratifying but tremendously challenging. It is most important that the people back home, the people throughout the country, realize the part they have played in the work that has brought about this progress—that they have made many necessary and vital contributions in their support of the American Heart Association, in their support of congressional appropriations for the National Heart Institute.

The last 10 years has witnessed great progress in the battle against these diseases. With the support of the people, under the leadership of brilliant and distinguished men such as we have here today who give of themselves and of their services in this never-ending battle, the next 10 years should be the most momentous in all the history of medicine.

As we hear these reports today, I hope you'll not only be stimulated and challenged but we may go forth with resolution in our hearts that we'll give our most active support our best support, to the men in the Heart Associatoin, to the National Heart Institute, in the cause of better health and a longer life for all our people. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Senator HILL.

Old presidents of the American Heart Association seem to have a remarkable talent for health and longevity. Not only do they refuse to die; they also refuse to fade away—as witness the presence of so many of us here on this platform today. This would seem to foreshadow many more years of activity for our next speaker, who is to present a brief accounting of the vital part played by the American Heart Association in the decade of progress being reported today.

It is my privilege to present Dr. Francis L. Chamberlain, of San Francisco, president of the American Heart Association. Dr. Chamberlain. [Applause.]

Dr. CHAMBERLAIN. Dr. Sprague, Senator HILL, Representative FOGARTY, distinguished guests:

My colleagues who have been presidents of the American Heart Association will soon report to you in their capacities as world authorities on various aspects of cardiovascular medicine and research. To me is reserved the privilege of speaking as president of the American Heart Association.

In this capacity one ceases to act as an individual physician, scientist, or teacher. He becomes instead the spokesman for a vast partnership of American laymen and physi-

cians who, realizing that 54 percent of Americans are suffering from some form of circulatory or heart disease, have voluntarily banded together to reduce death and disability from cardiovascular disease. It is this citizens' army that reinforces and sustains our research scientists, and that invests with greater meaning the efforts of the practicing physicians through whom the benefits of research flow to the people.

The initiative in creating this magnificent partnership came from a small group of physicians who, in 1948, transformed the American Heart Association from a professional society into a voluntary health agency, and thus set in motion a force of singular effectiveness.

One of the first endeavors of this newly formed agency was to spur the establishment of the National Heart Institute and to participate actively in the evolution of the policies and program.

Drawing its vigor from the grassroots of America, with dedicated leadership supplied by outstanding physicians and laymen, the American Heart Association immediately became the catalyst which gave strength, purpose, and direction to the struggle against cardiovascular disease.

As this new force gained momentum, programs were developed not only for the acquisition of new knowledge through research but also for its application through community service programs reaching into every State of the Union. Widespread professional educational activity has been paralleled by an intensive program of lay education through which a remarkable transformation is being wrought in the popular attitude toward cardiovascular diseases. A new climate of hope and confidence is being created—in itself one of the most important achievements of the past decade.

Let me conclude by saying it is especially appropriate that today's meeting is being held during the month of the Heart Fund campaign, which is the time of year when 50 million Americans are expected to show their support of the American Heart Association through their voluntary contributions of time, effort, and funds. Since 1948, this support has increased more than eightfold. It is a convincing reaffirmation of public confidence in the Heart Association program and an eloquent expression of the people's determination to conquer cardiovascular disease. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Chamberlain.

The close working relationship between the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute is effectively illustrated by the activities of our next speaker. Having spent the major part of his professional life in the conduct and administration of medical research and public health, he has served as Director of the National Heart Institute since 1952. He is a member of the editorial board of Circulation, the American Heart Association's official journal, and he has served on numerous Heart Association committees during the past several years. It is my privilege to present Dr. James Watt. Dr. Watt. [Applause.]

Dr. WATT. Dr. Sprague, Senator HILL, Congressman FOGARTY, guests, friends: We shall, in the next half hour or so, hear what Dr. Sprague has so aptly called a unique report. It is, indeed, so far as I know, the first time that such a message has been conveyed to the American people in this way. I am delighted that Senator HILL and Mr. FOGARTY asked the Heart Institute to join with the Heart Association in putting together this story of 10 years of progress against heart disease. As we shall soon hear, it is a dramatic story—a story of service and solid achievement.

I think, too, that all of us here owe a debt of gratitude to the two distinguished legislators sharing the platform this morning. It is, of course, to the Congress that the Heart Institute owes its existence; for in 1948 it was the 80th Congress that created this research arm of the Public Health Service, with the pasasge of the National Heart Act.

Since that time we have come a long way. We now have a substantial research establishment at Bethesda where a unique combination of resources enables us to pursue both basic and clinical studies under one roof. Research workers in these laboratories have made many outstanding advances. When these achievements are added to those of our grantees throughout the country, a picture of progress emerges that has few parallels in the history of medical research. Though an uncharted wilderness still remains to be explored, we have blazed a long trail toward heart disease prevention and cure. In our 10-year journey, dramatic milestones in heart surgery and drug therapy have followed close upon one another. New diagnostic methods are facilitating tremendously the work of our cardiovascular surgeons. With the combined efforts of the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute lending an ever-brightening prospect to the hopes of heart patients, who can say whether the next 10 years may not reveal a means of prevention or cure for arteriosclerosis or high blood pressure?

With so much of our national substance going into the awesome but indispensable weapons of defense, it is easy to lose sight of the need for stocking medicine's arsenal. I am reminded of a remark my predecessor, Dr. C. J. Van Slyke, the first director of the Heart Institute, made some years ago. Commenting on the need for increased support of medical research, he said, "* * * there is no phase of Government spending in which there is a greater return to all of our citizens. It is an investment in which the balance sheet of the future will show returns in human lives as well as dollars."

We are now privileged, I think, to witness this prophetic statement nearing fulfillment. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Watt.

We come now to our report to the Nation on "A Decade of Progress Against Cardiovascular Disease." Each of our six panelists has been assigned a specific area for discussion and has been requested to restrict his presentation to 5 minutes. One of our panelists will discuss prevention, one diagnosis; three will discuss advances in treatment, with one each being assigned to the specific areas of arteriosclerosis, hypertension, and cardiovascular surgery. Our final panelist will discuss basic research in its many applications.

The 5-minute restriction imposes a severe handicap. We know you can summarize the story of creation in less than 10 words: "In the beginning, God created heaven and earth."

I mention this because it would be difficult for any of our doctors to report on progress in their respective areas within the time allotted. Indeed, it might even be said that the telescoping of so much progress in 5 minutes is in itself a major achievement.

Before we begin our progress reports, I want to direct your special attention to the cards which have been distributed with your programs. If you will write your inquiries on each of the cards, they will be collected later and the doctors will attempt to answer them in this question-and-answer period.

I wish to draw to your attention that this question-and-answer period has been moved to the very end of the program.

My assignment today involves three special roads: those of chairman, moderator, and panelist. Having undertaken assignments one and two, I now turn to the third: a discussion of what has happened in the past 10 years in the field of diagnosis.

Fortunately for all of us, diseases of the heart can usually be discovered by a physician using his ears, eyes, and sense of touch, with the help of simple instruments, such as the stethoscope; but the impressive advances in treatment of heart ailments in the past 10 years, particularly in surgery, have made the simple description of the kind of heart disease not adequate in those cases in which special treatment is now available.

The detailed diagnosis of the damage to a heart valve by rheumatic fever, the exact nature of complex congenital defects in the heart, the remediable kinds of high blood pressure, and the extent of coronary artery blocking remain the major challenges for diagnostic study.

The past decade has supplied tools for such study. The vast and growing fields of radioactivity and electronics are rapidly adding instruments of amazing utility in the area of heart diagnosis, and the contributions of the American Heart Association, and of the National Heart Institute, have made these tools and techniques more widely and quickly available than in any other way.

While X-ray science is 63 years old and was early used to delineate the heart, it has developed recently the ability to photograph in rapid sequence a series of views of the heart as an opaque liquid passes through it, showing its course and the time elapsing for the substance to flow into the arteries of the lungs and the rest of the body. A very new device, the image intensifier, which gives a brilliant view of the heart on the fluorescent screen, with considerably less exposure of the patient to the X-rays, permits not only motion pictures to be made, but the transmission of the living image to a television screen in another room, where a large group of physicians can study it.

The cardiac catheter, first threaded into a vein and thence into his own heart by an intrepid German, Forssmann, in 1924, has turned to tremendous advantage in heart studies by Cournand and others in this country. Now it is possible to pass it directly through the chest into the left side of the heart and to measure the pressures behind and ahead of the two valves most commonly affected by rheumatic fever. The catheter is actually exploring the coronary arteries and, cooperating always with the X-ray, it is discovering the regions of blocking of those arteries by outlining them with a readily absorbed gas, carbon dioxide. By the catheter method, also, electrocardiograms and records of heart sounds can be led from inside the heart itself to instruments at a distance from the patient.

The electrocardiograph has developed from an instrument which, in a sense, looks at the heart electrically with one eye into a new electronic device, the vectorcardiograph, which traces on a fluorescent screen the actual course of the electrical energy of the heart. This can be photographed in stills or moves and transformed into a stereoscopic view with three dimensions.

Radioactive tracer material is widely used in cardiovascular research but in clinical diagnosis chiefly in discovering disturbance of thyroid function, which can upset the heart's action.

The striking expansion of chemical knowledge leads the physician daily to the chemical laboratory for information about the subtle diagnostic changes in the blood, urine, and tissues of his patients. The discovery of alterations in salts, fats, enzymes, and the multiude of chemical components of our bodies guides the treatment of all forms of heart disease. Sensitive chemical or biological detectors can show us the presence of a special tumor of the adrenal gland which, if removed, will cure a type of high blood pressure; or the amount of sodium

coming from one kidney may reveal a disturbance which, if relieved, may cure another type.

The ultracentrifuge with a force 300,000 times that of gravity; the electron miscroscope with a magnifying power almost a hundred times as great as that of the ordinary microscope, are discovering diagnostic elements in human tissues.

The "electric eye" oximeter measures the oxygen in the blood, the gas phase chromatograph tells us the elements of complex fats in food and body substances.

Chemical analyses which have always been extremely time-consuming are now performed by electrical instruments of superhuman ability, and electronic computers give us data at unbelievable speed.

Cardiovascular diagnosis of the present day looks forward to a future when these new methods can signal dangers which, hopefully, new methods of treatment can combat in the wholesale prevention of heart disease. Based on the advances made during the past 10 years, and the assumption that cardiovascular research will be highly accelerated and intensified, I would prophesy that we can look forward to markedly reduced heart disease in young and middle-aged people.

It was not many years after the turn of the century that our next speaker informed his friends he planned to specialize in cardiovascular medicine. Since so very little was then known about the heart and its disorders, they greeted this annoucement with astonishment and disbelief. Yet time has amply demonstrated the rightness of his decision. He has achieved a high measure of eminence among the world's cardiologists, many of whom affectionately regard him as a sort of living legend. A founder and former president of the American Heart Association, a former member of the National Advisory Heart Council of the National Institutes of Health, now president of the International Society of Cardiology Foundation, and emeritus professor of medicine of Harvard University, he is, of course, Dr. Paul Dudley White, who will summarize the past decade's progress in the area of prevention. Dr. White. [Applause.]

Dr. WHITE. Dr. Sprague, ladies and gentlemen, when I was a child, a medical student, a young doctor in the hospital, they said it couldn't be done. What couldn't be done? A lot of things that threatened the lives of all of us. I shall name a few. First there was still a high infant mortality. My earliest days as an intern were spent in a pediatric ward where babies died like flies, mostly of dysentery before the days of the routine pasteurization of milk. This was the will of God. The next year I had under my wing adult wards which were overcrowded every fall with patients severely and often fatally ill with typhoid fever and at other times of the year with pneumonia, empyema, meningitis, rheumatic fever, and malignant endocarditis. There was no room for cardiovascular patients even if we had been interested in them. Tuberculosis was still a great menace and syphilis and diphtheria quite common. Deformities of the heart and great arteries were strictly untouchable. And sudden deaths were acts of God. Often the good died young, no matter what their social or economic status. Only a small minority of Americans survived 70 and you were growing old at 50. There was only one threat to life in those days, that is, before 1920, that was infinitesimal compared to its huge size today and that was the toll from the automobile on the Nation's highways. Incidently I have personally come to believe that even more as a hazard to life and limb from acute injury, the automobile has become a symbol of the soft life unnecessarily engendered among our fellow citizens by our slavery to automotive devices and to the rusting effect of our enriched diets; even our everyday breads are no longer what they used to be. I shall not, however, belabor these points further except to appeal for the maximal amount of intensive and extensive research to answer for once and for all the questions on every tongue and in every news sheet and TV program today.

And what remains? Still enough rheumatic heart disease, acute and chronic, to keep us busy in its treatment and control for another generation, following the excellent program set up by the American Heart Association during the last 10 years. But the toughest problems are still unsolved. The three which demand the highest priority in cardiovascular research are in the order of their prevalence: (1) A serious degree of atherosclerosis of the arteries supplying blood to heart muscle, brain, viscera, including the kidneys, and the legs; (2) high blood pressure of the so-called essential (especially the malignant) type with serious effect on the heart and arteries; and (3) congenital defects of the heart and blood vessels of almost infinite variety. There is no reason to doubt, based on our experience of the past, that we can protect our young and middle-aged males by diet, exercise, medicines, and other measures from the ever-increasing threat of coronary heart disease, provided we support to the full medical and other scientific investigators working hard on this disease entity. I am sure it can be done, but we must maintain a well-organized and vigorous offensive to guarantee victory in our time. Although high blood pressure is a less dramatic problem, it too needs much patient study to render it not only controllable as it is already in some cases, but, much more importantly, preventable. A harder nut to crack because of its complexity and infinite diversity is that of congenital heart and blood-vessel disease secondary to injury during fetal life or to defects in the germ plasm or to both. But even here too, if we go at it in the proper way, we should be able to accomplish much within a generation.

It has been a source of the greatest satisfaction to me to have had the privilege and opportunity to have served both the American Heart Association in its early development and in recent days in its annual heart drives, and simultaneously, to have served as a member of the first National Advisory Heart Council under the U.S. Public Health Service after the passage of the National Heart Act which in June 1948 established the National Heart Institute. I would like to express to my colleagues and friends (both of the staff and among the consultants), who have given me such a wonderful 10 years, my deepest appreciation and affectionate regards. Also a word of gratitude to you gentlemen of the Congress serving on the committees of the House and Senate; I thank you from the bottom of my heart. I am sure that what has been started in the last decade in this country can now develop throughout the world as I have already seen some of its beginnings in other countries like Finland, Canada, and Australia. Thank you. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. White.

We now leave the area of prevention and turn to the field of treatment, where cardiovascular medicine has scored some of its most dramatic advances over the past 10 years.

Our exploration will get underway with a summation devoted to treatment within the broad framework of atherosclerosis. For this presentation, we are indeed fortunate to have with us one of the Nation's foremost medical scientists, Dr. Irvine H. Page of Cleveland.

Dr. Page, a past president of the American Heart Association, and formerly a member of the National Advisory Heart Council of the National Institutes of Health, has been Director of Research of the Cleveland Clinic Foundation since 1945. Dr. Page. [Applause.]

Dr. PAGE. Dr. Sprague, ladies and gentlemen, I doubt that 5 minutes is too long to talk about a disease described 5,000 years ago that kills about 500,000 Americans a year.

The problem of the prevention and treatment of arteriosclerosis, whether in the brain or the coronary vessels of the heart, differs from the prevention and treatment of infectious diseases where a single microorganism can be the cause of the trouble. It was during the past decade that medical science crystallized a profoundly important conclusion; namely, that arteriosclerosis is not just a degenerative disease and an inevitable concomitant of the aging process. On the contrary, we now know that arteriosclerosis affects all age groups and may well be reversible. Furthermore, it has many facets, the importance of each varying greatly in different people. Thus it has:

One, a strong hereditary factor. Formerly, this meant that nothing could be done about it but to make more careful selection of your parents, but the more modern "blue gene" age now has it within its power to change the hereditary mechanism. All that remains is to decide what it wants.

Now, the second factor is a hypertensive one. Elevation in blood pressure, even a small one, increases the amount of arteriosclerosis. Fortunately, treatment for hypertension has advanced rapidly in the past 10 years; hence, this factor is, in large measure, controllable.

Third, an exercise factor. Exercise seems to have several mechanisms by which it reduces the tendency to develop arteriosclerosis. We are a generation who seems about to give up the use of legs. As far as I can see, women are the only ones smart enough to find a use for them. [Laughter.]

Fourth is the stress factor. This seems to me to be overstressed. It may be that extreme stress might be more concerned with the development of a clot in the vessels of the heart or brain, rather than of arteriosclerosis itself. Children and Russians being what they are, it is hard to see how stress can, in turn, be much reduced. [Laughter.]

Smoking and alcohol are considered stress factors by some. This all depends on who is doing the smoking and/or drinking. I'd like to point out that 76 percent of the body is composed of water and some of my friends might like to keep it so. [Laughter.]

Now, fifth, there is a sex factor. This factor does not seem to have been invented primarily with the intent of preventing women from developing arteriosclerosis, but in practice it seems to be working out this way. Femaleness seems to be much more than sex, as many of the richer males are finding out. [Laughter.]

Femaleness seems to assure that women will inherit this earth, at least. [Laughter.]

Sixth, a diet factor. Obesity has long been believed a factor hastening development of atherosclerosis and overeating of certain kinds of fat in the diet as well. What constitutes the proper amount and kind of fat has been the subject of much talk and less investigation. There is growing evidence that saturated or animal fats in too great quantities are detrimental and that unsaturated or liquid fats are less so. The Bantu of South Africa has been the center of this controversy, although it is doubtful if he realizes it. [Laughter.]

It is possible that the low fat content of his diet protects him against coronary arteriosclerosis; unfortunately, there is much to suggest that being an American is more fun than being a Bantu. [Laughter.]

Diet is a facet of arteriosclerosis most likely to be investigated on large numbers of people to determine whether changes will reduce the incidence of heart attacks and

strokes. This is now a practical possibility, in my opinion.

Thus I can summarize by making several relatively commonsense suggestions for the prevention and treatment of arteriosclerosis.

1. Reduce weight if obese. Eat less in the hope you will live longer to eat more.

2. If heredity is poor and blood cholesterol level is high, see your doctor and try to reduce the level by changes in dietary habits.

3. Reduce blood pressure if it is elevated.

4. Reduce the proportion of solid animal fats to the liquid vegetable fats and reduce the quantity of both. A balanced diet is important and extremes of all sorts should be avoided.

5. Increase the amount of regular exercise.

6. Avoid excesses of all kinds, but don't miss anything. [Laughter.]

7. Accept life's challenges. Come to terms with the inevitable and live as though you would live forever, and in spirit you will.

Thank you. [Laughter and applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Page. I can assure the audience from my long knowledge of Dr. Page's habits that he lives by his own precepts. [Laughter.]

For a summary of advances in treatment, with special reference to hypertension, I now turn to a colleague who has a distinguished record as a clinician, teacher and medical scientist. A former president of the American Heart Association and a pioneer in the use and development of drugs to control hypertension, he is Dr. Robert W. Wilkins, professor of medicine at the Boston University School of Medicine. Dr. Wilkins. [Applause.]

Dr. WILKINS. Dr. Sprague, friends, since 1950, a number of new drugs have come into use for the treatment of high blood pressure and, considered together, they represent one of the great advances of medical science during the period of our report. These drugs have changed not only our treatment of hypertension, but also our concepts of the nature of this disease. Except in a few rarer forms, the cause of high blood pressure is unknown. None of the new drugs used in treatment, therefore, was designed to get at the cause. Rather, they were designed primarily to relieve the result; namely, the elevation of blood pressure, whatever its cause might be. However, the action of these drugs in lowering blood pressure has provided new information on the nature of hypertension and has brought us closer to a true concept of the cause or causes of this condition.

There are five main categories of drugs now in use for high blood pressure. These are (1) rauwolfia, or Indian snake root, and its derivatives; for example, reserpine; (2) hydralazine or apresoline; (3) veratrum viride and its derivatives; (4) the nerve-blocking agents, such as hexamethonium; (5) (and probably most important) chlorothiazide and similar diuretics that stimulate the kidney to excrete salt.

Each of these agents acts to lower blood pressure, but each acts in a different way. Rauwolfa has a tranquilizing action on the brain and lessens nervous tension. Hydralazine dilates the blood vessels directly, especially those in the kidneys. Veratrum also dilates blood vessels but reflexly through the autonomic nervous system. The nerve-blocking drugs, on the other hand, prevent reflex constriction of blood vessels by blocking excessive nervous reactions. Chlorothiazide and the other diuretic drugs seem to change the body's content or its distribution of sodium chloride and other salts, lessening the blood vessels' constrictive reactivity and the resultant elevation of blood pressure.

Thus, the doctor today has in his bag new chemical tools for lowering blood pressure, and he has a variety of them. One of the most interesting findings has been that these chemical tools are more effective when used together than when given singly, even in increasingly large doses. This is an old trick in treatment, familiar to everyone in the use of different drugs together for pain; for example, aspirin, phenacetin, caffeine, and codeine for severe headaches. The trick is that when the drugs, each in a small dose, are used together against a single undesirable effect, they "gang up," as it were, on that effect, whereas their own bad side effects are so dispersed that they produce no unpleasant symptoms. Thus, the doctor has learned that when rauwolfia, the mildest agent, is not effective alone in a hypersensitive patient, he must add apresoline or chlorothiazide, or both. He may then achieve a very satisfactory result which he could not obtain with any one of the drugs used alone.

The results of treatment of high blood pressure with drugs are most dramatic when the disease itself is so severe or malignant that without such treatment it would be quickly fatal. In less severe cases of hypertension, drug treatment may be as dramatic in lowering the blood pressure; but since many of these patients have not as yet been incapacitated by the disease, their symptomatic improvement is not as striking as in the malignant cases. Nevertheless, all observers are in agreement that treatment of all such cases is most worthwhile. The area of disagreement is now restricted to the question of whether the very mildest or earliest of cases should be treated with drugs in a preventive way, before strains develop in the heart and blood vessels and especially in the kidneys.

It would appear that in patients with a strong family history of serious high blood pressure this may also be worthwhile, since it is now clear that high blood pressure is definitely a familial disease that tends to progress with age. Finally, the newer diuretic drugs, by shedding light on the handling of salt by the body, have tended to reemphasize the important role of the kidney in hypertension, and of salt excretion, which normally is under the control of the adrenal glands. Thus, one can say that drug treatment is not only helping people who already have high blood pressure, but is also teaching us more about the nature of the disease, and how to prevent it, or at least how to prevent its more serious effects.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Wilkins.

Our summation of advances in treatment—this time with special consideration of heart and blood vessel surgery—continues with a report by an outstandingly eminent authority in this area. Winner of the 1954 Matas award for work in vascular surgery, cochairman of the committee on medicine and surgery of the National Research Council, member of the National Advisory Heart Council of the National Institutes of Health, and chairman of the Department of Surgery at Baylor University's College of Medicine, he is Dr. Michael E. DeBakey of Houston. Dr. DeBakey. [Applause.]

Dr. DEBAKEY. Dr. Sprague, ladies, and gentlemen, few areas in medicine have exhibited the phenomenal progress that has taken place in the field of cardiovascular surgery during the past decade. Indeed, the advancement made during this period far surpass all previous efforts in this field of surgery. Among the most striking features of these advancements, and undoubtedly important factors underlying their attainment, have been the increasing intensity of research endeavors and the bold ingenuity and aggressive approach characterizing the surgical attack on these grave diseases. As a consequence, many conditions which only a few years ago were considered hopeless are now amenable to effective therapy. No less important has been the fact that these surgical investigations have contributed significantly to greater knowledge and better understanding of the underlying fundamental factors involved in the pathologic, physiologic, and biochemical disturbances of cardiovascular diseases.

This is well illustrated by the progress which has been made in recent years in the surgical treatment of acquired diseases of the aorta—the main artery of the heart—and major peripheral arteries, particularly aneurysms and occlusive lesions. An aneurysm is a ballooning out and thinning of the wall of an artery.

Aneurysms of the aorta, for example, have challenged physicians for centuries; and although various methods of treatment were devised and attempted, none were effective. Within the past decade, however, curative therapy has been accomplished by the development of the surgical principle of extirpation of the lesion with restoration of normal function. The successful application of this method of treatment and development of these principles is dependent upon a number of factors, among the most important of which are the principles of blood vessel suture and arterial graft replacement.

The development and refinement of these principles were brought to full clinical fruition in the research laboratory. More recently, and as a result of these investigations, the problem of replacement of diseased arteries has been effectively solved through the development of substitute arteries made of such plastic materials as nylon, Dacron, and teflon; and these are now as readily available in the operating room as suture material.

Surgery to replace diseased arteries has become a complete reality. Deadly lesions which were formerly considered hopeless are now amenable to curative treatment.

Equally striking has been the progress made in the treatment of arteriosclerotic occlusive disease, the gravity of which has long been recognized. In arteriosclerotic occlusive disease, the thickening of the wall of the artery gradually narrows and ultimately blocks the opening in the artery.

Owing to its predilection to involving and blocking of such vital arteries as the aorta and those which supply blood to the brain and heart, it is by far the most common cause of death and disability among vascular lesions. As a consequence of intensive research and clinical investigations during the past decade, an important concept of the disease has been evolved which has led to the application of highly effective methods of surgical treatment. This concept is based upon the demonstration that in many forms of this disease the atherosclerotic occlusive lesion is well localized and segmental in nature with relatively normal arteries proximal and distal to the diseased segment of the vessel. From this fundamental knowledge, methods of surgical treatment were developed to restore normal circulation by removal of the occlusive lesion or by its replacement with a substitute artery. Within the past few years, sufficient experience has accumulated with these methods of treatment to establish their efficacy; and it can be stated that a high proportion of patients who formerly would have died or been seriously disabled from gangrene of the lower extremities, strokes, and high blood pressure due to arteriosclerosis, may now be completely relieved.

Equally significant are the brilliant advances made in surgery of the heart. Although pioneering efforts in cardiac surgery were made at the turn of the century, most of the important developments have occurred during the past decade. During this short period, intracardiac surgery was introduced. Although at first the scope of operative procedures on the valves and septum was limited by the fact that maintenance of cardiac function was vital during intracardiac manipulations, the efforts and contributions of the era of closed heart surgery were truly impressive.

Recently a major obstacle in heart surgery was overcome with the introduction of methods for open heart surgery. This problem was solved by the development of mechanical devices to substitute temporarily for the function of the heart and lungs, such as the pump oxygenator—or mechanical heart lung, as it is generally known—which is now in widespread use. Whereas less than 10 years ago only a selected few cases of congenital cardiac disease were amenable to surgical correction, today the majority of cardiac anomalies are completely correctible.

As outlined in this brief account, the tremendous strides that have been made during the past decade clearly reflect the vigor and intense activity characterizing the current status of cardiovascular surgery and portend other advances of even greater importance. With continuing generous support of these research endeavors, only the limits of imagination should restrict their progress.

One thing is certain: The future of cardiovascular surgery is brighter than ever. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. DeBakey.

Up to now, our discussions have largely concerned the clinical aspects of cardiovascular research. Our final panelist opens a new and vital area of exploration. He is to discuss the role of basic research in making possible the achievements already described and those we fervently hope will be forthcoming. One of the world's foremost authorities on renal function and electrolyte metabolism, he came to the National Heart Institute in 1950 and has been its associate director in charge of research since 1954. It is my privilege to present Dr. Robert W. Berliner. Dr. Berliner. [Applause.]

Dr. BERLINER. The tremendous stimulation of research which has occurred through the efforts of the American Heart Association and the National Heart Institute has already been cited to you by our chairman as a major achievement of the past 10 years. Much of this research is basic research. Thus the greatest portion of the research supported by the American Heart Association's national program falls into the category of basic research or has basic implications. Similarly, the philosophy that guides the research appropriations of the National Heart Institute also recognizes the vital importance of fundamental studies.

It is characteristic of basic research that its advances have the immediate purpose only of increasing our fundamental knowledge of ourselves and the world in which we live. In what way some specific bit of information will eventually serve its useful purpose is very difficult to predict. The basic research worker, however, does not concern himself with the application of his contributions, since experience has shown that it is upon such fundamental knowledge that the advances in applied science are built. Rather than attempt to guess which of the many major and lesser basic scientific discoveries of the last 10 years will eventually find important application in the control of cardiovascular disease, I would like to start with the other end and fill in the background of one of the more important practical achievements of recent years. In doing so, I hope to illustrate the practical results of scientific research done originally only out of scientific curiosity.

Dr. Wilkins has already mentioned the important advance made in the development of chlorothiazide. This drug has not only markedly improved the management of hypertension but, because of its capacity to cause loss of salt in the urine, has greatly facilitated the treatment of heart failure. It has reduced the need for rigid and onerous low-salt diets and practically abolished the need for repeated hypodermic injections in the management of cardiac patients. I would like to recount the development of chlorothiazide.

The story begins nearly 40 years ago. At that time, biochemistry was in its infancy as a science. One of the substances which quite naturally came under study was carbon dioxide, the main waste product of the burning of foods in the body. We eliminate it when we exhale. It was found that the blood can carry carbon dioxide, a gas, to the lungs because the carbon dioxide can react with water to produce carbonic acid. In the lung blood vessels, this is converted back to gas and excreted as we breathe out. However, when the rate of this conversion was studied, it was found to be quite slow. The question arose as to how the conversion could possibly occur fast enough so that the blood could give up its carbon dioxide during the very few seconds it spends in the lung blood vessels. It was concluded that there must be a substance in the blood which speeds up the reaction. Studies to find the substance resulted in an enzyme known as carbonic anhydrase. Subsequent studies showed that the enzyme was present in a number of tissues, although the nature of its function in these tissues was not clear.

Perhaps 20 years later we pick up the next thread of the story of chlorothiazide—and in an entirely separate context. It begins with the discovery in the late thirties that sulfanilamide was effective in the treatment of bacterial infections. As an unfortunate side effect, it was noted that patients treated with sulfanilamide developed a disturbance known as acidosis; but sulfanilamide was soon supplanted by other closely related drugs which did not have this side effect.

Nevertheless, some basic research workers remained interested in this property of the now obsolete sulfanilamide. It was finally shown that sulfanilamide was an inhibitor of carbonic anhydrase, the enzyme discovered some years earlier. The production of acidosis was attributable to this blocking action of the sulfanilamide on the substance that speeded up the elimination of carbon dioxide.

In the next few years, studies of the mechanisms of urine formation showed that carbonic anhydrase also had an important function in the kidney. When it was inhibited, not only was acidosis produced, but sodium was lost in the urine.

Now, since producing sodium, or salt, loss in the urine is one effective way of treating heart failure, it was suggested that sulfanilamide might be useful for this purpose. It was tried and found to have some favorable effect, but again its toxic effects were too numerous. Nevertheless, this led to the synthesis and trial of a large number of other carbonic anhydrase inhibitors; and finally one called diamox was found, which, although only moderately effective, found a considerable place in the treatment of heart failure.

Now, the search began for a more effective carbonic anhydrase inhibitor. One was found that proved to be far more effective than any other. This was chlorothiazide.

My story could end here but it doesn't, for a new twist has been added with the discovery that although chlorothiazide was synthesized, tested, and started on clinical trial because of its capacity to inhibit the enzyme carbonic anhydrase, it actually turns out to owe its effectiveness to a new and as yet unexplained activity.

Now investigators are following this trail back into pharmacology, physiology, and biochemistry. By the time they explain how chlorothiazide really works, which enzyme it inhibits and what that enzyme does in the body, who knows where and in what form it will turn up again in clinical medicine?

Chlorothiazide's story is, of course, but one example of the practical results that eventually grow out of basic research, chosen because it relates to one of the major advances of the period reported on here today—the control of hypertension. But of equal importance is the fact that the past decade has witnessed a great accumulation of basic new knowledge about the most fundamental processes involved in life itself—knowledge we need to break down the barriers of ignorance that nature has placed in our path.

As someone has said, "Basic research is a way of making nature talk." Before too long, I am confident, her voice will be loud enough in the land to show us the road to victory over the most pressing problems of cardiovascular disease.

To quote the recent report of a committee of consultants by Dr. Bayne-Jones to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Pressures of the practical results cannot be allowed to supersede the kind of fundamental studies which, in the long run, result in revolutions rather than mere improvement in health standards." [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Berliner.

May I ask you now that any of you who have filled in cards, pass them to the right and left, not the center aisle, where they can be collected.

A report to the Nation, which necessarily focuses on past achievements would be incomplete without inclusion of a statement regarding the future needs and aspirations of cardiovascular medicine. For this summary, we are privileged to have with us today Dr. LeRoy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Burney. [Applause.]

Dr. BURNEY. Dr. Sprague, Senator HILL, Congressman FOGARTY, and distinguished Members of Congress and guests, I think one has an advantage in appearing at this part of the program because all of the worthwhile things have already been said and one doesn't expect too much. [Laughter.]

I'm sure all of you have been impressed with the complexity of the problem of the cardiovascular diseases; and if one only takes a look at the various gentlemen here on this platform and whom they represent, I think one would even be more impressed with all of the forces we have used in our country to combat this No. 1 cause of death.

You have heard representatives of the American Heart Association, representing the thousands of volunter workers throughout the United States, who give not only of their dollars but of themselves, unselfishly, enthusiastically, to this program of education, of research and of service.

You have heard one of your fellow Congressmen here, Senator HILL, and you will hear from another one who represents the very interested and understanding and, I should say, very generous support that the Public Health Service through the National Heart Institute has received for funds for research training, for research projects, and for the construction of research facilities in which this research should be done; and I think I can say without contradiction that nowhere in the world have we had a legislative body that has been so interested and so generous in the support of research as we have in these United States; and through the very fine leadership of our leaders in Congress and through Senator HILL and Congressman FOGARTY who are here before you today, I think we can be very proud of this contribution.

Then we see all the doctors here on this platform representing medical schools, universities, and laboratories that are doing clinical and basic research and we see Dr. Watt, the administrator of the National Heart Institute—all of whom are important contributors to this very great problem—if this does nothing more than to impress upon you that there is a complex problem; that it

is not the isolated issue of any one group, whether it is official or voluntary or research or public.

I think of the vast cooperative enterprise so characteristically American which has brought us so far within a period of 10 years and which undoubtedly will carry us to new heights a decade from now. We in the Public Health Service are proud of the part we have played in this aspiring story of achievement. The report we have heard this morning is one of great hope for the future. The advances we have heard about represent not just dollars, not just research, but they represent human lives that have been saved; and we cannot overestimate the progress so meaningful to humanity.

In looking ahead, however, we must soberly evaluate the vastness of cardiovascular diseases as a national health problem, even an international or world health problem. We are, in fact, just beginning to realize the magnitude and complexity of this problem. I submit that even this realization is a measure of our progress. It is a measure of progress because it points to an intensification of two trends, now already discernible, which will chart our direction against heart disease in the next ten years. The first is a strengthening of basic research, whose great promise has been so ably presented this morning; and, of course, necessary for that is the continued emphasis on training of research manpower and the facilities in which research people can perform their research work. The second is the speedy application of research findings to the lives of human beings. It isn't enough just to have the knowledge, unless that knowledge is speedily applied to the people who need it.

Now, as you can well understand, this calls for a comprehensive attack. It calls for a total involvement of all groups, all agencies, all the individuals who can contribute to our forward progress; and, as Disraeli once said, "The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all of their happiness and on which all of their power as a state depends."

Thank you. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Dr. Burney.

When I opened this meeting, I referred to Senator HILL as one of its spiritual architects. Before turning to the question-and-answer period, it is fitting that we bring our formal part of the program to a close with remarks by the Representative in Congress who joined Senator HILL in requesting this meeting. He is well known to all of us for his stanch support of medical research and related programs. I refer, of course, to the distinguished Representative from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY. [Applause.]

Representative FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague of the Senate, Senator HILL, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, the American Heart Association epitomizes the present urge of the American people to achieve better health through voluntary collaborative effort. It is one reason why medical research, in contrast with most other fields of research endeavor, finds as much support from private as it does from public sources. There is lasting strength in such diversity, and I am confident that a balanced pattern of support will be maintained in the years ahead.

The Public Health Service's National Heart Institute, Federal partner of the Heart Association, mounts its programs through tax funds—your tax dollars and mine. As a legislator with some responsibility for the activity of the Federal Government in medical research, I think I have some evidence that the people of our country unequivocally support the use of tax funds for medical research.

In a sense then, since Federal funds are and must be used in a way that is responsible to public forces, its funds too are volunteered by the people for the purpose of bringing heart disease under control.

As I have listened to these reports of progress that have been made against heart disease, I feel its impact primarily in human terms. Broad statistics are, of course, important in appraising all or a segment of the national health and medical research scene. We must never forget that 54 percent of all deaths in the United States are caused by some form of cardiovascular disease, that this means about 900,000 deaths from heart disease last year and that the total number of deaths from the more than 20 disorders of the heart and blood vessels about which so little is known can be expected to increase, I am told; but one must never forget that behind all these statistics are people, human beings—their families and their friends and their community of which they are a living part.

When premature and tragic death strikes, deaths which would be unnecessary if man knew as much as he should about his life processes, it is a hundred percent failure for medical science as far as the individual and his loved ones are concerned.

The decade of progress that has been summarized today has permitted the percentage, in the case of many people that you and I know, to be, on the other hand, a 100-percent success. For example, I know a child who suffered an acute attack of rheumatic fever which led to heart disease. Once she would undoubtedly have been stricken again and again with increasing damage to the heart and early death; but today, because of research and because of the discovery of antibiotics, with antibiotic prophylaxis and sound medical care she can avoid increments of damage to her heart and predictably can live a normal, healthy, and happy life.

I know a man in his early forties, a man with average income and a family of three young children, who was afflicted with severe hypertension. Again, with a combination of sound medical care and therapy, with blood pressure lowering agents that have been recently developed, he is living a normal productive life as a father and a breadwinner; and, as now defined, not only can he keep the hypertension under control but it will become less difficult to control as time goes on.

I know a child, a boy of 3, born with a congenital heart defect—a large hole in the wall of one of the chambers of the heart. Just a few years ago, that defect could not have been repaired and the child would have been doomed to a few years of half living and premature death before his teens. Today the defect has been located and measured. New surgical techniques have been developed, making it possible for the opening to be closed. The child and his parents are now awaiting the time when the doctors think it best for the operation to be performed; but, as Dr. White has said a while ago, there is of course no absolute guarantee of success, but I am told the chances are well worth taking and the parents will be eternally grateful to medical science because today they have hope instead of the hopelessness of a few years ago.

These are just three among many people I know and you know who measure the past decade of progress against heart disease in the most meaningful terms of all, but the long tortuous road to better understanding and to better ability to control the diseases of man stretches out ahead. We cannot know its lengths or its turns or the lanes that lead off into a network of pathways that may or may not lead back into the main route again; but we can do two things, I think. First, we can express and demonstrate our confidence in the scientists and doctors and research institutions—professional societies and the American Heart Association and other health agencies—that lead in the support of and search for new knowledge and the means for its application to better health; and, second, I think that we can assure the people that we will not impede progress against disease by failing to provide adequately through our contributions and our appropriations for the support of health and medical research activities today and for the increased resources required, if the health challenges of tomorrow are to be met.

I join with you wholeheartedly and pledge that I shall continue to do everything in my power to see that these needs are met.

In recent days I have had the opportunity to study the appropriation requests for medical research that we are studying this week. The appropriation hearings have just started in the House of Representatives before the committee, of which I am chairman; but I am very sorry to report to you this morning that apparently the Bureau of the Budget feels it must go backward instead of moving ahead, if one can judge by the appropriation requests for medical research that have been placed before our committee for the coming fiscal year.

As a Member of Congress, I share a responsibility to create and maintain an efficient and responsible Federal Government. As a Member of Congress, I also have a responsibility to see that basic human needs are going to be met. I deeply believe that in the interests of efficient and responsible Government, its health programs must advance—not stand still or fall back—notwithstanding any action of the Bureau of the Budget to the contrary. [Applause.]

From the record of Congress in the past, from the sentiment I sense in Congress today, and from my personal knowledge of the convictions of many of its Members—and may I say at this point that in the 13 years I have had the privilege of serving on this particular committee, we have had occasion to disagree on many items in our appropriation bill; but when it comes to appropriating funds for medical research, I can say, without fear of contradiction, that politics was swept aside, there is no middle aisle, that men and women on both sides have cooperated fully and selflessly. I think that is a wonderful record for the Congress of the United States; and I would like to include many who are here in our audience today—leaders of our Federal Government, leaders in our House and in the U.S. Senate.

I am happy to see my counterpart on this committee, Mr. LAIRD, from Wisconsin, and the chairman of the full committee, Mr. CANNON, from Missouri, both of whom have shown keen interest in research in the medical program; and I think I can assure medical people that because of their support of medicine in the past that their Congress will continue to act for their better health as long as we have the manpower and the facilities and the will to solve these problems.

To me the words "better health" mean more than the words "balanced budget"; and in this matter, I don't believe we could have a stronger ally than one of the most stimulating, energetic, able leaders in the field of medical research and one of our truly great Senators—my colleague on the other side of the Capitol, the Honorable LISTER HILL, from that great State of Alabama. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you, Representative FOGARTY.

We now end the formal part of this Report to the Nation and go on to the question-and-answer period.

I have a few questions here; and from looking at the early ones, I can see that the gentlemen who are going to answer them can either spend an hour with each question or they can say, "I don't know." [Laughter.]

I think we had better take a compromise position.

Dr. White:

"You are a noted advocate of snowshoveling. When you hand a man over 50 a shovel, how do you know what the condition of his arteries may be?"

Dr. WHITE. I don't hand a snowshovel over to such a person unless I know he is used to vigorous exercise and is in good condition; and I think one of the great faults of today is that at about the age of 25, especially with our men, we begin to lead soft lives, and for the next 20 years they accumulate trouble and at 45 it may prevent one shoveling adequately. I think we've got to have a campaign to keep active, especially our men; and then I think they can shovel snow right through till they are a hundred years old. [Applause.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you.

Dr. Wilkins:

"How close are we getting to discovery of the underlying causes of essential hypertension?"

Dr. WILKINS. I'll also have to say, "I don't know." As I tried to indicate in my report, I think we're getting closer and closer to it.

Dr. Page on my left is very fond of saying that the causes of hypertension are mosaic, they are not simple, and they are probably not single; and, incidentally, this is the phase of health and disease work that we're in now.

I think it's perhaps a little naive to expect that we're going to find—from here on, at least—many diseases for which there is a single cause; but the mechanisms and the causes combine to give different people—perhaps different mechanisms in different people—hypertension.

We're coming closer and closer to understanding, and I think perhaps the next 10 years will see that pretty well delineated—perhaps not completely.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you.

Dr. DeBakey, we have one for you:

"From time to time we hear conjectures about the transplanting of human hearts. What are the chances of this happening in the foreseeable future?"

Dr. DEBAKEY. Well, this is dependent upon further basic knowledge about the transplantation of tissues from one person to another.

So far as the technical aspect of transplanting a human heart is concerned, this I think has been solved and can be done now, but there is a basic factor involved in the transplantation of tissues, and that is what we call the rejection phenomenon.

Now, there is much work being done in this field and, of course, this opens up a whole new vista of surgery if we solve this problem of the transplantation of tissue. Now, whether it will come in 5 years or 10 years is something I can't say yet.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Dr. Page—listen very carefully [laughter]: "Would you advocate a 'crash' program against heart and blood-vessel diseases—something comparable to what we did in producing the A-bomb and are now trying to do with ICBM's?"

Dr. PAGE. No. [Laughter.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. May I ask why you said "No"?

Dr. PAGE. Yes; because I think you can buy research up to a certain point and after that point you begin to just multiply a spinning of the wheels. I think what you don't get is creativity—that is, new ideas.

In other words, I would advocate a maximal efficiency in the spending of money but realizing full well that this goes only up to a certain point and then you don't go any faster than that because you don't have the creativity which is necessary to do this.

I think that there are many ways that we can improve the efficiency of research today.

Please don't misunderstand me on that score; nevertheless, I think there is an upper limit.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Dr. Berliner:

"How can we get more well-qualified medical scientists interested in doing basic research?"

Dr. BERLINER. Well, I would think that the most important factor in getting more qualified people into basic research and more people qualified to do basic research is to try to increase the understanding of what basic research really is and what its eventual products are so that the scientist gets a little more of the credit and a little more of the understanding from people for his achievements.

Dr. SPRAGUE. I think that this audience might be interested to realize at this time that the term "basic research" is often a matter of semantics. A discussion of this appears this week in Science wherein it is pointed out that universities, when they are asked, "How much do you think is given by the Federal Government to basic research?" come out with a figure which is twice as much as the amount which those who distribute the money think is given for basic research.

In other words, the motivation which occurs in in the recipients, themselves—determines the basic nature of the use of this money; so we shouldn't be too confused by a statistical approach in relation to this term "basic research."

Now, I can't avoid answering a question addressed to me:

"Why do some people die suddenly of heart attacks after the doctor has given them a clean bill of health?" [Laughter.]

I have a standard reply to this. I say, "If I knew the answer to this, I would be working for the life insurance companies only." [Laughter.]

Actually, there are some types of heart disease that can be readily diagnosed; but in the case of coronary artery disease, which is the type which causes sudden death in most instances, diagnosis may be very difficult—particularly if the patient has no symptoms and there are no changes in the electrocardiogram.

An answer to this might be one suggested by my friend, Dr. William Castle, some years ago; and that is that each one of us should engage every day in what he calls "sublethal exercise"—that is, we should exercise to the point where we don't drop dead. ]Laughter.]

And that would help to build up, as Dr. White pointed out, sound coronary blood vessels.

Now, Dr. DeBakey, I have a question for you which says:

"I saw a story recently which said, in effect, that an impending stroke might be detected by X-ray and that if this were so, perhaps the surgeon could actually go in, make certain repairs, and thus prevent a stroke. Is this possible?"

Dr. DEBAKEY. Yes; definitely. Now, some strokes are due to an atherosclerotic process partially blocking and then finally blocking part of the arteries which supply blood to the brain. Now, usually these can be diagnosed precisely by opaque substances injected into the arteries and they can now be operated on successfully to restore the normal opening in the artery and thus prevent the artery from becoming blocked.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Thank you.

Dr. White:

"During the past 10 years, what, in your opinion, has been the most beneficial discovery in the field of heart disease?"

Dr. WHITE. Well, research teaching and practice is the fundamental reason for the great advances that have been made; and then 10 years ago came this united effort—private and public enterprise hand in hand—the recognition of the need of that and of going along with these heart drives. We can't submerge them into community heart drives; the time is not ripe for that yet.

I think the realization that all research must be supported—I think that's possibly the most important advance. We know of many detailed advances which would be equally beneficial.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Also Dr. White:

"Are we keeping pace with the Soviet Union in heart disease research?"

Dr. WHITE. Well, I think so. I think we are ahead of them, actually. They are just planning to start a Russian heart association. It wasn't in operation last September, I know, but they said they were going to establish one and join the International Society of Cardiology.

Well, I think that's about the way we were a good many years ago.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Dr. Watt, there is a question that says:

"We haven't heard very much this morning about the so-called epidemiological approach to heart disease. Do you think that this approach has received sufficien emphasis in the past decade?"

Dr. WATT. I think it's one of the really neglected areas and yet one that has seen quite a lot of development in plans and in activity within the last—oh—2 to 3 years. I would add that this is going to be shortly accelerated with a National Conference on Epidemiology, planned by the Heart Association and the heart institute to be held within the next 2 months. Work on planning that meeting is already actively underway.

Dr. SPRAGUE. This question is for Dr. Wilkins:

"You told us how high blood pressure is being controlled. Can it ever be cured?"

Dr. WILKINS. I think it's conceivable that we may be able to cure hypertension if we really find enough causes in individual cases that we can remove. Actually, we cure hypertension now—as I may have wished to indicate in my report—and they are the rarer forms. There are very severe cases of hypertension due, let's say, to a removable cause, a single removable cause, such as one bad kidney or a tumor of the adrenal gland. These can be removed, and the hypertension is cured.

I'm glad you asked that question because many times patients or the lay people misunderstand the word "treatment." They think of that as being synonymous with "cure" but it isn't. The treatment you must continue in order for it to be effective, at least at some level.

"Cure" means you give the treatment, the patient is cured, and you can stop the treatment and he stays well. We are not at that stage yet, but I believe that it may be possible that we will achieve it in time.

Dr. SPRAGUE. Dr. Page:

"We hear much about fats being a possible factor in developing heart disease. Does the present body of knowledge indicate that we should now recommend any significant changes in the dietary habits of Americans?"

Dr. PAGE. That's a loaded question. [Laughter.]

Dr. SPRAGUE. The intention is so. [Laughter.]

Dr. PAGE. Well, I think that you have to divide the problem really into two sections: one, the question of treating sick people—and if you say then that they should change—rather, people with heart disease or arteriosclerotic heart disease—if you want to lower the fat content of their diet I think it would be desirable, particularly if their blood cholesterols are elevated. There is another group of people who have a high hereditary factor in the thing with high blood cholesterols, and I think those people might well be prone.

Now, when you talk about the problem of changing the fat content of the diet of the entire American public, I think you're talking about something else again because you're dealing with problems of youngsters, problems of old age; and I think the whole

problem simply deserves more careful consideration rather than any wholesale recommendation at the present time. I think it has to be individualized.

Dr. SPRAGUE. There is a question addressed to me:

"What, in your opinion, will be the next important advance in the diagnosis of heart disease?"

As I indicated earlier, I think the diagnosis of latent or incipient coronary disease is most difficult, and perhaps we may be able to find a coronary-prone individual for whom we should do more, perhaps, than for the general population.

Dr. Page has told you about the hereditary factors in coronary heart disease and it does seem that—at least in early life—under the age of 40, certainly, it is common in males and it is extremely uncommon in females. There is one coronary differentiation, and it does seem, perhaps, as if coronary disease is more common in muscular individuals who put on weight after the age of 25, but it's very difficult to be sure of a true coronary type.

Dr. Watt:

"In testing new cardiovascular drugs, what are the immediate needs—where are the critical gap areas?"

Dr. WATT. The immediate needs and the critical gap areas can be summed up in a few short words—the current shortage of trained clinical investigators to test and evaluate these new cardiovascular drugs. Just the other day I heard that something like 6,000 compounds were developed during the past year alone. To test these compounds adequately and to make them available readily, means that we literally have to have more trained people to be effective in carrying out studies to determine the safety and effectiveness of these drugs.

Dr. SPRAGUE. We have about 3 minutes. We started 5 minutes late and I'm going to end this at the proper time.

I'm going to ask Dr. White a question and Dr. Page a question.

Dr. White:

"You mentioned nothing about anticlotting drugs in preventing recurrences of heart attacks and strokes. Don't these drugs deserve listing as a major achievement?"

Dr. WHITE. Some of us used to be skeptical, and I think rightly so, until we had more proof; and now there seems to be more proof that anticoagulants, properly administered and carefully controlled, can help a good deal in persons who already have had evidence of thrombosis or embolism in the past or perhaps in those who in the past have had insidious symptoms of angina pectoris; so there is a place and this has been an important advance, without doubt.

Dr. SPRAGUE. I will address this final question to Dr. Page. There are several that come in this same category and they have to do with this rather popular notion at the present time that the emotional stress of our lives has something to do with the development of atherosclerosis of the coronary arteries.

Well, how do you feel about this, Dr. Page?

Dr. PAGE. Well, I feel I have answered the question many times before. I think that this problem is one that suffers from lack of objective definitions.

What do we mean by "stress"? It's always been with us. For instance, children have been defined by the agony of their illness and by the exhaustion of their well-being. [Laughter.]

And yet we have to have them, I am told. [Laughter.]

Now, I think that, again, stress has been in every generation. Every generation thinks they have more stress than the others. I am sure that building pyramids must have been a great stress for the people. It must be of some satisfaction now to know that the pyramids are holding down the Pharaohs. [Laughter.]

Now, I think that, lastly, this problem is a peculiarly human one in the sense that man is the only individual who really meets a challenge. Challenge is the one way we strive for success in the world. If there is a purpose in the world—and I believe there is one—then that is defined in terms of challenge; and if people can't meet challenge, they are something less than human in my book. Therefore, I would say that let's meet the challenges of the world as best we can because that is our purpose; and then let's not worry about the consequences of it.

We'll live the best we can; we'll take things as inevitably as we can; but let's still remain human beings.

Thank you.

Dr. SPRAGUE. I would like to end by saying that I agree with what Dr. Page says. If we let our citizens become so soft and fearful that the normal challenges of living may be harmful, then there is great danger that a less timorous and less pampered nation may well take us over; and I think that if stress were the important thing in the production of coronary disease, all these members here on the panel would go home and have a coronary thrombosis; and I don't think they are going to.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

## The Unsung Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a brief but concise editorial on the American Legion post service officers which, although long overdue, gives proper credit where credit is rightfully due to these outstanding veterans and offices of a great veterans organization.

The editorial follows:

THE UNSUNG HEROES

The post service officer of the American Legion—an unsung hero of war and peace. Without fanfare or publicity he carries on in one of the greatest humanitarian assignments in the country.

The post service officer is essentially a volunteer. He works for the good he can do. His reward lies in the happiness he brings to the lives of distressed veterans and in the smiles of the faces of war widows and orphans.

He is a true friend of all those upon whom the burden of war has fallen most heavily. He helps the sick veteran to get hospitalization and medical treatment. He assists the disabled veteran in qualifying for compensation or pension for his physical handicap. He has extended help in getting readjustment benefits for the eligible of World War II and the Korean war. He counsels and consoles the widow and sees to it that she gets compensation or pension and other death benefits. He assists in arranging for scholarships for the children of the service-connected deceased veterans.

He is the sympathetic consultant for all distress veterans and their dependents. They rely on him as having understanding, sympathy, and the know-how of effective assistance. He stimulates that warm glow of feeling to the disabled veteran that comes from the realization that no veteran in need stands alone but that the American Legion is fighting for his rights.

It is through the post service officer that the American Legion is able to measure the effectiveness and adequacy of Government service to veterans. It is upon him the organization depends for seeing that despairing veterans are adequately counseled and assisted. He and his department service officer are the effective team rendering this service.

The post service officer gives daily substance to the American Legion ideal of consecrating the association of legionnaires to mutual helpfulness. He may be little known beyond his community but his devotion to duty is the beautiful symphony of unselfish service to God and country and fellowmen that has made the American Legion great.

## Full Text of Senator Douglas' Article: "A Catholic Can Become President"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinous. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article by the senior Senator from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, in the current issue of Coronet:

A CATHOLIC CAN BECOME PRESIDENT

(By Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS)

I think a Catholic can be elected President of the United States.

Given the right man, a Catholic should be elected President.

It saddens me that it should still be necessary in America today to document these beliefs. Yet the issue is clouded by so much confusion that both non-Catholic and Catholics can profit by its frank discussion. For the closer we move toward the 1960 political conventions, the greater the danger that, in the heat of debate, matters of principle may become further distorted by the cobwebs of myths and religious suspicion.

The chief argument advanced for the contention that a Catholic either cannot or should not become President are:

1. Gov. Alfred E. Smith, of New York, the only Catholic presidential candidate in U.S. history, lost disastrously in 1928 because of his religion—and the memory of his defeat remains too fresh.

2. The religious views of a Catholic President would necessarily conflict with his constitutional duties.

3. The electorate still is not sufficiently tolerant to elect a Catholic.

4. Even if the electorate might prove willing to elect a Catholic, the professional politicians would be too cautious to nominate him.

Let us examine each of these arguments.

There can be no question about the overwhelming extent of Al Smith's defeat. He lost to Herbert Hoover by more than 6 million votes. He failed to carry four States of the solid South. He even lost in his beloved native State of New York and wound up with just 87 electoral votes.

It is also true that the Democratic candidate's Catholicism was a long and bitterly discussed issue. Methodist Episcopal Bishop

James Cannon, Jr., argued that "no subject of the Pope" should be President. The Republican national committeewoman from Virginia declared: "We must save the United States from being Romanized and rum-ridden, and the call is to the women to do so." A well-circulated cartoon depicted a kneeling Al Smith inviting his running mate, Senator Joseph Robinson, to kiss the Pope's bare toes. At the upper end of the intellectual scale, a noted attorney, Charles C. Marshall, addressed a 5,000-word open letter to Smith in The Atlantic Monthly, questioning the Governor's qualifications on the basis of the past pronouncements of various Catholic spokesmen. In reply, Smith issued a moving 4,000-word manifesto.

Nevertheless, historians now believe that the religious issue was only one of several that caused Al Smith's downfall. Quite probably it was not even the most important one. For Al Smith's America differed greatly from the America of the space age in one almost forgotten respect. Bishop Cannon also attacked Smith as the master henchman of evil forces representing the foreign-populated city called New York. William Allen White of Kansas' Emporia Gazette railed against him as the agent of saloon, prostitution, and gambling interests.

It is a little difficult not to smile at the motion today, but the fact is that in Al Smith's day much of rural America was in a state of undeclared war against its urban counterpart. To many voters in the rural South and Midwest the stereotype of the cigar-chewing machine politician from the East spelled government by city slickers, corruption, and foreigners. Happily, education, automobiles, television, and other unifying factors have pretty much wiped away these prejudices. Moreover, about 63 percent of the population now lives in urban areas.

Most difficult for Al Smith, perhaps, was the prohibition issue. Again, it may be hard for voters now in their 20's and 30's to picture how many people sincerely—and vehemently—opposed the legalized sale of liquor. Smith was an ardent wet and said so. After the votes were in, Prof. William F. Ogburn of the University of Chicago made a study of 173 counties and concluded that the prohibition sentiment was 3 times more decisive than the religious issue.

I am convinced, in view of this, that Al Smith's fate should not be too significant for any Catholic candidate of the future.

Since I am a Protestant, I feel I can discuss objectively the claim that the teachings of the Catholic Church would lead a Catholic President into inevitable conflict with our laws. Frankly, this so-called danger does not worry me.

It is, of course, possible to find some basis for conflict between church and state in the writings of the Catholic hierarchy of the past. This is particularly true of Pope Pius IX, who asserted in 1864: "To say in the case of conflicting laws enacted by the two powers, the civil law prevails, is error." The statements of Pius IX were, however, made primarily in reference to European conditions, and were issued a long time ago. I am convinced, however, that in our modern United States such areas of potential dispute would seem to exist chiefly in the realm of theory alone. Certainly Al Smith thought so when he answered Charles Marshall in the Atlantic Monthly:

"I believe in absolute separation of church and state * * * I believe in the support of the public school as one of the cornerstones of American liberty * * * I recognize no power in * * * my church to interfere with * * * the Constitution of the United States."

In other words, Catholicism is a matter of faith and morals for most members of the Catholic Church. Catholic officeholders have had no difficulty reconciling their faith with their politics in this country. As the militantly Protestant journal, Christian Century, pointed out during the 1928 campaign:

"Catholic political action in modern times has shown itself more modern than Catholic. France was overwhelmingly Catholic; it threw off the yoke. Italy was overwhelmingly Catholic; it destroyed the temporal power of the papacy. Catholics do not act as a unit at the wave of the Pope's baton. In actual practice, American Catholics love their country as much as Protestants do."

To which I would add: just what could a Catholic President of the United States do—against the will of the non-Catholic majority—to aid the Pope? The Constitution provides ample checks against the usurpation of powers by the executive branch, so that we need not—and indeed we must not—deny to 36 million Americans the right to have a qualified member of their faith elected to the White House.

Not only do I think that a member of a minority religion would do nothing to offend the beliefs of the majority, I believe there is strong evidence that Catholic officeholders would bend over backwards to avoid charges of religious prejudices against themselves or their coreligionists.

There is, for example, no record that Catholic members of our highest tribunal, the Supreme Court, ever found themselves in conflict with the laws they were chosen to interpret. This is true of two Catholic chief justices, Roger Brooke Taney and Edward Douglass White, who presided over the Court about 40 years. More recently, another Catholic justice, the late Frank Murphy, voted in favor of the right of a Jehovah's Witnesses minister to set up a public address system in a municipal park and make anti-Catholic broadcasts on Sundays. Currently, Supreme Court Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., a Catholic, has also shown himself to be a stout defender of individual rights and civil liberties.

Looking over the ranks of my Catholic Democratic colleagues in the Senate, I must confess that the average quality of their performance seems to surpass the average performance of my fellow-Protestants.

There is Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, who is considreed the front-runner for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1960; Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, the Democratic assistant majority leader; such veterans as Senators JAMES MURRAY of Montana and JOSEPH O'MAHONEY of Wyoming; newer Members like Senator JOHN O. PASTORE of Rhode Island, FRANK LAUSCHE of Ohio and PAT MCNAMARA of Michigan; and newly elected Senators PHILIP A. HART of Michigan, EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine and STEPHEN M. YOUNG of Ohio. In addition, there are two other freshmen Senators who have served with distinction in the House of Representatives: EUGENE MCCARTHY of Minnesota, and THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut. In the House, for the first time, there are nearly 100 Catholic Members.

I find these men remarkably free of prejudice and, as a group, less self-righteous than a large proportion of my fellow-Protestants. It may be that most Catholic legislators are above-average at their jobs because they had above-average obstacles to overcome in achieving election. Whatever the reason for their collective stature, I would like to see more such men in Congress.

If a Catholic is nominated for the presidency in 1960, or at any other time in the foreseeable future, I must admit that his religion would—regrettably—be held against him by some voters.

The Gallup poll has been asking a cross section of voters: "If your party nominated a generally well-qualified man for the presidency this year, and he happened to be a Catholic, would you vote for him?"

In 1955, 23 percent replied "No." In 1956, 22 percent. Last October, 25 percent.

To me, however, the more significant points established by these polls are:

1. Anti-Catholic voters are clearly in a minority.

2. Since a Catholic candidate almost certainly would be a Democrat, the majority of anti-Catholic votes in the public opinion polls were cast by Republicans who would not vote for him anyway.

3. The above figures compare with a "No" vote of 31 percent in the same poll taken in 1940.

4. The October 1958 Gallup poll also shows that anti-Catholic prejudice is significantly lower among younger voters and voters with a college education.

Clearly then, the trend is toward less religious prejudice in our voting habits. And it should be. Historically anti-Catholic feeling in this country has been an anti-immigrant prejudice against the stereotyped Irish cop, saloonkeeper or favor-peddling ward heeler. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews live in more or less separate social compartments. Nowadays, economic and social barriers are dropping rapidly. There is much more interfaith communication than ever before. We know and understand each other better than we ever did. The war and military service in a common cause melted away many hatreds. Few Americans still blindly believe that a man wears invisible horns because he worships the same God in a different church.

Recent election results bear this out. The electorate of Maine is only 26 percent Catholic and not noted for upsetting political apple carts. It was a State with a firmly fixed tradition that no man of immigrant stock and no Catholic could be elected to high office. Yet in 1954, Maine elected MUSKIE—a Catholic and the son of a Polish immigrant tailor—as the first Democratic Governor in 20 years. In 1956, it reelected him by the greatest majority ever given a Governor of either party. In 1958, it made him the first Democrat ever popularly elected U.S. Senator from Maine.

Analyses of the 1952 and 1956 election results also show that quite a few Catholic candidates for Congress ran substantially ahead of Adlai E. Stevenson. Among these were Representatives LEO W. O'BRIEN and JAMES J. DELANEY of New York (who ran 16 and 15 percent ahead of the national ticket, respectively); PETER W. RODINO of New Jersey (21 percent); Senator KENNEDY (12 percent); Senator PASTORE (12 percent); Senator LAUSCHE (26 percent); Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin (33 percent); Representative (now Senator) EUGENE MCCARTHY (12 percent); and Senator MANSFIELD (21 percent).

Many of these front runners undoubtedly come from areas with relatively heavy Catholic populations. But I believe that most of their constituents voted for these men simply because they thought they would do a good job.

By the same token, I will concede that many southern delegates who jumped on the KENNEDY-for-Vice-President band wagon at the 1956 Democratic convention did so largely because of their distaste for the alternative choice, my friend ESTES KEFAUVER of Tennessee. But it was an historic change to see delegates from the South (where, according to Gallup, only 51 percent of the voters would accept any Catholic Presidential candidate) rally to the KENNEDY banner—even for the second place on the national ticket. It showed that the South was willing to live with a Catholic Vice President.

There is no question in my mind that the increased acceptance of Catholics in public office is also attributable to the efficiency and fairmindedness of most Catholic officeholders at the municipal level. Robert F. Wagner, Jr., in New York, Richard J. Daly in Chicago, John B. Hynes in Boston, deLesseps S. Morrison in New Orleans and David Lawrence in

Pittsburgh have two characteristics in common. All are Catholics. All have been excellent mayors.

Because of his fine record, the voters last year elected Mayor Lawrence the first Catholic Governor of Pennsylvania. Three Catholics already were Governors of other States and making good records: Stephen L. R. McNichols of Colorado, Albert D. Rosellini of Washington, and Foster Furcolo of Massachusetts. Nor was Lawrence the only newly-elected Catholic Governor. Chosen in the last election were Christopher Del Sesto of Rhode Island, J. J. Hickey in Wyoming, Michael V. DiSalle in Ohio; and, most notably, Edmund G. (Pat) Brown in California. Brown defeated Senator William F. Knowland by 1,029,000 votes.

I think, therefore, that an impressive case can be made for the argument that the vast majority of today's voters look their candidates over for merit, not for religious beliefs. Now what about the politicians who nominate Presidents?

Here we are on more speculative ground. Politicians are worriers. Worriers are cautious. I am afraid there is evidence that a Catholic presidential candidate might aid, rather than hurt, the cause of the Democratic Party. At least this is the conclusion of a careful statistical study sponsored in 1956 by John Bailey, the Democratic State chairman of Connecticut. Its most intriguing findings were that Catholics tend to vote more diligently than do Protestants, and that their voting strength tends to be concentrated in 18 large cities of 12 key States. The study concludes:

"The Catholic voters in these cities can usually determine the size of the Democratic margin in these cities. The size of the Democratic margin in those cities usually determines whether these States go Democratic. Whether these States go Democratic usually determines whether the Democrats win the election."

This is a rather coldly clinical approach to the issue of religion in politics. But the men on the floor of our nominating conventions are clinicians who should be impressed by such statistics. They should also be impressed by the consistently spectacular showing made in the Gallup polls by Senator KENNEDY, whose Catholicism is not precisely a secret.

The second point I would raise with our over-cautious politicians is the same that I want to raise with all Americans: Hasn't the time come for us to quit thinking of our public officials in terms of their religious faith?

I think it has.

This is the 20th century, not the 18th or 19th century. We should not let the fears of the past dominate our thinking today. And surely it is essential that we cast aside all remnants of prejudice in a time when the whole world is watching to see whether we live democracy, or merely talk it. Personally, I believe that when the right candidate comes along—regardless of his religion—the American people will do the right thing. They usually do.

## Red Conspiracy in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of a number of addresses to the House on the subject of the Panama Canal, I have dealt at some length with communistic conspiratorial activities in the Caribbean area. That these were only a small part of agitational operations of hemispheric scope has long been evident.

A highly informative summary of such activities by David Lawrence, distinguished editor and columnist in the Nation's Capital, was published in his syndicated column in the March 4, 1959, issue of the Evening Star, Washington, D.C.

His reference to communistic influences with respect to the Panama Canal are taken from an address by me to the House, on February 25, 1959.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the indicated column is quoted:

RED CONSPIRACY IN LATIN AMERICA—COMMUNIST HAND SEEN BEHIND RIOTS AGAINST U.S. EMBASSY IN BOLIVIA

(By David Lawrence)

And now it's trouble in Bolivia. Yesterday it was in Cuba, and before that in other Latin American countries where hostility against the United States was artificially intensified by the Communists.

Unfortunately, maneuvers of the Communists in the cold war are usually poohpoohed by too many people in this country, despite bold propaganda operations that obviously are planned with care. When the anti-Nixon incidents occurred on the Vice President's tour of South America, it was conceded, of course, that an antagonism such as was manifested against the United States could readily have been brought into the open without the slightest stimulus by the Communists. But this was no reason to ignore the impetus given anti-American sentiment there or anywhere else in the world by the Communists.

It so happens that this week an article reporting an alleged remark by a minor American official was published in a magazine reaching Bolivia from the United States. The idea that a chance comment in a magazine, circulating a relatively small number of copies in that country, could produce a riot against the United States Embassy and cause the evacuation of its personnel is too fantastic to believe. Only an organized conspiracy by those malcontents with a desire to focus international attention on relations between the United States and an important South American country could have brought about the tragic episode.

The Bolivian Minister of the Interior, says a UPI dispatch, told newsmen last night the attack on the American Embassy was led by a known Communist named Victor Villegas Busaldo.

The other day in Congress, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania, Democrat, declared that Communist influence is back of some of the demands being made by the Government of Panama for an extension of its territorial waters which would adversely affect American rights in the Canal Zone. He said:

"Those in charge of the Communist movement in Latin America, and especially in the Caribbean area, have undoubtedly focused their conspiratorial activities on the Panama Canal with the purpose of causing destruction of amicable relations between the United States and Panama, with complete liquidation of United States control over the canal itself."

Nor is Communist activity confined to any one part of the globe. It is noticeable just now in Africa, where fuel is being added to the flames of nationalism. It is operative also in the Far East. A few days ago a United Press International dispatch dated Manila said:

"The foreign office warned yesterday it has received reports pointing to growing infiltration by Communists among the Philippine student population.

"Foreign Secretary Serrano conveyed the warning to Representative Lenardo Perez, chairman of the House Committee on Anti-Filipino Activities, and told him to put his committee on alert."

The pattern of student infiltration is worldwide. In Latin America, in particular, many of the anti-American demonstrations have originated in the colleges. To plant young leaders who will use any provocation to work up passionate outbursts is a relatively easy device. It has been revealed in Cuba in the so-called youth movement. While the top officials there vehemently deny that the Communists have anything to do with the Fidel Castro regime, it is an open secret in Havana that the Communists are busy causing mischief wherever they can in the little republic which is struggling to recover from the ill effects of the Batista dictatorship.

In the Middle East the Communist plotters have been more successful than anywhere else. Everyone who has watched the situation in Egypt is aware that the Communists have played an active part there in anti-Western demonstrations. The Nasser government, which at first welcomed such supporters, now is troubled by them. Iraq is an example of a successful conquest by the Communists of a country which until recently was one of America's stanchest friends.

Despite the denunciations of anything that even remotely resembles an intervention in their own domestic affairs, the Soviets are spending hundreds of millions of dollars fomenting internal trouble inside many of the countries sympathetic with the West.

In the United States, the effects of some of the insidious operations by Communists are more and more noticeable. Having won many a big battle in the courts through the aid of legal technicalities, the Communists have continued to plant their propaganda in important places and among groups which are gullible and naive, thus enlarging the scope of the Soviet propaganda drive.

Sooner or later the American people will come to realize that the Communists are succeeding in their infiltration of many countries and are dangerously impairing the relations between the United States and peoples in different parts of the world who normally would be very friendly to the people of this country. It's a significant type of fighting in what has been misnamed the cold war.

## The Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission Has the Grave Responsibility of Marking Hallowed Ground With a Fitting and Enduring Monument Symbolizing an Epic Struggle in Mankind's Quest for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in stressing the importance of an appropriate Corregidor Memorial it is pertinent to recall the stirring remarks made when Corregidor was returned to the Philippines, October 12, 1947.

Today the United States of America conveys to the Republic of the Philippines the last tangible bit of America, the island of Corregidor. It is right that this be done. But in a deeper sense, Bataan and Corregidor do not belong solely to any one country, even to the heroic Philippines there is more to this hallowed spot than what we here convey, and its that which belong to the ages and to all men who believe in human liberty. Nations yet unborn will strive for freedom and receive strength and courage from nearby Bataan. Men now living and yet to be born will carry on inspired by the true meaning of Corregidor. They are now enshrined in the temple of hope for mankind with Runnymede, Valley Forge and other places where the fires of freedom were lighted and kept burning.

The blood of Americans and Filipinos mingled indissoluble in the soil of Bataan and Corregidor, each defying the forces of autocracy and slavery. The bloodshed by your sons and our sons cannot be separated in the hallowed earth of Bataan and Corregidor. This spot will tell the story to oppressed and groping people how they, too, can attain liberty by devotion to the democratic way of life.

Mr. Speaker, my service as a member of Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission has given deep satisfaction to me. It is a highly patriotic service in a cause of far-reaching importance to our entire foreign program.

My greatest regret is that its purposes and plans are not fully understood.

The history of every public endeavor of this kind records opposition and, strange to say, the objections are largely the same. There has been very little opposition to the Corregidor Memorial, but widespread support. The critics have been quite active, but their numbers have never been large. The opposition in almost every case, has approved the idea of the memorial, but they wish the memorial to take a different form. They do not oppose the expenditure of the money, but they want all or a part of it to be expended for some civic need in which they have a particular interest. The Commission has noted that those opposed to the form of the memorial, disagree as to what form the memorial should assume. Their ideas differ greatly, the objectors have suggested these various ideas, a park, a building to honor jointly those who served in the far Pacific and General Rizal, a hospital for veterans—one has been recently built by the United States—a colossal statue of Christ on Corregidor, a theater—since Manila has no air cooled auditorium—and so forth, and so forth.

It is evident that if the objector's own pet project were not chosen he would still be opposed.

In commenting on the objections to the proposed memorial, the chairman of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, expressed his feelings as follows:

I have something which rebels within me when I see the pure sacrifices of our soldier dead used as a selling argument to provide some civic need. This need should be provided in some other way, not by capitalizing the death of a fallen soldier. When this is done a bronze plaque is placed on the side of a wall, and the civic service continues without further thought or remembrance of those who died.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said the comparatively few objections are similar to the experience of every group charged with erecting a memorial.

Some of the opposition have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD erroneous statements as to the memorial plans. In order that Congress and the general public may have a thorough knowledge of the concept and purposes of the memorial, I am incorporating in my remarks the following information furnished by the chairman of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission. This information answers questions which are pertinent to the subject of a memorial on Corregidor.

BASIC FACTS ABOUT THE MEMORIAL

It will be a symbol to every participant in the Pacific war both in the United States and the Philippines of the months and years of his service and sacrifices in the preservation of liberty against an aggressor bent on conquest, tyranny, and enslavement. To such a veteran, and there are over 4 million of them in every part of the United States, it will be deserved recognition of each one's service to his country. Primarily it will be a reminder and record of those who gave their lives to preserve freedom in the world.

It will be a sensitive and appropriate recognition of the most remarkable feat of arms in the world's history, America's participation in World War II, undertaken not for conquest.

The Philippines were a part of the United States until July 1946, almost one-third of our existence up to that time. It will be a symbol to every Filipino who sees it, and they will be numbered by countless thousands, of our understanding and appreciation of that long association unique in the annals of history. It will make clear our recognition of the price the Filipinos paid through 4 long years for remaining true to the United States and the cause of democracy. That deliberate choice caused them to suffer more loss of life than the combined losses of the American forces in both the European and Pacific areas combined. Further, it had deep meaning and will have far-reaching influence that an oriental nation, the Philippines, decided to stand by an occidental nation, the United States, against another oriental nation.

The memorial will stand on the sacred soil of Corregidor in the shadow of nearby Bataan, where commingled the blood of Filipinos and Americans. Manila is the crossroads between the East and the West, and only a relatively short distance from the mainland of Asia. Those who travel by air will see it, and all ships going to or from Manila must pass close to Corregidor. At night a perpetual shaft of light will carry its message far our across the China Sea. Its meaning will be clear to Asiatics, and we believe that it will be understood as a dedication of democratic peoples to the cause of peace and freedom.

All Corregidor will actually be a memorial. Malinta tunnel, the headquarters of the United States Army and the capitol of the Philippines in the early days of the war will be restored by the Philippine government. The memorial edifice will have appropriate sculpture, and so built that it may house libraries and the memorabilia of the war in the Pacific.

If our country through this commission and the architects can place upon Corregidor the type of symbolic memorial we are trying to create, it will reach the minds and hearts of millions of people who do not know and little appreciate the real United States. It may sound chauvinistic but something unheard of has risen in the world in recent years—an entire nation going to war on two occasions with its major objective the freedom and happiness of other nations. There was no thought of conquest of others, but there was on the part of the people of the United States an awareness that we were sure to suffer great loss of life and staggering financial burdens for years to come. It is true that we evaluated the impact upon our future of the defeat of free nations by dictators, but irrespective of that, the United States fought primarily to help other nations to live as free men.

The decision of the Philippines to stand with us was built upon their confidence after almost 50 years of association, in the truth and fairness of the democratic way of life, as cherished and lived by the United States.

The presence of this memorial on Philippine soil will be an aid in enlightening Asia and the world as to democracy and the character of America. All that we do in monetary assistance as a part of our foreign policy will be short of our objectives until the nations we help understand the United States. We can do more to bring about that understanding than is being done.

We are confident that with the actual memorial and the living memorial we can make a very important contribution to that end.

This memorial will be placed by the United States not in Washington or some other American city for the edification of ourselves, but on Asiatic soil which will mean a great deal to all Asiatics. Such a tribute on foreign soil is somewhat unique, and cannot fail to better explain to the world, especially Asia, what is the truth as to the real America, as an exemplar of democracy.

We do not intend to let it rest there. This sensitive symbol will become and be used as a living memorial. We have done a great deal of work to develop activities under the aegis of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial which we believe will do much to offset the effect of the all-out Communist effort in the Far East. We have an invaluable asset in the friendship of the Philippines, a democratic nation, just as Russia has in Communist China. This is not now fully evaluated nor adequately utilized. Russian communism, according to authorities, is daily gaining ground in Asia, largely accomplished in the name and with the assistance of China. We have reason to believe that we can secure active cooperation and abundant financial support which will make the actual memorial, when completed, continue to serve effectively as a living force. It is consonant with a memorial in the spirit that these dead shall not have died in vain.

---

THE COST OF THE MEMORIAL

World War I and World War II have been thoroughly memorialized in the European theater at an expense of over $40 million.

The far Pacific theater has not been memorialized. One cemetery, for Americans only, is in Manila and that practically is all that has been done in the far Pacific.

Instead of many memorials as in Europe, the Corregidor plan is to concentrate our country's memorial effort in one impressive, sensitive memorial, that will cost not over $7,500,000 as against the $40 million spent in Europe.

The memorial, to inspire the viewer, and be properly expressive as to what happened in the war in the Pacific must be heroic in size and inspirational in form. This is of even greater importance in the Far East than in our country. It will be an important

contribution to our foreign policy, and, for generations to come, it will be an influence for good between the East and West. It is believed that a dollar spent in this way will bring more returns than dollars now being spent in many other ways in our foreign work.

The long association from 1898 to 1946 of the United States and the Philippines justifies a reasonable expenditure to commemorate that long union. It will impress other nations that the United States places upon Asiatic soil a tangible, sensitive expression of its respect and affection for the Philippines. It is now being quickly forgotten that the Philippines elected to stand with the United States, in World War II, and by reason of that decision suffered more casualties than all the United States Armed Forces in the Pacific and European theaters combined. And even today the Philippines stand defiant on the doorstep of Communist China as an open and avowed ally of the United States and democracy.

This merited tribute to the Philippines would justify the cost of this memorial, even if there were no other reasons for the memorial.

The Island of Corregidor should be preserved forever as a shrine because of what occurred there and what it represents. Corregidor and Bataan should be so preserved as to keep alive the memory of the sacrifices and high purposes of the greatest exploit of arms in the world's history. This expenditure will restore Corregidor to a place of inspirational beauty, marking Malinta tunnel and other historical spots so that it will be the focal point of travel from all parts of the world.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Philippines are in a distressing financial condition. In its noble desire to be free, it began its sovereignty in 1946 under impossible loads. The obligation assumed by the United States as to the Philippines in 1898, increased by the loyalty of the Philippines in World War II, makes it certain that the United States will not desert the Philippines now.

This memorial can be of material financial aid to the Philippines, and would be justified from that standpoint, if no other, as a part of a plan to assist them in this critical period of their history.

It is well to bear in mind, certain surprising facts. Although the Philippines remained loyal to us in World War II and no other country in the Far East did so, according to a Commerce Department report, Foreign-aid money from the United States was disbursed from 1946 to 1957 as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Indonesia | 122,000,000 |
| Japan | 2,184,000,000 |
| Korea | 1,665,000,000 |
| Formosa | 711,000,000 |
| Vietnam | 547,000,000 |
| India | 214,000,000 |
| Pakistan | 150,000,000 |
| The Philippines | 144,000,000 |

About $5 million of the $7½ million to be provided for the memorial will be spent in the Philippines, in a manner greatly needed there, for common labor materials and services. Money being spent in erecting the memorial, could well be evaluated as a part of the help which must be made available to the Philippines soon. If our country is to continue foreign aid I believe that the erection of the memorial on Corregidor will serve the purposes of our foreign policy better than a like amount spent in any other way.

After its erection, the memorial will be of practical value to the Philippines in regaining financial stability. It will become one of the greatest tourist attractions in the world and be the means of creating jobs and services auxiliary to the operation of the memorial.

Further, it is believed that the erection of this memorial by the United States will result in raising money from private sources for the living memorial to be expended largely in the Philippines possibly more than the cost of the memorial itself. This amount, of $7½ million the authorization of which is being asked by the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission will be all the money that the United States will be called upon to furnish.

The greatest justification for the expenditure of $7½ millions is that:

It will honor the 4 million Filipino and Americans, living and dead, who served in the war in the Pacific;

It will commemorate the greatest and most unselfish feat of arms in the history of the world;

It will serve to combat communism;

It will create a war memorial, dedicated to the promotion of the cause of peace;

It will save for posterity as a shrine the hallowed island of Corregidor. There will be concentrated and preserved, the history of the War in the Pacific, its memorabilia, its records and its true meaning.

If the U.S. Congress continues foreign aid and expenditures designed to create tangible and intangible values of real importance to the betterment of our national existence, we believe that the Corregidor Bataan Memorial should have a high priority. The money requested is not a recurring item. Moreover the cost of the memorial is in the nature of an investment which will bring returns for generations to come to the Philippines and the United States.

Almost 15 years have elopsed since the end of the War in the Pacific. The work of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission should be expedited by Congress.

---

VALUE TO THE PHILIPPINES?

In consdeiration of this point the inspirational value of the memorial, which is of incalculable worth, will not de discussed—only its dollars and cents value.

In the first place, there is no decision to make as between investing U.S. dollars in some civic need or in a memorial. There is nothing before Congress to provide for the civic need, but Congress has authorized the erection of a memorial edifice without cost to the Philippines. Those who think in terms of a civic need would simply defeat the memorial and start something entirely new, in which effort there would no doubt be a great difference of opinion as to what it should be.

It is important to note that the erection money for the Philippines will be largely spent in the Philippines, perhaps $5 million, which no duobt would mean a great deal now to the economy of the Philippines. This would probably be spent in purchases, labor, and manufacturing costs.

When the memorial is finished it could be made to furnish employment to many collateral services for years to come.

Quite a few years ago there was a bill before Congress to spend Federal money on a then isolated spot on Lake Superior. A speech, a classic of sarcasm, was delivered by Congressman Knott. He attacked the idea as the ultimate in folly, and today Duluth, Minn., stands on that spot.

Corregidor is potentially one of the greatest tourist attractions anywhere, and certainly the outstanding one in the Philippines. The greatest drama of modern history occurred there and on nearby Bataan. In the early days of 1942 it was the Capital of the Philippines and President Quezon's office was Malinta tunnel and a chair just outside its entrance. It was the headquarters, also, of General MacArthur and all that was left of the high command of the American forces. It was there that the Treasury of the Philippines was located. It was the hospital for the sick, wounded and dying Filipino and American comrades in arms, as well as the only real shelter for the intrepid, starving troops from the vicious bombings by land and air.

General MacArthur said he could never forget their gaunt faces, unafraid.

If sensitively and beautifully memorialized, Corregidor will be recognized as an outstanding world tourist attraction, in the same way as the Taj Mahal, Gettysburg, and many others. Four million men served in the far Pacific; many of them have expressed their desire and intention of returning to the Philippines when the memorial is completed. A value to the Philippines may be anticipated in creating greater tourist travel, since it increases interest in the Philippines and its possibilities for the investment of capital. A recognition of this fact is just plain good business sense.

This cannot be done by the placement of a simple cemeterial shaft on Corregidor. It must be commemorated by a memorial which reflects the monumental effort of the war in the Pacific, and its worldwide historical significance. History records nothing comparable to World War II in magnitude or in unselfish service to mankind.

The Commission has corresponded with Mr. Modesto Farolan, president of the Philippines Tourist and Travel Bureau. We believe that his fine abilities and imagination will produce results in this field. Those who think that the 26 miles to Corregidor will defeat its value as a tourist attraction probably have not made a thorough study of the subject. The chairman has in his files a tabulation furnished by the Interior Department as to visitors to national parks, monuments, historical, and memorial parks. Many of these are in isolated areas, yet they are visited by millions every year. Many are quite isolated—hundreds of miles from large city populations.

It is true that conditions are not the same in the Philippines as in the United States from the transportation standpoint, but the Philippines has an advantage in a 12-month tourist season.

Corregidor will be at its maximum when the memorial is completed which will then have many other features which will attract large numbers of visitors. As an example, the memorial will have steps leading to observation points even to its full height; hundreds of thousands go to the top of the Washington Monument for the view and the excitement. One cannot imagine a more magnificent view from places hundreds of feet above the seas surrounding Corregidor. Malinta tunnel must be fully restored, with all its historic story fully explained. The entire island will be landscaped and beautified.

There is no serious doubt that the people will go there in great numbers if Corregidor is properly prepared.

The Philippines alone has a population over 24 million.

Almost 2 million lives within 75 miles of Corregidor.

The interisland steamers going to Manila pass within 3 miles of Corregidor, as well as the large liners and other ships carrying passengers. It would be little trouble to have scheduled stops.

In these days of air travel it is not too imaginary to depict service in short hops to Corregidor by planes, especially by passenger helicopters, a growing service, for such a trip as Corregidor would require.

It is true in America today that people like to accomplish an objective by making a trip. Thousands go to Mt. Vernon by excursion boats, a daily service, and the boat trip is an asset, not a deterrent.

It is hoped that some day the route of the "death march" will be a memorial highway. It will furnish an interesting approach to Corregidor for a short shuttle ferry from a point on Bataan to Corregidor.

We have had no expert traffic study made, but there is little doubt the Corregidor will experience the same thing which has occurred everywhere in this country as to thou-

sands of visitors making their way even to somewhat inaccessible points.

The usual small fees will carry the maintenance and upkeep, and perhaps will leave a sizable balance.

The memorial itself will need no appreciable amount for maintenance at least for 5 years, and then very little after that due to its construction. This is the opinion of the engineers.

This statement may seem to some to be too optimistic, but we believe from the experience of all resort areas in the United States it is not too much to expect.

The Philippines will have a tangible asset worth far more than the proposed maximum of $7,500,000. This is less than the cost of one B–52 plane which has an expected life of very few years.

Every State in the United States has spent large sums of money to create points of interest within their boundaries to attract tourists. It aids not only the States which own the areas, but the entire economy of the State. All kinds of groups, families, schoolchildren, and many types of organizations arrange trips in order to have an objective for a vacation or a weekend. If Corregidor, with little cost to the Philippines, can become one of the most outstanding and interesting objectives of travel (which it will), it will be of tremendous practical value to the Philippines.

WIDESPREAD SUPPORT OF THE MEMORIAL

Every Philippine President—Rojas, Quirino, Magsaysay, and Garcia—has been deeply interested in our efforts to place a memorial on Corregidor and given their support. The Government of the Philippines set aside Corregidor to be preserved as a shrine and created the Philippine National Shrines Commission. It was directed to work with the Corregidor Bataan Commission and has done so enthusiastically. It has officially and unanimously expressed its full endorsement of the concept and plans for the construction of the memorial. The members have individually and collectively expressed their unqualified appreciation of the winning design and officially approved it. They have stressed the great desire of the Filipino public to see the proposed memorial erected soon.

The Honorable Eulogio Balao, when Secretary of Defense, stated, "I hope very soon, we shall see standing on Corregidor a living symbol of the gallant struggle."

The Honorable Carlos Romulo said, "It is for this reason that we in the Philippines are happy to know that the United States Government has created a Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission and that plans are underway—and we sincerely hope they can be carried out soon—to build a memorial with Corregidor as its pedestal. Done with proper sensitivity, this memorial will be a perpetual beacon light to show the world the road to peace." On July 17, 1958, he said, "You are rendering an incalculable service to the cause of Philippine-American friendship."

The Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor, the representative veterans' group in the Philippines has written in part as follows:

"The veterans organization in the Philippines will be eternally grateful for the magnificent plans you have for the monument. * * * I can only say that they are with me 100 percent behind the idea."

General MacArthur said in a letter to the chairman:

"It is indeed a most worthy purpose. For no soil on earth is more deeply consecrated to the cause of human liberty than is that of the island of Corregidor and adjacent Bataan Peninsula. There, American and Filipino blood is intermingled to immortalize that gallant stand taken to resist against desperately overwhelming odds the onrush of the forces of despotism which sought to blot the concept of freedom from the face of the earth.

"I am quite confident that you will find among our countrymen few who will hesitate to support the erection upon that hallowed ground of so suitable a memorial to those who there fought and bled and died in desperate resolve that liberty should live."

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz has endorsed wholeheartedly the proposal and served on the jury of award which selected the winning design for the memorial.

Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright wrote as follows:

"Even while the fighting was going on, I visualized such a thing in the future, and of course, I am more than interested in seeing the project go through."

Major General Moore, who surrendered the Corregidor forces said:

"I feel that such a symbol erected on that hollowed ground would exert a deep influence throughout the Far East and impress upon all who see it the unselfish ideals of American democracy."

Similar statements could be quoted from Gen. A. M. Jones, one of the commanding generals on Bataan; General Krueger, who commanded the Army ground forces, and General Kenny, who commanded the Army Air Corps, both served on the jury of award and are giving their support to the cause.

No effort has been made to collect endorsements and these are but a few of many statements agreeing with the goal of the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, in summarizing my remarks the following are some of the purposes of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial. rial.

To honor the 4 million Filipinos and Americans living and dead who served in the war in the Pacific. They are in every State in the Union.

To commemorate the greatest and most unselfish feat of arms in the history of the world.

To use the living memorial as an instrumentality for combating communism.

To dedicate for posterity the hallowed island of Corregidor. There, will be concentrated and preserved, the history of the war in the Pacific, its memorabilia, its records, its true meaning as well as the names of those who served.

To place this impressive, sensitive memorial on Corregidor as an expression of appreciation from the United States which will mean much to the Philippines and the Far East.

If the United States continues its policy of foreign aid, and particularly to the Philippines, in my opinion every dollar spent on this memorial will serve the purpose of our foreign policy better than a like amount spent in any other way.

## Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the subject of statehood for Hawaii is today under further consideration by the Rules Committee. It is the hope of many that the bill will be reported out for action by the House. I am happy therefore to include with my remarks the following excellent editorial on this subject which appeared in the New York Times today:

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD ADVANCES

The drive to secure admission of Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State is making significant and heartening progress. The latest evidence of this is the unanimous approval for statehood given by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Last month statehood was approved by the corresponding House committee and the House Rules Committee has recently been holding hearings on the measure. In the latter hearings, unfortunately, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, has been leading a last-ditch fight against Hawaiian statehood.

Nothing has been more impressive in the recent discussions of this issue than the flimsiness of the arguments of those who oppose statehood. Sometimes these arguments are directly contradictory, as when some critics charge that Hawaii is in the hands of a few large corporations, while others claim it is really ruled by henchmen of Harry Bridges. Sometimes these arguments enter the realm of fantasy, as when they allege that admission of Hawaii as a State would give Communist propaganda grounds for accusing us of colonial imperialism.

But the most unworthy argument against statehood is the one which stresses the non-Caucasian nature of most of Hawaii's population. This is racism with a vengeance and directly contradictory to every ideal of our democracy. American citizenship is not, and should never be, restricted to white men, to people of European origin, or to any other such narrow elite. It is the glory of our Nation that here men of every color, origin, and religion have come together to live in freedom and equality, though these ideals have not everywhere been realized. Hawaiians of every background have proved their loyalty by fighting and dying for our country on equal terms with Americans from the mainland. Against that background statehood for Hawaii is an obligation the rest of us have long owed our fellow-Americans who live in those beautiful islands.

## The Man on the Firing Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 5, 1959*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article which appeared in the February 22, 1959, Los Angeles Times, entitled "The Man on the Firing Line."

Written by Mr. Kyle Palmer, political editor of the Times, the article is about a remarkable public servant on the American scene, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

More and more it is being realized that Vice President NIXON possesses an amazing understanding of the host of problems, both domestic and international, that confront our Nation and our generation. This article gives an insight into that quality and I commend it to the attention of the Congress and the public.

The article follows:

THE MAN ON THE FIRING LINE

(By Kyle Palmer)

Republicans are finding that the road back is long, rocky and occasionally complicated by detours. They should be heartened by knowing that the road, despite its difficulties, leads on to success if it is traversed with enough determination and intelligence.

Some of the trials to be encountered and the means of overcoming them were furnished the California GOP last week by a remarkably well-informed, down-to-earth young man who used commonsense to illustrate his points.

RICHARD M. NIXON was born January 9, 1913, in Yorba Linda, Calif. Today, at 46, he is one of the best-informed, most experienced and authoritative figures in the public affairs of the world—and he has been in the public service less than 13 years.

His rapid rise in the political world has occurred during a time of stress, strain and turmoil. And were he less a natural leader, less a man of conviction and courage, he would be as many another of his contemporaries—just a run-of-the-mine politician regarded as dependable but not outstanding.

Instead, in a unique way, he is outstanding. He may never be President of the United States, but it is a good thing to know that our Nation continues to produce men such as he—men who devote their lives, their talents and their well-being to the cause of national progress and security.

The real NIXON—not the NIXON variously described by political friend or political foe—stood out clearly and simply last week when the Vice President appeared at a dinner given in his honor by the Greater Los Angeles Press Club.

NIXON had indicated that, instead of making a set speech, he would much prefer to answer such questions as members of the club and the working press might submit to him. He set up no conditions and established no limits as to the nature of the queries he would undertake to acknowledge.

His performance under such circumstances was not only brilliant but remarkable.

Covering a field that encompassed virtually every aspect of domestic and foreign affairs, he gave prompt, straightforward—and thoroughly informed—responses. Questions ranged from the frivolous to the profound. Here is a summary of the questions and a paraphrasing of NIXON'S rejoinders:

How is the Nixon dog, Checkers? Fine, but a little too fat.

And what about the practicability of exploring outer space?

The cost will be great and the economic returns may not appear too promising, but the exploration will represent man's never-ceasing search for knowledge and on that account will be worthwhile and necessary.

Will the Federal budget be balanced, and how important is it that a balance should be reached?

First, a balanced budget will aid the wage earner to enjoy more of the benefits of his labor, will help the manufacturer to gain greater returns from the sale of his products and second, will bolster the United States in its struggle for coexistence with a Communist world seeking to destroy it in the international market place.

Should the scientists or the military control future development of space vehicles and research?

Civilian control should gradually be accomplished, with due attention to the requirements and the opinions of military experts.

What are the plans of the Cabinet Committee To Combat Inflation, of which President Eisenhower has designated him Chairman?

The Committee hopes to bring home to labor, to business and to government the imperative need for reaching a balance between wages, prices, and production to the end that the dollar will buy more at home and command more respect abroad.

What about our status in world trade?

Trade is a weapon the Russians can use to our disadvantage in a cold war just as it could use its military might to injure us in a hot war.

Whom would he prefer as a running mate in 1960?

NIXON will not be a candidate for Vice President next year.

Has he any suggestions as to a successor for Secretary of State Dulles?

While Dulles is Secretary of State, where his services are more valuable than could be rendered by another, it is inappropriate to discuss a possible successor.

Has he any plans for a visit to Russia?

While the Berlin crisis and other critical differences exist between the free world and the Soviet Union, an official visit would be out of the question.

Is there hope for labor union reform legislation in this session of Congress?

Congress should enact legislation with teeth in it to prevent exploitation of unions by their leaders, should give members full control of union policies and correct abuses brought out by the McClellan committee.

What about the future of the Republican Party?

The party should have less concern with the image its opponents seek to give it as the friend of big or little business and concentrate on the principles it espouses and the caliber of the candidates it supports.

For the most part the questions submitted to the Vice President were thoughtful and serious; his replies were in character.

Absent from the running give-and-take of question and answer was any suggestion of a desire on the part of those participating in the affair to slant it, or soften it, or use it as a vehicle for self-aggrandizement.

The press, take it by and large, is a rather cynical body. Newspaper reporters see so much of the other side of a public figure they seldom are impressed by the side he shows to the public. But if you were to take a vote of the members of the press who attended the Press Club dinner meeting you would find an astonishing unanimity of opinion: NIXON is a right guy.

Others under different circumstances but of a like turn of mind might express this good will differently, but to be a right guy to the men who write the news of the day you must have a great deal more than appearance to make the grade.

Aside from his few public appearances while in California, the Vice President made considerable progress in heartening and giving new avenues of approach to the Republican leadership and rank and file.

Counseling all and sundry to forget personal antagonisms and to subordinate party differences to party principles, he was remarkably successful in engendering an improved atmosphere in GOP councils.

DICK NIXON is a candidate for the Republican nomination for President in 1960. He now is able to speak for himself rather than primarily as a spokesman for the national administration.

During the coming months he will be able to give further evidence both of the independence of his views and of their substantiality.

And, whatever the outcome of the great contest of 1960, all of the people will know that few men in our history have sought the Presidency with a greater or more detailed knowledge of all that the post entails.

## Broadcast Music, Inc., Has Rendered a Real Service to the People of America by Commissioning Four New Busts of Lincoln, Two of Which Were Unveiled February 9 in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 9, I had the honor to participate with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, in unveiling two magnificent new heads of Abraham Lincoln executed by the internationally known sculptor, Avard Fairbanks.

This event took place at the headquarters of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission in the Archives Building and was one of the numerous affairs scheduled in connection with the celebration of the 150th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth.

Dr. Fairbanks, the sculptor, is consultant in fine arts to the University of Utah and resident sculptor on that campus. He will be remembered as the sculptor of the bronze statue in Greece of Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver; the doughboy of Idaho; the pony express for the Utah centennial; the celebrated statue of Lincoln for New Salem, Ill.; and a statue of Albert Woolson, last survivor of the Grand Army of the Republic for the cemetery at Gettysburg. He also created the 91st division memorial at Fort Lewis, Wash.; and the Marcus Whitman statue in the Capitol.

The heads unveiled by Senator COOPER and me at the ceremony depicted "The Young Lincoln" and "Lincoln, The President." They were commissioned as two of a series of four busts by Broadcast Music, Inc., of New York City, whose president, Mr. Carl Haverlin, is a distinguished Lincoln collector and an honorary member of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

The completed heads—these were plaster models that we unveiled—will be 21 inches high, 10 inches wide and 9 inches deep. They now can be seen at the Broadcast Music, Inc., exhibit of Lincolniana at the Statler Hotel in Washington.

The other two heads, when completed, will depict Mr. Lincoln at other stages of his life.

These are inspiring works which reflect fully the statement made by the sculptor that, "The truth of spirit is more important than external form." The external form is there, however, for the model used by Dr. Fairbanks was the Volk life mask of Lincoln, cast in 1860.

Mr. Haverlin, speaking for his company, said that the four heads will be executed finally in marble by Dr. Fairbanks and will be donated to the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission and

thereafter made available for perpetual display at an appropriate place in Washington where our millions of visitors, both American and from foreign shores, may take from them the same inspiration that those of us who participated in this ceremony experienced last Monday.

Among those present on that occasion from the Congress of the United States in addition to Senator Cooper were Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah, the Honorable Arthur V. Watkins, former Senator from that State and Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas.

I believe that Broadcast Music, Inc., has rendered a tremendous service to the people of this Nation through this generous gift.

## State-Owned Ferries Should Be Exempt From Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 9, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have long held the opinion that a State-owned nonprofit ferry system is a link between State highways similar to a bridge or a tunnel, and as such ferry tolls any more than tolls of a State-owned bridge or highway should not be subject to Federal transportation excise taxes.

The Washington State Toll Bridge Authority, which constructs and operates both toll bridges and ferries, held this same view in contrast to the claim of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. In this resulting dispute to allow for an orderly judicial determination, an agreement was arrived at whereby the State in 1957 increased its ferry system fares in the amount of the Federal tax and the amount of revenue accruing as a result was to be deposited in escrow. This fund contained originally 3 percent of property freight charges and 10 percent of fares of passengers. Subsequently, when Congress repealed the 3 percent tax on freight, I had hoped for a refund or some relief to the ferry users on account of the termination of the one transportation tax but the agreement provided for the taxes under the modified law to be held until final settlement.

So until final judgment the escrow of funds is continuing, but if the United States repeals or otherwise modifies existing laws so as to specifically exempt States from the 10 percent tax on passengers, the deposits, of course, would cease.

The funds on deposit collected from users of the Washington State ferry systems on property is $114,862.05; the amount which is regularly being added on account of possible tax liability from passenger transportation at the end of January 1959 was $239,060.97.

In the 85th Congress, 1st session, I introduced H.R. 2028 to amend the Internal Revenue Codes to make it clear that this tax on transportation of persons and property did not apply to ferry service provided by State-operated ferryboats. That was before the repeal of the tax on property. But other legislation took precedence and the Ways and Means Committee was unable to consider my bill.

Now I have introduced a new bill to exempt these State-operated ferryboats from the tax imposed by section 4261 on persons transported on a nonprofit basis by a State as defined in section 7701(a)(10) or by an agency or instrumentality thereof. The tax under my bill would cease on and after January 1, 1959.

I hope now the committee will take up this bill promptly. Meanwhile, let me make it clear that the passage of my bill would not admit any previous liability of the State. Rather its passage would clarify the State exemption which I believe already exists, and, of course, the excess fares which are being collected and placed in escrow would no longer be required.

The text of the bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 4263 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from tax on transportation of persons) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) STATE-OPERATED FERRYBOATS.—The tax imposed by section 4261 shall not apply to amounts paid for ferry service provided by a ferryboat operated on a nonprofit basis by a State (as defined in section 7701(a)(10)) or by an agency or instrumentality thereof."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to amounts paid on or after January 1, 1959, for transportation on or after that date.

## Fiftieth Anniversary of Mutual of Omaha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that in my district there is the headquarters of the world's largest health and accident insurance company, Mutual of Omaha. This firm has been a pioneer in the field of health insurance. It is because of firms such as Mutual of Omaha that literally millions of American families have been able to afford the tremendous costs of major hospitalization and the loss of income that all too often go with major illnesses or serious accidents.

Mutual of Omaha celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. I am pleased to called to the attention of my colleagues the fine record of this firm in serving the public for half a century, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement on the history of this company:

THE HISTORY OF MUTUAL OF OMAHA

On March 5, 1959, the largest company in the world specializing in health and accident insurance celebrates 50 years of service. This golden anniversary year sees the company as a record-setting leader in its field, while only 50 years ago, it was a small enterprise on the brink of seeming failure.

When the men who formed the company needed leadership, they called in an aggressive young medical student, Dr. C. C. Criss. He was earning his way through medical school by selling insurance. The other men listened to Dr. Criss but deemed his ideas too radical. They gave him the company—and its debts.

The dynamic leadership of Dr. Criss brought about an immediate change in the company. The previously limited policies were liberalized and the young doctor's ideas brought other men into the business. It has been said that the success of this now multi-million-dollar operation was based on Dr. Criss' ability to show young men how they could serve their fellow men through health and accident insurance.

Dr. Criss knew that men needed insurance to replace their incomes during time of disability. He know that people wanted and needed an insurance policy which would pay these income replacement benefits for a lifetime. He introduced his radical lifetime benefits policy to the public and Mutual owes much of its success to this idea. Even today, many of the firms in the field of health and accident insurance do not offer this essential benefit. Mutual is the only firm which offers lifetime benefits to a man who is a standard insurance risk.

Beside the doctor as he built Mutual of Omaha into a nationally famous firm were two people instrumental in many of the early decisions. They were his wife, Mrs. Mabel Criss, and his brother, Dr. Neil Criss. Mrs. Criss worked tirelessly at the side of the two brothers and from the very beginning accepted the responsibility of directing the operation of Mutual's home office. She is presently the company's director of personnel and planning. Dr. Neil Criss has also been with Mutual from the outset and is active to this day as medical director and treasurer.

Mutual's first office, a single room in an Omaha department store, was the beginning of an enterprise which is today housed in a modern home office containing over one-half million square feet of floor space. The staff, once composed of the two Drs. Criss and Mrs. Criss, is now composed of some 10,000 field representatives and 3,000 home office personnel.

Mutual was the first health and accident firm to employ an IBM 705 electronic data processing machine. This electronic brain remembers all policy information on 2 million of Mutual's policyholders and aids in even better service.

In the early times, Mutual sold policies only in Nebraska—then Iowa—and then the advanced ideas of Dr. Criss spread the fire of health and accident insurance across America at an unexcelled rate. Today, the company serves all of the United States, Canada, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico and portions of the West Indies.

Revolutionary has always been a routine word for Mutual, as it pioneered insurance plans which other companies failed to try until Mutual had led the way. It was revolutionary when mutual allowed policyowners to keep their policies without war clauses during World War II. It was unheard of when the company moved forward with an even stronger line of policies which paid disabled policyowners lifetime benefits.

Mutual also made insurance history by offering its low cost commercial air travel insurance to the passengers of the Military Air Transport Command. Through this program, Mutual now has foreign service facilities in 37 countries.

When the Government passed the Dependents' Medical Care Act in 1956, it was natural for the Defense Department to choose Mu-

tual to administer the program in a number of States because of the traditional low cost of the Company's clerical operation. In doing so, Mutual has proved that its average cost for handling these benefits to dependents of servicemen is most economical.

A guiding light in the growth of the company has been Mr. V. J. Skutt. When Dr. Criss retired as president in 1949, Mr. Skutt took the reins and continued in the tradition of his predecessor. Mr. Skutt has more than doubled the premium income of the firm since he attained this position—and he has emphasized many of the ideas on benefits to policyowners which Dr. Criss initiated.

Mr. Skutt's philosophy of business has been the key to company expansion: "We want to provide the maximum insurance coverage for the largest number of people possible at the lowest cost." It is this theory which has kept Mutual on the "grow" for the last 10 years—and it is this theory which is behind Mutual's policies.

Today, Mutual of Omaha has not only maintained its position as the largest company in the world of its kind, but it has also given the people of North America an immense amount of service in time of hardship. Each week, Mutual pays out an average of $2,250,000 in benefits to policyowners—people who would otherwise have to seek charity or public welfare assistance—or people whose homes might be broken by the financial hardship which accompanies disability.

Mutual of Omaha is a company whose history is based on service to millions—service in the form of prompt cash payments to sick and injured policyowners.

## Pay Something Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest throughout the country in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested, a very fine editorial which appeared on Monday, March 2, in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which include the Washington Daily News and the Fort Worth Press:

PAY SOMETHING OFF

At the close of business last Friday, the Government's debt stood at $285,495,075,863. This is approximately as high as it ever has been. On the same date last year it was $274 billion.

The debt is blamed on World War II, and most of it was incurred then. But at the end of the war it was only $269 billion and by 1948 it had been reduced to $252 billion.

How come it is so high now? Because the Government has continued to spend more than it took in. And because nobody has done anything about retiring the debt.

Now two young Texas Congressmen have a plan. They have introduced a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury, by law, to budget each year a 1-percent payoff on the debt.

The analysis worked out by JIM C. WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, and FRANK N. IKARD, of Wichita Falls, in support of their plan is astonishing, if you haven't thought of it before.

If the Government doesn't pay off any of the debt, in 28 years it will have laid out in interest an amount equal to the debt and will still owe every penny of it.

If it paid off only 1 percent a year, in 100 years the whole debt would be retired for $778 billion, principal and interest. But if it paid nothing on the principal for 100 years, the cost to the taxpayers in that time would be $980 billion and we would still owe the debt.

That is, our grandchildren, and great-grandchildren and great great-grandchildren, who had nothing to do with incurring the debt, would still owe it. It doesn't take a financial wizard to prove how ridiculous, and unconscionable, this would be. It's simple arithmetic.

Mr. WRIGHT says it will take some self-discipline to get started on this plan. Is that too much to ask of Washington? Unless we start now, he says, we'll never find a good time for paying off the debt.

"To expect some vague, future Utopia in which it will somehow be easy to reduce this obligation suddenly and dramatically," Mr. WRIGHT told the House, "would be to live in a fool's paradise."

Washington is living in it now.

## Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting and heartwarming tribute to Abraham Lincoln appeared in the Grays Harbor Post, of Aberdeen, Wash., February 12 of this year. Is was written by W. D. Fechter, retired Aberdeen postal employee and Lincoln student and admirer. Because of the beauty of its language and thought I place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Fechter's tribute to Lincoln follows:

When Lincoln was about 8 years of age, his mother, wearied, broken down with the struggle, gave up the struggle and as she lay on her dying bed she called little Abe to her bedside and said, "Abe, when you are a man, I hope you are able to sing." She was always interested in music, especially singing. Old Tom Lincoln, gruff and unsentimental, said, "Shucks, he'll never be able to sing. No Lincoln ever could learn to sing." "Well," said his mother, "if he can't sing, I hope he can make others sing." What a pity his mother did not live to realize her wish and hope. Lincoln never learned to sing, but when he struck the shackles from 3 million slaves, he made them sing. They sent up a chorus that was heard the world around. Lincoln reached the sublime in music when he said, "The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land will yet swell the chorus of the Union when touched again, as they surely will be by the better angels of our nature."

In Lincoln there was some quality that drew him to the people and kept them in tune with the music of his great humanity. He was proud of his humble birth. He often said, "I was born and have always remained in the most humble walks of life." He had no illusions of greatness. He knew that the river of time flows steadily on and that sooner or later the mightiest of the earth are swept out into the great sea of oblivion. He often recited the opening lines of his favorite poem:

"Oh, why should the spirit of mortal be proud,
Like the swift flying meteor, like a fast passing cloud,
Like a flash of lightning, like a break of a wave,
Man passes from life to death and the grave."

Many years ago, the then outstanding British statesman, David Lloyd George said of Lincoln, "In his lifetime he was a great American. He is one of the great figures of whom there are so few in history, who lose their nationality in death. They are no longer Greek, Hebrew, British, or American. They belong to the world."

George Washington was a great man, but Abraham Lincoln belongs to the common people in every land. Simplicity is greatness. He was meek, gentle, kind, and lowly and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world "This was a man." (Shakespeare). This might well be applied better to Abraham Lincoln than to any other man since the day 2,000 years ago when the meek and lowly Nazarene died on the Cross of Calvary.

"From humblest origin to loftiest estate,
He lives forever with the great.
Through all the ages yet to come,
His name will stand as one who
Served his God by serving men."

## The Late Pope Pius and His Efforts To Aid the Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 4, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the interesting story of how the late Pope Pius XII aided the Jews of Europe against nazism, and particularly during World War II, has recently become known to the world at large. At a time when Hitler's Nazi henchmen were conducting mass extermination and genocide of a whole people in the gas chambers at Auschwitz and other concentration camps, Pope Pius XII made a fervent plea that the Jews should be welcomed as friends.

Part of that story is depicted in an article "Pope Pius XII and the Jews," by Joseph L. Lichten, published in the October 1958 issue of the ADL Bulletin, a monthly publication of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The author, Dr. Lichten, is the director of the organization's foreign language department and is known as a specialist in international and ethnic affairs. I commend the article to the attention of all my colleagues:

POPE PIUS XII AND THE JEWS

(By Joseph L. Lichten)

On June 4, 1944, when the Allies entered Rome, the Jewish News Bulletin of the British Eighth Army spoke out:

"To the everlasting credit of the people of Rome, and the Roman Catholic Church, the lot of the Jews has been made easier by

their truly Christian offers of assistance and shelter. Even now, many still remain in places which opened their doors to hide them from the fate of deportation to certain death. • • • The full story of the help given to our people by the church cannot be told for obvious reasons, until after the war."

Today, 496 million Catholics all over the world, among them almost 35 million Americans, mourn the passing of their spiritual leader, Pope Pius XII. Representatives of other religions extend their profound sympathy to the Catholic world on its great loss. And today, almost 15 years later, much more can be told about Pope Pius XII and his efforts in behalf of Jews at critical moments in world history.

It is known today that Pius XII was, to a large extent, personally instrumental in organized action to help Jewish victims of nazism and fascism. He made clear his profound concern in many ways. After the liberation of Rome, while there was apprehension over the fate of Jewish prisoners in Nazi-Fascist hands in northern Italy and Germany, he made one of his most fervent pleas for brotherhood:

"For centuries the Jews have been most unjustly treated and despised. It is time they were treated with justice and humanity. God wills it and the church wills it. St. Paul tells us that the Jews are our brothers. Instead of being treated as strangers, they should be welcomed as friends."

Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli became Pontiff 6 months before the begining of World War II. For a long time he realized that the world was on the brink of the bloodiest war in history. The preservation of peace—"the fairest of all God's gifts"—was his driving concern. His temper and reactions were controlled by an acute, brilliant mind trained in the diplomatic service of the Vatican. It was a mind simultaneously active on several levels—diplomatic, humanitarian, charitable. During the early years of his reign he made very few solemn political declarations lest he contribute to the angers and dissension of the world. His interest was not war, but peace.

But his opposition to nazism and his efforts to help Jews in Europe were well known to the suffering world. Despite the fact that Cardinal Pacelli had spent 12 years in Germany as a papal nuncio and was instrumental in signing a concordat between Germany and the Vatican, both Hitler and Mussolini—through a violent press campaign—tried to prevent his election as new Pontiff.

The day after his election, the Berlin Morgenpost said: "The election of Cardinal Pacelli is not accepted with favor in Germany because he was always opposed to nazism and practically determined the policies of the Vatican under his predecessor."

After the war started, on March 11, 1940, Von Ribbentrop, after a formal request for an audience, was received by the Pope. The German Foreign Secretary went into a lengthy harangue on the invincibility of the Third Reich, the inevitability of a Nazi victory, and the futility of papal alinement with the enemies of the Fuehrer.

The Pope listened patiently and impassively to the very end of Von Ribbentrop's speech. Then he opened an enormous register on his desk and, in perfect German, began a recital of the catalogue of persecutions inflicted by the Third Reich upon individuals in Poland. He listed the date, place and precise details of each crime. The audience was terminated, the Pope's position clear.

Pius XII's humanitarian efforts to ease the lot of the Jews continued throughout the war. French, Dutch, Ukrainian bishops acted on behalf of Jews on instructions from the Pope. Their success or failure was determined, to a large extent, by the degree of cooperation received from the local population.

The Holy See established several offices devoted to rescue work among the victims of Nazis—including, of course, Jews. The Relief Commission and Commission for Help to Refugees were among them. The three letters—U.I.V. (Uffizio Informazioni Vaticano—Vatican Office of Information) are remembered by hundreds of thousands who first heard them in connection with news of relatives who had been missing, interned, or enslaved.

When the Fascist regime in Italy started to expel Jewish citizens from governmental and scientific positions, the Pope invited many of them to the Vatican. The president and two professors of the University of Rome and a famous geographer, all Jews ousted by the Fascists, received important positions in the Vatican City. Bernard Berenson received asylum in a villa near Florence, which belonged to the Minister of the Holy See to the Republic of San Marino. Under the flag of the Vatican's diplomatic immunity, he and his family lived there until British and American troops arrived in the late summer of 1944.

When Rabbi Herzog appealed to Pius XII from Jerusalem, the Pontiff answered that he would do "all in my power to end the persecution of the Jews."

Thousands of Jewish refugees poured into Vatican City; thousands of others sought shelter in the basilicas and other buildings of the Holy See outside the Vatican wall. No less than 15,000 were sheltered at Castel Gandolfo. The Pope sent by hand a letter to the bishops instructing them to lift the enclosure from convents and monasteries so that they could become refuges for the Jews. When the Nazis forbade ritual slaughter, the Pope sent shohetim into Vatican City to perform the ritual slaughter there and store food for Jews sheltered there. Throughout the city, priests and nuns often at great personal risk smuggled Jews to places of sanctuary in churches, monasteries, and other institutions. More than 180 places of refuge were made available in Rome and secret asylum given to more than 7,000 fugitive Jews.

As a result of these activities, often reported in the official press of the Holy See, the Fascists press even referred to the Osservatore Romano as a mouthpiece of the Jews.

At one point, Hitler threatened to enter Vatican City. The German Ambassador in Rome talked him out of it.

Once, the chief rabbi of Rome was summoned and told that he was expected to deliver to German authorities, by noon of the following day, 1 million lire and 100 pounds of gold. If he failed, the Nazis said, they would order the immediate dispersal of Jews, which meant atrocities and death. The Jewish community of Rome did not have 100 pounds of gold and the chief rabbi appealed for help to Pius XII. The Pope immediately instructed the Vatican treasurer to raise whatever amount was still needed. In less than a day, by melting down religious vessels, 100 pounds of gold were raised.

Italian Jews know how much they owed to Pius XII. A prominent Jewish citizen of Rome declared: "Our Catholic brothers have done more for us than we can ever do to repay." And another Jew, at a meeting of the National Committee of Liberation, said: "It was in the name of the frankest feeling of brotherhood that the church did its utmost to rescue our threatened people from destruction. The supreme ecclesiastical authorities and all those priests who suffered for us in imprisonment and in concentration camps have our eternal gratitude."

After the war, Pius XII addressed a group of European Jews who had come to the Vatican to thank him for his generosity on their behalf during their persecution." The Pope, obviously moved by the demonstration, told them that the church "could rise above all narrow and arbitrary limits created by human selfishness and racial passions."

## Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a timely and appropriate editorial which appeared in the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, on March 5, 1959:

REHABILITATION

Rehabilitation is a six syllable word which can mean so much to so many people. Among its other meanings it signifies a restoration on a proper basis or into a previous good state again, to restore, to reestablish.

In the course of a lifetime many a man and many a woman has wished that he or she might be restored to a proper basis or previous good state again.

At this moment of writing the National Rehabilitation Commission of the American Legion is holding its 36th annual conference in Washington, D.C., to discuss ways and means of reestablishing men and women who served in the Armed Forces in time of war to a proper basis, a basis to which they aspire but which they sometimes lose sight of in the cares and troubles of a life of maladjustment after their war service.

Some 700 or more representatives of the American Legion rehabilitation service are meeting in the Nation's Capital this week to discuss ways and means of furthering the rehabilitation of our war veterans to the end that they might once again take their place in our country's forward progress and to see that they are not left behind in the desire to achieve a reputable position in their community, State, and the Nation.

Except in the case of the purely selfish person whose motto is "Let the Devil take the hindmost," most of the decent American citizens are willing to lend a helping hand to their fellows along the rough highway.

Among this group of rightminded citizens we find a dedicated group. In this group we find the service officers of the American Legion, the field officers representing the national organization—all men who have devoted their lives to seeing that their more unfortunate comrades or the widows and orphans of other comrades receive their just dues from the country they served in time of war.

Some 32 years ago we were initiated in the objectives of the American Legion insofar as it concerned the welfare of veterans and their dependents. We were fortunate to have learned under the "Old Master," Watson B. Miller, who, despite his years, is still an interested in the conduct of the rehabilitation commission as he was when we first met him back in 1926.

In view of this early training we have learned the value of the service rendered by the Legion from the local service officer in the post to the department service officer and on to the excellent staff of workers in the national office of the rehabilitation commission where final argument is offered to further the cause of the interested veterans or their dependents.

Thirty-six years ago the National Rehabilitation Committee of the Legion in the Washington office was composed of approximately 10 or a dozen employees. Some of them are there yet, still working a behalf of their comrades.

Since that time the Legion has expanded its rehabilitation service to such an extent that when we attend a meeting of the group now we find ourselves lost in the maze of

new names and new faces but, despite the new names and new faces we find that same devotion to service as was evidenced when the Legion first decided to create an office to serve the veteran in his search for justice at the hands of the Government he served in war.

During this week, Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion, has presented the Legion's program for the welfare of war veterans and their dependents to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The text of this presentation appears on another page in this issue of the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes. It outlines the wishes of the American Legion as expressed in its mandates at the last annual convention of the organization.

It is only right that the national commander should offer the wishes of his organization to Congress. This is as it should be. He is expressing the aims of the Legion as they have arisen from the needs discovered by the men at the bottom of the ladder in Legion rehabilitation and passed on to the higher echelons which, in turn, have submitted these findings to a national convention which has found them worthy of support.

In considering this question of rehabilitation as it concerns veterans, we must realize that it stems, first, from the local community where an unknown service officer learns the problems of his comrades at first hand, studies them, presents them to the Veterans' Administration and, when he finds himself frustrated in his attempt to secure justice for the veteran, forwards the problem to a higher group who have the privilege of arguing the rights of the case before a higher tribunal of the VA.

Thus, the origin of the service carried on by the Rehabilitation Commission of the Legion must not be lost sight of because were it not for that unknown post officer the case might never reach the point where it can be considered in its entirety, with justice, and achieve its natural and successful conclusion.

In view of these thoughts, we wish the National Rehabilitation Commission of the Legion in its sessions this week all success. We know that because of the knowledge of the representatives attending the meetings, from the post service officer to the director of the commission, sensible recommendations will be made and offered for the removal of present obstacles in the path of final rehabilitation of the men and women to which the Legion has given its service for nearly 40 years.

## Article on Costa Rica Written by Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Post, of Frederick, Md., of February 24, 1959, announcing the new article by Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, on Costa Rica, now available at the Library of Congress and other leading libraries. Dr. Thorning is the pastor of historic St. Joseph's Church, Carrolltown Manor, Md., and honorary professor of international relations in the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution:

ARTICLE ON COSTA RICA WRITTEN BY DR. THORNING

WASHINGTON.—The Library of Congress and other leading libraries have received the second supplement of the Catholic Encyclopedia, including a new article on the Republic of Costa Rica by Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of historic St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., and honorary professor of international relations in the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution. Father Thorning, who is also associate editor of World Affairs, gives the facts about Costa Rica, often called a rural democracy, under eight heads: (1) Geography and climate; (2) the people; (3) commerce and industry; (4) history; (5) constitution and government; (6) international communications; (7) literature and music; and (8) religion.

Among other interesting facts, the author notes that coffee, now Costa Rica's principal source of wealth, was introduced into Central America by a parish priest, Padre Felix Velarde, in 1796. He adds that, as early as 1829, the "black grain of gold" had become the country's principal export.

Dr. Thorning observes that, in the past 100 years, the number of priests, relative to the needs of the people, did not increase: Whereas, in 1850, there was one clergyman for every 1,600 inhabitants; in 1958, there was one for every 5,200. The article concludes with a comprehensive record of the work of religious communities of both men and women.

## Independent State of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, on March 6, 1957, as an official representative of the United States Congress, I had the great privilege of witnessing the emergence of the Gold Coast of Africa into the independent State of Ghana. Today that occasion is being commemorated in the world as a triumph not only for the African people of this State, but for all men and women who believe in human freedom, individual dignity, and justice. In the 2 years since its independence, the State of Ghana has made significant economic, political, and social advances, despite the difficulties of its new statehood. It has evidenced a strong capacity for leadership in which the institutions of free and democratic government everywhere in the world have a vital stake. How great is this stake is made clear by the words of Prime Minister Nkrumah, of Ghana, who said recently:

The hopes and ambitions of the African peoples have been planted and brought to maturity by the impact from western civilization. The West has set the patterns of our hopes and by entering Africa in strength has forced the pattern upon us. Now comes our response.

The American people feel these ties and are personally gratified, therefore, by the progress which the State of Ghana has made under the banners of democracy and freedom. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, and of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I would like to extend congratulations to the State on Ghana on its second anniversary and on its progress and success. I am certain all of us share intimately the hopes of this people for a future that finds them an increasingly strong and free nation working among the family of nations for dignity, peace, and friendship among all mankind.

## Enforcement of Our Antismuggling Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, during the past dozen years or so since the end of World War II there has been a considerable increase in the illicit traffic in narcotics throughout the world, and we know that there is much smuggling of narcotic drugs into our country. We also know that the growth of juvenile delinquency in recent years is attributable in large measure to narcotic addiction among teenagers, who are driven to commit serious crimes in order to obtain funds to purchase these drugs.

In a report to the United Nations Economic and Social Council regarding its session in Geneva in May 1957, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs discusses the resolution it adopted concerning the illicit traffic in narcotics. The resolution states:

ILLICIT TRAFFIC

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs, noting that the volume of illicit traffic in narcotic drugs throughout the world is considerable and that there are indications of an increase in this traffic, considering the seriousness of the problem of this traffic in its different stages (production, transit, consumption), recalling that the Economic and Social Council has, on several occasions, requested Governments to give particular attention to the control of illicit traffic—

1. Urges governments to apply strictly the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolutions 159 II A (VII), 246 E (IX), 436 C (XIV) and 548 J (XVIII).

2. Again urges Governments to take appropriate measures to combat the illicit traffic, in particular by:

(a) Increasing their efforts to detect and suppress the illicit production and illicit manufacture of drugs, and strengthening the measures for apprehending traffickers.

(b) Imposing on persons convicted of narcotic offences very severe penalties in every country.

(c) Reviewing preventive measures for the purpose of satisfying themselves that the competent administrative bodies have the power everywhere to combat the illicit traffic.

(d) Arranging for the direct exchange of information with the authorities which in other countries are responsible for the control of the illicit traffic.

(e) Discharging fully the obligations placed on the states parties to the international narcotics treaties, in particular so far

as the communication of information relating to the illicit traffic is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the resolution speaks of the increased volume in the traffic of narcotics and the seriousness of the problem. It then urges appropriate measures to combat this illicit traffic and recommends five steps. I should like to call your attention to step (a) which advocates strengthening the measures for apprehending those who traffic in narcotics, and step (c) which calls for a review of preventive measures to ascertain that the competent administrative agencies have the power to combat this traffic.

Regarding the first of these steps referred to above, it is interesting to note that instead of strengthening the ranks of customs enforcement officers whose task it is to apprehend traffickers in narcotics, their ranks have actually been reduced to a point where we now have fewer officers in the Customs Enforcement Division since its establishment in 1909.

Furthermore, in order to make up budget deficits, it has recently become customary to close customs offices on Federal holidays and to give the enforcement officers time off. Smugglers are quick to take advantage of this situation which provides them with a safe period in which to carry on their operations. It should be realized that law enforcement should be carried on at all times. Crime does not take a holiday.

Not to be confused with customs agents or customs inspectors, the customs enforcement officers are the only armed personnel regularly assigned to our ports of entry and international airfields on a 24-hour basis in order to detect and apprehend anyone engaged in smuggling activities. Thus the customs service has sole responsibility to prevent smuggling and its enforcement officers constitute our first line of defense against smuggling. It is imperative, however, that this remain a 24-hour-per-day service if is to be effective.

As for the other step listed above, that is, a review of the preventive measures to give the agencies the power to combat the traffic in narcotics, it is quite obvious that at the present time the competent administrative bodies do not have such power everywhere to stop this traffic. In the same connection, it is interesting to reproduce the opinion expressed a little over a decade ago by the then Commissioner of Customs in a letter to our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, when a reduction in the Customs appropriation was considered. Mr. MCCORMACK inserted that letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1947, and from it I quote the following paragraph:

> Careful examination of the possibilities for meeting this situation (i.e. curtailment of activity) satisfied me that the only activity that can be discontinued without a substantial revision of statutory law is that directed toward the prevention of smuggling. While this is a clear statutory duty of the customs service, there is no statutory prescription as to how it shall be conducted and the effectiveness of our smuggling control has always depended upon the action of the Congress in furnishing funds.

This clearly shows that the extremely important work performed by the Customs Enforcement Division is not established by law. This was the time when the Customs Border Patrols were discontinued entirely and the Port Patrols were decimated to the point of ineffectiveness. The doorways of entry into our country remained wide open and practically unguarded. Narcotic control had ceased then, and soon thereafter we read in the newspapers of school children buying narcotics from peddlers and dopesters on our city streets.

It is absolutely necessary to expose the narcotics trade and the evil men who smuggle this poison into our country and force it into the inexperience hands of thrill-seeking youths. Narcotics are smuggled in by ship and plane, as well as across our borders, and then distributed to the dope traffic. If we can succeed in plugging up this evil trade and the corrosion of human lives, we will have solved much of this problem. Several years ago, Harry M. Durning, the collector of customs for the port of New York, stated that only one out of every five ships entering New York can be searched for smuggled narcotics because of the lack of sufficient personnel in the customs service. This situtaion has not improved since then, if anything it is worse today.

Congress must take effective action to suppress this vile trade by giving the Customs Service the means and the personnel for the proper enforcement of our antismuggling laws. In order to achieve this, I am introducing a bill to establish a Customs Enforcement Division in the Bureau of Customs in order to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws. The purpose of the bill is to make statutory the position of the Customs Enforcement Officer and the Enforcement Division under which he operates. This branch of Customs was originally created by Executive order of President Taft, but since 1947 its effectiveness in enforcing antismuggling laws has been seriously impaired due to budget deficiencies.

In addition to narcotic drugs, the bill also advocates the enforcement of laws relating to the prevention of clandestine introduction of biological, chemical or radiological weapons into the United States. This is a very important phase of our national security for which adequate means should be taken now to safeguard our Nation against future dangers. It should be done through specially trained enforcement officers, with special equipment and established at strategic locations.

The bill stresses that the Customs Enforcement Division is to be a major law enforcement body with adequate and most efficient means and facilities available, including radio-equipped motor vehicles, small watercraft and other equipment, for use in enforcement work in our harbors, airports and along the U.S. coasts. Enforcement officers shall be assigned to carry out their activities on a 24-hour basis, and they shall be empowered to make searches of all vessels, as well as make seizures and arrests in accordance with U.S. laws.

It should be noted also that in enforcing the antismuggling laws the customs enforcement officer renders other important public services. He helps safeguard the public health from diseases brought in by parrots, monkeys, and other animals used as pets. He helps protect our agriculture from destructive insects which accompany certain imported plants. He similarly helps protect the livestock industry from foreign animal diseases, such as rinderpest, foot-and-mouth disease, and so forth. Furthermore, he helps to apprehend stowaways who might be subversives, to intercept obsecene and seditious literature, and the enforcement of export-control and navigation laws.

Passage of this bill would once again tighten the cordon of men in our ports of entry and deal a formidable blow to the nefarious peddlers of narcotics. It would make the enforcement of the antismuggling laws a mandatory function of the Bureau of Customs. Our failure to pass this bill will result in continued violation of our laws, increase in crimes, and growing costs to the Nation and to the individual taxpayer. Hospital facilities would have to be increased to handle drug addicts, State and municipal police forces would have to be increased to cope with crimes and criminals, and the budgets of welfare agencies would have to be increased to aid victims and their families.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that parents, teachers, welfare workers, church leaders, civic organizations, and especially our young people, whose health, morale, careers, and their whole future life are at stake, will heartily support this legislation. For the sake of our Nation's future, Congress must safeguard our youth.

---

## A Tribute to Harry McGregor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Hubert Scudder, of California, voluntarily retired from Congress last year after 10 years of service in the House of Representatives. Throughout those 10 years he was a member of the House Public Works Committee and a close friend and associate of the late Hon. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio.

Mr. Scudder has written a short tribute to the worth and work of his friend, the Honorable HARRY MCGREGOR and asked me to have it inserted in the RECORD for him. I do so for him. Mr. Scudder's comments on Mr. MCGREGOR follow:

> Today, we pay homage to a man who long served his Government in both State and National affairs. HARRY MCGREGOR was not only a friend and a good companion, but a man who took a vital interest in the welfare of his country. He was a man of strong convictions and was not afraid to express him-

self for those things which he felt were right and for the continuation of our American way of life.

Too often we think only of today, but HARRY MCGREGOR thought of those who followed tomorrow and whether or not they would have a country such as we of this generation have been privileged to enjoy. His contribution to the highway program of this country will be a standing monument to his memory.

His sudden passing was a great shock and I desire to extend to his family my sympathy at their loss.

## Southerner Directs Attention to the Biggest Story in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a very wonderful editorial from the Mobile Press, of Mobile, Ala., of February 26, 1959. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that this great editorial is about one of the largest corporations in the world, an arm which reaches from one end of this Nation to the other—it reaches even beyond that—down to Venezuela, where this great company is bringing in thousands on thousands of tons of that rich iron ore to our port of Mobile, where they use the largest iron ore ships in the world, that bring in 60,000 tons at one time; I am referring to the great United States Steel Corp.

Recently the fabulous Tom Martin, chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co., had a group of people visiting us from all over this great land. This group was headed by the great Dr. Charles F. Kettering, the man who did so much good for all mankind. We made a trip from the mouth of Mobile River to our Alabama State Docks, and to the great paper mills and all the other industries there in the City of Mobile, including the Aluminum Ore Company, the International Paper Company, the Hollingsworth and Whitney Division of the Scott Paper Company, and how I wish we could have gone on a little farther and shown these men the largest rayon mill in the world up the river just a little farther, the great Courtaulds Company from England; and then just a mile or so farther on up this same great river, the Stauffer Chemical Company from France and other parts of the world; then on up the river a little bit farther at McIntosh, Alabama, we have three great chemical plants, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, a chemical kingdom—the great Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., have their big plant there located on the Southern Railroad, where they run their own barge lines all over this country from their special dock at McIntosh Bluff to their customers everywhere where they have the benefit of water transportation; then just a little farther up the river at McIntosh, we have the great Geigy Chemical Company. They get their chlorine from the Olin Mathieson Chemical Company; they have a double track railroad there, where they just switch cars from one company to the other. The Geigy Chemical Company are spending millions of dollars there on an expansion program. So we have all of these many industries there, and I wish everybody could have heard what this great Mr. Kettering had to say about the development there. He was telling Mr. Thomas W. Martin, Mr. J. L. Bedsole, Mr. Austill Pharr, and a group of us sitting at a table about our part of the South, with all of its great resources, not only natural resources, but human resources, and Tom Martin said this, among many other famous sayings; he said: "Surely, ladies and gentlemen, the last part of the 20th century belongs to the South." When anyone reads Art Wiebel's great statement which is published in part by a great newspaper, one of the oldest and best papers we have in the Nation, the Mobile Press Register, at Mobile, way down in our beloved Southland, well, it is time to look and listen. I wish everyone could read the facts which this great industrialist, Art Wiebel, has given to the world.

There are many other comments I could make on this subject, but I shall conclude my remarks at this time. I am very thankful for Art Wiebel; I am very thankful for everything he has said. May God bless him and his company, and here is hoping he will "keep on keeping on."

SOUTHERNER DIRECTS ATTENTION TO THE BIGGEST STORY IN DIXIE

Critical reports about the South from other parts of the Nation have obscured a much bigger and brighter story about Dixie, according to Arthur V. Wiebel, president of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Division, United States Steel Corp.

In a recent address before the National Society of Professional Engineers, Mr. Wiebel cited some interesting facts and then asked the visiting engineers from all sections of the Nation to take these facts home with them and help set the record straight.

The steel executive, a native southerner, said that the South's story of today is one of tremendous development.

"There is," he said, "a revolution going on in the South, but it has nothing to do with courts or Congress, laws, or legislation."

According to Mr. Wiebel this region is fast moving out of an agrarian blind alley toward a position of economic leadership to which its geography, its climate, and its natural resources entitle it.

"And that should rate a banner headline in any newspaper in the Nation," he said.

These are the important factors listed by Mr. Wiebel:

1. With one-quarter of the land area and one-quarter of the population of the 48 contiguous States, the South produces over half of the Nation's minerals.

2. This region has the Nation's greatest average rainfall as well as navigable waterways and mild climate. Alabama ranks second in the Nation in the miles of navigable waterways.

3. At the turn of the century, the South had 9 percent of the Nation's manufacturing facilities. Today it has 22 percent of American manufacturing plants.

4. Thirty-nine percent of American chemical manufacturing is now in the South and is still rising. The bulk of production of manmade fibers is in the South.

5. During World War II, approximately half of all American merchant ships of greater than 2,000 tons gross weight were built at southern shipyards.

6. The South has 40 percent of the Nation's forest area.

7. In the postwar decade from 1946 to 1956 factory employment in the Southeast rose 22 percent, as compared to 9 percent for the Nation as a whole.

Looking over the list above, we see that Mobile is particularly blessed since each of the factors named is directly linked with our city and this area of south Alabama.

Mr. Wiebel's words carry untold weight—this is not a voice crying in the wilderness. These are the words of an outstanding business executive who has grown up in and with the South.

In concluding his address, the speaker said:

"Tell your associates that under all the mountains of bombast and oratory there are cold hard facts and figures that reveal a South with which the world has not yet become familiar. And tell them for me that the conscientious, level-headed citizens of the South may one day hold the destiny of America in their hands."

And there the case rests. The facts are presented. The South is on the move to a bigger and better future.

We salute Mr. Wiebel for an excellent presentation of the facts.

## Encouraging Sign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest throughout the country in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested, a very fine editorial which appeared on Wednesday, March 4, in the Wall Street Journal:

ENCOURAGING SIGN

A pair of Texas Congressmen want to pass a law which would require an annual reduction of 1 percent in the Federal debt. If it were in effect now, for example, the $283 billion debt would have to be reduced by $2.8 billion this year.

The two Representatives are JAMES WRIGHT and FRANK IKARD, both Democrats. They declare the American people are ready for the self-discipline necessary to carry out such a program, though acknowledging it would require some sacrifices.

Plainly, the legislators take the long-range view. They base their argument on the idea the Nation can't go on indefinitely building up and maintaining an even higher debt.

"In 100 years," Mr. WRIGHT said, "we could completely retire the debt by paying $495 billion in interest and $283 billion of principal, a total of $778 billion. But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years would be $980 billion, and we will still owe the debt of $283 billion, or a total of $1.263 trillion."

Well, we would wonder about adopting a debt reduction plan based on a rigid annual cut; circumstances would vary. But the general idea is sound and a heartening indi-

cator that there are in Congress some Democrats who are willing to push the Nation's fiscal well-being even though most of them seem interested only in how much they can spend.

## Legal Control of Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING (REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK), FORMERLY RANKING MINORITY MEMBER ON THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS ON MARCH 5, 1959

The United States has made great scientific strides in the year and a half since Sputnik I began its historical orbit around the Earth. Within a few months we had our first satellite, Explorer I, circling the globe with an apogee of some 1,600 miles. This has been followed by about half a dozen other successful orbiters and two space probers which penetrated into space to distances of 71,300 and 63,580 miles, respectively. And just 2 days ago our first Sun rocket was successfully launched.

I am confident that within the next decade we shall place a man on Earth's own satellite—the Moon. Nothing should be spared to assure our eventual leadership in this new field of astronautics. A second-best position behind Russia in this space race could spell disaster for the whole free world.

Americans are fully aware of the scientific challenge with which we are confronted, and I have no doubt of this Nation's willingness to make whatever sacrifice is necessary to meet that challenge. But it would be a fatal mistake to approach the space era solely in terms of satellites and solar probes. While we must not slacken our great technological effort, it is of importance also that we develop an appropriate basis for meeting other vitally significant aspects of the space era.

I believe that there has not been enough emphasis on the necessity for adapting some of our earthbound concepts to the requirements of this new age. For that reason I am very gratified at this committee's initiative in centering attention in these hearings on one of the most pressing of all the new nonscientific problems raised by the space age—the need for new rules of law for the settlement of space controversies.

It may be, as many people claim, that it will be the scientists who will chart the future course of the world. Their spectacular achievements certainly have merited them unparalleled eminence. But the scientists cannot be counted upon or expected to keep our moral progress abreast of our scientific advances. This responsibility ultimately lies with the people, and they will properly expect their lawmakers to take the lead in proposing the new concepts and principles which are necessary. These hearings can serve a historic purpose if they result in even the most tentative first steps in the direction of devising a new legal code for the space age.

There are some who underestimate the serious consequences of any lag between legal and scientific developments. They recall with nostalgia the centuries required for the flowering of the common law, and fondly anticipate similar development of the new space law. I grant that law is shaped and nourished by experience—but I also insist that it is fundamentally based on necessity. The necessity for new laws and concepts in this case is overwhelming. There will be no time for legal craftsmanship and judicial speculation after rival claims are made to the moon or to space itself. Civilization has now reached a point at which a gap between our moral and technological tools could be fatal. The rule of law in the age of space is not a matter of philosophy, but a matter of survival.

The legal problem is not a new one. Down through the ages man has striven to attune his legal codes to progress in other fields. Constant change to insure maximum justice has been the hallmark of progressive and successful legal thought. History reveals that the physical sciences did not reach fruition until the proper moral climate had been achieved in civilized sectors of the world. This was brought about by the rise of mature religions and the promulgation and acceptance of legal standards by which man's conduct could be guided.

We have made some progress in dealing with this new dimension of our national existence, but much remains to be done. One of the important steps in the right direction was the enactment of legislation for a new National Astronautics and Space Agency. This legislation authorizes the agency to develop a comprehensive program of research and development in aeronautics and space science "and related matters."

I emphasize the phrase "and related matters"—which was added to the original bill by this committee. In my judgment these words were added among other reasons, to make it clear that the agency should consider the legal as well as scientific aspects of our space program. I hope that this committee will confirm my interpretation and reexpress the intention of Congress that the exploration and regulation of our interplanetary exploits must develop hand-in-hand.

I have also been very gratified by the proposals made by the United States to the United Nations for international cooperation in the exploration of outer space. This was concrete evidence of this Nation's determination to foster world peace and security. It revealed in a most dramatic and impressive manner our intention to do all we can to use the new discoveries from space exploration for the benefit of all mankind.

I have long advocated such a course by the United States. More than a year ago, I urged the following three-point program for international action: First, an immediate declaration that outer space was not subject to appropriation by any nation; second, an international agreement barring the use of outer space for any military purpose; and third, the creation or utilization of an international agency for the joint exploration of outer space.

Such a program is urgently needed to promote a universal dedication to the development of outer space for peaceful, scientific and humanitarian objectives.

We should all be gratified at the initiative taken by the United States to block the use of outer space for military purposes and to shower its benefits on all mankind. Our proposals in this field should have a profoundly favorable effect on world opinion. They are a most fitting response to the challenge of outer space by a nation dedicated to man's constant spiritual and material advancement.

These are the broad outlines of the Government's response to the nonscientific problems of outer space. I advocate two additional steps to complete our reorganization for the space age. First of all, I propose that there be established a Federal Department of Science and Research or its equivalent. Such a department could coordinate the efforts of agencies such as the NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Bureau of Standards. It would consolidate under one roof all fields of scientific endeavor in which our Government has an interest. This would facilitate the coordination of all these activities and guarantee cabinet-level consideration of the Government's overall undertakings in this field.

My second proposal is that there be established a Joint Congressional Committee on Outer Space modeled after the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. At present each House has its own separate committee on outer space. In addition, other committees in both Houses, such as the Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees, are continuing to exercise their jurisdiction over some of the problems in this area. This has meant that a great deal of valuable time of our top scientists and military experts is being spent on Capitol Hill instead of in the laboratories and on the proving grounds. While the testimony of these experts is, of course, essential to the work of Congress, the creation of a single joint committee would avoid duplication and greatly expedite matters.

These are problems primarily of Government organization. There are many, many more legal problems of direct practical concern. One of these is the question of who owns space—or even more fundamentally the problem of what is space. In "Coke on Littleton" we find the maxim: "To whomsoever the soil belongs, he owns also to the sky and to the depths. The owner of a piece of land owns everything above and below it to an indefinite extent." This maxim barely survived the age of aeronautics. It holds little promise for the age of astronautics.

In 1902, shortly after the Wright brothers' first flight, a convention was proposed under which the air would be free to commerce and travel just as is the sea. This proposal was rejected. During the First World War, each nation began to assert exclusive control of the airspace over its territory. After the war, the law of absolute sovereignty over airspace was formalized in the Paris Convention of 1919. This provided that "every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory." This principle has since been consistently adhered to in domestic legislation as well as in international treaties.

Significantly, the term "airspace" has never been defined in any of these treaties. Scientists have now established that there is no fixed separation between airspace and outer space. It is apparent that law and science will have to join forces in arriving at an acceptable definition of these terms.

Suppose one were to attempt to apply the principles of established international law by extending the boundaries of each nation into outer space. Because of the curved face of the earth, the extension would produce an inverted cone which would grow bigger and bigger in relation to the country as it reached farther into space. At some point these cones would overlap and more than one state would be occupying the same airspace. Moreover, the continuous movement of the earth on its axis means that the relationship of particular areas on the surface of the earth to space beyond the atmosphere would be constantly changing.

These solar facts illustrate the impossibility of applying existing concepts of international law to the control of outer space. In my opinion, space beyond the atmosphere must remain the common property of all the nations, or, what is the same thing, the property of no nation.

Another legal problem is determining the rights of nations to terrestrial bodies. Here again it is doubtful that the present earthbound rules of discovery and occupation are

suitable. I believe that only an early and firm assertion of international jurisdiction over such areas will avoid the kind of territorial conflicts in outer space which have plagued the earth for its entire history.

Looking ahead, it is apparent that we will also need new laws for the protection of persons, industries, and territories, from misguided missiles and plunging Pioneers. Rules will have to be devised with respect to liability for injury or damage from activities in outer space. What would you say as to the launching Nation's liability for damages if a satellite were to come crashing down on this room at this very moment?

I believe that an immediate start should be made in drafting a code for outer space which would cover such contingencies and numerous others. It could provide for such things as the filing of flight plans to prevent interstellar collisions and confusion; it could regulate spacecraft broadcast so as to avoid interference with present frequency allocations; it could set forth return-to-earth covenants, navigational guides, and the like. If we act in this field now, we can avoid the pitfalls which confront attempts to deal after the fact with comparable problems arising out of travel on the high seas and in the air and in the exploration of Antarctica.

Many legal scholars are pondering these problems. The American Bar Association has already organized a standing committee on space law. The International Astronautical Federation has become active in the field. Articles on the subject have been appearing in the legal periodicals. A report of the International Law Association deals extensively with these problems.

I have been very pleased to learn that these questions are being given serious consideration even by Soviet legal experts. A recent issue of a Russian legal periodical carried an article urging that no government be permitted to incorporate any portion of interplanetary space under its jurisdiction. The article suggests that a government's sovereignty over the space above its territory should be limited to a height sufficient to safeguard each nation from encroachments on its territory or from threats to its independence. In a more practical vein, the author urges that all satellites and other bodies sent into space be required to have identifying marks so that responsibility can be assigned for any damage caused by their falling back to earth. The article also recognizes the need for international agreement on assignment of radio frequencies for signaling apparatus sent into space. This is particularly interesting, since a complaint has been filed with the Federal Communications Commission protesting the Russian sputnik's use of radio frequencies in violation of international agreements for radio frequency allocation.

The official Russian line expressed by its representatives at the U.N. does not justify too much optimism about the adoption of needed international agreements for the legal control of space. Still we must not give up hope. A genuine international effort to define the rights of all nations in space is one of the world's compelling needs. Anarchy in space could be more dangerous than anarchy on earth. The United States should move ahead in this field with or without Soviet cooperation. If we succeed in promulgating a code which is reasonable and fair, world opinion might force its enactment as the law of the universe. Success in this effort, in the long run, may constitute our Nation's greatest contribution to the cause of peace and progress in this new era.

## Texans Would End Increase In Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest throughout the country in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here a very fine article written by the veteran Washington newsman, Bascom N. Timmons, as it appeared on Monday, March 2, in the Houston Chronicle.

I was particularly grateful for this article because of the mention it makes of the very substantial and much appreciated support this plan has been receiving from our extremely able new colleague, the Honorable BOB CASEY of Texas.

The article follows:

TEXANS WOULD END INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT

Two young members of Congress have come up with an idea of paying off the national debt.

That two Members of Congress out of 534 should bring forth a proposal that the Federal Government not only begin living within its income but also begin paying the bills of World War I and World War II is no reason to stop the presses and replate first pages of the country's newspapers.

The proposal has been received so calmly that no radio or television chain interrupted a popular program to give the country the glad tidings.

There are probably many Members of Congress who believe the country ought to start getting out of debt for two global wars, the Korean conflict, a continuing cold war, a depression which began in 1929 and a recession which began in 1957.

But the duo which proposes to do something about it are both young men of rock-jawed determination and their congressional connections are good.

They are both Texans, which is no disadvantage in the present congressional setup. In fact, Texans have exerted great influence in every Democratic administration beginning with that of Grover Cleveland.

Texans also have wielded strong congressional influence even in the Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Eisenhower Republican administrations.

Being Texans, the two young Representatives, JAMES C. WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, and FRANK N. IKARD, of Wichita Falls, are Democrats.

So is Representative BOB CASEY, of Houston, who made his first speech in the House in favor of the Wright-Ikard bill.

This also is encouraging, for it is the Democratic Party which is widely credited with harboring a thought that the Nation is in some sort of a fairyland where debts need never be paid.

WRIGHT, like IKARD, is a man of ability and on his way up in the House.

IKARD is a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee and one of his distinguished constituents at one time was Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson.

WRIGHT, like IKARD, is a man of ability and on his way up in the House.

Here is what WRIGHT and IKARD propose to do:

The national debt has reached the astronomical sum of $283 billion. On that debt the Nation is paying interest of $8,100 million yearly, and which, with increased interest rates, may soon go to $9,800 million a year.

WRIGHT, in a statement pointing out that "it is cheaper to pay than to owe," emphasized that if there is no reduction in the next 28 years we will have paid out in interest an amount equal to the debt without having reduced the debt itself by one penny.

So WRIGHT and IKARD propose that the Government live within its income and yearly earmark 1 percent of what the Nation owes for debt retirement.

That would not break any speed records in debt payment. It would, in fact, take 100 years to do it.

But no one can overestimate the psychological effect of a determined and systematic effort to pay off the Federal debt.

"One hundred years is, of course, a long time," said IKARD, "but the adoption of a definite plan for payment would be beginning, and now is the time that we should get started.

"During the past 4 years the debt ceiling has been increased four times, and only once since World War II has there been any debt reduction."

IKARD and WRIGHT have already introduced a joint resolution to accomplish the debt-paying plan.

Hearings on the subject will be scheduled by the Ways and Means Committee.

## National Milk Sanitation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which may be cited as the National Milk Sanitation Act. There has been considerable controversy here in Washington recently concerning the quality of milk, and I hope that my proposal will resolve some of this controversy. I believe it is time that we consider seriously the desirability of a national sanitary milk law.

The main objectives of my bill are to protect the public health and to eliminate the use of unnecessary or unreasonable sanitary regulations which burden interstate commerce. Such regulations, in some cases, eliminate the possibility of a competitive market in milk. This bill would establish uniform standards of quality for milk so that if milk produced in Iowa or anywhere in the country meets these standards it can be sold anywhere in the United States.

The quality yardstick for fluid milk moving in interstate commerce, which would be used under my bill, would be that single standard for high quality milk which has already been set up by the U.S. Public Health Service as the U.S. Milk Ordnance and Code. Designed as a model for the industry, the code is now

being followed in 15 States, 2 Territories, and 1,900 cities and counties.

Mr. Speaker, my bill does not require any State or municipality to adopt the code, nor does all milk shipped in interstate have to conform to the code. However, milk which does meet the requirements cannot be excluded from any fluid milk market in the United States, regardless of varying local health regulations. Dairy plant inspections would be certified by the U.S. Public Health Service. Milk from certified plants could not be kept out of any market on health grounds.

This bill provides many safeguards for areas receiving milk shipped from certified plants. Local health authorities would retain the right to inspect the milk upon arrival to make sure it had not deteriorated in transit. From there on, the handling, processing, and sale of the interstate milk would be required to meet the standards applied to milk entering the market from sources inside the State.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with Members on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress who have introduced similar bills which would protect the State and municipal health authorities' right to control the quality of milk shipped within their State, but which would at the same time go a long way toward eliminating the use of sanitation regulations as trade barriers against good, clean milk from other States.

## H.R. 2734

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an inequity in our Federal gasoline tax law which I believe should be corrected. To that end, I have introduced H.R. 2734, while H.R. 101, H.R. 1343, and H.R. 3196 are similar measures dealing with the same subject.

Under the present Federal gasoline tax law, the refiner pays the 3 cents per gallon tax to the Internal Revenue Service on the basis of sales and in turn obtains reimbursement for such tax by adding the amount on the invoice to the wholesaler or jobber.

The gasoline is then stored by the jobber usually in above ground storage tanks, awaiting subsequent sale and delivery to dealers or commercial consumers.

During the time of storage and wholesale delivery, normal evaporation and spillage losses take place amounting to more than 1 percent of the volume handled.

Inasmuch as the jobbers purchase the product with the Federal tax included in the price, there is no way to recover the tax represented by these evaporation and spillage losses.

Based on a 1-percent average loss of product, the tax loss alone amounts to $300 for every 1 million gallons of gasoline handled.

The refiner does not experience any such tax loss because he pays the tax to the Government on the basis of sales and not purchases.

The dealer also pays the Federal tax on his purchases, but such gasoline is stored by him in underground tanks, where there is little or no fluctuation in temperature sufficient to cause evaporation.

This bill now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee would change the definition of the word "producer" so as to include the jobber segment of the petroleum industry.

The jobber would then buy from the refiner, Federal tax free, and would in turn pay the tax to the Internal Revenue Service on the basis of his sales and not purchases, thereby saving him the tax loss on evaporated and spilled gasoline.

This would place the jobber on even terms with the refiner and enable him to complete on an equitable plane.

There is no opposition by any branch of the petroleum industry to the enactment of the amendments proposed in this bill. The only opposition comes from the Internal Revenue Service who resist the added number of taxpayers which would result.

It is undoubtedly true that a little more work and expense would be added to the governmental collection machinery, but it is small indeed, compared to the burden that has been borne by the jobbers for years.

The refiners are the first to admit that the present law has given them an unfair competitive edge over a segment of small business.

MICHIGAN SMALL BUSINESS PENALIZED TWOFOLD

The independent jobbers in Michigan suffer an additional blow, because of the manner in which the State sales tax law is interpreted in relation to the Federal gasoline tax. *Standard Oil Co. (Indiana) v. State Board of Tax Administration*, 283 Michigan 85, held that Standard Oil Co. in making a sale to a commercial consumer could compute the State sales tax on the selling price of gasoline less the Federal gasoline tax. The legal theory which prompted such a holding was on the basis that the Federal gasoline tax attaches at the time of the first sale, and since the sale in question was from Standard Oil Co., a refiner, to a commercial consumer, that the Federal gas tax and the State sales tax attached at the same time; therefore, the sales tax should be computed on the net price of the product, not including the Federal gas tax.

In the converse, however, if a jobber makes a sale to a commercial consumer, he must compute the sale tax on the price of the product including the Federal tax, because by the time the gasoline reached the jobber, the Federal tax had become an integral part of the purchase price of the product to that jobber. As a result a sale from a jobber to a commercial consumer would carry a sales tax based on the gross price of the product.

This means that under the present Federal gasoline tax law, on sales made from a jobber to a commercial consumer, that the sales tax is approximately one-tenth cent more per gallon, than on a sale from a major refiner to a commercial consumer.

In order to remain competitive, therefore, a jobber would have to absorb the additional sales tax in order to retain a customer.

The bills under question would remove both of the foregoing inequities.

## Importance of the National Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Teddy and Northern Montana," which was published last fall in the Glasgow (Mont.) Courier.

The editorial points out how President Theodore Roosevelt, who started the national reclamation program, exerted vigorous leadership toward the development of Montana's natural resources.

It is interesting, but depressing, to compare Theodore Roosevelt's energetic leadership in this field with the lack of leadership of the present administration.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix two articles appearing in the March 1958 issue of the National Union Farmer. The articles are entitled "Reclamation Pays for Itself," and "Reclamation Crops Keep United States Healthly—And Do Not Add to Our Surpluses."

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Glasgow (Mont.) Courier]

TEDDY AND NORTHERN MONTANA

Press and other media have been full of comments about a coming date, October 7, which is the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Theodore Roosevelt.

A positive man, physically fearless, Teddy Roosevelt goes down in history as one of the most colorful and effective leaders of our Nation. It is perhaps less well known that he had a considerable interest in Montana and some effect on its development and history.

The story has been told many times how, as a stockman on the Little Missouri when living just over the border in North Dakota, he participated in the organization of the Montana Stock Growers Association at Miles City.

Perhaps less well known is the story of his connection with the late John Willis of Glasgow, told in "Roosevelt in the Rough," which Willis related to Horace Smith, a former Butte newspaperman. The book was published in 1931 before Jack Willis' death. Oldtimers here will recall the Jack Willis ranch on Hell Creek along the Missouri.

The story begins in 1886 when Willis was living in Thompson Falls. Willis was a

commercial hunter. Roosevelt, then at Medora, N. Dak., had come across the mounted specimen of a rare antelope goat Willis had shot. He found the name of the hunter and wrote him that he wanted to hunt with him and shoot one of the rare animals.

Willis' brief reply to the future President was: "If you can't shoot any better than you can write, No."

Undeterred, Roosevelt went to Thompson Falls, and finally persuaded Willis to guide him on a hunting trip. From this developed a friendship and many more trips.

Roosevelt visited Willis in Montana and, when Teddy became President, Willis was several times at the White House, although he never was comfortable in the official atmosphere of Washington.

Although of opposite political persuasions, the two men got on well throughout a lifetime. This paid off for the hi-line in 1905 when Willis was selected with a Mr. Bingham of Havre and a Mr. Frank of Harlem to go to Washington to push for action on the Milk River irrigation project, as Willis says, "the first important work undertaken by the Government under the reclamation policy inaugurated by Roosevelt immediately after he moved into the White House."

Delegations had been getting nowhere with the Secretary of the Interior, and engineers had been delaying their findings on the proposed project. The upshot of the visit was Roosevelt's letter to Jack Willis, in which he said, in part:

"I have asked the Reclamation Bureau to take immediate action in the whole Milk River matter, and have authorized them to do what I have done in no other case—that is, go ahead with the scheme now before them." Work soon started.

So comes an interesting sidelight in history. There are many other delightful stories in the book, one of a banquet for Teddy in Butte when then warring copper factions were gathered around the table in armed truce.

This year, as we honor Teddy Roosevelt, it is well to remember his interest in Montana and his many acts that helped develop it.

---

[From the National Union Farmer, March 1958]

RECLAMATION PAYS FOR ITSELF—CUTBACKS AND NO NEW STARTS THREATEN TO STOP RECLAMATION'S 55-YEAR RECORD OF MAKING WEALTH DESPITE THE $21 BILLION ADDED TO U.S. INCOME

(By Roscoe Fleming)

What was once dry and unproductive western wilderness, now redeemed by reclamation, has generated $3.2 billion in income taxes for Uncle Sam's Treasury since 1940 alone.

In other words the Federal reclamation program has more than paid for itself—in addition to all other benefits it has brought the Nation—solely by the taxes turned into the Treasury from the prosperous farmsteads and blooming cities it has made possible.

The figures: Cost of the reclamation program, 1902–1957 inclusive, about $3 billion. Extra tax revenue since 1940 alone, about $3.2 billion.

This fact is particularly biting since the present national administration is now trying to hold down reclamation and plans no new projects this year in order to spend more money on defense.

Yet, at the current rate, what the Nation spends on arms in 1 week would finance reclamation for 4 years. To put it another way, 1 year's defense spending would finance 200 years of reclamation at the 1958 rate.

Further, in addition to contributing to the national strength needed to carry on wars hot or cold, reclamation literally almost rescued the Nation during World War II when the mighty generators of the Grand Coulee Dam were just coming on the line, and furnished the only possible source of quick power for much of the atomics program.

Such powerplants more than support themselves, and part of their profits go to help pay for the irrigation projects. And they attract industries, which build blooming new communities to use up the farm products. All this is good both for the region and the Nation.

UNITED STATES GAINS 7.7 MILLION ACRES

Recently the 55-year-old reclamation story has been freshly told in figures. Through 1957:

The Bureau of Reclamation has built or rebuilt facilities to furnish a whole or partial water supply to 7.7 million acres of tillable land. This translates into a land base for 125,000 farm families, and an additional 125,000 part-time farming suburban units.

Crop production from 77 projects in the 17 Western States now totals almost a billion dollars yearly, for a total of $13.5 billion during reclamation history. Yet almost none of this is of products now called surplus.

Net revenues to the Government from 41 powerplants under supervision of the Bureau of Reclamation totaled $41.5 million in 1957—after all expenses. Net revenue from all such plants during the life of reclamation total $359 million. Net for next 50 years from existing plants is estimated at more than $2 billion.

Payments to the U.S. Treasury for irrigation and city water supplies have so far totaled $130 billion, and such payments during the next 50 years from existing projects are estimated at $825 million.

FARM INCOME MULTIPLIED

Thus the net direct repayment to the taxpayer for the first 100 years of reclamation will be about $3.3 billion of which nearly $500 million has already been repaid. This is at the present level. If reclamation grows, so will the payments.

Income to reclamation-project farmers and workers totaled $666 million in 1956, for a cumulative 50-year total of $8.6 billion.

Income to the people of nonfarm urban areas created by reclamation totaled $952 million in 1956, and for the life of reclamation have totaled $12 billion.

Thus the total gross addition to national income from reclamation is estimated at nearly $21 billion.

This figure does not include the by-product income from fishing, boating and other recreation at reclamation reservoirs, estimated at $50 million annually. Such reservoirs are among the most popular resorts anywhere, and millions of people visit them yearly.

Billions of dollars worth of fresh specialty foods have been shipped to points all over the United States from reclamation projects to supplement healthy diets when the Midwest and East are snowbound.

The value of plant, property and equipment of all reclamation projects owned by you and me totals approximately $3 billion. This is based on original cost. At today's prices the value would be nearly doubled; and the cost, as shown, has been partly repaid.

Reclamation appropriations for construction, however, average only about one-fourth of 1 percent of the national budget—or one-fourth of 1 cent out of each dollar of national appropriation yearly.

These appropriations are among the best investments the people of the United States ever made, helping to keep our economy healthy and supplying the mighty muscles called upon in time of war. Yet reclamation is currently under fire as a luxury sort of enterprise that must be cut down to permit more spending elsewhere.

---

RECLAMATION CROPS KEEP UNITED STATES HEALTHY—AND DO NOT ADD TO OUR SURPLUSES

Theodore Roosevelt, whose powerful support of it as President started national reclamation, underestimated its benefits in one respect.

In an otherwise farseeing forecast of what it would do for the Nation, he foresaw reclamation as supplying food largely to nearby cities. But the advances of technology, particularly in the refrigeration art, make it possible for Americans everywhere to enjoy fresh vitamins from reclamation acres for several months each year.

Take just one such development, the so-called vacuum tubes that now can deliver virtually farm-fresh lettuce anywhere in the United States.

These tubes are actually big vacuum chambers. The fresh, washed lettuce is packed into crates and placed in these chambers which are then partly evacuated. This causes rapid evaporation, and evaporation means chill; the temperature goes down to just above freezing.

Three or four days later, housewives in New York or Chicago or anywhere in the winter zone are buying lettuce that appears as if it had been cut the day before and rushed to market.

The lettuce farmer in California's Central Valley or Arizona's Valley of the Sun gets an average of 5.5 cents per head of lettuce.

Shipping and other costs bring the wholesale price at New York City to 14 cents. But the New York housewife pays 29 cents. The extra 15 cents, or more than half the cost to her, is run up through chaotic, profiteering distribution in New York's produce jungles.

Western reclamation adds almost nothing to farm surpluses, though this charge is often made against it in the East. Instead, it supplies the Nation with fresh vitamins and calories when they are obtainable nowhere else.

In a recent talk before the Society of American Agricultural Engineers, Gov. George D. Clyde of Utah showed that 87 percent of the alleged surplus is in four farm commodities:

Wheat, 30 percent; corn, 29 percent; cotton, 20 percent; tobacco, 8 percent. Very little wheat (2 percent) is grown on reclamation projects, and very little corn (7 percent). Some cotton is grown, but it is not of the upland short-staple type which is in surplus. Instead, reclamation-acreage cotton is of the long-staple, Egyptian type, which is in heavy demand and far from being surplus. No tobacco is grown on reclamation projects.

Added Governor Clyde: "Crops grown extensively on reclamation lands are fruits and vegetables, alfalfa as a food for livestock, forage crops, sugar beets, and various specialty crops that make important contributions to the high-standard American diet and are vital to the health of the Nation.

"These crops are not surplus. It is the irrigated Southwest—and without irrigation there would be no farming in the arid Southwest—that gives America a large part of its fresh fruits and vegetables in wintertime. These crops do not compete with production in other parts of the Nation."

The winter of 1957–58 demonstrates what the Governor meant. With Florida and Gulf coast production virtually destroyed, America got its vitamins from fresh products grown on irrigated acres.

---

## Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, our new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Flemming, has developed the

Flemming formula to solve the classroom shortage.

He has discovered that if the States will repeal their statutory debt limits, amend their constitutions and cooperate by making other fundamental changes in their basic laws that the States and local school districts can raise more money for school construction. This discovery can have results in other educational fields beyond actual school construction.

The application of the Flemming formula to basketball would permit Ohio Wesleyan, the college of which Flemming was formerly president, to announce that it was going to win every game next season and set alltime records—an alltime high in scoring by Ohio Wesleyan and an alltime low in points scored on Ohio Wesleyan.

Under the Flemming formula, two midgets would be added to the Ohio Wesleyan team, one perched on each basket. The midget on the Ohio Wesleyan basket would deflect shots by the opposition. The midget on the opponents' basket would catch a ball fired by an Ohio Wesleyan player and drop it through the net.

Now this would require a change in the rules. Instead of limiting the number of players on a team, the limitation would be their total height. To do so would require a change in the rules of basketball and consent from the other teams, in addition to perfecting a side-saddle perch for the midgets. But those are minor problems for a man who claims he can solve the school construction shortage if only the States will change their constitutional or statutory debt limitations, and their basic tax concepts.

## Famous Women Inspiration to New Generation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, editor of the American Friends of Slovak Freedom, which appeared in the Bethlehem (Pa.) Bulletin of February 6, 1959:

FAMOUS WOMEN INSPIRATION TO NEW GENERATION

(By John C. Sciranka)

With the new year many American women took over important public offices. For instance in New York State, new Governor Nelson Rockefeller appointed a woman secretary of state. In Pennsylvania, new Governor David Lawrence, appointed a woman judge of Pittsburgh, new attorney general.

We find women in many important posts to which we point with pride.

However, women played important roles centuries ago in various countries. I mention for instance Czechoslovakia where the women ruled almost since the founding of the state. We learn from history and Czech legends that when father Krok led the first Czechs to their present land of milk and honey as the historians call Bohemia, one of his three wise daughters—Libuse—the youngest, ruled the nation after her father's death and ruled it wisely. She is credited with founding of the historical city of Prague.

The first Christian ruler of Bohemia was Ludmila, a princess of the Premysl dynasty, who was the grandmother of the good King Wenceslaus (King Vaclav after whom the famous Vaclavske namesite (square) is named in the capital of the country). Ludmila spread Christianity and was beatified. The women championed and won their places as teachers in even higher schools almost a century ago. The Women's Club was formed in Prague way back in 1903 even against the rules of Austria. Bozena Vikova-Kuneticka, well known authoress was the first woman to be elected to the Viennese Parliament in 1912 being thus the first woman in Europe to be so honored. Here in America, the Moravian Sisters of Bethlehem, Pa., established the first schools of higher learning for girls.

However, the Slovak women in America had it much easier for the first women's organization the Zivena (Goddess of Life) was founded in New York City in 1891. The First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union was founded in 1892. The women took part in Sokol activities, both Czech and Slovak for the past 80 years in America. It is remarkable that the Sokol organization is active in America since 1863. Their official organ "American Sokol" is observing its 80 anniversary. Women always played important parts in this movement, so it is nothing new that they are making steady progress; receiving deserved recognition in political, as well as business and scientific world.

## New Legislation To Bring Relief to the Fishing Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for reasons which are pretty generally known, fishermen and the fishing industry have been suffering from cheap foreign imports. Tariff relief under regular procedure which should have been available to the New England industry, for example, was denied because of factors of foreign policy relating to national security. That is not an easy obstacle to overcome.

One of the great problems of fishermen is an item of expense arising from the cost of insurance which runs into hundreds of dollars for each boat. As I understand it, the high claims and experience of losses cause the insurance underwriters to continually increase their rates.

There have been various suggestions as to ways in which the Federal Government might help. One of these has been to underwrite a portion of these insurance premiums, but knowing and sharing the prejudice against special subsidies, I have come up with a proposal which might indirectly contribute toward a solution by means of greatly reducing insurance costs.

The idea has been incorporated in a bill which I introduced today. This measure would extend medical, surgical, and dental treatment in hospitals and stations of the Public Health Service without charge to seamen on American-owned U.S. flag vesels in excess of 20 feet in length regularly engaged in fishing in international waters.

This medical care and hospitalization is available, of course, to our sailors and seamen in larger oceangoing boats. My bill would simply extend this service and by the saving to insurance companies through lesser number of claims result in a reduction in premium rates.

Here is a means of assisting the entire fishing industry. As I see it, all fishermen, Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast, would benefit by my bill. Accordingly, I offer it for consideration with the hope it might invite united support from the fishing industry and thus encourage the Congress to give it utmost consideration.

## A Mile High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I hope that Congress can soon stop trying to escape the agricultural dilemma by attacking Secretary Benson. We must rectify the existing farm program with courage and honesty. I commend to the attention of the Congress the following editorial in the Wall Street Journal of March 5:

A MILE HIGH

"If we don't stop Secretary Benson's policies," said Chairman WHITTEN of a House appropriations subcommittee, "the (farm) mess will get as high as Pike's Peak. * * * Many farmers will be out of business, and the Treasury will be bankrupt."

We concur—with the important exception that the mess isn't due to Mr. Benson's policies. It's thanks to the congressional farm bloc which has fought so hard to maintain the whole weird rigmarole of parity and high price supports. This program spurs the excess production that makes the huge surpluses that bulge both the Federal warehouses and the taxpayers' troubles. Mr. Benson has been trying to put farming on a rational basis, but the farm bloc has gone along slowly and grudgingly when at all.

As the Secretary himself answered Mr. WHITTEN: "If our opponents in the Congress had shown as much vigor over the past few years in making needed overdue changes in the old legislation as some of them have in attacking the Secretary of Agriculture, we would together be doing a better job for agriculture and the Nation."

The trouble, Mr. Benson noted on another occasion, is the legal—that is, congressional—requirement that the Federal Government support a few crops at unrealistic levels. Of those few, the worst is currently wheat. "If you combine wheat, corn, and cotton," the Secretary said, "you have represented 85 percent of the Government inventory of price-supported commodities. But these three crops produce only 20 percent of total cash farm income."

And he went on: "To me, the answer to this problem suggests itself in letters of fire a mile high: Eliminate as rapidly as practicable ineffective controls and use price supports at levels that will preserve and build markets."

Will those letters have to be burned into a mess as high as Pike's Peak before the farm bloc learns to read them?

## Origin of the Berlin Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS J. LANE**
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, which résumés the present Berlin situation with a reminder of our blunders and lack of foresight over the years concerning a very important matter:

ORIGIN OF THE BERLIN MESS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

Berlin is so much in the news, and in our thoughts, that several people have suggested it would be of interest to recall how we got into this mess.

Accordingly, my desk looks as if someone had raided an attic. Its usual calm disorder is buried under a mass of clippings from the New York Journal-American memoranda from our Washington Bureau, such books as Dwight D. Eisenhower's "Crusade in Europe" and Field Marshal Montgomery's "Memoirs," interpretive pieces from the New York Times and scribbled personal reminders.

It has been worthwhile, if only as a refresher course for this column. A review of the blunders and misjudgments of the past can be valuable if it is used for an understanding of the present and a guide for the future, and not to needlessly revive old controversies. The latter is not the intention here.

The conclusion from any thoughtful study of the antecedents of the Berlin crisis is that we have been babes in the woods in our diplomatic-political dealings with the Russians.

Fortunately, due largely to Secretary Dulles, that is not so today. But it is easy to see how the epigram came about that we win every war and lose every conference.

The big mistake, which planted the seeds of the present crisis, was made toward the end of the European phase of World War II. It was the failure, apparently shared by both our military and political leaders, to recognize the tremendous psychological importance of Berlin.

It is impossible to determine, unless the information is in secret archives, exactly where, when, why, and how the decision was made to hold back our troops from Berlin.

But what we do know clearly indicates a lack of coordination of military and political objectives, and a trust in our Russian allies that in the light of today's backward look, was incredibly naive.

For example—and this sounds like something out of "Alice in Wonderland"—we neglected or did not feel it necessary to reduce to writing the agreement with the Russians to guarantee our rights of access to Berlin. An oral arrangement was all we had to go on until after the bitter lesson of the Berlin blockade of 1948–49.

In the closing days of the war in 1945 both Gen. George C. Marshall, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General Eisenhower were single-mindedly concerned with ending it as quickly as possible.

As military men, that was their duty, and for that reason they considered Berlin of minor importance. Thus Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., had been deterred from what Gen Charles de Gaulle later characterized as his irresistible march as far as Berlin. And General Eisenhower, evidently on the instructions or with the approval of General Marshall, declined to support Prime Minister Churchill's plan to unleash Marshal Montgomery, with American assistance, in a drive to Berlin.

In "Crusade in Europe" General Eisenhower candidly writes:

"It (Berlin) was politically and psychologically important. I decided, however, it was not the logical or the most desirable objective for the forces of the Western Allies. The general plan was presented to Generalissimo Stalin.

"However, we quickly found that Prime Minister Churchill seriously objected to my action * * * he held that, because the campaign was now approaching its end, troop maneuvers had acquired a political significance that demanded the intervention of political leaders in the development of broad operational plans. He apparently believed that my message to the Generalissimo (Stalin) had exceeded my authority to communicate with Moscow on purely military matters."

As to the correctness of Mr. Churchill's views, there is this excerpt from Gen. Omar N. Bradley's book, "A Soldier's Story":

"We were less concerned with postwar political alinements than destruction of what remained of the German Army. As soldiers we looked naively on this British inclination to complicate the war with political foresight and nonmilitary objectives."

Naive as our soldiers were, this could not have been a purely military decision made in a political vacuum. The mystery is where the big OK came from. The gravely ailing President Roosevelt died April 12, 1945, and Germany surrendered May 8.

I do not pretend to be an international private eye in such complexities as diplomacy, but prior political events lend strength to the speculation that the decision was reached sometime before the dates above, or at least was an outgrowth of those developments.

In 1944 the European Advisory Commission, consisting of representatives of the United States, Britain, and Russia, met several times in London to discuss the future of postwar Germany. Our State Department recommended three zones of occupation (France was included later at Yalta) be drawn so that each would be in contact with Berlin like slices of a pie.

For reasons, if any, that are completely baffling, the War Department, then headed by Secretary Henry L. Stimson, rejected the idea. The War Department also objected to a British proposal for a corridor to Berlin from the western zones on the grounds that it was a military matter to be settled by military authorities.

This is not only completely baffling. It is completely idiotic. The result was that while agreement was reached on occupation zones in Germany and also in Berlin (later confirmed, after slight changes had been made, at Yalta)—no provision at all was made for access to Berlin.

It was not until June 1945 that this vital matter was taken up in consultations among Gen. Lucius D. Clay, our deputy commander in Europe, Lt. Gen. Sir Ronald Weeks, and Marshal Zhukov.

The upshot was an oral arrangement—a handclasp, in effect—for supply corridors to Berlin.

This situation existed until after the Russian blockade of Berlin was broken by the Allied airlift in 1949. In May of that year a meeting of the foreign ministers of the four powers was held in Paris. They agreed that each in its Berlin zone would have an obligation to take the measures necessary to insure the formal functioning and utilization of rail, water, and road transport.

So we got something in writing at last. But as Hanson W. Baldwin, military writer of the New York Times, has pointed out, there was still no specific written delineation of the military corridors to Berlin.

These, briefly, are some of the mistakes—of lack of military-political coordination, of misplaced good will, of judgment, or misplaced trust—that have led to our present predicament.

I do not cite them as reason for dismay but as a challenge to unity of purpose and a determination not to make them again.

The May 27 deadline announced by Krushchev for getting our garrison out of Berlin and dealing with puppet East Germany for right of access, is not far away.

Some of our Senators are calling for what amounts to outright mobilization to meet the threat. It seems to me at this time that it is too dramatic and overt a move.

I believe Congress should vote a strong bipartisan resolution supporting fully the administration's stand on Berlin; that our military men should go quietly about making sure our powder is dry, and that the American people should be trusted by our leaders to face up to the facts, which they will.

The one miscalculation that we have the power to prevent the Russians from making—right now—is that we are divided in purpose.

## Debt Reduction and Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. BRUCE ALGER**
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 2, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned over our apparent unwillingness in Congress to play fair with generations of Americans yet unborn, February 25 was a red-letter day for me. I do not know when I have been more heartened or encouraged than I was on hearing two Texas colleagues come out squarely, not only for a balanced budget, but for a sensible start toward paying off our debt—toward lifting the staggering mortgage we have all too heedlessly placed upon our children's futures.

Though the plan specifically advanced the other day involves no new idea, as its sponsors freely concede, I truly believe the Wright-Ikard resolution points the way to solvency. Of course, pointing—just pointing—is really pretty pointless, unless one is willing to travel in the direction pointed. In government, as in each of our households, there is little difficulty in formulating a balanced budget. The trick lies in liv-

ing up to one—in showing enough fortitude to say "no" to our own wants and desires until such time as a family or a government is living on its income.

We are fortunate that, unlike many of the problems confronting Congress, this one is entirely uncomplicated; even a schoolboy knows that he cannot regularly spend more than he regularly takes in without facing bankruptcy. He knows, too, that incessant borrowing to meet regular current expenses will only beget the need for heavier borrowing to meet interest costs, and will ultimately destroy his credit, and with it, himself.

I am perfectly confident that the Wright-Ikard resolution will be roundly endorsed by those of us who have tried consistently, over the years, to tighten our governmental belt to the point of solvency. What encourages me mightily is the fact that, judging by the speeches made here the other day, the resolution will apparently command the support of a good many others, as well, some of whom have, to say the least, not acquired any reputation as nickel-nursers during their political careers. That strong support for fiscal responsibility should develop, and that it should spring from some of the quarters where it appears to be developing, is indeed most heartening.

But while this resolution, as I said, points the way, let us not kid the public about what it can actually accomplish. Any proposed budget whether submitted by a Republican or a Democratic administration, can be only a list of projected expenditures measured against an estimate of anticipated income. No administration can stipulate the amount of money to be expended nor can it determine in any way the amount of the Government's income. Only Congress can appropriate money, and even Congress can only estimate the anticipated revenues from taxes imposed by the Congress. Just as in our households, all the "budgeteering" any administration may do, and all our directions to a Treasury Secretary to include a sum for debt retirement in his anticipated expeses, will not mean a thing in the world unless we here in Congress show the fortitude and determination to live within our governmental income. We can neither wish nor legislate away the obligations we have already contracted, nor can we simply direct a Treasury Secretary to do something about it if we ourselves fail to show a self-discipline to match our heralded good intentions.

As a gentleman from Wisconsin so aptly put it the other day, "all new recruits to the economy block" are certainly to be welcomed with open arms by an encouraged minority and a grateful Nation; and surely no one would be so mean as to suspect that any member's votes might not jibe with his avowals. However, I can not help but recall a Democratic leader's recent admonition about setting a coyote to guard the herd of sheep. Well, our Federal expenditures are based on votes, not speeches; and after a series of sheep killings, most of us would tend to judge a dog's trustworthiness, not by the wag in his tail, but by the wool in his teeth.

## Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from the State of Maine, OLIVER, and myself, a statement regarding the unemployment situation in Maine, and its implications regarding proposals for legislation to improve the unemployment compensation program.

The continuing unemployment crisis, with its attendant human suffering, waste of productive capacity, and demoralization of workers and their families, demands early action by the Congress. There is a danger of becoming callous to the needs of the millions of unemployed as the recession stretches out beyond the shock of the initial job losses. Within a month the temporary Federal program extending benefits to workers who have exhausted their eligibility under the unemployment compensation program will cease, even for those workers in the 17 States which have taken advantage of this gesture toward the plight of those without work through no fault of their own. As unemployment continues, unless necessary legislation to establish adequate benefit levels and payment duration is adopted, the recession will tend to be self-perpetuating as purchasing power is reduced even further.

In our own State there are some 40,700 persons unemployed—10.9 percent of the total working force. In some communities the percentage is two to three times higher. Of those without jobs, 19,400 are now receiving unemployment compensation payments. In less than a year, 32.7 percent of those eligible for unemployment compensation payments—9,900 of the jobless—have exhausted their benefits. This means an additional burden on towns for relief payments at a time when there are increased demands for education expenditures. On April 1, the beginning of the new benefit year, some of these workers will receive payments again, but at a reduced rate.

The Maine State Legislature has closed the door to any improvement in the unemployment compensation program at this time. By refusing to extend the benefit period, even on a temporary basis, and by refusing, for the second time within 1 year, to take advantage of the Federal emergency program, they have dramatized the need for Federal action to establish adequate standards in the unemployment compensation program to deal with extended recessions.

There are many ways of looking at the impact of unemployment. We are conscious of the 4.7 million persons without jobs across the country; the empty factories, sitting idle in a land of plenty; bills in the home of an unemployed worker, where even inadequate unemployment payments have stopped, where children are hungry and where hope is dim; and lost purchasing power which reduces demand for products and causes other unemployment. However we view the problem, a crying need confronts us. Congress must take action and adopt legislation for Federal standards for unemployment compensation and extended duration for the payment of these benefits. Such action will give our economy needed stimulus and it will restore hope where there is fear. The legislation which we are supporting will not increase the Federal budget and it will not contribute to inflation. It is a minimum step designed to combat the recession and provide a basis for confidence for those who are without work.

## Hon. Harry McGregor

SPEECH
OF
## HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we who knew him best should gather here today to pay tribute to the worth and works of our friend and colleague, the Honorable HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, who died during last year's fall recess of Congress.

I often think that the roadbuilder is among the greatest benefactors of mankind. The roads they build make it possible for people to get together easier and more frequently to exchange ideas and obtain inspiration from one another. Roads also facilitate the flow of commerce and the exchange of goods, thus promote prosperity and improve living standards.

Our friend HARRY MCGREGOR was a roadbuilder, one of the best and most effective of them, and therefore by his life and works one of the great benefactors of mankind. In private life he was a road contractor and during his 20 years in Congress he was a member of the Public Works Committee and its Subcommittee on Roads.

In the 83d Congress Mr. MCGREGOR was chairman of the Roads Committee and was the author of the Highway Act of that year which paved the way for the greatest advance in roadbuilding this Nation had ever made to that time.

In the 84th and 85th Congresses HARRY MCGREGOR was ranking minority member of the Public Works Committee and along with the Honorable GEORGE FALLON of Maryland, they did more than anyone else to write the present expanded highway program into law. This law, in my opinion, is one of the greatest achievents of Congress in the past 25 years.

HARRY MCGREGOR by his tireless work in Congress for better roads has paved

the way for a stronger, more prosperous and happier Nation for generations to come. His work has made all the tomorrows of our Nation better than its yesterdays. Such a life is most worth while.

HARRY MCGREGOR departed life carrying with him the affection of all of us who knew him for he had brought joy into our lives with his friendly and sunny disposition. He left us possessed of our admiration and gratitude because of his large contributions as a legislator to the strength and betterment of our Nation and its citizenry.

## Garnishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the last of a series of articles dealing with garnishment in the District of Columbia is inserted at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADVICE FOR BUYERS ON EASY CREDIT

(By Morton Mintz)

Here is some hard advice about easy credit—the kind offered by a troublesome few of the many firms in the field.

It is meant for you, if you are that bedeviled lowest man on the credit totem pole: You have little or no cash or savings and a small income, and you can't get normal credit. Garnishment or attachment of your wages, or even a freeze on them for a week to 10 days, would be a disaster.

The advice comes from Municipal Court judges and lawyers who have tried to help others like yourself learn that easy credit can be the hardest credit there is—when it is dispensed by the tiny minority of District businesses that exploit you and the law.

You want to buy a suit, say, or a TV set or a car. These things aren't absolute necessities, but you want them, and the only people who will sell them to you are the easy credit operators.

In many States you couldn't buy those things because the seller couldn't afford to take a chance on you. In those States, the law says in effect: This person can't afford these things; he needs the money for necessities; if the seller takes a chance on such a bad credit risk, the law is not going to help him collect.

But you are in the District. Here you might fall into the hands of the few easy credit firms that will try to sell you far more than you wanted in the first place. Short of a new law that would put a damper on selling like this, selling done in full knowledge that you cannot afford to pay, there's nothing to stop you from buying but you yourself.

The great majority of merchants, whether they offer regular or easy credit, will discourage you from buying more than you can afford. An unscrupulous few will do the opposite, because they know that if you don't pay they are ready to grab your wages with a court order to your employer.

But you find yourself in front of the store operated by one of the few. You don't know it, but the man who takes you graciously by the arm and pulls you inside is paid to do just that.

You pick out a winter suit. The salesman says it's all wool, but it would be wise for you to look for a label certifying that.

You are told the price is $60 (there may be no price tag). If you had saved the money to buy the same suit for cash, you could have gotten it for perhaps $40. There is a major reason why you should expect the price to be higher: Easy credit is expensive to the seller. His price must take into account, for example, interest, costly bookkeeping and debts that are never collected, even by wage attachment.

But you don't have $40 with which to buy the suit for cash. You agree to easy credit, say, $10 down and $2.50 a week for 6 months. If you figure out the final price, you will find that it is $75. So, right off the bat, that suit may be costing you $35 extra.

WATCH THAT CONTRACT

You will be asked to open an account—to sign a sales contract. This is vital: Do not sign until:

1. You are certain you will be given an identical copy.

2. You are aware that the name of another person on it may make him responsible for the debt if you don't pay.

3. You are aware your wages can be attached if you don't pay—sometimes if you miss only one payment.

4. You know the contract is completely filled in and shows a complete total for your purchase and the exact amount of the payments and just when you are to make them.

5. You get an agreement in writing that you can return any merchandise that you may find you don't want within a reasonable time.

Let's say you still owe $53. Something goes wrong—perhaps you are out of work unexpectedly—and you miss some payments. You go to the seller and ask for more time. Don't buy more. Don't relax if you are told not to worry; get an agreement in writing. But the creditor won't give you a written paper of this kind, you find, and he files a complaint against you.

DON'T GIVE UP

Within a few days, a summons will be served by a deputy U.S. marshal. Be sure that you get it, for it can be served on any adult on the premises.

You will do yourself the most harm at this point if you do nothing, if you just give up. The best thing to do is to get a lawyer. Persons without funds can get free legal help from the District Bar Association's Legal Assistance Bureau and the legal aid office, which both the DBA and the United Givers Fund support.

The bureau has an office in room 201 of the Municipal Court Building at Fourth and E Streets NW. It is open from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. Legal Aid's office, at 805 G Street NW., is open from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday through Friday and 10 a.m. to noon Saturdays.

A lawyer will check the complaint against you to see if it is valid. If he gets assurances from the creditor, the chances are good that they will be in wrting. He may be able to work out a plan with the creditor that will avoid garnishment of your wages. He will advise you on how to avoid going still deeper into debt. Most of the time it is necessary that an answer to the creditor's suit be filed, and the lawyer will do it within the 20-day deadline.

TREADMILL OF DISASTER

If you do not get legal help—and at least three out of five garnishment victims do not—you may well be on treadmill to disaster because:

If no answer is filed to the creditor's complaint with 20 days, the court hands down a default judgment against you. The creditor now can move to attach your wages.

If the creditor, however, waits 90 days after the default judgment to serve a writ of attachment on your employer, the judgment can only rarely be attacked—even if it asks more than you owe, even if you did not buy the merchandise in the first place, even if the statute of limitations has expired on the debt. The full force of the law is now behind the creditor, and, one way or the other, you are going to pay the bill.

You may not know that you may be eligible for an exemption, but your lawyer does, and he will seek it for you if you are entitled to it. This is an especially tricky field, especially for a layman.

The law seems, at least to a layman, to say that your income is exempt from attachment if it totaled $400 or less in the 2 months before the attachment was issued. The idea is that you need $50 a week for food and shelter, and this sum therefore should be exempt from attachment. In actual practice, however:

Some municipal court judges agree that the first $400 is exempt and that only income in excess of that can be garnisheed.

Others interpret the law to mean that nothing is exempt if your 2-month earnings topped $400 even by a nickel. Your fate may well depend on which judge is on the bench when your case comes up.

That suit of clothes—remember it?—cost perhaps $35 extra to start with. You may lose time off from work trying to escape the garnishment mess. Your wages may be attached, not only for the $53 balance but for court costs and 6 percent interest.

You may lose your job if your wages are attached more than once.

You may be evicted from your home because you have no money for rent.

Your children may go hungry because you have no money for food.

Even if you are entitled to an exemption, your wages will be frozen for 7 to 10 days until the court decides that you are eligible.

The question for you, then, is, how easy is such easy credit?

## Debt Payment or Drift to Repudiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continued and growing editorial interest in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested, a further editorial published by the Fort Worth Star Telegram and appearing Saturday evening, February 28:

DEBT PAYMENT OR DRIFT TO REPUDIATION

Congressman WRIGHT, after an interlude for the proposal to soak in, has renewed his insistence that the Federal Government must without further delay face the issue of national debt retirement.

Mr. WRIGHT, who has been joined by Representative IKARD, also of Texas, as cosponsor of a bill to establish a hundred-year debt repayment program, asserts that the public response to his suggestion indicates a willingness to assume the sacrifices and inconveniences involved in the payment of $2.8 billion a year to the $286 billion debt principal.

If the issue is not faced once and for all, he has told his colleagues in the House, "we shall never find it convenient or expedient when gaged in the crisis of the moment to assign a top priority to debt retirement. Until we have already crossed that bridge and resolutely set our feet in the path of regular annual payments we shall never find a good time to pay off the debt."

What must seem peculiar in the matter of the debt is the fact that most Members of Congress realize the necessity of some such program as Mr. WRIGHT has offered, but seemingly thrust from their minds the responsibility for turning thought into action. As time passes, management of a huge and growing debt will become progressively more difficult and its presence more menacing to the monetary and economic stability of the United States.

What the House is now being asked to signify is its opposition to a drift into policies of repudiation, which assuredly will appear if the debt continues to grow and if nothing is done toward its orderly retirement. Inflation which past policies of deficit financing of the Federal Government have created and aggravated is itself a form of repudiation. If the American people, because of inactivity on the part of Congress toward meeting its fiscal responsibilities, should lose confidence in the ability of the Government to preserve the value of money or its interest in doing so, the result would be disastrous.

It is not enough merely to balance a paper budget and to continue to provide the $8 billion a year in interest payments on the colossal debt. As long as the debt remains as a great weight hanging over the American economy, the danger to stability will continue to exist. What must be achieved before it is too late is simple political honesty. If, paradoxically, that may seem a political liability, Congress may reflect that it is easier to prevent the wreckage of a nation than to repair it.

## A True Tall Tale: How Your Fir May Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, through the courtesy of the Blitz-Weinhard Co. of Portland, Members of the Congress received baby Douglas-fir trees. It was my privilege to send the Oregon do-it-yourself kits as part of the Oregon centennial promotion.

Considerable interest has been expressed in these seedlings, and I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a story which appeared in the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard of February 27, 1959.

The hero of the story is a giant 430-year-old Coos County Douglas-fir which stood 283 feet tall and measured 9 feet, 10 inches in diameter at its base. This will give you an idea of how big a Douglas-fir seedling can get. Of course, this tree I have referred to is not of either record height or diameter.

The story by reporter-photographer Phil Wolcott follows.

FOUR HUNDRED AND THIRTY YEAR OLD TREE FELLED FOR CENTENNIAL

(By Phil Wolcott)

COQUILLE.—Oregon's generous forest gave up another of its giants Thursday, and even though it didn't come easy, it was for the good of the State.

The prime Douglas-fir was 430 years old, cut to be displayed at the Oregon Centennial Exposition in Portland this summer. Actually, only the 40-foot butt section, 9 feet, 10 inches in diameter at its base, will go to Portland. The remained will go into production channels.

Loggers from the Georgia-Pacific Co. worked off and on for more than 3 hours under the peering eyes of about a hundred spectators and school children to fell the 283-foot tree.

Although not a record Douglas-fir for either height or diameter, the tree was saved from timber sale and extinction by Dick Tyndall, Bureau of Land Management forester, at a site 40 miles east of Coos Bay 4 years ago, because of its symmetry. Trees as large as 10½ feet through have been cut in Coos County, according to B. T. Vladimiroff, the man in charge of the Coos BLM office.

This log tapers from the 9-foot, 10-inch diameter at its base down to 6 feet, 8 inches at the other end of the 40-foot section.

Actually, the diameter was measured at the cut, which was at shoulder height.

The display section contains about 19,000 board feet of lumber, enough to build almost three 2-bedroom houses. The whole tree was estimated to have in it about 40,000 to 50,000 board feet, Vladimiroff said.

The display log is expected to come through Eugene aboard a special 12-wheel Southern Pacific car next week.

## Trade Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, how we deal with our friends abroad is a very vital subject. The largest circulation newspaper in the State of Iowa, the Des Moines Register, on March 2 carried an editorial comment on this subject which should be required reading for all those in the United States who sincerely believe in their hearts that through international trade and understanding only can come true peace in the world. I am not suggesting which of the two transactions mentioned in the following editorial is right and which is wrong, but I think that the matter deserves our thoughtful consideration:

TRADE HYPOCRISY

Our foreign friends are not being wholly stubborn and unreasonable when they protest that the U.S. Government talks out of two sides of its mouth about encouraging more trade between nations.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is being subjected to heavy pressure and criticism for its recent decision to purchase a big turbogenerator from a British company.

TVA received three bids on this giant piece of electrical equipment. The British company's bid amounted to $13,140,700. Two American firms, General Electric and Westinghouse, submitted bids of $19,453,725 and $19,673,780, respectively. Purchase of the equipment from the British firm resulted in a saving of better than $6 million.

But TVA is a quasi-government operation so it has been subject to private and political pressure to buy American irrespective of the difference in cost.

Recently, the Army rejected a bid by a British concern for another generator to be installed at Greer's Ferry Dam in Arkansas. The bid was lower than any submitted by an American company. But the Army is more vulnerable to political pressure from Members of Congress than is the TVA. Three years ago, a similar howl was raised over the proposed purchase of electrical equipment for a Columbia River project, and a low British bid was rejected.

The argument most commonly made is that foreign purchases are against the Nation's defense interests. That argument is now being made in support of the application of lower quotas on importation of foreign oil. Usually it is a self-serving argument rather than one honestly in the national interest.

In the heavy electrical equipment category, however, foreign imports account for barely 1 percent of the total sales of such machinery in the U.S. market.

Even if imports were many times larger it would be difficult for American taxpayers, let alone foreign businessmen and governments, to understand why $6 million is not worth saving—especially when it might also produce an added dividend of understanding and confidence among our friends and allies.

## Mrs. Roosevelt Discusses Need for a Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members of the House who served here last year will remember the debate and vote on my bill to establish a food stamp plan for the distribution of up to $1 billion worth of surplus food a year to needy Americans. That bill, numbered H.R. 13067, was before us on August 18, 1958, and the debate was printed partly in the RECORD of August 18 and the remainder in the RECORD of the following day. I urge new Members to look up the debate and vote in the RECORD for those days; I am sure they will find it informative and interesting.

The vote on H.R. 13067 was 196 yeas, 187 nays, 1 present, and 45 not voting. Although a majority of the Members approved the bill, it was called up under circumstances requiring a two-thirds vote, and so it did not pass.

It is worth noting, I believe, that many of the opponents of the bill last year are no longer Members of the House.

WILL SEEK EARLY CONSIDERATION

Mr. Speaker, I am planning to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to plan for early hearings on the same bill which a majority of the House voted for last year. This year, the bill is numbered H.R. 1359. It is

identical with the bill we had before us last August. It is practically the same as the bill which I first introduced on this subject 5 years ago, and which has been the subject of widespread interest throughout the country ever since.

The point is that we have food in such abundance it is considered a national problem, whereas it could be a great blessing if it were properly used to help feed not only hungry people abroad but millions of our own Americans not now receiving an adequate diet.

HELPING TO BETTER THE LIVES OF PEOPLE AT HOME

Earlier this week, in her column in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt discussed the need for a food stamp plan in a manner which, I believe, makes convincing reading. I might say that when her article refers to the cost of storing our surplus food as being $1 million a year, it is either a typographical error or the result of misinformation, for this figure understates the actual cost rather widely. Actually, the cost of storing our farm surpluses is now 1,000 times $1 million a year—it is now $1 billion a year. It used to run $1 million a day, but the President has informed us that in the coming fiscal year it will be about three times that amount, or $1 billion a year.

Otherwise, I commend Mrs. Roosevelt's article and I hope all Members will read it. It speaks of the need to use our surpluses to help better the lives of our own people. Following her article, I submit for the RECORD the full text of H.R. 1359, so that the details of the bill will be available to all those interested in this matter.

First, Mrs. Roosevelt's column from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 2, follows:

DISTRIBUTING SURPLUS FOOD

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

REXBURG, IDAHO, March 2.—I have several letters in my mail about the question of our national food surpluses. People read about the great surpluses piling up in storage in this country and about the efforts made to send this food to foreign markets.

The reaction seems to be twofold. There is a willingness to share with other people in the world, but also a realization that sometimes, due to private situations which have brought about financial difficulties, there are many people here at home suffering from undernourishment. I quote from a letter of a Michigan correspondent. He writes:

"What is this so-called surplus? I think it is food, butter, beans, rice, flour, fruit, etc., that people in the lower brackets of income cannot afford to purchase.

"Millions of people, the aged, unemployed, those unable to work because of disability, etc., are unable to buy this much-needed surplus.

"Why not release this so-called surplus to more of the American people? They would soon reduce this vast hoard of food that our Government has purchased at a cost of billions of our tax dollars and is now paying $1,000,000 a year for its storage.

"Retired and handicapped people 65 or over living on Social Security checks could be presented with a card that would entitle the bearer to purchase some of this food for about the retail price.

"This would quickly reduce the surplus and help the Government to obtain a part of the cost of its expenditure."

I feel quite sure this could be done now: something like the stamp plan used during the depression might be inaugurated. But this does not mean that we should not make a careful study of what we can do for the world as a whole both by selling and by giving where it is necessary.

It is always said that anything of this kind should not be entered into lightly because it might upset the economies of areas elsewhere in the world. This is true, of course, and we should cooperate with Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and get some of our best financial brains to study the problem of distribution.

It may well be that we will need to enlist our farmers, who are both intelligent and literate, in a real campaign to change the surpluses that we now grow. We have a great range of climate. We can produce more meat, if needed, by feeding cattle some of our surplus grain. We can process certain things and send them to distant areas of the world.

All of this will require study, ingenuity and determination to be really useful to our fellow men who are hungry in other parts of the world. But it does not in any way prevent us from looking at our own home situation. Wherever surpluses can be used for helping to better the lives of people at home, it certainly should be done.

Mr. Speaker, the text of H.R. 1359 now follows:

[86th Cong., 1st sess., in the House of Representatives, January 7, 1959. Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture]

H.R. 1359

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1,000,000,000 worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and dispose in a beneficial manner of food commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Department of Agriculture in carrying out price support operations or diverted from the normal channels of trade and commerce under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation as quickly as possible, but not later than January 1, 1960, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system such surplus food commodities.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program, the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in commercially packaged form, preferably through normal channels of trade;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this Act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue, to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2(1), food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2(3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this Act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this Act to a value of up to $1,000,000,000, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this Act, a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State of political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within six months after the date of enactment of this Act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this Act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivors insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this Act by reason of section 6 of this Act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to out the purposes of this Act.

---

## General Rawlings Relinquishes the Helm of the Air Materiel Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, news stories are appearing in the press this week on the imminent retirement of Gen. E. W. Rawlings, distinguished commander of the U.S. Air Force Air Materiel Command. Ed Rawlings, as we

have called him in Washington for many years, nearly 8 years at the helm of this vast Air Force logistics system, has exemplified that rare and fortunate phenomenon, the right man in the right spot at the right time. General Rawlings was appointed as commander of the U.S. Air Force Air Materiel Command at the time of the Korean war. His searching inquiry into the logistics operation was the result of the careful grooming he had had through a number of key Air Force staff positions. On more than one occasion General Rawlings has said that it was clear to him that the Air Force had the responsibility for building and maintaining for the indefinite future a capability for fighting both global and limited wars. Also, he has said, he realized that logistic support of that capability must be progressively molded to a continual and extremely rapid evolution of weapons and strategies, and that a new order of speed, flexibility, and precision, which had been undreamed of in the past was essential. He has also said that he realized very early the need for any logistic system to be economically feasible and supportable for the long, hard haul.

To the task of creating the logistics system which he visualized so clearly, General Rawlings brought a depth of experience and a sense of dedicated urgency which had been evident in his previous assignments. He had, and has continued to have, a seeking receptivity to new techniques, to new ideas, and to new potentialities. He brought with him to his high post as Commander of the Air Materiel Command a supurb gift for management, including the ability to fuse diverse elements into a single combination for the promotion of objectives.

General Rawlings' genius has had its impact upon the entire Air Force logistics system. He has done a good job. We, as a Nation, have been most fortunate in having a man of Ed Rawlings' caliber, a man with his insights and capabilities ready and available to lead in this complex Air Force operation. In this period of 8 years, the concept of war and the ways of fighting war, the tools, techniques, and the mechanics involved, have changed a great deal. General Rawlings has been at the forefront of the thinking, planning, and testing that has gone on, and he has insured that Air Force logistics have kept abreast of new techniques and concepts of war as these have evolved. Of necessity, General Rawlings, in his job, has spent a lot of money, but in his operations he has saved vast sums by his ability to cast aside quickly outmoded techniques. From a logistic standpoint, he has spent public funds on future requirements and not on devices and supplies overtaken by events.

Prior to his assignment as Commander of the U.S. Air Force Air Materiel Command, General Rawlings served in Washington for a number of years. He frequently appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations in his capacity as Air Force budget officer, Air Force Comptroller, or otherwise. His work was impressive; his high dedication to national defense was evident; his ability was outstanding.

Aside from all other considerations, General Rawlings will be remembered here for the warmth and charm of his personality and the wholesomeness of his character. He is, first of all, a gentleman in the finest American tradition. In my service in Washington, I have seen many able military people come and go, but I have never encountered a finer soldier and citizen than Ed Rawlings.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to insert in the RECORD a story about General Rawlings which I observed last night in the latest issue of Time magazine. It is as follows:

BIG ED'S GOODBY

On the brass-spangled parade ground of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio, one day last week, a burly, handsome four-star general stepped forward to face Gen. Thoms D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff. Moments later, Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings was sporting a new piece of hardware on his chest; a first oak-leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal. With this parting gift, Ed Rawlings officially concluded 30 years of extraordinary service in the Air Force, went on his way at a youthful 54 to a civilian job as director and financial vice president of General Mills. Left behind: a Rawlings-rejuvenated Air Materiel Command, the global 200,000-man complex charged with buying, storing, supplying, and maintaining all equipment used by the Air Force.

"The most important thing we've done," says Rawlings, who can look deceptively easygoing with pipe in hand and feet on desk, "is to cut the time in getting our product to its ultimate consumer." The product can be anything from a 4½-ton Atlas missile to a bucket of paint; the consumer can be a Strategic Air Command grease monkey in Morocco, an Air Force fighter squadron in Tokyo, a missile-testing crew at Cape Canaveral. Adds Rawlings: "Since 1951 we've just about equpped the Air Force with jet equipment. We've written contracts for $93 billion and spent about $83 billion. For that we've got an Air Force that's maintaining the peace in the world."

UNIQUE TALENT

Minnesota-born Ed Rawlings was a good pilot long before he was a management man. He got his wings in 1930, that year won the Distinguished Flying Cross for his part in the rescue of an air crew that crashed off the Hawaiian Islands. He pulled a ripcord twice to save his neck: in 1932 he bailed out of his burning biplane at 500 feet, and in 1940 he parachuted from a storm-battered fighter. In 1954, as a three-star general, he won the Soldier's Medal for helping to save the pilot of his B-17 when the plane caught fire on landing.

Pilot Rawlings early began to show a unique talent in the management skills that the Air Corps needed more than pilot's deeds. In 1939, after a tour in the administrative branch in Matériel he took a master's degree (cum laude) at Harvard's Graduate School of Business Administration, worked on Air Force logistics in World War II, later set up the division responsible for postwar production cutbacks and contract terminations. By 1946 he was the Air Force's first comptroller; he took command of the Air Matériel Command in 1951.

SHORTER PIPELINE

In quick time he and his carefully selected staff junked the outdated system of stockpiling millions of items without much regard for inventory costs, obsolescence of models or parts. In its place they aimed at shortening pipelines from manufacturers, installed carefully scheduled airlifts and sealifts and huge computers (including the encyclopedic Univac), tied their depots and control points with a network of electronic transceivers that punch cards automatically with orders.

"Largely due to his guidance and leadership," said General White, "spectacular increases in the effectiveness of Air Force logistics have been accomplished through new management methods, concepts and philosophy, and thus the Air Force is able to match the tempo of the jet missile and space era."

## The Fight Against Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the February 28 edition of the Milwaukee Journal, entitled "The Fight Against Diversion."

In testifying recently before the Committee on Public Works, I expressed my opposition to the proposed increased diversion to the Chicago Sanitary Canal, pointing out that, in the opinion of many impartial observers, no necessity has been established for the enactment of this proposal. I still hold those views and I would like to commend the Milwaukee Journal's editorial to the earnest consideration of the membership of this body:

THE FIGHT AGAINST DIVERSION

"Water steal" is the convenient and forceful epithet often hurled at Chicago's unceasing demand for more Great Lakes water to be diverted into the Mississippi watershed.

It's fair enough, for there really is a major issue of morality in the effect of diversion on the pocketbooks and property rights of the rest of the Great Lakes area. Indignation over this issue pervaded the antidiversion rally of public officials just held at Detroit and beamed at Washington, where a new diversion bill is pending.

Chicago wants to use Lake Michigan to flush the untreated portion of its sewage down the Illinois Waterway, instead of building complete treatment works. This said the law director of Cleveland, would be a subsidy paid by the rest of the Great Lakes and seaway region, just as surely as if we handed Chicago the money that it doesn't want to tax itself for.

Spokesmen for New York State and for Hamilton, Ontario, Canada's main ore receiving port and steel producing center, itemized how the subsidy would be paid, in the effects of artificially lowerer lake levels—in less cargo per trip, reflected in higher shipping costs and higher steel prices, chain reacting on many other prices; in hydroelectric power losses; in impairment of both public and private investments in harbor facilities, powerplants, vessels, canals, and dredged channels, etc.

Milwaukee Port Director Harry Brockel dramatized the costs of addiaional dredging to maintain harbor depths. Silt used to be removed for as little as 30 to 40 cents a cubic yard. Blasting solid rock, as in the Detroit River right now, currently runs up to $21 a cubic yard—a charge against every American taxpayer. As Wisconsin's Governor Nelson put it, an easy inch off the top for Chicago is a costly inch off the bottom for the seaway.

Foes of the water steal attempt are in the curious position of defending even Chicago's own port, and its related economy, against the damage that Chicago itself would do. Harbor and shipping interests around the foot of the lake, Brockel reported, are muzzled by this obsession of Chicago officialdom. Their silence further discredits the diverison cause.

The needful aim of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, in hurriedly calling the Detroit conference, was to try to catch the ears of a largely indifferent Congress with these ethical implications—as well as the economic, legal, and international ones—in the diversion bill.

## Fight To Save Reno From Freeway Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to direct attention to a prepared statement of mine before the Special Investigating Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations investigating the Federal Interstate Highway selection through Reno-Sparks-Verdi, Nev.:

BARING FIGHTS TO SAVE RENO FROM FREEWAY DESTRUCTION

Mr. Chairman, colleagues and citizens of Reno, we meet here today in defense of the city of Reno. We here constitute a vanguard to stave off a concrete onslaught upon the Biggest Little City in the World.

We are gathered to prevent a project that would wipe out every vestige of industry that Reno has today, and it would forevermore block a further advancement of industry in this city.

I intend to prove that the Third Street route is in violation of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which in part reads that "Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of, or going through, any city, town, or village, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings, or has afforded the opportunity for such hearings, and has considered the economic effects of such a location."

I do not believe that any consideration has been given whatsoever to the economic effects of the Third Street location.

The situation we face today had its beginning back in 1955. The issue then played a very important part in the city elections of that year. Mr. Len Harris, who was a candidate for the important post of mayor of the city of Reno, declared that he would never tolerate a dual-lane highway through Reno.

Those aspiring to be city councilmen, with the exception of Mr. Mastriani, who was later appointed, stood firmly on their denunciation of a transcontinental highway bisecting this city.

I propose to introduce in evidence during this hearing newspaper advertisements to support these statements. After the elections were over things were different. When the time came to decide upon the routing of the freeway through or around Reno, the State highway department employed a firm of engineers to survey the several possible routes. The project cost the taxpayers $86,000, and their report rocked the people of our city like a supersonic blast.

Court Street had been recommended as the path of the interstate defense freeway.

You all remember what happened following that report. Many of you here in this room were up in arms. Some of you, who now belong to the Realistic Freeway Association, realized that your properties were endangered and you fought bitterly to prevent such a catastrophe. The result was a compromise. Raymond Smith, who decided to migrate to our city, recommended Third Street as such a measure. I cannot believe that he had any notion of what this would entail from an engineering standpoint. One bridge alone, in the form of a Y must diagonally cross the Truckee River at the city police department building at a cost of some $2½ to $3 million.

Eighty-six thousand dollars flew out the window, because the firm engaged by the State highway department did not even survey Third Street as a possibility.

During the events which led to the selection of Third Street, letters of protest began to flood my office. People of Reno pleaded with me to stop William Howard Smith, field enginer of the Bureau of Public Roads, from throwing his weight around, as they expressed it. They accused Smith and Houston Mills, our State engineer, of acting like a couple of dictators.

It is not uncommon for people to petition their Representative in Congress when things are not going well, and it was only in the line of duty that I responded to the voice of three-quarters of the population of Reno in their cry for help. I, too, am a taxpayer and a citizen of this city. As such, I opposed any routing of the freeway through town, and will fight to the end to prevent such a calamity, because once the freeway is built it is too late. The damage is done. Reno is fenced in and cannot expand. Its industry is knocked out. Homes are destroyed. Businesses are destroyed. Men are thrown out of jobs and many heartbroken citizens of Reno, who have worked hard all their lives to build the city will never again invest their money and their efforts to rebuild what they have lost.

Yes, I will fight, and fight hard, not only as your Congressman, but as a member of your community and my community to preserve our city against the onslaught of a concrete monstrosity.

However, beyond representing the will of some 17,000 of the people of Reno, there was another responsibility that I had to face. The Congress of the United States is charged with the responsibility of policing the expenditure of Federal funds. As you all know, the interstate freeway project is to a very large extent to be financed by our Federal Government. In the State of Nevada, some 95 percent of the cost of this freeway will be assumed by the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington. This money is appropriated by Congress, and I am a Member of that body. If I have been accused of interfering in a local matter the accusation is unfounded, and without the support of fact.

Realizing its importance to the defense of this country, the Congress of the United States appropriated a vast sum of money, which has now been raised to $27 billion, to build an interstate freeway system across the United States.

According to reports of the national chamber of commerce, the program has already bogged down because of local selfish interests. Some cities have attempted to exploit moneys appropriated to defend our country by diverting such funds to city improvements. Some city fathers have put their hands in the grab bag for local construction, because their city treasuries were exhausted. This happened right here in Reno. Certain city officials boasted that the only way to build railroad overpasses was with Federal funds. This greed has already taken a tremendous toll, both in loss of time and in increased costs.

To the north of Reno there is a natural bowl. The entire distance from Verdi to Vista can today be traveled by jeep. The inside rim of this bowl is referred to as the north rim route. It is approximately 17 or 18 blocks north of the post office in downtown Reno. It forms a natural line for the construction of a transcontinental defense highway.

Not only this, but the people of Reno want the freeway to skirt the city. I know this, because since I took up the fight some 3,500 people have written me commending me for the stand I have taken. These letters came from all over Washoe County, as well as other counties throughout the State—not just the people along the Third Street line.

As a child I fished the Truckee River from Lake Tahoe to Vista, and I do know every bend along the way, as many of you do. Also, as a college student, I took a course in geology, and I have prospected the greater part of Peavine Mountain. Two of my four years in college were in the department of engineering, and I certainly understand the topography of Reno. If the freeway, starting from the State line, followed a northeasterly course to skirt Verdi to the north, the entire route could be constructed without superstructures, and with the use of a couple of steam shovels and bulldozers the entire 19 miles could be made ready for concrete in short order, and the construction could be completed by snowfall of this year to service the winter Olympics.

There is no sane reason for following scheme J. That scheme crosses a deep ravine, and would require the construction of a trestle 125 feet high—as high as the Mapes Hotel—at a probable cost of $3 million.

There is no justification at all for the construction of an elevated freeway through Reno, at a cost of approximately $40 million, or $8 million per mile.

The Third Street line includes 13 turns, several bridges, and it has been said by an expert that, as designed, it would give a hotrodder a loop the loop, shoot the shoot, cheap thrill, driving 40 miles per hour.

To offset the destruction of the city, the destruction of industry, the destruction of homes, the destruction of established businesses, and I could go on, the Bureau of Public Roads has, in approving Third Street, relied entirely on what they term a cost-benefit factor. The benefit assigned to this factor is derived from a traffic study made back in 1955, and is nebulous at best. The cost is conservatively four times greater than the north rim routing.

It is amazing that such a nebulous benefit factor conceived 5 years ago can have the force to offset the expenditure of $30 million of taxpayers' money.

But how was the decision reached to follow scheme J and the Third Street line through Reno?

As you all know, the selection of scheme J was accomplished long before the so-called public hearings were held in Reno. Many Third Street advocates attended the Verdi hearings.

The board of county commissioners had rejected scheme J. It was not feasible. It would follow the sheltered side of the mountain, where snowdrifts up to 20 feet. The cost would be prohibitive.

However, on August 5, 1957, Ferin, Bureau engineer from San Francisco, wired William Howard Smith, Bureau of Public Roads engineer stationed at Carson City, that no Federal funds would be made available except for scheme J.

This information was immediately communicated to Commissioner Peterson, and a

special meeting of the board of county commissioners was held, at which meeting Peterson explained to the other board members that he had been notified that the Bureau of Public Roads would only support scheme J.

They then passed a resolution reversing their previous decision, and subsequently scheme J was submitted through the State highway department to the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington, requesting Federal approval. Third Street advocates were successful. They had gotten a foot in the door and had practically railroaded a downtown routing of the freeway through Reno.

Then followed the so-called public hearings at Reno. To say that inadequate notice was posted in the local papers is the understatement of the year. As was the case at Verdi, no mention whatever was made of any specific route. The papers did carry a notice that consideration of several proposed routes would be the subject of a public hearing 4 or 5 days later.

The meeting was a farce. Third Street supporters immediately stole the show. They were given every opportunity to speak their piece, and the mayor was booed off the stage, for belying his campaign promises. As the day faded, the people became tired and restless, many having already left. Members of the United Freeway Association were finally recognized late that evening, but were given admonition to make their stories brief. Actually, in the presence of Bureau of Public Roads officials, the Chair explained that no routing outside of the city of Reno was under consideration, as the Bureau would not provide Federal funds, except for a selection through the city.

Furthermore, the transcript of the hearings included the startling information, evidenced by a statement made by Mr. Holcomb, assistant engineer, who was in charge of the hearings, that he did not know where the north rim route was.

The Third Street selection was dressed up like a Christmas tree in all its tinsel and spangles. The people were told that it included railroad overpasses, and, as a matter of fact, this was the biggest selling point. For years, north and south bound traffic has been held up by passing trains, sometimes by long and slow moving freight trains. At last Reno would be rid of this bottleneck. This was the big selling point, yet after the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington denied the Third Street routing as submitted and explained to Mr. Houston Mills, our former State engineer, that the Federal Government could not build railroad overpasses, Mills took the trimming off the tree and returned the Third Street proposal to Washington without the railroad overpasses, and deliberately omitted a new public hearing. This was a flagrant violation of the Federal law which requires that a public hearing be held and a study be made of the economic impact for each new proposal submitted. I have already quoted the law.

Even though the overpasses were used to bait the public, he claimed that the omission of these overpasses did not materially alter the original Third Street plan and that it was not necessary, therefore, to hold new hearings. This was typical of his insolent attitude and indifference toward the people of Reno.

He did, however, turn to the city council, the board of county commissioners and the State highway board for their approval, so he must have recognized that a new proposal existed.

The same Mr. Mills, who has consistently refused to survey the north rim route at the request of the people of Reno, stated publicly that he did not believe the Bureau of Public Roads was right in refusing to build railroad overpasses, but, in any event, he would find funds from other sources, such as primary and secondary funds, to build them with.

I maintain that the State highway department did not follow Federal law in resubmitting Third Street without a new public hearing, and that there have been irregularities throughout all of the events leading to the approval of the Third Street line.

I want to call it to the attention of this committee that the people of Reno are fighting mad. Many of these people are fighting for their very homes. They are fighting to protect their city against the small handful of men who have always dictated what shall be and what shall not be done.

Yes, for the first time in their lives, the people have stood up against the city fathers. This issue is bigger and hotter than any issue that has ever faced the people of Reno.

It was made an election issue. Two county commissioners, a governor, a State controller, an attorney general, and one city councilman who sought a position in the State legislature, were defeated at the polls—this because they supported the Third Street routing, while at the same time my vote increased in Washoe County by some 8,500 votes, each of them a vote for the north rim route.

Had the freeway question been submitted to the people as a referendum, the Third Street issue would have then been resolved in triumph for the United Freeway Association, and the citizens of Reno.

Immediately after the election, with a new highway board, consisting of Governor Sawyer, Attorney General Foley, and Controller Keith Lee, I asked the Bureau of Public Roads to stop all further work and to freeze Federal funds until the new highway board could either affirm or disaffirm the decision of the old board.

Congressman BLATNIK, chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs, formally requested Mr. Turner of the Bureau of Public Roads to issue a stop order. When he refused, Congressman DAWSON, chairman of the full Committee on Government Operations, made a similar request. I will not say here, but I have a strong suspicion that it was not until a person even more influential than either of these two gentlemen interceded that Mr. Turner finally agreed to withhold Federal funds until this issue could be decided.

I had already asked for a congressional investigation of the whole mess, based on an excessive and unwarranted expenditure of Federal funds, as well as irregularities in the selection of the Third Street route. Nevertheless, Mr. Houston Mills, our former State engineer, stated publicly that he didn't care whether BARING had asked for a congressional investigation or not, he was going to build the Third Street Freeway, and went right ahead.

As a matter of fact, word has come to me from several different sources that the firm employed by the highway department is still surveying, driving stakes, and otherwise spending Federal funds, so in addition to other charges I have made, I must now charge that department with contempt of Congress.

Before closing I should like to leave with you a few thoughts. Picture, if you will, the Third Street Freeway come to fruition. There are two ammunition depots in the proximity of Reno. Ammunition trucks heavily laden with supplies and ammunition would rumble through the heart of town. Large tankers, transport trucks, and other vehicles practically bumper to bumper would roar their presence.

Elevated sound becomes more intense as it blankets the city. Many of the larger vehicles parallel the noise of our transport planes, and we all know the disturbance of a single plane flying over town. This noise would render motels, rooming houses, and homes absolutely valueless, because people cannot sleep in the vicinity of an elevated freeway.

Yet the owners of this property have no redress at all under our statutes. Only property actually taken must be paid for.

Picture again what might happen should a gasoline truck explode—one did on the Los Angeles Freeway only several months ago—we would have a burning inferno in downtown Reno.

More than ever before, we recognize the need of a defense highway. The Congress recognized this need when it appropriated $27 billion for its construction. Ammunition must be transported. In the event of an emergency possibly the entire population of towns must be evacuated. Foodstuffs must be brought in. We need a transcontinental freeway, but we certainly don't need all of this in the middle of our city, and parallel to a transcontinental railroad. One bomb could knock out both.

I have received several letters, with documented statements of the American Medical Association, stating that noxious gases emitted from this tremendous trucking industry would be conducive to the occurrence of cancer. There is a far better opportunity for these gases to dissipate out of the city in the open spaces.

In summary, only $13 billion were originally appropriated to support the Federal highway program. This sum has already been advanced to $27 billion.

It is in instances like those we face today, asinine plans that involve expensive trestles, river crossings, unnecessary elevated sections and the acquisition of expensive real estate to clear rights of way, that costs pyramid.

The freeway has not yet been built through Reno, but there is one thing that is certain—when it is built it will be built with your money.

Are we as taxpayers going to be coerced into spending millions of dollars unnecessarily to serve the selfish interests of a few individuals?

I have been in this fight for a long time, and I can assure you I have been thoroughly castigated by the Reno press. For 10 months there wasn't a newspaper that didn't carry a headline, "BARING Blasted." I became the most blasted man in the county. Even the Bureau of Public Roads engineers called me a rabble rouser, and quite a few able and responsible citizens of Reno have also enjoyed the same treatment from the press.

I have also been accused by my opponents of using the freeway issue for political gain. If fulfillment of my oath of office is politics, then politics is the science of government, rather than the means of gaining political favor.

Ladies and gentlemen, and my colleagues, if this committee permits the Bureau of Public Roads to construct a freeway through Reno at the cost of $8 million a mile, and if this committee permits the Bureau of Public Roads to continue to whitewash every action on their part, be it in wisdom or in ignorance, then there will be a thousand Renos across the entire country, exploiting Federal funds to fulfill local selfish interests. Then the Congress will have to appropriate many more billions of dollars, because the Federal road system will reach astronomical proportions, and the $27 billion now appropriated will not begin to scratch the surface. It is up to this committee and the citizens of Reno to prevent this. It is up to us to lend fulfillment to the purposes for which the Federal road program was conceived, and it is up to this committee to insure the construction of a defense highway around Reno, rather than permit the destruction of the homes of those very people who must pay for it.

## Centennial Birthday of Famous World Scientists To Be Observed on May 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, editor, of the American Friends of Slovak Freedom, which appeared in the Bethlehem (Pa.) Bulletin of February 6, 1959:

CENTENNIAL BIRTHDAY OF FAMOUS WORLD SCIENTISTS

(By John C. Sciranka)

On May 11, 1959, the scientific world in general and the Slovaks in particular will pay tribute to two great scientists—Dr. Aurel Stodola and General Milan R. Stefanik, who is better known as he cofounder of the first Czecho-Slovak Republic and also French general, astronomer, organizer of famous Czecho-Slovak Legion and member on the war staff of General Pershing. General Stefanik died in a tragic aeroplane accident on May 4, 1919. This is the 40th anniversary of his tragic death, mourned by all the freedom loving Slovaks all over the world.

Dr. Aurel Stodola is less known, therefore, let us state some facts on his most interesting life.

He was born in Liptovsky sv Mikulas, Slovakia (Czecho-Slovakia) on May 11, 1859. After his education there, he went to Prague in 1892 and joined the well known Rouston & Co. In 1892 he went to Zurich, Switzerland, where he became professor of the Technological Institute. There he spent the rest of his life.

His many books, and especially the 1,356 page book, published in 1927 by the McGraw-Hill Book Co. of New York City with 1,565 illustrations on the steam and gas turbines, is known as the bible of this art.

Famous German engineer, Dr. Lowenstein, who translated Dr. Stodola's works from German into English, writes this in the preface of his book "Steam and Gas Turbines" with a supplement on the "Prospects of the Thermal Prime Mover," by Dr. Aurel Stodola, professor at the Polytechnikum in Zurich, Switzerland.

Professor Stodola is recognized as one of the leading authorities on steam turbines, and his book on this subject has for years been considered the bible of the steam turbine art. No other book has in any way approached the completeness, thoroughness and the clear presentation found in his work. The book may well serve as a model of how an engineering subject should be treated. All the necessary features of steam and gas turbine study, namely the theoretical, the experimental, and the constructive, are presented completely and clearly.

"Knowing the need for an authoritative book in English on steam and gas turbines, the translator, who himself has devoted over 20 years to specializing in this field, has again translated Dr. Stodola's book. The first translation was made over 10 years ago and was based chiefly on the second German edition. The present book is an authorized English translation of the sixth German edition."

The D. Van Nostrand Co. of New York City, also published Dr. A. Stodola's works way back in 1905 (434 page book with 241 illustrations). J. Springer wrote several books on the life of Dr. Stodola.

He was honored by the University of Zurich, also the Hannover Technology and Prague University.

Dr. Stodola died during World War II (1942) when we were too busy to pay him honor. It is proper that we pay him tribute during the week of May 4 and May 11, 1959, when we wish to honor both of these great scientists—General Milan R. Stefanik and Dr. Aurel Stodola for their great contributions to science, humanity and freedom of the world. Your kind cooperation will be highly appreciated.

## What Is Brotherhood to Me?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the prize-winning speech in an oratorical contest sponsored by the Benjamin N. Cardozo Lodge of B'nai B'rith, New York City. The winner of this contest was Miss Marcia Metrinko, a student at Mother Cabrini High School in New York City. I was honored to have been one of the judges of the finals held in New York City on February 19.

Each of the students in the finals has survived a long ladder of eliminations; each of them made splendid presentations both in substance and delivery. Miss Metrinko's performance was outstanding, demonstrated by the fact that she won.

The subject of the contest was an original statement on "What Is Brotherhood to Me?" Everyone who heard Miss Metrinko was deeply moved by the quality and depth of her oration.

The Benjamin N. Cardozo Lodge of B'nai B'rith, its president, Morris Goldman, its secretary, Frederick Berman, and the oratorical contest director, Louis Grossman, are to be congratulated for the excellence of the program:

WHAT IS BROTHERHOOD TO ME?

(By Marsha Metrinko, Mother Cabrini High School, New York, N.Y.)

What is brotherhood to me? First, it is a cluster of tender memories. I can still recall the playmates of my childhood. See what a happy picture we make as the sun lights up our laughing faces and the wind blows through our flying hair. The flaxen braids of Gretta and the glossy black curls of Violetta are close as the two little heads bend over a picture book. Giuseppe and Vladimir are playing with the school team while Chang-Shu, Carmencita and I call out our admiring encouragement. Then hand in hand we skip together toward the home where a smiling figure greets us at the door. It is my mother. Pointing to slant-eyed Chang-Su and dark-skinned Violetta, I whisper, "Mother, why are they so different?" "Would you like to play a piano that had only one note, or a fiddle with only one string? Would you like your garden to have flowers of only one color?" she asks. "You see, dear, God planted red roses, yellow daisies, white carnations, and black orchids in His garden. You and your friends are each a different colored flower blooming there beautifully. And God, the good Father, loves all of you."

But I was soon to learn that all people were not as understanding as my mother and as mutually affectionate as my playmates. The world before me was full of ignorance, prejudice, and problems.

So brotherhood became to me a series of questions.

A Negro family moves into a house near Levittown—so near to the City of Brotherly Love. Why must this respectable family, a potential asset to any community, be driven out by violence lest a restricted area become unrestricted?

Why should a highly skilled applicant be refused a job because of a thick accent and different features? And why can we so often find on the supply closet of a business establishment a sign which reads, "Mr. Negro, B.A., M.A., Ph. D., assistant janitor"?

Groups of children stand knocking at school doors just to plead for the equal opportunities in education that are theirs by right. The doors are abruptly locked in their faces. When, from the highest authority, an order comes commanding that the doors be opened, then the whole school system is closed. Why?

A man suffering from almost any phobia will seek psychiatric consultation. But one suffering from a phobia for certain types of his fellow men will set himself up as a leader preaching his irrational gospel of hate. Why can we not convince him and others that he is ill?

We know that the Kremlin's strategy is to divide and conquer. Then why do we continue to permit the weakening of our bonds of unity at this crucial hour?

What is brotherhood to me? It is the answer to all of these questions. It is a hymn of love to be sung by all human hearts. Consider a choir. There are altos, sopranos, tenors and mezzos; but all voices blend in a melodious unison. Could not all of us under the leadership of the Greatest Director of all, sing the sublimest hymn of all—the song of the universal brotherhood of man through the fatherhood of God? This hymn of brotherhood should be lived daily, hourly—in our family relationships, in extending a helping hand to a new neighbor, in giving a job to an immigrant or an ex-convict, in voting into office the fairminded advocate of American ideals.

May we never find the strains of this great hymn of brotherhood silenced in our hearts. But if ever feelings of repugnance should blind us to the justice due a weaker brother, let us not be blinded to the angel who stands at his side. It is the angel of the Lord, who reminds us of the Great Commandment of God—Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself for love of God; for "Whatsoever you do to the least of these my brethren, you do it unto me."

## Bill Introduced To Improve and Extend Rural Mail Delivery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to correct an inequity in our rural mail delivery service that has existed for many, many years.

The present Postmaster General has effected more improvements in rural

mail service during his term in office than any other Postmaster General in my recollection. In my district alone, literally hundreds and hundreds of farm families have in the last few years seen desirable changes made in their mail delivery. These changes have included more expeditious handling of the mail in transit, greater efficiency in physical facilities of the post offices receiving and delivering mail, rural route extensions, and driveway delivery.

Having received my own mail on a rural route the better part of my life I know how much good mail service means to farm people and we are deeply grateful to Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield for the tremendous improvements he and his staff have made. We are also obtaining approval of house delivery in more and more of our towns and villages and that is a service long overdue in rural areas.

It will be recalled that one of the first improvements instituted by the present Postmaster General in behalf of farm people was the change in number of patrons required for rural route extensions from the previous rule of four to a mile to a more realistic three to a mile. Then, just last year, he announced that extensions would be approved on the basis of two families to a mile including retrace.

Regrettably, there are still many farm families who have to walk or drive long distances for their mail simply because they do not in their immediate area meet the test of two families to a mile of rural route. In some instances they fail to qualify by only a small fraction of a mile and it is inequitably unfair for them to have to go six-tenths of a mile or more for mail while a neighbor just one-tenth of a mile off the old route has his mail delivered to his driveway under the newly authorized extensions.

My bill proposes to correct most of these inequities and, at the same time, adhere to the Postmaster General's policy of providing rural mail delivery on routes averaging two families to a mile for the entire distance traveled. To illustrate the inequity I seek to correct, under present regulations a new route may be established or an extension approved if the new route or the extension will serve an average of two patrons per mile. However, where a route already exists extensions may be approved in only those instances in which the extension, by itself, will serve an average of two patrons per mile. This policy prevails regardless of the number of patrons per mile of the old, established route and regardless of the further fact that if a new route was being established it might gain approval with the proposed extension included on the basis of two patrons per mile of total length.

If approved, this bill would treat all families living in rural areas alike and I am advised that it would lead to extension of routes to serve virtually every farm family in a district like mine. All of us believe in the American principle that everyone be afforded equal treatment under the law and I propose such equality in this measure.

It seems elemental to me that a rural mail delivery policy of two families to a mile should be applied to old, established routes as well as to new ones. If it is the policy to approve an extension of a route on the basis of serving two patrons per mile of new route, then it should likewise be the policy to approve extensions where the total route, as extended, would serve an average of two per mile for its entire length. In simple terms, my bill extends to all farm people an equal opportunity for rural mail delivery on the basis of the present policy of the Post Office Department in approving proposed rural route extensions and the approval of new routes.

I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service agrees on the merits of this proposal as it would be a wonderful thing for farm people to know that the Congress recognizes their entitlement to equal treatment in the delivery of their mail. American farmers have certainly not received equality of consideration in an economic sense and it seems to me the least we can do is to treat them fairly in the delivery of their mail.

The provisions of the bill are as follows:

A bill to extend rural mail delivery service

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That rural mail delivery shall be extended so as to serve, as nearly as practicable, the entire rural population of the United States. For the purposes of this section, it shall be considered practicable to establish a new rural mail delivery route or extend an existing route if the new route or the existing route as extended will serve an average of two families for each mile of its total length, including retraces.

## Statement in Support of H.R. 3090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to place in the RECORD the following statement I delievered today before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary in support of H.R. 3090 and other civil rights legislation:

Mr. Chairman and my distinguished colleagues, I wish to thank you for affording me this time to speak in support of H.R. 3090. This legislation is similar to many of the bills now being heard by your committee to implement and to expedite progress toward the removing of the stigma of second-class citizenry from millions of first-class Americans.

Enactment of this type of legislation is immediately necessary for we have been most dilatory after nearly 200 years of our proclaimed credo of equality for all in making this principle a fact. In today's changing and turbulent world, we hear the birth cries of new nations achieving their independence. We hear the wails of those people's whose equality and independence is being stifled and we see the tears of those whose equality has been taken away. These sounds and sights are apparent now not only to us in Washington but also to the Communist overlords in Moscow.

In the present world conflict, more important than the material assistance we offer these people and countries, is our promise to treat with them on the basis of freedom and equality. How can we hope to convince them of our sincerity when it is so apparent to them that millions of our own citizens are in second-class status?

Opponents of this and similar measures argue that this legislation is merely an attempt to destroy their customary and long secured way of life. I respect their opinions but disagree with them that it is in the best interests of our Nation to maintain their status quo.

The history of short-lived nations and civilizations is undisputed in one important respect—that no nation can long exist which is built on the subjugation, in greater or lesser degree, of a large segment of its people.

We, as the leaders of the free world, offer to other nations the principle of equity. By what logic do we refuse it to our own people?

Let us in the spirit, heritage, and requirement of our democracy pass this legislation which is popularly called civil rights but which is freedom rights.

## Whose Interests Interest the FCC?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly clear that the richer the broadcast industry becomes from advertising the poorer its showing is in the field of public service.

When the Federal Communications Act was framed in 1927 and revised in 1934, Congress intended it to preserve the airwaves for the American people and to license the use of broadcast frequencies for the benefit of the public.

With the advent of television and its commercials the broadcast industry has become richer while, at the same time, its service to the public has become alarmingly poorer.

This has been documented by a number of courageous journalists including Edward R. Murrow, which undoubtedly is one of the reasons Mr. Murrow is taking a year's sabbatical. Edward R. Murrow is one of the great journalists of our day, one of the giants of American journalism ranking with Bernard De Voto, Thomas L. Stokes, Elmer Davis, and Gerald W. Johnson. Mr. Murrow is leaving the air at one of the critical periods in our history, and we are all going to be much poorer because of this. The broadcast industry is showing its usual unconcern in this as in other matters which affect the public.

For the information of my colleagues I include here a report on the Federal Communications Commission by William Costello, a veteran radio commentator and White House correspondent for the Mutual network. Mr. Costello's article is appropriately entitled "Whose Interests Interest the FCC?"

This report is the outgrowth of a study which Mr. Costello made privately

for his colleagues in the Association of Radio-Television News Analysts.

The report was carried in the New Republic of November 24, 1958:

WHOSE INTERESTS INTEREST THE FCC?

(By William Costello)

One of the anomalies of Washington is that the last Congress could for months investigate an agency like the FCC without ever being able to comprehend why that agency is not doing the job Congress intended it should. That intention, when the Federal Communications Act was framed in 1927 and revised in 1934, was to preserve the airwaves for the people, and to license the use of broadcast frequencies for the public's benefit. On both counts the FCC is failing.

The Harris Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight did manage to smell out a few major and minor instances of unethical or possibly illegal conduct, but it scarcely more than alluded to the subject nearest the heart of the average listener—the subject of better public service in radio and television programs.

Yet it is an easily demonstrable fact that, since television elbowed its way into broadcasting, public service programs have been steadily downgraded. More and more stations carry fewer and fewer programs dealing with education, religion, agriculture, talks, discussion, and community issues, even when the national networks incur heavy expenses to provide material of this kind. As a whole the broadcast industry is phenomenally profitable, but, as Edward R. Murrow more than implied in his comments in The New Republic (November 10), the richer it gets in advertising, the poorer its showing in public service. Moreover, no enlightened effort has been made in Washington to defend the program spectrum which is supposed to reflect civic interest and well-being. The FCC, which is primarily responsible, is afraid to assert its lawful authority; and Cogress, which was the first to proclaim that the broadcast bands belong to the people, has shown a singular unwillingness to call the FCC to account or tighten up the basic statute.

Last summer there was a stir of interest in the industry when word went out that the FCC had finally decided to assert its legal responsibility to encourage better programing, but in the end the report proved nothing more than wishful thinking.

What happened was this: When 10 stations in Atlanta applied for the periodic renewal of their licenses, the FCC postponed action on all 10 applications and asked for more information on their program content. The implication—at least as outsiders interpreted the action—was that the Commisison would give closer scrutiny than usual to the kind of "community service" that the Atlanta stations were offering, possibly as a warning to other stations that glowing promises made in previous applications would have to be followed by better performance.

It soon developed that the Atlanta case was nothing more than another bureaucratic tribal dance. The request for information actually came, not from the Commission itself but from staff attorneys, and consisted of a form 309b letter of the kind usually referred to as an "informal inquiry." Four (those with experienced attorneys) immediately complied with the request for supplementary information, and received assurances that their replies were satisfactory. The littler stations, operating with inadequate staffs and inexperienced lawyers, waded through varying degrees of paperwork and documentation, then sent attorneys or other emissaries to conciliate the FCC's legal staff with promises of reform. Most of the effort was wasted, because no matter how lax their program standards it was almost a 100-per-cent certainty that in the end they would receive their renewals.

It could hardly be otherwise, since careful examination shows the FCC has no affirmative policy on programing. Almost from the beginning there have been two schools of thought within the agency.

School I holds that the function of the FCC is purely technical—that it should license frequencies and supervise the accuracy of their transmissions; should prevent the use of the broadcast spectrum by persons threatening national security, or by persons who might be commercially irresponsible. Otherwise, the FCC should not meddle in any way with what may be broadcast.

School II goes one step further. It contends that the FCC must interpret "public interest, convenience, and necessity" in more than just a technical sense. This group favors, for example, close scrutiny of a station's performance record in any renewal proceedings; it would require new applicants to commit themselves to programing patterns that would affirmatively serve the public interest. It would hold the industry to a high standard of social responsibility.

By and large, school I has been triumphant, although for a time, under the impact of changing political fortunes, the philosophy of the FCC veered coquettishly first in one direction, then another.

In 1946, under the chairmanship of Paul Porter, the Commission was prepared—or for a time appeared to be prepared—to defend policies that would have required every broadcast licensee to offer substantial proof of community service before being granted a renewal. In a show of righteousness, the Commission even picked its own horrible example of bad programing—the Hearst station, WBAL, in Baltimore—and pilloried it publicly. When the chips went down, however, and when Drew Pearson filed a competing application for WBAL's license, the Commission's instinctive conservatism asserted itself. Dealing in a commodity which by law was not property but which by custom had begun to be vested with property rights, the Commission feared to revoke WBAL's license. Pearson's application was turned down, although it seemed evident to many that almost anyone could have offered the public better programing than the WBAL management of that period.

From the quasi-liberalism of the Porter era, the FCC has steadily grown more conservative, more property-conscious, more timid. The tendency, starting under Truman, was accentuated when the Eisenhower administration took office. Since 1953, almost all pretense of regulation has been abandoned, and the ancient and discredited doctrine of laissez faire embraced.

As administration policies began to crystallize in the early months after the Eisenhower takeover, the FCC tended to agree with those who regarded radio as an obsolete adjunct of the burgeoning television industry, a nuisance which ought to be left to die quietly by the side of the road with a minimum of attention from the Federal Government.

As late as 1956 this attitude was reflected in a demand that the application form for radio license renewals ought to be simplified, at least in section 4a which calls for a percentage breakdown of station programing. The proposition was advanced that radio and television were radically different. Entertainment and the big money in advertising had gravitated to television; it was assumed that radio as an advertising medium had nothing to sell but spot announcements and that its programing would have to be governed by that consideration.

It was logical, from that point of view, to argue that the number of program categories in the application form might as well be reduced from 10 to perhaps 3 or 4. It was even suggested that these limited few might be music, news, sports, entertainment. This would have eliminated such categories as religion, agriculture, education, talks, discussion—in short, it would have eleminated every specific allusion to what might be called balanced public service programing.

Such a proposal was actually submitted to the second Hoover Commission and relayed to the FCC. Two years ago, the proposal was passed along to the Budget Bureau's Advisory Council on Federal reports, which turned the suggestion over to an industry subcommittee. At that point the idea was quietly done to death; staff experts at the Bureau merely say it never got off the ground, without trying to remember exactly why. The official explanation is that radio and television function under the same legal umbrella and ought to file the same reports. After being kicked back and forth for 2 years, the much-debated revision of part 4a of the renewal form is now awaiting final approval by the FCC Commissioners.

This episode boils down to the fact that public service programing, or even reports on public service shows, are largely distasteful to station owners and the FCC alike. In this field as elsewhere the philosophy of regulation fights a running battle for its life. The FCC might have seen more than procedural significance in the failure to kill off public service categories in the renewal form; it might have reasserted the corollary that listeners are entitled to a conscientious, ever-wakeful watchdog in program policy-making. There has been no such awareness. The accent has been on the routine of licensing, sales, transfers, wave lengths, antenna design, power output, and so on. And in a further abdication of moral responsibility, the FCC even recommended that licenses be granted for 5 instead of 3 years, a practice that would relax the regulatory tether even further.

For years the FCC has teetered back and forth on the horns of a regulatory dilemma. On the one hand, it is inhibited by stern congessional command against any attempt at censorship over what is broadcast. Believers in laissez-faire have used this section in the law to argue that even a critical scrutiny of programing can be interpreted as a kind of subtle, indirect pressure or censorship. Using the plea of editorial freedom as both a blank check and a smokescreen, the industry has insisted on dealing with the FCC on a strictly statistical basis. It reports quantitatively on its program content but not qualitatively, and the result is a hodge-podge that defies any interpretation.

At the same time, the FCC is constrained by order of Congress to protect the "public interest" in the broadcast industry. Patently this calls for a definition of "interest." The definition depends on which segment of the public is paramount, licensees or listeners. At various times, when the Commission felt strong enough to assert itself, the courts have effectively supported its contention that it could consider programing and listener-interest in passing on renewals and granting licenses. More recently the Commission has shown an inclination to fight the listeners' battles.

Yet, can anyone be so myopic as to suppose that the public is interested primarily in such matters as wave lengths, business probity and advertising ethics? Obviously, while people do have an interest in basic technological problems, their first interest is in what they see and hear, on the content of the programs entering the home. Over the years, though, not a handful of broadcast station licenses or renewals have been denied on the sole ground that a station's programs did not serve "public interest, convenience and necessity."

If this seems a singular history, it is no more so than the official gobbledygook offered to explain it. You will be told that, if there are no complaints against a station, and if there are no competing applications

for a license, the presumpttion is that the license-holder has lived up to the requirements and has earned a renewal. If, in addiition, the FCC goes through the motions of asking for supplementary information on programing content, it can argue that all the requirements have been met.

What the agency doesn't acknowledge is that this method of handling renewals represents a grudging minimum rather than a wholehearted effort to comply with the law. If the FCC were to go all-out for compliance, it would also acknowledge this fact: that the Federal Communications Act says renewals shall be handled in the same manner as original applications; and further that, on its own iniative, the Commission can order public hearings on any application. The record shows that few public hearings are held on renewals, and fewer still on the ground of inadequate programing.

It goes without saying that licensees are content with this practice. So far as rivals entrepreneurs are concerned, there is no inclination to file costly competing applications, hire attorneys, and go to the time and expense of demanding hearings. The WBAL precedent has stood for more than a decade, with no hint from the Commission that the policy might be reconsidered or reversed.

Yet it would be simple enough, in many instances, for the Commission to justify a call for hearings. The woods are full of "horrible examples" which are deplored by public-spirited broadcasters. For a typical case history, take this one: a radio outlet which happens to be the only station serving a one-county market. It is 90 percent commercial. The music it plays comes from records it gets free. Once a week it has a sustaining hour of popular operatic music; these records come from a listener. Public service is strictly transcribed spots, and once a week a transcribed quarter-hour that is distributed gratis by a foreign country. There is nothing controversial on the station; no talks, no discussions, no forums, and nothing local except the commercials and any news that shows up on the ticker.

It is argued, and I suppose not implausibly, that there is nothing sinister in the Commission's failure to hold hearings; for the shabby fact is that Congress has never, since the creation of the FCC, voted enough money to hire examiners, engineers and attorneys for all the de novo hearings on renewals that would be required to give careful scrutiny to program standards. Under the law all stations must apply every 3 years for an extension of their permits. Since there are now more than 4,000 radio and television stations, this means there are approximately 1,300 renewal applications a year or more than a hundred a month. In cases of this kind, full hearings would take days or weeks, depending on the size of a station and the complexity of its operation; and the FCC would need a small army of additional examiners to be able to comply with the spirit of the statute. In the circumstances it is easier for the Commission to shy away from innovations. A staff already overburdened shrinks from the thought of the extra paperwork and the possible resulting litigation.

Still, those with an intimate knowledge of the regulatory problem in broadcasting insist that the question of hearings goes to the very heart of the matter. There can be no possibility of reform in station programing until station managers know they may be compelled to defend their programing the next time they apply for renewal of their licenses. Moreover, the absence of hearings inevitably tends to discourage competition. If licensees get renewals by default, without ever having to prove they are fulfilling their promises to serve the public interest, there exists an almost impossible burden of proof on a rival who might feel more entitled to the license.

Station XOOX in Podunk may have absolutely no concept of public service; it may pour out commercials one-to-the-minute and spin rock-and-roll platters all day every day. There may be others in the community who would like to run a station and would be prepared to do a better job. But so long as station XOOX owns the license (or thinks it owns it), and so long as the FCC renews that license without any kind of qualitative judgment, no competitor is likely to get a foot in the door.

Parenthetically, it is only fair to note that networks, although they are unlicensed and subject only to the vaguest regulation, and although they have other and no less conspicuous programing sins to atone for, have nevertheless shown themselves over the years to be the chief custodian of the industry's conscience in public service programing. They make a varied and commendable effort to serve the public interest, only to be frustrated—as Mr. Murrow pointed out—by the XOOX's who refuse to clear time for what is educational or enlightening.

The really sinister product of official negligence is that, in the course of time, broadcast licenses which were originally intended to issue only temporarily on evidence of good faith and meritorious public service, are now assuming more and more the stature of private property. Little by little, their possessors regard them as they would a parcel of land, as a freehold in fee simple, a vested right. The congressional doctrine that the airwaves belong to the people is being slowly smothered. And Congress has been willing to acquiesce in this.

Far from trying to correct the shortcomings of the Federal Communications Act, or tackle the evils of the present licensing system, those in Congress and the FCC who have a vested interest in their mistakes are beginning to lend a sympathetic ear to an elaborate new rationale.

This new gimmick is a casuistry known as specialized programing. Now that there are so many broadcast outlets, the argument goes, why should the FCC insist that every station follow the same program pattern? The Community doesn't need six or 16 stations unless those stations can provide program diversity and can appeal to different segments of the listening audience.

Let's admit, they say, there is room for some stations with balanced program patterns; for some concentrating on popular music and news; for others rocking and rolling; for the good music station, and for those appealing to racial or national minorities, farmers, teen-agers and so on. The advocates of this line of reasoning can sound very persuasive, but their argument comes down to the fact that there are only two kinds of stations: those that comply with the law and those that do not. Broadcasting licenses were not intended merely to create new advertising media but to insure a responsible public service.

The FCC's chairman, testifying some months ago before the Senate Judiciary Committee, virtually admitted that he regards the Federal Communications Act as unenforceable. In a classic example of weasel-wording, he told the committee:

"The policies of this commission have been, where feasible, to further the broadest possible variety and balance in the programing of radio and television stations, and to further the public interest, convenience and necessity whenever possible where it relates to broadcasting. The absence of direct authority and statutory jurisdiction over specific programs has not been construed as disabling this commission from adopting policies to encourage overall improvements in programing as distinguished from encouraging or discouraging any particular program."

According to that view, the FCC feels lionhearted enough to strive for balanced programing where feasible—but don't get the notion that that's a firm commitment. The agency likewise feels entitled to promote public interest, convenience and necessity whenever possible, but it feels no legal constraint to obey the congressional mandate putting public interest first. A more cynical construction of a statute would be hard to find.

And finally, on the advice of some hair-splitting legal bureaucrat, the head of the agency backs in with a cautious double negative and allows as how—maybe, perhaps—the Commission does have jurisdiction over program content (as an abstract concept) if it wants to assert itself.

---

## Address by Under Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller, Before National Automobile Dealers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following speech which was delivered by Under Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller before the recent convention of the National Automobile Dealers Association, in Chicago. In his address, Under Secretary Mueller gives his Department's stand on this subject of territorial agreements in the automotive field:

Your industry gave rise to the well-known expression "back-seat drivers." It is a curious paradox—or perhaps just poetic justice—that back-seat drivers have come home to roost. At any rate your industry, for the past year, has had more of them than any other business in the country. Everybody seems to have turned into a self-appointed expert on how to design, make, and sell automobiles.

One eminent economist, for instance, takes the position that 1960 will probably be a far better automobile year than 1959, since—and I quote—"most of the companies in 1959 are offering cars with features that consumers showed signs of rejecting in 1958." He thinks 1960 will see "cars with little more than 100-inch wheelbases" which he calls "markedly different in design from the clumsy behemoths the companies are trying to sell in 1959."

A November report of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Committee got into the act with a prediction that increases in advertising expenditures per automobile will have an adverse effect on the level of automobile sales. They go further, and state categorically that a $100 increase on a $2,000 car would tend to reduce annual sales by several hundred thousand cars. They express surprise that even in a recession businessmen don't usually cut advertising expenditures, which they term "the only significant cost element which businessmen consider increasing as a matter of deliberate choice."

Incidentally, suppose a dealer decided to absorb all or part of the cost of advertising and reduce his price per car accordingly. Would he want to tell potential customers

he was now selling at, say $100 less? And if he did, wouldn't that be advertising?

But let's get back to something more fundamental about the committee's viewpoint, its bemusement about maintaining or even increasing advertising expenditures when sales are lagging. The committee, viewing such expenditures simply as "costs," can't understand why any businessman would deliberately raise his "costs" in a recession.

The answer—which businessmen know but haven't got across to enough people—is that advertising that's worth buying actually reduces costs by increasing volume, making possible lower prices than would otherwise be possible by achieving the economies inherent in mass production and mass distribution.

If advertising were not profitable, how does the Senate Antitrust Monopoly Committee explain the otherwise perverse as well as huge advertising budgets of firms making and selling everything from razors and soap to hi-fi sets and automobiles? They must think every TV program is a giveaway program.

I could cite other examples, and so could you, of how the other fellow's business always looks easier to run than one's own. But I'm going to mind my own business—which is, in the words of the act creating the Department of Commerce, to "foster, promote and develop the foreign and domestic commerce and industry of the United States."

I don't intend to preach, or to tell you how to sell automobiles. But I do have a responsibility to relate my job to yours, and I do have some ideas which I hope will prove helpful and even cheerful.

In the latter category I should point out that all of the back-seat driving I mentioned indicates how important your industry is to the public. As an employer, as a purveyor of mass transportation, even as persons catering to the American yen for psychological satisfaction, those who make, sell, and service automobiles have achieved a public interest comparable to sex, shekels, and sin.

By the same token, any display of innocence or ignorance on the part of segments of the public with respect to your business you'd do well to view as in large part your own fault and in need of correction. For these are not only your customers—you hope—but also your governors—you know. If you don't take the mystery out of your industry, at the point of sale and at the manufacturing level, you court distrust and eventually hostile regulation. That's the closest I intend to get to preaching this morning.

However, before leaving this mystery theme, permit me one example. The December 20 issue of Business Week contained an article titled "Everybody Loves Posted Prices." Their reporters had found, on a coast-to-coast spot survey, that both dealers and public were pleased over the operation of the new Federal law requiring price tags for the basic car and all its optional equipment.

By taking that much mystery out of the traditional horse trading, it appears that customer confidence is growing and more stable prices and profits are being realized. Here is a case where public regulation had to step in to achieve the kind of dealer-customer relationship which businessmen themselves should have learned was just good business. You know how confidence breeds stability; and taking the mystery out of pricing is a big step in a sound direction.

Which brings me to an example of a trade practice on which the public and their political representatives particularly need enlightenment. I refer to the desire of some manufacturers and some distributors of automobiles to contract with respect to territorial security and protection. As you know, the right so to contract is now of doubtful legality under some current interpretations of the antitrust laws.

Right away we run into problems with the use of that term "protection." Shakespeare's Juliet asks, "What's in a name?"—and thinks she's said the last word when she states that a rose, under any other name, would smell as sweet. That's good romantic poetry.

However, Juliet wasn't in government and politics. There the choice of names and words for things is very important, and can even influence the smell of a rose if it's called skunk cabbage long enough. So if the automobile industry hopes to get public opinion behind territory protection or territory security, you'd better make clear who is being protected or made more secure by such franchise agreements. "Protection" and "security" are fighting words on both sides of the aisle in Congress, and in party politics throughout the country.

### WENT BEYOND POTTER BILL

In my statement before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last June, in support of the objectives of Senator POTTER's bill (S. 3865) to assure the legality of territorial agreements in the automotive field, I called them incentive payments for adequate servicing of cars sold in established trading areas. I went beyond the Potter bill to declare that all manufacturers and distributors of big-ticket items involving service subsequent to sale should be free to contract for territorial incentive payments by the manufacturer or outside dealer without running afoul of our antitrust laws.

I still personally feel that where a large investment by the customer and the dealer is involved, and where subsequent service is a big factor, manufacturer and dealer should be permitted to insure responsible and adequate servicing through appropriate agreements.

To any of your membership who share this view, I offer this advice: To talk about protected territory or preventing raids by outside dealers only plays into the hands of your opponents.

Such language make it appear that the protection sought is for the franchised dealers. This in turn conjures up a picture of the kind of protection symbolized by the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930, putting an umbrella over high-cost producers at the expense of consumers. It connotes a lessening in competition protecting entrenched sellers while raising prices to helpless buyers.

### INVITES ANTITRUST ACTION

Such a picture invites antitrust action, and properly so. If I thought these would be the results of a resurgence of exclusive territory contracts, I'd oppose the Potter bill or any reasonable facsimile. But it is because I view the persons ultimately protected, and made more secure in their purchases, as the great body of American car owners that I support such legislation.

At the risk of seeming to labor the point, it is an article of faith with me that protecting the consumer interest in a free market is the only feasible long-run way to protect the American worker, stockholder and businessman. It's simple arithmetic that the higher the price, the smaller the potential market; the smaller the market, the smaller the volume of sales; the smaller the sales, the higher the manufacturing and distributing costs; and the higher the costs the lower the profit.

But on these big-ticket items like automobiles, where subsequent service is involved, an important quality ingredient is also involved. To supply it must be profitable, or it ceases to exist. I refer to the equipment, experienced mechanics, and convenient locations which all add up to service to the buyer to keep his car operating satisfactorily. Unrelieved price competition can force responsible dealers into either loss of sales, loss of profits, or both—with service to the buyer the final victim.

One more observation, to make my position on territorial agreements altogether clear: I advocate no compulsion. Quite the contrary. I stand for freedom of contract and the principle that manufacturers and dealers should be permitted so to contract if they so desire. If the deal turns out to be unprofitable, such contracts would be canceled. As for the car buyer, as has been very well demonstrated since 1957, he retains the ultimate control of shopping around or not buying at all.

So now, let's have a brief look at today's and tomorrow's markets. As Secretary Strauss stated in his year-end outlook and economic review, the overall economy has regained the record high reached in mid-1957 and the prospect is for further improvement.

A key element in that improvement, as pointed out in the annual survey of the outlook for major industries by our Business and Defense Services Administration, is automobile production.

You know better than we in the Department how King Consumer is reacting to the 1959 automobile models. At the turn of the year, in spite of industrial disputes and the psychological scars of last year's poor auto market, the outlook was for production of 5.5 million cars, as contrasted with some 4.2 million last year, which was the lowest in a decade.

Naturally if this estimate of a 30 percent increase is realized, increased markets in metals, glass, rubber, and upholstery leather will be created; for your industry is the largest single customer for the output of these industries.

For the decade of the sixties, barring war or irresponsible interference with the workings of our free enterprise system, I foresee economic growth dwarfing our previous accomplishments. The impacts of population and household increases, and the flood of products growing out of past and current research and development, spell unprecedented opportunities for expanding job opportunities, capital investment, and sales.

Realization of this bright future, however, will not be automatic. It will take hard work and a willingness to produce in stable balance with our desire to consume. As so well put last December by Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve, "Stability is not an end in itself but a means by which this higher standard of living can be attained and without which a lower standard of living becomes inevitable."

This, in the final analysis, is a test of our moral fiber.

One such test we face annually in considering the program of proposed expenditures of public funds. I make no pretense to being an expert in economics and public finance. But I hold certain truths to be self-evident. One is that public expenditures that do not add to our Nation's productivity are merely a means of transferring wealth, not creating it. The other is that the test of what we can afford to pay for Government at all levels is whether we are willing to pay for it in taxes and fees rather than through the hidden and destructive method of inflation.

Of course national defense deserves first claim on our resources, just as survival is the first law of nature. But anyone who holds that we can have that cake and eat it, too, deceives himself.

You who have such a direct stake in consumer confidence should certainly share my concern that it can be destroyed—as history has shown many times—when the people get used to the inevitability of the cheapening of their money. You should share my zeal in encouraging true economic growth through putting a premium on saving, investment, better value for the consumer's dollar, and productive employment.

If there were any easier and better way to peace and prosperity, mankind would have

found it by now. We've enough examples of how not to operate an economy to insist that it be peaceful, productive and progressive.

I started my talk in terms of protection and security, and asked—for whom? I end it by affirming that every man, everywhere, will progressively become more protected and secure when he has learned to make everybody's business his business. This is one job you can't delegate, for the interest of each involves all mankind.

## High-Cost Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.**
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, much has been heard in recent months about American industry pricing itself out of foreign markets and at the same time becoming more vulnerable to import competition in the home market.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following letter written by O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, and printed in the Washington Evening Star. Mr. Strackbein's letter goes far to explain the competitive difficulty in which our industries now find themselves when confronted by imports both here and abroad.

Until the past year or two our large mass-production industries were virtually immune to import competition but now we find even the automobile and the steel industries complaining about loss of foreign markets and invasion of the home market by imports.

In world markets the American motorcar is no longer king as it once was. It is down the line from cars of European make. At the same time nearly 400,000 foreign cars were imported into this country last year or close to 10 percent of the sales of domestic cars. Many of these imported cars, to be sure, were manufactured overseas by our own companies such as Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. This fact can bring little comfort to the automobile workers here who are bypassed, or the steel workers or the workers employed in making glass, rubber, copper, and other products that go into automobiles, all of which are readymade and already assembled in the imported cars when they come in.

The steel companies have also seen their exports falling off sharply. Why? For the same reason. Mr. Strackbein in his letter points out what has happened. I commend it to the attention of all Members who are interested in the foreign trade question.

HIGH-COST SUICIDE

Your editorial entitled "High Cost Suicide," February 26, took note of President Eisenhower's recent comment on the competitive position of this country in foreign trade. You seem to agree with the President's view that our prices are too high and that we are pricing ourselves out of our accustomed foreign markets and at the same time finding import competition more difficult to meet in our home market.

What we witness today is but the surfacing of realities that have been in the making for some years. The results in the ordinary course of events were inevitable; but the end is not yet. This country has succeeded in making its economy very nearly untenable in the international competitive world. How did we do this so successfully?

We have systematically for 25 years striven to climb the very plateau upon which we now stand or lie economically. Had the rest of the world come along with us the competitive position would have remained the same; but it did not do so. We raised farm prices, we boosted wages and reduced hours of work, we instituted social security and established obligatory collective bargaining and we went into a world war which saddled us with an unprecedented debt; and we are now in a cold war. Without regard to the merits of these various steps, it must be clear that they raised the cost burdens of our domestic producers. We went a long way toward forsaking the free market in this country. Outwardly we sought to embrace laissez faire.

Now, while we were raising these costs at home, what were we doing outwardly, toward the foreign horizons? We reduced the average protective effect of our tariffs a full 75 or 80 percent. We shipped overseas billions of dollars worth of modern machinery and equipment and this was installed in foreign factories. We collected few debts. We brought nearly 10,000 productivity teams to this country to study our mass-production methods. We helped with the costs of rearmament. We instituted technical aid.

Thus, while our own competitive position was deteriorating under the burdens of our policies, that of many other countries was improving. Modern machinery was giving competitive effect to the low wages prevailing abroad. The question is not so much whether our wages are too high as it is whether foreign wages are too low—so far as this competitive problem is concerned.

The flight of our capital abroad is further evidence of the greater attractiveness of investments overseas, profitwise. This would not be the case if we had kept our own market more attractive to our own capital. On the contrary we have progressively exposed it to more and more ruthless import competition—all in the name of what President Franklin Roosevelt called the will-o'-the-wisp of foreign markets. Today even our most efficient industries, the highly automated mass-production industries, are groaning under the strain. What do you believe is happening to numerous smaller industries? Is it not about time that we reexamined a foreign trade policy that has come to the end of the road?

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
*Chairman, Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy.*

## Secretary of State John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ROSS BASS**
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have included in the RECORD the following editorial from the Robertson County Times of February 26, 1959. I think this editorial expresses the sentiment of many of us regarding the illness of Secretary of State Dulles.

The editorial follows:

IF DULLES IS REPLACED HIS SUCCESSOR SHOULD BE CHOSEN CAREFULLY

The illness of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles raises serious doubts that he will be able to continue actively in his position. His policies have been widely criticized at times but even his severest critics have admired the diligence and devotion with which he has dedicated himself to his duties.

Opponents of Secretary Dulles concede that he is by far the best informed man on details of the many worldwide aspects of foreign affairs. Thus, even these critics are disturbed by the possibility that the conduct of our foreign policy might now go into other hands, with less knowledge and experience. This is particularly true in view of the serious situation facing our Nation in regard to Berlin, relations with Soviet Russia, and other matters.

Both by tradition and authority, foreign policies of the United States have been largely determined by the Presidents themselves, with the advice and counsel of their Secretaries of State. But President Eisenhower has delegated, to a very large extent, most of the responsibilities in foreign affairs to Mr. Dulles, and thus to a perhaps unprecedented degree our foreign policy and foreign relations have been in the hands of Secretary Dulles during the present administration.

The growing importance of foreign relations and the fact that the United States has great worldwide responsibilities makes it necessary, more than ever before, that our Secretary of State be of the highest caliber. If Mr. Dulles is unable to continue his service his successor should be carefully selected. He should be adequately informed concerning our current commitments and objectives and capable of carrying them out.

## Thomas G. Masaryk: Defender of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND**
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 9, 1959*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Saturday March 7, is the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk.

It is especially appropriate for us in the United States to honor Thomas Masaryk. Here was a man who, as the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, stood for the principles embodied in the Preamble to the Czechoslovak Constitution, which bears a close resemblance to our own. The preamble unequivocably states the desire to consolidate the people in a Republic which shall establish a reign of justice, contribute to the welfare of all citizens, and secure the blessings of liberty to coming generations.

In it was stated also, that it was the desire of the newly formd Republic to take its place in the family of nations as a member at once "cultured, peace-loving, democratic, and progressive."

The ideals of this new nation were those of Thomas Masaryk, who led it, and who genuinely stood for all of these

things. Among his personal characteristics was a passionate love of truth. He advocated the scrupulous preservation of the rights of individuals and the fair and just treatment of minorities. A man of the people himself, he championed the people's cause. He succeeded in building a progressive democracy.

When he died, in 1937, one of his biographers wrote:

He had founded a state in which freedom was the watchword and he had educated a nation to be conscious of both the rights and duties of democratic citizenship. * * * But he never forgot the need of "a faith, a living faith in something higher than ourselves, something great, sublime, eternal."

That this nation to which he gave so rich a heritage should have since fallen behind the Iron Curtain with all of its curtailment of individual freedom, its insistence that man should serve the state alone, and its denial of a faith in anything higher than that state—that this should have happened to Czechoslovakia, conceived in the democratic ideal of its great leader, is the greater tragedy. But that that ideal lives on in the heart of Czechoslovakia today we have no doubt. No more have we doubt of that than we have of the permanence and effectiveness of the contribution of Thomas Masaryk himself, defender of freedom.

## Bar's Morning After

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 5, 1959:

BAR'S MORNING AFTER

No one can blame President Ross L. Malone of the American Bar Association for valiantly trying to prove that his organization's house of delegates was not in contempt of court last week. By calling upon Congress to modify the effect of key civil liberties decisions of the Supreme Court, the American Bar Association's house of delegates seemed—to laymen, at least—to be saying that it was a better judge of the Constitution that the highest court in the land. But President Malone, in a speech at Syracuse, N.Y., now assures us that the delegates were talking about some other fellow. The lawyers were "not in any sense attacking the Court," explains Mr. Malone, but were only suggesting improvements in the security laws. However, the action of the Philadelpiha Bar Association in repudiating the implied criticisms of the Supreme Court suggests that Mr. Malone's colleagues know that the main target was hardly the Weather Bureau.

Mr. Malone, along with other high officials of the association, is a lawyer held in high esteem; his organization performs many important and salutary functions. Yet bar association members are not invested with infallibility in judging the Supreme Court. It ought to infuse some humility among the association's zealots to recall the instance on March 14, 1916, when seven former American Bar Association presidents told a Senate committee that a nominee to the Supreme Court was not a fit person to hold that high office. The Justice in question was Louis D. Brandeis. That unhappy incident caused considerable blushing in later years, and perhaps the same will yet be true of the house of delegates' more recent attempt to place the Court before the bar.

Mr. Speaker, I also recall when this same American Bar Association turned down the application for membership of the very distinguished New York City Justice Francis E. Rivers, because some of its members did not like the color of his skin. So far as I was concerned, that was the straw that broke the camel's back. I got out of the American Bas Association at that time and never rejoined it.

I am sure that the example set by the Philadelphia Bar Association in repudiating the action of the American Bar Association will be followed by other fine, respected, and respectable associations.

## Attack on the FBI—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second in the series of articles by Pulitzer Prize winning reporter, Edward J. Mowery. This series deals with the campaign to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The following article appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 2, 1959:

REDS VILIFY FBI UNDERCOVER AGENTS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—Communists and their sympathizers follow a consistent pattern of ridicule and vilification when the Federal Bureau of Investigation flushes traitors from the morass of subversion.

They pillory, deride, and humiliate ex-Communists and undercover agents who finger spies and saboteurs.

They berate the FBI for cooperating with informants to safeguard national security.

It happened during the sensational exposes by Whittaker Chambers, Louis Budenz, and Elizabeth Bentley, former admitted Reds. The shrieks hit their peak when Boris Morros and Mary Markward laid bare the results of their undercover operations.

No informant, however, has taken more abuse than Elizabeth Bentley who exposed the Silvermaster-Perlo espionage ring. On October 18 the Nation actually accused the FBI of trying to give Miss Bentley the brushoff.

A Bureau official who handled the Bentley case presents the factual version of how the spies were exposed.

Charge: The FBI was so lackadaisical about pursuing espionage leads that Elizabeth T. Bentley was kept waiting for months to tell her story.

The facts: This charge is wholly without foundation.

On August 23, 1945, she visited the New Haven FBI office for one main purpose: To verify the asserted Government connections of a self-described officer of the New York National Guard and bigshot Government spy engaged in dangerous work. She also wondered if she could be of any assistance.

Bentley said she worked for the United States Service and Shipping Corp., New York (headed by Jacob N. Golos, a Russian national long identified with Communist activities) and the bigshot Government spy urged her to stick with the firm because she could obtain valuable information for the Government on Russians doing business with the company.

She gave her address as Old Lyme, Conn. Her visit touched off a thorough and far-reaching investigation. And on October 8 she was contacted for another interview. She responded 8 days later.

Bentley repeated her story and charged further that persons connected with United States Service and Shipping were engaged in Russian and Communist activities. She had considerable information but said she couldn't name the Russians involved. She then admitted she was a former member of the Communist Party and said she felt she had been mixed up in Soviet espionage and intrigue.

Her disclosures were immediately coordinated in the handling of the United States Service and Shipping Corp. and the investigation widened.

The unrelated pieces of the puzzle, despite extensive information on the subjects in FBI files, didn't tie together until Miss Bentley was interviewed at great length on November 7.

At this session for the first time, she disclosed her involvement in Soviet espionage (as a courier for the Victor Perlo and Nathan Gregory Silvermaster groups). Her revelations aided authorities in knocking the wraps off one of the first big Soviet spy operations in the United States.

Charge: Even though the FBI knew Jacob Golos was an admitted foreign agent of the U.S.S.R. the Bureau failed to arrest him as a spy.

The facts: The Bureau's information in 1940 on Golos' activities was insufficient to serve as a basis for his arrest as a spy. Golos was arrested in 1940 subsequent to his indictment for failure to register, with the State Department as a foreign agent.

The indictment was based upon his activities as head of World Tourists, Inc. which handled travel arrangements for Soviet nationals and others going to the U.S.S.R. In March (1940) he entered a guilty plea to the charge (admitting he was an agent of the Soviets.)

Later, considerable information was developed on Golos' activities in connection with the investigation of Gaik Ovakimian, reportedly the Soviets chief OGPU (secret police) agent in the United States. In January 1941, Golos was identified as a contact of Ovakimian. And a separate investigation began on both World Tourists, Inc., and United States Service and Shipping Corp.

INFORMATION LACKING

The Bureau sought a complete rundown on Golos' activities. It was known he had long been connected with the Communist movement and was instrumental in arranging passage for Communists volunteering to serve with the Abraham Lincoln Brigade during the Spanish civil war.

Golos died in November 1943.

As of 1940, the FBI had no information that could serve as a basis for his arrest as a spy.

## In Further Support of My Bill To Curb the National Conspiracy of Gangsters Through the Enactment of H.R. 5186

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD a copy of a wire received from the Honorable Nick Nuccio, mayor of Tampa, in support of my bill to give the Justice Department and the FBI jurisdiction to punish the use of interstate commerce in the furtherance of conspiracies to commit terroristic crimes and activities of gangsters and hoodlums. His wire clarifies, and properly so, the present situation in Tampa.

I also include my reply to the mayor which clearly indicates that my remarks, consistent with the position of the mayor, as made on the floor of the House on March 3 was in reference to the previous record of unsolved murders which, in my opinion, in order to have been perpetrated, must have been conspired on an interstate basis.

I also include a copy of my letter to the Attorney General, written on March 4, in transmitting a copy of my bill for his consideration, which further amplifies on my remarks.

I firmly believe that legislation of the nature I have introduced is essential if the people of this Nation are to be protected—whether it be in Tampa or in another community—from the nefarious activities of national criminal and racketeering conspiracies. As will be noted from my letter to the Attorney General, even the sheriff of Hillsborough County, on August 12, 1953, requested such help and my bill will provide Federal assistance when the crimes committed are of an interstate nature. My bill would make avaliable to local law enforcement the very type help requested.

The above-mentioned follows:

TAMPA, FLA., *March 5, 1959.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
*New House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

I wish to congratulate you on introducing a bill in Congress yesterday to curb terroristic conspiracies. As we have discussed before in regard to your thinking on this matter this is a law which is vitally needed and I am sure that all good citizens in our county join me in urging you to push for speedy enactment of this bill during this session of Congress. However, I would like to call your attention to the fact that Tampa is not the criminal city it was several years ago. It has always been my belief that organized crime cannot exist without the blessing of law-enforcement officers. Since my election as mayor of the city of Tampa 2 years ago, I have waged a vigorous compaign against all types of criminal activity and will continue to do so. Because of this Tampa today is living down its past reputation as a center of organized crime. The only recent killing was found to have no gangland connection after thorough investigation by city, county, and State law-enforcement agencies. Again congratulations on the job you are doing in Washington for the people of the First District of Florida.

NICK NUCCIO,
*Mayor.*

MARCH 5, 1959.

Hon. NICK NUCCIO,
*Mayor of the City of Tampa,*
*Tampa, Fla.:*

I wish to express my appreciation for your wire supporting my bill to curb national gangster conspiracies. I am fully aware of your announced purpose to wage a vigorous campaign against all types of criminal activity.

I congratulate you in this effort.

I trust that neither you nor my respected constituents of Tampa misinterpret any of my remarks or actions as being critical of Tampa's present local law-enforcement efforts.

I have referred to the 19 unsolved murders in Tampa's past history, without reference to the most recent killing that I understood the grand jury had found was outside the scope of the type of killing my bill is directed toward, that is, of interstate character inspired by a national gangster conspiracy: but it is my considered opinion, buttressed by information provided by the FBI, the Bureau of Narcotics, and the Justice Department, that other killings in Tampa's past history have the earmarkings of being part of an interstate conspiracy. My bill aims at that type of conspiracy because of its interstate nature, which is beyond the reach of local law-enforcement officials, the area where Justice Department and FBI assistance is needed to assist in stamping out such outside influences on communities such as Tampa.

I am forwarding by airmail a copy of my letter to the Attorney General dated March 4 in which I transmitted my bill for consideration of justice which I think clearly states my position. I am making your wire and this reply together with my letter to the Attorney General a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as further amplification of my remarks of the third in order to avoid any misconstruction.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
*Member of Congress.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., March 4, 1959.*

In re H.R. 5186, a bill to establish the crime of conspiracies to commit terroristic crimes and activities when interstate commerce is used with the objective of stamping out national racketeering.

The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
*Attorney General of the United States,*
*U.S. Department of Justice,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL ROGERS: You will find enclosed herewith a copy of the bill above referred to which I introduced on March 3 and about which I made a speech on the floor of the House, a copy of which I have previously forwarded to you. I am herewith forwarding to you a copy of the bill for your consideration, anticipating that the bill will be officially forwarded to you by the Judiciary Committee for a report by your Department. Of course, I am hopeful that this bill will result in favorable consideration of some legislation that will accomplish the same objective.

To amplify on this matter, I am sure your files will indicate that some 4 years ago, subsequent to the occurrence of one of the murders which I referred to in my remarks as one of the "19 unsolved sawed-off shotgun gang murders," I directed a request to the Justice Department that the FBI and the Department act favorably upon the request of the local law enforcement officials and assist those officials in attempting to solve this murder by placing the Mafia on the subversive list which would make it subject to Justice Department surveillance.

I stated at that time that it was my opinion that because this was a murder similar to those that had occurred in the past and which were also unsolved, apparently it was being done on the basis of the killer being shipped in and out rapidly in interstate commerce and that there was a connection between such killings and national gangsterism and possibly the Mafia or Murder, Inc. It was on this basis that I thought the FBI could accept this responsibility but I was advised that the Department of Justice had determined that it had no jurisdiction in the matter because no Federal crime was involved and that the Mafia did not come within the definition of subversive and thus could not be placed on your list pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

The purpose of my bill is obviously to plug up the loophole and in the future to make the FBI and the Justice Department available in similar instances with the presumption that interstate commerce is involved when this type of killing or other crime takes place.

I want it clearly understood that my remarks in the RECORD refer to the national activities of Murder, Inc., the Mafia, and other gangster conspiracies which prey upon cities such as Tampa and I cited Tampa as an example that I think is one of the clearest indications that this nefarious outside influence is affecting the local community and that, because such influence is of an interstate nature, the local law enforcement officials have not been capable of coping with this problem. Such officials obviously are not equipped to cope with this problem when it is of an interstate nature as is clearly indicated by the request of Sheriff Ed Blackburn, Jr., of Hillsborough County, for the assistance of the FBI and the Department of Justice to place the Mafia on the subversive list pursuant to Executive Order 10450, his request having been made in the fall of 1953 and my request having been made to back him up. My predecessor, the Honorable Courtney Campbell, properly initiated the sheriff's request by forwarding it to your Department.

Since that time when we were advised that no Federal crime was involved and that the Mafia was construed not to come within the definition of subversive, you know, in that I have been in consultation with the Department on a number of occasions concerning it, that I have been in the process of considering legislation to make such interstate gangster activities a Federal crime and the enclosed bill is the consummation of those efforts.

I want to make certain that you understand that my citation of Tampa is for the purpose of indicating a concrete example of where, in my opinion, the outside influence of gangster conspiracies in the past has had a very telling effect beyond the power of the local law enforcement officials to cope with and my reference to the city's having one of the worst crime records of course refers specifically to the 19 unsolved murders in the past. It is obviously not in any way intended as a reflection upon the efforts of the local law enforcement officials to clean up the city. To the contrary, it is my opinion that in recent years much has been done within their jurisdiction to clean up Tampa but that this national conspiracy still poses as a threat to the future safety of the citizens of this community and communities throughout the country.

It is my hope that legislation of this nature will be enacted, first, in that it will be a deterrent to future national activities of gangsters having local effects similar to those that have happened in Tampa in the past, and, second, should crimes be com-

mitted of this nature in the future in Tampa or anywhere else, the Department of Justice will have jurisdiction to investigate the matter.

I believe this matter is of sufficient concern for you to give personal attention to it and that is the reason for my forwarding to you a copy of my remarks and a copy of my bill and for calling this to your attention again, it being a follow-up of my previous correspondence and discussions with the Department on this matter.

Thanking you for your attention to and consideration of this matter, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
*Member of Congress.*

## Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a radio script by the winner of the Voice of Democracy contest for the State of Washington, Mr. Ed Kauffman, of Veradale, Wash.

Last week the State winners met here in the Nation's Capital for the finals. The top winner was Mr. James W. Rachels, of Columbus, Ga. The runners-up were Derek L. Booth, of Boonton, N.J.; Herman W. Mast, of Lawrence, Kans.; and Sanford L. Orkin, of Sunbury, Pa. While our titlist did not win the top honor, we are very proud of him for he did exceptionally well in very vigorous competition.

I think that the sponsors, the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electronic Industries Association, and the State associations of broadcasters, in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, are to be complimented on this fine project. It is all to the good. This contest was endorsed by the U.S Office of Education and was approved by the National Association of Secondary School Principals of the NEA.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Ed Kauffman)

Democracy has not changed with the passing centuries and must not change in the years to come. Nevertheless, we can assume that there will again be forces attempting to take democracy away from the people and with it those freedoms and privileges to which the people have a God-given right.

Now let us examine the way a democracy accomplishes the things it is designed to do. Democracy sees each person as an individual with certain inallenable rights, abilities, and responsibilities.

All men have certain rights given to them by God, rights which cannot be usurped by any force. Our democracy recognizes these rights and grants to the people the freedom to exercise them. Our Bill of Rights guarantees this freedom and our laws make provisions to protect it. Free press, free speech, and free worship help to bring the meaning of democracy down to an individual level and by doing this illustrate the true meaning of personal freedom.

All men have certain abilities that help to distinguish them as individuals. Democracy thrives on these abilities. The development and utilization of these abilities is encouraged by providing incentive. In this country we call this incentive, private or free enterprise, the freedom of a man or woman to create and build something for himself and contribute it to his society as a working monument to his own initiative. The free enterprise system is responsible for the fabulous growth of industry, agriculture, and the general prosperity in America. However, in return for the freedoms and opportunities offered by democracy, the citizen owes that democracy a responsibility.

The people must be aware of their debt to society and willing to labor and give of themselves for the fulfillment of the goals of democracy. This awareness and sense of willingness to work for the benefit of all is, to a certain extent, aided by the freedoms and incentives provided by our democracy. The people assume the burden of self-government and with it the privilege of insuring their own happiness and prosperity.

Our democracy encourages individualism. Righteous individualism based upon God's law, individualism with the purpose of helping one's self and others to enjoy the fruits of democracy leads to a cooperation that gives democracy strength.

It is said by some that we have become complacent and incapable of defending our democracy in the face of great threats to its security I believe that democracy has a built-in defense system more powerful than any weapon of war or subversion. Throughout our history, the people have risen courageously to ward off threats to their security. Whenever the people see that democracy is imperiled, they work and fight as a team with a spirit that inevitably leads to victory.

Our system of private enterprise has brought America greater general prosperity than any nation in history.

Our democratic system of self-government has produced a few mediocre leaders but no dictators or tyrants.

We hear frequently of the American people, the American heritage, and the great American dream. In our democracy, each man has his own people with whom he can live and enjoy the fruits of democracy, each man has his own heritage and he is able to do with it as he wishes, and each man has his own dream and the opportunity to fulfill that dream.

Democracy gains its strength from those who live as well as speak for the freedom, ability, and responsibility of each man. Take a few moments and look about you, then live and speak for the democracy that gives and expects so much.

## Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the following essay by Miss Sandra Malin, a senior in Gray High School, Idabel, Okla., won first place in the annual contest sponsored by the Governor's committee on employment of the handicapped in Oklahoma. It was the second straight year the essay contest had been won by a student from the Third Congressional District.

Miss Malin's clear and intelligent reasoning on why it is important to hire the handicapped is well expressed and I feel contains a timely message for our entire Nation:

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN

The girl was a teenager, just another student walking down the school hall. I spoke a hurried greeting, but afterward I felt a sense of guilt because I didn't stop and walk with her. You see, she was crippled in both legs. As I thought of her struggling to walk straight and trying so very much to be like other students, I asked myself, "What does the future hold for her? What kind of jobs can our town offer her when she graduates from school?"

The handicapped are everywhere. They are in small towns as well as big cities and are all sorts of people—rich, poor, fortunate, or unfortunate. These handicapped people are limited in their abilities, but they have an earnest desire to be accepted socially. They are people who, when they are doing jobs best suited to them, make invaluable workers, some of our Nation's best. Employers everywhere are realizing this, and greater efforts are being made to train them and help them get jobs. There are many obstacles to be overcome, however.

For instance, our town is a small one, and it has no large industries or factories. Many handicapped persons can never hope to find work if they must compete with persons who are not handicapped. Also the chief occupations of this area are farming and timber work which require hard manual labor that the disabled person cannot do. In spite of this, however, several handicapped people are finding their desire for a lucrative job realized.

A victim of infantile paralysis held the office of court clerk for over 20 years, and is now a State employee. Our county tag agent for the past 14 years is severely crippled in both legs, and our city clerk has only one leg. The chief of police, a few years ago, had only one leg, and at one time, a man without any legs and one arm held the office of county tax assessor. Our county courthouse was brightened a few years ago by the friendliness and cheerfulness of a man confined to a wheel chair by arthritis. He operated a small concession stand and was on hand every day, rain or shine, not only to sell his candy, but to satisfy his longing to be a part of the world of business so important to every man.

Our local newspaper has a practice of hiring deaf mutes. Recently, it employed two deaf men who worked as linotype operators and printers. Deaf people can do this type of work very well.

Other handicapped people of this area who have found employment are mechanics, radio and television repairmen, truckdrivers, an auctioneer, a schoolteacher, a barber, a social worker, a beautician, and even some farmers. These people are all doing their best to improve their communities, and they are doing a good job of it.

The vocational rehabilitation program has done a great deal for impaired persons in rehabilitating them and finding them jobs. At the present time, it is helping about a hundred people in our county of which approximately 60 are college students who are attending school through the aid of vocational rehabilitation. These students have such defects as paralysis, hearing difficulties, arrested tuberculosis, bronchitis, impaired vision, speech impediments, club feet, and damage from severe burns. They are studying to be teachers, secretaries, hospital workers, engineers, and radio and television workers. When they finish their courses, they will probably have no trouble in securing good jobs.

Our town has done much for the handicapped, but there is so much more to be done. A very small percent of the handicapped peo-

ple are actually working. Every year men and women stay idle drawing welfare checks, when with proper rehabilitation, they could be meeting their own needs. This saves the Government money, too, because it is less expensive to rehabilitate someone than to pay him a welfare check. We are all interested in saving our natural resources, then why not conserve our valuable resources in human lives?

The future looks bright for handicapped people. Even though hiring the handicapped is a new frontier for our town, I believe that as it grows and more industries are established, remarkable opportunities will develop for the disabled.

One way everyone can help the handicapped is by his attitude toward them. They don't want our pity and sympathy, but all they ask is an understanding heart and a chance to prove themselves.

There are some handicapped people who are the happiest people in the world. I once saw a boy who had stubs for arms playing in a football game. He couldn't run fast or carry the ball, but he could do a good job of kicking for extra points. His handicap couldn't keep him out of athletics because he had an indomitable spirit.

There is a woman that I know who has only one arm, but she can do almost anything a person with two arms can do. I believe she is happier than many other people because she has a spirit that won't quit.

Handicapped people can become quite successful. The lives of outstanding individuals have proved this. Socrates was one of the wisest men in all history, and yet he was ugly and deformed and was laughed at while he was living. Beethoven, while he was deaf, contributed much to the music world, and Charles Steinmetz, the electrical wizard, was never able to stand up straight. Helen Keller, who can neither hear, see, nor speak, has given much to her fellow man. Another outstanding example is Walter Davis who had infantile paralysis. He was told he could never run again, but he defied this and became the world's champion high jumper. These are only a few of the multitude of handicapped people who have overcome towering obstacles and climbed to great heights of success.

Yes, the handicapped can be very happy and useful citizens. I believe they have learned something which everyone could profit by in learning. They have learned that to forget oneself and lose his life in living for others is to really find life. May I, along with my town, urge everyone to "hire the handicapped—it's good business."

---

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

## REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

# Appendix

## American Strength and Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON**
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in connection with the very important discussions we have had today concerning American strength and preparedness I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

John W. Mahan speaks from the heart and raises questions which I think are disturbing to every American.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Kansas City, Mo., February 27, 1959.*

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington 25, D.C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently had an opportunity to meet with leaders from your State during our annual legislative conference in Washington, D.C. Since talking with your constituents, I thought it advisable to write you on a matter that concerns all of us—national security.

The VFW, by resolution and by unanimity of opinion, feels that our country is losing basic military strength through proposed plans to reduce our Defense Establishment. We believe, and we are on record, that our country should have a balanced defense which is ready to move at a moment's notice whether on the ground, on the seas, or in the air. We further believe that a reduction in our ground forces in the face of the Khrushchev challenge over Berlin is unthinkable. Even though the Berlin situation might be settled peaceably, there are still many trouble spots in the world where American support has already been committed.

It is our understanding that unless plans to reduce forces are halted, the Army will lose one division and the Marine Corps will suffer drastic cuts in its combat strength. Our military strength must be great enough to insure peace.

We are told that Russia has 25 divisions on the borders of Western Europe alone. Instead of a reduction of forces, the VFW knows that the American people are willing to pay more for defense, if necessary, and we should keep our ground forces at least at the level recommended by the Congress which was 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this matter and if you agree with us, I sincerely hope that you will lend your influence and support toward maintaining our military and naval forces at the above strength.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MAHAN,
*Commander in Chief.*

## Needed: Leadership for Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS J. DODD**
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last Saturday, March 7, 1959, in Clarksburg, W. Va., the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] spoke to a large audience of more than 400 people gathered together at a great West Virginia Democratic victory dinner.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the able Senator from Missouri be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I suggest that my colleagues take the time to carefully read this speech, because it is a serious, brilliant, and responsible address concerning some of the gravest problems which confront this Nation.

I was told by my friend and colleague, the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who introduced the Senator from Missouri, that the effect of this speech on the audience was electric, and that it evoked a remarkably enthusiastic response.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: LEADERSHIP FOR OUR ECONOMY

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, at Democratic victory dinner, Clarksburg, W. Va., March 7, 1959)

I am most happy to be with you at this fine victory dinner tonight. I bring greetings from the State of Missouri, which shares with you some beautiful mountain country, and also shares your faith in the Democratic Party.

We Democrats in Missouri, and throughout the country, are mighty proud of the Democrats in West Virginia. Last November, you led the entire country by electing not one, but two Democratic Senators; and five Democratic Congressmen.

No one could help admiring the spirit with which the Democrats of West Virginia have tackled the problems of your State. There is a big job to be done; and by their votes last November, the people demonstrated the extent to which they are behind you, and are working with you, for a greater, more prosperous State.

You can always tell a Democrat by his faith in the future—and by his willingness to work with the people to make the hope of the future come true.

For the past 2 months in the Senate I have watched your two fine Senators working together for their and your State—and for the Nation. There was never a better example of teamwork than that between JENNINGS RANDOLPH and BOB BYRD. Together, they have introduced bills to aid depressed areas, expand community facilities, research new uses for coal, and release more farm surpluses to feed hungry families.

They are joined in this effort by your Congressmen, my friends, including the beloved dean of your delegation, CLEVE BAILEY—and fine Congressmen and Congresswoman, ELIZABETH KEE, HARLEY STAGGERS, KEN HECHLER, and JOHN SLACK. These men and women are working to build a better future for West Virginia. They are doing everything in their power to restore prosperity to this State—so that your young people need not leave their homes and go to other States to obtain work. Surely this is a righteous cause which deserves everyone's support—and I intend to do everything possible to support it.

Your victory last fall was not easy. The Republicans poured everything they had into the West Virginia campaign. Someone said there were so many high Republican officials speaking and working out here last October, it would have been easier to get a Cabinet meeting together in Charleston than in Washington.

I wonder what has happened to all those Republican smiles and all that solicitude you saw in West Virginia, before last November 4. There was a lot of sunshine around here then, but it has all disappeared now. And it has disappeared from Washington, too.

I don't know what has become of all those bright Republican promises of the last campaign. The Republican administration does not seem so interested now in helping the people. We Democrats in the Senate passed a bill to provide more and better housing for people everywhere. The Republicans don't like it; they say it's too much, and that the President may veto it. We passed an airport bill, to keep our airports abreast of the rising tide of air travel, and to reduce the danger of airplane crashes. The Republicans don't like it; they say it's too much, and the President may veto it. And so it goes.

We Democrats want to do something about the growing shortage of school rooms and teachers. The President proposes to cut down on what little aid the Federal Government gives now to some school districts; and as for new schools, he comes up with a proposal that is about as helpful as trying to bail out a flooded cellar with an eyedropper.

The Republicans have their eye on the ball, all right, but it is the wrong ball. They are concentrating on the old dollar sign, and not on what the country needs to grow and prosper.

The Republicans' indifference to our needs at home is matched by their failure to properly recognize the growing grave dangers abroad.

We are faced with an immediate threat to our national security by the most ruthless and most powerful dictatorship the world has ever known. There is a real danger of a shooting war or a shameful surrender. But the Republicans seem more worried about a possible deficit in the budget.

Our Nation, which has increased by 30 million persons in a little more than 10 years, is bursting with needs for education, transportation and housing. But the Republicans are more worried about our gold supply.

In our mountains, fields, forests and streams, we have enough untapped abundance to double the standard of living of the American people. But the Republicans tell us we are practically bankrupt, and worry about whether we are living precisely within our income.

If William McKinley had told us that schools and public facilities and housing were not within our income, perhaps we could have understood it. In his day, the

American economy was not the mighty giant that it is today. But today we stand at the dawn of the space age, with science adding a hundredfold to the skill of our people; and for the Republican leadership to tell us that we cannot afford these investments shows a lack of vision which surpasseth all understanding.

My friends, with the countdown having already started toward a possible crisis next May 27 in Berlin, we must stop talking of what we cannot afford to do, and start talking of what we must afford to do. The brutal realities of the world in which we live today demand that we start marshaling our national strength—all our resources—so as to protect our country, preserve our freedom, and lead the world to peace. This kind of effort requires leadership. And if the last 6 years have taught us anything, it is that you do not get real leadership from the Republicans—but you do get it from the Democrats.

Let me talk tonight about one aspect of our Nation—our national economy—and what adequate Government leadership can do about that. All of us agree that economic strength rivals in importance our defense strength. For if we allow recession to permanently fasten its claws on our economy, undernourishing our people, lowering their morale and weakening their faith in the free American system, no amount of armament could prevent the present onward march of communism.

Here in West Virginia, as in many other parts of the country we are faced with just that kind of threat. A chronic condition of high unemployment is keeping you from the full benefits of the wealth that lies in your mountains and the skill of your people.

One thing is certain: A depression is not the fault of the people who suffer from it. Depressions are comparable to earthquakes. They are caused by deep-seated faults and shifts in the underlying structure of the country. Like earthquakes, tornadoes, or floods, they are beyond the power of any single individual to prevent.

But there is one difference. The people, acting together, through their Government, can prevent depressions. Let us look at what could be done—and should be done—for States where there is continuous high unemployment, in this, the richest country in the history of the world.

I spent many years in private business, most of them in effort to improve various companies.

When a business lags over a period of time, three things have to be done. First, emergency measures must be established in order to continue operating. Then invariably there must be a reorganization of plant setup and personnel. Finally, working as a team, the reorganized setup must work out comprehensive long-range plans, looking toward permanent growth and prosperity.

Let us apply these techniques to the situation now current in this great State of West Virginia.

For the emergency, there must be an immediate transfusion of the necessities of everyday life. Food is needed, especially proteins and calories, in order to bring the daily diet of the people up to minimum nutritional standards.

Our surplus agricultural commodities already total over $8 billion. The President himself estimates that next year the value of this stored surplus will be over $10 billion. Surely we can, and should, dip into this great ocean of food on an emergency basis, so as to give a more adequate diet to the victims of distress. We do this for the citizens of other nations. As example, right now we are shipping 450,000 tons of wheat a month to one country. I do not say this is wrong. But if it is right abroad, why is it not also right for our own needy people at home?

As a second step, our depressed areas must also be retooled, so as to increase income and employment. In industries where workers have been replaced by machines, they must be trained for new jobs. Where the flow of commerce and industry through the State is slowed by poor roads and inadequate airports, these, too, must be improved.

Such readjustment cannot be done solely by private hands, any more than can flood or tornado relief. There must be action by our Government to bring the men and the jobs together. Such action over here is essential if we are to counterbalance similar action now being taken by the two great imperialist empires which have sworn to destroy us—Russia and China.

A good example of the action required is the area redevelopment bill. I cosponsored this bill last year, and again this year, because America needs it far more than it needs further retrenchment and further unemployment.

Experience has shown that if it is to attract industry, a community must offer good living as well as good business. It takes more than a new factory building, ready for occupancy. It takes roads, schools, sewers, playgrounds, plus all the other things which make any town a good place in which to live and work.

And it also takes water supply development. Here in West Virginia, you have the greatest reserves of coal in the Nation. If nearby sources of water were readily available, it could be used in the process of generating power from coal. Generating plants could be built at the mouth of the mines. This would provide attractive industrial sites for more of the metal, chemical, and petroleum plants you need for your prosperity.

Can communities do this by themselves? Let's be realistic. Local government finances in many of our localities have been drained by the recession until there is barely enough left to meet payrolls. How, therefore, can they afford, on their own, to make the additional investment needed to attract industry?

Where necessary and right, loan capital should be furnished by the Federal Government. And that is exactly what this area redevelopment bill will do.

It was passed before, but vetoed by President Eisenhower. This year it should be passed over any veto.

Now there is something else which can be done that would help not just areas of high unemployment, but the whole country. For a number of years there has been increasing disagreement among certain segments of our economy—especially management, labor, and capital—on some of the most important problems incident to our growth and prosperity. There is disagreement on taxation, interest rates, hours of work, automation, the cause of inflation, and just how far the Government should go into the management of our economy. You have only to read the Chamber of Commerce Washington Report, the AFL–CIO News, and the newsletter of any large New York bank, to see how wide these gaps have now become.

Now, differences of opinion are all right. But these are not mere differences of opinion. These are hardening into battlelines. Like soldiers at the front, each group has stockpiled economic arguments to support its own position; and they spend a good deal of effort lobbing propaganda shells into the trenches of the enemy, each blaming the others for inflation, for recession, and for other economic woes. There is a lessening of the understanding and good will, the ability to see the problems of the other side, that has often characterized relations between these groups in the past.

Ninety-nine percent plus of the members of these various segments of our economy are good Americans who cherish freedom and our way of life. They know that this kind of internal quarreling isn't helping to solve any economic problems, or to cure the recession. It is just making it harder to work out a sensible policy.

I believe there is a much wider area of agreement among these groups than some of them would appear to admit. Why shouldn't these domestic differences be ironed out, face to face? We have heard a lot about summit meetings for international affairs. Why doesn't this administration sponsor a summit meeting for domestic affairs? Real leadership could reconcile most of the differences, find ways to curb inflation, and persuade capital, management, and labor to pull together for the good of America.

Benjamin Franklin said: "We must, indeed, all hang together, or, most assuredly we shall all hang separately." That observation was never more true than it is today.

We must all put aside our unilateral interests, and strive together for full production in our national economy. By full production, I mean the proper use of the great capacity of America, so that every able-bodied man and woman anxious to work can find work, at a wage compatible with self-respect.

Today, 20 percent of America's industrial capacity lies idle. This is not just a West Virginia problem. It is rapidly becoming a national problem. With the some thousand million people of the Sino-Soviet empire now working around the clock to surpass us, this nation can no longer allow a large percentage of its own production capacity to stand unused.

Therefore I recommend:

Interest rates which are low enough to allow businesses to borrow and expand, and homeowners to borrow to build.

A rise in the spendable income of the 7½ million people who still earn under $2000 a year. (The per capita income from farming of our millions of farm citizens is only $770 a year.)

If we can combine the increased investment opportunity of business with increased purchasing power, our economy will continue to grow and prosper.

So again, let me urge this administration to promote the general welfare by calling a summit conference of banking, business and labor leaders, in an effort to iron out the growing differences among them. These differences can only please the Kremlin.

Now, I want to talk with respect to one more thing that you have been hearing about, this wonderful "balanced" budget of the Republican Administration. I am for a real balanced budget. But this is a phony balanced budget. It hopes to be balanced by a margin of $100 million. That leaves a margin of error of just a little over one-tenth of 1 percent. But that's not all. It relies for its balance on a $9 billion increase in revenues that nobody is sure will happen, including higher gasoline and postage stamp taxation we know won't happen.

If a bunch of stock promoters got out a prospectus as misleading and as shaky as the so-called balanced budget of this administration, the SEC would be after them before they knew it. The budget this year is just as phony as it was last year, when they first claimed it was almost in balance, and then ran up a $10 billion deficit.

To slash into the needs of the Nation in order to conform to this phony budget is to sacrifice our opportunities, our future, and our national security on the altar of politics—and Republican politics at that.

You know better than I what the administration's phony budget will do to West Virginia. It will mean no depressed areas legislation; no help for the coal industry; no relief from unemployment. It will therefore add 12 more months of stagnation to your economy and 12 more months of suffering to your people.

It is now becoming increasingly clear that only the Democrats are willing to take the bold measures equal to the times we face. With Democratic leadership, following Democratic principles, we can break the bonds of economic stagnation. More than anything else, we want a just and lasting peace. To that end nothing is more important than a strong and vigorous economy. Because in addition to our physical strength, we know we must be strong morally and economically, by utilizing to the fullest the great natural resources which have been given us.

If we follow that course, and remain strong in our convictions, we know that we can remain a free people.

## Is Rudeness Also a Russian Invention?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Roscoe Drummond. It is an interesting and informative portrayal of a basic reason why international relations remain strained and why the process of developing better mutual understandings between the West and the East moves forward so slowly.

There may be some doubt about the desirability and wisdom of Prime Minister Macmillan's recent visit to Russia, but there can be no doubt about the bad taste and untoward acts and statements of Communist leaders in Russia while he was there.

Since the Communists are wont to claim every new development or process as a Russian invention, one wonders whether the manner in which they endeavored to humiliate Macmillan is an indication that they are trying to convince the world that rudity is also a Russian invention?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S NEW BRICK: CRUDE AND CAVALIER TREATMENT OF MACMILLAN

(By Roscoe Drummond)

You well know how hard it is, in any American sports contest, to tell the players without a scorecard. It's the same with the cold war. You can't tell what the Soviet players are saying without a special three-way dictionary: Russian-into-English-into-meaning.

And the trouble deepens when the Soviets decide to muddy the field, as in Moscow this week when, after an apparently candid exchange of views with Harold Macmillan, Premier Khrushchev waits until Mr. Macmillan is on an isolated trip 70 miles out of Moscow to drop a whole series of nyets which he had kept back from the British Prime Minister.

This is a crude and cavalier treatment of Mr. Macmillan.

The Khrushchev "nyets" were: He vetoed a big-four foreign ministers conference; he vetoed any big-four discussion of German unification, he vetoed any nuclear test ban unless Russia can keep a veto over the working of the inspection machinery.

They say that the Soviets always say no until the last split second, but this series, delivered publicly at a time when the British and Soviet premiers were apparently canvassing these very matters, hardly contributes to the climate of negotiation.

But there is another Khrushchev statement which needs a careful compass. It is this bland remark in the middle of what was described as a "warm and friendly" speech at the British Embassy in Moscow: "We understand that the reason for our differences lies in our social systems."

What does a statement like that mean? And is it true?

First, we have to look at what the "differences" between us are and at what Soviet actions created the tensions we would like to reduce.

There would be no cold war today if the Kremlin had not absorbed by force the independent nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, imposed Moscow-dominated regimes throughout Eastern Europe while violating the Yalta agreements to hold free elections, tried to drag Greece behind the Iron Curtain, kept Germany divided, and abetted the aggression against South Korea.

Is Mr. Khrushchev saying that these actions were inevitable with a Communist government and that the Soviet Union just had to do these things because of its social system?

There would be no cold war today if the free world did not have so much evidence that the Soviet Union is determined to hold by force what it has acquired by force—Hungary is a grim example—and that the Kremlin acts to spread communism by every device it believes can be made to work.

Is Mr. Khrushchev saying that the use of force and subversion is an essential part of the Communist social system?

I would think that most Western-minded people would believe that the compulsion to try to dominate other peoples and other nations by force does not have to be an automatic part of the Soviet-Communist social system. When he has been addressing exclusively a Western audience, as in his CBS-TV show a couple of years ago, Premier Khrushchev actually said that as between communism and Western democracy: "Let the people decide."

But the fact is that the Soviets have never been willing to let the people decide—neither in Russia nor in Hungary nor in East Germany nor anywhere else.

There would be no cold war today if Mr. Khrushchev really believed in letting the people decide what kind of government or social system they wanted.

But Nikita Khrushchev knows more about communism than any non-Communist Westener and we better take it that he is right when he says that Soviet foreign policy is an extension of the Communist social system.

Mr. Khrushchev is a dedicated Leninist and it was Lenin who said that the whole world must choose between communism and democracy, that it will be "one or the other, there is no middle course."

The Soviets might sometime abandon this Lenin thesis, but Mr. Khrushchev shows no sign of doing so.

## American Bar Association Recommendations on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there has been a substantial number of editorials recently which have praised the action of the American Bar Association in adopting the recommendations of its special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. Several New Hampshire lawyers have been a moving and a vital force in making possible the drafting and adoption of the association's report.

On March 4, 1959, an editorial in the Concord, N.H., Daily Monitor paid tribute to three of these New Hampshire men, as well as stating the issues which were raised in the American Bar Association's report. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled "Who Can Criticize?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO CAN CRITICIZE?

New Hampshire played an active part in adoption of resolutions by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association dealing with much criticized decisions of the Supreme Court in Communist and security cases.

To its credit, the house of delegates spurned anything approaching hysteria and calmly affirmed the right and duty of lawyers to criticize court decisions in a constructive manner. After all, if lawyers cannot do this important work, who can?

Attorney Robert W. Upton, of Concord, and Attorney Leonard Sweeney, of Nashua, are members of the house of delegates. Attorney General Louis Wyman was a member of the 10-man American Bar Association special committee that wrote the resolutions adopted by the bar association. Certainly, not one of these men is against the Supreme Court as an institution.

There is every reason to believe an overwhelming majority of New Hampshire lawyers support what the house of delegates did. Its major action was to ask Congress to remove doubts and uncertainties in existing anti-Communist and security legislation.

It also urged clarification of procedures to overcome obstacles to contempt proceedings, enforcement of subpenas, and the right of the Government to protect itself against infiltration by Communists.

The house of delegates wants State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States to have concurrent enforceability with Federal laws. Under a Supreme Court decision State antisubversive acts have been set aside, not as unconstitutional, but on the ground that such was the judicially implied intent of Congress.

For those who do not possess a legal mind there is ample reason for failure to understand why the Supreme Court has balked and handicapped States, including New Hampshire, in their efforts to combat subversive elements in cooperation with Federal authorities.

The house of delegates wants Congress to consider the need for further legislation to define powers of its committees, such as the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate.

It urges that the right of the Government shall be firmly established to require from a Government employee information as to Communist of subversive activities or any other matters relevant to the internal security of the Nation.

The bar association has not launched an assault upon the basic functions of the Supreme Court. It has not even tweeked the noses of the justices. It has emphasized that loopholes or quirks in antisubversive laws are for Congress to correct.

The bar association has pointed to the need for corrective action in this country's battle with Communists. But in doing so it took one important action that should not be overlooked. It took a firm stand against "proposals to limit any jurisdiction vested in the Supreme Court."

To this all thoughtful Americans should subscribe.

## The Place of Government in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful speech by the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, summarizing the farm situation. I think it is of such a character as to provoke discussion on one of the most important problems of our times, and it summarizes the very difficult situation that faces America's agriculture.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLACE OF GOVERNMENT IN AGRICULTURE

(Address by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, before the National Farm Institute, Des Moines, Iowa, February 21, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, farmers and friends of farmers, I am indeed honored and I am bound in gratitude to you for the opportunity to speak before this great gathering of agrarian intelligence which is mingled here with the business leadership of this vast Midwest. I am always happy to visit this region where your economy rests fundamentally upon your agriculture, and where the farm people are making such a tremendous contribution to the health and strength of our Nation.

My mission today is to present to your attention, and to the conscience of the Nation, the troubled conditions on our farms and to make common cause with you to search out the approaches to solutions of our problems.

I am going to talk about the place of Government in agriculture. But, at the outset, I want to emphasize to you that it is people such as you here within the sound of my voice—students, thinkers, and leaders—who must discover the way out. You must master the means of unity among us. You must amass the Nation's opinion to solid solutions for these baffling problems which confront us.

In dealing generally with my subject, "The Place of Government in Agriculture," I shall endeavor to be impersonal and entirely objective. However, all of us must realize that it is hardly possible in these times to take any affirmative position on any matter relating to farm policy without exposure to the charge of political motivation.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The President has submitted his farm message to the Congress. Mr. Ezra Taft Benson has made his statement before our House and Senate Committee on Agriculture. The President and his Secretary of Agriculture have proposed further withdrawal of the Government from responsibility in the price stability of agriculture and from farm production adjustment undertakings.

Mr. Eisenhower called in his latest message for outright repeal of the parity principle, which is the only means under law to determine a fair relationship of farm prices and income with farm costs and the total of the Nation's economy.

These proposals by the President and the Secretary relate fundamentally to our subject, "The Place of Government in Agriculture." My views are vastly different. They represent my studied and sincere convictions. I am a farmer and I have lived close to agriculture all my life. My views are not political convictions. These convictions are of my mind and of my heart.

I am deeply persuaded that the parity concept, which the Nation had come to accept as sound and just, embraces the aspirations of the farm people for a decent sort of life, that they may walk in equal dignity with the people working in industry, in business, and in the professions.

Of course we should constantly seek the soundest and fairest standards for parity determinations. But we are told now that the principle of parity is old and outmoded, that its overall standards date back before 60 percent of our present population was born. It occurs to me that if mere age of a principle is sufficient to condemn it, why then cannot it be put forth, with equal force and persuasion, that we repeal the Bill of Rights, the Ten Commandments, or the Sermon on the Mount?

The Congress is called upon to scrap the parity principle and to provide price supports for our major crops at 75 to 90 percent of average prices in the market place for previous years. The proposition obviously would withdraw the Government from effective responsibility in the price structure of agriculture.

Why, now, is it not proposed that the Congress repeal the minimum wage and collective bargaining laws, and that labor be paid 75 to 90 percent of its average wage of preceding years?

Why is it not suggested that the Nation's greatest industrial plants, performing on multibillion-dollar Government contracts with profits guaranteed, henceforward be paid on these contracts at only 75 to 90 percent of the former price?

Why is it not now proposed that Federal and State regulatory bodies abandon the fair earning standards and fix the rates of railroads, airlines, and all the great utility and service industries, at 75 to 90 percent of their accustomed charges to the public?

THE FARMER'S PRICE—PAID AND RECEIVED

It is clear that the increases in prices paid by farmers for items required in farm production are no longer determined by supply and demand in the marketplace. The price tags on farm trucks, steel, farm machinery and other things bought by farmers represent "administered prices." This means that the prices are set by officials of the firms manufacturing these things and they proceed to "administer" those prices in making sales to their customers, limiting supplies as necessary to maintain these prices. The concentrated industries have the economic power to modify supply-and-demand substantially in fixing their prices.

This is the simple explanation why, in 1948, a farmer out here in the Midwest could sell 686 bushels of corn and buy a two-row corn picker, but in 1958 it took 1,972 bushels of corn to buy a two-row corn picker; it is why a farm truck cost 1,080 bushels of corn in 1948 and 2,813 in 1958; and why 1,133 bushels of corn would buy a tractor in 1948 but it took 2,897 bushels to buy a similar tractor last year.

And I make this prediction on the basis of staff studies: If the Government withdraws from the wheat program as it has from feed grains, within a few years it will take at least 2,600 bushels of corn to buy the cornpicker, 3,800 bushels to buy the truck, and 3,900 bushels of corn to buy the tractor.

Why is the farmer singled out?

Others rely upon Government protections, or upon concentrations of economic power, to protect their wages and profits, but the farmer is told to find his price in the naked competition of the marketplace.

That is where he was bankrupted in the late 1920's and early 1930's and thus he entered the whirl of the economic storm that brought on the great depression. That is where—helpless without bargaining power—the farmer is unable to set a price on what he produces but takes what is offered him. This is where, before we had a farm program in America, he was reduced to a lesser economic position so that others in our society treated him with mirth, calling him a yokel, a hayseed, a country bumpkin.

THE INHERITED PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled here to identify myself as an advocate and a defender of the basic philosophy and purpose of our past farm program. In recent years the critics have been so numerous that I am sure you will welcome the words of one who is proud of this old program that it now is so fashionable to condemn.

The President, in his recent message to the Congress, gave support to efforts now abroad to convince the country that all of our present troubles in agriculture—with all the surpluses and all the costs to taxpayers—are caused by inherited programs.

To view agriculture with any perspective, we must look first at the program prior to 1953, and we must then make some comparisons with the program as it has been operated for the last 6 years. How can we truly examine the place of government in agriculture without asking questions and without making comparisons?

In 1953 we had a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years farm prices generally had averaged 100 percent of parity or higher. The Commodity Credit Corporation price support program for 20 years had cost only $1,064 million. Programs for the basic crops—corn, cotton, tobacco, wheat, peanuts and rice—actually showed a small profit of $13 million. In contrast, for the last 6 years net farm income has been almost $20 billion less than in the previous 6 years. CCC losses in these 6 years have been five times the total of the previous 20 years. CCC had commodities in inventory and on loan of a value of $2,452 million on January 1, 1953; as of January 1, 1959, the figure had reached the staggering sum of $8,716 million. Expenditures of the Department of Agriculture have increased from $1,800 million in 1952 to around $7,300 million for fiscal 1959.

It is true that war stimulated the farmers' markets during some of those 11 years when prices stood at 100 percent of parity or above; but it is true, also—though little noted—that during the last 6 years, because people generally have had more money to spend, the demand for what the farmer produces has been substantially greater than in wartime.

But here is the difference. In 1957, American consumers, with 13 percent higher per-capita incomes than in 1952, bought 11 percent more food from farmers, including more high cost animal products. Yet in 1957 the farmers received $600 million less than in 1952, although consumers paid $6,100 million more for the food in 1957 than in 1952.

The costs, to farmers and to taxpayers, during the last 6 years are not the costs of the farm program which was in operation prior to 1953. They are the costs of the program which has been recommended in the last 6 years and which the Congress reluctantly has allowed to be put into practice.

With misgivings, the Congress in 1954, allowed the sliding scale price supports to become effective. So did the Congress put into operation the soil bank of 1956. Then in 1958, with reluctance and grave doubts, the Congress authorized the reduction in support levels on corn and other feed grains and on cotton and rice.

The program we have today is not an inherited program. It is a completely redone program meeting every major request that the administration put to Congress in the past 6 years except the proposal to remove the minimum 75 percent of parity support level for all crops.

TWO PHILOSOPHIES

The great difference between the past and the present program is the basic philosophy for bringing production to reasonable balance with market requirements.

There are two main roads—two vastly different philosophies—to the accomplishment of essential balancing of supplies with available market outlets in agriculture.

The first is to set up machinery whereby farmers, at their own election, may bring their marketings into balance with assurances, as a matter of national policy, that they will receive, through price supports or other operations, profitable returns for their ample but not excessive supplies going to market.

The second course is to let farm prices decline—in the competitive marketplace—thus driving enough farmers off the land, and diminishing and weakening the productive resources of those who remain, so that total output will adjust itself to demand, in a mistaken expectation that prices may become and remain satisfactory to those who survive.

The old farm program took the first route. This program, based upon the parity principle, set up machinery for farmers to pattern their production to their markets and to give to farmers a voice—bargaining power—in the prices of their commodities as they delivered them into the markets. These are the requirements of any successful industry in a free enterprise economy. This program simply sought to place in the hands of farmers the tools for profit—control of their own supplies and price bargaining power—which have been used by industry since free enterprise was commenced.

Admittedly this program needed some changes in recent years, to adjust to the great technological advances in agriculture and thus to achieve the goals set for it. Adjustments were imperative, but never a change in the basic philosophy.

It is my opinion, it is my deep fear, that the policy we now follow surely will lead to the destruction of the family farm system which was our strength in the founding of our democracy, and it will wreck fine rural trading centers here in the Midwest and elsewhere throughout this great Nation.

Who would say that the Government has no responsibility in this?

FARM POLICY AND FARM INCOME

Let us assess for a moment the part farm policies have played in farm income.

Government programs in the past quarter of a century have increased farmers' net incomes by as much as 20 to 50 percent, in the years when these incomes otherwise would have been lowest due to excessive production in relation to market demand.

And hear this:

Government programs—even in time of dwindling effectiveness, probably have held net farm income at least one-third—$24 billion—higher than it otherwise would have been—in the last 6 years.

These figures and facts are on the authority of competent economists.

Government programs have reduced price and income uncertainty. They have accelerated the adoption of technological advances. On a national basis they have been a positive force for increased efficiency in agriculture.

Statisticians in the Department of Agriculture find that agriculture's efficiency has been increasing twice as rapidly in the past 25 years when farm programs were in operation, as in the previous 20 years.

Preliminary estimates indicate that the Commodity Credit Corporation by its loan and surplus disposal operations on a net basis removed $1.5 to $2 billion of farm products from commercial market channels in 1958. Without the soil bank payments and, had this additional $1.5 to $2 billion been pushed through commercial markets, it is reasonable to assume from past supply-price relationships that farm income in 1958 would have been $4 to $6 billion lower. Except for the price support operations net farm income in 1958 might have been only $7 to $9 billion, instead of $13 billion.

WHERE WOULD THE MIDWEST BE?

What would be the financial situation of Midwest farmers today if there had been no farm program since World War II? It is my considered judgment that most of you, and most of your financial and farm service institutions in the Midwest, would be flat broke.

What if the $8 to $9 billion of farm products now in Commodity Credit Corporation hands, or on loan, had been forced through commercial market channels in the last few years? What if the $1 to $2 billion of farm products sent abroad under Public Law 480 in each of the last few years instead had been channeled through commercial markets at home and abroad?

The questions go directly to "the place of Government in agriculture," the subject your program committee asked me to discuss.

You know the answers, and I am sure you understand my bewilderment when people vwho call themselves farm leaders, and who pretend to represent the Midwest farm opinion, come to Washington and tell us to destroy the parity principle, to scuttle what is left of the farm program and, as I must interpret it, to restore the farmer's freedom to go again into the marketplaces and, hat in hand, meekly accept in price not what he asks but whatever is offered him.

Is that what the great Midwest wants? Do you people out here want agriculture to be cast adrift again in the economic stream, while others, enjoying the protection of Government on utilizing the raw force of economic concentration, bargain away our profits, denying us fair rewards for the unmatched contribution our farm families are making to our great Nation?

I'll never believe it.

I say to the farmers of this great Midwest: Let your voice be heard. Let us know who speaks for you.

TRUE NATURE OF FARM INCOME PROBLEM

The critical elements in the farm problem today should be clear to everyone by now. Farmers are introducing new technology at such a rapid rate that they are fully replacing the labor which leaves the farm and in addition they are expending output faster than market outlets can be expanded.

Utilizing both a smaller crop acreage base and a shrinking labor supply, farm output increased 23 percent between 1950 and 1958 while total population increased only 15 percent. This increase in total farm output is largely the result of our excellent research and educational programs for farmers. It is a product of science and technology. We planned it that way. It is a wonderful blessing to American consumers, to the American economy, and to the hungry people of the free world.

But here is the rub. Individual farmers find it profitable to introduce these new production techniques, to expand their output even though the increase in total output outruns available markets, forces prices down, and reduces the total income to be divided among all producers. It is this feature of our agricultural economy which makes what is a blessing to consumers, economic suicide for farmers.

Other groups in our economy who manufacture and sell the supplies purchased by farmers, and those who process and market farm products have various degrees of market power. In the absence of marketing agreements and farm price supports the commercial farmers have virtually none.

Furthermore, this technological advance which tends to bankrupt farmers in the absence of an adequate farm program, would be substantially the same as it is today even though the current decline in farm numbers continues until there are only half as many commercial farmers in the United States as at the present and even though farms were increased to twice their current size.

As long as improved technology is available and farmers on an individual basis find it profitable to increase output more rapidly than markets can be expanded, it does not matter whether there are 5 million farmers, 1 million, or even 500,000, prices will fall faster than costs. In the absence of programs giving farmers bargaining power in relation to other groups in our economic society farm prices and incomes will be forced to disastrously low levels.

Any group, if it is to exercise bargaining power in the marketplace, must have a measure of control over its supplies. This is the key consideration in the formulation of an effective Government program giving farmers increased bargaining power.

THE ROAD AHEAD

Now where are we—the farmers of America—where are we headed?

We in Congress who have the well-being of farmers at heart are working on every conceivable approach to the problems now carying for remedies. But I must be frank with you. We shall never have another sound and effective farm program until a substantial majority of farmers—people like you who are gathered here—make up your minds. We shall never impose a program upon farmers. We are eagerly responsive to the will of farmers.

Now I have tried here to shed some light on the circumstances of agriculture and to illuminate the magnitude of the problems which confront us. It is far easier, of course, to reach an understanding on what is wrong in any particular situation than it is to agree on appropriate remedies.

But surely there can be no disagreement that the basic source of farmers' economic difficulties today in the rapid rate of technological advance in agriculture.

Surely there can be no disagreement that in the absence of a farm program in recent years farm income would have dropped precipitously.

Surely there can be no disagreement that current farm program costs are excessive in relation to the income of agriculture.

Surely no one will disagree that current stocks of storable farm products are excessive.

But can we agree on new approaches for dealing with the farm income problem I have described?

I have been bitterly disappointed in recent years in the wide differences in the recommendations of our national farm organizations. I was discouraged by the absence of constructive ideas in the President's farm message to the Congress last month.

Some basic determinations must be made. These determinations must precede any action by the Congress on a sound, long-range farm program. Our course must lie in one of a number of directions.

We can rebuild the old program, with more efficient means of production adjustment, more of the storable crops made eligible for such adjustment—all programs, as heretofore, subject to the election of farmers themselves—and provide assurance of reasonable prices for farmers who willingly adjust their outputs to market requirements.

We can provide a system of production payments or parity payments by the Government to pay to farmers the difference between the market price and a reasonable price, on all or part of what they produce.

We can formulate a program embracing a combination of production adjustment and price support, with supplemental production payments.

Or we can, if you desire it, employ either or both of these approaches to devise a program of tolerable security, as a shield behind which farmers may organize programs of their own for specific commodities, through marketing agreements, self-help plans or similar machinery designed to assure the producers increased bargaining power by creating an ability to regulate the flow of their commodities into the market. Producers of each commodity should be allowed a wide latitude to develop a program which would give them as much bargaining power as can be developed in the market.

Of course we must continue such programs as those making part of our overabundant supplies of food available to other countries in the operation of our foreign economic assistance program, and the programs of research into better distribution and utilization of food and more extensive industrial uses of farm commodities.

Those are perhaps the most discussed approaches. There are many other suggestions for the direction a farm program should take.

Now, what do we do? Where do we go?

Specifically, you have asked me: What is the Government's responsibility in agriculture? It is this:

The nature and the structure of agriculture are a matter of concern to all the people. I say to you that this exploding technology on the farm is creating a disastrous economic situation for agriculture. Our Government research and educational programs, mixed with the intelligence and labor of our farmers, have given us the most efficient agriculture in the world. They are giving consumers the cheapest food—in relation to wages—on record. Government cannot now stand idly by, wringing its hands, crying all old programs have failed and all new programs are doomed to failure. Government cannot say there is nothing we can do to avert the impending economic misery of the farmer resulting from this rapid rate of technological advance in relation to available market outlets. The Government has a moral, an ethical, an inherent, a constitutional obligation to create public policies that will open to the operators in agriculture the opportunities of due rewards for their management and their labor on a parity with the workers in all other undertakings in this free enterprise economy and in this democratic society. The safety, the health, the aspirations of all the people—the strength of our Nation—demand this.

This is my creed. It is the starting point.

The Government has given labor the minimum wage law and the collective bargaining law. It has given industry the corporate structure, the tariff and the many statutes that soften the perils of unregulated, unrestrained competitive enterprise. How, then, can the modern, highly mechanized farmer survive, ever selling in a free market and buying in a protected market? Where can there be doubt of the Government's obligation to agriculture?

I pledge common cause with the farmers of America to the fulfillment of this obligation, in public policies farmers themselves shall devise, and which will be fair alike to our farm people and to our great consuming urban populations.

## Is There a Budget Ceiling on Safety?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is There a Budget Ceiling on Safety?" published in the February 1959, issue of Skyways magazine, the magazine of the National Business Aircraft Association, which has established an enviable record for aviation safety.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THERE A BUDGET CEILING ON SAFETY?

Under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the Civil Aeronautics Board was directed by Congress to investigate all aircraft accidents and to report the facts, conditions, and circumstances relating to each accident and the probable cause of the accident.

This act was made into law on August 23, 1958.

On December 30, 1958, there appeared in the Federal Register a Public Notice 13 which announced, in essence, that the Board could not carry out the provisions of the act because sufficient funds have not been made available to the Board to provide adequate facilities and personnel to handle the additional workload prescribed by the act.

The Board, in this Public Notice 13, requested the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to take over part of the workload which Congress had directed the Board to carry out.

The Board said they would be able to investigate all rotary wing accidents, all accidents involving aircraft weighing over 12,500 pounds, and all accidents in which there were fatal injuries. The FAA, the Board requested, would have to investigate all other accidents.

What brought about this obvious circumvention of the intent of the Federal Aviation Act?

First, funds that should have been transferred from the Federal Aviation Agency to the CAB to continue its work through June 1959, were not transferred.

Second, and this is an incomprehensible example of the Budget Bureau flouting the will of Congress, no provisions were made in the 1960 fiscal year budget for the CAB to conduct its full-scale accident investigation program.

We do not seek to build an empire for the CAB—or for any governmental agency. There are ample safeguards, in this case, against this inclination—if there be any.

We do seek that the will of Congress, a direct reflection of the desires of an aroused citizenry, be carried out and that it is not thwarted by imprudent, ill-advised, and arbitrary budgetary mismanagement.

Why are we insistent on this point?

Many of our greatest advances in flying technique, many of the greatest advances in air-traffic control, many of the greatest equipment improvements have come as the result of exhaustive, detailed examination of all of the persons, procedures, and equipment involved in all types of accidents involving all types of aircraft.

Because, in 1953, the CAB was forced, then also by budgetary limitations, to delegate the investigation of accidents involving aircraft under 12,500 pounds to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the aviation community has not been as well informed as to the probable causes of these aircraft accidents.

We could have learned from 1953 to the present date, we could have advanced, we could have saved many lives had the proper dissemination of the circumstances of all of these accidents been made.

Congress recognized this deficiency.

Congress acted to prevent its repetition in the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

Will Congress allow this subversion of their will by the Bureau of the Budget go unchallenged?

We pray that Congress does not.

## Picture of an Excellent Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, when H. M. Baggarly, owner and publisher of the Tulia Herald, speaks about newspapermen, everyone listens with respect.

Mr. Baggarly has distinguished himself and his publication in this field as standing for what is best for the people and holding fast to ideals and principles.

Newspapermen occupy a special position in our society, charged as they are with accurately and fairly reporting the happenings of our world, and supporting worthy projects for a better life. H. M. Baggarly is a fine example of his vocation. He has built up a reputation as a fine, honest man and a thinker.

In a recent issue of his newspaper, he discussed some qualifications of a newspaper editor. I heartily agree with him.

Mr. Baggarly writes a column in his newspaper which he calls the Country Editor. Country editors, writing in weekly newspapers close to the people, have always been the backbone of American journalism and have often turned up ideas which the large daily newspapers could profitably follow.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and our friends in the press galleries will also find it interesting reading.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD the editorial which was published in the Tulia Herald for February 19, 1959, under the heading "Always on the Side of the People."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALWAYS ON THE SIDE OF THE PEOPLE

When the journalism department of a large State university asks a lowly country editor to give words of advice to a graduating class of prospective editors, it's like being asked to tell the story of one's life in one short paragraph.

The beginning editor, first of all, must get a clear picture of what he is supposed to be. It is assumed that he is a competent writer, that he fully understands the mechanics of operating a paper. If he isn't, he shouldn't be in the graduating class. But this isn't point 1. It only brings him up to point 1.

There may be many good thinkers in his community—men and women who have good and sound ideas—but most of them have neither the ability nor the facilities to express their thoughts. There may be many others who have the ability to speak (or write) with the tongues of men and of angels but who have nothing to say. The editor, if we are not being too idealistic, should possess both these abilities, he should be a combination of sound ideas and a golden pen.

To borrow another quotation from the Bible, the editor must "choose you this day whom ye will serve." The editor is truly a servant—but he is also a leader, a point around which like-minded persons can and will rally. While the editor will give an attentive ear—and space in his paper—to all persons and all good causes, regardless of their shades and even colors of opinions, still he cannot be all things to all people.

And right here we would warn him to abandon all such transient and meaningless labels as "liberal" and "conservative" which mean all things to all people. These tags are not those choices which we admonish him to choose this day. Rather we would have him choose between serving any one of a hundred special interest groups—and the people.

An editor may choose to hitch his wagon to the country club set. He may reason that it will be this special group which will buy his advertising space and will make or break him in the community. He may consider the social prestige that will be his because an editors' lack of economic resources can be offset by the power of his pen. The millionaires' club always has room for a nonmillionaire editor.

Or an editor may decide to cast his lot with the people—those young married couples, with starting families, who work for salaries, buy on the installment plan, and have difficulty making ends meet; white collared workers who serve in school rooms and offices; the family farmer who is striving to get ahead.

A price tag is attached to either choice.

In one instance, even his patriotism may be questioned if he rubs shoulders with too many common people, if he seems to attack the monarchy and uphold the democracy. Championing the cause of the people is often associated with such terms as "socialism," "leftist philosophy" and "reformer."

On the other hand, the popular course often is to promote the special interests who hide a multitude of sins under the gospel of "free enterprise" and "individual initiative."

After an editor has made his choice as to whom he will serve—and champion, all his subsequent decisions will fall in place in an orderly manner. If a man loves the people, one need have no fear as to how he will stand on such issues as public education, equality of opportunity and a hundred and one similar issues that will present themselves from year to year and from generation to generation.

To the prospective editor who is torn between two decisions, who is counting the cost of each decision, we would remind that someday some preacher is going to stand behind his bier and evaluate his contribution to mankind. They always do when editors die. That preacher will be able to summarize the editor's professional life in a mighty few words. He may say that Editor Jones gave his last full measure of devotion for the country club set and helping to make the rich richer—or he may say that the recently departed spent a lifetime fighting for and defending the masses of little men and women, young married couples, with starting families who work for salaries, buy on the installment plan, and have difficulty making ends meet.

Be not deceived * * * an editor cannot keep in touch with the people when he lives in an ivory tower or at the country club.

The decision must be made by the beginning editor and not by this or any other writer or adviser. But speaking for himself, this editor could want for no greater eulogy at his funeral than to have it said that "he was always on the side of the people."

## The American Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on February 6, 1959, the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D.D., Archbishop of Washington, delivered a penetrating address entitled "The American Stand," before the Catholic Laymans' First Friday Club in Washington.

Archbishop O'Boyle outlined with clarity and force the real foundations of our national strength. His thoughtful address deserves wide reading.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN STAND

(Address of Archbishop O'Boyle, First Friday Club luncheon, Feb. 6, 1959)

Upon this country, and this generation of Americans, is laid the heavy burden of preserving world civilization. There have been times in history when the lights of culture and progress grew dim, flickered, and seemed about to die. We know that great civilizations of the past were born, flourished, and decayed.

The lessons of the past should be a somber warning to us in the waning half of the 20th century. We know that nations decayed because they weakened from within. They lost their sense of purpose, even their will to survive. Younger and more vigorous peoples took over and built new cities on the ruins of the old, only in turn to grow old and die.

Perhaps this process of history is irreversible. The day may come when the United States we love and cherish may be no more. Only the providence of God will determine our future. But we pray the divine mercy that, if our time as a nation must come, it will not be in the near future. Let us make no mistake about the fact that youth and vigor today exists in the Communist world. If we weaken and falter in our position of world leadership, they will fill the vacuum.

We all know these truths. Indeed, they are so well known that they are truisms. Why repeat them today? My answer is that there were aspects of the recent visit of Anastas Mikoyan that made me wonder about the strength of our resolution. It is not that I question our ability to meet a clear and concrete issue, such as the Berlin question. Nor am I doubtful about our willingness to sacrifice to maintain an adequate defense, even when the cost is astronomical. What worries me is our reaction to sustained pressure in the fields of diplomacy and psychological warfare.

The Soviet tactics is both simple and effective. They try to promote world conferences, high-level ones if possible, as often as possible. They enter these meetings with attractive proposals for relaxing tensions and promoting peace. These capture headlines and win a favorable world reaction. Then, in actual negotiations, they raise difficulties and present impossible conditions. We have the unpleasant task of being negative. The conference fails. In the eyes of the world, the Soviet Union has sought peace; we have blocked it.

Even if agreements were reached, we can still be placed in a bad light. It is one thing to agree, another to perform. There can be delays, evasions, or outright flouting of solemn covenants. But the agreement is news and good propaganda; the violation is so prolonged and involved that most of the world overlooks it.

There is a twofold purpose in this tactic. The first is to mount world opinion against the United States, and some of its allies, as being the parties of war, while the Communist world can pose as the party of peace. Second, there is the aim to confuse, divide, and weaken the very nations that are bulwarks of defense for Christian civilization. Simple souls will plead for better understanding, when the real problem is not understanding, but the very will for peace. Some will ask for more negotiations, when our history books are crowded with the record of futile and even harmful negotiations. There will be a call to compromise, when compromise would mean betrayal of principle.

The very real danger of the Mikoyan visit is that it was well calculated to exploit this weariness born of incessant bickering. It was an unequal, even a one-sided contest, when the able and agile visitor from Russia was pitted against a group of businessmen or even reporters who have not specialized in foreign affairs. He could literally get away with murder, simply because his listeners did not have at their fingertips the concrete facts that could have demolished his facile answers. The result was that he left the impression of a reasonable, genial executive who was more than willing to go halfway in settling differences. It is significant, by contrast, that the only sharp words he used in public here came after his visit with experts in the State Department who asked the right questions and would not take the wrong answers.

Please do not mistake my attitude in regard to this visit. I am not sorry that our visitor had proof that we are a friendly, courteous, peace-loving people. But I hope that he did not go home with the illusion that smooth talk and the soft sell could take the place of performance. The American people have not forgotten Hungary.

Again, I would be happy to learn that he found us ready to forgive past evils. We are indeed ready to forgive. But the child at his catechism learns that the conditions of forgiveness are sorrow for the past, and a firm intention to avoid evil in the future.

I think that we should apply to Mr. Mikoyan some very wise words he uttered the day he left the United States. He said: "To renounce rigidity does not mean to renounce principles. We do not respect those who lack principles. Life is a many-sided thing. Sometimes even the smallest differ-

ences have great significance. What is needed is patience and understanding." (New York Times, January 21, 1959, p. 3.)

We can indeed be patient and flexible in negotiation, but we are ironclad in defending principle. We can bypass nonessentials, but we are adamant in defending justice, honor, and the rights of man. Russia may soar higher than we have in outer space, but we must always strive to soar to the summit in ideals and the truths that are the core of our national greatness.

The ideals that have been the backbone of America's strength are the love of liberty, respect for the rights of all men, and reverence toward Almighty God. Alexis de Tocqueville, one of the most perceptive visitors ever to come to our shores, noted this about our Nation. He wrote:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there. In her fertile fields and boundless prairies, and it was not there. In her rich mines and her vast world commerce, and it was not there.

"Not until I went to the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and her power."

It is indeed from the churches that has sprung the reverence for our fellow men which is the basis of our enduring love of freedom. It is not out of place to quote again the noble statements of great Americans in regard to liberty.

Jefferson said that "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." Patrick Henry asked: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Daniel Webster told us: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." Another American, William Allen White, stated well our historic position: "Wherever a freeman is in chains, we are threatened also. Whoever is fighting for liberty is defending America." Contrast, if you will, these noble sentiments that express the soul of our Nation with the cynical remark of Lenin: "It is true that liberty is precious—so precious that it must be rationed." Or these words: "We will take eastern Europe; then the masses of Asia; then we will encircle the United States which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

In these critical times, it is more necessary than ever to go back to first principles and fundamental truths. Without them, we lose our drive, our purpose, our will to succeed. We fall into the terrible morass of apathy, and, as Bernard Baruch said, "In time of peril, apathy is the unforgivable sin, the irredeemable error."

Let us remember that liberty is not maintained by forgetting discipline, seeking ease, and making the ultimate goals of our society to be adjustment and conformity. The clutter and complexity of modern living leaves little room for serious thought. Discipline and purpose in the cause of freedom alone can overcome the powerful discipline of the Communist state.

One of the greatest political mistakes of the modern world was its failure 22 years ago to heed the warning of Pope Pius XI when he issued his encyclical on atheistic communism. At that time Russia seemed weak and insignificant, a tyranny that bedeviled and destroyed its own people, but no menace to world peace. But with prophetic insight the Pope warned that the perverted idealism and the diabolically shrewd tactics of Communist Russia posed a basic threat to Christian civilization. "For the first time in history," he said, "we are witnessing a struggle, cold-blooded in purpose and mapped out to the least detail, between man and all that is called God." That, I repeat, was written 22 years ago, and it is most timely today.

Communism, in its path of evil, has all the world vision, all the burning zeal, all the fervor and devotion of the most zealous missionary preaching the true faith. Somehow it has instilled in its followers a willingness to sacrifice and even to die for a cause that to us seems so patently revolting and evil. Enthusiasm is contagious. When the uncommitted nations of the world are told that our society is soft, decadent, declining, and that the Communist world is vital, expanding, purposeful, which pattern are they likely to choose?

The answer to this challenge can be stated in the words of St. Paul: "Stir up the grace of God which is in thee * * *" (II Timothy 1:6). We must revive our strength by a return to the principles that alone will give true strength: faith, courage, discipline, dedication to duty, and some touch of austerity. Discipline and not ease in the school, at home, at work. Purpose and dedication in our political life. A life directed to what is right, not what is pleasant. These are some of the hard virtues, the manly virtues of the early Christians. They are also the virtues that conquered this continent and built a great and free nation.

If, as strong and disciplined men, we confront the Communist and the neutral world, they will respect us. They will know that we will not compromise with evil. They will realize that they, not we, must change if the world is to be blessed with peace and prosperity.

Our strength will then keep the peace. Our prayers will be that, in God's providence, the Communist world will realize the monstrous evil of its tyranny and that a new day may dawn for this dark and troubled world.

---

## World Medical Science Advances on Three Vital Fronts: The Hill Bill, The World Health Year, United States-U.S.S.R. Medical Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to several vital fronts on which, very fortunately, the health of the world is being advanced.

I was pleased to read in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald an illuminating article by its distinguished columnist, Malvina Lindsay, under the title, "Lowering Global Disease Anxiety."

With her usual insight and understanding of the interplay of psychological, cultural, and scientific trends, Miss Lindsay has pointed up two of the major fronts in which man is making great strides toward the conquest of disease.

HEARING ON THE HILL BILL, S.J. RES. 41

The first of these fronts is on Capitol Hill—where, tomorrow the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare holds its final hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 41, introduced by the esteemed Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. This resolution, which others and I are pleased to cosponsor, will establish a National Institute for International Medical Research.

WORLD HEALTH ACTION AGAINST EPIDEMICS

The second vital front to which Miss Lindsay refers is the action of the World Health Organization in leading the fight against the ancient scourge of pestilence.

Fortunately, mankind has been largely relieved of the fear of epidemics. Yet in this age of jet travel, the possibility always exists that with lightning fury an epidemic of cholera, yellow fever, bubonic plague, or the like, will race throughout the world, bringing mass death in its wake.

FORTHCOMING INTERNATIONAL HEALTH YEAR

In this connection, too, Miss Lindsay refers to the meeting in Geneva in May of the General Assembly of the World Health Organization. It will take up proposals for an International Public Health and Medical Research Year, possibly commencing in June 1961.

I am pleased that this action is largely at the initiative of the United States, in view of the unanimous Senate passage, last August, of Senate Resolution 361, 85th Congress, which I had introduced in order to facilitate such a year and which the Committee on Foreign Relations had reported without dissent.

UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. MEDICAL EXCHANGES

The third vital front is in the field of medical exchanges.

In this connection, I cite a most interesting article from the front page of Sunday's New York Times, entitled "Soviet Exchanges Alter Brain Study."

The article pointed out that, thanks to current exchanges of medical neurologists and other specialists between the United States and the U.S.S.R., both countries have been aided in their specific research on the central nervous system.

Russia, it must be remembered, has a great tradition of study of the processes of the brain. Russian scientists like the great Prof. Ivan Pavlov have contributed some of our most significant knowledge on the workings of the reflexes and of the central nervous system as a whole.

I have been in communication with American, Canadian, and other brain specialists in order to advance research into such problems as epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, and other disorders of the central nervous system.

It is only natural, therefore, that this very important subject of exchanges was one of the principal items for discussion in the course of my visit with Soviet medical authorities in early December 1958.

REPORT TO SENATOR HUMPHREY FROM STATE DEPARTMENT

A recent report which I have received from the State Department describes the welcome progress under the first year of the Lacy-Zarubin agreement in medical exchanges and in other fields.

I hope that these exchanges will be multiplied manyfold in the second year and that a broad new extension agreement will be negotiated. Exchanges represent one of the great hopes for advancing science and for improving relations between the East and the West.

In order, then, to point up the developments on these three fronts, I send to the desk the text of Miss Lindsay's article from the March 9 Washington Post and

Times Herald and of the New York Times story on March 8. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 9, 1959]

LOWERING GLOBAL DISEASE ANXIETY

(By Malvina Lindsay)

The fear of war may hang over mankind for a long time to come. But fear of scourge and pestilence, as well as of noncommunicable disease, is casting an ever-shorter shadow over the lives of people.

If medical research of all nations can be better coordinated—which is one aim of the proposed National Institute of International Research on which congressional hearings are now being held—many prevailing diseases can be conquered more quickly and more well-being brought to people everywhere.

This project, together with the activities of the World Health Organization, which is planning at its meeting at Geneva in May to set in motion an International Health Year, corresponding to the International Geophysical Year, will help prevent recurrence of the great traumas peoples have suffered from the beginning of human history as a result of disease visitations.

Recent outbreaks of cholera in Bengal and in Bangkok have shown that plague is not yet banished from the globe. Yet the speed with which these were countered by vaccination, disinfection, quarantine, demonstrated how well man today is mobilized to fight germs. But he needs a stronger intelligence corps to foresee and forestall their development.

It is hard for modern man, with his protection of hygiene and sanitation, his vaccinations and immunizations, to realize how disease has hampered, terrified, and devastated peoples of the past and left on them psychological scars that endured for years. It is hard for him to understand how the Black Death, the Great Plague of Europe, and later scourges of smallpox, yellow fever, typhus have influenced history and left legacies of mass debility and neurosis.

A society or culture, like a human being, has a "unique psychological fabric" on which any great crisis leaves its mark, Dr. William L. Langer, of Harvard University, said in an address in 1957 at the annual dinner of the American Historical Association. In support of this he cited the late Sigmund Freud. Contemporary man, said Freud, living in a scientific age in which epidemic disease is understood and, to a large extent controlled, is apt to lose appreciation of the enormous incomprehensible losses of life in past generations, to say nothing of the prolonged and widespread emotional strain occasioned by such disasters.

Dr. Langer suggested that the great epidemics of 165–180 A.D. and 250–280 A.D. may have contributed to the fall of Rome. The Black Death of 1348–49 he called the greatest single disaster that had ever befallen European mankind. In most localities up to half of the population was lost in a few months.

Europe was ravaged subsequently by disease for about 300 years, suffering epidemics of bubonic plague, typhus, syphilis, "English sweat" (influenza). Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo may have been in part owing to the typhus his army suffered during its invasion of Russia in 1812. These epidemics halted economic progress, led to emotional upsurges, as flagellant processions, searches for scapegoats, large-scale pogroms, flights of citizens from one place to another, outbreaks of riotous living. They caused moods of misery, depression, anxiety, a morbid preoccupation with death and, in the 15th century, the spread of witchcraft.

Yet international efforts to cope with such disasters began as early as 500 years ago at the time of the Black Death, the World Health Organization records in its recent issue of World Health. These quarantine efforts were strange, rigorous rituals, such as treating those exposed with fumes of boiling pitch and washing them in vinegar.

Quarantine efforts through successive years largely failed because they were not based on scientific knowledge. It was not until 1903 that an effective quarantine convention was signed to prevent the spread of disease over national frontiers. The World Health Organization, created in 1948, became the international authority on quarantine matters. The ideal to which the WHO now looks forward is the elimination of haunts of pestilence within nations so that measures at frontiers will not be necessary.

The proposed National Institute of International Medical Research should not only contribute to this but also to the conquest of other diseases that sap human energy and lower productivity in all parts of the world.

---

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1959]

SOVIET EXCHANGES ALTER BRAIN STUDY

A shift in emphasis on research in mental disease is apparently following the recent freer exchange of scientific information between the United States and the Soviet Union. This was indicated here yesterday by three Soviet scientists just before they started on the last leg of a month-long tour of American laboratories. The laboratories are engaged in research on the physiology and pharmacology of the nervous system. The visit here follows one made to similar Soviet research installations by five American scientists in November and December. The tour is provided for in an agreement between both Nations, made in January 1958, to exchange missions in eight fields of medical science.

Shifts in brain research programs in the two countries have already resulted from exchanges made during a colloquium last October in Moscow, according to Dr. Vladimir S. Rusinov, head of the Soviet mission.

Dr. Rusinov is the director of the department of physiology and pathology of the nervous system at the Institute of Neurosurgery of the Soviet Academy of Medical Sciences in Moscow.

"During that colloquium," he said, "it became quite clear that our scientists were approaching the problem through studies of the cerebral cortex while your workers were concentrating on subcortical structures, such as the reticular formation at the base of the brain."

Since the colloquium, he said, some Soviet scientists have initiated new studies of the brain's subcortical structures.

He said he found it "especially pleasing" that several American scientists had shifted the emphasis of their research toward Soviet ideas brought out at the Moscow meeting.

Another example of how Soviet and American medical research programs appear to be moving toward a unified front was cited by Dr. Sergey V. Anichkov, head of the department of pharmacology of the Sanitary-Hygiene Medical Institute at Leningrad, the oldest institution of its kind in the Soviet Union.

Dr. Anichkov said his task was to find drugs that were active on the central nervous system. He noted that Soviet scientists conducted research in that field by studying the effect of a drug on the entire body. American scientists concentrated more on the drug's action at the level of individual cells.

"For a profound study giving important answers, it will be necessary to combine these approaches," he said.

The third Soviet scientist, Dr. Vasily V. Zakusov, said research on the central nervous system and on the drugs that affect it was on about the same level in the United States and the Soviet Union.

Dr. Zakusov is the director of the Institute of Pharmacology and Chemotherapy of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in Moscow. It is the newest such installation in Russia.

"Of course, there are some differences," he said. "For example, we are somewhat more advanced in studies of the central nervous system. You are ahead of us in the synthesis of new drugs."

It was because of deficiencies in the Soviet program for drug synthesis, Dr. Zakusov said, that his institute was created 4 years ago. He said his laboratory had no exact counterpart in the United States, but that some of the pharmaceutical laboratories he had visited here "come close."

The Soviet scientists gave one example of recent advances made in the discovery of new drugs to treat nervous disease. It was an alkaloid called nevalin from the snowdrop flower.

---

## Bill Decker, High Sheriff of Dallas County, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, citizens of Dallas, Tex., recently honored at a testimony dinner one of their veteran public servants, Sheriff J. E. (Bill) Decker.

The record of this man's service is underlined by the qualities of ability, fairness, courage, and competence.

These attributes have been singled out in a recent editorial carried in the Dallas Morning News, for which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 4, 1959]

BILL DECKER

The high sheriff of Dallas County, J. E. (Bill) Decker, is known by his 253 other colleagues as the best sheriff in Texas. We in Dallas know him as the best in Dallas history.

But that honor did not singly attract all those local citizens last night to his testimonial dinner. They appreciate how a young lad started in the courthouse as an elevator boy and rose to high places through ability, fairness, courage, and competence.

Twenty-five years ago the notorious Harvey Bailey escaped from the Dallas County jail. Decker, chief deputy under Sheriff Smoot Schmid, walked into the press-room and told reporters before he told anybody else.

That's why we in the newspaper business admire him. He never covers up. Even criminals respect him for shooting squarely.

A salute. And many more years of service.

## Bill Monroe Exemplifies Courageous Spirit of Handicapped Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH**
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, once a year, a week is set aside for recognition of the broad strides made by the physically handicapped people of this Nation.

I believe this recognition should come more often. The things being done in America today by handicapped persons often constitute near-miracles.

For example, there is Bill Monroe, a student at Southewestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Tex.

When I say broad strides made by handicapped persons, this has particular meaning for Bill. He was stricken with polio in 1952 while serving with the Air Force in Korea.

Although doctors told him he would never walk again, he has proved them wrong. Today he carries 18 semester hours of classroom work toward a bachelor of divinity degree. He has a part-time job as a minister on weekends. In addition, he has opened a book store in Fort Worth. He travels with Baptist youth revivals about 3 months each summer. He was an all-A student while getting a master of arts degree from Baylor University. He is also the father of two young children.

This young man's faith and courage can serve as an excellent example not only to other physically handicapped persons but to all of us.

Mr. President, as special recognition of these fine accomplishments of Bill Monroe and his family, and as a salute to the other physically handicapped persons of our Nation who are establishing such wonderful records, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram for Sunday, February 22, 1959, under the heading "Polio Victim Kept Busy By Schedule."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLIO VICTIM KEPT BUSY BY SCHEDULE

Bill Monroe, busy student and father, is proving a crutch is something to lean on physically, not mentally.

A first-year student at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Monroe is a polio victim.

But he has overcome the crippling disease, propelling himself from a wheelchair into a full life.

He was stricken while in the Air Force in Korea in 1952.

Military doctors told him he would never walk again. But time and determination have proved the experts wrong.

Monroe has a schedule that might turn a business executive's hair white.

He is carrying 18 semester hours of classroom work. His aim is a bachelor of divinity degree.

On weekends he preaches on a part-time basis. His latest venture is a bookstore at 1710 Gambrell, near the seminary, where he will sell books to students.

Each summer he travels the State from 12 to 14 weeks, working in Baptist youth revivals.

Monroe and his wife, Patti, attended Baylor together in 1953. He was graduated in 1956.

"She got a little behind because she took time out to have two babies," Monroe said. The youngsters are a son, Cam, 2, and a daughter, Cathy, 4.

Monroe also earned a master of arts degree at Baylor, completing the work in 1958. He was an all-A student at Baylor, and is maintaining the high level at the seminary.

Monroe, a native of Omaha, Nebr., appeared on the nationwide Quiz Kids program in 1943.

During the Korean war, Monroe served as a radio operator on an air troop carrier.

He explained that he became a Christian in a military hospital in Japan.

"I was so weak I couldn't hold up a magazine. But I was able to read a New Testament that a chaplain had given to me. He told me that I could find the answer to my problems in the Bible. I accepted Christ right there in the hospital."

Monroe went through Baylor in a wheelchair. In 1955 he began standing to preach.

Now he can climb stairs without hand rails. He averages about 120 bowling from his wheelchair.

"The Lord is the limit as to how far I can go," Monroe said.

## Air Force Chief of Staff Believes United States Should Accelerate Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. MELVIN PRICE**
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 9, 1959*

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with much interest that among the reservations held by Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, regarding proposed Air Force funding in the fiscal year 1960 budget, is one having to do with the nuclear-powered aircraft.

There is no doubt but that the United States could now be laying claim to the world's first nuclear-powered airplane were it not for delayed decisions and, worse, lack of decisions in past years.

I am in complete agreement with General White when he points out that our aircraft nuclear propulsion program is sufficiently advanced so that we should proceed with construction of the prototype airframe development and that we should accelerate the propulsion phase of the program.

I herewith include with my remarks the reservations which General White has set forth regarding the 1960 budget:

GENERAL WHITE SETS FORTH RESERVATIONS ABOUT FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

Gen. Thomas D. White has told the Senate Preparedness Committee what are the reservations he holds regarding proposed Air Force funding in the fiscal year 1960 budget. The following is the text of General White's communication to the Senate group:

"This statement is in reply to the direct request of the chairman, Senate Preparedness Committee. It confirms oral examples given to the committee at the time questioning and completes my recital of reservations concerning the Air Force fiscal year 1960 budget.

"The present Air Force fiscal year 1960 budget does not permit the replacement of B–47's as rapidly as requested. While certain scientific advisers do not feel that we are ready to start building a nuclear powered aircraft, I consider that our aircraft nuclear powered program (ANP) is sufficiently advanced so that we should proceed with construction of the prototype development airframe and should accelerate the propulsion phase of the program. The density of coverage that will result from the Bomarc procurement proposed in this budget is substantially less than the Air Force initially submitted.

"The Air Force military construction program is marginal in terms of support type of facilities and does not provide for the cumulative and growing deficit in many equally important areas. In fiscal year 1960 the Air Force operations and maintenance funding is minimal and will require deferral of certain programs which it would be desirable, and in some cases more economical, to accomplish with fiscal year 1960 funds."

## Salute to 4–H and FFA Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ALEXANDER WILEY**
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I welcome the opportunity to salute two of the most outstanding programs for youth development in America—that is, the 4–H Club and Future Farmers of America programs.

Over the years, participation in 4–H or FFA projects has provided a splendid opportunity for our rural youth to develop special knowledges and skills in farming; as well as to participate in excellent programs for building of character and traits of leadership as citizens.

In Wisconsin, particularly, we have both outstanding 4–H and FFA programs. Under FFA alone, for example, there are over 14,000 members in our 283 chapters throughout the State. Overall, these have given our youth an opportunity to develop practical experience in carrying out special farm projects; including management, safety, forestry, soil conservation programs, home economics, and a variety of other activities on the farm. Participation in these programs acquaint boys and girls with the fundamental knowledges of how to deal with problems in these fields individually; as well as to cooperate with other young folks in group work for the development of such programs.

Here, too, they learn the principles of self-government, as well as develop traits of resourcefulness, ingenuity, teamwork, clean living, devotions to

principle, recognition of duty, and have various other constructive experiences that better enable them to meet the challenges of their own future.

The 4–H and FFA programs, too, are constructive antidotes to delinquency problems that sometimes develop in rural areas. According to estimates, over 520,000 youths over America were involved in delinquency cases in 1957.

Unfortunately, the growing problem of delinquency may sometimes overshadow the fact that the vast majority of our youth, many of them participating in such constructive programs as FFA and 4–H, are making commendable and constructive efforts for development of personal capabalities and abilities to serve their community and the Nation.

In recognition of National 4–H Club and National FFA Club Week—February 28 to March 7—the Rice Lake Chronotype, of Rice Lake, Wis., published a splendid editorial saluting the outstanding FFA and 4–H Club programs. I request unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALUTE TO YOUTH

This week is being observed nationally as 4–H Club Week and FFA week. The latter organization, to those acquainted with it, is the Future Farmers of America.

This edition of the Chronotype pays tribute to these two fine organizations and to the contributions of the young men and women who are members to the farm life of Barron County.

There are 4–H clubs in every corner of Barron County, composed of boys and girls who are pledged to the creed of "head, heart, hands, and health," and who are through 4–H becoming better citizens, more useful members of the farming community, better equipped to serve their families, their schools, their club, their country, and themselves.

Through their 4–H projects these youngsters are learning the rudiments of farm and home management. Herd management, gardening, farm safety, poultry raising, sewing, forestry, soil conservation—these are but a few of the projects these alert, bright-eyed, and eager youths have undertaken through 4–H.

As their years in 4–H pass and as they tackle more ambitious projects and take advantage of the widening circle of opportunities which the highly successful program affords, these youths grow in knowledge, self-assurance, usefulness, and good citizenship.

Much the same can be said of the Future Farmers of America. These boys are enrolled in an FFA chapter in their local high school, tied in with the agricultural training program at their school. The agricultural instructor is also their chapter adviser.

Improved farming methods, through recordkeeping, experimental grain plots, soil testing, reforestation projects—these are but a few of the undertakings of boys enrolled in FFA work. Through their chapters they learn the principals of self-government, so important to the youth in a democracy. They learn the rewards of a good showing in keen competition.

Resourcefulness, ingenuity, teamwork, clean living, devotion to duty—these are some of the things which the 4–H and FFA program instill in the farm youths who are enrolled as members.

For their personal achievements and for their contributions to a better life in rural America, and especially in Barron County, these young citizens are entitled to a well-earned salute from the older citizens.

## Fifty Years of Humanitarian Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tonight at the Willard Hotel there will be a dinner, one of the largest attended dinners of the season, honoring John W. Edelman. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, will be one of the many speakers from all fields of activity, paying tribute to a truly great American and one for whom for many years I have held admiration and affection.

No one knows the problems of housing better than John Edelman, and I am indebted to his constructive counsel and great founts of knowledge, statistic as to the past, wise planning as to the future, we vision wherein over every American family will be a decent roof, when I served as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. Yet housing is only one of the many subjects that affect the welfare of the American people and in which John Edelman is numbered among the experts.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article by Harry Conn, of Press Associates, Inc., and carried by the labor press throughout the country:

PIONEER UNION SPECIALIST

(By Harry Conn)

The trade union specialist—the trained professional expert who devotes himself to furthering the trade-union cause—is a common breed today.

This wasn't always true.

His path into the service of modern trade unions was blazed some 30 years ago by a small group of pioneers. They were trade unionists through conviction who went to work for unions to provide skilled assistance to union leaders.

The fact that specialists are so well integrated into the trade-union structure today attests to the effectiveness and zeal of the pioneers.

One of this group, John W. Edelman, Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union, is going to get some of the recognition which has been long due him when hundreds of his friends and associates gather at the Willard Hotel here on March 5.

John Edelman is being honored not just for his services to the trade union movement but to the cause of liberalism and humanity generally. It has been Edelman and those with the same outlook who have broadened the horizons of organized labor far beyond the bread and butter stage—and made the objectives of labor and liberalism one.

Edelman is the dean of labor lobbyists on Capitol Hill but his skills don't stop there. He has worked as a specialist in workers' education, publicity, housing, political action, legislation, community services—to name but a few.

"Today in the labor movement," he observed, "staff members are specialists in single fields or areas. It's political action or research or publicity or workers' education. In the twenties and thirties we were frequently called upon to be specialists in almost all fields."

His own interests and work remain wide and varied. He has an insatiable hunger for books, fiction and nonfiction. An unusually rapid reader, he has been known to finish several books a night.

Edelman is a slight, sharp-eyed man with thinning grey hair. His alertness, his preciseness of speech with a slight British flavor, his complete absorption with the subject at hand are familiar characteristics.

A fixture in the Washington area since 1939—and a frequent visitor before—Edelman has built up impressive relationships with Senators, Congressmen, trade unionists, the press, liberals. His deep regard for all persons, his warmth in these personal relations, have won him countless friends.

Asked by a reporter what was his title, Edelman replied: "I'm a labor lobbyist. It's a good name. I like it."

Testifying before congressional committees, Edelman holds his audience. He is a master of his facts; his preparation is sound.

Growled one reactionary southern Congressman after testimony on minimum wage: "I don't know what it is about him. He's about the only one of these labor guys I listen to, and damn it, he makes too much sense."

POLITICAL ACTION AT 14

Born in New Jersey, taken to England at the age of 9, Edelman spent his youth trying to find out what made sense. His stepfather was closely associated with the Socialists groups. At the age of 14, John Edelman branched out on his own and became a local secretary for the Independent Labor Party.

He joined his first union at the age of 16, the British Agricultural Labor Union, and did volunteer work with the exploited farmworkers. He had earlier experience, appropriately enough, assisting striking woolen workers.

At 17, he got his first newspaper job, writing for British and American papers. He joined the British Union of Journalists.

He returned to the United States several years later and eventually became Sunday editor and dramatic critic on the Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

Newspaper work, publicity, and even principal of a modern school in New Jersey, commanded Edelman's attention and skills for the next few years. Among his close friends were Clint Golden, later a leader of the United Steelworkers, and Edward Levinson, the late publicity director of the UAW.

It was during this period that he took what he calls the most constructive step of his life. He married Kate Van Eaton, a social worker from a good Ohio Republican family. He first met her when he was a private in the Army during World War I.

One of the first times that he really sank his teeth into social legislation was in editing a report, prepared by James H. Maurer and Abraham Epstein, on old-age pensions, for Gov. Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania. The report is still considered one of the finer social documents in America.

TO THE HOSIERY WORKERS

Edelman had steady contacts, at this time, with a comparatively small union, then called the American Federation of Full-Fashioned Hosiery Workers. The union needed someone with the skills which Edelman had developed over the years—in education, publicity, research and as a legislative expert. He agreed to go to work for the organization. The year was 1926.

Stephen Rauschenbush, who was on the staff of Governor Pinchot, as well as being a friend of Edelman, paints this picture of the period:

"Nineteen hundred and twenty-six was a terrible year for the trade union movement. It's hard to conceive of that atmosphere today. Some of us worked at it and talked—but it was mostly for the record. It was hard to believe that there was a future for unions.

"A professional man going to work for a union in those days was, in effect, casting his lot with those who would be underdogs all their lives and all his life. You had to be-

lieve when there wasn't tangible to believe in."

When Edelman took the job with the AFHW as an all-around specialist he became one of a very small number of such experts. Max Danish was editing Justice for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. The late Marion Hedges was putting out the Electrical Workers Journal for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, J. B. S. Hardman and Charles Erwin were working for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Eli Oliver had just been hired as research director for the Railway Clerks.

In the Hosiery Workers Union, Edelman worked with Gustav Geiges, then president of the union, and William Smith, secretary-treasurer, and later with Emil Rieve, who became president of the union around 1928. He also learned much about the South from two organizers—the late Harold Steele and Alfred Hoffman, both of whom later served as presidents of the AFHW.

"The Hosiery Workers Union," Edelman says, "was made up for the most part of young, militant, sanguine people who had in most instances quite an orientation toward trade unionism. I must say that there was an unusual degree of devotion and personal sacrifice on the part of these workers toward building of the union. Their dues were higher than average dues today and their union activities more intense."

HE RAN AND RAN AND RAN

Edelman, based in Pennsylvania, ran from spot to spot on assignments for the Hosiery Workers. He ran strikes. He put out publicity against scab hosiery operations. He ran an education and research program.

As a sideline, between strikes, negotiations, organizing, he conducted classes in labor history in Philadelphia and Paterson, N.J. One of his brighest students was Carl Holderman, now the Commissioner of Labor in New Jersey.

The immense importance of working with liberal, nonlabor groups has always characterized Edelman's activities. His work with the National Consumers League, for example, led to widespread public support and public sympathy for the trade union fight against sweatshops.

When many, in or out of the labor and liberal movements, think of John Edelman, they think of housing. He had no experience in this field at all before the onset of the depression.

Distressed by the housing problems of thousands of hosiery workers in Philadelphia who lost their homes during the depression, he tried at first to find a solution through organizing a cooperative housing corporation, but soon discovered that only through Federal financial assistance could an adequate remedy be found.

The way in which the resources of labor, Government, the community, and individual talents were mobilized to meet this situation is typical of Edelman's method of working. At the request of the union, the graduate school of Bryn Mawr under the leadership of Dr. Susan Kingsbury and Dr. Mildred Fairchild made a survey of housing needs and preferences of hosiery workers in Philadelphia. On the basis of this survey Architects Kastner and Stonorov designed a modern apartment project.

This project, sponsored by the American Federation of Hosiery Workers, was financed by a million-dollar loan from the Federal Government, supplemented with some assistance from private capital in the form of a private loan from William Jeanes, a young engineer with a social conscience. The project was named the Carl Mackley Houses in memory of the first hosiery worker killed in a strike.

HOUSING FOR ALL

In the year the project was built it was the only sizable construction job in the city of Philadelphia; it was the only such object of its kind in America, and created widespread interest and publicity. The Labor Housing Conference (later National Housing Conference) which grew out of this interest, actually became the initiator and the advocate of the first public housing legislation. James McDevitt, now head of COPE, was first chairman of the Labor Housing Conference; Edelman, secretary, McDevitt was chairman of the building trades in Philadelphia when Mackley was built. The Labor Housing Conference caused the first public housing resolution to be introduced at the AFL 1935 Atlantic City Convention.

Mention of other fields of activity where the Edelman imprint has been firmly marked is something like a congressional rollcall on major issues. Federal aid to education has occupied much of his time. In the field of foreign relations Edelman used his many talents for furthering interest in foreign economic aid. The labor attaché posts, which are now filled in embassies throughout the world with qualified labor people, were given much impetus by Edelman.

There is still another field where Edelman made his imprint—labor and social legislation—unemployment compensation, for example. It was in 1929 that he wrote the AFL resolution endorsing the program. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers, introduced it in the AFL convention in Vancouver, B.C., and for the first time the labor movement went officially on record for jobless benefits.

Minimum wage is another example of his pioneer work in the field of social legislation. Because of his interest and experience, the labor legislative committee assigned to him the principal responsibility for labor efforts in pushing the $1 minimum wage bill through Congress. Today Edelman and his associates are working for adequate Federal standards in many areas of labor and social legislation that are now well established as part of our economic makeup.

FIRST CIO EMPLOYEE

When the new Committee for Industrial Organization was set up by the new director, John Brophy, and his assistant, Katherine Ellickson, then Kitty Pollock, Edelman became its first employee. He was named a regional director in Philadelphia for the committee and later for the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

During this period of rapid development Edelman worked closely with scores of unions that brought thousands of members into the CIO. He served 3 years in this capacity before resigning late in 1939. A major disagreement took place with John L. Lewis over Communists and fellow travelers. Edelman felt that a strong stand had to be taken against them immediately.

He returned to Washington to take a job with the U.S. Housing Authority. Then to the National Defense Advisory Commission and then to the Office of Price Administration as CIO labor liaison officer.

OPA was the first of the war agencies that had clean-cut labor consultants established officially in conjunction with the Executive order. The order was, at least in part, the result of talks that Edelman and Philip Murray had with Leon Henderson, OPA director.

The cause of organized labor was still the closest to Edelman's heart. In 1943 he left the Government, at the request of Emil Rieve, to take over the Washington office of the Textile Workers Union. The office had been set up by Robert Oliver. Edelman has been running it ever since.

LOOKING BACK HALF A CENTURY

And John Edelman has been running himself since, too, to the far reaches of the country, wherever he can serve union men and women.

Here are some of his observations, today, as he looks back on 33 years of devoted service to trade unionism and 50 years of service to liberalism and social justice:

"The growing awareness of the necessity for legislative and political action is the most heartening development both within and out of the labor movement.

"It will take dedication of service, maximum political action, and legislative work, as well as the hard work of union organization, however, to eliminate exploitation and feudalism that remains in submerged groups in the South and agricultural labor. To this end we must mobilize the rank and file of our membership as well as citizens in the body politic."

And this word of advice from a successful father (3 children), grandfather (11 grandchildren) and husband (of Kate, of course): "An effective trade unionist or crusader for humanitarian causes is one who orders his own personal life to a reasonable degree."

To thousands John Edelman is a model—a tribute to clean, decent trade unionism and liberalism—a working fighter for humanitarianism.

John Edelman is a man who will go down in labor history as a man who never grew weary of making the hard fight in a good cause.

## Criticisms of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there have been bitter criticisms recently of the Supreme Court decisions, and in turn there have been criticisms of the criticizers. The Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., on March 7, 1959, reprinted from the Richmond News Leader an editorial entitled "How 'Law of the Land' Is Made." In this editorial the writer ably points out that some of the most blistering criticism of the Court comes from other members of the Court who are dissenting in particular decisions. I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW "LAW OF THE LAND" IS MADE

A few months ago, in its angry opinion in the Little Rock case, the Supreme Court of the United States proclaimed its supremacy unto all mankind. When the Court speaks, said the Court, it speaks the supreme law of the land. No man may disagree.

And how is such supreme law devised these days? The Court's opinions of February 24 afforded a remarkable picture of this solemn process in action.

One of the day's most significant opinions had to do with income taxes levied by Minnesota and Georgia on the interstate earnings of companies doing business in the two States. Six of the justices agreed upon an opinion upholding the taxes; they cited an impressive list of prior decisions to support their point of view. But Mr. Justice Whittaker, joined by Frankfurter and Stewart, wrote a blistering dissent. These three members said their colleagues of the majority couldn't read the English language; they accused them of sham and deception,

of muddy writing, of gauzy thinking, and of trespassing upon the legislative powers of the Congress.

Another of the day's more important rulings dealt with the power of Ohio and Wisconsin to tax certain products—iron ore and wood veneer—that recently had been imported. Mr. Justice Whittaker and five others joined in an opinion upholding the levies. Mr. Justice Stewart took no part in the case. Frankfurter and Harlan dissented; they accused their infallible brethren of upsetting long-established law, disregarding economic fact, splitting hairs, and in effect violating the Constitution they were sworn to uphold.

A third notable decision came when the Court upheld Virginia's franchise tax on the Railway Express Agency, Inc. Mr. Justice Clark wrote an opinion that evidently was altogether agreeable to Warren, Black, and Douglas. Frankfurter concurred in the result. Brennan agreed with Clark, "with some reservations." Harlan went along with Brennan, but with different reservations. Whittaker and Stewart dissented outright.

In three other cases decided on February 24, all of them admiralty cases, Stewart, Whittaker, Clark, Harlan, and Frankfurter went one way, and Brennan, Warren, Black, and Douglas went exactly the other. Black complained sourly that his colleagues were giving "technical or esoteric readings to congressional language which is perfectly understandable in ordinary English."

Each of these cases involved some important point of law, whether under the statutes of the United States or under the Constitution itself. The Minnesota and Georgia cases went to the heart of the whole constitutional concept of interstate commerce. The Ohio and Wisconsin cases required a direct construction of the constitutional provision which says that no State, without the consent of Congress, may levy a tax upon imports.

In the admiralty cases, the switch of one justice would have changed the supreme law of the land from A to B. During the course of the day, Mr. Justice Whittaker was both dead wrong and supremely right. In the Railway Express case, a five-man majority of the Court expounded, infallibly, the supreme law of the land; and as of the moment that opinion left their lips, it became the solemn duty of every judicial officer in the land (to recall the Little Rock case) to support the opinion and not to war against it, yet four members of the Court at once voiced reservations or outright disagreement.

These are our godlike masters—these nine quarreling, backbiting, dissenting, fueding, disagreeing mortals, whose every caprice is our command. And this, one asks in wonderment, is the great institution of judicial review? This is what is meant by the supreme law of the land?

## Appropriations for Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For Economy, but——" from the February 27 issue of the Newark Evening News dealing with the housing bill recently passed by the Senate. The views expressed indicate a keen understanding of the problems involved in the housing legislation. Such clear exposition is useful, indeed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR ECONOMY, BUT—

The House Banking Committee has approved an omnibus bill appropriating $2,100 million for housing. This is $1,250 million more than President Eisenhower recommended. Republican members of the committee say the bill will bust the budget.

The News believes in a balanced budget and favors economy in Government. But Newark needs more public housing and it needs Federal help with its Penn Plaza redevelopment project, which the committee bill would permit.

The dilemma is a familiar one. Republican Congressmen confront it continually. Supporting both economy in Government spending and Federal benefits for the home State requires a certain amount of rationalization.

It can be claimed for Newark and New Jersey that they produce far more in Federal revenues and get less back than many other cities and States. Industrial areas are forced to put up most of the billions that go to subsidize farmers and pay for reclamation and other projects in rural regions.

If this Government activity, wasteful and extravagant in the eyes of city folk, were curtailed, Federal taxes could be cut and urban areas would have money to do for themselves the things that need doing.

This isn't going to happen, of course. The farmers and other favored groups are going to continue to get handouts. And if taxes are not going to be cut, neither are they going to be increased by a Congress looking ahead to 1960. So urban needs like housing can be satisfied only at the risk of unbalancing the budget, with more inflation and more difficulty in selling Government bonds.

Sound principles of public finance cannot be compromised. On the other hand, the redevelopment that cities need for survival is beyond the resources of most of them.

It is not always easy to be consistent.

## Excerpts From Address by Mark W. Cresap, Jr., at the 18th Annual Science Talent Search

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other evening it was my privilege to attend the 18th annual science talent search and to hear an address delivered by Mark W. Cresap, Jr., president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. His address was a very interesting one. It stressed particularly the need to have young men and young women obtain a broader outlook upon life.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cresap's address, beginning on page 2, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MARK W. CRESAP, JR., PRESIDENT WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC CORP., AT THE 18TH ANNUAL SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 2, 1959

My duty is to congratulate the 40 young men and women in this room who are winners in the search this year. All of us share with you the satisfaction which must be yours at having made this promising start toward careers in science.

You have already demonstrated the interest and special talent requisite to a scientific career. Your job now is to develop that talent, to become increasingly skilled in the knowledge, the method and the mental discipline so unique to scientific endeavor. Factual knowledge you will gain as a matter of course; the scientific method you will come to accept as part of your way of life. But what may well be your greatest asset, to your profession and to society as well, will be your growth in the mental discipline of science.

This mental discipline I speak of is not easy to define. But as president of a science-based company, I have more than a casual opportunity to watch it operate. Every day I observe the stimulation which comes from some 7,000 productive scientists and engineers who are dedicated to those things from which the future will be made.

One might define this mental discipline of the scientist as an attitude, a philosophy, a sense of values. Or perhaps one can better define it through some of its characteristics: it is the conviction that what one is doing is eminently worth while; the attitude that one's best effort is what the job demands; the belief that competence is something to be sought after; and a sense of urgency about getting on with what is important to do.

Regrettably, this kind of philosophy is not one which permeates some segments of our citizenry. I join with those who are increasingly concerned about the growing tendency of so many individuals to accept mediocrity as a personal standard of performance. Mediocrity has not been our tradition. It did not colonize a wilderness and civilize a continent; it did not establish the world's greatest stronghold of human freedom; it did not create as near-perfect a system of government as man has yet devised; it did not build the vast industrial strength which has, on more than one occasion, preserved what was so dearly won.

Rather, these things have come from a national strength of character sparked in us by small groups of people imbued with more than their share of mental toughness, moral purpose and sense of destiny.

The results of scientific labors dominate almost every facet of the technological world we live in. It is the scientists who now face the great frontiers; theirs is a unique worldwide fraternity dedicated to the mastery of nature, not the mastery of men; in them we find the vision and spirit and purpose which have constituted the elements of leadership in the past.

Some 20 years ago an eminent English mathematician and astronomer, Sir James Jeans, expressed the vision and purpose of science this way:

"Our descendants of far-off ages, looking down the long vista of time from the other end, will see our present age as the misty morning of the world's history; our contemporaries of today will appear as dim heroic figures who fought their way through jungles of ignorance, error, superstition to discover truth, to learn how to harness the forces of nature, and to make the world worthy for mankind to live in."

Last spring, the American physicist, Dr. Edward Teller, expressed it in quite another way. In testimony before a congressional committee, he was asked why scientists wanted to explore space. "If we knew exactly," Dr. Teller said, "we wouldn't want to."

Such is the philosophy you embrace as you join the fraternity of scientists of the future. Congratulations and Godspeed.

## The Case for Nuclear Powered Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. MELVIN PRICE**
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Case for Nuclear Powered Aircraft" which appeared in the March 2, 1959, issue of Aviation Week.

The editorial follows:

THE CASE FOR NUCLEAR POWERED AIRCRAFT

(By Robert Hotz)

Public hearings on the nuclear powered aircraft program will begin soon on Capitol Hill, thanks to the persistent proddings of Senator CLINTON ANDERSON and Representative MELVIN PRICE, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. This will be the first opportunity for the American public to get any reasonably clear picture of the status of our military nuclear powered aircraft progress and the real reasons why this progress has reached a point of virtual stagnation.

Until now, this program, with some genuine cause, has been heavily shrouded in secrecy. Only its opponents have been able to make public statements supporting their secret decisions to retard or eliminate its financial support. We are all familiar with the "shitepoke" jibe of former Defense Secretary Charles Wilson when he tried to wipe out the entire program in 1953 and the more recent and technically indefensible statement of President Eisenhower that a nuclear powered aircraft, even if successful, "could only fly a few hundred feet off the ground"; and, of course, the monotonous chant of Deputy Defense Secretary Donald Quarles, with the leitmotif of technical timidity and false economy, is a key roadblock in any attempt to organize and sustain any type of fruitful program in this area. Mr. Quarles' consistent record of opposing any promising new technical development program proposed in the Pentagon during the past 4 years, including the initial USAF space-exploration efforts, the radar network to monitor Soviet missile tests, the WS–117L reconnaissance satellite, and efforts on basic research hardly lend credulity to his testimony against the nuclear powered aircraft program.

We firmly believe, along with congressional and USAF, Navy, and industry experts who have testified on the program, that there is a vital need for an accelerated development program aimed at producing militarily useful atomic powered aircraft. Within the limits of this space, we will try to summarize the case for this type of program.

First, there is a definite military requirement for nuclear powered aircraft.

For the Navy, a large nuclear powered aircraft with subsonic cruise speeds would make an ideal antisubmarine warfare weapon. Equipped with new and far-ranging detection devices now under development, a relatively small fleet of these aircraft could effectively comb critical expanses of ocean rapidly and effectively to locate enemy submarines and keep them under constant surveillance, even those using nuclear power. For the 40-kilometer speed of a nuclear powered submarine would avail little against the 350-kilometer cruise speed of a nuclear powered ASW plane. The Navy believes it can best utilize an airborne nuclear reactor to drive turboprop engines with a closed cycle type of operation. For only a few million dollars it could take the first vital step toward developing this aircraft using the British Princess flying boat hulls now in mothballs at Cowes.

For the Air Force, a nuclear powered aircraft would serve several useful purposes. It would provide a vital new element of flexibility and dispersal to out strategic deterrent capability that would be militarily more effective and economically more feasible than current airborne alert plans with chemically fueled bombers.

A relatively small fleet of nuclear powered bombers could remain on airborne alert continuously for periods of up to 30 days. They would require relatively short periods on the ground for maintenance and crew changes between missions. The entire fleet could be operated from a very few isolated island bases in the Atlantic and Pacific. These aircraft could carry heavy loads of long-range detection gear to provide a mobile flexible warning coverage beyond the capability of the fixed, immobile stations of the DEW Line and BMEWS that are so vulnerable to enemy ballistic missile attack.

The nuclear aircraft could also carry a sizable load of solid-fuel air launched 1,500-mile ballistic missiles that would provide an important, dispersed and quickly available element of our strategic deterrent.

In addition, the unlimited range of the nuclear powered aircraft makes it ideally suited for low level penetration to enemy targets under or around radar and missile defense systems. The high altitude nuclear explosions from Johnson Island during the Hardtack operations in 1958 marked the turning point for both offensive and defensive aerial delivery systems. The nuclear effects at high altitude are so widespread and devastating from heat and radiation that neither presently known aircraft structures nor nuclear offensive armament can remain useful when subject to its effect even at long range.

It is this capability for long range, devious, low level penetration, most probably through holes in an enemy's defense blasted by its own air launched missiles, that gives the nuclear powered bomber a capability utterly impossible for chemically powered aircraft even with aerial refueling.

The nuclear powered aircraft also fits into the military picture as a long-range, heavy cargo logistics support aircraft that could operate without refueling over intercontinental round trip ranges.

Second, the development of useful nuclear powered aircraft is technically feasible, and this feasibility has been demonstrated in an experimental environment.

The 13-year development program, starved for funds in its best years and almost choked lifeless by several economy-dictated decisions, has laid the basis for technical exploitation into workable hardware. If any doubts remain—and there are none among the technical personnel actually working on these projects—they will soon be dispelled by the public appearance of a Soviet nuclear powered aircraft whose existence was exclusively reported in Aviation Week, December 1. The public appearance of a nuclear aircraft during 1959 also was unequivocally promised by the official Soviet radio New Year's Day scientific broadcast. There are many difficult engineering problems, particularly in high temperatures metallurgy, between experimental feasibility demonstration of airborne nuclear power and production of useful operational hardware. But the latter goal will never be achieved unless we take the first steps with the determination to progress through increasingly better systems until the desired efficiency and reliability are achieved.

Third, radiological safety will permit operation of nuclear powered aircraft for military purposes, including exposure of aircraft crews and ground maintenance personnel and the civilian population at large.

Many horror stories have grown to credulity in the atmosphere of unnecessary military secrecy that has surrounded the radiological safety aspects of nuclear powered aircraft both in the air and on the ground. There is no good reason why the results of military and industry studies and tests in this area should remain secret any longer, and we hope Representative PRICE's group will pry it loose in the public interest.

Our nuclear powered aircraft program has suffered severely during the past 5 years from financial starvation and constant shifts in goals and pace by people who have had only the briefest and most vague contact with, or understanding of, the genuine problems involved in this undertaking. At this late date in the history of our technological weapons development race with the Soviet Union, it is imperative that we organize a technically sound and militarily useful nuclear powered aircraft program. Then, we must sustain it through its inevitable development problems and occasional experimental failures and finally employ its eventual products usefully in the military pattern of the future that is essential to maintain our position of leadership for the free world.

## Airlift Needed To Support Our Overseas Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY**
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Jim G. Lucas, a staff writer for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, regarding America's need for an adequate airlift to support our overseas forces in the event of a showdown. The article has been updated slightly to bring it up to date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRLIFT NEEDED TO SUPPORT OUR OVERSEAS FORCES

(By Jim G. Lucas)

WASHINGTON, Feb. 25.—Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said today Americans are kidding themselves if they believe we have the airlift needed to back our overseas forces in a showdown.

"With the exception of a few C–133s," the chairman of the Senate's Aviation Subcommittee warned, "we haven't a cargo plane which could cross the ocean nonstop with a payload."

MONRONEY said our 368-plane Civil Reserve Air Fleet, made up of commercial planes earmarked for use by the Armed Forces in an emergency, "exists only on paper and couldn't get out of the country." He said the CRAF consists of a hodgepodge of assorted passenger ships which do not meet the demands of modern war.

The Monroney subcommittee will soon have exploratory talks with Gen. William

H. Tunner, commander of the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), on adoption of a standard cargo design by military and commercial users. MATS has 500 four-engined planes and flies routes around the world. However, MONRONEY said these planes—of assorted sizes and speeds—are getting old and most cannot fly the ocean nonstop with a full military payload.

MONRONEY said a standard military-commercial design will eventually give us the airlift we think we have now. He warned however, it could call for an investment of more than $1 billion.

MONRONEY said his subcommittee will be accompanied by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, former Air Force Secretary, and Dalos W. Rentzel, former Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. Later, they will meet with representatives of major commercial airlines and aircraft manufacturers.

He estimated it will take the rest of this year to agree on a design, but that thereafter it shouldn't be too hard to get into production.

MONRONEY said his subcommittee is looking for a cargo plane about the size of the turbo prop C–133, but costing about half as much. He said the C–133, is far too expensive for commercial use. The Air Force has between 20 and 40 now in operation.

C–133s cost the Air Force $8 million each. MONRONEY said his group wants a comparable plane which could carry freight commercially at rates 10 to 20 percent higher than trucking. He said major aircraft companies have indicated such a plane is feasible, but none is in the design stage.

The Senator said commercial airlines now use passenger planes for cargo. He compared this to hauling freight in Pullmans and said it is no answer to our mobilization needs.

He said a fleet of 400 C–133 type cargo ships would solve our problem, but emphasized this figure is tentative, depending on his investigations. Of that number, he said, approximately 100 would go to MATS and the rest to the airlines to be ready to shift to military use on 6 hours' notice.

MONRONEY said 80 percent of our exposure to war involves the risk of limited conflicts, and that this makes even more imperative the need for an adequate airlift.

## Tribute to the Late Eleanor Stephens, Oregon State Librarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding State library systems in the Nation is that of the State of Oregon. This is shown by Oregon's high literacy rate and by the widespread use of books, magazines, newspapers, and other literary materials in Oregon. One of the people who contributed the most to the development of the Oregon State library system was our late State librarian, Eleanor Stephens, who passed away on February 25, 1959.

Because we are considering again this year Federal appropriations to strengthen rural library services and similar undertakings, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues the death of one who has been so important a figure in library work in our State and Nation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD House Concurrent Resolution 7, of the 50th legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, paying tribute to the illustrious memory of the late Eleanor Stephens.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7

Whereas Eleanor Stephens served the State of Oregon as State librarian for 17 years until her retirement of last month due to illness; and

Whereas the excellence of Oregon's library is the memorial to the constructive idealism of this wonderful woman; and

Whereas her personality and character enriched the lives of each person privileged to have known her and saddened the hearts of all on hearing of her death February 25, 1959; and

Whereas a poem of John Holmes, often quoted by Miss Stephens, seems particularly apropos this day:

"Under a strong light spread your map,
And plot the dear essential dream
In the fierce color of your blood,
Then say good-bye. Your star is up.
Trust your own heart to set you free
Along the curve of time, and go.":

Now, therefore, *be it*

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring therein)*, That this legislative assembly pay homage to a truly great and beloved citizen, Eleanor Stephens, and express its appreciation of her many contributions to the State and its citizens and the great loss suffered by us all on her death; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to her surviving family as an expression of sympathy from each member of this body.

## Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last week the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee unanimously recommended passage of the bill of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to admit the Territory of Hawaii into the Union as a State. I hope that this legislation receives as prompt and as favorable action on the Senate floor. On February 25 I testified before the Territories and Insular Affairs Subcommittee in behalf of this legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made at that time be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE, DEMOCRAT OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS ON HAWAII STATEHOOD, FEBRUARY 25, 1959

I am very grateful that this will be my last appearance before a Congressional Committee in behalf of Hawaii statehood.

It is not my intention today to go into any lengthy documentation of the case for Hawaii statehood. The record is formidable. It is replete with testimony that demands that the 86th Congress act without fail to make Hawaii our 50th State. For a number of years, as a member of the House Committee dealing with Territorial matters and as its chairman for 4 years, I was deeply involved in the question of statehood. I am convinced without question that the Territory of Hawaii has long been ready for statehood and that we will be guilty of grave dereliction if we delay any longer to bring it about.

The smoke screen of spurious arguments advanced by the opponents of Hawaii statehood has been thoroughly pierced, and in its disintegration it has been shown up for what it is—a device to hide the personal motives of the opponents of statehood.

The favorite line of the opposition has been to impugn the loyalty of Hawaii's citizenry, but the evidence shattering their accusations continues to grow in volume and strength. In June of 1953, Senator HUGH BUTLER, one-time foe of statehood because of possible Communist influence, made this statement at a Senate hearing:

"I believe the residents of Hawaii during the past 4 years * * * have demonstrated by positive action their awareness of the Communist danger and their determination to face it frankly and never let it strengthen its foothold. During those years they have fought it boldly, have restricted its influence, and to some degree have driven it underground. I believe they have shown that they are as well able as the Federal Government to cope with this measure."

James Michener, in his article in the December 1958 Reader's Digest, came to this conclusion after an extensive study:

"Hawaii does suffer from a Communist threat. So do San Francisco and Baltimore—and all America. Hawaii's problem is no different from that of any other area. * * *

"Hawaii is not a captive of the Communists. It is fighting back exactly like any mainland community. Its record is impressive."

It is no longer necessary to answer the argument of noncontiguity. It was answered firmly and finally when Congress last year made Alaska our 49th State. And there is no need to dwell on the argument of small population. It has been soundly refuted by the fact that Hawaii's 550,000 population exceeds that of five of our present States.

There remains then the basic question of whether Hawaii is economically, socially, and politically ready to become a State. These tests have all been met. There is no disputing the cold hard facts and figures that point up the economic prosperity of Hawaii. There is no mistaking the American culture and philosophy that dominates the lives of Hawaii's polyglot mixture. And there is no disputing the political maturity of the men and women in the legislative halls and the executive corridors of the Territory of Hawaii.

Last fall a joint congressional committee visited Hawaii. It went there with open eyes and open mind, self-consciously aware of the need to keep itself free of preconceived ideas and foregone conclusions. Members of the committee walked and rode and flew around the islands talking to people in every phase of life and meeting with labor and business groups and with fraternal, political, and community organizations. The committee came back enthusiastic. It came back secure in its conviction that Hawaii must become a State. In its report, the House members of the committee concluded that "admission of Hawaii, with its mixed races and its geographical position will vastly improve our posture and relationship throughout the vast Pacific area, where we are

striving with all our might and means to keep 800 million free and friendly."

Hawaii will, of course, benefit immeasurably from statehood. But let us not underestimate the economic, political, and diplomatic advantages that the United States as a nation will gain in having as a strong outpost in the Pacific a member of its "family of states." And let us not underestimate the fact that if we fail to bring Hawaii into this family we face the possibility of the Territory becoming a Commonwealth and all that that implies—a nation that belongs to us and yet does not.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that the question of Hawaii statehood is as much an international issue as it is a domestic issue. The nations in the Far East and elsewhere are watching us very closely on this. If we want to maintain their faith and confidence in us as a great democracy, we cannot afford to equivocate on this matter. There is a gap here between our pretensions and our performance. Let us close the gap by waiting no longer to make Hawaii our 50th State.

## Inflation—Take It With a Smile—But It Is Still Just as Deadly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, economists throughout the Nation, students of our fiscal system, and thoughtful leaders in our Government, have continually warned against the dangers of inflation.

Another viewpoint has been offered in the writings of Elmer Roessner, business writer for the McClure Newspaper Syndicate. His approach is in a humorous vein, but nevertheless, Mr. Roessner recognizes the deadly, inevitable results—complete crippling of our economic system—should inflation fail to be controlled.

Although Mr. Roessner has written his articles with tongue-in-cheek, it does not take much reading between the lines to understand that while today we can look at these problems with some humor, there will not be any laughing tomorrow for the millions of elderly people and salaried persons on fixed incomes who will suffer the most if we fail to halt inflation.

Added to the persuasive words of wisdom and economic science Mr. Roessner has brought out a statement of sarcasm, cynicism and humor in an effort to alert Americans to the perils of inflation as they exist today.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my weekly newsletter, which includes one of Mr. Roessner's columns, and a second column by Mr. Roessner.

There being no objection, the newsletter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL SOUNDNESS AN ESSENTIAL CONDITION OF ECONOMIC HEALTH

Sharpest debate in the Congress these days concerns the effect that inflation has on the economy. This concern over the dangers of inflationary practices is also reflected in the statements by many economists and leading administration spokesmen. The debates are not without humor, and for one tongue-in-cheek observation, I refer your attention to an article written by Mr. Elmer Roessner, noted business writer for the McClure Newspaper syndicate. His article follows:

"BUSINESS TODAY—INFLATION HAS GOOD POINTS—RUNAWAY ECONOMY BOOSTS INCENTIVE

"(By Elmer Roessner)

"NEW YORK.—Inflation is good.

"It is the cocktail of democracy.

"Yeah, I know. For years your boy has been denouncing inflation. He has called it the hole in the dike of business, the leukemia of the economy.

"Now your columnist, with a switch typical of his addled thinking, espouses inflation.

"Like lanolin, filtertips, and hexochlorophene, inflation is good for you. Here are some of the benefits:

"1. It rewards the smart. The wise ones who put their money in growth real estate and growth stocks gain more than the saps who store the cash in banks, Government bonds, or insurance.

*"Robin Hood angle*

"2. Inflation penalizes the rich and helps the poor as far as it diminishes the real indebtedness of those who owe money and diminishes the equities of those who lend it.

"3. Inflation is an incentive for simple people to work harder. The only way they can keep up with rising food prices is by swinging the axe faster or hitting the gong harder.

"4. It gets lazy wives off the sofa. Since inflation constantly increases the cost of living, more wives have to go to work to get more income to support their families. Government statistics show that the number of working females has risen directly with inflation."

"5. It encourages private enterprise. Workers often get weary of the wage-price rat race, in which they must strike once every year or so to get enough to keep even. They go into business for themselves, adding to the number of free enterprises in the country and eventually to Dun & Bradstreet statistics.

*"Ants punished*

"6. Inflation penalizes those who imitate the ants. It reduces the buying power of hoarded money and rewards the grasshoppers who, living for the day, spend their income.

"7. It keeps oldsters out of mischief. Because their savings are attenuated and Social Security benefits rise slower than prices, old people must keep to their grindstones. This keeps old gaffers from wasting their time flirting with girls.

"8. It keeps the younger generation alert. Youths realize that if they do not learn the economics of inflation along with reading, 'riting, 'rithmetic, and fingerpainting, they will be the knuckleheads of tomorrow.

"If a young man can't parse inflation, he's likely to spend his later years washing dishes—either in a hashhouse or in a jail for income-tax law violators.

"So, it's obvious that inflation is good for the Nation and anyone against it is in a class with those opposed to mother, clean fingernails, bright teeth, and the Boy Scout oath."

ANDERSON SOUNDS WARNING

Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, testifying before the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, illustrated fully why inflation is not merely an "opportunist political slogan," but is a stark dangerous reality that seriously threatens our economic stability.

In clearly defining the need for a balanced budget, Mr. Anderson said he is fearful "that price pressures may eventually revive, if we do not * * * close the budget gap," and expressed the belief that a nation as rich and productive as the United States, in times of prosperity, must "at least pay its way."

He said, "The fact of the matter is there is almost nothing which is more positive and more important * * * than fiscal soundness. This is an essential condition of our economic health, without which we can have neither adequate military security nor the adequate provision of other needed governmental services. Meeting our expenses currently and all that that means in the way of fiscal soundness and a healthy economy is a highly positive objective which deserves the support of everyone."

DEFICIT SPENDING FANS FIRES OF INFLATION

Dr. Don Paarlberg, administration economist, said, "* * * deficit spending is far more likely to fan the flames of inflation than to add substantial increments to economic growth. Little good and much harm can come from a price rise which is the result of fiscal irresponsibility or a speculative orgy."

Dr. Paarlberg rejects the contention that inflation is necessary for economic growth. Faster growth results primarily from actions undertaken in the private sector of the economy and by Federal measures to encourage and unleash private enterprise—not by Federal deficits. He said, "Historically, economic growth has been achieved by such methods as improving efficiency, accumulating savings, and encouraging investment. Solid and continued economic growth cannot be achieved by having the Federal Government continuously live beyond its means."

MASSIVE IRRESPONSIBILITY MEANS BANKRUPTCY

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, in a Senate floor speech, said, "We are witnessing the spectacle of massive irresponsibility by those who believe that spending funds we do not have will bring an unprecedented prosperity." He warned that if inflation is not halted, there will be nothing to prevent Americans from hauling a wheelbarrow full of dollars to the grocery store to buy a loaf of bread.

"The four horsemen of bankruptcy ride again—deficit, debt, inflation, and waste—spurred on by the disciples of massive irresponsibility, and if their mad gallop is not stopped, their devastation of our money and the future of world peace will be complete," GOLDWATER said.

BUSINESS TODAY—HERE'S HOW TO GIVE THE PEOPLE WHAT THEY WANT WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES

(By Elmer Roessner)

Things were tough in the republic of Democrastan. The people were clamoring for new schools with swimming pools, government sponsored art shows, and classier pensions.

But income taxes had reached 90 percent in top brackets, every thing from autos to light bulbs carried excises, and milk was taxed so much that the people would have drunk whisky instead if it were not for the fact it was taxed even more.

The President called in his Chancellor of the Exchecquer and the head of his Federal Reverse Board. "We have taxed everything to raise money," he said. "Nothing is made, nothing is done without the payment of a tax. We tax the dead, we tax the unborn—the former with estate taxes, the latter by loading them with a share of the national debt. We tax everything. Well, everything except savings."

*An idea*

"Hm." said the Chancellor. "Not savings? How did that escape us?"

"We wouldn't dare," said the President. "Thrift—the ant and the grasshopper—Benjamin Franklin and all that. It would undermine our cultural and ethical concepts. Besides the banks, the insurance companies, the savings and loan associations and all the other savings institutions would raise hell. We can't afford to have trouble with them if we ever hope to get elected again."

"Right," said the Federal Reverse man. "We couldn't just tax savings. People would say," his eyes twinkled, "that it would be confiscatory. But perhaps we can dip into the people's savings without calling it a tax, without even letting them know it's happening."

"It doesn't sound honest—I mean I don't think we could get away with it," said the President. "How would we go about it?"

*The old formula*

"It's easy," said the Fed man. "We just give the peoplel all the things they want, even the swimming pools. But instead of increasing taxes, we borrow the money."

"Couldn't we just print more?" asked the President.

"Of course not," said the Fed man. "That would be debasing the currency. People wouldn't stand for it. We'll borrow the money from banks, giving them bonds to hold. Then whenever they need money, they can put up the bonds as security, thus increasing the supply of credit."

"How will that tax the savings?" asked the President.

"By doubling the amount of credit, the plan will simply cut the buying power of savings in half," the Fed man answered. "The plan takes away half the real value of the savings and uses it to build swimming pools—or highways, apartment houses, or whatever the people want."

"Won't the savers object?"

*No one alarmed*

"Not very much. In the first place, this plan works fairly slowly. It will be years before they realize that half their savings are gone. Even then, what they have left will have the same name as their savings used to have—a thousand pesos, 10,000 marks, a hundred thousand dollars, a million pounds, or whatever the label was.

"Besides, those who own real estate or stocks will think they are richer, because the name of the prices of those things will have gone up. A one-hundred-simoleon stock will be worth 200 simoleons; a 10,000 bucko house will be priced at 20,000 buckos. Of course, they won't be any more valuable. It will just seem so because there is so much more credit bidding for them."

"Say, this is a great system," exclaimed the President. "We raise the money and the people we take it from never know its gone until it's too late. Something as good as this ought to have a name."

"It already has a name," said the Chancellor of the Exchequer. "It's called inflation."

"Nice boomy sound to it," remarked the President. "I have only one other question. Is it honest?"

## Aid to Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "'Pappa Fix' No Longer?" published in the Tulsa, Okla., Tribune of March 4, 1959.

This article deals with the need for an International Development Association, to facilitate the making of loans, mixing hard and soft currencies, to achieve aid for underdeveloped areas.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PAPPA FIX" NO LONGER?

When Oklahoma's junior Senator, MIKE MONRONEY, was in Bangkok, Thailand, in 1956, he was struck by a strange contrast.

The Thais were full of talk about two recently completed engineering projects. About the first, they were intensely proud. It was an irrigation dam built on the Chao Phya River at a cost of $35 million, which would increase their rice production almost 50 percent. The special reason for their pride was that they had financed the project themselves, on their own credit, with help of an $18 million loan from the World Bank.

But about the second project, a new 148-kilometer section of the Northeast Highway, they were strangely shamefaced. They were embarrassed because the road was built for them at American suggestion, with American engineering and supervision and $21 million of American money, as compared with only $1 million of Thai money. Senator MONRONEY's impression was that the Thais felt they had lost face and sovereignty in accepting the highway. The whole subject was a hot political issue.

The Oklahoma Senator cites this contrast as one reason why our lavish foreign aid program so often fails to win friends in the have-not nations of the world.

And it's one of the most dramatic arguments for the new approach toward foreign aid which he has been formulating ever since that 1956 trip. It is a businessman's approach, designed to put idle money to use, cut down our expensive foreign aid bill for gifts and grants, and promote rather than sap the self-respect of the needy nations on the receiving end.

He has a bill in Congress at this time to achieve that through the creation of an adjunct to the World Bank, which he would name the International Development Association. The bill has many supporters both in and out of Congress, but at this time its progress is being stalled by the ponderous wheels of the State Department.

Here's how the IDA would work. It would loan cheap money to needy nations on a second mortgage basis, probably as a supplement to make up the gap between what the World Bank can lend and what the nation in question needs. The money would be offered on lenient terms of perhaps 2 percent for 40 years, as compared with the stricter 6 percent for 20 years of the World Bank.

Where would the money come from? Ah, there's the beauty of this proposal. Instead of being precious hard-currency dollars such as the World Bank deals in, the IDA loans would be made largely in the so-called soft currencies which the United States receives from the sale of farm surpluses—currencies which often lie idle for lack of reinvestment opportunities.

Another beauty of this proposal is that the IDA probably would be capitalized by members of the World Bank. Thus, the almost exclusively American burden of helping have-not nations would be shared with many other free nations. Prosperous West Germany, in particular, might find great investment opportunity in the IDA.

Is this, then, the beginning of the end of the American taxpayers' foreign-aid burden? (Remember, foreign aid is costing Uncle Sam $4 billion this year.) Senator MONRONEY hesitates to guess how much it would reduce our burdens, except to say, "Probably substantially."

We would go further than that, though. If this program can be worked out, it might completely shift the emphasis of our foreign aid from a giveaway to an earn-your-way program.

And it won't be a minute too soon. It is an incredible paradox that this Nation, which pulled itself by its bootstraps from poverty to prosperity without help from anyone—indeed in the face of war and hazards—should have become so deeply committed to a giveaway program. It is so completely foreign to the nature of our competitive society that we should continually subsidize others.

We are not without compassion for the tremendous suffering of many have-not nations. It is our duty and our privilege to help. And we are aware, too, of the political implications of abandoning to communism the uncommitted nations which look to us for help. For it is not enough, as Senator MONRONEY points out, merely to offer them freedom, for to a hungry man freedom is abstract; only bread is real. It is important to demonstrate to the needy nations that democracy can offer them bread, as well as freedom, and that they do not have to turn to totalitarianism to satisfy their hunger.

But with all this, the principle must be one of helping those who will help themselves. The "pappa fix" emphasis of our present foreign aid has earned us few friends and some enemies. And it has the Russians laughing up their sleeves.

Senator MONRONEY's bill is one of the best hopes yet of putting an end to that.

## The Farm Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the article written by Mrs. Byron E. Guise, whose column "Ramblings" appears in the Marysville Advocate, brings back memories to everyone who has lived on a farm and observed the trend that is taking place in every agricultural area of the Nation. Those of us who remember a farmstead on practically every one-quarter section of land in Kansas have followed this trend with deep regret.

This article brings back many personal memories of my own early farm life, as I am sure it will for everyone who has that background.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAMBLINGS

(By Mrs. Byron E. Guise)

The most poignant phrase in the advertisements of the rural press is the oft repeated opening statement: "As I have decided to quit farmings."

Rural America is producing her own brand of displaced persons as farmers sell their lifelong way of life for the pottage of a job in town or forced retirement.

Never eulogized is the heartbreak of a farmer who has nursed the soil, watched the clouds for lifegiving rain to strengthen newborn blades of green and then witnessed the slow death of towering stalks of corn from the withering rays of a July sun.

Neither are there spoken words of sympathy for the man who watches the last balky cow loaded in the truck or the last stubborn hog, nursed from piggyhood to the porkchop stage, poked into the loading chute, or listens to that old tractor which bore several mortgages, slowly grunt into lethargic movement before it is driven from the farmyard for the last time.

He turns into the dark barn, its stalls now empty of livestock. Only the mingled odors of dried alfalfa hay and barnyard stench reminding him of the once sweet fragrance of foaming milk and the refrain of its steady stream filling the milk pails, of the purring kittens, their tails standing straight as bearing a flag, as they eagerly await the foam poured into the rusting drinking pans, and collie patiently thumping his bushy tail against the soft ground waiting to accompany his master to the lighted house.

Some of the freshly painted and cleaned machinery still stands in silent rows, as tombstones in a graveyard, awaiting the new owner's trailer hitch on the tomorrow to vacate the yard as empty as the now silent barn.

For the last time he makes the rounds, closing the heavy board yard gates where countless times before livestock was steered into a big truck for market, pulling together sliding doors on the now empty corncribs, once bulging with ears of golden corn, hinging the yawning doors on the henhouse where no longer the early morning cackles are heard and taking a last look at the omniscient quiet of the vacant chicken pen.

Habit is strong as he closes doors without reason, for no animals are left to get out, and he sees again in the reflection of the yard light the pink, green, and yellow sales bills bearing the words, "As I have decided to quit farming." The large type of his own name blurrs in the stark glow of light as the name of a stranger.

In this last hour alone with his soul before he faces his family in the farmhouse eagerly anticipating a move to the city, he recalls the purchase of his first steer as a 4–H Club member, his pride in feeding, washing, and currying the animal, his reluctance in parting with him to a new owner. Pride wells in his breast as he remembers with a glow the day he first rented the farm.

Again he hears the chant of the auctioneer, "I got 150; make it 60; who'll give 65?" endless as the procession of farm implements, livestock, and tools fell to new owners under the charm of his coaxing chant.

As the big yard is empty of life, he ponders, was it crop failures, poor management, not lack of hard work which prompted those fatal words, "As I have decided to quit farming"?

Soon the yard will be weed grown as spring arrives and the house, now brightly lighted in the evening sunset, will be dark as another farmer adds the 160-acre farm to his large farm operations and more deserted homes and empty farm lots add to the depressed scene.

An unknown fear aches in his heart as he faces the future in town. All of his life he has plowed the soil, milked cows, and slopped hogs. What use is such experience and background in applying for a new job? Only the endurance of physical strength of years of loading and lifting bales of hay, of pulling a mired tractor out of the mud, of long hours in combining wheat or milo or corn in harvesttime. Can a city employer use such a reference?

All of his life he has watched the sun and clouds for signs of weather in raising and garnering his crops. Now he must watch a clock. The hour hand will point time to work, time to eat, time to go home, but no time for the freedom of standing in the dark in a lonely, empty barn contemplating the future, no time for stopping the tractor in the field and leaning over the fence and exchanging views on the operations of new-model tractors, no time or place to see the sunset or the early morning dawn light the sky, no time to help the kids curry an animal for the 4–H fair, no time to go fishing when the grass greens in the pasture after an early spring freshet, no time to stop at a neighbor's and offer to exchange help in haying, no time to pat Collie's soft neck ruffle of fur in reassurance.

Here there is no boss to remind him he is loafing if the snow blankets the earth and he remains under his own roof, or oversleeps, to be awakened by the bellering of a cow. Never has he known competition except with his own sense of need of getting the work done.

There is a sudden feeling of kinship with Collie, limping with stiffness of old age. Neither knows what the future holds, because "I have decided to quit farming and move to town."

## State of Oregon Allows Citizens of Former Territory To Reunite During Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a part of its celebration of 100 years of statehood, the State of Oregon is giving a birthday present to citizens now residing in its former territorial boundaries. To all people living in the area of the once vast Oregon Territory, the centennial gift from Oregon is the privilege of being reunited with the present State. Thus, Mr. President, all residents of the States of Washington and Idaho and those residing in Montana and Wyoming west of the Continental Divide can, during this centennial year, enjoy the material and spiritual benefits of being Oregon citizens. No gift of liberation could be greater than to provide the displaced persons of the Oregon Territory with the right to return to the homeland.

Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, has designated members and officials of the Oregon Advertising Club as agents of the State in reclaiming for the State those portions of the Pacific Northwest which made up the original Oregon Territory. This is the expanse between the 42d and 49th parallels of latitude, and from one marine league seaward in the Pacific Ocean to the Continental Divide. I am sure that the residents of the original Oregon Territory will welcome this opportunity to reunite. The Governor's action declaring the territorial lands to be reunited with the mother State is not an act of aggression on the boundaries of the adjacent region, but an act of friendship and welcome.

So that Congress may know of the action taken by the State of Oregon to annex its former Territory and share benefits of Oregon citizenship with others less fortunate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix with my remarks the notice issued by Governor Hatfield and his open letter to residents of the Oregon Territory.

There being no objection, the notice and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKE NOTICE

Being entrusted with sacred obligations relative to the general welfare of the people of Oregon, and attending to the advisement of the Oregon Advertising Club, a body pledged to promote progress, industry and commerce within the great Commonwealth of Oregon, I do hereby advise and admonish a resort to return to the great State of Oregon those lands and peoples rightfully hers, which are presently incorporated within the boundaries of the original Oregon Territory.

I hereby grant amnesty and restoration of Oregon citizenship to all peoples now residing between the 42d and 49th parallels in the present States of Washington and Idaho, and those parts of Montana and Wyoming west of the Continental Divide. I declare those lands to be reunited with the mother State immediately, and, beginning in this year of 1959, the centennial anniversary of Oregon statehood, and that Oregon law shall spread its protective and loving arms throughout the original Oregon Territory, and that present boundaries within said Territory be declared null and void.

To this I do set forth my hand and seal:

MARK O. HATFIELD,
*Governor.*

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
SALEM, OREG., *March 9, 1959.*

*An open letter from the Governor of Oregon:*

As spokesman for Oregon and its citizens, I am honored to confer on you greetings and extend to you a sincere welcome home during this year 1959, the centennial of our great State.

I say "Welcome home," because where you now live is a segment of the Oregon Territory, a vast area that once reached from the Continental Divide to the Pacific Ocean, and from the 42d parallel to Canada. A parcel of land which, if reunited into one great Oregon would easily become the second largest State in the union, exceeded in size only by Alaska.

In recognition of this, and as Governor of Oregon, I hereby grant to you and to all people living in the Oregon Territory full amnesty and restoration of your Oregon citizenship beginning with this year, which commemorates the statehood centennial of your mother State, Oregon.

Welcome home. Come visit the Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair beginning on the 10th day of June; see the summer-long century of days' events in communities throughout the area. We'll be looking for you. Come early and stay awhile or a lifetime.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
*Governor.*

## Address by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer Before Military Government Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the ablest men in the entire Depart-

ment of Defense today is Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

On Saturday, October 25, 1958, General Lemnitzer made an address at the annual conference of the Military Government Association at Augusta, Ga., on the subject "The Role of Civil Affairs and Military Government." Mr. President, this is one of the most informative and enlightening addresses on the role of CAMG I have ever heard, and deserves the attention and consideration of all appropriate military commanders and staff officers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Lemnitzer's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF CIVIL AFFAIRS AND MILITARY GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY GEN. LYMAN L. LEMNITZER, ACTING CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY, AT THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE MILITARY GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION, HOTEL BON AIR, AUGUSTA, GA., SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1958

I consider myself greatly privileged to address this distinguished gathering of people dedicated to one of the vital activities of the Army. The title of my remarks is "The Role of Civil Affairs and Military Government." Actually, there could be little point in my talking to this group of experts on a subject of which you have such specialized knowledge and experience. More specifically, therefore, I shall direct my remarks to a discussion of the role of civil affairs and military government today, as it appears in the light of current considerations and of the Army's thinking with regard to the future.

Basically, the role of civil affairs and military government today may be said to be unchanged from what it has been in the past. Simply stated, that is to relieve commanders of combat units of the problem of administering the local population in the zone of operations; and beyond that, to influence the civilian population so that their cities and facilities not only cease to be liabilities but become assets. While the conditions which can be expected in modern war greatly complicate this task, the task itself is in principle the same obvious, basic one which has always existed in war.

I have just said that this task is both a basic and an obvious requirement in war. And yet, it is astonishing to consider the blunders which so many nations have made in this field. Possibly the best illustration in modern times of sheer, blind stupidity concerning the need for a sensible military government program was provided by the Nazis during World War II when their troops went into Russia.

You will recall that when the Germans launched their offensive against Russia, the troops who marched into the Ukraine were hailed as liberators and were offered bread and salt in the traditional gesture of welcome. Following up the combat forces, however, were the Nazis' so-called civil administrators and SS units. Their sole aim was to subjugate the local residents and extort from them every possible material resource. This objective could have been gained in large degree by persuasion and decent treatment, but the manner in which it was pursued was in complete defiance of the principles of humanity and benefit to the governed which are such important elements of our own doctrine.

Quite naturally, the Ukrainian people resented such treatment. They soon realized that the totalitarian domination which they had suffered under the Soviets had been replaced not by liberation but merely by totalitarian domination on the part of the Nazis. The Ukrainians' attempts to resist brought on brutal and ruthless retaliation. The result was the rapid growth of a widespread guerilla operation which had a serious impact on the German army's lines of communication, and which in the long run was a significant factor contributing to Germany's disastrous military defeat on the eastern front.

Brutality such as the Nazis displayed in the Ukraine is totally foreign to our own national character and violates basic principles of our doctrine for civil affairs and military government. Although we certainly have never been guilty of any such behavior, during the early months of World War II while we were building up our own military capabilities we committed serious errors of oversight in our planning, through our omission of adequate preparations for military government activities. These errors created major problems for us when we got into combat.

The fundamental difficulty, I believe, stems from the fact that some military men tend to think of civil affairs and military government as an activity whose necessity does not develop until there is a war or an emergency. Thus, there is an inclination to overlook it; or if it is not overlooked, to play it down or even to eliminate it altogether. Certainly, this situation existed before World War II. From time to time, the same attitude manifests itself even today, despite our experience, much of which was gained painfully and expensively.

Let me review some of the highlights of that experience, particularly those aspects which I observed myself.

Although just prior to World War II there had been some planning in the War Department and some instruction in the service schools with respect to civil affairs and military government functions, no organization existed for handling such matters. It was not until after Pearl Harbor—in fact, not until May of 1942—that the Army's School of Military Government was opened at Charlottesville, Va. Although the first gradautes of this school were trained in time to take part in the north African invasion, we had not yet clearly developed the concept of military government operations with the combat troops. We had given consideration to the administration of areas through which combat had passed, but not to the vital requirement of relieving the combat commander of the burden of taking necessary action with regard to civilians in the immediate combat zone. As a matter of fact, the administration of civilians in north Africa required us to divert substantial numbers of combat troops from other important tasks to perform this function and to protect our supply installations and communications. However, the situation could have been much worse if the civilian governmental administration had broken down. The question of continued local government and continued maintenance of utilities was one of the specific matters taken up with General Mast during the submarine operations which General Clark and I undertook on October 22, 1942, shortly before the landings. As a result, except for a short period in the areas where there was considerable fighting, local government continued to function.

This experience taught us a lesson, and we were more realistically prepared for the campaign in Sicily. The increasing efficiency of the Military Government School in Charlottesville as the lessons of actual experience became available, and the establishment of a combined British and American school near Algiers for allied military government officers showed fine results, and the difficulties with which we had been faced in the north African campaign were not repeated in Sicily. By the time we moved into Italy we had an efficient and smoothly functioning operation. The continuing progress showed again in Normandy, where despite the concentration of large numbers of troops in a relatively small and thickly populated area, civil affairs and military government personnel—among whom was your association's president, Gen. STROM THURMOND—made an invaluable contribution to the success which our forces achieved.

Notwithstanding the clear lessons of our past experiences, there are occasional recommendations today for civil affairs and military government to be eliminated as a peacetime activity of the Army. The thinking behind such recommendations is perhaps understandable in the light of the pressures upon the Army. These pressures stem from the requirement, in a period of rising costs and limited funds, to carry out essential missions including widespread operational activities, training, and logistical support functions for those activities, research and development to produce improved weapons and equipment, and modernization to replace wornout or outmoded items.

To mention a specific instance of the effect of these pressures, a few months ago the Department of the Army received recommendations which, if they had been approved and acted upon, would have abolished the Civil Affairs and Military Government School, transferring its functions to other existing agencies, and would have inactivated all civil affairs and military government units in the Active Army. The author of these recommendations was trying sincerely to effect worthwhile economies, and he had hit upon civil affairs and military government as an area in which he honestly believed that our current and wartime needs have already been met.

The viewpoint reflected by these recommendations was, of course, extremely shortsighted. Not only did it ignore the lessons of our past experience, but it failed to consider both the requirements of the future—about which I shall have something to say later—and those of the present.

Right now, for example, there are about 750,000 American military personnel stationed outside the United States—not including forces in our country's territories and possessions. In addition, there are some 23,000 U.S. citizens employed by the Military Establishment in these overseas areas. As you can well imagine, the presence of all these Americans in countries with cultures and values which are different from our own gives rise to problems which are numerous, varied, and often complex. Furthermore, these Americans exercise a positive influence on our relations with the nationals and the governments of the areas in question. If we are to realize the maximum benefit from this influence, it is essential that there be a point of coordination for the various aspects of their activities.

Besides these Americans, at our overseas military installations we are employing thousands of local foreign nationals who contribute enormously to the success of our mission. The relations which we have with these people influence not only our military effectiveness but have a significant impact on our chances for success in achieving our national objectives. The dealings of our military forces with these indigenous employees constitute a major civil affairs responsibility throughout the world.

I should like to make specific reference to this activity in the Far East—partly because I have fairly recent experience in that area, and partly because, as an area which is in many respects very different from our own in culture and outlook, our relations with the local populations there are of great importance.

First, I shall consider Japan. As you no doubt know, the United States and Japanese Governments have an administrative agreement dealing with the use of facilities and areas, the sharing of costs, the jurisdiction over persons, certain privileges and exemptions, and the methods of continuous mutual consultation necessary for our Armed Forces to carry out their missions effectively. When the Far East Command was disestablished on July 1, 1957, the Headquarters of U.S. Forces Japan was set up as a subordinate unified command under the commander in chief, Pacific. This headquarters includes a Deputy Chief of Staff for Civil Affairs, who is the U.S. member of a joint committee for consultation between the United States Armed Forces and the Japanese Government. Although the U.S. Ambassador in Japan is of course the principal American representative in the country, the senior military commander is authorized to negotiate with Japanese governmental officials on all matters relating to the administrative agreement. The joint committee is the forum for these discussions and negotiations.

One of the principal civil affairs tasks in Japan has been to deal with the large numbers of skilled and unskilled Japanese workers required in support of our activities, particularly during the Korean war. A monumental task which was successfully carried out was the development of a master labor contract with the Japanese Government, through which at one time we were employing almost 190,000 workers. Although this total has been reduced by half, there is still an essential civil affairs responsibility in connection with policy covering the rights and privileges of Japanese labor working for the U.S. forces, the establishment of sound labor relations, and the spread of information about our objectives with the object of gaining public acceptance of them. These functions are complicated in some instances by the rapid growth of Japanese industry and the consequent competition for facilities which occurs, and by our changing requirements.

I should like to make reference, also, to the very important civil affairs function in connection with the community relations councils which have been established. In Japan as in other countries where our forces are located, these councils have been instrumental in encouraging sound relations between the military units and the neighboring civilian communities.

In comparison with Japan, our civil affairs responsibilities in Korea are somewhat different. One of the chief differences results from the fact that in Korea there is a state of suspended hostilities rather than a condition of stable peace. To carry out his essential military mission in this situation, the commander in chief of the United Nations Command, as the principal representative of our forces, requires certain control and authority which, under normal conditions, would be vested in civilian agencies. These necessarily include economic assistance—particularly in support of defense activities—relief, and rehabilitation.

Our civil affairs program in Korea has been immensely rewarding. In addition to the United Nations rehabilitation programs, direct assistance has been rendered by our Armed Forces through the AFAK program—Armed Forces assistance to Korea. This program has been and continues to be a vital force in the reconstruction of the country and in the improvement of standards of living and general welfare. Through joint Korean-American effort, it has brought about the completion of some 3,500 projects with a value in money of almost $65 million. The value in good will between our two countries and in the welfare of the Korean people is incalculable. These projects have included schools, churches, bridges, public health facilities, orphanages, and flood control, among others. At the present time, almost 200 projects are underway.

Achievement of such noteworthy results would not have been possible without the effective coordination of the energies and objectives of many different agencies and organizations. The accomplishment of this coordination continues to be a major civil affairs responsibility.

The community relations program in Korea is inherently related to the AFAK program and, like it, is a concern of civil affairs. The community relations councils not only make it possible to combine the resources of our forces and the communities on a local basis for specific beneficial purposes, but permit a cooperative effort on the part of both military and local civilian officials to eliminate or prevent development of sources of difficulty and friction, to improve conditions, and generally to work to the best advantage of everyone concerned. This program is most valuable in achieving a relationship between our units and the Korean population which is beneficial to us in our activities in support of our national objectives, and which is highly important to our effectiveness for carrying out our military mission.

In this connection, the civil affairs function in Korea includes the vital task of planning for the handling of refugees in case an emergency should develop. In a heavily populated country with a limited road net and very difficult off-road mobility, such as Korea, this function is of particularly great importance both to facilitate military operations and to minimize the hardships for the civilian population in a zone of active combat. Such planning can surely reduce significantly the type of thing which occurred at the time of the invasion by the North Koreans in 1950, when thousands of refugees clogged the roads. Actions which prevent or minimize such mass flights are of very great importance, militarily and from humane considerations.

Before ending my discussion of our current civil affairs activities in the Far East, I should like to tell you something about the Ryukyu Islands, of which Okinawa is the largest. As most of you know, the chief of our civil administration in that area is the High Commissioner, Lt. Gen. Donald P. Booth.

Unlike Japan and Korea, the Ryukyu Islands have never, during reasonably recent history, been sovereign and independent, but they are now governed by a local government of their own choosing, which was first established during the U.S. occupation. As a result, among the important functions of civil affairs in the Ryukyus is assistance in the development of local government and in promoting the well-being of the people. This has required active cooperation with the local authorities in the development of financial and economic policy, in the greater utilization of local resources, and in a host of other aspects of government.

The record of civil affairs in the Ryukyus is one of major achievements. A new society has emerged from the almost complete destruction which occurred during the war. New standards of health, education, and welfare have been established, and new economic opportunities exist for a rapidly increasing population. A new political consciousness has taken root and has grown, and the people are participating actively in the conduct of their own affairs.

I have spoken to you of some of the important activities of civil affairs in the present. Now, what of the civil affairs function in the future?

An important part of our chances for success in any undertaking in the future depends upon the soundness of the actions which we take in the present. This fact emphasizes the importance of some of the major functions which are performed by the Chief of the Civil Affairs and Military Government Agency in the Department of the Army Staff. He is charged with formulating and developing civil affairs and military government plans and programs and with recommending civil affairs and military government policies for the Department of the Army. This function gains importance from the fact that, as you know, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have designated the Army as the service having primary responsibility in this field.

In addition the Chief of Civil Affairs and Military Government has important responsibilities in connection with the development of CA/MG units. Although direct training responsibilities for these units, of course, rest upon the commanding general of the Continental Army Command, the Chief of Civil Affairs and Military Government has staff supervisory responsibility in this field, to include developing doctrinal literature, maintaining liaison, and conducting periodic inspections of training, exercises, and other activities of both active Army and Reserve component units.

In my opinion, the development of clear understanding of civil affairs and military government functions throughout the Army and the maintenance of CA/MG units which are ready to perform their functions promptly in case of emergency are of greater importance today than ever before.

One of the characteristics of a nuclear war would be a great expansion in the area of the combat zone, with a corresponding increase in the number of people who would be caught in the path of the combat forces. Another pertinent factor would be the mass hysteria which the use of atomic weapons, or even the rumor of such use, might well be expected to cause in the civilian population of the combat zone. Still a third significant point to be noted is the greater tactical dispersion of combat units which would prevail. Finally, there is the fact that an atomic battlefield would be marked by extreme destruction.

All of these characteristics combine to intensify the importance of the civil affairs and military government role. If ground combat units are to operate successfully in a nuclear war—and their successful operation will be an essential element of victory—they must be able to concentrate rapidly from dispersed positions, to strike swiftly in exploitation of their nuclear strikes, and to disperse again quickly. The emphasis in each of these phases, as I have indicated, is on speed. But if the roads and the countryside are thronged with refugees it will not be possible to move speedily, and it may not be possible to move at all. If any illustration had been needed, the early months of the Korean war—even without atomic weapons being used—demonstrated this fact clearly.

Also, the wide dispersion which I mentioned as a characteristic of nuclear warfare on land will make infiltration by enemy agents or even troop units more feasible. Control of civilian movement will thus be of increased importance for the security as well as for the mobility of our forces. Again, the Korean war's early stages illustrate the point conclusively.

In short, in future operations, whether or not atomic weapons should be used, the responsibilities of civil affairs and military government will not only be no lighter than they have been in the past, but in all probability will be tremendously magnified. Therefore, we cannot sit back and assume that the organization and doctrine to carry out these vital functions can be created after hostilities begin. We must make every possible preparation now, so that in case of emergency the urgently needed steps could be taken promptly and efficiently. This is a need which, I am glad to say, is generally recognized and which is being met by a continuing and effective effort.

Your presence here today testifies to your own recognition and acceptance of a significant share of this important responsibility. Your varied professional skills, oriented through your military studies and training for application in the civil affairs and military government field, and your demonstrated willingness to render this vital service are among the Army's major assets in its efforts to prepare itself to meet whatever challenges the future may bring.

## Lincoln Day Address by Governor Underwood of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Gov. Cecil H. Underwood, of West Virginia, at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Lincoln Club of Kentucky, at Louisville, Ky., on February 14, 1959.

The Lincoln Club of Kentucky, one of the oldest in the United States, was honored by the presence of Governor Underwood and Mrs. Underwood, and particularly by his great speech. His speech differed from many other Lincoln Day speeches. It was a thoughtful and eloquent discussion of the principle of the Republican Party, and it suggested a chart for its future.

Governor Underwood is a young man, one of the youngest Governors in the United States. In his service as Governor he has already demonstrated his ability and leadership. I predict that he will continue to advance in the esteem of the people of West Virginia and in the service of the people of West Virginia and of the Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF CECIL H. UNDERWOOD, GOVERNOR OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT THE LINCOLN DAY DINNER OF THE LINCOLN CLUB OF KENTUCKY, BROWN HOTEL, LOUISVILLE, KY., FEBRUARY 14, 1959

As an American, as a West Virginian, as a Republican, I am honored to join with you in the observance of the 150th anniversity of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Of all the States in the Union, West Virginia owes most to President Lincoln. If there had been no Lincoln, there would probably be no State of West Virginia today. West Virginia is the only State in the Union created without the consent of the parent State and without the sanction of the Constitution; it was a war measure. President Lincoln's personal influence created widespread support among Members of Congress and the leaders of the new State.

After he had signed the Statehood Act, the President issued a public statement which included these words: "We can scarcely dispense with the aid of West Virginia in this trouble; much less can we afford to have her against us in Congress and in the field. Her brave and good men regard her admission into the Union as a matter of life and death. They have been true to the Union under several trials. We have so acted as to justify their hopes and we cannot fully retain their confidence and cooperation if we seem to break faith with them.

"The division of the State is dreaded as a precedent. But a measure made expedient by war is no precedent for times of peace. It is said that the admission of West Virginia is secession. Well if we call it by that name, there is still difference enough between secession against the Constitution and secession in favor of the Constitution. I believe the admission of West Virginia into the Union is expedient."

He thus made ours the 35th star in the American flag. Your invitation to the Governor of West Virginia, the war-born State godfathered by Lincoln, to speak to you as you honor Lincoln has a special meaning to me.

Since the November election, many people have become concerned about the future of the Republican Party. Prompted by post-election glee, the opposition would like to think the Republican Party has no future. Discouraged by post-election confusion, many Republicans see all sorts of things in the party's future.

By any measurement, the party suffered year, 1854, the year of Lincoln's election to a characteristic of off-year elections does not explain the extent of these losses. The reasons extend to more basic and fundamental problems.

This defeat, with certain bright exceptions, was nationwide. If we are possessed of doubts and fears about the Republican Party's future today, let us consider another year, 1954, the year of Lincoln's election to a second term. Civil war raged throughout the land; political leaders and writers thought the President was washed up politically; many important men in his own party viewed Lincoln's position as wrong.

Listen to the chorus of adversity.

A Union League worker in New York: "There are no Lincoln men. * * We know not which way to turn."

The Washington correspondent of the Detroit Free Press: "Not a single Senator can be named as favorable to Lincoln's renomination for President."

Henry J. Raymond, editor of the New York Times and chairman of the Republican National Committee: "The tide is setting strongly against us."

Horace Greeley (September 28): "Mr. Lincoln is already beaten. He cannot be elected. And we must have another ticket to save us from overthrow."

Even Lincoln himself admitted in an August memorandum that the November election seemed a lost cause. But he possessed hidden strength among the people of the Nation which had won him nomination and produced a landslide for him in the election. Most important was his courage to meet the issues of his day with faith and determination, placing his country's good above personal fortune.

Today's view is a picture of defeat; it should not be a portrait for despair. Its aftermath should be a time of resolution, not resignation, a time for action, not apathy.

I am encouraged—and so should every Republican—by the healthy response to this challenge. The course of the Republican Party is already being seriously debated by its leaders. There has been and there will continue to be controversy over the route of this course.

Honest difference of opinion about the party's position can be a sign of health. We are not hiding, in the closets of our party, any skeletons of shame and silence to haunt our political and national consciences. But controversy, to be productive, must be resolved in unity, a unity of purpose and means. We cannot afford to dissipate our opportunity for shortsighted, personally prejudiced motives.

I do not wish to stir dead ashes of inner-party conflict; however, two disputed points are worthy of consideration.

The first is the role of the President. President Eisenhower is indicative of American political paradoxes. The President must be both the national leader and the head of his political party. I personally believe that Dwight D. Eisenhower has done both tasks well, under the difficult circumstances of the past 6 years.

The job has been made more difficult by the opposition party control of the Congress. As a national leader, the President conscientiously could do nothing else but work with this opposition for the good of America. I am happy he did not choose, as did his predecessor, to sacrifice the national interest to partisan vindictiveness. Does any Republican or any American want to return to the Trumantics of a decade ago?

The second point is the repeated cry for principle in the Republican Party. I cannot take these outbursts too seriously. I believe the Republican Party is the party of principle. Too often, those who cry principle are merely disguising personal stubbornness and prejudice under the syllables of a high-sounding word.

One principle of American politics is that the parties have never been stifled by uncompromising dogmas. The American political system has been one of creative political compromise rather than blind partisanship. The very endurance of our political system—its flexibility—rests on this tacit recognition of the danger of dogma, the virtue of compromise. Those who falsely cry principle would do well to remember this historical fact.

At Des Moines, Chairman Alcorn outlined for all Republicans "A Road to Victory." This outline included both general points and specific proposals. His first general point is that we must convey to the electorate a true image of the Republican Party. I personally feel this to be most important; in order to attract and utilize the many workers needed in a great political party, that party must have a meaning for these people.

Today, the image of both parties seems blurred and obscure. Some people maintain that they cannot distinguish between them. To some extent, party lines are not as distinct as people once thought they were. And to a greater extent, it is easier to see party lines in retrospect than in the battles of a campaign.

This century has been one of unusually rapid change. The last two decades have altered the nature and aims of our political parties. The emphasis of American politics, perhaps due simply to the pressure of our world position, has shifted both in domestic and foreign affairs.

The image and meaning of political parties is now changing; they have always been changing. In its birth, the Republican Party was the party of the common man, the oppressed, and the enslaved. It was the party of the Union.

President Lincoln molded the young party in his own image. In his blood and bones he carried a living meaning for people. The breath of his speeches and the phrases of his writing carried the notion of popular government and Republican institutions. No voter experienced difficulty in recognizing the true image of Mr. Lincoln's party.

Only in the last 25 years have the labels "big business" and "vested interests" been tacked on the Republican Party, not out of conviction but out of political opportunity.

To present a true picture of itself, the Republican Party must shake off these stereotypes. Objectively, they are not true. In reality, big business has no party. In politics, business has been more of a pressure

group than a political ideology. Most business has contributed to both parties in the silent hope that it might benefit from whichever was the victor. To be blunt, businessmen have lost political influence because they have been apathetic and too engrossed in their own affairs to understand and appreciate the changing political world about them.

Nor is the Republican Party the party of vested interests. On the contrary, it is our opposition which is in the grip of a powerful pressure group. The Democrat Party and a labor hierarchy—a financially and politically wealthy minority group—campaign hand in hand.

I do not see this alinement as a threat to free enterprise. I believe that those who do are missing the more dangerous point. Over 50 years ago, American labor cast its aims within the free economic system; its aims then and since have been to get a bigger share of the profits of the system. The greater danger lies in their threat to subjugate national good to the selfish interests of this pressure group. "What's good for Jimmy Hoffa is not good for the country."

I do not think business and labor are basically in conflict, like all of us, they simply want a little more pay, a little bigger share of our economic wealth. This is not an unexpected or despicable aim. But it should be recognized for what it is.

In fact, I doubt if today business and labor form the bulk of America's social strata. We are witnessing the rise of a new force, the vast white collar and professional man. This politically potent group too shall soon demand its fair share of the national wealth.

Generally, these people earn a certain salary working for some other person, selling their talents and in some instances their personalities. They function daily in a system of bureaucracy whether in government, business, education, medicine, industry, or elsewhere. Today we are faced increasingly with a new and complex social organization of specialists, professionalists, and technologists.

The members of this new group have certain mutual problems which we must understand if we are ever to reach them politically. Difficult to delineate, this group is not homogenous and sometimes not even conscious of its potential influence. Perhaps the single common factor is indeed the white collar.

Politically, these citizens are unorganized and generally apathetic. They are attracted more by political personalities than by parties. Even in their apathy, they exercise tremendous influence. At neither extreme do their interests correspond with those of our major political groups, business, and labor.

Not bound to any pressure group and not beholden to powerful labor bosses, the Republican Party has a great opportunity in this area of modern America.

The stereotyped, false images of the Republican Party all point to one conclusion. We are still fighting battles over issues which no longer exist. Politically, this may have some merit, but nationally, it is foolish and dangerous. America is in a too sensitive and too powerful position to dissipate her energies in such fashion.

Our opponents are guilty of this in their stock response to every crisis. Waving the banner of 1932, these aging, but still naive, wonders of bureaucracy march again up the hill of Government spending, control, and expansion. Clinging desperately to a once politically potent weapon, these modern quixotes could tilt us into national disaster.

But the Republican Party is not innocent of this archaic activity. We have our shibboleths and old war clubs which we also wave at every battle, until the incessant din sounds like a freshman course in American history.

It is our obligation to present a true image of the Republican Party, an image which will be consistent with the problems we now face. Let me emphasize now. To do this, we must understand the meaning of the American experience. This is even more urgent in the face of international competition with a powerful enemy.

Our national experience, for all our traditional simplicity and emphasis on the common man and common ideals, has been a sophisticated experience. We were founded by a group of brilliant, cultured men, and the ideals with which they created America have governed her ever since.

The essence of the American experience has been the individual. Our Government was not founded for Government's sake, but to complement and guarantee the freedom and opportunity of the individual. Through history, this has meant a varying role for Government.

Freedom is inseparable from opportunity and security. To turn a man lose with no chance except for poverty and death is not freedom. Freedom is positive opportunity as well as freedom from restraint.

I cannot—I would not—tonight sketch such an image for you. It is one which we together must create, which will result from long study and much effort. Let me only emphasize the necessity for such a meaningful image.

The Republican Party must have emotional and intellectual content for its many workers. Practically speaking, a party will stand or fall on the work of the precinct level.

And it is work that must be implemented on the State level. A famous professor advanced the obvious thesis that we have national politics but State parties in America. Party organization can be most effective on the State level. The national level can best advise and coordinate.

Much of the party work requires the talents and energies of young people. Fortunately, the Republican Party is a young party, with fresh ideas and great opportunity.

I am confident of our response to this challenge. I am optimistic for the future of our party. From the ashes of 1958 will rise the victory of 1960.

## Amazing Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Mr. Brooks Atkinson which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 8, 1959:

AMAZING PARADOX—AMERICA IS STEEPED IN THE ART OF THE NATION THAT GIVES US ANXIETY

(By Brooks Atkinson)

While watching a delightful production of Turgenev's "A Month in the Country" at Arena Stage in Washington a few days ago, one member of the audience had a rueful thought: The nation that gives us the most anxiety has made a rich contribution to our culture.

The nation that hopes to supersede free society has given us plays, novels, music, and ballets that have profoundly affected our art and thinking. There is hardly a day when some Russian work of art does not impinge on our consciousness. Tolstoy's "War and Peace" (1865–68) is still the world's epic novel, not merely in length but in abundance of mind and spirit. Dostoevski's "The Brothers Karamazov" (1880), which was twice adapted on local stages last season, represents a psychological penetration into the mind that is still illuminating in a period obsessed with psychoanalysis.

Tchaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakoff are more familiar to us than our own composers. In 1915 the Diaghileff ballet, with Bakst, Fokine and Nijinsky, introduced us to the wild splendor of an unfamiliar art form. Pasternak's "Doctor Zhivago" is a major literary and political event today. While we as a nation are at logger-heads with the Russian nation, we draw daily sustenance from the granaries of Russian art.

Although Russia's national history is six or seven hundred years older than ours, there is not so much difference in the ages of our cultures. Pushkin wrote "Ruslan and Ludmila" in 1820, and the first Russian novel, "Eugéne Onegin," in 1831 Gogol wrote "Dead Souls" in 1842. Technically our imaginative literature begins with Irving's "Knickerbocker's 'History of New York'" in 1809, Cooper's "The Last of the Mohicans" in 1826, to confine this discussion to major works.

STAGE LITERATURE

But Irving and Cooper were saturated in British literary traditions. The nearest American equivalents to the Pushkin works are Whitman's "Leaves of Grass" in 1855 and Melville's "Moby Dick" in 1851. Emerson, Dana, Parkman and Thoreau—all thoroughly American writers—range from 1836 to 1854, but they do not make the best sort of camparison with Pushkin and Gogol.

In the literature of the stage, however, Russian drama is much older. In America, serious writing for the stage did not begin until 1920, when "O'Neill's first full-length play, "Beyond the Horizon," had a Broadway production. But Griboyedov wrote "Woe to Wit," a classic still played in Russia, in 1825. Gogol wrote "The Inspector General" in 1836; Turgenev, "A Month In the Country" in 1850; Ostrovsky, "Poverty is No Disgrace" in 1854.

In 1898 Stanislavsky produced Chekhov's "The Seagull" at the Moscow Art Theater; and that event has had the most enduring influence on our theater. Chekhov's elusive, poetic style is the source of the subjective school of playwriting in America. Tennessee Williams has absorbed it into an incandescent style of his own. And Stanislavsky's principles of acting are the primer of The Method. Although Russian intransigence is frustrating our political life, straining our economy and poisoning our spirit, we are stimulated by the vitality of Russian artists.

DARING RISKS

We are stimulated by the spontaneity with which Russians plunge into the heart of their subjects. The Russian temperament is more explosive than ours. Combining the recklessness of Asia with the disciplines of Europe, it is robust and invigorating. Russian artists have a natural instinct for probing close to the heart of life; they are concerned with ultimate truths and they accept daring risks.

Turgenev and Chekhov are particularly aware of the difficulty people have in communicating with one another. "We study ourselves very closely and then we think we know about everybody," a wistful character says in "A Month in the Country." Every man is a stranger. In Russian art there is an acute awareness of the fact that life has deep, tangled, furtive roots that reach down into a somber mystery.

All these Russian influences on American drama emanate from the smoldering, aimless years before the Soviet revolution. When the political scientists seized control of the nation, the originality, audacity, and fecundity in art disappeared. It is significant that Gorky, patriarch of art under Stalin, never wrote stories or plays about postrevolution life in Russia. His creative life stopped with the success of the revolution he supported.

Since the time of the revolution, the ballet has continued to flourish (the Moiseyev ballet was the sensation of last season in America); some stirring music has been written, and a few powerful novels, like Sholokhov's "And Quiet Flows the Don." But the drama has been returned to elementary propaganda and the obsolete methods of realism.

Although the standards of acting and producing are reported to be high, the literary content of the drama has lost the color and personality it had before the revolution. For the Russian dramatist has become an organization man. It is the mentality of the organization man that we want most to escape from, not only in the drama but in the whole range of American life. In short, what fascinates us in Russian art is the precise element that the Soviets cannot tolerate.

VIGOROUS NATION

Since the Soviet Union is a huge, vigorous nation, it is logical to assume that Russians still have great artistic capacity. The Pasternak novel proves that Russia still has at least one writer who follows the great tradition. Somewhere Russian artistic genius must be in existence. For the temperament that produced Bunin and Mussorgsky is not in the political textbooks, but in the bloodstream.

It will not flourish again in our lifetime. What we are left with in the theater are the ideals of the prerevolution Stanislavsky, and some wise, sad, humorous plays that reflect mature truths about life. They stimulate the American imagination because they are outside our national experience.

## Strategic Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article on the Strategic Army Corps, written by Col. Vernon R. Rowie, U.S. Army, professor of military sciences and tactics, University of Nebraska.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGIC ARMY CORPS (STRAC)

(By Col. Vernon R. Rowie, U.S. Army, professor of military sciences and tactics, University of Nebraska)

Will Rogers stated "everybody is ignorant; only in different subjects."

It appears we Americans, too, are having trouble today understanding the need for a strong and virile U.S. Army. The conflicting views expressed in the press, radio, and TV by senior representatives of our country concerning national defense requirements and strengths has naturally caused the average citizen to ask "Who am I to believe?" For example, are we ahead, or behind, the Soviets in missilery? Are we militarily inferior to the Soviets? Do we need to train more scientists? Is it true the next war will be of such short duration that ground forces are obsolete?

Again, today, the eyes of our Nation are focused upon our Armed Forces with an intensity that is demonstrated in times of great peril. Pearl Harbor was one of the blackest days in our history—but I wonder if future history will not look back at these present hours and term them even blacker than Pearl Harbor?

I wonder if we, ourselves, do recognize these days as days of our greatest peril?

The Communist goal of world domination has been too bluntly stated, and too often reiterated by the present leaders of the Communist conspiracy, for any of us to retain illusions about the reality of our danger. Can we disregard the indisputable fact that day by day Communist military power dedicated to our destruction is growing ominously on the ground, under the sea, and in the air? No American can have the slightest doubt that we have been selected as the Communist main target. Soviet Russia, as the leader of the Communist world, has announced its intentions concerning the fate of the United States and the free world—our destruction through any means whatsoever, and the complete control of world societies.

The Communists know that if they could defeat America by either military force, or by their insidious ideology, they could end all effective resistance everywhere else to their plans to capture the world for communism. Political, economic, and cultural strife backed up by military force; and similar forms of limited aggression are all down in the Soviet's book as very practical methods by which they might achieve their aims without ever challenging our nuclear retaliatory power.

Nuclear power—our newspapers, periodicals, radio, and TV are free of comment concerning nuclear power—both ours and the Soviet's. I should like to recapitulate for you, at this point, a few thoughts on nuclear power.

With the development of atomic energy and the perfection of guided missiles, we have in our arsenal today what is popularly known as "massive deterrence." This, of course, means that with our stockpile of nuclear weapons and a swift and sure delivery system made up of the Strategic Air Command and of our intermediate range and intercontinental ballistic missiles, we have the capability to destroy any nation which attacks us.

This retaliation capability is only a portion of our total deterrence, however, against thermonuclear attack upon the United States. An appreciable deterrent force also is the capability of our States and local communities to minimize damage from nuclear attack—that is, our civil defense capability. And, of course, a third very potent deterrent is our growing Nike missile system, designed to knock down single planes or fleets of bombers long before they reach their targets.

More emphasis is needed in this area if we are to provide adequate protection to the entire Nation in time. Also, more emphasis is needed to insure that the Army's antimissile missile, Nike-ZEUS, is ready in time.

But Soviet Russia, the leader of the international Communist conspiracy, also has comparable weapons and a delivery system comparable to SAC. At first glance, we both have the capability of destroying each other, the result should deter the Communist world from aggression against the free world.

As a soldier, I heartily endorse the concept of massive deterrence. Without it, we would be sitting ducks. But has this deterrent power of ours really prevented the march of communism? You need but to glance at your daily newspapers or tune in to your favorite radio or TV news programs to realize that it has not.

The pattern of Soviet aggression has been too well demonstrated and should impress Americans that something more is required if we are to avoid piecemeal defeat time after time. At the conclusion of World War II in 1945, America had every right to assume the Soviets would continue to be our allies. An American citizen could visit any part of the world and his reception was met with friendliness and prestige. Can you do this today—only 13 years later? No, you cannot. The Soviet strategy is spelled out for us. All we have to do is read it. In 1948, after a few years of peace to lull Americans asleep, the Soviets applied political and economic force backed up by military threat by blockading Berlin. Many futile diplomatic attempts were made but finally we had to respond with countermilitary force. This was followed by another short period of peace and light and in 1950 the Korean war was thrust upon us. The Geneva conference followed and again we believed we could honestly deal with the Kremlin leaders. And then in 1955 the bubble brcke once more with the ruthless subjugation of Hungary. In 1956 and 1957 it was peaceful coexistence and competitive coexistence; and once more many Americans could not understand why our leaders did not sit down at a conference table with the Soviets. This masquerade was terminated with the shocking execution of Imre Nagy, the troubled Middle East and the Formosan situations. In all the post World War II years the Soviets have used the same strategy over and over—a period of peace and light—long enough to lull Americans into complacency—followed by political, economic, and psychological thrusts backed by military might—followed by another period of peace to lull us asleep once more.

Also, we of the free world do not intend to use our nuclear weapons and positive delivery systems in an unthinking and foolhardy manner, I need but to remind you of Korea, Hungary, and Lebanon.

In short, indiscriminate use of nuclear weapons will not make the job of war any easier. In getting an enemy sniper out of a church steeple, we do not intend to blow up the bishop and the entire diocese.

With the advent of nuclear weapons, the types of warfare which could now occur have undergone a philosophical reshuffling. This is, our concept of total or unlimited war is now quite different from what it was during World Wars I and II, from both a military and an economic viewpoint. For example, while poison gas was available to both sides during those wars, it was not used except on rare occasions. Also, the delivery systems available were not capable of bringing this destructive weapon to all human and animal beings in Midwest America or central Europe. And poison gas, while it could contaminate installations, could not destroy them. Also, the entire economic machinery of neither side was totally affected.

Consider, then, what the effect would be today if both the United States, representing the free world, and the Soviet Union, leader of the Red bloc, were to unleash nuclear warfare upon each other. Entire cities and vast segments of human and animal population would be wiped out, and it is possible that both countries would be contaminated for years to come if dirty atomic, H, and cobalt bombs were indiscriminately used. This would be total war today, a general all-out war.

But the West realizes—and we most certainly hope that the Reds realize, also—that a general all-out war could not possibly result in a victory for either side. Total war today would have only two losers. With this pretty much of an obvious fact, even to men who desire to control the world, it does not

appear that total or unlimited war will be the method chosen to conquer the world.

In view of this logic, what is the position of the Soviet Union? In all the writings and policies of communism, especially since that disease conquered Russia from the Tsar, complete conquest of the world has been the guiding light for communism—unlimited political objectives.

Political objectives have always determined the amount of military force which would be applied. In World War II, the Allies had the unlimited political objective of beating Germany to her knees—that we did through unlimited military force, with the exception of such horror weapons as poison gas, germ warfare, and the like.

Today, however, is another era in the history of mankind, and in view of the almost certain destruction of both the West and communism in the event of an unlimited general war, total war does not appear to be the most likely threat, although it presents the gravest danger.

Although communism today is making great gains through indirect aggression, especially in the Middle East, it is only normal to assume that one day the free world shall say: "Stop. Beyond this point you will not transgress." And if we are firm in our resolve, and are prepared to fight if need be, what recourse will be left to communism if it cannot pursue its unlimited political objectives through cold war activities and realizes the utter folly of a general nuclear war?

Will Soviet Russia throw her unlimited political objectives out the window, and settle for something much less? No, she will not—her very existence is based upon complete subjugation of the entire world.

Between the two extremes of cold war and total war there is only one other way a nation can apply force to gain political objectives—the employment of measured firepower under conditions which are manageable and which permit negotiation, retreat, termination, or armistice—in short, limited war.

This is the most likely manner by which communism, led by Soviet Russia, will attempt to gain its unlimited political goal, world conquest—through a series of limited objectives, gained by force applied in a series of limited wars.

It would be complete folly for us to feel secure because we have the ability to deter the Soviets from a general nuclear war, if at the same time we left them free to pursue a policy of piecemeal conquest. The idea we can safely concentrate our efforts solely upon weapons, equipment, and strategy suited primarily for fighting the big war is completely unsound.

The recent Rockefeller report says: "It is, therefore, crucial to develop a notion of adequacy for each military mission so that we do not drain resources from some vital task by maintaining an excessive capacity in others."

David Lawrence, in an editorial entitled "Illusions of 1922 and 1956," published in the U.S. News & World Report, noted the similarity in arguments in both those years that war was a thing of the past, because gas was the deterrent in 1922 (or so ran the argument), while nuclear weapons are supposedly the deterrent of today. He then asked the questions:

"Will history repeat itself? We are being told that there will be no war because neither side will venture to use H-bombs. But if war breaks out and no superbombs are used, who will win that war?"

Well, the H-bomb is certainly not deterring Soviet Russia's war plans. In this day of nominal peace, Russia itself has 175 ground divisions in an active status. Add to this force, the divisions of other members of the Communist bloc, and the Red armies total more than 400 ground divisions. Communist aircraft number more than 25,000, and she is building her submarine fleet to where it now numbers more than 500. Communism's armed forces today, ground forces only, total more than the forces of Germany, Austria, and Italy at their peak during World War II.

The United States Army today has fewer than 19 divisions in being.

It is not my wish to be accused of interservice rivalry, but I state the simple fact that by air or sea, whatever is done forward of the leading ground elements, will only soften or ultimately paralyze enemy resistance, but it carries no permanent extension of sovereign power with it, any more than does artillery fire or an ICBM. The will of the people of the United States can only be expressed, administered, and policed as far from Washington as the furthest foxhole has been dug and held. No land is conquered until the ground soldier plants his muddy GI boot upon the enemy homeland and holds it. That the Communists are developing and improving their ground forces today verifies that they hold the same ideas.

Of the divisions we have in an active status today, five divisions and four regiments are in Europe, two divisions are in the Far East; one division is in the Pacific, two infantry battle groups are in Alaska; and one infantry battle group is in the Caribbean area. The bulk of our remaining Army forces are in the United States.

Our overseas divisions are in their present locations because our strategy needs them there. It is not our intention to pull out our European divisions in the event of hostilities in Bongo-Bongo land; we have no assurance that the Soviets and East German armies would not move in immediately into the areas of West Germany that we had vacated. The same holds true for Korea—you can well imagine would happen in that unhappy land if we were to remove our divisions from there. The presence of our ground soldiers in these areas in the front line of defense of the United States, where the U.S. soldier is presented as the first barrier to aggression, is proof in an unmistakable manner that we mean business, and that we will not tolerate aggression in those areas.

Because of such situations, and because we cannot hope to match the overwhelming Communist ground forces manpower, we have decided upon a strategy that is divided generally into two major concepts: One, is to develop the armies of the free world through our military assistance program. We furnish money, military guidance and equipment to those nations which request our aid. For example, Turkey. We furnish that brave nation with certain arms, with technological assistance in the forms of advice and schooling, with money to help her feed her troops and build military installations.

Turkey, for her part, furnishes the free world with some of the best fighting men the world has ever known—men who will fight for freedom, men who have fought for freedom many times, men who have licked the Russians every time.

The second part of our strategy in the face of communisms' human seas of manpower and equipment has been to create a mobile reserve in this Nation—a Strategic Army Corps, called STRAC—which can move on a few hours notice to trouble spots anywhere in the world. This STRAC of ours is composed of four famous Army divisions, all organized in the pentomic concept. They are: the 101st and 82d Airborne Divisions, stationed at Fort Campbell, Ky., and Fort Bragg, N.C., and the 1st and 4th Infantry Divisions, at Fort Riley, Kans., and Fort Lewis, Wash.

They have tremendous striking power, ranging from the bayonet to Honest John missiles, which, of course, have atomic capability. STRAC headquarters organization is provided by Headquarters, XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg. The slogan of STRAC is: "Skilled, tough, ready around the clock."

This slogan contains more than appears at first glance: These divisions are skilled in all crafts of war, including the most modern weapons; they are tough, trained to use bayonet, rifle, and atomic missiles—the initial elements are continually on the alert; these famous divisions are ready to move in a matter of hours with guns, vehicles and missiles, to a departure airfield or port of embarkation. The men are ready to strike anywhere around the globe. And when the clock of destiny turns, it will find battle-ready ground forces capable of turning the tide of battle in a limited war operation, or blunting a massive general attack, should the situation require it.

When and if STRAC moves out, it is backed up by the STRAC reinforcement, the National Guard and Reserve divisions. But it is STRAC itself of which I wish to speak.

This Strategic Army Corps of ours, and yours, is the fire brigade of the Army. It is a balanced force, with supporting units which give it staying power; it has the ability, as do all Army forces, to sustain itself in extended ground combat. And because it is armed with weapons from the bayonet to the atomic warhead, it can apply that measured, sustained degree of force appropriate to the threat—which thus can best avoid the risk of an all-out nuclear war.

But above all, STRAC is a ready force. In, these times, readiness to combat aggression is particularly vital to national security, for speed of reaction is a key factor in coping with brushfire war.

STRAC has one prime prerequisite which the Army itself cannot provide: It needs suitable transportation for strategic mobility. Under the present organization of our Armed Forces, the Army does not have organic transportation means for rapid, long-range movement of Army forces. The Army must therefore hitchhike with the other military services; in other words, the Army's fire brigade is dependent upon its sister services to get to the fire. In brief, STRAC is a tangible and positive factor which any enemy must consider seriously in the formulation of his war plans. With its mobility and tremendous striking power, it is an important element of strength in carrying out the Army's role in deterring, or if need be winning, a limited war.

Strategic mobility, as I use the phrase, means the ability to move military forces rapidly over great distances, together with their equipment, supplies and service support. Speed of military forces is a principal factor in strategic mobility. And because military forces require vast tonnages of equipment and supplies for sustained operations, the timely, efficient movement of these tonnages is another essential factor in strategic mobility.

It would appear that these two factors, speed and vast tonnages, are diametrically opposed; that no one means of transportation can accomplish both. To a degree, this is indeed the case. At the present time, and in the foreseeable future, the airplane is our most rapid means of transportation, while the ship can carry the largest load.

The Army requires a combination of airlift and sealift to attain strategic mobility. Note that I have said "airlift and sealift," instead of "long-range aircraft" and "ships." The question is not merely the number of vehicles, but rather cargo capacity and how many trips can be made and how fast these trips can be accomplished.

Based upon the study of many possible situations, the Army is convinced that strong ground forces will be needed to cope with limited aggression. The division is the smallest unit we have which is capable of the necessary self-sufficiency and staying

power in combat. If our allies are attacked, or if war breaks out again in Korea, we must reinforce these areas with our divisions. If we are faced with aggression in other areas in spite of all that can be done to prevent it short of appeasement, we must respond with suitable ground combat forces—and we must respond in hours and days, rather than months.

The Army is making great strides in streamlining its combat forces. Unit weights have been reduced while striking power has been increased. For example, the pentomic division weighs less than one-half as much as its World War II counterpart. The fighting elements of the division, with supplies and equipment, now weigh approximately 7,000 tons, with no lessening of firepower.

In active combat operations, divisions consume vast quantities of supplies—a unit may expend more than its own weight in supplies in a month of fighting. In the event the Army should be moved to fight in Korean, no supplies from America would be needed during the first weeks of operation. But if the Army were to fight in most other areas of the world, the supplies and logistic elements must accompany the combat units. Thus, it can be seen that the lift requirements for a force vary widely.

The airborne division is designed for tactical airborne assault operations, but it is also ideally suited for strategic or long-distance air movement. An airborne division might well be the initial combat element committed in a limited war.

The flying time from Fort Campbell, Ky., the home of the 101st Airborne Division, varies from 13 hours to Alaska to 45 hours to Indochina. A ready-to-go division can have combat-ready soldiers at a departure field in a few hours' time.

Allowing for ground and air movement, a reasonable objective would be to have the first Army green uniforms appear in an objective area within 2 or 3 days and for the first unit, at least a battle group, to be in the area on the third or fourth day. The airlifted force must have supplies and logistical support and, if these are not available in the area, they must be airlifted until such time as surface communications can be established. Additional divisions may, and usually will, be required as promptly as possible. Initial elements of these divisions will also require aircraft.

Army airlift requirements for limited war can be summarized as that lift necessary to have initial combat troops in the area in a matter of hours or days, to transport a strong force which may have to be as large as one-half of the Strategic Army Corps (STRAC) to an objective area within a very few weeks and to support that force until surface ships can take over this task.

The Army is convinced that strong combat forces should at all times be ready to cope on the ground with limited aggression. The risk in not winning promptly is too great to take, for it could result in expanding operations, possibly in an all-out nuclear war. In many countries facing the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, the Army has combat forces always ready to fight alongside their local allies; but if they were attacked these forces would have to be augmented in a hurry.

Or, aggression may come in areas where there are no United States combat troops. And I repeat, if aggression comes, how long should it take us to get fighting men to the scene? A ready-to-go division in the United States can have combat soldiers at a departure airfield in a few hours. The United States should be able to airlift a decisive limited-war force to any place in the world within 4 or 5 days.

This kind of essential mobility requires adequate airlift to start with, and modern sea lift to sustain. But there is an alarming lack of modernization in our troop-and-supply-carrying airfleet. Development of modernized planes and ships is outside the Army's sphere of activity, but in view of the importance of mobility the Army thinks it necessary to have sufficient facilities for moving troops and supplies swiftly wherever aggression appears.

You will note that, when the crisis in Lebanon erupted during the middle of July, it was the troops of the Army's 24th Division in Germany which were airlifted to Lebanon—not troops from our Strategic Army Corps in America—these troops, of course, were in addition to the United States Marines who were aboard the Sixth Fleet. That our STRAC Forces in the United States were ready to go was evidenced only a few days prior to the Lebanese crisis when airborne troops were airlifted to the Caribbean during the Vice President's tour in South America. The movement of troops from one critical area to reinforce another critical area is not in keeping with our Nation's strategy. The Army's STRAC Force is ready to go, but where we fall short is in the matter of transportation. To summarize:

1. We now have and certainly need three deterrents to unlimited war—the Nike system (not yet completely installed), our civil defense capability, and our Strategic Air Command. While these are obviously working, since we have not had a nuclear attack on the United States, more emphasis is needed on the first two—Nike system and civil defense.

2. We must be capable of deterring limited war, or winning it if deterrence fails, else the free world is nibbled away until we stand alone.

3. We have STRAC Army divisions ready to go, but the conveyances are not at hand nor in sight. Modern sea and airlift must be provided as a matter of urgency.

In closing, I should like to quote from Mr. Robert Endicott Osgood's book "Limited War: The Challenge to American Strategy":

"Preparation for limited war is as vital to American security as preparation for total war. It is a matter for thorough and systematic planning, not for improvisation. After all, in developing our capacity for total war, we are preparing for the least likely contingency; its principal justification lies in the fact that it may never be used. But in developing a capacity for limited war, we would be preparing to meet the most likely contingency; we would be maintaining the only credible deterrent to Communist advances in the most vulnerable areas of the world."

## Mrs. Harlan P. Bosworth, Jr., Oregon's Mother of the Year for 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, quite a few of us become weary of the selections, for publicity purposes, of so-called cotton queens, corn queens, fish queens, citrus queens, and the like in order to promote various commercial products. These selections usually are of dubious value.

However, by contrast, I think all of us are gratified that each of the 49 States now selects a Mother of the Year. This award goes annually to some mother who has contributed outstandingly to community and civic life, to the raising of children of character and integrity, and to the general welfare of the State in which she lives. These selections in my own State have been notably distinguished, and the choice for 1959 follows in such a pattern.

Mrs. Harlan P. Bosworth, Jr., of Medford, has been named Oregon's Mother of the Year. She is the mother of three sons and a daughter, and an illustrious person in her own right. She has been active in such intellectual activities as the Great Decisions Group, in such political functions as the Democratic Party, in such religious undertakings as those of the St. Mark's Episcopal Church. She and her husband, who is a vice president of the California-Oregon Power Co., have been leaders in Jackson County in the United Nations Association, a group with which my own wife is actively affiliated, I am happy to report.

In tribute to Mrs. Harlan P. Bosworth, Jr., Oregon's Mother of the Year for 1959, I ask unanimous consent that a sketch of her noteworthy career, as written for the Oregonian of Portland of March 3, 1959, by Mr. Dick Jewett, of Medford, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 3, 1959]

OREGON MOTHER'S CONCERN FOR HUMANS PROMPTS EFFORTS TO MAKE WORLD BETTER

(By Dick Jewett)

MEDFORD (Special).—"I couldn't wish for anything nicer, but I feel there are so many mothers who have worked harder than I have."

That was the response Tuesday of Mrs. Harlan P. Bosworth, Jr., Medford, named Monday as Oregon Mother of 1959. Selection was announced in Portland by the Oregon Mothers Committee.

Mrs. Bosworth's varied activities and interests in community, State, national and international matters, stemming from a deep concern for human beings, were prime factors in her selection. But her family has been her major interest for 30 years. She and her husband, a vice president and assistant general manager of California-Oregon Power Co., are the parents of a daughter and 3 sons and grandparents of 7 youngsters.

'PERMISSIVE' PLAN USED

The Bosworths have adhered to a permissive plan in rearing their children. "Our children are all individualistic," Mrs. Bosworth stated. "I highly approve, but sometimes have found it rough going."

A parent has to be very allowing, she said, in guiding a youngster to develop his own urges and talents. Such guidance, the mother of the year feels, has given her daughter and sons great tolerance and a spirit of cooperation, allowing her to carry on her activities outside the family. "I think it has given them a great interest and active concern in community life."

The children have assisted in many of her civic activities.

The Centennial Mother's work with Medford Council of Church Women, the Oregon United Nations Association, St. Mark's Episcopal Church Sunday school, Medford League of Women Voters, the Jackson County Democratic Party organization, the YMCA, and Parent-Teacher Association, her interest in Indian affairs and her hobbies of sketching, painting and gardening have influenced the lives of her children.

DAUGHTER SOCIAL WORKER

Her daughter, Mrs. William Hughes, Salem, has been a social worker and is active in church and civic work. Son Harlan P., IV., Oakland, Calif., has attended divinity school and plans to return in time to complete his ministerial studies. Son Robert is an architect at San Anselmo, Calif., and son David, a student at Southern Oregon College, is interested in politics. David once organized the small fry of the neighborhood to campaign for his mother when she sought a seat in the legislature.

The Bosworths did many things as a family, the Oregon Mother of 1959 said, such as swimming, skiing, skating, reading Shakespeare, and Christmas tree burning on 12th night.

Her life in community affairs and as a parent has not all been "peaches and cream," Mrs. Bosworth said. She admitted mistakes, but maintained that rectifying them and gaining understanding has helped her as a parent.

UNITED NATIONS HOLDS INTEREST

Since World War II, Mr. and Mrs. Bosworth have collaborated in their interest in the United Nations. She has been a board member of the Oregon association. The Bosworths have been hosts in their home to students and speakers from foreign lands. Her interest in the United Nations and as a great decisions group leader has been to bring information and to study the problems of crisis areas in the world, she reported.

Since their first cottage was built, the Bosworths have had a family garden, providing wholesome and healthful food. Products from the winter garden and fruits and frozen vegetables, provision the Bosworth table all winter long. Mrs. Bosworth enjoys making her own butter and bread.

NATURAL FOODS PREFERRED

Mrs. Bosworth joined the American Nutrition Society and Natural Foods Associates about 10 years ago when she began to see about her "too much failing health." Her activities led to the reactivation of an old stone burr flour mill at Eagle Point, establishment of a health food store in Medford and sale of raw milk by a local dairy.

"I hate to give over the fundamental homemaking things to the food industry," Mrs. Bosworth said. "I deplore the fact that the American family wants hamburger more than anything else." This trend, she maintained, has "reduced our consumption to antique cows and poorer meat and poorer portions."

Mrs. Bosworth is now looking toward purchase of a farm on which to produce the highest type of food employing organic-methods. No chemicals, sprays or pesticides would be used. The farm would grow every item of food it needed, including grain for livestock. Demonstration of the maximum health to the children would be the aim.

The Mother of the Year is serving as temporary chairman of the Jackson County Water Pollution Board, a watchdog organization. Air pollution has become recently her personal concern and she hopes to see that the board will extend its services to abatement of this problem.

CLEAN AIR SOUGHT

She has been residing much of the time in recent weeks in a trailer house in the Applegate Valley because of a lung ailment attributed to pollution of the air in the Medford vicinity.

Mrs. Bosworth voiced opposition to putting the Rogue River to industry. "We haven't begun to touch our potential in agriculture," she said. "With clear air and water, animal, plant life, and human life improve," she said.

A Sunday school teacher of 3-year-olds, Mrs. Bosworth said that her deep love of God and nature keep her in contact with little children and that they need to have that love and awe of God and nature. "It's a wonderful world and most of our problems have been caused by man," she remarked.

SWEET HOME BIRTHPLACE

Appropriately, the Centennial Mother of the Year is a native Oregonian. She was born at Sweet Home, coming to Medford with her parents in 1906. She resided from 1929 until wartime at Klamath Falls.

Mrs. Bosworth considers her work with the United Nations now her most important activity outside of church and home. A main interest for the last 5 years has been as chairman of the Medford Council of Church Women's project of cooperation with American Friends Service Committee to support a social worker for the Klamath Indians.

## Unity, Precision, Firmness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, March 8, 1959:

UNITY, PRECISION, FIRMNESS

The crisis over Berlin, which Mr. Khrushchev has brought about, to quote the words of Adlai Stevenson, with "no compassion for the feelings and the fears in so many human hearts," has made it necessary for the Western nations not only to stand their ground but to define it; not only to be united on general principles but to have a positive unified program; not only to take a position but to testify that they will maintain it at all risks.

When Prime Minister Macmillan arrives in this country next week he should have no difficulty in reaching an understanding with President Eisenhower. There should be an equally explicit understanding with President de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer. If there is any division among the Western allies it is probably due to an uncertainty in the minds of our allies as to how far this country will go to defend Berlin.

Our allies must be reassured, and Mr. Khrushchev must be made to understand, that we will hold that ground and the principle for which it stands rather than attempt later to hold worse positions and to support weakened principles.

In an article published today in the New York Times Magazine, Henry A. Kissinger contends that "the Western alliance is in serious danger, partly because of confusion about our purposes." He fears that we lack "a tone of urgency" and "a sense of direction." Nevertheless, the President and Mr. Stevenson now certainly agree that "under no circumstances will we forsake the people of free Berlin or compromise on the principle of free access." Mr. Eisenhower has received assurances from both parties in Congress that in the words of Speaker RAYBURN "we are united."

This sort of language cannot be lightly used. We stand in this generation in the shadow of a conflict little resembling what was called war as late as the spring of 1945. The front-line trenches are no longer held by soldiers alone. The blood of helpless unarmed millions would now be written with letters of fire in any declaration of war. There might also be written the lasting division of all the peoples of the world into two classes only—the ragged masters and the naked slaves.

When we stand unitedly, precisely and firmly for the security of West Berlin, we do this because we believe that otherwise there would be no security anywhere in the world. We must not, however, take heroic poses for their dramatic value. We must also offer to the peoples of the satellite states, and to the Russian people themselves, relief from the fear of aggression. We have no doubt they do feel such fear. It has been one purpose of Moscow propaganda to make them feel it. The propaganda of peace, which we can honestly put forth, will do more to undermine the power of Mr. Khrushchev than any barrack-room defiances. We must be armed with weapons for our self-preservation, but we must also put on the armor of compassion and truth.

If we follow this course, we run no risk of becoming what President Eisenhower the other day called "a garrison state." Let us act like reasonable men. If Mr. Khrushchev will do likewise there need be no crisis over Berlin and no obstacle to the peaceful coexistence of different kinds of governments and systems.

## National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very fine letter which I have received from John W. Mahan, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars together with a copy of my reply to Commander in Chief Mahan:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Kansas City, Mo., March 3, 1959.*

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
*U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently had an opportunity to meet with leaders from your State during our annual legislative conference in Washington, D.C. Since talking with your constituents, I thought it advisable to write you on a matter that concerns all of us—national security.

The VFW, by resolution and by unanimity of opinion, feels that our country is losing basic military strength through proposed plans to reduce our Defense Establishment. We believe, and we are on record, that our country should have a balanced defense which is ready to move at a moment's notice whether on the ground, on the seas, or in the air. We further believe that a reduction in our ground forces in the face of the Khrushchev challenge over Berlin is unthinkable. Even though the Berlin situation might be settled peaceably, there are still many trouble spots in the world where American support has already been committed.

It is our understanding that unless plans to reduce forces are halted, the Army will lose one division and the Marine Corps will suffer drastic cuts in its combat strength. Our military strength must be great enough to insure peace.

We are told that Russia has 25 divisions on the borders of Western Europe alone. Instead of a reduction of forces, the VFW knows that the American people are willing to pay more for defense, if necessary, and

we should keep our ground forces at least at the level recommended by the Congress which was 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this matter and if you agree with us, I sincerely hope that you will lend your influence and support toward maintaining our military and naval forces at the above strength.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MAHAN,
*Commander in Chief.*

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., March 6, 1959.*

JOHN W. MAHAN,
*Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, VFW Building, Kansas City, Mo.*

DEAR COMMANDER IN CHIEF MAHAN: I am in receipt of your letter of March 3 which I have read with special interest and pleasure. Your views, as expressed in your letter, are completely consistent with my views on the question of national security. I am sure that you have read in the papers recently my statement that I would be happier if the President would recommend more taxes for greater national defense. It would be good leadership for our people to make that sacrifice rather than holding up a reduction in taxes, which is leadership along the lines of complacency. I think that if you will examine my record in Congress, you will find that while there are other Members who are just as strong as I am for a powerful military force, there is no Member who has a stronger feeling on this question than I do. I have repeatedly said, "the only thing that those in the Kremlin respect is what they fear" and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

I know that you are aware of the fact that Congress last year appropriated money to maintain an Army of 900,000 officers and men; and the Marine Corps, 200,000 officers and men but the President did not maintain this force. The Army has been reduced, as you know, to about 870,000 or it is in the process of being reduced. The Marine Corps is now down to about 184,000 with the objective to reduce it to 175,000. The money has been appropriated but the President has frozen same. We also appropriated money for greater defense in other directions and most of the money that Congress appropriated last year under the President's budget estimates has been put in a deep freeze.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*Member of Congress.*

P.S.—The only one who can stop the reduction of the Army and Marine Corps is President Eisenhower. In fact he could increase the Army and Marine Corps to 900,000 and 200,000 respectively. The money has been appropriated and is available until June 30 of this year.

---

## Russian Inconsistency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the inconsistencies of Soviet propaganda and than when that Nation's Government complains of the supposedly undemocratic actions of the free nations of the world, in the very areas where its own Soviet actions are never more apparent totalitarian oppression is most apparent.

On the subject of free elections, Soviet actions have been typically erratic—with propaganda in the underdeveloped nations of the world contrasted with the brutal suppression of Hungarian freedom, the refusal to permit free elections in all Germany, and the use of only a single slate of candidates in the Soviet Union itself and in the satellites.

One of my constituents has pointed out the latest Soviet inconsistency in this area in a letter to the New York Times of Sunday, March 8, 1959, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET VIEW ON ELECTIONS

To the Editor of the New York Times:
In the United Nations Russia has demanded elections in the French Cameroons before that territory becomes an independent state. It is rather strange to see this demand coming from the country which violently opposes free elections in Germany as the basis for reunification, and where so-called elections are a farce, since there is only a single list of candidates.

PAUL M. KAUFMAN.

---

## Record of Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, recently a letter to the editor appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald which pays tribute to retiring Secretary of the Navy, Tom Gates. He fully deserves this hearty well-done which I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate. I should like to add my own congratulations to Mr. Gates for his admirable service over the years, for his great contributions to our Nation's security, and for his friendship, which I have greatly enjoyed. I know we all want to wish him well as he returns to private life.

I ask this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. GATES' RECORD

It is a pleasure to congratulate you on your February 5 editorial on Navy Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., summing up his accomplishments as he relinquishes his duties in June.

You have shown keen discernment and understanding of naval matters in the Pentagon and you have pointed out Mr. Gates' interest, competence, and balance on defense needs in the Pentagon.

Mr. Gates has accomplished much in the Navy Department. He will be remembered as a great Secretary of the Navy, ranking with the late James V. Forrestal and President Taft's Navy Secretary, George von L. Meyer.

He has done his work efficiently, silently, and with the least quarterdeck manner. He has had the public interest constantly in mind and he has had the wholehearted support of the Navy.

We wish the new Secretary of the Navy, William Franke, a fair breeze and good luck.

DONALD H. DALTON.

---

## In Support of S. 57, the Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an excellent and convincing letter received from George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, in support of S. 57, the housing bill. This letter of Mr. Meany's presents sound and convincing reasons why this bill should pass and become enacted into law:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL
ORGANIZATIONS,
*Washington, D.C., March 4, 1959.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: I understand that S. 57, the housing bill reported out by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, will soon be considered by the House of Representatives. On behalf of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, I am writing to urge you to support this bill.

Although S. 57 does not contain all of the features we would have liked to see enacted this year, it is a forward-looking bill which would provide a good foundation for attacking the most urgent housing and redevelopment needs of the Nation. Its authorization of $500 million a year for 3 years for urban redevelopment is the minimum needed to permit metropolitan areas to carry out their highest priority slum clearance and city rebuilding projects. Its provision of 35,000 low-rent public housing units a year is absolutely essential to rehouse at least some of the low-income families who will be displaced by already scheduled urban renewal, highway, and other public projects.

In addition to its constructive public housing and urban redevelopment provisions, S. 57 would also authorize an imaginative new program of low-cost housing for the elderly and would enhance the effectiveness of the already successful cooperative housing program.

Opponents of this bill have falsely charged that it would authorize excessive expenditures which would unbalance the budget and that it is an inflationary bill. Let me assure you that neither I personally nor the AFL–CIO as an organization would advocate excessive expenditures or support any proposal which would stimulate unnecessary price increases. The fact is that S. 57 authorizes only a moderate amount of nonreimbursable Federal outlays, and even these

involve no immediate Federal expenditures. With plenty of skilled workers and building materials available to build the houses S. 57 would make possible, there is not the slightest evidence that its enactment would have inflationary results.

The housing bill, S. 57, is the first major piece of economic legislation to be considered in this session of Congress. By enacting S. 57, the Congress will demonstrate that it is prepared to take effective action to help restore full employment and to assure economic prosperity. I therefore respectfully request that you vote for S. 57 and vote down any crippling amendments that may be offered.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY, *President.*

## Civil War Centennial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, with the presentation by Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, III, of certificates of commendation to film stars John Wayne and William Holden and motion picture director John Ford for their efforts in producing the new multi-million dollar historical spectacle "The Horse Soldiers," another step was marked today in the Civil War Centennial Commission's official 6-year nationwide program to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the epochal conflict.

The presentation ceremony took place at the Washington headquarters of the Civil War Centennial Commission, of which General Grant is Chairman. It was followed by a reception in honor of Messrs. Wayne, Holden, and Ford, held at the exclusive Army and Navy Club, and attended by members of the Commission, including high-ranking military, naval, and Government officials, and other distinguished guests.

In presenting the commendations, prepared in the form of scrolls, General Grant welcomed the United Artists film as one of the first contributions to the Commission program, "the avowed aims of which are to pay tribute to the memories of our forefathers who took part in the bitter conflict and to provide Americans with a new understanding of the way in which we built from sacrifice and suffering an enduring Nation and a lasting peace."

"The Horse Soldiers," which cost $5½ million to produce and was filmed on location in Louisiana, Mississippi, and in Hollywood, is a recreation of the famous Grierson raid of 1863, a commando-type operation in which several hundred Union calvalry invaded and rode across the State of Mississippi in order to cut the railroad lines of supply and district the enemy's attention from General Grant's maneuver to take Vicksburg. It was characterized by General Sherman as "the most brilliant expedition of the war." The first General Grant acclaimed it as "one of the most brilliant cavalry exploits of the war."

Today his grandson, the present general, described this horse soldiers' raid as "one of the most strategically important, colorful, and fascinating stories to come out of the Civil War." Of the film he said, speaking for the Commission, "We expect it will prove of great interest and significance to all Americans."

After accepting the commendations for themselves and Mr. Ford, Wayne, and Holden in turn presented to General Grant, for the Centennial Commission collection, an assortment of Civil War memorabilia used in the motion picture, including a McClellan saddle, carbines and carbine holders, and authentic reproductions of gabions (portable wicker cylinders filled with earth to give protection to men digging approach trenches) and guidons (banners mounted on standard poles).

While at Commission headquarters, Messrs. Wayne and Holden arranged with General Grant and the Commission's executive director, Karl S. Betts, for a special showing of "The Horse Soldiers" to the Commission Council as soon as the first technicolor print has been processed. The picture is scheduled for public viewing in motion theaters across the country, beginning on July 4 of this year.

## Mechanized Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, March 3, the noted radio commentator, Ray Henle, broadcast an excellent report on the dedication of the new mechanized Washington, D.C., Post Office and its significance to the American people.

I believe Mr. Henle's comments deserve wide circulation, and under unanimous consent I include his remarks:

President Eisenhower pushed a button in the White House today, and in the U.S. Post Office for the city of Washington some blocks away, $12 million worth of machinery began to move, beginning the Nation's first pilot post office almost completely mechanized.

An amazing assortment of machines, conveyor belts, electric eyes, push button sorters and what not began to function a postal show case for modern handling of the mails. In due course, some 60 other leading post offices through the Nation will have this equipment.

It was a banner day for Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield who, as an automobile businessman in Michigan, understands the value of the assembly line. He began to work on the new day in postal service 6 years ago, and hopes to see it completely finished before his term ends 2 years hence.

In addition to the machines put into operation today, there's a laboratory on one floor where they're testing even more advanced machines which, some day, will even more drastically improve postal service.

The point is, Mr. Summerfield said, he is trying to keep up with the great strides in the amount of mail that is handled by getting machines to do the work. Otherwise, he said, you wouldn't be able to get a building big enough, or find room enough for the number of persons that would be required to handle the mail in the old ways.

Most amazing to this onlooker were the machines where operators pushed three buttons in combination and the machines then automatically separated the mail in accordance with its destination by electric brain.

Then there's an automatic stamping machine that will properly cancel the stamp on a letter regardless in what position (upside down, right side up, forward or reverse) the letter happens to come into the stamping trough.

But in the future there's even more to come. We saw an experimental machine sorting mail by electric eye. The eye can read a printed name of a city or State, and automatically sorts that mail to the proper bag for dispatch to its destination.

Postmaster General Summerfield complimented the President and members of Congress and postal employees for the tremendous work necessary to put this revolutionary mechanized post office into operation. These in turn applauded the Postmaster General for his vision in making the biggest improvements in postal service since the pony express was gone with the wind.

## McElroy's Attack View Discounted by Some

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. L. Edgar Prina, which appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday, March 8, 1959:

MCELROY'S ATTACK VIEW DISCOUNTED BY SOME

(By L. Edgar Prina)

Defense Secretary McElroy's assertion that it would be almost impossible for the Soviet Union to launch a surprise air or missile attack against the United States has been received with some misgivings in military circles.

That this is the case is all the more noteworthy to military observers because the McElroy thesis has drawn surprisingly few immediate challenges from the press or Congress.

The Defense chief told a news conference last Thursday, in effect, that the United States would have advance warning of an impending attack because it would be virtually impossible for the Russians to make the necessary massive preparations for an all-out assault without being observed.

Mr. McElroy mentioned the tremendous amount of interchange of communications and just plain motions that would be involved in coordinating strikes against thousands of targets, each of which, he said, might take an expenditure of from 4 to 10 missiles if certainty of destruction was to be achieved.

These are the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and he shares them, the Secretary said.

ANOTHER VIEW

But a high-ranking officer, familiar with top-level operations, plans, and intelligence told an interviewer that a sounder way of putting it is to say it would be "difficult" for the Soviet to mount an all-out attack secretly and that "we hope" to have advance warning of any such action.

This he pointed out, is somewhat different than saying it would be almost impossible to avoid giving advance, or strategic warning to the defender.

The officer said that it would be more difficult to mount a surprise bomber attack, which is the greater fear today, than it would be for a missile assault, the capability of which the Russians may have in the next few years.

He said that it would not be prudent to suppose that the Russians, the most security-conscious people in the world, would be conveniently bumbling about it if they planned to attack us. Certainly, he added, a dictatorship finds it easier to be secretive than does a free nation.

RADIO MESSAGES

Asked about Mr. McElroy's stress on the great interchange of communications the Russians would have to carry on in preparing an all-out attack, the officer said he assumed the Secretary referred to radio messages. He then agreed that radio is not absolutely vital to coordinating the assault.

Couldn't the Russians screen the movement of their forces by announcing large-scale maneuvers or by other devices? Yes, they could do this, was the reply.

Couldn't a master plan be set up for execution at a certain hour and day unless a last-minute negative were given? Again, the reply was in the affirmative.

Other military observers, meanwhile, are asking these questions in the wake of the official optimism that we would have advance warning of a surprise attack:

1. Why is it necessary to keep a substantial percentage of the Strategic Air Command's bombers on a 15-minute ground alert at all times? (The Air Force hopes soon to have one-third of its medium and long-range bombers on the runways, armed and fueled for instant takeoff in the event of imminent attack. Later, when the Russians have a sizable missile capability, the Air Force expects to inaugurate a very expensive and complicated air alert, wherein a certain number of bombers and fuel-tanker planes would be flying at all times).

2. Why are the United States, our allies and even the Russians concerned enough about the possibilities of surprise attack to hold special diplomatic negotiations to find ways to decrease the possibilities of such assaults?

3. Does our optimism take consideration of the expected capability of the huge Soviet submarine fleet to launch nuclear missiles at our cities from the secrecy of the ocean depths?

4. The United States had both strategic and tactical warning of a Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor but did little about it. Is there any guarantee against another such debacle?

Some observers believe Mr. McElroy's statement indicates the United States is placing a heavy bet on electronic and radio intelligence to gather evidence of any Russian preparation for an all-out attack.

They point to the achievement registered when we obtained tape recordings of the conversations of the three Soviet flyers who shot down an unarmed American transport plane over the Turkish-Soviet border last year.

And they point, too, to President Eisenhower's recent reference to our very great and expensive intelligence forces.

## Robert Valeur, French Patriot, Minister Plenipotentiary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Elizabeth Maguire about the Honorable Robert Valeur, Minister Plenipotentiary of the French Embassy, and appearing in the January 29, 1959, issue of the Georgetowner, which article was called to my attention by my valued friend (Father) Joseph F. Thorning, Ph.D., D.D., who strongly feels that the election of General de Gaulle as President of France can be a turning point in European history:

ROBERT VALEUR, FRENCH PATRIOT, MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

(By Elizabeth Maguire)

President of the European Council for Nuclear Research, President of the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe, an officer of the French Legion of Honor, author of several books, lecturer and professor of distinction, a founder of France Forever, De Gaulle man from the start, Minister Plenipotentiary at the French Embassy—in short, Robert Valeur of Georgetown.

France is his first love, but Georgetown runs a close second. For nearly 5 years he and his American born wife have lived happily in a Georgetown house, picket fence and cobblestones without, and modern art and furnishings within. The Valeurs are fond of all their neighbors and friends, and as a consequence entertain for them on many occasions. Besides, Monsieur likes to cook. "Salmi de Canard" is his favorite dish, which, translated means duck with puree of duck liver and sherry sauce.

Expert though he is at cooking and collecting art, these are minor sidelines in a life busy with teaching, talking, toil and travel. He has a massive forehead which indicates intelligence, a massive frame which indicates energy, and good coloring which indicates health. Having these advantages, he grapples well with problems of state, and explains them to the layman with a talented, facile tongue.

"The diplomat's job at the present time is not a plush job," he comments wryly, "Since the first of October I've made between 70 and 75 speeches, all the way from Seattle to Boston." Since we have been in Georgetown all the time he has been traveling, we asked him to comment on current crises. He complied and replied, many of his remarks going over our head, but nevertheless clear enough to copy down.

First of all we asked about Gen. Charles de Gaulle, President of the Fifth Republic. Knowing that M. Valeur had offered his services to the general immediately after the armistice of June 1940, and knowing, too, that De Gaulle entrusted M. Valeur with the task of organizing and directing the Free French Press and information service in the United States during the war, we asked him if he had foreseen the greatness of De Gaulle's present stature.

"I was always convinced," he said, "that France would have to call De Gaulle back one day. I was convinced of this in view of the deficiencies of the constitution of 1946, which could lead only to such situations as Algeria because of the weakness of the executive branch as against the legislative branch. No government under that constitution was strong enough to face up squarely to such vital issues as Indochina and Algeria—we were bound to face a tragic crisis—and when this came, De Gaulle was the only possibility. He is the hope of the free world. France is in a strategic position, and De Gaulle has given France stability and leadership."

Referring to the many treaties between France and Germany today, we asked M. Valeur if friendship with Germany was considered a key policy of De Gaulle and we asked whether the Franco-German policy surprised him. "Not at all," he replied, "as De Gaulle has an extraordinary continuity of thought. The Franco-German friendship is most certainly a key policy, and as a matter of fact, when Time magazine recently put together material for their Man of the Year issue, I gave them, among other things, the following quote from a De Gaulle speech to a German audience, dated 1945: 'The world changes, and I firmly believe that henceforth there is every reason why you should be closer rather than farther from us. You will not that I have spoken only of the future and the present. This is not unintentional.'" (See Time, Jan. 5, 1959.)

We next asked M. Valeur for comments on the Common Market, which went into effect January 1, 1959. "Will it work out? Of course it will work out," he said, "in fact it is the greatest idea that has been founded in Western Europe, I would say, for centuries." Then he went on to say that although the British are worried by the Common Market, in the end it will help the British, as the purchasing power of the Common Market countries (Benelux, France, Germany and Italy) will increase and thereby benefit the British as well.

Next, we asked M. Valeur for comment on the new taxes in France, called President de Gaulle's Verite and Severite program, eliminating certain benefits and increasing certain taxes. M. Valeur said, "The French people of course grumble—they like to grumble, especially when they feel the pinch of any taxation, but I would like to say here, in regard to those new taxes in France, that the French people, who have a reputation in this country for not paying taxes, somehow pay more taxes relatively than either the British or Americans. At the present time the French are grim, but more in the spirit of resignation, because they know they have to do it."

Next we asked him if he approved of his Government's choice of bolstering housing more than education, and he replied, "Yes, the housing problem is more urgent than schooling. However, schooling has not been neglected—about 3 years ago an extensive schooling program was launched., But housing is urgent now—young people just married have no place to live. For over a century France had a low birth rate, the lowest in Western Europe, but since the war, France has had the highest birth rate in Western Europe, with the exception of the Netherlands and Portugal. In the year 1958, the population increased by 435,000, which means new blood and new vitality in France—it is one of the most hopeful developments."

Then M. Valeur said that while France has made industrial, agricultural, scientific, and technical progress, she has not made this progress at the cost of declining effort in the field of art and letters. He pointed to such names as Malraux and Camus. "Do you consider Malraux a great man?" we asked. "Yes, of course he is a great man—he is one of the greatest men in the whole world. Malraux, more than any other writer, defends fundamental values of man—freedom, independence, individualism—which values are being challenged by forces of communism and bolshevism. Malraux has redefined the

fundamental values of man, extolling him as against everything which crushes man, which crushes freedom, man's sense of dignity and his individualism."

There were many things to ask M. Valeur, but time was getting short, and there were many things to listen to, too many to write. There were praises for President de Gaulle, comments on the general's pleasant family—"He's very much of a family man," said M. Valeur with a fond smile. And there were praises for the new Prime Minister, brilliant and eloquent Michel Debre.

Our last question asked for comments on Algeria. "The situation in Algeria has improved greatly. De Gaulle has launched a 5-year program in Algeria for the development of industry and raising the standard of living. The results will greatly contribute to satisfactory settlement of the Algerian problem—essentially one of harmonious cooperation between the Moslem community of some 9 million and the French community of 1,200,000. I would like here to stress an aspect of the problem which often surprises our American friends, and that is that those Frenchmen in Algeria have been there for generations (since 1830 it was agreed), longer than most Americans who now live beyond the Mississippi have been on their land. The French people in Algeria look upon their farms and industries just in the same way a Colorado farmer or Idaho farmer looks upon his land."

"Do you know," we ventured, "we've heard that by holding Algeria, France is doing the free world a great service." M. Valeur looked hard at the top of his desk. "The situation is very well understood in certain circles," he said, "but the American people as a whole do not understand." Leaving a lot on Algeria unsaid, we asked for a thumbnail sketch of M. Valeur's busy, brilliant life. "I've lived a long time, so there's a lot to say," he laughed, but he condensed decades into a few salient facts:

He was born in 1903 in Lons-le-Saunier, near the Swiss border; he is a doctor of laws of the University of Lyon; he was awarded a fellowship by the Rockefeller Foundation; he came to the United States for the first time in 1926 to do research at Chicago, Columbia, and Harvard Universities; he had an interval in Oxford and London, and he returned to the United States to teach political science at Columbia University, with which he continued to be associated until 1945. After the war, M. Valeur went to Sao Paulo, Brazil, where he was consul general; he was named permanent delegate of France to UNESCO in January 1952, and he became chief of the Division of Cultural Exchanges in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris in 1953.

Additional salient facts: While teaching at Columbia before the war, he took 1 day a week to teach a course in economics at Briarcliffe Junior College; his best student in economics was blonde and pretty; they were married.

"Did you ever teach at Smith?" we asked, bringing in our alma mater. M. Valeur brightened, "Smith is the favorite college of France," he said, "because Smith College initiated the junior year abroad." And that was why, he went on to say, the members of the Smith College Club were entertained at tea this year by the Ambassador and Madame Alphand. We had to admit to M. Valeur that Smith girls had been puzzled by the favored-college treatment and had (foolishly) thought the Alphands had made a mistake. But to tea they nevertheless came to be greeted by almost the entire embassy staff.

## Attack on the FBI—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third in the series of articles by Pulitzer Prize winning reporter, Edward J. Mowery. This series deals with the campaign to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the following article appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 3, 1959:

FBI WARNED THE ARMY ABOUT ROSENBERG

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—One of the oldest gimmicks in the leftist repertory is to build up a straw man, then tear him down.

The straw man as applied to the present crusade against the Federal Bureau of Investigation, goes like this:

For years the Bureau has cultivated the myth that the agency is infallible. So how can Soviet espionage rings periodically explode if the FBI is errorproof?

The reason is obvious, say critics of J. Edgar Hoover. His agency, primarily responsible for internal security, is simply watchdog.

Smarting under this line of attack on both the agents' efficiency and integrity, an FBI official declared today that the overall record of his agency will conclusively prove that the FBI has been constantly alert to the Nation's security and, at the same time, has scrupulously observed the rights of the individual citizen.

Charge: If the FBI were efficient in guarding our internal security, the Rosenbergs wouldn't have been able to steal the A-bomb secret for the U.S.S.R.

The facts: On February 9, 1942, heads of naval and military intelligence and the FBI signed the Delimitations Agreement which provided that the War Department would be responsible for investigating civilian employees under military control or on military reservations.

The Manhattan Engineer project was under War Department jurisdiction. At an April 5, 1943, conference between representatives of the FBI and G–2 (Army Intelligence), G–2 took complete responsibility for protective activities. This agreement was effective until January 1, 1947, when the Atomic Energy Commission took over the project (under provisions of the 1946 Atomic Energy Act).

The FBI's first information on Julius Rosenberg developed in February 1944 when a highly confidential source revealed that Rosenberg was a member of the Communist Party. Further investigation disclosed that Rosenberg was a civilian employee of the U.S. Signal Corps.

This information, in accordance with the Delimitations Agreement, was promptly furnished to the Army and the FBI case was closed. The Army, after its own investigation, terminated Rosenberg's employment in March 1945. The FBI took no further action because it had received no information that Rosenberg was engaged in espionage.

In 1944, when the Communist Party had an estimated membership of 80,000, it was physically impossible to maintain a day-by-day surveillance of every member.

Charge: FBI inefficiency in protecting security enabled Klaus Fuchs, Harry Gold and David Greenglass to successfully steal A-bomb secrets.

The facts: Fuchs, a British subject, was employed on the Manhattan project. Under terms of the 1943 Quebec Conference, the United States, Britain, and Canada agreed to collaborate as partners in the Atomic field with each being responsible for the security of its own personnel.

Responsibility for Fuch's actions was divided between the British and the U.S. Army.

David Greenglass was a member of the armed forces employed on the Manhattan project. His actions were the responsibility of the Army.

The FBI first heard of Harry Gold in 1947 when his name came directly into the investigation of information supplied by Elizabeth T. Bentley.

Bentley said Abraham Brothman and Jacob Golos had been involved with her in Soviet espionage. On May 29, 1947, Brothman said Harry Gold had contacted him in 1940 as a representative of Golos (whom Brothman knew only as "John"). Interviewed the same day, Gold said he received unclassified blueprints from Brothman approximately every 3 weeks for a 6-month month period, and gave them to Golos.

Both Gold and Brothman appeared before a New York Federal grand jury in July 1947. The jury returned a "no bill." In 1950, Gold admitted that both he and Brothman lied when interviewed in 1947 by the FBI. It was determined that Gold didn't know Golos at all. His real superior in the conspiracy was Semen Semenov, a Russian diplomat assigned to New York.

Since Gold was a civilian, his actions were the responsibility of the FBI. However, a grand jury failed to indict him or Brothman. And their stories could not be verified since Golos died in 1943.

Gold was prosecuted when, after an extensive investigation, he was identified as the courier of Klaus Fuchs. Brothman was convicted for obstructing justice, after Gold told the truth.

Charge: FBI files are supposedly inviolate but files have been leaked to the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Roy Cohn, the late Senator Pat McCarran, and so forth.

The facts: As Senate Judiciary Committee chairman, Senator McCarran was authorized to receive specified types of information gathered by the FBI. Investigations of committee staff members are conducted by the FBI on the Attorney General's orders. This information is made available to the chairman.

Investigative reports of prospective Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, etc., are also made available in digest form to the committee by the Department of Justice. The FBI has never permitted any member of the committee to have access to raw files, nor have any FBI files been leaked to the committee.

With respect to Roy Cohn, he was an assistant U.S. attorney in New York and a confidential assistant, from 1947 to 1952, when he became a special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General. As a Department of Justice attorney, Roy Cohn had access to reports and other data supplied to the Justice Department by the FBI.

On May 28, 1954, Cohn testified under oath during the Army-McCarthy Senate hearings that, aside from the period of his employment in the Justice Department, he has not had access to FBI reports. Cohn's testimony:

"Since I have come with this committee (as chief counsel), I have not had access to FBI files, and I have never seen an FBI file. And I would like to make that very clear under oath to end any statement by anybody that I, while with this committee * * * have seen FBI files or have had them. That is not true."

Charge: On May 4, 1954, Senator McCarthy produced an FBI confidential document at an open Senate hearing.

The facts: Senator McCarthy, committee chairman, had a document slightly more than 2 pages in length which purported to be a copy of a January 26, 1951, letter from J. Edgar Hoover to Maj. Gen. A. R. Bolling (of G–2).

Actually, the document was not a copy of the Hoover letter and merely contained information taken from the much longer communication to General Bolling. Referring to this document on May 5, 1954, Senator McCarthy stated:

"Mr. JACKSON just made a completely false statement."

(Senator McCarthy referred to Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat of Washington, who subsequently voted to censure the Wisconsin Senator.)

"He said that I represented yesterday [May 4] that this [document] came from Mr. Hoover. I made it very clear that I have never received anything from J. Edgar Hoover * * * that this was not received from Mr. Hoover."

## Thomas G. Masaryk: Democracy's Advocate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 7, we honored Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic, and its first President. It was 109 years ago that this great Democrat and friend of the United States was born. Yet today the people Thomas Masaryk inspired just over four decades ago are banned from joining us in paying tribute to this great man.

The reason for this is quite simple. Those who rule Czechoslovakia today represent the negation of everything Thomas G. Masaryk stood for. He stood for truth; they stand for falsehood. He stood for liberty; they stand for oppression. He stood for a religious, moral way of life; they stand for atheistic materialism. Masaryk was a man of principles. The dignity of the individual, protection of minority rights, and sincerity in politics were among his basic convictions. The acceptance of even one of these beliefs would undermine the foundation upon which the Soviet empire, under whose domination Czechoslovakia has been chained, is based.

Thomas Masaryk was a friend of America. In America, he saw much to be copied in the field of technology. More important, however, he saw deeper into the workings of the American civilization than just technological innovations. Thomas Masaryk realized that at the heart of America lie the seeds of democracy that bud into the flowers of independence, justice, and freedom.

In America—He said—

We can and should learn * * * love of freedom and individual independence.

On this 109th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk it is, therefore, fitting that all America should join with the friends of this great Czechoslovak patriot in commemorating this historic occasion. Let us rededicate ourselves to those higher democratic ideals which are exemplified so much by the spirit of Thomas G. Masaryk.

## The Great Proposal: Studies and Recommendations Concerning Strategy in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Dr. Paul Shipman Andrews, the distinguished scholar and Dean Emeritus of the Syracuse University School of Law, Syracuse, N.Y., has developed certain important studies and recommendations in the area of strategy in the cold war. Dr. Andrews' proposal is thought provoking and has elicited widespread attention throughout the world. I append hereto an outline of Dr. Andrews' thesis which merits full consideration.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT PROPOSAL—OUTLINE OF POSITION

On the Kremlin's plan, the fifth cold war, and the great proposal:

The Kremlin does not plan a third world war, at least until convinced it can neutralize Western power of retaliatory destruction to what Russia could accept. It is doubtless also aware of the risk that a great war might be touched off by accident, miscalculation or misjudgment even of a subordinate, a risk which would be far greater as more and more countries, some of them perhaps irresponsible to dictatorships, get nuclear weapons.

As informed men agree, Russia genuinely fears Western attack from the ring of Western bases surrounding Russia.

Informed men of many countries, however, even neutrals, more and more believe that Russia's military buildup and their policies toward other nations, are not purely defensive but suggest a vast ambition to expand her influence and domination. China's rapid population growth, industrialization, and military buildup, moreover, spell a threat to the Kremlin's leadership of the Communist world and to Russia's sparsely settled adjacent Siberian lands. Russia is under heavy pressure here to strengthen itself by controlling the manpower and resources of more and more countries, and by denying China's own ambition to expand, particularly in Southeast Asia. Witness the Kremlin's refusal of nuclear weapons to China, and its radical cutback of aid for China's industrialization program. The Kremlin wants a China dependent on it for heavy weapons and for the development of heavy industry for as long a time as possible, at least until the Kremlin's expansion program has made it, if possible, invulnerable as against the powerful, industrialized China of the not too distant future.

What seems rather clearly, then, to be the Russian master plan could be called the fifth cold war.

The first cold war is the arms race for mutual retaliatory power of destruction; the second involves using and limiting or preventing and containing the small wars which might erupt into the great one; the third is the contest to educate more and more scientists, engineers, technicians, to make more and more murderous weapons, to produce achievements of propaganda and military value, to export into underdeveloped countries for use there, in addition to financial and economic assistance, for infiltration, etc.; under the fourth cold war may be included basic science and research, exploration of outer space, and the like. The Kremlin seems to concentrate on those weapons, industries, policies, and expansionist devices which will strengthen it most, both in military power and in expansion, as against the United States, and later on China and any neutrals which might choose to resist. To these programs it devotes a far higher percentage of its national income than does the United States, and it pays for them by depriving its people, willing or not, tough, industrious, and disciplined, of that early and great rise in living standards which the fast-growing Russian economy could otherwise provide. This is a ruthless dictatorship, already the most powerful in history, coldly determined to dominate.

But the fifth cold war seems to be the master plan. It is quite different from the first four.

The fifth cold war consists of the following elements:

A great buildup of Russia's power of shattering retaliation, to deter the Western allies and the United States from military action on any provocation short of direct attack which the Kremlin does not plan. Her power is great today. It is growing. It can or soon can reach all cities of our European allies, European, north African, and certain other bases, naval and commercial port facilities with short range Russian bombers and missiles; all or most American cities and installations with long range bombers with nuclear bombs on a no-return, sacrifice mission (if out of the thousands such a low 10 percent got through the American economic system, its communications, air bases and the like, we would be in flaming chaos, its naval and commercial port facilities destroyed, and perhaps some tens of millions of people incinerated); also, missile-launching submarines now or probably soon available, and hardly detectable at sea could reach all ports, naval and submarine bases and cities within some 1,500 miles inland.

With an adequate stockpile of intercontinental ballistic missiles—a House committee predicted this within 18 months—the Russian power of retaliation (to deter the United States and its allies from attacking Russia) would be rather terribly increased.

The question here is not American and Allied power to inflict damage on Russia in retaliation for any attack by it; the point here is Russia's power to deter military action against it which might interfere with its entirely nonmilitary plan for the fifth cold war.

Overwhelming Russian land armies could move after its bombers and missiles had done their work, and the Kremlin would hope to stop troop reenforcements and supplies from America by using its 450 to 600 submarines (Hitler had 57 in 1939, and with their help nearly won the war).

If Russian intelligence, wrongly or not, positively reported an impending Allied attack, Russia would doubtless strike first.

Even if we struck first, there seems to be no claim of any capability effectively and sufficiently to neutralize the Kremlin's power to spread devastation and death in Europe and the United States.

Let it be reemphasized that Allied power of retaliation is so unimportant to this fifth cold war as to be largely irrelevant; the Kremlin does not plan to start a war; simply to possess such terrible retaliatory capabilities as would prevent the United States and its allies from starting a war against Russia to interfere with the Kremlin's plan.

The Kremlin will continue to soften up key countries and others by blandishments, assurances, promises, infiltration, subversion, capitalizing on or fomenting disorders, offers of assistance, veiled threats—the carrot and the stick.

Russia has certain advantages in this battle for men's minds, of which she is taking advantage. Every newspaper reader should know that she can and does make certain appeals not open to the western nations, and is to some extent free from certain obstacles and prejudices which they face.

Russia is using local Communist parties and will continue to do so, for infiltration and subversion, and for fostering and capitalizing on local disorders.

The Kremlin's plan, rather clearly, is to capture the strategically critical Middle East and gain full control of the area and its oil—oil without which Europe slowly dies. What the Kremlin has done to this end and is trying to do should be familiar to all. But if it can find or manufacture a plausible excuse of protecting Middle East countries against Western aggression, doubtless it will pour volunteers (trained and equipped armies) into the area. This, it would almost certainly do if the Western Allies went to war in the area to restore Europe's oil sources. It should follow that the Kremlin would try to throw out a too-independent Nasser.

Moreover, there are time pressures. Surely the Kremlin wants to achieve all this if possible at the moment of its maximum lead in destructive power, for world blackmail would then be easier. Since, however, what alone counts in this plan is Russia's capability to deter, this time limit may not be decisive.

But the Kremlin must achieve this before Europe's energy requirements can be supplied by substitute means such as atomic energy reactors, and preferably before substitute oil supplies and tankers to carry them to Europe are available; also, long enough before China attains economic, industrial and military independence of Russia so that China could not risk interfering.

If seaborne oil promised to meet Europe's requirements enough to take off the pressure Khrushchev's submarines very probably would sink them beginning with those under other than the American flag, on the gamble that neither Europe nor the United States, whatever efforts they made to escort and protect the tankers, would face destruction by going to war for Europe's oil. And again, if war seemed imminent, Russia would try to strike first.

The Western attack on the Middle East might almost equally serve the Kremlin's purposes. For it tends to push all the uncommitted nations of the world into the hands of Russia.

The Kremlin's final objective, whether to be attained by blackmailing Europe as above and then by cajoling, luring, and threatening the uncommitted nations or by drawing the Western Allies into attacking the Middle East, with its probable consequences as suggested and in addition with the probable destruction there of pipe lines, oil wells, refineries, and port facilities, would be to swing Europe under Russian influence, to force out American troops, air bases, port facilities and the like, to break up NATO and to bring European nations economically into the Russian orbit, squeezing out the United States; to subjugate and control the uncommitted nations, at first key ones, and then others, with their unlimited potential of military manpower and their great resources; to confront China with a power she could not challenge; to confront the United States and anything left of NATO both with this manpower and the power to cut off foreign trade and to cut off the imports both of strategic materials necessary for war and of essential industrial raw material.

If this analysis is at all correct—and unhappily it has been accepted by wise and informed men from many countries both in and out of high public office—the Kremlin plans nothing less than to win the world by means less costly than allout war by peaceable strangulation.

It must not be forgotten that biology and chemistry can furnish additional means of retaliation. Dr. Brock Chisholm, lately head of the World Health Organization of the U.N. recently confirmed to the writer that he had earlier printed: that some 7 ounces of a preparation of botulinum toxin, if it could be finely and widely enough distributed could destroy the population of the world. And there are other biologicals, according to the scientific adviser at an Army Germ Warfare Research Center against which there is no method of immunization.

Obviously there is no answer to the fifth cold war in our thousands of millions of dollars for weapons of destructive retaliation, for means to prevent or contain small wars, for education, for research and exploration of space. Our billions are unavoidably necessary for the first four cold wars; in the fifth they are largely irrelevant, except perhaps to handle small wars which might be part of the Kremlin's plan.

An answer to the fifth cold war should meet among others, the following specifications: (a) It must recognize that open, naked aggression would not suit the Kremlin since it would antagonize the uncommitted world; (b) It should deny the Kremlin, if possible, any pretext for using volunteers; (c) It should lend itself to a world publicity campaign informing all nations and particularly the Middle East of the dangers of going with Russia, of becoming a battleground, and of the threat to all nations including the neutrals of the fifth cold war; (d) It should make clear the hostility to China concealed in the fifth cold war; (e) Through worldwide sustained education and publicity, it must hold out to all nations alike the hope of very great benefits—of things men burningly desire everywhere for themselves and their children, and seek to demonstrate to mankind that these benefits would be denied if the fifth cold war succeeded; (f) It must appeal to self-interest and to men's deepest desires and, being right and good, to the great religions; (g) It must be an idea to be for—not against, and simple to understand; (h) It must seek no special advantage for any nation; (i) In resolving the fifth cold war it must resolve the other four as well. It must be a great and heartwarming proposal, capable of capturing the imagination of mankind.

Peace, freedom, and our lives stand at the mercy of miscalculation, misjudgment even by one of thousands of subordinates on either side, of sheer accident, or the recklessness or fanaticism of some small dictator, and of the fifth cold war as well. An answer must be found before it is too late. The world needs, and waits for a proposal great enough to meet the problem, to offer hope to mankind, and to rouse millions of angry men and women everywhere with no uncertain voice crying to the world's governments, leaders, and statesmen, their wrathful insistence that their hopes for themselves and their children no longer be denied.

Such a plan exists. It is the only plan which the writer knows which would create inducements, incentives and pressures, and strong ones, upon the great powers and other nations, Western, Communist or neutral.

The plan, known to a considerable number of eminent and informed men from five continents as the great proposal has two objectives and a method: (a) World law covering war-prevention, with gradual, simultaneous and ultimately complete disarmament down to forces for internal order, under a United Nations invested with the additional powers needed effectively to prevent war and to provide all nations better security against war and aggression than the little any nation now possesses through the precarious balance of terror. That this could be both feasible and workable is, the writer believes, demonstrated by world peace through world law, the great book of Clark and Sohn (Harvard University Press 1958). (b) World mutual development fund, also a U.N. agency, financed by an adequate but still minor percentage of the savings from disarmament, for investment in necessary intrastructure and on fruitful projects in underdeveloped areas. (c) Equally important to create a demand and pressure for this package, would be intensive, sustained, world-wide educational publicity, tailored for each area, to make every family aware of the benefits it might obtain and the hopes it might realize from the twin, interdependent goals of disarmament under world law and the fund. Clark and Sohn set forth their plan for disarmament under world law, with an adequate fund for aid to underdeveloped areas. The great proposal recognizing these two goals are inseparably interdependent, would provide pressures tending to persuade the governments and leaders to achieve and accept them, through such charter revision as is envisaged by Clark and Sohn.

Certainly there are serious obstacles. But certainly also the persuaslve pressures would be strong. And it can be shown, the writer believes, that the disadvantage of rejecting the proposal in the face of such a strong demand as might be created by worldwide educational publicity, and the advantages of accepting it, would be very substantial.

---

## Address by Alexander Purdon, Executive Director, Committee of American Steamship Lines, Before Controllers Institute of America Southern Conference Meeting, New Orleans, La., March 6, 1959

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY ALEXANDER PURDON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMITTEE OF AMERICAN STEAMSHIP LINES, BEFORE CONTROLLERS INSTITUTE OF AMERICA SOUTHERN CONFERENCE MEETING, NEW ORLEANS, LA., MARCH 6, 1959

It's a privilege to speak to you today. And it is fitting that in your crowded program you pause to consider the importance of the merchant marine. It is especially fitting for a group meeting here in New Orleans. The evidence of the contribution that ships make to this city is all around—in shipping offices, wharves, terminals, ship chandlers, banks, insurance firms, and all

the kindred business and industry, including yours, that prosper from the sea.

Beyond New Orleans itself the fabulous growth and development of the entire gulf region and the great Mississippi Valley have been fostered by the steamship services initiated and maintained by American-flag steamship operators.

You are especially trained to evaluate. Economics is not a theoretical abstraction to financial men. I hope in these remarks to give you some facts on which you can evaluate the contribution made by the American merchant marine to you, your companies, the gulf, and the Nation.

The maritime industry is a vast complex of ships and seamen, shipyards, and shipbuilders, wharves, and warehouses and many allied businesses. It involves all of the mechanics of doing business with which you are so familiar but with ramifications and complications peculiarly its own.

As businesses go it isn't so big but it does a big and important job. Last Sunday I appeared on a television panel with Admiral Weakly, chief of our antisubmarine forces. He quoted a Navy study which showed that during 1957 1,120,150 million short-ton miles of cargo moved in and out of the United States. Less than one-fifth of 1 percent moved by air. Of course, if we had used long tons the figures would have been lower, but hardly less impressive in measuring the dependence of the United States on shipping.

Not all of the ocean-borne portion of this moved in American ships. Foreign ships actually got the lion's share and American ships got the short end. That's been the pattern most of the time—not enough of our own commerce moves on our own ships—the percentage is declining—and is currently at the lowest level in 37 years. This situation calls for correction and I hope that when I conclude you will echo my sentiments in this regard.

Statistically we have the world's largest merchant fleet but the figures are loaded for they include the Reserve fleet of 2,074 World War II ships tied up in numerous bayous and backwaters.

The active, privately owned and operated U.S. merchant fleet now comprises 927 vessels. This divides into 253 ships in coastwise service, 51 ships in intercoastal trade, and 74 ships in noncontiguous service—for a total of 378 ships in domestic trade. The number of American-flag vessels in foreign trade includes 452 dry cargo ships, 33 passenger-cargo vessels, and 50 tankers, totaling 535 ships.

The 313 ships owned by 15 lines having operating contracts with the Government to service 31 trade routes are the hardcore of our dry cargo fleet. They sail about 1,800 voyages a year and carry about 70 percent of U.S. dry cargo exports and 83 percent of dry cargo imports moved by American liners.

As the backbone of the American merchant marine these vessels must be kept modern and efficient to serve our foreign trade. They will be—for during the next 10 to 15 years the older ships will be gradually replaced in a program estimated to cost about $4 billion. Allowing for Government participation through shipyard subsidies which reduce the total private investment to about $2 billion we still have a staggering capital expenditure for a group of companies with a combined net worth of about $650 million in 1957.

These are the dimensions of our merchant fleet, but why do we need it anyway—what does it cost—and what does it contribute?

Shipping is not only a vital cog in our economic machinery but shipping policy is a vital element in our foreign economic policy. Thus it should be evaluated by the part it plays in our daily lives and the contribtuion made to building the kind of life that the peoples of the free world want and need.

There are some things I want to tell you about its economic contributions but before doing so let me point out that economic strength and military strength are inseparable. We can't have one without the other. Allen Dulles said that, "The fateful battles of the cold war will in the foreseeable future be fought in the economic and subversive areas."

The sword and the plowshare are now synonymous. We need to build ourselves economically to support an adequate Military Establishment. In addition we need to project and share our economic strength so that the accomplishments of dynamic capitalism and the moral, spiritual, and economic benefits of democracy will act as a beacon of hope to millions who seek a better way of life.

It is impossible to do so without an American merchant marine adequate to our domestic needs and international responsibilities.

Without realizing it we have become a have-not Nation. We are no longer self-sufficient.

Imports make up the material muscle that regulates the heartbeat of the economy. We can and we do use foreign ships to bring essential imports to us but we can only count on American ships to do so, come fair weather or foul.

With less than 10 percent of the free world population and 8 percent of the land area we use over 50 percent of the world supply of many raw materials either not available or in insufficient supply in our country. Without these our giant industrial machine would grind to a halt.

On the other side of the coin are exports. Everyone knows that we export much of our production but few realize how much. Fewer still realize how important exports are not only to the national economy but to local communities and individuals far removed from the sea.

For example, we export over 32 percent of our civilian aircraft, 19 percent of our trucks, and 13 percent of our agricultural machinery.

We are now exporting about 9 percent of the total production of our farms, mines, and factories.

And roughly, 1 acre in every 6 raises agricultural products for export. This agricultural market is of particular importance to the South for during the past 10 years we have exported over one-half of our entire cotton crop and one-quarter of our tobacco and peanut oil and soybean crops—all mainstays of the southern agricultural economy.

Put facts like these together and it is not surprising to find that 4½ million people in our country depend on foreign trade for their livelihood and indirectly everyone is affected. This applies even to the housewife who little realizes that her tea and coffee and the tin coating on the cans in her pantry were brought here by ship.

Roughly every 9 minutes a ship loaded with foreign trade cargo enters or leaves a U.S. port. About one in four sails under the U.S. flag.

Their cargoes are the foundation for the employment of the 4½ million American workers who are employed in foreign trade—not to mention other millions whose jobs are affected by foreign trade.

Our merchant marine supplies essential transportation on the sealanes of the world but here at home it is also a customer of many of the same industries it serves—purchasing food, fuel, supplies and services that in one recent 10-year period aggregated a billion dollars for my group of lines alone. This does not include the construction value of the new ships on order or under construction under our ship replacement program which was estimated at year's end to be worth $239 million for our 14 companies.

Surely the workers across the land—in all States—who service, supply or build American ships are aware that in addition to the service rendered to the overall economy the American merchant marine makes a very specific economic contribution to them.

Although it remains essentially a private enterprise industry our merchant marine requires Government support for two basic reasons: First, foreign operators can build ships at one-half the American cost; and second, can operate them for as little as one-quarter of our costs.

In order to maintain an essential hard core of ocean transportation under our own flag the Government agrees to make operating differential payments to those steamship lines willing to undertake the onerous requirements of contractual service on our essential trade routes.

These operating differentials are actually a form of casualty insurance. Without them our high standard of living and high costs of doing business would drive our merchant marine off the seas. Their aim is to achieve parity on certain specified costs in which the American operator is at a substantial disadvantage. The wage differential alone accounts for 80 percent of the operating differential.

The operating differentials do not guarantee success—eliminate risks or guarantee a profit. In some measure they are merely compensation for increased costs resulting from requirements imposed by our national policy or inherent in our economic system.

America's crown—a high standard of living for all—is also a cross which, in a growingly competitive world market has required many industries to adopt new tactics to meet foreign competition.

Historically we have met this problem by increased productivity through mass production and our superb production technology. While responsible for much of America's economic success this solution, unfortunately, is not adaptable to all industries and in others is still not enough to retain a competitive advantage in oveasea markets. Industries in this latter category have increasingly been forced to open foreign production and distribution facilities employing low-cost local labor or to make licensing arrangements providing for foreign use of American patents, trademarks, and processes. These solutions are not available to that segment of our merchant marine which operates under contracts with the Federal Government. These lines must build their ships, purchase their goods, and hire their crews in the United States. In effect they are an all-American team—that must play on a foreign field—under foreign rules.

To put yourselves in our position you might imagine the results if an American-built factory, employing all American workers, buying all American services, was to operate in a foreign country and try to sell its products in that country in competition with a native-built plant employing local workers, paying local wages, and buying local services.

The ship operator gets no direct advantage from construction differential payments, but the Nation and our shipbuilding industry do. This aid is given directly to the shipyards so that the American operator—who is required to build in American yards—can buy his ships at approximately the price he would pay if he were free as his foreign competitors are to build in low-cost foreign yards.

Building one freighter is roughly equivalent to building a Roosevelt Hotel. It costs approximately $11 million. Perhaps an even better comparison with this hotel is in passenger ships. The cost of these presently runs from $25 million to upward of $130 million.

In addition to the 19 ships presently under construction the subsidized lines are required by contract to replace approximately 257 vessels between now and 1970.

As I mentioned earlier this is a $4-billion program—the largest peacetime shipbuilding effort in our history and obviously quite a financial obligation to undertake, although the operators' cost after construction subsidy is paid to the yards will be roughly one-half or about $2 billion. Contract steamship lines are required by law to maintain capital and special reserve funds.

At the present time these statutory reserves aggregate about $324 million which will, of course, be increased in future years through deposits or depreciation, earnings and proceeds on the disposition of the present fleet. However, after giving effect to these equity payments it appears that the subsidized lines will have to obtain capital in excess of $1 billion to be raised through outside financing.

The Government has adopted a policy of encouraging private financing in lieu of Government financing previously available. In part, this was a desire to get the Government out of the banking business. In part also it was to reduce the effect of this program on the Federal budget. Under legislation adopted a few years ago, the United States is authorized to insure 100 percent of the unpaid principal of and interest on ship construction loans and mortgages which meet specific Government requirements.

During 1958, contracts of insurance aggregating $58,449,500 and mortgage loans aggregating $133,328,465 were made by the Maritime Administration. Since this became available, over $235 million of privately placed loans and mortgages have been so insured.

One line has very successfully financed through mortgage bonds secured by the Government mortgage insurance. These merchant marine bonds are not only a promising source of financing but their marketing has aroused new interest and understanding in maritime problems.

Naturally, the financial community has taken a hard look at our industry and a number of underwriting firms have published special studies. One of them makes this interesting observation: "Relationships and conversations with shipping executives would convince almost all observers that the companies and the people who run them are as efficient and aggressive as those in any other industry—even the automobile industry for example."

With rising competition and costs and faced with this gigantic replacement program American steamship lines need the assurance of reasonable stability in their rate structures. As you doubtless know international ocean freight rates are established by conferences. Maintenance of a strong steamship conference system is of vital importance not only to the shipping industry but to all American businesses engaged in foreign trade.

Stability of ocean shipping rates and equity of treatment between shippers are increasingly essential to American companies in meeting the mounting competition for foreign trade markets.

Steamship rate conferences are the only practicable means by which the ocean carrier can assure the shipper of regular service at stable nondiscriminatory rates in all world markets. They are the voluntary counterpart in international commerce of governmental rate regulation in domestic transportation of such industries as trucking, railroads, airlines, and the like.

Obviously, international ocean freight rates cannot be determined or established by any single nation. But steamship conferences must be strengthened by permitting them to make contract arrangements with shippers if they are to be effective in assuring the stability which only a strong conference system can provide. The alternative to the self-regulation of the conference system would be chaos in international ocean freight rates.

As you may know Congress is currently reviewing the conference system. The steamship industry has welcomed this study and is cooperating with it in every way.

Personally I am confident that the congressional studies will demonstrate that the alternative to a strong conference system would be ruinous rate wars which would be disastrous to shipping companies and shippers alike.

We have a strong merchant marine today. With increasing public understanding of the contributions it makes to our economy and defense, it can and will grow in service to the Nation.

Ships have supported and shielded Western civilization from time immemorial. But their task is not yet done. As the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and a distinguished aviator—Gen. Nathan F. Twining recently said.

"In case of surprise and devastating nuclear attack that might knock out land transportation, the merchant marine's availability to ply the great highway of the seas with strategic materials and foodstuffs might well be the one source of free world strength to pluck victory from chaos."

We cannot place all our bets on one weapon—one type of war philosophy. The Soviet bloc has in clear terms declared a new form of warfare whose goals are the hearts, souls and stomachs of mankind.

Our American merchant marine is not a touchstone of victory but it is a cheap form of insurance—insurance that provides economic dividends plus protection from military catastrophe.

The Soviet Union is now employing economic blandishments on an increasing scale. They employ foreign trade as an economic weapon combining subversion with money and weapons. They capitalize on poverty and political instability in the underdeveloped nations. We cannot be indifferent or complacent to their economic offensive.

We know that in war our merchant marine is a vital element of national security—a fourth arm of defense but in this new type of war in which we are immediately engaged it acquires a new stature—a new importance. It becomes in a sense the shafting by which we can transmit and project to the free peoples the social, economic and moral advantages of dynamic capitalism.

Two-thirds of the free world's people live in areas that, as a whole, have a per capita production only one-twentieth as large as the United States.

This is the new battleground in the struggle for the minds and hearts of men. Our American merchant marine is a vital element in an economic offensive which we have the capacity and the will to win.

## Statement by Preston J. Moore, National Commander, the American Legion, Before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 3, 1959, the honorable Preston J. Moore of Stillwater, Okla., national commander of the American Legion, appeared before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. It was my privilege and honor to present him to that distinguished group.

Through the years, the American Legion has always sent dynamic and able national commanders to appear before that committee. But never in its 40-year history has this great veterans' organization of nearly 3 million members had a more capable or a more personable leader than Mr. Moore. As a decorated World War II Army and Air Force veteran of combat campaigns in the southwest Pacific, he understands the problems and needs of our Nation's disabled veterans. He saw military service both as an enlisted man and an officer. In American Legion matters, he has time and again demonstrated his capacity for leadership. He has been commander of two American Legion posts, was the first World War II commander of the Oklahoma department and prior to his election as national commander was one of the most able and respected members of the national executive committee. He also is a successful business and professional man. He is a senior partner in the law firm of Moore & Murphy in Stillwater, Okla., and vice president and general counsel of the American Life Insurance Co. He is a man of good judgment, common sense and loyalty to his country.

Mr. Moore is to be congratulated for his excellent statement to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in my experience as national commander of the American Legion, I believe this occasion ranks at the top in importance. There is no other service in which our organization is engaged which affects the lives of so many war veterans and their dependents than that which comes within the jurisdiction of this committee.

As a result of the election you have some new members on your committee. I am sure they will join with you in maintaining the high degree of nonpartisanship which has ever been identified with your work. We congratulate you new Members on your election to a position of high honor in the House of Representatives. We hope you will maintain your interest in veterans affairs.

And to those of you who have been engaged in the activities of this committee for a longer period of time, we express our pleasure in the knowledge that the voters have put their stamp of approval on your activities in Congress.

This week our organization is conducting the 36th annual National Rehabilitation Conference here in Washington. The schedule for our meeting has been arranged so that many of our conferees may join with me and the members of our staff who are present, in expressing our interest in veterans' affairs. It is our hope that our conferees will find it possible to visit with Members of Congress in both Houses during this week. It will be obvious to you that they have many things to discuss.

OUR LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The American Legion legislative program is not new to your committee. Miles D. Kennedy, our national legislative director, has already furnished you with a copy of our National Legislative Bulletin No. 18 which contains a list of all resolutions adopted at the 1958 national convention and at the October 1958 meeting of our national executive committee, calling for legislative

action during the current session of Congress. In addition, Mr. Kennedy has complied with that provision of our congressional charter which calls upon us to submit an annual report to the Congress.

Incidentally, in addition to Mr. Kennedy I have with me other members of our national staff to answer questions on any technical matters which may arise.

THE HIGHLIGHTS

Our 1958 national convention adopted 22 resolutions calling for legislation in the field of veterans' affairs. Our national executive committee at its fall 1958 meeting adopted 10 additional resolutions requiring new legislation. There is one other resolution on which your committee has already taken favorable action. That is in the field of the home loan guarantee program. I should like to take this opportunity to express the thanks of our organization for the speedy manner in which this action was accomplished. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4, 1959, shows that in the floor handling of H.R. 2256 your chairman performed a magnificent job. We are hopeful that, because of the great interest of the individual members of your committee, you will do all that is proper to secure final congressional approval on this matter.

Many deal with legislation which asks for correction of technical details in existing law. Some of these resolutions call for action to give specific names to certain selected Veterans' Administration hospitals. In future sessions, our staff will be conferring with your committee when you have these bills before you for consideration. Each of the technical changes requested vitally affects the operation of existing law. Our recommendations in regard to such bills are based upon the experience of our practicing service officers, as such experience has been reported to our national convention rehabilitation committee.

For the purpose of this appearance before your committee I think you would be interested in the proposals which we think are being discussed more prominently.

DISABILITY PENSIONS; DEATH PENSIONS

There has been no increase in the monthly awards for disability pensions since 1954. The situation with regard to pensions awardsd widows and orphans is similar.

All of you will recognize the fact that there have been substantial increases in income for many large segments of the population since 1954. The cost of living index has continued its upward curve since that year.

Our request is that the rates be increased from $66.15, $78.75 and $135.45 to $75, $90 and $150 for those entitled to disability pension awards. The monthly increases in these rates amount to $8.85, $11.25 and $14.55. If you reduce those amounts to weekly increases and then do a mental arithmetic problems in seeing for yourself how much the increases would buy in the supermarket, then you will, we think, agree there is nothing drastic about our requests.

For the widows of war veterans, and for their dependent children, we ask a similarly modest increase.

INCREASE IN INCOME LIMITATION

Eligibility for disability pensions is established through length of service, type of discharge, degree of disability, and lack of employability. In the case of World War I veterans, death pension for widows and orphans are granted on the basis of the veterans' service and the financial need of the claimants. For widows and orphans of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, there is an added test of eligibility, i.e., that the veteran must have had a service connected disability.

Since 1952 the income limitation for war veterans and widows has been $1,400 for those without dependents, and $2,700 for those with dependents. The American Legion proposals request that these income limits be increased to $1,800 for those without dependents, and $3,000 for those with dependents. This would recognize the situation created by periodic increases in social security payments.

Some background history may be pertinent to this question. For modern wars, disability pensions were inaugurated by Mr. Herbert Hoover when he was President of the United States. There was no veterans organization requesting such legislation. The proposal was one wholly and completely attributable to the thinking of former President Hoover and those he consulted. This ability allowance legislation, as pension was then termed, became law in July 1930.

And what were the income limitations laid down for the disabled war veterans to be eligible for this benefit? The criterion was exemption from payment of a Federal income tax for the year preceding the application for the pension. Therefore, the limitations were $1,500 for those without dependents, $3,500 for those with a wife, and $400 additional for each child.

At the time, the early 1930's, $1,500 for those with no dependents would buy a fairly comfortable standard of living. With the addition of the pension the disabled war veteran could live comfortably.

And a married disabled war veteran with a wife and two children could get along very well on the $4,300 income limitation plus the pension.

The income limitations initially invoked maintained the concept that pensions and particularly disability pensions, were provided for those having a record of war service. The institution of the disability pension was considered a dignified means of aiding the war veteran to a point avowedly a good degree above the status of the person who found it necessary to seek private or public charity.

That this was no accidental development in the Hoover plan for a disability pension for war veterans is attested to in the message that the then President Hoover delivered to the Congress in December 1932, more than 2 years after the passage of the disability allowance law. In his message Mr. Hoover said:

"The Nation should not ask for a reduction in allowances to men and dependents whose disabilities rise out of war service nor to those veterans with substantial service who have become totally disabled from non-service-connected causes and who are at the same time without other means of support.

"These latter veterans are a charge on the community at some point, and I feely that in view of thefr service to the Nation as a whole, the responsibility should fall upon the Federal Government."

It takes two 1958 dollars to purchase what one 1940 dollar would have bought in the year 1940. And the 1940 dollar wouldn't buy nearly as much as the 1930 dollar. So the modest effort of our organization to secure an increase in the income limitation is to keep pace to a small degree with the increase in the cost of living and in the devaluation of the dollar.

PRESUMPTION OF UNEMPLOYABILITY AT AGE 65

Under the present law the Veterans' Administration must determine that the veteran's unemployability is due to disability. Even though only a 10 percent disability is required at age 65, the VA must find that it is that disability which prevents the veteran from following a substantial gainful occupation. This means that the present law does not provide pensions for veterans who actually have little income and little hope of ever earning more if it happens to be their age rather than some disability that denies them employment.

Age 65 is the customary age at which American employers will terminate the jobs of even their able-bodied personnel. So the American Legion again is asking the Congress to eliminate the disability requirement as a pension eligibility for veterans 65 or over. Actually, attainment of age 65 does constitute an economic disability.

PARITY FOR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN

At the present time death pensions are granted the widows and dependent children of veterans of World War I on one standard of eligibility requirements. The widows and dependent children of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict are granted death pensions on a different, more restrictive, set of eligibility requirements.

It is obvious that the widows and children of veterans of all three of our modern wars are similarly affected by the lack of an income to maintain them in the absence of the husband and father.

For more than 10 years we have been coming to the Congress and have asked that the widows and children of veterans of the three modern wars in which our country has engaged be placed upon the same standard of eligibility. Thus far we have been unsuccessful in this endeavor. We hope you are agreed that now is the time to act upon this simple request for justice and equity in dealing with the problems of women and children.

THE RIGHT TO CONTRACT FOR INSURANCE

Our 1958 national convention adopted a resolution which directs us to continue to seek legislation providing limited opportunity to secure participating national service life insurance for veterans of World War II, and nonparticipating national service life insurance for veterans of the Korean conflict. Such limited authority to purchase contracts of these types of insurance would exist for 1 year following date of approval of the legislation. The contracts would be issued only if the veteran were insurable or, as to Korean veterans, if he had a Veterans Administration rating for a service-incurred disability.

There are more than 10 million who would have the opportunity to secure Government insurance under such a proposal. The modest administrative cost would be borne by the policyholders if the bill the American Legion supports is approved.

It is believed that simple justice would be served in reopening the right to secure these types of Government insurance for a limited period. It is obvious that, at the time the right was taken from the war veteran, there were many veterans who, for one reason or another, had delayed making application to continue such insurance in force.

COST OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

The American Legion believes that every responsible individual should be deeply concerned with the cost of operating the Federal Government. The responsibility and the duty to consider such costs include the necessity of relating such costs to other factors.

Our organization starts with the prémise that the cost of war is always extravagant in terms of the dollars spent. In terms of the maintenance of our principles of government, the dollars expended are justified.

In this vein of thinking we believe it is correct to consider the dollar cost of veterans affairs a part of the cost of war. Though this is delayed cost, it appears to us that just as night follows day so will there always be a program of veterans affairs following any war in which our Nation engages.

From that point it is our belief that the cost of veterans affairs should be not considered solely in terms of the dollar expended. There should be relation to the income of the Nation, to the number of those who either volunteered or were called to service in time of war, and to such factors as the cost of living and the value of the dollar.

Since 1890, using the gross national product as the standard of comparison, the cost of veterans benefit programs has been the most consistently stable of any assistance program in the government. According to the Social Security Bulletin for October 1957, the cost of veterans benefit programs has hovered around 1 percent of the gross national product for most of the years since 1890. This statistics has been in this relationship despite the fact that our 3 modern wars have increased the war veteran population from about 2 percent to about 12 percent of the general population in the intervening years.

Members of your committee probably have noted that the Director of the Budget Bureau, in a message to the Joint Committee on Economics, dated January 29, stated that "with 2 exceptions, payments for every function of Government will be higher in 1960 than in 1948. These exceptions are international affairs and veterans benefits, for which special post-World War II conditions led to higher expenditures in 1948."

PROJECTIONS OF FUTURE COSTS

Obviously it is a good thing for those in control of any Government program to be fully informed of the cost of operations. To the extent that such studies indicate trends and provide guidelines for the future they have an important place in administration.

Too often it has been our experience that those who use the statistical projections of future costs as estimates are conducting futile arithmetic exercises.

Such projections are filled with assumptions. But those who want to defeat a project which is presently being considered disregard the assumptions and convey to the public estimates which, if the assumptions were removed from them, would fall of their own weight.

Since World War II, for example, those who are opposed to veterans benefit programs speak of the veteran population being one-half that of the Nation when their families are included. Such statements do not define what is meant by the veteran population, take no account of the fact that the war veteran population is declining, nor relate the statistics to the growth of the general population, now or in the future.

Further, there is a fallacy in using the total population of war veterans plus their families. To begin with, those veterans who benefit from Federal programs are only a small percentage of the war veteran population (for example, the number of war veterans hospitalized in Veterans' Administration hospitals in a calendar year is currently about 2.2 percent of the war veteran population, and only 0.0028 percent of the general population). In addition to that fact, one must remember that generally the wives of veterans will not draw benefits until the veterans are deceased, and that the same circumstance obtains for children, with the added limitation that children's benefits terminate, with rare exceptions, at age 18 or 21. Further, wives and children are never eligible to certain benefits, such as hospitalization. Thus, to suggest that at any given time one-half the general population may be entitled to Federal veteran benefits is grossly misleading.

So far as our organization knows, no projection embracing distance future years has proved out. For example, in 1943 the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs said 300,000 hospital and domiciliary beds would be required for war veterans. That estimate obviously did not include the need for hospital facilities arising out of the Korean conflict. In 1952 another Administrator said 255,000 beds would be required in 1975. In 1958 a third Administrator said 155,000 beds would be required in 1975.

Examples of other projections in different fields are readily available. Spanish-American War veterans are now about 82 years old. Yet approximately 5 percent of those living apparently have not sought the pensions which are available to them.

The Veterans' Administration never has been able to distribute all of the dividends accruing to those who carried national service life insurance in World War II.

The National Economy League said, in the early 1930's, that it would bankrupt the Nation to prepay the adjusted service certificates. It didn't. Further, not only is there a record that all of those eligible did not apply for such certificates, but the VA still has a couple of million dollars on hand which are held as a reserve for those who have not sought payment on the certificates issued.

Such fallacies in projections of future estimates lead us to the conclusion that the real purpose served in making such projections may well be to defeat the legislation which otherwise might be considered to have compelling virtues in the present.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE BUDGET

In general terms it may be said that the President's message of January 19, 1959, in the field of veterans benefits is slightly more liberal than messages in similar documents in the years 1950–58, inclusive.

Individual Members of Congress have indicated they did not approve the recommendations of the President's Commission on Pensions. It appears from the paragraph in the President's message relating to pension legislation that the administration still clings to a goal laid down by the report of the Commission submitted in 1956. The effort to shift, where possible, the cost of veterans pensions to the field of social legislation is still there. Then it no longer would remain a war veterans pension program. It is to be hoped the President is not being less considerate than was Mr. Hoover in 1930.

HOSPITALIZATION OF DISABLED WAR VETERANS

In the summer of 1958 your committee devoted a great deal of time and effort to the matter of getting information about the operation of the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery.

After the close of your hearings your committee approved H.R. 10028, a bill having as one of its purposes a congressional statement of intent to maintain a VA hospital system with a minimum of 125,000 operating beds.

In January, VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery supplied information showing the number of hospitals and beds in relation to the war veteran population for the fiscal years 1940 through 1958.

The table started with a veteran population of 4,286,000 in 1940 when there were 13.7 VA operating beds for each 1,000 veterans. This included 1.2 tuberculosis beds, 8.1 neuropsychiatric beds, and 4.4 general medicine and surgery beds.

As of June 30, 1958, when the war veteran population was estimated at 22,727,000, the ratio of operating beds for each 1,000 war veterans had dwindled to 5.3. This included 0.5 tuberculosis bed, 2.8 neuropsychiatric beds, and 2 general medicine and surgery beds.

Parenthetically, it may be said that in the general population, in 1957, in continental United States, there were approximately 9 beds for each 1,000 of population.

Again, the information showed that VA had, June 30, 1958, a rated bed capacity of 127,832; 121,201 operating beds; and an average daily patient load of 111,599.

The peak of the rated capacity for VA had been reached in 1956 when the system had a rated capacity of 129,704 beds in 173 hospitals.

Now, the administration has done more whittling on VA bed capacity. At the end of January the rated bed capacity was reduced to 123,667. This indicates a reduction of 4,170 in the rated bed capacity. The explanation is that that these were phantom beds.

From the base of 123,667 rated beds the administration then proceeds to add hospitals under construction, authorized, or approved for future dates at the following places (number of beds supplied):

| | |
|---|---|
| Palo Alto | 1,000 |
| Brecksville | 1,000 |
| Bay Pines | 350 |
| Miami | 350 |
| Jackson | 500 |
| Oakland | 500 |
| Cleveland | 800 |
| Washington | 500 |
| Nashville | 500 |
| Total | 5,500 |

Many of the beds in the hospitals listed in this group will be replacements for beds in existing hospitals. That would explain, in part, the possible confusion with regard to the manner in which the goal of 125,000 authorized beds is to be reached.

When and if these hospitals are constructed and placed in the VA system and added to the January 31 base of 123,667, that would provide a total of 129,167 beds. Apparently from that total another 4,167 beds would be administratively wiped out to produce the present goal of 125,000 rated capacity for the VA's hospitals, which presently number 168.

Reaching a goal of 125,000 rated capacity in beds under such an arbitrary system is a long way from the goal authorized by Congress under the 1948 appropriation bill, i.e., 152,000 beds.

It would appear that those who believe the program providing for Federal hospitalization of war veterans is a prime target for economy have been remarkably successful.

You will recall that VA supplied information regarding the waiting list for those applying for VA hospitalization, during the course of the hearings conducted during July and August 1958. At that time, VA reported that as of the end of May 1958 there were 26,807 war veterans certified as eligible for hospitalization, but not yet scheduled for admission. An additional number (not supplied in detail) had been scheduled for hospitalization but not yet admitted, and still a third group of applicants had not been certified as eligible to be put on the waiting list. The point of this is, that while there has been a steady decline, since 1948, in the number of existing and authorized beds, the VA reported that the number of applicants for general medical and mental hospitalization was on the increase. Only in the field of tuberculosis has there been a decline in the number applying for hospitalization.

We urge your committee to proceed to the support of a bill such as H.R. 10028 establishing a minimum goal of 125,000 operating beds in the VA system.

A LOOK AT THE RECORD

Let me be the first to give recognition to the fact that yours is a hard-working committee. Consistently it operates with a minimum of partisanship in its objectives and methods. Your long-term Members on the committee have devoted an extraordinary amount of time and effort to the field of veterans' affairs. Your committee deserves far more recognition and appreciation than it gets.

A review of the record for the decade 1948–58 establishes that it has been a period in which some beneficial legislation and adjustments have been accomplished. But liberalizations and necessary adjustments were effected in the face of strong opposition. In the field of pensions, the broadest liberalization was an administrative one and came at the start of that decade with the issuance of extension 5 to the rating schedule.

Our veterans programs suffered some losses during the last decade. War veterans lost their right to contract for new Government life insurance. In Public Law 881, 84th Congress, along with the higher awards went the partial marriage of veterans benefits with those administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under certain circumstances, the Veterans' Administration was for the first time not the agency obligated to pay death compensation to a child of a veteran whose death was service-incurred.

In the field of compensation, discriminatory rates have been established for the service disabled, in considering those with less than 50 percent ratings as compared with those above 50 percent.

The VA hospital system has been reduced from a congressionally authorized base of 152,000 rated or constructed beds, to 125,000 authorized. Your committee has given a great deal of attention to the maintenance of the VA physical plant. You have seen the need for a long-range program of modernization and repair. The Budget Bureau policy in such matters has not included recommendations to provide funds necessary to do the things your group approved. Further, the Budget Bureau has not recommended funds for the construction of new replacement hospitals authorized by Congress even prior to the start of the 1948–58 decade.

The Budget Bureau recommendations for appropriations have been cut so fine that hospital managers in the Western area publicly stated that without increased funds they cannot maintain the quality of medical care that once was the pride of the VA. The Chief Medical Director appeared before your committee and, as an illustration of the urgency of the fiscal situation, conceded that the quality and quantity of food were being decreased.

Since 1948 another war has been fought, one of the same magnitude in terms of men involved as World War I. To the veterans of that war a lesser standard of benefits was granted than had been provided for those who came out of World War I.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The American Legion is observing its 40th anniversary this month. In the field of veterans affairs it is possible that the four greatest achievements of The American Legion have been:

1. The work in establishing the Veterans' Bureau in 1921, and the Veterans' Administration in 1930.

2. The successful effort to overcome the wholly unjust and unfair havoc wrought by the Economy Act of March 20, 1933.

3. The move to modernize and update the practice of medicine resulting from Resolution 523 of the 1941 national convention, which led to the approval of Public 293, 79th Congress, establishing the present Department of Medicine and Surgery.

4. The work done in accomplishing the passage of Public 346, 78th Congress, the popularly termed GI bill of rights.

For the 10 years of the decade since 1948, the greatest controversy reaching the floor of our national conventions has revolved around the question of committing our organization to a program for general or service pensions. Each year it has taken hours of discussion among the delegates to resolve the debate. And this debate was preceded by lengthy consideration of the question in committee. Thus far the American Legion has voted for a conservative program, usually by an overwhelming majority.

Each year we have come to the Congress with that conservative program. Up to now our requests in the pension field have been denied. Along with the denial of our conservative requests there has been insistent demand from other areas for far more drastic liberalization of the pension program.

This year we believe there is a more receptive attitude toward the proposals for liberalizing the rates of disability and death pensions, toward equalizing the eligibility accorded widows and orphans of World War I, World War II and the Korean conflict. This is heartening. We think it is time that the war veteran, widow or child, who is reduced to the physical and economic status where he or she must seek the benefits of a disability or death pension to assist in meeting the problems of living, should receive more consideration.

During the past decade, because criticism of the war veteran program is inherent in the activities of agencies such as the Budget Bureau, the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions, the American Medical Association, and the two Hoover Commissions, a great deal of time has been occupied with the attention given to those who are questioned about their eligibility to a disability pension, or to entrance to a VA hospital for treatment.

Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, it seems to me that some manner of resolving all these details should be found. The American Legion recognizes that it is a bad plan which admits of no modification. At the same time we urge that amendments be based upon principle and not to appease critics who are philosophically and fundamentally opposed to our program and who use isolated examples and sore-thumb cases to give to their argument the color of sincerity. The American Legion is always anxious to cooperate with this committee in its endeavor to propose legislation aimed at the ultimate benefit of all veterans. Indeed, through forums such as our annual rehabilitation conference, through the experience of our service officers throughout the country, and through the studies performed by our national staff, we are constantly reexamining the great body of laws governing veterans benefits. We must oppose any proposal which would not be based upon sound principle, which would not maintain the dignity and respectable status of pension as a form of income, and which would not be in the best interests of the veterans and the Nation.

I thank you for the privilege of appearing before you today, and for the opportunity of presenting these remarks on the American Legion's legislative program.

---

## Hugh Alfred Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the life of the late Senator Hugh Alfred Butler, written by an eighth grade pupil, Gretchen Trimble, of McCook, Nebr.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUGH ALFRED BUTLER

(By Gretchen Trimble of McCook, Nebr.)

Hugh Alfred Butler was born on a farm near Missouri Valley, Harrison County, Iowa, on February 28, 1878. When he was 6 years old, he was headed with his father, his mother, and his brother, Guy to Cambridge in a covered wagon to settle a homestead (about which he had visions of scalp hunting Indians).

Unable to find land tillable in the northwest they had to live in the southwest where there was no doctor in time of sickness or childbirth.

At the age of 12, Hugh began to earn his money. He once dared to drop in on Mr. William H. Faling, who was president at the bank.

He got a job from Mr. Faling, trimming his lawn, milking the cow, and feeding, cleaning, and hitching the handsomest horse he'd yet laid eyes on. Sometimes Mr. Faling would let him ride the white-nosed gray mare, and this favor firmly cemented the friendship between the boy and man. After 4 weeks of effort had passed Mr. Faling handed him eight of the highest polished silver dollars in his drawer.

One day Hugh carried on his coat lapel the blue ribbon Mr. Faling had given him for becoming a member of the Boys Try Company. The gold motto on it read: "Try to be good; Try to do good." He had not failed Mr. Faling.

Hugh's mother while reading a few pages of a book began complaining of being tired. Sometimes her tone faltered and her face was ashen. Hugh was gradually becoming aware that her lips were losing their color. Late on a November night, his mother died, at the age of 32.

While in Cambridge High School Hugh won a scholarship worth $100 to Doane College in Crete, Nebr.

When he arrived in Crete on the train he met Old Frank, who owned a horsedrawn hack. Old Frank took Hugh to the Reverend Dean's where he was going to work for his room and board.

Later he began selling nursery products for which he earned $200 during the first summer.

Tacked up at Merrill Hall, a part of Doane, was a bulletin: Doane was looking for someone who'd take 10 cents an hour for mowing lawns and sweeping rooms. Hugh took it.

In his second year at Doane, he placed second in the Dawes oratory contest.

Also attending Doane was a girl, Fay Johnson, whom he hoped was noticing him as much as he was noticing her. One day he got up enough courage to take her for a boat ride up the Blue River. That was the beginning of a beautiful friendship.

Hugh went out for sports. When track season began, he became a champion track star.

When football season came, he went out as a candidate. Football that year resulted in a letdown for him and disaster for Doane. Making second-string halfback, Hugh squirmed on the bench, wondering if Fay were in the stands at all. Then the tragic blow came that rocked the foundation of all Doane sports. One of the squadmen failed to rise off the field after a routine line play. Opposing benches emptied, rushing to midfield.

"Give him air," someone yelled.

He needed none, the boy was dead. Football had decreased. In a year or two it might be considered concluded the report in apparent attempt to satisfy the male student body. This death made a great impression on Hugh.

After graduation from Doane, in June 1900, Hugh boarded the train that would take him to Tecumseh, Nebr., where he was to take a summertime job with the Burlington Lines. He was planning to enter the University of Nebraska Law School, the next fall, and he felt certain that his plans for the coming months lacked no serious gaps. Miles

on, he realized that one gap was open to admit loneliness. He'd left Fay Johnson behind in Crete, with no real commitments or understanding with her. In their flight over the rails, the wheels were repeatedly singing, "Fay—Fay."

Hugh's role in the railroad project was reducing grades and making cutoffs to shorten lines between its service points. The pay was good—$35 monthly.

The job was OK except for one detail which made Hugh sad. If extended trips headed him still further away from Crete, his chances of seeing Fay would be fewer.

Soon he was to go along with a location party to Wyoming. With the location party he received a promotion to rear chainman, which helped him to minimize the job's threat to his social enterprise. The adventure of the party was beginning to be spelled in a different way for Hugh: Education. Also the word "Free."

One day when he was in the field with his supervisor, he was asked to take a reading on a surveying instrument. He surprised and pleased his boss by the accuracy of his reading.

"Right on the nose, Butler. Nice work," commented his boss.

When Hugh required something definite in his future, he had to decide whether it would be law school or continuation of Burlington. And Fay, where would she fit, in either case?

"Trying can do some impossible things," was the remark that always stuck in Butler's mind.

On February 5, 1903. Hugh and Fay were married and took a second-floor flat in St. Louis.

Soon after, he was made a division engineer at $125 a month. But it meant they would have to move from town to town. Hugh was willing if Fay was and she was willing.

In June 1908 after a long while in the railroad business, Hugh decided he would quit the railroad and take another kind of scenery—grain elevators. He invested $3,000 in the Curtis Mills at Curtis, Nebr. They (Hugh and Fay) lived across the street from the Congregational Church, where she headed the choir and he was superintendent of the Sunday School.

He was so interested in the community and its problems, he was encouraged to accept a city office, thus the start of his lifetime of public service.

During this time, however, Mrs. Butler told him of her approaching motherhood, and he was extremely happy.

Lawrence Hugh was born. A beautiful child, whom they both adored with the full passion of their rich natures. The father devoted himself with new zeal to both the mill and his new avocation. Election-eve further brightened the horizon for he was well aware that the word "Butler" was on the tip of everyone's tongue. But then the shadow which was to bear relentlessly on Hugh Butler's happiness, revealed its first grim outlines on the horizon of his life. A few weeks later, Fay and the baby became ill almost simultaneously. Distraught, Hugh refused to leave the house, waiting anxiously on his loved ones, prodding both himself and the doctor, seeking some word of hope. The doctor was glum. He could offer little for either patient. There was only an outside chance that as the fateful hour of crises came closer, one might survive.

The tiny coffin was buried.

The University of Nebraska was planning on locating an agricultural school at one of several locations—Holdrege, McCook, or Cambridge. Cambridge had the best chances, since they had $50,000 to put up. But Butler felt such a school would be good for Curtis, and prepared to fight for it.

The state decision was made on July 1, 1911. On the 33rd ballot, Curtis had won itself a school. In celebrattion, a bonfire was started, and as a sacrifice someone suggested Hugh's new hat. "But it cost me five dollars," he protested. In it went.

The townsfolk had added reasons for suspecting that Mr. Butler had borrowed a page of Scripture which asserted the approbation of providence to the cheerful giver. Curtis Mills further prospered. Butler choosing to live outside of himself as a giver of hope to the needy, regardless of whether they were intimate friends, mere acquaintances, or persons whose name only was known to him.

One of these, a man who left Lafe's depot to study veterinary medicine had sold his house to pay for two years of schooling but was stuck for funds in the third. Only the bank was aware that it was Hugh who signed a note to cover the student's expenses in full.

They were aware of at least two town enterprises launched and periodically restimulated by a secret source of dollars. A bricklayer opened a brickyard. A hog caller became a buyer and shipper of the porkers. As a conveyor of many other miscellaneous gifts from the unpublished giver, Lafe kept mental tabulation of a succession of similar accounts. Full-hearted as the gratitude of the recipients was, Hugh could match it with gratitude of his aim for an abundant son, Robert Johnson, blessed their home.

In 1913 Hugh learned he was to be manager of the parent mill at Crete. His activities grew so rapidly, soon he was exporting flour to European countries. After 5 years, Crete Flour Mills planned a 10-story building. Then he decided to resign.

He became a partner of the Dawson Grain Co. in Omaha, where he learned grain buying and shipping.

After 6 months, he decided he wanted to be in business for himself, so with $20,000 borrowed, $8,000 of his own, and $2,000 from J. L. Welsh, the Butler-Welsh Grain Co. was organized. As reward for his efforts, Pillsbury selected the Butler-Welsh Co. as its Omaha buying representative, which meant almost $25,000 a year to the little company.

They expanded to Nebraska City, then to Council Bluffs.

During this time, Butler's personal scripture theory continued. His constant donation to charity and the public welfare were running into the thousands of dollars. He was charitable at home, too, and provided his brother, Frank, with a law education.

Then began Hugh's interest in Doane. He became President and enough financial assistance poured in to expand the school. He served as trustee from 1914 to 1954.

Death, however, lurked in the winter of 1925 to claim his own dearest possession. On March 12, his second son died of pneumonia. In their agony, Fay and Hugh decided to take a trip to get away from the awful loneliness.

Working hard in Rotary, he became district governor in 1933.

In 1936 he was elected as a Republican national committeeman.

In 1939, some of his friends were urging him to run for Governor of Nebraska. Others were trying to steer him toward the U.S. Senate, with Val Peterson as his campaign manager.

Preparing Butler for the strenuous days ahead, his friend, Dr. W. H. Thompson, gave him tips on public speaking and handshaking.

On the post-balloting day, Peterson came to Butler with "Hugh, the people want you." He had won over A. J. Weaver of the Norris entourage, to represent the Republicans. This would place his name against that of Roy L. Cochran, the Democratic candidate for the Senate.

Tired from the strenuous campaign, Senator-elect Butler and his wife decided to spend the Thanksgiving holidays with their parents in Cambridge.

They were near Atlanta when it happened. Holiday traffic had slushed the snow, sinking temperatures glazing the roads. At a junction he wheeled the car cautiously but it refused to come out of a stubborn skid. All control lost, he had but amoment left in which to grit his teeth before the horrible impact.

A special train carried Fay to Omaha, and during her almost 3 months of gallant struggle for life, Hugh clung close to her in the flower-filled room, wringing every syllable of hope and encouragement out of himself. On February 5 the Omaha Rotary Club sent a large floral bouquet, its ribbon congratulating the Butlers on their 38th wedding anniversary. 10 days later there were other flowers and wreaths.

Hugh Butler went to the Senate alone.

Upon taking his seat in the Senate he presented to Doane College a trust fund, in memory of his wife, in the amount of $250,000. That fund is known as the Fay Johnson Butler Scholarship Fund. It constitutes high evidence of his interest and faith in the youth of the country. Each year 30 young men and women receive the benefits of this fund.

Washington was a city of raging debate when Hugh Butler took his seat in the Senate on January 3, 1941. The Nation was inching closer and closer toward war.

In Europe, the Nazi war machine had swept unchecked through country after country. Adolf Hitler, its evil genius, had imposed his barbaric rule.

"This is a terrible war, Bob," Butler told a Senate colleague, "but it is our duty to our country to keep out of it if we can. If we are attacked—well, then we will fight with everything we have."

In the months ahead, heated debate echoed in the Halls of Congress. Step by step the Nation seemed to be moving from the status of a neutral to that of a belligerent.

Right down the line, the new Senator cast his vote against any bill which he believed would be a step closer to war.

Perhaps Butler did not possess the dramatic flair nor the forensic skill that were trademarks of certain Senate veterans' but something else stood out: his simple honesty.

He was a rugged man and his intense interest in farming and reclamation and in fiscal matters resulted in his assignment to the Finance Committee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the Senate. He became chairman of the latter committee in the 80th Congress, and regained the chairmanship in the 83d Congress.

Butler had fought hard against this country's involvement in war, but once we were committed he worked just as hard to bring it to a successful conclusion. He was disturbed, too, when he thought about the plight of millions of young American boys, torn from their classrooms and sent overseas to fight. With Senator Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, he worked on legislation which would assure veterans of an education and other rights when they returned from the war.

Hugh Butler breathed a prayer of thanks with the rest of his fellow Americans when September of 1945 brought peace to the world.

So much had happened, and now Hugh Butler would be up for reelection next year.

Butler had kept in close touch with his people back home. No problem from a Nebraskan was too small for his personal attention. No doubt about it: the people of Nebraska wanted to keep Hugh Butler in the Senate.

Butler became known as Nebraska's own "Mr. Republican." Yet his best friend in the Senate was a Democrat. He was never too busy to talk about local problems and welcomed all who came to his office.

His hobby was collecting elephant statuettes. Friends from all over the world would contribute to his collection. The picture on the next page is a view of the fireplaces in his office.

Gov. Dwight P. Griswold, of Nebraska, announced that he would be a candidate for Butler's seat in the Senate in 1946. Butler won the primary race, and was easily reelected in the general election that followed.

In the 80th Congress, Senator Butler introduced and sponsored in the Senate legislation to permit Puerto Rico for the first time to elect its own Governor. In the 81st Congress Senator Butler was an active sponsor of what became Public Law 600 which authorized the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico, and in the 82d Congress he helped obtain Senate approval of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which resulted in the creation of the Commonwealth.

He was a strong advocate, consistent and firm. He never conceded an inch to anything but facts. Typical was one of his last decisions on a national matter—the admission of Hawaii as a State.

One of his recommendations which has reaped dividends is the General Accounting Office. He recognized a need for a check on Government spending. Just as he was a frugal man, he felt the Federal Government should be frugal.

He liked to dwell on the possibilities of irrigation and reclamation in the Midwest and Far West. He once pointed out that geologists had stated that enough unused water existed to irrigate an additional 20 million acres of land in the 17 reclamation States. This would mean 200,000 more farms in America, producing increasing quantities of food for the Nation.

The girls in his office sometimes wished he would leave the typing to them. When he would go to his office on a Sunday, he would sift through his mail, and often answer some of the letters.

Still recalled is one letter sent by the Senator in connection with an important event in Nebraska. As a typist, Hugh Butler was not a perfectionist. This letter had margins askew and words struck over. The Senator's letter, along with others, was reproduced in a special pamphlet.

"Oh, you've disgraced us," said his secretary in dismay.

"I didn't know they wanted to print it," murmured the Senator unhappily.

Hugh was going to attend the Republican convention in Chicago in July with his brother Frank. It would be good to see Frank again. They were the last of the family. Parents, brothers, sister, wife, children gone; only Frank remained.

On June 16, 1952, word came that Hugh's brother Frank had died suddenly of a heart attack in Cambridge.

He stepped into his office and closed the door. He was alone with God. He stayed in his office an hour. When he emerged, his eyes were dry and acceptance was written on his face.

Butler underwent a serious operation in May 1953 at the Naval Hospital in Bethesda, Md. A kidney was removed. President Eisenhower wrote, expressing the hope that he would be back in the Senate soon. The party and the country needed men like Hugh Butler, declared the President.

Butler staged a remarkable recovery. He was cheered by a resolution adopted by the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, containing affectionate well wishes from his colleagues.

There came the shocking news on Thursday, July 1, 1954, that Senator Hugh Butler had suffered a severe cerebral hemorrhage and was critically ill.

Thursday, countless friends in his home State of Nebraska and in the National Capital as well as throughout the Nation prayed for him, but late that night, at 11:15 p.m., there came the sad news that death had taken this courageous fighter, at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, writing finis to this story of a great man who had devoted his life of 76 years to the welfare of others.

Two memorial services were held for him, the first in Washington on Saturday, July 3, and the second in Omaha, Nebr., on Tuesday, July 6.

Under a 103° sun in midafternoon, they gathered around the grave at Forest Lawn Cemetery to hear Dr. Harold Jones, a pastor of the First Congregational Church, give the final prayer.

Hugh Butler will live on in the thoughts of his countless friends throughout Nebraska for the good he has done and the encouragement he has given during his lifetime and 14 years in the U.S. Senate.

---

## Wisconsin Ports—Gateway to the Upper Midwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that development and progress in this great country depends on action by local, State, and Federal Governments, as well as constructive programs by private enterprise and individual citizens, to meet the challenges in the years ahead.

Today, I should like to call particular attention to the efforts by the State of Wisconsin, its citizens, civic, commercial, and other organizations, and the initiative of individuals aimed at paving the way for a brighter future for our Badger State. The program to which I am referring is the well-planned, forward looking, constructive effort for development and utilization of Wisconsin ports.

This program promises great things for the future of our State. Through these open doors to our inland areas will flow ever greater volumes of trade and commerce to improve our economy and benefit our people.

From these portals, also, will flow the products of the farms and factories, not only of Wisconsin, but of a great many other States in the upper Midwest.

The completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway—scheduled for next month—is also expected to increase and expand the benefits to be received from utilization of our ports.

As we plan for the future, however, the attainment of maximum benefits from the port and seaway development projects will depend, not only on the development projects themselves, but also upon constructive promotion programs.

Recently, I received from the State of Wisconsin Division of Industrial and Port Development a splendid brochure entitled "Wisconsin Ports—Gateway to the Upper Midwest." In this outstanding brochure, there is presented a description of our terminal facilities; industrial sites; links between water, air, rail, and road transportation systems; and other data of port capability and potential relating to the development of trade and commerce.

To give my colleagues the benefit of ideas so well presented in this promotion program, as well as a better picture of the advantages of utilizing Wisconsin ports, I request unanimous consent to have excerpts from this booklet printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN PORTS—GATEWAYS TO PROFITS IN THE UPPER MIDWEST

For shippers and manufacturers, Wisconsin's 14 ports and harbors are important and promising new gateways to the heartland of North America.

Wisconsin's ports lie at the western end of the Great Lakes waterway system, now being opened to deep-draft world shipping by the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Ocean-going ships, carrying cargo to and from all parts of the world, bring all the advantages of water transportation to Wisconsin ports 2,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean.

These ports serve as convenient transfer points for a vast and rapidly developing region extending a thousand miles to the west. This region includes all or part of 15 of the United States and 3 Provinces of Canada.

* * * * *

RAILROADS SERVING WISCONSIN PORTS

Twelve railroads, operating a total of almost 39,000 miles of right-of-way, connect the 14 Wisconsin port cities with railroad lines which fan out to the west. Altogether, trunkline railroads operate about 6,200 miles of right-of-way within the State.

Three other railroad companies cross Lake Michigan with their car ferries. These large vessels carry whole trains of freight cars from the Wisconsin ports of Kewaunee, Manitowoc, Marinette and Milwaukee to terminals on the eastern shore of the lake. These roads connect, in turn, with lines serving the east and south. Because these car ferry services are available, many Wisconsin industries find themselves in an excellent position to take advantage of savings offered by "fabrication in transit" privileges.

Many Wisconsin railroads have been developing "piggyback" services, an operation by which highway trailers are carried on railroad flatcars. The use of this new concept in transportation has in many instances proven economical, especially for long distance hauls.

For ratemaking purposes, Wisconsin railroads lie within the western trunkline territory. The car ferry terminals, however, are extensions of the official or eastern territory. Growth of Great Lakes overseas trade is resulting in the establishment of special export-import rail rates which benefit the competitive shipping position of Wisconsin port cities.

HIGHWAYS SERVING WISCONSIN PORTS

A well-engineered and maintained State arterial highway system connects Wisconsin's 14 port cities with the network of truck routes serving the upper Midwest. The 2,100-mile arterial system of most-used highways includes 482 miles on the National Interstate and Defense Highway System, shown by heavy lines on the map.

Nearly 100 common carrier trunklines carry freight to and from Wisconsin port cities. In addition, many more contract car-

riers and local cartage companies have highway cargo equipment available at these cities.

Some of the Wisconsin ports also serve tourists driving their own cars. Several of the Lake Michigan railroad car ferries which call at Wisconsin ports have space for automobiles and eating and berthing accommodations for passengers.

To keep the Wisconsin highway system in top condition, the Wisconsin State Highway Commission spends approximately $100 million a year in State funds raised entirely by road user fees and taxes. In addition, as much as $65 million in Federal highway aids goes into Wisconsin highways annually.

Wisconsin's county trunk highway system is one of the best in the Nation, nearly all hard surfaced for dependable, year around service to farms and factories throughout the State.

AIRLINES SERVING WISCONSIN PORTS

Wisconsin's lakefront cities are situated on the perimeter of the principal airline routes which serve the upper Midwest. Five of the 14 Wisconsin port cities have regularly scheduled airline passenger service. The others are about an hour's drive from scheduled service airports. Milwaukee is served by six airlines which provide fast and frequent connecting service to principal cities of the world.

Wisconsin now has 71 public airports throughout the State. The number is expected to reach 100 by 1965. Users of these airports include more than 200 Wisconsin businesses which operate their own executive aircraft.

The excellent airports and commercial air service put businessmen within easy reach of their customers, suppliers, and financial institutions. In addition, air cargo service assures fast shipment of valuable and perishable items and of repair parts for industrial machinery. Five airlines fly cargo to and from Milwaukee. One airline has established an air-truck freight operation with pickup and delivery service at most Wisconsin cities.

Wisconsin airport development and airline service have been encouraged and aided for more than a decade by a comprehensive State program, administered by the State aeronautics commission. Under this program the State and local communities join forces to match Federal funds for airport improvement projects.

SEAWAY HELPS INDUSTRIES GROW IN WISCONSIN

*Port cities are ready*

Wisconsin's 14 port cities are ready to serve users of the new St. Lawrence Seaway. Government and business leaders throughout the State are helping industries to take advantage of seaway opportunities.

All the Wisconsin ports have harbors already deep enough to accommodate moderate size ocean-going ships. Wisconsin has 381 miles of shoreline on Lake Michigan and 150 miles on Lake Superior.

For many years Milwaukee and Green Bay have nurtured the infant general cargo services established with many foreign nations via the existing St. Lawrence River route. Superior is recognized as the largest iron ore shipping port in the world.

Since construction on the seaway began a few years ago, several Wisconsin ports have improved their terminal facilities. Milwaukee is adding a new five-berth general cargo pier and a passenger and auto ferry terminal to existing excellent facilities. Green Bay and Kenosha have completed new general cargo pier sheds. Private interests at Superior have substantially enlarged their grain storage elevators.

All Wisconsin ports have many necessary harbor installations, including protective breakwaters, navigation lighthouses and buoys, moveable bridges, bulkheads and open storage spaces, bunkering facilities, railroad and highway connections, and marine repair facilities.

Many harbors have dockside warehouses, grain storage elevators, heavy lift cranes, shipyards and drydocks, customs offices and Coast Guard stations.

Looking ahead, Wisconsin port cities have adopted sound and practical industrial zoning ordinances and have spacious waterfront sites available for erection of industrial plants.

*Channels to be deepened*

Completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes connecting channels to the authorized 27-foot depth will open the Great Lakes to vessels with drafts of about 25½ feet. Plans have been made to deepen many Wisconsin harbors to the 27-foot standard. Other harbors will be dredged nearly that deep.

Channel depths of 20 to 25 feet have been adequate for safe navigation of lake vessels, which often carry iron ore loads of nearly 20,000 tons. To carry equal loads, ocean-going vessels must have deeper drafts to withstand greater stresses than lake ships encounter. Deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels and harbors will permit use of even larger and more economical lake vessels than at present.

United States and Canadian steamship lines operate about 700 vessels on the 5 Great Lakes and upper St. Lawrence River. Great Lakes and commerce is principally of bulk nature and is carried by fleets of vessels of special design. With few exceptions, these carriers contract directly with the shippers, in the same manner as ocean-going tramp steamers, to haul full shiploads on single voyages of for enure seasons.

Specific information about Great Lakes steamship lines can be obtained from the Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio, Dominion Marine Association of Montreal, Quebec, Canada; Division of Industrial and Port Development, Governor's Office, Madison 2, Wis.; or from individual port officials.

*Industrial development programs*

Wisconsin's State government port development program is supervised by the Governor. The 1955 legislature created the division of industrial development within the Governor's Office and the 1957 legislature added port development to the division's responsibilities.

The division is headed by a director appointed by the Governor. An advisory committee to the division consists of four legislators and 13 citizen members representing segments of business, industry, labor, agriculture, education, and ports. The division has a full time professional staff of five, including a port specialist.

The division promotes industrial development in Wisconsin in many ways. It assists manufacturers in the State and those indicating an interest in establishing plants in Wisconsin. It helps communities carry out their own long range industrial development programs. And it assists with legislative studies of laws affecting industry.

The State legislature has given preliminary approval to a constitutional amendment to permit use of State funds for port improvement programs. A program to consolidate and revise State laws relating to ports and waterways has been established.

Local industrial development corporations have been organized in more than 180 communities to attract and encourage industrial firms. Many of these groups sell stock locally to make loans to industries and to finance industrial sites and buildings which are leased or sold to manufacturers. Broad local programs include recruiting physicians and improving schools and public utilities to make the areas attractive to industries.

The Wisconsin Bankers' Association has organized the Wisconsin Development Credit Corporation. Through member banks, insurance companies, chambers of commerce and individuals, the credit corporation helps provide loans to promising manufacturing and commercial enterprises which need intermediate and long term working capital.

## The Public Hazard of Nuclear Blasting in Oil Shale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the whole realm of nuclear energy is one of great interest and vital importance to our country, as well as to the world.

Several weeks ago in an extended talk on this subject I said "As goes the atom so goes the world."

In my pursuit of this arresting subject, I have become increasingly concerned with the proposed nuclear blasting of oil shales in the Rocky Mountains.

I feel it is a fortunate development for the United States that among the scientific fraternity there is one man who took a second look at this proposed nuclear blasting of oil shale and entered a strong dissent. I refer to Morgan G. Huntington, Salt Lake City engineer, former engineer of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, and a specialist in the construction of nuclear reactors.

Thanks to Mr. Huntington, the American public is becoming acquainted with the hazards to public safety of the proposed nuclear blasting of oil shales. It has been my privilege to have championed Mr. Huntington's lone dissent and although the odds were very heavy against us, it appears we have been successful in making the Atomic Energy Commission stop, look, and listen. I now make so bold as to venture the prediction that the nuclear blasting of oil shales will never be made. This phase of "Operation Plowshare," I am certain will be scratched. Already we have had the admission from Chairman McCone of the AEC that the blast will produce no oil for the commercial market, although original publicity for the project was cast in terms of 25 million barrels of oil from a single nuclear blast.

Today, I am privileged to bring before you a specially prepared hazards report on the proposed nuclear oil shale blast. I urge each and every one of you to read it and carefully consider its import. Mr. Huntington shows his complete mastery of the subject, and his analysis of the problem at hand constitutes a distinguished public service which places his countrymen in his debt.

If the AEC should by any chance set off the nuclear explosion of a 10-kiloton device in the oil shales, Mr. Huntington describes the following results:

Within 6 hours following the nuclear blast in oil shale (described in the January 1959, AEC-distributed brochure entitled "Application of Nuclear Explosions to Oil Shale

Utilization") borne by the prevailing westerly winds, a huge dust cloud will settle out on Denver and its environs and how long the city will remain a scene of desolation during decontamination is speculative. To subject a population to such a risk is certainly foolish if not downright criminal.

Huntington also shows scientifically that a huge crater will be formed by the blast, millions of tons of rock, much of it radioactive, will be flung far and wide, and that after all of this, no oil will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I am equally concerned with another aspect of this whole project. It has been given intensive and fanciful publicity. The whole thing smacks of a well-conceived promotional campaign. All of this could have been done unwittingly out of an overabundance of enthusiasm, but nevertheless, we can readily see how such dramatic presentation could well cause lively speculation in oil leases and oil stocks. These are matters that are the concern of government, for the public interest, I submit, is paramount. We are all for progress, sound substantial progress, but we don't want the American investing public taken for a sleigh ride. I would suggest that certain agencies of Government, the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission give this matter their attention.

I now submit for the RECORD at this point, Mr. Huntington's carefully prepared and persuasive findings on the hazards report of proposed nuclear oil shale blast along with Mr. John A. McCone's letter to me of February 11 and my reply of February 14.

UNITED STATES
U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
*Washington, D.C., February 11, 1959.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am pleased to reply to your letter of January 17, 1959, asking for information concerning the Commission's plowshare program and raising certain questions concerning the proposed oil-shale experiment.

The Commission's plowshare program is an attempt to encourage the development and utilization of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes. The Commission and its staff have considered a number of experiments to utilize the phenomena associated with nuclear explosions to open the way for greater public benefits from our natural resources. Our present knowledge indicates that nuclear explosives might be used in large civil engineering projects, power production, isotope production, and in basic research studies, as well as natural resource development.

As a specific part of the plowshare program the Commission, in cooperation with the U.S. Bureau of Mines, for some time has been studying the feasibility of using nuclear explosives in recovering oil from oil shale. It is our expectation that the shock and rock crushing effects of an underground nuclear explosion would provide a means for breaking up the shale so that oil can be extracted with an in-place recovery process. The proposed oil-shale experiment is a research project to determine the possibility of developing thereby a process for economic extraction of oil.

This plowshare project has progressed to the point where a meeting was conducted on January 6–7 by the Bureau of Mines with representatives of industry to review proposals for an experiment. The Commission and its contractor, University of California Livermore Radiation Laboratory, presented data on Commission experience with underground nuclear detonations and results theoretically to be expected from a 10 kiloton, or smaller, detonation in the Green River shale. Copies of technical papers presented are attached for your information.

At the Dallas meeting the Government offered to consider the experimental detonation of a device, providing conditions of health and safety could be guaranteed, and providing industry would arrange for emplacement and the making available to the public of important technical information resulting from the experiment. As yet the Commission has not given firm authorization for such an experiment, nor has a site been selected. The next step will depend largely on how industry reacts to the proposal and this phase of the matter is being investigated by the Bureau of Mines.

So far as the public health and safety of such a project is concerned, the Commission will not approve any action that would endanger human or animal life, vegetation, water systems, or property. If there should be enough industrial interest to warrant concluding feasibility studies which are now in their initial phases, complete data on public health and safety would be compiled with the assistance of independent experts before the Commission would authorize a project.

In your letter you raise the following specific possibilities which were suggested to you by Mr. Morgan G. Huntington. I would like to comment on each in some detail.

1. A conical crater will be blasted about as wide as the explosion is deep.

Comment: The AEC is advised by its best technical experts that no such crater would be formed. On the basis of six nuclear underground shots that have been fired in Nevada and on the basis of experience in underground high explosive detonations, it is believed that the cratering effect of nuclear shots can be predicted with reasonable accuracy by our staff. The direct evidence from nuclear shots relate to tuff only and not to oil shale but the HE high explosive experiments relate to many kinds of materials including Green River oil shale. Mr. Huntington argues that the rock heaving gases formed in an explosion in oil shale will have more serious effects than hitherto encountered. Actually, the detonation of high explosive produces by its own combustion more rock heaving gas than can be obtained from an equivalent nuclear explosion in oil shale. Therefore, existing experimental results are sufficiently conclusive to assure us of the necessary safety of a particular nuclear detonation in oil shale with respect to cratering.

2. Millions of tons of rock will be thrown over the countryside, much of it radioactive.

Comment: As has been mentioned already, it is the intent of the Commission to insure that, before authority to proceed is granted, safety is guaranteed. Under such conditions this eventuality would not occur.

3. The huge dust cloud so formed will consist largely of carbon black from the destruction of shale oil.

Comment: Here the answer is similar to that of 2 above.

4. No oil whatever will enter commerce as the result of such a blast.

Comment: This is probably true in fact. This particular nuclear explosion and consequent technical investigation is planned as an experiment. Our hope is that it will show whether or not such extraction is technically and economically feasible.

5. The direct cost of this proposed nuclear blast will be in the order of $10 or $15 million, aside from the liability incurred from damages.

Comment: According to preliminary estimates the experiment over all would cost about $3 million. This sum will be spent partly on the nuclear detonation and partly on investigation by the Bureau of Mines of an oil extraction process. During the meeting on January 6–7, it was proposed that the petroleum industry share in the costs of this experiment.

Attached to your letter to me was a letter from Mr. Huntington setting forth certain more technical questions bearing on the above matters. I am attaching, as enclosure 1, detailed answers to his questions.

Your letter mentions that Mr. Huntington has not received an answer to his January 9, 1959 letter to Dr. Potts. This letter is being answered simultaneously by Dr. Potts.

I trust we have adequately replied to the questions you and Mr. Huntington have presented. If you should want further information I shall be pleased to send it to you or should you desire to discuss this matter with the technical experts, we will be pleased to arrange for them to meet with you during their next visit to Washington, or if you wish Commissioner Libby will be glad to discuss this matter with you. In addition, should Mr. Huntington desire to visit the University of California E. O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore to explain his ideas we will arrange for the proper people to discuss the matter with him.

I assure you that the Commission will undertake PLOWSHARE projects only after determining that they can be carried out without endangering public health and safety and that the project is justifiable from the standpoint of opening the way to greater public benefits.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. MCCONE, *Chairman.*

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., February 14, 1959.*

Mr. JOHN A. MCCONE,
*Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. MCCONE: Your letter of February 11 replying to mine of January 17 has been read with interest.

I have seen your January 31 announcement to the public press that you would detonate the first of a series of nuclear devices in Rocky Mountain oil shale sometime during the fiscal year beginning July 1. Now, less than 2 weeks later, you tell me that you won't explode any such weapons in oil shale unless industry asks you to do so.

I am greatly surprised and alarmed by your letter to me in which you state that you have not yet investigated the public hazard of nuclear blasting in oil shale.

It appears that your many press releases have lead a great number of people to believe that large scale nuclear blasting is the solution to the winning of oil from oil shale. Yet, you tell me in your February 11 letter that probably no oil would enter commerce as the result of your proposed 10-kiloton oil shale blast.

The data presented by Mr. Morgan Huntington, president of the RNB Corp. of Salt Lake City, Utah, clearly shows that no sizeable nuclear blast in oil shale can be contained beneath the surface because the great amount and pressure of the gases generated will inevitably blast a crater. Isn't this exactly what caused your small (100-ton) Neptune blast to heave out thousands of tons of rock October 14, 1958?

Because of the probably great public hazard involved and the apparent carelessness of your staff, I feel it my duty to ask several specific questions:

1. Why do you permit to be published under your name articles carrying the specific size, placement and geographical location of a nuclear blast in oil shale without

first preparing the usual hazard report, i.e., your best estimate of the maximum credible accident?

2. Do you yourself consider the nuclear blasting of oil shales a safe and reasonable experiment when you consider that each ton of TNT equivalent could instantly liberate some 50,000 cubic feet of hydrogen at 25 tons per square inch pressure? Didn't your October 8 1958 Tamalpais 50-ton blast produce about half this amount of highly explosive hydrogen with only a small amount of pariffin present? In the words of your own A.E.C. report, "the explosives gases were in such concentrations and amounts as to create a hazardous situation."

3. Since you tell me in your letter that the Atomic Energy Commission will not undertake the nuclear blasting of oil shale unless the oil industry requests it, I am compelled to ask: Can you name any major oil company executive who considers the nuclear blasting of oil shales an entirely safe and reasonable experiment?

4. Please identify the individual proponents of oil shale nuclear blasting in Government as well as in industry.

Because you have not yet compiled your usual "nuclear hazards report" on the blasting of oil shale, I have requested that Mr. Huntington prepare for publication a "maximum credible accident" report on the nuclear blasting of oil shales.

I shall appreciate an early answer to the questions posed in this letter as well as to my letter of February 11.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*Member of Congress.*

---

RNB CORP.,
*Salt Lake City, Utah, March 3, 1959.*

Re The public hazard of nuclear blasting in oil shale as proposed by the AEC.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*Committee on Appropriations,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FLOOD: At your request, I have prepared the following estimate of the maximum credible explosion which could be expected from the detonation of a 10,000 ton TNT equivalent nuclear weapon 900 feet deep in oil shale.

The conditions, placement and size of the device are specified in the January 1959 unsigned, unidentified brochure currently circulated by the Atomic Energy Commission entitled "Application of Nuclear Explosions to Oil Shale Utilization." Although this AEC-circulated brochure is widely accepted as an official Bureau of Mines publication because "Bureau of Mines Laramie Petroleum Research Center" appears on the cover, its authorship remains uncertain.

To summarize my estimate of the hazard of nuclear blasting in oil shale or other rich hydrocarbon impregnations, I find that not even 1/10 of the AEC's proposed 10-kiloton device could safely be detonated in such hydrogen rich rocks 900 feet beneath the surface. Whether this 10,000-ton TNT thermal equivalent explosive is in the form of conventional dynamite or whether the heat is released from a nuclear device, a crater would surely result. However, it is true that a conventional explosive would probably be very much less hazardous than the nuclear device for three reasons:

The conventional explosive cannot produce the tremendously devastating subsequent aerial explosion; and secondly, the power of conventional explosives can be precisely predicted while the energy of nuclear devices cannot be estimated nearly so accurately; also, the conventional explosives are completely free of the virulently poisonous radioactive isotopes generated by all nuclear blasts.

The 300,000 ton weapon described as containable in oil shales by Dr. Herbst of the AEC at the January 1959 Dallas oil shale meeting could completely pulverize the material blown from its crater. The power of such a weapon exploding in oil shale is so fantastic that I am reluctant to believe such a proposal could have been seriously made, particularly to such a gathering.

Given certain conditions of geological structure, somewhat less than a 1-kiloton nuclear explosive could very likely break the surface and heave a considerable tonnage of rock and dust into the air. From any nuclear blast in oil shale which should erupt through the surface, a highly spectacular aerial explosion of the hydrogen generated by the thermal destruction of hydrocarbons could be expected. The energy generated by this subsequent aerial explosion of hydrogen could yield more than double the heat of the initial nuclear blast.

Quite definitely, no sizeable (10 kiloton or greater) nuclear device could safely be detonated anywhere in the Rocky Mountain oil shales because at no point could the depth of burial afford sufficient weight of overburden to contain the great volume of high pressure gases inevitably produced. Even a single kiloton weapon in oil shale would probably disrupt the surface at a depth of 900 feet. Certainly, the hydrogen generated from even this modest device could produce a devasating aerial explosion.

On page 2 of Chairman McCone's February 11 letter to you, he contests my prediction that, should a 10,000-ton-TNT-equivalent nuclear device be detonated 900 feet beneath the surface in Rocky Mountain oil shale, "a conical crater will be blasted about as wide as the explosion is deep." Mr. McCone comments as follows: "The AEC is advised by its best technical experts that no such crater would be formed. On the basis of six nuclear underground shots that have been fired in Nevada and on the basis of underground high explosive detonations, it is believed that the cratering effect of nuclear shots can be predicted with reasonable accuracy by our staff. The direct evidence from nuclear shots relate to tuff only and not to oil shale, but the high explosive experiments relate to many kinds of materials including Green River oil shale."

Apparently, Mr. McCone's best technical experts hold that 10,000 tons (two miles of fully loaded freight cars) of conventional explosive 900 feet deep in oil shale would not blast a crater.

It is respectfully suggested that AEC Chairman McCone consult with the experienced staffs of such explosive manufacturers as Du Pont, Monsanto, Atlas, or others who do have extensive background in explosive engineering. It is further suggested that Mr. McCone specifically ask what size crater would probably result from the thermal equivalent of 10,000 tons of TNT in the form of, say, 60 percent ammonium dynamite exploding 900 feet deep in oil shale. (This is an explosive ratio of only 100 to 300 tons of rock per ton of dynamite.)

I must also refute the contention of Mr. McCone that "the detonation of high explosive produces by its own combustion more rock-heaving gas than can be obtained from an equivalent nuclear blast in oil shale."

The facts are that 4 million B.t.u. (AEC's arbitrary thermal equivalent of a ton of TNT) transferred to nearly pure hydrocarbon can instantly generate at least twice the rock-heaving gas produced from TNT. (Parts of the oil shale are 40 percent pure kerogen.)

It is abundantly evident that the Atomic Energy Commission's technical staff have considered carefully neither the public hazard nor the feasibility of this highly publicized project. Atomic Energy Commission Chairman McCone has freely admitted these facts to you in his letter to you February 11.

The scanty amount of time and thought so far devoted by the staff of the AEC to this widely discussed phase of "Operation Plowshare" is apparent throughout the voluminous press releases and other literature on the subject. The purpose of the Atomic Energy Commission in widely advertising this very unlikely oil shale blast is open to speculation.

For instance, opposite page 16 in the January 1959 AEC-circulated brochure is a graphic summary of the assumptions presented in that text. Specifically shown, 900 feet of rock capping exerting a maximum rock pressure of 900 pounds per square inch contains in equilibrium 10 million standard cubic feet of gas at a pressure more than six times as great, or approximately 6,000 pounds per square inch. It should be obvious even to the layman that there is no restraining force sufficient to prevent such high pressure gas from expanding to rock pressure with explosive force.

It is impossible for me to agree with Dr. Libby and with his assistant, Dr. John Potts, that even in this relatively mild, unrealistic case (10 million cubic feet of gas is but one-fifth to one-twentieth of the volume of hydrogen which would probably be produced under the conditions described by the AEC) that the surface of the earth would remain undisturbed and all fission products would be contained.

In Chairman McCone's February letter to you, he states that public hazards of nuclear blasting would be evaluated only after feasibility studies were affirmatively completed. One cannot help but wonder why public safety is considered by the A.E.C. to be of secondary importance in this completely unexplored, highly dangerous concept of exploding nuclear weapons within hydrocarbon impregnations. (The building of even the smallest research reactor is always preceded by a full-dress public hearing on all conceivable credible accidents and a detailed hazards report is published.)

In projecting "Operation Plowshare", of which oil shale blasting is a part, the Atomic Energy Commission leans very heavily upon the results of the six underground nuclear explosion tests conducted in Nevada in September, 1957 and in October, 1958. These are described in a report to the Atomic Energy Commission by the University of California Radiation Laboratory Report, UCRL—No. 5124, Rev. 1, dated December, 1958.

It is clearly apparent to me that the A.E.C.'s staff has grossly misinterpreted the results of these underground tests in a number of respects and that the erroneous conclusions so drawn lead directly to the questionable assumptions that nuclear blasting of hydrocarbon impregnations is feasible and safe and that the commercial production of petroleum can be achieved thereby.

I shall now explain why the effects of nuclear explosions in the porous, permeable, weakly-consolidated volcanic ash of Neveda are radically different from what can be expected of nuclear blasting in the dense, completely impervious oil shales of the Rocky Mountains:

First let me say, that in my 20 years of experience as a mining engineer, I have found very "fast" [1] high explosives to be relatively ineffective in breaking spongy rock, such as volcanic tuffs. On the other hand, a comparatively small amount of such explosive is fairly effective in shattering, heaving and breaking the dense hard rocks, such as granite, limestone and tightly laminated shales.

Volcanic ash of high porosity does readily absorb, without heaving, considerable kinetic energy imparted by high explosives.

---

[1] Very fast explosives are considered to be those with a propagation rate above 20,000 feet a second.

Dense, nonporous, noncompactible rocks such as oil shale can absorb relatively little kinetic energy without shattering and erupting.

Volcanic tuff is readily compactible to the extent of 20 or 30 percent while high grade oil shale is not at all compactible beyond about 1 percent.

In the Rainier blast in volcanic tuff (September 1957), a 110-foot spherical chamber was formed as a result of the compaction of the surrounding porous rocks. To provide the volume of the 110-foot cavity, 120,000 tons of the volcanic ash must necessarily be compacted to the extent of 25 percent. However, to produce such a cavity in oil shales, more than three million tons of rock surrounding the blast must be totally compacted. Moreover, the crushing strength of the Rainier volcanic tuff is only about 5,000 pounds per square inch while the compression strength of oil shale in test specimens is generally about 25,000 pounds per square inch. En masse, this compacting strength of oil shale is probably somewhat greater.

It is, therefore, patently impossible to spring[2] any comparable cavity in oil shale 900 feet deep without violently disturbing the surface.

Before examining in detail the relative differences of nuclear blast effects in volcanic tuff and oil shales, let me briefly criticize the AEC's claim of feasibility and appraise the possibility of producing any oil from oil shales through nuclear blasting:

The total heat generated by an AEC rated 10-kiloton device would pyrolize[3] no more than 40,000 tons of oil shale and free (if no violent explosion were to occur and if the 2,000,000° fireball somehow failed to destroy any hydrocarbon) no more than 30,000 barrels of shale oil, and the direct cost therefor would amount to $100 a barrel. (Oil shale is worth about $2 a barrel.)

The heating effect of nuclear devices is evidently unimportant in this particular application, except for the explosive effect of the hydrogen instantly produced at high pressure.

In the Rainier experiment, no rock was shattered nor fragmented save the 50,000 tons which caved of its own weight above the 110-foot cavity.

In the much-quoted Rainier experiment, the surrounding rock which was originally permeable and highly porous to the extent of 30 percent of its original volume, was compacted by the blast to practically zero permeability.

In blasting oil shale, because of its almost complete incompactibility, no sizable chamber can be sprung without heaving the surface and because of its strength, very little oil shale could be expected to cave. How, then, do the proponents of such a project expect to make large tonnages of impermeable oil shale freely pervious, and yet contain all fission products within the ground and not disturb the surface of the earth?

When solid rock in place is fragmented by blasting, it normally occupies at least 125 percent of its original volume. If this completely nonporous, entirely impermeable oil shale is to be shattered by nuclear blasting and to become freely pervious, from where is this extra space to come if the surface is to remain undisturbed? This I cannot explain nor has anyone been able to explain it to me.

[2] Fast explosives are commonly used in small amounts to spring or chamber the bottoms of small diameter blast holes in order to accommodate sufficient amounts of slower explosives with more suitable rock breaking and heaving characteristics.

[3] The pyrolysis of oil shale begins about 400° F. To effect complete destructive distillation, the oil shale must be heated to above 800° F.

Please refer to the appended "Comparison of the More Obvious Physical and Chemical Properties of the Rainier Volcanic Ash With Rocky Mountain Oil Shales and Tabulation of the Relative Effects of Thermally Equivalent Nuclear Blasts in the Two Different Rocks."

From this tabulated comparison of the corresponding characteristics of the spongy volcanic ash with those of the incompactible, impervious oil shale, a number of paramount differences become immediately apparent. Among these are:

1. In the nuclear blasting of volcanic tuff, because it contains 10 to 20 percent of water, steam is the principal gas produced and this can exert a maximum pressure of about 3,000 pounds per square inch at 700° F. (Compare this with the maximum pressure of hydrogen at this temperature. There is, of course, some disassociation of the water molecule to hydrogen and oxygen, and no doubt, some monatomic gases exist in the first instant of detonation. However, beyond the initial shock, the effects of gases other than steam are minor.)

2. So long as the surrounding rock temperature is below the boiling point of water, steam is instantly condensed upon passing into the porous cold rock and no effective amount of expanding gases remains to crack and heave the rock. Thus, the total destructive force of a nuclear blast in such saturated, spongy volcanic tuff is very much less than an equivalent nuclear blast in air.

3. Because hydrogen is the principal gas produced by the blasting of hydrocarbon impregnated rocks such as oil shales, the rock heaving capacity is enormous. Should pure hydrocarbons (containing from 10 to 15 percent of hydrogen) be exposed to the thermal radiation from the nuclear fireball, some 40,000 standard cubic feet of hydrogen would be instantly liberated at an initial pressure in the order of 25 tons per square inch. In this case, evidently (because hydrogen occupies about 14 times the volume of air per unit weight) the explosive force (pressure times volume of the gases) of a nuclear device is very substantially greater than an equivalent nuclear blast in air.

In order to calculate this maximum possible explosive effect, the following criteria are employed:

1. Per ton of TNT equivalent the heat radiated to the surroundings is 4 million B.t.u.

2. What the AEC rates as a 10 kiloton device may yield as little as 3,000 tons of TNT equivalent, or under completely favorable conditions of detonation, as much as 30,000 tons of TNT equivalent.

3. All the heat radiated is immediately absorbed by kerogen, the hydrocarbon in oil shale.

4. Some 40,000 standard cubic feet of gas is instantly generated at a pressure in the order of 25 tons per square inch.

5. More than 1 billion cubic feet of hydrogen at 25 tons per square inch would be instantly generated in a lateral area 100 feet square.

6. Vertical joint cracks occur in the oil shale with reasonable frequency, say on a hundred foot grid. Thus, the shearing strength of the rock is no factor.

From these several criteria, the following results appear credible:

1. A plug of about 600,000 tons could be ejected straight up at high velocity.

2. At least 3 million additional tons would be heaved and broken and a large portion of this would be scattered laterally over the surrounding area.

3. Instantly following the ejection of the central plug an aerial explosion of more than a billion cubic feet of hydrogen would generate more heat energy than the initial nuclear blast.

In conclusion, I must state that no sizable nuclear blast in Rocky Mountain oil shale can be considered completely and absolutely free from any likelihood of jeopardizing the public safety.

Yours very truly,

MORGAN G. HUNTINGTON,
*President, RNB Corp.*

ENGINEERING ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR BLASTING IN TUFF AND IN OIL SHALE

*Comparison of the more obvious physical and chemical properties of Rainier volcanic ash with Rocky Mountain oil shale, and tabulations of the relative effects of thermally equivalent nuclear blasts in the 2 materials*

| | Rainier volcanic ash | Mahogany bed, Rocky Mountain oil shale |
|---|---|---|
| Crushing strength | About 5,000 pounds per square inch | Greater than 25,000 pounds per square inch absolute (en masse). |
| Attainable compaction | At least 25 percent | Nil. |
| Porosity | 30 percent | Do. |
| Moisture | 20 percent | 0.5 percent. |
| Gas per ton evolved at 2,000° F. | 8,000 standard cubic feet of steam plus small amount of $H_2$-$O_2$. | Pure kerogen yields some 40,000 standard cubic feet of hydrogen when destroyed by heat of 1 ton TNT equivalent. |
| Rock-heaving gas pressure at rock temperature. | Nil (atmospheric), at 200° F. Volume, nil; some $H_2$-$O_2$ probably remains unrecombined. | Above 15,000 pounds per square inch at 200° F. Standard volume unchanged. |
| Effect of nuclear blast | Highly compactible; absorbs large amounts of kinetic energy. Spherical chamber results from the compaction of the surrounding porous rock. | Not appreciably compactible; absorbs relatively little kinetic energy. Horizontal splitting along bedding planes followed by vertical cracking normal to bedding planes. |

## Nelson Poynter, Man of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it was most gratifying to learn that Nelson Poynter, editor and president of the St. Petersburg Times and an outstanding citizen of the State of Florida, is 1 of 14 individuals nominated to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living.

Nelson Poynter is well known throughout our State as a man of integrity, courage, and conviction. Since 1923 he has built an outstanding career in journalism as a reporter, editor, and publisher, and has earned the esteem of the public and his fellow newsmen.

His unselfish efforts in behalf of his community, his state, and the Nation have brought him well-deserved tribute. Mr. Poynter's nomination to the South's

Hall of Fame for the Living is another reward justly bestowed.

We in Florida are particularly proud of this signal honor conferred upon Nelson Poynter.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article which appeared in the February 13 issue of the St. Petersburg Times pointing up this outstanding achievement of one of Florida's great sons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POYNTER IS NOMINATED FOR MAN OF THE SOUTH

ATLANTA.—Nelson Poynter, editor and president of the St. Petersburg Times, is one of 14 southern leaders recently added to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, from which the Man of the South is elected each year.

Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business magazine, which sponsors the honor group, said Poynter was nominated to the Hall of Fame by former Senator Wilton E. Hall, publisher of the Anderson Independent and Daily Mail in South Carolina. Hall was Man of the South for 1955 and strongly recommended Poynter for that honor this year.

Lee said nominations to the Hall of Fame are made on the basis of the life records of service and achievements of the nominees. The group is limited to 200 living southerners and replacements are made only when a member dies.

WHO MAY VOTE

The Man of the South is elected by ballot, which Dixie Business publishes and sends out by mail. Anyone may vote. Voting may also be done by letter. Lee said the ballots each year run as high as 5,000 to 6,000.

The editor of Dixie Business decides who will be selected to the Hall of Fame.

Hall, in nominating Poynter, called him "one of the most brilliant publishers of America" and said "many honors have been heaped on him for courageous editorial leadership."

He listed a number of awards Poynter has received, including ones from the University of Florida Blue Key fraternity for his contributions to the university; an American Bar Association award for the Times' articles on law and the courts; and the public service award presented by the Florida Associated Press Association and the Florida Daily Newspaper Association.

NEW MEMBERS

The 14 new members of the Hall of Fame are Poynter; Dr. O. C. Aderhold, president, University of Georgia, Athens; Harlee Branch, Jr., Atlanta, president, the Southern Co.; David Tennant Bryan, Richmond, Va., publisher, Richmond Times-Dispatch and News-Leader, and president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Norman Cocke, Charlotte, N.C., chairman, board of trustees, Duke University; H. McKinley Conway, Jr., Atlanta, publisher, Manufacturers Record; Dr. Ralph Draughon, president, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; Ben S. Gilmer, Atlanta, president, Southern Bell Telephone Co.; Clarence Haverty, Atlanta, chairman, Haverty Furniture Cos.

George Ivey, Sr., Charlotte, N.C., president, J. B. Ivey & Co.; Dr. James A. Jones, Richmond, Va., president, Union Theological Seminary; Ben M. McKelway, Washington, D.C., editor, the Washington Star and president of the Associated Press; Dr. John L. Plyler, president, Furman University, Greenville, S.C.; Dr. Clarence Poe, Raleigh, N.C., editor, the Progressive Farmer.

## Unveiling of Bust of the Late Charles Curtis, Former Vice President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent speech made by Patrick J. Hurley, former Secretary of War, former Ambassador to China, Minister to New Zealand, a distinguished Oklahoman, who has enjoyed the distinction of serving in the military field from buck private to general, of advancing from trial lawyer in Oklahoma to become an Ambassador, a man whose activities over a period of 50 years have been outstanding to our State.

The excellent speech was delivered by the Honorable Patrick J. Hurley on March 4, 1959, in the old Supreme Court Chamber in the Capitol, on the occasion of the dedication of the bust honoring the late Vice President Charles Curtis.

The bust, incidentally, will be placed in the Indian Hall of Fame, located in Oklahoma, which is the site of a display of monuments to, and busts of, distinguished American Indians who have won great recognition in all forms of American life.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES CURTIS, OF KANSAS

(An address delivered by Patrick J. Hurley on March 4, 1959, in the Supreme Court Room, the Capitol, Washington, D.C.)

We are assembled on this occasion to unveil a bust of the late Charles Curtis, Vice President of the United States, for the Indian Hall of Fame in Oklahoma.

BACKGROUND, EDUCATION, POLITICAL CAREER

Though he was a member of the Kaw (or Kansas) Tribe of Indians, and his allotment of land was in the Kaw Reservation in Oklahoma, there was also Osage blood in the veins of Charles Curtis. Part blood Indian that he was, those of us who knew him well found that Curtis had the appearance, and more of the traits of the Indian than he did of his European ancestry.

At the time of his birth, in 1860, the Kaw Tribe was restricted to a reservation. The Indians, thereby deprived of their traditional hunting grounds and their ability to move with the seasons to the places where game could be found, were on the verge of starvation. The restrictions and poverty imposed on his people by reservation life made a deep impression on the mind and character of young Curtis. Through all of his adult life, he fought to free his fellow Indians from the restrictive laws and customs that worked to keep them isolated from society and in physical want.

Charles Curtis was, for the most part, a self-educated man. He had received only an elementary school education before he embarked on the study of law, but at the age of 21 he was practicing law in Topeka, Kans. In 1884, he was elected county attorney and served in that capacity until 1888. He was elected to Congress, as a Republican, in 1893 and continuously reelected until 1907 when he was chosen to fill the U.S. senatorial term which expired in 1913. Three times more he was elected U.S. Senator from Kansas—in 1915, 1921, and 1927. In 1928, at the Republican National Convention, Charles Curtis was nominated for the Vice Presidency of the United States as the running mate of Herbert Hoover. On November 6, 1928, the Republican ticket was elected by the overwhelming majority of 444 to 87 electoral votes. Thirty years ago today, Charles Curtis of the Kaw Tribe was inaugurated as Vice President of these United States. He died at Washington on February 8, 1936.

President Hoover, after his inauguration, instituted a new practice by inviting Vice President Curtis to meet with, and participate in the deliberations of, the Cabinet. Curtis immediately accepted this invitation; and, though he had himself been a candidate for the Presidential nomination and consequently opposed the nomination of Herbert Hoover, Curtis nevertheless supported the Hoover administration loyally and efficiently through the difficult and trying years of the depression.

HIGH TIDE OF INDIAN IN POLITICS

This remarkable record of service to his State and Nation achieved by Charles Curtis marks the high tide of the American Indian in national politics. Even if it is true, as William Allen White relates in his book "A Puritan in Babylon," that President Calvin Coolidge had "picked up a drop of Indian blood" through his mother's family, Coolidge—unlike Curtis—had not been reared in an Indian environment and did not participate in Indian affairs.

REMOVAL OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES—TRIBAL PROPERTY

As a result of his experience and good judgment, Curtis was fundamentally opposed to the segregation and isolation of Indians on reservations. Indian estates were communal or tribally owned; title to the reservation land was vested in the Indian nation or tribe, and not in the individual members of the tribe. It is true that before the removal of the Five Civilized Tribes (or Nations) from their homes in the Southeastern States to Indian Territory, there had been some allotments in severalty—but in Indian Territory to which the Five Civilized Tribes were removed over the tragic "Trail of Tears" the new land was all held by the tribe. The land described as Indian territory, now the State of Oklahoma, was a part of the Louisiana Purchase, acquired by the United States in 1803. It was during the period from 1820 to 1835, roughly, that the Five Civilized Tribes (Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Seminoles) were induced or compelled to enter into treaties exchanging their homeland in the Southeastern States and move to land assigned to them in Indian Territory.

EARLY CONDITIONS IN INDIAN TERRITORY

Chaotic conditions, poverty and hardship awaited the Indians in Indian territory, and such conditions prevailed for years. Unquestionably, also, great and unpardonable injustices were committed against the Indians, not only by white citizens but by the Government itself.

Then, when the Five Civilized Tribes had become well settled in Indian territory, there came the Mexican War and the gold rush to California—conditions which brought great hordes of white people across Indian territory, emigrating to the West or traveling down the great Texas road across the land of the Five Civilized Tribes into Texas.

Legally, all white persons in Indian territory were intruders, and could be removed; actually, however, many of them intermarried with the Indians and remained.

INDIAN TERRITORY WAS TO BE PERMANENT HOME

The various treaties between the Five Civilized Nations and the United States, exchanging land in the Southeastern States for the new tribal land in Indian territory, were all intended to provide the Indians with permanent homelands free from intrusion by white men. One of the treaties, for instance, provided that the United States would protect the Indians in their communal possession of their land in Indian territory "as long as the grass grows and water runs"—treaties with other tribes contained like provisions.

TREATIES OF 1866 AND OKLAHOMA TERRITORY

Scarcely had life for the Five Civilized Tribes returned to normal, after the removal and the period of white migration, when the Civil War broke out. Many of the Indians, particularly among the Cherokees and Creeks, were Federalists; but the overwhelming majority of the Five Civilized Tribes supported the cause of the Confederacy. Because they had lent their support to the South, the Five Civilized Tribes, in the treaties of 1866, were required to cede (and in some instances to sell) to the United States the western portion of Indian territory. This land, returned to the United States in 1866, became Oklahoma Territory.

(NOTE.—The name Oklahoma was suggested by Allen Wright, Chief of the Choctaws—the word "Oklahoma" being composed of two Choctaw words meaning "people red.")

It was here in Oklahoma Territory that the so-called wild Indians were given homes and reservations. Here the great chief of the Comanches, Quanah Parker, and perhaps the greatest chief of the Apaches, Geronimo, were held prisoners at Fort Sill in what was then known as the big pasture country.

THE PROBLEM OF THE OUTLAWS

Under the reservation system, especially in the Five Civilized Tribes, the Indians lived under their own laws and their own constitutions. Following the Civil War, as the white emigration continued to flow across the territories, law enforcement by the Indians and in Indian courts became very lax; Indian territory became a haven for outlaws and a region of lawlessness. So strong did the outlaws become that one Indian, Tom Starr (husband of the notorious woman outlaw Belle Starr) forced the government of the Cherokee Nation to make a treaty with him.

Most of the white emigrants who had stopped to settle in Indian territory were decent, God-fearing citizens. They were vigorously opposed to the rampant violence and the reign of lawlessness. Many of them had intermarried with the Indians, and were hard-working, productive citizens who not only opposed the disregard of law, but also opposed the communal ownership of the land.

THE PROBLEM OF THE FREEDMEN

During the period of the leadership of Charles Curtis, another problem had grown to perplex the people of Indian territory. Some of the Indians, and particularly the part-Indian, were educated and economically successful people. Numbers of them had brought Negro slaves with them into Indian territory at the time of removal from the Southeastern States. It was in the enchanted land of the Choctaws and Chickasaws, on the Colbert plantation in the beautiful Red River Valley, that Negro slaves originated that inspiring spiritual "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot."

At the close of the Civil War, under the Emancipation Proclamation, these Negro slaves were freed. They became citizens of the tribe, or nation, in which they were freed—and, among the Five Civilized Tribes, were known as Indian freedmen. In addition to granting these Indian freedmen citizenship in the tribes, however, the U.S. Government in some instances purchased head rights within the tribes for them. Because of their association with the educated and successful Indians, and the exacting frontier environment in which they lived, these freedmen were of a high degree of intelligence and of resolute character, and the protection of their rights by law added another serious problem to the many land-title problems in Indian territory.

PROBLEMS OF PREPARING TERRITORIES FOR STATEHOOD

All of the problems had to be solved; but paramount among them was that of preparing Indian territory and Oklahoma Territory for statehood. Tribal title to the land had been acquired by the Five Civilized Tribes through treaties with the U.S. Government, and it was properly assumed that these rights could be relinquished, and the distributive share of the tribal estate vested in each individual Indian, only by new treaties—whereby the tribes would agree to the necessary changes for allotment in severalty. Without such new treaties, it seemed impossible to bring about the changes needed to prepare the Territories for statehood. In the meantime, under great public pressure, Congress had opened large tracts of land in Oklahoma Territory to white settlement. Great rushes for these free homes were made by people from nearly every State in the Union. In 1893, Congress authorized the Dawes Commission to induce the tribes to consent by treaty to individual allotments of Indian land, and to Government administration from Washington.

CURTIS DETERMINED TO SOLVE PROBLEMS

These were the problems that faced Indian territory and Oklahoma Territory when Charles Curtis officially entered the scene. It was his great love for the Indians, and for law and justice, that caused him to determine to stop the lawlessness that ruled the land; to abolish the reservation system which segregated the Indian from society; to extinguish the communal ownership of land that prevented admission to the United States; to resolve the problems pertaining to white intruders; and to give protection by law to the rights of all the citizens—Indian, white, and freedmen.

THE CURTIS ACT

Under the leadership of the Dawes Commission, new treaties were made with all of the Five Civilized Tribes—and were in each instance approved by the Indian electorate. But it was the Curtis Act of June 30, 1898, that presented the first answer to all of the basic problems which involved titles in Indian and Oklahoma Territories. It is beyond the scope of this address to recite the 16 fundamental changes brought about in Indian titles and relations, and the Indian way of life, by the Curtis Act. It should suffice for our purpose to say that the first of these provided for the enlargement and extension of the jurisdiction of the U.S. Courts for Indian Territory, so as to include causes of action irrespective of parties, and to give the U.S. Courts jurisdiction to try suits by or against the several tribes. It also conferred additional jurisdiction over crimes and other causes of action. Charles Curtis was devoted to ending the terror and lawlessness in Indian territory.

In this period one may read of the impress made by U.S. Judge Isaac Parker of Fort Smith, Ark., who with great courage conducted an unswerving program which went far toward resolving the reign of lawlessness by executing criminals and clearing the outlaws from Indian territory.

CRAZY SNAKE AND THE PIN INDIANS

Not all of the Indians, however, were in agreement with Charles Curtis' irrevocable commitments to the proposition that the future welfare of the Indians would not be served by segregating and confining them on reservations. Not all of the Indians upheld his determined advocacy of the policy to allot to each Indian his or her distributive share of the tribal lands and the conferring upon each Indian of unlimited citizenship. In fact, one of the most interesting movements among the Indians was organized to resist the distribution in severalty of the tribal properties.

As is usual in a period when a society is being transformed, there were those who were determined to preserve the old traditions, the communal way of life, the self-government. A segment of the Cherokee Indians organized into what they called a Keetoowah Society. They were known as Pin Indians because of the custom of wearing two pins crossed visibly upon their clothing as a symbol of membership in the Keetoowah Society. They were led by an Indian known as Red Bird Smith.

An organization among the Creeks known as Snake Indians was led by a Navajo, popularly known as Crazy Snake. Your speaker today remembers the immobile, sensitive, handsome Indian features. His group included not only Creeks but some members of the Choctaw, Chickasaw and Seminole Tribes. Though he and his organization were ultimately subdued and overthrown at every turn, he will be remembered as a great Indian leader who fought to the last for the preservation of the Indian way of life, the gallant leader of a lost cause.

ADMISSION TO STATEHOOD

The Curtis Act resolved every major problem in both Indian territory and Oklahoma territory, and completely altered the nature of all land titles, thus bringing about those changes which were necessary to prepare the territories for admission as a State. An enabling act was passed by Congress and, in a convention held at Guthrie, a constitution was prepared. On September 17, 1907, this constitution was adopted by the electorate of both territories; on November 16, 1907 the State of Oklahoma was admitted to the Union.

THIRTY THOUSAND LAND SUITS AND THE MAC MURRAY CONTRACTS

The old problems were resolved; now new problems arose. Some of the lands allotted to the Indians were unrestricted and could be sold by the Indians; other portions were restricted and nontaxable. These complex Indian titles gave rise to a period of land swindlers and grafters in the new State of Oklahoma. Crimes were committed; children were murdered so that their lands could be inherited unrestricted. The new rush to Oklahoma caused by the discovery of oil heightened the desire of the grafters to acquire Indian titles. A wave of protest and indignation against the conduct of the grafters arose, originated this time among the people of Oklahoma. Public conscience required that action be taken to protect Indian titles. Thirty thousand suits were filed to quiet title, alleging that the Indian in each instance had been defrauded. These suits were brought by the U.S. Government.

(NOTE.—Your speaker of today was appointed Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States to help bring the suits, and was also the attorney for the Choctaw Nation during the controversy which resulted in the cancellation of the MacMurray contracts.)

CURTIS "CLEAN AS A HOUND'S TOOTH"

During this period, nearly everyone connected with Indian affairs was charged with

some form of graft or corruption. The so-called higher-ups did not escape. There were those who even attempted to smear Senator Curtis, of Kansas, because of his prominent leadership in Indian affairs. Hardly anyone escaped some form of condemnation—but it was in this turbulant time that the character of Charles Curtis appeared in its true light.

Curtis was never a rich man, but with all the opportunities for graft available to him because of his prominence and power pertaining to Indian titles, people assumed that he would profit thereby. But, through all the charges and counter-charges of the period, the character of Charles Curtis stood out, to use an old frontier expression, "as clean as a hound's tooth." That is one of the reasons why the Indian people are conferring the great honor which Charles Curtis' memory is receiving today, and one of the reasons American citizens elected him to the second highest office in National Government.

PROGRESS OF INDIANS SINCE CURTIS ACT

As a result of the work of Charles Curtis, the Indians entered a new situation on terms of equality with their white fellow citizens. In the State of Oklahoma, the Indians were entitled to attend (and did attend) all of the schools in the great Oklahoma school system—all of the way from the primary grades through the preparatory schools to the colleges and the University of Oklahoma.

Now, after 50 years of statehood, Oklahoma Indians are competing not only in the schools, but also in every department of science and literature, of commerce and politics. The possession of Indian blood in Oklahoma is an honorable heritage. In all walks of life, Indians have distinguished themselves among the citizens of Oklahoma. They have been elected to represent the State in the U.S. Senate and in Congress; they have been elected to administer the State's affairs as Governor and as members of the judiciary—including justices and chief justices of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma. The blood of the original American flows in the veins of the present beautiful and talented First Lady of Oklahoma, and she is not the first woman of Indian blood who has enjoyed that distinction.

The Indians of the Southwest have distinguished themselves in peace and war—remember, there was an Indian hand on the staff of Old Glory when it was raised over Iwo Jima. More than that, the Indians have distinguished themselves as religious and educational leaders. The Indians have accepted in full measure the principles of the Sermon on the Mount, and especially the Golden Rule; they have accepted the American heritage, and have adopted as their own the truths that are self-evident in the Declaration of Independence and the rights of man enumerated in the Constitution. The Indians are fully committed to the proposition that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The Indians have accepted the white American heritage, and the white people, to a great extent, have accepted the Indian heritage. The result is that under the spiritual leadership of Charles Curtits, the Indian and the white citizen of Oklahoma have become one people. Together, they uphold the principles of individual liberty, regulated free enterprise, self-government, and justice. These are the principles which have made America great, and they are the same principles for which oppressed humanity has struggled through the ages. We might add that these principles have been defended, and upheld, by the sacrifice and suffering and courage of American soldiers and sailors in battle all the way from Bunker Hill to Heartbreak Ridge.

Today the Indians of the United States are honoring Charles Curtis for his great work in solving the problems that imperiled the growth and development of Indian territory; in helping to bring the Indians the rights and benefits, as well as the responsibilities, of American cittizenship; and for the constructive leadership he gave to all Americans.

On behalf of the National Hall of Fame for Famous American Indians, I accept the bust of Charles Curtis of Kansas for a place in the Indian Hall of Fame.

---

## The End of Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the November 29, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post is an article by Dennis William Brogan, professor of political science in Peterhouse, Cambridge University, England, titled "The End of Empire." An Irishman born in Scotland, he was educated at Glasgow University, Oxford, and Harvard. Author of some 17 books of political and historical interpretation, several of which treat the American scene with friendly warmth and understanding, Reinhold Niebuhr has praised his extraordinary gift for understanding and illuminating the woof of constitutional principles and the ways of political tactics in the fabric of democratic history.

World changes are taking place so rapidly these days, adjustment to new ways, new ideas, new horizons has become so imperative that an article such as "The End of Empire" makes a very real contribution to all who are endeavoring to keep a balanced view. To the end that others may find in Professor Bogan's presentation material that will be helpful, I am asking to insert it with these remarks.

THE END OF EMPIRE

(By D. W. Brogan)

More than one foreign observer has noted, admired, and envied the unconditional loyalty of the average American to the American political tradition. And as a source of internal, of external strength, the loyalty that sends boys and girls on pious pilgrimage to the National Archives to revere the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution is wholly admirable. But when the good American transfers his gaze to the outer world, when he innocently looks for equivalent institutions in that less fortunate part of the globe, when he takes as having the same meaning as he gives them inside America such common words as "freedom," "good government," "progress," he asks for trouble. And with the promptitude of superservice, he is given it. His plate is filled with problems, and he is driven to realize that he is the victim of the old Chinese curse. He "is living in interesting time."

The good American is confronted all over the world today with two linked phenomena, the decline of empires and the rise of nations. He can, as a good American, have no doubts as to the sentiments he must feel at the news and noise of those phenomena. He must rejoice that empires are falling (did not America give the first push in 1776?) and rejoice that new nations devoted to freedom are arising (did not America set the example in the same fateful and admirable year?).

But having paid this respect to the national tradition, the American notes with bewilderment and often with downright annoyance that peace, progress, good will, order, and liberty don't seem to be in any greater supply than in the bad old days. He hears doubts expressed as to whether some free nations (Indonesia, Burma) are as well off as they were in the days of imperialist tyranny. He notices that there are two nations on very bad terms with each other in that land called India that was united under British rule, and that their creation was the signal for massacre, rape, and exile on a colossal scale. He has to face in his morning paper news of bloody rioting in Ceylon, led, with a high degree of inconsistency, by Buddhist monks. New nations in Africa such as Ghana threaten to suppress internal opposition by methods very reminiscent of the bad old days. Even after paying during an American visit, homage to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, Dr. Sukarno, of Indonesia, returns home via Moscow much more impressed by the relevance of Soviet experience than of American. Newly enfranchised nations such as Egypt gladly dicker for arms with the Soviet Union. An Indian state elects a Communist government, and each area, liberated from imperial slavery, seems to develop odd ways of attaining those unalienable rights proclaimed in 1776. Indeed, some of them seem very easily alienable under the pressures of freedom.

Nothing can be done to make the world easily and automatically safe for democracy (as Chesterton pointed out in 1918, "The world will never be made safe for democracy, it is a dangerous trade"). The good American will have to get used to seeing his principles parroted and parodied. But he will suffer less and be less tempted to angry and foolish reactions if he can bring himself to think that maybe the decline of empires, at the speed at which it has taken place, is not an unmitigated benefit, and if he also can bring himself to accept the fact that a nation which gets its freedom—that is, is freed from foreign rule—gains that and nothing more. What it gains may have little or no relevance to its real economic or social problems, except to make them worse, and even if it is evident that the gains are well worth the price, the price may yet be very high. And if the price includes poverty, disorder, and division, the United States in its own interest may be forced to pick up the tab.

The United States may have to step in to fill the gap in common defense made by the withdrawal of the imperial power. It may have to spend men, money and patience (patience will be the hardest to come by) to prop up a new, free, but rickety governmental structure. It may even, as a last aggravation of its sad state, have to receive, with what self-control it can, charges of exploitation and imperialism made by peoples in complete control, as far as the American goes, of their own destiny. Bewildered and bothered, the American in the street—or in the White House—will be less bewildered, if no less annoyed, if he accepts the fact that the end of empires is the end of an epoch that suited the United States pretty well, and that the wicked, grasping imperial powers were doing a job (possibly from the worst of motives) that somebody had to do—a job that now must be done mainly by the United States, the reluctant legatee of the old firms now in liquidation.

For the decline of empire means that passing of a crude form of solution to a real problem. All nations are equal, but some are more equal than others. Since this cynical view happens to be true, it means that nations have very different resources, degrees of competence, are at very different

stages in historical development (but want to be at the same stage) and, in defiance of all objective assessments, are ready to assert that this stage of real equality has been reached—that Liberia is a Republic in the sense that the United States is; that Ceylon is a state in the sense that Holland is. The old, condemned imperial order denied this. It asserted that nations were unequal, that they were at different stages of development and that the advanced nations had the right, the opportunity and the duty to bring the backward areas, forcibly, if need be, up to scratch—a laborious and expensive process for which it was only reasonable to charge a fee.

I am well aware that this appears to contradict the formal doctrines of the Declaration of Independence and that such doctrines would be shocking if developed inside the United States. California and Mississippi are equal and are at the same stage of progress; the peoples of the two States are equal, if not identical, and law and custom make no difference between one group of inhabitants and another. Such is the theory; I beg to be excused from comment on the fact. But outside the United States, until very modern times, this was neither theory nor fact. No one thought that Egypt (legally then a Turkish possession) should be allowed a free hand in controlling the way from Europe to Asia simply because it owned the Isthmus of Suez. (The United States, nonimperialist as she was, took much the same line about Colombia's claim to own Panama.)

There was a practical justification for this high and mighty attitude. All the new techniques that transformed the world in the last 150 years originated in Europe or North America. The owners of the new machines and the new weapons faced a world that lay lapped in immemorial slumber. Briskly, like the proprietor of a health farm, the white world insisted on wakening the sleepers, by ruling them directly, as in India; by insisting on a highly privileged position, as in China; or by frightening the more alert into imitating the white man before he took over, as in Japan. Conquest, empire was an old as human society. What was new was the expanding technical superiority of the conquerors that ate into the "cake of custom," prodded the sleepers wide awake and bred, in reaction, the force that has undone the empires—nationalism.

It is desirable at this point to proclaim that I am too much disposed to accept the unavoidable to protest against this state of affairs. As the wise Bishop Butler put it, "Things and actions are what they are, and the consequences of them will be what they will be; why then should be seek to be deceived?" Why indeed? But it is a part of deception not to notice what follows from things and actions being what they are, and there is some danger of such error being committed.

The first error in which it is tempting to fall is to assume that the end of imperialism, the arrival on the stage of nationalism, is necessarily accompanied by material or even by moral progress. For it is too often forgotten that the basic article of the nationalist creed it that progress, good government, liberty and civilization have no meaning except in nationalist terms. It is true that nationalist propaganda usually promises lots of goodies as well as national "freedom," but they are not of the essence of the contract, and the promise is often not kept. For example, material progress may be accelerated, usually is accelerated when the economic area of a state is large. The size of the United States is one reason for its wealth. But nationalism usually breaks up existing economic units (usually, not always), for, to the nationalist, progress in material well-being is empty if it does not mean progress in national well-being. A man can be emotionally well off only in a nation state to which he belongs, even if he could be materially better off in his mere material command of goods in a vaster nonnational or antinational area.

Thus, although not a perfect economic unit, the old Austro-Hungarian Empire was a more satisfactory one than that created by the "succession" states. Yet it is now—and was in 1918—useless to point out this fact to the emergent nationalities. What they wanted was not well-being, but national well-being. It was a choice that the peoples of the old empire were free to make as a result of the Allied victory in the First World War. They made it, and no wisdom from above the battle, from Woodrow Wilson or Herbert Hoover, could have altered that fact.

After all, no such decision is as irrational as the decision to wage and endure war, and we are all conditioned to make that decision. "Give me liberty or give me death" is not only Patrick Henry's slogan. The same uneconomic choice can be seen nearer to the United States. What rational justification is there for the frontiers of Central America? The little republics round the waist of the Americas are obviously designed to be united or even to be united under Mexico. But suggest that to them. I am quite prepared to believe that even Panama, invented for the convenience of the United States, has bred in the past 50 years a genuine national feeling that will last—and may become a real nuisance to the United States, at any rate from a propaganda point of view. Why should Panama not imitate Egypt? And, from the nationalist point of view, there is no easy answer to that one.

The greatest single gift of British rule to India, perhaps the only one, was the creation of India. For it did not exist before the East India Co. and then the British Indian Government by war, by road, by railway, by law made a united government and a united economy for a subcontinent never before united in history under an effective central Indian Government. But the first result of freedom for the India thus created was suicide. We now have India and Pakistan, the latter state a nation that did not exist. even as a name, 50 years ago. The one great good thing imperialism did was undone. The unity the French imposed on Indochina has not survived their defeat, and it is not certain that the unity of Indonesia (another artificial, imported name) will survive Dutch rule for long. All of these breakdowns in unity may have been worthwhile; they were certainly nearly, if not quite, inevitable, but they had a high price.

Nor is that all. The division of the imperial units suggests something about nationalism that is novel and ominous. Nationalism often, too often, breeds nationalism. Peoples who have got along more or less with each other under foreign rule suddenly develop violent antagonism when foreign rule is withdrawn or is threatened with collapse. For under the foreign tyrant some kind of neutrality could be imposed from above. If neither group ruled itself, it had not to worry about being ruled by its neighbors. But if those neighbors were on the way to becoming the ruling class, then the prospect of local foreign rule became intolerable. So the Indian Moslems revolted against the prospect of Hindu rule: Turkish turned on Greek Cypriots; and in once peaceful Ceylon, Singhalese turned on Tamils as self-government, freedom, got more complete. Nationalism, that is to say, is often the result of a reaction. If a government claims to embody a national tradition, a way of life, a language, a religion, or all of them, people have got to ask themselves is it really their way of life, language, religion? Often the answer given in blood and rapine is "No, a thousand times no." Freedom is these situations—and they are common enough—brings not peace, but a sword.

And this leads to the invention of nationalities, to the creation of new human groups cut off from, the mass of mankind by new feuds, new and carefully fostered differences. It is, of course, too easy to be critical and cynical about the history manufactured for new nations or old nations making new claims. Popular history in all countries is full of comforting legend. It is largely because they have their nationalist growing pains far behind them that western European and North American nations can afford to be scholarly, critical; can debunk national heroes and legends, remember that Washington swore, and doubt the cherry tree. Some Americans in the South may even doubt whether Lee made the right choice in going with his State in 1861 instead of sticking with the United States, and some Germans may believe that Bismarck's temporary triumph was a long run catastrophe for Germany and for Europe.

We cannot expect this kind of critical history from new nations. We should be more struck with admiration than we are when we get an approach to it as we do in India in the educated classes, or when we think of Thomas Masaryk exposing the Dvur and Hora forgeries of the country's literary past, despite the fact that they flattered Czech national vanity. But we must be prepared today for a high degree of fiction in all or almost all nationalist propaganda, and the American people, full of kindness and credulity, must not be shocked when they discover that some interesting spokesmen for some interesting countries are prone to the use of what Huck Finn called "stretchers."

What is more important is the not infrequent case where historical fiction conceals from a long-suppressed and now renascent nation that its misfortunes are also largely its own fault. Except where the preponderance of power is overwhelmingly on the imperial side, and possibly not always then, the fact of subjection is a fact about the oppressed nation. It suggests weaknesses that mere freedom will not necessarily cure. Freedom may be (I think today it almost always is) the necessary preliminary to curing the weakness, but the weakness of resources, traditions, social habits is there to be cured. Waving a new flag makes you feel good, but that is about all.

It is difficult for Americans to realize that for a great part of the world, the views of poets and philosophers, of orators and legend makers are more important than the views of businessmen or scientists or economists. The Arabs are dazzled by their own past, seen in a golden haze. For two generations they have been asking the question why they, who once ruled the Mediterranean and brought civilization to the Christian barbarians, have been kicked around and subjected to foreign rule in their homelands. And the answer they expect must be encouraging. It must exaggerate the unity of the Arabs and suggest that only Western tyranny or local corruption prevents the creation of a great Arab nation stretching from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf. It must ignore permanent and desperate problems of inadequate resources (as in Egypt and Algeria); of undoubtedly Arab but totally anachronistic social structures (as in Yemen and Saudi Arabia). It must find in hatred of Israel a substitute for difficult problems of social and religious readjustment. It must be uncritical of the social results of Islam. And it must give a great place to treason. For all suppressed nations have a deep conviction of betrayal.

Let Erin remember the days of old
Ere her faithless sons betrayed her,
When Malachi wore the collar of gold
That he won from the proud invader.

What the Irish sang the new nationalities still sing, and so every national leader has to look over his shoulder to keep an eye on

his countrymen, who may see in the possibly inevitable failures and limited successes of freedom not a result of the nature of things, but treachery. So Nuri-as-Said is butchered, so Gandhi is assassinated.

And the leaders who have to be watchful often become leaders by negation rather than by affirmation; they are against something (foreign rule) rather than for something, for basic changes in the internal structure of the nation, eradication of the very weaknesses that helped to produce foreign rule in the beginning. Of course, this is not always so. Nationalist leaders are sometimes preachers, as was Gandhi, of self-reform as well as of the expulsion of the foreigner. The Gaelic League, the chief begetter of modern Ireland, had as one of its slogans: "And as we are shall Banba (Ireland) be." But it is easier to damn the imperialists than to go in for fundamental self-criticism, and when the imperialist has been heaved out or has left under his own steam, the basic problems remain.

So the world is faced with the new states with inadequate economic resources, with erratic frontiers, with dissident minorities, with delusions of grandeur and, what is worse, of goodness. And all this is in a world where the new nations are almost all arising in poor regions where, even with the best and most rational government, the headaches would be frightful, where the problem of keeping abreast of the birth rate and of not actually going backward in well-being is serious enough to daunt the bravest. It is not being offensive or aggressive to assert that half the nations whose delegates give parties in New York round the United Nations building are too poor and too backward to give their peoples in the next generation even as good a government and as adequate a standard of life as the most backward European nation (let us say Portugal) or the most backward American State (let us say Mississippi) possesses.

Freedom from imperial yoke may even be a luxury some of them (which could be named) can hardly afford. There are areas in the dwindling British and French Empires that are a dead loss to the imperial power; regions that cannot afford freedom, although only the most prudent of their leaders know this. For there is nothing in the law of nature and of nature's God that provides that an area with the linguistic and cultural unity that demands nationhood and will not be denied will have any of the other resources for even frugal well-being.

The great problem of the concentration of most of the world's wealth and technical competence in a small area of the globe has many nonpolitical aspects. It is to be noted that there is no first-class industrial power outside the temperate zones. But the political problem of the replacement of the empires by the nations is one of the governing conditions of any attempt to redress the imbalance that is so deeply and dangerously dividing the world. And it is the beginning of wisdom for Americans, conditioned as they are by their own largely irrelevant history of nationmaking, to recognize that national freedom may be an obstacle to a quick redressing of the balance, both by creating doubtfully viable national units and by transferring authority to leaders whose competence has lain in the exploiting (all right, the heroic undoing) of a national grievance.

But if this is the beginning, it is not the end of wisdom. For it is not only a fact, if not a totally welcome fact, that the days of empire are over; it is a fact that the nation state offers possibilities of improvement that the empires either never did (which I doubt) or have ceased to do (which I admit). There is another fact. If one political truth is established today, it is that once the nationalist bug bites a group of human beings they cannot be cured except by national freedom, with all the possible social and economic disadvantages it may bring. Once an Algerian, for instance, decides that he is not a Frenchman and doesn't want to be one, rational economic argument is wasted. Bernard Shaw usually talked nonsense of political questions, but he occasionally talked sense, and his Irish origin illuminated much of this question for him. So, he wrote sense in his preface to "John Bull's Other Island", the only play he ever devoted to his native land. "A conquered nation is like a man with a cancer: he can think of nothing else, and is forced to place himself, to the exclusion of all better company, in the hands of quacks who profess to treat or cure cancer." This is true, and the first great gain of freedom is that thought and effort can be devoted to something more immediately relevant than freedom.

It does not follow, of course, that it will be. There are few greater emotional losses than a grievance that explains why things have gone wrong in terms of another's fault. Any father of a family can testify to that (and his children can testify, too, in another sense). To get freedom is to lose a grievance, and some nations have firmly refused to give up their darling excuse. Thus, if the people of the Argentine Republic devoted a tenth as much rational thought to the causes of their serious, but quite curable troubles that they have wasted on irrelevant and unjust spleen about "Yanqui" imperialism, they would be a great deal better off. If a patriotic Cuban put to himself the question, "Would we not have been materially better off if we had had more Yanqui imperialism?" and then admitted that some, if not all, of the troubles of Cuba are homemade, freedom would be an unmitigated good. Can any candid observer, looking at Haiti and the Domincian Republic, pretend that freedom is always an unmitigated good?

The beneficial effects of freedom can be seen in two such different former jewels of the English crown as Ireland and India. For more than a generation of freedom has taught most of the inhabitants of the Irish Republic that their troubles are no longer of England's making, that the border is neither here nor there in the bookkeeping of a declining nation, that the Gaelic League was right: "And as we are shall Banba be." Even an act which, seen from the outside, seems one of the most foolish ever perpetrated by a rational community—the exit from the Commonwealth in 1948—may have been worth the price in making plain to the Irish people that a republic left them where they were, with the basic problem of why the Irish won't, if they can help it, live in Ireland.

The problems of India are so gigantic that courage fails the spectator (but not the Indians). But one great gain is the creation of a government that does not hesitate to face Indian abuses such as the caste system. The government of Nehru makes many mistakes, but it can, through the mouth of the Prime Minister, preach to the Indians the lesson that it is now up to them. No British Government could do that. It can risk appearing antireligious as no British Government dared risk appearing. It has not succeeded in abolishing untouchability or in winning over all the primitive tribes of India. It has not undone many centuries of limitations on the role of women. It has not succeeded in giving India what India needs badly, a competent and enlightened business class. But it has made beginnings in all these fields. It has kept India from becoming a mere Hindustan. And it has made it possible for Indians to borrow from the West with no feeling of humiliation.

There is nothing that the new Indian Government did that enlightened British officials didn't see as desirable. But, in this century, the British Government in India had lost the power to innovate. An imperial power that begins to doubt its mission is rightly doomed. The old, confident, authoritarian British rulers stamped out the burning of widows, the religious murders of the Thugs, abolished backward kingdoms like Oudh and introduced in a fine philistine fashion the English language as the lingua franca of all India. These things, with the Indian Army (obedient to civilian authority) and civil service (uniquely honest and competent in Asia), were great British legacies, but it was time for the British to go. Talk to an Indian who is now liberated from the need to think, all the time, in terms of national freedom, and you see the gain. He may even think that Macaulay, imposing English, had something to be said for him as he contemplates the bloody riots over languages that freedom has brought and the danger that an "Indian" national language such as Hindi may be a source of disunion and breed a new Pakistan in the south.

If this is the first, it is not the only gain. Indian nationalism may be simply the fruit of anti-British feeling, but it is a fact and gives India a new unity most necessary in a land divided by language, race, caste. It gives the Indian a new feeling of not being looked down on, and so a new freedom in his attitude to the outer world into which India has been dragged. True, the kind of dignity that nationalism breeds may be touchy, offensive, unrealistic, but there is no substitute for it. As the American Negro is no longer content to be grateful for concessions made from above, all over the world hundreds of millions of men are finding a new meaning in life, a new loyalty to something bigger than the village, the caste, the tribe.

It is not in solving immediate technical problems of well-being that the nations score over the empires. They often handle them, for quite a long time, worse than the imperial rulers did. It is in creating a new type of human being, who may not, is it true, adjust himself adequately to the new world, but at least is not doomed to fail in that adjustment as the empires finally became doomed to fail.

If the American abandons the fallacious parallel with the facts of the American Revolution (as apart from the spirit of '76) and contemplates the new world that is coming into being, he will be forced to avoid snap and easily systematic judgments (especially the judgment that assesses the worth and prospects of a new nation by its willingness to be noisily anti-Communist). He will see many nations running before they can walk—and so falling; demanding steel mills when what they need is more wells and better seed; aspiring after the heights of atomic cannon when they need to learn how to maintain a truck; above all, pouring out endless floods of what it may be too unkind to call mendacity, but can justly be called nonobjective information.

He will find few nations willing—or able—to imitate all or most of the American way of life, social, political, economic. If he wishes to help the world (as many do), he will have to learn to help it in un-American ways, to learn un-American qualities such as patience and the willingness to wait a long time for results. If what he wants is allies against communism, he will find in nationalism the most, perhaps the only effective force against international communism, even when that nationalism is unwilling to stand up and be counted. For the great battles will probably be fought in the hearts of men, not on material beaches where marines can land, but in a world now effectually united for the first time in history by material means and divided by passion and envy. One may regret the old imperial days, but the awkward and often unprogressive nationalist world is that in which we all must now live.

## Establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1959, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy. This school will provide the corps of well-trained, devoted foreign service officers required by America's position in world affairs.

For 10 years, the United States has been engaged in an uneasy peace—really a war with different weapons. This means, simply and fortunately, that the shots are not yet being called by the generals, but rather by our diplomats and policymakers. Important and far-reaching policy decisions are being made, based upon the assessment of local situations by our official representatives abroad. Their conduct, attitudes, and knowledge strongly influence the opinion which foreign nations hold of us. Frequently, the difference between a stunning diplomatic success and abject failure turns upon the effectiveness of our diplomatic representation. Yet, in this day and age, the Government of the United States still does not maintain any school, adequate for training our career Foreign Service officers.

Let us look at only one aspect of the need for such training. Fifty percent of the entire Foreign Service officers do not have even a speaking knowledge of any foreign language. Seventy percent of the new recruits coming into the service suffer the same deficit. Many of our Ambassadors cannot speak the language of the country to which they are at present accredited. In nine Arab Nations only two of our Ministers speak Arabic. In Japan, Korea, Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, and Indonesia, our Ambassadors must speak through interpreters.

Effective representation abroad requires proficiency not only in foreign languages, but a thorough knowledge of the history and culture of foreign lands, an understanding of international and local economics, a thorough familiarity with diplomatic practices and procedures, and a working knowledge of the political systems of other nations. Yet, many of these essential subjects are giving way to sciences and mathematics in our universities. In the interest of world peace, we must have a balance between emphasis on general education and emphasis on science. Scientists do not make policy and policy is what we sadly lack today. Good policy is born out of knowledge and training.

Training for our Foreign Service should be maintained by a Foreign Service Academy administered with the discipline present in our military service academies. Such an Academy would attract capable young people into the diplomatic service, who might otherwise go into other professions. Thus, the education of our future ambassadors would be begun at the receptive age of college freshmen and this would provide sufficient time for broad background studies and special training. Academy training would also generate the esprit de corps which every first-rate organization must have.

Under the provisions of my bill, students would be selected for the Academy upon competitive entrance examinations as prescribed by the Secretary of State. Each diplomatic cadet will be expected to sign an agreement signifying his willingness to accept an appointment and serve as an officer in the Foreign Service for at least 3 years following his graduation.

The establishment of a Foreign Service Academy will be a significant step forward in vitalizing the diplomatic service of the United States. This should not be the end, but rather the beginning. Congress must also consider granting realistic and adequate funds for the maintenance of our Foreign Service, so that capable Foreign Service officers will not be impoverished in the performance of their duties.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That this Act may be cited as the "United States Foreign Service Academy Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in or near the District of Columbia, a United States Foreign Service Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") for the instruction and training of diplomatic cadets in preparation for service as officers in the Foreign Service of the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) The Academy shall be under the general supervision of the Director General of the Foreign Service Institute and under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

(b) The course of instruction and training for diplomatic cadets at the Academy shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State and shall be the equivalent of the curriculum prescribed by accredited colleges and universities as a prerequisite to the granting of a master's degree. Upon satisfactory completion of the prescribed course of instruction and training, diplomatic cadets shall be granted a master's degree.

(c) The Secretary of State may appoint or assign such officers and civilian instructors as the needs of the Academy require.

SEC. 4 (a) The corps of diplomatic cadets shall consist of such individuals as may be selected and admitted to the Academy upon competitive entrance examinations as prescribed by the Secretary of State.

(b) Diplomatic cadets while in attendance at the Academy shall be entitled to quarters and subsistence.

SEC. 5. There shall be appointed each year a Board of Visitors to the Academy which shall consist of five members from the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and five members from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the respective chairmen of such committees. The Board of Visitors shall exercise the same functions and be entitled to the same expense allowance as is provided in the case of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 6. Each diplomatic cadet selected for admission to the Academy shall sign an agreement that, unless sooner separated, he will—

(1) complete the course of instruction at the Academy; and

(2) accept an appointment and service, as an officer in the Foreign Service for at least the three years immediately following the granting of his degree from the Academy.

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

## The Growing Intrusion of the National Government in the Field of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Growing Intrusion of the National Government in the Field of Education," written by Allen P. Burkhardt, superintendent of schools, and president of the Junior College, Norfolk, Nebr.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT'S VIEW ON THE GROWING INTRUSION OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

I would like to talk about the growing intrusion of the National Government in the field of education.

Let me put the case to you squarely—without prejudice—and with a full realization that time never stands still.

In recent years, the Congress has entertained legislation which called for National Treasury appropriations for school construction and for teacher salaries. These bills did not pass, but they are certain to be reintroduced. There is heavy pressure behind them.

Their passage would represent a basic change in the traditional philosophy of education in this country which dates back about 170 years.

Throughout our history, the American people have strongly adhered to the philosophy of popular education for all our citizens. During colonial times and during the early days of our Republic our schools were maintained by religious bodies, voluntary secular groups, and families who clubbed together to board a teacher around the neighborhood for the benefit of their children.

It was very early, however, that a public responsibility for education came to be recognized. We find the first evidence in New England where the free school was alined with the free church and the town meeting to form the third leg of what might be called a tripod of freedom.

The principle of education as a public responsibility spread from the New England colonies to others. In the second quarter of the 19th century, the movement for universal primary and secondary education led to a tremendous growth of public schools throughout the country.

State governments began to give financial support to education and to establish minimum education standards. The role of the States in education has steadily expanded ever since, although the immediate control and support of the primary and secondary school system still lies with the local school district.

The National Government stayed out of the educational picture insofar as control

was concerned; but it helped education. As early as 1785 and on later occasions, the National Government made grants of public lands to help States and Territories establish school systems. These grants were valuable assets to public education; but they did not initiate or imply a continuing national program of action for the support of education. They were in the category of single transactions. They were not in the category of continuing subsidies.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTROLS THAT WHICH IT SUBSIDIZES

The proponents of National Government intervention in public education today will tell us that times have changed, and that only a dinosaur mind would resist the appropriation of Federal funds for school construction, teachers' salaries, and other costs of schooling. They ignore or at least scoff at a Supreme Court decision which declares that the National Government may control that which it subsidizes. Those of us who say that Federal subsidy of education will lead to centralized control of education—with textbooks written by Washington bureaucrats—are brushed off as calamity howlers and croaking ravens of despair.

They will point to the fact that the National Government is already contributing to public education but is not attempting to control its direction. They raise the point that if a little Federal aid is a good thing, why not more of it?

They argue that Treasury funds help support agricultural extension programs and agricultural research at many colleges and universities; that the Reserve Officers Training Corps is federally supported. So are defense research contracts with colleges and veterans' education programs. And as for building schools—why—the argument is that the National Government built a lot of them in the 1930's and has built others since in areas especially affected by Federal activities. And what about the school lunch program?

In the end, they sum up their case by triumphantly challenging anyone who opposes Federal intervention in education by asking where the element of control comes in.

It all sounds plausible to those who have not taken the trouble to examine the facts. Those of us who work in the field of education know full well that control always accompanies gifts or loans of money. It is right that this is the case. No Government agency should "give away" the taxpayers' money without knowing what happens to it. Dr. Ward G. Reeder, professor of education at Ohio State University, an eminent authority in the field of school administration, in his book "The Fundamentals of School Administration," says: "For anyone to advocate Federal aid without Federal control is to advocate nonsense; a certain amount of Federal control has always followed Federal aid and, as the present writer believes, a certain amount of it should."

Let us take a brief look at these existing programs of so-called Federal aids to education and at the U.S. Office of Education.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION: A CLEARINGHOUSE FOR IDEAS

The U.S. Office of Education conducts research, provides information and service to school authorities and to Government agencies in the United States and abroad, compiles and publishes statistics and bulletins and performs varied service activities. It exercises little or no control over the schools because it has no general aid funds to distribute.

It administers the temporary programs of financial assistance for school construction in federally affected areas. It also administers grants to States in support of resident instruction at land-grant colleges and the program of aid to vocational education. As of today, vocational education is tied to general education more closely than it used to be, but the Federal program grew largely from a national concern about the shortage of trained labor in 1917—the year we entered World War I. As a result, the National Government provided grants-in-aid to the States for the salaries and training of teachers of agricultural, trade and industrial and home economics subjects in public schools.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FINANCED MOSTLY WITH STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS

Subsequent laws have broadened the scope of vocational aid. Total annual grants now amount to around $37 million, distributed among several categories.

In the fiscal year 1957, Federal grants accounted for only 19.4 percent of total public expenditures for vocational education. The States contributed 35.4 percent and local governments 45.2 percent. For every dollar the Federal Government is spending, the States are spending $1.62 and local government $2.32.

Compared with their Federal grants, 10 States spend over 5 times as much State and local funds, and 21 States spend more than 4 times as much. The two lowest spending States, Maine and New Hampshire, pay $1.90 of State and local funds for every $1 grant received from the Federal Government. Many of the States with low per capita income are spending heavily for vocational education.

It is apparent the States and localities have already assumed the major responsibility for supporting vocational education.

Most of the existing federally aided programs have matured, and might well benefit from closer integration with the general educational programs in the States and localities.

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee of Governors and Federal Officials, appointed by President Eisenhower last fall unanimously agreed that this vocational function of education should be returned to the States along with tax sources to support it. The administration has concurred in this viewpoint.

The key point is that the Federal vocational education program was designed to promote certain skills and not education generally. That is important to keep in mind. It is also important to note that the need for Federal aid in the fields of vocational homemaking and vocational agriculture has long since disappeared but the aid, with its accompanying control, continues to come. The control comes through the State, but it stems from Washington. The control is definite and in detail, regulating the course of study, length of class periods, qualifications and activities of the teachers, etc. It is also significant to note that the per student cost figures in vocational agriculture and vocational homemaking are among the highest, and in many schools the highest, of any subject in the curriculum.

FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS CONSTITUTE A SPECIAL CASE

It is also important to keep in mind that Treasury funds for schools in federally affected areas constitute a special case and have nothing to do with education generally. The program dates back to 1941 when Federal activity in the interest of national defense began to alter the character of various communities. Quiet communities suddenly found themselves the center of roaring activity as defense plants moved in.

The program, as it presently exists, recognizes the obligation of the National Government to support education in areas where increased school enrollment arising from activities of the National Government places a substantial and continuing burden on local school districts.

Business and civic groups which resist general Federal aid have endorsed this assistance to federally impacted areas as a necessary part of our defense effort. They know that many such areas cannot meet the sudden demands for school expansion and that the problem is often aggravated by the tax-exempt status of Federal property.

Conditions of eligibility for Federal funds and allotment criteria are provided by law. Grants are made directly to eligible school districts, and matching is not required.

In some of these schools, however, Federal support would be unnecessary and in others could be substantially curtailed if legislation providing payments in lieu of taxes were to replace the present law. There will, however, be some districts which should have continuing support from the National Government to insure adequate education for the children of Federal defense personnel—both military and civilian.

Again, the point is that the Federal aid to schools in federally affected areas is a special case. Any argument that this program is a worthy precedent for Federal intervention generally is a thing of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

SURPLUS COMMODITY DONATIONS SHOULD CONTINUE

Now we come to the school lunch program which is often cited as an example of how benevolent a centralized government can be while at the same time keeping its hands off the control of the schools by local authorities.

Irregular emergency grants for school lunches date back to 1933. Annual donations of agricultural commodities began in 1935, and annual cash grants for balanced lunches in 1943. The primary authorization for the present program is the National School Lunch Act of 1946, under which the Department of Agriculture distributes cash and commodities to States for nonprofit school lunches, and makes cash payments directly to nonprofit private schools in the 27 States which prohibit State payments to private schools.

Let us take note that the school lunch program is administered by the Department of Agriculture—not the Office of Education. This comes to pass because the program assists in cutting down agricultural surpluses. This is the primary purpose.

I think we can all agree that surplus commodity donations should continue, but I would like to see a reduction and eventual elimination of cash grants after a reasonable period of time and let the States, localities, and parents assume the full responsibility for the cash financing required.

The school lunch program has the definite merit of promoting child health, but here again, we have a case of a specialized Federal activity which can in no way be construed as a precedent for an expansion of appropriations from the National Treasury for education in general.

FEDERAL INTERVENTION IN EDUCATION IS A NEW PHILOSOPHY

The fact is that none of the long-standing education activities of the National Government have anything to do with general education. The ROTC was established in the interests of national defense. Research allotments to institutions of higher education are for the same purpose. Schools constructed in the 1930's with National Treasury funds were built to provide employment under an emergency public works program.

When closely examined, the case of the would-be interventionists in education falls flat on its face. Their alleged precedents have no real exhibit value.

THEY HAVE THEIR FOOT IN THE DOOR

Nevertheless, they have their foot in the door, and they are a force with which to be reckoned. They made definite gains in 1958. The last Congress was in a mood of intense concern about the sudden advent of the space age. It considered a variety of emergency programs to balance off the challenge of the Soviet sputniks.

In a sort of panic atmosphere the administration proposed scholarships and loans to high-ability youth and grants-in-aid to the States—which the States were to match—to improve the quality of instruction in science, mathematics, and foreign languages and to encourage statewide setups for testing, counseling, and the guidance of all teenagers.

Other proposals to accelerate the training of needed manpower included programs in foreign language training, with special language centers for the teaching of the more rare languages. They also included Federal fellowships to encourage the establishment and expansion of graduate schools and institutes at selected colleges for the further training of language teachers and guidance counselors.

Still other programs proposed as emergency defense measures were those to explore the possible uses of radio, television and other media to improve instruction, a system of area vocational technical schools, a new science information service and a better system of collecting statistics about education from the several States.

Altogether, the National Defense Education Act authorized 12 different programs, all presumed to meet the stated purpose of "insuring trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States." In signing the act, the President said it "is an emergency undertaking to be terminated after 4 years."

There are grave suspicions that it will not be terminated after 4 years or after 14 years. This sort of thing has an unfortunate way of becoming engraved in national policy, and the powers of the National Government under the National Defense Education Act are tremendous, even if uncertain at this date. That is why the close observers of National Government policies opposed it during its consideration by the Congress. There is suspicion about this new law, if for no other reason than it advocates of permanent Federal intervention see it as a step in their direction.

LOCAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION HAS SUCCEEDED

The best argument against such permanent Federal assumption of responsibility for education is the faith in and success of local-State government in this field. And local control of education has succeeded. In fact, we Americans have evolved the best system of education ever developed through the diverse approaches of the 48 States.

I have nothing against change, if change will actually mean progress. But there is no evidence that a change to Federal responsibility in education would represent anything but deterioration—deterioration in local effort and determination to have good schools.

The strength of this country springs from the fact that America is a Republic. The Constitution guarantees to each State the right of a republican form of government.

The phenomenal growth and development of this continent was achieved without the benevolent direction of centralized government.

Our per capita income is greater than that of any other nation. Our educational system is the admiration of the world. Only recently Britain has been examining our junior and senior high-school system with a view to adapting it to its own needs.

STATE AND LOCAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION, ONE OF OUR MOST PRIZED TRADITIONS

The trend throughout the world is toward centralized decision making—toward collectivism—and we ourselves have been edging in that direction for several decades. But collectivism breeds servility and stagnation. It has never worked anywhere, any place, in all recorded time of men.

What shall we do? Trade in a proven pattern of success for a pattern of acknowledged failure?

That is what we are being asked to do. National Treasury support for public schools would be a critical step in that direction.

The American people can take pride in the accomplishments of State and local governments in the continued extension of educational opportunities. Financial support has, on the whole, been generously provided and standards have steadily risen, even in the less wealthy States. There is ample reason to regard State and local control of education as one of our most prized traditions.

It is beside the point and completely unnecessary to justify a national interest in education solely upon considerations of national defense or population mobility.

There is nothing incompatible between the national interest in an educated citizenry and our tradition of leaving responsibility for general public education to the States. The national interest in education, like many other national objectives, is best served by State and local administration and control. National action related to general public education is best confined to research, advisory, and clearing-house functions.

It remains to apply these general considerations to existing Federal programs and to any present or anticipated shortages in elementary- and secondary-school facilities.

MORE STUDENTS, MORE TEACHERS, MORE NEW CLASSROOMS

Rapidly expanding communities have necessarily experienced some lag in getting schools built for their increasing enrollment, but the overall story of progress in education by local means is indicative of energetic leadership and widespread support.

I do not wish to clutter up this presentation with too many figures, but I would like to point out that school enrollments increased from 25.1 million in 1950 to 32.8 million in 1957. This was an increase of more than 30 percent. Nevertheless, the pupil-teacher ratio declined from 27.5 to 26.2. In other words, the teachers employed increased from some 917,000 to 1,254,000—or almost 37 percent.

This remarkable expansion of the teaching corps was achieved at the same time that the average salary of teachers was raised from $3,010 in 1949–1950 to $4,650 in 1957–58.

We expanded the Nation's teaching force by more than one-third, while at the same time increasing the average teacher salary by more than 50 percent—and during this period built almost half a million new classrooms. This is an amazing achievement. It has not been duplicated either in the world of business or in other fields of government.

Who did it? People did it. Localities did it. States did it. The National Government did not do it.

This achievement most certainly does not suggest any lack of will or ability on the part of the States and their communities to maintain good school systems.

On the contrary, it reveals a degree of leadership and a willingness to employ local and State resources for school purposes, that denies any justification for "a massive infusion of Federal funds to be used by the States and localities for teachers' salaries and to build classrooms" as recommended in September 1958 by the National Education Association.

POPULATION INCREASE CAUSES SOME GROWING PAINS

Educational facilities vary widely from State to State, from community to community. This situation intensifies the problems, found in some States, that stem from marked disparities in the size and resources of local school districts.

A number of States have reorganized their school systems to eliminate districts too small and too poor to do an adequate job. The consolidation of uneconomical school districts needs to be speeded in the interests of economy and the improvement of educational standards.

Consolidation should be supplemented by effective equalization procedures or other devices under which the State enables poorer districts to carry on an adequate school program. In addition, the State should help finance both current operations and capital outlays for buildings when the locality clearly lacks enough resources to provide them. Many States are now doing this.

Some States have severely restricted the taxing and borrowing powers of their subdivisions. Many of these restrictions, and some of the limits the States have imposed on their own taxing and borrowing powers, will, if not modified, deprive school systems of the increased capital outlays and operating revenues required during the next decade. The States should modify these constitutional and statutory limitations that impede effective State and local action.

The proper course for State and local governments is quite clear. Good schools are essential to the national welfare: The most important resource of the United States is not its soil, minerals, climate, or extent of territory, but its citizens.

STATES HAVE CAPACITY TO MEET EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

The States do have the capacity to meet their educational requirements. This is a proven fact. Every State in the Union, and probably every school district in the United States is in better financial condition than is our Federal Government. Federal aid to the schools of America would either increase deficit spending or Federal taxation and speed the inflationary trend. With financial aid would eventually come Federal control. Any degree of Federal control over education would be disastrous to our tradition of local authority and State responsibility.

If adequate educational opportunities were possible only through a program of Federal financial assistance, the decision would be clear. But it does not follow that Federal aid is the way to get good schools. Under any moderate program of aid, the amount going to individual States would not be large enough to count effectively. And Federal aid in an amount sufficient to mitigate the problem significantly would result in such undermining of State and local responsibility as to endanger seriously the kind of educational system that has served America so well.

Our lawmakers in Washington can serve us best by putting Federal participation in education and other fields which can best be honored by the States and local communities. They might better devote their energies toward the balancing of the budget and the saving of our economic system through halting the inflationary trend.

Local and State governments can, should, and, in my opinion, will make the wisest decisions—and adequate provision—for the best development of education.

## The Birthday of Amerigo Vespucci, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the birthday of Amerigo Vespucci, though it is not quite certain that he was born on March 9, and even the year of his birth, thought to be 1652, does not go without question by the historians. But these doubts are quiet,

peaceful matters compared to the controversies that have raged as to what discovering the famous explorer ever actually did, and whether discrepancies that appear in his accounts of his voyages are due to falsification, faulty memory, or several slips of Vespucci's pen, or whether transcribers and editors of Vespucci's letters, the originals of which no longer remain for our inspection, may have mistranscribed his figures so as to make him seem to sail right through the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific, without benefit of canal, and southward well into the Continent of Antarctica. But for all that, we honor the one whom we may call our national and continental godfather, the navigator and explorer, who, like Columbus, was of Italian birth and sailed in the service of Spain—except for one voyage for Don Manuel of Portugal. If, like Captain John Smith after him, he constructed a magnificent myth with himself as its hero, let us still gladly recognize the magnificence of the myth, and the narrative skill and geographic grasp of the writer. For it was surely Amerigo Vespucci who, by his writings as popularized by Martin Waldseemüller, brought home the new world to the hearts and minds and imaginations of the people of Europe, and roused the young ambitions of the boys who became the explorers and colonists of the next generation.

---

## Address by Hon. James C. Davis of Georgia at the Virginia Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Richmond, March 7, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I present a speech delivered by Representative JAMES C. DAVIS of Georgia at the Virginia Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Richmond on March 7, 1959.

Today our Government and the Constitution upon which it is founded are under heavy attack. It comes in a form which was anticipated by one of your greatest fellow citizens, the Father of our Country, General and President George Washington. In his farewell address on September 17, 1796, he said:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way in which the Constitution designates—but let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

The threat to our Constitution comes from activities of the Federal Supreme Court. The trend of the Supreme Court, as presently constituted, has been to flaunt the law and the Constitution; to regard the whole body of the law as an uncharted sea; to arrogate unto themselves complete authority to make law as they think it should be made. These would-be reformers want to write the law to conform with their own perverted ideas of what law should be instead of what it is. They want to read into the Constitution alleged meanings which no lawyer or judge or layman ever read into that document in the history of the country before.

In the 17-year period beginning with 1929, that Court rendered 28 favorable decisions to defendants who were either Communists or charged with subversive activities. This is the Court which struck one of the hardest blows at our Constitution in the school segregation decision of May 17, 1954. I want to talk some tonight about this case, where all pretense at following the law was dropped; where its decision was in effect that changing times and conditions required a changed interpretation of the 14th amendment, and, they said we therefore change it. The people of my State, and I believe the people of your State, do not intend to see our constitutional rights struck down by judicial dictatorship. We shall resist it by every legal means.

I have not come tonight to talk about what cannot be done. I have come to speak of what can be done—what is being done—and to repeat the age-old truism that where there's a will, there's a way. I know of no better philosophy than the motto of David Crockett: "Be sure you are right, and then go ahead." I am convinced that when right is challenged by arrogant authority, a bold defense of that right will rally to its cause the support of the people. I well remember the occasion in Georgia when a President of the United States declared himself against the reelection of our senior Senator who had refused the demand of that President to pack the Supreme Court. In ringing words, the Senator said: "Mr. President, I accept the challenge." The people of Georgia rallied to his side and returned him to the Senate with a tremendous majority.

The arrogant brutality of Mr. Eisenhower in running roughshod over the citizens of Little Rock with his paratroopers so crystalized sentiment in Arkansas that they did the almost unheard of thing to re-elect a Governor of the State for a third term, and to defeat an eight-term Member of the United States Congress with a write-in candidate. For the first time in the State's history the gubernatorial candidate carried all its 75 counties.

The answer to the threat which you people face in Virginia, and which my people in Georgia face, is first, to satisfy ourselves that we are in the right; second, to firmly resolve that we will support and defend that right; and third, to organize with all who believe as we do and then work together with all the energy and determination we possess to win the battle.

The most effective method, I think, of protecting ourselves against the fraudulent destruction of our constitutional rights is for the great mass of American people who believe in constitutional government to organize for the purpose of preserving it, to alert and convince our people of the need for active, continuous, cooperative effort to stop this encroachment upon our liberties. It is of the utmost importance that we all realize this need for organized, unending, cooperative effort, and that we make it our number one goal and objective until we have brought a stop to this Federal encroachment upon our States' rights and local control of our own affairs.

I can tell you, and I do tell you, that our people in Georgia have resolved that we will never surrender the control of our schools to a judicial dictatorship operating in Washington. When the fraudulent and outrageous school desegregation decision was foisted upon us in 1954, Georgia's people said—there will be no integration in Georgia schools. To this good day there has not been the first instance of integration in Georgia schools. The determination to resist is as strong in the hearts of Georgians today as it was when they resisted the carpetbaggers of the reconstruction era, and again when they declared their determination to resist modern carpetbaggers and modern reconstruction in 1954.

You Virginians do not have to look to Georgia, however, or to Arkansas, to point you the way. Within the borders of your own State, the determined people of Front Royal, Va., have shown you and the country one solution to the problem. The Communists, the NAACP with its multitude of Red front officers and members, that queer aggregation known as the ADA, aided and abetted by the local quislings and traitors, have all been loudly proclaiming that Front Royal children must go to integrated schools. But the good people of that community are going right along day by day operating their own schools in the way they have chosen to do. It is to their everlasting credit that, when the day came upon which the judicial dictatorship said Negro children would mix and mingle with white children in their high school, not one white child entered the schoolhouse door. The pickaninnies found themselves still as far from association with the whites as they were before the Supreme Court undertook to amend the Constitution in 1954.

The Front Royal people have simply accepted a fact which we all will realize when we look it in the face. It is this: that in the long run, whether public or private, the cost of operating schools is going to have to be paid by the white people of the country.

If the worst comes to worst, and the public schools are closed, white people will adjust themselves to the situation and educate their children in private schools, and bear the cost of operating them. There may be some Negro private schools set up. I am confident that good white people will help the Negroes whose aim is an education for their children and not social equality. I am confident also that Negroes of the NAACP persuasion, whose aim is not education, but social equality, will have to go someplace like Philadelphia, Chicago, New York City, or Washington. And when they get there, they will still find that the same feelings of race pride exist, that white people will move out rather than accept race mixing, and that they have been following a will-o-the-wisp and have been led astray by the false doctrine first expounded by the Communist Party when it proclaimed its platform at its national convention on May 26, 1928.

You will recall that just 8 days after the Supreme Court's constitutional amendment on May 17, 1954, the District of Columbia School Board ordered the schools to be opened the following September as integrated schools. President Eisenhower, eager to pander to those he thought controlled the Negro bloc vote, announced that Washington integrated schools would be a model for the Nation, a showcase for the country. The schools were integrated as ordered. But that which was advertised to be a model for the Nation to follow when and if it knuckled under to the judicial dictators turned out to be a monumental failure, a horrible nightmare.

Appalled by the tragic possibilities which they knew awaited their boys and girls under this rotten social experiment, white fathers and mothers of school-age children began a mass exodus out of the District of Columbia. They began to flee into the white suburbs in 1953 when the leftwing sociological Supreme Court turned the Negroes into the Washington restaurants and hotels in the Thompson Restaurant case. The handwriting on the wall was clear. The school cases were pending, and the first year 20,000

white people moved out. The next year the mass exodus increased to 33,000; the following year the outmigration had swelled to 42,000. In 1957, only 6,000 fled but by July 1, 1958, another 22,000 moved out, making a total loss to the District of Columbia of 123,000 white residents in 5-year period following the Supreme Court-Eisenhower forced integration program in Washington. In the same 5-year period, while Washington's white population was decreasing 123,000, its Negro population was increasing by 98,000. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia finally got around to the point of facing facts, and on Monday of this week they issued a statement acknowledging that 53 percent of the population of the Nation's Capital are Negroes. Washington is rapidly becoming a second Harlem.

It was evident from the first that this sociological experiment was a miserable failure.

One of the immediate and obvious results of mixing the schools in Washington was that white children were held back in the schools because the Negro children showed they could not keep the educational pace. As early as June 10, 1955, the U.S. News & World Report announced that white people were moving out of Washington to nearby Virginia in great numbers; the exodus of white people from Washington had resulted in a public school system in June 1955, of 61 percent Negro pupils and 39 percent white. The same magazine, 6 months later on November 25, 1955, reported that Negroes were pouring into Washington and white families leaving in droves, with the result that at that time 64 percent of the students were Negroes and only 36 percent white.

In 1956, 2 years after the schools were mixed, the House District of Columbia Committee set up a subcommittee and charged it with the duty of investigating the District of Columbia integrated public school system. I was chairman of that subcommittee. The tragic facts of the school situation had been concealed behind an iron curtain in Washington. The radical NAACP and other sponsors of integrated schools, including the notoriously radical newspaper, the Washington Post, wanted desperately to keep the facts concealed. They made frantic efforts to prevent our subcommittee from functioning. The NAACP sent telegrams of protest to the President, to the Democratic candidate for President, to the Speaker of the House, to the Democratic and Republican floor leaders in the House, to each member of the House District of Columbia Committee and others. The NAACP held protest meetings in Negro churches in Washington. Never have I seen such desperate and frantic efforts made to prevent a duly constituted committee of Congress from performing its function.

We let nothing stop us, however, and when the facts were uncovered, it was easy to see why proponents of mixed schools wanted to keep the facts secret. We brought before us witnesses best qualified to give the facts.

Our witnesses consisted solely of members of the school board, officials such as the superintendent of the school system, assistant superintendents, principals, and teachers. We had white witnesses and Negro witnesses. We had witnesses in favor of integration and witnesses opposed to integration. The testimony showed that, from the standpoint of mentality, the Negro pupils were not able to keep pace with the white children in the schools. That resulted in lowering the education standards.

We learned from accurate comparisons based upon recognized achievement tests, known as the Iowa Achievement Test, Standard Achievement Test, and IQ tests, that there was a very wide difference in scholastic achievement and mental ability between white and Negro pupils. To illustrate, we found that in Cardozo school, with 6 white and 1,694 colored pupils, there were 512 pupils in the tenth grade; 230 of that 512 were able to read only from fourth grade to seventh grade level; more than 300 were able to work arithemetic only at seventh grade level or below; and 283 of the 512, which is 55 percent, were classified as being in a category which would never be able to achieve beyond the sixth grade level.

One teacher in Roosevelt High School, with a class about 75 percent colored, said she had more failures in 1 year of integrated teaching than she had in 10 years of teaching in a segregated school.

The assistant superintendent in charge of all high schools testified that in 4 high schools, with a total of 8 white students and 5,011 colored students, these 4 colored high schools tested under the Iowa Achievement Test rated or scored in the lowest 5 percent of schools taking this test across the entire Nation.

Time does not permit me to give you the detailed results of these achievement and IQ tests. They are set forth in detail in the committee report, and it will be my pleasure to send a copy of that report to anyone furnishing me his name and address.

Testimony of many of the teachers showed that the Negro pupils, because of low achievement and mental ability, required so much time and attention that the white pupils had to be neglected, and failed to receive the time and attention they would have had otherwise.

I have given you just a few examples of testimony concerning scholastic achievement and mental ability of Negro pupils in the Washington schools. This testimony is typical of the bulk of testimony we took for 9 days from school officials, principals, and teachers.

Such conditions, of course, retard able pupils. They have a disastrous effect upon children from an educational standpoint. Yet, there is far more involved in this matter than just the educational problem. There is a human side and a moral side. This means even more in shaping and influencing the lives, the character, and the future of our children, which furnishes additional and imperative reasons for our insisting upon segregation in schools.

Among other objections to this close association with Negro children are the important matter of health, the Negroes' high crime rate and disrespect for law, the lower mentality level, and the high rate of illegitimacy among Negroes. It is well known that the crime rate among Negroes far exceeds that of whites. Washington, D.C., is noted for the great number of serious crimes committed within its limits. Its crimes of violence are more than twice the number committed in Boston, a city of comparable size; more than twice of those committed in Milwaukee; and, nearly twice those in New Orleans, La.

Negroes are responsible for this high crime rate. Over the years, they have averaged committing 82 percent of the major crimes in Washington, and during some periods the percentage has gone as high as 88 percent. The current rate of Negro illegitimacy in Washington is that more than one out of four births is illegitimate; Negroes constitute 87.1 percent of the names on the relief rolls, and the current reports of venereal disease in the District of Columbia show that, of total cases reported during the past year, 220 were white and 9,126 were colored.

These are repulsive statistics, but they show some of the impelling reasons for segregated schools. They show what an unspeakable tragedy it is for white children to have integration forced upon them.

We asked about personal relations between white and colored pupils, both as to pupils of the same sex and pupils of the opposite sex.

Practically without exception, the testimony was that dances, plays, senior proms, picnics, and similar social functions were discontinued when the schools were integrated.

At Roosevelt High School, where white and colored were about equally divided, it was necessary to discontinue girl cheer leaders and use only male cheer leaders because of remarks and incidents which occurred at the basketball games.

The testimony was that Negro girls were antagonistic to white girls, and did such things as stepping on their heels in the halls, sticking pins in them; a Negro girl would stand in the aisle and dare a white girl to pass her. A group of Negro girls attacked a white girl on the way home from school and inflicted personal injury upon her.

They testified that similar personal antagonism existed between Negro boys and white boys. At McKinley High School a group of Negro boys attacked two white boys who had been circulating a petition opposing an integrated prom. They beat them horribly and left one of the boys unconscious on the sidewalk. Fourteen stitches were required to sew the wounds inflicted inside this boy's mouth. His father brought him to the Capitol so that I could see the serious injuries he received.

There were numerous fights, beatings, stabbings, etc. The principal of McFarland Junior High School testified that, although it was never necessary to call for police assistance when operating segregated schools, in the last school year in his integrated school, he had to call for police assistance approximately 50 times to prevent fights and keep order.

Many of the witnesses testified as to obscene remarks, obscene literature, indecent proposals, indecent handling, and indecent approaches of Negro boys to white girls.

The principal of Roosevelt High School testified that she had two cases of Negro boys approaching white girls in her school the same week she was testifying as a witness. She said she had this trouble the preceding year, and the year before that, which was the entire period of integrated schools at the time of her testimony.

The former principal of Eastern High School swore that he retired the preceding year because of ill health brought on by conditions resulting from integrating the schools. He testified that it was necessary to require that all teachers leave their desks when the bell rang to keep order in the corridors. He said he heard colored girls at times use language that was far worse than any he had ever heard, even in the Marine Corps.

He said that fighting, including several knifings, went on continuously—that such incidents became more or less commonplace following integration; that there were more thefts in his school in 2 years of integration than he had known in all his 30-odd years of experience before; that there were many sex problems following integration; that colored boys wrote notes to white girls giving their telephone numbers and asking for the girls' telephone numbers; that colored boys touched white girls in a suggestive manner when passing them in the halls and made obscene remarks about them.

He stated that one white girl was surrounded by a group of colored students after leaving school one afternoon; that a colored boy put a knife to her back, forced her down an alley and against a wall, and while they were debating making her take her clothes off, she broke away and ran home. The principal stated that a dozen or more colored girl students became pregnant at his school during his last school year.

The principal of Jefferson Junior High School testified to 27 pregnancies in his school during the preceding year, 2 white and 25 colored.

The number of pregnancies among the colored girl pupils has created a serious problem in the high schools and the junior high schools.

The official report of the doctor at Southwest Health Center Clinic in Washington of illegitimate pregnancies during the 1956–57 school year in the junior high schools of the city of Washington is a shocking thing. Among other things that report stated that there was a rise of over 1,000 percent in the number of junior high school pregnancies in comparison with 1948–49 school year figures.

The report further states: "In the early part of the 1956–57 school year one school in Southwest reported over half of the 240 children enrolled were illegitimate." The report and exhibits attached to it tell a story of almost unbelievable and shocking conditions of health, illegitimacy, venereal disease, and assembly-line production of illegitimate children who promptly go on the relief rolls at the expense of the taxpayers.

These reports are made annually, and the last one available is almost a repetition of the report made available to the school investigating committee in 1956.

Mr. Howard West of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health stated that in the year preceding the school investigation there were 996 illegitimate babies born to girls of school age in Washington; further that it was a close estimate to say that one out of every four colored schoolchildren in the District of Columbia public schools was an illegitimate child. He furthere stated from the records of the District of Columbia Department of Health that in the year in question the total number of cases of venereal disease reported to the Department by persons of school age was 854. To bring the figures down to date, the records of that Department for 1957 show that of Negro birth more than one out of four was illegitimate.

For a long time the NAACP veiled their aims with the pretext that they wanted integrated schools for purposes of better education. They have now become so bold as to cast that pretext aside and boldly state that their objective is complete social equality. One of the Negroes who claims to represent the views of the NAACP stated in a magazine article as long ago as 1952, that the aim of the Negro is intermarriage with white people. It is a blind person indeed who is not now aware of that purpose.

School conditions in Washington for white children and white parents are pathetic today. They are worse than in 1954 and 1956. Some 10 days ago I heard a rumor that a Negro teacher in one of the Washington elementary schools had staged a play in the school in which two of the characters were husband and wife. The Negro teacher cast a little white girl in the role of the wife and a Negro boy in the role of the husband. I investigated the rumor and found it to be true. I obtained a copy of the fourth grade reading book which contained the play. This is it.

A few weeks ago, a worried father told me that a Negro boy tried to kiss his daughter; that she was able to fight him off, but he did succeed in kissing her girl companion.

One parent of a daughter in one of the Washington schools brought me this valentine from a Negro boy to his daughter, and this valentine from another Negro boy to another white girl in the same school.

It is distasteful to speak of such repulsive happenings, but you should know that if you permit this integration program to get a foothold in your State, you are opening your doors to a revolting systematic, progressive, disgusting campaign of race amalgamation.

By 1957 the mass exodus of white children out of Washington schools had become so great, the promoters of forced integration saw the need for desperate measures to stem the tide. Carl F. Hansen, then assistant superintendent of the District of Columbia school system, permitted a pamphlet to be issued in his name by the Anti-Defamation League. It was entitled "Miracle of Social Adjustment: Desegregation in the Washington, D.C., Schools, by Carl F. Hansen." It consisted of 70 pages of drivel and slanted propaganda in a labored effort to present the miserable District of Columbia integrated public school system as a system where everyone was happy and integration a huge success.

When we had our school investigation in 1956, it was obvious then to anyone with a thimbleful of brans that the parents of white children would move out of Washington as soon as they were able to, and that public schools would soon be segregated again because the pupils would all be Negroes. I so stated at the time of the investigation.

On Thursday of this week, the same Carl F. Hansen, the alleged author of "Miracle of Social Adjustment," said in a speech in Nashville, Tenn., that the Washington school system, pressured by powerful social and economic forces, is drifting back to a form of segregation.

He is quoted as saying among other things that "83 percent of the elementary schools are predominantly white or Negro, indicating clearly that if a numerical balance in enrollments does occur, it does not remain for long."

Even the notoriously radical newspaper, the Washington Post, one of the most zealous and fanatical promoters of integration in all phases of life in Washington has been forced to acknowledge, although most reluctantly, that the result is being attained which sensible people saw and tried to prevent, namely, that integrated Washington is slipping into the gutter. On Wednesday of this week, that pink newspaper, in a long editorial headed "New Form of Segregation," made this statement:

"The present problem arises because the District proper is moving very rapidly toward becoming largely a Negro city. We do not think that this sort of imbalance is good for either the white or the colored race. Certainly it is not good for the National Capital or for the District as a civic community."

Further along in the editorial, they say:

"Fortunately, there are many steps that can be taken to curb the trend toward an all-Negro District and an all-white suburbs."

They then suggest that the suburban communities share the blessings of integration by building a lot of Negro houses for Washington Negroes to move into, and to provide mass transportation to carry them to and fro.

It is unfortunate, but also true, that the integrationists' chickens are coming home to roost on the doorsteps of the radical zealots who disregarded all warnings, and who resisted all efforts to prevent the disastrous consequences of integration, which they now recognize with wails of anguish, and for which they seek to blame everyone else but themselves.

I warn you tonight that we must not accept this integrated school plan. We must defeat this fraudulent, strong-arm attempt to cram this integrated school plan down our throats. Unless we reject this school decision in toto, as certain as night follows the day, this sociological Supreme Court is going to hand down another decision holding that our marriage laws violate the 14th amendment. That decision will be the final step to mongrelize this country. The groundwork has already been laid for that decision, and it was laid in Virginia. Your State law prohibits interracial marriages. This was the case I believe in 28 of the States in this Union until Tuesday of this week, March 3, when the State of Idaho repealed its law banning interracial marriages in that State. In the Virginia case of *Naim* v. *Naim*, 87 S.E. 2d, 749, 350 U.S. 891, the Virginia Supreme Court, pursuant to Virginia law, declared invalid a marriage between a Chinese seaman and a white woman and annulled the marriage. The case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and appellant asked that Virginia's marriage law be declared unconstitutional in violation of the 14th amendment.

I do not think the Federal Supreme Court would hesitate a moment to strike down the marriage laws of Virginia and the other States now, if these sociological experts felt that public opinion would accept such a shocking decision now. They know that public opinion will not accept it now, but they saw in this case an opportunity to kick the question back and forth for a while between Washington and Richmond, to give the Communist Daily Worker, the so-called liberal press, the NAACP, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and other integrationists and mongrelizers some time in which to condition the public mind for a judicial decision striking down the last legal barrier which stands in the path of mongrelization. The Federal Supreme Court entered an order vacating the State court judgment of annulment, and sent the case back to the State court for further action, saying that it wanted additional evidence as to whether Virginia's court had jurisdiction in the case.

In rejecting this further attempt of the Federal Supreme Court to meddle in affairs belonging exclusively to the State, the supreme court of Virginia joined the supreme court of Georgia in refusing to recognize the right of the Federal tribunal to remand cases to State courts for further action where no ground for reversal was shown in the record. The Virginia supreme court on January 18, 1956, notified the Federal Supreme Court that it refused to take further action and closed the case.

But you may be sure that if the school integration question is finally settled against us, there will quickly come a Supreme Court decision declaring our marriage laws invalid.

There are some faint-hearted souls among us who say "Let's accept token integration. Let's keep our schools by admitting a few Negro children to white schools."

Do not be lulled into a sense of security by any statement we can have token integration and continue with segregated public schools. There will be no such thing as token integration. Token integration will not be approved by the Supreme Court. It will not be accepted by the NAACP. If you have any doubts on that score, settle them quickly. You are familiar with the fact that North Carolina 2 years ago inaugurated a token integration plan by admitting 11 Negro children to white schools in Charlotte, Greensboro and Winston-Salem.

On February 11 the Associated Press sent out a story headed "NAACP Trained Guns on Token Integration." It began with this paragraph:

"Negroes launched new attacks on North Carolina School laws Tuesday, filing integration suits in Federal courts at Charlotte and Greensboro, and promising more suits."

The news story further states:

"The presence of Thurgood Marshall, NAACP general counsel in both suits, hints that North Carolina—despite its token integration—may be the NAACP's next school segregation battleground."

The lengthy article concludes with this statement:

"The suits assert that the North Carolina Pupil Assignment Act, is designed to impede, rather than carry out Supreme Court integration edicts and therefore is unconstitutional."

The Richmond News Leader of February 17, 1959, carried a news item headed "Limited Integration Held Mistakened Motion."

It reported a speech by the executive secretary of the NAACP to a Negro audience of more than 2,000 in Portsmouth, Va. He urged Negro children in Virginia to apply for transfer to white schools by the hundreds. The news item stated:

"He called on them to proceed under pupil assignment laws not by twos and threes, but by hundreds. The laws can stop only so many, else they will be declared unconstitutional; so the more who apply, the more who will have to be transferred."

The notoriously radical Washington Post carried a story on February 28 headed "Wilkins Scorns Token Integration." The article stated:

"Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, declared last night that the admission of 4, or 12 or 20 Negro students can be regarded only as a beginning of school desegregation in Virginia.

"Speaking at the annual dinner at All Souls Unitarian Church, Wilkins said that it is not reasonable to expect Negro citizens to accept a few Negro students as full satisfaction of the Supreme Court ruling."

Let us not delude ourselves with any mistaken notion that this problem will be settled by token integration. Make no mistake about it; we will either have segregated schools with white students and white teachers, or we will have mixed schools with mixed students and mixed faculties. It is a decision which cannot be dodged. It must be made. When it is made, it must be carried out.

Egypt was once the center of the world. Its pyramids, the Sphinx, the tombs of its monarchs marked the grandeur of that once great nation which existed until their people became a mongrel race. The greatness of Egypt is gone forever.

Egypt will never again have the opportunity to make the choice which we have in America today. Throughout Virginia today are memorials to the courage and bravery of American patriots who struck the blow which brought freedom to the land. Almost within the sound of my voice is historic St. John's Church where Patrick Henry, speaking to men who were smarting under tyranny and oppression, with his eloquence fanned the spark of resentment smouldering in their breasts into revolution against the strongest world power of that date. In Virginia are Mount Vernon, Gunston Hall, Kenmore, Monticello, Stratford, Williamsburg, and many monuments to remind us of the architects of this Republic who, down to this day, have given us as great a degree of human liberty as mankind has ever known.

I am confident that the Virginians of today will make no decision which will stamp them as being unworthy descendants of their forebears. I am confident that we of this generation will no more accept oppression or dictatorship than they did. This principle which has come down through the ages rings as loudly in our ears as it did in theirs, that resistance to tyranny is obedience to God.

Let me say to you again that the fight is ahead of us, not behind us.

---

## Remarks by Gov. Leroy Collins to Democratic National Committee Victory Dinner, Washington, D.C., February 28, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of our oustanding leaders in American public life, a man of outstanding ability and great moral courage, and with an understanding mind, is the distinguished Governor of Florida, Hon. LeRoy Collins.

In my extension of remarks, I am pleased to include an excellent address that he made in Washington, D.C., the evening of February 28, 1959, on the occasion of the Democratic National Committee victory dinner.

Governor Collins well said:

While, in a legislative sense, ours is a nation of laws and not of men, it is men who make, interpret, and execute the laws. It is men who supply the character, competence, courage, and leadership to make government a vital, living force.

With the courage he displays, Governor Collins is one who could well make that statement.

REMARKS BY GOV. LEROY COLLINS

We are here tonight, Democrats from all across America, especially to honor the new Democratic Governors and Senators and Congressmen who were elected in that grand landslide of 1958.

I have found that the greatest single reason for the success of any candidate for any office is the inherent ability of the candidate, himself.

So, to all of these new Democratic officials I would like to say: "Congratulations. You deserve praise for your own success."

I also subscribe to the old-fashioned idea that at every Democratic meeting there should be a profession of faith in the principles under which our party has succeeded down through the years.

So, let us here reaffirm first the basic proposition that the Democratic Party trusts the people. This is the heart of our democracy and the impelling force within a sound, liberal approach to Government.

One cannot understand and trust people without also becoming sympathetic to their needs and aspirations.

If a government, if a political party is truly sympathetic to popular needs, it must possess the ability constantly to think in new terms.

The Democratic Party over the years has shown a willingness and an ability to move forward, to change with changing conditions, to stay abreast of the people and their needs.

This is what welds our Democratic Party so closely with the broad masses of the American people. This is why the Democratic Party historically has been the people's advocate rather than their referee, their partisan rather than their patron.

We know that to succeed we must speak for the public interest rather than for the largest possible collection of special interests.

On the other hand, the Republican Party, with its face turned in concern toward the past and its thoughts preoccupied with where the Nation has been, rather than opportunities which are at hand, has failed to put itself in tune with the aspirations of a growing and maturing people.

The uneasiness which stirs Americans these days is the feeling that our national administration, at a crucial time in history, is not measuring up to changing responsibilities.

To the average American, our National Government seems committed to a course which assumes that the cold war is a permanent state of affairs, to be fretted over and heavily financed with high taxes, but beyond power of solution.

And, clearly, they want leadership to get us on another course—not merely one which offers hope for survival, but one which gives assurance of triumph for mankind.

The people call not only for new missiles but, more loudly, for new ideas.

They realize that the current world conflict ultimately will be won or lost in the school classroom, that our first line of defense requires brilliant minds not just to forge new weapons but to fashion new ways to avoid war.

In our domestic affairs this one nation indivisible, to which we pledge so much allegiance, is in truth badly divided.

In the civil rights controversy, for example, we seem to be stuck behind entrenched positions, quaking in our political boots, with our long-range artillery trained on each other, fearful even to seek honorable, sensible adjustments through political processes, which have always been our shield against civil deterioration and self-destruction.

Today, the American people just cannot see and feel executive leadership which is competent to find proper answers—leadership all the people can follow with hope and faith.

Few occupants of the White House have so profoundly understood that office as Franklin Roosevelt, who said:

"The presidency is not merely an administrative office. It is preeminently a place of moral leadership.

"All our great Presidents were leaders of thought at times when certain historic ideas in the life of the Nation had to be clarified."

Now is, indeed, such a time.

While, in a legalistic sense, ours is a Nation of laws and not of men, it is men who make, interpret and execute the laws. It is men who supply the character, competence, courage and leadership to make government a vital, living force.

So, it will not be enough for us to enter the 1960 campaign with a set of national goals shaped by our Democratic philosophy. We also must have a candidate who can convey what we stand for to the American people and satisfy them he can carry out that program.

He must be a man who has attained in his own right a solid record of achievement, for the American people will be in no mood to experiment with untried leadership.

He must be a man of impelling sincerity, for the American people will have no part of phonies in the presidency.

He must be a man of progressive outlook, for the American people will insist upon moving forward.

He must be a man of courage, vigor and stamina, for the American people will look to the White House for strength and stability.

He must be a man whose allegiance to the national interest and welfare is forceful, absolute and unquestioned; for while his roots may grow in any region, they must nourish a man whose viewpoint, whose ambitions and whose vision reach into every corner of the land and embrace all our people.

He must be an uncommon man with a common touch—a real standup man who recognizes his responsibility to all the people, all the time; whose solemn commitment to the national interest and welfare he places above self, above friendship, above section, above State, yes, above all, save his God.

He must know progress not because he has looked at the low ground left behind, but because he has been a part of the struggle for the high ground ahead.

He must know injustice not because he can place the blame for wrong, but because he has righted it.

He must know truth not because he has heard it, but because he has spoken it.

In 1960, our Nation will sorely need such a President.

Our mission, as Democrats, is to provide leadership with old ideals and new ideas and a program of progress that will thrill Americans everywhere and hearten the world.

The tasks which lie ahead, if we are to fulfill the American dream, are staggering. The responsibilities are monumental, and the consequences if we fail are appalling.

But what an exciting challenge it all is.

What a magnificent period of history in which to be Americans.

What a thrill it is to be Democrats.

## Congratulations, Tad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newsstory and an editorial from the Stroudsburg (Pa.) Daily Record of Wednesday, March 4, 1959, upon the occasion of Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER beginning his 14th consecutive term in the House of Representatives. No Pennsylvanian in history has served in either the U.S. Senate or the House longer than Congressman WALTER.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS WALTER PASSES 26 YEARS IN CONGRESS

Twenty-six years ago today Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Easton Democrat, went to Congress for the first time as Representative of Pennsylvania's 15th District. Like the man who came to dinner, he's still there.

WALTER is currently ninth in individual Democratic seniority and seventh in group seniority in the House. Among both Democrats and Republicans, he ranks 12th in House seniority.

No other Pennsylvanian in history has served in either House or Senate for as long as WALTER.

The 15th District includes Monroe, Carbon, and Northampton Counties. Its 1950 population of 276,574 persons has increased considerably since the last census.

WALTER, who will be 65 in May, seriously considered not running for reelection last year because of his health. His friends persuaded him to return to Congress.

That he ranks high among his fellow legislators is indicated by the fact he heads the important House Committee on Un-American Activities as chairman.

He is also a member of the House Judiciary Committee and the Joint Senate-House Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

A long-time fighter against communism, he has been frequently criticized—and praised—for the actions of the Un-American Activities Committee.

He was not always so alert to the dangers of Communist expansion, however. Speaking at the annual dinner of the Four-County Firemen's Association in East Stroudsburg last summer, WALTER recalled that he once voted against funds for the very committee he now heads.

WALTER is a native of Easton. He received his bachelor of arts and bachelor of law degrees from Georgetown University.

During his college career, he was a member of Phi Delta Theta, Phi Alpha Delta and Pi Gamma Mu.

He served as Northampton County solicitor from 1928 to 1933 and is a veteran of World Wars I and II. He has decorations from several foreign governments.

WALTER still maintains a law office in Easton. In addition, he is a director of the Easton National Bank and vice president and director of the Broad Street Trust Co. of Philadelphia.

Since he has been in Congress, he has served as chairman of the Democratic caucus; chairman of the subcommittee on immigration and naturalization; chairman of the House patronage committee and member of the Government security commission in addition to his present committee assignments.

He was elected Speaker pro tempore of the 81st Congress and has served on the postwar economic policy and planning and select European aid committees, the latter of which did the ground work for the Marshall plan.

He also served as representative of the United States and spokesman for the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants From Europe, designed to relieve overpopulation of European countries by migration to countries needing population.

Walter is a member of the Loyal Order of Moose, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, Elks, Sons of the American Revolution, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American and Pennsylvania Bar Associations and is a member and past commander of the Amvets.

Among his awards are:

Americanism Award, Catholic War Veterans, Department of Maryland, 1957; American Bar Association award for outstanding services, 1946; Patriotic Order of Sons of America award for worthy patriotic services; life membership, American Legion, for noteworthy service to all veterans.

Outstanding citizen award, Sons of American Revolution; John Carroll Award for 1952, presented by Georgetown University Alumni Association; award, Japanese Government, 1956; Distinguished Service Medal, Pennsylvania Department, Amvets, 1957.

Golden Deeds Award, Exchange Club of Easton, 1953; award from Young Jeffersonians Democratic Club, Summit Hill, 1957, honoring him for 25 years' service in the House; Order of Orange-Nassau by the Netherlands Government for distinguished service to international migration, 1957; and certificate from the Americanism Commission of the American Legion at the 40th annual convention last year.

CONGRATULATIONS, TAD

The fact that no Pennsylvanian in history has served in either the U.S. Senate or the House longer than Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat of Easton, is a magnificent tribute both to the man and to the intelligence of the voters who have steadfastly returned him to office term after term.

Mr. WALTER begins his 14th consecutive 2-year term in office today, a record exceeded by only 11 other Members of the entire House of Representatives which now consists of 436 members. He ranks 9th in seniority among the Democrats who control the Congress.

His record is even more remarkable when viewed from a geographical standpoint. Six of the Democrats who rank above him in seniority come from the South where the Democratic candidates nominally meet only token opposition from the Republicans.

Mr. WALTER, meanwhile, was up against much stiffer competition throughout his political career. He met and defeated all comers and increased in stature with every succeeding election, dating from his first bid for a House seat in 1932.

Numerous awards and other honors have come to the veteran representative during his 26 years in office. He is chairman of the potent antisubversive House Committee on Un-American Activities, ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, chairman of the House Patronage Committee, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization and was elected chairman of House Democratic caucus by the membership.

Mr. WALTER has represented this country on various governmental missions abroad and received awards for distinguished service from both Japan and the Netherlands.

Among the many groups who have honored him nationally are the American Bar Association, Catholic War Veterans, POS of A, American Legion, Georgetown University Alumni, AMVETS, Sons of the American Revolution, Legion Americanism Commission, and others.

Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER has served his beloved 15th district well throughout his long tenure in Washington. More important, however, is the fact that he has also served his country exceedingly well. May he continue in good health so that he may add many more deeds to his long list of fine accomplishments.

## Address by Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn at Democratic National Victory Dinner, February 28, at Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an address of Democratic accomplishments made by the great American, and Mr. Democrat, our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN.

The Speaker's address, made at the Democratic national victory dinner, the evening of February 28, 1959, in Washington, D.C., clearly shows the Democratic Party is the "party of the people."

As Speaker RAYBURN well said: "It was our party that wrote into law the great reforms of the 20th century, beginning with Woodrow Wilson's "new freedom" and going forward under the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

"It was our party which successfully piloted this Nation through the dark days of the depression and the fateful struggle of World War II and its aftermath.

"And let us never forget that it was the Democratic Party, under Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, which moved this great Nation from isolation to the leadership of the free world."

There is no Member of Congress whose views carry greater weight with the people than those of Speaker RAYBURN.

ADDRESS BY SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE SAM RAYBURN

I'm mighty happy to be here tonight.

I'm always happy to break bread with Democrats of all shades of opinion and beliefs—but Democrats with a single, guiding purpose—the safety and well-being of the American people.

I never come to one of these great gatherings without a feeling of humility and gratitude for your friendship and your support through the more than half a century that I have labored as a loyal Democrat and an American lawmaker.

And I might add that the longer I serve under the Republicans, the prouder I am to be a Democrat.

I am proud to be a Democrat for many reason.

Let me list a few:

First, our party is a party with a heart.

It was our party—the Democratic Party—that created the ideal of humane government on this continent way back in the days of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

It was our party that wrote into law the great reforms of the 20th century, beginning with Woodrow Wilson's new freedom and going forward under the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

It was our party which successfully piloted this Nation through the dark days of the depression and the fateful struggle of World War II and its aftermath.

And let us never forget that it was the Democratic Party, under Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, which moved this great Nation from isolation to the leadership of the free world.

There is another reason I am proud of the Democratic Party.

It has always been—it is today—and it will continue to be—the party of responsibility. It acts and works responsibly when it is in power, and when it is in the minority, it still works responsibly for the good of the American people.

Regardless of party advantage, regardless of who is in the White House, the Democratic Party puts its responsibility to the American people first. We do not dislike the Republicans; we do not dislike Republicans who happen to be President. When we think they are acting for the good of our country, we help them; when we think they are wrong or unwise, we try to correct them.

The Republicans could profit by our example.

Today, under a Republican president, the Democratic majorities in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. Senate are still working as always as the party of responsibility.

We are charged by the American people with a heavy, and sometimes we feel, a terrible responsibility for their safety and their welfare.

We gladly accept this burden.

We are ready to meet the challenge of our times.

We welcome the opportunity to write sane, financially sound legislation to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population which has a rising productivity, requiring more homes, more highways, more schools, more factories, and more food.

We have taken, and we will continue to take, the responsibility for building the framework of laws under which we develop the atomic age and the space age.

The Democratic Party is ready to act responsibly to help our young families, our veterans, our elder citizens, and our poor to have decent homes that they can afford. We know that good homes make good citizens.

We accept the task of saving the independent farmer, of conserving our soil and water and natural resources, of bringing the blessings of electricity and good roads to those who till the soil which feeds our Nation and many underprivileged peoples in other lands.

We accept the responsibility to help the aged, the disabled, the sick, and the unemployed.

We gladly undertake the task of helping our cities to clear their slums, unsnarl their traffic, and modernize their facilities.

We have always made the promotion of trade with other nations a cardinal tenet of our democratic faith.

And let all the world know this—both inside and outside the Iron Curtain—the responsible Democratic Party is going to give the Republican President such sinews of defense that, if wisely used, this Nation cannot be driven from position to position by any power on earth, however strong. Our military posture will be made so mighty that troublemakers everywhere will decide that peace, not aggression, is the path of wisdom.

And let me make something else crystal clear.

The Democratic Party has been, and will continue to be, the party of financial responsibility. The air is full of deliberate political propaganda about reckless spending and liberal spendthrifts.

Let's look at the record:

In the Democratic 85th Congress, we appropriated $5,600,000,000 less than the Republican President asked us for.

And in the Democratic 84th Congress, we appropriated $2,300 million less than the Republican budget requested.

In the last 4 years of Democratic Congresses, we have cut $8 billion out of the Republican President's budget.

And the Washington Post on February 9 carried a news item that the President's director of the budget admitted to the House Appropriations Committee that President Eisenhower actually has asked Congress for more money than it has been willing to give him.

Now, I ask you, which party has been the party of financial responsibility?

As usual, it has been—it will continue to be—the Democratic Party.

Now let me say this: The rate of progress which we make in meeting all the Nation's problems never satisfies everybody. A lot of people say that we are going too slow; a lot of other people think we are going much too fast.

But I think the American people have proved, by their vote at the polls in three successive elections, that they like the rate of forward progress which the Democratic Congress has been making.

After only 2 years of a Republican-controlled Congress—the 83d—the American voters in 1954 elected the Democratic 84th Congress.

When it had written its record of responsible, forward-looking legislation the people voted for a Democratic 85th Congress in spite of the fact that they at the same time selected a Republican military hero as President.

Two more years we worked hard, responsibly, effectively, and submitted our record of legislation to the people. Last November they overwhelmingly elected the Democratic 86th Congress.

I think these election results prove that the American people like to have the responsible party—the Democratic Party—to make their laws, and they like the rate of speed at which we have been moving forward to meet the needs of a growing, sound and strong America.

At the polls the American voters have voiced their enthusiastic approval of the Democratic congressional program planned and put through by the splendid House leaders—JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, and the great committee chairmen, and by the brilliant leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, MIKE MONRONEY, of Montana, and the great committee chairmen.

You know, this new Republican line about reckless spending reminds me of their old propaganda line which has fallen flat. They went up and down the land in 1952 crying alarm about all the socialistic laws enacted under the New Deal and the Fair Deal. Well, they have been in the White House for 7 years now and, my friends, they have not even tried to repeal a single one of those laws that they made such a commotion about. If the Democrats were socialistic for putting them on the statute books—then the Republicans are just as socialistic for leaving them there.

I want to say something else.

Ours is the only national party, strong and active in every State, embracing people of every type of economic and political interest. All shades of opinion and belief are represented and considered in our party councils.

Being responsible men and women dedicated to our Nation's welfare, we cannot be expected to agree on everything, but we do agree on the basic fundamentals that have been the tenets of the Democratic Party from its earliest days.

So I have no patience with people who claim to be Democrats who say they want to run other people who claim to be Democrats out of the party. Let us differ; let us debate; let us struggle to have our views prevail in the party's councils.

But after that is done, and the will of the majority of Democrats is freely expressed, we will do—we must do—as we have always done. We will be good soldiers, and we will live up to the meaning of the word "democracy" by accepting the will of the majority.

I want to give you an example of how we can work together. In 1952 and again in 1956 after full discussion and arguments, the Democratic Party under wise management was able to write a platform on which all good Democrats could stand. If all of us are wise enough and generous enough, we can write such a platform in 1960, and I want to make the prediction that when we do this and when the 86th Democratic Congress writes its record of sane, financially sound legislation, the American people in 1960 will overwhelmingly elect a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress.

The responsibility of leadership of a great republic is a fearful thing anytime. Particularly is it an awesome task today, when, in my opinion, there are more forces of evil and destruction stalking the earth than at any time in 20 centuries.

But I am an optimist; if I were not, I could not have carried my burdens all these years.

I want to close on this note of faith:

We accept the responsibility for guiding this great land and its friends into the wonderful world of tomorrow.

Inspired by the memory of Jefferson, Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman, we Democrats gladly face the challenge of leading a prosperous, strong, solvent America—and with it free men everywhere—into what Woodrow Wilson foresaw long ago—"pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

United as good soldiers, we cannot fail.

---

## The Missing Rudder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Saturday, March 7, 1959:

THE MISSING RUDDER

It is time, we think, for the Democratic majority in Congress to assert the leadership that has been lacking from the administration in the looming crisis with the Soviet Union. This country and its Allies may very shortly face an extremely touchy and demanding military problem over Berlin. It will take far more than vague reassurances of bipartisanship, such as emerged from congressional leaders after their meeting with the President yesterday, to convince the Allies and the Russians that American inten-

tions are backed with carefully conceived plans. Generalizations about standing firm and rallying around the flag really do not mean very much.

Perhaps the administration is doing much more than it acknowledges publicly. If American policy were to zig every time Mr. Khrushchev zagged, the country soon would become seasick. It is easy to be too impatient and too critical. Nevertheless, the administration's public position has seemed to alternate between optimism about negotiations and the ill-considered assertion of Secretary McElroy that any war over Berlin would be of the all-out variety. With Mr. Dulles ailing, the administration gives the impression that it is operating without any consistent and thought-out guidance in this crucial area of foreign affairs. And appearances can be terribly important.

What can be done? One would think that the first thing the administration would do would be to halt the scheduled reductions in Army and Marine Corps manpower. Such moves as the prospective cut in the Strategic Army Corps from four to three divisions have a devastating psychological effect at this time. They seem to say that this country deliberately prefers all-out nuclear war to limited war, in the unhappy event that a clash should come, and is constituting its forces accordingly.

Beyond this, Adlai Stevenson has suggested in a speech in Boston that a resolute stand against interference in Berlin be coupled with exploration of a possible settlement in Europe "less unstable and explosive than the present situation," and that Democratic leaders in Congress attempt to focus public opinion. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson in an article written several weeks ago advocated the strengthening of conventional NATO forces in Europe. Senator JACKSON has called for the mobilization of four or five additional Army divisions to undergird diplomacy.

Some or all of these things may be necessary. Of course Congress cannot itself frame foreign policy or conduct negotiations, for the responsibility still rests with the administration. What it can do is urge detailed military planning for defense of land access to Berlin and any clash with the Russians, and encourage western counterproposals on the larger differences with the Soviet Union.

But the underlying need is not so much partial mobilization, however important that may become in the present siuation. It is, rather, the achievement and continuation of military parity with the Soviet Union. This is a long-range rather than a short-range problem. Ever since the first sputnik Soviet leaders have thrown their weight around. The administration has compounded its miscalculation on the significance of the earth satellite with a willingness to accept numerical inferiority in missiles and an unwillingness to prepare adequately to cope with limited war.

It is this, more than anything else, that is undercutting American diplomacy; and it is here that leadership is most necessary. Far beyond the particular crisis over Berlin, if we are to avert war and reach any sort of eventual settlement with the Russians, this will have to stem from military equality. The most important thing that Democratic leaders such as Senators JOHNSON and FULBRIGHT could do to strengthen confidence in the country's position, in this newspaper's judgment, would be to serve notice of their intention to increase the military budget so as to overcome the missile gap and provide for more adequate limited war preparedness.

## The So-Called Equal Time Section of the Federal Communications Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, section 315(a) of the Federal Communications Act has been termed "impossible" and "broadcasting's biggest headache." This is the so-called equal time section, which reads:

If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate.

I am introducing a bill today which will add the following sentence and exempt regular newscasts and news commentaries from this provision:

Appearance by legally qualified candidates on any news program, including news reports and news commentaries, where the format and production of the program are determined by the broadcasting station, or by the network in the case of a network program, and the candidate in no way initiated the recording or the broadcast, shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection.

In my mind there are good and bad things about section 315(a) as it now stands. It is good to have the equal time requirement for programs or announcements purchased by a candidate. The provision is also fair as it pertains to major candidates who appear on forum or debate programs.

The section is poor because it does not differentiate between a major party and a very minor party whose candidate or candidates have no possible chance of victory. It is poor because a station cannot delete libelous material but can be held liable. It is poor because it has been interpreted to apply to pure news reports.

My bill does not attack the problem of minor party candidates, because Congress refused several years ago to try to define this question, and it is a knotty one. My bill does not change any of the provisions pertaining to purchased programs or spot announcements nor to panel, interview or town meeting type programs. Nor does it change the "no censorship" provision.

My bill would merely ease the requirement as it pertains to legitimate news reports and news commentary. These two types of programs are the types that the Federal Communications Commission considers news programs, as defined in the report to be made by licensees to the FCC.

Many of my colleagues are aware of the recent interpretation given section 315(a) by the FCC. The Commission ruled that a Chicago television station must provide time to a mayoralty candidate in Chicago equal to the time provided the incumbent mayor—a candidate for reelection—when the mayor was shown on regular television news programs opening a charity drive and welcoming the visiting President of Argentina at the airport.

Strangely enough, this is a reversal of the FCC policy in a similar situation, in which the Commission refused to order equal time and held that—

The facts clearly showed that the candidate had in no way, directly or indirectly, initiated either filming or presentation of the event, and that the broadcast was nothing more than a routine newscast by the station in the exercise of its judgment as to newsworthy events.

It has been suggested that the Commission's recent ruling is an effort on the part of the Commissioners to force Congress to clarify this section. I have no proof of such a motive, but I do believe Congress should act to clarify the situation.

## California Veteran Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 the California congressional delegation met with the American Legion, Department of California, Rehabilitation Commission and Department Service officers to discuss the problem of adequate hospital facilities to take care of the ever increasing veteran population in California.

The following statement was delivered by Lewis S. Sloneker, director of the rehabilitation commission, following his introduction by John J. Flynn, department of California commander. Also present were Elvin R. Morgan, chairman of the California Rehabilitation Commission, and Charles R. Farrington and J. Earl Merifield, department service officers.

Mr. Sloneker's statement follows:

STATEMENT TO THE CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 2, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the California congressional delegation, we appreciate being given this opportunity to again meet with you and we bring you greetings from the American Legion, Department of California.

This is our 13th annual meeting with you. Later in the year, after our meeting with you in 1946, both the legislative and the executive branches of the Government approved for construction, a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital for the San Francisco area and one for the Los Angeles area,

a 250-bed general medical and surgical hospital for Fresno and a 200-bed general medical and surgical hospital for San Diego.

Construction of the hospital approved for the San Francisco area has been underway for approximately 1 year. Its location is on a part of the ground obtained from the Stanford University at Palo Alto. Construction of the hospital approved for the Los Angeles area was completed in April 1955 at Sepulveda, Calif. (San Fernando Valley). Construction of the hospital approved for Fresno was completed in March 1950. The hospital approved for construction at San Diego was cancelled very suddenly in January 1949 by Executive order after the site had been obtained, all plans and designs completed and the low bidder to construct the hospital had been announced.

At the time the two 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospitals were approved for construction in California on October 9, 1946, they were needed then. There were at that time approximately 3,000 war veterans in our State mental hospitals. In 1946, 16 percent of all male patients admitted to State mental hospitals were veterans. In 1952, 36 percent of all male patients admitted were veterans, and in 1958, 43 percent of all male patients admitted were veterans, and the veteran patient load today in our State mental hospitals is over 5,500. Approximately 45 percent of them came in to California from other States. For the most part, these veteran patients are having to be cared for by the taxpayers of California. This cost for their care should be the responsibility of all the taxpayers in the Nation.

At the time the two general medical and surgical hospitals were approved for construction in California they were needed then. We are thankful the one approved for Fresno was completed. It was most unfortunate, and we think unjustified that the one approved for San Diego was canceled.

WHY ARE MORE HOSPITAL BEDS NEEDED FOR VETERANS IN CALIFORNIA?

The major reasons for the need of more beds are:

1. The continuous heavy influx of veterans to California from every other State in the Nation. Literally thousands among those who formerly applied to Veterans Administration hospitals and medical clinics, in other States, now apply for such care to the Veterans' Administration in California.

3. The cancellation of 1,750 contract beds for general medical and surgical care that the Veterans' Administration formerly had with other Federal hospitals in California.

4. Failure on the part of the Federal Government to recognize and/or provide hospital and medical care facilities for veterans in California on a basis equal to what is provided for them in other States, to say nothing of its failure to provide such facilities in accordance with the need.

Disabled veterans in California who are broke, sick, and in need of hospitalization, except for tuberculosis, find it more difficult today to find an available bed anywhere than they have at any time since the close of World War II. There are 3,483 disabled war veterans in California who have been declared legally and medically eligible for hospitalization or domiciliary care on the waiting lists. The situation is so bad that private physicians are quite frequently unable to obtain a bed in a Veterans' Administration hospital for cases determined by them to be emergencies.

REPLACEMENT FOR OAKLAND VA HOSPITAL SHOULD BE 1,000 BEDS

It is quite evident that the executive branch of the Government does not intend to change its plans to eventually replace the old 712-bed (former Oakland hotel) Veterans' Administration hospital, at Oakland, Calif., with a new 500-bed hospital. This is deplorable. It should be replaced with a 1,000-bed hospital and it is very apparent that if justice is done, it will have to be by action of the Congress. It is our understanding that the President failed to request funds to construct this badly needed replacement hospital in his budget that is now being considered by the House Appropriations Committee. We understand the money for the plans and design for this hospital is all that has been requested. We urge each of you to do everything in your power to have the necessary funds appropriated for planning, design, and construction for a 1,000-bed hospital to replace the hospital at Oakland, and that the Congress direct the Veterans' Administration to get on with its construction without further delay.

NO ECONOMY IN ALLOWING VA HOSPITALS AND OFFICES TO DETERIORATE

We hope each of you will agree with us that there is no economy by continuing to allow Veterans' Administration hospitals and offices to deteriorate to where they create hazardous conditions, making them more expensive to operate, and next to impossible to keep clean and sanitary. Some of the Veterans' Administration hospitals and offices in California have been so badly neglected for so many years they need complete major overhauling or replacement.

LET'S NAME THE VA HOSPITAL AT FRESNO, THE B. W. GEARHART HOSPITAL

We wish to thank Congressman Sisk for introducing a bill, H.R. 1170, to name the hospital the B. W. Gearhart Hospital. We sincerely trust that all of you will use your best efforts in support of this bill. We believe you will agree with the American Legion that it is fitting and proper that this hospital be named in memory of one of your former members who worked so hard, with the support of you who are senior members, to obtain this hospital for the care of his fellow disabled war veterans. B. W. "Bud" Gearhart was a native son of Fresno, Calif., and Fresno was always his home. By profession, he was a lawyer, and was serving his county as district attorney when he entered military service in August 1917. He served overseas in France, was one of the founders of the American Legion, and was our department commander in 1930–31. He was a descendent of Capt. Jacob Gearhart who fought with Gen. George Washington throughout the Revolutionary War. While in Congress he was the author of the act establishing Armistice Day as a national holiday. He was loved and respected by all, whose privilege it was to know him. The citizens of Fresno and all of San Joaquin Valley will be pleased to have the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fresno bear his name.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICE, LOS ANGELES

On several of our past appearances before you, we have given you some facts and figures as to why a new building of permanent type construction should be built on Veterans' Administration property in West Los Angeles to house the entire regional office. The divided operation of the regional office is expensive, difficult to manage, and most unsatisfactory from every standpoint. The added cost of this type of operation over the 13-year period it has been allowed to exist would pay for the entire cost for constructing a permanent type building on this property, large enough to house the entire office. Added to the cost of operation and lack of efficiency is the huge turnover of personnel because of the unsatisfactory working conditions in the present building, which is known as the Douglas Building. The noise, dirt, dust, poor ventilation, and inconveniences make it an undesirable place in which to work. It is next to a disgrace to think that employees are required to work in this unsightly building under such conditions.

The General Services Administration has recommended that a new Federal building of permanent construction with space for a post office, other Federal offices, and for the entire regional office of the Veterans' Administration be constructed on Veterans' Administration land adjoining the old quonset hut now being used for a portion of the Veterans' Administration regional office. The Veterans' Administration is in complete agreement with the General Services Administration's recommendation. We wish at this time to thank Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON for his support of this recommendation and his firm stand against this property being sold or turned over to sources outside the Federal Government. We hope each of you will do your part in seeing that the Congress approves the General Services and Veterans' Administrations' recommendations and cause the necessary funds to construct this badly needed building for economy and efficiency be appropriated without further delay.

VETERANS HOME OF CALIFORNIA

In accordance with our national mandate we wish again to request your help for legislation, granting Federal aid for capital outlay on a matching basis with State funds for State veterans' homes. A majority of the States do operate veterans' homes for domiciliary and/or hospital care for disabled veterans. The Federal Government recognizes this assistance from the States by granting Federal aid subsidies in part payment for operating expense, but have failed to financially assist with capital outlay.

Our State government has been very generous in maintaining and modernizing our California Veterans Home. It is considered the finest State veterans home in the land. There are over 2,000 members, both male and female, being given domiciliary, chronic, and hospital care. The present Federal aid subsidy is $700 a year per member or patient. The Congress has recognized the added expense for such operations due to higher costs, inflation, etc., by increasing the amount of Federal aid subsidy from time to time, starting with $300 per annum per member. At present the amount of Federal aid subsidy is $700 per annum per member. It is past time when the Congress should again act by increasing the amount from $700 per annum per member to $1,000, with the proviso, of course, that Federal subsidy will not exceed 50 percent of the operating cost as has been the policy in the past. Refer to bills H.R. 1173 and H.R. 4230, SISK, of California.

All veterans admitted to State veterans homes are eligible for Veterans' Administration care. The Federal Government pays for a portion of their care. However, when a veteran dies in a Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary, the Federal Government, through the Veterans' Administration, will pay for the cost of transporting the body to any place within the continental limits of the United States for burial. The American Legion requests the Congress to make similar provisions for paying the transportation cost of the bodies of veterans who die in State veterans homes.

NEED FOR NATIONAL CEMETERY IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA

Again we appeal to you to use your best efforts in having the Federal Government provide a national cemetery in the Los Angeles area. There are over a million veterans residing in the area. The number increases by the hour. We do not know of any place in the United States with anywhere near the veteran population that is so far removed from a national cemetery. The Veterans' Administration Cemetery in West Los Angeles, where approximately 40,000 deceased veterans are buried, has very little space for future burials. Veterans who die outside of a Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary, unless their hospital care is being paid for by the Veterans' Administration in a hospital within the Los Angeles regional office territory, or their

bodies are unclaimed, are not eligible for burial in the Veterans' Administration Cemetery. Many next of kin from this area cannot afford transportation to Golden Gate Cemetery at San Bruno, near San Francisco, Calif., or Fort Rosecrans, at San Diego, Calif.

IN CONCLUSION

Tomorrow morning, Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion, and Robert M. McCurdy, chairman, National Rehabilitation Commission, will appear before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and present our proposals within the jurisdiction of the committee. We sincerely hope and request that each of you obtain copies of their statements and support the American Legion's very fair and justified request.

## Recognize the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at a time when a great number of people, particularly those living in metropolitan and industrial areas, after having read the statements of, and listened to speeches by the Secretary of Agriculture, have gotten the mistaken idea that the farmer is responsible for and has been the recipient of billions of dollars from which he received absolutely no benefit, it is indeed refreshing to come upon a statement which attempts to put the agricultural program expenditures in a true perspective.

Such a statement came to my desk over the weekend. It takes issue with the vicious attack which has been made on agricultural programs by the urban press. It labels these attacks for what they are—gross exaggerations. The statement classifies the various expenditures which have been made, and shows that the farmer has received a comparatively small amount of the appropriations made for fiscal 1959.

Finally, this statement shows that the real cost of farmers to the taxpayers stands at about $1 billion, and more important the statement concludes with the statement that "the public should recognize the true facts concerning the farmers and realize that the prosperity of the farmer is the backbone of the Nation."

The statement referred to above, and which is set out below, has been made by Daniel F. Rice & Co., 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., members of the New York Stock Exchange and other principal exchanges, in their commodity letter, under date of March 6, 1959:

COMMODITY LETTER OF MARCH 6, 1959

The urban press of the United States has unleashed a vicious attack on agricultural programs by repeatedly talking about the high cost to the taxpayer. The Congress and the general public appear to be taken in by this. The Department of Agriculture has taken hold of this tool to help push through its policy of liquidating price support programs and with them the liquidation of the American farmer.

Truly astronomical figures are bandied about. The lowest estimate of agriculture costs one hears these days is on the general order of $7 billion. It is not unusual to hear $12 or $13 billion mentioned. Another look needs to be taken. These are gross exaggerations and not much of it goes to farmers.

Agricultural appropriations for fiscal 1959 (millions of dollars) were:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Regular activities: | | | |
| Agricultural Research Service | $160.6 | C | |
| Extension Service | 63.2 | C | |
| Farmer Cooperative Service | .6 | C | |
| Soil Conservation Service | 128.6 | C | |
| Agricultural conservation program | 235.0 | C | |
| Agricultural Marketing Service | 146.0 | C | |
| (Includes school lunch) | 110.0 | C | |
| Foreign Agricultural Service | 4.0 | S | |
| Commodity Exchange Authority | .8 | P | |
| Soil bank programs | 809.5 | F | |
| Commodity Stabilization Service | 115.7 | P | |
| Federal crop insurance programs | 6.4 | F | |
| Rural Electrification Administration | 9.0 | C | |
| Farmers' Home Administration | 29.1 | F | |
| Forest Service | 130.3 | C | |
| General overhead | 7.9 | C | |
| Subtotal | | | $1,846.7 |
| Restoration of CCC capital | 1,760.4 | P | 1,760.4 |
| CCC administrative expense | 35.4 | P | 35.4 |
| Permanent appropriations: | | | |
| Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (30 percent of customs receipts.) | 235.9 | T | |
| Other | 61.9 | T | |
| Subtotal | | | 297.8 |
| Loan authorizations | 594.0 | L | 594.0 |
| Special activities: | | | |
| Agricultural Research and Marketing Service Activities | 20.1 | C | |
| Emergency Relief | 125.8 | S | |
| Public Law 480 and Barter | 1,509.7 | S | |
| Soil Bank Programs | 567.5 | F | |
| Subtotal | | | 2,313.1 |
| Grand total | | | 6,847.4 |

All of these costs in fiscal 1959 are keyed with a letter showing who really benefited. C—Consuming public; F—Farmers; S—State Department, as part of our foreign policy; L—Loans, repayable and bearing interest; P—Price programs; and T—Transfer of funds. Under the C there is $892.3 million. This went for research, teaching, disease eradication, monopoly control, school lunch, etc. Some of these programs are as old as the Land Grant College Act of 1862. These activities have enabled farmers to make the production increases that have enabled food production to keep up with population. Under the S there is $1,639.5 million that went to feed hungry people throughout the free world and advance our interests against communism. Under the L there is $594 million, sound and repayable and shouldn't be changed. Under the T is $297.8 million that is mainly customs and forest lands receipts, not costing taxpayers a dime. Under the P there is a $1,796.6 million. This went to support a vast bureaucracy, pay storage to nonfarmers on a mountainous inventory, and to take losses on commodities sold. A well run program would cost only a fraction of this amount. By no stretch of the imagination can over $850 million be considered as benefiting farmers. This leaves $1,412.5 million under the F. At the outside high, programs for the benefit of farmers cost $2.3 billion dollars. Of this, $1,377 million was for the soil bank, most of which has now been discontinued. The real cost of farmers to the taxpayers stands at about $1 billion.

Farmers got about a billion, and the consuming public got about a billion. Where did the rest go? We believe that at this time, Congress, the press, and the public should recognize the true facts concerning the farmer and realize that the prosperity of the farmer is the backbone of the Nation.

## New York Bank Bill Fosters Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the bank bill recommended by the New York Joint Legislative Committee would lead to monopolization of the State's banking resources by a handful of giant banks which, for years, have sought to achieve domination over the banking system of the State and for years have been pressing for such legislation.

It is deplorable that the joint committee reported out this bank monopoly bill without public hearings or without opportunity for its opponents to present their views. It is curious, indeed, that the New York superintendent of banks, G. Russell Clark, gave his enthusiastic endorsement to this measure after having been in office for but 1 day. The unseemly haste of the New York superintendent of banks in rubber-stamping this monopoly bill bodes ill for independent banking in New York State and for future vigorous, effective banking competition.

The bill recommended by the joint committee has two main provisions. First, it would obliterate the bank branch district line between New York City and the outlying suburban areas of Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties. Second, it would establish two bank holding districts in the State, the first consisting of New York City, Long Island and Westchester and Rockland Counties, the second, of the balance of the State. The bill would allow a bank holding company to acquire banks anywhere within the district. Beyond that, a holding company formed by a bank in the second district could acquire banks in the first district if these first district banks constituted 45 percent or less of the holding company's total assets. Thus, the bill would end the present legislative freeze on bank holding company expansion which was enacted principally to prevent First National City's proposed acquisition, via the holding company device, of the County Trust Co. of Westchester County.

The banking system of New York State traditionally has relied for its vitality on vigorous competition by a multitude of independent banks, locally organized, locally financed, and locally managed. Nevertheless, there has been in recent years a discernible trend in New York State toward concentration of the banking business into fewer and larger hands. Indeed, in New York City, the four largest banks now control over 60 percent of all commercial bank assets. What is more, the two largest—Chase Manhattan and First National City—control almost 42 percent of the city's banking assets.

Present statutory branch bank district lines were drawn 20 years ago in the shadow of the bank holiday in order to arrest undue concentration of banking facilities. The single most important reason for such geographical restrictions was to prevent banks with head offices

in New York City from establishing branches in the suburban counties of Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk and thus to protect independent unit banks outside of New York City from the encroachment of the giant money-market institutions located in the city.

Owing to the increase in concentration among the city's banking institutions in the past 20 years, it is even more important now to guard against the encroachment that would be permitted by the bill. There seems to be little doubt that if giant banks in New York City are allowed to penetrate into the suburban areas, the small unit banks there would be placed in far greater jeopardy. For one thing, their means of competing would be hardly comparable to those available to their huge city rivals. Indeed, to suppose that entry by the giant financial institutions of New York City into the suburban areas might have no adverse competitive effect on the independent banks located in these areas is to suppose that a chicken could dance with an elephant and come out unharmed. With the present district line obliterated, the suburban banking communities would soon be transformed into an area overwhelmingly dominated by a few large city institutions.

As to the second provision dealing with formation of two new bank holding company districts, certainly its most immediate effect would be to place New York State legislative imprimatur of approval on plans like that of the First National City Bank which unsuccessfully sought to form a bank holding company in order to acquire the County Trust Co., of White Plains, N.Y., the dominant bank in Westchester County. It will be recalled that the Federal Reserve Board, after hearing exhaustive testimony on this proposal, concluded that approval of such transaction would be detrimental to competition and contrary to the public interest. Should the State legislature ratify the bill recommended by the joint committee, there would be ignited, as Governor Harriman observed on November 20, 1956, what may be the greatest chain reaction in recent banking history the effects of which will go to the very roots of the entire banking structure of New York State with the distinct possibility of concentration of banking assets in the hands of a few institutions.

Commenting on a holding company proposal similar to the one now contemplated, Mr. George A. Mooney, the former superintendent of banks of the State of New York, had this to say on December 12, 1956:

> The very existence of a number of large bank holding companies would create competition amongst them for future expansion in other communities. If the many unit banks found it impossible to resist the holding company movement, we could expect in short order a heavy concentration of banking assets, facilities, and credit in a handful of giant statewide bank holding company systems.

It is crystal clear that adoption of either provision of this bank monopoly bill would amount to capitulation to a few powerful banking institutions in New York City. If the New York State Legislature desires competition rather than monopoly in banking, it should reject this measure out-of-hand.

## Reexamination of Our Bolivian Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which was published in the Hartford Courant, on Wednesday, March 4, 1959, calling for a reexamination of our Bolivian policy in light of the recent anti-American demonstrations.

I am a firm believer in providing technical assistance and aid to the underdeveloped areas. I believe that such aid should be supervised so that it offers effective assistance to a stable form of government to improve the living conditions of its people. It should have the utmost help and sympathetic consideration that it is possible for us to give.

In this instance, there is strong evidence that the money of American taxpayers is being wasted. I recognize that this appraisal is controversial and that, as the New York Times has said, the incident should not lead to destruction of the good and useful relationship between the two countries. On the other hand, the Hartford Courant is not given to irresponsible journalism and I believe its objective and thought-provoking views should be brought to the attention of this body.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME TO REEXAMINE OUR BOLIVIAN POLICY

It is very unlikely, indeed, that that was any spontaneous group of patriotic Bolivian citizens who, Monday, in La Paz, burned an American flag and stoned the U.S. Embassy and the U.S. Information Office. The left-wing radical government that controls Bolivia can produce a destructive street mob, almost as quickly as some of the Arab countries of the Middle East. One example of this occurred a few years ago in Cochabamba, Bolivia, when a mob destroyed the newspaper plant of Demetrio Canelas, a moderate critite of government policies, while the police stood by doing absolutely nothing to halt the mob's vandalism. Senor Canelas, himself, has said publicly on several occasions that he owes his life only to the intervention of the Inter American Press Association.

Members of the mob that burned the U.S. flag are alleged to have shouted: "We don't want to be colonized by the Yankees." There is nothing on record to indicate that the Yankees want to colonize Bolivia, but there is altogether too much on record to indicate that the United States has poured millions of dollars into Bolivia in a wasteful, fruitless, futile effort to support the economy of the Bolivian regime. During the past 5 years, the United States has poured more than $100 million into Bolivia, all of this in addition to loans from the Export-Import Bank and the Development Loan Fund.

What has this accomplished? Well, just the other day the Antofagasta & Boliva Railway Co., Bolivia's principal transportation agency, announced that it was discontinuing operations. Traffic had fallen by 40 percent, freight and passenger rates had been frozen by official decree and, as the company announced, unbridled and direct interference of the railway labor unions had made it impossible to fire superfluous workers and to effect other economies. Probably nowhere in the world is inflation so rampant as in Bolivia, where the boliviano has dropped from 200 to the American dollar in 1952, to 11,900 to the American dollar in January of this year. Upon assuming power, the left-wing government nationalized the tin mines, paying the owners nothing. And since that time output of tin has steadily dropped while costs have continued to go up. Among the reasons for increased costs is that labor gets a fixed weekly overtime whether or not any overtime is actually worked, full pay while striking, and a variety of other subsidies and bonuses too numerous to mention.

If a Latin American government is making a sincere and conscientious effort to straighten out its economy, as President Frondizi is trying to do in Argentina, then it should have the utmost help and sympathetic consideration that it is possible for us to give. But when a government is pursuing such a senseless and ruinous economic policy as the present Bolivian regime, then the millions of dollars contributed by the American taxpayers are just so much money poured down into a rathole.

Monday's demonstration should persuade the State Department to reexamine our whole Bolivian policy. Such an examination, and it doesn't have to be too thorough an examination either, should convince the State Department that these wasteful and futile grants to Bolivia should stop at once. This is obviously the time for us to prove to the Bolivan regime that we have no desire to colonize their country, and there is no better way to convince them of this fact than by shutting off the flow of American dollars.

## Telephone Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Rock Hill Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of March 5, 1959:

TELEPHONE TAX

American telephone users have learned first-hand how easy it is for a temporary tax to become a permanent levy. And in the hope that they'll put pressure on the 86th Congress to remove one the utility that must do the bookkeeping for Uncle Sam's collection is reminding these people of what has happened to them.

By booklet and by bill, Southwestern Bell points out that the Federal Government, through the excise tax, classes the telephone as a luxury and adds 10 percent to the amount that must be paid each month by the user.

The first excise tax in history on local telephone service was passed as a wartime measure in 1941, it is recalled, with two reasons having been given for imposing it.

First, a war was going on and the revenue was badly needed.

Second, there was a critical shortage of telephone equipment, which resulted in the effort to discourage the use of essential communications—especially long distance—which could not be expanded to meet civilian demand.

But, as Southwestern Bell and the other telephone companies are pointing out, times have changed. The war ended in 1945 and there no longer is a shortage of equipment.

They ask: Why an excise tax on your telephone today? (Beaumont Enterprise.)

## The Disabled American Veterans' Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Disabled American Veterans fortunately cannot compete in numbers with some other veteran groups. I say fortunately, because each member must have a service-connected disability.

But this organization has built up and trained a corps of salaried national service officers who have made an enviable record in serving and advising veterans with war-incurred disabilities.

The organization could not support this constructive work without outside help. A perpetual rehabilitation fund has now been established, the income of which will be devoted to this work. I include as part of my remarks an article about that fund from the Disabled American Veterans' Monthly of February 20, 1959:

PERPETUAL REHABILITATION FUND IDEA CONTINUES TO SPREAD—SEVENTY-THREE BENEFACTORS NOW LISTED ON MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A total of $3,300,000 has been turned over to the DAV, by the DAV Service Foundation, during the last 10 years for national service officer salaries.

Twenty-five States are now represented among the 73 benefactors of perpetual rehabilitation funds (ranging from $100 to $1,200 so far), established with the service foundation. Under its master declaration of memorial trust, only the interest earnings (4 percent per annum), from such permanent memorial trust funds, become available for appropriation to the DAV national headquarters for its use in the maintenance of its excellent rehabilitation service activities in the respective States of origin of such donations.

Among the first 73 benefactors, 26 are DAV units, including 3 State departments, 2 auxiliary units, and the National Order of Trench Rats. Three other organizations have each donated from $300 to $1,000. Among the 47 individuals who have created such special trusts, 30 are DAV members, including two Congressmen (Hon. LEE METCALF, of Montana, and Hon. LAURENCE CURTIS of Massachusetts, both of whom are life members), and 8 who have served as DAV national commanders; 11 other non-DAV donors have so far donated such special trust funds.

DONATIONS IN MEMORIAM

Several of these special donations are specified as memorials to deceased persons. A $1,200 special fund—mostly as the result of individual donations—was presented by St. Louis Chapter No. 1, as a memorial to William E. Leach, Sr., who had long effectively served as a DAV national service officer. Chapter and department funds have been appropriated to establish memorial funds in the name of deceased former officers.

Such a memorial trust may be donated by a widow in memoriam to a deceased husband, by a widower in memoriam to a deceased wife, by parents in honor of a deceased son, by a son in honor of deceased parents, and so forth.

Many different kinds of such memorials are possible, as to deceased and living persons. Such a memorial fund to be credited to "Anonymous" is entirely possible.

SIX FUNDS INCREASED

Six perpetual rehabilitation funds have been increased, over their original amounts, by three DAV units and three individuals. Having started with $100, one benefactor has so far built up his perpetual rehabilitation fund to $860 and has voluntarily pledged himself to add $110 more each month during the rest of 1959. Several other benefactors have declared their intentions to increase their totals.

INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS

Although the master declaration of memorial trust provides that a perpetual rehabilitation funds must be a donation of $100 or more the board of trustees has authorized the executive secretary to accept installment payments, in multiples of $5, which are to be placed into a permanent reserve fund, until $100 has accumulated. Several DAV chapters and members have remitted such installment payments, with the declared intention of thus building their contributions up to at least $100 and then having same transferred into a perpetual rehabilitation fund.

MONTANA LEADS FIELD

Montana is the first State in which all of the DAV chapters, plus its State department and two auxiliary units, one law firm, a past department commander and Congressman LEE METCALF, have established memorial funds, in amounts now ranging from $100 to $1,100 and equivalent to nearly $5 per DAV member in the State. Since their original donations were sent in, two chapters in Montana have increased same by another $100 and $200.

M'CLERNAN AUTHORS IDEA

This excellent record was attained under the leadership of the Montana Department Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund chairman, Judge John B. McClernan, who was the author of this grass-roots idea. His own Butte Chapter No. 6 sent in the first check to the foundation, $1,000, with a resolution which established the principles of this new method of creating special memorial trust funds. If every State were to do as well as has Montana, proportionately to its total membership, then about $1 million would have accumulated into such special memorial funds—as pointed out by National Commander David B. Williams in his January 13 bulletin to DAV national officers.

PLAN GROWING RAPIDLY

This unique idea has gradually spread to others. Only 11 such funds were established during 1956, 15 more in 1957 and 44 more during 1958, with 3 more having been received so far during 1959 "If the same upward curve continues, then several hundred will have become enrolled on the memorial honor roll by the end of 1959, and several thousand by the end of 1960, and so on," according to John L. Golob, chairman of the DAV Service Foundation.

All enrolled benefactors up to June 30, 1959, will appear in the July 1959 issue of the Disabled American Veterans Monthly, and will subsequently also appear in the 1959 annual report of the DAV to the U.S. Congress, which is then printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office as a public document.

## John Edelman: A Good Salesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members of the House have met John Edelman, the Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union, and some of us know him intimately. He has been a familiar and well-respected personality in the Halls of Congress for a quarter of a century. He certainly deserved the wonderful tribute paid to him by John Herling in his Washington Daily News column of March 5. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Herling's column about John Edelman in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A VERY PERSUASIVE MAN

(By John Herling)

Anywhere you go on Capitol Hill, you are apt to see John Edelman, officially the Washington representative of the Textile Workers Union. Actually he is the universal business agent for any of a number of labor causes. By now, he has the longest service of any labor lobbyist here in Washington. He began haunting the marble halls of the Nation's Capital 25 years ago when the New Deal was a baby and he was 40 years old. Today he is 65, ready as ever to wet-nurse a Congressman or a bill.

Many legislators regard him as a human conveyor belt, bringing to Washington the piled-up woes and grievances of otherwise inarticulate people.

By the time he gets through telling a big wheeler and dealer on the Hill about the legislative needs of underpaid unorganized textile workers, he has made it clear that the whole thing is bigger than both of them. Mr. Edelman's powers of persuasion are awesome because they spring from an intimate knowledge of the people he meets and the people he represents. He yearns to marry power to justice—even when there is no love lost between them.

But in a real sense, Mr. Edelman's power as a labor lobbyist springs also from his talents as a hidden dissuader. More than any single man, he has been able to keep union representatives from making fools of themselves on Capitol Hill through miscalculation or overzeal.

It would be easy to call him the lobbyist's lobbyist. But there's more to his competence than technique. What gives John Edelman his remarkable staying power is his roots. These go far back into the labor movement of Britain where he was born and of the United States where he has lived since his teens.

Mr. Edelman started out as an educational director of the Hosiery Workers of Philadelphia, but he soon became a one-man labor faculty for many an American community. Generations of college men and women, of YWCA industrial secretaries, and middle-class folks were, for years, charmed by his literateness, his intensity of purpose, and his quiet physical courage. He ran a prep school for the New Deal.

Mr. Edelman began to break through into unexplored social territory a full 30 years ago—in the spring of 1929—back in Elizabethton, Tenn., when he helped bring organization for the first time to Southern

rayon textile workers. That tough fight became a notable preparation for the future labor lobbyist, but nobody then gave legislative action a thought. Instead, a group of ardent first citizens of Elizabethton used direct action against outside labor agitators. One night they broke into the hotel rooms of two labor organizers—Alfred Hoffman, of the Hosiery Workers, and Edward J. McGrady, then an A.F. of L. representative, later an Assistant Secretary of Labor—and carried them bodily out of the State. This abduction brought the story to page 1 of the Nation's newspapers and it brought John Edelman on the run.

He had been running to do labor's business ever since. What makes Johnny run in this or any session of Congress is the almost compulsive determination to get important bills through for the benefit of folks in the smaller income brackets. He has long recognized that politics is the art of the possible. But this axiom has never slowed him down. The difference between him and other political figures is his conviction that few worthwhile things are really impossible. This makes John Edelman the poor man's LYNDON JOHNSON.

## Good Citizens in the Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy to do all I can to encourage interest in government at all levels. Consequently, it was with particular interest that I read an article in the Ladies Home Journal for January 1959, describing a special project in operation at Middletown, Ohio, in my district. Dean Lawrence, City Manager Thompson, and all those participating are to be complimented for the guidance they are giving to these young Americans in their firsthand study of their city government. In recognition of this program I present the following article:

GOOD CITIZENS IN THE MAKING: TEENS INTERN IN CITY GOVERNMENT

The little girl seemed to be lost. Slowly she walked along the rather forbidding corridor of the city building, looking hopefully into each office, backing away again. Everyone appeared to be very busy: there was a great clatter of typewriters, a rustle of papers, a chatter of voices. She paused, confused, and spotted a pretty young girl hurrying out on a door marked "Chief of Police." Quickly she ran after her. "Lady, lady."

Seventeen-year-old Sarah Smith turned and smiled. "Why, hello. Are you looking for someone?"

The child nodded. "I want to know," she said shyly, "where you go to get the money daddies pay mommies after they're divorced."

After she had recovered from her surprise, Sarah took the little girl's hand. "I don't know," she confessed, "but we'll soon find out. You just come with me."

Recounting the incident to her parents one night last spring, Sarah said, "Honestly, until you work in city government, you can't imagine how many things city officials actually do. Who screws new street-light bulbs in after they burn out, for instance? And where do firemen's boots come from? And who decides if it's o.k. to have a parade or run a bazaar? All these things you never think about—unless"—she laughed—"you happen to be a high school intern."

Sarah, then a vivacious high-school senior in Middletown, Ohio, is one of numerous students who have learned about city government through actual experience as interns. Every afternoon from 3:30 to 5 the old yellow-brick city building is filled with 20-odd enthusiastic boys and girls engaged in every conceivable activity, from conducting traffic surveys to drafting a "welcome" pamphlet for new residents of Middletown. "Frankly, I never thought the kids would help us so much," admits City Manager Charles Thompson, who originally conceived of the program as an educational experiment. "But the boys and girls aren't content simply to learn; they want to put their learning to good use."

The city manager's office walls are lined with professional-looking maps showing all land owned by the city, all recently annexed areas, street-resurfacing work done each year. "I'd wanted maps like these for years. The teenagers dug in the files, collected the necessary information, transferred it to maps. Now I can't imagine how I got along without them. Hundreds of such jobs which would make our daily work far easier must normally be left undone, because of more immediate problems. In these jobs the interns are invaluable."

Doris Kronborg, clerk of the city commission, agrees. Sandy and Phyllis Figgins, twin sisters who "never came to the city building except to pay the water bill" before the intern program started, found themselves working out a master application form for the myriad licenses issued by Miss Kronborg and streamlining her system of filing ordinances. "When completed, the new system will speed up my work tremendously," Miss Kronborg says, happily.

In the department of inspections, Dave Danner and Russ Galloway made a careful study of signs in the downtown area, noting details of size, method of construction, state of repair, projection over the sidewalk. "All this legwork takes time," says one official, "and the kids are wonderful at it. I only wish we'd started this program years ago."

Middletown's unique plan sprang into being 3 years ago through a happy coincidence. At Middletown High, Assistant Principal and Dean of Boys Herman H. Lawrence decided to form a citizens' club to promote responsibility and intelligent citizenship in school, home, and community. Encouraged by the student response—since 1955 the club's membership has skyrocketed from 23 to almost 300—Mr. Lawrence began investigating ways to canalize the members' enthusiasm into really worthwhile activity.

At this same time, City Manager Thompson was concerned with an idea stated almost two centuries ago by Thomas Jefferson: "Democracy depends upon an educated electorate." Aware that a city's health, community spirit and social conscience are mirrored in its local government; and that, inevitably, local government reflects the interest or inerita of the people, Mr. Thompson was looking for a way to give Middletown's citizens a better understanding of their town's government. And what better ambassadors could be chosen than bright, imaginative young people?

When the two men met, ostensibly to arrange a government-class tour of the city building, both were bursting with bigger ideas. Together they planned the intern program through which juniors and seniors might volunteer to spend one or more afternoons a week actually working side by side with regular city officials. Students would have a chance to sign up for the departments which interested them most, but would get no school credit or pay for their work, and would do all their interning after school hours.

An excellent idea, both agreed—but would it work? Would students already busy with extracurricular clubs and sports be willing to sacrific precious after-school hours in the interest of good citizenship? Would city officials approve the project? When Mr. Thompson explained the idea to heads of departments, some were dubious. Members of the citizenship club, however, reacted with excited approval. Thirty signed up immediately, and others were placed on a waiting list. "It's too fast * * * too unexpected * * * we don't have room for them all," protested the city manager, pleased but rather overwhelmed. And indeed, there were quite a few problems to cope with during those first weeks. In the absence of a general orientation period, department heads had to explain their work individually to each new intern who reported for duty. The popular fire and police departments were swamped with eager volunteers, while less glamorous jobs in purchasing and finance went begging. Other questions arose: Should teenaged boys be allowed to accompany patrolmen and firemen on calls that might be dangerous? Should interns be rotated from department to department, or should they remain in one job? Is it fair to give youngsters the responsibility of typing and filing confidential reports of the municipal court and the health department?

One by one the questions were answered, gradually the necessary adjustments were made. Now in its fourth year, the intern program is a little smaller and considerably more efficient. Before starting work, students hear an introductory talk by the city manager or his assistant, Patrick O'Brien; afterward, department heads explain to the group as a whole what their offices do, and how they relate to one another. After this careful briefing, students decide which jobs appeal to them most. They may continue to work in their chosen department throughout the quarterly term, or they may be shifted after having completed a specific assignment.

This year for the first time students may report on their intern work instead of writing a research paper for their government courses. But—"I didn't even know about that part when I signed up," says Tom Tenforde, 10th-ranking tennis player in the State and top student. "I really enjoyed working in the personnel department—getting credit for it, too, was just frosting on the cake."

Mr. Lawrence, who confesses that he has to discourage some of the juniors from interning in order to make room for interested seniors, estimates that well over 100 students have taken part in the program so far. Some of these, like pretty Sarah Smith, were active as both juniors and seniors.

Sarah, literary editor of the yearbook and vice president of the debating team, completed over 300 hours of work in comparison to the 100 hours usually expected of interns. Filing accident reports, checking dog-license records, posting water bills, Sarah slowly began to realize all the things people think just mysteriously get done actually take a lot of time and work. Those city officials have to worry about broken sidewalks and jammed parking meters—to say nothing about something complicated like the sewer tax.

Tom Tenforde can tell you about that. "A lot of people didn't understand the reason for the sewer tax, and kept complaining. Mr. O'Brien gave me a lot of cut-and-dried facts about the sewage system, and it was my job to condense all that information and write a sort of brochure in terms that made sense to the public."

Tom also helped plan the highly successful student election, in which five mock commissioners were chosen to run the city for a day.

"All candidates were put on the ballot by properly notarized petitions," Tom explains, "and they made speeches at the regular know-your-candidate night after the real candidates for city offices had spoken. They even spoke on the same issues—whether to annex West Middletown, the need for an overpass at Central Avenue, whether municipal employees should be unionized."

Lynn Danner, who helped Tom plan the election, and on her own organized a student League of Women Voters, remembers what a large crowd attended the meeting, in spite of a heavy rain. Both Lynn and Tom were elected to the commission, later helped appoint various "city officers."

On the long-anticipated "city day" a "crime" was committed, the culprit brought before Chief of Police Noel LeMoyne, and tried before Judge Rosalie Maffett with Sarah Smith as prosecuting attorney.

Such enthusiasm is gratifying to Manager Thompson, who hopes that at least a few interns will decide to make city government their career. And in some cases the influence of the program is already evident. Blond Kay Clark now plans to major in government at college. Sarah Smith has decided she wants to teach government in high school. And senior Max Sample liked making traffic surveys so much that he's seriously thinking of going into police work.

Max and Noel LeMoyne, working for Chief of Police Blackmore, stood on a particularly busy street corner one afternoon and counted all the left turns. "We counted about 150 in an hour," Noel told his parents that night, "and, man, some of those cars went around on two wheels. The chief says that's a dangerous corner, and because of our survey he's going to prohibit left turns there from now on."

One of Noel's most fascinating jobs so far was taking calls for the desk sergeant. "The first time I answered the phone, expecting nothing less than a murder on a fire," he grins, "it was some guy wanting the correct time. But once I got a call about a kid hit by a car, and had to send an ambulance over; and another time there was a big oil-company robbery."

Noel isn't the only intern who comes home in the evenings full of anecdotes about "what goes on at the city building." One girl's mother confessed that, purely because of her daughter's interest, she had started listening regularly to radio broadcasts of commission meetings. Tom Tenforde's father, head of the tax department in a large steel company, was intrigued by his son's work on the sewer tax brochure. "When Russel was a junior, I warned him to save time for this particular project," says Mrs. Galloway, busy herself as a minister's wife and mother of five children. "My eldest daughter was first president of the citizens' club, but by the time the intern program got underway she was too involved with other activities to participate. I was always sorry. A chance like this—to broaden young people's outlooks, teach them the realities of life, arouse their civic consciousness—well, such opportunities shouldn't be lost."

One girl who lost no opportunities as an intern is Nancy Kincaid, who graduated from high school over 2 years ago but is still remembered for her quick wit, here dependability and her eagerness. Nancy had not been interested in many high-school activities, so when she fell in love with the intern program, her parents were delighted. After a few weeks of inspecting beauty shops and barbershops for the Health Department, Nancy started working with Doris Kronborg, clerk of the commission. Soon she began attending regular meetings of the commission, calling the roll on motions, listening attentatively to the discussions. In the summer, as a temporary employee, she handled work in Miss Kronborg's absence, wrote rough drafts of the minutes. Perhaps the highlight of her internship was the convention of city clerks in Columbus, where she made a speech explaining Middletown's new program. Now in college and planning a career in medicine, Nancy retains her interest in law and local government.

Not all interns are as deeply absorbed as Nancy Kincaid. Some of the girls, perhaps, look upon the hours they spend adding up water bills and typing purchase orders mainly as training in office skills; so far the program has produced no boys dead set on becoming city managers as fast as possible. But, as Manager Thompson wisely points out, the program is geared to reap long-range benefits. "Twenty years from now, these same boys and girls will be leaders of their communities, I like to believe that, because of the knowledge they gain as interns today, they will be better equipped to handle the problems that will confront them as citizens."

Middletown won't have to wait 20 years for some benefits, however. The solution of the red water problem, for instance, can be attributed directly to the industry of boys determined to track down the rusty brown organism which periodically caused certain faucets throughout the city to run red. Although the organism was harmless, it did stain clothes, and had been a city headache for years. By pinpointing on a map the current complaints, and checking back files for earlier complaints, the boys finally established a pattern showing which mains and valves were susceptible to the organism and needed to be periodically cleaned out. City Manager Thompson now considers the problem virtually licked.

Right now, interns in the office of Planning Director James Cox are at work on a topographical map which will show, at a glance, the most practical and inexpensive way to bring a new highway through the hills and ravines southwest of Middletown. "At first they proposed to route the highway straight along here," says pert Sue Shokey, tracing a finger along the partially completed map. "But if it goes this way, following the natural line of the valley, it will cut down on filling and grading costs."

Sue, as a brand new intern, surprised Mr. Cox by volunteering to come in extra afternoons during a week of heavy rain. "That girl's a dandy," he said. "She wanted to get the map completed while the weather was bad because I had told her we'd be outside on sunny days, making a field inventory of how city land is used. Yes, I'm highly pleased with Sue." Leaning back in his chair, Mr. Cox gazes off into space. "Now Sue Shokey could go off to college in a couple of years, take a degree in urban planning, come right back here and be a real addition to our staff."

Sue may decide to seek a career in urban planning—and she may not. But it is certain that she will learn a lot of surprising facts about her city and its government. Not six blocks from the main street, interns on a house-to-house canvass were horrified to discover neighborhoods they never knew existed—places where 20 people live in a three-room house. "Where is this?" they asked. "Is this Middletown?" Boys who had bicycled from one end of town to the other all their lives were nevertheless astounded at the complex street system revealed by a police map. "What a crazy arrangement. I never know our streets were such a hodgepodge." And girls working in the purchasing department are getting a staggering picture of the office supplies, cleaning material, boots, brushes, and tools needed to run a city. "It never occurred to me," one says, "the cities are careful about what they spend for every single item—whether it's a pencil sharpener or a hydraulic jack."

Throughout the busy departments, perhaps the most frequent remark heard from teenagers is, "I never knew * * *." And, learning as they work, Middletown's young interns are gaining a true understanding of their city and its government—sure foundation for responsible citizenship.

## Patents-in-Fee-Simple to Certain Lands on Indian Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation directing the Indian Department through the Secretary of Interior to issue patents in fee simple to certain lands on various Indian reservations in my district, most of which have been approved and should have been issued years ago, but because of redtape, continuous delays, and lack of decision, have never been issued.

In each instance there was an exchange of lands with Indian owners. In each instance the exchange was approved by the Indian, it was approved by the tribal land committee, it was approved by the Indian Department, and in most instances those involved in the deals expected that title would be transferred in a very short time. However, years have gone by, in many instances as many as 10 years, and nothing has been done and probably never will be done, unless and until the Congress takes action to direct action.

It is my purpcse to herein explain briefly the transaction involved in each of the land exchanges described in the bill I am today introducing.

1. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—EARL ADRIAN

In the first case I am asking a patent to be issued to Earl Adrian on the SE¼ 27 and NW¼ 34–40–31, which was in exchange for the NW¼ 32–40–28. Application for this exchange was submitted in September 1949. The tribal committee approved the exchange November 9, 1949. Mr. Adrian conveyed his land with improvements, including a dwelling, shed, chickenhouse, and so forth, by deed in trust for the tribe at the time of making the application, September 22, 1949. The two tracts were appraised, each being appraised at $1,128, and as such determined to be of equal value. The Billings area office requested a patent to be issued to Earl Adrian by the Bureau of Land Management in Washington on August 8, 1950. No apparent reason has ever been given why such patent was not then issued, however, it dragged along year after year. Mr. Adrian feeling that his Government would protect him, did not press for patent until on March 5, 1958, the Rosebud Sioux Tribal Council adopted a resolution which would prohibit all pending land exchange applications.

Mr. Speaker, these cases would not be so serious were it not for the fact that there is more involved than just the deal between the Indian and his guardian, the Indian Department, and the non-Indian who has entered into this exchange. In this case, as in nearly every other case, the Indian Department required the applicant to transfer his land by warranty deed to the tribe, or to the Federal Government in trust for the individual, at the time of making the application for transfer. The deed was recorded which took the land off the tax list. The local governmental units have not had the benefit of taxes either from the originally patented land nor from the tribal or allotted land. Local governments have lost 10 years of taxes on this and practically all of the other land exchanges set forth in this bill. Another thing, in most instances the non-Indian rancher has been required to pay lease on the Indian land he has been using all down through the years, regardless of the fact that he has turned his land over to the Indian Department without consideration and without credit for the use of such land.

My bill simply asks that the Congress direct patents to be issued on this and other exchanges in order to straighten out some of these messes.

2. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—JOHN FERNEN

In this case application was made in 1948, wherein Mr. Fernen agreed to exchange lands with the tribe on the basis of two acres for one acre he was receiving of tribal land. The Rosebud Land Committee approved the exchange November 17, 1948. Mr. Fernen was advised by the superintendent that everything was in order and that the land he was receiving was his and that title soon would be in his name. He has been using this land for the past 10 years and has spent thousands of dollars putting improvements on it, including a large quonset granary, a machine shed, a new well with pressure pump and tank, fences, and so forth. He has planted 30 acres to trees. In the meantime, the tribe has been leasing the land, which Mr. Fernen deeded to them in exchange, to another individual. It seems that part of the delay in this case has been occasioned by the fact that it was discovered that the tribe did not hold full title to one of the parcels involved, that the tribe finally acquired title and apparently everything was in order except that no one got around to issue the patent to Mr. Fernen, and then the Rosebud Tribal Council adopted a resolution disapproving all pending land exchanges.

If this resolution of the Rosebud Tribal Council, adopted March 5, 1958, is to serve as a complete bar to justice, Mr. Fernen stands to lose thousands and thousands of dollars, because he trusted, because he had faith that the word of the Department of Interior was good and that he would be protected if he went in and improved this land for which he was exchanging.

3. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—ROY J. KELLEY

In this instance, Mr. Kelley returned from the military service, and being anxious to get started in the farming and ranching business, entered into an agreement with Simon Thunder, an allotted Indian, wherein Mr. Kelley was to buy a house for Mr. Thunder in exchange for his quarter of land. All negotiations were handled in the agency office. The house was appraised before Mr. Kelley bought it. The house was purchased by Kelley and moved where the Superintendent agreed it should be moved for Mr. Thunder's use. Mr. Kelley advanced $2,086 to Mr. Thunder for him to purchase his father's interest in Tribal Land Enterprise shares so that full title could be transferred to Mr. Kelley. Mr. Kelley made other advances from time to time and has a sizable investment in this property.

The application for exchange was submitted in 1951. The Rosebud Land Committee approved the exchange February 16, 1951, determining both the house and land of approximately equal value. Kelley conveyed title to the house to the United States in trust February 15, 1951. Since that time Simon Thunder has had the house, has used it without rent, has permitted it to depreciate in value. Today Mr. Kelley has nothing except a lot of promises by the Indian Department and a sad experience.

4. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—MRS. FRANCES MULLEN

Application was submitted in February 1949 for the exchange of 8 quarters of land for 10 quarters of land belonging to the Tribe. This land was appraised at almost equal value, and in order to make up the difference, Mrs. Mullen paid the tribe $383.14. The exchange was approved by the Rosebud Land Committee March 30, 1949 and August 17, 1949. The exchange was never completed and again was blocked by the resolution of the tribal council, April 24, 1957. Again in this instance, title to the Mullen land was transferred to the tribe years ago. The tribe has title to all the land, the difference in the consideration, et cetera, and nothing is being done.

5. ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION—THOMAS F. ARNOLD

In this case an exchange was worked out through the Indian office in Rosebud with the Indian landowner, Frederick White Face Woman, and $300 was paid by Mr. Arnold to balance the difference in the appraised values of the properties. This was in 1949. Mr. Arnold went into court and quieted the title in the land, and recorded the title in the United States in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe on April 26, 1952. The exchange was never completed. The tribal council by resolution protested the exchange being completed under date of February 24, 1957. The tribe has Mr. Arnold's land, has the White Face land, has the cash, and no one is doing anything to correct the situation.

6. PINE RIDGE RESERVATION—DANIEL HOLCOMB

Application was submitted for land exchange in 1954. The executive committee of the tribal council approved the application August 26, 1954. The properties were appraised and it was determined that there was $500 difference in the value, which amount Mr. Holcomb deposited at the agency office in 1954. On October 29, 1957, the Aberdeen area office disapproved the exchange for the reason that it was then decided that there was more than $500 difference in value. The area office decided that the difference in value was $680 instead of $500. No action has been taken, however, although more than ample time has elapsed in which the deal could have been consummated.

## A Bill To Amend the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill (H.R. 5219) that would amend the Social Security Act to permit those receiving social security benefits to earn up to $150 a month and $1,800 a year, rather than the present limit of $100 a month and $1,200 a year.

I have taken this step as the present earnings limitation imposes undue hardship on many retired people because of the loss of benefits that results when the $100-a-month figure is exceeded through their part-time employment.

Since my election to Congress last year, many of my retired constituents have explained to me the plight in which they find themselves because of the low earnings limitation imposed by the Social Security Act.

From the information given me, it appears evident that many of our retired people are suffering because of the $100-a-month and the $1,200-a-year earnings limitation. Many do not receive enough in social security benefits to take care of their most basic needs. When, through their own willingness and desire, they undertake part-time employment to bolster their incomes they find themselves denied benefits because they overstep the $100-a-month limitation.

The modest increase in the earnings limitation that I propose will enable many retired people to keep on with their part-time employment and thus maintain the independence they so earnestly desire and which they so justly deserve. In many instances, the $150-a-month and $1,800-a-year limitation that I propose will make the difference as to whether or not our retired people can enjoy even the most modest necessities and comforts of life. This is particularly true in the great metropolitan district that I have the honor of representing.

The raising of the earnings limitation cannot in any way be regarded as a handout for our retired citizens. Through their years of regular employment, they earned their right to social security benefits. Now, they are willingly

seeking to bolster sometimes meager benefit payments through part-time employment, but are thwarted in part by the low earnings limitation. They are more than willing to help themselves and we in the Congress should be willing to help them. Their willingness is in the tradition of true Americanism.

The statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that I obtained this week show that the average monthly social security benefits now paid are: Retired man with wife, $119; retired single worker, $67; and eligible widows of deceased workers, $56.

Certainly, those average figures show the need for the legislation that I propose, and particularly when it is borne in mind that there was a great increase in the cost of living both during and since the days of World War II.

It is my sincere hope that this very necessary amendment to the Social Security Act will be enacted at the earliest possible date.

## How Inflation Determines What You Have Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, inflation is one of the most distressing problems of our time. Because of its temporary exhilarating effect, many persons, who should know better, embrace it, especially if in a position of advantage.

On the other hand, to the aged attempting to live on social security or other fixed retirement income, inflation is a fearful and frightening thing.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of the really great newspapers of our country, has, in an editorial, described what inflation has been doing to the purchasing power of the dollar and what the consequences will be unless we have the courage to do something about it. The editorial follows:

HOW INFLATION DETERMINES WHAT YOU HAVE LEFT

There are some mighty shocking tables in the current Reader's Digest which show what inflation has done to your earnings. They came from an article written by T. Coleman Andrews, former U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Let's look at a few:

If (as a single man) you made $2,000 in 1939, you had $1,975 left to spend after taxes had been paid. But in 1957 you had only $863 left, since taxes had increased $215 and inflation had taken $897.

If you made $5,000 in 1939, you had $4,878 left after taxes. But in 1957 you had only $2,051 left, since taxes had increased by $696, and inflation had taken $2,131.

Or try it another way: It required an income of $4,806 in 1957 to match a 1939 income of $2,000, because the increase brought $755 additional in taxes, and inflation had already gobbled up $2,051.

It required an income of $13,004 in 1957 to match a 1939 income of $5,000, because of an additional $2,937 in taxes and an inflationary bite of $5,067.

But the really shocking thought is that the worst is yet to come—that, unless inflation can be stopped, it will take an income of $10,538 by 1975 to match a 1939 income of $2,000; an income of $92,141 to match a 1939 income of $10,000.

As Andrews pointed out, "Inflation cannot be stopped by more inflation. It can be stopped only by removing the causes"—the chief of which is wasteful spending.

A nation, Andrews observed, "cannot afford anything its people can't, and it cannot violate the rules of thrift and provident living without suffering the consequences that people do for the same offense."

As President Eisenhower has made clear, you start first by balancing the budget.

## Anniversary of the Communist Takeover of Rumania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that last Friday, March 6, marked the 14th anniversary of the Communist takeover of Rumania. In this connection, I would like to include the following text of a letter I have received from Mr. Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Romanians:

THE LEAGUE OF FREE ROMANIANS,
*New York, N.Y., March 5, 1959.*

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
*U.S. Representative From Michigan.*

DEAR MR. BENTLEY: This 6th of March, 14 years will have elapsed since the subjugation of Rumania by the Soviet Union. We feel that this brutal fact of permanent Soviet aggression should once more be denounced in the face of international public opinion, especially now when Moscow tries through its latest schemes over Berlin, to at least impose a character of finality to their domination of Central and Eastern Europe. This character of finality the Russians expect to have accepted without reserve by the West as an accessory of the negotiations over the blackmail issue of Berlin.

It seems to us that the gravity of the Berlin blackmail has been made possible, or at least greatly facilitated by the unwillingness of the Western Powers, for more than a decade, to determinedly use against the Kremlin, the powerful political issue of the Soviet tyranny in Eastern Europe, maintained through direct military intervention and pressure.

As one whose interest and comprehension have so largely contributed in keeping alive this problem, you have yourself, on many occasions stressed its political value and potentiality in the effort of the United States to check the Soviet offensive.

After 14 years of despotic Soviet yoke and forced collectivization, the Romanian people are basically unyielding to the Communist alien rule and ideology. This manifests itself through a permanent interior tension, the result of uninterrupted acts of sabotage by the population and recurring waves of terror by the Soviet stooge government.

It is this spirit of resistance which constitutes one of the most irritating thorns in the Soviet flesh. The political, economic, and military integration of the whole area of Eastern Europe in the socialist camp as planned by the Russians against the West, is being seriously hampered by this deep-rooted instinct of national independence.

It is true, as the Subcommittee on Europe stated that the failure to support the Hungarian revolt—a dramatic explosion of this national instinct—was a lost opportunity. But in general, everytime the question of East Europe could be raised and is not, constitutes a lost opportunity. The Russians are using every means in order to stifle this national instinct in East Europe, as their interest demands it, but the interest of the United States is exactly the contrary, to keep by every means this instinct alive.

What the Soviets intend through their engineered Berlin crisis is to eliminate the Achilles heel of free Berlin in the status quo of their dominated belt of Europe. The obvious reply to this maneuver should be the forceful raising at the forthcoming conference table the East European independence issue. Otherwise another opportunity will have been lost.

I remain, yours respectfully,
MIHAIL FARCASANU,
*President.*

## Communism, Hawaii, Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a statement which I made before the House Rules Committee on March 5, 1959, on the subject of Hawaii statehood:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in my humble opinion, the issue of statehood for the Territory of Hawaii ought to be deliberated from three broad aspects. This statement will deal with the subject in the following order:

First. The grant of statehood to Hawaii will expropriate sovereign personal political power from one segment of our population and bestow that power upon another segment of our citizens.

Second. The next phase of this discussion will attempt to refute the arguments advanced in favor of statehood. I will try to demonstrate that the reasoning for statehood is based either upon political error, or is of minor importance, or is irrelevant, or is of an emotional origin.

Third. The concluding portion of this statement will deal with communism in Hawaii and its dangerous political consequences.

THE POLITICAL POWER ASPECTS OF STATEHOOD

There is a mistaken popular notion that the people of the Territory of Hawaii are being deprived of their right of self-government. There are some differences between the powers of the governments of the 49 States and the powers of the Territorial Government of Hawaii. But, these differences are insignificant.

Essentially, under the Organic Act, the Territory of Hawaii possesses full power to enact laws relating to its property, affairs, and government. Its powers in relation to the conduct of its affairs are substantially as extensive as the powers of the State governments of the 49 States.

Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove Territorial legislation, no law passed by the Legislature of the Territory of

Hawaii has ever been invalidated by Congress.

Although the Governor of Hawaii is appointed by the President, there has never been any substantial complaint that the administration of the Governor's office has been contrary to the best interests of the people of that Territory.

To my knowledge, there has been no complaint by the Territory of Hawaii of a lack of power in the Territorial Legislature to adequately deal with its problems on the basis of home rule.

The concern of the proponents of statehood lies not in their need or desire for power to conduct the affairs of the Territory, but rather, in their desire for power to conduct the affairs of the 49 States. They seek the power associated with the election of two U.S. Senators, two U.S. Representatives, and four electoral votes in the choice of a U.S. President.

THE TRANSFER OF POLITICAL POWER FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE 49 STATES TO THE PEOPLE OF HAWAII

As you gentlemen know, all governments, good or bad, are mere organizations of political power.

It is a fundamental principle that our constitutional representative form of government shall give every citizen an equal voice in the conduct of our Government. The right of a citizen to participate in our Government, almost exclusively, rests with his right to vote. The importance of the right to vote lies in the effectiveness of this right to vote.

Although the Russian voters are granted the equal right to vote, it is not effective political equality in our estimation.

*Senate representation*

Statehood would entitle the people of Hawaii to two U.S. Senators. It is our responsibility to decide whether this amounts to an equitable apportionment of legislative power.

The population of Hawaii, according to the census estimate as of July 1, 1957, was 613,000. Of this population, 59,000 were military personnel. An additional 25,000 people are civilian Federal employees. If we consider these 84,000 Federal civilian and military personnel to each have only 1 dependent, then the basic population figure should be reduced by 168,000. This would reduce the Hawaiian citizen population to 445,000.

With the grant of statehood, the people of Hawaii will be represented by 1 U.S. Senator for each of its 223,000 citizens.

The 2 Hawaii Senators representing 445,000 citizens would nullify the will and the representation in the U.S. Senate of: New York's 13 million people; California's 14 million people; Georgia's 4 million people; and of the voters in each of the other 49 States.

The framers of our Constitution founded a Republic, combining the features of both a federal and a national type of government.

The plan to give each State two Senators conforms to a pattern suitable to a Federal Government, with limited powers, where the bulk of the sovereign power is reserved to the States.

The plan to apportion representatives on the basis of population conforms to the framework of a National Government where all power is concentrated in a Central Government.

The grant of equal representation, that of two U.S. Senators, to each State was adopted for the protection of the sovereign powers of the States from encroachment upon their powers by the Central Government. In furtherance of this purpose, it was provided that the U.S. Senate be chosen by State legislatures.

The framers of our Constitution repeatedly stated that the U.S. Senate would represent the States in their corporate governmental capacities. The election of Senators by the legislatures was an integral part of that historic compromise under which each State became entitled to two U.S. Senators.

The 17th amendment to our Constitution was adopted on April 8, 1913. This amendment fundamentally altered the basis for the allotment of two Senators to each State. This change in the mode of the selection of our Senators to that of popular suffrage totally destroyed the justification, the rationale, for equal representation for each State in the U.S. Senate.

There have been drastic changes in our Republic. The framers of our Constitution envisioned a Central Government of limited powers, with the bulk of the residual sovereign power being reserved to the States.

There is no mathematical formula for the measurement of the division of power between the States and our Central Government. However, we can measure the exercise of power by the expenditures of our governments.

In the year 1957, our total gross national product amounted to $440 billion. Of this sum, $79 billion, or 18.1 percent, was expended by the Central Government. The State and local governments expended $34 billion, or 7.7 percent.

It is evident that there has been a continuing erosion of power out of the States and a continuing concentration of power in our Central Government. We have become a National Government wherein the States are being relegated to mere provinces. We have evolved from a Federal Republic into a national democracy.

Twenty-five States, with a population of 31 million people, constituting only 18 percent of the Nation's population, control 50 votes and have a majority power in the U.S. Senate.

This imbalance of power is a prime factor in our huge Federal bureaucracy, its wastages, and the consequent huge Federal taxes. Our bankrupt agricultural program with Federal subsidies for surplus products and Federal subsidies paid to reduce crops is an example of the inconsistency between the possession of power and the accountability for that power.

The U.S. Senate is accountable to the pressure of their constituents rather than to the preservation of State powers. Their prime interest must lie in expanding national power.

The alarming growth of Federal aid is another example of the inequitable distribution of Senate power. These programs are a practical means of socializing the wealth of the State based upon the political combinations of State powers in the U.S. Senate.

Statehood for Hawaii will reduce the effectiveness of the right of suffrage of every citizen in the 49 States. It takes away the right of representation and transfers an excessive amount of representation to the people of Hawaii.

The average representation in the U.S. Senate is one Senator for approximately 1,700,000 citizens. Hawaii will have one Senator for each 223,000 citizens.

POWER IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

In the event of statehood, Hawaii will become entitled to 3 electoral votes toward the election of a President of the United States in the 1960 elections. This can be reduced to 1 electoral vote for each 145,000 of its population. The voters in the 49 States will only have 1 electoral vote for about each 320,000 citizens.

Again, the voting rights of the people of the 49 States are reduced in order to transfer excessive voting power to the people of Hawaii.

REPRESENTATION IN U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Under the present bill, Hawaii becomes entitled to one member in the House of Representatives. Actually, under the Census estimates, Hawaii would be entitled to two Representatives.

The proponents are waiving their entitlement of two Representatives on the theory of "don't raise any controversy now, we'll get two Representatives anyway, right after the 1960 Census reapportionment."

Since the membership of the House of Representatives is fixed at 435, the two U.S. Representatives from Hawaii and the one Representative from Alaska will displace three U.S. Representatives from the 48 States after the 1960 reapportionment. The voting effectiveness of the voters of the 48 States will be, thus, further reduced.

STATEHOOD FOR OTHER POSSESSIONS

Statehood for Hawaii will intensify the demands for representation in Congress for the citizens and inhabitants of all other possessions of the United States.

If Alaska is admitted with a resident population of about 100,000 people, why isn't Guam entitled to statehood with its population of 59,000 citizens.

If the psychological impact upon the Oriental countries is a valid reason for admitting Hawaii, then Guam should be admited because it is farther west and closer to the oriental cultures.

I received this invitation which is postmarked February 27, 1959, from the National Association for the Statehood of Puerto Rico. If Puerto Rico seeks admission, shall we admit her to statehood in the interest of reducing the possible enmities of South American countries.

Senator CASE recently introduced a bill to grant three delegates in the House of Representatives to the District of Columbia. Are its 900,000 citizens less entitled to two U.S. Senators than 445,000 citizens of Hawaii?

The Virgin Islands has a population of 30,000. Shall we admit the Virgin Islands on the ground that it will improve our relations with the African countries?

Before we further distort the structure of our Government, we ought to be prepared to deal with these prospective troublesome problems on the basis of a principle that is equally just and fair to all of these people and is also just and fair to the people of the 49 States.

EXTRANEOUS ISSUES

Just about any and every conceivable argument has been advanced by the proponents of statehood. The Territory of Hawaii has carried on a high-powered, soft-sell, campaign for the past 12 years. The Hawaii Statehood Commission is the official agency for the promotion of statehood. Since 1947 it has spent more than $1 million for public relations and lobbying. This sum far exceeds the spending by any other lobbying group.

I would like to comment on some of the arguments being advanced by this Commission.

They have raised the slogan of "taxation without representation." Taxation has never been the test of voting rights. The person who pays no taxes is entitled to one vote just as the citizen who pays $1 million of taxes per year. The alien resident who has no voting rights is still duty bound to pay taxes.

The taxes paid by the Hawaiian people just as the taxes paid by the residents of the 48 States was spent to protect all of us, equally, from foreign invasion. The Hawaiian people received from their taxes substantially the same benefits as the people of the 48 States. This is language of incitement.

No one has disparaged the bravery of Hawaiian troops in World War II and in the Korean conflict, except the Hawaii Statehood Commission. They have raised this issue by attributing it to the opponents of statehood. It is inflammatory, emotional lan-

guage that puts the opponents on the defensive and furnishes an emotional impact in Hawaii, coupling statehood with a defense of honor.

The loyalty of the Hawaiian people is conceded but it cannot and should not be the basis for the equitable apportionment of representation in Congress.

I might remind our fellow citizens in Hawaii that the people of the 48 States did not hesitate to bravely and completely repel the inglorious attack by Japan, not upon the U.S. mainland, but their attack upon Hawaii. The United States discharged its obligations to its fellow citizens in Hawaii in full measure.

The proponents say that denial of statehood would cause an unfavorable psychological impact upon oriental countries. This reasoning is a political mistake. It is an admission of weakness. This is a domestic problem that should not be decided by an emotional foreign opinion.

The Hawaiian Statehood Commission advances the argument that Hawaii has met every test of statehood. The Constitution provides no tests for statehood. Congress has not enacted any tests for statehood. The proponents refer to dicta emanating from the Supreme Court.

The opinion of the Supreme Court in this matter is another unwarranted intrusion upon the constitutional powers of Congress.

The height of irrelevancy was attained by a prominent proponent of Hawaiian statehood. He advanced this argument: "The delectation of visitors, the sweetness of Hawaiian music, and the rhythm of its dance." The muscular gyrations of the hula dance is certainly far afield from the crux of the statehood problem.

I received a rather strange Christmas card during this last holiday season.

It contains the words "Mele Kalikamaka." I do not know the meaning of this language nor do I care. It contains no Christian or religious sentiment.

This card is an irreligious and clever, too clever, attempt to associate, in the subconscious mind of the recipient, his regard for the Christmas holiday and his image of a feminine form wrapped in a sarong, with a favorable response to statehood. Since Mrs. William Howard III, uses her stage name of Dorothy Lamour, this card should be regarded merely as advertising fiction.

These are some of the soft-sell techniques of the Hawaiian Statehood Commission. The Madison Avenue advertisers could learn a great deal from the Hawaiian Statehood Commission about the motivation of the masses.

COMMUNISM IN HAWAII

Mr. Chairman, I have said, in and outside Congress, that in granting statehood to Hawaii, we actually invited four Soviet agents to take seats in the U.S. Congress. I repeat this statement.

Oh, yes, they will be carefully selected by Communist agents. They will bear no visible brand marks. They will not be Communist Party members. All that the Communists demand of them in return for political support is to cleverly follow the Soviet party line, although always appearing to be merely liberal.

The infiltration of communism in Hawaii continues to influence every phase of territorial activity to an alarming degree.

The Communist network is centered in two unions, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) and the United Public Workers (UPW). From these centers, their influence spreads into both the Republican and Democratic Parties, into the territorial legislature, into the county and city governments, into the newspapers, the radio, the television, and into every home.

The ILWU has a membership of about 25,000 workers. The UPW has a membership of about 2,700 employees.

Both of these unions were expelled by the CIO in 1950 on the ground that "their policies follow the Communist Party" and that "Communists control these unions."

Gentlemen, the policies of these unions have not changed one iota. I quote from the report of the Territorial Commission on Subversive Activities which was submitted to the Governor this last Monday, March 2, 1959 (p. 16):

"The propaganda line disseminated by the ILWU has continued to follow and further the Russian international and domestic viewpoint."

These unions continue to be dominated by the same Communist officials as in 1950. The ILWU in Hawaii is known as local No. 142. The international president is that most dangerous and effective Communist agent, Harry Bridges.

Since last August, Harry Bridges has been actively engaged in promoting an alinement of American labor unions with foreign Communist unions. This, of course, is part of the U.S. Communist Party's and the Soviet Communist Party's present program.

Since August 1958, Harry Bridges has made overtures to: (a) The all-Japan Dock Workers Union; (b) the Waterside Workers of Australia; (c) the Madras Harbor Workers of India; (d) the Waterside Workers of Indonesia. These unions are all Communist dominated.

Since January 1, 1959, Harry Bridges has had conferences with the Communist leadership of unions in London, Paris, Hamburg, Prague, Moscow, Leningrad, and Helsinki. I quote from a newspaper article in the Buffalo Evening News dated February 13, 1959.

"Bridges lauds Democracy in Russian Unions.

"Bridges has also alined his union with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, headed by James R. Hoffa.

"Jack Hall is regional director of the Hawaii ILWU, Local No. 142. He and six other Hawaiian Communists were convicted in 1953 for conspiracy to overthrow our Government by force and violence. These cases were reversed under the authority of the series of shocking Supreme Court pro-Communist decisions.

"The UPW's officers are Henry Epstein, Stephen Murin, Max Roffman, and Jeanette Nakama Rohrbough, all identified Communists.

"Both the ILWU and the UPW have exploited its members and continue to use the dues and the membership to further the Communist Party line.

"The UPW has 235 public employees employed by the government of the Territory of Hawaii. The city and county of Honolulu have 567 employees belonging to the UPW including 37 members of the sheriff's department.

"The county of Hawaii has 279 UPW, public employees; the county of Kauai has 233; and the county of Maui, 537.

"The ILWU and its conspiratorial Communist partner, the UPW, share the same large ILWU office building. This nonpublic building was recently exempted from public taxation by the Hawaiian Legislature.

"These two unions continue to spend upwards of $200,000 annually for propaganda and agitation.

"Although the English evening broadcasts by their chief English-speaking propagandist, Robert McElrath, have been discontinued, it is a mere tactical shift.

"The radio broadcasts in the Ilocano and Tagalog, Filipino dialects continue every weekday.

The Japanese broadcasts are continued on three stations every Sunday.

"The Commission on Subversive Activities monitored 350 ILWU radio broadcasts from Honolulu alone in 1957–58.

"The ILWU continues to operate another propaganda apparatus. It has a book lending library service that disseminates nothing but Communist literature featuring class conflict and other Communist doctrine. It has a Communist movie loan service. These Communist films are stored and checked in and out by the Public Library of the Territory of Hawaii. This Communist service is paid for by the Hawaii and the U.S. taxpayers."

Although the weekly Communist newspaper, the Honolulu Record, has discontinued publication, the ILWU has announced that it will publish a daily newspaper to take the place of the weekly Honolulu Record.

To demonstrate the growing and expanding power of the Communist ILWU, I show you two newspaper clippings.

The Honolulu Advertiser of November 26, 1958, reports the union election among the Foodland Super Market meatcutters.

The ILWU vote was 205.

The AFL–CIO vote was 14.

I show you a report of the Honolulu Advertiser of March 1, 1959, last Sunday, reporting on an election among the clerks of the Foodland Super Market: "The ILWU won with 134 votes. The AFL–CIO union received 42 votes."

This result is in spite of the fact that the Communist control and the 100 percent Communist propaganda efforts of the ILWU have been broadcast by newspapers, radio, television, hundreds of times to every citizen of Hawaii.

This certainly does not show any lessening of the influence of the Communist Party in Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to describe just one incident to show how the Communist Party infiltrates the cultural activities of a community.

The Honolulu Community Chorus is a civic musical organization. It has planned to produce a festival of folk songs this spring in conjunction with the Honolulu Symphony Orchestra. More than 300 vocalists and musicians are to participate.

The choral chairman, Mr. John M. Kelly, Jr., is insisting that the symphony orchestra present the "Song of the Forests," by the Communist composer, Dmitri Shostakovich. This music and words were written in praise of Dictator Joseph Stalin.

Mr. Kelly also insists upon the rendition of "The Lonesome Trail." This music is by Earl Robinson and Millard Lampbell. Both of these men have Communist affiliations for 20 years.

Mr. George Barati, the director of the Honolulu Symphony as of today, still refuses to play these two numbers on the ground that they are of poor musical composition.

The wife of Mr. Kelly is the former secretary to Jack Hall, the Communist director of the ILWU. The secretary of the choral group is Mrs. An Qwon Leong McElrath, the wife of the Communist ILWU propagandist.

There has been a recent change in the Communist tactics in Hawaii. They are now using the soft velvet approach to gain respectability and complete acceptance.

Last year, Mr. Newton Miyagi, secretary of the ILWU, was appointed to the Red Cross board. Mr. Miyagi is a die-hard Communist who took the 5th amendment more than 30 times on questions relating to his Communist affiliations before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. Mr. Blissard, the U.S. Federal attorney, was so outraged that he resigned as a member of the board.

Strangely, the Federal judge, there, also a member of the board, criticized Mr. Blissard and defended Mr. Miyagi's appoint-

ment. The Federal judge was seeking Presidential reappointment.

On November 8, 1956, Gov. Wilder King forced the resignation of his attorney general for attending a testimonal dinner for Jack Hall. Governor King was not reappointed.

Judge Stainback, a former Democratic Governor, vigorously opposed to the Communists, was also refused Presidential reappointment.

In the 1956 elections, Mr. William F. Quinn accepted the ILWU endorsement for the Territorial senate on the Republican ticket. He is now the Republican Presidential appointed Governor of Hawaii to replace Governor King. I show you newspaper clippings of Governor Quinn tendering a public office appointment to Jack Hall, the prominent Communist leader, as a member of the Hawaii Traffic Commission.

It is a well known political fact of life, that you can't receive the recommendation of the Department of the Interior today under a Republican administration or yesterday under a Demrocatic administration for a Presidential appointment in Hawaii without the blessing of the Communist ILWU.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by brifly reviewing the political power that is exercised by the Communist apparatus in Hawaii.

In the 1954 elections, the ILWU gave its endorsements to 71 candidates. A total of 58 of the 71 ILWU-endorsed candidates won. Of these candidates, 22 out of 28 candidates for the Hawaii Legislature won.

In the 1956 elections 21 ILWU-endorsed candidates won out of 30 representatives in the Hawaii House of Representatives.

In this last election of November 1958, there were 69 offices to be filled by election. For these offices, 57 candidates were endorsed by the ILWU. Four of these candidates rejected the ILWU endorsement. Fifty-three candidates accepted these Communist dominated ILWU endorsements.

Thirty-seven of the ILWU-endorsed candidates won their elections.

Thus the ILWU succeeded in electing 37 out of 69 elective positions in the Hawaii Territorial Legislature for a winning percentage of 55 percent out of all public elective offices.

The ILWU succeeded in electing 37 out of 53 candidates whom it endorsed and who accepted this Communist support for a winning percentage of 70 percent.

It must be remembered that four identified Communists sit on the ILWU political endorsement committee that handed out these endorsements. Their long standing Communist affiliations are well known to every person in Hawaii. These four Communists are: Thomas Yagi, Newton Miyagi, Castner Ogawa, and "Slim" Shimizu.

Mr. Newton Miyagi is the same gentleman whose recent appointment to the Red Cross board raised such a furor. During the 1956 U.S. Senate committee hearings on internal subversion, Mr. Miyagi invoked the fifth amendment 71 times and declined to answer when asked if he had been in contact with Russian military and intelligence agents.

These are the men whose political endorsements are sought for and accepted in order to attain public office. These are the same Communists who will pass upon and either reject or give political endorsement to the two U.S. Senators and the two U.S. Representatives to be elected in Hawaii and sent to our Congress. Is there any reason to believe that their self interest will be any less or any different than the 70 percent of those candidates who received, accepted, and were elected with this Communist support?

We can best judge the political power of the ILWU by comparing the results of their endorsements with the results of the endorsements of the Republican Party.

Out of the 69 offices in which the ILWU endorsed candidates, 37 won seats, the Republican-endorsed candidates won only 24 seats. In other words, the ILWU endorsement is much more valuable than the Republican Party endorsement.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate that the power of the Communist Party continues to be so potent that it is a menace to the people of Hawaii and to the people of the 49 States. There is no evidence of the lessening of that power.

In the event of statehood, the Communist Party will, in all probability, exert a continuing tremendous influence on the election of Hawaii's two Senators and two Representatives. The probable election of ILWU-endorsed representatives to the U.S. Congress will mean that the Communist Party will exert a substantial influence upon these Members of Congress.

The Communist Party will have succeeded in infiltrating the U.S. Congress and establishing a fifth column in this last defense of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that this committee refuse to grant a rule on this bill. There will be no harm done. The sponsors of this bill can bring this measure to the floor of the House without a rule. This committee might prefer not to lend its implied approval to this proposal by the grant of a rule.

Thank you.

---

## Layman's View of the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, this is in response to numerous constituent requests for a plainly worded, nontechnical explanation of the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959 (H.R. 4245) which recently passed the House. It was the year's first tax bill considered by the House of Representatives and was the first major legislation prepared by and reported from the Ways and Means Committee in which I participated as a committee member.

Background information includes the following considerations: There are approximately 1,300 insurance companies consisting of 300 mutual and 1,000 stock companies. There are big and small companies of each kind. Mutuals have 63 percent of insurance in force, hold 75 percent of the assets, pay 75 percent of the income tax, and had an estimated gain of 58 percent of all insurance business in 1958. Stock companies, therefore, are 37 percent, 25 percent, and 42 percent, respectively.

The kinds of taxation possible are based on insurance company income of two kinds: First, investment income—yield from investment of policyholders' money in 1958 was $3.25 billion—and, second, underwriting income—chiefly gain from margin in premiums charged, fewer death benefits paid than expected. Correct profit determination is complicated by the need for accumulation of various reserves to provide available assets or money to make good the promised payout later in death or retirement. Tax formulas, therefore, must include these factors and recognize analyses involving industrywide averages and/or company-by-company experience. All these considerations spell out the uniqueness of the insurance industry compared to other corporations in the context of a proper determination of taxable income.

The peculiar difficulties of taxation of insurance companies, therefore, are threefold:

First. Contracts are made with policy holders wherein profit may not be known for periods up to as much as 100 years.

Second. In investing policyholders' premiums insurance companies have a bank-like function, so intertwined with pure insurance operation, that it is difficult to determine what investment income does go to the policyholders and what part to the company.

Third. The greatest volume, approximately 75 percent, of life insurance is done by mutuals, that is, cooperative organizations and it is difficult to measure their income. It is maintained that mutuals refund profits or overcharges to policyholders while stock companies competitively at time of policy sale offer lowest possible premium charges without any overcharge refundable cushion on nonparticipating business.

A complicated three-step formula attempts to fairly spread the insurance company tax burden and in many ways is an improvement over earlier formulas.

THE PROPOSED TAX FORMULA

The regular 52-percent corporate rate—30-percent normal tax, 22-percent surtax on incomes in excess of $25,000—applies to the insurance company income tax base. The 25-percent alternative capital gains tax is applicable to capital gains.

The tax base consists of computations under a three-phase formula.

The first phase is concerned with investment income. Gross investment income consisting of interest, dividends, rents, royalties, and so forth, is aggregated and deductions are taken for such things as investment expenses, tax-free interest, a percentage of dividends received, and a special deduction to benefit small insurance companies. The net investment income is determined and further deductions are allowed with respect to reserve requirements, investment income on qualified pension plan reserves, and certain interest paid items. The deduction for net investment income required to be set aside in life insurance reserves to meet future policy obligations is determined pursuant to what is called the modified-Menge formula. This basic deduction is computed by adjusting the reserves in terms of earned interest predicated on an average industry assumed rate or an individual company's assumed rate, whichever is higher.

The second phase in the computation of the tax base is a determination of the net gain or loss from operations. Gross receipts takes into account investment income, income premium income, and other receipts. Deductions are allowed for benefit payments and expenses pertaining to investment and insurance

company operations. Deductions are also allowed for additions to reserves, certain dividends and credits to policyholders, certain group insurance premium income, and a special deduction for nonparticipating insurance equal to 10 percent of the increase in such life insurance reserves.

By deducting taxable investment income which has already been subject to tax in phase one from the aggregate determined under phase two, the underwriting gain or loss is determined. If there is an underwriting gain, one-half of that amount is added to the taxable investment income to establish a combined tax base under phases one and two. In the case of underwriting loss, such loss is offset in full against the phase one tax base.

The phase three tax base computation relates to stock companies and provides that for calendar year 1959 and subsequent years, income distributed to stockholders in excess of amounts already taxed on a current basis is to be included in the regular tax base of the company at the time of such distribution or at the time the company elects to be taxed on part or all of such previously untaxed amount.

ARGUMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED FORMULA

First. Loss would be fully deductible and could be carried forward or back.

Second. One hundred and ten percent deduction would be allowed for profit payment into reserves.

Third. Pension trust reserves investment yield would be deductible.

Fourth. Interest on tax-exempt securities would be deductible.

Fifth. The discriminatory 1942 formula would become effective if H.R. 4245 is not passed.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE PROPOSED FORMULA

First. Economic impact on the industry of 90 percent tax increase for 1958 over 1957 has not been sufficiently studied by the Committee or Treasury Department.

Second. State taxes of $300 million plus estimated $545 million of this bill make insurance companies the most heavily taxed thrift institution.

Third. Inflation and taxation are causing the trend to pure protection and away from savings through insurance.

Fourth. Federal Social Security program with no tax liability on investment income will be given discriminatory advantage over private efforts to provide for future security.

Fifth. There is an approximate 5 percentage point shift of tax load from mutuals to stock companies. Because of the preponderance of arguments against the bill, I could not agree to the bill in its entirety.

True, this bill is far superior to the 1942 formula, which was not intended to become effective and which we were warned would come into effect for 1958 if we failed to pass this bill. There is an alternative to the 1942 law which we could have used, namely, continuation of the 1955 Mills-Curtis formula with appropriate amendments plugging any loopholes until the full economic impact of this bill could be studied.

My objection and concern is best expressed in the Committee Report's Supplemental View—pages 87 to 88. I am a signatory to these views which state in part:

Individual economic security is now being provided the public by life insurance companies, other thrift institutions, and through the social security system. It is sound public policy to encourage everyone to provide for his own security on a voluntary basis and our tax laws should encourage, not deter, such efforts. This bill, however, makes voluntary provision for one's own economic security relatively less attractive since it increases the tax on life insurance while investment earnings under the social security system are free from either Federal or State tax. This incerases the advantage of the social security system over voluntary individual protection offered by life insurance companies, particularly if the latter must absorb taxes of the magnitude provided in the bill. Public awareness of this differential in cost will most certainly lead to incerased demand for larger social security benefits and less incentive to build security on a voluntary basis.

I feel that our haste precluded the full economic study that is still needed before evolving a permanent formula for life insurance taxation. Perhaps, my relative inexperience as a new members of the Ways and Means Committee in dealing with an extremely complex subject has made me overly cautions.

## Speaker Rayburn's 46 Years

SPEECH
OF
## HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every American is proud of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and his unparalleled record of public service.

In Oklahoma, where Speaker RAYBURN has long been regarded as "Oklahoma's Congressman at large," there has long existed a standing organization known as the Rayburn for President Club.

Thousands of Oklahomans have believed for many years that the best qualified man in the United States for President is SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

On more than one occasion, I have attended meetings in the Sooner State where all in the room were agreed that Speaker RAYBURN was the best man the Democratic Party could nominate for the Presidency.

On one such occasion, I heard our beloved Speaker tell a large group of Oklahomans that he deeply appreciated such sentiments, but that he firmly and emphatically declined to become a candidate.

Speaker RAYBURN'S refusal to become a presidential candidate has been a loss for our party in the White House, but our loss on the executive side of the ledger has undeniably been our greatest gain on the legislative side of the same ledger.

I doubt if any historian of our time will deny that the greatest single influence of this generation upon our Nation's legislative history has been the great Congressman from Bonham, who has served longer than any other American as Speaker of the House.

It has been a great privilege to serve with him in the House.

It is both a privilege and a pleasure to join with my colleagues in expressing congratulations and best wishes as Speaker RAYBURN begins his 47th year of congressional service.

## Peanuts and People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the peanut is more closely associated with fun and pure enjoyment than any other crop.

It is as American as baseball.

What would a circus be without a peanut vendor?

The peanut is a symbol of America at play—with children and grownups alike. It tempts the palate. It gives us energy. It is a solid food on our table. It is the constant companion of good appetite and good humor everywhere.

Versatility vies with taste to give the peanut its standing not only in America but throughout the world.

Its flavor is beyond challenge in the crunchy whole nut, or in spreads and confections. It has an affinity both for salt and for sugar. Throughout many areas of the world it is the most common substitute for meat, answering also the need for oil in the diet. The oil is used widely in chemistry and in commercial enterprises. Not only is the peanut a direct human food, but fed to hogs it makes the tastiest hams; and when the hay of the vine is eaten by cows, we get the sweetest milk.

Only perfect peanuts are used for edible purposes. Others are crushed for oil. The oil is ideal for frying because of its high smoke point of 450°. It does not scorch easily. It does not absorb flavors and can be strained and used repeatedly. The oil is best for salads because its tastes, it clings, it sparkles. It has many other aptitudes. It is the basis for many cosmetics, shaving creams and hair lotions. I am told that the energy value of 1 pound of peanuts equals 4 pounds of beef steak, or 21 pounds of cheese, or 10 quarts of milk, or 33 eggs.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we should be reminded occasionally of those things so often overlooked but which mean so much in our daily lives.

Peanuts are found on every continent and in almost every country where climatic conditions are suitable for their cultivation. They are a major source of food throughout the world.

The United States ranks fifth of all the countries of the world in the production of peanuts and produces a little more than 5 percent of the total world supply of 14 million tons. About one-third of all peanuts are grown in India. China produces a little less than a tenth of the total world supply and sizable quantities are produced in French Equatorial Africa and Nigeria.

Like many cultivated crops, plants similar to the domesticated peanut cannot be found in the wild state. Selection and cultivation of the plant have changed its characteristics until it can be scarcely identified with the wild form.

For a time it was thought that the peanut was a native of Brazil, but later it was found that the wild forms were grown extensively in Paraguay and Uruguay and the northeastern part of Argentina. It is assumed that the peanut came to the United States in the colonial days from Africa which had in turn received it from South America.

In the early part of the 19th century the cultivation of peanuts in the United States was limited to a small portion of eastern Virginia. The expansion of the crop to other areas and its development into an important agricultural commodity occurred, for the most part, in the early part of the 20th century.

During World War II, in response to the vast need in this country for vegetable oil, almost 5 million acres were devoted to peanut production. Much of the problems of the peanut industry today stem from the necessity for reducing this wartime level of production to that required to meet peacetime domestic demand. Peanut acreage has now been reduced to between 1½ to 2 million acres, but with the increased yields per acre annual production at the present time is near a million tons.

Peanut production is an important source of cash income to almost 200,000 farmers. It is particularly important in areas of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Texas, and Oklahoma, where soil and climatic conditions favor its production.

This is a brief chronicle. But I cannot close it without mentioning the wonderful work of the National Peanut Council in building markets. The work of this organization is beneficial not only to producers, but also to consumers as well, for the more peanuts we eat and the more we use, the healthier and happier we all will be.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the House joining, with its attention, in this salute to the most versatile, the most convivial, of all the products of our farms, the peanut.

## Uncle Sam's Security Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial gives a very fair picture of social security as it looks to Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen.

This editorial appeared in the Walden Citizen Herald, in my district, on March 5. It tells the facts clearly and truthfully and I feel that the Congress is entirely responsible for this very unfair and unjust situation.

UNCLE SAM'S SECURITY LOTTERY

When you buy insurance, the policy tells you what you'll get for your money and what you won't. It's a contract, and that's that.

Some people think of social security as insurance, but it isn't. The Government tells you what to pay now (or have your property seized) and maybe you'll get something later, maybe not.

Congress decides what you'll pay and what you'll get—if anything. The money goes into the Treasury to be spent, and the Government puts I O U's into the social security account for you to pay in taxes later, or for your children to pay.

You can pay all your life and collect a mere $200 death benefit.

Or you can pay a few years and hit the jackpot of maximum benefits. Congress makes the rules and a later Congress can change them. It often does.

This is just something to think about now that your contribution to this insecure "security" has gone up by another one-fourth of 1 percent.

## H.R. 10—Equality for the Professional or Self-Employed Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN**
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to speak out against a present inequality in the tax treatment of our self-employed citizens. The Congress can proudly point to its legislative record of providing financial security for our growing elderly population. One of the milestones in this record is the tax exemption to encourage employee retirement plans. Unfortunately, however, we have discriminated against the industrious self-employed individual by not extending to him a similar opportunity and encouragement to invest in his retirement.

Under private pension plans, which now cover over 15 million workers, the employer's contribution to the individual worker's pension plan is deducted as a business expense by the employer and is not currently taxable to the employee. However, there is no provision in the law for a smiliar partial tax exemption for retirement contributions made by the self-employed.

H.R. 10, reported out favorably by the Ways and Means Committee, would rectify this inequity by permitting a self-employed person to take a tax deduction for strictly defined types and amounts of retirement investments. This bill is extremely well drafted to insure that it actually will do those things for which it is designed, while precluding abuses. It has had the benefit of exhaustive hearings during the 7 years it has been under consideration.

All self-employed persons who fall within this definition in the Social Security Act, plus doctors and ministers, would be permitted to deduct for retirement investments 10 percent of their annual earnings with a ceiling of $2,500 a year and $50,000 for a lifetime. So that older persons would have an opportunity to build up retirement plans within a shorter period, the annual deduction could be higher for persons over 50 years of age on January 1, 1959.

In simplest terms, the principle of the bill is to permit—for example—the small businessman to spread out his income over a greater number of years. During his middle years, when his income is normally the highest, the greatest bite is taken from him under our progressive income taxes. Spreading consists in earmarking a part of his peak earnings for future taxation when his income will be less and consequently the tax will be reduced.

Since 1951, when Representatives KEOGH and REED introduced a bill to correct this tax discrimination, bipartisan attempts by Representatives Keogh, Simpson, Jenkins and the late Representative Reed have been made, without success, in each Congress to pass the necessary legislation. Last year the House passed the bill but it languished in the Senate.

This bill has been tested in practice. Both Great Britain and Canada have with success put similar schemes into operation.

Although previously supporting it, the administration is now opposed to this bill because of the revenues which will be lost to the Treasury. The administration estimates that H.R. 10 may result in a loss of revenue of $320 million for fiscal 1960 and $365 million for the first full year of operation. While $365 million may indeed be the loss in five years or so, based on experience in Canada and Great Britain, and on analogy with other forms of saving programs, it appears highly unlikely that the loss will even begin to approach this figure in 1960.

Furthermore, if revenue loss is to be the criterion by which a law is judged good or bad, then I submit that few inequitable laws will be corrected. It seems to me that we would recover many times the funds lost by this bill, if we applied the criteria of both revenue gain and equity to our present revenue codes and plugged some of the more glaring loopholes. I urge the passage of this measure instituting tax equality for the self-employed.

## New Bill Would Give Durum Separate Consideration It Deserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DON L. SHORT**
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Durum growers in North Dakota, Senator YOUNG of North Dakota has introduced a bill consponsored on

the Senate side by Senator LANGER, and by Senators MUNDT and CASE of South Dakota. I am today introducing a similar bill on the House side and I have some hopes that it will be included among the bills our Agriculture Subcommittee will consider during the next several days. One of the problems in promoting Durum legislation has been that Durum is just a subdivision under wheat, as far as a lot of people are concerned, and they want to treat it as such. Macaroni products made with our North Dakota Durum are superior, but that fact—so far, at least—is not appreciated here in the East.

Under the bill I am introducing today, it should be pointed out, is the provision that farmers cannot raise hard wheat on their farms if their Durum allotment is increased. Durum growers would be allowed to grow enough of their product to satisfy the demand. Under the mechanics of this bill, the allotment would be lessened if, at any time the demand for Durum lessened.

I hope the Durum growers, who neither create nor add to the surplus—which is in other classes of wheat—will receive the serious and separate consideration they deserve. That is all we ask in this bill.

## St. Patrick Fund Honors Saint With Cultural Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the St. Patrick Scholarship Fund, with which I am well acquainted, has done outstanding work in the cultural exchange field. Its program is financed through the annual sale of seals honoring Ireland's patron saint, which sale is in progress at the present time.

This organization is to be highly commended, and I wish to include an article which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 25, 1959:

ST. PATRICK FUND HONORS SAINT WITH CULTURAL EXCHANGES

St. Patrick, whose Christian missionary work brought ancient Ireland into contact with Western Europe, is being remembered fittingly by a group of Buffalonians. Like their patron, they seek cultural exchanges.

They're the St. Patrick Scholarship Fund, Inc., a nonprofit organization of volunteers who honor Ireland's patron saint by making it possible for American and Irish students to be educated in each other's institutions of higher learning.

The fund finances its program through the annual sale of St. Patrick seals. This year it has sent seals to 10,000 Buffalo-area residents.

The fund's immediate goals are:

1. To raise enough money to pay for transportation, board, books, and other expenses for a young man and young woman from Ireland to study in D'Youville and Canisius Colleges. Each college has awarded a 4-year tuition scholarship to the fund.

2. To send an American student to the National University of Ireland, with its constituent colleges in Cork, Galway, and Dublin.

The fund's long-range goal is the reciprocal exchange of scholarships between the National University of Ireland and Catholic colleges in this country, including the six in western New York. In addition to Canisius and D'Youville, they are Niagara and St. Bonaventure Universities and Rosary Hill and Mount St. Joseph Teachers Colleges.

Selection of the American student to be sent to Ireland will be made by the presidents of the six cooperating colleges and universities here, under the chairmanship of the fund's president, the Right Reverend Monsignor Francis Garvey, administrator of St. Joseph's Cathedral. He studied in the National University in Dublin.

## Warren Rejects Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include additional editorial comment on the courage and determination of the citizens of Warren County, Va., from the Richmond News Leader of February 19, 1959:

WARREN COURT, WARREN COUNTY

Back in 1954 and 1955, when the Warren court was rewriting the Constitution of the United States and laying down new rules for the operation of public schools, the legal situation could be summed up syllogistically:

(1) The Constitution prohibits the States from performing any act that denies a citizen equal protection of the laws.

(2) The maintenance of racial segregation in a public school is an act that denies a citizen equal protection of the laws.

(3) Therefore, the States are prohibited from performing any act intended to maintain racial segregation in a public school.

If every other consideration were put to one side, and these premises assumed to be true, the conclusion would follow logically. The late Circuit Judge John J. Parker, in expounding this process of reasoning, went to great pains to emphasize one thing: It was segregation that was prohibited, and not integration that was decreed. The procedure, he explained, was injunctive in nature: The States were enjoined against the performance of an unconstitutional act; the States were not affirmatively required to perform any constitutional act. The 14th amendment prohibits; it does not demand.

Many orders have been issued since Judge Parker spoke. In January of 1956, the first note of confusion crept in, when District Judge Taylor not only directed that segregation as to high school students in Anderson County (Tenn.) be discontinued, but also directed county school authorities to adopt a program of integration. The following August, Judge Taylor referred to his January decree as the aforesaid integration order. He enjoined six persons individually and all other persons who may act in concert with them from hindering, obstructing, or in anywise interfering with the aforesaid order, either by words or acts or otherwise. And among the acts of interference and obstruction cited by Judge Taylor were any acts that tended to prevent white students from attending the Clinton High School, and any acts that might keep the high school from operating in an orderly manner.

Just 1 year later, in Little Rock, the same sort of judicial orders were entered. There Judge Davies enjoined a group of white parents "from interfering with and preventing the opening of integrated high schools." On September 3, 1957, Judge Davies "directed and ordered [the Little Rock School Board] to integrate * * * the senior high schools immediately and without delay."

We recall the Clinton and Little Rock cases to make the point that in Clinton and Little Rock, Federal judges did not attempt merely to prohibit segregation; they attempted affirmatively to order integration, and they used the weapon of injunction broadly to prevent anything that might interfere with their decrees.

Now consider the situation in Warren County, Va. If the Taylor-Davies approach is to be pursued, what is the logical next step? Nothing could be plainer. It is to compel the white students to return to Warren County High School under threat of punishment for contempt of court. Under the Taylor-Davies doctrine, these students clearly are obstructing and interfering with integration of the high school. Their action in refusing to return makes an orderly high school impossible. On the face of it, there is something absurd in operating a 30-room high school, capable of housing 1,000 students, for the benefit of five 8th graders, four 9th graders, five 10th graders, six 11th graders, and two 12th graders. On the merits of the case, the school should be closed down again as an inefficient educational unit.

Presumably Judge Paul will not permit this. What, then, would be a logical solution? Would it not be to compel the white students to return, possibly in lock step, under the guns of Federal marshals? The sort of reasoning that defines freedom as slavery, liberty as tyranny, and twists an order prohibiting segregation into a decree requiring integration is capable of such a mandate. The process may be called law. Our own word for it is despotism.

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter dated March 7, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

"If Patrick Henry thought taxation without representation was so terrible, he should see it with representation." How often great truths are spoken in jest.

The Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, continues its almost daily all-day tax hearings. Simultaneously, the House meets to consider legislation already cleared by House committees for floor action. Daily mail and office case work (constituents with need for help in Government contact) continue heavy as ever. Beyond these activities are the necessary studies of issues, meetings, speeches, and papers for the RECORD with somewhere in here, a bite of lunch—these are full days, and had better

be, considering the problems confronting this Congress. Necessarily, my efforts in other legislative fields are limited in view of my increased duties and responsibilities in tax matters. Hearings on technical tax changes to the Internal Revenue Code concerning subchapters C, corporate distributions; J, estates and trusts; and K, partners and partnerships, are completed. Now we are holding hearings on depletion allowances. Oil and gas are not yet a part of these hearings. The depletion question is twofold. (1) The point of cutoff (point up to which depletion allowance is computed, a point between mining and manufacturing in developing a marketable product), and (2) the percentage rate. There are many minerals now benefiting by depletion allowances. Problems to resolve: Court reinterpretation of congressional intent and heavy litigation; and (2) mineral industries are each striving for maximum allowance; (3) a complicated new Treasury suggestion to replace existing law, disturbing to each industry, each of which is unique; (4) are the depletion allowances justifiable capital return, therefore tax free, or subsidy?

A bill to end the tax-exempt status of Federal public housing bonds was my legislative contribution this week. The Federal Government by law cannot sell its own tax-exempt bonds. Yet a practice has grown up whereby these bonds are sold in the open market by a shell or front agency designated by the local public housing authority, and Federal interest payments go directly to this front agency. This is simply a dodge or ruse, as many see it. As such, it is illegal. Further, compare this sale to that of a true municipal bond which is sold by a city such as Dallas. This bond is backed by local credit (not Federal), secured by property taxation, ad valorem taxes. These bonds, too, are tax exempt. Competitively, what chance has a city bond in open sale against a Federal bond? And how about the different Federal bonds? Public housing bonds will pay 3.4 percent tax-free to the wealthy investor, when Joe Doe's Government savings bond earns 3¼ percent, and on this he must pay income tax. Is that fair? It is obvious to me that ending the tax-exempt status of public housing bonds is legally and morally right.

Roundup of current items of interest: (1) The AFL–CIO Machinist published an analysis of the purchasing power of wages today compared to 1938 and found it takes fewer hours of work to earn food, clothes, furniture and other needs; simultaneously, the AFL–CIO's Meany lampooned Russia's claims of "workers' paradise" by comparing the lot of the worker in the United States and Russia. Unanswered: When will labor leaders recognize that the productive capacity of our industry joined with incentive, ingenuity, and sweat of our people is the cause of wage-earner prosperity and not Federal aid, which labor leaders incessantly demand. Unanswered, also, when will the wage earners wise up to inflation that waters the purchasing power of their earnings, inflation caused by big Government spending as demanded by labor leaders. Are the labor leaders trying to create problems for wage earners or solve them? (2) How about a Federal taxpayers' revolt? Taxpayers in the State of Washington have signed a petition pledging they'll seek no new State services. A Dallas taxpayer returned to me a Government check as his contribution to reducing the demand for Federal aid, reversing the trend. It wouldn't take many protests of long-suffering taxpayers across this land, in each congressional district, to make Members of Congress cut back on the big spending. (3) A fearless stay-put attitude on the U.S. part is the only answer to the Berlin crisis or to Khrushchev in any negotiation, and if that fails, as have all other contractual obligations been broken by Russia, then we'd better deny recognition to Russia, tighten our belts and be prepared for anything. Further, it's time, as I see it, to think about another defense attitude than our "let the other fellow strike the first blow" policy. In all-out nuclear war there might not be a counterpunch, let's face it. (4) Balanced budget department: We're just before having the financial roof cave in—fantastically expensive Democrat programs in housing, depressed areas aid, airports, farm subsidy, in the multibillions beyond the administration's budget, are facing us. So we are confronted again with fiscal responsibility versus the political "I'm for the people by spending more of their money" boast. Is it more courageous to spend someone else's money, and politically take credit for allegedly doing good, or to say no, we must live within our income and protect the value of our currency? The right course is not always the easy one. To the big Government planners, I quote former Speaker Cannon: "America is a hell of a success. Why tinker with it?"

---

## Hidden Taxes We All Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the following text of an article which appeared in the Detroit Times on March 1, 1959. The following is indeed an amazing disclosure of the hundreds of unknown taxes American citizens pay each year, many of which are duplications.

THE HIDDEN TAXES WE ALL PAY—THERE ARE 151 LEVIES ON A LOAF OF BREAD AND 600 ON YOUR HOME

(By John Gariepy)

Let's knuckle down to it.

When it comes to paying taxes we haven't heard the most of it.

That's because taxpayers and who isn't a taxpayer—don't know when they are paying taxes.

Confused?

Well, the taxes we pay and will continue to pay are staggering.

Some are well publicized, hundreds more are unknown.

When Joe Citizen shuts off his alarm clock (10 percent excise tax) and begins his day a host of taxes become due and payable.

The Tax Research Institute recently pointed up a few:

On a man's suit—116 taxes.

On a woman's hat—150 taxes.

On a loaf of bread—151 taxes.

On a house—600 taxes.

The institute estimates the average American family with an income of $4,500 annually probably pays about $1,425 in taxes, or just under one-third of its total income.

Now every business line and every product has specific taxes incident to itself as well as many that are commonly shared.

At every level of government, there are specific levies, totaling in the thousands. No business or individual is hit with all of them, a few share many of them.

Some take the form of permits or licenses and are actually fees paid for services rendered.

No one particularly objects to this type of tax because in most instances maintenance of safety in one form or another is involved.

Yet the total amount sucked out piecemeal from a single business each is substantial.

As part of the cost of doing business it is paid by the ultimate consumer when he receives a service or buys a product.

However, it must be remembered most of the hidden taxes (dollar volume) are duplication, rather than a widespread array of different levies.

With the help of the Michigan Association of Certified Public Accountants, let's follow Joe Citizen for 1 day, admittedly a big one, and see where he pays hidden taxes.

The electric bulb that lights Joe's bedroom and costs 83 cents, for example, includes 6 cents excise tax in the sales price. The electric current came from a plant which paid public utility property taxes at the rate of $32.89 per thousand in 1958.

The electric toaster, frying pan, or stove used for preparing breakfast carries 5 percent excise taxes. The same applies to refrigerator and furnace.

The match Joe used to light his first cigarette of the day he may carry as much as 10 percent of the sales price in the tax. Use a cigarette lighter, it's still 10 percent.

When a person smokes a cigarette the gray cloud curling away almost glitters with gold.

The cigarette came out of a pack carrying 8 cents Federal tax, 5 cents Michigan State law. At a pack a day, that is $47.45 a year in taxes exclusive of duplication taxes. The menthol aroma had 35 cents a pound excise tax on it.

As Joe drove his clunker towards the depot to catch the 8:10 commuter he was figuring how to buy a new car costing about $2,500.

Cars are gems when it comes to hidden taxes.

The Automobile Manufacturers Association estimates the taxes at 23.7 percent of the cost.

Every time raw materials or parts move from producer or supplier towards the ultimate consumer the taxes of producer or processor are duplicated.

The most frequently duplicated taxes are corporate income (maximum 52 percent), social security (5 percent total), unemployment (1 to 4.5 percent presently on the first $3,000 of every employe's income), transportation (10 percent), telephone and telegram (10 percent), stamp tax on security transfers (4 cents on each $100 of value), safe deposit box (10 percent), and gasoline (3 cents per gallon), permits, licenses, and inspection fees.

At the State level there are corporation, franchise, business activities, intangible, gasoline, motor vehicle, license, high, tunnel, ferry, and bridge tolls, sale and public utility permits, licenses and inspection fees.

The cities and counties level personal and real property taxes, some local units have sales and income taxes, permits, licenses and inspection fees.

The most obvious taxes on a car are the sales tax, about $72.82 on Joe's intended purchase, and the Federal excise tax of about $182 which include levies on heaters and radios (considered luxuries) and 8 cents a pound on rubber in tires.

This excise tax originally was an emergency measure of World War I when cars were a luxury, not a necessity.

The taxes on materials, parts and transportation prior to receipt by the auto manufacturer carry as estimated $150 tax on Joe's car to which the manufacturer adds his share of income and similar taxes, exclusive of excise and totaling about $137.

The dealer obtains another $36.44 mostly in duplication taxes. The license plate costs $12.75 and the Federal and State slices on 5 gallons of gas and 6 quarts of oil to drive out of the showroom add 68 cents more.

Altogether, special taxes on auto use in Michigan contribute 28.9 percent of all State tax revenues, the association said.

In gasoline, where Federal and State taxes total almost 10 cents a gallon, the 50 or 100 taxes paid from the moment oil is taken from the ground (severance tax) until pumped into Joe's tank may easily equal more than one-half the pump price, experts think.

When Joe walked to his office, he saw a car he liked and he took a picture of it. Some of the chemicals used in picturemaking carry a 6-cent-a-pound plus 38 percent ad valorem based on the selling price of competitive items made in the United States.

In the office, Joe turned on the air conditioning, unlocked the cash register, and uncovered the adding machine—all 10 percent items.

He changed his mind about buying a new car and called his serviceman to replace the battery, $16.50 ($1 tax) and put in a new set of spark plugs, $11 (70 cents tax).

When Joe bought his new ballpoint pen the dealer didn't miss collecting 10 percent excise tax. It was included in the wholesale price.

Before lunch Joe had a "boilermaker," a whisky and a beer. He also put a dime in the jukebox.

When a man imbibes he takes a drink of taxes.

The whisky price included Federal tax at the rate of $2.10 a fifth plus a markup of 46 percent by the State liquor control commission, profits from which support State functions.

Hidden in the retail price of the drink was a $50 Federal license, plus a $1,000 (maximum) State class D license for a hotel.

Also hidden were a city $100 license (hotel), $40 parking lot license, $10 restaurant permit, $20 hotel inspection, $15 public building inspection, plus a host of small fees such as signs, electrical, power, heating, additions, repairs, water, garbage disposal, plumbing, storage, air pollution, smoke abatement, and all the duplication taxes of the product and of the hotel.

On the way back to the office Joe stopped in to watch a bowling tournament. The annual Federal and city licenses on each bowling alley and pool table is $20 and $5.

One of Joe's friends "gave him a horse" and Joe called a bookie to place a bet.

To do business legally, under Federal law, the bookie must buy a $50 license.

Either way the local police will be watching the bookie and that's probably one reason bookies never pay odds of more than 20 to 1 on a straight horse bet, regardless of what happens at the track.

At the office he oiled some of the equipment. All the oils have excises, even castor oil, 1½ cents a pound.

At home that night, Joe watched television until expected company arrived to play cards.

Ten percent on the television, 13 cents a pack on the cards, both Federal. On packs carrying more than 2 jokers or 54 cards the tax is higher.

## What Is Happening to Our Republic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting and timely address delivered by Mrs. Lucile Hosmer, president of the northern division, California Federation of Republican Women, before a recent meeting of that organization:

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO OUR REPUBLIC?

George Orwell, famous author, once wrote a book called "1984" in which he described how history was rewritten daily to suit the purpose of the despots in a completely collectivized state. Any event which could be considered to be against the best interests of the state was rewritten or else completely eradicated.

Since there are those who have been striving for years to change the meaning of our Constitution and our system of government, don't you feel that it is time that we know and understand the forces at work?

Who are they who are so anxious to convert our form of government into a Socialist state? Where did they start and when?

Nearly 100 years ago, a group of political refugees met in New York City and set a goal by which they could convert our constitutional Republic into a Marxist-Socialist state. This group was joined by others of their kind who came to America for political asylum, after they had been expelled from their native lands for plotting the overthrow of the existing governments there and replacing them with Marxist-Socialist type of government. Their activities received little notice because news of the impending Civil War filled the papers. And those who were aware of their activities considered it a "crackpot" scheme which could never happen, here.

Yet, these people, like Marx, like Chou En Lai, like Lenin, and Hitler, had it all spelled out in a book as to just what they intended to do and how to do it.

They were smart enough to know that they could never sell the Marxist-Socialist philosophy to a deeply religious people who believed in God; nor to patriots who were proud of their country and its accomplishments. Those two things must be wiped out of the consciousness of the American people. The first target must be the strong religious faith of the people who wrote our Constitution and established our country on Christian principles, based on the Ten Commandments.

They (the Socialists) realized that the people of a nation whose forefarthers had distributed between the years 1777 and 1778, 20,000 Bibles in the Colonies as the political textbook for America would not be easy prey for their atheistic philosophy. They saw that our deep, abiding faith and religious convictions were reflected in our Constitution and Declaration of Independence, that man was created by God and endowed with unalienable rights by his Creator. These convictions were going to make it a difficult task to replace our concept of government with theirs—a system which made the state the supreme being and denied everything for which our American ancestors fought and died.

Consequently these exponents of change took the indirect approach, which they termed "political and legislative action." They combined this with the activities of their very talented and capable propaganda artists who had definite responsibilities: First, to destroy America's deep religious faith; second, to confuse and blur his understanding of the basic principles upon which this country was founded and the motives of the men who founded it; and last but not least, to completely annihilate the faith, pride and confidence of America in the rightness of our way of life.

They estimated that, with the indirect approach, it would take about 100 years to accomplish this goal. Never at any time using the word socialism; quietly, without fuss, without noise; steadily, continuously, they have been propagandizing a whole nation; its writers; it leaders; its teachers; its schools; until this plan is now in its final stages: and unless we, as individual Americans, wake up, their program will succeed (as they planned) by 1964.

All of us know that today our Congress and our Legislature is dominated by those who have been elected by the CIO–ADA political action groups which are so strongly in favor of a labor-socialist government. They have taken over complete control of the Democrat Party, except in certain parts of the South. They are marching steadily onward; toward the destruction of our constitutional republic and our rights and freedoms as individuals. They are determined to replace our constitutional republic with the Socialist state and with man as its servant.

They call it progress. Is it?

In 1872, Richard Frothingham, a noted historian of his day, in speaking of the social order prior to Christianity, wrote: "At that time, social order rested on the assumed natural inequality of man. The individual was regarded as of value only as he formed a part of the political fabric and was able to contribute to its uses as though it were the end of his being to aggrandize the state. This was the pagan idea of man. The wisest philosophers of antiquity could not rise above it. Its influence imbued the pagan world state. It regarded as of paramount importance * * * not the man * * * but the citizen whose physical and intellectual forces it absorbed. This low view of man was exerting its full power when Rome was at its height of power and glory.

"Christianity then appeared with its central doctrine that man was created in the Divine image and destined for immortality, pronouncing that in the eyes of God all men are equal. This asserted for the individual an independent value. It created the great inference that man is superior to the state which ought to be fashioned for his use. This was the advent of a new spirit and a new power in the world."

Where today, in our histories or our school texts do you find writings such as this? So, what's new about man as the servant of the state? Remember this: "A government that is big enough to do everything for you (socialism) is big enough to do everything to you, and is big enough to take everything from you."

What other things have contributed to the slow "creeping of socialism" into our midst with its doctrine of "something for nothing;" with its doctrine that we are a democracy in which the will of the majority 50 percent, plus one, is the law. Don't ever forget that while you may be one of the majority today, benefiting perhaps by taking something from your neighbor, tomorrow you can be the minority.

Three times in the history of mankind outstanding attempts have been made to establish the freedom of the individual.

First, in the days of Abraham, when he recognized that there was only one God of all things and that man was free and self-controlling, responsible for his own actions. His people prospered for a time under this concept, but once they permitted others to make their decisions for them, and took subsidies from the pharaohs for work that they didn't do—once they refused to stand firm for their convictions as free men, they returned to serfdom and slavery.

Moses came, centuries later, and took them out of the bondage and slavery in which they had placed themselves. Most of them had forgotten what it meant to be free. They abused and criticized Moses continually. He endured it because he understood the truth about God and man. Finally, he gave them the Ten Commandments, hoping it would serve as a moral code until such time as they were capable of understanding its deeper spiritual meaning.

It took many centuries of living with and under the Ten Commandments before mankind was ready for the advent of Jesus and Christianity. For 300 years after His coming there was great growth in the freedom of the individual. Jesus never taught mass salvation nor group salvation. His rule was "work out your own salvation," as an individual. It was not the job of the state to do it for the individual. Once again, however, men refused to accept their responsibilities as free individuals; they accepted patronage and protection from the pagan Emperor Constantine, instead of relying on God. Through their refusal to stand firm for their Christian principles they plunged the world into the era known as the Dark Ages.

The only glimmer of light in the centuries that followed was in 1215 when the Magna Carta outlined some of the rights of man as an individual.

When the republic of the United States was established and its Constitution adopted, some centuries later, the third outstanding attempt to establish the freedom of man as an individual was made.

Jesse T. Peck in his book, "History of the Great Republic," written in 1868, stated: "It may herewith be, with propriety, reaffirmed that Christianity was the guiding power of American colonization and the forming force of American institutions. This is the religion of our great Republic."

He said also "destroy religion and liberty is dead."

Pioneer Americans knew that all men were free under God and accepted their responsibilities that went with freedom, including eternal vigilance. They realized, too, the importance of written law as a restraint on an unlimited form of government, such as was accepted in European countries.

They had had the bitter experience of being subjected to the will of others, without any consideration for their own powers of judgment or right to make their own decisions. Therefore they designed to establish here a limited form of government, under a Constitution; one under which the largest freedom for individual activity would prevail and where the minority and the individual would have the same rights and freedoms as the majority. A government in which individual rights would be sacred from invasion.

Our constitutional Republic, with its checks and balances, with its freedom from unlimited power in any one department, held to this design, throughout. The fundamental rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions given "by God" are, as the Declaration of Independence states, "unalienable rights," and governments instituted by men "to secure these rights, not to grant them," as the Socialists believe.

The underlying principles of our Republic is that men are endowed with rights, not by the grace of a President, nor a court, nor a constitutional provision, nor a bureaucrat, but by their Creator.

Once again from the "History of the Great Republic," by Jesse T. Peck: "God is the rightful, actual sovereign of all nations; that a purpose to advance the race beyond all its precedents in intelligence, goodness and power, formed this great Republic; and that religion is the only life force and organizing power of liberty."

No government in the world has given to its people the freedom enjoyed by Americans; freedom of religion, the right to worship when and how we choose, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, the right to own property and universal franchise.

During the first 100 years of our country, these freedoms were jealously guarded. Men and women put God first, in their hearts, in their homes, in their schools, and in their businesses, and consequently, in their government.

However, through the subtle brainwashing and propaganda of the masters of deceit over a period of nearly a hundred years, any reference to God, to faith or religion has been so belittled and ridiculed that many people are ashamed to admit that they believe in God.

So it has been, too, with patroitism and pride of country and our way of life. Anyone so naive as to think that the accomplishments and freedoms which we have here in America are tremendous, and something which we should defend and protect, is often labeled a "reactionary" or an "isolationist" and someone to be ridiculed and scorned.

William Penn once said: "Men will either be governed by God or ruled by tyrants." Ever since World War I when we went into battle with the slogan "Make the World Safe for Democracy," we, as a nation, have slowly, gradually, without fuss, without noise, been indoctrinated with the idea that we are a democracy rather than a republic.

In 1928, the U.S. Army Training Manual (No. 2000-25, p. 51) appeared this definition of democracy:

"A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of 'direct' expression. Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic, negating property rights. Attitude toward last is that the rule of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demogogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

Within less than 30 years, the U.S. Army in its Department of the Army Field Manual, "The Soldier's Guide," has this definition:

"Meaning of a democracy: Because the United States is a democracy, the majority of the people decide how our Government will be organized and run and that includes the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The people do this by electing representatives and these men and women, then carry out the wishes of the people."

How come such a change come about, in less than 30 years, unless a very definite program had been operating to change the thinking of the people concerning the meaning of democracy? In fact, today most people believe that the two systems of government are synonomous. Yet the fact is that the very differences between our constitutional republic and democracy are the differences that can mean the loss of our freedoms and rights as individuals.

Our Constitution is the highest concept of government brought forth in any age to protect the rights and freedoms of the individual. We must recognize that our concept of a republic as prescribed in the Constitution rests upon our acceptance of man "as created by God" and his "worth and dignity" as an individual. We have to regain an understanding of our constitutional Republic and our republican form of government: as contrasted with a democracy and various forms of socialism. Unless our citizens are properly instructed in our American principles and the basic concepts of our republican system of government, how easy it becomes for large masses of our people to barter their great American heritage of freedom for a "mess of pottage"—"pottage" offered to them for their temporary or fancied needs by those dedicated to the destruction of our Republic or indifferent to its protection when it interferes with their own personal aggrandizement.

Our Republic was established as a government of laws, not of men. The destruction and intolerance of majority rule has always meant mob rule and the loss of human rights and freedoms.

In the San Francisco Examiner of December 11, 1958, there was an article by John F. Allen concerning the brainwashing of our American soldiers in Korea. The chief psychiatrist at Letterman General Hospital was quoted as saying that "many of the men knew so little about U.S. history, its ideals and traditions that they were unable to offset the advantage of the Chinese indoctrinators who knew so much more about American history and its political doctrine. They could not answer arguments in favor of communism with arguments in favor of Americanism."

He continues with this statement: "Knowledge for those who possessed it was a valuable weapon of defense."

Why didn't they have this knowledge? Why hasn't it been taught in our schools? Why do we not recognize that the basic principles of individual action, free enterprise, the right to make our own decisions, is slowly being stripped from us and that our sons and daughters are being educated for the "new social order" as started by the progressive educationists in the early thirties?

Dr. E. Merrill Root, who has been professor of English at Earlham College (Indiana) since 1930, and is well known for his poems and his prose as well as many articles on education, recently published a book called "Brainwashing In Our High Schools." In this study he quotes from some 11 textbooks on American history used throughout the United States. He found in these books overwhelming evidence of hostility to basic American principles. He found that the present school-generation is being thoroughly indoctrinated to accept socialistic and totalitarian "way of life". The authors of these textbooks misquote and distort the motives, the actions and the sayings of the authors of the Constitution, portraying them as being "creatures of wealth" engaged in a "class struggle"—not a revolution to establish the rights and freedoms of man as an individual. It seems as though the tactics described by George Orwell in his book "1984" have been in use for some time.

The New Deal is praised as "anti-capitalistic" government: interference was, and is, always for the benefit of the "average man" to protect him against "big business," and any strike is always caused by management. The unions and Government according to them, are always the fair-haired boys.

When we refuse to accept our responsibilities as individuals, as citizens, as parents, these foreign ideologies and "isms" make great strides. Our problem now, is how much time do we have to reverse this trend?

Now, that it is uncovered, what are you going to do about it? Go home and say "my, that was quite a speech—and so inspirational. Isn't it nice that there are people like that who take the time to do all that work and come and tell us about it?"

History records that every civilization goes through a cycle.

"From fetters to faith, from faith to freedom, from freedom to folly, and from folly back to fetters, again." Must we, as Americans, conform to this cycle? Or, will we, as individuals, do what needs to be done, right where we are, with courage and determination, upheld by our trust in God, faith in our country, our Constitution and its principles as a Republic, which protects our rights and freedoms as individuals * * * and fight hourly and daily until the victory is won * * * that we may remain * * * free.

## Ingenuity in Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the ingenuity and the ability of qualified small business management to make a great success from small beginnings is a true American story. That it still does happen in the United States in spite of the many problems of small business has been glowingly told about one of my constituents and an enterprise in my district.

I offer the story by Jerry Gillam, of the Star-News Vanguard Bureau, because I feel that not only is it an interesting story in itself, but because I feel that it will be an inspiration to many others and speaks eloquently of the advantages inherent in the enterprise of a free people:

REVELL, INC., MODELS OUTSHINE
(By Jerry Gillam)

Good-looking models are big business in Venice these days.

Not only the female variety, which are ever-present along the seashore, but eye-catching plastic model kits of airplanes, rockets, ships, cars, and animals produced by Revell, Inc.

Revell did a gross business of $35 million on the retail level in 1958.

Lewis H. Glaser is president of the firm which employs over 700 local residents in a modern plant at 4223 Glenco Avenue.

National magazines have praised the company as one of the most successful business ventures in our time.

County Supervisor Burton W. Chace presented a resolution last week which commended Glaser for spawning a hobby enjoyed by children (and their dads, too) all over the world.

The Los Angeles City Council recently bestowed a similar honor on the firm.

Revell models are a far cry from the old type containing a chunk of balsa wood, etc., with the hobbyist spending hours of shaping with a razor blade and sandpaper.

Glaser's kits are exact miniature replicas of the subject when completed, right down to the smallest detail.

Authenticity is obtained by going directly to the Armed Forces for blueprints on ships and planes or right to the Detroit manufacturer for specifications on cars.

Glaser is a real stickler for accuracy. In fact, plans for one kit of a jet fighter plane were held up by the maker until the Air Force passed on them for security reasons.

Although details of the current U.S. missiles and moon rockets are still rather vague to the average adult American, Revell has kits on the market for boy scientists with prices gaged to their weekly allowance.

Girls are not forgotten either for Revell also has a line of realistic animals, including a beagle puppy, squirrel and koala bear, complete with imitation fur, to attract the female sex.

A post World War II plastic toy manufacturer, Glaser found the key to success with one of his first model kits—a replica of the ancient Maxwell car made famous by the jokes of comedian Jack Benny.

The Maxwell was snapped up by hobbyists with bandaged fingers from razor blade cuts and Revell was on its way.

Today, Revell has three other plants in addition to the one in Venice which is "headquarters."

Branches in South Plainfield, N.J.; London, England; and Bielefeld, West Germany, take care of the demand on the east coast and overseas.

Glaser may be in store for a singular honor someday in the future when a youthful scientist tells newspaper reporters on the moon that he got his interest in science from a Revell model rocket kit back in 1959.

Fantastic? Maybe, but Chace's resolution could predict just such a happening when it says:

"Whereas the absolute accuracy of the models, besides providing an interesting hobby for our youngsters, also places in their hands models of devices which they, one day, must grow up to master as our world advances scientifically; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Board Supervisors congratulates Revell, Inc., for its outstanding success and expresses the wish that the industry will continue to grow for years to come by making available the type of product to our children which will excite their interest in scientific advancement while at the same time giving them a pleasant hobby to pursue."

## Schenectady Gazette Offers a Suggestion on the Use of Capitol Columns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, a good deal of interest has been focused recently in Washington and in the surrounding area with regard to the disposal of the 24 sandstone columns which have recently been removed from the east front of the Capitol, in connection with the Capitol extension program now being carried on under the supervision of a joint committee of Congress headed by the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I know that in response to the suggestions of a local newspaper, many persons have come forward with suggestions as to how these columns might be utilized. I was delighted recently in reading a copy of the Schenectady Gazette for February 26, in my home town, to see that this newspaper had also considered the matter editorially and had made its own suggestion for the use of these columns. I am delighted to see that the aesthetic problems of the District of Columbia are attracting the interest of leading citizens throughout the Nation, and I am happy to bring the suggestion of the Schenectady Gazette to the attention of the Commission in charge of the reconstruction work so that the views set forth may be given proper consideration. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the editorial from the Schenectady Gazette:

CAPITOL COLUMNS

In the process of enlarging the east front of the Capitol in Washington, 24 sandstone columns have been removed and they will be replaced with marble columns which are more durable. The 24 old columns are lying on the ground nearby. When the Washington Post and Times-Herald asked its readers for suggestions on what to do with them, all sorts of ideas were offered and it appears that a lively debate is shaping up.

To anyone who dislikes symbolism or monuments of any kind, a spirited discussion of what to do with the 24 columns will seem to be a waste of time. Toss 'em away and forget 'em, they will say. But there are others who like to retain physical evidences of the past as reminders of the sacrifices made by the generations that founded our Nation and made it grow.

One suggestion is that the 24 Capitol columns be set up on the Gettysburg battleground. Another is that each of the 13 original States receive one column and the remainder be set up somewhere in the District of Columbia. Another idea, which appeals to us, is that the 24 columns be erected beside the reflecting pool between the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial. Whatever the decision, we hope that their location will be esthetically attractive and tasteful and that there will be provision for permanent, proper maintenance.

## The Greatest Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY**
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a speech made by the Honorable Alf Landon at the Scottish Rite dinner, February 24, Topeka, Kans. I recommend to all Members of Congress they give thought and consideration to Mr. Landon's comments:

THE GREATEST THREAT

(Speech by Alf M. Landon at Scottish Rite dinner, Topeka, Kans., February 24, 1959)

Since World War II the Soviet has been campaigning against the free nations on three fronts:

1. Political.
2. Economical.
3. Military.

The moves on the political front are now converging on the Berlin decision.

The Soviet occupies the advantageous position in that there is unlikely to be any internal divergence in Communist policy.

The Soviet's policies are always devious—but settled. Khrushchev has no legislative body to consider and only manipulates public opinion behind the Iron Curtain to reckon with in formulating Communist policies.

Whereas the heads of the world's democracies have both to deal with in developing any united policies.

That the urgency is greater than in past crises precipitated by Stalin or Khrushchev is evidenced by Secretary of State Dulles talks a few weeks ago in London, Paris, and Bonn, and now both Prime Minister MacMillan and British Foreign Secretary Lloyd are in Moscow for a most unusual visit for the most unusual extent of 10 days. Immediately thereafter the British Prime Minister visits Paris on March 9 or 10, then Bonn on March 12 or 13 to discuss with the heads of the French and West German Governments the results of his talks in Moscow.

Undoubtedly he will then visit Washington for the final formulation of the Western democracies' united policy on Berlin.

Even then, with the sinister and menacing possibilities confronting them, the world's free states will not be in position with a settled policy and cannot be because as the deadline for civilization approaches the position of Khrushchev will shift north and then south like smoke in a drafting wind.

That will call for new consultations by the heads of government in Bonn, Paris, London, and Washington.

The situation is as if one football team decided on the field its signals and strategy by a committee—while all the plays of the other are called by one quarterback—Khrushchev.

All questioning of the President's defense budget as being inadequate for national security is academic as of now.

If fighting is necessary to protect the free peoples' rights in Berlin—there is nothing gained in charges and countercharges about the lag in America's guided ballistic missiles. We either possess the overall retaliatory power to make military action by the Soviet senseless or we do not. Nothing can be done about that now to affect the military balance of power by May 27.

All the questions on the economic front are actually somewhat academic also until the political or military decisions are made on Berlin.

If it is to be a shooting war what difference does it make whether the President's recommendations for sound money are to be ignored by the Congress or not. All civilization will be wiped out in a few days' time. Some life may be left here and there in remote jungles and mountain fastnesses of the world, where primitive barter still exists and the dollar, pound, franc, mark, and ruble are unknown.

The solidarity of the President, the Congress, and the American people has never in our entire history been greater than it is behind the plainly stated position of the U.S. Government. That is no surrender of America's rights and the free world's rights in Berlin.

We have been through so many crisis in the past 10 years that I think we are somewhat like the people in the old fable who were fooled so often by the boy crying "Wolf, Wolf" that they treated lightly the real event.

This is it. The other crisis precipitated by Stalin and Khrushchev have been on the periphery of the free peoples. This one involves the heart of Europe. Basically, the Berlin demands of Khrushchev are aimed to hamper the growing rearmament of West Germans. The Soviet fears that most of all.

I believe the free peoples of the world are like the patient hovering between life and death. They are facing a turn, either for better or for worse.

If the grim Berlin crisis passes, as the others have done, then the conflict will probably resume on the political and economic front.

In that event, I believe the tempo of the contest will pick up on the economic front.

If that occurs, the fiscal policy of the U.S. Government is not only of vital importance to every American, but to all the peoples in the world.

The primary principle of good government is to balance outgo with income. For 25 years we have departed from that policy of levying taxes to meet appropriations.

That policy has always ultimately wrecked every government that has tried it, whether democracy, republic, or monarchy.

Twenty-five years ago we deliberately adopted the theory of an English economist named Keynes that a little inflation every year would be good for any country.

However, in 25 years no other country has adopted that theory and our dollar has steadily been debased to the point that financial writers the past year are for the first time discussing evidences of a flight from the dollar.

Aside from nuclear war, no greater calamity could happen to the world.

In recent years the American dollar has been the mooring post for all the world currency to tie to. If it weakens, financial and political chaos will prevail.

The Keynes financial theory is a failure. The quicker we realize that, the safer our national existence as a people will be.

The longer the Congress delays returning to the old American principle of levying taxes to meet appropriations—the greater the danger to all Americans.

For 25 years the politicians have enjoyed a paradise of voting appropriations without levying taxes and if our republic is to survive that must be stopped.

In order to get the Members of the Congress off that loco-weed habit, each and every Member must be held accountable by his voters if he votes for appropriations in excess of revenues.

The only wage increase worthwhile to a working man is a wage increase with a stabilized dollar.

Everyone suffers. Not only the workers, who see their wage increases siphoned away by the decreased value of the dollar, but every bond holder, every owner of an insurance policy and everyone looking forward to social security.

The Congress has tried to meet the decreasing value of the dollar by increasing social security payments.

That is like taking "hooch" to cure cancer.

The steady decline in the value of American money by reason of the Congress' failure to match appropriation with revenues not only threatens wages but savings as well.

The lack of stability in the American dollar is one of the factors pricing our goods out of the world market—thereby creating unemployment.

It doesn't make sense, of course. A day of reckoning will come.

When it will come nobody knows. But that it will is a dead certainty.

## The Road to Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of Thursday, March 5, 1959:

THE ROAD TO BANKRUPTCY

What would happen to a business that operated on red ink 25 out of 30 years? Or to a family?

That is the record of the Federal Government. Sixteen of the last 30 years have been times of war or economic slowdown, when deficits were to be expected. But of the remaining 14 good years, the Government continued to spend more than it took in during 10 of them. The current deficit is by far the largest in a peace-time year.

The national debt goes up and up. So does the interest on it. So does the cost of living. And a man's tax burden gets heavier. This can't continue forever.

Nor is the $80-billion-a-year spending in Washington our only cause for concern. The costs of State and local government have been going up at a rate of $3 billion to $4 billion a year. They total something over $50 billion a year now. One-third, or more than $16 billion, of this comes from property taxes.

We are told that the reason for heavy Washington spending is that people are demanding more from the Federal Government all the time. We should expect then, that they would be demanding less from local and State governments. But the cost of these smaller governments is going up faster than the cost of Federal Government.

There are 3,000 counties, 34,000 cities and townships, 50,000 school districts, and 14,000 other districts. All of them are yelling for more money, or are about to.

## Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today, March 9, marks the anniversary of Amerigo Vespucci, a great Italian who left his mark as well as his name on our country.

Amerigo Vespucci, the merchant and adventurer to whom America owes its name, was born in Florence on March 9, 1451. This is the date given for Vespucci's birth in the "Encyclopedia Britannica." The "Encyclopedia Americana" gives March 18, 1452, and variant dates in other sources include the year 1454. He was the third son of Nastagio Vespucci, a notary, and Elizabetta Mini. His uncle, Fra Giorgio Antonio Vespucci, to whom he owed his education, was a scholarly Dominican. Amerigo was particularly devoted to the study of geography, and is believed to have encountered frequently the celebrated Toscanelli. For a time he was employed by the great commercial house of the Medici, then the ruling family in Florence. He made an avocation of the collection of maps and charts and became a skilled map draftsman.

Some time between the middle of 1489 and the end of 1491 he went to Barcelona, probably in connection with the Spanish business interests of the Medici. In 1493, he became connected with the commercial house of Berardi at Seville. Berardi, in the employ of the Spanish Crown, engaged in fitting out vessels for expeditions across the Atlantic. In this position it is probable that Vespucci participated in the fitting out of Columbus' second voyage.

Knowledge of Vespucci's own voyage is based on two letters written by him. One was written in 1503 to Lorenzo di Pier Francesco de'Medici, and the other was addressed in 1504 to his boyhood friend, Piero Soderini, gonfaloniere of Florence. The latter gives an account of four voyages in which the writer took part, the earlier two in the service of Spain and the latter two in that of Portugal. According to this account the first expedition sailed from Cadiz on May 10, 1497. Thus Vespucci visited the American Continent a year before Columbus, touching land at several points, including one not far from Cape Canaveral, Fla.

The letter to Soderini appeared in print in at least two editions, probably without Vespucci's knowledge. A Latin translation was published at St. Dié in Lorraine in April 1507. Martin Waldseemüller made use of it in his "Cosmographiae Introductio," published in St. Dié in the same year. This work con-

tained perhaps the first suggestion in print that the newly discovered fourth part of the world should be called America, because Americus discovered it.

## H.R. 5123, a Bill To Extend and Amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the last session of the Congress, I introduced a bill, known as H.R. 13092, proposing amendments to the Renegotiation Act of 1951. Time did not permit a full study of this and other bills proposing much-needed reforms in the procedures which now govern the renegotiation of defense contracts. One of the proposed amendments, providing for the judicial review of Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases, was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. In reporting favorably the bill incorporating this provision, the Ways and Means Committee announced that it was limiting the extension of the Renegotiation Act to a period of 6 months, because the committee intended to undertake a broad review of the entire subject of renegotiation early in this Congress. The report stated that at that time—

> Consideration will be given to the scope, objectives, and procedures of renegotiation and to possible amendments, including those proposed at the hearing on the present bill.

INFIRMITIES OF ACT SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Since the last session of the Congress there has been considerable study of the problems of renegotiation. I believe, as a result of what we learned during the last session and from the studies made since that time, that certain basic factors indicate quite clearly the course we should follow in providing the necessary reforms in the conduct of renegotiation. In the first place, renegotiation of contracts with the United States was initiated as a temporary wartime measure, because the exigencies of a national emergency required the expeditious procurement of property and services under conditions which precluded the safeguards attendant upon normal contracting procedures within the Government. At that time it was not expected that the renegotiation of Government contracts would last beyond the emergency. Nevertheless, we have now found that, despite the implication of a temporary existence inherent in usual provisions for a short extension of the act each time it expires, renegotiation has been a part of defense procurement for almost the entire period since the war. Many infirmities have remained in the act from the beginning, on the theory that it is purely temporary. As a result, controversies arise as to the reasonableness of the Board's action, particularly in view of the wide discretion given to the Board in determining excessive profits in individual cases and the secrecy which surrounds its deliberations and findings. Under the present act the Board is permitted to operate in a manner that is foreign to any other administrative agency of the United States having quasi-judicial powers.

CONTINUATION OF RENEGOTIATION IS NECESSARY

It may be that the continuation of renegotiation is necessary, because recurring threats to peace still require the expenditure of large sums of money for the national defense. However, I believe that contracting procedures within the Government are now adequate to prevent the accrual of profits beyond those contemplated by the parties in most cases, but the Government should be provided a means of recouping profits which may be considered excessive by appropriate standards. In other words, we should guard against windfall profits, which was the objective of statutory renegotiation in the first place. It is important to emphasize that the head of the department or agency of the Government negotiating a contract has the primary responsibility for preventing the accrual of excessive costs and profits by the effective use of available contracting procedures, and when this responsibility has been properly discharged, the integrity of Government contracts must be preserved to the same extent as contracts between private individuals. In my opinion it is morally wrong for the United States to contract in good faith with a person and years later, after performance has been satisfactorily completed, permit the Renegotiation Board to change the contract and take away profits that were openly and fairly negotiated by the parties in the first place.

EMPLOYEES DEPENDENT UPON SOUND DEFENSE INDUSTRY

I am especially concerned with renegotiation as it presently exists, because in California, and particularly in my district, there are thousands of employees who are dependent upon the soundness of the defense industry for their livelihood. Throughout the country there are millions of employees in the same position. In a situation as important and as serious as this, a maximum of publicity should accompany the findings of the Board to guard against unreasonableness and discrimination, and to allay suspicion of such shortcomings in the conduct of the Board's operations.

OBJECTIVES OF H.R. 5123

Accordingly, H.R. 5123 has four principal objectives:

First. The bill would add to the statutory factors which the Board must take into account under section 103 of the present act, the need for financial stability and incentives to efficiency and economy in the defense industry, and the desirability of comparing costs and profits of the defense industry with other industries in determining the reasonableness of profits.

Second. The bill seeks to preserve the integrity of contracts fairly negotiated with the Government by rendering subject to renegotiation profits in any year which exceed by more than 10 percent a portion of the profits contemplated by the parties.

Third. The bill seeks to give the Congress, the public and the individual who is affected thereby, more information on the reasons for the Board's decisions and the results of its determination in important cases. Freedom from congressional and public scrutiny has been a privilege enjoyed by the Board for reasons which do not appear on the surface, and in this age, which demands that Government activities be carried on in the light of day, a change in this respect is badly needed.

Fourth. The bill also provides for appeals from Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases to the same extent as in ordinary Tax Court cases. In view of the favorable reception given to a similar proposal during the last session, the justice of this amendment seems obvious.

TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF THE RENEGOTIATION ACT

During the last session of the Congress, the Renegotiation Act was extended for only 6 months to June 30, 1959. Section 1 of H.R. 5123 provides for a 2-year extension of the act to June 30, 1961.

AMENDMENTS PROVIDING ADDITIONAL STATUTORY FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING EXCESSIVE PROFITS

Section 2 of H.R. 5123 amends section 103(e)—title 50, United States Code Appendix, section 1213(e)—to insert new statutory factors among those which the Board must now take into account in determining excessive profits. In subsection A, it is provided that the Board must take into account, in addition to those items now set forth in the comparable provision of the present act, "a comparison with the costs and profits of other industries." Since the defense industry is in competition with industry generally, it is appropriate that the reasonableness of costs and profits be determined in the light of costs and profits incurred and enjoyed by other industries. Whether or not the Board now takes this into account is problematical. It is believed appropriate that it should be directed to give this factor due weight.

A new statutory factor is included in subparagraph F, which requires the Board to take into account in determining excessive profits:

> The need for financial stability in the defense industry and for proper financial incentives under a system of free enterprise in order to produce the highest degree of efficiency and economy in the performance of contracts with the departments and related subcontracts.

The defense industry has become a permanent part of the economic life of the Nation. The need for financial stability to the same extent as other industry forming part of our national life would seem apparent. The proposed statutory factor would require the Board to take this into account in determining excessive profits.

At the present time, section 103(e) enables the Board to take into account, in determining excessive profits, such other factors the consideration of which the public interest and fair and equi-

table dealing may require which factors shall be published in the regulations of the Board from time to time as adopted. The Board has not seen fit in its entire history to adopt any additional statutory factors by regulation. It would seem appropriate to direct the Board to take into account other factors if the public interest and fair and equitable dealing require it regardless of whether it is constrained to adopt regulations with respect thereto. By eliminating the requirement of a regulation a person subjected to the Board's jurisdiction would, if this amendment were adopted, be able to urge matters consistent with the public interest and fair and equitable dealing, which he is now precluded from presenting under the existing act.

PROTECTION OF AGREED PROFITS

Section 2 proposes a further amendment which is designed to encourage efficiency and cost reduction and at the same time give some support to the integrity of contracts entered into in good faith by the U.S. Government.

In substance it provides that the Board's determination of excessive profits cannot reduce the contractor's retained profits below the sum of the aggregate of agreed profits plus 10 percent of such agreed profits. The proposal includes a definition of the term "agreed profits" which is designed to produce an amount of such agreed profits generally less than those actually agreed upon. This amendment places renegotiation in its proper perspective, namely a method whereby "windfall" profits are recouped. Renegotiation is not the equivalent of an excess profits tax. Congress has not set up a formula or any real standards to enable the Board precisely to determine what profits are excessive. As a result controversies and inconsistencies appear to exist which should be eliminated to the greatest possible extent. The proposed amendment is designed to accomplish this end. This particular amendment will operate with respect to those contracts in which the profit negotiated by the parties is ascertainable either by specific reference in the contract or by other proof. It is to be noted that the departments may adopt rules where appropriate to identify the profits agreed upon by the parties.

PUBLICITY OF BOARD'S FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS

Section 3 entitled "Renegotiation Proceedings" is designed to provide the contractor with a full exposition of the reasons for a determination of excessive profits by the Renegotiation Board and the facts used by the Board in arriving at its decision before an order is actually issued. At the present time, not until an order is issued fixing excessive profits is a contractor entitled to any statement explanatory of the Board's position. Moreover, the statement itself cannot be used in the Tax Court for any purpose. There is a specific provision in the proposed amendment that such statement may not be used in the Tax Court as proof of the facts or conclusions stated therein but may be used as proof of the reason for such determination. The proposed amendment would also require the Board to make available for inspection by the contractor all data relating to the renegotiation proceeding and to supply the contractor, upon request, with copies of any part thereof which may be requested by the contractor. All of this is designed to give more attention to the basic principals of fair play to the end that the contractor may be fully apprised of the basis for any determination alleging excessive profits.

EXEMPTION OF STANDARD COMMERCIAL ARTICLES

H.R. 5123 in section 4 proposes an addition clarifying one of the criteria in the definition of a standard commercial class of articles.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF TAX COURT DECISIONS IN RENEGOTIATION CASES

Section 5 permit appeals from Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases to the same extent as other tax cases. It also removes any presumption of correctness in the determination of the Board from which an appeal is being taken. The act now provides that a proceeding before the Tax Court is a proceeding de novo. In such a proceeding the contractor and the Board should have equal status with respect to the controversy since the Board's determinations are not made in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act. It is not a true de novo proceeding if the Board's findings are entitled to a presumption of correctness. The proposed amendment is designed to eliminate the possibility of such an interpretation of the present act.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

Section 114 of the act now provides for a report to the Congress by the Renegotiation Board. The report contains no information with regard to the specific determinations of the Board in individual cases. As a consequence, the Congress, the public, and the adversaries before the Board are unaware of inconsistencies which may develop in the administration of the act resulting in unfairness and discrimination regardless of an innocent motive. There should be no objection to exposing findings of the Board to the light of day. The requirements of the proposed amendment simply provide that certain information already made available by the Board to the specific contractor involved be made public in its report to the Congress in all cases where the renegotiable business of a contractor exceeded $20 million in the year in question. I believe the public is entitled to know, where these vast sums of Government money are involved, how the Board has interpreted this law which is designed to eliminate excessive or windfall profits. The consolidated statistics that are submitted under the present law do not permit me or the public to learn how the Board is exercising its broad discretionary powers. It would seem to be a help to all—the Renegotiation Board, the Congress, procuring services, the public, and the companies who are receiving such large amounts of Government money—to open these actions to the light of day. Not only will this information be of interest to the Congress and the public but it will be in such form as to assure its use in Tax Court proceedings involving renegotiation determinations.

CONCLUSIONS

The amendments proposed by H.R. 5123 are designed to accomplish a greater degree of due process than is now the case and to surround the Board with the same safeguards against unreasonableness, discrimination, and abuse that apply to other administrative agencies with the power and authority similar to that conferred by the Renegotiation Act. Their adoption will tend to bring about stability in the defense industry to the advantage of the Government, the public, the defense industry, and its employees.

## Orient Air Deep Freeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 17, 1959*

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, a most excellent editorial which appeared in the Portland Oregonian on February 21 outlined very clearly and forcefully the urgent necessity for prompt and affirmative action by the administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide competitive transpacific airline service not only for the Pacific Northwest, but for California cities as well.

As indicated in the editorial, the year 1959 is certain to show a considerable gain in transpacific airline traffic and the American lines should not be handicapped more than they are now by foreign competition and U.S. restrictions. I join with the Oregonian in urging speedy action to alleviate this situation and to provide the good people of Oregon, California, and Washington the type of airline service they desire and to which they are entitled.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the editorial to which I referred:

ORIENT AIR DEEP FREEZE

President Eisenhower has sharply reminded the Civil Aeronautics Board that it has been dilatory in providing competitive transpacific airline service—a policy of the administration in which Portland has a big stake.

The President has addressed a letter to CAB instructing the agency to consolidate all requests for transpacific flight permits into a single case, decide which airlines should provide service and report the decision to him "at the earliest possible date." The President has final authority over overseas air traffic.

In 1957, the President approved CAB's decision granting Northwest Orient Airlines permanent certification for service to the Orient via the great circle (northern) route pioneered by that airline. The President also granted permission for Pan American World Airways to use the great circle route from Los Angeles and San Francisco to Tokyo. But he held in abeyance permission for Pan American to compete with Northwest Airlines in the Pacific Northwest by loading passengers, freight and mail at Portland and Seattle.

Since Northwest Airlines does not serve Portland on a direct route to the Orient, but only Seattle in this area, Portland is very much in favor of having the Portland and Seattle stops added to Pan American's service. Pan American has not yet begun to use the northern route to Tokyo while insisting that CAB and the President add Portland and Seattle first.

So far as Pan American's great circle service is concerned, we continue to be mystified as to why the President doesn't use the authority he reserved to add Portland and Seattle to the service—a move sought not only in Oregon and Washington but supported by chambers of commerce and others in both San Francisco and Los Angeles. Instead, he is checking the whole matter back to CAB for another go-around.

The CAB report to the President in January showed that transpacific traffic is continuing to grow; that a slight increase was recorded last year although domestic lines showed a slight decline; but that foreign lines made transpacific gains in passenger traffic while American lines slipped a little.

In other words, the competitive situation Mr. Eisenhower wants for the Pacific services is being provided by non-American lines. Granting of Pan American's right to serve Portland and Seattle-Tacoma and thereby to initiate its great circle service should not be further delayed. And if the competition is to be made complete, let CAB grant Northwest Airlines' application to serve California cities, also. The year 1959 is certain to record a considerable gain in transpacific traffic and the American lines should not be handicapped more than they now are by foreign competition and U.S. restrictions.

## John S. Letcher, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, Virginia is proud, and the Nation may be proud, of a teenager who has achieved public notice through his achievement in science, John S. Letcher, Jr., of Lexington, Va.

While we struggle, in self-conscious ineptness, to preserve a world for our children to inherit, those children, in the unquenchable optimism of youth, go bravely forward in the marking of new mileposts in man's search for understanding of the mysteries of his cosmos.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include editorial comment on the honor accorded this young Virginian.

From the Richmond Times-Dispatch of March 4, 1959:

TO THIS TEENAGER, A SALUTE

The news that 17-year-old John S. Letcher, Jr., of Lexington, had won a nationwide science contest appeared on the front page yesterday along with the exciting story that a U.S. rocket for the first time was expected to soar through the bounds of the earth's gravitation.

The simultaneous appearance of these two stories was a happy coincidence. Six-foot-six-inch John Letcher also hopes figuratively to reach out into space some day by developing a nuclear propulsion system for interplanetary travel.

John was chosen from an original field of 28,000 science-minded boys and girls who competed in the annual Westinghouse talent search. Not that it means anything to most laymen, but the record shows that an experimental linear electron accelerator built by young Letcher helped him win the coveted $7,500 scholarship first award.

ROTC Captain Letcher has been president of the Rocket Club at Baylor School in Chattanooga, Tenn., and has been on the varsity wrestling and soccer teams. His grades, needless to say, have been excellent. He's the kind of teenager we like to see make news.

John's mother told the Times-Dispatch that this talented young man wants to go to the California Institute of Technology.

"I guess he won't have a hard time getting in now," she said.

To Mrs. Letcher goes the national award for the understatement of the year.

## Are We Selling Children Down the River?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am more than pleased to make known to my colleagues a very fine article, well writen and well reasoned, in support of an urgently needed federal-aid-to-education program.

While I and many of my colleagues have appeared before the General Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor in support of the School Support Act of 1959—sponsored by my able colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and cosponsored by myself and others—I think it is always of interest and of importance to all of us to get the views from those in the community who have a close, on-the-spot acquaintance with the subject at hand.

Mr. Paul D. Ward, secretary, American Federation of Teachers, is certainly well qualified to speak and write on the educational needs of our Nation. His article, "Are We Selling Children Down the River?" appears in the March issue of The American Teacher, the publication of the organization he represents.

I heartily recommend wide readership of his article which follows:

ARE WE SELLING CHILDREN DOWN THE RIVER?

(By Paul D. Ward, secretary, American Federation of Teachers)

Federal aid to education is like motherhood; everyone who has a deep regard and concern for the future generations is for it. Those who oppose it claim we don't need it, and if we get it, Federal control is certain to follow.

Recent national and international developments have placed the arguments that "we don't need it" in grave doubt. Further, if we analyze the many programs of Federal aid that have existed in the past, there is little or no evidence to indicate that Federal aid necessarily leads to Federal control. If we make an all-out effort, Federal support for education can become a reality in this session of Congress. What is perhaps most crucial at this point is the type of program of Federal aid that is proposed and passed.

Many of the programs submitted to the last Congress were out of step with the need. Primarily to avoid the "Federal control" argument, the bills emphasized or pertained solely to construction of new school buildings. Construction of new buildings without provisions to adequately operate them, and operate those already in existence, may tend to add more complications to the problem than it does solutions.

Federal aid to education is not a new nor novel suggestion. It has existed in one form or another since the year 1785, 2 years before the adoption of our Constitution. Those who argue that Federal aid necessarily means Federal control either do not know the historical development of our schools, or they are deliberately using false assumptions and conclusions to obscure the real issue.

Federal support of education began with the Congress of the Confederate States in 1785 when it adopted an ordinance granting certain lands and moneys for school aid to each new State admitted to the Union. Many different types of Federal aid programs followed. More recently, in the 1930's the Federal Government participated to a very large degree by building many needed school plants under the PWA and WPA programs. During the 1940's still more aid was granted under the Lanham Act.

The early 1950's saw the development of Public Laws 815 and 874, which continued the principles of the Lanham Act and gave aid for the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools in federally impacted areas. These acts are in operation today and, if fault can be found with them, it is only that they are too limited in scope and appropriation. Certainly there is no evidence of Federal control nor any evidence of any attempt at Federal control.

One important lesson is obvious in any review of the operation of Public Law 874 and 815. It is that if any district is restricted in the moneys available for school purposes because of limitations on its real property tax base, then Federal aid for construction is not enough. There must also be Federal aid for the operation (including teacher salaries) and maintenance of the buildings once they are erected. Public Laws 815 and 874 are designed to relieve federally impacted areas, especially where there are large Federal installations that pay no property taxes to the local district. The families of the workers at the Federal plants may even live in public housing units which also are exempt from the property tax. Public Laws 815 and 874 compensate for this limitation on the local tax base by providing funds for construction and funds for the operation of the district based upon the number of children from federally connected families.

This has been a successful aid program. However, as several of the districts that receive this aid have pointed out, construction aid is often more harmful than helpful unless it is accompanied by a sound program of operational aid. In fact, there have been occasions where districts have rightfully threatened to refuse acceptance of buildings if they were not accompanied by operational aid.

But even this position of demanding that operational aid accompany construction aid is not the real answer to the problem. Actually, we are not operating the school buildings we have today at their highest efficiency. To be sure, we need new classrooms, and we need them desperately, but even more desperately we need qualified career teachers to man the classrooms now in existence. We can build buildings from now until there is no more land, but this will not guarantee every child an education. The

only opportunity a child has to be taught is to come in contact with a good teacher. It is possible that he could attend hundreds of classrooms and yet have learned nothing simply because the classroom lacked a full qualified teacher.

To solve the problem of an adequate education for our future generations, we first must admit to certain facts:

1. We need buildings, but first we need to keep our qualified teachers and we need to attract new qualified persons to the profession. This is an immediate need. This can only be done by increasing teachers' salaries to the point where the salaries become competitive with other professions and the conditions in teaching become attractive to a significant portion of the young people of America. Since most districts are at their tax-ceiling level now, the salary problem can only be solved through Federal aid or support of operation of existing school plants. The problem of those districts that are at their tax ceiling now is identical to federally impacted areas that are now served by Public Laws 815 and 874; only the cause is different.

2. The citizens of every community must take a close look at the framework of our present-day tax support of education. If they do, they will realize that the property tax is outmoded as a single source of school revenue. The only answer to the problem flows from the fact that the national wealth today is more realistically reflected in the growing income, not property as it was in the past, of the country. Therefore, needed support is most equitably arrived at through the Federal income tax.

Today we need an average additional amount spent on the education of each child per year equal to $240 to bring education to its proper levels. What would it cost the average taxpayer? In most districts because of the legal ceiling on real estate tax this need could never be met. Thus, if we are going to rely on local and State taxes alone, we must be willing to admit that in most cases we can never meet the challenge. But if no ceiling exists, the average householder would contribute approximately $200 per year more in property tax, or his rent would be raised proportionately. On the other hand, if the cost is borne through the Federal income tax, by lowering the exemptions of each income taxpayer by $100, each child in the United States can have $240 additional per year spent on his education. The real estate tax costs the average household $200 while the Federal support costs the same household less than $100 and avoids the whole question of legal ceilings on the local level. Which is the best for the average householder? Is not this the real issue in place of the so-called Federal control?

To put it another way, the tax for Federal support of education could be made even less regressive if Congress were to adopt the recommendations of the AFL–CIO economic policy committee. More than sufficient funds could be raised, without lowering the personal exemption, by taking the following actions:

(a) Repeal the special tax relief granted to dividend income by the Revenue Act of 1954.

(b) Require withholding taxes on the payment of dividends and interest.

(c) Repeal excessive depletion allowances and remove from such tax privileges many of the metals and minerals now covered.

(d) Tighten the capital gains tax structure by lengthening the holding period of long-range gains and increasing considerably the 25 percent tax rate. Remove from capital gains treatment the many types of income not originally included.

Is not the question of whether the burden of education should be borne inadequately by a tax on property or adequately by a tax on income the real question? This would appear as a conflict between the real-estate taxpayer and the income taxpayer. However, the real estate taxpayer knows he is protected by legal ceilings in most areas, thus he alines himself with the pressure groups and lobbyists who oppose any Federal expenditure for schools. The lobbyists for the children and future generations of America have never been able to equal the lobbyists of the anti-tax groups, thus adequate Federal support of education has been difficult to obtain.

3. When we reach the point that we are adequately financing the operation of our existing school facilities, we must build the additional classrooms that will bring each class size down to educationable and manageable proportions. As long as we have over 20 to 25 in any class we are not meeting sound educational requirements. To build the classrooms without having the qualified teachers available makes no sense, nor does the recruiting of capable people for teaching without classrooms make sense. The situation demands a well-coordinated program.

Future generations of Americans are being cheated of their rightful place of influence, leadership, and respect in the world community because our generation is not supporting education to the extent that today's world developments demand.

It is sheer folly to spend billions on ground, sea, air, and space defense today if at the same time we neglect the intellectual development of our children who must meet the challenge of tomorrow.

Every phase of our life, as well as the very defense of our democratic ideals and way of life, becomes more dependent each day upon the development of the mental skills of our people. Leading atomic scientists claim that the sum total of man's knowledge has more than doubled in the past decade.

Unless we are willing to face the facts of this development, and unless we are willing to develop a Federal support program that meets the educational need of our children and their children, then we must be prepared to face the horrible fact that we may be defending ourselves today but at the same time we are selling our future generations down the river.

## Thomas Masaryk: Man of the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marked the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic.

I want peace, but that does not mean that I am going to meet aggression unarmed; rather the contrary. I want practical, not Utopian, peace.

These were the words of Thomas Masaryk more than a generation ago. And these words alone would link him to America today, if nothing else did. The founder and first President of Czechoslovakia combined practical idealism with realism. Actually, however, we in the United States honor Thomas Masaryk because of the qualities of the political philosopher and the statesman, which link him with the men of all time. He was a man of stature, intellectually, politically, philosophically.

He arose in a day when western civilization was prepared to welcome a man of the people who promoted respect for the individuality of the common man. Not in the sense of Marxism did he plead the cause of the masses; for he rejected Marx. He also rejected Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche. In the truly democratic sense he followed the philosophers Plato, Hume, Mill, Spencer, but, above all, Comte.

His humble birth and struggle to secure an education made him sympathetic with the difficulties of the poor. His zeal for an education and his diligence as a tutor brought to him the realization of the value of the things of the mind and the things of the spirit. His experience as a member of the Austrian legislature gave him political insight. Because of his independence in that capacity he was recognized as a figure of remarkable political, philosophical, and ethical stature. His democratic thought and spiritual freedom were incorporated in his political actions.

When he had been for only 5 years President of the new Czechoslovak nation, of which he was the founder, laudatory messages came from Paris, from Brussels, from London. In them stress was laid upon the fact that the success of his leadership was due to the idealism with which he guided the young state. Comprehension of the kind of freedom desired by the nations in revolt at the time of World War I and a faith in the strength of the democratic feeling within them dominated all of his actions, and gained for him a reputation of rare insight and unusual political honesty.

He believed that Czechoslovakia had a special and unique message for mankind. Marked by religion and spiritual culture of a high order, the mission of the Czechoslovak soul as Masaryk saw it was independence and originality of thought. The shadow of this man stretched not only across and beyond the borders of Czechoslovakia. It has stretched down the decades since his death; and will, no doubt, continue to do so as long as there is a free world to recognize his great contribution to western civilization.

## A Good Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested, an editorial published in the

Lubbock Avalanche Journal, February 21, 1959:

A GOOD PLAN

Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of Weatherford, has a plan which, if followed long enough, eventually would liquidate the national debt.

Mr. WRIGHT has introduced a resolution in the House which would express the desire of Congress that in each succeeding year the Nation should pay on the principal an amount equal to not less than 1 percent of the present national debt. He points out that the debt now stands at $283 billion and that in the new fiscal year, we shall be paying $8,100,000,000 annually in interest.

The Weatherford Congressman believes the only way the debt can be eliminated is by paying on the principal a definite amount each year, while keeping up the interest.

The plan makes sense. That is the way a family or a business firm gets out of debt. What works for a private debtor should work for the biggest debtor of all—the U.S. Government.

## A Background Paper on Krebiozen From the American Cancer Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper from the American Cancer Society:

A BACKGROUND PAPER ON KREBIOZEN FROM THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

I. THE CONTROVERSY OVER KREBIOZEN

During the past 7 years, the owners and proponents of Krebiozen, a substance alleged to be beneficial in the treatment of cancer, have been engaged in a great campaign to publicize this substance. They have been disseminating propaganda through articles strategically placed in newspapers, magazines, and books, as well as by organized letter writing, and they have been using national political channels to further their interests. They have already been involved in legislative investigations in two States, California and Illinois.

According to Herbert Bailey's book, "A Matter of Life or Death" (Putnam's Sons, 1958), these individuals have made it clear that they wish to recoup from the sale of the substance an investment claimed to be about $2 million and that they intend to sell the substance for profit as a proprietary drug. Despite this fact, they have repeatedly petitioned health organizations supported by public funds to underwrite a test of the therapeutic efficacy of Krebiozen in collaboration with them. They have hoped to use public funds to defray the cost, estimated at $500,000 or more, of testing this privately owned substance.

Moreover, the chemical composition of Krebiozen remains unknown. The recent claims of its therapeutic efficacy which they have broadcast are based on case histories of patients treated with Krebiozen, although they have not given independent investigators access to these records within the last 5 years. The owners and proponents have demanded that the substance be tested according to their own terms, which are demonstrably unscientific.

Their steady campaign of publicity ostensibly designed to obtain support from either the American Cancer Society or the National Cancer Institute for testing the substance on their own terms has aroused public interest in Krebiozen. The following documentation which chronicles the history of Krebiozen will provide answers to some of the questions which the public has been asking about this unproved substance.

II. WHAT IS KREBIOZEN?

"Krebiozen" is a coined name applied to an alleged anticancer drug. It is said to have been produced by Dr. Stevan Durovic in Argentina prior to 1949. Dr. Durovic claims that he injected 2,000 Argentinian horses with Actinomyces bovis, a microorganism which causes "lumpy jaw" in cattle, and from the blood of these infected horses he extracted two grams—about one-half teaspoonful—of a whitish powder which he named "Krebiozen." The full details of the method of extraction have never been revealed. Later, Dr. Durovic brought this powder to the United States. Here, without prior chemical analysis of the powder, he dissolved it in No. 9 mineral oil in the ratio of one part of Krebiozen to 100,000 parts of mineral oil. Thus he made the original (and only) supply of Krebiozen amounting to 200,000 doses, 1 cc. each.

III. THE MEN BEHIND KREBIOZEN

Dr. Stevan Durovic:[1] Born in Ulcinj, Yugoslavia, in 1905, Dr. Durovic received the degree doctor of medicine from the University of Belgrade in 1930. He did postgraduate work at the University of Vienna and at the Pasteur Institute in Paris. During World War II, as a captain in the Medical Corps of the Royal Yugoslav Army, he was taken prisoner by the Italian army and was held for 18 months. In 1942, on the basis of his being a physician in ill health, he was released and he traveled to Spain and Argentina on a Yugoslav passport with a Vatican visa. In 1944 in Buenos Aires, he established Duga, S.A., which was financed by his brother, Marko Durovic, a former munitions manufacturer. At the Duga laboratories he prepared a whitish powder which he named "Kositerin" and which he thought was useful for treating high blood pressure. Dr. Durovic visited the United States in March 1949, for the purpose of working with doctors at Northwestern University in testing Kositerin. Kositerin was found to be without value for the treatment of high blood pressure.

In August 1949, Dr. Durovic met Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, a distinguished medical researcher and vice president of the University of Illinois. At this time Dr. Durovic told Dr. Ivy about another substance, Krebiozen, which he believed was effective against cancer, and he solicited Dr. Ivy's help in testing the drug.

Dr. Durovic is not licensed to practice medicine in this country. He has stated that he is interested only in research, but he has not published in any scientific or medical journal in this country during his nearly 10 years of residence here. In July 1952 he was granted permanent residence in the United States through Senate bill 1159, sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois. In September 1958 he became a naturalized citizen of the United States.

Dr. Andrew C. Ivy: Born in Farmington, Mo., in 1893, Dr. Ivy received his Ph. D. from the University of Chicago and his medical degree from Rush Medical College. He has been the author or coauthor of many published scientific articles. Numerous honorary degrees have been awarded to him and he has held important posts in several universities, in the Government and in private organizations. He was at one time Scientific Director of the Naval Medical Research Institute, Executive Director of the National Advisory Cancer Council, and consultant (on war crimes) to the Secretary of War. When he met Dr. Durovic in 1949, he was vice president in charge of the Chicago Professional Colleges of the University of Illinois and distinguished professor of physiology and head of the department of clinical science at the university.

Although he had not previously published any papers on Krebiozen in medical journals, at a meeting in the Drake Hotel in Chicago on March 26, 1951, attended by physicians and laymen including members of the press, Dr. Ivy submitted a privately printed, 106-page brochure which favored Krebiozen and of which he was coauthor. The meeting was widely publicized in newspapers and there was a public furor over Krebiozen. Because of the methods Dr. Ivy had used to promote Krebiozen, his membership in the Chicago Medical Society was suspended for 3 months. Although he was later invited to reinstate his membership, he declined to do so and was dropped from the roster of the society for nonpayment of dues. This action automatically terminated his membership in the Illinois Medical Society and the American Medical Association.

Dr. Ivy has stated that the process of manufacturing Krebiozen has not been revealed to him and that he has neither seen nor analyzed the original substance in the undissolved state. He also stated that in Chicago he has extracted a substance from 40 horses, recreating by deduction the process that Dr. Durovic used to extract Krebiozen in Argentina. Dr. Ivy is reported to have obtained ten times the amount of powder that Dr. Durovic claimed to get from the same number of animals. However, since the composition of Dr. Durovic's powder has never been revealed, there is no way of knowing whether the substance extracted by Dr. Ivy in the United States in 1957 is the same as that obtained by Dr. Durovic in Argentina 8 years before.

Several other physicians in association with Dr. Ivy have privately published monographs on Krebiozen. These men are Dr. J. F. Pick, a plastic surgeon; Dr. W. F. Phillips, a general practitioner; and Dr. L. Krasno, a researcher in antibiotic dusts.

Marko Durovic:[2] Born in Ulcinj, Yugoslavia, in 1900, Marko Durovic, brother of Stevan Durovic, received his legal training at the University of Paris and the University of Belgrade, completing his training in 1923. In 1926 he was appointed Judge in the Yugoslav District Court in Belgrade. He practiced law from 1927 to 1941 and was coowner of Vistad, a munitions plant. In 1942 he was seized by Italian troops and was sent to Rome. Through the intercession of the Vatican he was released and allowed to travel to neutral Argentina with his brother. There he bought a steel plant and the Instituto Biologica Duga and underwrote his brother's experiments which produced Kositerin. He came to the United States in 1950 on a visitor's visa. In July 1952 he was granted permanent residence in the United States through Senate bill 1159, sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois. In September 1958 he became a naturalized U.S. citizen.

IV. ORGANIZATIONS CONNECTED WITH KREBIOZEN

A number of organizations have been created by the supporters of Krebiozen to publicize, promote and distribute the drug and/or to obtain public support for the testing of Krebiozen according to the terms laid down by its proponents. These organizations are:

1. Duga Laboratories, Inc., Chicago, Ill., and Buenos Aires, Argentina: This drug firm was established by Marko Durovic to underwrite Dr. Stevan Durovic's experiments which produced Krebiozen. Duga Laboratories, Inc., distributes Krebiozen to physicians through the Krebiozen Research Foundation (see footnote 2), which it supports. Duga Laboratories, Inc., accepts from the foundation money which the foundation receives as contributions from patients who have been given Krebiozen. According to

Footnotes at end of speech.

Herbert Bailey's "A Matter of Life or Death." Dr. Durovic has stated that the Duga Laboratories, Inc., is in debt to creditors who expect to receive a return on their investments if Krebiozen is proved to be an effective cancer remedy.

2. The Krebiozen Research Foundation, Chicago, Ill.: This foundation is registered in the State of Illinois as a nonprofit corporation. It furnishes Krebiozen to selected physicians for use in treating patients. The necessary steps under the Public Health Service Act have never been taken to make it possible for Krebiozen to be sold for use in interstate commerce. However, the recipient is requested to make contributions to the Duga Laboratories, which supports the foundation. The request for contributions is at the rate of $9.50 per ampule. The foundation library center reports that as of February 1959, the Krebiozen Research Foundation has not published a list of officers, a report of activities, or a financial statement.

3. Committee for Independent Cancer Research, Inc.: Originally formed ostensibly to investigate various cancer remedies, this organization has put forth major efforts to promote Krebiozen and a book "Krebiozen: Key to Cancer?" written by Herbert Bailey, president of the committee. Because of a disagreement over a matter of policy, this committee has since split into two divergent groups:

(a) The freedom for cancer research committee: Mr. David M. Kasson, who claimed he had been treated for cancer with Krebiozen, presided over this committee. Upon his death from cancer in June 1958, the committee was dissolved.

(b) The Independent Cancer Research Foundation, Inc.: Miss Gloria Swanson, former chairman of the committee for independent cancer research, serves as a member of the board of directors. This group is devoted to gathering and disseminating "all possible information on trends in cancer research and treatments."

4. Committee for a Fair Test of Krebiozen, Inc: This group has circulated petitions urging the American Cancer Society to support the method of testing of Krebiozen which its proponents are demanding.

5. The Lakeland Foundation of Chicago, Ill.: This organization has also been involved in the Krebiozen controversy. According to the foundation library center it is a private corporation and is incorporated under a broad charter that includes conservation of natural resources, care of the aged, research in economic science, and medical research in the field of malignancy. The Lakeland Foundation does not currently publish an annual report.

The Lakeland Foundation has come to Dr. Ivy's assistance on two occasions. When he was on a leave of absence from January 1 through June 30, 1953, from the University of Illinois and without salary, the foundation loaned him $5,000 for living expenses. In 1956–57, the Lakeland Foundation advanced the sum of $10,000 to Dr. Ivy for the purpose of recreating Krebiozen.

V. HAS KREBIOZEN EVER BEEN TESTED?

1. (a) The powder form of Krebiozen was never chemically analyzed before being dissolved in mineral oil. An analysis of Krebiozen dissolved in No. 9 mineral oil has been done by the Clark Microanalytical Laboratory, Urbana, Ill., and was reported in Chemical Week, June 16, 1956. According to the Clark analysis "it contained no nitrogen and * * * might contain some sulfur in addition to carbon, hydrogen and oxygen. Infrared and ultraviolet spectroscopy revealed absorption bands indicating that it could be either a polysaccharide or a steroid. A further study of the product is required before a more definitive statement about its chemical structure can be made."

(b) Two distinguished chemists, Drs. Paul Kirk, of the University of California, and Arthur Furst, of Stanford University, testified at the 1958 hearings of the California General Assembly Committee on Public Health that they had independently attempted to extract and to analyze Krebiozen. After the most exhaustive tests Dr. Kirk independently concluded that "the extraction failed to reveal the presence of anything dissolved in the ampules and would lead to the supposition that all that is contained in Krebiozen is mineral oil, Nujol,' to be specific, because the analysis indicated the identiy with Nujol." Dr. Furst concurred. "I say it is pure Nujol," he stated.

Dr. Ivy has challenged this testimony.

2. (a) A few animal studies have been done with Krebiozen by its proponents. From these studies it is claimed that the substance is nontoxic in rats, cats, and dogs.

(b) Twelve dogs were said to have been treated with Krebiozen by Dr. Hannibal DeGrana at the School of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Buenos Aires. All the animals were described as having natural cancer; seven animals were said to be almost blind because of cataracts. It was aid that all of the tumors were affected to some degree and that in six dogs the cataracts cleared and the dogs regained sight.

(c) John B. Loefer, Ph. D., of the Southwest Foundation for Research and Education, San Antonio, Tex., reported on the effects of Krebiozen therapy on transplanted mouse leukemia and lymphosarcoma in the Journal of the American Medical Association on May 17, 1952. "Krebiozen * * * did not affect the course of development of either the leukemia or the lymphosarcoma," he wrote.

3. (a) In 1952, the committee on research of the council of pharmacy and chemistry of the American Medical Association published "A Status Report on Krebiozen" in the Journal of the American Medical Association. This report, made by a group of four distinguished educators from several medical schools in Chicago (excluding the University of Illinois), contained an analysis of 100 case histories of patients treated with Krebiozen. The case records had been received from seven sources and were examined at the request of Dr. Ivy and his assistants at the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

"Ordinarily, the committee on research * * * would not attempt to evaluate the clinical benefits, if any, of a substance whose character and method of manufacture were not known and standardization of which was so loosely defined," the AMA report stated. "However * * * tremendous worldwide public interest created a moral obligation * * * which transcended the issue of medical ethics ordinarily applicable to secret remedies."

The conclusions of this report were:

"Ninety-eight (of 100 cases studied) were reported as failing to show evidence of improvement.

"Two patients showed some evidence of temporary improvement coincident with Krebiozen therapy. In one patient this was apparently fortuitous; in the other major lesions showed continued rapid progression."

(b) Seven investigators reported on 63 cancer cases treated with Krebiozen to the committee on cancer diagnosis and therapy of the National Research Council. The committee then reviewed these and other cases in 1951 and found no evidence of any curative effect and no proof of palliative effect attributable to the drug itself. This opinion was based on an analysis of the 100 cases already reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association, some of which cases were included among the 63 cases studied by the committee and of 22 cases reported by Dr. Ivy and others in the booklet distributed at the meeting in the Drake Hotel on March 26, 1951, when Krebiozen was first announced.

(c) In 1952, a committee of six distinguished physicians from several medical schools, headed by Dr. Warren H. Cole, head of the department of surgery of the University of Illinois, was appointed by Dr. George Stoddard, president of the university, for the purpose of reviewing Dr. Ivy's 500 cases of cancer treated with Krebiozen. The committee's report, presented to the trustees of the university, contained the following significant conclusions: "Ignorance of the material interferes with a sound evaluation of its therapeutic effectiveness * * * no acceptable evidence that any malignant tumor had been cured by Krebiozen * * * no evidence of prolongation of life * * * no historical evidence that Krebiozen produced degenerative or regressive changes in tumor cells * * * no radiographic evidence that Krebiozen could reduce metastatic tumor lesions in bones or lungs * * * statement in Dr. Ivy's report that a large majority of patients reported a decrease in pain was not confirmed."

In a discussion of future tests, the Cole committee advised that a supply of Krebiozen should be made available for testing and that investigators should attempt to reproduce the material and determine its chemical content.

(e) A committee of supervision, under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert E. Johnson, head of the department of physiology, Urbana, Ill., was appointed by Dr. Stoddard to carry out the recommendations of the Cole committee. The committee of supervision reported in part that a supply of the original material was needed so that it could be tested directly. A supply of the vehicle was needed for adequate scientific control. Complete information on the mode or modes of preparation was needed * * * the originators of the preparation are unwilling to furnish materials and will not provide full technical information * * * (therefore the committee is unable to proceed further.

(3) In 1952, after a 21-month investigation, Dr. Stanley P. Reimann, director of the Institute for Cancer Research, Philadelphia, Pa., announced: "We now know we have cured no patients (with Krebiozen) and we don't believe the length of life has been prolonged on any we have treated."

4. The proponents of Krebiozen have been involved in legislative investigations in two States and have received support from at least two U.S. Senators and one U.S. Representative.

(a) The Illinois Legislature: In 1953, a joint committee of 14 Illinois legislators was appointed from the two State legislative bodies to investigate the Krebiozen controversy. In 1954, after extensive hearings for which records were subpenaed, this committee concluded that Dr. Ivy and the Durovic brothers "were men of good character" and that neither Dr. Stoddard nor the American Medical Association had conspired against Dr. Ivy. The committee urged further research on Krebiozen but made no recommendations as to how this research was to be conducted.

(b) The California Senate: In 1958, the California Senate Committee on Public Health held hearings on "Fraudulent, Dangerous, Unscientific, and Deceptive Practices in the Field and Treatment of Disease," at which Dr. Ivy testified. The burden of Dr. Ivey's testimony was directed to the advocacy of a double blind test of Krebiozen which its proponents have been endeavoring to get.

(c) The late Senator Charles W. Tobey: Senator Tobey is reported to have sponsored an investigation of Krebiozen by a staff investigator.

(d) The Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI, U.S. Representative from the State of Illinois. On several occasions, Congressman LIBONATI has had remarks on Krebiozen inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His remarks have generally echoed Dr. Ivy's.

(e) Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois: Senator DOUGLAS sponsored a bill in the U.S. Senate which gave the Durovics permanent residence in the United States. On the floor of the U.S. Senate, in August 1958, Senator DOUGLAS proposed a fair test of Krebiozen to be done by the National Institutes of Health, a U.S. Government institution. Later, Drs. Ivy and Durovic met with Dr. Heller, Director of the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health, and with a representative of Senator DOUGLAS. At this meeting, Dr. Heller stated that "the first step should be an examination of the case records in possession of the Krebiozen Foundation."

At a meeting on September 24, 1958, attended by Drs. Ivy and Durovic, Senator Douglas' representative, and Dr. Heller, it was generally agreed that the evaluation of Krebiozen should be explored further, and that the group was seeking to develop an agreed procedure that would be acceptable to the scientific community.

On December 5 at another meeting attended by the same group, this time including Senator DOUGLAS, the National Cancer Institute suggested an examination of Dr. Ivy's data by a committee of mutually acceptable scientists to decide whether clinical trials should be undertaken and how they should be undertaken. Senator DOUGLAS expressed the opinion that this suggestion was a proper one. Dr. Ivy was invited to define his role as consultant to the evaluating committee, to which he had agreed.

He answered in a letter to the Institute, dated February 1, 1959, insisting that he personally should be a member of an arbitration type of committee and a party to the administration of the therapy and the interpretation of the results under conditions where bias cannot operate. This is a procedure which, as pointed out in two conferences attended by Dr. Ivy, could admit bias and would not be acceptable to the scientific community.

The Institute responded to Dr. Ivy's letter on February 6 by asking him to clarify his apparent rejection of the previous plan made between him and the National Cancer Institute, because "it is the desire of the Institute to get on with the evaluation of Krebiozen as soon as a scientifically acceptable procedure can be effectuated."

VI. CAN KREBIOZEN BE TESTED?

The proponents of Krebiozen have frequently stated that they would welcome an evaluation of their preparation, and during the last 2 years they have conducted an active campaign to promote a specific type of evaluation which they have outlined as a double blind test.

In the past, an evaluation of Krebiozen by independent researchers has been obstructed because of lack of information about the substance and its preparation, and the unavailability of the substance. Thus, the committee on supervision, which was appointed at the University of Illinois in 1952, was unable to proceed with an evaluation of Krebiozen.

Also, independent evaluation of Krebiozen has been impeded because of inadequate information about the drug, the unwillingness of its proponents to surrender to independent researchers the case histories on which they base their claims, and the insistence of the proponents that Krebiozen be tested only on the terms which they themselves have set forth—terms which have been unacceptable to reputable scientists unassociated with Krebiozen.

Recently, the supporters of Krebiozen have concentrated their propaganda efforts on trying to get a reputable organization to sponsor a "double blind" study of their substance.

The proposal for such a study was first made to the American Cancer Society in 1958 by James L. Griffin, director of the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

Briefly, the study proposed by Mr. Griffin called for the appointment of a committee of laymen and a committee of physicians, one-half of the members of each committee to be selected by the Krebiozen proponents and one-half to be chosen by the American Cancer Society. Each committee would then select a single additional member. Ampules of plain mineral oil and ampules of Krebiozen, identified only by code numbers, would by administered by Dr. Ivy to known cancer patients. The extra member of the lay committee would be the only person to know the identity of the contents of the ampules and he would be instructed to keep the code list in a safety deposit box.

At the end of the period of treatment Dr. Ivy would evaluate the results and undertake to identify the patients who had received Krebiozen and those who had not. Committee members would be permitted to observe the patients and to take notes during the treatment period.

The Krebiozen proponents claim to have 1,200 case records of patients already treated with Krebiozen. In testing an unproved substance, the first step would be to evaluate the results already achieved, and in this case it would mean an analysis of the alleged case records. In its proposal to the American Cancer Society, the Krebiozen Research Foundation, however, refused to permit an examination of these case records unless the society agreed beforehand to sponsor their suggested study.

Their proposal for this particular study was carefully considered by the American Cancer Society's advisory committees on research and on the therapy of cancer and by the society's research advisory council. These three groups of scientists concluded that this proposal does not provide a scientifically valid plan for conducting an objective and meaningful evaluation. Their opinion was adopted by the board of directors of the American Cancer Society on October 24, 1958.

The first reason for rejecting the proposal was that the committees to be set up as outlined by the Krebiozen proponents would not be truly independent research groups, because one-half of the membership of each committee would consist of individuals selected by the proponents.

The second reason was that the plan stipulated that only Dr. Ivy would administer the Krebiozen. The American Cancer Society felt that this would not permit an opportunity to determine whether physicians generally can obtain the same results.

The third reason for rejecting the proposal was that the plan provides no clear-cut standards for measuring either the result desired or defining or measuring the results obtained.

The society further stated that it would be willing to support the testing of any substance proposed for the prevention, treatment, or cure of cancer, provided the substance is available for testing under the well-established scientific methods known and accepted for all products proposed for human use, and further, provided that satisfactory preliminary evidence exists that the substance has shown promise of being useful in the treatment of cancer.

The American Cancer Society itself cannot test any drug. It does not operate research laboratories, nor does it control hospitals or other facilities for the treatment of cancer patients. The society has clearly made it a matter of record that it favors the full knowledge and testing of Krebiozen.

VII. IS KREBIOZEN PATENTED? CAN IT BE SOLD?

The owners of Krebiozen have stated on numerous occasions that they have a large investment in this substance and intend to market it for profit. For this reason they are concealing the details of the manufacturing process, thereby setting up a barrier to the testing of the substance by independent researchers.

If the owners of Krebiozen wish to protect the substance, they may apply for a patent on it. They may also apply for a patent on the process by which it is made. Hundreds of drugs are manufactured in this country under such patents.

Such applications are temporary protection for the proponents while the patents are being searched.

Some years ago the owners of Krebiozen applied for a patent but when the U.S. Patent Office returned the application with request for further information, the owners of Krebiozen failed to supply this information and did not resubmit their application. Hence, there is no patent or new application for a patent on Krebiozen, either the substance or the process, in the files of the U.S. Patent Office as of January 1959.

By its description Krebiozen is subject to the biologic control provisions of the Public Health Service Act and thus it may not be legally shipped for sale, barter, or exchange in interstate commerce or exported from or imported into the United States, unless it is produced under Government license. No application for such license has ever been completed for Krebiozen. If an application were made, supported by adequate evidence of safety, purity, and potency of the product, it would be the responsibility of the Division of Biologic Standards of the National Institutes of Health to recommend whether or not a license should be issued. Without this license Krebiozen may be distributed only to qualified experts, solely for purposes of clinical investigation, but it cannot be sold. Some physicians, as indicated earlier, have obtained Krebiozen in this way since 1952.

VIII. PUBLICITY AND PROMOTION OF KREBIOZEN

The history of Krebiozen has presented elements both of wide publicity and deep secrecy. The proponents, although they are physicians and well acquainted with the accepted procedures for introducing a new substance, have ignored and flouted these procedures in the case of Krebiozen. From the very first they have sought to arouse the public interest in Krebiozen before adequately demonstrating to the medical profession the utility or efficacy of the substance.

For this unorthodox approach, Dr. Ivy was disciplined by the medical society of which he was a member. He consequently was relieved of his position as vice president of the University of Illinois. Such censure, however, has not deterred him from continuing to publicize Krebiozen. He has since appeared on television and radio programs devoted to the promotion of the drug, has held interviews with the press, and has made other public appearances in behalf of Krebiozen.

An example of Dr. Ivy's methods of attracting publicity is provided by the circumstances of his recent letter to Dr. Harold S. Diehl, senior vice president for research and medical affairs of the American Cancer Society, proposing a test of Krebiozen. Dr. Ivy was not content merely to communicate privately with Dr. Diehl. At the time he sent this letter, he also released copies of it to the press in an obvious effort to create publicity.

The press releases that have been issued by the proponents of Krebiozen, or in their behalf, are not always consistent with the facts. For instance, G. P. Putnam's Sons, publishers of the new book, "A Matter of Life or Death: The Incredible Story of Krebiozen," by Herbert Bailey, issued a press release stating that ". . . 'The evaluation of Krebiozen—the controversial anticancer agent—by the National Cancer Institute is underway and will proceed with all possible speed,' Dr. John R. Heller, the Institute's Director, told Herbert Baily [sic]." This re-

lease, dated November 11, 1958, also declared that the National Cancer Institute had agreed to conduct a "double blind" test of Krebiozen. Herbert Bailey, who apparently prepared the Putnam release, had sent a copy of it, prior to its publication, to Dr. Heller for his suggestions. Dr. Heller answered immediately, on November 6, 1958, correcting two inaccuracies in the copy: (1) The evaluation of Krebiozen is not underway, and (2) the method of testing has not yet been agreed upon and cannot be determined until examination of data has been completed. "Actually," wrote Dr. Heller, "we are now approaching the preliminary stage of examining the data submitted by Dr. Ivy to determine whether it warrants further investigation of the treatment."

Although Dr. Heller's comments were sent to Mr. Bailey 5 days before the press release was published, Mr. Bailey replied that they were received too late for the necessary revisions to be made.

It has also been pointed out by Dr. Heller that on September 24, 1958, when he and other members of the National Cancer Institute met with Drs. Ivy and Durovic to discuss the testing of Krebiozen, Drs. Ivy and Durovic subscribed to a press release issued by the National Cancer Institute which stated that the method of testing Krebiozen should be acceptable to the scientific community. At that meeting, there was no agreement to undertake the double blind study proposed by Dr. Ivy and which had already been widely rejected by scientific investigators.

IX. NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE REQUIREMENTS

The conditions under which the National Cancer Institute would consider an investigation of Krebiozen are based on principles long accepted by the scientific community at large. They apply to the testing of any drug, the value of which has not been adequately proved. These accepted conditions were first outlined by the National Advisory Cancer Council as guidelines for the National Cancer Institute in evaluating compounds, and are subscribed to by the American Cancer Society. They are the following:

1. The chemical formula, if known, must be disclosed to the National Cancer Institute, or if not known, the method of preparation must be supplied.

2. Adequate amounts of the chemical having known purity must be available.

3. The evidence upon which any claim of efficacy is based must be presented along with a full explanation of the method of treatment.

4. The National Cancer Institute reserves the right to determine if, how, where, when, and by whom the investigation is to be carried out.

5. The scientists making the investigation will have the right to publish the results.

The National Cancer Institute is willing to undertake an evaluation of claimant's data on an unorthodox treatment claimed to effect cancer cures in humans, provided that the following conditions are accepted:

1. The method of treatment must be fully explained. There must be full disclosure to the National Cancer Institute of the composition or nature of the treatment.

2. Complete records of clinical and laboratory findings must be submitted of the total number of patients with cancer treated with the remedy or method in question. These records must demonstrate the following:

(a) Diagnosis of cancer in each case, confirmed by verifiable microscopic examination.

(b) Detailed and documented objective evidence that malignant neoplastic disease has disappeared or that its progress has been arrested for a significant period of time in a significant number of patients. It must be shown that no definitive treatment other than the one in question was used during this period of observation; in addition, a detailed record of all treatment received by the patients prior and subsequent to the test period must be supplied.

(c) Details as to preparation, dosage, frequency, and route of administration of the agent in question.

(d) Complete details as to physical and supportive laboratory findings and histologic studies in the patients prior to, during, and subsequent to the course of and cessation of the treatment in question.

(e) Objective evidence of regressions of primary tumor and metastases as shown by recorded measurements of observable tumors, photographs and X-rays, with dates of observation.

3. The National Cancer Institute reserves the right to determine whether or not the evidence submitted warrants further investigation of the proposed treatment and its results, and reserves the right to determine where, when, by whom, and under what conditions such investigation will be made. The National Cancer Institute reserves the right to make public its findings.

X. THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY AND UNPROVED DRUGS

Under the American Cancer Society's research program, hundreds of organic and inorganic compounds have been screened and a few substances have been found which are palliative in certain types of human cancer. The results of research on all of them were first published in medical journals. All of these substances can be manufactured by a drug concern and all are readily available to doctors and to hospitals for experimental purposes.

The American Cancer Society is dedicated to the task of finding the cause and the cure of human cancer at the earliest possible moment. To this end, it supports scientific investigation of every promising kind. At the same time, however, it has the responsibility of seeing to it that the public is not misled by enthusiastic claims of individuals who would exploit unproven methods or drugs for the treatment of cancer. Ill-advised reliance on such unproven methods or substances militates against possible cure of the disease by the acceptable methods known at the present.

Any drug which is claimed to cure cancer must fulfill certain objective criteria. Krebiozen has not met these standards. No acceptable evidence that treatment with Krebiozen causes any objective benefit in human cancer has yet been offered by independent researchers.

CONCLUSION

Advocates of Krebiozen have demanded through all publicity channels what they describe as a fair test of the drug. The National Cancer Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service is willing to conduct a test to further evaluate Krebiozen but insists that it be done in a manner acceptable to the scientific community.

The Krebiozen Research Foundation, Dr. Ivy, Dr. Durovic, and their associates have long claimed they have a tool useful against cancer: it is, then, their clear duty to thousands of cancer patients to cooperate with the National Cancer Institute or any group of competent, objective scientists in an objective test of the drug. Delays now are clearly the responsibility of the Krebiozen Research Foundation.

When Krebiozen was first announced, it was tested in hospitals, clinics, and laboratories, according to scientifically accepted procedures. The results of the tests carried out by scientists and clinicians were reviewed in reports mentioned earlier. This avenue of testing still remains open to advocates of Krebiozen.

However, the agitation continues. This has an unsettling effect on cancer patients, their families, and friends, who question whether the extraordinary claims about Krebiozen are true. The answer can only be settled by a thoroughly objective study such as the one the National Cancer Institute has indicated it is willing to make.

The American Cancer Society hopes that the Krebiozen Research Foundation will recognize the integrity of the National Cancer Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service, respect its well-established methods and procedures, and that the foundation will drop its demands for its own rules and procedures.

---

[1] Details of Stevan Durovic's career before he came to the United States are based on a pamphlet published in June 1953 by the Krebiozen Research Foundation, and on a letter from the foundation's secretary, now in the files of the National Cancer Institute.

[2] Details of Marko Durovic's career before he came to the United States are based on a pamphlet published in June 1953 by the Krebiozen Research Foundation, and on a letter from the foundation's secretary, now in the files of the National Cancer Institute.

## Surplus Foods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with people throughout the world dying of starvation, it has long been my feeling that we in America should share with them any food commodities that we might have in surplus after taking care of our own aged and needy. I have discussed my feelings in this regard with Mr. Lois Laycook, an outstanding columnist with the Nashville Tennessean, and I think the article he wrote as a result is worthy of the attention of my colleagues in the House. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would, therefore, like to insert Mr. Laycook's column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

After Mr. Laycook's column was published in the Tennessean, I received a letter from Mr. William A. Harwell, of Lawrenceburg, Tenn., advising me of his opinion of my suggestion. Mr. Harwell, who is district attorney general, is an outstanding citizen and is highly respected by his community. I feel that his comments merit the attention of the membership of the House; and, therefore, I would like to include his letter in the RECORD also.

Mr. Laycook's column and Mr. Harwell's letter follow herewith:

STATE OF TENNESSEE,
*Lawrenceburg, Tenn, March 4, 1959.*

The Honorable Ross Bass,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR ROSS: I saw an article in the Nashville Tennessean by Lois Laycock which mentioned the fact that you have made a suggestion that the United States should feed the hungry multitudes of the world out of the present farm surplus commodity.

I want to congratulate you on the idea with which I am in complete harmony. It is my opinion that a bold stroke in foreign affairs is now necessary to not only return the United States to its proper place of leadership, but that present day thinking on matters involving other people of the world

is wholly inadequate to meet the unusual challenge of our day. The time for dollar diplomacy has long since passed away.

In the Bible we are told, you being a minister's son ought to be familiar with it if you are not, that one's neighbor is not necessarily the person who lives next door. Christ when explaining who a person's neighbor was gave the parable of the Good Samaritan. The fact of the matter is that people are no longer interested in who is the greatest nation or who has the most unique gadgets and labor saving devices, but the burning question of all mankind is, "How can we bring our moral and spiritual life up equal to and beyond our scientific achievements?"

On a national scale this can only be done by a complete about-face on foreign affairs. This country should, without any strings attached, feed and clothe the underprivileged, the hungry, and naked of the world insofar as our substance will permit. We have been chained to a fiendish idea of conformity which has led us now to the greatest brink of disaster this country has ever faced. You should not be discouraged in this idea, as it will no doubt have serious opposition by practical minded people, but I hope that you will pursue it as I believe it offers one of the best opportunities to carry into fulfillment the best relationships that have ever been devised by man and taught by the matchless Son of God Himself when He said that if your enemy hungers feed him, if he thirsts give him water, and if he is naked clothe him.

A nation with that kind of an attitude carried into active belief will have the best guidance for its foreign policy because it emanates from the source of all wisdom and all understanding.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM A. HARWELL.

---

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Mar. 1, 1959]

FEED WORLD'S STARVING—BASS FEELS U.S. BULGING FOOD SURPLUS WOULD STEM COMMUNISM SPREAD

(By Lois Laycook)

WASHINGTON.—Representative ROSS BASS is pressing for an all-out program to feed the world's starving millions out of the $8 billion worth of surplus food stored in bulging Government warehouses.

BASS said he believes such a program offers the sole solution to halting the spread of communism in poverty-stricken countries of the Far and Middle East. Of secondary importance, BASS said he also is convinced a program of this type is the only answer to the ever-growing surplus food problem.

"I think our vast supply of food products in this country is the most potent weapon we have to combat communism and prevent its expansion into the free world," he declared. "After all, poverty is the breeding ground of communism. Our so-called surplus commodities, instead of being a curse on the Government ledger, could be used as a real blessing in the promotion of democracy throughout the world.

"With hunger almost rampant in many countries of the world, particularly in the East and in countries behind the Iron Curtain, our surplus commodities together with our potential production of food commodities properly exploited, could mean more toward promoting democracy than all the other foreign aid efforts combined."

RIGHT DIRECTION

BASS said that Public Law 480, passed in 1954, was a step in the right direction toward helping famine-ravaged countries. Under this law, the President is authorized to furnish a limited amount of emergency assistance to friendly nations or to persons friendly to the United States living in Communist-dominated countries. Food for this program is taken out of surplus stocks.

BASS, however, maintains Public Law 480 is too limited in scope. Furthermore, he said, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson is not taking full advantage of his authority in administering the program under provisions of the law.

"Mr. Benson's excuse is he doesn't want to disrupt the normal channels of trade by flooding the market with surplus food," BASS said. "My answer to that is that when people are hungry and do not have the money with which to purchase food, there is no normal channel of trade as far as they are concerned."

STEP UP PROGRAM

BASS said he feels the House Agriculture Committee, of which he is a member, will be ready to step up the program when the present law expires this year. Meanwhile, our surplus food stocks continue to grow to preposterous proportions.

When Benson took office in 1953 there was approximately $1.2 billion worth of surplus food and fibers stored in Government warehouses. That amount has grown to $80 billion in 1959 despite small dents made in the stockpiles by Public Law 480 and the school lunch program.

For example, Government storage bins now contain 777 million bushels of wheat, 1,168 million bushels of corn, 7,106,000 hundredweight of rice, and 56 million pounds of butter.

GORE TO SPEAK

Senator ALBERT GORE has accepted a number of speaking engagements in March.

They include a speech before the Maryland Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Baltimore, March 7, and another before the Wisconsin Electric Co-op Association in Madison, March 11.

He will speak at the annual convention of the Tennessee Road Builders Association in Nashville, March 26, and before the New Century Club at Richland Country Club, March 27.

Representative JOE L. EVINS is slated to address the Washington chapter of the Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity, March 6.

Neil Bass, Knoxville, consulting engineer for the World Bank, will represent the bank at conferences at the United Nations in New York. Bass' wife is the former Miss Betty Neal of Nashville.

Thomas B. Kanaday of Nashville, has been appointed a Senate page by Senator GORE.

---

## Program for Relief in Areas of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Last week I joined 51 of my colleagues from both parties and from all sections of the country in proposing a three-part program which would bring both immediate and long-range relief to those areas which are suffering from persistent and heavy unemployment. The action of the 52 Members dramatizes the gravity of the economic situation facing many areas and the need for immediate action by the Federal Government.

Here is what the 52 Members of Congress proposed:

1. Immediate expansion of the surplus food distribution program, upon which thousands of families throughout the country depend in whole or in part for subsistence.

2. Immediate appropriation of funds by Congress for flood control, reclamation, rivers and harbors development, and other public works in depressed economic areas.

3. Immediate passage by Congress of area development legislation to provide a long-range relief measure which will assist local communities in helping themselves.

Many Members of Congress, especially those from areas which have not suffered severely from the recent economic downturn, do not fully realize just how widespread and intense this economic distress is. Also, the administration has failed to face up to this problem. Perhaps these figures will change their minds—21 percent of the total population in 210 counties in 24 States are now receiving surplus agricultural commodities; 269 different locations, suffering from 6 percent unemployment, are classified as distressed areas; 73 areas, with 15 percent or more unemployment, are acutely distressed.

In the Fifth District of West Virginia, six of the seven counties have 15 percent or more of the total population receiving surplus foods from the Government. In one county, the percentage is 41 percent of the total population.

The 52 House Members who are working together on this problem believe the surplus food program should be expanded to bring immediate relief, that additional foods should be acquired by USDA to bolster the subsistence diet of these people and that greater quantities should be distributed to each family.

Immediate construction of flood control and other public works projects is needed in these distressed areas to provide immediate jobs for men who are unable to find employment. This part of the program would only apply to projects which have already been authorized by Congress but for which no money has been appropriated.

These projects are economically feasible. They are needed. If Congress would make the money available, work could start in about 3 months, thus creating thousands of desperately needed jobs. It is my understanding that foreign aid funds, voted by Congress, are supporting about 100 public works projects abroad but the President does not advocate one new start in this country.

The most important part of the program, in the opinion of many of the 52 Members, is that dealing with area redevelopment. There was unanimous agreement that permanent solutions must be found to rebuild the depressed areas economically. We hope that action by the 52 Members will clearly show the rest of Congress just how urgent this problem is.

The House Banking and Currency Committee plans to open hearings later this month on this legislation. A Senate subcommittee has already started hearing witnesses.

The action of the 52 House Members should serve to indicate the strong support for such legislation in both parties. Perhaps it will speed up final consideration.

The three-point program is urgently needed: (1) More and better surplus foods for the 1,298,201 people forced to subsist on this handout from the Government because of the lack of job opportunities; (2) an immediate public works program to build needed projects and create urgently needed jobs; and (3) area development legislation to rebuild these areas and provide new and permanent employment.

I was happy to join 51 of my colleagues in setting forth this program and in working for its enactment.

## Mary Jo Peterson of Elkhart, Ind., Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to draw to the attention of Congress an essay entitled "I Speak for Democracy," written by Miss Mary Jo Peterson, a senior at Elkhart High School in Elkhart, Ind., in the district I represent.

Miss Peterson was a few days ago awarded a $500 prize by the Indiana Broadcasters Association as the winner over 200 other contestants in the State of Indiana of the national Voice of Democracy essay contest, sponsored by the National Broadcasters Association.

Miss Peterson, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Peterson of Elkhart, will use her prize money to begin her studies next fall in the Ball Memorial School of Nursing at Muncie, Ind.

It is customary these days to criticize teenagers as irresponsible and concerned only with having a good time. I think that Mary Jo Peterson's splendid essay and the career she has chosen for herself symbolize the thoughtful, conscientious way in which the great majority of the young people of our country are preparing themselves to be useful, worthwhile citizens.

Miss Peterson's essay follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Mary Jo Peterson)

I speak for democracy. But, I can't speak for you, the doctor, the mother, the factory worker, or the teacher. I can speak only through the few experiences I have encountered as an American teenager.

Many people have tried to define democracy; Webster says, "Democracy is the belief in or practice of social equality and a disregard for social barriers, such as race or class." also "A government by the people."

In Lincoln's Gettysburg Address he stated that democracy is "A government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Can democracy be defined in a few words? No, I feel that the effects of democracy are far too great, reaching out in all directions, like the roots of a tree, too far extended and deeply rooted to be defined in a sentence or two.

I would like to tell you how democracy has played a vital part in my life—how I have seen democracy at work.

One of the first times I recall coming in contact with democracy was when, as a child, my mother took me to the polls on election day. Here, I saw her and many others exercising their right to vote, to vote for the leaders whom they felt represented the principles they believed in.

As I grew older, I became even more aware of the beauty and equality I experience every day living in a country where democracy is the teacher.

Upon entering junior high school, I became an active part of a student government, our student council. Through the council, each student has a voice through representation in making his school the best possible. Not long ago, we experienced a new type of government. We, the high school pupils, elected a student mayor, judge, and clerk. These three recently represented our high school by spending a day with our city mayor, judge, and clerk. We elected a Negro boy as our judge. I stopped to think once again how this would never have been passible before the 14th and 15th amendments.

Recently, I visited a Jewish synagogue and a Catholic church. Being a Protestant, I noticed many differences in our beliefs; but how unimportant this was when I thought of the precious freedom of choosing when, how often, and how I will worship God.

Another valued possession is our right to an equal education for all. What would it be like to live in a country where only the wealthy, or the top 5 percent of a class could go beyond the eighth grade? I'm thankful to be a part of a school where all who are willing to learn may receive an equal education with opportunities unlimited.

Each Friday in our government class, we discuss current problems facing our country. Here, again, we as youth are taking part in one of our greatest privileges—our freedom of speech. We, as Americans, can speak freely for or against our Government and its leaders.

God must have been a loving Father to give me this country to live in—a country with freedoms and advantages impossible to measure—a country which my forefathers sought to find in answer to their many dreams.

As I see these privileges I have as an American youth, I am only too glad to try to meet my responsibilities—my responsibilites to God, to my community, and to my country.

This year, for the first time, I realized these responsibilities which came to me as I learned to know our foreign students. I hope along with the understandings we have both gained, that these visitors may have seen in my life a spark—a spark that helps make up the flame that burns in the American youth—the flame burning with democracy.

Yes, I'm glad that I'm an American. Because opportunities, though not alway equal, are more widely open than in any other country * * * because the first thought of an American is trust, instead of distrust * * * because the millionaire, the workingman, the Negro and white—all work together sharing their truths and ideals on equal terms.

For these reasons, I speak for democracy.

## Start Trimming the Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested a further editorial published by the Nashville Banner some days ago:

START TRIMMING THE DEBT

[From the Nashville Banner, March 1959]

Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., Democrat, of Texas, and Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, are one in the belief that a start should be made on reducing the national debt.

The Texan's plan, already offered in the House, would make it mandatory that each annual budget—starting in 1961—appropriate for debt reduction in an amount equal to 1 percent of the debt then outstanding.

What is wrong with that? What, after all, is a budget for, if not to precisely calculate necessary costs within estimated income, and provide a margin for paying off accumulated encumbrances as they fall due?

In individual financial cases the honest and responsible householder makes such provisions. He doesn't spend wildly on current desires to and beyond the limits of income, and ignore such pressing obligations as already exist. If he budgets, he makes allowance for those past due, rather than just borrowing more and more to go deeper and deeper into debt.

The Wright and Saltonstall proposals are not quaint and outgrown ideas of national rectitude. They incorporate an elementary principle which is ignored to any nation's peril.

Even at 1 percent a year it would take 100 years to pay off the debt. It shouldn't even have to be pointed out that the added cost soon would be offset by a reduction in the amount required annually for interest payments—which is $8,100 million in the present budget.

That interest cost alone is more than the entire cost of operating the Federal Government before the New Deal took over with its pledge of reducing that total outlay.

It is time, 26 years in the wake of that, to start trimming the debt.

## Out of Debt in a Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested an Associated Press commentary by the well known news analyst, James Marlow.

OUT OF DEBT IN A CENTURY?

WASHINGTON.—Many a man has looked at the national debt—big as a mountain in dollar bills—and asked himself: "How can we cut it down to pebble size?"

The latest to look and be appalled is Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., 36, a Texas Democrat. He has an idea which might take 100 years to work out. But he thinks it's better than just sitting and looking.

Although WRIGHT stuck a needle in the national conscience, and one House Member after another arose to applaud him, nothing is likely to come of the idea except that it may be enshrined in a place set aside for noble thoughts.

The national debt now is $285 billion. This year the Government will have to pay $8,100 million in interest on it, without knocking off a dime on the principal.

* * * * *

WRIGHT, like others hates to think of that going on indefinitely. He told the House that with interest rates going up, the Government soon will probably be paying $8,800 million a year in interest, if we just assume

the total debt remains unchanged and does not get even higher than it is now.

So WRIGHT said: "This means that if things go along exactly as they have been going, without any more increases in the national debt and without still another jump in the interest rates, in 29 years we shall have paid the total amount of the debt and still owe every penny of it."

WRIGHT suggests Congress tell the Treasury Department to set aside each year 1 percent of the present national debt of 285 billion—or $2,850 million a year—to pay off the principal.

This, WRIGHT figures, would be cutting down not only on the size of the debt each year but on the interest, too.

Using a $283 billion debt figure which is now the permanent debt ceiling—the temporary ceiling until July 1 is higher than that—WRIGHT told the House: "In 100 years we could completely retire the debt by paying $495 billion in interest and $283 billion in principal, or a total of $778 billion.

"But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years will be $980 billion, and we will still owe the debt of $283 billion, or a total of $1.263 trillion."

The only trouble with the idea—if it was going to work on schedule—is that for 100 years the Government would have to balance its budget and not go further into debt.

But it hasn't been doing that. The budget, or cost of running the Government, has been going up. While this year President Eisenhower is making a try at budget balancing, the chances are he won't make it.

His budget this year calls for spending $77 billion and he estimated the Government would take in through taxes and other revenues $77,100 million or $100 million more coming in than going out. But even those estimates included higher postal rates and gasoline taxes, and some other changes Congress isn't likely to make.

For WRIGHT's idea to work—that is, for the Government to spend every year around $2,850 million on paying off on the debt—the Government would have to be taking in more than it spent.

How could it do that? In only one of two ways: either by reducing spending or getting more income or revenue, which would mean raising taxes. But Government spending seems pretty sure to be going up, not down. And new taxes aren't popular.

## Senator Wayne Morse Honored by University of Minnesota for Outstanding Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Oregon's distinguished senior Senator has received high honor from his alma mater, the University of Minnesota. He has been given an "outstanding achievement" award from the regents of his university "as a token of high esteem and in recognition of noted professional attainment." In part the award also notes he is a "keen student of jurisprudence."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story concerning this honor which appeared in the March 2, 1959, edition of the Albany, Oregon, Democrat-Herald. The text of the award given my friend and colleague in the other body is part of the news story:

UNIVERSITY GIVES AWARD TO MORSE

WASHINGTON.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, has received an "outstanding achievement award from the University of Minnesota in connection with the school's Charter Day observance. MORSE is a graduate of the university.

The text of the award read: "The regents of the University of Minnesota as a token of high esteem and in recognition of noted professional attainment by WAYNE MORSE, distinguished graduate of the university, U.S. Senator from Oregon, keen student of jurisprudence especially as a legal educator, effective in labor relations, particularly adept as an arbitrator, always stimulating others to reappraise their positions, deem him to be worthy of special commendation of outstanding achievement."

## Special Bill for a Special Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Daily News, Friday, March 6, 1959, titled "Special Bill for a Special Group," which gives some facts on H.R. 9 and H.R. 10. These facts should be considered before the bill is enacted into law:

SPECIAL BILL FOR A SPECIAL GROUP

There may be merit in the general principle of permitting Federal income tax deferments on money laid aside for pension funds.

The bill just approved by the House Ways and Means Committee proposes to grant this tax deferment to self-employed taxpayers who lay aside up to $2,500 a year for their old-age retirement.

The bill is intended, the committee says, to provide greater equality of tax treatment to such people. It mainly would affect doctors, lawyers, dentists, and some businessmen.

The Treasury is opposed to the bill on two grounds:

That it would deprive the Government of some $365 million a year in revenue, thereby creating another deficit in present circumstances.

That is doesn't provide the same treatment for other taxpayers who now are not covered by pension or retirement plans—estimated at some 30 million. If the measure were broadened to include everybody, it would cost the Treasury $3 billion a year.

It is true that many whose employers finance pension plans and deduct the expense from their income tax returns, are permitted to defer taxpayments until they begin drawing on these funds. But if this privilege is to be equalized, what's wrong with the 30 million who get no benefits from this bill? They vote, too.

Besides, the Government simply cannot afford such concessions just now. Congress could do everybody a greater favor by restraining its spending craze—so that the value of the dollars saved today won't be depreciated when the time comes to live off them.

## The Liberals' Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, after reading this opportune article by William S. White, those Members of Congress who support greater spending and lower taxes might take a good look in their mirrors:

LIBERALS' TAXATION PROBLEM—ROCKEFELLER AND NEUBERGER SEEN TRYING TO END IRRESPONSIBILITY ON ISSUE

(By William S. White)

Political liberalism in both parties is long on good ideas for spending public money for the public good, and sometimes for the public safety as well. But political liberalism generally is short, indeed, on willingness to face up to a plain if unhappy fact: When money goes out money also has got to come in, unless Government is to become a kind of spending-happy, grinning farce.

This built-in tendency toward irresponsibility is the greatest single long-term weakness of the liberals, whether Democratic or Republican liberals. And it is, to reasonably detached people, the best single argument for preserving conservatism as a counterforce.

Liberalism, in a word, often comes close to the classic definition of the demagog. This fellow, being bravely consistent, always votes for all appropriations and against all taxes—except, of course, those on corporations and the rich.

This small lecture having been duly entered into the record, it is possible to report that two young liberal politicians are now trying to do something about it all. And while they no doubt will fail in their ultimate objectives, they are making genuine contributions to reason in the current budget debate.

A liberal Republican, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, is trying to persuade the New York Legislature to put on large new State taxes to pay for the new welfare programs he is proposing. He is having very hard going. But, at any rate, he is serving candor, and something else as well. He is giving valuable warning to fellow liberals that more and more voters who are not necessarily reactionaries are tiring of the liberal notion of trying to do much for most everybody without asking anybody much to pay anything much back.

A Democratic liberal in Washington, Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon, is having his own try for similar motives. He has asked Congress to raise taxes by about $3 billion before it approves more housing, more unemployment benefits, and other inherently desirable things.

Senator NEUBERGER wants to soak everybody at least a little bit. He would raise Federal gasoline taxes and he would allow the Post Office Department to lift postal rates to sensible levels. And he wants to hit some of "the interests." He proposes excess-profits levies on the arms makers and reductions in the tax writeoffs long guaranteed the oil industry because of the highly chancy nature of its operations.

Congress is perhaps even less likely to do all this than the New York Legislature is likely to let Governor Rockefeller slap on new taxes to the degree he wishes. But Senator NEUBERGER, a liberal of the liberals, is determined at all events to force his own fellow liberals into some self-examination. If he is able to do only this much he will be content.

His view, and it seems perfectly sound, here as in Albany, is that the voters have pretty well come to know a hack from a handsaw; or that anything that is any good will cost somebody something. He even suspects that the people know that consistently supporting in Congress the most madly liberal programs, and simultaneously crying out for lower taxes on the little man is not really liberal.

The word for that kind of policy is not liberal; the word is spelled p-h-o-n-y.

Senator NEUBERGER himself has painful memories of the real spelling of the word. Last year in the Senate he had the duty to guide a bill to raise postmen's pay. At this point his fellow liberals regarded him as a very sound man. But then he came along with the obviously necessary second part of the thing, a bill to increase postal rates to pay the freight. A great chill fell upon some of his fellow liberals.

"They acted then," he says wryly, "as though I had come out for a bill to nationalize women and children."

## Need for Housing Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD a thought-provoking statement presented to the Colorado State Legislature recently by the Colorado Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. The statement was prompted by bills on housing and migratory workers pending in the State legislature. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado Advisory Committee on Civil Rights, and its chairman, Mr. Arthur Ballantine, are to be commended for the solid work they have done in this field. The statement follows:

NEED FOR HOUSING LAW

Hearings before this advisory committee indicate that discrimination in housing is Colorado's biggest unsolved civil rights problem.

Members of minority groups are unable to obtain the kind of decent housing they can afford to buy or rent. They are forced to live in crowded conditions in substandard housing and are often victimized as to prices, sometimes even by members of their own groups.

This situation is wrong. The aim of all Americans and particularly Coloradans should be to work steadily toward the ending of prejudices and discriminatory practices based on race, color, or religion. Human beings should and must be accepted for what they are and what they have accomplished.

A number of groups have lagged behind other groups especially in respect to education. The commission believes this has been due principally to unfortunate economic conditions—not to inherent defects of human material.

Happily, the evidence is abundant that all groups in a State like Colorado which has made solid progress in human relations are producing citizens with high personal standards, intelligence, and often capacity for leadership.

No Coloradan should be content to know such fellow citizens are facing grave housing problems and do nothing about the situation. Just as these citizens are now able to vote and gain admittance to all of our institutions of learning, they should and must be able to get jobs for which they are qualified and decent housing they can afford.

The housing problem cannot be solved within housing areas now generally assigned to minority groups. Such areas are mostly substandard and already overcrowded. Moreover, segregation in housing as in schools is against the Nation's principles.

The only satisfactory way to meet the problem is to end discrimination in housing on a statewide basis—to make available homes in every well-built area to all decent, self-respecting families who can afford them regardless of race, color or religion.

Much is made of the argument that such a policy will endanger property values. The committee has not only read extensively on this subject, but has heard many witnesses, including builders, which negates such arguments.

Such fears appear unfounded. Where property values go down upon entry of minority groups, it is usually because the area is already becoming run down. Where construction is new and in good condition, several important studies show prices as likely to go up as down.

This Colorado Advisory Committee is charged with reporting to the Federal Civil Rights Commission in Washington on the status of civil rights in Colorado, and with making recommendations for their immediate improvement. The Federal Commission will use the Colorado committee's report we make in March to help it formulate recommendations to the President and to Congress later this summer.

Among our findings will be one that civil rights are definitely a State as well as Federal problem, that the Federal Civil Rights Commission should strongly urge the States to take action on matters which fall within their province, such as housing, employment, etc.

The Colorado Legislature is now considering house bill 259 directed specifically at ending discrimination in publicly assisted and privately financed housing. Since this is the kind of law we believe many States should adopt, we are issuing this preliminary report for the specific purpose of endorsing this proposed legislation.

The main emphasis of this bill is on negotiation and mediation, trying to settle problems before they reach public attention or the courts. This is an effective way of dealing with discrimination problems. Colorado already knows this from the experience of using the same technique in employment cases. Many lose their fears upon learning the actual facts and upon finding that others have done successfully what they have been asked to do in dealing with discrimination.

Housing is perhaps the most touchy civil rights problem Colorado has. Many who have not had the privilege of learning as much about the subject as this advisory committee has these last 3 months are fearful of all anti-discrimination acts. In such situations private mediation is especially valuable. The State antidiscrimination commission and its coordinator would have good opportunity through wise administration to provide education and solid progress without the unhappy incidents that have marked civil rights matters in some other States.

House bill 259 also contains enforcement provisions and the committee would like to emphasize its firm belief that enforcement provisions are an essential part of any effective antidiscrimination act. Their existence gives private negotiations a better chance to be successful. They also give the antidiscrimination commission and its coordinator an effective weapon to use when progress can be made in no other way. The enforcement provisions provide that the commission can issue "cease-and-desist" orders enforceable by the district courts, penalties for noncompliance are those of contempt of court.

Other excellent features of the bill are that it is specifically directed against discrimination in both publicly assisted and privately financed housing and against discriminatory practices of realty firms and financing institutions.

It is our belief that if this session of the Colorado Legislature adopts such a housing bill as proposed, Colorado will be tackling effectively the biggest problem facing the State in connection with civil rights.

In the area of migratory workers, the committee would like to call attention to and note with favor another piece of legislation already adopted by the general assembly and pending in the senate. This is house bill 103 requiring field labor contractors and crew leaders to keep payroll records and give wage statements to migratory workers.

In the State of Colorado the migratory worker has been another of our special fields of study. We are especially concerned by problems affecting American citizens who come into Colorado from another State, since Mexican nationals are governed by an agreement between the American and Mexican Governments.

Some excellent work has been done in this field by the migrant ministry and the Catholic women as well as by several companies operating within the State.

However, it is clear that numerous abuses exist in this field, particularly regarding wages, housing, transportation and other facilities for the migrant workers.

The present bill requires detailed wage records to be kept. This should prove to be a protection against unscrupulous individuals who have been taking advantage of the migratory workers.

While the commission regrets that no penalties are written directly into the bill now before the legislature, the very passage of the bill may prove helpful.

(Signed: Arthur Ballantine, Jr., chairman; Wendell A. Peters, vice chairman; Max E. V. Torres, Mrs. L. Arthur Higgins, and Rabbi Manuel Laderman.)

## We're Not Broke—But

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in today's RECORD I am inserting an address recently delivered by Mr. George Champion, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York. I am glad to present here a thoughtful editorial on that address which appeared in today's issue of the New York Daily News:

WE'RE NOT BROKE—BUT

We—the United States, that is—are the world's richest nation. But will this fine situation continue automatically and forever? Will the citizens of the world always crave and respect our products and our dollar?

We'd better, on the word of a real expert, not be too smug about any of that prosperity and prestige. Says George Champion, president of the renowned Chase Manhattan Bank, a number of factors already are putting our country on the economic sliding board.

WE'RE STILL INFLATING

(1) Our exports are falling off. People abroad can't afford to buy our wheat, cotton,

steel, autos, and other products into which we've packed the cost of Government subsidies and high-cost labor's low productivity or outright featherbedding. (2) Our gold is disappearing, largely because foreigners fear the inflation built into our governmental deficits. (3) Instead of using self-discipline and trying to check our something-for-nothing habits, too many of us (housing, shipping, and aviation industries, as well as our 20 percent subsidized farmers) continue to demand handouts from the Government—meaning our own neighbors.

It's a startling picture—a nation with our traditions, educational level, research instinct, and industrial know-how allowing itself to skid into what may be financial catastrophe. If you'd like the full eye-opening details, Chase Manhattan Bank may have a few extra copies of its president's remarks, "The Challenge to the Dollar."

## A Mickey From the Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of February 26, 1959.

It is the privilege, in fact the duty, of members of the bar to criticize court opinions which they believe to be wrong.

But the criticism should not be made unless it can be constructive. Urging that a court decision is wrong, without suggesting a proper remedy, tears down the respect for our courts and tends to undermine our constitutional form of government.

When dealing with constitutional questions we must bear in mind that the problem is a twofold one: Sometimes a court will strike down a law as unconstitutional because it does not conform to the requirements of our Constitution, that is, the language of the statute is inappropriate or indefinite. In such instances those who dissent from the decision should recommend legislation which will comply.

There are other instances where a court declares a law unconstitutional because the subject matter violates the basic rights guaranteed by the Constitution. In those cases, the remedy of the dissidents is to urge amendment of the Constitution.

To those in a hurry, both of these procedures are slow and cumbersome. The answer, however, is that such is the democratic process in a republican form of government such as ours. May it be ever so.

The editorial is as follows:

A MICKEY FROM THE BAR

It is astonishing that the house of delegates of the American Bar Association—the body which is supposed to be the watchdog of law and justice—would adopt a set of recommendations flatly hostile to the intent of the Supreme Court. The resolutions voted at Chicago disavowed any direct effort to limit jurisdiction of the Court and were candied up to remove outright criticism, but they still call upon Congress in effect to set aside decisions of the Court in important areas of civil liberties. It is difficult to avoid the impression that members of the house of delegates followed the narrow report of their special committee like sheep without serious consideration of the momentous issues involved.

Not all of the recommendations are bad, to be sure. No doubt it would be useful for Congress to clarify the purposes and powers of its committees, and the bar group makes this recommendation specifically in respect of the House Un-American Activities Committee. But the tenor of the whole move is shown by the praise of the Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee without even a hint that these committees might have exceeded their authority, engaged in persecution, or indeed ever done a single damaging or foolish thing.

In particular the delegates want Congress to amend the Smith Act to make it a crime to advocate overthrow of the Government by force irrespective of whether any damage results, thereby raising a serious question of encroachment upon the first amendment. The delegates want the States to be able to take action in cases of sedition against the Federal Government, thereby reversing the Supreme Court ruling in the Nelson case and inviting confusion of authority. They want to extend the Federal security program to nonsensitive jobs without any showing of need, and they want to require that a Federal employee forfeit any rights he might have under the fifth amendment with respect to testimony about past associations as a condition of employment.

The real problems of subversion need not be ignored in order to understand that this is not a big danger to the United States today. Indeed, if some of the persons who are so concerned about an internal menace would be more concerned with the need for a more adequate defense budget, the country would be safer. As one lawyer has put it, the house of delegates seems to want to do things in the internal security field which the Supreme Court has said or implied are unconstitutional. This is a position unbecoming the American Bar Association, and the more surprising because of the constructive top leadership given the association in recent years by such men as Ross L. Malone and Charles S. Rhyne. It would be frightening to think that the emanations from Chicago represented the sober judgment of the country's lawyers.

## Second Anniversary of Ghana Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message which I recorded for the Voice of America extending congratulations to the people of Ghana on the second anniversary of their independence:

My warmest congratulations to the people of Ghana on this, the second anniversary of your independence.

What a day it was in 1957. Indescribable heat that everyone ignored. Amazingly well-managed crowds—deeply interesting ceremonies culminating in that final midnight moment when the Prime Minister spoke from the little stand in the Polo Field and said: At long last we are free.

All this is in my mind today.

To Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, I extend my good wishes and friendly congratulations.

How proud all of you must be of the advances that have been made in your educational services in all fields of education. Such evidences of your recognition of the fundamental part education plays in all areas of freedom give confidence to all.

Last summer we here in the U.S. Congress of which I am a long-time Member welcomed your Prime Minister with sincere pleasure. He spoke to us of your country's need for American investment. He told us of your efforts to eradicate poverty, disease, and illiteracy, and to achieve the sustained economic development which will permit a reasonable standard of living.

We have been happy that a survey team has gone to you in preparation for a useful mission of technical cooperation. We are ready to serve with you in the program you are developing.

This is but a word on this, the second anniversary of your freedom to congratulate you and to do with you all good things.

Heaven blessing you, Mr. Prime Minister, and every man, woman, and child in Ghana.

## I Am Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us are familiar with the Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest for high school students, sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters. The young lady who won in the 1958–59 contest for the State of Texas was Miss Patricia Frances, of Wichita Falls. She submitted an excellent paper, entitled "I Am Democracy," which I wish to include in the RECORD. The winning paper submitted by Miss Frances is timely and thought-provoking and reflects much credit on the author:

I AM DEMOCRACY
(By Patricia Frances)

I walked down the lonely streets of Paris on July 12, 1789. I walked down the silent streets of Lexington on April 19, 1775. And I walked tearfully down the bloody streets of Budapest in October of 1956. I am Democracy.

How can I survive in the face of tyranny? I live in the hearts and minds of the people, for it is the natural desire of all to be free. I am the hope that makes life livable in times of oppression. I am the spirit that inspires men to fight and even die to obtain that goal. Men are conquerable, but I am unconquerable. History has proved that I have never been killed even in the most enslaved countries. I have even gone underground to give comfort to those who would keep me alive. Thus I grow stronger as brave men gather. And from such gatherings, the torches of liberty are lighted.

Who represents me? I am represented by a government that is of, by, and for the people. Even while communism flourishes, I am the hope of the just. Where I am present, people have freedom of speech and free-

dom of press. Where I am present, people have freedom of religion. Where I am in practice, a man is allowed to vote. Where I am in practice, a man is innocent until he is proved guilty.

What have I seen in my travels? I have seen empires rise and fall and I have seen dictators come and go. I have seen the great masses of people fighting for me and for what I represent.

I helped capture the Bastille. I helped dig the trenches at Valley Forge. And I helped raise the flag on Iwo Jima.

It was for me that those brave men left their bloody footprints in the snow of Valley Forge. It was for me that those brave women left their handprints on the huge door of the Bastille. And it was for the freedom that I represent that brave men also left footprints in the muddy fields of Iwo Jima.

Those men left a mark—a mark in the path of time than can never be erased.

I have many symbols—a burning torch of freedom which illuminates the darkness of oppression, a sword in the hands of a nation in bondage, and a towering Statue of Liberty that cries for all the world to hear:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free—the wretched refuse of your teeming shore—send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

How many years will I continue to endure? I will endure as long as men cherish freedom; I will endure as long as men will fight for freedom's sake; as long as man will lay down his life that others might live.

I have walked the streets for centuries and with God's grace I'll walk forever.

I am Democracy.

## The Great 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Friday, March 6, 1959, listing the legislative efforts of the 86th Congress today. While that article by Mr. Peter Edson is not fairly representative of the record, we hope this Congress will make, it is nevertheless a warning to all of us that the legislative mill had better commence some vigorous action to establish a worthwhile and workable Democratic program:

THE GREAT 86TH CONGRESS
(By Peter Edson)

The great Democratic 86th Congress—with majorities of 30 in the Senate and 130 in the House, exercising last November's mandate from the voters, operating under peerless mastermind leadership—has now completed 2 months of labor.

It has piled up a tremendous CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: 2,760 pages of proceedings, 1,890 pages of appendixes, 1,207 Senate bills introduced, 5,095 House bills introduced, to say nothing of 707 resolutions.

After all these millions of words and mountainous labor, the 86th Congress has now brought forth one mouse. It is Public Law 1, 86th Congress.

It fixes representation of the majority and minority members on the Joint Economic Committee.

But if this great act of statesmanship is supposed to correct everything wrong with the country, it may still leave something to be desired. Something is lacking.

Let no carping, critical soul think this is a record in donothingism, however. This is par for the course.

It always takes a new session of Congress about 3 months to roll up its sleeves and start to begin to commence to get ready to work. Running true to form, it will be some time after the Easter recess at the end of March before things begin to happen around here.

Right after the election there was a lot of big talk about how the new Democratic majorities would be so busy promoting their reforms that there wouldn't ever be time for meaningless, divisive, intraparty fighting.

Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON spelled out a 12-point platform. It called for new vitality in the space program, new peaceful uses of atomic energy, bold and imaginative foreign policies, a consistent approach for the State Department's stepchild, Latin America, more aid for depressed areas, urban renewal, airport construction and water resources development, new farm, labor and housing legislation, with lower interest rates for all.

Just after Congress returned in January, Leader JOHNSON made a pep talk to the Democratic caucus in which he accused the Eisenhower administration of "moving hardly at all" and exalting the static.

This is the only caucus Senate Democrats have held this year. They held only one last year. This is what Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, complains about openly, others q.t.

In all, the Senate has passed four bills and the House three. Everything else is in the talk stage.

This indicates how much work will have to be done in the last 4 months of the session if the Democratic majorities make good on their promises and exercise their mandate. And the consensus is that the man will have to do better than that if he wants to be President.

## Statements on Two Issues of Great Importance to This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1959, representatives of the Alabama League of Municipalities conferred here in Washington with the Alabama congressional delegation. These representatives presented excellent statements on issues of great importance to this session of Congress. At this time, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the following statements which were presented to our Alabama congressional delegation by Hon. E. J. Henninger, mayor of Tuscumbia, Ala., and Hon. R. B. Searcy, mayor of Huntsville, Ala.:

THE GREAT NEED FOR PASSAGE OF TVA SELF-FINANCING BILL
(By E. J. Henninger, mayor of Tuscumbia)

As you know, Congressman ROBERT E. JONES and other Members of the House and the Senate have reintroduced a bill to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to finance additional needed power installations by the sale of revenue bonds backed by TVA's earnings. Such bonds would not be obligations of the Federal Treasury and would not add to the national debt. This method of future financing for TVA has been recommended by the TVA Board and is approved by the users of TVA power who alone will pay for the bonds. It is hard to imagine a fairer proposition that could be made to a Nation by one of its regions.

Of course TVA is and remains a property of the United States. After 25 years, it efficiently operates the greatest integrated power system on earth with a capacity of over 10 million kilowatts. This great plant has been built by (1) Federal appropriations; and (2) TVA's own revenues. In the past 7 years, no appropriations have been made to TVA for construction of new generating capacity. TVA is spending out of revenues for new construction now at the rate of a quarter billion dollars every 3 years. Obviously no major utility—public or private—can indefinitely furnish this capital outlay out of current earnings.

DEMAND FOR POWER CONSTANTLY INCREASING

Meanwhile, the region's demand for power presses dangerously close on the TVA supply. The urgency of present finance proposals is marked by the real prospect of a power shortage in the Tennessee Valley by 1961. That event would bring to a rude halt the economic development of the region and could seriously impair the national defense, which year in and year out requires the use of more than half the power TVA produces.

The President four times has called for TVA self-financing. Legislation to that purpose was passed by the Senate in 1957—was reported favorably last year by the House Public Works Committee. This year, the budget presupposes enactment of such legislation. Surely it must be apparent to this session that TVA no longer should be subjected to its present catch-as-catch-can financing which drastically limits its ability to plan and build on schedule to meet its power obligations. We know you gentlemen are as alert to the increasing hazards of this situation as we are.

We in Alabama are counting heavily upon adequate TVA services in the total underpinning of our industrial progress and the advancement of our standard of living. This is an anticipation following naturally upon the lesson of experience. We share with the whole TVA region the impetus TVA has given toward full utilization of our natural resources. Indeed, its leadership and practical demonstrations in this field, in happy conjunction with the enterprise of our State agencies, has quickened our accomplishment and our hope in almost every plane of endeavor—industry, agriculture, commerce, health, and domestic well-being. The unfolding virtues that have made TVA an outstanding American showpiece to the world we have witnessed at firsthand.

TVA HAS LIVED UP TO ITS OBJECTIVES

TVA has lived up to the job it was set to do. Its probity and administrative excellence have placed a shining example before all our public services; its material benefits unquestionably reach to all parts of our State. The salutary effect of its yardstick power rates saves millions of dollars in the pockets of all our people, whether inside or outside of the TVA power service area. In the great northern valley of Alabama it has brought to realization the magnificent waterway the Tennessee River formerly had only in promise and has made possible—soon, we hope—the interconnection of the Tennessee with our other waters already developed for navigation down to the sea. It has shown how floods can be mastered and put to work for mankind, how the

forests and fields can be preserved and enriched and restored, how by intelligent and orderly improvement of the natural potentialities the wealth and strength of a State, a region, a nation can be increased.

Why then is TVA, an agency of our Government that is admirably carrying on the task it was assigned in the beginning, forced to stand up year after year and fight for the means of continuing its success? It pays its own way—it has earned and holds the confidence and esteem of the people of its valley who know it best, and of a great many besides in our own land and in lands around the globe. Yet—and this, of course, I hardly need tell you gentlemen—the powerful interests which all along have sought to halt, to cripple and to erase the TVA are aggressively arrayed against it now, seeking in these halls of Congress to block its path and pull it down.

These interests failed to kill TVA, in its early days, in the courts. They failed, in the notorious Dixon-Yates plot, to infiltrate and corrupt the TVA power service. Since then, they have carried on a war of attrition, campaigning on the one hand to poison the public mind, through national advertising at a cost of millions of dollars, against TVA and all public power—on the other to stifle TVA by shutting off appropriations for new construction.

U.S. CHAMBER FRONTS FOR TVA OPPOSITION

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has permitted itself to become the chief front and mouthpiece of these interests. On the surface it seems strange that this organization, which previously has itself proposed that TVA be required to issue bonds for its financing, now should be loudest in opposing legislation to authorize this method.

It is not, in fact, strange. For years, despite the existence of Federal law directing TVA to return to the Federal Treasury out of its revenues all appropriated money used in building its power system (TVA is $43 million ahead of schedule for this) these interests have labored to persuade the American people that TVA is subsidized by their taxes. The charge has been their main bludgeon. Now, faced with the self-financing bills and the readiness of the TVA consumers to have their responsibility for TVA financing written specifically in law, they realize that the authorization for self-financing knocks the wind out of their claim of subsidy.

We must comprehend that the end aim of these people is to stifle TVA. They are equally opposed to appropriations and to self-financing. They demand that TVA be broken up and sold. BOB JONES and others of our Representatives repeatedly have advised us of the busy and well-financed lobby against TVA maintained here in Washington. It can be assumed, I believe, that this lobby had hopes of making good its designs against TVA during a period in which elements of the national administration sharing its aversion to TVA were in power.

WE NOW FACE THE BIG SHOWDOWN

This fight on the self-financing bill could be the big showdown. Unless TVA is given access promptly to adequate financing, its whole operation could be hobbled and discredited. At least 3 years are required to build a major generating unit—hydro or steam: TVA should already have begun construction of the new plant it must have to meet forseeable power demands by 1961.

The situation is critical now, and certainly those of us in our State and in neighboring States also served by TVA—conscious of our own large stake in a depepdable supply of electric power from this source—need to put forth our most determined effort to protect our future. Our Representatives are placed by compelling circumstances in the leadership of the fight to obtain bond financing for TVA at this session—without fail, and as early as possible. We urge their maximum effort and pledge our firm and attentive support.

---

STRONG LOCAL CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAMS ARE IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

(By R. B. Searcy, mayor of Huntsville)

Being aware of current international tensions and the availability of modern weapons to potential aggressors, the Alabama League of Municipalities emphasizes to its members and to you, the members of the Alabama congressional delegation, the continuing importance of adequate civil defense preparation and the necessity for all levels of government to have the capability to carry out their responsibilities in the event of attack.

The use of terribly destructive weapons, with subsequent radioactive fallout which may make thousands of square miles uninhabitable, makes civil defense a matter of grave importance to the State of Alabama and to its cities and rural areas alike.

It is essential that Federal, State, and local governments be prepared to meet all eventualities of attack through the preparation and testing of operational survival plans.

JOINT RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROGRAM

We agree with present policies which place the responsibility for civil defense jointly in Federal Government, the several States and their political subdivision, which provide for Federal sharing in the administrative and personnel costs of State and local civil defense organization, which provide for Federal sharing in the costs of personnel attending training schools, and which provide for the procurement, distribution and maintenance of radiological detection instruments.

We should like to urge you to support legislation providing the funds needed to implement these programs.

The threat to our national survival requires rapid implementation of the national policy on shelters as promulgated by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, its expansion to include blast, heat and radiation shelters within target areas, and the provisions of adequate funds for planning and construction.

We endorse the national plan for civil and defense mobilization establishing national nonmilitary courses of action both to deter aggression and for national survival in event of attack. We feel that the statement of principles, responsibilities, requirements and broad courses of action for the Federal, State, and local governments and for the American people contained therein fulfills a critical need in the coordination and direction of the civil defense effort of our Nation.

CIVIL DEFENSE AFFECTS NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS

We hope that attention continues to be given to all aspects of civil defense as they affect our national preparedness including among others the broad training program of Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization staff college, assistance to all elements of local training programs and the public information program.

Public Law 85-606 was enacted by the Congress of the United States and approved by the President in 1958 and provides, among other things, for the sharing of administrative and personnel costs of State and local civil defense organization by the Federal Government, the sharing of costs of State and local personnel attending civil defense training schools, and the procurement, distribution, and maintenance of radiological detection instruments.

Although the Congress has authorized the expenditure of funds to accomplish these and other purposes related to the essential activities of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, it has failed to appropriate necessary funds. The appropriation of such funds is urgently necessary to insure the forward progress of State and local civil defense activities and therefore essential to the proper defense of the people of the United States.

We urge you members of the Alabama congressional delegation to do all in your power to immediately make the appropriations necessary for the complete and proper implementation of the provisions of Public Law 85-806 to provide for the full and proper assistance of our State and local civil defense efforts.

ADDITIONAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition, we commend to you the following specific policy recommendations:

That a much more complete and adequate financial program of civil defense which recognizes the urgent importance of protecting and defending our homeland be approved by the Congress. To this end we recommend funds under the Federal Civil Defense Act which will assume 75 percent of the administrative costs of recognized local civil defense agencies. We further recommend that the Federal Government assume full financial responsibility for the purchase and maintenance of all equipment primarily purchased to further the civil defense effort.

That the Congress of the United States continue laws which give to all civil defense agencies a high priority in the procurement of such Federal surplus properties as are necessary to the organization, maintenance, and operation of an effective civil defense and disaster program.

RECRUITMENT OF KEY MUNICIPAL PERSONNEL

That the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense adopt and enforce policies relating to the military and manpower recruitment of municipal personnel which will preserve the capacity of municipal government to protect its citizens and to discharge its national obligations for civil defense in case of national emergency.

That the Federal Government establish a system of issuing priorities for critical items in times of national emergency. A single agency should determine these priorities and the essential needs of municipalities should be given a preference at least equal to that afforded private industry.

That the Federal Government raise sufficient funds to finance the construction of shelters in cooperation with State and local governments including school and other districts. A program of blast, heat, and radiation shelters within target areas is a necessary addition to the present work toward fallout shelters.

We recommend also that the shelter program give proper consideration to the multiple public uses that may be obtained so as to make them as self-liquidating as possible. We urge that adequate shelters be included in all new public construction and that standards for construction of buildings under all federally aided programs include requirements for adequate shelter spaces.

---

## Proposed Changes in Universal Military Training and Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include several letters which I have received in the past few

days. These will serve as a sample of the numerous letters and inquiries I have received from coast to coast in support of my proposal to shorten the time our young men are eligible for the draft under the present Universal Military Training and Service Act. This act subjects young men to draft call for a period of 8 years between their 18th and 26th birthdays. I proposed an amendment to the bill before the Senate Armed Services Committee last Wednesday, which would have cut this time to 3 years by providing that the age limit be lowered from 26 to 21.

Adoption of this proposal would still give the draft a 3-year crop of manpower from which to fill their quotas. It would still give the recruiters their chance to obtain enlistments. It would hold all eligible young men to the obligation of military service to their country, but only in accordance with the present day needs of the country and with some consideration for the youth of America and their prospective civilian employers. I believe the present draft law is outdated and out moded in many instances. It is a modern day outrage to continue subjecting our youth unnecessarily to the uncertainties of the draft for this prolonged period of time and it is most certainly inconsistant with the more recent efforts to stress and aid the education of our youth, for I could point to no other single factor more unsettling to education than the present draft law.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join with me in ending this grave inequity and restoring to America's youth their constitutional rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
*Princeton, N.J., March 6, 1959.*

The Honorable MERWIN COAD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Although I am not in your constituency, I am writing in reference to your proposal before the Armed Services Committee that draft exemption be granted for men over 21 (New York Times, Mar. 5, 1959). I am extremely pleased that someone in Congress has noticed the gross inequalities and inefficiencies which our present Selective Service System produces. In recent months our population has become concerned with our educational system, at our lack of progress in science and in the needs of higher education. However, I feel that a great deal of our difficulties in these areas are either produced or hardened by the Selective Service System.

While it is true that the draft is beneficial both to the country and often to the individual concerned, it is perhaps more true that the draft is selective in such a way that we do not use our manpower efficiently. Since my personal concern is with higher education, I should like to point out some of the difficulties which arise from our present Selective Service System:

1. Students, otherwise not motivated, apply and accept positions in graduate students in order to avoid the draft.

2. Persons deliberately retard their graduate-school work so thta they will be 26 years of age before completing the doctorate, while the student who is motivated, and perhaps better trained, finishes at an earlier age and is then drafted.

3. The later persons are then placed in a position in which their training is not used for 2 years. Not only does the country lose the benefit of the trained, but the individual finds his ability depreciating during the 2 years since he is out of touch with his field. On the other hand, selective service recognizes a large number of critical skills—that of shop foreman, for example—which are exempted from the draft.

4. Men who marry young and have a child are exempt, while men who pursue their education are then asked to spend 2 additional years in service.

It is clear, I think, that the present System not only discourages students from receiving the training necessary to become a scientist, but punishes him for doing well. I feel that the establishment of the period from 18 to 20 years of age as the years for military training would eliminate this problem, and I would hope that your efforts would prove fruitful.

Sincerely yours,
DOUGLAS K. CANDLAND,
*Department of Psychology.*

---

NEW YORK, N.Y., *March 5, 1959.*

The Honorable MERWIN COAD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. COAD: Today's New York Times included a small notice of your proposal to exempt all men over 21 years of age from the draft. I am writing the newspaper to promote more publicity for your much-needed draft-law revision.

It is unfortunate that most of our Nation's leaders do not express any attempt to best utilize the coming generation; and the Armed Forces is certainly not the place to develop young talent, especially the college graduate. An inexpensive survey, or merely a few visits to Army camps to speak with college-trained servicemen would show the great waste, even in the 6-month plan, that our men, and thus the country, must endure.

I wish you success in your current endeavor.

Very truly yours,
DONALD M. LEVIN.

---

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 6, 1959.*

Representative MERWIN COAD,
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: In this morning's Los Angeles Times there was published your proposal for draft exemption for men over 21.

I have never written a letter to anyone like you before, although feeling strongly about many other public issues. This idea of yours affects me personally, however. I would like to add my story to perhaps many others.

My son will be 27 this year. From kindergarten on he has shown a marked proficiency in everything he has tackled. He skipped 2 grades in elementary school. In junior high he was editor of the school paper, writing all the feature editorials himself, as well as specials. In senior high he led all his classes and upon graduation was named the most outstanding scholar. His report cards were always above average.

He attended 4 years at the University of Southern California wholly on his scholarships each succeeding term. He was a Phi Beta Kappa as well as in other honorary fraternities. He graduated from there magna cum laude.

He went on to an assistantship at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and was wholly self-supporting. He graduated there last June, a Ph. D.

He was awarded a Fulbright grant and at present is in Paris, France, at the University of Paris. He will be back next fall.

All these years he has been deferred from the draft. He will be a very valuable man in his field of physics. Important to our world of today. He is being sought by leading and powerful industries, prominent in this age of space.

He has not married. How can he? He has no assurance that he has any future. The draft board hangs over it. His whole life has been dedicated to scientific learning and he certainly deserves a chance now to marry and have a home and serve his country well in his field.

Hope I have helped to bolster your cause.

Very sincerely,
MRS. ELMA FRIEL.

---

## Pertinent Information on Puerto Rican Taxation and Cost of Living

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of a number of questions which will arise in our forthcoming floor debate on Hawaiian statehood I have asked our colleague, Resident Commissioner Fernós-Isern of Puerto Rico to prepare a memorandum on, first, the economic and fiscal relations between Puerto Rico and the United States; second, tax exemption in Puerto Rico; and third, cost-of-living differential in Puerto Rico allowed civil servants of the Federal Government. Invariably, in Hawaiian statehood debates these matters arise and usually are discussed with much of the factual information not being utilized. In order to provide those persons who wish to discuss these Puerto Rican matters as they relate to Hawaii with reliable information I wish to insert in the RECORD the following memorandum prepared by Resident Commissioner Fernós-Isern:

MARCH 4, 1959.

Dr. JOHN TAYLOR,
*Professional Staff Member, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR DR. TAYLOR: With reference to our recent conversation I am enclosing the memorandum which I have prepared at your request on (1) the economic and fiscal relations between Puerto Rico and the United States; (2) tax exemption in Puerto Rico; and (3) cost-of-living differential in Puerto Rico allowed civil servants of the Federal Government.

If you feel that further details are required, I should be happy to provide them.

Sincerely,
A. FERNÓS-ISERN,
*Resident Commissioner.*

---

MARCH 4, 1959.

Memorandum with reference to: (1) Economic and fiscal relations between Puerto Rico and the United States; (2) tax exemption in Puerto Rico; (3) Cost-of-living differential in Puerto Rico.

1. Ever since the United States acquired sovereignty over Puerto Rico under the Treaty of Paris in 1899, the Organic Acts enacted by Congress to organize a civil government in Puerto Rico (1900 and 1917), as well as the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act (since Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth) have provided that all expenses incurred by the Government of Puerto Rico shall be paid out of the Treasury of Puerto Rico. (See sec. 12, Organic Act of 1900, and sec. 6 of the Second Organic Act of 1917).

No Federal appropriations have ever been made to pay for the expenses of local government, as has been the case in the Territories. This refers, of course, to the government establishment of Puerto Rico and not to the operation of Federal activities and programs undertaken by the United States in Puerto Rico.

The expenses of the U.S. Government in Puerto Rico can be classified into three groups:

(1) The Defense Establishment, including payments to veterans. (Thousands of Puerto Ricans have served during the First World War, the Second World War, and the Korean action and, of course, are entitled to the same compensations as their mainland fellow citizens.)

(2) Civilian Federal agencies, which operate in Puerto Rico in the same way as in any State of the Union. (Federal agencies in Puerto Rico include, of course, the Post Office system, the Immigration Service, the U.S. district court, buoys, lighthouses, agricultural agencies, etc.)

(3) Grant-in-aid laws, which have been extended to Puerto Rico and which operate with joint Federal-Commonwealth funds, under the supervision of the respective Federal departments.

The same rates of tariff applying in the United States to imports from foreign countries apply to merchandise from foreign countries coming into Puerto Rico. The expenses incurred for collecting the customs duties in Puerto Rico are paid out of collections made, and the remainder is covered into the treasury of Puerto Rico (see sec. 4 of the Organic Act of 1900 and sec. 58 of the Second Organic Act of 1917). There are no customs between United States and Puerto Rico. The U.S. Internal Revenue laws would have no force and effect in Puerto Rico (see sec. 14 of the Organic Act of 1900 and sec. 9 of the Second Organic Act of 1917).

In other words, Puerto Rico was accorded free trade with the United States, within a common tariff, and was given fiscal autonomy, while it was supposed to support its own government with its own revenues.

This treatment was accorded Puerto Rico on the theory that Puerto Rico was not incorporated into the United States under the terms of the Treaty of Paris with Spain in 1899, nor has it been incorporated by act of Congress at any later date. It was not a Territory in the traditional sense, but "a people" under the sovereignty of the United States. (See sec. 7, Organic Act of 1900.)

The provisions of the Constitution of the United States concerning the uniformity in tax laws do not apply in Puerto Rico as they have always applied to incorporated territories such as the present Territory of Hawaii.

The distinction between incorporated and unincorporated territories was early made by the Supreme Court in the well-known insular cases, *de Lima* v. *Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 1 (1901); *Jones* v. *Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901); *Dooley* v. *U. S.*, 183 U.S. 151 (1901); and later confirmed in *Balzac* v. *People of Puerto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298 (1922).

All these congressional and judicial decisions took place long before the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was organized. The Commonwealth has evolved within this framework of relations. The fact that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was created in 1952 did not alter the above situation. As a matter of fact, the sections in the Organic Act of 1917 which dealt with these matters were specifically continued in force and effect, as the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act (sec. 4 of Public Law 600, 81st Cong., which enabled the people of Puerto Rico to organize the Commonwealth). The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, therefore, now has the same fiscal situation and economic relationships which Puerto Rico had before it became a Commonwealth.

Although the general rule is that United States internal revenue laws do not apply in Puerto Rico, it should be noted that the U.S. income tax law applies to the income of residents of Puerto Rico when such income is derived from sources outside of Puerto Rico. This includes Federal salaries paid to residents of Puerto Rico who serve the Federal Government in Puerto Rico. The fundamental fact, then, is not that Puerto Rico is exempt from Federal taxes, but that Puerto Rico is not included in the tax area of the United States and has its own separate tax system as an unincorporated area.

The tax system of Puerto Rico includes income tax laws, excise tax laws, real estate tax laws, inheritance tax laws, etc. The tax laws in Puerto Rico are comparable to those prevailing in the mainland.

2. Puerto Rico has adopted a program of tax exemption for a short period of years, for new industries that may wish to establish themselves in Puerto Rico. This program was implemented in view of the enormous unemployment problem in Puerto Rico and in view of the very limited natural resources. Without this temporary dispensation to new industries, they would have no reason to come to Puerto Rico, and Puerto Rico would neither collect taxes on unexisting industries nor be able to create new opportunities of employment for the unemployed. Since it was not possible to have both taxes and employment from new industries, Puerto Rico had to decide to have one of the two, i.e., employment, and temporarily give up taxes that it would not have received anyway. The program has met with a great deal of success. Employment opportunities in Puerto Rico have increased rapidly. The standard of living has been raised, the purchasing capacity of the average citizen has increased, and as a result (since Puerto Rico does most of its outside shopping in the U.S. mainland) the purchases made by Puerto Rico in the last year exceeded $600 million actually approaching the $700 million mark. Puerto Rican sales to the United States were about $450 million. Puerto Rico is today the third largest market for U.S. products in the New World.

It should be emphasized that the tax exemption program is applied exclusively to new industries coming into Puerto Rico which duly qualify for the exemption; that each case is decided on its merits. Also that except for these new industries the people of Puerto Rico do pay taxes to the Commonwealth, as aforesaid, in a comparable manner as the citizens of the United States pay taxes to the States and to the Federal Government. It should also be emphasized that the tax exemption given to new industries is a temporary measure, limited to a fixed period of time, and that after that time elapses, the new industries are subject to taxation the same as the old-established industries. It should also be emphasized that tax exemption is not granted to industries that may pull out of the United States and come into Puerto Rico. Only brandnew industries which represent an expansion in the industrial organization of the United States are eligible to tax exemption under the Commonwealth law.

3. Although the average per capita income in Puerto Rico is lower than the lowest average per capita income in any State, it has been found, through surveys carried out at the initiative of the Civil Service Commission, that the cost of living in Puerto Rico is about 17½ percent higher than it is in Washington, D.C. Although there may be differences of opinion as to the reasons for this higher cost of living, it seems logical to assume that among the factors creating this higher cost is the fact that Puerto Rico buys in the mainland no less than 50 percent of the food it consumes and pays very high freight rates for transportation. These high freight rates are paid not only in transportation from the mainland to Puerto Rico but also on what is transported from Puerto Rico to the mainland. All this transportation, according to law, must be made within the terms of the coastwise shipping laws of the United States which apply to Puerto Rico, i.e., in vessels registered in the United States.

Since the same situation prevails in other offshore areas, namely, Alaska and Hawaii, the Congress has adopted the policy of compensating United States officials and employees serving in these offshore areas, for this higher cost of living. It seems to be a sound policy, since what it does in fact is to equalize the income of Federal employees in the offshore areas to the income of Federal employees in the mainland areas.

The fact that the Federal Government follows this policy serves to emphasize the difficult economic problem the people of Puerto Rico must meet in their endeavor to attain a standard of living comparable to that of their fellow citizens in the mainland. They must cope not only with unemployment and the fact that their income is lower than that of the average income in the mainland, but also with the fact that their cost of living is higher than in the mainland.

Puerto Rico is making great strides in improving the lot of its people. It has attained Commonwealth status which the multitudes of its people endorse and support. Commonwealth status means that the people of Puerto Rico have full self-government in a measure comparable to that enjoyed by a State of the Union. But the U.S. Government exercises authority in Puerto Rico also in a measure comparable to the authority it exercises with respect to any State. The people of Puerto Rico, fully participating in the election of their Commonwealth officials, do not participate in Federal election or legislation, except that they have a spokesman in the Resident Commissioner, who may present the views of the people of Puerto Rico before Congress as well as before the executive departments in such matters as affect Puerto Rico and are within the province of the Federal Government.

The people of Puerto Rico do not participate in the election of the President, or the Vice President; they do not elect two Senators; they do not elect a proportionate number of voting Members of the House. If Puerto Rico were a State, it would be entitled to no less than five House Members. Nevertheless, Federal laws apply in Puerto Rico equally as in any State, except tax laws, but including, of course, selective service.

---

## Prof. L. P. Gabbard, Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, A. & M. College of Texas, Suggests Plan for Supplemental Income Payments To Provide for Logical Approach to Parity for Farm and Ranch People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a suggested plan of supplemental income payments

for the purpose of providing parity for farm and ranch people.

The following plan was prepared by Prof. L. P. Gabbard, of the department of agricultural economics and sociology of the A. & M. College of Texas, College Station, Tex.

Prof. Gabbard has long been associated with the college and with the agricultural experiment station and has a wide background in the agricultural field both economically and in the sociological phase of the farm family. I think his long experience of personal contacts in this regard make him most competent and it is with pleasure that I make his suggestions available to the Members of this body:

SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME PAYMENT PLAN

For about 20 years we have had, in one form or another, commodity price supports for agriculture. During this period, troublesome agricultural surpluses have accumulated to plague us.

Currently, farmers are not happy. The farmer finds prices for his products declining, and cost for production items increasing. This price-cost-squeeze leaves him less and less income from his farm operations. Yet, he looks about him and sees wages of laborers increasing, salaries rising and profits of industry mounting.

Fundamentally, the farm problem is not one of politics, but one of economics. It is not so much a maladjustment within agriculture as it is a maladjustment in the overall economy of the Nation. And it is not so much a case where the Lion and Lamb are called on to lie down together as it is one where the Mule and the Elephant have an opportunity to stand and work together for the best possible program for the National interest.

It is assumed that as a Nation we are generally committed to the concept of parity income for agriculture and nonagricultural industries. We may differ widely on details, but we recognize that parity is a goal which may never be completely realized, yet an ideal ever to be sought in the operation of our economy. Any time an important sector of the economy operates on a relatively low income and purchasing power basis, the economy as a whole is not well.

Much of the disparity between agricultural and nonagricultural industries stems from policies and activities of the Government. Throughout practically its entire history, American industry has been protected by tariffs on competitive imports. Industrial labor has benefited from immigration laws limiting the number of people coming to this country, and more recently a minimum wage law has been passed, both of which add up to an indirect subsidy to labor.

What about the American farmer? During the past 150 years, he has had relatively little effective protection, except for the past two decades. He has bought in a protected market and sold in an open market. He maintained production of our foods and fibers, basic necessites, during the depression decade, while industrial production was being cut drastically. He responded generously and effectively in his production program to meet the needs of World War II, but aside from a commodity price support program, he had no assistance in adjusting to peacetime production following the end of the war.

It would be difficult to offer an entirely new farm program in view of the many which already have been tried or proposed. Admittedly, there is no magic formula for a problem so complex. But surely there is a plan that provides the elements of self-adjustment to a much larger degree than any which has been tried. We are currently experiencing the embarrassment of large surpluses under the price support program. Once the Government purchases and stores agricultural commodities there is never a satisfactory time short of war or extended drought to put them on the market. Yet these stored commodities, as a part of the total supply, hover as a threatening cloud to depress farm prices at a time when farmers are already in a painful cost-price squeeze. To the extent that the program succeeds in keeping prices relatively high, consumers in general must pay more for their food and fiber.

A satisfactory farm program should cover the entire farm unit. The moment we single out a particular commodity or commodities for special treatment, the chances are that those commodities left will soon be in trouble. To be fair to all producers, all commodities should be included in a program and each should receive due consideration. To do this on a commodity supply and price basis requires superhuman wisdom.

To be broad and comprehensive, the farm program should go beyond mere price considerations. Price is only part of the formula which makes income. The major concern should be the content and level of farm family living. This includes such items as housing, health, transportation, recreation and the like. With good health, good training and access to adequate resources, a people should find a satisfactory solution to their social and economic problems with a minimum amount of direct aid from their government.

Mere lipservice will not establish and maintain family-size farms. Adequate and suitable credit for the purchase and operation of such farms is a must. Farm income and farm purchasing power based on parity with that of nonagricultural income would be of great help. It is important to the welfare of the Nation that the family farm not only be economically efficient, but socially efficient. The Nation's most important social product of the farm is people. The farm is especially productive in this respect.

If price is to be counted on to bring to the market an adequate supply of commodities in line with demand, the market must be kept free and competitive. The market is not freely competitive for each and all commodities if for some there is a supporting price, while for others there is no support. Programs of this kind often result in greater maladjustment than they propose to remedy.

If the free nations are to be most effective in conducting an economic and ideological warfare on communism, they must arrange their trade relations so as to make full use of the principle of comparative economic advantage. Nations vary greatly in their resources, stage of development, skills, capital and managerial ability. A relatively free exchange of goods and services is about the only permanent basis on which these nations may cooperate. The free nations of the world should have a trade compact providing for an exchange of goods and services approaching the freedom enjoyed by the States of the United States of America.

It is generally conceded that nonagricultural industry enjoys a much greater degree of control over supply than do farmers; hence, a more effective control over price. This control by industry is a major cause of the disparity between agricultural and nonagricultural incomes. The very large number of farms and the vagaries of weather under which they are operated may serve to cause even wider fluctuations from year to year. In the interest of the whole economy, it is well to keep its major sectors on as even keel as possible. Any farm program which does not possess to a large degree the elements of self-adjustment, will ultimately break down under the weight of its own weaknesses. It must rely on prices in the open market to balance production with demand. One of the best means of getting a well balanced allocation of our resources is through a sensitive pricing system. This assumes a market in which the consumer is free to make his choice of goods and services on a fully competitive basis.

This brings us to our main proposal that any disparity in agricultural income when compared to nonagricultural income should be adjusted through supplemental income payments. The supplemental income payment plan in its pure form possesses the elements of self-adjustment to a large degree. It lets the free market set price and determine production and in theory is the most logical approach to parity income for farm people. This plan would leave farmers free to grow and market those products which seemed to offer best returns on a free and open market. Prices made in such a market would serve to guide production and consumption and encourage foreign trade, whereas artificially high prices of commodity price supports tend to cause overproduction and to price us out of foreign trade with certain commodities.

Under the plan it would be necessary to choose a base representing a period when agricultural and nonagricultural incomes and purchasing power were in a satisfactory relationship. This period would equal 100 percent, and needed adjustments of income would be calculated on this base. For example, if for a given year the national average agricultural income per family was relatively 15 percent lower than the nonagricultural income per family, compared with the base period, the income of farm producers would be increased 15 percent to bring the two groups as individuals into relatively the same purchasing power position.

Income payments should be based on net income rather than gross. To illustrate, let us assume that a payment of 15 percent is necessary to bring agricultural income in line with nonagricultural income.

Brown has a net income of $3,000. He would be given 15 percent of his net income or $450 in order to bring his income up to parity. If farmer Brown had a net income of $4,000 he would get a supplemental payment of 15 percent or $600. Thus emphasis is placed on efficient production and marketing because the larger net income gets a larger supplemental payment.

Supplemental income payments would not take care of crop failure due to unfavorable weather, insects, diseases, and the like. Such disasters will need to be covered by crop and livestock insurance or other emergency programs.

The cost to the Government would depend on the degree of disparity between agricultural and nonagricultural income for any given year, compared with the base period. For illustration purposes only, let us select the years 1946–50 as the base period or years in which agricultural income was in good relationship with nonagricultural income. Then during the years 1951 through 1954 the cost to the Government would have been about $10 million in 1951, about $900 million in 1952, about $1.6 billion in 1953, and about $1.4 billion in 1954.

The plan does not propose to stabilize farm income other than to make it comparable with nonagricultural income from year to year. The flexibility and simplicity are perhaps its strongest features. Under the proposed plan, market prices are left free to serve as a guide to the allocation of resources within agriculture for their most efficient uses. Supplemental income payments would eliminate agricultural surpluses and obviate the need of storage, except for normal trade carryovers.

Admittedly, the supplemental income plan is not ideal. We still are looking for an ideally workable plan. This plan would leave the processes of our economic system free to

be self-adjusting. Disparities between agricultural and nonagricultural income would be adjusted outside the market leaving the competitive market to operate freely.

TEN IMPORTANT POINTS (YOU SHOULD KNOW) ABOUT THE SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME PAYMENT PLAN

1. The cost of the program would be reasonable compared with results accomplished: The cost of the proposed plan would vary with the percent of disparity of farm income and how farm income compared with the base period. In a year when the disparity is as much as 15 percent, as in 1954, approximately 1.6 billion dollars would be needed to give farmers parity income and purchasing power equal to the average for the base period 1946–50.

2. The administration of the program would be simple and inexpensive: The administration should be kept as simple as possible. A farmer who wished to benefit under the program would apply through his county ASC office. To his application would be attached a copy of his annual report to the Internal Revenue Service for Federal income tax purposes. His county ASC office would check, record, and forward his application to the USDA for final approval and payment. Application by the farmer would be optional.

3. The plan would apply to the farm as a unit and not to commodities: The plan does not apply to individual crops, but to the farm as a unit. Any and all crops and livestock enterprises included in the organization and operation on the farm would be treated as a unit. Supplemental payments would be based on net income from all farm enterprises.

4. About 50 percent of farm families would benefit directly from the plan: According to the recent U.S. agricultural census about 40 percent of the farm families produce approximately 88 percent of farm products sold. Three-fifths of our farm families produce only about 12 percent of farm products sold. Obviously this plan or any other financial plan will help the farm family less as the net income declines. The low income group of rural families will need assistance through other types of programs, such as technical training, health programs, farm-to-market roads, and similar kinds of services.

5. Consumers and processors who pay for the program should be able to buy food and fiber relatively cheap: Under the plan all farm commodities will be put on the open market. Products are not held off the market by the Government to hold the price artificially high as is done under the commodity price support program. The consumer and processor will be able to buy his food and fiber on an open competitive market. Thus, while as a taxpayer, they are helping pay for the program they should be able to enjoy relatively cheap food and fiber.

6. Foreign trade should benefit substantially under the plan—commodity prices would seek their world level: Since World War II foreign trade has made up roughly 12½ percent of agricultural income in the U.S.A. There could be no such thing as a commodity being priced out of the world market as happens with the commodity program—cotton is a good example. The program should strengthen foreign trade substantially.

The plan should be in harmony with national defense: Under the plan agricultural resources would be allocated and utilized through prices made in the free market. One could not imagine the organization and operation of agriculture on a more flexible or responsive basis. In case of an emergency such as war our entire agricultural economy would be in a position to move readily in the direction of new and special demands.

8. The plan should increase the importance of noncommodity programs: The plan would supersede the current commodity price support program. Agricultural research and agricultural educational programs should increase in importance. The more efficient the producer is under the plan, the greater will be his benefits from it. The soil conservation and related programs would continue.

9. It is a positive program—It does not pay for not producing: It is a positive program. It proposes to help the farmer adjust his business on the basis of production. It will not pay for not producing. It rewards and encourages good management, efficient production, efficient marketing and the production of quality products.

10. It will correct maladjustments and conflicts between commodities arising out of the present program: The plan should help to correct maladjustments and inequities which have arisen between agricultural commodities under the commodity price support program. This should unify the efforts of farmers throughout the Nation and give them greater strength to help themselves as a group.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting another article, this time one which appeared in the Denver, Colo., Post on November 14, 1958, describing the "dirty, rotten water" which citizens of Colorado find distributed through the Baker Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District. It was interesting to note in that article that parents among the audience said they feared the water was making their children sick. They said the prevalence of gastritis and enteritis was unusually high:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Nov. 14, 1958]

IRATE CITIZENS BESIEGE BAKER WATER BOARD

(By Mark Bearwald)

Residents besieged the board meeting of the Baker Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District Thursday night with impassioned complaints about "dirty, rotten water."

Board members sat glumly listening to a long list of grievances from more than 60 persons who jammed a small board room at the district's office, 6530 Federal Boulevard. Others stood outside with ears cocked toward the open windows.

Residents have been complaining for several weeks about the odor, taste, and milky appearance of drinking water. One householder said the water has "a rotten odor, like swamp water."

Most of the complaints came from persons living in the Perl-Mack area bordering the upper Valley Highway. Baker District serves water to Perl-Mack, Fairview, and Florado subdivisions.

The district furnishes 2,200 homes with water from its Clear Creek treatment plant and another 603 homes with Denver water. The district hopes to buy more water from Denver once the "blue line" limit is withdrawn.

Several parents in the audience Thursday night said they feared the water was making their children sick. They said the prevalence of "gastritis and enteritis" was unusually high.

Also, the audience charged the Baker board of directors was "sitting on its hands" and doing nothing to clean up its water and sewage in line with recommendations from the State and Tri-County Health Departments.

Speaker after speaker voiced complaints. One man said, "The public is pretty damn well fed up." Another charged the district operated only for the convenience of a Perl-Mack construction firm.

Perl-Mack has lent money to the district for needed improvements of water and sewer works. A lawsuit contesting that financial arrangements is now pending in the State supreme court.

Sheldon Silverman, an attorney for Perl-Mack, told the crowd two water wells will be completed in about 2 weeks.

"Give the wells a chance," he said. "If that doesn't work, we'll be glad to work with you to find another solution." The audience hooted.

Joe Vigil, Tri-County sanitarian, said the wells will help "tremendously in improving the quality of the water."

He said Baker now gets its water from Clear Creek. In the spring and summer there is sufficient flow in the creek to dilute the discharge from upstream sewage plants. But in the fall and winter, Clear Creek falls to a trickle and that trickle at times is 100 percent sewage affluent, Virgil said.

CHRONIC PROBLEM

He said the pollution problem is chronic along Clear Creek "every year at this time." The city of Westminster had a similar protest meeting 2 weeks ago.

Vigil said 15 of the 34 Baker water samples he took in October tested "unsafe."

Both Vigil and Eugene Facetti, district health engineer for the State, seemed to doubt that Baker water was causing any outbreak of disease. Vigil said a State health department team would survey the area to see if a health problem existed.

George Stump, president of the Baker board, and members Herman Osborn and Robert Sandersfield urged the crowd to wait until the two wells go into operation.

The crowd asked for another meeting in a lafger hall. Stump tentatively scheduled a special board meeting on the evening of December 4 at the Francis M. Day School in Perl-Mack.

## Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the serious problems that labor unions have run into in organizing the dairy industry is that the cows have to be milked twice a day every day. No 5-day week for a dairyman. Many commentators on the changing conditions in farming have pointed to the decline of the family cow. This, too, is mostly caused by the fact that one family cow requires milking every morning and every evening. No weekends permissible when "old bossy" is home bawling to be milked.

Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has evolved a

formula whereby he says 75,000 classrooms can be built without unbalancing the budget if the local subdivisions will only change their tax concepts, if the States will change statutory debt limits and if constitutions in more than half the States be changed. But Dr. Flemming points out these statutory and constitutional changes will be minor obstacles in the working out of his plan if the States and districts will only cooperate.

Dr. Flemming's formula should be used to put cows on a 5-day week. Of course, it will mean a basic change in the constitution of the cow and her cooperation but with the application of the Flemming formula, those minor obstacles can be easily overcome.

## National Aeronautics and Space Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the space program of the United States is of extreme importance to every Member of Congress. Mr. T. Keith Glennan, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has given an excellent address to the Aviation Writers Association on March 5, 1959 at the National Press Club. I commend it to my colleagues:

PRESENTATION TO THE AVIATION WRITERS ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., BY T. KEITH GLENNAN, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, MARCH 5, 1959

October 1, last, 5 months and 5 days ago, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration became an operating agency of the Federal Government. The 9 weeks preceding, counting from July 29 when President Eisenhower signed the legislation which established NASA, had been used in recruiting the staff and in performing the many tasks essential to getting underway.

To provide us with many of the resources we would need—the men, the facilities, and the money—there were transferred to NASA the 43-year-old National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, with its 8,000 people and fine laboratory facilities, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory—including some 2,300 people—operated by the California Institute of Technology, the Vanguard program and with it, the fine group headed by Dr. John P. Hagen, the Pioneer space probe program which the Air Force and the Army were conducting under the direction of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, three satellite projects, and a number of ARPA and Air Force engine development programs.

To sum up, by the end of 1958, NASA had vigorous, rapidly moving, although somewhat ad hoc programs of space technology, space science, and space exploration. The total funding available to NASA for fiscal 1959 was $335,719,532. We have since asked for $48,354,000 in supplemental funds for fiscal 1959 to permit acceleration of Project Mercury, the manned orbital space flight program, and to finance certain necessary construction and equipment items.

One of the most urgent tasks we faced when we began operations last October was to plan for the longer pull, as distinguished from the more immediate, more obvious projects that could be promptly programed or were already underway.

I want to speak briefly about our long-range planning, and in this connection, to consider two problems that are of concern to you, to me, and in fact, to all Americans. The first of these problems, simply stated, is how much should the NASA be talking about what it hopes to do in the future.

You are generally familiar, I believe, with the language of the Space Act, relating to information, but to be specific, I quote: "The Administration (NASA) in order to carry out the purpose of this act, shall * * * provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning its activities and the results thereof * * *" and "Information obtained or developed by the Administrator in the performance of his functions under this act shall be made available for public inspection, except (A) information authorized or required by Federal statute to be withheld, and (B) information classified to protect the national security: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall authorize the withholding of information by the Administrator from the duly authorized committees of the Congress."

The way I read this language is that we are enjoined to report fully and candidly about what we have done, and about what we are doing. As I see it, we are supposed to talk as freely about our failures as we do about our successes. Having opposed unnecessary and excessive secrecy in the conduct of scientific investigations by governmental agencies for many years, I find myself in complete agreement with this provision in the Space Act.

The American public, the people who will have to pay the costs of our space programs, most certainly are entitled to full disclosure about the way we are accomplishing our vital, assigned missions. Further, science will flourish best when interchange—free interchange—of information between scientists is encouraged.

Now, there is another aspect to this matter of reporting to the American public about our activities, and that is what we should do about discussing futures—what we plan to do, and what we hope to do. Here again, it is obvious to me that we cannot expect the Congress, representing the taxpayer, to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to NASA unless and until it has become convinced of the soundness of our planning and the need for the space programs we propose.

To do this—to give the congressional committees solid evidence of the validity of our requests for funds—requires that we present a strong case for the future activities of the agency. In the research and development business, there is an old saying that if you know how an experiment is going to turn out, it no longer is justified as an experiment. Thus we find ourselves selling the need for expenditures against the reality that we don't know exactly how to go about each element of the task ahead. And we find it necessary to set dates and suggest the end results to be obtained even though we may be uncertain about the precise methods we shall have to use to assure accomplishment. More often than not, those dates rise up to haunt us for it is characteristic of people working in exploratory activities to be optimistic about their abilities to meet schedules.

In passing, I believe I should observe that you, who have the vital role of providing the citizens of the United States and, in fact, the entire world with prompt, accurate reports about what is happening in the realm of flight, are not in agreement as a group, on the course we should chart in this area of discussing futures.

By way of example, I recall the general criticisms directed our way late last fall and early this year when it was widely reported that we had no long-range plans. The fact that we were very, very much absorbed with performing work of great immediate importance—work that, incidentally, had to be done before we could tackle futures—apparently was far less exciting and newsworthy than reports that we didn't know what we ought to be doing in the years ahead.

Hardly 5 weeks ago, I outlined the procedures we were using to select volunteers for our first manned, orbital space flight program, Project Mercury. You will recall the schedule: First, presentation to about 110 potential candidates of details of the program, after which the call for volunteers—and you should know that nearly 80 percent of those to whom we talked volunteered; second, selection from these volunteers of a group of approximately 30 for further tests; and finally, choice of a small group of these men who were found to be best qualified. In this instance, the criticisms were divided. We were subjected to heavy pressures from some editorial quarters because we declined to make public the names of the 110 potentials or of those volunteering. (The reason: The psychological and physical evaluations leading to the final selections are a private, privileged matter between the examining aeromedical specialists and the volunteers.) Elsewhere, we were lampooned as blue-sky merchants because we had talked about the pilot selection process before the space capsules had even been built.

Getting back to the business of long-range planning, we have been working very hard to map out with some precision the routes we intend to follow on our journeys into space. A first step in this direction was the blueprinting of our programs for fiscal 1960. We took the position that these plans should be directed to the appropriate congressional committees before they were broadcast to the general public by press, radio, and TV.

I am sure I am not overstating the case when I observe that this decision was not altogether pleasing to all members of the fourth estate. Even so, we were somewhat surprised to note fairly sharply worded editorial comment, that instead of talking about our plans for the future we would be serving to better effect the national interest if we stuck to our allotted task of sending more and better probes and satellites into space.

I could go on with other instances where our discreet silence or our modestly phrased forecasts of future goals have aroused editorial umbrage, but I expect I have made my point: We're damned if we do and we're damned if we don't. I am reminded, somewhat ruefully, of the old saying that the man who walks in the middle of the road is the one mostly likely to be run over by the steamroller.

On the other hand, having admitted to being human in this matter of occasional bewilderment when the editorial shot and shell seem to be coming from every direction, I sincerely mean it when I say that responsible comment—public comment—is a necessary ingredient in our business. This exciting, expensive space business we're doing is only one small segment of the total activity of the Federal Government, and yet it is one about which it is vital that the American public shall be promptly and fully informed.

I say, fully informed, because not only is it essential that the American public know they are getting an honest dollar's worth of

performance for every dollar of their taxes appropriated to this business, but it is at least equally important that our citizenry become aware of how necessary it is for them to support our national efforts to pioneer in space. And, by support, I mean much more than mere acceptance of tax levies; I mean no less, the unstinting contributions of talent that will be required from so many. And over the long pull, it is important that a larger proportion of our citizens gain an appreciation of the importance of the support—the generous support—by the Government of basic research in a variety of fields.

The second of the problems I want to discuss is how to inform the American people about our national progress in space in such fashion as to insure that they won't, on the one hand, become discouraged and adopt the belief that we are hopelessly behind the Russians and on the other, and even more erroneously and dangerously, become confident that a couple of recent successes have demonstrated our preeminence in space matters. In the same manner in which I have urged that our space program be planned and operated on a sensible and continuing level of effort, it is important that we realize that this is a long-range program, full of uncertainties—one demanding sustained effort and support over a great many years.

That we started later than the Russians to build the vehicles that would be needed to send first instruments and then man himself into space is a matter of historic record. That the Russians today possess rocket engine systems more powerful than the biggest in our inventory, and consequently, that for some time to come they will be able to loft into space payloads, substantially larger than ours are, again, facts of life that must be accepted.

Earlier this week, I had to be in Boston. During this brief journey, I was repeatedly asked by responsible citizens if the successful Vanguard II and Pioneer IV launchings weren't, indeed, proof that we had caught up with the Russians. It wasn't pleasant for me to have to reply that, no, these U.S. space efforts didn't mean we had drawn even with the Soviet space workers. Of course, we were tremendously proud of the February 17 vindication of the basic validity of the Vanguard project that NASA had inherited from the Naval Research Laboratory. And we are, equally happy about the March 3 performance of Pioneer IV, the solar-orbiting payload that had been put into space by NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the Army Ballistic Missile Agency. But the fact remains, that for months to come, we must count the weights of our space payloads in tens of pounds, while the Russians count theirs in the hundreds of pounds. It is not at all clear that this single criterion of weight is the most important one—but it is one measure of our capability to engage in more complex experiments in the future. Hence it is impossible, indeed, it is unwise to console ourselves with the knowledge that published information about outer space phenomena show that this country has been doing very well in acquiring that information.

We are, as has been duly reported, working very hard to develop the large, reliable rocket engines required by our future space projects. At the same time, we are developing—on a national basis—the other requisites for our rapid, orderly progress into space.

To excel in space technology, space science, and space exploration means that, for years to come, we in the United States must be prepared to invest—and in substantially large amounts—talent, treasure, and time. This, I submit, is a story that demands telling; upon our determination to commit ourselves in matters of this kind depends our survival as the leader of the free world.

## Commission To Study Government Uses of Radio Frequencies Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution which proposes the creation of a Commission to study the utilization of those areas of the radio frequency spectrum which are assigned to the Federal Government.

I sponsored similar legislation in the 85th Congress, and a companion bill in the Senate was introduced by Senator POTTER. The Potter bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, passed by the Senate and then reported by the House committee in the last days of the 1958 session. It appeared for a while that this Commission would become a reality before adjournment last year, but a variety of circumstances contrived to defeat it.

Essentially my purpose remains unchanged. I would establish a Commission composed of experts in the communications field, but men who are not employees of the Federal Government. The idea is to allow persons outside of the Federal Government, but competent in the field, to see how well the frequencies reserved for Government use are being used. The Commission, in addition, might make some assessment about the future requirements for Government use of radio frequencies.

When this bill was introduced 2 years ago the Bureau of the Budget reported adversely on it and endorsed the views set forth in a letter from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Director of Defense Mobilization stated that such an undertaking would require the work of many experts over an extended period of time, and pointed out that a study of only a portion of the spectrum required the efforts of more than 50 experts for an estimated equivalent of 2½ man-years. At that time the reaction of the executive department was that such a report would be impossible to achieve and, if achieved, unnecessary.

A year later the Director of OCDM reported to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when it was considering the Senate-approved resolution, that he favored the establishment of the Commission but wished to see it encompass a thorough study of the problems concerning frequency allocation and of the utilization of spectrum space, not only by the Federal Government but by all private users as well. These suggestions were incorporated into the bill as it was reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Now, in 1959 the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has proposed that a subcommittee of that group study the utilization of those areas of the radio frequency spectrum which are assigned to the Federal Government. I believe this is a worthwhile endeavor and I hope that the subcommittee will make such an investigation. I believe this study can logically be carried on by the legislative branch; my only hesitancy has been would they have the time and opportunity to give to such a large-scale undertaking in addition to their many other duties.

The President, through the Director of OCDM, has suggested a new proposal to establish a Commission. The administration proposal requests legislative authority for a five-man Commission, appointed by the President, which would study the entire field of frequency allocations, the methods for making allocations, utilization of allocations, and would propose sweeping changes in the management and control of spectrum problems. This seems to me a full reversal of the opinions held by the executive branch 2 years ago, when I first sponsored legislation on this subject.

I still feel that a study is necessary. My central interest has been and still is utilization. I would like to see a thorough and impartial study of spectrum utiliaztion before attempts are made to change the entire structure of spectrum allocation and control. I believe that the proposal of Representative HARRIS for a subcommittee study is of more immediate value than the Commission proposal as it was delivered to Congress. Or, if the Commission proposal were amended back to the form of the Potter-Bray resolution which was before us last year, which provided for legislative selection of some commissioners and which directed a study of the utilization of the spectrum reserved for Government use, then I would support it wholeheartedly. To have this proposal before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I have introduced this measure again.

It provides that a Commission of five members, not officers or employees of the Federal Government, be established to investigate the utilization of the radio and television frequencies allocated to the agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government. Two of the Commissioners would be appointed by the President, one by the President of the Senate, one by the Speaker, and one by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

I am pleased to see the increasing interest in this problem evinced in both the executive and legislative branch. Whereas 2 years ago it was difficult to get support for a study commission, it now appears we might have both a legislative and an executive study of spectrum use. Spectrum problems are likely to become more acute as time goes on. The minimum requirements for solving these problems is understanding and impartial knowledge and analysis. To the extent that these studies can contribute in laying such a foundation, these are eminently worthwhile.

## Study Indicates Civil Service Needs New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therein an article by Jerry Kluttz, dealing with the Civil Service Commission, which appeared in the March 8 edition of the Washington Post.

I commend this article to the careful consideration of my colleagues. Unfortunately, the Civil Service Commission has gone downhill considerably during the last 2 or 3 years. I do hope the future holds a brighter prospect for its improvement:

STUDY INDICATES CIVIL SERVICE NEEDS NEW LOOK

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Civil Service Commission has a new Chairman in career executive Roger W. Jones, and there seems to be a growing number of thoughtful people who feel it should also have a new character.

Paul P. Van Riper, the Cornell University professor, has concluded that the civil service system and the Pendleton Act on which it is based are becoming obsolete. In his weighty study, "The History of the U.S. Civil Service," the professor says a new forward-looking theory of public administration is long overdue.

In Van Riper's opinion, the system is slowly strangling on its own red tape, controls, and regulations in the name of justice, security, and fair play for all Federal employees. This overemphasis on job rights, he says, is "wreaking havoc with flexibility, administrative discretion, decentralization, and ultimately the individual employee." Continued he:

"It would seem that the Pendleton Act has carried with it the seeds of its own potential destruction. As the vehicle for a useful and efficient administrative device it will soon be obsolete, even a barrier to progress, if action along the lines suggested above is not taken soon. Like the spoils system it replaced, the civil service law of 1883 has, after 76 years, become a conservative institution.

"Now it is protective, not of business, property and acquisitive economics, as the spoils system had been, but of outdated controls, restrictive and costly procedures, and another species of property right, this time relating to public office."

The way out of this dark picture is, he believes, to concentrate on strengthening Government management instead of controlling it. Most of the procedural controls wouldn't be needed, Van Riper said, under these conditions:

"When employees possess the civil rights which permit them to argue their own case with management on something like equal terms, and when management is aware of both the deep human desire for individual expression and the utility of creativeness on the part of all employees, from the top to the bottom."

Two more problems were cited by Van Riper. One is the leadership factor which has been touched on by other critics. Says Van Riper, "The civil service may, like the Army of the Potomac under Gen. George B. McClellan, be well armed, well trained and ready to go, but if there is no one to lead it and nothing clearly outlined to be done, its potentialties can hardly be fully realized."

Even consolidating personnel and line management and putting them under White House control may have distinct limits, he wrote, if firm leadership is missing.

Finally, large numbers of military personnel in the executive branch prompt Van Riper to say that ignoring the largely unexplored area of civil-military relations "courts great damage to our traditional civilian Federal service and also imperils the even more fundamental constitutional doctrine of civilian control."

Other informed leaders who feel it's time for a change include John W. Macy, Jr., former executive director of Civil Service Commission; Robert Merriam, White House assistant, and Senator Joseph S. Clark (Democrat of Pennsylvania), whose Senate subcommittee recommended putting civil ervice operating leadership under a single White House administrator.

Macy charged that the emphasis on getting and keeping top quality personnel "tends to be lost in a maze of policies, regulations, and procedures."

Merriam says the civil service system has a negative philosophy and that Civil Service Commission should discard its time-worn ideas to keep up with changes in the Federal service.

Jones himself, when he testified before the Clark subcommittee last summer, was careful not to criticize the plan to shake up the Civil Service Commission. In fact, the Budget Bureau, which he represented at the time, gave the Clark bill its left-handed endorsement.

At one time the Eisenhower administration considered modernizing Civil Service Commission. But with less than 2 years to go, it's now content to allow Civil Service Commission to continue unchanged.

This would be a timely period to have a thorough study made of the entire civil service system and what should be done to make it better able to serve the Government and its employees in the years ahead. The findings and recommendations of an objective study group could be ready for the next President and his administration.

## Fidel Castro Errs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Fidel Castro is a great human being, but as a human being he errs. His decision to require retrials of the 43 Batista airmen in Santiago simply because he did not believe they should have been acquitted was wrong. The New York Times has been a friend because Castro has been an effective enemy of terror and injustice. Now the Times reproaches him.

I am glad these men have only been sentenced to prison terms. This at least gives an opportunity to Castro to ponder the implications of his act and to let the original acquittals be the final verdict.

Castro is big enough to admit a mistake. He ordered the trials held in the sports arena because he wanted the world to see that his procedures were fair and the evidence overwhelming. When he saw that a Roman spectacle resulted, he stopped the trials and ordered them held in more appropriate settings. He also ordered a retrial for the man concerned.

Castro is a lawyer, a soldier, an idealist, a politician, but also a human being. This order is a mistake his friends, both here and in Cuba, hope he will rectify very soon.

Following is the text of the editorial:

THE JUSTICE OF CUBA

There has been no news out of Cuba recently more disturbing than the refusal of Premier Fidel Castro to accept the verdict of the military court in Santiago de Cuba acquitting 43 airmen. Dr. Castro has not only ordered a retrial, but according to accounts from Cuba has made it clear that he considers the airmen guilty and wants them to be condemned.

One must hope that this was either a misunderstanding or a hasty and thoughtless gesture on the part of Premier Castro which will be corrected. The fact that the respected National Bar Association in Havana and the Bar Association of Santiago de Cuba have both protested against the Premier's action is surely proof enough that opinion everywhere has reason to feel shocked.

The airmen were accused of bombing and strafing civilians in Oriente Province during the regime of General Batista. One can argue that the bombing and strafing of one's own people in a civil war is criminal in a moral sense, but, if so, the criminals were General Batista and the officers who ordered the airmen to attack certain targets.

In any circumstances, why hold a trial at all if the accused are to be considered guilty in advance? Fidel Castro is now a statesman to whom his people look for justice. As a lawyer he knows the functions of the courts. He is surely big enough to admit an error if he makes one and this, even in the judgment of his own Cuban legal profession, is an error.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 23

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Middletown, Ohio, Journal on October 24, 1957. It was interesting to me to see that in this area thousands upon thousands of fish in the lower Miami River have been killed by pollution. Neither the source nor the cause of the pollution has been ascertained. The health authorities of the area were having great difficulty in determining what had caused the death of the fish, and this apparently is one of the reasons for vested interests opposing liberalization and expansion, not to say even the bare continuance, of the program of pollution abatement under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress.

If our waters are polluted with municipal and industrial sewage the situation is such that those who would foul the rivers further may do so with impunity. They, accordingly, do not want

any cleanup of the waters in this once beautiful land of ours.

This article is just another reason why the enforcement features of Public Law 660 must be strengthened to the utmost and why the full amount of the appropriations, some $50 million a year, must be made available for control of the filth and dirt in our waters through grants to States and municipalities for construction of sewage-abatement works:

POLLUTION OF RIVER UNSOLVED

The source of pollution which last week killed thousands of fish in the lower Miami River has not yet been pinpointed, Earl Wallace, game protector, reported today.

Neither has the nature of the pollution been ascertained, Wallace said.

Wallace, whose territory includes four counties in the Miami Valley, said one thing appears clear:

"The source of the pollution does not seem to be north of Hamilton."

The fish, found dead on sandbars by the thousands, lay along the river in a stretch extending from a mile north of the Venice (Ross) Bridge to Hooven.

Found dead were carp, channel cats, bluegills, and minnows, he said.

Paul Shafer, chief of the pollution abatement board of the Division of Wildlife, said an analysis of samples of water, taken from various locations in the river, now is being made in Columbus, and the nature of the poisonous material may soon be learned.

E. Hjalmer Persson, acting city manager of Hamilton, noted that although industrial wastes, dumped into the river above the Hamilton Dam, have been suspected as a source of the pollution, the city itself discharges sewage into the river below the dam. He said he believes the city's waste is not a contributing factor in the pollution.

Both Hamilton and Middletown still discharge wastes into the river, pending the completion of their new sewage treatment plants.

Middletown's treatment plant is expected to be put into operation next month.

## Are We Smart Enough To Survive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Marquis Childs, eminent columnist, and the Washington Post on February 25, 1959, and February 22, 1959, offer mutual useful thoughts on the question of survival in this age of fearful weapons. I ask unanimous consent that both articles be appended:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Feb. 25, 1959]

NUCLEAR TESTING DEBATE MUSHROOMS

(By Marquis Childs)

The dispute within the administration over whether to go on trying to reach an agreement with the Russians on suspending nuclear tests is at the boiling point.

While it is almost entirely hidden from public view by top-secret classification and the censor's blue pencil applied to testimony before Senator HUMPHREY's disarmament subcommittee, a high-level decision may soon be required to resolve it. Here, as in other areas, Secretary of State Dulles' grave illness has removed the authority that might have been invoked.

Reduced to simplest terms, the dispute which has deeply divided the scientific community, is over whether a detection system can be devised that will detect underground nuclear blasts. Those opposing any suspension of tests—most of the Pentagon, the Atomic Energy Commission, Edward Teller, "father of the H-bomb," and the scientists in his camp—argue that the series of nuclear tests at the Nevada Proving Grounds last fall show that no inspection system can be trusted.

But from an unimpeachable source it has been learned that scientific testimony, later stricken out of the disarmament subcommittee record by the censor, seems to undermine this argument. The two principal points were:

1. In the laboratory, without any further tests, the efficiency of nuclear weapons can be doubled. The ratio of increased efficiency could be even greater than this suggests.

2. Since the nuclear tests in Nevada last fall, designated by the name "Hardtack," detection methods, including those for underground tests, have been worked out that promise far greater effectiveness. New techniques or picking up earth waves raise the factor of assured detectability many times.

The witness who gave this testimony was Hans Bethe, one of America's leading physicists, a participant in the early work on the atomic bomb and now a professor at Cornell University. Because of Bethe's position as head of the panel of scientists that appraised Russia's test and detection system, his testimony cannot be idly dismissed.

Furthermore, what Bethe and others have testified to in secret session is that America's present development of nuclear weapons may be sufficiently far in advance of Soviet development so that a test suspension would be to America's advantage. At the very least, it would be a standoff, with neither side gaining.

Those favoring a policed and controlled inspection believe that besides curbing the deadly atomic fallout it would be a small beginning toward negotiating a check in the nuclear-armaments race.

Dulles, before his illness, was on the side of suspension—the official position of the Eisenhower administration. The danger now, in the view of those arguing for a strong U.S. position on suspension, is that the Russians themselves, wanting to continue testing, will use American foot dragging as a justification for breaking off the talks at Geneva. This is not likely to happen until after British Prime Minister Macmillan concludes his visit to Moscow.

So bitter is the division within the scientific community that some scientists fear another explosion like that which saw J. Robert Oppenheimer forced out of Government on charges of being a security risk. TELLER, whose zeal both as scientist and advocate of weapons of ever-greater destructiveness is legendary, was perhaps as responsible as any single individual for launching the drive on Oppenheimer.

Only flashes of this, like figures suddenly silhouetted against a brilliant light, are revealed to the public. Military witnesses discuss the necessity to accept 30 to 40 million casualties in the United States in a future war, but all this is censored out.

HUMPHREY has repeatedly fought the censorship, which is fourfold—Defense Department, Air Force, White House, and State Department. Nevertheless, most of the testimony falls under the censor's pencil.

Dr. James R. Killian, the President's adviser on science, has given cautious testimony favoring a test suspension. But that, too, is censored out. It is like a debate being held in almost total darkness, with only a voice heard and identified now and then. And it is a debate that can determine the future of mankind on this planet.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1959]

GHOST OF TERROR

In these latter days of the Eisenhower administration a sort of aimless drift seems to characterize American efforts on the urgent question of arms control. There are many groups with either an honest suspicion of negotiations with the Russians or a vested interest in avoiding any sort of arms control agreement—the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission among them. Nothing like the same amount of top-level attention and vigor is found on the other side of the issue.

With Harold Stassen long out of the picture and with Secretary Dulles confined to the hospital, there is almost no one in high responsibility other than the President himself who earnestly seeks agreement. Indeed, the scientists and other experts who argue for American initiative have their motives questioned and are subjected to a continuing vendetta. Powerful, almost overwhelming pressures are exerted to prevent such initiative and even to undercut proposals already made.

Arms control and adequate defense are two parts of the same problem. This newspaper believes strongly that the United States ought to be spending more money on defense in order to maintain parity with the Soviet Union, not only to defer attack but also to preserve an equal basis for negotiation. But it is not paradoxical to contend that the country ought to be devoting some significant fraction of the energy it expends on armament to the negotiations at Geneva on ending of nuclear weapon tests and the suspended parallel talks on means of preventing surprise attack.

Of course there is no assurance that even the most intensive American effort would produce a satisfactory agreement. The swaggering of Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet recalcitrance on inspection indicate that any real meeting of minds will be incredibly difficult to attain. Nevertheless, this country has contributed to Soviet misunderstanding with the report casting doubt upon the detection system for underground tests which had already been accepted in principle. There has been no effort to make an inventory of points that might be prudently bargainable for a workable warning system against surprise attack.

Meanwhile, however, the clock ticks inexorably on. What might have been possible in effective arms control 10 years ago is no longer possible today because of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the advent of intercontinental missiles. What is possible today probably will not be possible even 2 or 3 years hence.

For example, a defense system built upon manned bombers and cumbersome liquid-fuel missiles is subject to some degree of check with adequate inspection. But solid-fuel missiles will be readily storable underground, and they will be almost impossible to detect. It will be possible to launch them almost instantaneously without the long preparation necessary with first generation missiles.

Manned bombers which travel three times as fast as present aircraft will vastly compress the time during which missions can be called back under the fail safe system. There will be at best only a few crucial minutes in which to decide whether enemy attack is imminent. As numbers of weapons and carriers multiply, the chance of mistake and accident will grow proportionately—and a single misjudgment could set off a nuclear holocaust.

In practical terms the nuclear test discussions at Geneva are considerably less important than more substantive efforts to

control missiles and prevent surprise attack. But the talks on a nuclear test ban are the only current negotiations, and the reports that a breakdown is imminent are discouraging indeed.

The argument for a nuclear test ban is based upon three principal objectives: to reduce the danger from radioactivity in the atmosphere, to provide a check upon the production of nuclear weapons by additional nations and possibly to build more confidence for real disarmament. The fears of radioactive contamination are substantial enough (and not all the effects of past tests will be known for some years), but the second objective is of fundamental importance. The thought that the unrestrained rulers of Communist China may soon have nuclear weapons at their command is enough to fill even the men in the Kremlin with horror.

Assuredly the Soviet Union has been very sticky over such issues as the veto and whether inspectors will have freedom of movement. But there have been enough quirks in the American position to cast doubt on whether this country has done all it could to promote agreement. For example, there is good reason to believe that the interpretation placed upon the findings of the panel of seismologists about the difficulty of detecting underground tests was exaggerated. Instead of a basic change in the system, all that is required may be to increase the number of inspection stations by perhaps one-third to one-half.

The impression remains that the American course in the negotiations has fallen by default under the influence of groups which want to see a continuation of nuclear tests at any cost—and that, apart from the constructive interest shown by the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, the whole attempt at arms control is essentially piddling. Perhaps it will yet be necessary to learn to live with terror on a permanent basis, but the prospect certainly is not one to be taken lightly. Agreement with the Russians may not be possible even with the most serious effort, but the haunting question remains whether the administration has really tried.

---

## These Firms Were in Nowise Abused—They Had $4 Million Advantage To Start

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two editorials which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean recently. A lot of publicity has been given the purchase of a turbogenerator by TVA from a British firm. As the editorial states, "It is problematical whether the explanation given by TVA for accepting the foreign bid" will silence the complaints, but the TVA Board's statement should set the record straight.

The editorials follow:

THESE FIRMS WERE IN NOWISE ABUSED

It is problematical whether the explanation given by TVA for accepting a foreign bid on an Alabama steamplant turbogenerator over two domestic bids will silence superprotectionist complaints. But it ought to.

Any way one figures it, the two domestic bidders had a 20 percent advantage over their British competitor at the outset. But the bids of Westinghouse Electric Corp. and General Electric Co. figured roughly 50 percent higher.

With particular effect did the TVA statement silence the well-worn cry that the higher cost of American labor put these domestic firms at a disadvantage. The cost of electrical industry labor in Great Britain is approximately 40 percent of that in this nation, but this amounted to only $1.5 million of the $6 million difference in the evaluated bids. And the British firm will have to pay about the same amount—$1.5 million—in import duty.

This labor figure applies only to the productive labor on the turbogenerator itself, of course, and does not include higher American labor costs which may be reflected in raw materials such as steel and copper.

But if the American labor disadvantage and the British tariff disadvantage cancel each other, the two American firms still had a $2.6 million beginning break, which figures about 20 percent. And that 20 percent, incidentally, was granted them by TVA in a real bend-over-backward decision.

The Buy American Act gives domestic firms a 6 percent advantage. This can be doubled when the low domestic bidder is in an area of substantial unemployment. But TVA topped both these with a generous 8 percent additional break. And this is not to mention the fact that Westinghouse and General Electric refused to accept bid stipulations, which refusal, according to TVA, would have "rendered their bids unresponsive and unacceptable even if one of them had been low bidder."

This is a case of a squawk where none was justified, and causes one to wonder how two firms which export about three times as much as is imported in their line each year can conscientiously do the squawking.

---

THEY HAD $4 MILLION ADVANTAGE TO START—BUT THE U.S. BIDS ON TVA TURBINE SOARED 50 PERCENT ABOVE THE BRITISH FIRM'S BID

(Following are excerpts from the TVA board's statement answering critics of its recent award of a turbogenerator contract to a foreign bidder.)

On February 6, 1959, TVA purchased a 500,000 kilowatt turbogenerator, to be installed at the Colbert steam plant near Tuscumbia, Ala., from C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England. The delivered price will be $12,095,800.

The purchase, made under competitive bidding procedures required by the TVA Act, was based on the following considerations:

1. The evaluated Parsons bid was more than $6 million lower than the evaluated bids of the only other bidders—Westinghouse Electric Corp. and General Electric Co.—both American firms.

2. Full compliance with the provisions of the Buy American Act and established national policy on foreign purchases.

3. A determination that Parsons is qualified, technically competent, and adequately equipped to build and deliver the turbogenerator on schedule.

4. Assurance that Parsons is able to provide promptly any repair service and replacement parts which may be necessary during the life of the machine.

Since 1951 the prices charged by domestic manufacturers of such equipment have increased by more than 50 percent, while the average wholesale price of all commodities has increased only about 5 percent.

In its invitation to bidders TVA set forth certain factors that would be taken into account in comparing bids. These included differences in escalation of prices, and willingness of the manufacturer to pay specified damages if the machine were not delivered on time.

After adjustments for efficiency and esclation, the evaluated bids compared as follows: Parsons, $13,140,700; Westinghouse, $19,453,725; General Electric, $19,673,780.

The evaluated General Electric and Westinghouse bids were thus nearly 50 percent higher than the Parsons bid.

Moreover, of the three bidders only Parsons indicated a willingness to accept a contract containing the provision specified in the invitation for payment of damages in the event of delay in delivery. General Electric and Westinghouse both took specific exception to the provision.

This exception constituted a material deviation from the terms of the invitation which rendered their bids unresponsive and unacceptable even if one of them had been a low bidder.

National policy governing purchases of foreign equipment has been established by Congress in the Buy American Act and by the President, in Executive Order 10582 of December 17, 1954, prescribing the manner in which all Federal agencies shall apply the Buy American Act. The act provides generally for purchase of domestic articles, materials, and supplies, unless their cost is determined to be "unreasonable" as compared to foreign goods. The Executive order provides that ordinarily the "offered price of materials of domestic origin shall be deemed to be unreasonable" and purchase shall be made from competing foreign source if the domestic price exceeds the amount of a foreign bid by more than 6 percent. If the low domestic bidder is in an area of substantial unemployment, a 12-percent differential is used in accordance with a recommendation of the Council on Foreign Economic Policy.

TVA stated in its invitation for bids on the 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator that it would accept the lowest bid from a U.S. manufacturer if it did not exceed the lowest foreign bid by more than 20 percent.

This price advantage given to U.S. manufacturers was in addition to the import duty which would have to be paid by the foreign manufacturer.

The import duty which will be paid by Parsons amounts to about $1.5 million. The additional 20-percent advantage provided for domestic manufacturers, based on Parsons' evaluated bid, was over $2.6 million. Therefore, the total price advantage enjoyed by domestic bidders as a result of these two items alone amounted to over $4 million.

One explanation which has been offered for the inability of American manufacturers to meet the foreign price competition in this field is the difference in wages paid in this country and abroad.

But comparative figures suggest the differences in labor costs would be in the neighborhood of $1.5 million, and this does not allow for any greater manufacturing efficiency in the larger U.S. plants of General Electric and Westinghouse.

This computed difference is less than half the price advantage provided for domestic manufacturers.

Economical operation of the TVA power system, to which the saving of more than $6 million contributes, is important in the national defense budget, since half of the power from the TVA system goes to Federal defense installations.

In addition, the saving of over $6 million affects TVA's ability to provide low-cost power to farms, homes, and industrial concerns within its power service area. The availability of ample power at the lowest cost stimulates industrial employment, and enables the home consumers of this power to continue to provide the best market in the Nation for electrical appliances, of which General Electric and Westinghouse are leading suppliers.

# *Daily Digest*

## HIGHLIGHTS

Senate took up authorized appropriations for National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

# Senate

## *Chamber Action*

*Routine Proceedings, pages 3133–3159*

**Bills Introduced:** 33 bills and 8 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1315–1347; S.J. Res. 69–74; S. Con. Res. 14; and S. Res. 91. Pages 3145–3146

**Bills Reported:** Reports were made as follows:

S. 243, 328, 330, 331, 332, 624, 633, 869, 459, 460, 327, and 425, private bills (S. Repts. 84–95);

H.R. 2260, to extend until July 1, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, with amendments (S. Rept. 96);

Report of the Committee on the Judiciary entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights" (S. Rept. 97);

Report entitled "1959 Joint Economic Committee Report," with minority, supplemental, and additional views (S. Rept. 98);

S. Res. 91, providing $60,000 for Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of Federal judicial system (no written report); and

S. Con. Res. 14, providing for ceremonies in the placement temporarily in the Capitol Rotunda of statue of the late Joseph Ward, of South Dakota (no written report). Page 3141

**Bills Rereferred:** By unanimous consent, Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of the following two bills, which were then rereferred to Committee on Finance: S. 723, to amend title 38 of U.S. Code (codification of veterans' benefits) respecting amounts payable under Servicemen's Indemnity Act; and S. 911, relating to circumstances under which former members of armed services may be paid pension by Veterans' Administration.

Committee on Armed Services was also discharged from further consideration of S. 1165, relating to dual compensation provision in the Economy Act of 1932, and the bill was then rereferred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Pages 3157–3158

**Legislative Program:** Majority leader announced that it is the intention of the Senate to take the same action contemplated by the House in recessing from Thursday, March 26, until Tuesday, April 7, but it is hoped that the hereinafter listed bills may be considered before the Senate takes such an Easter recess: S. 1096, authorized appropriations for NASA (already reported); H.R. 2260, extension of draft (ordered reported today); S. 50, Hawaiian statehood (already reported; it is hoped that by Wednesday of this week, following action on NASA appropriation authorization and draft extension on tomorrow, Senate may begin consideration of this bill); S. 726, more expeditious enforcement of cease-and-desist orders under Clayton Act (already reported); S. 12, educational TV bill (already reported); S. 722, area redevelopment (expected to be reported this week with minority reports filed probably by middle of next week); S. 465 or S. 522, additional judge for D.C. juvenile court; S. 643, collection of taxes in D.C.; S. 644, school census in D.C.; S. 645, amend D.C. Removal of Dangerous Buildings Act; S. 745, amend D.C. Condemnation of Unsanitary Buildings Act; S. 4245, taxation of life insurance companies; S.1094, respecting International Monetary Fund and World Bank (very high priority); S. 747, Illinois surplus property; S. 422, prenotification of mergers; S.505, labor reform (to be reported on earliest possible date); S.J. Res. 41, International Medical Research Institute; and S. 226, amend Railroad Retirement Act.

In response to an inquiry the majority leader stated that it cannot be predicted accurately when the farm bill will be ready for consideration, but when it is it will receive the highest priority. Pages 3160–3161, 3210

**National Aeronautics and Space Administration:** Senate made its unfinished business S. 1096, fiscal 1959 supplemental authorizations of appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It was announced that a yea-and-nay vote will be had on passage of bill. Page 3200

**Confirmations:** The following nominations were confirmed: James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, to be Director of ICA, Department of State; numerous diplomatic and Foreign Service appointments; and three postmasters. Pages 3213–3216

# Appendix

## The Need To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to speak at a banquet held in connection with the Northwestern University Owen L. Coon Memorial Debate Tournament at Evanston, Ill., on February 13, 1959. On this occasion I was honored by receiving the Speaker of the Year award as presented by the Northwestern University debate squad.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the speech which I delivered at this banquet be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED TO KNOW

(Excerpts from address prepared for delivery by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, upon receiving Speaker of the Year Award, at national debate banquet, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., February 13, 1959)

I am deeply grateful for the award you have bestowed upon me tonight.

To be cited as a person who has, in your opinion, done a commendable job to stimulate discussion and thought on current public issues is indeed a great honor. It is the more so because it is presented by a group which has so much experience and talent in the art of public discussion and debate.

Your award places me in the position of having earned a reputation which I must continue to deserve. But since you have presented me with this citation it is fitting that I use the occasion to speak briefly on the importance of discussion and debate, and on the essentiality of having the necessary information on those subjects chosen for discussion.

DEBATE ESSENTIAL TO THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

It is axiomatic that without lively discussion of current public issues, our political system—with its inestimable democratic process—would not survive. It would atrophy through lack of an essential ingredient in its diet, public discussion and debate.

* * * * *

Public debate and discussion, although imperative if our society is to survive and retain its vitality, must also have substance. If debate and discussion mean an exchange of ignorance, or prejudice, then certainly our people will be fooled into approving policies, and our legislators will be misled into passing laws, which are wrong from the standpoint of our national security and the well-being of our citizens.

On domestic matters, reliable information can and does emanate from a variety of sources. Our universities, our research institutions, our inquiring press, and the well-informed voter all make priceless contributions to the evaluation of proposed solutions to problems facing the body politic.

On the foreign front, however, our store of reliable information is sometimes more limited.

I do not mean that private institutions and private citizens do not and cannot make a contribution in the field of foreign policy. They can and they must. But on certain aspects of our national security, the information that is necessary to have for making decisions and rendering judgments is contained within the executive branch of our Government.

Let me cite an example which is very familiar to you, the problem of controlling and reducing armaments, and particularly the question of the prohibition of the further development of nuclear weapons.

You have been debating this question for the past several months. In order to prepare your cases, you have needed information. Without knowing what your various sources were, I am willing to bet that many, if not most, came from hearings and studies held and conducted by our Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament. Or, if they did not come directly from the subcommittee, many of your sources were stimulated as a result of the subcommittee's work.

LACK OF INFORMATION ON THE DETECTION OF NUCLEAR TESTS

Last year it took us literally months to find people in the executive branch of the Government who were willing and prepared to discuss the problem of the detection of nuclear weapons tests. Once we had some knowledge of what was involved in the detection problem, we could go outside the Government for additional views. But basically, we had to start with information that only the executive branch of the Government could supply. Until the Government agencies involved could be persuaded to release more information, intelligent discussion of the control and inspection aspects of prohibiting nuclear weapons production and stopping nuclear weapons tests could not progress.

But there is still a great deal of information that is classified on this matter, and some of it for reasons that are difficult to understand.

The Disarmament Subcommittee has been holding hearings the past couple of weeks on many aspects of the disarmament question. Many of these hearings the subcommittee felt required to hold in executive session. The reason for this was only so that the executive officers could speak frankly before the subcommittee. An executive session means that no witness can refuse to speak or discuss a matter on grounds that the matter is classified. However, the subcommittee requested each witness to go over his testimony carefully so that the maximum portion of it could be made public, and thus contribute to the public's understanding of the issues involved.

CONTINUED GOVERNMENT CLASSIFICATION OF ARMS CONTROL DATA

But getting information that has been presented in executive session released to the public is a frustrating and time-consuming job.

Le me give you some examples, all of which have come out of my recent experience with the Disarmament Subcommittee hearings. * * *

QUESTIONABLE WITHHOLDING OF INFORMATION

*Weapons information*

Case No. 1: Information relating to the weight of atomic weapons relative to their yield, their power, is classified. This, I think you will agree, is clearly sensitive. I have no quarrel with this type of classification.

*Disagreement among executive agencies*

Case No. 2: A private witness who has been serving the Government in a specific capacity makes recommendations to the executive branch regarding future policies on the relationship of disarmament matters to the prevention of surprise attack. These recommendations are agreed to by one agency, but may be opposed by another agency and, therefore, the recommendations are classified.

This case I would call highly questionable. It is understandable that the executive branch prefers to coordinate policy and reach agreement with all agencies concerned before a given policy is stated to the public. But such an attitude assumes that the public should not be privy to the formulation of policy, that the public should only know of policy after it has been set and determined.

It is reasonable to wait for policies to be coordinated among the various agencies of the Government if eventually a decision is made which the public can then discuss and debate. But what we are witnessing today is a Government in which decisions are not being made. There is a lack of leadership at the top to resolve the differences of opinion among the various executive agencies.

Oh, yes, I am aware that this is somewhat a partisan remark.

But I would be dishonest if I tried to gloss over this problem. It's a fact. I can understand that the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Atomic Energy Commission as well as other agencies in the Government have different views on such a question as to whether the United States should attempt to negotiate with the Soviet Union on questions of armaments control.

These differences of opinion are legitimate.

But, if our Government is to be a positive force in this world, if our national security is to be preserved, if we are to earn the respect and confidence of the peoples of other nations, and if we are to know what kind of policies we should follow in dealing with the Soviet Union and other countries of the Soviet bloc, then these differences of opinion must be resolved. And they must be resolved within a reasonable period of time.

* * * * *

SEISMOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Case No. 3: Scientific research is now going on regarding the study of the earth, how to distinguish earthquakes from nuclear explosions, and how to perfect instruments to identify earthquakes and explosions. This research is still classified. I fail to comprehend why the nature of the research is withheld. The research does not deal with weapons; it deals with seismology. We are told that if instruments are placed deep in the earth, this may be an excellent means of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions and earthquakes. But you cannot be told how the experiments will be conducted, where they will be conducted, who is responsible for carrying on the research, and when it is ex-

pected to be completed. Yet, the experiments would have great interest for seismologists the world over, and even more important at this particular time, the results could have a significant impact on negotiations now underway in Geneva for a controlled suspension of nuclear weapons tests.

*Case of Executive privilege*

Case No. 4: Certain portions of testimony are deleted on the ground that the witness is a consultant to an advisory body to the President and, therefore, the information should not be given out. Not only is it contended that this is privileged information, but it is contended that since the testimony of the witness may conflict with the views of another executive agency, that this matter should be left to be ironed out within the executive branch of the Government.

What this amounts to is that a regular executive department can air its views in public, even if these views conflict with declared public policy, but a consultant to a Presidential advisory body cannot make some of his views public, even if they agree with declared executive policy. Now this is a strange situation. Let me be a little more explicit.

The stated policy of the Government at the moment is that we shall try to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests, provided an effective control and inspection system is included in the agreement.

The Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission question the advisability of this policy, and say so publicly.

However, all the private evidence is that the President's Science Advisory Committee, headed by Dr. James R. Killian, formerly head of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, approves the policy.

Yet, neither Killian nor any of the members of the Committee can publicly say they agree with the policy if their statements imply they are speaking as a member of the Committee.

So what we have is a policy, the defenders of which are gagged and those who oppose it have a relatively free hand in expressing their opposition.

All I can say is that this is a rather peculiar way to run a government.

* * * * *

Before I leave this point, I wish to stress I do not disagree with the right of the President to have advisers who have a confidential role. But this prerogative can be carried too far, so far that whole segments of informed opinion are constantly being bottled up. They are stored away and saved for the infighting of the executive branch but the benefit of their views and wisdom are hidden from the public.

Dr. Killian and his Science Advisory Committee is not the only group which has been sheltered from congressional and public inquiry. When Mr. Stassen was Disarmement Adviser to the President, all of his work and the studies conducted for him, were classified under the label of Executive privilege.

When Clarence Randall was the President's adviser on foreign trade, he was prohibited from testifying before Congress because of his role as Presidential adviser.

Nelson Rockefeller, when he was advising the President on matters of psychological warfare, could not tell the public what his views were and that they were not being accepted.

William Foster, as able and conscientious a public servant as one can find, served as vice chairman of the famous Gaither report on our national defense. The Gaither report was completely classified, even from Members of Congress. Mr. Foster, it is reported, felt so strongly about his views that he wrote a book, but even this was labeled secret by the White House. Mr. Foster is a patient man, far more than I would be under such circumstances.

As an illustration of a recent success we have had in getting executive witnesses to declassify testimony which they had labeled "classified" when they first edited it, let me cite our experience with the Army in regard to the testimony of Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the Army Chief of Staff. On the first time through the Army's security office, we were told that certain portions of the general's testimony could not be released. Actually this was only a small portion of the entire record of the hearing. However, it seemed to us that what the Army had red-penciled was in many cases the result of over-caution rather than of genuine security concern and we challenged them on it.

The Army security office reviewed it again. On the second round they restored over 90 percent of what they had taken out the first time. It would be of interest to you I am sure to have an idea of the kind of thing they restored and the sort of data they decided just could not get a declassified stamp. Among the passages they finally declassified were those containing general discussions of new nuclear weapons development and the tactical uses of these weapons. They also put back statements the general had made on the necessity of improving our nonatomic or conventional weapons capabilities if a test ban should go in effect, general information on the fabrication of nuclear weapons, expressions of opinion regarding the reliability of agreements with the U.S.S.R., views on the psychological impact of a nuclear test suspension on people around the world, and the effects of nuclear fallout. They retained a classified stamp, however, on data specifically dealing with dimensions and yields of nuclear weapons, on specific details regarding fabrication of weapons, statements regarding our intelligence capabilities, and data on the Sagebrush maneuvers in Louisiana several years ago. In this case our declassification campaign was a marked success.

*Validity of Soviet positions*

Case No. 5: Another type of information that the Government classified in our recent hearings has to do with the validity of arguments presented by the Soviet Union. A Government witness in the course of his testimony suggested that the Soviet Union possibly had a valid objection to one of our arguments, but the executive branch decided this ought to be censored.

Now, there is considerable merit in not conceding too many points to your opponent in the course of a debate or in the course of delicate negotiations. On the other hand, if the American people are constantly fed the line that every Soviet proposal is by definition full of evil for us or that every Soviet fear is "a trumped up Communist plot," then how shall we ever judge the genuine points of view of that nation and its people?

I am not suggesting here that the Soviet Union is a country to be trusted.

I am suggesting, however, that occasionally the Soviet leaders have made arguments that are legitimate from its security interests, and that it is to the interests of the American people to be aware of what those points of view are. I think we should be sufficiently mature to allow witnesses to release remarks which indicate that a particular Soviet position has some merit, and ought to be studied and given some consideration.

* * * * *

DIRECTION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICIES

* * * * *

Since about the time of the Korean war, in 1950, our foreign policy took the form of building national defense so that when the time came, we could negotiate from a position of strength. This was the theme, adopted in the late forties or early fifties, and carried on until the present.

I have no objection to this principle—negotiating from positions of strength. In fact, I would say that the principle is a fundamental prerequisite to any kind of negotiation.

But I doubt that we have followed and abided by this concept. We have allowed certain aspects of our national defense to be weakened considerably, and we have forgotten that we wanted to achieve positions of strength so that we could engage in meaningful negotiations.

On the one hand, we have acted as though we could engage in some unilateral disarmament at home, directed by the Bureau of the Budget and motivated by a desire to save money at the expense of national security.

And on the other hand, we have forgotten that the positions of strength we wanted to build were to be used as the basis for serious bargaining and negotiation.

We have spent billions and billions of dollars for weapons of destruction and annihilation.

We have put most of our knowledge and efforts in the nuclear weapons field into weapons of the very large yield.

By comparison, we are spending all too little on problems of arms control. We are spending very little on the problem of defense against probing actions of the Soviet Union, and on the problem of limited military conflicts and the war of economic competition.

We have also used the vast majority of our foreign aid expenditures to supply other countries with military hardware.

We have joined with as many nations as we could in signing military defense pacts.

We have responded to an increasing degree to the problem of competition from foreign markets by establishing import quotas and raising tariffs. We have accumulated large amounts of foreign currencies through the sale of surplus agricultural products, currencies which now sit idle and which day by day depreciate in value and are not used for productive projects.

These are some of the things we are doing in the field of defense and foreign policy. I submit that the direction of this approach is wrong, misguided, and lacking in vision and creative leadership.

POSITIONS OF MILITARY, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC STRENGTH LACKING

The direction of our policies is not making for positions of strength. They are going in the direction of retrenchment.

Too often we appear to be saying, that we, the richest nation the world has ever known, cannot afford to spend the money to have a balanced defense establishment. Too frequently we give the impression that we dare not sit down at the bargaining table with the Soviet Union because our representatives cannot bargain as effectively as the Soviets.

Too many times do we seem to be saying that the great American market cannot take the competition of foreign made goods.

And, finally, too often does our answer to the problem of need abroad seem to be in terms of military equipment—and not enough in terms of the implements for economic well being and the expansion of opportunities for human growth and happiness.

But I do not propose to dwell on the inadequacies of our policies. It is more important to stress what we should be doing, what we can be working for as citizens of a free government and a rich and prosperous society.

PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE

1. We need to have a much more balanced defense establishment than we now have. Tthe threats to security and peace today exist in such areas as the island of

freedom of Berlin, Communist subversion and infiltration in the Middle East, and probing actions along the periphery of Asia. If we do not have the know-how, the fortitude, and the equipment to face these situations, then the Soviet bloc will gradually nibble away the free world, bit by bit.

2. We must engage in serious study and preparation for the purpose of bargaining with the Soviet Union on all areas—exchange of persons, joint participation of international health activities, solution of the division of Europe, trade in goods, and the control of armaments. We should not be fearful of negotiating, but whenever we negotiate we should know what we are after, and we must be well prepared and select the best of negotiators to represent us. In none of these areas should we expect quick results.

3. We should focus more on the potential of the economic and political power of the newly developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In this power-conscious world we have tended to look primarily where power is today and not enough where power may be tomorrow. * * *

4. The direction of our foreign economic policy should be one of expansion, not one of caution and retrenchment. As we have grown rich and wealthy in our economic system, we have lost to some extent the spirit of competition and the spirit of risk in conducting our economic affairs. If we are to promote and extend ideas of a free economy, I believe we must look outward, not inward. But we canont expand and strengthen international trade and international economic development without meeting some competition from abroad and without subjecting our capital to some risk.

5. The focus of our cultural policy should be one of opening up our shores for the people of all nations to observe the operation of our political, economic, and social system.

We know there are many aspects of our way of life that require vast improvement. But what is and can be exciting and challenging about our free society is that if we have the vision, the will, and the leadership, the sores and the defects can be removed.

Our society is constantly changing, and it is the art of statesmanship and politics to have this change be for the good and not the bad.

I could go on at considerable length elaborating on these points and adding more.

But on all these maters, much more public discussion and debate are needed.

You have done a masterful job in weighing the pros and cons and the various courses of action on one of the crucial issues that face us, that of the direction of our arms control program and policies.

I cannot help but have the feeling that whatever views you come out with on this issue, the country will be better served as a result.

I am pleased to have had a small part in your deliberations tonight, and I can only hope that through the deliberations of you and your fellow students, U.S. policy will evolve to serve the Nation in the cause of a better and more peaceful future for all of us.

## Our Schools Must Be Helped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Congress failed last year to enact the Murray-Metcalf "Federal aid to education" bill, a bill which would have gone a long way toward eliminating the serious inadequacies in our elementary and secondary schools. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] reintroduced his bill this year, and I joined with a number of other Senators in cosponsoring it.

Today we are involved in a headlong race for supremacy in missiles and satellites, and our education problem has gone from the critical to the crucial stage. If we do not lend a hand to our schools, we will be shirking our responsibilities to our children and jeopardizing the very security of this Nation. On March 6 I submitted a statement to the Subcommittee on Education in support of Senator MURRAY's bill. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE, DEMOCRAT OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, MARCH 6, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to present to the committee my views on Senate bill 2, the Murray bill, which should alleviate our critical shortage of classrooms and remedy the inadequacies in the salaries of our teachers. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am anxious to go on record as being wholeheartedly in support of the effort to wipe out substandard schools and substandard education.

Presenting the case for Federal aid to education has been made somewhat easier these days. After the Russians launched Sputnik I, the people of the United States were made aware for the first time that the scientific education of this country was not what it should be. This also reflected on the state of education in general. The continued manifestations of Russia's success in the field of missiles and satellites has done as much to argue the case than has the compelling testimony of our legislators and educators. It is indeed regrettable that it has taken an affront to our competitive spirit to arouse us to a sense of urgency about a situation that has existed for some time.

The resistance of the vocal opponents of Federal aid to education is beginning to break down. The passage of the Defense Education Act in the second session of the 85th Congress, and the great success of the programs created by that act, has done much to undermine opposition. There are still features of the legislative proposals that are vigorously objected to, but the major objection now seems to be the extent of the Federal obligation to provide assistance.

With regard to general objections to S. 2, the case has been built on the three-pronged thesis that such aid destroys local initiative; that it results in Federal control over the school operation; and that it places on the shoulders of the whole Nation a tax burden that should be carried by the respective State and local governments.

These arguments have been thoroughly penetrated and shattered. Testimony before this committee by responsible educators has exposed the first two themes as pure myths. The facts clearly show that State and local governments receiving Federal assistance for education have strained themselves to a greater degree than has the Federal Government. The facts show that school districts receiving such aid are not beholden to their benefactor in making up their curriculums, in choosing their teachers, in setting up their operation. The evidence plainly shows that the schools are free to run their own shops, that they are free to stick to the three R's or to encourage handicrafts or homemaking. We need no better proof that there is no validity to the argument of Federal intervention than to take a look at the educational program in federally impacted areas under Public Law 874. The tax argument offered by the opponents of Federal aid to education is perhaps the most illogical of the three. It indicates, first of all, a refusal to recognize the severe limitations of the local tax structure. And, it indicates a failure to recognize that the effects of education cut across State and local boundaries. Certainly, with the tremendous interstate movement of the American people, the educational achievements in each State are the concern of all the States. And, certainly, in the face of Russia's startling success in satellites and missiles, we cannot afford to take the short-sighted attitude reflected in this argument.

Questions of a budgetary nature must be resolved before we can come to grips with the education problem. With rising concern over the size of the national debt and a corresponding effort to maintain a balanced budget, we must make hard decisions on how to finance the level of school support we believe essential. Of one thing I am certain—that the American economy can afford to invest a higher percentage of the gross national product in education than it does at the present time. And this is an investment which should pay the highest dividends in terms of future national income as well as national security. For this reason, our major efforts should be aimed at awakening the public to a sense of urgency about the situation. These efforts should be aimed at awakening the American people and our legislators to a realization that time is very short if we are to preserve the American way of life. There is an appalling slackness in our public school education that must be overcome immediately if we are to keep pace in the space age. We are becoming more and more aware of the vigorous education the Soviets are giving their youngsters. But we still need to impress upon our legislators that our educational needs represent a crisis at least as worthy of financial assistance as our highway or housing or airport needs.

Just what are the dimensions of the problem? We have, first of all, a shortage of some 140,000 classrooms—resulting in the deplorable situation of 9 million children exceeding the present school capacity. (While approximately 2 million children are forced to part-time sessions because of lack of adequate classrooms, when we consider the ideal class size of 30 pupils per teacher, we have 9 million children exceeding our school capacity.) We have, next, a critical shortage of teachers. It has reached the figure of 132,000 and continues to move upward. It is superfluous for me to stress the point that this is due largely to the pitiful salaries teachers in many school districts receive. We have, in short, the situation of hundreds of thousands of children getting a part-time education, and hundreds of thousands more being cheated of effective instruction because classes are too large.

While California is doing a great deal to meet the problem locally, we still have a vital interest in the enactment of the Murray bill, S. 2. There is a great influx of people coming to California and the contribution they can make to the State's welfare depends on the level of their education. It is just as much to our interest to aid them in their home States as it would be if they were natives of California. In any event, we are one Nation, and the fate of all of us depends on the educational level maintained in the poorest States.

These are the tangibles. But there is a more insidious aspect to the problem. It is in the shocking number of teachers of substandard qualifications that our poorer com-

munities are forced to hire. This is not because they are less aggressive or less imaginative than other communities. It is because they are trapped within the narrow confines of a limited, inflexible tax structure and they must stand by helplessly as their qualified men and women turn away from the teaching profession to take jobs that will pay them a living wage.

It is a serious situation, and unless the Federal Government does something about it we stand a good chance of becoming a Nation of schools without scholars. The consequences will reach far into the future and they will be felt in the caliber of the scientists and engineers and researchers who emerge from our colleges. College graduates of high quality are, after all, not merely the product of their college training. They represent the evolvement of layer upon layer of education and training beginning in the elementary and secondary schools.

There is an answer to the situation. It lies in the realization that it is unrealistic to expect that State and local sources of revenue can maintain and build the kind of educational system we want and need for our children. It lies in the realization that the situation demands the breadth and strength and flexibility of a financial structure that only the Federal Government possesses. It lies in the realization that we cannot do the job with halfway measures. We must provide for an adequate program that makes adequate financial assistance available. If we do not accept this thesis, millions of children in this country will be cheated out of their basic rights and the harm done will be irreparable. Losses in education suffered in the formative years cannot be made up. If we allow the Federal Government to default on this responsibility we stand to risk our national economic strength, our security, our very survival.

We need, I repeat, to awaken our legislators and the American people to the urgency of the situation, and to make a concerted effort to convince them that the Murray bill now under consideration meets the two most critical problems in our public school system—the shortage of classrooms and the inadequacy of teachers' salaries.

In passing, I would like to comment on the Murray bill's provision to reduce the annual grant by the percentage by which the State's school effort is below the national average. This provision creates a formula to measure effort, and should do much to encourage States to go to the limit of their local financial abilities in meeting the challenge.

I should like to remind the committee, in closing, that in the Soviet Union there is a total commitment to education; that if our free society is to prevail we must maintain a system of education that serves us as well as the Soviet educational system serves the purposes of it social order. In short, if we are to prevail as a free society we must become as interested in launching educated men and women as we are in launching satellites.

## In Support of the Housing and Urban Renewal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very fine letter which I have received from the Honorable Norris Poulson, president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and mayor of Los Angeles, Calif.; and also by the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, president of the American Municipal Association, and mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, in support of the housing and urban renewal bill recently reported out by the Committee on Banking and Currency, which letter strongly supports the passage of such bill:

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D.C., March 8, 1959.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The housing and urban renewal measure recently reported by the Banking and Currency Committee deserves your support. The bill will provide local government officials with assistance indispensable to their efforts toward the eradication of blight and the renewal of the Nation's cities.

As mayors and as the authorized spokesmen of our fellow mayors throughout the Nation, we assure you that local governments have made real and substantial efforts to meet the tremendous demand for necessary public works growing out of the unprecedented population growth of the last two decades.

This year at our direction a survey of local government renewal plans and needs was made. This survey demonstrated that local government revenues alone cannot finance this effort and that $600 million in Federal capital grants for urban renewals is needed in each of the next several years.

The bill reported by the House committee does not go as far as we believe it should, but it would encourage these local efforts by making $500 million available in urban renewal grants in each of the next 3 years. The committee bill would also assure the availability of low-rent housing which is essential to the continued success of urban renewal and other governmental improvement activities such as highways.

We believe that the committee bill is consistent with the determination of the Congress to promote prudence and thrift in the use of public funds. Careful analysis of the measure has convinced us that the committee has made every effort consistent with sound progress and true economy to keep the bill within the budgetary framework suggested by the President.

Supporting these programs at the level recommended by your Banking and Currency Committee is the best investment that can be made in the future of this country. We urge you to vote for S. 57.

Sincerely yours,

NORRIS POULSON,
*President, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Mayor of Los Angeles.*
ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
*President, American Municipal Association, Mayor of Cleveland.*

## United States Is Losing to Russia in Vital Race To Harness Oceans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the accent today is on research, and research is being accelerated along many diverse avenues. None, I submit, is more worthy of the interest and support of Congress than that of oceanography.

The ocean not only covers approximately three-fifths of the earth's surface—it could hold the key to the future of humanity. And we in Congress have it within our power to see that the United States is first to unlock the mysteries of the seas, and with this knowledge to work for the betterment of mankind everywhere.

The Soviet Union will be the victor in this vitally essential area of science—and military or economic defeat of the United States could result—if our country fails to regain the margin of leadership it once held in oceanographic research.

Startling and sobering in its revelations is a series of articles by Everett S. Allen, staff writer of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times. The articles were published in that newspaper last year. The urgency of their appeal for an awakening on the part of this Nation to the need for an expanded program of ocean study is heightened with the passing of time. Nearly 1 year has elapsed since Mr. Allen's reportorial voice was raised, and the opening statement of his first of 13 articles rings as ominously today as it did when first printed:

The United States is losing to the Soviet Union the biggest and most important sea battle in mankind's history—the contest to unlock the ocean's secrets for use in peace or war. Principally by default, American oceanography is surrendering the lead in a half dozen marine science fields to a Russia that is better equipped, spending more money, and able to put more capable scientists on this particular assignment.

And what of the role of Congress? Only Congress has the authority to provide the tools and manpower that are needed if this Nation is to win this most important race—a race we cannot afford to lose. And with that authority goes the responsibility for restoring the United States to its once favorable position in this field.

Experts have estimated that the present level of financial support for the marine sciences is approximately one-fourth of what is needed if this country is to prevent the Soviet Union from overtaking and surpassing the United States.

To compare the amount of money spent on sea research with that spent on space research is not to minimize the need for the latter. But a comparison of the importance of these two areas of study would indicate a disproportionate percentage of funds going into space research. It is the conviction of sea scientists that returns from the investment of additional money in oceanography would more than justify such expenditure. Now that the United States has drawn alongside the Soviets in the race for outer space, it is essential that we concentrate as well on developing to the fullest our capacity for probing the oceans.

And it is as an investment that funds for oceanography should be regarded. With our very freedom, economic and otherwise, at stake, there remains no

alternative course of action. We must step up our oceanography program.

I would like at this juncture to note approvingly the appointment by the chairman [Mr. BONNER] of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of a special Subcommittee on Oceanography, with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] as its chairman.

In announcing the appointment of this subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina said, in part:

Despite the importance of the oceans, our knowledge of them is small when compared with the need.

Accordingly, I have presented to each member of the Subcommittee on Oceanography a complete set of the 13-article series by Mr. Allen. I know all will find it a highly informative and useful weapon in the arsenal with which we must fight against retrogression in oceanography.

Toward achieving among Members of the Congress a broader knowledge of this subject and maximum support for an expanded sea research program, with unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the first article of Mr. Allen's series on "Sea Battle, 1958":

SEA BATTLE, 1958: KEY TO SURVIVAL, I—UNITED STATES IS LOSING TO RUSSIA IN VITAL RACE TO HARNESS OCEANS

(By Everett S. Allen)

The United States is losing to the Soviet Union the biggest and most important sea battle in mankind's history—the contest to unlock the ocean's secrets for use in peace or war. Principally by default, American oceanography is surrendering the lead in a half dozen marine science fields to a Russia that is better equipped, spending more money and able to put many more capable scientists on this particular assignment.

Further, since Russia is largely a landbound country, it has been suggested her primary interest in the sea might well be for aggressive purposes.

It is noteworthy in this respect that the Soviet Union's chief target in either a hot or cold war, the United States, has the largest coastline of any nation in the world.

REDS GAIN RAPIDLY

Soviet oceanography 10 years ago was provincial. Today, it is worldwide in scope and progressing rapidly. Russia has initiated a crash program in ocean study comparable to the rocket-outer space effort that produced sputnik.

For it is increasingly accepted in scientific circles that whoever controls the seas and whoever knows most about them—not only from coast to coast, but from top to bottom, as well—could conceivably control the world, the effect of airpower notwithstanding.

These are the concerted views of America's leading oceanographers, qualitatively among the world's best, who have been interviewed exclusively by the Standard-Times to find out how the United States stands in a scientific race on which the world's survival could rest. For the future depends upon the sea, which covers three-fourths of the earth's surface, and contains the answers to most of its pressing problems.

By comparison, they say, rocketry, missiles, space transport, and the like are essentially adventures in gadgetry. That is why most oceanographers, seriously concerned at the prospect of Russia establishing a long lead in the earth sciences, warn:

"Spend all of America's might and money on rockets, and you will still lose the war with Russia, whether it be cold or hot."

SEAS TO BE DECISIVE

To the degree to which the Soviets gain a lead in oceanography, the possibility of war increases. If there is war, there is sound reason to believe the seas—not the air or outer space—will be the decisive theater of military operations.

As weapon systems evolve the submarine-launched missile will prove to be the most effective, for it will be extremely difficult to tell where it came from, and it can be lanuched close to the target, allowing little time for defense tactics. By contrast, the intercontinental ballistics missile will allow defenders several thousands miles worth of reaction time before it arrives in the target area.

The ocean also is the medium over which America must carry supplies and support to its allies if the free world is to stand. Further, in the modern concept of atomic war, the seas' depths are the most effective hiding place for concealing both offensive and defensive action.

If there is cold war only, there still remains the present struggle for balance of power in the world. Of tantamount importance in this East-West contest for alliances are the underdeveloped "have not" nations, which require such basics as food and fuel. Also torn between necessities and loyalties are many of the more developed countries, which are in pressing need of cheap power and new sources of minerals and metals when petering-out mines are exhausted.

OCEAN HOLDS KEYS

In the ocean lies the answer to all of these things, fundamentally important in peace, critical in war. Either Russia or the United States will find the keys to these secrets, since no other nation is making anything like the deepwater scientific effort of these two—and the Soviet effort is several times that of America.

The nation that does score an eventual breakthrough on any of these principal marine fronts will be in a greatly enhanced position, through prestige, politics, and persuasion, to tip the worldwide balance of power.

As an example, which way would India's hungry millions look for leadership, East or West, if Russia first found a practical means of providing limitless quantities of fish protein for 1½ cents a pound or less to Nehru's money-poor country? Protein is a principal lack of the Indian diet, and this question will be answered one day.

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS

Here are a few of the fundamental problems that oceanography and its allied sciences will help to solve, and it is the growing prospect of their solution that has caused the Soviet Union to place new emphasis on basic research in the earth sciences:

1. Dr. Edward Teller, prominent U.S. physicist, has suggested Russia might conceivably be able to halt rainfall in the United States for a 2-year period, or otherwise control its weather so that Americans possibly would be willing to surrender without a shot having been fired. An apparent major key to weather control lies in the circulation and surface action of the earth's oceans.

2. Prof. Harrison Brown, California Institute of Technology geophysicist, predicts oceans eventually will provide power in quantity because man will extract its hydrogen for fusion energy. Both British and U.S. Governments have announced initial-step laboratory successes in this direction; the goal is electrical power virtually as inexhaustible as the seas themselves.

HARNESSED SUNLIGHT

3. Dr. Clifford C. Furnas, chancellor of the University of Buffalo, says the seas eventually will give up zinc, gold, vanadium, titanium and unique liquid fuels, the latter formed by the photosynthesis of harnessed sunlight in the oceans. There is mounting interest in possible undersea oil deposits which one day might supplement diminishing petroleum supplies on land; southern California offshore wells are only surface scratchers compared with sources that might be developed.

4. Gigantic undersea mountain ranges, vast plains, submarine valleys hundreds of miles in extent, swift currents like rivers that flow across the ocean bottom at speeds up to 75 miles an hour, all of these phenomena, discovered relatively recently, point up the fact that the undersea world's contour has much in common with our own.

Militarily, there is an obvious advantage to being able to feel at home in this new world, to be able to cruise, fight and hide at depths up to 2½ miles, over an extended period. The United States, and undoubtedly Russia as well, already has started making hydrographic charts of the undersea such as now are available for surface navigation.

5. Earth populations are soaring; millions already are chronically hungry. The sea will become the principal source of the additional foods mankind is going to need.

THREAT TO LIFE SEEN

6. Through industrial and domestic uses of fuel, principally coal, man has injected into the atmosphere increasing amounts of carbon dioxide since 1900. This may be jeopardizing his way of life, if not his existence, and the oceans apparently contain the first clue to this possibly grim riddle.

7. The shortest East-West distance in a hot war is over the pole, across the Arctic wastes. Adm. Donald B. MacMillan, and other Arctic and military experts long have predicted that if the Russians come, they will come that way. Successful Arctic offense or defense requires knowledge of this still little-known area, which is principally ice-filled ocean.

8. If it is proved that waters in the great ocean depressions do not rise to the surface in less than decades, or even hundreds of years, these depths may offer a partial solution to the problem of disposal of radioactive wastes. Europe, urgently seeking a new power source to replace diminishing coal and oil supplies, is face to face with this problem right now.

In the light of all this, America's top oceanographers watch the administration and Congress apprehensively, comparing last year's modest national budget of $6 million for basis ocean study with the billions now scheduled for missiles, rockets, and outer space effort.

FUNDS UNCERTAIN

The Navy, which relies heavily on oceanography, and would be critically dependent upon its efforts in an undersea war, has to parcel out funds to ocean scientists from year to year, usually with worry periods in between. Just prior to each contract termination, the scientists do not know whether their jobs, plans and ideas will be perpetuated or dumped into the discard.

"Why on earth can't you guarantee financial support to us over a period of 5 years, or even 2?" a pleading geophysicist asked the Government. "Contractors, grocers, anybody in business has to be able to make long-range plans.

"Suppose we work a year to put together a competent team of specialists. Then the funds are cut off, the team scatters, because its people have to find other ways to earn a living. What the team learned in its brief study is largely lost. A few months later, the Government decides it wants the work continued, and you find you can't get the team together again.

"Right now," the scientist predicted, "if the Government wanted to double its effort in oceanography, which probably should be done—it would be virtually impossible to get the people to do it.

## Talmadge Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column of Holmes Alexander commenting on the Talmadge farm plan as it appeared in the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press of March 2, 1959; the editorial, "Can Talmadge Bail Out U.S. Farm Program?" from the March 3, 1959, issue of the Atlanta, (Ga.) Constitution; and my letter to the Wall Street Journal which appeared in the February 26, 1959, issue of that paper.

There being no objection, the column, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press, Mar. 2, 1959]

SENATOR TALMADGE HAS A SWORD

(By Holmes Alexander)

Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, has a sword (S. 306) and it might cut the Gordian knot which binds the once-proud giant—the American farmer.

As things stand today, the producer of our basic foods and fibers has been bound hand and foot with ruinous red tape. His pockets have been picked by our economic system. He stands, in a state of shame which he never earned, as the object of public ridicule and abuse.

The Talmadge bill, cited as the Agriculture Income Equalization Act of 1959 is just that—an equalizer. It suffers from its nature of being an economic leveler, but it has the virtues of leveling up, not leveling down; of junking much red tape while creating only a little bit more; of paying for production rather than for nonproduction. And while the Senator doesn't pretend to the patience and dexterity that would be required to untangle the snarls, he is offering a sharp weapon to sever the cords for good and all.

There should be no further effort at this late hour to demonstrate the need for a new farm policy. As one who believes that the farm picture has been smudged and the American farmer himself dehumanized by the overuse of statistics, this reporter refuses to rehash the oft-told figures. Suffice it to say that corporation farming draws the six-digit subsidies, while the person we call the American farmer gets the bad reputation of being a public charge. He earns less money every year. He works below minimum wages, and above maximum hours. He has no place at the collective bargaining table. He is the victim of the kind of big brother bureaucracy which could devour us all, unless soon mastered by the people.

Senator TALMADGE is not the only farmer in the upper House, but he is very likely the only one who could be called postwar. He commenced raising household crops and meat animals shortly after his 5-year hitch in the World War II Navy. Like nearly all postwar farmers, he is a part-timer, since the land will hardly yield a decent living to the individual or family producer. The Senator counts himself lucky, he tells me, if his farm makes expenses, pays taxes, and keeps a good table. A man has a better chance today at rolling dice, he adds, than at farming. The dice occasionally turn up right; farming never.

The Senator's bill is a refined Brannan plan, according to its author. It frankly provides that the Federal Government pay the difference in cash between what the farmer gets for the domestic purchase of his basic crops and what he ought to get by American standards of livelihood.

In farm legislative language, the farmer would receive 100 percent parity on his produce, but no producer would receive more than $25,000 a year. (Many corporations now receive 10 to 20 times that much.) The basic crops, with corn figures unavailable, under the Talmadge plan would yield an estimated total subsidy of $1.8 billion. But the savings to the public would be several times that amount by elimination of all Government controls and loans, all Government purchase and storage of crops, much Government personnel and property that makes up the present system.

It won't do to present the Talmadge plan as utopian or even wholly satisfactory. It would require a vast staff of paper shufflers to assign each farmer a domestic production quota and to pay to each farmer a sales price support. The farmer himself would be required to submit a bill of sale with his application for sales-price support payments. And without doubt a large crop of inspectors would be on the rolls to check the farmers, and another corps to check the inspectors.

The Talmadge plan would not bring about free enterprise, but it would allow the farmer to raise whatever he wants and sell it for whatever it brings, knowing that there is a Federal floor under the prices. Thus the farmer would be equalized under the same economic protection as the industrial worker, the metals producer, and the numerous other segments of the population.

Secretary Benson's 6-year scheme of reducing price supports and reducing acreage has a negative quality which may be at the heart of its failure. In any event, it is a discredited cause and should be abandoned. The Talmadge proposal, which had a trial flight last year, has many friends in the Senate.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 3, 1959]

CAN TALMADGE BAIL OUT U.S. FARM PROGRAM?

Georgia's able commissioner of agriculture, Phil Campbell, told a television audience on the "Constitution's Press Gallery" program Sunday that Senator TALMADGE'S proposed farm legislation offers the Nation's agriculture relief from the expensive and destructive policies of the Eisenhower administration and of Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

He is not alone in his attitude. There are increasing signs of congressional revolt against continuation of a program which is destroying the small farms, drying up the Nation's export markets, and costing the taxpayers more and more every year.

Senator TALMADGE'S proposed legislation, first introduced last year, would tend to reverse the trend to bigger and bigger farm units. It would cost much less than the Benson program. Products would be sold on a free market at home and abroad with farmers receiving parity payments on certain basic commodities consumed in this country. There would be a limit on such subsidy payments.

Such a program would tend to curb inflation in farm prices and restore competitive conditions in world markets. It would reduce Government-held subsidies which have reached the astronomical total of $9 billion costing a billion and a quarter a year for storage alone. Reportedly, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri; and Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin; are working with the Georgian to iron out further details of the proposed program. While it may not pass at this session of Congress, it forms the outline of what very likely will become the Nation's future farm program.

Supporting the Talmadge plan is the obvious fact that farmers must have some sort of protection in a protected economy to maintain a competitive position with other groups.

It is quite plain the Benson program has been a failure. There is need for a change and a version of the Talmadge plan offers the opportunity.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1959]

TALMADGE FARM PLAN

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In your editorial of February 3, "And a 'New' Farm Plan," your characterization of the farm bill which I am sponsoring in the 86th Congress as a new version of the Brannan plan is not supported by the facts of the matter.

If it is the intent of that language to equate the compensatory payment feature of my idea with the so-called Brannan plan, by the same logic it also could be called the Eisenhower plan, the Benson plan, or the Seaton plan because officials by those names have advocated a similar application of the compensatory payment idea to growers of wool and sugar and producers of metal.

The purpose of the Talmadge farm plan is simply to put American farming back on a free enterprise basis again with protection equivalent to that received by labor through organized bargaining and the minimum wage, and industry through the tariff and various Government contracts and subsidies. It attempts realistically to take into account that with all other segments of the American economy being dependent to some degree upon Government support and protection, the farmer, cannot be left as the only person without a legislative guarantee of his proportionate share of the national purchasing power.

The only way in which the American agricultural economy can be restored to its rightful place in the national economy is through removing the Federal Government from the business of buying, selling, storing, and transporting agricultural commodities and putting American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices. It would be ideal if that could be achieved by repealing all farm laws and letting agricultural prices seek their own level, but to do so would place the American standard of living, which is the world's highest, in competition with living standards in other countries which are mere fractions of ours.

Therefore, it logically follows that the only sensible and economically alternative compatible with our American concept of free enterprise economy is to support the American standard of living for farmers on that portion of their output consumed in this country and let the law of supply and demand come into play with respect to the remainder.

I do not share the pessimistic view of some that the American farmer cannot conduct his operations responsibly without Government planting and marketing controls. I am convinced that, given an opportunity, the American farmer will prove that he can intelligently regulate his production and marketing in accordance with natural economic laws once the responsibility for making his own decisions with respect to them is returned to him.

The farmer is the backbone of this Nation's economy. To give him less consideration than is accorded all others will create a

double economic standard which canont help but have the eventual result of adversely affecting every phase of our economy.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
*U.S. Senate.*

WASHINGTON, D.C.

## Fitness and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for years I have maintained a lively interest in the fitness of our youth. In this field I have counted it a privilege to have often associated with a long-time friend who is widely recognized as a persevering worker for, and authority on, youth fitness. I refer to the Honorable Shane MacCarthy, executive director of the President's Council on Youth Fitness.

At the recent annual meeting of the President's Citizens Advisory Committee with the President's Council on Youth Fitness, Mr. MacCarthy delivered the keynote address on the subject: "Fitness and the Future."

Mr. MacCarthy has been working closely with groups and individuals in my home State of West Virginia in the youth fitness movement. He has afforded us a better understanding of the purposes and objectives of the President's Council on Youth Fitness, having appropriately termed it "a catalytic agent attempting to awaken our Nation to the bad effects of soft living habits." And he has made it clear, too, that fitness of human beings, embracing mental, emotional, social, spiritual, and physical components, is an item which concerns itself within the human fabric of our democratic society.

Mr. President, the address by Mr. MacCarthy, "Fitness and the Future," is an excellent explanation of the policies and objectives of the President's Council on Youth Fitness, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FITNESS AND THE FUTURE

The issue which brings us together for 2 brief days may well influence the strength of our Nation for centuries to come. For, the concern which gave rise to the establishment of the President's Council on Youth Fitness is raising the very fundamental point that, as the human being moves up the rungs of the ladder of material progress, he is prone to measure the advance by the amount of ease, comfort, and leisure he has acquired. In this process of waging war on work he has a tendency to extol everything as good if it reduces the demand on him to work, to struggle, to strain, to energize, and to be vigorous. What we do not realize sufficiently is that this system of equating an easy life with a high standard of living is selling short the real goals of human existence, in which a purposeful pattern for active personal development is an essential part. This process of nurturing comfort has had similar chapters in world history. Ease and luxury, while being recognizable goals of human effort, have too often deluded major civilizations as to the real estimates of their strength. This is the magnitude of the fitness issue before this conference. From you we hope to get concrete suggestions on how to carry this message to the Nation and arouse our adult and youth populations to assuming the iniative in local programing for tangible, visible fitness results.

Giving stature to the importance of this subject is the organizational composition of the Council itself, made up of Cabinet posts of Government, and also the method by which our chairman, Secretary Seaton, has conducted the Council meetings. He has insisted that the principle of nonsubstitutional representation be applicable. In other words, the Council is not a letterhead organization but an active unit of Federal Government with meetings made up of the Council members themselves. As a mechanism to assist the members of the Council, we have in operation a body known as the Interagency Advisory Group, composed of responsible representatives of the Council members. This group is advisory to the executive director, and it screens all formal items to be brought to the attention of the Council.

Throughout the past year private organizations of all kinds have responded with positive and enthusiastic reaction to the fitness appeal. Governors of States, mayors of cities, presidents of social, civic, fraternal, educational, religious, medical, health, recreational, and other youth-serving organizations and business concerns have taken the Council message not as a castigation of their current projects for young people but rather a pleading that they reexamine and reevaluate their own programs so as to make greater contribution to the youth-fitness crusade. In this way, the Council, instead of detracting from the objectives of these organizations, strengthens all of their aims and purposes. Since our method always has been to work through organizations already in existence without seeking a credit line, much of what is happening today in the communities of the Nation, and which does not bear our fingerprints, will never be credited directly to our efforts. As long as we have a like understanding on this subject between the Council and you, its advisory committee, we can avoid much useless questioning. This is the way a catalytic agent works, and lack of identifiable recognition between results and its efforts is part of the penalty which must always be paid.

To help blueprint a course for the future, we must have a common understanding of the factors involved in fitness so that, with like recognition of the problem areas, we may attempt to attack each issue with a mutual understanding of what we are trying to accomplish. In his message to the initial conference on this subject at Annapolis in 1956, the President said:

"Our young people must be physically as well as mentally and spiritually prepared for American citizenship."

In that same letter, the President also recognized the need for arousing in the American people a new awareness of this subject so that youth may achieve a proper balance of physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual strength. From this basic philosophy the Council has never veered, knowing that the human being cannot be unraveled into identifiably separate parts if he is to live and thrive and be fit. The arousal responsibility is the Council task. The action programs for youth fitness are the job of the citizens in the communities.

Applying the fitness yardstick to communal life in our country today, we must examine how human beings are living, how they are using their energies, how they are designing their environments, how they are working, how they are recreating, because at the very kernel of the fitness concept is the dignity of the human being. Into this context fit the youth who must conform to what we design for them.

But while we speak in pious and patriotic phraseology about the rights of the natural law—God's law—as it applies to each citizen, our format for fitness action does not reflect that philosophy too accurately. As identifiable dangers of current living, ill-affecting the fitness of our citizens, we find:

1. Machines above men. Giving priority to the mechanized over the personal may make nonentities of humans, who then handle in robot manner gadgets of their own design. The self, the person, the individual may well be lost in a mass accumulation of mechanical might. Human desires for space for youth are dwarfed and lost in such issues as traffic, parking, building, and suburban development.

2. Inactivity over action. Work is frowned upon as a hangover of serfdom and those who seem to enjoy self-energizing habits are classed as eccentric. Keeping up with the Jones family is evaluated by the size of the television screen for sitting and watching and the horsepower of the family vehicle, while paying little concern to the human octane rating.

3. Speed over moderate travel. We pack our bodies, minds, and emotions into a mold of tension and consider human beings as trespassers if they as much as step on the street which was a personal thoroughfare a few years ago, and was then a recognized part-time play area for youth. To expedite our breakneck process, we have our millions of miles of turnpikes for traffic while giving little consideration to trails for humans.

This system of urbanized and automized development is largely for the comfort and convenience of the adult. In fact, what we are doing today is saddling on youth a middle-aged method of living in which they have few of the chances for self-determination, self-decision, and spontaneous methods of expending in regular, wholesome, and safe manner their young human energies. Born into this complex maze of people, the attitudes and total personality of the child are influenced by his environment, in which he comes from an initial dependency on all about him to the adult goal of self-dependency. In this process, the mores of home and community, the mechanical methods, the traffic patterns, the urbanized congestions, all influence his thinking and his own pattern of living.

We would indeed be doing a disservice to our Nation if we did not put the fitness problem in the proper context of national dimension. Buttons and dials are just a tiny evidence of this age of automation. The human desires and habits that we are forming—the buttons and dials of the young mind—are much more fundamental. The crowded conditions in which people live complicate further the fitness problem. For example, in 1950 the census showed that more than half of the American people lived in 168 metropolitan areas, ranging in size from about 55,000, to New York with its population of approximately 13 million. Between 1950 and 1957 our population went up another 15 million and the metropolitan areas received 90 percent of this total increase. Continuing this trend, the United States could come close to 220 million inhabitants by 1975 and 60 million of the increase would swell those same metropolitan areas, accentuating the urbanized problems which we have today. This should not be interpreted to mean that youth fitness problems pertain only in the city. Mechanized agricultural methods and school buses combine to make life on the farm much less demanding. All modern means of communication and transportation tend to give an

aspect of urbanization to rural living. Thus, if the present living pattern continues into the future, if the trek of automation reduces further the need for human, healthy exertion of mind and body, if the stress is to continue on the means of living over the ends of living, human softness will accelerate to our own loss as man becomes more and more an automation of his own making.

To counter the detrimental effects on young lives by our primacy on mechanization we are doing much today for youth, often too much.

1. The code of carting. Early in life we make them sedentary by directing that they ride instead of walk. No wonder little boys and girls look on their parents as delinquent adults if we do not act always as their chauffeurs.

2. The inverted sports pyramid. We design leagues for athletic competition in which the gifted few, who are least in need of the experience, get most of the benefit. Such programs would be good if they included all in keeping with their skills. But the best estimates available to us indicate that formal leagues for boys and girls cover less than 10 percent of the total available youth. Let's never forget that there is no cutting from the squad of fitness. Few fitness benefits come from many of these projects in which adults too often demand a brand of overspecialization and undue emphasis on winning at any cost.

3. Parental powder-puffing. To climax our sense of affection for our own children we present to them the gift of automobility so that they may enter the adult stream of movable inertia.

As immediate byproducts of this method of living, we buy fun and watch others participate, thus avoiding the very beneficial attributes of human development which are involved in personal doing, making, creating, and achieving processes. "I don't want to" and "I can't" become the catch phrases of youth and adults alike when asked to do something that can be done by harnessed mechanical or other energy. Such negative attitudes bring about unfitness of attitude and ability in which the boredom of mental and physical inactivity creates a lack of challenge, of dare, of courage, of pioneer spirit—attributes which have made men thrive and survive in the past. These were the qualities which brought about the survival of the fittest. Today the unfit not only survive but they do little to improve their condition of mental, emotional, and physical well-being by self-discipline or by any process involving self-effort.

Perhaps the most disheartening aspect of American life today is the weakness of our moral fiber, as evidenced by the everincreasing youth crime rate in our spiraling population. Crime costs us 10 percent more than education each year. Adult toleration of disregard of authority in home and school, parental allowances to children for nothing done, overgiving for overindulgence in food, drink, and empty pleasure beget an unfit and undisciplined young citizen.

Thus, as the President's Council faces the future, we want your advice on how best to further awaken a democratic society to achieve by voluntary methods the proper fitness needs of human beings. To do this, it is basic that we as citizens strongly supplement, if not replace, our present scheme of materialistic values by a rebirth of the true needs of human personality so that men and women, boys and girls, come before machines. If we continue to conform to the pressures of economic mechanization we are losing. For human fitness we need now an overwhelming force ready to strike for democratic living. Democracy must dare. To stand still is to stagnate. The conformism which we seek is that which will compel economic and political institutions in our society to contribute to the enlargement and intensification of human living, including the physical, social, and moral necessities of persons. These results we must attain not by central dictations but by voluntary methods. Since fitness is not a social theme but an individual determination of each person, proper personal motivation is the key to success. It would be too simple and misleading to feel that the fitness answer can be found in exercise or calisthenics, unless we consider these items as part of a program to develop the love of doing over the affection for indolence. But never should it be a fitness goal to make a "John L. Sullivan" out of a "Thomas Aquinas."

Youth, being particularly affected by what they see and hear and experience, will be benefited most if we use for any fitness program the target of opportunity, which has within it elements of spontaneity, freedom of action, and self-determination. Little will be attained if we bracket all children into the one word "youth" without recognizing the aptitudes, attitudes, and abilities of different ages. By giving them the chance means neither coddling nor directing their every desire. Overprotection can stifle instead of help. To take advantage of opportunity, the incentive of youth must be stimulated. Otherwise, safe space could remain unused and empty.

The youth fitness challenge is in the way we live at home; in the educational system in the school; in the urban design of communal living; on the playground and on the sidewalk; wherever boys and girls of any age live. It is that which considers trails over turnpikes, sandlots over parking lots, walking over sitting, discipline over license, inclusive participation over the naked goal of victory, humans over machines. The fitness concept has the intestinal fortitude to challenge conformity to present methods even though vested monetary interests may react adversely. Only in this way can such needs as space for recreation be considered a necessity in all building projects. Applause for fitness programs, planned and carried out by others, is at most a palliative for conscience. Each person of influence cannot shed the fitness responsibility by such efforts of delegation. Every community leader must consider fitness a priority item demanding attention with all other local undertakings. And men of business and of affairs must recognize that youth fitness is good business to be incorporated in every public relations and advertising endeavor.

Though the President's Council on Youth Fitness was not set up to counter juvenile delinquency, we would be shortsighted if we did not see the relation between the Council goals and the current major national problem of youthful crime. We are, indeed, convinced that as localities provide opportunities for fitness of youth they will be giving the positive and long-range answer to the problem of delinquent acts by boys and girls. Young idle hands, and feet and minds, which are the spawning ground for the devil's work, can be made busy for benefit and guided in ways of wholesome living.

The Council was not born to implement national defense. Its purpose is not to provide more and better prepared soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. However, the fact cannot be blinked that emphasis on youth fitness is bound to improve the preparedness of youth for military service—and well it might. For today, we are truly a civilian-military society. Almost 30 million of our population have served in our defense forces. It is the expectation of every male being born today, and a great many of the females, to invest 2 years of that very learnable, teachable, post-high school and pre-college or pre-vocation period in military service. The Armed Forces will give the inductees training which will make them self-reliant and help them to mature. When they don the uniform, society should see that they are fit youth so that the period of military duty will enrich their citizenship quality and at the same time enable them to serve on foreign soil as ambassadors of good will.

Your presence shows that you share these convictions on the importance of this subject. You know that fitness is not achieved by fitful starts and stops. It is not a crash project to overcome a momentary problem. Its efforts will always be required as we become more mechanical and automatic and as our population increases. Perhaps, therefore, as we stress the need for current action programs, you, of the President's Citizens Advisory Committee, can tell us how venture money for fitness research can be made available, since we need more facts instead of impressionable opinions to stimulate people to action.

We need your help on the best method for translating this theme into a suggested set of programs for local action. Each community must be irrigated by the flow of human fitness, which is the only guarantee we have that our civilization will renew itself with strength and will endure. In this sense, our most solid defiance of any dictatorial enemies is to demonstrate to them that by harnessing the strength of free minds we can achieve free men of strength. This is the fitness answer.

## The Lincoln Oration by Bruce Catton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD "The Lincoln Oration" by Bruce Catton, who is editor of the American Heritage magazine. I listened to Mr. Catton's address, which was delivered at the annual Middlesex Day dinner in Boston on February 12. I was so impressed by the historical analysis which Mr. Catton has made, as well as the message which his speech delivered, that I felt it appropriate that it be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and brought to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LINCOLN ORATION BY BRUCE CATTON

It is often remarked that Abraham Lincoln was technically very poorly prepared for his role as Commander in Chief of America's Armed Forces in the Civil War. He had had no professional military training whatever; his own military experience had been of the sketchiest, confined to service in a loosely organized volunteer company, which saw no combat service, in the Black Hawk war. He had been a politician and a lawyer all of his life, and he suddenly found himself commanding one of the largest armies in history in a war of surprising magnitude and complexity.

From this the suggestion often follows that this was a terrible handicap to Lincoln himself and to the country. Lincoln approached his war role as a politician; he played politics, so to speak, with the command of the Army; and the implication usually is that the war would have been won more quickly and would have gone a great

deal more smoothly if things could have been different.

I would like to suggest that if Lincoln did handle the war and all of its military issues as primarily a political problem, this was in the main a very good thing.

Political management of the Federal armies during the Civil War undoubtedly caused many difficulties. I believe that it also brought many advantages. If it was a source of weakness, it was even more a source of strength.

Politics is usually supposed to be a bad word. We are a political people; we live by politics; we turn to politics for our leadership, a great part of the time, especially in moments of crisis; but we usually agree that the word has a shady connotation, and that the art of politics itself is somehow unworthy of exercise by a man who hopes to qualify as a great leader and a great statesman.

Now by "politics" I mean the plain, ordinary, everyday politics of the kind we are all familiar with—the kind that is played, year in and year out, in the city hall and the country courthouse, as well as in the National Capitol and the White House itself; that queer, illogical exercise in human leadership which stirs lofty idealism up with the grossest materialis mand gets good results a little oftener than there seems to be any good reason to expect.

Bearing in mind that that is just what I mean by "politics," I would like to go on and state my thesis. Lincoln and the Federal Government which he controlled did play politics with the military phase of the Civil War.

That was partly what was wrong with the northern conduct of the war. But at the same time that was very largely what was right with it. The good and the bad came together, as they usually do in politics, and in the end the good greatly outweighed the bad.

Back of the military campaigns, the selection of generals, the choice of strategic objectives and all the rest, the Northern leaders never once forgot that what they really had on their hands was a political problem. It was like no political problem the Nation had ever seen before, to be sure; it was enormous, violent, tragic, explosive, but it was basically a political problem and in the end it was handled as one. I don't suppose Lincoln or anyone in his cabinet had ever read Clausewitz, but they all knew without being told that war is simply an extension of politics. Especially the American Civil War.

In the beginning, of course, the big danger was that the whole problem raised by Southern Secession might be regarded as the exclusive creation, possession and concern of the Republican Party.

A month or two before Fort Sumter, a leading Ohio Democrat warned Jacob Cox that if any effort were made to coerce the South the Republican invaders would have to push 200,000 Ohio Democrats out of the way before they could even reach the Ohio River.

When the war began that attitude faded. The very Democrats who voiced that warning, as it happened, presently became a stanch war governor of Ohio. But there was always the danger that the two political parties in the North would eventually line up, simply as a war party and a peace party. The administration had to win and hold the support of a great many people besides those who had voted for it in 1860 if the war was to be won.

All of this, to be sure, is part of the elementary A, B, C, of the Civil War story. What I want to invite your attention to this evening is the political device which Mr. Lincoln's government used most effectively to pull the northern people together and get something like unity in the war effort.

That device was the institution of the political general—the man who was given an important command in the Army, not because anybody supposed that he knew anything about military matters, but simply because he had prominence and political influence which the administration wanted to enlist in support of the war.

The political general is usually regarded as the greatest single drawback to the northern war effort. His very existence is supposed to prove that the Federal administration was stupid, heartless, and probably rather corrupt. He is supposed to have lost battles, to have prolonged the war and to have caused the needless slaughter of many good soldiers. We are usually assured that the war would have been won much more quickly if he had never existed.

I believe that that conception of the role played by the political general in the Civil War is just about 100 percent wrong.

I believe that the political general was an instrument the northern government had to use if the war was to be fought sucessfully. To wrench Voltaire's famous remark out of context, if he did not exist it would have been necessary to invent him. The Government was right in appointing political generals, and, in the main, it was right in using them as it did. As an institution, and with some individual exceptions, the political general was worth all he cost and a good deal more.

Let us not judge the 1860's by the standards of the more sophisticated and intricate 20th century.

To begin with, remember that the tradition of the professional soldier with professional training was by no means as well established in the America of 1861 as it is today.

On the contrary, American tradition then tended to glorify the amateur—beginning with George Washington himself. Such military heroes as Andrew Jackson and Zachary Taylor had had no West Point training. American experience at least seemed to show that perfectly capable military leaders could come straight out of civil life.

The processes of warfare were simpler in those days than they are now, and they probably looked even simpler than they really were. Anyone can see, today, that to handle a modern armored division or a group of long-range bombing planes requires a good deal of highly technical training. It was not nearly as easy for a civilian in 1861 to realize that leading a division of infantry might also be a job for a technician. And, as a point of simple fact, the technician was not as essential then as he is today.

No matter what system the Northern government followed in 1861, it was going to have to create large armies practically overnight. Those armies—in the beginning at least—were going to be volunteer armies. Nobody was going to be made to come in. Everybody had to be asked.

Not to dwell on the point unduly, the creation of the Federal armies in 1861 and 1862 was of necessity pretty much a homespun process. Leading citizens of high and low degree organized companies and regiments, winning commissions for themselves in the process. Given the circumstances, that was probably the best and quickest way in which those new armies could be called into being.

In any case, while it was creating these armies, the Government also had to create generals to command them. Before we condemn the process by which those generals were created—that is, the process by which a number of unblemished civilians suddenly found stars on their shoulders—I think we have to ask what was principally required of those Civil War generals.

They had to lead troops in action, to be sure. But, if they were amateurs leading amateurs, so were the people they were going to be fighting against. There were quite a number of West Pointers around to leaven the loaf; meanwhile, it was, above everything else, important to get into the Government's service the qualities of leadership which these eminent civilians possessed—not merely the quality which would enable them to lead troops under fire, but the quality by which the people who followed and believed in these men would be brought into wholehearted support of the war effort.

In other words, it was not possible to approach the gigantic task which the Civil War presented as a straight military problem. The war was not going to be fought by professional soldiers. In the numbers required they simply did not exist, and there was no way on earth to create them. Win or lose, the war would be fought by civilians in arms—by hundreds of thousands of young men who had no military experience and no indoctrination, and who had to be brought together by some device that would appeal to their patriotism, their ideals and their youthful enthusiasm. Turned into soldiers, these men, to the very end, would display traits that would drive the ordinary professional soldier to complete distraction. They would respond to leadership, but it had to be the kind of leadership that talked their own language. In plain English, it had to be political leadership.

Yet there was a huge pitfall in this path. The war might well be a violent extension of the political campaign of 1860—of the whole political struggle which had made the decade of the 1850's the haunted, tormented decade of American history—but it would not be made a straight Republican war. There was, to be sure, an important segment in the Republican Party which wanted to do it that way, but the war would inevitably have been lost if it had been approached in that way. Mr. Lincoln met that problem at the very beginning, and met it in the traditional American way—the way of ward and courthouse politics. That is, he gave to various important people, including the leaders of the political opposition, a piece of the job. He commissioned many highly unmilitary people as generals and gave them some pretty consequential commands. What did he get out of all of this?

Well, to name only a representative few, he got such generals as Fremont, Sigel, Banks, McClernand, Logan, Blair, and, of course, the one and only Ben Butler.

There is no denying that some of these men turned out to be utterly incompetent soldiers. Is saying that the same thing as saying that the Lincoln administration made a terrible mistake in commissioning them? I do not think it is.

Fremont and Sigel and Butler would handicap any army, of course. But would the Federal war effort have gone along faster if better men had been in their places—and if the Government had never had the popular support which it won by commissioning those men? Could the war have been won if the hard core of free-soil antislavery men had been alienated? Was not the support of the German community essential—particularly in such a State as Missouri? Was it not necessary to carry along the War Democrats? McClernand was of no great account as a general, but he personally recruited thousands of the men with whom the Mississippi Valley was opened. The support of Blair and Logan was beyond price, and—just incidentally—those two men turned into first-rate soldiers to boot.

To win the war the northern government had to ride half a dozen horses at once. It had to get and keep the support of any number of separate groups, factions and classes. One of the important ways in which it got that support was through the appointment, as generals, of civilian leaders in whom the members of those highly divergent groups strongly believed.

That is obvious enough, of course. Was it all worth what it cost?

In the main, I think that it cost a great deal less than we ordinarily assume.

Beyond any question, the war was made longer and more costly than it should have been by many failures on the part of northern generals. Yet if you will study the record in the eastern theater of the war—which is where most of those expensive mistakes took place—you will presently encounter a rather remarkable fact.

The really disastrous mistakes were made by the professionals, not by the amateurs.

From first to last, the Army of the Potomac was under professionals—McDowell, McClellan, Pope, Burnside, Hooker, and Meade. Some of these generals did indeed play politics, before and after they got to high command, but not one was a political general in the ordinary meaning of the word.

There were two battles in the East which to this day stand as melancholy examples of useless butchery—Fredericksburg and Cold Harbor. They were strictly the work of the professionals. No political general had an important role in either one. The greatest missed opportunities of the war, probably, was Antietam and the Battle of the Crater. Both were strictly the work of the West Pointers.

If the 1864 campaign of the unfortunate Army of the Potomac was made more difficult by the failure of Sigel, the political general, it was equally affected by the failure of the professional who took Sigel's place—David Hunter. Ben Butler failed ingloriously to take Petersburg in May 1864, thereby helping to prolong the war; and equally expensive failure to take Petersburg occurred exactly one month later under Baldy Smith, who was a professional.

That peculiar falling short in generalship which lengthened the war and cost so many lives simply cannot be blamed on the administration's habit of commissioning prominent politicians.

If the Government had never issued one political commission, but had chosen all of its generals from the ranks of the professionals—assuming that it could have found all of them there—none of the really disastrous mistakes in the eastern theater of the war would have been averted. The record there would be about what it is now—a record of prolonged suffering, of missed opportunities, of needless bloodshed.

What I am arguing, of course, is that the northern government was correct in seeing the war as a political problem and in adopting straight political measures in regard to it. Its use of the political general was justified. That much maligned creature was worth more than he cost. If, now and then, in the guise of a Sickles, he gives us the creeps, he makes up for it a moment later by appearing as a Joshua Chamberlain. All in all—given the conditions which existed in the 1860's—he was a character who had to be there if the war was to be won.

The political general had grave defects and he had high virtues, but the most important thing to remember about him is that under the circumstances he was an irreplaceable instrument. The act of secession had presented the Federal Government with what was primarily a political problem. It could not have been met by other than political means. Lincoln had to take his leaders where he could find them. He found a great many of them, naturally enough, in the field of politics. With them, he mustered mass support for his great fight to save the Union. With their aid, he brought the people through a fiery time of trial and testing.

Before we leave the subject, take a brief glance at the course followed by Mr. Lincoln's opposite number, President Jefferson Davis of the Southern Confederacy.

Mr. Davis was a much more rigid man than Mr. Lincoln. He had had West Point training, combat experience, a term as Secretary of War, a period as head of the Senate's Committee on Military Affairs. He did his level best to apply straight military principles to his conduct of the southern war effort—and the result was wholly disastrous. For his position was precisely like Lincoln's, he was facing, primarily, a political problem—the task of welding a great many diverse people into one coordinated and enduring effort—and to a great extent he refused to use the instruments of politics in doing it. The flexibility which, in the North, enabled Lincoln to make use of the talents of men who bitterly opposed him politically, was almost entirely lacking in the South. As a result, in the tragic final months of the war Mr. Davis became more and more isolated from the people he was trying to lead. The Confederacy failed, ultimately, partly because the North brought overwhelming force to bear on it, but at least partly, as well, because so many of the southern people had become detached from their leadership.

In the last analysis, by going to politics Lincoln was going to the people themselves. Among the people he had to look not only for followers but for leaders. In the long run he found precisely what he was looking for. That was the greatest source of his strength—the fact that he had discernment enough to make his search there, and the added fact that the American people themselves justified his faith.

---

## Give Patients a Green Light to Their Doctor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Adrian Scolten, a Portland, Maine physician has long been an effective spokesman regarding public affairs. In the past, there have been many times when Dr. Scolten and I have not seen eye-to-eye on various issues; however, I have always respected his point of view and his integrity.

The depth of Dr. Scolten's convictions can easily be ascertained from the following articles. Both in discussing his sincere dedication to serving his patients faithfully regardless of monetary gain and in expressing the belief that doctors should be placed under the social security system, his inner conviction in the justness of his cause is evident. In these days of conformity and "me tooism," it is gratifying to know that men like Adrian Scolten have the courage to express their opinions so forthrightly. With great pleasure, I request that the following articles be inserted in the RECORD.

GIVE PATIENTS A GREEN LIGHT TO THEIR DOCTOR—IT IS A PRIVILEGE TO BE AN M.D.

(By Adrian H. Scolten, M.D.)

In Medical Economics, a Maine physician recently made a strong plea for charging patients for telephone calls. He stated in an article in this medical magazine that charging for telephone calls worked out well in his experience and it made his life less burdensome. To me, at least, he gave the impression that he believes that physicians are too soft-hearted, and too charitable.

I am an M.D. practicing dermatology in Portland, Maine, and therefore wish to apologize for the smug commercialism shown by this Maine doctor who through Medical Economics, a magazine read by many M.D.'s throughout America, has attempted to spread the impression that Maine doctors do not have the dedication or idealism that M.D.'s everywhere in America should have. In my humble opinion, this doctor who wrote under an assumed name has views which are no credit to my State nor to the doctors of America and I write this letter because I am sure his views and his way of treating telephone calls from patients should not be considered acceptable. No doctor should take his advice I feel sure.

All patients should have a green light to their doctor and no charge or other roadblocks should be set up to keep the mothers or anxious patients from telephoning him and getting his personal attention. There are too many middlemen between patient and doctor and one of them is the doctor's secretary.

Twenty-five or thirty years ago no M.D. would dare write as this Maine doctor did and to his credit is the fact that he did not use his own name. I therefore do not know his identity and believe he is secretly ashamed of his self-interested and uncharitable stand.

We who have practiced medicine for a long time and without ever doing what some of the younger "better business men" do, want to see the profession we highly revere and love put back in a class with the clergy and priesthood. Those doctors who are most successful in helping people or in the art of medical practice are not often financial successes. The two do not often go together for great physicians are like the clergy—altruistic, uncommercial and unselfish. They try to do good—not to just make money.

American medicine became a great and grand profession because they put the patient first, not their own convenience, or their own pocketbook. In those days, no public relations men or business advisers put good doctors on wrong roads. The rules of conduct of an insurance executive were not their guideposts.

The doctors of the past were on a pedestal in the public's opinion because they deserved to be there. They lived to serve and they observed strictly the oath of hippocrates and the code of medical ethics which was inexcusably revised by some of our representatives in the house of delegates of the American Medical Association recently. I am sure that like the Ten Commandments, it needed no revision. Today the conduct of quite a few people in all walks of life, including a few doctors, badly needs revision. We should get our number of M.D.'s whose conduct is questionable or needs revision down to an irreducible minimum. In all walks of life we must set a better example in a materialistic, selfish, and corrupt world.

The public did not get billed for telephone calls, canceled appointments, nor were they sent to free clinics by the truly great physicians of the past and none were told to take out insurance so the surgeons or obstetricians or other doctor could get paid. The public is still getting this good old-fashioned treatment from most of the doctors practicing today. They get it without fail from the many unbusinesslike older doctors who don't want any middlemen between them and their patient, and who die without leaving an estate of over $10,000. They, like the preachers, priests, and many teachers, go about doing good all their lives without regard for the financial return.

Like these good people the great physicians of the past were not unhappy men and they were truly successful. Those who follow their ways in collecting fees will not go wrong. The aged and the poor we will always have with us. None must be neglected.

All of us should read our Bibles more and we should be less self-interested. Too

many doctors, especially the younger ones of today, try to act like businessmen. If they wanted to become rich men they should not have become physicians.

"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven."

Commercial interest does not guide the true physician, and there are many thousands of these men in America. They believe it is a privilege to be an M.D. and they go about daily doing good, giving of themselves gladly and generously, showing a heart as well as a well-trained medical mind.

ADRIAN H. SCOLTEN, M.D.

---

[From the March 1958 issue of the Journal of the Maine Medical Association]

RANK AND FILE M.D. WANTS U.S. SOCIAL SECURITY

EDITOR OF MAINE MEDICAL JOURNAL:

A few years ago at an annual meeting of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association I was the only M.D. who spoke in favor of U.S. social security for self-employed physicians. This was at a hearing held by the AMA on a resolution seeking endorsement of it. Ever since, almost without other support (and no financial support whatever to this day), I have been trying to make the rank and file M.D. see that we can have and should have this social security and we will have it if we let Congress see that we rank and file M.D.'s want it.

Last June at the AMA convention in New York City another hearing on the social security question was held. At it I again spoke but so did some others who are not satisfied with the way the big brass of the AMA speaks for us of the grassroots on this vital question. Maine has only one young delegate and no alternate in the AMA house of delegates but all M.D.'s are allowed to speak for themselves, and all should do so now while Congress is in session by talking, wiring, or writing direct to Congressmen.

All doctors anywhere in America who want social security for themselves and their families should do this even though a poll of the rank and file was taken or will be taken. Polls taken on a statewide basis in Massachusetts and Connecticut show that over 70 percent of the doctors in those States voted for social security. They did this even when their representatives in the AMA had already voted the other way.

The AMA's House of Delegates has voted against giving us a nationwide poll of the membership, something some of us have been advocating for some time.

America still has many dedicated independent thinking doctors who are not rich surgeons, or on good salaries, and who have not like sheep been led astray by the Blue Shield overlord or that too-powerful small group in the house of delegates of the AMA who do not want M.D.'s to have U.S. Government social security for themselves or their families. These doctors know that the members of all other professions through act of Congress have been put on social security and if each doctor who wants social security only takes the time to write to six U.S. Senators or Congressmen they too will be made eligible for social security, by Congress in short order.

As I so well know from experience there is no wish to present the case for social security for M.D.'s or against so-called voluntary health insurance including Blue Shield in the medical journals (see editor's note) or the daily press of the United States for the public relations department of the AMA and of most State societies are continually trying to brainwash the doctors and the general public with propaganda saying that the majority of the M.D.'s do not want social security and that Blue Shield can be made to work satisfactorily.

For over 10 years I have tried hard to make the public and the doctors see that all voluntary health insurance plans, including Blue Shield are frightfully expensive, and have created more problems than they have solved. We who have practiced a long time know they were not needed in the first place and that they have made many American medical doctors who should be their own boss just abject handmaidens of commercially minded insurance people. When a doctor cannot use his own best judgment he cannot give the best possible service to his patients.

Because we do not always get the news presented to us impartially I believe it is time the medical and lay press give out the data which supports giving U.S. Government social security to everyone including M.D.'s and also all data which tends to prove that voluntary health insurance including Blue Shield surgical and obstetrical insurance and every other kind has created more problems than it has solved.

I have long had the firm conviction that this kind of insurance is not a needed kind and that it is much too easily sold.

I began practicing when American medicine was the best in the entire world and before we had meddlesome well-paid middlemen standing between doctor and patient handcuffing both as is now the case in so many instances.

American doctors in years gone by were free from entangling alliances with controlling self-interested insurance middlemen and looked up to because they could and did live up to the Hippocratic oath and a high-minded medical code of ethics. Insurance people with their more money-minded restricting rules and regulations and a far different commercial code of conduct are making no contribution to better medicine in my opinion and in the opinion of many dedicated doctors who practiced before these meddlesome middlemen disrupted the more satisfactory and successful old way of having the patient pay his doctor directly or not at all.

Insurance people now restrict the precious freedom and liberty of both patient and doctor and deteriorate the quality of American medical care. American medicine is at its best when there are no well-paid middlemen between the doctor and his patient.

ADRIAN H. SCOLTEN, M.D.

---

## Diversion of Water From Lake Michigan Into the Illinois Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am asking permission to include herewith a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 9 as adopted in the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, as certified by Charles F. Carpentier, secretary of state, in connection with the O'Brien lake diversion bill—H.R. 1—which provides for a 1-year trial study of an additional 1,000-cubic-feet-per-second diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

The resolution in letters and figures is:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

Whereas the effect of diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway has long been a source of dispute; and

Whereas House Resolution 1 now pending before the 86th Congress proposes that an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second be permitted for 1 year; and

Whereas such additional flow will permit a proper survey and evaluation to be made by the Secretary of the Army; and

Whereas House Resolution 1 expressly prohibits any diversion during times of flood in the Illinois, Des Plaines, Chicago, or Calumet Rivers; and

Whereas existing facilities at the point of diversion are adequate to control the proposed increased flow, and are beneficial to marine life by reason of providing added oxygen; and

Whereas the preservation of public health is vitally involved in this proposal: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That we respectfully request the Congress to pass House Resolution 1; and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be sent by the secretary of state to every Member of the 86th Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the senate, February 26, 1959.

JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
*President of the Senate.*
EDWARD E. FERNANDEZ,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

Concurred in by the house of representatives, February 26, 1959.

PAUL POWELL,
*Speaker of House of Representatives.*
———,
*Clerk of House of Representatives.*

---

## Money and Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the October 1958 Progressive magazine, entitled "Money and Medicine," by Mr. Selig Greenberg:

MONEY AND MEDICINE

(By Selig Greenberg)

Are doctors in North Carolina of a breed wholly different from those in the rest of the country? This question is inevitably raised by the high ratio of incompetent performance among general practitioners in that State disclosed by a study jointly sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation and the University of North Carolina whose findings I reported in the September issue of the Progressive. Out of a representative sample of 88 physicians whose work was carefully examined in the survey, 39 were classified as "poor," 27 as "average," and only 22 as "good" or "outstanding." The study brought to light a truly appalling proportion of medical services of a quality falling far short of generally accepted standards of professional competence, which means that many patients fail to get the kind of care they are entitled to.

How prevalent are similar conditions in medical practice in other States? This is a question which is certain to produce more heat than light when it is discussed with most doctors. The North Carolina survey was the first of its kind ever made, and there is no equally documented evidence to show whether the quality of medical care is better, as bad, or even worse elsewhere. But several distinguished authorities in the field of medical care with whom I have discussed this question have told me they saw no reason to think that the situation found in North Carolina is an isolated phenomenon.

"I was not all surprised at the findings of the study," said a nationally known Boston physician who has had many years of experience in medical practice, education, and administration. "I expect that, to a greater or lesser extent, this situation holds true generally. North Carolina is not a typical Southern State. It has a far higher standard of living than most States in the South and good medical schools and hospitals. North Carolina doctors are no different from doctors elsewhere. They're doing the best thy know how. It's not a question of the individual; it's the system."

The report of the North Carolina survey emphasizes that the physicians whose work was studied appeared to be typical of general practitioners. "The training taken by these doctors," the report says, "is similar to the training taken by doctors in the country at large. They had received their training in a wide variety of hospitals in all parts of the United States. The physicians studied came from many medical schools and had exhibited all degrees of academic success, so there is no reason to assume an adverse selection. It can, therefore, be stated with considerable assurance that in terms of medical education and training the physicians who participated in this study are not evidently different from general practitioners at large."

Whether we get good or poor medical care is determined by a great many things, almost all of which basically involve the economics of medical practice. Among these factors are the fragmentation of medicine as a result of specialization, the growing professional isolation of the general practitioner, the size of a doctor's practice and its effect on the quality of his work and his ability to keep up with medical advances, whether there are enough doctors in a community, and the even more controversial issue of whether there are effective mechanisms for assessment and control of the quality of medical care. Under the prevailing system of solo, fee-for-service medical practice, there is, above all, the question of the patient's ability to pay. Consciously or subconsciously, this question of what the patient can afford to pay has a great deal to do in the doctor's mind with the kind of treatment provided and the degree to which such treatment meets the patient's needs.

The march of science has profoundly affected the whole system of the organization of medical practice. The family doctor can no longer take care of everything, and the patient must now frequently be passed on to one or more specialists for diagnosis and treatment. The more things medicine can do, the more splintered and expensive it gets—and the more difficult for the average physician to keep up with scientific advances. There are now 30 recognized medical specialties and sub-specialties, each of which requires special training and certification by a specialty board. Because specializing means greater income and prestige, there has been a steady trend in this direction. While the overall ratio of doctors to population in the United States has declined in the past 25 years, the number of specialists has in the same period quadrupled.

The stampede toward specialization has had several results which thoughtful observers regard as disturbing. It frequently leads to piecemeal medical care, to excessive resort to expensive procedures, and to the kind of concentration on a single organ in which the doctor loses sight of the patient as a person. But perhaps its most unfortunate consequence has been the decline in the status—and very often in the competence—of the general practitioner. Since more than half of the doctors in this country are still engaged in general practice, the professional isolation of the general practitioner is having momentous effects upon the quality of medical care received by millions of Americans.

Aside from their numerical preponderance in the profession, general practitioners have a vital function to perform. The general practitioner is the firstline diagnostician. At his best, he is the family physician who provides not only medical care but the integration of this care with the personal interest and psychological support of such great value to the patient. Furthermore, there are few, if any, specialists available in many smaller communities.

But the growth of specialization and of the system of postgraduate training set up for specialty certification has created a caste system with medicine, putting the general practitioner on the defensive and relegating him to an inferior status. He has no required graduate education program, is looked down upon by the specialist, and is frequently isolated from the mainstream of medical developments. The Academy of General Practice, which was established a few years ago as something of a counterpart to the specialty boards, says that the competence of the general practitioner extends to whatever he feels he is capable of doing. In view of the tremendous complexity of today's medicine and the wide range of skills it requires, this is a pretty big order. Nor does it make for good medical care under the handicaps within which the general physician is often forced to practice.

In smaller communities in particular, the general practitioner frequently does almost everything. As a rule, he works longer hours than the specialist, and his income is considerably lower. He has a wide range of medicine to keep up with but less time and, even more important, less professional stimulation to do so. He is often barred from hospital staff appointments or is relegated to the courtesy staff. This not only deprives him of an important source of income but of an extremely valuable opportunity for teamwork, a form of continuing education essential in modern medicine.

The nature of the work of general practitioners, one of the excellent reports published periodically by the New York Academy of Medicine has said, "calls for unusually broad knowledge, but they are most often so taken up with their practice—and generally isolated from hospitals and other medical centers—that they have little time for continued training. The result is that in all parts of the country, but particularly in the smaller and more isolated communities, there are general practitioners who still practice much the same medicine they learned in their student days." There is reason to believe that the general physician, who is more and more becoming a medical jack-of-all-trades and master of none, sometimes tries to do things for which he is not qualified because of fear that if he makes a referral to a specialist he will never see the patient again. It is out of this situation that the reportedly not uncommon practice of fee-splitting between general practitioners and surgeons and other professional abuses arise.

A vexing problem for all doctors, and especially so for the usually overworked general practitioner, is how to keep up with the rapidly changing and constantly expanding body of medical knowledge.

If you have recently kept an appointment in your doctor's office, you may have wondered how he stands the pace. It is not uncommon for a physician to see as many as 15 to 25 patients in the course of an afternoon, and, in addition, hold office hours several evenings a week. In the mornings he usually makes his hospital rounds. And some nights he is liable to be out until all hours on house calls. The American Academy of Pediatrics reported after a nationwide survey that 20 percent of the general practitioners interviewed saw more than 30 patients a day, and 5 percent saw more than 50. A study made jointly by the American Medical Association and the U.S. Department of Commerce, in which information was collected from more than 30,000 doctors, established that doctors were working an average of 60 hours a week.

While such long hours undoubtedly entitle many physicians to their generous income, they raise two important questions: Is the average doctor able, under these circumstances, to give his patients the amount of time they should have for adequate treatment? And does the average doctor have enough time to try to keep abreast of new developments in medicine?

A physician's ability to keep up with medical advances obviously affects the quality of his work and the extent to which he can give his patients the full benefits of the experience and progress of medicine. If he is to do so, the doctor must have time to read some of the professional journals, to attend medical meetings and lectures, and perhaps occasionally to take some postgraduate refresher courses. Above all, he must have the stimulation of working closely with other physicians. Such an opportunity for continued education, for pooling knowledge and learning from one another, is offered by the better hospitals. To an even greater degree it is provided by group practice. Close professional association in one form or another tends to maintain both technical and ethical standards. The solo practitioner, on the other hand, is completely on his own.

The report of the study of general practice in North Carolina has some enlightening comments about the average physician's difficulties in keeping up with the avalanche of medical literature. Many doctors, the report says, are increasingly coming to depend for information regarding medical progress on digests put out by the big drug companies and on drug salesmen who are known in the trade as detail men. "It was apparent from observation and statements from physicians that their practices in regard to medication and therapy are influenced significantly by the information and products supplied by the drug salesman," declares the report, adding that this is a far from desirable state of affairs, "since the detail man's function is not to provide education but to sell pharmaceutical products." The introduction of each new medication, it notes, "is accompanied by a mass of literature which descends upon the physician's desk each day showing him the presumptive virtues and excellence of each. , The practicing physician cannot know everything about therapy nor evaluate the very optimistic claims made for the many medications pressed upon him. A good conscientious doctor may easily fail to keep up with the vital new knowledge in medicine."

The obstacles now frequently standing in the way of adequate professional performance underscore the danger stemming from the public's lack of proper safeguards against poor medical care.

Some of the top authorities in the health field hold that one of the most serious weak-

nesses of the prevailing system of medical practice is that there is no means for maintaining standards, except within the broad limits set by licensing and laws against malpractice. Present provisions for professional regulation offer the public little protection against incompetent doctors. Once a man obtains a license to practice medicine, he can usually do anything he wants, short of criminal abortion, as long as he can find the patients.

Just what can be done about this is admittedly a tough problem. Some experts advocate more rigorous policing of professional conduct and, specifically, relicensing examinations for all physicians at intervals of five or ten years. One of those favoring such a step is Dr. Walter Bauer, chief of medical services at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston and professor of clinical medicine at Harvard Medical School, who feels the public "has a right to satisfy itself concerning the continued competence of doctors." A serious question, however, is whether it would be feasible to require such reexamination in view of the solid opposition to be expected from the profession and of the difficulties involved in setting up adequate and fair criteria for measuring the competence of men long out of medical school.

One of the merits of group practice—and particularly the kind of joint practice associated with a comprehensive insurance plan, such as the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York—is that it provides for control of the standards of medical care within the professional family. This type of practice has many other advantages. Among the most important are that it makes doctors responsible not just for treating illness as it occurs but for the total health care of the insurance plan's subscribers, and that it eliminates the economic barrier inherent in fee-for-service practice.

One distinguished physician summed up the medical care situation in a recent interview this way:

"The important thing in medical practice today is not just the doctor's training, knowledge, and conscience. Equally important is the framework within which he practices. And this framework is based on the fact that the physician's remuneration is directly dependent on the number and complexity of procedures he performs. The more of them he does, the more money he makes. At what point does a doctor decide that he is seeing too many patients, that he is getting too tired, that he can't do a good job? What are the criteria—in terms of activity and performance? As long as remuneration is based on the type and frequency of procedures, the doctor has to fight off the tendency to put the emphasis there. It's a tough temptation and it may warp judgment.

"As far as evaluating the quality of one's work and keeping up to date, the important thing to bear in mind is that no one can do it himself. It takes the day-to-day interplay with one's peers on an organized basis. This is done in the last 2 years of the physician's medical school education and during his internship and residency. Then it stops. Group practice prepayment removes both the fee-for-service deterrent to good medicine and the professional isolation of the solo practitioner. It is true that this isolation is counteracted to some extent for many physicians by the work they do in hospitals—which, by the way, provide the doctors at public expense with an indispensable workshop, with the necessary tools, to a degree which doesn't hold true of any other profession. But much of the most significant medical service takes place in the home and in the office, where the original diagnosis is made.

"There is no getting away from the fact that the element of the patient's ability to pay is all-important and that it leads to many compromises. Often the investigation recommended is very much tailored to the patient's ability to pay, not only in the direction of overdoing but even more so in the direction of underdoing. The doctor's judgment is based on the question whether the patient can afford many procedures. This inevitably affects the quality of medical service. In prepaid group practice you not only eliminate this factor of ability to pay but the doctor has continuous responsibility for comprehensive care, without which there can be no good medicine."

All of which underlines the cogency of the statement by Dr. Leroy E. Burney, the U.S. Surgeon General, that change in the medical field "not only produces new products; it also calls for new patterns of thought and action."

---

## The Origin of the Massachusetts Consumer Council Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the first States of the Union to attempt to give official representation to the consuming public is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The present attorney general, the Honorable Edward J. McCormack, Jr., has acted to establish an advisory consumer council in his office, and Governor Furcolo has presented a bill to the general court to establish such a council as an official State agency. The chairman of the attorney general's advisory council is Rev. Father Robert J. McEwen, S.J., of Boston College, Boston, Mass. Father McEwen is one of the outstanding economists of the country.

The committee on State administration of the Massachusetts general court on February 16, 1959, held hearings on the bill introduced and pending before that committee, at which hearings Father McEwen appeared and testified.

In my remarks I am pleased to include the statement made by Father McEwen to the members of the committee on State administration:

ADVISORY CONSUMER COUNCIL

(Statement by the chairman, Rev. Robert J. McEwen, S.J., before the Committee on State Administration, Feb. 16, 1959)

THE ORIGIN OF THE CONSUMER COUNCIL BILL

For some 10 years this has been part of the general Democratic legislative plan. Originally, it appears to have been aimed primarily at public utility hearings in order to have some representative or watchdog for the consumer interest in cases where rates were to be raised or services altered. For 3 years now the present Governor has been advocating, in accordance with the Democratic tradition, the formal establishment of a State agency charged with the representation of the consumer interest.

Until last year no bill ever got through the house of representatives, partially because this agency was to be granted subpena powers to get the records of business concerns. Business was quite fearful of such power. Last year, however, the bill was radically changed and the subpena power was omitted. Then, largely due to the almost singlehanded attention of the Governor's legislative secretary, Miss Margaret O'Donnell, this bill finally obtained house approval by the narrow margin of one vote. It subsequently was defeated on straight party lines by the then Republican senate.

Parenthetically, I might add here, I tried last year before this committee to make it perfectly natural for members of both parties to support such a bill. I still believe it is not primarily, or should not be primarily, a party bill.

At any rate, the present attorney general, Mr. Edward J. McCormack, Jr., shortly after he was elected by the legislature, decided to use the inherent powers of his office to set up a consumer council attached to the attorney general's office. This he did, and it has proceeded to function along the lines that most of you know. I believe its operation, even for such a short period of time as it has existed, has convinced many skeptics and doubters about the potential contribution to the general welfare that the consumer council idea does posess. The present bill, therefore, is an endeavor to give legislative approval and statutory authority to the consumer council idea and to enable it to function more effectively by allotting some meager budget.

THE COST OF THE COUNCIL

Up to now the operation of the present council in the attorney general's office has shown that much good work can be accomplished in this field at a relatively trifling cost. The universities have been glad to contribute the talent of their men and women to this type of public service on a completely voluntary and unpaid basis.

Incidentally, I consider this aspect of the consumer council movement one that is not sufficiently appreciated by outsiders. The Governor and the attorney general deserve great credit for this pioneering effort toward a closer integration of the political world and the university world. Each has much to learn from the other and mutual cooperation cannot fail to produce lasting benefits for the general public.

Last year I urged this committee to continue the Massachusetts tradition of leadership in such ventures as this present effort at political and university collaboration in the fields of consumer education and protection. I repeat again this year my feeling that this is one of the most important virtues of the present bill.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE CONSUMER COUNCIL

A Herald editorial, discussing the consumer council, correctly appraised it as an agency charged with specifically protecting the consumer public in several areas where other agencies had also at least a partial obligation to protect the consumer. It admitted that in the course of time most of these agencies had strayed from this consumer protection purpose. It then asked the question: "Won't the same thing happen to the consumer council in time? Will it, too, not be taken over by the special interest groups and diverted from its original purpose?"

I must admit this editorial question has bothered me a great deal. It is true that no formal agency structure, apart from the talents, energy, and integrity of the individual members staffing the agency, will suffice to achieve the original purposes of these bodies. Furthermore, any agency, including the consumer council, can be "stacked" and consequently thwarted if the appointing officials or the executive agents so desire. If that happens, the Herald may be right—a new watchdog agency may have to be formed.

But that is only to be expected from reading the history of human institutions. They all tend to stray from their original purposes and have to be abolished or reformed in time. That is exactly the meaning of the warning that "eternal vigilance is the price

of liberty." The citizens should never delude themselves that once a consumer council is officially established all their problems are solved. By no means.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL

Now let me give you my conception of the functions that such a consumer council should undertake to perform.

1. Research: This almost always has to start with legal research on (a) the present prescriptions of law on a certain point and this may frequently involve an official opinion or decision by the attorney general; (b) the history of past legal and court actions in the area; (c) what State and Federal officials have any jurisdiction in the matter and what are their duties. Then comes the very difficult, painstaking job of economic research and economic analysis to diagnose the true welfare of the consuming public in the area under discussion.

2. Representation: This involves lawyers before courts and regulatory agencies stating the position of the consumer council on issues before those bodies. This, of course, can only be done after the first function of research has been thoroughly completed.

3. Education and organization of consumers: Ideally, the small consumer council should work with a very large group, or third layer, of consumer organizations and other public service groups. This may lead to periodic conferences such as the one recently conducted on the subject of advertising. Under this heading also should fall the task of coordination of official State activities for consumers.

4. The fourth function of the council, which in a way depends on the other three, is that of advice and suggestion to the executive and legislative branches of the Government. This could concern (1) new laws needed; (2) old laws to be enforced or discarded; and (3) recommendations on consumer complaints.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE CONSUMER COUNCIL

Two chief alternative structures are possible: (1) There could be one chief officer with a subordinate advisory council; this was the New York system. The second possibility is to have the small council, acting as a group, the main director of the activities and functions of this consumer agency. This would involve giving the council subordinate officers for legal, secretarial, and research assistance. It is the consensus of the present council that the second structure is preferable for Massachusetts.

The question of cost, I realize, must be uppermost in the mind of every legislator in Massachusetts this year. Really, the budget for the council could be an extremely modest one involving secretarial and research salaries for those assistants and certain allowances for the publication of reports. We must remember that an orderly continuing research study such as this council envisages would prevent the legislature from having to throw $100,000 or $200,000 quickly into a hasty panic study of utility rates or railroad rates, or what have you, as a last-minute desperate effort to show the public that something is being done to protect their interests.

## Man of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news release announcing the forthcoming poll conducted by Dixie Business magazine of Decatur, Ga., to select the Man of the South of 1959. The release, prepared and distributed by editor Hubert F. Lee, lists the outstanding southerners who have been nominated for this honor.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP ELECT THE MAN OF THE SOUTH

Readers of this newspaper are invited to help elect the Man of the South for 1959 from a group of leading southerners who have been named to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, an honor group limited to 200 living southerners.

Votes for seven from the honor group should be mailed to Hubert F. Lee, founder of the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, 4592 Covington Road, Decatur, Ga.

The annual poll is sponsored by Dixie Business, which Lee has edited for the past 30 years.

Past Men of the South since 1946 include Thomas W. Martin, Birmingham; Donald Comer, Birmingham; C. Hamilton Moses, Little Rock; Ernest L. Kurth, Lufkin, Tex.; Reuben B. Robertson, Canton, N.C.; David Ovens (deceased), Charlotte; James C. Self, Sr. (deceased), Greenwood, S.C.; Robert T. (Bobby) Jones, Atlanta; Bishop Arthur J. Moore, Atlanta; Wilten E. Hall, Anderson, S.C.; Senator Walter F. George (deceased), Vienna, Ga.; A. Dee Simpson, Houston; Frank P. Samford, Birmingham.

Vote for seven of the following, giving reasons for first preference: Dr. O. C. Aderhold; Ivan Allen; Remmie L. Arnold; Robert O. Arnold; Harry M. Ayers; C. W. Bailey; Hines Baker; William N. Banks; Col. T. H. Barton; Bruce Bartin; Bernard Baruch; George C. Biggers, Sr.; L. L. Baxter; Morgan Beatty; Barry Bingham; Alfred Blalock, M.D.; Gen. A. R. Bolling; Harllee Branch, Jr.; Carl D. Brorein; Rex I. Brown; David Tennant Bryan; Wright Bryan; A. M. Burton; C. F. Byrns; Erskine Caldwell; Cason Callaway; James L. Camp, Jr.; John W. Carpenter; Bishop C. C. J. Carpenter; Hodding Carter; Dr. O. C. Carmichael; Owen R. Cheatham; James Saxon Childers; Will Clayton; Erle Cocke, Sr.; Erle Cocke, Jr.; Norman Cocke; Charles A. Collier; Hugh Comer; Senator Tom Connally; H. McKinley Conway, Jr.; Richard W. Courts, Jr.; Dr. John R. Cunningham; Virginius Dabney; Jonathan Daniels; Colgate Darden, Jr.; E. M. "Ted" Dealey; James K. Dobbs; Dr. Ralph B. Draughon; John E. Drewry; Hal S. Dumas; B. M. Edwards, Jr.; Oliver Emmerich; K. A. Engel; William Faulkner; Milton Fies; Fred F. Florence; B. T. Fooks, John Nance Garner; E. K. Gaylord; Dr. Francis P. Gaines; Alvan Gillem; Frank Gould; Walter F. Graefe; John Temple Graves; Gordon Gray; Robert Gregg; F. E. Grier; Haynes McFadden; Robert W. Graves; Robert M. Hanes; Clarence Hanson, Jr.; Dr. Rufas C. Harris; Harry G. Hastings; Dan J. Haughton; Clarence Haverty; J. N. Heiskell; Arthur M. Hill; Gov. William P. Hobby; Oveta Culp Hobby; Hamilton T. Holt; Gen. George A. Horkan; Clark Howell; Frank Huntress, Jr.; R. F. Hudson; George M. Ivey, Sr.; Maxey Jarman; Robert Jemison, Jr.; Hershel V. Jenkins; Dewey H. Johnson; Walter C. Johnson; Thomas M. Johnson; Dr. James A. Jones; Helen Keller; Kenneth S. Keyes; Dr. James R. Killian; Edwin D. Lambright; Samuel L. Latimer, Jr.; Thomas C. Law; Spencer Love; Joseph T. Lykes; Robert T. Maddox; Gen. George C. Marshall; Rabbi David Marx; Ben Massell; Ben M. McKelway; J. Finley McRae; C. B. McManus; Dr. James Ross McCain; S. C. McMeekin; Ralph McGill; Henry T. McIntosh; Quimby Melton, Sr.; Troy Middleton; Thomas A. Morgan; William M. Murphey; Frank H. Neely; Abit Nix; E. L. Norton; Alton Ochsner, M.D.; Gen. E. W. Opie; T. W. Pangborn; Roger Peace; Commodore E. H. Perry; Gen. John C. Persons; Louis Pizitz; Dr. John L. Plyler; Dr. William G. Pollard; Dr. Clarence Poe (for 60 years editor, Progressive Farmer); Legh R. Powell, Jr.; Nelson Poynter; L. W. Robert; E. A. Roberts; Caffey Robertson; James C. Self, Jr; John A. Sibley; Tom Slick; Frank G. Slaughter; McGregor Smith; Richard P. Smith; William A. Smith; Frank E. Spain (past president Rotary International); Talbot T. Spear; Tom D. Spies, M.D. (A Great American for 1958 Distinguished Service Award winner); Eugene W. Stetson; Louis V. Sutton; James G. Stahlman; L. P. Sweatt; Dr. Charles A. Thomas; Fred J. Turner; W. R. Turner; W. G. Violette; Louis Ware; P. F. Watzek; Dr. Goodrich White; A. L. M. Wiggins; Robert W. Woodruff; C. E. Woolman.

## I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I recently attended a dinner cosponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters and the Electronic Industries Association in honor of the 50 winners of the Voice of Democracy Contest, representing each State and the District of Columbia. Miss Margaret Rose Deraps of Portland, Maine, was the outstanding representative from my State. Miss Deraps in her radio script, which I am pleased to include in the RECORD, has shown a marvelous insight into the concept of democracy.

Her essay is a well-written expression of the true meaning of our most treasured possession—freedom. Her thoughts and ideas should be an inspiration to all Americans:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Margaret R. Deraps)

"Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God." These simple words compose the epitaph on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier—a symbol of our country and all that it stands for.

Who is this unknown soldier? He is every unidentified soldier who died for his country—be he rich or poor—farmer, executive, or laborer—white or black—Catholic, Protestant, or Jew. This hero died for Hometown, U.S.A.—for his loved ones—for his freedom. This hero died for democracy.

He is the unknown soldier who marched, tramped, and crawled through an insect laden jungle, striving and sweating for the hill looming before him, yet so far in the distance. He is the unknown soldier who lay in the mud and snow of a trench, waiting for the bullets and grenades to let up, and then plunged ahead, only to be driven by a bullet into the muck and stench of the battlefield far from the homelands for which he gave his life.

What made this man willing to face the gravity of war, its dangers, sufferings, and hardships? What gave him the courage to laugh and be gay and brave at the point of death?

To Joe, it was a small white bungalow on Main Street set among pines and shrubbery. It was the quiet evenings his family and friends spent together discussing each other's

problems and those of the world. They had individual opinions. They did not always agree, but they spoke their minds openly for they possessed one of the four great freedoms of democracy—freedom of speech.

Then again Tony, the Italian immigrant, gave his life so that others like himself might enjoy the happiness of living in a land of superabundance. To him democracy meant freedom from want. It was the joy of having a humble little place he could call his own; of having such simple luxuries as running water, electricity, soapsuds, and a few extra coins jingling in his pocket. It was the inexpressable look of joy on the faces of his children on Christmas morning.

But let us not forget Jacob, just out of high school, green and just plain scared. Wearing the identification band his girl gave him, he said brave goodbys to his family at the station. In his heart he carries one thought alone—there must be freedom, freedom from fear. This adolescent is going to free the world from fear itself so that people may never again be sick with panic; so that boys like himself would never have to face terror, shock, mutilation, permanent disability, death. Even in his short life in a democracy, he learned those ideals that helped him to fight and die as heroically in his first mission as the veteran beside him.

And to each of these Americans—Joe, Tony, and Jacob—democracy was freedom of worship. It was the right to attend the white Congregational Church at the top of the hill, or the great stone cathedral with its many spires, or the synagogue with the Star of David etched above its portals. How this priceless freedom should be cherished.

Yes, I am an American and I speak for democracy, but were I the greatest of orators I could not speak as eloquently as the silent voice of the Unknown Soldier. A silent voice shouting for democracy and begging us, the living: "Preserve these liberties for which I have died—freedom of speech, freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom of worship."

## Report on National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, of which I am happy to be a member, has embarked on a detailed study of our Nation's future recreational requirements and an evaluation of the assets available for fulfilling the indicated needs. The staff of the Commission will soon be assembled under the direction of its newly appointed executive director, Mr. Francis W. Sargent, former commissioner of natural resources for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In my comparatively brief association with the Commission, with its Chairman and staff members, I have been favorably impressed by the enthusiasm and perspective with which the congressional directives of the, act establishing the Commission are being pursued. I think these attitudes foreshadow fruitful and imaginative results from the 3-year study being planned by the Commission.

Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, able Chairman of the Commission, is largely responsible for the splendid start which has been made. Last week, at the North American wildlife conference, Mr. Rockefeller summarized what the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission is, and what it hopes to achieve. Because many Members of Congress will find Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller's address valuable as a kind of interim report on Commission activities and its plans. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of his speech of March 4, 1959, delivered in New York City.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING FUTURE RECREATIONAL NEEDS

(An address by Laurance S. Rockefeller before the North American Wildlife Conference, Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y., March 4, 1959)

It is a great pleasure for me to be here today. In a sense, this is my first public appearance as chairman of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Naturally, I would prefer to talk about the accomplishments of the Commission rather than its plans. However, as our work is just beginning, I can, of course, only speak of the plans. I am delighted to have the opportunity to do so before this conference, whose members have long shown their deep interest in the subject of the Commission's study.

I might note that in one of the earliest meetings of the Commission it was agreed that where questions of opinion were expressed by Commission members in public, we would speak only as individuals in order to maintain the objectivity of the Commission. Thus, I have divided this talk into two parts: In the first part—where I try to spell out the why, what, where, when, and who of the Commission—I shall speak as its chairman; when I go into what I believe is the underlying philosophy that must guide our thinking, I will be speaking simply as an individual interested in our Nation's recreational resources.

The title "Meeting Future Recreational Needs" is both broad and ambitious, but no more so than the task set up by the 85th Congress last year when it established the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The "why" of this accounting lies in the fact that in creating the Commission, the Congress and the President recognized that conservation for the physical, cultural and spiritual benefit of the American people is in a critical period of transition as a result of new demands. The unprecedented growth of population, the basic shifts of age groups within the population, the increase in leisure time because of shorter hours and earlier retirement, increasing urbanization, and the tremendous strides taken in transportation all lead to the need for reexamination of our outdoor resources and a new appraisal of our requirements, not for just today but, in the terms set out by the act establishing the commission, looking as far ahead as the year 2000.

The "what" of the Commission is pretty plainly set forth in the establishing act by Congress. Our task will be, in the words of the act:

"To preserve, develop, and secure accessibility to all American people of present and future generations such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation resources as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment, and to assure the spiritual, cultural, and physical benefits that such outdoor recreation provides.

"To inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation, to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations.

"To make comprehensive information and recommendations leading to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States and Territories."

Now as to the "where" of the Commission's work. In the first place, possibly we should define what is meant by outdoor recreation resources, and for an accurate account I shall use the formal definition set out in the act:

"Outdoor recreation resources shall mean the land and water areas and associated resources of such areas in the United States, its Territories, and possessions which provide or may in the future provide opportunities for outdoor recreation, irrespective of ownership.

"Outdoor recreation resources shall not mean nor include recreation facilities, programs, and opportunities usually associated with urban development, such as playgrounds, stadiums, golf courses, city parks, and zoos."

The Commission's evaluations and recommendations are to be made on a State-by-State, region-by-region, and national basis. Needless to say, local and community relationships must play an important role if the Commission's objectives are to be achieved. As part of its work, the Commission must survey, analyze and catalogue all presently existing outdoor recreation areas and, in doing so, the Commission will keep in mind both present and potential use. The scope of the Commission's operations will require it to determine the qualitative as well as the quantitative recreation facility needs of the American people. Naturally, there has to be some general relationship between the amount of land assigned to specific recreational purposes and the popularity of the purposes involved, but this cannot be formulated on purely mathematical terms; for recreation facilities and the need for them bear a direct relationship to public health and other social considerations as well as to population growth and concentration. In summation, the Commission's "where" covers the entire Nation, for means must be found to survey the Nation and pinpoint available sites, irrespective of ownership or present use, which might be used for recreation purposes, and which can be added to those already partially or fully developed, for the purpose of more nearly matching availability of nearby recreation areas to recreation needs. Special attention will be given to new multiple uses where this is judged compatible with presently established uses.

Only in this way can a formula be worked out in which we can make recommendations, where indicated, to the Federal Government, States, counties, municipalities, and private owners for the creation, management, and financing of present and planned recreation areas.

We come now to the fourth "W" or the when of the Commission. By September 1, 1961, the Commisison is asked to present a report of its review, a compilation of its data and its recommendations to the President and Congress. Act S. 846 calls for the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to cease to exist not later than 1 year thereafter.

The present plan of the Commission is to allocate its 3-year term roughly as follows: (a) The first year to be devoted to an overall staff study and correlation of all available materials; (b) the second year to developing conclusions, policy, and program; (c) the third year to completing the report and making recommendations. One quite obvious difficulty facing a new Commission such as

ours is the always adherent and ever-present desire by interested parties for it to arrive at conclusions before an objetcive study has been made. No doubt a great many special interests will in all honesty expect the Commission to take positive stands either for or against pending legislation, or in connection with areas where use and protection may be in conflict.

With regard to other legislation which might effect recreational areas and opportunities, it is the majority opinion of the Commission that no recommendations should be made by it unless specifically requested by the Congress or the President. And it might be added it is our earnest hope that such recommendations will not be required before the review is far enough along to be significant.

We now come to the who of the Commission. As you may know, the members of the Commission have a responsibility under the act to coordinate its objectives with various persons and activities. We have spent already a considerable amount of time building what I consider to be this very essential base from which to operate.

The Commission, of which I am privileged to be chairman, has 15 members. Our congressional contingent has four Members of the U.S. Senate—CLINTON P. ANDERSON, RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, HENRY C. DWORSHAK, and THOMAS E. MARTIN—and four Members of the House of Representatives—HAROLD R. COLLIER, GRACIE PFOST, JOHN SAYLOR, and AL ULLMAN.

The other members of the Commission, in addition to me, are: Mrs. Halfdan Lee, Samuel T. Dana, Bernard Orell, Joseph W. Penfold, M. Frederick Smith, and Chester S. Wilson.

I believe most of you are already acquainted with these people, who have been long identified with the broad areas with which we are concerned.

The act calls also for the appointment of an advisory council of 25, who represent various special interests and geographic locations. To make sure that we would get the ablest and most representative group available, we requested recommendations for nominees from approximately 200 organizations and citizen interest groups. We have received to date over 500 nominations and have reviewed each with regard to respective categories of interest, abilities, etc. We will shortly announce the names of those appointed to the advisory council, which, we feel, will be a very important arm of this Commission. I might note that uppermost in our minds in selecting this group has been our desire to get persons to participate actively on the basis of a broad understanding of the underlying problems rather than merely representing special interests.

Mr. Francis Sargent, former Commissioner of Natural Resources for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, officially started his tour of duty as executive director to the Commission just 3 days ago. In various positions, he has served under both Republican and Democratic governments in Massachusetts. He has been Director of Marine Fisheries, chairman of Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, one of the three U.S. Commissioners on the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, and chairman of the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission.

That we were lucky to get Mr. Sargent as executive director is attested to by the really tremendous number of laudatory articles and editorials which appeared in the newspapers of Massachusetts since his resignation from his posts there.

A small but very capable staff is already at work at our headquarters in the Regional General Services Administration Building, Washington, D.C.

We have been in touch with each of the 13 Federal departments and independent agencies having a direct interest in outdoor recreation and have requested the appointment of liaison officers from each. In every case, an Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary, or a Director has been named to work with the Commission. I personally have had the opportunity to meet with most of the Secretaries and agency heads in regard to their designation of a liaison officer and have found them unfailingly cooperative and actively interested in the jobs we are undertaking.

In the course of the Commission's life we will wish to coordinate our work closely with that being carried out by individual States. Indeed, we plan to take into account the problems and opportunities of outdoor recreation in each State. This, of course, will require access to such studies by the States as might be available concerning existing and possible future recreational problems as well as plans for meeting them. To further this program, we have written to the Governor of each State requesting the designation of an official with whom the Commission can work.

In addition, we will call on individual consultants and private consulting firms to the extent that they can enable us to get specific information as needed without having to enlarge our staff.

We are hopeful that the type of joint effort we will endeavor to carry out at all levels of government—be they State, Federal, county, or municipal—and with private persons and groups, can provide a lasting service to all concerned with the broad problems of recreational resources.

Before concluding, I should like to add a few personal observations about the underlying importance of outdoor recreation resources.

Quite apart from the physical benefits resulting from outdoor activity, man needs outdoor recreation resources because it is through them that he is reminded that he is part of nature. There was a time, not too long ago, when such reminders were not needed. Outdoors, natural beauty—and natural hazards—were a part of everyday life. Indeed, I fancy that there were a great many people, especially among the early settlers, who then looked upon nature as a constantly threatening force, ever to be pushed back. In this connection, many people today feel that the hardy pioneers of yesterday were impelled to seek new horizons not by a love of the wilderness as by a desire to improve their condition or status.

When the pioneers had no new lands to conquer, when people started moving from isolated farms to small communities and thence to urban centers, our relationship with nature underwent great change. As we became less fearful of the forces of nature and more mindful of the pressures of civilization, we began to seek solace in our former foe. Thus the need for outdoor recreation resources became established. Recognition of this need has tended to grow proportionately to the increasing urbanization of our country.

The United States, despite having been a forerunner in the establishment of National and State park systems, is on the whole just beginning to wake up to the vital importance of recreation. The reasons for this are not difficult to ascertain: we are still a relatively new country and have been engaged in the necessity of settling and developing a land that was wilderness two centuries ago. Thanks to the energy and drive of our people as well as to the wealth of our natural resources, no nation in history has developed so fast. But to accomplish this, our society in the past has had to emphasize—and rightly so—the dignity of work. Recreation, or the proper use of leisure time, has not yet attained a comparable social or moral stature. It is still considered by many, including policymakers, with suspicion—as a waste of time.

We can recognize, as a sign of our reaching maturity as a people, that this attitude is beginning to change. We are beginning to recognize that outdoor recreation—as a healthy, satisfying and often creative use of leisure time—has evolved from a luxury of the few to a necessity of the many. We must recognize also that sports promotion, travel advertising, and the commercial use of outdoor areas and attractions have all played a part in accentuating the demand for outdoor facilities.

To meet these demands, I think they must be approached on three fronts: Federal, State, and community. Great strides have already been made, but I feel much remains to be done—particularly in the third area. Recreational problems at the community level are particularly important because there are fewer answers and greater pressures. An editorial in the New York Times last week mentioned in this connection:

"Our city and our suburbs need more park land, not less. • • • There would be a willing buyer, industrial, commercial, or residential, for every piece of park land in the metropolitan area if government were willing to sell out. Our suburbs are for the most part poor in public recreation areas. They cannot spare an acre."

While this editorial was referring to the situation in New York, it could apply to most of our large cities throughout the United States.

I have previously spelled out the official why, what, where, when, and who of the Commission. Unofficially, I would like to recapitulate as follows:

The Commission expects to serve as a clearing house of information and ideas.

Its review will cut across all areas and all activities dealing with land use.

Its purpose is to anticipate needs and prevent shortages in our natural recreation resources.

Its work is already in progress; its findings will be made available in 1961; its responsibilities are to tomorrow as well as today.

The Commission recognizes that outdoor recreation resources are something in which every one of us has a stake.

The goal of the Commission will be to reflect the needs and aspirations of the entire national community.

---

## Poison in Your Water—No. 22

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in another insertion which I made into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix appeared complaints about the water in the region of Denver, Colo.

This article appearing on November 25, 1958, entitled "Metropolitan Denver's Sewer Problem, or How Long Can We Hold Our Noses?" sets forth one of the reasons why the citizens of the area complain about the dirty, rotten water. The reason is pollution in the waters of the area.

This is just another reason why Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress must be implemented by full appropriation and

why the program must be expanded rather than contracted:

METROPOLITAN DENVER'S SEWER PROBLEM, OR HOW LONG CAN WE HOLD OUR NOSES?

Come late summer and autumn, many residents north and west of Denver are not very happy when they lift their water glasses from the dining room table.

Too often it isn't really what a chemist would call water at all. It's a chemical solution. It has a sight color, a slight odor and a slight taste.

It's sanitary all right. It's been treated and it's safe. It just isn't savory.

Why? Because four of the water districts in that region depend on Clear Creek water for part of their supply. And upstream from the water inlets are the outlets of as many as seven individual sewage treatment plants.

All but one of these dump sewage into Clear Creek after only primary treatment.

When Clear Creek is low, as it is every late summer, fall and early winter, a sizeable portion of the flow is what is dumped in upstream.

This problem is not only Clear Creek's, but the South Platte's as well. As one housewife we know says as she pulls the plug in the sink, "Well, there it goes to Brighton."

In addition to stream pollution, the dilemma of what to do with sewage (some 95 percent of the 55,000 gallons each Denver area resident uses annually goes back into a sewer) takes many another form, most of which are financial. Examples:

Denver is under court order to construct a secondary sewage treatment plant, at a cost of several million dollars. No one knows where the money is coming from.

The little town of Sheridan, on Denver's southwest edge, having trouble making ends meet financially, is dickering with both Denver and Littleton to hook on to a larger city's sewer rather than build its own treatment plant.

The small enclave of Glendale, enclosed on four sides by Southeast Denver, has had a bond issue passed by its voters to build a sewage treatment plant. But Glendale is having difficulty selling its bonds.

The majority of the 53 separate sewer districts in metropolitan area are having some kind of trouble, mostly due to lack of money or capacity. The Denver public works department is constantly badgered by these districts to annex them; and sometimes, after Denver has said no, city sewer men find the districts have secretly hooked on anyway.

The metropolitan area has 27 sewage disposal plants where only four would do. This makes sewerage costs much higher than necessary.

The inescapable conclusion is that metropolitan Denver's sewage problem is going to get worse and worse until some kind of area-wide cooperation and planning results in a metropolitan sewer system.

## The Challenge to the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the following address, delivered by Mr. George Champion, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York on January 30 last has just come to my attention. It is a broad and careful survey of the major dangers that threaten our national economy, and I am sure it will interest every Member of this House and every other reader of the RECORD.

Mr. Champion's remarks and suggestions deserve wide attention and careful study:

THE CHALLENGE TO THE DOLLAR

When I lived in San Diego there was some substance to the disparaging remarks made there in regard to your harbor, which was then called San Pedro. The tremendous work you have done in building this great body of water which now exists is a tribute indeed to the farsighted citizens of Los Angeles. Having seen this great development over the years I was not too surprised to hear you had passed the old port of Boston as a center of world trade.

Because of your historical interest in the importance of international trade I felt that there could be no better place to discuss the position of our country in the world markets, and that the future of the dollar would have especial significance to you.

The life of every one of us here, indeed every American, is inextricably bound up with what happens to the Nation's international position. So interdependent has the world become—so interrelated are the domestic and world economies—that none of us can esecape the consequences of a basic change in our relations with other nations. And yet in the past several years some rather disturbing trends have developed which suggest such a change may actually be under way unless we act with vigor and courage to head it off.

Let me point to just three items which suggest we ought to dig beneath the surface to unearth any fundamental disturbance that may be in the making.

GOLD STOCK IS DOWN

Item 1: Our Nation has experienced a sizable gold outflow over the past year. For 1958 as a whole we shipped abroad about $2.3 billion of gold, and our total gold stock today has fallen to around $20.5 billion, still a sizable figure, but the lowest since 1946. During the recession a year ago, with interest rates falling, there were good reasons why the United States should lose some gold. But the outflow has been persistent and is continuing today, although at a reduced rate.

Item 2: U.S. exports have fallen rather sharply. Our exports actually fell from a peak rate of $21 billion annually in mid-1957 to a recent rate of about $17 billion. This decline in foreign sales was a major contributor to the drop in domestic output in early 1958.

And item 3: We are hearing increasing talk (most of it from abroad) that the dollar may be heading toward a period of severe trouble. Far-fetched as it may seem, there are reputable analysts in Britain and on the Continent who even predict eventual devaluation of the dollar.

Actually these symptoms, these surface manifestations of potential trouble, are all interrelated. They involve the sum total of our economic relations with other peoples, relations which finally come to be reflected in the balance of payments between the United States and other nations. Most of us, I am sure, never look at this particular balance sheet. Yet buried in the fine print are certain trends which we all ought to know something about.

For one thing, it may not be widely appreciated that the volume of dollars the United States is providing other nations has increased immensely in recent years. Moreover, most of these dollars are not tied to any specific exports. Take, as an example, the heavy expenditures that are made in connection with American military forces abroad. Today our Government pays for the support of troops in Germany, England, Japan, and at dozens of other far-off bases. And, of course, the men themselves spend their pay.

The result is an outlay of more than $3 billion to countries which are the hosts of our military men. At the same time a dozen other streams are feeding dollars abroad—the imports we buy (which are steadily increasing), our foreign aid, and the private foreign investment we send to other countries among them. This foreign investment alone has more than doubled since 1955.

DOLLARS NOT BEING SPENT

When all these dollar streams converge they make a mighty river. Last year the sum total of dollars provided to other countries came to the impressively large figure of $26 billion. And it is a significant fact that, counting the world as a whole, not all these dollars the being spent. Indeed, over the past decade many individuals and many countries have sought to save dollars rather than to spend them. As a result the dollar balances and short-term investments held on foreign account in the United States have more than doubled and now exceed $15 billion.

Now this increase in dollars held in foreign accounts isn't bad in itself. Over much of the postwar period the free world suffered from a dollar shortage. It became the objective of governments and central banks to build up their stock of dollars, and to hold dollars was regarded as being as good as holding gold.

For some countries this dollar shortage still perists—India, the Philippines, Brazil, and Argentina are examples. Many such countries are lesser developed lands to which we channel much of our aid. But for a number of others, particularly in Europe, the dollar shortage has become a thing of the past. Such countries no longer have a pressing need to build up balances in the United States. On the contrary, if they are to retain the balances already here, if they are not to convert them into gold, they must stay convinced that the dollar will indeed continue to be as good as gold.

KEEP THE DOLLAR STRONG

So here we come to the heart of the matter: the dollar must be kept strong and respected in every country of the world. For if it ever proves otherwise, if the dollar ever begins to be questioned and a feeling generated that the United States cannot properly manage its affairs, then our Nation, indeed the whole free world, will find itself in deep trouble.

We clearly are not in deep trouble at the moment. But this does not mean we should wait and act only when trouble becomes acute. Certainly we should not wait for any real crisis to develop. The fact of the gold flow, the fact that questions are being raised about the future of the dollar—these are warning signs which it would be folly to ignore.

What are the fears in the minds of our friends abroad? What are the dangers which we Americans must guard against? I think they can be boiled down to these:

First, there is concern that the United States is pricing itself out of foreign markets—that it cannot achieve the level of exports necessary to prevent a continuing outflow of gold.

INFLATION A GROWING FEAR

Secondly, and related to the first, there is fear that we may lack the necessary discipline to keep our costs and prices under control—in other words, to avoid inflation.

And, thirdly, I might add, there is concern that our country may be in the process of scrapping some of the fundamental principles which in the past have made it strong—that we may be foregoing our reliance on free enterprise and individual initiative in order to take the easy road of Government action and subsidy.

I want to say just a few words about each of these dangers. It certainly would do us no good to deny that we are encountering difficulties in some export markets. I have mentioned earlier the rather sharp decline in shipments abroad this past year. Some of this reduction, it is true, is due to cutbacks in demand. In Europe business is now experiencing a moderate letdown in activity—very much like ours of a year ago. And some of the raw material areas, like South America and Africa, are suffering from lower prices.

Yet the fact still remains that American exports are holding up less well, relatively, than those of many nations including Germany, Britain and Japan. Moreover, we have testimony from a number of our producers that they no longer can match foreign firms when it comes to prices on a wide range of items. Producers of electrical equipment tell us their counterparts in Britain or Switzerland can build a generator for considerably less than it can be produced here.

NOW WE'RE IMPORTERS

We used to be exporters of all kinds of copper products, but now we are importers. Or take the story Roger Blough tells about the industrious Japanese who buy scrap metal here in California, haul it back to their mills in the Orient, manufacture it into finished products, and ship it back across the wide Pacific to undersell American producers by such wide margins as $29 a ton on reinforcing bars. We can hardly compete in Latin America when foreign producers undersell us in our own frontyard.

Then turn to still a different sector of our economy—agriculture. Almost from the founding of our country the United States has been known as the world's primary source of supply for certain farm staples, especially cotton and tobacco. Prior to World War II our country provided nearly 40 percent of all cotton that entered into world trade. By the early fifties, after 2 decades of inflating farm prices, we furnished only one-fourth of foreign shipments. Meanwhile stocks began to mount sky-high in our warehouses.

So what did we do? Did we try to make ourselves truly competitive in the world's cotton market? Not in the least. Our Government said that it would compete, but only on the artifical basis of a subsidy. This season it is estimated our exporters will ship abroad some 4 million bales by selling cotton at an average around 28½ cents a pound, almost a fifth below the domestic price. The same technique of course has been employed to dispose of wheat, rice and other products in world markets. Truly this is one of those situations that might even have seemed strange to Alice traveling in Wonderland.

Now I don't want to imply that all of our problems in export markets are of our own making—that we can't compete on any range of items. That just isn't true. After all, we are shipping abroad some $17 billion of goods a year—more than any other single nation. The trouble is that $17 billion just isn't enough to balance our accounts, and we have to put ourselves in a position to expand the volume.

Right here I ought to say that in some areas of the world—and it is particularly true of Europe—American shippers face tariffs, quotas, and other obstacles to a degree not confronted by other nations. Indeed, some of these obstacles are designed specifically to exclude U.S. products, and except for liberalization by Germany and some by France (on raw material quotas), the recent moves toward currency convertibility in Europe didn't affect them.

U.S. CARS COSTLY ABROAD

Take the case of automobiles. You all know that foreign cars are having quite a vogue here in America. We even lowered the tariff on them recently from 10 to 8½ percent. But what about American cars abroad? True, their price has gone up and they cost more. I want to say a word about that trend in a moment. But in countries like Britain, Italy, and France a buyer can hardly get an American car if he wants to.

Ernest Breech recently cited the case of a 1959 Ford Fairlane, which carries a price here in California of about $3,400, including optional equipment and taxes. Mr. Breech points out that in France the delivered price of that car is about $8,200. It includes no less than $3,200 of duties. In Italy the car would cost $5,800, with a penalty of $1,400. And in England the price would be about $8,000, with the penalty composed of a 30-percent duty.

IMPORTS ARE LIMITED

Moreover, if this were not enough, Mr. Breech added, imports are further limited by severe quotas and other devices. Thus France admits only a relatively few cars from outside the European Common Market, the United Kingdom presently restricts imports from the United States and Canada to 650 automobiles per year, and Italy admits only a few hundred American cars.

One could go on and read off a long list of other products, from refrigerators to machinery to chemicals, that face similar obstacles. On some of these our producers might not be able to compete even if the barriers were down. But on others—particularly specialized products—we undoubtedly could.

Initially, of course, there were good reasons for these discriminating barriers. Europe had been torn by war, its industry was badly hurt, and it was woefully short of dollars. But these circumstances are a thing of the past. The time has come for most European countries to stop singling out U.S. products for special treatment. They should move to eliminate discriminating quotas and other devices, so that we are allowed to compete as best we can, on the same terms as other suppliers.

I wish I could say that this were all that would be needed to solve our problems. But unfortunately it isn't. There are other deeper, highly significant trends, to which we ourselves hold the key, and which also have an impact on our position in world markets. One of these goes back to the whole vital matter of prices and the persistent tendency toward inflationary pressure here in the United States; and another, not unrelated to this, is the growing inclination to turn to Government whenever the going gets tough.

No producer can expect to hold on to his market if prices are pushed incessantly higher. And yet that has been the rather unhappy record for a number of items over the past few years. Since 1955, at least, prices have risen more in the United States than in either Germany or Japan, and this in spite of the fact that the Federal Reserve System did all that it could to stem the advance.

LABOR COSTS SURGING

Now we don't have to look very far to find the major source of this pressure on prices. It comes from rising costs—and the chief item on the list is labor costs. The story is too familiar to you gentlemen to need retelling. Many of you have lived through it yourselves: the wage increases that far outrun any gains in productivity; job featherbedding, which is uneconomic and indeed morally indefensible; and still other labor practices which interfere with the process of passing savings on to the consumer. Most of us could cite chapter and verse, and the pity of it is that the leaders who take this path really do a disservice to every citizen individually and the Nation as a whole.

Let me cite you a story as one hears it told abroad—the pattern of the future as some of the foreign seers profess to see it. It goes like this: "The United States lacks the internal discipline (or should I say fortitude) to control its costs. Prices are bound to rise. As a result U.S. producers will continue to lose out in world markets even if other countries quit discriminating against them, and the adverse balance of payments will remain. The gold flow will persist, and at some point, as the holders of dollars become concerned, the flow will turn into a torrent. The United States will then be faced with the necessity to devalue the dollar."

That, in essence, is what some of our foreign critics are saying.

Now I don't think for a moment that any such pattern of events will take place, and the consensus of informed economists is that it will not happen. But it would be foolish for us to hide our heads in the sand and conclude that it could never come to pass. At all costs we have to guard the integrity of the dollar, and that means that we all have to work to curb the forces that could weaken it. You may have heard the old saying "God save th Queen, but only the English people can save the pound." Well, only the American people can kep the dollar sound.

DEFICITS DURING PROSPERITY

This means, too, that we have to remove the pressure on prices that could arise from a continuing Government deficit. Here we are, running a $12 billion annual deficit at a time of mounting prosperity. We quite rightly give help to many other countries that need it, working through a variety of agencies to do so. The Monetary Fund and the World Bank, in providing such help, rightly insist that recipient nations balance their fiscal budgets as well as their payments with other countries. Then we turn around and do the opposite ourselves.

BALANCED BUDGET IS AIM

It just won't work. No nation, any more than any family, can long exist if it tries to run counter to the fundamental laws that guide economic life. We, too, must bring our public expenditures under better control and balance our dollar outgo with income.

The President has made it unmistakably clear that this is his policy, that he aims for a balanced budget. Now it is up to us, the American people, to tell him and Congress clearly and without equivocation that we are back of him one hundred percent—that we strongly urge a cut in expenditures.

There is no doubt in my mind that if we tackle this problem with vigor and determination we can lick it. It is not enough for trade associations, business clubs and other civic organizations to send resolutions to Congress, though of course these actions are good in themselves. In the final analysis it comes right down to the individual. What do you and I do about it? Do we make ourselves heard? Do we take the time and make the effort to express our opinions plainly and vigorously to those who represent us in the Federal Government? (And State and local governments, too, for that matter.)

And when we talk about cutting expenses we should make it known that we mean the nonessentials, and not vital items like defense and essential foreign aid. When it comes to defense, an establishment that is second to none is vital. Nothing is more perilous or useless than a second-best defense.

And related to this is our foreign aid. I don't mean aid to countries that are piling up dollar balances—any aid to them, including the military, ought to be reexamined, and indeed it now is being reexamined. I mean aid to countries that really need it: countries in Asia, the Middle East, or other areas that may go under without it.

TWO AND FOUR-TENTHS BILLION DOLLARS TO FARMERS

I realize it has been fashionable to blame the national deficit on the need for huge defense and foreign aid expenditures. Yet

I wonder how many of our citizens appreciate that of the $7.5 billion increase in Government expenditures this year, none flows to foreign aid and only $1.7 billion represents an increase in defense outlays. Where does the remainder go? Well, $2.4 billion (the largest single increase) is going to the farmer; $1 billion is going for housing; about $400 million has been earmarked for added unemployment benefits; and the remainder of the increase is scattered among other beneficiaries.

It is significant that a sizable portion of these outlays involves a subsidy to one group or another. I am afraid that it is fast becoming a habit in our country to regard Washington as a highly convenient storm cellar—a place for one and all to run to at the first sign of disturbance. Unfortunately this is too often true of business as well as other groups, with subsidies flowing to such diverse fields as housing, shipping, aviation, and now to the whole area of small business.

But probably no area receives as heavy a subsidy today as does agriculture. Almost one-fifth of all cash income for farming (close to $7 billion) flows from the Federal Government. Moreover, this farm subsidy has a double meaning in terms of our international position. Not only is it a major contributor to the unbalanced budget, and hence to the concern about inflation, but it also acts to price us directly out of important world markets.

I have already mentioned the gap that exists between the world price and our own domestic price for such crops as wheat, rice, and cotton. The truth is that the farm program of our Government, now almost a quarter century old, effectively deprives the United States and the world of some of our most productive resources. For I'm completely convinced that if farming were permitted to develop unhindered in America we could produce many staples here more cheaply than anywhere else, and all to the benefit of peoples everywhere.

COTTON AND RICE

I am sure that all of you who are familiar with the cotton situation in California would agree with me. But perhaps an even more dramatic example is to be found in the case of rice. Experts tell me that if the controls were to be removed from rice output, modern methods would make it possible to produce rice more cheaply in the South than in the Orient—and this in spite of the fact that the laborer in the Orient earns only 20 cents a day.

Clearly there is something wrong with a program that blocks this kind of efficiency and spends $7 billion in the process of doing it. The underlying truth may be that in exports the United States may find itself heading toward a growing advantage in farm products even as compared with many manufactures.

We cannot ignore the fact that in the postwar period productivity in farming has been increasing by 6 percent or more a year, while that in manufacturing has grown a bit less than 3 percent on the average. In such circumstances it should be natural for us to place increased emphasis on the export of farm items. That is a main reason why our farm program needs to be revised and brought into harmony with the facts of the mid-20th century.

ADVANTAGES ARE MANY

In farming, as in industry, we need to return to some of the basic principles that did so much to encourage the growth of our country in its most formative years: A reliance on our own individual enterprise, encouraged by enlightened self-interest, and making full use of the marketplace, of the normal forces of supply and demand, to direct our efforts.

Think of all the advantages we start with: a level of education, know-how, and productivity that is greater than anywhere else in the world; an industrial plant and capacity that can't be matched in any other country; and an eagerness and willingness to learn, backed by research and scientific inquiry on an unprecedented scale. These are advantages that give us a headstart on all other nations. But we have to make full use of them.

You have heard the saying, "The world is full of willing people; some willing to work, the rest willing to let them work." We have to disprove that saying. We can't featherbed; if anything we have to work harder and longer, make better products and relax less in the suburbs—and that applies to bankers, as well as to everyone else.

The fact is (and too often it's overlooked), we continue to be at war—a war not of our own choosing, but still all embracing. It is a war for men's minds and men's souls, with active battles being fought on the political, ideological and economic fronts, while the military position holds at a stalemate. Consider again those words of Khrushchev:

"We declare war on you * * * in the peaceful field of trade. We declare war. We will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system. * * * We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political reasons."

Is it any accident, then, that the Russians in the past year have begun a trade drive in the West? That they have sold tin, aluminum, asbestos, and other products at cutrate prices? That they seek to become the suppliers of oil to Latin America? Or to tie Egypt and Syria to their orbit through loans and the iron bands of trade? Or is it any accident, on the other side of the globe, that Communist China has begun to undercut the Japanese in markets of southeast Asia?

OUTCOME IS CLEAR

The answer is, of course, that it is no accident; and this economic war promises to affect the lives of all of us. And yet I am sure that none of us has any doubt as to the outcome. Our Nation is manned by a people of great resourcefulness and proven strength. When confronted by large problems and issues in the past they have displayed remarkably good judgment. There is no reason why the future should be any exception.

The future will be what we make it. There are encouraging signs that we are beginning to recognize and face up to our problems. On all sides one hears of a growth in productivity, of a striving to get costs under better control. And the President, with his inspiring leadership, has pointed to the road that can lead us to fiscal stability. Certainly our scientists are working overtime; and no nation is devoting so much thought and effort as we in the search for better ways of doing things.

We do indeed possess great advantages, and I for one am confident that we shall make full use of them. We can overcome our economic problems. To do so we will need determination and skill, imagination and hard work, courage and self-discipline. Americans are rich in these qualities. Now we must roll up our sleeves and show the world how to use them.

## Thomas Masaryk: Champion of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have a part in honoring a man of the stature of Thomas Masaryk. One cannot overpublicize the contribution that this man made to the cause of democracy. His is a name that is likely to endure as long as the world has a place for the cause of individual freedom.

Yet his position of prominence was of relatively short duration in the scheme of things. As President of the Czechoslovak Republic—whose existence as an independent state was itself short-lived—Thomas Masaryk, in a brief 17 years, promoted the true ideal of democracy as few men have been able to do in the space of a lifetime.

Thomas Masaryk founded the Republic of Czechoslovakia. When he became its first President, in 1918, he was chosen for the post because of his ideals, his devotion to them, and his willingness to make sacrifices for them. This characteristic idealism had marked his life.

As a youth of lowly parentage, but encouraged by his mother, he had struggled to achieve an education. As a young man his talent and dedication to high principles was recognized; he was encouraged and assisted to become a teacher. As a teacher he developed an independence of spirt and devotion to mankind that gained for him a place in the legislature of his then mother-country, Austria. As a legislator his chief contribution to his fellowman derived from his independence of spirit. He had sufficient courage and consecration to principle to fight the reactionary government, to insist on the rights of the individual against the state.

Then when World War I liberated his compatriots and generated an independent state, it was he who guided it to the fruition of a faith. He led this new nation for more than half of its independent existence, and his idealism persisted.

As long as the free world shall endure it will be appropriate to recall that whatever the fate of this one-time Republic of Czechoslovakia, now fallen behind the Iron Curtain, its very existence was the culmination of an idea—the idea that men should be allowed to live in freedom and in peace, with emphasis upon the individual, his rights, his dignity, and his high promise.

Thomas Masaryk, Czechoslovakian leader, was the very embodiment of this idea. In his promotion of it he made a contribution to the world which will not be forgotten.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 24

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently an article describing how the rivers in the Philadelphia area are fouled and soiled and polluted by sewage and industrial waste.

An interesting consequence to this pollution and filth in the water of the area appeared in an article in the Philadelphia, Pa., News, on October 10, 1957.

The waters and springs of Fairmount Park, traditional sources for pure drinking water for millions oppressed by foul tasting tapwater, have now become polluted so that they are no longer available to the people of the area for drinking.

The springs are characterized as dirty as "what you'd find in a sewer." The area once available to the people for pure drinking water is now posted with guards to see that no one drinks from the springs or takes the water away for use at home.

This is just another reason why the Federal Government must vigorously continue its action to abate pollution, both by enforcement action and by continuation of the grants authorized under Public Law 660 of the 84th Congress:

PARK SPRINGS ARE POLLUTED

One printed sign created a sensation in Fairmount Park yesterday. Generation on generation of our town's families would never believe it, but—the sign says: "This spring water unsafe for drinking."

Remember the days when Philadelphia's tapwater was renowned for its odor of stables? When the Nation laughed at jokes about the chlorine cocktails that flowed in our kitchens?

In those days, just a few years back, Philadelphians by the hundreds drove to the pure spring on East River Drive above the Girard Avenue Bridge, to fill their gallon jugs.

Here was the oasis in the middle of millions of people. And now, the water that spouts from the stone lion's mouth has been disgraced.

It's polluted, said the health department.

And so are the other springs in Fairmount Park, 75 all told.

Health Commissioner James P. Dixon says stay away. The springs suffered the greatest degradation of all: the water is what you'd find in a sewer. This was established through 1,861 tests.

Most popular springs, in addition to the East River lion, are Harrison Spring, on East River Drive; the spring near Black Road on West River Drive; Murphy Spring, Belmont Avenue near Wynnefield Drive, and Mount Pleasant Spring in the East Park.

All over the park, the signs went up. Park guards were instructed to see that nobody drank from the springs, took water away—or moved the signs.

Charles I. Thompson, president of the Fairmount Park Commission, said the springs have been tested for 20 years. And this is the first time they've been found contaminated to a dangerous degree. In 1941, 16 springs were closed for a while.

If tapwater could laugh it'd have a chuckle today. Taps running free and healthy, and spring water's in the guardhouse.

## "For God and Country"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include, therewith, the winning address for the Freedom Award by the Reverend Feltham S. James, then national chaplain of the American Legion, on May 30, 1958, at Omaha, Nebr., the title of which is "For God and Country." Mr. Speaker, for this address this distinguished clergyman and theologian, at the annual conclave of the Officials of the Freedoms Foundation, was selected to receive the top award from that illustrious organization at their headquarters, at Valley Forge, Pa., on Sunday, February 22, 1959. Mr. Speaker, no finer American could have been selected; Mr. Speaker, no finer address could have been selected; Mr. Speaker, no finer place could have been selected for the award.

The address follows:

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

(Address by Rev. Feltham S. James, national chaplain of the American Legion, delivered at Omaha, Nebr., May 30, 1958)

Several years ago the United States issued a special commemorative postage stamp honoring four army chaplains, who lost their lives in the Second World War. The engraving shows the sinking troopship *Dorchester* and, above the stricken ship, the calm, friendly faces of the Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish Chaplains who died hand in hand. The *Dorchester* was torpeoded and sunk in the North Atlantic in February 1943. On board were four chaplains: George Fox, a Methodist; Clark Poling, Reformed Church of America; John Washington, a Roman Catholic; and Alexander Goode, a Jew. When the ship was hit, each of the four chaplains gave his lifebelt to nearby soldiers who did not have one. Then they joined hands and prayed to the one God they all served for the safety of the men struggling to leave the fast sinking vessel. The survivors finally landed in Greenland. They said, "This is the picture engraved on our minds and hearts as the *Dorchester* disappeared beneath the waves."

There we see exemplified the sacrifice upon which our Nation was built. Those four chaplains, as well as countless thousands of other men, have given their lives that you and I might enjoy the heritage of freedom that is ours. One of our greatest faults is that we too seldom pause to recall the heroic sacrifice of those brave men and women of yesterday. We do not follow the injunction of the Old Testament, which required of the father to recount to his children the great and noble deeds of those who won for Israel the high place of the chosen people of God.

The ancient Romans remembered their honored dead by placing statues of their Roman children would see them and be reminded to emulate their noble deeds. We have no statues of our honored dead in our dwelling places. But we do have occasions the obvious meaning of which is to remember our honored dead. Such an occasion is this morning. We have come together to remember and pay honor to comrades who have answered the final bugle call.

On occasions like these we pause and pay tribute. But this is not all the occasion means. If we stop there, we are not true to our honored dead, to ourselves or to our beloved country. These occasions should have a profound effect upon our lives and thought. Those who gave their life's blood did not do it that we might simply meet to sing their praises. The spoil they won for themselves was only a fraction of what they secured for us. They were strugglers for the future, battlers for a heritage for generations yet unborn. They died for a purpose, for a cause. It is for us to accept the challenge to continue what they began.

"For the youth they gave and the blood they gave
We must render back the due;
For every marked or nameless grave
We must pay with a service true;
Till the scales stand straight with even weight,
And the world is a world made new."

Out of the past we should learn our lessons for the building of the future. There are times in the history of persons and peoples, particularly times of crisis, when a rediscovery of yesterday opens a new pathway to tomorrow, when the awakening of a sense of heritage becomes a powerful force for determining our destiny. Men must learn to look back if they are ever to succeeed in moving forward. Behind us are the wisdom and the experience of the ages. The past is full of landmarks and danger signals which he must study who would advance into tomorrow. And so occasions like these have a twofold function: they not only lift up tributes for the dead, but they have exhortations for the living. They bring challenges from the graves of our dead. Those graves are not silent. They speak. They remind us of what God expects of us and of this land we profess to love. Memories carry us back into the past. But on these occasions the past warns us to look into the future and make certain that war will not visit us again. They warn us that we must work to conquer the sins that have so long conquered mankind. They warn us, also, that America's dream of freedom and liberty will melt like the hoarfrost in the morning sun unless we keep it alive in the minds of the people and defend it with the power of the Nation.

Certainly it is not secret that there are forces in the world seeking to destroy that dream. Russian strategy and policy has been—and is—the destruction of free America. It is more important than ever that our Nation maintain its ability to resist aggression—because in our strength rests our power to avoid the holocaust of atomic destruction. Only through peace can we bring our dream into a reality and only through power, in the face of Russian threats, can we maintain that peace.

Mere anticommunism is not enough. We must know what we believe, why we believe it, and why we must resist that which would destroy us and destroy as well the faith that has made us what we are. Before we lower our guard, we muts have convincing proof that there has been a change in Soviet strategy and their basic goal of world domination.

Yes, the graves of those whom we this day honor speak out in a clear, unmistakable voice. They tell us that the course of history has proven that our only hope for realizing our dream of freedom and liberty today is to be so strong that no aggressor, or group

of aggressor nations, will dare to seek to impose tyranny and dictatorship upon freedom-loving men who desire to live in dignity in the image of God.

And as we recall the past we not alone recognize the patriotism of our fathers but we find an even greater purpose in that recollection—that this patriotism must be perpetuated. Let us then cultivate patriotism. But while we do it, let us bear in mind that one way to do it is to put down all sectionalism and divisions that break up into feuding camps. The downfall of many a nation has been its internal divisions. Our duty is for us to forget that there is any North or South, East or West, but to know only that we are one people. It was the immortal Patrick Henry who said, "I am not a Virginian. I am an American," and these words should find echo in every American heart. As we are bound by the bridges that span our streams, by the continuous steel rails that support our trains, by the wires that transmit our messages, and by the blue canopy that shuts us under the same roof, so let us be bound by the eternal ties of brotherhood that make us one people.

It is thus that memorial occasions call us to a high patriotism, a patriotism that lives and works for the highest ideals of American life. We who are churchmen must not forget that those ideals include the making of our patriotism religious and our religion patriotic. Love of country is not only a natural sentiment in every heart, but it is right in the sight of God. No one can ignore his relationship to his country and not sin against God.

Then, too, memorial occasions should bring us to a fuller understanding of the value of peace. They show war at its best to be only a necessary evil, never justified except in a righteous cause. They show the cost of war. I am not thinking of the financial cost either. For what our wars have cost us in dollars and cents may some day be wiped out and forgotten, but what they cost in hundreds of thousands of precious lives will never be forgotten so long as we meet like this to pay honor. We must never forget the value of peace and freedom, purchased at so great a price.

One more strong thought ought an occasion like this bring to us—the truth of self-sacrifice. Tradition has it that in Scotland there is a battlefield on the Colloden Moor on which the natives and their saxon foes met in mortal conflict. No monument marks the spot, but a singular, little blue flower grows there and there alone. It sprang up after the battle and they call it the "flower of Colloden," because it sprang from the soil made sacred and rich with the blood of fallen heroes. The seed were there, of course, but they needed the baptism of blood to make them grow. And now every blue flower on Colloden field, as it bends its head in the summer breeze, is a tender memorial of the brave spirits who dyed that soil with their life's blood and fertilized it with sacrifice. The flowers of Colloden are always the choicest because of the cost of their production.

The choicest flowers of human civilization are always the Colloden flowers; they spring alone from soil that has been watered by sacrifice. Freedom is one such flower. True patriotism is another. Religious liberty is another. Christianity is another—it sprang from the blood-dyed ground at the foot of a cross. He who is not willing to open his veins to sanctify his country, is not worthy of the inheritance that an occasion like this brings to him. No man has begun to be a real citizen until his citizenship has cost him something. We must feed our most holy institutions as our heroic dead fed freedom—with sacrifice.

Self-sacrifice for one's country has given us a heritage unmatched in the history of man. But I am sometimes apprehensive about the other half of that phrase carved on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, "For God and Country." Great have been our sacrifices for our country, but what of the sacrifices for our God. We honor those who fought and gave their lives that the whole world might be freed from the domination of tyranny and oppression in whatever form it might present itself. But how little of sacrifice for the highest things in life there is among us. It is a noble sacrifice for the highest things in life there is among us. It is a noble thing to die for one's country and it is highly commendable but there is another to whom we owe greater allegiance—that is God. This thing we call sacrifice is not complete when made for country alone. It must be for God and country and when we leave God out we have undermined the very foundation upon which country stands. Only by our country becoming a great spiritual bastion and by exalting God in personal testimony and public action can we prevent the sacrifice of our soldier dead from having been made in vain. We must be moved to deeper spiritual dedication. We are heirs of a great legacy, and we are proud of what those who have gone before us have achieved; but every generation must vouchsafe its own faith and insure its own freedom.

Edward Gomez was a private in the Marine Corps. He was killed in action in the Korean war. As his machinegun squad moved up, an enemy grenade landed nearby, threatening the entire operation. Shouting a warning to the others, Gomez grabbed the grenade and fell on it, his body absorbing the shock of the explosion. For this action his parents received on his behalf the Nation's highest honor, conferred at their request in their little parish church.

Edward's mother found among his personal effects a letter—a letter written in premonition—a testimony of faith and courage of all those who laid down their lives that we might enjoy the fruits of liberty and freedom.

"I am not sorry I died," he wrote, "because I died fighting for my country. I am very proud to have done what little I have done to keep my honor free. Be proud of me, Mom, because even though I'm scared now, I know what I am doing is worth it. Tell Dad I died like the man he wanted me to be. The kids—remind them of me once in a while. And never forget, kids, fight only for what you believe in; that's what I'm fighting for."

We can never close our account with those who died on the field of honor. Perhaps the humblest tribute we can pay to their memory is to follow the wisdom of the young hero: "Fight for what you believe in."

The men who fought and died, either in the line of battle or at home, after having carried the contest to a successful conclusion have left us a well-defined duty. That duty is to reassert and reemphasize the principles for which they died; the principles in which they believed. These are the principles of liberty, freedom and truth.

All our efforts to save a world by diplomacy, treaties, food distribution, economic loans, reciprocal trade, foreign aid, or otherwise, will fall unless at the foundation we put the basic stone of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Unless we can do this, those who have died gave their lives in vain. Having failed them, "these cannot sleep in Flander's Fields" or in any other spot on the face of the earth. We must take up the torch, hold it high and march under the banner of the Kingdom of God in bringing to pass the things for which "they gave the last full measure of devotion."

## Trujillo Trembles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Trujillo trembles and well he might. Batista and Peron are in his domain as living examples of deposed dictators. Perez Jimenez cowers in Miami on a day-to-day parole by the U.S. authorities.

Trujillo talks big about foreign legions with lots of guns and machetes. He takes over Haiti by a show of force and money. He blusters and he storms to hide the trembling of his body and soul. The day of reckoning is nigh and he knows it.

He violates ancient and revered traditions of asylum, a sure sign of panic. I include, under unanimous consent, a letter I have just received from an American citizen, Bienvenido Gonzales, about his family and friends now imprisoned in the Venezuelan Embassy in Ciudad Trujillo. It speaks for itself and marks up another score to be settled soon when Trujillo finds that even his fearful subjects will turn and fight at long last to purge their beautiful land of a benefactor whose benefits have been largely confined to himself and whose malefactions are many.

MAYAGUEZ, P.R.,
*February 28, 1959.*

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
*Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PORTER: I am writing this letter to you, appealing to your humanitarian sense of justice, not only as an American citizen born in Puerto Rico, but as a distraught father who finds himself helpless and unable to help his two sons, a daughter, the wife of the oldest son, his three grandchildren, and his exwife, all presently in asylum at the Venezuelan Embassy in Ciudad, Trujillo, Dominican Republic.

Certainly I will not take your valuable time to recount all the abuses which the generalissimo has wrought on the citizens of Santo Domingo. But I am appealing to you to help and assist and possibly see that a safe conduct is granted to my family who, my children especially, are in a sense derivative American citizens. I hope and pray that this right may some day be established, the right to call themselves American citizens.

The safe conduct I beg you to try and obtain, so that they may leave Santo Domingo and go to Venezuela or any other friendly country, is for the following:

Bienvenido Gonzalez Mieses, my own son, Norka P. de Monte de Gonzalez, his wife, and their children (my grandchildren): Milagros Atlagracia Gonzales, age 5; Angel Bienvenido, age 3; Bienvenido Eudoro, age 2 months; Antonio Gonzales Mieses, my own son; Diana Margarita Gonzalez Mieses, my own daughter; and my exwife, mother of my children, Caridad Mieses de Rojas.

I understand and this I say because I have not been able to establish contact with my family, that they have been deprived of all creature comforts, possibly even food and water.

In the name of humanity, the love of a distraught father and as an American citi-

zen, I beg you, sir, to find a way directly or through our State Department, to help my family leave Santo Domingo safely and as soon as possible.

Faithfully yours,

BIENVENIDO GONZALEZ.

## Essay by William Anderson, of Linfield College, Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the March 14, 1959, issue of the Union Signal, which is published by the National Womans Christian Temperance Union, a thoughtful and provocative essay has been written by Mr. J. William Anderson, a student at Linfield College, McMinnville, Oreg. This is one of Oregon's outstanding private schools of higher education.

Mr. Anderson, who writes vividly and effectively, has emphasized with dramatic effect the tragic result of the combination of alcohol and gasoline. The essay won the 1958 intercollegiate oratorical contest in Oregon, and deservedly placed second in the Nation when judging took place in Washington, D.C., last August.

For the information of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the able essay by J. William Anderson, of Linfield College, entitled "The Real Enemy," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL ENEMY

(By Bill Anderson)

Explain something to me, Christian temperance worker. Explain the grounds on which you fight your dreaded enemy. Tell me how you prove to the farmer growing hops, to the foreman in the brewery, or to the clerk behind the liquor counter, that what he's doing is wrong. He knows it's not a sin to drink; not a sin against God, nor against his fellow man, nor against himself. How do you intend to convince him otherwise?

After all, doesn't the Psalmist include it in his praise to God for His gifts to man: "wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart?" Wasn't King Lemuel in Proverbs advised to "give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts," to "let him drink, and forget his poverty and remember his misery no more" (Prov. 31: 6–7)? And didn't St. Paul advise Timothy to "use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities" (I Tim. 5: 23)? We know they're not all talking about fresh grapejuice.

How then can the Christian church stand on scriptural grounds to renounce the use of alcohol? Wouldn't those who are already antagonistic toward the church, likewise be antagonistic toward its scriptural dictates?

Come now, take off your white ribbon. Cease this useless fight against man's privilege to drink if he so chooses——

"But wait."

A voice cries out from behind me, and another and another, until there's a great chorus, crying out as one voice, "Wait! Wait!" I turn to see who would interrupt me, but I see nothing but a vast gray mist from which the voices emerge. Then one voice issues forth and takes on the misshapen form of a twisted, dirty man, old before his time; a staggering, stumbling relic of the streets, with the stench of too much alcohol permeating his very being, crying, "Wait! Wait!"

I turn away in disgust. "Wait for what, old man? Why should we listen to you? We're not of your kind. We're young and healthy, not old and diseased." And the man falls back, to be swept away in the current of the gutter, like 520,000 others, never to be seen again, his warning unheeded.

Another voice takes on form and emerges from the fog; a woman with a baby in her arms and two crying children hanging to the tattered hem of her faded dress. Her face is scarred, but with scars far deeper than just the torn skin of her cheek; a mind and body, scarred by the constant abuses of a drunken husband. And she, crying out for the 200,000 alcohol-ruined homes she represents, cries above the rest, "Wait! Wait!"

Still the clamor from the fog continues, and I cry back, "Let us alone. We can't enjoy the pleasures of our drinking if you insist upon annoying us so."

But the clamor only increases, and another figure steps forth. This time it is a young, good-looking man, yet a man whose mind is slowly being eaten away by the ravages, not of alcohol, but of a disease that has come from his intemperance. He, as he is led away, like 190,000 others, cries back, half-crazed, "Wait! Wait!"

I begin to tire from the parade of useless exceptions who would try to blame drink for their downfall and not their own inherent weakness, their own intemperance.

Then beyond the rabble of voices, I hear another sound, not the sound of a human voice, but that of a modern, high-powered automobile, racing at high speed, careening from the mist. There's an anguished scream of streaming brakes, a pause, and a rending crash of metal, and glass, and concrete. Then silence.

The vehicle that only moments before had been the beautiful, sleek, swift product of the latest of Detroit's engineering ingenuity, lies upside down in the middle of the highway, torn and twisted beyong recognition. Flames begin to lick out from the gasoline-soaked interior, and with the flames, a woman, trapped inside, screams out in pain and fear. The flames reach the tank, and in a blinding flash, the woman's fear and pain are over.

Then I notice another figure lying in the ditch at the side of the road. I rush to his side and kneel beside him. In the heavy, fog-laden air, above the stench of warm human blood, there is the oder of the drinks that had made the evening so gay, but so dulled his judgment that he did not realize that he could not control his car.

Here had been a man of distinction, a man of good health and prosperity, a man who had loved and provided amply for his family, who had gone to church regularly, and followed unfailingly a life of moderation.

Yet in an instant, he and his wife had become 2 more additions to the list of 20,000 "alcohol-flavored" traffic deaths anticipated this year. A life of moderation?

Then the light shifts, and I see the face of the man for the first time. I am sickened with what I see, for the face on the dead man is mine. My own body destroyed, my wife dead, my children homeless.

Then it is that I know. "There's no need to explain, Christian temperance worker. This is your proof."

There may be no evil spirits in the glass, but death and poverty and disease swim within it. There may be no sin in the act of drinking itself, but wanton murder and destruction lie submerged in the unconscious, unknowing release of inhibitions; complete oblivion in the unwarranted self-confidence imparted by it. There may be no literal condemnation, scripturally, of drinking, but with drunkenness and its attendant social evils, we have no alternative but total abstinence.

Here then is our real task. Go beyond pinning white ribbons just to the women of the church. Tie in one great bond all peoples. Go beyond taking temperance tracts only to the destitute in the gutter. First provide for young minds a realistic education in the social deterioration and destruction that is consistently the result of even the most moderate use of alcohol. Go beyond using biological object lessons to scare men away from drink. Give them, instead, a glimpse of social tragedy: skid-row derelicts, broken homes, social disease, crime, and the broken body and homeless children of the would-be moderate social drinker. Save them from becoming just another pathetic figure on some Sunday evening pulpit statistic.

Let's work together, you and I, to battle the real enemy, not the bottle and what it contains, but the ignorance of the mind that turns to that bottle for release from its tensions, that knows no greater release than self-destruction, no higher joy than momentary pleasure, no greater goal than complete oblivion. Offer them, instead, an abundant life, with freedom from themselves and a trust in someone far greater. Then, and only then, can we completely defeat our real enemy.

## Item Veto Legislation—The Other Side of the Coin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a recent article in the New York Herald Tribune by Victor Wilson centers attention on executive control of expenditures under the law creating the Bureau of the Budget. The article points out that the language under which the Budget Bureau operates allows it, with Presidential approval, to hold up expenditures of money to effect savings, promote greater efficiency, or because of "other developments" subsequent to approval of an appropriation.

This situation indicates that Congress may not now have the absolute power of the purse which has been assumed. I do not say this critically, since I believe that the Chief Executive frequently is in the best position to judge where savings can be made in nonessential programs and for unjustified projects. Indeed, in my opinion we would be taking a great step in promoting economy in Government operations by giving to the President the express power to veto specific items in appropriation bills, such as is proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 44, which I introduced in behalf of myself and other Senators.

Mr. Wilson's article suggests another side to the item veto coin. For while an item veto amendment would vest the Chief Executive with more direct control over appropriation bills, it could

serve to diminish the indirect administrative veto of expenditures finally approved by Congress. This fact may be worthy of serious consideration by those who have opposed item veto legislation on the ground that it would give the executive branch too much authority over appropriation measures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ITEM VETO

(By Victor Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—For more than half a century, American Presidents, right down to Dwight D. Eisenhower, have pleaded with Congress—in vain—to give them a law that can be summed up in two little words—item veto.

Those two little words would permit the Chief Executive to kill individual items in appropriations bills without being forced to veto the whole measure simply to strike down the items he dislikes.

Presidential yearning for the item veto is generally well known.

What isn't so well known—though Congress is becoming more acutely aware of it—is that latter-day Presidents, including Mr. Eisenhower, are achieving some measure of item-veto power without congressional sanction.

They do it through an agency called the Bureau of the Budget, created in 1921 in the Treasury Department, but transferred to the Executive Office of the President in 1939.

The language under which the Budget Bureau operates allows it, with Presidential approval, to hold up expenditure of money if it will effect savings, promote greater efficiency, or because of other developments subsequent to appropriation.

This language, as wide open as a barn door, permits the President, through the Director of the Budget Bureau—whom he appoints—to impound funds voted by Congress instead of spending them on projects he disapproves.

That word "impound," by the way, raises hackles from one end of the Budget Bureau to the other. The preferred phraseology is "creating reserves."

Budget Bureau officials are reluctant to discuss—for publication—how far this technique of "creating reserves" can be pushed. Would it be possible, one was asked by a reporter, for Congress to vote funds for a postoffice, say, and then have actual construction held up by a President who thought the project wasteful?

After a bit of hemming and hawing, the official replied cautiously: "The speed of a project can always be determined by the Chief Executive."

The chief congressional feeling aaginst the item veto stems, of course, from jealousy over the power of the purse. Congress simply doesn't want any executive interference in that area.

And what Congress thought of the item veto in the past can be told quickly. The first such proposal was introduced in 1876. From that day to this only one vote on the subject—and an oblique one, at that—has been taken.

It came in 1883, in a House vote to suspend the rules so that an item-veto bill, locked in the Judiciary Committee, could be brought to the floor for a full House vote. The motion failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote, though 101 voted for it against 58 nays.

Within Congress today there is disagreement whether item-veto power could be granted by simple statute or would require a constitutional amendment. Several bills covering both methods have been filed in the House.

In the Senate there is a joint resolution sponsored by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, and supported by several others, providing for a constitutional amendment. This would require for passage a two-thirds vote by both Houses, and subsequent ratification by three-fourths of the States within 7 years.

Does Senator KEATING's resolution, or any of the House legislation, have a chance for passage? The general feeling here seems to be negative.

Still, with President Eisenhower, like his predecessor, managing to sidestep Congress' will, to some extent, by not spending moneys voted, Capitol Hill may be goaded into action—in self-defense.

Action could be speeded if Mr. Eisenhower extends use of the Budget Bureau technique to check spending by what he calls the "radical spenders" in this Democratic-controlled Congress, in opposition to his own balance-the-budget views.

One congressional device might be to approve a constitutional amendment, but stating in it that the Congress may by law permit the President to exercise item-veto power.

This would be the item veto with a fishhook inserted. The barb would be the provision that congressional approval would still be needed—perhaps item by item.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article appearing in the St. Louis, Mo., Globe-Democrat, October 1, 1957, telling how poor sewage facilities make that area one of 10 most polluted in the United States.

The authority for this statement was Mr. Jack K. Smith, chief of the water-pollution-control section, bureau of public health engineering, Missouri Division of Health. Mr. Smith said sewage-polluted waters cannot be used for irrigation in the area:

POOR SEWAGE FACILITIES MAKE AREA ONE OF 10 MOST POLLUTED IN UNITED STATES

St. Louis and Kansas City are among the 10 most polluted areas in the country because of inadequate sewage-treatment facilities, Jack K. Smith, chief of the water-pollution-control section, bureau of public health engineering, Missouri Division of Health, said here yesterday.

Mr. Smith took part in a panel discussion of river pollution at the annual joint meeting of the Missouri Water and Sewerage Conference and the Missouri section of the American Water Works Association, at Hotel Sheraton-Jefferson.

The State official pointed out that at least 189 communities in Missouri, not counting the St. Louis and Kansas City metropolitan areas, need new sewage-treatment facilities or additions to existing plants. Construction of adequate sewage-disposal facilities is not keeping pace with residential construction, he observed.

PLANTS INADEQUATE

"Three-fourths of the people in the State are served by sanitary sewers," Mr. Smith said. "Of this number, one-third is served by adequate sewage-treatment plants."

Such a situation has a direct effect on health, Mr. Smith stressed, aiding the spread of such diseases as typhoid fever, dysentry and, possible infectious hepatitis.

Mr. Smith also pointed to the bad effects which stream pollution has on fish and other wildlife. Pollution "renders many streams unfit for recreation uses because of odors and unsightliness," he added.

Recent drought conditions which caused low river flows and greater pollution in the Missouri River "affected the water supply for 534,000 persons," Mr. Smith said. Further problems will occur, he warned, "until such time as adequate treatment works have been installed along the river."

STOPS IRRIGATION

Sewage polluted waters cannot be used for irrigation, which is becoming increasingly important to the State's agriculture, he said.

Nevertheless, Missouri is making some progress in correcting this situation, Mr. Smith said. He praised the action taken by many cities and industries along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers to construct or take steps to provide sewage treatment facilities.

A new State law, passed by the last legislature, also will aid the pollution abatement program by providing for "prevention, regulation and penalties for failure to comply," Mr. Smith said.

He predicted that continued progress will be made in the next few years to relieve the stigma placed on the State by a survey which indicated that two of the 10 most polluted areas in the United States existed in Missouri.

Others taking part in the panel discussions were Vance C. Lischer, principal engineer, Horner & Shifrin Consulting Engineers, St. Louis; Thomas F. Maher, chief engineer, hydraulics branch, Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis, and L. C. Burroughs, assistant to vice president, manufacturing, Shell Oil Co., New York.

Allen H. Wymore, principal engineer, Burns and McDonnell Engineering Co., Kansas City, served as panel moderator.

## The Need for an Increase in Social Science Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following preamble to the report of the Social Science Committee, National Science Board, of January 23, 1959, and also an article by Dr. Harry Alpert, dean of the graduate school, University of Oregon, reprinted from American Sociological Review for December, 1958:

PREAMBLE TO THE REPORT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE COMMITTEE, NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

The National Science Board recognizes the importance, as well as the complexity and

difficulty, of research in the social sciences. It is clear that the intellectual, economic, and social strength of our Nation requires a vigorous approach to social problems, with scientific techniques of study making their maximum contribution.

Accordingly, the National Science Board considers it proper and desirable for the National Science Foundation to support basic research in the social sciences, where such research meets the usual scientific criteria of objectivity, verifiability, and generality. Such support is valuable in assisting social scientists to improve their research techniques, to accumulate fundamental knowledge about human behavior and society, and to develop sound theoretical bases for further inquiry. In addition, such foundation support stimulates interchange between natural and social scientists. Finally, a program of basic research support will undergird any serious effort on the part of others to deal with social problems.

---

[From American Sociological Review, December 1958]

CONGRESSMEN, SOCIAL SCIENTISTS, AND ATTITUDES TOWARD FEDERAL SUPPORT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

(By Harry Alpert)

(This article is Dean Alpert's generous response to my suggestion that, after so ably serving the interests of the social sciences for many years in the National Science Foundation, he prepare a "retrospective" paper. Readers of the Review will agree, I am sure, that we are (once more) in Harry Alpert's debt.—The EDITOR.)

The U.S. Senate just 12 years ago voted to exclude from the then pending bill to establish a National Science Foundation the specific provision which created a Division of the Social Sciences. In his report on the crucial Senate debate which preceded this vote, George A. Lundberg concluded that the outcome "should perhaps not be taken as reflecting any considered hostility or opposition on the part of the Senate, but simply as a reflection of the common feeling that the social and the physical sciences have nothing in common and that at best the social sciences are a propagandist, reformist, evangelical sort of cult."[1] At the same time, Lundberg expressed concern about social scientists being their own worst enemies by failing to recognize their proper function as scientists.[2]

Another interpretation of the Senate's action was presented more recently by former President Harry S. Truman. In commenting on the development of the social science program of the National Science Foundation as reported in the Saturday Review last February, Mr. Truman suggested that opposition to social science study on the part of Members of Congress was the result of fear of the implications of the report "To Secure These Rights" which had been prepared by his special Commission on Civil Rights. "The southern Senators," Mr. Truman wrote, "were afraid of equality of education and equality of opportunity as set forth in [this] famous report."[3]

I trust it is not an act of ingratitude, in view of President Truman's strong support of the social sciences, to suggest that there is apparently a telescoping of historical events in this version of the Senate controversy regarding the role of the social sciences in the proposed foundation. "To Secure These Rights" was published late in 1947, the Committee on Civil Rights having held meetings through September of that year. The critical vote in the Senate on Senator HART's amendment to drop the social sciences took place on July 3, 1946, almost 6 months before President Truman established his Civil Rights Committee. Examination of the rollcall on the Hart amendment does not support the view that the voting was regional in character and, obviously, it could not have been influenced by the report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights.

My own analysis of this important vote suggests: (1) the absence of a disciplined party position; (2) the operation of a complex multiplicity of motivations and attitudes; and (3) the effectiveness of the lobbying activities and personal representations of various individual natural scientists and of natural science groups and organizations such as the committee supporting the Bush reports.

Whatever may be the correct interpretation, the events of 12 years ago clearly indicate that the fate of public support of social science research, particularly at the Federal level, is dependent on the fundamental attitudes of key Congressman toward the social sciences, on clarification of the almost inevitable confusion of social science and social issues, and on the active and skillful participation of social scientists in the legislative process. Therefore this report directs attention to some of the more recent attitudes toward science expressed by Members of Congress and to the role of social scientists in effectively presenting to congressional committees the national importance of the positive contributions of social science research and education. An effort is also made to define some of the issues and problems which continue to serve as obstacles to the full acceptance of the social sciences.

An important turning point in congressional expressions toward the social sciences was the vigorous and forthright statement by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency which late in 1955 and again in 1956 and 1957 strongly urged increased support of basic research in the social sciences and, in particular, recommended extension of the National Science Foundation's basic research and fellowship programs into the areas of human social behavior. Senator KEFAUVER wrote to the Director of the Foundation and to all members of the National Science Board, directing their attention to the recommendations of this subcommittee. Also late in 1955, Representative RICHARD BOLLING'S Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report recommended expansion of the National Science Foundation's social science research program so as to include support of research in the area of economic statistics. In both instances, the subcommittees gave sympathetic attention to the expert testimony of distinguished social scientists. Paul F. Lazarsfeld's views were presented to the delinquency committee and Martin Gainsburgh and Rensis Likert were leading witnesses before the economic statistics committee.

When the American Sociological Society passed official resolutions regarding support of the National Science Foundation's social science program, they were brought to the attention of Senator JACOB JAVITS who inserted them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the summer of 1957, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, on returning from a trip to the Near East, made a strong plea for more generous support of the social sciences. Senator HUMPHREY remarked, a full year prior to the outbreak of the current crisis in the Middle East, that:

"My recent experience in the Middle East has impressed upon me more than ever the urgency of getting on in the social sciences. There is immediate and crying need for trained and knowledgeable personnel to deal intelligently and rationally with a variety of social science problems. For example, the question of equitable distribution of agricultural surpluses, the need for better understanding of the obstacles and impediments to reasonable interpersonal and intergovernmental relations in the area, and insight into the mentalities and personalities of the individuals and masses with whom we have to deal. The effectiveness of our various assistance programs depends in large measure upon having reliable information about, and understanding of, the hopes, aspirations, motivations, and expectations of the peoples involved. In so many different ways there was impressed upon me the tremendous benefits which would accrue to us as a Nation from having available a well-trained corps of social-science technicians and experts.

"I deem it essential, therefore, that the National Science Foundation set about with dispatch to broaden its research and fellowship programs in the social science. The needs are considerable."[4]

Senator HUMPHREY noted that his attention had been directed to this problem by Dr. Malcolm Willey of the University of Minnesota.

A month earlier, in similar vein, Senator WAYNE MORSE recommended greater emphasis on the social sciences and reproduced as part of his statement in support of expanded National Science Foundation appropriations the full text of communications he had received from Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., and Luther S. Cressman. Additional arguments for social science support were presented by Senator MORSE later in the summer.[5]

The sense of crisis in American science and education created by the launching of Sputnik I last October affected the social sciences, too. In November, Vice President NIXON initiated discussions with Dr. James G. Miller which led to the formation of a Temporary Group on National Support for Behavioral Science. Mr. NIXON was particularly concerned with maintaining our superiority vis-a-vis the Russians in the social and behavioral sciences. In a discussion during a dinner meeting of the Conference on University Contacts Abroad, Mr. NIXON stated that:

"I think it is essential that we not make the mistake at this time of going overboard in developing or in putting emphasis on scientific and technical training to the exclusion of training in the social sciences and other fields. I say this because the greatest mistake we could make would be to become simply a pale carbon copy of the scientific materialism which the Soviet Union represents in the world today. We have something other to offer than simply leadership in the field of science. We must not be behind in that field, but we also have to train leaders in government, leaders in business, leaders in the social sciences."[6]

The report by Dr. Miller's group, National Support for Behavioral Science, was presented to the President's Scientific Advisory Committee and was endorsed in principle by a number of Senators and Representatives of both parties with whom Dr. Miller discussed it. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY inserted the complete text of the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,[7] and Dr. Miller offered a summary of it in testimony before the Subcommittee on the Independent Offices appropriation bill when it was hear-

---

[1] G. A. Lundberg, "The Senate Ponders Social Science," the Scientific Monthly, 64 (May 1947), p. 399.

[2] Ibid., p. 410.

[3] H. S. Truman, the Saturday Review, 41 (Mar. 1, 1958), p. 40.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 9, 1957, p. 9969.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 3, 1957, pp. 7348–51; June 12, 1957, p. 7966; Aug. 26, 1957, pp. 14564–65.

[6] Higher Education and National Affairs, 6 (Dec. 2, 1957), p. 2.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 23, 1958, pp. 6252 ff.

ing witnesses on the 1959 appropriation for the National Science Foundation. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL expressed interest in the report and requested the director of the National Science Foundation to comment on it.

Senator MORSE perhaps has been the most persistent legislator in urging support for the social sciences. Early this year he reproduced in the RECORD, with appropriate remarks, the complete text of the Saturday Review articles on the social sciences by Harry Alpert and Pendleton Herring and, in May, once again reiterated his strong feelings on the importance of the social sciences.[8]

On the House side, Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, of Oregon, in March 1958, attempted by amendment of the fiscal year 1959 appropriation for the National Science Foundation, to double the amount included for social science research.[9] Although the amendment did not prevail for parliamentary reasons, Mr. PORTER was specifically advised by Representative ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the appropriations subgroup which reviews the National Science Foundation's budgets, that his general purpose was an admirable one. Mr. PORTER has placed in the RECORD an entertaining and instructive essay by Dr. Joseph Clawson on "Social Science—the Unused Weapon," as well as the cogent testimony presented before the Senate appropriations subcommittee by Dr. Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr.[10]

Finally, another facet of the social science problem, namely representation of the social sciences on the National Science Board, was discussed recently by Senator MORSE. Reproducing a letter from Dr. Cottrell to President Eisenhower in which disappointment is expressed over the President's failure to appoint social scientists to the Board, Senator MORSE commented, in part, as follows:

"The National Science Board is a key body in guiding the progress of this Nation in the field of scientific research. I deplore the absence of social science representation and trust that the President will bear this in mind in future nominations. In approaching these nominations I hope that the Senate will convey to all members of the National Science Board its keen interest in the National Science Foundation and its hope that the Board will move forward vigorously in improving the state of what the Saturday Review called the knowledge we need most—increased research and studies that relate to man himself. * * * I shall continue to do everything I can in the Senate to support needed appropriations for the physical sciences. We certainly need to keep ahead of Russia in the development of scientific research in the whole field of natural science, but let me warn the Senate that we also need to keep ahead of Russia in the field of social science. When we look at the educational program of Russia; when we look at the effort Russia is putting forth in the field of social sciences, we realize that in this field, too, we are beginning to lag behind Russia. Therefore, I think it is regrettable that the President has not nominated a social scientist to the Board of the National Science Foundation."[11]

Moreover, a very penetrating and systematic analysis of the serious consequences of the failure to recognize the social sciences in National Science Board nominations was presented toward the end of the last session of Congress by Representative PORTER.[12]

This account of recent congressional expressions of opinion is by no means complete, but is indicative of the growing positive interest in the social sciences. It underscores the importance of active participation of social scientists in the legislative process. Many of the statements and actions mentioned above are the immediate and direct result of personal appearances of social scientists before congressional groups, direct discussions with Congressmen and members of their staffs, letters urging specific types of actions and votes, and communications of appreciation for favorable actions taken. It is axiomatic that legislators need to be informed of their constituents' feelings on particular issues. It is also elementary that they like to feel that their actions are commended and appreciated.

Still, it may be asked: With all this support, why are the social sciences not more advanced in the National Science Foundation and other governmental agencies? The answer lies in the persistence of many of the attitudes and viewpoints identified by Professor Lundberg a score of years ago.

In reviewing the types of objections to social science voiced by scientists, administrators, executives, and Congressmen, I have been able to identify nine major themes or issues which appear with greatest frequency in the various debates and deliberations. The following summary statements of these issues and the accompanying comments are presented with special reference to the National Science Foundation, but they have, I believe, wider implications.

(1) Vagueness: One cannot identify the social sciences or know just where and how far one is going in a social science program, since the social sciences are vague and indefinite. Comment: While the phrase "social science" is used quite loosely in some quarters, it has been found possible to be both specific and concrete in identifying the precise areas of the social sciences which are included in a program of research support. This has been achieved by identifying the program in terms of recognizable and established academic disciplines.

(2) Controversy: The social sciences involve areas of public controversy which might jeopardize an agency's general growth and development. Comment: The social sciences unquestionably involve areas of public controversy, but the experience of the National Science Foundation and other Government agencies has demonstrated clearly that reliance on scientific methods and the scientific integrity of investigators can insure freedom from involvement in controversial areas.

(3) Soft areas: The social sciences include activities which are scarcely identifiable as science and are more concerned with considerations of ethics, welfare, and philosophical interpretations of man's destiny. Comment: The term "social sciences" covers a wide range of activities. These activities may be thought of in terms of a continuum. At one end of the continuum lie the hard-core scientific studies of human social behavior. These include the use of experimental techniques, controlled experiments, laboratory studies, statistical and mathematical methods, survey design techniques, the development of measurement devices and instruments such as standardized tests and scales, the empirical testing of hypotheses and concepts, and other characteristic features of scientific research. At the other end of the continuum lie philosophical, ethical, and political studies and interpretations of human social conduct, including interpretations of social welfare, concern with the amelioration of social conditions and the elimination of social problems, and similar considerations relating to social values and the good life. A social science program within the general framework of scientific objectives can properly be limited to the hard-core scientific end of the continuum.

(4) Debasement of human dignity: Social science provides powerful weapons for hidden persuaders, brainwashers, and other manipulators of human populations and permits them to direct and control human lives. Comment: The social sciences do not differ from the natural sciences in the utilization of scientific knowledge. The scientist provides fundamental knowledge. The objectives toward which that knowledge is directed are beyond his immediate control and are determined by a complex of societal forces. Whether the atom is used for peace or destruction, whether bacteria are mobilized for purposes of health or disease, whether knowledge of human motivations is used to provide happiness or to sell soap, are alternatives which the scientist as seeker of knowledge and truth cannot determine. It should also be noted that one of the best defenses against the manipulators of the human spirit is the understanding of their techniques and weapons which social science provides.

(5) Partisanship: The social sciences are in early stage of development as sciences and hence are characterized by schools, philosophies, and perspectives, each of which has its group of ardent supporters and detractors. It is difficult to avoid dogmatic partisanship for a particular viewpoint. Comment: By careful selection of advisory panel members and research referees who are catholic and broad in their orientation to their respective social science disciplines, discrimination based on narrow partisanship can be avoided. There is ample evidence that the quality of men and of proposals can be identified regardless of one's own commitments to this or that school of thought or approach.

(6) Applied research: The social sciences are applied and practical and therefore have no place in a program dedicated to support of basic research and education. Comment: Like other scientific disciplines, the social sciences have an identifiable basic or fundamental component as well as an applied or developmental orientation. Although the line between basic and applied research is often difficult to draw in many scientific areas, experience over several years has indicated the possibility of a satisfactory operating division of labor between agencies supporting fundamental explorations of the unknown in social science and those whose major responsibilities lie in applied areas such as mental health, delinquency, marketing, social security, and illegitimacy.

(7) Magnitude: The needs of the social sciences are tremendous and consequently a social science program would make heavy and disproportionate demands on an agency dedicated to promoting the advancement of science in all fields. Comment: A major limiting factor in the ability of a scientific field to spend funds expeditiously and fruitfully is the available supply of trained personnel in that field. The manpower differentials between the social sciences and other sciences are such that the social sciences could profitably command only a small percentage of the total funds available for research. In the United States there are approximately 35,000 social scientists in comparison with 250,000 physical and biological scientists, and over 600,000 engineers.

(8) Private resources: Private resources support the social sciences quite adequately; hence, there is no need for a Federal pro-

---

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 4, 1958, pp. 1408–1411; May 1, 1958, pp. 7049–7050.

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 27, 1958, pp. 4993–4995.

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 21, 1958, pp. A3543–A3545; May 12, 1958, pp. A4319–A4321.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 28, 1958, p. 8727.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 19, 1958, pp. 16986–89.

gram in the social sciences. Comment: Analysis of the activities of the major private foundations supporting the social sciences indicates that the programs of these foundations, in large measure, are problem-oriented and training-oriented rather than research-oriented. Moreover, when the Ford Foundation became active a few years ago, some of the other large foundations modified their programs by placing far less emphasis on the behavioral and social sciences. Last year, the Ford Foundation discontinued its behavioral sciences division, thus eliminating a major source of private support of social science. It should also be noted that certain social science and interdisciplinary areas are not normally included in private foundation programs or have been drastically curtailed in recent years.

(9) Separate agency: The Federal Government should support the social sciences, but not through the same agency which supports the natural sciences. Comment: There are numerous advantages, as pointed out by Dr. Vannevar Bush,[13] in the intimate association of the natural sciences and social sciences. There is a unity of scientific method and scientific outlook from which all the sciences benefit. Moreover, the distinction between the natural and social sciences is not clear cut. Considerable areas of overlap exist in such disciplines as geography, anthropology, psychology, statistics, and mathematical social science. Separate agencies would involve unnecessary duplication of effort and complicate the problems of coordination.

Despite these various arguments, the National Science Foundation has a social science research program [14] and overall governmental expenditures for research and development in the social sciences have been steadily increasing in recent years.[15] The sociologist of science will one day marvel at the extent, variety, and depth of the resistances to the application of rational intelligence and scientific method to the understanding of the nature of man's social behavior. And a latter-day Vilfredo Pareto, with some psychiatric sophistication, will delight in recording the derivations and rationalizations which man has invented to keep himself from a better understanding of his own nature and his social environment.

Yet, the exigencies of social living in contemporary society are developing their own momentum and are overcoming the resistances to social science at a rate which would have seemed incredible a short decade ago. But social forces operate only through individuals and it is the individual social scientist who must undertake the professional tasks which will insure reasonable support of the sciences of man. At various universities, when asked what the individual teacher of social science can do to enhance public support and understanding of his discipline, I have invariably replied: Teach as if every student in your class is a potential legislator who will one day have to vote on an appropriation for your discipline.

---

[13] Hearings on science legislation (S. 1297 and related bills), hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., 1st sess., Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1945, p. 200.

[14] See Harry Alpert, "The Social Science Research Program of the National Science Foundation," "American Sociological Review," 22 (October 1957), pp. 582–585; and "The Knowledge We Need Most," "The Saturday Review," 41 (Feb. 1, 1958), pp. 36–38.

[15] I am indebted to Mrs. Bertha W. Rubinstein of the National Science Foundation for making available her unpublished trend analysis of Federal expenditures in the social sciences.

## Who Should Go to College?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the general scientific breakthrough achieved by the Russians has aroused great concern among the American people as to the deficiencies in our own educational system. In our zeal to match these scientific achievements, there is danger that we shall lose respect for the culture and scholarship that represent the best of Western civilization. Mr. Robert U. Redpath, Jr., of South Orange, N.J., has kindly sent me a statement "Who Should Go to College," by the Northern New Jersey Humanist Association. Mr. Redpath stresses the point made by the association that—

The disproportional stress on the student gifted in science is the mark of our growing imbalance—

In education.

It is a disavowal of the liberating principle of Western education, which recognized the inherent worth of each child, each human being as such.

I believe the statement is deserving of examination by the Congress and I include it at this point:

WHO SHOULD GO TO COLLEGE?

(A statement by the Northern New Jersey Humanist Association)

The American people have adopted, in a spirit of almost mystical faith, a new program of higher education with which to master the challenge of the nuclear age. Unusually able scholars in science and mathematics will be systematically identified and assisted. Curriculums will be oriented toward the massive objectives of the military-industrial complex. Forces of the universe now locked in matter and remote in space will fall within the soaring orbit of the human mind. In the long run these positive aspects of the program will multiply our deterrent power in war and our productive resources for peace.

But what, in the long run, will be the effect on the democratic form of life? Only a small number of talents that rise haphazardly above the average level of our school system will be nurtured. The mass of men, with their immeasurable store of unsifted talents, are not called upon. If they are excluded from higher education, what part can they play in the great social and scientific projects of our age? Are they to be only instruments? What will become of their human dignity? For dignity is not a partisan battle cry, it is a state of moral clarity wherein man is free, and prepared in his whole being, to be a constructive factor in the common life.

Certainly America needs to foster genius as an illuminating and organizing power; but it needs even more a multitude of young minds and spirits disciplined in science, the humanities, and the democratic process. The disproportional stress on the student gifted in science is the mark of our growing imbalance. It is a disavowal of the liberating principle of Western education, which recognized the inherent worth of each child, each human being as such.

This insight was the fount of all democratic beliefs. The minds that conceived the Declaration of Independence posed no riddle in the assertion that all men are created equal. If equality does not exist in the practical life as it has evolved, if men differ in intellectual training and in economic status, there is nevertheless a human status, separate and inviolable, where equality should rule with primal force: in freedom of access to the educational facilities of the Nation for the utmost development of everyone's native powers. To withhold this freedom is to profane the individual, almost as a matter of policy, and to weaken the Nation by denying it the multiform creative forces of its people. The inner unity of democratic society, historically always in sensitive balance, cannot survive discrimination in education.

Higher education should not be bent to the needs of technology and the market alone, for if it does not serve a far-reaching public philosophy it will not serve even limited ends. It is for the sake of the moral and ethical decisions that none of us can delegate to another that we ought to be educated. For each must choose whether to write further in the human epic or bring it to a close; to incinerate those who offend us or to seek their redemption, and thereby our own; to degrade men of another race or to revere their humanity.

The Humanist Association offers as an opinion that the minimum requisite for so necessary an estate of life is a college education for all who want it and who qualify by scholastic standards that are not narrowly exclusive. No youth should be left out for lack of means. The GI bill of rights was a beginning; it remains to extend that program to the totality of the Nation.

## The Argument for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who are not fully prepared with certain facts and figures on the newest proposed State in the Union, I want to present some information that may help our people to have a better understanding of Hawaii, its peoples, its aims, its habits, and more important, its united effort and yearning to become one of the great States of the United States of America.

After 46 years as an organized Territory of the United States, Alaska in 1958 became the 49th State and left her older sister, Hawaii, the only remaining incorporated Territory.

Hawaii has proved its qualifications for statehood time and time again since becoming a Territory in 1900. The islands' people revere the American flag and the principles it symbolizes. Their mode of life, the type of local government they support, and the service they give to the Nation are a credit to the colors.

They are much like the people of Main Street, U.S.A. For more than half a century they have lived as Americans, worked as Americans, and fought in wars for America. They have always conducted themselves as first-class citizens.

Modern Hawaii, destined to become Uncle Sam's 50th star, is already the Nation's star performer in the Pacific.

Before going into the details, here are some of the salient points that show Hawaii as one of the country's most modern, progressive, and prosperous areas in 1958:

First. A fast-growing population reached 575,000, plus another 41,000 military personnel.

Second. Business in the Territory approached a volume of $2 billion annually, with sugar, pineapple, and tourism leading the industrial moneymakers.

Third. Fifty-nine banks had a total of $481 million assets, clearings of $3.3 billion.

Fourth. With the expansion of tourist facilities and industry, including a forthcoming Standard Oil refinery and a steel mill, construction was a $200 million island industry.

Fifth. Two hundred thousand employed persons in the Islands were paid $850 million annually in wages and salaries.

Sixth. Per capita personal income rose to $1,821 in 1957, ranking Hawaii 25th with the States.

Seventh. Taxes paid the Federal Government reached a record $166 million, putting Hawaii ahead of 10 States as a taxpayer.

Eighth. A total of 136,000 students attended the Islands' 208 public schools in 1958, and 7,000 were enrolled at the University of Hawaii, highest per population in the Nation.

Ninth. The United States was spending more than $300 million to maintain the strength of this Pacific bastion of defense and America's show window on Asia.

Such are some of the highlights of modern Hawaii, an integral part of the United States since 1898, a proud and loyal community of half a million American citizens asking their full measure of equality under the American flag. Hawaii has repeatedly shown her true red-white-and-blue colors. She was never more fit and ready for the crowning honor or statehood. Hawaii is headed for stardom.

By embracing Hawaii as a State America would advance three bold steps closer to victory in the cold war against communism in the Pacific and Asia.

First. It would demonstrate dramatically that the United States both cherishes and practices the democratic ideal that her citizens stand equal before the law regardless of color and creed. The example of a State of Hawaii would shine in the Pacific for half the world's people to see and to compare with the empty promise of equality held out by communism.

Second. Admission to the Union would bolster Hawaii's role as our defense outpost in the Pacific.

Third. It would make Hawaii a center where the people of the Pacific basin could study and learn our best American traditions.

When the United States granted independence to the Republic of the Philippines, the peoples of Asia understood. Statehood for the strong, loyal body of American citizens of many Pacific races in Hawaii would be an even more striking example for Asia.

It would be a sign to a billion men, women, and children that the Pacific Ocean is no longer a barrier between them and a free way of life. Statehood would confirm their hope that America believes in the full development of local self-government.

In these times, statehood for Hawaii is an ethical rather than a political question.

Old World colonialism has run its course in Asia, leaving its people with a choice—a free way of life, or communism.

Our national policies will be judged in no small measure by the decisions we make in respect to the people of Hawaii.

It is imperative that we continue to demonstrate our belief that all people should have a government of their own choosing.

Hawaii already is a Pacific outpost of the American way of life, a window on our freedoms. The people of Hawaii already have reached a goal still sought by the rest of the world. Nowhere else is there a mosaic of races, national origins, tongues, cultures to compare with this community of Americans.

The Territory is no longer an experiment in democracy. It is proof, tested in war and peace, that people of the East and West can work together for the good of all under the flag of freedom.

Hawaii occupies a key position in the commerce and defense of the Pacific. Her many racial backgrounds give her people a keen and knowing interest in Pacific affairs. A State of Hawaii, fully represented in Washington, would be a voice alert to the problems of national security in the Pacific, with a background of knowledge to furnish ways of meeting the problems.

The people of the Islands have long paid tribute to the American way of life by their persistent demand for statehood. They do not seek independence. They do not ask dominion status. They seek American union.

They ask, with overwhelming voice, to share the privileges and responsibilities of full citizenship with their fellow Americans.

Again, more than 50,000 young men of Hawaii served in the Armed Forces during World War II and the Korean conflict. Hundreds more are volunteering or being drafted today on quotas enforced in the same proportion as in the States. Yet Hawaii's citizens had no voice in the passing of the draft law.

Only the change from territorial status to statehood will properly correct this situation by giving Hawaii full equality in the American system of government, including:

First. The right to full voting representation in both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, with the people of Hawaii selecting these representatives.

Second. The right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States.

Third. The right to choose its own governor, and to carry on functions of government by its own elected officials instead of Federal Adminstrators.

Fourth. The right to the wider latitude of a State in lawmaking by its own legislature.

Fifth. The right to judicial functioning in its courts by local authority rather than by Federal appointees.

Sixth. The right to freedom from overlapping of Federal and local authority.

Seventh. The right to an equal share on a per capita basis in Federal grants for education, health, highways and other public improvements.

Eighth. The right to voice in any proposed amendment of the constitution.

And all of these rights would be irrevocable.

Citizens of all the States enjoy these rights; Hawaii's Americans have earned them too.

Hawaii is an industrious, prosperous, and progressive community—a showcase for democracy.

It is a land of sunshine, scenic beauty, natural grandeur—as Mark Twain said: "The loveliest fleet of islands that lies anchored in any ocean."

It is America's strongest military outpost in the Pacific, a symbol of our Nation's firm intentions.

Hawaii is also a modern American community. It has a streamlined government, a high standard of living, progressive industries, first-rate schools, familiar churches, and up-to-date transportation and communication facilities.

Its citizens live in modern houses, drive new automobiles—some with help of the finance company—belong to Republican and Democratic clubs, and send their children to the University of Hawaii or a favorite mainland college.

Hawaii residents yell themselves hoarse at football games, eat hot dogs, attend church services, watch television. They enjoy Broadway hit plays at Honolulu Community Theater and they take in "thriller" movies at drive-ins; they go to afternoon jazz sessions and attend evening Honolulu Symphony Orchestra concerts; they enjoy exhibits at the Honolulu Academy of Arts and read the funny papers.

They are Americans, through and through.

They are particularly proud that whatever their racial origin, they have learned to live together, work together, play together and study together—that is Americanism too, and the kind that makes the deepest impression on the half of the world's population that faces toward Hawaii. To these peoples, Hawaii is a fascinating laboratory; a place where democracy has been planted and thrives in fertile soil, whose appealing crops are worthy of attention.

This land of economic prosperity and social opportunity deserves a close look from its Pacific neighbors—and from its American neighbors on the mainland.

Hawaii has an area of approximately 6,400 square miles, larger than any of three States—Connecticut, Delaware, or Rhode Island.

The Territorial Department of Health estimates October 30, 1958, put Hawaii's population at 575,711, or a total of 616,711 including military personnel. Hawaii's population was thus larger than the population of any of five States: Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada,

and Alaska. Hawaii has a larger population than existed in any State at the time of admission with the exception of Oklahoma. As a State, Hawaii will fit the pattern of 14 States, with 1 or 2 Representatives in Congress and the usual 2 Senators.

Eighty-five percent of Hawaii's people are citizens of the United States. More important, between 98 and 99 percent of grade and high school students are citizens.

Hawaii's finances are sound. The Territory has substantial resources in lands and industries and has taken care to build a strong economy with them. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the Territory paid a record high of $166,306,000 in Federal taxes, more than any of 10 States, including Alaska.

Hawaii has paid more than $2.3 billion in Federal taxes since becoming a Territory.

At the end of June 1957, total assets of the 59 banks in Hawaii were $481 million. Clearings amounted to $3.3 billion.

Hawaii's 1957 mainland dollar earnings were $856 million. Hawaii spent $833 million.

Per capita personal income rose to $1,821 in 1957, putting Hawaii in 25th place nationally or ahead of 24 States—U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, State Tax Collection in 1958, August 1958.

A notable expansion and diversification of industry is taking place. Among the most dramatic of recent developments was the choice of a site on Barber's Point several miles from Honolulu for a $40-million refinery by Standard Oil Co. of California. Construction was begun in October 1958, for this first oil refinery in Hawaii.

The island's first steel mill, for production of reinforcing bars for the construction industry, was to be completed and in operation early in 1959.

Agriculture has branched out into other fields besides sugar and pineapple, such as macadamia nut production.

Hawaii's homegrown textile industry is setting tropical garment fashions for all the Nation.

Agriculture is the foundation of Hawaii's economy. The Territory leads the world in the technique of sugar production and far outstrips the rest of the world combined in the canning of pineapple products.

Nowhere in the world have scientific methods been applied to agriculture on the scale that prevails in the sugar and pineapple production of Hawaii.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported in 1951. In 1957, Hawaii's 28 independent sugar plantations produced 1,085,000 tons of raw sugar on their 220,000 acres with a crop value of $148 million.

Hawaii's 9 pineapple canneries processed 30,787,000 cases of fruit and juice grown on 77,000 acres of 13 plantations. Total value of the crop was $117 million.

The young coffee industry in 1957 grew 4.404 tons worth nearly $6 million. Beef and dairy products continued their rapid expansion in order to match the demands of a vital, growing population. Fruits, nuts, vegetables, and flower crops contributed nearly $5 million to Hawaii's economy.

Islanders consumed 7½ million dozen eggs and a goodly quantity of chicken to account for $6.5 million in the poultry industry.

Hawaii's superb climate, scenic beauty, and recreational facilities are a major economic asset to the islands.

Tourism ranks as Hawaii's third basic industry, and is determinedly challenging sugar and pineapple in dollar value.

Every year sees new highs in the number of visitors, which reached a record figure of 168,000 in 1957. In dollar volume this has meant a jump from $6 million in 1946 to $77 million in 1957, or an increase of 1,183 percent. The elements that caused this increase point to further expansion. These include the continuing national population migration to the west coast, and the expansion in volume and speed of air transportation. By early 1959, Hawaii will be served regularly by jet liners taking a scant 4½ hours to fly the 2,000 miles from California.

To accommodate the increase in visitors, multimillion-dollar developments like Henry J. Kaiser's Hawaiian Village Hotel and the rapid rise of luxurious apartment-hotels have become common sights.

Several first-class hotels have been built on the neighbor islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai. One notable area is the Kona coast of the island of Hawaii, which, in a smaller way than Waikiki, has grown phenomenally.

A projection by the Hawaii Visitors Bureau indicates the Territory will be hosting 280,000 tourists annually by 1965.

In 1950, 63 delegates were elected throughout the islands to write a constitution for the proposed State of Hawaii. Foes of statehood said that the ILWU's Communist leadership would control a majority of the delegates. But candidates identified as representing the ILWU leadership were defeated.

As the convention met, the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities opened hearings in Honolulu. One convention delegate resigned and another was expelled as a result of testimony, or of refusing to testify, at the hearings.

The State constitution finally drawn contains a provision that "no person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization or association which advocates the overthrow by force of violence of the Government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment."

It is the first State constitution to contain such a provision.

Despite bitter ILWU opposition to this conservative constitution, it was ratified by the people by better than 3 to 1 in a plebiscite. The National Municipal League of New York City said Hawaii "had set a new standard in the writing of a modern State constitution by convention."

Among strong anti-Communist measures, Hawaii's Legislature has enacted:

First. Legislation setting up a subversive activities commission to ferret out security risks.

Second. A series of loyalty acts as stringent as in any State.

To summarize, the Nation needs Hawaii because:

Statehood would be an example before the world of American democracy in action. It would bolster Hawaii's defense role in the Pacific. It would make Hawaii a center where Pacific peoples could study American traditions.

Hawaii is a community of Americans who have proved that East and West can live and work together, in peace and war, under the flag of freedom.

Hawaii has passed every test. Congressional committees, Government departments, military leaders and others have marked her "A" for American. Five major Pacific commands in Hawaii show the Islands' military importance. Statehood will serve notice to the world that the United States intends to stay in the Pacific.

The Nation wants Hawaii because:

National surveys since 1941 show public opinion overwhelmingly in favor of admitting Hawaii into the Union.

The American press is nearly unanimous in its support of Hawaiian statehood.

Nearly two score national organizations are on record in favor of it.

The platforms of both political parties call for immediate statehood.

Twenty separate Congressional hearings have exhaustively investigated Hawaii's fitness for statehood.

The U.S. House of Representatives has passed Hawaiian statehood bills three times, in 1947, 1950, and 1953.

Although reported out favorably by the Senate and House Interior Committees in succeeding sessions of Congress, Hawaii's bills never came to a vote in either chamber. The Hawaii and Alaska measures were combined, then reintroduced separately, and Alaska's bill was finally enacted in the 85th Congress.

Why Hawaii wants statehood:

Hawaii's 575,000 people have fulfilled the obligations of citizenship for more than half a century without enjoying all the privileges.

They pay taxes as residents of the States do and serve on battlefronts equally, but have no voice in either tax or draft legislation. Taxation without representation violates a basic American precept.

Statehood is the expressed will of Hawaii's people. They have elected or reelected 10 ardently prostatehood Delegates to Washington since 1900. In a plebiscite in 1940, 67 percent of those voting said they favored statehood.

In 1949, the people elected 63 delegates to a convention to draft a proposed State constitution. At the next year's elections they ratified the constitution drawn by better than 3 to 1.

In February 1954, 116,000 persons on all the major islands signed a huge petition for statehood addressed to the U.S. Senate.

The case for Hawaii rests. The people of Hawaii have spoken eloquently and

without reservation. They want to belong. Now the American people, through their representatives, must make the all-important decision.

Will Hawaii be admitted as a State in the firmament of the United States of America?

I say "Yes."

## Law in Space: Call for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most pressing of the nonscientific problems raised by the space age is the need for adoption of new rules of law for the settlement of space-age controversies. The urgency of this problem is generally underestimated. Many who recall with nostalgia the centuries required for the flowering of the common law fondly anticipate a similar development of the new space law. I grant that law is shaped and nourished by experience—but I also insist that it is fundamentally based on necessity. The necessity for new laws and concepts in this case is overwhelming. There will be no time for legal craftsmanship and judicial speculation after rival claims are made to the moon or to space itself. Civilization has now reached a point at which a gap between our moral and technological tools could be fatal. The rule of law in the age of space is not a matter of philosophy, but a matter of survival.

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics recently conducted extensive hearings on the subject of legal control of outer space. This committee should be commended for its initiative in centering attention in its hearings on this most significant problem. I had the privilege of appearing as a witness before the committee and in the course of my testimony, I urged the importance of taking immediate steps in the direction of devising a new legal code for the space age.

A recent editorial in the New York Times deals directly with these issues. In view of its pertinence to this important subject, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR LAW IN SPACE

The East Berlin radio, acting perhaps as a mouthpiece for Moscow, has objected to the launching of Discoverer I into orbit, claiming that it is engaged in espionage and has been sent into orbit without prior permission by the countries over whose territory it passes. The issue thus raised is an important one, even though it is obviously not a real one in the present case of a satellite whose signals have been so irregular that it took almost a week to gain evidence that it actually was in orbit. The real issue is posed, of course, by what is now the great likelihood that within a comparatively short time, a few years at most, both the United States and the Soviet Union will be in a position to launch "seeing eye" satellites for surveillance of activities on earth by cameras radioing their observations back to stations on our planet.

What is involved here is the simple fact that man's technological capabilities have outrun the existing system of international law. How far up does a nation's sovereignty extend? What rights, if any, does a nation possess for protection against surveillance by a satellite circling the globe at a speed of thousands of miles an hour? Does a nation possess the right to shoot down—assuming technology is developed for this purpose—a satellite that passes over its tefritory without prior permission?

Thus far a makeshift solution has ruled, inasmuch as the satellite launchings began during the International Geophysical Year and no nation objected to their movement over its territory as part of purely scientific research. But the IGY period originally defined has ended, and the era of military satellites is near at hand. Is it not high time for the United Nations to convene an international conference to consider the knotty legal issues now posed in this area and to work out a system of space law which would avoid international tensions arising over this issue?

## Industrial Education for Foreign Students, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days ahead, the Congress will be considering programs to promote better relations and understanding among nations.

Today, I should like to pay tribute to a fine program, sponsored by private initiative, which is making an important contribution toward this objective.

The project to which I refer is Industrial Education for Foreign Students, Inc. Its originator and director, Mr. A. Roger Hook, deserves particular commendation, as well as do the many other individuals and organizations which have contributed to its development, for their relentless efforts to make the project a success.

Basically, the objectives of the program are:

First. To develop a program to make available opportunities for on-the-job training for foreign students in American industry and business.

Second. To assist, encourage, and cooperate with U.S. business and industry in establishing education and training programs for foreign students within their organizations; and in locating foreign students suitable for enrollment in such programs.

Third. To assist foreign students in U.S. colleges and universities who are interested in obtaining on-the-job education and training in American industry before returning to their native countries.

Overall, these efforts will assist in acquainting students from other lands with the operations of our free enterprise system, as well as better enable American industry to expand in foreign nations by utilizing the services of students trained in this country.

In carrying out these objective, Industrial Education for Foreign Students, Inc., will benefit both industry and students.

By promoting exchange of persons and ideas between ourselves and foreign countries, this program will act as an important supplement to the many Government sponsored efforts in this field.

Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Hook, indicating that an additional step of progress had been achieved; that is, the appointment by the board of directors of an advisory council, a legal council, and a finance committee to help carry out the operations of the program.

I warmly commend these individuals for their willingness and readiness to assume a responsibility in this constructive project.

Believing that this program deserves the consideration of my colleagues as a fine example of private initiative in promoting international cooperation and understanding, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hook's letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION FOR
FOREIGN STUDENTS, INC.
*Janesville, Wis., March 1959.*

DEAR FRIEND: Three years ago a group of business and professional men of this community met together to discuss ways and means of helping foreign students find on-the-job training upon completion of their academic training at United States universities and colleges. During the past 3 years the many problems involved in developing a national organization for this purpose have been under constant study. With the excellent help of a committee of faculty members of the University of Wisconsin Law School, several Federal Government agencies, and many organizations, individuals and business firms, the entire program is gradually unfolding.

In accordance with action taken by the board of directors, the following committees have been appointed:

Advisory Council: F. H. Elwell, Dean Emeritus, School of Commerce, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Clifford A. Randall, attorney, president of Rotary International, Milwaukee, Wis.; John J. Benson, director, Division of Industrial and Port Development, Governor's office, Madison, Wis.; W. A. R. Walker, liaison officer, West Indies students liaison office, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. Lawrence H. Smith, veterans liaison office, Washington, D.C.

Legal Council: Professor Arthur Sporn, Chairman, Law School, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Professor Wm. G. Rice, Law School, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Hiram Nowlan, attorney, Jeffris Mouat law firm, Janesville, Wis.

Finance Committee: G. Earl Best, chairman, secretary, treasurer, Parker Pen Co., Janesville, Wis.; Walter R. Arthur, president, W. R. Arthur and Co., Inc., Janesville, Wis.;

Robert W. Bliss, copublisher and editor, Janesville Daily Gazette, Janesville, Wis.

* * * * *

In response to a letter to Gen. Wilton B. Persons, the assistant to the President, in which our program and method of financing was carefully detailed, we are most happy to have the following reply:

"Your program has interesting possibilities and could serve a valuable function in assisting foreign students in the United States to supplement their regular academic study with practical training."

General Persons further suggested that we keep the State Department informed of the progress of our program.

The White House has thus given us their moral support—the above committees have agreed to serve with us because they believe in the objectives of our corporation. Janesville, Wis., is now truly the focal point for a movement designed to help the many young people from other lands who are interested in learning more about our way of life.

Because of the worldwide publicity the organization has received, universities and colleges throughout the United States, foreign embassies, and some 40,000 foreign students have turned to our corporation, the only one of its kind, for leadership in this tremendously important activity. The opportunity for your cooperation is present, may we look to you for guidance, and for your assistance in carrying forward the work.

Very sincerely yours,

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS, INC.,
A. ROGER HOOK, *Executive Director.*

## The President Is Looking the Wrong Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the entire Nation stands behind President Eisenhower in his determination on the Berlin issue.

However, it appears to me that the President is more concerned with saving dollars than with saving the Nation. In the Berlin situation, in which we are facing a possibility of a May 27 deadline, we are confronted by a vocal threat of war, and Secretary of Defense McElroy says any clash in the area is likely to result in a nuclear war.

Yet it seems the President is allowing the bugaboo of spending to scare him away from preparedness for defense. This Nation, the recognized leader of the free world, has been openly challenged by the Russians. The threat of all-out, global war is far greater than it has been for some time. Yet this Nation seems to be showing no concern, seems not to realize the danger at hand.

This course of action could cost us a heavy defeat psychologically—a defeat which would undercut our position in the world. And there is the possibility of a diplomatic defeat as well. We must begin work immediately to strengthen this country's defenses, and those of our allies as well.

We stand behind the President in his firm position on Berlin. But it seems to me that when faced with a snarling bear, a man should at least have a rifle. He does not have to fire it unless the bear charges, but it is good to have the bear know it is there and can be used if the bear attacks.

Mr. President, in support of my position, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald for Tuesday, March 10, 1959, under the heading "Bankrupt."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKRUPT

The attitude reportedly expressed by President Eisenhower in his meeting with congressional committees last Friday is almost as frightening as the possibility of war over Berlin. Time and again the President is said to have reverted to his theme that the Soviet strategy is to induce the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy. On this basis he resisted all talk of a general mobilization (which no one has advocated in such broad terms), of an increase in the defense budget and even of deferring the manpower cuts in the Armed Forces. It sounded very much as if George Humphrey were determining American policy.

Leaving aside the question of how Mr. Eisenhower can be sure that this is indeed Soviet strategy, is there a real danger that the United States would spend itself into bankruptcy? The sums being mentioned by way of addition to the military budget to overcome the missile gap and provide more limited war preparedness add up to some $2 billion. This amounts to about 5 percent of the new military budget, a little more than 2½ percent of the total national budget and less than one-half of 1 percent of the gross national product. The augmented military budget would still be under 10 percent of the gross national product.

The notion that this or even a substantially larger effort would cause national bankruptcy is, we believe, absurd. The United States made proportionately far greater expenditures during World War II and even during the Korean war without such dire consequences. If the President is concerned about inflationary impact, let him recommend tax increases—but let him not contend that the richest country in the world cannot afford a more complete defense. Ancient Athens did not fall to Sparta because of bankruptcy.

It is unnecessary to quarrel with Mr. Eisenhower's assertion that he knows more about military needs than outsiders. Certainly the appraisal of military requirements should be his forte—even though the list of reservations about the adequacy of the budget furnished to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee by members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff seems highly disturbing. Mr. Eisenhower's wish to avoid an appearance of provocation also is understandable—although the danger seems to us that the administration will lean so far over backward in this respect that it will lose its balance.

But has the President fully considered the psychological impact of the administration's course? If the country is in fact facing a military crisis in Berlin—one in which Secretary McElroy says that big nuclear war is likely in any clash—has the public been conditioned to the seriousness of the situation? Are this country's allies encouraged to be firm when they see no evidence of any special preparation or concern here?

And what about the effect on the Soviet leaders themselves? If, as seems apparent, the Berlin crisis is in part the result of Mr. Khrushchev's confidence in Soviet superiority, what is this country doing to counteract such an impression and equalize its bargaining power? One would think that an administration which had been so tragically wrong about the psychological effect of the first Soviet sputnik would at least question the validity of its assumptions.

Obviously the whole country stands behind the President in his determination on Berlin. It is splendid to see Mr. Eisenhower taking a more active personal role of leadership. But neither of these is enough in the particular challenge the country faces. If the President will not act to improve American military and negotiating posture, congressional leaders will have to assert themselves independently. Much more worrisome than the possibility of bankruptcy is the possibility that a thoroughly solvent United States could pinchpenny itself into psychological, if not actual, defeat.

## There's No Real Recovery Without Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one of the great threats to economic stability is the rapid advancement of automation coupled with the displacement of goods on markets on the importation of produce and production from other countries. Hardly anyone wants to fight automation. Yet this Congress or some future Congress, and I hope in the not too distant future, must take cognizance of the fact that we will have a number of displaced workers in all fields and areas if we let automation come in at too rapid a pace without creating legislative safeguards against long duration unemployment. This fact is becoming more and more apparent every day. Some of our harder working, conscientious labor leaders are taking cognizance of the fact. They're beginning to speak out. Although we are gaining in production, we are losing in employment. I herewith submit the following article which I believe to be one of the best written observations I have seen on this subject in a long time. The observations are those of David J. McDonald, president of the Steelworkers of America. I hope that all of the Members of this Congress will take heed and read the warning signals on the horizon. Drastic and bold action is needed now if we are to regain our economic stability. I submit the following article for the edification and education of those of us who are paying too little attention to these important matters:

THERE'S NO REAL RECOVERY WITHOUT FULL EMPLOYMENT—STEEL OUTPUT RISES BUT JOB GAINS DECLINE

Steel production is likely to reach 90 percent, or more, of capacity this month. This will equal production in early 1957.

But there is no prospect that employment in the industry will go to what it was 2 years ago.

This is the puzzling situation as union and management people and economists keeping close tab on the picture agree that the current recovery has not produced improvement in recession-induced employment that came from two earlier postwar recessions.

A recent study by the Federal Reserve Board points up that employment gains most certainly have dragged behind output (production) gains in the current recovery, but it adds:

"The lag, however, has been greater than in preceding postwar recovery periods and the level attained by unemployment has been higher and somewhat more sluggish in its response to rising activity."

"It's true—there has been a pickup in employment," declared Otis Brubaker, director of research for the United Steelworkers of America, as reports trickled in of an upsurge in Pittsburgh and Chicago, at Buffalo and on the west coast.

WHAT'S THE REASON

He cited Buffalo as an example where, at the time of his comments on the situation, between 17,000 and 18,000 were at work in a major steel industry plant in that city.

"At the low period last year, the figure was 13,000 but 2 years ago, at this time, 19,000 were at work.

"This is still a typical picture," Mr. Brubaker asserted. "The employment figures are not at all proportionate to the increase in operating rates."

As production figures spiraled upward, the USW research expert said there was no indication that this much steel was being used—or how much could be attributed to scare buying.

In surveying the lagging employment picture, Mr. Brubaker declared:

"There is no prospect that employment in the first half will go to what it was 2 years ago."

Newer and more modern facilities for production, and utilization of new techniques in the industry, permitting greater output with less people, were cited as reasons for the employment decline.

New techniques would include the new use of oxygen in both the open hearths and in a relatively new basic oxygen process.

"It's just another way of saying they are getting more productivity per man-hour which means simply less people turning out more tonnage," Mr. Brubaker concluded.

NO EXTENSIVE HIRING

William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in testifying before the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee, said that "since last September, there has been little evidence of any extensive general rehiring of workers other than for seasonal reasons.

"By contrast, in two earlier recoveries, employment stabilized for a number of months after the recession bottomed but once recovery set in, employment increases were not halted until a new peak had been reached," the Martin report disclosed.

Looking ahead, the report said that "if inflationary tendencies can be checked, currently available manpower resources and unused capacity can provide the basis for an extended period of economic growth."

Viewing the current unemployment picture, which saw jobless figures nearing the 5-million mark—highest since 1941—union economists recalled that it was just about a year ago that President David J. McDonald expressed real concern over the state of the national economy in general and for the state of the steel industry in particular.

LOSS IN REAL WEALTH

Mr. McDonald said then that the Nation was suffering a loss in real wealth—goods and services which would have been produced but for the depression.

"Effective action to halt this loss and to eliminate the hardships and sufferings which are the consequences of unemployment in our industry and the economy is overdue," Mr. McDonald declared.

He outlined a nine-point program which would place the Nation on the road to recovery:

1. Federal income tax cut for lower income groups.

2. Eliminate or reduce Federal excise taxes which impede or reduce consumption.

3. Federal raising and extension of unemployment compensation benefits.

4. A broad program of construction and much-needed public works.

5. An expanded Federal housing program.

6. Passage of a Federal school construction bill.

7. Economic aid for distressed areas.

8. Increase the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and expand coverage of the act.

9. Implementation of the Full Employment Act of 1946 by other appropriate Federal fiscal and financial action.

FULL EMPLOYMENT ANSWER

(A résumé of the points above shows that none has come to pass in the real sense intended. Points 1 and 2 are virtually eliminated for budget reasons; there was some temporary relief on Federal extension of unemployment compensation; construction programs were stepped up in some areas; aid for distressed areas was vetoed, but likely will be revived again this year; and there was no real progress on points 5, 6, 8, and 9.)

President McDonald, arguing for full employment as the answer to recession problems of the Nation, said:

"When we spend money to start the wheels of industry moving again, we increase the real wealth and the real strength of the American economy. * * *

"We particularly want to emphasize the need for taking steps now which will provide the immediate purchasing power necessary to enable Americans to buy automobiles, refrigerators, and other consumer durables, and the need for instituting programs which will permanently increase the real wealth of America by providing schools, houses, and public works, while also releasing purchasing power which will end the current depression."

## Or Could They Really?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest in the necessity for a systematic program of national-debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested a further editorial published by the Greenville Piedmont, Greenville, S.C., Tuesday, March 3:

OR COULD THEY REALLY?

Representative JIM WRIGHT, a studious Congressman from Texas, has come up with figures indicating that in the next 28 years interest will be paid equal to the total amount of the present national debt, but Uncle Sam will still owe the whole principal.

That, says Representative WRIGHT, is neither nice nor necessary—in view of which he holds up the bright promise of retiring the national debt over the next 100 years, at an end saving of more than $485 billion.

Mr. WRIGHT would do this simply by paying on the $283 billion principal each year an amount equal to not less than 1 percent of the present debt. By keeping everlastingly at the program, he goes on, year by year both the principal and the interest decrease.

And at the end of a round century the Government is out of the red, and there's plenty of money available for highways, soil projects, water resources and whatever fine things congressmen may have in mind 100 years from now.

Representative WRIGHT's exciting prospectus makes passing mention of the fact that during the last four years the temporary debt ceiling has been extended three times and once raised permanently.

This would have to stop, of course, along with increased spending, more Government services and a lot of the other fiscal business that has been in progress for some time. They are details, however, that could doubtless be worked out.

Or could they?

## Military Aid Folly Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely, thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the March 4 edition of the Cleveland News. It presents a challenge to Congress which appropriates taxpayers' money to the military for the purpose of national defense.

The incompetence of the military should not be clothed in secrecy. Congress will appropriate ample funds for national defense. However, Congress will not, and should not, countenance incompetence. Those responsible for this incompetence should be identified and relieved of their positions of responsibility. Congress owes it to the taxpayers to explore this program of wanton waste and expose the ineptitude of the military who administered it with such utter disregard for the taxpayers' money, and the purposes for which the appropriations were made.

MILITARY AID FOLLY TOO

All of the news accounts and editorials in this newspaper during the last 2 years exposing the expense, the waste and extravagance permeating United States foreign aid have concerned the economic assistance phase of our so-called mutual security program overseas.

We did not get into U.S. military aid abroad—about three-fifths of the total foreign-aid program annually—because the administration and the Pentagon hid that phase of the program behind an impenetrable veil of secrecy which kept even Congress in the dark.

A House foreign aid watchdog subcommitteeae, however, has just lifted that secrecy veil slightly, but enough to disclose that our military aid is pitted with watefulness and a callous disregard for American taxpayers' dollars which the subcommittee said shocked it.

The subcommittee's findings spell even more trouble for President Eisenhower's 1959 request for $3.9 billion in foreign aid spending than was building up before the House group reported its condemnation of what it learned firsthand about our military aid abroad.

This is illustrative of what it found:

One unnamed U.S. ally—presumably in the Far East—was building planes for the personal use of its officers with facilities this country had provided to keep up military equipment.

A foreign motor pool received enough U.S. tires in 1 year to put 44 tires on every truck in these countries.

American materials intended for military construction were used to build apartment houses for foreign civilians.

Poor recordkeeping by natives of another unnamed foreign country who knew little English tabulated receipt of American goods thusly: "For so many cases of 'this side up,'" One U.S. aid installation had a 185-year supply of ammunition. So it went.

One of the worst aspects of this House report is that after the subcommittee held lengthy hearings on military aid abroad, especially in the Far East, the Pentagon put such a tight secrecy lock on the information that the subcommittee was barred from issuing even a censored transcript of the testimony because the Pentagon claimed it would "reflect unfavorably on our foreign aid administrators and on policies of Allied nations."

This is a fine kettle of fish. Congress appropriates money for all types of foreign aid, yet the Pentagon is powerful enough to bar even a censored transcript of the testimony the House subcommittee heard on our overseas military aid.

It's high time Congress told the Pentagon who's boss in foreign aid funds and to investigate military aid spending as vigorously as it has economic aid expenditures abroad. There is altogether too much secrecy hiding the spending of billions of American taxpayers' dollars annually to foreign countries.

## The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT has brought to the attention of the House his proposal concerning the systematic reduction of the national debt.

This proposal was the subject of an editorial in the Beaumont, Tex., Journal, on February 28, 1959, and I would call the attention of the Congress to this article. The Members will note that the writer recognizes, as we all do, the wisdom of all of us paying our debts and reducing the principal and interest at the earliest practicable time and that Congressman WRIGHT's proposal may result in stirring up greater public interest in this problem and in putting the national debt in its proper economic perspective.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD:

TEXAN SUGGESTS SOLUTION TO NATION'S GREAT DEBT PROBLEM

In Texas, where there is room for a man to back off and take a long-range look at anything, it is possible to make a mountain shrink to the size of a mole hill.

That, in a visual sense, is precisely what Texas Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT, Jr., would have Congress do for the mountainous national debt. He suggests pushing it off 100 years into the future and, by simply applying a little downpayment each year, reduce it to nothing.

The Wright gimmick is this: Congress would tell the Treasury Department to set aside each year 1 percent of the present national debt of around $285 billion to pay off the principal of the debt. This annual payment would amount to about $2,850 million a year. This would reduce both principal and interest and completely wipe off the debt 100 years hence.

As it is now, the Government (the public) is paying more than $8 billion a year in interest without making any dent at all in the debt itself. Representative WRIGHT figures that with interest rates rising the Government may soon be paying nearly $10 billion a year in interest. At this rate, the Government will have paid in 29 years the total amount of the debt and still owe every dime of it.

His proposal would be costly, of course. The debt would be retired at the end of 100 years after $495 billion in interest and $283 billion in principal had been paid, or a total of $778 billion.

This staggering sum shrinks in comparison with the cost of no payment at all on the principal. WRIGHT says if this course is taken the interest bill alone for 100 years will be $980 billion, leaving the principal at $283 billion. Together, they would total $1,263 trillion.

All this is based on the assumption that the cost of running the Federal Government will stand still and stay put for 100 years. It has not been doing that in the past. Instead, it has been steadily rising.

It is unlikely, the need for money being what it is, that Congress will give the Wright proposal serious consideration. But the long-range look puts the costly mountain in proper perspective and may result in stirring greater public interest in perhaps the Nation's greatest roadblock to economic stability.

## The Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas Plassman, OFM, Former President of St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mrs. St. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the February 13 issue of the Olean Times-Herald, Olean, N.Y., concerning the death of the Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas Plassman, OFM, who for 29 years was president of St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, N.Y. The St. Bonaventure Alumni Association had planned to request the late Honorable Daniel A. Reed to insert this article in the RECORD. He and Monsignor Plassman had been close friends for many years. I am glad to do this in memory of my very dear friend, Dan Reed:

FORMER BONA PRESIDENT DIES IN OLEAN HOSPITAL

OLEAN, Feb. 13.—Father Tom is dead.

Thousands of alumni of St. Bonaventure University today mourned the Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas Plassmann, OFM, whose death at 10:45 this morning in St. Francis Hospital terminated a 46-year association with the Catholic educational institution. He had been a Franciscan priest nearly 61 years. He would have been 80 years old on March 19.

The internationally-known Franciscan educator was St. Bonaventure's president for 29 years, rector of Christ the King Seminary about 7 years and instructor on the college faculty for 10 years.

He joined the faculty as an instructor in 1910 and became president in 1920.

INFLUENCE CITED

He was away from the campus only 3 years while serving as provincial of Holy Name Province from 1949 to 1952. He returned in the latter year to head Christ the King Seminary.

Father Thomas exerted a deep influence on many generations of collegians and seminarians. His fighting spirit, magnetic personality, and friendly manner inspired students and faculty members alike.

Regarded as one of the Nation's great Catholic educators and scholars, Father Thomas spoke 18 languages and dialects. He understood nine other dialects.

His linguistic ability was acquired in student days. After 5 years in Catholic University, Father Thomas traveled to Egypt, Mesopotamia, Ethiopia, and Arabia in his efforts to trace the roots of Semitic languages.

SUPERVISED CONSTRUCTION

The ability of Father Thomas as an administrator helped him to overcome terrific odds. The college was hit by fire May 5, 1930. Flames destroyed the monastery, seminary, and church.

The fighting spirit of the president saw the disaster as a divine invitation to rebuild on a bigger scale. He collected funds and supervised construction of new dormitories, a chapel, classrooms, laboratories, a dining hall, gymnasium, stadium, library as well as a parish church for the village of Allegany.

He had served the Order of Friars Minor as Superior of the Franciscans on the faculty, as Visitor General to Canada, Mexico, and postwar Germany, as perfect of studies of Holy Name Province. He was responsible for the founding of Siena College at Albany. He served as provincial of Holy Name Province from 1949 to 1952.

BORN IN GERMANY

Born March 19, 1879, in Avenwedde, Germany, the son of a Westphalian woodchopper, the boy who was to become a university president completed elementary studies in his home village.

When he was 15 years old, the future priest crossed the stormy Atlantic to join the Francisan Friars in their U.S. missions. He was assigned to St. Francis Solanus College, now Quincy College, at Quincy, Ill. He had been baptized in Avenwedde as Bernard Plassmann. In 1898, when he entered the Fran-

ciscan Order at Paterson, N.J., he received the religious name, Thomas.

ORDAINED IN 1906

Father Thomas made his simple profession of vows at Paterson, September 15, 1899. Three years later, he made solemn profession while matriculating at Catholic University.

He was ordained priest at Washington, June 9, 1906, by Archbishop Diomede Falconio, then Apostolic Delegate to the United States. He received his Ph. D. in 1907 at Catholic University and his S.T.D. at Apollinaris, Rome, in 1909.

He arrived at St. Bonaventure in the fall of 1910, at the age of 31, fresh from his European and Asiatic studies. He soon was teaching oriental languages, hermeneutics, Exegesis, sacred scripture, dogmatic theology, and patrology. He sang in the choir and played in the band. He served as vicar and guardian of the monastery.

During his teaching years, he completed his thesis "The Signification of Beraka" (the Jewish benediction), highly regarded by philologists. A printer was found in the parish who could set the Hebrew and oriental letters in the work.

PRESIDENT AT 41

At 41 years of age, Father Thomas became president of St. Bonaventure.

One of his famous projects was the Bonaventure Railroad. An old trolley line which served the college had expired. Father Tom bought a leaky old steam locomotive, had it painted brown and white, his school's colors, and operated it between the campus and Olean, hauling carloads of fuel and food.

Once at a railroaders' banquet, the college president bragged to executives of the Pennsylvania & Erie: "My railroad may not be as long as yours, but it certainly is just as wide."

FOUNDED ACTION AWARD

Father Thomas in 1931 founded the Catholic Action Medal awarded each year to an outstanding layman. The first was presented to former Gov. Alfred E. Smith.

In 1946, Father Thomas donned the uniform of an auxiliary chaplain in the U.S. Army and investigated postwar Germany, helping to repatriate German prisoners of war.

Crowning a long list of honors, the Cross Pro Ecclesia et Pontiface was conferred in 1956 on Father Thomas by his holiness, the late Pope Pius XII. The rare papal decoration was presented by the Most Reverend Joseph A. Burke, bishop of Buffalo, during the celebration of Father Thomas' golden jubilee.

Father Thomas held six honorary degrees. He was a former president of the New York State Association of Colleges and Universities and the Catholic Bible Association.

MEMBER OF REGENTS

Father Plassmann was founder of the Franciscan Educational Conference and its president 38 years.

He was president of the Seminary Department, National Catholic Education Association; president of the Association of Colleges and Universities of New York State, head of the Catholic Historical Association and member of the State Regents College Council.

A poet at heart, he loved to write in what spare time he could find. He was the author of spiritual works such as "The Priest's Way to God," "The Seven Words of Mary, From Sunday to Sunday," "The Upper Room," "The Radiant Crown of Glory." He contributed scores of articles to periodicals and to the Catholic encyclopedia.

BUILDING HIS MEMORIAL

He spoke Hebrew, Syriac, Latin, Greek, Ethiopic, German, Spanish and Italian languages as well as a number of biblical and oriental dialects.

He had been president and consultor to the Catholic Biblical Association and was on the editorial board for the Confraternity of the Douay Bible.

The university's new $1 million arts building, Father Thomas Plassmann Hall, was dedicated to Father Thomas October 7, 1958, as a living memorial.

Surviving are a brother, Johannes Plassmann, of Avenwedde bein Gueterloh, Westphalia; and a sister, Sister Maria, a member of the Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, Rechlingshausen.

One of his nephews is the Very Reverend Hugo Plassmann, OFM, procurator of the Franciscan Order, with headquarters in Rome, Italy. Other nephews are Otto, Hans, Hermann, Bernhard, Ernst and Joseph Plassmann, and three nieces, Catherine, Elizabeth and Maria Plassmann. Nephews and nieces are the children of Johannes and Margarita Plassmann, of Westphalia.

## Wage Rates and the General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, inflation is not a condition which springs from nowhere. Its seeds are sown by the Government itself when we overspend our income. Once the seeds propagate and take root, we find many forces at work nurturing the spiraling vine, not the least of which is the demand for higher pay without a corresponding increase in productivity.

Dr. Wilford I. King, the nationally known economist and statistician; former adviser to the U.S. Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Census wrote me a few days ago relative to my personal interest in the workingman, pointing out that his real friends are those who insist on keeping the Federal budget balanced and our currency on a sound basis.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to have reprinted at this point one of Dr. King's recent articles entitled, "Wage Rates and the General Welfare." Dr. King aerates several fallacies concerning proposed actions which are supposed to benefit the wage earner.

WAGE RATES AND THE GENERAL WELFARE

(By Willford I. King)

Aside from inmates of institutions, it would be difficult to find residing in the United States any person whose economic well-being is not affected materially by the currently existing rates of pay for human services. Of the 62,907,000 persons constituting in 1958 our Nation's employed working force, some 46,096,000, or more than 73 percent, are estimated by the Bureau of the Census to have been in that year clerks or wage earners. Their reason for having a vital interest in the wage-rate question is obvious. Usually, each is most intensely interested in his or her own rate of pay, and naturally, as a rule, the higher the rate, the better is the recipient pleased.

However, it does not necessarily follow that, in a given occupation, the highest obtainable rate of pay is the one which benefits most the employees working in that line. Why not? The answer is that, in the case of any type of labor, just as in the case of any other good, the volume thereof which can be sold depends upon its market price. It follows that, if the price is low enough, the total available supply can be marketed. On the other hand, the higher the price asked, the smaller the potential sales volume. In the case of labor, this means the larger is the percentage of unemployment.

So, when a labor union pushes up the wage rates in a given occupation to levels decidely higher than those which would offer employment to all competent workers in the field, the results are, of course, regarded as highly meritorious by those workers who retain their jobs, but, on the other hand, they may be disastrous for those whom they throw out of employment. And, nowadays, when public unemployment insurance to aid the idle is in vogue, the upgrading of the wage casts a heavy burden upon the taxpayers who support the unemployed.

One of the lines of propaganda put out by some of the union leaders responsible for forcing wage rates up above the level permitting full employment of the available working force sets forth the claim that raising wage rates, by increasing the buying power of the recipients, strengthens demand for the products of industry, and thereby generates prosperity.

If this were the actual result of pushing up wage rates, asking for a 5 or 10 percent increase would seem to be the height of folly. Why not call for a 50 or even a 100 percent raise and thereby bring on a first-class boom?

Unfortunately for the proponents of the just-mentioned theory it disregards completely the obvious fact that, in the absence of increased production, every million dollar increase in the income of the wage workers, reduces the incomes of the employing concerns and their stockholders by a million dollars, the result being that aggregate purchasing power is not elevated in the least. The notion that it can be thus increased is, indeed, no more logical than is the idea that it is feasible to lift oneself by one's own bootstraps. However, so strong is the influence of wishful thinking that the obviously fallacious nature of the theory is ignored by great numbers of union members and sympathizers.

Those leading the battle for ever-higher wage rates commonly imply in their propaganda that workers' gains resulting from wage advances, if not derived from enlarged production, come, as a rule, primarily out of the pockets of the over-paid officials and the other bloated plutocrats who are assumed to own most of the stock in the company under consideration.

As a matter of fact, however, the amount of wage advances which could be extracted from these sources, even if they were completely absorbed, is decidedly limited. Thus, the U.S. Statistical Abstract shows that, in 1956 (the last year recorded), in the case of the steel industry, a 24 percent advance in the pay of the wage workers would have absorbed all of the salaries then paid to both officials and clerks employed in that field. On the basis of the United States Steel Corp. reports, it appears that with steel prices rigid, a further advance of around 15 percent in wage rates would have eliminated all possibility of dividend payments by that concern. It follows that, if the steel companies had failed to raise the prices of their products, had cut off all salaries and dividends, and had been able to continue operations on the 1956 scale, they could have raised the pay of their wageworkers only around 39 percent. But U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports show that, in the period between January 1950 and December 1956—a mere 7 years—average hourly earnings in the steel industry ran up 56 percent. Since, obviously, no industry can operate without a managerial and clerical

force, and since the stockholders would vote to elect new officers if the company never paid dividends, it is clear that, under existing conditions, wage advances of the magnitude occurring in industry in recent years must either be largely offset by greater productiveness on the part of the average wage-worker, by advances in the prices of the products sold, or by both.

And the notion that the salaries and dividends paid out by corporations go mostly to plutocrats is far indeed from the truth. Not infrequently, of course, salaries of clerical workers are lower than the earnings of the wageworkers, and such clerical stipends make up a sizable fraction of the total salary bill.

Furthermore, according to Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, two-thirds of all stockholders have incomes under $7,500 per annum—scarcely a plutocratic figure. Of course, many of these are less prosperous than the upper-bracket wageworkers. And, as he puts it, "In addition, some hundred million Americans are indirect share owners through their investments in insurance and pension programs, banks, and other financial institutions which own stock." It goes without saying that a large proportion of these indirect investors in stocks are wageworkers or their dependents.

Indicative of the breadth of stock distribution which may characterize a large company is the case of the United States Steel Corp. as shown in its annual report for 1957. The stock of this company, which, in that year had on the average 271,037 employees, was held in 294,608 accounts, of which 139,668 were owned by women, 103,390 by men, and 51,530 were in joint ownership. No individual share owner held as much as two-tenths of 1 percent of either the common or the preferred stock.

Since, as indicated above, when unions push up wage rates faster than production increases, it is usually impracticable to impose any considerable fraction of the added cost of products upon either the salary recipients or the stockholders, it follows that most of the burden must be borne by the consumers of the products of the industries affected by the wage advance.

But do wage costs play an important or only a minor role in determining the total costs of most industrial products? Apparently, the easiest way to answer this question is to refer to the estimates made by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Its figures indicate that, in 1956, while the proportion of the value added by manufacture represented by the wages of production workers varied from industry to industry, running, for example, from only 20 percent in the chemical and tobacco manufacturing fields to 42 percent in the steel industry and 52 percent in the making of textiles, the average for all manufacturing was 37 percent. And, if one is to gain a clear picture of the overall influence of the wage factor upon the prices of the final products of the manufacturing industry, he must not overlook the fact that wages play an equally important role in the cost of the materials used in making the final products, and also in that of the materials employed in producing those materials—and so on indefinitely. The evidence indicates, indeed, that, in toto, wage costs constitute the major part of the expenses involved in the production of most kinds of consumption goods.

Such being the situation, the conclusion must be that any wage advances unjustified by growth in production or increases in the price level, penalize decidedly not only those workers whom they cause to lose their jobs and the taxpayers who become their supporters, but also impose undue burdens upon the consuming public—an aggregate which includes practically all wage workers and their families and that, therefore, such wage advances are in conflict with the public weal.

## Economic Facts Significant to Agriculture in Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable controversy over food costs and price spreads, and the consumer is many times inclined—without justification—to point an accusing finger at the farmer whenever there is an increase in food costs.

For the purpose of placing this matter of food costs in proper perspective, I am submitting to the RECORD a report prepared by the Maine Extension Service:

STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Recovery from recession is proceeding according to schedule except—and this is a pretty big except—the pickup in employment is lagging pretty badly.

The problem is that factories are rehiring only about 1 in 4 of the numbers laid off. Factory workers dropped 1.7 million while business was dropping. Since improvement set in the number had increased only 465,000 up to December. Most of the increase in production is the result of improved plants, machines, and their use, together with a little increase in hours worked by those who were on a part-time basis.

The figure for the unemployed in the country was 4.7 million recently—a still serious problem.

The crop in factory employment isn't new. The number of factory workers in the country had been decreasing even before the depression. The cut to the 5-day week and the 8-hour day hasn't stopped it.

What has been happening is that our increase in number of workers is in what is called the services—all the way from taxi drivers and store clerks to doctors, lawyers, and so on. They include well over one-half of all workers now. The number engaged in farming, mining, and factory production altogether adds up to well under one-half our employed.

One of the problems that comes with our mounting efficiency is where to find jobs for all the extra workers.

Some talk of the 4-day week, but few want it. It's easier to work than to stay home and mind the baby. And with a 4-day week or a 7-hour day many more would be holding two jobs and destroying the effectiveness of the further shortening of the work week from the job creating standpoint. And how to keep people out of mischief with all that time on their hands?

Seriously, we have the problem ahead of what use to make of the labor that increasing efficiency frees—what use will be of greatest advantage to the people of this country. And then how to get that use made within our free economy system.

To the farmer working over-hours and often plagued by the difficulty of hiring any labor that is at all effective this often seems a nasty sort of joke. From this standpoint the problem won't be solved until farm prices are such that he can pay competitive wages and earn a comparable living while working more or less the same hours as other people.

THE WIDENING SPREAD

This is about price figures—not human figures. When you stop to think about it, it isn't strange that the spread between what the primary producer gets for an article and what the consumer pays at retail keeps getting wider.

That's where our increasing employment—some of it goes—into what is done between the first producer and the consumer. For food, for instance, there is more and more processing. A great part of the food is sold almost ready to eat, now. And packaging has become a fine art. Some food is so wrapped up that it is getting to be a problem to ever get at it to eat it. But it looks pretty.

Then we haul the food around more. Not only does more of it come from far-distant places—sweet corn from Florida, lettuce and potatoes from California, apples from Washington, and so on ad infinitum—but even nearby products we haul farther. The route for Maine lettuce to Maine shore resorts is often via Boston or thereabouts. Even milk is hauled miles and miles in and back again, with processing en route.

A recent official report shows that the costs of all these things combined have increased as fast as the spread between producer and consumer has widened. It isn't a case of exorbitant profits anywhere along the line, usually; it's just piling on more handling and more costs.

FOOD COSTS

It cost what is supposed to be the typical American city family $58 more for food last year than the year before, or would have if they had eaten the same things as they did the year before. Of that $58, farmers got $26; processors, wholesalers, retailers, etc., got $32.

Food costs are supposed to be a little lower this year. If they drop, the farmer will lose his $26, maybe more; the others will keep their $32, or most of it, anyway. At least, that's the way it usually works. The handlers will have increased their costs—and their costs are usually covered by their returns. Th farmers' costs don't get that protection. Here are figures on the cost of that typical family's food supply for a year:

| Year | What the farmer got | What the handler got | What the family paid |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1947 | $467 | $444 | $911 |
| 1948 | 497 | 485 | 982 |
| 1949 | 435 | 493 | 928 |
| 1950 | 432 | 488 | 920 |
| 1951 | 497 | 527 | 1,024 |
| 1952 | 482 | 552 | 1,034 |
| 1953 | 445 | 558 | 1,003 |
| 1954 | 421 | 565 | 986 |
| 1955 | 395 | 574 | 969 |
| 1956 | 390 | 582 | 972 |
| 1957 | 401 | 606 | 1,007 |
| 1958 | 427 | 638 | 1,065 |

There are a lot of morals here if you want to figure them out.

For one thing, the city buyer who is mad at the farmer because of the high cost of food obviously is shooting at the guy who is not to blame. Even at last year's prices, the farmer was selling him his food cheaper than in the old days. And, more than that, drops in farmers' prices do not seem to do the consumer much good. He paid the farmer $55 less last year than in 1952, for instance, but his food bill was $31 more.

If Mr. Consumer feels like shooting anybody he had better aim at the system or his own demands for more services if he makes them. Any individual along the line has a good alibi. He is only getting back cost plus a moderate profit.

THE PRESENT STATE OF U.S. AGRICULTURE

In January the U.S. farm parity ratio reached slightly the lowest point since before World War II. Those big words mean that what the average U.S. farmer could get for the average farm product would buy a little less than in any time in the last nearly 20 years.

The situation is more the result of climbing prices of what the farmer buys than of dropping prices of what he has to sell. The prices he pays have gone up 2 percent on the average in the last year.

He now has to pay $2.98 to get as much of what he needs or wants as he could get for $1 way back in these old 1910–14 years. Two dollars and ninety cents would turn the trick a year ago.

Looking ahead the opinion seems pretty general that average farm prices will work downward this year.

The commodity doing the most to hold them up has been meat. Last fall's pig crop was 17 percent more than the year before. An increase of 13 percent is expected in the spring crop. Increased marketings are expected to lower prices at least moderately.

## Military Prowess Depends on Economic Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is urgently concerned with maintaining both its economic and its defense strength. Weaken one, and we automatically damage the other. If our economy is forced to forever bow to unlimited and unrealistic defense planning, we will no more survive as a Nation than if we sacrifice national security to fiscal parsimony. As a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, intimately involved every day with the ledgerbook details of our defense program, I was highly gratified to see the military aspect of the 1960 fiscal budget presented with clarity and restraint in this morning's Wall Street Journal. The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 10, 1959]

DEFENSE AND DEFICITS

Some people in Congress reportedly fear that the administration is putting its goal of a balanced budget next fiscal year ahead of its defense needs to deal with the Berlin problem.

This would be a very serious matter if it were true. In a war situation it cannot be reasonably argued that the budget should be balanced to the exclusion of other considerations, and Berlin could conceivably become a war situation. But does it follow that the United States now faces the alternatives of a balanced budget with inadequate defense or more deficits to get adequate defense?

In the first place, the United States is militarily prepared as never before in a situation short of war. According to military experts, we have the power to knock out the Soviet Union not once but several times over. President Eisenhower is apparently convinced that at this time we have the stuff to handle any contingencies that may arise out of the Soviet squeeze on Berlin. And Soviet knowledge of this great American retaliatory power, plus our determination to use it if necessary, is one of the best reasons for believing that the Kremlin will not push the Berlin issue over the brink into general war.

To be sure, military planning cannot be based primarily on what we assume to be Soviet intentions, and ours is not. It is always possible that Khrushchev is so bemused with Soviet scientific progress that he is capable of a fatal error of judgment. And that danger is one reason why we have such large and costly defense forces in being.

Moreover, to increase our forces unnecessarily at this time might actually make matters worse. When a nation is dealing with aggressors, it is important to be strong and firm and clear; it is also important, however, to be wary of actions that could be construed as belligerence.

But the question of how much defense is enough is one that can never be easily or dogmatically answered. Suppose it could be demonstrated—which no one has yet done—that the United States should start spending another several billions on the Military Establishment in the light of the Berlin mess. Would that mean that the forthcoming budget would have to be automatically unbalanced?

Spending for the Pentagon, nearly $41 billion in the next budget, is the biggest single Government expense, and has been for several years. But the cost of defense is not what has mainly brought total Federal spending to such towering heights in those years; the rise in Federal spending for civil benefits, including a lot of dubious and wasteful spending, has been much greater. So if Congress really believes more is needed for defense, the right way to get it is not by red ink but by curtailing these nonessential activities.

Why is it so important to balance the budget, at a time when we are faced with this danger from Russia? Part of the answer is that we are almost certainly going to face such periodic Kremlin-created crises for many years to come. If we go deep into deficits every time one comes up, we will seriously undermine the economic strength on which our military prowess depends.

The President is said to believe the Soviets may be trying to get the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy. It is not a new thought, but it is an eminently sensible suspicion. And it could happen, unless we finally decide, after nearly 30 years of damaging and almost constant deficits, to restore discipline to the management of our affairs. That is exactly what Mr. Eisenhower is trying to do.

So we think that those who criticize the administration for sticking to its budget proposals despite the times are posing unreal alternatives. The real alternatives are not a deficit in the budget or else a deficit in defense; the alternatives are irresponsibility or responsibility.

## Comments on the Extension of the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, February 8, 1959, "The Draft Is Outmoded":

THE DRAFT IS OUTMODED

If the Armed Forces are to have the newest and best weapons that science and industry can provide, they should have men who are fully qualified to use them. Therein lies a manpower problem. A vastly improved National Defense Establishment could be had if a way were found to solve this manpower problem, the crux of which is the draft. The draft simply is not supplying the type of recruits that are needed, nor is it fair to the youth of the land.

As matters stand right now, military conscription is necessary until some better substitute can be devised. The draft inspires many to volunteer so that they can pick their own branch of service as well as the time they want to begin serving. If there were no draft, there would be insufficient volunteers. This is proved by the fact that during 1948–49 the armed services tried to maintain a combined force of less than 2 million men without draft quotas, and failed miserably.

There is little chance to devise a substitute for the draft between now and June 30, when the law will expire unless extended. It seems certain to be extended. The House voted last Thursday, 381 to 20, to extend it for 4 years.

Why would it not be wise to extend the bill just for 2 years, and during that time have a joint congressional committee, or a civilian-military committee, study the manpower problem seriously in an effort to reach a solution?

A good long look at the draft and how it has been functioning is badly needed. The Army is the only service using the draft. In recent months it has called about 8,000 men per month; less than 7,000 are inducted for the 2-year period of duty. About 90,000 sign up annually for a 6-month period of service followed by 5 years in the Reserve or the National Guard. Thousands of others volunteer for duty in the Air Force, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard, which do not depend on draftees.

Some 1,200,000 youths come of military age every year. According to the Pentagon, some 660,000 persons enter the services, only 180,000 being inductees. Thus the chances are excellent the vast majority of the class that attains military age every year will not see service. That is not fair to those who are drafted or who volunteer.

Reference is sometimes made to the military pay increase bill which was passed last year by Congress after it had somewhat watered down the Cordiner report which stressed the need for better pay to keep the best men in the service. The matter of higher pay begs the question for those who enter in the lowest ranks. And even the higher pay now permitted is not sufficient to retain many of the very best and most badly needed men.

Surely a group of men such as those who turned in the Rockefeller and Johnson committee reports should be able to find a better solution to the manpower problem. The draft, as it stands now, is badly outmoded in this era of atomic-powered submarines, radar, ballistic missiles and space satellites. A thoughtful study to devise a space-age substitute is needed.

On March 3, 1959, I appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to testify on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. A statement of my views on the subject follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This act had a difficult birth and its life has been a strange one. If anyone doubt it let him ponder over its title. It is probably neither universal, military, nor training. It is theoretically a draft act, as it is popularly called.

I would like to review the legislative birth of this act from the time it received its undescriptive title if I had the time. Instead I will refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House during various debates upon it. The first, April 3, 1951, pages 3220–3222 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; April 12, 1951, pages 3786–3787; February 29, 1952, pages 1674–1678; May 17, 1955, pages 6497–6498, and stress the highlights.

Before doing this I would like to refer to the testimony I gave before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which reported out its version of the National Defense Education Act of the last Congress, an act which also does not live up to its title.

I quote: "Before Congress undertakes to extend the Federal Government's authority in the field of education it is essential that it thoroughly appraise the Federal Government's present role in this important area to determine whether its role is proper and conducive to the growth and stability of the educational system. Regrettably, this appraisal has not been made to any great extent to date. I am convinced that the greatest damage that is occurring in our educational system today stems from the role of the Federal Government during the past 8 years.

"Under the guise of a peacetime draft law the Military Establishment has effectively disrupted for the past 8 years the education and training of every youth in America. Even those who have not been drafted have had their plans disrupted by uncertainty. Those who have been drafted include potential teachers, engineers, scientists, and indeed any potential professional man or technician who have had 2 to 3 years taken out of the most crucial periods of their education. Their time has been devoted to largely sitting on their hands in a military uniform. If the military utilizes the peacetime draft system for its intended purpose, i.e., acquiring the personnel needed to carry out its functions, it would be an entirely different matter. Unfortunately, the peacetime draft law is being used to carry out the specious, impractical, and rejected philosophy that 'every American boy should have military training.' I say rejected philosophy because the Congress rejected the Military Establishment's request for universal military training. It was rejected, in part, because the military could never define by curriculum or even in general terms what constituted military training. During the debates on the various bills, members of this Committee on Education and Labor raised the point that if the bill really was to be a training bill it should be referred to the Committee on Education rather than to the Committee on Armed Services. Members of your committee warned, and I joined in that warning, that UMT would badly damage our educational system. I charge that the peacetime draft has been perverted in its use to a quasi-universal training program and indeed it has badly damaged our educational system and is continuing to do so.

"The first step that should be taken by this committee is to examine into this charge to see if it is substantiated. If it is, then it should recommend to the Congress what steps must be taken to require the Military Establishment to carry out the intention of the peacetime draft law and not subvert it. Such positive action should bring positive results, to wit: (1) We would improve our educational system, particularly in the area of scientists and technicians; (2) we would improve our defense strength because we would be getting our men trained in military science back to the jobs they are trained for and away from education for which they are not trained; (3) we would save billions of dollars that are presently being wasted on inadequate training and usage of personnel.

"In the 1920's and 1930 the American Legion sponsored a universal military training bill that was based upon an extension of the high school ROTC program. It had proved quite effective in training men for wars like World War I and to some degree World War II. The basis of this plan was the proper utilization of the educational facilities already existing in the society, rather than an attempted duplication of these facilities in the military.

"The need in modern warfare for technical skills, as opposed to close order military drill skills indicates that we should be utilizing the educational facilities that exist in the society in the field of vocational education, instead of having the Military Establishment duplicate them at the cost of billions of dollars.

"We achieve at least three things by following a program based upon utilization of the educational plant already in existence, to wit: (1) We get better trained technicians; (2) we get these technicians at one-tenth the cost; (3) we work with rather than foul up the civilian educational system.

"Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory. It is a matter that was proved conclusively in World War II by the Seabee personnel procurement system. To illustrate, the Seabees needed bulldozer operators. They did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks boot training camp experience and send them for a few months to a bulldozer operating school set up by the Navy. Instead they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to the experienced bulldozer operators in the civilian society and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they really knew how to operate a bulldozer. The accomplishment of the Seabees in World War II is fabulous and resulted essentially from this personnel system.

"The Seabee formula was abandoned when the war was over. The Navy now operates a bulldozer operators school and takes young men, whether they want to be bulldozer operators or not and sends them to this school for a few months. The results are obvious: (1) You don't have a very good bulldozer operator; (2) after the enlistment period is up the man involved may or may not take a civilian job operating a bulldozer * * * likely not * * * so the skill is lost * * * (the Reserve program has not been carried out successfully to retain these skills); (3) the cost to the Navy of running the school is considerable; (4) the talents of the naval personnel who run the school are taken away from the fields where they could be efficiently utilized."

Unfortunately the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor did not make the studies I recommended. No committee in the Congress or executive agency to my knowledge has made such studies. Yet the truth of my basic observations is borne out by our common experiences and requires some pretty strong evidence to rebut.

The reason I am before this committee in the Senate is because the House Armed Services Committee made no study into these important charges. In hearings covering a period of 4 days and lasting only 7 hours and 13 minutes according to the committee's own records the extension of this draft act was passed out unanimously by the committee. An examination of the hearings demonstrates that it received the most cursory type of study. Not one educator testified. Not one person in the field of technical training testified. The testimony was exclusively that of representatives of the armed services and various church and other groups who were concerned with the spiritual aspects of the draft law.

I am concerned with the efficacy of the draft law in providing the type of defense this country needs. Not so strangely the most efficacious measure to provide the strongest defense happen to be the least costly. A fat man never could fight with efficiency and a fat Military Establishment can't fight any better.

The speeches I referred to in my opening remarks give sufficient detail to follow up the points I shall now state. If this committee undertakes to make a real study of these points I should be happy to supply to your committee staff the many reference books and other materials I have accumulated on this subject, hoping that some day some committee or even executive commission would undertake this important study.

The points:

1. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a draftee. Enlistees are obtained by making the military service as attractive as possible.

2. Draft laws are necessary if there are insufficient volunteers. Yet relying on the draft law to meet personnel needs tends to weaken the efforts to attract volunteers. It is like getting used to relying on a crutch.

Therefore, drafting as a basis for getting personnel should be abandoned just as soon as possible. Indeed, it should be abandoned on a trial basis—just as a crutch should be abandoned—to see if a system of attracting volunteers will not work. And to test different methods of attracting volunteers.

3. To defend our way of life without having the very defense we set up destroy our way of life we must rely on a small standing military force backed by Ready Reserves:

(a) To make a Reserve system work the regular Military Establishment must try to make it work. One good test of whether they have tried to make it work is whether they are in a position to testify in detail as to why it does not work. The testimony of the leaders of our Military Establishment over a period of years on the inadequacies of the Reserve and National Guard systems demonstrate beyond much doubt to one who looks a little beneath the surface that they have not tried to make either system work.

4. Modern warfare (even the World War II variety) requires 90 percent noncombatant skills and of these noncombatant skills an increasing proportion are technical skills:

(a) Most of these skills have their civilian counterparts and these civilian type skills are readily adaptable to their military counterparts.

(b) The civilian educational system, including the vocational, trade, industry, etc., schools, has the specialists in the field of education and training.

(c) The leaders of the Military Establishment are specialists in the field of military science. Military science is a different field from education and training.

Therefore, the 90-percent noncombatant skills needed by the Military Establishment should be taught through the civilian educational system. The 10-percent combatant skills should be taught by the Military Establishment.

Corollary: The 10 percent needed for combatant duties could undoubtedly be procured through volunteer enlistment, particularly if the bright uniforms, medals, honors and veterans' benefits were reserved for this group.

Corollary: The 90-percent noncombatant skills could be procured through voluntary enlistment inasmuch as the men would be moved by the greatest incentive there is to be employed in skills they know and like.

5. A–1 physical specimens are not needed for noncombatant skills. A one-legged man can be a stock clerk. A midget an airplane mechanic. Only one thing seems to serve as a check on utilization of personnel with physical limitations: the cost of veterans' benefits. But if veterans' benefits are reserved for combatants this problem is eliminated.

6. Military law and discipline is required for combat and those who might be in combat. It is not the best or most efficacious

system for utilizing noncombatant skills.

The Code of Military Justice of World War II evolved from centuries of battle experience was found to be inadequate when applied to the 90-percent noncombatant personnel. Without appreciating the fact that the error lay in trying to apply a system of discipline and law in an area where it was inappropriate we junked this time-tested code for a watered-down code which is no longer effective for combatant activity and doesn't do very well in the noncombatant area.

We should take a new look at the code for military justice. Set it up for combatant activities and combatants and withdraw it from noncombatant activities.

In other words, there is no sense in putting a military uniform on a Pentagon clerk. In fact, we cut down on the ability to recruit good clerks by subjecting them to military law.

7. A thorough job analysis of the technical skills needed by the Military Establishment should be done. At the same time an inventory of the civilian counterpart skills should be taken. Match the two groups to determine what may be lacking and set up an incentive system to encourage the training and the enlistment for training through the civilian educational system in those areas where there are skill shortages. Have a reserve system set up geared to receive these skills to keep them from becoming rusty and to keep them up to date with the needs of the military. Have a stepped-up civilian-type law during war or emergency to deal with absenteeism and malingering and I believe we will have a strong defense system.

Gentlemen, these are the points that have not been studied. I am satisfied a study of them would give a sensible answer to what some have looked upon as insoluble problems of how we are to have defense in modern warfare and sustain its cost, how we are to preserve and strengthen the educational system that will continue our advance in science and technology and yet have the manpower necessary to man the defenses, how to defend our way of life without destroying it, or setting it aside for the nonce saying we will reset it up after the emergency.

This committee has several months to study this serious matter. I pray that you take the time to make this study.

## The Antitrust Law and Relations With Foreign Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the address delivered by the Honorable Loftus E. Becker, Legal Adviser, Department of State, before the antitrust law section, New York State Bar Association, at the University Club in New York City on January 29 1959.

The subject is most important. It deserves the attention of the Congress.

The text of Mr. Becker's address follows:

The topic that we shall be discussing at this time is "The Antitrust Law and Relations With Foreign Nations."

If I may begin upon a personal note, there seems to be a direct connection in my own life between antitrust and foreign relations. When, in the spring of 1951, I was called down to Washington to work for Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who was then the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, I was actively engaged for the defense in the Investment Bankers case. And, in the spring of 1957, when Secretary Dulles called me to my present assignment, I was in the Federal courthouse down on Foley Square attending a pretrial conference before Judge Dawson in an action brought under section 7 of the Clayton Act, where, mirable dictu, we represented the plaintiff.

Our topic today is timely and appropriate, because the cold war on the economic front is being intensified beyond anything that we have experienced before. The entire Sino-Soviet bloc is engaged upon a foreign trade offensive of unprecedented magnitude and it is actively seeking to extend its operations, not only in Europe, the Near and Middle East, the Far East, and Africa, but also to our very doorstep in Central and South America. You may be well assured that the force and impact of that trade offensive will not in the slightest degree be blunted by any antitrust concepts or practices. Sino-Soviet bloc economic penetration has behind it the full, monopolistic resources of the countries of that bloc. And with due regard to the value of our own antitrust concepts—which, after all, are directly related to the right of freemen to trade and act without artificial restraints—we should not underestimate the seriousness of the international economic struggle that lies ahead of us.

It is fitting, therefore, that you, who are engaged in the legal aspects of antitrust, both in and out of Government, and we in the Department of State, who are concerned with foreign relations, engage upon a discussion of how, and to what extent, antitrust concepts and foreign relations considerations conflict and must be reconciled. We should also consider how, and where in our Government, that reconciliation may be had.

The subject is a big one, and in any talk such as this, it is possible at most to touch upon certain highlights.

I shall not attempt to discuss here either the history or the merits of the great and continuing debate on the question of whether the so-called "extraterritorial" application of the antitrust laws, as permitted by the many court decisions distinguishing the Banana case[1] constitutes a violation of the principles of international law and an infringement of the sovereignty of friendly states.[2] That, alone, could be the topic of several talks of this character.

It is sufficient for our present purposes to recognize that whatever be the correct answer to that question, there are a number of friendly foreign governments, foreign officials, and even foreign courts, which believe strongly—or even passionately, I may say—that it is such a violation and infringement. Once that much be conceded, as it must be, in my opinion, we have a foreign relations problem of interest to, and within the competence of, the Department of State.

I would like to emphasis that this is only one of a great number of situations in which my Department cannot afford the luxury of securing a definitive decision on the merits of a particular controversy. We are under obligation to continue dealing with foreign governments whether or not we agree rationally or legally with the arguments presented by their representatives. And there are definite limits to the extent to which we can impose our will upon them. The practice of diplomacy is more often accommodation than decision.

It is by no means difficult to understand why this particular foreign relations problem exists. What Congress in the Sherman Act referred to as "trade or commerce * * * with foreign nations" very often appears to the particular foreign nation concerned, to be the trade or commerce of England, or The Netherlands, or Switzerland with the United States, over which that nation, too, has a co-equal right of control. Even more difficult is the case where the activities complained of by the Department of Justice consist of arrangements, legal under the local law, made and carried through by nationals of the foreign country in question, whether or not they have individual or corporate collaborators who are citizens of the United States. Not only foreign business men, but also their governments, tend to regard the legality of such arrangements as a matter for determination under the standards of their national law, whether or not such arrangements may have some degree of effect upon the foreign commerce of the United States.

In some instances a foreign government has a more or less direct interest in an enterprise charged with an antitrust violation. In others, papers are demanded which relate to what the foreign government deems to be its national interests. In still others, the foreign government believes that it and its nationals are entitled to some sort of an international "right of privacy."

In foreign eyes, moreover, both the Department of Justice and the courts of the United States are unduly sophisticated in tracing cause and effect, in assuming that business men intend the "natural consequences of their acts" in the context of highly complex business arrangements, and in treating all foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations as U.S. citizens, bound to conform to our standards of economic behavior.

From where we sit in the State Department, it is not sufficient to say that this irritation on the part of foreign nations stems only from the fact that their standards with respect to restraints upon competition differ from our own. True—that is frequently the case and it serves to intensify the degree of difference between us, but even nations having statutes or standards at least comparable to those of the United States, such as Canada, from time to time express a strong dissent from particular applications of our antitrust laws. The difference is as much psychological or emotional, as legal, and it can be compared with the heat of the debate as to whether the United States or the receiving state should have criminal jurisdiction over U.S. servicemen stationed abroad.

When we deal with antitrust matters beyond our borders, we are not only raising the technical legal issue of jurisdiction, but we must also, in most instances at least, face up to the issue of sovereignty.

That, I can assure you, is an issue which is capable of generating strong emotions in international relations, entirely aside from objective standards of international law. This is particularly true with respect to those underdeveloped countries which are just now gaining their independence and it is in and with those very same countries that we are encouraging private U.S. investment and trade.

Considerations such as these, moreover, explain why it is not sufficient to explain to foreign governments or officials, with citation of U.S. court decisions, that the United States has an absolute legal right to punish anyone for taking action anywhere, which has a substantial effect upon the foreign trade or commerce of the United States. Even though it be assumed that this is true,

Footnotes at end of speech.

it is too often a truth which, like the defense of truth in criminal libel, only serves to aggravate the offense.

If I may assume that we have by now established an area of potential friction in the foreign relations of the United States, I would like to discuss with you two related questions. First, what has been and is being done to deal with this foreign relations problem? Second, can our techniques in this area be improved?

As respects my first question, I shall, of course, have to proceed by way of example. Those of you who are interested in a much more complete review of the precedents and some excellent bibliographies will find them in Professor Brewster's study entitled "Foreign Commerce and the Antitrust Laws," which was published earlier this year.

Generally speaking, the President is the exclusive channel of communication between this Government and foreign nations. The Secretary and the Department of State operate under his direction in this regard, pursuant to a statute, enacted originally in 1789, which, in generality, compares favorably with the antitrust laws themselves.[3]

In a number of instances, the Department of States has acted as sort of post office in order to transmit the view of foreign governments directly to the court. In some of these instances, these communications have been delivered to the court without any expression of views on the part of the Department of State.

One example is the protest of The Netherlands Government with respect to the decree proposed by the Attorney General in the General Electric Lamp case,[4] which was transmitted by the Department of State for delivery both to the court and to the Attorney General. The requested delivery was made without comment.[5] Another similar instance was a statement from Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden delivered through the Department of State to the grand jury investigating the alleged cartel of the major international oil companies in 1952.[6]

In still other instances the foreign government has communicated directly with the court as did the French Government in a case involving the legality of the activities of a potash syndicate as to which sovereign immunity was claimed.[7] In that case there was also submitted to the court a letter from the Secretary of State to the Attorney General expressing the view of the Department that agencies of foreign governments engaged in ordinary commercial transactions in the United States enjoy no privileges or immunities not appertaining to other foreign corporations, agencies, or individuals doing business here.

As a matter of protocol and foreign relations, it would appear to be the better practice to have all such communications transmitted via the Department of State. But passing that relatively minor question, it would appear that this practice has merit where purely legal issues are involved, in that it gives assurance to foreign government concerned that its views have been considered by the decision-making tribunal.

As far as the domestic laws of the particular foreign government are concerned, the practice also permits the United States court to receive what would appear to be an authoritative interpretation of those laws. Moreover, if the issue raised is the legality of proposed action under the principles of international law, it is one that the court is well competent to decide because it is firmly established in the precedents that U.S. courts recognize and apply the principles of the law of nations.[8]

But this practice has, at best, a very limited application. What should be done in a particular case as a matter of foreign policy and foreign relations of the United States of America goes far beyond technical issues of international law. Indeed, there is a line of decisions in which the U.S. courts have recognized their lack of competence to pass upon issues of foreign policy, which they leave to exclusive determination by the political departments of the Government. As pointed out in *Chicago and Southern Airlines* v. *Waterman Steamship Corporation*, 333 U.S. 103 (1948):

"The President, both as Commander in Chief and as the Nation's organ for foreign affairs, has available intelligence services whose reports are not and ought not to be published to the world. It would be intolerable that courts, without the relevant information, should review and perhaps nullify actions of the Executive taken on information properly held secret. Nor can courts sit in camera in order to be taken into executive confidences. But even if courts could require full disclosure, the very nature of executive decisions as to foreign policy is political, not judicial. Such decisions are wholly confided by our Constitution to the political departments of the Government, Executive and Legislative. They are delicate, complex, and involve large elements of prophecy. They are and should be undertaken only by those directly responsible to the people whose welfare they advance or imperil. They are decisions of a kind for which the judiciary has neither aptitude, facilities nor responsibility and have long been held to belong in the domain of political power not subject to judicial intrusion or inquiry. *Coleman* v. *Miller*, 307 U.S. 433, 454; *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation*, 299 U.S. 304, 319–321; *Oetjen* v. *Central Leather Co.*, 246 U.S. 297, 302."

A practical consideration leads to the same conclusion. Trial or discussion in open court of issues of the foreign policy of the United States with regard to one or more foreign countries would exacerbate, rather than solve, our foreign relations problems.

One variant of the practice of raising the issue of foreign policy directly before the court is illustrated by what was done in connection with the entry of the consent decree in the recently concluded United Fruit Company case.[9] At the time that that case was submitted to the court for signature, I was present in court as a representative of the Department of State. I was prepared to say, if asked, that the terms and conditions of that consent decree were not inimical to the foreign policy and the foreign relations of the United States. I wish to emphasize that, in so doing, I was not appearing as the legal representative of the Department. I was there, instead, to express the views of the policymaking bureaus which had made that determination.

In my view, this practice, too, has an extremely limited application. It can be availed of only where the Department of Justice and the Department of State are in full accord. It would be highly inappropriate to have the two Departments engage in a debate in open court on foreign policy and foreign relations issues, for the reasons that I have already indicated.

Since, therefore, the related issues of foreign policy and foreign relations can only occasionally, and in an extremely limited way, be presented directly to the court, we shall have to find our solution to these questions within the executive branch.

First, of course, it is essential that there be, at all times, a close liaison between the Department of State and the Department of Justice with respect to proposed action having foreign policy and foreign relations implications. It must cover the entire range of antitrust administration and enforcement, because we may, and do, experience foreign relations repercussions from the institution of an investigation, from the issuance of a Grand Jury subpena, from an informal request for documents, and from the terms proposed for a consent decree, as well as from the terms of a litigated judgment, to name only a few examples.

I can assure you that such close liaison does exist and that it has been my experience that the Department of Justice has been meticulous in consulting the Department of State upon such matters. It is entirely possible that mistakes have been made, but if they have, the Department of State must share the responsibility.

But liaison is not enough. We within the executive branch should be more alive than we have been in the past to the imponderables involved in international trade and commerce. Where, for example, entry into a cartel or some other price-fixing arrangement is expressly required by the law of a particular foreign country, there is a relatively solid issue for resolution. Even the United States courts, although they have extended the application of our antitrust laws overseas to a degree deemed offensive by many foreigners, have generally in their decrees not required a defendant to take action which is illegal under the law of the foreign country concerned. In one instance, of course—ICI [10]—the views of a United States court and of an English court differed upon this point, but ICI, so far as I am aware, is an isolated instance in the reported cases.

Far more frequently the compulsion to make arrangements or take action subject to objection under our antitrust laws is much more subtle. It consists more in the local climate of doing business, which is regarded benevolently, if not actively ecouraged, by the foreign government or governments involved, even though there is no affirmative requirement of law.

Now as you are aware, there are those who advocate strongly that this Government should meet this problem squarely by negotiating and ratifying an international treaty or convention against restraints of trade and monopolistic practices. Their views were ably stated by a dissenting minority of the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws.[11]

I, personally, do not share their views. I believe that an effort to reach agreement upon such an overall basis in the present climate of national laws and international relations would be counter-productive.

Although there are a number of countries whose views respecting private restraints upon competition differ substantially from our own, there are, as you know, a number of antitrust laws in various foreign countries and, now, analogous provisions are being included in the charter of such supra national organizations as the Common Market and the Coal and Steel Community.[12] While it is true that the administsration and application of these foreign antitrust laws differ substantially from our own, they mark a healthy beginning.

We, too, have a number of bilateral treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation having anticartel provisions,[13] and various economic cooperation agreements with participating countries also contain express anticartel clauses.[14]

I believe that we would be wise to continue and to extend this ad hoc approach.

One possible extension that comes to mind is for the Department of State to play a more active role than it has in the past in attempting to resolve problems or potential problems in the foreign policy and foreign relations field arising in the administration of our antitrust laws. While this has not always been the case heretofore, the Department's activity in particular cases has consisted mainly of advising with the Department of Justice as to the implications overseas of a particular action. I believe that the Department of State could do more in the way of affirmative consultation with the foreign governments concerned, with the view of

Footnotes at end of speech.

obtaining agreement that specific practices or arrangements are, or are not, contrary to our mutual interests. We would not, of course, be successful in reaching intergovernmental agreement in every such instance, as the Swiss Watch[12] case demonstrates. But the fact that the foreign government in question had been consulted in advance would tend to lessen the violence of its reaction to enforcement of our law. Moreover, through such consultation, both the Department of State, and through it, the Department of Justice, would be in a better position to receive and evaluate facts and arguments as to why the particular arrangement or activity should not be proceeded against under our law. I have no doubt that if this were done in more cases than it is done at present, there would be instances in which the two Departments would be thus persuaded by the foreign government, although they might not have been so persuaded had the same arguments been made by attorneys representing private litigants.

Let me emphasize that I do not wish to indicate that we should relax our efforts to explain to foreign nations the relationship between the application of our antitrust laws to the foreign commerce of the United States to the objective shared by a number of other countries of increasing the growth of world trade, free from artificial restrictions, whether of a governmental or private character. Many of these nations are members of the International Monetary Fund, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and other institutions, whose task it is to facilitate such growth by eliminating so far as possible exchange controls, import quotas, and other measures which adversely affect trade. We should continue to explain that private restrictive business practices can, and very often do, have the same adverse effect upon world trade as do the governmental measures.

There is, moreover, as you know, a well-established procedure for clearing in advance with the Attorney General the legality of a proposed arrangement or course of action under the antitrust laws. While this procedure has frequently been availed of with respect to proposed domestic arrangements and activities, I am informed that it has rarely been used in connection with overseas activities. It is possible that if the Department of State took a more active part in this procedure than it has in the past, more American businessmen might be inclined to avail themselves of it in the foreign field. In particular, the Department of State, through the information available to it, might well be able to give the Department of Justice objective advice as to the express and implied conditions of doing business in a particular overseas area. This, in turn, might materially affect the Department of Justice's clearance determination.

I would like to turn now to the question of what is or what should be done when there is a direct conflict of views between the Department of State and the Department of Justice with respect to a particular action in the antitrust field, or where from the outset it is recognized that issues transcending prosecution policy under the antitrust laws are involved. In the past, as you know, such determinations have been made at the Presidential level in the National Security Council. One instance of this was the advice given to the President by the National Security Council which led to an invitation to U.S. oil companies to participate in the Iranian oil consortium.[16]

I am not convinced that this is an entirely satisfactory practice. For one thing, the primary concern of the National Security Council is the national security and there are many issues with respect to the overseas application of the antitrust laws which should be considered as matters of national interest, even though the national security factor is not predominant. While the Council, itself, has a membership fully capable of passing upon the national interest in this field, I question whether its executive staff, the Planning Board, possesses the expertise or the time to give these issues of ever-increasing importance adequate staff preparation.

I confess that I do not have the answer to the question that I have posed, but I believe that it is a question deserving of serious study. In that connection, I may say that I have been authorized by Secretary Dulles to retain a qualified consultant, or consultants, to consider how our resolution of problems such as these could more efficiently be handled both within and without the Department of State. I believe that many members of the bar engaged in private practice have given much thought to these questions, and we shall welcome suggestions from the bar on these points.

What I have already said will, perhaps, forecast my opinion with respect to the proposal made in a preliminary report by the special committee on antitrust laws and foreign trade of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York[17] to the effect that Congress should by legislation vest in the President the power to grant exemption from the antitrust laws to any one or more persons, firms, or corporations, domestic or foreign, engaged or proposing to engage in any activity that may present a question of violation of the antitrust laws as applied to commerce with foreign nations. First I have a grave question as to whether such a law could be obtained from Congress. But more importantly, it is my belief that if we face up to the problems involved, with due appreciation of their complexity and importance, we shall be able through flexibility of administration of the antitrust laws to accomplish substantially the same result. Moreover, if we have within the executive branch a focal point where more time can be devoted to the study of the national and international aspects of our antitrust policy than is available to the National Security Council or any of the other of our existing supradepartmental agencies, we shall be able to develop more adequate policy planning in this field.

Antitrust actions, involving, as they do, the application of a national policy, the impact of such a policy on our foreign political relations, and the kind of foreign economic life which we are striving to create, require a careful assessment of all factors, some of which may be countervailing in particular cases, if they are to serve the overall national interest. This kind of appraisal represents judgment upon an amalgam of facts and circumstances, there is no easy generalization.

At any rate, I believe that the problems involved should receive more study within the Government, with the view of seeing whether we can make affirmative progress in solving these very real problems within the executive branch before we ask for legislation.

It is difficult to overestimate the complexity of the problems that require further study. As a Nation we are firmly committed in general to a policy of international trade and commerce, free of restraints by either governments or private individuals. While this is our ideal, we have our own governmental restraints in the form of tariffs and other restrictive statutory provisions and through our participation in GATT we have a machinery for intergovernmental consultation and action with respect to such restraints. In the case of the oil consortium that was formed at the time of the Iranian crisis, this Government gave its approval to private activities which might otherwise have been called into question under the antitrust law. More recently, the Federal Government, for reasons of defense, called upon the importers of crude oil to engage upon a voluntary program of limiting their imports. We have negotiated with various countries, notably Japan, quota restrictions which those countries impose upon their exports of various products to the United States market. These examples are only illustrative of the currents and eddies of practice in this area.

In brief, in the international field as in the national field, while this Government is committed to the principle that trade and commerce should be free of all unreasonable restraints, it does not as a Government invariably hew to a straight line in this regard. I am not satisfied that there is within the United States Government today a single focal point which can serve, on the one hand, as the place for solution of intragovernmental disputes on what the Government should do with respect to private international arrangements and activities operating within this context and, on the other hand, as a form where businessmen desiring to engage in international trade and commerce, and their lawyers, can seek as much certainty as to whether their activities accord with the national interest as it may be possible to give. I am well aware, as you are, that complete certainty in this field can never be obtained, but I sincerely believe that if we devote more study to this problem, we can work out arrangements more satisfactory than those that we have at present.

I cannot say how strongly I feel that we must devote more time and effort to a study of these problems and to their resolution.

---

[1] *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.*, 213 U.S. 347 (1909).

[2] For opposing views cf., e.g., Fugate, Foreign Commerce and the Antitrust Laws, 5 and passim (1958); Haight, International Law and Extraterritorial Application of the Antitrust Laws, 63 Yale L.J. 639 (1954); Whitney, Sources of Conflict between International Law and the Antitrust Laws, 63 Yale L.J. 655 (1954).

[3] Revised Statutes 202, 5 U.S.C., sec. 156, derived from the acts of July 27, 1789, c. 4, sec. 1, 1 Stat. 28; September 15, 1789, c. 14, sec. 1, 1 Stat. 68. By the latter act, the name of the Secretary and Department of "Foreign Affairs" was changed to that of the Secretary and Department of "State."

[4] *United States* v. *General Electric Co.*, 115 F. Supp. 835 (D.N.J. 1953).

[5] Note and memorandum from the Netherlands Ambassador to the Secretary of State, May 3, 1951.

[6] Note with certificate from the Chargé d'Affaires of Great Britain to the Secretary of State, December 2, 1952.

[7] *United States* v. *Deutsches Kalisyndikat Gesellschaft, et al.*, 31 F. 2d 199, 200 (S.D.N.Y. 1929).

[8] E.g., *United States* v. *Pink*, 315 U.S. 203 (1942); *United States* v. *Belmont*, 301 U.S. 324 (1937); *B. Altman & Co.*, v. *United States*, 224 U.S. 583 (1912). These particular cases deal with the interpretation of treaties and executive agreements.

[9] *United States* v. *United Fruit Co.*, Civil No. 4560, CCH Trade Reg. Rep. 66135 (E.D. La. 1954).

[10] Cf. *United States* v. *Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.*, 105 F. Supp. 215 (S.D.N.Y. 1952), and *British Nylon Spinners, Ltd.* v. *Imperial Industries, Ltd.* (1955), ch. 37, 45, 52 (1954).

[11] Report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws (1955), p. 99 et seq.

[12] See Bennett, "Comparison of United States and Foreign Antitrust Laws," Bulletin of the Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association (December 1958).

[13] E.g., the Treaty between Italy and the United States of 1948, article XVIII (3),

Footnotes at end of speech.

TIAS 1965 (July 26, 1949) and that between Japan and the United States of 1953, article XVIII (1), TIAS 2863 (Oct. 30, 1953). The latter provision reads: "1. The two parties agree that business practices which restrain competition, limit access to markets or foster monopolistic control, and which are engaged in or made effective by one or more private or public commercial enterprises or by combination agreement or other arrangement among such enterprises, may have harmful effects upon commerce between their respective territories. Accordingly, each party agrees upon the request of the other party to consult with respect to any such practices and to take such measures as it deems appropriate with a view to eliminating such harmful effects."

[11] See, e.g., the Economic Cooperation Agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom, article II(3) TIAS 1795 July 6, 1948).

[12] *United States* v. *Watchmakers of Switzerland Information Center, Inc.*, Civil No. 96-170, CCH Trade Reg. Rep. No. 66145 (S.D.N.Y.).

[13] The facts are set out in "Current Antitrust Problems." Hearings Before Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 1st sess., part II, pp., 1555-1562.

[14] National Security and Foreign Policy in the Application of American Antitrust Laws to Commerce With Foreign Nations (1957).

## Courage and Ideals of Ex-Representative Brooks Hays of Little Rock, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all too few in the Senate or the House seem to have the will to stand against dominant or hysterical public opinion in their own constituencies. Yet just such courage is what the critical problems of the 20th century demand. I think most of America salutes Brooks Hays of Little Rock, Ark., who paid with the loss of his seat in the House of Representatives because he took a moderate and fair course with respect to the question of school integration and civil rights.

Mr. Hayes is no longer a Member of Congress because of what he did. Yet, in the history of our critical era, I predict that he will have a larger and more heroic place than many who have survived politically. Brooks Hays, despite his defeat, is still a great lay leader of the Baptist religion in our country, and he commands respect and admiration in every community because of his integrity and sincerity.

In the issue of Look magazine for March 17, 1959, ex-Representative Brooks Hays has written an illuminating and thoughtful article about the course of events in the Little Rock school crises—events which eventually led to his retirement from Congress, but which also have shaped the ultimate march toward a fair solution of this difficult issue.

I should like to read to my colleagues the concluding paragraph of Brooks Hays article. This is what this outstanding man has written:

I shall continue to work for the acceptance of three principles: (1) The American idea—the constitutional rights of all children (as distinguished from the social aspirations of their elders) must be recognized and enforced, though this will mean some altered patterns. (2) The Jefferson idea—the determination of educational policies to achieve a nonviolent application of those constitutional rights must rest finally to a large degree on the individual communities, and the State must not thwart that determination. (3) The Christian idea—those who work both inside and outside the political and governmental systems for equality and justice must have both a tireless devotion to these ideals and an attitude of love and patience.

Mr. President, that is the philosophy of a man who was defeated for reelection to Congress because he practiced that philosophy and lived up to it. His defeat is not an indictment of Brooks Hays, but of a district or state or nation in which such a defeat could occur.

Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues and for the records of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Hon. Brooks Hays from Look magazine entitled "Little Rock From the Inside," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I should like to emphasize that the article in Look has been excerpted from Brooks Hays' forthcoming book "A Southern Moderate Speaks," soon to be published by the University of North Carolina Press. If the ideals and principles which I have quoted are a sample of the thinking advocated by Brooks Hays in "A Southern Moderate Speaks," then I predict that this is a book which ought to be on the desk of every Cabinet officer, Member of the Senate and House, Governors of the 49 States, judges, district attorneys—indeed, of all Americans who are charged with responsibility in these troubled times.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article exceeds the usual length of inclusions in the Appendix of the RECORD, and that its cost for printing is estimated to be $222.75.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the cost, the article by ex-Representative Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK FROM THE INSIDE

(By Brooks Hays)

Eighteen months have passed since the Little Rock school crisis broke upon the Nation. Is it possible to say now that we could have avoided the violence and misunderstanding that followed? As an observer who saw what went on behind the scenes, I can only tell you what actually happened.

For 15 years, I had served as Representative in the U.S. Congress for Arkansas's Fifth District, which includes Little Rock. My participation in the school crisis began that September of 1957. I was tormented by the realization that my home city was drifting toward a terrible crisis and that nothing was being done to avert it.

What is a Congressman's responsibility in such a situation? If it were a flood or a tornado, and Federal emergency help were required, the Congressman would certainly act. Then, should he not act in a situation in which the misfortune centered around human relations rather than physical forces? I decided to act.

Monday morning, September 9, I called Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams at the White House. This conversation served as the beginning of the negotiations which led to the Newport, R.I., meeting. When Sherman asked for some specific steps that might be taken, I suggested that President Eisenhower invite Governor Faubus to Washington for a conference. Though I had not talked to the Governor, I was convinced he would accept. I explained that, in dealing with Governor Faubus, Sherman would not be confronting a stubborn, last-ditch segregationist, a point of view which, up until that time, Governor Faubus had continually encouraged. At that stage, the Governor's actions justified my statement that, quite aside from the question of the propriety of his course (I thought he had been wrong in going against court orders by excluding the Negroes, not necessarily in calling out the National Guard), one would have difficulty in proving insincerity. I told Sherman that my one great concern was that the Governor not be driven into the arms of the few extremists in the Southern Governors' group.

FAUBUS APPEARS WILLING TO COOPERATE

Sherman thought that a favorable answer to three questions should be forthcoming before steps were taken to arrange a conference. They were: (1) Would Governor Faubus come with an attitude of constructiveness, with a give-and-take approach, with a desire to achieve something that would preserve the dignity and authority of Federal law? (2) Would the Governor indicate that he expected to comply with court orders, that he would avoid defiance and would accept jurisdiction of Federal authority in the field of school integration? (3) Would the Governor indicate that, "upon the President's request," he would remove troops from the high school?

The Governor's attitude, from my point of view, was very satisfactory. On the first point, there was no doubt about his desire to work constructively with the President and to avoid a showdown that would aggravate the tension. The Governor, of course, gave a qualified answer to points two and three, as I expected him to, but he had enough to say concerning his basic purpose of preserving law and order to make a convincing case for his actions in preventing violence, rather than preventing integration.

Governor Faubus told me that he was convinced that the overwhelming sentiment of the State and of Little Rock was in opposition to the admission of the nine Negroes to Little Rock's Central High School, and to any further steps under the plan approved by the school board and upheld by the Federal courts. The Governor said that if he went to see the President, he would like me to go with him.

On Tuesday, I talked many times with the White House. Sherman Adams took the position that the request for a conference should come from the Governor, and the Governor agreed. The White House did not wish to be in an attitude of initiating anything. Sherman indicated that I should create the wording of the Governor's request. I gave him some intimation of what the Governor should say and would say, and he commented here and there—reminding me that it was "my responsibility" and "my message" and that these were my overtures. I could understand his reason for being emphatic on that point, but he had some very clear ideas about what the telegram should and should not say. The Governor capitulated on language at practically every point.

When Governor Faubus agreed to indicate his respect for the courts in the request, I felt we had the basis for a productive conference. The Governor seemed anxious for a truce, with integration beginning by midterm, after the situation had settled down. He felt that the school-board plan should be changed, permitting integration to begin at the first grade, rather than the high school level. He had a strong desire for conciliation, but sought time to soften the adjustment. It seemed ironic that the Federal courts were forcing a showdown that neither side wanted, when true justice might best have been served by traditional judicial calm and exhaustive deliberation.

PROVIDENCE CROWDS ARE COOL

On Wednesday, the telegram was sent to Newport, where the President was vacationing. This was the Governor's message:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have accepted summons from the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Arkansas, to appear before that court on September 20 to answer certain allegations in litigation affecting the high school in Little Rock. Recognizing that we jointly share great responsibility under the Federal Constitution, I feel that it is advisable for us to counsel together in determining my course of action as chief executive of the State of Arkansas with reference to the responsibility placed upon me by the State and Federal Constitutions.

"The U.S. District Court has already entered an order relative to the integration of the high school in Little Rock, and this order has been affirmed by the circuit court of appeals.

"All good citizens must of course obey all proper orders of our courts, and it is certainly my desire to comply with the order that has been issued by the district court in this case, consistent with my responsibility under the Constitution of the United States and that of Arkansas.

"May I confer with you on this matter at your earliest convenience?"

The President's answer:

"I have your telegram in which you request a meeting with me. Would it suit your convenience to come to my office on Naval Base, Newport, either Friday, September 13, at 3 p.m or Saturday a.m., 14, at 9 o'clock? If you would let my office know your method of transportation to the Newport area, my staff will arrange to have you met and brought to the Base."

The Governor, his private secretary, Arnold Sikes, two pilots and I left Little Rock early Friday morning. The conference had been scheduled for Saturday. Adams had arranged for us to be met at the Providence airport by an aide and escorted to a hotel. The character of the reception given us at the airport convinced me that sentiment in that area was not friendly, and it became obvious within a short time that this reflected the national sentiment (outside the Deep South). No one representing the Governor of Rhode Island or the mayor of Providence was on hand to welcome us. There were curious crowds, but no cheering. It was rather pathetic to see Governor Faubus looking vainly for some sign of enthusiasm. I was beginning to understand the criticisms of the President's decision to confer with the Governor and to realize that I, too, was becoming a target for attack by extremists on both sides for my efforts to compose differences.

At Newport, we were met by Sherman Adams and taken to President Eisenhower's office. The President shook hands with his usual cordially. "How are you, Brooks?" he asked, and it was easy for me to say I felt fine. At that moment, I did.

President Eisenhower and Governor Faubus were in the President's private office only about 15 minutes, less time than Sherman had thought they might wish to have alone. The President (in sport coat and blue shirt, looking in the pink) came out with the Governor and suggested, as he helped Sherman rearrange the chairs, "Let's just sit here and talk." That we did for nearly 2 hours. The atmosphere was fairly relaxed. The Governor, being closer to the problem, was a bit solemn, and the President at that stage doubtless did not foresee the dilemma that would confront him within 10 days. Atty. Gen. Herbert Brownell, Jr., and Press Secretary James Hagerty came in for the last part of the discussion.

Governor Faubus stressed the importance of the time element. A way should be found, he felt, to get Federal court relief for Little Rock until the Supreme Court had ruled on the valldity of the State constitutional amendments and statutes (interposition and several other measures) approved either by the people of Arkansas in the 1956 election or by the Arkansas General Assembly in 1957. The President conceded that time was a factor, but thought that the matter fell so completely within the jurisdiction of the courts that little could be done by the Executive in that regard. There was some discussion of the various ways of complying with the Supreme Court decision, and the Governor expressed the view that the plan advanced by School Superintendent Virgil Blossom, and later approved by the courts, was subject to criticism. The President was inclined to think that any advantage in other plans, such as beginning in the 1st grade instead of the 12th, would be offset by disadvantages.

I remember how emphatic the President was in assuring the Governor that he regards the States as responsible for maintaining law and order and that the Governor's primary responsibility should be respected. "I do not criticize you for calling out the guard—our only difference is that I would have given them different instructions." The Governor at one stage said, "I expect to send the guard home." (This he did on September 20.)

The political aspects of the problem were touched upon, and the President expressed sympathy for those of us who live so close to the problem, at the same time minimizing the seriousness of the so-called political revolt.

I had the feeling when the meeting ended that we were leaving loose ends, and wished that an afternoon session had been set up. There was unfinished business. Still, I can see why the President would think that the matter had been sufficiently explored. In statements later issued to the press, both men gave assurance that the meeting had been "constructive" and that the decisions of the Court would be respected.

BROWNELL TAKES A RIGID POSITION

I had come to Newport confident that a carefully drawn agreement could be reached, and both the President and Governor Faubus had acted in a manner that had strengthened that opinion. What made me uneasy, however, was the uncertainty about the time element that both sides agreed was the key to a final solution. The rigidity of Brownell's position on this factor gave me some forebodings. Brownell seemed to have blocked a definite commitment to work for delays in further court action. The intention of seeking such delays was to permit questions of interposition and sovereignty. The courses of action that would then be available would be clarified by such court rulings. If the State laws were upheld, the situation would be eased, because then the Governor could say, "I am following State law." If they were invalidated, then he would have an answer to the cry that one heard in parts of Arkansas, "You are under a mandate of the people to prevent any degree of intergration." My assumption is based not so much on what was said at Newport as on what was not said. I was still hopeful of working out a timetable with the Governor when we returned to Little Rock. It is obvious to me now that this step should have been taken at Newport.

I left the party in New York and took a plane to Fort Worth. I called Governor Faubus on Sunday. He said, "I'd appreciate your coming back to Little Rock for a day or two if you can." I agreed at once. I sensed that terrific new pressures from extremists were being applied and that the Governor was in a difficult situation.

I am often asked if I think violence would have taken place had Governor Faubus not predicted that it would take place and then placed the troops at Central High School. My own opinion is that probably it would not have taken place, but one can only speculate. It has always been my opinion, however, that the Governor was sincere in his fear of the outbreak of violence. He was also aware that a majority of Little Rock people were opposed to desegregation, even when the solid Negro opinion to the contrary is taken into account. In the final analysis, it was this sentiment rather than the threat of violence that accounted for most of the Governor's actions.

Governor Faubus had too few political advisers who sympathized with his moderate views. Some of them exploited his promise not to force integration upon an unwilling community.

The Governor had been impressed by my reasoning that Federal law would ultimately prevail. Then in came the "practical men." "Don't let Brooks talk you into something; he's too visionary." I could hear them say. The Governor, priding himself on his political acumen, accepted this reasoning. He gave me every chance, however, to present my case. Never at any point did he show impatience, nor did he seem to tire of efforts to find a way out. He was not happy with the turn of events, and I do not believe he is happy about it today. There were moments of exaltation, perhaps, when the glow of acclaim in the Deep South cheered him, but underneath was a wistfulness for a smoother path to political glory and power.

Governor Faubus and I held numerous conversations at the mansion between Monday, September 16, and Friday morning, September 20, when the Federal court met to consider the school situation. On Monday, the Governor indicated his willingness to send the National Guard home, provided the target date for admission of Negro students was changed to a later date, possibly as early as September 30. He was quite concerned, however, that the constitutionality of the Arkansas sovereignty laws be determined as soon as possible, so he would not be caught between conflicting directives concerning his lawful action.

By negotiation with various prominent people in both public and private life, I arrived at this proposed course of action for the Governor: (1) That he write a letter to the parents of the Negro children, asking them voluntarily to keep their children out of school until a set date arrived (we had assurances they would agree); (2) that he guarantee to use his influence to create a peaceful atmosphere; (3) that he see that the local school authorities provide private tutors for the nine Negro children during the interim period; and (4) that he pledge to use his office to insure the peace after the proposed September 30 deadline.

One of the major stumbling blocks was the attitude of the Justice Department, which would make no commitment not to take Faubus to court. While this Department was also determined not to wait for State court action on the sovereignty laws, it did indicate that Federal action might be withdrawn once the school was integrated. The Governor would not write such a letter under those conditions. He seemed willing to go

along with Sherman Adams in the use of State patrols to control the school situation once the National Guard was withdrawn, but he was impatient with Attorney General Brownell for not meeting the Government's legal responsibilities.

By Tuesday, both sides had become belligerent. Adams said that the Governor could do anything he wanted to, if he had no regard for the consequences. Faubus now told me that he could not let the Federal Government ram integration down the throat of the city.

GOVERNOR FAUBUS IS READY TO FIGHT

Meanwhile, Washington sources informed me that the Justice Department was not eager for a fight, and was deeply alarmed at the possibility of a showdown of force against force. There was an alternative available. If the National Guard were federalized, then integration could be enforced without the Governor's open advocacy. All that would be required of him then would be for him to plead for peaceful acceptance of this move, and not to object to the federalizing, so that he could explain to the segregationists that he no longer had any control over the situation.

Wednesday morning, Sherman indicated to me that he was not convinced that federalizing the guard was the answer. When I visited the mansion that afternoon, Governor Faubus seemed ready for a fight. His growing irritation made the possibilities of a peaceful adjustment appear remote.

Late Thursday night, my wife and I left for Oklahoma City. When I called Sherman Adams and mentioned engagements I had in Kansas City on Saturday and Sunday, he asked me to cancel them and return to Little Rock. I phoned Harry Truman to explain why I would not be at a dinner planned for us by Mayor H. Roe Bartle and my friend Joe Culpepper, a Kansas City businessman. "That's all right," Mr. Truman said, and he added, "Brooks, I'd been thinking about you and feeling for you." "Thank you, Mr. President," I answered, "but you stood 8 years of it; I can stand 8 weeks of it." "No," he said, "it's harder on you than on me—I can cuss and you can't."

On Friday, Federal Judge Ronald Davies ordered the Governor to end his opposition to judicial authority and directed him to stop interfering with integration at Central High School.

Three hours after the decision, Governor Faubus went on television to announce his withdrawal of the guard. He said that the right of Negro children to attend white schools had been upheld by the Supreme Court, but that he hoped "by their own volition the Negroes would refrain from seizing upon that right until such time as there is assurance that it can be accomplished in a peaceful manner." He closed with an appeal for "reason and clear thinking and good order."

I returned to Little Rock on Saturday. Governor Faubus had flown to Georgia to attend the Southern Governors' Conference and had left Lt. Gov. Nathan Gordon as the State's acting chief executive. When asked in Atlanta if he believed there would be violence at the school, Faubus answered, "I think so."

On Sunday, I talked with various people regarding plans for protecting the Negro students if they appeared at the school. No one seemed to know the intentions of the nine students who had previously been turned away. I was determined not to make any contacts with the NAACP officials, either national or local. I disagreed with their tactics and, in the Little Rock situation, I could not even discuss the question with them without appearing to approve projection of the national organization into Little Rock's difficulties. One can oppose, as I do, the national organization's strategy and still believe in its right to function as an agent of its people's interests.

In the late afternoon, School Superintendent Virgil Blossom asked me, "Should I talk with Judge Davies about the necessity of having deputy U.S. marshals accompany the nine Negro students into the Central High School, if they appear?" I thought it would be proper for him to approach the judge.

He reported back to me that the judge would not talk to him—he merely referred him to U.S. District Attorney Osro Cobb. Blossom called Cobb, but Cobb thought he would have to have specific authority from the Department of Justice to seek such an order. I called Sherman Adams.

LOCAL POLICE REFUSE TO ESCORT NEGROES

Adams gave me a telephone number at which Cobb could reach a responsible top official of the Department of Justice. Some of the legal abracadabra seemed to annoy Adams, who is a businessman and definitely the executive type. By this time, I had come to appreciate more than ever his sense of justice and his tirelessness in discharging his duties. Cobb did not get the authority from the department when he called for further instructions as to Blossom's request for deputy marshals to escort the Negro students. The local policemen (officers and men) had balked at escorting. They pledged to do their duty in preventing violence, if the Negroes showed up, but as to escorting—they said, "No, don't ask that."

I knew Brownell's reasons for this ruling. He had publicly made much of the fact that title III had been taken out of the civil rights bill by the Senate during the 1957 debate. Since that title proposed to give the Justice Department authority to participate in suits for enforcement of Negoes' rights, he construed the action as a legislative declaration that he, the Attorney General, should exercise no such authority. It was up to the judges of the district courts, he believed.

Technically, that may have been correct—it would take a court decision to make sure—but I believe that since the Federal Government was responsible for Blossom's predicament, the Federal Government should have acted affirmatively and imaginatively to protect him, and to uphold its own court's orders with civil, not military, power.

The court had invited the United States to be a party to the action restraining interference with the school-board plan. The Government's failure to do so is the weak place in the Justice Department's case on Little Rock.

The city officials were still considering keeping the Negro children out until at least the following Thursday, so that inflamed passions could cool. But Acting Gov. Nathan Gordon indicated that a detachment of State police would be sent to the area. This fact, coupled with Mayor Woodrow W. Mann's confidence that the situation was manageable, led Blossom and the school board to make the fateful decision to go ahead with integration on Monday, even without the availability of Federal marshals.

I shall not dwell long on the unfortunate occurrences of that tragic Monday. I shared the feelings of horror held by all law-abiding citizens when acts of violence took place at Little Rock Central High School.

After the nine Negro students had been spirited into the school by means of the side entrance, the huge crowd which had gathered at the school quickly got beyond control. Blossom called to say that it looked bad outside and asked me if Federal troops would be called. Then the mayor informed me that fighting had broken out and that he needed about 150 soldiers as soon as possible. I called Sherman Adams, and he commented cryptically, "That's all the information I need." By 11 a.m., I was quite nervous, because Adams had not called back. Blossom telephoned again, and his voice was almost frantic as he asked, "Are the troops coming or aren't they?" As he saw it, the safety of the children depends on it. I tried to reach Adams again, but he was not available. I finally managed to talk with the Cabinet secretary, Maxwell Rabb. By the time he called back to say, "The troops are not on their way," the Negro students had been removed from the school on Blossom's suggestion. What influence this had on the administration decision to send in troops, after all, I do not know. It was apparent that the local police did not have sufficient manpower to preserve order with Negro students in the school.

Sherman Adams and I talked to each other later in the day, and he said, "You and I can sign off now—it's in other hands, I guess." On Tuesday, September 24, President Eisenhower ordered troops from the 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell, Ky., to go to Little Rock to see that integration at Central High School was carried out without further violence. At the same time, the Arkansas National Guard was federalized. On Wednesday, the nine Negro students attended school with the armed might of the U.S. Army protecting them from lawlessness.

Perhaps I could sympathize more fully than anyone with both the President and the Governor. My relations with each of them had been nonpolitical, and I had been privileged to have an intimate view of their struggles with the problem. I can say that I detected real pain in the President's expression and his words in announcing his decision to move troops into Little Rock. One can believe, as I do, that a better way could have been found and still not be interested in an assessment of blame. Close as I had been to the situation until a few hours before the President's action, I did not have all of the facts upon which to base a judgment. I know that the moral and intellectual resources of our Nation must be directed to avoid a recurrence.

My own experiences are also testimony to the difficulties encountered by moderates in dealing with such situations as arose at Little Rock. Governor Faubus told me in June that he would not become involved in my primary campaign for renomination on the Democratic ticket for a ninth term in Congress. I won renomination by a margin of 15,000 votes. I assumed, then, that as my fellow nominee for reelection to the governorship, Faubus would not oppose me in the general election with another candidate. On September 12, 1 week after the final date for filing of candidacies for the general election had passed, I had a letter from Faubus congratulating me on my primary victory and wishing me continued success.

As late as October 14, I spent an hour and 20 minutes in conference with the Governor to explore a way out of the Little Rock school difficulties. Two weeks later, the Governor's advisers were calling for my defeat. His former secretary had been released by the Governor to manage the campaign of my write-in opponent in the general election. It was not until 48 hours before the election, however, that my associates and I were sure that the Governor's organization was "giving it the works" to bring about my defeat.

HAYS' POLITICAL DEFEAT IS PROBED

I received 12,000 more votes in the July 29 primary than my write-in opponent received in the November election. I received 49 percent of the vote in the general election, or 1,249 less than my opponent, as shown in the official returns. Certain aspects of the general election were made the subject of an inquiry by proper committees of the House of Representatives. I personally have not precipitated these inquiries; rather they have

been instigated by John F. Wells, publisher of the Arkansas Recorder, who charged irregularities in several precincts in Pulaski County, which includes Little Rock.

It is clear from my experience that the political moderate in the South is caught between two highly vocal groups that entertain strong feelings. But there are many moderates among that multitude of segregationists in the Deep South who, when free to speak without inhibition, will confess to having a sensitive conscience and a dissatisfaction with the total picture of today.

The school segregation decisions have caused the development of two streams of traffic moving in opposite directions. We who are on the line down the middle have often felt lonesome and frightened, but, as more and more people have joined us, we are beginning to feel that it will not be long before almost everyone is moving in the same direction again. The decisions cannot now be recalled, but they can be interpreted in a way that will preserve the rule-of-law tradition and still meet with acceptance in the South.

I shall continue to work for the acceptance of three principles: (1) The American idea—The constitutional rights of all children (as distinguished from the social aspirations of their elders) must be recognized and enforced, though this will mean some altered patterns. (2) The Jefferson idea—The determination of educational policies to achieve a nonviolent application of those constitutional rights must rest finally to a large degree on the individual communities, and the States must not thwart that determination. (3) The Christian idea—Those who work both inside and outside the political and governmental systems for equality and justice must have both a tireless devotion to these ideals and an attitude of love and patience.

## Congress Should Enact Without Further Delay an Effective Area Redevelopment Bill Designed To Eliminate the Prospects of Another Presidential Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, following is the statement I made this morning before the House Banking and Currency Committee in support of area redevelopment legislation:

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, ON MARCH 10, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. Chairman, over a period of years it has been my privilege to appear before this committee several times in support of area redevelopment legislation.

As a matter of fact, I am among a group of Representatives in Congress who are recognized as pioneers in this particular field.

As many of you know, my congressional district in Pennsylvania, comprising the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield, has been plagued with chronic unemployment for years due to depressed conditions in the coal and railroad industries. At times as much as 18 percent of our total labor force has been unemployed.

Therefore, we know the meaning of "ghost towns" and the misery that follows in the wake of unemployment as we watch good American families being forced to exist on public assistance and surplus commodities.

Speaking of surplus commodities, in my three-county area there are 57,323 persons eligible for surplus food or 18.8 percent of the overall population.

In fact, in Clearfield County nearly 23 percent of the population are recipients of surplus commodities and dependent upon them for the necessities of life.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time in the two labor forces in my congressional district, here is the picture.

As of January 1959 in the Altoona area, out of a labor force of 53,600 there were 7,700 unemployed or an average of 14.4 percent of the labor force; while in the Dubois-Clearfield area, out of a labor force of 37,000 there were 5,200 unemployed or an average of 14.1 percent of the labor force.

Therefore, the unemployment situation in my congressional district is simply this. Out of a labor force of nearly 91,000, there are 12,900 unemployed or 14.3 percent of the labor force.

As I have said before, unemployment in my congressional district has been as high as 18 percent of the labor force. One point I want to emphasize is that unemployment conditions are not temporary or seasonal nor can we see any improvement in the coal and railroad industries.

As a matter of fact, employment in these industries is still on the downward trend and nobody dares to predict when employment will level off.

For an illustration, my hometown of Altoona is principally a railroad town because it is the site of the largest railroad shops in the world operated by the Pennsylvania railroad company.

Early in 1951 these shops employed 14,361; while last August employment dropped to 2,050.

According to information released on March 1 of this year, employment reached 6,000 and by the middle of April employment is expected to level off at 7,000. This means that in the city of Altoona alone, there has been a loss of over 7,000 jobs.

Mr. Chairman, this situation in Altoona is duplicated in the city of Dubois where hundreds have been furloughed by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

Instead of having around 1,200 employees, as of March 1, 456 were employed with the expectation that employment in Dubois will level off at 600, which means that 50 percent of the B. & O. labor force will be jobless.

I have been pinpointing unemployment in the railroad industry in an effort to show the permanent loss of jobs. Similar facts reveal that the same condition exists in the coal, brick, and related industries in my congressional district.

We residents of central Pennsylvania recognized this chronic unemployment situation years ago and through local community effort, area redevelopment groups were organized for the purpose of diversifying the economy by attracting new industries.

To date we have enjoyed a measure of success, but it is such a mammoth task that we are convinced we cannot do it alone.

Before substantiating this statement, let me emphasize that we are not looking for a Federal handout. What we need primarily is additional borrowing power which, coupled with other forms of Federal assistance as contained in pending bills, will enable us to abolish unemployment in our midst.

In achieving this objective, we will not only rehabilitate our economy through diversification of industry, but we will, in effect, be barring a repetition of this chronic unemployment that we have been faced with for years.

Before giving you the highlights of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, I should like to repeat a question constantly asked by many of my constituents—"Why is it that Congress sends billions of dollars to so-called underprivileged nations yet ignores the plight of good American citizens who through no fault of their own are unemployed?"

Mr. Chairman, the answer to this question is that Congress too long has ignored "the pockets of unemployment" that have brought suffering and despair despite national prosperity.

I hold no brief for the action taken by President Eisenhower in vetoing area redevelopment legislation last year. In my opinion, he was poorly advised.

Nor do I hold any brief for those who quibble and employ delaying tactics over the cost of area redevelopment legislation. Since we have billions to pour into foreign aid, we certainly have a moral obligation to care for the needs of America's unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, the fact that area redevelopment legislation is fully justified makes it pertinent to ask—"Why solicit a repetition of last year's veto by having the pending Douglas-Flood bill given similar treatment since it resembles to a marked degree the Douglas-Spence bill of the 85th Congress?"

Frankly, it will not be difficult for me to support the Douglas-Flood bill, but I must confess the possibility of another veto is a cause for great concern.

While there is no one in the Senate or the House who would stoop to playing politics with the misery of unemployment, we cannot ignore the fact that unless a bill is enacted the suffering of the people in the depressed areas is not going to be alleviated.

Mr. Chairman, among the sponsors of depressed area legislation there exist two conflicting points of view.

To begin with, in principle the administration has endorsed aid to depressed areas.

In addition, the two great major political parties also endorsed the principle in their 1956 platforms.

Therefore, the question that Congress must resolve is the extent of aid to the depressed areas of the Nation.

In an effort to reach this common objective, it is imperative that reasonable people should be willing to compromise.

In this connection, it is my belief that the President will find it possible to accept a reasonable compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas-Flood version of the legislation.

In my plea for a reasonable compromise, it must be thoroughly understood that I am not presuming to speak for the administration nor have I had any consultations with administration leaders on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, let us be practical and face the facts concerning depressed area legislation.

In the event of a Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill, I have been unable to find anyone willing to flatly predict that the veto will be overridden by the House of Representatives.

The fear of being unable to override a veto is based on the fact that it requires two-thirds of the votes cast to accomplish that purpose.

Therefore—looking the facts right in the face—when you review the position of those Members of the House today in relation to their last year's vote on the Douglas-Spence bill, one finds that the margin of victory would be insufficient to override a possible Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill.

Mr. Chairman, to improve the chances of enacting depressed area legislation, I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill which represents a compromise between the administration's approach and the Douglas-Flood proposal.

With a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, offers the same types of aid con-

tained in the Douglas-Spence bill vetoed last year.

For example, instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same types of assistance, my bill provides different degrees of Federal assistance based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

1. Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

2. Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of $100 million.

We know that the conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

3. Public facilities: Some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

My bill provides for an establishment of a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending before the House which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under my bill, H.R. 4878, a smaller fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have the sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of $25 million.

At this point let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation, but is intended to be a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limit the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no give-away program. Under the provisions of my bill, grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and thus broaden the economic base of the communities.

4. Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems of the people in depressed areas is the fact that many of their industries have declined or disappeared, and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

But many have been unemployed for a long period of time, and it would be unreasonable to expect that they could undergo an effective period of vocational training without any means of support.

Consequently, while the unemployed are undergoing training and if they are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation, they would be receiving subsistence payments equal to the average unemployment insurance in their State during the period while they are undergoing training, but not for a period exceeding 13 weeks.

Only the unemployed residing in the communities with the highest level of unemployment would be eligible for this type of aid and the total amount that would be appropriated for this program would be limited to $5 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, in brief, these are the provisions of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878.

They are modest, but at the same time will provide a sound program of Federal assistance to depressed areas.

All of us are deeply concerned by the latest reports about the rise of unemployment.

Experience has shown that the people in depressed areas are the ones that are mostly hit by any rise in unemployment and are the last to recover from the onslaught of recession.

Therefore, it is urged that we enact the program contained in my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, as a realistic means of providing an effective program to aid the chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Since the cost of depressed area legislation has proved a stumbling block in the past and impeded our efforts, let me point out that the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill is $389.5 million as compared to the cost of the administration bill which is $53 million.

By way of contrast, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, will cost $158 million or just about midway between the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill and the administration bill.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in my remarks I should like to include the following comparative analysis of the provisions and costs of the Douglas-Flood, administration, and Van Zandt bills. [Not printed in the RECORD.]

In connection with depressed area legislation, let me state that I have no pride of authorship.

My sole desire is to aid the people in the depressed areas and to attain such a laudable objective the spirit of compromise should be dominant in our minds.

As one who represents two chronically depressed areas in Pennsylvania with unemployment as high as 14 percent of our labor force and which has plagued us for years, my goal is that Congress enact without delay an effective bill in a form acceptable to the President, thereby eliminating the prospects of another Presidential veto.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of the 269 depressed areas of the Nation are entitled to this type of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that we can compromise any differences and enact a depressed area bill without further delay.

---

## Trends in Cancer Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Trends in Cancer Control," published in the February 1959 issue of Progress in Health Services, a publication of Health Information Foundation, of New York City.

I may add that for a long time we have been chipping away at cancer. Progress has been made; and the article I am submitting for printing in the Appendix shows what has come about.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRENDS IN CANCER CONTROL

With the elimination of communicable disease as the leading cause of death, the rising death rate from cancer has made this disease a steadily increasing health problem. From seventh in 1900, cancer rose to become the second leading cause of death in 1938 and has remained there since. It is now the leading cause of death among women aged 30–54 and (excluding accidents) among school-age children. In 1900 this disease accounted for less than 5 percent of the deaths in this country, but by 1958 the comparable figure was 16 percent, or approximately one out of every six deaths.

Cancer took more than 250,000 lives in 1958, mainly in the middle and older years but including some 4,000 children under age 15. Its death rate is now higher among males than females, among nonwhites than whites, and is highest in the northeastern part of this country. Even though cancer mortality is rising, however, the prognosis for cancer patients is today much better than it used to be. Many forms of the disease previously incurable can now be treated.

Cancer is the generic name for a group of diseases characterized by the irregular and uncontrolled growth of cells. The invasive growth and metastasis (spread) of these cells, often through the lymph channels or blood, to other areas, usually leads ultimately to death.

Cancer is the end-product of an exceedingly complex chain of circumstances. Research into the etiology of this group of diseases investigates mechanisms within the cell, stimuli arising outside the cell, and hereditary and environmental factors. Malignancies of specific sites have been associated with different agents. The list of biological substances and chemical compounds known to cause malignant tumors in animals is impressively large and growing. Nevertheless, the cause of the overwhelming proportion of the malignancies seen in human populations remains unknown.

In 1900 about 80 persons for each 100,000 of the population died from cancer. This rate climbed steadily early in the century and reached 114 by 1926. After some fluctuation up to 1933, the rate began to rise again, but more slowly. It reached 128 by 1957 but dropped to 125 in 1958.[1] These rates were about 60 percent higher than in 1900.

Part of this increase is undoubtedly due to improved diagnosis of the disease and to the development of better techniques for case finding and detection. Thus many deaths perhaps erroneously attributed to other causes are today more correctly attributed to cancer. But part of the increase is probably real.

Mortality from cancer is low during infancy and the preschool years, and drops to its minimum level during the subsequent childhood period. In 1956 cancer caused 8 deaths per 100,000 among infants under 1, 11 at ages 1–4, and 6 at ages 10–14. At older ages the rate rose consistently to a peak of 1,464 per 100,000 at 85 and over. More than half the cancer deaths today are of persons aged 65 and over.

Women constituted a larger proportion of the cancer victims than men early in the century, but recently this has changed.

---

[1] Comparisons of long-term trends are based on mortality rates adjusted to the age distribution of the 1940 U.S. population and, except for the discussion of specific sites, to the Fifth Revision of the International List of Diseases and Causes of Death. Data for 1958 are estimated by the Research Department of Health Information Foundation.

Thus in 1900 the cancer mortality rate among females exceeded that for males by 65 percent. Later this ratio narrowed, and by 1946–47 mortality for the two sexes was at the same level. By 1956 the former positions were reversed—the male mortality rate now exceeded the female by 22 percent.

The female mortality rate from cancer, after rising continuously since 1900, began to level off during the late 1920's and early 1930's and has declined since then. In contrast, the male mortality rate has continued to rise steadily, in part because of the rapid rise of respiratory cancer among men, but also because in general cancers afflicting males more often occur in less accessible sites.

CANCER MORTALITY BY SITE

The distribution of all cancer deaths by primary site has changed greatly since 1930. For example, cancer of the respiratory system has become a more important part of the total picture. It accounted for only 3 percent of all cancer deaths in 1930, but by 1956 its proportion had risen to 13 percent. The death rates per 100,000 population for these years rose from 3.7 to 17.1. The rise in mortality from leukemia was also notable, from 2.3 to 6.0. However, death rates from cancers of the other major primary sites have generally been leveling off, and in some instances actually declining, since 1930.

The respiratory system has become one of the main cancer sites for males. Their mortality rate in 1956 was six times as high as in 1930, while the rate for females doubled in the same period. In 1930 this site accounted for 5 percent of all cancer deaths among males, but by 1956 the proportion was 21 percent. For females the comparable rise was from 2 to 4 percent.

Although part of this rise may be spurious (because of better diagnosis, case-finding, etc.), the strong sex differential and other factors suggest that most of the rise represents a true increase in incidence. This is the most rapid ever recorded for a noninfectious disease.

Recently a number of large-scale investigations have shown that lung cancer [2] occurs 5 to 15 times as frequently among cigarette smokers as among nonsmokers, and that there is a direct relationship between the incidence of lung cancer and the amount smoked. From a public health point of view, the conclusion of a cause-effect relationship between lung cancr and cigarette smoking has now been accepted by many responsible health agencies.[3]

But in addition, studies have shown other possible causal factors in the environment, especially motor-vehicle exhaust and other forms of air pollution. And also, specific factors in particular individuals may increase their susceptibility to environmental influences.

LEUKEMIA DEATH RATE RISES

Recent increases in the death rate from leukemia [4] have also attracted considerable attention. The largest increases in leukemia mortality have occurred among children and older people, where the rates were highest to begin with. During the preschool years leukemia accounts for nearly 50 percent of all cancer deaths.

[1] As used here, this term refers to epidermoid and undifferentiated types of carcinoma of the lung, but not adenocarcinoma.

[2] Statement by Sureogn General Leroy E. Burney of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on Excessive Cigarette Smoking and Health, July 12, 1957; and statement by John Vaughan-Morgan, parliamentary secretary of the Ministry of Health, to the House of Commons, June 27, 1957.

[4] A malignant disease of the blood and bloodforming organs, involving the excessive formation of white blood cells.

It is now widely accepted that exposure to nuclear and allied radiations (including X-rays used for medical diagnosis and therapy) can cause leukemia in man. The evidence for this is derived from extensive extensive laboratory investigations on animals and from studies of the distribution of the disease in humans.

These studies have shown a higher mortality from leukemia among radiologists than other physicians, a decrease in incidence of this disease in proportion to the distance from the center of the atomic bomb explosion among survivors in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and a relationship to past exposure to X-rays for various conditions (including children exposed in utero during X-ray examination of the maternal abdomen and pelvis).[5] Nevertheless, many aspects of this relationship remain unexplained, and many investigators do not accept a linear cause-effect linkage.

Although cancer mortality as a whole has risen, a decline has been recorded for the digestive system as a primary site, and this despite its relative inaccessibility.[6] This site today accounts for only about one-third of all cancer deaths, while in 1930 the comparable figure was about one-half. Mortality from cancer of the digestive system declined 33 percent among females from 1930 to 1956—from 55.4 deaths per 100,000 to 37.2. For males the comparable drop was only 13 percent—from 59.7 to 51.9.

In a similar manner, opposing trends for the sexes in mortality from cancer of the genital organs have contributed to the current excess of male mortality from cancer of all sites combined. While mortality from genital cancer rose for males, from 10.6 per 100,000 in 1930 to 15.3 in 1956, the rate for females declined about 25 percent, from 31.9 to 23.8.

The better female record probably results in part from recent advances in obstetrical technique, from their greater propensity to seek medical care (even exclusive of pregnancy), and also from the widespread use within the last 10 years of the Papanicolaou vaginal smear test for early detection of uterine cancer. Among males, most of the mortality from cancer of the genital organs (94 percent in 1956) is from cancer of the prostate. Detection at this site often occurs at a late stage of the disease, when a cure is difficult to achieve.

Mortality from cancer of the breast—restricted almost entirely to females—has changed little since 1930, despite the accessibility of this site and intensive educational campaigns to promote early detection and case finding. In 1956 breast cancer caused 23 deaths per 100,000 females; and accounted for nearly one-fifth of the total female cancer mortality.

DISTRIBUTION AMONG POPULATION GROUPS

In 1914 (the first year these data were available), mortality from cancer among the white population exceeded the rate for nonwhites by 30 percent. But by 1950 mortality for the two groups was approximately the same. By 1956 the rate for nonwhites actualy exceeded the white rate by one-eighth.

Much of the more rapid rise among nonwhites is attributable to their increased mortality from cancer of the digsestive system, especially for males, in contrast to a decline among whites. Similarly, the rise among nonwhite males of mortality from cancer of the genital organs was more rapid. But cancer of the skin, an accessible site and only a minor component of the total of cancer mortality, is twice as frequent among whites.

Cancer mortality is highest in the urban and metropolitan areas of the United States and in the industrial Northeastern and North Central States. It is lowest in the South Central and Mountain States. The industrial Northeast exceeds the remaining regions of the United States, especially in mortality from cancers of the digestive and respiratory systems and the breast. The South, low in other forms of cancer, exceeds the national average in skin cancer incidence, especially among whites.

ILLNESS AND SURVIVAL

In 1959 over 700,000 Americans will be under medical care for cancer, and about 450,000 new cases will be diagnosed for the first time. More than 40 million Americans now living—1 in every 4, according to present rates—will eventually have cancer.[7]

No real cure is yet available for all cancers, and the results of treatment are still generally defined in terms of years of survivorship free of clinical evidence of the disease. However, the prognosis for cancer patients is more favorable now than formerly, especially where there has been early diagnosis.

A few years ago 1 cancer patient in 4 was being "saved"—alive 5 years after diagnosis. Today the proportion is 1 in 3. Currently, the number thus saved is estimated at 150,000 annually. There are 800,000 Americans alive today who have been "cured" of cancer—free of the disease at least 5 years after diagnosis. And at least an additional 500,000 cancer patients, diagnosed and treated within the last 5 years, will live to become "cured."

The record of improvement has been clearly shown in a study of survivorship in Connecticut. The proportion of male cancer patients in that State surviving at least 5 years from the time of original diagnosis in 1935–40 was 24 percent; the figure rose to 32 percent for those diagnosed during 1947–51. For females the corresponding improvement was from 33 to 45 percent.[8] This improvement in survivorship has involved most of the major sites, including some of the more difficult, inaccessible areas. But the greatest improvements were reported for cases diagnosed at an early stage of the disease.

Surgery and radiation, still the only effective methods of cure, are successful only when the cancer cells have remained localized in areas which permit such treatment.[9] These techniques have become immensely more effective than in former years, partly because other scientific and medical advances now permit them to be used more extensively against tumors that were previously considered inoperable or inaccessible to radiation. The operative mortality rate has decreased, and great advances have been made in knowledge of the radiation sensitivity of different types of cancer.

One of the most promising fields for research, and one which has expanded greatly in recent years, is chemotherapy. Some therapeutic chemicals have already shown effectiveness in temporarily halting the progress of certain cancers, alleviating pain, and rehabilitating the body to provide greater chance for survival. These chemicals are

[5] See W. M. Court-Brown, "Radiation-Induced Leukemia in Man, With Particular Reference to the Dose-Response Relationship," Journal of Chronic Diseases 8, 1:113–122 (July), 1958.

[6] This decline may be partly spurious, representing little more than improvements in the accuracy of reporting or changes in classification of primary site.

[7] American Cancer Society, "1959 Cancer Facts and Figures," New York, N.Y.

[8] Survivorship ratios adjusted for normal life expectancy. The discussion here refers only to cases reported in hospitals. M. H. Griswold et al., "Cancer in Connecticut, 1935–51," Connecticut State Department of Health, Hartford, 1955.

[9] J. R. Heller, "Progress in Cancer Control," Journal of the Florida Medical Association, 44:347–356 (October), 1957.

now regarded as valuable supplements to surgery and radiation. Moreover, hormones as well as radioactive substances have proved valuable against some forms of malignancy.

FUTURE RESEARCH GOALS

Although much is being done against the disease today,[10] far more could be accomplished mereby by bringing present knowledge more effectively to bear. Perhaps as many as 75,000 cancer patients will die this year who might have been saved by earlier and better treatment. The hope for the future lies in research into the nature and etiology of the disease, to discover an effective diagnostic test suitable for large-scale screening, and to find more effective therapies than those known at present.

THE IMPORTANCE OF EARLY DETECTION

Great progress has been made in recent years in the treatment of cancer, and current research on the causes of this disease hold the promise that major new discoveries may be just around the corner.

Nevertheless, the annual number of cancer victims continues to rise. With present knowledge it is estimated that some 40 million Americans now alive will eventually contract the disease. Not only do we need more effective methods of detecting and curing cancer, but the public needs a greater awareness of its role in the fight.

The rise of cancer as a cause of death can be attributed partly to the decline of deaths from other causes, notably infectious diseases, now readily subject to medical control. A population that lives longer naturally runs a greater risk of developing diseases such as cancer, which are especially prevalent among older people.

Fortunately, although cancer is an increasingly serious health problem for the population as a whole, the propects for the individual cancer victim are brighter today than ever before. Whereas a few years ago only one cancer patient out of every four survived for five years or more, now the record shows one of every three so surviving. Thanks to modern methods of treatment, an estimated 150,000 individuals were saved from cancer deaths last year.

Even so, the American Cancer Society, which has given much leadership in the fight against cancer, maintains that half of all those who develop cancer could be saved. The Society, other health agencies, and the medical profession have joined in urging the public to be on guard for signs that indicate the need for prompt medical care. Since early cancer often gives no warning signs, even persons with no outward symptoms are urged to see their physicians periodically for checkups. The improved prognosis for today's cancer victim may be due largely to the impression these early-detection urgings have made.

Whether from fear, negligence, or other factors, however, many people still fail to have regular physical examinations. In fact, despite the rising threat of illness in the later years, older people are less likely to have physical checkups than is the public at large.

More than half the cancer deaths in this country occur among persons 65 and over. Yet a recent survey[11] indicates that 45 percent of the persons in this age group have not had a physical examination in five years. A quarter of all these older people report that they have never had such an examination.

Medical knowledge has advanced so much recently that the public has reason to expect that better ways of diagnosing and curing cancer will soon be found. For the foreseeable future, though, the main hope for any individual lies in early detection of the disease. The person who fails to consult a physician regularly is depriving himself of the benefits modern medical science could give him.

GEORGE BUGBEE,
*President, Health Information Foundation.*

[10] Especially through the programs of such agencies as the American Cancer Society, the National Cancer Institute of the U.S. Public Health Service, and the research departments of pharmaceutical manufacturers.

[11] National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, in cooperation with Health Information Foundation, Survey 367.

## Welcome W. Wilson, of Denton, Tex., Recipient of Flemming Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANK IKARD**
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1959, the 11th annual Arthur S. Flemming awards program, sponsored by the Washington Junior Chamber of Commerce and the American Security & Trust Co., was held here in Washington. The Flemming awards are designed for the following purposes: To recognize young men who perform outstanding and meritorious work for the Federal Government; to attract outstanding young men to Federal employment; to encourage high standards of performance in Government service; and to enhance appreciation of our form of government and the responsibilities it presents.

I am proud to say that a young man from my congressinoal district, Welcome W. Wilson, of Denton, Tex., who is the director of the southwestern regional headquarters, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, received a Flemming award this year. I have known Welcome Wilson since he came to Denton several years ago, and I know him to be a young man of outstanding ability, integrity, and honesty of purpose. He has a brilliant mind and is dedicated to his job and to the people he serves.

Mr. Henry M. Moore, chairman of the Arthur S. Flemming Commission, in presenting the award to Welcome Wilson, made the following statement:

This award is presented to Welcome W. Wilson for his outstanding leadership and creative ability in developing ways and means of enabling States and communities to combat and to repair the ravages of natural disasters. With five States under his jurisdiction—Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas—Mr. Wilson had been in office only a short time when four of those States were stricken with a series of natural disasters, culminating in Hurricane Audrey which, in June of 1957, demolished Cameron, La. Tried by this ordeal, Mr. Wilson's previously developed plans for meeting just such a disaster revealed the imaginative planning and organizational ability that had created them, and, in largest measure, held casualties and damage to a minimum and speeded the recovery and rehabilitation of the stricken communities. Throughout the long disaster period Mr. Wilson, without regard to his own health or safety, supervised disaster operations, working long hours with minimum rest and sleep. The most significant accomplishment of the relief operation from the point of view of agency natural disaster planning was that the vast amount of Federal assistance rendered the stricken areas was supplied entirely from sources within the region, demonstrating that properly organized and administered, these resources can make a region self-supporting.

Later in 1957, Mr. Wilson and his associates revamped their regional planning in accordance with the lessons just learned. These improved operational plans were amply tested in the spring of 1958 when three of the States were again stricken by disaster. As a result of Mr. Wilson's foresight and leadership, relief and rehabilitation operations were again conducted with maximum efficiency.

In recognition of the significantly higher degree of preparation for combating nationwide disaster resulting from an attack upon the country with nuclear weapons, and an increased public awareness of the need for civil defense preparedness, I am honored to make the presentation of this award to Welcome W. Wilson.

## Synopsis of Resolutions Adopted by Governor's Interstate Indian Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. E. Y. BERRY**
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1958 the Governor's Interstate Indian Council, composed of 18 States, passed a number of resolutions. The States represented at the council include: Arizona, California, Florida, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. A synopsis of these resolutions is as follows:

(a) Resolution 3: The Governor's Interstate Indian Council favors legislation to amend Public Law 568, 83d Congress, the Indian Health Program Transfer Act. The primary purpose of the proposed legislation was to clarify the authority of the Surgeon General to institute a program for the provision of Indian sanitation facilities as a part of its overall health program, and S. 3694 will be a great aid in assisting the Public Health Service in carrying out its sanitation program.

(b) Resolution 4: The council strongly urges that Congress double the appropriation for vocational training for Indians to the amount of $7 million a year, and wholeheartedly endorses the philosophy of extending this vocational training program to nonreservation Indians.

(c) Resolution 5: The council requests the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to adopt a program to extend certain health and welfare services to Indians residing off the reservations who would otherwise have been entitled to receive such services and benefits had they remained on the reservations.

(d) Resolution 6: The council resolved that the Secretary of the Interior be petitioned to present to Congress more clearly defined statutes to assure that no termination procedure be consummated without direct acceptance of the terms by the tribe and the consent of the State legislature.

(e) Resolution 7: The council resolved that the Secretary of the Interior be petitioned to inaugurate procedures for determining the status of those who claim to be Indians, and establish a roll on that basis in every tribe.

(f) Resolution 8: The council reaffirms its Resolution XI passed in 1957, requesting Congress to provide adequate appropriations for Indian education.

(g) Resolution 9: The council resolved that Congress effect passage of proper legislation amending the Claims Commission Act to clearly define just what matters constitute a valid and equitable offset to aid the Commission in making a fair and just adjudication in an instance when the Government by way of counterclaim and setoff, charges the tribe with certain services and benefits extended to the tribe in the past and other offsets such as for the operation and maintenance on old USIS irrigation projects against individual allottees and old unsettled obligations of renters of said lands belonging to the individual allottee—not obligation of the allottee or Indian tribe.

(h) Resolution 10: The council resolved that the Bureau of Indian Affairs be requested to initiate a more vigorous Indian reservation road improvement program in the immediate future, as good roads on a reservation are the lifeblood of educational and economic development.

(i) Resolution 12: The council resolved that the Bureau of Indian Affairs be urged to place more emphasis upon the secondary high school education program and make the facilities and opportunities for this kind of education more widely available to Indian youth on reservations, because the educational program on Indian reservations is the basic foundation on which the solution of all problems confronting Indian people will be based.

## Centennial of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Nation recently participated in the commemoration of 100 years of Oregon statehood, for our great State was admitted to the Union on February 14, 1859.

The Oregon Historical Society is ever in the forefront of acquainting the country with Oregon's illustrious traditions and legacy. On October 17, 1958, in the city of Portland, the Oregon Historical Society held its most successful and significant annual meeting. I was privileged to participate in the event, and to discuss briefly the legislation establishing the Fort Clatsop National Memorial near Astoria. Principal speaker of the occasion was the distinguished Oregon author, Stewart H. Holbrook.

Two documents presented at that time will help to acquaint the United States with the background and heritage of Oregon's first century as a State. These are the report of Thomas Vaughan, director of the Oregon Historical Society, and the president's message given by Mr. Donald H. Bates, retiring president of the Oregon Historical Society.

Because we have started the Oregon centennial, an event officially proclaimed by President Eisenhower under a resolution which I offered during the 85th Congress, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the report of Director Vaughan and excerpts from the message of President Bates be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

These thorough and informative documents should be of interest to Members of the Senate and the House, who last year enacted our legislation creating the Fort Clatsop National Memorial, the first such national historic shrine in Oregon under the active custodianship of the U.S. National Park Service.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

(By Thomas Vaughan)

An annual report to the society could not be made without commenting on the superb support of our 40 active and 6 exofficio board members. Our institution is in the middle of a great renascence which the board stimulated and is now carrying through the membership. Because of this hard determination we have been able to:

Embark on a huge library assessment and recataloging program which has already received national attention.

Continue our notable publications program which we now need to expand. Our books receive important national citations and they sell, too. In reference to this program we certainly hope to find money to match the fine Hill Foundation offer during the coming year.

Continue our 2-day annual spring forum, now in its fourth year. Next April 10–12, we shall have the Pacific Northwest regional meeting honoring the centennial.

Hold our second annual Trappers Rendezvous, which this year in Lincoln County was the high point of a busy summer.

Hold the fourth muzzle-loading turkey shoot at Camp Withycombe, attended by over 1,000 this fall. Next year we shall have the international shoot here in cooperation with the Multnomah Muzzle-loading Rifle Association.

The Oregon century farm program held in cooperation with Robert Stewart and the State department of agriculture was a very valuable program in public interest and leads to important new materials. Two hundred and twelve Oregon century farms were located this year and in 1959 there will be more eligible.

The long work devoted to a proper inventory and assessment of the battleship *Oregon* collections is now over. We are very pleased that we could provide this highly specialized service to the department of finance and administration.

In regard to our collections one of the very important areas that has been somewhat ignored is the great story of Oregon's maritime and interior waters. Thanks to Mr. Donald H. Bates, our marine history program is now moving rapidly forward. This is a brilliant achievement.

During the year Michael Haggerty was given a leave of absence to work with the Oregon Centennial Commission. Mr. Cai Lindquist, of Stockholm and Helsinki, came to join our staff via Salt Lake City. He serves as registrar.

Miss Jeannette Stewart, of Alaska, joined the staff April 1 to work under Mr. Duckett as chief catalog librarian, responsible for our important new library program. Mrs. Judith Scharf came to the society in July as public information representative. Associated with the colorful centennial van of history are Capt. Harry Paget, Edward Durham, and Sam Galloway.

During the year the board held four regular meetings and the executive committee six special meetings. The other hard working permanent committees of the society held a total of 20 meetings. Our temporary centennial liaison committee, one. The director also held over 200 conferences with various officers, subcommittees and board members.

During the year members of the staff spoke at 74 public meetings, appeared on 88 radio programs in Oregon and 56 special and regular television programs. We are grateful to these mediums for the interest shown our work. The society also gratefully recognizes the unusual number of editorials, feature stories and regular news coverage which our State newspapers gave to society activities this year. We are most appreciative of this important source of public support. From this has stemmed a larger historical interest which has been instrumental in the information of two new local affiliated societies in Linn and Yamhill counties. We extend warm congratulations to them.

In many ways the most important development for the Oregon country was the great legislative triumph achieved with the passage of the Fort Clatsop National Memorial bill. The society has owned this key property in Clatsop County since 1901. We are giving up our ownership to the Federal Government, for we feel the whole region will benefit from the magnificent plans the National Park Service has in store at Fort Clatsop. May I point out that hard as we have all worked in the society, in Clatsop County, in the State, this victory could not have been achieved without the drive, persistence and comprehensive support of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER. To him, to Representative WALTER NORBLAD, and the other members of the Oregon congressional delegation we all owe heartfelt appreciation. The impact of this legislation will soon be felt both historically and economicaly in Oregon.

Our demanding work with the Oregon Centennial Commission continues. As a member of the commission, I am obliged to attend countless meetings important to some phase of our statewide planning. The centennial year will soon be with us. I earnestly beseech you as members or interested friends of the society to call at our offices of the centennial offices, Jackson Tower, as soon as possible. This is an Oregon commemoration. We need the help of every Oregonian to give the country and the world the kind of commemorative show they want and expect from our State.

Respectfully,

THOMAS VAUGHAN, *Director.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

(By Donald H. Bates)

One hundred years is not such a long span of history, particularly when some of us can vividly recall what has occurred for over half of it. The year 1958, however, closes the first big step of our statehood and in her activities this organization has participated for 61 years. That is good, for in other areas, lack of timely interest has resulted in the loss of records; here our archives are filled with data pertinent to our life and to the

accomplishments of those who have preceded us. This information, by generous donations, is increasing and will prove invaluable to our citizens through students and future historians.

I feel humble to note the time, energy, and money contributed by members, and especially the directors of the society to its many activities. It is more in evidence this year than in any period I can recall. When the impact of their current accomplishments is realized, you, too, will all be pleased.

The centennial commission is moving along a broad front to publicize our State's birthday next year. I hope we all contribute to this occasion and assist the commission in its assignment.

There are some excellent people on the staff of this society. The librarian, Mr. Kenneth W. Duckett, and Dr. Claude E. Schaeffer, museum curator, ably spark responsible activities. Mr. Thomas Vaughan, directing the management of the many services of the society, will speak for them. There are Priscilla Knuth, Bonita Stephan, Cal L. Lindquist, Jeannette Stewart, and Judith E. Scharf, all well qualified and assisting to good work of our director. The Van of History also carries an important staff: Harry Clark Paget, captain, with Samuel F. Galloway, and Edward A. Durham, entertain our citizens in many communities, and Mr. F. S. Burt paves the way for them in an extraordinary manner, and we hope he will carry on in cataloging the department of our marine documents.

At this moment the Van of History is in eastern Oregon. It is a caravan, a symbol of the people, through the joint enterprise of their spokesman, the Oregon Centennial Commission and this society, made possible only by the magnificent contributions of a great many persons. You will learn more of them through the caravan itself. Our staff and architects are responsible for its excellent appearance and exhibits. We are indebted to the coordinators, Sidney Burt and Arthur L. Crookham, including members of the centennial commission, who have so ably stimulated local people's historical interest in each of the communities to be visited. Attendance to the Van of History from all the advance work is proving fantastic and attests the quality of this nerve center.

As you are aware, there is an increasing interest in our society at the State legislature level. Legislators know we are here to foster all local historical enterprises, to assist them in every way possible, and to keep our State's historical records. All of them have helped us in this task.

For the immediate future we sorely need a new building to house our bulging library, archives, museum pieces, and also to accommodate extensive activities. It is urgent that we have a broader base of contributing membership. You personally can help us in this. Our activities are crowding every moment and while it is "more blessed to give than to receive," we must from necessity confine and curtail our services, within a balanced budget, expressly tailored for each activity undertaken. The integrity of the society is paramount and there is no place for personal aggrandizement in any personal, political, social, or religious field for we are in a position of trust to be held inviolate.

I find interest in historical things pertinent to this area extremely wide. I like early buccaneers, the mountain men, including trail blazers and those who manned the early waterways. To the scientists in geology and anthropology their fields of interests are no less glamorous. By and large there is a great interest, of many persons, in our early settlers who made the Territory safe and pegged down the last corner of our country. We, the directors of this society, must cater to them all.

Our State affiliated societies have increased their activities and we hope to do more to assist each one to reach its goal. The State of Washington had added excellent essays on Northwest industries and the Washington Historical Society published a fine volume on "Fort Vancouver," by Mr. Hussey. The citizens of the Province of British Columbia have been so stimulated by their successful centennial that records are now published covering each section of this area. The "Skeena River" saga, by R. C. Large, is a case in point. This river of destiny describes one of the routes into the Yukon. Some of our residents will still recall that "Grease Trail." Marion County has now the fourth volume published of the Salem area. It is good. We have Dorothy Johansen and Charles M. Gates new history "The Empire of the Columbia," a truly significant book. Dr. Burt Brown Barker will add much to the lore of Dr. John McLoughlin and his "Oregon the Unique Prize" will be on the shelves shortly. Our own Stewart H. Holbrook too, adds to the rich printed history of our State. This next year should increase, over the entire State, new and interesting records as the volume soon to appear on Oswego, Oreg., by Mrs. Kenneth Goodall, and the many local tales by others.

To my mind the foremost editor and moralist in the land speaks for the Royal Bank of Canada at Montreal. Simplicity of his words will describe my views; and, I believe, yours as to "what use is history?" I will also borrow from our Navy the significant statement "now hear this"?

Not all of us agree about the benefit to be had from studying the past. People who believe its experiences should be used today and passed along in trust to their successors, rub elbows with those who think that tradition and precedent are a ball and chain hindering progress.

What a pity it is that this should be so. The vital beliefs and good practices of our western world rest on the fulcrum of historic knowledge. There is no basis for our society save its past. There is no guide to business decisions except that given by experience. There is no personal maturity that is not built upon reflection on events of yesterday.

The record of things to be recalled is contained in books, in the minds of parents, in universities, and in business files. What are books but the thoughts of men of their time put down in type? What has a university to proffer except what it has absorbed of the past, to be communicated to every new generation with interpretation and adaption? What has any mother to pass on to her children except the accumulated wisdom of mothers of the past and the lessons of her own experience? What is the purpose of all our office work from the clay tablets of Babylon to the punched tape of today's electronic machines except to provide the history of transactions? There is one qualification to be made: we must use only what is true, significant, and applicable. We must, as Jean Jaures, French statesman, philosopher and orator said it: "take from the altars of the past the fire—not the ashes."

* * * * *

We are forever indebted to the past. It is the source of our very identity. In the present moment, which changes as we live it, the past is all we know. By telling us what our forefathers did, history inspires us in two directions: to respect their achievements, great in their day, and to strive to equal their resourcefulness and courage.

Children take many things for granted. They do not marvel over automobiles, airplanes, radio, television, the telephone. Many things seem to us very simple because someone ages ago or a half century ago was clever enough to think of them. It would be a healthy custom to pause, every once in a while, to pay a memory tribute to the explorers and inventors, the enterprisers and the artisans and the farmers, who laid the foundation of our prosperity. They blazed trails through the forest and over mountains, trails which we have widened into highways and along which we have laid railway tracks. They paddled their canoes along unknown rivers and lakes where we have developed a seaway. We have all those past ages open to us. Everything is in our history to tell us how we arrived at today's comforts and sorrows: the efforts, actions, and sufferings which wrung our civilization and culture out of chaos. That is one use of history. It is the record of societies of men and women, of the changes which those societies passed through, of the ideas which determined their actions, and of the material conditions and forces that helped or hindered their development. Arnold J. Toynbee, one of the foremost historians, has chosen selections which demonstrate his theory that all civilizations pass through similar transitions and that we can better understand our own times through a study of the past. We can use history to give us binocular or stereoscopic vision, so that we see all around today's problems. Life in the present takes on a deeper meaning in the larger context of time. When you put a picture of history into the viewer alongside one of a similar event of today, you get a roundness. The picture enables you to judge the necessity and importance of proposals for action today. It even provides examples of the results that may be hoped for, and warnings about the failures.

Therein lies the secret of a rewarding use of history. We are not seeking to put history under a microscope, to cut it into slices for critical examination. What we do want is to apply the experiences of the past to events today. A spark from another age may illuminate our problem, and help us to plot our course. Nothing can be more precious and useful to anyone than openmindedness. The hidebound politician cannot become a statesman; the one-idea business man cannot become a great captain of industry; the bigoted man or woman cannot enjoy the fullness of satisfaction that life proffers.

History contributes to openmindedness. It shows that people holding widely different views of social, political, and religious matters have lived worthily and contributed their share to achievement in the arts, letters, and sciences. Mature thinking is aided by history. The student of history is less likely than others to believe that any opinion is altogether right, that any purpose is altogether altruistic, that any calamity is altogether deplorable. He is less likely than people ignorant of history to pin derogatory labels on people; to emphasize differences so as to stir angry emotions; to allow prejudice of race, creed, or caste to dictate his association with people around him.

We need to pay attention to the significant things, and avoid wrangling over the trifles. If we become confused by the 50 different reasons given in various books for the outbreak of the two world wars, yet we have a better understanding of the cause than if we assumed there was only one reason, or no reason at all except fate.

When we read the story of mankind we find that there has never been a period which has not been regarded by some of its contemporaries as critical. History seems to be made up of one crisis after another. Ours appears to be more serious because we are in it.

DONALD H. BATES,
*President, Oregon Historical Society.*

## Deterrent Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bonner Fellers has proved correct in many of his analyses of foreign and military affairs. The following article is timely and warrants the urgent consideration of us all:

WHERE WE STAND

(By Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, U.S. Army (retired))

At a recent press conference, President Eisenhower was asked how the Government could hope to reduce expenses when the expanding missile program would be so costly. He replied:

"When guided missiles prove their efficiency, then certainly there must be some other kind of weapon that they are displacing * * * We have got to do some good hard thinking * * * not just pile one * * * system of weapons on another and so in the long run break ourselves."

This expresses the essence of effective, efficient defense. If our Government is to remain solvent and free enterprise survive, we must replace old-fashioned, inadequate, and expensive weapon systems with the most effective and hardest-striking modern weapon systems that American genius can devise.

The President did more than state a principle. He followed with a significant cut in military manpower. By June 30, 1959, our Armed Forces, principally the surface forces—Army, Navy, and Marines—must reduce their strength by 70,000 men.

Behind the scenes there is a more drastic proposal—this one is dangerous. It has been transmitted by letter from the President's National Security Council representative to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The message suggests the idea of a minimum deterrent. By this is meant a deterrent only strong enough to knock out a limited number of enemy targets—principally cities. The theory is that the potential destruction would be great enough to be unacceptable to the Soviets.

The minimum deterrent program would effect vast savings in our air and missile development and production. But soon the Kremlin dictators would have decided air and missile supremacy. Nevertheless, advocates of minimum deterrent argue that, since we would have sufficient striking power to inflict unacceptable losses, it makes no difference how strong Red air and missile power may be. But the minimum deterrence theory is more attractive fiscally than militarily.

The manpower cut and the deterrent proposal represent two possible approaches to husbanding our defense dollars. The first would save money by buying the past. The second, also with the national pocketbook in mind, would risk burying our future.

In any event, whatever our course, the cost of modern defense is prodigious, and the accent on economy grows more and more pronounced. And the public question of which service gets the largest slice of the limited financial pie yields this startling fact year after year.

If the next war comes, each service, supported by the other two, plans to play the dominant role. This, in brief, is where each stands:

The Army holds there can be no victory in war unless land areas which support the enemy's military effort are occupied. The Army feels that, supported by the Air Force and Navy, it must win the land battle as the final decisive act of any war. Man, the Army reminds us, lives on the land. There he has his home, his village, his country. Therefore, the decisive element of victory must be to take the enemy's land from him.

The Army further argues that the United States and U.S.S.R. have reached parity in nuclear weapons, and neither could survive all-out nuclear war. As a consequence, such a war is becoming increasingly improbable. We must prepare instead for limited war in the form of bit-by-bit encroachment on the free world, the Army contends. To the soldier, the Army, with air and sea support, is the ideal limited-war weapon. But should an all-out war materialize, the Army proposes as well to defeat the Red army on its home ground.

To quote from Army doctrine:

"Army power is the power of discretion. It fights troops and captures Communist leaders rather than destroying a country. It can, in conjunction with the other services, preserve the peace, meet Korean-type wars, and defeat the full might of the U.S.S.R. in the event of an all-out war."

The Navy's concept of the next war is that nuclear-armed intercontinental bombers and missiles would knock out both our own and the Soviet land and air weapon systems. The Navy says her ships, safe at sea, would survive. And these ships—especially the carriers and submarines—could then make quick work, the Navy believes, of finishing off the enemy.

The Navy also claims a dominant role in limited war. The Navy can strike anywhere. It has its own movable airbases. It has a Marine amphibious force with tactical air support. The Navy's atomic submarines could strangle enemy shipping and are testing IRBM's to fire deep into enemy territory. As these atomic-powered vessels come into general use, the Navy feels it will be able to cruise or fight for indefinite periods of time in any critical area.

The Air Force maintains that its strategic bombers, and soon the ICBM, can strike and destroy almost instantly any target anywhere on earth. Thus, according to our airmen, strategic airpower has become our first line of defense and our principal war deterrent.

The Air Force holds, and the Army and Navy agree, that control of the air is a prerequisite to successful surface operations. But the Air Force claims more than the ability to control the air. With air control achieved, in either a limited or all-out war, the Air Force obviously could attack and destroy enemy surface forces on land or sea.

This latter air capability clashes head on with the traditional roles of the Army, Navy, and Marines.

Jointly subscribing to the theory that limited wars are more probable than all-out war, Army and Navy chiefs have launched an effort to reduce the fiscal year 1960 Air Force budget by some $6 billion. They would, of course, increase their own budgets accordingly.

The big bomber is almost obsolete, they declare, and will soon be replaced by ballistic missiles. This Army-Navy confederacy urges more money for missiles and for the expansion and modernization of our surface forces to meet the limited-war threat. Except for aircraft to support and transport their surface forces, the Army and Navy chiefs maintain that the Air Force as we know it today is gradually being phased out of existence.

The Air Force fights back. It points out that the only true war deterrent in the world today is the United States Strategic Air Command. And since it will be some years before the ICBM can even partially replace the intercontinental bombers, SAC needs more, not fewer bombers.

From this desperate interservice rivalry looms two potentially fatal dangers.

First, duplication brought about by each service planning to play the major role in war lifts defense costs even higher than necessary. This defense outlay combined with foreign aid and domestic expenses is, in the view of many, undermining our economy. If our economy collapses, there can be no adequate defense.

Second, interservice rivalry results in intolerable compromise. In some cases it leads to actual abandonment of defense measures vital to our survival.

In shaping its defense budget, the administration faced a quandary. It had decided to hold defense expenditures for fiscal year 1960 to some $41 billion. The services originally wanted close to $57 billion. Naturally, the line of least resistance was taken and something like a 30-percent cut straight across the board was imposed. The result will be a defense characterized by compromise, only partially responsive to this air-space-nuclear age.

THE RED THREAT

The United States had to move into the air-space-nuclear age. The enemy was already in it. Conventional surface weapons cannot materially influence air-space-nuclear weapon systems. One reason today's defense is so costly is that the Army and Navy are endeavoring to superimpose air-space-nuclear weapons on antiquated surface forces.

Enemy capabilities are well known. Both the Soviets and Red China are committed to vast standing armies to control their populations, hold satellite peoples in check, and threaten the free peoples on the Eurasian continent.

The Soviet-Red China axis, self-sufficient so far as strategic war materials are concerned, has little need for large surface fleets. But the Russians have more than 500 modern submarines, a frightful threat to free-world shipping and overseas troop transport. In addition, Red submarines will relatively soon be able to fire IRBM's with nuclear warheads against our cities and military installation.

Russia boasts the world's largest air force, Red China the third largest. The Red Chinese have some 2,500 modern combat planes, more than the Chinese Nationalist Air Force and America's Pacific Air Forces combined.

The Soviet Air Force consists of some 22,000 modern combat planes, mostly jet. The air defense force has 4,000 supersonic jet fighters. Russia's intercontinental bombers are believed close to our own SAC bombers in quality. How many ICBM's Russia has ready to strike is unknown. But the Kremlin arsenal of nuclear bombs and delivery systems is feared full enough to level the United States and Europe.

To counter these Red capabilities, we need not three war plans, but only one war plan which takes full advantage of the inherent capabilities of each of the three combat arms; once more in service-by-service format:

Army: Neither the United States nor the rest of the free world can afford armies comparable in size to those of the Soviet Union and Red China. Nor is there reason to do so. The Communist governments have neither the air nor the naval lift to transport their armies overseas. Not only is Europe vulnerable to invasion by the Red Army, but Soviet bombers and IRBM's could devastate Europe without a Red Army invasion.

Even were it possible for the NATO powers to create armies fully capable of defending Europe against Red Army invasion, Europe could still be destroyed from the sky before troops could be moved into battle.

Thus the United States need not create nor plan to create armies to engage the full weight of the Red armies. Consequently the Army is free to turn its attention to defense

of strategic bases, participation in continental defense, and other roles.

Navy. In a future war, we would not be sending millions of troops overseas. The Navy would be relieved of the hazardous transport role. The Communist powers have no surface fleet of magnitude; our own fleet can concentrate on base supply and resolving the menace of Red submarines. Our surface fleet can be materially reduced. The British, although steeped in naval tradition, have all but abandoned their fleet. The United States is, in fact, the only power today which clings to an enormous surface fleet.

The Navy takes violent exception to the idea that our surface fleet could safely be reduced. It is making a desperate fight for a nuclear carrier force. One ship is being built; six are planned by 1966. There are impressive advantages to the nuclear carrier. Mobile, it can cruise in critical areas without refueling for the duration of an emergency. Its air arm can attack enemy ships and bases; it can strike enemy inland targets; it can support landing operations; it is less open to sabotage or capture than an overseas land base.

But the carrier has a fatal weakness. It is vulnerable to air and undersea attack. In combat against an enemy with the largest air and submarine forces in the world the carrier cannot survive. The fireball of a megaton nuclear bomb is 4 miles in diameter. The heat it gives off is more intense than that from the surface of the sun. Thus a direct hit would not be necessary to melt a steel vessel.

The submarine, however, is not especially vulnerable to enemy air attack. Atomic submarines, eventually to be armed with nuclear IRBM's, could strike deep into enemy territory. Because such submarines will be able to fire the IRBM while submerged and then remain under water indefinitely, this striking potential obviously should be developed to its maximum.

A nuclear submarine costs some $200 million. Construction of nine has been authorized by the Congress. A nuclear carrier is more than twice as expensive as a nuclear submarine.

Despite the recognized vulnerability of the costly carrier and the obvious advantages of the submarine, the Navy is psychologically unable to abandon the carrier and go all-out for the submarine. Should the carrier go, with it goes most of the surface fleet and naval air arm. A carrier-vs.-submarine fight rages within the Navy itself, of course. The President and Congress should settle the matter—on behalf of the submarine.

Air Force. The Red Air Force is the most fearsome, deadly threat the United States has ever faced. The best defense against its nuclear and missile threat is an effective maximum war deterrent. The United States has one true deterrent. It is the Strategic Air Command. At this writing, SAC is believed to be stronger and have more experienced and talented crews than the Red Strategic Air Force. In ICBM, IRBM, and space development, the United States appears behind the Soviets. We must work unceasingly in these fields.

The Air Force is now developing the technique of firing an air-to-ground IRBM, or an air-launched ballistic missile. This means that SAC bombers will be able to release the ALBM 1,000 to 1,500 miles from the enemy objective, thereby increasing the effectiveness of the bomber and enhancing the safety of its crew.

In another field of endeavor we must make giant strides. We are desperately in need of an adequate antimissile defense missile. No expense should be spared to provide this. Our fighter-interceptor defense against Red bombers is inadequate. It must also be improved.

NATO

From the beginning, NATO has followed a surface-defense concept which commits NATO ground forces against the Red army. Since World War II the Soviets have kept some 175 regular army divisions in the field. In addition, there are 300 Red reserve divisions, well trained, with modern equipment. The central European satellite states have some 85 additional divisions.

Despite this enormous Red strength, at the 1952 Lisbon Conference NATO decided on 50 divisions and 4,000 aircraft as its minimum defensive force. Today, more than 6 years later, there are scarcely 21 NATO divisions between Switzerland and the North Sea. Of these, 5 are American and 3 British. Thus, the continental NATO powers, with a population of more than 200 million, have under 13 divisions on the line for the defense of Western Europe. The NATO air support for these 21 divisions is insignificant compared to the strength of the Red air force.

After Sputnik I was put into orbit, NATO members met in Paris in December 1957. There President Eisenhower personally promised European NATO members they would be supplied with the most modern of all weapons—the American IRBM's, Thors, and Jupiters. The concept was to emplace a line of IRBM's from England, southeast through Western Europe, and on into Greece and Turkey. Such a chain of well-stocked IRBM bases could send a devastating nuclear barrage deep into the Soviet Union.

But European NATO powers have not reacted as anticipated. While we offered our allies the IRBM as a striking force, we provided them almost no protection against Red nuclear attack. Actually, we are unable to do so. Quite realistically, the NATO powers envisage total destruction by incineration should the Reds retaliate with nuclear IRBM's and bombs.

At the close of 1958 only Britain had accepted and was emplacing a limited number of our IRBM's. These, as they should be, are under British command. Some 18 months ago Italy agreed to accept IRBM's, but as yet has not built bases for them. Turkey, under the muzzles of Red weapons, is eager for the IRBM but has not the technically trained men to handle it. Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, France, north Africa, Greece, and Portugal have turned thumbs down.

The Berlin crisis at the close of 1958 brought forth another NATO Conference. From it came a bold announcement that we would meet force with nuclear weapons. It was something of an empty threat in view of the fact that of all the NATO powers in Europe only Britain is accepting nuclear IRBM's.

The facts compel these conclusions: We should produce fewer IRBM's; we should have more ICBM's to be based on the North American Continent and able to reach any target in the Soviet Union.

THE LIMITED WAR FALLACY

The most dangerous assumption which Pentagon planners could make would be to rule out the possibility of an all-out nuclear war against the Soviets. Such a war can be avoided, but only if we lead in air/space/and nuclear weapons.

In determining the number and types of weapons we need, we must recognize the possibility that the enemy will probably strike first. Our weapons must, so far as possible, be given underground protection. We must have enough weapons to retaliate successfully after absorbing the initial enemy strike.

We must face the fact that war between the Soviet Union and the United States is a possibility. Conventional causes for war already exist. The Soviets have shot down American planes, killed some of the crew members, and interned others. Kremlin leaders openly criticize our institutions; they boast of a Communist-dominated world.

Recently the Soviets have undertaken a massive civil defense program. But the Russians know full well that we have no intention of striking unless we are attacked. One must then assume that the Red bomb shelters are to protect against American retaliation.

The second most dangerous assumption which Pentagon planners could make is that we can fight limited wars and thereby avoid all-out war. We cannot depend upon the Kremlin to keep such a war "limited."

Moreover, after war starts, its course may lead anywhere, regardless of the initial intentions of the adversaries.

The fact is, limited wars would be to our great disadvantage. Limited wars in the traditional sense cannot be decisive. Korea was a limited war which resulted in a most unsatisfactory armed truce. Victory in any limited war would not resolve the issue with the Kremlin. We would be weakened, bled white in manpower, and our economy strained. Meanwhile, the Kremlin's position would grow stronger in comparison.

We have but to glance about the globe to see an array of potential limited wars. The Formosa Strait, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, north Africa, and Berlin all present explosive situations. Commitments in one or more such conflicts would be most unfortunate.

But, if we did have to fight such a war, the weapon system which could strike first would be airpower. Airpower can move rapidly and decisively. At the outbreak of the Korean War our fighters crossed the Pacific with only two stops. During the Lebanese crisis, fighters moved from the United States to that area in 17 hours. It is routine for fighters to span the Atlantic nonstop in 5 or 6 hours.

With nuclear weapons the striking power of one of our fighters is now a thousand times greater than that of a B–17 in World War II. Development in the size and types of nuclear weapons has given tactical air a new dimension to its power and flexibility. On short notice, tactical air can deliver a variety of firepower ranging from small-arms bullets through rockets, napalm, and high explosives to nuclear bombs. With such a variety of weapons, tactical air can destroy enemy communications, troops, supply bases, and other military installations. This striking power combined with speed and range renders tactical airpower decisive in any limited war.

To place chief reliance on surface forces in limited war would mean that the conflict might be lost before our troops could be committed to battle. Dependence primarily on tactical air makes a would-be aggressor hesitant. He knows that before he can win he will feel the full weight of modern airpower.

Thus, tactical air becomes our best limited-war deterrent. Against this reasoning, surface-forces advocates will argue that ground forces will be flown into limited-war combat and arrive promptly with the fighters. This is conceivable but unrealistic. If the enemy initially has control of the air over the potential combat zone, it is unsafe to fly the troops into the area. In any case, it would appear clear that:

1. In limited war tactical air can be the first to strike;

2. Necessary reliance on the full exploitation of tactical air in limited war makes the surface combat role a minor one;

3. The great lesson in considering limited war is that we must be prepared to fight an all-out nuclear war.

If we are prepared to win an all-out nuclear war, we most certainly can win a limited war by using the same, if modified, means. And with the power to win an all-out war the probability of being able to avoid any kind of war is greatly enhanced.

CONCLUSIONS

The minimum deterrent idea suggested to the Joint Chiefs must be rejected. If the minimum deterrent in our hands is expected

to keep the Soviets from striking us, then a maximum deterrent in Red hands will keep us from lifting a finger in defense of our allies, ourselves, or to keep the peace of the world.

In the past we had a superior deterrent and the Reds had a minimum deterrent. The Red minimum deterrent did not prevent our entry into the Korean war because we had the means—SAC—to fight an all-out war if challenged. The Reds with their minimum deterrent were not in a position to challenge us, and we fought a limited war.

We know that at this time the Reds want to continue their gains without risking all-out nuclear war. Our real problem is how to deter the Reds from taking over critical and exposed areas such as Berlin, the Middle East, and Formosa without resorting to an all-out nuclear war. None of these critical areas can successfully be defended without our using nuclear weapons. And this means the risk of a nuclear world war.

If the consequences of all-out nuclear war are worse for us than for the Reds because we have gambled on the minimum deterrent theory, then, in a crisis, we will be more likely than our enemy to back down. The Reds know this.

Adoption of the minimum deterrent theory could end our influence in Europe and Asia.

Our leaders are now examining a program which soon would give us a minimum deterrent and the Reds a maximum deterrent. Should we permit this condition to eventuate, we shall have forfeited our present position in the world. The Reds would likely assume a bolder, more arrogant attitude toward the free world.

Our survival today depends upon:

A striking force capable of destroying Red military capabilities. It must consist principally of air-space-nuclear weapons.

An effective war deterrent, which means an effective striking force.

An adequate continental defense of antimissile missiles and fighter-interceptors, together with the techniques to handle the submarine menace.

Our conventional surface forces—the mass army and the surface fleet—must be largely displaced. Neither of these forces, nor the two combined, can be decisive against the Reds. Our major striking power has passed from surface forces to air, space, and submarine nuclear weapon systems.

The ICBM has not yet displaced the intercontinental bomber and is not likely to do so for at least 5 years. Consequently, our cut-the-dead-wood formula should not be applied to SAC's manned bomber force. Actually, SAC must be sufficiently strengthened to insure our overwhelming air and space superiority.

The President would be justified in cutting deep into surface force budgets. Their combined budget is over $20 billion. A 50 percent cut would be militarily safe.

None of our essential defense bills will be too high if we realistically tailor our arms budget to the needs of the times.

---

## Expansion of Base of Contributions to Political Parties

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since January of last year the American Heritage Foundation has been engaged in a program to expand the base of political contributions to the political parties.

One of the themes developed by the foundation, and now familiar to millions of Americans throughout our country, sums up the purpose of this undertaking:

Want to keep politics clean?

Don't pass the buck—give a buck to the party or candidates of your choice.

I take this opportunity to commend the American Heritage Foundation for this fine program. It is doing a wonderful job in bringing to more and more of our citizens the realization that politics is everybody's business, and that the financing of our parties and political candidates should not be left to only a few.

I ask unanimous consent that the annual report on the American Heritage Foundation's Contribute to Your Political Party program, as prepared by John C. Cornelius, president, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE FOUNDATION ANNUAL REPORT TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES BY JOHN C. CORNELIUS, PRESIDENT, DECEMBER 2, 1958

Last January, when the board of trustees of the American Heritage Foundation adopted Mr. Phil Graham's proposal to conduct an educational campaign—with the Advertising Council—designed to broaden the base of political giving, we looked at it as a trial run, a pilot operation, a pioneer experiment in practical politics. And so to our continuing "Register, inform yourself, and vote" movement we added this new dimension, "Want to keep politics clean? Don't pass the buck, give a buck to the party or candidates of your choice."

Both the Republican and Democratic National Committees wholeheartedly endorsed the project and agreed to direct a nationwide door-to-door solicitation timed to capitalize on our motivational campaign.

THE PROBLEM

In a speech, "The High Cost of Politics," at the University of Chicago, Mr. Graham had spelled out the hard fact that modern political campaigns cost huge sums of money. He issued this challenge: "How can we raise enough honest, untainted money to permit our politicians to run for office without becoming obligated to corrupt and selfish forces? And in doing this, how can we help to create a higher regard and respect for the importance of politics and people in political life?" Research uncovered these facts:

1. Only 2 percent of the American people contribute to political parties—an unhealthful situation from the standpoint of participating citizenship.

2. Approximately $200 milion were spent in the 1956 elections—including local, county, State, and national campaign expenses. About $50 million of this was so-called under-the-table money, according to one political scientist.

3. Surveys of Dr. Gallup in 1955 and 1956 indicated that 16 to 17 million families expressed a willingness to give $5 or more to a political party, if properly approached.

CAMPAIGN TIMETABLE

1. January to April: Planning phase. The American Heritage Foundation met and worked with the Republican and Democratic National Committees; the Advertising Council; our volunteer advertising agency, Foote, Cone & Belding; our volunteer public relations organization, Vernon Pope, and Mr. Graham's staff. The immediate problem was to work out an adequate psychological approach and copy platform embodying all phases of the new program. Result was the basic theme, now familiar to millions of Americans:

"Want to keep politics clean? Don't pass the buck—give a buck to the party or candidates of your choice."

2. On May 21 the campaign got underway with a news conference in Washington. General Sarnoff, T. S. Repplier of the Advertising Council; Michael Ryan of Allied Chemical, volunteer coordinator, and Cal McCarthy of Foote, Cone & Belding, and I presented the new program and Mr. Alcorn and Mr. Butler pledged the support of both parties. The event was well-publicized with all wire services, TV newsreels, and nearly every daily giving it top priority. Favorable editorials appeared in the New York Times, New York Daily News, New York Herald Tribune, Christian Science Monitor, Washington Post and Times Herald, the Des Moines Register and Tribune, and hundreds of other leading newspapers.

Regarding the new campaign, Harper's editor, John Fischer, stated, "If it works, it may turn out to be the most effective weapon for good government since the invention of the grand jury."

3. In June, 60,000 "Contribute to Your Party" car cards were posted in buses, trains, and streetcars from coast to coast. More than 3,000 three-sheet posters were put out by transportation advertising firms. These showings continued until election day.

Most of the Nation's principal columnists added their approval: Peter Edson, Marquis Childs, Sylvia Porter, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Charles Lucey, Roscoe Drummond, and others. The June 1 issue of the New York Times Sunday Magazine published General Sarnoff's fine article, "Campaign for Campaign Money," and other magazines announced their support of the new program.

4. In July sponsored advertisements began to appear in weekly and daily newspapers throughout the Nation. Between July and November, more than 600 newspapers made use of 3,000 mats.

One newspaper, the Washington Post, carried every ad offered by the Advertising Council. In California and Michigan advertisements were cosponsored by local candidates of both major parties.

In July, 5,000 house magazines received advertising and news copy which many of them used right up to the eve of election.

5. In August, all radio stations—over 3,000—and networks received a radio kit containing spot announcements and a disc of jingles, "Now is the time for all good folks to come to the aid of their party." Liberal use was made of these materials throughout August, September, and October.

6. In September and October, all television networks and 593 stations used the cartoon films, slides, and visual announcements urging Americans not only to contribute to their political party but also to register, inform themselves, and vote. This television kit resulted in more than 25,000 local station messages.

TELEVISION SUPPORT

Television support was exceptional. Nearly 100 top network shows carried our public service messages—among them "Ed Sullivan," "Today," "Steve Allen," "Hallmark Theater," "Perry Mason," "Red Skelton," etc. On September 21, "What's My Line?" devoted 15 minutes to a most effective appearance by Mr. Alcorn and Mr. Butler in behalf of the "Contribute to Your Party" program. Phil Graham spoke on CBS-TV's "Great Game of Politics." Arthur Godfrey interviewed me on the CBS-TV network for 12 minutes; so did Dave Garroway's NBC-TV "Today" show, and CBS-TV "Big Payoff."

Several other foundation trustees appeared on television in behalf of our campaign.

Among them were Mr. Brophy, Mr. Dowling, Mr. Farley, and Dr. Gallup.

MAGAZINE SUPPORT

Virtually every weekly and monthly magazine gave editorial or advertising support. Life, Saturday Evening Post, and Newsweek carried full-page advertisements especially prepared for each magazine by Foote, Cone & Belding. McGraw-Hill publications featured advertisements representing the businessman's approach to campaign financing.

The Reader's Digest article, "Back Your Ballot With Your Buck" by William Hard, touched off nearly 100 newspaper editorials. Free reprints provided by the Digest were sent to 10,000 political leaders.

A partial list of supporting magazines includes Nation's Business, New York Times Sunday Magazine, Ethyl News, Congressional Quarterly, Democratic Digest, Pennsylvania Farmer, Reader's Digest, Michigan Farmer, America, Chemical Week, Mademoiselle, Ladies Home Journal, Christian Herald, National Business Woman, Newsweek, Better Homes & Gardens, Redbook, Look, Catholic Digest, Parade, Scholastic, Voice of St. Jude, National Jewish Monthly, This Week, and the New Christian Advocate.

NEWSPAPER SUPPORT

Newspaper editorial comment on the campaign was broader than any foundation project since "Freedom Train" days. The Washington Post and Times Herald gave the campaign six editorials. The New York Herald Tribune carried three. Leading columnists vied with each other in praising the campaign. Full-page stories appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Des Moines Register & Tribune, Kansas City Star, and so forth.

The Des Moines Register & Tribune syndicate and its general manager, Henry P. Martin, foundation trustee and our newspaper participation chairman, deserve special recognition for a series of editorial cartoons popularizing the concept, "Democracy is everybody's business. Give, register, inform yourself, and vote." Cartoon panels such as Walt Kelly's "Pogo" and Milt Caniff's "Steve Canyon" stressed the "Give a Buck" theme.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

To enlist business and industry participation, a series of informal cultivation luncheons were held in key cities:

Boston, Mass., Michael T. Kelleher, host; Dr. Robert E. Wilson, speaker.

Chicago, Ill., Robert Galvin, host; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

Dallas, Tex., Fred F. Florence, host; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

Des Moines, Iowa, Henry P. Martin, host; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

Duluth, Minn., Harry Zinsmaster, host; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

Kansas City, Mo., J. C. Hall, host; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

Los Angeles, Calif., Leonard Firestone and Justin Dart, hosts; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

New Orleans, La., George Healy, host; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

New York, N.Y., John L. Burns, host; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

Wichita, Kans., William Graham, host; John C. Cornelius, speaker.

Similar luncheons are scheduled for December and January in Minneapolis (hosts: Peavey Heffelfinger and John Cowles), Pittsburgh (Henry J. Heinz II), Baltimore (Jacob Blaustein), and Milwaukee (Francis Trecker), all trustees of our foundation.

COMPANY PARTICIPATION

Sending materials to 23,000 member firms, one of our partner organizations, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, urged companies throughout the Nation to participate in the program.

A unique campaign by Aerojet-General Corp. resulted in 11,000 of the firm's 15,000 employees giving a total of $25,000 to the party of their choice. Outstanding company campaigns were also conducted by Standard Oil of New Jersey, Continental Airlines, Allied Chemical, Hallmark Cards, Gulf, Cities Service, Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric, General Electric, Maytag, Continental Can, Swift, Delaware-Lackawanna, Ford Motor Co., Johnson & Johnson, Sears, Roebuck, Timken Roller Bearing, Consolidated Laundries, North American Car, Pan American Petroleum, Ethyl, General Foods, Kellogg, Simoniz, Armour, Schering, Broadcast Music, and Metropolitan Life.

Never before have so many companies launched their own nonpartisan practical politics program. Employees were urged not only to register and vote their convictions, but to join a political party and to undertake specific party chores such as getting people to attend political meetings, soliciting contributions, etc.

Company participation in support of the foundation's new campaign was truly outstanding. It reflected the same high level of business leadership as in 1956 when a confidential study, made for our foundation by Dr. Gallup, showed that 19 percent of the American people were reminded to register and vote by citizenship programs in their own companies.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Newest member to join the foundation team was the Japanese-American Citizens League—bringing the number of national participating organizations up to 153.

The foundation's role in relation to these membership organizations is that of clearinghouse, supplying how-to-do-it materials to them, and secondly, coordinator encouraging a division of labor so that each group conducts a special project of its own. Some of the many special projects undertaken by cooperating organizations:

Naturalized citizens program (American Bar Association).

First Voters Week (Jaycees).

Essay contest and distribution of national anthem records to rural schools (American Farm Bureau Federation).

Ringing church bells on election day (Lions).

Lincoln-Douglas debates and voters service centers (League of Women Voters).

Armed Forces Week (U.S. Department of Defense).

Community get-out-the-vote kits (B'nai B'rith).

Promoting advertising council newspaper ads (Newspaper Advertising Executive Association and Bureau of Advertising of the ANPA).

Company practical politics programs (N.A.M. and U.S. Chamber of Commerce).

"Register, vote and contribute" reminders to membership (Pilot International National Congress of American Indians, American Hotel Association, AFL–CIO).

Baby-sitting service project (Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls).

Encouraging use of our radio and TV materials (National Association of Broadcasters).

RESULTS ACHIEVED

A thorough study of the campaign's effectiveness, both in attitudes engendered and money collected, is being made for our foundation by Dr. Gallup. Complete findings will be available in January. Meanwhile, evidence now at hand clearly indicates that certain specific and tangible results were accomplished:

1. A good beginning toward a nationwide public awareness of the need for political giving as an essential phase of participating citizenship.

2. A growing realization on the part of the general public and both Houses of Congress of the necessity for improved legislation on election finances.

3. On November 4 more people went to the polls than in any previous nonpresidential election. This record vote was in part a result of the "Contribute to Your Party" campaign. A citizen who invests in a political party or candidate is more likely to vote.

4. Present estimates of the total collected in small gifts range from 3 to 12 million dollars. Reason for varying estimates is that many local and county committees and special candidates' drives do not give accurate reports to State and national committees. For instance, the foundation knows of one county where $5,700 was collected in small gifts, but the county chairman reported only $250 to the State committee. Greatest success was in the suburbs and smaller towns; greatest disappointment—the big cities.

5. Dr. Gallup gives this preliminary report of some of his findings:

(a) Forty-four percent of the American people report that they are aware of our new "Contribute to Your Party" program. According to Dr. Gallup, this 44 percent penetration is a remarkable achievement for a new campaign.

(b) Only 5 percent stated that they were actually solicited by a political party.

(c) Twenty-three percent reported they would have given $5 had they been solicited by the political party of their choice. Dr. Gallup says that this comes to approximately 24 million households and therefore $120 million in small gifts, with no strings attached, is available to the political parties.

The first nationwide bipartisan drive to broaden the base of financial support of our political system, our pilot operation taught us and the political parties many valuable lessons. We learned, for example, the need for greater coordination between the special gifts and small donors phases; the need for bringing more local and State politicians into the planning; the need for getting more people to join a political party; the need for recruiting more volunteer solicitors; the need for working out a different pattern for the big cities, etc.

Was the campaign a success from the standpoint of the political parties? Both Mr. Alcorn and Mr. Butler have already asked us and the Advertising Council to continue the "register, vote, and contribute to your party" program, giving special attention to the 1960 elections. Excerpts from their evaluation of our program:

Mr. Alcorn: "Your public service campaign is taking the curse from political financing. You broke the ice for the Republican Party with thousands who never before had contributed to a political party and, perhaps, thought there might be something tainted about giving to a political cause. Please continue. I pledge you the full-fledged support of our party from the smallest precinct to the White House."

Mr. Butler: "Your 'Give a Buck' program performed a truly outstanding public service in making the financing of our political parties the responsibility of all the people, not just a few. You are giving increased vitality to our political system through the participation of more and more people. Your program is the greatest step forward in the history of 20th century politics."

OTHER ACTIVITIES

A more complete report of all foundation activities for 1958 would have to mention the national anthem project and the Law Day U.S.A. program.

The national anthem project is still going on. So far, 85,000 schools are now using our new high-fidelity recording of the national anthem. This is the first time a high-fidelity disc of the national anthem is being made available to all schools throughout the Nation—162,000 in all—thanks to the generosity of our trustee, Mr. Louis Schweitzer, and the help of the Victor Record Division of RCA. Distribution to remaining schools will be completed in 1959.

At the request of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, one of the founders of the Freedom Train and of the American Heritage Foundation, we joined with the American Bar Association in cosponsoring the nationwide Law Day U.S.A. program. Our contribution was supplying educational materials to newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations—stressing respect for law and order as the cornerstone of our American heritage. The importance of jury duty as a basic act of American citizenship was also emphasized. Widespread publicity in all media was partly a result of our foundation's efforts, according to Justice Clark and Mr. Ross L. Malone, president of the American Bar Association. General Sarnoff spoke at Law Day U.S.A. exercises held at the New York County Courthouse, and more than 20,000 separate Law Day U.S.A. programs were held across the Nation. We look forward to continuing our participation for 1959 in this timely program.

## No Inconsistency in Insurance Industry's Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives recently approved a bill sharply increasing taxes on life insurance companies. At the time that the bill was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee, 10 members expressed grave reservations as to the possible impact of this tax burden on a vital form of individual, and voluntary, thrift. I was pleased to associate myself with these views.

Now we find that the very points emphasized in our supplemental remarks in the Ways and Means Committee report on the life insurance tax bill, H.R. 4245, are being given serious attention by the other body, and public hearings on H.R. 4245 have been recessed while the economic factors implicit in this legislation are examined.

Some of the economic factors relating to H.R. 4245 and another significant tax bill, H.R. 10 (the Keogh-Simpson bill), are discussed in a recent editorial in the National Underwriter, a publication widely circulated in the life insurance industry. I call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues for their consideration:

NO INCONSISTENCY IN INDUSTRY'S STAND

The life insurance business is actively against inflation and in favor of a balanced budget. It is also against the huge rise in income taxes the companies would have to pay under the House-passed bill pending now in the Senate. And it favors the Keogh-Simpson bill, the 1959 version of last year's Jenkins-Keogh bill, giving self-employed persons somewhat the same tax break in accumulating retirement funds as employed persons enjoy under approved pension plans.

Is there danger that the public will think it detects an inconsistency between the latter two viewpoints and the first two? We believe there is no inconsistency whatever but since the layman is likely to jump to conclusions on superficial evidence, it would be well for life insurance men to be prepared for the accusation that the life insurance business is talking out of both sides of its mouth on the subject of inflation.

Treasury officials testified in ways and means committee hearings that the Keogh-Simpson bill would trim $365 million from anticipated tax revenues. Estimates vary considerably on what would be a fair increase in the tax bite on the life companies, but it would certainly be a lot less than the one contained in the pending bill. Probably the difference between a fair increase and the boost specified in the bill, plus the $365 million revenue loss inherent in the Keogh-Simpson bill would push the budget nearly half a billion dollars in the direction of imbalance.

How does this square with the insurance industry's implacable opposition to inflation and unbalanced budgets, John Q. Public may ask, if he thinks about the matter.

The answer is that the fight against inflation and in favor of balanced budgets is not really won if the victory rests on gross injustice to certain segments of the taxpaying public.

The imposition of a tax increase on life companies far in excess of any possible concept of fairness cannot be defended on the grounds that it would help balance the budget and fight inflation. Neither can the continuing of a manifest discrimination against the self-employed in their retirement plan accumulations be defended on those grounds.

It could be argued that by removing a discrimination against the self-employed and refusing to impose a discrimination against insurers, Congress would be encouraging people to save money that would otherwise add to inflationary pressures. We believe that to be true, but transcending all that is the matter of simple justice: Heaping an undeserved tax load on policyholders and on the self-employed is neither just nor defensible. There is no inconsistency in opposing such unfairness and at the same time fighting against inflation and unbalanced budgets.—W. M.

## Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the Minnesota State Legislature on March 6, 1959, adopted House Resolution No. 8, requesting Congress to enact railroad retirement and unemployment benefits.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 8

Resolution requesting Congress to enact railroad retirement and unemployment benefits

Whereas a large number of residents in Minnesota are employed by railroads and are vitally affected by unemployment and retirement benefits of railroads; and

Whereas H.R. 1012 would provide an increase in retirement and unemployment benefits to employees of railroads; and

Whereas we are informed that the retirement fund for railroad employees is actuarially sound and that the increase in retirement benefit proposed in H.R. 1012 would not adversely affect that fund and would not result in increased cost to the railroads or their employees: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota*, That Congress be requested to enact H.R. 1012 as originally introduced without amendments; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be instructed to mail each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota a copy of this resolution.

E. J. CHILGREN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
G. H. LEAHY,
*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

Adopted by the House of Representatives, the sixth day of March, nineteen hundred and fifty-nine.

## Haley's Business Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for all of us to become aware of the almost criminal act we are committing against the generations yet to come by continuing to amass more and more Government debt without any definite system of curtailing the principal. We manage somehow to budget the interest but little or no attention has been given to budgeting a set amount for the retirement eventually of our tremendous debt load. I think the gentleman from Florida has introduced a bill that is practical and deserves much conscientious consideration by this Congress. The following editorial from the Lakeland Ledger of Thursday, March 5, 1959, reflects the good business practicability of Mr. HALEY'S proposal:

HALEY'S BUSINESS PROPOSAL

Congressman JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida's Seventh District, introduced a bill this week for retirement of the national debt. It is the kind of measure that immediately commands the attention of businessmen throughout the Nation. For businessmen have long looked on disconsolately as the Federal Government has plunged ahead on an unbusinesslike basis.

There is no hope that Government will ever be as financially efficient as a private business enterprise. In the first place, Government is on a nonprofit basis. Second, it embraces a large area of service to people from whom no financial return can be expected.

But there is a margin beyond which lies peril for our Federal Government. The margin has long been exceeded by our national debt. It soars at the legal limit. Periodically there is a demand that the ceiling be raised. Each such proposal brings a reaction of heavy gloom among businessmen.

The Haley proposal is the essence of sound and solid arithmetic. Set aside 5 percent of the revenue each year to apply on retirement of the staggering debt, he says. But his proposal goes one important step further. Have no budget that exceeds estimated revenue, he urges. Instead of going a little further into the red, raise taxes, meet the problem head-on instead of prolonging the misery and adding to the burden to be carried by successive generations of Americans.

HALEY, it is clear enough, is not advocating that taxes be increased. He is advocating that the Government do something realistic

to pull itself out of the bog of debt. In effect, he is saying: Let's pay as we go and start paying off what we owe. And that makes extremely good sense to every businessman.

There is no valid reason why the Federal Government should not begin to reduce the great debt load. It is a problem that calls for a rigid application of national self-discipline. It is one that cannot go on indefinitely without resultful attention.

From the viewpoint of businessmen throughout the Nation, therefore, it is encouraging when a Member of Congress launches a direct attack on the problem as Congressman HALEY has done. He has proposed a sensible course in an area of astronomical figures.

## Scholl Canyon Win Is Tribute to Determination of Mayor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published in the Ledger, Montrose, Calif., newspaper dated March 8, 1959, entitled "Scholl Canyon Win Tribute to Determination of Mayor":

SCHOLL CANYON WIN IS TRIBUTE TO DETERMINATION OF MAYOR

(By Ed Delaney)

Three days ago, the battle of Scholl Canyon raged before the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County. The principal proponents of that reclamation project were members of Glendale City Council, the city manager and department heads, led by Mayor Zelma Bogue. She received much countywide publicity as being the one who is largely responsible for having stymied the efforts of private dump operators and vote-conscious politicians who tried to block Flendale's plans for proceeding with the project.

The purpose of the undertaking as she insisted is to develop a recreational area that will prove beneficial to all sections of the county—not just for Glendale. Her efforts, very ably augmented by those of City Manager C. E. Perkins, were crowned with success when on Thursday the supervisors reversed a previously taken position and approved the project.

That was not the first time the feminine fighter for Glendale took command of the city's forces to press for a matter which she felt was for the best interest of the taxpayers and the general welfare of the local citizens.

About a month before last week's stormy session in Los Angeles, she and Perkins appeared before the supervisors and prevented what appeared to be a planned move to indefinitely shelve the Scholl development project. Her persistence at that time resulted in Thursday's session, when victory was recorded for her and the "shock troops" of the city which she headed.

Taking the lead in projects for the welfare of the community during the past 20 years, has made Zelma Bogue the best known and probably the best liked woman in Glendale.

During World War II, she was named an honorary Navy recruiter by the U.S. Naval Department. She has received the coveted Gulick Award of the Camp Fire Girls and a Certificate of Merit from the California State Assembly. For years she had been on the advisory board of the Salvation Army and last year she was made an honorary colonel in the California National Guard. She has been given life memberships in practically all the local women's organizations, such as the Tuesday Afternoon Club, the Business and Professional Women's Club, the Soroptimists, the Civic League, and the Teen-agers Club—though she admits being past the age of those who are usually admitted to that group.

NAMED MAYOR

When she first ran for city council, she was opposed by five politically experienced members of the so-called stronger sex. She won. Two years ago she was reelected to a 4-year term on the council and received more votes than the two men also elected at that time. She was chosen as Glendale's first woman mayor.

Contrary to the predictions of some, she gained fame as one mayor who takes her duties earnestly and works at the job. Incidentally it is not financial remuneration that impels her to give so much time and energy to the obligations of her office. Council members, including the mayor, receive no salaries, but are paid $25 for each meeting of the council they attend. Until last year they received only $10 per meeting. So it is more or less a labor of love for the betterment of the city that keeps the council members and mayor at their tasks.

NOT A PUPPET

Zelma speaks her mind when necessary and can remain discreetly silent if the occasion demands. After weighing the facts of a case brought before the council for decision, she states her position. She is adamant to the blandishments of pressure groups and is not the puppet of any opinion-making mediums.

Many of the problems brought before the council have to do with construction of buildings, planning and zoning. She is not without some personal knowledge of these activities. She built and owns the apartment house in which she lives alone and has built several others which were sold.

Not infrequently when one such zoning or building case comes before the council, she is the only member who has personally inspected the location and bases her decision on what she observes. One seeing, she asserts, is worth a thousand tellings.

BLASTS JAIL

While serving on the county grand jury some years ago, she says she visited every jail in the county and discovered that Glendale had the worst. For 5 years she had labored to remove that blot from the reputation of the city. Only last week were her efforts crowned with success. The council approved plans and appropriated funds for construction of a million dollar police building and jail.

She believes in and personally practices the simple life as the best in which to preserve the fundamental principles of our Americanism. She endeavors to form her decisions on the city's expenditures, in the way they will affect the pockets of the taxpayers. Economy and efficiency are her guides when spending public funds.

When she took a firm stand on the Scholl Canyon project, she was not imbued with any desire to garner publicity, but to get the best deal for Glendale. Her stubborn and determined resistence to the efforts of powerful pressure groups and individuals was displayed in the meetings before the Board of Supervisors. Her stand may also cause some practical politician to hesitate about clashing with Zelma when she is about her city's business.

Despite the apparent decline in the political morals of some American statesmen, this Nation shall not perish from the earth, so long as we have women who will assume public office and carry out their duties with the intellectual honesty and zeal of Zelma Bogue.

## Comments on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it seems that some people are determined that the Federal Government shall take over the financing of the public schools, regardless of need. Fortunately not all educators have been misled. I respectfully commend to the attention of the House a copy of a letter from Evan J. Worley, principal, Niobrara County High School, Lusk, Wyo., to Dr. Walter W. Heller of the University of Minnesota, which was recently transmitted to me.

The letter is as follows:

Dr. WALTER W. HELLER,
*University of Minnesota,*
*Minneapolis, Minn.*

DEAR DR. HELLER: I have just read "Education U.S.A." dated February 12, 1959, and noted your comments on Federal aid to education and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's contention that States have sufficient fiscal capacity to take care of their own school needs. You say the facts do not support the chamber's contention. Do you mean by this that the Federal Government is in better condition to pay for education than are the States?

I certainly disagree with you on this—at least as it applies to our wonderful State of Wyoming. This State is in good condition financially and definitely has the capacity to take care of its own school needs. Our problem here is to prove to the people that it is cheaper to keep our tax dollar in this State and spend it on our schools than to send that dollar to Washington and get back 40 cents to use on our schools. And I know of other States that are also in good condition.

Do you have any figures as to how much in debt each State is? I'll bet that the total debt of all 49 States is much smaller than that of the United States Government. Should a business in fair shape borrow from a business in poor shape? I can't see it.

I see that you are an economist. May I ask if you feel that a business can continually go farther into debt and survive? If we have more Federal aid, it means more deficit spending—isn't there a breaking point? I certainly can't see having our Federal Government going into debt deeper in order to send money back to the States to use for education when it means a cheaper dollar, probably more inflation, etc. I'm certainly glad I'm getting along in years—I'd hate to be a young person and see the tremendous debt that is continually piling up and will have to be paid eventually by the next generation and the next and the next—or don't you economists think that debt will have to be paid?

A local businessman referred to Federal money the other day as free money. I proceeded to try to straighten him out on his misconception—but I'm afraid too many other Americans (educators, included) feel the same way. How wrong they are.

Sincerely yours,

EVAN J. WORLEY,
*Principal.*

Mr. Speaker, I further commend to the attention of the House an editorial appearing in the Wyoming State Tribune, Cheyenne, Wyo., in its issue of February 17, 1959, showing some of the things

the State is in fact doing to take care of its educational needs. This certainly substantiates the position of Mr. Worley.

The editorial is as follows:

It seems clear that the 35th Wyoming legislature is dealing handsomely, financially speaking, with public schools and education.

Whether it is also dealing well of course remains to be seen.

The most important education bill is, certainly, the one approved by both legislative houses and which amends the school foundation program act. This boosts the value of the classroom unit—which determines State aid—by $700 and it also authorizes use of average daily membership rather than average daily attendance in computing classroom units.

The two changes, says an analysis by the Wyoming Taxpayers Association, will give close to a $1,000 increase in the classroom unit value as that has been computed through the current school years.

"Estimates are that over $3,500,000 more will be distributed in State aid to Wyoming school districts next school year than currently," the association said.

An appropriation of $1,250,000 (same as that provided 2 years ago) from the general fund is pending. Of that, the association says:

"With the expected balance in the fund to be used to finance the increased State aid distribution contemplated, it appears that something over $5 million in new and increased revenues must be found by the time of the 36th (1961) legislature."

That, concludes the association, will be a "sizeable and disagreeable task." Indeed it will.

The legislature has also—

Raised the effective limit of property taxation, for school district current operational expenditures, from 14 to 21 mills.

Four mills above that limit may be authorized by voters in unified districts without limitation as to duration (restricted to 4 years heretofore) and without provision for future district voter reconsideration or revocation of such authority.

As to school district reorganization, the association comments, and glumly so—

"It appears that again this session of the legislature, considerations as to desirable steps toward more efficient organization of school districts have been ignored and more money will be poured in by the State to further entrench the current situation."

## American Moral Flabbiness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief item from the Alcove, a weekly bulletin of the Mount Vernon, Ohio, Rotary Club, and reported by Mr. George T. Culbertson, Jr., for Tuesday, March 3, 1959.

This article tells of a speech by Prof. Raymond English, of Kenyon College, who warned the Rotarians about the dangers of our Nation's moral flabbiness and exposed some of the methods the Soviet leaders are using to weaken us in the international field. It is well worthy of the consideration of my colleagues.

The article follows:

PROF. RAYMOND ENGLISH WARNS AGAINST AMERICAN MORAL FLABBINESS

(By George T. Culbertson, Jr.)

In a sobering talk on the new trends of international relations, Prof. Raymond English, Kenyon College, told members of the Rotary Club Tuesday noon that Soviet Russia poses a grave danger to the United States during the next few years.

He compared the world today with an old patched intertube—trouble is likely to break out at any one of a dozen places—Berlin, Middle East, Quemoy, Korea, Indonesia, South America, Africa.

The United States is in the position to check one—possibly two—of these trouble spots, but if Khrushchev should manage to cause half a dozen outbreaks at the same time, we would be in no position to act on any of them, he said.

An ideal time for such a plan, English told the group, would be the summer of 1960. The gap will have been widened in the guided missile race, Communist leaders will be due for a boost and the United States will be deeply engrossed in a presidential election.

Attacking the present foreign policy, English said that it is the same policy that existed in the late 1940's that was so successful in containing Russia, but that since 1952, these conditions no longer exist. The foreign policy has lost its flexibility and is unable to meet changing conditions.

"Moral flabbiness seems to be the cause of our diplomatic troubles," he said. "We have been putting the wrong things first. We need a complete reevaluation of our way of thinking. More of our money should be spent on education and defense—our whole society is becoming flabby and hesitates to sacrifice."

English said that massive retaliation is no longer useful in detering small wars and uprisings. He stressed the value of developing highly mobile forces to cope with such situations.

"There is the danger," he said, "that by the mid 1960's, the balance of terror may swing to Soviet Russia. It is far better to fight several small wars to contain Russia than to have them wage an all-out war without retaliation."

## Steel Costs Are Determined in World Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June 30 marks the end of the present 3-year contract between the steel industry and its principal unions. Various proposals have been advanced that will considerably add to the wage costs of the U.S. steel industry. In view of the extension of the Trade Agreements Act last year and the increasing imports of steel products, it behooves the steelworkers to maintain a wage-cost structure that will be competitive in world markets. No matter how high wages might be raised if our markets are lost to foreign competition, there will be fewer jobs and lower payrolls for everyone concerned.

The magazine, Steel, in its issue of February 23, 1959, presented a penetrating review of the prospects before the American public in an editorial entitled "Dear Mr. McDonald: Why a Steel Strike?" Under unanimous consent, I ask that it may be included as an extension of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

DEAR MR. MCDONALD: WHY A STEEL STRIKE?

Almost everyone expects that you will pull members of your steelworkers union off their jobs when your present 3-year contract with the steel industry expires June 30.

The minority thinks you will borrow a leaf from the book of your intramural competitor, Walter Reuther, and ask your men to work without a contract until consumers get low on steel.

But, whatever the timing, the odds still favor a strike lasting 4 to 9 weeks.

That is because most people think steel industry management cannot be expected to come across with your $1 billion package (50 cents an hour) that calls for increased pensions and insurance, longer vacations, more holidays, more unemployment compensation, and larger shift premiums.

As a basic industry, steel is under compulsion to help hold the wage-price line as a means of averting inflation. It cannot grant increases in wages that exceed increases in productivity without raising prices.

Because of the wage-price spiral, steel and the products made from steel are already losing out in world markets. Here at home the St. Lawrence Seaway will provide still easier access for foreign steel to the heart of the American market.

Mr. McDonald, you need to help strengthen, rather than tear down, the position of the industry on which your million and a quarter members depend for their livelihood.

A long steel strike would deliver a lethal blow to the recovery in business that has not been felt fully by the automobile industry and hardly at all by the capital equipment industry. It would disrupt the Government's fiscal planning. It would increase unemployment, now numbering nearly 5 million. The prospect of a strike has already forced consumers to rush in for material they will not use for months.

Why not demonstrate true labor statesmanship by asking for a contract with adjustments that are reasonable and fair?

Really, Mr. McDonald, why is a steel strike necessary?

IRWIN H. SUCH,
*Editor in Chief.*

## Work Being Done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Implementing the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish once more to illustrate the impressive work being done by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in implementing the National Defense Education Act. It gives me great pleasure to advise this House that a counseling and

guidance training institute will be conducted at Hunter College July 1 through August 7, 1959. Hunter College is located in the heart of Manhattan and in the heart of New York's 17th Congressional District. Hunter is one of the many institutions in the 17th District that makes the 17th one of the truly great communities of the Nation.

The selection of Hunter as the site for one of the Nation's training institutes under the National Defense Education Act results from preliminary arrangements concluded between the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Lawrence G. Derthick, and Dr. Harry N. Rivlin, dean of teacher education, College of the City of New York, representing the four municipal colleges—City, Hunter, Brooklyn, and Queens.

A central feature of the institute at Hunter will be a reexamination of guidance policies in the light of today's needs as the core of a training program for counselors.

What are some of these needs? The Congress has declared that the Nation is losing too much of our most valuable and precious resources—the talents of our children in our schools. We know, for example, that many able students do not continue their education beyond the high school. At any time, but especially in these critical times, we cannot afford such waste. The survival of our democratic way of life demands nothing less.

Consequently, the Congress, through the National Defense Education Act of 1958, authorized a program of federally financed counseling and guidance training institutes. They represent one of several features of the act designed, in the words of the act itself, "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States." Title V of the act is entitled "Guidance, Counseling, and Testing; Identification and Encouragement of Able Students." The cited title suggests the problem which the program of counseling and guidance institutes—such as the one at Hunter—will attack. It will do so by expanding educational programs for the professional preparation of counselors. The need is great for professional personnel to identify, counsel, and motivate the more able students to continue their schooling. This does not mean that current educational programs for counselors are not good. It is simply that a national condition exists, which the Congress has recognized by calling on our colleges and universities to meet it. The institute at Hunter is a response to this challenge.

We can take pride that we are in a good position to help meet the challenge. Physical facilities at Hunter, and nearby, will lend themselves admirably to the purposes of the institute. In fact, since 1950, there has been an on-going program of graduate training in guidance and school counseling at our municipal colleges. The standards of this program are high and well recognized. As a result, skilled training resources will be available to meet a critical need. This insures the leadership of a faculty for an imaginative program contributing to the maximum development and utilization of the rich talents possessed by the young people of the metropolitan New York area.

This institute is but one of some 40 that will be conducted this summer throughout the Nation under the authority of title V–B of the National Defense Education Act. But it represents the imaginative way in which the Office of Education is implementing this important legislation. It is an example of the sound principle of building on strength by utilizing the outstanding skills and resources of institutions well qualified to tackle this problem. New York City and other urban areas—indeed school systems throughout the Nation—stand to benefit enormously from this militant attack upon the problem of America's loss of able manpower.

I call upon the Congress once again to act promptly on the President's request for additional funds to carry out this and other vital programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act. I know that friends of education everywhere join me in urging this action.

---

## Treasury's Back Door: Some Lawmakers Seek To Block Agencies' Habit of Using Shortcuts to Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very enlightening and interesting editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 9, 1959, on the subject of the back-door approach to the Treasury:

TREASURY'S BACK DOOR: SOME LAWMAKERS SEEK TO BLOCK AGENCIES' HABIT OF USING SHORTCUTS TO SPENDING

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—A small band of Congressmen is waging an intensive and intermittently successful campaign to block off some heavily traveled shortcuts to the Federal Treasury.

Sometimes the route used is authority to expend from public debt receipts. Sometimes it's contract authority. Sometimes it's a revolving fund, or the right to spend foreign currencies, or any one of several other shortcuts. All avoid entirely, or at least minimize, the usual review of Federal spending programs made each year by the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, indeed by Congress itself. House Rules Committee Chairman SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, and House Appropriations Committee Chairman CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, two of the leaders in the fight against these shortcuts, call them back-door approaches to the Federal Treasury.

Most Federal aegncies have to run the congressional gauntlet twice to get funds for their programs. First, the regular legislative committees must authorize the program. This authorization law, which must clear both Senate and House, in effect sets the framework, the limits, within which the program can operate. Then, the Federal agency carrying out the program must go back each year to the Appropriations Committees to get an allotment of money to carry out the already-authorized program.

DOUBLE SCRUTINY

From the Treasury's point of view, this double scrutiny has obvious advantages. Authorization bills are frequently passed under the spur of some unusual event or crisis; the second check gives time for a calmer second look. Legislative committees, over the years, tend to get a vested interest in their subjects; the House Agriculture Committee, for example, wants to spend as much as possible for the farmer, the House Banking Committee as much as possible for housing, and so on. The Appropriations Committees can weigh all these demands against each other.

Certainly, the most widely used of the devices at the moment is the authority to expend from public debt receipts. It was begun in the depression days of the early 1930's—to get the Hoover-created Reconstruction Finance Corporation operating to shore up business in the shortest possible time. But the practice of permitting Government agencies to borrow directly from the Federal Treasury spread to more and more programs over the years—housing programs, the Commodity Credit Corporation's price support program, Export-Import Bank lending, and many more.

By now, Congress has authorized Government agencies to spend some $150 billion this way. The General Accounting Office, Congress' watchdog over Federal spending, recently said the device "tends to perpetuate programs that might not otherwise stand the test of continued Federal scrutiny." But it also complicates the budget process in that unused borrowing power is always hanging over the budget. Right now, Federal agencies owe the Treasury something over $20 billion, but have unused authority to borrow another $25 billion.

The original justification for the borrowing device was that it was being used for Government lending programs. Since these loans would eventually be repaid, the argument went, it would complicate the budgeting process less to have the agency borrow the money from the Treasury than to go to Congress for a regular appropriation.

But several questions can now be raised about this claim. For one, not all lending programs depend on borrowing authority from the original legislative committee, and yet seem to get along satisfactorily. The rural electrification program and Farmers Home Administration, for example, are set up by having the Appropriations Committee itself set each year the amount that can be borrowed from the Treasury, and the Small Business Administration's lending funds come from a regular annual appropriation.

ITS USE SPREADS

Moreover, the device is being used for many lending programs when Congress knows right from the start there is little likelihood of repayment. Congress, for example, had to cancel $12.8 billion of the $26.6 billion the RFC borrowed from the Treasury, most of the loss being on World War II programs. Congress knows all along that only a small part of CCC price support loans will be repaid.

Finally, in recent years the device has spread to programs not involving lending at all—frequently being resorted to specifically to get around the annual Appropriations Committee review. Industry, Federal agency, or congressional sponsors of a program get tired of running the annual gauntlet and switch to the borrowing approach. For instance, last year, the Senate passed a mineral subsidy bill that would have allowed the Interior Department to go directly to the Treasury. There was no thought that this might later be repaid. Sponsors frankly admitted they were proposing to finance the

program in this fashion because in previous years the House Appropriations Committee had been hostile to mine subsidy bills and had refused to appropriate money to carry out authorized programs.

No one in Congress seems quite sure why some of the economy-minded Members were so long in waking up to the trend; some economizers frankly admit they were asleep on the job. The Treasury borrowing device got a big play in the antirecession bills ground out early last year—the Senate used it not only in the mining bill but also for housing, community facility loans, aid to depressed areas, and help for small business investment companies—and the surge of these bills focused attention on the financing approach involved in them.

Rules Committee Chairman SMITH last year did succeed in blocking finally some use of this approach. For example, as a price for having his committee clear the bills for floor action, he forced the legislative committee to switch to regular appropriations procedures on the minerals, depressed areas, community facilities, small business, and aid to education bills.

This year, Mr. SMITH is trying again. He's sponsored a resolution that would change House rules so that only the Appropriations Committee could OK the actual withdrawal of money from the Treasury. Legislative committees would continue to have the power to authorize programs—set the limits—but appropriations, contract authority, authority to spend from public debt receipts, and all the other avenues to the Treasury would have to be checked annually by the Appropriations Committees.

The Rules Committee has held hearings on the Smith resolution, and the testimony highlighted not only the arguments on each side, but, perhaps more importantly, the basic power struggle that will shape the outcome far more than the issues involved.

Testifying against the resolution were top members—Democratic and in several cases Republicans, too—of the legislative committees whose power would be diminished by the resolution: Armed Services, Banking, Interior, Public Works, Veterans' Affairs, Agriculture. They didn't argue, of course, that they were against the resolution because they would lose power. They argued that programs subject to their committees—farm price supports, highways, military housing, and many more—would be crippled if they had to face the delays and uncertainties of the usual appropriations route.

Testifying for the resolution were Representatives GARY, Democrat, of Virginia, MAHON, Democrat of Texas, KIRWAN, Democrat of Ohio, TABER, Republican of New York, and FORD, Republican of Michigan—men from both parties and all wings of the party, but also all members of the Appropriations Committee, whose power has obviously been seriously curtailed by the back-door devices. They, too, didn't phrase their arguments on power grounds, but rather argued that sound budgeting required all Government spending programs to get an annual review in one central spot.

Appropriations Committee members argue that with larger and larger amounts of Federal spending automatically required under basic laws—for price supports, or veterans' pensions, or interest on the debt, or public assistance payments to the States—the spending area subject to annual congressional control is shrinking all the time, and these back-door devices shrink that area still further.

House Speaker RAYBURN of Texas, who generally does not like to change the rules of the House, has thrown his weight against the rules change proposed by Mr. SMITH, and this opposition, plus the opposition of the various legislative committees, seems certain to block the resolution. Bills must be reported by the Rules Committee by a clear majority of 7 of the 12 members, and Mr. SMITH has only 6 votes, including his own. But Mr. SMITH is far from licked. For one thing, he is exploring ways of modifying the resolution to reduce some of the opposition. More important, though, if he and his five supporters on the Rules Committee stick together, they can force the other committees to change individual bills as they come along to an appropriations method of financing, just as they did last year.

SENATE RESOLUTION

In the Senate, too, agitation is mounting. Senator THURMOND, Democrat of South Carolina, has introduced a resolution generally similar in purpose to Mr. SMITH's. Senator BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, will include a similar provision in a general budget reform bill he'll introduce shortly.

The administration's position in the matter is somewhat ambivalent. Generally speaking, it approves using the back-door approaches on programs where they've always been used, but opposes them on any new programs.

Of course, there is no guarantee that even if all this spending were channeled each year in the regular fashion through the Appropriations Committee that any great economies would result. The Appropriations Committee could go through spendthrift stages just as well as other committees, or could find it difficult to spot areas for savings. But economy forces feel the change is worth trying and promise to keep up their fight to close the back door to the Treasury.

## Hawaiian Statehood Advances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 5, 1959:

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD ADVANCES

The drive to secure admission of Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State is making significant and heartening progress. The latest evidence of this is the unanimous approval for statehood given by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Last month statehood was approved by the corresponding House committee and the House Rules Committee has recently been holding hearings on the measure. * * *

Nothing has been more impressive in the recent discussion of this issue than the flimsiness of the arguments of those who oppose statehood. Sometimes these arguments are directly contradictory, as when some critics charge that Hawaii is in the hands of a few large corporations, while others claim it is really ruled by henchmen of Harry Bridges. Sometimes these arguments enter the realm of fantasy, as when they allege that admission of Hawaii as a state would give Communist propaganda grounds for accusing us of colonial imperialism.

But the most unworthy argument against statehood is the one which stresses the non-Caucasian nature of most of Hawaii's population. This is racism with a vengeance and directly contradictory to every ideal of our democracy. American citizenship is not, and should never be, restricted to white men, to people of European origin, or to any other such narrow elite. It is the glory of our Nation that here men of every color, origin, and religion have come together to live in freedom and equality, though these ideals have not everywhere been realized. Hawaiians of every background have proved their loyalty by fighting and dying for our country on equal terms with Americans from the mainland. Against that background statehood for Hawaii is an obligation the rest of us have long owed our fellow Americans who live in those beautiful islands.

## The Critics of the Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS**
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on March 7, 1959, discussing "some of the spending-minded Members of Congress" criticism of the Federal Reserve Board:

THE RESERVE AND ITS CRITICS

It hardly came as a surpise to read yesterday that some of the spending-minded Members of Congress were critical of the Federal Reserve Board for its action in authorizing higher rediscount rates at four regional banks after the close of the market on Thursday. This is an old story for the Board. Not a whisper of criticism was ventured when, in the recovery from the recession of 1953–54, it permitted its easy money policy to continue into April 1955, when the recovery was reaching boom proportions. After the boom was over, in mid-1957, however, no one was too poor to venture his own particular second guess concerning that belated shifting of gears in 1955.

Even Senator DOUGLAS, who is actively supporting a policy of heavy spending in this, the 11 month of recovery, is quoted as describing this increase to 3 percent in the rediscount rates as extraordinary in view of the 4.7 million unemployed. Is Senator DOUGLAS trying to say that it is part of the Federal Reserve's responsibility to accommodate its policies to the unprecedented situation that obtained in 1958 when labor insisted upon, and obtained, wage increases of roughly the same magnitude as those obtained in the boom years? Is he saying that if money rates were to be cut in half tomorrow this would automatically eliminate the seasonal influences that have invariably made the months January, February, and March three of the four highest unemployment months of the year?

The fact is that by any historical test, or by any geographical test, 3 percent is a very low central bank rate. What is of more significance to the present situation is that for the Reserve to have permitted the rate to remain at 2½ percent would have been to continue a serious distortion in the interest rate structure. The monetary authorities would probably have dealt with this earlier had it not been that such action might have threatened the delicate problem of financing the Treasury's huge requirements. And who, if not the spend-happy boys in Congress, is chiefly responsible for the dimensions and complications of that problem?

It is traditional that the rediscount rate be held above the going rate in short-term paper. Until this week's increase in the rediscount rate was inaugurated a banker could borrow at this regional reserve bank at 2½ percent and immediately invest the proceeds of his loan in Treasury bills, the latest auction sale of which brought a price

to yield 2.816 percent. This is not a healthy situation if the Reserve is to be in a position to manage the money market. Across our border to the north Canada has adopted a policy of maintaining a differential of one-fourth of 1 percent between its rediscount rate and the Treasury bill rate. Under that arrangement, it is worth noting, the rediscount rate last week hit 4.32 percent.

## Rehabilitation Program at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Lebanon, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lisle C. Wochner, Chief of Special Service at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Lebanon, Pa., supplied me with an article called "The Open Door," together with a covering letter.

Its meaning in this instance, can perhaps best be put in a few words as something new in rehabilitating their patients—a departure from the old. This is, of course, a two-way proposition, as he indicates, that requires understanding on the part of the people in the community and the trained professional staff of the hospital facility. As this article points out, this understanding is an actual reality there, and does go far in the treatment of hospitalized veterans and in solving some of the problems thus created.

Toward this common goal thus pursued by all concerned, the policy of outward and open cooperation has produced wonderful response as well as results.

It is gratifying to read this article that sets forth the honest and tireless efforts aimed at rehabilitation, and while the article admits it is not the easy path to follow at times, the treatment is well worth the cure. This in itself is heartwarming.

The letter and article follow:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
*Lebanon, Pa., March 2, 1959.*

The Honorable WALTER S. MUMMA,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. MUMMA: At a group meeting held at the hospital on September 26, 1958, between city officials, representatives of various businesses in the city of Lebanon, and members of the hospital staff, it was indicated that an article or articles covering the hospital would be valuable to leaders of the community in furthering an understanding of the treatment of hospitalized veterans and the solution to some of the problems, which are thereby created.

Although the article has been published in a series in the Lebanon Daily News, January 19 through January 22, 1959, we are hereby sending you a copy for ready reference.

Sincerely,

LISLE C. WOCHNER,
*Chief, Special Service.*

THE OPEN DOOR

It was Monday morning when a local businessman telephoned the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Lebanon, Pa. He asked to speak with the ward physician of a certain patient who had visited his store the preceding Saturday afternoon. He explained to the physician that a group of patients on pass from the Lebanon Veterans' Administration hospital were shopping in his store. One patient was especially interested in buying a bicycle for his 12-year-old daughter. The businessman was pleased to show him the wide selection of bicycles available for sale. The three or four fellows who accompanied the patient on this shopping trip seemed to enjoy looking at the many differently styled and colored bicycles. The businessman noticed that the patient interested in buying the bicycle seemed to be trying to impress his friends by picking out the most elaborate and expensive bicycle. It so happened that the most expensive bicycle on the floor was a boy's bicycle. The patient decided this was the one he would buy for his daughter. In spite of the advice to the contrary given by the businessman and some of the fellows in the shopping group, the patient obstinately insisted on having the most expensive boy's bicycle. Employing considerable tact, the businessman did succeed in having the veteran postpone his purchase until he had given some additional thought to the matter of possibly buying a girl's bicycle. The veteran agreed to think it over and return the following Saturday, providing the businessman would set the expensive boy's bicycle aside so that it would be sure to be available a week later. This the businessman agreed to do without requiring any deposit from the veteran. In his talk with the ward physician, the businessman was informed that the veteran has a very great need to impress others and in so doing tends to show questionable judgment on certain occasions such as took place in the store on Saturday morning. In all likelihood, if he returns to the store and is not accompanied by a group of friends whom he is trying to impress, he will show better judgment and purchase an appropriate girl's bicycle for his daughter.

This story helps to explain why the open door policy is assisting veterans in regaining their health at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital. It demonstrates the good relationship between the hospital and the community. Without this good relationship, there cannot be an open door policy. Equally significant, without an open door policy, there cannot be a good relationship between the hospital and the community. Certainly one can close the doors and run a trouble-free hospital. By locking the patients in and the public out, it is quite possible that a hospital can be run without even being subjected to criticism. Occasionally, a family may object if passes are refused but all too frequently this essential family interest is lacking in a closed-door setup. On the other hand, if a pass is allowed and something goes wrong, taxpayers and their elected representatives, who are unaware of the role of the community in the treatment program, are quite likely to be highly critical of the hospital administration. The easy way to protect one's self against the charge of being lax would be to build up a tight security system and pretend that the doors are closed to protect the patient. Under such a system, a hospital usually prospers. Its census goes up and its cost per day goes down. The hospital might be free of scandals, suicides, assaults, street scenes—and also, alas, free of recoveries. Such policies can only perpetuate the old concept of a mental hospital as a place where annoying people are "put away" so that they never bother anyone. With the old closed-door system, they would never be given opportunities to learn to adapt themselves to new situations involving other people. This restricted environment practically doomed them to permanent hospitalization. This can hardly represent the honest desires of our present civilization. The administrative and clinical staff at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital is replacing such outmoded concepts with modern progressive open door policies.

The open door policy neither starts nor stops with the opening of the door. Simply opening the doors of mental hospitals could result in chaos and be detrimental to both the hospitalized patients and the healthy members of our communities. The open door must be backed by an active treatment program involving a psychiatrically oriented staff at the hospital and an understanding citizenry in nearby communities. The hospital staff must be prepared for the advent of integrated and coordinated psychiatric activities. This is a difficult and challenging task for the staff. It was relatively easy with the old closed door system to take care of, for example, the matter of haircuts. A schedule for wards was arranged and on the scheduled day all the patients on a certain ward were taken to the barbership and had their hair cut, whether they needed it or not. Along with the ease of scheduling haircuts under the closed door policies, there was frequently a "type" haircut prescribed for all patients and this, likewise, resulted in speed and efficiency insofar as getting large numbers of patients in and out of the barbershop was concerned. With an open door policy, barbershops are set up much as you will find them in any community. Patients are permitted to decide when they need a haircut and, even more important, they are allowed to select the type of haircut they desire. Barbers are on duty at convenient hours and the patients are given some choice in the matter of when they will have their hair cut. Initially, when such policies are adopted, a certain amount of confusion arises. But the patients soon learn that they cannot all wait until the day before passes are granted to secure haircuts. They learn that the shop is busier on certain days and at certain times of days and they, accordingly, have to make their plans so that they get to the shop when they can receive necessary services. This they learn to do in the same way that citizens in any community learn to utilize the services of the available barbershops. While learning this, they are actually learning how to adjust to new situations. This helps prepare them for leaving the hospital. Getting a haircut actually becomes part of the treatment program and assists the patients in regaining their health.

The open door policy has resulted in tremendous strides forward in other areas. For example, take entertainment and recreation. A decade ago, under the closed door policy, the entertainment needs of the patients were considered cared for when movies were provided several evenings a week, with bingo parties on the remaining evenings. No consideration was given to whether or not the patients enjoyed movies or playing bingo. On the evening that a movie was scheduled, all the patients finished their evening meal and returned to their respective wards. This return to the wards was essential because all the patients were then told to go to the bathroom because once they left for the movie, under the closed door policy, it was most inconvenient and practically impossible to get to a bathroom during the time involved in taking them to the auditorium, looking at the movie, and then returning to their wards. At a designated time, this being dependent on how far removed the ward was from the auditorium, each ward then marched their patients to the auditorium. If this was precisely coordinated and if the patients walked at the exact rate they were expected to walk, then the respective wards arrived at such time as to permit each ward group to enter the theater and take assigned seats in an orderly manner. It is to be remembered that occasionally not all patients could go to the bathroom as hurriedly as the ward attendants might have predicted and, accordingly,

the arrival time at the auditorium was not always on schedule. This, of course, led to long lines of patients in corridors awaiting their turn to enter the auditorium. It is also to be remembered that these patients left for the auditorium without knowing what movie was being shown and without having had any choice in the matter of whether they attend the movie. Any protests or any derogatory remarks concerning their forced attendance at the movie were considered evidences of uncooperative behavior and, of course, an accumulation of such recorded observations in their records was considered evidence that they belonged in a mental hospital and were not ready for any privileges. After sitting through the movie, in which they may or may not have been interested, the procedure was then reversed and they were returned to their wards by the platoon system through the long corridors. This regimentation continued even after they returned to their wards single file, being counted as they entered the ward by way of that heavy wooden door, which they knew would soon be locked behind them. The procedure was continued "by the numbers" to effect another visit to the bathroom and then to bed. Their evening of entertainment then concluded with a flash of light in their eyes as the highest ranking and most responsible employee on duty made a careful flashlight check from bed to bed to make certain that there had been no error in the count at the door when the men returned from the movie. Remember, too, that any patient who dared express dissatisfaction or resistance to the above regimented routines was considered uncooperative and, if his so-called uncooperative attitude and behavior continued, it was further considered proper to remove him to a ward with tighter security and less opportunity for entertainment.

Under a progressive system, with open-door policies such as are being practiced at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital, a totally different picture exists. Entertainment and recreation needs are arranged in accordance with the needs and desires of the patients. It is recognized that not everyone wants to attend a movie 3 nights each week. Likewise, not everyone likes to play bingo. In order to assist patients to take a part in activities in which they have an interest, a large variety of activities has to be provided. Lounges and writing rooms are made available for those who might prefer to use their leisure time on a certain evening to write letters. Other rooms are made available for those who prefer to listen to recorded music, watch television, or read books. Schedules are posted so that the patients will know when certain receration areas are available and they can plan their activities accordingly. Occasionally, dances are scheduled and those who are interested dress appropriately, attend the dance, and dance with ladies who have an understanding of the needs of convalescent patients and are willing to devote an occasional evening to helping them regain their health. Every now and then, a variety show is sponsored by some interested city, State, or national organization. Invariably, these variety shows are carefully chosen, of a high caliber, and satisfy the entertainment needs of a large segment of the patient population.

Smaller groups, and at times individuals, from nearby communities bring more specialized and extremely interesting entertainment to the hospital for groups with special interests. During the past summer, the hospital librarian arranged to have a father and his school-age son from nearby Lebanon come to the hospital library and exhibit their collection of rocks and minerals. This event was publicized throughout the hospital. More than 20 interested veterans attended and a most interesting discussion period was held. The father and son took just pride in their extensive collection of rocks and minerals. In response to questions asked by the veterans, they explained their hobby in interesting and stimulating detail. The beneficial effect on the veterans was manifested by the favorable comments heard in subsequent discussions and by the demand for books on mineralogy and related subjects in the hospital library.

There were other events at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital for groups with special interests during the past summer. A local businessman gave an illustrated discussion on the history of Lebanon County for those interested in historical events. Another interested citizen brought his hobby of pigeons to the hospital and fascinated and helped create an education interest in a group of patients who attended the display. Still another scheduled event brought trained dogs to the hospital. A nature talk by a biology teacher from a nearby community was of great interest to another group of patients. A husband and wife team, who were fortunate enough to have visited the Brussels World Fair during the summer, came to the hospital and gave a most interesting and colorful presentation of their experience at the fair. These and many other similar activities are designed to fill the needs of individuals. A patient who may have been apathetic and disinterested for months or even years may start showing the first signs of interest in life after attending one of these special events. When this spark of interest returns, the patient becomes accessible to other treatment activities. He will start showing an interest in group work and eventually gain the necessary motivation to seek individual attention and benefit by same.

With the open door policies being practiced at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital, the patients are encouraged to handle all of the responsibility which the physician considers them capable of assuming. This means that the patients are given more and more opportunity to take part in selecting activities, sharing these activities with others of similar interests who are making progress in the treatment program.

The open door policy is not an isolated area of progress in the treatment of the mentally ill. The philosophy of the open door is integrated with advancements in other areas of treatment. For example, with the use of the tranquilizing drugs during the past several years, many patients, who, for a decade or longer, have been almost helpless and in need of constant supervision are now able to do some things for themselves. With the use of appropriate tranquilizing drugs, their fears, tensions, and anxieties have been reduced and they come out of the corners and begin to express themselves. This awakening of interest will prove of little value if the patient remains behind the closed door and is unable to reach out and take part in activities requiring greater responsibility. Many of these individuals who have been sick for 6, 8, or 10 years have lost the capacity to do such simple things as use a modern telephone. Tasks such as operating an "automatic" elevator are a real challenge to them and initially they need assistance in order to learn how to do many of the ordinary everyday activities which healthy people take for granted.

It is obvious that this series of new events presents many challenges to the staff and makes a much greater demand on the staff for individual work with the patients. Patients, who formerly needed strict personal supervision for bathing and dressing, are now learning to take care of themselves. They are gradually developing pride in their personal appearance. This transition period places many new demands on the staff. It takes much longer to let a patient, who is learning these things, bathe and dress himself than it used to take to supervise a strict routine of bathing and dressing the patient. For example, the patient will be permitted to select the shirt and tie he wishes to wear. Under the old closed door system, it was easy and time saving to simply pass a shirt and a tie from the clothing room and tell the patient that's the one he is going to wear. But it is essential that the patients have adequate experience in making these small decision if they are ever going to progress to the point where they will make larger decisions. Only by mastering these elementary situations are they going to be able to move out and establish themselves in relation to other people in society.

As a patient improves and handles increasingly greater responsibilities, especially those related to self care and the ordinary activities about the hospital, it becomes necessary to assist him in making the big step from the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital into the community. Here again there are easy, relatively trouble-free ways of helping the patient but these methods frequently fail in achieving the goal which is to help him continue improving. For example, the hospital could provide the bus and take a group of patients to town, have them return to the bus at a designated time and return them to the hospital. This simplified system, however, fails to give the men any training in learning their responsibilities of handling public transportation. Some of the men going on these passes may not have been outside the hospital for years and, likewise, may not have handled cash for many years. Furthermore, he isn't going to learn how to handle cash, read bus schedules, reach a predetermined destination and get along with people if all these things are done for him. He has to learn to do then for himself. When he approaches the bus, he may become almost panicky by not knowing whether he pays as he enters, pays as he leaves, the amount of the fare, whether he is going to be able to count his change properly, and many other matters which healthy individuals take for granted. Exactly at this point, when the patient is leaving the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital for the first time and entering a public bus, the relationship between the hospital and the community is on definite trial. A bus driver who is unsympathetic or who lacks understanding of the situation can very easily throw a patient going on his first pass into a panic. If the open door policy is going to continue to work, then the bus driver actually becomes a part of the treatment program for this particular patient taking his first trip to town. By his patient understanding, kind guidance and genuine interest, the bus driver can actually help the patient make this first big step into the community.

Hospital staff understanding and cooperation is also essential at this point and here again we see the definite need for a closely integrated relationship between the hospital and the community. For example, the men going on pass may have no cash in their pockets until they withdraw funds from their hospital account on the morning of their departure. For these initial brief visits to town, a "uniform round sum" used to be authorized for each patient. Until the situation was fully understood by all the clinical and administrative people involved, these men were usually given $5, money of their own, for this first pass to town. Imagine the situation if 18 or 20 men start boarding the bus and each presents the driver with a $5 bill. Not only was receiving the change very time consuming but actually it is unreasonable to expect a bus driver to carry sufficient change to accept $5 bills for a small local fare. It is also unreasonable to expect a bus driver to remain patient, calm and understanding when confronted with such a situation.

Little matters like this were called to the attention of the staff and subsequently arrangements were made to release sums of money which included some small change. This resulted in a far more pleasant atmosphere at the point of departure and assisted the men in successfully completing this first and important step into the community. When the veteran successfully accomplishes his trip to town, he will have gained a bit of confidence and a bit of self-esteem, which will help prepare him for greater responsibilities and further advances in the treatment program.

If he is able to make the decisions necessary to successfully get to town and return to the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital, he can start planning for a longer journey. His next step might well be to plan a visit to his former community. This would involve taking a bus to town then making his own arrangements for other transportation by either bus or train to get from Lebanon to his destination. As the patient repeats these experiences during a period of weeks or months, he gradually overcomes his fears, doubts, and anxieties, and slowly resumes his capacity to enjoy the rights, responsibilities, and privileges of citizenship in his own community.

So far, we have mentioned only the bus drivers in terms of helping the patients make this first big step from the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital into nearby communities. Many other members of the community are, of course, involved. For example, occasionally, a patient may choose to ride to town by taxi. Here too an efficient system could be worked out if the ward nurse, knowing that the patient wants to go to town by taxi, would telephone the local taxi dispatcher, give brief and specific directions to the dispatcher, and then accompany the patient to the agreed meeting place and make certain that he gets his ride to town. By doing all this for the patient, he learns nothing about the responsibilities of making telephone calls, giving directions and cooperating in those directions in order to achieve a desired purpose. It is far better to instruct the patient to use one of the many conveniently located public telephones at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital, have him look up the number in the telephone book, dial that number and use his own money to pay for the telephone call, give his own directions to the taxi dispatcher and then assume the responsibility of being at the designated waiting place when the taxi arirves. In this situation, understanding dispatchers do much to help the patients at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital by assisting the veteran in establishing a specific meeting place where the taxi will pick him up.

Once a patient from the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital arrives in town, many other members of the community begin playing significant roles in the treatmcnt program.

When a patient who has been hospitalized for several years goes to town on his first pass, he may become quite scared and momentarily appear confused and bewildered. At such a time, an understanding police officer or citizen may offer some friendly guidance, put the patient at ease and inform him about available commerical and entertainment establishments.

When the patient eats his first meal at a restaurant in town, he may become conspicuous by his reactions to the new surroundings. Remember, he has been used to eating in a dining hall, cafeteria style, menu prearranged, and in the environment of a large group of fellow patients. In the restaurant, he will receive a menu and for the first time in perhaps several years he will have an opportunity to select various courses. He will also have his first opportunity in many years to observe the prices of food and this, too, may prove rather interesting to him. All of this newness may cause him to be somewhat anxious and perhaps rather slow in presenting his order. This calls for special understanding and perhaps some kindly guidance on the part of the waitresses in the restaurants. Perhaps he is eating with one of his fellow patients who accompanied him to town and their emotional reaction to all this newness may cause them to forget about the other people in the restaurant and their conversation may be carried on in a real loud tone of voice.

By a kindly comment or explanation, an understanding waitress or proprietor can help these men relearn acceptable social customs. There are many ways in which intrested members of the community can help make these passes a truly gainful experience for the recovering patients.

Various members of the community will play their role for these patients on pass in the areas of entertainment and recreation. At the Lebanon Veterans Administration Hosptial, the patients will have become acquainted with certain recreation leaders and specially trained therapists who supervise their recreation activities. When these patients visit, for example, a community YMCA, they will feel lost initially because of not knowing the schedule of activities, not knowing what activities are available and having had only limited experience in taking part in activities with strangers. In order to avoid the risk of establishing an acquaintance with a stranger, they may sit in a chair and do nothing. Unless they are given information about the activities and encouraged to take part, they may spend their entire afternoon or evening sleeping in a chair.

After all, sleep is one way of avoiding social contacts and thereby avoiding the risk of rejection and lack of acceptance. If there are no activities on the schedule at the YMCA, which interest the patient, he should leave. A suggestion to this effect would be in order. Some information concerning activities elsewhere in the community might be offered. If he lacks interest in any other activities, it is quite likely that he will return to the hospital.

Occasionally, a patient on pass may fail and become a temporary behavior problem. While hospitalized, he does remain exposed to all mediums of advertising and some delightful jingle may remain in his mind as he goes out on his first pass. That refreshingly clear beverage or the drink preferred by the man of distinction may have impressed him sufficiently to give it a whirl. Not being accustomed to any alcoholic beverages, he might consume only a small amount and still have used what for him is an excess of alcohol. This will require a great deal of forebearance on the part of the community since perhaps for this one failure there may have been ninety-nine others who went to town on pass and succeeded.

Every effort possible is made to encourage wholesome and healthy habits on the part of the patients leaving the hospital. Patients are carefully evaluated so as to attempt to grant passes only to those who have improved sufficiently to control their habits and be able to benefit by the pass. Unfortunately, the adverse publicity given to one failure frequently overshadows any mention made or note taken of ninety-nine patients who utilize their passes to good advantage and progress toward recovery and return to their home community as worthwhile and productive citizens.

Most of the earlier discussion of the open door policy has been from the point of view of the patient going into the community. There is another equally important aspect of the open door policy which has to be considered. This pertains to having the community come into the Lebanon Veterans Administration Hospital. With the open door philosophy, this is achieved in many ways.

Visiting hours are more convenient. Appropriate facilities are made available to the family and friends as visitors. Visiting rooms are pleasant, well lighted, and well ventilated. The hospital canteen is available so that patients can accompany their visitors to the canteen and enjoy fellowship with refreshments.

The role of the volunteers is outstanding in this matter of bringing the community into the hospital. To a great extent, these volunteers coming into the hospital have a lot to do with the success and progress of the open door policies. These volunteers get into all areas of the hospital and actually learn about the treatment activities which are going on for the benefit of the patients. They learn and understand newer concepts of treatment programs for the mentally ill and, with this understanding, return to the community and help correct the many prejudices and untruths which exist in the minds of the uninformed.

At the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital, there are approximately 440 volunteers on the rolls who participate in activities with the patients on a regular basis. An average of 325 of these volunteers visit the hospital each week. Without monetary compensation, these volunteers serve throughout the hospital in many capacities, providing that certain intangible benefit, which cannot possibly be achieved by a paid staff alone.

Some assist the nursing service, working on the wards and offering services directly to the patients while others work in such areas as central sterile supply and thereby indirectly offer their services to the patients. Some patients need assistance in being fed and this important role is played by volunteers working with the dietetic section. Other volunteers work in the physical medicine and rehabilitation section where they assist patients in the occupational therapy clinics, educational therapy section, manual arts therapy workshops, the hospital greenhouse and numerous other areas.

Another group of volunteers assist in the chaplaincy service. These volunteers assist in making the hospital worship services a more meaningful religious experience for many patents. They assist in providing the music for worship, in the distribution of hymnals and devotional literature and, for those patients who might otherwise not be able to get to the chapel services, they assist in transporting by wheelchairs. Volunteers assist regularly in passing out the elements for communion services.

Volunteers take an especially active part in assisting special service in providing entertainment and recreation needs for the patients. The volunteers in the music therapy program have helped organize patient orchestras and choral groups. Individual instrumental and vocal lessons are provided by volunteers. Social dance groups, at which interested patients are taught to dance, are sponsored by volunteers. Volunteers serving as hosts and hostesses help the patients on wards and/or at activities.

Other volunteers, serving as receptionists, greet and help to smooth the way for family and friends when visiting the hospitalized veterans. They provide an invaluable service through their kindness in helping relatives and friends to understand the ill veteran. By their friendly acceptance, they help the relatives and friends to realize the needs of the sick veterans.

In addition to the many services rendered by the volunteers who visit the hospital on a regular basis, there is another important group of people who come to the hospital from communities near and far. These peo-

ple usually come in organized groups and are referred to as casual volunteers. Approximately 700 casual volunteers visit the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital each month and provide special entertainment programs. These consist of variety shows, band concerts, social dances, picnics, and many other forms of wholesome entertainment.

Although the value of these volunteers can never be measured in units of time, it is interesting to note that, during the year 1958, the regular volunteers devoted approximately 36,000 hours of service to the patients at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital. During the same period, the casual volunteers devoted approximately 21,500 hours of service. The patients at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hopsital are indeed fortunate in having such a responsive population of devoted citizens in Lebanon community.

The contribution of these dedicated volunteers is an essential ingredient in the open door policy, which is now an integral part of the treatment program at the Lebanon Veterans' Administration Hospital. One might justly say that, in the hearts of the patients and the eyes of the staff, the volunteers are truly the symbol of the open door policy. To the patient, this symbol provides a new hope for returning to his family and community. To the staff, this symbol points out new horizons of treatment goals. We are no longer satisfied with a comfortable status quo; the open door makes every achievement of today a challenge for greater accomplishment and more devoted service to the hospitalized veterans tomorrow.

## Mine Crisis Aid Fully Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Friday, February 27, 1959:

MINE CRISIS AID FULLY JUSTIFIED

The fact Luzerne County and its subdivisions, among other things, are confronted with a potential loss of $30 million in coal assessments as a result of the Knox disaster, as developed at a meeting of public officials, coal company representatives and civic leaders in Hotel Sterling last night, is an added incentive to speed action on the rehabilitation of the industry.

This is not to imply there will be such a loss unless the industry tosses in the sponge because Government aid in sufficient amounts is not forthcoming to dewater the flooded mines and prevent further flooding. The Glen Alden Corporation, still the largest of the local producers, has made it clear, for instance, it is staying in business.

Logic would seem to dictate a positive approach rather than a negative attitude.

When the river broke into the Port Griffith mine, the first consideration was the fate of 12 missing men. That continues to occupy the top place on the agenda, although hope for their rescue has faded.

The second task was the plugging of the gap in the river to shut off the flow. That has been partly accomplished, but it will take months to finish the project.

Some pumping has been started and more is contemplated. The newest challenge is at the Lehigh Valley operations, particularly at the Dorrance, which has been closed as a precautionary measure due to the threat from the water in the Henry and Prospect collieries. From indications, the menace can be contained here if vigorous measures are instituted.

If that is done, with teamwork between Government agencies and the coal companies, the day will be saved, not only restoring jobs to most of those now idled, but protecting other operations in this field. Surely, with such a tremendous stake, any investment by the Government will pay a handsome return.

When we think of the billions that have been spent on foreign aid, farm relief, TVA development, river projects and other forms of assistance, the local program is just a drop in the bucket, so far as expenditures are concerned. The Federal Government and the Commonwealth have an obvious obligation to meet; moreover, both stand to gain by restoring the economy of the region.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 28

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal, September 6, 1957, chronicling how two children had gotten typhoid fever while attending summer camp in Medina County as a result of contact with a polluted stream near that camp. This is just another reason for vigorous Federal action and for full grants under Public Law 660 for cleaning up our foul and disease-ladened waters.

IT CAN HAPPEN HERE

The discovery of two cases of typhoid fever among children who attended a summer camp in Medina County puts added emphasis on the need for speed in solving some of the growing problems of sanitation in parts of Summit County.

Medina County and State health officials who still are working on the typhoid cases believe that the victims probably got the germs from a polluted stream near the camp. The stream was off limits from the camp, but that did not prevent the two girls who came down with typhoid from playing in it.

The stream suspected of being the source of the Medina County typhoid scare does not flow into Summit County, but there are small streams and ditches in Summit which are carrying effluent from inadequate sewage disposal systems and are little more than open sewers.

Summit County health and engineering officials are deeply concerned with the situation and are working toward a solution. So are the officials of the villages, especially those in the northern part of the county where new allotments are putting a heavy burden on existing sanitation facilities.

Typhoid fever is a comparatively rare disease today. It was brought to the present point of almost complete control by enforcement of proper health regulations and elimination of pollution of milk, water, and food.

Every effort should be made to see that conditions continue to prevail that will prevent the outbreak of typhoid or any other disease that can be spread by unsanitary means.

## A Day of Mourning of the Rumanian Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the 6th day of March was a day of mourning of the Rumanian nation. It was 14 years ago that Rumania was subjugated by Soviet Russia.

On March 6, 1945, the late abject executioner of Soviet crimes, Vishinsky, installed with the help of Marshal Malinovski's guns and tanks a puppet government in Bucharest.

The circumstances of this act of interference and brutality are fairly known, but insufficient stress is laid on its political consequences. The plight of Eastern Europe is too often represented as the product of an implicable destiny, in the decrees of which the western world had no share. It is a misconception that our only relation to the problem of subjugated Europe is merely one of a remote moral character, a matter of pure generosity. The truth is that the Western Powers have contracted very definite obligations regarding the freedom and independence of the Eastern European nations. The binding legal character of these obligations originates both from the declarations of principle and intention made during the war—like the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta declaration—and from the guarantees recorded in the so-called peace treaties signed by the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union.

The puppet Government of Rumania has continuously infringed the provisions of the peace treaty. All the nonrepresentative governments recognized in East Europe have done the same. Being under Soviet control and direct military pressure the occupied countries have been transformed in Soviet bases and domains of ruthless economic exploitation. Rumania's fertile agricultural country, with the richest deposits of oil in Europe, is now in a permanent state of alimentary crisis, her population is impoverished and public health is reaching its lowest ebb. But despite these horrible hardships, the resistance against communism is ever present in Rumania, the sabotage widespread over the country and the deep allegiance of the people to the West stubbornly manifest. The situation is characteristic of the whole area of Soviet dominated Eastern Europe.

At this critical historical juncture it will be a tragic error to ignore, or gloss over this state of things in such a vital strategic point. By their old and proud traditions of freedom, by their economic and human resources, the nearly one hundred million of enslaved Eastern Europeans appear as a potential political force of the first magnitude. It is amply proved by now, that the Russians are intensely conscious of this fact and try by every means to annihilate this

pro-Western potential and its dangerous implications for Soviet imperialism.

The offensive of Khrushchev through the Berlin maneuver to achieve a settlement in Europe, with the final recognition of the Communist controlled area, indicates the urgency and importance the Soviets attached to this problem. The freezing of the status quo of Russian domination in Central and East Europe, would mean indeed the decisive step toward an ultimate Soviet control over the whole of Europe.

The two main ideas of the Russians in this campaign are to get rid of American military bases and what we call psychological bases; namely, the American presence in Berlin with its powerful psychological impact on the whole of Eastern Europe. These psychological bases should at no price be weakened, but on the contrary, a clear indication should be given that no deal will be made regarding the status quo. The best policy in this matter would be to actually raise the issue of Soviet domination of the entire East European area. Any negotiations in the Berlin crisis offer ample opportunity to counterattack on this vital matter and the most vulnerable point in the Russian offensive.

## Veterans of Foreign Wars Call for Balanced National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. John W. Mahan, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, with national headquarters in Kansas City, Mo. The letter is dated March 3, 1959.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Kansas City, Mo., March 3, 1959.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently had an opportunity to meet with leaders from your State during our annual legislative conference in Washintgon, D.C. Since talking with your constituents, I thought it advisable to write you on a matter that concerns all of us—national security.

The VFW, by resolution and by unanimity of opinion, feels that our country is losing basic military strength through proposed plans to reduce our Defense Establishment. We believe, and we are on record, that our country should have a balanced defense which is ready to move at a moment's notice, whether on the ground, on the seas, or in the air. We further believe that a reduction in our ground forces in the face of the Khrushchev challenge over Berlin is unthinkable. Even though the Berlin situation might be settled peaceably, there are still many trouble spots in the world where American support has already been committed.

It is our understanding that unless plans to reduce forces are halted the Army will lose one division and the Marine Corps will suffer drastic cuts in its combat strength. Our military strength must be great enough to insure peace.

We are told that Russia has 25 divisions on the borders of Western Europe alone. Instead of a reduction of forces, the VFW knows that the American people are willing to pay more for defense, if necessary, and we should keep our ground forces at least at the level recommended by the Congress, which was 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this matter; and if you agree with us, I sincerely hope that you will lend your influence and support toward maintaining our military and naval forces at the above strength.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MAHAN,
*Commander in Chief.*

## Our Housing Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, with the Housing Act of 1959 expected to come before the House shortly, I wish to commend to my colleagues' attention the able address delivered yesterday by Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, to the 28th Annual Housing Conference in Washington. Mr. Meany presents most persuasively the economic, social, and moral reasons why the Nation cannot afford to postpone action on our housing needs. As Mr. Meany stresses;

This is not primarily a spending program, but a lending program; not a waste of money, but a sound investment; not a surrender to inflation but a bulwark against inflation.

His address merits full consideration.

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY

America is still a growing nation. Those who believe we have reached the last frontiers of progress are looking through the wrong end of the telescope. Many of us can remember the big headlines and the feeling of pride that swept the country when the 1920 census showed our population had passed the 100 million mark. Today, less than 40 years later, it is 175 million. By 1970 it is expected to go up to 210 million.

These human statistics constitute a key factor in any intelligent analysis of what America needs today and for the future.

It is encouraging to find independent citizens' organizations like the National Housing Conference devoting themselves to blueprints for a better future. You believe, as we do in the trade union movement, that America needs to build millions of new homes for its ever-growing population. You understand, as clearly as we, that there are compelling social and economic reasons why the Nation can no longer safely postpone action. We are therefore happy to serve with you for the realization of our common objectives.

Because of long years of neglect and inertia, housing has become one of our great national problems. It is a problem that goes to the very roots of our community and national life. It is a problem of such magnitude that it must be considered in the light of the whole national economic picture.

What does that economic picture look like today? Where do we stand as a Nation? Let us take a quick inventory.

A year ago industry was struggling in the midst of a serious slump. Today we have recovered 80 percent of the lost production. Yet we have reemployed only 30 percent of those who lost their jobs in the recession. As a result, there are still 4,700,000 people unemployed now—200,000 more than at this time last year.

This spells danger—in big letters. Our economy cannot afford to carry 5 million unemployed as a chronic drag against progress. The very safety of the Nation demands that the unemployed be put back to work.

What is the answer? Well, there are those in Washington who believe that the problem will solve itself as long as we achieve a balanced budget. They feel that everything will work out neatly and comfortably if the Government sits still and lets private industry work its way through the muddle, without any national planning, encouragement, or assistance.

And there are even some extremists who believe it is a good thing for the country to have a large group of unemployed. They like the idea of a surplus labor market as a weapon against union organization and higher standards. These are the same people who opposed any Government action during the depression of the 1930's, who prated about rugged individualism when we had 14 million people jobless.

Well, we have come a long way since then. The American people will not accept the idea that we must have long periods of widespread unemployment from time to time as part of our way of life. Neither will they accept the idea that by doing nothing everything will soon be all right. And they believe it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to act in a time of crisis like this—not merely to sit tight and hope and wait.

This is definitely and clearly a time for Government action. Something is radically wrong with our economy when we pile up more and more unemployment at the very time we are producing more and more goods. The problem is too extensive and too complex for private industry to cope with unassisted.

Each year more than three-quarters of a million young people enter the labor market looking for jobs. Each month automation spreads and improved methods of production are introduced, thus cutting down the supply of jobs.

In terms of gross national product, if we maintain our present level of production, we lose ground. If we raise that level by 1 or even 2 percent a year, we still lose ground. It will take an increase of almost 5 percent a year in the gross national product to obtain reasonably full employment in the face of population growth and technical advances.

How can we gain that essential 5 percent annual increase?

There is only one answer. We must increase our capital investment—investment for the important things the American people urgently need—investment in millions of new homes, in thousands of new schools, hospitals, airports and better roads.

This is not primarily a spending program, but a lending program; not a waste of money, but a sound investment; not a surrender to inflation but a bulwark against inflation.

Yes, it will undoubtedly take several billions of dollars of Government funds to start the wheels rolling for such a construction program, but most of the money will be

reimbursed. And private capital will quickly enter the market if the Government shows the way and insures the risk.

Each month, the Government spends many millions of dollars in experiments with rockets, missiles, bombs and other military devices. This is a vital and necessary expenditure for our national defense. Every right-thinking citizen understands that, in the face of the constant and determined efforts by the Soviet Union to undermine and if possible to destroy our free way of life, we must, no matter what the expense, be completely prepared to meet open aggression.

But, at the same time, we are firmly convinced that the strengthening of our national economy is equally important to our national defense. An economic collapse in the United States, which the Communist theorists have confidently predicted for many years, would result in victory for dictatorship without Soviet Russia having to fire a shot.

Thus an effective building program, that would restore economic health and prosperity to the country, must be considered an indispensable element in our national defense.

Let's examine another angle, the one we hear so much about in Washington these days, inflation. Fear of inflation seems to have become an obsession in certain influential quarters. Any proposal for the investment of Government funds is met with an emphatic and automatic "No" on the ground that it might upset the possibility of a balanced budget and cause further inflation.

When it comes to housing, this attitude just doesn't make sense. The real danger of inflation would come if we continue to neglect the Nation's housing needs and permit present shortages to become aggravated. Short supply in the face of great demand is the surest way I know of driving up prices. Obviously, the safe way to avoid inflation in the housing field is to build more now, before it is too late.

What are the facts about housing? Few of us can remember when there was enough to go around. Wartime restrictions on construction, the continuous growth of our population and high financing costs—all have contributed to a mounting deficit of decent homes. Slum areas in our cities and even in rural communities have not been replaced. As a nation, we are far behind the needs of our people and we are falling further behind each year.

Last year about 1,200,000 houses were built in this country. That was 150,000 more than the year before, but 200,000 less than in 1950. Yet, since 1950, the population has increased by 25 million. This year, because of tight-money policies, the prospects for home construction are only a little better than last year's.

It is time for all of us—and especially the Government—to realize that "a little better" is not enough. We can, and we must, do a great deal better.

To come up to minimum requirements, we must build at least 2 million housing units a year for the next 10 years.

That mark cannot be reached by the building industry without Government help in the form of liberal financing. Today, Government funds for home financing are virtually exhausted.

Labor, therefore, calls upon Congress to enact new legislation as promptly as possible to provide ample home construction financing at attractive interest rates.

This legislation should be part of a comprehensive housing program.

Too many of the new homes built today are priced far beyond the reach of the average American family. Congress should encourage the building of more homes that people in the middle-income bracket can afford to buy.

Remember, these financing programs are lending, not spending.

But there is a very important housing field where the Government must spend—at least until private capital can be encouraged to undertake the risk on a broader scale. I refer to slum clearance, low-cost public housing and the redevelopment of blighted urban areas.

Besides the economic factors involved, there are overriding social and moral reasons for spending Government funds for these purposes.

There can be no intelligent disagreement with the conclusion that slums breed disease and crime. The problems of juvenile delinquency oppress our great cities primarily because millions of young people are brought up in a slum environment. For every Al Smith who can triumph over the handicap of being raised in a substandard tenement, there are thousands of potential gangsters in the making in our slum areas.

Only last week the mayor of Cleveland came to Washington to plead with Federal officials for loan guarantee for a private slum clearance project in his city. He told an enlightening story about the results of a previously completed slum clearance project in the Woodland area of his city. Before that housing development was started, the mayor said, the Woodland area was responsible for 80 percent of the crime in Cleveland. Now crime in the same area has been reduced to less than 1 percent of the city total.

To my mind that experience provides justification for an all-out attack against slums, for the expenditure of far more Federal money than ever before for slum clearance and public housing. All over the Nation, municipalities have plans ready, but they are forced to mark time for lack of funds and they are getting no help at all from the Federal Government.

As I indicated earlier, housing is only one of the many fields of essential Government investment. The school shortage is perhaps even more acute. We need many more hospitals and laboratories to safeguard the health of our people. Federal support also must be given on a large scale for larger and more modern airports and for better roads.

The economic impact of such a construction program would be far reaching. It could set off a chain reaction for nationwide prosperity. It would provide tremendous stimulus to such basic industries as steel, cement, lumber, glass and brick. But it would also give a sharp lift to the production of home appliances, furniture, floor coverings, textiles and dozens of other items which go into every American home. It would create millions of new jobs for years to come, not only on construction sites, but in the mills and factories of our Nation.

To the timid souls who say America cannot afford to spend the money, we reply that America cannot afford to miss the opportunity. Let us match our faith in the future of our country against their fear. Let us build a better America.

## Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has perfected the formula under which he alleges that the classroom shortage can be eliminated if only the States will cooperate by changing the constitutions and the States and local districts by changing their rules as to the incidence of taxes and debt limits for bonds on property.

Application of Dr. Flemming's formula to the Congress of the United States would reveal much to Mr. Alcorn's surprise that the Republicans actually won the last election. A minor change in the Constitution and rules of the House and Senate would give the Republican Members two votes for each single Democratic vote.

Under the Flemming formula the Republicans would organize the House of Representatives by a vote of 306 to 283; the Senate by a vote of 68 to 64. Of course, that is a very narrow margin and anticipating further losses in the next election perhaps it would be well for Dr. Flemming to make his ratio of Republican votes three to one Democratic. Minor obstacles to effecting this change are the Constitution of the United States, the rules of the House and Senate, but with the cooperation of the Democratic Members these minor obstacles can be overcome.

## Do Ducks Smoke?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent in the field of research in an effort to discover the cause of cancer—so far without success. Some people, equally without sucess, have sought to place the blame for lung cancer on tobacco. As a pertinent item in the search for the truth, I include herewith an article by John Troan, Scripps Howard science writer, in the Washington Daily News, Monday, March 9, 1959:

Lung cancer is increasing in ducks as well as humans.

If you're in the mood for a wisequack, you could ask: "How come—since ducks don't smoke?"

Dr. Ernest J. Witte, chief veterinarian for the Pennsylvania Health Department, says the answer might be air pollution.

Dr. Witte reported today a 54-year study of animal deaths at the Philadelphia Zoological Garden showed lung cancer among ducks now occurring with high frequency.

He said this prompted speculation about the growing amounts of cancer-causing chemicals in the air "as a result of increased industrialization."

AIR POLLUTION?

"The high frequency of lung cancer (in ducks) in the past 10 years," he reported, "would seem to emphasize the importance of air contamination—since these species are kept in outdoor pens throughout the year."

Dr. Witte set forth his findings in the journal, Cancer Research. Louise S. Lombard, now with the Argonne National Laboratory at Lemont, Ill., also helped conduct the study.

The research revealed both cancerous and noncancerous tumors are on the increase in the animal world. But most of this seems

to be linked to the fact animals—like humans—are living longer.

However, some of the findings couldn't be correlated with longer life span among the zoo occupants.

PARAKEETS HIT

Among these were lung cancers in ducks and kidney cancers in parakeets. These tumors apparently are due to something other than aging—but nobody can say what.

Skunks and badgers are getting more cancers of the thyroid, a neck gland that serves as the body's carburetor.

Dr. Witte said these thyroid cancers "may be related to social pressures" in the zoo "rather than to iodine deficiency." He said some rats cropped up with such tumors after developing oversized thyroids which followed "crowding and group conflict."

## Unborn Americans Cannot Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, like many million other Americans, I have fought in a war. Modern warfare has a single basis of comparison with that of ancient times. It consists of 10 percent doing and 90 percent waiting.

During my time of waiting, I had a lot of hours, days, weeks of thought.

I thought, "Do I hate these Japanese people whose property I am going to destroy, whose lives I am going to snuff out?"

This was no easy question. It required the searching of my soul. It demanded that I look into myself, my family teachings, my religious experiences, my formal education.

My answer finally came: "No. I do not hate these Japanese people, whose property I will be called upon to destroy, whose lives I will be called upon to snuff out. I do hate their ideas—that they were justified in their massacre at Pearl Harbor; that they are supermen, accountable only to their leaders; that inhuman cruelty to those other than their own countrymen was natural, even praiseworthy."

I am glad I thought this problem out for myself so many years ago, because, now, I find that I must dedicate my every effort to destroy an idea while respecting and admiring many of the men who hold that idea.

I refer to the idea that it is right to continue one's self in office by providing luxurious Government services which will not alter the present tax structure materially, but which will so increase the national debt that a child born in the United States of America in 2059 will be paying for what is done today.

I am quite confident that no Member of the 86th Congress will be running to retain his same seat in the 136th Congress. The voter of 2059 will have no opportunity to express his resentment of the tax burden we put upon him by using his ballot to defeat any of us.

In my book, it is cowardly, unsportsmanlike, and un-American to injure someone whom you are dead certain will not be able to fight back.

Balance our national budget by cutting all unnecessary expenses to the bone.

Meet present-day problems in the present—do not defer paying for what you get until the next century.

It is not liberalism to promise everything to your contemporaries while leaving your descendants the responsibility of footing the bill.

That, to me, is liberality. That, to me, is the philosophy of the libertine.

Can you still be brave and live with yourselves when you remember, "Taxpayers of today can vote. Taxpayers as yet unborn cannot"?

## Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert herewith a letter from Mr. Adolf Schoepe, president of Fluidmaster a manufacturing organization in my district, on the subject of labor legislation. It is most forceful and convincing and I hope that my colleagues will bear the comments in mind when such legislation comes before us.

FLUIDMASTER,
*March 6, 1959.*

The Honorable JAMES B. UTT,
*House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR JIM: I am enclosing a copy of a statement presented by Donald J. Hardenbrook before the Kennedy Subcommittee February 5, 1959, on the behalf of the N.A.M. and its members.

It is my opinion this statement, for the most part, reflects the views held by wage-earners, businessmen, and the public. It deserves your consideration and support. In addition I should like to offer some further comments and observations.

The Kennedy bill and the administration bill are both entirely inadequate. I am hopeful strong amendments will be offered from the House and Senate floor and that they will have the needed support of Congressman BARDEN and Senator MCCLELLAN.

As you know, section 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act makes provisions for the States to pass State right to work laws. Nineteen States have such laws at this time. Kennedy has not proposed in his labor reform bill that section 14B be repealed from the Taft-Hartley Act. In the speech on the floor of the Senate, he made known his position that he would oppose any such amendment from the floor at the time the Kennedy bill was under consideration. We should avoid this political boobytrap. Obviously, his strategy is to isolate section 14B for the purpose of a successful allout attack at a later date. As long as 14B remains in the package it will be most difficult, if not impossible, for the union bosses to obtain its repeal. Kennedy is running for president every day and in every way and is looking for union boss support for 1960. He is not in favor of right-to-work laws and would move with dispatch to abolish section 14B and the laws presently on the books in 19 States at the opportune time.

We need a return to constitutional government. We need government responsible to the people and not responsible to the union bosses. We need government that will not tolerate the violation of civil rights or civil liberties from any quarter. Finally, we need officials in local, State, and Federal government who are both willing and able to prosecute vigorously those who violate our rights and liberties. We must have effective legislation based upon these American concepts if we are to remain a free people in a free economy.

Surely the McClellan committee, McConnell committee, Kefauver committee, Un-American Activities Committee, and many other congressional committees have clearly demonstrated time after time the need for laws with teeth in them and the need for public officials who have the moral courage, political honesty, ability and the intestinal fortitude to give them real meaning.

Under the guise of collective bargaining, our international unions have grown into a huge monopoly and private forms of government. They have become a sanctuary for gangsters and Communists. For the most part they recognize only union law, which they themselves make and administer. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government extended official recognition when they accepted and sponsored compulsory union membership by allowing unions and employers to enter into collective-bargaining agreements requiring union membership as a condition of employment or continued employment. Under this type of agreement union members soon learned that they did not have the right of free speech or the right to worship, except where these rights did not conflict with union law. History has proven that where people can only enjoy part-time freedom they wind up with a full-time dictatorship. When our Government extended official recognition to these private governments, it also gave them the power to tax, make their own laws and establish their own courts. Unions and the union bosses enjoy all the benefits and all the privileges of a foreign government without the responsibilities of citizenship.

Under the Federal preemption doctrine, States rights in the field of labor legislation have been so curtailed or impaired as to no longer enable them to pass and enforce effective labor legislation. While this program has been underway, the many international unions or private governments have entered into agreements and arrangements which, for all practical purposes, amounts to one huge, private government, which may even now be equal in power to our own Constitutional Government.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act the wage-earners' rights in collective-bargaining matters are well protected from employer abuses. He enjoys free elections by secret ballot under Federal law and supervision. However, he has little protection under this law from the abuses and violence practiced upon him by union bosses. His right to vote by secret ballot in the election of local and international officers should be protected by amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act. Likewise, strike action should not be permitted except by authorization of the membership obtained by secret ballot. Such balloting should be conducted under the direct supervision of the Government. The machinery of the National Labor Relations Board could be used for these purposes.

The right of secret balloting becomes meaningless so long as the international unions are allowed under their law to impose trusteeship upon local unions. Therefore, the Taft-Hartley Act should be further amended in order to take this power

away from the unions. This power should rest with the courts. Any international union wishing to place a local union under trusteeship should be required to show cause in the proper court of jurisdiction. The court should determine if and under what circumstances the trusteeship is warranted. Any such trusteeship should be imposed by the court and operate only under its direct supervision for a period to be determined by the court, not by the international union. All of the rules and penalties prescribed by law for the election of public officials should be made applicable to union elections. The same principle should apply in the case of trusteeships.

The Byrnes Act, more commonly known as the Antistrike Breaking Act, makes it a crime to have persons transported in interstate commerce for the purpose of interfering with certain employee rights related to collective bargaining. Persons doing the transporting and those being transported are subject to fine and imprisonment. Also guilty are those who aid or abet in the violation. This act is aimed directly at employer conduct. It does not apply to the use of muscle men by unions transported in interstate commerce for the purpose of practicing violence or otherwise illegally interfering with the rights and liberties of employees, employers and the public. The Byrnes Act should be amended to apply with equal force to unions and their muscle men.

There are many case examples available, and should you be interested in examining some of them, I will be glad to furnish them.

After you have had an opportunity to consider the contents of this letter, I would appreciate hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

FLUIDMASTER, INC.,
*Adolf Schoepe, President.*

## The Story of "Mr. Peanut"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief history of the founding and development of the immensely successful Planters Nut & Chocolate Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., the city of its founding and where its main offices are located. This history takes the form of a letter, which I sent to each Member of Congress this week:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., March 11, 1959.*

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Peanuts, one of the Nation's six basic farm commodities, have long been America's favorite snack—at baseball games, at the circus, and to add taste and enjoyment to parties of all kinds.

And possibly the most important contribution to the peanut industry as we know it today has been made by Planters peanuts, founded in Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pa., in 1906.

The development of Planters is the story of Amedeo Obici, an Italian immigrant, who came to this country as a boy of 11. At the turn of the century, he soon found himself the proprietor of a fruit stand with the conventional peanut roaster. Young Amedeo, however, foresaw a future in the peanut business and soon had two floors of an old frame building in Wilkes-Barre devoted exclusively to the processing of blanched Virginia salted peanuts which Amedeo and his new partner, Mario Peruzzi, called Planters peanuts.

The next step was the creation of Mr. Peanut, the company's popular trademark, and today, this insignificant beginning has resulted in a worldwide organization with factories in Suffolk, Va., San Francisco, Calif., and Toronto, Canada.

However, the headquarters of Planters still remains in Wilkes-Barre. From there, over 300 Planters salesmen are directed and controlled. All sales and promotional plans are developed in Wilkes-Barre, where Planters president, Mr. Frank A. English, maintains his office and executive staff.

Premiums have been basic Planters selling tools for many years—the pen and pencil set enclosed herewith is the latest in a long line of Mr. Peanut premiums, which is for your use with our compliments.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*Member of Congress.*

## Judy Price Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALVIN R. BUSH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1959, we memorialized the 150th birthday of our great President, Abraham Lincoln. On Tuesday, February 10, 1959, the town of Danville, Montour County, Pa., paid a fitting tribute to one of its leading and outstanding citizens, Edward Foley Price, who like Abraham Lincoln served his God by serving men. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by news editor Jack Feeley, of Danville, Pa.

JUDY PRICE DAY

Mr. Price, known to his friends as Judy, was honored with a special day; the first time in the history of the community such honor has been accorded to one of its residents.

During this day, Mr. Price's hundreds of friends, from tykes to men with whom he has worked and lived all his life, recounted the myriad contributions made by him to Danville and its people.

Sincere messages of congratulations came from across the United States, and several countries overseas.

Vice President NIXON and Pennsylvania Governor Lawrence added their plaudits for this man who is loved and respected by all who know him.

Danville, by honoring Mr. Price were attempting to repay, even in a small way, for the many things he has done and continues to do.

Mr. Price, son of an industrialist, has had an illustrious career. He has been a World War I aviator, top athlete at Lehigh College in Pennsylvania, high school coach, Danville Borough and Montour County official, bank officer, State Hospital and Geisinger Memorial Hospital trustee, to name but a few positions.

As a coach at Danville High School he inspired boys to win—but, also, to do much more.

One of the young me he coached so many years ago emphasized this in a letter:

"It is considered a joke today to speak of coaches building character. But Judy Price did just that.

"Every one of us is a better man today because of him. He taught us confidence in our individual selves and pride in the team. I can still hear him saying, 'There'll be no stars on this blankety-blank ball club.'"

Mr. Price's greatest love remains young peeople. He has given unselfishly of time, money, and work, so that youngsters could enjoy more opportunities for recreation.

In truth, there are many facilities in Danville which would not be in existence except for Mr. Price's efforts.

Everyone in town, except Mr. Price, admits to this fact.

The Danville News, in describing Mr. Price and his dedication to community, wrote:

"It's difficult to describe the effect Edward F. Price has had on Danville, and the many contributions he has made to its well-being.

Perhaps the best way is to say the Montgomerys may have founded Danville, but Judy was among the men to make it.

"It would take a lot more than these columns to review what Judy has accomplished, what he is still doing, and what he will continue to do.

"So we won't even try. If for no other reason than we don't relish Judy looking for us, and waving that black cane like an Irishman going after a Black-and-Tanner.

"We might say that Judy shines, in areas where most of us, although we might try hard, seem to fail. He's best at being a human being."

Much of what Mr. Price has done for his fellow citizens is cloaked in secrecy. That's the way he demands it.

At the February 10 banquet, after receiving the plaudits of his townsfolk from all walks of life, Mr. Price said:

"Let me tell you this. Nobody owes me a dime. What little I did, I did because I wanted to, and I had fun doing it. That, to me, is the only way for a man to live."

Mr. Price will long be remembered in central Pennsylvania as the man who gave so much and asked nothing in return.

Pennsylvania and America were made great because of men of the caliber of Mr. Price.

We could use many more of them in this trying and complex world of today.

## Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter which was addressed to the editor of the Wall Street Journal by Will Clayton on the subject of taxation of cooperatives.

TAXATION

Editor, the Wall Street Journal: Mr. C. H. Lushbough's letter in your February 10 issue is critical of your January 22 editorial calling attention to the fact that in practice cooperatives and their members are permitted to handle their affairs in such way as to avoid payment of income tax.

Mr. Lushbough compares the issuance of stock dividends by noncooperative corporations with the issuance of certificates of interest to members of cooperative corporations, neither being taxable to the recipients. He says that the object in both cases is the conservation of working capital. But he fails to mention that in the case of the noncooperative corporation, the earnings represented by the stock dividend have already

paid a tax to the Federal Government of 50 percent of such earnings, whereas the earnings of the cooperative corporation represented by certificates of interest are, by the very issuance of such certificates, rendered free of income tax; and since the courts have held that such certificates are not taxable to the recipient, it follows that both the cooperative corporation and its members escape taxation and the Federal Government loses the revenue.

Mr. Lushbough makes the further point that the patronage rebate is nontaxable to any type of business, whether legally organized as a cooperative or not, and he wonders why so few corporations take advantage of the opportunity which is legally open to all.

Maybe he has something here. This would certainly be an easy way to abolish the income tax without bothering with legislation or a constitutional amendment.

But the truth of the matter is, in a free enterprise society such as I hope ours will continue to be, the motivating force on which it is founded is the profit and loss system. If we must abolish this system in order to participate in weighty tax favors by our Government, the day we do that will mark the end of our free society.

WILL CLAYTON,
*Houston, Tex.*

## Poison in Your Water—No. 26

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, all parts of our beloved land witness dirty, foul, and polluted waters.

An article from the Newark (N.J.) News of October 20, 1957, chronicles how the "Dirty Whippany River, Hurdle for Park Plan."

The river in question has been so fouled that 40 percent of the flow in the river each day is waste matter. That river is so polluted that while it supplies only 12 percent of the water in the Passaic River watershed it accounts for over 80 percent of the pollution there.

DIRTY WHIPPANY RIVER HURDLE FOR PARK PLAN

WHIPPANY.—Construction of a system of parks from the headwaters of the Whippany River in Mount Freedom to its confluence with the Rockaway and Passaic Rivers in Parsippany-Troy Hills Township hinges on the clearance of pollution from the Whippany River.

Russell W. Myers, Morris County parks director, said his office has given thought to the mammoth project and probably would take specific steps to start it once the pollution is cleared up.

Steps are being taken by the Whippany Paperboard Co., which empties wastes into the Whippany River, to remove the pollution. But the wastes, though not dangerous to health, will continue to discolor the water. In addition, nonpolluting wastes from the Morristown sewage disposal plant and the Greystone Park State Hospital plant are emptied into the stream, according to Frank De Hooge, superintendent for the Passaic Valley Water Commission, which owns the water consumption rights to the stream.

FORTY PERCENT WASTE MATTER

The waste matter amounts to 40 percent of the flow in the river each day, according to De Hooge's figures. He said the average flow in the river is 25 million gallons daily. Of this, he said, 10 million is waste matter from industry and sewage plants.

De Hooge said that although the Whippany River supplies only 12 percent of the water in the Passaic River watershed, it accounts for 80 percent of the pollution.

In view of the figures, De Hooge cautioned the Morris County commission. He said: "If I were them I'd go a little slow on plans to use the river for recreation."

Myers noted, however, that the stream is a "splendid recreation area from many aspects." He said that the Morris County Board of Freeholders had pledged its aid to return the stream, as much as possible, into its natural condition once the sources of pollution are eliminated.

LONG-RANGE PLAN

Myers emphasized that the string of parks would be accomplished under long-range planning and would not be started for a number of years.

Myers envisioned a system of municipal parks that would be tied together by county-maintained park areas on the order of Branch Brook Park in Essex County. The parks would contain recreation areas, hiking trails, wildlife sanctuaries, and, in the Troy meadows, a nature preserve.

Myers' office has given up on the prospect of creating swimming areas in the river. Generations of untamed industrial and municipal exploitation as a sewage disposal outlet have defiled the stream to the point where it is no longer suitable for swimming.

## The Late Reverend George J. Goeckel, Pastor of St. Cecelia's Chuch, Exeter, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Saturday, February 28, 1959:

REV. GEORGE J. GOECKEL

As a parish priest, hospital chaplain, and college professor, the Reverend George J. Goeckel, pastor of St. Cecelia's Chuch, Exeter, and native of Wilkes-Barre, combined three careers in the 35 years he labored in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Scranton since his ordination.

Member of an old and respected city family, he was one of a score of clergymen St. Nicholas congregation furnished to the church here and elsewhere. The late Monsignor Charles J. Goeckel, pastor of St. Nicholas Church, was a cousin.

The Reverend Father Goeckel was known for his vigor and zeal as well as for his intellectual attainments. Endowed with a refreshing frankness, he possessed the courage of his convictions and was as interesting as he was convincing when he espoused a cause.

His students at the University of Scranton, where he taught Latin, knew him as an educator of considerable capacity as well as a dedicated priest. A ready wit enhanced his popularity and effectiveness.

Parishioners, students, and patients will remember him chiefly for the example he set in his own life. Wherever duty called, he responded with a zest that left no room for doubt about the outcome. In thousands of homes in Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties, there will be genuine regret today in the wake of news of his passing.

## We're Widening Our Lead Over Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include the following text of an article which appeared in the March 1959 issue of Nation's Business. In this article, Dr. Demitri B. Shimkin, authority on Soviet industrial power, answers some very interesting questions concerning our military and economic strength as compared with the Russians.

WE'RE WIDENING OUR LEAD OVER RUSSIA—COMMUNISTS ARE STRETCHING THEIR RESOURCES, SACRIFICING FUTURE GROWTH FOR TODAY'S GAINS

The greatest danger facing America today is a lack of self-confidence in the face of Russia's military and economic strength.

That's the opinion of Dr. Demitri B. Shimkin, who is interviewed this month by Nation's Business.

Clearly, a dispassionate assessment of true Soviet strength and weakness is needed at this time, along with an equally unemotional analysis of our own economic problems and possibilities.

Dr. Shimkin provides such an assessment.

A student of the Soviet Union's economic and social system for about 20 years, he is currently on leave from his regular post as a senior research specialist in the Foreign Manpower Research Office of the Bureau of the Census.

While on leave, Dr. Shimkin has been engaged as a senior scientist at the George Washington University in Washington, where he is completing a monograph on the Uralic languages (Finnish, Hungarian, etc.). A native of Russia, Dr. Shimkin served from 1941 to 1946 with the War Department General Staff, specializing in supply problems arising out of lend-lease to Russia. From 1946 to 1947 he taught at the National War College; from 1947 to 1948 he was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, where he wrote an award-winning monograph on the Soviet automotive industries.

In 1953, while at Harvard's Russian Research Center, he wrote the book, "Minerals, Key to Soviet Power." He has written numerous articles and papers on the Soviet system.

At the Census Bureau, Dr. Shimkin has specialized in research on Soviet industry and, in 1955, he was one of several authorities who drafted a comparative study of the United States and Soviet economies for the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report. In 1956 he was a consultant to the Defense Department's Weapons System Evaluation Group.

Here is how Dr. Shimkin answered questions submitted by Nation's Business:

"Do you believe that the Soviet Union is likely to achieve its goal of economically outstripping the United States and the rest of the free world?"

I emphatically do not. Exaggeration aside, Soviet postwar growth has been no faster than that of Western Europe, Japan, or Australia. American growth from a high

wartime peak, although slower, has also been substantial. Today, the margins of skills, or resources, and of inherent economic efficiency in the West are sufficient not merely to maintain the gap, but even to increase it.

In Europe, the widening of markets caused by an American-inspired revolution of anticipations and by greater integration are providing impetuses for future growth. In this country, the essentials for vigorous growth are greater than ever, but we need to rekindle our national self-confidence and clarify our goals in terms, not of vague objectives, but specific means attainable within the framework of free enterprise. Overall, I see every possibility for healthy growth of the free world, a diffusion of economic strength and initiative into Western Europe, the British Commonwealth, and, in part, Latin America. The newly independent countries of Asia and Africa, however, are likely to have persistent political-economic problems.

In the Soviet bloc, the economic promise of Poland and China may exceed that of the Soviet Union itself.

"Does the Soviet Union face significant economic problems?"

Yes. In striving for world supremacy, the Soviet Union constantly overcommits its resources for grandiose military and economic programs, at home and abroad. Actually, it tries to gain its key targets without much regard for secondary ones. It stresses workable expedients rather than basic solutions. Thus, in Soviet coal mines, lavish mechanization has been superimposed upon inappropriate, old-fashioned layouts. The results have been only two-thirds as much production and a fifth of the American man-year productivity, with 2,000 continuous coal cutters compared to 500 in the United States.

In agriculture, Soviet output has been increased through vastly expanded acreage, constantly cropped, in marginal dry lands, rather than through soil improvement, irrigation, and higher yields. With low fluctuating yields, the net costs are high; moreover, long-term soil deterioration is inevitable.

Also, the gaps between availabilities and priority demands have been closed by stagnation or sacrifice elsewhere. Soviet housing is notorious. Only an eighth of all Soviet food stores have refrigeration. The repudiation of state bonds in 1956, the recent discontinuation of state wages and social security for 2 million farm laborers, and the cutbacks in education illustrate the exactions demanded by Soviet industrialization. The absence of effective controls over air and water pollution by Soviet industry and admittedly poor labor safety also take their toll.

"What other problems do the Russians face?"

In industry and transportation, overloading and the desire to minimize investment have led to widespread technological and structural obsolescence, with corresponding drags upon efficiency and productivity. Miserable roads and inadequate rural electrification contribute toward spoilage and excessive costs in marketing food. Dependence upon low-calorie solid fuels, coupled with transport of petroleum primarily by tank car rather than pipe, lead to a ton-mileage per unit of industrial output 40 percent higher than in the United States. An inadequate variety of products from Soviet rolling mills necessitates extensive and wasteful metal cutting in Soviet machinery industries, with less finished output and heavier investment for lathes, planers, and shapers per ton of steel consumed than in the West.

Finally, the militaristic direction and the totalitarian nature of the Soviet system have generated profound social injustices, particularly toward the rural population. The Soviet peasant receives little schooling, inferior medical care, and no social security, yet he is specialy subject to compulsory work on roads. His children are required to start farming at 12, and may be conscripted at 14 for work on railroads, or in factories and mines.

In fact, all Soviet adolescents today, young aristocrats apart, represent a savagely deprived class. Even members of the managerial class cannot feel too happy at the loss of bond holdings, nor at the full usurpation of power by the Communist apparatus. Thus deep grounds for unrest exist. While state coercion may hinder their open expression, their effects upon productivity gains and creativity are hard to exaggerate.

"What about the Russians' striking progress in such fields as cosmic rocketry?"

Such a contradiction is one of the basic characteristics of the Soviet system. It gains results by intense concentration upon selected sectors. The costs of rocket-launching successes are the stagnation of agricultural research; tuberculosis mortality at least five times that of the United States; the absence of a single civilian automotive proving ground. But the system represents great skill in psychological warfare, in selecting a course of action to hide Soviet weaknesses and substitute for them an image of ruthless power hypnotically effective upon the fearful West.

"Will Russia reach the targets fixed in its new domestic program?"

The current program appears to be a speed up of previous Soviet plans for this period, especially in relation to metal production. Its prospects can be gauged this way: Historically, the Soviets have done well in their heavy industrial output goals, but poorly in agriculture, consumer goods and services, and in productivity gains. Overall, this pattern is likely to continue. However, the depletion of prime iron ore, coking coal and bauxite resource is creating new problems of relocation, processing and substitution.

"Why are they taking such severe measures?"

The most important reason is the steady deceleration of gains in industrial productivity. According to my estimates, Soviet postwar man-year productivity gains through 1950 were about 10 percent per year; between 1951 and 1956 they ran 5 to 6 percent a year; and in 1957 and 1958 they were less than 3 percent. At the same time, the Soviet labor force is entering into a period of slow growth, caused by low birth rates and excessive mortality during the 1940's. Thus, Soviet industrial manpower requirements must be met by employment at earlier ages, and by transfers of manpower from agriculture and services to industry, construction, and transportation. Such transfers will mean continued rapid city growth, and necessitate substantial housing and utilities programs to maintain even today's low standards.

"How will Soviet economic growth over the next 5 or 10 years compare with ours?"

This question really involves two facts that must be explored in turn—a clarification of what we mean by economic growth, and an understanding of the limits within which the rate of growth may be predictable.

Economic growth involves several dimensions. One is the expansion of economic activity of an essential homogeneous type. By this measure, the Soviet Union has been growing at least 5 percent per year since 1951.

This estimate is substantially lower than the official Soviet version, which excludes civilian and military services (a slowly growing component), which makes inadequate allowance for capital consumption, and which is constructed on a gross rather than net basis.

In Soviet agriculture, the difference between the rise of gross output and that of income originated, at constant prices, is particularly large, since productivity increases have been moderate while mechanization and fertilizer costs have been high and rapidly mounting.

The second dimension of growth is qualitative change, a matter of substitution by improved products or methods rather than of intensified economic activity alone. By this measure, Soviet progress has been much less favorable. Many types of substitution, such as the switch from steam to diesel and electric locomotives, which took place years ago in the United States, are just getting underway in the U.S.S.R. The pressure to maximize economic activity regardless of costs keeps obsolescent plants and even industries—such as peat fuel—in operation. Conversely, the past decade has witnessed an exceptionally rapid rate of product change in American industry.

The third dimension is the accumulation of national wealth. While the Soviet Union has greatly increased its capital resources, its mines, powerplants, and factories, it has had no counterpart to the tremendous westward and southward shifts, the improvements in housing, the suburbanization and the reduction of rural-urban differences which have taken place in the United States since 1940.

Our rural electrification, our national highway program, our telephones, are unique accomplishments.

Thus, no single measure can encompass economic growth. By some measures, the Soviet Union has been growing faster; but by others, the United States leads.

So far as the future is concerned, I am not a prophet. However, one basic change in relative resource availability as between this country and the Soviet Union is taking place. That is in the population of working age, essentially 15 to 60, from which the labor force is drawn. Between 1950 and 1956, a 14 million-person increase in the Soviet population of working age provided a basis for rapid growth, while in the United States growth was retarded by a mere 4.5 million-person rise in the corresponding age group. That was a long-term effect of our great depression.

Conversely, the consequences of World War II will hold the rise of the Soviet working-age population, 1956 to 1965, to 8 million, while the American rise will be 12 million. Consequently, if we employ our human resources effectively, we can maintain an economic expansion over the next decade surpassing that of the Soviet Union by any measure.

"What do you see as the principal economic challenges facing the United States in the coming decade?"

Politically, a high employment policy will be inescapable. Therefore, the decisive question is whether employment will increase through vigorous growth or through shorter hours and overstaffing. If we take the second course, we are due for continued inflation because of higher costs, increasing difficulty in competing in world markets, and a sharp loss of influence internationally.

To follow the first course, we must, I believe, face five general problems:

First, we must make effective use of our technological advances. The crucial need is for the prompt and effective dissemination of information to smaller business, coupled with ready licensing and improved marketing. A decentralized pattern of cooperation between government and private enterprise, broadly similar to that of our soil conservation districts, might prove useful in attacking this problem.

Of equal importance is a serious and continued effort to maximize feedback of the practical developments made in military fields, such as printed electrical circuits, into civilian technology. A vigorous policy, not merely of declassification, but of active dissemination, would have two other conse-

quences. By introducing compatible standards into civilian technology, it would expand the mobilization base for scarce commodities. By changing military production in many fields from special order to standard items, it would reduce procurement costs.

Second, to take advantage of new machines and new techniques, a vigorous program of technical and vocational training appears essential, both for new workers and the present labor force. The effects of the medical profession's refresher programs in making possible the prompt exploitation of advances show the potentials of such an effort.

Third, we need a systematic, timely expansion of natural resources, especially minerals, water, and timber. In general, one of America's historic advantages has come from well balanced and low-cost raw materials supplies. However, for many years we have failed to develop our domestic resources at rates commensurate with foreseeable demand. We have become increasingly dependent on foreign sources. Today, new methods of exploration, of refining, and purification, of management, and of substitution permit substantial strengthening of our resources base.

Fourth, to promote effective capital formation, to establish new businesses, to maintain a healthy consumer demand and to control inflation, we must have a wise system of financial management. The problems in this field are innumerable and complex—the development of sound criteria for amortization in a highly competitive, technologically advancing economy, the reduction of the sensitivity of income tax yields to moderate business fluctuations are two examples.

Fifth, we need balanced growth to maintain stable cost relationships domestically and an effective posture in foreign affairs. Yet, while the various segments of our economy expanded rather proportionately between 1940 and 1951, practically our entire economic expansion since then, especially the growth of employment and of companies, has been in the service sector. The growth of manufacturing, which underlies productivity gains in other sectors, has been measurably slower in the United States than in the Soviet Union or Western Europe.

"Why has our manufacturing growth tended to slow down as compared to our growth in the service industries?"

Apart from somewhat unfavorable cost, price, profitability, and demand trends, I think the following are significant:

Since World War II, a tremendous amount of product substitution has taken place. Many new commodities—tubeless tires, transistors, synthetic diamonds—have appeared, while other products have become obsolete. Also, American industry has developed an extraordinary capacity to saturate markets. Under such conditions, business mortality is high. How to reduce it, how to promote economic stability under conditions of rapid technological advance, present fundamental problems.

"What impact will Soviet foreign trade and aid programs have on the United States?"

I think Soviet foreign trade is a dual phenomenon. In one sphere, its purpose is to import commodities difficult or costly to produce in the Soviet Union: Heavy-duty copper wire, which has constituted the bulk of British exports to the U.S.S.R. in recent years, is an example. To pay for those imports the Soviets must export, and the product exported is generally some short-run overage, which is dumped for what it will bring. Since the Soviets may shortly be importing the same product, the ensuing market disruptions give them both a political and an economic bonus. This kind of an operation can be bothersome, but is rarely a major threat.

But Russia also uses foreign trade as one instrument in a strategy of penetration and subversion designed to deny selected areas to western trade and investment, if not to convert them to active hostility. Such operations are exceedingly dangerous, but the counter to them is only partially economic. Political stability and military viability are the essentials.

In the economic field specifically, perhaps more attention is needed in the promotion of geological and other resources exploration by newly developing countries, and in the development of vocational training.

"Will Soviet technology mean an increasing problem for us in the years ahead?"

Soviet military technology has been original and effective for many years, and will unquestionably give us serious problems. Also, in certain areas such as the machine-tool industry, there is a possibility of genuine Soviet competition in world markets. Finally, Soviet research, like American, British, or Swedish research, always has the possibility of breaking through to new potentials in fields such as thermonuclear power.

In the military field, the Soviets have gained advantages from the continuity, on a large scale, of their effort, and from its integration by specialized, permanent institutions. One of the most notable has been the Academy of Artillery Sciences which has united the soldier and the scientist in coordinated planning, research and development in systems design, ballistics, propellents, metallurgy, etc. In addition, the Soviets have carefully followed, and often exploited effectively, new scientific developments in the West.

Our own effort in large-scale research is essentially an outgrowth of World War II. It has expanded far more rapidly than the Soviet effort, but still suffers from inadequate coordination, insufficient attention to basic research, and inadequate use of accumulated findings, both domestic and foreign.

"Can study of Russian experience and developments help our economic growth?"

Certainly. I would stress three aspects: know-how in the organization and administration of military-scientific programs; provision for highly specialized training; and substantive accomplishments in varied fields such as crystallography, geochemistry, and soil science. In general, they have a more orderly approach and more patience. By anticipating substantial needs for specialized personnel in dynamic fields such as metallurgy, they have kept better balance than we between basic research and application.

Even in areas where we generally excel, such as statistics, they have ideas worthy of emulation. For example, they gather fuller, more current data on physical capital in industry (numbers, types, and ages of metal working equipment, electrical apparatuses, etc.) and on capital utilization (number of shifts of operation, etc.). As a result, they have a better understanding of their investment requirements. In addition, while they have comprehensive statistics on their professional and subprofessional manpower, our statistics in this basic area are partial, contradictory, and out of date.

"How will the development of West European economic union affect our future?"

The breakdown of barriers in Europe and, above all, the changing outlook of the European consumers are creating new markets and new economic strength. At the same time, if these advantages are to persist, trade barriers with this country and the British Commonwealth must be held to a minimum. However, since European productivity is rising rapidly, we must, to compete effectively in our own and foreign markets, maintain increasing productivity and the active innovation of new goods. Certainly, it does not seem probable that industry can effect economies by reducing wage levels. Thus, from this standpoint as well as that of the Soviet military threat, we have the choice of vigorous progress or serious trouble.

"Can we handle these problems on the basis of a private-initiative economy?"

Of course. In fact, I can conceive of no sound program that does not originate through cooperative efforts at the local level. However, if that does not eventuate, the cumulation of unsolved problems will bring about centrally imposed answers. Overall, I think the issue boils down to a question of initiative. If private enterprise does not take an active role, not merely in accepting economic expansion but in helping frame its direction, and in educating the public as to the alternatives open to it, then we will have increasing state control.

---

## Stable Dollar, Balanced Budget, Farm Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a clipping from the Weekly Star Farmer of February 18, 1959, written by Roderick Turnbull a well known and highly respected reporter and commentator on agricultural matters.

STABLE DOLLAR, BALANCED BUDGET, FARM ASSETS

(By Roderick Turnbull)

President Eisenhower has laid before Congress a financial program calling for a balanced budget, which simply means the Government would not spend any more in the next fiscal year than it collects.

It is not a Scrooge budget; in fact, the President expects the Government to collect $77.1 billion in taxes, a record, and spend approximately the same amount. But it looks as if he would have a hard time holding the line. Congress indicates it is in the mood to spend far more and add to the public debt of $283 billion. When the Government spends more than it takes in, as it is doing this year and has been doing most of the time for several years, it can only borrow to keep paying its bills or deliberately print money. This can be one cause of inflation.

Inflation, as many authorities now are pointing out, hurts people who are on fixed incomes, such as old-age pensioners, schoolteachers, white collar workers who find it difficult to get raises in pay, people living off of insurance, or their savings and the like.

But we would like to insist, also, that inflation hurts farmers in a situation where farm products are in ample supply or in surplus. Inflation, to a large extent, is the reason for the price-cost squeeze, which is the farmer's major current economic difficulty.

Inflation made its greatest strides from 1945 to 1951, with the big jump in 1950 and 1951. The consumer price index jumped from 76 points to 111 from 1945 to 1951. Since that time the index has moved up to 123.7, a more gradual increase, but still always going up.

It is significant that back in 1940, when the first social security benefits were paid, the maximum was $60 a month. Now the maximum for any retired worker is $127 a month, but the $127 today has about the same buying power as the 1940 $60.

Inflation is felt first on commodities which are in short supply. One definition of inflation is that more money is in circulation than products to be bought. So people with

money are in competition for products available and prices go up. But there are no shortages of farm products, thus prices lag.

When you see the figure that the Government is in debt, $283 billion, do you ever wonder to whom does it owe the money?

Banks, the places where we have money on deposit and where we do our banking business, have lent the Government $67 billion. It owes Federal Reserve banks $25 billion. Government trust accounts have lent Uncle Sam $55 billion. These include the social security fund, unemployment insurance reserves, civil service retirement funds and others. A whopping $133 billion comes under the heading of private, nonbank investors. These include individuals who have bought savings bonds and other securities to the tune of $65 billion, insurance companies which have invested $12 billion in Government paper, mutual savings banks, $7 billion, and corporations, $16 billion. The latter investments are mostly short-term deals, such as Treasury bills, for tax reserves.

Included in the $133 billion also are funds of State and local governments invested with the U.S. Government to the amount of $17 billion. Miscellaneous investors, such as the Federal land banks, account for another $16 billion in this category and even foreign governments come in for about $6 billion. We have rounded out the figures, which is the reason the total doesn't quite reach the $283 billion.

Few persons can escape having some personal interest in the Government's debt and the fact that it must be paid off. It is your bank's money, or the money in your retirement fund; it is the money you expect to get some day as social security payments, or when you collect on your insurance policy. It is money you expect to get when you cash your savings bonds.

Therefore, if anything is done to cheapen this money in the future (inflation) you won't get as much back, in purchasing power, as you lent to the Government originally.

The interest on this debt is now running at $8 billion a year.

That is as much money as all the farmers in Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico received last year for everything they sold—not net, but gross. And last year was the best year this area has had in a long time.

The farmer has a tremendous stake in a stable dollar. He should, therefore, lend his support to a balanced budget for whatever effect it may have in contributing to that stability.

## Fiftieth in the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 8, 1959:

FIFTIETH IN THE UNION

Once Alaska became the 49th State, is seemed certain that Hawaii would sooner or later become the 50th. This is happening with gratifying speed, and it now is likely that the Senate will approve the Hawaiian statehood bill by Easter. The measure is ready for debate on the Senate floor; Senator JOHNSON hopes it can begin this week. Since the bill is sponsored by over half of the Senators, there can be little doubt about its passage. Some of the Southerners are expected to oppose it—two more new Senators will inevitably dilute the Southerners' influence as a group. But delay is the most they are expected to accomplish.

The arguments for Hawaiian statehood are as strong as they were for Alaska, if not stronger. Hawaii has over half a million people to Alaska's 160,000. As long ago as 1940, the Territory voted overwhelmingly to join the Union. To object to the fact that Hawaii is separated from the continental United States by 2,000 miles of water is as foolish, in the world of today, as objecting to the fact that California is separated from Washington by 3,000 miles of land.

The United States has ruled Hawaii for over 60 years, and it is time the citizens of this thriving and highly civilized archipelago were enfranchised. The first official 49-star flag is to be run up over Fort McHenry in Baltimore on July 4. We suggest that someone have an extra star in his pocket just in case.

## Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY, is now in the process of drafting immigration legislation which would replace the rigid national origin quota system which has been the criteria for admission into the United States as an alien for decades.

In a letter to the editor of the New York Times today, Senator KENNEDY lucidly explains the desirability and his reasoning for sponsoring immigration legislation that would reunite blood relatives in the United States and provide for the entry of nonrelatives without a quota limitation based on country of origin.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Senator KENNEDY's letter appearing in the New York Times of today be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

ADMITTING IMMIGRANTS—SENATOR KENNEDY EXPLAINS PROVISIONS OF BILL FOR ENTRY OF NONRELATIVES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A letter to the editor of the New York Times by Richard Robbins, printed in your issue of March 4, has been called to my attention. It is a thoughtful and cogent statement of the undesirability of replacing the rigid national origins quota system in our immigration policy with merely a blood relationship formula. I wholly agree with the basic conclusions expressed by Mr. Robbins.

Insofar, however, as he assumes that the bill I am preparing would be limited in the way he describes, he is mistaken. At the press conference called by the Antidefamation League to announce the publication of a booklet I wrote entitled "A Nation of Immigrants," I emphasized the point that I planned to introduce a bill to replace the national origins quota system, and that preferred status in immigration would be given to relatives of American residents. But I also stated—and this has been overlooked in many of the comments upon my position—that the bill I was working on would retain provisions for the admission of nonrelatives.

The proposal for the elimination of the national origins quotas has two phases: First, it will admit relatives for the purpose of reuniting families that have long suffered from unnatural separation. They will be admitted without the rigid restrictions of the national origins formula which currently imposes tiny unworkable quotas on many countries.

REDUCING BACKLOG

Thus we would reduce the huge backlog of applications by brothers, sisters and other close relatives of American citizens. (It is estimated that currently this backlog exceeds 200,000 relatives who have been waiting for many years.) It would render unnecessary many of the private bills introduced in each session of Congress to ameliorate particular hardship. Finally, the natural desire of members of the same family to help each other would assist the assimilation process.

Second, the proposal would provide for the admission of nonrelatives—refugees and so-called new-seed immigration—under a flexible formula that would take into account America's needs, our historical position as a home for the persecuted, and our standing as a world leader.

While the statistical formulas to govern the various categories of admission are still to be worked out, at least as many nonrelatives as we now admit annually would be eligible for admission under the new program. There would be one important difference—quota limitations based on country of origin would be largely eliminated.

This is one of 10 proposals I mentioned at the press conference. It is by far both the most difficult and the most delicate. I am confident, however, that we will ultimately be able to enact a law which is consistent with our position of leadership in the free world.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

WASHINGTON, *March 6, 1959.*

## Andrew J. Sordoni, of Wilkes-Barre, Again Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Tuesday, March 3, 1959:

AWARD FOR MR. SORDONI

Choice of Andrew J. Sordoni for the Back Mountain Community Service Award at the annual dinner of the association next month was a surprise only in the fact that he had not been singled out for this distinction previously. As a summer resident of Harveys Lake and head of the Commonwealth Telephone Co. with offices at Dallas, the Harveys Lake Light Co. and Sterling Farms, to say nothing of his extracurricular activities, the former State senator easily qualifies for special recognition by this group.

The Back Mountain, among other places, is deeply indebted to Mr. Sordoni and this expression of its appreciation will reflect

the sentiments of the community. It is no secret that the area holds a special place in Mr. Sordoni's affections because of his many ties there, personal and business.

Unquestionably, he has contributed as much as any individual to its development from a rural district into a thriving residential community with industrial possibilities. It is the good fortune of the Back Mountain to have a man of his caliber linked with its progress, for it augurs well for the future.

Honors are nothing new in the life of Andrew Sordoni, but this recognition should carry with it special significance and satisfaction for him.

## Life of a Midsouth Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by a distinguished Washington correspondent, Mr. Morris Cunningham, which appeared Sunday, March 8, in the Memphis Commercial Appeal, a great southern newspaper. In recent days much has been said and written about the salaries and the staffs of the Members of this House. In the following article Mr. Cunningham has clearly and accurately described many of the duties, burdens, and cares which fall upon one who chooses to engage in a career of public service by becoming a Member of the legislative branch of our great Government. I suggest that all of my colleagues will find the following remarks to be a true, enlightening, and thoughtful description of our activities:

MR. MIDSOUTH CONGRESSMAN AT TIMES FEELS OVERWORKED

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Mr. M. S. (for Midsouth) Congressman draws $22,500 a year before Federal income tax, retirement, insurance, and other deductions, but sometimes feels overworked and underpaid.

He has a staff of between five and seven assistants to help him keep track of affairs in his district and the rest of the world.

His constituents demand he be informed on everything from the winter boll weevil count to Khrushchev's latest blast and the chances of atomic war.

He is a member of at least one committee and of two or more subcommittees. He must attend their meetings, put in time on the House floor debating and voting, stay in touch with party leaders, answer his mail and telephone calls, spend time with visitors from home—and see that Farmer Brown, his good friend, gets a copy of the agriculture yearbook.

He must maintain two offices and two residences, since he's in Washington half the year and in his district the other half.

The average Mr. M. S. Congressman is married and has children. The children get their schooling in snatches. Some of it in the school back home and some of it in Washington, since Congress convenes in January and usually quits in August.

MUST BE EVER ALERT

Sometimes Mrs. Congressman will stay in Washington and start the kids in school while Mr. Congressman goes home to visit around his district during the fall. Maybe the family will reunite at Thanksgiving, maybe not until Mr. Congressman returns around Christmas for the start of the next session in January.

And every other year, Mr. Congressman, if he wants to keep his job, must run for reelection. Sometimes he's lucky and doesn't draw an opponent. But he must be ever alert.

If he's opposed by a formidable challenger, he must reconcile himself to commuting between Washington and his district for at least 2 months—flying here to vote and briefly looking after some of his office affairs, then flying back to the district to resume his campaign. What with the vagaries of air travel, this can be a grueling ordeal.

Along with everything else, Mr. Congressman, as well as Mrs. Congressman, are required to attend innumerable banquets at countless conventions which attract friends and constituents from home.

One night it's a farm organization, next it's a veterans group, next a political dinner, and on and on.

FAMILY OBLIGATIONS

And with all this, they must rear their children, go to church, look after their health, and, somehow, find time for that family association known as togetherness.

It's no wonder Mrs. Congressman sometimes complains her children see their father more frequ ntly on television than they do at home.

Mr. Congressman must also be ready to donate his money. After his election, he quickly finds he's a sitting duck for everything from a Red Cross drive to a campaign for new window curtains in a local school.

To help him with his problems—including ducking an occasional brickbat from a newspaperman, colleague, administration official, or political enemy back home—the average Mr. M. S. Congressman has about six aids.

His top aid may be a man or a woman, but is a person experienced in governmental know-how who refuses to take "No" as an answer when the Veterans' Administration says no, they cannot grant a pension to Banker Jones because of the permanent disability he suffered when he dropped his rifle on his toe at National Guard camp.

Mr. Congressman probably pays this top aid the top allowable salary of $13,344.62, and often wishes he could raise it. To earn this, the aid works from 9 to 6, 5 and sometimes 6 days a week, and sometimes on holidays and Sunday afternoons when Congress is in session. When Congress quits, the aid accompanies Mr. Congressman to his district and establishes and runs his office there. The aid relies entirely upon the salary, receiving no travel or living expenses.

The next aid probably makes $8,192.10 a year, and, like the other one, is a highly competent typist and stenographer who can turn out one letter after another. This aid must also be versed in Government because, when Mr. Congressman and the other one leave for the district, this one is left in charge of the Washington office.

THIRD HANDLES MAIL

The third one is a girl who is an excellent typist who knows something about filing and devotes herself mainly to handling the mail.

Besides this, Mr. Congressman may have a young boy who will attend page school part time and run errands, operate the duplicating machine, drive Mr. Congressman's car to the airport to meet visitors when he can't make it, and perform a variety of other chores, including fetching the Congressman a ham sandwich and glass of milk for lunch.

Then, back home, Mr. M. S. Congressman probably has two field secretaries. One will be located at one end of his district and the second at the other end. One may make $4,047.37 a year and the other perhaps $3,072.66.

It's their job to deal firsthand with the problems of the about 350,000 constituents in the district, process and investigate them, and then pass them along to Mr. Congressman.

These problems can range from organizing local support for a Federal-local flood control project to getting storekeeper Smith's boy an appointment to West Point.

In addition to his salary, Mr. M. S. Congressman gets 20 cents a mile for one round-trip a year between his home and Washington, which figures out to between $400 and $500 a year. That's the only travel allowance he gets. On it, he can make about three round-trips home a year. Additional trips—to speak at a Kiwanis Club luncheon, for instance, come out out of his own pocket.

PAYS DIFFERENCE HIMSELF

He also is allowed up to $1,200 a year for rental of an office in his district; if the Federal Government is unable to furnish adequate space in the post office or other building. He gets only what he spends of this up to $1,200. He also is allowed $600 a year for expenses in his district, excluding rent. No office equipment is furnished for his district office and he can't move it from Washington. So he must buy and maintain whatever typewriters and other machinery he uses at home.

He is allowed 3,000 minutes of free long-distance telephone time a year—and usually exceeds this and must pay for the excess. He is also allowed 20,000 words in telegrams and $400 a year for airmail and special delivery stamps—which he also usually exceeds. Another allowance is $1,200 for letterheads, envelopes, and all other printed matter.

And next time you have lunch with him, remember that Mr. Congressman gets no allowance for entertainment. When he picks up the check, it comes out of his salary.

He has the services of the Capitol physician but if he goes to the Government hospital here—the Bethesda Naval Hospital—he must pay $19.80 a day, again out of his own pocket.

## James A. Adams, Dean of Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, Pa., To Retire This Year After 39 Years' Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Thursday, March 5, 1959:

JAMES A. ADAMS, DEAN AT SEMINARY FOR 39 YEARS, TO RETIRE JULY 1

The dean is retiring.

For thousands of Wyoming Valley residents and many hundreds of his former students scattered throughout the United States, he needs no further identification. For those less familiar with Wyoming Seminary, he is James A. Adams, dean of Wyoming Seminary since 1936 and a member of the faculty for 39 years. Dean Adams, whose integrity and depth of understanding have made him one of the most popular administrators in the 115-year history of the school, will retire July 1 for reasons of health.

In giving up his post, the dean, as he is known to faculty veterans and incoming freshmen alike, will be able to look back over a career in schoolwork that began 45 years ago. The only event he permitted to interrupt his service to education was World War I, in which he served as a member of the American Expeditionary Force in France and Germany.

Despite his 60-odd years, the Dean retains a youthfulness of mind and spirit that puts him in intimate touch with the dreams and aspirations of young people. He feels with them what they feel, and hopes for them as they hope. It is this quality of sympathetic understanding that marks him as a man in whom young people and their parents can place their trust, and has gained for him the respect of his colleagues and the community.

A native of Orono, Maine, he is the son of hardy Scotch-Irish parents; and, in spite of nearly 40 years residence in Pennsylvania, Dean Adams, whose personality is mirrored in his ready smile and firm handclasp, retains many of the characteristics so apparent in people of Yankee stock. His habits of thought and manner of speech still reflect his New England background.

Following graduation from the public schools of Orono, Dean Adams entered the University of Maine from which he received the degree of bachelor of science in mathematics in 1915.

In the years preceding participation of the United States in World War I, he served as principal of secondary schools in Exeter and Jonesport, Maine, and as teacher of mathematics at the high school at Norwood, Mass.

When the United States entered the war, the youthful teacher enlisted in the Army where he served as master sergeant at an evacuation hospital on the western front.

Following his discharge in 1919, Dean Adams returned to teaching, accepted a position as submaster and teacher of mathematics at the high school at Biddeford, Maine. It was at this time that he married the former Mildred Ordway, a native of Waterford, Maine. The following year, the young couple came to Kingston where the future dean had been employed as head of the mathematics department.

Confidants of Dean Adams are aware that his original intention was to spend no more than 2 years gathering experience at Wyoming Seminary and then to move on. When asked why he changed his mind and decided to make his career at the school, the dean readily replies that it was the influence of the late Dr. Levi L. Sprague, president of Wyoming Seminary from 1882 to 1936, that convinced him to stay in Wyoming Valley and help build the institution with which he has become so closely identified.

The dean is frank to admit, as are many others, that Dr. Sprague was the one man who most influenced the course of his life. "I saw the chance of a lifetime to work under the guidance of a great administrator and schoolman," said the dean.

When Dr. Sprague died in 1936 and Dr. Wilbur H. Fleck moved from the dean's office to the presidency of the school, Dean Adams was elevated to the position in which he has served for 23 years. In this post, as second in command of the school with its nearly 500 students, he has been responsible for the day-to-day administration of school affairs including most of the discipline problems. In addition, the dean's office, which is the nerve center of the school and repository for all student records, acts as a three-way contact point between teachers, students, and parents.

In surveying the field of education from his vantage point of nearly 50 years experience, Dean Adams is mainly impressed by the belief that schools are doing a much better job than when he entered the profession. "For example," he said, "we are now teaching subjects that used to be considered too difficult for secondary school students, and were reserved for college classes. I am happy but not surprised that this is so," he added, "because I know American young people have the intelligence and ability to compete successfully with the youth of any nation."

He is particularly proud of the fact that although enrollment at Wyoming Seminary has doubled in the last 15 years, academic standards have remained high, a fact that in no small part is due to his constant supervision of the curriculum.

Despite the many duties of his office, the dean has continued to teach his highly regarded course in advanced mathematics. In addition, he has served as a member of the Board of Readers in Advanced Mathematics of the College Entrance Examination Board from 1927 to 1939. For several years, his summer vacation was given over to study and in 1934 the degree of Master of Arts was conferred on him by Columbia University.

A member of the Rotary Club and Torch Club, both of which he has served as president, Dean Adams is also an active member of Kingston Methodist Church.

When Dean Adams presents the class of 1959 to the board of trustees at commencement, he will view the end of a parade of over 5,000 students who have passed through Wyoming Seminary during his tenure. Many of his former students have risen to positions of rank in government or military service while others have become prominent in the professions. Among them are several members of the board of trustees including Dr. Ralph W. Decker, president of the school.

Others who have been taught or guided by Dean Adams are Pennsylvania State Supreme Court Justice Benjamin R. Jones and Luzerne County Orphans Court Judge Paul R. Selecky. Retired Air Force Gen. Elwood R. (Pete) Quesada, who was recently appointed by President Eisenhower to head the Federal Aviation Authority, is another of his former students.

Dean Adams remembers all the young people he has helped to educate, but the memories of some stand out more clearly from the others. The two boys who most impressed him, he said are Dr. Joseph Donchess and Dr. Eric Faigle. Both, he recalls, suffered great hardship and overcame severe handicaps to acquire an education. Today, Donchess is chief surgeon at the United States Steel Co. Hospital at Gary, Ind., while Faigle is dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Syracuse University.

Locally, he has cause to remember Drs. Jacob G. Hyman and Charles N. Burns, two former students, who pulled him through a serious illness 2 years ago.

When Dean Adams arrived in Wyoming Valley in 1920, the school was just starting a period of building which reached a high point early this year with completion of the new Wyoming Seminary Gymnasium on North Maple Avenue. Among the other buildings the dean has seen rise on the campus are Sprague Hall, in which his office is located, Carpenter Hall, Nesbitt Stadium and reconstruction of the dormitories on Sprague Avenue.

An active man by training and temperament, Dean Adams does not intend his retirement to be a period of idleness. He and Mrs. Adams, who will celebrate their 40th wedding anniversary in October, plan to live in Wyoming Valley, resting and following their common hobbies. When conditions permit, they will travel as they have in the past. Together they have visited the West Indies, Europe, the western United States, Alaska, and Canada.

Although the dean will no longer be actively engaged in the affairs of Wyoming Seminary, he does not intend to drop his interest in the school to which he has given nearly 40 years of service. "I want to rest," he admits, "but I also want to continue serving the cause of education in Wyoming Valley whenever the opportunity presents itself."

## Chronic Unemployment Areas Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article which appeared in the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune on March 3, 1959.

The article follows:

CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS NEED HELP

The United States Conference of Mayors appealed to Congress the other day for Federal assistance for the revival of industry in chronic unemployment sections of the Nation. In this connection, Mayor Buckley submitted some robust facts and figures relating to Lawrence and the manner in which the so-called area redevelopment bill could benefit this area. There is belief that something may come from this legislation this year.

We have in mind that last September, President Eisenhower, in withholding his approval from an area redevelopment bill at that time, emphasized that every year for the previous 3 years he had strongly urged the adoption of a program of Federal assistance to communities of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purpose of assisting those areas to develop a sounder and more secure economic base.

He regretted that no action along these lines had been taken by Congress until 1958 but that he was greatly disappointed that he found himself unable to approve that particular bill. The President killed it with a pocket veto after Congress had adjourned.

While the current bill calls for $389 million in Federal loans and grants, the administration proposes a $53 million aid program at present. It is to be hoped that some kind of a compromise, as to the amount, can be arrived at so the latest bill will not receive veto treatment.

Incidentally, even the program contemplated by last year's bill could not be of immediate help to any community because Congress, before adjournment, failed to provide money with which to carry out the bill's purposes.

Last year's bill also was defective because its assistance in certain instances would have been available in areas in which employment was traceable essentially to temporary conditions. Federal assistance to communities where unemployment is not clearly chronic would necessarily mean the assumption of responsibility by the Government for the direct support of local economies—an assumption of responsibility that the President left would have profound consequences.

President Eisenhower is in favor of the enactment of area assistance legislation soundly conceived to carry out the purposes which he has repeatedly stressed as being in the national interest. He has expressed the hope that Congress, this year, will enact such an area assistance program.

Lawrence can use the type of assistance that the present area redevelopment legislation proposes for areas suffering substantial and persistent unemployment. Among other things, it would provide low-interest

loans for private industry, and public projects and grants for public facilities in addition to informational, planning and technical assistance where unemployment has become chronic.

## Here They Come Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEE METCALF
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in the January 13, 1956, issue of the Outdoor News Bulletin, the Wildlife Management Institute warned that "the familiar clique of western cowboys again are hitting the trail in their ceaseless effort to bring all public domain lands under the control of the individual States." The article follows:

HERE THEY COME AGAIN

Astride a fresh mount is the familiar clique of western cowboys who again are hitting the trail in their ceaseless effort to bring all public domain lands under the control of the individual States. Their hopes this time are cinched on a closely guarded plan of the New Mexico Land Resources Study Council. The plan is said to parallel that which led to the ceding of the tidelands to the various States by the Federal Government, the Wildlife Management Institute reports.

Prime movers in the new organization are Floyd Lee and Dee Brownfield, widely known New Mexican stockmen, whose names have been linked with many previous attempts to alter the administration of the public domain and the national forest lands for the sole benefit of the grazing interests.

Turning over the public lands to the various States would be tantamount to handing them directly to the grazing interests. Stockmen already dominate the grazing district advisory boards and no more than token recognition is being given these lands for their other resource values such as watersheds, timber production, hunting and fishing, and other recreational uses.

This danger is underscored further with the realization that most of the State-owned lands in the West are controlled largely by stockmen. Although they have virtual control of the land, the grazing interests have not assumed many of the responsibilities that go with land ownership. A few States are doing a conscientious job of managing their lands, but the administration of State lands in New Mexico is among those having the weakest record.

In New Mexico the land is administered by an elected land commissioner who generally is a representative of the livestock interests. The prevailing philosophy is that the lessee would take better care of the land than would a governmental agency. The lessees, therefore, are given full control over the State land, and they have the power to restrict all other uses of the land.

Among the 18 persons presently listed by the Silver City Press as being members of the land resources study council are State land commissioner Johnny Walker, of Sante Fe, and land commissioner candidate Murray Morgan, of Alamogordo.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, this plan did not get off the ground. But another is taking form. According to the March 1 issue of the Denver Post, this Congress will be confronted with another in a continuing series of attempts to separate the taxpayer from his revenue-producing assets, the public lands of the Western States.

Associate Editor Leverett Chapin writes of a plan to reduce valuable Federal land holdings, bought with the funds of all the taxpayers, by one-half or more. Chapin says the proposal that the land be sold to the States for resale to private owners would exclude Forest Service timberlands, and those which protect high-altitude watersheds, national parks and monuments, lands earmarked for defense purposes, Federal fish and wildlife preserves, and Indian lands.

There have been several similar proposals during the years I have been in Congress. The last time we went over this ground the clause to protect national parks mysteriously disappeared on the way through committee.

Several of the sponsors and principal supporters of previous land grabs have also disappeared. In this respect, I hope history repeats itself. Two articles from the Denver Post of March 1, 1959, follow:

TWO HUNDRED MILLION ACRES—NEW MEXICO GROUP TO SEEK SALE OF U.S. LAND

(By Leverett Chapin)

A plan to transfer some 200 million acres of Federal public lands to State and private ownership will be advocated within the next few weeks by the New Mexico Land Resources Association, a private organization formed by prominent New Mexicans, it was learned Saturday.

Aim of the group will be reduce Federal land holdings in 11 Western States by one-half or more.

The plan is expected to call for the purchase of the Federal public domain by the States on long-term payments at low interest rates. The land would then be resold by the States to private owners on similar terms, with present users of the land having the first option to buy.

MORE MINERAL RIGHTS SOUGHT

The resources association is also expected to launch a drive to obtain for Western States 90 percent of the oil and mineral royalties from Federal lands instead of the 37½ percent they now receive.

This proposal would provide the States an additional $45 million a year or more. Additional revenues would amount to $8 million a year for New Mexico, $4 million for Colorado, $15 million for Wyoming, and varying amounts for other States.

Under present law the largest share of oil and mineral royalties, 52½ percent, goes into the Federal reclamation fund for western water and power projects.

Most of the lands the New Mexico group wants to put in State and private ownership, under the purchase plan, are grazing and other lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, a branch of the Department of Interior.

However, the plan is expected to call for the transfer by the Federal Government of large tracts of land which are administered by the U.S. Forest Service although they are not counted as timbered land.

Exempt from the sale provisions would be Forest Service lands which are timbered or protect high-altitude watersheds, national parks and monuments, lands earmarked for defense purposes, Federal fish and wildlife preserves and Indian lands.

News of the proposals of the resources association which would amount to a major shift in Federal land policies in the West, reached Denver when "confidential" copies of a preliminary draft of the recommendations began to appear here.

Clarence E. Hinkle, Roswell, N. Mex., attorney and president of the association, told the Denver Post every effort had been made to prevent premature disclosure of the plans.

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS REVISED

He said the recommendations have been revised to some extent, although the plan, generally, is the same, and that the final version is now awaiting publication which may come in 6 weeks or 2 months. He urged that no publicity be given the report until that time.

The published study and recommendations will represent 3 years of work by the association and the Southwest Research Institute of San Antonio, Tex. The institute was employed to survey Federal and State land resources and policies in cooperation with the University of New Mexico and other State agencies, including the New Mexico Economic Development Commission.

Denver experts on public lands said the report may be expected to touch off a controversy similar to those which developed several years ago when Wyoming stockmen proposed to be allowed to buy grazing lands. At that time, the then U.S. Senator Frank A. Barrett (Republican) of Wyoming authored a bill to give States 90 percent of oil and mineral royalties from Federal lands.

POWERFUL INTERESTS BACK LAND PROGRAM

The New Mexico Land Resources Association, which is preparing to publish recommendations that some 200 million acres of public land be sold to Western States and private users, is composed of influential residents of that State and supported by multi-million-dollar business interests, its membership list shows.

Officers of the association are Clarence E. Hinkle, Roswell attorney, president; A. D. Brownfield, prominent stockman and former legislator of Deming, vice president; S. Y. Jackson, head of the Albuquerque School Board, secretary; and Floyd Lee, San Mateo rancher and head of the New Mexico Woolgrowers, treasurer.

Prominent stockmen, railroad and oil company officials, mining men, attorneys, land company executives, and the heads of two State institutions of higher learning are included on the association's rolls.

Sustaining members include such corporations and groups as the El Paso Natural Gas Co., Kennecott Copper Co., New Mexico Cattle Growers Association, New Mexico Oil & Gas Association, the Pack Foundation, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Santa Fe and Southern Pacific Railroads, and the Anaconda Co.

The Land Resources Association was organized 3 years ago.

"This is the first time," says President Hinkle, "that so many diverse interests in any State have organized to study land problems as a public service to try to recommend a land policy for the future.

"Land problems won't be solved overnight. But we have been floundering without a policy suitable for the maximum development of the West."

Preliminary drafts of the association's recommendations which have appeared in Denver show the principal contention of the New Mexico group is that Federal ownership of more than half the land in the 11 Western States is not conducive to the economic development of the West through free enterprise and private proprietorship.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 29

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the El Dorado, Ark., Times, October 1, 1958, where Dr. James Hawley warned of the dangers of raw sewage and other waste converting streams in the area into open sewers.

The article follows:

DR. HAWLEY WARNS OF DISEASES CAUSED BY OPEN SEWERS IN CITY

"Over the past 8 years 34 persons in Camden were stricken with paralytic polio and a recent survey showed that all but 1 lived in areas that do not have sewers," Dr. James Hawley said in a talk here Tuesday.

Dr. Hawley spoke during a panel discussion on the need for an adequate sewer system at the noon luncheon meeting of the Rotary Club.

In his remarks Dr. Hawley warned of other diseases that can be caused by open sewers. "Just because you happen to live in an area that has a sewer system does not mean you are safe, since flies and animals can carry the virus over the entire city," he pointed out.

Concerning the $1,150,000 bond issue for extending and improving the municipal sewer system, Dr. Hawley urged those present to cast their vote in favor of it at the special election on October 14.

This is why 20 local doctors voted unanimously to support the proposed sewer system at the last meeting of the Ouachita County Medical Society, he said.

The panel also included Bill Shelton, chamber of commerce manager, who pointed out that industries regard sewer system of towns being considered for one of their factories. He said one of the main reasons one industrialist gave for not coming to Camden was the inadequate sewers. "Raw sewage is dumped into the Ouachita River," the industrialist stated on his report in turning down Camden.

"At the present time four large factories are considering Camden as a possible location. They have made preliminary study of the town but as yet don't know about the sewer situation, but they will find out," he said. The sewer bond issue must pass if we expect to bring industry here, he said.

H. K. Thatcher also spoke on the effect the raw sewage has on Ouachita River, which goes in at four different places. People who have boats know the terrible condition this creates, he said. "We must clean up our river or we will lose the economical value of what we are trying to do," he said with regard to getting a 9-foot channel for navigation.

The panel discussion was led by Mayor James Rowan. The floor was thrown open for questions after each panelist spoke.

Panel discussions like this are being held all over the city in an effort to inform the public of the need for sewer improvements. The next meeting will be on Wednesday night at Whiteside School starting at 7:30 p.m. It will be open to the public and individuals may ask any question they wish.

All Rotarians who expressed their opinion spoke in support of the project. Approval was indicated by the enthusiastic reception given the panel in their efforts.

Guests at the meeting were Jimmy Chambers and Frank Anthony of El Dorado and H. S. Neal of Stuttgart, all visiting Rotarians. Steve Bratton of Camden and Bobby Tutt and Herbert Asberry of Harmony Grove High School were junior Rotarians.

## Eastland Bills Will Fortify Internal Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit for the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Nashville Banner, a great newspaper of my home state, last Saturday, March 7. This editorial deals with the vital legislative program introduced in the other body by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND. Senator EASTLAND's program, as pointed out in the following editorial, would reverse several recent rulings of the Supreme Court in cases involving communism and other subversive activities. I believe that the views expressed in this editorial merit the careful consideration of my colleagues in this House:

EASTLAND BILLS DESIGNED TO FORTIFY INTERNAL SECURITY

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND is in a position to push—with the help it merits—the seven-point legislation now introduced to reverse recent rulings by the Supreme Court on Communist and kindred subversive cases.

The 85th Congress came within one Senate vote of doing that last year, with the bill by Representative HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, which would have restored the right of States to enact their own antisedition laws. Under the Court decision in the Steve Nelson case, that convicted Communist was freed because his conviction was under a Pennsylvania statute—the court holding that it was invalid because Congress had preempted that field.

This time the legislative program presented, and by Senator EASTLAND, involves the seven bills recommended by the American Bar Association's house of delegates—calling clearly for corrective action by Congress to close the loopholes recklessly opened by the Supreme Court.

Specifically, the Eastland bills would reverse the judicial decisions in the Yates, Nelson, Bonetti, Cole, Watkins, Witkovich, and Kent cases—itemized instances of flagrant challenge, and among them rulings that shocked the White House no less than concerned Members of Congress.

This newspaper has said again and again that the job of repairing internal security jeopardized by these blows at the legal structure belonged to Congress. Where by eccentric interpretation of a law it is wrested out of legislative intent, Congress can act for redress by the law itself; and where some twilight zone exists, Congress can enact appropriate and adequate legislation.

It is not an area of responsibility to accord the kid-glove treatment, for the chips are down and the issue faced for what it is.

A host of Congressmen see the obligation clearly, as does Senator EASTLAND. The indications now are that with the backing of the bar association and other influential organizations—equally concerned with America at large, for internal security—the measures will pick up substantial support.

They merit that. They demand it.

It is not enough to simply deplore this opening of hazardous loopholes, more and more evident as the record is studied. The case calls for responsible action by Congress—elected to represent, and the only lawmaking body in the Federal Government. To it America looks for requisite defenses where, under the impact of judicial recklessness, they have been weakened.

## Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the adjournment of the 85th Congress, this short item—without attribution—became widely circulated in the press:

If Patrick Henry thought taxation without representation was so terrible, he should see it with representation.

How often great truths are spoken in jest.

Section 7 of the Constitution places the responsibility of originating all revenue-raising bills with the House of Representatives.

No matter how many times in the past we have failed to live up to it, it is still our constitutional responsibility.

If we must collect the money to meet the expenses of our Federal Government, we must, at the same time, be seriously concerned with the cost of that Government.

There are numerous governmental luxuries which we would like to provide for the American people. But we can't afford them.

Many an American family would like to live in a penthouse. But, because they can't afford it, they settle for their mortgaged bungalow.

Many an American family would like to eat steak regularly. Instead, because they can't afford it, they get along with more ham hock than steak.

Many an American family would like to have a new car every year. Yet, because they can't afford it, they make the old jalopy do.

It would be a matter of wisdom for the Members of the House of Congress designed to be closer to the people to follow the example of the people.

It would be a matter of wisdom for us to legislate against those Government services which, while they may seem helpful, are actually luxuries.

Abraham Lincoln provided a most useful yardstick for such services when he said on July 1, 1854:

The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they

need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities.

In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.

We are not alone in our making-ends-meet problem. Sweden has its problem, too. Let us look at Sweden's problem in the words of the U.S. News & World Report for January 23, 1959:

Swedes got a jolt from their Socialist-dominated government. The 1959 budget called for heavy boosts in * * * spending, indicated a deficit of $500 million. The alternative: higher taxes in a land where a couple with two children and $300 a month income pay out nearly $100 a month in taxes and social contributions.

Sweden's Socialists have still another way out—a way which is, even now, being suggested to them by American liberals.

As you well know, both Socialists and liberals enjoy thinking of themselves as being interested solely in people; not things.

Our liberals are not concerned with increasing current taxes to pay for the governmental services they so glibly advocate. They reserve the privilege of increased taxes for your children and mine; for your grandchildren and mine. Taxpayers today can vote. Taxpayers as yet unborn cannot.

I say, "Cut governmental luxuries to the bone. Balance the budget."

I thoroughly agree with the late Joseph G. "Uncle Joe" Cannon, of Illinois, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, in his most frequently quoted remarks:

America is a hell of a success. Why tinker with it?

## Peace by Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if the world had more of the true spirit of brotherhood, we would not have the frightening problems that threaten our very existence.

Gerald G. Acklen, acting editor of the Grants Pass Daily Courier, has written an excellent editorial about Brotherhood Week and included several valuable quotations. I want to share this editorial with my colleagues and other readers of the Appendix, and I ask unanimous consent to append it hereto:

THIS IS BROTHERHOOD WEEK

A peaceful world depends upon better understanding and respect for each other in a spirit of brotherhood and adherence to ethical principles. If these are lost, civilization gradually disappears.

Every great movement for bringing about better understanding with, and greater respect for each other, helps advance civilization.

President Eisenhower, honorary chairman of National Brotherhood Week, February 15–22, has issued this statement:

"Our abundant plains and mountains would yield little if it were not for the applied skill and energy of Americans working together, as fellow citizens bound up in common destiny. The achievement of brotherhood is the crowning objective of our society.

"On this circling planet, with nations poised for mutual advancement or destruction, we must enlarge our spirit of brotherhood to include all men who live under the banners of liberty and law."

The National Conference of Christians and Jews is a powerful medium set up to bring about harmony among humans. Annual Brotherhood Week is a period of special emphasis for the promotion of this cause. In calling attention to the importance of the week the press committee for the group has gathered statements from various individuals engaged in different activities. Excerpts from some of these are reprinted here:

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell says, "Brotherhood is needed now."

His statement goes on to say in part:

"Brotherhood is a concept that has attracted mankind for centuries.

"It stands in the face of the infinite variety of man's social, cultural, and physical differences, and cuts through them all to relate directly to the only real unifying feature of humanity, its sharing of a spiritual nature.

"It is thus a concept that ranks as one of man's finest discoveries.

"As such it has tremendous power.

"If it has eluded mankind, it is only because man has permitted his tangible differences to obscure his basic oneness. But this in no way diminishes the force inherent in the idea.

"Any effort, such as Brotherhood Week, made to bring that force to bear in the solution of grave problems is to be commended and shared."

George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, declares, "The AFL–CIO is dedicated to the eradication of discrimination and segregation in our land. It is determined to achieve, in our time, the full measure of brotherhood among men."

Meany says:

"The trade union movement, which is founded upon the principle of brotherhood, stanchly supports National Brotherhood Week.

"The brotherhood of workers in free and democratic trade unions is fundamental to social and economic progress for American wage earners. Discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin, is thus especially repugnant to the American labor movement."

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States and the United Nations, stresses the "four faces of peace" in his statement:

"There was a time when we were told that we would have peace, but it is a peace by mutual terror. Now, it doesn't seem to be mutual any more. Modern technology sems to have made it possible for one nation to have such superiority, that it can shoot an intercontinental ballistics missile through outer space and destroy not only one nation but the whole world.

"It has also been said that peace has four faces, peace by power, peace by trade, peace by diplomacy, and peace by people. It would seem to me that peace by people should have been called instead peace by brotherhood because it is only when peoples of the world understand and believe in and carry out brotherhood that there can be real peace."

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, and chairman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, points out that science and education are vital forces toward brotherhood in a divided world. Excerpts from an address given by Dr. Killian illustrate his point:

"As President Eisenhower once said in marking National Brotherhood Week: 'Brotherhood is one of the most demanding—and most rewarding—principles in our lives. Its application is not limited to our homes or to our homeland. The responsibilities of brotherhood stretch around the world; and wherever men dwell, their needs and their successes are for all to share.'

"I have been fortunate and happy in a career that has permitted me to be associated with two fields: education and science, in which prejudice has no rightful place and does great damage when it appears. A philosopher once observed that 'unrelated men give little joy to each other.' It is one of the functions of education and one of the accomplishments of science that men unrelated in interests are encouraged to work together and thus to find joy in each other. Especially does science tend to bridge the cleavages and boundaries of our time and to bring together its practitioners in a commonwealth of thoughtful purpose. This commonwealth of science is today one of the greatest forces toward brotherhood in a divided world."

Faith Baldwin says it is necessary to live in the spirit of brotherhood to help promote it. She says:

"I believe that we use the term 'brotherhood' too often too lightly.

"To agree that we should do unto others as we would be done by—a teaching which did not originate with Christianity nor cease there, but is implicit in all religions—is not enough. Nor is it enough to be tolerant of other people, their race, color, or religion. It is not enough to agree in theory that, being human, we are brothers, hence suffer or enjoy the same experiences and, as Mr. Shakespeare pointed out, bleed equally when stabbed.

"You cannot contribute anything to the ideal condition of mind and heart known as brotherhood, however much you preach, posture or agree, unless you live it."

Cornelia Otis Skinner sums it up in another way, quoting George Bernard Shaw as saying, "Hatred is the coward's revenge for being intimidated."

"Even in cases of strong personal dislikes for individuals, if they were analyzed we would find that the person we think we hate has some quality of which we are jealous or which we are afraid might harm us.

"Again in Shaw's words: 'We are all children of one Father and the sooner we stop calling each other names the better.'"

The theme for the week is: "Brotherhood for Peace and Freedom—Believe It—Live It—Support It."

One week is too short to achieve the aim of those working for brotherhood among all Americans. But it is a good itme to get started.

We can do our part by taking that theme to heart.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Gainesville (Tex.) Daily Register, September 3, 1958. This article shows the

tremendous shortage of water in this county and the need for vigorous efforts to clean up our diseased and polluted waters. The situation in the Wichita Falls area is so bad that industry is refusing to enter that area because of the shortage of water supply in the future.

[From Gainesville (Tex.) Daily Register, Sept. 3, 1958]

WATER FOR FUTURE

"Lack of water is driving new industry away from Wichita Falls" is the flat allegation made in a recent feature story appearing in the Wichita Falls Times. The article goes on to point out that new industry means more jobs, more homes, more business for groceries, clothing stores, service stations, banks, cleaners, and many other businesses, and more valuation on tax rolls.

"New industry," says the Times, "helps the whole community, bringing payrolls and a healthy impetus to the economic life. But because sufficient water could not be assured a fertilizer plant last year abandoned Wichita Falls as a site. The loss to the community: 100 jobs.

"Only last month a national canning company virtually wrote Wichita Falls off its list because assurance of 4 million gallons of salt-free water per day could not be given. The company plans to build a new canning plant. Such a plant would be of tremendous benefit to the Wichita Falls area because it would provide a natural market for Wichita Valley farmers. But Wichita Falls could not assure the canning firm of sufficient water, so the company is looking elsewhere. Fifteen Texas cities have been eliminated from its list for the same reason.

"A petrochemical company is planning a new plant. Wichita Falls is so short on a long-range supply of water that efforts have been made to interest the company in using reclaimed water from sewage disposal," the Times article continues.

"Wichita Falls is a natural site for a tanning industry, which requires high-quality water. New processes have lowered the amount of water needed, but Wichita Falls still cannot give sufficient assurance of supply to attract a tanning industry.

"New industrial plants are amortized over long periods of time. If Wichita Falls cannot show a long-term supply of water, industry is not interested in locating here. * * * Even industries that do not use large quantities of water are not interested in Wichita Falls. They know that it will be difficult to get employees. They also realized the disadvantageous economic effects of lack of sufficient long-range water supply on their business and the community."

Gainesville, like Wichita Falls, is also handicapped in obtaining industry because we have no surface-water supply. Though we apparently have a good supply of underground water to meet our immediate demands, industry is not interested. Industrial users must see the water on the surface before they move into a community. They cannot depend on estimates of underground supplies.

The recently adjourned 85th Congress gave a tremendous push toward making more water available to the State. Congressional approval of the Johnson bill authorizing the President to name a 14-man commission to study the Texas water picture will provide some of the background for future development. There was also an appropriation of $28,993,000 for 38 water-development projects in Texas.

Exploratory steps have been taken by Gainesville with an eye toward the creation of a surface supply of water through a proposed reservoir on Fish Creek. This project should remain high on any list of long-range development plans for the city. We know that the cities with adequate supplies of good surface water are the communities that will experience the greatest growth and prosperity in the future.

---

## Attack on the FBI—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the fourth in the series of articles by Pulitzer Prize winning reporter, Edward J. Mowery, dealing with the campaign to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The following appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 4, 1959:

HOW FBI MOVED IN TO PLUG SPY LEAKS

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—For 14 years, groups hostile to the Federal Bureau of Investigation have charged the agency with conducting illegal searches during the Amerasia spy case and bungling the exhaustive investigation.

The FBI's role in the sensational espionage conspiracy is told here for the first time by a top spokesman of the Bureau.

Charge: The FBI was impotent in preventing the theft of classified Government documents by conspirators in the Amerasia spy case.

The facts: The FBI was told that Government documents were being stolen, which might also indicate the more grave offense of espionage. It was the FBI's clear responsibility to investigate and give its findings to the Department of Justice. The Bureau was (and is) responsible for protecting this Nation's security.

The information received indicated that classified documents containing wartime secrets were going to unauthorized persons, possibly jeopardizing security, and the documents were in the office of Philip Jaffe, editor of the pro-Communist Amerasia magazine. Jaffe also allegedly had connections in governmental departments, indicating the possible source.

The arrest of six Amerasia case subjects plugged a leak that could have reached floodtide proportions in a period of grave national emergency.

Jaffe's Communist connections were well known to the FBI which had every reason to assume that such purloined data would have been used against the best interests of the United States.

Charge: The FBI tramples on civil rights by making arrests without warrants and conducting illegal searches. It happened in the FBI apprehension of Emmanuel Larsen, coconspirator in the Amerasia case.

The facts: The FBI search of the Larsen apartment was subsequently ruled illegal. The Bureau acted on information indicating a leak of vital wartime secrets. The primary and immediate concern was to identify those getting this data and stop the leak. Investigation had established that Larsen was involved.

On April 6, 1945, FBI agents entered Larsen's apartment (No. 207) to obtain intelligence information to assist in protecting against Soviet espionage operations. They observed that the flat contained classified Government documents which they didn't disturb. They then took a typewriting sample from a machine on the premises.

On June 5, a warrant for Larsen's arrest was obtained from Federal Judge Henry A. Schweinhaut. Larsen had moved the previous day from No. 207 to No. 227 (1650 Harvard Street NW., Washington). He was arrested on June 6 and when asked if he had official Government documents in the apartment, he answered affirmatively and led agents to the documents.

The April 6 visit of FBI agents to Larsen's apartment—to halt a mushrooming espionage operation—was subsequently ruled "illegal." Five years later (May 31, 1950) testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (executive session) indicated the urgency under which the FBI moved in this case.

Senator Millard E. Tydings, Democrat, of Maryland, committee chairman, questioned Assistant FBI Director Louis B. Nichols as follows:

Tydings: "Was evidence sought * * * by entering the apartment * * * without legal process and without knowledge of the accused?"

Nichols: "Our chief and immediate concern * * * was * * * who was getting this information and how to bring a stop to it. Our internal security function was one of prevention as well as apprehension and prosecution. We put first things first. We did enter the premises * * * where we observed classified documents * * *. This was prior to the arrest (Larsen's) on June 6."

Tydings: "Were these entries * * * before arrest made by the agents * * * without legal process * * * (or) knowledge of the subjects?"

Nichols: "Obviously, the entries were made without the knowledge of the individuals involved."

Tydings: "I would like to say now on the record that I thank you * * * for giving us this account of what happened. I understand how during the war your first concern—and properly so—was to put an end to whoever who getting these documents. And zeal to that end was more important than anything else, with men fighting and dying all over the world.

"* * * If you had a little more zeal in accomplishing that (feat) than maybe in a sober moment we might think was necessary, I would be the last to criticize you, because I think your primary objective of stopping this (espionage) business was of major concern.

"And I think that all who know the facts * * * are going to give you commendation rather than criticism."

Charge: The FBI's illegal arrest of Judith Coplon permitted her to escape imprisonment for espionage.

The facts: The FBI received statutory authority in 1934 to make arrests without warrants if there was reason to believe that the subject would escape before a warrant could be obtained.

On the basis of this authority and on specific orders of (then) Attorney General Tom Clark, Judith Coplon was arrested without a warrant by FBI agents on March 4, 1949. She was accompanied by Valentin Gubitchev, third Secretary of the U.S.S.R. Foreign Affairs Ministry.

On appeal, the Coplon arrest was ruled illegal by the U.S. Court of Appeals because there was no warrant, the court holding that there were insufficient grounds to show that Coplon was likely to escape. Evidence gathered in the case was ruled inadmissible.

As a result, Congress adopted legislation giving the FBI statutory authority to make arrests without a warrant for any offense against the United States if here are reasonable grounds to believe that the person has committed or is committing such a felony.

## The Draft Dilemma: A Way Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an interesting article written for the Nation magazine, issue of March 14, 1959, by John C. Esty, Jr., associate dean and military service adviser at Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., and a captain in the Air Force Reserve:

THE DRAFT DILEMMA: A WAY OUT

(By John C. Esty, Jr.)

Selective service and the teacher shortage carry one major common denominator; they are both serious national problems to which no acceptable solution has been found. Curiously enough, everyone knows about the shortage of teachers, but appallingly few people understand the dangers of the present draft situation. It is my intention to point out a few of these, and then show how both problems might be solved by one stroke.

On February 5, the House Armed Services Committee brought to the floor of the House of Representatives a bill to extend the draft beyond June 30, 1959. In his report, Chairman CARL VINSON, of the committee, made a convincing defense of the bill. It is worth examining some of his reasoning. In the first place, he pointed out that in 1948, when there was a hiatus in draft legislation, there were 1,384,000 men in the Armed Forces on a voluntary basis. This was well short of the 2 million men deemed necessary at the time; if projected to today's need of 2.5 million, it would be manifestly inadequate. (But since 1948, higher pay rates, incentive pay, and fringe benefits, have combined to make a military career more attractive. In other words, we just don't know what strength levels we could predict today with voluntary service.)

Speaking to the point of alleged inequitable liability to the draft, Mr. Vinson cited Department of Defense figures to show that on November 30, 1958, 9 out of 10 qualified men attaining age 26 had served, or were serving, their obligation and that for all registrants, the ratio was 7 out of 10. Projecting present strength levels and annual replacement needs, it was estimated that in 1963, of those reaching 26 years of age nearly 8 out of 10 qualified men will have served; and of all men in the age group—including 4-F's and other deferments—the ratio will be 5½ out of 10.

During committee hearings, the Chief of Staff of the several Armed Forces testified unanimously on the absolute necesisty of extending the draft. It was clear that each of them benefited from selective service—even though only the Army requires draftees—because of the large number of volunteers produced by its pressure. Debate on the House floor generated only mild challenging of the wisdom and acuity of these military leaders. In the end, an amendment to extend the draft for only 2 years, and to establish a factfinding committee, was beaten down, and the bill to extend the draft for 4 years passed, 381 to 20.

The opposition expressed itself mainly on the customary ground of hopeful abdication from world responsibility and sincere revulsion over mandatory bearing of arms. But unlike the debate 4 years ago, when the final vote was 394 to 4, there was a new element of discontent, partially characterized in the concern of a number of freshman Congressmen over the military effectiveness of present procedures. Their argument centered on the need for a new concept of manpower usage, more imaginative recruitment, and reenlistment policies, and the obvious inequities and uncertainties felt by young men who are facing the draft. They emphasized the waste of money and morale attending forced conscription, and envisaged much bolder applications of the Cordiner Committee recommendations for an all-volunteer, competitively attractive armed service. Their efforts were overriden by powerful bipartisan leadership in the lower House.

However, the insurgents were successful in the creation of a subcommittee on manpower needs. Under the chairmanshp of MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, this group will examine "all phases of defense-manpower utilization, including * * * the utilization of technically trained personnel in technical positions * * * a determination as to whether additional combat organizations may be created by more efficient utilization and without increasing the total strength of the military forces, and such other matters as may be pertinent to the foregoing." It is expected that a report will be available by midsummer (although anyone familiar with the involutions and sprawling elusiveness of the military organization might agree that a fair report would take 2 years). In any case, it is to be hoped that the subcommittee, in preparing its report—

(1) Will realize that the Defense Department figures of Mr. Vinson overlook the working of the youthful mind. The statistics quoted deal with what can be said about 26-year-olds. But surely a young man does not wait until he is 26, then look back to see if he has been handled justly. The figures for the men of age 26 in 1963 pertain today to the man who is 22. He senses that only half his age group will have to serve, and wonders how to get in the half which won't. Even worse is the superimposition of service needs on a population curve just starting to bulge with the war babies. In 1963 about 1.8 million men will turn 17. Projecting the same service needs on this group means that only one-third will serve. In other words, the inequity is not even static; it progressively worsens.

(2) Will take a long hard look at the Reserve program, the most involved and most confusing of all the manpower programs, with the exception of a few outstanding units. The 6-month program seems to me to bear utterly no relation to national defense in the nuclear age. Reserve-unit meetings are almost universally a farce. Why is the program so slick in theory and so chaotic in practice? The answers aren't to be found in Pentagon charts or generals; you have to go to the reservist who sits through boring, irrelevant programs one night each week.

(3) Will realize the demoralizing effect on young men as they witness the Selective Service machinery, clogged with an ever-increasing input and much smaller military demands for the output, deferring larger groups for poorer reasons. For example, in the 4 years that fathers have been deferred by Executive order, almost a million men otherwise qualified have escaped the draft; in 4 more years, the figure will at least double. Several hundred thousand more will escape because they have the inclination or the money to continue their schooling. The key point now is that deferment, which extends the age liability legally to 35, is necessary only to age 26, after which age the draft boards are instructed to induct no one. The college senior, who is generally within hailing distance of 26, thus sees his chance to escape and is sorely tempted to make a try for it. With so many ways to avoid the draft and watching so many men succeed at it, he loses his sense of duty. If he cannot become a father conveniently or doesn't get to graduate school, the uncertainty of his status undermines any constructive plans for the future. (I have elaborated on this distressing phenomenon in "Draft Dodger or Patriot: The Dilemma of the College Student," the Nation, Jan. 10.)

(4) Will examine just who the people are who have been escaping. The largest category by far is the 3 million or so who are physically or mentally unacceptable. General Hershey has suggested that some civilian defense duties be assigned to this group. Certainly there must be many thousands whose intellectual talents—albeit lodged in infirm bodies—could be used. The million draft-free fathers could be utilized some way without causing undue community hardship, especially those who have been educated or trained in critical specialties. And what of the group over 26? Most of those who would be acceptable are the very ones deferred to continue their graduate training, the very ones whose talents could be of inestimable value directly in the national service. In other words, certain policies of the draft act systematically preclude a great reservoir of brains and talent to the Defense Establishment.

(5) Will see the problem simply: Too many men with two few places to utilize them effectively, and scandalous disuse of talent, particularly brainpower.

There is one more chance for a public look at manpower legislation before it crawls back under the obscuring mantle of short-sighted, unimaginative execution.

Last week the Senate Armed Services Committee began considering the House bill on the draft. They will have to deliberate on the feasibility of several proposed alternatives, the most satisfactory of which is clearly a volunteer service established to compete in the market place qualitatively and quantitatively for manpower. Epitomized in the Cordiner report, this concept is an old story to Congress and apparently presents too bold a gamble for our military leaders. It has clearly not been sufficiently or seriously enough explored by either the Pentagon or Congress, and one gets the uneasy feeling that this is partially because it is a new idea. The small steps already taken to implement part of the Cordiner proposals have proved effective in raising the reenlistment rate, although the very duties for which the Pentagon says men are needed most received the poorest incentive increase. In any case, the whole concept seems unfortunately to be a dead issue.

Realistically, then, it would seem as though we must continue to operate under a system of forced conscription of some people for some military duties. The problem therefore reduces practically to finding meaningful and defense-related occupations for the huge surplus of trained brainpower which drains systematically out of the manpower pool. At this point I would like to suggest that the Senators view the problem, thus reduced, in juxtaposition to another national problem even more serious—the shortage of teachers. The instant, striking observation is that the wasted talent in one pool is potentially what is needed desperately in the other. Could we not create a scheme whereby the two problems resolve each other?

So much has been written about the teacher shortage that its existence no longer needs elaborating. Two points will suffice. Both the Rockefeller Brothers' report on education and the Fund for the Advancement of Education have positively stated that it will take something like one-half (about 2 million) of all our college graduates in the next 10 years to meet the need for teachers. Recently about one-fifth have been entering teaching. The second point is that with all the efforts of hundreds of agencies and groups to increase the supply of teachers, the requirement cannot possibly be met; we probably can't even come close. But there is one untapped source of potential teachers

which could supply the quantity and motivation needed: the surplus selective service manpower pool.

With the advent of Russia's sputnik, it became clear that education and training were major weapons in national defense. Congress recognized the relationship in the title of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It would seem logical, therefore, to make teaching an extension of national service, and permit young men to satisfy their obligation by becoming teachers at whatever level they are able to find a job and for a specified period of time—say 3 years.

The principle would appear to be especially applicable to those who are now escaping the draft entirely because they are over 26, fathers, or physically unqualified. The relief valve thereby created to the presently unmanageable surplus would eliminate many of the inequities which are a function of too many men with too few places to utilize them.

The idea is somewhat similar to Walter Reuther's plan of a broad, Federal scholarship program in diplomatic, teaching, technical and service subjects to induce young people into these fields voluntarily in place of military service. The Reuther plan, however, is offered as a substitute for conscription, whereas my proposal seeks to make the best of a bad situation—the draft—with which we shall presumably be forced to live for at least another 4 years.

The proposal is not radical, for there is plenty of precedent for exempting certain groups and providing alternative service. Ministers, for example, are exempt from military service; conscientious objectors may serve as medical guinea pigs and in hospitals; workers in essential industry are deferred as long as they remain essential (although this is not strictly alternate service); teachers of science can often be deferred, and will not be drafted at all if they teach until age 26. It must be said that the draft law is at least this flexible, and some order may be brought out of the impending chaos through Executive action. But these groups comprise only some thousands annually, while the proposal to make teaching an alternative form of service would involve several hundred thousand men each year. This should probably be the province of Congress to sanction, and anyway, constructive action seems to be too much to expect from manpower officials without prodding from Congress.

The proposal has these features:

1. The Selective Service System would be retained for its value in providing military inductees and volunteers, and for readiness in case of sudden large-scale need.

2. No great increase in administrative machinery is necessary. The procedure for reporting alternate service and employment in essential industry already exists. An approved list of institutions at which teaching could be credited is available from the Veterans' Administration and regional accrediting agencies. A man who has taught for 3 academic years at an approved institution would be considered to have discharged his service obligation.

3. If the number of vacancies now existing and projected in our schools and colleges were filled by alternate-service teachers, and there are more than enough trained, talented men in the draft pool to do this, then it would be possible for all young men (except the physically and mentally unqualified, who might be used in civil defense) to fulfill some sort of obligated service. This would more truly meet the "universal" concept and ease the democratic conscience.

4. Many more trained minds could be utilized in the defense effort than at present, at no additional cost to the Government.

5. The chance is provided for wholesale recruitment of potential teachers, many of whom might be permanently "captured" for the profession.

6. With more applicants than vacancies, the teaching profession could raise standards all along the line; if a prospective applicant didn't qualify, he would simply be inducted for military service.

There are a number of objections to this proposal—all of them, I think, answerable. It is dangerous to force people to teach. Quite true, but I have talked with many college students about the plan, and almost unanimously they would feel so grateful for the chance to use their education and settle their plans, that they would give maximum effort gladly. It is not a good idea to recruit teachers on a temporary basis. There is always this risk anyway, and thousands of young women just out of college enter teaching with every likelihood that they will leave for marriage and a home after a few years. Isn't the proposal a case of special rewards for a privileged class? Yes, but we appear to provide the opportunity for any American with the urge and the brains to go to college, and it's certainly more democratic than to allow a privileged class to escape the draft completely, as now happens. If you provide alternate service for teachers, why not for social workers, foreign service people? Why not.

The defense of this country rests fundamentally on two great systems: The one for enlisting talent in its service, the other for developing that talent. Both systems are now inadequate and can only deteriorate in the future. A relatively simple act of Congress could transform the weakness of one into the strength of the other.

## Adverse Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as one of a growing group who advocate: First, a balanced budget; second, economy in the Federal Government; and third, the continued control of the constitutional powers of the House of Representatives to originate money bills.

I call to my support four adverse witnesses.

First, I call Thomas Jefferson.

He wrote to Samuel Rerchibal in 1816:

To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude.

And, again in 1816, he wrote to Governor Plumer of New Hampshire:

I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

Second, I call Andrew Jackson.

In his fourth annual message to Congress, in 1832, he declared:

The soundest maxims of public policy and the principles on which our republican institutions are founded recommend a proper adaptation of the revenue to the expenditure, and they also require that the expenditure shall be limited to what, by an economical administration, shall be consistent with the simplicity of the Government and necessary to an efficient public service.

Next, I call Grover Cleveland.

In his 1893 second inaugural address, he declared:

The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught that while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their government, its functions do not include support of the people.

And I call Woodrow Wilson, who, 40 years later said:

The duty of economy is not debatable. It is manifest and imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I have additional evidence to submit.

The Democratic national platform of 1932 asserted:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagances, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, running on that platform, included this in one of his campaign speeches:

Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse.

Also, it is appropriate at this time to recall that in 1943 Senator Harry Truman declared on the Senate floor:

It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the pursestrings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever.

It seems that—in the past—the Democratic Party openly advocated that stand which I take today. I want a balanced budget, economy in the Federal Government, and the continued constitutional control of money bills by this House.

Certain liberal gentlemen may say that times have changed.

Indeed, they have—for them.

I have used many quotations. I close with one.

Patrick Henry flung this challenge on May 29, 1765:

If this be treason, make the most of it.

## Guarding the Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on March 4, 1959, entitled "Guarding the Port":

GUARDING THE PORT

In the last 15 years the antismuggling responsibilities of the customs service in the port of New York have been carried out by a steadily declining staff. During the war years there were approximately 800 enforce-

ment men in this important arm of the Treasury Department. After the war the roster was reduced to about 500 men. Now it is less than 250. The 5-day week means that it is no longer possible to maintain constant surveillance on the hundreds of piers where ocean vessels dock. Nowadays on the average pier there is no regularly assigned customs man to check ships and their seamen against illicit imports, including narcotics.

New York is an obvious target for every heroin-smuggling ring serving as a transmission belt from Europe or Asia. The potential apparatus for smuggling includes many of the 12,000 ships that come into this port every year.

The customs service budget, among others, is a matter of current discussion. In this connection top officials of the agency have said that there was no intention of replenishing the staff assigned to the traditional guard against smuggling. An increase in the budget is being sought, but it is for statutory salary increases and for more men to handle pyramiding details involved in the entry of commercial cargoes. Studies show, they said, that there is no satisfactory ratio between the size of the port guard and the number of narcotics seizures. In other words, a double port guard would not necessarily mean twice the number of seizures.

This seems to be an appallingly negative enforcement philosophy. It might as well be said that there is no use having policemen, inasmuch as they cannot possibly do away with all crime. Surely we cannot, on the ground of economy, the real reason for the cutback, do anything to perpetuate our growing reputation as a wide-open port.

## Thomas G. Masaryk, Founder and First President of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, March 7 was the 109th anniversary of the birth of a man of great ideals, a great champion and a symbol of human freedom, the George Washington of Czechoslovakia—Thomas G. Masaryk.

As Mr. Joseph Mekota, one of the great leaders of Iowans of Czechoslovakian descent in the city of Cedar Rapids, recently wrote to me:

Thomas Masaryk is regarded in the hearts of all Americans of Czech origin—and by the people who live today in subjugated Czechoslovakia—as the Great Liberator, an outstanding teacher and statesman.

Thomas Masaryk worked unceasingly during the First World War to gain support for Czechoslovakia's longing for independence. He came to the United States in 1918 and convinced President Woodrow Wilson of the justness of his cause. On October 18, 1918, the Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence was formally published in Washington, D.C., and the constitution of the Republic of which Masaryk was the first President, was based in large part on our own Contitution.

Perhaps the spirit of freedom is catching—at any rate, Mr. Masaryk married an American lady, and his devotion to freedom never wavered. The bond and spirit of friendship between the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the United States have always been very strong.

Unfortunately, the new area of democracy for all the world which was the hoped-for result of the allied victory in World War I did not become a reality. The Czechoslovaka Republic, the first fruit of that victory, was short-lived. Nevertheless, the memory of the freedom enjoyed by the Czech people from the date of the adoption of the constitution in 1920 until the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1938, has not, and will not, be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I visited Czechoslovakia in the summer of 1957. It is a tragic thing to see the work of Thomas Masaryk set aside now by a Communist state. But freedom still burns in the hearts of the Czech people. We must keep it burning so that some day soon, with God's help, it can begin to glow and burst into the flame of liberty once more. We must dramatize here in America that we are conscious of their sacrifice. For this reason, I am happy to join tomorrow with those Americans who claim kinship with Thomas Masaryk in the hope and prayer that the light of liberty will aagin shine in the lives of the subjugated nations of the world. I propose, also, that we resolve to honor him every day in 1960—the 110th year of his birth. We can do this by issuing in his honor one of the champions of liberty stamps.

The champions of liberty series of stamps were conceived for the purpose of doing honor to leaders of other lands, and I think it would be a highly proper and desirable action to honor in this way one of the greatest statesmen and democratic leaders of this century on the 110th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. Speaker, I have today written to the Postmaster General of the United States, urging that one of the two champions of liberty series stamps to be issued in the year 1960 be issued in honor of Thomas G. Masaryk.

It is my earnest hope that the Members of the House and of the Senate will see fit to express to the Postmaster General their endorsement of the issuance in 1960 of a Thomas G. Masaryk postage stamp.

## Checking on Drivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Checking on Drivers" which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 9, 1959. This is in line with H.R. 4946 which I introduced on February 24. The title of my bill is to establish penalties for the operation of a motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce without a valid motor vehicle operator's license and to provide for a register in the Department of Commerce in which shall be listed the names of persons refused a motor vehicle operator's license or who have had such licenses revoked.

The editorial follows:

CHECKING ON DRIVERS

One of the serious loopholes in the system which most States have set up to bar reckless drivers from the highways is the lack of information about license revocations which a driver may have undergone in another jurisdiction. As a result, applicants for automobile permits frequently are given the right to drive in a State, despite the fact that another State has suspended or revoked their licenses for dangerous driving.

To meet this threat to public safety, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has proposed to Congress the establishment of a national clearinghouse to list suspended or revoked licenses, as reported by State authorities. The list would be open to all State traffic and highway officials wishing to check on the driving record of an applicant for a driver's license. The Government would act merely as the repository for such records, with any action against drivers to be the sole responsibility of State and city authorities.

In view of the constant shifting of residents from State to State, such a central checkup headquarters could serve a very useful purpose in making the highway safer.

## Price of Government Handout Is Loss of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for 6 years we have heard President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson plead for a flexible farm program which would do away with lost markets, crippling allotments, huge surpluses, high costs to the taxpayer, and would return freedom and dignity to the farmer. Within the last few months we have learned of the millions of tax dollars paid to a few big business farms. We have also heard from a Michigan farmer named Stanley Yankus who protests being penalized $4,562 for growing more wheat on his few acres to feed his chickens than the law said he should. The law under which he is being penalized was enacted by the 75th Congress in 1938. The Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) Daily News recently told the Yankus story—and it embodies the story of the whole farm mess today—in an eloquent editorial, which I submit for the RECORD:

PRICE OF GOVERNMENT HANDOUT IS LOSS OF FREEDOM

Just how far the American people have gone in surrendering their individual freedoms for a mess of Government pottage was poignantly illustrated the other day in the testimony of a Michigan farmer before a House subcommittee.

The farmer, Stanley Yankus, of Dowagiac, Mich., appeared before the congressional group for one purpose. He wanted all the

people of America to hear his story and to think about the high price they are paying for the privilege of getting handouts from the Government.

The story of Stanley Yankus is not unusual. It is happening to many farmers who still believe they have a constitutional right to manage their own affairs but who, unlike Stanley Yankus, haven't the courage to stand up and fight for their rights.

Yankus owns a 100-acre farm in Dowagiac. He also owns some 5,000 chickens whose main source of food has been the wheat that Yankus grew on his farm.

Some time ago farmer Yankus was told by the Federal Government that he had to restrict the amount of wheat he was accustomed to planting each year. This acreage restriction, he was told, was approved by a majority of wheat growers who had agreed to reduce their acreage by a fixed percentage in return for the Government's promise to buy all the wheat they could produce on their reduced acreage.

Now Yankus didn't go along with this deal, and since he didn't grow any wheat to sell to the Government or anybody else, he could see no justification for the Government to step in and force him to cut down the wheat crop he needed to feed his chickens. He claimed this amounted to "confiscation" of his property so he went ahead and planted his usual number of acres.

The Federal Government then hailed farmer Yankus into court where he was eventually fined a total of $4,562 for refusing to abide by the acreage allotment program. When he refused to pay the fine, Federal agents seized $1,700 from his bank account and threatened further reprisals unless he paid the remainder of the fine.

This happened last June, and after months of vainly protesting against this violation of his constitutional rights, Yankus finally got a chance to tell his story to a House subcommittee and to the people of the Nation.

But even this hasn't done him any good. He got some sympathy from some Congressmen on the subcommittee, but the majority shared the sentiment of Representative J. FLOYD BREEDING, a Democrat from Kansas and a director of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, who told Yankus he had two sons engaged in farming who would go broke without Federal Government price supports.

The reply of Yankus to that argument is a classic that every American ought to well remember.

"It's sad to go broke," said Yankus, "but if we guarantee everybody against going broke, we'll all be like we're in jail cells."

Even though he spoke the truth, and the assembled Congressmen well knew it, the Michigan farmer didn't secure any relief from his appearance before the legislators. So, a few days ago he wrote the Government a check for $3,370.56 and enclosed it in a letter to U.S. Attorney Wendell Miles at Grand Rapids, in which he revealed he was giving up his long fight, selling his farm, and migrating to Australia where he would have more freedom.

"I feel kind of bad," he stated, " but if I had it to do over, I'd do the same thing again. I've got two strong hands and a mind. I made good once and I can again."

"The only thing I'm guilty of," he wrote Miles, "is fighting for my constitutional rights."

Today the Yankus farm, its buildings and its 5,000 chickens are in the hands of an auctioneer and will be sold on April 5. Yankus, himself has already applied for a passport and within a few months he will probably be in Australia getting prepared to start a new life for himself in a nation which still permits its farmers the right to grow whatever they choose to grow on their own property.

The tragedy of all this is that the acreage allotment program which cost this Michigan farmer $4,562 in fines and which ultimately drove him out of his native land to find greater freedom somewhere else, has proved to be utterly worthless. It is penalizing the small farmers like Yankus for the enrichment of the big wheatgrowers who have now piled up such tremendous stocks of surplus wheat at the taxpayers' expenses that the Nation would have more than enough to meet all it needs if not a single bushel was harvested this year.

Truly, this case well illustrates that the price of Government handouts is the loss of our individual freedom. But, outside of a few men like Stanley Yankus, who cares about that today? It's much easier to grab the handouts and ride the "gravy train" and permit our children, if they are still able, to try to regain the freedoms that we are bartering away.

## Needed: Western Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times of March 10, 1959, entitled "Needed: Western Action":

NEEDED: WESTERN ACTION

While Premier Khrushchev campaigns in East Germany, intervenes in West German politics and gives voice to all sorts of plans, threats, and promises in his campaign to drive Western forces out of Berlin, the Western Powers are still engaged in preliminary consultations on how to meet this Soviet challenge. Since it is the Soviets who do the challenging, and since the Western response must rest on agreement among democratic nations, this seeming discrepancy of effort is to some extent inevitable. But the situation enables Mr. Khrushchev not only to keep the initiative but also to make ever new tactical proposals, without ever yielding in substance, in order to keep the Western Powers off balance.

To be sure, the Western Powers are moving in the right direction. They are discussing an American draft for a new note to Moscow which welcomes the Soviet agreement to join in a foreign ministers' meeting but firmly rejects the conditions which the Soviet attaches. The note particularly rejects the Soviet proposal to limit the conference to a discussion of Soviet plans for a peace treaty with a divided Germany and Western withdrawal from Berlin and insists on discussing the whole German problem in all its aspects and implications, including German reunification in freedom and European security.

At the same time Prime Minister Macmillan is visiting Paris and will then go to Bonn and Washington to report on his visit to Moscow and to help concert Western policies for firm but flexible negotiations, with a summit meeting in mind.

Meanwhile, though the North Atlantic allies do discuss plans for meeting a military challenge over Berlin, President Eisenhower is obviously pursuing a policy of avoiding any provocation, either military or political. He has rejected any immediate steps toward any kind of Western mobilization. In fact, the United States and some Western allies are now actually reducing rather than increasing their armed manpower. Likewise, while the President welcomes congressional support of his stand, he seems to prefer an informal and implied rather than formal endorsement.

Inevitably the question must arise whether the West is not moving too slowly or leaning backward too far for its own good. Indeed, the lack of a definite program or even an agreed frame of reference is already arousing some fear among the Western allies that flexibility and disengagement may turn into new appeasement. This does not strengthen our alliances and can only encourage Mr. Khrushchev in his present tactics.

This newspaper has long advocated a concrete and comprehensive Western program to oppose the Soviet plan. It has also advocated a congressional resolution to express our national determination to stand fast in Berlin. We believe that the latest events give new point and emphasis to these suggestions.

## What Now, Khrushy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 18, 1959*

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, Nikita Khrushchev has come up with another suggestion on the Berlin situation which will never work. I refer to his suggestion that it might be possible to have a garrison of neutral troops stay in East and West Berlin or a security garrison of American, British, French, and Russian troops there. Someone must insist on fulfilling the pledge made as a part of the Atlantic Charter, to wit, the right to self-determination. What is wrong, I ask, in permitting free and open elections so that the peoples of East Berlin may decide their own fate?

It has often been said that we win the wars and lose the peace—could this be because of our inability to match or our inability to estimate the diplomatic and political dealings of the Russians? I have maintained for many years that the source and core of our troubles in the world are, to a great extent, the result of the commitments made at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam. This present crisis in Berlin pinpoints the necessity for a full and open disclosure of everything that went on in those conferences. How is it possible that we reach an agreement at Yalta on occupation zones in Germany, also in Berlin, and yet make no provision for access to Berlin? Surprisingly we seem content with an oral arrangement for supply corridors to Berlin—oral arrangement was all we had at the time of the bitter lesson of the Berlin blockade of 1948–49. What is our status today? True, we have something in writing, but all it did was to provide an obligation to take the measures necessary to insure the formal functioning and utilization of rail, water and road transport but with no specific written delineation of the military corridors to Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that now is the time to call for a unity of purpose and a determination to correct the inequities of the past. Let us not be led into a trap of flowery promises and no performances.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Daily News on this subject which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT NOW, KHRUSHY?

Nikita Khrushchev, most loquacious dictator in U.S.S.R. history, broke several of his own records yesterday. He had a 2-hour talk with Erich Ollenhauer, West Germany's Socialist chief and political rival of Chancellor Adenauer.

KHRUSHCHEV IN REVERSE?

Then the beefy Kremlin bossman really went all out by stating that he had changed his mind about positively kicking Western armed forces out of West Berlin. Now, he says amiably, it will be perfectly all right by him if a garrison of neutral troops stays in East and West Berlin. Or, come to think of it, it would be okay as an alternative to keep a security garrison of American, British, French, and Russian troops posted there. That is almost what Berlin has now—the glaring gimmick being that, under Khrushchev's plan, U.S.S.R. troops then would be circulating in West Berlin, too.

What's Khrushy up to? Can he be trying to drop that hot Berlin potato before a possibly humiliating showdown, with our General Eisenhower not giving an inch? Or, ever hopeful, is he giving another try to the cynical Communist tactic of promise everything, perform nothing?

In any event, all Communists are by definition professional liars. Let's wait for deeds, not words.

## Metropolitan Area Residents Affected by Federal and State Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced, for consideration by the 86th Congress, two bills I first introduced during the preceding Congress. Both represent efforts to deal fairly and equitably with residents of metropolitan areas, especially those areas that are located close to State boundary lines, insofar as such residents are affected by Federal and State tax laws.

The first bill, H.R. 5307, would allow as a deduction from Federal income taxes, the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by individuals for transportation to and from work. The maximum deduction fn any one taxable year would be $300, and the deductible expenses would include transportation costs either by private automobile or public transportation.

I share the conviction with many of our colleagues that this is a long overdue reform in our tax structure. Especially for those who live in the subrubs of our large metropolitan regions, the costs of transportation to and from work—the costs of commutation—are considerable. In my own Sixth Congressional District—where the number of commuters represent a fair average for the metropolitan New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area—I know of a great many instances where people must pay from $300 to $1,000 in commutation costs each year.

These travel expenses, I believe, are a necessary and legitimate cost of holding one's job, just as necessary and just as legitimate as those expenses presently authorized to be deducted on income tax returns. It is not always possible or even desirable for families to establish their homes in areas immediately adjacent to their jobs. Jobs change and employment opportunities shift, and seldom is it possible for the employee to control these circumstances. To insist that the taxpayer move his home every time he changes his job is obviously impossible and unjust, especially in crowded metropolitan areas. But we unfairly pressure such a person in this direction when we discriminate against him by refusing to permit normal, standard tax treatment for his necessary costs of traveling to and from work.

This legislation would in no way favor one group of taxpayers as against another. It would simply recognize a situation that has grown increasingly significant in recent years—the great migration to the suburbs of America. It would help restore a measure of fair and equitable treatment for these millions of our people. And it would remove the unjust price tag from one of our country's most precious freedoms—the freedom to live where one wants to live.

My second bill, Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 288, proposes to amend the Constitution by prohibiting any State from taxing the wages or salaries or other compensation for personal services received by a person who is not a resident of that State.

This measure, too, has been introduced by several of our colleagues, and I am hopeful that with greater awareness of the elementary justice involved in this proposed amendment there will come the support necessary to win the approval of the Congress.

While the problem this amendment would solve affects residents of New Jersey and Connecticut especially, it also affects residents of several other States who have been recently subjected to the tax laws of the States in which their jobs are located.

Here, again, we are confronted with the same fundamental questions: shall American citizens be free to establish their homes wherever they choose? Or shall we permit citizens who exercise this right to be penalized because of it?

Not only is there a cherished principle involved here—and who does not, in theory at least, subscribe to the dictum, there shall be no taxation without representation—but there is also much at stake from a practical viewpoint. Income taxes levied by some States have grown steadily heavier, and, of course, it has been this growing burden that has prompted some to seek added revenues from outside their boundaries. But States like New York have gone even further and discriminated against nonresidents in such a way that the nonresident's tax is more than the resident's tax, when both are in similar circumstances. Of course, the nonresident receives few if any of the benefits and services provided residents, for which the tax was levied in the first place.

But then there is little reason to expect logic where there is no justice.

Mr. Speaker, 60 percent or more of the American people have chosen for a variety of reasons to live in metropolitan areas. They are fully aware of the special problems, as well as advantages, which life under such crowded conditions means. And they are willing and able to solve these problems if they are allowed the means to do so. They ask no special privileges, no subsidies, no unwarranted exemptions from civic responsibilities.

They ask only justice, fair play, and equal treatment with fellow citizens living under different conditions. It is time, I believe, for Congress to recognize that America is no longer a rural nation. It is time for us to give the city and suburban dwellers of America a fair break.

## All Teamsters Carry the Stigma of Hoffa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call to the attention of the House the following editorial which appeared in the March 2, 1959, issue of the Saginaw News. As I stated yesterday, the Congress has a very real responsibility to insure that no one private individual can possibly possess the amount of power that now lies in Mr. Hoffa's hands. This is even more alarming when it is realized, from past experience, the motives which have caused Mr. Hoffa to make use of such power as he possesses. If this Congress adjourns without having taken concrete, positive and adequate action to meet this serious situation, it will have failed in its obligation to the American people and the responsibility will rest on the Congress leadership and the majority party in this respect.

ALL TEAMSTERS CARRY THE STIGMA OF HOFFA

A chill which has nothing to do with its sunny climate is sweeping across Florida these days as word spreads that Teamsters Union President James R. Hoffa is on the move to organize the State's workers all along the Gold Coast and across the citrus belt.

Gov. Leroy Collins has already invited him, politely, to take himself elsewhere. Declaring that Hoffa has been "personally discredited," he said he wished the man would "keep out of Florida."

To which Hoffa replied: "I don't think Collins can talk about Hoffa without speaking against Teamsters and all working people in Florida."

This is the trap in which Teamsters are caught, whether they choose to recognize it

or not. Governor Collins says he has no "feeling of antagonism toward the Teamsters Union" but he has all sorts of misgivings about the man who runs it.

How to separate the character of the man from the character of rank and file teamsters is always the problem which confronts any who stand for decent working conditions for labor—and decent treatment from organized labor leadership.

We can well imagine the shudder running through the Florida business community at mere mention of Hoffa's arrival on the organizing scene. The little businessman can't escape him either. Hoffa and his top lieutenants have been shown to be ruthless in their organizational efforts. One needs only mention the McClellan committee's investigations to envision what Florida may well be in for.

This is the stigma the Teamsters carry, and it must weigh heavily upon the good and decent men in the union who have no stomach for the dark gray side of their organization's acts.

Hoffa puts the reputation of his Teamsters and of "all the working people" on the line to defend himself against the public's personal antipathy for him. He gives guilt by association a reverse twist—all who condemn him condemn every man who holds a job controlled, or to be controlled, by the Teamsters.

He can't hide behind them, but few dare to disassociate him. Some openly bask in the power-by-association light that membership under Hoffa lends to them. Others, not overly troubled by ethics, see only what the union has done for them and consequently pass lightly over Hoffa's underworld connections and irregular financial exploits.

There may well be truth in Hoffa's declaration that "there is too big a spread in Florida between wealth and poverty." For certainly it is true that you need something besides sun to enjoy life in Florida.

But the AFL–CIO long ago decided that that something decidedly was not Hoffa. Governor Collins agrees, and great numbers of the American people agree. But neither the parent union which ousted the Teamster because of their president nor Governor Collins nor the unorganized public can do anything about Mr. Hoffa until the loose labor laws of this land which allow assembly of the tools of power are tightened against men of his ambition.

To rail against unrestrained power and the men who wield it in cynical disregard of the Nation's interest is so much wasted breath. The power to combat power lies with Congress. Whether it has the courage to invoke it is a decision resting with the conscience of each lawmaker.

## Help for Oil, Not for Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, although the New England area is almost a 100 percent deficit area in oil production, it nonetheless has an industrial complex that primely relies on residual oils.

Because residual oils are of such great importance to the State of Maine and its sister New England States, I am submitting to the RECORD this appropriate editorial which appeared in the March 5, 1959, issue of the Bangor Daily News:

HELP FOR OIL, NOT FOR TEXTILES

Strange indeed at times are the workings of the Federal Government. It seems ready to jump through a hoop whenever the oil industry has a bit of trouble; yet stubbornly declines to help the long-ailing textile industry.

Right now, President Eisenhower is giving consideration to putting a mandatory curb on fuel oil imports. This is because the voluntary quota program hasn't worked out. Domestic producers say foreign competition has created an oversupply at home.

But what happens if a mandatory clamp is put on imports? First, it will further hurt relations with two good oil-exporting neighbors—Canada and Venezuela. They are already displeased by the voluntary plan.

But, to bring the issue closer to home, an import curb is going to boost fuel oil prices in Maine. Maine consumers will, in effect, as the Maine delegation in Congress has pointed out, be called upon to help subsidize the oil industry.

We can understand that the Texas oil millionaires hate to give up any of their Cadillacs. But the people in Maine aren't in a position to support them in the manner to which they are accustomed. Nor are they inclined to do so if they could, considering that Maine's textile mills are barely limping along, because of Uncle Sam's helpfulness to foreign competition.

## Student Loan Program Booms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 17, 1959*

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a very interesting editorial written by Mr. Robert Ingalls in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette Times:

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM BOOMS

In 1958, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act. One of its less publicized provisions authorized the Federal Government to give colleges $295 million to put into student loan funds. The act stated that the participating college had to put $1 of its own into the loan fund for every 9 Federal dollars received.

Several people said at the time the program was unnecessary—that loan and scholarship money already went begging. Apparently they were wrong.

Arthur S. Flemming, the Cabinet member representing the education department calls the reception of the loan program the most surprising thing in the whole act. He says the study-now-pay-later philosophy of today's students represents a revolution in thought. U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick contends the popularity of the loan program is "more than anyone had any reason to expect."

Between passage of the act and December 31, 1958, colleges and universities asked for $62 million to meet student loan requests. Approximately 1,200 colleges representing 80 percent of the college population made requests. Congress, figuring the loan fund would take awhile to get started, had appropriated only $6 million.

Another thing that has educators excited is the seeding effect of the Federal money. The Office of Education says that of the 883 colleges which had no loan programs at all last year, 466 have stated them under the stimulus of Federal dollars.

How about all that private money that goes begging? "The thing about that money," Joseph Moffit, assistant dean handling the loan program at Georgetown University, explains, "is that it has strings attached. To qualify for the money, a student often has to be from a certain county or sometimes even have a certain last name." Other educators claim many of the former programs required the student to repay the money in a fairly short time at going interest rates and they couldn't afford it.

There has been a great deal of fuss about a provision in the act requiring borrowing students to sign a loyalty oath to the United States. Reed College even refused to accept any of the money because of this clause. However, bills have been introduced in the Senate to eliminate this particular feature which is odious to some people. It is difficult for us to understand why people feel discriminated against to have to swear allegiance to their own country and benefactor, but those arguing against the provision point out that some $4.8 billion could be paid to farmers under the price-support bill and no such loyalty oath at all is required under these circumstances. Why should students and educators be singled out?

Because of the success of the program's first year, Congress will undoubtedly pour many more millions into the program. It is a great step forward in education and it doesn't cost the taxpayers a thing.

## Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to a detailed study of urban renewal. This study on my part, documented with 52 exhibits, was prompted by the interest of my district, the city of Dallas, in making a study of urban renewal, and of course the possible use of Federal funds. Naturally, I was immensely concerned as a Congressman because this would involve the expenditure of taypayers' money. I was further interested because as a small businessman and realtor I know something about land development, urban renewal, condemnation, building codes, and other matters involved in urban renewal. This study may be found on page 3223 of the RECORD of Monday, March 9.

Today it is my great pleasure to announce that Dallas officials have decided to make urban renewal a local, not a Federal project. It is with great pride that I announce this to my colleagues and that I compliment these city officials and the citizens themselves for their initiative, local pride, and sense of responsibility.

Knowing that Dallas is similar to many other cities the country over, I know my colleagues and the people of other areas may benefit from the Dallas experience. Therefore I am including the newspaper account of this decision on the part of the officials of the city of Dallas.

DO-IT-YOURSELF SLUM CLEANUP PLAN FOR WEST DALLAS BARED BY OFFICIALS—COUNCIL ACTION EXPECTED MONDAY

(By Kenneth Smart)

City officials Saturday announced an unprecedented do-it-yourself revitalization program for West Dallas as a private enterprise-local Government answer to the city's worst slum problem.

The plan features creation of a new city department, cooperation of Dallas lending agencies and use of existing city powers without resorting to Federal urban renewal aid.

Mayor R. L. Thornton, chief architect of the plan, said the area will now be referred to as Dallas West. The plan could lift Dallas West out of the mud and make it a comfortable community of modest homes in 5 years, he declared.

The area encompasses 599 acres north of Singleton and west of Hampton.

POLICY GROUP

As a first step, the city council Monday will create by ordinance a five-member Dallas West Revitalizing Commission. This group will be the policymaking body for a new city department to be established to coordinate improvement efforts.

The mayor pledged his personal assistance to Dallas West citizens interested in forming neighborhood improvement organizations.

The plan apparently spelled an end to the city council's avowed intention to order a referendum on Dallas participation in an urban renewal program.

"In view of this measure, I intend to propose to the council that if the citizens of Dallas desire to go any further on an urban renewal program, they should make it known by submitting petitions in substantial numbers," said Councilman W. C. (Dub) Miller.

Under Texas' urban renewal laws, petitions by 5 percent of the qualified voters in a city can force a referendum on urban renewal.

DALLAS' ROLE

The city's role in Mayor Thornton's program will be mainly one of building streets, sewers, and water mains necessary to serve the area, then demanding strict enforcement of minimum housing standards. Private agencies will lend money to individuals for home repairs.

"By doing it this way, it will not necessitate using Federal funds and, in the end, will cost no more than what the city would have to pay if we went into a Federal urban renewal program," Mr. Thornton said.

No cost estimates have been prepared, but the city's share in a Federal program was estimated by a Chicago engineering firm as between $2,770,000 and $3,340,000, based on a 599-acre area east of Hampton and north of Singleton.

Private enterprise participation will come mainly from approved FHA lending agencies, which Mayor Thornton described as "willing and ready" to grant home repair loans to citizens who can qualify.

Up to 90 percent of the loans would be guaranteed by FHA, and standard FHA interest rates would apply, the mayor said.

REPAIR LOANS

In the past lending agencies have been reluctant to make home repair loans on West Dallas property, but the mayor said several firms have agreed to participate in the program.

Loan applications would be made through the new city department, then submitted to FHA-sponsored lending agencies.

"This is no charity package. It is a pay deal," Mr. Thornton stressed. "These people will have to help themselves."

PROTECTION OFFERED

"What we are doing is making credit available to people who couldn't get it before and at the same time providing leadership and protection for them."

The course charted by the mayor dispels once and for all speculation that West Dallas may be converted to a heavy concentration of industry.

Instead, the city is accepting a recommendation by DeLeuw, Cather & Co., a Chicago engineering firm, that the Dallas west sector be maintained as a residential area of modest homes.

CLEAR FUTURE

"With the future of the area clearly in mind, the city now can go in and spend money to build streets and sewers," said City Manager Elgin Crull.

No new bond funds will need to be voted for the work, he added.

The DeLeuw, Cather report estimated that 75 percent of the families in the area are financially able to make needed repairs to their homes, provided credit is available to them.

The Chicago engineers said special urban renewal powers of condemnation would be necessary to clear and redevelop property along Singleton and in a 13-block area in the vicinity of Chihuahua and Morris. Instead, according to the mayor, the city will rely on its existing powers to open new streets and abandon old ones to resolve platting difficulties.

WORKING TOOLS

Mr. Crull said this power and the city's tough new housing code are the only legal tools needed to proceed with the revitalization program.

Out of 3,029 residential structures in the area, 82 percent are considered severely deteriorated.

Storm drainage is poor, streets are largely unpaved, and many dwellings still lack connection to city water and sanitary sewer mains.

Mechanics of the revitalization program are indefinite, but the mayor indicated a small area—possibly a single block—would become a pilot project. Sector by sector, the entire Dallas West area, east of Hampton gradually would be improved.

METHODICAL PROJECT

"We'll take a section at a time, hit it methodically, and that will stimulate pride that will give other sections encouragement to do the same thing," the mayor said.

"We have every faith that the citizenship over there will organize their own neighborhood improvement groups to get the job done."

Mr. Thornton said the plan is no jumped-up gimmick but a program that has been months in the making. He said it is without precedent anywhere else in the Nation.

The new city department will be a small one, possibly staffed by four or five people including a director, a building inspector, and clerical and stenographic help, Mr. Crull said.

After the council approves the broad framework Monday, the next step will be the appointment of the new commission.

## Dan Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our beloved friend, the Honorable Dan Reed, is still difficult for us to realize. When a man of Mr. Reed's character, ability and patriotism passes from the Congressional scene, it leaves a vacuum. His loyalty, nonpartisanship and love of America has always been to me an inspiration.

When I first came to this Congress, he encouraged me to stand up for our country regardless of politics or pressure. He was a great American in the tradition of the founding fathers of our country. Dan Reed was forthright, courageous, and pro-American. He stood up for States' rights, the free enterprise system, and individual liberty.

Congressman Reed believed that those things that made America the great Nation that it is also could preserve America. Mr. Reed fought inflation, extravagance and waste in government. He believed in frugality, independence, thrift and virtue in government as well as in private life. The State of New York and the United States have lost a great statesman and we have lost a dear friend.

Mrs. Dorn joins in my deepest sympathy to his immediate family and to his constituents to whom he devoted so much of his time and affection.

## We Mustn't Embarrass Our Thieving Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the March 2, 1959, issue of the Saginaw News. This is merely another reason for an overall review and reappraisal of the foreign aid program which many of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee and in the House of Representatives have been calling for during these past 6 years.

WE MUSTN'T EMBARRASS OUR THIEVING ALLIES

A short item from Washington Monday reported simply that a congressional committee had announced "much waste in American military aid overseas."

Findings were by a House foreign affairs subcommittee which had to operate in the usual behind-closed-doors hearing fashion, since Defense and the State Department are skittish about upsetting our allies.

What the committee wanted to say was that some of these good friends are plain thieves. They've been pilfering and diverting all sorts of supplies we've sent them under the foreign military assistance program for civilian resale or personal use.

In an apologetic tone, the committee report explained that "the scarcity of consumer goods and the low pay scales of military and civil service personnel provided an incentive for stealing of United States military supplies."

American taxpayers mustn't be told which countries have been flimflamming us, for two reasons:

"First, many of the events described reflect unfavorably on officials or policies of allied nations.

"Second, publication of full details would provide the Communists with material which would be used to create dissension among our allies."

Admitting that this is an especially touchy time, what with Premier Khrushchev's ultimatum to the West to get out of Berlin by May 27, or else; and admitting that all the cooperation and unity that can be mustered will be needed to face out this challenge—we fail to see that it also demands suffering in silence as the price of foreign cooperation.

Maybe the Communists would use the details to cause dissension. Maybe, too American taxpayers might cause a little dissension. And maybe they should.

We've got a job of defense on our hands—defending ourselves and defending our allies who are in the front ranks. If they are allies it must be that they don't hanker to fall under the Soviet yoke of slavery.

But if they'd quit on us because we caught their civil and military employees redhanded, and blew the whistle on them, it is hard to believe that their love of freedom is as passionate as we have trusted it to be.

There has been much sober talk these past few weeks of beefing up the military strength of our allies and our own establishment in preparation for a showdown over the Berlin issue.

The beefing up would be done predominantly at American taxpayers' expenses. If President Eisenhower, with his military and diplomatic advisers, decides that this is the necessary course, Americans will unite behind him to pay whatever the price must be to defend freedom—and that doesn't stop at dollars.

What vexes us is the plaintive but timid attitude of official Washington toward our allies whose officials and national policies have tolerated waste and stealing directly harmful to their own national interest. Obviously, too, there has been a cynical contempt for the interest of American taxpayers as far as these unidentified allies are concerned.

A typical American working full time earns $4,500 a year—but $1,393 of it is taken from him by his Government in direct and hidden taxes. There is nothing soft-handed about Uncle Sam when he demands an accounting at income tax time. And the taxpayer isn't filled with the milk of human kindness when he reads about America's allies stealing from him, but being just too thin-skinned to be chastised.

---

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

## REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

# Appendix

## Order or Disorder in the Space Age?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the United States has achieved a great international status for its accomplishments in the area of managerial efficiency. We have been represented as the model for democratic decision-making and speed of production. But as we move into the space age we find great confusion in both the decision-making process and the production process. We are facing the greatest threat to our survival in our history; yet we are not drawing on our genius for organization and management. The time is now if we are to develop the kinds of procedures which will guarantee our national security and enable us to become the leaders in the space age.

Last week I addressed myself to these problems before the Western Space Age Conference in Los Angeles, and I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on that occasion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVING FEDERAL PROCEDURES IN THE MISSILE AND SPACE CONTEST

(Excerpts from speech by Senator CLAIR ENGLE at Western Space Age Conference, Los Angeles, Calif., March 5, 1959)

I am sure that everyone here is aware that I have only recently become a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—and more particularly, the Aviation Subcommittee which deals with civilian aviation. On the other hand, for a number of years I have taken a great interest in the aircraft and missile business. I have spent three tours of active duty with the Air Force in research and development and the missile field.

But obviously I am not an expert on missiles and aircraft design and construction. And I intend, in these remarks, to stay within my specialty—which is legislation and government. I have spent some 16 years in the Congress of the United States, and I am much concerned with the procedures in government affecting production in the aircraft, missile, and space field. I know that these procedures, both legislative and administrative, have a direct effect on the speed and efficiency with which Government programs are put into operation.

THE SUBJECTS

There are two aspects of administrative and legislative management in the production of aircraft and missiles that I particularly want to mention:

First, the contracts, the continuity of the contracts, stretchouts, and termination; and

Second, the complexity of the governmental organization in the aircraft, missile, and space production field.

THE CONTRACTS

We in California have had brought home to us in a particularly acute fashion what it means when a major defense contract is canceled, or stretched out to any appreciable extent. I do not have to remind you of what happened in the summer of 1957 when the Defense Department canceled the Navajo contract. There have been others that have been canceled more recently.

We need to take a hard look at this situation to see to what extent such contract cancellation and stretchouts are a necessary and unavoidable part of our national defense effort.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES

Clearly there are sound technological reasons why some defense cutbacks are made. The extent to which obsolescence makes this necessary is reflected, for example, in the statement of Assistant Secretary of Defense W. J. McNeil before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress on February 10, in which he listed, on the one hand, the programs which have been or are being phased-out or canceled and, on the other hand, work being accelerated.

BUDGETARY PROBLEMS

However, not all defense cutbacks can be accounted for solely on technological grounds. A great deal has in the past depended upon budgetary considerations—and here the record is not so good. Our defense budget, on which our national existence depends, receives less consistent treatment than any other part of the Federal budget.

AN EXAMPLE

As an example, let us review briefly some of the things that happened during 1957 in the way of management of defense funds. In April, the Department of Defense, making new estimates of expenditures through the fiscal year, found that its major programs were moving much faster than they had been aware of, and that expenditures might be as much as $2 billion more than anticipated. To reduce or defer the anticipated overrun of $2 billion, contracting agencies in the Department of Defense were sent telegrams and ordered to curtail or to cease overtime expenditures. Some contractors were asked to withhold voluntarily all or a part of their April, May, and June billings. The result of that was that a budget surplus was created more by deferment of payments than by reduction of obligations. Thus, the Government entered the fiscal year 1958, on July 1, 1957, with a large carryover of bills—and at the same time, new budget appropriations which had in many ways been cut to the bone.

Those contractors who voluntarily or otherwise agreed to deferred payments found themselves with sudden and unanticipated demands upon their working capital, all without additional compensation or profit. The Defense officials found themselves in the awkward position of having to reconcile a large carryover of unpaid bills with orders to hold defense spending to $19 billion in the 6 months from July 1 to December 31, 1957.

AFTER SPUTNIK

After Sputnik No. 1, in October 1957, the Defense Department, faced with a demand for acceleration of defense activity, found itself right up against the debt ceiling, with legally available cash nonexistent. When the new orders really started up after January 1958 contractors had to bid hurriedly and simultaneously on more projects than they could handle. As a result some companies came out overloaded and others had insufficient work.

SPECIFIC REMEDIES

Here are five specific steps I think should be taken:

1. We can insist that the Department of Defense and its branches do a better job in forecasting and budgeting their cash requirements for years ahead. The Department of Defense should provide for an earlier review of the allocation of these needs to particular projects or contracts. This would enable the Congress to make more adequate budget reviews and should facilitate the letting of contracts once appropriations were passed.

2. Carryovers of unpaid bills from one fiscal year to the next can and should be eliminated or minimized. Abnormal peaking of cash requirements in any particular year or period distorts the rate of defense expenditures, gives the Congress and the people of the United States the wrong picture, and accomplishes no more than putting off the day of reckoning.

3. The Congress and the Treasury must make certain that a sound and regular flow of defense contracts is not impeded by the debt ceiling.

4. Recognizing that neither curtailing nor stepping up a firm's production under a defense project can be done without a sizeable adjustment of plant, facilities, personnel, and financing, a contractor should have at least 6 months' notice, wherever possible, of requirements to accelerate or decelerate work on a particular contract.

5. If it is found necessary to continue to make limitations on progress payments, as has been common in recent years, the Government should recognize that such limitations involve an increased financial burden borne by the contractor by increasing the compensation allowed him.

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

On the second point—the complexity of the governmental organization in the production of aircraft, missiles, and space vehicles—we find that this governmental organization is often responsible for the difficulties that arise. Especially after Sputnik I, the Government agencies in the missile and satellite field have simply flowered, with new committees, new responsibilities, new people, each one of whom is supposed to exercise an important function in this field. I believe that a member of the missile industry looking at these organization charts and this mass of committees will be just as confused as I am—although as a legislator I have had years of familiarity with organizational charts. The one that Trevor Gardner presented in Life magazine over a year ago showed 90 bases that needed touching for complete coordination of space activities. No wonder we are having difficulty keeping up with the Soviets.

MORE CZARS

The successful firings of IRBM's and ICBM's by the Russians led to the appointment of William M. Holaday as Guided Missile Director; the launching of Sputnik I brought in two czars—Roy W. Johnson as Chairman of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA), and James Killian as

the President's special assistant on science and technology; and concern over military domination of space activities resulted in the appointment of Dr. T. Keith Glennan as Administrator of the Civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Meanwhile, Donald Quarles, Deputy Secretary of the Department of Defense, has responsibilities that tend to put him in direct conflict with all of these people. And we have just scratched the surface of those who are involved in the decision-making process.

AGENCY HODGEPODGE

At the top levels of decisionmaking, we find a proliferation of committees. The NASA law created a Space Council, which is chaired by the President himself. It also set up a Civilian-Military Liaison Committee to coordinate space activities. The Chairman of this Committee is Guided Missile Director Moladay, who has no authority to give orders to any of the members. About all that happens at the regularly scheduled meetings, attended by people from NASA, ARPA, military organizations, and others, is that information is exchanged. NASA itself has 13 coequal committees consisting of 15 or more members each. To complete the jurisdictional complexity and overlap, both NASA and agencies of the Defense Department give assignments to research and development units of the military services. As would appear inevitable, disputes arise on the control of certain projects and the solutions are always compromises which satisfy no one and cause further delays.

VIEW FROM THE PRESIDENCY

If we were to look at it from the vantage point of the President, we would find him advised by so many agencies that he could not possibly know where the decisions should be made. Here is an incomplete listing of the groups he turns to for assistance: The National Science Foundation; the National Science Board; the chief scientific adviser, Dr. J. R. Killian, Jr.; the Federal Council for Science and Technology (proposed); the President's Scientific Advisory Council; the special aviation adviser, General Quesada; the National Security Council; the Federal Aviation Agency; NASA; the Bureau of Standards; and the Department of Defense with all its subdivisions such as ARPA and Guided Missiles and the military services. If Mr. Eisenhower wanted to know about the value of a certain proposal, I doubt if he would be sure where to turn or whether he could get better information from someone other than the adviser he was consulting.

SPECIFIC EXAMPLES

General Medaris: It cannot be doubted that this confusion, overlapping of jurisdictions, and absence of a clear line of command are reflected in aircraft and missile production lags. Gen. John Medaris, Commander of the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency, at a congressional hearing, said: "We have no handicap in the use of our resources once the resources are approved to us and our line of approach is approved." Inherent in the whole process of missile development is the decision-time element, the time required to get decisions as definitive approvals or guidelines on which to proceed.

I asked General Medaris recently how many people—as a minimum—he would have to get in the same room to get a decision that would be firm. He counted off at least five—the Secretary of the Army, the Army Budget Officer, the Secretary of Defense, the Defense Budget Officer, and someone from the Bureau of the Budget. I asked him if he thought he ever could get them all in the same room at the same time, and he said he didn't think so. At the hearing, he cried out rather forlornly: "Some place there has to be one man who can make a decision, who can give a command, and who has the resources to carry it out."

Dr. von Braun: Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency, went even further in criticizing the constant interference with project development. He could not understand why there had to be so many committees. Medaris went from Huntsville, Ala., to Washington once a week to get decisions while Braun visited the Pentagon twice a month for committee meetings. And if that wasn't enough, from time to time the committees visited the Huntsville project.

Admiral Hayward: Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, Director of Research and Development, Department of the Navy, commented at a House Space Committee hearing: "U.S. supremacy in space science is threatened not by lack of talent, but by lack of skill in bureaucracy."

Admiral Hayward believes that we should have one U.S. space program. With regard to the confusion on organization and lines of command, he commented that it was not a question of standing the heat in the kitchen," but "who it was who was in the kitchen." He said, "In the atom business you never had that—you knew who had the responsibility. You knew how it was done, and the military got what we needed."

Admiral Hayward testified that when he had a program he was anxious to see carried out, he would bring it to Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and then he would take it to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development for his approval. He would also go to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Gates. Once it has cleared the Navy Department, the program goes to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, Dr. Herbert York—and then Dr. York may or may not present the matter to Roy Johnson of ARPA or to William Holaday, the Director of Guided Missiles.

This isn't a complete count. Admiral Hayward said there were at least 10 places where he could be vetoed. He then went on to say that after he gets the program approved in all these places and even after appropriations are made by Congress, he still has to fight back down the line to get approval for the expenditure—and at any time the Bureau of the Budget may step in and impound the funds for the project.

AMMUNITION—KOREA

That these problems are long-standing can be shown by the trouble we had getting adequate ammunition to Korea as the war dragged on. It took 18 months from the time the money was made available to get the first ammunition from the manufacturers. When we look at a chart of the operations of the Army Ordnance Corps, we find that an average of 113 days elapses from the original order for ammunition to the award of the contract to produce it—then it has to be produced. According to ordnance lingo, there are 11 action offices and 35 steps to be taken in the process.

NOT EXECUTIVE BRANCH ALONE

The presentation of this whole range of shortcomings in the defense effort does not mean that I am blaming the executive branch for all of the problems, or that the confusion has been confined to this administration. The ammunition hassle in the Korean war is a case in point. At the time, President Truman told me that he spent 80 percent of his time trying to make the Federal Government work—to keep the gears in mesh. The Congress bears much of the responsibility, since it enacts the legislation creating many of the executive agencies involved in the decision-making process. Furthermore, it has its own overlapping jurisdictions, such as the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee covering much the same ground as the Senate Space Committee.

SUMMARY

I have dwelt today on two subjects:

First: The contracts, the continuity of these contracts, stretchouts, and termination.

Second: The complexity of the governmental organization in aircraft, missile, and space production.

I have not suggested all the answers—I don't know them all. But I know we must get the answers.

If we are to be superior to the Soviets, the first requisite is to have the system of government that can maximize our scientific and industrial capabilities.

Two oceans and time will not be protections from now on. The world is shrinking and we must face the new order in the world. We must move fast.

Our form of government, our way of doing business, is relatively new in the perspective of history.

The question is whether we can stand the test against one of the most efficient examples of the old order—a dictatorship with modern refinements—a dictatorship that has the singleness of purpose, the discipline to over-ride the agony and frustration of the masses, and a straight-line of command that can direct the resources, human and material, of a whole and powerful nation toward a single objective.

Both the economic and political structures of this country face the greatest challenge in our history in the short years ahead.

I think we can do it. But we must recognize the challenge. And we must be willing—in sacrifice, in diligence, and in the intelligent application of our talent—to meet the challenge. How we organize to do the job can be the difference between winning and losing the cold war.

## David J. McDonald, of the United Steelworkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in recent times so much publicity and governmental attention has been given, and very properly given, to the criminal elements in some of our major labor unions and to some illegal activities on the part of certain labor leaders that I am afraid that too often we tend to forget that the vast majority of our organized workers and their respective leaders are totally loyal, hard-working, exemplary American citizens.

As a case in point, I refer to Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, who recently returned from a trip to Australia, Singapore and Hong Kong. Part of Mr. McDonald's mission during his trip was to declare the American ideas of free enterprise and to help enlighten our friends in the Far East on the vast improvements that have been made in labor-manage-

ment relations in the United States in recent years.

In one of his speaking engagements, Mr. McDonald spoke before the Australian Institute of Political Science in Canberra, and it seems to me that the substance of his remarks on that occasion are of value to all of us. I ask unanimous consent that a report of that speech which appeared in the Canberra Daily Telegraph on January 22, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NO ANTI-BOSS HATRED FOR THIS TOP U.S. UNIONIST—HE PREFERS TO COOPERATE, BUT DOES NOT SHIRK A FIGHT

(By Zelie McLeod)

David John McDonald, president of the 1,250,000-member United Steelworkers, third largest labor organization in the United States, certainly has a fresh, dynamic point of view about management-labor relations.

Mr. McDonald is in Australia to address the Australian Institute of Political Science summer school at Canberra on Saturday, to study our long-service leave legislattion, and as guest of the Ironworkers's Union.

His expansive approach to the eternal differences between capital and labor makes the mental processes of some of our leading labor men appear a hundred years out of date.

I would wager that he doesn't possess an ounce of the stubborn (almost neurotic) "antiboss" hatred that so bedevils our own labor movement.

He believes capitalists are necessary, and that private enterprise, coupled with a strong trade union movement, is the only way to run any economy.

He doesn't want to see capitalists deprived of their financial power to make way for a Socialist economy.

"Socialism doesn't work. That's been proved in a number of countries," he said crisply.

"The drive for profit is the factor that has brought technical improvement. Socialism stifles this urge. Why should trade unionists want to stop progress?

"My union has no sympathy with companies that do not keep up with technical progress. We don't care if they close down, even if this means putting men out of jobs. We teach them something else and get them working again."

He quickly dispelled any idea that American big businessmen bend over backwards to give workers a bigger slice of the national pie.

"Employers invariably resist progress in working conditions," he said.

"They've never handed us anything on a silver platter. I've never improved a labor contract without a struggle."

He described how his union draws up a labor contract with the employers, usually for a period of 2 years, and when it terminates employer and trade union representatives get together and hammer out new conditions.

"If a dispute occurs during the contracted period, the facts are laid before a private arbitrator paid jointly by the employers and the union. His decision is binding on both parties," he explained.

"Sometimes it is necessary to strike at the end of a contract period," he added dryly.

He has the reputation of regarding strikes as a last-resort weapon not because he loves employers, but because men out of work mean a general loss of prosperity.

This 56-year-old tall, distinguished, well-dressed son of an Irish migrant family earns £22,300 a year.

He is built like a steel mill, has the manners and poise of a diplomat, pilots his own plane, and is clearly mentally and physically tough enough to take on all comers.

He was apprenticed in a Pittsburgh steel mill when he was 15, graduated to machinist's helper before leaving the mills to operate a switchboard, and study dramatic art.

By chance a few months later he became secretary to Philip Murray, leader of the United Steelworkers, and one of America's greatest and "cleanest" labor leaders.

For the next 30 years, until Murray's death in 1952, the two men worked closely together. David McDonald succeeded Murray unopposed as president of United Steelworkers of America.

His aim is simple 100-percent employment that will bring peace and contentment to everyone.

I asked him if he had met any of our militant trade union leaders.

"I haven't met any Communists, if that's what you mean," he replied.

"I don't regard Communists as militants. I regard them as centers of reaction. The whole Marxian idea is bunk. It doesn't work. It is a retrogressive force."

I asked him how he reconciled that with the fact that Russians had clear technical advantages over the United States in the outer space missile field.

He gave me a slow, good-humored smile.

"The Russians have given special privileges and resources to some scientists working on purely military projects. * * *

"Our aim is to take the burden off man's back and put it on his mind," he said.

"Humanity has been doing that ever since it discovered the wheel."

He leaned toward me, blue eyes alight.

"Before the wheel, men had to use four women to drag one tree trunk about," he said in mock seriousness, then laughed delightedly as if at some unimaginably freakish jape.

I doubt whether any woman would drag anything about while Mr. McDonald was around. He's that sort of man.

We got back to the serious business of automation.

"Wholesale automation is no good if it puts men out of jobs," he said.

"Machines don't buy goods. We will deal with automation in a way that won't put men out of work. They may work fewer hours. There's nothing sacred about the 8-hour day, you know.

"However, I estimate that industry will find it cheaper, and more efficient, to give employees several weeks' paid leave, say every 5 years, rather than reduce the number of weekly working hours.

"People who think differently just haven't got their mathematics straight. Employees will also learn to do other jobs, probably working with their brain instead of their hands."

I suggested that automation would call for a higher standard of education for workers' children.

"Surely," replied Mr. McDonald, "automation will raise the general standard of the people.

"However, there is no such thing as a working class in America. Everyone is middle class.

"A man's job is not his whole life. Among his friends he is known more for his prowess in sport or hobbies than because of what his job is."

This week Mr. McDonald visited the B.H.P. steel mill at Port Kembla, and was delighted.

"Wonderful expansion, very stimulating," he said.

Expansion, jobs, prosperity—those are his watchwords. To gain his ends he prefers to cooperate with those who own wealth, but if need be he will declare war, a ruthless war at that.

## 1970–80: A Decade of Reckoning?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address recently delivered by President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, at a convocation at Pomona College. President Kerr reviews imaginatively and perceptively the economic challenge for the United States in the developing nations of the world.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1970–80: A DECADE OF RECKONING?

(Address by Clark Kerr, Pomona College, Feb. 12, 1959)

It is with particular pleasure that I join you at this convocation today. Speaking as an institutional representative, I can note with pride the close ties which have existed between the University of California and Pomona throughout your long and distinguished history. Many of our best graduate students have received their undergraduate training at Pomona. Some of our faculty members have studied or taught at Pomona, and many others enjoy warm friendships and academic associations with your faculty. One of your trustees, Mr. Arthur J. McFadden, served for many years as a member of our board of regents. The University of California cannot claim a share in the formal education of President Lyon. Misguidedly or otherwise, depending upon one's point of view, he chose to attend other institutions, including Oxford. But we have done our best to appropriate a belated line in his academic biography by awarding him, this last September, the degree of doctor of laws.

Speaking more personally, I can express my own interest in and appreciation of Pomona. As a Swarthmore graduate, I have an abiding respect for the small liberal arts college with high intellectual standards and a well-rounded community life. In fct, I have always considered Pomona as the "Swarthmore of the West"—and I think that compliment might justifiably be returned by referring to Swarthmore as the "Pomona of the East."

Certainly Pomona has greatly enriched the educational resources of California and the Nation, which is the best of reasons to wish you continued growth and success in the years ahead.

It has become a popular cliche to characterize today's college students, whether at small private institutions like yours or large public universities like ours, as apathetic at best and beat at worst. The generalization usually runs to the effect that the present student has limited his goals to an early marriage, a secure job in a large corporation, a gracious home in a gracious suburb, a car in make and model just above that of his immediate subordinate and just below that of his immediate superior, and so forth. The standard characterization of the beat student limits his horizons even more sharply: He is supposed to be concerned only about expresso coffee, sandals, and the fact that life in general; and apparently washing or shaving in particular, is a lousy drag.

Like most generalizations, these are true only of a small segment of the group described. And I believe this minority is very much smaller than is popularly supposed. By far the greater number of the students I know are earnest and sincere and seriously interested in the world they are inheriting. Judging by what I think are the most indicative measures—the courses they take, the reading they do, the interest groups they follow—today's students as a group are far from apathetic and even farther from beat.

And so I should like to talk soberly to you today about an aspect of the world of the near future which will certainly affect the students of today—an aspect about which I know quite a few students here, and far more abroad, are concerned. Indeed, for many students abroad it is the central issue.

Just 8 days ago I returned home from a 6-week trip with four colleagues throughout the Middle and Far East. We participated in conferences and seminars and gave lectures in Athens, Istanbul, Beirut, Damascus, Teheran, Karachi, Delhi, Calcutta, Singapore, Djakarta, Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Osaka. The trip was obviously brief but extremely intensive. Except for actual travel time, we spent almost all of our working hours with professors and students, industry and labor representatives, government and military leaders. The purpose of the trip was to gather current data for part of the final report on a 6-year study of "Labor and Management Problems in Economic Development."

This is the first opportunity I have had to comment formally on some of the impressions we gained on this trip. In doing so, I should like to direct particular attention to their implications for the decade 1970–80, a decade about as far ahead of us today as World War II is now behind us; a 10-year span which may well become a decade of reckoning around the world.

To provide a meaningful framework for my comments, I should point out three important and self-evident facts about the 20th century:

First, it is a century of great transformation. Nation after nation is taking the road from an agricultural or commercial form of society to that of an industrial society. Some nations, including ours, have come far along this road since the turn of the century. Others, particularly in the areas which we have just visited, have scarcely begun. But there are almost no countries in the world today which do not view industrialization as a logical and desirable direction to follow. Certainly it is accurate to say that this is the century of the greatest worldwide transformation in history.

Second, the world at mid-20th century has witnessed the emergence of two great powers, the strongest nations industrially and the most influential politically—the United States and Russia. And these two great world powers hold sharply conflicting theories about how best to organize industrial society. The Soviet approach concentrates all authority in the state as the logical means to assure maximum efficiency and productivity. The American approach relies upon many centers of authority—Federal and local government, corporations, unions, trade associations, and the like—and upon the open labor market and the open consumer market. It obviously provides great freedom for the individual, though perhaps at some potential sacrifice of maximum economic development.

Third, an important segment of the world is observing the differing policies and actions of these two powers with intense interest, watching and still making up its mind about the course of industrialization which will best serve its own purposes.

I do not intend to discuss in any detail the direct competition of the United States and Russia. But I should like to note Russia's potential impact on the world situation by the 1970's if that nation continues its present high rate of investment and of expenditures for education. Comparative figures are difficult to obtain, but the best current estimates indicate that Soviet commitments may be twice as high as ours for both investment and education—and these are two prime sources of progress in modern industrial society.

However, I am more concerned today with the immediate impacts which Russia and particularly our own Nation are making upon the peoples of those nations which are for a little while longer reserving judgment about the course they will follow.

In Calcutta it is common to see a refugee family literally living on a 3-by-5-foot mat spread out on a public sidewalk. This mat, this small rectangle of space, is home. The babies, often unclothed, crawl on the sidewalk beside the destitute mother. The small brothers or sisters beg. Flies settle on the sacred cow standing nearby or on a vendor's cart.

Travelers returning from Peking report that there are no babies living on the sidewalks of that city and almost no flies anywhere in China. These travelers also report that, in a land that has known starvation for centuries, agricultural production has risen quite significantly. India also has known starvation—and still knows it. As yet India's agricultural production is rising very slowly.

This, of course, is only part of the story. Perhaps 2 or even 20 million people have been killed in China by the new regime; in India, none. China knows the rigid discipline of the anthill—blue-clad ants toiling ceaselessly at their allotted tasks. India is a free country.

Millions of people in southeastern Asia are watching and evaluating developments in these two countries. These people prize freedom, but they may consider freedom too great a luxury if the cost is continued destitution and the constant specter of starvation. Should China maintain anything like its present pace of development, and should India make no greater economic progress in the next decade than it has during the 10 years just past, how will the situation look to these millions of deeply interested observers by 1970?

The really largest university in the world today is the University of Calcutta, whose present enrollment numbers well over 100,000 students. Already in 1959, the Communists control large segments of that student body. A recent study revealed 40 percent of the student body to be undernourished. These two facts are not unrelated.

India and China, because of their vast size, population, potential industrial might, and present political orientations, may turn out to be the test cases for the course of industrialization and political organization throughout the still underdeveloped areas of the world. But they are not the only testing grounds. Japan, for example, is currently faced with serious underemployment and is eying the China market as a partial solution to its economic difficulties. Indonesia, struggling with the problems of recent independence, is now living off the capital accumulated under Dutch management—and this capital won't last forever. The Middle East generally is in the throes of political and economic change.

Last year I visited the countries of sub-Sahara Africa. Much of this vast continent is undergoing intensely dramatic change, often from primitive tribal life to modern industrialization in less than one generation, with racial conflict as an added source of tension.

But this is California and the United States in the year 1959, and we enjoy the highest per capita consumption of goods and services any people has ever known; and India and Africa and 1970 seem a long way off. A long way off—and yet increasingly we realize we cannot ignore the years ahead nor those countries even on the other side of the world.

And so I should like to add some suggestions to the many being made today as we continue as a people to explore our new position in the newly emerging world of science and of industry.

To begin with, we should assume that peoples everywhere want desperately to have the better health, the better education, the more material goods, the greater national prestige that industrialization ultimately brings. We should assume that industrialization will be accomplished, under either Communist or non-Communist auspices, and that the latter course is far safer for us and far better for the peoples directly involved. We should also assume that these people themselves prefer industrialization under non-Communist auspices, particularly because they believe the Western approach will enable them to preserve their national independence and culture whereas the Communist approach would destroy both.

Next, we should act on these assumptions and set resolutely about assisting the non-Communist industrialization of the underdeveloped areas of the world. This will require that we devote some real thought and imagination to the development of a long-range program, rather than relying upon the stock answers of the past and the patched-up expediencies of the moment. This program need not be the exclusive responsibility of our Nation acting alone. Sometimes, and for some purposes, we can operate most effectively in concert with other nations, as witness the excellent work of the World Bank in undertaking crucially-important investments which individual nations are not in a position to make. In any case, we urgently need to shape our day-to-day decisions according to a creative overall plan of assistance to underdeveloped nations. You may be sure that Russia has such a long-range plan, and has had for some time now. I would hope that we might develop our program not only as a part of our military strategy but for its own sake and the sake of common humanity.

Such a program should, I believe, include at least the four following parts:

First, we need to adopt a realistic attitude. All the world is not going to be just like the United States, and we should not be too morally indignant about it. There may in fact be instances when it is better for a country to have a temporary military dictator who is honest and progressive, as in Pakistan today, than a democracy which is run by corrupt and bungling politicians. May it not be enough to warrant our support that a regime be peaceful, honest, progressive, and independent?

A country may not have free trade unions in our sense of the word, or free enterprise either. But free trade unions under existing local conditions might well be Communist, and might for their own purposes sabotage all efforts at economic development. And free enterprise in the absence of effective competition can engage in the most outrageous exploitation.

Though we cherish self-government, we should be realistic about both time and place. Degrees of guidance from above may be inevitable in some situations today, and should be both expected and accepted.

Second, we need to make substantial sums of money available for new investments in underdeveloped countries. Many of these nations lack the large amounts of savings or other internal financial resources necessary

to give the process of industrialization its initial momentum. Without external assistance, they may drag along for years at a very low level of industrialization with no hope of achieving the sort of escape velocity necessary to put their economy on a self-expanding basis. Our investments must be extensive enough to help these countries get over that difficult industrialization hump; half a loaf, in this case, is not better than none at all.

Third, we need to accompany these funds with a policy. And I should like to suggest that such a policy might include at least these points:

(a) That a country seeking aid be prepared to accept from the outside or to train from the inside professional management to direct the effective use of the new investments.

(b) That new plants or facilities aided by such outside funds be operated efficiently and and not loaded with excess labor as a method of solving the country's unemployment problems.

(c) That the country itself match outside funds with its own savings—for people must learn that heavy saving and investment are the keys to continued and successful industrialization.

If these points are not met, the chances for successful economic development of a country are negligible despite the willingness of outsiders to make substantial initial investments there.

I might add parenthetically that efficiency, hard work, and some austerity were among the sources of America's prosperity—but that this is seldom apparent to the average citizen abroad. We announce to the world the results rather than the causes of our successful industrialization. The Voice of America too often features the high income and the great leisure in the United States. But what the underdeveloped countries need to launch their economic progress are austerity and long hours. The result is that much of our present American message abroad leaves no residue except frustration. We should be selling less the American way of consuming and more the American way of working. There has never been an easy road to modern industrial society, and we should say so.

Fourth and finally, we need to accompany our policy with personnel. We can do without so many persons oriented toward a social life and a standard of living which would be beyond their reach at home, and moving from country to country at 2-year intervals. What we do need are many more technicians oriented toward accomplishing specific tasks, willing to learn the language and to accept the local standard of living for people of their level of training. And of course we should encourage the training, in their own countries or abroad if necessary, of native technicians for service in their home countries.

The world's pressing need for experts in a host of technical and professional fields presents unusual opportunities for qualified young people today. Those persons who are anxious to combine their regular work with the challenge of pioneering or with the satisfactions of broader service to humanity may find abroad the prospects which are less likely to arise in this country today. Students who plan to devote at least a part of their careers to constructive work abroad will certainly not be motivated by such goals as a gracious house in a gracious suburb. But they will find other rewards, including the knowledge that their individual contributions have counted significantly toward the achievement of a better world.

May I briefly summarize my suggestions: We must assume that all countries desire the benefits which come with modern economic development, that industrialization is inevitable, whether under Communist or non-Communist auspices, and that the latter alternative is obviously to be preferred. Accordingly, we should develop a long-range program, independently or, when appropriate, in concert with other nations, to assist the non-Communist industrialization of underdeveloped countries. Such a program might include four principal points: a realistic attitude about degrees of self-government in these countries, substantial amounts of money for investment, a policy to assure the most productive use of such investments, and the technical personnel to help effectuate this policy.

As I said earlier, millions of people throughout the world are still reserving their commitment to a particular course of industrialization. They are still watching—watching particularly the United States, and generally in a very friendly way. I can assure you of that. They still visualize the United States as the land of opportunity. They would like eventually to emulate our society, and they would much rather accomplish the modernization of their countries with our aid than with the assistance of Russia. They want to know whether our way is applicable to their problems and whether we are prepared to help in a significant way. The eagerness with which they turn to us is sometimes almost overwhelming.

Fortunately for us, we are not quite yet at the point of crisis. There is still some time for the discussion which is going on at many levels of American society, the discussion about how we can best meet this great challenge. But we should be aware that there will not always be time, that many nations during the next few years will be nearing the crossroads where decisions must be made—that we are approaching what may be a decade of momentous reckoning throughout the world.

Our Nation has met many serious challenges well in the past. The problem which confronts us today will require our searching study, our ingenuity, and our most clear-sighted judgment. But I am confident that we will find the means to meet this new challenge in a way which will extend freedom and the meaningful pursuit of happiness to new areas of the world.

## Commendation of Senator McClellan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 9, 1959, Miss Chloe Gifford, the president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, wrote a letter commending the able and distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] for his outstanding public services as chairman of the Senate Rackets Committee. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 9, 1959.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
*U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I have followed the proceedings of MCCLELLAN'S select committee with great interest and am sure you know that women generally are opposed to corruption in any quarters.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has through the years supported resolutions urging higher levels of national morality and integrity, and has urged bipartisan action to curb corrupt practices.

I wish to commend you for the thorough and tireless work of this committee and wish you every continued success.

Sincerely yours,

Miss CHLOE GIFFORD,
*President.*

## Resolution of Americans of Lithuanian Descent Opposing Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the spread of communism today has imprisoned the lives of about 1 billion people. The hopes—the ideals—the aspirations of these people—indeed, their right to respect as human beings—has been subjugated to, and in far too many cases crushed beneath, the iron hand of Communist dictatorship.

Among our American citizens there are, unfortunately, a great many who have families or friends still behind the Iron Curtain. As loyal, patriotic Americans they abhor—as do all freedom-loving people—the continued enslavement of vast throngs of people under communism.

Today I received a resolution adopted at a meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of Kenosha. The words—and the spirit—of the resolution cry out for the liberation of Lithuania and other countries too long under communism. To give my colleagues the benefit of the thinking of the people who met recently at Kenosha to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

The following resolutions are for adoption at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Kenosha, sponsored by the Lithuanian American Council and held February 22, 1959, in the hall of St. Peter's Parish to commemorate the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas Lithuania, motherland of millions of American citizens, since 1940 is under the occupation of the Russian Army; and

"Whereas the resistance of the Lithuanian people against the Russian oppressors is continuing constantly; and

"Whereas no peace and stability in the world is possible until the Red army is withdrawn from Eastern Europe: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this meeting of Lithuanian Americans of the city of Kenosha, Wis., calls upon the President and the Government of the United States, urging them to use all the available means for the liberation of Lithuania and other Communist-enslaved countries; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the U.S. Government, for this purpose work through the United Na-

tions by raising the problem of enslavement of Lithuania and by demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania as well as from other subjugated European countries."

Rev. M. URBONAVICIUS, M.I.C.,
*President, Kenosha Chapter, American Lithuanian Council.*

## A New Farm Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, there is one subject on which almost everybody in and out of Congress is agreed, to wit: We need a new farm program. The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has introduced a bill, S. 306, to reduce Federal controls on agriculture. A clear and thoughtful memorandum on the subject has been sent to me by a prominent California farm executive, Mr. Fred G. Sherrill, of the J. G. Boswell Co. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Sherrill's statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After going over the President's agricultural message of January 29, 1959, Senator Talmadge's bill (S. 306) together with his remarks, and the article, "New Farm Bill," in the Wall Street Journal of February 2, 1959, I have reached the conclusion that no one likes the present farm program. From this it is but a step to the conclusion that a substitute program will in time be worked out and put in effect.

The Wall Street Journal article leads one to feel that such a program may be along the lines of the Talmadge bill. The urgency for something new in this field and the possible nature of it presents us with a most serious challenge. I feel that we must take a hand to influence as far as we can the shaping of this program into a sound course and one under which we can continue to operate and live. I urge your consideration and approval of this action and, in keeping with it, working toward the ideas suggested herein.

Considered from the point of view of cotton alone, there are several things in the Talmadge proposal which I feel should be given further thought and consideration.

A. DOMESTIC PRODUCTION QUOTAS

This seems to follow the farm alone, and I think it should be on the basis of State and from State to county and from county to farm, with a sufficient flexibility so that what is not used on one farm may be available for another within the same county or back within the same State and then from State to State. For a domestic production quota to be effective on a sound basis, there must be a domestic market for each farmer's share of the domestic production quota. The origin of present loan stocks, or possibly the qualities therein, make quite plausible the thought that there is a large amount of cotton being grown in the United States which no one will buy at current support levels, at least, and may not, in fact, be willing to buy at all. Should this be the case, some farmers might be called on to supply for the domestic market a quantity greater than their quotas. Inasmuch as no compensatory payment would be available on such overplus, if any, would we not automatically be tending toward a two-price system in the domestic market? It occurs to me that this could be overcome by continuing the acreage allotment program for a few seasons and making a diminished compensatory payment available on presentation of receipts of sales on any and all cotton. Doing away with the domestic production quota would have other advantages, not the least of which would be savings in administrative expenses. To determine each farmer's share of the domestic consumption and process the papers thereon would, I think, force an enormous increase in the administrative staff of the Department and in the various county agent offices throughout the country.

B. COMPENSATORY PAYMENT TO BE THE AMOUNT BY WHICH PARITY PRICE EXCEEDS MARKET PRICE

To pay this full difference would, I am sure, tend to destroy the farmer's incentive to get the most he could when making a sale. It seems to me if the Department is going to pay this full difference, the farmer would concern himself little as to the sale's price—so little, in fact, almost to the point of giving his cotton away. This difficulty could be overcome in part, at least, by using the average spot market prices for like qualities on the day of sale. A further incentive, I believe, would be to pay only a part of the difference. Under such circumstances, the farmer's revitalized zeal to do his best for himself would come clearer to giving him a 100-percent return on his own efforts and to that extent would lighten the load on the taxpayer.

C. NO PAYMENT IN EXCESS OF $25,000 TO ANY PRODUCER

Somehow, I consider this part of the proposal as a recognition of the two aspects of the problem—sociological, on the one hand, economic on the other. Of course, I could hardly be expected to do other than try to justify large-scale farming if for no other reason than as a livelihood for myself.

Even in a broader field, I think it can be justified as a matter of necessity for the livelihood of the country. Secretary Benson, I am sure uninfluenced by me, has stated recently that less than half the farms of the country produce 90 percent of the salable farm produce. Stated another way, possibly more graphically, maybe even tragically, more than half of the farms of the country produce only 10 percent of the salable food and fiber. I think this raises a very grave question: How safe is it through this means or otherwise to discourage the operations which really feed and clothe us? Certainly, the more than half of the farms against which the limits would not apply are not going to provide food and clothing for this Nation, to say nothing of the rest of the world dependent upon us.

This is a dangerous doctrine and cannot be characterized as anything else. As a matter of fact, we already have handicaps on size imposed and accepted in the income tax laws. Under this proposal a large farm will be further handicapped in the market place, if for not other reason than that its dollar limit may be reached before its domestic production quota has been sold, whereupon such an operator will be competing in the domestic market against cotton produced by farmers who may be utterly uninterested in sales price. Under such a situation it hardly seems equitable to the producer and to the consumer to have an operator whose necessity cannot be gainsaid handicapped just because he is large and for no other reason.

These circumstances add further to the necessity of stimulating every producer's interest in price through some such proposal as "B" above and through some arrangement whereby the compensatory payment would apply to all cotton, as suggested in "A" above or through a combination of the two.

In this respect I would suggest the adjustment or compensatory payment be on the historical production in pounds from the allotted acres, provided the cotton is sold, payment to be limited to 80 percent of the difference between sales price and parity, but not in excess of 6 cents a pound. This would give us a single competitive price at home and abroad. I would anticipate that this would increase quickly the consumption of American cotton and to the extent that it did, I would suggest that the acreage allotment might be increased to cover one-quarter of the increased consumption and CCC stocks used to cover three-quarters of the increased consumption. Should the point be reached when CCC stocks are inadequate, allotments would be increased accordingly and, to that extent, the percentage payment and the limit in cents per pound would be decreased year by year until extinguished entirely.

## The Senior Class From the University High School of Baton Rouge, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was my pleasure on March 10 to have as my guests in the Senate Chamber the senior class from University High School of Baton Rouge, La. Every year the senior class of this fine institution visits our Nation's Capitol as part of their general educational program.

I am particularly glad to see this group because University High School is my alma mater, and my two daughters are presently students there. The chaperons and my two girls have informed me that the academic standards are even higher now then they were when I was a student. Let me say that I was under the impression that the standards were very high at that time.

This is the largest senior class in the history of this school. University High is part of the Louisiana State University College of Education and these students have the benefit of studying under some of the finest teachers in the State of Louisiana.

It was a real privilege for me to meet with this group.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the 51 students and 5 chaperons from University High School in Baton Rouge.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chaperons: Mr. R. F. Crawford, Mrs. Wiley A. Dial, Mrs. M. E. Kopfler, Mrs. Charles Parker, Mr. G. B. Thomas.

Students: W. D. Atkins, Karen Berg, Jingle Cook, Marilyn Cowart, Robert Crawford, Wiley Dial, Lilliam Dicks, Millard Dixon, Hilary Duchein, Sally Dupree, Judy Fuller, Brenda Frazar, Peggy Godfrey, Conway Gaston, Kay Griffon, Judy Guy, Dolores Hackett,

Eddie Hanchey, Linda Harris, Nancy Harris, Carmelite Hebert, Ann Hickman, Dian Hitt, Laura Holloway, John Hoppe, Arthur Keller, Albert Kirby, Mike Kopfler, Frances McGuffey, Anne Menville, Terry Miller, Mary Ellen Monroe, Tonsie Moreau, Lynda Moss, Lee Nettles, Cary Frank Owen, Charlotte Parham, Peggy Perkins, Jerry Perrine, Clint Pierson, Jim Pisa, Robert Russell, Malcolm Shuman, Margaret Stamples, Sarah Tessier, John Thomas, Linda Vennard, Tommy Watts, Jayne Whitley, Horace Wilkinson, Jack Shortess.

## Marion H. Hedges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in January, Mr. Marion H. Hedges, who was known to many of us in Congress as an outstanding spokesman for labor, passed away at his home in Takoma Park, Md. Mr. Hedges was best known as the father of the Tennessee Valley Authority's contract with organized labor—the first contract ever negotiated between a Federal agency and labor unions. The contract has brought about not only harmonious, but extremely cooperative relationships, between the agency and its workers.

Mr. Hedges' passing is also mourned in the field of journalism. He was a founder of the professional journalism fraternity, Sigma Delta Chi. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the SDX News for March 1959, and an editorial published in the Quill for March 1959, relating to Mr. Hedges.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the SDX News, March 1959]

FOUNDER MARION HEDGES AND PAST PRESIDENT BOB TARR DIE

Sigma Delta Chi lost a true friend and willing worker as Past National President Robert B. Tarr died in his sleep November 15 while attending an Associated Press managing editors convention at French Lick, Ind.

Journalism was an early love for Bob Tarr and he joined the staff of the Greensburg Review while attending high school near his birthplace in Tarrs Station, Pa. The Michican Daily carried his byline while he worked toward his degree in journalism from the University of Michigan. Following his graduation in 1924, he served with the Burroughs Corp. and the Detroit News before joining the Pontiac Press as a reporter in 1925. Here he rose to suburban editor and then city editor before being named managing editor in 1951.

The silver-haired, soft-spoken newsman truly typified the ideals of SDX and was a source of constant aid and inspiration to scores of young reporters.

Prior to serving as national SDX president in 1929, Mr. Tarr was a member of the executive council and SDX secretary. He also served as president of the Detroit Professional Chapter and was believed to have attended more national conventions than any other member.

He was a member of the National Press Club, a past president of both the Pontiac Lions Club and the Oakland County Torch Club, and a member of the first city editor's seminar of the American Press Institute at Columbia University in 1947.

The 57-year-old newsman is survived by his wife, Florence; and two sons, David, a journalism senior at the University of Michigan, and James L., of Champaign, Ill.

Marion H. Hedges, retired labor consultant and a founder of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism fraternity, died January 6 of a heart attack in Takoma Park, Md. He was 70 years old.

Before his retirement in 1954, Mr. Hedges had served as labor adviser to various Government agencies and as research director of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Mr. Hedges was professor of English at Beloit College from 1913 to 1920 and a reporter for the old Minneapolis Star from 1920 to 1924. He participated in the founding of Sigma Delta Chi in 1909 while a student at DePauw University.

Mr. Hedges, who graduated from DePauw in 1910 and later received a master's degree from Harvard, began his association with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in 1924.

He had served as secretary of the council on industrial relations for the electrical construction industry and also of its national joint committee on apprenticeship standards.

Formerly a special consultant on labor relations to the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. Hedges was a U.S. delegate to several international labor conferences in Geneva and a technical adviser to the World Textile Conference held in Washington in 1937.

In World War I Mr. Hedges was a member of the Planning Committee of the War Production Board. He had been a consultant to the Federal Social Security Board, chairman of the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship for the Construction Industry, and vice chairman and a founder of the National Economic and Social Planning Association.

Mr. Hedges was the author of several books, including "Iron City," "Dan Minturn," and "A Strikeless Industry."

Honorary pallbearers for Sigma Delta Chi were Luther Huston, Sol Taishoff, Herbert Little, Edward L. Keenan, John Herling, and G. Douglas Stengel.

[From the Quill, March 1959]

MARION H. HEDGES

With the death in January of Marion Hawthorne Hedges, only five of the founders of Sigma Delta Chi remain to help celebrate the fraternity's golden anniversary. There have been many tributes to Mr. Hedges' long and dedicated service to the ideals of Sigma Delta Chi. The following excerpts from the labor column of John Herling, of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, express the respect and affection he held in his profession:

"Marion Hawthorne Hedges lived the life of a triumphant egghead. He died last week at 70, a man of vast talent and intense dedication to social justice who gave a good part of his creative life to the labor movement.

"As a writing craftsman, he helped organize the Sigma Delta Chi fraternity to remind newspapermen that their calling demanded the faithful marriage of the search for truth and the exercise of skill. He aimed to raise the standards of labor-management relations in labor, business, and the public press.

"In recent years Mr. Hedges devoted considerable time to international labor relations. He was a U.S. labor adviser to the International Labor Organization, the ECA, and other predecessor agencies of the International Cooperation Administration. Since his retirement, he had been busily engaged in mulling over the lessons of his career. If his work is in any shape to be published, perhaps his NPA associates might take the initiative. A quarter of a century ago, Mr. Hedges was already known as the author of two novels, 'Iron City' and 'Dan Minturn.'"

## Labor-Management Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials dealing with pending labor-management reform legislation.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, Jan. 26, 1959]

THE LABOR BILL

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY is losing no time in offering Congress his bill to prevent labor racketeering of the kind that has been revealed in abundance in the Senate investigations. This is, with a few modifications, the same bill that Senators KENNEDY and IVES introduced at the end of the last session of Congress, which was passed by a practically unanimous vote of the Senate, but then died in the House. Senator KENNEDY, as a member of the investigating committee, is in a good position to know the conditions he is trying to regulate in the proposed legislation.

He is quite frank about it. He says the bill, if enacted, will virtually put Mr. Hoffa and his associates out of business. Few who have followed the proceedings of the committee even partially would regret the removal of the arrogant and self-assured Mr. Hoffa from the management of the Teamsters Union. But it is more than Mr. Hoffa that is at stake. The very integrity of American labor is threatened by the machinations of a few powerful men who assure themselves of the support of the union by posing as martyrs persecuted by the law. The present bill undertakes to correct that misrepresentation and the conditions that make it possible to restore to labor the control of its own business.

As to some of the particulars, the provisions of the bill are directed against false financial reports, the misuse of union funds, the rigging of elections to keep the officers in power, against shakedown picketing, and the solicitation or payment of extortionate fees for unloading cargo from interstate carriers. The bill will also make it impossible for union management to employ or sanction the employment of former convicts in responsible positions, a practice which has shed ill repute on some of our most powerful unions, such as the Teamsters and the Longshoremen. It is utterly unjustiable and inconsistent with honest leadership.

Whom the gods will destroy they first make mad. Mr. Hoffa has not only resisted the measure intended to bring his feet back on the paths of right and justice, he has reached out to incorporate in his unregenerated domain other vast segments of the Nation's honest working force. It is about time that he is spoken to by a superior and authoritative voice.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 31, 1959]

PANEL ON TAFT-HARTLEY

The Kennedy labor bill and the one to be introduced on behalf of the administration are both weighted heavily toward protecting union welfare funds and eliminating racketeers and racketeering. Both measures include, however, some revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. Which means that both lap over into the more delicate balances of labor-management relations.

It is said that Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY added these few items in his bill to win organized labor's support for some of its less palatable provisions. It can be reasonably deduced that the administration also broadened the scope of its bill to appeal to organized industry. Both additions have been made in apparent disregard of the existence of an extragovernmental, nonpartisan panel named to study and evaluate Taft-Hartley in the light of its 12 years of operation.

Who are these men? All have legal backgrounds. Five have been chosen to represent the public, and two each labor and management. A number have had especial experience in labor-management relations. For instance: David L. Cole, former director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service; Archibald Cox, former chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board; W. Willard Wirtz, twice head of other wage stabilization boards; Russell Smith, member of atomic energy labor-management panel; Guy Farmer and Gerard Reilly, both former members of the National Labor Relations Board; Arthur J. Goldberg, special counsel of the AFL–CIO; and Louis Sherman, general counsel of the Electrical Workers.

Unhappily, though perhaps inescapably, these labor bills promise to be drawn deep into partisan controversy. The report of such an experienced panel—expected by spring—should help the public see through the dust clouds. And perhaps Congress will pay some heed.

---

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Jan. 21, 1959]

LET'S HAVE ACTION ON RACKETEERING

Senator JOHN KENNEDY has another labor-management reform bill promptly ready for this session of Congress. The Nation earnestly hopes that strong and effective action will be forthcoming in this field.

"This is primarily a labor-management reform bill, dealing with problems of dishonest racketeering," Senator KENNEDY says. "It is not a bill on industrial relations, dealing with the problems of collective bargaining and economic power."

He urges that the issue on reform not be confused by efforts on the part of Senators to attach to his measure proposals for changing the Taft-Hartley law.

Last year the Senate passed, 88 to 1, a bill similar to the new legislation Senator KENNEDY is proposing. KENNEDY and former Senator Irvin Ives of New York sponsored the measure. The legislation died in the House.

Senator KENNEDY says his new bill is aimed specifically at practices of such figures as Teamster President James R. Hoffa. It would provide for setting up an election democracy code for all unions, public financial accounting by unions, criminal penalties for mishandling union funds or books and changes in Taft-Hartley sections, objected to by both labor and management.

A prompt start should be vigorously pushed to get results in this field. The Nation as a whole, the vast majority both in unions and in management, we are confident, strongly call for adequate measures against evils that deeply assail the public interest and the best interest of employers and employees.

Legislative proposals in this field also are expected from the administration and Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, chairman of the Rackets Committee.

Let's not fail to get thorough and effective action this time.

---

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Jan. 23, 1959]

GOLDWATER DISSATISFIED—LET'S NOT SEE ANOTHER LABOR REFORM FIASCO

It is a well-known fact of legislative life that bills usually are greatly changed between the time of their introduction and final passage.

Sometimes, only the original title remains. Extensive alterations most often occur in committee, although amendments sometimes are adopted on the floor. In Congress, this happens more often in the Senate than in the House.

Thus, anything can happen to the labor reform bill which Senator KENNEDY introduced this week.

The criticisms immediately leveled at it by Senator GOLDWATER forecast a legislative battle which may center more around strategy than substance.

The Arizona Senator pooh-poohed the Kennedy proposal and asked for something a lot tougher.

Certain of the proposals made by GOLDWATER—especially a tightening of the Taft-Hartley boycott restrictions—certainly are desirable.

But it would be a great mistake, in our opinion, to insist on wrapping up all the 1959 labor legislation in one package and to say: "All or nothing."

The net result probably would be nothing as was the case last year when those who wanted a tougher law succeeded in defeating the Kennedy-Ives bill in the House. It had been passed 88–1 in the Senate.

As a result, there have been months of unnecessary delay in imposing curbs on labor racketeers of the type of Jimmy Hoffa.

KENNEDY's new bill is much like last year's. Perhaps it should be made stronger and more comprehensive. If such is the will of Congress, this can be done in the legislative process.

The aim, of course, is to correct the glaring exploitation of union members and the public which has been revealed by the McClellan Committee. Most responsible union leaders agree on the need for such legislation.

Whether called the Kennedy bill or something else, a law to stamp out labor racketeering would be assured of overwhelming support in both Houses.

Some of the proposed revisions of the Taft-Hartley law, as desired by GOLDWATER and others, are much more controversial. Frankly, their chances of passage are not as good.

It would be a disservice to the public, we believe, to repeat last year's fiasco when the Kennedy-Ives bill was defeated because certain people wanted something more.

Let each phase of labor legislation stand on its own feet.

---

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, Jan. 24, 1959]

TRY, TRY AGAIN

There is a new labor-management reform bill in the legislative mill at Washington, D.C.—the Kennedy-Ervin bill. It appears to be a clearer and stronger version of the Kennedy-Ives bill, which unfortunately died a year ago after passing the Senate 88–1.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, was the author, in cooperation with former Senator Irving Ives, Republican, of New York, of the bill which received such solid Senate support last year. Unfortunately, despite the overwhelming backing of the upper House of Congress, the measure was the subject of what might well be considered fantastic distortion by extremists on both sides. Despite its excellent start, it died on the vine under the barrage of propaganda.

In presenting the new measure to the Senate on January 20, Senator KENNEDY called it a bipartisan measure on a nonpartisan subject. A reading of the measure seems to support that thesis.

What the gentleman from Massachusetts hopes to accomplish by this legislation is to protect workers, employers, honest unions, and the general public from the unscrupulous or dictatorial tactics of the labor racketeers.

Senator KENNEDY makes an excellent point when he cites the fact that this new measure is "primarily a labor-management reform bill, dealing with the problems of dishonest labor racketeering—it is not a bill on industrial relations, dealing with the problems of collective bargaining and economic power."

There can hardly be any question that these are two different fields—and certainly no question that something must be done to eliminate labor racketeering for the general economic welfare of the country.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill contains 19 specifically and carefully outlined key provisions, which should provide the basic weapons against labor racketeering of the kind typified by some of the operations of the Teamsters Union.

Without going into detail, it is readily apparent that the new legislation is strong legislation which is sadly needed. It will, we are sure, be subject to all sorts of emotional arguments, political perils, and outside pressures. Senator KENNEDY seems convinced, however, that the measure, without any great alterations, can and will be passed this session. We hope he is not overly optimistic, and we especially hope that Connecticut's Senators and Representatives will get behind the gentleman from the Bay State.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 27, 1959]

OPENING THE LABOR BATTLE

A legislative battle that probably will be fought on many fronts and through much of the present session of Congress has been touched off by introduction of a new labor-management reform bill by Senator KENNEDY, Massachusetts Democrat. The measure is dsignated by its author as a successor to the Kennedy-Ives bill that was passed, 88 to 1, by the Senate last year, but was rejected by the House.

In brief, the new bill would require disclosure of union financial data and conflict-of-interest transactions involving union officials, prohibit loans by employers or unions to union officers, require secret ballot elections at specified intervals and with provisions for rank-and-file nominations, and provide criminal penalties for a wide range of violations. It drops from last year's version a provision for non-Communist oaths by both union officers and employers, and modifies an employer-opposed section covering company communications—newsletters and educational programs, for example—with employees. Many of the provisions coincide with recommendations of the McClellan rackets committee, and Mr. KENNEDY has contended that enactment of his measure would virtually put Mr. Hoffa (Teamster president) and his associates out of business.

Mr. KENNEDY has attempted in several ways to anticipate criticism of his legislation. He has appealed, first of all, for passage of this measure as only a first step—directed at dishonest racketeering, not at such controversial issues as boycotts, blackmail picketing and right-to-work laws which become involved in amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act. All of these, he says, "should definitely be considered by the Congress this year"—but in separate legislation. It is this separation, however, which may amount to a boobytrap in the Kennedy bill—with the administration expected to press for a more inclusive package measure. In addition, there have been indications that Chairman MCCLELLAN, who supported the Kennedy-Ives version last year, may introduce a stronger antiracketeering bill of his own this winter.

There may indeed be honest differences of opinion about the most effective strategy in improving labor-management legislation. Mr. KENNEDY has made his own opinion

clear and has offered a starting point, at least. The administration should send its own proposals along as soon as possible. Others should do likewise and let the labor committees get down to the essential business of hearings and drafting something for action. There can be little difference of opinion about the need for action.

---

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Jan. 23, 1959]

HOFFA FIRST TARGET, THEN FIELD IS OPEN

First things first is the motto of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY in reintroducing last year's labor reform bill which is chiefly designed to get rid of Teamster boss James R. Hoffa.

This is the same measure that passed the Senate last year, only to bog down in the House in the face of charges that it was a device to avoid passing adequate labor-reform legislation. Republicans and Southern Democrats who set up this roadblock are now told that they will have a chance later on to deal with the added reforms. Hoffaism is only the starting place.

The beauty about this new legislation is that it not only would virtually put Mr. Hoffa and his associates out of business, as Mr. KENNEDY reminds, but would do the same to any others who trod the same path.

On this occasion the issue is not one of industrial relations, but an attack on the outstanding evils as revealed before the McClellan committee—evils dealing with abuse of union finances, destruction of the secret ballot among members, and relief from worker domination by ex-convicts and thugs. Criminal penalties would be set up for stealing union funds, making false reports, keeping crooked books, or destroying records.

By concentrating his initial effort on these ends, Mr. KENNEDY has simplified the situation and at the same time made it difficult for others to complain that the measure does not go far enough.

---

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Jan. 21, 1959]

BETWEEN THE EXTREMES

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY has introduced a labor reform bill which he says would virtually put Teamster President James R. Hoffa out of business.

The fair-haired lad from Massachusetts thus jumped the gun on the administration, which is expected to offer a somewhat stiffer proposal in the near future.

The Kennedy bill sets up safeguards for union funds, requires democratic procedures in union affairs and bars convicted criminals from holding union office.

The measure probably will have the blessing of the great majority of organized labor, which for some time has supported remedial legislation to rid itself of the stigma imposed by Hoffa-type operations.

Last year a down-the-middle labor reform bill succumbed to a weird combination of administration backtracking and pressure from business interests and some labor groups.

The prospect for labor legislation is pretty good this year. For one thing, some of the emotional issues which had clouded the scene, such as the right-to-work controversy, have simmered down.

The country doesn't need punitive labor legislation. Neither is there any call for a do-nothing bill. The Kennedy proposal may be the basis for action between these extremes.

---

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Jan. 18, 1959]

CONGRESS TURNS TO EXPERTS

The Senate Labor Committee is undertaking a promising new approach to revision of the Taft-Hartley labor law. It will create a commission of nine experts outside of government to recommend alterations in the law which has not been altered, despite repeated efforts, since it was passed in 1947.

A panel of nine lawyers—five representing the public and four divided between labor and management representatives—should be able to take a more objective look at Taft-Hartley than Congress or labor-management partisans have been able to do. That is the hope of Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, who sponsored this new approach. In the last session, Senator KENNEDY introduced Taft-Hartley amendments which the Senate accepted but the House rejected.

That is the closest anyone, including the late Senator Taft himself, has come to changing Taft-Hartley, but it was not close enough. The Kennedy-Ives bill was grounded in a partisan dispute.

To avoid politics, and to avoid the usual fixed and opposed positions of labor and industry lobbies, Congress needs expert and outside advice. The new commission will be asked to report by spring. If it does, and can agree, this session could become the first to improve the Nation's basic labor code.

---

## Forest Service's Fine California Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Report of Work and Progress," which appeared in the Bakersfield Californian on Monday, February 23, 1959.

This editorial is very complimentary to the U.S. Forest Service and to its regional forester, Mr. C. A. Connaughton. This type of public relations to the service of the Federal agency is a welcomed relief from the usual complaints about Federal agencies which come to a Senator's office. As a civil servant, Mr. Connaughton is to be commended for his capable administration of the Forest Service in California. He has shown outstanding leadership.

In addition, I should like to call to the Senate's attention that Mr. Walter Kane, publisher of the Bakersfield Californian, has pursued a progressive and laudatory policy regarding the conservation of the State's resources. He has been alert and vigilant in the protection of the resources needed for the future growth of the State and the Nation. The force of his editorial opinion has helped bring about better understanding of the need for true conservation of the State's natural resources.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF WORK AND PROGRESS

Comprising practically all of the natural resource areas of California and most of the recreation lands, region 5 of the U.S. Forest Service is an organization that is important in the conservation and development of our resources, the preservation and development of the increasingly needed recreation areas and the progress of our entire State economy. A report on its year's work is a document of vast interest to those who are aware of the part played by the Forest Service in the life of Californians, a part that is not generally recognized.

Regional Forester Charles A. Connaughton, who heads this division of the U.S. Forest Service is a man of keen perception, wide experience in forest management and exceptionally aware of the problems of California. His leadership has resulted in a definite increase in the accomplishments of the Service in California; his influence is felt in all areas of the Forest Service units in the State.

In his annual report for 1958, just submitted, Mr. Connaughton notes several achievements of particular interest that indicates the tremendous strides being made by the Service in its work on behalf of the people of the West. Good progress is being made on Operation Outdoors, a comprehensive program of the development of more recreation sites and facilities on the national forests and the rehabilitation of those suffering from overuse. An indication of the use given California national forests may be found in the fact that exclusive of campers and weekend outdoor recreation seekers, the forests were hosts to more than 770,000 hunters and 1,860,000 fishermen during 1958. The number increases each year.

Mr. Connaughton notes that a complete inventory and study of the recreational resources of the national forests were begun in 1958 and the information will be used to integrate properly the development of land for recreation use with the development and use of other forest resources in the multiple use program.

This study will prove of benefit to the new State project calling for a wide study of outdoor recreation resources. Significant progress has been made in both new construction and rehabilitation of recreation sites in spite of vastly increased use and a heavier burden of maintenance, cleanup, and caretaker services.

An improvement in timber stand and cutting operations is reported by Regional Forester Connaughton, who notes that timber stand improvement work was done on 50,000 acres in timber sale areas which betters the rate of growth and quality of lumber being grown. Timber management plans for eight areas involving more than 1 million acres have been prepared. The timber cut for the fiscal year was 946,067,000 board feet valued at $11,811,879.

Range management came in for considerable attention also with new range analysis plans being completed in many areas and improving the operation of allotment capacities and other phases of the work. More range improvement, reseeding and other methods to increase livestock use have been undertaken successfully.

Wildlife management, important in connection with the heavy use of the national forests in California by hunters and fishermen, made good progress during the year with excellent cooperation reported by Regional Forester Connaughton from the State department of fish and game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Many awards for superior service were won by Forest Service personnel during 1958, which indicates an exceptionally high degree of morale in the ranks of region 5. Improvement in efficiency and economy of operation result from this development.

Good progress is reported in cooperation with State and private forestry during the year, and improved fire control, pest control and other work has been noted, with the utilization of new methods and equipment.

Altogether the report indicates that region 5 of the Forest Service, the California region, is alert and active in fulfilling its assignments and developing new ways to serve the public better.

## H.R. 4001, Townsend Plan Amendments to the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I have wholeheartedly joined with Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, in sponsoring legislation embodying the Townsend plan. My bill, H.R. 4001, is identical with H.R. 4000, introduced by Representative BLATNIK. It has been my pleasure to sponsor this legislation in past Congresses.

My reason for promoting this legislation is that, in my view, it is conservative legislation. It is conservative, in the first place, because it involves the smallest possible cost of administration while it expends the greatest possible proportion of the revenue it raises for the purposes of paying social security benefits to the American people. This principle of the Townsend plan—holding to a minimum the part of the money the Government spends and uses, while expending the maximum amount on the purposes of the legislation itself—is of the essence of conservatism.

It embodies the philosophy of government expressed by our great President when he said:

> In all those things which deal with the people be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy, or their form of government, be conservative.

In the second place, this legislation will amend title II of the Social Security Act so that the program under that title will be on a solid and reliably pay-as-you-go financial basis. Pay-as-you-go governmental operation lies at the very roots of conservatism. It is absolutely essential to balanced budgets. The Townsend plan amendments to title II will permanently balance the budget to the extent of the part of the budget concerned with the greatest part of our national social security system.

Furthermore, the amendments to title II proposed in this legislation will contribute tremendously to balancing the budgets of our State and local governments. It recognizes that the problem of old-age retirement, disability insurance, and the protection of widows having the care of minor children—the great areas to which title II is addressed—is an out-and-out national problem. My bill is calculated effectively to solve the problem of these needs without the aid of State programs, such as the present program under title II requires to supplement its inadequate benefits. These State programs, under the public-assistance titles of our Social Security Act, dealing with what is properly a national problem, result in ridiculous disparities, discriminations, and injustices. The result of my legislation will be to end this impractical situation, relieving State and local governments of the financial burden of carrying such misplaced and unworkable programs, thereby offsetting greatly improved opportunities to balance their respective budgets.

In respect to these foregoing points, the present system under title II—namely, old-age and survivors and disability insurance—with its collection of generally far more money from the current economy than benefits currently require—and the use by Government for purposes other than social security benefits much of the money collected in the name of that purpose—this present program violates every principle of sound governmental finance and of just apportionment of the taxload.

The Townsend program for social security provides for the perpetual gearing of benefits to changes in the cost of living and in prevailing standards of living. When changes in either standards or costs occur, this program provides for automatic matching of benefits to such changes, up or down, as the case may be. This feature of the program I hold to be preeminently conservative, because it results from careful analysis of the real problem of social security and the evolving of provisions permanently and effectively to meet it—rather than purely expedient makeshifts, patchwork, temporary provisions which are out of date almost before they can be put into effect.

Mr. Speaker, as coauthor of the Townsend bill, I do not contend that it can never be improved upon. However, I am certainly sure that the Committee on Ways and Means, upon full and objective study of it, will find that it affords them the ways and means for giving the American people and our national economy an incomparably more efficient, effective and beneficial system under title II of the Social Security Act than is afforded by the present program. I am equally certain that, after thorough committee studies and hearing and after full and conscientious debate in the House, it will become obvious to all that these amendments to title II will provide not only benefits affording our aged and other proper groups of people benefits reflecting up to date, just standards of living—but, also, an effective, permanent and, in the true sense, a conservative solution of our national social security problem.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD, with this statement, two statistical compilations of great significance. The first shows the rank discriminations, disparities and almost unbelievable violation of anything remotely resembling standards which the present programs of public assistance—supplementing title II—display. The second item sets forth the facts as to the utter failure of our efforts to date to make any progress towards solution of the social security problem under the means afforded by the present system of old age, survivors, and disability insurance:

*Comparative statistics—Old-age and survivors insurance, old-age assistance, for the United States, by States and Territories; and per capita income by States, 1957*

| Area | 1957 per capita income | OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957 | | OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Average benefit | Number per thousand 65 years and over | Primary benefit | Wife and husband | Widow and widower | Parents | Number per thousand 65 years and over |
| United States | $2,027 | $60.68 | 165 | $64.58 | $34.37 | $51.08 | $51.87 | 550 |
| Alaska | ------- | 63.43 | 260 | 63.79 | 30.07 | 48.97 | 70.00 | 469 |
| Alabama | 1,324 | 38.23 | 436 | 55.34 | 27.28 | 44.60 | 47.21 | 434 |
| Arizona | 1,750 | 55.38 | 198 | 64.60 | 34.17 | 50.68 | 49.76 | 503 |
| Arkansas | 1,151 | 45.72 | 306 | 52.84 | 26.03 | 42.86 | 47.99 | 434 |
| California | 2,523 | 83.16 | 227 | 65.07 | 35.48 | 51.48 | 53.60 | 572 |
| Colorado | 1,996 | 81.74 | 340 | 63.08 | 33.62 | 50.25 | 48.18 | 483 |
| Connecticut | 2,821 | 106.20 | 71 | 71.78 | 39.09 | 54.44 | 54.79 | 657 |
| Delaware | 2,740 | 49.31 | 52 | 65.11 | 36.69 | 52.37 | 52.86 | 632 |
| District of Columbia | 2,514 | 56.41 | 46 | 62.50 | 35.12 | 49.96 | 50.00 | 433 |
| Florida | 1,836 | 54.19 | 161 | 66.27 | 35.40 | 50.70 | 49.50 | 596 |
| Georgia | 1,431 | 43.06 | 369 | 55.00 | 28.40 | 44.84 | 46.27 | 402 |
| Hawaii | $1,821 | $51.56 | 54 | $61.17 | $30.84 | $46.08 | $53.45 | 519 |
| Idaho | 1,630 | 60.55 | 143 | 61.51 | 32.59 | 46.76 | 51.35 | 544 |
| Illinois | 2,447 | 67.82 | 92 | 68.17 | 36.86 | 52.95 | 55.60 | 554 |
| Indiana | 2,010 | 56.94 | 76 | 65.00 | 35.08 | 50.88 | 54.02 | 611 |
| Iowa | 1,806 | 67.36 | 121 | 62.13 | 33.65 | 48.82 | 52.86 | 509 |
| Kansas | 1,787 | 73.04 | 141 | 60.67 | 32.31 | 47.89 | 50.21 | 518 |
| Kentucky | 1,372 | 38.63 | 216 | 57.27 | 28.42 | 47.16 | 50.07 | 494 |
| Louisiana | 1,566 | 63.06 | 586 | 57.25 | 29.34 | 46.02 | 47.65 | 374 |
| Maine | 1,663 | 55.79 | 123 | 60.16 | 32.73 | 48.39 | 50.25 | 630 |
| Maryland | 2,156 | 51.75 | 49 | 63.18 | 35.27 | 51.32 | 49.46 | 549 |
| Massachusetts | 2,335 | 95.83 | 163 | 67.86 | 37.62 | 52.80 | 53.73 | 627 |
| Michigan | 2,141 | 66.23 | 117 | 71.08 | 37.84 | 54.15 | 57.00 | 618 |
| Minnesota | 1,850 | 79.10 | 149 | 63.17 | 33.97 | 51.18 | 52.92 | 522 |

*Comparative statistics—Old-age and survivors insurance, old-age assistance, for the United States, by States and Territories; and per capita income by States, 1957*—Continued

| Area | 1957 per capita income | OAA average monthly benefits, December 1957 | | OASI average monthly benefits to aged beneficiaries, December 1957 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Average benefit | Number per thousand 65 years and over | Primary benefit | Wife and husband | Widow and widower | Parents | Number per thousand 65 years and over |
| Mississippi | $958 | $28.43 | 464 | $49.67 | $24.06 | $42.27 | $47.52 | 408 |
| Missouri | 1,940 | 54.53 | 272 | 62.46 | 33.17 | 50.28 | 51.42 | 519 |
| Montana | 1,896 | 61.99 | 128 | 64.62 | 35.20 | 50.36 | 50.00 | 515 |
| Nebraska | 1,818 | 62.18 | 110 | 61.15 | 32.77 | 47.83 | 49.58 | 507 |
| Nevada | 2,423 | 67.72 | 196 | 64.89 | 34.63 | 51.64 | 50.00 | 600 |
| New Hampshire | 1,862 | 68.57 | 86 | 63.12 | 34.61 | 49.95 | 51.56 | 644 |
| New Jersey | 2,504 | 80.43 | 40 | 70.64 | 38.97 | 54.22 | 57.47 | 657 |
| New Mexico | 1,686 | 53.83 | 211 | 58.38 | 29.41 | 46.56 | 49.63 | 392 |
| New York | 2,578 | 92.08 | 61 | 67.72 | 37.38 | 52.80 | 55.35 | 618 |
| North Carolina | 1,317 | 36.44 | 180 | 55.20 | 27.44 | 44.77 | 47.21 | 467 |
| North Dakota | 1,435 | 76.33 | 140 | 61.74 | 32.79 | 47.29 | 48.33 | 447 |
| Ohio | 2,255 | 64.54 | 112 | 68.31 | 37.18 | 53.17 | 54.18 | 574 |
| Oklahoma | 1,619 | 72.79 | 407 | 58.88 | 30.39 | 47.01 | 50.00 | 405 |
| Oregon | 1,914 | 77.77 | 109 | 64.74 | 34.30 | 50.44 | 54.15 | 648 |
| Pennsylvania | 2,112 | 52.00 | 48 | 68.17 | 37.03 | 52.20 | 53.70 | 606 |
| Puerto Rico | ------ | $8.09 | 300 | $41.98 | $17.96 | $39.40 | $43.51 | 320 |
| Rhode Island | $1,990 | 70.61 | 91 | 66.61 | 36.49 | 51.76 | 54.55 | 606 |
| South Carolina | 1,180 | 37.52 | 247 | 55.42 | 27.59 | 44.72 | 46.71 | 497 |
| South Dakota | 1,531 | 49.18 | 144 | 61.16 | 32.79 | 47.62 | 51.61 | 496 |
| Tennessee | 1,383 | 38.03 | 210 | 53.95 | 26.81 | 44.84 | 48.34 | 457 |
| Texas | 1,791 | 47.15 | 337 | 58.09 | 29.88 | 46.93 | 43.36 | 425 |
| Utah | 1,604 | 65.45 | 164 | 65.65 | 35.04 | 50.59 | 52.58 | 541 |
| Vermont | 1,665 | 50.64 | 150 | 60.76 | 32.82 | 48.54 | 54.17 | 571 |
| Virgin Islands | ------ | 18.51 | 318 | 46.72 | 24.32 | 40.00 | ------ | 206 |
| Virginia | 1,660 | 35.66 | 62 | 57.69 | 29.57 | 47.32 | 48.41 | 514 |
| Washington | 2,128 | 84.46 | 219 | 65.86 | 35.07 | 50.47 | 50.79 | 569 |
| West Virginia | 1,554 | 34.05 | 133 | 62.42 | 31.32 | 48.24 | 50.15 | 560 |
| Wisconsin | 1,920 | 71.09 | 103 | 64.89 | 34.78 | 54.23 | 52.76 | 585 |
| Wyoming | 2,038 | 69.93 | 155 | 62.82 | 32.96 | 49.50 | 59.09 | 503 |

Sources: Survey of Current Business, Department of Commerce, August 1958 table 2. Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, tables 12 and 15; July 1958, tables 6 and 8.

*Population increase in adult age groups, United States, 1847 through 1957, income position of aged, 1847 through 1957*

Increases in numbers of persons:

A. Aged 14 and over:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1947: | |
| Men | 52,459,000 |
| Women | 54,953,000 |
| Total | 107,412,000 |
| 1957: | |
| Men | 57,583,000 |
| Women | 62,219,000 |
| Total | 119,802,000 |
| Increase (11.5 percent) | 12,390,000 |

B. Aged 14 through 64:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1947: | |
| Men | 47,403,000 |
| Women | 49,368,000 |
| Total | 96,771,000 |
| 1957: | |
| Men | 50,925,000 |
| Women | 54,307,000 |
| Total | 105,232,000 |
| Increase (8.7 percent) | 8,461,000 |

C. Aged 25 through 64:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1947: | |
| Men | 35,578,000 |
| Women | 36,919,000 |
| Total | 72,497,000 |
| 1957: | |
| Men | 39,264,000 |
| Women | 41,558,000 |
| Total | 80,822,000 |
| Increase (11.5 percent) | 8,325,000 |

D. Aged 65 and over:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1947: | |
| Men | 5,056,000 |
| Women | 5,585,000 |
| Total | 10,641,000 |
| 1957: | |
| Men | 6,658,000 |
| Women | 7,912,000 |
| Total | 14,570,000 |
| Increase (36.9 percent) | 3,929,000 |

*Population increase in adult age groups, United States, 1847 through 1957, income position of aged, 1847 through 1957*—Con.

| Share of money income by persons 65 and over: | Percent |
|---|---|
| 1947 | *7 |
| 1952 | *8 |
| 1953 | 7.3 |
| 1954 | 7.7 |
| 1955 | 7.9 |
| 1956 | 7.6 |
| 1957 | 7.4 |

Sources: Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 5, table 15; No. 30, table 18. *Social Security Bulletin, February 1954, article by Jacob Fisher. Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, table 7 and table 11.

Our elderly population is increasing over three times as rapidly as the rest of our adult population. The income-share of the aged group remains static. Since the whole group receives the same total share of income, the economic position of the average member of the group continuously declines.

The part of the income of the aged which is made up of social security benefits increased from 13.9 percent in 1947 to 36.8 percent in 1957. Conversely, the part of their income made up from other resources declined from about 86 percent in 1947 to about 63 percent in 1957.[1] The ability of most Americans to finance their old age through other means than our Federal social security law is shrinking fast and steadily. Our present social security program has failed, not only to better the economic position of our people in old age, but it has even failed to compensate for the constantly shrinking ability of the people otherwise to provide for their old age. These are the facts.

Drastic action on social security legislation must be taken.

[1] Social Security Bulletin, March 1958, tables 7 and 11.

## Antibombing Legislation

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a series of editorials which comment on the antibombing bill, which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and I have introduced.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERVIN'S SPONSORSHIP OF ANTIBOMBING BILL

[From the Durham (N.C.) Herald, Dec. 22, 1958]

North Carolinians should strongly endorse the decision of Senator ERVIN to cosponsor, with Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, an antibombing bill. On the part of Senator ERVIN, it is a demonstration of the kind of leadership the South needs in these troubled times. For the South abroad is all too often regarded as a region of lawlessness and violence, a section where respect for law and human values is lightly held. The conduct and the speech of extremists tend to confirm this unfavorable impression.

For one of the sponsors of a Federal antibombing bill to be a southerner speaks for the inherent and the predominant decency of this section; for him to be representative of the State in which more than 2 dozen reports of bombs planted in schools have been received in recent weeks is evidence that the body of public opinion condemns such irresponsible and reckless conduct.

The bombing of schools and synagogues shows the need of stringent legislation against this form of violence. The numer-

ous reports of bombs in schools reveal how lightly a few regard it, and how they have made a joke of what is in reality most serious. The safety of human lives is involved; that is something about which there ought to be no horseplay.

Governor Hodges has spoken out firmly against this sort of conduct and has promised to use the power of the State to prevent it. North Carolina courts have in the penalties they have imposed on those perpetrating bomb hoaxes shown that they will not wink at this threat to public safety. Senator ERVIN'S role as cosponsor of a Federal antibombing measure fits into the picture. It is one more expression from responsible leadership that bombing and false report of bombing will not be lightly regarded here.

There is another aspect to Senator ERVIN'S decision. It is a move to help bridge the widening gap in the Democratic Party in Congress. Just as his endorsement of the right of every citizen to vote helped him defeat the dangerous feature of the civil rights bill which would have denied jury trial to those accused of violating laws in this field, so his sponsorship of an antibombing bill may contribute to the defeat of bills which will be punitive and vindictive toward the South. Not only, then, is he sponsoring needed legislation; he is playing a conciliatory part in a drama of division.

---

[From the Sayre (Pa.) Times, Dec. 29, 1958]

OTHER EDITOR'S VIEWS: BOMB LAW PLAN

Senators KENNEDY and ERVIN are obviously appropriate as the sponsors of a proposed Federal antibombing bill. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, is one of the northern liberals, though he has not pressed hard in the civil-rights area. ERVIN, a North Carolinian, has southern race views, but is also a former judge and a man of solid responsibility. Both men understand that the present wave of bombings in the wake of the desegregation decisions represents something not previously experienced. Their proposal of Federal legislation is quite natural.

But some careful factual study will be needed before Congress makes up its mind to go along with the proposal. Is a new Federal law in fact needed to enhance the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in this kind of crime? It goes without saying that wide scope for FBI entry into the bombing investigations already exists. Soon after the first incidents were reported, the Justice Department began field meetings between FBI agents and State and city police throughout the country. Well-laid plans for collaboration doubtless emerge from these meetings.

The Kennedy-Ervin proposal is careful to reserve full power to the local agencies in any new intervention of the Federal police. But it is when the term "Federal police" is used that thoughtful Congressmen will prick up their ears. We have gone a long way already toward expanding FBI powers in the country at large. So long as those powers are exerted in Federal matters, the pattern of our dual federalism is intact. It begins to cloud up a little whenever the Federal officers move into matters primarily for the local police.

Obviously mere jurisdictional and theoretical considerations cannot be allowed to slow the drive against the bombers. But Congress will be expected to assure itself that the bombings take on Federal aspects not covered by present statutes before it widens the intervention of the Federal security officers.

BALTIMORE SUN.

---

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, Dec. 17, 1958]

FEDERAL TEETH

The cosponsorship by Senators ERVIN and KENNEDY of a Federal antibombing bill reflects the growing concern of national legislators over the bombings and bombing threats which have struck at homes, schools, and churches in the South and elsewhere. The proposed law would not encroach upon the law enforcement rights of the States, but would assure prompt investigation by the FBI in many actual bombing cases.

The Ervin-Kennedy measure is a modification of a similiar bill introduced by Senator KENNEDY in the last Congress which outlawed bombings of churches, schools, synagogues, and community centers. The new bill broadens the coverage to include the bombing of business establishments. It adds a section making it a Federal offense for one who uses explosives within a State to flee that State for the purpose of avoiding arrest or prosecution. It also provides that local authorities shall not be deprived of any jurisdiction by virtue of this legislation. The measure makes dynamiting a school, church, business, or community building a Federal crime. The dynamite must be brought over State lines. But the bill brings the FBI into such cases by making a presumption that the explosives used in any bombing have been transported in interstate commerce.

This bill, or perhaps one providing even stiffer penalties, should be enacted by the next Congress. In the meanwhile, State legislatures should enact laws providing severe punishment for bombers and the perpetrators of false bomb reports. Merely enacting new laws will not in itself end the bombings and the scares. But some would-be bombers and hoaxers would be impressed by the penalties.

Close local and State cooperation with the FBI in handling these cases undoubtedly would expedite the detection and arrest of many of the bomb criminals. The chief virtue of the Ervin-Kennedy bill is that it would throw the expert investigative resources of the FBI into these cases at the beginning. The value of this has been well demonstrated in the Atlanta bombing case, and in kidnapings and other offenses involving the violation of Federal statutes.

---

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Jan. 16, 1959]

FEDERAL CURBS ARE NEEDED ON BOMBING OUTRAGES

In December, a mistrial was declared in the case of George Allen Bright, one of five men indicated in connection with the bombing of a Jewish temple in Atlanta, Ga. The foreman of the jury reported his colleagues hopelessly deadlocked after 22 hours of deliberation. Reindicated, Bright is scheduled for a retrial due to begin this week.

Whatever the outcome of the case, Congress can anticipate a number of proposals in this session aimed at making the bombing of schools, churches, and synagogues punishable by Federal law. JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING, both Republican Senators from New York, have already introduced a seven-bill package making such crimes a Federal offense and banning hate literature from the mails as well. A similar bill, broader in some respects but confined to bombings, is being introduced by two Democrats, Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts and SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., of North Carolina.

This measure is expected to carry the endorsement of 30 to 40 other Senators. And in the House, EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is sponsoring other bills as he did at the previous session. A key provision in Mr. CELLER'S earlier bill would make it a Federal crime to transport or ship explosives across a State line for terroristic purposes.

This would have justified immediate entry by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in bombing cases by setting up a presumption that the explosives had been carried in interstate transportation. Up to now, the Department of Justice has held that crimes of violence, including bombing of religious buildings, are subject to exclusive State jurisdiction, even if they are a conspiracy and even if the conspiracy is operative in several States.

Nevertheless, the FBI has been active in recent bombing cases, though J. Edgar Hoover, its director, said there had been no Federal law violations in the Atlanta case. Agents and technical experts were sent to the Georgia city at the express orders of President Eisenhower, laboratory facilities were made available, and the FBI cooperated in covering out-of-State leads of interest to Atlanta and Georgia law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Hoover has said that bomb outrages can be materially curbed by an aroused public opinion, a cordinated effort on the part of Federal, State, and local agencies, and stern punishment of the perpetrators. He can be assured of the first. Congress is in a position to do the rest by passing measures that are thorough, comprehensive, and that especially do not niggle over niceties of law enforcement jurisdiction.

---

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, Dec. 30, 1958]

ANTIBOMB LAW SUPPORTED

Strong support is developing among Members of Congress for a Federal law aimed at giving the Federal Bureau of Investigation authority to enter all cases involving the bombing of schools, churches, and business buildings.

Patterned after the Federal Lindbergh Antikidnapping Act, the proposed law would make a U.S. crime of interstate transportation of explosives intended or used for bombings. The FBI would have authority to enter these cases immediately, on the presumption that the explosives were carried across State lines.

In the Senate, some 20 supporters of such a law have been lined up by Senators JOHN KENNEDY of Massachusetts and SAMUEL ERVIN of North Carolina. The House Judiciary Committee, which last summer favorably reported a similar antibombing bill, is expected to approve the legislation again in 1959.

A Federal prohibition against bombing would be of valuable assistance to local and State authorities. The FBI's facilities in both manpower and scientific investigation would probably help solve many bombings which have baffled local law-enforcement agencies.

Moreover, the wave of church and school bombings across the country indicates that bombings is a national problem, spurred on by fanatics and hate groups. With the combined forces of the law bearing down on the responsible persons, a particularly vicious offense against society should be curbed.

---

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Dec. 16, 1958]

A FEDERAL LAW TO CURB BOMBINGS

It is entirely possible that the least controversial major piece of legislation to come before the new Congress will be a bill to give Federal law-enforcement agencies increased powers to act in bombing cases.

There are, roughly, two categories of criminals who engage in bombings. In one category are the lunatic elements, including racial or religious hatemongers. In the other are professional gangsters, who use bombs to enforce demands or to eliminate or terrorize rivals.

Indignation against both categories of bombers (the latter type have been spotlighted in regard to labor disputes by the Senate Rackets Investigating Committee) runs high throughout the country.

The public wants Federal action, and is well aware that local enforcement agencies not always are able to cope with either haters or racketeers—particularly when groups of either type are organized to operate on an interstate basis.

Last month, Senator JAVITS, of New York—after an on-the-spot investigation of bombings in the South—suggested that Federal agencies be given concurrent jurisdiction with local agencies in hate bombings where interstate conspiracy or action is indicated.

Two other Senators now have called for legislation going even further than that urged by JAVITS. Senators KENNEDY of Massachusetts and ERVIN of North Carolina would make the bombing of schools, places of worship, community centers, and business buildings a Federal crime, and would provide the death penalty in cases where someone is killed by such a bombing.

The Senators, representing a happy combination of northern and southern viewpoints, said the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while assisting local police in investigating bombings, "has been handicapped by lack of authority to initite its own investigation."

To our mind, the need for legislation of the type envisaged by JAVITS, KENNEDY, and ERVIN is clearly apparent. The Congress, with overwhelming public support, should take prompt action to insure that bombers—no less than kidnapers—will risk quick Federal apprehension and prosecution.

---

[From the Middletown (Conn.) Press, Jan. 15, 1959]

CURBING DYNAMITING

Congress can anticipate more than a few proposals at this session aimed at making bombings of schools, churches, and synagogues punishable by Federal law. The two Republican Senators from New York, JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING, on January 9 introduced a seven-bill package making such bombings a Federal offense and banning hate literature from the mails as well.

A similar bill, broader in some respects but confined to bombings, was to be introduced January 12 by two Democrats, Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina. This measure was expected to carry the endorsement of 30 to 40 Senators. Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee is sponsoring similar bills in the other Chamber, as he did at the 1958 session.

Shipping explosives across state lines for terroristic purposes was to be made a federal crime by a key provision of a bill advanced last year by CELLER and Representative KEATING, then the ranking minority member of Celler's committee. The specific ban was against such interstate transportation "with the knowledge or intent that it will be used to damage or destroy any building for the purpose of interfering with its use for educational, religious, charitable, or civic objectives or of intimidating any person pursuing such objectives."

The bill would have justified immediate entry by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in bombing cases by setting up a presumption that explosives used in bombings had been brought across State lines. The Department of Justice takes the position that ordinarily crimes of violence, including bombings of religious buildings, are subject to exclusive State jurisdiction, even if they are a conspiracy and even if the conspiracy is operative in several States.

Nevertheless, the FBI has been active in recent bombing cases, though Director J. Edgar Hoover on October 23 said that here had been no indication of federal law violations. Agents and technical experts were sent to Atlanta, Ga., scene of the October 12 bombing of the Reform Jewish Temple, at the express orders of President Eisenhower.

## Leandro Lombardia, Jr., Florida State Winner of Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the 12th annual Voice of Democracy Contest, a broadcast script-writing and voicing competition which enable more than one million high school students to think and speak positively in behalf of our democratic processes each year, was completed recently. The Florida State winner was Leandro Lombardia, Jr., of Jesuit High School, Tampa, Fla. He and the other State and Territorial winners assembled in Washington recently to receive national honors and recognition from the sponsors of the contest, the National Association of Broadcasters, Electronic Industries Associations, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the several State associations of broadcasters. I have read young Lombardia's script with keen interest and recommend its reading to the Senate membership. I ask unanimous consent that this winning script be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Leandro Lombardia)

My name is unimportant. What I have lived through, and what I now regard and hold close to my heart is.

Previous to the Hungarian revolution, I was a well-to-do radio-disc jockey, enjoying a respectable amount of popularity. In peacetime Hungary, I lived comfortably but not lavishly.

When the revolution was in its initial stages, I began taking a casual interest in it, not realizing that this event was the first of a series of occurrences that were to cause profound changes in my way of thinking that were in fact to change my entire attitude toward life, toward the world, toward the people who live in it.

One thing led to another, and at length I found myself one of the thousands of Hungarian refugees who came to America to seek something missing in our souls and our lives. In America, I found that something.

I found, in America, a new world. I was not only moved by the fact that I was seeing and experiencing new people and places and circumstances. I was even looking at the old familiar sun and stars and trees in a new light; what I found in America made me see reality itself with new eyes and I was astounded by the vision.

I looked before me and saw a great giant, striding mighty steps in this, the 20th century. America was to me a giant, a giant taking matter into its hands and mastering it; conquering, subduing nature, taking the world that it found and making it productive of great fruit and using all its new findings to its advantage, to make its life better, richer, more worthwhile.

Of course, this huge giant is my symbol for the American people, the people whose American way of life has amazed me, the people whose great President recently said of them: "Achievement and progress cannot be created for our people; they can only be created by our people; Americans would have it no other way."

And what is it that encourages these people to keep going on their victorious road of achievement and progress? It cannot be anything other than their sense of freedom and justice and equality, which is the natural consequence of their way of life. In this atmosphere, they feel they can live as becomes a human being, that they can advance in knowledge, and culture and human endeavor.

The freedom that Americans live in and enjoy is in fact, the atmosphere, the setting which makes it possible for them to improve their lot, to advance mightily in human attainment, to live a more successful life. A man reaches his full human stature only if his natural rights and privileges and opportunities are respected by the State and by his fellow citizens. A man cannot improve himself to the utmost unless he has the freedom to do so. If a man is free to search for the truth; if he is free to invent; if he is free to try out new ideas and new methods; if he is free to speak and publish as he sees fit (within the bonds of reason); if he is free to live by a faith he himself prefers. Then he will be producing at his best and consequently living at his best.

These, then, are the people of whom I am now one. Last month, I was naturalized an American citizen. In all my entire life I have never felt as much pride as when I call myself an American. I now work for a radio station as a diskjockey. But when I speak, I don't speak for rock and roll, or for progressive jazz, or for modern art, or for culture, I speak for democracy.

---

## Gov. David L. Lawrence of Pennsylvania Emphasizes Commonwealth's Needs in Flood Control Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania, made before the Pennsylvania congressional delegation in the Senate Office Building in Washington on Thursday, February 26, 1959. Also submitted at that time are listings of corps of engineers' projects in Pennsylvania which include authorized studies and investigations:

I think all of you are aware of the serious damages suffered by our Commonwealth in the recent floods. The tragedy at Pittston, in which we lost 12 men, and the severe damages sustained in Meadville and Sharon, are only several incidents in a general picture of devastation.

A few weeks ago, I toured the areas in western Pennsylvania stricken by these floods. I saw what water and ice can do to Pennsylvania homes, businesses, and factories. I have with me some photographs of the floods. You are welcome to look at them.

The department of forests and waters estimates that damages in western Pennsylvania from the January floods in cities and towns alone is approximately $13,500,000.

In my frank opinion, we must do more to cut the losses from floods in our State. I am

convinced that new industry will not come into a community constantly vulnerable to flooding. It is equally evident that established industries are not going to subject themselves indefinitely to heavy losses from recurring floods.

We have no choice. We must get all the flood protection we can afford and we must get it now.

You all know that floods like those in January are not rare in Pennsylvania. The city of Sharon, for instance, has suffered from three serious floods in the space of 1 year. Pennsylvania sadly remembers the destruction wrought by Hurricane Diane in August 1955.

We have brought along with us some very interesting charts showing the magnitude of our problems. If you study the maps, you will note that the dots on the map of the United States representing cities with flood problems come to a focus in Pennsylvania. Another map shows the dominant storm patterns in the Eastern United States—most of them pass over Pennsylvania.

I am here to urge that you do everything in your power to make the Federal Government aware of what we need in Pennsylvania in the way of flood control. In his budget the President proposes expenditures of $13,565,000 for construction and $659,000 for planning of navigation and flood control projects in Pennsylvania. In addition, $13,500,000 has been programed for dredging the Delaware River.

This is the minimum amount needed in order to continue work on projects already underway and for planning of already authorized projects. In view of the floods of 1955, 1956, 1958, and 1959, we can ill afford deferring any of this construction.

I ask your help in seeing that at least the amount requested by the President is appropriated.

In my frank opinion, however, the President has not asked for enough. The proposed Allegheny Reservoir near Kinzua and the planned reservoir on the Shenango River near Sharpsville would have reduced flood damages in Western Pennsylvania to a far, far low figure. The Shenango Reservoir would have minimized damages to Sharon, Sharpsville, Farrell, Wheatland, New Castle, Ellwood City, not only in this past flood, but in the two floods which struck the same area in 1958.

The President asks for only $150,000 in planning money for the Shenango Dam. I believe that in view of the heavy flood damages sustained by this heavily industrialized region in recent years, construction money for this dam must be appropriated for fiscal 1960 so that the construction of the dam can begin as soon as preconstruction planning is completed.

We cannot afford a lag between planning and building the dam.

Prior appropriations have been made for the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir. However, construction has not been started because of the right-of-way dispute with the Seneca tribe which lives nearby in New York. It is not anticipated that this litigation will remain in the courts much longer and, I therefore, urge that you press to have construction funds for the reservoir included in the 1960 appropriations. As soon as the case is clear of the courts, the Corps of Engineers would have ample funds to get a good start on the reservoir's construction.

As you know, the city of Meadville suffered heavily from the January floods. The Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, provides for the construction of a reservoir on French Creek above Meadville just a few miles downstream from Cambridge Springs. The project was delayed by local opposition to a large dam, however, and the Corps of Engineers has been considering the construction of five smaller dams.

I understand that the Pittsburgh district of the Corps of Engineers is currently making this study. I believe that it should be expedited and additional funds provided to complete the study and to get into construction as fast as humanly possible.

The department of forests and waters is currently completing a Commonwealth flood control project on Turtle Creek in Allegheny County at a cost of $500,000. This work was planned only to provide emergency relief and it will not provide for the stream discharges for which a Corps of Engineers' project on the same stream is designed. We have had two instances of flooding on Turtle Creek Valley in the past year. Had the Commonwealth's project not been underway, damages suffered would have been high.

The cost of the State project was paid in just the damages it prevented in these two floods. Turtle Creek Valley is heavily industrialized. We can afford neither the heavy damages to industry, nor the resulting loss of employment.

The Federal project on Turtle Creek was authorized in the last session of Congress. I urge you to press for an appropriation of planning money for fiscal 1960.

I understand that a flood control project on Connequenessing Creek in Butler has been approved by the Chief of Engineers and is awaiting authorization by Congress. The Commonwealth is vitally interested in this project and has recommended Federal authorization and construction at the earliest possible date.

The department of forests and waters currently has under contract a $115,160 maintenance dredging project there in order to minimize flood damages in Butler. Again, the area on this creek is highly industrialized and the permanent flood control project proposed by the Corps of Engineers is necessary to adequately protect the area against future heavy losses.

In the Flood Control Act of 1938, three projects were authorized on the Allegheny River that have been held up because of local opposition. The damage wrought by the recent floods in the three communities to be protected—Freeport, Kittanning, and New Kensington—seem to indicate that the Corps of Engineers should reevaluate these projects to determine whether they should not be constructed after all. We have photographs here showing the damages in these communities.

I do not want to give you the impression that the Commonwealth has come begging to the Federal Government unwilling to do its own work. We have for distribution, tables showing how much the Commonwealth has invested in flood control over the last 8 years.

Since 1950 the Commonwealth has completed $16,729,300 worth of flood control projects. In addition, we have another $13,904,878 in projects proposed, under contract, or under construction. Included in the flood control budget for the 1959–1961 biennium, I am requesting from the general assembly, appropriations of $6,076,200 in general fund and capital budget allocations.

Surely this is clear-cut evidence of the importance the Commonwealth attaches to flood-control projects.

It is a vital activity, to relieve human suffering, to reduce heavy property losses, and to encourage economic development which is of such paramount concern in every area of the State.

I need not tell you that the need is urgent.

Pennsylvania is prepared to do its share—as it always has been.

With concentrated and determined effort, we must make certain that the Federal program is speeded up and enlarged for the safety and well-being of Pennsylvania and for hundreds of thousands of its citizens.

*Corps of Engineers' projects in Pennsylvania*

AUTHORIZED STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

| Project and location | Estimated total Federal cost | Allocated through June 30, 1958 | Fiscal year 1959 allocation | Fiscal year 1960 budget request | Balance to complete after fiscal year 1960 | Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navigation studies: | | | | | | |
| Lake Erie coast, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York. | $300,000 | $89,400 | 0 | 0 | $210,600 | Inactive. |
| Delaware River channel dimensions, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey. | 147,000 | 52,000 | 0 | 0 | 95,000 | Do. |
| Delaware River oil pollution, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. | 27,000 | 24,900 | 0 | 0 | 2,100 | Do. |
| Beach erosion control: Presque Isle Peninsula, Pa. | 11,100 | 4,300 | $6,800 | 0 | 0 | Report scheduled for completion and submission to OCE in summer 1959. |
| Special studies: Delaware River review | 1,992,500 | 1,162,500 | 500,000 | $330,000 | 0 | Close coordination with other Federal agencies and local interests has been maintained. Completion by reporting officers has been scheduled for about the end of 1959. |
| Potomac River review, District of Columbia, Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania. | 1,501,500 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 500,000 | 601,500 | Completion of comprehensive report dependent upon availability of funds. |
| Great Lakes harbors | 1,004,000 | 410,000 | 227,000 | 260,000 | 107,000 | Interim report on Erie Harbor completed by reporting officers; tentatively scheduled for consideration by Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at meeting on Mar. 13, 1959. Completion of final report dependent upon availability of funds. |
| Great Lakes water levels | 816,500 | 691,500 | 0 | 0 | 125,000 | Inactive. |
| Ohio River comprehensive | 1,710,000 | 310,000 | 356,000 | 400,000 | 644,000 | Completion dependent upon future appropriations. |

*Corps of Engineers' projects in Pennsylvania*—Continued

AUTHORIZED STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

| Project and location | Estimated total Federal cost | Allocated through June 30, 1958 | Fiscal year 1959 allocation | Fiscal year 1960 budget request | Balance to complete after fiscal year 1960 | Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Flood control: | | | | | | |
| Allegheny River and Oil Creek | $300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $300 | Inactive. |
| Beaver River, Ohio and Pa | 32,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32,000 | Will be included in Ohio River comprehensive study. |
| Chartiers Creek, Allegheny County | 205,000 | $52,000 | $65,000 | $45,000 | 43,000 | Completion dependent upon availability of funds. |
| Connoquenessing Creek, Butler | 60,700 | 60,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Favorable report with BOB for review prior to submission to Congress. |
| Eldred | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 | Inactive. |
| French Creek | 120,000 | 45,100 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 24,900 | Completion dependent upon availability of funds. |
| Girtys Run | 21,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21,000 | Inactive. |
| Hottenbaugh Run | 8,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,800 | Do. |
| Johnstown channel extension | 40,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40,000 | Do. |
| Loyalhanna Creek, Latrobe | 47,700 | 47,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Report scheduled to be submitted to OCE in spring 1959. |
| Sandy Lick Creek, Dubois | 55,400 | 6,100 | 0 | 0 | 49,300 | Inactive. |
| Stump Creek | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Being investigated under Public Law 685 authority. |
| Upper Allegheny River, N.Y. and Pa | 183,000 | 72,900 | 0 | 0 | 110,100 | Inactive. |
| Walnut Bottom Run | 33,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33,000 | Do. |
| Youghiogheny River, Md. and Pa | 17,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17,500 | Do. |
| Juniata River | 187,500 | 161,800 | 25,700 | 0 | 0 | Report scheduled for submission to OCE summer 1959. |
| Lackawanna River | 137,600 | 111,300 | 26,300 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Miscellaneous streams, Maryland and Pennsylvania | 75,000 | 26,000 | 10,000 | 39,000 | 0 | Funds requested for fiscal year 1960 would complete studies. |
| West Branch, Susquehanna River | 277,000 | 227,300 | 0 | 0 | 49,700 | Inactive. |

AUTHORIZED PROJECTS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Navigation: | | | | | | |
| Allegheny River canalization | $18,158,000 | $18,158,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Allegheny River open channel work | 197,000 | 197,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Chester River [1] | 26,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $26,000 | Inactive. |
| Dam 4 (raise crest), Monongahela River | 8,590,000 | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 8,570,000 | Preconstruction planning not started. |
| Dam 8, Monongahela River | 3,560,000 | 895,000 | $1,880,000 | $725,000 | 0 | Underway; fiscal year 1960 funds will complete. |
| Delaware River navigation (completed work) | 35,818,000 | 35,818,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Includes work completed Delaware River channel under older authorization. |
| Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea: | | | | | | |
| (a) 37-foot channel from Philadelphia to Allegheny Ave. and Port Richmond anchorage | 1,440,000 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,439,000 | Preconstruction planning not started. |
| (b) Anchorage at Reedy Point | 26,800,000 | 42,000 | 0 | 0 | 26,758,000 | Do. |
| (c) 40-foot channel to navy yard | 1,281,000 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,280,000 | Do. |
| Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton: (a) 40-foot channel | 96,000,000 | 10,560,000 | 11,645,000 | 13,500,000 | 54,295,000 | Underway; 21 percent complete as of Jan. 1, 1959. |
| Erie Harbor: | | | | | | |
| (a) Approach channel and turning basin | 1,680,000 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,677,000 | Preconstruction planning not started. |
| (b) Deepen approach channel to easterly docks | 632,000 | 526,000 | 0 | 0 | 106,000 | |
| (c) North pier extension of breakwater [2] | 1,050,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,050,000 | Deferred. |
| (d) Widen 25-foot approach channel to ore dock | 180,000 | 180,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Frankford Creek | 10,000 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Ice Harbor at Marcus Hook | 199,000 | 199,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Maxwell lock and dam, Monongahela River | 30,400,000 | 120,000 | 275,000 | 95,000 | 29,910,000 | Preconstruction planning will be completed with fiscal year 1960 funds. |
| Monongahela River navigation (completed work) | 19,198,000 | 19,198,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Includes work completed on Monongahela River under older authorizations. |
| Monongahela River (lock 2, reconstruction) | 16,967,000 | 16,967,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Pittsburgh Harbor | 111,000 | 111,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Schuylkill River | 2,753,000 | 2,753,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Schuylkill River, Rock Shoals (22- and 26-foot channels) [2] | 52,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52,000 | Deferred. |
| Schuylkill River above Fairmount Dam | 4,292,000 | 4,292,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Youghiogheny River canalization [1] | 8,785,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,785,000 | Inactive. |
| Total, navigation (24) | 278,119,000 | 116,051,000 | 13,800,000 | 14,320,000 | 133,948,000 | |
| Flood control: | | | | | | |
| Allegheny River Reservoir | 113,000,000 | 1,793,000 | 940,000 | 0 | 110,267,000 | Construction syspended pending action of U.S. Supreme Court on Seneca Indian Nation's application for injunction to stop project. |
| Allentown, Lehigh River | 1,810,000 | 467,000 | 663,000 | 680,000 | 0 | Underway; fiscal year 1960 funds will complete. |
| Bear Creek Reservoir, Lehigh River Basin | 11,700,000 | 4,938,000 | 2,001,000 | 3,400,000 | 1,361,000 | Underway; 56 percent complete as of Jan. 1, 1959 |
| Bethlehem, Lehigh River | 9,300,000 | 265,000 | 329,000 | 1,050,000 | 7,656,000 | New construction start for fiscal year 1959. Not yet started. |
| Tarentum, Brackenridge, and Natrona, Allegheny River [3] | 11,800,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,800,000 | Inactive. |
| Blanchard Reservoir, West Branch, Susquehanna River Basin | 26,500,000 | 18,000 | 0 | 0 | 26,482,000 | Preconstruction planning not started. |
| Bradford, Allegheny River Basin | 8,600,000 | 2,588,000 | 2,585,000 | 2,400,000 | 1,027,000 | Underway; 50 percent complete as of Jan. 1, 1959. |
| Brockway, Little Toby Creek [2] | 477,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 477,000 | Deferred. |
| Brookville, Sandy Lick Creek | 1,340,000 | 52,000 | 35,000 | 73,000 | 1,180,000 | Preconstruction planning will be completed with fiscal year 1960 funds. |
| Conemaugh River Reservoir | 45,800,000 | 45,800,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Coraopolis, Ohio River [1] | 3,080,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,080,000 | Inactive. |
| Cowanesque Reservoir, North Branch, Susquehanna River Basin | 35,000,000 | 60,000 | 0 | 0 | 34,940,000 | Preconstruction planning not started. |
| Curwensville Reservoir, North Branch, Susquehanna River Basin | 28,000,000 | 69,000 | 175,000 | 200,000 | 27,566,000 | Preconstruction planning will be completed with fiscal year 1960 funds. |
| Dyberry Reservoir, Lackawaxen River | 4,000,000 | 2,090,000 | 1,520,000 | 390,000 | 0 | Underway; fiscal year 1960 funds will complete. |
| East Branch Clarion River Reservoir | 9,382,000 | 9,022,000 | 360,000 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Elkland, North Branch Susquehanna River | 1,370,000 | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,350,000 | Preconstruction planning has not been started. |
| Freeport, Allegheny River [1] | 1,480,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,480,000 | Inactive. |
| French Creek Reservoir [1] | 18,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18,500,000 | Do. |
| Industry, Ohio River [1] | 1,560,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,560,000 | Do. |
| Johnsonburg, Clarion River | 668,000 | 668,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Kettle Creek Reservoir, West Branch Susquehanna River Basin | 13,600,000 | 402,000 | 752,000 | 2,500,000 | 9,946,000 | New construction start in fiscal year 1959. Not yet started. |
| Kingston Edwardsville, Susquehanna River | 4,472,000 | 4,472,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |

Footnotes at end of table.

*Corps of Engineers' projects in Pennsylvania*—Continued

AUTHORIZED PROJECTS

| Project and location | Estimated total Federal cost | Allocated through June 30, 1958 | Fiscal year 1959 allocation | Fiscal year 1960 budget request | Balance to complete after fiscal year 1960 | Status |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Flood control—Continued | | | | | | |
| Kittanning: | | | | | | |
| Part I, Allegheny River | $130,000 | $130,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Part II, Allegheny River [1] | 5,940,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $5,940,000 | Inactive. |
| Latrobe, Loyalhanna Creek | 207,000 | 207,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Leetsdale, Ohio River [1] | 1,270,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,270,000 | Inactive. |
| Loyalhanna Reservoir, Allegheny River Basin | 5,452,000 | 5,452,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Allegheny River Basin. | 6,421,000 | 6,421,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| McKees Rocks, Ohio River [1] | 5,470,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,470,000 | Inactive. |
| Neville Island, Ohio River [1] | 3,210,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,210,000 | Do. |
| New Kensington and Parnassus, Allegheny River. [1] | 7,900,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,900,000 | Do. |
| Pittsburgh Golden Triangle [1] | 9,390,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9,390,000 | Do. |
| Pittsburgh, North Side [1] | 22,400,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22,400,000 | Do. |
| Pittsburgh, The Strip [1] | 10,700,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,700,000 | Do. |
| Plymouth, Susquehanna River | 1,866,000 | 1,866,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Prompton Reservoir, Delaware River Basin | 3,700,000 | 1,546,000 | $1,034,000 | $1,120,000 | 0 | Underway; fiscal year 1960 funds will complete. |
| Punxsutawney, Mahoning Creek | 3,587,000 | 3,587,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Red Bank Creek Reservoir, Allegheny River Basin. [1] | 39,800,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39,800,000 | Inactive. |
| Reynoldsville, Sandy Lick Creek | 1,866,000 | 1,866,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Ridgway Elk Creek | 608,000 | [2] 2,000 | 20,000 | 25,000 | 561,000 | Preconstruction planning will be completed with fiscal year 1960 funds. |
| Rochester, Ohio River [1] | 3,350,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,350,000 | Inactive. |
| St. Marys, Elk Creek | 528,000 | 2,000 | 20,000 | 38,000 | 468,000 | Preconstruction planning will be completed with fiscal year 1960 funds. |
| Shenango River Reservoir | 28,000,000 | 274,000 | 100,000 | 150,000 | 27,476,000 | Preconstruction planning underway. |
| Smiths Ferry, Ohio River [1] | 2,120,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,120,000 | Inactive. |
| Stillwater Reservoir, Lackawanna River | 6,000,000 | 2,538,000 | 1,222,000 | 1,500,000 | 740,000 | Underway; 40 percent complete as of Jan. 1, 1959. |
| Sunbury, Susquehanna River | 6,076,000 | 6,076,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Swayersville-Forty Fort, Susquehanna River | 2,692,000 | 2,692,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Tioga-Hammond Reservoirs, North Branch, Susquehanna River. | 65,700,000 | 120,000 | 0 | 0 | 65,580,000 | Preconstruction planning has not been started. |
| Tionesta Reservoir, Allegheny River Basin | 5,213,000 | 5,213,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Turtle Creek Basin, Monongahela River | 14,400,000 | 95,000 | 0 | 0 | 14,305,000 | Authorized in 1958. Preconstruction planning has not been started. |
| Tyrone, Little Juniata River | 9,000,000 | 166,000 | 0 | 0 | 8,834,000 | Preconstruction planning partially accomplished. |
| Uniontown, Redstone and Cold Lick Creeks | 1,815,000 | 34,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,781,000 | Preconstruction planning has not been started. |
| Washington, Chartiers Creek | 1,400,000 | 37,000 | 25,000 | 78,000 | 1,320,000 | Preconstruction planning will be completed with fiscal year 1960 funds. |
| West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River, Ohio and Pa. | 6,940,000 | 61,000 | 200,000 | 229,000 | 6,450,000 | Do. |
| West Bridgewater, Beaver River [1] | 2,340,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,340,000 | Inactive. |
| Williamsport, West Branch Susquehanna River. | 12,819,000 | 12,819,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Completed. |
| Wilkes-Barre-Hanover Township, Susquehanna River. | 3,789,000 | 3,789,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| York and Indian Rock Reservoir Codorus Creek. | 5,087,000 | 5,087,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Youghiogheny River Reservoir | 9,675,000 | 9,675,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Total, flood control (59) | 668,360,000 | 142,469,000 | 11,981,000 | 13,833,000 | 500,077,000 | |
| Multiple purpose: None. | | | | | | |
| Beach erosion control: Presque Isle Peninsula | 817,000 | 817,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Do. |
| Grand total, all Pennsylvania projects | 947,296,000 | 259,337,000 | 25,781,000 | 28,153,000 | 634,025,000 | |

[1] Inactive projects.

[2] Projects deferred for restudy.

FLOOD-CONTROL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS IN PROGRESS

Scranton, unit No. 2, streambed paving, Roaring Brook, $1,047,232.

Repairs to Toby Creek pressure conduit, Kingston, Luzerne County, $38,400.

Glendale Dam, Cambria County, $1,474,697.

Galeton flood-protection project, Galeton, Potter County, $63,320.

Weissport flood-control project, Weissport, Carbon County, $50,584.

Hawley flood-protection project, Hawley, Wayne County, $492,757.

Brown and Wedham Creek flood-protection project, Plymouth, Luzerne County, unit No. 1, $108,298; unit No. 2, $477,522.

Channel dredging Connequenessing Creek and Sullivan Run, Butler County, $50,060.

Four Mile Creek bank stabilization, Wesleyville, Erie County, $29,991.

Greensburg flood-protection unit No. 2, Greensburg, Westmoreland County, $817,088.

Lackawanna River dredging, Scranton, Lackawanna County, $544,108.

Brockway Channel rectification project (riprap protection), Brockway, Jefferson County, $34,970.

Slope installation, Newfoundland stream-clearance project, $96,586.

Installation of peizometers and relief wells, Windber, Somerset County, $14,643.

ENGINEERING CONTRACTS IN FORCE

Plymouth area, $28,000.

Scranton, $60,000.

Turtle Creek, Allegheny County and Four Mile Run bank protection, Erie County, $9,000.

Stroudsburg area, $55,000.

Engineering services, redesign project, Greensburg, $5,000.

TABLE I.—*Pennsylvania flood-control and navigation projects included in President's budget request for fiscal 1960*

| | |
|---|---|
| Construction: | |
| Dam 8, Monongahela River (navigation) | $725,000 |
| Delaware River, Philadelphia to Trenton (navigation) | 13,500,000 |
| Allentown (flood control) | 680,000 |
| Bear Creek Reservoir (flood control) | 3,400,000 |
| Bethlehem (flood control) | 1,050,000 |
| Bradford (flood control) | 2,400,000 |
| Dyberry Reservoir (flood control) | 390,000 |
| Kettle Creek Reservoir (flood control) | 2,500,000 |
| Prompton Reservoir (flood control) | 1,120,000 |
| Stillwater Reservoir (flood control) | 1,500,000 |

TABLE I.—*Pennsylvania flood-control and navigation projects included in President's budget request for fiscal 1960*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Planning: | |
| Maxwell Lock and Dam, Monongahela River (navigation) | $95,000 |
| Brookville (flood control) | 73,000 |
| Curwensville Reservoir (flood control) | 200,000 |
| Ridgeway (flood control) | 25,000 |
| St. Marys (flood control) | 38,000 |
| Shenango River Reservoir, Pennsylvania and Ohio (flood control) | 150,000 |
| Washington (flood control) | 78,000 |
| Total allocated to Pennsylvania civil works projects in fiscal 1960 | 27,924,000 |

TABLE II.—*Amount expended by Commonwealth on completed flood-control projects, Jan. 1, 1950, to Dec. 31, 1954—Total cost upon completion*

| | |
|---|---|
| 7 permanent flood-protection projects | $2,114,193.00 |
| Contributions to Federal projects | 810,316.00 |

TABLE II.—*Amount expended by Commonwealth on comlpeted flood-control projects, Jan. 1, 1950, to Dec. 31, 1954—Total cost upon completion*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| 144 stream clearance projects | 610,799.20 |
| Total | 3,535,308.20 |

TABLE III.—*Amount expended by Commonwealth on completed flood control projects Jan. 1, 1955, to Dec. 31, 1958—Total cost upon completion*

| | |
|---|---|
| George B. Stevenson Dam | $10,018,937 |
| 44 nondisaster stream clearance projects completed | 206,036 |
| 210 emergency channel rectification projects completed | 664,988 |
| 41 emergency debris removal projects completed | 1,095,763 |
| 3 nondisaster permanent flood-control projects completed | 281,266 |
| 3 emergency permanent flood-control projects completed | 143,053 |
| 3 contributions to Federal flood-control programs | 496,000 |
| Total | 12,906,043 |

TABLE IV.—*Commonwealth flood control projects proposed, under contract or under construction Feb. 15, 1959 construction Feb. 15, 1959—Total cost upon completion*

| | |
|---|---|
| 24 nondisaster stream-clearance projects proposed or under construction | $88,300.00 |
| 32 emergency stream-clearance projects proposed or under construction | 185,124.00 |
| 4 emergency debris-removal projects proposed or under construction | 28,428.00 |
| 8 nondisaster permanent flood-control projects proposed or in the design stage | 2,988,404.00 |
| 5 nondisaster permanent flood-control projects under contract | 2,273,407.50 |
| 15 emergency permanent flood-control projects under contract or in the design stage | 8,341,214.65 |
| Total | 13,904,878.15 |

TABLE V.—*Emergency projects completed by Department of Forests and Waters under Act 1–A, Feb. 5, 1959—Total cost upon completion*

| | |
|---|---|
| Picture Rocks | $1,000 |
| Lick Run | 300 |
| Total | 1,300 |

TABLE VI.—*Flood-control budget, 1958–61 biennium, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*

| | |
|---|---|
| GSA funds | $4,545,800 |
| Projects from general appropriation | 1,530,900 |
| Total | 6,076,700 |

## Senator Kennedy Favorably Received and Hailed in State of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER**
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my native State recently was honored by a visit from the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who spoke at the annual Democratic Party dinner in Jackson County which is always dedicated to the shining memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Senator KENNEDY and his attractive wife made a highly favorable impression in Medford, if we are to credit an article written for the Oregonian of Portland by one of the State's most able journalists, Albert L. McCready, associate editor of that daily newspaper which is published in Portland.

One particular portion of Mr. McCready's article deserves emphasis. He has called attention to a rather sorry chapter in Oregon's past, when the Ku Klux Klan was hysterically active in 1922. Mr. McCready notes that Jackson County was a citadel of such bigotry. Now, however, Mr. McCready has written:

Perhaps of some significance to the question of religion in politics is the fact that the same Jackson County which turned out to give warm greetings to a Catholic Senator in 1959, was a hotbed of Ku Klux Klanism when the forces of bigotry reached the zenith of their influence in Oregon politics in 1922.

And Albert McCready concluded his article on the hopeful and enlightened note that perhaps we have entered the age of reason when candidates for high office, like the Senator from Massachusetts, can be evaluated on their ability, intelligence, and character rather than on the basis of religion.

I know that many of Senator KENNEDY's friends and colleagues will be pleased to read the article from the Oregonian of March 9, 1959, by Albert McCready, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY LIKED KENNEDY IN JACKSON COUNTY
(By Albert McCready)

MEDFORD.—Since Al Smith's defeat in 1928, there has been a political axiom that a Catholic can't be elected President of the United States. But that was 30 years ago, and the United States and the attitudes of its citizens in the meantime have undergone a considerable change. Has religious bigotry diminished to the extent that a political party may safely ignore it in choosing a presidential nominee? If the professional pulsetakers are right in tabbing Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY as the front runner in the field of Democratic presidential aspirants, this question may be put to a new test in 1960.

Last Friday evening the tousle-haired Senator from Massachusetts flew into Medford from Washington, D.C., to address this city's ninth annual Franklin Delano Roosevelt memorial dinner. The enthusiasm of his reception was convincing proof of his remarkable public appeal.

A crowd of several hundred was on hand when the Senator and his handsome wife, the former Jacqueline Bouvier, stepped out of their chartered United Air Lines Convair. Later, some 700 southern Oregon Democrats paid $5 apiece to eat a ham dinner and size up KENNEDY'S qualifications for the White House. Judging from the tumultous applause that followed his remarks, they liked what they saw and heard.

Apart from the unknown quantity of church affiliation, Senator KENNEDY has almost every asset a successful politician could want. He is young, personable, well-educated and well-to-do. He is an outstanding writer and speaker, and a much-decorated skipper of a Navy PT boat in World War II. Like F.D.R., he has political sex appeal as a country squire with a Harvard background who feels a common bond with the common man.

"My, doesn't he look young," was a comment frequently heard among the onlookers wherever Kennedy appeared in Medford. His boyish grin and his unruly mop of hair do give the 41-year-old Senator a deceptively youthful appearance, from a distance. But maturity shows in the lines of his face, the firmness of his handshake, and the solemnity of his words when he discusses the dangers facing the country he hopes to lead in 1961.

KENNEDY obviously is a man of energy and positive ideas. Unlike some administration critics who carp at the President's policies but offer no constructive suggestions for their improvement, he expresses definite views on what should be done in such fields as foreign aid and national defense.

His solutions would be expensive, and hence not very popular with tax-conscious Americans. But the outspoken Bostonian does not let this deter him from saying bluntly that America needs to spend much more money building up the economy of the undeveloped, uncommitted countries of the world, and strengthening our armed forces along the lines suggested in the Rockefeller report. To him, Mr. Eisenhower's emphasis on a balanced budget is not basic, not significant, not important.

Perhaps of some significance in the question of religion in politics is the fact that the same Jackson County which turned out to give warm greetings to a Catholic senator in 1959, was a hotbed of Ku Klux Klanism when the forces of bigotry reached the zenith of their influence on Oregon politics in 1922. That was a long time ago. It would be good to think that we are now much farther along the road to complete racial and religious tolerance, when political candidates such as the Senator from Massachusetts can be evaluated by the voters solely on their abilities.

## Construction of Timber Access Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANK CHURCH**
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this year, as every year, Members of the Congress are conscious of the heavy responsibility which falls upon us in appropriating the public funds required for the defense of our country, and for the essential services which the people can provide for themselves only through their Government.

No political party has a copyright on the maxim, "A penny saved is a penny earned." There may be some differences, however, in our abilities to perceive that an apparent saving is not always a real saving.

I recently received an editorial from the Emmett, Idaho, Messenger-Index, commenting on a budget reduction of $6 million in funds for the construction of timber access roads. The editorial points out, I think correctly, that the saving here proposed is illusory: It will

be more than offset by decreased revenues to the Public Treasury from timber sales, and it will lead directly to increased taxes for roads and schools in the affected areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALSE ECONOMY

The declining Federal budget (and we mean declining in ratio to gross national product) plays queer tricks on us Idaho hicks from the sticks who parrot the N.A.M. clamor for further reductions.

Sometimes we wouldn't praise the economics and assail the free spenders quite so vigorously if we knew the whole score.

Look at one example of the hundreds that could be cited:

Plaudits to the fiscal 1960 budget now before Congress. The U.S. Forest Service estimates show a further $6 million cutback in timber access road funds.

Hooray for the administration. Cheers for conservationism. If that burgeoning monster named Federal spending ever is to be corseted, we must hack, hack away at the fat rolls. Six millions on access roads, millions in a thousand other places.

That's the way to trim the monster down to size.

Well, let's look at this economy a little further.

Idaho is a timber State. A great portion of its timber is in national forests owned by the Federal Government. Everyone knows the Federal Government doesn't pay taxes.

It so happens, however, that 25 percent of national forest timber sales goes to county road and school funds—in lieu of taxes.

When the Federal Government curtails access road funds, two things happen:

1. Overage and diseased stands rot for want of harvest.

2. Bidding competition on other stands becomes restricted to the huge concern which has sufficient capital to build its own access roads—not public roads—and the bid price goes down to offset the road cost.

The result is that valuable natural resources are allowed to waste, the public pays for but does not get better forest roads, and the proper cost of developing Federal timber resources is not evaded but only shifted to local government.

According to figures compiled by Senator FRANK CHURCH, last year's cut in the Federal access road program cost Idaho counties $1,110,000 in revenues they otherwise would have received for their road and school funds from timber sales.

The fiscal 1960 cuts will reduce county revenues further.

Revenue to the Federal Treasury from timber sales will be reduced proportionately.

Even if it could be argued that non-Federal access road construction is cheaper (it can't be successfully), or that it is better long-range economy to exclude the small timber bidder, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce adherents still miss the main point.

The amount saved in the Federal timber access road program was not saved at all; it was lost in Federal timber sale revenues.

Moreover, the $1,110,000 lost to Idaho county governments represents just one tiny facet of the unrelenting NAM-U.S. Chamber pressure to alter the tax structure away from corporate and high personal income tax brackets.

Every Idaho farmer, home owner, and small business man knows exactly how that loss in county school and road fund revenue is paid—by ad valorem tax levies made by the counties on their farms, homes, and small businesses right here in Idaho.

The big bracket corporate schemers have dumped $1,110,000 of the Federal income tax load onto local county taxpayers in Idaho, and an economy-minded administration gets the cheers.

Too often we climb on the big business bandwagon for Federal economies, and are such dupes that we fail to see that the economies are false, that in reality we witlessly join a disguised crusade to tighten the purse strings on the big pocket and loosen up the small one.

Big business is still looking after big business, and former Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey still has the most potent voice in the administration.

## Commodity Price Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial commenting upon the price support program, which was published in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, March 3, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We suppose many readers were struck, as we were, by the irony pointed out by Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware in his recent criticism of the farm subsidies.

Of this costly program we are told helps the poor farmer, Senator WILLIAMS had this to say:

"The high rigid support program is little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate-type farming and actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmer."

The Senator named two such corporate-type farmers in a long list of other 1957 payments of up to $1 million or more. He singles out Producers Rice Mills, Inc., of Stuttgart, Ark., and the Delta and Pine Land Co. of Scott, Miss., because they received more than a million. Producers Rice Mills got $1.4 million in price supports for rice and Delta and Pine Land $1.1 million for price supports on cotton.

Mr. WILLIAMS could have named some farm-type corporations, too, that benefited in 1957 because of the insanity of some of the farm program. Fortunately, the acreage reserve phase of the soil bank is no longer with us, but when it was, it paid both farmers and corporations for not planting commodities.

Ford Motor Co., for example, received $13,649.40 for not planting corn and wheat in 1957. Libby, McNeill, Libby got $19,654 for not planting cotton.

Nor did Uncle Sam overlook some others in his lavish handouts to all the poor farmers. The American Christian Institute of Phoenix, Ariz., benefited to the extent of $73,088.40 for not planting cotton, and the Mississippi State Penitentiary at Parchman was paid $71,000 for not doing ditto. The Arkansas State Penal Institute proved it can also not plant things. Its bill to Uncle Sam for not planting rice came to $22,800. And the Kansas State University Endowment Association shows that at least one institution of higher education knows what's going on besides sputnik. For resisting the impulse to sow wheat, the association was endowed by Uncle Sam with $17,125.14.

No wonder the price of farm land is sky-high. With such goings-on as this sort of agricultural foolishness, Uncle Sam's problem is becoming one of not how to keep the farmer on the farm but of how ya gonna keep everybody else off the farm.

## Why the Dollar Price of Gold Must Stay Fixed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the heavy outflow of monetary gold from this country over the past year and longer has been the subject of much comment and in certain quarters has been cited as foreshadowing the eventual raising of the official price of gold by the U.S. Government. While, undoubtedly, much of this comment is inspired by the gold producers themselves, there are indications that some of it can be traced to a deliberate effort to discredit the standing of the U.S. dollar in the minds of United States and foreign investors as part of the economic cold war.

From time to time, rumors affecting the price of gold are being circulated around the world and the U.S. Treasury Department has felt it necessary periodically to restate its firm intention not to depart from the present price of $35 an ounce. As recently as January 19 it felt itself under the necessity to issue such a statement to the press.

An able article by an authoritative voice, Mr. Herbert Bratter, appeared in the December issue of Optima, a quarterly published in Johannesburg, South Africa.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the indicated article is included.

AMERICA STILL FIRMLY REJECTS A RISE IN THE PRICE OF GOLD

(By Herbert Bratter)

Six years ago in Optima the writer gave an American view of the official price of gold, concluding: "In sum, there is no present prospect of a change in the U.S. attitude toward the present price and status of gold. Whether $35 is or is not the right price, there is no disposition to change it."

Since 1952 various developments have occurred. The United States has experienced two considerable business recessions. International trade has grown. Important British spokesmen have carried to America the argument, well buttressed with statistics, that the value of the world's monetary gold reserves is no longer commensurate with the need for reserves as measured by the volume of international trade. Sizeable international flows of gold, now in one direction and now in another, have taken place in response to military and economic occurrences. And there has been during the past year or so probably more discussion of gold in the United States than in a number of years, although less in respect of the price of gold than with reference to the U.S. gold outflow and the deflationary potentialities of foreign-owned dollar balances; and also the alleged

possibility of a Russian gold war. Nonetheless, the official and general public attitude toward the fixed $35 price of gold appears to be exactly what it was in 1952.

Our purpose now is to review U.S. official gold policy under the Eisenhower administration which assumed office after publication of the previous article—bearing in mind especially the price of gold; and to recount various other official and unofficial developments in the United States bearing on our subject.

On money questions the quadrennial platforms of the two leading American political parties have been unreliable keys to performance. In this respect the Eisenhower administration has run true to form. The 1952 Republican platform looked toward a dollar on a fully convertible basis, which, to advocates of a return to domestic convertibility, spelled the intention to make some change in the position of gold inherited from the Democratic administrations of 1933–52. However, in practice the Eisenhower administration has clung closely to the lines of gold policy followed by its predecessors, both in respect of the domestic inconvertibility of the dollar and the fixed $35 price of gold. The official attitude of the Treasury Department—the Government spokesman on gold matters—has been, with reference to convertibility, the price of gold and a free gold market, the same under Mr. Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury, as under his Republican predecessor Mr. George M. Humphrey and the earlier Democratic fiscal chief, Mr. John W. Snyder. Throughout recent years the gold views of the Treasury's career staff have remained consistent with official policy and vice versa; and the composition of the staff itself has been relatively little affected by the change in administrations. The unchanged official attitude toward gold undoubtedly mirrors the viewpoint of the Congress and the country.

For the record it may be useful to note here some of the occasions on which the Eisenhower regime has expressed views on gold. Thus, on March 11, 1953, the Treasury wrote to Delegate BARTLETT of Alaska:

"The Treasury remains opposed to any such legislation (to raise the price of gold) primarily because of the inflationary effect such a program would have on the domestic economy of the United States. Careful study has been given by the Treasury Department to both the Canadian subsidy and free market programs for marketing newly mined gold. Although the Department is sympathetic to the problems of the gold miners, it does not favor the adoption of either plan by the United States."

On the McCarran bill (S. 13) for a free gold market, the Treasury sent the Senate Banking Committee an adverse report.

In May 1953, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, of California, published the negative results of a visit by himself and a prominent gold mine officer to the Treasury—very much along the lines of the above quotation.

The following month this writer sought the Treasury's views on gold. In its reply the Treasury stated:

"Our sound money program does not contemplate an increase in the price of gold. We believe that raising or lowering the price of gold to compensate for price rises or declines is inconsistent with the principles of sound money and the gold standard, and tends to have a disrupting effect upon the economy."

After rejecting a free gold market, a subsidy to gold mines and authorization of exports of American newly mined gold for sale on free markets abroad the letter continued:

"The Treasury Department believes that present conditions at home and abroad are not favorable for a return to a convertible gold coin standard. Until the budget is balanced and world conditions are more stable, internal gold convertibility is likely to exert dangerous pressure at critical times. What we are saying is that the return to sound money must proceed by steps. The first step to take is to balance the Nation's budget, and the second step is to get the national debt in better order."

At the 1953 annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund Mr. W. Randolph Burgess, representing the United States, expressed disagreement with the South African position, on the grounds that the inflation danger was not wholly past and that a change in the price of gold would undermine the stability of our program. Stating "our firm belief is that a change in the price of gold would disrupt the efforts being made in other countries to restore stable currencies," Mr. Burgess added: "In our judgment, tampering with the price of gold would be a step backward. * * * It does not, gentlemen, go to the root of our problem, which is much deeper."

In a magazine interview later in 1953 Mr. Burgess answered in similar vein several questions on gold policy, and made an interesting comment in reply to the question, "Do you think a mistake was made in letting the price of gold go up to $35?"

He said, "That's a very debatable question. I did think so at the time. A great many people in the world have suffered from it. I think we could have gone along on the lower price of gold with much less inflation. On the whole, I think we would have been much better off."[1]

In March 1954 Mr. Burgess testified for the administration before a Senate committee in opposition to four bills which would have removed restraints on gold. Through the years the present administration has unyieldingly clung to the status quo. This stand was reiterated by Mr. Burgess during the 1956 annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and by Secretary Humphrey before the Senate Finance Committee during hearings held in July 1957. To an inquiry from Mr. Merrill E. Shoup, president of a Colorado organization called Committee for the Golden Road to Security, the Treasury replied on May 5, 1958:

"We do not believe that an increase in the price of gold would be in the best interest of the United States and the free world. The value of the dollar is firmly linked to gold; the official value of $35 per fine troy ounce was established in 1934. This relationship has contributed to the maintenance of a stable and strong financial structure in this country, and thus to the soundness of our domestic economy. Foreign countries have also come to rely on the dollar as a strong and secure currency, firmly fixed in value in terms of gold. We believe that flexible credit and monetary policies on the part of the Federal Reserve System, which can be readily adapted to changing economic conditions, are far preferable to increasing the price of gold."

The Secretary of the Treasury (Mr. Anderson) on May 6, 1958, reaffirmed this long-standing position in a letter saying:

"The administration has made clear on many occasions, most recently at the September 1957 meeting of the International Monetary Fund, that the United States has no intention of increasing the price of gold or devaluing the dollar. I must say, without qualification, that this continues to be the position of the Government."

An incident of the Eisenhower administration's gold policy has been the use—on two occasions—of so-called free gold in an inflationary manner, a paradoxical development under a Government committed to sound money. Free gold is gold owned by the Treasury but not held as security for gold certificates which constitute the credit base of the Federal Reserve System. Most of the free gold held by the Treasury at the start of the Eisenhower administration represented the unused part of the profits of the 1934 devaluation of the dollar.

In November 1953 the public debt then being close to the statutory limit set by law, the Treasury used $500 million of free gold; and again in February 1958 it similarly used another $100 million of free gold. This gold did not physically leave the Treasury's possession, but gold certificates were issued against it and deposited with the Federal Reserve to create a balance against which the Treasury could write checks. The certificates, of course, remain outstanding. Since the Federal Reserve's required reserve ratio is 25 percent, the Treasury's two actions, totaling $600 million, make it possible for the Federal Reserve System to issue $2,400 million of notes of deposits; and these, in turn, potentially could support an increase in commercial bank credit of several times as much.

Thus the Republican administration, although it came into office on the promise of a balanced budget, has had to ask the Congress to raise the debt limit on more than one occasion, and on two other occasions avoided making such request by carrying to its inevitable conclusion an inflationary process begun by the New Deal a generation earlier. (The $600 million, of course, constituted only a fraction of the $2,800 million profit produced out of thin air by the 1934 devaluation.)

For some years various prominent persons have advocated that the Congress create a monetary commission such as the Aldrich Commission of 1908, whose 1912 report gave rise to the inauguration of the Federal Reserve System. Many Members of the Congress also have favored the creation of another National Monetary Commission. President Eisenhower last year formally asked the Congress to authorize a monetary and credit commission. But because of clashing preconceptions as to the nature of the problem and how to handle it, and particularly how such a congressionally authorized commission should be composed and directed, the proposal has not been able to get through the Congress. Meanwhile, in 1958 a private research and educational group supported by progressive businessmen and called the Committee for Economic Development (CED) has sponsored a national commission on money and credit. A 10-man selection committee drawn from universities and research bodies selected the 25 members of the new commission, which will be equipped with a research staff.

This CED-appointed commission is under the chairmanship of a CED trustee, Mr. Frazar B. Wilde, president of a large life insurance company. The vice chairman is another businessman, Mr. H. Christian Sonne, who is active in the work of the liberal National Planning Association. Among the commission's remaining members are Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. David Rockefeller, vice chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, Mr. Allan Sproul, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Mr. Robert R. Nathan, who heads Americans for Democratic Action, and Mr. Stanley H. Ruttenberg, AFL–CIO[2] research director. The commission's work is expected to take 3 years. Of eight studies assigned to it, none relates to gold.

Excepting for the mining industry, few of those who have been advocating the creation

[1] U.S. News & World Report, Dec. 4, 1953, p. 63.

[2] American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

of a national monetary commission have been particularly interested in the role of gold in the American monetary system. Their interest rather has centered on how the American monetary and credit system should be managed. The conduct of Federal Reserve policies and the fiscal and debt-management policies of the Treasury have been controversial political topics in and out of the Congress during the postwar years. Part of the picture is the continuing concern of the American public with inflation; the seemingly perpetual depreciation of the dollar in terms of its buying power. Many Americans are seriously worried about the wage-price spiral, and increasing attention is being given in business and political circles to the question: Is inflation inevitable if we are to pursue the apparent goals of the Employment Act of 1946?

Under the law governing it, the Federal Reserve Board, responsible only to the Congress, operates with a wide degree of freedom. It cooperates with the Treasury, particularly during periods of Treasury financing operations, but on a voluntary and independent basis. In recent months, under President Eisenhower, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has participated in periodic meetings at the White House along with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Despite this innovation, the Board takes no orders from the administration. This summer a subcommittee of the House of Representatives has held hearings on a bill to amend the 1956 Employment Act by a provision under which the administration would give the Board recommendations on monetary and credit policies. This proposal is so controversial that its adoption in the visible future is not predictable. None of the public debate on this question even touches on the proper price of gold or the internal convertibility of the dollar.

The American Mining Congress, reflecting the views of gold miners, for several years has advocated the appointment by the Government of a commission to make recommendations as to the price of gold and restoration of the gold standard. This year mining-State Senators on the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs supported a Senate joint resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold mining industry. After reporting out the resolution (S.J. Res. 16) the Senators realized that it would, under Senate rules, require the President's signature, whereupon a substitute was hurriedly issued, Senate Concurrent Resolution 91, for which White House assent would not be necessary. This resolution called for a commission instead of a committee.

This special gold committee would have consisted of 10 Members of the Congress and 6 private individuals familiar with the gold mining industry who will help to write the final report to the Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported. The latter report also expressed the view that: "The gold mining industry has become more and more frustrated as the years have rolled on and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee believes it is time that there was created a sympathetic sounding board such as this special committee would furnish."

For reasons connected with Senate procedures, Senate Concurrent Resolution 91, instead of being referred to the favorably inclined Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. There considerable differences of opinion developed as to various points involved. Amendments were discussed, but, in the end, the sentiments of a substantial majority were reflected in the decision not to report out the resolution. The latter accordingly died with the adjournment of the Congress in August. Possibly next year an attempt will be made to reintroduce the measure and to include Alaskan representation on the Commission's membership. How effective such a Commission would be in changing U.S. policies on gold is a question.

Within the Congress the most persistent effort to have U.S. monetary policy reviewed has been that of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas Democrat, who, in terms of seniority, is third ranking member of his party on the House Banking and Currency Committee. An outstanding advocate of cheap money, Mr. PATMAN has been for many years a sharp critic of Federal Reserve Board policies as also of the Eisenhower administration's allegedly tight money fiscal policies. Last year, when it appeared that the Congress would endorse President Eisenhower's recommendation to set up an official National Monetary Commission similar to that of 1908–12 but consisting of able and qualified citizens rather than Members of Senate and House, PATMAN blocked the effort. The chairman and vice chairman would have been Presidential appointees.

Congressman PATMAN, recommended instead first a joint congressional monetary committee assisted by outside experts; then an alternative study to be conducted by the House Banking and Currency Committee alone. Although for a while it appeared that Mr. PATMAN would have his way, he was, in the end, defeated by his more conservative colleagues. His influence, however, blocked the Eisenhower proposal for good. On two subsequent occasions Mr. PATMAN made renewed efforts to obtain House endorsement of his own suggested "investigation of the Nation's money and credit systems," each time unsuccessfully. Were his plan to be adopted, Mr. PATMAN would expect to be named chairman of the study, but because he is himself a rather controversial character in the House, his efforts in this matter have as yet come to naught. The course of the 1958 congressional elections is still in the future as we write. A strong Democratic victory could improve the chances of the Texan's project in the Congress which convenes in 1959.

On September 10, 1958, Mr. PATMAN announced that the economic stabilization subcommitte of the Joint Economic Committee was sending to about 1,500 economists in 150 selected universities a questionnaire on stabilization problems and policies. The questionnaire contained a number of questions under seven main headings. One question dealt with gold, namely: "Do you favor restoration of free domestic exchange of dollars for gold: Soon? Ultimately?"

In recent years there have been several Congressional inquiries into monetary and credit policy, one of them headed by Congressman PATMAN himself as then chairman of a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee—a House-Senate body. In the present Congress, 1957 and 1958, Mr. PATMAN has been chairman of the full Joint Economic Committee, a subcommittee of which has held discussions of monetary and fiscal policies. The chief result of the defeat of the Eisenhower request for a National Monetary Commission, however, was the study of the financial condition of the United States launched in 1957 by the Senate Finance Committee. Its hearings and replies to questionnaires published to date fill several volumes. The subject of gold received slight attention during the Finance Committee's sessions, chiefly in the questioning of witnesses by Senator George W. Malone of Nevada, a Republican but nonetheless a caustic commentator on the policies of the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board. Mining-State newspapers may have noted Mr. Malone's inquiries, but they received almost no attention elsewhere.

Indicative of the place of the price of gold in public consideration of monetary questions in the United States nowadays is the questionnaire sent out in connection with the above-mentioned study by the Senate Finance Committee chairman, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, a conservative Democrat, to the presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, economists, professors, corporation executives and others early in 1958. In the questionnaire the word gold appears not even once. The 17 questions deal with inflation and deflation, Federal Reserve monetary policies, Treasury fiscal policies and stable currency and full employment as national goals.

Of two major congressional postwar studies of money, credit and fiscal policies, the first was that of the Joint Economic Subcommittee headed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat. Its report in 1950 opposed a return of the United States to gold coinage and recommended the repel of any existing laws that might be construed as permitting a change in the price of gold. The second comprehensive study made by a subcommittee headed by Congressman PATMAN in 1951 and 1952 dealt with monetary policy and debt management, their role in achieving price stability and high-level employment. It examined Treasury-Federal Reserve relations, interest rates and other credit-rationing devices, etc.

Mr. PATMAN's personal views on gold were reflected in a speech he delivered on the floor of the House on July 6, 1951, in which he declared that going back to the gold (coin) standard would be the quickest way entirely to wreck the country. He added "Going back on the gold standard would also lead to a worldwide depression. You would be putting your money behind something that is scarce and, it being scarce, a few international racketeers could do as they have done in the past—cornered the gold and cause a worldwide depression."

The summary of the PATMAN subcommittee's report, published in June 1952, with reference to gold addressed itself to only two propositions. The report endorsed the continuance of the United States on the gold bullion standard at the $35 price: and it rejected the restoration of domestic convertibility of the dollar into gold coin. At the time the price of gold was not an issue in the United States. In the intervening years no change has occurred in the overwhelmingly predominant sentiment in the Congress for keeping the status quo as to gold.

Gold mining interests and others in the United States who, during recent years, have advocated a higher price of gold have continued to do so during 1958. The early months of the year having been marked by an outflow of considerable dimensions, much of the recent discussion has centered on the meaning and effects of the loss of the yellow metal and the threat to financial stability allegedly arising from the magnitude of foreign short-term claims aganst the dollar. The 1957–58 gold outflow, while large, has not disturbed the Treasury or Federal Reserve Board, as was made clear in a letter from the Chairman, Mr. William McChesney Martin, answering an inquiry of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, in April. Mr. Martin pointed out that the Board's recent policy of expansion was in part designed to offset the contracting effect of the decline in the United States gold stock. Gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve System, he noted, were in mid-April 64½ percent of deposit and note liabilities, as compared with the statutory minimum of 25 percent, and there was no danger that in the foreseeable future they would be brought down to the neighborhood of the statutory level.

The influential monthly letter of the First National City Bank of New York in June discussed the price of gold at some length. It

addressed itself particularly to the British advocacy of a higher price. The 1958 gold outflow was not the first of such magnitude since World War II, but the third one. Despite the outflow, the United States still held $9,000 million of gold over and above the $11,400 million needed to satisfy legal requirements. "With beyond $9,000 million of surplus gold reserves, there is obviously no question of any practical need to consider either raising the gold price or suspending U.S. Treasury sales at $35 an ounce and permitting the price to rise in free markets," the bank said.

Continuing, the letter noted that foreign holdings of deposits and short-term investments in the United States totaled some $13,800 million, the existence of which does not imply that any large-scale conversion into gold is either likely or practicable. Because foreigners need many thousands of millions to finance essential commerce, the bank concluded that "while the outside world theoretically could force a change in United States gold policy, it would be at the cost of upsetting world trade and finance." Even if conditions required the United States to place an embargo on gold exports, there would be no necessary assurance that an embargo would be followed by a rise in the U.S. price. The article discounted the suspicion voiced in some circles that the heavy 1958 gold outflow reflected British and other pressure to bring about an increase in the United States official price of gold. Britain, the chief destination of the outflowing gold, was merely restoring the proportion of gold in its total gold and dollar reserves. The fall in short-term money rates in the United States, moreover, weakened the incentive of foreign authorities to hold dollar balances. Balance of payments trends, including over-generosity in foreign aid, sufficed to explain the gold outflow.

The theory hopefully circulated abroad that perhaps the recession would lead the United States to raise the price of gold was also rejected by the bank. Unlike the early 1930's, today gold is not a limiting factor in the Federal Reserve System, what with a stock of $9,700 million over and above the legal requirement. Furthermore, the letter continued, increasing the price of gold—devaluing the dollar—would be a measure of dubious merit, with implications far beyond the bonanza to gold miners. It went on:

"An increase in the dollar price would penalize foreign governments, banks, and individuals who have trusted the dollar; it would hand out windfall profits to those who have not. The intricate world-wide machinery of industry and trade needs credit and trust as lubricants. The very talk of a rise in the dollar price of gold is a threat to prosperity. The sooner the question ceases to disturb men's minds the better."

Finally, the First National City Bank addressed itself to the most imposing argument for an increase in the gold price: that the growth of world trade plus inflation creates a need for more gold reserves, which can be provided by marking up the price of gold worldwide.

"This is getting the cart before the horse: the inflation of the past 20 years got its gold base out of the excessive rise in gold price and enormous stimulation to good production. If the gold price were to be related to commodity prices and marked up every time commodity prices rose, it would cease to have use or meaning as an official currency standard. The use of any fixed gold price is to check excessive credit expansion and rising commodity prices. * * * But to raise the price of gold dramatically at this juncture would be to destroy faith in all the currencies of the Western World. * * * Inflation today is barely mastered. We have no wish to give it a longer lease on life."

Another New York bank letter published in June by the Hanover Bank dealt with the U.S. gold outflow and the gold price rumors in similar vein. The gold outflow it termed nothing ominous and a wholesome development. Suggestions that the price of gold be raised had elicited absolutely no favorable response in congressional or business and banking circles. To raise the price of gold to increase international liquidity the bank letter regarded as a questionable proposition. "It might easily cause inflationary fears and a flight from the dollar, which could drive up prices of commodities and services. This would wipe out the advantage of the dollar price of gold. Increasing the price of gold would be the more dangerous undercurrent conditions because, despite the recession and the widespread unemployment in manufacturing, both wages and prices are still rising," the letter observed.

A still different reaction to London gold suggestions is found in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Monetary technicians there are quoted as stating that the liquidity argument for a gold price hike ignores the considerable growth of dollars as part of the world's reserves; i.e., the short-term balances and investments held in the United States. Secondly, the liquidity argument glosses over the fundamental cause of international economic imbalance; i.e., the tendency of countries still suffering from shortages of monetary reserves to live beyond their means. Thirdly, in tending to undermine confidence in the dollar, the talk about a higher price of gold tends to promote a decline in reserves, insofar as thereby inflation in the deficit countries is excused, the need for reserves is enlarged.

Foreign short-term assets in the United States increased from less than $5 billion at the end of 1947 to more than $15 billion at the end of 1957. Mr. Fred H. Klopstock, an economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, terms these balances an economizer of gold, stating:

"Had foreign central banks as a group chosen to utilize all their net dollar acquisitions since 1948 for purchasing gold from the U.S. Treasury, our own gold reserve would have fallen considerably and the increase in aggregate monetary reserves of the world would have been substantially less."

Apart from the American objection to raising the price of gold on the grounds already referred to, the proposal cannot be discussed in U.S. financial circles without raising the additional objection that to adopt it would be to confer a major benefit upon the U.S.S.R., a country described in London bullion circles as the world's second largest gold producer. If we are going to increase the world's supply of dollars, Americans reason, why do it in such a way as to reward our cold war enemies; why not rather do so through the International Monetary Fund, which cannot only apportion the new purchasing power among the most deserving member countries, but, at the same time, exert its influence toward discontinuance of unsound monetary and credit policies? Needless to say, International Monetary Fund economists go along with this reasoning. Enlargements of the Fund's resources, when the step seems necessary, is much more likely to enlist U.S. Government support than an increase in the price of gold.

Articles by American newspaper columnists and others dealing with Russia and gold in recent months have tended to create public confusion on the subject. A few specimen quotations may be cited as illustrations:

Senator Malone, of Nevada: "It is my opinion that gold may be Russia's secret weapon. They have gold. If they put the ruble on the gold standard, with $30 billion or $40 billion in gold behind it on the world market, the ruble could well soon replace the dollar as the criterion of exchange."

Wiesenberger Investment Report: "Another rumor is that a trade deal of important dimensions might be worked out between the United States and Russia, involving United States acceptance of gold. If Russia succeeded in making the ruble convertible, we could be forced to take rubles."

Donald H. McLaughlin, president of Homestake Mining Co. and chairman of the gold producers' committee of the American Mining Congress: "A sudden announcement of a ruble convertible into gold at a fixed rate for use in international trade could bring Russia as much new prestige as their success in sending up the first satellite * * *. The rest of the world would be in a most disadvantageous position if earlier steps had not been taken to put the dollar and European monetary systems in better order."

George E. Sokolsky, syndicated columnist: "How soon will it be before Soviet Russia issues a gold export ruble: If the world turns to gold, as it is likely to do in an effort to save itself from economic strangulation, the country with the most gold will be the center of the universe, as England was for centuries."

Franz Pick, foreign exchange consultant: "The nonresident gold ruble which the Russians are planning to create within about a year will be nothing but a copy of registered sterling * * * and lead to the listing of Soviet currency in all large capitalistic trading centers. * * * After the creation of this unit the Russians would not have to ship gold abroad, but the central banks of other countries would have to take delivery of the gold in Russia, which is the procedure of the Bank of England and the Federal Reserve."

Doubtless such comments may raise uneasy and vague forebodings in the minds of casual readers. But persons with any familiarity with foreign exchange are unlikely to be so easily frightened. "Do you seriously believe what you say?" they might ask Mr. Malone. "Why," they might ask Mr. Wiesenberger, "would the world be forced to take rubles if the rubles were made convertible?" (The writer asked by letter but received no reply.) Just what steps is Mr. McLaughlin recommending, and just why? Just what is Mr. Sokolsky saying? "And just what," Mr. Pick might be asked, "is there so embarrasing in using a convertible ruble for which foreign countries would have to take delivery of the gold in Russia and not abroad?"

One American attempt to arouse interest in a higher price of gold during 1958 merits special mention here because of its origin. What appeared to be the beginning of a campaign emanated from the offices of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., in New York, one of the many public educational groups of varied viewpoints that dot the U.S. scene. What lends special interest to its 1958 gold efforts is their signature by Edward A. Rumely, 76-year-old public relations veteran. No organized force played a greater role in the increase of the price of gold a generation ago in the United States than Mr. Rumely and the self-styled Committee for the Nation which he guided and directed. In the late 1930's Mr. Rumely was executive secretary of both the Committee for the Nation and the National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government (now called Committee for Constitutional Government), both operating at the same address, with the same public relations personnel. The latter committee appears to be a lineal descendant of the former committee, now defunct.

In March 1958, Mr. Rumely's former interest in devaluation of the dollar unexpectedly revived. Brushing off the old techniques and arguments of the depression days of the early New Deal, Mr. Rume-

ly addressed telegrams to President Eisenhower, his aid, Mr. Sherman Adams, and the Secretary of the Treasury, and mailed copies thereof addressed to all editors. The latter were also supplied with copies of telegrams Mr. Rumely sent to the Committee for Economic Development and to administration leaders and Members of the Congress. These were supplemented by reprints of articles apeparing in the committee's occasional bulletin, "Spotlight," and other material, including a recent endorsement of a rise in gold price by the Australian economist, Douglas Copland, who, in 1934, was brought to the United States by the Committee for the Nation in support of its devaluation campaign of that period.

Among other 1958 activities of Mr. Rumely has been the distribution of a 400-page book, "Prices," by George F. Warren and Frank A. Pearson, published in 1933 and bearing the imprint of the Committee for the Nation. The authors were Cornell University professors who advocated an increase in the price of gold. Warren was a close adviser of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., when he was Secretary of the Treasury. Warren is no longer alive. Pearson survives. Mr. Rumely this year called for a conference of informed monetary experts, adding: "Prof. F. A. Pearson should be present, among others." He has also invited public encouragement in the revival of another Warren and Pearson book of the 1930's "Gold and Prices," now completely out of print.

Just what revived Mr. Rumley's interest in devaluation in 1958 can only be conjectured. His revived interest may have been temporary. In recent months he has been quiet on this topic. His above-mentioned efforts appeared early in the year, when all published economic indicators were pointing downward and there was concern about the seriousness of the recession. Thus, the Rumley appeals were addressed to all interested in quick recovery from the spreading depression. To President Eisenhower he wired in March: "This recession, now growing into a serious depression, has the same cause as the great depression of 1929–33. Its origin lies in worldwide forces and shortage of gold for its increased workload." The telegram mentioned the fact that Rumley had organized the Committee for the Nation in 1932 and its reliance on the Cornell monetary experts (i.e., the two above-mentioned professors of agricultural economics) who, according to Mr. Rumley, "guided the thinking that led, in the spring of 1934, to the release of our dollar from the depression price of $20.67 per ounce for gold."

Mr. Rumley's gloomy appraisal of the economic outlook in March this year has not been borne out by events, and public dissatisfaction with $35 price of gold has not been aroused.

Apart from the Senate Joint Resolution 16 and its replacement, the Senate Concurrent Resolution 91, already mentioned, and three equivalent resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives, only a few other bills on gold were introduced in the Congress during 1957 and 1958, and on none of them was any action taken. This year, Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, was the author of a bill to allow private trading in gold, simliar to a bill introduced in 1957 by Congressman ENGLE, of California. Other bills with the same purpose were introduced in 1957 by Congressmen PFOST, of Idaho; BARING, of Nevada; Berry, of South Dakota; GUBSER, of California; and Delegate BARTLETT, of Alaska, and Senator MURRAY, of Montana.

The only four other gold bills were those of Congressen HIESTAND of California, Reed of New York, Hale of Maine and KEARNS of Pennsylvania, all providing for a resumption of gold coinage without a change in the price of the metal. Some of these bills have been reintroduced year after year without any result. These bills have the support of the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy, 58 members of which in May 1958, issued a public statement entitled, "The United States must not devalue her dollar."

We have seen nothing during the past 6 years to suggest any change in the firm adherence of the U.S. Government and public to the established price of $35 per ounce of gold. The country's majority support of foreign aid as a continuing proposition suggests that, in the not very distant future, it may be prevailed upon to contribute another major transfusion of dollars to the monetary resources of the rest of the free world; but, if this comes about, it is far more likely to take the form of an increase in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund, plus contributions of dollars to other international and national agencies engaged in world finance, rather than an increase in the price of gold, either unilateral or multilateral.

The enlargement of World Fund and Bank quotas, which has been advocated for some time in Britain as one of the several alternatives to a replenishment of world reserves through a gold price increase and which was discussed by British Treasury representatives in Washington early in 1958, has been formally accepted by the U.S. administration. A published exchange of letters in August between the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, and President Eisenhower disclosed that the United States would sponsor an increase in members' quotas in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank at their annual meeting in New Delhi in October as well as open discussions looking toward the creation of an International Development Association as an adjunct of the World Bank.

Further helping to crystallize U.S. views on the so-called international liquidity question was an article in the September 1958, letter of the First National City Bank of New York. The bank rejected the thesis that inadequacy of reserves is demonstrated by comparing 1957 and 1937 gold and trade data. The bank, instead, compared 1957 with 1928, and found total official gold reserves as a percentage of world imports to be 36 percent in 1957, compared with only 32 percent in prosperous 1928. In physical terms, the bank noted, world trade has increased by less than 80 percent since 1937; the quadrupling of its value being a result of inflation—i.e., "overswollen monetary reserves created by the radical mark-up in the price of gold in 1934." The bank adds: "The thought emerges that a big rise in the price of gold today would have the practical result of giving inflation another 25 years' lease of life."

As 1958 draws to a close, nothing on the American scene suggests the slightest change in U.S. opposition to a change in the official price of gold.

## The Danger From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, 15 years have gone by since F.D.R. ordered "Clear it with Sidney," meaning the approval of Candidate Truman for Vice President rested with Sidney Hillman. Today the requirement for every Congressman, Democrat or Republican, is he must clear his candidacy with COPE. Times have changed.

Willard Edwards, a political writer, has an article in the April issue of the magazine American Mercury that everyone interested in preserving our American form of government and our American way of life should read.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a part of that article only. The article is entitled "Is a Labor Government in 1960 Inevitable?"

The freshman Congressman remarked, despairingly, "I never knew what I let myself in for when I accepted labor's support. I don't know whether I can take it for 2 years. If they don't get off my neck, I'll never run for Congress again."

The speaker was young, intelligent, ambitious. In his first venture into politics last November, as Democratic candidate for the House of Representatives in a populous Eastern State, he had scored an upset in defeating a veteran Republican incumbent.

His district, a suburban area adjacent to a large city, contained no large industries. But organized labor had contributed heavily to his candidacy because his Republican opponent had publicly espoused right-to-work laws and had otherwise shown an antilabor attitude. There was general agreement that the money, propaganda, and paid workers thrown into the district by the Committee on Political Education (COPE), electioneering arm of the AFL–CIO, had been responsible for the results on election day. Scores of similar surprises were registered from coast to coast.

The victor had paid graceful tribute to this support in his post-election statement, promising to lend a sympathetic ear to labor's problems. Sublimely ignorant that something more practical and substantial might be expected, he turned his attention happily to organizing an office force equipped to deal with the special problems of his constituency.

Shortly thereafter, an affable representative of COPE presented himself and offered to assist the Congressman-elect in his hiring problems.

"Your administrative assistant will be the most important man in your office, next to yourself," he was informed, truthfully. "Your future career will depend to a great degree on his skill and efficiency. We are interested in your future and can help you to select the proper man, with the proper attitude, who will organize a smooth-working staff."

The new Congressman already had picked his number one assistant, a friend, a young lawyer, with a sound political background. The labor representative shook his head sadly when informed of this selection.

"This man of yours said, only 6 months ago, that the wage spiral was contributing to inflation," he remarked. "He does not recognize that inflation is a Republican bugaboo, that it is inevitable in this Nation's dynamic economy, and that rising costs hurt no one as long as personal income rises at a greater rate. Anyone with his views would be a pernicious influence on your whole staff. Don't you agree?"

The young Congressman protested feebly but eventually agreed to discard his original choice and appoint a former union organizer as his chief assistant. This individual took over the hiring of the office staff, carefully examining each job applicant, including clerks and typists, on his labor attitude.

"I've lost control of my own office force," the freshman legislator remarked, bitterly, to an intimate. "I've kicked myself for permitting it, but I couldn't forget that I'd never have got to Congress without labor's money and organization. Now, I'm beginning to wonder how far the pay-off will extend and whether it's worth it."

This incident is not an isolated one. All over Capitol Hill, in the months since election of the 86th Congress with its overwhelming Democratic-Socialist-labor majorities, new Members of Congress in both Senate and House are discovering the price they must pay for labor's support.

Reports of labor's patronage takeover came first from a group of career workers in congressional offices. These men and women, skilled in dealing with problems peculiar to the legislative branch, have never, in past years, been disturbed by election returns which frequently removed their employers from office. Equally valuable to Republican or Democratic legislator, they always found ready employment in each new Congress. Their party affiliation and political opinions had never previously been questioned when their qualifications were under consideration.

These workers reported a phenomenon. When they interviewed a Congressman-elect, seeking employment, there was usually present a third party, silent but interested, who took notes and whispered suggestions to the employing legislator. Word quickly spread that this was the labor man and it was obvious that he inspired a number of questions new to congressional office workers.

"Your former employer, Congressman X, held antilabor views," a job applicant would be informed. "Did you endorse them? What is your position on the Taft-Hartley Act, on so-called right-to-work laws, on the Kennedy-Ives amendments?"

If the answers by bewildered applicants did not satisfy the labor man, the career workers discovered, letters of commendation for years of previous service, from either Democratic or Republican legislators, were valueless. A number of veteran staff workers, despite their high professional capacities, found themselves unable to survive the examination.

There were mutterings of discontent. The young Congressman, quoted above, threatened, darkly, to take the House floor some day and reveal his experiences. But it is a mournful duty to record that he is representative of an exceedingly small minority and the odds are high against this lone fighter staging a rebellion. The comforts of his office, with its $22,500 salary, its prestige, its junkets to foreign lands at public expense, its social prerogatives for wife and family, can be expected to soften his resentment. Like all of his colleagues, he will want more of the same and is acutely aware that a public attack on labor's dictatorship would almost certainly end his political career.

Some realists among the newcomers needed no coercion from labor to put their offices on a sound footing. Freshman Representative GERALD T. FLYNN, Wisconsin Democrat, delayed scarcely at all to pay off his principal election debt.

He appointed as his administrative assistant one Samuel Rizzo, international representative of the AFL–CIO United Auto Workers and chairman of the UAW midwestern foundry subcouncil. Rizzo took the job with a special dispensation from President Walter Reuther of the UAW who granted him a leave of office, obviously on the theory that Rizzo would be more useful calling signals in Washington than in Wisconsin. FLYNN installed another union man as secretary in his home office in Racine, Wis. He could do no less in return for the funds and organization which enabled him to take the seat long held by a veteran Republican of ultraconservative views.

At least one other newly elected Democratic Congressman made no secret of his gratitude to labor. Representative WALTER H. MOELLER, of Ohio, announced the employment of union staff assistants after COPE helped him unseat an antilabor Representative.

## Military Retired Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, most Members are receiving a large number of letters with reference to the disparity of retired pay of military men retired before and those retired after the military pay bill, effective June 1, 1958—Public Law 85–422.

Because I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which wrote the bill, Members are inquiring of me as to what is involved in this issue. In an effort to be helpful to my colleagues, I have formulated a number of questions and answers which reflect answers to most of the inquiries made of me.

The information given below is intended to be factual. No effort has been made to evaluate the merits of the issue nor to debate the same.

The questions and answers follow:

Question 1: Is there a material difference in the retired pay of members of the military, in the same rank and same length of service who retired before June 1, 1958, and those retiring after June 1, 1958?

Answer: In the higher ranks there is a very material difference in retired pay. The difference diminishes in the lower officer ranks and enlisted grades.

The following table contains full information as to officer ranks and enlisted grades of those retired with average years of service related to retired grade:

*Examples of military retired pay under the Career Compensation Act—Nondisability retirements*

| Grade | Pay grade | Years of service | Paid prior to June 1, 1958 | Paid after June 1, 1958 | | Increase over old rate | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Retired before June 1, 1958 | Retired after June 1, 1958 [1] | Retired before June 1, 1958 | Retired after June 1, 1958 [1] | Difference [1] |
| | | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| Chief of Staff | O–10 | 30 | $807 | $1,015 | $1,406 | $208 | $599 | $391 |
| General | O–10 | 30 | 807 | 1,015 | 1,275 | 208 | 468 | 260 |
| Lieutenant general | O–9 | 30 | 807 | 935 | 1,125 | 128 | 318 | 190 |
| Major general | O–8 | 30 | 807 | 856 | 1,013 | 49 | 206 | 157 |
| Brigadier general | O–7 | 30 | 725 | 769 | 881 | 44 | 156 | 112 |
| Colonel | O–6 | 30 | 608 | 645 | 739 | 37 | 131 | 94 |
| Lieutenant colonel | O–5 | 27 | 453 | 480 | 523 | 27 | 70 | 43 |
| Major | O–4 | 26 | 385 | 408 | 410 | 23 | 25 | 2 |
| Captain | O–3 | 25 | 322 | 341 | 328 | 19 | 6 | −13 |
| 1st lieutenant | O–2 | 25 | 258 | 274 | 238 | 16 | −20 | −36 |
| 2d lieutenant | O–1 | 27 | 253 | 268 | 212 | 15 | −41 | −56 |
| Master sergeant | E–7 | 23 | 184 | 195 | 201 | 11 | 17 | 6 |
| Technical sergeant | E–6 | 23 | 166 | 176 | 167 | 10 | 1 | −9 |
| Staff sergeant | E–5 | 24 | 155 | 164 | 144 | 9 | −11 | −20 |
| Sergeant | E–4 | 25 | 137 | 145 | 119 | 8 | −18 | −26 |
| Corporal | E–3 | 25 | 102 | 109 | 88 | 7 | −14 | −21 |
| Private 1st class | E–2 | 24 | 80 | 84 | 65 | 4 | −15 | −19 |
| Private | E–1 | 23 | 61 | 65 | 60 | 4 | −1 | −5 |

[1] Not applicable to persons on saved pay at time of retirement.

NOTE.—For brevity, tables concerning commissioned officers with over 4 years of active enlisted service and warrant officers have not been included.

Question 2: Under the 1958 pay bill did persons retired before June 1, 1958, receive any increase in the retired pay previously received by them?

Answer: Yes. Those persons retired before the effective date of that pay bill received an increase of 6 percent of the pay previously received. The dollar amount in each grade and rank is given in the above table.

Question 3: Why was 6 percent increase granted rather than some other percentage?

Answer: The Department of Defense had recommended a formula granting a cost-of-living increase of 6 percent for all those active-duty members not receiving a 6 percent increase under the recommendation submitted by it. The subcommittee did not recommend the formula submitted by the Department of Defense. However, the pay scales recommended by the committee, and adopted by the Congress, reflected with but very few exceptions a 6 percent increase. Therefore, the committee recommended an increase of 6 percent for persons previously retired as approaching the increase in the cost of living.

Question 4: What was the annual cost of the increased retired pay of 6 percent?

Answer: Approximately $36 million per year.

Question 5: What increase for persons previously retired was recommended by the Department of Defense?

Answer: The Department of Defense recommended that the retired pay of those retired before the effective date of the bill not be computed on the new rates. Therefore the Department recommended no increase for these officers.

Question 6: What would be the increased cost if those retired before the effective date of the pay bill were permitted to recompute their retired pay on the new pay rates?

Answer: It is estimated the increased cost for the first year would be between $25 million and $26 million, in addition to the $36 million previously granted.

This cost would recur annually, but would be reduced by approximately 2 percent per year due to attrition of personnel on the retired rolls.

Question 7: Did the granting of an increase of 6 percent depart from the previous custom as to retired pay?

Answer: Yes. In the past, persons retired prior to the effective date of any pay act have had their retired pay recomputed upon the new rather than the old pay rates.

Question 8: What is the cost of military retired pay, and what has it been in the past?

Answer: The current and past cost of military retired pay is as follows:

*Appropriations or expenditures for military retired pay, fiscal year 1950–60*

| Fiscal year | Million |
|---|---|
| 1950 appropriation | $219 |
| 1951 appropriation | 322 |
| 1952 appropriation | 329 |
| 1953 appropriation | 356 |
| 1954 expenditure | 386 |
| 1955 expenditure | 419 |
| 1956 expenditure | 477 |
| 1957 expenditure | 509 |
| 1958 expenditure | 561 |
| 1959 budget | 640 |
| 1960 budget | 715 |

## Federal Student Loan Program Booms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 2. 1955, I introduced a bill to increase the educational opportunities of needy students through a Federal loan fund. In the 85th Congress I reintroduced the bill and its provisions were included in the National Defense Education Act of that Congress.

I am pleased to note that the program has proved highly successful. In that connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the February 20, 1959, issue of Congressional Quarterly:

FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM BOOMS

Figures within the U.S. Office of Education show the Federal program to loan money to college students is booming. Items:

Colleges requested 10 times as much money as they received for student loans. 1,221 colleges and universities, representing 80 percent of the Nation's collegiate enrollment, have entered the program.

Of the 883 colleges which had no student loan program whatever last year, 466 have joined the Federal program.

U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick February 6 said the program "has generated more genuine interest among the colleges and universities than anyone had any reason to expect." Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, contended it was the biggest surprise of any of the programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Public Law 864). Flemming said it represented a "revolution" in thinking about college loans.

BACKGROUND

The National Defense Education Act was signed into law September 2, 1958, after passing the Senate August 22, 1958, on a 66–15 rollcall vote and the House August 23, 1958, on a 212–85 rollcall vote (1958 Almanac, p. 213).

The act authorized for the student loan program $47.5 million for fiscal 1959; $75 million for fiscal 1960; $62.5 million for fiscal 1961; $90 million for fiscal 1962. But Congress in 1958 appropriated only $6 million to start the loan program. The $6 million already has been allocated to applicants who requested Federal money before January 1, 1959. More money is certain to be appropriated in 1959 for the program.

The colleges themselves award the loans. They must put one dollar of their own into the student loan fund for every nine Federal dollars received. To fulfill this matching obligation, colleges can borrow money at 4 percent interest from the Federal Government.

The more students enrolled in colleges within a State the bigger slice of loan money that State gets, since the distribution is in proportion to how the State's college population compares with the national college population. The State's share is divided among individual colleges in proportion to how much they ask for. Therefore, the more money a college requests, the more it receives.

A college student can borrow up to $1,000 a year as long as he is a full-time student, but he cannot borrow more than $5,000 all told. He pays the money back over 10 years starting 1 year after he stops being a full-time student. The interest rate is 3 percent on the unpaid balance. If he teaches in high school or elementary school, 10 percent of his loan is canceled every year he teaches. But no more than 50 percent of the loan, or 5 years worth of teaching, can be forgiven.

The loan program is scheduled to expire June 30, 1966.

COLLEGE LOAN MONEY ALLOCATION

This chart shows how much Federal loan money the colleges requested and how much they received under the first appropriation:

| | Money requested | Money received | Recipient colleges |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | $793,702 | $88,625 | 19 |
| Alaska | 7,500 | 1,347 | 1 |
| Arizona | 500,435 | 39,705 | 6 |
| Arkansas | 452,115 | 47,553 | 17 |
| California | 3,499,927 | 571,499 | 81 |
| Colorado | 1,067,756 | 81,116 | 17 |
| Connecticut | 490,285 | 83,011 | 15 |
| Delaware | 32,500 | 11,657 | 2 |
| District of Columbia | 653,097 | 71,276 | 9 |
| Florida | 1,328,755 | 106,476 | 17 |
| Georgia | 1,203,120 | 98,290 | 29 |
| Idaho | 219,675 | 22,810 | 8 |
| Illinois | 2,858,957 | 305,718 | 52 |
| Indiana | 2,395,294 | 174,357 | 27 |
| Iowa | 1,326,511 | 113,971 | 36 |
| Kansas | 1,244,229 | 97,508 | 30 |
| Kentucky | 965,548 | 77,472 | 25 |
| Louisiana | 1,200,868 | 105,125 | 15 |
| Maine | 282,600 | 22,858 | 7 |
| Maryland | 882,955 | 81,525 | 22 |
| Massachusetts | 2,328,488 | 249,680 | 52 |
| Michigan | 2,645,905 | 255,618 | 35 |
| Minnesota | 1,692,000 | 135,107 | 27 |
| Mississippi | 572,700 | 65,719 | 22 |
| Missouri | 1,990,508 | 142,128 | 37 |
| Montana | 146,230 | 23,549 | 8 |
| Nebraska | 457,815 | 57,263 | 14 |
| Nevada | 42,223 | 4,363 | 1 |
| New Hampshire | 257,000 | 24,655 | 6 |
| New Jersey | 919,600 | 108,448 | 19 |
| New Mexico | 324,142 | 24,987 | 9 |
| New York | 6,977,377 | 623,442 | 92 |
| North Carolina | 1,498,878 | 138,216 | 46 |
| North Dakota | 185,940 | 25,249 | 9 |
| Ohio | 2,840,170 | 274,124 | 47 |
| Oklahoma | 1,634,631 | 105,097 | 27 |
| Oregon | 788,839 | 73,393 | 17 |
| Pennsylvania | 3,836,435 | 354,192 | 75 |
| Rhode Island | 352,650 | 31,755 | 8 |
| South Carolina | 673,533 | 65,687 | 21 |
| South Dakota | $661,900 | $27,375 | 13 |
| Tennessee | 1,763,088 | 110,207 | 37 |
| Texas | 3,256,984 | 344,090 | 62 |
| Utah | 201,234 | 60,460 | 10 |
| Vermont | 318,510 | 20,016 | 12 |
| Virginia | 777,950 | 96,624 | 17 |
| Washington | 935,475 | 105,572 | 15 |
| West Virginia | 241,645 | 52,806 | 9 |
| Wisconsin | 1,203,770 | 135,462 | 30 |
| Wyoming | 95,800 | 9,627 | 3 |
| Total | 61,187,279 | 5,947,450 | 1,215 |
| Hawaii | 92,900 | 14,465 | 3 |
| Puerto Rico | 655,000 | 33,500 | 3 |
| Grand total | 61,935,179 | 5,995,415 | 1,221 |

Source: U.S. Office of Education.

## Trade Unions in Oregon Support Educational Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, organized labor is on the receiving end of a great deal of criticism these days. Therefore, I think it is only fair that the record should be balanced when it is possible to do so with accuracy. In my native city of Portland, Oreg., members of trade unions are voluntarily denying themselves such pleasure as a glass of beer so that they may contribute financially to a scholarship fund, which will help deserving Oregon boys and girls obtain a college education.

The moving spirit behind this project is Miss May Darling, a retired Portland high schoolteacher, who is chairman of the AFL–CIO committee on education in our State. Miss Darling has organized what she describes as the "one-less-beer-a-week" club. Although Miss Darling is not necessarily crusading against beer, she certainly is crusading affirmatively in behalf of education. She pointed out that if members of trade unions would deny themselves one glass of beer weekly, the $5.20 a year thus saved could be donated for college scholarships. This is helping to make possible educations for deserving high school seniors, who are being awarded scholarships by the Oregon AFL–CIO.

This entire worthy project has been described by Stan Weber, labor editor, in the Oregon Journal for Sunday, February 22, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Weber's informative article be printed, Mr. President, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR REPORT

(By Stan Weber)

May Darling, chairman of the Oregon AFL–CIO's standing committee on education, is welcoming recruits to a new organization called—of all things—the "one-less-beer-a-week" club.

Not that Miss Darling is necessarily opposed to anyone having a glass now and then of Blitz, Lucky Lager, or Olympia.

But the OLBW club has as its primary goal the financial betterment of the Oregon AFL–CIO's scholarship fund, a worthy cause near and dear to the heart of Miss Darling.

So far, the new organization hasn't brought in a tremendous amount of money, and it has only two members. But it has interesting possibilities.

The idea for the OLBW was hatched in the basement of the Labor Temple, where a barroom is located.

It seems a couple of patrons of the place were discussing labor's scholarship program and agreeing that, of all the worthwhile endeavors being undertaken, this is one of the most commendable. But, they told each other, as much as they'd like to, they couldn't afford to contribute to the fund which finances the program.

Then, one of them got the bright idea that if he drank only one less glass of beer a week (the 10-cent variety) he would save $5.20 in a year, which he could donate scholarships. In less time than it takes to quaff a glass of the Bright Cascades, he had plunked out on the bar $5.20 for his companion to take up to Miss Darling's office.

The other man felt it his duty to also consume one less beer a week and put in his $5.20, too. And that's how the OLBW club was started.

Miss Darling is aware that the Bartenders Union cannot be expected to give unqualified support to movements such as this one. But, Fred Gee, secretary of the Portland bartenders local, has given his stamp of approval to the idea. Provided, of course, "it doesn't go too far," he adds, laughingly.

Miss Darling, in reporting on this new trend in fundraising, adds a reminder that examinations for this year's contests will be held April 8 in each school where there are students wishing to try for a scholarship. Principals must notify the Oregon AFL–CIO not later than March 23 of the number of students in their respective schools who wish to take the examination.

Miss Darling points out that the purpose of the contest is not to instill propaganda for organized labor or for any particular union. "The aim," she says, "is to encourage high school studets to study the American industrial system with special emphasis upon the role of management and labor."

This year the Oregon AFL–CIO will give three $600 scholarships and three $150 to high school seniors.

## Farm Cooperative and the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Wisconsin electric cooperatives begin a 3-day meeting in Madison, Wis.

The convention is expected to attract about 500 delegates from rural electric and telephone cooperatives in Wisconsin and affiliated groups in 9 Midwestern States.

During the meetings, it is expected that, among other discussions, the question of whether REA-financed cooperatives should or could absorb higher interest rates will be considered.

I am hopeful that out of this meeting, and similar conventions throughout the country, will come a greater understanding of the significant role of the REA and other co-ops play in the overall economy now, and in the future; as well as the problems that may be created by drastic changes in policy toward co-ops.

To illustrate the improvement in farm life throughout the availability of electricity—a most significant proportion of which has been provided through the REA—the numbers of farms in Wisconsin serviced by electrical service have jumped from 19.6 percent in 1935 to 97.4 percent in 1958.

Overall, this program has been vital to agricultural progress and to improvement of rural living.

As Congress considers legislation affecting the future of the cooperative movement, I believe it must take a look at the overall record.

Today I received from Mr. Homer Brinkley, executive secretary of the National Council of Farm Cooperatives, a brochure entitled "Farm Cooperatives and the Record." The brochure gives a fine resume of the role of cooperatives in the farm econmy.

In view of the attention now being given cooperatives—particularly from the tax angle—I believe this brief look at the record of cooperatives is most pertinent.

I ask unanimous consent to have the material printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER COOPERATIVES AND THE RECORD

Farmer cooperatives have grown and developed under the stimulus of many wise legislative acts and the support of farmers and a thoughtful public. Yet they have remained perhaps the least understood of all farm organizations.

This brochure has been prepared to help you better understand farmer cooperatives, their objectives, and their place in the national economy. It attempts, too, to show how the aids and benefits provided farmers through the years by State and Federal legislatures, and approved by a thinking public, have resulted from recognition that this Nation cannot afford a permanent "underdog" agricultural economy.

A careful study of the facts presented here will show that farmer cooperatives represent one sound way to correct the unbalances which have plagued agriculture for two generations.

THEY'RE FARMERS' OWN BUSINESS

Farmer cooperatives are organizations set up by producers to provide better business services for themselves in terms of efficiency, quality, and cost. Their objective is to increase their individual profit from farming through greater returns from products marketed, better quality farm supplies and services, and savings effected through mass purchasing. They give meaning and purpose to our private enterprise system as it relates to farmers.

THEY'RE DEMOCRATIC AND ECONOMICAL

Democratic control and operation at cost through distribution of financial benefits in proportion to patronage are basic principles of farmer cooperatives. Common characteristics are voluntary membership, member contributions to capital and member use of association services. They are off-the-farm extensions or integrations of their members' operations in production, marketing and purchasing.

THEY HELP FARMERS HELP THEMSELVES

Cooperatives provide farmers an effective form of organization through which they can develop economic strength to deal with other economic groups. They afford the means by which each farmer can continue to control his own farming operations rather than transfer vital management decisions to others. They help to develop more balanced competition in our economic system. They are innovators of new ideas and stimulators of new practices. They perform valuable services to producers through their efforts to spread economic understanding of methods and costs in marketing and purchasing, and in stimulating farm people to take constructive action in business and civic affairs.

The growing concentration of strength in nonagricultural groups brings farmers face to face with many complex problems. Their cooperatives, which they themselves own and control, offer the means through which farmers can gain for themselves a position of equality with other groups in the market place.

THEY'RE PART OF OUR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Cooperatives are a vital part of our country's free enterprise system. In addition to their economic functions, they have a constructive role to play in our society through their emphasis on the development of joint strength and responsibilities of farmers. In an increasingly organized and mechanized world, cooperatives serve to protect the functions of individual producers in an economy of mass production, mass distribution and mass communications—all springing from the growing force and consolidation of economic power.

THEY'RE AS OLD AS AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Farmer cooperation is as old as American agriculture itself. Over the years, cooperatives have earned a place of importance in the agricultural economy. In recognition of this, they have received bipartisan support and statutory sanction from the Congress of the United States and from the legislatures of every State in the Union, encouragement from both political parties, and words of approval and support from national leaders—including Presidents of the United States.

CONGRESS AND THE STATES HAVE ENCOURAGED THEM

For some 60 years now, the Congress repeatedly has enacted legislation designed to encourage farmers to establish and operate their own marketing, purchasing, and service cooperatives. In this legislation, the Congress has continued to recognize the distinct character of farmer cooperatives and to demonstrate its desire to foster these mutual, self-help agricultural institutions.

There actually is no Federal statute providing for the incorporation of agricultural cooperatives, however. They are set up and operate under State laws, and all States have statutes adapted to incorporation of such associations.

It is believed the first Federal statute to refer to farmer cooperatives was the War Revenue Act of 1898, which carried exemption for farmers' cooperatives and other types of organizations from payment of the stamp taxes.

The Clayton Antitrust Act became law in 1914, and section 6 of that act gives agricultural organizations meeting specified conditions certain types of limited immunity under the antitrust laws.

The Capper-Volstead Act became law in 1922. Its objectives were to permit associations of farmers, corporate or otherwise, and formed with or without capital stock, that met certain conditions prescribed in the act, to organize and operate without rendering

themselves liable under the antitrust statutes as combinations in restraint of trade.

The Robinson-Patman Act, pertaining to price discrimination between purchasers, which was enacted in 1936, provides that nothing in the act shall prevent a cooperative association from returning to its members, producers, or consumers, all or any part of net earnings or surplus resulting from its operations, in proportion to their business with the association.

The Agricultural Marketing Act of 1926 established in the U.S. Department of Agriculture a division to provide research, service, and educational assistance to farmer cooperatives, and contained provisions to enable farmers to set up joint business enterprises. Later, the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 created the Federal Farm Board and authorized it to make loans to associations of farmers. The 1929 act also authorized the Board to encourage "the organization, improvement in methods, and development of effective cooperative associations."

The Farm Credit Act of 1933 provided for 12 regional banks for cooperatives and the central bank for cooperatives, for the purpose of making loans to cooperatives meeting the definition of such association contained in the Agricultural Marketing Act.

The Motor Carrier Act, enacted in 1935, providing for the economic regulation of the trucking industry, specifically exempted trucks owned and operated by cooperative associations as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act.

The Office of Price Stabilization during the war and postwar years wrote into its price ceiling regulations provisions for pricing which specifically allowed farmer cooperatives to adapt pricing methods to conform to their operating procedures.

Six times since adoption of the 16th amendment sanctioning income levies by the Federal Government, the Congress has written legislative provisions dealing specifically with farmer cooperatives. In each case, the distinct character of the cooperative form of doing business has been recognized, and the Congress has continued to demonstrate its desire to assist farmers in their cooperative enterprises.

SO HAVE BOTH MAJOR POLITICAL PARTIES

Encouragement and endorsement, likewise, have come from U.S. political parties. Framers of both Democratic and Republican Party platforms for many years have recognized the importance to agriculture of cooperatives which enable farmers to combine their economic resources to market their commodities and purchase their farm supplies to advantage through joint action.

*As a matter of record*

In 1956 the Democratic Party pledged to "encourage bona fide farm cooperatives which help farmers reduce the cost-price squeeze and protect such cooperatives from punitive taxation."

The Republican Party pledged "to give full support to farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperatives."

In 1952 the Democratic platform said: "We will continue to support the sound development and growth of bona fide farm cooperatives and to protect them from punitive taxation."

The Republican platform declared: "We support the principle of bona fide farmer-owned, farmer-operated cooperatives."

In 1948 the Democratic Party said: "We will encourage farm cooperatives and oppose any revision of Federal law designed to curtail their most effective functioning as a means of achieving economy, stability, and security for American agriculture."

The Republican Party declared: "There must be a long-term program in the interest of agriculture and the consumer which should include * * * support of the principle of bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperatives."

And so they go. In other convention years the story has been much the same, going back to 1924.

IT'S A STRONGER AMERICA BECAUSE OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

The purpose of the Congress and national leaders over the years with respect to farmer cooperatives has been clear. With proper concern for the comparative economic weakness of sellers in a buyers' market, and with prophetic vision as to the growing costs of production, they set about doing their part toward helping farmers to help each other. The net result has been to give farmers a stake in our economic system that can grow with their own desire and ability to cooperate with each other in a common purpose. Not only agriculture, but the Nation itself is stronger because of farmer cooperatives.

## Statement of Hon. Carl Vinson of Georgia on H.R. 3460

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a short statement which I made before the Public Works Committee today, and also include a good and a great statement by a good and great statesman—one of the finest men I have ever known on earth, a man with whom I have served over a quarter of a century here in the Congress of the United States, where the men that are standing around me at this moment represent every human being in America and where, Mr. Speaker, they all love and respect the great CARL VINSON. It is a joy and a pleasure to place his statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that will be read all over this land and in many foreign countries.

I consider it a good statement; I consider it a fair statement for private industry. All of us love the TVA and the REA and have voted and worked and pulled for them, but we do have to stand for private enterprise. However, I will say no more about this at the moment, but I do hope that many people everywhere will read the great statement made by this man from Georgia, who has been in the Congress about as long as any man that has ever lived.

This is the statement by the great Congressman, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia:

STATEMENT OF CARL VINSON OF GEORGIA, ON H.R. 3460

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee today to offer an amendment to the bill H.R. 3460.

The basic law establishing TVA has no restrictions upon the area in which TVA may operate.

However, TVA has been operating within its present area for many years under a gentlemen's agreement between TVA and surrounding private utility companies.

I understand this gentlemen's agreement as to their respective areas of operation is on an entirely friendly and cooperative basis between TVA and the private utilities.

It is also my information that TVA takes pride in the fact that it is living up to this so-called gentlemen's agreement with private utilities, as to their respective areas of operation, and that TVA-private utility relations are uniformly congenial.

This bill proposes to give TVA its own legal financing and borrowing powers without congressional supervision or control. I propose through the amendment which I am submitting and advocating that if TVA is to be granted this tremendously broad financing power, Congress should now also write into the law the definite and specific area limitations under which TVA is now operating under its present gentlemen's agreement.

In other words, my amendment converts the gentlemen's agreement to law. That's all it does. If Congress is going to grant such exceedingly broad and unrestricted financing powers, to TVA, it should by all means write into the law definite territorial limitations, as to its operative power, to the area TVA now serves.

If, in the future, it is desirable for TVA to extend its area operation beyond its present territorial area, it should come back to Congress and then let Congress pass on the desirability of such an extension.

This is the sensible and sound way to go about this thing.

I understand that TVA itself is not asking for an enlarged or extended area of operation.

I am reliably informed that while TVA of course might like to have enlarged area of operation, they are primarily interested in being given power of self-financing in their own present area of operation.

If Congress is not going to give TVA further financial aid, TVA apparently needs some kind of self-financing powers if it is to meet expanding demands for power in its present operating area.

And that should be the primary aim of this legislation.

Why tack on to it a provision extending TVA territory 25,000 square miles into areas now being well and efficiently served by private utilities on all sides of the presently TVA-served area?

Why encroach so heavily upon areas now well served by present utilities?

Why upset the present gentlemen's agreement areas and the evidently pleasant relations now existing in these areas?

We should limit the area of TVA operation to that now covered by the existing gentlemen's agreement.

That is all I am asking in this amendment.

It is the sensible thing to do, if we are to grant TVA these wide financing powers.

It is fair to all parties.

My amendment does no harm to anybody or to any private or public utility or to any American citizen. It does not affect in any way the present operations of TVA. It closes no door to future congressional legislation which might be desired as to the area or any other feature of TVA.

And it places safeguards around both public and private utilities, which I believe it is our duty to do.

Mr. Chairman, the wording of the pending bill as to additional areas which TVA could serve is very uncertain and ambiguous.

It is estimated that this additional area of TVA operations as provided in the bill as it is now written is at least 25,000 square miles. This is in addition to the 80,000 square miles now served by TVA under its so-called gentlemen's agreement.

This is an increase of over 30 percent into areas now known as private utility served areas; and there are those who are of the strong opinion that the bill as written even covers a far greater area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, throughout the years, from the very inception of Muscle Shoals, I have always supported TVA legislation. But I've always known the area it could cover.

In considering this vitally important legislation, let us use discretion. Let us limit the area of TVA in this bill to its present area of operation if Congress is going to give TVA these huge self-financing powers. I hope this committee will see fit to adopt such an amendment. That is the intent and purpose of my amendment.

Last year in the report which accompanied S. 1868, this committee stated:

"The committee is convinced that this bill provides a workable solution of the problem of supplying the future power needs of the area served by TVA on a basis which will adequately protect the Federal Government, purchasers of TVA power, and investors in TVA bonds."

I appear this morning in support of an amendment to this bill which will permit TVA to supply adequate power needs in its present area, will adequately protect the Federal Government, will adequately protect purchasers of TVA power and investors in TVA bonds; and will also protect the municipalities of Georgia, the taxpayers of Georgia, the stockholders of the Georgia Power Co., the employees of the Georgia Power Co., as well as thousands of individuals who have investments in private utility companies.

Last July when the president of the Georgia Power Co. appeared before the House Committee on Public Works, he advised this committee that the Georgia Power Co. had 5,008 employees operating its properties which served 95 percent of the State of Georgia in an area of 57,000 square miles.

As of June, 1958, the Georgia Power Co. directly served electrical energy requirements of 662,385 customers. In addition, approximately 300,000 Georgians receive electric service from 39 rural electric membership corporations and 50 municipal electric distribution systems who in turn receive electric power on a wholesale basis from the Georgia Power Co. The power company also carries on retail operations with 631 municipalities.

Now let me call this to your attention.

In 1957, the Southern Co., with its affiliates, including the Georgia Power Co., paid a total of $55,946,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes.

I am advised that this was considerably larger than the dividends paid to the stockholders. The affiliates of the Southern Co., including the Georgia Power Co., have over $1 billion invested in their facilities.

The Southern Co. have 21,000 preferred stockholders and 124,000 common stockholders in every State of the Union.

The Georgia Power Co. has over 8,910 stockholders, 6,600 of whom are citizens of Georgia.

Therefore, I am appearing this morning in the interests of the State of Georgia, the municipalities of the State of Georgia, the taxpayers of the State of Georgia, as well as thousands of other citizens of this country who have a vital interest in the preservation of free enterprise.

Now, just to give you an example of what the Georgia Power Co. does for the State of Georgia, and the municipalities of Georgia, let me read to you a newspaper clipping from the Union Recorder of Milledgeville, Ga., my hometown, dated Thursday, February 26, 1959:

"POWER COMPANY DELIVERS CHECK TO CITY OVER $10,000

"A check for $10,276.14 was delivered to the city of Milledgeville, February 19, 1959, by H. M. Woodard, district manager of the Georgia Power Co.

"This payment represent 3 percent of the gross receipts in 1958 from the sale of electric power to commercial and residential customers of the company under the municipal partnership plan. The 3 percent tax is paid by the company in place of occupation and franchise taxes and is in addition to the company's property taxes, which totaled $5,270,000 last year.

"More than $2,135,000 is being paid to the communities of Georgia for 1958 under the municipal partnership plan. This is an increase of more than $117,000 over 1957.

"The company's total tax bill for 1958 was $26,600,000. This does not include the sales tax which the company collects from its customers for the State of Georgia nor the sales tax which the company pays on materials used in its operations."

I want to make mighty sure that Milledgeville, my hometown, and 630 other municipalities in Georgia continue to receive these annual payments. That's the main reason I'm here today with a suggested amendment.

Now, the amendment I propose strikes out the last four words on line 13, and all of lines 14 through 25 on page 2, as well as all of lines 1 through 11 on page 3, and substitutes the following in lieu thereof:

AMENDMENT

"Unless otherwise specifically authorized by act of Congress existing and subsequently built, leased, or acquired power facilities of the Corporation shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power for use outside the service area of the Corporation as it existed on July 1, 1957, except, when economically feasible for exchange power arrangements with other utility systems with which the Corporation had such arrangements on said date."

Now let's see what the amendment does:

1. Unless specifically authorized by an act of Congress, present power facilities and those subsequently built, leased, or acquired by TVA shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power for use outside the service area of TVA as it existed on July 1, 1957. This carries out the existing gentlemen's agreement.

2. The exception to this prohibition, however, is that when economically feasible it will be permissible for TVA to provide service for interconnection with other utility systems for exchange power arrangements, if such arrangements were in effect on July 1, 1957. Such a plan is now in operation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this permits the expansion of TVA facilities within the present service area of TVA.

It is my understanding that the sole purpose of this bill is to allow TVA to finance its future expansions through a bond issue but that that expansion is to be limited to the expansion required to meet the needs of the communities and users of electricity within the present boundaries of TVA.

My amendment permits this; it merely prohibits TVA from going beyond its present service area.

The bill as written provides that power facilities financed with bond proceeds or power revenues shall not be used for the sale or delivery of power by TVA outside the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin or the service area in which power generated by the Corporation is being used on July 1, 1957. (Lines 13–21, p. 2.)

Although the proponents of the bill represent the intention of the bill to be to confine TVA to its existing service area, with some minor flexibility, the truth is that the provision: (1) Contains a number of loopholes, ambiguities and exceptions which could be used to expand TVA's existing service area virtually without limit; and (2) in addition, in express terms, permits expansion of TVA's existing service area into an additional area of some 25,000 square miles (or approximately 31 percent of TVA's existing service area) which is not now serviced by TVA.

The loopholes, ambiguities and exceptions, which could be used to permit unlimited expansion, are:

1. The provision does not deal directly with the scope of TVA's operations but is drafted in terms of the use of power facilities financed with the proceeds of bonds or power revenues. But existing facilities or new facilities financed in any other way could be used to expand TVA's service area without any limitations whatever.

2. The provision is phrased in terms of "sale or delivery" (rather than use) of power in the defined areas and, except for the proviso which refers only to a "distributor", does not prohibit the purchase of power within the service area for use outside. There is, for example, nothing in the provision to prevent an industrial customer from taking delivery of power within the defined area and using it outside such area.

3. Power may be sold or delivered to a Federal agency wherever located. It is not clear whether the proviso against resale by a "distributor" would apply to a Federal agency. If not, such an agency as Southeastern Power Administration could qualify as a purchaser for resale, and then, obviously, that would permit it almost unlimited expansion of the area in which TVA power could be used so as to include the entire State of Georgia.

4. The bill authorizes a bond issue of $750 million to be outstanding at any one time to assist TVA in financing its power program. What appears to be words of limitation requiring approval by Congress with regard to the use of these bonds for the expansion of TVA service areas, actually constitute an authorization for expansion over and above the areas now served by TVA. This comes about as a result of the language on lines 17 through 19 which says that it is the intent of this act that the facilities constructed with the proceeds of these bonds or power revenues can't be used without prior approval by Congress, "for the sale or delivery of power by the corporation outside the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin."

But the geographical studies show that there are about 8,500 square miles within this drainage basin which are not now served by TVA. Thus what appears at first to be a limitation in the bill is actually an open invitation to expansion.

5. The words of limitation with regard to prior approval by Congress apply only to the power facilities built or acquired with the proceeds of the bond issue or power revenues derived from construction resulting from the bond issue. However, there is no limitation with regard to the utilization of revenues derived from existing facilities. Revenue from these facilities therefore could be used for unlimited expansion because there are no words of limitation applicable to these facilities.

6. In other words, the bill contains no limitation whatsoever with regard to new facilities that may be constructed on the basis of revenues produced by existing facilities.

There are some words of limitation with regard to new facilities constructed on the basis of the new bond issue authorized by this bill or on the basis of revenues produced from the new facilities constructed under the bond issue, but even this part of the bill authorizes an expansion of 8,500 square miles in the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this bill, H.R. 3460, is so cleverly drafted that hereafter TVA is going to keep two sets

of books—one set of books will be known as the limited expansion set of books, and the other, the unlimited expansion set of books.

Now, why do I say that?

Well, it is perfectly obvious from the way this bill is drafted, that any facilities built from the $750 million bond issue can't be used for expansion without congressional approval other than the 8,500 square miles of expansion which will result from the language with regard to the counties lying partially or wholly within the Tennessee River drainage area.

Now, any revenues that are derived from any of these new facilities can't be used for expansion other than that I have just mentioned, so they will be kept under the limited expansion set of books.

But if TVA wants to expand without congressional approval, all they have to do is to take the revenues from existing facilities which were not built from the proceeds of the proposed bond issue, and use those revenues for new facilities without any limitation whatsoever and without ever coming back to the Congress to even say, "how do you do."

This is true because there is no limitation in this bill on the utilization of revenues derived from existing facilities.

Now I don't know how TVA plans to operate in the future, but certainly there is nothing in this bill to prevent them from using two sets of books and every time they want to expand into a new area, all they have to do is point to the set of books marked "unlimited expansion" and say, "Congress knew exactly what it was doing. They only restricted us from expanding with the proceeds or revenues derived from the bond issue. They didn't restrict us with regard to the proceeds from existing facilities built before the bond issue was authorized."

It is difficult to understand why the language "the counties which lie in whole or in part within the Tennessee River drainage basin" is used unless the proponents are demanding that the present service areas of TVA be expanded.

Geographical studies and maps show unquestionably that there are some 8,500 square miles in this drainage basin which are not now served by TVA.

Furthermore, the bill refers to the whole of counties which are only partially within TVA's existing service area or the drainage basin. This would permit expansion into some 16,500 square miles which are not now served by TVA. By far, the major part of this 8,500-square mile area and the 16,500-square mile area are now served by investor-owned power companies.

The TVA problem faced by Congress arises from the fact that TVA and its supporters have stated that they would need $1.5 billion in the next 10 years to provide for the expansion of the electric power requirements of its existing service area.

TVA and its supporters profess to have no desire to expand its service area geographically. But its supporters have not been willing to accept an unambiguous direction that the existing service area is not to be extended without further congressional authorization.

Congress may have to face the problem of finding some way to provide for the increased power requirements of the area now served by TVA. But Congress can and should insist that this problem be at least confined to that area and that effective limits be placed on further geographical expansion without express congressional approval. No good reason has been advanced to justify the expansion permitted by the bill or, indeed, to justify any geographical expansion at all.

There should be a direct and unequivocal provision confining TVA's power operations to its existing service area. Further geographical expansion should be permitted only after a showing of the need therefor and express congressional approval.

From the standpoint of the Georgia Power Co., this service area expansion problem is indeed a grave one. If not amended so as to fully protect this company, the adoption of the bill in its present form would have a most immediate and direct adverse effect on the company, which, as of June 1958, directly served the electric energy requirements of 662,385 customers.

I say that the language on page 2 of the bill (lines 13–25) provides the expansion of TVA directly or by its power distributors throughout counties in the Tennessee River drainage basin, and other counties in northwest Georgia now receiving TVA power through the North Georgia Electric Membership Corp., to an extent that was never dreamed of, even during the 1930's.

I interpret this language to not only permit, but also to encourage TVA to service directly some of the municipalities which the Georgia Power Co., now serves in northwest Georgia and, in addition, authorizes North Georgia Electric Membership Corp., a distributor of TVA, to extend its sales of TVA power throughout the whole of all of those counties in northwest Georgia in which it operated as of July 1, 1957. Necessarily, a very uneconomic and destructive duplication of already adequate electrical facilities would eventuate. Such an expansion would involve the largest cities in northwest Georgia.

It is for these reasons that I am proposing this amendment, so that the bill will be confined to what the stated need is, and not permit action to be taken which would adversely affect the municipalities of Georgia, the taxpayers of Georgia, the employees of the Georgia Power Co., and the stockholders of this and other private utility companies.

Mr. Chairman, I offer no apology for appearing here today on behalf of the municipalities of Georgia, as well as the Georgia Power Co. The Georgia Power Co. is a private utility system owned by private citizens. It has 8,910 stockholders, 6,600 of whom are citizens of Georgia.

My amendment very clearly protects my constituents who are stockholders in the Georgia Power Co., and most importantly, the municipalities of my district, who do business with this company.

If TVA facilities must be expanded to provide for increased power demands within its present area, then let's confine the bill to only that purpose.

Let's not use a steamroller where a simple sledge hammer will do the job.

---

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN, OF ALABAMA, ON H.R. 3460

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before your committee on behalf of myself and the other members of the Alabama House delegation who have the services of the Alabama Power Co. in their respective congressional districts. We are proud of the Alabama Power Co. and feel that it has done much for the betterment of our district and our State. We are also proud that we have the great TVA in our State. We are for both Alabama Power Co. and TVA and want to help both.

We are all aware of the gentlemen's agreement between TVA and Alabama Power Co., which has been so carefully kept by both parties for so many years. We feel that anything that can be done to continue this peaceful coexistence is all to the good and that it is to the best interest of all concerned that this gentlemen's agreement be preserved by making it the law, as CARL VINSON has suggested.

## Congressman (and BRTer) Kirwan Is Praised by Commentator Coffin

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article in the March 9, 1959, issue of the Trainmen News. The title of the article is "Congressman (and BRTer) Kirwan Is Praised by Commentator Coffin."

The Congressional Distinguished Service Award, sponsored by the American Political Science Association, will be made for the first time in September 1959. This award will be given to four outstanding Members of Congress for the first time this year; two Senators and two Members of the House of Representatives, one from each political party.

I would like to fully endorse this article and personally express my devotion and high regards for the gentleman from Ohio who has been nominated for this award. He is a living symbol of our American way of life and I feel eminently qualified to receive recognition of the highest order for his dedication to duty:

CONGRESSMAN (AND BRTER) KIRWAN IS PRAISED BY COMMENTATOR COFFIN

WASHINGTON.—His nominee for the Congressional Distinguished Service Award by the American Political Science Association is Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat of Ohio, who is a BRTer and a member of Lodge 952, Youngstown, Ohio.

So said Tris Coffin on his recent broadcast, sponsored by Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, in which he paid lofty tribute to the Ohio Democrat who is chairman of an important House Appropriation Subcommittee.

Commentator Coffin declared that in this key spot as chairman of the subcommittee, "MIKE is a combination of romantic Irishman with a taste for the idealistic, a shrewd and hardheaded bargainer, a scrapper and a wit. He gets the money for those huge concrete dams that store water for irrigation and power."

Coffin recalled that the Western States water and power conference had this to say of BRTER KIRWAN: "There is no Member of Congress, either in the House or Senate, who has done more to bring about regional development of natural resources than Congressman KIRWAN. Despite the fact that the Congressman does not live in the West, and therefore has no direct interest in reclamation projects, he has worked hard and long to bring water to arid areas and electric power to the people of the West. He is one of those who believe that the development in one State is of indirect benefit to the others. He is a great exponent of investing in the West as a sound policy for all the country." Asserted Coffin: "MIKE's own life is the kind of story we used to read about in those little books with poor type and entitled, 'Sink or Swim,' 'Do or Die.' He was one of the brood of a poor Irish miner, and his learning was mostly in the school of hard knocks. There are, the Irish poets say, two kinds of Irishmen, the

gloomy ones and the happy ones. MIKE is one of the happy romantic kind. He wanted to see the world, and so, like a bold kid who sees this as the best of all possible worlds, he set out to explore it. Not in any gilded carriage mind you.

"He 'hitched' rides on freight trains and went West. He worked in the wheatfields and the lumber camps, and on the ranches until his wild heart was tamed, and he came back home to work as a miner and later, on the railroad. The people of Youngstown, Ohio, sent him to Congress in 1936, and he has been elected every term with the kind of lopsided majority that shows the voters must love the 'guy'."

Coffin said that Congressman KIRWAN once told the House: "I was raised in the foothills of the Pocono Mountains, and I remember the warnings in the early 1890's against the waste of our resources. 'It is wrong. You will live to regret it,' they said. We were going into the forest and burning trees that it took God 200 years to grow. What was the result? Today, we have to go to Canada for lumber and wood products and pay three times the price. We have wasted land and water just because we were afraid to spend a dime. We are wasting our resources now, and the payoff, when it comes, will be terrific, and all because we have not had the courage to spend money to save our resources.

"From Maine to California, there is a waste and destruction of our natural resources, yet every time we try to appropriate some money to correct it, the cry is that we must economize. The national income last year was over $200 billion, and all of it came from the good earth, from the air and sky, by rain on the earth. If our economy produced $200 billion, surely it is worth half a billion dollars to protect it, and that is what I am asking for."

Pointing out that each year Congressman KIRWAN travels thousands of miles to check on reclamation projects he must OK, Coffin added: "The story is told of MIKE KIRWAN on a pilgrimage to the Far West to investigate a proposed new project. He was in Boise, Idaho. A curious reporter asked him, 'Why is it, that you, a Congressman from Ohio, are so interested in western conservation?' MIKE KIRWAN, a stocky man with friendly eyes, did not speak for a moment. He watched the flow of automobiles back and forth along the busy street. Then he said in his brogue, 'My friend, water development brings prosperity. Prosperity means people will buy cars, and every car moving along this street has steel in it made in my hometown of Youngstown, Ohio.'"

## Flood Control in the State of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 9, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in 1951, a devastating flood occurred which inundated many of the business and residential sections of a number of cities in the State of Kansas. The loss ran into billions of dollars.

A plan of flood control has been adopted and includes a number of large dams and reservoirs. Construction has been started on a number, and Tuttle Creek, one of the major units, has 60 percent of the dam structure proper complete.

The overall plan for the Kansas basin includes reservoirs for flood control, irrigation, water conservation and recreation, and other purposes. Local protection works, including levees and channel improvements, are to supplement the flood control provided by the huge reservoirs.

Four important authorized projects have not yet been started: Lawrence, Melvern, Hillsdale, and Fort Scott. Detailed studies of the 1951 flood, and those occurring to a lesser extent every year since that date, by the U.S. Army engineers, demonstrated the need for additional reservoirs and some modification of local projects at critical locations for the protection against floods. Eight additional reservoirs of moderate size have been recommended and none of these, of course, has been started, and are not in the budget submitted by the President. Neither were any funds included in the administration's budget for Fort Scott and the other three important projects heretofore mentioned.

On a long-range projection, if the rate of construction is not stepped up, this overall flood protection project will not be completed until the last quarter of the 20th century. The frequency of floods, such as the one which occurred in 1951, cannot be determined, and such a flood may reoccur at any time. Should this happen with its tremendous loss of property and revenue to the Government, the shortsightedness of the administration and of the Congress would be pronounced, and there would be no satisfactory explanation of our failure to take affirmative action in making funds available. In the meantime, the industrial growth of cities such as Lawrence and Fort Scott is at a standstill because water is not available for industrial use, and a tremendous loss of tax revenue to the Federal Government results. The shortsightedness of the Bureau of the Budget by failing to include ample funds for flood control and water conservation is injurious to the economic growth of eastern Kansas and our national economy as a whole.

Realizing these facts, a concurrent resolution has been adopted by both houses of the Kansas Legislature, which has heretofore appeared in the RECORD.

## Hon. Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a very fine editorial, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Monday, March 9, 1959, on the Honorable Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel to the United States.

Ambassador Eban ranks high among the statesmen of the world. The State of Israel has been extremely fortunate in having such a man as Ambassador Eban among its diplomatic representatives. The Ambassador is a man of great ability; his astuteness and acumen have served him well in espousing the cause of his country as well as the cause of world peace. Ambassador Eban is deserving of every high praise for his services in the cause of democracy. As Ambassador of Israel to the United Nations, he has been a beacon of light on behalf of his country and world peace. His service as Ambassador of Israel to the United States has been outstanding, and I take this opportunity to wish him every success and happiness when he returns to Israel.

MR. EBAN INTO POLITICS

Abba Eban has spent almost a decade among us as Israel's Ambassador to the United States and permanent representative to the United Nations. The posts have been exacting ones, but through all his years of activity in them—intense years, including more than a few moments of crisis—he has served his young and often embattled country with great distinction. Personable, energetic and highly articulate, he has labored hard and effectively for the Israeli cause. And he has done so not only in his formal diplomatic capacity, but also in many hundreds of meetings with nongovernmental groups of Americans, to whom he has spoken eloquently about his land and its aspirations.

But now Mr. Eban has reached a point where he has decided to resign (effective at the end of May) from his arduous ambassadorial role in order to run for office back in Israel. Still in his 40s, he is a relatively young man, and he is endowed with all the makings of a formidable campaigner. In that respect, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion does not seem to have exaggerated in writing to him that "your integration into the political life of our country heralds many achievements no less great than those which you have accomplished as our representative abroad. I am certain that the strength which has sustained you in your foreign service will be with you in even greater measure at home."

This accolade has been well earned by Mr. Eban. Just as he has starred in his work as Ambassador to the United States and as his country's voice in the U.N., he is likely to shine more and more, in the years ahead, in the domestic political life of Israel. As far as that goes, he can be sure that he has the best wishes of all his friends in America. Whoever is named to succeed him here will have big shoes to fill.

## Foreign Fallacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, here is more proof, if needed. The foreign aid and mutual security

programs are not only bankrupting America, they are the worst thing under the sun to build up loyalty, cooperation, courage, self-reliance, respect, and determination among our allies.

The following is from the highly respected Wall Street Journal:

BOLIVIA BLOWUP—IT PROVES ONCE AGAIN THAT DOLLARS CANNOT ASSURE AMITY AND THAT AID OFTEN DULLS THE EDGE OF RESPONSIBILITY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The anti-American riots in Bolivia, a nation rich in tin and poor in just about everything else, underscore the fact that lavish handouts are no passport to friendship.

The demonstrations were ignited by a story in the Latin-American edition of Time magazine which reported some of the less favorable aspects of Bolivian social and economic life. The magazine also quoted an unidentified American diplomat who allegedly suggested that Bolivia be broken up and its territory distributed among its neighbors.

Local reaction to the story was immediate and intense. Mobs stoned the U.S. Embassy at La Paz, burned diplomatic cars, and oddly enough, the Bolivian Government lent dignity to the demonstrations by filing formal protests with the State Department.

In a country with a 68-percent adult illiteracy rate it is not surprising that the incensed masses do not realize that the U.S. Government has little to do with what a publication prints about any country, including the United States. But the Bolivian officials should have known better. Nevertheless, it is not too difficult to understand the sensitiveness of a welfare state that has received $129 million in U.S. aid ($43 per Bolivian, the highest per capita figure in the whole foreign-aid setup) and has only economic chaos to show for it.

LEFTIST REVOLUTION

Some years ago Bolivia, always prone to violent shifts of power, experienced a leftist revolution and has been in economic hot water ever since. Two measures of the new regime were nationalization of the tin mines, formerly owned by foreign capitalists, and so-called land reform, splitting up large estates among the primitive Indians of the countryside.

On paper a good theoretical case could be made for these changes; but the practical results have been considerably short of satisfactory. The tin miners would apparently rather strike than eat and show little inclination to work even when they are not striking. The Indian peasants, accustomed to a very low standard of living, knock off work as soon as they have satisfied their simple needs—with bad results for agricultural output. A social security system that is out of proportion to the country's means has added to financial and economic difficulties.

It would be a rash man who would pretend to know the answers to Bolivia's social and economic problems. It does seem reasonable, however, to suggest that the solution of these problems is up to the Bolivians and that economic mismanagement in a remote land is not a proper charge on the American taxpayer.

It would also not be surprising as some old-fashioned Americans were becoming more than a little tired of having their country villified, its flag desecrated, its public buildings sacked and damaged, its official representatives insulted and attacked by lawless mobs. It is only a year since Vice President NIXON was stoned in Peru and nearly assassinated in Venezuela. More recently a high State Department official, William M. Rountree, was outrageously abused and attacked by the rabble in the streets of Baghdad.

Perhaps we take these things too lightly. Indeed, there is a most unfortunate tendency in some circles to consider an outburst of hostile mob violence as a signal and an admonition to think up new giveaway schemes to the country in which it takes place.

The time has passed, to be sure, when landing of American Marines would have been considered a normal reaction to an insult to the American flag.

But we should not go to the other extreme of seeming to take our national dignity and prestige lightly. If we do not respect ourselves, no one is likely to respect us. A suspension of diplomatic relations and a prompt cutoff of largesse to countries whose governments are so hostile that they will not or so weak that they cannot give proper protection to American official representatives and American citizens would have a very salutary effect.

The Bolivian experience is only the latest of many proofs that government-to-government subsidies are often the wrong road in economic cooperation. This is far from the only case where such subsidies seem to have produced enmity rather than friendship and served the recipients badly by preventing them from pulling themselves together and taking a hard look at economic realities.

A recent news item that attracted little attention outside the financial pages points up the right road to healthy cooperation. This was the floating of the American private capital market of the first Japanese Government bond issue since the end of the war, to the amount of $30 million, half in short-term 4½-percent bonds, the rest in a longer term 15-year issue at 5½ percent. Tied in with this private loan is an agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to advance $10 million to the Japan Development Bank.

The proceeds of both these loans will be made available in yen to the Electric Power Development Company of Japan, a corporation engaged in the construction and operation of large-scale hydroelectric power enterprises and the disposal of the electricity produced to electric utility companies. Power is one of Japan's few natural assets, because of the number of mountain torrents in the country which can be harnessed to generate electricity.

The floating of these loans is calculated to serve as a reminder that the economic comeback of Japan in Asia is comparable with that of Germany in Europe, making due allowances for differences in the economic structures of the two countries. Japan was flat on its back at the end of the war, most of its merchant marine at the bottom of the ocean, its industries and large cities shattered by bombing.

But the Japanese gift for cooperative hard work served the people well in the task of reconstruction. Japan now leads the world in shipbuilding. Its industrial output is 2½ times the prewar figure. Especially impressive have been the gains in chemicals (more than 3 times the prewar figure), and in machine building (more than 4 times).

POPULATION PROBLEMS

Japan still faces difficulties, to be sure, such as the explosive pressure of some 90 million people living in an area smaller than California and poor in natural resources. Japan has lost its overseas investments and its preferred condition of trade with China, Korea, and Manchuria. Its progress, partly because of shortage of capital, has been on a zigzag basis, periods of rapid boom and heavy imports of foreign raw materials being interspersed with pauses for consolidation.

But the successful floating of the Japanese loan at reasonable rates of interest shows that there is almost always credit for a credit-worthy nation. It is a serious question whether nations which lack the will to work and the willingness to accept internal financial discipline are a good investment, either for loans or for the new-fashioned grants which often seem to accomplish little except irritating the recipients.

And that is one of the lessons of Bolivia.

## The Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times the bulwark against subversion that we all should be thankful for is the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Essex and West Hudson Federation of Holy Name Societies, through its president, Mr. Walter L. Joyce, has sent to me a copy of the resolution adopted by the federation, in which they resolved to properly thank the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, the special agent in charge of the Newark office, William O. Eimon, and all the personnel of the Bureau, for their successful and dignified efforts in the protection of our country against its enemies, domestic and foreign.

It is a privilege for me to include a copy of the resolution in the RECORD.

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has performed exemplary service over many years in the safe-guarding of our country against criminals of all degrees of viciousness and against subversives of all species of cunning and mendacity; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has performed its work with a keen regard for the constitutional rights of individuals, and in doing so, has added dignity and respect for our system of Government; and

Whereas a great part of the record of achievement of the Bureau is due to its highly efficient, self-sacrificing Director, J. Edgar Hoover, who has given the Bureau a leadership of preeminence based on morality and patriotism; and

Whereas in our own area of Newark, N.J., men such as the present special agent in charge of the Newark office, William G. Simon, and his predecessors in that office, and the personnel serving under them, have always impressed us with their efficiency, dignity, and conduct; be it

*Resolved by the Essex-West Hudson Federation of Holy Name Societies of the Archdiocese, of Newark, N.J., in regular meeting assembled, on this 4th day of March 1959,* That this organization publicly thank the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its Director J. Edgar Hoover, the special agent in charge of the Newark office, William G. Simon, and all the personnel of the Bureau, for their successful and dignified efforts in the protection of our country against its enemies, domestic and foreign; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Director J. Edgar Hoover, to special agent William G. Simon, to our U.S. Senators and to our Congressmen, and to the newspapers in the Newark area.

WALTER L. JOYCE,
*President.*
FRANK DE GEORGE,
*Secretary.*

## The Plot To Move Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL**
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to invite the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial aired by the general manager of Station WJZ–TV in Baltimore, relative to a proposal pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission. If this proposal is approved it will have drastic effects upon the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland.

The Port of Baltimore is the second largest port in the country and it is vital to the economy of our city and State. The New York railroads have asked the commission to remove the 82-year-old freight rate differential granted to Baltimore. If this request is approved the jobs of some 80,000 Baltimoreans will be directly affected. The resulting economic loss to the city and State would be staggering.

The following article exemplifies the manner in which Mr. McClay and station WJZ–TV have contributed to the public understanding and betterment by presenting full information and constructive suggestions on issues of local and national importance.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Mr. McClay and station WJZ–TV for their consistent efforts in the public interest.

This is the thriving port of Baltimore on the eve of the most serious threat to its prosperity in more than 80 years.

Hello. I'm John McClay, general manager of WJZ–TV. We intentionally chose a provocative title for this editorial. By calling it "The Plot to Move Baltimore," we hope that we have jarred you into realizing the seriousness of a problem that has attracted very little public attention.

If the threat we are about to discuss with you becomes a reality, the jobs of some 80,000 Baltimoreans will be directly affected. Indirectly, every wage earner in the Baltimore area might suffer to some extent. And all this might come about by the mere stroke of a pen in Washington.

Here is the story:

Baltimore, like most great cities, has grown and flourished through a combination of natural advantages and human perseverance. As a seaport, it has had to compete with other cities along the North Atlantic coast—Portland, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Norfolk. Despite the competition, Baltimore has managed in most years to hold onto its position as the second ranking foreign trade port in the Nation, exceeded only by New York.

New York has remained supreme because of its exceptional natural assets that no other seaport can match. Its magnificent harbor is close to the open sea. The Hudson River has provided a navigable waterway to the inland markets. Railroads, especially the New York Central and the New Haven, brought additional markets within reach of the world's greatest port.

In contrast to New York, the port of Baltimore has thrived for entirely different reasons. It is 150 miles up the Chesapeake Bay and therefore farther west than any of the other east coast ports. This inland location is Baltimore's principal asset. When a vessel arrives here, it is much closer to the markets of the Middle West than it would be in any of Baltimore's rival ports. Since moving cargo by sea is far cheaper than by land, Baltimore benefits by its short overland distance to the Middle West.

For 82 years, the railroads serving Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York have honored a rate agreement that recognizes the facts of geography. Since Baltimore is closer to the Middle West, the agreement provides that its railroads may charge 3 cents less per hundred pounds than New York when shipping freight into the area west of Pittsburgh to the Mississippi. Philadelphia is allowed to charge 2 cents less than New York.

This so-called freight rate differential has survived many attempts to break it down. But it has thus far been maintained and continues to assure Baltimore a fair chance to enjoy its geographical advantage.

But over the years this advantage would have meant little had it not been combined with human resourcefulness and determination. To attract import and export cargo to Baltimore, railroads have spent more than a quarter of a billion dollars on dockside loading facilities. No port in the Nation can match this railroad investment in Baltimore. The city now handles more than a billion dollars worth of import and export cargo annually and more than half of this moves by rail to and from the Middle West. It is truly a free enterprise success story.

In recent years, as Baltimore's port business has improved, New York's relative importance as a port has declinled slightly. New York interests are inclined to blame this on Baltimore's more favorable freight rates.

Baltimore interests maintain that New York's slight decline as a port is a result of the tremendous growth of the Middle West and Far West. We believe the evidence shows this to be the correct analysis of the ssituation. The shifting of the Nation's center of gravity westward has placed Baltimore in a better relative position than New York.

The railroads serving New York have, in recent years, come upon hard times. This is not a unique situation. Railroads everywhere, including those serving Baltimore, are hard pressed because of rising costs and competition from other forms of transportation.

Gazing longingly at Baltimore, the New York railroads see a glimmer of hope. If they can capture some of the Baltimore traffic, their financial troubles may be lessened.

Consequently, the New York railroads have come before the Interstate Commerce Commission to ask that the 82-year-old freight rate agreement be ended. They want Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York railroads to equalize the charges for shipping to the Middle West. In other words, the New York railroads want the right to charge the same rate for shipping a hundred pounds of freight between New York and Chicago as between Baltimore and Chicago, even though Baltimore is 123 miles closer.

If this request is granted, it would mean that the Interstate Commerce Commission had, by decree, nullified geography. It would mean, in effect, that Baltimore is no longer here, but there, 123 miles east of its present location. That is why it is scarcely an exaggeration to say this is "The Plot to Move Baltimore."

Baltimoreans have a special reason to be incensed about this effort by the New York railroads. For even with Baltimore's freight rate advantage, most of the cards are still stacked in favor of New York. Let's review the situation.

First. Time and inflation have improved New York's rate position. The agreement back in 1877 set the rate differences in absolute terms—of dollars and cents—instead of in terms of percentage. In 1877, when it cost 20 cents per hundred pounds to ship a certain commodity from New York to Chicago, it cost 17 cents from Baltimore to Chicago, or 15 percent less than the New York rate. Today rates have increased fivefold and where New York railroads charge a dollar, Baltimore must charge 97 cents, or only 3 percent less. In short, the increase in rates has steadily enhanced New York's position. But the differential today, small as it is, is still a critical advantage for Baltimore.

Second. Steamship rates from any foreign port to any North Atlantic port have been equalized by the steamship lines. If rail rates were also equalized, Baltimore's chief reason for existence would be abolished. There would be little reason for a shipper to choose Baltimore when he could ship through New York, with all its advantages, for the same price.

Third. Equalization of the rates would have a far more ruinous effect on Baltimore's economy than maintenance of the differential rates is having on New York's economy. New York's port, in addition to serving a large part of the United States, is also serving 13 million people in the New York area. Baltimore's comparatively small metropolitan area, one-eighth the size of New York, is not a large enough market to keep the port busy. Baltimore depends on its middle western trade, which comprises nearly half of its import-export volume.

Fourth. The approaching completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, opening much of the Middle West to deep-water ships, is a critical threat to Baltimore. This city cannot maintain its competitive position if its natural advantages are wiped out by decree. The seaway is a far less serious threat to New York.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is now considering this rate case and therefore holds the future of Baltimore's port in its hands. Our battle is being fought for us by the railroads serving Baltimore and by the Maryland Port Authority. The authority is the public agency charged with the promotion and development of the Port of Baltimore.

At the present time there is no direct action that we as citizens can take. But since it involves all of us in the Baltimore area, it must be watched closely. If the time comes when Baltimore wage earners and businessmen can help, we will do our part to encourage such help. There may be a long battle before "The Plot to Move Baltimore" has been halted in its tracks. Meanwhile, we at WJZ intend to keep you informed. And we suggest you keep yourself informed by learning everything you can about "The Plot to Move Baltimore."

## Uncle Sam's Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ANCHER NELSEN**
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 9, the problem relative to uniform milk-marketing procedure was discussed at length on the floor by several Midwest Members of Congress. As further testimony in support of this

much-needed legislation, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 9.

UNCLE SAM'S MILK

In formidable and bipartisan strength, Midwest House Members in Washington this afternoon will raise for later decision a key issue. This is the question of abolishing Federal, State, and municipal barriers against freedom of interstate commerce in milk of established wholesomeness and quality. Their abolition would be achieved by enactment of the Lester Johnson bill.

Special target will be the new Federal milk order now being proposed for the Washington area by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This amazing 15,000-word Government edict would regulate milk supplies for the District of Columbia and nine surrounding counties in Virginia and Maryland. The order is in itself a summation of types of milk barriers being used to wall out milk that can compete with local dairy monopolies.

The order starts by complaining against increasing competition from such outside milk. It proceeds to impose the usual Federal restrictions plus some more. Then it gives special Federal sanction to milk regulations of surrounding municipalities. Thus it authorizes them to bar any outside milk they choose by simple refusals to inspect, as Washington already does.

From that point, the proposed order applies itself to sales of milk to all government agencies, whether Federal, State, or local. This includes all defense agencies and military posts, docks, wharves, piers, and ships in the Nation's key defense area. And it applies specifically to fresh or frozen concentrated milk that can be and often has been sold to Government defense agencies at economical costs to them.

Finally, an order omission opens the way for Washington area milk prices and Government milk costs to rise as high as the artificial restriction of supply helps push them. The order regulates supplies but not prices. Its stipulated prices are merely minimums. Right now actual Washington area milk prices are much above the order's show-window figures.

Of course, the 2,000 or so dairy farmers supplying that market have a natural advantage due to location and hauling costs that cannot be taken from them. But why deliberately erect artificial barriers on top of the natural one? Our Government claims to be founded on principles of freedom of competition and enterprise. These principles can be applied in ways that treat Government suppliers fairly. Or, in the face of severe budget problems, they can be flouted to discriminate between citizens and inflate Government costs.

Midwest dairying asks that these principles be reaffirmed by enactment of the Johnson bill. Our farmers, cooperatives, and milk handlers are Americans, too. They pay taxes to the Government. Their sons help man its defenses. They ask Congress by enacting the Johnson bill to get rid of such harmful and costly discriminations as the proposed Washington order exemplifies.

## Draft Law Complacency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Middlebury Campus, the student weekly newspaper of Middlebury College, from the edition of Thursday, February 26, 1959:

DRAFT LAW COMPLACENCY

On June 30, 1959, the Universal Military Training and Service Act will lapse. Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, has asked Congress for a 4-year extension of the law—to June 30, 1963. If public complacency and congressional opinion do not change radically in the next few weeks and months, Hershey's request will be granted.

College students are fully acquainted with this act, for it places on all physically and mentally qualified men between the ages of 18½ and 26 a legal obligation to perform at least 6 years of military service. This obligation may be fulfilled by various combinations of active and Reserve duty—the Armed Forces currently offer 34 alternative enlistment programs. Theoretically, any qualified youth who fails to sign up for one of these programs will be drafted for 2 years of active duty.

The present administration in Washington has carefully chosen to avoid controversy over the extension of the existing law. President Eisenhower did not mention it in his state of the Union message. Yet Adlai Stevenson, in the 1956 presidential campaign, advocated an end to the draft in the foreseeable future. Current governmental strategy favors a kid glove, no publicity treatment of the extension of the law. As one commentator put it, the administration wishes to avoid opening up a whole can of worms.

Worms, political expediency, and congressional fatigue over a law which affects much of this Nation's youth are objectionable and unrealistic.

As students interested in world affairs, we read about the advances in new weapons, including missiles with nuclear warheads and other basic units of mass destruction. We realize that, in the event of war, the fighting, if one can call it that, will actually take place in a limited number of days. Unfortunately, military strategy and service manpower requirements appear uncoordinated. We realize the need for a small, highly trained, professional army, yet the Government by extending the present draft law throws 450,000 civilians a year into military positions which offer limited incentives for professionalism.

Anyone who has actively participated in the peacetime Armed Forces knows the waste and meaningless, obsolescent activity forced on the draftee. Anyone who has watched a draftee with a Ph. D. degree in economics picking up small pieces of paper in front of a barracks building has seen this ridiculous use of manpower. An Amherst student disgusted with his meaningless Reserve meetings described the content of these sessions as listening to a "halting personal account of supply operations in the Panama Canal Zone, a lecture on military administration, or a talk on Pentagon organization." Is this type of training likely to produce efficient personnel for nuclear warfare?

If the University Military Service and Training Act slips quietly through Congress, and is extended, college students everywhere will continue to be plagued by its provisions. The uncertainties of the draft often discourage students from entering into specialized graduate training. The force of the draft may mean the postponing or interruption of college or marriage plans or the first job.

One may argue that the college student faced with conscription may elect ROTC as an alternative. But ROTC, especially Middlebury's 2-year compulsory plan, represents time taken away from subjects that are of greater intellectual value. Certainly, it is difficult for any college administrator to explain the existence of an ROTC unit in peacetime as part of an educational curriculum. In general, training of this sort converts most of those trained to placing undue importance on the role of the military. The emphasis subsequently appears in foreign and domestic policies. From such training the student receives a magnified view of the role of military force. Unfortunately, few students are alienated by this type of propaganda.

Everyday we are told that the only language the Communists will understand is force. In this way conscription and nuclear weapons symbolize our strength and inability to negotiate for worldwide disarmament. In 1960 Great Britain will discontinue conscription—but as a part of an increasing reliance upon nuclear weapons.

It is time the United States took a firm stand for world peace. A clear cut affirmative act could bring about such a stand. The elimination of the peacetime draft could achieve such results.

It is also time for the United States to lift the burden of conscription from this Nation's youth. This can be accomplished only by providing the Armed Forces with attractive pay scales and other professional incentives.

It is not yet fashionable to be unpatriotic, but the college student cannot hold out forever if congressional complacency overshadows consideration and reform.

## Statement by Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, Regarding Right-to-Work Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Gov. Harold W. Handley, of Indiana, on the occasion of the refusal of the Indiana Senate to enact senate bill 100, which would have repealed the right-to-work law in that State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. HAROLD W. HANDLEY

I believe that the freedom of the individual—the dignity of a person, regardless of his power, wealth, or influence—transcends that of any well-knit group or organization.

The price of this freedom is measured in terms of hundreds of years and millions of lives. Principles of justice thus arrived at cannot be taken lightly, nor may they be disregarded for reasons of expediency.

It may be argued that before the right-to-work law was passed, industry on the one hand and organized labor on the other were free to negotiate and to compel membership in a given union as a condition of employment. However, I question the right of any group, either business or labor, to force its will upon the individual, regardless of how desirable membership in either group might be.

To act voluntarily and according to the dictates of ones' own conscience and will

is a principle too often overlooked, but it is a principle still worth pursuing.

The time has not yet come when the State of Indiana should say to its citizens: join a church—join a specific fraternal order—join a given business group or organization.

To join or not to join is an individual freedom just as important as the right to speak, write, and worship freely.

I recognize the tremendous contributions of both business groups and labor unions to the welfare of Indiana. But at the same time I know that the right of these groups cannot rise above the freedom of the individual.

In making this statement, I have tried to entirely disregard the so-called political implications. Popularity and principle sometimes do not travel the same road.

I entertain no feelings of bitterness for—nor do I criticize—those who in their secret hearts have arrived at a decision different from mine. But I must express my convictions in the same spirit of sincerity with which those disagreeing with me have acted.

Because of these reasons, I congratulate the Indiana Senate for its decision to refuse to enact senate bill 100.

## Need for Assistance in Economically Distressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter "Keenotes":

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia)

Recently I filed with a Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee a statement in support of legislation introduced by myself and other Members of Congress to assist economically distressed areas.

This legislation is similar to that passed by the Congress last year but vetoed by the President. There seems to be even more support for the proposal this year and I am confident the bill can be passed by such a large majority that it will not be vetoed.

The bill would establish a Federal loan program under which States and local communities would act to create new job opportunities. The need for such a program is urgent in areas where unemployment has existed for a number of years. In the case of West Virginia, workers have lost their jobs in the coal mines and there is little chance they can ever go back to work there.

The answer is to attract new industries. States and local communities cannot do the job alone. They need the type of financial and technical assistance from the Federal Government which this bill would make possible.

The main financial burden would be borne by the States and local communities over a long period. Local resources simply are not available now with which to do the job. That is why Federal funds would be made available on a loan basis. Cities in the Fifth Congressional District have attacked the problem of lack of job opportunities with vigor and intelligence. Yet, a larger and better financed program is called for.

Some people have criticized the proposed programs as too costly. These people fail to take into consideration the fact that States are paying out hundreds of millions of dollars in unemployment benefits. In West Virginia, these benefits amounted to $50 million in 1958. Is it not more sensible to invest in new job-producing enterprises that will do away with the need for unemployment benefits? No cost tag can be attached to the misery and heartache of a family which is forced to subsist upon handouts because jobs simply do not exist.

The Federal Government is spending billions of dollars abroad to assist underdeveloped countries to build up their economies. Much of the activity financed abroad with tax money from the United States is similar to the type of activity envisioned in the area redevelopment program. Why is it right to do these things abroad and wrong to do them at home?

West Virginia has suffered grievously during the last 5 or 6 years. Coal mines have cut back on production as imported residual fuel oil has taken over more and more of the market. Technological improvements in the coal industry have reduced the number of jobs.

We can go on paying out unemployment benefits and welfare payments and distributing surplus agricultural commodities indefinitely without getting at the root of the problem. The men of West Virginia want jobs. If they cannot find them in the mines and plants for which they once worked, let us start a determined effort to bring in new industries. In the interim, we can build community facilities to provide jobs while the program is getting underway.

No doubt it will be charged that the area redevelopment legislation is a part of the program of the spenders. I insist it is an economically sound program, one that is absolutely essential to many areas all over the country. Soon the House must act upon an administration request for $235 million additional for loans to foreign countries for overseas redevelopment projects. The program we are trying to get for the unfortunate people in this country would not cost as much altogether as this one supplemental foreign aid program.

## Republican Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD two articles written by George Todt and published in the San Fernando Valley Times. The first is entitled "GOP Problem as NIXON Sees It." The second is entitled "What Future for Republicans?" These articles were published, respectively, in the February 26 and 27, 1959, issues of the San Fernando Valley Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Fernando Valley Times, Feb. 26, 1959]

GOP PROBLEM AS NIXON SEES IT

"They never taste who always drink;
"They always talk who never think."
—*Prior.*

The question I put to Vice President RICHARD NIXON at the Greater Los Angeles Press Club's dinner in the Embassy Room of the Ambassador Hotel on February 17, which was the subject of a half-hour national radio broadcast by the American Broadcasting Co. emanating from Hollywood, was as follows:

"What can the Republicans do to step up their old-fashioned horse-and-buggy 'Madison Avenue' public relations approach in order to match the more effective Democrat 'grassroots' approach?"

Both the crowd and Mr. NIXON got a chuckle out of that one, and he replied with a good-natured grin:

"I suppose that's one of these questions, 'When did you stop beating your wife?'"

Then he sank his teeth into the question and answered it in these words:

"The Republican Party has a very real problem looking toward 1960 and the years ahead.

"I, personally, am not one of those who have been particularly impressed by all the talk about the necessity for the Republican Party to change its image.

"I think this creates, frankly, an impression among the people that the Republican Party stands for nothing and that all we are intersted in is to find out what the people may want at a particular time—and then be that way.

"Now if both parties follow this kind of a line, there is no use to have a Republican Party; we might as well have one party.

"I think that what we ought to do, on the contrary, is to emphasize the principles for which the Republican Party stands—and find ways and means to present those principles in an articulate and effective way to the American people."

I am indebted to Milt Fishman, head of ABC's radio news bureau, for the above verbatim transcript of Mr. NIXON's words, which were sent to me on a playback recording.

The Vice President spoke for another 5 or 6 minutes on this matter of correct and adequate public relations for the GOP in the future. He spent, altogether, more time on this question than any of the many others that were put to him during the evening—which indicates to some extent the gravity with which he regards the issue for himself.

Actually, he hit the nail on the head with his simple but eloquent words which I have capitalized in a preceding paragraph. Let's analyze what he has said there.

In essence, Mr. NIXON has indicated that there is nothing wrong with the moral issues and bedrock principles with which the Republican Party has been identified over the years. In other words, its basic character. It doesn't need a new image if that means to change the solid fundamentals of the GOP insofar as sound principles are concerned.

According to the Vice President, this is not where the trouble lies for the hard-pressed elephant in these modern times we live in today. His problem is to find new and better ways of getting his responsible story over to the people of the United States.

This story, emphasizes Mr. NIXON, must be told in an articulate and effective way. All of which implies that it has not been told either articulately or effectively, therefore, in times past. Nothing could be closer to the truth, incidentally.

The stand which the intelligent young man from Whittier has taken is simple, to the point, and eminently correct.

The Republican Party needs to remind itself again and again and again that it can forever purchase millions of words in print or on the air, if it wants to do so. But all to no avail unless those who construct such words have enough intelligence, principle, and character of their own that they can create ideologically the kind of moving terms which are on the level, understandable, and reach the hearts of the public.

Publicity and "flak" men are far cries indeed from the ideological experts the GOP

requires so much today in its so-called public-relations division of responsibility. It is in this area of second-rate accomplishment (there are only two parties running, by the way) that the Republicans need to stress an effective new image, and soon.

Otherwise, the infinitesimal chances of the proverbial snowball will greatly exceed those of Mr. NIXON and by far the greater balance of the Republican hopefuls, come 1960.

That was why I asked the admirable Mr. NIXON the question I did at the Los Angeles Press Club the other day.

Shall we hope that he puts it to good use in the months ahead of us? Can the elephant recoup his losses at this late date? Anything is possible in love or war—so why not politics, too?

---

[From the San Fernando Valley Times, Feb. 27, 1959]

WHAT FUTURE FOR REPUBLICANS?

"The great hope of society is individual character." Channing.

Instead of pussyfooting and making self-serving excuses for its failures in the past 6 years, the Republican Party needs to take a good look at itself in the mirror of accomplishment and ask itself this serious question:

"How was it possible for us to win the Presidency of the United States by pluralities of 7 million in 1952 and 9 million in 1956—and gain nothing except a Pyrrhic victory in the end?"

It was old Pyrrhus, King of ancient Epirus (now tiny Albania), who won some early victories over the tough Roman legions of his day which cost him much too dearly. So much so, in fact, that he was heard to exclaim: "One more victory such as these, and I am undone."

So the GOP has won the Presidency by millions of votes in the last two outings—but has lost the Congress. Another costly victory similar to these and, like Pyrrhus, it will also be undone.

What has happened to the Republicans and their hopes? When former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt had identical margins of Presidential victory in the days of the Democratic Party's triumphant New Deal, he carried Congress on one occasion by a margin of four to one.

When Mr. Eisenhower obtained his biggest plurality in 1956, the GOP went under by 21 seats in Congress. How come?

Why is it that only 46 percent of eligible voters went to the polls to vote? What happened to the other 54 percent? What caused them to stay at home instead of performing their civic duty?

Isn't it time to face up to the facts? The real reason why citizens stayed at home was not apathy—it was disgust.

Disgust because the Republicans have been so busy imitating the Democrats' New Deal that the liberal wing of the party has been able to produce a veritable carbon copy which it has called by the disconcerting name of "Modern Republicanism." But others, less charitable, call it "The Republican New Deal."

Failure to give the American people a better pick than largely a high-spending choice between New Dealish tweedle dees and tweedle dums accounts for the reason why "they'd rather have stood in bed" when election day has come around in November of late years.

Yes, 54 percent of them stood in bed. How do we like them apples? Who can alibi away such forlorn and pitiful statistics as these?

Let's go to the heart of the problem for the Republicans. The only way they can win in 1960 is to convince the people of the United States that they are a genuine American party.

The GOP must persuade the electorate that it stands for the continued independence and solvency of the constitutional Republic of the United States.

America must be led away from world socialism and back to the fundamental traditions of the Founding Fathers.

Today, the Democratic Party is under the control of the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) and the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE). The Republican Party has already yielded too much to these influences. The American people don't want any cheap carbon copy of the Democratic political formula to reside in the GOP—we want a difference and a very recognizable distinction, at that.

Until we get a clear-cut philosophical difference between the two parties it is only insulting the intelligence of the 64 percent of stayaway, uncommitted American voters to ask them to come to the Nation's polling places and vote.

But it is in this most potent area of the electorate—the uncommitted 54 percent who did not vote in previous elections—that the Republican Party can recoup its tragically inept losses of the past 6 years. It can win again, but only with a new ideology based on compelling principles of 100 percent Americanism.

Recently I heard one of the greatest political editors in our country tell the Republican Associates of Los Angeles County this simple and eloquent truth:

"You're not going to win elections until you impress voters that the Republican Party stands for the finest things that exist in this freedom-loving Nation. Republicans will start winning again when they have won the confidence of the people and not before."

I subscribe to this statement and suggest that the GOP, in addition to its new predilection with grassroots organization, must also emphasize principles of rugged Americanism—not the effete standards of the socialistic New Deal, mind you—and must tell its story in the most honest terminology which an inspired public-relations program based on character and integrity can get over to Joe Doakes and the public.

Typical of such principles to be emphasized are the separation of powers, the rights of the individual, and the sovereignty of the States, subject only to the powers ceded to the Federal Government as set forth in the Constitution. A new stand against Communist-inspired race turmoil is in the books. And a courageous stand against undue usurpation of power by either big labor, big business, or big government is also in the cards as well. Most important of all, a really militant stand against domestic and international communism, with no holds barred.

The people of our Nation admire intestinal fortitude; and if the Republican Party will abandon its modern timidity in favor of crusading principles of honest Americanism forthwith, there will be no keeping at home the 54 percent of uncommitted voters we have previously mentioned, come 1960.

Isn't this worth a try by the beleaguered GOP?

---

## Area Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, while we are according much attention to the subject of redevelopment of depressed areas, perhaps we are too little inclined to think and plan sufficiently on other aspects of area development, particularly those relating to the orderly utilization of recreational resources.

At my invitation, Theodore C. (Ted) Fearnow, of Berkeley Springs, W. Va., and Philadelphia, Pa., a well-known conservationist and assistant regional forester for the eastern region of the U.S. Forest Serivce, recently addressed an assembly of some 200 persons at Wardensville, Hardy County, W. Va., on February 11, 1959. The occasion was a dinner meeting sponsored jointly by the Lions Clubs of that county.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a part of the press account of Mr. Fearnow's splendid address on the subject "Area Development."

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEARNOW OUTLINES AREA DEVELOPMENT PLANS BEFORE LIONS GROUP

WARDENSVILLE, W. Va.—Theodore C. Fearnow, of Berkeley Springs, W. Va., well-known West Virginia conservationist and Assistant Regional Forester for the Eastern Region of the U.S. Forest Service, speaking before an assembly of Lions from Moorefield and Wardensville, and other sections of Hardy County, Wednesday evening, February 11, stated that orderly development of recreational resources in the Cacapon Valley and surrounding counties could materially augment personal incomes and, at the same time, preserve the area as a wonderful place in which to live.

"Under this type of development you can literally have your cake and eat it, too," Fearnow said.

Listing the numerous practical advantages this area holds for recreational development, Mr. Fearnow pointed out that "the entire eastern Panhandle of West Virginia is ideally situated to serve nearby growing metropolitan centers. East coast cities are expanding until we have almost continuous urban development from Norfolk, Va., to Portland, Maine. The natural outlet for many of these recreation seekers is the Appalachian foothills, and this area is destined to serve as a playground for millions in the future. In addition, many West Virginians from the industrial and mining centers of the State are being attracted to the eastern Panhandle for outdoor recreation in increasing numbers. The success attained in developing and maintaining prized recreational resources of this area will be directly related to the skill and foresight we apply now in charting a course for the future."

Fearnow spoke before the assembled Lions at a dinner meeting in the well-filled War Memorial Auditorium at Wardensville on the subject "Area Development," at the invitation of the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, senior U.S. Senator from West Virginia.

"The importance of the publicly owned George Washington and Monongahela National Forests as recreation centers and for permanent watershed protection here in West Virginia is very great," Fearnow said. "The beautiful Cacapon River, one of the largest and best clean streams remaining in the East, is a priceless asset of this area. People are naturally attracted to streams of this type for sport and recreation," he added.

National forest hunting is bringing thousands of people into this section of the State every year. Ten years ago, Mr. Fearnow, then regional wildlife biologist for the U.S.Forest Service, was active in developing a cooperative wildlife program under which the West Virginia Conservation Commission

and the U.S. Forest Service are now jointly developing nearly a million acres of national forest for public hunting and fishing.

Mr. Fearnow continued: "Our expanding population will create many problems, and these will be particularly acute in the matter of outdoor recreation, where remoteness, scenic beauty, and unspoiled natural surroundings are important considerations. The U.S. Forest Service approaches this problem on the basis of multiple-use management. Timber production, watershed protection, game and fish production, and recreational use are conducted on the same areas through careful long-range planning and coordination. As pressure on the land increases, we must turn more and more to this type of management if we are to meet expanding public needs.

"The cooperation and assistance of private landowners are essential if we are to meet this country's growing needs for forest products and services. Public meetings were recently held in Boston, Philadelphia, and Charlottesville to solicit recommendations from small woodland owners seeking means for meeting goals calculated for 1975 and 2000. We must gear up to meet these goals without delay. Much of Cacapon Valley and the surrounding area is well suited to timber production under good multiple-use management. Hardy County has witnessed the mounting pressure of recreational use on adjacent national forest lands during the past decade. This can be taken as an indication of what is to come."

An important step toward facing recreation needs on a countrywide basis was taken when the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was set up by the last session of Congress. This Commission is directed to make a nationwide inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation resources—to determine the amount, kind, quality, and location of such outdoor resources—required by the year 1975 and 2000. This congressional action follows on the heels of programs already underway, including the well-known Forest Service program, Operation Outdoors. At last, outdoor recreation needs are receiving serious attention.

"The importance of interested and informed citizen groups in shaping plans for the future cannot be overestimated," Fearnow said. "Under our democracy, it is difficult to advance faster than public opinion and support. We have made great strides in protecting our forests from fire because we have had public support. The next few years will see other events of far-reaching importance. Our dynamic population growth and increasing amounts of leisure time, as the workweek grows shorter, hold tremendous possibilities.

"Forty-one thousand miles of new superhighways are to be built, making it easier than ever for city dwellers to reach rural areas. Additional roads will be needed in forest areas as management is intensified. But we must remember that people seeking relaxation and enjoyment of scenic, historic, and recreational wonders don't want to vacation where the noise and fumes of heavy traffic are oppressive. Streamside highways, with disturbed soil eroding into streams, can seriously damage fish habitat. Sixty million cubic feet of silt is being carried past Washington, D.C., by the Potomac River each year. Much of it comes from West Virginia. Research is under way by the Forest Service to determine means by which soil losses from forest roads can be held to a minimum. The eventual solution will surely involve careful advance planning. An informed and active citizenry is essential to obtaining and carrying through this type of coordination."

Fearnow, who supervises the rural-development program for the eastern region of the U.S. Forest Service, pointed out to this audience that areas which protect their scenic and recreational resources often find that they have a strong selling point for attracting desirable industries. Burned-over forests and polluted streams offer very little inducement for the investment of new capital. Industrial leaders have learned that it is far easier to attract and hold skilled labor and professional management people at plants located in attractive surroundings where wholesome outdoor recreation is available.

Offering as a slogan "Conserve what we have while we build for the future," Mr. Fearnow stressed the importance of conservation as a part of our national philosophy. He quoted the words generally attributed to the late Gifford Pinchot, first Chief of the U.S. Forest Service: "A nation that loses its liberty may regain it, a nation divided may be reunited, but a nation deprived of its natural resources is doomed to a future of poverty and degradation."

## Radio Liberation—Our Strong Voice of Truth and Freedom in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the great challenges facing the free world today is to assure the people behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten and to do all possible to see that they receive all the news and truth we can get to them.

An outstanding organization which is doing fine work in this field is the American Committee for Liberation. By means of regular, effective broadcasts beamed to the people of the Soviet Union, the committee's Radio Liberation strives to get news and facts behind the Iron Curtain. Radio Liberation attempts to let the people of the Soviet Union make up their own minds—but with the other side of the story known to them, as well as the Kremlin line.

The effectiveness of Radio Liberation's efforts is attested to by the hysterical jamming tactics engaged in by the Russians, as well as the covert messages of response and encouragement which have been smuggled out through the Iron Curtain.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to work with the American Committee for Liberation on several occasions. They deserve the commendation of all of us for the effective manner in which they are carrying out their important work.

A recent article in the Scholastic Teacher edition of World Week outlined well Radio Liberation's tactics and mission. I ask unanimous consent to have this piece printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Scholastic Teacher edition of World Week, Jan. 16, 1959]

MESSAGES OF FREEDOM—FROM THE FREE WORLD, FOR 24 HOURS A DAY, RADIO LIBERATION BROADCASTS A "NEWSPAPER OF THE AIR" TO LISTENERS IN THE SOVIET UNION

(By Oliver Bell)

How can the people of the Soviet Union get news that is not heavily dosed with Communist propaganda? One organization that aims at this goal is Radio Liberation. For 24 hours a day it broadcasts to the Soviet Union from this side of the Iron Curtain.

Among Radio Liberation's main efforts is a drive to get the people of the Soviet Union to form their own opinions based on accurate information. It is felt at Radio Liberation that when enough people in the Soviet Union do so the iron dictatorship of the Communists will be forced to yield increasingly to popular demands—demands for a government more responsible to the peoples themselves and for a system of political liberty.

Today there is only one official "truth" in the land of the Soviets. That is the version of events put out by the Soviet dictatorship. But a large number of the Soviet people know they are being subjected to a flood of propaganda, and, consequently, there is a real hunger for other sources of information. Radio Liberation gives its listeners news. For example, it reports what Western proposals for disarmament are. Listeners can compare what Radio Liberation says with what the Soviet Government tells them, and draw their own conclusions.

"It goes further than that," an official at Radio Liberation explained. "Reviews of recent books that were best sellers in the United States, Britain, and France; talks on Danish cooperatives, or on poultry farming in the United States—we broadcast on subjects like these. Why? Because our listeners are isolated—their minds are isolated. We open the doors of the minds of our audience to what people in the West are thinking.

"You, in the United States, can hardly imagine the hunger among intelligent Soviet citizens for cultural talks. When they hear them they feel that they are—in their minds—citizens of the world. For a few minutes they have broken out of the closed Soviet system. Besides, Radio Liberation builds up its reputation for truthfulness by reporting soberly on cultural subjects."

To return to the Danish cooperatives, Radio Liberation tells its listeners how the Danish farmers manage to live well with the help of their cooperatives. This strikes deep in the Soviet Union. For the Soviets have regimented their farmers, while the Danes have not. Furthermore, the Soviets have never been able to produce an abundance of food, while the Danes have. Radio Liberation just gives facts and lets its Soviet listeners judge for themselves.

Again, Radio Liberation gives a talk on how chickens are raised in the United States. It drives home how farmers and consumers benefit from private ownership of farms. But Radio Liberation does not directly compare inefficient Soviet farming with efficient U.S. farming. It leaves that to whoever is listening.

Radio Liberation's work is necessarily a slow process of education. But it is sure that the words that it sends vaulting through the air are having a mounting effect.

The American Committee for Liberation is the head office of Radio Liberation. Heading this committee is Howland H. Sargeant, its president. He is a former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State. One of the committee's trustees is Dr. John W. Studebaker, vice president and chairman of the editorial board of Scholastic magazines, and formerly U.S. Commissioner of Education (1934–48).

To run Radio Liberation is expensive. The millions of dollars a year that it costs come from private contributions—overwhelmingly from the United States. In this it differs from other organizations broadcasting to the Soviet Union, such as the Voice of America. The Voice is a branch of the U.S. Government, and its policy is set by the U.S. Government.

Furthermore, Radio Liberation is not the same as Radio Free Europe. This last organization is also financed by private contributions, but it broadcasts to the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe—Poland, Czecholsovakia, and others.

ON THE AIR

Nearly 6 years ago, on March 1, 1953, Radio Liberation went on the air. A staff had been assembled that included a large number of former Soviet citizens. These defectors as they are called, have all escaped from the Soviet Union. When they broadcast to the Soviet people, the defectors know what the interests of their audience are. They are not foreigners talking to the Soviet people, they are fellow countrymen.

In Russian and 17 other languages spoken in the Soviet Union, Radio Liberation broadcasts its messages. To the people of the Ukraine, it speaks in Ukrainian; to the Turkic peoples in their own tongues. Programs are specially tailored to these different audiences. For instance, the head of the Turkestani broadcasts is Veli Zunnun. Formerly he edited a newspaper for the people of Turkestan. But it was a newspaper controlled by the Soviet Government. During World War II, Zunnun was captured by the Germans. Having suffered under the Soviet system, he refused to return home after the war. Now, employed by Radio Liberation, Veli Zunnun is—in the opinion of the Kremlin—a capitalist scoundrel.

For the rulers of the Soviet Union attack Radio Liberation fiercely. "It is an organ," said the Moscow newspaper, Izvestia, "for spreading vile falsifications and black slanders fabricated by the American intelligence." Other attacks on Radio Liberation frequently appear. Radio Liberation feels that this proves that it is accomplishing its purpose.

The Soviet rulers make desparate efforts to prevent Radio Liberation from being heard. Ten minutes after it went on the air, the Soviets began to jam it. Jamming is the broadcasting of radio signals on the same wave length as another station to drown out that station. To avoid jamming, Radio Liberation switches from one wave length to another—and manages to get through to its listeners.

LISTENERS RESPOND

This is known through many reports brought out by visitors to the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Radio Liberation regularly asks listeners to write to innocent sounding addresses—continually altered—in the free world. Letters arrive. Some are written in a sort of code. "Your relatives will be very grateful that you are young and strong enough to do intensive work for the betterment of others," one postcard said. It meant, "I approve of Radio Liberation broadcasts. Keep them up." Fear of the consequences of writing what they think makes Soviet citizens use such a roundabout way of expressing themselves. Some brave writers speak out directly. One wrote that the Communists "are as scared of your words as the devil is scared of incense. Many people listen to you but they are afraid to write letters."

To do the job of broadcasting constantly interesting material to the Soviet Union, Radio Liberation has a large staff in Munich, West Germany. They must keep informed on events in the Soviet Union. Therefore monitors listen to 88 Soviet radio stations. Piles of Soviet newspapers, magazines, and books are studied. Persons who have escaped from the Soviet Union are interviewed. This makes it possible for Radio Liberation to analyze events in the Soviet Union for its listeners. Again and again, Radio Liberation details how the rulers of the Soviet Union oppress the Soviet people.

Extracts from books that carry a message of freedom, and which are forbidden in the Soviet Union, are put on the air. Discussion of these books is also broadcast. "Dr. Zhivago," now a best seller in the United States, was banned in the Soviet Union. This Nobel Prize-winning novel by a Soviet author, Boris Pasternak, has recently been featured prominently by Radio Liberation.

Mesages from outstanding figures in the free world are also sent over Radio Liberation. And the anniversary of the famous uprising in one of the Soviet Union's slave-labor camps—the Vorkuta uprising in 1953—is marked each year by a special program.

Some broadcasts originate in Radio Liberation's studios in New York, some in Munich. Transmitters are located in West Germany and Taiwan (Formosa). Recordings are flown to Taiwan and thus Radio Liberation pours its words into the Soviet Union from the West and from the East.

If you were in the Soviet Union today, you could listen to these words of hope:

"This is Radio Liberation, the voice of your fellow countrymen abroad. We are for freedom from arbitrary rule, for a government of freely elected representatives of the people, and for peace throughout the world."

## Widespread Caribbean War Is Seen up to Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Frank H. Bartholomew, president of United Press International, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Tuesday, March 10, 1959:

WIDESPREAD CARIBBEAN WAR IS SEEN UP TO CASTRO

(By Frank H. Bartholomew)

SAN JUAN, P.R., March 9.—The Caribbean area today presents all three Americas—North, South, and Central—with another Balkans on their doorstep that could erupt in warfare.

Tensions appear to be mounting steadily in the potentially explosive military-political situations involving the island republics. If the first gun is fired in invasion attempts against the probably initial targets of the Dominican Republic or Haiti, it seems equally probable a whole series of wars may start in chain reaction around the Spainish Main.

The decision appears to rest on the dramatic person of Fidel Castro, who ousted dictor Fulgencio Batista from Cuba and who is committed to supporting revolutions in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Nicaragua in the Caribbean and Paraguay in South America. His argument is that their Presidents are as dictatorial as Batista was.

REVOLUTIONARIES BUSY

Catching his zeal, revolutionaries from these target nations have been holding meetings in Cuba, many of them public and well advertised, to formulate their own plans.

A typical incident was observed by this correspondent in a crowded Rancho Luna suburban restaurant outside Havana. Multicolored handbills distributed at the tables called for "liberation of Santo Domingo (the Dominican Republic)" and concluded "down with the tyranny of Trujillo."

To Castro and his supporters, Dominican strongman Gen. Rafael Trujillo is the prime symbol of remaining dictatorship.

An excited Dominican leaped on a table, called for silence and addressed himself to the Cubans present:

"As you fought in the jungles of Oriente (Province), so will we soon fight in the forests of the Dominican Republic."

A public address system in the restaurant played the Cuban revolutionary song, "Day of Freedom," ending in a simulated burst of machinegun fire.

SEEM READY FOR ACTION

Some of these revolutionary groups in Cuba appear ready for immediate action.

Haiti, under President Francois Duvalier, seems to be regarded as the ripest target at the moment with an invasion unit under former Haitian Senator Louis de Joie announcing itself ready to take off this month.

The overthrow of Duvalier in Port au Prince would not only place a man friendly to Castro in control but would give the Cuban leader an operating base against Trujillo—his primary target—since Haiti and the Dominican Republic share the same island.

Responding to the mounting pressure, Trujillo has announced formation of an anti-Communist legion of 25,000 men armed with new machineguns to supplement his regular army.

PLANS LAID IN CUBA

The probability at the moment is that Castro himself would not directly participate in any military moves against the target nations. But he is believed to have given so much direct encouragement and the promise of arms to revolutionaries from these lands that they may launch offensives on their own, unless he orders them to stop. But, so far, offensive plans continue to be made in Cuba, while defense measures are taken in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua and Paraguay.

There seems a good chance that the warlike talk in all the countries visited by this correspondent may subside, exhausted by its very violence.

Despite all threats, no trigger has been pulled yet. And each day without gunfire is one more day of stability.

At the same time, it is evident that the emotional level of exiles is so high and arms are so plentiful that an international military adventure may start anywhere in the Caribbean unless the man of the hour in Cuba takes specific steps to halt it.

## How To Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article which appeared in the National News, Veterans of World War I, Washington, D.C., in the March issue.

The article follows:

HOW TO WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

(By Merle E. Hopper)

On one of my first trips to Washington, I dropped into the office of a Congressman, now retired after many years of service in the Congress of the United States. Sitting in the balcony of the House, I could not help but admire him and wonder how he consistently returned to Washington. I asked later, "What is the secret of staying in Congress so long?" Without hesitation he replied, "I read every letter that I receive from my constituents and my office endeavors to answer them within 24 hours."

YOUR LETTERS DO COUNT

Another Congressman, no longer a Member of the Congress, while a Congressman was making a speech on the floor said, "What a man says down there can very well defeat him, but what he does in his office can reelect him. After you have been around here a while you will discover that some of the most influential men in Congress, seldom speak on the floor, but they are most conscientious in their committee work, and I've never known them to neglect their mail."

These two instances are cited because the statement is often made, "It doesn't do any good to write any Congressman." But it does. It is found that our Congressmen spend more time reading and replying to our correspondence than on any other part of their work. In fact they are at it early and late.

Letters to Congress average 120,000 a day, rising to a half million when we really get "riled up" and "mad" about something.

LETTERS WIN SUPPORT

In my 35 years of experience in visiting Members of the Congress, I find most Congressmen depend upon our letters for support and guidance. They do pay attention to what we have to say. For instance when our charter bill, H.R. 11077, was up for consideration, there was a flood of letters received by Members of the Congress. They were just flabbergasted. The pressure was so great that this piece of legislation passed by nearly a unanimous vote.

Hardly a day goes by without bringing a deluge of mail to Members of the Congress from their constituents. These persons are deeply stirred and want to do something. Now it isn't the long drawn-out letter that does the most good. It's the brief, to-the-point note or letter which lets the Congressman know what we really think, that does the trick.

When we pick up a stub of a pencil and write on a postcard our message, we have started something. I have seen such a card pass from one Member of the Congress to another and on it was the name and address of the sender. This kind of a contact causes your Congressman to think.

A Member of the Congress once said, "We depend upon the letters from our constituents for advice on many things. For instance, over 11,000 bills were introduced in the House in the first session of the last Congress and over 6,500 in the Senate.

"Now, I depend upon the interest of the constituents back home on a particular bill. If he is interested enough I dig into the bill and study it, but if I don't hear from anyone on the bill I don't do anything about it except to vote against it.

"During the last 28 years, letters from my constituents have increased 1,000 percent, and I have been able to vote more intelligently because of them."

LOGIC IS EFFECTIVE

We are most effective when we ask our Congressman to vote yes or no on any matter which we are intersted in.

We should accompany our requests with enough logic to show that we have a reason for wanting him to vote yes or no. We should never let it appear that we are doing this as a favor for some organization or a friend. Congressmen know that the voter who sits down and expresses his feelings in his own language will remember him on election day.

Now if we really want to make a botch of things—spell the Congressman's name wrong or confuse Federal with State issues.

We must make up our minds what we want done and why. Then write and tell him about it. Don't send him clippings from newspapers on legislation. Our Congressmen want to know what we think.

NEVER THREATEN

Never threaten a Congressman. It is the old story of the vinegar and the honey. We can catch plenty of flies with the honey. We should never say, "A lot of my neighbors feel as I do and unless you vote so and so we will take care of you at the next election."

In all my contacts with Members of the Congress, I have found them to be human and when we threaten them they become resentful. It is a safe rule that if our neighbors, buddies, and sisters feel as we do our Congressman will hear from them, too. I've never heard of a Member of Congress who was fooled by a mimeographed release from a department or by letters from auxiliary secretaries and barracks adjutants implying that a proposed resolution represented the thinking of all of the barracks or the auxiliary.

PETITIONS HARMFUL

A Member of the Congress said to me, "Merle, I thought you told me you were representing the World War I vets? I just returned from home and they tell me they don't want your type of pension; that the Legion is their spokesman and that they want the pension program passed at the last Legion convention.

"And those petitions we have been receiving, anyone can sign them, in fact I mailed out some letters to signers of the petitions you gave me a couple of weeks ago and do you know that 23 letters came back from the Post Office Department marked 'Deceased'."

A word to the wise. Don't ever sign a petition and send it in—write that letter or postcard.

A U.S. Senator now decreased once said to me, "Got a flock of telegrams from some of your people the other day and I question them for the reason that I doubt the senders ever sent them."

Don't send telegrams unless asked to and then mention specifically the matter we ask you to. These telegrams were effective during the charter bill fight for they were specific, and asked the Member of the Congress to support our proposed bill and the bill number was in the telegram.

Former Senator Arthur Vandenburg, in a letter written a few years ago, on the World War I soldiers' bonus issue said, "When people take enough interest to write us and feel free to speak their minds and when we scrupulously reply—faith in democratic government is established."

## Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, soon to be leaving the post in which he has served with great distinction is Secretary of the Navy Thomas S. Gates, Jr. Since I represent a community which has a great variety of naval interests, I have had more than an ordinary opportunity to observe the Secretary at work. I am sure there has been no period in history when the Navy has been faced with more problems and more tough decisions. The commendable manner in which Secretary Gates went about his work deserves the attention and commendation of the entire country. The Navy and our country have greatly benefited because of his leadership.

Mr. Gates served for nearly 4 years as Under Secretary of the Navy. He was the good right hand of another distinguished Navy Secretary, the Honorable Charles S. Thomas. Following that same tradition, the present Under Secretary William B. Franke will take over when Secretary Gates returns to private life in Philadelphia. This smooth transition in the leadership of the Navy from the period of Secretary Thomas through to the new Secretary Franke is an excellent example for the other agencies of the Government. Service as Under Secretary ideally prepares a man to serve in the highest spot in the Department. Obviously, Secretary Franke will have big shoes to fill, but his background and training and devotion to the Navy should help him to carry on in the Gates tradition. Under unanimous consent, I include as a portion of my remarks a recent letter to the editor which appeared in the Washington Post on February 14, 1959:

MR. GATES' RECORD

It is a pleasure to congratulate you on your February 5 editorial on Navy Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., summing up his accomplishments as he relinquishes his duties in June.

You have shown keen discernment and understanding of naval matters in the Pentagon and you have pointed out Mr. Gates' interest, competence and balance on defense needs in the Pentagon.

Mr. Gates has accomplished much in the Navy Department. He will be remembered as a great Secretary of the Navy, ranking with the late James V. Forrestal and President Taft's Navy Secretary, George von L. Meyer.

He has done his work efficiently, silently, and with the least quarterdeck manner. He has had the public interest constantly in mind and he has had the wholehearted support of the Navy.

We wish the new Secretary of the Navy, William Franke, a fair breeze and good luck.

DONALD H. DALTON,
*Public Relations, Forty and Eight, District of Columbia Voiture 174.*

## Mania for Growth Obscures Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 11, 1959*

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by economic reporter J. A. Livingston, writ-

ing in the Washington Post and Times Herald Sunday, March 8, 1959.

This article is timely, and ably written by a highly respected observer of the economic scene:

In the pastwar cold war, one of America's greatest vistories was won right here at home. This victory ranks with the Marshall plan in propping up the ailing economies of Italy, France, and other Western European countries against the political assaults of Communist leaders. It ranks with the successful defense of Korea and the hold-fast policy of Quemoy.

This strategic victory is the respulse of recessions in 1948–49, in 1953–54, and just recently. It is proof to the world that the American system works, that it is not inherently unstable.

The other day, perchance and unexpectedly, I ran into one of the leaders of the American Communist Party. As soon as he learned that I was a writer on economics and business, he said portentously: "This country is heading into a great bust—a grand depression."

THE DOOM TOM-TOMS

I pointed out that that has been a Soviet theme song since the end of the war. I noted that Eugene Varga, Stalin's pet economist, had predicted an American catastrophe at the end of World War II. I noted that each time we've had a business decline, Soviet economists beat the doom tom-toms.

Yet, never did the dire doom come. The last decline though deeper than the two previous ones, lasted only 8 months, as against 13 months for the 1953–54 contraction and 11 months for the 1948–49 drop.

Compared with recessions in the past, the postwar recessions have been mild, averaging 10 months. From 1899 to 1945, the declines averaged 19 months. Even more discomfiting to Soviet propagandists is that the periods of expansion, of prosperity, have lengthened. The postwar average is 39 months as against 31 months from 1899 to 1945.

But now that we have established that our system works, the Marxists have another propaganda point. Premier Khrushchev boasts that my 1970 Soviet output will "advance to first place in the world, both in absolute volume of industrial output and in per capita production. This will mark the history-making victory of socialism in peaceful competition with capitalism in the world arena." This is his refined way of saying: "We will bury you."

YES, WE HAVE SLACK

Result: At a hearing before the Joint Economic Committee, Richard V. Gilbert, chief OPA economist during World War II, deflected an entire session from the question of growth and stability to fear of Soviet expansion by declaring that "Russian rates of overall economic growth and of industrial production are more than double our own and in the key areas on which warmaking depends are three or four times our own." America-isn't-growing-fast-enough has become a common phobia.

Yet, a nation's economy can't always run at top-speed any more than does a mile runner. Economics is an eternity, not a 60-yard dash.

Sure, we could produce more. The Government could order 500,000 automobiles it doesn't need from the Detroit factories. It could buy textiles, stockpile lead, and issue orders to the machine tool industry. It could fill freight cars with sand and shunt them back and forth across the country to create activity. It could force companies to work overtime. But would that be growth?

Or we could build schools, highways, low-cost housing—projects which appeal to commonsense, which fill an obvious social need. But would additional schools and roads help Detroit? Would they generate a demand for machine tools? Moreover, how would they be paid for?

WHO WOULD DECIDE?

We talk of this as a free-choice economy. People—consumers—buy what they want. The Government doesn't dictate how much of what shall be made and at what price, as in the Soviet Union.

When the Federal Government runs in the red, it means that we, the people, are buying things that we, the taxpayers, aren't paying for. In New York State, Governor Rockefeller is having a hard time selling his new tax program. The State of Michigan ran out of money and had to ask corporations to pay taxes in advance. These are evidences of inability or unwillingness to pay.

Certainly, we could use more schools, roads, hospitals, etc. Plenty of teenagers would welcome more automobiles. Plenty of families would welcome second cars. Our problem is to decide what we want, what we are willing to pay for.

We've won one victory in the postwar period—preventing deep depressions. We can't speed our growth, reduce hours of work, raise wages, expand defense outlays, and maintain stable prices, all at once. In the Soviet Union Khrushchev would decide what's what; but, here, we don't want to win one victory only to lose a greater one—our system.

## Herb Zandler—Good Citizen Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to join in honoring one of my constituents, Herbert S. Zandler, who has won a national good citizenship award from the National Association of Food Chains for his outstanding record of service to his community. The Honorable Thomas C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, will make the presentation to him at a banquet at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington on March 16.

Mr. Zandler, manager of a supermarket in Bridgeton, N.J., is one of nine national winners and the only winner east of Illinois. They were selected from among 10,000 supermarket managers who entered the nationwide competition.

Mr. Zandler has done outstanding work with the Bridge Baseball Little League and was instrumental in making that group one of the largest in the United States. He is also Scoutmaster of Boy Scout Troop No. 30. He is a member of the Exchange Club and conducts a Christmas tree sale at his store each year, the proceeds of which go to the maintenance of the club's summer day camp. On top of this full schedule, Mr. Zandler is a tireless worker for the United Fund and is president of the Bridgeton Table Tennis League.

Mr. Zandler, a veteran of World War II, married the former Lucinne Hoyet in Cherbourg, France in 1945. They have three children. Mrs. Zandler now tutors students going to France under a student exchange program.

Mr. Zandler has been recognized by his community in setting a day to do him honor. Mayor John Spoltore has issued a proclamation for "Herb Zandler—Good Citizen Day" as follows:

Whereas the welfare of our community is the basic responsibility of our citizens; and

Whereas such welfare is best served by the voluntary cooperative efforts of all with a common pride and interest in their community; and

Whereas the duties and responsibilities of good citizenship must continually be brought to the public's mind and recognition accorded those who have played an important part in the furtherance of community achievements; and

Whereas Herb Zandler, manager of the Food Fair supermarket in Bridgeton, has been selected as the winner of a national good citizenship award in competititon with 10,000 store managers throughout the country; and

Whereas Herb Zandler's contributions to our community through his practice of the rights and duties of citizenship at the local level have been singularly outstanding, gaining for him and our community this national recognition.

Now, therefore, I, mayor of Bridgeton, do hereby proclaim Thursday, March 19, 1959, "Herb Zandler—Good Citizenship Day" in honor of our friend and neighbor for the honor he has brought to himself, his family, and his community.

Herb Zandler is, indeed, a fine American, with a fine American family.

## A Valiant Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert a press release which I recently issued. The story of the U.S.S. *Maryland* should be of interest to all those who remember how valiantly she served our country during World War II.

This is a story of a valiant lady of days gone by.

The Department of the Navy recently advised the Armed Services Committee that it intended to scrap 43 warships.

The U.S.S *Maryland* is one of the ships destined for the ironpile. I thought it might be appropriate to review her illustrious career.

This ship is the third to carry the name of *Maryland*. The first was a 380-ton vessel carrying 20 guns and 180 men. Commissioned in 1799, she served in the West Indies during the naval war with France in 1800. The second *Maryland* was an armored cruiser commissioned in 1905. She saw duty in the Atlantic in World War I. The present *Maryland* or "Old Mary," or "Fighting Mary," as she was known to her crew, was commissioned in 1921. She saw heavy action in World War II, and was under attack over a hundred times in the Pacific. The Japanese reported her sunk on three occasions.

On December 7, 1941, the *Maryland* and six of her sister battlewagons were moored along Ford Island at Pearl Harbor. The *Maryland* was severely damaged in the sur-

prise Japanese attack of that morning, but 23 days later she pulled into Puget Sound for repairs. She shortly thereafter rejoined the fleet in the Pacific.

The *Maryland* saw further action at the battle of Midway and in the Solomon Islands. She supported the Marine assaults on Tarawa, Kwajalein, and Saipan. At the last of these engagements, a torpedo ripped a gaping hole in her port bow. After repairs, the *Maryland* again joined the fleet and participated in many engagements. The five old battleships which the Japanese thought they had sunk at Pearl Harbor, the *California*, the *Tennessee*, the *West Virginia*, the *Pennsylvania*, and the *Maryland*, met the Japanese fleet at Leyte Gulf. The thundering guns of these old battleships decimated the enemy's forces.

Shortly thereafter, the "Fighting Mary" was hit by a suicide dive bomber and severely damaged. Ground repairs were quickly made. On April 1, 1945, the *Maryland* was given the job of providing close support for the Marine invasion of Okinawa. I personally well remember the part she there played. I was in the first wave of the invasion, and I will always carry the picture in my mind of the *Maryland's* 16-inch guns shelling the coast as we Marines moved in.

The *Maryland* was again hit by a kamikaze, and again dreadfully damaged. In spite of the heavy casualties, dead and wounded, the *Maryland* continued to support the Okinawan invasion. Having been battle damaged three times in the course of 10 months, she was on her way back to strike again, when the Japanese finally surrendered.

Modern warfare has now rendered this grand lady obsolete. She and her sisters are destined for the scrap heap. I do think, however, that it is only proper to recount her gallant service as she is about to go on her last voyage.

---

## A Look at West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is nothing more refreshing, nothing more hopeful for the future, than the sobering fact that our youth can and does take the time to indulge in the purposeful activity of a searching analysis of where we have been, where we stand as a society today, and where our course may be in the tomorrows if we but will it.

There is no state in our Union of States where it is more appropirate and necessary that the citizenry awaken to face realities than in my home State of West Virginia. The evolution of change has brought upon the people, their State and local governments and, indeed, upon their economic and social way of life, the pressing problems of serious portent.

Our educators, our journalists, our economic researchers, and our men and women in public affairs have struggled to plumb the depths of West Virginia's difficulties and to find solutions for them. The written and spoken word of the veterans in these specialized fields would fill volumes.

But, Mr. President, I repeat the observation that it is as comforting as it is hopeful when we find our youth ready, willing, and able not only to participate in the search for truth but, indeed, to state the truth in positive terms. They come forth with challenging willingness to join the campaign for progress.

I was especially impressed when I read some weeks ago in a leading West Virginia newspaper a few quotations from an address delivered by a second-year student in the College of Law of West Virginia University before the Civitan Club of Charleston on the subject: "A Look at West Virginia."

The young man who took a searching look at his home State and related it to an audience. Frank Lile Taylor, Jr., son of the Honorable and Mrs. Frank L. Taylor of Charleston, W. Va., was the speaker. His father is the distinguished judge of the 13th Circuit Court of the State's judiciary system.

I requested the young man to supply a text of his "A Look at West Virginia" address. It was necessary for him to place his notes in manuscript form after he had completed his final semester examinations.

When Mr. Taylor's manuscript was received, and after I had the opportunity to read and study its content, I was all the more impressed with the fact that here was the manifestation of West Virginia and American youth in purposeful and thoughtful endeavor, which augers well for the future of the State and the Nation.

Mr. President, even though the picture of West Virginia as painted in the factual and descriptive words may contain drab coloring in certain areas relating to our economic and social status, I believe it is a thoroughly objective picture which would bear careful scrutiny and study.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this address, "A Look at West Virginia," by Frank Lile Taylor, Jr., of Charleston, W. Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOOK AT WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. President, guests, members of the Civitan Club of Charleston, I am grateful for the kind words of introduction. I fear he has, however, overstated his case. And though such things are always pleasing to the ear and exhilarating for the ego, at the same time they can be worrisome for the speaker, who already finds himself beset with numerous problems.

For instance, the subject is ambitious and difficult for anyone. It is increasingly more so for a young law student who is attempting to discuss it with many of the business and professional leaders of this community. Therefore, I feel compelled to make clear several points at the outset.

First, I recognize that it would be presumptuous, yea, ludicrous, for me to represent to you that I know as much about this State and its problems as any or all of you. Yet I feel it fair to say that I am as aware of them as any or all of you. Awareness is not enough. Hence, I am here to ask a favor, not just for me, but for every boy and girl in West Virginia. We need your active participation in the furtherance of our cause. What is this cause? It is to spotlight the problems which confront our State, thus creating here a dynamic and forward-looking populace, dedicated to the development of this State's potential in every way.

Again, I come to you without the benefit of experience, without much knowledge of the practical approach to life. I offer simply the exuberance and enthusiasm of youth, a keen interest in the subject, and a sincere belief in what I am about to say.

Bearing in mind, then, that my mission is to crystallize, not criticize, to ask a favor rather than rap a wrist, join me, if you will, for a look at West Virginia.

It is recorded that, "They must upward still and onward who would keep abreast of truth." Appropriate to the subject this day is an attempt at paraphrase, the result being: They must upward still and onward who would keep abreast of changing times. West Virginia has reached a crucial point in its history. Its citizens must now decide whether to go forward to meet the uncertainties of the space age, or to go backward, thus hurtling headlong down the late Fred Allen's treadmill to oblivion. West Virginians must choose between action and inaction, between accepting the challenges of the future or resting on the accomplishments of the past.

Determining the direction we want to go is easy. The answer is forward. Nor does the choice between action and inaction present a problem. How do we start? Ah, that is the rub.

It occurs to me that we must begin by looking to the charts at hand and scrutinizing the courses available. This scrutiny must, of necessity, be a critical and piercing one. We must look, not solely to our laurels, but also at our liabilities. In short, there must be a determination of the problems which confront us. Then, having determined them, we must search for solutions.

Of course, any analysis will indicate that we in West Virginia are confronted with more than one problem. However, one stands alone above the others. I refer, in a word, to population. This is the key. All other causes for concern are related to or connected with it. Specifically, the problem is to check emigration from our State, to retain those of us who have elected to stay and to attract others to compensate for our recent losses. You ask whether the problem is extensive. I answer that it is perilous. Herein is why:

The population of the United States increased between 1950 and 1954 from 151 million to 158 million, or by 5 percent. It decreased in West Virginia in this same period from 2 million to 1.9 million, or by 3 percent. The decrease is greater now because of the recent recession. These figures, of and by themselves, are of little value. However, the decrease means several things.

First, West Virginia will lose one Congressman after the 1960 census. Further, should the decrease continue at its present rate, we could lose stil another of our Washington Representatives after 1970.

Second, the population decrease means that one of West Virginia's greatest assets, an able and eager labor force, is being tapped at an alarming rate. We know this because the statistics indicate that most of our emigrants are in the 20–40 age group. This second effect is directly related to the third and last one, which I shall mention—namely, that a decreasing labor force makes more difficult the attraction of new industry, that ingredient so vitally essential to the alleviation of the economic slack caused by mechanization in the coal mines.

The foregoing figures and observations represent some effects of the problem. Attend now to several of its causes.

There is authority for the proposition that imbalance in the industrial structure in our State contributes to the population problem. This is borne out by the fact that 17 percent of the income payments in West Virginia in 1953 was derived from the mining

of coal, whereas coal mining provided but 1.4 percent of the income payments in the United States, .6 percent in Ohio, and only 2.9 percent in Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania figure, 2.9 percent, takes on added significance when we recall that the Quaker State is second only to West Virginia in the production of coal in this country. Moreover, the West Virginia figure, 17 percent, is more frightening when we consider the number of men employed in the mines in 1953 as opposed to the number employed in 1945. At the end of the war, West Virginia's pits and strips provided gainful employment for 152,000 men. Slightly more than one-half that many, or 81,000, were so employed in 1953. The figure is smaller today.

The same imbalance which affects the coal business hampers effective manufacturing development. True it is that West Virginia has made remarkable manufacturing strides since 1939. In fact, it can be said that we are a manufacturing State today, not primarily a coal State. You see, 22 percent of our income payments in 1953 was derived from manufacturing. But—and this is important—we have capitalized on this economic boom in only three areas. They are in the iron and steel, chemicals, and stone-clay-glass fields. This is illustrated by the fact that 86,000 of the 136,000 residents who derive their incomes from manufacturing depend on the just mentioned three areas of endeavor.

Hence, it is fair to conclude that any disturbance in the coal industry, or in the manufacture of iron and steel products, chemical products, or ceramics, will throw the entire economic scale in the State out of balance. To put it another way, gentlemen, we have put our economic eggs in one basket, possibly two.

Some say that a lack of job opportunities has driven many people from the West Virginia hills. You and I have noticed this in the last 18 months, especially. In addition, I see it each June at graduation when our prospective business and professional leaders, whom we sorely need, look elsewhere because there is no opportunity to work here. Those who stay do so at considerable personal sacrifice. This is particularly true of those who seek employment in our public schools.

This brings us to a third cause of our population problem, a lack of proper educational facilities. Although my next remarks are inapplicable in Kanawha County, the following facts are worthy of notice: West Virginia stands 42d in the Nation in public per pupil spending. The I.Q. of the average student in school in West Virginia is five points below that of the average pupil in school in the United States. Education officials are constantly plagued and hampered by a lack of physical facilities and study aids. For instance, biology, a required course for graduation from a secondary school in West Virginia, is taught in several counties without the aid of microscopes. History and geography are taught without maps. I could go on and on, but this is another story.

Fourth, it is said that people leave because West Virginia is a cultural void. Whether this is entirely true I do not know. Whether there is a proper cause and effect relation between decreasing population and decreasing culture I do not know. But I do know that our population has dwindled and is dwindling. Further, I know that symphony orchestras are dying on the vine in West Virginia. I know that West Virginia can boast of but one major art gallery, that being in Huntington. I know that we rank last in public expenditures for public libraries. The Kanawha County Public Library knows this only too well.

No doubt there are other reasons why we have a population problem. Nevertheless, I submit that the four facets discussed this afternoon are primary causes of it.

What, then, is the answer? There are as many "solutions" to the problem as there are people who know of it. I'll enumerate some.

The Arthur D. Little Co. suggests, among other things, the development of four industries—chemical, woodworking, apparel, and metal fabricating. This organization has devised several modes of advertising West Virginia to others. Its attractive brochure has been and will be invaluable in helping us sell our State.

Dean E. K. Feaster declares that the remedy lies in more money for the school system, in a tightening of the educational requirements, in the provision of more adequate facilities and better qualified instructors.

The Charleston Gazette opines that there is need for cooperation between government, management, and labor in the establishment of a long-range, orderly tax program. This would take the place of the hand-to-mouth, crisis-to-crisis plan under which we operate today.

There are many other suggested solutions, all of which are meritorious. But I submit to you that we have overlooked the first step. Before we can formulate a plan of attack, we, and I mean all, must be acutely aware of the problems which confront us. I submit that the ultimate solution rests with you and me, and with our desire to learn of the problems before attempting to prescribe some wonder cure.

The welfare of this State, like the welfare of the Civitan Club or any other organization to which you belong, will be no better and no worse than you want it to be. West Virginia will prosper only in direct proportion to the degree you desire it should prosper. This being so, I bring you back to the outset of my remarks. I remind you that I said that I am here to ask a favor. The favor I ask is this: When you make your resolutions for 1959, promise yourselves to discharge more fully your responsibilities as interested citizens of West Virginia. Then, having made the promise, keep it.

Now this can't be done merely by promising to vote in the forthcoming city election, or in any election, for that matter. Nor can it be done simply by pledging not to ask to be excused when next you are summoned for jury duty. Your responsibility will be discharged if, but only if, you dedicate yourselves collectively and individually, to learning more about your State and its problems. Then, once aware of the situation, motivate your neighbors and public officials. Let your legislator and all other public officials know that you know as much about our government and our problems as they do. Keep them on their toes. Make them more cognizant of the fact that you care what happens.

This burden is yours more than mine. The reason is that your contemporaries will be quicker to react to these suggestions when they come from men of stature and experience than they will should similar suggestions emanate from us whose feet are not yet wet.

Therefore, I reiterate that the first step in the solution lies with each resident of West Virginia. The Arthur D. Little Co. almost had it with the inclusion in its brochure on the State a section entitled, "What Industrialists Are Saying About West Virginia." The essence of the comments there set out was what great benefits were derived from their decision to come to West Virginia. Conspicuously absent, however, was a section entitled, "What West Virginians Are Saying About West Virginia." Such a section will remain conspicuously absent until West Virginians know what can be said for West Virginia. Meeting the challenge of the future depends on finding many contributors to such a section. Will you be one of them?

## Individuation Versus Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, occasionally there is printed by an outstanding newspaper an editorial which goes directly to the heart of a problem and succinctly sums up the conflict involved.

Such an editorial appeared in the Anniston Star on Sunday, March 8, 1959. I am proud to say that this newspaper is located in the Fourth Alabama District, and that its editor and publisher, the distinguished Col. Harry M. Ayers, is a personal friend of mine. I commend the following editorial to the reading of every Member of Congress:

INDIVIDUATION VERSUS INTEGRATION

There was an element of bitter irony in the fact that on the same day last week there appeared in this office a well-known Negro citizen who has given the larger part of his life toward the betterment of his race, while almost simultaneously on the floor of Congress a Representative from the State of New York was opening a campaign further to divide and to embitter the white and colored peoples of the Nation.

The Negro man was Sidney J. Phillips, president of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, who got the State of Virginia to help him buy the lot on which Washington was born and got the U.S. Government to erect there a monument that would serve to perpetuate the life and deeds of that great American.

The other gentleman was EMANUEL CELLER, Member of the House of Representatives from the 11th District of New York, who is head of a committee whose efforts will have the effect of widening the breach between the white and the Negro races and of stirring up a spirit of racial hatred.

Sidney Phillips is conscious of the need for racial unity in this crucial moment in our history and, not satisfied with having erected monuments to the memory of Booker T. Washington, the founder of Tuskegee Institute, he now wants to bring about a moratorium with respect to the so-called civil rights legislation and to have us get back to the fundamental principles of Americanism.

WASHINGTON'S SOUND ADVICE

Booker Washington gave sound advice to his own people. In one memorable address, he said: "We want to get a reputation for doing things without having to be told to do them every time. If you have work to do, think about it constantly, investigate and read about it so thoroughly that you will always be finding ways and means of improving that work.

"The average person going to work," he said, "becomes a regular machine, never giving the matter of improving his work a thought. He is never at his work before the appointed time, and is sure to stop the minute the hour is up. The world is looking for the person who is thoughtful, who will say at the close of work hours: 'Is there not something else I can do for you?'"

Better advice was never given to any people, white or black, and that is just one quotation from the lips of that eminent American, whom Alabamians were proud to vote a place in the Hall of Fame from this State.

TUSKEGEE'S GREAT TRIUMVIRATE

He also gave to Americans, through Tuskegee Institute, the world renowned Dr. George Washington Carver and William L. Dawson, a native of this city, whose "Negro Symphony" and other compositions, as well as his skill as a conductor and his interpretation of music indigenous to his own people from the depth of Africa, likewise have made him internationally famous.

At the Atlanta exposition back in 1895, Dr. Washington said, after having been publicly introduced by Henry Grady, the noted editor of the Atlanta Constitution: "In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress. • • •

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremist folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle, rather than of artificial forcing."

PROUD OF HIS HERITAGE

"I am a Negro and am proud of my heritage," said Washington. But the ideals and practical lessons that were taught by the sage of Tuskegee are no longer taught in the Negro schools and colleges today. They want to take over the Government, State and local, if not national, without disciplines, mental and moral, that have been required of white voters from the days of Magna Carta on down.

Scholars like Phillips and editors like Davis Lee of South Carolina and Newark, N.J., understand this to be true and are trying to bring about a renaissance of that spirit of fellowship and cooperation that existed between the races here in the South before the NAACP and politicians like EMANUEL CELLER came upon the scene to plant seeds of discord.

WHAT WARREN COURT'S DONE

And what have been some of the results of that "law" that was "enacted" (sic) by the Supreme Court and enunciated by Chief Justice Warren on May 17, 1954?

It has threatened to destroy the mores of the South, which today has the honor of enjoying that last "distinctive heritage" of America, if we may believe Historians Pierson of Yale and Woodward of Johns Hopkins.

It has brought about dissension and division in our churches, Protestant and Catholic.

It has destroyed a great social experiment: whether two races of different culture and background could live together in harmony and cooperation?

It has given rise to a new era of demagoggery throughout the Nation and has turned friends of yesterday into enemies of today.

It has brought about chaos in the public schools of all of our big cities, which have been turned into virtual concentration camps, with police in every corridor.

Hence, one principal in New York committed suicide and another in Nashville died of nervous prostration.

It has brought about sexual laxity among whites and colored students in the schools of New York, Milwaukee, Washington, D.C., Little Rock, Ark., and elsewhere.

ALARMING INCREASE IN CRIME

It has brought about an alarming increase in crime, especially in our big cities. Forcible rapes, as opposed to statutory rapes, increased 31 percent last year, 725 rapes having been reported in New York.

It has made it unsafe for white women to walk the streets alone at night in any city where the Negroes congregate.

It has made homeowners, or neighbors, feel insecure from "blockbusters" in all of our big cities, having caused race riots in Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, Louisville, Detroit, Wilmington, Del., Levittown, Pa., and elsewhere as a result of this sort of confiscation of property.

It has caused the public to lose confidence in a free press, because so many papers refuse to name offenders against the law by the race to which they belong.

Two of our great dailies, the Washington Post and the Los Angeles Times, have even rejected paid advertisements from the South, the Putnam letter to President Eisenhower being a case in point because the letter, written by a northern author, conflicts with their editorial views.

Attacks on the Southern States have become so vicious and continuous that the new president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Dr. Lewis Webster Jones, has said that this region has become "the Nation's whipping boy."

REGARDING THE NEGRO BALLOT

These attacks by CELLER and other northern politicians say the South will not allow the Negro to vote. However, when and where the cumulative poll tax prevails or has prevailed, Negro and white persons, rich and poor, were penalized alike.

Also, it might be observed, the manager of Bob Taft in this State was able to deliver Alabama's Negro vote time after time. And Negro politicians like Perry Howard and S. D. Redmond of Mississippi got rich by delivering the Negro vote to the GOP convention candidates.

It might be said further that the poll tax also was conceived for the purpose of limiting the vote, whereby corporation lawyers would have a better chance of looking out for the interests of their clients.

That condition no longer prevails in most of the Southern States, but the South still seeks to maintain an intelligent vote. And to that end the white people of this region have been willing to tax themselves so as to educate the Negroes, few of whom pay any considerable taxes.

But as a result of this effort in recent years some of the best school buildings in the South have been built for Negroes. And on a per capita basis Negro teachers are paid better salaries than are white teachers.

NEGRO COLLEGES SUPPORTED

It is a fact, too, that Alabama supports the largest Nego college in the world at Montgomery and an outstanding technical college near Huntsville. The presidents of both schools have Ph. D. degrees.

Moreover, Alabama and other Southern States finance Negro graduate students for study anywhere in the United States in courses not available in their home States. And a majority of those awarded these scholarships in Alabama have elected to enter exclusively Negro schools, proving thereby that they are happier among their own people.

Lynching, which was a hangover from Reconstruction and scalawag mischief, has been outlawed in the South for a considerable period; the Negro is given equality before the law and has equal access to public health. White people, too, help to support their churches and their charities.

Most southern cities support parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, and other sources of recreation that come from the taxes of the white people almost exclusively.

NEGRO TOWN IS AIDED

Anniston and county officials also help materially to support Hobson City, the exclusively Negro town between Anniston and Oxford, which gets little help from the better-positioned Negroes.

Cultivated Negroes like Sidney Phillips understand these facts and they are doing all in their power to maintain the pleasant relations that have prevailed between the two races.

But rulings such as have emanated from the Supreme Court under its present personnel in the last few years, plus Reconstruction-minded officials in the office of the Attorney General, would like to put the whole South in hairy shirts again as of yore.

But, in the final analysis, it still is true that no region of the United States, any more than any individual, can live to itself alone. Hence, if other regions succeed in retarding the South in its social and economic relations, the entire United States will have to help shoulder the penalty.

---

## Science and Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following thought-provoking editorial entitled "Science and Books," which appeared in the March 9 issue of the Newark Evening News:

SCIENCE AND BOOKS

It is something of a modern paradox that as men everywhere are being brought into closer communication their ability to communicate seems to have been weakened rather than improved. The physical boundaries of the world shrink steadily, but unfortunately the new familiarity tends to breed distrust and fear. And competition, of course. Whether men of science have replaced men of good will is a question that must increasingly trouble the thoughtful. To the layman the scientific mind is committed to worship of the intellect as opposed to things of the spirit and heart.

This is, apparently, a fallacy since no less an authority than a Nobel Prize winner, speaking for the scientists, declares that he believes in miracles. In an address at the 10th annual national book awards ceremony recently, Dr. Arthur M. Compton said that he and his fellows "have lived miracles and know how they work."

Seemingly with terrible power in their hands, with the knowledge of how to destroy men in the mass, the realization of the value of life to the individual has come to be sharply accented. If the new power is to be used for good, the burden of responsibility accepted, then intellectual concepts are not enough.

Channels of communication are urgently needed and Dr. Compton would have American writers create the needed vision. Miracles must be interpreted for those who have not witnessed them. Miracle-makers cannot serve a public they fail to understand, or see dimly as lower creatures with inferior brains. Scientists today want to know what effect their work is having upon mankind and how much human nature has changed, if it has changed at all.

The American writer has not been deaf or blind to the challenge which he may variously regard as responsibility or opportunity. We have had a flood of books by authors, established and new, whose business it has been to examine the minds and hearts of fellow men at home and abroad. Sometimes disguised as fiction, more frequenly openly set forth in a travelog, our writers have approached the man-in-the-car who has succeeded the man-in-the-street, and in humility and compassion have tried to speak for him.

It would be better, perhaps, if he would speak for himself, but failing that, the

writers must do the best they can. A larger and better man for a larger and better world is the scientist's dream. He may be only waiting for the writer to discover him.

## Textile Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article that appeared in the publication of the American Stock Exchange in their issue of March 1959:

TEXTILE OUTLOOK—INDUSTRY DEPENDING MORE AND MORE ON RESEARCH INTO FIBERS AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW LINES

Belief that the textile industry may emerge from its own depression is gaining strength. Said William I. Kent, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, "Though the outlook for the immediate future in the wool textile industry continues somewhat cloudy there may be room for a sensible portion of guarded optimism. At the same time, even with cautious assessment, the prospects for the more distant future seem considerably brighter." Halbert M. Jones, president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, surveyed his industry and reported production and demand are closer together than they have been since World War I. The most glowing claim of all came from the industry's best known trade paper Daily News Record which simply recorded: "Textiles are entering a new era of growth, a period attuned to dynamic developments in a space age."

That there is any hope for a turnaround in the immediate future is regarded by some as preposterous. They point out that consumption is continuing to decline. They admit that production is too, but argue that this is not generally regarded as a good sign in an expanding economy. Competition stiffens constantly from both inside and outside the industry. Currently about 35 man-made fibers are in commercial production and use. New discoveries and new blendings are sure to increase well before the year is out. And new developments in other fields are certain to produce products to compete with textiles for the consumer's dollar.

But the reasons for hope are many and they are largely signs that the industry has grown up. Research, for instance, has finally been recognized by the industry as a factor needed to stimulate progress. Obsolete machinery and methods have been or are being replaced. Perhaps of greatest importance is the liquidation of submarginal mills which often dumped goods on the market at cutrate prices. With many such mills closed and other textile makers using self-restraint, prices have shown a tendency to stabilize.

Textiles are claimed by the industry to be the consumer's best buy valuewise. With 1947–49 as a base period of 100, the wholesale index price for textiles in August 1958 was at 93.3, compared with 126.1 for all industrial commodities. Thus it is figured that a fractional increase would hardly be noticed by the consumer but would mean a flourishing business for the textile industry. To make this possible, the industry has begun to promote itself as never before. That this can be successful is aptly shown by the wash-and-wear fabrics which have done so well in the apparel field. Increased interest in new styling can also help.

But, quipped one tradesman, "the biggest reason for hope is that things are so bad they can't get worse." Chances are that most of the companies able to survive this long can make the rest of the way, too. The industry shows promising signs of ability to work out its problems.

## Nixon's Progress by Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Fernando Valley Times of Monday, February 16, 1959:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

NIXON'S PROGRESS BY SERVICE

"Example sheds a genial ray
Of light which men are apt to borrow;
So first improve yourself today
And then improve your friends tomorrow."
—*Herber J. Grant.*

Three little Indians—and then there was one.

That's the present reading on the California Republican Party's erstwhile Big Three in State and national politics which loomed so large in just about everybody's calculations up to 3 or 4 months ago.

The Big Three, as you may remember, were Vice President Richard M. Nixon, Senator William F. Knowland, and Gov. Goodwin J. Knight. The last two names have been scratched from the Presidential Sweepstakes for 1960 and are no longer in the running.

But DICK NIXON is very much alive and kicking—and is an odds-on favorite to capture the GOP nomination for President 2 years hence. He deserves it, too.

The constantly improving young man from Whittier is in the Southland today and tomorrow, and many of us will have a chance to observe him at close range. How will he measure up?

In this reporter's opinion, the United States has never seen the equal of a man who started from scratch, with one exception, and so consistently improved himself with the passage of time as has Mr. NIXON.

The one exception I mentioned was Abraham Lincoln, who also commenced at ground zero and went to the top.

Both men are similar in their thirst for improvement and progress—not only of their personal characters but in behalf of the Nation. Although 100 years apart in the political spectrum of the United States, I have seen of late years a rising young Lincoln in DICK NIXON of Whittier.

If he has the opportunity to continue to serve his country and his party with the same degree of consistency and improvement in the years ahead of us—I think the comparison with Lincoln will become more obvious to everyone.

This is all predicated, of course, upon the assumption that he will continue to improve himself with every passing opportunity, as he seems to have done so capably in the past. Let's hope so.

Frankly, it is this capacity for eternal progression which has gained my respect for the Vice President over a period of years. When he first appeared on the political horizon, he was just another guy named Joe to me. Up to and including the time he became holder of the second highest office in the land, I was hardly impressed. Com ze, com za. So what?

But the last 6 years have seen Mr. NIXON take hold of a job that had never been considered as anything except a fifth wheel in our Government and turn it into something approaching the nature of an assistant President, in reality.

He might have just sat back on his haunches, as the others pretty much did before him, and taken his chances. About 15 or 20 percent of our Chief Executives made the grade that way. But not DICK NIXON. This young man, with the boundless enthusiasm of youth, preferred to earn his pay as a useful worker in the Government and, as a result, he expanded his usefulness to the President so much that he has worked harder in his present office than any other occupant ever did before him.

Today, the Californian is perhaps the best man—by dint of on-the-job training for the office—the Republican Party has ever qualified to head its ticket. But whether he is to be nominated in 1960 is, as yet, no foregone conclusion.

I have no crystal ball for forthcoming events, but there is at least some handwriting already appearing on the wall for all of us to see and ponder upon. Let's take a solid look at some of it in my next column. Who will be the GOP's choice next year?

## Mismanagement of Military Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1959, I received from the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of a report on the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center at Yokohama, Japan. The report indicated beyond doubt the lack of adequate supply management at the base in Yokohama.

Because of my long interest in this subject I wrote to the Comptroller General on January 30, 1959, and asked him, among other things, if it were not possible for the excellent staff of the Comptroller General to make some systems studies going into all facets of supply management with regard to electronic supplies and equipment and other related fields consistent with the intent of the so-called McCormack amendment to the Military Reorganization Act of 1958 which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to "carry out any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate."

On March 9, 1959, I received a splendid letter from the Comptroller General wherein he states that during the year ending June 30, 1958, over 200 reports were issued by his agency to the Congress and military departments, the majority of which dealt with various aspects of the supply operations of the military services and involved deficiencies in requirements determination, procurement

practices, and supply control management.

The Comptroller General makes this significant statement:

Our previous reviews have disclosed the unreliability of stock records at major supply centers and the consequent lack of sound data on which to base supply decisions; requirement determinations have been improper; inadequate coordination existed for supply matters among the military services; contracting procedures in awarding and administering procurements required improvements; and stocks were being disposed of as surplus when valid requirements existed within the military department.

Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in the subject matter involved in this exchange of correspondence with the Comptroller General of the United States which, without objection, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
*Washington, D.C. January 30, 1959.*

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: I am in receipt of your report (B–133036) relating to examination of the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center, Yokohama, Japan. This and the other reports which you have furnished to me are of great value and, as you know, relate directly to the so-called McCormack amendment (Sec. 3.(6)) (Public Law 85–599).

I note from your letter of transmittal and from the report itself that this one Signal Supply Center has failed to properly discharge its supply-control responsibility in regard to determining requirements. As a result of this failure the Government was placed in a position of buying millions of dollars worth of unneeded stocks.

I also note on page 1 of the report itself: "We did not make an overall appraisal of the activity or its administration. Our work and the related report devote major attention to the identification of deficient areas and the corrective actions taken by the Agency in those areas."

It occurs to me that the findings and conclusions of your excellent report at one supply center indicate a deficiency in the supply system itself in the Signal Corps with respect to requirements determination, procurement, overall inspection and review, and inventory control methods and procedures.

Nor can I help but wonder as to the adequacy of the overall Department of Defense supply demand control system. For example, your report indicates a failure at the one Signal Supply Center in the supply management function involving one item—dry batteries. What is the situation with respect to dry batteries within the Department of Defense? Does anyone relate overall inventory with requirements before procurements are made? Is there concurrent buying and selling?.

I am enclosing for your use a copy of the Federal Real and Personal Property Inventory Report issued by the House Government Operations Committee. In analyzing the inventories in the supply systems of the Department of Defense it is noted that communications and signal equipment total hundreds of millions of dollars. It is to be noted also from the distribution of the reported stocks that a large percentage falls into categories that are either designated as being excessive or could reasonably be so considered. Also that each of the major services carries similar categories of stocks which undoubtedly include identical items.

The McCormack amendment to which I referred earlier reads as follows:

"(6) Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate. For the purposes of this paragraph, any supply or service activity common to more than one military department shall not be considered a 'major combatant function' within the meaning of paragraph (1) hereof."

Would it be possible for your Agency to extend the scope of its investigation to all facets of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense? This would mean a study as to the adequacy of the requirements determination, procurement, inventory control, utilization of all available assets before procurement, distribution of stock and disposal of excess or surplus property.

I should also appreciate recommendations which you may be able to make for improvement of supply management across the board in the Department of Defense as contemplated by the legislation to which I refer.

Sincerely yours,
/s/ JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*Majority Leader.*

---

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, D.C., March 9, 1959.*

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
*Majority Leader,*
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: Reference is made to your letter of January 30, 1959, acknowledging receipt of our report on examination of the U.S. Army Signal Supply Center, Yokohama, Japan. We are particularly appreciative of your comment that this and other reports which we have furnished you are of great value.

A substantial portion of our adult efforts in the Department of Defense is directed toward the delineation of significant areas of deficiencies in the supply and logistics system, and examination and analysis of these deficiencies in terms of shortcomings in management controls including basic policies and procedures, and recommending to management, and to the Congress when appropriate, such action as will, in our opinion, correct or improve the logistical inadequacies. During the year ended June 30, 1958, over 200 reports were issued to the Congress and the military departments, the majority of which dealt with various aspects of the supply operations of the military services and involved deficiencies in requirements determinations, procurement practices, and supply control management. Our reviews have covered signal supply control agencies and depots of the Army, requirements determinations for ground communication-electronic equipment in the Air Force and various supply installations of the Navy. In addition, we have reviewed selected aspects of the supply operations of the military services in Europe, north Africa, and the Far East.

Our previous reviews have disclosed the unreliability of stock records at major supply centers and the consequent lack of sound data on to base supply decisions; requirement determinations have been improper; inadequate coordination existed for supply matters among the military services; contracting procedures in awarding and administering procurements required improvements; and stocks were being disposed of as surplus when valid requirements existed within the military departments.

The results of our previous reviews can now be applied to a study of all facets of supply management of electronic supplies and equipment within the Department of Defense, as you suggested in your letter of January 30, 1959, including a review of the inadequacy of requirements determination, procurement, inventory control, utilization of all available assets before procurement, distribution of stock and disposal of excess or surplus property. The broad nature of such a study, which must encompass evaluation of basic policies and procedures of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, as well as the Office of the Secretary of Defense, will also include a review of the operations of the major electronic supply agencies of the military services in the United States and abroad. As significant matters are disclosed during the course of our review, management and the Congress will be apprised of our findings.

We anticipate that as a result of this Defense-wide study we will be in a position to make appropriate recommendations for improvement of supply management applicable to all three military services. In this report we will, of course, consider the objectives of the McCormack amendment to which you referred.

As a matter of collateral interest, we have today advised the chairman, Military Operations Subcommittee, House Committee on Government Operations, that as a result of the deficiencies disclosed by our reviews of military supply operations, this area may be of interest to that subcommittee in determining the adequacy of action undertaken by the military departments to correct the matters brought to their attention.

We would be pleased to discuss the proposed study in more detail with you or your staff if you should desire.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

---

## The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the growing body of approving editorial comment concerning the plan suggested by several of us in this body to create an orderly and systematic method for reducing the national debt, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared on March 4 in the Telegraph Herald of Dubuque, Iowa.

COULD THEY?

Representative JIM WRIGHT, a studious Congressman from Texas, has come up with figures indicating that in the next 28 years interest will be paid equal to the amount of the present national debt, but Uncle Sam will still owe the whole principal.

That, says Representative WRIGHT, is neither nice nor necessary—in view of which he holds up the bright promise of retiring the national debt over the next 100 years at an end saving of more than $485 billion.

Wright would do this simply by paying on the $283 billion principal each year an amount equal to not less than 1 percent of the present debt. By keeping everlastingly at the program, he goes on, year by year both the principal and the interest decrease.

And at the end of a round century the Government is out of the red, and there's plenty of money available for highways, soil projects, water resources and whatever fine things Congressmen may have in mind 100 years from now.

Representative WRIGHT'S exciting prospectus makes passing mention of the fact that during the last 4 years the temporary debt ceiling has been extended three times and once raised permanently.

This would have to stop, of course, along with increased spending, more Government services and a lot of the other fiscal business that has been in progress for some time. They are details, however, that could doubtless be worked out.

Or could they?

## Gateways to Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Division of Industrial and Port Development recently published a most informative booklet, entitled "Wisconsin Ports—Gateway to the Upper Midwest."

I commend this publication to shippers and manufacturers who are looking ahead to the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the connecting channels. As the Governor of our State says in the foreword of the booklet:

Completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project will make Wisconsin's coasts frontiers once more, as they were in the days of the French voyagers and later, when the pioneer settlers arrived from Europe by ship. This time the frontiers are industrial, created by the opening of Wisconsin's 14 port cities to ocean ships. Men of vision are planning for the industrial developments that the seaway will make possible and profitable in Wisconsin and the entire upper Midwest.

The booklet points out that—

Wisconsin's 14 ports and harbors are important and promising new gateways to the heartland of North America. They lie at the western end of the Great Lakes Waterway system, now being opened to deep-draft world shipping by the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Oceangoing ships, carrying cargo to and from all parts of the world, bring all the advantages of water transportation to Wisconsin ports, 2,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean. These ports serve as convenient transfer points for a vast and rapidly developing region extending a thousand miles to the west. This region includes all or part of 15 of the United States and 3 Provinces of Canada.

Of the 14 ports described in detail in the booklet, 6 are located in the congressional district I am honored to represent. These ports are Marinette, Green Bay, Sturgeon Bay, Kewaunee, Two Rivers, and Manitowoc.

These six ports connect with railroads which serve the West and with a well engineered and maintained arterial highway system which joins a network of truck routes serving the upper Midwest. Two of the ports have regularly scheduled airline passenger service; the others are less than an hour's drive from such service. All have harbors already deep enough to accommodate moderate size ocean-going ships, together with the necessary harbor installations, including protective breakwaters, navigation aids, movable bridges, bulkheads, and open storage spaces, bunkering facilities and marine repair facilities. Many have dockside warehouses, grain storage elevators, heavy lift cranes, shipyards and drydocks, customs offices, and Coast Guard stations.

Each of these harbors is actively promoting its future development, and Wisconsin, in 1955, created a division of industrial development, and in 1957, added port development to the division's responsibilities. Assistance to shippers and manufacturers interested in the potential of Wisconsin harbors as new gateways to profits is readily available.

Copies of the booklet describing Wisconsin port facilities may be obtained from the State of Wisconsin Division of Industrial and Port Development. More detailed information concerning the harbors in my congressional district can be obtained from the following sources:

Marinette: Manager, Marinette Chamber of Commerce.

Green Bay: Secretary, City of Green Bay Industrial Development Authority, or chairman, committee on industrial development, Green Bay Association of Commerce.

Sturgeon Bay: Sturgeon Bay Development Corp.

Kewaunee: Office of mayor.

Two Rivers: President, Two Rivers Industrial Development Corp.

Manitowoc: Office of mayor, or harbor commission, city of Manitowoc.

## Protest to Awarding Government Contracts to Foreign Business Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received from Mr. Robert H. Acker, Jr., general manager of the radio station WLYN of the Puritan Broadcast Service in Lynn, Mass.:

PURITAN BROADCAST SERVICE, INC.,
*Lynn, Mass., March 6, 1959.*

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN, LANE: I, and many others feel it to be our duty to protest the award of U.S. Government-financed contracts to firms in business in foreign nations. We feel that this practice, if continued to be allowed to develop, can only serve to undermine our current U.S. high standards of living.

I refer specifically to the recent award to the Swiss firm of Brown-Boveri Co. The money for this award was loaned by the Rural Electrification Agency (a branch of our Government) to the group which awarded this contract to a competitive foreign firm, rather than to a U.S. firm. This does not make sense. We should not, and cannot, afford to loan money to firms that use our own money to underbid our business firms.

If U.S. money is to be used, then we must insist that U.S. firms be employed to carry out the projects.

Your efforts to obtain this objective are respectfully requested. Please do everything in your power to enact legislation which will make it mandatory to use U.S. business firms when U.S. Government finances are involved.

Kindest regards.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. ACKER, Jr.,
*General Manager.*

## Raw Greed Menaces Westchester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the county of Westchester in New York State, one of the foremost and finest counties in the country, is being menaced by the threat of New York bank expansion which would enable the New York City banks' branches to operate in that county.

The Daily Times and other Westchester papers on March 7 carried an editorial which exposes the dangers of the David Rockefeller bill.

The editorial from the Mamaroneck Daily Times is as follows:

RAW GREED MENACES WESTCHESTER

An unholy alliance of Wall Street bankers and Tammany Hall politicians, seemingly being quarterbacked by a wily upstate Republican politician, is getting set to crucify Westchester County and upstate Republicanism on what can only be described as a "cross of gold."

This the schemers would accomplish by jamming through the legislature next week a so-called "comprehensive bill" to "modernize" the New York State banking law.

And they are so sure their strange amalgamation of political forces will be able to do the trick they have made it known there will be no public hearing on the bill—they don't have to care, so they don't care, what the people of the State may think.

When one of these men was asked if there would be hearings before the banking committees of the senate and assembly before the bill was acted upon, he is reported to have sneered: "Hearings? What the ——— do we want hearings for? We had all the hearings we needed last year."

The fact is, of course, that bad banking bills have been killed in the past by angry outcries at public hearings—so this crowd is taking no chance on having that happen again.

This is a "comprehensive bill," all right. It includes everything the big bankers and their politician friends want to "modernize" New York State banking in the interest of big banks that want to become bigger. It thus sacrifices every consideration of the welfare of Westchester and other suburban counties on an altar of raw greed erected by the high priests of finance in downtown Manhattan.

Specifically, what will this bill do to Westchester County? It will permit New York City banks to invade Westchester communities either by creating their own branches or by gobbling up small independent Westchester banks whose stockholders will be beaten into line by competitive pressures.

But that isn't all it will do to us. If and when we have storefront branches of New York City banks scattered over our countryside, particularly in new shopping centers or business districts, we shall have lost the distinctive identity which always has been the vital element in Westchester's development and prosperity. Then we shall be on the way to becoming another Bronx or Queens, compelled to crawl to lower New York for the capital and credit essential to our growth.

And in such economic dependence are, only too obviously, the seeds of economic control. If the New York banks decide that it will be more to their advantage to sink their money in the building up of Long Island, they will be free to do so—and Westchester can go hang.

All of this, of course, will be deprecated, and maybe violently denounced, by the men behind this scheme. None other than the chairman of the senate banking committee already has talked condescendingly about provincial objections to the bill.

Such deprecations, such denunciations, such holier-than-thou talk will be designed, of course, not only to offset protests such as those already being heard from Westchester and Long Island but to prevent any general awakening to what is in store for upstate communities that, up to this point, are asleep or heedlessly apathetic.

The hope is that, perhaps by the end of next week, the whole thing will be in the bag—a big money bag for the whole State, with the drawstrings firmly in the hands of a single chain of upstate banks and a New York City bloc pretty clearly dominated by the Chase Manhattan Bank, the David Rockefeller bank, in other words.

Indeed, this is beyond doubt a David Rockefeller bill, even though David Rockefeller, who gave birth to its basic ideas a year ago—to be exact on February 18, 1958—is presently and conveniently abroad—in Africa, we are told.

Here are the things Mr. Rockefeller wanted written into the banking law of this State a year ago:

First, a provision that the State be divided into two bank holding company districts, one embracing the metropolitan area of New York City and the other the rest of the State.

Second, that the New York metropolitan area be redistricted so as to include in one district New York City proper, Westchester, Nassau, Suffolk, and Rockland Counties.

And those are exactly the things the David Rockefeller bill, which they want us to know as the omnibus bill, intends to do this year.

The only new wrinkle is political—the scheme has been refined to obtain key upstate Republican support and the solid backing of the Tammany Democrats at Albany.

What do we mean by key upstate Republican support? We mean that the Senate majority leader, Senator WALTER MAHONEY of Buffalo, is calling the upstate shots—for reasons which aren't readily apparent.

This whole mess may, of course, wind up in the lap of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, David's brother. We hope it doesn't, because we respect and like and admire the Governor.

But, so far as Westchester and other similarly situated communities throughout the State are concerned, this is a matter which transcends confidence in or friendliness toward any one official or group of officials, or any one group of politicians or political party.

Nor, we might add, do we care whose bank stock is worth what, or which bank gets control of what rich territory. We're concerned only that this and other areas of the State of New York shall not be made pawns in a battle of greed by financial giants.

We don't need New York banks' branches in Westchester—even Westchester banker-advocates of this bill admit they've never had to turn away a customer. And the people of Westchester certainly don't want New York banks here. No more will upstate communities want to be invaded and taken over, we are convinced, once they become aware of the big banks specter hanging over them.

## Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin as president of George Washington University, a few weeks ago calls to mind the outstanding contributions of this great educator and administrator, not only to the university, but to the city of Washington and the whole field of higher education.

Dr. Marvin was made president of the school 31 years ago and raised it from obscurity to an institution of recognized national prominence. Over a half dozen new and imposing buildings have been erected, including the George Washington University Hospital. Under his administration the enrollment doubled to 18,000 and the number of faculty members tripled to 1,000. An example of its influence in government is the fact that over 350 of the listings in the Congressional Directory and over 822 in the Biographic Register of the Department of State are graduates of George Washington University.

Dr. Marvin's activities also extended into the life of the whole community, where he participated in many lasting achievements. His labors deserve the commendation of all who admire accomplishment to the fullest. In commenting on his retirement, the Washington Post, in an editorial of December 13, 1958, said in part:

Dr. Marvin's role has been that of an educational builder. If he sometimes seemed to yield to conformist pressures and to shun the controversy that is inevitable in an educational environment, his successful efforts to weld a university merit warm appreciation. Every university needs such a builder at some stage in its development. Dr. Marvin's success is the more remarkable because he started with great disadvantages when he set out to achieve for a rundown institution with little prestige the position envisaged in its charter as a university worthy of the Capital of the United States.

The esteem in which he was held at the university was expressed in an editorial in the Hatchet, the campus paper, as follows:

We could never express fully the appreciation we have for the many things Dr. Marvin has provided us. It has been President Marvin's spirit that has given our university the best in faculty, equipment, and classroom teaching, which gives us loyal and generous alumni, a devoted faculty and student body, and the inspiration to grasp the ideas which are put before us and make them our own academic standards.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 33

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune, August 25, 1958, entitled, "Solution of Sewer Problems Must Be Found Without Delay."

This article merely tells how San Diego families must face up to the problem of cleaning up its municipal waste or face some rather dire consequences.

SOLUTION OF SEWER PROBLEMS MUST BE FOUND WITHOUT DELAY

Time has run out for San Diego in its search for a solution to its sewage problem.

The city is now confronted with an emergency situation in Mission Bay calling for the expenditure of $50,000 for a stopgap measure.

Meanwhile, permanent—or at least long-range—solutions must be sought and pushed with all speed.

The temporary 70-acre oxidation pond in the mud flats northeast of Crown Point and west of De Anza Cove probably is the best answer at the moment. Something had to be done fast to eliminate the unpleasant and potentially menacing condition caused by the overflow of a sewer mainline along Highway 101 northward from the San Diego River.

It may be necessary to provide another oxidation pool in the south end of Mission Bay.

The northwest section of the city will have to make the best of this sewer expedient for quite some time—perhaps as long as 2 years—until a new million-dollar trunk line is ready.

This is not the happiest of prospects. But any workable temporary solution is preferable to the dangers of pollution that have been accumulating over the past several months.

City officials say that a properly designed and operated oxidation pond should be free of odor. There is no chemical treatment. Purification is supposed to take place over a period of 30 to 60 days through natural reactions. However, deodorizing agents can be used, if there is an odor problem.

It is essential that this emergency treatment not become a nuisance. It is fairly close to a high density residential section; Mission Bay High School, and one of the city's most popular recreation areas, at De Anza Cove.

While this localized problem is of particular concern to the residents of Bay Park, Clairemont, and Pacific Beach, it also carries a warning for all San Diegans, regardless of where they live.

As City Manager George Bean told the city council:

"The city is oversized for the present sewer system. We are in deep trouble, not only in this area, but elsewhere."

We have arrived at this deep trouble by stages.

As long ago as 1952, we had a warning in the fact that San Diego Bay was becoming

contaminated by the overloading of the present disposal plant on Harbor Drive.

But voters failed to approve a bond issue 2 years later for a new trunk system with a treatment plant on Point Loma.

In 1956, the State health department declared the polluted bay a health hazard, and quarantine signs went up.

Then the voters approved a method of financing the necessary sewer system through revenue bonds. Costly chlorination of the discharge into the bay eased the pollution problem.

It will be at least another year and a half before detailed plans for a new system can be completed. A revenue bond election is contemplated for June 1960.

We have spent our time freely in the past. There is now none to waste. There is no need for panic. But complacency is also out.

## The Common Market in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JAMES G. FULTON**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a startling new discovery is taking place among six of our friendly allies in Europe: France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg.

These six nations through a Common Market treaty arrangement are setting up a free trade area which will have a Common Market of 170 million people, about the size of the United States as a trading area.

We in America must know of this development and its effect upon the United States and its world policies.

An excellent article in Réalités magazine discusses these problems, and I commend it to my colleagues:

HOW WILL THE REST OF THE WORLD GET ALONG WITH THE COMMON MARKET NOW THAT IT IS HERE?

National reactions to the Common Market have been predictable. Tass condemned it as a warmongering trick by German militarists to get Western Europe into war with Russia.

John Foster Dulles said: "We believe the Common Market is going to create a situation where that part of Western Europe, though being more closely united, will have larger markets, will be stronger and less dependent on the United States. We have been very eager to get Western Europe into a strong position to carry an even larger percentage of the load of mutual security. * * * We believe this will be a development in that direction."

Britain, declaring itself spokesman for all West European countries not in the Common Market, redoubled its efforts to set up a free trade area, through which 11 other nations would share some of the advantages of the "6" without incurring all their responsibilities. Failure, the British said, might weaken the Western alliance.

The six themselves—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—took the general excitement as proof that they had opened the door to a profitable future. They renewed their resolution to stick to the Market-treaty schedule, which will wipe out internal tariffs among the Six at the rate of roughly 10 percent a year until they are one great unified trading area of 170 million people.

The Market will also eliminate trade quotas, allow free interchange of labor and capital, and coordinate the Six's economic policies. In the long run it may lead to a common currency. Even with necessary escape clauses, permitting delay in some phases of the program if any member finds it necessary, the Common Market, now that the first step has been taken, should be completely achieved in 15 years at the outside.

Britain is not the only country that finds it necessary to come to terms with the new economic giant, which will rank fourth in the world for total output, after the United States, Russia, and the Commonwealth. In the United States, President Eisenhower, late in 1958, prevailed on Congress to renew his power to make reciprocal trade treaties for 4 years instead of the customary 2, so that his Government may deal more advantageously with the Market. He also got the right to cut American tariffs up to 20 percent in striking bargains with the "Six," who will henceforth set their own collective tariffs against the rest of the world.

Meanwhile, foreign business firms, particularly American, scrambled to take advantage of the new European situation—or to cut their losses.

The treaty calls, with some exceptions, for setting the Market tariff on any commodity at the arithmetical average of the six separate tariffs previously imposed by the members. Some present exporters to parts of the Market will benefit in the immediate future—but most will lose. For example: Suppose an outside exporter has been selling electric motors to Holland. In 1958 he had to add a 31-percent tariff to the price of his motors. So did his principal competitor, a German. This year, after the 10-percent tariff cut, the German incurs only a 28-percent tariff in Holland while the outside exporter still has to figure 31 percent. So the German will probably take over some of the outside exporter's Dutch customers.

By 1968 the outside exporter will find the tariff he pays to get into the Common Market down to 21 percent—but the German's, for Holland, will be down to 10 percent, and in a few more years will disappear entirely. The outside exporter must look forward right now to the day when he will sell few outside-made motors to the Dutch.

Not all Market imports will be so strongly affected, at least not at the beginning. Cotton is on the free list: Europe doesn't grow it and needs lots of it. Coffee, cocoa, and bananas will be partly excepted for awhile, but in the long run will come almost exclusively from the French and Belgian territories in Africa. Raw materials, such as steel and nonferrous metals, are likely to find a booming market as European factories expand. So will machine tools for awhile. Chemicals will find harder going. Consumer goods, notably cars, electrical equipment, and pharmaceuticals, may in the long run be frozen out.

For the foreign firms now selling the "Six" an item likely to be adversely affected, there is a solution: make it inside the Market. The outsider's existing sales organization, production experience and goodwill put him in on the ground floor as a producer in a market that will soon be nearly as big as that of the United States.

Foreign capital, principally American, has been staking out new claims in the six nations for the last year. Hundreds of American enterprises had already been established there, through branch plants and subsidiaries or through patent-licensing and royalty arrangements with European firms. At the beginning of 1957, direct private U.S. investment in Common Market countries stood at $1,400 million or £500 million. This was mainly in manufacturing companies. Some observers expect this figure to double by 1962.

The big question for new capital coming in is where to settle. Even firms that already have subsidiaries in one of the six countries may find that a better location is possible under the changed situation created by the Market. Each of the "Six" has its own special characteristics as a manufacturing and trading base. From the standpoint of a potential American investor, they present the following characteristics:

Germany: The Federal Republic has a third of the Market's population, its biggest pool of skilled labor, relatively low wages and social-security charges, and a stable government. The high reputation of some of its products, such as chemical and optical goods, attracts foreign business. It has made a spectacular recovery since the war, shows the fastest rate of industrial expansion and has the most favorable balance of trade of all the partners, with receipts exceeding payments by a considerable margin.

On the other hand, Germany's very industrial success means there is less opportunity for American technology to come in and make a profit. The payments situation may compel other Market nations to invoke escape clauses and perpetuate import quotas within the Market to protect their own financial stability. Wages and social charges will in the long run be equalized throughout the Market. Though Germany needs capital, the Bonn government has not especially encouraged foreign investment.

France. The most centrally located partner has a gross national product almost as big as Germany's. Since its population is smaller, that means the overall efficiency of its production is higher. Its industry shows a fast rate of expansion. Its balance of payments is unfavorable—which means better export opportunities to the rest of the Market. Its high wages and social charges go with a highly skilled and educated labor force. Its best industrial plants, such as the Renault car works and the Alsthom electric locomotive works, compare with the world's most modern. France also has probably the greatest number of small, progressive, efficient companies now eager to expand but hampered by lack of capital. These offer a notable opportunity to foreign investment.

On the other hand, France has suffered in the past from unstable governments and unstable currency. The first problem appears to have been solved by General de Gaulle. An improved balance of trade can provide a remedy for the second.

Italy. The second largest member in population is the Market's biggest reservoir of cheap, unskilled labor. Its relatively retarded industry has some highly efficient sectors and is developing fast—the index was 138 in 1958 compared to 100 for 1953 (comparable figures, Germany 147, France 140). It has a big, recently developed supply of natural gas. Under the freedom-of-labor clause of the treaty, Italian unskilled workers are to become available in all six member countries.

Holland. Suffering from a limited local market, the Dutch have nevertheless created major export industries—notably the Philips electrical firm. They started early on an allout drive to exploit their new opportunities as part of the Common Market. Their Government offers inducements to foreign firms bringing in capital. As a result, Holland was able to point on January 1, 1958, to figures showing that 69 American firms had set up affiliates in the Netherlands and 36 had established capital participation in Dutch firms. These figures compared with 17 and 95 for Belgium and an overall figure of 20 for France. No comparable figures are available for Germany, but they would probably be higher, though not in proportion to the size of the various countries involved.

Dutch skilled workers earn about 50 cents

or 3 shillings and six pence an hour, the lowest rate in the Market except for Italy. The working week, at 49 hours, is the longest in Europe, and yet there have been few strikes. English is very widely spoken.

Belgium. This country has for years been a favorite European base for United States business. All three major American car firms have assembly plants at Antwerp. Standard Oil, International Business Machines, Colgate, Armco, Proctor & Gamble, and Johns Manville, among other American concerns, operate in Belgium. The Government encourages American investment, and there are no restrictions on reexport of capital or profits. Wages are high, but so is the rate of productivity.

Luxembourg. The smallest member is the most heavily industrialized. Its specialization in heavy industry and metallurgy give it a bigger role than its size—population 315,000—might indicate. Its foreign trade is handled through economic union with Belgium.

Which country is best for a foreign investor depends on his specific needs. Foreign firms are warned to start small and expand in the light of experience. This rule applies particularly to American companies for several reasons.

First. European governments are sometimes wary of large foreign corporations, especially from large, powerful countries, which set up highly capitalized subsidiaries and try to gain a dominant position in one sector or another of the local economy. The Europeans often prefer, or even require, that foreign capital collaborate, perferably in a minority position, with an existing national firm.

Second. American and European business practices differ. Europeans tend to take more of the profits out of a company. Americans tend to plough more back in for expansion. Clashes of personality are more frequent than inside an organization where there is no difference of language and customs. American executives chosen for jobs in Europe need some familiarity with the local tongue and social customs as well as with business practices.

Third. Operations subject to American antitrust laws have to be reconciled with European inclinations in favor of cartels, marketing agreements and production quotas.

The nature of the world's business with Western Europe is going to change. American Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks forecast: "With this economic unification should come faster economic growth and, consequently, enlarged opportunities in the European market for our traders and investors."

The "Six" collectively have been the United States third best customer (after Latin America and Canada). In 1957 they bought $3,200 million, or £1,100 million, worth of American exports. According to a study by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, by 1975 the Common Market's raw-material imports should have gone up 50 percent, its fuel imports two and a half times. It should be buying more food. Even its imports of capital and consumer goods should have gone up with rising prosperity, despite a vast increase in internal production.

At the same time, Common Market exports will be preempting a larger share of world markets. In particular, a larger volume of goods, turned out cheaply and efficiently for the new European mass market, will be sold to the United States. Common Market internal consumption will go up with a rising standard of living, meaning profits for both local and foreign investors.

The net result should be more prosperity for everyone nimble enough to adjust to the new opportunities and a firmer Atlantic community based on a stronger and a more independent Western Europe.

## Resolution Advocates Installment Payment Annually on Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the growing body of approving editorial comment concerning the plan several of us have advanced to create an orderly and systematic method for reducing the national debt, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in the Austin Statesman, of Austin, Tex., under date of February 27.

RESOLUTION ADVOCATES INSTALLMENT PAYMENT ANNUALLY ON PUBLIC DEBT

Representative JIM WRIGHT has introduced a concurrent resolution in Congress whose effect, if acted upon, would be to authorize a reduction of the national debt by not less than one percent of the total of that debt annually.

It provides that the secretary of the Treasury should include that amount in any request for funds to pay any obligatory interest payments which become due and payable.

The resolution further states that the sense of Congress is that the plan should be implemented beginning with the fiscal year 1961, and continued annually without any interruption until the total national debt now outstanding is retired.

The national debt today stands at $281 billion. In the new fiscal year the taxpayers will be paying $8.1 billion in interest.

The trend toward higher interest in Representative WRIGHT'S view, which will find much support particularly among the people, indicates clearly that the Federal Government soon will be paying 3.5 percent on all its obligations, or a total annual interest of $9.8 billion of the total debt that remains unchanged.

This means that of every dollar paid in Federal taxes about 11 cents must go for serving the national debt. It means also that if they go along exactly as they have been going, with no change in the national debt as of now and with the Federal Government having to pay 3.5 percent interest on its borrowings, then in 28 years we will have paid in interest the total amount of the national debt without having a penny of the principal discharged.

Our national debt is gnawing like a rat at our substance. We are paying a high price for the privilege of owing our national debt. So long as it is owed, then it must entail heavy interest charges.

Payment of $2.81 billions on the principal the first year, at 3.5 and subsequent 1 percent payments on the balance would be an almost painless procedure. It would be far better to reduce the public debt by this amount than to go further in hock through a system of yearly deficits of equal or greater amounts..

The national debt clutches at the back of the American economic system like the proverbial old man of the sea. If we had in the past dozen years or so made progress in reducing the national debt we would be in a far better position to meet the crisis created by Russia than we are now.

Moreover debt reduction, even in that low amount annually, would be psychological encouragement to our system of free enterprise. It would help to remove the ponderous doubt existing that it is to be carried and added to forever.

Since the end of World War II there has been only one brief period, that in the Truman administration, when the Federal Government has made any reduction whatever in the national debt. Yet we have enjoyed some of the most prosperous years in our history.

Representative WRIGHT'S resolution has much to commend it. But it requires more than a resolution favorable to the action it supports to get the machinery moving.

Congress should translate the resolution into real meaning.

---

## Co-ops Lost a Stanch Defender: Representative Dan Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on behalf of the many bonafide farm cooperative organizations that have been and are now engaged in the cooperative buying and selling for their respective members in my congressional district. These organizations share my views as well.

I, therefore, wish to add my own personal regards and respect for the efforts and interest of the late Honorable Dan Reed, Congressman of New York, who but recently passed to his just reward in the Great Beyond. I feel it well worth noting that the sentiment expressed in the March 2 edition of the Farmers Union Herald, published in St. Paul, Minn., fully covers those of myself and my constituent farmers.

Yes, indeed, Congressman Reed was a militant and vigorous battler for the cooperatives of this Nation.

CO-OPS LOSE A STANCH DEFENDER: REPRESENTATIVE DAN REED

Co-ops lost one of their best friends in Congress late last month.

He was Representative Daniel Reed, 83, of New York, who died February 19 of a heart attack in Walter Reed Army Hospital, in Washington, where he had gone 2 weeks previously to undergo treatment for an infected foot.

Reed, one time chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee—which originates all Federal tax legislation—and at the time of his death its senior minority member, was a stanch defender of cooperatives in their fight against the National Tax Equality Association and other big business groups who have sought to inflict punitive taxes against co-ops.

It was at the 1951 congressional hearings that Representative Reed denounced the NTEA as an "unscrupulous racket."

The Congressman exposed NTEA's vicious propaganda against farm cooperatives on the House floor. "To get contributions from businessmen," Representative Reed declared, "this racketeering organization has propagandized businessmen with false statements that if farm co-ops were taxed and not exempted, tax revenues would increase $800 million annually."

"This is absolutely false," Reed continued. "It is nothing more nor less than getting money under false pretenses. To spread such falsehood through the U.S. mails to get con-

tributions for this racketeering outfit is fraudulent use of the mails."

In his exposé of the NTEA, Reed covered nearly five pages of small type in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with names of NTEA contributors. NTEA later admitted that many of those listed thereupon quit, apparently not willing to have the general public know of their affiliation with that organization.

## Where the Arab Refugees Should Be Settled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Eliezer Livneh which appeared in the American Zionist, February 1959 issue. Mr. Livneh is one of the foremost independent writers in Israel on social, economic, and political themes:

WHERE THE ARAB REFUGEES SHOULD BE SETTLED

(By Eliezer Livneh)

There is again some well-meant talk about the Arab refugees who would like "to return home." Every detached person feels of course a deep sympathy with people who persevere in their wish to go back home; there are however very few who try to clarify for themselves what this "home" may mean. It is worth while therefore to inquire into the meaning of this sweet word which appears to be quite simple and self-explanatory.

According to official statistics there were in 1957 some 934,000 Arab refugees outside Israel. "Refugees" mean people who succeded in entering the lists of UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Work Agency) and benefiting from rations and other philanthropic help. It is generally acknowledged that many thousands of them are neither refugees nor Palestinians, but local Arabs who "infiltrated" into the roster in order to obtain free rations. But this question is irrelevant to our discussion. Much more important is another question: Where do these refugees dwell? Almost 60 percent of them, 518,000, are in the Kingdom of Jordan, which annexed large areas of western Palestine. Some 20 percent, 221,000, in the Gaza strip. The remainder, 195,000, in Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq. These figures are essential for any further analysis.

Now we can proceed to the second point: What does "home" mean in the context? If it means an Arab country—which one is immaterial from an Arab Nationalist point of view—then all the refugees are at home. Surely they are entitled to full indemnity for any property they lost. There are very few people in Israel who would deny this right or the duty of Israel to shoulder its share. Even those refugees who had no property whatsoever in present Israel have a human right to be resettled with international help.

But this is not the debatable issue. The issue is where should they be resettled? In the Arab countries—where they live the last 10 years—or in Israel. Here, however, another definition of "home" may enter into the discussion. One may argue—and people do—that "home" means Mandatory Palestine of 1947, to which all the legitimate refugees belonged in some way or other. Well, in this case almost 80 percent of the refugees are already at home. The figure comprises the 518,000 in Jordan and 221,000 in the Gaza strip. The remaining 20 percent are mostly absorbed in their new countries of residence—few tens of thousands in Lebanon excepted—and they would not exchange their present status for a new beginning in former Palestine, whatever this geographical term may mean.

There may be a literal interpretation of the notion "home." "Home" may mean the physical former homes of refugees, that is their former houses in Jaffa and Haifa, their former villages and lands in Judea and Galilee. If this should be meant by "returning home" then such a suggestion, whatever its political implications, is nothing short of madness. Its practical consequence should have been the turning out of hundreds of thousands of Jewish immigrants and refugees—most of them probably from Arab and Moslem lands—and the creation of a new refugee problem quite unmanageable by any standards. Of course, such a cataclysm is unthinkable.

The only remaining interpretation of "returning home" may mean going back to Israel, although to quite different places than the former homes, towns, and villages of the refugees. There may be some cases where family members will join their respective families in Israel—a process going on since 1949. However an essential question has to be asked here. We cannot avoid it owing to its compelling commonsense: If Arab refugees have anyhow to change their place of residence inside former Mandatory Palestine, why should they prefer Israel—where they will form a minority community—to the Arab part of Palestine where they belong to the majority nation? This is not only a question of nationality and politics.

The old life to which the Palestinian refugees were accustomed in former Palestine and to which they presume to return no longer exists in present Israel. It is a vastly different country, with cultural and social standards quite foreign to the refugees. Resettling in Israel means for the mass of refugees a very unusual strain which they are spared in an Arab country, including the Arab parts of Palestine in which most of them dwell at present. On top of all this, owing to the much higher stand of wages and prices in Israel any definite resettlement scheme in Israel will require a much higher expenditure than a comparable scheme in any Arab country. Funds are limited. The preference of Israel to an Arab country means using public funds in the most ineffective way.

From whatever angle we approach the problem, the substitution of Israel for an Arab country as the place of final resettlement of Arab refugees does not make sense. The only weighty reason for demanding a mass resettlement of Arab refugees inside Israel is of course a political one: to install a powerful Arab minority within the Jewish State whatever the human, social, and economic inconveniences of such an artificial operation even to the refugees themselves. Is it really inconceivable that every Israeli—and for that matter any man concerned with peaceful relations between nations—should react to such a prospect with disfavor and dissent?

## Madame Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very pointed and truthful statement that appeared in the Chelsea (Mass.) Record of March 4, 1959, concerning the nomination of our former colleague in the Congress, the able and capable Clare Boothe Luce to the highly responsible position as Ambassador to Brazil. There is no doubt in the minds of all of us that she will reflect credit to the United States in her new assignment in South America:

MADAME AMBASSADOR

There are two excellent reasons for welcoming the President's nomination of Clare Boothe Luce as Ambassador to Brazil. One of these is that the appointment will return to public service a woman of great capabilities. The other is that the naming of such a person to represent us in a Latin American country indicates a heightened recognition of that area's importance to the United States.

Mrs. Luce served well during 4 years as Ambassador to Italy, a post she resigned in 1957 because of ill health. Her background, intelligence and perceptive understanding give assurance that she will represent U.S. interests well in Brazil. That will be of particular importance during the trying period of Brazil's comeback from the ravages of the Peron dictatorship. It is to be hoped that the Senate will speedily confirm this wise appointment.

## Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has come up with a proposal which he says would solve the school classroom shortage. But application of the Flemming formula would require States to alter their constitutions, their statutory debt ceilings and their basic internal tax concepts. Dr. Flemming says these alterations would be a minor obstacle.

The Flemming formula has other applications.

According to Hoyle, the best possible 5-card poker hand is a royal flush. The relative value scales down through a straight flush, four of a kind, a full house, a flush, a straight, three of a kind, two pairs, one pair, to high card.

With individual application of the Flemming formula, a pair of deuces could take the pot over a royal flush. Now this would require a change in the rules—a revision of Hoyle's book—and there undoubtedly would be some constitutional, perhaps even internal, alterations of the players in the resulting disputes. But these would be a minor obstacle to Dr. Flemming.

Of course, it is difficult to see any possible benefit resulting from application of the Flemming formula to poker. It is just as difficult to see any possible benefit resulting from its application to the classroom shortage.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 32

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the San Jose, Calif., Mercury, September 15, 1957, entitled "Pollution Problem Grows Acute."

The article follows:

POLLUTION PROBLEM GROWS ACUTE
(By Bill Feist)

There isn't much question but that one of the major problems confronting the department of fish and game is that of pollution, its disastrous effects on fishing and what can be accomplished to eliminate it.

The pollution problem isn't new. It has been under study by the department for years. It has been present both in streams and coastal waters for some time and in certain instances steps have successfully been taken to remedy the situation. However, with increased population and industry the problem is increasing.

Many lawmakers, assemblymen, and senators believe that pollution will be a very important item on the agenda of the legislature when it convenes in January.

Latest step in the study of pollution so far as this locality is concerned will take place Wednesday and Thursday when five agencies, including the department of fish and game, conduct tests in the bay area south of the Dumbarton Bridge, which includes the town of Alviso. Agencies in addition to the DFG are the San Francisco regional water pollution control board, the bay area air pollution control district, the State department of public health, and the Santa Clara County health department.

The purpose of the study is to secure figures on the effects of cannery wastes and other sewage discharges on the air, water, and aquatic life in the region. It will also determine to what degree the cities south of Dumbarton Bridge are meeting the requirements set for their waste disposal by the regional water pollution control board.

San Jose along with Sunnyvale and other nearby cities have constructed primary sewage treatment plants since the requirements were set. Some have gone into operation only recently though.

Floating laboratory during the 2-day test will be the DFG boat *Albacore*. It will also serve as a mother ship for several skiffs to be used in gathering actual test samples along the shallow shoreline. During the study samples of air and water and of bottom muds at various phases of the tide will be taken.

Several years ago a serious pollution problem was present in the east bay in the vicinity of Berkeley. Fish life was extinct. However, through chemical treatment the pollution was eliminated and today perch and striped bass can be found. Eventually there is hope that present polluted sections where the fish are no longer found can be cleared.

When most of the measures passed by the State legislature during its 1957 session became law Wednesday a new antipollution regulation came into existence.

Entered into the California fish and game code under section 5948 the law is designed to protect streams of California from damage by logging and other operations. It makes it unlawful to cause logjams or debris accumulation in streams which prevent the passing of fish or which is harmful to fish life.

The new regulation also provides that anyone convicted of unlawfully polluting, contaminating, or obstructing waters to the detriment of fish shall, in addition to any other penalty provided, either be required to remove the substance or to pay the costs of such removal to the DFG.

Previous laws allowed the DFG to take action against stream pollution violators in northern California, but not elsewhere. Now the department can move throughout the entire State.

Outstanding event of the Santa Cruz deep sea fishing season takes place Saturday when the 14th annual Cottardo (Babe) Stagnaro memorial oldtimers' fishing derby will be held off New Year's Island.

One hundred and thirty-six entrants, some who've fished in all 14 derbies, will seek the heaviest lingcod which brings the masculine winner the title of king and the feminine victor the honor of queen.

Prizes will be 14 in number ranging from $200 for first down to $15 for 14th. In addition the most fish of any species pays another $10, while the first 10 fishermen on each of the three boats landing a lingcod will receive $5 apiece. The person registering the smallest fish also will be given $5.

Rules of the derby require the use of only a single pole or line and obeyance to the commands of the skippers.

According to derby rules all contestants will draw for their fishing spots on the boat at 5 a.m. The boats will depart from the dock at 6 o'clock and start the inward journey about 2 p.m.

Boats scheduled for use and their skippers, *Stagnaro No. 1*, Paul Lybrand; *Stagnaro No. 2*, Maurica Krauser; and the *Cottardo Stagnaro*, Joe Stagnaro.

The annual oldtimers' dinner-dance follows at the Riverside Hotel.

## In Support of the Civil Rights Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the text of my statement in support of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1959, which was presented to Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON MARCH 11, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1959, AND RELATED COMMENTS

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss my measure, H.R. 430, the Civil Rights Act of 1959, as well as to offer comment on other major civil rights proposals.

H.R. 430 is a companion measure to that introduced by the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, and in the other body by Senators DOUGLAS and JAVITS, who were joined by members of both parties. It is gratifying to see bipartisan support of legislation in the civil rights field. Guaranteeing these constitutional rights does not belong exclusively to one party. It is my profound hope that this Congress will assure to the American people that these rights do apply to every citizen regardless of race, creed, color, or national ancestry.

I think that we are all very much aware that the challenge in this fast-moving 20th century is to bring social progress up to scientific, technological, and material progress. This has always been, down through the centuries, the real and overriding challenge to mankind. And the grave internal and external pressures that face this Nation today further emphasize the need for perfecting our democratic institutions through a recognition that social progress—and certainly implementation of civil rights is part and parcel of such progress—is an indigenous ingredient in democratic concepts and institutions.

Therefore, I resolutely affirm that Congress, in recognition of the challenge, must act affirmatively and expeditiously in the field of civil rights legislation.

Any discussion of my proposal would be lacking in depth and fairness if I only allude to its provisions without any reference to other major legislative proposals that have come before this Congress for its consideration and action. A discussion of the relative merit of various measures will, I believe, offer the best approach in determining the most effective civil rights legislation to implement the law of the land—the U.S. Constitution and the interpretation of it by the Supreme Court. I wish to emphasize that while I feel the measure which I am cosponsoring offers the most extensive and meaningful approach to the problem of school integration, as well as the protection of civil rights in general, I also know that no one has a monopoly of ideas on how best to accomplish this implementation nor does any one person have all the answers. Collective thinking is essential for a clear solution.

For the purposes of discussion, I propose to discuss (1) my measure, H.R. 430, which is the same version of the legislation popularly called the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill; (2) the administration proposals, introduced in the other body as seven separate bills, but introduced in the House as one measure, H.R. 4457, and (3) the Johnson proposal. Although Senator JOHNSON'S bill has not been offered in the House, I think it will be useful and helpful to include reference to it in any full discussion of pending civil rights legislation. Parenthetically, may I say that for purposes of my presentation, and for clarification, I shall not refer to my given measure, H.R. 430, but rather to the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill.

In recent days, a very useful and careful summary comparison of the main civil rights bills has been prepared and distributed by the executive committee of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, comprised of 53 national religious, civic, interracial, labor, welfare, veterans, and fraternal organizations. It should be noted that the organizations involved have more than a fleeting or passing interest in civil rights matters; they all have one common bond: their sincere, studious and enduring interest in and concern about the full implementation of the constitutional guarantees from which should flow first-class citizenship for all. Among the 53 organizations are the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Improved Benevolent Order of Elks, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the United Automobile Workers, both AFL–CIO affiliates, and the American Council on Human Rights, to mention just a few.

I don't think anyone could properly quarrel with the contention that these groups have had a real and active interest in civil rights matters or that their summary

analysis of the proposed bill was done in a perfunctory or superficial manner.

In offering the summary comparison, this group prefaced it by the following statement:

"The summary comparison would appear to justify the following conclusions:

"1. The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill, providing support for the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions and technical and financial assistance to assist the process of school desegregation and including an improved version of the old part III stricken from the 1957 bill, is essential to the accomplishment of school desegregation within a reasonable period and to the maintenance of the equal protection of the laws in other fields; it is certainly the No. 1 civil rights bill. The Javits bill, S. 456 (see also Celler bill, H.R. 3148), which is not included in the summary comparison, also contains an improved version of the old part III of the 1957 bill, but the Javits bill does not contain the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. The old part III contained in both bills authorizes the Attorney General to bring injunction actions against those denying equal protection of the laws to anyone because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and is the single most essential part of any civil rights legislation.

"2. The administration school bills omit part III completely and contain an inadequate version of the remainder of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill. Other administration bills, and particularly S. 957 authorizing inspection of voting records, make advances in the area of civil rights which deserve the support of civil rights organizations, to the extent that support for the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill is in no way reduced.

"3. The Johnson bill, by failing to support the school desegregation decisions and by conciliation provisions that may result in civil rights being bargained away rather than enforced, appears to be a step backward. It seeks to relegate the assertion of rights to equal protection by citizens and defiance of the law by States to the status of a neighborhood quarrel to be resolved only by an ill-defined conciliation procedure. Its other provisions would seem to be better dealt with in the administration and other bills."

Mr. Chairman, may I say in reference to S. 957, mentioned in point two of the above quoted statement, that this proposal is also sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and is contained in the House bill, H.R. 4457, which has incorporated all seven administration proposals. I heartily concur that legislation covering the objectives set forth should be part of a comprehensive civil rights program.

A COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

As stated in my earlier remarks, I shall direct my comments to the three proposals already referred to, the details of which are known to the committee members. Therefore, I think the most logical approach to this matter is to offer what I believe highlights the similarities and/or differences in as concrete and brief a fashion as possible, without perverting the intent.

In broad, general terms, I believe the bills can be discussed under the following headings:

1. Support of the Supreme Court Decisions.
2. Federal technical and financial assistance to States.
3. Compliance and enforcement of Supreme Court Decisions.
4. Suits by Government.
5. Obstruction of justice.
6. Voting records.
7. Civil Rights Commission.
8. Antibombing.
9. Children of military personnel.
10. Equal job opportunity.
11. Conciliation service.

SUPPORT OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

I think it is significant to point out that the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure is the only one of the three approaches under discussion that expressly endorses the principle of the Supreme Court's antisegregation decisions in schools, transportation, and recreation. It likewise recognizes the responsibility and authority of Congress to uphold these decisions.

While the administration proposal recognizes that the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land, it does not include the findings of the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill approving the High Court's decisions, nor does it pledge Congress to support those decisions by all due and reasonable means.

The Johnson proposal does not refer to the Supreme Court's decisions. Indirect recognition is given by the feature of his proposal which notes there are constitutional requirements that give rise to disagreements which require conciliation of such disagreements forthcoming from legal decisions. The conciliation approach is, of course, less direct in assuring compliance and enforcement of the law of the land.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this distinctive feature of the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure may, in some respects, be the most important provision contained in any measure because it is an expression of philosophical endorsement of our national ideals; it is one way that Congress does not leave exclusively to the courts the implementation, as well as the proclamation, of the abiding American belief and conviction that all Americans are equal in the eyes of God which, translated into our constitutional concepts of democratic government, means every human being is entitled to equal protection of the laws.

FEDERAL TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES

The Douglas-Javits-Celler proposal authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to render technical assistance to States and local communities seeking to comply with the High Court's antisegregation decisions.

In addition, the measure which I am supporting makes provision for grants to States and local governmental units for additional school facilities and additional teachers, to mention just two provisions among several. It also provides for grants to local communities, eliminating segregation, when the State threatens to cut off school payments.

To carry out the intent of these sections, the Douglas-Javits-Celler legislation calls for appropriations up to $2½ million a year for a 5-year period for the technical assistance phases of the program; for the program of grants, appropriations up to $40 million a year for a 5-year period.

The administration's program covers the above approaches but is a limited version of the Douglas-Javits-Celler approach both as to extent of the program and the amount of aid to be given. The estimated expenditure has been set at $4½ million for 2 years.

COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Douglas-Javits-Celler bill sets up the procedure by which the Secretary would be authorized, when other methods fail, to assume responsibility for initiating the development of desegregation plans, with fullest possible local consultation and participation. When the Secretary certifies that all efforts to secure compliance by persuasion and by technical and financial assistance have failed, the Attorney General, as authorized in the bill, would file compliance action.

Neither the administration nor Johnson proposal has provisions in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of the committee members that there is another important section of the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure which calls for the injunction procedure which I shall discuss shortly. However, at this point I wish to bring to your attention that the measure has been criticized editorially in the Washington Post, February 2, 1959, as it pertains to the Federal desegregation plans and the injunction procedure if compliance fails. Indeed, the editorial opposes the injunction features as it applies in this matter and as it appears elsewhere in the bill for the purpose of ending denials of equal protection of the laws.

The editorial stated, and I quote only that portion of it concerned with the subject at hand:

"It sweeps on to authorize the HEW to draw up desegregation plans for communities failing to act on their own initiative. Such plans could then be imposed on the reluctant communities through court injunctions. This sort of carpetbaggery would produce more sectional hostility than desegregation. It looks in precisely the opposite direction from Senator JOHNSON'S proposed conciliation agency.

"Nor do we think the time has come to seek enforcement of all civil rights through use of the injunction. Recent events in Virginia indicate that the barriers to desegregation are beginning to crumble. The processes of peaceful adjustment might be gravely upset by undue haste in the application of force from Washington. The wisdom of moving a step at a time in this delicate situation and of converting instead of blundgeoning has been too well demonstrated to be seriously challenged."

The Attorney General of the United States is taking a similar position regarding the injunction provisions, although it should be recalled that the administration program of 1957 included such authority for the Attorney General.

I think this is healthy in our discussion to have such criticism because it offers an opportunity to join the issue and to clarify misconception, confusion, and hasty conclusions. In a letter to the Washington Post, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has done just that. He logically, factually, and legally challenges, and certainly weakens, the argument of those opposed to the HEW desegregation plan authorization and of those opposed to the injunction features of compliance in connection with such plans and with respect to the injunction features elsewhere in the bill which are aimed at ending the denial of equal protection of the laws in other fields, not just in the field of school integration.

Mr. Chairman, because of the importance of the points made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I wish to submit the full text of his letter of February 2, since it covers the issue at hand in a comprehensive and clear manner.

LETTER OF SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS TO THE WASHINGTON POST

FEBRUARY 2, 1959.

EDITOR, LETTERS TO THE EDITOR COLUMN,
*Washington Post and Times Herald,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: Reasoned analysis and widespread public discussion are prime essentials in arriving at a workable approach to desegregation and full compliance with the Constitution and decrees of the Supreme Court. Your editorial on "Aid, Not Carpetbaggery" (Washington Post, Feb. 2, 1959), is a long step in this direction and is a welcome contrast to the more superficial treatment, vituperation, or indifference with which such proposals have been met in the past.

To clarify the issues, however, and to correct some misunderstandings about our proposal, may I be permitted to make a few comments on your analysis.

First, I am proud of the civil rights bill which I introduced last week, and I am glad that it bears my name. But it also bears the names of 16 other Senators as cosponsors, including many of the best known and most thoughtful and reasonable advocates of a sane approach to progress in the field of human relations. A number of these Senators gave important help in the drafting of this measure, and it is therefore truly a joint product. A dozen or more House Members, including Judge CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, have sponsored the same measure. The credit—or blame—for the proposal is therefore shared by these other Members as well.

We are naturally gratified that the Post recognizes the constructive character of that part of our bill which undergirds the desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court by a statement of supporting congressional policy. Your support is also welcome for our rather comprehensive authorizations of technical assistance and financial aid through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the States and localities seeking to work out their desegregation problems.

Your criticisms of the proposed authorization to HEW to draw up and issue desegregation plans as being too hasty and sweeping, however, seem to us to reflect an inadequate understanding of what is proposed.

Title IV of our bill which sets up this administrative action first requires HEW to make every effort to persuade the States and local districts to make a start toward eliminating segregation in public education, utilizing the aids and financial assistance previously referred to. It thus first emphasizes the procedure of conciliation, which you endorse, but specifies that it shall be conciliation with the aim of bringing compliance with the Constitution.

Secondly, in preparing such tentative plans the Secretary is required to seek the advice and assistance of public officials, private organizations, and private citizens in the area and of any * * * advisory council.

In the third place, the proposal specifies that such tentative plans shall take into account the need of the particular area for time to make an orderly adjustment and transition from segregated to desegregated schools.

In the fourth place, if the plan thus formulated meets with the approval of the locality and is adopted by it, a beginning can be made, and the various other forms of assistance can be brought into play.

In the fifth place, however, if the tentative plan is not accepted, the Secretary must set up a public hearing upon the plan, and at this hearing, the local authorities, private organizations and private citizens shall be permitted to participate. Only after all of these steps have been taken is the Secretary authorized to prepare and issue an approved plan for desegregation. The detailed requirements for local participation in our opinion make it clear that your rather captious characterization of "carpetbagger" is wholly unwarranted.

But, finally, it is important to recall that these desegregation plans, if still resisted, cannot come into effect until the Attorney General files an injunction suit and the court, after listening to all of the evidence and hearing arguments, issues its decree in line with the underlying decisions of the Supreme Court requiring all deliberate speed. The trial court's determination is further subject to appeal and review right up to the Supreme Court.

The bill thus seeks to use the assistance and advice of executive and administrative agencies and the experience, recommendations and criticisms of the local community in affirmatively formulating desegregation plans. In similar circumstances of bitter-end resistance under the present law, such plans have to be developed solely by the courts in injunction suits brought by the aggrieved persons in behalf of their children. But the proposed plans under our bill would in no case have any legal effect until they had gone through the judicial processes of court hearings and decision, with full right of review. The procedure is not unlike that now provided to secure compliance with NLRB recommendations.

Surely this accepted, reasonable, and deliberate procedure cannot fairly be characterized as a force plan, as your news reports have described it, or bludgeoning as you editorially refer to it.

In opposing our proposal to authorize the Attorney General to seek injunctions to end denials of equal protection of the laws, you cite with favor the recent events in Virginia. But what has brought about—at long last—the crumbling of the barriers of segregation and the peaceful adjustment which you herald there? Clearly, it is a series of court decisions, in cases initiated by individuals. The patient, thoroughly argued, long drawn out legal proceedings and decrees have been the path to progress in that State.

But what is the ultimate sanction under our bill? The answer is again court actions. These could, however, be initiated by the Attorney General. But in this case they must be preceded either (a) by the lengthy HEW procedure I have outlined above, or (b) by the signed complaint of individuals and a determination by the Attorney General that those individuals are unable to seek the effective legal protections for themselves. The injunctive procedure authorized in our bill is thus basically the same as the procedure under which progress is being made in Virignia, except that under carefully specified conditions the Attorney General may file the suit.

Why is it necessary that the Attorney General be empowered to initiate these procedures which can now be initiated only by individuals? This is necessary because without it the weakest, the poorest, and those most subject to intimidation or coercion are required to fight their case with their own resources against all the legal talent, power, legislation, and economic resources which a State opposed to desegregation can throw into the breach. Because of the antibarratry laws, the anti-NAACP laws, school placement laws, and the multitude of other barriers thrown up to resist the law of the land, and the scales of justice can only be evenly matched if these legal and economic burdens of enforcement are borne in part by the Federal Government, whose duty it is to enforce the law of the land. To require—as is now the case—that this burden be placed solely on the backs of the fathers and mothers of Negro children in areas which are overwhelmingly hostile to them is to apply that concept of justice made famous by Anatole France's remark that the law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread.

This injunction procedure is not unique or extreme, for, as I have said in the Senate, it is now so commonplace that it is provided in 39 other laws to bring compliance with various Federal statutes, including the voting rights bill of 1957. This procedure is necessarily coupled with all the usual protections of the exercise of the equity powers of the courts and subject to all of the normal appeals in the higher courts. It has been twice approved in school cases by overwhelming votes in the House of Representatives, once in 1956 by a vote of 279 to 126, and again in 1957, by a vote of 286 to 126 in favor of the so-called part III of the civil rights bills of 1956 and 1957.

If the Attorney General sought to move faster than the Supreme Court decisions provide, the Federal judge would deny or modify his request. Thus, there are adequate safeguards through the Federal district courts and judges—almost all of whom in southern areas are southern born—against "undue haste in the application of force from Washington."

The inadequacy of the conciliation proposal by Senator JOHNSON, which you endorse, is that if the dominant forces of the community refuse to restore peaceful relations in accordance with the Constitution, the Federal Government would then lack the authority to initiate court cases to bring compliance. This failure could invite nullification and the ultimate breakdown of the Constitution.

The sponsors of our bill earnestly hope that the affirmative approaches which provide congressional backing for the Court's decrees, technical assistance, financial aid, etc., will be largely effective in getting the movement toward desegregation off deadcenter and demonstrating to the world that we intend to live by our principles of equal justice. But in the background, just as the historic decisions of the court have been the firm rock upon which we have now begun to break away in both the North and the South from our previous discriminatory practices, so do we believe that the ultimate possibility of an appeal to the courts, initiated by the Attorney General, will be helpful in winning acceptance for these constitutional principles all along the line.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

SUITS BY GOVERNMENT

The outstanding difference between the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill and the administration program is found in the matter of suits by the Federal Government. The difference is this: The provision contained in the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure represents an improved version of part III of the 1957 bill. The significance of this provision lies in the fact that the objective is for preventive rather than punitive action. It would authorize the Attorney General to seek preventive relief to protect persons being deprived of, or threatened with deprivation of, equal protection of the laws, if the persons whose rights are invaded are unable to seek legal relief because of a lack of finances, economic pressures, or fear of physical harm.

The Attorney General would also be authorized to seek preventive relief to assist public officials in guaranteeing equal protection of the laws by enjoining anyone hindering or attempting to hinder such officials or hindering, attempting or conspiring to hinder the execution of any court order involving the equal protection of the laws.

Again, I bring your attention to the injunction features of the bill as explained and ably supported by Senator DOUGLAS.

The Attorney General would also be authorized to intervene in private civil rights suits, as well as to initiate action.

This singular approach is important in comparing this proposal with the other two under discussion because neither makes such provisions in any manner.

OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

It is literally true that the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill does not have a provision contained in the administration proposal: that is, a provision making it a criminal offense to use force or threats to interfere with court orders in school desegregation cases. However, to accept this literally is also to be misled about the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure. The injunction procedure already discussed would come into play in such a situation, as well as in other civil rights areas. The proposal which I support thus emphasizes preventive rather than punitive action in the matter covered in the administration bill. Since injunctions can be enforced by contempt proceedings, I feel that

such an approach is far more effective than the limited usefulness of criminal action.

VOTING RECORDS

Both the administration and Johnson proposals, while differing in given respects, make provision for inspection of voting records.

I shall support an adequately written proposal and on the basis of the legislation at hand it is my belief that the administration bill offers a better approach in that there would be less delay in obtaining voting records where discrimination in voting has been charged, and it also contains the proviso that such records must be kept for 3 years; the Johnson proposal does not, thus not touching on the problem of the destruction of records. In addition, the latter proposal has a more limited application of the subpena power to obtain such records.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Here again, the administration and Johnson proposals contain a feature not incorporated in the Douglas-Javits-Celler proposal: That is, the continuation of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years in the administration bill, and until 60 days after January 31, 1961, in the Johnson measure.

I think it is important that the work of the Commission continue, but that it would be a grave error to claim that such a combination makes additional legislation in the civil rights area unnecessary.

It is important to consider strengthening the Commission by authorizing it to investigate all denials of civil rights because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

ANTIBOMBING

While antibombing provisions are not contained in the Douglas-Javits-Celler bill, I think it should be noted that I and many supporters of this specific proposal have introduced separate legislation. The administration proposal and the Johnson measure both contain provisions in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into a comparison of how these measures differ, but I do wish to comment that I have introduced legislation which includes residential property in its provisions. This provision has not been incorporated in several of the measures that will be considered.

I am hopeful that effective antibombing legislation will be achieved in this Congress.

CHILDREN OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

The administration proposal authorizes the Commissioner of Education to operate schools for children of members of the armed services where local schools are not operating as a result of defiance of the Supreme Court's decisions. It also provides that a school constructed in the future, built in whole or in part with Federal funds, may be taken over by the Federal Government for operation with the latter paying the State rent in line with the State's investment.

The proposal has, in my opinion, certain defects: First, if the goal in administration thinking is only to take care of children of Federal personnel, why limit it to the children of members of the armed services? Why not include other Federal employees? Second the provision with respect to schools constructed under the impacted areas program would be of limited effect, since it would apply only to future construction; thus it would not apply to previously constructed schools. And, finally, the approach offers no provisions relating to desegregating impacted area schools.

I bring to the attention of the committee the fact that the Douglas-Javits-Celler measure has broader application in dealing with closed schools since Federal funds would be offered to local communities where the State has withdrawn school payments; in addition the stronger provisions relating to school desegregation also make the approach more effective.

EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY

The administration propose that Congress create a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, similar to the present Committee established by executive order. The statutory duties and functions granted to the Commission would not differ greatly from those now exercised by the committee, except that it would be able to make its own investigations and conduct hearings.

While I think this approach could be strengthened, for example, by providing such a commission with subpena power, I would hope that creation of such a commission would be another factor in the further dimunition of job discrimination by companies holding Government contracts.

My real concern, however, is that this is only a small part of the concept of equal job opportunity for all. I am proud to state that I have introduced legislation that would prohibit discrimination by companies and labor organizations because of race, color, creed, or national origin. While my proposal will not come before this committee, I merely want to apprise the members of my thinking in the matter.

CONCILIATION SERVICE

Reference has already been made to Senator JOHNSON'S proposal to conciliate disagreements by establishing a community relations service. I only wish to pose this question: Will this approach hamper enforcement?

Will conciliation, at the level it is proposed, be a necessary prerequisite of judicial action?

I wish to thank the Chairman and members for their kind attention and to commend the Committee on the Judiciary for its desire to hold full and necessary hearings on civil rights legislation.

May I merely add that I am pleased to have been able to offer my comments and to indicate my support, for the reasons I pointed out, of the Civil Rights Act of 1959.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 31

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Rome (Ga.) News-Tribune, September 18, 1957, entitled "Stream Pollution Problem Grows":

STREAM POLLUTION PROBLEM GROWS

The problem of stream pollution in Georgia grows and with it grow concomitant problems of public health, loss of wildlife and recreational areas, and depreciated property values.

Polluted water is a constant hazard which will continue to increase until we take steps to clear up our rivers and streams of industrial and municipal wastes.

A case in point is Big Cedar Creek in neighboring Polk County. Once widely known for its scenic beauty and fishing abundance, the stream in large part is befouled and poisoned by wastes today.

The same is true of Rome's own three rivers which are disposals for municipal and industrial wastes, destructive to their water life and ruinous of appearance.

Federal laws provide aid to cities and towns for construction of modern sewage disposal systems. Some industries privately have realized their share of the pollution problem and have constructed waste treatment plants. Others have failed to accept this responsibility.

The problem can be met only with adequate legislation which is supported by public demand for action.

## Forty Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 17, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very illuminating editorial on the birth and 40 years of accomplishments by that great veterans' organization, the American Legion. It is well from time to time, to be reminded of the outstanding work of this great organization since World War I in behalf of the veterans and their families.

The editorial follows:

FORTY YEARS OF SERVICE

Except for those coy people, both male and female, who do not wish to admit their age for fear they will be dated, most people, young and old, rejoice in birthdays.

The youngsters look forward to them with joy because they know their family, their relatives, and their friends will remember them with gifts.

The oldsters who are not ashamed to admit their age look forward to it, not for gifts but for the greetings they receive from family and friends but, more particularly, for the memories which the years have brought them.

During this week the American Legion will be celebrating its 40th anniversary—not so long in calculating years but quite long in accomplishment.

As we look back on the meeting in Paris in March 1919 when the idea of the formation of the American Legion was first contemplated, we feel certain that the founders of the American Legion had little or no idea of what the organization might develop into as it dedicated itself to "God and country."

The ideals which the founders of the American Legion put forth in their deliberations 40 years ago in Paris were but a dream of the reality which their organization has accomplished.

But, to prove that their thoughts were not only dreams but a vision of the years to come, the activities of the American Legion during these past years has been a perfect demonstration of the thoughts which they might have envisioned and which have come true in the sense of service to their country, their comrades, the Nation and the community, from the lowest to the highest level.

Little did they know—those men drawn from all ranks and from all services in the AEF in France 40 years ago, that the group which founded the American Legion would grow up to such a power, dedicated to their country's welfare, that today it has attained a membership so great that their deliberations have a profound effect on the welfare of our country. They were idealists but the organization which they founded has lived up to the highest concept of those ideals, born of war and comradeship.

There will be no concentrated birthday celebration of the Legion this year but posts throughout the country and the world will recall the day in 1919 when the Legion was formed and rejoice in their service to their country in the past and resolve that this service will grow and grow until all America will realize that the American Legion stands for all that is good and great in this country of ours.

To tell of the accomplishments of the American Legion in the past 40 years would be but a story of the accomplishments of the Nation since the signing of the Armistice on November 11, 1918.

Let us sum up in a short time what the American Legion has given to the country their members served in time of war. We have only to look about us and realize that every part of our country has benefited by the work of the American Legion.

While it is possible to count noses and reckon expenditures, the profound effect of the labors of millions of Legionnaires on American life cannot be measured. They had a tremendous and beneficial impact on the American scene.

Few have ever credited the American Legion with pioneering in new social concepts. But it is a fact that through its rehabilitation activities for World War I veterans, the American Legion brought about enlightened new concepts in the care of all sick, disabled, and physically handicapped.

Likewise the American Legion through its child-welfare program achieved a recognized leadership in raising the standards of the care and protection of all children in America.

By its persistence on adequate national preparedness since its cradle days, the American Legion helped to convince the American people that peace can be insured only through strength and not by example in disarmament.

The American Legion has made monumental contributions to the cause of education. It initiated American Education Week in 1921 to focus public attention on the accomplishments and needs of American schools. The annual observance of this week has become an American tradition. From its very beginning, the American Legion has supported better pay for teachers and during depression periods fought against economies that would have closed schools. Through the educational provisions of its World War II and and Korean war GI bills, the American Legion brought a boom to college and vocational training that has resulted in raising the intellectual level of the entire Nation.

Through its unflagging and militant opposition to communism, the American Legion was largely responsible for the creation of the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1938 whose exposés have aroused the American people and Government to the Red conspiracy in the United States.

American Legion legislative efforts helped to bring about enactment of the National Defense Act of 1920 which gave this country its first workable plan for a small Regular Army, augmented by adequate National Guard and Organized Reserve components.

The Veterans' Administration is the American Legion's greatest living memorial. Organized first as the Veterans' Bureau through American Legion legislative efforts in 1920, it became the VA in 1930.

The adjusted compensation for World War I veterans was largely the product of American Legion efforts.

Benefits taken away from veterans by the Economy Act of 1933 were restored by the American Legion-backed Public Law 141 over a Presidential veto, March 28, 1934.

Since 1925 the American Legion and its affiliated organizations have expended more than $148 million for child welfare, most of this money going for food, clothing, shelter, and medical treatments. It continues to spend about $8 million a year on this work.

In 1925 the American Legion raised a $5 million endowment fund, the earnings of which help to finance its national rehabilitation and child welfare activities. This was increased to $7 million in 1945.

In 1946 the American Legion and its auxiliary contributed $50,000 to start the American Heart Association on its career.

In 1950 the American Legion gave $25,000 to the National Association for Mental Health to launch this organization.

The American Legion launched its junior baseball program in 1925; its boys state program in 1935 and its boys nation program in 1947.

The American Legion National Child Welfare Foundation was incorporated in 1954 to make grants within its means to finance needed surveys and studies relating to childhood diseases and improved services for mentally retarded and partially seeing children.

More than 60 percent of the 17,000 American Legion posts today own their homes. A recent survey of 12,539 posts found 7,759 owning their homes with a total valuation of $263,375,000.

With these facts and many more which could be cited, the American Legion has every reason to be proud of its service to God and country and may look forward to years and years of service as, more and more, the American public realizes what the American Legion means to every citizen of our great Nation.

## Montana's Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks of a good friend of mine in a letter I received recently regarding one of Montana's most famous citizens, the late Charles Russell, Montana's cowboy artist and philosopher, whose memory will be honored forever with the dedication of his statute in Statuary Hall on March 19 of this year. I am happy to present at this time this letter, from a man who knew Charles Russell for 18 years. I feel that his comments would be of interest to the membership of the House, and therefore, I would like to include his letter in the RECORD. It is as follows:

HELENA, MONT., *March 1, 1959.*

Hon. LEROY ANDERSON,
*Congressman from Montana,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR LEROY: Today's Great Falls Tribune carried an article about the placing of the Russell statue in the Hall of Statuary in the Capitol Building.

One very interesting statement was to the effect that the dedication would take place on the 19th day of March. Had Charlie lived he would have been 95 years of age on that date. Nothing could be more appropriate than the placing of this statue on his birthday.

I knew Charlie for 18 years of his lifetime and attended his funeral in Great Falls during October 1926, one of the most somber events of that kind I have ever attended. His saddle horse following the remains seemed to know that Charlie had passed on.

He did more to perpetuate the open range in Montana than all the rest of the artists and writers. He is receiving an honor long due him as Montana's outstanding citizen.

I hope that you have a good horse for that ride.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN JACOB JEWELL.

## Secretary Benson Dissents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include an interesting letter written by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, in reply to one of Joseph Alsop's columns. The letter which was printed in the March 11, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald newspaper follows:

SECRETARY BENSON DISSENTS

My attention has been called to the February 25 column, "Operating on Ezra," by Joseph Alsop.

Mr. Alsop's article is based on the premise that the farm program operating today is my program. The farm program now in effect is not that of this Secretary of Agriculture. The Benson program has never been allowed to go into effect.

Today's program is a holdover from a Democrat administration, modified grudgingly to the limited degree to which Congress has been willing to grant our requests for changes. If it were my program we would not be asking Congress to make the far-reaching changes contained in the President's recent farm message to the Congress.

It is true that the Government will have $9 billion invested in price-support commodities (as of July 1, 1959) and that it will cost over $1 billion a year for storage, interest, and transportation on these stocks. However, these stocks consist mainly of wheat, corn, and cotton accumulated under programs we inherited and have tried to change with but little success.

The President has pointed out these facts. The Secretary of Agriculture has called attention to these facts. These facts are a visible demonstration of the bankruptcy of the old program. We have recommended changes to the Congress.

Mr. Alsop says a proposed production payment plan will cost "half the cost of subsidies requested by Benson." Our figures based on studies by career economists show the Talmadge-Brannan payment program will cost annually about $5.4 billion, for payments for the basic commodities alone. In addition we would still have the present tremendous stocks and attendant costs, the special surplus disposal programs and the soil bank, etc.

Mr. Alsop cites a $2 billion figure for the Brannan proposals. This is the first time that I've seen this figure. It is fallacious.

Congress refused to adopt this program when submitted by my predecessor, Secretary Brannan. It would have these undesirable effects:

1. Require drastic controls of production to keep costs within reason.

2. Will limit opportunity of new farmers to enter into the production of these crops.

3. Unless extended to livestock (which would boost the cost to even higher levels) could create extremely serious problems for livestock producers.

4. Will lead to international repercussions because U.S. surpluses would be dumped on world markets.

5. Would make farmers even more dependent than now on Government appropriations for farm income (quite obviously this payment approach would be a step away from our efforts to balance the budget).

We want a farm program which will give farmers a satisfactory level and stability of income consistent with a balanced and expanding consumption of agricultural commodities here and abroad and the most rational use of resources. Our alternative suggestions to achieve this goal already have been submitted to Congress. The type of farm program we will have in the future will depend upon the action Congress takes.

Unless Congress makes changes in the present unworkable and unrealistic farm program, we are bound to have costs in the future of the size Mr. Alsop cites regardless of who is Secretary of Agriculture.

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON.

---

## Promoting United States-Philippine Islands Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 last, the distinguished floor leader of the majority party in the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], spoke on the floor to hail the return of Gen. Carlos P. Romulo as the Philippine Ambassador to the United States. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] also spoke on the floor in the same vein.

On Saturday, March 7, we had the pleasure of welcoming General and Mrs. Romulo in Cleveland, Ohio, where he appeared to speak at a dinner honoring one of Cleveland's foremost citizens, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, a great American, who was given the national award for 1958 of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Speaking for labor was Albert J. Hayes, and for capital, Philip Sporn. The presiding officer was Sterling E. Graham, president of the Forest City Publishing Co., and the toastmaster was Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press, who himself received the same award a year ago. It was a great tribute by the citizens of Cleveland and the northern Ohio region to a civic and religious leader who has earned the esteem and regard of all those privileged to know him.

I am not speaking on this occasion of my good friend, Rabbi Silver, but I wish to invite attention to an incident which occurred during General Romulo's visit to Cleveland which to my mind shows how a good friend of the American people can ably and effectively defend the interests of his nation and at the same time win our respect and affection.

I had the pleasure of meeting the Romulos when they arrived at the Cleveland airport and escorted them to the Carter Hotel. Upon their arrival in their hotel room, a reporter of the Cleveland Plain Dealer showed the general a proof of an editorial on the Philippines that was to appear in the paper's Sunday edition. The Philippine ambassador forthwith proceeded to answer the editorial.

The editorial, entitled "The Heart of the Matter," follows:

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

A great deal of hurrying and scurrying by diplomats can often conceal some unpleasant but pertinent truths. This is certainly the case in the present strained relations between the United States and the Philippines.

There are real differences, of course. The United States owes the island republic more than $900 million for past services and supplies, the Filipinos claim. We have rejected most of this claim but have decided to pay some of it. There is the question of military bases. Also continued American aid comes into the picture.

The Philippines desperately need current cash. The present trouble which brought Ambassador Charles E. Bohlen hurrying back to Washington and Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo scurrying back to Manila was sparked when the republic which we fostered to independence raised the tariff on American goods to get that cash.

Bohlen has returned to Manila and Romulo when he arrived yesterday in Washington said that conditions in the Philippines are fine. He must have been talking about weather conditions.

The basis of the trouble came out in an interview which Vice President Diosdado Macapagal gave the other day. He is head of the opposition party, the Liberals, while President Carlos P. Garcia heads the Nationalist Party. The Nationalists are inclined to be a bit anti-American, but Macapagal hit it when he said that this anti-Americanism is fostered in the hope of diverting the attention of the people from graft * * *"

American residents in Manila report that the corruption in the government and in business today is wide-spread. Everyone is out to make a fast peso and the devil with the country or its condition. The politicians are having a saturalia at the public trough. Until this situation is eradicated anything done for the Philippines is likely to be futile.

When the Sunday Plain Dealer appeared the following day, both the editorial and the interview with General Romulo appeared, together with a picture of the general and his wife.

The interview follows:

AMBASSADOR IRKED BY PLAIN DEALER EDITORIAL

"I differ vigorously. This is so unfair," the Ambassador of the Philippines to the United States said last night at Hotel Carter.

"Yes, I am angry," said Carlos P. Romulo, former president of the United Nations.

In his hand was a first-edition copy of a Plain Dealer editorial on page 4B of today's paper.

His voice shook as he said: "There is no anti-Americanism, not unless it is caused by things like this. There is no idea of diverting attention from graft.

"Certainly there is graft in my homeland. There is graft in Washington, D.C. There is graft in Cleveland.

"The administration is doing all it can to eliminate this cancer from our body politic.

"If there is news of graft now it is because the Government is busy exposing evildoers."

Ambassador Romulo, who speaks English without an accent, criticized what he called a "whispering campaign."

"If those 'American residents in Manila,'" he said, quoting the editorial, "have any information, they should have the courage to speak up instead of conducting a whispering campaign against a government that gives them protection and a people that extends to them hospitality."

Ambasador Romulo, here to speak at a dinner honoring Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver tonight in Hotel Carter, made the brief visit from Washington just for the one occasion.

"But now, reading this, I may have other business in Cleveland," he said.

"Write this down. In 1946 the United States gave the Philippines political independence.

"In 1974 we are to achieve economic independence. (Then full duty will be charged on imports from the Philippines to the United States.) We are simply trying to prepare for that day, looking for new markets."

At the dinner Sunday evening where General Romulo spoke, many of those who heard him favorably commented on the fact that he made no reference to the critical editorial. A man of lesser caliber would have taken advantage of the opportunity to retort. As a veteran diplomat, he knew that it was neither the place nor the occasion to make his reply.

The following day, however, on the editorial page of the Plain Dealer, featured prominently, was General Romulo's letter to the editor, as follows:

ROMULO'S ANSWER

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER.

SIR: May I expand on the short interview that I had with your reporter in order that your readers may get all the facts regarding current Philippine-American relations. I regret to say that your editorial, "The Heart of the Matter," is the type of writing that does not contribute to the friendship of our two nations which men of good will in your country and mine have been working all these years to foster and strengthen.

It is not true that the present trouble was sparked by our raising our tariff on American goods. The fact is that it is the cumulative result of many unresolved issues, most important among which are our claims totaling $942 million—one of them of 24 years' standing—and the military bases question. Neither is it true, as you say, that your Government has rejected most of our claims. We filed such claims 5 years ago and we have received no official reply. It is only now that we are in the process of negotiation.

The military bases question is a matter of national pride and self-respect for us Filipinos. We cannot understand why your Government should be willing to grant to Japan, a former enemy country, and to Iceland, with which you do not have the close political and economic ties that you have with us, the same court jurisdiction rights that you refuse to give us.

I have just returned from Manila and I can say truthfully that I found no anti-American sentiment among my people. That our opposition party should attack the present administration is nothing bizarre in a democracy such as ours with a two-party system. But while it may be effective for electioneering purposes to accuse the party in power of fostering anti-Americanism "in the hope of diverting the attention of the people from graft," the charge does not hold water when it is known that we have in the Philippines a free and courageous press the pages of which are full of revelations of cases of corruption precisely because the

present administration is engaged in identifying and exposing those guilty of malfeasance in public office. President Garcia has gone as far as to propose the creation of an antigraft court that will be independent of both the executive and the legislative as an earnest of his determination to weed out this cancer from our body politic.

I must say that I am amazed by your statement that "American residents in Manila report that corruption in the government and in business today is widespread" and that in the Philippines "everyone is out to make a fast peso and the devil with the country or its condition." I cannot believe—although I am sure you will not make such an attribution without direct communication with them—that "American residents in Manila" should indulge in a whispering campaign against the government that gives them protection and libel an entire people whose hospitality they are enjoying. If their charge has any basis in fact, why don't these "American residents in Manila" have the civic courage to go to the authorities in Manila and cooperate with the administration by exposing those they know are guilty instead of merely "whispering" to you in Cleveland the slander that among my people "everyone" is out "to make a fast peso"?

Would it be fair for us in the Philippines to say that because of the padded payrolls of Chicago all the American politicans are having a saturnalia at the public trough?

The Philippines is unquestionably your best friend in Asia. While it may be true that sentiment, much less sentimentality, does not govern the relations between Governments, I hope it is not amiss for me to recall that in America's darkest hour in the Pacific we stood loyally by you without counting the cost. That your Government and mine should differ at time should not cause intemperate statements to be made by either of us. It is when such misunderstandings occur that we should counsel with each other as friends and allies with sobriety and restraint. That we Filipinos should stand up for our rights should draw your understanding and admiration and not your resentment because if it shows anything it is that American tutelage does not breed spineless servile puppets.

One last word, Mr. Editor: We are today engaged in a common fight against a ruthless, unscrupulous foe. Communism seeks to divide us against ourselves. Let us not allow thoughtless statements that wound the dignity of a people to help the Communists in their malevolent work. This is the sincere plea of one who need not protest his friendship for your country nor his loyalty to the ideals of freedom and democracy.

CARLOS P. ROMULO,
*Philippine Ambassador to the United States.*

When I discussed this incident with General Romulo on our return flight to Washington, this was his comment:

The American sense of fairness was never better shown than in this instance. The Plain Dealer wrote an editorial in accordance with the editor's honest conviction based on the information given him. But to be fair he sent his reporter to me so that my interview would appear in the same edition with his editorial. This morning he played up my reply on the editorial page so prominently no reader can miss it. That is what I call fair play and that is one of the reasons why I have such faith in America and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, that is an example of General Romulo's effective service to his country as Ambassador to the United States. How fortunate, indeed, for his country to have him as its representative. How fortunate for our Nation to have him as our friend.

## Crime Casts a Wide Net

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1959, the New York Herald Tribune published an editorial on the subject of the campaign by the New York State's Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz to curb underworld infiltration of the securities field. This is a matter which deserves nationwide attention, as it is demonstrated that the real principals in this nefarious scheme make good use of interstate facilities to pursue and put into effect their programs.

Attorney General Lefkowitz is to be commended for his early and effective action.

The Tribune's editorial follows:

CRIME CASTS A WIDE NET

The campaign of New York State Attorney General Lefkowitz against underworld infiltration of the securities field is clearly paying off. One firm moved across the river after Mr. Lefkowitz began his attack and into the arms of the Securities and Exchange Commisison—which has suspended its registration. This action was preceded by allegations to the Commission that the president of the suspended firm, George Wagner, has a police record as a bookmaker and that the real principals, Arthur Tortorello, Carmine Lombardozzi, and Louis de Fillipo, all have extensive criminal records. Lombardozzi, in fact, had been identified in testimony before the Senate Rackets Committee as the defendant before a mobster court at Apalachin, N.Y., where, it was said, his death sentence was commuted to a $10,000 fine.

It is good to find Mr. Lefkowitz' efforts producing such positive results; it is good to have the Government moving in on a tainted operation and to have a little more light shed on the dark and grimy corners in which invisible government functions. But each bit of evidence of the width of the net which crime has cast over our society comes as something of a shock. Once crime was considered a localized phenomenon, acting in specific areas and in particular ways. Now, like free cancer cells, it affects the whole body politic and economic.

Gangsterism is by no means a new thing in the United States. In the cities it provided strong-arm men for many illicit purposes: settling labor disputes by force; intimidating voters; exacting toll from shopkeepers and shanghaling seamen. In the West, where the gangsters only seem more romantic because they rode horses, they terrorized mining camps, were the tools of range wars, and engaged in organized banditry. The record of the past is not a pretty one. But it became uglier when prohibition made the defiance of law popular, put millions into the hands of those who supplied the means for that defiance, and gave crime a national scope for organized activity.

Despite the gangland killings and the jailing of some members of the prohibition rackets (which, even before repeal, had branched out into many fields of extortion and "protection") the end of the great experiment found the United States infested with a large number of wealthy racketeers, skilled in breaking the law and looking avidly for new worlds to conquer. The national climate was less favorable to the kind of outright thuggery that had characterized the prohibition gang wars, but with a more sophisticated organization the mobsters were able to apply their old methods to stifling competition and pushing sales in enterprises which were themselves not illegal. Their influence has spread into such dissociated fields as jukeboxes and securities. They have made money, corrupted officials, and ruled themselves by their own anarchistic law.

The answer to all this—and there must be an answer—is not a simple one. Crime has spread its net wide; law must do the same. The kind of digging that the Rackets Committee has done has provided invaluable clues to action. The work of Mr. Lefkowitz and the SEC is an example to all law-enforcement agencies. Where gangsters break the law, let the police and courts move in. Where they can be debarred from certain enterprises, let all licensing authorities be alert and swift to repel any underworld invasion. Publicity will help where laws and regulations are weak.

It must be remembered that when the mob muscles in on a legitimate business there is not only a threat to free competition in that business. Often it can provide a front and the sinews of war for even more dangerous operations by the gang, for the lawbreaking that threatens the lives, the pocketbooks, and the civic spirit of whole communities. The battle against invisible government must be fought on many fields and it must be fought with spirit and determination. Its survival cannot be tolerated.

## The Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the Members' attention the resolution adopted by the Essex-West Hudson Federation of Holy Name Societies of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark, N.J., with respect to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I know that it is heartening to the distinguished Director, the able special agent in charge of the Newark office, and the excellent personnel of the agency to have this expression of their fellow citizens' esteem and gratitude.

The resolution reads:

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has performed exemplary service over many years in the safeguarding of our country against criminals of all degrees of viciousness and against subversives of all species of cunning and mendacity; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has performed its work with a keen regard for the constitutional rights of individuals, and in doing so, has added dignity and respect for our system of Government; and

Whereas a great part of the record of achievement of the Bureau is due to its highly efficient, self-sacrificing Director, J. Edgar Hoover, who has given the Bureau a leadership of preeminence based on morality and patriotism; and

Whereas in our own area of Newark, N.J., men such as the present special agent in charge of the Newark office, William G. Simon, and his predecessors in that office, and the personnel serving under them, have always impressed us with their efficiency, dignity, and conduct: Be it

*Resolved by the Essex-West Hudson Federation of Holy Name Societies of the Archdiocese of Newark, N.J., in regular meeting*

*assembled, on this 4th day of March 1959,* That this organization publicly thank the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, the special agent in charge of the Newark office, William G. Simon, and all the personnel of the Bureau, for their successful and dignified efforts in the protection of our country against its enemies, domestic and foreign; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Director J. Edgar Hoover, to Special Agent William G. Simon, to our U.S. Senators and to our Congressmen, and to the newspapers in the Newark area.

WALTER L. JOYCE,
*President.*
FRANK DE GEORGE,
*Secretary.*

## Latin American "Marshall Plan"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our Latin American policy, for many reasons, some defensible and some not, has been either negative or sterile far too long. The kind of thinking Paul R. Porter has been doing about a Latin American "Marshall plan" is what is needed in the formulation of a positive new policy. If Milton Eisenhower's report has made a great contribution I agree with Mr. Porter that we need more vision and inspiration in order to evoke the heroic efforts which are necessary.

I recommend close attention to the following article, which I include here by unanimous consent:

LATIN AMERICAN "MARSHALL PLAN"
(By Paul R. Porter)

(Paul R. Porter has been associated with the Marshall plan as chief of mission in Greece, Assistant Administrator in Washington and as European regional administrator. Earlier, he served as the U.S. member of the European Coal Organization.)

If the United States acts boldly while circumstances remain favorable it could spark a transformation in Latin America more fundamental and far reaching than the historic changes stimulated by the Marshall plan in Europe. I mention the Marshall plan to connote an imaginative program that kindled hope and courage among millions, that inspired emerging leaders to create effective institutions for intra-European cooperation, and that produced a working compact between the United States and free Europe which is the main bulwark of democratic strength and hope in the world today. Reference to the Marshall plan is not intended to suggest a massive program of economic grants, which would not be relevant.

The element of novelty and greatness in the Marshall plan was the concept that the recovery of Europe was one problem—not a collection of national problems—and that its solution would require a joint European effort no less than U.S. financial assistance.

The central problem in Latin America is rapid industrialization so that the region's natural resources may support more adequately a fast-increasing population. Diversified and more efficient agriculture, education, and medical care—these too are urgent, but the most pressing problem is industrialization. The transformation of more than a continent within a generation should be the goal, and it should be regarded as one goal to be undertaken by all Latin American nations in a joint effort with assistance from the United States.

Such cooperation in economic development might lead to one or more institutions of political federation among the Latin American nations. But whether or not this would be the case, we should make it known that we would welcome and will strongly back joint efforts toward rapid industrialization.

It is the absence of an imaginative concept of a transformed Latin America which makes the Eisenhower administration's new look southward so disappointing. Since Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S misfortunes in Peru and Venezuela last May, the administration has been trying to devise new policies. When President Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil tried to turn the dismay over the demonstrations against NIXON toward constructive ends by proposing a major undertaking in economic cooperation, his proposal was dignified by a John Foster Dulles visit to Rio de Janeiro. But any fault in the American response must be found in substance rather than in protocol.

In the popular fashion of celebrating any new governmental activity with a title in the Operation series, the new look came to be known as Operation Pan-America. A hemispheric conference of foreign ministers in September initiated a gathering in Washington in November of representatives of 20 Latin American Republics plus the United States, known officially as the Special Committee To Study the Formulation of New Measures for Economic Cooperation.

President Eisenhower encouraged the committee with a message of well-worn phrases such as "constructive measures," "concrete measures," "fruitful cooperation," and "we are determined to press forward." Participating State Department spokesmen kept the conference on a creative level with similar sentiments and more specific references to "practical measures," "problems already at hand," and "one step at a time." No new measures were formulated, but before the committee recessed—a working group was appointed with instructions to keep trying.

It would be unfair to leave the impression that the administration's new look has been or will be wholly barren. There are some concrete and constructive measures, though not especially new ones, contained in the special report submitted to the President by his brother, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower. The scope of what the administration has in mind is presumably to be found in this report, which was made public on January 3.

After noting that there is "a high degree of illiteracy, poverty, and dependence on one-commodity economies," and that the people of Latin America look to the United States for assistance in remedial actions, Dr. Eisenhower states that "heroic efforts are required" and submits recommendations. The recommendations are a basket of many things, offered in the following order:

Each American republic should establish a body of distinguished citizens to promote better understanding.

Latin American news should be better reported in the United States.

Activities of the U.S. Information Agency should be increased.

The United States should support a Latin American proposal for an Inter-American Development Bank.

Latin American nations should control inflation and create a favorable climate for private investment.

The U.S. Government should offer tax incentives to Americans investing abroad.

The Latin American nations should establish three regional common markets.

The United States should disclose information to commodity study groups without implying support for price stabilization efforts.

We should make a modest increase in the present $32 million technical assistance program.

Each U.S. Ambassador should have direct supervision over technical assistance.

General responsibility for the technical-assistance programs should be vested in the State Department.

The Latin American people should recognize that they have benefited indirectly from our aid programs in Europe.

A council on inter-American affairs should be created to advise the Secretary of State.

If we are obliged by internal political pressure to discriminate sometimes against Latin American countries in trade matters, we should inform them in advance.

We should cease bestowing decorations or other honors upon dictators.

This melange of some potentially important economic measures, possibly useful good-will committees, and minor juggling of administrative responsibilities falls short of the heroic. Unquestionably, Dr. Eisenhower, a man of demonstrated good will, earnestly hopes to promote more literacy, less poverty, and better understanding. But his recommendations lack the vision and inspiration which alone can evoke heroic efforts.

There is nothing in Dr. Eisenhower's report that suggests that he or the administration contemplate a major transformation in the economic status of Latin America, or any fundamental change in power relationships which would put our neighbors on a more equal footing. It would be fair to say that Dr. Eisenhower's concept is a nicer status quo.

Any program to lift Latin America to a significantly higher economic level by democratic means will doubtless require a large volume of public loans for the infrastructure industries. The administration's acceptance of the idea of an Inter-American Development Bank to make such loans, which it had earlier opposed, is a welcome move. About half of the capital would come from the U.S. Government; some loans would be repayable in dollars and some in local currencies.

The usefulness of the bank will depend upon the magnitude of its operations and the relationship of loan projects to a general development plan. Until now the administration has also resisted the idea of a general plan. Dr. Eisenhower's report does not foreshadow a change in this position.

Development on a major scale would also require a major infusion of U.S. private capital. A major private investment in the nonextractive industries is unlikely without substantial tax incentives in both the United States and in Latin America. Current administration views on this subject are sharply divided, but even the proposals for tax incentives thus far offered by those in the administration who favor them are fuzzy and fail to focus on areas where the need is greatest.

Commodity price stabilization, which Dr. Eisenhower in effect opposes, is unquestionably a difficult subject. A major part of Latin American exports, however, are unusually sensitive to such external factors as a U.S. recession. Unless the economies of Brazil, Chile, Peru, and Colombia, among others, can receive some protection against violent price swings, these countries are likely to be subject to severe and unpredictable economic crises no matter how bravely they try to control inflationary forces. Until these economies become more diversified we should give sympathetic consideration to stabilization proposals.

To the south of us circumstances are now favorable for a big step forward. Never in the history of these nations have so many of them simultaneously had democratic leaders who place popular welfare above personal ambition. Kubitschek in Brazil, Arturo Frondizi in Argentina, Lleras Camargo in Co-

lombia, Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela and Lopez Mateo in Mexico appear to be men of ideas with a high sense of dedication. Among these men and others like them may well be leaders who, with U.S. help, could collectively create a new age in Latin America.

Dr. Eisenhower has urged a more cordial attitude toward democratic governments than toward dictatorships. "Trivial as this may sound," he says, "I recommend that it be our official policy in relations with Latin American leaders and nations." It is a pity that he conveys an impression that the policy he recommends really is trivial. His single illustration of what he has in mind concerns bestowing medals on officials.

A policy of giving solid encouragement to the democratic forces in Latin America would seize the present occasion for initiating an undertaking which would be as bold and beneficial—and untrivial—in this hemisphere as was the Marshall plan in Europe.

## Who Really Desires a U.S.-Latin American Rift?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1958, I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives, House Concurrent Resolution 335, to establish a Pan American Parliamentary Association to be made up of parliamentary representatives of all the 21 nations of the Western Hemisphere. In my statement on the floor of the House at the time the resolution was introduced, I defined the purposes of the association as follows:

> The purpose of this organization should be to create better understanding among the peoples of the hemisphere, expansion of educational and scientific exchange programs, closer cultural relations, improvement in trade relations, encouragement of large-scale tourism between North and South America, help to provide relief in times of disaster, seek means to dispose of surplus commodities in the various countries to help their economies, etc.

In that statement, I also pointed to the Communist efforts to obtain a foothold in Latin America and to discredit the United States. I stressed the urgent need for the United States to help Latin America achieve a higher standard of living, and I concluded thus:

> We have taken the Latin Americans for granted, while pouring our aid to other parts of the world. A positive people-to-people approach in our dealings with our neighbors has been lacking. We must restore such relationship.

Subsequently, I made a trip to several Latin American countries in connection with my resolution and was received by heads of governments, as well as legislative leaders, with whom I discussed my proposals. The press of the countries I visited reported on my trip and the comments made by various leaders who hailed the purposes of the resolution as a great step in the right direction. For example, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of Argentina's Chamber of Deputies, Juan Lopez, was extremely enthusiastic about my plan, while the President of the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies, Ranieri Mazzilli, made a public statement in which he said about the proposed Pan American Parliamentary Association:

> It could mean a new stage in the relations among our countries, a new era of good friendship.

From time to time thereafter, because of my interest in Latin American affairs, newspaper representatives visited me or called me on the telephone for an expression of my views whenever Latin American problems arose. I saw such a reporter on March 2, 1959, after it had been reported in various newspapers and magazines that trouble was brewing between Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and the new Government of Cuba, and that threats of invasion had been made against one or another of these countries.

On this particular occasion I was asked by the reporter, who represented the United Press International—certainly a most reputable news agency—whether I favored armed intervention on the part of the United States in the event of such invasion. I stated most emphatically that peace in the Western Hemisphere "should not be left up to the United States alone." Then I added as follows:

> The whole idea of the Monroe Doctrine has been superseded by the Organization of American States. However, the United States has a large stake in maintaining peace and security at its backdoor and this certainly concerns such countries as Haiti, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic.
>
> For this reason, I think if there is a serious threat that any one of these nations will start an armed invasion, then the United States should take the lead in calling upon the other 20 members of the OAS to establish a police action to prevent such an invasion.

The above is taken verbatim from the UPI story as it appeared on the UPI news ticker of March 2, 1959, and which was published in various newspapers here and abroad. On March 3, Radiodifusora at Caracas, Venezuela, broadcast a vitriolic attack on me which was intended as a reply. Following is the full text as reported by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service, in its daily report No. 42:

REPRESENTATIVE ANFUSO HELD WIDENING UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RIFT

Caracas, Radiodifusora Venezuela, in Spanish to the Americas, March 3, 1959, 0400 GMT—W.

The U.S. Democratic Representative VICTOR ANFUSO said today that the United States should ask the Organization of the American States to intervene to prevent the liberation of the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Nicaragua. Such is the sense of a statement of another disciple of Foster Dulles. The Representative says that the OAS must prevent any invasion in the Caribbean by police action.

The impudence of this enemy of Latin America reached such extremes of cynicism that he added: "The United States should (play a bigger role?) in the maintenance of peace and security." And further on he said: "If a threat of an armed invasion presents itself"—naturally, he is referring to the Caribbean problem—"then the United States must take the initiative to call on the other 20 members of the Organization of American States to take police action to prevent such an invasion."

Such are the demagogic statements of Mr. VICTOR ANFUSO, Mr. VICTOR ANFUSO, Representative, Democrat, to the U.S. Congress, trying to (bring back?) a new intervention of the sadly famous marines, going back 40 years in history and (one word indistinct) to discredit even more, if it were possible, the foreign policy of the State Department. No wonder that the rift between the United States and our peoples is growing daily.

Mr. Speaker, when this attack and distortion of my words and aims was called to my attention, I was shocked and infuriated. The report of the Venezuelan radio appeared to be a deliberate attempt to create dissension and to discredit me as a friend of Latin America. No fairminded person could have so mutilated my statement, which a careful comparison between my words and the Venezuelan radio will readily prove.

I say, in all sincerity, that I profoundly regret this. If friends of Venezuela and of Latin America generally, people who are earnest in their efforts to create better understanding and mutual cooperation throughout the hemisphere, are going to be thus berated, then I fear not only for the future of Venezuela but for the future of all of Latin America and of the whole world to survive in freedom and democracy. We are waging a great struggle against an evil power which seeks our enslavement and the eradication of every vestige of human freedom and human dignity. This is no time for bickering. We must stand united throughout the whole Western Hemisphere, if we seriously want to prevent this hemisphere from falling under the yoke of communism.

To deliberately distort my words to show that I am preaching armed intervention, when in reality I suggested that the United States call upon the other 20 members of the OAS to prevent such an invasion; to call me an enemy of Latin America, when actually I am advocating hemispheric unity and cooperation to achieve a higher standard of living for the people of Latin America and I am urging greater economic aid to the Latin American countries, to twist my words in this manner and to make them appear demagogic could have been done only by someone who is not serving the interests of Venezuela or of Latin America, but those of communism.

Only a person who is steeped in Communist methods of falsification and forgery, in Communist propaganda tactics and the perversion of ideas, could do something as vicious as that. That person is not interested in creating better United States-Latin American relations—his interest lies in creating a greater and a wider rift on which Communist elements could capitalize for their benefit.

I expect to communicate with the President of Venezuela in the very near future and to request an explanation of this vitriolic attack on me, who is behind it, and why I was singled out for this attack.

## Pow-Wow on 40th Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 27, 1959, there appeared an editorial in the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va., entitled "Pow-Wow on 40th Street." This editorial points out cogently the efforts of certain elements in trying to brainwash our people into accepting integration. It also points out the lack of coordination of effort on the part of the people of our area who are trying to maintain constitutional government in America. The comparison is well demonstrated and I hope that enough of our people will read this editorial and profit therefrom so as to set up some cohesive and coordinated effort to get across to the people of the Nation the truth regarding the false propaganda being carried in many elements of the press and news mediums.

There also appeared in connection with the same editorial the minutes of the mass media committee of the Consultative Conference on Desegregation meeting on February 4. Our people are entitled to know what is going on and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I desire to include the editorial as well as the minutes referred to in the editorial:

[From the Richmond News-Leader, Feb. 27, 1959]

POW-WOW ON 40TH STREET

In the following article appear the minutes of a most interesting meeting held in New York City on February 4, at the NAACP's headquarters on West 40th Street. The document speaks for itself, and it should speak eloquently to white southerners.

Until this week, we ourselves had never heard of the "Consultative Conference on Desegregation" or of its "Mass Medina Committee." Inquiry this morning to the Associated Press elicited a few facts, drawn unwillingly from a reluctant source: The CCD is made up of about 40 organizations with an interest in promoting racial integration. The AP's source declined to release a list of these members. The CCD's "Mass Media Committee," we may conclude for ourselves, is charged with influencing newspapers, magazines, press associations, and radio-TV networks in behalf of the integration cause. In a free country, this is certainly anybody's privilege, and there ought not to be any particular secret about what these people are up to.

What are they up to? They are a busy crew.

They are distributing thousands of copies of a "Pogo" comic strip which ridicules Virginia's action in closing schools last fall. They are reprinting a series of pieces from the Arkansas Gazette and circulating some articles from the Washington Post. They direct attention to a pamphlet of the Urban League and a "workshop report" of the National Social Welfare Assembly.

Several special assignments claimed the committee's attention on February 4. A letter was at hand mentioning that the Associated Press and United Press International are engaging in "race labeling." Alan Reitman, of the American Civil Liberties Union, is instructed to talk with officials of the wire services concerning this matter. Evidently the committee had been unsuccessful in planting in Life magazine an article about southern clergymen who support integration. Mr. Reitman agrees to contact Life again. The busy Mr. Reitman also will call upon the New York Times to suggest a particular article there. The NAACP's Henry Moon is to push the same kind of stories at Time and Newsweek.

To judge from the waspish tone of minute No. 9, the famed Carleton Putnam letter is beginning to hurt. This was an open letter sent by Mr. Putnam to President Eisenhower last fall. Following its publication in the Richmond Times-Dispatch in October, the letter was distributed widely around the country. Subsequently, a group of Alabamians formed a committee to arrange for publication of the letter as paid advertising in major newspapers. James E. Simpson, attorney, 317 North 20th Street, Birmingham, is treasurer of the committee.) Mr. Putnam, who assuredly is distinguished though he has not described himself as such, had nothing to do with formation of this committee. In his letter, the New York-born historian, biographer, and businessman ringingly defends the Southern point of view on school segregation, and urges upon the President a reconsideration of civil rights agitation. The integrationists' Mass Media Committee finds the Putnam letter a problem, and outlines various schemes for undermining the letter's effectiveness.

There is much for the Southern traditionalist, believing in essential separation of the races, to learn from the minutes of this New York committee. Two points especially bear emphasis:

First, this is a coordinated effort. Nine different organizations sent representatives to the committee meeting.

Second, this is a professional effort. Reitman and Moon are not amateurs in public relations. They are pros, full-time people, and when the committee members meet on West Fortieth Street in Manhattan they meet within a few minutes' taxi ride of the top men in the communications industry.

What does the white South have to match this? Let us attempt an answer in one word: Nothing.

Organizations that believe in the constitutional right of the States to maintain racially separate institutions have no coordination of any sort. Conservative, right-wing groups as a whole have no unity or strength. We have no consultative conferences, no mass media committee, no skilled and personable representatives to call upon magazine editors and network officials. Is it any wonder that the South continues to take a terrible licking?

Let us ponder these revealing minutes more in sorrow than in anger, more in honest concern than in resentment. We live in a day of the pressure group, in which public opinion is molded like wax, and the grassroots are fertilized from a hundred artificial sources. It is high time for the conservative South to unstuff its shirt, put up some real money, and adapt the techniques of its foes to the cause we hold to be right.

MINUTES OF THE MASS MEDIA COMMITTEE OF THE CONSULTATIVE CONFERENCE ON DESEGREGATION WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1959

Present: Arnold Aronson, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Gunther Lawrence, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Henry Moon, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Alex Morisey, American Friends Service Committee; Guichard Parris, National Urban League; Alan Reitman, American Civil Liberties Union; Ed White, United Steelworkers of America; Chairman, Ali Bernheim, American Jewish Committee; Secretary, Harry Fleischman, National Labor Service.

1. Approximately 15,000 copies of "POGO and the Speakeasy Schools," a reprint of Walt Kelly's comic strips on that subject, will be published by the National Labor Service of the American Jewish Committee, the Southern Regional Council, the Anti-Defamation League, the American Friends Service Committee, and six AFL–CIO unions. Sample copies will be distributed to CCD agencies.

2. A letter was received from Herman Long, of Fisk University, Director, Race Relations Department, Congregational Christian Churches, mentioning that race labeling has begun to appear widely in wire service stories in the newspapers. It was agreed that Alan Reitman would talk with officials of Associated Press, United Press International and Editor and Publisher concerning this matter.

3. Reitman agreed to contact Life magazine again concerning a proposed article on the role of the clergy in the South in supporting law and equality.

4. The American Friends Service Committee is sponsoring a pamphlet on American Race Relations, which will be published by the University of Oklahoma Press. Agencies interested in quantities of the pamphlet should write to Alex Morisey, American Friends Service Committee, 1201 Chestnut St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.

5. The Southern Regional Council reported that it will reprint the Arkansas Gazette report on the effect of the desegregation controversy on economic conditions in Arkansas. Sample copies will be sent to all CCD agencies.

6. The National Urban League has prepared an attractive 11 by 14 illustrated pamphlet, "Half a Life," in connection with Equal Opportunity Day. Copies are being sent to CCD agencies.

7. The Turnpike Press has just published as a 24 page pamphlet, "The Truth About Desegregation in Washington's Schools," which first appeared as a series of articles in the Washington Post by Erwin Knoll. The series is an excellent survey of progress in the Washington schools and should be helpful in countering the vicious propaganda being spread by Governor Faubus of Arkansas and other southern segregationist leaders. Single copies are 15 cents postpaid; 10 copies or more 10 cents each postpaid; 100 copies or more 7½ cents postpaid; 500 copies or more 5 cents each plus shipping charges. Please order from the Turnpike Press, Annandale, Va.

8. A group of organizations in Miami, under the leadership of the United Church Women, have conducted a community audit in connection with United Nations Human Rights Day. Copies of the folder describing the community audit are being mailed to all CCD agencies.

9. Prosegregation ads have appeared in the New York Times, January 5, 1959, and in the Wall Street Journal, February 9, 1959, under the signature of Carleton Putnam, who describes himself as a distinguished New Englander. Putnam, a board member of Delta Airlines, has set up a Putnam Letter Committee in Birmingham, Ala., to solicit contributions to reprint his letter as an ad in additional northern newspapers. When a similar ad was placed by Louisiana segregation leaders in the New York Herald Tribune in February 1958, we urged CCD member agencies to alert their local units to such ads and ask them to check with editors and publishers about the problem. When such ads appear in northern papers, it would be helpful if southerners would write dissenting letters to the editors analyzing the misstatements and errors in the ads. Where such ads appear, editors should be asked to include editorials rebutting the segregation thesis advanced in the ads, or at least run

news articles (in the same issue carrying the ads) quoting opponents of segregation.

10. "Integration—A Challenge to the Social Agency," a 25-page report of a workshop conducted by the National Social Welfare Assembly's Committee on Intergroup Relations, features discussion of case histories in hiring Negro social workers, establishing integrated programs, problems of loss of financial support by prointegration agencies, achieving community acceptance, developing national and local policy on integration, etc. Copies of the Workshop Report are available at 75 cents each from the National Social Welfare Assembly, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N.Y.

11. Papers throughout the Nation carried an Associated Press wirephoto February 2 and 3, showing a lone Negro boy in Maury High School Auditorium in Norfolk, Va.—apparently shunned by his classmates. An article in the New York Post February 3 reported that the photo was phony. Photographers had beckoned the Negro boy up front and took the picture. A minute later the seats around him were filled and other kids were asking him if he could play basketball or football. By then the photographers had gone. It was agreed that it would be useful if editors throughout the country who used the photo would query AP on the alleged irresponsible reporting, and also bring this to the attention of Editor and Publisher magazine.

12. Alan Reitman agreed to suggest to the New York Times that it carry a story concerning the reactions of students who have returned to desegregated public schools from private schools and tutoring classes. It was felt that such a human interest story might make the comparison more meaningful, even in the South. Henry Moon agreed to suggest the same kind of stories for the educational pages of Time and Newsweek.

13. Members of the committee expressed great indignation over the way in which Chet Huntley had called for virtual suicide by the NAACP on his program on "The Second Agony of Atlanta." It was suggested that the February 8, 1959, program ought to include a genuine moderate, who recognizes the importance of the role of the NAACP in the desegregation issue. This, it was felt, could effectively explode the Huntley thesis that southern moderates were only awaiting NAACP abdication to rise up in their might to support orderly desegregation. NAACP attempts to arrange for the inclusion on the program of such a moderate were unavailing. (Fortunately, Roy Wilkins did such a tremendous job on the February 8, 1959, NBC program with Chet Huntley and Thomas Waring, editor of the Charleston, S.C. News and Courier, that he removed a good deal of the sting from the Huntley thesis.)

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY FLEISCHMAN,
*Secretary, Mass Media Committee, CCD.*

## Telegram From Eugene Castle to President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram from Eugene Castle to the President will be of interest to the Congress:

MIAMI BEACH, *March 8, 1959.*
President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Mr. PRESIDENT: Every loyal American applauds your promise not to give an inch in West Berlin. Our Government must not provide another inch of helpful propaganda for Khrushchev while he threatens war. All good Americans resented the propaganda tour of Anastas Mikoyan. We can never hope to hold our own in the cold war by fawning over Soviet leaders and their agents. The tour of the Bolshi ballet in the United States should be stopped before it starts. The ballet is a principal promotion weapon for the Kremlin. Following British Prime Minister MacMillan's experience with Khrushchev I also urge you to terminate our cultural exchange pact with Soviet Russia and to postpone indefinitely such projects as the fairs scheduled to be held in Moscow and New York City. We cannot expose ourselves to these propaganda traps that would help the false peace claims of the Soviets and disgrace us before the entire world while the Kremlin points a gun at our Armed Forces in West Berlin. It is imperative that this action be taken immediately to preserve our country's good name and as a mark of respect to the thousands of Americans who made the supreme sacrifice in two World Wars.

EUGENE W. CASTLE.

## A Challenge to Our Diplomacy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Dr. Albert Simard, "Pertinent Facts on the Aswan Dam," appears in the 1959 winter-spring issue of the magazine, Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

Based on Dr. Simard's letter in the Christian Science Monitor, the article, in the words of Dr. Simard, "challenges the ability of our diplomacy to develop a farsighted approach in regard to the Middle East."

I believe this article is well worth perusing for its factual content and timely subject:

PERTINENT FACTS ON THE ASWAN DAM
(By Albert Simard)

The Soviet Union's offer to loan the equivalent of $100 million toward the construction of a high dam at Aswan on the Nile challenges the ability of our diplomacy to develop a farsighted approach in regard to the Middle East. It is probable that the Soviet move will stimulate pressures here to have our Government participate in the financing of this project or other grandiose schemes. Besides the propaganda overtones of the Russian gesture, it is clear that Egypt's aim is to entice the United States to emulate or to outbid the Soviets.

However, if our Government shows prudence and realism, it will avoid the pitfalls which lurk behind the diplomatic maneuvers of the Kremlin and Cairo.

It is in the context of Cairo's imperialistic ambitions and its failure to substantially improve the plight of the Egyptian people, that the Aswan project serves as a gigantic political diversion for a bankrupt leadership.

Contrary to a widespread impression, the efficacy of the Aswan project has been challenged by authoritative sources. For example, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development asserted in detailed analyses that the construction of the project would impose upon the Egyptian people rigid austerity over a period of years and in the end provide them with a standard of living no higher than the one on which they now barely subsist. The Bank asserted that, if the dam were built, the pace of industrial growth will be slower than heretofore, and that "it seems probable that over the next decade or two the overall expansion of the manufacturing industry will take place at a considerably slower rate than in the past 15 years."

As regards the Aswan project's effect on the Egyptian agriculture, the Bank pointed out that even with an increase in agricultural income over the next two decades, "Egypt will no doubt face continuing problems in keeping pace with the growth of population. In view of the probability that the population by 1975 will be about 60 percent greater than at the present, there is little or no prospect that Egypt will have done much more than maintain the present standard of living * * *."

Mr. Morris L. Cooke, a consultant engineer of international reputation who has served the U.S. Government in high posts, has also analyzed the soundness of the Aswan project. ("Panacea or Politics?" by Morris L. Cooke, published by the Public Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C., 1957.) The following are some of the pertinent conclusions made by Mr. Cooke:

(a) "The $1,350 million high dam project would not, in fact, raise the present abysmal living standards of the Egyptian people."

(b) "The enormous cost of the undertaking would impose upon them a decade of severe austerity, during which urgent needs for social improvement and industrial expansion could not be met."

(c) "Construction of the high dam would invite disastrous inflation unless the Egyptian Government were willing and able to enforce rigid controls over the country's economy."

(d) "This the Nasser regime appears unable and unwilling to do. In the face of the World Bank's advice, the Nasser Government has persisted in a capricious 'development' program completely out of line with the realities of its precarious economic position."

(e) "Most striking of all is the fact that Nasser has so crippled the Egyptian economy through his arms-for-cotton deal with the Soviet bloc and his huge internal military budget, that it would now appear impossible for Egypt, with or without Suez Canal revenues, to mobilize the financial resources necessary to complete the project."

Mr. Cooke further observes that the project in its proposed context would discriminate against other states through which the Nile flows, including the Sudan, Ethiopia, and Uganda.

However, the decisive factor which militates against the Aswan project is the underlying character of the present Egyptian regime. In Mr. Cooke's words, the Egyptian economy has been undermined by "militarism, fiscal manipulation and political adventuring of the Nasser regime."

Thus, by its very nature, the Nasser regime cannot implement a sound constructive economic program to better the living conditions of the Egyptian people, and the construction of the Aswan Dam cannot produce any significant improvement in the economic status of the people.

Practical economic measures for the benefit of all of the people in the Middle East are,

of course, a high priority. Experts on this subject have been in general agreement that the nature of the distribution of the resources in that area makes it advisable that economic programs be conceived in terms of treating the Middle East as a unit. The validity of an overall approach was reaffirmed in the President's speech before the United Nations General Assembly in August, 1958. On the other hand, it has been proven that the Aswan project is not only of questionable economic advantage to the Egyptian people, but it also discriminates against the rights of other states on the Nile. Therefore, the national interests of the United States and of all friendly countries in the Middle East area would best be served by developing practical programs of aid based on the principles outlined by the President.

It follows from the foregoing that a hasty attempt to outbid the Russians in projects such as the Aswan Dam would, in the last analysis, only serve the political objectives of the Cairo government. These objectives contemplate the subjugation of free countries in the Middle East and the ultimate undermining of the U.S. position in that vital area of the world.

## Attack on the FBI—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the fifth in a series of articles by Pulitzer Prize winning reporter, Edward J. Mowery, dealing with the campaign to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The following installment appeared in the February 5 Newark Star-Ledger:

INFLUENCE OUTWEIGHS RED PARTY SIZE

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—One of the principal themes of the current anti-FBI campaign is the asserted weakness of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The party is pictured as a faction-torn "political" entity with no Soviet ties and "falling apart at the seams."

In short, the Communist Party is harmless both in ideology and accomplishment. And FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover is perpetrating a colossal fraud on the public in casting the organization in any other light.

A top FBI spokesman flatly refused today to disclose the Communist Party suspected membership (revealed in fiscal 1958 by Hoover as approximately 17,000), but he did assess the movement's inherent danger to the overall national structure.

Charge: The FBI continues to picture the Communist Party, U.S.A., as a threat to internal security when the party is falling apart at the seams.

The facts: Many misguided people still retain the erroneous belief that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a dying organization which no longer represents a threat to our internal security. They base their opinion on the party's relatively small size in relation to our overall population.

For every party member, 10 others in Communist fronts knowingly or unknowingly carry on the party's work. Party influence far outweighs its numerical strength and its leaders consistently emphasize quality, not quantity, in membership.

In recent years the party has been trying desperately to remove the stigma of its Soviet ties. But the Supreme Court passport ruling to ease restrictions on suspected subversives found a steady stream of Communist leaders and sympathizers heading for the Kremlin, the fountainhead of the international Red conspiracy.

(A State Department official said 702 individuals with some record of subversive activities have applied for passports since the Court ruling; 650 received passports up to January 1.)

Some were in Moscow for the party's "Extraordinary 21st Congress." Later younger Communist Party adherents will join the 17,000 delegates attending the July 26 World Communist Youth Conference in Vienna.

Obviously, these people aren't traveling to Moscow and Vienna for their health. They'll bring back new orders and techniques from their Soviet masters.

Charge: Factional battles within the Communist Party, U.S.A., have weakened its influence and rendered it harmless, but the FBI claims otherwise.

The facts: The party's propaganda and agitational activities suffered to some extent, dissident elements were removed and the national leadership solidified. However, the hard core of devoted Soviet followers at the party helm can still count to a large extent on full support from the dedicated Marxists who are not bona fide party members.

At present, the party is taking a nationwide headcount. They're registering mainly in Illinois, California, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan.

The comrades issue no membership cards or receipts for dues.

Here are some noteworthy results of the "dying" Communist Party's 1958 activity:

With firm party support, a candidate long identified with Red causes received 400,000 votes in a State primary for the post of superintendent of public instruction, although he didn't qualify for the general election (Holland Roberts, California, June 1958).

The party is infiltrating Negro mass organizations not to champion Negro rights but to exploit the racial situation, create unrest, spread confusion.

Communist pressure campaigns directed at the President and Congress to benefit the Soviets accompanied the landing of our marines in Lebanon, deployment of our naval forces in waters adjacent to the Red Chinese mainland and recurrent demands to seat Communist China in the U.N.

Even the tragic Chicago parochial school fire became a pawn for Red propaganda leaflets distributed by the party's Illinois district. The United States spends so much on arms, the leaflet explained, there's no money for new schools. The leaflet urged a shower of letters to Government officials to divert money from war expenditures.

Infiltration of trade unions is a primary and continuing goal of the party with stress on the vital railroad and steel industries where success would strangle internal security.

And one of the party's most deadly objectives is the formation of a revitalized nationwide Marxist Youth Organization now in the formative stage of development.

Charge: The FBI is an avowed enemy of liberal groups which seek to safeguard civil liberties. Like the party, they are harmless.

The facts: The Communist Party's influence, abetted by fronts, sympathizers and stooges, has penetrated every phase of our society. Fronts are methodically used to gain the support of unsuspecting citizens to further Communist Party goals. Unceasing efforts are also being made to infiltrate and ultimately control lethargic, legitimate groups.

At present, the FBI has approximately 150 known or suspected Communist and Communist front organizations under investigation.

The official Congressional Guide lists 628 cited Communist or Communist front organizations and 105 subversive publications; the Attorney General has designated 282 groups.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., remains today as it has since its birth, an integral part of the international Communist conspiracy. In evaluating its current menace it should be remembered that the U.S.S.R. currently poses a far greater potential threat to world peace than ever before.

Russia's scientific and technical capabilities have been thoroughly mobilized to enhance its military and political position in world affairs. And the seriousness of the domestic threat from a Soviet-dominated Communist Party in this country bears a relationship directly proportionate to the world threat posed by its master in the Kremlin.

To minimize the current danger of the American Communist Party to our security could lead only to ultimate disaster. The U.S.S.R. is now astride 800 million people, most of whom were not subjugated by force of arms.

(Another Government spokesman pointed to the recent coup in Cuba as dramatic evidence of the "successful technique of revolution" by a small band of partisans. Fidel Castro, this official said, initially raided Cuban soil in 1956 with 82 men, 12 of whom escaped in the first encounter. He is master of Cuba today.

(And while this is a Nationalist, not a Communist movement, "some Communists" have infiltrated Castro forces. Castro's coup, the official added, has painted a vivid picture of revolt for the "venomous, 'dying' Communist Party in the United States.")

## Poison in Your Water—No. 30

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Seattle (Wash.) Post Intelligencer, August 12, 1958, entitled "Report Tells Pollution at Seattle, County Beaches."

The article follows:

REPORT TELLS POLLUTION AT SEATTLE, COUNTY BEACHES

A comprehensive report on pollution at 105 Seattle and King County bathing beaches was received yesterday by Mayor Gordon S. Clinton.

The report, prepared by the sanitation division of the Seattle-King County Health Department, rates only 11 of the beaches usually good and 11 generally good. These are the highest ratings pollutionwise.

The list includes both public and private beaches. They are listed in eight classifications—Salt water, Lake Washington, Mercer Island, Lake Sammamish, North End lakes and East Side and southeast and southwest King County. The beaches and the ratings by the Health Department follow:

Salt water: Richmond Beach, not recommended; Carkeek Park, not recommended; North Beach, generally poor; Golden Gardens, not recommended; Alki, 53d Avenue SW., fair; Alki, 61st Avenue SW., fair; Lincoln Park, not recommended; Seola Beach, not recommended; Three Tree Point, fair; Normandy Park, no information; Des Moines

and Zenith, not recommended; Redondo, not recommended; Salt Water State Park, fair; Burton (Vashon Island), fair; Lowman Park, not recommended.

Lake Washington: Kenmore Beach (Ward's Resort), ordered closed, swim at own risk; Lake Forest Park, no longer sampled since found to be grossly polluted, no improvement since 1956; Sheridan Beach, no longer sampled since high pollution was determined; Mathews Beach Club beach, no longer sampled since high pollution determined; Mathews Beach, not recommended, Seattle Park Department has not developed pending sewers, highly polluted from Thorton Creek; Windermere, usually good except after heavy rain; Laurelhurst, usually good except after heavy rain; Edgewater Apartments Beach, fair; Madison Park, fair; Denny Blaine, usually good.

Seattle Tennis Club, usually good; Madrona, fair to good; Leschi, usually good; Mount Baker, fair to good; Lakewood Pl., usually good; Seward Park, fair; Martha Washington School, usually good; Pritchard Beach, fair to good; Kennydale, fair; Enatal, fair; Beaux Arts, no recent information; Bellevue, Chesterfield, generally good; Bellevue, Meydenbauer Park, generally good; Bellevue, Clyde Dock, generally good; Medina, no new information, still considered highly polluted; Houghton City Park, generally good, bacteriological counts running very favorably.

Kirkland, 7th Avenue S., generally poor; Kirkland, City Park, fair; Kirkland, Camp Kiwanis, fair; Kirkland, Marine Park, unclassified (newly established sampling point); Juanita, Forbes Beach, fair; Juanita, Shady Beach, fair; O. O. Denny Park, generally good.

Mercer Island, 97th Avenue SE., fair; Shorewood Apartments, generally poor; McGilvra Dock, should be satisfactory since sewers are in; Franklin Dock, generally poor; Forest Avenue, generally good; Mercer Island Beach Club, fair; Wormser's private beach, generally good.

Lake Sammamish: Gateway Grove, generally fair; Idylwood Park, generally fair; Smith's Beach, generally fair; Vasa Park, fair; Timberlake, generally poor; Sammamish State Park, fair to poor, municipal treatment plant remains potential pollution source; Alexander's Beach, fair to poor, initial bacterial counts running more favorably this year; Parr's Park (now Maggard's), generally good.

North End lakes: West Green Lake, fair to poor, closed by park commission; East Green Lake, same as West Green Lake; Bitter Lake, fair, not sampled in recent years; Haller Lake, generally poor; Echo Lake, Erickson's, fair to poor; Echo Lake, Ranch Motel, fair; Echo Lake, E. L. Motel, fair; Cottage Lake, Norm's Resort, generally poor; Cottage Lake, Bon and Ray's Resort (was Erickson's) generally poor; Cottage Lake, Cedar Grove, fair.

East side lakes: Pine Lake, French's, fair to poor; Beaver Lake, Andy's Resort, fair.

Southeast lakes: Lake Boren, public access street end, fair; Lake Kathleen, usually good; Lake McDonald, generally fair; Lake Desire, generally good; Shadow Lake, Heiser's fair; Shadow Lake, Foss' Resort, fair; Lake Wilderness, Gaffney's generally good; Lake Lucerne, Cherokee Bay, generally poor; Lake Meridian, Ky. Fox Resort, generally poor; Lake Meridian, Vista Park, generally fair; Lake Sawyer, fair; Lake Retreat, L. R. Resort, good to fair; Lake Retreat, Baptist Camp, usually good; Deep Lake, usually good, no late information.

Southwest lakes: Hicks Lake, fair to good; Lake Burien, fair in past area around lake now sewered, should be all right; Angle Lake, (A. L. Plunge) usually good; Angle Lake, Dreamwood Park, usually good; Star Lake Inn, usually fair; Steele Lake, King County Park, usually fair; Mirror Lake, fair to poor, no recent information; North Lake, North Lake Park, fair to poor; North Lake, public fishing area, fair to poor: Lake Geneva (Broomes') fair; Lake Geneva (Jardin's), fair; Lake Killarney, fair to poor; Five Mile Lake (Baptist Camp), poor; Five Mile Lake (Five Mile Lake Resort), poor.

## Tristate Rail Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the March 10 issue of the New York Times, entitled "A Tristate Rail Agency," which I believe should be of general interest to the Congress.

While I believe that some of the points made in the Times editorial require more study, the editorial as a whole is an able statement of some of the problems involved in the present transportation crisis in the New Jersey-New York-Connecticut commuter area.

Most important, I believe, the editorial recognizes that the problem is a tristate one, and will not be solved alone by the piecemeal proposals presently being offered—even though several such proposals should be carried through and will be genuinely helpful.

It is this fact, Mr. Speaker, that moved me to urge the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Government Operations Committee to initiate a study of how best the many levels and units of government in the area might best cooperate to develop a long-range solution. The subcommittee is ideally situated to make such a study, I believe, especially since its findings would be entirely nonpolitical and could serve as a case study for similar situations in other metropolitan areas of the country.

The editorial follows:

A TRISTATE RAIL AGENCY

Recognizing, as we must, the failures of the past to get a cooperative attack, joined by New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, upon the problem of the commuter railroads, we nevertheless remain convinced that only by such cooperation will maximum results over the long term be achieved. There was evidence yesterday in the New Jersey Legislature of new desire to revive a common approach to the problem. We believe it should be welcomed and encouraged by New York and that further explorations should be sought with Connecticut.

It is perfectly clear that New York and New Jersey have the major stake and the major responsibility; Connecticut would not want to be an equal partner in burdens borne, certainly, but she would nevertheless be a respected member of the team in making decisions and policy. The importance of the New Haven Railroad to Connecticut and its residents is manifest.

The problem of the railroads will not be solved by fiat, whether executive or legislative, or by a quasi-judicial agency. The problem runs deeper than equipment, or capital needs, and it will not be solved by tax forgiveness alone. It crosses State lines, and any authentic major solution of the Hudson River crossing that would promise transportation improvement, such as tying-in with the New York City Transit System, certainly requires bistate cooperation.

One seldom sees or hears a discussion of the commuter-railroad problem that does not yearn for involvement of the Port of New York Authority in it. This is inspired largely by flattering respect for the port authority's efficiency in coping with difficult problems. But the authority achieved this position of respect by paying its own way, by balancing its budget with sure income that made its bonds safe for investors—since it has no taxes to rely on—and by agreeing to undertake only what offered sound promise of being self-sustaining by revenues.

The heavy financing, to say nothing of work load on executives and staff, that lies ahead in waterfront development, in construction of the Narrows Bridge, in improvement of the George Washington Bridge and other projects leaves no room for accepting a multimillion dollar, sure-thing deficit operation like the commuter railroads. The port authority is not a community banker to be assigned to bad risks, or a trustee in bankruptcy for nearly defunct enterprises, no matter how seriously fraught with public interest.

This is not a job for the port authority, a good horse that some of our friends in New Jersey, for instance, and in New York as well from time to time, would be willing to ride to death. The railroads are a State job, as New York recognized in helping the Long Island, to be shared with the local communities according to benefits received. There lies the authority for tax relief; there lies the taxing resource if deficits are to be subsidized. And we say it would be better done as a tristate job.

## News Release Issued by Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, on the Discount Rate Increase by the Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Al Whitehouse, director, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, charged that the action of the Federal Reserve Board in raising the discount rate from 2.5 to 3 percent is "in callous disregard of the Nation's welfare, especially that of almost 5 million unemployed workers."

The IUD official added that the Board appears "more interested in the welfare of the Nation's bankers than of the Nation's people." He declared that this latest action will tend to brake "an economic recovery that is not yet fully underway."

He further declared:

I am appalled at this Federal Reserve action which bears earmarks of social irresponsibility. Only the other day, one of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors noted that high unemployment was causing the Reserve to move cautiously. Evidently, the Board has now thrown caution to the winds.

Two years ago, organized labor warned against the high interest policies of the Reserve. These warnings were ignored and

the recession that followed stands as a monument to a philosophy that subordinates the welfare of the many to that of a privileged few.

Industrial workers have borne the brunt of unemployment throughout the recession and during today's lagging recovery. They are again being made sacrificial lambs to a monetary policy that will further restrict job opportunities.

Tight money had an almost disastrous impact upon the housing industry 2 years ago and its return could once more deprive the American people of needed homes. There are reports that auto sales will fall below even the relatively low levels previously anticipated by that industry. Small business, just starting to revive, can hardly be expected to appreciate this new dose of credit restriction.

The Federal Reserve and the administration should have found out by now that they cannot fight the gray ghost of inflation with policies that restrict the Nation's growth and prosperity. High interest rates in the present situation make no more sense than baying at the moon. The major shortage in the United States today is that of jobs. The Federal Reserve apparently is more interested in the welfare of the Nation's bankers than of the Nation's people.

This most recent action of the Federal Reserve is proof of the need for broad representation on its Board so that it may become, in fact, a public system representative of American life, as urged by the AFL–CIO executive council. It is time to remove the people's central banking system from complete domination by the bankers.

## Report of Citizens Medical Committee on Health, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the report of the Citizens Medical Committee on Health appointed by Gov. LeRoy Collins, of Florida. This committee is made up of a distinguished group of doctors and other outstanding citizens and its officers are: Dr. Edward R. Annis, chairman; Dr. H. Phillip Hampton, vice chairman; and Mr. W. Harold Parham, secretary. The objectives as outlined by the Governor are:

(a) Care of chronically ill and aged indigents.

(b) Outpatient care of indigents.

(c) Coordination and maximum utilization of State agencies rendering health services.

(d) Role of voluntary health agencies operating in Florida.

(e) Maximum utilization of personnel trained in the health field.

(f) Additional areas of study deemed advisable by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for publication in the RECORD a summary of the report which I recommend for the careful reading of my colleagues in the Congress. The complete report and the charts which give much more detailed information are available upon request to the Secretary at Post Office Box 241, Jacksonville 3, Fla.:

SUMMARY REPORT—CARE OF THE CHRONICALLY ILL AND AGED; AND OUTPATIENT CARE OF INDIGENTS

To accumulate the factual data needed for sound planning the staff of the committee conducted extensive studies. Major findings are presented in the full report and the detailed data are in the files of the committee. There was an examination of population distribution and trends; a review of plans used in other areas for the care of chronic illnesses and for the provision of health services to the aged, and an examination of auxiliary home services now available in Florida. In the study of medical care the nature of outpatient services in one of the major cities was examined fully. There was a detailed investigation of nursing homes and their patients, the first adequate study of this type in Florida. This involved collecting information on 330 of the State's 344 nursing homes, also individual, personal, medical, and financial data on 6,298 of the 6,567 known residents of the homes. There was an even more extensive study of hospitals conducted with the cooperation of the Florida Hospital Association. Medical and financial data were collected on 8,474 patients in 114 hospitals located in 65 counties. These represented a cross section of Florida's hospital population. Additional data were elicited on 1,590 patients who remained in the hospital for 15 days or more. This was a cross section of the approximately 10 percent who are long-term patients in Florida's hospitals. Data on the present State program for the hospitalization of the indigent were reviewed also. In cooperation with agencies offering medical and health insurance, there was an exploration of possible plans for the provision of appropriate insurance to cover chronic illnesses and to meet the needs of the aged. In these studies there were the following observations which are particularly pertinent to the specific assignments of this committee.

*Population data*

Population trends indicate a Florida census in 1960 of 4.9 million with 9 percent (400,000) aged 65 and over.

Almost 50 percent of the men and 75 percent of the women in this age group reported incomes of less than $1,000 in 1950. (This economic measure does not take into account other assets or the factor of relative responsibility.)

State welfare recipients in Florida during the month of October 1958 in the four categories numbered:

| | |
|---|---|
| Old age assistance | 69,839 |
| Aid to dependent children | 26,171 |
| Aid to the blind | 2,540 |
| Aid to the disabled | 6,785 |
| Total recipients of public assistance | 105,335 |

*Nursing home study*

Information obtained from 330 of the 344 licensed nursing homes in Florida revealed:

| | Number of beds |
|---|---|
| 273 privately owned | 7,061 |
| 38 nonprofit (including church related) | 936 |
| 19 city or county institutions | 510 |
| Total | 8,507 |
| Nursing home median bed capacity | 20 |
| Total nursing home residents | 6,567 |
| Average age resident | 79 |

*Nursing home study*—Continued

| Religious preference: | Percent |
|---|---|
| Protestant denominations | 74 |
| No preference | 37 |
| Baptist | 21 |
| Methodist | 16 |
| Presbyterian | 7 |
| Episcopalian | 6 |
| Lutheran | 3 |
| Christian Scientist | 2 |
| Remainder (17 other denominations) | 8 |
| Catholic | 11 |
| Jewish | 5 |
| No preference | 10 |
| Mentally: | |
| Clear | 33 |
| Completely confused | 25 |
| Sometimes confused | 42 |

Incontinence of bowel or bladder or both occurred in one-third.

Less than 50 percent were able to walk alone.

The average resident had been in the nursing home 2 years.

The median charge for nursing home care was $123 a month, chiefly ranging from $70 to $500 a month.

The median drug cost reported was $15 a month.

Total nursing home costs analyzed were:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Patient and family | 22.1 |
| Social security | 15.5 |
| Insurance | 1.1 |
| Welfare, State | 22.6 |
| Welfare, county and city | 35.7 |
| Other | 3.0 |

According to the opinion of the operators or senior nurses of the nursing homes, about one-third of the occupants could be cared for in a home, if they had one, and if home nursing or other supporting services were available in the community.

*Hospital service for indigent program*

The Hospital Service for the Indigent Program is State-county financed and administered. Its purpose is to provide hospital services for indigent persons who are acutely ill or injured. An added objective is to stimulate all counties of the State to recognize and discharge their responsibilities for providing adequately for indigent residents. Participating counties are required to appropriate, annually, county funds of at least 50 cents per capita according to a current population estimate. State matching funds are available also.

In summary the activities of this program for the period October 1, 1957, through September 30, 1958, were as follows:

Effective October 1, 1958, all counties except Franklin, Gulf, Washington, and Okaloosa were participating (effective for 97 percent of State's population).

For the first 6 months of the current budget year, 10,483 hospital admissions, representing 101,020 patient days, were financed in whole or part by the program.

The average length of stay per hospital admission was 9.6 days at an average per diem cost to the program of $19.94 or an average cost of $191.42 per admission.

The average total cost for inpatient care to hospitals submitting data was $22.45 per diem.

For the period October 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, (three-quarters) total funds expended amounted to $3,056,782, consisting of $1,686,603 county funds and $1,370,179 State funds.

Of all patients 26 percent were aged 65 or over. There was also a concentration of nonwhite females aged 25 to 34 who were admitted primarily for delivery or the complications of pregnancy.

In a sample of cases in which data were obtained from the State welfare department 46 percent of those admitted were categorically indigent. The proportion varied from county to county; for example, in Pinellas County 59 percent were categorically indigent in contrast to 31 percent in adjoining Hillsborough. In only 10 percent of the admissions was there participation in payment to the hospital by family or relatives, charitable organizations or insurance.

Based on previous studies it is conservatively estimated that the value of physicians' services given gratuitously for the care of indigents approximates the cost of hospitalization.

*Hospital studies*

This study was designed to assemble information, including hospital cost, on a representative cross section of the total hospital population. Information was provided on a total of 8,474 patients in 114 hospitals located in 65 counties. Average length of stay was 6.7 days.

Length of stay of patients discharged:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| 1st week | 73.6 |
| 2d week | 16.6 |
| 3d and 4th week | 7.7 |
| 1 to 3 months | 1.8 |
| Over 3 months | .2 |

Nine and seven-tenths percent of the total hospital population remained for longer than 2 weeks. Average length of stay of long-term patients was 90.4 days. Average total cost of hospitalization was $183 per case and tended to increase with age. The highest average cost was for those age 65 and over. This study revealed that 40 percent of the long-term patients did not need the specialized care of a general hospital.

*Outpatient care*

Currently outpatient care is available only in the major cities. Hospital outpatient clinics were of substantial importance in making medical services available to the aged. In the area studied a relatively small percentage of those attending the clinics were categorically indigent. The remainder are classed as medically indigent by the social service department.

*Hospital insurance for the aged*

Sixty-three percent of the population of all ages have health insurance; however only 35 percent of those 65 and over are insured.

*Recommendations*

1. For the extension of the benefits of health insurance: through every practicable channel encourage the development and promote the use of voluntary low-cost health insurance which will extend benefits to the aged and cover long-term illnesses.

2. For reduction in the costs of hospital care in long-stay illnesses: the encouragement of the construction and operation of "limited service hospitals" in close proximity to major general hospitals to promote early transfer of patients from general hospitals and to provide efficient long-term care of chronic diseases.

3. For more adequate nursing home care: legislative authorization for the welfare board to implement a program to pay the cost of nursing home care for public assistance recipients, this to be provided by county, State, and Federal matching funds as outlined in House bill 1561 of the 1957 legislature; also encouragement of the active participation of religious groups in developing and maintaining nursing home facilities.

4. For accessible and economical medical care for the aged and those with chronic illnesses: the expansion of present' outpatient clinics and the organization of additional clinics to meet the medical needs of the indigent aged and the chronically ill, with such services coordinated with and fully utilized in expanding and strengthening the intern and resident medical training program.

5. For home care of the aged and the chronically ill: within the realm of existing health agencies expand and modify community nursing programs so the services of visiting nurses will be widely available; and existing welfare agencies to sponsor foster home care, and homemaker and friendly visitor services.

6. For extension of the hospitalization of indigent program without added State or county tax funds: continue program at present level of State and local support with authorization for extending benefits to outpatient care of indigents for chronic as well as acute illnesses; expand budget through the development and adoption of acceptable plans whereby Federal matching funds for medical care of the categorically indigent will be available to Florida administered as at present insofar as practicable (to finance the additional outpatient care).

7. For increased State and local responsibility for medical care of the indigent program: use every possible influence to obtain a release to the States of tax sources now utilized by the Federal Government for the support of health services with planning and administrative responsibility centered as close as practicable to those served.

8. For promoting positive health in the aged: develop a pilot demonstration in one or more communities of a total comprehensive health program for the aged with strong emphasis on the maintenance and enrichment of the health of the senior citizens, involving broad coordinated participation of the medical profession, health department, hospitals, institutions, and other community agencies.

9. For the accumulation of statewide budgetary data on health and welfare services: the evolution by the State auditor (in cooperation with appropriate county officials) of uniform budgetary accounting procedures covering public welfare, medical, and health activities.

COORDINATION AND MAXIMUM UTILIZATION OF STATE AGENCIES RENDERING HEALTH SERVICES

Information concerning the medical and health programs of 13 State agencies was assembled and reviewed in committee with representatives of the agencies concerned. These detailed reports, including budgetary data, are in the files of the committee and a summary description of the program of each agency is included as a part of the full report of this committee. The annual cost in State tax funds for these medical and health services is approximately $30 million. Local and Federal tax funds still further increase this total. Furthermore, expenditures for medical care for those receiving public assistance, with major support from Federal sources, has been increasing and there is no indication of a reversal of this trend.

The committee had particular concern with the provision of medical services at public expense. In addition to the State hospitals for tuberculosis and mental illnesses, six State agencies contract for medical care. There was wide diversity, rather than general uniformity, in plans. There was a greater variation in determining eligibility than deemed desirable. There was no uniform policy governing the selection and payment of medical consultants and hospitals. The more adequate investigation of the financial status of the family of patients in State hospitals is needed.

The committee was further concerned by the lack of definition of the role of welfare agencies in medical and health matters. The responsibility and authority of the public welfare and public healthy agencies for medical and health matters is not now adequately specified. The committee holds that services provided by the medical professions, particularly for medical care in and out of hospitals, should be the responsibility of the medically-directed health organizations. As a basis for sound planning and to foster even better working relationships, a clear definition of roles in medical matters is indicated.

In the matter of tuberculosis control the State at present is believed to have infectious cases which would more than completely fill all available beds in the tuberculosis hospitals. However, there are currently vacant beds. Moreover, in the State prison in Raiford, with present hospital facilities admittedly inadequate, open cases of tuberculosis are being cared for under less than satisfactory conditions. Particularly vigorous case-finding and follow-up programs at this time are indicated to maintain the progressive decline of this disease and through prevention to avoid the high future cost of treating this prolonged disease.

The continuing inadequacy of physical facilities, despite current expansion, is the notable feature in the mental hospitals, child training schools and the State Prison System. There is the lack of any special facility for the care of psychotic children.

The alcoholic rehabilitation program is a pilot activity rather than one designed to fully resolve a state-wide problem. Eventually other agencies will need to participate in the application of effective procedures. The present program appears to be arriving at a point where appropriate agencies—on a cooperative pilot basis—might with advantage be encouraged to incorporate specific portions of the alcoholic rehabilitation program within their broad activities.

Regarding organization of medical and health services in Florida, the Committee sees no serious disadvantage in distributing the responsibilities for medical and health services at the State level to the agencies now concerned. However, at the community level consolidation is essential for economical and efficient operation. The State has virtually complete coverage by well established county health departments which could be strengthened so they could provide broader services.

In view of the importance of accidents as the first cause of death in Florida for persons from 1 to 45 years of age, the accident prevention programs of State agencies were examined separately. There is much concern with work in this field but at present each agency is proceeding independently with its own particular activities. That the programs are not as effective as desired is apparent from mortality and morbidity statistics.

The committee is favorably impressed with the variety and amount of needed medical and health services provided through official agencies to the people of Florida. They commend the agencies for the generally smooth and effective cooperative relationships. There is no significant amount of unwarranted overlapping or duplication of services at State level. With a program distributed through 13 agencies there could be obvious imbalance but this was not evident. Despite these generally favorite observations, it also was clear that there are possibilities for improvements in organization and in operations. The following recommendations call attention to these and are designed to still further strengthen these very creditable medical and health services.

*Recommendations*

10. For the provision of medical care at public expense: central purchasing by the State Board of Health of medical care vendor services together with establishment of uniform criteria for eligibility for medical services at public expense, and the adoption of a uniform policy governing the selection and

payment of medical consultants and hospitals.

11. For the provison of medical services to recipients of public welfare: the assignment of responsibility for medical and health matters to the medically directed health agency with the evolution of appropriate interagency administrative relationships.

12. For tuberculosis control: an intensification of casefinding activities to identify and treat every active case of tuberculosis at the earliest possible stage of the disease. and for the best use of tuberculosis hospitals, a consideration of the practicability of transferring prisoners with tuberculosis to wards with appropriate security in a tuberculosis hospital.

13. For better care in State institutions, proceed without delay with the planned and needed expansion of mental hospitals, child training institutions and the medical facilities in the State prison system and establish a unit for the treatment of psychotic children.

14. For improvement of the alcoholic rehabilitation program: the cooperative development by the alcoholic rehabilitation program, and some selected local health department, of a pilot control program incorporated within the general community health program.

15. For the organization of medical and health services: no wider dispersion of responsibilities at State level, and at the community level an immediate effort to consolidate all medical and health programs for the protection and promotion of health, physical and mental, within strengthened and expanded health departments which would serve the local needs of the various State agencies on a cooperative basis.

16. For school health services: continue and strengthen the present cooperative program.

17. For accident prevention: the designation of a Governor's interagency committee on accident prevention to foster and coordinate all promising activities.

18. For the promotion of interagency cooperation in medical and health programs: the establishment of an interagency advisory committee or council to consider on a continuing basis interrelated medical and health services and facilities with view to their progressive improvement.

ROLE OF VOLUNTARY HEALTH AGENCIES IN FLORIDA

There has been a marked expansion of voluntary health agencies in the past decade. Prior to 1949 only 5 are known to have been active in Florida. Since that time State organizations of voluntary health agencies, with full-time paid staff, have been established in Florida at a rate of more than one per year. Of 19 known agencies, 18 provided data concerning activities and budgets. (Only the National Foundation failed to submit the information requested.) Detailed reports on the activities of each of these agencies are in the files of the committee, and brief summary statements are a part of the full report.

The people of Florida contribute voluntarily each year nearly $5 million for the support of these 18 agencies, and with the estimated contributions to the National Foundation, the total would be between $5.5 and $6 million, an amount equal to the total tax funds provided for any major statewide heatlh program. Each voluntary health agency has tended to develop a distinctive and independent program. Some emphasize research, others education and promotion. Provision of direct medical service is unusual. Cooperative programs with official agencies are common but there is little coordination of activities among the voluntary health agencies themselves.

The important contribution of voluntary health agencies in the initiation and promotion of health activities in Florida is warmly acknowledged by the committee. Likewise, the generosity of the residents of Florida in voluntarily making available these millions of dollars for special health activities is recognized. The work of the leaders who give of their time, with and without compensation, displays an admirable concern for the welfare of the less fortunate. Even though present activities are commendable, it is believed they may be strenthened. It is feared also that there may be danger to the voluntary health agencies through wholly uncontrolled multiplication of organizations seeking public supoprt, and particularly through the possible promotion of agencies with less worthy programs.

Funds provided voluntarily by large numbers of contributors for the support of the voluntary health agencies are regarded as the public's money. The public cannot see and appraise the results derived from the expenditure of their funds for widely dispersed health activities. Inevitably there is a degree of public uncertainty as to whether funds contributed are used to the very best advantage. Therefore, it is recommended:

19. For the protection of the public's investment and of the favorable reputation of the agencies: legislation requiring the issuance of permits by an appropriate official agency (aided by the guidance of an advisory board) for the solicitation of funds for voluntary health activities, with provision for public reporting of activities and budgets.

20. For more effective coordination of the work of voluntary health organizations: every encouragement be given to evolve a State Coordinating Council to facilitate interchange, to promote effective evaluations, to coordinate activities and to plan cooperatively with related professional bodies and official agencies.

MAXIMUM UTILIZATION OF HEALTH PERSONNEL

Currently 7,037 physicians hold licenses to practice in Florida and of these 4,585 are residents of the State. There are also 519 licensed osteopaths, 2,356 dentists, 14,443 registered nurses, and 6,059 licensed practical nurses. Sound scholarship plans assure opportunities for training in the major health professions to the sons and daughters of Floridians. In this State, as in most States, the troublesome problem is one of distribution of medically trained personnel. Placement services are maintained by some institutions and professional bodies. However, there is no central body with general responsibility for maintaining current data as to needs and personnel available. Therefore it is recommended:

21. For distribution and placement of medically trained and health-related persons to satisfy needs; that the State board of health maintain a central clearing house for placement services with the major objective of bringing together interested prospective employees and employers, and of accumulating and distributing information concerning openings for qualified persons who are interested in locating or relocating in Florida.

RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH

A statement of this problem was presented by the radiologist member of the committee and is a part of the full report. There is the problem of assuring a safe and effective use of radium and radioisotopes and of X-ray particularly as widely employed for diagnostic purposes. Education of the public and the medical profession is involved and special control measures need to be evolved. Therefore, it is recommended:

22. For the better control of the medical application of ionizing radiation: that there be designated a medical committee on radiological safety, a majority of whose members would be qualified radiologists, to serve as a subcommittee of the Radiological Safety Committee of the Florida Nuclear Development Commission.

IMPLEMENTATION

The committee recognizes that the improvements visualized in its recommendations may be attained through different channels. Recommendation number 7 seeks a modification of Federal legislation and outlook. State legislative authorization would be required to implement recommendations Nos. 3, 6 and 10, relating to the provision of nursing home and hospital care for the recipients of public welfare with partial support through Federal matching funds, including administration of such programs, and No. 19 requiring permits for voluntary health agencies. Three recommendations, Nos. 5, 12 and 13, involve State budgetary considerations. Others might be attained by administrative directive or suggestion, e.g., the last part of No. 3 and Nos. 9, 10, 17, 18, 21 and 22. Professional persuasion and interagency planning are the major needs for implementation of the remainder (Nos. 1, 2, 4, 8, 14, 15, 16 and 20). For all, the support of the professional groups involved and an informed public is to be desired. Therefore, it is recommended:

23. For the dissemination of factual data relating to medical and health services in Florida: that the committee be authorized to prepare for appropriate publication selected findings of importance to the medical profession, hospital administrators, health workers and the public.

## Advertising Most Effective Good Will Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, too often the functions of advertising are misunderstood. This is especially true in the fields of education and politics. Oftentimes sincere and well-meaning politicians and educators make unwarranted and untrue attacks on the advertising profession. It has become a favorite whipping boy for those who want to discredit business and enterprise in America.

As one of the few advertising men in Congress, I was much impressed recently by a speech made by the Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, a distinguished citizen who is well-known for his service as an admiral in the U.S. Navy and as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Secretary Strauss' remarks should be read by every student of economics, and by leaders in Government, too. These remarks present a clear picture of the relationships of advertising to the American system of free enterprise. Under unanimous consent, I include his speech as a portion of my remarks:

ADVERTISING MOST EFFECTIVE GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR

(Remarks by Lewis L. Strauss, U.S. Secretary of Commerce, at the annual New York conference of the Associated Business Publications, New York City, February 26, 1959)

Calvin Coolidge once said, "The chief business of America is business." If that state-

ment is still valid, then Mr. Coolidge's description also depicts the significance and the importance to the Nation of publications designed to assist business.

The more than 2,000 business periodicals with a circulation of approximately 40 million and a $540 million advertising revenue in 1958 constitute a tremendous generative force in our free enterprise system.

You are the eyes and ears of business, collecting news of value to resourceful executives. You also are the voice of business—bringing timely information and stimulating ideas to your readers who range from big corporation executives all the way to proprietors of "Pop and Mom" shops. Indeed, your specialized publications have well been described as the research department of small business.

For these reasons, as Secretary of Commerce, I am happy to acclaim your special service in the practical promotion of private industry. I understand that my great predecessor, Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover, initiated contacts with business editors and worked in close cooperation with them. I shall try to maintain the same relationship.

EXTREMELY VALUABLE PUBLIC SERVICE

Your publications already are performing an extremely valuable public service for the Commerce Department by creating abroad a better understanding of our American free enterprise system and its products. I refer, of course, to the thousands of copies of business and technical publications which you freely contribute to our numerous international trade fairs—from Addis Ababa to Zagreb.

Thanks to the publishing industry, a fresh, new library, numbering around 1,000 volumes of business and technical publications, fact-books and directories, is shipped with each trade mission. These become quick, authoritative referencee sources for Government experts and business executives on our trade teams, enabling them to answer questions about American markets, techniques, convention dates, tariffs and other information of interest to potential buyers and sellers.

One of the most effective American ambassadors for good will is the American advertisement.

European and Asian businessmen, women and other trade fair visitors gaze with excited wonderment at—to them—the unbelievable superabundance displayed in the ads. Tourists are intrigued by the pictures; students and authors gain an insight into the American way of life.

The Soviet pavilions at trade fairs generally have information booths but their supply of reference works and publications is meager in comparison with the U.S. exhibit.

Incidentally, in Poland not only were American periodicals eagerly thumbed through from cover to cover, but also every American city telephone directory was scrutinized line for line by the news-starved people, searching for traces of relatives and friends in the land of the free.

In your comprehensive collection of facts for business, I trust that you will find fresh sources of information in the Department's new series of economic censuses now underway. Included are: the Census of Business, of Manufactures, and of Mineral Industries. The Census of Agriculture, which is taken every 5 years, is scheduled for October and November of this year. Next year, we shall take our great Decennial Census.

And while on the subject of censuses, let me express appreciation to the Associated Business Publications for your active assistance, particularly with respect to the Census of Business. Your cooperation with us has helped to insure the cooperation of the millions of businessmen to whom the reporting forms were mailed. It is important for them to realize that this information is being gathered not to harass them but to help them.

Still another vital function of business publications that is becoming of increasing importance is the spread of genuine economic literacy. None can do this job better than you. The success or failure of growth depends primarily on managerial decisions made in more than 4½ million independent American enterprises. The more adequate and accurate the information, the more likely the wise decision. Yours is that opportunity of leadership—to provide the truth—the whole truth on our economy—thus benefiting sound judgment in economic planning and action.

RISING NATIONAL ECONOMY

I hope to contribute a few facts about the economy, which may be of some use to you in further appraising for your readers the recovery, the current business situation, and the outlook. Some of this data is new.

For the past several months, it has been apparent that the national economy is in the rising phase of a business cycle.

The total value of the Nation's output of goods and services—the gross national product—rose from an annual rate of $430 billion in the second quarter of last year to a $453 billion rate in the final quarter.

The American people's purchasing power is at an all-time high. Personal income in January was at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $362½ billion, $2½ billion above the previous month.

In retrospect, now that rather firm figures for 1958 are available, it appears that the gross national product for the year as a whole was very little below the 1957 record total. At $438 billion, gross national product in current dollars was virtually the same, and after adjustment for the 1957–58 rise in prices, was only 3 percent lower.

There seems to be a fairly general feeling among many economists and business executives that in dollar terms the 1959 gross national product will exceed 1958 by about the same margin that 1955 was above 1954—more than $30 billion.

How much the gain will be in real terms depends upon our ability to maintain price stability. It should be evident by now to all Americans—and especially to businessmen—that President Eisenhower, and we of his administration, consider this the most important problem that the American economy has to contend with today.

If the richest nation on earth, in the richest year of its history, refuses to live within its income and pay its bills as it goes, when will it ever get out of the red?

We have in prospect an increase in our population from 165 million in 1955—it is now 176 million—to 195 million in 1965. By 1980 the population may not be far below 260 million.

DANGERS OF INFLATION

I think we are well warranted in assuming—if we do not stunt real growth through runaway inflation or other blunters—that living standards, rather than declining, will tend to rise. This means that the demand for consumer goods will be greatly increased. As that dynamic market expands, production must increase to meet its demands and new jobs will be created.

Our long-range view of the national economy and its prospects ought to be a compound of great optimism and common sense caution. The outcome will depend upon how wisely the government and the people handle the temptation of inflation. The forthcoming expansion of the American economy therefore represents a challenge not only to those who formulate public policy but to the free private enterprise system and all engaged in it.

The prospect also offers to the business publication industry immeasurable opportunities of private and public service.

The keys to our continually rising standard of living are mass production and a high rate of technological progress. But in a land of vast distances and millions of inhabitants, production, unaided, never could reach the entire market. The progress of growth will depend in considerable measure on the pace and breadth of distribution. It is in this field that publishing and advertising supply a driving force.

This fundamental truth often is misunderstood and frequently denied by business-baiters. They like to cite Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, "If a man can make a better mouse trap than his neighbor, though he builds his house in the woods, the world will make a beaten path to his door." This, the pundits say, illustrates why advertising is superfluous. That is nonsense, of course, for if the successful trap manufacturer had the intelligence to invent the better mouse trap in the first instance you may be sure that he also had the good sense to see that the path to his door was well indicated by direction signs attesting to the virtue of his product and tied in with display advertising in all the media of the day.

One of my prized possessions is a copy of Weekly Observer and General Advertiser of Culpeper Courthouse, Va., for May 28, 1858. I prize it because it contains the advertisement of my grandfather who came over from Germany 9 years earlier and had saved enough money to set up in the mercantile business. As advertising copy it isn't much but it shows at least that my respect for the institution of advertising is inherited.

Government and business should stand up for the distribution factor of our economy. Last month, at the meeting of our National Distribution Council, an addition was suggested to be made to the objectives and responsibilities of the Department's Office of Distribution. The recommendation reads as follows: "The Department of Commerce should assume responsibility for disseminating an adequate understanding of the vital importance to our economy of the distribution process in all its dynamic activities; and to take appropriate action seeking to defend it against misrepresentation or attack, from whatever source they may arise."

You may be interested to know that on the council's committee of leading executives who drafted that challenge was your own Associated Business Publications president, William K. Beard.

Those recommendations will be carried out.

PROUD TO CHAMPION ADVERTISING

This is how I feel about advertising. To me it is more than a specialty; it is the bloodstream of healthy growing business. Think of a country without advertising. It would be drab—as drab as Russia. I don't mean just the absence of neon signs and lights and display. I mean the monotony of sterile uniformity. Come to think if it, one of the great differences between our system and the Communist system is well exemplified by advertising. For the significance of advertising is that the buyer has a choice.

It is the very ozone of the free air of freedom—the freedom to choose. "Buy my product," one advertiser will urge, "it sells for less." "Buy mine," says another, "it is more durable," or "king size," or "copper riveted," or "aged in the wood," or better than any one of a thousand different ways.

Choice—something the unfortunate dweller under communism never has. Somebody makes the choice for him—even the choice of candidates. There is no place for choice and therefore none for real advertising in a dictatorship.

Freedom of choice is as important as freedom of speech but in this blessed land we take it for granted. We ought to recognize it as the fifth freedom and advertising is the touchstone which proves its existence and its vigor.

Advertising stimulates competition, which in turn, keeps free enterprise vigorous. It

points to where needs can be supplied and adds stardust to humdrum living. As the average modern family budget can cover more than sheer necessities, advertising steers discretionary purchasing power.

The size, quality and news coverage of the daily papers, magazines, radio and television are made possible by advertising revenue. Naturally, the detractors of the profit system and the enemies of private enterprise deplore such commercialism. Some would even prefer government subsidy because with it goes the possibility of government thought control.

You, as publishers, and I, as Commerce Secretary, are proud to champion advertising—because its primary function helps our economy to grow and its revenues help a free press to remain free.

## Why Small Colleges Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, we will shortly have before us for action the National Housing Act of 1959. I have received many letters recently concerning the college housing program, which is a part of this act.

In these days when everything is inflated, and when bigness is a help in attracting attention, anything small is likely to be lost in the shuffle. It has been brought to my attention by a number of sources that the small college appears to be at a disadvantage in securing a loan under the college housing program as well as under the National Defense Education Act. The president of upper Iowa University, the eminent Dr. Eugene E. Garbee, has stated excellently the case of the small college in a recent letter to me, excerpts from which are as follows:

WHY SMALL COLLEGES NEED HELP

The recent refusal of a dormitory loan application by the Housing and Home Finance Agency prompts this letter. Your interest in the problems of the small businessman and your interest in the individual citizen and his personal problems are a very encouraging departure from the usual viewpoint on the national scene.

As you know I have been the president of Upper Iowa University since 1952. Since Upper Iowa University is located only a few miles from your hometown of Elkader, you are familiar with her outstanding record of service to northeast Iowa. This service, primarily to a local area, is one of the soft spots that some Government agencies point to as a reason for favoring a more cosmopolitan college. The fact that many smalltown and farm boys and girls want to stay near home, are actually afraid of the bigness of large colleges, who want to continue their education in an environment pleasing to them, should be a strong reason for the continued support of small colleges such as Upper Iowa University. You know, too, that Upper Iowa University is independent and has no church or community affiliations.

What is the size of a small college? In Iowa we have twenty-four, 4-year degree granting colleges and universities. Three have more than 5,000 studnts; 3 have from 1,200 to 4,999; 5 have from 800 to 1,199; and 13 have fewer than 800. Within a few years the number of colleges in each group will change, each is growing in enrollment. Right now, however, a small college appears to have fewer than 800 or a thousand students enrolled.

One major problem which we face is that of misinterpretation to the public of the aid received by small colleges from various governmental and foundation programs. The public thinks that such assistance is available on request of the college. The refusal to grant Upper Iowa University a second dormitory loan by the Housing and Home Finance Agency is an illustration:

"This action is without prejudice to reactivation and further consideration of the proposed project at a later date when the financial position of Upper Iowa University indicates the ability to assume this added obligation. This, of course, is subject to the availability of funds under the college housing program at that time."

Obviously we met the financial requirements for the 1954 loan. At the time of application, we had 232 students enrolled. A budget of $256,144.30 which included a deficit item of $50,141.11. A restricted estate grant for a dormitory from which we pledged $50,000 plus $25,000 for the bond and interest sinking fund, plus coverage of any charges exceeding the contract cost. We had an outstanding accumulated indebtedness of $146,389.26; an endowment of $368,786.22; $141,720 of the indebtedness was covered by a loan against the endowment. Apparently certain individual representatives of the Agency feel that with a loan goes the right to advise the administration on any or all problems of the university.

The Agency required that the charter be renewed and that the bylaws of the university be rewritten to meet the Agency's approval. This brought about a reorganization of the trustees which caused a writeoff of the loan against the endowment thus reducing the endowment. Subsequent sales of nonincome producing property has reduced the endowment to $136,128.76 as of this date. This attitude on the part of the Agency was further, very pointedly, made clear to us when we were advised not to invest our Ford Foundation grant in an addition to the Graf Hall on which we have the Housing and Home Finance Agency loan. I am sure that such a representative of the Government would not dare make such a suggestion to a larger college.

In June of 1958 we received preliminary approval for a second loan in the amount of $540,000 for a boys' dormitory to house 180 students. The 1958 fall semester enrollment showed an increase of 115 students over the preceding year. We were advised that our request would be strengthened if we changed the occupancy to 209 students. This was accomplished by placing three students in each room. Thus the basic plans were not changed and the estimated construction cost was unchanged. However, we were given a real going over on finances. In each conference we were repeatedly reminded that we had not taken the advice of their representative. Subsequently the loan request was disapproved as indicated in the previously quoted paragraph.

What was our financial position at the time of disapproval? On January 18, 1959, we had 476 students enrolled. Our present budget is $453,354, with an anticipated excess of income of $3,196 over expenses. Our accumulated outstanding indebtedness was reduced in 1958 from $142,786.66 to $108,618.48, a gain of $34,160.18.

Twenty-seven thousand of this is owed to 11 trustees; $18,300 is owed to the alumni association. Two new buildings have been constructed and are paid for. The Dickman Recreation Hall at a cost of $42,000, and the Colgrove-Walker Memorial Building at a cost of $400,000. Both buildings are income producing. The total budget is increased by operating these two buildings at the same time income receipts are increased, because of income from each of the buildings. As you can see the university has made astounding progress financially as well as in increased enrollment.

Being a small independent college without tax support or organized group support such as a church, must have influenced the Housing and Home Finance Agency decision.

Let me cite another example of such reasoning on the part of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. According to a newspaper account in October of 1958, 7 or 8 tax-supported colleges located in New York State were approved for dormitory loans to house from 196 to 210 students each. The approved loans ranged from about $850,000 to $1,200,000. Why? Upper Iowa University requested $540,000 for 209 students for a splendid building. One must draw the conclusion that being tax supported and large are very important factors.

What about the National Defense Education Act? The public across America was thoroughly indoctrinated that the act would solve many of the financial problems of the colleges and universities. Individual giving to the small college fell off very markedly.

In only one area does the small independent college have any chance at all to participate—in the loan program. However, the formula established is based on X number of dollars per student enrolled. Upper Iowa University submitted a request for $10,000, which was the actual amount needed by 32 students. According to publicity they were eligible for $16,000, or $500 each for the spring semester. Late in January I received a telegram from the agency in Washington informing me that our request was greater than 87 percent of the colleges in our area and "strongly urged" that we review our request to bring it more nearly in line. We had submitted actual needs. We received a total grant of $3,609, to which we have added $191 of our own funds. From this amount, 15 loans have been made, only two for $500 each. The State University of Iowa received $27,924. Our position is that the small college simply does not get effective help although the general public is led to think that we do get all the help that we need.

"A small college such as ours cannot participate in any of the other programs of the National Education Act for the very simple reason that the requirements fit only large, complex institutions. Our constituency does not know that. Therefore, they are led by the publicity to wonder "What is the matter with our colloge?"

The bills now before Congress purporting to make funds available to colleges for the modernizing and construction of classroom and other facilities on the college campus will, once again, make our problem more difficult. If the small college cannot qualify for an income producing loan, how on earth can we expect to borrow and repay money for improvements which add to our cost with no return? Once again, only the large and the wealthy will be helped.

The picture at the local area is no brighter. In Iowa each of the three large tax-supported education institutions has one or more active fund raising campaigns under way. The competition from this source for the gift dollar from the people in tremendous. The small college is virtually helpless to fight back.

In Iowa the State board of regents has authorized the three large tax-supported educational institutions to give a large number of "full tuition remission grants" to students. A conservative estimate would be as many as 1,200 in the three institutions. This in effect is free college education at the taxpayers' expense.

There is not a single representative from a really small college on a single government committee and very few on committees representing higher education.

The small colleges need a champion in Washington. I trust that you will be that champion.

EUGENE E. GARBEE,
*President.*

# *Appendix*

## Winning Speech by Jimmy Owens—"The Bill of Rights: Reciprocal Rights, Duties"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN SPARKMAN**
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently Jimmy Owens, a student of the Clements High School in Limestone County, Ala., was the winning speaker in a contest covering several counties. The contest was under the auspices of the American Legion. It was based on the United States Constitution.

Jimmy's speech was entitled "The Bill of Rights: Reciprocal Rights, Duties." It was a very fine speech, and I believe it will be interesting to all who may read it. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BILL OF RIGHTS: RECIPROCAL RIGHTS, DUTIES

(By Jimmy Owens)

The Constitution of the United States is a beacon that has lighted the hopes of men throughout the civilized world. For well over a century and a half, it has withstood the ravages of time. It is one of the most important documents ever conceived by the minds of men. Before nor since has the world of civil government seen its parallel.

The Founding Fathers who assembled in Philadelphia in the long, hot summer of 1787 knew that their work was an experiment; if this grand experiment were successful, it would herald the dawn of a new day of freedom for generations yet unborn.

The convention directed that Gen. George Washington should keep the records of the convention "subject to the order of Congress, if ever formed under the Constitution". These three little words, "if ever formed", illustrate how dangerously near we came to breaking up in the very beginning.

However, never was a project in more capable hands. The most illustrious of all statesmen were in attendance at Carpenter's Hall. Aristocratic Alexander Hamilton was there. George Washington, the savior of his country, was president of the convention. Gouverneur Morris, a financial wizard and great orator, often had the floor. Benjamin Franklin, America's senior statesman, cast his influential shadow upon the assembly; and James Madison, the most methodical of all secretaries, preserved for posterity the very words of this brilliant assemblage.

The Constitution itself stands as a monument to the ideas of that great son of the enlightenment, Thomas Jefferson. The document, like Jefferson himself, condemned tyranny over the minds of men. Its wisely constructed Federal system was a master stroke in governmental design. The Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, in his "Democracy in America," praised federation as the most effective safeguard of individual liberty. Its checks and balances ingeniously prevented a concentration of power. Article V allows for amendments and improvements.

All these things were wonderful, but they were not enough. Several States refused to ratify unless individual liberties were guaranteed. Today, we are, indeed, grateful for these holdouts, for the result of their struggle was the most revered section of our Constitution, the Bill of Rights.

The rising chorus of "Holy, holy, holy" wafting on the Sunday morning air, the chant of the cantor in the huge city synagogue, and the strains of the Ave Maria vibrating against cathedral walls—these are living testimonies to the freedom of every American to worship in his own way. Freedom of religion, though it is one of the most cherished privileges, brings with it the obligation of tolerance. How could we dare practice such liberty if we would deny it to others?

Our Bill of Rights guarantees no more important liberties than those of speech and press. For this right is the very foundation upon which democracy rests. It is the right to protest, to praise, to encourage, and to criticize. And yet it does not guarantee the right to slander. Every radio and television station, magazine, newspaper, and street-corner politician owes its very existence to this great liberty. It is the duty of all of us to use this privilege wisely.

How many of us realize that when the Parent-Teachers Association meets to discuss a youth center, when the Kiwanis holds its regular meeting, and when the American Legion assembles to plan its Fourth of July parade, that these activities represent a right that many countries of the world do not enjoy? A privilege like this must not be taken lightly.

Where else in the world do the people have the right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances? Many people have never even heard of this right; yet we are prone to take it, like too many of our other freedoms, for granted. It is not only our right but our duty to attempt through any legal means to rectify any unsatisfactory situation for which we hold our Government responsible. Grunting and groaning will not change a thing, we must be constructive. We must air our views, write our Congressmen, stand for our rights, and do our duty.

Under our Bill of Rights we may not be prohibited from bearing arms; yet the good citizen does not murder. He does not use arms carelessly. In this regard, he is aware of his responsibilities to his fellow citizens.

Has any soldier, sailor, marine, or airman of the United States been quartered in your house uninvited? No; of course not. Does an officer of the law search your house without a warrant? Certainly not. But our forefathers were forced to fight against such unwarranted acts. Colonial Boston was enraged over the quartering of British soldiers in the colonists' homes. They were subjected to humiliating searches by British officials. Yes; they were enraged. This, they could not stand, would not stand, and did not stand. Against this they fought, and we thank God that they won. Protection from such invasions is worth fighting for. The modern American citizen must not lose sight of these sacrifices made by our forefathers. He must manifest an equal willingness to do his part to preserve our freedoms.

The drafters of the Constitution, realizing the importance of the protection of individuals through the courts, added four articles covering this subject. In these four articles is embodied our cherished principle that a man is innocent until proved guilty. Colonial Americans had seen their countrymen accused of crime and carted across the ocean to be tried in an alien land by jurors whose impartiality they suspected. Consequently, they were very specific in indicating the procedure to be followed regarding those accused of crimes. The Bill of Rights guarantees that we shall not be obligated to testify against ourselves and that we may not be deprived of our property without just compensation and due process of law. Amendment 6 assures us a speedy trial before an impartial jury.

To be tried, an American citizen must be aware of the charge made against him, must be confronted by witnesses, must be given every opportunity to secure witnesses in his favor, and must be allowed the help of a lawyer. He cannot be tried twice for the same offense. In suits at common law, if the amount in question exceeds $20, he may demand trial by jury. We are protected against excessive bail or cruel and unusual punishments.

Do we as Americans realize the significance of these four short articles? Though they are brief, they speak volumes. We have only to observe the evidence of the mock trials held in the Soviet Union during the last few decades to appreciate the fruits of justice which we enjoy. We are obligated to be ever alert to see that our courts remain untarnished. We must be willing to cooperate with the forces of law, to serve on juries, and to help protect the rights of the guilty as well as the innocent.

The retention of local sovereignty is provided for in the 10th amendment, the last section of the Bill of Rights. This amendment nourishes the grassroots of democracy. On this principle the power and sovereignty of our 49 States rest. For it is at the State level that our people come into closest contact with our governmental processes. Throughout our history, the matter of States rights has occupied the attention of our most brilliant statesmen. Our own day offers no exception. This is a question that should concern and does concern every citizen of every State of this great Union.

Few are those who would claim that the Constitution with its Bill of Rights isn't an adequate foundation for our democracy. Abounding are those prophets of doom who claim that Americans no longer care about preserving their traditional liberties. Americans do care, but caring is not enough. We must be ever watchful for subversive ideas that would undermine the structure of our Republic.

A contemporary writer has said that "freedom is but one generation from extinction." He means, of course, that if the youth of America are not made aware of its heritage, its duties, and its responsibilities, then freedom cannot perpetuate itself. It is up to the older generation to see that our young people are instructed in Americanism, that they are familiar with the principles contained in our Declaration of Independence,

our Bill of Rights, and the other famous American documents that make up the basis of our law and our way of life. On the other hand, we as the youth of America are almost ready to assume full citizenship. We cannot afford to be indifferent to our civil duties. We must be courageous, sacrificing, and informed if we are to subdue the forces that would destroy our heritage.

This is easier said than done for the space age with its many uncertainties has complicated our roles as citizens. We have faith, however, that Americans will not fail to meet the challenge of our time. From Lexington and Concord to Pork Chop Hill, loyal Americans have given their utmost to preserve the traditions of liberty that have made us the greatest Nation on earth.

No, we will not fail to meet our obligations. We will agree with the words of William Tyler Page's "American's Creed": "I * * * believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

## Gen. Floyd Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the untimely death of Gen. Floyd L. Parks is a national loss, but is most deeply felt in South Carolina, his home State. General Parks and I were close friends. I was proud of the fact that we were both South Carolinians, both graduates of Clemson College, and both Army men. General Parks was outstanding in all three. He was a great soldier, a great South Carolinian, and a great American.

In view of his assignment as Chief of Information for the Army, he maintained close relationships with the newspaper people in the country. The esteem of one's associates and neighbors is usually most difficult to earn. General Parks considered Greenville, S.C., his home. In recent years he spent a great deal of his time in Washington. It is only appropriate that the editors of the Greenville and Washington newspapers have written editorials testifying to the fine qualities of General Parks.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the March 11 editions of the Greenville News, the Washington Post, and the Washington Evening Star be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 11, 1959]

GEN. FLOYD PARKS

Although he was not born here and, in fact, spent relatively little time here, Lt. Gen. Floyd Parks regarded Greenville as his home and honored the community by doing so.

During his long and illustrious military career, General Parks never lost the common touch. He was the least "military" general officer we have ever known, though admittedly that term is difficult to define precisely.

The list of his honorable service is a long one. He was Chief of Staff to Gen. Matthew Ridgway and jumped with the latter into Nazi-occupied Holland in the largest airborne attack in history. After the defeat of the Axis forces, he was commanding general of the U.S. sector of Germany and led the first American troops into Berlin. He served as head of the administrative arrangements for the Potsdam Conference in 1945 and was commended by President Truman for his work.

General Parks was best known to thousands of Washington newsmen in his later role as Chief of Public Information for the Department of the Army. In that trying task, he was consistently courteous and helpful to a degree—to use an old military expression—"above and beyond the call of duty."

General Parks was a graduate of Clemson College and his name had been mentioned among those being considered for the presidency of that school. He would have been an excellent choice.

His death yesterday of cancer is a tragic event for it cut short a life still filled with activity and promise for the future.

The State which he loved so well pays him homage.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 11, 1959]

GENERAL PARKS

Lt. Gen. Floyd L. Parks, dead at 63, had a distinguished career in the Army—in peace, in war, and in the difficult period which has beset the world since 1946. Both his competence as a soldier and his skills in the field of interallied administration were reflected in the many honors paid him by our own and other governments. But to newsmen in Washington, and indeed to many from other cities at home and abroad, General Parks occupied a special place of respect and affection. He did two tours of duty as the Army's chief information officer at the Pentagon and they were years of pleasant and productive harmony between that service and the press. On that level, General Parks was serving his country again in the finest tradition of a good soldier—an officer and a gentleman.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1959]

FLOYD L. PARKS

Lt. Gen. Floyd L. Parks was a fine soldier with an exceptional understanding of the importance of public information. This graduate engineer who served with armored and paratroop forces had a splendid wartime record as chief of staff at headquarters of the Army Ground Forces in Washington, as Chief of Staff of the 1st Allied Airborne Army in Europe, and later as commander of the 1st American Airborne Army and commanding general of the U.S. sector in Berlin. He led the first American troops into Berlin, helped restore public services in that devastated city, and made administrative arrangements for the Potsdam Conference. Afterward he served two tours as Army Chief of Information, as deputy Army commander in the Pacific and as commanding general of the 2d Army at Fort Meade before his retirement 3 years ago.

But these cold statistics do not tell the full story about a warm and able man. Floyd Parks had an innate sense of the situation, and his judgment, whether in command or in his information activities, was almost invariably keen. He was a valuable counselor who made his impact felt at top levels. He was an expert golfer and rifleman who also lover a good story. This flair for putting the Army's best foot forward was recognized in the fact that he was twice brought back to the Pentagon as Chief of Information. His credo, as described in the Army Information Digest, was a simple one which bears much emulation:

"Many people mistakenly think that the primary public information mission is to suppress unsavory stories or at least counter them with favorable releases. In reality it is not possible to suppress news, whether good or bad, and it is poor policy to tray. * * * Therefore if the story is bad, I admit it; if it is good, I try to see that the good points are known—and speedily."

In addition to the many military comrades who will miss Floyd Parks are a host of grateful newsmen who respected him as a good friend and ally.

## The Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, experienced newspapermen, from nationally known columnists like Walter Lippmann to publishers of country weeklies, like A. M. Secrest of the Cheraw Chronicle in South Carolina, have called attention to the failure of the Eisenhower administration to implement the Employment Act of 1946.

Some additional legislation such as the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act proposed by the Senators from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA and Mr. HART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and several other Members, are necessary to combat unemployment. However, as the Cheraw Chronicle has clearly pointed out, the administration does have on the books laws which would help increase employment if the administration only chose to use these laws.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the March 5 issue of the Cheraw Chronicle. This editorial states that—

For those, however, for whom private enterprise cannot provide, State and Federal Governments should work out a plan, perhaps patterned after the New Deal's old CCC

Thereby, this vigorous country weekly endorses the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and many other Members of the Senate, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVERMIND LABELS, WE'RE FOR EMPLOYMENT

There is a Federal statute known as the Full Employment Act. This law, presumably, would abolish unemployment.

We are not acquainted with the provisions of this particular law and cannot know, therefore, whether it, in truth and in fact, is capable of doing the job for which it is intended. We suspect, however, that, as is the case with so many other problems, there are ample laws to take care of the unemployment situation. What is lacking, most probably, is the will of the present administration to use effectively those laws already enacted.

Despite record-breaking prosperity, the soaring stock market, and all the other evidences of good times, there remains a chronic unemployment problem in America. It affects all sections of the country, but it is most apparent among the ghettos of the northern cities and in small towns and rural areas down south.

The effects of unemployment are felt right here in Chesterfield County. To shrug off the difficulty with the remarks that "there are always unemployable people" and those "inherently indigent" is a thoroughly inadequate response to a very real and cruel human dilemma.

It is up to private enterprise and the government to join hands in a cooperative effort to lick the problem. Failure to do so spells poverty for large numbers of our citizens—not only material poverty but intellectual and spiritual poverty as well.

For honest labor, whether it be painting a portrait, digging a ditch, managing a store, regulating an assembly-line lathe, or writing a best seller, lends a person self-respect, self-confidence, security, and dignity.

Much crime, delinquency, squalor and disease stems from enforced idleness. Furthermore, an area's economy and living standards decline when chronic unemployment becomes the accepted pattern. The more people we have making more money to spend on more things, the greater prosperity we all enjoy.

When you see lines of strong able-bodied men and women reporting for their unemployment checks, or crowding the offices of the employment services; when you observe stout-looking fellows hanging around street corners without anything to do, when you see empty streets and scantily-filled stores during mid-week, you realize the need for more industry to provide more jobs for the folks here at home.

While the white population is affected considerably by unemployment, the situation is at its most acute and painful among colored people. What a monumental waste of human brains and brawn one sees.

What we need is an ambitious cooperative undertaking, involving private management, and the State and Federal Governments, to provide useful work for those who aren't employed now. At a time when the economy of Communist nations is multiplying at a rate far greater than our own, it is sheer folly not to use all our resources.

There's still much want in this country. There are still great conservation measures to be taken, roads to be built, dams to be constructed, forests to be planted, swamps reclaimed, and civil defense projects to be erected.

We are opposed to putting men on leaf-raking schemes so long as there are so many worthwhile projects to undertake. The primary aim, however, is to put people to work, preferably in jobs near their own homes. Work secured in private industry is the ideal answer, and for that reason we ought to bend every effort to attract more risk capital here and bring in more outside industry.

For those, however, for whom private enterprise cannot provide, State and Federal Governments should work out a plan, perhaps patterned after the New Deal's old CCC.

Greater productivity creates greater real wealth, and such a program should, eventually, more than pay for itself. We suggest, furthermore, that bookkeeping problems should not be our primary concern. Solutions ought to be sought, and we should not permit opponents of full employment to use scare words, such as the much-abused and overused label "socialism," to defeat worthwhile goals.

## The Mikoyan Salesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles dealing with Deputy Premier Mikoyan's visit to the United States.

The first article by Harrison E. Salisbury was published in the New York Times of January 11, 1959, and is entitled "Mikoyan's Success."

The second article is one which I prepared for the North American Newspaper Alliance.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1959]

MIKOYAN'S SUCCESS—SOVIET VISITOR MAKES DEEPENING IMPACT DESPITE WASHINGTON'S HANDS-OFF ATTITUDE

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

SAN FRANCISCO, January 10.—Anastas I. Mikoyan brought his Soviet good will mission to the Pacific coast today. There were signs in each city that the First Deputy Premier has visited of a deepening impact resulting from his blunt words, crackling wit, and unfailing good humor. For a man who has spent most of the last 35 years high in the ranks of the Kremlin leadership, Mr. Mikoyan has displayed outstanding gifts of public relations. He has campaigned in Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, and now San Francisco with the skill of a veteran of the American political lustings.

In fact, his whirlwind trip has acquired much of the flavor—but few of the amenities—of a national Presidential campaign tour. However, Mr. Mikoyan is not running for American political office—not yet, at least.

He is running for peace at every point, in every city, before every kind of audience—before workingmen in the River Rouge powerplant of the Detroit Edison Co., before the bankers of Cleveland, the furniture salesmen of the Chicago Merchandise Mart, the lawyers of the Middle West. To every American he can reach with his message, Mr. Mikoyan is saying: Let's argue, let's dispute, let's compete, but let's not fight.

SEES NO GOLDEN AGE

He is not holding out hope of a golden age in which the capitalist lion and the Communist wolf shall lie down together. But he is saying with every modulation of his quick-witted Armenian temperament that this is one world and that Russians and Americans must live in it together, at least as peacefully as, for instance, General Motors and Ford inhabit the environs of Detroit.

Mr. Mikoyan's speech has not been completely uninhibited. But he has been saying the kind of things that Americans are not used to hearing from Kremlin spokesmen. He is talking in pithy terms of men whose names so long have been headline words in the United States—Lavrenti P. Beria, former police chief; Vyacheslav M. Molotov, former foreign minister; Nikolai A. Bulganin, former premier.

He is talking about these men not in the cliches of Pravda but in salty language of his own. And the American audiences, made up of influential business, industrial, and banking leaders, are reacting positively. Their warmth surprises Mr. Mikoyan and sometimes, it seems, even his listeners as well.

U.S. HANDS-OFF ATTITUDE

No Soviet statesman has ever attempted anything like Mr. Mikoyan's campaign before. In fact, few foreign leaders of any country have taken to the road in the United States in the manner in which he has done. Few would care to tackle the odds against which Mr. Mikoyan has been working thus far with startling success.

The way in which Mr. Mikoyan's campaign has developed has brought into critical focus State Department policy with respect to the Soviet visit. The State Department has maintained an official hands-off attitude, taking the line that Mr. Mikoyan is here on a private visit that must not be dignified by official arrangements.

It has accepted minimum security responsibility for Mr. Mikoyan's movements, but nothing more. It has done nothing to facilitate his visits to United States cities. It has provided no official host of liaison for his party. It has refused to offer advice to local officials as to how Mr. Mikoyan should be treated, whom he should see or what he should be shown.

Under the circumstances, the White House statement expressing hope that Mr. Mikoyan would be afforded every opportunity to see American life at its best has a somewhat dubious ring to correspondents who have observed the Mikoyan visit.

The fact is that Mr. Mikoyan is seeing a good deal of the United States and is making a decided impact on many leading Americans. But he is doing this in spite of the State Department.

The impression given to Mr. Mikoyan is that there is a deep split between official Washington, on the one hand, with its narrow definition of protocol and deep-freeze approach, and the attitude of powerful business interests of the country. In contrast to the Government, big business has acted with traditional warmth.

It would appear that the State Department once again was caught off balance by Soviet initiative. It seems probable that Washington, despite repeated advice from Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., Ambassador to Moscow, underestimated the force and vigor of Mr. Mikoyan's personality and the energy that he would dedicate to the cause of convincing Americans that it is time to end cold war.

The seeming discourtesy of the State Department, the constant harassment by Hungarian pickets and the erratic arrangements of the local police, who in Chicago spent more time fighting newsmen than holding back demonstrators, have produced a barrage of negative publicity for the United States in Europe.

Mr. Mikoyan's trip is being covered in minute detail by a corps of foreign correspondents. Many of their dispatches have been couched in acid terms as far as official America is concerned. And Mr. Mikoyan is getting the highest marks for ability to maintain equilibrium under trying circumstances.

Mr. Mikoyan's talks have not been a mere collection of platitudes about good relations. He has been advancing a consistent line for United States-Soviet relations. This is simply: Let us stop arguing about the past and concentrate on negotiating our way out of present difficulties.

Mr. Mikoyan insists that the Soviet position on Berlin will not be changed. But at the same time he has given repeated and clear hints that, like all Soviet positions, this is in fact negotiable.

With regard to United States-Soviet relations in the United Nations, he has said:

Let us stop making the United Nations a propaganda forum. There is no useful purpose served in rolling up majority votes against the Soviet Union. This settles nothing.

Instead let us negotiate. Let us seek to reach agreements. If we cannot get an agreement, let the question lie over for 6 months or a year while the diplomats work at it. Perhaps after a year they will come up with a solution. Meanwhile, do not bring the issue up for a vote, which may go against the Soviet Union but certainly will not solve the issue.

---

MIKOYAN'S VISIT SPELLS FURTHER SOVIET SALESMANSHIP ON TRADE AND BERLIN, SENATOR HUMPHREY STATES

Anastas Mikoyan's tour of the United States added up to:

1. A new chapter of Soviet supersalesmanship to win the American "market" of public opinion.

2. A signal of additional Soviet overtures to come so as to break the diplomatic impasse over Berlin.

In appraising the coast-to-coast Mikoyan tour, too many people jump to one or the other conflicting conclusions to the effect that the overall result was a success or a failure, that it changed nothing, or changed a great deal.

Actually, Soviet diplomacy is relentless and is based on the most intricate long-range planning. It rarely consists of "one-shot" trys. Successful or not, each step fits into an unending pattern of probe and thrust. That means, constantly feeling for weak spots and then exploiting every point which may yield to pressure.

Throughout his travel, the shrewd First Deputy Premier evaded, in effect, all the embarrassing $64,000 questions, such as the martyrdom of enslaved Hungary and what if anything he would concede as being wrong today in Russia. Instead, he seized the offensive and boldly sought to appeal over the heads of U.S. officials. His aim was a psychological breakthrough, especially on the trade, Berlin, and other key fronts.

How successful his effort was, only the future can really confirm or deny. But these facts seem evident:

(a) Mikoyan's deft public relations, his "soft sell" salesmanship did pay off in favorable reaction in some quarters. The fact which is obvious, now even to the Soviets, is that their traditional "hard sell"—bluster and threats—wins few, if any, friends or converts here. But some Americans do react to Soviet "soft sell."

(b) The Soviets may now be expected to offer a new alternative formula looking toward disengagement in central Europe. Mikoyan's comments at the luncheon of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations indicated that the road to any agreement on troop rollback from the Elbe is still a hard one, but that it is nonetheless a possibility which the Soviets are seriously offering.

(c) Mikoyan did bring home at least part of the bacon for the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which opens next Tuesday. Khrushchev, in dispatching Mikoyan here was, I believe, determined to be able to report thereby to the assembled comrades that Khrushchev and company are making some progress toward settlement of the serious Berlin crisis. I am convinced Mr. Khrushchev is extremely concerned as the May 27 "ultimatum—which was not an ultimatum" approaches for Allied forces to get out of Berlin. The Soviet Premier knows that the Allies remain united in rejecting the ultimatum, and he has somehow to get off the hook of his own making.

(d) Mikoyan did, I believe, considerably jolt American opinion in high circles. He forced the State Department to think through whether our old, tired formula of weak counterpunching to the flurry of Soviet cold war proposals will suffice. The vigorous, imaginative Soviet diplomacy such as Mikoyan represented can hardly be contested effectively except through far greater vim, imaginativeness, and initiative on our own part. But these are qualities which have often been conspicuous by their absence in recent U.S. diplomacy.

(e) Mikoyan has impelled American opinion and the American Government to answer the question of, "What, indeed, is our policy toward expansion of U.S.-U.S.S.R. trade?" To date, our attitude toward such enlarged trade has been neither "fish nor fowl."

We had better make up our minds whether (a) we, in effect, regard all such trade as needlessly strengthening world communism, or (b) whether we feel there should be such expanded trade aside, of course, from materials useable in military weapons.

We cannot underestimate how zealous the Soviets are to trade in heavy items, especially those like petrochemical equipment and pipelines, which are crucial to the success of their ambitious 1958–65 7-year plan.

This was an impression which I gained in my December 1 talks in Moscow with Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and with Trade Expert Kuzmin, whom Khrushchev had specifically suggested I see. Khrushchev went allout for trade. "We desire mutually beneficial trade, not gifts," he told me. "We trade with 70 countries. Our firm is a good one."

The Premier, however, did not hesitate to add that if we refused to sell various needed items Russia would produce them, anyway. "By refusing to sell items to us you do not prevent us from producing them; you simply cause a delay which we overcome because we are forced to rely on our own resources," he told me.

In any event, a priceless opportunity was, in my judgment, lost when Mikoyan visited the U.S. Commerce Department. There, we could have offered him before the eyes of the world a long list of consumer items which the Soviet people do desperately want (in contrast to the heavy industry goods) which alone interest the Kremlin.

It was Berlin, however, which was on Mikoyan's mind most of all.

Russia had confidently expected that her 6-month ultimatum would precipitate fissures and pressures inside allied ranks, but Big Four unity has held firm. Instead, there is evidence to believe that the threat of a May 27 deadline has, like previous Soviet saber rattling, actually caused alarm within the Soviet hierarchy itself. Among all governing people, the crafty leaders of the presidium are, perhaps, least of all willing to permit Khrushchev and company to risk an all-out war over Berlin or on any other local issue, however important.

Inevitably, the Soviet Premier has been getting more and more impatient for a Berlin settlement. "What are your counterproposals on Berlin?" Khrushchev had asked me, just as Mikoyan kept probing for some new formula and U.S. concession.

All in all, the Soviets feel that if the Mikoyan visit did set the stage for a U.S.-U.S.S.R. agreement on Berlin, it might establish a basis for further globe-changing decisions. These might bilaterally alter the map of spheres of influence. The implication here is: Let's you (the U.S.) and us (the U.S.S.R.) talk; just ourselves; no one else. This is a theme which I had heard repeatedly, in effect, from the Soviet Premier. But we are not buying it. The United States has no intention of violating genuine partnership with its allies by unilateral decisions without their consent.

For resolving world policy problems, Premier Khrushchev apparently divides people and nations into two categories: those with supreme power, or access to it, and those who lack such supreme power or access. He is interested basically in deals only with the powerful. He has no time for anyone else. "We're competing only against you, the United States," he told me. This was in the context of his pointing out a contrast between the Soviet Union and Red China. Here, he was referring to the latter's assertion that in 15 years, Peiping would surpass the steel production of the United Kingdom. To surpass Britain might be considered a feat for the Chinese Reds, but to the Soviets, there is only one big league team worth competing against, and that is the United States.

The "world series," so to speak, is the contest for the entire globe. It is a contest which the Kremlin would like to win peacefully through what I described to Khrushchev as its Operation Nibble. Khrushchev chuckled at the characterization, but did not refute it.

Peace was his refrain, just as it was Mikoyan's.

MIR—peace—is constantly on Khruschev's and Mikoyan's lips, just as it was on the lips of Russians in all walks of life whom I encountered during my week in Russia.

Khrushchev knows what world war III would mean, for during our discussion, he indicated in turning to a large polar map, a virtual East-West inventory of possible U.S. and Soviet thermonuclear targets.

But talk of the possibility of war is never too far from the lips of the Soviet hierarchy. It is determined to impress us with the fact that it is not panic stricken by the thought of conflict. Khrushchev, for example, told me, bluntly it will be war "if you attack the forces of the German Democratic Republic. We will not permit the liquidation of a Socialist state."

I do not doubt that Khruschev feels that his whole house of cards in Eastern Europe might indeed collapse if the very survival of the misnamed East German "State" were endangered. And that is one reason why he is determined to get the "Berlin bone" out of his "throat." For Free Berlin, apparently, does represent a critical threat to the puppet regime of Walter Ulibricht. The astonishing 10-year total of 3,500,000 refugees who had previously fled from East Germany through the Free Berlin escape-hatch is supplemented each month by an additional 20,000 refugees. How long, many observers have wondered, can a State like East Germany continue to hemorrhage in this fashion, losing its lifeblood—its people, particularly its top specialists like doctors and engineers?

Naturally, Khrushchev in his talk with me did not acknowledge that this embarrassing dilemma is the crucial reason for the Soviet's wanting so-called internationalization of West Berlin. Instead, Khrushchev pointed his fire at Allied occupation troops there, pretending that their presence constitutes a danger of aggression.

This camouflage of real reasons is characteristic of Soviet double talk and feint. Disguise, together with attempted outwitting—these are Soviet stock in trade.

It was not without significance that Khruschev recalled another memory from experiences at the key city of Kharkov during World War II. He mentioned how, anticipating the Germany onslaught toward that vital objective, the Red Army had laboriously built up extensive lines of defense. But a tour de force in Nazi strategy completely outflanked the defenses.

Khruschev has not forgotten that and a lot of other tricky lessons.

"We will outflank your NATO—it is obsolete," he told me. "We will surpass you

economically." And I believe that he is determined to do exactly that, particularly in the area of the world which has far too little concerned us—the emerging areas of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.

Yet NATO is not obsolete if it can be transformed from a straight military alliance to a fountainhead of free world economic, political and social strength. Therein is a key to U.S. success in competitive coexistence.

## Need for Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a thoughtful and informative editorial in the Medford Mail Tribune for March 1, 1959, entitled "NEA Points the Finger," has emphasized the fact that Federal assistance is needed in many school districts to avoid a ruinous increase in local school taxes. The editorial, written by Eric W. Allen, Jr., managing editor of the Mail Tribune has relied for its factual statistics upon material gathered by the National Education Association. My own experience with the NEA has convinced me that this material is fundamentally accurate and reliable. Mr. Allen, in his editorial, stresses further that since 1948 this Nation has spent only about half as much on public elementary and secondary schools as it has spent on alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and cosmetics. This is not an encouraging picture, but unfortunately it is the sorry truth.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial from the Medford Mail Tribune of March 1 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEA POINTS THE FINGER

The National Education Association is not exactly an unbiased outfit.

It is composed largely of schoolteachers and administrators, and is, quite naturally, concerned with the future of the schools in particular and education in general.

For this reason its pronouncements can be eyed with the knowledge that they come from a not-disinterested group, although it is a group which generally is characterized by high ideals, and a dedication to their life's work—which is as it should be.

That preamble is by way of putting in perspective a release received this week from the national headquarters of the NEA, which had to do with what it called one of America's national blind spots—paying for good schools.

The news release concerns a report from the NEA Journal entitled "Can America Afford Better Schools?"

Here is a sample of the eye-opening statements of fact contained in the report:

In 1902 the share of all taxes going to education was about 17 percent.

In 1932 the share was 25 percent.

In 1958 it was 12 percent.

The figures, coming from this source, can be presumed to be accurate. (The only qualification that immediately suggests itself is that in neither 1902 nor 1932 was national defense a major taxeater, as it is today).

The report goes on to present other figures of interest.

It points out that the Federal Government, with its efficient, streamlined collection system, collects almost 3 out of every 4 tax dollars. And it adds:

"Yet, despite the national implications of our brainpower race with other nations, it (the Federal Government) pays only 4 percent of the cost of public schools. Local and State governments pay 96 percent."

The NEA says there will be a 100-percent increase in the cost of education within the next decade. This is based on census figures showing the rising number of school-age children, plus the expanding birth rate.

And the NEA doubts that local and State governments can handle this 100-percent increase, pointing out that local and State debt has risen 182 percent since 1948.

Unless the Federal Government assumes a larger share of the cost of schools, it forecasts:

A 50- to 90-percent increase in real estate taxes in thousands of communities.

A 2- to 4-percent increase in sales taxes in some States.

An income tax jump of 2½ to 5 percent in some States.

An increase of 4 to 8 cents in cigarette taxes in several States.

This is a pretty dismal picture.

Can America, then, afford to double its school expenditures, no matter what unit of Government pays for them?

The NEA says it can. It says:

"The value of all goods and services produced by the Nation in 1 year is now $430 billion. That's 70 percent over what it was in 1948.

"Our national income is up 63 percent since 1948, and our personal incomes after taxes and our personal savings have increased drastically. Since 1948, we were able to afford $110 billion for new and used cars, $151 billion for alcoholic beverages, tobacco and cosmetics, and $127 billion for recreation.

"In the same period, we spent only $78 billion for public elementary and secondary schools."

We would like to see some authoritative, unbiased source either corroborate or disprove these figures, for they look highly significant to us.

Are we, really, spending only about half of what we did in the depression year of 1932 (percentagewise) on schools?

Have our incomes after taxes, and personal savings, increased drastically since 1948?

Do we really spend only about half as much on schools as we do on liquor, tobacco, and cosmetics?

If these things are true, then we, as a Nation, ought to be thoroughly ashamed of ourselves.

Does education really mean so little to us?

If the NEA's figures are not correct, then they should be set straight.

But if they are correct we can have both guns and butter—which in this case means schools—with less sacrifice than in 1932 or 1948.

Taxes on all levels and of all varieties have risen sharply. But if the NEA's statement is well founded, they have not risen as sharply as personal income, and as a result, a lesser proportion of individual income is going to buy the things that only government can furnish.

The most important of these, in the short run, is national defense. The most important in the long run is education.

## Inflation: A Matter of $2 or $3 Billion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and informative editorial from the Journal of Commerce of today entitled "A Matter of $2 or $3 Billion." It deals with the subject of inflation, and I think it will be most profitable for every Member to read.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MATTER OF $2 OR $3 BILLION

The administration keeps walking farther and farther out on that well-known limb with its every fresh assertion that the Federal budget must be kept in precise balance if this country is to avoid a renewal of inflation.

The fact of the matter is, barring the wholly unlikely eventuality that 1959 turns out to be a boom year of 1955 dimensions, that the 1960 budget is going to be unbalanced. A boom could produce enough additional revenue to put the Government in the black for fiscal 1960, but spending, regardless of economic conditions, is bound to exceed the budgeted $77 billion. This will happen because Congress will have it that way; because the administration based its every estimate of outgo on the happiest possible assumptions, and some of them are bound to turn out wrong; and because there is evidence of plain hanky-panky in some of the budget figures, such as the maritime subsidies.

Government leaders surely know this as well as we do, yet all of them, from the President down, keep warning of terrible inflationary consequences if there is a deficit, however small. They are doing this, quite obviously, because they hope to scare Congress out of voting additional spending programs.

But it would appear that the administration has never stopped to consider the fact that it is helping to create the very thing it is seeking to avoid—inflation—by this constant equating of a deficit with inflation.

The day of reckoning may come soon, and certainly not later than August or September, a few weeks after Congress has completed action on the last appropriations bill, when the Bureau of the Budget publishes its annual revised budget estimates. If the revision indicates a deficit, as we believe it surely will, the administration's response can only be one of two things, neither of them very pleasant to contemplate.

It can say, in effect, "Shucks, Mr. Citizen, Mr. Investor, Mr. Businessman, we didn't really mean it. A deficit of this size isn't really going to hurt much."

Or it can say, "Well, we warned you and now it has happened. Congress unbalanced the budget and prices are going to take off into the upper stratosphere."

Obviously, some version of the former, rather than the latter, is the line which will have to be adopted. But it may not be believed in the light of all that has been said in the past, and the financial markets,

business, and the public may begin behaving as though inflation were inevitable—thus helping make it inevitable.

Even if the public accepts the Administration's sudden assurances that all is going to be well after all, real damage will have been done, because no future warning of inflationary danger will be credited. This is no small point. In the calendar year 1960, unlike this one, economic conditions may be such that a balanced budget actually will be crucial to the prevention of inflation. And 1960, as everyone knows, is a presidential election year and therefore a year in which it will be difficult, indeed, to hold the congressional spends in line.

There are those (including one member of the Eisenhower Cabinet) who have chided us for not joining in the fight for a budget balanced to the last penny and asked why, as a conservative newspaper, we are not more concerned about the inflationary consequences of an imbalance.

This newspaper's unyielding opposition to even a little bit of inflation ought to be fairly well known by now. But as a conservative newspaper, we have always taken seriously our obligation to think straight on economic issues. It just isn't that to hold that a deficit of $2 or $3 billion would pitch this economy into inflation.

Such a hypothesis implies that the single factor which dictates the trend of prices is the Federal budget. Not so. The economy must be looked at as a whole and present conditions are not inflationary. It is an increase in the money supply, basically, which creates inflation, and the Federal Reserve—having learned a lot from its errors in 1953 and 1954—maneuvered through the late recession without allowing any important increase in the money supply and then pulled the reins tight again almost at the first sign of recovery. In addition, there is little reason to believe that consumer or business borrowing is going to expand to any dangerous extent this year. There is small prospect of any strong pickup in business spending for capital equipment until fall or later, and plenty of retained earnings in hand to finance what pickup there is.

In examining the inflationary impact of debt, it is the total of new debt creation that has to be looked at, not just the Government deficit. This is a fact the administration appears to have forgotten.

To be sure, the administration should try for a balanced budget because there is moral worth in pay as you go in reasonably good times. We agree with that. We should limit Federal spending because there is danger in constantly increasing the centralization of power in Washington. We agree with that.

We ought to balance the budget in 1960 so we can have a tax cut next year. We hope conditions will be such that we can agree with that.

Washington ought to stop telling us that the budget has to be balanced to the last penny because otherwise uncontrollable inflation will result. We know better, but many people will be persuaded if administration spokesmen keep saying it. And therein lies the danger.

## Safety in Operation of Boats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the real accomplishments of the 85th Congress was passage of the Small Boats Act, which seeks to assure safety on the water for the ever-increasing number of Americans who venture out on rivers, lakes, and the sea in their own craft.

An outstanding and thorough book which seeks to advise our countrymen on how to operate and navigate boats has been written by a talented constituent of mine, Mrs. Enid Wolf, of Portland, wife of Professor Ray Wolf, of the faculty of Portland State College.

Mrs. Wolf's book is entitled "A-Boating We Will Go." It is published by the McGraw-Hill Book Co., of New York City. Mrs. Wolf's volume was capably reviewed in the Portland Oregonian of October 20, 1958, by Lawrence Barber, veteran marine editor of that daily newspaper. Because of our great interest in assuring safety on the high seas and on lesser water routes for the owners of pleasure and commercial boats, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Barber's review of Enid Wolf's book be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANUAL ABOUT BOATING PUBLISHED

(By Lawrence Barber)

After several years of pleasure boating, Enid Wolf, of Portland, compiled a how-to-do-it manual which is being published this month by the McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, under the title "A-Boating We Will Go."

Addressed to new boating families, and particularly to the first mates in these families, Mrs. Wolf's work delves into many of the little problems which face people who have just acquired their first boat.

Mrs. Wolf and her husband, Ray, a professor at Portland State College, acquired a 14-foot boat and outboard motor which they mounted on a trailer and towed off to alluring lakes, bays, streams, and sounds of the Pacific Northwest. But they hankered for a larger craft—say about 22 feet in length—with facilities for cooking meals, sleeping, and living comfortably afloat.

MANY BOATERS SEEN

Through the medium of the boat, the Wolfs met many dyed-in-the-wool boating people of Portland and vicinity, and they enrolled in the Portland Power Squadron's classes in piloting to learn all they could. Enid eventually became an active member of the Lady Pilots, the squadron's auxiliary, and she now is its secretary. They live at 4035 NE. 70th Ave.

When the inspiration to write a book on family boating overcame Mrs. Wolf, she turned to her new-found friends for much of the material. She wrote letters all over the Nation, especially to the commanders of power squadrons and members of auxiliaries, to gather together suggestions, recipes and experiences. So "A-Boating We Will Go" has a national as well as local scope, although many Portland boaters find themselves mentioned.

The book is slanted toward living and cruising in a 22-foot cruiser, which is about as small as a family of four can comfortably and safely get along with. To make the story more savory, Mrs. Wolf created a family of four, the Patricks—Ed, Sally, Bill, and Sue—who are typical of many Portland families now a-boating. She takes this family through 336 pages of do's and don'ts, a new language, tips on stowage and built-ins, cabin decor and conveniences, clothing, safety afloat, cruise planning, piloting and seamanship.

MISTAKES NOTED

She points out the awful mistakes of another imaginery boating family, the Marstens, who started out on their first cruise without giving thought to numerous mistakes that could be made in their first hour afloat. This family soon was back at the wharf utterly disgusted and confused.

"It's like trying to drive a car at high speed down a crowded highway without ever before having had hands on the wheel," the author notes.

One of the choicest sections in the book is given to food service—meals that can be prepared at home to take to the boat, meals that can be prepared on the boat for a small group, and meals that can be prepared on the beach for a large party.

Sketches throughout the text illustrate such diverse subjects as cabin arrangements, artificial respiration, knots and piloting problems.

## Meyer Berger, a Giant Among Journalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the real giants of the fourth estate recently passed away. He was Meyer Berger, the skilled, knowledgeable, and human newsman of the New York Times. Better than any other man, he captured the sights and sounds, the heart and heartaches, of the city of New York. He managed to infuse into his writing the same warmth which characterized the man himself.

Shirley Povich, the able and well-informed columnist of the Washington Post, who possesses many of Meyer Berger's fine characteristics, epitomized Mr. Berger's qualities in his moving and effective column of February 12, which has been inserted in the RECORD by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD. The Post of February 11, published a fine editorial about Mr. Berger which also describes well the special place he held in the hearts and minds of his fellow reporters.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTER'S REPORTER

In city rooms across the country—where the ersatz is invariably given short shrift—the reputation of Meyer Berger has long held a special magic for newspapermen, young and old. Until his death on Sunday at 60, Mr. Berger seemed as much a fixture of the New York Times as the motto pledging all the news fit to print. Many of Mr. Berger's human interest stories were not only fit to print but also became known as classics of their kind because he was able to infuse such warmth and insight even into the most outwardly mundane local happening.

One reason for his success was that he retained the inquisitiveness of a cub reporter while his inborn gentleness shielded him from the arrogance which can be a journalist's worst occupational vice. Combined with this was a vivacity of style that placed Mr.

Berger among that small group of newspapermen who have become legend in their craft, writers like Robert J. Casey of the old Chicago Daily News, Richard S. Davis of the Milwaukee Journal, and Ray Sprigle of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette.

There remains an anecdote. In 1950, Mr. Berger won the Pulitzer Prize for his report of the day that Howard Unruh ran amuck in New Jersey, killing 13 persons. In its obituary, the New York Times adds: "Only one or two intimates ever knew that Mr. Berger sent his $1,000 prize money to the mother of the 28-year-old killer." Mike Berger's spirit as well as his pen will be missed.

## Death of Former Senator Joseph F. Guffey, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last Friday, March 6, a distinguished Pennsylvanian and a long-time former Member of the Senate, Joseph F. Guffey, died at the age of 88. A number of Pennsylvania newspapers, and also newspapers in Washington, where Senator Guffey lived during his declining years, published biographies of this stanch Democrat and fine American.

I ask unanimous consent that articles relating to Mr. Guffey and published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Philadelphia Bulletin, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, and Washington Evening Star be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Mar. 7, 1959]

JOSEPH GUFFEY IS DEAD AT 88

Former Senator Joseph F. Guffey, 88, Democratic stalwart of New Deal days, died last night of a heart ailment in Doctors Hospital, Washington.

Guffey, only Pennsylvania Democrat to serve two Senate terms, was a power in the State's politics for decades.

Born in Westmoreland County, he spent most of his life in Pittsburgh, but lived in Washington since losing to former Senator Edward Martin in the 1946 GOP landslide.

Guffey's political ascension began in 1912 with a gamble that paid off.

Breaking with his uncle, Col. J. M. Guffey, veteran Pennsylvania Democratic leader, he backed his former Princeton University professor, Woodrow Wilson, for President.

Wilson's nomination and election established Guffey as a power in the Democratic Party.

During his years in the Senate from 1934 to 1947, he was one of President Roosevelt's strongest backers, describing himself as "a 100-percent Roosevelt man."

As Democratic national committeeman from Pennsylvania, he helped swing the first nomination of F.D.R. He also backed a fourth term for Roosevelt in 1944.

He defeated the late Senator David A. Reed for his first Senate term, and was reelected in 1940. He had a record of never opposing an item of New Deal legislation.

Guffey was best known for sponsoring a bituminous coal stabilization bill, known as the Guffey Coal Act.

The original act, which fixed prices, was voided by the Supreme Court. A subsequent measure was passed in a form that satisfied the Court.

In May 1941 Guffey urged Navy convoys for submarine-threatened merchant ships en route to Britain.

Guffey was at Princeton between 1890 and 1892. His first job was with the Post Office Department.

Then he held a string of executive positions with various oil and utility companies, rising to president of Guffey-Gillespie Oil Co., Atlantic Gulf Co., and the Columbia Syndicate.

Guffey began his long service on the Democratic National Committee in 1920. He battled Governor Lawrence during much of his career for control of the State Democratic organization.

Guffey was born in Guffey's Station. His father, John, was then sheriff of Westmoreland County. Guffey once said:

"I grew up in politics. There was a time when there were 31 Guffeys of voting age—all Democrats and voting in the same precinct."

He was a bachelor, and is survived only by his sister, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, with whom he made his home in Washington.

Guffey once summed up his feelings by quoting Senator Par Harrison of Mississippi:

"I love my party better than anything in the world except my country."

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Mar. 17, 1959]

SENATOR GUFFEY DIES AT 88; WAS ARDENT NEW DEALER

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Joseph F. Guffey, Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania from 1935 to 1947, died last night following a heart attack. He was 88.

Mr. Guffey, an ardent New Dealer, was elected on the one-sentence campaign slogan: "I will be 100 percent with F.D.R." He backed a fourth term for President Roosevelt in 1944.

The ex-Senator was taken to Doctors Hospital yesterday afternoon. He has lived here quietly since leaving the Senate.

Relatives said he had been having heart trouble for the last 2 weeks but was thought to have been recovering. He suffered a relapse and was taken to the hospital yesterday afternoon. Death occurred at 7:40 last night.

Guffey is survived by a sister, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller.

BACKED WILSON

Politics was a lifelong hobby as well as a career for Mr. Guffey. He was a powerful figure in Democratic politics, both in Pennsylvania and nationally, starting in 1912 when he took a political gamble—that paid off—in backing Woodrow Wilson for the presidential nomination.

His own career reached its peak around 1940, when he was elected to a second term to the Senate. In 1946, a Republican landslide year, he was defeated for reelection by Edward Martin.

Mr. Guffey had an abruptness of speech and a manner which made it clear he was no backslapper. He habitually dressed like the picture of a conservative banker, including a vest with white piping. Yet he knew the value of friendly relations with his constituents, and was known to many of them as Joe.

Mr. Guffey had investments in oil and other things which brought him a comfortable income, once estimated at $50,000 a year. He virtually dropped from sight after his 1946 defeat.

LED DELEGATION

Funeral services will be held in his Washington apartment at 4 p.m. Monday, with burial Tuesday afternoon at the same hour in the family vault at West Newton Cemetery, West Newton, Pa.

He was born at Guffey's Station, near Pittsburgh.

His first big political success came in bucking his uncle and sponsor, Col. J. M. Guffey, to back Wilson for the Democratic nomination. The colonel favored Champ Clark, of Missouri.

Young Guffey won the day, and got a majority of the Pennsylvania delegation to back Wilson.

By 1920 he was a Democratic national committeeman. In 1924 and 1928 he lined up the Pennsylvania convention delegations behind Alfred E. Smith, of New York.

BROKE 58-YEAR STRING

But in 1932, the future Senator took another shrewd gamble that paid off. He quietly switched his allegiance to Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt didn't forget.

Two years later Mr. Guffey was elected Senator from Pennsylvania—the State's first Democratic Senator in 58 years. In 1936 he helped swing the whole State into the Democratic column in the presidential election.

After the Pearl Harbor attack, Senator Guffey declared that the fighting vindicated Wilson's League of Nations peace plan.

After World War II, Mr. Guffey spoke out frequently against the world's dictators. He opposed the sale of five transport planes to Franco's Spain and urged the Government to break diplomatic relations with Peron's Argentina.

He studied at but did not graduate from Princeton University between 1890 and 1892. His first job was with the Post Office Department.

After that he held a string of executive positions with various oil and utilities firms, rising to president of Guffey-Gillespie Oil Co., Atlantic Gulf Co. and the Columbia Syndicate.

Between the First and Second World Wars, Mr. Guffey served in the Petroleum Service Division of the War Industries Board and directed the Bureau of Sales in the Alien Property Custodian's office.

During his long service on the Democratic National Committee, he battled David Lawrence, now Governor, for control of the Pennsylvania Democratic organization.

He was known principally in the Senate not as an innovator but as a party wheelhorse, a 100 percent Roosevelt man.

GUFFEY, DEMOCRAT, UNMARRIED

Senator Guffey's biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory—which he wrote himself—was the shortest in the book. It said:

"Joseph F. Guffey, Democrat, Pittsburgh, Pa., unmarried."

After his defeat by Martin in 1946, Mr. Guffey vowed:

"I will never run again for any office, and I will not accept any appointive position."

But the lure of active politics was too much for him to overcome. In 1948 he ran for and was elected a delegate at large to the Democratic National Convention.

In the ensuing years, Mr. Guffey occasionally visited his old friend, Harry Truman, at the White House.

During the Adlai Stevenson-Dwight Eisenhower presidential campaign in 1952, Guffey showed up at a party rally in Pittsburgh's Syria Mosque. Grasping a cane, the former Senator seemed to glow as Truman loosed a blistering attack on Eisenhower.

In March 1953, Mr. Guffey announced that he had sold his 13-room house in Washington. He moved into a five-room apartment where he was reported writing his memoirs.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Mar. 17, 1959]

EX-SENATOR GUFFEY DIES AT AGE 88: DEATH OCCURS OF HEART AILMENT IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Joseph F. Guffey, former Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania, died last night in Washington, D.C., at the age of 88.

Mr. Guffey, the only Pennsylvania Democrat to serve two terms in the Senate, had been retired since 1946. He had been ill for several years.

Born of a pioneer family in Westmoreland County, Mr. Guffey lived most of his life in Pittsburgh, where for years he was a power not only in State but in national Democratic political circles.

HELPED F.D.R. IN NOMINATION

As Democratic National Committeeman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Guffey helped engineer the first nomination of President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 and even before his first election as Senator in 1934 was the recognized Federal patronage dispenser in Pennsylvania.

He unseated the late Senator David Aiken Reed and was reelected for a second term in 1940 largely on his record of having never opposed a single item of New Deal legislation.

However, he was defeated in 1946 by Republican Senator Edward Martin and was not active in politics since.

Nevertheless, he continued on the best of terms with old friends in the Senate, among them Harry S. Truman who became President upon Mr. Roosevelt's death.

In fact, one of the last times Mr. Guffey figured in the news was a report from Washington December 31, 1952, that he and his sister, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, long-time Democratic national committeewoman from Pennsylvania, had called at the White House to pay a farewell visit to President Truman.

PUSHED THROUGH COAL ACT

As long as he was in the Senate, Mr. Guffey never left any doubt about where his loyalty rested.

Often branded a "rubber-stamp" by his opponents—and he had many of them—he is reported to have said:

"I ran on a New Deal platform and I will vote for whatever the President wants me to vote for."

Mr. Guffey seldom spoke in the Senate and the few speeches he made were from carefully prepared manuscripts. He shunned the rough and tumble of extemporaneous debate but made his political and legislative influence felt mainly though private conversation with individuals or small groups.

As a Senator his most notable accomplishment was pushing through adoption of the bituminous coal stabilization act, known as the Guffey Coal Act. The original act, which fixed prices was voided by the Supreme Court but a subsequent measure, meeting the Court's objection, finally was passed.

The ex-Senator was born at Guffey's Station where his great-great-grandfather, William Guffey, had settled in 1758. His father, John Guffey, was sheriff of Westmoreland County at the time of his birth.

GREW UP IN POLITICS

Recalling his early days, Mr. Guffey once said:

"I grew up in politics. Why there was a time when there were 31 Guffeys of voting age. They were all Democrats and voted in the same precinct."

As a youth Guffey received his early education in Greensburg and then attended Princeton University. He was not a graduate but was always a strong Princeton booster. The Guffey family fortunes had their ups and downs and after leaving Princeton he went to work for the Government—his uncle, Colonel J. M. Guffey, was a State Democratic leader—as superintendent of home mail delivery in Pittsburgh.

He held the job until after he became, through the friendship of the late Judge David Reed, general manager of the Philadelphia Company, largest public utility in western Pennsylvania.

INVESTED IN OIL COMPANIES

He held that position for almost 20 years, worked hard and invested his money in oil and water companies. In 1918 he formed a partnership with E. N. Gillespie and resigned from the Philadelphia Company to devote his attention to the Guffey-Gillespie Oil Co. His holdings in the company were sold in 1921 to the Tidewater Oil Co.

During World War I he was director of sales for the Alien Property Custodians offices which led him into subsequent legal difficulties settled out of court.

Until he published his book of political memories, Mr. Guffey seemed to prefer to recall incidents in his long and eventful life in conversation rather than in writing.

His biographical sketch was certainly among the shortest ever published in the Congressional Directory. Written by himself, it said simply:

"Joseph F. Guffey, Democrat, Pittsburgh, Pa., unmarried."

Although a confirmed bachelor, the ex-Senator claimed he had been the best man or an usher at 31 weddings, including that of David Aiken Reed, son of his benefactor, Judge Reed, and, ironically the man he defeated for the Senate years afterward.

Once in 1936 he had to deny a rumor that he was engaged to an attractive young woman member of the White House secretariat and quipped:

"If I married all the girls I never proposed to, I'd be some marrying man."

FINALLY WROTE BOOK

But finally the urge to leave a written record of his times and experiences led him to write a book—"Seventy Years on the Red Fire Wagon"—but it never was available to the general public. Those who read it said it was interesting both for its history and anecdotes concerning the great and near-great, both living and dead.

The red-fire wagon, incidentally, was used in political parades to carry the powder which was burned to attract crowds to rallies in the days before torch light parades, now virtually forgotten along with political parades themselves.

EXPRESSED LOVE FOR PARTY

In concluding his book, Mr. Guffey seemed to sum up his political philosophy when he said:

"I never have regretted the decisions I have made politically, for they have all been made to the best of my knowledge and ability with one guiding principle, which has never been expressed more ably than by Pat Harrison (a Senator from Mississippi) whose words I echo fervently:

"I love my party better than anything in the world except my country."

In recent years, while looking after his still considerable oil and other interests, Mr. Guffey had made his home with his sister, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller, in a Washington apartment.

---

[From Washington Evening Star, Mar. 7, 1959]

JOSEPH F. GUFFEY DIES: SENATOR IN NEW DEAL

Joseph F. Guffey, former Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania and a major party power in the New Deal era died yesterday of a heart ailment at Doctors Hospital. He was 88.

Mr. Guffey, who had lived at 2126 Connecticut Avenue NW., since his defeat for reelection in 1946, suffered a relapse and was taken to the hospital yesterday afternoon. Relatives said he had been having heart trouble for the last 2 weeks but was thought to have been recovering. He was a bachelor.

Mr. Guffey, who made politics both a hobby and a career, was the opposite of the back-slapping loquacious senatorial prototype. He had an abruptness of speech and manner and avoided the rough and tumble of extemporaneous Senate debate.

A keen discerner of potential political winners, Mr. Guffey's first success on the road to Capitol Hill came in 1912, when he bucked his uncle and sponsor, Col. J. M. Guffey, to back Woodrow Wilson for the Democratic nomination.

SWITCHED TO ROOSEVELT

By 1920 Mr. Guffey was a Democratic national committeeman, and in 1924 and 1928 he successfully lined up the Pennsylvania convention delegations behind New York's Gov. Alfred E. Smith. Four years later he quietly switched to Franklin D. Roosevelt and Mr. Roosevelt did not forget it.

Mr. Guffey reached the Senate in 1934, the first Democrat elected to wear Pennsylvania's senatorial purple since 1875. In 1936 he helped swing the State into the Democratic column in the presidential election that swamped Republican Alfred Landon.

Mr. Guffey was born December 29, 1870, near Pittsburgh. Recalling his early days, he once said: "I grew up in politics. Why, there was a time when there were 31 Guffeys of voting age. They were all Democrats and all voted in the same precinct."

He was educated at Princeton where he first met Wilson when the latter served as his professor.

An analyst who measured action in terms of results, Mr. Guffey never permitted sentiment to interfere with his conception of politics as a practical game. He was essentially a conservative in private life, though he was a "100 percent Roosevelt man" and an uncompromising New Dealer in the Senate.

THE COAL ACT

Mr. Guffey's most notable accomplishment in the Senate was as legislator of the Bituminous Coal Stabilization Act, known as the "Guffey Coal Act." The original act was voided by the Supreme Court, but a later measure was passed.

Mr. Guffey had sizable investments in petroleum and water companies, which brought him a comfortable income. In public life, though he virtually dropped from sight after his 1946 defeat by Republican Edward Martin. He sold his 13-room house here in 1933 and moved into a Connecticut Avenue apartment.

Mr. Guffey leaves a sister, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller of the home address, who is an active Democrat, and four nephews.

---

## Endorsement of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle a reproduction of an editorial which was published by the Selma (Ala) Times-Journal commenting upon the situation of the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, particularly regarding a comment which I made that the Secretary ought to be

given time to see if he can come back to his job.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELL SAID, JOHN

In the past, the Times-Journal has experienced many differences with Alabama's junior Senator, JOHN SPARKMAN.

We, therefore, hasten to record that he reached the level of statesmanship in refusing to join the growing Democratic wolf pack dedicated to destruction of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles during his current bout with cancer.

Declaring that he saw no need for making a replacement for Secretary Dulles, Senator SPARKMAN said:

"He may bounce back. If anyone can, I believe he will."

This, of course, constitutes a strong endorsement of Secretary Dulles, which undoubtedly is justified but also probably is dangerous for an ambitious Democrat.

Well said, John.

## Rights in Berlin and Size of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by James Reston, and published this morning in the New York Times. I think the article clarifies in a most effective way the debate which is presently occurring between the Congress and the Executive.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEGENERATING DEBATE: U.S. DISCUSSION OF RIGHTS IN BERLIN TURNS TO ANGRY DISPUTE OVER ARMS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—The debate on Berlin is getting out of hand.

What started as a discussion of political rights and objectives preliminary to a series of East-West negotiations has suddenly degenerated into an angry argument over military strategy in which both sides are now calling for peace and threatening war.

In the imprecise give-and-take of today's news conference, President Eisenhower said flatly, "We are certainly not going to fight a ground war in Europe." He left the impression that the West's reaction to a blockade of Berlin would be retaliation with nuclear weapons.

No doubt this would be true if the Soviet Army moved into West Berlin or advanced across the Iron Curtain into West Germany. The most likely prospect, however, is not that Soviet forces would get involved in the exercise at all but that the East German Communists would, at worst, interfere with the West's supply convoys to West Berlin.

On May 27, the Soviet Union is expected to make a separate peace treaty with the East Germans and to turn over to them the task of checking the West's Berlin convoys. It does not follow that the East Germans will halt or even harass the convoys. Even if they do, it is not to be assumed that Washington would resort to extreme military measures, even if the other Western Allies agreed (which they probably would not).

In the first place, there would probably be a series of negotiations with the Russians, whom Washington would hold responsible for any blockade of Berlin, and an appeal to the United Nations.

NO SUDDEN JEOPARDY

This is not a situation—despite all the current war talk—in which the passage of time is going to place West Berlin or the Western troops in sudden jeopardy. West Berlin has many weeks of supplies available in storage, and while a Western airlift to Berlin is more difficult now than it was 10 years ago, this alternative is still available to give time for negotiations.

The U.S. policy, even after all the talk about atomic war, is still a policy of making the punishment fit the crime.

In the official jargon it is a policy of graduated deterrence. That is to say, if the Communist attack is limited, the retaliation of the West will be limited, but if the attack jeopardizes the security of the United States or its allies, then the retaliation will be massive.

President Eisenhower answered his critics today as if they were saying that the addition of a few western divisions in Western Europe would enable the West to defeat the Soviet army in a nonatomic ground battle in Central Europe.

This is not what they are saying at all. They agree with him that the 21⅓ western divisions on the central front could not deal with the Soviet and satellite divisions in East Germany and Eastern Europe.

What the President's critics are saying is that his policy of cutting the ground forces might mislead the Russians and force the United States to choose between total war, nonresistance, or ineffective resistance.

One here thinks it would be easy to limit an East-West war in the center of Europe once it started. But to repeat, the crisis is likely to come, not with the Russians but with the East Germans, and in any clash at the East German border conventional weapons would be important.

"What good would it do to send a few more thousands or, indeed, even a few divisions of troops to Europe?" the President asked today.

The answer of the President's critics is that it might convince Moscow that it would be wiser to negotiate a reasonable settlement than risk a war.

FIGHTING A GROUND WAR?

"Why in the world would we dream of fighing a ground war?" the President asked.

Because, his critics reply, a limited ground action would at least give some time for common sense to prevail and negotiations to start, whereas a nuclear war would almost certainly devastate half the world.

One of the interesting aspects of the President's statement that "we are certainly not going to fight a ground war in Europe" is that it is precisely the opposite of the policy he advocated as Supreme Commander of North Atlantic forces in 1952.

Then he was arguing that the Western Allies must raise not the 21⅓ divisions he now says are adequate but 96 divisions. These were to be used to defend Europe "as far east as possible" and to stand as a warning to the Soviet Union that the West's rights were to be maintained.

General Eisenhower was not asking then what good a few mere divisions would be.

"Our Governments," he said in his official report on April 2, 1952, "must convert the Lisbon program (50 divisions by 1952) into actuality. It demands full and unstinting support.

"It can be done, given the will to do it. There is power in our Union—and resourcefulness on land, sea, and air. Visible and within our grasp we have the capability of building such military, economic and moral strength as the Communist world would never dare to challenge."

## Administered Pricing in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, I have followed carefully the increasing supply of evidence to the effect that administered pricing in the big steel and other industries has been to a substantial extent responsible for the price inflation which is putting our cost of living close to outer space.

I have read with interest an editorial and an article dealing with this subject and bearing out the subcommittee's findings along these lines, both of which were published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today. I ask unanimous consent that, in support of the subcommittee's findings, the editorial and article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE ADMINISTERED PRICES

(By Woodlief Thomas)

(Woodlief Thomas, author of this communication, is the economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board.)

Recent discussion of the influence of administered prices, stimulated by Gardiner Means' statement before the Kefauver committee (Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary), has made a significant contribution to a better understanding of the problems of inflation and fluctuations in economic activity and employment. This contribution is in pointing out that there are unstabilizing forces in pricing actions of the private economy—on the part of both management and labor—that cannot be effectively controlled or corrected by governmental actions in the area of fiscal and monetary policies.

The columns of the Washington Post have covered much of this discussion, beginning with Bernard Nossiter's lucid presentation on February 8. Gardiner Means placed major—and apparently undue—emphasis on the role of administrative decisions by powerful corporations and labor organizations in fixing prices and wages without due regard to economic forces or public interest. He also expressed the view, which was not supported and is inconsistent with his major thesis, that restrictive monetary policies brought on the recession in 1957. Eugene Havas in his letter of February 19 to the Washington Post pointed out the effects of pricing policies on the profits of steel companies and expressed the view that monetary and fiscal policies, though sound in themselves, cannot stop inflation spurred by administrative price in-

creases. Ralph Young, in his letter to Senator PROXMIRE and also in his more recent appearance before the Kefauver committee, pointed out the various demands and other market factors that have influenced price movements in recent years. Harold Dorsey, in some of his recent excellent Monday columns in the Post, has also presented a realistic analysis of recent price changes and their possible effects in contributing to economic instability.

Objection to administered prices, it may be concluded from these discussions, although not precisely stated in any of them, should not be so much that they contribute to inflation but that they interfere with the proper functioning of the price mechanism and lead eventually to unemployment of resources.

Prices should serve as a means for obtaining the most effective allocation of resources and maintaining a balance between output and use. In a free-market economy, there should be no objection if an industry or a company or an individual endeavors to obtain the highest prices obtainable for its products or services in the light of existing and foreseeable circumstances. Such a policy stimulates investment in increased productive capacity and tends to restrain demand.

One of the considerations in fixing prices, of course, should be what price can be sustained and whether markets might be lost for a longer period by asking the highest possible price for any short period of time. Criticism arises with respect to administered prices when they are not adjusted properly in response to supply and demand forces. They are harmful if prices are raised so as to choke off demand and lead to reductions in output or if prices are held up in the face of declining demand when lower prices might sooner or later stimulate some demand. The result is that production and employment are reduced more and kept down for a longer period than would otherwise be the case. Such a result is harmful to those responsible for the bad judgment in setting prices as well as to the general public interest.

Consumers have the privilege of deciding whether or not to buy a product or a service that is offered at the price demanded. Higher wages or other cost increases are not a decisive reason for raising prices, if consumers won't buy the output that can be produced at the higher prices asked. An economic system cannot be expected to operate on the principle that a seller can always obtain any price he wishes to ask for his product. In order to maintain sustainable economic growth, it is the task of the seller to adjust his prices or his product so as to stimulate demand. Otherwise, it is to be expected that resources will be allocated to other uses, but this is a time-consuming process and results in unemployment. Much of the unemployment existing today can be attributed to distortions and inflexibilities in the price and income structure.

It is most likely, for example, that some wages and prices were raised or kept up too high in 1957 and thus choked off demands. Moreover, they have not been adjusted downward sufficiently to stimulate demand since then. This is particularly true of the automobile industry with respect to styling as well as to prices. The principle is the same in either event. It is no doubt also true of the steel industry. At present the threat of further increases in steel wages and prices may be stimulating a surge of buying that might not last after the event.

Consequences of such distortions and inflexibilities in the price and income structure cannot be avoided by monetary and fiscal policies. Any attempt to do so would not remove the basic difficulty but might increase the distortions and lead to a more severe adjustment. Nor should monetary and fiscal policies be blamed for recession and unemployment that result from incorrect pricing policies of management and labor. They might alleviate some of the consequences and should endeavor to do so. Monetary policy, however, operates within a limited area and is concerned primarily with commercial bank credit. As Ralph Young pointed out in his statement before the Senate subcommittee:

"If monetary policy should undertake to finance whatever demands for credit are made upon the banking system, or permit itself to be used to justify all decisions made by producers, whether correct or faulty, it would become an engine of inflation, not a force for stability and sustainable growth. Monetary policy must be concerned with the interests of all the people, consumers as well as producers, not with particular interests or industries.

"Obviously, monetary and credit policy cannot do everything needed to attain stable growth; it must be supported by appropriate fiscal and other public policies, as well as by prudent private policies. During periods of expanding demands, accompanied by speculative psychology and expectations of creeping inflation, monetary policy has no option but to assume a restrictive posture. If it did not assume such a posture, widespread expectations that prices and costs would be steadily raised might indeed lead to further spiraling of costs and prices. Individual or group efforts then to hedge against or by escalation to protect against inflation would tend to aggravate inflationary forces rather than to bring them into balance."

In conclusion, the objection to administered prices and wages is not so much that they create inflation but that they tend to retard growth and to increase unemployment. Inflation might be created if monetary and fiscal policies attempt to validate such prices, but eventually these attempts will only make the inevitable collapse more disastrous.

---

THE PRICE ISSUE JOINED

Senator KEFAUVER reads national sentiment accurately, we think, in his warning to the steel industry that another round of unjustifiably high price increases this year would lead inevitably to some form of public restraint. There is a growing consensus that present fiscal and monetary controls of the Government simply cannot cope with the administered price sector of the economy, where concentrated industries like steel can, as they have shown, defy sagging demand, increase prices and profits and thus seriously retard economic growth. Woodlief Thomas, the distinguished economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, notably reinforces this judgment in a published letter.

As important as his recognition of the fact of administered pricing is, Mr. Thomas' warning that monetary controls of the Federal Reserve cannot be cut loose merely because they alone are inadequate. As he notes, a different basic policy from that which the Federal Reserve now pursues could exacerbate the effect of demand-defying pricing by the concentrated industries if it served to ratify their unjustified price increases by easing credit.

Ralph A. Young, research director for the "Fed," has also joined the chorus of criticism of last year's steel and auto-price rises. Earlier Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, sounded a similar note, blaming unsound pricing by heavy industry for limiting output between 1953 and 1957 and thus depressing employment.

So the issue is joined. If the masters of steel and autos and other heavy manufacturing and the unions which serve these industries will now acknowledge their power, accept the social responsibility that goes with it and discharge it in the public interest, the American economy can avoid further regimentation and control. If they will not, Congress and the administration will be under mounting pressure to devise effective restraints.

---

## Ship Repair Work Needed for the Port of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the ship repair industry of the port of New York is in an extremely distressed condition. The decline began to assume serious proportions last summer and has since become progressively worse.

I urge the Defense Department to allocate enough ship repair work to the New York area to save this industry. In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Times of March 1, 1959:

SHIP REPAIR WORK IN SERIOUS SLUMP—YARDS HERE ARE WORST HIT, WITH JOBS FEWER THAN 30 PERCENT OF 4-YEAR AVERAGE

(By Arthur H. Richter)

The ship repair industry in this area is in its worst slump since pre-World War II days.

Employment in local shipyards is at or below 30 percent of the average for 1954 through 1957. Some of the larger concerns, however, report even deeper cuts in their worker rolls.

The decline is not restricted to yards within the environs of the port of New York. Manpower reductions have been noted in yards on all three coasts and on the Great Lakes and rivers, although the drop is not so severe as in this port.

The decline, according to leaders of the ship repair industry, began to assume serious proportions last summer and has since become progressively worse. According to the Shipbuilders Council of America employment for vessel repair is now at its lowest point nationally since June 30, 1954.

TWO COMPANIES WORST HIT

Locally, the two hardest hit companies are Bethlehem Steel, which has four shipyards in this port, and the Todd Shipyards Corp., which has two. These are by far the larget ship repairers in this port. Employment at the Bethlehem yards is down to approximately one-third of the average over the last several years, while Todd is operating with less than a fourth.

A number of reasons are advanced for the decline, all of them, however, stem from some phase of the worldwide shipping slump.

Arthur Hiltebrant, general manager of Bethlehem's New York district shipyards, said yesterday that a principal cause of the present trouble was the large number of vessels withdrawn from service and laid up during the shipping decline.

Vessel operators also are postponing repairs wherever possible, doing only minimum work on their fleets. Foreign ship work is lost because time is of less value in a sunken market, and owners can send their ships to home ports, where labor is cheaper,

for all work that is not of an emergency nature, Mr. Hiltebrant explained.

The poor economic condition of the railroads serving this port was also blamed by the Bethlehem official for the lowered amount of work in local yards. He said little or nothing was being done on the tremendous marine fleets of the rail lines.

"Business in general may have recovered from the recent recession," Mr. Hiltebrant said, "but for the ship repair industry it is still here."

TODD SPOKESMAN AGREE

A spokesman for Todd agreed generally with Mr. Hiltebrant. He noted also that a large portion of the slump here could be traced to cuts in the Navy's and Military Sea Transportation Service budgets.

At present the Todd yards in Brooklyn and Hoboken have a combined production force of about 600 workers. The average over the last several years for this time of the year was about 2,500. Bethlehem's four local yards—Hoboken, Staten Island and 27th and 56th Streets, Brooklyn—are down to about 1,000 men from an average of 3,000.

The smaller ship-repair concerns in this port, known in the industry as shore shops, have not suffered to the same degree as the big companies. The smaller ones do not have the plant maintenance problems of their larger counterparts and, since they generally employ subcontractors on repair work, they do not have large work forces of their own.

The New York & New Jersey Dry Association reported a drop last year of about 30 percent in man-hours worked from the average for 1954-57. The association set the average for this period at 9,818,015 man-hours a year, compared with 6,912,929 for 1958.

Figures supplied by the Shipbuilders Council of America showed that 25,239 workers were employed on vessel repairs in 90 shipyards as of December 31, 1958. At the end of 1957 the totals were 91 yards and 37,627 workers, and at the close of 1956, 91 and 35,896, respectively.

The council said the last low to compare with present conditions was June 30, 1954, when 95 shipyards employed 27,291 workers.

## Dedication of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the remarks addressed to the President in his office by the Honorable Thomas B. Fugate, a former Member of Congress from Virginia, when he extended to the President an invitation to dedicate the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park on July 4, 1959.

There being no objection, the text of the invitation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVITATION TO DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TO DEDICATE THE CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ON JULY 4, 1959

We are deeply grateful to you, Mr. President, for the privilege of presenting to you an invitation to participate in the dedication of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park on July 4, this year, if that date is convenient with you, or on some other date prior to, or subsequently, subject to your selection.

We want to thank the Members of the Congress for their presence here this morning. We want to thank Assistant Secretary Kennedy and Conrad Wirth for their assistance. To all who have in any way contributed to our cause, we want you to know we are appreciative.

Mr. President, down in the southern Appalachians where the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia corner, there is a famous pass through the Cumberlands. Through it moved the Indians for untold centuries. Through this pass the Cherokees journeyed every spring from their camp at Chota (Knoxville) to their summer hunting grounds in the Ohio Valley. Near the gap the Indians would camp in the spring and hold their spring festival. Again in the fall on their return they had their fall festival.

On April 12, 1750, Dr. Thomas Walker and a party of five discovered the pass. Mr. President, this was only 20 years after your maternal grandfather, Jacob Stover, came to Virginia. It was in 1730 he received from the Virginia colonial council a grant of 10,000 acres on the South Fork of the Shenandoah River near the present town of Luray, "for the settlement of himself and divers Germans and Swiss whom he proposed to bring thither within the next 2 years."

He named the gap Cumberland Gap, in honor of the Duke of Cumberland, son of George II who was then commanding the English armed forces. Cumberland Gap, because of its importance as a way through the mountains to the Ohio and the West, came to be the most renown place west of the Blue Ridge. From Virginia and the Carolinas the westward migration began about 1770 and continued for half a century. Among the first were Henderson and Boone who cut a road through the wilderness to become the highway of the pioneer. A human drama was enacted on this Wilderness Road which has been the subject of many books. In this trek were the Lincolns, the Hanks, the Logans and many, many others. By 1792 100,000 people had transited the gap to populate a State. Kentucky was chartered in 1792, to become Virginia's eldest daughter. Toward the middle of the 19th century Henry Clay and a companion on horseback were riding the road to the gap. Clay halted his horse and tilted his head, remaining completely silent. When asked by his companion why the pose, he said, "I am listening to the tread of the coming millions."

In the War Between the States Cumberland Gap was a strategic point. In the first year of the War the Conferedate forces occupied the gap. These forces were commanded by General Zollicoffer. The Confederates held the gap for the first year of the war.

In the spring of 1862 General George Morgan with 10,000 men came down from the Ohio and captured the gap and held it until the fall of 1862.

Gen. Carter Stevenson commanding a large force of Confederates came in September of 1862 and laid seige. Morgan discovering scouts on the north side of the Cumberland Mountains withdrew. On October 8, 1862, an outstanding battle took place at Perryville, Ky., which ended in a draw. Cumberland Gap was held by the Confederates until September 1863. General Ambrose Burnside had captured Knoxville in August 1863. General Burnside after the capture of Knoxville had moved in from the South. Union forces commanded by Col. John de Courcy came down from the North. The Confederate forces under General John Frazer surrendered. About 2,400 men were taken prisoners.

Gen. U. S. Grant visited the gap on January 6, 1864, and spent the night. Because of the independent nature of the citizenship and few slaveholders the area was largely Union.

It was in a conference here at the White House that President Lincoln said to Gen. O. O. Howard, "Howard, if you come out of this horror and misery alive, I want you to do something for these people—around Cumberland Gap—who have been shut out from this world all these years." Howard's answer was the founding of Lincoln Memorial University whose campus adjoins the lands of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park. The university has one of three of the finest collections of Lincolniana in the world. It would be most appropriate, therefore, during the visit to dedicate the park and during this year of the sesquicentennial of Lincoln for you to place a simple wreath of laurel from the Cumberlands at the foot of the statue, "Lincoln the Lawyer," located within the quadrangle on the university grounds, thereby honoring the great war President.

One mile north of the gap is Middleboro, Ky., a city of 15,000 people that was established by an English land company and named for Middlesborough, England. When the city was laid out the company also laid out a golf course. It is the oldest course in America. It would be historically significant for you to play a few games while visiting with us.

Mr. President, the first concerted effort to establish a national monument at Cumberland Gap came in 1929. A commission was appointed by the three States to make a study and recommendations. The senior Senator of Virginia was then the Governor. In 1938 a three State meeting was held on the campus of Lincoln Memorial University. In 1940 the enabling act to establish the park was passed by the Congress and signed by the President. The period from 1941 to 1956 was devoted to the purchase of the lands. In September 1956 the park property was transferred by the States to the U. S. Government. Since then considerable development has been made. There will be, by the time set for the dedication, a beautiful visitor center along with parkwide improvements.

The people of the Appalachian highlands are proud of their park. It is the largest historical park in the United States. Its history is the story of a great migration accomplished by toil, deprivation, and human suffering. It is, therefore, proper and fitting that you, the President of these United States, honor the occasion of the dedication by your presence. We do hope you accept our invitation.

## Farm Subsidies in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all aware that the American farmer continues to be faced with serious economic problems.

Unfortunately, the admixture of Democratic and Republican farm programs now in effect has not brightened the outlook for the future.

According to USDA, the prospect for 1959 is a drop in farm income. At the

same time, surpluses are piling higher and costs are continuing to be high.

The big question facing the Nation is: How can we deal with this situation more effectively?

We recognize, of course, that there is increasing public interest—including a substantial amount of criticism on the cost of the farm program.

Like the American farmer and the public, I look forward to the time when these costs can be reduced and an economically healthy farm economy can forge its own way toward a brighter future.

Meanwhile, I believe it is extremely important to correct a false impression that may exist in the minds of many people—that is, that farmers, alone, are the recipients of subsidies in this country.

The contrary is true.

Across the Nation, a great many people, businesses, industries, and others in various fields of endeavor benefit from Government subsidies. Yesterday the Washington Daily News published an article by Dickson Preston: "Millions of Americans Rely on Federal Subsidies." In this article Mr. Preston outlines the fact that not only the farmers, but many other segments of the economy—including publishing, manufacturing, transportation, and dozens of other special groups—benefit from subsidies of one type or another.

To put the subsidy picture in better perspective—particularly as regards the farmer—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS RELY ON FEDERAL SUBSIDIES

(By Dickson Preston)

Millions of Americans live wholly or partly on U.S. Government subsidies. Many may not even know it. Others think their own special interest groups are peculiarly deserving of Federal aid.

But the sum total of their demands for what they consider free money from Uncle Sam is a major factor in pushing the Federal budget higher year by year.

$5.4 BILLION

Most publicized are the farmers. Helping maintain their prices is costing U.S. taxpayers $5.4 billion this year. Here are some others:

Magazines, newspapers, and businesses which use the mails. They benefit from postal subsidies—in the form of deficits—which add up to more than $6 billion since World War II.

Manufacturers. One study by the House Appropriations Committee estimates they have received $43 billion in subsidy-like benefits such as tax amortization and business reconversion payments in the past 12 years.

Veterans. Besides pensions, they get free schooling, special help in finding jobs and in many cases medical care for nonservice ailments. These and a host of other benefits have cost more than $60 billion since 1948.

Airlines. Direct subsidy payments from 1938 through 1957 totaled $614 million. Some airlines are still receiving them. Federal aid to airports has already passed $465 million, and Congress appears likely to vote $270 million more.

Water transportation. Every ship flying the American flag is subsidized. Construction and operating subsidies have cost $3.5 billion since 1938. They're in the budget for $217 million next year. Improvements to inland waterways add up to additional billions.

OTHER GROUPS

Dozens of other special interest groups—mining firms, oil producers, public power users, cooperatives, labor unions, religious, and educational institutions—receive subsidies or tax concessions which amount to the same thing.

---

## TVA: A Fine Investment for the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the Public Works Committee of the House is considering a bill to permit the TVA to finance needed additions to its power capacity through the sale of revenue bonds.

Once again the hearings of the committee have offered the enemies of the TVA an opportunity to propagandize, and once more we are hearing many misrepresentations about the TVA, and particularly in regard to taxes. In this connection, I should like to commend to my colleagues' attention an objective survey of the TVA's power operations written by Mr. Miles McMillin, of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, which appeared in the New York Times.

Because this article so cogently presents the facts, I request unanimous consent to have the article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

POWER, PROFITS, AND PROPAGANDA

(By Miles McMillin)

John Gunther once said: "Quite possibly the TVA is the greatest single American invention of the century, the biggest contribution the United States has yet made to society in the modern world."

If TVA were just an idea—and not the reality it is—Gunther might find his evaluation accepted these days even at the White House. The Eisenhower administration has shown that it is sufficiently impressed with TVA to export the idea to foreign lands. But to President Eisenhower, TVA in actual operation at home is a disease called creeping socialism which should be treated with applications of old-fashioned power trust snake oil bearing the Dixon-Yates label.

The paradox of TVA is that, while we proudly export its principles, it is the one New Deal achievement which has to continue to fight at home the hammer blows of those who have long since accepted, in varying degrees, the other accomplishments of perhaps the most socially creative era in our history. Hardly a session of Congress goes by that the friends of TVA do not have to ward off another attack. And the propaganda campaign, organized and financed by the power trust to persuade the American people that what has made the Tennessee Valley livable is communism or worse, continues unabated, day after day, year after year.

Why?

The reason is simply that TVA produces and sells electric power at prices people can afford to pay.

The other functions of TVA—flood control, navigation, fertilizer development, recreation, soil-erosion control—have come to be accepted. But the power program is still treated as if it were proscribed by the Ten Commandments.

When Louis V. Sutton, chairman of the board of the Carolina Power & Light Co. submitted a statement for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce last year to the Senate Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors opposing legislation to give TVA authority to issue its own revenue bonds, he was careful to distinguish between TVA's power and nonpower functions.

"TVA," he said, "should conduct only its authorized nonpower functions. The TVA power facilities should be transferred to local ownership and operation. This transfer should include transmission lines, steam plants, and hydroelectric plants at TVA dams, but not the dams or other related river control facilities."

What Sutton almost said right out loud was that TVA is a great idea if the utilities can have the power produced by the dams. The more closely the anti-TVA propaganda is examined, the more clear it becomes that the utilities have only one aim in their attacks: To get their hands on the power-producing facilities of this great public asset.

The enemies of TVA have not always been willing to grant the wisdom and legitimacy of its nonpower functions. In the earlier stages of the fight against TVA, the utilities were willing to finance any argument that would discredit TVA—almost to the point of defending the anopheles mosquito whose life has been made more difficult by TVA's malaria control program.

One of the earliest campaigns against TVA—then under the chairmanship of Arthur E. Morgan—was an attempt to persuade the public that the multiple-purpose dams could not do all the things they were constructed to do. Numerous authorities were cited in an effort to prove that flood control and navigation were not compatible with power production, but enthusiasm for this argument waned under the weight of contrary evidence.

As late as February 1948, TVA's detractors were praying for a great flood in the valley—the kind that in pre-TVA days regularly ravished the countryside. On February 15 of that year the Associated Press carried a story out of its Atlanta bureau saying: "On the Tennessee River the floodwaters were too much for the great dams set up by the TVA. The huge reservoirs filled and the water was released to rush over the low country."

Anti-TVA papers whooped up the story, bellowed for photographs—and then settled back into a deep funk when the AP's Atlanta bureau contritely explained it had not bothered to check rumors concerning the flood-breeding rains in the valley. Actually, as the New York Times reported, the "great reservoirs of Norris, Cherokee, Douglas, Fontana, and Hiwassee on the tributary streams, took all the water that was poured into them and had plenty of room left. By this means the flood crest at the Chattanooga was cut 10 feet with an estimated saving of $6 million."

TVA's flood control program has succeeded because it has adhered faithfully to the mandate of Congress to regulate the streamflow primarily for the purpose of promoting navigation and controlling floods. While private power companies must necessarily give primary emphasis to power production, power production by TVA must be consistent with the operation of its dams for flood control and navigation.

As the flood season (late December to early April) approaches in the Tennessee Valley, the TVA dams are controlled to reserve 12 million acre-feet for water storage. Near the end of the flood season the reservoirs are allowed to fill and are fed out during the dry season for power production and stabilization of navigation. The average annual benefit from flood reduction is estimated at more than $11 million. In February of 1957 the valley had its second largest flood of record. TVA's control of the water prevented damage of an estimated $66 million. TVA has helped also to control floods along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, into which the Tennessee's waters flow.

The 630-mile navigation channel is a national investment, making the Tennessee part of a 19-State, 9,000-mile inland waterway. Sixty-eight percent of the shipping is either from outside or destined for outside the TVA region. In 1933 traffic on the Tennessee was 33 million ton-miles. In 1956 it was about 2 billion ton-miles. Transportation savings, now $20 million a year, return over 10 percent on net navigation investment when measured against the cost of maintaining and operating the waterway.

This is a success story that that the foes of TVA cannot ignore. If the late George Norris and the others who dreamed the TVA dream had not tacked on the authority to produce power, TVA would be as acceptable today as Federal bank deposit insurance. But they had the practical idea that as long as dams had to be built, the power potential should be used for the benefit of the people who were paying for the dams.

The nonpower functions have changed the history of the valley. But it is the power program which is primarily responsible for raising the productive level of the region. And it is the power program that has made TVA the target of one of the most relentless propaganda campaigns in the history of the Nation.

TVA power has not only changed the way of life for millions within the seven-State region it serves; its price yardstick has jutted out of the valley to drive down the rates for other million of consumers served by the private power companies.

TVA power is distributed by 151 distributing systems, 149 of which are publicly or cooperatively owned. In fiscal 1957 they sold 15½ billion kilowatt-hours and earned revenues of $163 million, of which $25½ million was net profit.

There are 1,460,000 customers buying TVA power for the use of 4 to 6 million consumers. In the pre-TVA era, the private power companies served 275,000 in the same area. The average annual consumption of electric power in valley homes has jumped from 600 kilowatt hours to 6,000—twice the national average. The price has dropped from an average 5.7 cents per kilowatt hour to 1.2 cents, less than half the national average of 2.6 cents.

Less than 4 percent of the valley farms were electrified when TVA's turbines started rolling and its first highlines leaped the mountains. Today 95 percent have electricity. The customers of these rural co-ops are buying power at less than 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. Except for the Pacific Northwest, where Bonneville and Grand Coulee are transforming the energy of the mighty Columbia, this is the lowest rural electric rate in the Nation.

TVA power has made the valley a strategic defense area for the Nation, accounting in large measure for the rapid expansion in steam-produced power. More than half (57 percent) of TVA's power goes to the atomic energy projects at Oak Ridge and Paducah. It is estimated that this power at private utility rates would cost the Atomic Energy Commission from $50 to $60 million more each year than it pays to TVA. The Air Force wind tunnel plant at Tullahoma is supplied by TVA, as is the Redstone missile program. Huge amounts of aluminum and chemicals vital to the defense program are produced by private industry using TVA power.

It is worth speculating, considering the power shortage of World War II, whether the United States would have taken the lead in the development of atomic energy had not the power facilities of TVA and the Columbia River program been available to pour out the staggering amounts of electricity needed for the Oak Ridge and Hanford projects.

The utility propaganda which seeks to inspire sectional jealousy against TVA is always careful to hide from the American people this monumental record of service to the defense program of the whole Nation. Also ignored in these sectional appeals are the expenditures made by TVA with industry located outside the valley. In the years 1934–56 TVA made purchases of $1,024 million from businesses located outside of the seven States in the TVA area. Almost a billion has gone for manufactured articles. Here is where some of the money went: Pennsylvania, $311 million; New York, $156 million; Ohio, $127 million; Illinois, $112 million; Wisconsin, $60 million.

Add to that the $1,750 million the users of TVA power have spent on appliances—most of them manufactured in other States—and you get a fair notion of how TVA is helping business in the rest of the country. Workers in Milwaukee and Schenectady are living better because farmers in the Tennessee Valley are living better.

No assessment of what TVA has done for the country as a whole would be complete without mentioning what has happened to the Valley's tax contribution to the Federal Government since TVA lifted it to a level more comparable with the rest of the Nation. In 1933, 3.4 percent of total Federal individual income tax collections came from the seven States which embrace the TVA region. Recent studies show the proportion of tax contribution has almost doubled. During the 1933–56 period $21,900 million was collected. At the 1933 rate only $12,200 million would have been collected. That $10 billion difference is almost five times the amount the Government has invested in all of TVA's functions.

If TVA is doing these things for the Valley and for the rest of the Nation, then why the incessant campaign to wreck it? Has TVA done so much damage to the private utilities that they should continue to spend millions of their customers' dollars in a campaign to destroy it?

TVA has forced the utilities to sell power more cheaply, it is true. In 1932 some of the highest electric rates in the Nation were paid in the TVA area cities, according to studies made of cities of 50,000 population and over. By 1956 the situation was reversed. In cities of 50,000 and over, the lowest rates are now in the TVA area and the area serviced by the Bonneville program. The influence of these two great public power projects is shown by the fact that rates get progressively higher as the distance from TVA or Bonneville increases.

Significantly, the private utilities in the areas bordering TVA have not been hurt. They have found that the TVA theory of power distribution works profitably for them. As they reduced rates under the impact of the TVA yardstick, they reaped the financial benefits of the resulting increase in demand. Studies of the period 1937–55 show that earnings available to common stockholders of the big profit utilities across the country multiplied by less than three times—yet companies bordering TVA multiplied similar earnings 6½ times.

The utilities claim that TVA is unfair because it is subsidized. If the utilities themselves weren't subsidized by the Federal Government on a scale more staggering than TVA, this argument might have some appeal to fair minded citizens. The truth is that under the fast tax writeoff policy the utilities have been handed subsidies over a 2-year period that exceed the total investment in TVA in more than a quarter of a century.

The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee recently issued a report quoting R. C. Rainwater, Chief Accountant of the Federal Power Commission, as saying that the tax writeoff policy has benefited utilities in the 1955–57 period by $2,621,318,000. The report made it clear that consumers receive no benefits from these subsidies, because of Government rulings that they need not be passed on in decreased rates.

Are these tax writeoffs subsidies? Let Walter H. Sammis, president of the Ohio Edison Co., a large utility with offices in Akron, Ohio, testify. Sammis appeared before a Senate subcommittee in opposition to the bill to allow TVA to issue bonds to help finance its operations. Senator ROBERT KERR, Oklahoma Democrat, was presiding. The following exchange took place:

SAMMIS. It should be the policy of the Federal Government to cooperate with taxpaying businesses and to encourage their participation to the fullest extent in the power features of water resources instead of engaging in unfair competition through the advantages of Government subsidies.

Senator KERR. Let's talk about Government subsidies. Has your company received any certificates of accelerated depreciation (tax writeoffs)?

SAMMIS. Yes, sir.

Senator KERR. How much?

SAMMIS. $46 million as of February 28, 1957.

(There followed several minutes of argument about depreciation formula and other matters and KERR returned to the tax writeoffs.)

Senator KERR. I asked you if that was in the form of Government subsidy?

SAMMIS. Oh, surely.

Senator KERR. That is all I asked you.

SAMMIS. That is right. Surely, I am sorry. I didn't get your point earlier.

Senator KERR commented that the utilities really have no objection to subsidies as such. Their complaint seems to be that others get bigger subsidies. The testimony of the Federal Power Commission's chief accountant would seem to indicate that if anyone has cause to claim discrimination in the matter of subsidies, it is TVA.

TVA's power operations are often criticized by the power trust as unsound and unbusinesslike. But when the critics are examined on this point they are usually found retreating to another point which permits them to make vague charges about socialism or to cry out that TVA pays no taxes or interest.

By law, TVA's power operations have to be self-supporting and self-liquidating. The record shows that the law has been obeyed. Gross power revenues from 1933 through fiscal 1957 amounted to $1,474 million, of which net revenues amounted to $424 million.

Here is a summary of TVA's power operation through fiscal 1957:

| | *Millions of dollars 1933 through 1957* |
|---|---|
| Revenue | 1,474 |
| Expense: | |
| Operation and maintenance | 736 |
| Taxes | 46 |
| Depreciation | 268 |
| Total expense | 1,050 |
| Net income before interest | [1] 424 |
| Investment assignable to power (24-year average) | 442 |
| Annual return on investment (24-year average)—percent | 4 |

[1] Of the $424 million net income before interest shown above, $10 million has been used to pay interest on bonds, $65 million has been used to retire bonds, and $175 million has been paid into the Federal Treasury as an offset to appropriations previously made. The remainder, $174 million, has been reinvested in power facilities.

From a cold business viewpoint, Uncle Sam's stockholders would have a difficult time finding a better investment.

The law imposes on TVA another obligation, one that distinguishes its power operations from the exclusive profit motive of the private utilities. TVA's objective is the widest use of electricity at the lowest possible price to consumers. This aim is achieved by utilizing more economical sources of power and by keeping operation and maintenance costs below the national average of the industry. The distributors of TVA's power also operate at costs far below those of other utilities. As the use of electricity by consumers goes up, the cost per kilowatt-hour of delivering it goes down. Many of the distributors have been able over the years to reduce rates.

The utility industry insists that these low rates are made possible because of TVA's tax-exempt status. This is the argument most frequently made in the propaganda of the utilities.. Of course, TVA pays no income taxes to the Government. Income taxes are based on profit and all of TVA's profits belong to the Government, not just the part paid in taxes by the private companies. TVA's net income in fiscal 1957, after allowance for the cost of money to the Government at 2½ percent, was approximately $21 million. Uncle Sam claims all of it. If it were the income of a private utility, the Government could claim only half of it, in the form of income taxes.

If TVA had been privately owned over the last 24 years, it would have paid Federal income taxes of about $170 million. TVA earned $424 million—a 4-percent return on the investment. The average cost of money to the Government over this period was 2 percent. Had that rate of interest been charged against the power investment, it would have amounted to half the 4-percent return, or $212 million, leaving a margin of $212 million for the Government. This is $45 million more than the $170 million that would have been paid in taxes under private operation.

Despite the sweeping claims that TVA pays no taxes, it does pay local and State taxes or tax equivalents. They amounted to $4,744,000 in fiscal 1957. Its distributors paid $7,646,000 in taxes or equivalents in 1957. In 1937, when power in the TVA area was distributed by private companies, taxes paid to local and State governments by the utilities amounted to $3,350,000. The total under public ownership in 1957 was $12,390,000. In the intervening 19½ years the increase in State and local taxes was 270 percent. In roughly the same period the State and local taxes paid by private utilities across the Nation increased by 232 percent—a difference of 38 percent in TVA's favor.

Furthermore, the utilities' argument that the difference in tax payments accounts for the difference in rates doesn't stand up in the light of practical experience. Two of TVA's distributors are private utilities, selling power at the same low rates as TVA's publicly owned distributors. Yet they are able to make a profit just as if they bought power from private sources for resale at presumably higher rates.

If a lot of water has been spilled over TVA's dams in the last quarter of a century, it is perhaps exceeded in quantity only by the volume of words that have been spilled attacking and defending TVA. TVA has endured, not because the words of the defenders have been wiser or more forceful. Its own record of achievement for the people of the valley and the people of the Nation is its stoutest shield. The avalanche of utility propaganda has not been able to dent that record. It has stood up through 5 years of an administration which has been steadily probing for weaknesses—indeed, has tried to create some.

This record was made possible because TVA produced power at prices people can afford to pay. If its power program is allowed to be pillaged and turned over to the profit utilities, TVA's service to the people of the valley and of the Nation will be ended. But more than that, its service to democracy would be destroyed. For TVA has come to mean something to the rest of the world. It was best expressed by the people of the valley who belong to the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, in a letter to President Eisenhower in April of 1957:

"TVA is more than a regional agency; more than just a Federal power system. It is an international symbol to people of free Nations all over the globe—a symbol of democratic methods and democratic ingenuity and enterprise applied to one of mankind's most challenging problems: How to develop natural resources for the benefit of the most people. TVA carries a vital international message—a message that people from all over the world can see and study and carry home to their own lands."

## Off to Australia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, as an exponent of the small family farm and deploring legislation under which corporation farms and million-dollar operations have skimmed off benefits intended by Congress for the small operator, I submit for the RECORD an editorial of the Catskill Daily Mail which seems to reflect grassroots opinion:

OFF TO AUSTRALIA

The rugged individualism of the American farmers is obviously still with us. Consider the story of the Michigan poultry farmer who has announced his intention of selling his farm and moving to Australia.

Apparently this embattled farmer has had his fill of what he calls regimentation. Tired of acreage allotments, crop restrictions and most of what goes to make up our domestic agricultural program, this intrepid Michigander says the question is: Do I own my land, or don't I?

While this is probably an extreme view, there is a kernel of truth in it. American agriculture, under the aegis of big government and a price-support program, is necessarily subject to some regulation. With subsidy inevitably comes a measure of restriction on the freedom to act. Government assistance and government direction too often go hand in hand.

It is this sort of thing that can frustrate a man who wants to run his farm in his own way. But without price supports and the regulation that goes with them, the farmer takes great risks. It boils down to the question of how much regulation is justifiable to minimize the risk. The Michigan poultry farmer's answer seems to be: Not this much.

## Hon. John V. Lindsay on the Passport Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party from time to time produces a young, adventurous crusader who can be likened to the bright star of the future. The new Representative from New York's 17th District, JOHN V. LINDSAY, falls squarely into this category. Typical of his courageous, forthright and intelligent appraisal is a recent address he delivered in New York on the passport question. While not in complete sympathy with Mr. LINDSAY I feel that his approach deserves public hearing and should be set forth in the RECORD.

The address follows:

One of the most important subjects of legislative concern to the 85th Congress, and I suspect it will be to the 86th, is passport legislation. It is important because it involves the question of a citizen's right to travel—not only the question of whether there is such a right, but its metes and bounds. These questions have been cast into special prominence by the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in June of 1958. The Court did not decide these cases on constitutional grounds. It held only that Congress had not given the Secretary of State authority to withhold passports from citizens because of their beliefs or associations. This put it up to Congress. What kind of legislation do we want, if any? What kind of balance should we strike between competing interests?

When the Supreme Court said that the Congress had not given the Secretary of State authority to do what he was trying to do in these cases, it said a mouthful. The word "authority" is a big word. And when one is talking about the sovereign and its powers, the word "authority" means different things under different circumstances. What does it mean here?

We start with a pretty broad hint from the Supreme Court. The Court said this: "We deal here with a constitutional right of the citizen, a right which we assume the Congress will be faithful to respect." And this: "The right to travel is part of the liberty of which a citizen cannot be de-

prived without the due process of law of the fifth amendment." Now this may give us the dimensions of the ball park but it doesn't tell us much about the ground rules of the game.

In July 1958, the President and Secretary of State sent to the Congress proposed passport legislation with accompanying messages. The legislation was introduced and received considerable bipartisan backing, but not enough to get it through. It has been reintroduced in the 86th Congress, although to date there has been no comment from either the White House or the State Department. The proposal spells out the authority that the Secretary of State would have in respect of the issuance of passports. The chief difficulty I have with it lies in two short provisions.

One gives the Secretary authority to withhold passports from citizens where it is "determined upon substantial grounds that their activities or presence abroad or their possession of a passport would * * * (ii) seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States, or (iii) be inimical to the security of the United States." The other would permit the Passport Hearing Board of the Department of State, in determining an application for a passport, to consider nonrecord (undisclosed) information. The Board would be required to furnish a résumé of the confidential information to the applicant and certify that it is a fair résumé. The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Board would be transmitted to the Secretary of State, who would make a final determinatoin. The Secretary, if he should deem it in the interest of the national security or the conduct of foreign affairs, also would be empowered to consider nonrecord information, whether or not contained in the résumé. Presumably, under the general rules and regulations of the Department of State, the Secretary is not obliged personally to consider the case but may delegate the authority, including that of resorting to confidential information, to a subordinate officer. There is provision for appeal to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, but the court is not given access to undisclosed information and must accept the résumé provided by the Board. There is no definition of the circumstances under which confidential information may be used, such as on certification by a senior officer of the State Department that its disclosure would expose so-called double or buried agent of tested and known reliability, that the case cannot be decided without the use of such information, and that the decision as to the need for both its use and its secrecy has been made by a top officer of the Department of State. And, as I have stated, the court would not have access to the information. The power thus reserved to the Department is sweeping and final; its exercise is not subject to scrutiny by applicant or judicial tribunal. On what ground, then, does the Department of State predicate its request for such authority?

In an important address last November before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, a State Department spokesman made a strong plea for this proposed legislation. He cited examples where the Department of State had been required, as a result of the Supreme Court decisions, to issue passports to known members of the Communist Party. One of two were admitted members with long histories of attendance at various international Communist meetings and functions. Undoubtedly true, and certainly distressing to us all. But let's take a look at the proposed cure. The spokesman stated that personal communication by travel is the most effective way for any person or group to do business, whether it be the U.S. Government, United States Steel Co., two individuals trying to make a contract for the sale of paper clips, or members of the international Communist Party. What is needed, therefore, it was argued, is authority in the State Department first, to refuse to issue passports on the broad ground that their issuance would impair the conduct of foreign relations or be inimical to national security, and, second, to act as sole judge, in many cases, of what impairs or what is inimical, because neither the applicant nor a court would be allowed to know what the evidence is. The rationale for this approach is stated as follows: "By so doing we can very seriously hinder the effective operation of the Communist Party both here and abroad by making it difficult for the supporters of that party to depart from the United States." In other words, put a crimp into communication.

Like every American who bears allegiance to this country, I loathe and detest communism. It is not only dangerous, but as a philosophy it is repugnant to a freeman's sense of ordinary decency and fairness. Its trained agents and obedient servants in this country are detestable, mainly because they lie to you and to me in their daily lives. They use us and our institutions while their total allegiance is to a foreign power. They are mere pawns, and their objective is to use us in the same fashion. Undoubtedly, this raises a question of security. Here, then, is a competing interest which may call for some careful, limited restrictions on personal freedoms in certain cases in the interest of safeguarding the whole. But, to quote Justice Frankfurter, "let's not throw out the baby with the bath." The way to fight the disease is not to kill the patient with the cure, but to strengthen the body with the same nourishment that made it strong in the first place—by holding high the torch of liberty and rekindling its fires. Important as the need for vigilance is, let us not be so overcome by fear and mistrust that we lose precious ground gained in the ancient struggle for freedom. It is our duty to etch out legislative standards which, while giving due regard to the dangers of the international Communist conspiracy, preserve and safeguard to each individual his most precious liberties.

What is the right to travel? In my book it is one of the most fundamental liberties that we have. The Supreme Court tells us that it is "part of the 'liberty' protected by the due process clause of the fifth amendment." The Solicitor General of the United States conceded as much in his argument before the Court in Kent and Dayton. But I would suggest also that it is conjoint with, and a part of, the first amendment—freedom of speech and assembly. Of all the freedoms that we have, the one I should most hate to lose is freedom of speech. Speech is communication, and communication this modern day is impossible without locomotion. Speech is meaningless unless thought of in the context of the physical and social aspects of human existence. The social aspect suggests that speech is not effectively exercised when a man talks to himself; speech implies communication. The physical aspect renders communication impossible under some circumstances—or possible only through certain means. The social aspect may in turn attach connotations to the physically possible means, rendering all but one appropriate. The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized the interaction of these aspects in its interpretation of free speech and has held that denial of the appropriate means of communication may abridge free speech.

The abridgement of free speech is precisely what is sought to be accomplished by this legislation. Let's recognize it for what it is, and then see how far we should or can go. In other words, let's find the balance.

Now let me make it absolutely clear that we are not here talking about anyone who is under indictment for the commission of any crime, or is under restraining order of any kind by any court, or has been stripped of any right or liberty by due process of law. There may well be risks inherent in allowing a member of the Communist Party, or one identified as such by our intelligence units, free exit from our shores to travel abroad. But it is necessary to point out that this is true when Communists travel from Chicago to New York, or from New York to the Bahamas, or from Dallas to Mexico, or from San Francisco to Buenos Aires, or to any other South American country, none of which places requires a passport for exit or entry. It should be pointed out also that under the McCarran-Walter Act we are required to deport alien members of the Communist Party and we go to elaborate efforts to secure their removal after they have ben traveling freely in this country for years. Well and good enough. Yet under our passport procedures, until the Supreme Court decided otherwise, we have insisted that it is essential to the national security to keep citizen members of the party confined to our shores. The point is that there could possibly be something wrong with our reasoning; and when we are dealing with limitations on constitutional rights it is important that our reasoning be compelling and logical.

The elimination of passports between this country and Canada, and Central and South America, and all of the contiguous islands is a good thing and is consistent with the several statements that the President has made about the need for facilitating travel. In the last Congress, for example, following an administration request in support of greater ease and freedom of travel, the requirement of fingerprinting was eliminated from the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act for all transients and temporary visitors. Under modern means of travel and communication, and the expectation of greater miracles to come, the world has shrunk and distances mean nothing. It means little more to fly from New York to Paris or Vienna than it does to fly to San Francisco. Therefore, until passports are abolished under reciprocal arrangements with all countries—a development much to be hoped for—passports remain important.

What, then, is the nature of the passport? Passports have only been fashionable with our Government since World War I. Prior to that time we got along without them mainly becaues they were not a requirement of travel abroad. After World War I the citizen's request for a passport was generally regarded as nothing more than a request for a service from his Government to facilitate his travel in other lands—something which governments have an obligation to do for all citizens.

The right to a passport has always been assumed to be subject to the general war power. Few would argue that in the case of armed hostilities there are not extraordinary powers lodged in the sovereign to place limitations on all of our constitutional liberties, limitations which in the absence of the war power would be unconstitutional. The history of limitations over the right of exit goes back in the common law to the writ ne exeat regno under which the English kings could prohibit a man's departure or recall him if he had gone abroad. It was identified with war and service in the King's armies. In

more modern times it became a credential to facilitate travel. But since 1941, the crucial function of the passport in this country has been control over exit. The earlier purpose of the passport—to facilitate travel—is not only subordinate but has in fact become an appendix which we have appropriately gotten rid of in some areas in order to facilitate travel.

Let's go back to the first amendment. Although constitutional sources do not reveal that the first amendment was framed specifically to preserve a right to travel, they do not reveal the contrary. They strongly suggest, at least, that early Americans recognized a freedom to move beyond national frontiers. However uncertain its basis may have been, however unclear its limitations, the English recognized that freedom long before they crossed the Atlantic. The people of the colonies, moreover, evidently took the freedom for granted: witness the constant movement between colonies and to the West. That may explain why the freedom was not more clearly recognized in writing. The Declaration of Independence goes no further than to list as a grievance the restrictions which George III placed upon emigration. The Articles of Confederation merely guaranteed free movement between different colonies, though the colonies, not yet joined in a more perfect Union, were more like foreign countries to each other than the United States are today. Perhaps the most direct documentary evidence is to be found in the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1790 which declared "that emigration from the State shall not be prohibited."

These sources, taken together, and viewed in the light of the ninth amendment, warrant the assumption that omission of the words "right to travel" was not intended to eliminate the right. Nor is the omission inconsistent with a specific intention to include the right in free speech. The Constitution was designed to guide the United States for an indefinite period of time. It would have been impossible to enumerate the variety of ways in which free speech might be abridged—and the framers recognized this in the generality of the first amendment's language.

It is equally fundamental that the liberty guaranteed by the Constitution is not absolute. "Civil liberties", says the Supreme Court, "imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses." Freedom to travel, like other liberties, is subject to reasonable regulation and control in the interests of the public welfare. I am not sure that it is possible to draw up absolutely fixed rules which will in advance strike a proper balance which will meet the exigencies of every case, protect the public interest, and yet stay within constitutional limitations. Circumstances and the times vary and due process of law has never been a term of fixed and variable content. But the following general rules I would deem to be guideposts which should guide the Congress in its consideration of this subject:

First. The right to travel—to communicate—is a constitutionally protected right which may not be abrogated by the State except under the general war power, which normally may be invoked only in time of extreme emergency, usually involving armed conflict between nations. The right is a concomitant of, and conjoint with, the first amendment of the Constitution. A denial of a passport therefore, may result in violations of both the fifth and first amendments.

Second. Neither the right of the citizen to have issued, nor the right of the Secretary of State to deny issuance of, a passport is an absolute right.

Third. A general standard under which the Secretary of State is authorized to deny the issuance of a passport whenever he finds that its issuance would seriously impair the conduct of foreign relations or be inimical to the national security of the United States probably is too indefinite a standard when applied to a right as firmly grounded among our basic liberties as is freedom of speech and assembly. In the past we have too often seen examples of executive arbitrariness under the umbrella of "the national security" and "the conduct of foreign relations."

Fourth. A refusal to issue a passport may not rest upon confidential, undisclosed information, under a blanket, unlimited authority to use the same. Such a refusal would, in all probability, be a denial of due process of law under the fifth amendment. The authority to use confidential information in the administrative process, under imprecise standards, coupled with the power to delegate the authority to subordinates, can result in a breeding ground of arbitrariness in the course of which innocent people may suffer. I have spoken here of blanket, unlimited authority. There may be room for an exception to cover the hard core Communist case, under which the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary, personally, will certify that disclosure will expose a double or buried agent of tested and known reliability, that such exposure will be prejudicial to the national interests, and that the case may not be decided without resort to such evidence. But even then, full access to the evidence in question should be given to the court, under seal, for examination by the court in camera.

I have not in this discussion tried to spell out an entire code to govern the issuance of passports, or to draft legislation. My purpose here has been only to state my views on some of the fundamentals, and I would hope that consideration of this matter in the Congress would be guided by those fundamentals. Neither have I touched upon the whole subject of area restrictions, except indirectly. Here, I would recommend the report of the special committee to study passport procedures of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, an excellent report, prepared by a distinguished committee of lawyers. Its conclusion on the subject of area restraints is as follows:

"Travel abroad by all U.S. citizens may be prohibited in areas where the Secretary of State determines that such prohibitions should be imposed in the national interest, but only in situations of exceptional gravity. The imposition of area restrictions should be accompanied by a statement by the Secretary of State setting forth the reasons therefor. Exceptions to general area prohibitions, permitting travel by particular individuals or groups, may be made by the Secretary of State in his discretion."

In closing, I should like to make a reference to a document of great importance, which is too seldom invoked. It is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which this year celebrates its 10th anniversary. Article 13 of the declaration reads as follows:

"ART. 13. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state. (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

The United States along with the other member nations, has pledged itself to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect and observance of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in the declaration. Let us in the United States be faithful to our pledge.

## Du Pont Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before, on the floor of this House, about the peril of pricing ourselves out of the world's markets, not to mention pricing ourselves out of our own home markets. This peril is not too apparent at present, but it has to be faced and conquered now, because when we have lost the world's markets and our people are walking the streets looking for work, it will be too late.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Newburgh·News of March 10 tells the story as it affects the Du Pont Co.'s plastic-coating plant in Newburgh, N.Y. It points out the facts and once more sounds the warning. It is necessary to face the truth, in the words of the editorial, that—

It will do none of us any good to raise wages 5 percent if the cost of living is to rise 10 percent at the same time.

The editorial follows:

DU PONT REPORT

The Du Pont Co., whose plastic-coating plant at Newburgh is one of the area's major sources of employment, has announced a 7-percent drop in sales for 1958, but the firm's final 3 months did set a record high for any quarter in the company's history.

That's good news, and news which we hope will carry over into 1959. There's no doubt that as Du Pont prospers, so does our community prosper, as do so many other areas where Du Pont plants are located.

In announcing the firm's achievements for 1958, President Crawford H. Greenewalt uttered a warning of the wage-cost price inflation which has been intensified in recent years.

"Prior to World War II," said Mr. Greenewalt, "advances in technology made possible by research and development in the Du Pont Co.'s plants and laboratories more than offset increases in the elements of manufacturing cost.

"It was thus possible to maintain competitive wages and salaries and a satisfactory return on our operating investment while prices were being reduced."

The executive noted that in the postwar years the increase in wages and salaries has made it difficult for improved technology to keep pace.

"In 1958 the Du Pont average weekly wage was 71 percent above the 1947–49 average, a rate of increase of 5½ percent a year, which more than offsets advances in technology arising from research and development activities during the period," added Mr. Greenewalt.

"In consequence, the company's sales price index increased 5 percent—a modest increase compared with the advance of 23 percent in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics consumer price index."

In other words, Du Pont ingenuity and skill was able to a large degree to offset the inflationary trend. But it couldn't overcome the thing in its entirety.

This is the peril that confronts us. If our best brains, our most skilled scientists,

are unable to preserve the American tradition of industrial supremacy over costs and prices, how shall we be able to save ourselves in the markets of the world? In the markets of our own homeland?

There can be no genuine increase in our true wages and living standards unless we can produce more and keep prices down. It will do none of us any good to raise our wages by 5 percent if the cost of living is going to rise 10 percent at the same time. Serfdom lies at the end of that path.

PATH TO SERFDOM

Worst of all, as prices go up beyond wages, we shall find others under-selling us. Then, as our products remain unsold, we shall see the specter of growing unemployment stalking through our cities and villages.

The figures indicate that Du Pont is faring better than other industry of the land. This is encouraging in one way, but we shouldn't lose sight of the cold truth that, as a Nation, we seem to be losing this fight against wage-cost-price inflation.

Where is it going to end?

## Veterans' Direct Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, some time ago in passing H.R. 2256, a bill to extend the direct loan program of the Veterans' Administration, the House approved an amendment designed to remove from the language of the present statute, at that part which authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to designate eligible areas for direct lending, specific reference that such areas be rural areas or small cities and towns not near large metropolitan areas.

The passage of this amendment raises questions as to the effect of the language on the operations of the direct loan program. Since the passage of the bill, I asked the Honorable Sumner Whittier, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, to express the opinion of the Veterans' Administration in this regard. I should like at this time to ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Whittier's analysis inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. And, to include, as background material, a short excerpt from the report of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Committee Print No. 1, which deals with this matter, including the tables showing the National and State totals of direct loans under this program. Mr. Whittier's letter and the other data follow:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., March 10, 1959.*

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. EVINS: In your letter of February 25, 1959, you asked what effect the amendment to H.R. 2256, offered by Congressman ABRAHAM MULTER and adopted by the House in passing the bill, would have on the direct loan program and particularly rural areas served by that program. The amendment is designed to remove from the language of the present statute, at that part which authorizes the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to designate eligible areas for direct lending, the specific reference that such areas be rural areas or small cities and towns not near large metropolitan areas.

The concept of the direct loan program upon its creation in 1950 was that it would supplement the guaranteed loan program in areas where, historically, private capital for mortgage lending purposes was not generally available. Based on the legislative history the Veterans' Administration considered that the intent of the Congress was to confine the program to rural areas and small cities and towns. As a consequence, we followed the policy of restricting eligible areas to rural areas and small cities. Generally, we confined approval of cities to those of 25,000 population or less. On some three or four occasions we approved cities of over 50,000 population as eligible areas for a period of time.

When Public Law 85-364 was approved on April 1, 1958, the Congress evidenced concurrence in our practice by writing into the statute the references to rural areas and small cities and towns which would be deleted by Congressman MULTER'S amendment to H.R. 2256 should such bill, or one with similar language, be enacted and approved.

The effect of this action is not entirely clear to us. The colloquy on the floor of the House during the debate on the amendment seems to us to indicate an intention that eligible areas for direct lending could be established in any locality where guaranteed loan financing was not generally available. However, there is implied that direct lending should not be extended to large metropolitan areas. We refer to pages 1644-1645 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4, 1959.

We would certainly not favor any change in the basic concept of the direct loan program designed to make metropolitan areas eligible. Those areas where there is a supply of mortgage funds available can be accommodated through the guarantee program, provided the GI loan is allowed to have a competitive status in investor appeal. With the GI loan on a competitive basis, the direct loan properly may be confined to the rural areas and small towns where historically investment capital has not been available for mortgages.

We regret that we have no breakdown of our direct lending program which would show the number of loans and the dollar value of loans made to veterans in urban areas as compared to rural areas. Our reporting of direct loans made is by the county in which the property is located, without regard to whether it may be located in a city or town or a strictly rural area. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has published an excellent summary of our direct lending operations by counties. It is House Committee Print No. 1 dated January 26, 1959, and a copy is enclosed for your information.

Sincerely yours,
SUMNER G. WHITTIER,
*Administrator.*

HISTORY OF THE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM
LEGISLATION

The direct loan program as authorized by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, has been extended from year to year for financial assistance to those veterans living in rural areas, or in small cities and towns not near large metropolitan areas, where other types of financing are not available. The direct loan program, as originally authorized, was to extend from July 19, 1950, to June 30, 1951, and empowered the administrator to make direct loans up to $150 million (Public Law 475, 81st Cong., approved April 20, 1950). After expiring, on June 30, 1951, the program was renewed on September 1, 1951, on a revolving-fund basis, limited to $150 million outstanding at any one time and extended the program to June 30, 1953 (Public Law 139, 82d Cong.). The revolving fund included the unreserved portion of the original $150 million fund allocation, plus the increment from loan repayments, and the proceeds of sales of direct loans to private investors. The revolving fund was augmented in April 1952 by an additional allocation of up to $125 million, to be made available by the Secretary of the Treasury in quarterly installments of $25 million, less the proceeds of direct-loan sales in the preceding quarter (Public Law 325, 82d Cong.). Under provisions of Public Law 101, 83d Congress, approved July 1, 1953, the program was continued for 1 year, to June 30, 1954, with up to $100 million added to the revolving fund, to be made available in quarterly installments, and the maximum interest rate on direct loans was raised to conform to the rate on guaranteed loans. The program was again continued for 1 year, ending June 30, 1955, by Public Law 438, 83d Congress, approved June 29, 1954. Public Law 88, 84th Congress, approved June 21, 1955, revised the program and extended the program for 2 years, expiring June 30, 1957. Public Law 1020, 84th Congress (Housing Act of 1956), approved August 7, 1956, extended the program for 1 year from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, but failed to appropriate funds for the extended period.

VETERANS UNABLE TO OBTAIN LOANS

The committee made a survey throughout the country of the inequity of opportunity and found that of 3,234,438 veterans living in 1,635 rural counties, less than 10 percent had obtained a loan to purchase a home. This compares with 2,857,307 veterans residing in 126 metropolitan counties where over 40 percent have obtained a guaranteed loan.

The committee found that the administration of the direct loan program was such that it was almost impossible for a veteran to build a new home in a direct loan area. Approximately 80 percent of the direct loans were for the purchase of old and existing homes. The committee further found that veterans were unable to buy a farm and farm home with the aid of a VA direct loan because the Veterans' Administration required the veteran to obtain at least 60 percent of his income from farming operations. This was not the intent of Congress.

To correct this situation and clearly establish the intent of the committee and Congress, the committee reported H.R. 4602, which was approved by the Congress.

H.R. 4602 VETOED

H.R. 4602, approved by Congress, established the intent of Congress on direct loans, extended the program to July 25, 1958, provided $150 million for the year's extension, and increased the maximum amount of a direct loan from $10,000 to $13,500. However, the President vetoed the bill on September 2, 1957.

PUBLIC LAW 85-364

Public Law 85-364, approved April 1, 1958, contained all the provisions of H.R. 4602, extended the program 2 years, from June 30, 1958, to July 25, 1960, and provided $150 million for each year of the 2-year extension. Public Law 85-364 also increased the maximum interest rate the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs could set on guaranteed and direct loans. The maximum is set at 4¾ percent, but is also tied to the interest rate set for loans under section 203(b)(5) of the National Housing Act, in that the rate can-

not be higher than 4¾ percent, or one-half of 1 percent below the rate on type 203(b)(5) loans, whichever is the lower.

NEW DIRECT-LOAN PROGRAM

It was the intent of the committee and Congress that new rules and regulations be established by the Veterans' Administration for the direct-loan program which would enable builders to participate in the program in rural areas, small cities, and towns. The new program would also assist veterans to purchase a farm with a farm home, to purchase a farm and build a home on the farm, to build a home on a farm already owned, or to repair and remodel a home or farm home.

The intent was carried out in detail through the new rules and regulations issued by the Veterans' Administration on April 16, 1958.

PRESENT-DAY WAITING LIST

On April 1, 1958, the day the present law was signed by the President, there were 13,084 veterans on the waiting lists of the Veterans' Administration regional offices for a direct loan. The Veterans' Administration received the first funds under Public Law 85-364 on April 4, 1958. This $50 million was allocated to the regional offices with instructions to try to take care of the veterans who were on the waiting list as of April 1, 1958. Veterans who had applied after that date were to be placed on a new waiting list which could not be taken care of until the next allotment was received.

Veterans' Administration records indicate that 50 percent of the veterans who make application for a direct loan do not want one by the time their name reaches the top of the waiting list and funds are available to them. In many cases the veteran no longer desires the direct loan because he has obtained a loan elsewhere or there has been a change in his plans. In too many cases, however, the house he wanted has already been sold. The average amount of a direct loan is $9,044. If only 50 percent of the 13,084 veterans on the waiting list as of April 1, 1958, actually wanted a loan, it would have taken $65.42 million to make loans to the 6,542 veterans. However, only $50 million was available. Using the 50-percent figure, this would mean that 1,542 veterans had to remain on the waiting list until the next funds were received.

Veterans' Administration records indicate that on December 1, 1958, there were 41,025 veterans on the direct loan waiting list. The $50 million quarterly allotment will, if the average amount of a loan is $9,044, provide loans for only 5,000 veterans.

It is evident that additional funds must be made available if direct loans are to be provided the veterans who desire and are entitled to them.

If only 50 percent of the veterans on the waiting list still desire home loans by the time theirs is reached, it will take $216 million to eliminate the waiting list of 41,025 veterans.

Under the present law, the Veterans' Administration drew $50 million in January 1959, which will be the only funds for direct loans until July 1, 1959. This amount will make only 5,000 loans. The $50 million will be allocated to the VA regional offices and earmarked for the veterans on top of the list. This will leave over 36,000 veterans on the waiting list, who will have to wait until July 1, 1959, for a home loan—if the home they want is still available—and then only the top 5,000 veterans on the waiting list will be able to obtain a loan.

*State totals*

| State | Direct loans, April through November 1958 | | | | | | | | Guaranteed loans July through November 1958 | Veteran population | Veterans on waiting list for direct loan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total loans made | Purchase new home | Purchase existing home | Construct new home | Purchase farm with home | Construct farm home | Repair home | Repair farm home | | | |
| Alabama | 341 | 81 | 85 | 157 | 10 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1,052 | 328,000 | 1,163 |
| Arizona | 94 | 0 | 73 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 692 | 111,000 | 42 |
| Arkansas | 305 | 22 | 112 | 125 | 41 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 192 | 180,000 | 1,301 |
| California | 82 | 55 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,572 | 1,681,930 | 306 |
| Colorado | 186 | 135 | 28 | 7 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1,823 | 194,000 | 448 |
| Connecticut | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 1,530 | 275,000 | 0 |
| Delaware | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 216 | 48,000 | 0 |
| Florida | 355 | 24 | 107 | 216 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2,474 | 458,000 | 1,601 |
| Georgia | 704 | 52 | 296 | 291 | 50 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 535 | 368,000 | 2,407 |
| Idaho | 234 | 12 | 126 | 92 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 212 | 69,000 | 1,217 |
| Illinois | 242 | 23 | 193 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 1,363 | 513,000 | 940 |
| Indiana | 366 | 345 | 32 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2,249 | 1,142,000 | 1,312 |
| Iowa | 257 | 13 | 202 | 38 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 721 | 289,000 | 346 |
| Kansas | 190 | 6 | 144 | 24 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 838 | 236,000 | 136 |
| Kentucky | 467 | 25 | 353 | 39 | 40 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 429 | 315,000 | 2,686 |
| Louisiana | 262 | 27 | 114 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 760 | 296,000 | 783 |
| Maine | 200 | 6 | 267 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 842 | 107,000 | 79 |
| Maryland | 110 | 10 | 91 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,882 | 268,080 | 66 |
| Massachusetts | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 5,695 | 743,000 | 0 |
| Michigan | 239 | 78 | 139 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2,173 | 884,000 | 1,503 |
| Minnesota | 375 | 89 | 175 | 86 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1,342 | 445,000 | 1,403 |
| Mississippi | 272 | 77 | 151 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 397 | 201,000 | 1,321 |
| Missouri | 618 | 35 | 363 | 86 | 129 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1,767 | 487,000 | 1,369 |
| Montana | 143 | 10 | 79 | 50 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 155 | 75,000 | 1,049 |
| Nebraska | 167 | 6 | 137 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | 157,000 | 502 |
| Nevada | 42 | 22 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35,070 | 332 |
| New Hampshire | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 910 | 72,000 | 0 |
| New Jersey | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 3,453 | 707,000 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 84 | 38 | 28 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 893 | 90,000 | 457 |
| New York | 63 | 18 | 39 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,980 | 1,931,000 | 152 |
| North Carolina | 570 | 30 | 317 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 610 | 448,000 | 2,792 |
| North Dakota | 65 | 12 | 32 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 106 | 63,000 | 857 |
| Ohio | 489 | 333 | 143 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,623 | 1,079,000 | 2,425 |
| Oklahoma | 174 | 21 | 80 | 43 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 502 | 274,000 | 1,118 |
| Oregon | 218 | 13 | 194 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 212,000 | 304 |
| Pennsylvania | 135 | 18 | 104 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,020 | 1,455,490 | 667 |
| Rhode Island | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 374 | 118,000 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 287 | 21 | 137 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 217,000 | 884 |
| South Dakota | 151 | 28 | 71 | 43 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 103 | 75,000 | 665 |
| Tennessee | 193 | 27 | 118 | 31 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1,002 | 380,000 | 901 |
| Texas | 514 | 50 | 288 | 147 | 21 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 5,332 | 998,000 | 602 |
| Utah | 185 | 55 | 113 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 341 | 95,000 | 854 |
| Vermont | 21 | 2 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 43,000 | 0 |
| Virginia | 532 | 364 | 164 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 928 | 360,430 | 3,154 |
| Washington | 141 | 0 | 136 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 624 | 306,000 | 521 |
| West Virginia | 445 | 64 | 334 | 68 | 21 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 89 | 243,000 | 1,191 |
| Wisconsin | 138 | 0 | 115 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,053 | 403,000 | 795 |
| Wyoming | 79 | 9 | 25 | 41 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 86 | 33,000 | 323 |
| District of Columbia | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | 1,581 | 213,490 | 0 |

[1] No areas eligible.

## Curbs on Oil Imports Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that mandatory oil import limitations will increase fuel prices and are inflationary. Furthermore, by discouraging private capital in exploring for oil in South America and other countries we harm our security indirectly and kill the most effective and only type of foreign aid program that costs the taxpayer nothing.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the best long-range defense is to conserve our oil storage underground and that is what I thought was supposed to justify the Texas Railroad Commission's conservation control.

I regret and oppose these import restrictions and agree with the following editorial of the New York Times which was in today's paper:

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

President Eisenhower's decision to set up a system of compulsory import quotas covering crude petroleum and its products is an unhappy victory for a group of special interests whose gain will be at the expense of the general welfare and perhaps, ultimately, even at the expense of those who sought this move. If the immediate aims of these interests are served, the new restrictions on imports will tend to raise the cost of oil and its products, and perhaps also of coal, thus further intensifying the inflationary pressure which, in other respects, the Government is seeking to combat. And if, as is hinted in the President's statement, the Government seeks to police the price of oil and its products by changing the levels of permitted imports in response to price changes in this country, the result will be a further major intrusion of Government control in our economic life, with consequent weakening of the free enterprise system.

The national security argument for these controls is not convincing. This is shown most obviously by the inclusion of Canada in the list of countries whose oil exports to us are curbed, though there is no threat of interruption of seaborne transport in the case of Canadian oil. Beyond that, if serious attention need be paid to assuring sufficient petroleum for future emergency needs there is much to be said for keeping as much of

our oil as possible in storage under the ground and increasing, not reducing our use of imported oil.

Nor can we look with equanimity upon the probable foreign repercussions of this move. The Canadian Trade Minister has already protested it, and similar resentment is undoubtedly felt also in Venezuela and other sources of imported oil. To many abroad this will look like still anther calculated act of economic warfare by the United States against its friends, an act they will interpret as again repudiating our frequent protestations of desire for the freest possible flow of international trade. It is an unhappy precedent which has been set.

## New York Upstate Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, a speech by Mayor Frank Seditta of Buffalo delivered March 10, 1959, at the DeWitt Clinton Hotel, Albany, N.Y., during a gathering of legislators and public officials of Italian origin proved so interesting to me that I believe it will prove worthwhile reading. This speech expressed beautifully and succinctly my thoughts and feelings of the large audience which had assembled in upstate New York under the shadow of the capitol.

Also attending and speaking were the Right Reverend Bishop Pernicone; Joseph F. Carlino, majority leader of the New York State Assembly; Anthony J. Travia, minority leader of the New York State Assembly; Joseph Caputa, New York State rent administrator; Angela R. Parisi, member of the New York Workmen's Compensation Board; and Carmine G. DeSapio, chairman of the New York Democratic County Committee. The chairman who arranged this function was Assemblyman Louis DeSalvio. More than 250 public officials of Italian origin from throughout the State of New York from Chautauqua County to Staten Island assembled at this gathering.

The following is the speech delivered by the mayor of the city of Buffalo, Mr. Seditta:

I think the idea of this dinner is a good one. I do not mean that any useful purpose is served by a mass demonstration of ego or self-satisfaction. Rather I think it appropriate that we remind ourselves of the special responsibilities which go with the collective positions of trust represented in this room tonight.

It is well to remember that governmental leadership for the American of Italian origin, in any large degree, is a relatively new thing. As a group, we are but once or twice removed from loved ones who are lately come from the mother country. In many cases, the new life they found here was only slightly less onerous than the one they left. Here they spent their strength and their skill in incredibly hard work, living simply, humbly, and in the gentleness which is the singular grace of our people. But they did find what they sought, something they did not have before. And that was hope—not necessarily hope for themselves, but the hope that their children, or their children's children, might find their places in the sun. This dinner, I think, is eloquent proof that this hope was well founded. But this proof is still fragile, still tentative.

This, I believe, is the important lesson for us to remember. It is still for us, on the one hand, to continue to justify the faith and the labor of our parents. It is, again, our special responsibility to discharge honorably the trust which we bear. True, this is the responsibility of any one in public life, regardless of origin. But we may not yet walk with the serenity and confidence that comes only with an American maturity of centuries. This challenge, which is ours, is the more biting because of our ancestral identification with an infinitesimally small percentage, who have become associated with the very worst in American life today.

We might point out that such an identification is grossly unfair. And we'd be right. We might point out that every group has its brothers who forever lurk in the shadows. And we'd be right. We might point out that our national character was formed by a culture and civilization that was old and wise when the rest of the world was emerging from the forests—that this ancient civilization developed systems of philosophy and ethics that today are the standards of morality throughout the Christian world. This would all be right. But still the identification would persist. It may not be reasoned away. It will pass in its own time.

And right here, it seems to me, is our special test. We can bring that time closer or we can put it off. But in no case do we have the luxury of thinking and acting and speaking just for ourselves. The judgment on all of our people, on what we really are and what we really stand for, will be made out of the things we do and the things we leave. It seems to me that these things should be a dominant theme, whenever Americans of Italian ancestry meet. There is no doubt in my mind, and I am sure in yours, that we are rising to the occasion.

## Federal Reserve Board—Please Take Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 8, 1959, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues and of the Federal Reserve Board:

ECONOMIST FINDS NEED OF LOWER INTEREST RATES

The 1958 housing boom can be expected to fizzle unless effective mortgage rates are deflated to 5 percent rather than 6 percent, and mortgage terms closer to 35 years rather than 20 years, reports Eliot Janeway, economist and president of the Janeway Research Corp. He declared yesterday that "unless Federal National Mortgage Association mortgages are again selling at par on the basis of 5 to 5¼ percent yields, the so-called housing boom will go bust."

"Businessmen, investors, and just plain consumers who are still being stampeded into the stock market," said Mr. Janeway, "either don't know what's going on in Washington, and in the all-important housing sector of the economy, or are not concerned over the duration or the extent of the 1959 disappointment building up for business in general and housing in particular.

"No matter what happens, housing cannot be expected to pick up again until the end of the year, after money conditions have turned easy once again," Mr. Janeway said.

"People are assuming too much about the 1959 business outlook and they are going to be hurt by it. It is surprising," he said, "to see relatively well informed people believe that recovery can keep right on going in 1959 despite the stalled status of the trendmaking housing industry.

"But," he said, "there is a decisive difference between this year and last year in the state of the long-term Government bond market."

"Last year," he said, "the bond market strengthened enough to permit Washington to stimulate a business upturn led by housing. But this year, the bond market has weakened enough to stop this 1958 housing upturn in its tracks."

"No matter what kind of housing bill is finally enacted," Mr. Janeway said, "housing will not revive until the bond market has."

## Ever Vigilant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to know that in times of stress clear-thinking citizens come to the defense of our Republic and to safeguard our principles. I refer in this instance to the members of the American Legion. We have all heard and read of attempts by misguided individuals to abolish the Committee on Un-American activities of this House. This committee's role in safeguarding our freedoms is well known to every patriotic citizen. The following resolution adopted by Hinsdale Post 250, the American Legion, is reassuring in our efforts to preserve these freedoms:

Whereas it is an established fact that our concept of government based on the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States is under attack by an opposing ideology, despotic and godless in nature; and

Whereas the perpetrators of this ideology have ceaselessly proclaimed to the nations of the world their plans for subjugation of said nations; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has been designated as a major objective of aforementioned subjugation; and

Whereas one of the approved techniques of appropriation is the infiltration of the subversive element into policymaking levels of Government and into strategic defense positions;

Therefore the undersigned do petition the Congress of these United States for the continuation of the Un-American Activities Committee, the past achievements of which have been of inestimable value to our national security.

## Why We Are Unpopular Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune of Lawrence, Mass., on March 9, 1959.

WHY WE ARE UNPOPULAR OVERSEAS

The U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee is digging into why America and Americans are unpopular overseas.

The auto of Assistant Secretary of State William M. Rountree was recently stoned in Iraq. Vice President Nixon was spat upon in Peru and Venezuela.

There have been 75 attacks on American libraries and U.S. information centers in 25 countries. They have ranged from window breaking to bombings and attempted arson. In Formosa the U.S. embassy was sacked. All this in spite of a multibillion-dollar U.S. foreign aid program.

The easy explanation is that Communist agitators are responsible, but that doesn't appear to be the whole story.

Two Syracuse University researchers, operating on a Carnegie grant, have been studying this question from the angle of whether Americans are properly trained for service abroad.

Their findings, to be published in book form next fall, have been given advance presentation to the Senate committee.

There are now over a million-and-a-half Americans, including dependents, stationed overseas. This is under 1 percent of the population. It includes 520,000 private business representatives and missionaries, 940,000 military personnel and 83,500 civilian Government employees.

The last category catches most of the criticism. It includes 50,000 working for the Department of Defense, 13,500 from the State Department, 11,500 on foreign aid and technical assistance, 3,500 U.S. Information Agency, 5,000 others.

These figures do not include another million-and-a-half tourists, students and traveling businessmen. They also contribute to the image of "The Ugly American," to use the title made popular by the current best seller.

The bad name is by no means proportionate to the number in any foreign country. A fourth of the Americans abroad are in Germany. Relations there are good. The same is true in Japan. And these two countries might well have the best reasons in the world for hating Americans.

The principal criticisms of Americans working overseas are that they are too rich, that they are too impatient about making over the world in the image of the United States of America, and that they live abroad in a cultural land, refusing to mix with or learn about the country to which they are assigned. In short, they don't make friends.

The two Syracuse University researchers tackled this problem of whether properly trained people were being sent abroad by interviewing 240 Americans in 6 selected countries—Mexico, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia, Iran, Japan, and Indonesia.

They first looked into why Americans go abroad to work. Missionaries go because of their dedication; Foreign Service and Army officers because they're assigned, as part of their career training. Some make good and some don't.

Civilians often take foreign posts because they can make and save twice as much and live better. Some go for escape—from relatives, wrong jobs, disillusion or because competition at home is tougher—all bad motives.

The investigators found that conditions under which Americans must work abroad are changing. The old idea that Americans don't mix in the affairs of countries to which they are assigned no longer holds. Every foreign job now concerns the country's internal economic, social, and political affairs.

One great difficulty has been that Americans stationed abroad have not been close enough to the new middle class leaders they are training to govern their countries in the future. The United States missed this boat in both Iraq and Cuba.

What all this boils down to is that Americans have not been properly educated or trained for overseas service. What should be proposed is a new set of standards for such education, so that more Americans can be properly prepared for what is called overseasmanship.

## Hawaii Statehood

SPEECH
OF
### HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4221) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, after the long and many years of effort and struggle spent in our quest, it hardly seems possible that the supporters of the legislation now before this committee can sense the thrill of success which is apparently only hours removed from this debate of today.

At this time I desire to especially commend to members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]— who have so ably spearheaded the fight for granting the status of statehood to Hawaii—the last of our incorporated Territories. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], is the ranking member of the majority side of the committee which I have the honor to chairman. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], is the ranking member on the minority side of each committee. Each of them has done yeoman service in this program. To them, along with the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. BURNS], is due more than to any other like Member of the Members of our body the credit of getting this legislation along so quickly in this session. Also they are due great credit in presenting the bill in the fine form and detail in which it is presented to us. Certainly, I do not desire to minimize the good work done in the interests of statehood for Hawaii by other members of the committee particularly, and Members of the House generally. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], floor manager of the legislation for the minority, has been extremely helpful and constructive with his searching and meaningful questions which he had propounded during committee consideration.

Without in any way attempting on my part to prejudge the final decision on the legislation which we are now considering, may I say, that, in my opinion, a great majority of this body—truly representing the great majority of the citizens of our Nation—will voice their approval of the bill within the next day or two. Yet, may I say that there are those among us who look with question and fear—and may I add with some suspicion on what the sponsors and supporters of the legislation desire to do. In most instances these questioning and opposing colleagues of ours are most sincere in their opposition. I truly hope that as the advocates of the legislation present their case that the fears and especially the suspicions of our opposing colleagues may be allayed and even removed. Our presentation will be to that end.

Some of my friends have said that the granting of the status of statehood to Hawaii is but the beginning of like attention to be paid to other areas now under our national jurisdiction but not enjoying the status of full membership in our sisterhood of States. I say to those of my colleagues who oppose this legislation for this reason that you have no need for further worry—to be perfectly and brutally frank I say that you really have no logical justification for your opposition founded on such thinking.

Hawaii is the last of the incorporated Territories. With its admission to full statehood in our Union, we shall have filled the galaxy of stars in the field of blue in our National banner. For the foreseeable future there will be no more. It is my opinion that it is most unlikely that there ever will be others. Yet, I know full well that the Members of the 86th Congress cannot speak for the succeeding Congress or Congresses. And, here, may I add my own personal position, which is that I have sufficient faith in those who will be chosen to follow us that they shall do that which is best for the general welfare of our country and its people.

Now, may I explain in some detail just what I mean by stating to you that Hawaii is the last of our incorporated Territories and just what significance must be attached to such statement.

STATEHOOD IS THE NECESSARY CONSEQUENCE OF TERRITORIAL INCORPORATION

The claim that the incorporation of a Territory makes mandatory its graduation to statehood is supported overwhelmingly by historical precedent and the dicta of the Federal judiciary.

Every incorporated Territory—and there have been 31 of them—has become a State except Hawaii. The first of a series of organic acts for incorporated Territories was the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which outlined a policy of ultimate status not only for the Northwest Territory, but also for all the Territories subsequently to be acquired. A basic provision was that when the population of any district within the Northwest Territory should total 60,000, that district was to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original 13 States.

Organic legislation which ensued for the Southwest Territory, the Territory of Michigan, the Territory of Illinois, and so forth, incorporated the Territory to which each of the acts applied and made provision for eventual statehood.

One after the other, all the incorporated Territories on the mainland were admitted to the Union; and only last January 3 Alaska joined the great sisterhood. The constitutional status of Hawaii is identical to that of Alaska, as well as to that of each of the other former incorporated Territories. True, the Organic Act of Hawaii does not refer in explicit terms to statehood; but the fact that the act extended the Constitution in all its parts to our great Pacific Territory and thereby incorporated it into the Union was sufficient to guarantee it eventual statehood.

The courts time and again have made it plain that the act of incorporation constitutes a commitment by the Congress ultimately to admit as a State the Territory incorporated. In *Ex Parte Morgan* (20 F. 298, 305 (1883)), an incorporated territory is considered an inchoate State. In *McAllister* v. *United States* (141 U.S. 174, 188 (1891)), territorial government was said to be temporary and destined to be superseded when the—incorporated—territories became States of the Union. In *Balzac* v. *People of Puerto Rico* (258 U.S. 298 (1922)), the Supreme Court said that incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood.

One of the more baseless of the charges long cherished by antistatehood elements is the allegation that Hawaii's admission would be followed, necessarily, by that of Guam, American Samoa, and all the other unincorporated areas controlled by the United States. The very fact that these Territories are unincorporated precludes their admission. Not until the Congress makes them an integral part of the United States, and thereby accords them incorporated status, can they hope to achieve statehood. Such a development is utterly unlikely, at least for the foreseeable future.

*The 30 States having previous Territorial status and their respective periods of such status,[1] plus Hawaii interpolated as of 1959*

| State [2] | Date of organic act | Date admitted as State | Years elapsed |
|---|---|---|---|
| New Mexico | 1850 | 1912 | 62 |
| Hawaii | 1900 | 1959 | 59 |
| Arizona | 1863 | 1912 | 49 |
| Alaska [3] | 1912 [3] | 1959 | 47 |
| Utah | 1850 | 1896 | 46 |
| Washington | 1853 | 1889 | 36 |
| Michigan | 1805 | 1837 | 32 |
| North Dakota | 1861 | 1889 | 28 |
| South Dakota | 1861 | 1889 | 28 |
| Idaho | 1863 | 1890 | 27 |
| Montana | 1864 | 1889 | 25 |
| Florida | 1822 | 1845 | 23 |
| Wyoming | 1868 | 1890 | 22 |
| Mississippi | 1798 | 1817 | 19 |
| Arkansas | 1819 | 1836 | 17 |
| Oklahoma | 1890 | 1907 | 17 |
| Indiana | 1800 | 1816 | 16 |
| Ohio | 1787 | 1803 | 16 |
| Colorado | 1861 | 1876 | 15 |
| Nebraska | 1854 | 1867 | 13 |
| Wisconsin | 1836 | 1848 | 12 |
| Oregon | 1848 | 1859 | 11 |
| Missouri | 1812 | 1821 | 9 |
| Illinois | 1809 | 1818 | 9 |

*The 30 States having previous Territorial status and their respective periods of such status,[1] plus Hawaii, interpolated as of 1959*—Continued

| State [2] | Date of organic act | Date admitted as State | Years elapsed |
|---|---|---|---|
| Minnesota | 1849 | 1858 | 7 |
| Iowa | 1838 | 1846 | 6 |
| Louisiana | 1804 | 1812 | 3 |
| Kansas | 1854 | 1861 | 2 |
| Tennessee | 1790 | 1796 | 9 |
| Nevada | 1861 | 1864 | 8 |
| Alabama | 1817 | 1819 | 8 |

[1] The Thirteen Original States did not, of course, pass through any territorial stage. Vermont, Kentucky, Maine, and West Virginia were formed from already existing States. California and Texas were acquired from foreign governments and consequently escaped the territorial apprenticeship.

[2] States are listed under the names by which they are now known rather than by the name of the Territory from which each was formed.

[3] Alaska was incorporated as of 1868, but its first organic act was not passed until 1884. This first organic act, however, provided only for a "district" rather than a "territorial" form of government. Hence, the organic act of 1912, which created Alaska's first legislature, may more truly be considered the basic act in the establishment of Territorial government.

Source: Statutes at Large.

We have no more areas which have been or are likely to be designated as incorporated Territories. Hawaii is the last. The people of Hawaii—good, loyal, and patriotic citizens of the United States of America—have served well their apprenticeship. They are ready. They are deserving. We are ready to receive them. Let not any fears of ours deny to our own that which our own is entitled to receive—the blessing and responsibilities attendant with full sisterhood in the United States of America.

## Repeal of the Hiss Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today I presented my statement in support of H.R. 578 which I introduced to repeal the so-called Hiss Act before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

My statement was as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 578

Mr. Chairman, allow me to express my appreciation for this opportunity to explain the purpose of my bill, H.R. 578 and to urge its careful consideration by this committee.

The purpose of the bill is quite simple to explain. It is to repeal in its entirety Public Law 769 of the 83d Congress—the so-called Alger Hiss Act. This act, as you know, prohibits the payment of annuities or retired pay to retired civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government and to retired military officers and enlisted men who are or who ever have been convicted of certain criminal offenses or who commit certain acts in the future.

It is my firm belief that not only is repeal the simplest way to handle what promises to develop into a very complicated problem, but that it will prove to be the most effective and the cheapest way of doing it. I say this because, first, the law is grossly unfair to the great majority of persons to whom it applies and should, therefore, be either abolished or amended so as not to apply to them. Second, as regards the other individuals to whom it applies, the law is subject to attack on a number of constitutional grounds, and if allowed to stand it will be the subject of endless litigation with the probable result that its provisions will gradually be chipped away by the courts.

First, I would like to discuss the broader policy aspects of the law.

This law was passed during what might be termed the witchcraft era on Capitol Hill. When I say this I do not mean to imply that I do not think that we have never had a national security problem in this country or that we might not have one in store for us. However, looking back to the year 1954, I think that our increased concern with this problem made us lose sight of its true dimensions. In such a setting, the Hiss Act passed the House of Representatives, unchallenged and undebated. And this despite the warnings of Civil Service Commission officials that the legislation's language was so general and vague that numerous inequities and hardships would result from it.

From the reports I have seen and heard, a good number of these hardship cases have already presented themselves. To date some 200 civil service retirees have been denied annuities approximately some $300 million in benefit rights. I do not claim familiarity with all of these cases.

I have heard of some, however, which demonstrate the extreme injustices which can result from the provisions of the act. For example, a study undertaken by the Federal Bar Association in 1956 disclosed that 51 out of the 64 cases that had arisen at that time involved offenses that had been committed prior to the law's enactment. Thirteen of these 51 cases—more than 25 percent—concerned employees who had been hired or rehired by the Government after they had been convicted and punished for the offense for which their annuities were later denied.

The Government, in other words, employed these persons with full knowledge of their past convictions. They were allowed to work for years, making contributions to the civil service retirement fund with the expectation of retirement benefits for themselves and their families when they reached the eligible age. Out of a clear sky, this law appeared on the statute books and their plans and dreams for a secure old age vanished into thin air. This, I submit, is not in keeping with the American concept of justice and fair play.

The Hiss Act, like charity, it might be said, covers a multitude of sins. About one-third of the crimes for which a person can lose his retirement rights are misdemeanors. Thus, a very valuable property can be lost for a minor offense. It has been reported that one employee lost an annuity valued at over $49,000 for a conviction in which the court saw fit not to impose any fine or imprisonment. Another case involved a person who in his youth stole a ham from the Army. This law, it seems to me, fails to comply with the basic principle of criminal law of trying to make the punishment fit the crime.

There are other proposals before this committee to amend Public Law 769 so as to eliminate many of the problems I have referred to. The administration, I understand, has finally realized the problems that have arisen because of this law, which it advo-

cated in 1954. It now offers proposals to amend it to apply only to convictions for disloyalty reasons.

As I stated earlier, however, I believe that the problem would be best solved by repealing the statute entirely, as my bill, H.R. 578, would do.

I shall not undertake at this time to present a brief on the unconstitutionality of the law. That is a study which this committee is better equipped to undertake than I am. I am here only to point out that the subject deserves serious consideration.

Indeed one section of the act has already been declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Court of Claims. In the case of *Steinberg* v. *United States*, decided last July, the Court of Claims struck down the provision of the law denying retirement benefits to persons who refuse to testify on the ground of self-incrimination before a congressional committee, a Federal court, or a Federal grand jury. This provision, the Court declared, circumvents the fifth amendment guarantee against compulsory self-incrimination and indiscriminately links the innocent with the guilty.

To be sure, in the Steinberg case the Court was dealing with what is probably the most vulnerable section of Public Law 769, which does not even require a conviction but makes the simple exercise of a constitutional right grounds for withholding retirement benefits. It does point up, however, that the entire law was passed and adopted without careful scrutiny. Otherwise such an obviously invalid provision would not have been included in it. It also, I am afraid, portends the fate of other provisions of the act.

Those persons who were convicted of crimes before Public Law 769 was passed, but who will lose benefits if its provisions are carried out will attack it as ex post facto. The man whose name was made a part of its legislative history may well challenge it on the grounds that it is a classic bill of attainder.

Others may maintain that they are being deprived of vested property rights without due process of law. They will point to the concurring decision of Judge Whitaker in the Steinberg case and the recent decision of Judge Tamm of the District Court of the District of Columbia, in the Nester case which involved social security benefits. If there ever was a piece of legislation which was destined for rough sledding in the courts, this is it.

The judiciary, of late, has often been charged with usurping some of our legislative functions. But what about the other side of the coin? Isn't it about time we admitted to ourselves that perhaps in passing Public Law 769 we were trying to exercise some judicial functions.

I think that Public Law 769 was a mistake—well intended, it may be true—but still a mistake. I sincerely hope this committee will take early action on my bill, H.R. 578, which would strike this provision from the statute books.

## Whose Farm Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a chronology of some statements made by the Secretary of Agriculture during the past 5 months. I will leave it to my colleagues to determine what the administration's position is on the farm program now in effect.

Washington Post, February 25, 1959—Joseph Alsop column:

Secretary Benson is ripe for the operating table because his farm program has finally got absolutely out of hand.

Letter to the editor of the Washington Post, March 11, 1959, by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson:

The farm program now in effect is not that of this Secretary of Agriculture. The Benson program has never been allowed to go into effect.

Omaha World Herald, October 9, 1958—interview with Secretary Benson at Nebraska City, Nebr., when the Secretary visited Nebraska on a campaign junket:

Mr. Benson said that his farm program has been in effect only since the fall of 1955 and that there had been a steady improvement in conditions since then.

Associated Press story of Secretary of Agriculture Benson's address to a luncheon of the National Affairs Forum sponsored by the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce which appeared in the Lincoln Journal October 8, 1958:

Secretary of Agriculture Benson says the American farmer "never had it so good."

## H.R. 105 Endorsed by International Rescue and First Aid Association, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 105 in the House. This bill is similar to a measure that I sponsored in the last Congress—H.R. 242—and would make volunteer fire departments and rescue squads eligible for donable surplus Federal property.

In the second session of the last Congress we approved a bill pertaining only to volunteer fire departments. However, this bill was not passed in the Senate prior to adjournment.

It is my sincere belief that both volunteer fire departments and rescue squads should be eligible for the surplus property that might be donated for their use. Each of these organizations performs a very vital public service.

A few days ago the board of directors and executive committee of the International Rescue and First Aid Association—IRFAA—met in nearby Alexandria, Va. The members of this group went on record as endorsing and urging passage of my bill, H.R. 105.

During the IRFAA's convention last November, the membership reaffirmed the association's position as set forth in a resolution adopted at the 1956 convention. I include this 1956 resolution in these remarks for the benefit of my colleagues who have sponsored legislation similar to H.R. 105.

The resolution follows:

Whereas in recent years our great Nation has suffered enormously from the destructive forces of nature by virture of hurricanes, floods, and tornadoes, which caused great tolls in loss of life and injury to thousands of our citizens as well as being most destructive to commercial establishments and residential structures; and

Whereas these catastrophies must be met by the immediate organization of disaster squads, equipped with articles from Federal surplus stockpiles, which would greatly enhance rescue, first aid and transportations so vital at said disaster areas; and

Whereas disaster squads should be organized, equipped and trained within the organizational planning of Armed Forces Reserve training centers, stations, and armories, Civil Defense, Civil Air Patrol, and organized civilian rescue-first aid squads; and

Whereas the release of said surplus Federal equipment would also enhance routine localized functions on a year-round basis and thereby greatly reduce death and injury tolls from the presently high rates; and

Whereas human misery could be relieved and alleviation of unwarranted delays could be achieved by trained and well-equipped squads which would provide the best in rescue, first aid, and transportation; and

Whereas within the past 2 years the eastern seaboard and the New England States have suffered high tolls in loss of life and billions in property losses, causing peril to our national security and public safety: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this resolution be unanimously passed in concurrence and proper Federal authorities be notified.

This resolution outlines succinctly the need for this legislation; its statements are also applicable to the volunteer fire departments of the Nation.

Because of the important role IRFAA plays in community service in the Nation, I outline herewith the organization's purposes and objectives:

THIS IS THE IRFAA

The International Rescue and First Aid Association is an association of organized volunteer, paid, and industrial rescue squads, ambulance and first-aid crews, fire departments, and other comparable units equipped with all types of rescue and first aid apparatus and devices which can be carried in mobile units, either by vehicular, water, or air transport; county, State, and other associations; and individuals, both men and women, active or interested in the rescue and first aid movement.

The IRFAA membership thus is composed of individuals, organized units, and associations, and associate members in the United States, Canada, and other countries. This association was organized in 1948 at the first annual convention in Atlantic City, N.J. The IRFAA is incorporated under the code of the Commonwealth of Virginia as a voluntary nonprofit organization.

OBJECTIVES OF THE IRFAA

First. To promote the ideas of organized rescue and first aid work throughout the world;

Second. To promote and assist in the establishment and training of rescue and first aid organizations;

Third. To cooperate to the fullest possible extent with other organizations whose objectives are accident prevention, safety education, rescue and first aid work;

Fourth. To cooperate in, foster, and conduct research designed to advance the science and art of rescus and first aid work, and to encourage the desirable standardization of practice and equipment;

Fifth. To establish a system of mutual assistance both within the association and with other organizations to be used in the event of large-scale disaster;

Sixth. To develop and maintain a code of high ethical standards among rescue and first aid personnel;

Seventh. To promote the general good and welfare of the members of the association;

Eighth. To aid in bringing about and maintaining world harmony by developing a spirit of kinship among the people who are devoted to the cause of saving life and aiding the sick and injured;

Ninth. To bring together in a common association all organizations and individuals interested in the aforementioned objective.

ACTIVITIES

All activities of this association are designed and carried out to accomplish and forward the aforementioned activities. All elected and appointed officers are volunteers in their work in and for the association except the executive director who is employed to conduct the operations of the executive office and to serve as editor of the association's official magazine, the International Rescuer.

This association encourages plans of cooperative action and mutual assistance among its members; and on local, county, State, provincial, and other levels but it does not itself become operational in any emergency or disaster situation whether it be of a local, State, National, or international character. It does not order, dispatch, or request any member unit to go to the scene of any emergency or disaster of any type. Any unit, individual, or organization does not lose any autonomy or freedom of action through membership in this association.

Mr. Speaker, when surplus Federal property is available for donation purposes, it should be placed in the hands of those organizations performing a public service. The volunteer rescue squads and volunteer fire departments of America certainly meet this test.

The chairman of the Donable Property Subcommittee had advised me that when departmental reports are received on the pending bills that consideration will be given to hearings.

It is my hope that we can complete action on H.R. 105 in this session of Congress and make these organizations eligible to receive donable property.

## The Questing Desire To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial by President Virgil M. Hancher, of the State University of Iowa, won the George Washington Honor Medal Award presented by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa. The award was made for "bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life." Since the editorial originally appeared in the National Education Association Journal, it is possible that not many of the Members of Congress have had a chance to read it.

Because its message is of such importance that all of us need to study these words and take them to our hearts during the deliberations we hold on one of the great issues of the moment, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In placing it in the RECORD, I also wish to pay tribute to Dr. Hancher for the continuing contribution which he is making to higher education. The George Washington Honor Medal Award is further evidence of the recognition he is receiving throughout the United States.

The editorial follows:

THE QUESTING DESIRE TO KNOW

Our Nation has been severely shaken by recent events. Hope and a profound belief in our ultimate destiny have sustained and strengthened this Nation from its earliest beginnings. Now, for the first time in this century, we have been asked suddenly to face the possibility that we may become a second-rate power. How shall we meet the challenge of that sobering fact?

Perhaps nothing has been so disillusioning to the rest of the world, nothing has so diminished the reputation and standing of our great Nation, as the conduct of our people since October 4, 1957. Russia launched a satellite, and the schools and colleges of the United States became the scapegoat for an adult generation's own feeling of inadequacy.

That generation, being unwilling to admit its inadequacy, turned its anger loose upon the schools. But if there is one thing under the sun for which today's schools and colleges are not answerable, it is the sorry state in which the world now finds itself.

Men have always sought scapegoats for their shortcomings. The search is as old as Abraham and as new as the latest political speech. In the midst of all this search for a scapegoat, someone needs to tell the blunt and bitter truth: If any schools or colleges are responsible for the present crisis, it is the schools and colleges of 20 to 40 years ago—the very schools so often cited as models of what we should return to today.

If the men and women of my generation can keep from blowing the world to bits in the next 10 years, those now about to graduate from our schools and colleges may well do a better job than we have done of keeping the peace and of building a great society.

"Make no little plans," said Daniel Burham, the great architect and city planner, "they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistency. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order and beacon, beauty."

The New Testament parable of the talents embodies a great spiritual law, and a great law of life. It says: "Unto everyone that hath shall be given, * * * but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." If our young graduates play it safe and wrap their talent in a napkin, hiding it away until the Day of Judgment, as many of my generation have done, they will have nothing to show for the life and the talent given them, and will stand condemned.

But these young people are learning, I hope, as Somerset Maugham once said, that those who surrender their liberty in return for security will learn to their sorrow that in the end they have surrendered both their liberty and their security.

They are learning, I hope, that the fundamental challenge of our time is whether free men can achieve the intellectual eminence and the force of character requisite to demonstrate that freedom is better than regimentation and spiritual power greater than the Marxist dialectic.

This is a time for statesmanship, intelligence, character, and imagination. We need trained intelligence and intellectual eminence, as the Russians do, because these are national assets. But we, in this country and in the free world, need them even more because they are among the highest attributes of man.

Man alone, of all creation, possesses the restless and questing desire to know, and it is this desire which today's schools and colleges are seeking to stimulate and guide and direct into creative channels.

## North Dakota Legislature Urges Full Recognition of U.S. Maritime Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the North Dakota State Legislature, adjourned last week, passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to establish and maintain the United States Maritime Service as a uniformed service. I am sure that most of us are familiar with the history and great traditions of the Maritime Service, both in peace and in war.

The concurrent resolution passed by the North Dakota Legislature follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION "J-1"

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to establish and maintain the U.S. Maritime Service as a unifomed service

Whereas the U.S. Maritime Service performs a highly valuable service to the United States in time of peace and is an integral part of our national defense in time of war; and

Whereas a measure will be placed before Congress during its current session to recognize the status of the U.S. Maritime Service by making it one of the uniformed services of this country: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein,* That Congress is respectfully urged to pass suitable legislation to establish and maintain the U.S. Maritime Service as one of the fully recognized uniformed services of this country, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of Commerce, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
*Speaker of the House.*
GERALD L. STAIR,
*Chief Clerk of the House.*
C. P. DAHL,
*President of the Senate.*
VIC GILBREATH,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

## Administration's Failure To Promote Industrial Uses of Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, city dwellers often ask midwesterners why we disagree so firmly with the administration's policies on the farm program. And sometimes we wonder if, indeed, we are unfair.

But then other facts come to light which confirms our basic position that the administration should be working to improve the plight of agriculture which is one of the basic industries of the Nation.

A story told to me privately by J. Leroy Welsh and later told to a House agriculture subcommittee recently which was studying industrial uses of agriculture products further reaffirms our suspicion of the administration.

Welsh, of Omaha, is well known for his efforts as Chairman of President Eisenhower's Bipartisan Commission To Study Utilization of Farm Products for Industrial Purposes.

He said that he and other members of the Commission visited the Federal research laboratory in Peoria, Ill., that has been working for years in this field of agricultural products.

VISIT LABORATORY

While there, Welsh and others were told that 100 million bushels of corn could be utilized annually in the manufacture of paper if one problem could be solved.

By adding 5 percent starch to woodpulp in paper manufacturing, a better quality paper could be produced. It would be economically feasible since the cost of the starch would be competitive in price to that proportion of woodpulp it replaced. Incidentally, Welsh said that 90 percent of all woodpulp is imported.

This use of starch has been tried, but it developed that something in the starch caused it to become brittle and caused brown spots to appear on the paper after a time.

This was the problem.

Welsh asked the Peoria people if that could be solved. After some discussion, the Peoria people agreed that by intensifying their effort on the project it could certainly be done within 2 years—maybe 2 months. Two million dollars would be the most it would require to do the job.

ACTION PLANNED

Welsh went to the Secretary of Agriculture and other members of his staff and related the story. It was agreed that it was a wonderful plan. The $2 million could come from the money Congress made available to the Secretary for just such projects.

A man was named in that meeting as the person who would have the responsibility of working out the starch research project.

Welsh in visiting with the Secretary seven and a half months later found that nothing had yet been done.

When Welsh testified this past week to the Agriculture Subcommittee, he reported that it was now a year and a half from that meeting in which the project was set to go. As far as he knows nothing has yet been done.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a fund now of $300 million which comes from import duties earmarked by the Congress for use in financing a program for industrial use of agriculture projects. The Congress has authorized an additional $500 million for the same purpose.

And yet the Secretary insists that the new agency that is being considered in legislation pending before the Congress should be under the Department of Agriculture.

WHAT MOTIVE?

It is difficult to determine the administration's motives. It also raises the question if the administration provides the incentive needed to carry out this program which would be a boon to agriculture and reduce the ever-increasing burden on the taxpayer.

It has all the authority and all the money needed to have initiated a program within the framework of the Department of Agriculture.

However, I submit that the Department officials indicate that they do not realize that our present need is to push wholeheartedly for programs in utilization research, instead of continued attention to means of increasing production.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 35

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Green Bay, Wis., Press-Gazette of July 3, 1957, entitled "Petitioners Ask End of Pollution in Rock River":

PETITIONERS ASK END OF POLLUTION IN ROCK RIVER

MADISON.—A petition asking Governor Thomson to bring an immediate halt to existing industrial and sewage pollution in the Rock River and Lake Koshkonong was forwarded Wednesday to the State committee on water pollution.

A delegation from Rock County presented the petition to the Governor Monday. It contained 3,000 signatures and said the pollution was damaging fish life, boating, swimming, and recreation in the area.

The Governor forwarded the petition to the committee along with a letter in which he said he wanted "our streams cleared as rapidly as possible."

"If the committee determines that all reasonable speed has not been used or if cooperation has been lacking," the Governor wrote, "I urge that you take the action within your power which may be required to impress upon the offenders our determination to see that the law is observed."

Practically all U.S. public waterways, including canals, are maintained today by U.S. Army engineers.

## Science Honors Utahan Who Heads Glen Canyon Archeological Salvage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, last week in New York City an honor of international importance in science was conferred upon the head of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Utah, Dr. Jesse D. Jennings. I believe the honor merits the attention of the Congress because Dr. Jennings is engaged in scientific exploration closely connected with that monumental reclamation development spawned and sustanied by the Congress—the Upper Colorado River storage project. Dr. Jennings is the director of the archeological and historical salvage work on lands which will be flooded by the Glen Canyon Reservoir.

In this salvage work, Dr. Jennings and his colleagues are working against time—once the reservoir begins to fill, the record will be closed forever on the lore which the reservoir bottoms contain. The best interests of not only western history, but the Nation and science generally, demand that this work be carried to a complete and successful conclusion. The work will be carried to such a conclusion only with the sustained support and interest of the Congress.

For this reason, I direct the attention of my colleagues to two articles—an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune which list some of Dr. Jennings' personal accomplishments including the Viking Gold Medal which the Wenner Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research presented him last week, and a feature story from the Deseret News—Salt Lake City—which reviews some of the interesting progress which Dr. Jennings' salvage team has made in the Glen Canyon region.

The Tribune editorial follows:

HONORS TO JESSE JENNINGS

Jesse D. Jennings is a man of talent, boundless energy and many interests. He is the pleasing combination of scientist and extrovert.

Since coming to the University of Utah, where he is now head of the department of anthropology, Dr. Jennings has made extensive scientific studies of the remains of ancient life in Utah and neighboring States. Not the least of research papers he has published is called "Danger Cave," the name of an underground area near Wendover, Utah, where the remains of an ancient culture have been under intensive study.

Currently Dr. Jennings is director of the Utah side of an archaeological salvage project of lands which will be flooded by Glen Canyon Dam in northern Arizona. The project, financed largely by the Federal Government, is to preserve and evaluate remains of prehistoric villages in the rugged area. More than 90,000 specimens and thousands of pictures, maps, and records were processed last summer.

Before coming to Utah, Dr. Jennings gathered archaeological data in the Middle West, the Southwest and in Guatemala.

This week Dr. Jennings was presented the coveted Viking Gold Medal of the Wenner Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. Some of his work has been done with grants from the foundation.

The Tribune joins in complimenting Dr. Jennings and his staff and the University of Utah for the honor.

The Deseret News story follows:

GLEN CANYON STUDY DATES INDIAN RELICS

(By Vard Jones)

Field and laboratory research by University of Utah scientists has disclosed that ancient inhabitants of the Colorado River area above the Glen Canyon Dam site were Pueblo Indians of the time from about A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1250.

Dr. Jesse D. Jennings, head of the department of anthropology at the University of Utah, said there is some indication that some inhabitants of the area were there even before the Christian era began.

"But while we have these indications of prepottery occupants, we must await much more extensive excavation and research before this is completely established," Dr. Jennings said.

SALVAGE OPERATIONS

The University of Utah anthropologist is directing salvage operations to preserve the remains of the cultures that existed in the Colorado River area which soon will be covered by water backed up by Glen Canyon Dam.

On June 15 field crews from the university will move into the area for the third summer of research along the north banks of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers.

"We expect to be excavating sites for about 75 days this summer," Dr. Jennings explained, "with the Museum of Northern Arizona conducting similar research on the south banks of the river," he added.

SAVE ARTIFACTS

To date the researchers have taken thousands of artifacts from the dam site to far above the confluence of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers.

Some excavations have been made as far as 75 miles from the Colorado River in order for the researchers to obtain comparative samples with which to classify artifacts found in the areas to be covered.

"By having such comparative objects we can tell the date of pottery and other artifacts by cross-dating with other areas," the university researcher said.

One such digging away from the river proper was made at Boulder, Garfield County, last summer by a team headed by Dr. Robert H. Lister, a full professor at the University of Colorado, who has been on leave to the University of Utah to help in the Colorado River salvage project.

FOURTEEN-ROOM DWELLING

At Boulder the researchers uncovered a complete 14-room dwelling inhabited by Pueblo Indians about a thousand years ago. Although covered with silt and soil, walls of wood and rock were still standing. Nine of the rooms appeared to be storerooms. Three main living rooms had fireplaces in the center of each.

Other potentially valuable historical sites have been found by field teams on the Kaparowitz Plateau in Kane County. A team headed by James Gunnerson, curator of the university museum of anthropology, has made initial surveys of this area, but these sites are not expected to be investigated until after the Colorado survey is completed.

IDENTICAL CULTURE

Objects found at Boulder and those found in the river bottom which will be flooded by water from the Glen cofferdam in the next few months have been cross-checked, showing the same culture of Indian lived at both areas.

"We have salvaged adequate samples at every significant site in the cofferdam area and feel sure we have a sufficient amount of material on which to do analysis," Dr. Jennings said.

This summer's project will cover sites above the confluence of the Colorado and San Juan Rivers up to Hite. With private funds, the university researchers will also do additional work at Boulder again this summer—hiring volunteer diggers.

THIRD PROJECT

"If sufficient funds are forthcoming, a third project will be undertaken also this year in the triangle formed by the Colorado and San Juan Rivers," Dr. Jennings said.

The project head also pointed out that the Navajo Indians living on the south side of the river are in no way related to the ancient Pueblos who once lived along the Colorado. The Navajos apparently migrated down from northwestern Canada about 500 years ago, he explained.

Dr. Jennings explained also that although some of the Indians of this ancient culture lived in cliffs, the bulk of them lived on the mesas and lowlands of the area.

## Oregon Selects Mrs. Harlan P. Bosworth as Its Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to pay tribute today to the 1959 Oregon Mother of the Year. She is Mrs. Harlan P. Bosworth, of Medford, which is a city in my district. Marie Bosworth and her husband have four children, now grown. The Bosworths have many interests in local, State, National, and international affairs.

Oregon's Mother of the Year is concerned about matters which go far beyond the beautiful Rogue River Valley in southwestern Oregon. She considers her most important activity outside of home and church her work with the Medford chapter of the Oregon United Nations Association. She is on the State board and last year she attended the National United Nations Convention in New York. She recently was invited to join the Citizens' Consultation Group of UNESCO.

Marie Bosworth is an active member of the League of Women Voters. She has been president of the Medford Council of Church Women. Her civic activities are many.

She is a group leader for the Great Decisions program and a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. An active member of the Democratic Party, she once ran for the State legislature. At one time she taught in the public schools.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an editorial which appeared in the March 4, 1959, edition of the Medford Mail Tribune entitled "Mother of the Year." It is written by Eric Allen and his comments cogently sum up some of the reasons for her selection.

I consider Marie Bosworth an outstanding mother, citizen and woman. I am proud to bring her work to the attention of this body:

MOTHER OF THE YEAR

Marie Bosworth has been a frequent visitor in the newsroom of the Mail Tribune, in pursuit of one or another of her activities and projects. She is a welcome visitor, for virtually always she has something constructive to offer or suggest.

Mrs. Bosworth's interests are both varied and broad. She is a conscientious worker in her church, and in the Medford organization of churchwomen. She is an ardent supporter of the United Nations, and of its various agencies. She has been active in a number of organizations which have as their objective the betterment of government, or of the conditions of American Indians.

She is concerned with proper nutrition, with air and water pollution, with artificial additives to foods—with anything, in short, which will tend to improve the human condition, mentally, physically, emotionally, or governmentally.

This she does without thought of personal reward. It is because she is the kind of person she is.

Our most vivid memories of Mrs. Bosworth are from an election campaign several years ago, when she was a candidate for the legislature. She put her whole effort and enthusiasm into the campaign.

She didn't win, but that wasn't the important thing to her. What was important was the individual's responsibility to participate in government, and to do what one could, as an active citizen, to make this a better community, State, Nation, and world.

This week she was chosen as Oregon Mother of the Year, an honor and a recognition which she did not seek, but which fits her perfectly.

We are proud of Marie Bosworth, perhaps almost as proud as must be her husband, her four children, and her seven grandchildren.

## Congratulations to St. Catherine's High School Basketball Team of Racine, Wis., Champions of Wisconsin State Catholic Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GERALD T. FLYNN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of satisfaction that I rise to inform this august body of the fact that my high school alma mater, St. Catherine's, of Racine, Wis., has again

in 1959 as in 1958 won the State basketball championship in the Catholic Conference of Wisconsin. This team, under the skilled leadership of Coach John McGuire and the tutelage of a most personable athletic director, to wit: the Reverend Cletus V. Uhen, has amassed the outstanding record of 26 wins and 3 losses for the 1958 to 1959 season and 51 won and 5 lost in the last 2 years. I might state that St. Catherine's High School in Racine, Wis., is one of the finest secondary scholastic institutions in the State, that a large building project recently completed has tripled its student capacity but that, with these enlarged facilities, the recognition of its valuable effect on the community and the good work of its Dominican Sisters who comprise its teaching staff and the hard work of its president, Rev. S. B. Whitkowiak, is such that its expanded facilities are already overcrowded to a point where the school is teaching on a two-platoon basis. The school is outstanding for its part in the development of a Christian attitude and a good moral character among the students in addition to its scholastic training.

High on the agenda of the school activities, however, is its athletic program. It has repeatedly won the State championship in both football and basketball. It is also active in track and other sports.

The basketball team has been invited by Georgetown University to participate in the first national Catholic basketball conference to be held here in Washington, D.C., on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday of this week, to wit: March 13, 14, and 15, 1959. The members of the St. Catherine team are: Jim May, Jim Poulsen, Joe Gammell, Jim Olley, Tom Schilke, Chuck Wood, Bob Letsch, Don Tempesta, Rocke Calvelli, and Todd Pettit.

I predict that this fine group of midwestern boys from Racine, Wis., will leave Washington on Sunday next with the national Catholic basketball crown tucked securely in their suitcase and I issue to all of you who enjoy watching basketball, played by artists in their field, to join me at Georgetown University Gymnasium in watching the Catholic invitational basketball tournament during this coming weekend.

## Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has brought to Congress a new proposal which he says will help meet the shortage of more than 140,000 classrooms. However, in order to build the 75,000 classrooms Dr. Flemming says will be built under his formula for Federal aid, State constitutional and statutory debt limits will have to be revised and basic tax concepts of many States will have to be changed.

Dr. Flemming should devote his considerable talents to other national programs which are in trouble. The United States lags behind the Soviet Union in ability to put heavy loads of instruments into space. He could offer a wealth of ideas to solve this problem. He could announce a new ratio of translation between Soviet kilograms and American pounds, which by a simple shift of two decimal points could make the United States payloads heavier than the Soviet performance. Better yet would be to abolish the law of gravity by Executive order, applicable only within the confines of U.S. launching areas. Then we could send our battleships on good will cruises to the moon.

Either of these proposals should be minor problems to an official of the executive branch who cannot see the difficulties in other jurisdictions. A simple edict should suffice, and if the Russians do not see things his way, that is only what should be expected of backward people.

## USDA Barter Regulations Depress Our Commodity Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the awkward regulations which surround the Public Law 480 barter program have had the unfortunate effect of cutting world prices on U.S. agricultural commodities, seriously disturbing trade operations and preventing the movement of our farm products into some of our normal export areas.

As a result of the so-called modified barter regulations, instituted last fall by the Department of Agriculture, this program lacks the flexibility which would enable it to supplement our cash sales and to meet competition from the Soviet bloc. In fact the Department has publicly admitted that it is more difficult to move commodities under their present regulations than it was under the old ones, which the Congress had sought to liberalize under the new law.

Two years ago, over $350 million in surpluses were moving into export annually through barter, at discounts or commissions to exporters averaging only one-half to 1 percent, and with no disruption of world prices or normal trade operations. Now, as a result of the new regulations, we are moving commodities at a rate of less than a hundred million dollars a year, at discounts ranging from 7 to 12 percent, or even higher. And these discounts are beginning to have a serious effect on normal commercial sales and world prices.

I want to emphasize that the present high discounts on exported commodities are not taken out of the price paid to the CCC. They are made possible only because the private traders are able to capitalize on temporarily depressed minerals markets. In some cases, they are buying material at distressed prices. Were it not for the fact that stockpile materials can be purchased at 10 percent or so below world prices, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to negotiate barter deals under the present regulations. We are doing business now only because we can take advantage of the misfortunes of others.

Of course the American farmer, and the foreign producers too, are hurt by the big discounts, because they have the effect of cutting both the prices and the quantities of agricultural commodities that are sold abroad. Foreign buyers, in a desire to buy their stocks at a reduced price, may hold off buying in hopes of getting a discount.

In place of a good barter program which supplements and stimulates our cash sales, such as we had before these restrictions were instituted, we now have an operation which invites unfortunately large discounts on the small amount of goods that are being bartered.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the procedures required under the so-called modified barter regulations are responsible for the present high discounts. These regulations make it so difficult to dispose of our farm surpluses overseas that those with materials to barter are having to pay these unreasonable commissions in order to barter at all. All the responsible contractors I talked with have affirmed this, and I believe that the experts in the Department of Agriculture would also affirm it.

I would like to explain, as I understand it, how the barter regulations are creating this situation. Although the matter is somewhat technical, briefly it amounts to this: in order to deliver goods into the big "A" and "B" markets—the countries which would be the best outlets for our surplus—a contractor must specify ahead of time the commodities and the country into which he intends to sell and from which he must secure the materials covered by the barter contract. By the time he gets approval from the Department of Agriculture, which takes up to 3 months, the contractor may find that the market he counted on no longer exists. In this situation, if he were permitted to dispose of the commodities into any of the free world countries, he could move the surplus into some other market; but under the present regulations he has to sell the commodities within the specified country. Under these circumstances there is a great risk that he may be forced to reduce his price or even to take a heavy loss. Thus the reason for the high discounts.

These regulations are creating the unfortunate situation they are supposed to

prevent. They depress our cash commodity markets. They cripple our barter program. They are a real hindrance to our efforts to distribute our tremendous agricultural surplus.

We urge the Department of Agriculture to modify or abolish these regulations which now frustrate the barter program.

## The Challenge Before Us in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by my good friend, Dr. José A. Mora, who has an extremely important assignment for the welfare of this hemisphere. The article appeared in the fall 1958 issue of the Lamp, a magazine published by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey:

PATHS TO UNITY IN THE AMERICAS—ACHIEVING CLOSER COOPERATION AMONG THE AMERICAN NATIONS REQUIRES BETTER INTERPRETATION OF ONE PEOPLE TO ANOTHER

(By Dr. José A. Mora)

The demonstrations against Vice President and Mrs. Nixon during their South American trip made it appear that Western Hemisphere unity was severely shaken. Yet, distressing as they were, the demonstrations may actually have the effect of strengthening inter-American ties.

It would not be the first time that apparent catastrophe turned out to have positive advantages. I will never forgt the rioting that broke out in Bogotá during the Ninth International Conference of American States in 1948. The instigators of the riots hoped to break up the conference. Instead of voting postponement, however, the delegates calmly waited until the rioters were dispersed. Then they took up where they had been interrupted. The demonstrations focused the attention of the world on Bogotá. When our work culminated in the charter of the Organization of American States, this document, the foundation of today's relations among the New World nations, awakened wider interest and assumed greater importance because of the turbulent circumstances under which it was created.

In much the same way, the recent incidents have also fixed official and public attention on a subject that can benefit from renewed scrutiny: the relations between the United States and her Latin American neighbors.

A MINOR SYMPTOM

Of course, there is unrest in some parts of Latin America, but I believe it is only a minor symptom of the tremendous forces of social and economic readjustment in motion all over the world. And at least some of the problems that beset us would, I believe, cease to exist if we of the Western Hemisphere could know each other better. Certainly there are no differences between us on human fundamentals, such as the freedom and dignity of the individual, or on the economic facts of life, such as our mutual interdependence.

Misunderstandings lie in lesser matters. Unfortunately, most people see those of other nations in terms of preconceived and not always flattering generalities that bear little relation to the truth. Such misconceptions are rarely held by those who have traveled or who have studied the cultures of other nations. But these people are the minority. Most of us get our stereotyped ideas of other nations secondhand from the press, novels and movies. Some distortion is unavoidable.

By distortion I do not mean the presentation of inaccurate facts. I mean, rather, that so many important things are not reported at all. The U.S. press, for example, rarely has the time or the space to give its readers the kind of details of South American life that would illuminate our character and our accomplishments. How many North Americans know that the oldest universities in the hemisphere are in Latin America, or that four of the eight largest cities in the hemisphere lie south of the Rio Grande?

NOT THE WHOLE PICTURE

Latin American reporting of life and events in the United States suffers from the same lack of background detail. Accurate enough in the facts presented, it fails to give a rounded view. It tells of the stock market, and tariffs, and automobiles produced and any number of other necessary things. But these do not give the whole picture or perhaps even the most significant part of the picture.

I know that my picture of the United States will always include the New York taxi driver who told me proudly that the earnings from his cab and put two children through college and were now sending a third. This man, an uneducated immigrant from Austria, represents to me the essence of the freedom and opportunity that the United States offers to the world. If more Latin Americans could hear this story, what it tells of the U.S. character would do much, I think, to correct mistaken impressions.

Good interpretive reporting does exist, of course, in both the Americas. Its influence can be astonishing. An outstanding example that comes to my mind is the series that appeared a few years ago in the Kansas City Star. In the whole United States there was probably no city more thoroughly insulated from Latin American influence than Kansas City. A few years ago Hal Hendricks, a Star reporter, took a vacation trip to South America. He wrote a series of reports on the trip, did some research and wrote some more stories. Then he began a weekly column on Latin American events. This became a twice-weekly, then a three-times-a-week feature. Presently a large group of Kansas City businessmen, led by Mayor H. Roe Bartle, paid their own expenses on a see-for-yourself expedition through Latin America. Later a group of mayors of municipalities in the state of São Paulo, Brazil, return the visit. The net result of one reporter's interest is that the people of his city in the heart of the Midwest have a better knowledge of their Latin neighbors than their compatriots in many cities closer to the border.

A UNIVERSAL TONGUE

Our arts are another path to better understanding, and have already accomplished much. Artists speak a universal tongue that recognizes no differences of politics, language or geography. Witness the recent triumph in Moscow of Van Cliburn, and of the Moiseyev Ballet in the United States. The 1950 tour by the talented Negro company, the Katherine Dunham Dancers, opened for enthusiastic Latin American audiences a whole new vista of interpretive and folk dances of the United States. More recently, Leonard Bernstein's triumphal tour of Latin America with the New York Philharmonic reiterated the principle that art surmounts all barriers.

Latin American artists find equally enthusiastic reception in the United States. The disciplined brilliance of Chilean pianist Claudio Arrau, of Brazilian soprano Bidú Sayão, of Cuban ballerina Alicia Alonso, draw capacity audiences wherever these artists perform in this country. The vivid and powerful conceptions of the Mexican painters Orozco, Rivera, and Siqueiros and of Brazilian Candido Portinari are well known and appreciated here.

Translations of leading writers' works also further understanding Edgar Allan Poe, Ernest Hemingway and William Faulkner, to name only a few, are always in demand in Latin America. Translations of Latin American authors are less widely known in the United States, but novels by Brazil's Erico Verissimo, Peru's Ciro Alegria, and Haiti's Marcelin brothers have attracted favorable notice. Argentine Ricardo Güiraldes' "Don Segundo Sombra" introduced the legendary life of the pampas to thousands of North Americans.

A BOOK BARRIER

Much more can be done. A proposal that I hope will be considered at the 11th Inter-American Conference in Quito next year recommends the adoption of a convention that will encourage, through the reduction of tariff barriers and administrative restrictions, the freer circulation of books among all American countries. I was dismayed to learn, not long ago, that the $40 million worth of books exported from the United States in 1954 actually cost foreign consumers $100 million.

In the struggle to know each other better, visiting professorships, student exchanges and other types of scholarships have immeasurable, permanent value. Thousands of U.S. students have gained firsthand knowledge of Latin America through attending summer school sessions at the University of Mexico. Recently the Fulbright scholarships were extended to Latin America, financed by local currency purchases of U.S. agricultural surpluses.

The creative forces in America, both North and South, can be joined in other ways. Much of South America, for example, is still a pioneer country, an economic frontier, where great opportunities await the enterprising and the courageous. These opportunities lie not only in the empty land and untapped resources but also in the unsatisfied needs of the people. There is much less of an unconquered West than formerly, but the frontier spirit is still strong in the Americas. It can still test its mettle in the conquest of untamed nature. We all know of the fortitude and daring of Lewis and Clark blazing the trail to the Northwest, and of the terrible 2-year climb of Jiménez de Quesada from coastal Santa Marta to the Sábana de Bogotà. But the Chilean engineers who harness the cataracts plunging from Andean snows are pioneering as truly as their ancestors who fought the Araucanos.

THE MODERN PIONEERS

To speak of 20th century pioneers in this sense of economic development is to bring up some of the most complex and urgent problems in Pan American relations. Basically the problems are rooted in the fact of one immensely powerful and productive Nation living next door to a group of smaller nations of greatly varying economies, populations and stages of progress.

Fifty years ago this did not matter. Travel was slow, and the Latin Americans who traveled went to Europe. But airliners chopped distance to a fraction of what it had been. Thousands of Latin Americans whose fathers had hardly been aware of the United States saw at firsthand the electrifying results of a technological economy. Mentally they com-

puted the tons of produce from their own plantations which better roads would enable them to get to market, and the improvement in their regions' standard of living that would be made possible by, for example, a single cement plant. These visions would not permit them to be content with the old ways. History had turned a page.

The major products of Latin America are traditionally farm produce and raw materials. This is one reason why these countries are classified as "underdeveloped." It would be more accurate to call them countries of "restricted" development. During the century in which North America slowly built its industrial might, we in Latin America did not feel the pressures that created your industrial empires.

UNEXPECTED RESPONSIBILITIES

Thus the 20th century burst upon us like a bomb. Two world wars and the vastly increased speed of transportation and communication created and released sweeping new aspirations. U.S. economic aid during World War II gave most Latin American people their first experience with the benefits of an industrial economy. Bulldozers had more impact that a revolution. At the same time, from the United States came avowals of such ideals as the four freedoms, with implications of a higher standard of living for all the free world.

After the Axis defeat, the United States found itself involved in totally unexpected responsibilities of worldwide scope. If this naturally detracted from the attention given Latin America, it also evoked among Latin Americans the fear that their powerful neighbor was no longer interested in the problems of the southern nations. There were fluctuations in the prices of some of Latin America's basic products, such as cotton, sugar, coffee, copper, tin, lead, and wool. These were accompanied by serious inflation in several countries. Uncertainty resulted. In some cases there were charges that the United States had abandoned Latin America.

We who are familiar with the United States know that this is not true. We know that the destinies of North and South America are indissolubly linked. The economic facts speak for themselves: The United States sells 25 percent of its total exports to Latin America, while buying nearly half of Latin America's exports.

Latin America, of course, is trying to industrialize. During the past 17 years employment in industry and related services increased 76 percent, while agricultural employment rose only 10 percent. During the same period industrial production increased 175 percent.

POPULATION EXPLOSION

This sounds like progress. However, though countries of Latin America are increasing their gross national products (at very uneven individual rates), the overall rate of increase is slower than those of highly industrialized countries. The result is that, by present indications, each year will see Latin America falling further behind such countries in living standards. In this one fact lies the sum total of all our material problems. As in all such situations, the great common denominator is the expanding needs of the people.

Latin America's population is increasing at the rate of 2.5 percent, or 4½ million, per year. This is the fastest growth of any of the world's major areas. The projected population of Latin America by the end of the century is 493 million, as compared with 380 million for the United States and Canada.

This population explosion multiplies demands for facilities that do not exist, and puts an intolerable overload on those that do exist. The simplest necessities of city life, such as electricity and water, taken for granted in U.S. communities, become a sort of Holy Grail for their Latin American counterparts. A generator designed to produce current for a thousand families is inadequate even before it can be delivered and installed. Similar shortages exist in housing, sewerage systems, schools, hospitals, tractors, telephones, railroads, automobiles, and textile mills, to name only a few.

To do the job ahead we must use all kinds of capital and technical assistance wherever we can get it. If Latin America is to keep a place in the industrialized world of today, we must make, in a single generation, the material progress that kept the United States busy for a hundred years.

Can we do it?

I believe so. I believe we must.

IT CAN BE DONE

Material progress takes money, investment capital which we must seek inside our countries and beyond our borders, as we have in the past. In the early stages of its development the United States too had to seek private investment capital from outside the country. There have already been impressive examples of cooperative use of private capital between Latin Americans and North Americans. Sears Roebuck, which has invited the participation of domestic capital in the building of plants in a number of South American countries, is one of the North American companies now engaged in developing Latin America's markets and resources. Less well known are such enterprises as the building of the free port at Nueva Palmira in Uruguay, where both foreign and domestic investors helped install heavy equipment for transshipping Brazilian manganese from river boats to seagoing vessels.

Of course, Latin Americans must continue their struggle in their own way. Sometimes a major development comes from little capital and much faith and hard work. The coffee industry of Brazil, today the largest in the world and a model of scientific planning and development, grew from the labor and imagination of a group of coffee farmers many years ago. Only recently, some young engineers and mechanics in San José, Costa Rica, started an airplane repair service that filled such a need that their business is their nation's second largest producer of foreign exchange. Such successful enterprises, small and large, give a nation economic stability.

KILLERS ON THE WANE

We must consider other vital matters, too. Take public health. A sick people cannot be a productive people. Under a concerted campaign by such agencies as the Pan American Sanitary Organization, working in cooperation with national governments, that great killer, malaria, is disappearing from many areas. Studies show that extension of the program, estimated to cost $150 million, can completely eradicate malaria in the Western Hemisphere within 5 years. The hideous and disabling tropical affliction of yaws yields easily to a massive shot of penicillin. These are only two of many health problems.

However healthy he may be, a man who cannot read can hardly learn to operate and maintain modern machinery. An estimated 40 percent of Latin America's adult population is still illiterate. Like malaria, illiteracy gives way before an intensive regional or nationwide effort. Progress here is encouraging but spotty. The effort must be increased.

On higher levels of technological and scientific training our own resources are inadequate. Improvement is an absolute necessity that touches every phase of 20th century life. Significant beginnings have been made in most areas. For example, the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences at Turrialba, Costa Rica, has for 10 years been turning out well-trained agricultural specialists who go back to their own countries to apply what they have learned and to teach their colleagues. The experimental farms, training programs, extension service, and homesteads at Tingo María have brought tens of thousands of once-idle acres in the Amazonian basin of Peru into the national economy.

FORWARD OR BACKWARD?

In several countries there are training and research centers operated by the OAS technical cooperation program. They deal with such things as housing, instruction for rural schoolteachers, evaluation of natural resources, agricultural extension, foot-and-mouth disease, economic and statistical training. The new OAS fellowship program will offer grants every year for specialized training in these and other fields. Pan Americanism, once a wholly intangible ideal, is now producing vaccines, making bricks, and tilling the soil.

All such programs are geared to the hard fact that the need is increasing more rapidly than the supply. Every hundred yards of water pipe is a help. But, if our expanding birth rate creates new families requiring 200 yards, we are not making progress; we are going backward.

In our list of Latin American scarcities, perhaps the most critical, in the long view, is that of physical scientists, those modern magicians who juggle forces that most of us can scarcely comprehend. Synthesizing materials through rearrangement of atoms, making cheap and plentiful what was once rare and costly; increasing agricultural yield by finding new food sources in the sea—these are some of the hopeful visions of 20th century man, and only the scientist can bring them to reality. A deposit of petroleum, a vein of ore can be mined out, but the human mind remains an inexhaustible natural resource that will produce forever. We need to intensify our educational programs so that the supply of trained people can keep pace with the demand.

COMMERCE IS COMPLEX

Solutions to our problems in the field of international commerce are perhaps even more complex. A number of nations have found an economic cushion in an expanded tourist business. But a country such as Chile, which depends almost entirely upon copper, or Cuba, which depends on sugar, is like a man walking on one leg. Anything that happens to his single support is likely to be disastrous.

Commodity agreements that would prevent overly drastic drops in the prices of important products would enable Latin American countries to make long-term plans with confidence. In addition, there might be an Inter-American Payments Union which could extend to member countries credits to be repaid during periods of high export earnings. This would also simplify the exchange of currencies and tend to stimulate trade through the entire hemisphere.

Perhaps the basis of all such foreign trade reforms should be a system of regional common markets or free trade zones similar to those now being planned among the Central American countries. This would be a first step toward economic integration of the hemisphere. It would rest on the slow but steady reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers.

UNDERSTANDING REQUIRED

These are our chief mutual problems in the Western Hemisphere. All are difficult, and all are inextricably interlocked. Some

are closer to solution than others, but I believe remedies exist for them all. Reaching the solutions presupposes a high degree of international cooperation; it also presupposes the will to change established policies. In this period of rapid transition our problems can be solved only through a deep understanding of common interests, on the basis of imaginative and far-reaching proposals.

This is the challenge before us. In it lies the answer to those who assert that the Americas are hopelessly divided. I am confident that men of the New World will unite their great gifts of spirit, intellect and technology to meet the challenge.

## Let's Plant Every Allotted Cotton Acre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that southern cotton farmers plant their full allotment, if the South is to retain its cotton acreage and in effect, over the years remain in the cotton business.

The March issue of Progressive Farmer magazine, which is widely read in southern farm homes, has an excellent article in regard to the importance of planting every allotted cotton acre. I submit this article, by Eugene Butler, president and editor in chief of Progressive Farmer, for the benefit of my colleagues and in the interest of southern cotton producers.

The article follows:

LET'S PLANT EVERY ALLOTTED COTTON ACRE

(By Eugene Butler)

For many years, cottongrowers in the South have complained bitterly about the Western States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico stealing their cotton acres. It is true that since 1938 these States have increased their acreage about 85 percent, while other cotton States have lost 40 percent of their acres. But, in large measure, this is due to a difference in attitude toward the crop. These westerners appreciate and carefully guard cotton as an important economic asset. But we have taken our cotton acreage for granted and done practically nothing to protect it. The Western States have boosted their cotton acreage by always planting very close to their full allotment. And during years of uncontrolled production, they have sharply increased acreage, thus improving acreage history at the expense of other States. On the other hand, many people in parts of the South act as though cotton were a plague rather than a tremendously valuable asset. We have persistently failed to plant a considerable part of our alloted acres.

Now, the South has reached a crucial stage in its cotton acreage history. We had about 4,925,958 acres in the 1958 acreage reserve of the soil bank. In addition, there were about 700,000 acres of our allotment that we failed to use for various reasons. These 700,000 unplanted acres represent a larger acreage than has been allotted to Arizona, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Tennessee in 1959. In all, there are better than 5½ million acres that are in jeopardy. We stand a good chance to lose a considerable part of these acres, unless cotton leaders in each State organize at once to prevent it.

PLANTS MILLIONS OF UNUSED ACRES

The situation as to acreage in each cotton State is shown by figures in the table on facing page. [Table omitted in RECORD.] The 1959 national acreage allotment is about 7 percent less than in 1958. But many States will lose 5 percent or less of their allotment in 1959. Alabama, for example, will have a 1959 allotment of only 50,000 acres less than in 1958. On the other hand, it had 466,000 acres or 45 percent of its 1958 allotment in the acreage reserve, and also failed to use nearly 40,000 additional acres. By picking up and planting a good part of its acreage reserve and making full use of its 1959 allotment, Alabama could easily plant several hundred thousand more acres in cotton in 1959 than in 1958. And this is true of the South as a whole.

The South has had its 1959 allotment base cut over a million acres. But we can draw on the nearly 5 million acres in the soil bank and the 700,000 additional acres of our allotment not used in 1958 to make good this loss. In fact, it is possible for the South to plant 2 or 3 million acres more in 1959 than in 1958. So, let's quit crying about the cotton acreage lost over the years and save the acres we have now.

What about the 5 million cotton acres in the soil bank? Many of them will be permanently lost if farms are abandoned and their owners fail to release their acreage. It is true that farm, county, and State allotments are protected in 1959. But if a landowner abandons his farm after the 1958 crop, it will be much easier to get him to release his acres right away rather than waiting until late in the year when he may be long gone out of the county. Moreover, he must release his acreage now, if it is to be made available to other growers in 1959.

The Progressive Farmer is dead set against taking a single cotton acre away from a grower that wants it and will plant it. But if a grower has unwanted acres and can release them 1 year without losing them in future years, it is dog-in-the-manger selfishness not to do so.

Even in the counties that are now more interested in livestock and poultry than in cotton, there are quite a considerable number of farmers who could very well use more cotton acres. With modern equipment and know-how, it now takes many more acres of cotton on a farm to make the crop pay.

If we could save all the 5-acre allotments that are lost by small farmers moving to town and pick up the 100-acre allotments that are canceled when cottonfields are made into livestock farms, there would be enough additional acreage to make cotton a profitable crop on many thousands of farms. Moreover, this would save hundreds of gins and oil mills, give balance to more farming systems, and add additional millions of farm income in areas where it is badly needed.

What can we do to save the situation? State meetings with no definite plans on the county and district level will not get the job done. State meetings are all right, but the real work must be done on the county level.

The Progressive Farmer has been able to learn of no other State in the South that is going at this problem with so well organized a plan as Texas. Leadership in Texas is being provided by C. B. Spencer, of the Texas Cottonseed Crushers' Association, working with Searcy Ferguson, the very able and cooperative chairman of the State ASC committee.

WAYS TO SAVE COTTON ACREAGE

Here are some of the things Texas cotton leaders are finding necessary to save these cotton acres, and which other States might well consider:

1. The full cooperation of office and field staff of the State ASC office must be obtained.

2. The problem is one that, if solved at all, must be accomplished in a county by cotton growers as a group working with the county ASC committee. This means that if there is no county organization of farmers available, a committee of growers must be set up to work with the county ASC office.

3. The organized farm group in the county must meet with the county ASC committee and make definite plans to get the job done and then follow through on such plans.

4. The primary responsibility for securing the release of unwanted cotton acres rests with the county ASC office and committee. But many ASC committees have neither the money nor the manpower to do the job. Organized growers of the county should provide the needed funds and appoint a prominent grower in each community to work with the ASC committee in getting unwanted acres released. And by unwanted acres, we mean the acreage of all growers who do not want to grow cotton on all or part of their allotted acres.

5. The dates by which unwanted acres must be released and reapportioned to those who want more acres vary by zones according to the period at which cotton is usually planted. The final release date varies from February 13 in south Texas to April in the northern part of the Belt. Then a period of a week or so is allowed for the county ASC committee to reapportion the released acreage.

6. In most cases, ASC community committeemen will take the lead and secure the release of unwanted acres on farms in their communities. When they run into trouble, they should be in a position to call on influential cotton growers, business leaders, and others to help secure the release.

7. Cotton growers who want to grow cotton in excess of their present allotment should request the county ASC committee in writing for the number of additional acres they want. The county committee should then reapportion the released acres to growers they feel certain will actually plant all of the additional acreage requested. This is important, because if they request more acres than they plant, the cotton history of the county will suffer.

8. The county cotton growers' organization, working with the ASC office, should enlist the help of other important individuals and organizations in the county.

It should request county agents, vo-ag teachers, newspapers, radio and TV stations to keep in close touch with the program and supply growers and the general public with all information needed to make the program a success.

No one plan will work in every county. Some county ASC committees are already doing a good job of getting unwanted acres released. In Kaufman County, Tex., for example, when Earl Wisdom, the ASC office manager, hears that land once in cotton is to be abandoned, he visits the owner and makes a special effort to get it released to the county ASC committee. Cotton growers of a county should not expect the ASC committee to make an aggressive effort to get this job done unless they (the growers) show a real interest in the problem.

FUNDAMENTALS TO GET JOB DONE

Check your plan to insure that it fits the needs of your county. But remember that

to get the job done, there are four fundamentals:

1. Get unwanted acres released quickly.
2. Urge those wanting more acres to apply in writing.
3. Get the unwanted acres reapportioned to growers who want them.
4. See that all the reapportioned acres are actually planted.

To those who think we are already growing too much cotton, it may seem ill advised to urge that unwanted acres be released and reapportioned to growers who will plant them. The Progressive Farmer is still heartily in favor of production control. But once national acreage is fixed by law and allotted to States and counties, we must use these allotted acres if we expect to hold them. And we must hold them, if we intend to remain in the cotton business.

## Small Business Investment Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. B. R. Fuller, Jr., executive director of the Florida Development Commission, Tallahassee, Fla., has furnished me with material in connection with the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which I feel should be brought to the attention of my colleagues and in order that the Congress may be informed, I take pleasure in having Mr. Fuller's communication under date of February 11, 1959, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

FLORIDA DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION,
*Tallahassee, Fla., February 11, 1959.*

Hon. BOB SIKES,
*House of Representatives,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR BOB: I know that you are very much interested, as we are, in the problems of small business. We have been dealing with the Small Business Administration a good deal in the last 6 months, and we are confronted with a problem which is partly a matter of administrative interpretation and partly a matter of legislation. The law involved is the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

Let me say first that we feel that the passage of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is a great step forward. The availability of financing to small business has not changed noticeably yet, but we think there will be a distinct change for the better among the more profitable businesses in middle size and large cities during the next year or two. Assistance to State and local development companies is particularly welcome, and this may help our rural counties. I think it is too soon to pass judgment on the administration of the law in general or to suggest amendment of the law itself in its financial aspects.

Our present problem concerns section 7(d) of the Small Business Act of 1958, which was actually enacted as section 602(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. It provides for "grants to any State government, or any agency thereof. State chartered development credit or finance corporations, land-grant colleges and universities, and colleges and schools of business, engineering, commerce, and agriculture," for the purpose of "studies, research, and counseling concerning the managing, financing, and operations of small-business enterprises and technical and statistical information necessary thereto in order to carry out the purposes of section 8(b)(1)."

The proposed regulations issued by the Small Business Administration (Federal Register, January 28, 1959) under this authority seem to us quite reasonable and workable except as to the interpretation of the phrase "studies, research, and counseling." They define counseling to mean "counseling with SBA," rather than with small businesses themselves, and they define "research" to mean "studies, research, and counseling." The effect of these definitions, as admitted in the cover letter sent to prospective applicants, is to exclude "programs primarily designed to give direct advice to small business concerns—without prejudice to the financing of these programs in subsequent years." We have discussed this matter with Mr. Wilford White, of SBA, and have protested officially by letter. A copy of Mr. Shelton's letter to Mr. White on this point is enclosed for your information.

There is an important substantive point here, which is quite simply: Is SBA going to use the funds available for the program merely to elaborate research reports, or are they going to use part of the money to try to get the research applied by individual small businesses? The total amount of money involved is about $27 million, for, on the basis of our discussions with SBA officials, we seriously doubt that they plan to change their definitions in later years except under congressional pressure. Notice also that this money, as we understand it, is not subject to annual appropriation because the source of the funds is money recaptured from the Federal Reserve banks.

We have discussed this matter rather widely in Florida with selected businessmen, Government officials and heads of schools of business. Dean Charles Rovetta, of the School of Business Administration of Florida State University, and Mr. David Caldwell, of Florida Power & Light Co., have been of particular help. We have concluded that in Florida the application of small business research is at least equally important with the conduct of further research. We also feel that to be useful, the program will have to be long term, and it will require the active cooperation of the Small Business Administration, the Florida Development Commission, the schools and departments of business administration in Florida, local chambers of commerce, and other groups of businessmen.

A brief study done in 1957 by Dave Caldwell, of the Florida Power & Light Co., indicates that the large amount of research work so far done by SBA is getting to small businessmen only indirectly if at all. There is little doubt in our minds that the application of research in this field is running way behind the conduct of research. We therefore feel that it is a great mistake to use this $27 million entirely to produce more research and not at all to try to popularize and put to use the research already done.

We also feel that the interpretation put by SBA on the phrase "studies, research, and counseling" is not a sound interpretation of the law. But SBA officials argue that this section of the law is not clear, and to this we agree. It would certainly help to straighten out this matter if the law could be amended to make clear that the administration of funds for "studies, research, and counseling" should give priority to a balanced program in each State for the conduct and application of research in small business.

Consideration should also be given to other changes in this section of the law, such as authorizing long-term rather than 1-year arrangements and requiring matching funds on the part of the States beginning at some future date. We have no final opinion on these points yet.

I am sending somewhat similar letters to the other members of the Florida congressional delegation. If you agree with our practical as distinct from academic approach to this problem, we would greatly appreciate anything you can do in this direction.

Sincerely,

B. R. FULLER, Jr.,
*Executive Director.*

Mr. Speaker, I think the points brought out should be explored very carefully from the standpoint of achieving clarification, either through regulation, or legislation, or both.

## Centennial Celebration of the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to pay honor to Heffley & Browne Secretarial School of Brooklyn, N.Y., on the occasion of its centennial celebration. Brooklyn is proud and fortunate to have had the hundred-year influence on its youth of this school. It is vitally important that capable, modern and scientifically designed instruction in present day office procedures be given to our young men and women. Heffley & Browne have kept abreast of the times. The student body, alumni, and faculty are to be congratulated.

This is the year which marks the centennial of the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, founded in 1859, and the oldest school of its kind in the East. It has graduated over 100,000 students, many of whom now serve in positions of responsibility and distinction in the Nation.

We in Brooklyn are glad to call attention to Heffley & Browne's record of achievement as a pioneer in commercial education, in training personnel to fill important positions in the business world, and as Brooklyn's only accredited, registered secretarial school.

The success of the school is due in large measure to the demonstrated ability of the many young men and women who have emerged from our classrooms into the business world. We take pride in their accomplishments and feel deeply appreciative of the renown and distinction which these graduates, now in government, industry and the professions constantly, through their ability and outstanding service, are bringing to this institution.

## Attack on the FBI—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the sixth in a series of articles by Pulitzer prize-winning reporter, Edward J. Mowery. This series deals with the campaign to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the following article appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 6, 1959:

CONVICTIONS RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—How good is the Federal Bureau of Investigation as measured by its conviction record?

In the farflung anti-FBI campaign now underway, the FBI is accused of ballooning its conviction percentage to make itself look good and of backing away from arresting bigshot criminals.

Citing 24-year-old statistics of the Brookings Institute, one critic charged that the FBI's percentage of convictions in 1935 was 72.5 percent (not 94) and the FBI actually trailed five other Federal investigative agencies in the percentage of convictions.

This is one area of criticism, an FBI official observed today, where cold statistics more than speak for themselves.

Charge: FBI statistics concerning its own accomplishments can't be trusted, as evidenced by the Brookings Institute survey in 1935.

The facts: The fiscal 1935 Attorney General's annual report shows convictions in FBI-investigated cases brought to trial totaled 94 percent. The Brookings figures were based upon all Federal agency investigations presented to U.S. attorneys for consideration as to prosecution.

They were not cases that went to trial and resulted in convictions or acquittals. Actually there is little common ground for an objective comparison of accomplishment between the FBI and the other Federal investigative agencies due to the vast difference in the responsibilities of the FBI and other units.

And it's virtually impossible to make a comparison based upon convictions.

Many Internal Revenue Service tax cases, for instance, are settled or adjusted without reaching a court. Customs inspectors at ports of entry deter smuggling by their very presence. Efficiency of these agencies cannot be measured by convictions. The FBI also processes many types of cases seldom reaching court.

Intelligence and counterintelligence operations, as an example, are primarily preventive in nature. Information gained in this field frequently leads to protective measures before any violation of law occurs at all.

Two other such activities involve capture of fugitives who cross State lines to avoid prosecution, and deserters from the Armed Forces.

In the past 10 fiscal years FBI-investigated cases have resulted in 99,397 Federal convictions.

In fiscal 1958, FBI convictions totaled 11,457 (96.8 percent of those tried being convicted, 93.1 percent of whom entered guilty pleas).

Among FBI cases which seldom reach Federal courts are investigations to locate deserters from the Armed Forces as well as persons charged with certain local crimes who have fled across State lines in violation of the Fugitive Felon Act.

During 1958 (fiscal), 4,653 deserters were located and made available to military authorities. A total of 1,021 fugitives under the act were located in FBI cases last year. They were turned over to State and local authorities for prosecution in compliance with the intent of the act.

To get back to the question: The Brookings Institute statistics purportedly reflecting FBI cases that were adjudicated (in fiscal 1935) were erroneous.

Charge: Through the years, big-shot mobsters have operated without being bothered by the FBI, which didn't even investigate the Apalachin mob concave.

The facts: The FBI has arrested scores of bigshot "mobsters" through the years. "Mobster" implies the existence of a syndicate bent on criminal practices. To attain the statute of a big-shot mobster carries the obvious implication that both the individual and his mob have thrived unmolested by all law-enforcement agencies.

The FBI has never concerned itself with the potential power allegedly held by a mobster in determining whether it should investigate that individual.

The Bureau has one guidepost in undertaking an investigation: Legislation provided by Congress giving the FBI investigative jurisdiction over certain types of criminal or civil acts committed against the Federal Government.

During the twenties and thirties, so-called big-shot mobsters were most frequently involved in narcotics (Narcotics Bureau jurisdiction), bootlegging (Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Unit), gambling (strictly local jurisdiction), etc.

Today's mobsters prefer the lucrative and rewarding field of gambling, and activity not falling within the jurisdiction of the FBI.

The only phase of gambling in which the FBI is empowered to act deals with interstate transportation of lottery tickets and gambling devices or their parts.

Gambling activities fall within the jurisdiction of the State or municipality—the responsibility of State or local police.

Charge: The FBI stood by in the forties when an eastern gambling syndicate shuttled customers from New York to Bergen County, N.J. by limousine.

The facts: This was a State or local matter.

The FBI could only apprehend an individual criminal if he has fled from one State to another to avoid prosecution for murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, assault, arson or extortion. And the FBI could make the arrest only if a local warrant is outstanding and local authorities request FBI assistance.

To make such an arrest without jurisdiction and specific authorization would, indeed, constitute methods of a Gestapo.

As for the FBI's role at the Apalachin meeting, the Bureau simply had no investigative jurisdiction.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 34

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, August 22, 1958, entitled, "State Orders Big Smell To Stop It." This story tells of the big stink at Candlestick Cove caused by dumping untreated sewage and municipal waste into Candlestick Cove. In addition to the danger to individual and municipal health this dumping causes a chemical reaction, a condition that creates a hydrogen sulfide smell:

STATE ORDERS BIG SMELL TO STOP IT

(By Donovan Bess)

The State of California yesterday ordered an end to the big stink at Candlestick Cove—but no deadline was set.

The resolution of the Regional Water Pollution Board asked the San Francisco scavengers to take steps at their garbage dump to eliminate the rotten egg small within a reasonable time.

Another resolution called for eliminating raw sewage from the lagoon created by the causeway—a section of the freeway. Richard Pomeroy, expert on hydrogen sulfides, found last week that sewage is only a minor culprit in the stench.

The unanimous decision of the board, meeting in Oakland, came after Pomeroy described the lagoon as worse than a cesspool and insufficiently flushed out. He said future research on the precise causes of the odor should be carried on, but not while the public continues to suffer.

Acting under the State water pollution control act, the board ordered that the odor be eliminated.

The Sanitary Fill Co., owned by the two San Francisco scavenger companies, specifically was ordered not to let garbage be washed by high tides—a condition that creates the hydrogen sulfide smell.

The resolution cited the smell-makers before the board on September 18, when they will be called to a formal hearing unless they can prove the requirements will be met within a reasonable time.

The requirements also were served on the Easley and Brassy Co., contractors for fill and cover dumping, the city of San Francisco, and the Southern Pacific Co., owner of the land.

Before the vote, Sanitary Fill's persident, Joseph D. Molinari, declared his firm believes its blame in the situation is relatively minor.

He said the company is conducting a 90-day experiment of filling on dry land to help determine the effects, if any, of the company's operation upon the odor problem. Simultaneously, he declared, a power shovel now is cleaning up and straightening the face of the fill to try to keep old garbage from sloshing with the tidal waters.

The board also set requirements for the Bayshore Sanitary District, whose sewage drains into the lagoon. A. H. Beckel, secretary of the district, said his board is ready to let a contract for a pumping plant as soon as San Francisco agrees on a project to connect the lines with the city's.

## Winning Essay in Employ the Handicapped Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay written

by Janet Scott, student at St. Gabriel's High School, Hazleton, which was awarded first place in the Employ the Handicapped contest sponsored by the Tri-County Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Miss Scott's essay appeared in the Hazleton Plain Speaker on Tuesday, March 10, 1959.

JANET SCOTT WINS EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED ESSAY CONTEST

The following essay, submitted by Janet Scott, a junior student in St. Gabriel's High School, recently won first place in the annual essay contest sponsored by the Tri-County Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Using the assigned topic "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town," Miss Scott's essay competed with 385 entries from students of seven area high schools.

WINNING ESSAY

It has often been said, "Employment is nature's best physician; it is essential to human happiness." A job to a person who has perhaps never known success, who has been looked upon by his family, his friends, and the community as different, assumes even greater importance than it has with the physically able. Some individuals have, through their performance, adequately demonstrated their ability to become self-supporting, contributing members of society.

It is an inspiring sight to see confined persons expand and assume personality and self-confidence through a job. It is with great respect that we salute the employers of Hazleton who have helped these physically handicapped people to an almost normal life.

VISITS TAILOR

One afternoon I went to the tailor's with a beautiful new coat which had been burned by someone carelessly tossing a cigarette away. I was sure it could not be mended and was heartbroken about it. The proprietor sent me to see a very attractive, charming young lady sitting behind a sewing machine.

She looked at the coat, and, with a cute smile and a wink, told me she would fix it like new again. Then she pushed herself over to a nearby supply table; to my amazement, she was in a wheelchair. Noticing my surprise, she told me that through an accident she had become paralyzed in both legs. However, she had a wonderful job, having been trained for it in the school of tailoring.

I was so interested in this case, I discussed it with my parents and learned, to my amazement once more, how many Hazleton employers have found that employing the handicapped pays off.

We all know one of the most responsible positions in our town is that of postmaster. I wonder how many of us know that our postmaster has had both feet amputated. He is a war veteran whose ability was recognized by the Government. The Government needs his brains, not his feet.

In an area hospital you will find a cheerful, understanding worker ready to help patients or visitors. He is an amputee; both of his legs are off, but that doesn't hinder him from helping others.

In one of the city's largest stores, there is a lovely young woman working in the office. She would not hear you come in, for she is deaf, but she works speedily and well, without distraction.

BLIND ASSOCIATION

In Hazleton we are fortunate to have the Pennsylvania Association for the Blind, which is made up of a board of directors, a group of local men and women who donate their service and time without pay to benefit those who cannot see.

Under their direction, Hazleton has a workshop for the blind who make rag rugs, brooms, whisk brooms, belts, caned seats for chairs, crocheted and knitted articles. These articles are then sold to the public at the workshop, or from house to house. The association has also arranged operations and eye examinations for those who are losing their eyesight.

They arrange to help people learn Braille. Through their efforts, blind men and women are brought out of loneliness and are made into splendid workers and proud workers.

In addition, I must include those who are mentally handicapped. In the Arthur Street School in our town, there is a complete workshop, with trained personnel, for the mentally retarded. There are 2 women instructors and 16 students. These young boys and girls are here taught many useful trades.

CLINIC TRAINING

The State and private organization called the Guardian Clinic buy the supplies needed at the Arthur Street School. My mother has a pair of earrings made by the students; we think they are as beautiful as any sold in stores downtown. A good percentage of these students will be taken into the local factories as soon as they have completed their training.

In Hazleton, many people with heart conditions hold positions, despite their handicaps. They are doing simple work where there is no climbing, no heavy lifting, no continuous standing or walking. That is, no strenuous activities that will endanger their heart muscles by undue strain are engaged in. These handicapped workers are sometimes more dependable than others, because there is less chance of their changing jobs.

People in Hazleton, as well as all over America, must share the responsibility of encouraging the employment of qualified workers with a handicap. It will be a source of tremendous personal satisfaction, and a major contribution to the welfare of the country. Experience here in our own town has proved that the job can and will be done. What citizens can do on a small scale locally, the country can multiply in every locality.

Formerly in our town the handicapped were limited to such jobs as elevator operator or nightwatchman. Now, as I have just shown, the handicapped have taken other and sometimes more difficult jobs and have proved their ability to handle them.

In future years, with new inventions, there will be an increasing demand for brains, not muscles. The physically handicapped will be wanted again by their communities. About 8 to 12 percent of the workers in Hazleton are handicapped, according to the local employment office. On the whole, it takes no longer to train the disabled than to train the physically fit. Employers in our town have expressed their amazement at the quickness of the handicapped to adapt themselves to their jobs.

Handicapped workers themselves realize that they sometimes have one strike against them; therefore they strive harder than ever to show employers that they can deliver the goods.

In a sense, the handicapped are not handicapped at all in our town, for they have been given the chance to go ahead and do their best in their respective jobs. In our town business is good; we hire the handicapped—it's good business.

## Why the United States Should Stand Fast in Berlin, Quemoy, and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 of this year, Mr. Eugene Lyons, a senior editor of the Reader's Digest, addressed the Detroit Economic Club on the subject of "Why the United States Should Stand Fast in Berlin, Quemoy, and the Middle East."

Mr. Lyons spoke with authority. He was, for 6 years, United Press correspondent in Soviet Russia. He is the author of: "Assignment in Utopia," "Stalin, Czar of All the Russias," "The Red Decade," "Our Secret Allies: the Peoples of Russia," and other works, on the Soviet Union and communism.

His comments on the recent Mikoyan visit are particularly timely. Mr. Lyons' words are worthy of close study by every Member of Congress and by the public generally particularly at this moment when we are faced with a showdown on the Berlin question and a decision in the Congress as to the size and power of our Armed Forces:

WHY THE UNITED STATES SHOULD STAND FAST IN BERLIN, QUEMOY, AND THE MIDDLE EAST—AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE DETROIT ECONOMIC CLUB, FEBRUARY 16, 1959, BY EUGENE LYONS

A mere writer facing a roomful of distinguished businessmen, as I am doing, is impressed and even a bit intimidated. While he's been making black marks on white paper, here before him are the doers, the builders, the practical men.

So it is reluctantly, and only as a matter of conscience, that I must begin on a sour note—by congratulating American businessmen, not on their wisdom, but on their strong stomachs. I'm not referring to these ritual luncheons either. I'm referring to their recent binge of hospitality to one of the toughest, cruelest and most cynical chieftans of the Moscow murder-bund.

There were plenty of Americans who refused to fraternize with Comrade Mikoyan—Congressmen, labor leaders, churchmen—but not, so far at least as the public record goes, a single eminent businessman.

Those who spurned meetings with Mikoyan were, I believe, a lot closer to basic American sentiment than those who dined, wined and applauded the butcher of Budapest. They showed, it seems to me, more moral sensitivity and more political sense. Congressman JUDD, of Minnesota, spoke for them all when he declared that he would not dine with Mikoyan for the same reasons that he "would not attend a social function honoring Hitler, Himmler, Nero or Genghis Khan." "Ghosts of many enslaved, tortured and murdered human beings," he went on to say, "will be looking down on the dinner."

There was no such squeamishness among bankers, businessmen and industrialists. They turned out eagerly, by the hundred, to shake the bloody hand and applaud the

impudent lies. And they frowned upon the unmannerly refugees from Communist terror who tried to remind freemen that the visitor was a ruthless assassin of freedom. Almost any one of those humble pickets might have told them more vital truths about communism than the slick Mikoyan.

Our business community, more than anyone else, helped to make Mikoyan's American safari almost a triumphal tour. It provided him with a platform for raw deception—especially the deception now being spread throughout the Soviet slave empire—that the American people have forgotten Hungary, their own murdered airmen, and the other piled-up Communist crimes.

Many of those who played up to the Soviet emissary are having second thoughts. Where there were red carpets there are now some red faces. Certain of the eager-beaver hosts claim that they talked "tough" to Stalin's—now Khrushchev's—man Friday. Unhappily, none of the toughness showed at the time. The public picture throughout the world was plainly that of an orgy of cordiality for a leader of the world movement pledgde to our extermination.

Did any of those who entertained Mikoyan pause to look at the spectacle through the eyes of th enemies of the regime in Soviet Russia itself? The Mikoyan affair has been a stunning blow to the morale of these people, to their spirit of resistance.

Whatever the alibis for kowtowing to Mikayan, it has reduced our moral stature. We who so recently were expressing horror over the blood bath in Hungary were now "honoring" the man who helped organize the carnage. And what did we get in return? Only a phony amiability and some verbal soothing syrup. The statements that sounded most reasonable and made optimistic headlines here were not even reported in Russia—just pap for American gullibles. Lenin once said that when it comes to hanging capitalists they will be bidding against one another for the sale of the rope. That unflattering estimate, we may be sure, has been revised—downward—as a result of the Mikoyan episode.

This Soviet visitor had a special claim on the good will of American industry. During the war there was a vast network of economic espionage here. Tons of industrial data, including nuclear information and samples, were stolen and shipped to Russia. In direct command of that noble allied enterprise stood none other than Anastas Mikoyan. The least that the American victims could do in appreciation was to entertain him to a fare the well.

As for Mikoyan's public palavar while in our midst, it adds up to a classic example of Communist double talk. He had the unmitigated gall to cry, "Peace, peace!" at the very moment his Government was holding a gun to our heads in the Berlin ultimatum. He lied without limit about the American plane illegally shot down in his native Soviet Armenia.

He described the barriers between our two countries as "nonsense," and there was no one to remind him publicly that we do not regard freedom and morality, systematic violation of treaties, and mass murder of innocents, including innocent Americans, as nonesense.

Mikoyan praised certain Americans for "helping to build Soviet industry." One can only hope that the kind words brought a flush of shame to the cheeks of a few of our captains of industry. By now they know, or ought to know, that the weapons and equipment produced by the Soviet industry they helped to build in due time killed American boys in Korea, slaughtered Hungarian women and children in their streets, and now threaten our very civilization.

But Mikoyan was telling the truth this once. I was in Soviet Russia throughout the first 5-year plan and can attest that it was more truly an American than a Soviet plan. At the peak there were some 10,000 foreign engineers and technicians engaged on it, most of them Americans. The Kremlin could not have gotten its industrialization off the ground if the West had not been blinded by a fever for immediate profit. It's an unpleasant thought, but one that should be faced today, when the Communists desperately need our machines and machine tools for their latest 7-year plan.

It was hinted to me that I might profitably comment on a certain financier who preceded me on this famous rostrum. I felt that Mikoyan rated priority, yet I can't resist a few kind words on Mr. Cyrus Eaton. Here's a man who insists that America is more of a police state than Russia; who has said that the Kremlin, unlike Washington, speaks for all its people; that our FBI is as bad as the Kremlin's murderous secret police. These are, of course, profound observations which indicate a deep political thinker and student, a man of balanced judgment.

Mr. Eaton has asked our country to "quit meddling in the affairs of other nations"—to quit meddling, that is to say, with Moscow's meddling in our own and every other nation. Just why he wants to give Moscow a monopoly of meddling, with the free world in the posture of a sitting duck, is not quite clear.

Mr. Eaton asked you, as he has asked other audiences, to "trust Russia." Now, as a businessman he would not, I assume, invest money without a tough-minded and thorough study of the credit record and reliability of those whom he must trust. But he is ready to invest the survival of our country, the survival of freedom on this planet, without such a study, by an act of sublime faith.

If anything is crystal clear in the world picture today it is that the Kremlin has violated virtually every treaty, every pledge, every promise it ever made. The injunction to trust Russia therefore amounts to a prescription for suicide, and anyone who accepts it uncritically is yielding to what Freudians call the death wish.

I'm not straying from the subject assigned to me in these introductory references. They are wholly pertinent to the challenge in Berlin, the Formosa Strait, the Middle East, and all other areas of Soviet infiltration and manipulation. The Soviet Minister's reception here—he said in California that he felt as if he were in his own Soviet Union—and the attention being paid to the Eatons point up the failure—worse, the refusal—of the free world to understand the nature of communism and its challenge. It reveals once more the chronic wishful thinking that has made us, these 40 years, such easy marks for Communist blandishments and perfidy.

The West's willful ignorance, its political sleepwalking, are prime elements in Moscow's calculations whenever it touches off another of the periodic crises to test our nerves, and intensify our jitters. Repeatedly, they have gambled—and won—on our refusal to see that we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle and not in an international parlor game; on our pathetic eagerness to end the cold war; on our hunger for narcotic phrases about peaceful coexistence. The Communists know our yearning for some patent medicine that will permit us to sleep in peace, and they exploit it to the limit.

How can we square peaceful coexistence with the Leninist mission of permanent world revolution, from which the present rulers have not retreated a single inch? It's a meaningless phrase intended to disarm us psychologically, so that they may more easily pursue that mission.

Khrushchev and his mob have made that amply clear again and again. As recently as 1957, the Moscow magazine, Kommunist, wrote: "The Socialist and bourgeois ideologies are mutually exclusive; there is not and cannot be any peaceful coexistence between them." And that goes back to the founder's, Lenin's, thesis, in 1920: "As soon as we are strong enough to strike down capitalism, we shall seize it by the throat." But at our end we persist in the pathetic hope that the Communist cancer can be cured with cultural exchanges, doses of good will and courtesy to visiting Kremlin killers.

Certainly the Communists themselves can't be blamed for our complacency and confusion. They have shouted their intentions so that even the deaf could hear them. Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev and their myriad mouthpieces have made no secret of their plans—so successfully carried out that already a third of the human race is writhing under the Kremlin's iron heel.

Winston Churchill did us no favor when he called Russia "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." Actually, few historical phenomena are less mysterious and enigmatic. Communist purposes have been spelled out all too clearly both in words and in actions.

The real enigma is why we who are earmarked for conquest prefer to kid ourselves that communism can somehow be bought off, or contained, or induced to commit suicide by suddenly renouncing global conspiracy and world dominion. We behave as if this were a conventional disagreement between nations, a question of territory and markets and colonies, as in the past. But it's nothing of the kind. What's involved is the permanent revolution unleashed by Lenin, promoted with increasing zeal and increasing success by all his successors. And we're doomed to defeat as long as we subsist on political tranquilizers.

The great Western Powers, custodians of mankind's treasures of freedom and culture, seem to have suffered a disastrous loss of nerve. Western policies have been wholly defensive, improvised in a panic to meet the crisis of the hour, while ignoring the larger, all-embracing crisis of this historial period, of which each new outbreak is only a part.

We have shied away from firm, consistent policies on the ground that we might antagonize the enemy and close the doors to understandings with him. But the enemy has had no such inhibitions. He has attacked, attacked, and attacked. If you are under any illusion that there has been a change on this score since Stalin's death, read the speeches of Khrushchev and Gromyko at their party congress last month.

Oh I know, I shall be asked, "Do you want a third world war?" But the question makes little sense. It evades the grim lesson of very recent history, that appeasement and retreat, far from ending danger are the guarantees of more terrible dangers to come. Nobody in his senses wants war, and that includes me and Khrushchev. The real question is whether war is best avoided by softness, jitters, submission to blackmail, piecemeal surrenders—or by a principled, self-respecting firmness.

Those who point with trembling fingers to the new military strength of the Soviets should be reminded that communism scored its greatest triumphs precisely in the years when the free world held overwhelming military superiority; that the Kremlin conquered country after country at a time when we had an absolute monopoly of nuclear power. This land of poker players has consistently been bluffed out of winning hands.

The primary Soviet advantage, now as then, is not in material might. On that level we can continue to outmatch them, if we make up our minds to do so. No, their advantage lies on other levels, in their zeal, their determination, their unswerving dedication to a fixed goal. When two fighters are in the ring, one determined to score a knockout and the other looking only for a draw, who is likely to win?

There are those who argue that anything—even surrender—is better than war. Others imply this without saying it. At best that's a shabby, morally shocking proposition. People who fear death more than they love liberty, justice, and honor no longer deserve to survive as independent human beings. Already, before the chains have been welded on their wrists and ankles, they have assumed the posture of slaves.

The mischief of announcing in advance that we don't intend to defend our way of life is that it helps to provide the very catastrophe it proposes to evade. For it amounts to an open invitation to the enemy to make more demands, issue more daring ultimatums, create more dangerous crises. And these in turn push the world closer and closer to the wall of ultimate despair where even a terrified kitten turns on a big dog.

The advocates of surrender-rather-than-war are still few, of course. But their extreme view reflects, as in an enlarging mirror, the attitude of the free world. It differs only in degree from the policies we have actually followed.

Take Korea. There we won a costly victory, then proceeded to turn it into a more costly defeat, rather than risk the attack on the enemy's sanctuary in Manchuria demanded by MacArthur, Van Fleet, Stratmeyer and nearly all our military leaders. And remember that we had, at the time, unquestioned control of the air and exclusive control of the atomic weapon. Red China could not possibly have held out alone, and Moscow would not have courted annihilation.

A decisive United Nations victory might well have stopped Chinese communism in its tracks and reversed the whole trend of Asian history. But instead of clinching our victory, we settled for an uneasy stalemate that will burst into flames again just as soon as Moscow and Peiping consider the time propitious.

Then there was the siege of Berlin. Of what avail was the airlift to save the city, if we are called upon to save it again? In retrospect it is clear that had we followed the advice of the American military men closest to the scene—had we established our rights of access by force—there would have been no war, and there might have been no repetition of the challenge at a more dangerous time, such as we face today.

An even greater opportunity to arrest the expansion of communism—the kind that may not return for a great many years—was opened up when the people of Hungary overthrew their hated puppet regime. There were a hundred things the free world could have done, this side of open military involvement, to help the heroic people maintain their new-won freedom and head off Soviet intervention. Moscow, in fact, hesitated for nearly a week before sending its tanks rolling. It had to make sure that the West would not interfere with the slaughter. Obligingly, we gave them that assurance.

Yet the Kremlin was scarcely in a position then to invite a world war. Its whole satellite empire was tensed for revolt, and its own country, especially its youth, was in a rebellious mood. But Moscow had one great source of strength—namely, our psychological weakness. Again free nations were paralyzed by lack of nerve and heart and moral passion, and the unique chance to cut communism down to size was deliberately thrown away.

Or turn to China. In 1955 we forced the Nationalists to give up the Tachen Islands. Today we see that this has merely enabled the Communists to advance their fighting line to Quemoy and Matsu.

When the aggression against Quemoy was unleashed, a few months ago, hysterical voices were raised here, in England, and elsewhere, demanding withdrawal from the offshore islands. They painted a panicky picture of the world going up in smoke unless the Chinese Communists got what they wanted, and quick. But Secretary Dulles, almost alone, insisted on rejecting intimidation. And even limited resistance has sufficed to deny the Communists another victory by default.

If those islands are surrendered, or lost, exactly nothing will be settled. The line of conflict will simply have been moved deeper into our area—to Formosa, then to Okinawa and other American outposts, and after that perhaps to the Philippines. The trouble with buying peace by concessions and compromise is that the Communists never stay bought. On the contrary, every payment "ups the ante" for the next holdup.

And today there are voices, not so many or so loud but still powerful, urging that we seek what they call a sensible compromise in Berlin. Their zeal for appeasement is masked with beguiling talk of negotiation and disengagement—but it's still the same sick urge to surrender rather than risk conflict.

The Berlin ultimatum is aggression pure and simple, unprovoked, illegal, defiant. Moscow threatens to abrogate rights held by the West under wartime agreements, explicitly reaffirmed after the lifting of the Berlin blockade. It is a unilateral cancellation of clear-cut agreements.

Let's have not only the political but the moral picture clear. We are tied to the two-and-a-quarter million men, women, and children in West Berlin by solemn documents, by ordinary human compassion, by simple self-interest. They have stood up to the Communists because of unflinching confidence in our pledges. It was on the basis of our assurances of safety that they built homes and industries and founded families. To turn those people over to Communist vengeance would be a crime and a betrayal. If the free nations fail this supreme test, they will go down the drain of history and will not even deserve a better fate.

Let's not bemuse ourselves again with the hope that a tiny concession here and there—a soupçon of dishonor in the name of flexibility—will end the crisis. It will merely establish the conditions for a bigger crisis tomorrow. If we give Communist East Germans authority over the land and sky approaches to the beleaguered city, it would be merely the beginning of a process, no matter how the submission is disguised to save our face.

Step by step, the remaining autonomy of West Berlin would be cut away until, through sheer attrition, the city is drowned in the surrounding sea of totalitarian horror. The vengeance wreaked upon its people would then make Budapest look like a picnic. And the first to be tortured and liquidated would be our friends, precisely those who played bravely on our team.

Of course we must stand fast on Berlin, on Quemoy, in the Near East, in Iran, at every point where communism presses forward. Compromise may buy a little time—time that is more valuable to the Communists than to us, because they are more skillful in using it—but it will solve nothing. Whenever Moscow succeeds in making an outrageous aggression stick, the next one is even more outrageous.

In the Berlin gambit we see again the familiar Soviet technic. It is to create a crisis, then demand counterproposals. The bandit covers you with a gun, asks for all you possess, then suggests you make counterproposals. What could be more reasonable? And if you hesitate, even some of your friends complain that you lack flexibility.

To stand fast involves risks, terrible risks. But the risks of yielding are far greater, far more terrible. Remember that the only threatened segments of the map which have been kept out of Communist hands are those where we showed courage and a clear determination to back words with action. Greece and Iran and at least part of Turkey would by this time have been securely behind the Iron Curtain had we not acted boldly and in time.

By the same token, our position is least stable, most explosive precisely in the areas where we made most concessions and surrenders, as in Germany and Korea and China. We sought to buy peace in our time by turning over 100 million people in Eastern Europe—all of them our friends and most of them our allies—to the Red barbarians. We sought to buy peace in Asia by giving communism the right of way in Manchuria, and then in all of China. You know what we bought instead.

Much of our weakness derives from a myth that defies commonsense—the enfeebling myth that Soviets somehow dread war less than we do; that if we dare affirm our rights they will begin tossing bombs. The men in the Kremlin are utterly ruthless, but they are not suicidal maniacs. They are more determined than ever to achieve one Communist world, but this doesn't mean that they seek an all-out global war.

On the contrary, they aim to take over our world and its wealth intact, not in a heap of nuclear ruins. Above all, they don't want their own base of power, Soviet Russia, and the material foundations of that power, the Soviet industrial complex, reduced to rubble. They do not, of course, exclude the possibility of war, but they are profoundly sure that they can win the world without a major war, by means of the relentless harassment that we have come to call the cold war.

Now as always, the Communists count on victory through propaganda, subversion, Machiavellian diplomacy, the fomenting of economic crises and civil strife in target areas. They count on undermining our self-confidence and in the end destroying our will to resist. Safe in the knowledge that we won't start a final fight, they whip up panic fear of war in order to exact concessions, compromises, and thinly disguised surrenders from a terrorized world.

The Soviet leaders, I am convinced, fear a real war even more than we do. Surely, after the events in East Germany, Poland, and Hungary they have reason to wonder and worry which way satellite guns will be pointed in the showdown. They must reckon with the likelihood of rebellion in Eastern Europe and more important, they cannot count, as a certainty, upon the allegiance of their own subjects.

These gentry have a chilling memory of what happened in 1941, when the Germans attacked and they had to fight a war on two fronts—against the foreign foe and against their own people. Millions of Red soldiers surrendered virtually without resistance, and nearly everywhere the invaders were greeted with joy as liberators from communism.

Only after the nature of the Nazi beast and his insulting racial arrogance became obvious did the Soviet people rally around their hated tyrant. And even then close to a million Soviet patriots put on German uniforms to fight against the Kremlin regime. We have forgotten this, but not Khrushchev and his confreres when they weigh the hazards of war.

The great gulf of mutual distrust and hatred between the Soviet masters and their slaves, between the rulers and the ruled, is a fact of transcendant importance, which we have ignored and have lacked the wisdom to exploit. In my book "Our Secret Allies, I tried to show that Soviet history amounts to a continuous civil war between the regime and the people. That war is now, if anything, more intense than in Stalin's pe-

riod. The new intelligentsia, and especially the youth, are in a ferment of soul searching and discontent. This is not my guess—it has been repeatedly admitted by the regime itself.

As against the bland assumption by 3-week tourist experts that the people are behind the regime, there is the towering fact that in 41 years of absolute power, Soviet communism has failed to win what political scientists call legitimacy. It cannot, that is to say, count on the automatic loyalty of its subjects. It still feels obliged to maintain colossal machinery of brainwashing and internal secret police. It still dares not risk the slightest freedom of speech and press and must continue to seal its frontiers hermetically against outside ideas by jamming and censorships and medieval punishments. It continues to behave more like an occupying force in a conquered province than a native government.

I am not suggesting that we can expect a revolution tomorrow or the day after. I do say that the potentials for internal trouble are there; that the masters are deeply scared of an uprising of the slaves, especially under the impact of a devastating war.

In talking of the Russians, we should never fail to distinguish between the dictators and their long-suffering subjects. Nor should we ever lose sight of the nature of the Soviet setup—the framework of police-state oppression and terror; now harsh, now soft, but terror still. Too many of our hurry-up experts describe achievements without mentioning that they are talking about a prison land. It is as if they described the fine work being done in the shops of Alcatraz or Sing Sing but failed to make clear that they're talking about a prison.

And that leads me to another timely caution; namely, that not even eminent Senators or educators or industrialists can buy an understanding of a phenomenon as vast and complex as Communist Russia at the price of a 10- or 30-day tour—not even if it's capped with a personal interview with Khrushchev. Real understanding calls for long and deep study. Recently a special committee on Communist tactics set up by the American Bar Association offered some advice. "For those who want to understand communism" its report said, "we prescribe, not a 15-day trip to Russia but 15 days in a library studying the Communist conspiracy." I think it's sound advice.

We have no alternative in commonsense but to maintain our military vitality. It's our last-ditch insurance against all contingencies, the guarantee of everything else we do or dare. But the fateful decisions are being made now, by means short of war. The much discussed gap in missiles is negligible by comparison with the huge, almost complete gap in political weapons, those that have been giving the Communists an unbroken series of large and small victories. That's the gap, above all, that must be closed if we are to survive.

The Communists do not even pretend that what now exists is peace. For them it is war with revolutionary cold-war weapons—war to the finish—our finish. And that war can't be called off. Even if Moscow wished to do so—which it decidedly doesn't—it couldn't dismantle its worldwide apparatus of infiltration and subversion, its Communist parties, its global empire of false-front organizations, its paramilitary formations in some places, its vast agencies of mischief everywhere.

The essence of the matter, which so many of our opinion makers fail to grasp, is in the dual nature of the Kremlin. It is at the same time a conventional government and the spearhead of a world revolutionary movement. That's the hidden trap in negotiations with the Soviets. Agreements undertaken by the Government, even if they were kept, would not be binding upon world communism. Often, in fact, they have provided a convenient cover for expanded and intensified Communist activity.

Like it or not, the great and inescapable task of our epoch is not to end the cold war but to win it. And to win it we must acknowledge its reality, then develop a strategy for fighting it boldly, aggressively, on a scale commensurate with the stakes involved—meanwhile maintaining military superiority to make sure that the war remains cold.

It's late, but not too late, to save our civilization and the values we cherish from being overrun by the new barbarism. We must face up, once and for all, to the fact that the struggle with communism can't be wished away; that it won't end until their world or ours is eliminated. There is no reason why we should merely wait for the next Communist blow to descend. We, too, should confront the enemy with hard choices at times and in places of our choosing; encourage and intensify the tides of mutiny under the policed surface of Soviet life; keep the Communists constantly off balance—in sum, we should do to them what they have been so successfully doing to us.

I am uncomfortably conscious that because of the limited time I have dealt with vast issues in every summary, and therefore oversimplified, fashion. But I know I can count on your forgiveness. I consider it both an honor and a unique opportunity to have been invited to address you.

## The Present Administration Has Done Good Job of Steadying Prices and the Value of the Dollar

SPEECH
OF
### HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, any consideration of inflation comes down in the end to this question: Which party has done the better job of steadying prices and the value of the dollar?

The record clearly is in favor of the present administration.

The Truman administration's policies burned up about 50 percent of the dollar's value. Under this administration, the value shrinkage has been less than a nickel in practically the same number of years.

Under the preceding administration, prices soared approximately 50 percent. The rise in the cost of living under this administration, in sharp contrast, has been held to less than 9 percent and the present plateau of price stability is one of the longest on record.

I agree generally with the statement on AFL–CIO President George Meany in the February issue of the Federalist:

Our trade unions have continued to obtain substantial wage advances while prices have remained relatively stable. * * * Real wages are showing very significant increases. This means a continuously rising American standard of living.

All this could be destroyed, of course, if the excessive spending indirectly and directly advocated in the majority Joint Economic Report of 1959 were implemented by an irresponsible Congress.

## Speech of Robert T. Murphy, Esq.

SPEECH
OF
### HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick's Day comes early—at least in Arlington, Va., where the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Northern Virginia traditionally conduct their annual banquet on the eve of the birthday of the Father of Our Country. In this way they honor the memory of our first President who became an honorary member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in 1781 at Philadelphia. The northern Virginia chapter was organized some years ago by a group of Virginia residents headed by my former assistant and close friend, David P. Doyle.

This year the principal address was given by Robert T. Murphy, a member of the bar of the State of Rhode Island and the District of Columbia. Bob Murphy was my classmate at La Salle Academy in Providence R.I. He has long been a member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Providence of which his father-in-law, Felix Meenagh, is the oldest living member and its distinguished Almoner. Bob Murphy and Felix Meenagh are men of great stature and outstanding examples of what we like to consider as the best in Irish-American gentlemen. I feel privileged to count both of them as personal friends.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of Robert T. Murphy before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Northern Virginia on February 21, 1959, at Arlington, Va.

Mr. Kirby, Mr. Wynne, our toastmaster, Father McMahon, distinguished guests, and members of the George Washington Chapter of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, I am honored, indeed, to be called upon to address a group of fellow Irishmen of northern Virginia once again. I say "again" for the reason that more than a decade ago, at the invitation of my dear, departed friend, Dave Doyle, I spoke to some of you in the old parish hall at St. James on the eve of St. Patrick's Day. About a year or so later, this society was founded and now I return to undertake this pleasant task again. Some may properly observe, at this point, that this lapse of time probably had some relation to the length and quality of my remarks on that occasion. Fortunately, for me at least, your toastmaster, Dick Wynne, a fellow-Rhode Islander, was not there at old St. James which may account for his invitation to me to speak to you tonight.

I wish only to briefly allude to some of the background of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick—your own, George Washington Chapter, in particular—so that we may all appreciate, in some measure, its tradition and the purposes for which it stands.

The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, a Society, was founded in the city of Philadelphia, in the year 1771, by 31 Irish gentlemen, 28 of whom were Protestants and but 3 were Catholics. Its first chosen president was Stephen Moylan, brother of the Catholic bishop of Cork, and later a famous Revolutionary War general. There was no bigotry then among them and, in keeping with the Christian love of St. Patrick, there is none among the Friendly Sons today.

From this group, as it grew, were furnished a number of outstanding Revolutionary War figures, both military and civil, so that 10 years later, in 1781, when George Washington was made an honorary member he could say that he was proud to wear the ensign of such a noble society which was distinguished for the firm adherence of its members to the glorious cause in which we are embarked.

Some of its members were Generals Moylan, Shee, Wayne, Knox, Butler, Irvine, Hand, Commodore John Barry, Capt. Matthew Mease, of the U.S. Navy.

On June 17, 1780, 27 members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick subscribed 103,500 pounds sterling to furnish provisions for are army. Robert Marris and Blair McClenachan, both members of the society, each subscribing 10,000 pounds. So numerous were Irishmen and their descendants in the Pennsylvania line, commanded by General Wayne, a member of the Philadelphia Friendly Sons, that it was characterized by General Harry Lee, Governor of Virginia, in his "Memoirs of the War" (vol. 2, p. 203), as follows: "They were known by the designation of the line of Pennsylvania, whereas they might have been, with more propriety called the 'line of Ireland.'"

Little wonder, therefore, that in the severe winter of 1780, in northern New Jersey, General Washington issued a special order to his half-frozen, half-starved troops, directing that all fatigues and working parties cease for tomorrow, the 17th of March in honor of the loyal support of the Sons of Ireland to the flickering cause of American liberty. So, I leave it to you to decide whether George Washington did not truly love St. Patrick and his society.

Thus, it is a perpetual tradition, among the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Philadelphia, that the toast, immediately following the first of the evening to St. Patrick, is always to "the immortal memory of Washington," its distinguished honorary member.

In New York City, on March 17, 1784, a Friendly Sons of St. Patrick was founded by Daniel McCormick and a group of Irish officers in the Revolutionary Army. William Constable, an aide to Lafayette, who had been a member of the Philadelphia group, was one of the founders of the New York society.

Since those days, it has spread and flourished in other parts of the Nation where men of Irish ancestry reside. From its inception, the society has been a truly democratic one, with no national headquarters, no national charter or bylaws, no national dues or retinue of national or international officers. Separate individual units have sprung up from coast-to-coast, each a law unto itself. Thus, in the great State of Pennsylvania, the birthplace of our society, we find a famous unit in the greater Pittston area, whose activities and achievements are a legend. In Lackawanna County, the home of many famous Irish leaders in American life, there is another. In my native city of Providence, a unit was organized in 1901 and I am proud to say that my father-in-law, Felix Meenagh, of County Tyrone, is its oldest living member. Other well-known units in Washington, Boston, Atlanta, Chicago, and elsewhere have long been functioning.

Yet there is common bond that ties one with the other—love of Ireland, love of God, love of country. Naturally, by virtue of its very name, love of St. Patrick, and all he stands for, is taken for granted and unites all its members.

The history of this group is comparatively short and yet its roots touch deeply on the history of the past. I can think of no other unit in the country which is more fittingly identified with the things for which the society stands. Here we gather, on the eve of the birthday of the Father of Our Country, close by his very home and near the place where rest his mortal remains. We meet in an area where men and women from Ireland were welcomed in the early 1700's, where many lived and died and from whence large numbers journeyed westward and south to carve out a destiny in the Blue Ridge, the Smokies, the flatlands of the Carolinas, from where so many of their children later rose to prominence in America's history.

It seems but a few short years ago, that David Patrick Doyle, fresh from Rhode Island and filled with a love and devotion to Ireland and its traditions, set about with many of you to bring the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick into being here. I recall an invitation to attend an organization meeting at his home. I was asked to bring a book containing the charter and bylaws of the Providence group, which I did, and upon which your own activities are modeled. It was there that I first met Joe Freehill, who worked so diligently on this project, as he did on everything he touched. Tonight, both these men, together with Addison Clohosey, Edward J. Kelly, and Creston Giblin, are not with us—although they truly must be in spirit. But if Dave Doyle or Joe Freehill left no other monument—and they certainly did—this group will, I trust, ever remain as a living testament to their zeal for St. Patrick and his sons and daughters in that part of the world where they lived and died.

In conclusion, let me repeat a few lines from an old poem dear to the heart of David Patrick Doyle, which expresses a happy view on life, a view which I find so well exemplified among you, his fellow Friendly Sons:

"From humble homes and small beginnings,
Out to the undiscovered lands,
There is nothing worth the while of living,
Save laughter and the love of friends."

## Emilie Martine Nelson and Her Famous Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise my remarks, I include herein an award of the Boys' Club Bronze Keystone for long and devoted service to boys recently tendered to my dear and valued friend, Nils V. (Swede) Nelson by the famous West End House of Boston.

This award, which came in recognition of Swede Nelson's unparalleled contributions to the welfare of boys in the Boston area, came on the occasion of the 95th birthday of his beloved mother, Mrs. Emilie Martine Nelson on January 13, 1959.

I join many in expressing appreciation for this highly merited award, because there is no one in Massachusetts or the Nation who has done more effective work among our young people, to inspire, encourage, and guide them along constructive pathways, than the great Swede Nelson.

Time and time again he has been recognized and honored for his outstanding work in athletics, social service, career guidance, and worthwhile fraternal and charitable activities.

Famous wit, outstanding afterdinner speaker, indefatigable worker for every good cause, Swede Nelson is one of our greatest contemporary Americans. It is indeed appropriate that he should be honored again on the occasion of the 95th birthday of his dear mother who, like his gracious wife, throughout the years has counseled, inspired, and assisted him in his praiseworthy work.

I am highly privileged to join very many admiring and grateful citizens in Massachusetts and the Nation in congratulating these grand citizens for their unselfish endeavors for a better, stronger, and more vital America. Would that we had more Swede Nelsons.

BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA PRESENTS THE AWARD OF THE BOYS' CLUB BRONZE KEYSTONE FOR LONG AND DEVOTED SERVICE TO BOYS TO NILS V. NELSON

He has served on the board of directors of the West End House, Boston, Mass., since 1943. He has been of great assistance to the Boys' Club alumni and to the active membership of the West End House. He has been a constant proponent of the Boys' Club movement and has utilized his great speaking ability and humor to win many friends for its support. He is devoted to the West End House and is a good will ambassador for the organization. His interest and efforts have been of immeasurable value to the Boys' Club and to hundreds of boys. In recognition of his long and devoted service to boys, Boys' Clubs of America awards him the Boys' Club Bronze Keystone.

HERBERT HOOVER,
*Chairman of Board.*
ALBERT L. COLE,
*President.*
JOHN M. GLEASON,
*National Director.*
MORGAN D. WINSLOW,
*Chairman, National Awards Committee.*
WALTER M. HALL,
*Secretary, National Awards Committee.*

## H.R. 5633—To Amend the District of Columbia Code With Reference to Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 5633 to amend the District of Columbia Code with reference to income taxes.

I am hopeful that by the enactment of this bill we will give to residents of the District of Columbia the same privileges as granted to all citizens in connection with the filing of their income tax returns with the United States. It is intended to equalize those exemptions and benefits.

At the same time it should put residents of the District of Columbia at least on an equal basis with residents in Maryland and Virginia in that connection.

The benefits will inure principally to our aged citizens 65 years of age and older and those who are called upon to pay large medical, dental, and hospital expenses.

## All-Out Air Alert Involves Problems for the Strategic Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. John G. Norris which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, March 8, 1959:

The great debate over the Eisenhower administration's defense program shifted course last week as critics turned their fire from the coming missile gap to the lack of a SAC air alert.

Considerable heat, but little light, however, was cast on the complex and vital military problem involved by what was said on both sides.

For shifting Strategic Air Command bombers from ground to air alert will require substantial changes in the Nation's all-important nuclear deterrent system. And the pro and con arguments within the Pentagon over an air alert proposal by Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC commander, differ considerably from those in public debate.

Congressional and newspaper critics of the administration suggest that SAC bombers are in danger of being destroyed on the ground by a surprise Soviet ICBM attack, and therefore a sizable portion of them must be kept continuously in the air, armed and fueled for retaliatory attack. Since this would cost money, many conclude that budget limitations are hamstringing security.

President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary McElroy answer that the present SAC alert—which maintains nearly one-third of its bombers on a 15-minute readiness status on the ground—is completely satisfactory at this time. They say that the time may come when an air alert will be necessary and will be put into effect at that time.

Part of the confusion stems from some cryptic testimony by General Power before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. He said, without amplification or clarification under cross-examination, that he had made recommendations regarding an air alert and that what is done about it is up to higher authority.

Actually, what the SAC chief has proposed is permission and funds to go ahead with an air alert on a limited, trial basis. Air Force officials say he is not at present concerned about his bombers being caught on the ground by a massive, surprise Soviet missle attack.

But since the day could well come when Russia's ICBM strength may make such a disaster possible, Power wants to start now determining just how an air alert should be operated, and getting the additional resources needed for the purpose.

Some very small scale experiments already have been held in SAC, which convince its chiefs that an air alert is feasible, when and if it becomes necessary. From these tests the Air Force draws these tentative conclusions:

A continuous, large-scale air alert—up to one-third of SAC bombers aloft at all times—would involve much additional flying, perhaps doubling the maintenance and operations costs. That would mean providing sizable amounts of additional fuel, engines, spare parts, oxygen, overhaul facilities, and probably tankers. More ground crews, air crews, and support forces almost certainly would be necessary to maintain a maximum effort.

A regular air alert would be practicable only with SAC's B–52 heavy bombers, now numbering nearly 300 in operational status. Too many problems would be involved in extending it to SAC's 1,200 B–47's. Also the B–47's are old and intensive flying would wear them out quickly.

Cost of a B–52 alert is estimated at from $750 million to $1.5 billion or more, depending upon the proportion kept in the air, and what actual trial operations would prove. Rough estimates are all that is possible now. As the force of B–52's grows, the cost would be greater.

Adoption of an air alert would require major changes in SAC training schedules. Fully operational air crews conduct routine training and fly missions that are almost complete replicas of what they would do if the bell rings. They fly the precise distance to a designated target in Russia, actually on a triangular course over the United States. Other crews always are in training to replace them.

Instead of such replica flights in the United States, bombers on air alert would fly toward the Arctic, probably get an additional aerial refueling and remain in the North for a few hours. The refueling B–52's would be assigned a deeper target for a time, and then revert to their original target when their gas depletes. Longer missions would be flown, involving greater crew fatigue.

An air alert would degrade the present ground alert, as obviously both could not be maintained at anything like maximum strength. Weighing the relative merits of the two is complicated by the fact that an air alert is not desirable for protection against enemy bombers. It is also complicated by some questions raised by the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System, expected to be ready in 1961. If the two warning stations in Alaska and Greenland prove fully reliable, a ground alert might have greater advantage over an air alert.

All these things are being weighed at the Pentagon. But what General Power stresses is that the major changes required in SAC if an air alert is ordered in the next 1, 2, or 3 years, when Russia may gain a big ICBM superiority, will take time.

If SAC has to double its flying in 1961, reorganize and increase its maintenance, training and operating schedules, and procure additional crews, planes, and parts, it needs to start now, not only to find out exactly what must be done but do it in an orderly manner.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 36

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the RECORD an article from the Salisbury, Md., Times entitled "Pollution May Bar Oystering in Sho' River":

POLLUTION MAY BAR OYSTERING IN SHO' RIVER

CAMBRIDGE.—The director of the State health department has been given authority to close the Little Choptank River, in the lower area of Dorchester County, to oystering unless residential pollution is reduced before the oyster season starts on October 1.

The board of health has directed Dr. Perry F. Prather to take this action unless satisfactory improvement is made in the meantime.

Robert M. Brown, chief of the department's bureau of environmental hygiene, recommended the board action after pointing out that inadequate sewage disposal has caused a problem in the river for several years.

According to sanitarian J. William Robbins, of the local health department staff, 13 new sewage systems have already been installed by property owners along the river. This leaves 31 of the 54 notified of inadequate systems, who have failed to take any steps to comply.

Earlier this year the State health department threatened to close the Little Choptank to oystering before the 1958–59 season opened. The closing threat was again made last week, unless a substantial number of corrections were made before October 1.

Dr. Clarence Tinsman, county health officer, said that all 54 violators were sent health department orders in July giving them 30 days to comply.

Next step of Dr. Tinsman's department will be to hold hearings, and then secure warrants against those property owners who refuse to make any attempts toward compliance.

Hearings must be held soon, Dr. Tinsman said, in fairness to the many watermen who depend on oystering in the Little Choptank for their livelihood.

## TVA Generator Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN**
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, when the award was announced, I strongly protested to the President and Mr. Herbert D. Vogel, head of TVA, to withdraw the recent order for a 500,000-kilowatt turbogenerator for the Tennessee Valley Authority awarded to a British concern. The contract price was some $13 million.

There are concerns in my district and State which employ our fellow citizens and taxpayers with highest capability of performing this large Government contract.

It is neither just nor wise to displace American labor and penalize American business by giving out contracts to foreign competitors which results in depriving American industries of business and taking bread out of the mouths of American working people.

Most of us are willing to help our allies of the free world as much as we reasonably can. In the past 18 years, we have spent well over $100 billion for this purpose overseas.

In addition, we have allowed a flood of competitive goods to come into the United States to undermine standards of employment and industrial vitality.

This law is threatening to infect our whole economic structure. Industry after industry is being hit.

The practice of purchasing overseas government procurement items that can be purchased in this country, cannot be justified. Whether it technically complies with the Buy American Act or not, it is to say the least, ill-advised, unsound economic policy.

In any event I believe that this turbine-generator bid should be rejected

and the order canceled and readvertised so that American industry can qualify to get the work.

The Buy American Act formerly was interpreted to prohibit purchases overseas when the price range was within 25 percent. In my opinion, 25 percent is not enough in most cases to reflect the wide wage differentials between foreign and domestic labor let alone other cost factors.

Moreover, the Government has by administrative ruling, reduced the former 25 percent differential requirements to about 6 percent, and that literally opens the floodgates that could well permit foreign bidders to have a picnic at the expense of American producers and workers in the American market.

I also question heavy overseas purchases by the Armed Forces.

The offshore procurement policy, so-called, is another example in the assortment of huge financial subsidies we are heaping upon foreign nations at the expense of our own economic machine.

There are instances where it is feasible to purchase certain goods in foreign aid and military aid programs, but there are also instances where it is an extremely unsound, costly practice. The most recent instance of this practice was the purchase by the U.S. Navy of 7,000 tons of steel from Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I am preparing legislation to amend the Buy American Act, calling for the study and adoption of sound methods to bar large overseas purchases harmful to American industry where monopolistic or excessive costs are not in question.

Obviously Congress must protect the Government as well as the consumer against monopolistic or unfair trade practices.

The shortsightedness of the purchase is shown by the fact that servicing and repairing of this TVA foreign-made equipment estimated over a period of years will unquestionably raise the original purchase price very considerably above the bid price. If this additional cost were taken into account, it would prohibit the purchase under any fair interpretation of the Buy American Act, because it would bring the price within a prohibitory range.

The situation is the more indefensible because of the status of TVA, a taxpayer-supported public utility, grossly competitive with private enterprise utilities, having the temerity as a recipient of huge Government largesse, to award a contract to a foreign company and leave American workers in the lurch.

There is also a very serious security aspect to the award. What will the situation of TVA be in the event of war or emergency should this electricity-producing equipment break down and require parts replaced or technical aid from overseas?

I am astonished that any responsible Government agency would be willing to put its seal of approval on a deal so unfair to American industry and its employees.

## Debate on Military Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. James Reston which appeared in the New York Times on Wednesday, March 11, 1959:

DEBATE ON MILITARY CUTS: DEMOCRATS HAVE BUILT AN IMPRESSIVE CASE, BUT EISENHOWER HAS LAST WORD

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 10—The Democrats have built an impressive case against cutting the Army and the Marines in the middle of the Berlin crisis, but in the end, President Eisenhower will have the last word.

For this is not a questtion of objective fact, but a question of judgment, and on such a question the Democrats know that the public is not likely to reject the judgment of one of the most famous general officers of his generation.

Moreover, while the Constitution requires the Congress to raise and support armies, it does not give the Congress power to compel the Commander in Chief to do more than he wants to do. It can cut his funds and thus force him to do less, and it can, and probably will, vote him more defense funds than he requested, but he can refuse to spend them as he did last year.

STILL VASTLY OUTNUMBERED

The President's argument is that even if he did all the things proposed by his critics—increase the U.S. forces in Europe, urge the British and French to do the same, build up the North Atlantic Treaty's tactical air force, retain the present Army and Marine force levels, and step up the missile program—the West's total forces would still be vastly outnumbered by the Communists in Europe and would have to rely on atomic weapons to redress the balance of power.

What the administration has not been able to do, however, is to articulate its policy clearly enough to persuade many of the most responsible members of the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses.

The President has the final say, but the opposition has captured the debate. The result is that, lacking an effective presentation of the administration's case, the impression has been created that the President is more concerned about balancing the budget than in balancing his military forces with his political commitments.

LIVELIEST DEBATE

There was, for example, the liveliest debate of the present session of the Congress in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate today. Christian A. Herter, Acting Secretary of State, and Livingston T. Merchant, Assistant Secretary, appeared in secret before almost a full committee.

In the questions that followed, the two officials were repeatedly charged with following a policy that could be redeemed in any fight over Berlin only with the use of atomic weapons. The answers given were that these were highly speculative military questions that could be answered only by the President and the Pentagon.

This, however, merely added to the frustration of the members present, for while the President has said he was satisfied that he did have the necessary forces to deal with Berlin, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have taken a different tack.

The Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, told the Congress:

"During the development of both the fiscal year 1959 and the fiscal year 1960 budgets, I recommended that the active Army be maintained at a strength of 925,000. The fiscal year 1960 budget will provide an active Army strength of 870,000."

"My reservation with regard to the personnel situation," General Taylor added, "is based upon the results of reports and of my personal visits to the principal Army commanders abroad and in the United States, all of whom consider their personnel resources as inadequate to meet the full requirements of their assigned missions."

NATIONALS SERVING

At the present time, large numbers of South Koreans (the Pentagon will not say how many) are actually serving in the regular combat units of the U.S. Army in Korea.

Also, while there are not, as General Taylor implied, foreigners serving directly in the U.S. Army in Germany, there are still 14,033 foreigners in uniformed labor service units of the U.S. Army in Germany.

Of these, 8,138 are Germans; 2,293 Poles; 84 Albanians; 144 Bulgarians; 232 Czechs; 240 Estonians; 999 Hungarians, of whom 810 are in Berlin; 922 Latvians; 457 Lithuanians; 57 Russians; 130 Ukrainians; 230 Yugoslavs, and 7 Rumanians.

In commenting on this method of compensating for a shortage or regular U.S. Army personnel, General Taylor commented that the Army was thus "incurring a heavy dependence upon foreign personnel which might have serious consequences in an emergency."

At no time since the beginning of the Berlin crisis last autumn has the Congress been more disturbed about the conflicting testimony before it on the adequacy of the Nation's defenses.

It is not so much that the legislators are worried about the actual strength of the services as they are about the psychology of cutting manpower further in the midst of the crisis.

Many of them believe this increases the dangers of miscalculation by the Soviet Union. The Members of Congress do not hope to master all the intracies of military power and strategy, but they feel they are entitled to a sense of confidence that military and political policy is being determined in a careful and orderly way.

This confidence is lacking in Congress at the moment. The legislators know they cannot force the President to change his plans, but they are still hoping that he and his Secretary of Defense will explain more clearly why the administration has confidence that it has adequate forces of all kinds to meet its political commitments.

## State's Oldest Editor Thinks 96 Is Time To Sell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, one of the miracles of our

times is the fact that the weekly country newspapers still go to press. In my district we have 84 newspapers whose editors brighten and lighten the days of farm people by the regular publication of the local news. The economic, mechanical, and other difficulties faced by these dedicated journalists are such that it is remarkable indeed that they continue to render this much needed public service.

For a quarter of a century I have regularly visited with the editor of the Echo Enterprise at Echo, Minn., and have marveled at his capacity. When I first met him, he had then been editor of his weekly for almost 30 years. At 96 he has reluctantly decided to sell out and those of us who have for so long enjoyed his wit and his wisdom shall miss him greatly. He has for 54 years dedicated himself to the publication of the Echo Enterprise and all of us who know him want to wish him well in his retirement.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am including the following feature story from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of March 8 by Miriam Alburn:

STATE'S OLDEST EDITOR THINKS 96 IS TIME TO SELL

(By Miriam Alburn)

ECHO, MINN.—George B. Hughes, the oldest editor in Minnesota, has finally decided he has had enough of the newspaper business.

At 96 he is ready to sell out.

With the Echo Enterprise a new buyer would acquire a newspaper tradition of 68 years in Yellow Medicine County, a following of about 400 subscribers and printing equipment so old there is talk of moving it to the museum of the Minnesota Historical Society.

The shop, which occupies the first floor of a small frame building, is just about the way it was when Hughes took over the Enterprise 54 years ago.

It is crowded with essentials—the banks of type still set by hand, the flat-bed press run by a gasoline motor that could be heard all over town till a muffler was added a few years ago, the kettle of melting metal and the heating stove which never quite wins against cold weather.

Hughes' only major concession to progress in the printing business was to add a small job printing press about 8 years ago.

His clinging to the old techniques has been deliberate, and he gives you both philosophical and practical reasons.

"If you make more money, you just spend more money," he says. And if you buy expensive machinery, you have to hire expensive help to run it, and every time it breaks down you have to get someone to come all the way from the cities to repair it, he explains.

Hence the Echo Enterprise is the only hand-set newspaper left in Minnesota—to the regret of Hughes' daughter-in-law, Mrs. Leland A. Hughes, who now has the responsibility of getting it published every week.

George Hughes, who proudly maintains that his hearing and vision are still perfect, still comes into the office for an hour or so every day. He writes an occasional story in long hand, but no longer attempts to work with type or press.

His son, Leland, left a newspaper job in Beaumont, Tex., in October 1956 to return to Echo to help his father. Recently he went back to Texas to take a job on the Galveston News. His wife stayed for two reasons—to carry on with the Enterprise until it could be sold and to avoid having to shift their daughter, Lynn, to another high school.

Although George Hughes is still owner of the business, at present the Enterprise is practically an all-woman publishing operation.

Lynn and a friend, Elaine Rebers, both 17, come in after school and Saturdays to set type, and they help with the printing Thursday evenings.

Mrs. Arthur Holt, who has worked off and on for Hughes since she was in high school, now sets type 3 days a week.

But it is Mrs. Leland Hughes who does the supervising, writes much of the copy, sets type, puts the advertisements together, makes up the pages, operates the cranky press and sees that the papers get folded and into the mail every Friday morning.

She does enlist the help of a farmer, Lester Schroeder, to get the gas engine and big press running once a week.

Echo is a farmers' community of about 500 residents, 20 miles northwest of Redwood Falls. It has two grain elevators and a block of small stores. The creamery closed about a year ago.

Hughes, who came here in 1905 after working on newspapers in St. Peter, Mankato, Marshall and Redwood Falls, has liked the town because the people were friendly and it was a good base for the hunting and fishing he always liked.

Big cities hold no appeal for him.

"I've never been a chase-about," he said. "When you've seen one city, you've seen them all, though one may have higher buildings than another."

The Enterprise has four pages, filled with neighborly social notes, with news of school and church and town council activities and the ads of local merchants.

On May 6, 1955, the town held a "George Hughes day" in recognition of his 50 years with the newspaper, and there was a big celebration, with smorgasbord and band music in the village hall. Scott Schoen, editor of the Redwood Falls Gazette, then president of the Minnesota Editorial Association, was there to present him with a gold makeup rule, tool of the printing trade.

Hughes' wife died in 1942. "Now," he said, "there's not a person my age around here."

But the old editor, who started his newspaper career in 1881, still, as in years past, wears his hat in the shop, wears no coat outdoors, and walks the Main Street of Echo with a jaunty air.

## Small Business Administration's Aid to Aggressive Detroit Company

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration, as all other agencies of Government, comes in for its full share of abuse from the Congress and the public generally.

Therefore, I am happy to give them praise and to acknowledge their ability today in a case which happened in my own district. I am happy also that their able Administrator, Wendell B. Barnes, who has appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency has done his best to make this agency of real service to the community.

The Lite-Vent Co., whose offices are in my district, got its start from the Small Business Administration. I herewith offer the article from the Detroit News for insertion in the RECORD concerning this company:

IT'S A MILLION IN THE SHADE FOR TWO WITH LOTS OF HUSTLE

(By William T. Noble)

Young men who have been warned by grumpy cynics that days of opportunity have gone forever in America, might get a kick out of listening to Leo P. Sklar.

Leo is an outspoken 29-year-old business administration graduate of Wayne State University who decided after graduation a few years ago that he now had the education, a surplus of ambition, and therefore should be a millionaire.

His only drawback was the fact that he didn't have more than $100 to start with and had to exist on a rather small salary as a hardware store clerk.

WELL ON WAY

But in about 4 years Leo and a rough and tumble partner named Samuel H. Ellman have built up a $1 million business.

"I haven't quite made my own $1 million yet," smiled the athletic young executive who occasionally relaxes playing golf, "but I'm three-quarters of the way."

How did he do it?

By providing Detroiters shade on sunny days.

There was an element of luck too. One stroke was his meeting Ellman, a busy 43-year-old gruff talking salesman who readily admits he spent at least 3 years in one grade, hitched rides about the country and never expected to be a "hundredaire," let alone flirt with a $1 million.

AVOIDED THE SUN

Sklar worked as a clerk at his father's hardware store at 2038 Springwells. Ellman ran an aluminum awning store across the street. Frequently he bought items at the Sklar store.

"But I always avoided letting young Sklar wait on me," said Ellman. "He did not know a nail from a nut."

Later, however, he started talking to Sklar who thought there might be a future in the aluminum awning business.

FORM COMPANY

Both men formed a company called Lite-Vent. Instead of trying to worm products out of a harassed outstate company, Sklar and Ellman decided to make their own step-down aluminum awnings for homes and industry.

"The first 6 months," recalled Sklar sourly, "we lost $10,000. It took a lot of maneuvering. We didn't have much money in the first place (all of it borrowed) and bills were piling high. But Ellman was a good salesman and I had learned quite a bit about paper shuffling at Wayne."

Money lenders agreed there was a fantastic potential in this area and happily risked their money, "in some cases at 18 percent interest," Sklar added.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS IN SALES

The next year, with rotund Ellman cracking earthy jokes and flitting about the country selling, Lite-Vent sold $325,000 worth of awnings. They leased a building at 14637 Meyers and made their own special machinery to shape the light metal. But all of this took extra money.

"And then one day I read in the Detroit News a story about the Small Business Administration office here. I rushed down and landed the office's first loan for $35,000, pledging the company's assets. That was in 1955. In 1957 we landed a second $100,000

loan from the SBA. That put us in good shape."

All of the bill shuffling and tension gave Sklar a permanent case of heebie jeebies. But he relaxes his frayed nerves on a golf course or vacations after a 20-hour-a-day, 7-day week.

BRANCHING OUT

The company now employs about 25 skilled workmen; has a private plane Ellman learned to pilot so he could get to clients faster than the competition; and the latest IBM bookkeeping machinery in the city.

Lite-Vent also is branching into different aluminum products.

So when someone tells Sklar or Ellman there no longer is any opportunity in the United States, they smile to themselves and go home to their families with a pocketful of cash and a fat bank book.

Sklar, a native Detroiter, lives at 23880 Morton, Oak Park, with his wife and three children. Ellman, once well known about Detroit as "Sam the Repairman," lives with his wife and daughter at 18034 Birwood.

## A Friend to Our Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a recent editorial from the celebrated Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram entitled "A Friend to Our Rescue," which a valued friend and constituent of mine has brought to my attention.

This able editorial makes reference to a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post written by my old friend, the famous, talented, Clinton-born writer, Richard Attridge, whose admirable pieces in the Post are so enthusiastically received by the American public.

This very well-written editorial, in mentioning the Attridge article, deals most appropriately with the great changes that have taken place in the banking business in recent years.

Mr. Arthur Ryan, able and distinguished editor of the Transcript-Telegram, is to be commended for the splendid coverage he has given to an absorbing, interesting facet of American business life which is not too often discussed in the press.

A FRIEND TO OUR RESCUE

A banker friend called the attention of the director of this editorial page to a sin of omission recently. It was failure to say a kind word for banks and bankers at the time they were staging their annual meetings for stockholders and trustees. There have been such tributes paid for a great many years and we admitted error to the questioner.

But there must be something in this subconsciousness of mind and power to awaken it in a pinch. While we were neglecting to think about this highly important matter, a good friend and fellow resident of the Holyoke community was thinking about it and was acting thereon. How else can one explain the fact that Richard Attridge, on whom we have fallen back on many occasions to provide an icing for many an important event cake, should have provided, in the latest edition of the Saturday Evening Post, an editorial that deals with the subject of the modern bank and its better relations with the general public than prevailed a generation ago under the title, "No Place for Old Scrooge in Today's Friendly Bank." It's most readable and, we trust, fills to overflowing the vacuum created by our own neglect. Here it is:

"One of the most amazing developments in modern merchandizing has been that carried out by American banks. It is not true, of course, that banks attempt to rival supermarket come-ons, although they do have gala openings for new branches, serve refreshments and present gifts to customers who open new accounts with even very small deposits. They have installed drive-in windows, increased the number and convenience of their offices, brought their personnel into approachable view and adopted a far friendlier attitude for the man in the street.

"Almost everyone has a banker today; for one thing, the immense popularity of pay-as-you-go checks has attracted millions of Americans to the banks' once forbidding portals. It is now estimated that approximately 14 million bank checks a day cover 80 percent of all our business transactions. The banks now place great importance on their personal-loan services for ordinary citizens especially for home improvements.

"Banks today are equipped to transfer funds by wire from city to city and by cable to foreign countries; they provide night depositories for businessmen; they offer packaged payroll plans for industrial firms; are a prime source of industrial credit information and handle business payments at distant points through correspondent banks. Trust departments assist in estate planning, executorship, trusteeship, guardianship, and administration of wills. In spite of many new and expanded business services, however, modern banking's most radical departure has been its concerted and successful efforts to sell its product to small, but good customers.

"Millions of Americans can remember when the general public regarded banks as forbidding cold storage plants and most bankers as calculating machines equipped with phonograph records set to say 'no.' The great change in banks is dramatized by the Connecticut institution which provides banking by video. The customers drive up to a deposit box equipped with a TV screen and a pneumatic delivery-and-return setup for money and deposit book. The customer just has to push a button to carry out his transaction with the teller. And it's a sure thing that the banker will give him a great big smile."

## The Principles and Guides for Adequate Area Development Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony by Mr. Solomon Barkin, Director of Research, Textile Workers Union of America, before the House Banking and Currency Committee on Monday, March 9, 1959:

The human, social, and private waste in America resulting from unemployment, underemployment and low living standards in distressed and underdeveloped areas represent a challenge to the American people we can no longer avoid. All but the committed economic standpatters have joined the supporters of area development legislation. There is a consensus that these areas and the people within them need outside help to convert their moribund and contracting economies into flourishing economic communities.

The distressed areas at one time represented the backbone of the American economic structure. No one can list towns such as Lawrence, Mass., Scranton, Pa., Durham, N.C., Detroit, Mich., and Portland, Oreg., without recalling their days of economic glory. Their present distress was brought about by the vast structural changes in American industry such as transferred demand from anthracite coal to oil; the surge of technology which has raised productivity to new heights, and the substitution of old by new products and processes and raw materials. These are changes which have brought new economic opportunities to the country as a whole and helped develop new areas. But now problems beset the older areas and their inhabitants.

The fate which has befallen these communities might well become the destiny of many other areas now enjoying the peak of their economic growth. Economic and technical changes may in the future spell decline for them. No group is protected from the ravages of this highly turbulent and dynamic economy. What is planned for the presently distressed communities will be of help to those which will arise in the future.

The proposed legislation for area development seeks to erect a permanent and continuing Federal organization which will be ever present to nip the economic decline at the beginning and help local areas reassess their problems and plan for their new growth and possible ultimate renaissance. Cities and areas have in the past experienced growth and decline cycles; others will in the future. The function of the present legislation is to provide the machinery for assuring the most facile and expeditious redevelopment. It is to shorten the decline and stimulate the growth phases.

The renewal of the distressed areas is imperative on both humane and economic grounds. To allow them to continue to fester without hope or plan for recovery or without assistance for definitive recovery is to permit human beings to deteriorate and be demoralized, to sink to levels of abject poverty and destitution and dependence upon public support, and to deprive them of an opportunity for constructive, dignified participation in society. The distressed area is a malignant social cancer which brings social difficulties and problems; it's a pathological state which breeds costly deficiencies in our society. They cannot be neglected without damage to the greater social matrix.

The physical investments, both by individuals and public institutions and organizations in these distressed areas, exceed tens of billions of dollars. To fail to help these areas is to scrap the efforts and savings of decades. At a time when we are faced with stupendous financial burdens to develop our military strength, help underdeveloped areas and to create the physical plant for our expanding population, and complete the facilities required by our bulging metropolitan areas and suburbs, we cannot afford to overlook existing plants, homes, and community investments. It would be poor national economy.

The redevelopment of these areas and the modernization of their facilities could save our Nation billions, hasten our growth and bring nearer the day of adequate facilities for all. If we forget these facilities and capital, we shall have to duplicate them afresh in new areas, a real costly process. We have accepted the principle of urban renewal as a necessary constructive and economic procedure for conserving our urban communities and utilizing our private and public capital. We are contributing millions to the rebuilding of cities as necessary for our national economic health. Similarly, the redevelopment of our distressed areas constitutes a comparable process of renewal dedicated to the same principles of economic growth.

The program of economic development of urban distressed areas followed in the bills are similar to those in our urban renewal program. The fundamental responsibility for economic expansion is placed in the hands of the local area. The ultimate burden must be carried by the people themselves. The State planning bodies must help these groups define the appropriate geographical area and lines of activity. Only where there are no such State bodies will the Federal agency be authorized to help local citizen groups constitute themselves. In defining the geographical area, the scope must be broad enough to undertake adequate planning for the true economic region.

To date the scope of most local developmental bodies has coincided with a preexisting political boundary. Economic areas do not necessarily follow such boundaries. Development has often been frustrated by such sharp limits. Therefore, it is hoped that the development bodies will be regional in scope seeking to conform with actual economic areas to be developed as a single unit.

Following the demarcation of the proper area, these development bodies will have to study their areas and formulate long-term plans for physical redesign and the upgrading of the human resources. The distressed economic areas are fundamental regions in which some human and physical locational advantages have become in part or wholly obsolete. Some part of the structure no longer fits current economic trends. It is therefore necessary to determine which locational advantages no longer serve, or no longer exist and what has to be done to refashion them for current use. Such a study will also uncover gaps in the human and social and private capital. These will have to be filled through public or private enterprise.

It is important that there be provision for public facilities. In many communities, the renewal of the area demands improvement in public facilities. Insofar as housing, continental roads, flood control, and other similar projects are concerned, varying amounts of help can be obtained from the Federal Government. But there are other facilities essential to development for which Federal funds are also necessary. The physical rebuilding of these areas demand immediate attention. They are the prerequisites to much effort in the area of economic growth. The communities don't have the money for these purposes in part due to other distress.

The upgrading of the human resources through schooling and retraining are also vital in many areas. That is why it is essential that the bill provide for vocational training and the subsistence grants for people during this period.

The above provisions of the bill are drawn for long-term development programs. There is also a need for immediate assistance; some areas have more or less completed the preliminary planning and blueprinting of the future lines of economic growth. The designing of the physical structure and economic pattern will necessarily be more limited in scope in some areas since the degrees of obsolescence and number and types of gaps in their economic structure are relatively small. They are ready for action to stimulate the cycle of economic growth. In these places, immediate help is essential to supplement their local financial resources to erect some of the structures vital to the economic renaissance. It is therefore important that we have the provision for loans for land and buildings.

A controversy has arisen as to the size of the funds for planning and the construction of industrial and comercial public facilities as well as the grants for public facilities. These differences are reflected most strinkingly in the provisions of the Spence and administration bills. The appropriation offered in both bills for planning for area development are inadequate. Certainly the administration bill which allows only for $1.5 million is deficient. Under urban renewal, the average assistance cost per single project is approximately $40,000. Certainly, a single area development project will require more money than the above sum. With the numerous areas needing these surveys and technical assistance, an impecunious appropriation would stifle progress. I would personally like to see the technical assistance provision increased to a larger sum.

As for the amounts of money needed for grants and loans for public facilities, I believe the present proposals in the Spence bill are quite adequate and we shall be prepared to await future experience.

Finally, as the funds for loans for industrial structures, the administration bill assumes as a current target a total number of jobs in excess of 6 percent in the distressed areas as it has defined it as being in the neighborhood of 200,000. Under the Spence bill, it is probable, though our figures are most inadequate to be able to make a definitive estimate, that the number is over 350,000. The difference results from the varying definitions of the distressed area. Moreover, the restrictive qualifications set up in the administration bill will rule out any significant new additions to the list of the distressed areas in the remainder of the year 1959 and 1960 whereas under the Spence bill a significant number will become eligible.

We estimate that the number of major areas currently qualified under the administration bill is 15, whereas it is 26 for the Spence bill. At the end of January 1960, the number qualified under the administration bill will be 19 whereas it will be 72 under the Spence bill. Obviously, the number of jobs which the respective bills seek to impel into existence are markedly different. In addition, the more liberal share of the Federal grants provided in the Spence bill will require more funds.

In considering the size of these funds and the proportion of the Federal share, we must remember that the more depressed the areas the greater the sums and the Federal share should be. If an area has only been recently affected by structural unemployment, much of the private and social capital still is in workable condition. The degree of obsolescence, the scope of redesign, and the amount of Federal participation will all be more limited. But for areas where distress has been long and enduring and where deterioration has proceeded far, the amount of assistance will have to be broader and the sums even greater. It would therefore appear likely that the average amounts of funds required per community will be larger for the group of communities which will be aided in the early years of the administration than in the later ones.

The purpose of the entire legislation is ultimately to help the communities in the first stages of structural dislocation so that renewal may be more immediate and adequate. The ultimate costs will decline except for those areas where the catastrophic change is most radical and far sweeping.

A sharp difference of attitude exists between the administration and Spence bills on the subject of rural development. While the Spence bill proposes comparable aid to both areas, the administration limits the rural areas to technical aid. The latter assigns a fund of $1.5 million for rural areas and in industry towns. The administration's attitude is that the present rural development program administered basically by the U.S. Department of Agriculture is sufficient and the proposed supplement would round out the project.

We are glad that the administration has recognized the need for funds for technical assistance and planning. Local rural groups have complained about these inadequacies. But the administration's failure to make any other proposals reflects inadequate analysis. One would have thought that the present experience with these rural areas and the broader international experience with underdeveloped areas would have provided the policy personnel in the administration with a better measure of rural needs. We have drafted adequate blueprints for economic development of rural areas in other countries, but we are conservative and niggardly as affects our own people. If we are ready to help to rebuild southern Italy, why not underdeveloped areas in rural America?

The present rural redevelopment program suffers from several major defects. First, only pilot counties have been selected. There are many regions where the need is very pressing which need help. The proper unit for assistance is the economic area and not the county. Second, these programs depend upon existing agencies and loans of personnel and funds from existing programs. Third, they are without funds for public facilities or industrial or commercial structures. Fourth, they are completely locally oriented so that the goals are as narrow or broad as the local group sets them. Fifth, the emphasis has been on immediate local goals rather than on long-term redevelopment of the area and the upgrading of the people. Sixth, the progress has been slow and modest because of the limited goals, the reliance on vountary and gratuitous help and the absence of funds. Seventh, the program has proceeded from the theory that local efforts are sufficient. A bootstrap operation has much virtue, but it is usually least applicable to underdeveloped areas. It's a choice which only a poor county follows. We can afford and have an obligation to undertake a more ambitious and effective program financed by Federal funds. These rural underdeveloped areas are seldom able to meet the severe tests of local participation set in the administration bill for urban distressed communities.

The last question on which I would like to touch is that of administration. Where should the responsibility be placed? The administration has insisted on assigning the work to the Area Development Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce. This operation has hitherto been a modest limited section of the Department. It has had no experience in making grants or planning operations; it has offered limited technical assistance other than through publications and hasty surveys; it has never passed on applications for grants or loans for public facilities and industrial or commercial structures. Its main functions were to follow general economic and locational trends and report on them and to deal with the problems of diversification. We believe that it can and might continue these functions. These are problems not of a catastrophic character. They are the routine questions arising in the ebb and flow of American industry. The administration's proposal to include funds and advise for technical as-

sistance for diversification of industry towns might be separated out of the present bill and used to expand the operations of the Area Development Office. But it is not the proper agency for the broader operation for the distressed community.

The one agency which has most experience in comparable fields is the House and Home Loan Agency. Its urban renewal program requires it to promote and pass on planning projects; its grants to local communities for the construction of public facilities are similar in character to these proposed in the present program; its procedures for loans for new housing projects leave many common elements to those offered in the present bill. Of existing agencies, it is best fitted for the task.

As for the rural redevelopment, the Department of Agriculture has long been associated with the big interests in this area and has not been prominent in its identification with the well-being of the low-income farmer. A number of agencies designed for this group have not fared well under the direction of the Department.

This area development work is so important to the future economic well-being of this country that it should be delegated to an independent agency which has status. It should report directly to the President and Congress.

We wish to underscore the importance of the citizen's advisory group proposed in the Spence bill because it will keep the purpose of this bill prominent in the administration and before the public. Another provision allows the Administrator to convene members of the industries responsible for the contracting areas and to help them reconsider the directions of their development for the possibilities of stimulating them to undertake redevelopmental work.

Finally, the current recession has brought a new group of distressed areas to the surface because of the vast technical and structural changes in society. It is most important that we recognize their plight by appropriate definitions of the term "distressed" so that they may begin the job of economic redesign. No matter how widespread and great economic recovery will be at the close of the year, the effects are not likely to be substantially felt in many of these areas. The number of distressed areas will remain larger than numbers in existence in the fall of 1957.

The Congress should again adopt the area development bill modeled after the Spence proposal. It follows sound principles and guides. The administration bill is too impecunious and restrictive to deal with the restraints imposed on America's economic growth by structural unemployment, and distressed and underdeveloped areas.

## Prospects for Gas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Oil Daily, Monday, March 9, 1959, quoting the able and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as saying, "I therefore have no plans at this time for scheduling of the gas bill (H.R. 366)":

[From the Oil Daily, Mar. 9, 1959]

PROSPECTS FOR GAS LEGISLATION SLIMMER THAN EVER, HARRIS SAYS

WASHINGTON, March 8.—The chances of gas legislation during the present Congress now seem slimmer than ever, with no prospect of action on a bill until the Eisenhower administration serves notice that this is a must measure.

The White House, to date, has given no indication that it supports the new Harris gas bill, although a majority of the Federal Power Commission backs the measure.

Representative HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the House Commerce Committee, spelled out the situation here at weekend to a briefing conference of the Federal Bar Association.

He said that unless the administration shows some enthusiasm for the bill, no hearings will be held. He pointed out also, that there are differences of opinion, even within the industry, on the bill. One segment now is opposed to the legislation, he said.

"I detect there are divergent views on the question," the Arkansan said, "and apparently the industry itself is divided which is not by any means historymaking, even though most unfortunate. Do I need remind anyone that a divided house cannot stand."

He declared that the bill, as amended to prevent dumping of offpeak natural gas in industrial markets would have been and would today be in the best interest of the American consumer.

"Some day," HARRIS added, "not too many years in the future, the full effect will be realized. Apparently it must get much worse before it can be made better. My fear is that it will be too late."

"While there is little enthusiasm in the industry for such legislation," he said, "there is apparently less enthusiasm within the present administration itself."

"As yet, this question has not been included in the program of the President for this Congress," HARRIS pointed out. "Certainly it was not included in the budget. Neither have we received any word thus far.

"In view of this apparent attitude, lack of enthusiasm or interest, my committee has plenty of other work to do and we have no time for lost motion. I therefore have no plans at this time for any scheduling of consideration of the bill and do not expect to do so unless conditions change."

Earlier, Chairman Kyukendall of the Federal Power Commission, indicated that those in the FPC behind a gas bill have thrown in the sponge, at least for now.

He told the briefing conference that some way must be found to work out a formula for handling producer rate cases, in the interest of orderly procedure. To continue the present policy of dealing with producers' gas prices on a case-by-case basis will only compound present administrative confusion.

Kuykendall generally favors the tests set up in the Harris bill for determining whether field prices are just and reasonable, but he also believes that under current court decisions costs must be taken into account, also.

Other members of the Commission, however, expressed the opinion that area, or field prices, probably will set the pattern for production regulation within the next several years. But, so far there is little agreement on the standards that could be used.

## Chronic Unemployment Needs Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to insert and call the attention of my colleagues to testimony which I submitted yesterday before the House Banking and Currency Committee which is presently considering measures designed to benefit depressed areas and encourage area redevelopment.

The statement follows:

The general topic under consideration before this committee is second to none in national importance, and the actions to be taken as a result of these hearings will have far-reaching consequences. The economic redevelopment of those areas which have lost step in the forward march of our national progress is no longer a matter of interest to a few Members of Congress or to a relatively small percentage of our citizens.

It is demonstrably a national challenge, arising out of national and even international trends, and of increasing interest to more persons every year. The manner in which it is approached, and the extent to which it is recognized for what it actually is, will go far toward encouraging or discouraging national unity of thought and purpose in our struggle to maintain economic leadership among the peoples of the world.

Our people today pay high taxes, and with their money we support and maintain foreign aid programs of many kinds, reciprocal trade agreements, international barter arrangements, worldwide activities through the United Nations, foreign development programs and overseas information services. All of these activities are perhaps worthy of support, and are possibly a necessary part of our role in the world situation of today, but they are a mockery and a sham if we do not first and foremost adequately protect our own people here at home. For no matter how generous our intentions abroad, no nation overseas has a prior claim on us above and beyond that of our own people for food and shelter and the right to an opportunity to earn a decent livelihood.

At first glance it seems strange indeed that we must consider legislation of this kind at all. As a Nation we are generally prosperous today. At the end of 1958 our gross national product had reached an annual rate of $453 billion, an all-time high and an increase of $13 billion over the previous year. Personal income hit a new high also, reaching a rate of $362.3 billion annually in January, an increase of $13.5 billion over the preceding year. Construction and new housing are increasing, and the indications are that, with the exception of a few industries and a few areas, most of the ground lost during the 1958 recession has been regained.

Total unemployment has declined slightly, to 4,724,000, and constitutes 6 percent of the labor force, as against 7.6 percent a year ago.

In the face of these figures, however, we must acknowledge that there are areas which do not respond to the upturn of the business cycle, but remain dormant or continue to decline as our economy progresses. These areas are the victims of a special situation, and their recent history marks them as forerunners of serious trouble in the future.

Their circumstances underscore the need to begin action to solve their special problems now, that we may learn today on a pilot basis the procedures which will be effective wherever the situation may develop tomorrow.

On the basis of facts established there is little disposition to dispute the causes of chronic unemployment in particular areas. It is directly traceable to technological advancement by industry. We in the Congress support and actively encourage the increase of technical skill and productivity in business and industry. Much has been said recently about the threats from our enemies overseas, and fear has been expressed that they will surpass us in technical skills. All of us know that we as a Nation cannot afford to be second best in the international race for top industrial skill.

But some byproducts of this progress are, as in this case, problems in terms of displaced human beings. The advance of the machine adds muscle power to our national strength, but at the same time forces some of our people into permanent idleness. They become casualties of the battle for international survival, with none of the protection afforded the casualties of any other type of conflict or disaster.

We are actively encouraging programs designed to increase and accelerate the education of scientists and engineers. Their efforts will be reflected throughout our economic life in the years to come, and the pace of technological advance must inevitably quicken as their knowledge is brought to bear on existing methods and processes.

Already, however, the rate of technical progress has created a pool of chronically unemployed. It has happened gradually but steadily over a period of years, and in the face of growing national prosperity. The trend is established, and knows no state or industry boundaries. I call your attention to some findings of a special study of postwar job loss published recently in U.S. News & World Report:

"Since the close of World War II, the output per worker has increased 19 percent in the steel industry. As a result, the steel industry in 1957 employed only 536,000 workers. If output per man had been the same as in 1947–49, steel companies would have needed 637,000 workers to produce the same tonnage.

"In automobiles the loss during the past 10 years because of higher output per man is estimated at 132,000 jobs. An additional 48,000 jobs were lost because of the importation of foreign cars.

"In the oil refining industry there is an estimated loss of 71,800 jobs during the past 10 years.

"In coal mining there has been an estimated 46 percent increase in efficiency due to mechanization. In 1958 there were 195,000 employees in bituminous mining, but for the same output, as produced in 1948, there would have been required 95,000 more workers than are needed today."

You have heard from many other sources the details of the effect of mechanization on the coal industry which, on an industry-wide basis, has been first and hardest hit. I do not intend to review those details. I offer for your serious consideration, however, the knowledge that only a few weeks ago in my own State of West Virginia a mechanized mine was opened which will produce 50 tons of coal per day per man, as compared with the average of 10 tons per day by conventional pick and shovel operation.

This is technological advance run rampant. Yet, mine owners must mechanize to survive. They must be competitive nationally and internationally or they will lose markets to other fuels. What has been happening to coal will evenually happen throughout industry as we develop increasingly efficient machines and processes. It has been happening in other industries already—in textiles, leather products, and railroading, to name a few.

Recently a spokesman for the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission stated that, although the production of passenger cars is 12 percent ahead of a year ago, automotive employment is down 30,000 from that date, and stated further that the city of Detroit has developed a hard core of about 200,000 unemployed who just aren't going back to work in the plants.

The Wall Street Journal cites countless examples of increased productivity per man-hour, in everything from television to paper products and from floor wax to camera parts. The industrial drive for greater man-hour productivity is unceasing, and is a recognized part of the enterpriser's plan for success.

The trend is not confined to this country; it is not based on national characteristics but rather on the forces which drive an industrial economy. Recently the A. V. Roe Corp. of Canada laid off 15,000 men on 5 hours notice, and suspended the production of the Avro Arrow, Canada's finest supersonic interceptor plane. There was nothing wrong with the product or the workers, but the Arrow had been superseded by a new missile which is cheaper and more efficient.

If this can happen in supersonic aircraft, what industry or industrial region can feel certain about its status a year hence?

The foregoing statements add up to just one conclusion: The coal industry is far from alone in this situation. It has been first to feel the effects of technological advance, and its employees have seen the byproducts of that advance left unattended, with the result that temporary idleness has hardened into chronic unemployment with no hope for a return to work in the future. The condition of the unemployed miner today point dramatically to the need for pioneering in the field of economic redevelopment.

For the temporarily unemployed there are programs of assistance, but for the displaced and dispossessed worker there is nothing. He is consigned to a permanent dole, and it is the permanence of his condition that I wish to emphasize most strongly.

Several weeks ago, in an attempt to pinpoint the areas in which chronic long-term unemployment has hardened into a way of life, I requested from the Department of Agriculture a tabulation of counties in which 15 percent or more of the population received surplus agricultural commodities as needy persons. Persons in this classification are necessarily unemployed, and have been unemployed for a sufficient time to exhaust unemployment compensation benefits, have generally been certified for direct relief, have little or no income, and few other food sources.

The resulting tabulation which I received emphasizes the national scope of the problem. It reported that there were 210 counties, 7 percent of the counties in the United States, in which 15 percent or more of the population received surplus commodities under the classification of needy persons. These counties are distributed through 24 States, and are in the districts served by 75 Members of the House of Representatives.

In one county 51 percent of the population received these commodities, while in numerous others between 40 percent and 49 percent are in similar condition. The average for the 210 counties was 21.8 percent of the population.

I call these figures to your particular attention because of two conclusions resulting from a study of three of these counties in my own Sixth West Virginia District:

1. Reviewing the monthly percentages during the past 2 years, we found that the number of persons receiving commodities seldom rises or falls more than 1 percent in any month. In short, the trend has been growing slowly for a long time, and cannot be reversed overnight.

2. Employment experts in my district estimate that 72 percent of those persons now receiving commodities are unemployed employables.

As proof of the relentless growth and permanent nature of the trend, I offer you these statistics from the Department of Agriculture:

*Needy persons in family units receiving commodities*

| Fiscal year: | |
|---|---|
| 1956 | 3,170,000 |
| 1957 | 3,485,000 |
| 1958 | 4,665,000 |
| First half of 1959 | 5,230,000 |

Surplus foods are distributed to needy persons in 45 States, although the percentage of recipients is notably small in some. The percentages are excessively high in some other States, however, and it is noticeable that those are the very States which have been hardest hit by chronic unemployment due to technological progress. The top 10 States, according to number of recipients, are as follows:

*Total needy persons receiving surplus commodities*

| State: | |
|---|---|
| Pennsylvania | 829,550 |
| Michigan | 538,385 |
| New York | 348,871 |
| Mississippi | 331,441 |
| West Virginia | 278,223 |
| Kentucky | 254,377 |
| Oklahoma | 246,960 |
| Arkansas | 219,354 |
| Tennessee | 154,551 |
| Louisiana | 137,713 |

Statistics of this kind are helpful, but they must not cause us to lose sight of the human element they represent. The bald statement that a needy person receives surplus agricultural commodities means that he receives currently just five items—butter, dry milk, rice, flour, and cornmeal. The commodities distributed are controlled by previous legislation enacted by the Congress, and the Department of Agriculture has no responsibility to conduct a welfare program, or authority to purchase foods to help States or communities operate welfare programs for the needy.

In the areas of chronic unemployment thousands of families exist on these commodities alone, and in my own district I have talked with families who have not had fresh milk, eggs, meat, or citrus juices for periods ranging up to 2 years. These Americans actually exist on a diet less than half as nutritive as that provided for the occupants of displaced persons camps in Europe after World War II. From a nutrition standpoint they are slightly below the level of common laborers in the Soviet Union, as reported by Senator ALLEN ELLENDER last year after a visit to Russia, when he stated that the largest proportion of Soviet citizens in the common laboring class subsisted on a diet of black bread, cabbage, potatoes, beets, and tea.

To give you an idea of the situation that is developing, the Bureau of Nutrition of the West Virginia State Health Department reviewed the diet of persons existing on surplus commodities and announced that the average family of four would receive, for 1 month, 20 pounds of flour, 10 pounds of corn meal, 9 pounds of powdered milk, 2 pounds of rice, and 4 pounds of butter. This would give them only 26 percent of the calories they need each month, 36 percent of the proteins, and 46 percent of the calcium considered necessary for good health. In other words, a protracted diet of this kind will create a group of persons who will soon not be able to work, and will rear children con-

demned to be a permanent charge on the community.

This condition is destroying home and family life. Children quit school and migrate without being prepared to work, fathers desert their families so the families will become eligible for relief, crime is on the increase, but these desperate people steal food, not money, according to local enforcement officials.

Only one conclusion is supportable in the face of the evidence—our mode of industrial advance is cannibalizing our own people. Technical progress, without attention to its byproducts and effects on human beings is building a massive complex of industrial skill based on a pile of human bones and operating to the tune of wailing, hungry children.

We are already working around the edges of the problem. This year we will again appropriate funds for more surplus foods for needy families, and for school-lunch programs. We will, no doubt, extend the supplemental unemployment relief measure set up by the last Congress. In these and other ways we will spend millions of dollars to deal temporarily with the undesirable aspects of the problem without undertaking a general assault on the core of the problem itself.

This piecemeal approach cannot be effective. The problem is too great and its origins are too complex. It can only be overcome by a bold program of action in several areas simultaneously:

1. Liberalization of the surplus commodities program as a temporary measure to maintain life and health among those who have been displaced by the growth of machine efficiency.

2. An economic redevelopment measure to place the Federal Government in support of efforts to correct the situation, and to lend the power and prestige of the Federal Government to such efforts as a recognized Federal policy.

3. Public works activity in these areas where economically justifiable, on a priority basis, particularly where such public works will improve the attractiveness of such areas to industry.

I am not speaking here in behalf of any particular measure already introduced. Indeed, it may well be that this committee will, after hearing the testimony, conclude that a new and inclusive measure should originate with the committee itself.

Further, I am not proposing a massive spending program. But when we use that word "spending" it is only fair to remember a few facts: We are currently spending at the rate of $6½ billion per month, or $40 per month for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Would it be unreasonable to embark on a program to recoup the fortunes of the dispossessed at the rate of $10 per month for each of the 4 million unemployed employables? This would add up to $480 million a year.

I do not propose this figure as a basis of consideration, but only as a spending yardstick, if the program is to be considered as a spending measure. Certainly some money must be spent, but it will be self-liquidating through the return of these people to full status as citizens, able to bear their share of the tax burden. I have talked with dozens of them, and they want work, not handouts. Money itself is not the answer.

The answer would appear to lie in recognition of the trend as a growing national economic peril, of which the situation in these districts is but a forerunner; in placing the strength of the Federal Government behind a definite program of evaluation and correction; in activities which will increase job opportunity by creating conditions which will be attractive to industry and lead to long-term economic stability in these areas; in short, an investment in the future of a growing segment of our people.

The Congress has faced similar specific problems before and has acted to control them. When nuclear energy was born, the Atomic Energy Commission was devised to deal with its development and use. When space flight began to seem possible, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created. This problem deserves similar treatment on a long-range basis, or we will be caught unprepared in the years to come.

The alternatives are brutal and unthinkable. Condemn a growing number of Americans to a starvation diet, without hope for the future, or tell them to uproot themselves and be scattered across the continent, seeking work as best they can, destroying home ties and family loyalties. This would indeed mark a low point in the development of the American heritage, and constitute a damage to national morale far more serious than could be created by an enemy with a bomb.

I am confident that this committee will grasp the implications of the problem, and will demonstrate the resourcefulness in meeting it for which the Congress is world-famous, in war and in peace. And I believe that when the record of this Congress is written, and the pages are studied in future years, it will be unanimously agreed that your efforts to deal with this problem will stand as a high point of accomplishment for this congressional session.

## Tax on U.S. Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Monday, March 9, 1959:

TAX ON U.S. COAL

The American people, particularly those in mining regions, will share the resentment of John L. Lewis and Thomas Kennedy of the United Mine Workers of America toward West Germany as a result of Bonn's unilateral action in levying a tax of $4.76 a ton against U.S. coal, thereby depriving this country of an important market.

What is especially aggravating is that West Germany is arranging barter deals with the Soviet Union, coal among them, at a time when the United States is trying to save West Germany from being crushed by Moscow. This is friendship and gratitude?

West Germany's only hope of survival is the United States. It is no secret that Germany is the principal target in the immediate offensive of the Soviet Union, the United States, of course, being the ultimate goal of the Kremlin. At this very moment, Nikita Khrushchev, the Red dictator, has stirred up a hornet's nest in Berlin the objective of which is the eventual conquest of Germany. He already has East Germany.

West Germany cannot be unaware of this, yet it has the effrontery to play ball with the Reds via barter deals. The irony of this is that trade is a part of the cold war the Soviet Union is waging against the West. It is hard to believe a people as intelligent as the West Germans cannot see through this ruse.

This reminds us of the efforts of a short-sighted Great Britain to do business with Red China.

Khrushchev is playing a wily game and in this instance he stands to obtain an extra bonus in the form of splitting the West under the old adage of divide and conquer.

Frankly, the United States had reason to expect greater cooperation from West Germany than the penalty on American coal in favor of Communist foes. Actions speak louder than words.

## General Electric News Has Been Serving Its Lynn, Mass., Employees for 40 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 16, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a lot of progress in labor-management relations has been made since the far-off days of World War I.

Back there, in most corporations, the gulf between front office and workbench was seldom bridged.

The reputation of a business enterprise was judged solely by products, sales, profits, and dividends.

Appreciation of the human element was secondary.

General Electric was an exception to the rule.

The industrial climate at General Electric in Lynn, Mass., encouraged forward-looking policies. Mangement realized the need of keeping in close touch with its thousands of employees on matters of mutual interest to all members of this successful industrial team.

And so, a plant periodical was started—one of the first of its kind on the American scene—that has become invaluable in promoting company-employee morale. Personal items, benefit plans, negotiations, business prospects, employee activities, as well as interesting pictures, enlivened the General Electric News.

It has been going strong for 40 years.

In recognition of that happy anniversary, which was reached on February 20, 1959, and under leave to extend my remarks, I bring you the story of that wholesome development in the art of company communication with its employees that appeared in the February 20, 1959, issue of the General Electric News:

GENERAL ELECTRIC NEWS MARKS 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Exactly 40 years ago today—on February 20, 1919—one of the pioneer employee publications in the country was born. It was the fledgling Lynn Works News—today the General Electric News—whose arrival on the scene was hailed as a fresh, new approach to employee communication.

The first Works News which sold at 1 cent per copy or 20 cents for an annual subscription was prepared locally at the West Lynn plant under the editorial direction of an employee committee comprised of Joseph A. Fortier, Phillip Watt, and Milton French. Before the second issue rolled off the presses, however, George B. Grant was named editor and took over official direction of the publication.

In those days, the publication was prepared locally but printed at the Maqua Co. in Schenectady. Many years later, in 1934, the printing of the Lynn Works News was taken over by the Dwyer Printing Co., which is known today as the Commercial Printing Corp., a local Lynn firm.

In the early days of the publication it covered employees at both the Lynn River Works and the West Lynn Works, today headquarters of the instrument department. According to a report in the first issue, there were 7,919 employees employed at the Lynn River Works in October 1918, shortly before the first issue was printed. At that time the River Works ground area was 100 acres; it's 123.65 today exclusive of the Government leased areas; and the floor space was 2,074,181 square feet; it is 3,374,253 today.

The Works News has remained in publication over this 40-year span except for a brief respite during the depression years, 1932 to May of 1934, during which publication was suspended. When publication resumed in 1934, the Lynn Works News split into two separate papers, one covering the river works; the other, the West Lynn plant.

Prior to the split, however, Manfred Bowditch and J. Edwin Doyle were named editors, and M. Frances Nicholson, who had a record General Electric News service span of 34 years before leaving the News last year, was named associate editor. Mrs. Nicholson edited the popular women's page.

When the News split in 1934, Paul Robinson was named editor at the river works and J. Edwin Doyle at West Lynn. Later Doyle was succeeded by Vincent G. Pendleton. Finally in 1938, the publication combined again, but broke again in 1943. Edward A. Smith, who had been editing the Quality News at West Lynn, was named editor, while earlier in 1941 Fred W. Mahan was named editor of the News at the river works. Editors successively at West Lynn have been Edward J. Murray, Dana C. Pierce, William Leavitt, John R. Richards, and presently Lucas Persinos. Editors successively at the river works have been William H. Weicker and the present editor, Dana C. Pierce.

The first issue of the Lynn Works News featured a front page of World War I service stars, showing that 1 employee had been captured, 42 died, 1 was missing, 14 were cited for bravery, 496 were reemployed and 66 were disabled, and a total of 2404 had served. Since 1919 a lot has happened in the General Electric Co., locally and nationwide, and a great part of it has been recorded in the pages of the General Electric News.

## Distribution of Obscene Literature Through the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad commentary on our sense of values when we cannot distinguish between objects of art which are a matter of national pride and the use of such objects as lures to the theater box office.

There is a great deal of difference between the student of anatomy at a great university who is engaged in its study for the sake of humanity and the student of anatomy in the front row of a burlesque theater. It is high time that something is done to zero in our thinking on this important moral issue.

The American public—American fathers and mothers—have a right to resent the use of themselves and their families as a captive audience to be bombarded through the avenues of the U.S. postal service by material to which they object plainly calculated to undo years of training they have devoted to their children.

Mr. Speaker, as the House has directed our committee to look into the use of the mails to send obscene literature, I wish to announce that the Postal Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, intends to take immediate action to thoroughly explore the situation as it now exists. We are watching with interest the present efforts of the Postmaster General to protect the rights of patrons of the postal service. We hope that his arm is strong enough to properly enforce what we believe to be the wishes of the public. If not, we intend to develop and recommend legislation which will give him the necessary tools.

It is unfortunate that the American theater should line itself up in this situation with those who seek to corrupt the morals of our country by sending obscene material through the U.S. mails. Obviously, the attempt to send through the mails the advertisement of the now notorious stamp portraying a nude painting was not intended to raise the dignity of the stamp or the painting. It was intended solely for the profit of the owners of the film.

## Conventional War Capability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, March 11, 1959:

CONVENTIONAL WAR CAPABILITY—U.S. ANTISUBMARINE BUREAU CURBED ON FUNDS IN FACE OF RED FLEET OF 475

(By Constantine Brown)

The sooner some of our policymakers get over the idea that the next worldwide conflict—if it ever occurs—will be fought by pushbutton machines, the better it will be for all.

The best post-World War II military minds who have been studying the preparations of the free world's enemies point out that while much noise and spectacular headlines center around the massive advantage of the Russians in guided missiles, the Communist would-be aggressors are working overtime to increase and improve their conventional warfare capabilities.

In the face of this, the administration is advocating further important cuts in the strength of our ground forces and in the Navy which may have to bear an important part of the brunt in any future conflict.

The Russians are known to have at least 475 submarines—the bulk of them ocean-going. Hitler almost won the last war in its early stages with fewer than 50 ocean submarines. Our best naval minds are sure the Russians are not building these submarines because they like to play with them. They are intended to cut off the United States, in the event of a major conflict, from both our Pacific and Atlantic allies. They are intended to interrupt the flow of essential raw materials and all seaborne communications with Asia and Europe.

The antidote to the long-range Soviet underseas fleets is, of course, antisubmarine preparedness by the U.S. Navy. Studies have been made and important new devices discovered to offset the likely efficiency of the Russian submarines. Yet the Antisubmarine Bureau in the Navy Department can hardly function because of lack of funds. The Budget Bureau in its great wisdom apparently has recommended that the funds for such developments were a luxury for the Navy. It believes, apparently, that the old-type cans dropped overboard from a destroyer proved pretty effective in two world wars and sees no reason why they should not be effective in a possible new conflict.

If international communism decides to unleash another world conflict, the U.S. Navy will have a burdensome role, principally because the navies of our allies have been reduced. The powerful British Navy is being cut down drastically, compared to what it was at the end of the last war. The French Navy is increasing in strength, but is still far from being an important adjunct in the event of an early world conflagration. The other navies are token forces which would not face alone the power of the Soviet fleets.

The Baltic Sea has become of real importance in the strategy of another world war. The NATO members—Germany, Denmark, and Norway—are supposed to prevent the Russian submarine and surface forces from breaking out through the Skaggerak and Kattegat Straits into the Atlantic. The naval forces of these three countries consist of 37 destroyers, 14 submarines, 107 minesweepers, 53 motor torpedo boats, and a few other minor auxiliaries. These forces, regardless of how efficient and self-sacrificing they may be, can hardly be more than a small bite for the Soviet Baltic fleet commanded by 53-year-old Admiral Charmalov, whose high competence as a naval commander is matched only by his ruthlessness.

Charmalov, who has under his orders 40 Red admirals, commands the most powerful of Soviet fleets. The Baltic squadron is composed of six heavy cruisers of the Sverdlov or Frunze class, 150 submarines, 70 destroyers and upward of 450 auxiliaries. An air force of 1,200 craft is always in readiness to support these naval forces. There is no doubt that should a major conflict break out, American carriers and other naval vessels would be compelled to reinforce the present NATO Baltic Forces whose mission besides that of interdicting an outbreak of the Soviet submarines into the Atlantic also is to restrict Soviet supply operations by sea above small craft transports for Red ground forces and to neutralize enemy operations on land, by sea and in the air directed against Danish islands.

There are no effective naval forces available to put into effect the NATO high command directions except the U.S. Navy. In the event of war, units will have to be sent from our Atlantic bases, and they will have to go through the submarine barrage of the Russians.

The problem could be licked by our highly advanced, but still in blueprint, antisubmarine operations and devices. These are working now at less than 20 percent preparedness efficiency because of lack of necessary funds.

Some of our planners are so hipped on pushbutton war that they are prone to overlook the fact that the international Communists with vast manpower and raw material resources are actually continuing preparations for a modernized conventional warfare.

## Let's Reason Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANK T. BOW**
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thoughtful editorial on the subject of rural electric cooperatives.

In this connection, let me point out that four rural electric cooperatives provide service to some 2,000 farms in my congressional district. Recent reports show that each of these cooperatives is in sound financial condition and has been able to make substantial advance repayments on the money loaned by the Government.

The editorial follows:

[From the Ohio Farmer, Feb. 21, 1959]

LET'S REASON TOGETHER—REASONS FOR RESTRAINT

(By Earl W. McMunn)

During the past couple of decades rural electric cooperatives have supplied power to just about half the farm homes of Ohio. In many cases power would not otherwise have been available. And, it's a sure bet that the co-ops did the job a lot more quickly than it would have been done by the power companies alone. If you're getting your power from a rural electric co-op, you know how much it has meant to you in the form of low-cost, efficient service. You have every reason to be proud of the organization of which you are a member.

It doesn't follow, however, that everything done in the name of rural electrification can be accepted without question. Right now some leaders of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association are screaming that the Government is out to kill the whole rural electric setup. They object to any increase in interest rate on loans from the Government to rural electric cooperatives. They resist all attempts to "wean" the co-ops from Government loans to private sources of credit. And, they want authority to move into urban areas to supply large industrial users located there.

Government loans to rural electric co-ops have been made on the basis of 2 percent interest. That's provided by law, even though the Government is now forced to pay more to get the money it lends. But, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has unleased a violent attack against any who even suggest raising the rate to what it actually costs the Government. They prefer the socialistic approach of letting others help bear the cost.

Then, they've turned a deaf ear to the suggestion that at some time the "bottle feeding" of Government loans should stop and be replaced by capital from private sources. This the farm credit banks did with great success. But, it's something the electric co-op leaders don't want.

Finally, these leaders want to sell service in urban centers in competition with the power companies. The REA was organized to provide electric power to rural areas. It received tax and interest favors for that reason. The very name declares this purpose.

You'll hear these points discussed in the months ahead. When you do, consider the motives of those speaking to you. Rural electric co-ops have earned a real place for themselves in our economy. This doesn't mean they should be given complete freedom to take business away from taxpaying utility companies. And, to do it with low-cost loans that every taxpayer is helping subsidize.

Ambitious people have the habit of running wild when they're provided with large amounts of public money. There are good reasons why these ambitions should be contained within proper bounds.

## Opposition to Chicago Water Diversion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert an article from the Michigan Out-of-Doors, for March 1959, in opposition to the Chicago water diversion bill, H.R. 1:

LAKE STATES PROTEST MORE WATER DIVERSION AT CHICAGO—DRAFT STRONG RESOLUTION TO PRESENT TO SUBCOMMITTEE

All of the Great Lakes States except Illinois, meeting in Detroit February 25 and 26 under the sponsorship of the Great Lakes Harbor Association, again voiced strong protests over the proposed increased diversion of water by Chicago.

Out of the 2-day meeting came a proposal which said in effect that the group "rededicated themselves to the continued unalterable opposition to either direct or indirect diversion of any waters at Chicago from the Great Lakes Basin."

This proposal was then forwarded to Members of the Congress, the Governors of the States, the attorney generals of the participating States, mayors, civic and port officials.

The stand taken by the States was given further weight by the full support of Canada, who has already lodged a protest with the United States Government.

In a panel discussion led by Michigan's own Attorney General Paul Adams, State after State took the stand to protect against the proposed "steal" for private benefit of a publicly owned resource.

Canadian speakers said that the reduced water levels would hurt industry and transportation, as well as the power development along the Seaway.

Other Michigan speakers included Assistant Attorney General Nicholas Olds, and water resources secretary, Milton P. Adams, who have been working with Attorney General Adams against the diversion for some time.

Mr. Herbert Naujoks, outspoken president of the Harbors Association who is from Chicago, said that the people from Chicago have been ruthless in their demands.

During subsequent discussions it was made clear that the port authorities and harbor association will continue to protest in view of necessary reduction in shipping. A single inch of water drained from the lakes would mean that the shipping industry would lose $2,500,000 in revenue a year.

Mr. J. B. McMorran, representing New York State, said that it would cost the people of New York State millions of dollars in power revenue a year. He added that it would be more fitting if Chicago would spend a million a year to treat the sewage and water and return it to the lakes like other cities do.

On Thursday morning another panel headed by Detroiter Carlis J. Stettin, port of Detroit director, featured talks by Adm. Lyndon Spencer, president of the Lake Carriers Association, and Harry Brockel, port of Milwaukee director.

Brockel summed up by saying: "This conference has established that Chicago's proposals are contrary to the progressive and expensive programs to build the Seaway and improve the connecting channels and to the efforts of both public and private enterprise to expand and improve our port gateways for world shipping to the United States."

To bring the problem closer home, Nick Olds says that it behooves conservationists of Michigan to pay more attention to the Chicago diversion controversy.

"Hunters and fishermen should realize that the water depth and water area is the basic resource upon which their sport is founded and any destruction of this resource is an injury which will reflect in the number of ducks and fish that they will have in pursuit of their sport.

"It is important that conservation groups interest themselves in putting a halt to this water steal, which Chicago will continue to demand as the cheap and easy way out for flushing its sewage down the sanitary and ship canal."

As we go to press the subcommittee is meeting in Washington to hear arguments for and against the proposed diversion. Several bills have been introduced by almost every lawmaker from Illinois.

The first bill introduced in the Senate this session, Senate bill No. 1 was the Chicago diversion bill, indicating the determination of the city of Chicago in its attempts to get cheap sanitation.

A series of hearings, and the delay of a definite decision by the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works has cheered those who oppose the bill. The Detroit meeting and other meetings have given hope that the proposal will have rougher sledding than it had last year in the final sessions in Washington.

## Patriotic Award to Citizens of Louisville, Clark County, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANK T. BOW**
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Louisville, Ohio, "Constitution City," has won new recognition for its annual Constitution Day program which has come to mean so much to the people of my district.

I include with my remarks the Louisville Herald story concerning the new award.

HISTORICAL SOCIETY PRESENTS PLAQUE, "A PATRIOTIC AWARD," TO CITIZENRY—CALLS LOUISVILLE "CONSTITUTION CITY"

Louisville's 125th anniversary celebration will be marked by various events throughout the year and the latest to be announced comes from the office of the Stark County Historical Society. An award in the form

of a plaque measuring 11 inches by 14 inches has been prepared as follows:

"A Patriotic Award to the citizens of Louisville, Stark County, Ohio, March 1, 1959.

"This tribute to Americanism is presented to the citizens of Louisville, Ohio, for the splendid effect in honoring the Constitution of the United States of America with a yearly celebration climaxing with Constitution Day.

"Special recognition is also accorded to Mrs. Olga T. Weber, prime mover in the project which was first held in September 1952.

"Our congratulations to Louisville, Ohio, the Constitution City.

"The Stark County Historical Society.

"FREDERICK BRODA,
*"President.*

"EDWARD T. HEALD,
*"Local Historian.*

"JOSEPH M. MARKLEY,
*"Secretary-Treasurer.*

"GEORGE R. BECHTEL,
*"Field Representative."*

(Official presentation will be made on Constitution Day, 1959, by the Society.)

## Some Stars That I've Lived By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 22 years Dr. P. O. Davis has served as director of the Extension Service of Alabama Polytechnic Institute, better known as Auburn. During these years, his devoted leadership and guidance has served the farm families of Alabama on many fronts, bringing to our rural society higher levels of education, the benefits of agricultural research, advice, and assistance in crops and constant improvement in the family farm home.

On May 1, Dr. Davis will retire and another highly qualified and gifted extension director, Dr. E. T. York, a native of DeKalb County in the Fifth Congressional District, will succeed him.

We in Alabama feel that Auburn and our State are highly fortunate in having such men to guide and assist our farmers. The Agriculture Department's Extension Service is equally fortunate in having men of their caliber and ability as recognized leaders in the program.

Recently Dr. Davis delivered an address to the Alabama Association of Home Demonstration Agents which reveals his personal faith in democracy, in America, and in the family farm as a vital unit of a free society. I submit his remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

SOME STARS THAT I'VE LIVED BY

(By P. O. Davis, director, Alabama Polytechnic Institute Extension Service, Auburn, Ala., at the annual meeting of the Alabama Association of Home Demonstration Agents in Birmingham, February 26-27, 1959)

A good beginning for any speaker on any occasion is a proper recognition of his audience. You are as fine a group of coworkers as any man ever had and I shall always be profoundly grateful to you. Because of you, our other coworkers, plus those who have been with us and passed on the Extension Service of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute is now at a new summit of value and influence.

We can think of it as the end of an era during which the record has been constantly upward and the beginning of a new era during which new records will be made and bigger goals attained. All of them enable farm people to move upward and forward at the same time for their own good and for a greater Alabama in every way.

Dr. E. T. York who will succeed me on May 1 is highly qualified in every way. I bespeak for him your complete and enthusiastic cooperation. You will soon be devoted to him as he will be to you; all working together as a real team on one program of work for all.

Therefore, we can now review together before taking another forward look into the future to see what it holds for Alabama and for the Extension Service. Our primary concern is farm people but farming is now so big and so involved that it includes all people, either directly or indirectly.

It has been my good fortune to be director of the Extension Service of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute during the most eventful period of American history—the period of greatest progress in the entire economy of Alabama. On all fronts and in all segments Alabama has gone forward and continues to go forward. Today exceeds yesterday and tomorrow will exceed today.

The Extension Service has been out front in this matchless progress; and, for my part, I give full credit to the staff in the counties and at the State level. I have tried to be the symbol and leader as well as the administrator but the work has been done by the personnel.

It has been, and is, the age of science, the age of technology, the age of vision, the age of change, the age of progress. President Eric A. Walker, of Pennsylvania State University, depicted it when he said:

"A central characteristic of the scientific age is that it replaces, at the level of routine chores, human labor, and machines that do the work faster, more accurately, and at less cost.

"Consequently, all along the line everyone must operate on a correspondingly higher human level of mental activity.

"We replace muscle power with brain power. The unskilled laborers must then become craftsmen, the craftsmen technicians, the technicians engineers and professional people, and the professionals must become scientists and philosophers."

This has been the major star in my horizon. It is the star which beckons and challenges mankind to nobler achievements based upon clearer thinking about life and the multitude of problems involved in earning and in living; and I have not lost sight of it.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, FARMERS

Underneath this star is my belief in science, in technology, in life itself. I believe in people, in the dignity of the individual, with emphasis upon farm people.

This State, this Nation, and no other nation will ever be too grateful to farm people for what they are, for what they have contributed to the Nation, for the progress which they have made, and their unfailing faith in the future.

Again and again I have insisted that farmers go first class and be first class. They deserve it.

No longer is a farmer rated as a hayseed who scoffs at book farmers. Instead, he is a student, a thinker, and a leader—a real man among men.

Young people are especially dear to me because the future is for them. It will be what they make it in addition to what we and our ancestors have done up to now.

About everything that we have in this Nation stems from the fact that we have a surplus agriculture. Without it we would not have, for example, our gigantic industry which produces adequate clothes, automobiles, trucks, tractors, household appliances, radios, television, and countless other things that remove drudgery and lift life to a higher level.

This reveals why I believe in agricultural research, including home economics. At last we are about to learn that it's one thing to produce the essentials of life in abundance and another thing to use them for better living. It took a long time for mankind to learn this; and too many people don't yet know it.

The family farm is a star that never grows dim with me. It entered our crown of lasting stars with the birth of our country at Jamestown, Va., three and a half centuries ago. It has endured and will continue to endure.

The growing brilliance of that star is now reflected in public education, in research, in organized farmers, in farmer cooperatives.

During all of my public career I have been positive for each of these four horsemen of good farming, good farm homes, and good living. It went to dignify, to glorify, and to use them.

Educated farmers know how to work together in their own organizations for their mutual welfare; and how to transact their business in their own way within their co-ops to better themselves and their families.

It has long been clearly obvious to me that the community is second only to the farm family as the unit upon which rural society rests and within which it lives and thrives or dies and decays. It is the basis for much more of our work than we have yet done to be more effective with more people. It's a big challenge to us.

THE POWER OF DEMOCRACY

Naturally, I believe in democracy in terms of the sovereignty of humanity. We must never forget the fact that our success has been determined much more by our way of life than by the abundant natural assets that we have for earning and living.

Other nations have people who are, in many ways, naturally as intelligent as we are. They are probably as abundant in natural resources as we are but they lag far behind us in food, in clothes, in homes, and otherwise. Most of them are hungry, ill clothed, and ill housed all the time.

This lethargy, or lagging, on their part stems not from what nature did or did not do for them but from what they have failed to do for themselves in developing a way of life which enables man to be productive and to live adequately with genuine faith in the future.

In brief, they don't have human freedom without which our lot would be at their level; and our future as dim as their future.

My faith in our democracy is strengthened by this statement by Helen Keller who is prepared to speak as no other living American can now speak. I quote her:

"I did not choose my country any more than I chose my parents, but I am her daughter just as truly as I am the child of my southern mother and father. What I am my country has made me. She has fostered the spirit which made my education possible. Neither Greece nor Rome, nor all China, nor Germany, nor Great Britain has surrounded a deaf-blind child with the devotion and skill and resources which have been mine in America.

"But my love for America is not blind. Perhaps I am more conscious of her faults because I love her so deeply. Nor am I blind to my own faults. It is not easy to hold a steady course in a changing world.

"It need not discourage us if we are full of doubts. Healthy questions keep faith dynamic. In fact, unless we start with doubts we cannot have a deep-rooted faith. One who believes lightly and unthinkingly has not much of a belief. He who has a faith which is not to be shaken has won it

through blood and tears—he has worked his way from doubt to truth as one who reaches a clearing through a thicket of brambles and thorns."

When all events in the world since its creation are viewed and measured in importance the birth of Christ stands at the summit. Up to now He has had more influence on the world than all the armies and navies combined. The same will be true in the future of the world, as I see it. Therefore, Christ is the big star of all time for all people. From Him came our democracy.

SOME BASIC FAITHS

In brief, I believe that man is a triumvirate with body, mind, and spirit. His needs are distinct and clear in all three parts of his nature. This is the essence of democracy while communism thinks of man as being an economic and physical animal.

Thus you see that I believe in the American competitive enterprise system; that man's search for progress should be encouraged by maintenance of opportunity, not hindered by illusions of security; that a person should be rewarded in accordance with his productive contribution to society; that every man is entitled to own property, earn money honestly, save, invest and spend as he chooses; that property rights cannot be taken away without infringing on rights guaranteed by the Constitution; that the Constitution is the basic law of the land, and that its interpretation should be in accordance with the intent of its authors; that government should operate impartially in the interest of all; that government's regulatory functions should be based on law; that governments should provide only minimum controls and aids; that government should stimulate, not discourage, individual initiative; that propagandizing by government is dangerous to the maintenance of self-government; that monopoly, whether by government, industry, labor or agriculture is dangerous; that voluntary cooperation is a part of the American system; that all candidates for public office should state their beliefs with respect to communism, socialism, and capitalism.

Obviously, I believe in the land grant college—in our own Alabama Polytechnic Institute and all of its divisions at Auburn and throughout Alabama.

In all the world there is no real counterpart to our land-grant college but it is heartening to know that other nations are now trying to follow the American pattern and ideals for the same goals. More power to them.

Always and everywhere I have insisted that we of the Extension Service must look first class, think first class, act first class, and be first class.

We should strive always to be real artists in all that we do both by precept and by example.

We are engaged in the highest form of education because it is for practical people; and it must be true information to succeed when intelligently applied which may be immediately.

To meet the high calling which is ours we must have men and women of high ability; men and women who are adequately trained; men and women of unfailing character; men and women who are always and everywhere loyal to the Service and to those who are administratively responsible. One who is not loyal is unfit and unworthy of any trust.

A LOOK INTO THE FUTURE

So far I've talked about principles and the past which, after all, is gone and static. Nothing we can do will change it, but the future will be what we make it.

My three big stars are (1) truth, (2) people, (3) God. Truth includes principles and philosophies as well as science and technology.

Based upon my experiences of the past, my studies of the present, and my crystal ball of the future I am bold enough to name 20 specifics which I foresee for the year 2000, as follows:

1. A nation of 250 million people, life expectancy lengthened a third over 1959, and far more people 60 years and older.

2. Farm population has declined from the present low of 12 percent to 8 percent of the total; fewer farms and bigger farms.

3. Adequate food and fiber for all—even more per capita than in 1959—so that all who earn are fully fed, comfortably clothed, and well housed.

4. A little more land in crops than in 1959, but production per acre is 50 to 100 percent higher. There is a big increase in grazing land; and meat, milk, or egg production per acre annually is much higher, due to better breeding, better feeding, better management, more fertilizer, and much more irrigation in the South.

5. Animal power is gone except to convert feed into meat, milk, and eggs. Animal efficiency in feed conversion is double that of 1959.

6. Mechanical power per farmworker is three to six times that of 1959, which is eight times that of 1910.

7. By rotation, legumes, livestock, fertilizer, lime, and management land is improved, while it produces more farm products.

8. Fertilizer contains more plant food per ton, and plant food used annually per acre is thrice that of 1959.

9. Chemicals are a major factor in weed control, the same as insects.

10. Cotton is still a big cash producer on southern farms and the Nation's best and most widely used fiber.

11. Trees are still No. 1 in the use of southern land. They are managed as a crop. Hybrid trees are established, and forest fires are almost entirely an evil of the past.

12. Homes, especially farm homes, are much better. Power and machines and gadgets are serving the average home with the equivalent of 50 to 100 human slaves.

13. The farm family is still the essence of America's greatness, and many more people with nonfarm employment and income live in the country.

14. Both farm and nonfarm rely more heavily upon the Extension Service for sound information about farming, about living, and about many other subjects.

15. Nonfarm income of farm people exceeds their net farm income each year.

16. Rivers—especially in the South—are fully developed for power, navigation, industrial water, and flood control.

17. Most farmers are active in their organization; and real farmer cooperatives are bigger and better in service to both farmers and nonfarmers.

18. Farm production and marketing are dominated by science, power, engineering, and applied economics. These have freed farmers from grants, from subsidies, and from artificial controls; but price supports remain with politics in the farm program.

19. The U.S. Patent Office is still issuing more than 100 patents daily; as now; and most people have faith in the future.

20. The United States is still the No. 1 democracy in the world and farmers, as in the past, are the foundation and the bulwark of individual liberty and freedom through the processes of democracy.

WHAT ABOUT ALABAMA?

Alabama will continue to go forward because the people of Alabama were born to go forward. They know that things don't get better and better by themselves. Human energy and human intelligence must be applied.

We're proud of the past but we would be unworthy of it if we were not eager to make the future better. I remind you that the 4-H motto is "To Make the Best Better."

Alabama will go forward on farms, in factories, in mines, in banks, in business, in the professions, and otherwise. The forces of science and technology are impressive, irreversible, cumulative, and continuous.

Indeed, Alabama is the heart of the Southeast which is the great magic area of the United States. It's a great State where all of the essentials of nature are rolled together for success and inviting us to use them for abundance and with no limit as to our future.

We should build our State upon our young people—upon their training because "the foundation of every State is the education of its youth."

The Alabama of tomorrow is being molded by our schools of today; and the effectiveness of our schools is determined, in a large measure, by funds available for them. Therefore, all of us need a willingness to be at least as good to our children as we are to our highways which we are not now. Unless we are, the Alabama of the future is certain to suffer.

So all the stars that I've named are shining brighter before you and me today; and all of the challenges are ever more inviting and more dynamic. By keeping our eyes upon these stars and driving full speed ahead toward them we cannot fail.

We must ever be mindful of the fact that the only limit to our realizations of tomorrow are our doubts of today. As we remove our doubts and go on with what we have and what we know the ideals and goals of the entire Extension Service will be attained in an ever-increasing measure.

This star is big and bright before me as I near the end of my 22 years as director.

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

# Appendix

## DAV Services in Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to insert the following speech which I made at the DAV installation of officers last night in Greenbelt, Md.

I believe that it speaks for itself.

An exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Maryland citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Maryland, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims is Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations is John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability-compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after it formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans, themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well informed claimants.

Located in the Veterans' Administration regional office at St. Paul and Fayette Streets, Baltimore, Md., is the DAV national service officer, Mr. Frank Dubinskas, a fine friend of mine. Because of the financial inability of the DAV to pay salaries in competition with commercial enterprise and the Federal Government, Mr. Dubinskas is now doing the work that should ordinarily be done by two national service officers and he is doing a fine job.

The present department commander of the DAV in Maryland is another friend of mine, Mr. John Stubbs, and the adjutant is Jake Finn. The DAV Department of Maryland has nationally appointed representatives to the Veterans Administration Voluntary Services Advisory Committees at each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals servicing Maryland veterans. These DAV representatives and the hospitals are as follows: Mr. John E. Kellam at the 291-bed Tuberculosis Hospital at Baltimore, Mr. Earl Vellaca at the 377-bed General Medical and Surgical Hospital at Fort Howard, Mr. Charles Kennedy at the 1,800-bed Neuropsychiatric Hospital at Perry Point, and Mr. Earl Rosensteel at the 1,340-bed VA Center at Martinsburg, W. Va.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $67,498,000 for its veteran program in Maryland, including $20,506,324 disability benefits to its 27,041 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Maryland furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

Only about 7 percent—1,756—are members of the 27 DAV chapters, ranging up to 510 members in the Baltimore Chapter No. 1.

This 7 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Maryland's veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the folowing statistics:

| | |
|---|---|
| Claimants contacted (estimate) | 45,438 |
| Claims folders reviewed | 37,865 |
| Appearances before rating boards | 3,670 |
| Compensation increases obtained | 3,332 |
| Service connections obtained | 661 |
| Nonservice pensions | 456 |
| Death benefits obtained | 66 |

Total monetary benefits obtained were $1,082,193.72.

The above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32 and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Maryland's veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted these DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and businesses, etc. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment (to utilize their remaining abilities), civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death, or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service-connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendent, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV Acting National Director of Claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others, at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1 percent (.013) of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Maryland, with a consequent loss of about $364,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Maryland to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the back-

ground of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag (miniature automobile license tags) project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project is thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag Department, 13,555 of whom during the last 8 years, were Maryland residents.

Every elegible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the general support of all service claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Maryland by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100 ($50 to those born before January 1, 1902 or World War I veterans), payable in installments within two full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of American's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of Amercia's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

I am proud to be a life member of the DAV.

## Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, Passes 26 Years in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a great American and a great legislator of outstanding ability and courage is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTERS].

In the March 4, 1959, issue of the Daily Record of Stroudsburg-East Stroudsburg, Pa., appears a splendid and deserving article and editorial relating to our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTERS], which I include in my remarks:

REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, PASSES 26 YEARS IN CONGRESS

Twenty-six years ago today, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Easton Democrat, went to Congress for the first time as Representative of Pennsylvania's 15th District. Like the man who came to dinner, he's still there.

Walter is currently ninth in individual Democratic seniority and seventh in group seniority in the House. Among both Democrats and Republicans, he ranks 12th in House seniority.

No other Pennsylvanian in history has served in either House or Senate for as long as Walter.

The 15th District includes Monroe, Carbon and Northampton Counties. Its 1950 population of 276,574 persons has increased considerably since the last census.

Walter, who will be 65 in May, seriously considered not running for reelection last year because of his health. His friends persuaded him to return to Congress.

That he ranks high among his fellow legislators is indicated by the fact he heads the important House Committee on Un-American Activities as chairman.

He is also a member of the House Judiciary Committee and the Joint Senate-House Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

A long-time fighter against communism, he has been frequently criticized—and praised—for the actions of the Un-American Activities Committee.

He was not always so alert to the dangers of Communist expansion, however. Speaking at the annual dinner of the Four-County Firemen's Association in East Stroudsburg last summer, WALTER recalled that he once voted against funds for the very committee he now heads.

WALTER is a native of Easton. He received his bachelor of arts and bachelor of law degrees from Georgetown University.

During his college career he was a member of Phi Delta Theta, Phi Alpha Delta, and Pi Gamma Mu.

He served as Northampton County solicitor from 1928 to 1933 and is a veteran of World Wars I and II. He has decorations from several foreign governments.

WALTER still maintains a law office in Easton. In addition, he is a director of the Easton National Bank and vice president and director of the Broad Street Trust Co. of Philadelphia.

Since he has been in Congress, he has served as chairman of the Democratic caucus; chairman of the subcommittee on immigration and naturalization; chairman of the House Patronage Committee and member of the Government Security Commission in addition to his present committee assignments.

He was elected Speaker pro tempore of the 81st Congress and has served on the post-war economic policy and planning and select European aid committees, the latter of which did the groundwork for the Marshall plan.

He also served as representative of the United States and spokesman for the Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants From Europe, designed to relieve overpopulation of European countries by migration to countries needing population.

Walter is a member of the Loyal Order of Moose, Patriotic Order of Sons of America, Elks, Sons of the American Revolution, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American and Pennsylvania Bar Associations and is a member and past commander of the Amvets.

Among his awards are: Americanism Award, Catholic War Veterans, Department of Maryland, 1957; American Bar Association award for outstanding services, 1946; Patriotic Order of Sons of America award for worthy patriotic services; life membership, American Legion, for noteworthy service to all veterans.

Outstanding citizen award, Sons of American Revolution; John Carroll Award for 1952, presented by Georgetown University Alumni Association; award, Japanese Government, 1956; Distinguished Service Medal, Pennsylvania Department, Amvets, 1957.

Golden Deeds Award, Exchange Club of Easton, 1953; award from Young Jeffersonians Democratic Club, Summit Hill, 1957, honoring him for 25 years service in the House; Order of Orange-Nassau by the Netherlands Government for distinguished service to international migration, 1957, and certificate from the Americanism Commission of the American Legion at the 40th annual convention last year.

## We the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a matter of grave concern to the people of Queens County, N.Y., a matter which I am sure could be multiplied many times in many congressional districts of this Nation. It involves the proposed expressway which needlessly will cut through the heart of Queens sweeping in its wake some 1,500 homes, places of business, churches, and other buildings and forcing thousands of persons to relocate in areas against their will and in dwellings not of their choosing; this, despite the fact that a far more appropriate alternate route is available.

While I realize Congress cannot legislate on such a matter, I strongly believe in view of the severe impact of this move, that the great forum of this House should hear this petition in protest of an ar-

bitrary act so strongly against the wishes of the people.

Furthermore, the prepared report on the alternate route was never properly presented to the New York State Department of Public Works or the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, as it should have been in accordance with paragraph (c) section 116, page 12, of title 1, Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

The usurpation of the democratic process is despicable wherever it occurs, either local, national or international, and I feel it incumbent to pinpoint any indication of its existence.

That is why I bring this case to the House. That is why I present this petition which graphically discloses the story of these outraged taxpayers. I refer to the petition from two civic and taxpayer organizations in my district, the Bayside Neighbors Council, Inc. and the Bellaire Gardens Taxpayers Association, Inc., protesting this routing and calling for an immediate halt to this project by the appropriate authorities. Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD at this point the petition from these fine civic-minded people:

PETITION TO EACH MEMBER OF THE U.S. SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 28, 1959

We, the people, unnecessarily and very disastrously affected by the proposed route of the Clearview Expressway, in Queens County, N.Y., from the proposed Throggs Neck Bridge through the heart of Bayside via 207th Street, crossing the new Long Island Expressway, veering somewhat eastward and extending through Holliswood, Bellaire, Queens Village, St. Albans, and Laurelton to Idlewild Airport, homeowners, taxpayers, businessmen, members of religious and other organizations and other victims of the arbitrary, ruthless, and capricious selection of a route that will remove 1,500 or more homes, business, religious, and other buildings, assessed at millions of dollars from the tax rolls with the anual loss of the taxes thereon, make this plea. We victims will be forced to relocate in places not of our choice and will be unable to obtain equal facilities or in as desirable locations as we had, for the compensation we will receive. In addition a "Chinese Wall" will be placed through the very heart of the above communities.

We homeowners hired a competent consulting engineer, at a cost of many thousands of dollars, to survey the 207th Street route and another suggested route through the city-owned Alley Park meadowland, a short distance to the east and report to us. His report stated that the Alley Park route was more desirable and would save millions of dollars and take very little property from the tax rolls. This report was never properly presented to the New York State Department of Public Works or the Federal Bureau of Public Roads as it should have been in accordance with paragraph (c) section 116, page 12, of title 1, Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. The suggested route was summarily dismissed by the local authorities as not feasible and we were told we should not be concerned with the cost as the Federal Government was going to pay 90 percent of the cost, but the annual loss of the tax money was not mentioned nor were we told that this loss would have to be borne by our taxpayers every year.

In spite of the work already done, the contracts let and properties condemned, it is not too late to change the route. The properties taken can be sold at a profit and the money saved by using city-owned property, the annual savings in taxes and the lessened cost of construction will many times repay the cost so far incurred and save millions of dollars in addition and will eliminate the tribulation that is being inflicted on these communities now and forever. All the taxpayers in the Nation will benefit now and forever. This wanton and needless destruction of homes and other valuable buildings and public utilities should be stopped immediately, when Federal, State, and city governments are faced with huge deficits and greatly increased taxes. This change should be the concern of and receive the support of all. It was not too late to recover Tea Pot Dome after it had been stolen and the proposed route of the expressway is causing and will cause much more grief.

We suggest reading "Extinction by Thruway" in the February Reader's Digest, to understand the plight of the people in this ruthless outrage by appointed bureaucrats, answerable to no one, making a mockery of democratic government and wasting millions of dollars of public funds, uselessly and unnecessarily, to aggrandize their own egoism. The Seventh Avenue route of the approach to the proposed Narrows Bridge, in Brooklyn, Kings County, N.Y., is another example of diabolical devastation and waste of public funds.

Pursuant to article 1 of the Bill of Rights (first amendment to the Constitution), we earnestly petition that you use all the powers vested in you to—

1. Immediately stop all work on the Clearview Expressway and Throggs Neck Bridge;
2. Have the arbitrary selection of the 207th Street route investigated by an unbiased individual or body, not having any previous connection with the matter;
3. Have the Daniel J. O'Connell report considered by the investigators.

We believe it is never too late to right a wrong, correct an injustice, or save the taxpayers' money.

GEORGE P. AMES,
*Committee Executive Secretary.*

(Bayside Neighbors Council, Inc., 35–42 207th Street, Bayside, N.Y., Joseph W. Maneri, president; Bellaire Gardens Taxpayers Association, Inc. (affiliated with adjacent civic organizations), 93–47 210th Place, Hollis, N.Y., Peter P. Bach, president.)

## Sesquicentennial of Giles County, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Giles County, Tenn., will observe its 150th anniversary with a special sesquicentennial celebration July 11 through July 17 of this year. In honor of this momentous occasion, the 81st General Assembly of the State of Tennessee has unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing and commending the celebration; and, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to offer this resolution for inclusion in the RECORD. I would like, also, to take this opportunity to congratulate the citizens of Giles County, of which I am honored to be one, and to offer my best wishes to them for a successful and happy celebration.

The resolution follows herewith:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 39

Resolution relating to the sesquicentennial of Giles County

Whereas by chapter LV of the Public Acts of 1809, adopted November 14, 1809, the eighth General Assembly of Tennessee created and established a new county, known and designated as Giles County; and

Whereas this county at the suggestion of Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson was named for the Honorable William B. Giles, Congressman, U.S. Senator, and Governor of the great State of Virginia, a statesman who stood stalwartly and at the forefront of those who advocated and urged the admission of Tennessee into the Federal Union; and

Whereas in the aforesaid act creating and establishing Giles County, the legislature designated and appointed James Ross, Nathaniel Moody, Tyree Rhodes, Gabriel Bumpass, and Thomas Whitson, as county commissioners and directed them to "proceed to fix on a place on Richland Creek as near the centre [sic] of the county as an eligible scite [sic] can be procured, at which scite the said commissioners shall procure at least 100 acres of land * * * on which they shall cause a town to be laid off, with the necessary streets, at least 80 feet wide, reserving at least 2 acres, for a public square, on which shall be built a courthouse and stocks, also reserving a public lot, sufficient to contain a jail in a convenient part of the town, which town shall be known by the name of Pulaski"; and

Whereas responsive to this legislative mandate, the commissioners selected and laid off the county seat town named in honor of Count Casimir Pulaski, the Polish nobleman who cast his lot with the downtrodden people of colonial America and lost his life while leading Pulaski's Legion during the War of the Revolution in the historic Battle of Savannah; and

Whereas the legislature further directed the commissioners to sell lots in said town, using the proceeds to erect a courthouse, prison, and stocks. Thus it was that the early pioneers of this county purchased their county seat town and paid for their public structures and so, without subsidy, they builded upon the firm foundation of economic self-reliance in local government without which true self-government cannot exist; and

Whereas this county, which was a canebrake inhabited by the wild beasts of the forest and a part of the hunting grounds of the Cherokees, the Chickasaws, the Creeks, and the Choctaws, has now become truly a land flowing with milk and honey; and

Whereas down through the 150 years of its existence it has not only abounded richly in natural resources but in the rich heritage of the strong men and courageous women who plunged into the wilderness country and established their homes, schools, and churches, to the end that cultural pursuits, religious worship, and the home and fireside might form the firm cornerstone of their future existence; and

Whereas this county from its very beginning has stood stalwartly and steadfastly for the Jeffersonian concept of democracy, in fact to such an extent that one historical sketch recites that "while the commissioners named the streets for the Presidents, there is no Adams Street, they taking care to see that no Massachusetts Federalist President should receive the honor of commendation at their hand"; and

Whereas three distinguished Giles Countians, Aaron V. Brown, Neil S. Brown, and John C. Brown, served with honor and distinction as Governor of the State of Tennessee; and

Whereas so strongly did the citizens of Giles County feel on the theory of States rights that when they voted on the question of seceeding, some 2,456 voted in favor of casting their lot with the cause of the Confederacy whereas only 11 misguided individuals were counted in opposition thereto; and

Whereas Giles County, Tenn., was the scene and situs of the No. 1 atrocity of the War between the States—the execution of Sam Davis, Confederate scout who was hanged as a spy even though wearing the uniform of the Confederate Army, but who set an example for dying rather than betray a trust; and

Whereas when the South was writhing under the fell clutch of the carpetbagger and the scalawag, it was in Pulaski that there came into being the patriotic organization known as the Invisible Empire, of which Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, the world's greatest natural cavalry genius, became the grand wizard; and

Whereas Pulaski, the county seat of Giles County was the first municipality in Tennessee to receive the blessing of TVA current; and

Whereas with this tradition, background and heritage, the citizens of Giles County are planning a sesquicentennial celebration, commemorating the 150 years of the proud and progressive history of their county, and this celebration will be highlighted by appropriate ceremonies during the period, July 11, to July 17, 1959: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, (the Senate concurring)*, That we do endorse and commend the sesquicentennial celebration of Giles County and that we offer our congratulations to its constituted citizenry; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the county judge of Giles County and a copy to the chairman of the sesquicentennial committee.

WM. D. BAIRD,
*Speaker of the Senate.*
JAMES L. BOMAR,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

Approved February 27, 1959.

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
*Governor.*

## Hawaiian Statehood

SPEECH
OF
## HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, today is an historic day in the history of our beloved country.

Today by our vote on Hawaii we have shown once again to the world, as we have done throughout the history of our Nation, that ours is indeed a living, dynamic, and freedom-loving country dedicated to the principles enunciated in our Bill of Rights.

Today we have done our part to assure statehood for Hawaii. We have said to the world that the United States truly measures up to the oft-stated expression that it is man's greatest experiment in self-government. Our laws have long provided for admission to statehood of incorporated Territories when they should have attained the standards required for admission.

Today we are seeing these laws live and with such a magnificent vitality.

We are welcoming to the sisterhood of States an incorporated American Territory, 2,200 miles out in the Pacific Ocean, southwest of California, whose population is 85 percent native-born American and of diverse racial and national backgrounds, which are 23 percent Caucasian, 37 percent Japanese, 17 percent Hawaiian, and the remainder Filipino, Chinese, Korean, Puerto Rican, and others.

In effect we have proclaimed to all the world that America is for all Americans regardless of color, creed, or racial origin. We are welcoming a group of loyal Americans to the sisterhood of States realizing full well that the racial and national backgrounds of a majority differ from those of most continental Americans.

Surely this proves the spirit and words of the Constitution of these United States that America is not for some people, dependent on their race or color, or nationalistic background or religious belief, but rather that it is for all Americans. This has always been the heritage of America. This has always been the mission of America.

Today it has been proven once again to those who may need the proof.

I shall always remember with the greatest of pride for my country what has been accomplished in these last 2 days for Hawaiian statehood.

Truly, this has been a day in which history has been made and with humility and gratitude I am happy to have participated in it.

## The Telephone a Necessity, Not a Luxury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing demand that the Federal excise tax imposed on telephone messages during World War II be repealed.

My own State senator, the Honorable Lottie Holman O'Neill offered a joint resolution in which she was joined by Senators Peters, Groen, and Collins expressing the consensus of opinion of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois to the House of Representatives that this tax be now repealed. The resolution was adopted in the State senate and it is expected to receive early action in the House. The resolution follows:

PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTIONS

Senators O'Neill, Peters, Groen, and Collins offered the following senate joint resolution:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10

"Whereas there is in existence an unfair and unnecessary Federal excise tax of 10 percent on all telephone calls; and

"Whereas this tax was imposed during World War II not as a revenue measure but essentially as a method of restricting the use of the telephone because of the critical wartime shortage in the communications field and has continued since World War II although no shortage in available communications exists today; and

"Whereas the Federal excise tax on the telephone is unfair because it is the only such excise now imposed on household utility services such as electric, gas, and water service: Therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the 71st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the house of representatives concurring herein,* That the U.S. Congress is respectfully requested to repeal the Federal excise tax now imposed on telephone service and that suitable copies of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the President of the U.S. Senate, and each Member of Congress elected from the State of Illinois."

Senator O'Neill moved that the rules be suspended for the purpose of immediately considering the foregoing senate joint resolution.

The motion prevailed and the rules were suspended.

Senator O'Neill moved that senate joint resolution 10 be adopted.

The motion prevailed.

Ordered that the secretary inform the house of representatives thereof and ask their concurrence therein.

## Question Is, How Much Is Enough?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Springfield, Mass., Union on Tuesday, March 10, asked the question "How much is enough?" in appropriations for an adequate defense budget.

This is a very pertinent question at this time and one that certainly merits a considerable amount of study. I think we must listen to the individual views of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff if we are going to be fully enlightened on this subject.

We must study their recommendations and weigh them in the light of potential threats of aggression, the type of war that a potential enemy might choose to fight; and at the same time seriously consider the cost of a defense budget that would insure an adequate defense posture for this country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Springfield Union editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

QUESTION IS, HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

The Berlin crisis is a powerful new argument for those who think our military spending ought to be increased. Some in the armed services and a number of lawmakers contend our defenses are being weakened by economy considerations.

Well, it certainly would be a matter of concern if there were a serious weakening of the defense structure. The sticking point is: How much is enough? What kinds of wars are being prepared against? In what year?

No one knows how much is enough. The only possible basis for military planning is an informed guess about the potential enemy's capabilities and intentions. There must be adequate firepower in being to make it impossible for an enemy to overwhelm this country in a quick series of sudden blows, and consequently enough to show him it would be stupid to try.

No one knows, either, what kind of wars we may be forced to fight. The only sensible approach is to prepare, as we are preparing, for the onslaught of a total nuclear war that might finally be won by conventional arms. If the Nation prepares to fight that kind of big war, it is automatically preparing to fight a little war with troops and normal weapons.

No one knows, finally, when the enemy may strike. This is the costliest part of military planning. In the world today a major war is not expected next year or the year after. In that situation, how much, and what, is it safe to cut? Cuts in troop strength, within reason, are probably the least risky.

In a long-pull military preparation such as we necessarily have, the continual replacement of old weapons with new is fantastically expensive. In a short time billions of dollars worth of military hardware is ready for the junkyard, and new weapons must be designed for 10 and 20 years hence. A future war will use, in addition to conventional arms, the instruments of the atomic-rocket age. So if war comes in 15 years, we will be saved not by the instruments being built today but by the research being done today.

Sound military planning must also depend on the allocation of total Government resources. Government spending cannot constantly rise without impeding economic growth and encouraging inflation and so, in the end, weakening the military itself. If more is spent on defense, then it must come out of savings on other and less essential Federal programs, and the military themselves will be under an increased obligation to examine their own apportionment of funds and to make a concerted attack on waste and duplication.

## Detroit Newspaper Endorses Urban Renewal and Area Redevelopment Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Detroit Times on Monday, March 9, 1959:

WHAT WE NEED

Three events which occurred in government-industry relationship last week deserve review.

On Monday, Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, staged hearings here on his proposed $383 million area redevelopment act, a proposal to pump Federal loans into areas distressed by continued unemployment.

On Tuesday, the board of assessors of the city of Detroit announced the total assessed valuation of the city dropped $71 million under 1958 levels. It was the second successive year of reduction and was caused primarily by loss of industry.

On Wednesday, the Ford Motor Co. and the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. simultaneously announced separate expansion programs that will mean a total investment in their Detroit area installations of $69 million.

The hearings staged, and we use the word advisedly, by Senator DOUGLAS, revived last year's State election campaign issue of whether high wages and high taxes in Michigan have created an "unhealthy climate" for industry here.

The bulk of the testimony came from witnesses Senator Hart, Democrat, of Michigan; Governor Williams, Mayor Miriani, and Walter P. Reuther. All heartily endorsed the Douglas measure, as DOUGLAS had expected.

But Senator WALLACE BENNETT, a Republican from Utah and DOUGLAS, colleague on the committee, raised a question whether Michigan did not need first to get its house in order before Federal assistance would be of benefit. Some wee small Republican voices from outstate echoed his sentiments.

Reuther replied that unemployment is a national problem, showed that most of the distressed areas are in the East.

Miriani placed the blame on industrial blight—old factories which must be torn down and replaced with new, efficient ones, if Detroit is to regain high employment and maintain sufficient tax revenues.

The announcement of the decreased assessed valuation was like an exclamation mark after the mayor's testimony.

Announcement of the expansion plans of Ford and Michigan Consolidated seemed further to show that Michigan is a good place to do business.

The series of events aptly, and in rapid-fire succession, dramatize how Detroit and Michigan are being swept by crosscurrents of transition. The winds of politics help fan these crosscurrents.

Primary cause for the dispersion of industry in this area has been decentralization and automation in the automotive industry.

This is the basic reason Michigan has not recovered as quickly as some other States from the effects of the recent recession.

There is an element of truth in the charges that high wages and high taxes may discourage new industry from locating here.

There is an element of truth also in the contention that industry had had to disband some of the old Detroit factories because they are obsolete.

But no single source ever seems to tell the whole story. And no one seems to have enough wisdom to get the entire matter into perspective.

From the testimony submitted to the Douglas committee, however, it should be clear that Detroit and many upstate cities could utilize to advantage the provisions of the Douglas bill.

It would provide loans to private industrial firms for building new plants and loans to local units of government for building such facilities as waterlines, and roads to service these plants. The money would be repaid to the Federal Government.

As Mayor Miriani pointed out, the bill would help rejuvenate industry here.

It should be made clear that the Douglas bill does not provide outright grants to cities or anyone else either for slum clearance or for building new plants.

The slum clearance grants are included in other legislation labeled "urban renewal," also currently under consideration in the Senate.

Money from the Douglas bill could be utilized by the new industries expected to locate here once old factories have been torn down and the land made available by the city.

Detroit badly needs both the urban renewal legislation and the Douglas bill if it is to stave off industrial decay.

## Threshing Straw: Civil Rights School Probe Beyond Jurisdiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a very fine editorial which appeared in the Nashville Banner, concerning the hearings of the Civil Rights Commission in Nashville, Tenn.

It is my belief that each Member of Congress will want to read this editorial on the hearings which were specifically addressed to the field of voting but injected an assumed authority in the school dispute.

The editorial follows:

THRESHING STRAW: CIVIL RIGHTS SCHOOL PROBE BEYOND JURISDICTION

As was expected, the Civil Rights Commission has threshed mostly straw in its Nashville hearing on school desegregation—a fact due to several circumstances glaringly apparent from the outset:

By Chairman Hannah's own statement, the body's intrusion on the school question was by a role self-assigned. The act creating it for a 2-year study of discrimination, elaborately refrained from mentioning education. The only field to which it was specifically addressed was that of voting, and it is far more than a necessary inference that the Commission's injection of its assumed authority in the school dispute was not the intent of the lawmakers who enacted the 1957 act.

Notwithstanding that language of the law is at points ambiguous, full debate in Congress elicited assurance that as finally drawn it was restricted, and extremists on the integration side bewailed the fact that it provided no carte blanche. There is every evidence that had Congress foreseen the present use of this act in the absence of express authority, it would have defeated the legislation.

Not without cause, therefore, have representatives of the Deep South States stayed away. They are not parties to this advertised study—agreeing that, however much it may fatten the files of the Commission preliminary to expiring, it can help not at all the State problems created by Supreme Court decree. These will remain, part and parcel of what Commissioner Hannah has called a constitutional crisis all but unequaled in our life as a Nation, after the Commission has folded its tent and finally stolen away.

The hearing if it had to be held in contravention of what was the accepted interpretation of the body's domain did not belong in Nashville. Washington would have been one place for it, or in the other direction St. Louis—either point geographically nearer most of those in attendance. Nashville did not invite it. It did abide by the rudimentary rule of good manners. It could point, as did Mayor West, to the fact of a working system, by good sense spared the exactions of extremists on either side.

Virginia, South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida were not represented—and there was ample reason.

They have no big race problem of their own making. The controversy stirred has been by Supreme Court creation, and by agitation of it through outside agencies coming in to foment such where historically good and improving race relations have pre-

vailed. These would include the NAACP and its camp followers on the one hand—the Operation Dixie boys like Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and JACOB JAVITS in that train—and on the other, the professional hate baiters like John Kasper.

The Civil Rights Commission could render a service—helpful to eventual solution of this constitutional crisis which it properly deplores—if it reported that; if its recommendation on the basis of logic and of fact dwelt on the principles of States rights which have been put in jeopardy by these elements. It is impossible not to believe that some members of that body are sensitive to these points.

Barring such recommendation, probable or improbable, the next best thing will be for the Commission to get back to its valid and expressly legalized domain of operations—the matter of voting. If it fails to do that, there is even more abundant reason to let it expire in September—and let these busy gentlemen resume their several private occupations.

## Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I was privileged, with Representative BYRON JOHNSON, of Colorado, to address a workshop session at the second national conference on cooperative housing being held this week at the Hotel Statler, here in Washington, under the auspices of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A. I would like to call the attention of the House to this splendid gathering which is searching out ways and means to improve, promote, and further the development of cooperative housing in America.

This excellent form of middle-income housing offers a practicable means of meeting a goodly share of America's housing needs.

The cooperative movement is a constant training ground in democracy, and cooperative housing projects in particular are instrumental in promoting the values most cherished in our traditions.

The housing cooperatives, however, are running into some difficulties in a period of rising costs. Two problems are of particular significance. The first is the maintenance of reasonable monthly carrying charges within the means of the middle-income owner occupants of existing cooperatives. The second is the encouragement of new cooperative housing construction with adequate sized units for today's middle-income families and for which the monthly carrying charges are bearable.

Those financed under section 213 of the National Housing Act will receive some relief under the provisions of S. 57 as reported from the Banking and Currency Committee. In my remarks at the Cooperative League workshop session I pointed out that I was not at all sure that the proposed measures would be adequate to do the job, and I offered several suggestions to strengthen and expand the legislation to meet the needs of the present and potential owners of cooperative housing.

Because of the importance of this vital housing program and the timeliness of the conference, I would like to present to this House the talk I gave at the league's session on Tuesday which in substance discusses the cooperative housing provisions of S. 57:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my sincere pleasure to be with you today and to participate in this workshop on legislative proposals on cooperative housing pending before Congress. This is a field of great interest to me and I am pleased that I have secured membership on the House Banking and Currency Committee where I can, I hope, effectively carry the objectives of your league.

In my short capacity as a Member of Congress and of the committee I have worked since the start of the current session for legislation of assistance and benefit to the cooperative housing movement. In this regard I have received sound advice, counsel and background from my friends in the coordinating council of 213 cooperative many of whose members are in my district, from its first president and counsel Si Gallet whose aid has been invaluable; from Paul Golz, executive secretary of the council, with whom I have been in constant touch; from Gerry Meyers, president of the council who has contributed so much; and, I might add, the helpful background offered by Bernie Walpin; and from many groups and other individuals who are interested in cooperative housing. Now I feel I'm part of the co-op family and can earn the good counsel of the parent group, the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

Cooperative housing is one of the finest ways to provide worthwhile and adequate homes for people in the middle income group. It offers the opportunity to secure attractive, durable homes at reasonable carrying charges. It provides an excellent solution to urban housing problems.

But, as your discussions have brought out, there seem to be two significant problems confronting cooperative housing in this period of rising costs. The first is the maintenance of reasonable monthly carrying charges within the means of the middle-income owner-occupants of existing cooperatives. The second is the encouragement of new cooperative housing construction with adequate sized units for today's middle-income families and for which the monthly carrying charges are bearable.

The pending legislation before Congress does include some provisions of benefit to new owners and of supposed benefit to existing owners. We all welcome these provisions which Congressman JOHNSON has described so well for us. But they do not, in my opinion, go far enough, particularly in helping existing owners to maintain reasonable monthly carrying charges.

I would like to discuss with you some other possibilities and perhaps amendments to a few of the provisions in the proposed legislation which, if enacted, would, together with most of the pending legislation, make up a portfolio of instant and real benefit to cooperative owners, present and potential.

As this point I would like permission to have included in the record at the conclusion of my statement a copy of the views on section 213 cooperative housing which Congressman FINO and I presented as supplemental views in the report on the omnibus housing bill from the House Banking and Currency Committee. I do not wish to take up too much of your time, and if the views could be included with these, it would save time all around.

Briefly, the report covers the various amendments I had offered in committee to fill what I feel to be obvious gaps in the omnibus housing bill.

First, for the benefit of owners of existing management-type cooperatives with commercial or community facilities, there is the proposal that such mortgages be open-ended to permit the inclusion of new commercial or community facilities. Cooperatives could utilize this provision to up-date their facilities and acquire the same facilities for their needs such as could be secured by new cooperatives after the passage of the pending legislation. Mortgages could be opened up in an amount which together with the original obligation would not exceed any principal obligation limits in effect after the passage of the Housing Act of 1959. The advantages which would flow to owners of existing management-type co-ops from this privilege are self-evident. They range all the way from the acquisition of needed new facilities to retardation of obsolescence.

Second, for new cooperatives, proposals would: (a) Authorize new sales-type and investor-sponsored co-ops to include both commercial and community facilities in their mortgages. This would provide income to both types to aid in keeping the monthly carrying charges at a reasonable level, and would provide a stimulus to construction because of the assurance that many of the needs of the owners could be provided for; (b) extend the amortization period of mortgages of new co-ops from 40 to 50 years. This is predicated on the supposition that present interest rates will not be changed. Although by stretching out the amortization period the eventual total cost to the owners will be greater, such an extension would help to reduce monthly carrying charges; and (c) increase the FNMA per unit limit on special assistance purchases to $20,000. This would be more in accord with provisions in the pending legislation which increase the per-room limits for FHA insured mortgages, and would help to meet the needs of today's middle-income families for adequate sized homes, particularly in high cost areas.

These were the amendments I offered to the so-called Rains housing bill when it came before the full House Banking and Currency Committee. They are contained in the supplemental report to which I referred and in separate legislation I sponsored. At the committee meeting I was given full assurance that they would be fully reviewed by the Housing Subcommittee and that ample opportunity will be given the proponents to present their case.

Since the publication of the report further consultation with counselors in the cooperative housing movement—and here again I want to point to the enlightened information provided by Si Gallett—has convinced me of the need to broaden the scope of the open-ending proposition. It should include authority for capital improvements and replacements. Costs such as $14,000 for the rewiring of air-conditioning systems, as was presented to one co-op, or costs for the resurfacing of sidewalks, among others, should be included in the open-ending suggestion. Legislation to cover this is now being prepared and will be introduced within a matter of days.

But, particularly I want to discuss two proposed changes in the pending legislation which, if adopted, would be of great benefit to owners of existing cooperatives.

One of these is discussed in the supplemental views referred to. It relates to extending the proposed one-quarter of 1 percent insurance premium minimum to existing cooperatives. I am happy to see the provision in the pending House bill which grants this benefit to new co-ops, but it should and can be extended to existing co-ops. If it were, occupants would be accorded a well-merited reduction in monthly carrying charges and they would obtain some relief in a period of rising costs.

It is my understanding that a surplus of between $7 and $10 million exists in the insurance fund. There is no reason why, if the proposed lower rate can be applied to new co-ops which will be built at higher costs, existing co-ops which have been paying at the one-half of 1 percent rate on lower mortgages cannot acquire the same privilege.

When this question comes up, the proponents have run into the argument that in order for individual mortgages to benefit, the consent of the mortgagee banks would have to be obtained. This it is argued, is because a stated insurance premium rate forms a part of the mortgage contract with the banks. A reluctance to open all the mortgages to renegotiation has prevented acceptance of the legislation. That is what others have been told; that is what I was faced with as I offered the proposal. My legislative aid, Bob Tienken, also has been faced with this reasoning and has been trying to effectuate an answer.

Here again, working together with your able brains in this field—I should mention Si Gallett again—sound basis has been found to refute this contention. We are convinced that this matter of contract renegotiation is a misunderstanding and that, in fact, the co-op mortgages, in the main, only refer to the mortgagors paying each month, one-twelfth of the annual premium. As a result, it is possible to enact legislation which does not refer to obtaining the consent of mortgagees, but which need only state that the rate of one-quarter of 1 percent will be applicable to existing cooperatives after the date of passage of the Housing Act of 1959. The rate is a matter of interest to the mortgagors and the FHA, and legislative change in the rate is all that should be required. It would not be made retroactive but only apply to premium payments by existing co-ops as of the passage of the 1959 act.

The second issue affecting carrying charges for owners of existing co-ops relates to the application to existing mortgages of the pending provisions for the establishment of mutual insurance funds. Under the pending legislation the excellent mortgage amortization experience of co-ops would be pooled, and return insurance premiums paid back to owners over a period of time. The proposed bill provides, however, that the consent of the mortgagees must be obtained if existing mortgages are to participate in the new funds. This might delay or prevent existing co-ops from sharing in the benefits of the mutual funds. On the reasoning which I have presented as to the relationship of the mortgagors and mortgagees concerning inclusion of references to the insurance fund in the mortgage contracts, I do not believe that consent of the mortgagees is necessary in this regard either. Again, the question of insurance would seem to be of interest to the mortgagors and the FHA, and thus, since contract renegotiation is not necessary, the requirement for consent of the mortgagees can be stricken from the pending legislation.

New legislation is being prepared (a) to provide for broadening the open-ending possibility; (b) for extending the one-quarter of 1 percent to existing co-ops, on which I am working closely with Congressmen HOLTZMAN and FINO, two of the pioneers in this field; and (c) for deleting and reference to the consent of mortgagees when existing co-ops join the mutual insurance funds. And I will continue to press the committee to consider the other legislation that I outlined earlier and which, I was assured, would be given full review.

If such additions can be made to the pending omnibus housing legislation I believe that the greatest benefit will accrue to both existing and future co-ops.

I thank you for this opportunity to discuss certain features of the pending legislation. It has been a real pleasure to me to be present with you. I want to again thank all my friends in the cooperative housing movement who have given me wise advice and counsel and who are helping me in my efforts, Paul Golz, Si Gallett, Gerry Meyers, Bernie Walpin. My appreciation and profound thanks to you, Wallace Campbell, for giving me this privilege to be with you.

I want you and all those who are interested in cooperative housing to know that my door in the House Office Building is always open to you, and that my aid, Bob Tienken, my staff, and myself are always ready to work with you in this good fight.

I assure you that it is a real pleasure to be with you, and I hope that the word "cooperative" will also be descriptive of my own endeavors in this extremely important field.

## Observations on Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, some very interesting and provocative observations on civil defense are contained in a letter written by Mr. Keith Hook of Hartford, Conn., to the Director of Civil Defense in that city.

The opinions expressed by Mr. Hook might well be studied by us all, for they refer to a situation which might occur though we hope it never does.

Here is the text of Mr. Hook's letter:

THE CONNECTICUT MUTUAL
LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
*Hartford, Conn., March 9, 1959.*

DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE,
*City of Hartford,*
*Hartford, Conn.*

DEAR SIR: The new civil defense plan to send workers home on 1 hour's notice of an air raid appears to be a plan for mass slaughter and utter confusion. With people working staggered hours, we now have considerable traffic congestion. What would it be like with everyone in a hurry—full of fear and panic—and much more traffic on the streets. And suppose minutes after such a signal there is signaled take cover because of missiles launched from Soviet submarines off the Atlantic Coast which could reach Hartford in a matter of minutes from the time of launching? It would take days to recover from the chaos even if the missile never struck. And when these people get home, what shelter or protection do they have? The protection afforded by public buildings, offices and industrial plants is substantially greater than that afforded by residential homes.

Presumably, an air raid would occur only if there is a war with all the restrictions and shortages, and demands for production which go with it. With missiles traveling at the rate of 1,000 to 2,000 miles an hour, anything coming across the Arctic to a target east of the Rockies would presumably necessitate a tactical alert for the entire area. One or two of these a day, if this is followed throughout the country, would confuse and disrupt production and demoralize community life in general.

This plan would seem to indicate the total bankruptcy of our entire civil-defense thinking. By us, I mean everybody—the Civil Defense officials are merely the butt of it. It starts with the President, the Department of Defense, and Congress on down. I am not aware that any Federal buildings are being constructed with any shelter provisions. One doubts whether military installations generally have much in the way of shelter provisions and one believes that no provision has been made for the dependents of military personnel even those living on the base. Apparently the Department of Defense has the idea that a few Nike installations and air defense wings are sufficient, and that no passive civilian defense measures are important. This is like teaching a soldier how to fire a gun but not how to dig a trench or foxhole and take advantage of cover.

The only sound plan would appear to be to seek shelter at the point each person happens to find himself. All new construction should make some provision for shelters—at least new public buildings, office buildings and industrial plants. The use of a small percentage of the construction costs of this purpose could provide much more protection than would otherwise be afforded where such a problem is not considered.

I think the public should be informed of the thinking and reasons behind this decision for a tactical alert so that the public itself can weigh the pros and cons.

Very truly yours,

KEITH HOOK.

## Editorials Back American Bar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I place in the RECORD the report of the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives of the American Bar Association whose recommendations were adopted overwhelmingly by the American Bar Association at its Chicago meeting.

The Cincinnati Enquirer on March 2, 1959, and the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph on February 25, 1959, commented editorially on the action of the American Bar Association. These are excellent editorials which I feel should be read by every Member of the Congress. I am therefore inserting them in the RECORD:

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Feb. 25, 1959]

PLUG THEM UP

The governors of the American Bar Association have endorsed a report of a special committee on communism, which we consider of primary importance.

It calls on Congress to plug up technical loopholes upon which disturbing Supreme Court decisions have been based, and which "have had the effect * * * of freeing the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation."

This is no scatter-gun attack. In fact, the committee recognizes the Supreme Court and an independent judiciary, the "ultimate guardians of our bill of rights and the protectors of our freedom."

What concerns it is that decisions have "encouraged an increase in Communist activities." The concern, in other words, is the same as the Hearst newspapers have expressed often.

It is that Supreme Court decisions have sacrificed the rights of the community for protection against subversion by excessive

attention to the rights of individuals. Both rights must be kept in balance.

In this connection the resignation of Chief Justice Warren from the bar association, reportedly in anticipation of and protest against the report, can only strengthen the committee's case.

The report makes these specific recommendations:

Give States clear authority to enforce their own laws against subversion.

Empower the Secretary of State to withhold passports from subversives.

Clarify the Smith Act against conspiring to teach or advocate the overthrow of our Government.

Apply the Federal employees security program to so-called nonsensitive as well as sensitive jobs.

Tighten immigration laws for deportation of Communists.

We support them all and we hope Congress gets to work on them without delay.

---

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Mar. 2, 1959]

SUPREME COURT ON TRIAL

It's a rare and significant event when the representatives of 200,000 American lawyers register a scathing criticism of the U.S. Supreme Court and call upon Congress to remedy what the Court has done. Yet precisely that happened at the midwinter meeting of the American Bar Association House of Delegates at Chicago.

What aroused the lawyers' indignation and concern was a long series of Supreme Court rulings—24 in all—involving accused Communists or antisubversive legislation. For many months a special committee of the ABA on Communist tactics and strategy has been studying those rulings in the light of the internal threat from Communist and Communist-front groups. The committee has concluded that the majority rulings have been consistently and dangerously easy on the Communists.

"Many cases," says the committee report, which was given overwhelming approval at Chicago, "have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States." The net result is a paralysis of our internal security, resulting from the Court's reliance upon technicalities which play into the hands of the Reds—whose aim, of course, is to destroy our whole judicial process.

This is not the first evidence of concern in sound and experienced American legal minds. The conference of State chief justices last year felt compelled to call upon the U.S. Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial self-restraint in dealing with subversion cases. There have, too, been frequent dissenting opinions, worded in language suggestive of alarm.

The most telling sidelight on this controversy was the action of the ABA house of delegates last week in accepting the resignation of Chief Justice Earl Warren, fountainhead of the go-easy trend in Court rulings on subversion cases.

What is now to be done about it? The ABA delegates recommended that, wherever there are reasonable grounds to believe that as a result of Court decisions internal security is weakened. Congress should step in and pass laws to seal up the leaks. Specifically, they demanded that State laws against a sedition should have enforcement powers concurrent with Federal laws. The Court has held that antisedition laws are the exclusive province of the Federal Government.

A State has little chance, of course, against a Federal Supreme Court bent upon a certain course of action. But Congress can pass laws to undo the effects of wrong-headed Court rulings. And if a Court arbitrarily rules such laws unconstitutional, the people can adopt a constitutional amendment.

In one way or another, and legally, the internal security of this Nation must be preserved. The blunt fact is that that security has been weakened by judicial misguidance at the highest level and it is time to call a halt.

---

## Balance Budget for Bright Economy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to enclose part of the transcript of a television program filed February 27, 1959, for presentation over KOMO–TV, Seattle, Wash., and KVOS–TV, Bellingham, Wash.

The program is an interview between myself and Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. I believe Dr. Saulnier's remarks are of interest not only to the citizens of my own Second Congressional District of Washington, but also to all citizens of this land.

The transcript follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVE JACK WESTLAND AND DR. RAYMOND J. SAULNIER

Mr. WESTLAND. Practically everybody is interested in the future economy of the country and just what it holds for us in the way of economic development. I have been getting a lot of letters from people in my district and from people outside my district, talking about this budget we have, whether or not it should be balanced, and about our economy in general.

I believe that this subject is important and people all over the country are interested in it. In order to bring some discussion of this matter to you, I have as my guest today, Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, better known among his friends as Steve. Steve is chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President. Maybe, he'll be able to answer some of the questions that I'll ask here. Steve, it's good to have you on this program with me.

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I'm delighted to be here. It's a flattering invitation.

Mr. WESTLAND. Tell me, just what is the Council of Economic Advisers, and what is its relationship to the President?

Mr. SAULNIER. The Council is a body set up by law—set up in the Employment Act of 1946. That means the Council has been in operation now for 12 years. Our job is to follow developments in the economy, to keep the President informed, and to work with the administration generally, appraising the impact of legislation and administrative actions on the economy and on jobs and income.

* * * * *

Mr. WESTLAND. The President has recently made a statement, Steve, that this last recession—the 1958 recession—was the sharpest and the shortest one we've ever had in history. Just how sharp was it and how long do you feel it lasted?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I think I'd want to correct that just a bit. We've had some sharper ones but we've had very few shorter ones. This is not to say that it wasn't a sharp recession, because it did fall off very quickly, beginning about the middle of 1957 and continuing through for about 9 months. We hit a boom, so to speak, in April. Now that's a very short recession by most of our historical experience.

* * * * *

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, do you feel that it is over now?

Mr. SAULNIER. I don't think that there is any question about that, in the sense that we are on a recovery path. The fact of the matter is we, certainly, in terms of production, have recovered by now the ground that was lost. In terms of employment we have recovered a bit less than the full amount of the ground that was lost.

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, that was one thing I want to discuss just a little bit later, Steve. But, now, this was one recession where we came out of it without any of these tremendous Federal programs. Remember, we had many recommendations or suggestions for sort of another WPA program, a tremendous building program which we avoided. We did do some things, but how do you account for this recovery without those other types of Government intervention?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I think fundamentally the most important feature of the recession and recovery was the fact that sales at retail stores through the country stayed up very well throughout the recession. There was a remarkably small drop in sales and that meant confidence was maintained and recovery came fairly quickly. Now, this is not to say that there weren't some industries that were badly hit—the automobile, for example.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes, you're right. The lumber industry, for example, in the Pacific Northwest was hit quite badly, Steve, because the fact is, I think, that we only built about 900,000 homes in 1957.

Mr. SAULNIER. In 1957, but, I'm glad to say that's pretty much as, let us say, we expected. The building industry was one of the first to pick up and the pickup has been, as you know, very substantial. I certainly hope that we can continue a high level of building through the rest of this year and 1960.

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, actually, we've gotten off into home building and that's a real important thing in the Pacific Northwest, of course, to the lumber industry as a whole. I think we built pretty close to 1,200,000 homes, wasn't it, in 1958?

Mr. SAULNIER. That's correct, and we now are operating at a level a little bit better than 1,300,000.

Mr. WESTLAND. A million three hundred thousand?

Mr. SAULNIER. At the present time. And we are hopeful that that can be continued. I can assure you one of the things we have tried to do in Government has been to maintain a high rate of home building and there is hardly anything that has a more beneficial effect throughout the economy generally.

Mr. WESTLAND. That's right. The ramifications of it are tremendous. It gets not only into our lumber, of course, but also into all of the utilities and so many other things.

Mr. SAULNIER. That is correct. Then there is another aspect of it. And that is, we like to see homes being built.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes, we like that, too. Steve, I think it was a week or so ago a professor at one of the universities, was talking about inflation. I believe he said that 3 percent inflation was creeping inflation, but that 5 percent inflation was galloping inflation. Now it is pretty hard for me to distinguish between these two. I'm basically opposed to any kind of inflation. But do you feel that we must have inflation if we're going to have this so-called full employment?

Mr. SAULNIER. No, I don't think so at all. I not only do not think that we need to have it in order to have full employment, but what is even more important, if we get into an inflationary period, we're just not going to have full employment. I feel very strongly about this. We can't sustain economic growth over a long period of higher levels if we are indulging in an inflationary spree.

Mr. WESTLAND. Why?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, there isn't any such thing, really, you know as a moderate or creeping inflation. It starts at a low rate and that in itself will tend to pick up, feed on itself. This encourages all kinds of developments in the economy that at some point come to a crisis. Then you have disaster. What we want to do is to avoid that and have steady sustainable growth.

Mr. WESTLAND. What can we do here, say my job as Congressman, and others in the same area that you're in, to try to prevent inflation, Steve?

Mr. SAULNIER. There are a lot of things we can do, and as a government, many things. Now there's a program, that we think will promote steady growth and high employment and will avoid inflation, put forward by the President. It is spelled out in some detail in the Economic Report of the President which he sends to Congress every year, and sent in January. The cornerstone of that, I can tell you, for the Government, in my judgment, is a balanced budget.

Mr. WESTLAND. Just how important is a balanced budget?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I think it's vitally important, not only just for technical, economic reasons, the sort of reasons as economist can spell out for you in some detail. There's a psychological factor as well, and I think that at this time a balanced budget would do more for the psychology of Americans and for people around the world than any other single thing that government can do.

Mr. WESTLAND. Well, it's good to hear you say that, Steve, because that certainly repeats the feeling I've had for a long time. We're getting some brickbats thrown at us, such as you can't meet the enemy with a balanced budget. But it does seem to me that unless a country, as well as an individual, lives within its income it can go broke just as it happened in France or in Germany in the extreme. It could happen, I suppose, here.

Mr. SAULNIER. Of course, it could happen and we don't want that to happen. It is perfectly possible, as the President has shown, to have an adequate defensive budget within the framework of an overall balance, and that is the kind of budget which we have presented.

Mr. WESTLAND. Steve, the cost-of-living index has been remaining pretty stable for about the last 8 or 9 months. This is real important, Steve, to people who are retired or are trying to live on social security or their own pension plans. Is this balanced budget going to affect that or is it going to help keep it on a level keel?

Mr. SAULNIER. I think it will. I know it will. Of course, we're pretty grateful that it has been stable now for 8 or 9 months. I honestly believe that the outlook for some time ahead is for stable prices in general. On the other hand, we can upset this. One of the ways to upset it, in my judgment, is to engage in a level Federal spending that is not needed in terms of the needs of our country and is not matched by necessary revenues.

Mr. WESTLAND. Steve, in 30 seconds can you tell me what you see for the future economic wealth of this country?

Mr. SAULNIER. Well, I think the future is very good. Quite sincerely, I think the outlook for the rest of this year is good. We've had a good recovery so far and it is my own feeling that 1960 is even better.

Mr. WESTLAND. Thank you, Steve, that's good news and thanks very much for having been on this program with me.

## Statemaker: Leo William O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] received a most deserved recognition from the New York Times in their issue of Friday, March 13, 1959, for the magnificent part he has played in the struggle for statehood for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. The great contribution which he has made will, of course, be written clearly and bright in history's pages of this era. In order that his many friends and associates may have the opportunity and pleasure of reading the profile written in the Times, I take pleasure in having it inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMAKER: LEO WILLIAM O'BRIEN

WASHINGTON, March 12.—A small, gray-haired, quick-witted, easy-going dynamo who likes to refer to himself as "one of the laziest men alive" has nonetheless found sufficient energy to pilot two new States into the Union.

Last summer Representative LEO WILLIAM O'BRIEN did it with Alaska. Today he did it with Hawaii. In both cases the task was made relatively easy by the intensive work done by the Albany Democrat in his capacity as chairman of the House Interior Subcommittee on Territories.

To hear the 58-year-old Representative tell the story, it all came about because "basically I'm a lazy guy, and I figured that if I got rid of enough Territories by making them States I wouldn't have so much work to do in my subcommittee."

But there are other, more serious motives:

"I have five grandchildren," he says. "They're coming along faster than the States are—and, well, when they read their history— books about the 49th and 50th States coming into the Union—they're going to have to give some thought to the old man. How many other Congressmen have that assurance?"

Statehood for these two long-hopeful Territories became something of a personal challenge to Representative O'BRIEN when he was first assigned to the Territories subcommittee 7 years ago.

The then-chairman, now Senator, CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, told him, "These are your babies."

"There was something about the way he said it," Representative O'BRIEN recalls, "that sounded sort of like, 'nobody else wants to be bothered with 'em, so you worry about 'em.' I decided I'd see what I could do."

The man who was to play such a major part in expanding the Union was born in Buffalo, N.Y., on September 21, 1900, attended St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute, Mount St. Joseph School, and Niagara University, from which he was graduated with a B.A. degree in 1922.

Unlike many a Member of Congress who says dreamily, "I was a newspaperman myself, once," on the basis of a few summers on the hometown weekly, Representative O'BRIEN can say it with reason. For 30 years he was a working newspaperman. He was a correspondent in Albany for International News Service and represented the New York Times there.

From 1935 to 1952, when he was elected to the 82d Congress to succeed the late Representative William T. Byrne, he served on the Albany Port District Commission.

Representative O'BRIEN is married to the former Mabel Jean of Cambridge, Mass. They have two children, Robert and Mary.

## Aid to Haiti Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the New York Times:

AID TO HAITI OPPOSED—MAINTENANCE OF REGIME DECLARED NO SOLUTION TO ISLAND'S PROBLEMS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The policy of the State Department as reported in the New York Times on February 26 to extend financial and diplomatic support to the government of Dr. François Duvalier of Haiti is incomprehensible. In the light of recent Latin American and Caribbean developments this support can only raise extremely serious difficulties for the United States in the future. The reasons purportedly given that Dr. Duvalier's overthrow would lead to chaos and that his alleged incongruous opponents are united only in their ambition to gain power are both false and misleading.

It is the dictatorship of Dr. Duvalier, backed by his secret police and the army, following his fraudulent election in the summer of 1957 that has presently created political chaos and financial bankruptcy. To try to maintain this regime by loans and other grants-in-aid may possibly aid existing conditions but cannot solve the Haitian problem in the future. For even were Dr. Duvalier to finish his term, he must sooner or later surrender his power. His successors, who already represent at least two-thirds of the Haitian people, will surely be among those now opposing him.

Moreover, to denigrate his three leading political opponents by challenging their good intentions to establish a functioning democracy flies in the face of any intelligent foreign policy. Also to rest a program of support of a dictatorship upon the alleged political incongruity of the Duvalier opposition is, to say the least, bizarre when it is considered that there are such disparate elements in the Democratic Party, for example, as Senator EASTLAND and Senator HUMPHREY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LOAN

A question may also be raised as to the manner in which this policy has been arrived at. It was preceded by and followed closely the announcement by a group of American economic and financial advisers to the Haitian Government that the Economic Cooperation Administration had made available a loan of $6 million. Undoubtedly the State Department and other Federal agencies have been contacted by public relations and economic experts representing the Haitian

Government in connection with this and other matters. It therefore seems unusual that this U.S. Government loan is first announced by the borrowing country's private agents rather than by the officials of our Government.

It is to be hoped that there will be a reconsideration of the implications of the policy to shore up the Duvalier regime, and that there will result a policy more in keeping with the lessons we should have learned from our recent Latin American experiences.

CLIFFORD FORSTER.

NEW YORK, March 2, 1959.

## Reuniting of Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include my statement issued in connection with a bill I introduced on March 11, 1959, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the reuniting of families:

TO FACILITATE REUNITING OF FAMILIES

On March 11, 1959, I introduced a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to grant nonquota status to certain immigrants who are brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters of American citizens. These close of kin are classified under the fourth preference quota section of the act, and it is unjust and inhumane to prevent them from being reunited with their families. One of the cardinal principles of our immigration laws should be to facilitate the reuniting of families.

Fourth preference visas can be issued only when deficiencies occur in the first, second, and third preferences, which are allotted 100 percent of the quota. It is unjust to permit American citizens to file petitions for their brothers, sisters, sons, or daughters, granting them approval and then let them pile up in a huge backlog at the American consulates abroad without the hope of any visas being issued.

There are approximately 100,000 petitions on file and many of these were filed as far back as 10 years ago. The petitioners have been waiting hopelessly for many years to be reunited with their parents, brothers, or sisters. In Italy, for example, there isn't a single available quota for the fourth preference group nor is it contemplated that there will be one for many, many years to come. This is true of Poland, Hungary, Spain, Greece, Portugal, and many other countries. The consulate in Iraq is now processing applications filed in 1946 and applications from Turkey are presently being processed which were first filed in 1945. It is estimated that there is a backlog of some 100,000 people who daily crowd the offices of our consulates abroad and unless this conversion is made from quota to nonquota, the number will grow and the pressure will increase.

This backlog is due primarily to our national origin quota system which gives such pitifully small quotas to the countries of southern Europe and Asia and gives to Great Britain 65,360 of our total annual quota of 152,000. Yet Britain uses only 10 percent of this alloted quota and the rest is wasted.

To rectify this inequity of opportunity, I therefore introduced a bill which, following the precedent established by the act of September 11, 1957, will provide for the conversion of the fourth preference category registered up to July 1, 1959 to nonquota immigrant status. It is my considered opinion that this is the just and humane thing to do in the interest of the United States.

## We Can Go Broke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Peoria Journal Star of March 8, 1959, entitled "We Can Go Broke":

WE CAN GO BROKE

Numerical symbols expressing the national debt and annual Federal spending no longer correspond with anything in human experience. Such amounts are beyond our ability to imagine. Maybe that's why Americans seem to feel that the Nation can't go broke. But they are wrong. Governments can go broke. The danger sign is weakening credit.

A recent offering of 3-year Government bonds at 4 percent failed by $2 billion to be taken. The Treasury had to issue short-term paper for the difference.

One editorial comment was: "Worried officials pointed out that short-term paper is much the same as printing-press money. The issuance of it has the effect of turning $2 billion of unbacked currency into the money supply."

A business publication commented: "Where there is aversion to a Government 3-year obligation at 4 percent, the technical financial position of the Government debt service does not seem too healthy."

Governor Williams of Michigan is a believer, like Leon Keyserling and Walter Reuther, of freer government spending. Michigan has gone broke, flat broke. Because it was unable to meet its payrolls or pay its bills, some Michigan industries prepaid $35 million in taxes. This, we understand, enabled the State to pay some employees who had received no checks since last November.

Doubtless the day is coming when other States will go broke. One major reason for this is that Federal taxation takes dollars while States are collecting dimes.

The Federal tax collector also makes the financing of local governments difficult. We pointed out not long ago that Peoria County's share of just the interest on the national debt runs into millions of dollars a year.

The national debt has increased $12 billion in the last 10 years. At the same time, the total debt of local governments has increased $32 billion. The total State and local government debt now is more than $50 billion. Add this to the national debt and you get a figure around one-third of a trillion dollars. And the total is still going up. Is anybody foolish enough to believe that there is no limit?

The United States can go broke, of course. We are well on our way when the dollar depreciates by more than 50 percent in 20 years.

What can we do? We can do what any prudent family would do on the brink of bankruptcy, start living within our income and paying off our debt.

We certainly can't do it, as today's Alice-in-Wonderland economists urge, by going further into debt.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 37

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Boston, Mass., Globe on September 24, 1957, discussing water in the United States.

Some remarks there discussed how one river along the once beautiful Ohio is affected by pollution. That article tells of the Ohio River in the following language:

When the Ohio River is flowing at minimum stage, one quart of every gallon of water flowing through the faucets of Cincinnati has been through someone's toilet or a kitchen sink upstream, or through a mine dump or industrial plant.

This situation we find everywhere in this country and, indeed, it will get worse rather than better with our population growing at the most rapid rate in history.

If we are to leave a land where our children can have pure water we must take vigorous action now to clean up the filth that we dump in our streams.

The article from the Boston Globe follows:

RIVER TAPPED FOR DRINKING WATER SO POLLUTED FISH CAN'T LIVE

(By Sidney Goldberg)

When the Ohio River is flowing at minimum stage, one quart of every gallon of water flowing through the faucets of Cincinnati has been through someone's toilet or kitchen sink upstream—or through a mine dump or industrial plant.

The Ohio at such times is more like an open sewer than a river, and the disease possibilities are limitless. Although this water can be rendered harmless by chlorination, the fact is that Cincinnati has to go through enormous expense because of the sloppy habits of other cities.

This is no strange-as-it-seems example of what is going on in America. It is the common accepted fact.

Most cities enacted legislation decades ago to stop people from tossing their garbage into the streets. As far as the cities themselves are concerned, however, they toss their mountainous supply of waste products into America's rivers or streams without so much as a warning.

The Nation's Capital, indeed, is in the thick of it. The Potomac is so overloaded with sewage, largely human waste, that around Washington it is carpeted with garbage to a depth of several feet.

Many of America's rivers and streams have become so polluted that even the fish have died. Some river bottoms are lined for miles with coal dust, others with animal or vegetable wastes, which combine with so much oxygen in the water that fish can no longer breathe.

The latest count shows that there are 16,000 community water supply systems in the United States—but only about 9,000 sewage disposal plants. This means that 7,000 communities have no sewage disposal or purification systems whatsoever. Their system is a simple one: merely throwing their garbage—well beyond the city limits, of course—into the river that will carry it downstream to the next town. Very likely, the next city will do the same thing.

Industry is affected as much as the public by this defacing of America's rivers. Some industrial processes require water that is as pure—or purer than drinking water.

But industry, besides needing it clean, needs it cool. Yet water that is piped through factories to cool off the machinery and the water emerges pretty hot.

The Merrimack, lined from Manchester, N.H., to Lowell and Lawrence, Mass., by scores of industrial plants gets as hot as 110° during the summer.

The Mahoning River flowing through Youngstown, Ohio, is an extreme example. Water used by the steel industry for cooling is used sometimes as many as 10 times and on occasion this has raised the temperature of the river to 140°. Recent construction of reservoirs along the river has solved this problem somewhat, but expansion possibilities are limited in the area.

The Merrimack and the Mahoning, one might say, are relatively small rivers and can be overheated rapidly. But as industry moves south and west even the mightiest streams will start sizzling. The Atomic Energy Commission's plant at Hanford, Wash., for instance, casts off enough heat to raise the temperature of the whole Columbia River by one degree. And the atomic age is just beginning.

Because of pollution and heat, there is far less usable water in America's lakes and streams than one thinks. The logical answer is for every city and industrial plant to clean up its sewage through purification processes and then use it again before it accumulates and does serious damage to the life of the rivers.

Somehow Americans can't get used to the idea of drinking their own sewage, even after purification. They much prefer to go right on purifying other peoples' sewage and drinking it down heartily.

But a start is being made. In August 1956, New York City announced it would spend $225,000 to try to clean all its surrounding waters of sewage by 1965.

The Ohio Water Pollution Control Board has spent $200 million for municipal sewage disposal facilities since 1952, especially between Cincinnati and East Liverpool.

Factories are beginning to clean up too. When Kaiser set up a plant in Fontana, Calif., it installed a recirculation system that uses partially treated municipal sewage as a coolant. General Motors' new refinery at Ferndale, Wash., releases an affluent so thoroughly clean that salmon have been caught 100 yards below the sewage outlet.

Most towns, however, are wary of forcing antipollution measures on factories out of fear that the plants will pack up and move to a less prudish municipality.

The U.S. Public Health Service estimated in 1955 that, merely to keep pace with increasing pollution, the Nation's cities would have to spend at least $500 million every year for the next 10 years. By doing so, our rivers wouldn't be any cleaner—but at least we would be able to hold the line against further damage.

Until we start spending even more on this mammoth clean-up project, however, Public Health officials will continue characterizing many American streams as sewers a thousand miles long.

## The Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of this body to this statement in the March 1959 Monthly Review published by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York:

Total output and incomes have been expanding strongly so far in 1959. However, even measured by the most optimistic data, the accompanying recovery in employment has been disappointing compared with that achieved during the previous postwar business upswings. Unemployment, moreover, is still high for a period at which production is on the verge of, or even at, an all-time peak. A considerable further expansion of demand and output will be required to bring down the unemployment rate to its prerecession level.

This paragraph is the summation of a discussion of measurements of the business situation. I commend it to the reading of the House and I would respectfully emphasize that this unemployment problem remains one of the two most significant problems facing the Nation today.

## Preservation of Gettysburg Battlefield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Pennsylvania is justifiably proud of its part in our history.

It is just as proud of the historic sites and landmarks that punctuate this history with lasting monuments.

The senate of that great State has passed a memorializing resolution, calling upon its Members in Congress to give their full support to any proposal in the U.S. Congress that will help in the preservation of one of these great monuments, the battlefield at Gettysburg, Pa.

I submit for the benefit of non-Pennsylvanians a copy of this resolution:

RESOLUTION

The battlefield of Gettysburg is one of the most sacred historic shrines in Pennsylvania and the United States as the scene of the great battle on July 1 to 3, 1863, which marked the turning point in the Civil War.

As the result of the initiative of Gov. Andrew G. Curtin, of Pennsylvania, and of other northern Governors, the site of the battle became a national cemetery and park which eventually passed into the care of the Federal Government.

The plans for the continuing development of the Gettysburg National Military Park which calls for the eventual inclusion in the park of the entire area where the battle was fought are seriously threatened by commercial enterprises which are stimulated by the volume of visitors to the park: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby recommends to the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress that they support any legislation and appropriations which will protect the environs of the battlefield of Gettysburg from encroachment by commercial enterprises and housing which may prevent the full and complete development of Gettysburg National Military Park by the National Park Service; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each U.S. Senator and Congressman from Pennsylvania.

## Hemingway Has Great Hope for Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of March 9, 1959:

HEMINGWAY HAS GREAT HOPE FOR CASTRO
(By Emmett Watson)

SUN VALLEY, IDAHO, March 9.—It was early afternoon and the bright, high sun was melting the snow to slush on the walk to the Challenger Inn. The skiers were on the slopes and the village was nearly empty.

This was a good day for skiing. But the figure coming down the main walk on the west side of the village was unmistakable—tall, white-bearded, with steel-rimmed spectacles.

We had met Ernest Hemingway two nights before and he remembered. We went inside to a place called the Ram for a drink. The mountains would always be there, but a chance to talk with Hemingway doesn't come with every show.

We talked about Cuba and the Castro revolution—the first time Hemingway has commented on this historic event for any American newspaper.

Hemingway, 59, who has fought in two wars, observed firsthand the Franco revolution in Spain and has written about all three, called the Cuban uprising against dictator Fulgencio Batista the first revolution in Cuba that really is a revolution.

Hemingway said he has "great hope for the Castro movement."

Hemingway now lives in Ketchum, Idaho, with his wife, Mary. He is busy finishing his latest novel in Sun Valley.

The famed American novelist has lived much of his recent life in Cuba. "To Have and Have Not," a hard bitten but compassionate book, begun in 1933 and finished in 1936, had its setting in Cuba and part of it was written there. "The Old Man and the Sea," his most recent success, has as its central character an aging Cuban fisherman.

"I believe in the cause of the Cuban people," he said, during the relaxed hour-long talk. "They have had changes in government before in Cuba. But these were just changes of the guard. When the new ones got in, they went right on stealing from the people."

Hemingway, who has won both the Pulitzer and Nobel prizes for literature that spanned the past 30 years, spoke intently of Cuba.

"Some of Batista's officials and police officers were good, honest men," he said. "But a lot of them were thieves, sadists, and torturers. They tortured kids, sometimes so badly they would have to kill them."

Hemingway described how the bodies were found—horribly mutilated. He catalogued in unprintable details the methods of torture used by Batista police. He described the graft and corruption.

"These trials and executions are necessary," Hemingway said. "If the government doesn't shoot these people, they will be killed for vengeance. The result would be personal vendettas in every village and town."

Hemingway said the Castro movement depended, in large part, on its promise to the Cuban people that Batista men, responsible for atrocities, would be punished.

"The Government has to carry out its promises," he said. "There was a lot of criticism over the shooting of Batista officials.

"But the Government had to show it was in control, to give people a respect for law and order."

Hemingway talked of the Cuban revolution with scarcely a pause. He went on:

"When the executions are over, I believe the Government should ban capital punishment. Shooting a man is not necessarily the right punishment."

Hemingway said he believed the Cuban labor laws, under Batista, were good. "But the unions were closed to a lot of workers. Others couldn't get in. They were closed, and a lot of people couldn't work. They were actually going hungry."

He spoke of returning soon to Cuba to live. "Cuba has been good to Americans," he said. "It's a wonderful place to live."

Hemingway sipped his Scotch and lime slowly; his working day was over and he seemed relaxed and happy.

The huge, roughly-dressed writer has become a legend in Sun Valley, where he has lived, intermittently, since the early days of the village, and where he wrote parts ("the parts with snow in it") of "For Whom the Bell Tolls."

He loves to fish and hunt with a few close friends, or with an occasional visiting celebrity.

He said he works in the mornings, writing in longhand, and that his new book is nearly completed. Almost apologetically, he refused to discuss it.

"If you talk about it," he explained, "you lose it. Something happens to it."

Hemingway is slimmer and much older than when he wrote "Green Hills of Africa." But if someone asked him, as Kandisky did, "and what do you want?" he would still reply, as he did in 1935, "To write as well as I can and learn as I go along. At the same time I have my life which I enjoy and which is a damned good life."

## H.R. 5464: A Bill Providing for a Patent-in-Fee-Simple Covering Rosebud Tribal Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation similar to H.R. 5468, directing the Indian Department through the Secretary of Interior to issue a patent-in-fee-simple to Bartley M. Mills, covering Rosebud tribal land he should receive in exchange for deeded land.

In this instance Mr. Mills made application for trade with the Rosebud Tribe in 1950. At that time both tracts of land were appraised at equal value by Indian Bureau appointed appraisers. Mr. Mills proposed to exchange 160 acres of his land in Todd County for 80 acres of tribal land located in Tripp County.

On January 10, 1950, Mr. Mills conveyed his patented land to the United States in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe. The deed was recorded in the register of deeds office in Tripp County on September 20, 1950. Since that time the Rosebud Sioux Tribe has had title to Mr. Mills' 160-acre tract, has collected lease rentals from both pieces of land, and Mr. Mills has been waiting to receive title for the N½NW¼ S. 32, T. 100 N., R. 75 W., Fifth Principal Meridian, in Tripp County, S. Dak., which is the land he was to receive for his land.

Both tracts of land have been off the tax list since 1950. The local governments have been deprived of tax revenues from both tracts. All steps in the transaction have been handled and approved by the Department. There is no excuse for the delay other than abnormal Bureau redtape.

The transaction was never completed, however, and on March 5, 1958, the Rosebud Sioux Tribe adopted a resolution disapproving all exchanges involving tribal lands.

## Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, March 12, 1959:

BERLIN

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The United States, Great Britain, France, and Soviet Russia are in Berlin as an act of war because they defeated Hitler and conquered Germany. Germany itself came to be divided into two parts, East Germany and West Germany. East Germany developed into a satellite of Soviet Russia, a part of the Soviet universal state; West Germany developed into a free country, rich, effective, competitive in world markets with Great Britain and the United States.

No peace treaty has ever been arranged with Germany because there can be no agreement as to which of these two is Germany. Therefore World War II never ended in Europe.

Since the end of World War II as a fighting phase of a continuous war since 1914, various attempts have been made to find a formula for uniting the two Germanys but all such efforts have failed. The fact is that whereas West Germany can speak for itself in the voice of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, the voice for East Germany comes from the Kremlin in Moscow and its owner is Nikita Khrushchev.

Errors were made during World War II at Yalta and Potsdam in the determination of the fate of Germany on the assumption that Soviet Russia was a loyal ally which sought the same kind of a peaceful world that the West sought. The imperialistic characteristics of Soviet Russia were not identified, with the result that today, 14 years later, the question of Berlin and of the unification of Germany is still before us and may lead to world war III.

Two courses are open to the United States:

1. Berlin and West Germany can be abandoned to the imperialistic purpose and strength of Soviet Russia;

2. The United States and its allies can refuse to abandon Berlin and West Germany.

The first course would bring the power of Soviet Russia to the Rhine and France would have to prepare to defend itself from being absorbed in the Soviet Universal State; the second course could lead to a general war involving the United States.

The second course indicates that patience has been exhausted and that the Western world will defend itself; the first course indicates that the West has become obsolescent and gives up under threat.

Eugene Lyons, who is an authority on Russia and a senior editor of the Reader's Digest, said:

"The real enigma is why we who are earmarked for conquest prefer to kid ourselves that communism can somehow be bought off, or contained, or induced to commit suicide by suddenly renouncing global conspiracy and world domination. We behave as if this were a conventional disagreement between nations—a question of territory and markets and colonies, as in the past. But it's nothing of the kind. What's involved is the 'permanent revolution' unleashed by Lenin, promoted with increasing zeal and increasing success by all his successors. And we're doomed to defeat as long as we subsist on political tranquilizers."

This view is absolutely correct. It can only be hoped that it is not too late. Soviet Russia seeks the absorption of the continent of Europe in the Soviet universal state, which would give the Soviet universal state an industrial base unequalled in world history and which would reduce the significance of the United States considerably. In Germany, Soviet Russia would find a hard working, initiating, and imaginative people.

The ultimate target is, of course, the United States, which is the principal stumbling block to Soviet Russia's imperialistic ambitions. The Communists have always held that they can defeat the United States without a fighting war. The mechanism for that is for Soviet Russia to use capitalistic methods to compete with American manufacturers in world markets. In this phase of the cold war, Soviet Russia is progressing rapidly. Secondly, Soviet Russia employs the psychological phases of the cold war to raise our budgets, to stimulate inflationary measures in this country, and a flight of nervous capital to Switzerland, and other tax and money havens.

Khrushchev may retreat from his threats over Berlin but that will be of no significance. He will try in Iran; he will try in Cuba or Venezuela, or Bolivia; he will try in Indonesia. Should Khrushchev fall or die, the same program will be followed.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 39

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to premission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Charleston, S.C. News & Courier of May 29, 1958, entitled "Harbor's Pollution Warning Is Issued."

The waters of Charleston Harbor were described in this article as a "huge dumping ground for tons of raw sewerage daily" which "post a threat of infection to swimmers or persons shellfishing in the harbor area."

This is just another of the prices that Americans in all corners of our land must pay for the filth and sewage which we dump into our waters.

HARBOR'S POLLUTION WARNING IS ISSUED

The waters of Charleston Harbor—a huge dumping group for tons of raw sewerage daily—pose a threat of infection to swimmers or persons shellfishing in the harbor area.

A spokesman for the County Health Department said yesterday that water pollution control studies made in Charleston Harbor indicated harbor waters were polluted by raw sewerage and swimming or shellfishing were not advised. The amount of contamination varies depending on the amount of raw sewerage dumped into the harbor daily, the Health Department said.

He continued that it was not practicable to post warnings on the entire harbor perimiter, but public announcements of the condition were made from time to time.

## Meet the Weintraubs From North and South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO**
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. M. Martin Turpanjian, the president of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, and associate editor of Spotlight magazine, has kindly sent me an article which will be of interest to the membership. The article appeared in a recent issue of the Spotlight magazine, which this year is celebrating its 25th anniversary as the "Bible for Who's Who in New Jersey." Mrs. Conrad Lyons is the editor and publisher.

This article is a fascinating account of two men, one of whom I am privileged to claim as a constituent, with the same name and profession who have carved distinguished records in two different sections of the country. It reads as follows:

MEET THE WEINTRAUBS FROM NORTH AND SOUTH

Two men, same name, same profession, bearing a superficial resemblance to each other, but with an uncanny similarity of handwriting, have written another chapter in the familiar American success story in two different States of the Union.

In New Jersey, Joseph Weintraub is the chief justice. Born in March 1908, the third month of the year has played an important part in his life on two other occasions. March 1943 he was inducted into the Army, from which he was inactivated 3 years later with the grade of captain, Judge Advocate General's Office; and in March 1956 he was appointed judge of the superior court of New Jersey.

An unassuming man, he moves with the quiet dignity the responsibilities of his office entail, but his own charming, considerate, and gracious personality is a powerful force that is immediately felt by all who come into contact with him. He is noted for his courtesy and his kindness both off and on the bench.

One of the youngest men ever to hold the highest office in New Jersey's judicial scale, Weintraub has enjoyed a truly meteoric career.

Educated at Barringer High School, Newark. Bachelor of arts degree, Cornell University. Elected to Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, and Alpha Kappa Delta. Bachelor of laws degree with special honors, Cornell Law School. Editor in chief, Cornell Law Quarterly. Elected to the Order of the Coif. Admitted to New Jersey bar 1930. Counselor 3 years later. Associated continuously in the practice of law with Edward R. McGlynn, Newark, becoming a member of the firm of McGlynn, Weintraub & Stein in 1948. Special assistant to attorney general, 1941–43. New Jersey member, waterfront commission, New York Harbor, 1954. Counsel to the Governor. Appointed to the superior court 1956 (March) and in November 1956 to the supreme court, becoming chief justice August 19, 1957.

Chief Justice Weintraub was a member of the board of editors of the New Jersey Law Journal. He is a member of the American Bar, New Jersey State Bar, Essex Bar, and Judge Advocates Associations. His hobby is golfing, and he is said to be championship material.

His elevation to the highest bench in New Jersey came as no surprise to lawyers who have long recognized that in Joseph Weintraub "law" is personified.

Since the age of 13, when he became an office boy in the law firm to which he finally ascended to full membership, he has lived and breathed Blackstone. His amazingly retentive memory, his long years of study, his extensive headings, and even his travels, have been in the interest of law and law enforcement. He is presently engaged in a program of streamlining the New Jersey courts.

In Florida Joseph Weintraub, lawyer, brilliant, witty, and delightful personality, combined a background of the law, with his knowledge of finance to place himself in the forefront of the South's outstanding citizens.

Born in Waynesboro, Ga., December 10, 1904, he was educated at the University of Virginia, 1922–25; New York University, 1925–26. Admitted to the Florida bar 1927. Admitted to practice U.S. District Court 1927; and before the Supreme Court of the United States in 1937.

He has practiced law in Miami since 1927, and now heads the law firm of Weintraub, Martin & Schwartz.

Among his many other interests are: Organized American Title & Insurance Co., 1936. President since 1940. Director since 1936. Proprietor Cortez Hotel. President and director of Gibson Security Corp. since 1936. President, Equity Fire Insurance Co., Ltd., of Basle, Switzerland, 1951. President, Management Co. Swiss National Insurance Co. Chairman of board South Atlantic Title Insurance Co. Vice chairman of board, Mercantile National Bank of Miami Beach. Director, Metropolitan Bank of Miami. Director, Bank of Hollywood Fla. Director, South Atlantic Mortgage Co. of Miami. Member of Florida and American Bar Associations. Member, American Judicature Society.

A joiner he is a Mason, Elk, Shriner, Rotarian and president of the Westview Country Club and Variety Club.

The Florida Joseph Weintraub is married to the former Hortense Katz, and they have two children Joanne and Michael.

## Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON**
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday and Thursday when H.R. 4221, the Hawaii statehood bill, was before the House, I was unable to be present because of illness. Having been a supporter of such legislation for many years, I regret missing the two votes very much. Had I been able to be present, I would have voted "yea" on the rule for consideration and "yea" on passage of the bill.

I extend my congratulations to the people of Hawaii, and shall hope to visit our 50th State sometime in the not-too-distant future.

## When Pope John Goes to Moscow—That Will Be the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JAMES B. UTT**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following editorial, "When Pope John Goes to Moscow—That Will Be the Day," which appeared in the March 8, 1959, issue of the Indianapolis Sunday Star:

WHEN POPE JOHN GOES TO MOSCOW—THAT WILL BE THE DAY

For 1,000 years the leaders of Irish independence declared they would stand by their principles "until hell freezes over." It was a picturesque way of saying never.

Now we would like to suggest a modern paraphrase: "When Pope John goes to Moscow—that will be the day." It, too, means never.

Nobody in this world expects Pope John to go to Moscow to beg for peace or negotiate for mercy or to plead for cooperation. And why don't they? Because they know that to try to make a deal directly with atheistic murderers, mass killers, unprincipled destroyers of the people's liberties, liars and persecutors of religion would be unthinkable for the Pope, the leader of Catholic Christianity.

This is so because the Pope has taken an inflexible, unchangeable and absolutely firm stand on the question of the existence of God. He does not believe there could be any compromise on that important matter. Any flexibility on that issue would of course destroy the church, the Christian religion and indeed our whole civilization. There can be no coexistence agreement between God and Satan, and you cannot reconcile good with evil. Neither can you reconcile democracy and freedom with communism and slavery.

But if it is unthinkable for the Pope, why is it not for the leaders of Christian nations, of religious peoples, of free institutions? Why does Prime Minister Macmillan trot obligingly off to Moscow at the behest of the evil Khrushchev and permit himself to be slapped in the face with insult and treachery? Why does President Eisenhower even consider going to Moscow or sending Vice President NIXON as his emissary to the Kremlin to receive the same rough treatment? Why does Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, plan a trip to Moscow where he, too, can only expect to be received with calumny and sneers?

Do you know why? Because they are afraid not to go. That is all there is to it. Khrushchev, the dictator of a backward and brutal tyranny, has become like a Roman

emperor in our world, calling in the neighboring kings to be exhibited scornfully to the jeering crowd of onlookers just to prove that he is master of the world.

By these craven missions to Moscow, the leaders of the free world are acting like those European and Asiatic ambassadors who trekked across the Russian plains to the abode of the great khans to grovel and beg for mercy when these Mongol tyrants were sweeping half the world before their murdering cavalrymen. But Khrushchev is no Genghis Khan. Nor is his force so irresistible. As Adm. Arleigh Burke told us the other day, the United States of America has the power to destroy the Soviet Union should Khrushchev trigger an attack. Our Nation is the most powerful nation, with or without allies, in the world.

But power, without the will to use it when necessary, is useless. The British and French discovered this when they faced a daring and rearming Hitler across the Rhine, and ended up with appeasement at Munich and war. The Romans, centuries before them, discovered this when their great and glittering empire was assaulted by the barbarian tribes from the north who coveted their riches. The Babylonians, with their brilliant but decadent civilization, had the same experience when the Assyrians came down like a wolf on the fold, their helmets all gleaming with purple and gold.

Are Americans or Europeans no different from these faded civilizations which have risen to the heights only to die in the depths when they lost their will to independence and freedom from barbarous tyranny? Will we, too, quail before the rough and arrogant barbarian ruler who now tells us that he intends to bury us and all we hold dear?

The Communists in the Soviet Union are openly bent on the destruction of free Europe and the United States. They have told us, as repeatedly as Hitler told his neighbors what he intended to do to them, that they will make us Communist captives if they can. Yet while we still have the power to resist and defeat them, while we have the strength to protect our liberties and secure our nationhood against these terrors, we accept with honor and hospitality Khrushchev's suave and cunning ambassador Mikoyan, the murderer of thousands of Hungarian patriots. The British Prime Minister went on his pilgrimage to Moscow only to be rudely insulted while he was forced to listen to our own leaders being reviled. And still some of our legislators in Washington entertain thoughts of accepting this tyrant's terms for a summit conference and the Berlin seizure, calling it "flexibility." There can be no flexibility when compromise and surrender mean tyranny and slavery.

Flexibility is just a new diplomatic word for cowardly appeasement.

It is better to die on your feet, if you must, than to live on your belly. It is better for the United States to revive its old revolutionary slogan, "Don't Tread on Me," and face the consequences of a brave and determined policy against communism than meanly to give away, a bit at a time, our pride, the liberties of our friends, our treasure, and finally our independence as a nation.

## Greater Safety in the Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Public Health Service in approving a research grant of $79,775 for the Beckley Memorial Hospital at Beckley, W. Va., for studies in cardiopulmonary diseases is a well-deserved recognition of the fine hospital and medical system created by the miners welfare fund.

The Federal grant will go to build and equip a health research laboratory, supplementing existing facilities, for studies in the disease which is prevalent in the West Virginia mining area, much of it being pneumoconiosis presumably related to coal dust.

The facility will provide for biochemical studies, microbiological studies, morphologic pathology with a limited amount of space for animal quarters.

This facility represents another step forward in the program to bring greater safety into the mining industry.

West Virginia University received a grant of $56,328 for equipping a new medical center building, and for this we are very grateful, Mr. Speaker.

## Farm Frustration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Peoria Journal Star of Monday, March 9, 1959, entitled "Farm Frustration":

FARM FRUSTRATION

Pulling up stakes and leaving the country is a pretty drastic way of making a protest but that is what Stanley Yankus, poultry farmer of Cass County, Mich., is preparing to do.

Infuriated at Government collection of a $5,000 fine against him because he ignored wheat acreage controls imposed on him, Yankus has put his farm up for sale and says he is going to Australia.

While we doubt the wisdom of his move—Australia has crop production controls too—we can sympathize with Mr. Yankus' frustration. Had he voluntarily signed up for the wheat production program, it would be different. Then he could have expected to have to abide by acreage allotments set by a control board. Mr. Yankus, however, did not join in the production control program. He received no financial benefits as a result of withholding a certain amount of his acreage from production.

The Yankus case is made more complex by the fact that he didn't place any of the wheat he raised on the market, at least in the form of wheat. He used its as feed for his chickens and the chief commodity produced on his farm was eggs.

The Yankus case demonstrates graphically what happens when a Government engages in a program of crop control. Not only the people who want to join in such a program and receive recompense for withholding acreage from production have to accept controls. So do those who ask no aid and want no part of the program. The whole idea of free enterprise is throttled by such a program.

On top of everything else, acreage controls are ineffective, anyway. Some farmers get paid for withholding certain amounts of land from production, then raise more on the ground they have left by using greater amounts of fertilizer or engaging in more intensive methods of production. The objective of reducing production is defeated.

The Yankus case is a prime example of the futility of governmental meddling with agricultural production.

## Army Defends Nike-Zeus, Sidetracked ICBM Killer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following new story written by Mr. Bem Price which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on February 23, 1959, and an editorial from the same newspaper of February 24, 1959:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 23, 1959]

ARMY DEFENDS NIKE-ZEUS, SIDETRACKED ICBM KILLER

(By Bem Price)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—Embittered Army sources claimed today the United States is much closer to a workable defense against intercontinental ballistic missiles than testimony before Congress would indicate.

The sources for this story—3 months in the gathering—stretch from Redstone Arsenal at Huntsville, Ala., to Fort Bliss, Tex., to Washington. None can be identified.

Permission to use some of the information gleamed since early November was granted by these sources after testimony before Congress by Dr. Herbert C. York, Director of Research for the Defense Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency.

MAJOR DEFENSE PROBLEMS

At the moment the Nation's major defense problem is development of a missile which can intercept and destroy warheads loaded with small hydrogen bombs aimed at this country over intercontinental ranges and traveling at speeds of 15,000 miles an hour plus.

The Army believes it has such a defense in the projected antimissile missile, the Nike-Zeus. The Zeus is a nuclear missile which is intended to destroy enemy ICBM's out in space.

An artist's sketch of the Nike-Zeus accompanies this story. It is based on well-authenticated details and, so far as is known, is the first reliable sketch of the kind to be published.

APPROPRIATION REJECTED

What has embittered Army sources is Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy's rejection of a request for $730 million to produce the Zeus.

W. J. McNeill, Assistant Secretary of Defense, has explained that the defense budget seeks no money for production of the Nike-Zeus missile because it is not far enough advanced.

He told the Senate-House Economic Committee that the budget does contain money to perfect the missile "but we have not put in money for bases or production lines because the missile is not ready."

YORK BACKS M'ELROY

On February 17, York testified before the House Space Committee that he believed

McElroy was right in making the turndown; that Zeus had not reached a point in development where large scale production was warranted.

Douglas Aircraft Corp., at Santa Monica, Calif., is now in limited production on components of the yet-to-be produced prototype of the Zeus.

Western Electric Co. is the prime contractor for Zeus and is engaged in research on a huge new radar system for picking up targets.

READY FOR TEST SHOT

The Army sources claim that work on the Zeus is so far advanced that they are ready to build a prototype and haul it to a mid-Pacific island to test fire against a nose cone from a Redstone missile.

The Redstone is the Army's 500-mile range, liquid propelled missile. On a long shoot the nose cone reenters the earth's atmosphere from an altitude of about 300 miles at a speed of 15,000 miles an hour.

So confident is the Army that the Zeus will work that the U.S. Air Defense School at Fort Bliss already has appointed a Zeus projects officer to get training courses ready.

The over-all configuration of the Zeus is essentially that of the Nike-Hercules, a powerful and antiaircraft missile which can reach to the upper limits of the atmosphere.

HAS RADICAL LAUNCHER

The Hercules is launched from a rail-like track which can be installed above or below the ground.

The Zeus launcher is a radical departure from the Hercules concept. As now designed the Zeus will be hurled upward from an underground concrete cylinder in much the same fashion as a rifle bullet is fired.

At present the plans are to mount 24 Zeus missiles on a launching pad which will look from the air like a rectangular, perforated ceiling tile.

In each Zeus defense complex there will be three or more such launching pads capable of hurling between 60 and 90 antimissile missiles into the air almost simultaneously.

TREMENDOUS THRUST

Each Zeus would be propelled initially by engines remaining on the ground which generate 450,000 pounds of thrust in less than 3 seconds. Such an engine was test fired successfully at Redstone Arsenal August 26.

As the Zeus takes off, an airborne booster cuts in and sends the missile streaking upward at an even faster speed. This booster eventually will drop away and a sustainer engine will begin operating as a source of power for space travel.

At burnout of the third stage—the second airborne stage—the missile is designed to travel at substantially the same speed as the incoming missile on an intercept course.

All engines involved will employ solid propellants which burn almost instantaneously, giving off a controlled explosion.

NOT NEAR CITIES

None of the Zeus launching complexes would be located near populated areas as are the antiaircraft Nike Hercules, but would be scattered on what one source called our far flung continental frontiers.

The key to the success of any antiaircraft or antimissile missile is radar.

Since a ballistic missile would require only 30 minutes to reach from Moscow to New York, the first 10 minutes of flight would be vital.

In these 10 minutes, the ballistic course of the enemy missile must be computed. At the end of another 6 minutes, the target track must be firmly established by radar.

FOUR MINUTES TO FIRE

The Army sources figure that as soon as the missile's track has been ascertained, they have 4 minutes in which to aim, fire, and intercept. In brief, the missile's warhead—containing nose cone must be knocked down 20 minutes after launching and 10 minutes short of U.S. targets to protect against even partial nuclear destruction.

Under the Zeus system as now contemplated the Air Force's long-range radar would be used to give early warning of an enemy launch and the Army's newly designed target tracking radar would take over and fire the antimissile missiles automatically.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXY READY DATE

These Army sources, all of whom are close to the Zeus program or who have followed its progress intimately, believe that with the radar now available or in the advanced design stage, a workable system could be obtained by mid-1960.

To the scientists' objection that the system has yet to be proved, these sources retort that the United States is behind in ballistic missile development because scientists once advised the military that the atom bomb could not be made small enough to mount in a missile.

---

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 24, 1959]

ANTIMISSILE DEFENSE IS VITAL, TOO

Part of confusion about national defense bears heavily on pulling and hauling among the branches of the armed services. To this is now added an appearance of conflict between the Secretary of Defense or others in the Defense Department and the Army.

The particular case in point is a contention from Army sources over conditions that may squeeze off intensive efforts to bring into early production an antimissile-missile designed to combat and destroy Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Soviet ICBM's are declared to be in a flourishing stage of production and capable of landing, 5,000 miles away—H-bomb and all—on any target desired. Some kind of counterweapon is very much needed.

Army sources insist they have under development such a weapon, called the Nike-Zeus, to combat ICBM's, of which Soviet Boss Nikita Khrushchev has been boastful. As this stands, it appears there is money provided in the prospective budget to perfect the Army device. But an Army request for $730 million to produce it has been rejected by Secretary of Defense McElroy.

The reason given is that the preliminary research and development for it has some distance to go. As reported, the production rejection has embittered Army enthusiasts. So, in one direction we are told that further progress is not feasible; in another that it is.

Here is a painfully familiar parallel to other missile and missile defense plans—large question marks about what to do and when to do it. We can't figure the answers, from our home bases. But answers are needed, clear and positive.

The paramount requirement is to have projects, and keep them moving, to get missiles—all sorts necessary—and defenses against them going ahead toward concrete results, and fast. And also to have full understanding that no interservice contentions or cross purposes will interfere. What's most essential is assurance to the American people that progress, even though it costs a great deal, will be maintained.

---

## Very Much Canada's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the position of Canada on the Chicago water-diversion bill H.R. 1.

I would like to submit the following editorial which appeared in the Financial Post, of Toronto, Canada, of February 21, 1959, entitled "Very Much Canada's Business":

Trying to justify a further diversion of Great Lakes water by Chicago for floating sewage and ships down its private canal into the Mississippi, the Chicago American says this:

"Lake Michigan is traditionally an American body of water. It is the only one of the Great Lakes entirely within U.S. borders, and what Congress does with it would not seem to be Canada's business."

That is garbage.

What Chicago does, or is permitted to do, with Lake Michigan would not interest Canada in the slightest provided only Lake Michigan were involved. But as every reader of the Chicago American must know there is no dam across the upper end of Lake Michigan and what water Chicago takes from the southern end, Lake Michigan takes from Lake Superior and Lake Huron. If Chicago were permitted to keep on increasing its diversion, as it is trying to do, conceivably it could drain the Great Lakes right down to Windsor and Detroit, dry up the St. Lawrence Seaway and put out of commission every powerhouse at Niagara and on the St. Lawrence.

Water levels on the Great Lakes are very much Canada's business and those of every American State touching the lakes as well. As the Buffalo News points out: "The lakes are not the private cisterns of any one city or State—or country. Chicago should meet its water needs without robbing others. Congress should say so by standing firm against this raid as often as Chicago chooses to attempt it."

---

## Encouraging Development in the Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the action of the President in imposing mandatory quotas on the imports of residual fuel oil was an encouraging development for the coal industry. Certainly, it is not the complete answer to the very serious problem of unfair competition offered to the coal industry by this cheap, foreign produced fuel.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time we have been able to persuade the Federal Government to recognize the threat to coal posed by these imports, and it took strong and definite action and persuasion by the West Virginia congressional delegation. It is true, that in the past, Government officials and agencies have cited residual oil imports as a threat and recommended action. The important difference is that this time the Government acted.

Imports will be limited to the amount brought into the country in 1957. In that year, about 475,000 barrels daily entered the country from abroad. This amount of foreign residual fuel oil represents the equivalent of more than 110 million tons of coal. It would have been

far preferable if the 1954 base, which has been suggested as more suitable, had been selected.

The pegging of imports at this high level will not win back many, if any at all, of the jobs in coal mines which have been lost because of the competition with foreign fuels oils. But at least it means that no additional jobs will be lost.

During the first 2 months of 1959, imports have been unusually heavy, running at an annual rate of the equivalent of 191 million tons of coal. I am hopeful that in carrying out the order, the Government will make the 1959 quota retroactive to January 1 and will not agree to an effective date of April. Otherwise, these extremely heavy imports will act as a drag on the coal market.

Mr. Speaker, the President's order for mandatory quotas was extremely gratifying to the West Virginia congressional delegation. The two West Virginia Senators and all Members of the West Virginia congressional delegation worked hard as a unit to convince the executive department of the compelling need for controls of some type on the ever-increasing flow of foreign residual oil into this country. The delegation appeared before every department and agency in Washington concerned with the foreign trade problem, arguing that the great domestic coal industry was being slowly but surely liquidated.

I was extremely gratified to have a colleague from a non-coal-producing State tell me that it was this untiring work by the West Virginia delegation which led to this victory. Perhaps this is an overstatement of the situation, but I know I speak for the entire delegation when I say that no development of recent years has been as welcomed as this.

Mr. Speaker, we have won a battle. However, the war to create a climate in which the coal industry can prosper and expand will be long and difficult, and there will be many battles to fight.

## March 15, 1959: Anniversary of Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1848, the Hungarian people under the leadership of the famed Louis Kossuth, won freedom from Hapsburg rule. The freedom movement led to the abolition of serfdom and to enlarged public representation in political affairs. A charter of freedom also proclaimed the right to create a national government. This victory over tyranny, although short-lived, will never be forgotten by the people of Hungary.

It was the spirit of 1848, for example, that guided the October 1956 revolution against the rule of Communist Russia. Certainly no people have struggled more valiantly for freedom than the people of Hungary. I am sure that these people shall always rank freedom and independence as the highest goals that man may seek.

I salute the people of Hungary on the anniversary of their independence from the Hapsburgs 111 years ago. I am proud that many Hungarians have come to this country where they have enriched our own democracy with their high concept of freedom. I am proud of their traditions, proud of their remarkable past, and look forward with them to the day when this great heritage may come to its full fruition in Hungary.

## Statement in Opposition to H.R. 1, Lake Michigan Diversion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a statement I presented to the Committee on Public Works on February 17 in opposition to H.R. 1, the Lake Michigan water diversion bill.

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1 AND OTHER BILLS TO REQUIRE A STUDY TO BE CONDUCTED OF THE EFFECT OF INCREASING THE DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, ON FEBRUARY 17, 1959

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for giving me an opportunity to present a statement in opposition to H.R. 1, a bill to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

As you know, this subject has been debated in practically every session of Congress since 1937. The Great Lakes Harbors Association, the port cities of the Great Lakes, the Lake Carriers' Association, and the governments of the States bordering the Great Lakes have always been united in opposition to the demands of Chicago for permission to divert additional water from Lake Michigan.

While we realize that the measure presently under consideration (H.R. 1) is deemed to be a study bill, we feel that its enactment will be a detriment to the best interest of all areas in the Great Lakes other than Chicago. In Ohio our industries have a great need for additional water for industrial use, however we oppose diversion of water where there is no means provided for returning water to the lakes.

The diversion of water from Lake Michigan will lower the natural level of that lake and the other Great Lakes, their connecting and tributary waters and the St. Lawrence River, thereby reducing the carrying capacity of ships and leading to higher transportation costs. At this time we in the Midwest are anticipating the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway to large oceangoing vessels. When the Federal Government is spending large sums to deepen the Great Lakes connecting channels and improve the harbors on the Great Lakes to accommodate these deep-draft vessels, it would be most inconsistent to permit this measure to pass which will eventually result in lowering the lake levels.

It is my hope that the committee will table H.R. 1 and all other bills which would permit additional diversion of water into the Illinois Waterway.

## American Legion Protests Soviet-American Film Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, no organization has had a more consistent record in defense of American programs and principles than has the American Legion. For that reason, when the Legion speaks out the elected representatives of the people are always happy to listen. Recently, the Schenectady County Committee of the American Legion adopted a resolution opposing the cultural exchange of Soviet films with this country which has been proposed by the motion picture association.

We are all aware, Mr. Speaker, of the subtle and persistent campaign of Soviet propaganda that goes on in this country and in other parts of the free world. We are aware of the efforts the Soviets use not only to undermine our own system of government but also to represent their system in a far different light than is warranted by the facts. I believe there is a real danger that this exchange, brought about in the name of broader cultural understanding, could in fact contribute unwittingly to this subtle and insidious propaganda. For that reason, I believe the resolution of the Schenectady County Committee of the American Legion deserves the most serious consideration by those officials who have permitted this exchange program to take place. I include herewith the full text of the resolution:

SCHENECTADY COUNTY COMMITTEE,
*Schenectady, N.Y., February 12, 1959.*

Whereas the State Department has arranged a cultural exchange by which Soviet films, made under political censorship by the U.S.S.R., are to be shown in American theaters and on television; and

Whereas Soviet officials reserve the right to doctor any films in which America is reflected in favorable light, just as they have always done; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. will send us films applying the soft sell as they would picture life under the Soviet system of atheistic communism, to be followed by the hard sell as and when the political climate in the U.S.A. may permit; and

Whereas certain U.S. Motion Picture Association officials, as parties to this deal with Soviet Russia, attack the New York censorship authority, accusing it of using the weapon of totalitarianism indicating that they believe that while the Soviets may censor our films, we are not to be permitted to censor theirs; and

Whereas it has been reported that Hollywood studios are about to let down all bars against employing known Communists, thus permitting Soviet Russia to perpetrate its long sought gradual infiltration of American

communication arts, in order to promote worldwide Marxist propaganda; and

Whereas Russia will seize with alacrity the opportunities to be offered by the greatly enlarged audiences of American television: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That Schenectady County Committee, American Legion, does hereby register its vigorous objection to, and protest of, the State Department's cultural exchange of films with Soviet Russia; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Schenectady County Committee, American Legion, also registers its vigorous objection to, and protest of, the hiring, by motion picture and TV industries, of known reds and pinks in American entertainment; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives for their appropriate action; and be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the 4th District organization of the American Legion for further action; and be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be presented to local newspapers for publication.

## We Need a New Approach to Food and People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the hardest-working Members of the House, our colleague from Michigan, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, has always been in the forefront here of efforts to help the poor, the needy, the unemployed. I am particularly grateful to him for the invaluable assistance he provided me the last two times my food stamp bill came before the House for debate and vote. As we all know, a majority of the House voted for that bill last August, but it is not yet law.

I have discussed with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, the renewed urgency for this legislation, in view of continuing high levels of unemployment and distress, and I am hopeful that hearings can soon be arranged on H.R. 1359 and companion bills to establish a food stamp plan.

Recently, Congressman DINGELL introduced a companion bill to H.R. 1359, reemphasizing his long and effective interest in this proposal, and his remarks in introducing the bill were noted with great interest by many individuals and groups throughout the country. Among those taking particular note of the Congressman's views were the editors of the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal, who commented on them in a comprehensive editorial, which I believe is well worth the attention of every Member of Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Courier-Journal editorial of March 3, 1959, inspired by Mr. DINGELL's action in introducing a food stamp bill. The editorial follows:

WE NEED A NEW APPROACH TO FOOD AND PEOPLE

Representative DINGELL, of Michigan, is the latest of a number of Congressmen to sponsor a bill for distributing some of the Nations surplus food to needy Americans. His, like others, is a variant of the food stamp plan that did so much to make food available to persons on relief up to 1943.

The problem of islands of need in our ocean of plenty is not a new American phenomenon, but it is growing more acute. It is a problem that must trouble the Nation's conscience since one of the items of our democratic creed is that this bountiful land can produce enough to feed all its people. In truth, the land does produce enough and to spare. But the mechanics of distribution have broken down somewhere along the line and the lines of the ill fed, the ill clad, and the ill housed are haunting realities in every community.

As Ora Spaid pointed out in Sunday's Courier-Journal, the public responsibility for relief of the needy has only recently become a governmental function in our society. We have done something for various categories of human need, the poor and fatherless child, for instance, the indigent aged, the total cripples and misfits of our society.

But the human being who is in need only because he is out of a job does not fit into any of the categories. Governments and communities are only just now beginning to look at him with a new anxiety. His numbers are increasing. His joblessness is no longer a matter of a month or two. It is stretching into years. And this is no fault of his. For the most part he is comparatively young, productive, willing to work. He is also untrained, uneducated even in the basic three R's and has nowhere to turn to remedy these deficiencies.

From a purely callous viewpoint these are the people, even more than those already receiving some Government dole, who most urgently need the basic foods now bulging our warehouses, who need some sort of retraining and relocation program to fit them again for self-support. And these are the people who receive only token assistance grudgingly given, because of our long-cherished belief that an able-bodied man can find work if he really wants it.

A food stamp plan that would merely keep such people vegetating in idleness, prolonging life but destroying hope, is not a real answer to America's growing relief need of the moment. It is doubtful whether a real answer can be found within this administration which loses no opportunity to demonstrate that it is penny-conscious and dollar-foolish.

But now is the time for a Democratic planning committee to get together and plan for the rescue of this drowning segment of our society. It is a plan that should include unemployment compensation of limited amounts and for limited periods. It should also take a new look at the whole problem of our agricultural surpluses.

As these are now distributed, the Department of Agriculture, which is not in the business of giving relief any way, grudgingly distributes whatever can no longer be stored; cornmeal, wheat flour, dried milk and, occasionally, butter, are the staples. But cotton, feed grains, tobacco, peanuts, continue in storage or are given away abroad, where they are needed and gratefully received but still not consumed in sufficient quantity to empty the warehouses.

A first step in redistributing our agricultural wealth ought to be the creation of machinery whereby the crops in surplus could be sold to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which could then trade its peanuts, tobacco and cotton for other foods and arrange to have the surplus feed grains fed to poultry and animals for human consumption.

RATS BEFORE PEOPLE?

Such a plan could not operate under the rigid price supports that Congress has enforced on the Department of Agriculture. Nor could it work under Secretary Benson's dog-eat-dog idea of farming. But under some modification of the Brannan plan, for instance, it could put food into hungry mouths and reduce the surpluses in a useful and humane fashion. It would not preclude foreign food aid. We have enough and to spare, and at the moment it is more available to rats than people.

But the plan for the needy should go farther. Forest farms for growing boys could be one of its aspects. Simplified schools and training courses for adults would be another. Such a plan should be given first priority by an administration that can assess the terrible waste of human hope and ability involved in the families now living on starvation's edge, and weigh it against the dollars and cents involved in putting all our resources to work for each other.

## Status of the Nation's Highway Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention, and to the attention of the Congress, an address given by A. C. Leonard, Chief, Secondary Roads Branch, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, recently.

I feel this address on the status of the Nation's highway programs should be of interest to every Member of Congress.

In this connection, I am still very hopeful that U.S. Route 50 will be included in the Interstate Highway System, especially that part of it which goes through West Virginia, and which is badly in need of straightening and widening. I believe this is one of the most important roads crossing America today.

STATUS OF THE NATION'S HIGHWAY PROGRAMS

(By A. C. Leonard, Chief, Secondary Roads Branch, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce)

I am particularly glad to be given this opportunity to speak with you an the status of the Nation's highway programs. For we have just completed the most productive year in Federal-aid highway history. The active program for the entire United States at the end of last year and including State matching funds amounted to $9.2 billion. This includes engineering and rights-of-way. By active program we mean projects in the programed, plans approved, and construction stages. One year earlier the active program amounted to $7.1 billion. Thus during 1958, highway activity in the Federal-aid production pipeline was increased from the 1957 level by $2.1 billion; a 49-percent rise. And significantly for your industry, almost all or $2 billion of the $2.1 billion increase was in work on which contracts had been awarded and was actually underway at the end of the year. In addition, there was over $500 million in projects on which contracts had been awarded but construction not yet started, and almost $500 million in plans approved but not yet awarded to contract at the end of the year.

When I said that we had just completed the most productive year in Federal-aid highway history, the we refers to the efficient partnership that exists between the Federal Government and the State highway departments in the undertaking. It refers also to the splendid cooperation obtained from consulting engineers, from equipment suppliers, from contractors, and from material suppliers, particularly your industry which, according to Bureau of Mines reports, supplies 75 percent of all the crushed or broken stone sold or used by producers in the United States.

A good portion of the work described as being in the pipeline at the end of the year, but on which plans had not yet been approved, will be translated into construction in 1959. About $2 billion in projects are in this program stage. In addition, there are substantial amounts of Federal funds apportioned to the States for highway projects awaiting programing to specific projects and matching with State funds.

Thus far I have been discussing the end-of-year status of all the Federal-aid highway programs combined. Of course, everyone is interested in the physical progress we have made in the individual Federal-aid programs since passage of the 1956 act.

Considering the Interstate System alone and using July 1, 1956, as the bench mark date for the beginning of the program, the total obligation of funds was on schedule.

As of December 31, 1958, construction was underway on 3,571 miles of the Interstate System at an estimated total cost of $2.33 billion. Construction contracts had been completed since July 1, 1956, on 3,159 miles at a cost of $944 million. Included in the program were 3,758 bridges underway and 1,643 completed. In addition, $1.83 billion had been spent or authorized since July 1, 1956, for preliminary engineering and rights-of-way.

On the regular ABC program, which is the program carried on with funds regularly authorized for improvements on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and the extensions of those systems in urban areas, construction contracts had been completed on 60,112 miles and 10,217 bridges, at a total cost of $3.56 billion by the year's end. Work was underway at the same time on 16,754 miles, including 4,002 bridges, at an estimated cost of $2.06 billion.

On the special program using $400 million of the so-called D funds authorized by Congress as an antirecession measure, as of December 31, 1958, the States had work completed on 2,689 miles and 80 bridges at a total cost of $59 million, and work underway on 8,394 miles and 1,178 bridges at a total cost of $489 million.

As you will recall, the special D funds were required to be under contract by December 1 of last year. Mr. B. D. Tallamy, the Federal Highway Administrator, in speaking before the American Association of State Highway Officials in San Francisco on that same date, announced that every cent of the $400 million authorized for this purpose had been obligated by the States. He went on to say, "Further, the improvements are urgently needed; they are not leafraking or boondoggling projects; they are being woven into the integrated road network which has been the ultimate goal of all Federal-aid legislation since 1916." He then complimented the State highway officials on the speed and initiative with which they had translated a legal authorization into work underway on projects of unquestioned value.

Continuing, he said, "This is important in itself but even more so in its implications. For we have demonstrated beyond question that, if the need to stimulate employment and bolster the economy should arise in future years, the dollars invested in highways will be among the soundest of the Nation's investments."

The eventual effect of the Federal highway programs on your industry probably is a difficult one for you to asses readily at this time. The figures released are large and not easy to grasp completely. Certainly through the stepup in volume should have begun to make itself felt to you since aggregates of all kinds are the major bulk ingredient of all highway construction and constitute the largest single element of cost. The cost of all types of aggregates including those used in premixed bituminous material and ready-mixed concrete amounts to one-fourth of that for all materials and supplies furnished by the contractor on Federal-aid work.

If it mattered much to you, I believe you would have a perfect right to object to some of our roadbuilding terminology. We speak of asphaltic concretes and portland cement concretes, giving the product the name of an ingredient which is present in only small quantities. Actually, the aggregate industry must supply the largest fraction of the material. And you as producers of crushed stone probably have found that in any area which produces a quality crushed stone, it is usually the aggregate of choice for both types of pavement. This is because the interlocking action apparent in nearly all crushed stone gives it the inherent advantage of resisting motion and displacement and provides basic stability for load distribution to the subgrade.

Over the years the Bureau of Public Roads has kept a running 3-year average of the tonnage of aggregates going into Federal-aid construction and we have found that for every million dollars of total cost approximately 100,000 tons of aggregates of all kinds are used. This is a mass figure and, of course, varies from State to State and from year to year within States and from project to project, but the national 3-year running average does not change appreciably. Unfortunately we do not have the tonnage broken down as to the proportion of crushed stone or crushed limestone in particular. However, it was estimated by a task force of the American Road Builders' Association, in connection with reports submitted to the President's Advisory Council on a National Highway program, that within the aggregates used for highway construction and maintenance, 40 percent of the total tonnage consumed is crushed stone either purchased from commercial sources or produced on the site.

Another indicator which should be of interest to you is contained in the reports received from 44 States by the Bureau of Mines. The Minerals Year Book for 1956 showed that crushed limestone constituted over two-thirds of all concrete and road stone sold or used by producers during that year.

While there are undoubtedly many fallacies in combining these factors, if you do, you can come up with a rough indicator of the ratio of dollars to crushed limestone in highway construction. First you divide the number of dollars by 10 to find the approximate tonnage of all aggregates combined, then divided by four to obtain the tonnage of crushed limestone involved. For example, we previously stated that there was an increase of $2 billion in the Federal-aid highway work underway at the end of 1958 as compared to the end of 1957. If we divide this figure by 10 we get 200 million as the approximate increased tonnage of all aggregates that will be required as the projects are advanced to completion. Dividing again by four, we get about 50 million as the increased tonnage of crushed limestone involved.

I want to repeat that there may be many fallacies in this method of arriving at a use factor for crushed limestone. It is intended only as a horseback estimate. However, it should be apparent that we are well underway in the most ambitious highway construction program of all time, and that the sheer volume of the bulk aggregates involved may or has already presented problems of trucking, shipping, storing, and handling. The trend toward stabilized aggregate shoulders and wider, thicker pavement designs will almost certainly result in even greater demands on your industry. This prognostication will not be entirely confirmed of course until completion of the AASHO test on the many various designs that are being carried on at Ottawa, Ill.

In summing up the status of the national highway programs, I would like to quote again from Mr. Tallamy's talk at the recent AASHO meeting. He said, "Since enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 we are now approaching nationally the end of what corresponds to a tooling-up period in private industry. In the early stages of the program made possible by that legislation, it was inevitable that there would be a lack of uniform progress among the States for a variety of reasons which are familiar to all of you. The States did not start from scratch with the passage of the act of 1956. Some were far better prepared to launch the new program than others. A number of States had few if any plans that could be fitted into the interstate program. Inevitably, the program forged ahead fastest in the States that were best prepared. Ironically, the general public, which accepts as normal and routine the necessary leadtime or tooling-up period in private industry is not fully aware that there is also a necessary leadtime in the road program. It is not generally recognized outside of highway circles that the necessary preliminaries to actual construction—the engineering work and the acquisition of right of way for interstate projects—takes 18 to 24 months.

"In any case, while there is still some disparity in relative progress, most of the hurdles have been leaped and the States which have been trailing in the obligation of funds are closing the gap. I have no doubt that we are progressing toward the simultaneous completion of the Interstate System in all the States in accordance with the mandate given us by Congress in the act of 1956. The engineering shortage is pretty much a thing of the past, the question of matching funds has been resolved in many States and is nearing solution in others. The contracting industry, as well as the suppliers of materials and equipment are geared to meet all of the requirements of the program.

"I wish I could go further and say that all of our problems are solved. In all honesty, it would be nearer the truth to say that all of our problems are practically solved except the big one. Last August we apportioned to the States a total of $3.4 billion for the fiscal year 1960, including $2.5 billion for the Interstate System and $900 million for the ABC program. This was made possible by suspension of section 209(g) of the 1956 act—the so-called Byrd amendment—for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960. As matters now stand, however, we face the prospect of apportioning no interstate funds next summer for fiscal 1961 and possibly as little as $300 million for the following year. That, as you all know, is because of the operation of section 209(g) which limits apportionments of Federal funds to the amounts that will be in the trust fund when the obligations fall due.

"Revenues accruing to the trust fund during the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 totaled $3,526 million, or $41 million more than the original estimates. During the 4 months of this year the revenues have been slightly less than estimated for this period. On November 1 there was a balance of $811 million in the trust fund. This balance will be reduced during the remainder of the year and during fiscal 1960, since expenditures are estimated to exceed revenues during each of those years. That is the problem, stated

simply. The administration and the Congress are well aware of it and I would hope that during the course of the coming year a satisfactory solution will be worked out by the executive and legislative branches of the Government."

Since the next speaker has as his topic the financing of the highway program, I will close with that statement from Mr. Tallamy. Let me repeat that it has been a pleasure and a privilege to have been given this opportunity to speak with you.

## Attack on the FBI—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the seventh in a series of articles by Pulitzer prize-winning reporter, Edward J. Mowery, dealing with the campaign to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The article, which follows, appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 8, 1959:

FOES CRY "LONE WOLF" AT FBI—THAT'S NOT WHAT LAWMEN SAY

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—In the current campaign to belittle the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the agency is accused of playing lone wolf at the community level, ignoring cooperative local police and stealing the show.

Mutual cooperation and understanding between various enforcement agencies, an FBI spokesman explained today, is the very essence of successful law enforcement and every FBI operation is anchored to this concept.

Charge: When a big criminal case erupts in a community, the FBI swoops in and takes credit for capturing the criminals from other cooperating agencies.

The facts: The FBI always gives proper and full credit to such agencies and if a press release is issued, the assistance of local officers is specifically set forth. The FBI never attempts to steal credit from other peace officers or conceal their legitimate efforts in the handling of a case.

If the FBI stole publicity, as alleged, it couldn't enjoy the wholehearted cooperation from other agencies it receives throughout the country. But this isn't an enforcement one-way street.

To assist municipal, county, and State enforcement agencies in better fulfilling their responsibilities, the FBI renders many other services without charge.

These include scientific examination of evidence (criminal cases), fingerprint comparisons and identifications, police training assistance and exchange of information in matters of mutual interest.

The Director, J. Edgar Hoover, frequently sends letters of FBI appreciation to participating officers and their superiors. Bureau files are filled with such correspondence. Since the press gathers its own information on criminal cases and local police freely talk to the press, it would be quite a feat for the FBI to hog publicity, even if it so desired.

The Bureau does not cooperate with police departments or individual officers who aren't trustworthy, when it is likely that confidential information given a local officer will be made available to the underworld. The existence of criminal tie-ins or venal control of police, however, is becoming increasingly rare.

The FBI is proud of the cordial relations it enjoys with local enforcement throughout the Nation.

Charge: The FBI ignored other cooperating police agencies and took full credit in cases involving Bruno Hauptmann, "Machine Gun" Kelly, John Dillinger, Thomas Robinson, Harry Brunette and Merle Vandenbush.

The facts: Here's a brief résumé in each case:

Hauptmann: The Lindbergh kidnaping case was a joint venture of the FBI, New Jersey State Police and New York City police. Having no official jurisdiction, the FBI entered the case at the specific direction of the President. Teams, composed of representatives of each agency, combed New York banks for the ransom money.

In September 1934, a gold certificate turned up in one bank. Checked by one of the teams, it proved to be the clue leading to Hauptmann's identification.

Hauptmann was arrested by such a team. The tremendous public interest in this case plus blanket press coverage makes such a charge against the FBI ridiculous.

Kelly: A cordial relationship existed between FBI agents and Memphis police who cooperated in capturing Kelly (in 1933). On September 30, 1933, Hoover sent warm letters of thanks to Chief Will D. Lee, Detective Sgt. William Raney and other members of the Memphis force for their cooperation. No attempt was made by the bureau to hog publicity in this case.

Dillinger: He was killed while resisting arrest in July 1934 by FBI agents and East Chicago police who pursued investigative leads and coordinated their information. Agents worked closely with Capt. Timothy O'Neill and Sgt. Martin Zarkovich of the East Chicago police, who made available Mrs. Anna Sage, the so-called "woman in red" (who fingered the gunman).

Robinson: A report that a Lynn Allen (of Pasadena) supplied the tip leading to Robinson's arrest (as the alleged kidnaper of Mrs. Alice Stoll) is completely false. His arrest was exclusively the result of FBI-developed information.

Brunette: He was arrested by FBI agents assisted by New Jersey State Police (in 1936) following a raid on a New York City apartment (304 West 102d Street). A New York detective had left the area shortly after arrangements had been made to surveil Brunette and no member of the New York Police Department was in the vicinity when the raid commenced.

The New York detective left without telling New Jersey police or FBI agents where he was going or what plan (of action) he contemplated. The FBI at no time broke faith with any other enforcement agency in this case.

Vandenbush: He was arrested by Sgt. John C. Hergenhan and Patrolman W. G. Hendricks of the Armonk, N.Y., Police Department, following the February 25, 1937, robbery of a Katonah, N.Y., bank (Brunette was assertedly his partner in earlier escapades). The FBI established Vandenbush's identity via fingerprints.

On the day of his capture, Hoover wired congratulations to Acting Police Chief Hergenhan for the department's fine work in apprehending Vandenbush.

Any charges of an FBI attempt to hog publicity in these cases are completely false.

Charge: J. Edgar Hoover never made an arrest until the apprehension of Alvin Karpis. Then he forgot to bring along handcuffs.

The facts: It is true this was Hoover's first arrest. Congress didn't empower FBI agents to carry arms or make arrests until June 1934. Previously, agents had to request local officers to make such apprehensions. By the very nature and importance of his duties as FBI Director, Hoover wasn't expected personally to handle the many cases erupting in the field.

His primary function was, and is, to direct the vast FBI operation from his Washington headquarters.

(The true account of Karpis' capture appears here for the first time.)

Karpis, a vicious and vain hoodlum, had needled Hoover with postcards and letters for more than a year to come and get me. Naturally, Hoover was most eager to do just that when the criminal could be firmly located.

The word came on April 30, 1936. Karpis had been found in New Orleans and a stakeout had been placed on his apartment. Hoover had had a plane waiting. He boarded the plane in Washington and headed for the Louisiana city.

Hoover entered a car with three other agents in New Orleans and they drove to the vicinity of the Karpis hideout. Everything seemed to go wrong. Karpis unexpectedly left his apartment as the car bearing Hoover approached. He'd have to be taken immediately, in daylight. Gunplay (Karpis was heavily armed) could endanger citizens.

As Hoover's car neared the scene, a mounted policeman walking his horse, hogged the center of the narrow street. The car edged forward as Karpis left the building. A boy on a bicycle then came directly into the possible line of fire but wheeled away as Hoover and the agents ran toward Karpis.

The Director jammed his gun in Karpis' ribs. And to Hoover's surprise, Karpis recognized the FBI Director, explaining he had seen his picture the previous year in a Miami newspaper.

As to the handcuffs, unfortunately they had been left in another car but Karpis was quickly and thoroughly trussed with a Texas agent's necktie.

Later Hoover participated in the capture of many dangerous criminals, risking his life along with the men under him.

## Hungarian Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, March 15 will mark the anniversary of Hungarian Freedom Day.

More than 100 years ago Europe experienced one of its recurrent revolutions. That revolution, begun in 1848, marked the rise and spread of national feelings, national dreams and aspirations. As the movement swept from Paris to other capitals, suppressed and subjugated nationalities were encouraged. They saw the chance of realizing their dreams, and all were stirred by the new wave of freedom and liberty. A number of old guard reactionary despots and governments were shaken. Among these was the arch enemy of freedom in Europe, the dominant Chancellor Metternich, of Austria, who had set the pattern of autocratic government throughout Europe for almost half a century. In 1848 his supremacy came to an end.

On March 15 of that year a group of liberty-loving and patriotic Hungarians, in their irrepressible zeal for freedom and independence, staged a bloodless demonstration, presented their grievances to the government, and demanded reforms and freedom. The government, apparently aware of the spreading discontents and dangers, acquiesced in these demands, and allowed the Hungarians certain freedoms. That March 15, the day on which demonstrations were staged, is marked in Hungarian history as a national holiday. Annually it is being celebrated as their Freedom Day.

Today they once more find themselves under tyranny and unable to celebrate this holiday. I am glad to join Hungarians in the free world in the celebration of Hungarian Freedom Day, in the hope that liberty may soon be restored to their homeland.

## Official Community Protests Against TVA Turbine Contract Award Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the administration on March 9 to cancel the award of a large steam turbine generator by TVA to a British firm rather than to American firms operating in areas suffering from heavy unemployment, has made this a black week for the future of the American turbine industry. The feelings of those individuals whose jobs are scheduled to be lost as a result of this decision, and of the trend which it may establish, are nowhere better exemplified than in the official reactions of municipal governing bodies. I am submitting for the attention of every Member of the House the following two resolutions, one approved unanimously by the Common Council of the City of Gloversville, N.Y., the other unanimously by the Common Council of the City of Johnstown, N.Y.:

RESOLUTION BY COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GLOVERSVILLE, N.Y.

Whereas Fulton County is already a surplus labor area; and

Whereas recent news reports indicate that the Schenectady plant of the General Electric Co. has lost a Government order for a large turbine unit to an English firm which will result in the loss of many jobs in this area; and

Whereas many Fulton County and Gloversville residents are dependent on the prosperity of the General Electric Co. for their livelihood: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Gloversville Common Council go on record as opposed to the future awarding of Government contracts to foreign firms; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, and U.S. Senators JACOB K. JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING.

RESOLUTION BY COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JOHNSTOWN, N.Y.

Whereas it is general public knowledge that this area is considered a critical labor area, and

Whereas a recent contract amounting to several million dollars for a turbine for the Tennessee Valley Authority was awarded to a foreign firm in preference to the General Electric Co., the lowest American bidder; and

Whereas in order to promote employment in the labor markets of the United States and to relieve the critical labor situation the above said contract should have been awarded to an American corporation: Now therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the mayor and common council of the city of Johnstown hereby oppose the awarding of the above said contract to the foreign firm and request that the contract be rescinded and awarded to an American firm, and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Congressman for this district and the Senators for the State of New York.

## That Taxpayers' Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a taxpayers' revolt has erupted in my State of Washington, because the people are concerned about taxes and unnecessary Government spending. So far, the revolt has been directed against the State government, but the implication is clear. The people want a realistic, sensible and responsible fiscal policy on all levels of government.

What I have just said is in line with a well-expressed editorial that appeared in the Edmonds, Wash., Tribune-Review on March 5, 1959. The Tribune-Review, I might add, has the largest paid circulation of any weekly newspaper in my district and its publisher is aware of public sentiment on the issue.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial entitled "That Taxpayers' Revolt." The editorial follows:

THAT "TAXPAYERS' REVOLT"

About the most interesting thing that has happened during this session of the Legislature—or Congress—is the "taxpayers' revolt" that has spread (like wildfire, of course) across the State, starting over in eastern Washington. It has long been a favorite gambit of politicians to shrug their shoulders while levying new taxes and intone solemnly: "You understand, dear people, that it kills us to put on these taxes, but then you asked for all these things, so naturally you're going to have to pay for them." But the rebelling taxpayers reply, to paraphrase their petitions: "Whatever we're getting from the Government now, that's enough. We don't want any more Government services, and therefore we don't want any more taxes being raised on the pretext of paying for them."

This of course runs counter to the philosophy enunciated as far back as a quarter century ago, that the best way to keep a party in power was to spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect. It's been followed pretty successfully all these years—until suddenly something so simple and dramatic as a "taxpayers' revolt" brings a slight pause in the proceedings.

Inasmuch as the Democrats are in complete power in the State, it's natural that the Republicans, recognizing a good thing when they see it, should jump on the bandwagon and help urge along the petitions to Olympia. But paying taxes is not exactly a partisan operation, and there are indications that a good many people on both sides of the political fence are joining forces to impress upon the legislators the idea that before they get too eager to figure up more new tax sources, they take a second look to see if all that money in the budget is really needed.

While we're inclined to sympathize with the taxpaying petitioners, we would hate to see all this energy just channeled to Olympia, and neglect Washington, D.C. The closer you get to the taxpayer himself, the more supervision you have of his tax funds. Thus the State is only one jump away from the local tax level, and in fact many local facilities, most importantly schools and highways, depend upon that State tax dollar for their income.

The farther away the taxes get, the more chance there is of real waste, so the boys in Olympia are playing with peanuts compared to what goes on in Congress. Only this week, for example, a House subcommittee reported enough money being wasted in foreign aid funds alone to supply a big chunk, if not all, of our entire State budget. A week or so before, the papers delved into the comfortable situation of Congressmen who have wives and sons on the payroll at something around $1,000 a month, added to their own $22,000 annual stipend, figures which make the proposed raises for Washington State officeholders look paltry indeed.

If the taxpayers' rebellion results in clipping a few million off the State's take, that's fine—but we'd like to see even more energy put into convincing Congressmen that they too were elected for something else than just figuring new ways to spend money.

## Hawaii Statehood

SPEECH
OF
### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 12, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, on this historic occasion I am happy and privileged, on behalf of the people whom I represent in the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, to add my support to the legislation which is pending before this Committee granting statehood to Hawaii.

The record is abundantly clear that Hawaii, its people and its government have met every fair criteria and condition for joining us in this great union of sovereign States.

Over the many years that the issue of Hawaiian statehood has been considered, the people of Hawaii have waited patiently, and yet as Americans, have acted vigorously so that as this outstanding event in history takes place, the people of Hawaii can note with pride the progress which they have made.

As a star in the Pacific, the new State of Hawaii expresses a fulfillment of a hope—not only to Hawaiians, but to all people in the world who love and cherish freedom and respect of the individual found under our form of government.

Let us hope that the favorable and affirmative action which we take here today in the creation of the State of Hawaii will long be a shining light to the mass of humanity in this world still struggling mightily to achieve some small measure of a life free from fear, economic want, and political tyranny.

---

## ECAFE—Remarks by Hon. Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Honorable Henry Kearns, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY KEARNS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, TO THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST, BANGKOK, THAILAND, FEBRUARY 6, 1959

The United States is convinced that the economic development of the ECAFE region is essential. Not only as a basis for increased trade but as a foundation for peace and tranquility in the world. Among the elements of economic development are industrialization and adequate utilization of natural resources, which will increase the living standards of the people, their self-reliance and assume the long-range development of the area.

The U.S. delegation respectfully submits the results of its examination into the potentialities, the problems and the aspects of this very important region.

First as to govermental assistance. The contributions of the countries of the free world are well known and require no recital.

It is the intention of my country to continue, to the limit of its ability, substantial assistance programs. It must be recognized, however, that funds made available by our Government are produced as a result of taxation upon the people. From time to time resistance to such heavy taxation is experienced with the result that there is a definite limitation placed upon the amount of aid that can be available from this source.

An analysis of developmental projects that are desired and needed by the developing countries of the ECAFE region indicates that they may be divided roughly into two classes.

The first will be those of an industrial or production nature; the type the free world has historically assigned to private enterprise.

The second is that type of activity that cannot best be carried on by private sector. This may include (a) development of highways necessary to move products to the markets and raw materials to industrial facilities. (b) Adequate harbors that are necessary for the reduction of shipping costs and to expedite the flow of materials into and the flow of exports out of the countries. (c) Railroads for the transfer of goods within the country or for shipment to ports for exporting. (d) Educational facilities that are needed to increase the ability of people in the developing countries to meet the requirements of an industrial society. And (e) in some cases, the generation of power to provide the energy necessary to operate industrial plants.

It would appear to us that the assumption of governmental responsibilities in these fields poses a tremendous challenge and will tax the utmost financial facilities of your government even when aided to the fullest possible extent by friendly foreign countries. If these areas are adequately developed the basis for the necessary increase in industrial potential and raw material production should be realized with a minimum of delay or conflict.

It is well, of course, to observe that there is some hazard in heavy reliance on loans. Inasmuch as it is always expected that interest must be paid and repayments made, both will place a fixed burden upon the developing country.

Our Secretary of State recently set forth the U.S. policy on economic aid in these terms: "In the United States, economic expansion has paralleled the peaceful evolution of political and social life. But we work not for ourselves alone. We live in a community of nations, with each member dependent in varying degrees on the other."

Now we turn to the development of industrial plants and the exploration and production of raw materials. The U.S. delegation, of course, has no desire to impose its views on any country, and we recognize that each of the countries represented here has its own traditions and independence of action. We do, however, hope that our analysis may be of some assistance. It may be remembered that compared with the ancient civilizations of the world, we are a new country with our industrial development occurring in recent years, consequently it is possible to review the causes and effects of such developments from actual experience.

It is apparent to us that productive facilities develop and flourish if there is the combination of capital, technical skills, management, desire to succeed, and a knowledge of markets and market trends. We believe that all of these elements are necessary for sound and sustained productive development. From the experience within our country the best method of producing the combination of these facilities is through the encouragement of private enterprise.

You may be interested in some of the effects of U.S. private investment that has gone abroad in recent years. The rate of such investment has been approximately $4 billion per year and the total amount of this private capital invested abroad as of the end of 1958 was approximately $37 billion. A detailed study of the flow of this capital indicates that with rare exceptions U.S. investors abroad do not attempt to repatriate their capital. Our studies indicate that very seldom do the investors remove the earnings of the capital from the host country. The effect of this can be seen when it is estimated that at the end of last year the net value of the American investment had grown to more than $60 billion. This, of course, means that a country receiving American private capital need not be concerned that this capital will be hastily withdrawn causing exchange problems for the host country. It may be pointed out that our studies indicate that American private capital is only withdrawn when it is threatened by some overt action that appears to jeopardize its safety.

A further study of capital outflow reveals that there are several types of American investment, each type of a nature that will fit a particular need in a developing country. Some of these types include (1) a wholly U.S.-owned branch or subsidy. (2) A partnership arrangement in which the U.S. investment joins with capital for the host country. A third type is where the U.S. investor purchases a minority equity and provides either working capital or developmental capital. And a fourth type that is becoming increasingly popular is that of a "pay-back contract" in which the capital is provided to be paid back out of earnings. Each of these types of investment can be modified by either partially or completely providing management and technical direction.

It is a general trend today of American investors abroad to establish training programs through which the nationals of the host country are trained to assume top management jobs and technical direction at the very earliest possible moment. Increasingly this has become an important factor in improving the productive and industrial capacity of the developing country. Full use is made of the experience and training facilities of the successful private business, avoiding the trial and error period that is so costly when such knowledge is not available.

Historical examination of American private capital flowing abroad reveals that it went largely into the field of the extraction of mineral resources. A change, however, is taking place where it is apparent that substantial amounts of capital are now available for manufacturing and industrial facilities. The flow of capital also has been toward areas of the greatest security, particularly those that are close to or adjacent to the United States. However, there are many examples of the willingness of substantial capital going abroad if and only if developing countries indicate a real and sincere welcome. As to the amounts of available capital, the recent actions of our stock market indicate that when confidence is established there are tremendous pools of investors funds within our American public. The largest reserve of available capital is in the many thousands of medium and small sized investors. Those investments will flow in sums from a few thousands to many millions of dollars when the investment climate is favorable. Experience has taught us that the most desirable type of capital development is that where the workers and the managers each can see an opportunity for partial ownership of a profitable and successful enterprise.

It is our belief that if substantial sums of private capital from abroad are invested in the countries of this region that they in turn will increase the confidence of the people of the host area and will ultimately result in local capital formation that will sustain not only continuing but accelerating industrial expansion.

We must now examine some of the deterrents that reduce the flow of private capital to the developing countries. First, is the unfortunate result of constantly changing attitudes, unfriendly pronouncements and harassing local regulations. Second, violent fluctuations in currency values. Third, a governmental competition in the industrial field. Fourth, restrictive import laws that make it difficult for industrial concerns to operate upon a continuous basis. Fifth, capricious and discriminatory tax laws.

Evidence or threat of these actions serves to discourage the person or the company who controls substantial amounts of capital, management, and technical skills. Any country desiring to increase the flow of capital can profitably examine its actions in the light of these factors: It will, of course, be remembered that private capital will not be forced into any area—but will flow freely when it is assured of reasonable safety, earning potential and opportunity for growth.

The U.S. delegation is proud to work with this committee. We look forward towards attaining a greater knowledge of your view points and we hope that through this cooperative action a further step can be taken in increasing economic well-being of this very important area. If we are successful, we will expect to increase our trade and to improve the opportunities for peaceful development of the world.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 38

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Onancock, Va., Eastern Shore News of February 6, 1958, shows another of the dangers inherent in water pollution.

The article, entitled "Science Warns of Pollution Dangers," tells how "the world's largest marine resource, the U.S. menhaden industry," is threatened by water pollution.

Dr. J. L. McHugh, director of the Virginia Fisheries Laboratory at Gloucester Point, told of the danger to this resource and pointed out:

Most of our important seafoods spend at least a part of their lives in the rivers and estuaries, where they are vulnerable to the effects of industrial and domestic pollution.

He pointed out the danger exists not only to oysters but to shad, river herring, blue crabs, croakers, spot, trout, and menhaden.

[From the Onancock (Va.) Eastern Shore News, Feb. 6, 1958]

SCIENCE WARNS OF POLLUTION DANGERS

Water pollution threatens the world's largest marine resource, the U.S. menhaden industry. So stated Dr. J. L. McHugh, director of the Virginia Fisheries Laboratory at Gloucester Point, today.

Addressing members of the Virginia Fisherman's Association, holding their annual convention at the Chamberlain Hotel at Old Point Comfort, Dr. McHugh stressed the dangers to Virginia's important fishery resources of increasing population and industrial expansion. "Most of our important seafoods spend at least a part of their lives in the rivers and estuaries, where they are vulnerable to the effects of industrial and domestic pollution," he said.

"Oysters are not the only important resources that may be harmed by the effects of expanding civilization and industrialization," he stated. "Fish like shad, river herrings ascend the rivers into fresh water to spawn and the young spend their first few months of life in these waters. The estuaries also are important nursery grounds for blue crabs, croakers, spot, trout, and menhaden.

Dr. McHugh paid high tribute to Virginia's water-control board and State agency responsible for pollution control and abatement. "The water-control board and its able staff headed by A. H. Paessler, is doing a wonderful job against terrific odds," he asserted. "Methods of sewage treatment are known, and cities and towns are required to meet rigid standards in treating their domestic wastes."

## The Protocol of Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleague the following article by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 13, 1959:

THE PROTOCOL OF HUMPHREY
(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Until recently the protocols of Zion held their rank as history's most influential fraud. In case anyone has forgotten about them, the protocols were a gross anti-Semitic forgery that helped to warp the mind of Adolf Hitler, and then helped Hitler warp the mind of the German people.

Now, however, one begins to wonder whether the protocols of Zion are not losing first place to what may be called the protocol of Humphrey. This is the theory of George Magoffin Humphrey, supported by a wholly unverifiable quotation from Lenin, that the true Communist strategy for the defeat of the West is to force us "to spend ourselves into bankruptcy."

From a moral standpoint, of course, the two cases are as different as chalk from cheese. The people who peddled the protocols of Zion were creatures from the gutter instinctively dealing in garbage. George Humphrey is a courageous, high-minded, and patriotic man. Where on earth he picked up the protocol of Humphrey the record does not reveal. He peddles it, moreover, only because he knows a great deal more about the management of large industrial enterprises than he knows about the forces at work in the modern world.

From a practical standpoint, however, the protocol of Humphrey has the utmost significance. It was twice cited by the President himself when he discussed the Berlin crisis with congressional leaders before the weekend. On that occasion, the President gave Lenin as his authority for the theory, just as his friend, the former Secretary of the Treasury, customarily gives Lenin as his authority. At his press conference, President Eisenhower did not quote Lenin, having perhaps been warned that the quotation was unverifiable. But he again insisted on the validity of this theory that the real Communist aim is to cause the collapse of the free economies by excessive defense spending.

Hence it is necessary to say again, in the most emphatic terms, what has been said already by Marguerite Higgins, by this reporter and by one or two others. The protocol of Humphrey is a transparent, glaring, and rather ridiculous fraud.

There is not one iota of discoverable evidence to support or excuse the fraud. There is also a vast mass of evidence to prove the fraud. Over and over again, the Soviet leaders have said that spending for armaments is the sole prop of the free capitalist economies. Without this stimulus, they have declared, capitalism would soon totter and fall. Furthermore, every knowledgeable expert on the Soviet Union agrees the Soviet leaders are sincerely convinced that heavy defense spending is necessary to keep free capitalism going.

In these circumstances, the question arises why a former Secretary of the Treasury and a President of the United States should both be parroting such nonsense. As to Humphrey, the answer clearly lies in his peculiar conviction that the American economy is desperately fragile.

"Two more years of Truman budgets," he once told this reporter with perfect solemnity, "would have landed this country in communism anyway." On being asked whether he truly meant communism, rather than some vague, unpalatable form of left-wing experimentation, Humphrey replied the he meant communism in the literal sense. If he could believe this much—as he certainly seemed to do—it must have been easy for Humphrey to discern a Soviet plot behind the pressure for defense spending created by the arms race.

As to the President, there is no secret about the vast power over Eisenhower's mind that Humphrey early acquired and still retains. The protocol of Humphrey, being believed by Humphrey, would have at least three chances in four of gaining Eisenhower's credence, too.

To be sure, the $7 billion of tax revenues that George Humphrey sacrificed when first in office would alone be enough to balance the budget after paying all the bills for overcoming the missile gap. But this reminder will hardly alter the opinion of Humphrey, which seems to be shared by Eisenhower, that a serious attempt to defend this country is really much more dangerous than leaving this country quite inadequately defended.

## Welcome to the United Christian Youth Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the delegates of the United Christian Youth Movement of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America are visiting Washington, D.C., during the current week. This is a significant and unique representation of the church youth of America, and is a welcome indication of the responsible attitude of our modern youth today.

The President on Thursday, March 12, 1959, received the delegation of the United Christian Youth Movement officers and national denominational youth presidents at the White House. The delegation has called during the past several days on Senators and Congressmen, as well as certain key leaders of our Government, active in areas of concern in which they are vitally interested.

In order to acquaint the Congress and the American people with the purposes of this UCYM visitation during 1959, I am including for the RECORD their current memorandum on UCYM involvement in White House interests, as well as their current background memo which has been sent to their membership when the Washington visitation was proposed.

My high congratulations go to the delegates, officers, and members of the

UCYM for their dedicated and responsible approach to the problems facing our young people in the United States and the world today. It is a real pleasure to welcome such a fine group of youth leaders to Washington, D.C., and I hope that you plan to make the Washington visitation an annual event which will be productive in knowledge to the delegation attending and also have a lasting imprint on the conduct of U.S. affairs at home and abroad:

MEMORANDUM OF UCYM INVOLVEMENT IN WHITE HOUSE INTERESTS

The United Christian Youth Movement has a long record of active and responsible involvements in matters of national and international concern. Among its current involvements, in which it is known the White House also has deep interest are:

1. Foreign aid: A consistent record of support of this program was most dramatically demonstrated this past year with UCYM testimony directly to the House subcommittee and entered in the record of the Senate. The UCYM, also, was one of the 40 or so national organizations which joined in immediate and coordinated support of the President's television appeals to the Nation on behalf of the mutual assistance legislation.

2. People-to-people: An associate executive secretary of UCYM serves as a member of the Executive Committee of the Youth Committee of the People-to-People program which was directly inspired by the President. In addition we are sponsors of the new International Christian Youth Exchange program of the churches (high school overseas exchange).

3. White House Conference on Children and Youth: Mr. John Tannehill, a member of UCYM's Outreach Commission and chairman of its International Affairs Policy Committee has just been named a youth member of the National Committee for the 1960 White House Conference.

4. National Day of Prayer: The UCYM national chairman (Mr. Stuart Langton) and an Associate Executive Secretary of the Movement were privileged to attend the October 1 services with the President at National Presbyterian Church, and information on this observance has been shared with our constituents.

5. Traffic safety: One of our five current special concerns is in the area of youth traffic safety in which we work directly with the National Safety Council and indirectly with the President's Committee.

6. Disarmament: Members of a UCYM delegation had personal conversations with Mr. Stassen while he was on the White House staff to better understand the complex issues involved in this important issue and more clearly understand the various proposals and plans under discussions.

7. Integration: The UCYM and its constituent groups have been deeply involved for the past 2½ decades in seeking the goal of a nonsegregated church in a nonsegregated society. The USYM never has held a meeting or function in segregated circumstances. In direct mailings and staff and officer visitation throughout the southeast and in the Nation in general we have called for communication and conciliation between persons of differing views and different heritages. Thousands of church young people have had their first positive and profound interracial experiences in UCYM-sponsored activities. At every point possible, we have supported efforts of the administration to simultaneously guarantee adherence to the law of the land and to lead men to support law and order.

8. United Nations N.G.O. status: A reflection of our intense and continuing interest in world peace and the support and strengthening of the United Nations may be found in our maintenance of "Non-Governmental Observer" status at the United Nations. That this is no mere listing of interest may be seen in our cosponsorship (with some 30 other N.G.O.'s) of the community action booklet "In Your Hands" and the nationwide TV program based upon it, both in observance of the 10th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

9. And, one final item, Miss Kathy McElroy, our national secretary was privileged to share with the President in applying mortar to the cornerstone for the new Inter-Church Center in the New York ceremonies on October 12th last.

---

BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON A PROPOSED WASHINGTON VISITATION

All around the world today one may hear the charge that America's youth are apathetic and complacent, poorly informed, and obviously little concerned about the critical state of the world's affairs. Even in our own land, this evaluation has wide circulation and acceptance.

On the other hand, it must be recognized that U.S. church young people have their own overseas relief and mutual assistance operation in the nature of direct youth-fund giving, amounting to well over $1 million annually; that countless thousands of their number are engaged in "pen pal" relationships with young people overseas; that many hundreds of them, at their own personal expense, are annually engaged in overseas work camps and voluntary service programs or high school and college student exchange programs, and that many are earnestly preparing for careers in overseas service of church, industry, or government.

Admitting that all of the above, significant in their own right, are but a drop in the bucket in terms of either the vast numbers of youth comparatively untouched by such programs or the great need of a world in crisis, but sincerely convinced that young people can and will act intelligently and responsibly when live possibilities are given them to make their individual witness count, the church youth programs represented in the United Christian Youth movement are now embarked on a concerted effort in the realm of international affairs study and action as described in the enclosed paper.

We feel that we are now far enough along in that emphasis to be able to speak of the realistic enthusiasm with which it has been received and which is being reflected in ever-wider circles of our church young people.

We feel that it is time to demonstrate to the Nation and the world that U.S. Christian youth are concerned and active, and to dramatize our progress so as to attract the attention of even larger circles of young people.

For these reasons, and in respectful stewardship of the time of persons in important positions, we would like to bring a group of about 20 persons (a cross-sectional representation of the presidential leadership of our many denominational member movements) to call on the President, the Secretary of State, and leading Members of the Congress to briefly present a picture of what U.S. church youth are doing in support of their sincere efforts for peace; solicit their personal reactions and advice as dedicated churchmen regarding the role of the layman in international or governmental service careers; and together demonstrate and dramatize the vital, supportive role of an informed citizenry and call other young people to join in similar programs in their own churches and synagogues.

We feel that 1959 is the appropriate year in which to undertake such a visitation in order to avoid the partisan overtones present during 1960 and yet stimulate widespread interest and study in time to prepare the citizenry for intelligent participation in the decisions of the months and years ahead. In addition, a 1959 experience would find direct reflection in the nationwide observance of Youth Week, the 1960 theme for which is in the area of Christian citizenship.

---

## Romulo Hopeful—Leaves for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, there have been press reports in some of our newspapers about so-called strained relations between our Government and that of the Philippines. Our Ambassador to Manila, Charles E. Bohlen, and the Philippine Ambassador to Washington, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, were recalled by their respective home Governments for consultation. Both have now returned to their posts.

Some American magazines, particularly the Time magazine and also the U.S. News & World Report, have printed articles stating that there is a developing anti-American sentiment in the Philippines. In a recent statement on the floor of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who is the majority floor leader, declared that General Romulo has denied this and an interview with the Philippine Ambassador published by a Manila paper was included in the remarks of our distinguished floor leader in which the General explained the present temper and attitude of his people.

I have recently received a more comprehensive statement by Ambassador Romulo on the same subject, published by the Manila Daily Bulletin of February 19, and written by the paper's editor, Felix G. Gonzalez, considered in the Philippines as one of the most outstanding newspapermen of that country, highly respected for his integrity and ability. The Bulletin is owned by a distinguished Philippine citizen, Hans Menzi, whose war record was highly praised by General MacArthur, and who is a great industrialist whose successful business enterprises are contributing to the economic welfare of the Philippines. During the enemy occupation of the Philippines, Mr. Menzi played an active role in the resistance movement.

Because General Romulo's statement as published by the Bulletin is vital background material essential for the proper comprehension of the problems now facing our two Governments, and because we have a high regard in this House for the views of our esteemed former colleague, I ask for permission to include the whole article in the RECORD, as follows:

ROMULO HOPEFUL, LEAVES FOR UNITED STATES

(By F. G. Gonzalez)

Gen. Carlos P. Rombulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, slipped out of town quietly at midnight last night conscious of the hard task that lay ahead of him but confident that with the huge reservoir of good will in America for the

Philippines all differences between the two countries would be ironed out amicably and to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Only a few immediate members of his family and some close friends were at the airport to see him off. He had kept his departure so secret that many of his intimate friends did not know when he would leave and even his family was notified only at the last hour.

Since his return last January 26, for consultations with the Government on growing difficulties in P.I.-U.S. relationship, he has not granted a press conference and has avoided getting into the limelight. He has held closed-door conferences with high Government officials—with President Garcia at Baguio and again here, and with Congress leaders and committees of both Chambers and with leaders of commerce and industry.

As he left last night he was reported to have been fortified by the feeling that he enjoys the confidence of the responsible segment of the population, from President Garcia down to prominent men in and out of Government whose interest lay in the welfare of the country to which furtherance of close Philippine-American relations can contribute in large measure.

People close to him said he had set for himself the interlinking goals of presenting to American officials and the public the validity of Philippine monetary claims on the United States and the restoration and augmentation of the close ties that bind the two countries. And with the support and confidence of people in his home country, General Romulo felt that he could not fail in the difficult tasks that confronted him as envoy of the Philippines to America.

He had confided to intimates that he felt he could obtain settlement of several items in the $900 million omnibus claim of the Philippines against the United States, such as the $130 million in additional war damage payments now object of committee hearings in the U.S. Congress, and the $23 million due the Philippines when the United States devalued the dollar in 1934.

(Official sources have reported that other items in the omnibus claim not now subject of U.S. Government action would be taken up in discussions here between Secretary of Foreign Affairs Felixberto Serrano and U.S. Ambassador Charles E. Bohlen upon the envoy's return from Washington where he has been since January 29 for consultation with high officials on Philippine problems.)

In this enterprise of briefing American officials on Philippine monetary claims Romulo's course of action has been carefully charted in the course of conferences with high officials here. Playing an important part in this project is a review of Philippine-American relations from the time of Governor General William Howard Taft who was first to enunciate, shortly after the turn of the century, the policy of "Philippines for the Filipinos."

Over the opposition of some segments of the population in America and of the military in the Philippines, Taft paved the way for political independence of the Philippines by supplanting the Philippine Commission with the Philippine assembly where Filipino leaders were given ample opportunities to learn and practice democracy.

With the passage of the Jones law, definitely committing the United States to grant independence to the Philippines as soon as a stable government can be established here, the Philippines took rapid strides toward freedom in preparation for severance of political ties with the United States. Then U.S. Congress passed the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act setting a definite date for Philippine independence after an interim of Commonwealth government. Philippine officials now recall that if the so-called Hare-Hawes-Cutting law lost in the plebiscite held here it was because of objections to its provisions relative to U.S. military bases here.

Finally the Tydings-McDuffie Act was passed under the provisions of which the Philippines went through the commonwealth period and attained independence with the establishment of the Republic. Under the Republic the Philippines enjoys complete political independence from the United States, exercising all attributes of a sovereign state.

This review of the political aspect of Philippine-American relations, carefully considered and adopted in several top-level conferences here, has been drawn principally to call attention to the parallelism between these steps and those that are now being taken to attain economic independence.

High officials recalled that under the Philippine Trade Act, our economic ties with the United States will be severed in 1974, when our preferential market there will no longer exist. In view of this, Philippine efforts to open up markets outside the United States should not be misinterpreted as anti-Americanism but rather as steps in anticipation of a development in Philippine economy dictated by necessity.

These officials have hastened to ease apprehension on both sides of the Pacific over Philippine efforts geared toward curtailment of dependence on the American market. They stressed Philippine confidence in American understanding and sympathetic attitude toward Philippine problems. They recalled that in the campaign here for approval of the Parity Act, granting American citizens equal rights and privileges with Filipinos, some sectors voiced apprehension over possibility Wall Street moguls would rush in and secure a stranglehold on Philippine economy. Such fears have been proven unfounded, officials point up proudly, adding that Filipinos can continue secure in their faith in America.

Expanding on official thinking here, men in high Government positions have linked current economic difficulties with efforts toward economic independence. In the alleviation of these hardships the United States has contributed as a friend by recognizing valid claims of the Philippines and by acting to pay them, according to officials.

If these monetary claims are being presented now, officials say, it is because the Philippines is hard pressed and payment of some of them has been due for years. Furthermore, it is pointed out, the claims are submitted as a matter of right and the United States, recognizing justice, will see its way clear to meet its obligation. Thirdly, officials declare, settlement now will certainly remove an irritant in Philippine-American relations.

These considerations are reported to be reflected in high quarters in Government and shared by General Romulo. The Philippine diplomat has consistently turned down requests for a press conference and up to his departure maintained silence when queried on the conferences he had with high Government officials. However, intimates claimed that he shared official thinking on Philippine-American issues and that his views ran closely parallel to official sentiment as reported above.

At the same time, General Romulo was understood as wishing that Philippine Congress leaders would exercise greater moderation and temperance in their public utterances so that they could better cooperate in the creation of a favorable atmosphere for the bilateral negotiations scheduled to start soon both here and in America. He is known to feel that given an atmosphere of amity and understanding no issues outstanding between the two nations cannot be resolved satisfactorily.

"It would be a shame," he was heard to remark, "if the indissoluble bounds (between the two countries) forged in peace and in war should be allowed to weaken over problems that could arise in the best of families."

---

## The American Bar Association and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1959, an editorial entitled "A Mickey From the Bar." In the same connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter to the editor of the New York Times which appeared in that newspaper on March 5, 1959. The letter was written by Jefferson B. Fordham of Philadelphia:

LAWYERS GROUP CRITICIZED—BAR ASSOCIATION SAID TO ALINE ITSELF WITH LAY CRITICS OF COURT

(The writer of the following letter is dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

By action of its house of delegates taken on February 24 the American Bar Association failed the American public in interpreting for the citizens the work of the Supreme Court in our constitutional and legal system. What the bar association did, in short, was to aline itself with lay critics of the Court. I am grieved that this is so.

On that date the house of delegates adopted recommendations put forth by the association's special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives. These recommendations began by declaring that it was the duty of members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks and expressed disapproval of proposals to limit Supreme Court jurisdiction.

They went on, however, to laud the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the House Un-American Activities Committee for their "records and accomplishments and great service to the Nation" and to recommend a number of changes in Federal legislation.

In calling for changes in Federal legislation the House of Delegates has left a very strong impression that the reason it is considered to be needful is the bad job the Supreme Court is thought to have done in interpreting the Constitution and Federal statutes, the latter in particular. To suggest statutory change is one thing, to imply that it is needed due to bad work by the highest Court is another.

EFFECT ON SECURITY

I simply do not believe that any weakening effect on internal security has been shown or that the association's attack on the Court can be effectively sustained on a lawyer-like basis. The decisions that the Court has made in cases involving security problems have been supported by legal reasoning and methods of interpretation which are familiar to members of the legal profession and generally respected.

It is, for example, a well-understood and well-accepted doctrine in constitutional interpretation that a constitutional question is to be avoided in the interpretation of a statute if this can be done without violence

to the measure examined in its totality. Yet when the Court followed this doctrine in the Yates case and thereby made it unnecessary to pass upon a serious question as to the constitutionality of the Smith Act, the critics of the Court seemed to be able to see nothing but the fact that the result in the case was not to their liking. The ABA would so change the Smith Act as to present squarely the substantive constitutional question which, under the present language, the Court was able to avoid in the Yates case.

The action of the House of Delegates discloses strong preoccupation with matters of internal security rather than with the protection of civil liberty. I do not suggest that lawyers have no proper concern with internal security. But I must say that I find a serious imbalance reflected in the action of the House of Delegates. In my system of values the preeminent concern of lawyers, as individuals and as a group, is with human liberty. Security does not mean much to me except as a means to preserve the conditions under which there will exist maximum freedom for individual human expression and fulfillment.

APPLAUSE FOR COURT

The bar association action has a Maginot line psychology. For my part, I am glad to record the opinion that instead of being charged by the organized bar with reaching decisions inimical to our internal security, the Supreme Court should be warmly applauded by the profession for its fidelity to the substantive and procedural safeguards of the Bill of Rights and for its interpretation of statutes in keeping with the spirit of the Bill of Rights.

When it comes to recommendations for substantive legislation I think the A.B.A. should assert leadership in the realm of civil rights and civil liberties. For years the committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives has been very active and strongly supported, while the committee on the Bill of Rights has languished.

Considered as recommendations for legislative change the bar association proposals are vulnerable. I invite particular attention to the proposal that Congress specifically provides that State statutes forbidding sedition against the United States be enforceable concurrently with the Smith Act.

The Smith Act was interpreted in the Nelson case to supersede a Pennsylvania State sedition law so far as sedition against the United States was concerned. The State supreme court has held that, as to sedition against the United States, the Smith Act superseded the State law. The Supreme Court of the United States agreed with this.

Is not national security a national responsibility? How would it aid to leave each State free to have its own law and enforcement machinery on this subject? I can see in such a system ample grist for the mill of politically ambitious local prosecutors, with the attendant hazards to fair play and civil liberty, but I do not delude myself with the notion that the cause of national security would be served.

JEFFERSON B. FORDHAM.

PHILADELPHIA, *February 26, 1959.*

## Dr. Flemming's Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Flemming, has recently applied his talent to the development of a formula which he states would solve the classroom shortage.

Under the Flemming formula, the Federal aid will be supplied to the States which will enable the building of an additional 75,000 classrooms over the next 5 years. In order for this formula to work, however, it will be necessary for the States and local districts to repeal debt limitations, for many State to amend their constitutions, and for others to completely revamp the system of State aid which they and the local districts have worked out over the years. To Dr. Flemming, these are only minor obstacles.

Dr. Flemming has expressed great concern over the problem of supplying an adequate number of competent teachers for the public schools but, as yet, his administration has not seen fit to take any action in this field. He has not made sufficient application of his own ingenious formula.

He should consider applying the Flemming formula to other education problems—teaching the English language, for instance. Under the Flemming formula, all he would have to do is change the basic rules of grammar.

Then a noun does not have to agree with a verb. And there would not be nothing wrong with a double negative. It would be all right to mispel words and use a preposition to end a sentence with.

This application of the Flemming formula might help solve the classroom and teacher shortage. Children would not have to spend so much time learning English. Fewer English teachers and fewer classrooms would be needed. Of course, this is an absurd application of Dr. Flemming's formula but no more absurd than his contention that the classroom shortage can be overcome by changing State constitutions and taxing concepts.

## Hon. James A. Farley Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1959, the National Democratic Club of New York gave a dinner in honor of one of its most distinguished members, the Honorable James A. Farley, to mark the 40th anniversary of his membership in the club.

It was truly a well-deserved tribute. No American has ever served his country with greater devotion. Jim Farley's contributions to Government, to poltics—in the best sense of that term—and to the welfare of his fellow citizens, have, in his lifetime, won him an enduring place in our history. He has always been motivated by the highest ideals, and his service has been, and continues to be, an inspiration to all of us, regardless of party.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the wording of an inscription which was on a plaque presented to Mr. Farley on this occasion.

The National Democratic Club presents this token of respect and esteem for our distinguished first vice president, Hon. James A. Farley, on the occasion of the 40th aniversary of his membership in the National Democratic Club.

An outstanding citizen, admirable public official and revered gentleman who by his exemplary and outstanding civic and governmental achievements, contributed greatly to the welfare of his Nation, his church, his community and his fellow club members.

His distinguished career has set a high moral standard to which all public officials can aspire and brings to mind the oft-quoted words of the bard, Longfellow:

"Lives of great men all remind us we can make our lives sublime, and departing leave behind us footprints on the sands of time."

Presented on behalf of the board of governors.

CARMINE G. DESAPIO,
*President.*
JEROME H. FRANK,
*Second Vice President.*
THOMAS A. LENANE,
*Secretary.*
C. JOSEPH DANAHY,
*Treasurer.*

## Hawaii Statehood

SPEECH
OF
## HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have only one question to ask. There has been extended debate here concerning communism, but there is this one question I would like to ask of the distinguished chairman who has had control of this bill. The gentleman filed a report over his name in which he admitted that the union that has leaders in it who are members of the Communist Party had control of the economy of Hawaii, and I heard the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who has done such great work against the Communist menace in this country, say that same thing was true and that he also found that. Then they undertook to take the position that the granting of statehood to Hawaii would provide the means by which you could combat that Communist menace. I think the record ought to be clear here during this debate as to where the responsibility lies at the present time for the failure to effectively combat communism in the Hawaiian Islands up to this date. I sincerely hope that the chairman of the committee or someone can answer that question for us.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the report to which he makes reference calls attention to the passage of a dock seizure bill by the legislature of Hawaii in 1949 which

was stoutly resisted by the ILWU and the Communist element and which they have been trying to repeal ever since its passage, but without success.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is not the question I asked. The fact of the matter is it was stated there has been no effective combating of the Communist situation in Hawaii up to date. I think we ought to know who is responsible for the failure up to date. Is it this Congress who is responsible or who is responsible for not having done something up to this date? I yield to the chairman because I think he is the one who ought to be permitted to answer that question in view of the report that he filed.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the report by the committee which visited Hawaii did not say that nothing was being done to combat communism in Hawaii. In fact, the very strength of our report was based upon what they were doing, and what they are doing in Hawaii. We were told by the highest authorities and the people responsible for security that the Communist apparatus there had become ineffective. We know of our own knowledge that the punishment meted out to the Communists there was punishment meted out by the people of Hawaii and by a Hawaiian jury, and these people escaped jail by a decision outside of the islands.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further, because the gentleman is not answering my question. If that is true the ILWU still has control of the economy of Hawaii.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I say to the gentleman, if he has asked me that question, that as far as the security of the United States is concerned that control to whatever extent it may be is just as serious to us whether Hawaii is a Territory or a State; but we believe that with statehood they can combat it even better than they are now doing.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman from Texas know that within the past month Mr. Hall, the Communist director of the ILWU, joined with Mr. Charles Kuomi, a member of the House of Representatives in Hawaii, and other radical ILWU members of the lower house of that legislature, and the whole membership of the Republican Party, to depose and get rid of the Democratic speaker, Mr. Esposito? And that the speaker who replaced that gentleman is now a creature of Mr. Hall and Mr. Kuomi? He was a leader of the Communist Party and the gentleman they put in as speaker sent a gavel to Mr. Bridges to open up the ILWU convention in San Francisco, and they now control the lower body of the House of Representatives in the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman from New York.

## The Need for a Food-Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the labor columnist, Victor Riesel, writing in the Milwaukee Sentinel recently, vividly described the paradox of "hunger in the midst of plenty" caused by our high unemployment on the one hand and the Government's $9 billion surplus of farm commodities on the other hand.

The solution to this problem, the food-stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to needy persons, long advocated by my outstanding colleague from Missouri, Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, has been rejected as too expensive by Agriculture Secretary Benson. This seems to me the height of folly, especially in light of the fact that it is going to cost Secretary Benson $1,200 million of the taxpayers' money next year just to pay the storage bill on his surplus foods.

I quite agree with Mr. Riesel that the time has come to take some of our surplus food out of high-cost Government storage and put it on the dinner tables of the people who need it. Mr. Riesel's column follows, and I recommend it highly:

HUNGRY JOBLESS DENIED SURPLUS FOOD
(By Victor Riesel)

It's time for lots of us with money in our wallets to say it: Soon there will be actual hunger in the midst of plenty of prosperity in this Nation. There are poverty pockets. There are heartbreaks at plant gates each week. There are tens of thousands of charity cases. There are loaded welfare lists. All this, in the midst of plenty—of memories of the Thirties.

And all the while the Agricultural Department is nursing more than $9 billion worth of surplus foods. Yet there are thousands of families of unemployed men who need this sustenance but will have to grovel or sell their toasters, TV sets or old washing machines and prove themselves absolutely destitute before they can get what is stored up in Federal bins.

It takes a trip such as I've just made through this land to see personally that in these poverty pockets in the midst of our very real boom are an estimated 1 million of the 5 million jobless. They need help desperately.

They've been out of work so long, they'll be hungry—real 1930-type hungry—in the next 6 months.

But it's a rare community—possibly only Bristol, Pa.—which has set up efficient offices to apply for the surplus foods and distribute them in such hard-hit areas as Pennsylvania, northern New York, and Michigan.

Yet the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation—official keeper of the stores—now has over $9 billion worth of foods such as dried milk, soybeans, cheese, meats and wheat on hand. By June 1960, this vast surplus stockpile of edibles (and a few other commodities such as cotton) will hit $10½ billion.

And just imagine, the sheer cost of keeping this stuff from rotting each year could feed most of the unemployed. Government records reveal that in the 1959 fiscal year it will pay $850 million for storage, transportation and interest on the surpluses. Next year this cost will jump to $1,200 million just for the handling of stuff which apparently will never be eaten by anyone.

This money has absolutely nothing to do with the cost of purchasing the surpluses—it's just the handling charges, let me reemphasize.

But despite the need of those caught in the Nation's poverty pockets, only a few million dollars worth of this gargantuan store of staples has been distributed this year. The AFL–CIO community services committee, headed by Leo Perlis, reports that some of the neediest unemployed will go along on meager diets rather than see themselves left with just meager shreds of dignity.

They feel they lose their self respect when they are required to fill out forms stating they have no close relatives working, that they have less than a few hundred dollars in the bank, or that they have no assets such as a TV set or an old car.

And even when they have convinced Scrooge-type officials that they are not moochers, they get a handout of dry milk, cheese, or soy beans. The officialdom just doesn't bother to attempt to make available the other varieties of surpluses such as meats or eggs.

All this—and more—will be spoken of bitterly at the AFL–CIO unemployment demonstration in Washington which labor's four-man task force planned in detail in Washington last week.

From all over the Nation, representatives of jobless councils will come by plane, train, and chartered bus to hear speakers demand a Nation moratorium on debts of the unemployed. They will hear pleas for a holiday on taxes in the form of reduced withholding amounts from pay envelopes each week. Orators will urge a free medical plan tied to the distribution of surplus foods and free legal aid and psychological guidance for families hit by the strains of sudden poverty.

There will be calls for the kind of laws you would expect a march on Washington to demand. There will be a surplus of such demands—but, agree with them or not, let's get those billions of dollars worth of foods from the Federal bins to the breadbaskets of the folks who need our help.

## Thirtieth Anniversary Testimonial Banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proceedings of the 30th anniversary testimonial banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, in honor of the Honorable Maximilian Moss, Surrogate of Kings County, held at the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn on October 16, 1958.

Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association of Brooklyn, was the toastmaster.

Mr. ROSCOE. Distinguished officers, guests, and friends, this is the 30th annual award dinner of the Brooklyn region, National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Each of these 30 years has been significant in bringing men of faith together in common purpose, peace and freedom. But, this is very special, a very extraordinary gathering of men and women of good will, for it honors a very great person, a true leader, one who embodies all the ideals of brotherhood, one whose entire life represents just this—the promotion of good will and understanding among all the people—the Honorable Maximilian Moss, Surrogate, Kings County.

As you can see in this crowded ballroom, this is the largest assembly we have ever held. The success of our dinner is due to the selfless, infinite labors of our chairmen: Mr. Chester A. Allen, treasurer; and Alexander Aldrich, Vincent Caristo, and Arthur Levitt, regional cochairmen. And there are others whose help has been strong and eager: The members of our executive dinner committee, and, as well, the workers of our general committee, who worked with unsparing time and labor.

There are many, many credits, many thanks to offer to many of you tonight. But let me mention just a few quite casually: Mr. Joe Weinstein, who contributed great moral and substantial support and presented us with a gracious reception and gave us these beautiful flower arrangements.

Mr. Harry Aschkinasi, the spark plug of the professional staff.

Mr. Joseph L. Edwards, director, Brooklyn region, National Conference of Christians and Jews, and finally, each of our many sponsors, who really made this historical event possible by their good will and solid effort.

Cochairman of the Brooklyn division of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and cabinet officers of the police commissioner in charge of Youth welfare, deputy commissioner of the New York Police Department, the Honorable Alexander Aldrich.

Brooklyn philanthropist and banker, recipient of the 1957 Brotherhood Award, president of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, the treasurer of this 30th anniversary testimonial dinner, Mr. Chester A. Allen.

Distinguished statesman, organizer of the Italian Board of Guardians; military leader and veteran; knighted by Pope Pius XII because of humanitarian service to all, especially children of unhappy homes, Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

A truly admirable public servant, a beaver in the municipal government, budget director of the city of New York, Hon. Abraham Beame.

A philanthropic leader, honorary president of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn; and associate justice of the appellate division of the supreme court, the Honorable George J. Beldock.

A philanthropist and distinguished jurist who has provided strong, unfailing support for Brooklyn's effort in vigorous social progress, Hon. A. David Benjamin.

A philanthropist, and a dedicated public servant, justice of domestic relations court, Hon. Maurice Bernhardt.

A devoted leader of human understanding, vigorous leader in every effort to increase human tolerance among all classes and creeds, vice president of the National Conference, Dr. Sterling Brown.

Chaplain of the Italian Board of Guardians, whose service to troubled youth is of inestimable value, and rector of Our Lady of Grace Church, the Very Reverend Monsignor Salvator B. Cafiero.

Distinguished philanthropist and builder, cochairman of the Brooklyn division of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Mr. Vincent Caristo.

The first citizen of Brooklyn, and my dear friend, the borough president of Brooklyn, Hon. John Cashmore.

A distinguished lawyer and a philanthropist, vice president of the Flatbush Boys' Club, Hon. Daniel G. Connolly.

Executive director of the Brooklyn division of the Protestant Council, Dr. David M. Corey.

Vigorous, youthful, energetic community leader and responsible, devoted, public servant, builder of highest standards of civil and human justice, senior judge of the supreme court of New York, Hon. Anthony DiGiovanna.

Able, consistent worker for local progress and national security. Sturdy representative of human rights and honest government, and member of our Brooklyn team of representatives, Hon. FRANCIS E. DORN.

Participant in every worthy cause in our community, a worker of genuine sincerity and energy, and the hardest worker for this dinner, Mr. Joseph J. Dreyer.

Executive director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Brooklyn division, and the sparkplug of this dinner and of the conference all year around, Mr. Joseph V. Edwards.

The municipal court of the city of New York is the primary frontier of justice in our great frontier town, the welcoming harbor of our Nation.

We are privileged to have the president justice of this court, Hon. Harry Eppig.

A communal leader in manifold fields, chairman of the Brooklyn chapter of American National Red Cross, vice president and general manager of the New York Telephone Co., Mr. Walter A. Giles.

One who portrays the best of American womanhood and dedicated to the service of all worthy community endeavors, Miss Elizabeth A. Goodman.

An educator of international distinction; recipient of many deserved honors and awards, including the French Legion of Honor. A distinguished companion of our superintendent of schools, Dr. Jacob Greenberg.

Recipient of the 1957 Brotherhood Award, trustee of two great colleges, philanthropist, industrialist, and banker, Mr. John W. Hooper.

The "Horatio Alger" of Brooklyn, good friend of the conference, and member of the public service commission, Hon. Aaron L. Jacoby.

A former member of the American diplomatic corps, educator, philanthropist, and industrialist, president of the Navy Yard Boys' Club, Mr. Douglas James.

A distinguished leader in social welfare and public service, president of the Brooklyn Borough Gas Co., Mr. Walter M. Jeffords, Jr.

Back in darker days of the Nation's history our homeowners had a friend in the Halls of Congress, presently a guiding member of the House Ways and Means Committee, a distinguished Member of Congress, Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH.

A distinguished, untiring leader in the field of social welfare and community effort, Mrs. Bertha Kirsch.

Distinguished young banker, chairman of the board of governors of the Brooklyn Academy of Music, unfailing leader in Brooklyn cultural education, Mr. Everett Livesey.

Philanthropist, industrialist, and former recipient of the brotherhood award of our conference, Mr. Lester Martin.

A generous, great-hearted citizen, public official, lawyer, and banker, immediate postcochairman of the Brooklyn division of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Hon. John P. McGrath.

Great champion of freedom of enterprise and the dual banking system, Superintendent of Banks Hon. George A. Mooney.

Distinguished Congressman, thorough student of economics and political science. Recognized leader of our national parliament and member of a grand and worth team representing the Borough of Brooklyn, Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Distinguished war veteran, aristocrat of merchants, and one who brings philanthropy and integrity to our community, Maj. Benjamin H. Namm.

A friend of our guest of honor from a distant land, human and compassionate American, esteemed by those who know him, former mayor fo the city of New York and former U.S. Ambasador to Mexico, Hon. William O'Dwyer.

Ever kindly, sympathetic and understanding friend of humanity, a distinguished community leader, judge of the eastern district of the State of New York, Hon. Leo F. Rayfiel.

Our good and able friend, director of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Dr. Allyn Robinson.

Dedicated community leader well in the vanguard in every movement for community improvement, leader of the city council, Hon. Joseph T. Sharkey.

A soldier, a lawyer, a corporate executive, and a philanthropist, president of Mays Department Stores, and our host of this evening's reception, Maj. Max L. Shulman.

A distinguished leader in business, social welfare, and community effort, president of Abraham and Strauss, Mr. Sidney L. Solomon.

Active in all worthy efforts and dedicated to community welfare, judge of the court of claims, Hon. Sidney Squire.

The businessman of our city administration, champion of human rights, and president of the city council, Hon. Abe Stark.

Poet laureate and spiritual leader of our guest of honor and rabbi of Temple Ahavath Sholom, Rabbi Alexander Steinbach.

A big heart whose warmth embraces everything worthwhile in human relations, outstanding industrialist and businessman, chairman of the board of May's Department Store, Mr. Joe Weinstein.

A devoted, consistent community servant, justice of the municipal court of the city of New York, and designated as an acting justice of the city court, Hon. Oliver D. Williams.

One who has dedicated himself to our community's welfare; a distinguished philanthropist and an outstanding businessman, president of Martin's Department Store, Mr. Harry Zeitz.

In introducing our speakers tonight, allow me, please, to limit my introduction to extraordinary phases of these distinguished careers, only referring to the peaks of their communal service, for it is community service and community conscience that bring them here with us tonight.

Distinguished statesmen, our good friend, Col. Arthur Levitt, comptroller of the State of New York, is more than a great public official. He represents civic and communal life on its highest level here in our community of Brooklyn. He is our cochairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Brooklyn region; cochairman for civil defense of Brooklyn; former vice chairman of the Brooklyn chapter of the American Red Cross; president and trustee of the Union Temple of Brooklyn, counsel and director of the Pride of Judea Children's Home, and past commander of the Sydney Rosenberg Post, American Legion, and former president of the Board of Education of the city of New York.

Fellow guests, it is a great honor to present to you a citizen of our community whose breadth of vision and intelligence is as great as his community service and sense of duty, The Honorable Arthur Levitt.

Mr. LEVITT. The sum total of activities of the National Conference of Christians and Jews is devoted to building brotherhood. There are a number of ways that this is being done in the Borough of Brooklyn.

Brooklyn high school students have attended the annual High School Youth Conference at Camp Lake Bryn Mawr in Pennsylvania and these students form a nucleus of a group actively working in the Brooklyn region.

Much is being done in educating Brooklyn teachers who are in direct touch with the adults of the future. Teams of teachers have attended workshops at colleges and universities throughout the Nation. Many more are taking courses in human relations, and a group of five has journeyed to Puerto Rico to better equip themselves to work with the Puerto Rican children in the Brooklyn school population.

A unique program is the National Conference of Christians and Jews training in human relations for the Police Department. High-ranking officers are attending these courses on their own time with the approval of the Commissioner of Police, Stephen P. Kennedy. Last year a similar program was conducted for members of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Brooklyn.

Apart from these specific programs, the National Conference of Christians and Jews has rendered services to all types of schools, community, and religious organizations that wish to promote the idea of brotherhood.

The National Conference of Christians and Jews exists to create harmony and understanding among the many different groups that make up America. As much as any place in this country, Brooklyn has representatives of every race, religion, and national group in the world. Fortunately, we've been able to live together in harmony and understanding, but it is only because of organizations like the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which have taught us to appreciate the fundamental necessity of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Mr. ROSCOE, distinguished jurist, justice of the supreme court of the State of New York—in introducing this good friend of ours, let me tell you some of his less known achievements because his major accomplishments in his distinguished career are part of the history of Brooklyn and the history of the State of New York.

Judge Keogh began his professional career as a teacher in Public School 183 in Brooklyn, N.Y. Apparently, Judge Keogh has dedicated himself to public service ever since those early days in 1924 when the young boys and girls of Brooklyn first knew him. For he has served the citizenry of youth of our community well and consistently ever since as borough commissioner of the Boy Scouts of America, trustee of the Brooklyn Juvenile Guidance Center, Brooklyn Cancer Committee, New York Heart Campaign. He is now president of the Brooklyn Council of Boy Scouts of America and vice president of the Friends of the Brooklyn Public Library.

As teacher, community friend, author, distinguished jurist and scholar and, above all, able leader of the best in Brooklyn, we proudly introduce the Honorable J. Vincent Keogh.

Representative KEOGH. Mr. Toastmaster, reverend clergy, our guest of honor and his lovely family, Borough President John Cashmore, Dr. Jones, my colleagues on the bench, our friend, Ambassador O'Dwyer, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, friends of the Conference and of Surrogate Moss:

When one as our guest of honor has been acclaimed in so many tangible ways with medals, plaques, loving cups, desk sets, and citations, it is appropriate to recall Keats' classical expression from Endymion, "A thing of beauty is a joy forever." The great artists were not only those of the dim past—there are some who are contemporary, and one of them is Leslie Huvos whom I should like to have join me. Mr. Huvos was kind enough to execute for the Conference of Christians and Jews the presentation I am about to make. His great artistry now joins the company of the Winged Victory of Samothrace, Venus de Milo, Michaelangelo's David and Moses and the other great works of art, even to those now exhibited in the Museum of Modern Art. Mr. Huvos, who did not always live in the United States, was considered the outstanding sculptor of middle Europe. His works are in the Paris Opera House and throughout Europe. Most of the statues in the public squares of Budapest are his creations. He created the St. Christoper monumental statue in the Salon des Artistes Francais in Paris and was complimented therefor by President Theodore Roosevelt at the unveiling. The statue was blessed by the Pope.

Among other works of art of this sculptor are the busts of Admiral Horthy in the royal castle in Hungary, Hector Berlioz in the opera houses of Budapest and Paris, Toscanini, Frantz Liszt, and Chopin. Surrogate Moss, an artist of such talent was chosen so that on this occasion we could tangibly present to you a creation that will live forever and is less expendable than even a car, that forever will reflect the talents, attributes and congenital humanity of one who stands out in our community as representing all that which is noble American democracy. A lawyer, veteran of World War I, then for many years associated with an outstanding law firm in Brooklyn, president of the New York City Board of Education, our guest of honor has contributed to the interests not of any one particular group, but of our entire borough and city, not only president of the Jewish Community Council, but interested in the work of the Salvation Army and yes, even the defunct Dodgers' Knothole Club, not only a member of the executive committee of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, but active in our Boy Scout and Red Cross movements, not only past vice president of the Brooklyn Zionist region, but a member of the advisory council of the Sister Kenney Foundation, and on the Columbus Day Citizens Committee, and also Brooklyn Week for the Blind, elected a justice of the supreme court in 1951 and later as surrogate of Kings County in 1955, maintaining the dignity, high standards and sincere understanding of that long line of surrogates, Ketcham, Wingate, McGarey, and Rubenstein. We who work with and know our guest of honor take pride this evening in reminding him of his many unselfish community activities, all consonant with the philosophies and ideals of the Conference of Christians and Jews. Surrogate Moss, it is my heartfelt pleasure on behalf of all those assembled, to make this presentation.

Mr. Moss. Revered members of the clergy, Mr. Chairman, Borough President Cashmore, President Jones, my brethren on the bench, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and my family, particularly Richard and Nikki, the eldest two of my seven grandchildren.

Although Judge Benjamin could have expressed it better than I, yet I would not be happy without paying my personal respects to that genuine lovable human being, our dynamic chairman, Andy Roscoe. Only those who worked closely with him know of the hard labor performed by him even until 3 in the morning; and always with patience and much charm.

But no man can stay out, day after day, until the early hours of the morning without an understanding wife, and therefore we owe much to Ethel, Andy's better half, and incidentally to my own dear wife, Grace. Both have our genuine gratitude.

Now, when a president of a bank gives his time to a community project, it cannot be done without the consent of its board of directors, and therefore we tender our thanks to the board of the Equitable Savings and Loan Association.

You will see that this is a chain reaction, for when the directors of a bank give leave to their president to engage in a communal endeavor, it is because this is agreeable to the superintendent of banks.

In this audience, we are privileged to have Mr. George Mooney, superintendent of banks of the State of New York, and, Mr. Mooney, I know I bespeak the voice of Brooklyn when I say that we appreciate deeply the policy which you pursue of encouraging presidents and officials of banks to become part of all worthwhile community endeavors. Your presence and their presence tonight attest to that.

My appreciation also goes to the dedicated sponsors, chairmen, and members of the various committees, and to Mr. Edwards and Mr. Aschkinasi of the professional staff; and, of course, to my own spiritual leader, Rabbi Steinbach for his kind words. But transcending all, we recognize that you in this ballroom are the dedicated persons who really made this dinner.

And I cannot restrain myself from singling out the man who first brought me into public life; one whose picture has always occupied the most conspicuous place in my chambers, one whom I have never deviated in my opinion, admiration and love, in storm as well as fair weather—our former Mayor Bill O'Dwyer.

To Mr. Leslie Huvos: I feel very humble to have merited the attention of such an outstanding sculptor. A thousand thanks for having recorded so faithfully my wrinkles and facial muscles; and my deep appreciation to the gentlemen who donated the bust to the conference without a penny's expense to the organization.

And finally my gratitude to my very dear friend, Judge Keogh for his laudatory, but undeserved remarks.

I would not be human if I were not profoundly touched by all of this; and I pledge to you that the events of this evening will seal within me that inspiration which guides men to devote their lives to their community.

The presence of so many people demonstrates clearly an essential aspect of the American way of life; that American culture is no abstract isolated concept but rather a living and growing force which has fed upon the established cultures and religions of all the faiths.

There is in this audience, Prof. Abraham Katsch of New York University, who said in a lecture that on close analysis, our practical democratic creed turns out to be merely an affirmation of the common basis of all the many faiths; that democracy is a masterful symphony, the mellowness and richness of which depend upon an amalgam of the traditions and cultures of all its peoples, brought into an harmonious accord.

The freedom of the human mind is a gift of God to man. But the distortion of the human mind is the act of man, which Dr. Jones has just described as "wicked and destructive", and which we hope can be changed by education. That is why so many of us of all faiths are behind the work of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

History has a habit of repeating itself, for today we are witnessing a resurgence of hate. The ministers of God recognize it.

As an example, in a recent sermon at solemn Mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Father Francis X. Duffy declared, "God cannot be adequately loved by any person who harbors hate." He said that it "is a disease of the spirit." He called it, "Murder from the heart which can express itself in the sharp tongue, the heavy fist, and open war."

The instigators of the hate campaigns care little for the aftereffects of their poison, which by careful studies of the past, have proved beyond doubt that the person who, for example, today is antisemitic, tomorrow becomes anti-Negro, anti-Catholic or anti-

Protestant, and vice versa; antieverything outside his own particular group.

This is not mere surmise but stark past history. And to show you the truth of this assertion, I need only bring to your mind a few examples:

In 1826, an Anti-Masonic National Party was started in America. One history book said: "Anti-Masons were as thick as hornets in the rural Yankee Belt from Maine to Ohio."

The Anti-Masonic Party was the first American party (I hate to call it "American") to hold a presidential nominating convention, which it did in September of 1831 in Baltimore.

The party carried Vermont.

The party ran ahead of President Jackson in Massachusetts.

But, as I said before, prejudice and hatreds once engendered have habits of changing quickly from one scapegoat to another.

And so, a few years later in 1844, an anti-Catholic party was formed, called the "Native Americans." (Notice how all these anti forces always use the cherished name "American.")

As a result of the formation of this anti-Catholic party, many persons were killed and ancient Catholic churches here and elsewhere were burned.

This was the predecessor group to the Know-Nothings, which elected Governors in Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware, and four New England States. They also elected a mayor in New York City and even President Fillmore later became one of their party.

Today the world has made tremendous progress. Dr. Jones has touched on our rocket exploration as but one example. Man's brain has thus brought great scientific triumphs. But it seems that as man's mind becomes sharper in material things, the world becomes more hazardous. And because of that we must encourage every organization and group, whose purpose is to direct man's brain to the more important victories of spiritual triumphs. If the history of civilization proves anything, it proves that the flesh is endowed with something which lifts it above the material, and that something is the divine spirit in man.

Man's future and his progress throughout the ages have always been the history of his spirit. It is no different today, and happily there is a growing realization of this infinite power in both our young and old.

Oh, if the peddlers of hate could only learn in their lifetime, that regardless of the extent of their hates and prejudices, in the republic of the grace, all men, at last, are equal. The tragedy of the world today is that this eternal truth is unfortunately learned by too many, only in death. If only the world would hearken back to the Book of Genesis, for then they would realize that all the people of the earth sprang from the same ancestry; that there is a unity of the human race; that God is the common Father, the creator of all; that it is His divine law which declares all men to be brothers.

---

## Impact of the 1957–58 Recession in Relation to Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, unemployment continues to increase in this country. It has now reached a seasonally adjusted figure of 6.1 percent of the working force. That is, 1 of every 16 working people are out of jobs.

Fortunately, we are better prepared to deal with unemployment and its attendant problems today than in the past. The University of Michigan's subcommittee on income maintenance has just released its study entitled "Significant Findings on the Impact of the 1957–58 Recession in Relation to Unemployment Insurance." The authors of this study, William Haber, Fedels F. Fauri, and Wilbur J. Cohen, have made a significant contribution to the unemployment problem which is especially timely in light of the current debate over extending emergency unemployment benefits. A related study will be offered for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a later date.

The aforementioned study follows:

PART 1. SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS ON THE IMPACT OF THE 1957–58 RECESSION IN RELATION TO UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(By William Haber, Fedele F. Fauri, and Wilbur J. Cohen)

I. SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER DATA

Information from continuing studies by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan on the nationwide impact of the recession during 1957–58 in relation to unemployment insurance indicates the following significant findings:

*Impact of unemployment on families* [1]

Eighteen percent of all families in the Nation had one or more family members unemployed during the 12-month period prior to October 1958.

In 14 percent of the families the head experienced some unemployment;

In an additional 4 percent of the families another member experienced some unemployment.

*Relation of annual unemployment to October unemployment* [1]

In the month of October 1958, nearly 6 percent of American families had one or more members unemployed while an additional 12 percent of families experienced some unemployment during the previous 12 months, a total of 18 percent in the 12-month period.[2]

*Duration of unemployment* [1]

The average duration of unemployment was 18 weeks for individuals who experienced some unemployment in the previous 12 months.

For those who were unemployed in October the average duration of unemployment was 26 weeks; 42 percent of this group had been unemployed more than 26 weeks.[3]

For those who were back on the job in October 1958, the average duration of unemployment was about 14 weeks.

*Impact of the recession* [1]

An estimated 13 million different persons experienced a period of unemployment during the 12 months, October 1957–58. This compares very roughly with the 9.8 million different persons who were unemployed during the year 1956, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. The recession thus had the double effect of increasing the number of unemployed as well as lengthening the duration of unemployment.

The number of unemployed during the 12-month period of 1957–58 was roughly 35 to 40 percent greater than in the calendar year 1956. The duration of unemployment also substantially increased. In 1956, according to the census, about one-third of all individuals experiencing unemployment during the year had only 4 weeks or less of unemployment, while the corresponding October 1957–58 figure from the survey was about 13 percent. On the other hand, the proportion experiencing unemployment for more than 26 weeks increased from about 11 to 22 percent during the same period.

About 25 percent of all families reported in October that they experienced unemployment or shorter hours at some time during the previous 12 months. In four-fifths of these families, the main breadwinner was affected. About two-thirds of the unemployed, and half of those whose working hours were cut, attributed this to the recession. An additional 13 percent of families felt that the recession had hurt their financial situation, even though they had experienced neither unemployment nor shorter hours. For some of these families earnings in their own business were lower, others said that their wages or salary had been reduced, that an anticipated raise did not materialize, or that the recession affected them because prices rose.

In all, 38 percent of all families reported either unemployment, shorter hours, or some other setback to their financial situation which they blamed on the recession.

*Income losses of unemployed families* [1]

Income losses were unevenly distributed among the unemployed families. The median net income loss (after taking into account unemployment insurance benefits) for the year reported in the families where the head was unemployed was approximately $900. About 3 percent of the families, where the head was unemployed, reported that they suffered no net income loss and about 18 percent reported they suffered a net income loss of $2,000 or more in the year.

*Measures taken by families to adjust to loss of income* [1]

The most important measures taken by families to adjust to the unemployment of the head of the family were in the order of importance: use of savings, cutting down on buying, help from relatives, piling up bills, and borrowing money. Some families moved to cheaper quarters, were able to have another member of the family go to work, or sought relief from a public welfare agency.[4] The average family with unemployment took two of these measures. The larger the income loss, the more measures were taken to meet the unemployment situation.

*Relation to receipt of unemployment insurance* [1]

Most significant was that of those families where the head received unemployment insurance benefits during the entire period of his unemployment, about 85 percent still took one or more measures (such as those listed above). Unemployment insurance benefits by themselves did not assure to these families sufficient income to continue their previous level of living without some basic adjustments.

The kinds of measures taken differed significantly, however, for those heads of families who received unemployment insurance benefits during the entire period of their unemployment as compared with those who received benefits for only part of their unemployment or not at all. For instance, use of savings was more often resorted to by the first group than the second while piling up bills and borrowing money were more often resorted to by the second group than by the first.

*Relation to thrift* [1]

About 44 percent of the unemployed heads of families reported that they had some savings which they used in the emergency. Although the extent of the savings drawn is not known, reliance upon savings was by far the most important measure taken by heads of unemployed families who received unemployment insurance for their entire duration of unemployment. This fact indicates the extent to which thrift and self-responsibility are relied upon to meet unemployment emergencies.

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

*Relation to help from relatives* [1]

Twenty-three percent of the families in which the head was unemployed reported that they received some help from relatives. Although the extent of the aid is not known, the general magnitude indicates that family aid plays an important role in providing some protection in an unemployment emergency.

*Moved to cheaper quarters* [1]

About 7.5 percent of all heads of families who received unemployment insurance benefits during the entire period of their unemployment moved to cheaper quarters. This figure increased to about 18 percent for those who received only some or no benefits. Thus, it appears unemployment insurance benefits played an important role in helping unemployed persons maintain their previous housing arrangements.

*Relation to public welfare* [1]

About 6.5 percent of all heads of families who were unemployed sought and obtained public relief from welfare agencies. For those with unemployment of less than 14 weeks, the proportion who went on relief was negligible. But the proportion increased substantially as duration of unemployment increased.

*Impact by occupation* [1]

About 10 percent of the heads of families who were in clerical and sales ocupations experienced a period of unemployment during the 12-month period; 20 percent of those in service occupations; nearly 30 percent of craftsmen; and 40 percent of those in unskilled labor.

Taking all individuals who were unemployed during the 12-month period about 9 percent were clerical and sales persons; 10 percent were in service occupations; 53 percent were craftsmen; 16 percent were unskilled laborers; and 12 percent were in all other occupations.

*Impact by age* [1]

About 20 percent of all unemployed heads of families were between the ages of 18 and 29 and about the same percent were age 55 or over. However, of the younger group, 13 percent were unemployed 26 weeks or more while in the older group the comparable proportion was 29 percent. In other words, the older the person, the longer his unemployment tended to be.

*Unemployment within the family* [1]

Of those unemployed during the 12-month period, 71 percent were heads of families, 14 percent were wives of heads, 12 percent were sons or daughters, and 3 percent were other relatives.

Twenty-five percent of the unemployed were women (heads, wives and daughters).

*Evaluation of chances of finding another job* [1]

Of the heads of families who experienced some unemployment during the previous 12 months, 50 percent said their chances of finding a new job that would pay about the same would be bad, about 34 percent, they would be good. Seven percent were uncertain, and 9 percent were not ascertained.

*Differential expectations about business conditions* [1]

Pessimism about future business conditions was only slight higher for all unemployed persons compared with other persons. For example, while 15 percent of those unemployed 8 weeks or less expected bad times in the coming year, the figure was only 18 percent for those with unemployment of more than 26 weeks. The comparable figure was 8 percent for those individuals in the labor force not affected by unemployment or shorter hours.

Unqualified optimism about future business conditions declined sharply as duration of unemployment increased.

Persons who experienced a spell of unemployment and then became reemployed, however, had more optimistic expectations about future business conditions than those who were still unemployed in October, 1958.

*Receipt of unemployment insurance* [1]

About 36 percent of all unemployed individuals did not receive any unemployment insurance benefits. This was due to lack of coverage, as well as to the fact that some persons with short durations of unemployment were not eligible for benefits or did not choose to apply for them. Among individuals with unemployment of 5 weeks or more, a lower proportion of the unemployed did not receive any benefits.

*Opinions of Government policies during the recession* [1]

About one-half of all adults in the Nation (employed, unemployed, and retired) reported that the Government had done a good job during the recession. The major reason given—by 14 percent—for favorable responses was that the Government extended help, through unemployment insurance, social security, or other measures.

About 23 percent of all adults felt that the Government had done a poor job. Among only those persons who reported they were affected unfavorably by the recession (unemployment, shorter hours, business losses, or other reasons), a somewhat larger proportion—34 percent—were of that opinion.

*Duration of unemployment in relation to major purchases* [1]

About 60 percent of those unemployed 14 weeks or more made no major purchase during the survey year and did not spend money on home improvements. The corresponding figure for all persons not affected by unemployment or shorter hours was 40 percent. The proportion for persons with unemployment of 8 weeks or less was about the same as those who were not affected.

Plans for major expenditures during the coming year also were lower among those with prolonged unemployment than among those in the general population, despite the lower level of purchases of the unemployed in the past year.

---

[1] All findings marked under this footnote are results obtained from interviews with a random sample of 1,323 families taken in October 1958 on a nationwide basis by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. Unemployment in the survey includes all unemployment experience over a 12-month period, in contrast to the monthly census report on the labor force which measures only current unemployment in a month. It should be noted that the census also publishes annual data on unemployment occurring within a calendar year.

[2] The 18 percent of families unemployed is slightly higher than the rate of unemployment of individuals in the labor force—17.2 percent. Both the family and the individual rates cited understate the volume of unemployment since the study conducted by the survey research center did not include the unemployment of persons aged 14–17 or new entrants into the labor market.

[3] The census reports the average duration of unemployment for those unemployed in October as 17 weeks. The difference between the survey data and the census data reflects the difference between the total duration of all spells of unemployment experienced by individuals in the 12-month period (survey research data), and the duration of the last spell of unemployment (census data).

[4] It is significant that less than one-half of 1 percent of all those who suffered an income loss reported that they sold their car or some other durable.

## The United Christian Youth Movement and International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information explaining the important work being done in the field of international affairs by the United Christian Youth Movement:

THE UNITED CHRISTIAN YOUTH MOVEMENT AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The United Christian Youth Movement (UCYM) is the official cooperative agency for the youth program of 30 national denominations reaching some 10 million young people between the ages of 15 and 23. The United Christian Youth Movement has structural entity in a national general council, 40 State Christian youth councils, and hundreds of community and area councils across the Nation, and, through its contacts with denominational program directors and editors and the resources and curricular materials they prepare and circulate, reaches into every local church youth program.

The national general council of the United Christian Youth Movement is an officially delegated assembly, bringing together the National and State leadership of the churches' youth program. It attempts to provide leadership for all church youth by focusing attention on areas of common concern, speaking the mind of youth to both church and community, lifting up critical problems for priority consideration by all the churches, and planning cooperative projects through which all Christian youth may make manifest their unity in Christ.

In fulfillment of these functions, the 1956 session of the general council voted to embark on a 5-year emphasis on education and action in international affairs, believing that Christian youth have a role and responsibility in the world today, that the issues of peace and war are among the most critical of our time, that responsible study and action can be effective in swaying the balance.

The general council sought to avoid a superficial rash of activities and projects directed that careful study and preparation precede any action phase. A highly selected group of 35 denominational leaders met in a Preparatory Commission on International Affairs in the spring of 1957. They spent a week in intense conversation with administration and congressional leaders, officials of the United Nations, professors of political science, theologians, and leading churchmen, and developed a fourfold strategy ("principles," "policies," "program," "projects"), including very careful and responsible coordination with the overall concerns and program of the churches as reflected in various units of the National Council of Churches (missionary education materials on "Into All the World Together"; Department of International Affairs program, including the Fifth World Order Study Conference and coordinated field program, Church World Service, etc.).

Small study groups within each constituent unit worked for nearly 2 years in the drafting and redrafting of a statement of basic principles underlying any concern or action in this field. The statement, "Moral and Theological Principles for Action in International Affairs," now stands as an official and major statement of the movement and

has been received with widespread respect and enthusiasm.

A similar process of intense study is now being pursued in the development of policy statements and discussion resources in several critical areas (disarmament, human rights, rapid social change, nuclear control, nationalism).

A handbook for use by local church leaders is now in prepaartion and is expected to be published early in 1960. The nationwide observances of Youth Week by all of our cooperating denominations and churches will focus attention in late January of 1960 on the role of youth in responsible citizenship and in 1961 on worldwide responsibilities.

Projects already under way include international Christian youth exchange, world youth projects, share our surplus, participation in trick-or-treat support of UNICEF, numerous U.N. and Washington seminars, and similar programs in several State capitals.

Projects being prepared include a teenage clothing drive for refugee relief, information and recruitment for careers in international affairs, development of a realistic and positive program of alternative service opportunities, and increased contact with congressional and administration leaders to reflect the concerns and opinions of Christian youth.

Already, at least a dozen of the national denominational youth organizatons and an even larger number of the cooperative state Christian youth councils have given major blocs of time in their annual meetings and summer conferences to a consideration of the ways in which this emphasis can be implemented in their constituency. Several are now developing their own supplementary programs of study and action.

The entire emphasis is geared to increased involvement of even larger numbers of young people in responsible, intelligent, informed study and action in international affairs concerns. The emphasis will have its major field thrust in 1960 and 1961 as the years of careful planning and basic study begin to reach the local level in widespread fashion. It is our faith and hope that Christian youth as instruments of God can influence change toward His will as a part of the world mission of the Church.

PERSONNEL

The United Christian Youth Movement, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The Department of International Affairs, National Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

State youth councils: Several State councils are listing resource persons and developing their own resource materials. If you do not know the address of your State council write to the national UCYM for information.

UCYM training conferences: The UCYM assists State UCYM councils in UCYM training conferences to train youth and their adult leaders for leadership in a program of United Christian youth action.

Your Denominational National Office.

PROJECTS

International Christian Youth Exchange, Brethren Service Center, New Windsor, Md.

Commission on Ecumenical Voluntary Service Projects, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

World Youth Projects, UCYM, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

UNICEF: U.S. Committee for UNICEF, United Nations Building, New York, N.Y.

United Nations and Washington seminars: Contact your national denominational youth office for information on denominational-sponsored seminars.

PUBLICATIONS

(Office of publication and distribution, 120 East 23d St., New York, N.Y.)

The United Christian Youth Movement, Some International Facts of Life.

Moral and Theological Basis for Christian Action in International Affairs.

Community Service (a guide to weekend work camping), world Christian citizenship through united Christian youth action.

Department of International Affairs: A Christian Newsletter on International Affairs.

Church Peace Union, 170 East 64th Street, New York, N.Y.

Public Affairs Pamphlets, 22 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.

U.S. Mission to the United Nations, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street, Washington, D.C.

Department of State, Public Service Division, Washington, D.C.

---

THEOLOGICAL AND MORAL BASES FOR CHRISTIAN ACTION IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—STATEMENT OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED CHRISTIAN YOUTH MOVEMENT

Christian faith speaks to our time. In this revolutionary world our faith and the urgency of international issues call us to prayer, thought, and action.

The revolutionary love of God in Christ has been a motivating factor in transforming men and nations. It has led men to seek such things as social reforms, political freedom, and personal equality.

Vast revolutions are taking place throughout our world in industrialization, nuclear power, communications, population explosions, anticolonialism, nationalism, race relations, and struggles for human rights and dignity.

As Christian young people we act in faith believing that both individuals and social orders can be transformed. Christian youth, as instruments of God, can influence change toward His will as a part of the world mission of the church.

There is a new urgency for us to know more clearly the meaning of our faith and how it is related to the life and death decisions of our generation in this nuclear-space age. Certain elements of our faith have particular meaning in this time as imperatives for action that will be most effective for peace and order with justice and freedom.

SOME ELEMENTS OF OUR FAITH

We believe in God the Creator of heaven and earth and Father of all mankind. "He made from one every nation of men." Racial, social, economic, and political distinctions made by man do not hold with God who "shows no partiality." He wills that all His children should live in love, in intelligent good will toward others.

God is Sovereign, Ruler over time, history, nations, and peoples. God has revealed Himself to be a God of justice, order, love, and peace. He desires that all people of the world live these qualities of life.

In a race against time to find ways of peace, we are sustained by our faith that God who is working in time is also the Maker and Sovereign of time.

In working to affect decisions of history, we are aware that men can serve as instruments of God and His purposes while the final issues are with Him, the Lord of History.

We maintain that the nations of the world are not ultimately sovereign, all powerful, or ends in themselves. They are under the sovereignty of God. Therefore, we hold that nations should strive for equality, cooperation, and community; they should serve the good of all individuals; and they should seek to promote justice, freedom, and peace, which God wills. It is the responsibility of the church to remind nations that ultimate sovereignty belongs to God.

We believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, through whom God redeems man and reveals His nature as a God of love. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself." The cross of Christ represents that death to sin and resurrection to new life which is man's redemption. In His teachings and practices, Jesus set an example of love in action. He counseled that men should love their enemies, and He, Himself, responded with love to His enemies when He said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

We believe that man has been created by God in His own image. This spiritual dimension in man imports to every man a sacredness. Jesus emphasized the unique value and potentialities of every individual. Man in his relative freedom is capable of depths of sin, including self-righteousness, pride, greed, hatred, prejudice, perversion of power, and in other ways exalting himself to the place of God; but he is also capable by the grace of God of self-evaluation, humility, selflessness, love, justice, and devotion to God. By acknowledging his limitations and sinfulness before God and by the strength of Jesus Christ dwelling in him, man is enabled to move toward a life of obedience to God. Such obedience involves more than complying with a set of rules; it results from love, a love responsive toward God which issues forth in love toward man.

We believe that the spirit of God at work within us can and will take hold of our total being and negate our self-centeredness and sin. Thus when we come into a meaningful relationship with Jesus Christ, we do not merely change our mode of conduct. Rather, our lives, in totality, are transformed so that we share this creative and active love.

We believe that Christians are called to new life in Christ which is given to us as we are receptive and aware of the opportunities and the imperative to become instruments and channels of God's will rather than our own. In this new obedience what we are and what we say and do become witness and proclamation of the power of the gospel. As the Christian witnesses in love he is to remember: "Nevertheless, not I but Christ who dwelleth in me."

We believe that Christians are members of a community, the church, and are bound together by the grace of Jesus Christ and their loyalty to Him and have the responsibility of providing in their common life and fellowship the kind of community God wills for the world. In the growing ecumenical movement the Christian Church, transcending national, political, economic, and social distinctions, is increasingly a proving ground of world-wide community. The church as a redemptive, suffering, serving fellowship also has a responsibility for working to transform the society in which we live, for our faith is relevant to all of life.

SOME MORAL IMPERATIVES

In theological convictions, moral imperatives appear. We are reminded that Jesus spoke of man's duty to man in light of man's duty to God. Jesus not only taught, but He "went about doing good." For the Christian, consideration of God's love for us implies the necessity for moral action by us to serve God by serving mankind. "For he who does not love his brother whom he has seen, cannot love God whom he has not seen."

This Christian love is not a sentimental feeling but an attitude of life rooted in the nature of God and in our relationship with Him.

Christian love involves responsibility. Because of what God in His love has done for us, we are awakened to responsibility for our fellowmen. This demands of us many things: We are constantly to strive toward more order, harmony, and unity in the world, acknowledging that distortion of these elements means distortion of God's creation, and we are to practice faithful stewardship of God's abundance.

Christian love involves reconciliation. As God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, we are to be reconciled to our fellowmen and to serve as ministers of reconciliation. This means forgiveness and the developing of new relationships among men and nations. All men and nations are under judgment and stand in need of God's forgiveness, grace, and power for rebirth in newness of life.

Christian love involves respect for all men. We respect each individual because he is created in the image of God. He deserves that which we ourselves need—recognition of the dignity of self. Respecting him we respect his rights. We also respect the culture resulting from the exercise of these rights, insofar as the rights of other humans, who are also God's creatures, are not endangered.

Christian love involves concern. All people are within our Christian concern. When we understand the needs of others, Christian love changes these needs into demands upon us. Our Christian love changes these needs into demands upon us. Our belief in the equality of men under God gives us a concern for people which requires a just society. Discrimination, exploitation, segregation, unequal opportunities for health, work, and education, and gross inequities in living standards must be eliminated. Recognizing that all men are conditioned greatly by their environment, the Christian is thus inescapably responsible for actions to help shape society, under God, for human well-being.

Christian love involves self-sacrificing service. Jesus said, "He who finds his life will lose it, and he who loses his life for My sake will find it." The love of God revealed in Jesus Christ is a new dynamic in the life of men and nations which moves us to respond with compassion to the needs of the hungry, naked, sick, and homeless, remembering that, inasmuch as we do it to one of the least of these His brethren, we do it to Him. We recognize limited self-interest as a valid concern of men and nations but we also believe that we have a mandate to apply the scriptural precept of "the suffering servant."

Christian love must be expressed in relation to key values in international relations such as peace and order, justice, and freedom. These broad, general objectives are rooted in the Scriptures, Christian theology, philosophy, and history. They must be kept in balance with one another and with love.

Peace is not simply the absence of war but the development of order with justice and freedom. Nations have been driven by the quest for national security to a practical and as yet limited order as exemplified in the United Nations. Christians are also concerned that there be deeper motivation. We believe that the peace our world hungers for will be brought nearer as and if the nations strive for more of God's order with a real sense of responsibility to all men. Peace involves disarmament, the beating of swords into plowshares, the elimination of the causes of war, and the dealing realistically with the existence and use of power. We work for peace in light of the mission of Jesus Christ who preached good news to the poor, proclaimed release to the captive, gave sight to the blind, and set the oppressed free.

Justice which protects the rights and dignity of the human person is essential to peace. It is demanded by the will of God and by the realities of human experience. Justice demands dynamic economic and political structures which will give equal opportunities to all individuals and groups to develop their potentialities and make their contributions to society. Such justice based on the rule of law promotes human welfare and peace.

Freedom which enables God's creatures to live their lives after the will of their Creator is also essential to peace. Such feedom gives men the power to control, cirticize, and change their government. This freedom must also guarantee civil liberties to every man. We believe all people must have the opportunity to know the truth which makes men free.

To act in love for peace and order, justice, and freedom, we must move from principles to specifics. This involves no easy, direct application, but a working through "middle axioms." "Middle axioms" are limited goals not necessarily binding for all time, but setting forth general direction for necessary decision and actions in given times and situations. For example, in our time we are moved to work for more effective international organizations, for increasing provisions for human rights, for world economic development, for institutions for peaceful settlement and peaceful change.

A CALL TO PRAYER, THOUGHT, AND ACTION

Christians have been expressing love in worldwide witness through missions, world service, evangelism, and prayer. These have made important contributions in international relations. They are essential, and we desperately need more of all such efforts in new forms and with new urgency in our revolutionary age.

As a part of the total world mission of the church, we also need further development of specific actions immediately related to foreign policies and international affairs. It is not enough for the churches to proclaim was as "the supreme sin."[1] Churches and Christians, knowing and declaring this, must work to root out the causes of war—personal and social, psychological and ideological, cultural and military, economic and political—and to promote in every possible way the things which make for peace.

Historically, the Christian in the United States has won the freedom to confront his society with the higher spiritual order. We have felt that we must obey God, rather than man, and we have had the liberty to obey God's will. With this providential freedom comes increased duty. God's order is brought nearer to reality as we critically weigh our society from within, using Christian values and constructive attitudes. But these evaluations and attitudes must lead to effective action. "Every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required."

"Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, since we know not for a moment what the day may bring forth, but only that the hour of serving Thee is always present, may we wake to the instant claims of Thy Holy Will, not waiting for tomorrow but yielding today."

(This statement of "The Moral and Theological Bases for Christian Action in International Affairs" was first projected by the Preparatory Commission on International Affairs (March 1957), drafted by a special committee of qualified young people, accepted as a study document by the 1957 general council of the United Christian Youth Movement, referred to the constituent national denominational youth organizations and State Christian youth councils for study and reaction, and revised and accepted as an official statement of the United Christian Youth Movement by its duly elected and representative general council, August 1958.)

[1] Oxford, 1936.

## Oregon's 100th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 16, 1959*

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. L. Propst, Orofino, Idaho, has forwarded to me a copy of a letter written in 1850 by his great grandfather, Mr. C. C. Parrish.

On the occasion of Oregon's 100th birthday, I think it is very fitting to print this letter. I think it is one of the finest descriptions of the thinking, the feelings, and the way of life of the great pioneers who settled the Oregon Territory. I think my colleagues will find it most interesting:

NEAR SYRACUSE, MARION COUNTY,
OREGON TERRITORY,
*November 15, 1850.*

HUGH & SAREPTA NICKERSON, DER CHILDREN:

By this you may see that we still live, it is by the mercy of a kinde & indulgent Heavenly Father that we are thus faivored. Seven long years have hastened away since we took the parting hand with our friends upon the old walks of Ohio, to go, we then knew not where, but our kind guide conducted us safely to this good land, and now may we not inquire, what shall we render to God for all his benefeits. Oh, what cause of thankfulness have we, seeing that we all live, and enjoy life, and the bounties of a good providance. While we are continually hearing of the doings of the monster Death, and, notwithstanding, we feelingly condole with our friends in their losses and bereavments, yet, we all have cause to thank God that it is no worse; for when we morne, not as those do, who have no hope, we find in the cup of sorrow, a mixture of joy which nothing but the religion of Jeasus can inspire. O, then let us lean on the Saviour for support, and all will be well. As for my familly, we have nothing to complain of except our own unworthyness, and not much to desire that we have not, except it is religion and the means of grace, we have long looked and desired to see the day when some of our good preachers would come to our releaf. And we are now cheered with prospect and are beginning to sing. There is a better day a coming—we are plased to here that our friends are waking up to a sence of their own intrust in view of coming to this country, the best we honestly believe on this side of Heaven. When we try to discribe it, we fall short about half way, yet the people of the States think it is romance. Business is now verry lively in this territory. Markets are pretty good. Jackson and his mother has just returned from Oregon Ct. with the team. They sold 23 bushels of onions at seven dollars per bushel, 126 pounds of butter at one dollar per pound, 24 hed of cabages at fifty cents per hed, 14 bushels of oats at two dollars per bushel—Beets were worth four dollars per bushel but they took none with them—They bought good calico at 12½ cents per yd by the bolt. Bleached muslin at 18 cents pr yd by the bolt. Brown muslin at the same. Sugar at 18 cts. per pound, salt 4 cents per pound. We sold our peaches this year at six dollars pr bushel and from .25 to .50 pr doz. In this way we took in some 300 dollars. Potatoes are worth three dollars at the Citty, but we have sold them at home this year

for one dollar, and as low as fifty cts, they are plenty here now, for all the prices are so high, yet provisions of all kinds are exceding by plenty for every boddy, hereabouts. I wish to say to you, and threw you to all my relations and old acquaintances that we are prepairing to supply you with provisions, on the cheepest terms, we have already planted considerable many potatoes, and but for the school, we should be at it today, as the weather is fine.

While I am writing I look out at the window upon the prairies and fields and they remind me of your middle of May. The emigrants have bin coming in, more or less for two months, their stock is poor, but all they have to do is to let them loos and look after them a little and they soon come out of the kinks. A large portion of this years Emigration started for California, but on hearing of the grass being burned of on that road they turned for Oregon, but being so verry late in the season, fall raines came on, then snow caught them in the Cascade Mountains. Much of their stock died, they had to leav Waggons and all behind, and be carried out on hors back. O, take warning of this, start early on Brother Clancies plan, and when you start, press on, be fourmost if possible. You may be here by the tenth of August at farthest, then you may bring in your stock in good condition, weather dry and pleasant—bring your beads and clothing with plenty of provision. Feather beds are harder to come at then anything els, if I was Hugh & Mc. I would bring a small box of small tools, such as match plains and the like with plain bits, as timber is plenty in Oregon. Broad axes, addzes, augers and the like are plenty and of good quality. I wish Hugh and ——— and the friends to help McClure to a deacent outfit so that he may bring his family along with the rest of the friends as comfortably and as independently as the rest, having his own Wagon and team, and I will take it as a faivour, and will refund the money on your arrival at my place. The propper way will be to take his note or receit and present it to me, as I cannot bare the idea of having him left—I want to say a word on a dilicate subject. It is this—it sometimes comes to pass that we are admonished that before we can posably get threw this long journey that we must have an increas of familly, and of cours we cannot go this season, now for the information of all such, we can inform you that we had a great many such ocurances in our Emigration and are prepaired to say that we a whole, we never knew Mothers and infants to do better, our frolicks mostly came on in the nite, and when the signs of the times indicated a storm it was easy to select a suitable place in the incampment and we were always ready to role out in the morning with the company—I want to say a word about the journey, that it is long and tiresom, is a matter none of ya need doubt, but if you can keep health, the continual occurance of knew objects will make the time pass along more agreeably—how to preserve health, in ordinary seasons you will not be likely to git sick if you conduct with prudence untill you reach the great Plat River.

This river is like no other River, perhaps in the world, it is made by the streams of the Rocky Mountains, water pure at first, but is flows down with a courant bold and majestic, its bed is sand and that continually, conciquently, the water is muddy, looks like it is not fit for man or beast to drink. To avoid this dificulty, our Emigration resorted to well diging with a spade. You can dig a well 2 or 3 feet deep in a few minutes when clean water imediately comes in plenty, this practice became general, and the conciquence was we soon had sickness plenty, the River water is the best by far, and you should avoid those stink holes as you would avoid poison. Now friends, I wish you to take this advise, provide buckets or other vesels sufficient to hold water nough to do you threw the night and some to put in your water bag in the morning, by standing threw the night it settles with the sand at the bottom—but if you put a little sweet milk in the water, it settles in a few minits reddy for use, take this cours and plenty of good Cayanne and Labeliei, with the blessing of God and industry and you may get threw in good time and perhaps better health than when you started—One word more for McClure, we wish him and his family to take courage. I think he will get money before you get this, as James R. Robb (a good fellow) has written to his partner at New York to send him money, but if he should not git it in that way, let the friends who can, advance it for him doubting not Robb, Gamahil and myself all stand readdy and pledged to refund the cash on sight, my wish is that you take pains to let this paper have a circulation among all the friends—my opinyan is that prices will be a little reduced by the time you arive, but if prices should keep up, all the better, as it will soon be your turn to sell to others—This is the easiest place to make a living, to make property, or even cash if you pleas that you ever saw—My sheet is now full, I must bid you fairwell for a while, be sure, write when you start from Misoury and tel us know who is coming.

C. C. PARRISH & WIFE.

---

## The Resolutions and the Platform for 1959 of the American Association of School Administrators

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, more than 20,000 persons attended the 91st annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators held during February this year in Atlantic City, N.J. The association unanimously passed a number of important resolutions and pledged to work toward their attainment.

The American Association of School Administrators spoke out courageously on many of the significant issues of our day.

I am pleased to include here the 1959 resolutions and the platform, together with a letter I have received from Dr. Finis E. Engleman, executive secretary of the American Association of School Administrators. This fine organization is a department of the National Education Association:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS,
*Washington, D.C., March 10, 1959.*

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: As you may know, more than 20,000 persons recently attended the 91st annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators held in Atlantic City, N.J. The association unanimously passed a number of resolutions and pledged to work toward their attainment. I believe the administrators spoke out courageously on several significant issues and because of your known interest, we are forwarding a printed copy of the resolutions for your perusal and study.

Sincerely,

FINIS E. ENGLEMAN,
*Executive Secretary.*

---

THE 1959 RESOLUTIONS AND THE PLATFORM, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, ATLANTIC CITY CONVENTION, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

The American Association of School Administrators believes that the educational goals of this Nation are an expression of the convictions of successive generations regarding their faith in democracy and the opportunities and responsibilities of free men. The association further believes that improvement in education is so important that it cannot await the ideal circumstance or the perfect climate. Now is the time to exercise wisdom, insight, imagination, and creativity so that continued improvement is made in organization, finance, curriculum, instruction, teacher training, recruitment, and administrative leadership. The association pledges its unwavering support to these ends and dedicates the following statements indicating convictions with respect to persistent and emerging problems.

1. Education for all American children and youth: This association reemphasizes and believes that the public schools in the United States were established and have been developed on the fundamental premises that each and every child is important, that each is endowed with unique aptitudes and abilities, that the strength and well-being of this Nation are dependent upon developing these capacities to the fullest extent, and that a well-informed, educated electorate is essential to the survival of a free society. The association urges school board members, administrators, teachers, and citizen groups who are making timely and much needed efforts to develop the full capacities of the extremes in ability and motivation (either the intellectually gifted and academically talented pupils or the retarded and handicapped pupils) to be continuously mindful of the majority of the children who do not fall into these or other special categories. The problem is not that of deciding which groups should take precedence over the others; rather it is one of identifying the weaker points in the program and strengthening them to the end that the abilities of each and every child can be developed to full capacity. The American Association of School Administrators is firmly committed and pledges its full strength and support to the preservation and further development of public schools undergirded by and committed to this basic principle.

2. Priority for education: The American Association of School Administrators believes that we must assign an ever higher priority to our schools. While we still believe ours is the best educational system in the world and does enjoy a high priority, we reflect that our total endeavor in this regard is not comparable to the manner in which we attack those lesser goals involving comfort and pleasures. If the United States wants good schools, adequate for our time, we have the resources. The American Association of School Administrators is convinced that the citizens of the United States desire to attach an increasingly higher priority to its youth and to their education. The association pledges every effort to the achievement and justification of this goal.

3. Quality education: The major purpose of school administration is to facilitate and assure quality instruction. We believe it is the responsibility of school administrators to provide leadership to communities and

boards of education to develop the essential prerequisites if the educational program is to have quality characteristics. We consider it a responsibility of the superintendent of schools to make clear to the community and the board of education the necessity for adequate facilities, appropriate instructional materials, a diversified program, and a full staff of qualified specialists and teachers, each with a reasonable work load. As administrators we reaffirm our commitment to work for improved teaching and learning.

4. Spiritual values: The members of this association recognize that the future will demand of our citizens a moral fibre seldom required of any society. The complex and difficult problems which they will face require a strength of character and a set of values which give them the power and the courage to hold steadfastly to those ideals and spiritual concepts on which this Nation was founded. We believe that the school should play an important part in building spiritual values. We also believe that the school should do this in cooperation with the home, the church, and other community organizations which have as their goal a service to children and youth. Since public education in the United States was established to help all citizens achieve the highest aspiration of man, the schools dare not falter in their responsibility.

5. The creative arts: The American Association of School Administrators commends the president, the executive committee, and the staff for selecting the creative arts as the general theme for the 1959 convention. We believe in a well-balanced school curriculum in which music, drama, painting, poetry, sculpture, architecture, and the like are included side by side with other important subjects such as mathematics, history, and science. It is important that pupils, as a part of general education, learn to appreciate, to understand, to create, and to criticize with discrimination those products of the mind, the voice, the hand, and the body which give dignity to the person and exalt the spirit of man.

6. Strengthening teaching: The association is fully aware of the wide range of competencies required of the qualified teacher. We pledge to assist in providing suitable physical environments, tools, and conditions for teaching which will include such features as adequate classrooms, laboratories, libraries, audio and visual teaching aids, reasonable work assignments, class size consistent with the task at hand, and specialized personnel and community resources.

We recognize that education demands teamwork and cooperation of all professional people. Support of each to the other is essential to individual and professional staff development.

Because of the important contributions made by classroom teachers to improvement of schools through professional organizations, we recommend establishment of appropriate policies of releasing, without loss of pay, teachers who are invited to serve as participants in conferences and conventions of major professional organizations at local, State, and national levels.

We shall also assist in the establishment or continuation of programs that will make classroom teaching more attractive as a career, such as tenure, sick leave, and adequate retirement provisions.

7. Recognition of professional competency: The association believes that the degree to which the public schools meet their responsibilities to the Nation depends upon the competency of professional personnel at all levels. We call upon the school districts of our country to pay teachers and other personnel salaries which are commensurate with their responsibilities and which compete effectively with salaries in other fields of human endeavor. We suggest that boards of education give careful study and consideration to salary plans and other means of recognition designed to attract and retain competent people in the service of public education.

8. Citizenship rights: The American Association of School Administrators urges every school system, in its written personnel policies, to guarantee to all personnel full political equality with other citizens in the exercise of their political rights and responsibilities.

9. Preparation of administrators: The American Association of School Administrators pledges its continued support to dedicated efforts for improving school administration. To this end, it enthusiastically commends and congratulates colleges and universities which have established careful student selection programs, have developed sound and comprehensive programs of preparation in school administration, and have incorporated field experience under careful guidance as an integral part of the total planned sequence of preparation. The association further recommends that a program for preparing school administrators such as outlined in "Something To Steer By" be implemented as rapidly as possible.

10. Maintaining perspective: Those who would fully understand the value of the school as a public institution must have knowledge of it as an entirety. The association urges its members to be diligent to maintain balanced perspective in these crucial years so that we should not take false stands or allow any one segment of the educational curriculum or program to dominate or skew the total picture.

Forthright criticism based on accurate information and directed toward constructive purposes has been in the past, and continues to be, a vital force in shaping the public schools. Such criticism is sought and welcomed by the association. The association commends those who approach evaluation in a sane, comprehensive, considerate, and intelligent manner.

11. Control of certification: The American Association of School Administrators is unalterably opposed to any and all Federal legislation that would place, with any national board or committee, the authority to exercise control over public education through the establishment of certification regulations for teachers in science and mathematics or any other field. Further, the association objects to any proposal whereby Federal funds would be utilized to augment teachers salaries contingent upon national certification.

12. Communication: The association commends producers, writers, publishers, and others who are directly or indirectly responsible for bringing educational problems and progress to the attention of the people of this Nation through mass media of communication. The association recognizes that responsibility for accurate and comprehensive communication rests with both the educational leaders and the leaders in the field of communication, and the association pledges its wholehearted support to all efforts aimed at improving the scope and methods of communication.

13. Use of texts: The importance and usefulness of tests in evaluation and teaching cannot be overestimated. There is a great need for improved and more adequate instruments for evaluation of many kinds of educational growth. The misuse of tests and the misinterpretation of test data continue to be a glaring danger to good educational programs. Any testing instrument should be selected and used in terms of what a particular school had intended to teach. To judge a school solely on the basis of data derived from any battery of examinations is an invalid and dangerous venture. State or national examination results used without due regard for the educational objectives of the school and the nature of the student body, are likely to be misleading.

14. Desegregation: In this Nation composed of people with diverse cultural backgrounds, traditions, customs, and preferences, there is a common core of ideals fundamental to its greatness. The association believes that free and equal opportunities for education for all children and youth are essential to the perpetuation of these ideals. The association realizes that adjustment consistent with the Supreme Court ruling on school segregation is a process, complex in nature and deep seated in social and cultural conflict, which calls for calm judgment, tolerant understanding, careful planning, and concerted effort by lay citizens as well as by educational leaders. We believe this can be achieved without abandoning those fundamental principles of public policy which have established the public schools as the one sound educational institution to be supported by public tax funds. We commend those school superintendents and community leaders whose efforts have led all races and creeds to study the issues involved and to approach the problem with open minds and willingness to seek the good of all. We urge people in all States and all communities to do this in a spirit of good will, good faith, patience, and courage, fraught with humility.

15. School district organization: The association commends legislatures, State departments of education, boards of education, school administrators, and other citizens who have assisted in the elimination of those small school districts which are inadequate. It further commends the progress that has been made in some States toward the improvement of the intermediate unit as an effective instrument for providing special services to the local districts. The association deplores the existence of nonoperating school districts which serve no purpose other than to provide an avenue of escape from sharing a fair and just responsibility for school support.

16. Fiscal responsibility: This association believes that boards of education as representatives of all the people and agents of the State should be held responsible for the maintenance of good schools. This responsibility implies a freedom from other governmental agencies and a fiscal independence controlled only by the people. This position is based on the belief that educational matters should be decided by the boards to which the State and the people have delegated this special function. The association is of the opinion that the presence of any noneducational authority standing between the local board of education and the people makes it extremely difficult if not impossible for the board of education to fulfill its responsibilities.

17. Federal and State support: Realizing that, under present tax structures, resources for local school purposes are woefully inadequate for quality school programs in many areas, and observing that recent events make it more clearly apparent that public education is essential to national strength, security, and welfare, the American Association of School Administrators reiterates its belief that substantial financial resources available to the Federal Government should be made available for the support of public schools. Unprecedented increased enrollments and the need for additional staffs and new physical plants make it urgent that greatly increased funds be made available for education in the immediate future. The association therefore urges that State legislatures and the Congress of the United States at once make major appropriations to strengthen the general programs and facilities in the public tax-supported schools and colleges.

Until such time as these appropriations are forthcoming, the American Association of School Administrators strongly urges the Congress to provide the necessary appropriations needed for the continuance of exist-

ing federally supported programs in education.

The association expresses its sincere appreciation to those Members of the Congress, of State legislatures, and other officials at all levels of government who have consistently sponsored and supported legislation for the improvement of financing public education.

18. Use of public tax funds: The association again expresses its opposition to use of funds collected by public taxation for nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, whether intended to strengthen or support teaching, scientific training, or school facilities.

19. Student and teacher exchange programs: The association is highly gratified with and lends its full support to arrangements for the exchange of teachers, students, and administrators with other countries. To foster international understanding, the association urges its members to seek the benefits resulting from exchange of teachers and students by making arrangements for such exchanges in local school systems.

20. Research: The association recognizes the great interdependence of research and technology and firmly believes that basic research and its application must evolve concurrently if further progress is to be made in an increasing number of fields. To this end the association urges the Federal Government, institutions of higher education, State departments of education, individual and combinations of local school districts, and foundations to give continuing and increased concern to this great need in education and to allocate the finances and personnel needed to further educational research and its utilization.

21. Kindergartens: In view of the need for constantly improving the quality of public education at every point, the association reaffirms its belief that the kindergarten level is an essential and integral part of the community's educational program.

22. Public education beyond the high school: As the economic, social, and technical aspects of our civilization become broader, deeper, and more complex, it becomes increasingly imperative that we both intensify the preparation of all citizens and extend the opportunities for additional education to increasing proportions of our total population. The American Association of School Administrators urges the continued expansion and rapid development of 2-year public junior colleges, community colleges, or other similar public post high school educational opportunities, and further recommends that vigorous measures be taken to continue to improve the quality of existing programs.

23. Adult education: The American Association of School Administrators believes that a comprehensive and diversified educational program for adults should be an integral part of every school system. To this end the association recommends and strongly urges local and State boards of education to make provisions for educational opportunities at the adult level for all who desire and can profit from such experiences.

24. W. K. Kellogg Foundation: The American Association of School Administrators expresses its sincere gratitude and stands in great debt to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for its generosity, its foresight and planning, and its valuable guidance through the cooperative program in educational administration and presently through the Committee for the Advancement of School Administration.

25. National Congress of Parents and Teachers: The association pledges anew its trust and confidence in the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and again expresses its admiration and gratitude for the splendid efforts that great association has made toward improving public education. In support of these efforts, boards of education are urged to make school facilities readily available to local parent and citizen school groups.

26. National School Boards Association: The association recognizes the outstanding educational leadership of the National School Boards Association and offers full cooperation to that organization in its efforts toward improving the public schools of this country.

27. U.S. Office of Education: A strong and effective U.S. Office of Education, sensitive to the needs of education throughout the Nation, is an essential part of the educational picture now and in the future. We commend the many improvements which have been made in the operation of this governmental function. We consider it imperative that the Federal Government establish conditions and provide funds adequate to employ educational leadership of the highest professional competence.

James H. Corson, *Chairman;* Walter A. Anderson, Robert R. Ashworth, Samuel M. Brownell, Jim Cherry, William H. Flaharty, Frederick W. Hill, Carl Jensen, Kermit A. Johnson, Robert H. Johnson, Everett Keith, Robert E. Lucas, Charles L. Mills, Robert D. Morrow, D. Ross Pugmire (deceased), F. L. Schlagle, William H. Soule, G. E. Watson, E. Davis Woodbury.

THE PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AS REVISED BY A SPECIAL COMMITTEE AND ADOPTED BY MAIL BALLOT OF THE MEMBERS IN DECEMBER 1951

Preamble: As citizens of the United States of America, we cherish our heritage of freedoms and government under law as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. We regard our freedoms as a sacred trust which imposes upon each of us an obligation to help build a society in which respect for the individual is recognized as the basis of all human rights. In such a society opportunity is provided for the advancement of the political, social, economic, educational, and spiritual welfare of all its citizens. In the belief that universal, free public education provides the principal means for the achievement of these ends by the individual and by the Nation, we—the members of the American Association of School Administrators—pledge ourselves to the support of the program and principles contained in this platform.

A. As citizens of the United States of America we believe—

1. That the maintenance and extension of the basic principles of our American democracy, including individual freedoms and human rights, are essential to us and to the world for the solution of social, economic, and political problems.

2. That peace which preserves our freedoms and our democratic way of life is a requisite to all other qualities of individual and group welfare.

3. That education is the greatest constructive force at the disposal of democratic peoples for the solution of their problems.

4. That every privilege in a democracy must be matched by an equal responsibility.

5. That our traditional policy of separation of church and state is essential to our American way of life.

6. That expanding and unlimited sources of nuclear power are one of the most significant developments of our age for the welfare of mankind.

7. That the strength of the Nation will depend upon the conservation and intelligent development of our human and natural resources.

8. That progress in our social, economic, and political life must keep pace with changes in our material and technological environment, such progress can result from a better program of education and spiritual growth.

9. That the United Nations needs and should have the support of every citizen.

B. As educators we believe—

1. That the purpose of education in the United States of America is the development of each individual for the fullest participation in the American democratic way of life.

2. That universal free education must be made available by and to all peoples in the interests of world understanding, citizenship and peace.

3. That the American democratic way of life may be perpetuated.

(a) Through universal free education fitted to the abilities, interests, and needs of each person and of the society in which he lives; and

(b) Through teaching the individual how free America permits him to choose and plan his own goals, provides him increasing equality of opportunity to reach these goals, allows him to keep the rewards for his work, and matches these privileges with serious duties of citizenship.

4. That the school program should emphasize the worth and dignity of all essential work.

5. That the quality of education will be determined principally by the quality of the persons who teach.

6. That the structure of American school systems should be adaptable enough to meet the educational needs of a changing society.

7. That the total educational experience of each individual must be designed to contribute to the development of effective ethical character.

8. That spiritual, social, civic, economic, and vocational competencies are as important as academic literacy.

C. In order that these principles may be realized in our society, we as school administrators propose to work for—

1. Professionally competent administrative leadership, dedicated to the service of good teaching in every community.

2. The recruitment, preparation, and in-service growth of outstanding individuals as teachers, administrators, and other professional workers to assure good teaching.

3. Salaries and conditions which will attract and retain good teachers.

4. A curriculum which includes teaching the background of the thinking of our Founding Fathers, so that pupils may have a thorough understanding of the intent and possibilities of our form of Government for the individual and society.

5. Smaller classes, more attention to each individual, and more adequate materials and equipment—thus providing a better educational program for each child.

6. Wide sharing with teachers and lay groups in the cooperative formulation of educational policies and programs on local, State, and national levels.

7. An extended use of all school facilities for educational and recreational purposes.

8. School districts large enough to meet modern educational needs effectively and economically.

9. A program of joint lay and professional activities which will lead to an intelligent appreciation of the work and needs of the schools and to the development of ways and means of meeting those needs.

10. Complete fiscal independence of local boards of education.

11. Federal aid for operating and providing facilities for publicly supported and controlled schools, administered, without Federal control, through the U.S. Office of Education and State departments of education.

## Victims of Charity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

VICTIMS OF CHARITY

(By Dan Wakefield)

"Charity," the speaker said, "begins at home."

The hall, full of some of our affluent era's most underpaid and poorly benefited workers, clapped and cheered. They are workers who commonly average $34 a week, without unemployment and disability benefits, without union representation, and in some cases, with a 6-day week. They are waging a large-scale battle now against one of New York City's most useful and important instruments of charity—the voluntary hospitals, supported mainly by private philanthropy. That philathropy is not their benefactor, but their boss. In the kind of wages it pays, it has driven many of its workers to seek extra help from the public welfare agencies of the city and State. Such are the tangled curses and blessings of our affluent society.

Until last year, some 30,000 men and women who have now been tagged as "New York's forgotten workers" were quietly toiling away in the city's 81 voluntary hospitals with wages and benefits—or lack of benefits—that made even most of the exploiting employers who operate in conjunction with the "racket unions" seem rather progressive. But the hospital-employer was breaking no law, indulging in no sort of labor-racket trickery, and sweating no personal profits from the lowly-paid workers. Because of their status as charitable, nonprofit institutions, the voluntary hospitals are excluded from jurisdiction under the Taft-Hartley Law and the State Labor Relations Act, and are exempt from unemployment and disability payments.

A comparable situation exists throughout the United States in voluntary hospitals, which make up a vital part of the Nation's health service. There are three main types of hospitals, based on their means of support: City and State, voluntary, and private. The first type is supported by city and State funds; the voluntary hospitals are subsidized mainly by religious institutions or by contributions from private philanthropic agencies (for instance, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, which helps support Mount Sinai and Montefiore in New York City) and individual and family money (for instance, support from the Winthrop and Vanderbilt families of New York Hospital); the proprietary or private hospitals are privately owned and, unlike the others, operate on a profit basis. The private hospitals are usually smaller institutions, ranging from 20–120 beds, but there are a number of them, and it is estimated that they employ around 12,000 workers in New York City. But the much larger voluntary hospitals, numbering 81 in New York City and employing roughly 30,000 workers, rank with the city-supported hospitals in total number of beds. The city hospital employees have been organized by the State, County, and Municipal Employees, and a Teamsters Union local, but until the last few months, all efforts had failed to launch a large-scale organizing drive among the underpaid workers of the voluntary hospitals.

Except for a few abortive efforts during the massive CIO drives of the thirties, unions had largely left these hospitals alone. The thousands of workers required to run them had been forgotten by unions, employers, and public alike. But within the shining walls, beneath the highly paid and always short supply of doctors, beneath the efficient squadrons of Florence Nightingales (also short in supply, and organized into a professional nurses' group, though not a union) there have simmered in silence the thousands of nonprofessional and nonprotected workers whose daily tasks are essential for the hospital's maintenance. They are cooks and dishwashers, nurse's aids, and lab technicians, janitors and clerks, plumbers and laundry workers. In New York City, most of them are Negro and Puerto Rican.

A citywide drive to organize these workers is boiling now under the leadership of the Retail Drug Employees Union, Local 1199 (an affiliate of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union). The local broke the traditional nonunion front of the voluntary hospitals last December with a decisive 628–31 representation vote at Montefiore Hospital, climaxing 8 months of organizing activity. Up till that time, the only voluntary hospital in New York City that had recognized a union was Maimonades, which had been passed on to local 1199 of the Retail Drug Employees by the Teamsters several years ago. Local 1199, which was born in the thirties, has organized 85 percent of the city's pharmacists, a total of about 6,000 workers. Now it has decided to try to extend the single voluntary hospital group it already has in the fold into a wide-scale movement that will crack the whole nonunion policy of these institutions.

The crack at Montefiore resounded through the New York City press with a long belated discovery of the forgotten workers in the voluntary hospitals. When Montefiore recognized the union, the New York Times editorialized:

"Montefiore President Victor S. Reisenfeld and President Leon J. Davis of local 1199 deserve public applause for having settled their dispute * * * With City Labor Commissioner Felix they can take great satisfaction for having jointly blazed a trail that looks as if it will be widely followed."

Local 1199 jumped into this clearing in the woods with everything it had, and shortly after its December victory at Montefiore was distributing cards and leaflets at 41 of the city's 81 voluntary hospitals. Meetings were scheduled nearly every night at the local's midtown headquarters for workers from hospitals all over the city. Requests for information grew—especially from Puerto Rican workers—as El Diario de Nueva York, the largest Spanish language daily in the city, published more stories and editorials on what it called La Cruzada de Local 1199.

La Cruzada in many ways is the only union-organizing drive of the fifties that the word "crusade," in any language, seems appropriate to attach to without provoking a tongue in the cheeks of the organizers, or a flush in the cheeks of the reporters looking on. To walk into one of these organizing meetings is to walk back into a time of the 5½- and 6-day week, the wages under a dollar an hour, the fears of firing from the boss for talking union, and the almost revival meeting enthusiasm of workers, suddenly awakened to a way out of their plight.

Last January, some 50 workers from Lenox Hill Hospital sat in a smoky meeting room at local 1199 and looked up, not toward a white-coated superintendent, but to an organizer in open-necked sport shirt and horn-rimmed glasses. He was telling them in firm, slow words, "It is no secret that till recently workers in this city felt a hospital job was one you come into, save a little, and go on. Everyone felt there was no future in hospitals. Now, for the first time, they know that if they organize well enough they can get decent wages and conditions until they can look on hospital work as a job where they can be treated as respectable human beings."

The organizer said that Lenox Hill, with a total of 600 workers, now had 200 signed up with the union; he asked the brothers and sisters assembled how the prospects looked for getting a majority.

A Negro lady from the nurse's aides' department spoke up to say: "We're doing pretty good in our department, but a lotta people are afraid—they think they're gonna be fired. And some of the nurses told the girls they shouldn't join a union because then the hospital would be like a business."

The others hooted, and one voice raised above the rest to say, "It's all right for the nurses to talk, they get plenty and they don't want us to get it."

A lady from the kitchen staff raised her hand and reported that "The ladies in the cafeteria say they get paid mostly by tips and the union cant' help them. One of the supervisors said the union can't help us, we'll still have to work no matter what the union does. Well, all I know is when I see those people making $32 a week I'm ready to join anything."

After most of the departments had reported their progress, and the organizer had answered questions and urged them on, a Negro organizer from the union staff got up to assure his people in the audience of the fair treatment they would get in this union. The union, he said, had no discrimination, and welcomed Negro people, Puerto Rican people, Jewish people. Later on, he asked how the Puerto Ricans were doing. A Puerto Rican boy rose to report with pride: "We signed up all the Spanish people in the kitchen but the cook."

The organizer smiled and said, "You fellas can do a good job, see, you can speak on the job and the boss don't know what you're talkin' about."

Before the questioning was over, there arose the problem that comes up in all these sessions—the balking of the white-collar and professional workers. Clerks and lab technicians don't fare much better than the other workers, but in the grand old tradition, attempt to supplement their income with pride through distinction from the masses. College-trained lab technicians usually make less than $50 a week in these hospitals, but along with the office workers, they are the last to accept the union. It was the constant task of the organizers to remind the other workers that the white-collar brothers and sisters usually didn't make enough to keep their collars white.

The Lenox Hill meeting was about to break up, with another scheduled for 2 weeks off, when a lady hesitantly raised her voice to ask what seemed a possibly embarrasing question: "Some of the ladies heard they have to pay dues and a big fee to get in the union, and I don't know what to answer 'em." It was the organizer's pleasure to assure the assemblage that "We're not asking hospital workers to give us one penny for dues or anything else—until the day we get a contract for them with better wages and conditions. Then, our dues are $3 a month; but the rest of our union has decided that the hospital workers are getting so little to begin with that they won't have to pay an initiation fee at all."

The audience applauded in relief and approval, and got up to file out the door, some of them stopping to pick up more cards for the continuing crusade. These smaller conclaves of organizing committees and department meetings, both at union headquarters, and at temporary halls rented out near the

larger and hotter hospitals of the campaign, had grown by the first week of February to rallies of hundreds of workers from hospitals that had reached a majority. By then, Local 1199 had rolled up majorities at four hospitals and claimed to be nearing the mark in several others. President Leon Davis of Local 1199 on February 4 sent letters to the directors of Mount Sinai and Beth David in Manhattan, the Jewish Hospital in Brooklyn, and the Bronx Hospital, announcing that a majority had been reached and requesting recognition and contract negotiations. He also announced that the union was approaching majorities at Knickerbocker, Lenox Hill, and Flower Fifth Avenue hospitals.

The Mount Sinai workers, who represented the largest of the bastions newly encircled by the union, met at 1199's headquarters on February 4 to hear new congratulations and exhortations. There to express the shame of neglect and promise of fulfillment from the city's organized labor movement was Morris Iushewitz, secretary of the Central Labor Union Council of New York, who admitted that the 30,000 unorganized toilers in the voluntary hospitals are the shame of the labor movement of this city.

Davis told the hall, packed with more than 300 workers from Mount Sinai, that they were finally making their way out of the wilderness: "I don't know of any organizing drive that took on the kind of crusading spirit that you have—it's taken exactly 3 weeks and 2 days to get the majority signed up at Mount Sinai. * * * This is the beginning of a new day—a new day of dignity and self-respect. The hospitals will never be the same and the workers will never be the same."

The audience was with it, and out of the rows came low "Umm-hmm"s of approval in the tone and cadence of the "Aaaamenn"s that rise spontaneously at revival meetings. "Yes, yes. * * * You said it. * * * Oh yes * * *" came from ladies swaying slightly back and forward in assent. The problem of the union was not so much to urge them on as to keep them in line.

"We must," said one of the organizers, "have discipline." He explained that some overzealous workers in the hospital had already broken ranks in private "strikes" of their own invention: "Last week a couple of people in oxygen decided to strike on their own—they just walked off the job, and now they're waiting to be called back. * * * A couple of others over at the animal house, in the lab, stopped working and started making demands. Well, we just can't do it that way."

Local 1199 has a specially sensitive responsibility in organizing the hospitals because of the obvious dangers involved in workers walking out of oxygen wards and surgery rooms. Such potential dangers have been major factors in keeping the hospitals a sacrosanct field long held untouchable by unions. The very phrase "hospital strike" sounds almost villainous. But local 1199 threatened just that at Montefiore—though of course with careful safety precautions that would keep essential functions going—and had even hired a strike hall before the last-minute recognition was granted. Davis has said that his union will use the strike, as a last resort, in fighting for recognition at the other hospitals. But at the meeting of the Mount Sinai workers, the union leaders repeatedly urged the group to have patience, and not to make any sort of move without consent from the union. The crowd listened to all these appeals for faith and patience, and at the end of the evening a man from the back of the hall got up to ask the first question: "When," he asked, "are we going to strike?"

After their long sleep, the hospital workers have awakened with impatience and outrage. There is still a long way to go before the traditional nonunion front of the voluntary hospitals is broken, but the first break has come and thousands of workers are knocking at the white-painted walls. Already a major step toward better conditions has been brought about by the union drive through a $12 million increase in the city's payments to voluntary hospitals, announced last month by the mayor. The city contributes $16 a day for each ward patient in the voluntary hospitals, but the cost of maintaining these patients is $25 a day. The new grant will mean an increase to $20 a day for each ward patient, effective July 1; and in 3 more years the grant will rise to $24 a day. It has been the argument of the nonprofit voluntary institutions that they already operate at a deficit, and can't afford to increase workers' wages. The union can now point to the increase as a source to be used for this purpose.

The tide that is running now in New York will also inevitably seep into the hinterlands. Only in California are other voluntary hospitals organized, but the precedent in New York City will probably shake the customs across the country. The last of the "forgotten workers" seem finally launched on the crusade that most of their brothers performed in the thirties. The rhetoric of battle is nearly the same, but in our complex era of affluence these underprivileged workers are not the victims of profiteers, but of charity.

---

## "Painter's Self-Portrait"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining with my friend, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, the distinguished editor of the Detroit Jewish News, in honoring one of the great leaders of our country, the eminent lawyer, Mr. James N. Rosenberg, of New York.

Mr. Slomovitz, in his nationally syndicated column "Purely Commentary," commented on Mr. Rosenberg's book, "Painter's Self-Portrait." In his article, Mr. Slomovitz wrote:

Every lover of art and all who are interested in the highlights of American history, especially the major incidents relating to the Jewish communities, should read Louis N. Rosenberg's "Painter's Self-Portrait" and should make a study of his great number of drawings and paintings, many of which are reproduced in this volume.

PURELY COMMENTARY—MAJOR EVENTS OF THE CENTURY EVALUATED IN JAMES N. ROSENBERG'S "PAINTER'S SELF-PORTRAIT"

(By Philip Slomovitz)

Mr. Rosenberg deals with many problems. His reminiscences serve as warnings to the complacent not to be fooled into believing that all traces of anti-Semitism have disappeared. They admonish us never to forget the Nazi holocaust. They remind us of the days when anti-Semitism was rooted in social life in our colleges and was rampant in fraternities.

A very successful lawyer, Mr. Rosenberg, who is now in his 85th year, practiced his profession during the day and painted at night. He devoted his vacations, his weekends, his free days, to art.

Many of Mr. Rosenberg's works are now in the Metropolitan Museum of New York, in the Museum of Fine Arts of Boston, in the Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University, in the New York Public Library, in the Smithsonian Institution, in the U.S. State Department, in the Cleveland Museum of Art, in the Georgia Museum of Art (Athens, Ga.), in U.S. Embassies, in many other national galleries here and abroad, and in many private collections, including those of the Herbert Lehmans.

The rise of Hitlerism and the consequent Nazi horrors inspired the Rosenberg art works which will remain indelibly in the art world's history. Mr. Rosenberg's evaluation of Hitler, in "Is This the Man That Made the Earth to Tremble?" in his Ironism series (Pastel, 1944), is a historic document. So are a number of others which the eminent artist was moved to draw and to paint as an expression of protest against the terror that gripped the world.

He befriended Sholem Asch and David Ben-Gurion and drew impressive portraits of them.

His "Peace on Earth," a Hanukah-Christmas montage, is exceptionally interesting. He specialized in landscapes, and he also revealed his moods in various paintings that were the results of historic occurrences in his 50 years' activities as a painter.

The value of "Painter's Self-Portrait" as a great human document is evident in many of its aspects. Mr. Rosenberg, hailing from a religious background, was raised in a rather un-Jewish environment. He was born in Allegheny City, Pa., November 20, 1874; his grandfather, Louis Naumburg, who reached the ripe old age of 87, was cantor, and officiated as rabbi of Rodeph Shalom Synagogue in Pittsburgh; but when his family moved to New York in 1879, his "parents forsook the strict rituals of orthodox Judaism, joined the Ethical Culture Society, headed by Felix Adler," and James N. Rosenberg attended ethical classes. But in the course of time, in college and elsewhere, experiences brought him to an awareness that he was a Jew.

Mr. Rosenberg might have become a Detroiter. He relates, after accounting for his early law practice and his association with the late Abram Elkus (who later was U.S. Ambassador to Turkey).

"In 1912, when I was 38, there came to me the U.S. Motor Receivership. This was my big-best case up to that time; it was presided over by Judge Hough. When its reorganization in 1913 created the Maxwell Motor Co.—now Chrysler—George W. Davison, chairman of the reorganization committee, invited me to abandon the law, move to Detroit (at a large salary and a stock of bonus), and become the company's head. This was another of those crucial moments which make or mar a man. What, I wonder, would have happened had I accepted that tempting proposal to become an industrial leader? Success or failure? Leader? Or slave? I declined the offer. Somehow, I had the sense to realize that to accept would have meant farewell to the kind of life I wanted to lead."

The question often is asked in our community: Why weren't there Jews in the pioneering automobile industry in Detroit? There was one such pioneer: the late Bernard Ginsburg (father of Mrs. Golda Krolik), whose truck manufacturing venture was short lived. Had Mr. Rosenburg come here, a different story might have been recorded.

In his self-portrait, however, he does relate his numerous successes in law, the friendship that was established with Judge Hough after he had won a case, as a young practitioner, against the veteran, eminent lawyer, Max D. Steuer.

But he had a special love—for art—for which he finally forsook his lucrative law practice 12 years ago—and his motivation, in refusing the tempting Maxwell offer, is understandable.

He begins his narrative of his Jewish activities in a chapter in his book under the heading "Another World." In it he tells of the meeting with Felix M. Warburg and the invitation that he go to Russia to work for the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. It led to his friendship and his joint activities with the great Jews of his day, with Louis Marshall, Warburg, Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Judge Julian W. Mack, Cyrus Adler, Herbert H. Lehman, and many others.

He assisted in the formation of the Jewish Agency in Zurich, in 1929, went to Palestine and later to Israel, cooperated in major movements for rehabilitation of suffering Jews. He was the coworker with Dr. Joseph A. Rosen in the Agrojoint (American Jewish Joint Agricultural Cooperation) which established self-supporting colonies for 300,000 Jews in the Crimea in Russia, and he had occasion to meet with Stalin and to confer with Soviet leaders. During World War II these colonial settlements were completely destroyed. It is one of the tragedies of our time referred to in Mr. Rosenburg's accounts of his Jewish activities.

There is much—very much—more that can be said about Mr. Rosenberg, and a great deal that is worth quoting from it. One additional incident must not be overlooked. He went to Berlin, in the course of his agrojoint mission, and he tells this story:

"A dinner party was given for me at the splendid Wahnsee home of Lola Hahn, glamorous daughter of Felix Warburgh's brother Max. There I met some 20 topmost German Jews, who were eager to know about the Crimean work. Albert Einstein was one of the guests.

"When the time came for me to speak, I dealt but briefly with the Crimea and turned to another topic. This, be it remembered, was 1926. Taking a magazine called Bren Essel (Nettle) from my pocket, I told how by chance I had picked up that savage anti-Semitic journal at the Berlin railway station. Pointing to hideously offensive caricatures of some of the very men who sat at that dinner table and to inciting libels against them, I asked what was being done to stop Hitler. They listened tolerantly to this ignorant American and assured him that Hitler was just another one of those harmless demagogs who from time to time rose briefly to the surface and soon vanished. Germany, they told me, suffered no such anti-Semitism as did we of the United States of America. They were members of some of Germany's most exclusive clubs. Einstein's warnings were heeded no more than were mine. Who can blame them?"

At this point your commentator couldn't avoid recalling the activities of the late Rev. Dr. Leon M. Birkhead. He was a Christian minister in Kansas City, Mo., and had gone to Germany on a vacation in the early 1930's. There, by chance he visited a book exhibit. It was a display of anti-Semitic literature arranged by Streicher, and the sponsors of the exhibit indicated that most of the tremendous mass of hate literature was published in the United States. Our good friend Birkhead began to wonder: Was it possible that such vile, hate-inspiring pamphlets could find sponsors in his own country and he was unaware of it? He returned to this country, began to study the situation, learned of the extent of bigotry, became acquainted with the growing anti-Semitic movement, and he gave up the ministry to devote himself to the fight against bigotry. His movement, "Friends of Democracy," made great headway in warding off mounting prejudices in our land.

This is the story of a great book and a great man. It keeps us fully aware of what had happened to us and to our people in this and the last generation. It admonishes us to be on guard against the inroads of bigotry into our civilized democracy.

It reminds us of the immense philanthropic efforts of Mr. Rosenberg's contemporaries, and, above all, it causes us to sit in admiration for a man who was so socially minded, who was great in his profession—the law—and who, at 84, remains a keen observer, a sensitive artist, a dedicated fighter against all types of prejudices, a remarkable Jewish leader.

"Painter's Self-Portrait" by James N. Rosenberg assumes one of the most cherished spots in our bookshelves.

---

## Now Castro Faces the Harder Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine section of the New York Times, March 8, 1959:

NOW CASTRO FACES THE HARDER FIGHT

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

HAVANA.—The dawn of February 17, 1957, in a sunless jungle grove of Cuba's Sierra Maestra was a bare lightening of the gloom and wetness. A week of cloak-and-dagger negotiations in Havana, an all-night drive to the eastern end of the island, the tricky penetration of the army cordon at the foot of the mountains the next evening, the long, slippery climb in the dark after midnight, the 2 hours of welcome sleep on the ground in the rebel outpost—all this had now led to the anticipated moment.

A swift crackling of branches and leaves, a sweeping commotion as if a sudden gust of wind had hit us, and there was Fidel Castro. His younger brother, Raul, was with him. So were Vilma Espin, now Raul's wife; Haydee Santamaria, wife of the present Minister of Education, Armando Hart; Celia Sanchez, still Fidel's faithful companion. In the encampment were Ernesto (Che) Guevara, the Argentine doctor; Juan Almeida, the Negro who was to become an outstanding column leader; Camilo Cienfuegos, now Cuban Chief of Staff; Faustino Perez, Minister of Recuperation in the present government; Frank Pais, who was killed.

All these names will go down in Cuban history, and that meeting in the Sierra Maestra was, too, in its way to make Cuban history when the story was published in the New York Times a week later. The Government of Gen. Fulgencio Batista had given out that Fidel Castro was dead and Batista himself believed it.

I was talking to a hunted man, so closely pursued by army troops that all of us had to speak in whispers. My guess, at the time, was that Fidel Castro had 300 or, at most, 400 men. General Batista had an army of 30,000 using the latest American equipment, as Castro pointed out bitterly. It seemed safe enough for me to write that the rebels were invincible, given the impregnability of the Sierra Maestra and their fighting spirit. But their position was essentially defensive and could not have been further from the seat of power in Havana.

For 3 hours we sat there in the semigloom while Fidel talked in a passionate whisper of the hopes, dreams, and ideals he had. A conversation with Fidel Castro, as everyone has discovered lately, is something of a monologue on his part. Words flow like a torrent.

This much was certain: Here was a powerful personality, a powerful physique. Passionate convictions and courage were also obvious enough. The intelligence had a quality of youthful brilliance—cocksure, dogmatic but untrained, inexperienced, a bit fuzzy. The ideals were admirable, but there was no apparent conception of how difficult it is to put such ideals into practice. The ignorance of economics was notable.

Castro had to be conceded a good chance of victory even then, presuming he was not going to be killed, leading his men—as he always did. Anyone knowing the situation in Cuba at that time realized how overwhelming was the popular antagonism to the Batista dictatorship, which meant that Fidel Castro was not fighting alone. Clearly, he was going to be the symbol and rallying point for the opposition. But what a long distance Havana was from the Sierra Maestra.

Exactly 2 years later, the two of us were together again, in his new house at Cojimar, outside Havana. In those 2 years the hunted, besieged little group of rebels had swollen to thousands of effective fighters. They had spread out over Oriente Province in the east and gradually worked westward.

Popular support grew steadily, as General Batista met the threat and the attacks of the opposition with counterterrorism. Cubans now estimate as many as 20,000 civilians were killed by the Batista regime, many or most after torture. By late 1958, the sugar crop, on which Cuba lives, was seen to be in danger. The war moved closer, and when Santa Clara, 150 miles from Havana, fell, Batista gave up and fled, on New Year's Day.

Now Batista was in exile in the Dominican Republic. Late the night before my visit, Fidel Castro had been sworn in as Prime Minister of Cuba. "This is slavery," he exclaimed. "If I were a king, I would abdicate in favor of my nephew."

I had spoken to him three times in the wild, exultant first days of his victory. Six weeks had since passed. The excitement was over. The dreams had turned into harsh realities. For 4 afternoon hours, sometimes surrounded by his barbudos (the bearded ones who fought with him in the Sierra) and by the women who were looking after him, but mostly alone with me indoors or strolling around the grounds of his house, he talked and occasionally listened.

Standing or sitting, he gets right up close. He cannot bear to sit even 2 feet from the person he is talking to. His face is inches away; his dark rich brown eyes are hypnotic in their intensity; one or both hands are on your shoulders or knees and the flow of words comes with such animation and fervor that it is hard to keep one's mind clear to argue or even grasp what is saying.

The ideals he was expounding now were just the same as 2 years before, only better formulated. He looked the same in his famous fatigue uniform of green khaki and the peaked kepi that he kept on his tousled brown hair indoors and out. Around his neck was a small gold religious medallion on a gold chain which he chewed on now and then, as he did the end of his straggly beard. His one touch of luxury was an expensive gold wrist watch on a wide gold band.

Watching him so closely all afternoon made nonsense of a rumor (bola is the Cuban word) that is current in Havana, which is that he keeps going on benzedrine or some similar stimulant. Apparently it is hard for some to understand how otherwise he can work so feverishly for 20 or 21 hours a day, every day without a break. But the answer is simple: he has the build of a professional football player and the strength of a bull.

To complicate the metaphor, he eats like a horse. Soon after striding into his house—and he does stride rather than just walk—he packed away a lunch that would have satisfied three ordinary men. Miguel, his little Negro barbudo cook from the Sierre Maestra, is still with him and still "boiling things," as the disapproving women remarked. Celia

Sanchez supervised the huge meal and improved on Miguel's simplicities.

Fidel (no one ever calls him anything else in Cuba) obviously arouses all the maternal instincts in women. The only time he kept quiet all afternoon was while he downed his food at the kitchen table and the women chattered at him. Whether he listened was problematical.

Fidel Castro is an essentially simple young man faced with a task of extraordinary complexity. The process he is now going through is one of trying to put into effect the ideals for which he always fought—and finding that the realities of politics, economics, and the administration of a nation do not often permit him to do so.

He freed Cuba, and now he has to conquer himself. He has been a destroyer; now he must create. He has been a fighter; now he must become the leader of a civil government. He has had companions; now the burden is his alone.

At times he seems dismayed and bewildered by it all. "Cuba is harder to run than the United States," he says. "Everything is disorganized." Yet one cannot see that his faith or courage or confidence have weakened, nor have his ideas changed.

"You are a newspaper man," he says, "devoted to your profession, determined to work for good, honest journalism. I am a revolutionary. Either I work, live, and fight for social justice, for bettering the life of the people, or I have no reason for existence. This is what the people of Cuba expect; it is what they demand. They understand what we are trying to do and we are going to give them what they want."

His whole philosophy is one of revolution, but it is still, as 2 years ago, expressed in vague, general terms. "Social justice is the necessity of the future everywhere in the hemisphere and the only hope of preventing much worse kinds of revolution," he says. "This is what you have achieved in the United States. Unemployment cannot go on at this high level in Cuba. The standard of living must be raised, but not by soaking the rich, not by war of class against class. I have complete faith in the triumph of this revolution, although I know that it will take time."

When it is pointed out to him that revolutions of a social and industrial nature are easier to formulate than to carry out, especially in the sort of democracy he is dedicated to, he is unimpressed. He seems still to lack an understanding of the complexity of a modern, industrial, free-enterprise structure, although he claims to have done much studying and meditating in the Sierra Maestra during the past 2 years and his grasp of economics and finance is certainly much greater than it was.

However, this is the first time he has ever had political, economic, and administrative authority, and no one can yet say just what he is going to do with the power he possesses. He himself cannot know, because he is finding that some ideals, like the abolition of gambling, are not feasible. For all the searing experience of those 2 amazing years of conflict, Fidel Castro is still an unformed, untried, inexperienced young man, when it comes to running a country.

This is what worries and even frightens many of his most ardent admirers. There is no escaping the fact that Fidel has that rare gift, which nature seems to bestow impartially on good or bad men, of being able to sway popular feeling at will. Such men, if they are evil, ambitious, or corrupted by power, can become dictators. If they are good men, they are in danger of crucifixion. One has just to think in our era of such complete opposites as Mahatma Gandhi and Adolf Hitler. It is only in our times, with newspapers, radio, and now television, that such men reach millions of people.

The great liberators in Latin-American history—Miranda, Bolivar, San Martin, Marti—died brokenhearted, denied or martyrized. Fidel, who is called a great liberator by his people, at moments seems to have a tragic sense of doom. He spoke of the danger of assassination the other afternoon as we strolled alone, unguarded, around the extensive grounds of his house, beyond the ineffective fence that we climbed over, and along a path that skirted a cliff, below which a little winding river ran into the sea. His house is on a knoll, the Sierra de Cojimar, with barren, open lands stretching a half-mile to the sea.

"There are so many former soldiers of Batista around," he said, "and the families of the men we have executed or sentenced to jail. But I don't like to go around with a big guard."

The risk is really great, and his followers and friends are continually worried. Yet he cannot bear to isolate himself. Fidel really loves people as people. It is not a pose, not the baby kissing and hand shaking of a politician, but a genuine, simple pleasure, and affection for people, the humbler the better. This was part of the secret of the unanimous support Fidel always got from the guajiros or peasants of the Sierra Maestra, and also a reason why his soldiers worship him. Fidel's father, a Gallego from northern Spain, was a man of the people who made a fortune in sugar.

When I remarked, standing under the trees outside the house while he was measuring a place for a hammock, that the power he has to sway the masses could be dangerous, he planted himself inches away, put his hands on my shoulders and said: "Why? How? Such a gift, as you call it, can do evil in the hands of dictators, but not in the hands of one who lives only for the people, who has no strength except in popular support."

His followers—now almost all Cuba—would also add that he is a man of high moral principles and is essentially good in the moral sense, although some of these worry about the way in which the force of circumstances has willy nilly given him the power of a dictator. But few Cubans critize him, as many Americans do, for the executions of the war criminals.

"I didn't foment the executions as I have been accused in the United States of doing," he remarked resentfully. "On the contrary, I yielded to popular demand as little as possible and, in fact, the unjust, ignorant accusations by Americans made our people much more determined than ever to have justice, and I was put under still greater pressure. I want these executions to end within a month, so that we can get down to happier and more important things." He added, in response to a question, that the families of the men executed will be taken care of by the state.

"I am not anti-American or anti-United States," he protested when taxed with constantly attacking the United States in his speeches and interviews. "I am anti American policies. Most of all, I had to defend myself and my countrymen against the injustice of American attacks and threats against us."

Like most Cubans, he has the same basic resentment against Americans that Americans used to have against the British, and he feels especially critical of American policies and of the two American Ambassadors in Havana during his fight to overthrow Batista. However, he agreed that berating the United States was a luxury that Cuba cannot long afford and anyway, he insists, he wants friendship and will respond in kind. Incidentally, while welcoming American investments he says he would prefer American loans.

It was consistent with his revolutionary outlook that in his opinion the attacks on him in the American press were motivated by interests seeking to defeat the aims of the Cuban social and economic revolution.

The afternoon sun was getting low as we sat on the steps of the house looking out over the sea. One of the officer barbudos came up and said there did not seem to be enough water for the plumbing in the house. "You mean to say we won't be able to take baths," said Fidel, doubling up with laughter.

His gaiety and sense of humor were a revelation to Habaneros and foreigners when Fidel Castro first reached the capital. The house in Cojimar has a happy atmosphere, friendly and relaxed. Barbudos wander around, looking sloppy and outlandish, usually smoking cigars as their leader continually does, but one cannot underrate those bearded ones after what they did, and every one of them would give his life in a second for Fidel.

He was pleased to be away from the luxurious confinement of the Habana Hilton Hotel, where he had been staying. He is one of those people to whom luxury or hardship is meaningless. He misses the Sierra Maestra, the trees, the jungle, the green things, the comradeship and the danger—all so simple and now so far away.

There is nothing simple today. Those who put Fidel Castro in a category, who label him, judge or praise or condemn him, are only expressing fears and hopes. Like all romantics, he defies classification, and in any event there is no adequate basis for judgment yet.

Two years ago he was beginning an epic struggle to overthrow his country's dictator and that was essentially simple. "We will know how to win or die," he said.

Now he has won and is beginning a new struggle, but the terms this time cannot be victory or death, only success or failure or something in between for the social revolution which is his goal. Two years ago Fidel Castro was a confirmed, fanatical idealist. Others around him, like his younger brother Raul, or Che Guevara, can still be, but not Fidel. The responsibilities and the realities of power are forcing him to compromise, to yield, to adapt himself.

To create an honest, efficient, democratic Cuba is an infinitely harder task than Fidel faced when we first talked together in the Sierra Maestra on February 17, 1957. All one can say today is that he knows it and is confident. Circumstances, not Fidel Castro, have changed.

## Hungarian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the bloody events of October-November days of 1956 in Hungary were the result of an outward manifestation on the part of tough and tenacious Hungarians held down by the most powerful totalitarian dictatorship. There in their homeland they were being oppressed by their taskmasters. Hating and detesting these alien overlords, and yearning for freedom, the people staged a sudden uprising, thereby hoping to expel Russian

Communists and the Red army detachments, and thus regain their freedom. Unfortunately, the helpless and brave Hungarians were alone in this unequal struggle against the massive and monolithic might of the Soviet Union. The valiant efforts of the brave Hungarians ended in a tragic blood-bath. But such events are not new or rare in Hungary's long history. Such an epochmaking event took place a little over 100 years ago which began on the 15th of March 1848.

In that year, when revolutionary waves were sweeping all over Europe, all oppressed peoples under autocratic regimes were stirred and became restive. Hungarian people showed their resentment against the Austrian government. Their great spokesman, Louis Kossuth, presented their grievances to the government early in March. But, before the government had given serious considerations to these grievances, demonstrations were held in various parts of the country, demanding freedom. Fortunately the government was not in position to suppress the people and ignore their demands. Finally on March 15, on the "Ides of March," their demands were granted; the people regained their freedom. Since then, for more than 110 years, March 15 has been celebrated as one of the chief national holidays of Hungary. The events of that day proved that however ruthless and heartless autocracies may seem, and often are, they are bound to lose out in the end against the will and tenacity of a sturdy and stout-hearted people. Perhaps the best way to revive the spirit of those days is to celebrate the anniversary of that great event, even when today Hungary is suffering under Communist tyranny. I therefore take pleasure in associating myself with Hungarian Freedom Day, and with those Americans of Hungarian descent who mark this day.

## Hawaii Statehood

SPEECH
OF
### HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I heartily support this bill and hope it will have a speedy passage. It not only makes possible the addition of a new State to the Union that richly merits such recognition, but awarding statehood should prove most advantageous to the future of the United States. Hawaii has for 40 years awaited statehood status since the first bill was introduced in the House. Its population of almost one-half a million has for years shown its ability to support a sound economy and it has had outstanding development through progressive leadership. During World War II many of our citizens believed that, because of the very varied national background of the people of Hawaii that the islands would prove an Achilles Heel in our defense. To the contrary and to the everlasting credit of its residents their full loyalty was proven continually and aided immeasurably in our ultimate victory.

I believe that admission of Hawaii will prove of great significance in our history. It carries even greater import than the admission of Alaska last year. Finally, after many years of debate, sober thought, and judgment, the representatives of the 48 States and now Alaska, have put aside their prejudices and narrow views of the past. This year the debates on both the Senate and House floors were on a high level and did not display the appeals to passion and bias exhibited on some past occasions.

Not only does statehood fulfill the promises made in the Republican and Democrat platforms, but it demonstrates to the world that the people of our country respect the dignity of man and sincerely mean our belief in freedom and liberty and opportunity for all our citizens. Hawaiian statehood carries with it a spiking of Communist propaganda claims and I hope that it also indicates that the temper of both Houses is such that the long disfranchised residents of the District of Columbia will be granted self-government. It is a tragedy that the residents of Washington have been voteless for so many years.

We have spent billions on defense for missiles and H-bombs and billions to bolster the economy and yet unwillingness to grant the vote to District of Columbia citizens again provides Communist propaganda.

The vote that will be taken today will mark the beginning of a new era for the United States. As the Representative from the Seventh District of New Jersey, I consider myself most fortunate in being able to vote for Hawaii as our 50th State.

## Plumbing Contractors of Chicago Endorse H.R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday H.R. 10, the Keogh-Simpson bill, on which there is tremendous national interest, is scheduled for floor action in this body. For the information of my colleagues, I am extending my remarks to include a statement by the Plumbing Contractors Association of Chicago. Nationwide there are in excess of 9,000 plumbing contractors, all like those of the Chicago association, small businessmen and largely self-employed. Their strong endorsement of H.R. 10 certainly merits the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The statement follows:

The tax inequity which would be rectified by passage of the Keogh-Simpson bill, H.R. 10, is exemplified by the plight of members of the Plumbing Contractors Association of Chicago.

Plumbing contractors are usually self-employed and they are almost without exception small businessmen. Here in Chicago, about 85 percent of the local contractors are self-employed and employ 10 men or fewer. Very, very few have as many as 300 employees.

All these men in the small shops as well as the lareg ones are covered by a pension plan provided by their employers, as a fringe benefit, under an areawide labor-management agreement. Those employers who are self-employed plumbing contractors cannot provide similar protection for themselves except out of their income after taxes.

The tax laws make it hard for a self-employed person to provide retirement income, in two ways. For one thing, the high tax rates, especially those that apply in years when a person has a fairly good income, make it impossible, in many cases, to accumulate an estate that is big enough to provide retirement income. And, second, a self-employed person who tries to provide himself with a pension or annuity for his retirement has a tax burden that an employed individual who is covered by a union or company retirement plan does not have. The self-employed person must pay a tax on his entire income and save for his retirement out of what is left. He cannot, as part of his business expense, set aside a certain amount under a pension plan and deduct it from his taxable income.

Employed persons, on the other hand, have a tax benefit when their employers or a union provide coverage for them under an approved pension plan. The amounts paid by the employer are deductible by him as a business expense. Often the employee pays no part of the cost of providing for his future retirement; and he pays no tax on amounts used by the employer to provide the retirement benefits.

By allowing a self-employed person to deduct a limited amount of income if it is invested in an approved retirement fund, Congress would help the self-employed person on both these points. The self-employed person has more peaks and valleys in his income than an employed person does. In the peak years he must pay taxes at a high rate, but he gets no credit for this during low income years. By permitting a deduction for sums invested for retirement, you could help the self-employed person level out his income for tax purposes. Taxation of part of the income would be postponed until it is received as retirement benefits. More important, however, is the need for getting rid of the inequality that exists between the self-employed person and the employed person who is covered by an acceptable company or union pension plan.

Present inflation also makes it hard for a self-employed person to save for retirement. High prices increase his costs of doing business and require that he spend more to provide a reasonable living standard for himself and his family. Part of the inflation we have today results from the fact that people generally are not saving enough out of current income. A law that would encourage people to save would work against inflation to some extent.

The self-employed small businessman has always been an important factor in maintaining our system of private, competitive enterprise. Taxes that discriminate against self-employed people in favor of employees discourage self-employment, self-reliance, and individual initiative. To that extent they put a brake on the competition that has been provided by small business units.

We are not asking for tax exemption. What we seek is a postponement of part of a self-employed person's income tax from

his working years to the years of his retirement, and equitable tax treatment with employed persons under the law.

## A Wisdom Unmarred by Vanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, a good friend of mine, Jim Johnson, of Coos Bay, Oreg., just sent me a copy of a fine editorial written by another friend of mine, Bill Tugman, editor and publisher of the Port Umpqua Courier, Reedsport, Oreg.

Jim told me to memorize the part he underlined, which was "a wisdom not marred by the vanities which have blemished the achievement of so many other famous men." The editorial refers to General Marshall, a man to whom this Nation owes so much and whose example is surely one Americans will treasure throughout our existence as a Nation.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the text of the editorial entitled "Gen. George C. Marshall: An American":

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL: AN AMERICAN

It is our belief that history will recognize in Gen. George C. Marshall one of the greatest Americans of all time—the man who gave guidance to those who played the more heroic role of leadership through the trying days of World War II; the man who later, as Secretary of State, conceived the program of aid and rehabilitation for our war-stricken allies which saved many of them from the ravages of communism; the Secretary of Defense who brought some degree of commonsense into the relationships of our Army, Navy, and Air Corps.

In war or in peace, George Marshall served his Nation and humanity as long as God gave him strength to serve—quietly and unselfishly. In this man was a blend of the indomitable courage and steadfastness of George Washington, much of the gentleness of Abraham Lincoln, and a wisdom not marred by the vanities which have blemished the achievement of so many other famous men. But it is for others to relate and appraise the many attainments of George Marshall. We are going to relate an incident which occurred long before Marshall rose to national fame.

It was during the terrible depression years. We started to Portland early one morning on the old Highway 99. On the outskirts of Eugene we noticed a tall, dignified gentleman, not "thumbing," but evidently eager for a ride. We stopped and took him in. His name, if we recall correctly, was Monroe, but names did not seem to matter for the moment. We talked about the weather and this and that. In a large field near Albany, we noticed a small herd of excellent horses, and Mr. Monroe said:

"You notice that close-coupled chestnut in the corner, the one with the deep chest and well-made legs? Notice him step. He's got springy pasterns. That, sir, is a riding animal. Good blood lines."

"You seem to know something about horses."

The old gentleman grinned.

"I ought to. I spent 50 of the best years of my life in the U.S. Calvary."

"Well, I was just a field artillery hack, but I worked with lots of cavalrymen. Ever know Col. Jimmy Hornbrook, of the 8th; Dodd of the 13. * * *

"Of course, of course, why most of those fine men were my boys. Why when I was just a recruit Black Jack Pershing was just a shavetail out of the Point."

The old gentleman went on to explain that he had never had enough education (as he called it) to rise above the rank of top sergeant (but you had to be all man and a little more to be a top in one of these old outfits). He explained how the young second lieutenants just out of West Point always placed themselves under the guidance of their senior sergeants till they had really learned how to lead men.

"There were always a few who were too proud to defer to the judgment of an enlisted man," said he, "but the really bright ones always bided their time to give commands. I'm on my way to to visit one of my boys right now."

"Who's that?"

"George Marshall, the new brigadier at Fort Vancouver, just across the river from Portland."

"I've heard good things of him."

"He is one of the best. I had him when he first came from VMI; he did not go to the Point. He and Mrs. Marshall always have me as their house guest during my birthday week. I'll be 80 this week. The visit always ends with a big review in my honor."

"That's nice."

"General Marshall never forgets an old friend. They'd be pleased to have you come to my review, if you could."

It has been a matter of long regret that "important" engagements prevented attending this review. We never saw the old gentleman again. Nor did we ever see George Marshall except across a large room. But we knew his friend and neighbor Hap Arnold very well—the impulsive, explosive, dynamic Hap who made Air Force a power in the world and his gentle wife, Eleanor, and through them many of the high rankers at Fort Myer. There was only one thing on which all these high-spirited and brilliant leaders were agreed during World War II—their confidence in the integrity and judgment of the modest Virginian who was their Chief of Staff.

The career of George C. Marshall deserves much thought and study by young Americans.

## Bar Association Praised on Supreme Court Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, February 25, 1959:

BAR ASSOCIATION PRAISED ON SUPREME COURT REPORT

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 24.—Seldom in American history has there been such a scathing criticism of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States as has just come from the American Bar Association.

This has nothing to do with the decisions of the Court on segregation or integration. Nor do the members of the bar—who by overwhelming vote approved at the Chicago convention this week a committee report on the subject of Supreme Court decisions—come from any one section of the country.

The action taken is a formal disapproval of several decisions of the Supreme Court not only in matters of law but in the misuse of the judicial power itself. The report, comprising about 20,000 words, does not criticize the Supreme Court as an institution nor recommend any limitation of its powers, but does say that Congress should at once, in the proper way, endeavor to correct the ill effects of the decisions. The report declares:

"Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through invalidation of State sedition statutes and limitation of State and Federal investigating powers in the field of subversion although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting national and State security efforts."

SECURITY SEEN IMPERILED

"The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process which the Communists seek to destroy, yet use as a refuge to masquerade their diabolical objectives.

"This trend was treated fully in the conference of State chief justices last year when they called upon the U.S. Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial self-restraint. The dissenting opinions of certain Supreme Court justices have been crystal clear in charting the effect of the failure of the majority to recognize the underground forces that are at work and to appreciate how these decisions affect our internal security."

CONGRESS URGED TO ACT

The bar association's report says it is the duty of members of the bar to defend the institutions of the judiciary from unfair and unjust attacks and that proposals to limit the court's jurisdiction should not be approved. But at the same time the committee report, as adopted by the convention says that, where remedial legislation can be enacted by Congress to deal with Communists and other subversives, this should be given prompt attention. The report cites a long list of Supreme Court decisions in the internal-security field and points out exactly how they can be overcome by action of Congress.

Also, a chapter is devoted to current fallacies about communism. The report says: "It is just as false to measure the strength of communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship."

DANGER WORSE THAN EVER

Adding that the danger and the menace of communism are worse than ever, the report calls on the members of the bar to alert the Nation on the menace of international communism.

As one reads the report, there comes a feeling that its writers tried to be as tactful as possible in their references to the present membership of the Supreme Court but nevertheless reveal again and again their dismay at the abuse of power by the highest Court.

"Our internal security," says the report, "has been weakened by a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public and technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind have had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and free the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation."

M'CARTHY DETRACTORS BLAMED

The indifference of the public may be due to the job performed by some of the opponents of the late Senator McCarthy, of Wisconsin. Unfortunately, the period in which he struggled to direct attention to the Communist menace now is brushed off as merely one of hysteria, and there is no effort nowadays to separate what was valid in the crusade from that which was due to overzealousness and emotionalism.

Since the famous battle took place in the Senate in 1954, moreover, it has been an open secret in Washington that the Democratic Party leaders in both Houses have been under pressure from its so-called liberal elements to soft-pedal the inquiries into communism. Though two committees still do some work in this field, they are restrained by word from higher up in the party whenever they really want to expose some palpable manifestation of Communist effort inside the United States. Some prominent American citizens, for example, who have been openly siding with the Soviets against their own Government in certain controversies have never been called as witnesses by the committees of either the House or the Senate to explain their activities or their connections with the Communist propaganda machine. Maybe the American Bar Association report will awaken American public opinion and help to overcome the timidity of the Democratic Party leadership on these subjects.

## Nation's Information Mediums Portray South's Position in Unfavorable Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including three editorials which appeared in the Thursday, March 5 issue of the Jackson, Miss., Daily News. The first of these, entitled "Publicity Peter Funks" appeared on the front page of this paper, and makes reference to the succeeding editorials.

These editorials point up what many of us have known for years: that a concerted and highly organized conspiracy exists among much of our Nation's mass information mediums to portray the South's attitudes and position to the rest of the country in the most ridiculous and unfavorable light possible.

The information contained in these editorials should be cause for grave concern on the part of every right-thinking and patriotic American citizen:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, Mar. 5, 1959]

PUBLICITY PETER FUNKS

The extent to which organized, professional pressure groups apply the squeeze to the Nation's large newspapers, magazines, wire services, radio and television outlets on behalf of stirring up racial hatreds and warped opinions of the South has been uncovered.

Minutes of a secret meeting held in New York recently have been obtained. This document reveals very significant background into reasons the South continues to suffer abuse and slander in the court of last resort—public opinion. The judge and jury are both stacked against millions of decent, law-abiding people who disagree with left-wing, Communist-front strife-spreaders, do-gooders, and social and publicity Peter Funks.

The minutes of the hush-hush session at which distorted stories against the South were conceived appear, along with additional editorial comment, on the editorial page in this issue of the Jackson Daily News.

You will see from the pressure techniques plus an abundance of fawning willingness on the part of journalists and television commentators that the South has no more chance of unbiased treatment than a billy goat has of winning a prize at a perfume contest.

The minutes reveal propaganda leaflets are distributed by the Mass Media Committee of the Consultative Conference on Desegregation to all CCD agencies. It is reported about 40 agencies cooperate in this the falsehood spreading, but the names of these agencies are kept secret.

Visiting newsmen can swarm into the South and get all the factual information they desire on any organization, but the nerve-center of world journalism, television and radio has not been able to get a list of these agencies.

Right-thinking southerners should study with concern the underground activities of vicious sabotage against reputable people.

It must be accepted that the South has been long-suffering in enduring the assaults.

Although it can hardly hope to cope with a secret underground of hate-pushers, the Citizens Council (there's no secret about its board of directors) is the only active organization putting up an intelligent defense against the constant barrage of smear against the South.

After reading the details on the editorial page today we believe our readers will hold renewed respect and admiration for those who stand on the forefront of this all-important fight for decency and fairplay.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, Mar. 5, 1959]

NEW ANTI-SOUTH PROPAGANDA PLOTTED AT SECRET HUDDLE

How does a pressure group dedicated to racial agitation work?

How do these creatures continue to gag the press, magazines, and radio and television?

How do they successfully distort and discredit remarks made by honorable American people who oppose their vicious slander?

In these same columns below you will read minutes of a most remarkable secret meeting held in New York City on February 4 at the NAACP's headquarters on West 40th Street. These minutes have been brought to public attention by the Richmond News Leader, of Richmond, Va.

Efforts by that newspaper have failed to establish the identity of "about 40" organizations allegedly supporting the organization known as the "Consultative Conference on Desegregation."

It is extremely significant that news media in New York, the nerve center of world newsgathering, can send high-powered journalists into the South to dig up any facts they desire on any organization, but the group of about 40 organizations supporting the CCD remain anonymous.

Is it not extremely strange that the CCD voted to protest to the Associated Press, United Press International and Editor and Publisher regarding identifying people by race when the meeting was arranged by an organization which includes the term "colored people" in its own name. We refer to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

There is no more reason why the news media should suffer censorship at the hands of this unidentified outfit than should a judge juggle evidence in court or turn a deaf ear to defense attorneys.

After you have read the article below, we believe you will agree the Nation's press and radio and television facilities are being pressured into giving the South another double dose of ridicule in the court of last resort—public opinion—and, please, look at the professional agitators packing the court.

In the face of this evidence it is no wonder the South continues to take such a licking.

In the face of perpetual bombardment with vicious lies, it is a wonder this region has shown the remarkable restraint it has exercised.

The falsehood peddlers yell for moderation, yet they display no regard for the word in dishing out abusive propaganda.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, Mar. 5, 1959]

HERE IS PROOF AGITATORS SERVE AS PRESS CENSORS—MINUTES OF THE MASS MEDIA COMMITTEE OF THE CONSULTATIVE CONFERENCE ON DESEGREGATION, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1959

Present: Arnold Aronson, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Gunther Lawrence, Union of American Hebrew Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Alex Morisey, American Friends Service Committee; Guichard Parris, National Urban League; Alan Reitman, American Civil Liberties Union; Ed White, United Steelworkers of America; Chairman Alf Bernheim, American Jewish Committee; Secretary Harry Fleishman, National Labor Service.

1. Approximately 15,000 copies of Pogo and the Speakeasy Schools, a reprint of Walt Kelly's comic strips on that subject, will be published by the National Labor Service of the American Jewish Committee, the Southern Regional Council, the Anti-Defamation League, the American Friends Committee, and six AFL–CIO unions. Sample copies will be distributed to CCD agencies.

2. A letter was received from Herman Long, of Fisk University, director, race relations department, Congregational Christian Churches, mentioning that race labeling has begun to appear widely in the service stories in the newspapers. It was agreed that Alan Reitman would talk with officials of Associated Press, United Press International, and Editor and Publisher concerning this matter.

3. Reitman agreed to contact Life magazine again concerning a proposed article on the role of the clergy in the South in supporting law and equality.

4. The American Friends Service Committee is sponsoring a pamphlet on American Race Relations, which will be published by the University of Oklahoma Press. Agencies interested in quantities of the pamphlet should write to Alex Morisey, American Friends Service Committee, 1201 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

5. The Southern Regional Council reported that it will reprint the Arkansas Gazette report on the effect of the desegregation controversy on economic conditions in Arkansas. Sample copies will be sent to all CCD agencies.

6. The National Urban League has prepared an attractive 11 by 14 illustrated pamphlet, Half a Life, in connection with Equal Opportunity Day. Copies are being sent to CCD agencies.

7. The Turnpike Press has just published as a 24-page pamphlet, The Truth About Desegregation in Washington's Schools, which first appeared as a series of articles in the Washington Post, by Erwin Knoll. The

series is an excellent survey of progress in the Washington schools and should be helpful in countering the vicious propaganda being spread by Governor Faubus, of Arkansas, and other southern segregationalist leaders. Single copies are 15 cents postpaid, 10 copies or more 10 cents each postpaid; 100 copies or more 7½ cents postpaid; 500 copies or more 5 cents each plus shipping charges. Please order from the Turnpike Press, Annandale, Va.

8. A group of organizations in Miami, under the leadership of the United Church Women, have conducted a community audit in connection with United Nations Human Rights Day. Copies of the folder describing the community audit are being mailed to all CCD agencies.

9. Prosegregation ads have appeared in the New York Times, January 5, 1959, and in the Wall Street Journal, February 9, 1959 under the signature of Carleton Putnam, who describes himself as a distinguished New Englander. Putnam, a board member of Delta Airlines, has set up a Putnam Letter Committee, in Birmingham, Ala., to solicit contributions to reprint his letter as an ad in additional northern newspapers. When a similar ad was placed by Louisiana segregation leaders in the New York Herald Tribune in February 1958, we urged CCD member agencies to alert their local units to such ads and ask them to check with editors and publishers about the problem. When such ads appear in northern papers, it would be helpful if southerners would write dissenting letters to the editors analyzing the misstatements and errors in the ads. Where such ads appear, editors should be asked to include editorials rebutting the segregation thesis advanced in the ads, or at least run news articles (in the same issue carrying the ads) quoting opponents of segregation.

10. Integration—A Challenge to the Social Agency, a 25-page report of a workshop conducted by the National Social Welfare Assembly's Committee on Intergroup Relations, features discussion of case histories in hiring Negro social workers, establishing integrated programs, problems of loss of financial support by prointegration agencies, achieving community acceptance, developing national and local policy on integration, etc. Copies of the workshop report are available at 75 cents each from the National Social Welfare Assembly, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N.Y.

11. Papers throughout the Nation carried an Associated Press wirephoto February 2 and 3, showing a lone Negro boy in Maury High School Auditorium in Norfolk, Va.—apparently shunned by his classmates. An article in the New York Post, February 5, reported that the photo was phony. Photographers had beckoned the Negro boy up front and took the picture. A minute later, the seats around him were filled and other kids were asking him if he could play basketball or football. By then the photographers had gone. It was agreed that it would be useful if editors would query A.P. on the alleged irresponsible reporting and also bring this to the attention of Editor and Publisher magazine.

12. Alan Reitman agreed to suggest to the New York Times that it carry a story concerning the reactions of students who have returned to desegregated public schools from private schools and tutoring classes. It was felt that such a human interest story might make the comparison more meaningful, even in the South. Henry Moon agreed to suggest the same kind of stories for the educational pages of Time and Newsweek.

13. Members of the committee expressed great indignation over the way in which Chet Huntley had called for virtual suicide by the NAACP on his program on the Second Agony of Atlanta. It was suggested that the February 8, 1959, program ought to include a genuine moderate, who recognizes the importance of the role of the NAACP in the desegregation issue. This was felt, could effectively explode the Huntley thesis that Southern moderates were only awaiting NAACP abdication to rise up in their might in support of orderly desegregation. NAACP attempts to arrange for the inclusion on the program of such a moderate were unavailing. (Fortunately, Roy Wilkins did such a tremendous job on the February 8, 1959, NBC program with Chet Huntley and Thomas Waring, editor of the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier, that he removed a good deal of the sting from the Huntley thesis.)

Respectfully submitted,

HARRY FLEISHMAN,
*Secretary, Mass Media Committee, CCD.*

---

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

---

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

---

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

---

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

---

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

# *Daily Digest*

## HIGHLIGHTS

House received President's message on mutual security program and passed bills on Lake Michigan water diversion, coloring of oranges, military enlistment, and naval construction.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

# Senate

## *Chamber Action*

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Monday, March 16, at noon.

## *Committee Meetings*

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

### COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

*Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:* Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported an original bill authorizing the leasing of cotton acreage allotments during the crop years of 1959 through 1961.

Also, the committee agreed that subcommittee hearings will be held as soon as possible on wheat programs.

### APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WORKS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Public Works had as its witness Gen. William A. Carter, Division Engineer, Lower Mississippi Valley Division, Army engineers, and president of the Mississippi River Commission, who discussed fiscal 1960 budget estimates for rivers and harbors and flood control projects in this area.

Hearings continue Tuesday, March 17.

### DEFENSE MATTERS

*Committee on Armed Services:* The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee continued, in executive session, its hearings relative to major defense matters, with especial emphasis on the military budget for fiscal 1960, and the Berlin situation, with testimony from Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

### WITHHOLDING OF INFORMATION

*Committee on the Judiciary:* The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee held hearings on the subject of "Executive Privilege" and Freedom of Information, with testimony from Robert Keller, General Counsel, who appeared for the Comptroller General, who was accompanied by Lawrence Powers, Director of Defense Accounting and Auditing Division, both of the GAO; and Prof. Joseph W. Bishop, Jr., Yale Law School. Topics of discussion included description of experiences in obtaining information from the Air Force, ICA, and Navy, and legal and constitutional questions involved in the power of the President to withhold information from the Congress.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

### ADMINISTERED PRICE INFLATION

*Committee on the Judiciary:* The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee continued its hearings on the character of public policies which can be adopted by the Congress to combat price inflation, with testimony from Dr. Simon Whitney, Director of the Bureau of Economics, Federal Trade Commission; and Eugene Havas, an economist, Washington, D.C.

Subcommittee will meet again on Tuesday, March 17, when it will begin hearings on S. 11, to amend the Clayton Act with regard to equality of opportunity.

### LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM LEGISLATION

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:* Committee continued its executive consideration of S. 505, proposed Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, but did not conclude its work, and will meet again on Tuesday, March 17.

# House of Representatives

## *Chamber Action*

Bills Introduced: 37 public bills, H.R. 5655–5691; 9 private bills, H.R. 5692–5700; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 308 and 309, and H. Res. 209, were introduced.

Pages 3745–3746

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

(For details of H. Repts. 201–207 see under "Administration Resolutions" elsewhere in this DIGEST);

H.J. Res. 115, relative to a memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt in the District of Columbia, amended (H. Rept. 208);

# Appendix

## Freedoms Foundation and the Philosophy of Our American Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

**Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 17, the Honorable Charles H. Davis, Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court, delivered an address before the American citizenship committee of the Rockford, Ill., Women's Club. The address, under the title, "Freedoms Foundation and the Philosophy of Our American Government," is a solid contribution to this basic subject; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

(Speech by Justice Charles H. Davis before the American citizenship committee of the Rockford Women's Club, Tuesday, February 17, 1959)

Freedoms Foundation is a nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpolitical organization, incorporated under the laws of New York. It is located at Valley Forge, Pa., on a small plot of the tract of land which served as the 1777–78 winter campground for the colonial troops during the Revolutionary War. David Taylor, author of "Farewell to Valley Forge," has called it the Gethsemane of the Revolution. At this site, 3,000 men perished of exposure, starvation, and disease, and were buried in unmarked graves, while those who were physically able built huts for living quarters and learned the rudiments of warfare. There General Von Steuben, the German; General Pulaski, the Pole; Generals Lafayette and Duportail, the Frenchmen; and General Lord Sterling, the Englishman, suffered side by side with the ragged but inspired Americans. And there, during the months of privation and death, these generals, under Washington's command, were building an army out of the survivors which, during the next 3 years, would defeat the best trained soldiers of the British Crown.

Our great and good President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, is honorary chairman and Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, is honorary president of Freedoms Foundation. Dr. Kenneth D. Wells is its president, Adm. Felix B. Stump, its vice chairman, and its trustees are: Don Belding, chairman of the board and trustee; Roger S. Firestone, Hon. Herbert Hoover, Jr., Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Charles M. White, and Charles E. Wilson, distinguished and devoted Americans.

Freedoms Foundation is dedicated to the principle that freedom belongs to all people and that only by the thoughts and acts in their everyday lives can the American people extend and preserve their freedom.

Its charter purpose is:

"To create and build an understanding of the spirit and philosophy of the Constitution and Bill of Rights and of our 'bundle' of indivisible political and economic freedoms inherent in them.

"To inspire love of freedom and support the spiritual unity born of the belief that man is a dignified human being, created in the image of his Maker, and by that fact, possessor of certain inalienable rights."

To this end, Freedoms Foundation encourages all citizens to speak and act for freedom and gives awards for such conduct. These awards cover many fields such as essays, sermons, editorials, cartoons, public addresses, and school, college, plant and community programs.

Its many award entries are judged in relation to its credo of the American way of life which considers:

1. Is the entry based on a fundamental belief in God?

2. Is it free from Socialist, Communist, Fascist and totalitarian concepts and ideologies?

3. Does it pertain to economic and political rights and responsibilities?

These awards are made by a jury composed of at least 30 distinguished persons—one-third of State supreme court jurists, and 20 executive officers of national patriotic, veterans and service club organizations. All awards selections are made solely by this group, and no selections are made by any foundation official or employee. The awards jury selections are announced at Valley Forge on Washington's Birthday each year.

Through this program, the foundation has brought to many the significance of the American way of life and freedom. It has renewed and revitalized faith in America, liberty and justice. For this contribution to the strength and worth of America, Freedoms Foundation is in the process of earning one of America's greatest awards—the affection of her devoted citizens.

During the past 50 years, irresponsible historians and writers have depreciated the American concepts of government, disparaged the character of our national heroes and impugned the purity of their motives. They have attempted to rob our children of their real Americans of distinction, and have been joined by others who have substituted a fictitious Davey Crockett and synthetic heroes in the form of western lawmen, city police officers and private detectives. It can truly be said that the American people of today are overentertained and underenlightened.

In his "Collected Legal Papers,"[1] Justice Holmes stated:

"When the uniformed are taught to doubt, they do not know what they may safely believe. And it seems to me at this time we need education in the obvious more than investigation of the obscure."

There have been so many and varied attacks upon our system of government and its capacities that I believe it time to reaffirm the obvious rather than to investigate the obscure in form of foreign ideologies of government.

The philosophy which underlies our Government was conceived by our Lord and Master almost 2,000 years ago when He taught mankind a lesson it has never learned, yet never quite forgotten[2]—the personal dignity of each man, women, and child.

This idea received little or no application in government until 1215 when the lords of England wrested certain rights from King John at Runnymede. These rights were embodied in the Magna Carta and included certain rights which the lords were willing to grant to the freemen under them. By this move, the lords won the support of all England against the King. The most important of these rights were:

1. No freeman shall be arrested, imprisoned, outlawed, or deprived of property except by a judgment of his equals or the law of the land.

2. Justice shall not be sold, delayed, or denied to any freeman.

3. No taxes, except the customary ones, shall be levied except with consent of a council of prelates and greater barons.

The Magna Carta was drawn mainly to give more rights and privileges to the barons. The common people of England continued to live in a condition of inequality for hundreds of years. But the charter did break the barrier of special privilege and it is a landmark in human liberty.

Later in the history of England, a group of people refused to follow the practices of the Church of England and set up their own churches. In 1607 and 1608, they were driven from England by the religious persecution of both the church and the state. They temporarily found refuge in Holland. And, in 1620, they boarded the *Mayflower* to come to America to seek religious freedom. Upon reaching the American shores, and before disembarkment, they drafted the Mayflower compact which bound them into a religious-political group. It began with the words, "In the name of God, Amen." This compact established the first self-determining government in America and constituted the first American expression of the concepts which were later to be woven into the fabric of our Government. The 53 men who signed it agreed to set up a government that would make just and equal laws.

The years brought governmental abuses and tyranny to this and the other American colonies. And the American concepts of personal dignity, just and equal laws, and freedom were thwarted and denied by the King of Great Britain. And the men and women of America, few in number but firm of purpose, revolted against the greatest nation of the world.

They adopted the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, in which they declared the causes which impelled the separation from their mother country. They then proclaimed their concept of the dignity of man in these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pur-

[1] Holmes, "Collected Legal Papers," pp. 292–293.

[2] This clause was taken, in part, from the following clause, in Learned Hand's speech, "The Spirit of Liberty": "The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who near 2,000 years ago taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

suit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. * * *"

Under this theory of government, men have unalienable rights because they are men and such rights are not the gift of any government, but rather are the endowment of our Creator; and governments exist for men, not men for government.

This theory of government, conceived in the teachings of Christ, sustained by the Magna Carta, first expressed in America in the Mayflower compact, and proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, was enshrined in the Constitution of the United States. Under this concept, the people are sovereign, and all powers are vested in them, but certain of these powers and duties are delegated to the Government because it can administer them more efficiently than the individual. But, in the area of personal dignity, of freedom and liberty, the Constitution and the first 10 amendments provide that Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting its exercise, or abridging freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. All persons are guaranteed the right to be secure in their persons and homes against unreasonable searches and seizures; each person accused of crime is given the right to a speedy and public trial, by jury if desired, in the district where the crime was committed, with the right to process, to secure witnesses and to have the assistance of counsel of his choice. Excessive bail cannot be required of any person accused of a crime, and in all legal proceedings, every person is entitled to due process and equal protection of the law.

Our forebears were not willing to leave freedom to chance. Even though assured by the Constitutional Convention that the foregoing rights were embodied in the Constitution by implication, they proceeded, at the first session of Congress, to provide for the submission of the first 10 amendments to the respective legislatures of the States. These amendments, which specifically assured the preceding rights, were adopted June 15, 1790, and are commonly called the American Bill of Rights.

This concept of Government was revolutionary. It struck down the care-worn doctrine of the divine right of kings, and the theory that might makes right, upon which all totalitarian governments have been, are, and ever will be founded. By way of comparison, our concept of government is as revolutionary, new, and glorious today as it was in 1776. Under this theory, we are governed by laws and not by men. The rights of the meek and the poor are as sacred as those of the rich and the proud. Neither the legislator, the executive officer, nor the courts can deny them to the humblest citizen of the land. No man is above the law, and the sovereignty rests in the people.

Today America has great natural resources of minerals, oil, rivers, lakes, harbors, forests, fertile valleys, and prairies. We have built giant factories, office buildings, schools, colleges, universities, homes, and churches which manifest our wealth. We have developed railroads, highways, air transportation, intercontinental missiles, and rockets which travel in outer space. We have new and unused powerful weapons of destruction and defense. We have led the world in mechanical and inventive genius. Yet, America's greatest wealth and power lies in an idea—in its concept of freedom and liberty and government under the rule of law.

A large part of the earth and its people are today behind the Iron Curtain. Communism is not only a battle for power and for material things, but it is also a battle for the minds and hearts of men. Its threadbare totalitarian philosophy of the absolute supremacy of the state, its denial of God, the suppression of religion in the life of its people, and its rule by men and not by law, cannot compete in the open market with our philosophy of the personal dignity of man, and the rule of law.

However, the kind of freedom which lies at the heart of our way of life is not given to a nation so that it possesses it once and for all—rather, this freedom has to be won anew in each generation by a reinterpretation of its meaning and its responsibilities for the particular circumstances of the day. Government may acknowledge, but it cannot bestow freedom, and, like religion, freedom is a personal belief which every person has to renew. Our task is to maintain the meaning of American freedom, to pass it intact to each succeeding generation and to all the people of the earth.

Since our country was founded, it has been a refuge for the oppressed people of the world. In commemoration of this facet of our freedom, France, in 1886, presented to America the Statue of Liberty which now graces New York harbor. It bears these words:

"Give me your tired, your poor
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shores,
Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

From these humble origins we have built America strong and free. Our philosophy of government, under God, can rebuild the world.

Freedom is only kept as we share it with our neighbors and with all of the people of the world. With freedom and liberty, to share is to increase—to hoard, to decrease. Our greatest contribution to the peace of the world and to its people lies neither in our Armed Forces, atomic missiles or sea power, nor in our foreign aid expenditures, even though such expenditures amount to billions. In truth, our foreign aid is too cheap; America needs to give more of herself and her theory of government to the end that all the people of the earth may have our freedom and liberty.

Our freedom is not free. It is not free from the responsibilities of citizenship. It is not free from respect for the rights of others. It is not free from the duties of service and devotion to an ideal. It is not free from debt to the lives of those who bought and defended it. It is not free from obligation to posterity and to God who has preserved it. And, we can only have it, if we are expendable for it. To have freedom is to live, proclaim, and share it.[3]

There are those who suggest that this theory of government is old and outmoded, but it is the newest concept know to man. Like love, faith, and hope, it is ageless, yet ever new upon affirmation. These are ideals, yet in the words of our late Justice Holmes, "Ideals furnish us our perspectives and open glimpses of the infinite."

Judge Learned Hand once said: "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it."[4] Our challenge is to proclaim our concept of government—to share our liberty and freedom, and to make it live in the hearts of all men and women—for it is the last fond hope of the earth.

[3] The thought of this paragraph was derived, in part, from a sermon of Rev. Edward R. Ellson, entitled "Freedom is not free."

[4] Learned Hand, "The Spirit of Liberty."

## Student Views on Student Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Student Views on Student Values." This was delivered by Dr. Edward D. Eddy, Jr., vice president and provost of the University of New Hampshire, at Boston University's Founders' Day observance Thursday, March 12, 1959.

Dr. Eddy is a well-recognized national authority in the field of education, the problems of youth in their educational pursuits, and in the administration of educational institutions. At a time when the whole Nation is concerned with educational problems as never before, because of the challenge of other nations in this field, I feel that Dr. Eddy's speech has much to recommend it to thoughtful students of the problem.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDENT VIEWS ON STUDENT VALUES

(Speech by Dr. Edward D. Eddy, Jr., vice president and provost, University of New Hampshire, delivered at Boston University's Founders' Day observance, Thursday, March 12, 1959)

One of the favorite pastimes of the present age is to wring our hands in despair and cry loudly over the deep-seated decadence of today's youth. In case you don't know it, you are a very nasty generation—corrupt, distorted, self-seeking, and obviously incapable of making any sense out of the near-perfect world which the older generation is handing you. Don't take all this too seriously. One of my favorite quotations goes like this: "Denunciation of the young is a part of the hygiene of older people, and greatly assists in the circulation of their blood." I suppose what I most rebel against is the idea that today's college youth somehow ought to be secure, purposeful, and endowed with all the attributes which are so obviously missing in their adult counterparts. Too often students are criticized as if they were somehow a breed apart, something to be judged by entirely different standards than anybody else. On the one hand, they are accused of having no spark. On the other hand, heads shake when the spark ignites occasionally in the wrong way. A great many of us appear to have forgotten that youth is a time of ferment, not cement.

Now that I have said all this, let me proceed to contradict myself by indulging in some rash accusations. I hope, however, that you will take them in the spirit in which they were reached and are now expressed—a supreme, unbending confidence in the silent generation and a sneaking suspicion that we are the ones who really are at fault. What I am going to say this morning emerges for the most part from a study which is reported in full in the volume "The College Influence on Student Character." Last year three of us, under the sponsorship of the American Council on Education, set out to take a look at the American college student and the process

of gradual enlightment which we like to call "higher learning." Two of the three members of the staff were recent college graduates whose job it was to become as much a part of the campus as possible. We spent time at 20 colleges and universities—of all types and sizes—in 17 different States across the country. On each campus the staff members lived with the students in dormitories, fraternities, or sororities. They ate with them, went to class and to meetings, participated in bull sessions, drank countless cups of coffee and mugs of beer. In addition, we interviewed members of the faculty and staff on each campus. In this way we began to feel the pulse of the college student and to understand a bit better his reactions to certain planned and unplanned influences.

In our observations and conclusions we leaned heavily on the reaction of students to the collegiate experience. We did this in the belief that how students receive education conditions what they receive. Everywhere we traveled we found the majority willing and often anxious to talk about what was happening to them. In many cases we noted a genuine sense of urgency. We emerged with no easy definition of education or of the contemporary college student. The best slogan which I can offer is that we found the student to be a paradox in parenthesis.

Now I'd better tell you what I mean by thtat. First, let me take the word "parenthesis." Over and over again college students told us that, in their opinion, the content and form of higher education are not sufficiently related to the rest of life nor is education genuinely relevant to their concerns. Because of this lack of relevance, students tend to regard the 4 years of college as a parenthesis between the brackets of which they can perhaps enjoy themselves for the last time before real "maturation" sets in. The parenthesis encloses something which has not particular striking relationship to what went on before nor to what will follow. Nevertheless, it is socially necessary—both as a custom and for the sake of a better life (which usually means a better job for the boys and a happier home for the girls). This is the background for the concern of one student who told us, "They keep telling me that college is preparation for life, but I'm alive now."

The absence of relevance of collegiate education has some side effects of substantial importance. If college is regarded only as a pleasant respite, the student may well come to feel that there are two worlds in which he may live—the here and the then. Not infrequently, for instance, we came across the student who was frank enough to admit, "I really don't see any relationship between my cheating on an exam now and what I'll do later in life. Because I get my kicks today doesn't mean that I'm always going to be living it up."

That's the parenthesis and the danger of its maintenance. Now what about the paradox. This is what I shall spend most of my time discussing with you—because I think the paradoxical student has something to say both to himself and to his teachers. And both had better listen.

First of all, let me pose the initial paradox: Beneath the student's studied pretense of indifference and apathy lies as unfashionable but searching desire for meaning in all that he does.

On almost every campus we visited—from California to New England—student apathy was the major topic of conversion. This was the one subject mentioned most often in our conversations with both students and faculty members. The characteristic student statement was couched often in the simple phrase: "I couldn't care less." This applied to academic work, to leadership positions in activities, to any number of campus events. A faculty member told us: "Apathy is another way of describing the attitude that registers superficial or studied indifference. The unfortunate result is satisfaction with mediocrity." The student it appears, should never become excited or involved. But, fortunately, we were not satisfied to stop here. What lies deeper?

When we probed—and sometimes it took some real digging—we found another but wholly contradictory characteristic: the student is interested, often urgently interested, in an honest search for meaning. To many the search is not an easy one because the student is just beginning to sense the dimensions of truth. As one student wrote in his campus newspaper: "I do not know what I want out of life—or what I want to contribute to it—but I am learning. First I had to learn that it was necessary to have some idea about these questions. It didn't take me long to discover that there are no simple answers." The search, it seems, is often hid under a crusty layer of nonconcern—but it's there.

David Riesman expressed it well in a recent article on dating patterns: "The qualities which young men and women today seek in each other in college are much less frenzied and much less external that 20 or 30 years ago. There are still, of course, big wheels and little wheels, and big wheels within little wheels on campus; and there are still fraternities and sororities and still an interest in good looks, popularity, good grooming, smoothness. But all this is more subdued and the relationships increasingly sought are more searching, more profound, more sincere. There's more desire to share; less desire to impress * * *. Young people are increasingly preoccupied with their capacity to love as well as to be loved."

If, then, students have this crusty layer of nonconcern skillfully covering the genuine search for meaning, why is there so little penetration, so scant a satisfaction with higher education? I'll put the blame squarely on us—the faculty the administrators. And, in doing so, I'll borrow Ordway Tead's phrase that so much in college education today is "so chatty, so trivial, and so inconsequential." In a nutshell, then, our collegiate expectations are not sufficiently high.

On only a handful of the campuses which we visited did many students claim that they were really performing to their full capacity. Their conclusion was further strengthened by our direct observation of the amount of time students expend on meaningless activity. College campuses may be busy places, but it's surprising how much trivia consume the important hour of growing up. Students are much too easily distracted, much too quickly dumped into a rut of self-pity and sometimes self-indulgence. It's fashionable, of course, to be busy—but the busyness is often more important than the achievement. Prestige comes from busyness. The student who can sing the loudest, "I've got more to do than you" gets the lead in the campus musical comedy.

Something rather dramatic and mighty encouraging happened last spring on the campus of the University of Wisconsin. Over 200 students, leaders active in campus affairs, sent to the president a petition which, according to our study, reflects well the sentiments of many students throughout the country. The petition read, in part: "Although the university is constantly making attempts to improve its standards, we believe that it has failed to challenge its students sufficiently." In many senses, it is too easy for thousands of students to get by and never learn to become critical, analytical thinkers or to achieve an understanding of the world around them. Students on all levels of attainment feel that they have not worked to the limits of their ability and time. "The university must raise its standards. In some cases this means simply requiring more work; in many more it means emphasizing an improved quality of work and an intelligent, analytical approach to the subject matter. Students must extend themselves to achieve a deep and meaningful understanding of material. But this is possible only if the faculty seeks to help us by challenging us more fully."

Paradox No. 2: While wanting to know what he should know, the student protests that he should have increasing opportunity to think and act for himself. The student, like all human beings, is naturally self-centered. He views education in terms of what it will do for him rather than with him. And so, over and over again, he will complain about his instructor with this kind of language: "If only he'd tell us what he wants us to know."

While desiring more independence in both thought and action, the student, nevertheless, has a strong urge to know exactly where he stands at any given moment—but, note this, he also wants the right to influence the conditions affecting the stand. Threatened with more stringent restrictions on one campus, a junior girl wrote a typical letter to her campus newspaper protesting that students desire to be treated as something better than machines. Bitterly she announced: "It is time to herald the thinking machine. No emotion, no benefit of experience—just an enormous brain—reading, listening to scholars, writing papers, taking exams. Learning about democratic ideology, but not having the terrible conflict of acting. And if the machine lasts 4 years without breaking apart or running down (it will be given) a piece of paper and (made into) a man or woman, prepared to assume its role in a much less bright society."

This paradox is beautifully illustrated by the response to one of our most challenging questions. We asked the student to describe the ideal person. His answer, for the most part, was first a reflection of society's current concern over the well-adjusted person who can get along with anybody. To this was added quickly education's concern over the person who reasons and acts for himself. The man of character, according to the student, is one who does not accept too readily the point of view of others and yet has the well-worshiped knack of understanding and working with all who cross his path and so is respected by them. Obviously the desire for individual thought is gravely threatened and compounded by the equally strong desire for social acceptance.

Let us move on quickly to another paradox: Often intensely dissatisfied with the programs and processes of education, the student, nevertheless, is reluctant to play much part in change. To my mind, there is no doubt whatsoever that the average student is not happy with his concept of higher learning. We came across unusually strong criticism of classroom methods: the overemphasis on marks or the heavy stress on the use of the cure in determining grades, for instance. One student told us: "We don't mind competing, but this is encouraging unhealthy competition. And then it often ends up this way: instead of competing with one another, we all gang up on the prof and compete with him."

A frequent complaint wherever we traveled centered on the overuse of objective type examinations. The most valuable use of objective tests is to analyze weakness and find the degree to which the student has acquired background material for more involved thinking. But if not attempt is made to take the second step, then the student feels that the teacher has really insulted his intelligence.

An editorial in the Colorado student paper discussed the question of whether or not the college graduate learns how to think and to weigh various concepts. It concluded: "In too many cases the answer is 'No.' Four years in college may simply signify that one is more adept than most at surviving the multiple-choice, true-false exams which are given in most classrooms. Colleges are turning out satisfied men with empty heads—and it is the colleges themselves which are primarily guilty."

The freshman year seems to take the brunt of the criticism. Here the courses are said to be the most tradition bound and the teaching the least inspiring. Unless the student is challenged and becomes, to some degree, fascinated at this stage of his educational career, later efforts to interest him will meet with far less success. As one commented, "In the middle of my freshman year, I suddenly discovered that I'd become awfully sour. I was pretty cynical about the great things the college said it was going to do with me. (Note the emphasis on 'with me.') I've recovered somewhat, but that first experience started me off on no feet at all."

Against this sometimes intense dissatisfaction with educational process lies the student reluctance to take part in change. Perhaps because students are campus transients, they are less prone to uproot traditional groups and events. Students will cite numerous activity groups and functions which might profitably be combined with other groups. But few profess a willingness, in accepting leadership, to be the one to take the leadership in change or to allow their organization to die a nice, relatively painless death. The question, Why? is a neglected interrogation in both curricular and extracurricular life. It is buried under the weight of the system, the custom and the tradition.

Most students have no idea of the influence at their command. They have the unquestioned opportunity to help broaden the horizon of higher education, to force the faculty member to delve more deeply and to cherish more fully. We were delighted to find one student who told us, "In our class the students agreed the teaching was lousy. The treatment was superficial. We backed the prof. in a corner and shot so many questions at the poor man that he had to go back and take a second look at his own knowledge as well as his method."

Let me deal but briefly with the next paradox of the modern student: Keenly interested in sensing and experiencing the totality of life and knowledge, the student often reacts by preferring to compartmentalize his own life and knowledge. The interest in totality is obvious. The inquiring student seeks the broader implications and relationships of what he studies. He frequently complains that too few of his teachers begin the encounter by discussing their concept of the overall purpose of the course, the place it may hold in the student's educational development, its relationship to other subjects, and what it might say to the student as a living, striving person. No matter what the field of study, that field does have a relationship to fundamental issues. A faculty member put it this way: "Do I insist that what is important is and must be something which is important in the immediate present? Or shall I be willing to consider the past? Do I identify myself simply with my colleagues who are living now, or do I try to sense the whole experience of the race? Am I willing to consider the question of tradition? Do I consider, for instance, the human image simply as I happen to meet it—walking around on the street, God help me—or do I view the human image at all times and in all places and contexts?

There, in a nutshell, is the heart of liberal learning. And how does the student react? He, like the instructor, proceeds to compartmentalize, to make no attempt to relate, to live today—not in the past and the present and the tomorrow. There is no better example than the student who gives lip service to integrity as a fundamental value of the human race and then cheats on the next examination, or copies the theme of another, or does any number of things which are quite foreign to the logic which he demands of the teacher.

The last student paradox is, in a way, a better illustration: While he respects and honors the adult who has explicit convictions, the student prefers to hide his own in the shelter of the group. Over and over again students claim to value far more highly the faculty member who is willing to make known his own commitments. The faculty member should not, of course, expect the student to accept them unexamined, for only by working ideas out himself does the student truly appreciate his own position.

Students agree that often they first recognize the importance of taking a stand after they have actually observed a person who is honestly and carefully committed. They sense immediately and are suspicious of any teacher who tries to hide under a blanket of assumed objectivity. One student concluded, "We're called the silent generation, but can you really blame us? We've studied under those who often make a fetish of silence."

A Harvard Student Council report commented: "Students frequently receive the impression that this noncommitted objective stance is the only one that is scholarly and scientific. Hence they may think that they should try to maintain it all of the time, even when commitment is in order. * * * If suspended judgment is connected with a scholarly approach, students may remain suspended until they leave the academic community, and then revert to earlier social norms or unthinkingly adopt new ones offered them by the society they enter."

This is what the student says he wants, but what really does he himself practice? As one told us, "Students prefer to hide their convictions under a blanket of superficiality because of the social pressures of the crowd." It is not popular on a campus to have a well-considered, deeply entrenched concept. We found, however, that most students are idealistic individually—but the group norm does not sanction expression. The setting of standards, for instance, is a group process. Relatively few students profess to maintain individually held values.

For this, they blame the world around them. Here is a beautifully phrased rendition of the current attitude, as reflected in a campus editorial: "We are the antiseptic generation. We have grown up protected from the germs of extremisms which had given our elders a case of intellectual gout. For us history is a study only of the past; greatness today is not our necessity. Therefore, we concentrate on life adjustment which helps us rid ourselves of the little idiosyncrasies of which greatness is made. (Malcontentism) is as great a sin as adultery and probably more often punished. But somewhere in the back of our minds we know that this protection is but a flimsy wrap. We want to know more, hear more, do more, think more, but our society neither encourages nor rewards those who inquire."

Parenthetically, let me add that we found significant differences on overt idealism between men and women. In a word, the women want to be better and the men, better off. Most students are deeply introspective. They want a frame of reference for their lives—but, let us add, it is not necessarily a religious frame. The student is not antireligious but he is, usually, uninspired by the usual pattern of religious activity. And often he confuses religious belief with mere humanitarianism. The student will not respond to empty moralizing. He will not commit himself religiously until he has found what is for him adequate grounds for commitment. This is why he prefers, at present, to intellectualize religion.

We found, too, that most students associate morality with their inability to comprehend and accept absolutism. For example, many expressed an inability to understand what they term the vestiges of a God-centered system of self-discipline to which their grandparents subscribed—and their parents less so. They contend that this system of Puritan ethics has been diluted by generations of growing questioning. It involves more compromise and hypocricy than they wish to embrace. So the moral standard becomes: "I'll take my chances but I will play it safe in the future." Here again: the standard of double existence. To the student, morality is stricly a personal matter; but it is, on inspection, largely group controlled.

The final paradox involves directly the college itself: The student is ready for a more searching and strenuous educational experience but the colleges themselves have not fully recognized nor are they fully prepared to meet this potential challenge. I shall not delve into this at length at this point because I suspect it will emerge from our luncheon session. Let me say only this: The colleges are often the purveyors of security worship. The failure of the student to respond is basically the failure of the college to challenge. As one student told us, "We all do our best when we really believe that somebody has faith in us. It's the indifference that makes rationalization so much easier."

We must overcome the motion in American higher education that our chief role is to preserve tradition. Wherever we traveled, we found that the student, beneath his facade of cynicism in strange combination with buoyant optimism, is ready to be challenged. This generation of college students may be silent at times and most loquacious at other times, beat one moment and out to beat the world the next, self-satisfied and frightened, but it is, by and large, well aware of its growing pains and not particularly reticient about discussing them. If the stimulus is right, the student will respond. Without the right stimulus, however, he will drift and finally moor in the haven which immediately appears most attractive.

For the intelligent student as well as the perceptive college, this represents both an obligation and a magnificent challenge.

---

## The Spiral of Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Spiral of Danger," published in the Morgan County News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPIRAL OF DANGER

Business leaders and skilled economists all over the Nation are constantly warning of the danger of inflation in America's economy. Russia is playing cat-and-mouse and brushfire politics in the hope that the United States will fall, without gunfire, through

collapse of our economy. The spiral of inflation is recognized as the greatest danger facing the United States.

And still, with all these facts known and accepted, union leaders are crying for strike-enforced increases in salaries and wages.

To us, this doesn't make sense. That is, shouldn't make sense to the rank and file of unionism. The writer has an obsolete union card. It is a little easier to face these facts for that reason. Practically every union man we have known was an honest, hard-working, ordinary every-day guy who was more or less forced to go along with what the big bosses—the men in the ivory towers in Detroit and Chicago and New York City—handed down in demands through the organization.

Every time there is an enforced raise in salary, it automatically means an increase in union dues. This means more money for the bosses. It means more slush fund to be poured into the political contests. It means added power for the heads of the unions, who are already nearing the national dictatorship stage. It probably means only a few dollars a week for the worker—and these extra dollars are quickly swallowed up by the raise in the cost of living which was forced by the increase in salaries.

And so it goes—an endless spiral which can end only in chaos and destruction—a double fist-full of dollar bills for a loaf of bread. It can't happen here? It has happened elsewhere. And it will happen here unless the powers of labor bosses are curbed.

## Calm Talk Amid Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal recently carried an editorial entitled "Calm Talk Amid Confusion." This editorial did a remarkable job of distilling the essence of a recent speech by Adlai Stevenson in Boston on our foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALM TALK AMID CONFUSION

It was another noisy, confusing weekend, with American eyes and ears assaulted with conflicting advice and information about the Berlin crisis.

There will be a war and there will be no war. It will be a nuclear war; it will be a limited war. Khrushchev plans this and plans that. We have no plans, we have a plan, we have various plans.

There was one calm, clear, firm voice. It was that of Adlai Stevenson, in a speech in Boston.

Here is what he said:

"Khrushchev should not drive this Nation too far and not mistake the underlying temper of our people. There will be no knuckling under to threats, no appeasement. Any interference with the West's freedom of access to Berlin must be understood by the Russians to entail the risk of war.

"Some issues are being built out of proportion. I don't think the issue of who stamps the [military] passes [Russians or East Germans] is important. If the Russians hand over their control functions to the East German Government or sign a separate peace treaty, I cannot see that any great harm is done. The East Germans are so blatantly and totally dependent upon Russian military support that no ceremonial dickering about their status or functions will change them from puppets.

"We should not show too much unwillingness to negotiate at the summit or any other level. Don't we have a supreme interest in reducing Soviet control in uneasy Eastern Europe by gradual withdrawal of Russian forces? Have the Eastern European countries any other hope of national freedom? Don't we * * * have a supreme interest in exploring new ideas on the possible future shape of a European settlement?

"I doubt if the Russians will negotiate seriously on the possibilities of withdrawing their forces. But if, despite all their protestations and propaganda about peace, self-determination of peoples, and noninterference, they dare not risk serious negotiation, we shall at least have recovered the initiative and made clear our own readiness for a more stable and hopeful settlement.

"The months ahead are far too grave for partisan bickering or for personal competitiveness in political influence."

## How To Get Everything Without Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Evening Star of March 2, entitled, "How to Get Everything Without Tax Increase," written by Elmer Roessner.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO GET EVERYTHING WITHOUT TAX INCREASE

(By Elmer Roessner)

Things were tough in the republic of Democrastan. The people were clamoring for new schools with swimming pools, government sponsored art shows and classier pensions.

But income taxes had reached 90 percent in top brackets, everything from autos to light bulbs carried excises, and milk was taxed so much that people would have drunk whisky instead if it were not for the fact it was taxed even more.

The President called in his Chancellor of the Exchequer and the head of his Federal Reverse Board. "We have taxed everything to raise money," he said. "Nothing is made, nothing is done without the payment of a tax. We tax the dead, we tax the unborn—the former with estate taxes, the latter by loading them with a share of the national debt. We tax everything. Well, everything except savings."

IDEA IS OFFERED

"Hm!" said the Chancellor. "Not savings? How did that escape us?"

"We wouldn't dare," said the President. "Thrift—the ant and the grasshopper—Benjamin Franklin and all that. It would undermine our cultural and ethical concepts. Besides the banks, the insurance companies, the savings and loan association, and all the other saving institutions would raise hell. We can't afford to have trouble with them if we ever hope to get elected again."

"Right" said the Federal Reserve man. "We couldn't just tax savings. People would say," his eyes twinkled, "that it would be confiscatory. But perhaps we can dip into the people's savings without calling it a tax, without even letting them know it's happening."

"It doesn't sound honest—I mean I don't think we could get away with it," said the President. "How would we go about it?"

OLD FORMULA

"It's easy," said the Fed man. "We just give the people all the things they want, even the swimming pools. But instead of increasing taxes, we borrow the money."

"Couldn't we just print more?" asked the President.

"Of course not," said the Fed man. "That would be debasing the currency. People wouldn't stand for it. We'll borrow the money from banks, giving them bonds to hold. Then whenever they need money, they can put up the bonds as security, thus increasing the supply of credit."

"How will that tax the savings?" asked the President.

"By doubling the amount of credit, the plan will simply cut the buying power of savings in half," the Fed man answered. "The plan takes away half the real value of the savings and uses it to build swimming pools—or highways, apartment houses, or whatever the people want."

"Won't the savers object?"

NO ONE ALARMED

"Not very much. In the first place, this plan works fairly slowly. It will be years before they realize that half their savings are gone. Even then, what they have left will have the same name as their savings used to have—a thousand pesos, 10,000 marks, a 100,000 dollars, a million pounds, or whatever the label was.

"Besides, those who own real estate or stocks will think they are richer, because the name of the prices of those things will have gone up. A 100 simoleon stock will be worth 200 simoleons; a 10,000 bucko house will be priced at 20,000 buckos. Of course, they won't be any more valuable. It will just seem so because there is so much more credit bidding for them."

"Say, this is a great system," exclaimed the President. "We raise the money and the people we take it from never know it's gone until it's too late. Something as good as this ought to have a name."

"It already has a name," said the Chancellor of the Exchequer. "It's called inflation."

## Senator Johnson's Stabilizing Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 13, 1959, the Asheville Citizen, of Asheville, N.C., carried an interesting editorial entitled "Senator JOHNSON's Stabilizing Influence," which points out that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is the ablest, most

dynamic, and result-getting Senate leader of modern times, or perhaps of any time in American history. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR JOHNSON'S STABILIZING INFLUENCE

Maybe Wisconsin's Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE has a point in his series of Senate speeches criticizing the mood and methods of Democratic Senate Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Perhaps Senator JOHNSON should call a party caucus occasionally and invite all the brethren to say their say. It might be a rare occasion, however, when the caucus did not adjourn, leaving the burden of formulating a clearcut policy and then finding Democratic and—sometimes—Republican support for it in the hands of the ablest, most dynamic and result-getting Senate leader of modern times, or perhaps of any time in American history.

When the new Congress began, Democratic Senate Leader JOHNSON saw and seized the opportunity of two important tasks:

1. He would prevent President Eisenhower, still immensely popular among the American people, and his aids from taking the legislative ball from the Democratically controlled Congress. Speaker SAM RAYBURN would give aid in this in the House.

2. In early January Mr. Eisenhower was still unhappy over Republican defeat last November. He had withdrawn a good deal into himself and there was little or no active leadership from the White House. (The President in recent weeks seems to have taken on new leadership life.)

Here was a vacuum in leadership. Such vacuums are for the occupancy of those who can take charge and do a good job. JOHNSON walked into the opening and began to lead.

But Mr. JOHNSON did not only run circles around the administration in the introduction of important bills, and securing passage of some of them. He had the responsibility of another big task.

The President and many others were talking much about radical "Democratic spenders." The country was being told to be ready for all sorts of wild-eyed Democratic legislation.

There was possibility of this prophecy's being fulfilled. It was JOHNSON'S job to stabilize what could be an unwieldly Democratic majority; to prevent the extreme Democratic liberals from taking charge of legislation.

He did this. First he defeated such extremists as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat (now one of his critics), in the liberals' attempt to enact a radical law on the filibuster. DOUGLAS and many others wanted a simple majority to have power to end debate.

In short, JOHNSON followed a middle course, and in the filibuster battle 20 Republicans supported him while he daily disconcerted Vice President NIXON on parliamentary procedure.

For the first time since the Confederate War, a southerner, if a West Texan is truly a southerner, is being very seriously discussed by commentators and political leaders all over the country as a real presidential possibility. Perhaps Senators PROXMIRE and DOUGLAS would do better to talk more privately to their leader and less to the country at large.

## "Do's and Don'ts" for Traveling Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that tourism—involving more and more travel of persons between this country and other nations—will be expanding over the years to come.

Recently I was privileged to comment on the expansion of such travel—not just as a luxury for the rich, as in the past—but today as an opportunity to folks in a great many fields for business, pleasure, education, and other purposes.

We recognize, of course, that Americans traveling abroad are, in effect, ambassadors of good will for the United States wherever they may travel. Consequently, journeying in other lands is not only an opportunity but also an obligation for U.S. citizens to present only the best possible impression of our way of life and of our people.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal carried a helpful article by Paul M. McMahon, travel editor, under the column "A Vagabond's Bench," outlining some important "do's and don'ts" for travelers.

In the article is included some helpful suggestions from Miss Frances G. Knight, director of the U.S. Passport Office.

Recognizing that travel abroad is a relatively new experience for a great many Americans, I believe that wider familiarity with Miss Knight's recommendations would be beneficial.

I therefore request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VAGABOND'S BENCH

(By Paul M. McMahon)

SOUND ADVICE FROM THE PASSPORT OFFICE

Some solid advice on how to handle a passport and a few suggestions on "getting along abroad" are offered in two new brochures which the U.S. Passport Office will distribute for the summer travel season through its passport field agencies and clerks of Federal district courts. Here are some things which the Passport Office says "Don't do":

Tamper with the passport picture.

Pack it in your luggage. When traveling keep it readily available but safe.

Use the passport as a notebook, scrapbook, or autograph book.

Tear or substitute pages.

Lend it for use by a friend or stranger.

Alter, insert, or overwrite any information or entry. If a change is necessary, it must be made officially by authorized Government agents.

If the traveler wants to make the Passport Office happy, here are things he should "Do":

Keep the passport safe. Its loss or disappearance can cause the owner considerable delay and expense.

Notify the Passport Office in Washington, D.C., or, if abroad, the nearest American consul, if the passport is lost.

Register it if it must be mailed.

Sign on page 2 as indicated. An unsigned passport is not valid.

Fill in the information required on the inside front cover. This is important because, in case of an accident, the next of kin or designated agent can be reached.

Check the visa requirements of countries to be visited.

A FEW SUGGESTIONS

In a recent letter to the Vagabond, Miss Frances G. Knight, Washington, D.C., Director of the U.S. Passport Office, said, "I am not in the business of teaching etiquette but I think the suggestions in the 'Getting Along Abroad' might do some good." In part, this pamphlet says:

"Most Americans who travel abroad are aware that their conduct as guests in a foreign country can have an important bearing on the good will of other nations toward the United States. Consequently they try to understand and appreciate the economic problems, customs, restrictions, and regulations of the lands they visit.

"Many citizens also try to learn something about the countries they intend to visit before they get there. In that way they are better able to appreciate the contributions of those countries to the world's culture. They seek to respect the local laws and try to avoid inadvertent acts or misinterpretations which could be embarrassing.

LEARN LOCAL CUSTOMS

"They familiarize themselves with local customs, such as the manner in which people dress in churches, restaurants, theaters, and other public places. In short, they show abroad the same consideration for others that they do at home and, consequently, they are our most effective and welcome ambassadors of good will."

## Tribute to Our National Park System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a stirring and eloquent tribute to the outdoors, in general, and to our national park system, in particular, appeared in the New Leader for March 9, 1959, under the byline of one of the most thoughtful commentators on the American scene, William E. Bohn.

Mr. Bohn, who visited the Western States last year, also discusses Mission 66 and its importance to the expansion and protection of the park system.

I am pleased that in his article Mr. Bohn has quoted from a letter to him by Thomas J. Williams, able superintendent of Crater Lake National Park, in southern Oregon. Crater Lake is one of the outstanding scenic marvels of the whole world. Mr. Williams has stressed to Mr.

Bohn that excursions into the wilds by the common people definitely will not spoil the beauty of the national parks. With that thought I emphatically agree.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bohn's article, entitled "People, Plants, and Animals," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE, PLANTS, AND ANIMALS

(By William E. Bohn)

On January 5, I wrote a column in praise of Joseph Wood Krutch and his book "Grand Canyon," which is a brilliant example of Krutchian thinking and good writing. But toward the end of the column I got off my chest something which had been bothering me for a long time. Krutch, as we all know, is a reincarnation of Henry D. Thoreau. Don't be surprised if any day now he sets out to build a shack on the edge of some Walden pond though, making allowance for this frightful inflation, the building of it must be expected to require the expenditure of more than 28 dollars and 12½ cents. Like his Concord prototype, Krutch has an accurate knowledge and deep love of outdoor things and, like Thoreau, he also has a quiet fear and suspicion of his fellow men.

So I wrote: "There is in both Thoreau and Krutch an attitude toward human beings which I find unpleasant and dangerous. Both of them are afraid of people. Our versatile amatuer of things in general gives himself away in his discussion of the crowds in our national parks. There are, he explains, three sorts of nature spots, 'the wilderness area, the protected nature reserve and the recreation resort.' The first is for the small minority, the second for a larger group of the partially civilized, the third for the poor, dumb dopes who have never been taught to take care of things. Our author views with alarm the onward tramp of this mob."

Krutch, though the gentlest of souls, apparently is perfectly capable of defending himself. I have received from him two restrained but very effective letters. In the first of these he writes: "I most certainly do not resent crowds in the national parks. As you say, they were established to give as many people as possible at least a glimpse of nature. But I don't think there is anything undemocratic in recognizing differences of taste or the minor rights of a minority. We have land enough still in the United States to provide national parks, recreation areas and also wild regions. The latter are supplements to the parks and are proposed as such in the pending wilderness bill. All I am saying is that the two cannot be successfully combined. Wonderful as the parks are, they are not quite the same as genuine wilderness."

In another passage our champion of the wilderness explains himself thus: "The truth is merely (1) that I am the kind of person who likes people least in crowds and, even in the case of social gatherings, prefers the small to the large; (2) I don't believe that it is proper to regard other living things as merely for man's use. I think that one should recognize as far as possible that the right to life is not an exclusive human right. That doesn't mean that we don't often have to make a choice. I am not even a vegetarian. Many animals have to be condemned to death and (possibly) a few human beings too. But to deprive of life any creature capable of a real desire to live is a serious matter."

It is plain that Krutch is thinking of preserving the woods and all their teeming life rather than of developing human beings. In this respect, his center of interest seems to be different from mine and from that of the men who have developed our national park system. I have received letters on this subject from two of our park superintendents. The first is from John S. McLaughlin, Superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park, the gorgeous piece of national real estate which inspired Krutch's exciting volume. Among other interesting things, he has this to say:

"I am inclined to think that Krutch's real concern is the basic natural or land resourse. Considering the performance of the human race thus far, he has real doubts about the future. I think, to a degree, we share his concern but not his seemingly deep-dyed pessimism."

In another passage McLaughlin says of Krutch: "He has his doubts about developers in the National Park Service, and he calls our developments and facilities compromises. Actually our developments are based on master plans * * * which are drawn up after much study. * * * I suppose all plans are compromises, but there is a difference. * * * Krutch does not mention Mission 66, which you so ably covered in your series on the national parks. If the parks are to be preserved from overuse or, as Director Conrad L. Wirth said, 'from being loved to death,' then, as you point out, we need more parks, more rangers, more scientists, and greater provision for people's comfort."

The second letter is from Thomas J. Williams, superintendent of that heavenly spot, Crater Lake. After explaining that he has no fear that the common people will destroy the beauty of the parks, Williams goes on: "To date I think the National Park Service has done an exceptionally fine job of doing what Congress has ordered. There have been times when the areas have been threatened by lack of adequate appropriations to administer and protect them. However, under Mission 66 we shall be able so to plan and develop the several areas * * * that they will be protected for the use and enjoyment of all future generations."

## Criticism of the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a highly thought-provoking and timely column entitled "Criticism of the Court," written by Raymond Moley, appears in this week's issue of Newsweek magazine.

Regardless of one's opinions concerning the recent actions of the Supreme Court, Mr. Moley's observations are worthy of the attention of this body. He points out that—

The Court is a responsible, human institution. To elevate it above criticism would be to create a tyranny above the law and above the Government of which it is a part.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Moley's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITICISM OF THE COURT

(By Raymond Moley)

In the discussion over the American Bar Association's series of recommendations to Congress for legislation clarifying, limiting, and defining our protections against internal enemies and subversion, it was intimated that it is unwise to criticize not only the U.S. Supreme Court but any of its interpretations of the law. There are several good answers to this claim, some of which have been supplied by the Justices of that Court.

The statement adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association specifically disclaimed any general criticism of the Court itself or any effort to limit the jurisdiction of that Court as defined by the Constitution. The recommendations of the house of delegates aim to have Congress clarify its own laws and to assume the powers vested in it by the Constitution.

For the Constitution in article II, section 3, states that "In all the other cases before mentioned the Supreme Court shall have jurisdiction, with such exceptions and regulations as Congress shall make." The only cases in which Congress may not regulate are named in the same section and are not pertinent to the cases which were under consideration.

THE BAR'S RESPONSIBILITY

The bar in this instance is acting in its most significant role. A lawyer is something more than a plain citizen. He is by tradition and law an officer of the court and an agent of the government. To refrain from guidance would be to shirk the bar's responsibility, as a professional association, to the public and to government.

Among the recommendations which the house of delegates has made to Congress, three are outstanding: The States should be permitted to enact and enforce laws to protect the Nation and its citizens against subversion, and Congress should make clear that by enacting its own security laws it is not preempting the field; the Smith Act of 1940 should be amended and strengthened to include not only participation in organized subversive groups, but the advocacy of overthrowing the Government, or to teach the necessity, desirability, or duty of seeking to bring about such overthrow"; and Congress should continue its committees on internal security.

The American Bar Association report points out the necessity of such legislation because of the serious consequences of various decisions of the Supreme Court. These, in the holy name of freedom, have seriously impeded efforts to investigate and legislate against subversive activity.

In the debate in Chicago over the American Bar Association recommendations some pertinent evidence favoring the report was presented by Alfred J. Schweppe, a Seattle lawyer who has labored indefatigably for years to provide public leadership through the bar. His evidence consisted of statements made by Justices of the Supreme Court itself concerning the right and duty to subject the decisions of the courts to merited criticism.

VIEWS OF JUSTICES

Back in 1898, Mr. Justice Brewer stated in an address that many criticisms may be devoid of good taste, but better all sorts of criticism than no criticism at all.

In 1941, Mr. Justice Black said in writing for the majority concerning a contempt case against the Los Angeles Times: "The assumption that respect for the judiciary can be won by shielding judges from published criticism wrongly appraises the character of American public opinion * * * an enforced silence, however limited, solely in the name of preserving the dignity of the Bench, would probably engender resentment, suspicion, and contempt much more than it would enhance respect."

Dissenting in the same case, Mr. Justice Frankfurter nevertheless said: "Therefore judges must be kept mindful of their limi-

tations and of their ultimate public responsibility by a vigorous stream of criticism expressed with candor however blunt."

The late Mr. Justice Jackson wrote in "The Supreme Court in the American System" that criticism by the profession is one of the important criteria in appraising a decision's real weight in subseqeunt cases.

The Court is a responsible, human institution. To elevate it above criticism would be to create a tyranny above the law and above the Government of which it is a part.

## Inside View of a Political "Angel"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a remarkably perceptive, refreshing, and high principled discussion of political contributions and the role of political contributors, by Mr. Arnold Maremont, the highly successful Chicago industrialist, which was carried in the March 18, 1958, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE VIEW OF A POLITICAL "ANGEL"
(By Arnold Maremont)

Meet a political "angel" who has never been appointed ambassador, never mentioned for minister to some two-by-four principality, and who has no worries that a Senate committee sometime may trip him upon the pronunciation of the name of a prime minister in some faraway country. Meet a political "angel" who has nothing to sell to any public body or branch of government, State or Federal, and who carries no clout. I offer myself as exhibit A of that tribe of political "angels" who go unobtrusively about their tasks in everyday life, unnoticed, unmentioned, unrecognized, and just about un-everything.

That is, until the campaign year rolls around. Then we who are marked as political "angels" become important. Our ratings in Dun & Bradstreet are considered. The politicians want our money.

Yesterday they passed us in the street without a flicker of recognition, and they were perfectly honest in doing so because, until the need for cash arose, they didn't know us from Adam's off ox.

My first contribution was in a primary campaign in 1933. In 1933, with lots of energy and a starry-eyed belief that a big change in political philosophy was called for, I volunteered to work for a Democratic nominee for the U.S. Senate. This was in St. Louis, and the nominee was the late Congressman John J. Cochran, who was running against a man named Harry. Harry won.

In the 1955 Chicago mayoralty campaign, when Robert Merriam ran as a Republican candidate against Richard J. Daley, the Democratic organization's choice, I supported Merriam with money and whatever influence I had to contribute. Dick Daley won. Fortunately, he developed into an aggressive mayor with great dedication to his job and the city of Chicago.

I am one man who can say that he lost political battles to both Dick and Harry. Whether there is also a Tom around the corner, I cannot say. But I have the satisfaction of knowing that I stood up and fought as a political "angel" for what I believed to be best for Missouri and best for Chicago.

My motivation is not unique. Of the hundreds of people that I know who make political contributions in amounts ranging from $10 to $1,000, practically none of them is furthering anything more ulterior than what he believes is in his own best interest as a fellow citizen of the community or Nation. He has convictions as to which types of government are best. He is willing to back these convictions.

The supreme tragedy of all this is that in our political arena, these do-gooders, these political "angels," are kept back in the grandstand or rather, the political dugout, until the moment of combat.

Milburn P. Akers, executive editor of the Chicago Sun-Times and at one time a member of the distinguished administration of the late Gov. Henry Horner, once said:

"We have, in far too many instances, abandoned party affairs and party control to persons interested only in profits, not principles. Such persons quickly turn political organizations into political machines."

A political party raises only a small fraction of the money spent in campaigns; out of some $90 million spent in a national campaign, only $8 million, roughly, is raised by the two national committees. Fully 90 percent of political money goes to various committees, organized only for a specific, one-shot campaign.

In 99.99 percent of the cases of political "angels" who shell out for campaigns, it is known in advance that they will neither ask nor receive any special consideration if their candidate is elected. I know that when I give $5 or 5 cents to the campaign of a man like Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, or Congressman SID YATES, of Illinois, I am going to receive no special VIP treatment for my contribution. These men, either of them, would do for me exactly as much, no more and no less, than they would do for any other person among their constituencies.

It is neither a sin nor a crime to spend one's personal funds in support of a candidate; I wish more men and women would do it, because we need broader and more open political activity, not less of it. I think all of history proves beyond dispute that the broader the participation of the citizens in political affairs, the commensurately less opportunity there is for graft, corruption, and political dictatorship. I do not fear the many in politics; I fear the few.

I have thought of organizing a society of political "angels" to coordinate our thinking, and to take concerted action to insure that our opinions are given some weight.

The cynicism of the pros who in many cases would rather lose with a stumblebum than win with a DOUGLAS, and thus keep control of the organization, plus the cynicism of the public, is enough to discourage any political idealist. One group regards us political "angels" as infantile touches; the other as sinister men bidding with our money for backdoor influence and power.

One view is as wrong as the other. I submit that we who are political "angels" have a job to do on the polls and the public alike.

## Criticism of the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the March 5 issue of the New Jersey Law Journal I find a thoughtful editorial entitled, "On Court Criticism."

In the State of New Jersey, the Journal, edited by Joseph Harrison, has long been highly regarded. I am sure Members of the Senate will find the editorial a constructive contribution to our thinking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON COURT CRITICISM

Members of the bar, individually or associated in bar organizations, have a right and, it may well be argued, a duty to offer critical analyses of Court decisions. This is particularly true where such decisions have important impacts on the economic, social, or political life of our society. How the Court in a particular case interprets or applies Federal or State constitutions and statutes and the significant effects of such judicial constructions offer a legitimate area for commentaries by members of the legal profession. There is abundant legal literature to attest to this long-exercised prerogative by lawyers. Law reviews, texts, treatises, bar association reports, bar journal editorials and published speeches delivered at bar meetings are full of critical comments on Court decisions. In many instances they have brought about changes in decisional as well as in statutory law and many procedural reforms.

But it is one thing for lawyers or associations of lawyers to voice objective criticisms of court decisions and quite something else to impugn the motives of individual members of a court or an entire court. The latter suggests judicial impropriety, lack of judicial integrity or, as in some recent instances, plain judicial subversiveness. Such criticism, frequently intemperate, serves to undermine public confidence in our courts and to that extent threatens the existence of our constitutional form of Government, which for good reason is founded upon a division of authority among the executive, legislative and judicial branches of Government. When lawyers or bar associations, deliberately or otherwise, indulge in this type of destructive criticism, it then, indeed, becomes the duty of more responsible lawyers and members of bar associations to speak up and defend the integrity of judges and courts.

The fact that our history records many precedents of bitter personal criticism of judges and courts does not condone or excuse current attempts to discredit the Supreme Court of the United States or any other American court. It is significant that in supporting its report critical of 24 decisions of the Supreme Court, at the midwinter meeting of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, the committee on communist tactics, strategy, and objectives went to some pains in its effort to indicate that it was not attacking the members of the Court and was not suggesting any curtailment of the Court's authority. If that committee felt that the 24 decisions called for remedial statutes to strengthen our national defenses against international communism it had every right to make appropriate recommendations.

Whether the tone of the report belied the committee's protestations of objectivity and its desire not to attack the High Court or its members will depend, in a large measure, on whether lawyers happen to agree or disagree with the committee's position on the 24 cases cited. The problem of balancing the constitutional freedoms of individuals against the rights of the State is as old as the struggle for individual freedom itself. Runnymede, the French Revolution, the American Revolution, each are milestones in this struggle. Today, as then, there are many men, includ-

ing many lawyers, who as a matter of legal, social, and political philosophy agree with the Supreme Court's decisions criticized by the American Bar Association's House of Delegates on the recommendation of one of its committees. Which consideration, the State or the individual, shall receive more emphasis will doubtless be determined by representataives of interests broader than those represented by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association. Certainly the ideal balancing of the rights of the individual and the State is one of the most delicate and difficult duties of the judiciary.

That the Supreme Court will give proper consideration to objective criticism is evidenced by a decision handed down on February 24, 1959, in *United States* v. *Durham Lumber Co.* In that case it granted certiorari but refused to summarily decide the merits as it had done in other cases. Such summary dispositions on applications for ceriorari had been criticized in a recent law review article. Commenting on this change in the Court's attitude, Anthony Lewis, the New York Times' special writer on the Supreme Court, said on Monday of this week:

"The significance of the episode lies in the fact that the criticism that moved the Justices was detailed, professional, and constructive. It was not a generalized, emotional attack of the kind often made against the Supreme Court these days."

Mr. Lewis has well stated the core of the issue as to the propriety of recent Court criticisms.

## The Supreme Court and the Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled, "The Supreme Court and the Weather," from the March 1959 issue of the Young Lawyer, publication of the Junior Bar Section of the District of Columbia Bar Association, written in endorsement of my proposed bill (S. 880) to prescribe minimum qualifications for Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE WEATHER

"Everybody talks about it, yet nobody ever does anything about it." This was Mark Twain's classic remark about the weather. In recent years the same statement could be made about many lawyers and lay "Monday afternoon Supreme Court Justices." On February 2, 1959, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, U.S. Senator from Georgia, at least attempted to do something about the Supreme Court. Senator TALMADGE introduced S. 880, an act entitled, "A Bill to Establish Qualifications for Persons Appointed to the Supreme Court." It reads as follows:

"No person shall be appointed after the date of enactment of this paragraph to the office of Chief Justice of the United States or to the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court unless, at the time of his appointment, he has had at least five years of judicial service. As used in this paragraph 'judicial service' means service as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, a judge of a court of appeals or district court of the United States, or a judge or justice of the highest court of a State."

Of the nine present Supreme Court Justices, Senator TALMADGE pointed out in introducing his bill, only five had any judicial experience prior to their appointment to the Supreme Court and one of those had experience only as a police court judge. With the exception of Justice Brennan, none of the Justices had prior judicial experience of more than 5 years. Regardless of how one may feel about specific decisions of the Supreme Court, any fairminded person would agree that its present members are gentlemen of notable attainment and outstanding accomplishments in their fields. But the fact, nevertheless, remains that the majority of them have not labored as practicing lawyers or as judges in State or Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court. Consequently, events have found them either unable or unwilling to subject themselves to judicial restraint or to sublimate their own beliefs and conclusions to the provisions of the Constitution and the laws of the land.

The wisdom of Senator TALMADGE's proposal is manifest; his logic is unassailable. Man's knowledge today is so diverse and broad in so many fields that many of our wisest leaders have had to train themselves to know more and more about less and less if they are to know anything useful about anything at all. We are living in an age of specialization; just look about you at the communication lawyers, the FTC practitioners, the immigration lawyers, the old and gas lawyers, and the tax specialists to name only a few of the specialists within our profession of the law. Thus, faced with the growing complexities of our modern life and law, it seems a small thing to ask that judges and only judges be appointed to our highest Court.

We may not yet be able effectively to do anything about the weather; we could, however, do something to make sure that our highest judicial tribunal remain truly a Supreme Court.

## Ten Times as Popular: The National Education Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, what we know as this modern world was made modern by scientists, scholars, and other men of learning. In this era of keeping pace with the stars, we have come to realize all the more the vital significance of education.

George Davenel, a noted educator, was quoted in a national magazine this month as saying that in 1900, the United States needed 1 engineer for every 400 workers. "Today," he continued, "we need 1 for every 40 workers. By 1965, we will probably need 100,000 more engineers plus 40,000 more doctors, 75,000 more college-trained nurses, 485,000 more elementary and high school teachers, 120,000 more college teachers, 8,000 more natural scientists, a total of nearly 1 million young people will have to be trained for these 5 professions alone."

Our Nation has the students willing to study. We must take all necessary steps to see that they are given the chance. Education today is the key to a better world tomorrow.

As a coauthor of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I read an editorial in the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times recently.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Times for Wednesday, March 4, 1959, under the heading, "Ten Times as Popular."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN TIMES AS POPULAR

The student loan program authorized in last year's National Defense Education Act is proving far more popular than Congress anticipated.

A report from the U.S. Office of Education reveals that by the end of 1958, more than 1,200 colleges and universities had asked for $62 million under the loan program. Congress appropriated $6 million to get the program started.

Under the program, college students can borrow up to $1,000 a year for academic expenses. Repayment of the loan is not required to be started until 1 year after graduation, and then the terms are reasonable—10 years to pay at 3 percent on the unpaid balance. The colleges have to put $1 of their own into the loan fund for every 9 Federal dollars received.

A question has arisen over the program. Some doubt that loans to all for a college education, as far as the money goes, is a good policy. They would prefer a further requirement of scholarship ability for an initial loan and scholastic achievement for additional annual loans after the first year of college work has been completed.

At any rate, the popularity of the loan program cannot be denied. The applications for the money far outstrip the amount available and the administration has, in its budget request, asked only for another $24 million in fiscal 1959 and $30 million in fiscal 1960.

## The Resolution of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 13, 1959, the Richmond News Leader, of Richmond, Va., carried an editorial comment, entitled "Letter on the Law," on the recent resolution of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association relating to certain recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on communism. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial comment be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER ON THE LAW—CONNIPTION FITS: WARREN'S FRIENDS ARE HAVING THEM

Stand by for gas attack. A truly lethal fog of confusion is being spread concerning the recent resolutions of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association with

reference to Supreme Court decisions on communism.

Critics of the American Bar Association are now busy dressing up the resolutions to make them appear as attacks upon the Court. The American Bar Association's action is described—in typical liberalese—as "frightening" and "shocking." Though these critics of the American Bar Association stuff their knuckles in their mouths, make with saucer eyes and give every appearance of whooping terror, I think they are feigning, faking, and phonying.

For one thing, these people take to shock and fright on a very selective basis. Communism, for example—the most dangerous thing going—doesn't seem to shock them at all. Chiang shocks them. Mao doesn't. Syngman Rhee shocks them. But not Kadar. The House Un-American Activities Committee shocks them. Not un-American activities. Dulles, not Mikoyan.

For another thing, having selected the particular manifestation of anticommunism which they want to be shocked about, they then set up a howling, apocalyptic din well contrived to make us all think that the end of the world will soon come if the end of Chiang, Rhee, the house committee, or Dulles doesn't soon come. And so the public—deceived—gets stampeded.

Look now at the American Bar Association matter. The house of delegates on February 24 passed a series of resolutions which (1) called upon the bar to defend the U.S. Supreme Court from unjust and unfair attacks; (2) stated that three decisions of that Court had the effect of weakening internal security; (3) urged continuance of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Un-American Activities Committee; and (4) recommended that Congress strengthen our internal security laws.

Do you find those recommendations terrifying? I doubt it. But in the old, familiar pattern they are now getting the "shock" treatment, soon to be followed, critics of the resolutions hope, by the public stampede. These people must have it 100 percent their way. The house of delegates, having defended the institution of the Court, even went on to disapprove any proposals (such as Senator BUTLER's) to limit any jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

But this, apparently, did not suffice to satisfy the critics of the resolutions. They smelled in them criticism of some decisions of the Warren Court: The American Bar Association delegates were plainly deviationists who had dared to make one or two mild animadversions respecting the Court. Though, oddly enough, the American Bar Association resolutions do not in the least take the Warren Court justices to task. In fact, the resolutions actually do not even criticize the Court for the three decisions it refers to in the Watkins, Yates and Nelson cases. The resolutions say, in effect: "Rightly or wrongly decided, the net result of those decisions is weakening to our internal security. Therefore, we recommend that Congress pass legislation strengthening security in the areas affected by those decisions." This is bad?

So it seems clear that the resolutions do not constitute "attacks" on the Court—even on the Warren court. Anyhow, many of those now attacking the resolutions were—just a few years ago in the 1930's—spearheading the effort to attack the Court, pack the Court—even sack the Court.

Plainly, preserving of the "Court" does not constitute their motivation. What they seem most deeply to desire—with a truly poisonous passion—is to kill all efforts of this people to defend themselves against the Soviet world.

## World Refugee Year Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received a resolution, adopted by the National Lutheran Council at its annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., entitled "World Refugee Year Resolution."

Commendably, the National Lutheran Council—as have many other religious, Government, voluntary, and other groups and agencies—is giving deep consideration to the tragic plight of the millions of refugees around the world.

As we recognize, this is a tremendous problem that demands a constructive solution because of humanitarian, political, sociological, and other considerations.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the resolution, received from Paul C. Empie, executive director of the National Lutheran Council, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD REFUGEE YEAR RESOLUTION, ADOPTED AT 41ST ANNUAL MEETING, NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL, MILWAUKEE, WIS., FEBRUARY 5, 1959

That the National Lutheran Council—

Concerned over the long-continued plight of refugees in Western Europe, the Middle East, Hong Kong, and other areas of world tension;

Conscious of the debilitating effects of this situation not only upon the personalities of the individuals thus handicapped but also upon the moral sensitivity of nations in a world community;

Aware of the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly adopted December 5, 1958, as follows:

"General Assembly, having considered the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, together with a resolution adopted by the UNRAF Executive Committee at its ninth (special) session on September 26, 1958, convinced of the need to make a further worldwide effort to help resolve the world refuge problem, having considered the proposal for World Refugee Year, to begin in June 1959 noting that this proposal has two aims, namely:

"(a) To focus interest on the refugee problem and to encourage additional financial contributions from governments, voluntary agencies and the general public for its solution;

"(b) to encourage additional opportunities for permanent refugee solutions, through voluntary repatriation, resettlement or integration on a purely humanitarian basis in accordance with the freely expressed interest of the refugees themselves.

"1. Urges states members of the United Nations and members of the special agencies to cooperate in accordance with the national wishes and needs of each country and from a humanitarian point of view, in promoting a World Refugee Year as a practical means of securing increased assistance for refugees throughout the world;

"2. Requests the Secretary General to take such steps as he may think fit to assist in the promotion of a World Refugee Year in accordance with the present resolution."

Mindful that the proposal of a World Refugee Year has received the endorsement of many world organizations, including the Lutheran World Federation and the World Council of Churches, and also that its objectives are in harmony with those pursued by the council during the past 10 years of its own extensive refugee resettlement program and through its financial support of related LWF and WCC programs;

Hereby endorses the general aims envisioned in the proposed World Refugee Year, and expresses its readiness to cooperate toward the attainment of the proposed objectives by whatever measures are appropriate to it and within its means.

## Qualified Diplomats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two very fine editorials from the Plain Dealer, of Cleveland, Ohio, and the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

These editorials deal with a matter of great importance to the future of our country; and I hope my colleagues will take the time to read them.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 16, 1959]

QUALIFIED DIPLOMATS

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will do much to arrest the deterioration of the United States overseas if he sticks by his guns in insisting on the selection of qualified ambassadors.

His ideas, and the policy which he intends to implement as head of the committee, were contained in a recent letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles prior to his illness.

With FULBRIGHT's record of conscientious effort to improve international relations his insistence that the committee "know of the candidate's language ability, his ability as an administrator, his ability to make friends, the nature and depth of his interest in foreign affairs generally, as well as specifically in the country to which he is being sent," cannot be taken lightly.

FULBRIGHT echoes his predecessor, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, who wrote on April 3, 1957, that "we can no longer afford to give way to such pressure in appointment making." He referred to political pressure, the rewarding of incompetent men with ambassadorial appointments because they helped the party or contributed heavily to campaign funds.

The United States has been more lax than any other nation in sending overseas, at the most critical time in world history, not only envoys, but lower ranking personnel in no way qualified by knowledge of language or customs for the jobs in the countries that may be the field of their labors for years.

This indifference has cost us heavily in nations where there is a life-and-death struggle with the Russians. The Russians are expertly trained, they know the language, the mores and psychology of the people.

This tragedy is set forth with the sugar-coating of a novel in the current best seller, "The Ugly American," by William J. Lederer and Eugene Burdick. It is not much of a novel, for there is no plot. It is rather a series of sketches that dramatize a most unpalatable truth. And the final chapter is all undisguised fact. A couple of quotes sum it up:

"In the few years since the end of World War II, Russia has added 700 million people to the multitude already under direct rule. Its land empire has been swollen by about 5 million square miles."

"Yet in France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, and Turkey, our Ambassadors cannot speak the native tongue 'although our Ambassador to Paris can speak German and our Ambassador to Bonn can speak French). In the whole of the Arabic world—nine nations—only two Ambassadors have language qualifications. In Japan, Korea, Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, Indonesia, and elsewhere, our Ambassadors must speak and be spoken to through interpreters."

FULBRIGHT is right. It is time to quit fooling and get down to the serious business of winning the people of the world.

---

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette Feb. 28, 1959]

NAME TRAINED ENVOYS

The new chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, believes that this country's ambassadors should be appointed on the basis of qualification rather than as a reward for party service. We subscribe heartily to that doctrine.

The issue has been raised in a letter which Senator FULBRIGHT sent to Secretary of State Dulles. The new chairman expressed the committee's concern that for several years "some of our ambassadorial appointments have not been up to the standard that should be maintained if our interests abroad are to be fully promoted."

Every President is subject to pressures by party leaders who feel that ambassadorships should, like postmasterships, be awarded on the basis of past service or help. In far too many instances that procedure has been followed.

Many ambassadorial appointments have gone to wealthy individuals who contributed to the party in power. The only justification for this practice has been the fact that the United States is so niggardly in its financial support of embassies that only wealthy men who were willing to spend out of their own pockets could afford to take some of the top appointments.

But this Nation has come of age in foreign affairs. As leader of the free world, it can no longer afford to make ambassadorial appointments on a patronage basis.

The nations to which we send diplomatic representatives expect to be taken seriously. They look to us for responsibility and leadership. They will no respect us if we demonstrate through careless diplomatic appointments a disregard for their importance and sensibilities.

International diplomacy in this atomic era is far too important to be put into the hands of untrained people. This Nation should recruit, train and finance adequately a carrer foreign service from which diplomatic appointments can be made on the basis of ability.

We hope that Senator FULBRIGHT and his committee will examine closely the diplomatic qualifications of all future ambassadorial appointees.

## Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale Daily News, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., in which comment is made on our present farm program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TAXPAYER: READ AND WEEP OVER GRAVY TRAIN BIG U.S. FARMERS ARE RIDING

This past week, a well-known Republican Senator who comes from one of the so-called farm States rather bitterly chastised Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson for proposing some much-needed changes in the Nation's farm program.

This Senator declared in stentorian tones that if Mr. Benson's proposals were ever adopted by the Congress the Republican Party would be lucky to elect a single candidate in the farm belt when the next election rolls around.

Like so many other Congressmen, this particular Senator wasn't the slightest bit interested in looking at Secretary Benson's commonsense proposals from the viewpoint of what's best for the Nation as a whole.

He was only interested in the political repercussions that might stem from Mr. Benson's efforts to put our extravagant farm program on a more sensible basis, and thus, even though this Senator might privately admit that the current program isn't working and that vast sums of money could be saved by revising it, he wasn't about to publicly support any changes because of the political dangers involved.

A few days later another Republican Senator, JOHN J. WILLIAMS of Delaware, who doesn't happen to hail from one of the farm States, also had something to say about the farm program.

Senator WILLIAMS had been doing some checking on the amount of money the Government handed out to farmers under the price-support program in 1957.

The Senator found out that two large farm operators had collected over $2,500,000 from the Federal Government in 1957. The Producer's Rice Mill, Inc. of Stuttgart, Ark., collected $1,460,902 in support payments on its rice crop, while the Delta & Pine Land Co., of Scott, Miss., collected $1,157,502 in price-support payments on its cotton crop.

Senator WILLIAMS declared that these two payments alone were larger than those received by all the farmers in his home State for the combined years of 1957 and 1958.

"The high rigid support program is little more than a Government guarantee on the operations of corporate type farming," Senator WILLIAMS declared, "and it actually encourages and underwrites absentee ownership to the detriment of the small farmers."

If the two cases cited by Senator WILLIAMS had been unique, the Delaware lawmaker might not have felt that it was necessary for him to take to the Senate floor to inform his colleagues of what he had found out. But while these two payments were the largest handed out in 1957, the Senator also found out there were scores of others in excess of $100,000.

Senator WILLIAMS, on the strength of his own personal survey, has now concluded that whereas the price-support program has been widely hailed as primarily benefiting the little farmer, it has actually been of far more benefit to the big-scale farmers who till thousands of acres per year and who have been primarily responsible for our huge crop surpluses.

As Senator WILLIAMS pointed out, the price-support program as it is being administered today, serves to guarantee big-farm operators an annual profit on their activities. It is the reason why the Federal Government now has enough surplus wheat in storage to meet all of our domestic and export needs for a full year if not a single bushed of wheat were to be harvested this year. It is why the annual cost of support this crazy farm program is now the third largest item in the Federal budget and going higher all the time.

This is not speculation. It is the cold, hard truth which some of our more conscientious legislators have been aware of for a good many months, yet every time these legislators, Secretary Benson or even President Eisenhower even suggest that the time might have come to stop this gravy train for the big farmers the legislators from the farm States immediately raise a tremendous howl and start pointing out the terrible things that will happen to their respective parties if any money-saving changes are enacted.

And so the farce continues. Secretary Benson wants to solve the wheat surplus problem by slashing the price supports on the farm commodity. But if he does it, even one of his closest associates remarked that "it will be very difficult for Republican Congressmen in wheat areas to run with Ezra's picture on their chests."

Supporting this nonsensical farm program is now demanding almost 10 cents out of every dollar every American pays in Federal taxes each year. The same porgram is also forcing every American wage earner to pay inflated prices for the food he eats. Yet it can't be curtailed or ended because neither of our political parties has the guts to put the Nation's welfare above its own selfish interests, and the few members of either party who aren't afraid to endorse a change can't get to first base because of the overwhelming opposition of those who won't risk a change for fear it might cost them some votes.

JACK W. GORE.

---

## The Major Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Augusta Chronicle of March 9, 1959, entitled "The Major Question," discussing a speech made by our colleagues, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAJOR QUESTION

In an impressive speech in defense of the rights of the American people, the American system of government, and free enterprise itself, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART of Indiana recently put the major question of

the times to Members of the United States Senate.

"Do Senators want," he asked, "to maintain the kind of government our Nation has had for 170 years, or do the Senators want a system of government under which the government will impose controls?"

The decision Senators must make, he declared, is "whether they wish to maintain the American system of government in all its phases or whether they want a controlled economy, whether they want a dictator, whether they want to adopt the kind of government that exists today in Russia. The government which now exists in Russia controls everything in that country. Our Government cannot control part of our economy without controlling all of it.

"Why should we vote to break down our great American system of government? Why should they (some Senators) vote to break down the great American system of government which has served our country so well for 170 years?"

He riddled the Senators for talking about the American people having given them a mandate in the last election to support legislation destructive to the American system.

"I do not think," said Senator CAPEHART, "that they (the American people) mandated the Congress to liquidate the American system of government. I do not think that they mandated the Congress to liquidate the private enterprise system.

"Let us," he begged, "stand four-square behind the American system of government, or the private enterprise system, which it really is. Let us cut out the chaff and get down to the wheat. Let us use commonsense. Let us defend this great system of ours."

He charged that speeches made upon the floor of the Senate are giving aid and comfort to enemies of the Republic in that they portray the capitalistic system as a failure and the American people as being inept and mistreated.

He paid tribute to the American people in these words:

"I know our people are not perfect. I know that I make mistakes. I know that all other Members of the Senate make mistakes. But I am talking about the general principles of the American system of government. I oppose burning down a church or a house in order to get rid of the mice that may be in it. But that is about what some Senators have advocated here tonight; in effect, they have advocated going against the American system of government."

But, said the Senator, "I am going to fight for the private enterprise system."

Senator CAPEHART has sounded a pure note of patriotism amidst continuing cacophony of words in praise of the socialistic and totalitarian concepts in government.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that not only the Senators of the United States have got to decide whether or not they will protect and preserve the American system of government but the American people as well must wake up to the fact that they too must assume responsibility for perpetuation of those principles.

## Necessity for Assistance to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of editorials and comments regarding the vital importance of a more vigorous U.S. and international effort in meeting the needs for economic growth in India. As these editorials make clear, it is vital that we place our loan assistance program on a larger and more sustained level and that we join with other nations in providing a basis of support for India's needs during this crucial period of economic takeoff.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Mar. 5, 1959]

SAVINGS ACCOUNT

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—During the first Berlin crisis of 1948–49, China tottered irrevocably into Communist slavery. Now, 10 years later, while the free world's attention is fixed upon the second Berlin crisis, will India take giant steps toward the same dark fate?

No one knows whether Stalin seized Czechoslovakia and blockaded Berlin partly because he wanted to distract Western attention from the Communist takeover in China. But it is cetrainly conceivable that Khrushchev's manipulation of the present Berlin crisis is importantly connected, in some way not yet clear to us, with his and Mao's ambitions in Asia.

One hears much argument about standing firm or being flexible in the Berlin situation, but no one can question that there is one place in the world where we can do more than stand firm, where we can take the initiative, where we can do something positive and fundamental to direct the course of events to our own benefit. That place is India.

India has 40 percent of the population of the uncommitted world. It is the only major country on the Asian land mass that stands outside the Russian-Chinese combine. If India's economic development progam breaks down for lack of outside help, if the Congress Party then falls apart the way Chiang Kai-shek's Kuomintang Party disintegrated and India in the 1960's passes under Communist control, this will be a moral and strategic catastrophe.

If that disaster occurs, we can forget, for example, about Thailand, Vietnam, Pakistan, Iran, and our other small allies on the Asian mainland.

Those struggling countries will disappear into the Communist camp overnight. The whole fight for freedom on the mainland of Asia will have been lost.

The case for speedy action to help India is so compelling and the consequences of failure are so terrifying that one wonders why there should be any doubt about the American response to this challenge. Yet the record of the Eisenhower administration toward India is one of criminal negligence and irresponsibility. It has shuffled ambassadors back and forth to New Delhi for irrelevant political reasons, in one period leaving our ambassadorship there vacant for months.

In 1953–54, the administration helped lure Pakistan, India's northern neighbor, into the absurd Baghdad Pact. Every dollar we poured into Pakistan the Indians have tried to match on their own defense-spending for fear the Pakistanis would use American arms to seize disputed Kashmir by force.

This has siphoned off money that should have gone to economic development. The Indian response may be neurotic and wrongheaded, but it was wholly predictable and is understandable in human terms. As if deliberately wanting to make matters worse, Secretary Dulles and Vice President Nixon then engaged in the mad business of slapping the Indians in the face for being immoral neutrals.

We were meanwhile dribbling out economic assistance to India at the rate of $50 million annually during the first Eisenhower administration, but in 1955–56 that diplomatic genius Herbert Hoover, Jr., then the Under Secretary of State, decided to cut it by 25 percent in order to have $10 million.

A year ago, the Senate tried to reverse this record of folly. A bipartisan coalition under the leadership of Senators KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts and COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky wrote into the foreign aid authorization a special pledge of American help for India's economic development program. At first, the administration supported this move but when Senators KNOWLAND, Republican, of California and BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire put pressure on Dulles, he left the pro-India forces in the lurch. The proposal was killed in the House-Senate conference.

There was brave talk last year that the new Development Loan Fund would give special attention to India's needs and permit orderly planning on a long-term basis. The DLF, however, "has totally failed to fill the need for long-term capital," as Senator KENNEDY recently said, "because it has never been given either a long term or very much capital."

KENNEDY and COOPER are urging that the DLF be put on a more nearly permanent basis (it is now dependent on yearly renewals) and that its funds be greatly increased above the $750 million requested by President Eisenhower. They are also urging the United States to join with Britain, West Germany, and other investing nations to set up a joint, long-term program to meet India's desperate need for hard currency.

The proposals for international action will become effective only if the administration gives some help. Is there no one who can persuade the man in the White House to put aside his bookkeeper's ledgers and look to freedom's needs in Asia?

---

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 22, 1959]

THE HELP INDIA NEEDS

The proposal for long-term aid to India made by Senator KENNEDY and Senator COOPER deserves support not only because India desperately needs help in its heroic struggle to improve the living standards of 400 million people, but because it would foreshadow an important change in our whole foreign-aid program. What has been suggested is to put the Development Loan Fund on a permanent basis so that help extended to underdeveloped countries is not subject to the annual pleasure of Congress. These countries are uneasily conscious of the temporary nature of this help. And they cannot, in any case, think of financial undertakings except in terms of several years or more.

Moreover, countries like India, and especially India, realize that our present system of foreign aid entails consideration of momentary political moods. Thus Indians reacted angrily last year to a western suggestion that India could receive much more financial support if its foreign policy were less neutralist. The Soviet Union has been careful not to make this kind of suggestion—at least not until its aid has been accepted.

The Senators emphasize India because India would profit most from the kind of loans made by the Development Loan Fund. He goes so far as to say that in deciding the fate of the fund this year, Congress will in large measure be deciding the future of India. This is the crucial year of India's current 5-year plan. Even after severe cutbacks, the Indian Government is still short almost $600 million which must be invested if the

plan is to succeed. For not only is the 5-year plan an article of faith with Indians. It is also a practical necessity if India is to keep its growing population alive. Unless India receives steady, long-term support from the West, of the kind the Soviet Union has given to Communist China, Senator KENNEDY warns, India as a free and democratic state will not survive. And this does not mean a dam here, a railroad there, and a model farm somewhere else. We have helped India a great deal in the past, and it has done good, but the time has come for help of a new order. That is the challenge.

---

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, February 20, 1959]

THE SHAPE OF AID

James W. Riddleberger is an able career diplomat who should do a conscientious nonpolitical job of directing the International Cooperation Administration. He has an excellent record as ambassador to Yugoslavia and Greece, and his nomination by the President to succeed James H. Smith, Jr., in ICA is certainly preferable to a choice of one or another of the defeated politicians whose names were bruited about. It is regrettable, though, that the President did not see fit to select someone of national reputation who could evangelize the importance of an adequate economic assistance program in this time of challenge.

The need for such evangelism is the more pronounced because of the approach reportedly being taken by the Draper Committee surveying foreign aid. The committee is said to be embarked upon a very different tack from that envisaged at the time of its appointment last fall—supposedly in response to some of the questions raised in "The Ugly American."

Far from scrutinizing the balance between economic and military aid in critical areas, the committee has been focusing primarily upon the need for military aid itself, and a majority is said to favor a $500 million increase in military help to NATO countries. There may be something to be said for this, but the economic needs of nonallied countries apparently are being subordinated. At any rate, there reportedly is unwillingness among Members to recommend anything above the President's budget in economic help for underdeveloped areas.

In view of this approach, the speech by Senator KENNEDY yesterday stressing the need for a larger Development Loan Fund was especially appropriate. Mr. KENNEDY asserted that the DLF "has totally failed to fill the need for long-term capital—because it has never been given either a long term or very much capital." This is an exaggeration; but in place of the $1-billion-a-year 5-year capitalization which was proposed within the administration, the President requested a $225 million supplemental appropriation and a $700 million 1-year new appropriation. So far the DLF has had a total of $700 million, and against this it has more than $1.7 billion in partially screened requests for help and another $500 million in applications which meet the criteria.

Obviously the short-term approach is failing to meet the need; and, worse, it discourages long-term planning and efficiency. The same considerations apply with especial urgency in the particular case of India, where the hand-to-mouth help now being lent is not enough to bring rapid progress in the economic rivalry with China. In this connection Mr. KENNEDY has a constructive idea. He proposes a joint survey by Canada, Britain, West Germany, Japan, and the United States to appraise India's real needs with a view to increasing their assistance. Mr. KENNEDY and Senator COOPER are sponsoring a resolution to this effect.

But the essential objective is a larger Development Loan Fund. A DLF capitalization of $1 billion a year for 5 years would amount to only a little more than two-tenths of 1 percent of the gross national product expected during that period. It is incredible that the United States would not set aside that much to help insure the economic success of the free world. We suspect that there would be a good bit of sympathy in Congress for such an effort, but first it will be necessary for the President to ask for an increased sum above the budget. Timidity can only bring neglect of this part of free world defense which is just as important as missiles.

---

[From the Indianapolis Times, Feb. 23, 1959]

INDIA'S PROBLEM

One of the major problems of the non-Communist world is the economy of India in its struggle to improve its very low standard of living.

The danger is that Indians—seeing the tremendous leap forward in Red China but not seeing the slavery that goes with it—will pressure their leaders to go in that direction, too.

Last year the United States and other elements of the free world scraped together enough to save India from collapse. But it was a stopgap.

Now Democratic Senator KENNEDY and Republican Senator COOPER (former U.S. Ambassador to India) are sponsoring an eminently sensible approach—to get away from the sporadic, hit-or-miss, crash type of aid.

Their bipartisan proposal is that the United States invite other friendly nations to join us in a free world mission to India to discuss possibilities for joint action. It would be long range—looking to bolster the current second 5-year plan, which is at the halfway point, and the third 5-year plan.

The Kennedy-Cooper resolution in the Senate anticipates Great Britain, Canada, West Germany, Japan, and others as possible partners in such an undertaking.

"This policy of using money on a crisis basis, from year to year, where difficulty arises, is expensive and ineffective," said Senator KENNEDY.

The Kennedy-Cooper proposal makes sense and we should be prepared to do a great deal to keep India from turning north to China for aid and guidance.

---

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 23, 1959]

THE DANGEROUS GAP

It is a wonder that cartoonists, especially abroad, do not depict Uncle Sam as a one-eyed giant, a giant very alert to the missile gap or the military disparities between East and West, and seemingly blind to the economic gap, the disparities between the rich nations of the world and the poor ones.

The second gap got the attention it deserves in a fine speech by Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts last Thursday. He said:

"Since the truce negotiations began in Korea 8 years ago, it should have been obvious that our greatest danger was no longer military. Since the Russians began their aid and trade penetration of the undeveloped world some 5 years ago, it should have been obvious now that if India were to fall, if Latin America turned away and if the Middle East slid behind the Iron Curtain, then no amount of missiles, no amount of space satellites or nuclear-powered planes or atomic submarines could ever save us."

Senator KENNEDY freely admits that he is by no means the first to raise this alarm, but he emphasizes two ways of responding to it this year: bolstering the Development Loan Fund and giving real help to India.

We cannot afford to extend economic aid only on a crisis basis, from year to year, wherever difficulty arises. This is expensive, and it does not encourage nations to make the sort of effective, long-range plans which alone can meet their difficulties. Emergency bailouts, as Senator KENNEDY said, only mean that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

India is the prime example. This is the year in which India, representing 40 percent of the population of the uncommitted world, may have to cut back the goals of its second 5-year plan. Or it can be the year in which it will set even more impressive goals for a third 5-year plan. Prime Minister Nehru has courageously called for new advances, but this courage will be wasted if it is not effectively supported by the United States, Britain, Canada, Germany, Japan, and other free nations. China is making its great leap forward with Russian help. The non-Communist nations have their great opportunity in enabling India to keep pace.

So with Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, Senator KENNEDY introduced a resolution calling on the Government to invite other friendly nations to join in a free world mission to India to discuss detailed possibilities for joint action to assure the fulfillment of India's second 5-year plan and the effective design of its third plan.

In this 10th anniversary year of President Truman's point 4 program, there is one step above all others which the United States can take promptly in extending long-term help and to achieve a better balance between military and economic assistance. This is to provide the Development Loan Fund with the means of achieving its objective: in Mr. KENNEDY's words, "a substantial, long-term program of productive loans to underdeveloped areas from a fully capitalized central fund, capable of working with either independent nations or regional groupings."

The fund never has had a real chance to do its job. Its initial $700 million is committed, and it has a backlog of approved projects running to more than $1,700 million. Neither the administration's supplemental request for $225 million nor the regular budgetary request for another $700 million is enough. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee originally contemplated a capitalization of at least $1 billion a year.

There are other instrumentalities of foreign aid—the World Bank, the U.N. programs of technical aid, and the distribution of our surplus farm products, for example—which should not be neglected. But in the long run—and it is the long run which is all important—no agency could do more than the development fund to close the economic gap which, as Senator KENNEDY says, is even more threatening than the missile gap.

---

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Record, Feb. 2, 1959]

LONG-TERM TREATMENT

Senator JOHN KENNEDY cites Communist China's economic growth rate as three times that of India last year. He calls for the United States to join other Western Powers and Japan in moving to meet India's need for investment capital. The Development Loan Fund authorized by the last Congress is inadequate and in the face of China's great leap forward, this may be the last year in which the West can effectively aid Indian democracy, the Senator warns.

Meanwhile, there is disturbing news from the Eisenhower administration's foreign aid study group. When President Eisenhower appointed the Draper Committee a few months ago, it was understood that "The Ugly American" had inspired the move. The President wanted to know if the novel's allegedly true scenes of aid mismanagement were typical. Further, he was anxious to

have a study of the relative merits of military and economic aid. The Washington Post says now that the Draper Committee, far from seeking a balance between economic and military outlays, is reported thinking primarily in terms of a $500 million military aid program for North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies. Where are yesterday's visions of a new aid program, suited to the demands of the Soviet economic offensive—the ruble war?

Senator KENNEDY clearly demonstrates the need for economic statesmanship, and the folly of delay in meeting the Communist challenge. The Development Loan Fund should be increased promptly and given long-term responsibilities.

## Support for Establishment of a National Park on Padre Island, in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, since I introduced a bill providing for the establishment of a national park on Padre Island, in Texas, I have invited the attention of the Congress to a wide variety of reasons for the passage of the measure.

It would provide a winter playground for the Nation, preserve a portion of our rapidly vanishing public shoreline in its natural state, provide a game preserve for wildlife native to the area, and enable greater recognition of the rich historical significance of the region.

This measure has been backed by a number of groups interested in conservation and other organizations. A bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Texas to authorize the State parks board to acquire land on Padre Island for park purposes. In addition, the measure would allow the National Government to acquire land on the island for the same purpose.

The Honorable Commissioners Court of Willacy County, Tex., in a meeting March 9, 1959, adopted a resolution relating to this matter. A portion of Padre Island is included in Willacy County, and these people are in a position to know firsthand the advantages for wildlife conservation, historical preservation, and other benefits which would accrue from establishment of a park on the island.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the excerpt from the proceedings of the Honorable Commissioners Court of Willacy County, Tex., which includes the adoption of this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas House bill 469, introduced in the Texas Legislature, authorizes the Texas State Parks Board to acquire land on Padre Island for park purposes and authorizes the U.S. Government to purchase, condemn, receive, hold, and acuire title to land for the creation of Padre Island National Park, and

Whereas Senate bill 4, introduced in the U.S. Senate, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by gift, purchase, transfer, or otherwise, lands for the purpose of establishing a national park on Padre Island and to construct and maintain therein such roads and improvements as he may deem necessary, and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior shall take no action until the State of Texas, by appropriate legislative action, has consented to the establishment of such part: Now, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the commissioners court of Willacy County recommend that house bill 469 be enacted into law, thereby giving legislative consent, by the State of Texas, to the establishment of Padre Island National Park, and be it further

*Resolved*, That our representatives be requested to give active support to the creation of Padre Island National Park and that copies of this resolution be sent to Gov. Price Daniel, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator Ralph Yarborough, Congressman Joe Kilgore, State Senator Bruce A. Reagan, Representative Carl Conley, and to Representative Roger Daily, author of House bill 469.

## Morality, at a Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Morality, at a Price," published in the Daily Herald of Provo, Utah, of February 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORALITY, AT A PRICE

Up until now organized labor has lent unqualified support to the kind of labor reform represented by the current Kennedy-Ervin bill. It accepted the idea that control of rackets and elimination of corrupt practices are fundamental requirements meriting top priority.

But at the Puerto Rico meeting of the AFL–CIO's Executive Council, it was decided to insist firmly upon linking labor reform with concessions to labor through amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act.

As it happens, a few such amendments are now in the Kennedy-Ervin measure as approved by the Senate Labor Committee subgroup headed by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. Others are due for later study.

But it is one thing for Congress, for government generally, to propose this sort of approach to labor legislation, and quite another for labor to demand it.

Reform obviously is not something to be accepted only at a price. To reform is to attempt to correct wrongs or shortcomings. If these exist, then any organization with standards of decency and honesty—whether union, business or political party—must inevitably commit itself to their correction.

There can be no strings attached, no saying "we will take reform only if you give us this in return."

You do not bargain over the matter of living up to the moral standards of the community. If doing the right thing is something you can offer in trade for some gain or concession, then it is not a standard.

The leaders of labor who have now deflected the federation from its former course seem momentarily to have forgotten that men who live under law and morality do right because they believe in doing right, because it is for the best interests of the whole society, not because they hope to get something by doing it.

## The Importance of People, Not Merely Statistics, to a Correct Appraisal of the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, later this week the Senate will begin the active consideration of S. 722, the area redevelopment bill, which is designed to aid sections of the country in which there are conditions of chronic unemployment.

In this morning's New York Times I read the comprehensive article in which these compelling words were used in the opening paragraph:

Unemployment is a figure in a Government report, as dreary and lifeless as the Federal debt or the death rate.

Yes; there is a human side to this national problem which directly affects more than 4,450,000 workers who are eager to be gainfully employed, but for whom no jobs are available.

Before reading the article in the Times, which is a challenging news coverage on a broad basis, I had been privileged to hear Frank Blair, on the Monday morning Dave Garroway television program, explain, with filmed scenes from West Virginia, and with quotations from statements by the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] the plight of the sturdy folk in our hills of home who need work, and need it now.

It was my opportunity to be a part of this presentation and to make a statement, which had been recorded last Friday, in which I told of the distress in West Virginia and of the assistance which would result, in substantial degree, if S. 722 becomes law.

The writer of the New York Times article, Mr. A. H. Raskin, told of the assignment of correspondents of that newspaper to put faces on figures.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article writen by Homer Bigart, relating to the conditions in West Virginia as he saw them, and published in the New York Times of March 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the article ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA GRIM

(By Homer Bigart)

CHARLESTON, W. VA., March 10.—Thousands of unemployed coal miners have used up their rockin' chair money and are living

on mollygrub in the coal fields of West Virginia.

Rockin' chair money is the miners' term for unemployment compensation. Mollygrub is the monthly dole of Federal surplus foods.

With about 15 percent of its work force idle, West Virginia is the blackest spot among the Nation's areas of economic distress.

The statistics are grim enough: 45,000 workers have exhausted their unemployment benefits; 280,000 to 300,000 persons are subsisting mainly on mollygrub.

A tour of coalfields south of Charleston revealed that the human tragedy was not yet as stark as in the 1930's, when children fainted in schoolrooms for lack of food. This time the schools are providing free lunches for the desperately poor. And at home the surplus food dole, while deficient in protein and in bulk, is generally enough to support what the natives call a cornbread livin'.

There are no signs of desperate physical distress, not even in Big Coal River Valley, where the expiring communities of Edwight and Highcoal present ghostly rows of boarded-up shacks. In the half-deserted streets and in the tiny yards of ramshackle dwellings, children play who look at least as robust as children in urban slums.

Tensions and despondency bred by long idleness are evident in the hopeless complaining tone of minors who have returned in disgust from job-hunting expeditions in Cleveland, Columbus, and Detroit. The added complaint of racial discrimination was raised by Melvin Smoot, a Negro miner, in Highcoal. "A mine superintendent told me he ain't hiring any colored," Mr. Smoot said.

The mine at Highcoal blew out [shut down] more than a year ago, throwing 82 men out of work. They were the last of a gradually reduced force of about 500. Mr. Smoot, 37 years old, with eight children, was laid off December 31, 1957, the night his wife gave birth to twins. He has had no work since then. He drew the maximum of 24 weeks, plus a special extension of 12 weeks, in unemployment payments last year. Payments in reduced amounts ($21 a week) were resumed a few weeks ago, but Mr. Smoot said he had to use his first two checks to pay the utilities bill.

NO RENT SINCE JULY

The Smoot dwelling is a gray, soot-crusted 4-room house renting at $16 a month. But Mr. Smoot said he had not paid rent since last July. Nor had he been able to buy tubes for his television which failed Christmas Eve.

His monthly mollygrub included 30 pounds of flour, 5 pounds of butter, 10 pounds of rice, and a small quantity of meal. This was not enough for 3 weeks, he said. Supplementing the Federal dole was a windfall of canned milk, canned peas, and a little sugar from Charleston churches following an exposé of Highcoal's plight in the Charleston Gazette.

Despite the dismal outlook, Mr. Smoot said he would remain in the dying town because jobs were scarce in Ohio cities and because "they claim there's going to be a lot of roadbuilding around here."

But up in the road in the white community, Carl Harris had decided to quit the mines and try farming. He had gone to Lincoln County to look for a farm. Meanwhile, Mrs. Harris, carried away by visions of bucolic plenty, had bought 100 pullets for $2. They were cheeping in the kitchen as Mrs. Harris told of the impending move to Lincoln County.

"They do right smart farmin' down there," she said. "They got some little bitsy old mines but mostly farms."

Still she hated to leave Highcoal. "I like the people here: they're friendly," she said.

In nearby Whitesville, shopping center for Big Coal Valley, Quentin Barrett, principal of Whitesville Elementary and Junior High School, summoned his teachers to an emergency meeting.

"Starting tomorrow," he announced, "all children who are completely destitute and look undernourished will be given a cup of cocoa and a hot biscuit at the start of school each morning in addition to the regular hot lunch. Maybe some scrambled eggs, too."

He asked the teachers how many children came to school without having had any breakfast at home. They reported a total of 65. The school has an enrollment of 700.

FREE LUNCH TO DESTITUTE

For the hot lunch the school charges 25 cents. But families on relief pay only 15 cents and the lunch is given free to those described as "penniless and destitute."

The Reverend Jack Weller, director of the mission project of the United Presbyterian Church, said conditions were particularly grim in Edwight, a few miles up the valley. He said the land company that owned the miners' houses had recently turned off the street lights adding to the tension, and there were reports the water supply would be shut when the village school closed at the end of the spring term.

He estimated that "at least 1,800 persons in the valley aren't getting a balanced diet." He recalled that the Whiteville Fire Department, in making up its Christmas list, found that 300 families in the area had no income at all.

In Charleston, Raymond Lewis, brother of John L. Lewis and presentd of District 17 of the United Mine Workers Union, doubted that many miners now out of work would find jobs again in the industry.

He called the current crisis a lot worse than the depression of the thirties.

"The 1930's depression was just the end of a boom period. It was not caused by technogolical advances but by oveproduction. This one here is a different story, an industrial revolution like the one that hit England when the spinning jenny was invented."

Mr. Lewis said scarcity of labor during World War II forced operators into mechanization. "By 1949 new equipment began to come in. Thereafter there was a steady decrease in miners and an increase in production.

"In 1948, West Virginia had 125,000 coal miners. Last year there were only 68,000 men in mines."

Sheriff T. H. McGovran, of Kanawha County (Charleston) said the number of men arrested for nonsupport had risen steadily during the last 14 months of deepening unemployment.

He suspected that in come cases the man was driven by desperation to seek a jail sentence for nonsupport so that his wife could then apply to the State department of public assistance for benefits. "A man who can't support his wife can do it by going to jail," the sheriff explained.

---

## Old Dogs, New Tricks, New Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a recent article in the 65 magazines entitled "Old Dogs, New Tricks, New Lives," written by Dr. Joseph W. Still, which gives facts disproving many popularly-held ideas on the abilities of our senior citizens.

As director of the Bucks County (Pa.) Health Department, Dr. Still has conducted a constructively critical examination of American education and science which proposes a number of bold new solutions to many problems of the elderly. Our country has need for the services of these older people—to let their skill and experience go unused is a tragic waste of manpower which our economy can ill afford.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD DOGS, NEW TRICKS, NEW LIVES

(By Joseph W. Still, M.D.)

Old adages, like old soldiers, never die. But unlike old soldiers, some of them never quite fade away, even when disproved time and again.

One such adage—"You can't teach old dogs new tricks"—is still with us and doing plenty of mischief, too, for it's being applied to those of us past 40. It discourages millions of men and women from trying or being permitted to try to learn the very tricks they must learn to avoid spending the second half of their lives in boobish boredom.

Why do we accept this innocuous sounding cliche so meekly? One reason is that until recently the number of older people wasn't great enough to make an aging problem. Also, until recently most old people were able to live in rural or suburban areas where they found more to occupy their time than many of today's old people are able to do. Consequently, no one thought much about the validity of the adage. It didn't matter to most people whether it was right or not—for not many people were affected by it.

But when an adage adversely influences employment policies affecting millions over 40, and when it discourages them from learning those things needed to make their later years interesting and happy ones, then it is not just a harmless notion.

Another reason we have accepted this cliche is the common belief that aging sets in at some specific age—most people would probably say about 35 or 40. This view divides our lives into two neat packages—childhood and youth, followed by adulthood and old age.

No one can deny that some important physical changes take place between 35 and 45. Most of us slow down somewhat and gray hairs begin to appear, or on some heads, hair begins to disappear. But many physical changes have been taking place since birth, and continue to occur at all ages throughout life. These physiological facts would hardly be worth discussing, if it were not for the fact that this oversimplified idea about physical aging is being carried over into the psychology realm. Its most subtle presentation is in the form of the "Old dog * * *" adage, so basically fatalistic and pessimistic. This basic attitude focuses all attention on our disabilities and implies that our lives are really complete at about age 35 or 40 and that the remainder is only a sort of grim and stubborn wait for death.

Our bodies and minds are in a continuous state of dynamic change, chemical, physical and psychological throughout life. Consequently, we reach many peaks in our lives. No one age is perfect or ideal as opposed to all others. How then can the different periods of life be compared, for they are too different to warrant close comparison?

As babies, we excel in our capacity to eat, sleep, and grow. We are wonderful vegetables. Psychologically, we are busy forming basic emotional patterns.

In childhood, we reach several peaks as far as auditory, visual and other perceptions are concerned. That is, our full complement of nerves has been formed and organized and our nervous receptivity is at its peak. At this age, we are keen receptors. Intellectually, our attention span is short, and we learn best in frequent but small doses.

In adolescence and youth, we reach peak skills in those physical activities requiring maximum speed and short-term muscle activity, and in the mental ability to memorize abstract information (sense or nonsense).

Sports requiring the greatest stamina and endurance are often dominated by men in their thirties and early forties. This is true especially of marathon running and mountain climbing. In the mental realm, great feats of mathematical imagination have been performed by men in their thirties. In the years 15 to 35 or 40, our various types of physical skills reach peaks. The exact time of occurance of the several peaks varies in different individuals so there is considerable variation within the group. But there is clearly a group difference between the average peak for sprinters, as compared with the average peak for baseball players, for example.

In the forties and fifties, we excel in those activities requiring not only good physical power, but also brainpower * * * the ability to organize others, to lead them, to put in long hours of hard work on abstract problems, to make sound value judgments. These are the peak years for military leaders, engineers, and businessmen. They are action years, but action guided by brain. There is a fusion of brawn and brain, and brain begins to be the more important.

In the fifties and sixties, and beyond, many people begin to see more clearly the large patterns of life. They may describe them and be classed as artists. They may manipulate and try to change them and be classed as politicians. They may study them and be called scientists. In any case, they excel at seeing the large patterns only because they have lived long enough to have studied the whole pattern in more or less detail in many of its smaller areas. They understand quality as well as quantity. Brawn is unimportant in such work * * * brain power has, at this age, become dominant.

Are we going to say the child is growing old at age two because his cells are multiplying less rapidly than at one? Is the marathon champion of 35 or 40 old, because he can't beat the 20-year-old sprinter? Is the sprinter older than the marathon runner because he can't beat him in the marathon?

While, with increasing years, we gradually fall below our peak of physical skills, most of us are able, in the middle years, to maintain our competitive position, even in a total physical sense, by using our brains to spare our muscles. The old pros in sports give us wonderful examples of this. In the later years, good medical care and reasonable amounts of exercise can also do much to preserve our physical capacities at effective levels. Many men are able to do long hours of hard work in their fifties, sixties, and even in their seventies.

As our physical skills change from an emphasis on speed toward greater endurance, our mental capabilities are also changing. If we exercise our intellectual skills they also tend to grow in the direction of toughness to endurance as do physical skills when they are utilized. And we can continue to grow mentally long after physical strength has declined appreciably. Intellectual skills can grow indefinitely * * * so long as severe brain damage does not occur. If a Sophocles, a Victor Hugo, or a Michaelangelo can produce great works of art in their seventies and eighties, then it cannot be argued that age, per se, prevents valuable creative mental activity. The real problem we should be studying is not why we do not have more Michaelangelos at 70, but rather why we do not produce more creative people in the middle years of life. I suspect the reasons will not be found in our genes, but rather in our social attitudes which are discouraging most people from making the necessary effort to develop their mental capacities.

Whether dogs or people learn tricks is a question of motivation. If a dog or a man can be motivated to want to learn, he can and will learn. There are many older people (Grandma Moses is one of the most prominent) who have learned some right clever tricks in all fields in their older years. Many more could and would do so if they were given a little help and encouragement.

In order to understand why some of those who are supposed to be helping our senior citizens are still accepting the "Old dog * * *" idea, we need to look into the business of intelligence testing. Because IQ scores fall with increasing age, it has been widely inferred that man reaches the peak of his intelligence between the ages of 25 and 29. This observation has been interpreted as scientific proof which supports the old adage. Some of the main flaws in this interpretation of these IQ findings are these:

IQ (and most similar) tests and scoring procedures are so constructed that they give maximum advantage to the quick-witted youngster of middle class, northern, white, American background. The slow, deliberate individual or the individual of somewhat unusual background is likely to get a low score. Southern children (Negro and white) get lower scores than northern children. Inadequately stimulated children everywhere get lower scores than those whose minds are stimulated. Edison, Einstein, and Darwin are said to have been rather dull strange children who were not very happy in school. Based on reports of their behavior, it seems quite certain they would not have gotten gifted IQ scores as children. If some of the policies for selecting and segregating the gifted now being so widely and confidently advocated by some educators were then in force, those three great men probably would have had many barriers placed in their intellectual paths. It has been clearly shown that the IQ scores of so-called feeble-minded children, as well as those of underloved children, increase significantly if the environment is properly changed. So the IQ score does not even measure inborn intelligence accurately, even in childhood, much less in adult life.

Another objection to the IQ tests for adults is this. The incentives to acquire the kind of information which dominates in the IQ type tests are strongest in youth. Then you learn such facts and information in order to get passing grades in school so you may later get along in life. It is then very important to learn the definitions of words, various mathematical procedures, historical dates, etc. It is not at all important that most of us retain much of that information, unless we plan a career of being on quiz shows. But the IQ tests penalize the older person when he doesn't remember data that he knows belong in books not in his head.

Finally, IQ type tests do not even attempt to measure the really subtle aspects of mature intelligence which have led to the really great works of art, science and philosophy, so many of which are produced not at age 25 to 29, but in the fifties, sixties, seventies and beyond.

Sweeping scientific and philosophical discoveries can be made and elaborated upon only by people who have lived long enough to collect sufficient data to develop sweeping generalized theories. Although it is said that Darwin had the germ of the evolutionary theory when he was a young man, it took him many more years of searching to amass and arrange and become confident of the evidence, and then to prepare and state his theory in the logical fashion which caused it to be accepted as scientifically proved.

In our other-directed society, most of us tend to act as the prevailing folklore says we should act. Since the folklore (backed by some IQ experts) says we get dumber and dumber as we grow older than age 29, many older people oblige and act the part. Psychologists should be constantly on the alert to protect people from the kinds of damaging misinterpretations I have mentioned. Though many psychologists have always been alert to the dangers inherent in these tests, others have not. Their use has now become so widespread that the abuses could damage a valuable research tool.

One of the most important things to do about the "aging problem" is to challenge and destroy this myth. We must stop saying and thinking "You can't teach old dogs new tricks". We must stop emphasizing the disabilities of people and thereby discouraging them. We must place the emphasis on encouragement of people at all ages to enter into intellectual life and to do the best they can with the abilities they have.

---

## Markle Foundation To Encourage Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senate soon will be debating appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, in the vital field of medical research. Federal support of medical research is strengthened by all private benefactions in this area. One of the outstanding programs in this respect is that of the Markle Foundation, with its financing of 25 outstanding medical students in the United States and Canada for 5 years each with a sum of $6,000 a year.

An informative and valuable article on the Markle scholarships, with particular emphasis on Dr. Donald E. Pickering, of the University of Oregon Medical School, was published in the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., of February 8, 1959. The article was written by Jessie Scott, special writer for the Oregonian. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article by Mrs. Scott, from the pages of the Oregonian, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTOR SHOWS WORKINGS OF ELECTRONIC ANALYZER

(By Jessie Scott)

Three Portland enthusiasts for the Markle Foundation met in the pediatrics department

of the University of Oregon Medical School, Harold S. Hirsch, president of White Stag, was newly back from working for the third time on a Markle Foundation selection committee. With him, to the session in Williamsburg, Va., had gone his wife, Elizabeth.

Oregon's one Markle scholar, Dr. Donald E. Pickering, professor of pediatrics, showed the two a piece of equipment he had helped design.

"Its nickname in the department," mentioned Dr. Pickering, "is the thinking machine."

Actually it is an electronic analyzer. A bit of human tissue, bone development and thyroid problems are under study at present—is taken over by the machine, which renders a report. The Hirsches viewed it with respect. Someone asked if Dr. Pickering was also an engineer.

"No, only a gadgeteer," quipped the doctor.

The $20 million Markle Foundation has, since 1948, shifted its emphasis from projects to men—men with special aptitudes as medical educators. Markle scholars—about 25 chosen annually from 65 qualified medical schools of the United States and Canada—get $6,000 a year for 5 years. This money goes to the medical schools where they will teach, to be used as salary, in research, or for equipment and assistants.

Dr. Pickering, University of California Medical School graduate, came to University of Oregon Medical School faculty as a Markle scholar in 1957 and has 3 more years to go. A previous Markle scholar, Dr. John E. Harris, after a tour of duty with the U.S. medical faculty, has joined the staff of the University of Minnesota Medical School.

It is in the selection of these Markle scholars—few but important, and selected largely on a basis of intangibles such as capacity for original thought, that the five committees of selection come in. They are laymen, not physicians, and are about equally divided between educators and businessmen, bankers, lawyers, and journalists.

HIRSCH REPEATS

Portland's first Markle selection committeeman was the late Henry L. Corbett, who served twice. Each committee, having ended its work, is dissolved. It is considered a compliment to be the layman's ability to judge a candidate's qualifications, when he is asked to serve a further time.

Hirsch, listed in the committee as a manufacturer, served his third time in late January. President Richard H. Sullivan, of Reed College, also a repeater as committeeman, served for the second time in January, but with a different group. Neither was on the committee which considered the candidacy of Dr. Pickering. Foundation officials arrange to have small groups of about a dozen candidates meet with selection committees from a different region and with no previous contacts.

Wives of committeemen are invited to attend these 3-day house-party style committee sessions strictly as silent partners, Mrs. Sullivan and Mrs. Hirsch were careful to point out.

The committees meet at such places as Montebello, Quebec; Williamsburg, Va.; or Colorado Springs, Colo.; and eat, talk, perhaps play bridge together while judgments are being made. Since all candidates are highly qualified or they would not be there, the choice is difficult.

## Political Situation in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a dispatch from Honolulu by Lawrence E. Davies, the western correspondent of the New York Times, which gives a forecast of the political situation in our shortly to be 50th State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1957]

HAWAII GIRDS FOR STATE ELECTION; BURNS MAY OPPOSE GOVERNOR QUINN

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

HONOLULU, March 15.—Hawaiian leaders tentatively bill Quinn versus BURNS as the main event of the first election of the 50th State.

This would pit the Territory's Gov. William F. Quinn, a Republican, against the Democratic Delegate to Congress, JOHN A. BURNS, 49, for the governorship.

But neither has announced his candidacy definitely. There are matters not only of personal choice and Territorial party committee preference, but also the national leadership of each major party to be considered.

Delegate BURNS is given much of the credit for building the Democratic Party of the islands into a winning combination that seized the legislature in 1954 after half a century of failures.

He is known to be inclined to run for the Senate. On the other hand, he is a strong party man and more than once has bowed to the wishes of the party leadership.

With some exceptions, the Democratic tacticians in Hawaii would like to see him in the Governor's office at Iolani Palace.

Governor Quinn indicated during the battle for statehood that he wanted to be the first elected Governor of the 50th State.

He has made no flat announcement, however. Moreover, there is speculation here over how the Eisenhower administration is going to respond.

The forthcoming political struggle here could be Alaska all over again. In the 49th State, Walter J. Hickel, Republican national committeeman, was insistent that Mike Stepovich, the Eisenhower appointee as Governor, should run for that office in the State election.

SEATON FAVORED SENATE

The Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, confident that Mr. Stepovich would be elected to one of the Senate seats, pressed for his candidacy for that post.

As things turned out, Mr. Stepovich was beaten for Senator by Dr. ERNEST GRUENING and the Democrats made a clean sweep of the five major posts in the first election for State offices last November.

Democrats of Hawaii are confident that Delegate BURNS can take the measure of Governor Quinn or any other candidate the Republicans may offer, either for Governor or Senator.

The question many ask is this: will the national administration leave the political maneuvering to the island Republican leadership or will it seek to dictate strategy from Washington?

BURNS WORD AWAITED

With a few exceptions potential Democratic candidates for major offices under the Hawaiian state constitution are deferring to Delegate BURNS. They want to know his plans before making their own.

One Republican, however, has vowed that he will seek the governorship whether Mr. Quinn does or not. He is Samuel Wilder King, 72, a former Delegate to Congress, a former Governor, and one of Hawaii's veteran workers for statehood.

He is convalescing from an operation performed last week.

Mr. King, who is part Hawaiian, was appointed Governor by President Eisenhower in 1953. This made him the first Governor of Hawaiian ancestry. There was considerable resentment over the manner he was displaced by Mr. Quinn in 1957.

DETAILS RECOUNTED

A friend tells the story:

"Sam got a telephone call from Washington at 11 o'clock one morning and was told his resignation was wanted. There was an element of cruelty in the maneuver and it has left a lot of resentment to this day.

On the Democratic side, should Delegate BURNS decide to seek a Senate seat, 76-year-old William H. Heen, another of the island's political warhorses, is mentioned for Governor.

He is vigorous despite his age. A Hawaiian-Chinese, he was appointed by President Wilson to the first circuit court here in 1917. He resigned after 2 years on the bench and served 32 years in the Territorial senate, 4 of them as senate president.

The party that captures the governorship will be in a highly strategic position in the island for years. The first Governor will appoint the heads of the 20 departments making up the executive branch of the government.

He will name a chief justice and four associate justices of the circuit court. Further, he will designate the makeup of various boards and commissions.

## Melba Philleo, Winner of the "I Speak for Democracy" Contest in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a couple of weeks ago, I had the privilege of addressing a most stimulating gathering, at which were assembled in Washington the winners of the "I Speak for Democracy" contest—boys and girls from the 49 States and the District of Columbia who had won local contests in their home States on this important subject.

The winner of the Alaska contest was Melba Philleo, of Fairbanks, Alaska.

It gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent that her contribution, "I Speak for Democracy," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Melba Philleo, Fairbanks, Alaska)

I speak for democracy? What is democracy? What does it mean to me?

Whenever I think of democracy, I think of a flag. The flag is that of the United States of America. A flag, as composed of threads—thousands of threads, and I think of each thread as representing a group within our society. Each group represents a way of life, and just as each thread is vital to the pattern of the flag, so each group of people and each individual within the group is important in our society. If one thread in the flag is pulled, the entire pattern becomes distorted, and it follows that the entire community feels the effect when one group of people, no matter how small, tries to harm or intimidate another group. Is it democratic to say that one person is inferior to another because of his religion, or because of his lack of formal religious ties?

I am sure that most individuals, if they considered carefully would not say that a Protestant is superior or inferior to a Jew or to a Catholic, but that is exactly what a small, selfish group of bigots are proposing when they bomb Jewish temples, or close schools to Negroes. America is a land of freedom. People who have deliberately closed their eyes to this sort of thing are as guilty of prejudice as are those who have participated actively in such violence. America, the land of the free; this is what we call our land.

But is it really the land of the free? Is it freedom to be kept out of school because of your color? Is it freedom to be forced, because of restrictive covenants, to live in a certain part of a city because you speak with an accent? Of course it isn't, but these are the things the Communists have used and are using to influence people of other countries.

These things that really do happen, that are on radios and in the newspapers, these are the things which make people in other countries wonder if America is really such a wonderful place in which to live. How can we expect people to believe us when we tell them the good things about America?

Even though we do have freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and a right to ballot secretly; even though these things are part of our Government, and the main part, these are surely not the things that are told people in different lands by enemies of the United States. In the preamble of the Constitution is says:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution, for the United States of America."

These were the ideals upon which the United States was founded. Do they still sum up the hopes and aspirations of its people? If they do, each individual must strive to see that these are the things that happen. Each one of us must make sure that the United States of America is, and stays, a democracy.

## Mrs. Lucile Sims, South Carolina Mother of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "1959 South Carolina Mother Is Mrs. Sims," published in the State in Columbia, S.C.

The article in the State of March 13, 1959, reports the news that Mrs. Lucile Howell Sims of Orangeburg, S.C., widow of Hugo S. Sims and the mother of three outstanding sons—Hugo S. Sims, Jr., Edward H. Sims and Henry Sims II—has been selected as South Carolina's Mother of the Year for 1959. This is a very high honor, and one which is well deserved by Mr. Sims. She is a lady of high intellect, dignity, and charm, and has established a record of great public service in religious, civic, and educational affairs in her community.

Mrs. Sims' late husband was one of South Carolina's most distinguished and outstanding attorneys and newspaper editors, who himself performed a great service for his community, State and Nation.

Her three sons, although still quite young, have been very successful. Hugh S. Sims, Jr., has served as a Member of Congress and is presently enjoying a successful practice of law with Henry Sims II, who recently completed his law studies at the University of South Carolina, where he served as president of the law federation. Edward Sims is an outstanding newspaper editor, author, and correspondent, and was recently selected by the South Carolina Jaycees as the Young Man of the Year. All three of these young men have outstanding military service records, Hugo, Jr., having been recommended in World War II for the Congressional Medal Honor.

I commend the State mother committee for their wisdom in selecting Mrs. Sims to represent South Carolina in the National Mother of the Year competition which will be held later in the year.

South Carolina is proud of the fact that in 1958 our State Mother of the Year, Mrs. David R. Coker, of Hartsville, was selected as the American Mother of the Year. We in South Carolina are hopeful that our State may again be honored by having our State mother selected American Mother of the Year. We feel we have a most worthy candidate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA MOTHER, 1959, IS MRS. SIMS

Mrs. Lucile Howell Sims, widow of Hugo S. Sims, of Orangeburg was yesterday named State Mother of the Year for South Carolina.

The mother of three outstanding sons, Mrs. Sims still carries on a host of activities requiring diverse talents. She has long been active in the religious, civic, and educational affairs of her native city. She also continues to write a column for the Orangeburg Times and Democrat.

Possessing boundless energy, a keen mind and a radiant personality, Mrs. Sims has taught for many years in the St. Paul Methodist Church Sunday School, has operated a private kindergarten for preschool children, taught school, served as a director of the American Red Cross, is a past president of the Orangeburg Garden Club, a past president of the Town Players of Orangeburg, has been the Society editor of the Orangeburg Times-Democrat, writes a column, and been active in aiding underprivileged.

The new State Mother of 1959 will be honored at special services at the church of her choice on Mother's Day. She will also receive a special plaque, and will be presented a State Mothers pin.

In addition, she automatically becomes the South Carolina nominee for national mother, and will be entitled to participate in a national conference of State mothers in New York City.

Mrs. Sims will succeed Mrs. David R. Coker of Hartsville as State Mother. Mrs. Coker was also named National Mother last year, and was sent to Europe carrying a message from American mothers to European mothers.

The four men in Mrs. Sims' life have all been eminently successful. Her husband was for many years city attorney for Orangeburg, and the editor of the Orangeburg newspaper.

Mr. Sims was killed in an automobile accident in 1951 while returning from Spartanburg where he had attended a meeting of the board of trustees of Wofford College. He was chairman of the board at the time. Mrs. Sims was badly injured in the accident, and did not fully recuperate for about a year.

Mr. Sims, in addition to his work as an editor and an attorney, was a past president of the Orangeburg Rotary Club, a trustee for the Orangeburg City Schools, and was well known for his speaking ability.

The other three men in the life of this outstanding South Carolina mother are Hugo S. Sims, Jr., Edward H. Sims, and Henry Sims II, born in 1921, 1923, and 1931, respectively.

Hugo, Jr., a graduate of Wofford, entered the service during World War II as a private and came out a much decorated captain.

As a paratrooper, Hugo jumped in Normandy and Holland and was in Bastogne during the siege of that town. He won the Distinguished Service Cross as the leader of the "Incredible Patrol" which went behind the German lines and brought back 33 German prisoners.

The story of the patrol was carried in Life magazine, and he also received medals from Holland, Belgium and France. After release from active duty, he studied law at the University of South Carolina, was elected to the State legislature while in law school, and subsequently became the youngest congressman in that body. He was 26 when elected Second District representative. He made the race for lieutenant governor of South Carolina last summer.

Edward H., the second son, was only recently named Jaycee Young Man of the Year for South Carolina, and his recently published book "American Aces" has gone into its second edition.

In 1947 Edward founded a Washington bureau for daily newspapers (the State uses the service) and also became Washington correspondent for Editor's Copy Syndicate, a national news and feature service started by his father in 1918. He is now editor of the syndicate, and writes a column and has been

on the air with a news analysis program since 1951.

In recent years he has traveled abroad extensively, and has written several articles on foreign and economic policy. He is also editor of the Orangeburg Times and Democrat.

Henry, the youngest son, only recently completed his law studies at the University of South Carolina, where he served as president of the University of South Carolina Law Federation. He is now a member of the Sims & Sims law firm, and an active worker in St. Andrew's Methodist Church.

He spent 2 years in the armed services as a paratroop lieutenant. He was stationed at Heilbronn, Germany, a part of this time.

Mrs. Sims was born in 1894 in Orangeburg, a daughter of the late Charles L. and Jessie Smoak Howell. Her father died when she was 13, and her mother died of cancer in 1914.

She was a sophomore at Winthrop when her mother became ill, and she had to leave school to be with her mother in Florida. Her mother died a few months later.

After teaching school for 2 years in Alabama, she returned to Orangeburg County and taught for a year at West Middle school. In the spring of that school year, she and Mr. Sims, who had just opened his law office and was beginning a weekly editorial syndicate for newspapers, were married.

Later other features were added to the syndicated offerings, four of which were written by Mrs. Sims—"Louisa's Letter," "Screen Stars," "Movie Reviews," and "Fashions." "Louisa's Letter" is still written by Mrs. Sims.

In addition to the columns, Mrs. Sims also served as society editor of the then weekly Orangeburg Sun.

Despite the demands of writing for the syndicate and editing the society page, Mrs. Sims managed to teach a Sunday school class and take part in community projects.

As the depression of the 1930's deepened, she opened a private kindergarten and taught in the school for 7 years.

When World War II came along, Mrs. Sims headed the Women's Civilian Defense unit at Orangeburg .

For the past decade Mrs. Sims has served as chairman of the board of the Orangeburg Day Nursery for underprivileged children, a charitable institution.

The nursery was started in an old store building but now, with three workers, is housed on city property. It is entirely supported by donations and cares for and feeds from 24 to 40 underprivileged children 5 days per week.

Mrs. Sims was instrumental in investigating conditions in the jails for children, and helped publicize a report of these conditions. As a result, a bill was passed establishing a juvenile court and authorizing a probation officer for children.

She has been active in Red Cross work, having served as a director and having completed a canteen course, first aid, and served as a gray lady in the hospital.

She has also served as chairman of the tuberculosis drive, and is a past president of the Orangeburg Winthrop Daughters.

Active in the Orangeburg Garden Club, she is a past State treasurer and a past State historian for the Garden Clubs of South Carolina. She has appeared on television with a program on roses sponsored by the Garden Club of South Carolina. She fills numerous speaking engagements, discussing roses, European travel, book reviews, and community needs.

She had the lead role in "Kind Lady," a Town Players production directed by Murray Bennett of Charleston in 1953, and has played numerous other roles. She is a past president of the organization.

In addition to her other activities, she now has eight grandchildren to help keep her occupied.

Regarding her church activities, her pastor has this to say of the new 1959 State mother:

"She has a deeply religious nature and has imparted spiritual principles to her family, and to others through her writings."

Selection of the State mother was made by the State mothers committee, composed of a number of outstanding South Carolinians and all previous State mothers.

Serving on the committee are Caroline McKissick Belser, chairman; Mrs. B. P. Davies, of Barnwell; Dr. A. C. Flora, of Columbia; Mrs. Archie Schiffley, of Orangeburg; Mrs. Taylor Stukes, of Manning; Mrs. R. D. Wright, of Newberry; Mrs. Solomon Blatt, of Barnwell; Mrs. Robert Coker, of Hartsville, and Mrs. Patrick C. Smith, of Columbia.

Those previously named State mothers include Mrs. J. D. Arthur, Union, 1942; Mrs. Frank Price, Florence, 1943; Mrs. Annie Hudgens Dunlap, Mountville, 1944; Mrs. A. E. Holler, Ridge Spring and Columbia, 1945.

Also, Mrs. Andrew J. Evans, Dillon, 1946; Mrs. John William Thurmond, Edgefield, 1947; Mrs. Constance Furman Herbert, Sumter, 1948; Mrs. Blanche Mobley Creech, Spartanburg, 1949; Mrs. E. P. Kennedy, Aiken, 1950.

Also, Mrs. Lee Muller, Blythewood, 1951; Mrs. John S. Baskin, Bishopville, 1952; Mrs. St. Clair P. Guess, Denmark, 1953; Mrs. Luther Edward Gatlin, Sr., Newberry, 1954; Mrs. Marion E. Carter, Elliott, 1956.

Also, Mrs. Dewitt Talmadge Latimer, West Columbia, 1956; Mrs. Rosalie Ciatt Rayle, Sumter, 1957, and Mrs. David R. Coker, Hartsville, 1958.

## Panama Canal Zone: Focus of Communist Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, among the outstanding characteristics of the Communist conspiracy are its worldwide operations so well illustrated by certain recent events on the Isthmus of Panama.

An enlightening article on Panama-United States relations by Edward Hunter was featured in the March 14, 1959, issue of National Review, the well-known journal of fact and opinion published in New York.

Mr. Hunter, an old China hand, and author of "Brainwashing in Red China" and "Black Book on Red China," is exceptionally well qualified to speak on his subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I quote the indicated article:

WE'RE ASKING FOR IT IN PANAMA

(By Edward Hunter)

Pigeons come home to roost. This is the plain logic behind much of the news from Latin America. Panama is a specific example. Organized student groups already have demonstrated for a 50–50 split on the Panama Canal tolls, ignoring U.S. expenditures; for a monopoly of canal jobs by Spanish-speaking peoples, which would squeeze out the Yankees; for the return of the canal through nationalization.

The political opposition to the present Panama regime has used students callously as a ferment, incited and guided from the shadows by Communists. The demagogs are hellbent for all the U.S. cash and spoils they see others gathering in Europe and Asia by irresponsible tactics. Why should Panamanians have to work for a living when they have this lucrative canal running through their country?

They see the "Colossus of the North" talking big but ultimately giving in whenever anyone creates trouble. The pattern is simply to raise the roof, then relax in return for concessions by Washington in return for agreeing to negotiate what before had not been considered subject to negotiation; and then to repeat the process as often as convenient. If America's enemies can get away with it, why not her friends?

This is the attitude behind cryptic items that have appeared spasmodically in some of our newspapers, such as a couple of paragraphs in the New York Herald Tribune not long ago, from AP wires, reading:

"The seizure of two batches of arms by the national guard has nipped a plot of students and opposition politicians for a nationwide uprising within a week, official sources said.

"The seizure of arms on Monday and yesterday resulted in 12 arrests, including 4 persons identified as students and 2 prominent in opposition groups. Three other arms caches involving students have been uncovered in the last 2 months."

A subsequent item told of eight bomb explosions in Panama City and of a "call by striking students for a general nationwide strike against President Ernesto de La Guardia's government." Schools were closed, but otherwise the strike fizzled out. There was no issue. Somebody behind the scenes had revived an old issue, created in a week of riots the preceding May when a number of persons, including a student, were killed and many more wounded.

Students, principally high school boys and girls, were seen during those riots, fanning out according to textbook rules for an insurrection. Molotov cocktails were exploded and many buildings badly damaged. Roadblocks cut off sections of the city; all business was suspended; shops were closed; Government offices were besieged; public services, including newspaper publication, were halted.

STUDENTS AS PAWNS

The students were not the prime movers in all this. They were being used. Student representatives protested later that they weren't the people who had started overturning autos on the streets. They declared, too, that politicians had tried to sell them arms. A dirty war was being waged, with children as pawns. This was not in the Latin character.

Witnesses generally agreed that a sprinkling of men in their thirties and forties had mingled with the children and had done most of the actual destruction and shooting. At a certain hour a big gang of hoodlums, brought in from outside, shoeless and raging for loot, were set loose on the capital. All this took planning.

Whose planning it was, behind the students and behind the politicians who would play any game for a chance at power, was shown when one demonstration nearly miscarried. On the afternoon of May 22, mothers and girl students were assembled and started marching toward the presidential palace along a route that would take hours, in a fevered city with snipers wildly shooting about. When they reached the National Bank corner, male students, responding to their true, inner character, spontaneously formed a cordon, linking hands, to march in front as protection. By then more than a thousand mothers and girls were in line. But this was obviously contrary to someone's intent. They had gone only a short distance when a notorious professional student, old enough to be the father of some of the boys, dashed out in front. He was

Cleto Manuel Sousa, a Communist organizer who had made his trek to Moscow for learning. He took charge, made a short speech, called for the singing of the national anthem, and instructed the men and boys to stand aside and let the women go on alone. Procedure having been restored according to clandestine Red planning, he left the scene.

It was all over very briefly; but it takes only a moment for a shade to be blown aside and disclose what lies behind. Professional students are a routine Red device. They are Soviet agents who persist in flunking courses in order to be able to remain in school and carry on Communist activity. This was the tactic used at Yenching University outside Peking, and was responsible for the entire last graduating class in that liberal American university, which didn't believe in interfering with student activities, going over to the Communists.

There are comparatively few Communists in Panama. Everyone agrees that the United States has many true friends there. But it takes only one individual in the right spot—one Hiss—to deflect an organization into a pro-Red line. Communism need never be mentioned. A few Reds, in contact with experienced agents of the Peking-Moscow axis in South America, stand ready to exploit a favorable situation when it arrives, and once more America won't know what has hit its international affairs.

This phase of Communist planning has been carried on patiently for years. It first came to my attention in March 1935 when I was covering a spy trial in Paris for International News Service. The 23 Reds involved were mostly from Eastern Europe, but included a young American couple from East Orange, N.J. They were Robert Gordon Switz, a commercial aviator and Princeton graduate, and his dainty wife, Marjorie Tilley, a Vassar graduate who turned out to be an expert on invisible photography. They turned state's evidence in return for their release. Most of the others got maximum prison terms, which, being only 5 years, couldn't have fazed them less. As I witnessed the trial from day to day, I couldn't help noticing the esprit de corps among them, the way they collaborated, their strange outside contacts, and their triumphantly exchanged raised-fist salute when they were taken from the dock to serve their terms, which they obviously regarded as a brief interlude in their professional activities.

What especially struck me, as an American, was Switz' casual remark to the court that his missions for the Red network included work in the Panama Canal Zone. I asked the judge about this. He said yes, Switz had referred to having spied for Moscow at the Panama Canal; but the matter was not investigated because it concerned America, and the French Government was interested only in what happened on its own soil. Paris had informed the U.S. Embassy, though, and I went over to inquire. The most personable, certainly the most informative man in the American Embassy was a lanky young consul named Bob Murphy, now Deputy Under Secretary of State. He assured me that the tip had been cabled to Washington, but what interest, if any, our Government had shown in it I could never learn. Those were united front days. I tried to trace the Switzes on their release, to ask them about it, but they disappeared.

What also struck me was the way this important news was slurred over in the American press. Time gave it only a couple of paragraphs, making it sound like a joke. Only later, when I joined the Newspaper Guild in New York and found myself in the thick of the fight that succeeded in ending its Red domination, did I learn how successfully the Communists had planted Red cells in our most conservative publications.

What was obvious, too, was that Panama Canal espionage was being directed from outside the United States by American citizens operating abroad. I got another insight into this while covering the Spanish civil war. Every American recruit who joined the International Brigade was at once relieved of his passport, which was never returned. The passports were immediately passed on to Red operatives. Unlimited access to American passports is a very important matter for the Communist world network. I told Murphy about this, too. He nodded. He knew. But what could he do? He was only a consul.

AMERICAN APATHY

There are few subjects in which the American public appears to show less interest—perhaps taking for granted that all is under perfect control—than the Panama Canal. An exception is DANIEL J. FLOOD, Congressman from Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania is far from Panama, but what Mr. FLOOD came upon during his routine work in congressional committees so alarmed him that he fortunately made it his personal crusade. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is more filed away than read, but anyone who took the time and trouble to look up the speeches and insertions contributed by FLOOD on this critical issue would have a book that might not be a best seller, but would surely be one of the most informative volumes we could have. An entire drawer in a big filing cabinet in his office is stuffed with material on the Panama Canal, and it bears out the premise that the Communist psychological warfare machine is by no means neglecting the Canal Zone.

In overseas Chinese communities everywhere, the utmost pressure is exerted by Peiping, through tactics such as the holding of relatives on the Chinese mainland as hostages, to enforce collaboration in Red objectives. We would be naive to believe that the same thing is not being attempted, and to an unknowable extent succeeding, among the large Chinese community in Panama. Every indication of free world—especially American—surrender to Red demands makes acquiescence in the scheme more probable.

Panamanian officials themselves, from the presidential palace down, taking their cue from Washington's so-called liberal ideological imperialism, are flirting with pro-Reds just in case of further surrender to communism. The Panamanian Government has done so officially in the U.N. In mid-September its foreign minister, in what the Panamanian press called a vibrant speech, reasserted Panama's claim to sovereignty in the zone, which has never been denied; but he left unstated the limitations of a specified, permanent nature set upon this sovereignty by treaty.

Washington seems content so long as the English-language press in Panama remains comparatively restrained. Meanwhile practically the whole Spanish-language press, which the population reads almost exclusively, has been beating the drum for the most extreme demands, including nationalization. This satisfies Moscow, for with a climate of opinion sufficiently doctored, and sufficient propaganda points granted—the latest is the demand that the Panamanian flag fly in the Canal Zone instead of the American—when the time is ripe the issue can be made very uncomfortable for the United States. Doubletalk in the United Nations would be sure to put us in the wrong; this has been the routine, with vehemence in lobby discussions where parliamentary trickery is hatched. And in Panama, high school boys conditioned to participate unthinkingly in demagogic demonstrations can be depended upon for any exploitation the Red interests may require.

That is, if we continue to present a spectacle of surrender made to appear as a concession after a threat, and of weakness in character and policy generally. So long as the evidence shows that foreign countries can take advantage of Kremlin pressure against the United States to obtain grants otherwise unthinkable, that kind of blackmail will continue. No concessions the United States can make will be satisfactory; there will always be new demands for more. When the 1955 agreement was made granting big financial and economic concessions to Panama, a friend of mine connected with that Government was unreservedly delighted. This treaty seemed to settle the issue for years to come. But the ink was hardly dry before voices from the shadows began impugning American motives and insisting on more. A Panamanian President was assassinated. The wheel turned back to where it had started, except that this time agitators became more reckless with the truth in framing their grievances. Why not? Under such circumstances they can hardly lose.

On our part, we consider it illiberal to tell the facts straight. The construction of the Suez Canal was child's play compared to that of the Panama Canal. Its historic background is utterly different. From the start, the Suez Canal was recognized as Egyptian, with a lease that was to end only a few years after Nasser seized the waterway. In Panama, we first had to create a country, which in return granted us canal rights in perpetuity. We had to make the land habitable, by almost miraculous measures of sanitation. Out of this experience a Panamanian character has developed, in some ways much akin to our own, just as determined on freedom as the Filipino. We can be proud, along with the Panamanians, of this development. Why should we, or they, treat it as if it were something to be ashamed of? Let the facts be known to every high-school student in Panama as in America, and they would make short shrift of the Red propaganda.

FIRM POLICY NEEDED

We should heed the warning of the self-avowed Marxist, Diogenes de la Rosa, the Panamanian President's economic adviser and confidant, Director of the National Economic Council. Panamanians, he said, are so unsympathetic to Americans that they might help the enemy in case of war. This could only mean the enemy of their own country as well as the United States, and clearly refers to the Soviet Union. In spite of everything we have done, he declared, "The Panamanians don't believe the United States keeps its promises to Panama." This indicates a dangerous failure in our public relations.

Mr. de la Roca's views echo what many in other Latin American countries are saying, especially our friends. What is needed in this situation is a policy understandable in its integrity to the simplest man anywhere in the world, conducted with the humility, firmness of principle and friendliness that have marked the American of past generations. We must come to believe in ourselves once more before we can expect others to regain trust in us.

---

## We Are Duped With Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the recent mandatory controls on oil imports of crude unfinished and finished oil products (which includes residual oil) by order of President Eisenhower is a severe blow to New England, its industries, its workers, and its people.

It is estimated that this will result in increased costs to New England of at least $100 million annually.

Throughout the past 6 years this administration has shown a disregard for the best interest of New England.

For example, within this past few months, in addition to this blow to New England, orders have been issued that will in the near future result in the virtual closing of the South Boston Naval Annex, and of the naval ammunition depot located in Hingham, Mass.

It is only a year ago that an important activity which meant so much to the businessmen of New England and particularly small businesses located at the Portsmouth Navy yard was closed and transferred to another section of the country.

As incidence of the resentment of the people of New England on the recent action taken by President Eisenhower, I enclose in my remarks an editorial "We are Duped With Security", appearing in the March 12, 1959, issue of the Boston Herald, a strong Republican newspaper.

WE ARE DUPED WITH SECURITY

In the deceptive name of national security, the administration in Washington has moved to put New England into a fuel hotspot. Again flagrant protection has been cunningly disguised as defense.

Here's how it goes:

New England uses large quantities of residual fuel oil in industry, in nonresidential heating and in the production of electricity. More than 55 percent is imported, mostly from Venezuela, which produces a crude suitable for topping out other products and leaving this heavy oil.

Domestic crudes are not so well suited, and the prices of other products are so much higher that refineries here operate more and more without any residual. In 1950 residual oil was 27 percent of domestic refinery production; today it is 12 to 14 percent and dropping.

Clearly New England is sharply dependent on imported residual fuel oil. Yet the Government has just announced that it will impose import quotas on residual as well as on crude oil, gasoline, and other products.

In deference to protests from this region, the administrator of the program said, disarmingly, that New England would be affected to only a small degree; that the quota on residual for the country east of the Rockies would be not a great deal less than present imports.

This is a trap. In any competitive field, it takes only a little less than enough to supply the demand to set the price soaring. In the winter of 1947–48 a shortage of only 1 percent sent fuel prices up in New England at the rate of at least $100 million annually.

In other words, the domestic oil producers, whose interest in exploration and development of new petroleum fields is supposed to be indispensable, are to get only a slight lift in demand for domestic residual, but to pay for that, New England is to be stuck with much higher prices.

Does that make sense? Or have the coal interests bilked the Government into contriving a better competitive position for coal in New England?

In this colder than normal winter, substantial additional amounts of heating oils came in to New England from Halifax, Puerto Rico, Venezuela, and California by boat, simply because our usual domestic sources could not meet the demand. But maybe New England is expendable and can be allowed to freeze for the good of security. Or made to pay plenty.

The security angle is the thin nest subterfuge in all this business. Canada is part of our continental defense, yet we slap quotas on her oil. Venezuela would be an ideal source for oil in case of war, yet she is quotaed, too.

The fleets of tankers and the docks and handling equipment were invaluable in the Suez crisis. Do we give them up in the name of a dubious security? Or is security only for Texans?

There should be no restrictions on residual oil imports. New England, too, has a right to security.

## Tribute to Jack Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Alaskans are extremely grateful to many people for their great assistance in helping us to secure statehood, and if I were to list those to whom Alaskans feel deeply indebted, I would occupy far more than the 3 minutes at my disposal. But particularly Alaskans feel grateful to delegate JACK BURNS for his statesmanlike attitude during the 85th Congress, in which he resisted all efforts, all political attacks, to push him into a position where he would insist that Hawaiian statehood be considered at the same time or immediately after Alaskan statehood.

We knew, as he did, from past experience that that move would be fatal to the success of both statehood bills. Had he acted otherwise we would not now be rejoicing at the admission of Hawaii as our 50th State.

"His Tactics Paid Off" is the title of an article published in this morning's New York Times about JACK BURNS, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1959]

JOHN ANTHONY BURNS—HIS TACTICS PAID OFF

HONOLULU, March 15.—Less than a year ago JOHN ANTHONY BURNS was regarded by many Hawaiians as little short of a traitor to his island constituency.

The Delegate to Congress, a Democrat, had advised having Hawaii step aside in its drive for statehood to give Alaska the honor of putting the 49th star on the flag. Republican leaders and some Democrats accused him of lying down on the job, of selling out. They bitterly refused to support his tactics, despite his confidence that Hawaii would be a State before the end of 1959 if Alaska were successful. He even promised that unless Hawaii won statehood at this session of Congress he would not run again.

Now the islanders have seen his tactical move pay off. Political leaders view him as a candidate to be feared by any Republican. And he is expected to be his party's candidate either for Governor or the U.S. Senate.

The Delegate will be 50 years old on March 30. He wears $125 gray suits and polka-dot ties and is an expert politician. Wearing pink carnation leis in a campaign he walks up to the voter and says politely: "My name is BURNS, may I shake your hand?"

The son of an Army regular, Mr. BURNS was born at Fort Assinneboine, Mont. His family brought him to Hawaii when he was 4. He attended the University of Hawaii but had to drop out because of the depression.

At college he worked as a messenger boy, a soda clerk, a newsboy, and a pineapple cannery hand. He also spent a couple of summers in Kansas wheatfields.

FIRST IN POLICE TEST

The depression years helped shape the BURNS philosophy and career. Finding jobs scarce here and on the mainland, he took a Honolulu police examination. He placed first. He started as a patrolman in April 1934, and was a captain when he left the department 11 years later.

Here he won the gratitude and the support of islanders of Japanese ancestry, of whom there are around 200,000. During the war he formed a contact group in the police department dedicated to restoring morale to the frightened Nisei and their parents.

Mr. BURNS' defense of the Japanese-Americans and his belief in a continuation of civil government in Hawaii were openly expressed.

He and his wife, the former Beatrice Van Fleet, have three children, John Jr., Mary, and James Seishiro Burns.

James' middle name—Japanese—is taken from a nurse who attended Mrs. Burns during a long convalescence from a poliomyelitis attack 20 years ago.

Mr. BURNS says he looks at all major issues in the light of "the morality that was instilled in me," and asserts:

"I do what I think is right regardless of the consequences."

## Panama Canal: United States Irritated Over Agitations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, a recent news story on the cumulating isthmian developments affecting the Panama Canal by Walter C. Hornaday, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, was published in the March 1, 1959, issue of that paper.

Statements in it attributed to Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania were made by him in an address on February 25, 1959. It is unfortunate that the State Department, in its extreme desire to placate demagogic and self-serving elements in other countries, quite uniformly pursues the path of least resistance well illustrated in the attitude ascribed to it in the indicated article.

Under leave to extend, I include as part of these remarks the indicated news story:

UNITED STATES IRRITATED BY EFFORTS OF PANAMA TO HIKE REVENUE

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

WASHINGTON.—The tiny Republic of Panama, lying across the narrow neck connecting North and South America, is becoming a soruce of increasing irritation to the United States.

Panamanian politicians seem to stay up late at night thinking up ways to annoy this country and extract tribute from the Panama Canal.

The latest action was a declaration by the Government of Panama that its boundaries extend out into the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans 12 miles, instead of the accepted 3 miles.

The effect of this extension has been to surround with Panama territory a belt 9 miles wide at the entrances to the canal through which ships must pass.

The State Department protested and asked Panama to reconsider, but the Panama National Assembly voted unanimously not to reconsider for any reason whatever.

There have been alarming statements made about the danger of this 12-mile zone to the canal. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said on the House floor last week that the encirclement made the United States-controlled Canal Zone across the isthmus another Berlin.

FLOOD asserted that Panama officials have stated that the country should demand half of the gross revenues of the canal. In asserting sovereignty 12 miles out, it was claimed that Panama could require vessels to display the Panama flag, exercise vigilance over shipping to maintain internal security, and generally harass foreign shipping.

The Congressman declared that the Panama Canal, through this country's diplomatic failures in dealing with Panama, has become the tiny Republic's milk cow. Panama is using the canal as an international relief agency, he said. FLOOD called for the United States to stop playing the part of "Uncle Sap."

FLOOD figured that Panama believes that the canal is a monopoly and that the United States and other shipping must use that route to go between the two oceans. He said investigations are now being made of another location to relieve traffic from the Panama passageway.

The Pennsylvania Congressman, called the watchdog of the canal by his colleagues, deplored the actions of some of Panama's heedless leaders and agitators. He said they seem more determined to follow the example of Egypt in the Suez crisis and Communists rather than the real interests of their country.

"All these radical and impossible demands in Panama can have but one result, that of helping to dig the grave of the Panamanian Republic," commented FLOOD. "Though radical elements may be planning murder, they are actually preparing for suicide."

FLOOD saw the hand of the Communists in the trouble over Panama. He believed the Communist movement in Latin America has been focused on the canal for the purpose of destroying amicable relations between this country and Panama. Complete liquidation of American controls over the canal is the Communist aim, he asserted.

The State Department doesn't take the situation in Panama as seriously as does FLOOD. Officials are annoyed but say they understand.

Heckling the United States is bread and meat for Panamanian politicians, the State Department figures. No politician can hope to get along unless he attacks the United States and tries to get all he can over the fact the Canal Zone and the canal are in their country. It was doubted in diplomatic circles that the agitation was Communist, only an expression of nationalism and self-interest.

"Panama is trying to exploit the canal," the Latin-American experts say. "The outbursts there are harmless, and we are not losing sleep over them."

The United States now gives Panama $1,900,000 a year of the canal tolls. Formerly the payment was $400,000. But Panama naturally wants much more, wants to squeeze out all the juice possible.

The United States has all rights of sovereignty in the Canal Zone, but is not actually a sovereign owner, the State Department said. As for extension of the seaward limit to 12 miles, the State Department didn't believe it would affect shipping. Officials pointed to a treaty with Panama and claimed the little republic can do nothing to obstruct access to the canal.

Panama is a creature of the United States. It was born under the sponsorship of the late President Theodore Roosevelt when it was decided to dig the Panama Canal.

The people of the area had long sought freedom from Colombia and had been successful at times and for a time, but couldn't shake entirely free.

When the last successful revolt occurred, Colombia started troops to quell the rebellion. Teddy Roosevelt ordered American battleships to prevent Colombian forces from entering, on the basis that it would cause trouble.

The United States was granted a zone across the Isthmus, dug the canal, fortified it and has been feeding off the Panamanian objection to presence of the canal and Americans ever since.

## Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association Radio Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of four radio broadcasts by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn., dated March 9, March 10, March 12, and March 13.

There being no objection, the texts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF MARCH 9, 1959

Even in a country as prosperous as the United States there are hungry people today. Even hungry enough to steal. You and I may question this, but it is true.

Where are the hungry people? One place is in the West Virginia coalfields. Technology and the use of new fuels such as oil and gas has hit the coal market hard. A lot of miners are out of work, and it is as difficult for them to find jobs as it is for farmers who leave the land go to the cities.

The tragic irony of the whole thing is that these hungry people exist while our warehouses are stuffed to the rafters.

With 5 million unemployed around the Nation the jobless miners are desperate. News reports say that crime, family desertion, distress, and near starvation are increasing in West Virginia. The sheriff of one coal county says that the miners are not stealing money "they are stealing food. Women with babies come crying to me because their husbands can't find work. One woman yesterday," the sheriff told newsmen, "said her family was starving."

Meanwhile, how about those warehouses full of wheat and corn and cotton and butter and powdered milk? Why doesn't the Government load up some Army trucks and roll them down to West Virginia?

Well, it seems that the legal machinery to do that doesn't exist. Organized charities and school lunch programs get surplus foods because they fit the legal pattern. But the miners haven't got the right kind of organization to qualify. The two West Virginia Senators are trying to do something about it—with special bills they've introduced into Congress. But so far, no food.

One of the big stumbling blocks is: Who's going to pay for processing and distributing the surpluses, for milling the wheat and hauling the flour? Maybe the taxpayers, if they knew the story, would be more than willing to pay. But for the services they might perform, the millers and truckers and wholesalers and storekeepers want money, and that's understandable.

It's also a mighty big item when you look at the figures. That's what Business Week magazine did in a recent issue and it came up with some interesting facts. For example, retail food prices, in the cost of living index, are only 2 percent below what they were a year ago. But at wholesale food prices are 5 percent lower. Some wholesale food prices, Business Week found, are as much as 15 percent lower. Yet the consumer pays about the same. This despite the fact that farm prices are nearly 20 percent lower than they were back in 1952.

So while food itself is inexpensive the cost of processing it and getting it to the table is going up all the time. Still, that doesn't seem to be a legitimate excuse for letting people go hungry—like the unemployed miners and their families in West Virginia—while our national warehouses are filled with farm products. Agriculture abundance is an American blessing and it shouldn't be denied to anyone for the sake of a few dollars.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF MARCH 10, 1959

Every farmer who borrows money—and what farmer doesn't—knows that it costs a pretty penny to use the other fellow's cash. And if every city man who borrows to buy a house will sit down and figure out what a 25-year mortgage cost him, he'll find that the interest charge is not much less than the original cost of the house.

That may strike some people as fantastic but farmers know from experience that it's true. And interest rates affect each and every one of us. They are high now and going higher because that's the policy of the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, bankers for the Nation.

And every time that the big bankers raise the interest rate, which is the rent on their money, they say it is to check inflation. But to a lot of people it looks like just another way of making more money.

In other words, it is hard to find any real proof—no matter how hard you look—that higher interest rates have ever halted inflation. Maybe it makes money harder to get and more expensive, but people and businesses still borrow and spend. Higher interest doesn't stop inflation. It just means more profit for the big bankers who rent out money and call the tune.

How much? It's coincidence, but the national debt is about as high now as it was in World War II days—some $280 billion. The yearly interest bill then was only $4.5 billion. It's $8 billion today. So you get an idea of how much more high interest costs people, and how much more the banks make. It adds to our bill for new schools and roads and houses. It adds to just about everything, in fact.

But it doesn't halt inflation even though the Federal Reserve Board said that was the reason for raising, last week, the rate charged commercial banks for borrowing Federal Reserve funds.

The Wall Street Journal, the business newspaper, says in its weekly review of fiscal matters that a battle is shaping up over the Federal Reserve's action. The Journal says that a good many businessmen are calling it "economic idiocy" and that it threatens to prevent business expansion. Others approve

the action as one calculated to avert the danger of inflation.

That's a greatly exaggerated belief, says the Wall Street paper. Interest costs "are a very small portion of business costs to start with," it explains, "and on top of that they are cut roughly in half because they are tax-deductible." So it pooh-poohs the idea that boosting the cost of borrowing money cuts back on inflation.

Then what is holding the cost-of-living in line? Actually, the biggest block to inflation so far has been farm prices. They've been carrying the big load.

That's a fact often overlooked by the high-powered economists who keep check on the business pulse of the Nation. And it is almost totally ignored by the top echelon in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. But the Bureau of Labor Statistics says, "The only reason the cost of living is stable is that farm prices are lower."

At least the farmers should be given full credit for the big contribution they are making. That won't buy tires and tractor gas but it might smooth the road a little until farm prices can be made better in Washington.

---

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF MARCH 12, 1959

Are farmers getting 82 percent of parity or are they getting 79 percent of parity? There seems to be some confusion on the point, and the reason for the confusion is that Secretary of Agriculture Benson's office has juggled so many farm statistics that nobody knows what's what.

The official Government price report, that measured farm prices as of February 15, says farmers are getting 82 percent of parity. But on the other hand here's a news release from the office of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, and he says that farm prices are at 79 percent of parity.

PROXMIRE explains that "farm prices have dropped to the lowest purchasing power in 18 years although a statistical revision put into effect on January 1 by the Department of Agriculture made it appear that farm prices went up instead."

So right there Senator PROXMIRE pinpoints another step in the statistical juggling that has characterized Secretary Benson's efforts to lower farm prices. It would take a crew of certified public accountants and several months of work to fully analyze how Benson, with his crew of nearly 100,000 USDA employees, has juggled the parity formula. But juggle it he has and the net result has been another drop, this time about 3 percent, in the parity value of farm products. That took effect on January 1—quietly and with no fanfare—so that few people realized that farm prices were being made lower again in Washington.

But farmers have organization offices in Washington and a good many Congressmen keep a close watch on USDA activities. The new gimmick didn't slip by.

Testimony at Senate Agriculture Committee hearings in February brought out the fact that the parity ratio for January dropped to only 79 which is the lowest since August 1940, measured on the statistical standard that was in use before the latest juggling of the figures.

It's a real fooler as far as the general public is concerned. It's like the statistical trickery that's being used to make 50 or 60 percent of parity look like 90 percent. That's what is being done to corn, you know. The price support for 1959 is 90 percent, and that makes the headlines. But 90 percent of what? Why, 90 percent of the last 3 years' average free market price. On the true parity scale it's maybe 60 percent of parity. But in the headlines it's 90 percent.

And who knows but what we'll soon see another attack launched from USDA headquarters in Washington against "90 percent price supports for corn." Remember how it started just that way 6 years ago?

This is the sort of thing, earlier this month, that led Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, to demand a full scale investigation of Secretary Benson's administration of farm programs and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. "Termites," he said, "never did a better inside job of destruction."

Well, perhaps an investigation would bring the whole mess out in the open for all to see and serve as a beginning toward a better and more sincere administration of Federal farm affairs.

But meanwhile, keep your co-ops growing. They are on your side all the way—GTA the co-op way.

---

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF MARCH 13, 1959

Down in Washington a group of farm State Senators are working to put together a farm bill that will actually help farmers. At the same time, they want it to be acceptable to Members of Congress who come from city districts. It takes votes to pass any bill, and farm-State Members are in the minority. So they've got to win votes from the Members who might be fearful that retail food prices would go up if farm prices went up.

And farmers will be the first to admit that their prices in the field have some effect on food prices in the grocery stores. Not much, but some.

So the question is, How much would it cost consumers if farmers got a break and regained a little of the price ground they've lost since 1952—say, a 10-percent increase in farm prices? The economists tell us that would boost net farm income by 50 percent. How much would it cost consumers at the grocery stores? Four percent more, the economists say. Four percent more, to take the squeeze off farmers. It's amazing to realize that so little could help so many so much. But it's true.

Now, quite naturally, consumers don't want to pay more for food. They say, "How in the world can we pay more? Food prices have been going up right along.

And food prices have been going up. They are 19 points higher on the Government index than they were 10 years ago. But all consumer items lumped together are up 24 percentage points. That includes things like rent—up 38 points; medical care—up 47 points, and so forth. Consumer items made out of farm products are right down at the bottom of the list as far as inflation is concerned.

So food is one of the big bargains, and 4 percent wouldn't make enough difference to take it out of the bargain class.

On the floor of Congress, farm-State legislators hammer away at points like this, working to convince other legislators that a vote for fair farm prices is well worth the small cost to consumers.

And we think that if people everywhere understood this, they'd be writing to Washington demanding that agriculture be helped back on its economic feet. Maybe you saw the headlines in the newspapers last week to the effect that the 1957–58 recession was cushioned by the climb in farm income last year, small though the climb was.

You get an idea of how important farming is to city jobs and city paychecks when you look at the figures. Agriculture buys more petroleum than any other industry. It buys 6½ million tons of finished steel each year—enough rubber to put tires on 6 million autos; uses 50 million tons of chemicals annually; and more electric power than Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Baltimore, and Boston combined. That adds up to a lot of jobs in the cities. And there would be more if farmers were getting fair prices and decent incomes.

So right now might be a good time to drop a note to your Senators and Representatives in Washington, encouraging them in their battle for a better farm program. That's where farm prices are made, in Washington.

In the meanwhile, builds co-ops by buying and selling, GTA, the co-op way.

---

## Decision of the Supreme Court in the Brown Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Part of the Fabric," from the March 12, 1959, issue of the Richmond News Leader.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PART OF THE FABRIC

On Monday of this week, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the conviction of one Emanuel Brown on a charge of criminal contempt.

The facts of the case are not particularly important to the point we want to make here. Briefly, Brown was summoned before a grand jury in New York and questioned about violations by truckers of the Motor Carrier Act. The act contains a provision specifically granting immunity from prosecution to witnesses reluctant to answer questions. Brown nevertheless refused to answer the grand jury's inquiries. When he persisted in his refusal, a district judge sentenced him to 15 months' imprisonment for criminal contempt.

This is the paragraph in the Supreme Court's opinion that southerners, especially, will find of rather bitter interest:

"The statute which confers immunity upon a witness testifying in a grand jury investigation under part I (of the Motor Carrier Act) was enacted in 1893. For more than half a century it has been settled that this statute confers immunity from prosecution coextensive with the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, and that the witness may not therefore lawfully refuse to testify. (*Brown* v. *Walker* (161 U.S. 591 (1896)). The context in which the doctrine originated and the history of its reaffirmance through the years have been so recently reexamined by this Court * * * as to make it a needless exercise to retrace that ground here. Suffice it to repeat that *Brown* v. *Walker* has become part of our constitutional fabric. It is thus clearly too late in the day to question the constitutional sufficiency of the immunity provided under part I of the act."

May a remarkable parallel be drawn?

The Brown case decided upon Monday involved a constitutional question, whether a law, in this case a Federal law, contravened the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Another Brown case, *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, decided May 17, 1954, also involved a constitutional question, whether a law, in that case a State law requiring school segregation, contravened the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

In deciding the Brown contempt case on Monday, the Supreme Court looked back to a key decision of 1896.

In deciding the Brown segregation case in 1954, the Supreme Court also looked back to a key decision of 1896.

And what did the majority say on Monday about the respect to be accorded the precedent of 1896? Why, the Court said the 1896 decisions settled the point at issue. The Court called attention to the context in which the 1896 ruling had originated, and to the consistent reaffirmance of that ruling. The 1896 decision, said the Court, has now become part of our constitutional fabric.

But what did the Court say in 1954 of the 1896 decision as to segregated schools? "We cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the (14th) amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written. * * * Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* the finding (that segregation has a detrimental effect on colored children) is amply supported by modern authority. * * *"

What sort of constitutional fabric do our masters weave? Which decisions of 1896 shall one believe?

## Wide-Ranging Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to note that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has elected as its new president Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, of Boston, Mass. With his excellent experience in journalism and public affairs, Mr. Canham is well equipped to give the greater chamber of commerce an outstanding administration.

Mr. Canham is highly respected for his ability, his refreshingly progressive outlook, and for his nobility of character.

In congratulating Mr. Canham on his election and wishing him every success during his term of office, I also congratulate the members in electing him as the president of their organization.

In my remarks, I include an article "Wide-Ranging Editor—Erwin David Canham," appearing in the New York Times of March 14, 1959.

WIDE-RANGING EDITOR

(By Erwin Dain Canham)

"He is a sort of John Foster Dulles among editors," a colleague said of Erwin Dain Canham. "He is always traveling and making speeches. And he belongs to everything. I do not know when he gets time to do his editing." Mr. Canham has just taken on a new job as president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. But he still finds time to edit one of the Nation's best-edited newspapers, the sober, serious Christian Science Monitor. Along with that, he advises the Government on information work and on manpower problems, is a trustee of Simmons College and of Bates College, is an active Mason and Rotarian and is much in demand as a commencement speaker at colleges.

At the age of 55, Mr. Canham can boast of 47 years in newspaper work. He has said that when he was 8 years old he used to stand on a chair in front of an old-fashioned wall telephone and take down items for his father, who was agricultural editor of the Lewiston (Mo.) Sun and Journal.

DEVOTED TO PRINTER'S INK

At 14 he was a general reporter for that paper, when the shortage of manpower in World War I gave him his chance, and he has been with the Monitor for 34 of the paper's 51 years. He is said always to use the back door to the newspaper's $4 million plant in Boston so that he can walk through the pressroom and smell the ink.

His own spacious office has been compared to a quiet, comfortable living room with a big desk in it. It looks out on the Mother Church of the Christian Scientists, and in it, as elsewhere in the building, nobody smokes.

In keeping with his beliefs, Canham neither smokes nor drinks, but he is not looked upon as dull or goody-goody. Newspaper friends call him "Spike" and find that he has a quiet sense of humor under his serious exterior.

In January 1955, he was one of a group picked as mediators by four desperate convicts who were besieged in Massachusetts State Prison after an unsuccessful jailbreak. Holding five guards as hostages, they had threatened to kill them if anybody approached.

HEADED PRISON MEDIATORS

After 3 days they agreed to talk with a committee that they felt they could trust. It included two prison chaplains and the prison doctor, the associate editor of a religious paper, a member of the Governor's council, the president of the Boston Bar Association, and Mr. Canham as spokesman.

After two sessions of discussion the desperadoes were persuaded to lay down their weapons and release the hostages without any promise of concessions.

Mr. Canham, of medium height, has a strong, rather square face and wavy silver-gray hair. He dresses well and soberly and wears rimless glasses that give a touch of severity to his appearance.

Mr. Canham was born in Auburn, Maine, on February 13, 1904, and spent all his youth in that area. His parents were Methodists who joined the Christian Science Church when he was a small boy.

After graduating from Bates College in 1925, he worked for a year on the Monitor before going on to Oxford University as a Rhodes scholar, where he continued to write for the Monitor. At the age of 37 he became its managing editor and 4 years later its editor.

Two of his major interests outside the newspaper have been the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, helping to shape U.S. policy in the field of information and propaganda, and the Manpower Council. The Council, formed by President Eisenhower when he was president of Columbia University, studies how to make the best use of the Nation's manpower. Mr. Canham heads it.

He is married to the former Thelma Hart. They have two daughters.

## Merchants of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pageland Journal, Pageland, S.C., of March 5, 1959:

"If you don't come in this minute, I'll whale the daylights out of you." Such an admonition, addressed to a child, is stated in terms a child whose daylights have been belabored betimes will readily understand.

Later in life, one would hardly expect to be addressed in that manner. Regardless of size of state of physical readiness of the speaker, such a remark addressed to me would arouse a strong inclination to see just whose daylights would get whaled, even in the face of long odds against successful defense. Yet the American public is subjected to a monstrous and continuous dose of threatening, and is held largely under the heel of the tyranny of fear.

We must do something about education because the Russians are getting ahead of us, and if they get ahead we are sunk. We must take vitamin pills or our hair will drop out, our teeth turn green and large lavendar blotches will appear in the vicinity of the flattagus. You must contribute to this or that because the next one to need help might be you. You must come indoors now, Junior, or get your tanny fanned. It's all on the same level, I don't think people realize just what a low level.

It should occur to us that we have a much more compelling reason to improve our educational standards: to meet the changing demands; that vitamin pills have a purpose too; to improve our general health, lengthen our life-span, make us better people to live with, and do business with, and better parents for our children, and that we have a God-given obligation to love others as ourselves, and to care for others to the extent we are able, and not because we hope the poor suckers will help us when we're down. Just a few thoughts that lead up to the conclusion that I'm sick and tired of being threatened and bullied by merchants of fear. Old F.D.R. declared war on it, and whipped it in his day. Madison Avenue has recognized it as a handy device for huckstering everlasting linoleum and retirement homes on the fringes of Elysium. Join the Journal's Society for the Elimination of Scare-Merchants. Down with threats and prophecies of doom. Help stamp out the haunted look.

## Thoughts on French Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a special article, entitled, "Thoughts on French Foreign Policy," written by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of France, M. Maurice Couve de Murville, which appeared in the American Society Legion of Honor magazine, volume 30, No. 1, 1959. The article follows:

THOUGHTS ON FRENCH FOREIGN POLICY

(By Maurice Couve de Murville, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Republic of France)

In recent years France has suffered from internal difficulties, but there has been a marred continuity in the development of her foreign policy. In tracing the main lines of action, it is necessary to begin with a consideration of a number of constant factors.

France belongs to several distinct spheres of interest. Both geography and history establish her as part of Western Europe. By the standards of the humanistic civilization which she shares with other democracies, she is a part of the larger group which is known as the Atlantic world. On the continent of Africa she has interests and major responsibilities, both in the matter of foreign policy, and with the community defined by the new Constitution. And finally, in view of the special friendly relations she maintains with a number of countries that have felt her influence, and in view of all she contributes to the main channels of trade and cultural and technical exchanges. France is a power with worldwide interests.

In these various spheres, France participates actively in the leading organizations which have been created for the purpose of providing close cooperation among the member nations in each group. Examples of these are the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, SEATO, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Western European Union, the Common Market, and Euratom. With her long tradition of assuming international responsibilities, France, as a part of these organizations, follows a political course whose aim is to balance the two main concerns of safeguarding her own essential national interests and attaining the objectives common to all members of the various organizations. This is the case, for example, in matters which concern the functioning of the Atlantic alliance and the perspectives of European economic cooperation.

After nearly 10 years of existence the Atlantic alliance remains the framework within which expression is given to the determination of the free world to prevent and, should the need arise, to meet aggression. During the period of its history, NATO has given proof of its vitality, as well as of certain weaknesses. Development in technical matters, particularly in connection with atomic weapons of various types which can be integrated into the strategy of the alliance, has very considerably increased the inequality among the member countries, since some possess these weapons and others do not. That is why, in the absence of an agreement on general disarmament, France wishes to acquire the means which will permit her to make a full contribution to the alliance. In political matters, experience has also proved that, when an important question comes up outside the limited field covered by the treaty, the procedure of consultation in force does not rule out actions which may directly affect the security of each of the member countries. Those nations which have responsibilities of their own outside Europe must then concern themselves with meeting them in a manner in accordance with the interests of the entire alliance.

In the field of European economic cooperation, 1958 has been notable both for the coming into force of the Treaty of Rome and for the opening of negotiations within the OEEC to find a means of safeguarding the interests of the nonparticipating European countries. Certain difficulties have developed in this regard, which have not yet been entirely solved. These difficulties could have been foreseen since the problem is to reconcile the unwillingness of certain countries to accept the obligations and possible risks implicit in the Treaties of Rome with the importance of avoiding any creation in Western Europe of different zones.

This is a very brief outline of the problem that the six must solve together. France views it as a matter of priorities, believing that the first need is the maintenance of the integrity of the Treaty of Rome. Second, France wishes, for political reasons, to cooperate fully in the search for any formula that will weaken the effect of the Common Market on the economy of outside countries. The third point in French policy is the feeling that in any such negotiation, where the various needs seem at first sight contradictory, each question coming up for debate must be examined on its own individual merits and not in terms of abstract generalities.

Outside the framework of the various organizations mentioned above, the foreign policy of France has been well defined on the international problems which are of general concern: notably, the situation in the Middle East and the problems of disarmament and of security.

The situation in the Middle East seems at the moment to have become somewhat less critical, but it has not yet been stabilized. The essential principle to be followed, it would seem, is to allow the governments and peoples of this area freedom of choice as to their future course without any foreign intervention. However, to affirm this principle would be to risk the unattainable so long as agreements are lacking on the maintenance of the territorial status quo and on the noninterference, direct or indirect, by powers which are outside the area but which are, at the same time, interested in the development of the various countries which comprise it. France made every effort to make this principle prevail several months ago at the time of the events in Lebanon and Jordan, and remains convinced that one day in the future the problem will have to be squarely faced if there is to be any lasting settlement in this region. It is evident, furthermore, that the peaceful development and the genuine independence of the countries of the Middle East are, to a great extent, linked to their economic expansion. But there again the initiative must come from the countries themselves, since foreign aid cannot, looked at from the long-term point of view, provide a real stability if it appears to be a disguised form of political interference.

As for disarmament and security, these are difficult problems whose technical factors cannot be isolated from the political context. In recent months the trend has been toward the search for limited agreements on certain specific points, such as the banning of nuclear tests and the prevention of surprise attacks. This approach has its merits in that it allows direct confrontation of views and gives us hope for the future, but it also has the serious disadvantage of dissociating the problems from each other and causing us to lose sight of the overall view.

The present diplomatic policies of the Soviet Union are aimed at the preservation of the European status quo and the nuclear status quo. Are such aims consonant with the development of genuine security for Europe and the world? France does not think so. But in spite of reservations, France, wishing to explore all possible methods for controlling preparations for future aggression, is participating actively in the technical conference at Geneva called to consider ways of preventing surprise attacks. She is not participating, however, in the projected political conference on the prevention of further nuclear tests, but her attitude on this matter is already very well known. The halting of such tests is not in itself a step toposite, unless other agreements simultaneously entered into provide for the cessation ward disarmament. It is, in fact, the op- of manufacturing and the reconversion of stockpiles, and unless such agreements are tied to a system of strict controls intended to carry out the successive stages in the arrangements. Without such an overall plan of action the nuclear powers will be free to continue the fabrication of the weapons of mass destruction they have already perfected and nothing will check the growing stockpiles in their arsenals. As a result, the imbalance between the means available for use by some powers and the risks common to all could only be accentuated and political ill feelings increased. Public opinion in various countries would confuse the silence on the proving grounds with security, and the true problems of disarmament would thus be lost sight of and nothing effective would have been even started.

France played a large part in drawing up the western plan of August 27, 1957, which reflected all these concerns. She remains loyal to the concept of the package deal proposed at that time, which not only dealt with all phases of nuclear disarmament, but also with what is known as conventional disarmament. France is keenly interested in a global agreement of that type, but so long as such an accord is not reached, she cannot give up her freedom of action.

These matters do not comprise a full picture of all the aspects of French foreign policy. It is nevertheless possible to draw certain general conclusions from them.

France, whose rising birth rate dates from the period directly after World War II, is now assured of a political stability which was for some time lacking. The modernization of her industrial equipment and the anticipated potentialities of the new sources of energy which are beginning to be developed represent, for France, major assets for the years to come. Thus, she is in a position to contribute more to the alliances and the organizations of which she is a member and, at the same time, the means at her disposal for assuming her international responsibilities become more clearly evident.

French policy is entirely directed towards the maintenance of peace. In the present international situation the pursuit of this objective is impeded by certain factors making for tension which must be realistically weighed if serious consequences are to be avoided. The rivalry of ideologies, the effect of modern methods of propaganda on the state of public opinion in the various countries, the assertion of genuine nationalisms, the legitimate ambition of underdeveloped countries to raise their standard of living rapidly—all these constitute so many forces which sometimes operate independently but more often have combined effects. With a situation as complex as that we face at the present time, patience and, above all, clear thinking are essential if a distinction between the fundamental and the ephemeral is to be made and if illusions are to be avoided. And that is why France, whether the matter at issue be of a local or general nature, feels a particular concern to promote, to the utmost of her ability, concrete solutions firmly based on a realistic appraisal of the facts.

---

## Toward a Court for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very thoughtful editorial from the Orlando, Fla., Sentinel of February 26, 1959:

TOWARD A COURT OF THE PEOPLE

The U.S. Supreme Court's friendly attitude toward subversives has been severely criticized by members of its own fraternity, the American Bar Association.

The American Bar Association's house of delegates has not only questioned the Court's rulings on accused Communists but has recommended legislation by Congress

to cure this dangerous situation by which fifth columnists are given more latitude than loyal Americans.

In the light of so clear an indictment of the Supreme Court by the men who help make, enforce, interpret, and uphold the Nation's laws—attorneys themselves—it is inconceivable that Congress will continue to allow the Court to run the country.

Concerned Americans have for several years questioned the Supreme Court's right to loose on the people known criminals because of technicalities; to order all schools to be integrated when the Constitution does not provide this; to forbid individual States to punish sedition against the United States.

The present Court has, in fact, refused to abide by the decisions of earlier Supreme Courts, has not recognized that States have the power to make certain laws for their own protection, and has undertaken by its interpretation of the Constitution to make laws rather than merely rule on their legality.

Congress has authority granted by the people to limit the Supreme Court's activities, to rewrite those laws whose intent has been perverted by the Court's interpretation.

But Congress has been hesitant. It may feel itself on firmer ground now that the august house of delegates of the American Bar Association has spoken.

The Nation prays that it does.

## A Question to McElroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include a penetrating editorial entitled "A Question to McElroy," appearing in the Boston Herald of March 7, 1959.

A QUESTION TO MCELROY

Defense Secretary McElroy on Friday left an extraordinary session of the National Security Council and presided at a press conference. There he said, among other things, that a surprise Russian attack on the United States was virtually impossible; that the complications of coordinating the various required preparations for such an attack would assure the United States of advance notice.

This is both sensational and disturbing. It is sensational because, if true, it means that the need for 24-hour alert by the Strategic Air Command is gone and our whole retaliatory setup is vastly simplified. We might conceivably be able to get in the first blow—if we were willing to make a tragically perilous moral decision.

It is disturbing because it suggests that the United States is relying in part on intelligence estimates that can be completely wrong, completely misinterpreted, or completely ineffective.

Mr. McElroy has access to material that we do not. He knows better than we do the reliability of U.S. intelligence sources on Russian preparations for attack. We cannot fairly say he is gambling the destiny of the United States on uncertain information. But it is not necessary to have Central Intelligence Agency reports to know that the risk is great.

The risk is involved in two ways: uncertainty about detecting Russian preparations and uncertainty about our response.

If the Soviet delivery of nuclear bombs is to be by bombers, we might get some advance notice when the planes were moved up to advance bases. It would, however, be an ambiguous warning.

The planes might be there for diplomatic reasons, as a device to scare us and nothing else—a show of force. During the Suez crisis, Soviet planes were moved to forward bases, but we did not press the SAC button.

To detect missile preparation is even harder. If we know all the missile bases; if we have reliable data that they are being readied for a countdown and if we have ways of knowing that the intent is attack and not testing or satellite launching, we might feel assured that this was it. Such a sequence of certainties is unlikely.

But having determined that this is it, what can and should be our response? What would we do with the advance notice?

Our retaliatory power is directed at the obliteration of Russian centers of population. We are not equipped to knock out Russian bases and sterilize the Russian capacity for strategic attack.

Could we bring ourselves to the greatest mass slaughter in history, with the accompanying massive fallout throughout the Northern Hemisphere for months thereafter, on anything less than absolute certainty of necessity for it?

Our intelligence is much better now than it was before Pearl Harbor. But it is not yet adequate to deal in anything but probabilities.

If Mr. McElroy is expressing a confidence in intelligence that justifies a reduced capability for a strategic attack, then there is need for a searching reconsideration of the adequacy of our military resources.

A few days' notice of Russian intent would be welcome. But if it gives us nothing more than a chance to grit our teeth in anticipation of doom, the value is slight.

## Caught in the Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress has rushed through a 4-year extension of the draft under the guise of national security, I hope that it will take seriously the suggestions of certain Members of the House, the Senate and the press who have maintained that a full review of our military manpower procurement policies be carried out either by Congress or an independent Commission appointed by Congress. A terse reminder of our responsibility appears in the Washington Post and Times Herald, March 14. Under leave to extend my remarks I introduce this editorial into the RECORD.

CAUGHT IN THE DRAFT

The speed with which the Senate passed the 4-year draft extension and obtained House concurrence is almost breathtaking. No doubt legislators were moved by the wish to make a gesture of strength in the Berlin crisis—although the effectiveness of the gesture will be diminished by the prospective administration reductions in military manpower strength. In present circumstances there appears to be no satisfactory substitute for an extension of conscription. At the same time, we regret that the Senate did not give more consideration to the proposal of Senators MORSE and FRANCIS CASE to set up a commission to study alternative methods for the future. There is an element of manifest unfairness in a system that has been taking fewer than 100,000 young men a year of the 1.2 million who come of military age; the remainder, except for those who enlist or volunteer for the 6-month training program, are untouched by military obligation. Now that the draft extension has been approved, is it not worth another try in both Houses of Congress to initiate a study of whether there are more equitable means of meeting military needs before another deadline?

## Hungarian Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 111th anniversary of Hungarian Freedom Day. By all that is morally and legally right the anniversary of March 15, 1848, should have been a day of great rejoicing. Instead, and because of the tyrants who rule the Kremlin, it was a day of sad contemplation.

We of the free world observed Hungarian Freedom Day solemnly, while those captive people behind the Iron Curtain looked upon it sadly and yet with great hope and yearning for eventual freedom and independence.

It was in 1848 under the leadership of the famed and great Louis Kossuth that the patriots of Hungary boldly bid for freedom after being tied to Austria for centuries. It brought freedom and national autonomy. There was great rejoicing as there was in many years following even though this nation of freedom-loving people experienced many hard and trying days.

Then in 1945, Hungary found its freedom crushed completely through occupation by war-minded Soviet Russia. Yet, the cruel yoke of the Communists could not crush the desires of the Hungarian people for a free and independent nation. It burned steadily in their hearts and in their minds. In the tragic fall of 1956 the Hungarian people again rebelled against foreign rule.

Once again they demanded freedom and independence and fought courageously for it. This time from the tyrants of the Kremlin. Unfortunately, the freedom day victory of 1848 was not repeated. Soviet tanks and artillery proved too much for these inspired and dedicated people.

However, it was a sad event that freedom-loving people of the world never should forget. The shocking end of the Hungarian uprising of 1956 cannot and must not be forgotten. Although physically and ruthlessly crushed by Russia's hideous disregard for the fundamental aspirations and rights of mankind, the patriots of Hungary gave enduring proof that their yearning for freedom remains unquenchable.

Today, as we commemorate an earlier era of Hungarian freedom, we honor all Hungarians for their gallant and tenacious longing for liberty and pray together that the day soon will come when the light of freedom and independence again will be burning brightly in their beloved land.

## National Coordination for Space Exploration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the February issue of the JAG Journal—published by the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy—contains an article explaining the National Aeronautic and Space Act of 1958. The article was written by Paul G. Dembling, Assistant General Counsel for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Prior to the establishment of NASA, Mr. Dembling was General Counsel for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and played a major role in drafting the bill establishing NASA. A member of the District of Columbia bar, he received his bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees from Rutgers University in New Jersey and his doctor of laws degree from the George Washington University Law School. It is a particular pleasure to ask permission to have the article printed in the Appendix because he is not only a native of New Jersey but was born and raised in my hometown of Rahway.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COORDINATION FOR SPACE EXPLORATION—THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

(By Paul G. Dembling,[1] Assistant General Counsel for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration)

The age of outer space has begun. It is just a matter of time until manned flights to the moon and planets will be made. The science fiction of space exploration will become as real as Jules Verne's famous submarine, the *Nautilus*. In the perspective of history, the enactment of the National Aeronautics and Space Act will probably be considered the most important legislative event of 1958. The Space Act signals a new field of lawmaking. With the enactment of this act, the United States is launched on a tremendous program of aeronautical and space activities in the interests of general welfare and security.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 creates a civilian agency with broad powers to plan and coordinate the efforts of this Nation in matters relating to aeronautical and space activities. The act establishes the basic national policy and the organization to implement this policy. Under this law, exploration of space is a Government program. In declaring the policy and purposes of the act, the Congress stated that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind and that the general welfare and security of the Nation require that adequate provision be made for aeronautical and space activities. These activities are made the responsibility of and are to be directed by a civilian agency, "except that activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States (including the research and development necessary to make effective provision for the defense of the United States) shall be the responsibility of, and shall be directed by the Department of Defense."

The purposes for which the aeronautical and space activities are to be conducted by the United States include (1) the expansion of human knowledge of phenomena in the atmosphere and space, (2) the development, operation, and improvement of aeronautical and space vehicles, (3) the determination of the peaceful and scientific benefits to be obtained from aeronautical and space activities, (4) the preservation of this Nation as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology, (5) cooperation with other nations in this work and in the peaceful application of the results, and (6) the most effective utilization of the scientific and engineering resources of the Nation.

### CIVILIAN OR MILITARY CONTROL

The question of whether programs or projects were civilian or military arose time and time again during the hearings before the House of Representatives and the Senate and during the debates on the bill on the floor of the two Houses. The Senate-House conference committee recognized that there was a gray area linking civilian and military interests, and unavoidable overlapping. They felt it was necessary to establish machinery at the highest level of Government to make determinations of responsibility and jurisdiction. The machinery created was the National Aeronautics and Space Council. The Council consists of the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and not more than four others, one of whom shall be from the executive branch of the Government, and the other three "from among individuals in private life who are eminent in science, engineering, technology, education, administration, or public affairs." The Council's functions are to advise the President with respect to the duties prescribed for the President, which are to (1) survey the policies, plans, programs, and accomplishments of all agencies of the United States engaged in aeronautical and space activities, (2) develop a comprehensive aeronautical and space program to be conducted by the executive branch, (3) designate and fix responsibility for the direction of major aeronautical and space activities, (4) determine which activities may be carried on concurrently, resolving differences among departments and agencies as to whether a particular project is an aeronautical or space activity.

A review of the hearings indicates emphasis on securing cooperation and coordination of aeronautical and space activities between the military departments and the new agency. For these purposes, the act provides for a Civilian-Military Liaison Committee headed by a chairman appointed by the President and composed of an equal number of representatives from both the military department and from NASA. The NASA and the Department of Defense, acting through the Liaison Commtitee, will advise and consult with each other on all matters within their jurisdictions having to do with aeronautical and space activities, keep each other fully and currently informed on these activities, and strive to reach agreement on differences which might arise in this area between the two agencies. If the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator fail to reach agreement on any difference, then either official may refer the matter to the President for final decision. The act also provides that the NASA Administrator and the Secretary of Defense may seek solutions to questions of jurisdiction either directly or through the Liaison Committee to hold to a minimum the questions referred to the President and the Space Council.

### NASA FUNCTIONS

The new civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration is created by section 202 of the act and is headed by an Administrator assisted by a Deputy Administrator. It assimilates into its organization the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the agency which, since its establishment by the Congress in 1915 has been the Nation's aeronautical research establishment. The act provides that NACA would cease to exist as of the date the Administrator of NASA announced that his organization was organized and ready to exercize its powers, but not later than 90 days after approval of the act.

The act provides that it shall be the function of NASA to plan, direct, and conduct aeronautical and space activities, to arrange for participation by the scientific community (both in the United States and abroad) in certain of such activities, and to provide wide dissemination of information concerning such activities.

In carrying out the functions assigned under the act, the Administration is given broad powers. These powers authorize NASA—

To appoint and fix the compensation of officers and employees needed to carry out its functions;

To acquire, use, and dispose of property and facilities;

To accept unconditional gifts of services or property;

To enter contracts, leases, and agreements, without regard to existing prohibitions against the advance payment of money in the absence of authorization by law. The act also provides that contracts shall be allocated in a manner to enable small business to participate equitably and proportionately in the work of NASA;

To use facilities and other resources of Federal and other agencies, and to offer similar cooperation to such agencies;

To appoint advisory committees;

To establish procedures for coordinating activities with related activities by other public and private organizations;

To employ experts and consultants;

To employ aliens when determined by the administrator to be necessary;

To employ retired commissioned officers of the Armed Forces;

To enter cooperative agreements by which members of the Armed Forces may be detailed for duty in NASA to the same extent as they might be assigned in the Department of Defense;

To settle and pay claims against the United States for injury or death resulting from activities of the Administration. NASA may settle and pay claims up to $5,000. Meritorious claims in excess of $5,000 must be reported, without any partial payment, to the Congress for its consideration;

[1] Mr. Paul G. Dembling is Assistant General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In 1958 when he was the General Counsel for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, he was one of the principal drafters of the bill establishing the NASA, as sent to Congress. Mr. Dembling received his A.B. and M.A. from Rutgers University and his J.D. from the George Washington University Law School. He is a member of the District of Columbia Bar.

To make security investigations of NASA employees, contractors, and employees of contractors;

To hold patents and supervise issuance of patents on inventions or discoveries;

To make monetary awards for scientific or technical contributions; and

To engage in a program of international cooperation for peaceful applications of the results of the work of NASA, subject to foreign policy guidance of the President and under agreements made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Thus, section 205 of the act provided a legislative basis for establishing a long-range and continuing program in the field of international cooperation.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

An important provision of the act is the one relating to the transfer of functions. For a period of 4 years, the President may transfer to NASA "any functions (including powers, duties, activities, facilities, and parts of functions) of any department or agency of the United States, or of any office or organizational entity thereof, which relate primarily to the functions, powers, and duties of the administration * * *." In connection with such transfer the President may also transfer records, property, civilian personnel, and funds. However, after December 31, 1958, any proposed transfer must be submitted to the Congress and would become effective after 60 calendar days unless rejected by the Congress by a concurrent resolution.

PROCUREMENT

Procurement is of major interest in this new field of space activity. During the hearings, witnesses testified that the contracting of the new agency would be vastly expanded over that which NACA conducted. Thus, NASA will occupy an important role in Government contracting. The procurement powers of the new agency are well established, since the NASA is included in the Armed Services Procurement Act. The application of this act to the new agency is accomplished by one short provision in the Space Act which adds NASA to the list of agencies whose contracting is subject to the Armed Services Procurement Act. By applying this act to the NASA, contracting may be accomplished by negotiation as well as by formal advertising under a variety of circumstances. However, the Armed Services Procurement Act establishes certain rules which are now applicable to NASA. This act (a) prohibits cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost contracting; (b) limits the use of cost, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee and incentive contracts; (c) limits the fee which NASA may allow in its cost-plus-a-fixed-fee research, developmental or experimental contracts to not more than 15 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, excluding the fee; and (d) requires that contracts include a warranty against contingent fees.

While the NASA was included in the Armed Services Procurement Act, the Space Act in section 203(b)(5) appears to grant the administration even broader powers. It is not clear whether it was the intent of the Congress to provide two avenues on which NASA could travel on its way to market. The act states in the section just cited that the Administration, in the performance of its functions, is authorized "to enter into and perform such contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in the conduct of its work and on such terms as it may deem appropriate. * * *" This provision standing alone would certainly have been a much broader contracting authority than exists in the Armed Services Procurement Act. However, with NASA being included in the Procurement Act and the above-cited section also providing contracting authorization, certain inconsistencies appear. In this connection, the Administrator of NASA has announced that the administration would follow the Armed Services Procurement Regulations in every practicable way.

PATENT PROVISIONS

One of the most significant provisions of the act is that relating to "Property Rights in Inventions." The original administration bills contained no provisions relating to patents, leaving the questions of securing rights in inventions to the discretion of the agency operating under the general principles of law and regulations adopted by each agency. There appears no discussion in the congressional hearings of the patent provisions as they were enacted into law. In fact, all of the testimony taken before both congressional committees related to bills not having any special patent clauses.

The administration bill was replaced in the House by a new bill H.R. 12575, which did contain provisions relating to patent rights.

Senate 3609, as amended and reported by the Senate's special committee contained patent provisions similar to those contained in H.R. 12575; these were eliminated from the bill on the Senate floor in order to permit further consideration of the problem in conference.

In conference, the committee rewrote and expanded the patent provisions. The bill containing these new provisions was passed by the Senate and House of Representatives without further discussion to become the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

The Space Act provides that inventions which are made in performance of work under NASA contracts shall become the exclusive property of the United States whenever the Administrator determines that (1) the person who made the invention was employed or assigned to perform research and development or exploratory work and the invention is related to such work or was within the scope of his employment duties, whether or not the invention was made during working hours or with a contribution of Government funds or facilities or the services of Government employees during working hours; or (2) the person who made the invention was not so employed or assigned but the invention is nevertheless related to the contract or to the work or duties he was employed or assigned to perform and was made during workhours or with Government contributions. The Administrator may waive title to any invention or class of inventions made by any person or class of persons in the performance of any work under any NASA contract if the Administrator determines that waiver would serve the interests of the United States and upon such terms and conditions which will protect the U.S. interests. While the Administrator may waive title, the Government must retain, under the provisions of the act an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferrable, royalty free license for the practice of such invention throughout the world by or on behalf of the United States or any foreign government pursuant to any treaty or agreement with the United States.

The act also provides that "No patent may be issued to any applicant other than the Administrator for any invention which appears to the Commissioner of Patents to have significant utility in the conduct of aeronautical and space activities. * * *" Procedurally, no patent shall be issued for such an invention unless the applicant furnishes the Commissioner within 30 days of his application a sworn statement setting forth the full facts concerning the circumstances under which such invention was made and stating the relationship—if any—of such invention to the performance of any work under any NASA contract. This statement is furnished to the Administrator who may, within 90 days, request that the patent be issued to him on behalf of the United States.

This provision has led some to hold that the act permits the Administrator to take ownership to any invention which has significant utility in the conduct of aeronautical and space activities. It appears to this writer that this subsection should be read in conjunction with the preceding subsections 305 (a) and (b). Thus read, the Administrator could take title only when there was a contractual relationship with the NASA. The conference report appears to support this interpretation since it discusses subsections 305 (c) and (d) as providing a means for determining "any controversy with respect to the validity of the Administrator's claim of title to any invention." If the Administrator requested title to be vested in the United States regardless of any contractual relationship to NASA, it is not clear from section 305 whether the Commissioner of Patents could do so.

The act also provides for notice to the applicant and a hearing before the Board of Patent Interferences and determination by the Board, subject to appeal to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. The Administrator may during a 5-year period challenge any applicant's statement as containing a false representation of material fact and request transfer of title to the patent to him. Such transfer will take place unless within 30 days after receipt of notice by the patent owner he requests a hearing before the Board of Patent Interferences.

The act authorizes the Administrator to license others under patents held by him on behalf of the United States and to protect inventions or discoveries owned by him, and to require contractors or persons retaining title under the act to protect such inventions to which the administration has or may acquire a license.

INVENTIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS BOARD

The act provides for the establishment of an Inventions and Contributions Board within the Administration whose functions are (1) to evaluate and recommend to the Administrator for a monetary award, if any, any scientific or technical contribution which may have "significant value in the conduct of aeronautical and space activities," without regard to the patentability of the contribution or its conception in the performancec of work under any NASA contract; and (2) to recommend to the Administrator action to be taken on proposals to waive title to inventions.

The Board is a very important factor in the granting of waivers of title to inventions, as discussed above. This is so because the act provides that each proposal for any waiver "shall be refefred to the Board." The Board must accord each interested party an opportunity for a hearing and must transmit to the Administrator its findings of fact with respect to such proposal and its recommendations for action taken.

Regarding the other function of the Board, each application made for a monetary award for a scientific or technical contribution must be referred to the Board. The Board must provide an opportunity for a hearing upon such application and must transmit to the Administrator its recommendation as to the terms of the award, if any, to be made to the applicant. The Administrator would make his determination on the basis of the record so made in the light of prescribed standards.

The Administrator is authorized to apportion the award made for any contribution among two or more contributors in proportions determined by him to be equitable. An award made for any contribution must be conditioned upon the waiver by the recipient of any claim which he might have to receive compensation for the use of such contribtuion. The legislative history of the act indicates that one of the objectives of the awards provision was to provide a basis

for payment to an inventor when title to his invention was not waived by NASA. No award exceeding $100,000 may be made until after a complete report regarding the proposed award has been made to the Congress and 30 days have expired after receipt of such a report by the Congress.

CONCLUSION

The establishment of a national program is necessary for reasons of national defense and to insure that in the long run outer space is effectively utilized for peaceful purposes. The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 provides the charter to carry out such a program.

## Joseph Alsop's Reply to Secretary Benson's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted in connection with the few remarks which I made in the House today, I am presenting herewith copy of a letter written by Mr. Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the March 14, 1959, issue of the Washington Post. It points up, I believe very clearly, why Secretary Benson has failed, and why he has been such a disappointment to those, who like Mr. Alsop, had great hopes for the man upon whom President Eisenhower put such great faith and dependence in to build a strong agricultural economy. It is a letter which every American should read:

MR. BENSON'S MESS

Secretary of Agriculture Benson's March 11 letter deserves and indeed demands a reply.

To begin with, there is Secretary Benson's strange disclaimer of responsibility for everything that has happened in the Agriculture Department during his term of office, on the ground that "a Benson program has never been allowed to go into effect" by Congress. This is pious twaddle.

The great majority of Secretary Benson's requests to Congress have in fact been granted, in whole or large part. What happened in 1954 when the Secretary was dealing with a Republican Congress is perhaps the best test. Benson then requested authority to flex parity payments from 90 percent down to 70 percent. As the President had made contrary promises during the 1952 campaign, the Congress voted a compromise. Flexing to 85 percent in the first year, and 75 percent in the second year was approved.

More recently, additional congressional action has permitted additional flexing. Thus parity payments today now average about 70 percent; and they therefore stand at the lowest level the Secretary originally told Congress he wanted. If the Benson program had been any good, in short, it would now be producing results.

The real truth about this matter of congressional dealings with Benson's program lies even deeper, however. As the Secretary himself very clearly admitted in an interview with John Osborne, published in Fortune in January of this year, Benson has never presented the Benson program he moans about in any clear, complete, and consistent manner. Mr. Osborne, who certainly cannot be charged with lack of sympathy for the Secretary, puts the matter most succinctly.

"Benson's claim that things would be in materially better shape today if Congress had followed his 1954 lead hardly stands up to scrutiny. He not only has never asked Congress for all he believes necessary; he has yet to apply his own doctrine to the full within the limits that Congress has allowed him."

There could be no clearer summary of Secretary Benson's failure. Very early on, Benson must have realized that his remedies were not working. Yet he has let the farm surpluses accumulate fantastically. He has permitted the total cost of the farm program to double and then triple, while prating about economy. He has tolerated the frustration of the only sensible aim of any farm program, the promotion of independent farming in this country. Meanwhile, he has offered no new remedy of his own except for the totally disastrous soil bank, which had soon to be abandoned. Barring the soil bank, his only prescription has been another dose of the same medicine that proved ineffective when he first prescribed it in 1954.

I myself was a strong supporter of Secretary Benson when he took office. Like many others, I supposed that he had the determination and the courage to remove the anomalies of the earlier Democratic farm programs. I am only ashamed that it took me so long to notice that Benson's long suit was pious talk rather than positive performance. His efforts to remove past anomalies and extravagances have in fact produced even greater present anomalies and extravagances. On this point, the really horrifying figures of increase of the Agriculture Department's expenditures under Benson speak for themselves in the loudest possible voice.

I have no doubt that the Secretary is a worthy, religious, and not uncourageous man. But the agricultural mess that he found was much less bad than the agricultural mess that he has made. The fact cannot be denied, so it had better be faced.

JOSEPH ALSOP.

WASHINGTON.

## Overhaul of Our Farm Policy Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am introducing for the RECORD my sentiments regarding a letter that appeared in the Washington Post on March 14, 1959. This letter was written by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop. He points out that the sincerity and religious conviction of Mr. Benson does not change the fact that he has been an inept Secretary of Agriculture who has created a farm surplus problem that is almost insurmountable. Mr. Alsop clearly implies that a complete overhaul of our farm policy is needed under the leadership of a new Secretary of Agriculture. I heartily concur with these remarks.

## The American's Creed: A Summary of the Fundamental Principles of American Political Faith as Set Forth in Its Greatest Documents, Its Worthiest Traditions, and by Its Greatest Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that "The American's Creed," selected from more than 3,000 statements submitted by Americans from every walk of life, should have been written by a man who at 13 years of age came to work as a page boy in the Capitol of the United States, and stayed on to serve the Members of the House in increasingly important capacities for 61 years. That man was William Tyler Page. At the time of his death in 1942 he was minority clerk of the House of Representatives.

The story of "The American's Creed," how it came to be our national creed, something of its doctrinal origins, and what Members of Congress have said about it, is fascinatingly told by Myrtle Cheney Murdock in her new book, "The American's Creed and William Tyler Page." The author is the wife of the Honorable John R. Murdock, for 16 years a Member of this body from the State of Arizona. Mrs. Murdock, educator, lecturer and writer, has been an official guide in the Capitol Building since her husband's retirement in 1952. Her knowledge of the Government of the United States, her love and appreciation for the Capitol Building and its history, have made her an invaluable friend of the Members of both House and Senate.

Mrs. Murdock was uniquely fitted to write about the American's Creed. She knew William Tyler Page personally, and had drawn from him the hitherto untold story of how the idea of summarizing our basic principles into a brief 100-word creed unfolded in his thinking. He told her of his pride at having worked in the Capitol Building for so many years. He told her he had set aside 1 day each year, Independence Day, to read and reread our great American documents. This systematic study of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, Washington's Farewell Address, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, the writings of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and other of our Founding Fathers, made him a profound student of the fundamental principles of American political faith as set forth in these documents.

The late Daniel A. Reed, our beloved colleague from the State of New York, came to Congress soon after "The American's Creed" was accepted in 1917. He sensed the true meaning of Mr. Page's effort when he said:

Crystallized within this patriotic creed is the very spirit of a free people. It breathes freedom in every word. This great document has entered the sacred archives of our Republic as a worthy companion of the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution.

At this point in the record, Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote "The American's Creed" as given to us by Mr. Page.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people, whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity, for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution, to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.

Mr. Speaker, our national patriotic organizations have been untiring in their efforts to keep "The American's Creed" alive. We in the Congress of the United States have an opportunity and a responsibility to see that the creed and the inspiring story of its conception is introduced into the schools and libraries of our respective States. Along with many of my colleagues, it has been my practice for some years to present parchment copies of the creed to each graduating student of the high schools in my district. Other Members may have utilized the creed in even more effective ways.

I was gratified to receive a gift copy of Mrs. Murdock's book, "The American's Creed and William Tyler Page," this past week. I am happy to know that she has presented a copy to every Member of the Congress. This and other books written by Mrs. Murdock are on sale in the House stationery room at discount prices to the Members. Her books about Washington are: "Your Uncle Sam in Washington," "Your Memorials in Washington," "Constantino Brumidi, Michelangelo of the United States Capitol," "National Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that many of my colleagues who may wish to speak about Mrs. Murdock's gift may be given 5 days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

---

## Matthew Fontaine Maury: Man of Genius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy has produced many illustrious leaders whose fame extended beyond the confines of the naval profession. Preeminent among such men was Matthew Fontaine Maury.

In view of recent navigational achievements of U.S. submarines in crossing the Arctic Ocean under the icecap, it is indeed timely that Shipmate, the well-known monthly magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, in its February 1959 issue, should feature an admirable article on the Navy's first great navigator by Ruby R. Duval.

Miss Duval is a native of Annapolis, Md., and was long connected with the U.S. Naval Academy as secretary to the head of the department of English, history, and government. She bears a name distinguished in the history of Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Florida, and Texas.

In order that the indicated article may have a wider circulation over the Nation at large and be permanently recorded in the records of the Congress, under leave to extend, I include its text.

MATTHEW FONTAINE MAURY—MAN OF GENIUS

(By Ruby R. Duval)

Why is it that the U.S. Government publishes monthly through the Navy Hydrographic Office in Washington, great pilot charts bearing at the top of each the notation "Founded upon the researches made in the early part of the 19th century by Matthew Fontaine Maury, while serving as a lieutenant in the United States Navy"? This is a recognition paid to no other naval officer and these charts perform a service, and have for over a century performed a service without parallel among government publication. Something that Maury thought and something that he did have plainly become the heritage of the ages and this heritage has grown rather than diminished with every passing year.

Born near Fredericksburg, Va., January 14, 1806, Matthew Fontaine Maury entered the U.S. Navy as a midshipman in 1825. His naval service commenced on board the frigate *Brandywine* at the time she was ordered to convey our national guest, General Lafayette, back to France and then to cruise in the Mediterranean. Two years later Maury joined the sloop-of-war *Vincennes* aboard which he was destined to circumnavigate the globe, and it was not until June 1830 that this vessel returned to the east coast of the United States.

It was during this long and useful cruise—an absence of 4 years—that young Maury arranged the material for his valuable work on navigation, "a volume of the greatest usefulness to the young man of our Navy and of the highest order of merit," wrote an officer of our Navy in 1841. "It is hardly possible for students on land to estimate accurately the merit of Maury's exertions in the preparation of this work, for the quiet and leisure so essential to deep study are seldom experienced on a man-of-war," continued the officer in his appraisal of this look on navigation published early in 1836. Almost immediately this publication displaced all rivals and remained for many years the authoritative textbook on the subject. And it is fitting to recall that when the Naval Academy was established at Annapolis in 1845—another reality of Maury's constant urging—one of the textbooks adopted for instruction given midshipmen was his "New Theorectical and Practical Treatise on Navigation."

In June 1836 Maury was commissioned a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy; in September of the following year he was appointed astronomer for the exploring expedition to the South Seas! and in 1839 he was selected as assistant to the hydrographer in carrying on the work of examining and surveying southern harbors with the view of establishing a navy yard in the South.

It was while returning from a month of leave to visit his family in the fall of 1839 that Matthew Fontaine Maury's leg was broken in a stagecoach accident, and he was relieved temporarily from active duty. During his enforced leisure he turned to the pen to expound the needs of the Navy and in a series of articles published in the Southern Literary Messenger under the nom de plume Harry Bluff, USN, he offered his "Scraps from the Lucky Bag."

"Every man-of-war, you know, has her lucky bag containing a little of everything, and something belonging to every body * * *" wrote Maury in 1840. "The bag which I am about to overhaul, has been open for 15 to 20 years. The facts collected about the Navy during that time—hints dropped by messmates—opinions, notions, etc. have been picked up and carefully preserved in this big. * * *

"The great interests which this arm of national defense was designed to guard and protect, demand that it should be placed upon a better footing; for it has not kept pace with the improvements of the age. * * * Nearly a half century gone by, Congress passed an act for the building of six small frigates; and without any settled policy or fixed principles as to a Navy, the Government upon the most simple and economical plan, organized a mere handful of officers for those ships. To correspond with a Navy upon so small a scale the ladder to promotion in it had but a few steps—lieutenant, commander, captain—and the officer stood on the topmost round. * * *

"Times have changed since then. The maintenance of a Navy is no longer a matter of doubtful expediency. * * * The very interests which point to the necessity of a Navy, and which brought it into existence, require for it a vigorous and healthy system. But many of its laws are wrong—many of the principles engrafted upon it, have, by the changes of time, become defective. Experience points out many amendments and improvements which should be made; and necessity calls loudly for reorganization."

Maury went on to cite colorful incidents in this country's naval history since Congress had authorized the building of the *Constellation*, the *Constitution*, the *United States*, etc., and again and again plainly pointed out the need for expansion to keep pace with the times. In reference to personnel, he alluded to the want of grades in the scale of promotion. He wrote in part: "We have a Navy respectable in force—sending its squadrons to different seas—boasting of the largest ships and the finest specimens of naval architecture in the world. True policy and self-respect require that that Navy and those squadrons should be commanded by officers similar in rank and equal in grade to the officers of other navies. * * * Their want of rank often places American officers in embarrassing situations."

On gala days and at parades; at public fetes and in official ceremonies, in presentations and court etiquette, and in the eyes of nations; honors, attention, respect, civilities, and privileges are paid to the English, or to the French, or to the Russian admiral, while the American captain may expect such courtesies in vain, wrote Maury. He went on to explain that an officer of rank to correspond with that of admiral in other services was essential to a complete organization of the Navy—the efficient management and discipline of a fleet—as that of major general was to a grand division of the Army.

Harry Bluff wrote at length and the arguments which he employed were forcible and convincing. He clearly revealed that the immediate and pressing demands of American commerce, the interest of American citizens, and the dignity and honor of the American Nation, all required that a larger naval force than was then (1840) maintained, should be kept in commission.

In another offering under the caption "Scraps from the Lucky Bag," Maury raised the question as to whether, for the true interests of the service, the officers should be adept and proficient in one particular branch of science that had a bearing on their profession—or whether each officer should understand something of all—a man of real solid parts, well grounded in mathematics and sufficiently indoctrinated in the elements and principles of the other branches of science to pursue in after life his favorite department of science, with advantage to himself and the service. Further, that the officer's attainments be such as to enable him to put into practice, whenever the exigencies of the service should require it of him, the principles of any other branch of science which may have formed a part of his studies on board the schoolship. Examples of occasions that he knew vividly emphasized his recommendation that the foundation of a school for the Navy officer should be on the most substantial basis—broad, solid and comprehensive—not too deep, lest the means defeat the end.

In July 1841, a contributor to the Southern Literary Messenger, identified as "A Brother Officer," wrote in part: "'Scraps from the Lucky Bag' have turned the attention of the whole Nation toward the Navy, and have won for their author an enviable and lasting reputation. * * * Facts were brought before the public, connected with the abuses of the Navy, which produced universal astonishment. His 'Scraps from the Lucky Bag' produced an enthusiasm throughout the whole extent of the country, which has not subsided and will not subside until the whole Navy is reorganized. These 'Scraps' will, in the end, save millions to the country and give an efficiency to the Navy that will be a guarantee to it of future renown."

Three months later an editorial note in this widely read magazine reveals the trend of that period in our history: "Our columns are open to the officers of the Navy; and we here again repeat our invitation to them to discuss the measures and means for putting the Navy on a proper footing. We have hoisted the flag of reform to the Navy and nailed it to the mast. Under it we mean to fight as long as there is 'Scrap in the Lucky Bag,' or as a sailor would say, 'a shot in the Locker.'"

For a long time nobody knew who the author of "Scraps From the Lucky Bag" was and the criticisms of the Navy, though severe, were so wisely constructive that naval officers welcomed them and set about embodying them in a new and better organization. Out of the reforms inaugurated there can be little doubt that the Naval Academy, founded at Annapolis in 1845, is the product of the suggestions made by Maury in his articles. At first, he had proposed merely a schoolship for the instruction of midshipmen but after his articles were so well received he let it be known that he would welcome the establishment of a naval school ashore, a parallel to the Army's Military Academy at West Point.

Matthew Fontaine Maury was sent to Washington in 1842 and placed in charge of the Depot of Charts and Instruments which some years later became officially known as the U.S. Naval Observatory and Hydrographical Office. He was destined to make this office or bureau the observed of all observatories, and he was to prove to all scientists and to the masters of vessels at sea that the ocean is as law abiding as the land. The method that he pursued was that of cooperation. He had blank forms—abstract logs, as he called them—prepared and sent out to all ships that would use them. These called for a sort of recorded diary of temperatures, air pressures, depths, winds, and currents over every surface of every sea that was traversed. The sea was having its biography written.

The effect on navigation was immediate and dramatic. From the thousands of logbooks returned to him, Maury studied, arranged, and charted the data; and he soon began to issue his "Wind and Current Charts and Sailing Directions," pointing out to mariners the natural paths of sea travel. He published also his "Physical Geography of the Sea," which was translated into many languages and included in the curriculum of numerous European schools.

Maury, as the representative of the United States, attended the International Meteorological Conference at Brussels in 1853. This was a memorable occasion not only for navigation but for sponsoring international good will and cooperation. It was the first League of Nations and at its close Maury's meteorological charts had been unanimously adopted and the greater part of the shipping of the world had come within the compass of his beneficent design. His research in oceanography led him to publish the first depth map of the North Atlantic and to point out the pathway for the laying of the first Atlantic telegraph cable in 1858.

There are always some people jealous of the achievements of others and it is a matter of record that a considerable number of Maury's fellow officers were resentful of his achievements and of the acclaim he was receiving from all over the world. In February 1855 an act of Congress was passed to promote the efficiency of the Navy, and a board of naval officers was directed by the President to make a careful examination of the personnel of the Navy and to report those found incapable of performing promptly and efficiently all their duty both ashore and afloat. The following September Maury was notified that his name had been placed on the reserved on leave of absence pay list. He was further advised that he was not detached from the Naval Observatory, but was to continue on his present duty. This action of the board was taken as a severe blow and he tried to ascertain from the Secretary of the Navy and from members of the board just what was the accusation in regard to his service to his country. Replies to his inquiries were evasive and the action of the board produced a very demoralizing effect on the naval service.

Meanwhile Maury's real friends and the press of the country had taken up his cause, but 2 years passed before justice was done. The President of the United States not only restored him to the active service list but also promoted him to the rank of commander, retroactive from September 14, 1855.

Maury was 55 years of age when in 1861 a tragic call sounded throughout the country—the War Between the States. All was changed and, like Robert E. Lee and other loyal Virginians, he resigned his commission in the Federal service and offered his sword to his beloved State. In the summer of 1861 he was appointed Chief of the Confederate States Naval Bureau of Coast, Harbor, and River Defense, and began to plan the construction of submarine mines to be placed in the rivers and harbors of the South. It was in a house still standing on Clay Street in Richmond that he invented the electric torpedo in 1861–62. Later he was sent on a diplomatic mission to England and he did not return to his native land until 1868. In that year he declined the directorship of the French Imperial Observatory and accepted the call to head the department of physics at the Virginia Military Institute at Lexington, preferring to give himself to the service of his impoverished State. There he could be in close proximity to his illustrious countryman, Robert E. Lee, then president of Washington College—later to be known as Washington and Lee University.

Now began still another contribution to Maury's fellow men. The thought of helping the farmers, especially the cotton planters, by the establishment of a more effective Weather Bureau in Washington, motivated him with enthusiasm that knew no bounds. He traveled and lectured in every section of the United States. European countries were soon sending him resolutions of thanks for the stimulation of agriculture that his far-flung addresses had inspired.

Maury's abundant energy finally overtaxed his strength. When he returned to his home from a lecture in St. Louis in the fall of 1872 he realized that his career was near its close. He must have realized also that victory had been won, that the task of interpreting nature in terms of help rather than of hindrance had been permanently advanced by his methods, and that his "Scraps from the Lucky Bag" had awakened and inspired the urgings which eventually resulted in the reorganization of the old Navy. Alfred Thayer Mahan, the historian, had found real food-for-thought in Maury's extensive writings, and an incentive to his (Mahan's) fond objective which was to establish the fact that maritime strength was a determining factor in the prosperity of nations. He was able, therefore, to reinforce his argument that the future interests of the United States required a departure from the old traditional policy of neglect of naval-military affairs.

During his long illness, Maury's resolute faith displayed itself and he became resigned to the inevitable. The end came quietly on February 1, 1873. "Do I drag my anchors?" he asked with a smile. "Yes," said his son Richard. "All is well," he replied.

---

## The International Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

THE INTERNATIONAL DILEMMA

(By Spruille Braden)

From a Yankee mother I inherit so enduring a pride in my New England ancestry, as always to make returning to Boston a happy homecoming. It is an especial honor to be invited by the Associated Industries of Massachusetts to address so distinguished an audience. I am deeply grateful.

Your officers have asked me to take a good hard look at the international situation. This is difficult because the international scene changes so rapidly and many of the actors are so shifty and evasive that the eye hardly can follow them. And the subject is so vast that tonight I can touch on only a few of the dilemmas confronting us.

Many of these are the result of history, of our past sins of both omission and commission—of our failures to catch and settle problems at their inception, when it could have been done readily, sensibly and permanently.

Too often we Americans get into trouble because we are guided mainly by sentimentality—by almost schoolgirl crushes—instead of by intelligence and experience. After all, the record shows that it has been weakness from within, and not an enemy's

power, which usually has caused nations and civilizations to fall.

Obviously, the international situation is grave. Therefore, like our forebears at Bunker Hill, we must act speedily, courageously and intelligently, with full knowledge of the facts, of our opponents, the so-called neutralists, and of our allies. Above all, we must know ourselves.

History shows that if a nation is to survive, realism and self-interest must be the dominating, almost the sole, considerations.

We must end the self-delusion that we are a uniquely practical and far-seeing people. In foreign affairs, we are no such thing. On the contrary, we are the most sentimental and naive Nation in the world.

Mistakenly, we are prone to attribute to others those virtues we like to think we have. Americans really are eager to do right. No other nation has rushed so generously as we to help stricken peoples all over the world.

This is fine, so long as it is done privately and voluntarily. It becomes disastrous if imposed on us by government for any length of time.

Our emotional enthusiasms have led to mistaken and fickle or vacillating policies which often make us look foolish, and have taken us into wars and other misfortunes.

In 1940, our sympathies were all with little Finland, who paid her debts and was being attacked by a large and cruel aggressor. Twelve months later, that Soviet aggressor had become our great and noble ally. Twice since my young manhood, the Germans have been portrayed as the arch villains of all time. Now they are our esteemed allies. Our history shows change after change from friendship to enmity, and back again.

One of our more harmful waverings has been with the neighboring 20 American Republics, who are natural allies, because their interests and political traditions are similar to ours, and they have the same need to defend this hemisphere as we. The State Department loved them dearly for a time and called them our "good neighbors." Then it forgot about them until its memory was jolted by what happened to Vice President NIXON. Now, in an attempt to win back their friendship, we propose to flood them with extensive grants and loans, which will injure both them and us.

Sentiment makes us fall for any high-sounding cliche: "Make the world safe for democracy." That took us into the First World War.

Many of us were thrilled by Wilson's dictum about "Open covenants openly arrived at." Yet, the only effective procedure is to have open covenants secretly arrived at by representatives of intelligence and complete integrity. The resulting agreements, of course, before final ratification, must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny by the American people, the press, and Congress.

In the musical comedy, "The Bells Are Ringing," Judy Holliday sings that she was taught, "Be they neighbor's keeper," and "mind your own business." Our sentimental propensity for trying to be our neighbor's keeper, even against his will, and for dispensing charity on an enforced government-to-government basis, instead of voluntarily as individuals, has increased our country's disposition for meddling in other people's affairs. This is not the way to make friends and favorably influence people.

Let us consider a concrete example: Our present predicament in the Near East stems largely from a sin of omission during the years following World War I. Justifiably stirred by pity and a desire to help millions of cruelly persecuted Jews, our motives were splendid; but we went about things the wrong way, when we first countenanced talk about the establishment of a Zionist state in Palestine, and, after World War II, helped set it up. If anyone is going to throw a million people out of their country and homes, and seize their properties, he must cast morality aside and ruthlessly exterminate and suppress them and all their brethren, as we did the North American Indians. Of course, we had neither the desire nor the ability to wipe out millions of Arabs. Now, it is too late to reverse matters without causing a major catastrophe. Thus, the establishment of Israel, as it was done, was bound to bring trouble. If our leaders had had the integrity to resist Zionist pressure in domestic politics, I doubt that there presently would be a fertile field for Soviet influence and the threat of war in the Middle East.

Pouring hundreds of millions of dollars under the Eisenhower doctrine into that area has not cleansed us of our sin in condoning and helping to rob Peter to pay Paul.

Probably the most inexcusable and disastrous of all our sins of omission occurred in Korea, when MacArthur and our other generals, who had victory within their grasp, were not permitted to win the war.

Historically speaking, dictators usually fall by assassination, revolution, or defeat in war; witness Caesar, Louis XVI, and Napoleon, or, in our time, Hitler and Mussolini. Thus the defeat of Mao Tse-tung and his hordes well might have wiped communism out of China and discredited it everywhere.

Pray God. Our policy from now on may be expressed in the words of Capt. John Parker to his Minute Men at Lexington, 183 years ago: "Stand your ground. Do not fire unless fired upon, but if they mean to have a war, let it begin here."

Another dilemma or diplomacy is that realistic decisions usually cannot be clean cut for good or bad, but must be taken between two or more unsatisfactory alternatives. Unless the diplomat has been wise or lucky enough to solve a problem at its birth, the best he may later hope for is to choose the lesser evil. In making these close decisions, it is perilous to be swayed by any sentiment, other than patriotism and simple morality.

In 1956, the Suez Canal incident seemed to present such a choice of the lesser evil. Nasser flagrantly breached Egypt's solemn commitments. Whereupon, the British, French, and Israelis, in violation of the U.N. Charter, resorted to force to protect their rights. All were guilty. But each did what every country (if not overwhelmed by superior strength, subverted by socialism, or weakened by sentimentalism), will and should do in a crisis; they acted to defend their national interests.

The choice for us seemed hard. Yet, both our national interest and basic morality lay on the side of enforcing respect for international agreements, the sanctity of a legal contract, and the protection of private property, and defeating Moscow's maneuvers in the area. Also, it would have been wiser to stick with our allies. By joining Khrushchev to side with Nasser, we lost another chance to clean up the Near Eastern situation.

I should add, parenthetically, that allies will remain together only so long as their interests are parallel or of such a nature as to make it worthwhile. Always, to count on allies when the chips go down is foolish sentimentality. The validity of George Washington's farewell advice remains unaltered by time, space, or science, because it rests on the facts of life and human nature. He counselled: " 'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world."

Everyone respects power, and nothing succeeds like success. If we will make the United States as strong as possible spiritually, economically, and militarily, other nations will feel that their best interests will be served by being on our team, and to this end, will make themselves strong. This is the best way to get responsible partners.

Among our other historical sins have been: our establishment of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R.; our not letting Stalin and Hitler kill each other off like the Kilkenny cats; our failing to take advantage of Stalin's death, and of Russian internal crises; and our not backing resistance forces behind the Iron Curtain.

But enough of the past. Instead, I shall list just a few of our present sins and sentimentalities which, since their inception, have grown into serious threats to our security. Fortunately, it still is not too late to wipe them out and so strengthen ourselves both at home and abroad.

Both Democratic and Republican administrations have made peace almost the sole objective for their foreign policies. Of course, we want peace. But I submit that honor and honesty, freedom and decency, self respect and respect of others, are infinitely more important.

There is no sense, at the summit or anywhere else, in talking about peace or coexistence with Communist governments. They may squabble a bit amongst themselves, but every one of them is dedicated to the annihilation of both our faith and our Nation.

They will stop at nothing to enslave and debauch mankind. Unless we act on these cold facts, they will bury us as Khrushchev prophesied. Either we destroy communism, or it will destroy us.

Let us cut out the sentimental farce of cultural, agricultural or scientific and other interchanges with Communist-controlled nations. They, and not we, will benefit. Also, by thus lending prestige to the Communists, we set a bad example, which others follow.

It is a mortal sin to tolerate Communists anywhere. But above all, it is a sin to tolerate them in our Government. Witness the statement by Lt. General Trudeau, the Army's Chief of Research and formerly of Intelligence, that the Soviet's rapid military advances reflected successful espionage within the United States, rather than scientific prowess within the U.S.S.R.

It is only a somewhat lesser sin to allow in critical government and civilian posts socialists, well-intentioned idealists, unidentifiable theys, and others who too often are ready dupes for the Communists. The career Foreign Service, as I have known it so intimately, by and large was a fine body of trained and competent diplomats. Unfortunately, the Service has been submerged by swarms—literally thousands—of outsiders brought into the State Department, the International Cooperation Administration (ICA), and other Government offices. Probably a majority of these are loyal citizens, but some just do not know the traditions and real meaning of the United States. A few of these, having risen to policy making or influencing posts, often speak for the State Department, and so can and do distort or ignore those basic precepts by which this Nation has been guided until recent years.

Another mortal sin is that following Lenin's plan, we are bankrupting the United States, making us easy prey for the Soviet and a Communist takeover. Khrushchev gloated that our grandchildren would live in a socialist America. My friends, already we have traveled far down that path toward ruin. No socialist or welfare state, with all its inherent weaknesses, can be defended against the ruthless power of communism.

Extravagance and inflation are bad enough at home, but since 1946, over one-fourth of our $285 billion national debt has been loaned or given away to foreign governments. Some of this may have been essential. But much of this approximately

$70 billion has been squandered in useless grants and dubious loans.

About $3 billion of our hard-earned tax money has been used to reduce the taxes and national debt of other countries.

We have helped communism, the anti-Christ, by giving billions to Tito and Gomulka, and encouraged and financed socialism elsewhere.

ICA personnel has grown from 571 employees in 1948 to 12,586 in 1957, plus 7,000 or 8,000 more engaged on this same work in defense or other Government agencies. In addition, Senator BYRD reports 212,423 foreign nationals working for U.S. military agencies abroad.

A congressional committee unanimously reported: "Loose, slipshod, and unbusinesslike spending of more than $250 million—a quarter of a billion dolalrs—in Iran" and added, "It is now impossible with any accuracy to tell what became of the funds."

On June 26, 1958, the House Committee on Government Operations criticized ICA because:

"The administration of major construction projects * * * had been inadequate, indifferent, and incompetent * * * as a consequence * * * cost to U.S. taxpayers has been increased and the dignity and prestige of the U.S. Government * * * has suffered. * * * There was virtually no supervision of engineering or construction contractors * * * which opens the door for collusion."

ICA personnel discussed their own future employment with contractors under their supervision. The Congressmen, amongst other transactions, report that:

"ICA permitted the construction contractor on the Cambodian road to purchase about $1 million of used equipment from himself. Approval of this unusual procedure was based on the contractor's assertions that similar new equipment was not available. As ICA could have determined, this was not the case.

"The contractor sold his used equipment to ICA at a price substantially higher than that at which he had been offering it—unsuccesfully—on the world market for 6 months previously."

Further shenanigans enabled the contractor to evade taxes on $500,000 profit from the sale. He also ignored ICA requirements to report commissions on the sale of his used equipment, paid to persons who had rendered no service to the Government.

Last January, this same Committee on Government Operations[1] officially asked, "How much of the $24 billion appropriated by the Congress for this (military aid) program has been wasted?" This is nearly $3 billion more than the assessed value of all of the real and personal property in the 6 New England States (please see table on page 9a) amounting to approximately $21.2 billion. It is twice the anticipated $12 billion Federal deficit for fiscal year 1959.

The Comptroller General also reports similar goings-on by ICA.

The fiscal 1958 Federal deficit of $2.8 billion could have been wiped out with $\frac{1}{2}$ billion left over, had we kept our direct foreign giveaway money for this year at home.

The 2,000 members of your own Associated Industries of Massachusetts, by sweat and sacrifice, intelligence and initiative, have accumulated a capital investment in plant, machinery and current assets of approximately $3,936 million. But this is chicken feed for the bureaucrats, who induced President Eisenhower to ask for almost exactly this amount for foreign aid this year, exclusive of at least $1$\frac{1}{2}$ billion for the farm disposal program abroad, $2$\frac{3}{4}$ billion for the World Bank and Monetary Fund, and $2 billion additional for the Export-Import Bank.

If your A.I.M. industrial payrolls of $2,737 million per year were devoted entirely to foreign aid, they would pay barely the annual carrying charges on the $70 billion given away overseas since 1946.

One would expect the recipients of our bounty to be enthusiastic about it, but listen to what just a few of the many statesmen and other leaders of this hemisphere have written to me:

"From a predominantly free enterprise and private economy, there will emerge, due to foreign aid, a system of public ownership, planning, and compulsory saving similar to that in Russia.

"I cannot resign myself to thinking that we must depend on foreign aid * * * it is demoralizing our youth and promoting laziness and corruption.

"As a Latin American, I am ashamed of the begging policy, coupled with aggressiveness and ingratitude.

"This aid is humiliating. Each country must resolve its own problems * * *. If it (needs) aid from the outside, it should start by creating such favorable conditions as to attract the aid from private sources.

"The cold indiscriminate aid given because your Congress authorizes it is a corrupting and impoverishing influence."

I entirely agree with a U.S. engineer who has operated successfully all over the world when he writes to me:

"We definitely are doing ourselves no good. The policy of Government personnel doing this work is playing the Kremlin's game. * * * Waste and inefficiency is the rule, rather than the exception. * * * It is definitely international socialism. Consciously or unconsciously, a majority of the personnel administrating the aid program abroad is antagonistic toward American private enterprise."

Since 1940, the forces laboring to get Uncle Sam to give away everything he has, have grown extraordinarily effective. Some of our World War II giveaway may have been essential, but others, as in Latin America, were silly and useless. Then came UNNRA; we put up the money, but Stalin and Tito got the thanks. After 1946, help had to be given on a so-called temporary basis to devastated Europe—yet we are still giving. Later, we said our aid was to defeat communism, although we had invited the Soviet to be a beneficiary of the Marshall plan. Now, the sentimentalism is advanced that morally we are obligated, as a matter of Christian charity, to help the underdeveloped nations industrialize and raise living standards at a speed, anyone with a speck of common sense, knows is unattainable.

Egging us on in this quixotic misadventure are the Communists, abetted by Socialist and do-gooders, plus thousands of bureaucrats, anxious to continue a luxurious living to which they fast are becoming accustomed.

From the start, proposals were advanced for the U.S. Government to finance equity investments and make increasingly soft loans. One official committee after another advocated these global giveaways. A rear guard action against these programs has been fought by U.S. investors, assisted by the still sound managements of the International (World) and Export-Import Banks. At least a show of businesslike procedures and protection of private property had been retained until lately.

Now, the defense is weakening. Inevitably, 12 years of government-to-government loans and grants have eroded the resistance and common sense of both the executive and Congress. Many private business leaders either are uninformed or subjected to the strongest kind of political and other pressures. Some accept each successive step as an alternative to something worse. Valuable contracts are offered by ICA as enticements to both employers and labor leaders.

The Development Loan Fund has been formed to make soft loans payable in local currencies, with which already we are surfeited. These loans are so dubious that no existing private or official institution would be allowed to make them. In addition, there are plans for similar funds in the Middle East and Latin America, to which we would be the main contributor, but without management control. Under Greshanis law, these bad credits will drive out the good, with dire consequences for both lender and borrowers. This is confirmed by the Fairless committee appointed by the President to study foreign aid. It said this type of loan was "undesirable and should be terminated."

From the outset, these Statists, Socialists, and Communists have tried to set up these programs in the United Nations under their control, but with Uncle Sam footing the bills. For a time, SUNFED (Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development) was blocked. But the victory was short-lived. The trend is toward U.N. control. President Eisenhower has suggested the organization of an International Development Association as a soft loan affiliate of the International

[1] This committee on June 26, 1958, exposed many other shocking conditions.

| State | Estimated 1956 population | Assessed value (In thousands) | | Total assessed value | Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Real estate | Personal property | | |
| Maine | 910,000 | (*) | (*) | (1,991,358) | 1955-56 |
| New Hampshire | 560,000 | 894,206 | 94,276 | 988,482 | 1956 |
| Vermont | 370,000 | 359,126 | 69,673 | 428,799 | 1956 |
| Massachusetts | 4,812,000 | 7,822,659 | 766,913 | 8,589,572 | 1956 |
| Connecticut | 2,232,000 | (*) | (*) | (6,640,514) | 1956 |
| Rhode Island | 828,000 | 1,712,188 | 887,064 | 2,599,252 | 1956 |
| Subtotal (4 States only) | | 10,788,179 | 1,817,926 | 12,606,105 | |

(*) No breakdown. Estimated breakdown based on averages for 4 States:

| | Estimated 1956 population | Assessed value (In thousands) | | Total assessed value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Real estate | Personal property | |
| Maine | | 1,704,602 | 286,756 | 1,991,358 |
| Connecticut | | 5,684,280 | 956,234 | 6,640,514 |
| Total | 9,712,000 | 18,177,061 | 3,060,916 | 21,237,977 |

Source: Moody's Municipal and Government Manual.

Bank and Secretary Dulles declared at the U.N. Assembly opening: "We propose that the nations dedicate the year 1959 to these purposes of economic development."

A continuation of our vast giveaways will be disastrous, but with the U.N. Communists and Socialists, neutralists, and supplicants for aid more and more directing the spending of your and my money, world ruin through inflation and bankruptcy will become inevitable. There will be no incentive for countries to put their houses in order and balance their budgets, stop inflation, and create favorable environments to attract private investment. Poverty, dissatisfaction and socialism will spread, while we in the United States will face ever bigger deficits and taxes and an ever smaller dollar.

This alarming and tragic outlook readily can be reversed by returning to the provenly successful methods of private enterprise, which have brought far greater and more widespread benefits to everyone concerned than governments ever could. I know firsthand what magnificent jobs have been done by the great mining and other companies throughout Latin America, including your own Boston-born United Fruit Co., which has performed miracles, converting uninhabitable jungles and swamps into valuable farmlands and raising the standard of living.

Those who beg for aid should remember how an undeveloped New England became a rich center of industry and finance. It was not by loans or grants from abroad, nor even because of its own natural resources. It was by courage and character, the initiative and moral qualities of its sturdy citizens. The great economist, Luigi Einaudi, former President of Italy, made this clear when he wrote:

"The heart of American wealth has not been in the rich Southern cotton regions, in the fruitful middle western plains, in the coal, iron, or oil regions. It lay in the New England States, in the inhospitable stony regions between New York and the Canadian border where the land yields little because of the profusion of rocks, where even the forest grows with difficulty, where there are no minerals of any kind, indeed where everything is lacking except the indomitable energy of man."

The only sensible thing, the Christian thing for us to do, is to give the indomitable energy of man a chance to work.

"Love thy neighbor as thyself implies that a rational love of self is the basic standard, measure, and gage which must guide us."[1] Charity does begin at home in our Christian-Judaic religions.

One should neither sin or bankrupt himself for the sake of his neighbor, however pressing the latter's needs may be. The head of the family's duty is not to engage in futile sentimentality but first to care for his own, however pitiful may be the appeals for charity or help from others.

In our times, the future of all civilization hangs upon the integrity and security, solvency, and prosperity of the United States. If, through the continued and growing abuses of foreign aid, we bleed to death, liberty, order, and peace, will be extinguished everywhere.

I pray that we start solving our problems at their beginnings and that soon we purge ourselves of the sins of both omission and commission and of the sentimentalities, so barren of real moral content, which now plague us. I pray that we quickly return to the honesty, realism, and high principles of the Founding Fathers, the courage of the minutemen, and respecting ourselves, demand and merit respect from all others. Truly, there is no other road to survival.

[1] The Priest, July 1958.

## The Role of the American Citizen in Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the role of the American citizen in the formulation of our foreign policy was clearly outlined in a recent address by a distinguished colleague, the Honorable LEONARD G. WOLF, of Iowa, to the delegates to the Midwest Democratic Conference in Milwaukee, Wis. Mr. WOLF's thought-provoking speech stimulated the conference delegates to a healthy discussion of the foreign policy issues confronting us today. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Congressman from Iowa:

It is a pleasure to be attending the Democratic Midwest Conference here in Milwaukee. As some of you know I was born and raised in Wisconsin. This meant that during my youth, I considered Milwaukee the hub of the universe. My feeling for this city carried over through my undergraduate days at the University of Wisconsin and now I admire Milwaukee and Wisconsin because it is the home of so many truly great liberal leaders in Congress.

I might say in passing that there are no districts in this country that are better represented in Congress than Milwaukee by HENRY REUSS and CLEM ZABLOCKI. There are no more dedicated and effective Members of Congress than Congressman REUSS, ZABLOCKI, JOHNSON, KASTENMEIER, and FLYNN. There is no better or harder working Senator than BILL PROXMIRE. He has become the conscience of the Senate just as not so long ago Bob La Follette fulfilled this role for his State and Nation. Yes, the Wisconsin Democratic delegation are legislators of whom we may all be proud. They are men of principle fighting for those liberal ideals which we hope and know will become the policy of the new Democratic administration in 1961.

Milwaukee is, of course, a fitting place to talk about the problems of foreign policy. Here, in such plants as Allis-Chalmers, machinery is built which is used around the world. Machinery which has aided the underprivileged of this world to build homes in place of hovels, roads in place of paths, and factories in place of sweatshops: machinery which has resulted in cultivation of crops in areas where there were no crops. The world has much to thank Milwaukee for, and everyone thanks Milwaukee except the old Boston Braves fans.

In the future as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Milwaukee will take on even added significance in its role as a world city similar in importance to Paris, New York, and Rome.

I am here today to talk about one of my favorite topics. And that is, how the average citizen in this country can participate in decision making in an era when it appears that the important decisions of public policy are vested more and more in the hands of a few. This is a tremendous problem and unless we as citizens of this country solve this problem, we will have, through laxness, indifference and irresponsibility, lost the most prized possession that a democracy can bestow on its citizenry—the right to be heard, to be listened to, and to affect the decisions of its Government.

We cannot allow a few men the right to decide the issue of peace or war,

We cannot allow a few men the right to decide the issue of atom bomb testing,

We cannot allow a few men the right to continue outmoded 19th century colonial policies toward the people of Asia and Africa.

In this past year we have gone from brink to brink on the international front. In June of 1958, American troops were sent to Lebanon. In October of last year Mao Tse Tung and Chiang Kai Shek had us trapped in a Chinese puzzle box called Quemoy and Matsu, a box which could have become the world's casket. Now we are involved in an even more difficult crisis—the Berlin question with all of its attendant problems, such as German reunification, the problem of NATO, and the arming of West Germany with nuclear weapons. Any one of these problems can lead to world war. And make no mistake about it, the present Berlin question, if handled carelessly, dogmatically, and without imagination or knowledge of what our objectives are in Europe, could very well involve us in a world war—a war which will not be limited if nuclear weapons are used. A war that could, if not destroy the human race, return humanity to precaveman days. The stakes are high. The issues are great.

No one can disassociate himself from politics. Every citizen in this country must commit himself to politics. That is why it is more important than ever that each and every citizen fight to make his opinion felt in the public arena. That is why rational discussion about public issues is more important than ever. That is why there must be a full scale debate on the floor of both Houses of Congress on issues such as the Berlin crisis and nuclear bomb tests.

But it is not only in those hallowed halls that there should be fuller discussion—and I am sad to report that there has not been fuller discussion—there should be fuller discussion in our universities, colleges, and churches. Let us for a moment take the Milwaukee area. Milwaukee is blessed with a number of great educational institutions, among them Marquette University and the University of Wisconsin. These universities should hold open debates on the great ideological and moral problems that nuclear science and communism have brought in our time. Thus, in this city could there be the beginning of the great dialog our beloved Adlai Stevenson talks about. These meetings must not be one-shot haphazard affairs; they must be part of a determined campaign by the Milwaukee Journal, the University of Wisconsin, Marquette University, the AFL–CIO, the chamber of commerce, and all church groups to work together jointly to create the atmosphere for debate and discussion. They must be wide-ranging discussions such as the role of the military in our foreign policy, nuclear testing, what should be our attitude toward Communist nations, the question of Red China. These are questions that should be talked about all over this country, not in television commercial terms but in terms of rational, serious comprehensive discussions. I assure you that your representatives in Washington follow all public discussions and public sentiments with interest. It is your job to create something that these men can listen to. Congress not only needs consent from the governed—it needs direction from the governed.

Finally, in considering the citizen's role in foreign policy, we should attract men—and encourage our most brilliant minds to speak out on issues of foreign policy. If possible, we should attract them into government. These men should be allowed to seek truth wherever they think they can find it. And, just as important, they should be allowed to speak the truth as they see it. If any of you have ever been in an organization, you will know how difficult this is to do.

We as citizens must destroy any ill-conceived notions or time-honored prejudices about the people in Asia and Africa.

We as citizens must think of them as fellow human beings who we must aid and accept just as we aid and accept our next door neighbor.

We as citizens must be tolerant of people in other lands.

We must give aid to all emerging nations in their struggle for freedom and material well-being, for if we do not, communism will conquer these areas without firing a single shot.

We as citizens should know that in complicated international situations one side has never had, nor I daresay ever will have, a complete monopoly of the right, and the other side a complete monopoly of the wrong.

We as citizens must encourage greater contacts between people on more than an official level. It is in this way that we will better be able to understand our neighbors.

We as citizens should train ourselves to keep our heads in time of crisis. For if we do not do this during this period of history we shall never have to worry about keeping our heads during any other future period.

The citizen must encourage and demand from his Congressman that he speak out on foreign policy issues.

In this most difficult of times the discouraging fact is that there is no leadership in foreign policy in the administration. This very fact puts a heavy burden on Congress. Because of this lack, you as citizens have the right to demand of your Congress that it take a more creative role in foreign policy. The public is bewildered. It has been stunned into apathy by this administration's futile foreign policy. Therefore, it is incumbent on the Congress to carry a good share of the responsibility for informing the public and offering constructive alternatives to an administration that is completely bewildered and confused. The average Congressman is reticent about speaking on foreign affairs; unless he knows that his constituency demand it of him. The Congressman in foreign affairs is as informed and aware as his constituency demands him to be.

And finally, the citizenry must keep vigilant and demand of its Government that insofar as is possible, and this means almost all the way, the Government take its people into its confidence about the matters of foreign policy. The people should never forget that government is a creature of the people and not the people a creature of the government. Because of this, upon every citizen in this country rests the responsibility of achieving the goal of peace, freedom, and justice. This is the price that a citizen must pay in a free nation. Thank God, that because we have a free Nation, we have the chance to pay such a price.

## Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce Observes Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Thursday, March 12, 1959:

The Greater Wilkes-Barre Junior Chamber of Commerce came of age last night when it observed its 21st birthday anniversary with fitting ceremonies. It was a milestone for the community as well as the organization, the city and its suburbs being the chief beneficiaries of the Jaycees' program.

Robert Eyerman, one of the founders of the junior chamber in 1938, had the distinction of being its first president. Two years later, he helped organize the Pennsylvania Junior Chamber of Commerce and became its first president also. Subsequently, like so many other Jaycee alumni, he was active in the parent organization, serving on its board of directors and important committees, thus continuing to serve the community as well. The current president of the senior chamber of commerce, Sam Wolfe, is a former Jaycee, as were two of his predecessors, Edmund Poggi and Toby Armstrong.

The junior chamber of commerce, now headed by William Strey, is open to men 21 to 35 years of age. To carry out its program effectively, it maintains its membership between 200 and 250. Because of "graduations" by reason of age, new blood is sought annually, adding to its effectiveness.

The Jaycees are primarily a working organization, although they mix a lot of fun with their activities. The fact that they put so much time, effort and talent into it explains why the record of achievement is so impressive. Projects like the Parade of Progress and the Orphans Shopping Tour just don't happen.

Wilkes-Barre and neighboring boroughs and townships are deeply indebted to the junior chamber of commerce for spearheading so many undertakings that have as their objective the betterment of the community. If it is in the public interest and they are not engaged otherwise, the Jaycees lend a helping hand.

The members themselves derive no financial rewards for their service, but are compensated in experience and contacts which make it very much worth their while.

On this occasion, it is a privilege to extend congratulations and best wishes on behalf of a grateful community.

## Statement on the Area Redevelopment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Herbert J. Bingham, executive secretary of the Tennessee Municipal League, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee to testify on H.R. 3505, the Area Redevelopment Act, on behalf of the American Municipal Association as well as the Tennessee Municipal League. Because in his testimony Mr. Bingham so cogently sets out some of the problems the municipalities face in attempting to assist in the economic development of their cities in the interest of their residents, I include Mr. Bingham's testimony in the Appendix of the RECORD. The statement follows:

TESTIMONY BEFORE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON H.R. 3505 BY HERBERT J. BINGHAM, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, TENNESSEE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE, NASHVILLE, TENN., ON BEHALF OF THE TENNESSEE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE AND THE AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

I am Herbert J. Bingham, executive secretary of the Tennessee Municipal League. I am testifying also as a representative of the American Municipal Association, which, through its affiliated State leagues and cities, speaks for virtually all of the municipalities in the Nation.

The bill before this subcommittee today has as its primary purpose the redevelopment, or development for the first time, of the most economically depressed areas of our country. That development can come about only through industrial growth, and this bill recognizes that.

My principal point is that industrial growth is largely dependent upon whether standard municipal services and sound municipal government are present in the community. Almost without exception, industry locates or expands within an incorporated city or near enough to a city to avail itself of municipal services.

Industry nowadays can be, and is, highly selective in its choice of plant sites. Plant locators weigh carefully the local situation with respect to water and sewer service, streets and roads, fire and police protection, schools, libraries, recreational facilities and various other services—most of which are the direct financial responsibility of the local municipal government. The municipal governments in the depressed areas of our country are trapped within this vicious circle: They are not attractive to industry because they are deficient in the services and facilities industry demands. At the same time, they desperately need industry, and the payrolls and tax base which industry provides, in order to supply such services and facilities.

The only practical way to break out of this circle is to make available Federal aid, such as that proposed in this legislation, and give these depressed areas at least a fighting chance to save themselves from utter bankruptcy, and the destruction, through abandonment, of enormous investments in private and public facilities used by people and business in these areas.

There is ample evidence that municipal governments—even those in the strongest financial positions—must have help from the Federal Government. They receive help through such great and beneficial grant-in-aid programs as urban renewal and public housing, aid to airports, sewage treatment plant grants and the like.

Other Federal legislation, such as the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, has recognized the fact that local communities must have better means of financing new and expanding industry than is now available through private banking and investment channels.

This point has been made so many times, in hearings before committees of the Congress and in the action of Congress itself, that I will merely reaffirm complete agreement with this finding of fact, and the provisions in this bill to provide loans for industrial building and equipment.

The relationship between industrial growth and adequate municipal facilities has been of particular concern to us in Tennessee for a long time. The Tennessee Municipal League and various State government agencies—and two Governors—have made a thorough study of this matter and we have reached certain fundamental conclusions.

One result of our thinking and planning has been the Tennessee community progress program, administered by the State government at the request of the municipal officials of my State. Under this program dozens of communities in Tennessee are making a thorough analysis of the adequacy of facilities and services and resources to support industrial growth, and then preparing an intelligent long-range community progress plan to remedy the deficiencies they discover in making their self-inventory.

We believe this program is the first of its kind in the country. It is comprehensive, thorough, and as scientific as we could make it.

We have set up some 250 definite standards for facilities and services in communities of all population classes, and we have listed about 500 individual items and methods for measuring the community against the standards. We are trying to go about this business of getting ready for industrial growth in the soundest, most fundamental way possible.

Before the State formally launched the community progress program, we tried it out experimentally in seven test cities. Later, three cities went one step further and drew up plans for progress based on the facts disclosed in their inventories. Our experience proves that such a program for community development and industrial progress is practical and workable—provided the necessary money is available in the community.

I will leave with you copies of the Tennessee handbook for a community inventory and progress plan, and of the first three community progress plans made. I hope you will find the time to examine them closely. You will note that they cover almost every conceivable subject matter field related to industrial development. We feel that this is indicative of a sincere and earnest local effort to help ourselves, economically. I hope you will note particularly the fact that most of the really expensive items in a community progress program of this kind—and therefore the major financial responsibility—falls upon the municipal government.

One of the most alarming deficit areas in our public life today is that of municipal services and facilities. We were not up to current needs and demands when World War II came along, and we have by no means caught up in the intervening years. The municipal league made a partial survey last year of urgently needed public facilities in Tennessee cities. This survey indicated that by a very conservative estimate there was a backlog of unmet needs that would cost $500 million. Practically all of this backlog relates directly to the requirements and demands made by new or expanding industry upon its home city. And, of course, much of this backlog of unmet needs is in the prospective urban and rural redevelopment areas contemplated in this pending legislation.

I believe it is fair and relevant to refer in some detail to Tennessee as we consider the probable benefits of this bill, because much of Tennessee is economically depressed. Three of our largest cities, at least 6 smaller industrial centers, and some 54 of our 95 counties (including the municipalities in them, of course) have chronic unemployment or underemployment problems of such magnitude that they might expect some assistance under this bill.

The conditions in the economically depressed areas of Tennessee are not unique. Unfortunately, they are instead typical of the conditions in similarly afflicted areas throughout the country. Each one of these pockets of economic strangulation and frustraton represents not only human misery, but a chink in our national armor as we wage economic war with the Communist bloc of nations. These distressed areas should be making a positive contribution to the welfare of their own States and regions, and to the Nation as a whole. Without help, they will continue to be an economic liability.

The depressed areas of Tennessee, and I believe many of these in other States also, are turning to the Federal Government for aid as a last resort. They have given up hope for help from State government, which by and large is either uninterested in the problem, or unwilling to make the necessary efforts, or both.

Our State government in Tennessee has declared a policy of no increased taxes. This automatically claps a lid on expanding State activities directed at economic development, and on local government activities financed by shares of State-collected taxes. The cities of Tennessee concluded that they could not fulfill their obligations and responsibilities, to industry and to their citizens, by sitting tight or by further taxes upon property. They did not ask the State government to change its announced policy on tax increases. Instead, the cities merely asked for the authority to broaden their local tax base and shift some of the burden from the property tax to more modern and more equitable sources of revenue. They even proposed that no such local tax could become effective until approved by referendum.

Gentlemen, when our tax bill came before the Tennessee General Assembly a few days ago, every interested group in the State descended upon it, knives sharpened and poised.

The cities of Tennessee had an excellent case—a fair and logical case for expanding local government revenue authority to provide facilities to improve their economic situations. But it soon became obvious that no self-help local revenue bill could be enacted.

The same lobbies, the same pressure groups and business interests which have consistently opposed Federal aid, including H.R. 3505, and which have halted action at the State government level, have succeeded in depriving cities in my State of the opportunity to make themselves more attractive to industry.

I know that this situation is typical of State-municipal relationships throughout the country. Experience in the 48 States indicates State governments will not take effective action to remove the basic causes of our depressed areas. I believe municipal government, by and large, are willing to do the job needed in their communities—although at present they are severely limited in revenues and in authority by sovereign State governments.

They have tried every other approach, and now they come to the Federal Government as their best and last hope for the necessary help.

I was surprised by the President's reasoning last year when he vetoed a bill similar to this one. His veto message questioned whether Federal loans for construction of industrial buildings in rural areas would be proper or effective.

We in Tennessee, with perhaps as much rural depressed area as any State in the Union, know very well that adequate financing for industrial buildings and equipment and public facilities in rural areas is effective—and essential. We are not talking here about building a huge heavy manufacturing plant at an isolated crossroads. We are talking about rural areas and their small towns and cities which can provide the labor force and the municipal services required for industry if the financing is available. Just as "urban" does not refer solely to a metropolitan center such as New York or Washington, "rural" does not refer only to very sparsely populated farmland or wasteland.

Let me cite two examples of such rural areas in Tennessee, and the small cities which are their trading and manufacturing centers, to show how this legislation would improve economic opportunity. I would like to file for the record of the committee hearings, to appear after my testimony, statements by Mayor Dwain Peterman of Livingston and Mr. Hugh Heatherly, city recorder, of La Follette.

These communities—and they could be duplicated many times in Tennessee alone—are two relatively small towns in the eastern part of the State. Both are situated in areas of chronic and persistent underemployment. They are in counties which have lost populations at an alarming rate, because there were no jobs to keep the young people at home. They are in extremely poor areas, where the average per capita income is in the neighborhood of one-third of the national average. They are, in short, exactly the kind of communities which this legislation proposes to help. And they are not beyond help—yet.

As part of their efforts to help themselves, the citizens of La Follette and the surrounding community formed a development corporation and raised $90,000 to buy land for industrial sites and for construction. When one industry needed a $40,000 loan to go into business there, the directors of the corporation borrowed it from local banks and got 40 persons to sign notes in the amount of $1,000 each.

Thanks to this kind of community spirit, LaFollette added four new industries in 1958 and one plant expansion occurred there. But despite this local effort, fewer than 600 jobs were created for the entire community and the town's financial resources were strained to the breaking point.

The other town I want to mention, Livingston, has only about 2,500 population. The citizens of that community have raised $282,000 in private and public funds to finance industrial buildings and otherwise try to attract industry. The little town has incurred a bonded debt of $538,000 to help finance industry and to provide the necessary municipal services for industry. As a result of these efforts, there are about 1,800 industrial jobs available in an area which, by any definition, is rural. This little town is providing virtually all the nonfarm jobs and supporting the economy of an astonishingly large section of our State in relation to its size. Only 3 percent of the industrial workers employed there live inside the town of Livingston, and 30 percent of them live in some other county.

Livingston has gone about as far as it can go in financing industry by public subscription and bond issues. It has critical shortages in municipal facilities and services which somehow must be met if it is to support the industry now located there.

Another small town in that same general area of Tennessee, Oneida, is in a similar situation. The citizens of this town of approximately 3,000 have voted for bond issues amounting to $400,000 or more to finance buildings for new and expanded industry. A financial obligation of this size necessarily limits the services and growth of a small city.

These obligations were incurred locally only because there was no other means of even beginning to secure capital to attract industry. It was a case of trying to ward off complete economic collapse.

In Tennessee, we have concluded that public financing of industrial growth is the only answer to the problem in certain depressed areas. The municipalities of Tennessee have advised the State government, and in these hearings they are advising the Federal Government, that their debt capacity and financial resources will not permit an expansion of local financing programs. I believe this also is true of the cities in other States which would be affected by H.R. 3505.

Tennessee municipalities have assumed the major public responsibility for industrial financing by obtaining legislative authority to issue both general obligation and revenue bonds for this purpose. General obligation bonds are not entirely satisfactory at best, and we have issued about all we can without damaging our credit ratings. Revenue bonds must be bought locally in most instances, and this has absorbed nearly all of the available capital in those communities which have resorted to them. What other source is left, except Federal aid?

Some people may try to tell you that the private credit corporation can provide the industrial financing needed in these depressed areas. Such an unrealistic approach

was taken by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce at a Senate committee hearing recently on this same legislation.

I think there is a place for a private credit corporation in the overall program to save the depressed areas. In fact, the municipalities of Tennessee sponsored State legislation this year to authorize formation of such a corporation in our State. Tennessee municipalities also are proposing a further step, never tried in any other State, through a bill which would authorize both city and county governments to buy the capital stock of a development credit corporation. But the private development credit corporation alone is not the real solution to our problem.

In the first place, it can do nothing whatever about providing or improving the public facilities which industry must have and which the employees of industry must have.

Secondly, the private credit corporation has proved to be of very limited assistance and effectiveness in the States which have experimented with it. It has been very difficult to sell the necessary capital stock—which is one reason the cities of Tennessee are offering to help out in this respect—and the interest charges usually have been higher than those on loans from conventional private sources. In fact, a survey made for the Tennessee Legislative Council indicated that in most cases the interest on loans from private credit corporations is at least 6 percent because of the greater risk usually involved and the relatively high cost of capital.

I have made a personal, on-the-scene study of the private credit corporations in the six New England States and in North Carolina, and I do not see how anyone can seriously expect them to do a job of this magnitude. The credit corporation idea, you will recall, originated in Maine. From there it spread throughout New England, and to various other States. Already Maine, New Hampshire and Rhode Island have found the private corporation inadequate and have acted to provide direct financing by the State government. Other States, such as Arkansas and Pennsylvania, have concluded that public financing is the only practical way to meet this need.

But we cannot sit on our hands and wait for this philosophy to take hold in all of the States, and wait for the various State legislatures to recognize the problem and perhaps, some day, do something about it. While we wait, debate and procrastinate, men are out of work, children are hungry, entire communities and regions of our Nation are drying up before our eyes—because they lack the essential ingredient for industrial growth—capital.

In conclusion, I would like to cite one fact which justifies, and makes urgent the enactment of the provisions of this bill to assist depressed agricultural areas.

An exhaustive study conducted by our State government on outmigration and industrial development revealed that in the period from 1950 through 1957, the State experienced a net loss of homegrown people through outmigration of 255,000, and that 90 percent of these were in the productive age group from 18 to 34. Tennessee's loss was the gain of other States.

By the most conservative estimate, an investment of some $10,000 or more is required to feed, clothe, educate, and otherwise provide for a young Tennessean until the productive age of 18 to 22 years. Thus, the economy and the people of our State lost an investment of more than $2,500 million by exporting 255,000 of our young men and women. Thus, it is clear that the chief economic product of my State is productive manpower sent out without cost to staff the offices, laboratories and factories of other States and areas of our Nation.

We believe that this bill offers the first practical means to permit the rest of the Nation to return some of our investment by financial assistance to increase the industry and employment opportunities in these areas, mostly rural and agricultural, which have every resource and opportunity to industrialize except access to the necessary financial resources.

---

## Due Process of Law, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Georgia Bar Journal is a publication issued quarterly by the Georgia Bar Association. The November 1958 issue carried an article by Mr. R. Carter Pittman, entitled "Due Process of Law Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow."

The ability of Mr. Pittman as a student and exponent of constitutional law has been recognized nationally as well as locally.

I think that all who are interested in proper application of the due process clauses in our Constitution will find this article well worth reading. Under unanimous consent of the House I insert Mr. Pittman's article herewith:

DUE PROCESS OF LAW YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

(By R. Carter Pittman [1])

Speaking of the due process clauses in the 14th and in the 5th amendments, Chief Judge Biggs of the 3d Circuit Court of Appeals had this to say in 1951:

"The reach of the 14th amendment is not coextensive with that of the 5th. It may in fact be broader or narrower but it is not identical. * * * The area is not a tidy one for history has been a bad housekeeper and there is some disparity between what the framers intended by the amendment and what it accomplished." *U.S.* v. *Warden of New Jersey State Prison* (187 F. 2d, 615, 619) (citing *Adamson* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 46).

That which appeared to be untidy as a result of history's bad housekeeping back of 1951 appears to be chaos in 1958.

Advocacy of order under law, in the midst of a strange judicial revolution is an ungrateful task. Here, as in all other areas of life, we cannot chart a course straight ahead without knowing the course we came over to get where we are. Straight ahead is in any and all directions, unless the course is set by that from whence we came.

The first section of the 14th amendment is:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

[1] Of the Dalton Bar.

We are here concerned only with the due process clause which says: "* * * nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

In construing that clause, as any other, we must follow the precept of Ex Parte Bain (121 U.S. 1), quoted approvingly by Justice Black in *Adamson* v. *California* (332 U.S. 46, 72):

"It is never to be forgotten that in the construction of the language of the Constitution * * *, as indeed in all other instances where construction becomes necessary, we are to place ourselves as nearly as possible in the condition of the men who framed that instrument."

Those who wrote the 14th amendment in 1866, applicable only to States, simply lifted the due process clause from the 5th amendment, written in 1789, which applied only to the Federal Government. It had been transplanted many times before, as we shall notice hereafter. As stated in the 5th amendment:

"No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law";

Both the history and language of the first 10 amendments, which we call our Bill of Rights, show that they were adopted solely to limit the powers of the new Federal Government. The history and language of the 9th and 10th amendments show that they were adopted in order to reaffirm and reemphasize, (1) that the enumeration of certain rights in the Constitution did not have the effect of denying or disparaging other rights retained by the people, and (2) that the powers not delegated to the new Government by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people. All of the 10 amendments affirm in one way or another that human rights are the gift of God—not governments—and that the powers of governments are only such as are delegated by people in constitutions that constitute governments.

In order to understand amendments to the Constitution, one must first understand the Constitution. In section 9 of article I and section 2 of article IV there is an "enumeration * * * of certain rights" just as there is in the first eight amendments. That accounts for the extreme caution evidenced by the ninth amendment in making it plain that to mention one or a hundred didn't affect the tenure with which others were held.

Section 10 of article I catalogs certain things that States may not do. On June 8, 1789, James Madison sought to include a provision in the Bill of Rights enlarging the prohibitions on the States, such as were set forth in section 10. His proposal was to prohibit violation by the States of the right of jury trials, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press. Specifically, Madison's proposal was:

"That in article 1st, section 10, between clauses 1 and 2, be inserted this clause, to-wit: 'No State shall violate the equal rights of conscience, or the freedom of the press or the trial by jury in criminal cases.'" (Annals of Congress, First Congress, vol. 1, 452.)

The proposal was rejected with apparent ridicule. The restriction or limitation of the powers of State governments was not on the agenda of the First Congress in 1789. The chief purpose of that meeting was to restrict the power of the Federal Government. The very first line of the first amendment makes that plain:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

The second amendment, for another example, reaffirms that rights are God-given—not Government-given. It says:

"The right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

On and on they go securing—never giving—rights.

Nevertheless, it became necessary for Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Barron* v. *Baltimore*, 7 Peters 243, 247 (1833), to say again what the framers had said, to the effect that the first 10 amendments limit Federal powers—not State powers.

The "due process of law" clause in the fifth amendment is due process of Federal law. The right to due process of Federal law is merely one in the catalog of rights enumerated successively in section 9 of article I, article IV, and in each of the first eight amendments to the Constitution.

In the Adamson case (1947) Black, Murphy, Douglas, and Rutledge, insisted that the 14th amendment, like Aaron's rod, had swallowed up the first 10 amendments, and that its due process clause was the vortex which sucked them in. A precarious majority of one, Vinson, Frankfurter, Jackson, Burton, and Reed, saved the Bill of Rights from absorption into the 14th amendment. If "due process of law" as set forth in the 14th amendment should be given the meaning that Justices Black, Murphy, Douglas, and Rutledge contended for in the Adamson case, all of section 9 of article I, a part of article IV, and all of the first eight amendments, except the due process clause of the fifth were superfluous.

Ten years after the alleged ratification of the 14th amendment, in the case of *Davidson* v. *New Orleans* (96 U.S. 97 (1878)), Justice Miller said of the due process clause:

"It is not a little remarkable, that while this provision has been in the Constitution of the United States, as a restraint upon the authority of the Federal Government, for nearly a century, and while, during all that time, the manner in which the powers of that Government have been exercised has been watched with jealousy, and subjected to the most rigid criticism in all its branches, this special limitation upon its powers has rarely been invoked in the judicial forum or the more enlarged theater of public discussion. But while it has been part of the Constitution, as a restraint upon the power of the States, only a very few years, the docket of this Court is crowded with cases in which we are asked to hold that State courts and State legislatures have deprived their own citizens of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. There is here abundant evidence that there exists some strange misconception of the scope of this provision as found in the 14th amendment."

That strange misconception bristles from the pages of Adamson and scores of other cases decided in recent years.

In *Hurtado* v. *California*, 110 U.S. 516, 535, Mr. Justice Matthews contrasted the meaning of the due process clause in the 14th amendment with that in the 5th amendment and in doing so quite accurately recognized a distinction that we may well recall:

"Due process of law in the latter (5th amendment) refers to that law of the land which derives its authority from the legislative power conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States, exercised within the limits therein prescribed, and interpreted according to the principles of the common law. In the 14th amendment, by parity of reason, it refers to that law of the land in each State, which derives its authority from the inherent and reserved powers of the State, exerted within the limits of those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions, and the greatest security for which resides in the right of the people to make their own laws, and alter them at their pleasure."

It should be added that due process of law in the fifth amendment has reference not only to the acts of Congress authorized by the Constitution, as stated by Justice Matthews, but also to the Constitution iself and to treaties made before the adoption of the Constitution, in acordance with the Articles of Conferedation or international law, or made after the adoption of the Constitution in accordance with section 2 of article II of the Constitution. Thus the "due process of law" clause of the fifth amendment guarantees, as against Federal power, that no person in America may be deprived of his life or his liberty or his property by any contrivance or process except due process of law embodied either in the Constitution, in statutes enacted by the Congress or embodied in treaties mad by the President—(after 1788) "with the advice and consent of the Senate."

This view of the matter is demanded by the judiciary provisions of the Constitution. Section 2 of article III extends the judicial power to "Cases . . . arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made [theretofore], or which shall be made, [thereafter] under their authority" (meaning the "authority" of the Confederation or the President with Senate approval as granted in section 2 of article III).

The only cases that Federal courts were given the power to try, which involved any other kind of law, were (1) those "affecting Ambassadors"; (2) those affecting "other public ministers and consuls," "cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction"; and (4) "controversies to which the United States shall be a party" and (1) "between two or more States"; (2) "between a State and citizens of another State"; (3) "between citizens of different States"; (4) "between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States"; and (5) "between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects."

It is therefore clear that the Federal judicial power was not extended generally by article III or any other provisions of the Constitution to cases arising under the common law or arising under the laws of States. The only cases not involving the Federal "law of the land" as defined in article VI as delineated in article III were those which might involve the law of nations, the law of the sea, or any law applicable in cases or controversies between States and citizens of different States. Thus the "law" involved in the 5th amendment is that article III and article VI "law" written into the Constitution, into statutes enacted and treaties made under constitutional authority.

The "law" involved in the 14th amendment is both the written law embodied within the constitutions and statutes of states and the unwritten (or common) law of States, whose vitality stems from common consent inherent in the ageless customs and mores of a people, but not yet enshrined in statutes enacted by representatives, except by adoption as "common law."

As was held in *Erie R.R. Co.* v. *Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 78:

"Except in matters governed by the Federal Constitution or by acts of Congress, the law to be applied in any case is the law of the State. And whether the law of the State shall be declared by its legislature in a statute or by its highest court in a decision is not a matter of Federal concern. [There is no Federal general common law. Congress has no power to declare substantive rules of common law applicable in a State whether they be local in their nature or 'general,' be they commercial law or a part of the law of torts. And no clause in the Constitution purports to confer such a power upon the Federal courts.]"

The doctrine of Hurtado and Erie is fully sustained by history and is unquestionably right.

Now let us take a brief look at some of that history. The 29th chapter of Magna Carta provided:

"No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseised of his freehold, or liberties, or free customs, or be outlawed or exiled; or otherwise destroyed; nor will we pass upon him, nor condemn him, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land."

The ink on Magna Carta was not dry before it became necessary to reaffirm it. It was reaffirmed at least 40 times between 1225 and the American Revolution in 1776. (DeLolme, "The Constitution of England," (1784), p. 155).

The necessity to reaffirm Magna Carta so many times verifies Lord Acton's sad assertion that "power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

In a monarchy tyranny tends to beat down the fences that are set around it. In Republics tyranny tends to leap over fences. Edward I was a pretty good King, yet he beat down the fences of Magna Carta repeatedly. The people of England forced him to reaffirm Magna Carta 11 times in the course of his reign (LeLolme, supra, p. 29).

During his reign it was enacted by Parliament that whatever should be done contrary to Magna Carta should be null and void; that it should be read twice a year in all cathedrals; and that the penalty of excommunication should be denounced against anyone who should presume to violate it. But violated it was.

On June 7, 1628, the tyrant, Charles I was put in duress by the petition of right. After citing the 29th chapter of Magna Carta and its recent violations, the petition continues:

"And in the 8 and 20th year of the reign of King Edward the Third, it was declared and enacted by authority of Parliament, that no man of what estate or condition that he be, should be put out of his lands or tenements, nor taken, nor imprisoned, nor disinherited, nor put to death, without being brought to answer by due process of law" (Gardner, "Constitution Documents of the Puritan Revolution," 3d ed., p. 67).

The petition continues:

"And whereas also by authority of Parliament, in the 25th year of the reign of King Edward the Third, it is declared and enacted that no man shall be forejudged of life or limb against the form of the Great Charter, and the law of the land; and by said Great Charter and other laws and statutes of this your realm, no man ought to be adjudged to death; but [by the laws stablished in this your realm, either by the customs of the said realm of by acts of Parliament]." (Gardner, supra, p. 68.)

Those quotations from one document are enough to illustrate what "the law of the land" and "due process of law" had meant for 400 years prior to 1628. "Customs of the realm" were common laws that came into being by "common consent." That is where the word "common" came in as the progenitor of "law."

Acts of Parliament were laws that came into being by consent given by the citizens through representatives. Edicts however royal or majestic—decrees of courts, however solemn, could never serve for law in England—not for long anyway.

For attempting to reestablish edicts and decrees as laws, Charles I was executed on January 27, 1649. His death sentence recited "that * * * Charles Stuart * * * being trusted with a limited power to govern according to the law of the land, and not otherwise—design[ed]—to rule according to his will." (7 Rushworth, Historical Collections, 4418–19 (1721)). Indeed, it was edicts and decrees of kings and courts that were responsible for the "law of the land" and the "due process of law" clauses playing the most vital part in our fundamental laws.

The Virginia Declaration of Rights, adopted on June 12, 1776, 3 weeks before the Declaration of Independence, expressed the prevalent concept of due process of law like this:

"That no man be deprived of his liberty except by the law of the land, or the judgment of his peers."

Other Colonies threw off the yoke to become sovereign States with law of the land clauses expressed in their Declaration of Rights much like Virginia's, successively, as follows:

Pennsylvania (August 1776): "Nor can any man be justly deprived of his liberty, except by the laws of the land or the judgment of his peers."

Maryland (August 1776): "That every freeman * * * ought to have justice and right according to the law of the land."

Delaware (September 1776): "That every freeman for every injury * * * ought to have remedy by the course of the law of the land."

North Carolina (December 1776): "That no freeman ought to be * * * deprived of his life, liberty, or property, but by the law of the land."

New York (April 1777): "No member of this State shall be * * * deprived of any * * * rights or privileges * * * unless by the law of the land, or the judgment of his peers."

Massachusetts (March 1780): "No subject shall be deprived of his life, liberty, or estate but by the judgment of his peers, or the law of the land."

New Hampshire (1784): "No subject shall be * * * deprived of his life, liberty, or estate, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land."

South Carolina's Constitution (March 1778): "That no freeman * * * be * * * deprived of his life, liberty, or property but by the judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land."

No State used the phrase "due process of law."

George Mason, who wrote the Virginia Declaration of Rights refused to sign the Constitution in Philadelphia, because it didn't contain a Bill of Rights restraining Federal power. He prepared proposed amendments for the minority in the Pennsylvania Ratifying Convention in late 1787. Paragraph 3 of their proposal contained the clause in these words:

"That no man be deprived of his liberty, except by the law of the land, or the judgment of his peers." (Dumbauld, "The Bill of Rights" (1957), p. 173.)

Mason prepared the amendments proposed unanimously by the Virginia Ratifying Convention in June 1788. That famous document copied Magna Carta's 29th chapter in its paragraph 9, as follows:

"That no freeman ought to be taken, imprisoned, or disseised of his freehold, liberties, privileges or franchises, or outlawed or exiled, or in any manner destroyed or deprived of his life, liberty, or property but by the law of the land." (Dumbauld; supra, p. 184.)

On June 9, 1778, 3 weeks before being submitted to the Virginia Convention, Mason sent a copy of his Virginia proposals to the New York Ratifying Convention where it was substantially copied. (Pittman, The Fifth Amendment, ABA Journal, vol. 42, p. 509, 588 (June 1956).) The New York Convention rephrased Mason's proposal slightly and for the first time in history used the phrase "due process of law" in a proposed constitutional document. It said:

"That no person ought to be taken, imprisoned, or disseised of his freehold, or be exiled or deprived of his privileges, franchises, life, liberty, or property but by due process of law." (Dumbauld, supra, p. 190.)

North Carolina's convention copied the Virginia proposal word for word in August 1788. (Dumbauld, supra, p. 200.)

The amendment proposed by the committee of which Madison was chairman in the First Congress in June 1789 followed the New York variation: "No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." (Dumbauld, supra, p. 207.) The select committee made no changes. (Dumbauld, supra, p. 211.) Thus it was that the clause "due process of law," lifted from the act of Parliament of 28 Edward III, went into the 5th amendment in lieu of the clause "the law of the land," from the Magna Carta of 9 Henry III 29, but they meant the same thing as they had for 500 years.

As we have seen, the word "law" in the due process of law clause of the fifth amendment is synonymous with and is restricted to "the law of the land" defined in article VI, and as we have likewise seen, the Federal judicial power is restricted in article II to cases involving such "law." Common law, civil law, natural law, and unwritten law of any nature is proscribed as the basis for Federal jurisdiction.

As we have seen also, the word "law" as used in the 14th amendment necessarily refers to the laws of the States, which includes "the customs of the realm" or the "common," or unwritten law, adopted either in the constitutions or by the statutes of the several States or by custom. Customs of a people are not broken by revolutions. They live on until no longer common or customary.

As applied to Louisiana, 14th amendment "due process of law" includes the civil law in the exact measure it has been adopted in Louisiana. Changing the flag didn't change customary law.

The word "law" in the due process clause of the 14th amendment now seems to mean all things to all judges. As far back as the conservative case of *Twining* v. *New Jersey*, 211 U.S. 78, due process of law became not something fixed but something to be "ascertained from time to time by judicial action." In *Moyer* v. *Peabody*, 212 U.S. 78, 84, the court set itself adrift without chart or compass, saying: "What is due process of law depends upon circumstances." The State assemblies and supreme courts are whipped with unreasoned assertions that their acts and decisions invade "fundamental rights." The standard variously stated in cases in that State action, approved by State courts was, "so acute and shocking that our policy will not endure it," or "it violates those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions," or it violates some concept "basic to a free society" or "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty," or "civilized standards of law * * * for judgment in the progressive evolution of the institutions of a free society." *Palko* v. *Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319; *Adamson* v. *California*, supra; *Malinski* v. *New York*, 324 U.S. 401.

In Adamson, Justice Black pointed out some of the instances in which the court had used and abused the 14th amendment, as follows:

"This Court has now held that the 14th amendment protects from State invasion the following 'fundamental' rights safeguarded by the Bill of Rights; right to counsel in criminal cases, *Powell* v. *Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45, 67, 53 S. Ct. 55, 63, 77 L. Ed. 158, 84 A.L.R. 527, limiting the Hurtado case; * * * at the very least, certain types of cruel and unusual punishment and former jeopardy, *State of Louisiana ex rel. Francis* v. *Resweber*, 329 U.S. 459, 67 S. Ct. 374; the right of an accused in a criminal case to be informed of the charge against him, see *Snyder* v. *Massachusetts*, 291 U.S. 97, 105, 54 S. Ct. 330, 332, 78 L. Ed. 674, 90 A.L.R. 575; the right to receive just compensation on account of taking private property for public use, *Chicago, B. & O. R. Co.* v. *Chicago*, 166 U.S. 226, 17 S. Ct. 581, 41 L. Ed. 979. And the Court has now through the 14th amendment literally and emphaticaly applied the 1st amendment to the States in its very terms. *Emerson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 67 S. Ct. 504."

In Adamson the majority held that the due process clause of the 14th amendment forbids State compulsion to testify "by fear of hurt, torture or exhaustion." No reason was stated for giving the 14th amendment such content.

In his dissent (p. 91) Justice Black made the following pertinent observation:

"To pass upon the constitutionality of statutes by looking to the particular standards enumerated in the Bill of Rights and other parts of the Constitution is one thing; to invalidate statutes because of application of 'natural law' deemed to be above and undefined by the Constitution is another. 'In the one instance, courts proceeding within clearly marked constitutional boundaries seek to execute policies written into the Constitution; in the other they roam at will in the limitless area of their own beliefs as to reasonableness and actually select policies, a responsibility which the Constitution entrusts to the legislative representatives of the people.' *Federal Power Commission* v. *Natural Gas Pipeline Co.* 315 U.S. 575, 599, 601, n.4, 62 S.Ct. 736, 749, 750, 86 L.Ed. 1037."

Whether we proceed with the minority and adopt the standards set forth in the Federal Bill of Rights for the strange new "law" of the 14th amendment, or proceed with the majority and adopt natural laws or other undefined standards not a part of the "law" in the particular State involved, we are proceeding without—not within—clearly marked constitutional boundaries, seeking to execute policies that are not written into or delineated in any applicable written document, but which are in the minds of men, who by some hook or crook became judges. In both instances courts roam at will in the limitless area of their own beliefs as to reasonableness and actually select policies, a responsibility which the Constitution entrusts to legislative representatives of the people, in both State and Federal assemblies.

Commenting on the views of the minority in that case Justice Frankfurter said that their construction of due process would "tear up by the roots much of the fabric of law in the several States." The estimates of Black and Frankfurter as to the doctrine of the other are eminently correct.

Whether the plain, unambiguous and restricted meaning of "due process of law," appearing in 14th amendment, be evaded under the "natural law doctrine" or under the doctrine of "absorption of the Bill of Rights by the 14th amendment," the result is the same. Neither doctrine is supportable by any argument except the arbitrary will of judges. All of the ill things said by the majority about the reasoning of the minority and by the majority about the reasoning of the majority, in Adamson, are close to the kingdom of truth. In that decision both the majority and the minority leaped the bounds of the 14th amendment and the Constitution. But that is a habit now. All stand triumphant over a broken Constitution and a shattered Bill of Rights.

In *Crocker* v. *California*, (decided June 30, 1958) 357 U.S. 433, 78 S.Ct. 1287, the court by the common majority of one declined to release a college-educated lawyer-murderer for California's delay of 14 hours in providing him with free counsel. Yet the majority opinion by Justice Clark says:

"The right of an accused to counsel for his defense, though not firmly fixed in our common-law heritage, is of significant importance to the preservation of liberty in this country. (See (1) "Cooley's Constitutional Limitations" (8th ed.) 696–700; (2) "Story on the Constitution" (4th ed.) sec. 1794.) That right, secured in state prosecutions by the 14th amendment guaranty of due process includes not only the right to have an attorney appointed by the State in certain cases, but also the right of an accused to 'a fair opportunity to secure counsel of his own choice.' *Powell* v. *State of Alabama*, 1932, 287 U.S. 45, 53, 53 S. Ct. 55, 57, 77 L. Ed. 158."

For himself, Warren, Black, and Brennan, Justice Douglas made a powerful defense of the legally trained murderer, declaring in the last feverish words of the dissent:

"The demands of our civilization expressed in the due process clause require that the accused who wants a counsel should have one at any time after the moment of arrest."

If the right of an accused to free counsel was held by California courts not to be a part of common-law heritage in California, and was held by California courts not to be a right under the statutes or constitution of that State, where could the supreme court find it to be fundamental law in California that an accused be furnished counsel? If it is a law in California it is either old or new. Where is it? "There is no federal general common law," says Erie, and every school child should know that.

The entire nine men of the supreme bench are now giving to the word "law" in the due process clause of the 14th amendment just such content as one may dream and four approve. Now, the will of Supreme Court judges is the law of the land, and might makes right.

Fourteenth amendment due process of law in California is the same as the due process of law required by California's Constitution. It differs from due process of law in Oregon in such measure as Oregon law differs from California law.

The due process of law clause of the 14th amendment commands the Federal judiciary to respect and apply the written and unwritten laws of the States, adopted with the consent of the people of the States. The due process clause of the fifth amendment commands the Federal judiciary to respect and obey the written laws of the land as defined in the Federal constitution. What "due process of law" is, is ascertainable in any case by a simple reference to applicable laws which judges must find—never make. A constitution that guarantees to each State a "republican form of government" cannot impose a judicial oligarchy too.

In a republic the exertion of the powers of government is confined to cases where home-made rules are expressed by laws in being. That the was meaning of the 29th chapter of Magna Carta. The well understood words of Magna Carta moved across six centuries into the 5th and 14th amendments. Once they were our freedom—now they are our chains. Once they restrained power—now they are made to confer power. Our limited Constitution has become an unlimited Constitution. The revolution is a fact accomplished. It was simple and bloodless.

The first 12 amendments to the Constitution say nothing about who shall enforce them. History shows clearly and conclusively that the judiciary was left free to do it. "Madison's Writings," vol. V. 385; "Jefferson's Works," vol V, 461; "Annals of Congress," vol. I, p. 457. But the enforcement of the 13th and 14th amendments was not left to the judgment of judges. Each in its last words confers the power on the Congress "to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Note well: The word is "enforce"—not "enlarge." All that these amendments left to judges was simply to obey their oath "to support this Constitution" as written.

Perjury becomes a privilege annexed to the office of judge in the last stages of depravity. Speaking of the Roman Empire as it was disintegrating near the time of its fall, DeLolme, supra, p. 233, pointed out to our forefathers 3 years before the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia and 5 years before the fifth amendment was framed in New York, how at last it came to be that:

"The judges proved as corrupt as the magistrates had been oppressive. They equally betrayed, in their own province, the cause of the republic with which they had been entrusted; and rather chose to share in the plunder of the consuls, the praetors, and the proconsuls, than put the laws in force against them.

"New expedients were therefore resorted to, in order to remedy this new evil. Laws were made for judging and punishing the judges themselves; and, above all, continual changes were made in the manner of composing their assemblies. But the malady lay too deep for common legal provisions to remedy. The guilty judges employed the same recourses, in order to avoid conviction, as the guilty magistrates had done; and those continual changes, at which we are amazed, that were made in the constitution of the judiciary bodies instead of obviating the corruption of the judges, only transferred to other men the profit arising from becoming guilty of it. It became a general complaint, so early as the times of the Gracchi, that no man, who had money to give, could be brought to punishment. Cicero says, that in his time, the same opinion was universally received; and his speeches are full of his lamentations on what he calls the levity, and the infamy of the public judgments.

"The laws and public judgments not only thus failed of the end for which they had been established; they even became, at length, new means of oppression added to those which already existed. Citizens possessed of wealth, persons obnoxious to particular bodies, or the few magistrates who attempted to stem the torrent of the general corruption, were accused and condemned while Piso, of whom Cicero, in his speech against him, relates facts which make the reader shudder with horror, and Verres, who had been guilty of enormities of the same kind, escaped unpunished."

## Wilkes-Barre Post, No. 132, of the American Legion, Observes 40th Anniversary of Its Founding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Thursday, March 12, 1959:

FORTY YEARS OF SERVICE

Wilkes-Barre Post 132, of the American Legion will anticipate the 40th anniversary of the founding of the organization March 15–17 with a program tomorrow night to be highlighted by the presentation of a distinguished service award to Robert W. Johnson, editor of the Wilkes-Barre Record. Starting on Sunday and continuing through Tuesday, the general observance will be held, with 17,000 posts and 14,000 auxiliaries participating.

Although the Legion came formally into existence on March 15, 1919, in Paris, the idea of a veterans' organization to represent the citizen soldiers of the United States was developed in a conversation between Lt. Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and Sgt. William Patterson while they were convalescing in a base hospital in the French capital in midsummer, 1918.

When hostilities ended, General Headquarters authorized 20 National Guard and Reserve officers to confer with Regular Army representatives in Paris. A meeting was held on February 15–16, 1919, and recommendations were drafted and arrangements made for a caucus on March 15.

A lot of water has gone over the dam since that historic gathering. The whole world has changed, along with the Legion which has expanded into an organization, representing the veterans of three wars. But its ideals and objectives remain the same—the preservation of American and service to its defenders.

The American Legion, dedicated to God and country, has reason to be proud of its record during the four momentous decades that have elapsed since it was formed. Its impact on America and the world has been tremendous. Not only has it been in the front ranks in the defense of freedom, but it has sought to raise the standards of living in this country and to enlighten the populace. Communities, as well as the country as a whole, have benefited.

Today, it is a high privilege to join in a salute to the American Legion and wish it well in the challenging years ahead.

## The Need for a Free Market for Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a letter from Donald I. Segerstrom, publisher, Western Mining and Industrial News, Sonora, Calif., and a letter from L. L. Huelsdonk, secretary-treasurer and general manager of Best Mines Co., Inc., Downieville, Calif., commenting on the President's recent message on U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, particularly in relation to our gold reserves and policies.

They have made a very thoughtful analysis of the problem which ties into legislation I have introduced calling for a free market for gold. I have requested a meeting with officials of the Treasury Department to see what might be worked out toward solving the general problem and hope these gentlemen will be able to appear as they are experts in this field.

Their letters follow:

WESTERN MINING AND INDUSTRIAL NEWS,
*Sonora, Calif., March 5, 1959.*

Hon. HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON,
*Member of Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR "BIZZ": Thank you for the copy of the Presidential message of February 12 and the accompanying book on the U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund and in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

I read the whole thing over with intense interest for it pointed up with considerable force the fact that international inflation has slaughtered the American dollar overseas and the size of the two above mentioned institutions must be doubled simply to fill the gaps created by inflationary pressures both at home and in all the countries participating.

If you could devote the considerable time needed to reading the document over, you will note that the bill would propose to add 344 millions more in U.S. gold to the Fund plus an X number of dollars in credit. The bad part about the outflow of this amount of gold is that it comes on top of the anticipated outflow of more than 3 billions in gold expected due to adverse trade balances in 1959. This will thus create a situation where the gold outflow will be more than a serious thing and if 1959 ends up as anticipated, the value of the dollar represented by Treasury gold in the United States will be just 8 mills on the dollar. As you know, in these parts we would call that a helluve note.

It is a hypothetical thing, and probably an obscure chance to take, but I would think that if an amendment was tacked on to this measure that would resupply the United States with gold from domestic sources, the problem could at least be pointed up for public consumption. My suggestion would be to ask the Congress to apply the Canadian theory to the purchase of Treasury gold to assure a constant supply of new gold to replace, in part, the vast outflow. The idea in Canada, in a nutshell, is this: They pay a premium of up to $7.50 per ounce of newly mined gold in any case where the cost of production of each ounce of newly mined gold exceed $25 per ounce. A variation of this then might be to reduce the size of the premium to any mine producing more than 100,000 ounces per year. But, at any rate, the gold would be mined and most certainly would firm up the gold backing of the dollar, at home and abroad.

As you know, the Canadian dollar is now the firm measure of value in the entire world and it is simply because they have continued to mine gold to back their currency.

An argument against this premium payment for gold would certainly be that which is presented against any subsidy, that it is costing the taxpayers dollars to buy their own Treasury deposits. However, in this instance such an argument is not valid in that the more gold present in the Treasury, the more credit can be extended to the banking system to make more dollars and at the same time making those dollars possess constantly increasing gold backing. Thus, we would avoid what seems to be a great fetish against going back on the gold standard.

Of all the gold bills present in the hopper, your bill for a free market has the most merit. However, I think that the Eastern thinking on such a measure is that outside gold will flood the United States via illegal entry and the effect of a free market here would not last long enough to get mines going to supply newly mined domestic gold. Thus, I am inclined to think that a gold subsidy amendment to the International Fund bill might stir up at least enough interest that such a measure, by itself, would get enough support to pass. I, for one, would like to see a gold bill of some kind or other, at least get out of committee one of these sessions.

Those are my thoughts, rather poorly put to be sure, but I very much appreciate the opportunity to put them down here for your consideration.

Most gratefully yours,
DONALD I. SEGERSTROM,
*Publisher.*

---

BEST MINES CO., INC.,
*Downieville, Calif., March 11, 1959.*

Hon. HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
*The House of Representatives*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR "BIZZ": Thanks for your letter of February 23d with the enclosed report on the problems of the International Monetary Fund. I am very pleased to see the interest that you are taking in this matter and feel that if all Congressmen would do the same, a sane monetary policy could be worked out that would not only relieve the United States from "holding the sack," but would also mean permanent prosperity to world over commensurate with economic growth—with no periodic setback adjustments necessary to compensate for over-issued currencies.

In commenting on this report I would like to begin by saying that I would be opposed to increasing quotas of the International Monetary Fund or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development unless provisions are first written into the Bretton Woods Agreement (and ratified) that will either prevent or compensate for the depreciation of the U.S. dollar. My reasons for this are very simple. Under paragraph (a) of section 1 of article IV of this agreement gold and the U.S. dollar are tied together as a common denominator to set the value of the currency of each member of the Fund. This means that U.S. dollars have been set up to act with and as gold as a standard for the other member nation currencies—and therefore, because the relative value of gold and the dollar is not being held as an equivalent—a double standard is being continually created. Such a situation can only lead to perpetual confusion and frustration. It might be pointed out that since this agreement was ratified in 1945, the dollar has lost over one-half of its purchasing value and yet it is being used on a par with gold and as gold as a standard in foreign monetary reserves.

I would like to cite the following example to show why this double standard works to the disadvantage of the United States and leaves us as the scapegoat:

When the foreigner gains one of our dollars, he can do one of three things: he can buy American goods with it; he can monetize it (that is, use it as and with his gold reserve as backing for the issuance of his currency); or he can redeem it in gold from our Treasury Department at the standardized ratio of $35 per fine ounce.

When our goods are priced higher than comparable foreign goods, he will not use his dollar holdings to buy American goods. If he monetizes these dollars, he inflates his own currency proportionately to the degree that the dollar has lost purchasing value in relation to its original fixed (so-called standard) value with gold.

From an American viewpoint, we can readily see that if we purchased 35 foreign pocketknives at $1 each in 1945 (when this agreement was ratified, the foreigner would be in a position to collect 1 ounce of our gold (if he chose redemption) against the one-fourth ounce of gold that was used to issue the $35 (25 percent gold reserve requirement). Even in this regard, such a loss to the United States is significant when gold and dollars which were considered on a par (according to the Bretton Woods agreement) have redemption discrepancies. From a practical viewpoint it means that on a trade basis the Bretton Woods Agreement was set up in 1945 to force the United States to sell its gold to member nations for $8.75 per fine ounce as a means of redistributing monetary gold reserves.

Today the problem has grown much more serious because when we now negotiate to purchase 35 foreign pocketknives, the foreigner tells us that our dollar is not as good as it was in 1945 by one-half. He therefore collects $70 for 35 pocketknives and is in a position to claim 2 ounces of gold. Bluntly speaking, when he redeems his dollars, he is now buying gold from us in trade for $4.375 per fine ounce. At home—our gold is currently worth only $17.50 per ounce in dollar-purchasing value by using the same indices. This is the real reason that we are holding the "sack" and our gold is flowing out and will continue to do so in spite of all the pressure that is currently being exerted to stop it. These pressures may hold the line for short periods of time (such as at this time when the order of the day is to force these increased quotas), but in the long run, economic facts will prevail and the outflow will resume at full speed.

In going over the special report of the National Advisory Council, I would like to point out on page 4 (near the bottom of paragraph 3) that although export trade increased in dollar value by nearly 7 times from 1937 to 1957, the volume increase was less than 3 to 1 for the same period. Also on imports, the dollar value ratio increase was about 5.2 times as against a volume increase of less than 2 times. The difference, of course, reflects inflation and points to the evils of a double, inconsistent standard (such as is being practiced under the Bretton Woods agreement where one factor—the dollar—is allowed to become a variable and upset what should remain a constant between gold and dollar value for the purpose of creating a fixed standard for the establishment of a stable exchange-value rate for all currencies.

The anticipation of further future increased quotas are graphically forecast in line 3 of the next paragraph. "These large increases in postwar values have substantially reduced the adequacy of the fund quotas." This statement is very true and there will be no end to future demands for increased quotas until and unless the value of the dollar can be controlled. It is evident that large increases in values of the will continue so long as a cure is being sought by neglecting the cause, and working only on the symptoms.

On page 6, paragraph 2, an ingenious method of dollar inflation is illustrated. If memory serves me right, this transaction occurred just prior to July 1957, when the Treasury was short of dollars (more so than the Fund) to meet payments on maturing bonds. In such a case $150 million worth of gold (25 percent gold reserve requirement) produces $600 million, which purchases $600 million worth of gold from the Fund; which in turn (again on the 25 percent gold reserve requirement) produces $2,400,000,000 in Federal Reserve dollars for bank deposits; which under the average fractional reserve deposit requirements of about 15 percent, produces about $12 billion of money supply through the commercial banking system with only 80 percent of the deposits working. Thus, with all of the deposits working, $150 million worth of gold (proper money) can be used to produce $15 billion in money supply (improper money) or at an inflationary ratio of 100 to 1. Such money supply—which is worth only 1 cent per dollar in gold—can draw 100 cents worth of gold per dollar from

our Treasury when it is credited to a foreign government or central bank account. This is one of the reasons that we are losing gold and this is one of the reasons we should not increase our quotas unless some protection is given to us through the Bretton Woods agreement.

The inadequacy is not in the quotas—it is in the international monetary gold reserves and these cannot be built up by redistribution because the buildup of one reserve means the teardown of another. These can only be built up through adequate gold production and value.

Under the present setup the United States can only lose gold and in the long run it is bound to sink to a low-rate nation, if something is not done by Congress to stop the giving away of our assets.

On the bottom of page 1 of the special report in the last two sentences it states: "These repurchases must be made with gold and dollars, or other convertible currencies as defined by the Fund. Up to the present, all repurchases have been made with gold and dollars." I would like to call attention to the fact that in spite of 14 years of operation, no currency has been made strong enough to repurchase drawings. Dollars have been used, because the United States underwrites her dollars at the ratio of 1 to 3 in gold. During this same period—if efforts had been directed toward building up adequate international monetary gold reserves—all member nation currencies would now be strong enough to repurchase drawings and there would be enough gold in the Fund to ably unify all exchange rates.

I am sorry for being so late in making these few comments, but my schedule has been rather full lately. I realize that the subject matter is a complex one and therefore warrants much more detailed study. I have withheld comment on the increased quotas for the Bank, because my objections stem from the same source. In short, I would object to an increase in either of these quotas unless and until the dollar is tied realistically to the situation. I hope what I have said will serve a purpose in helping to alert Congress to some of the dangers that are facing this country today.

Congratulations on the good work that you are doing and best wishes.

Sincerely,

L. L. HUELSDONK.

## Pure Pork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, of March 13, 1959, entitled "Pure Pork":

PURE PORK

By a vote of 9 to 6, the Senate Banking Committee has approved one of the worst pork-barrel bills introduced in the 86th Congress, a measure that would provide $389 million in loans and grants to so-called depressed areas. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, manager of the legislation, and other proponents of the Democratic-backed bill, have turned a completely deaf ear to President Eisenhower's plea for economy and a balanced budget.

The bill, which would carry pump priming to extremes, provides for a $100 million loan fund for construction of community facilities; a $100 million revolving fund for low-interest loans for projects in urban areas; a fund of the same amount and for the same purpose in rural development areas; and $75 million in direct grants to communities for public facilities such as sewer and water systems.

Under the measure, the Federal Government would provide up to 65 percent of the cost of land, building, and machinery in each instance. The localities or State would put up 10 percent, and private sources 25 percent.

Republican members of the banking committee fought the bill as unworkable and socialistic. The measure is patterned closely after one vetoed by the President last year as unsound because of its heavy reliance on Federal responsibility in relieving economic distress of communities.

The proposed legislation provides for establishment of an area redevelopment administration which would designate depressed areas in accordance with a formula based on the percentage of unemployment for periods ranging from 12 to 24 months. The proposed new Area Redevelopment Administration would be set up in the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency. Loose loan terms and criteria for Federal grants are provided in the bill.

Such legislation, even the more modest $53 million administration program for so-called depressed areas, is wrong in principle. It ignores the importance of local responsibility and local efforts and would subsidize inefficient and mismanaged operations. Such pump priming is particularly unwarranted at a time when every effort needs to be made to reduce rather than expand Federal programs.

## Restrictions Urged on Importation of Foreign Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record of Monday, March 9, 1959:

FOR EARLY ACTION ON IMPORTS OF OIL

We may be headed for early action to restrict the imports of foreign oil. Friends of the coal industry, and particularly anthracite at this crucial juncture in its history, will hope so. In the Anthracite Bulletin of March 4 we find this statement: "The Federal Government has for years permitted the ruinous importation of foreign oils and their derivitives, a practice which has been, and still is, vigorously opposed not only by the coal industry, but by many domestic oil and gas producers as well."

Tomorrow has been set by the Eisenhower administration as a deadline for deciding whether to replace the voluntary oil import quotas with a mandatory system that would slash quotas of all major importers.

As reviewed by many students of the question the choice—at least in part—is between cheap foreign oil or cheap money. We have had strong tastes of the evils of both and to the extent that one is the cause of the other the argument for restriction on imports of oil is strongly supported.

Voluntary curbs were to have expired February 28. But on February 27 the President's Special Committee on Fuels received a report from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, as it is now named, finding that imports of crude oil and major petroleum products threaten the national security.

The President ordered a 10-day extension of the voluntary restraints while a study was being made of the inflationary effect of imposing mandatory curbs. These would impose a further cutback of about 20 percent.

The coal industry and the independent oil producers are plumping for the mandatory quotas. So is the railroad industry, which reacts quickly to anything that may hurt coal output. Unbridled competition of residual oil imports with coal is seen by Howard E. Simpson, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. "Unless the coal industry is healthy," Simpson declared on February 25, "railroads won't be healthy either."

But big oil companies that import cheap Mideast oil oppose mandatory curbs in whole or in part. They threaten to go to the courts or have them nullified.

## Let Us Constantly Remind the World of the Aspirations of the Polish Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of a press conference held by the Honorable Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, chairman of the Polish Peasant Party:

Question. Mr. Mikolajczyk, what is your opinion of the present international situation in connection with the Berlin problem?

Answer. I do not believe that Khrushchev wants to start a third world war at the present time. He still thinks that by spreading communism he will gradually subjugate the whole world without war. What Khrushchev wants at the present time, blackmailing the West with the Berlin question, is to obtain at least the silent consent of the West to the integration of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain into the Soviet Union. For, no matter what will be the form or the agenda of the forthcoming international conferences they will of necessity affect the most vital interests of the Polish Nation as well as those of other European captive nations which have been deprived of freedom and independence by the Soviet imperialism and Communist dictatorship.

Question. Why then the problem of Berlin?

Answer. Berlin is a pretext. The problem of Berlin cannot be dealt with separately. It is closely connected with the whole problem of Germany and the problem of European security in the same manner as the security of Europe and peace of the world are connected with the fate of the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

It is necessary, therefore, to remind the Governments and peoples of the West that their obligations to the Polish nation are of a much earlier date than those to the German nation. The obligations of the West to the Polish nation were undertaken as a natural and logical result of joint fight of the Allies against the German aggression. These obligations are found in the promises

made to the Polish nation by the Western Powers during and after the Second World War as well as the international agreements concluded by them with the Soviet Union. The forthcoming international conferences between the West and the Soviet Union, therefore, should have in first place on their agenda also the question of Poland and of the other nations of Central Europe. Having violated all mutual pledges and the international agreements, the Soviet Union and its agents deprived these nations of freedom and independence, falsified their will and imposed on them a dreadful system of Communist dictatorship.

Question. What is your opinion of the question of a peace treaty with Germany?

Answer. I am in favor of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany as soon as possible.

I cannot forget, however, the aspect stressed some time ago by the Polish National Democratic Committee, that at the present time the Polish nation would be deprived of free representation at such a conference, because the representatives of the Warsaw Communist regime represent only the interests of the Community Party, bound with the policy of the Community Party of the Soviet Union, and not the interests and the will of the overwhelmingly anti-Communist oriented Polish nation. Nevertheless, I consider that a peace treaty with Germany should be concluded as soon as possible. This peace treaty should contain the guaranties of security, freedom, and peace to Poland and to other nations behind the Iron Curtain. It should ratify finally the present western frontier of Poland at the Oder and Lusatian Neisse Rivers. It should make impossible any rise of Germany revisionism and imperialism as well as continuance of the pretenses that the Soviet Union and its satellite Communist parties in the countries behind the Iron Curtain are the only defenders of Poland and other captive nations in the international arena.

Question. Much has been constantly written and said of the necessity of mutual concessions in case of an East-West summit conference. What do you think about it?

Answer. So far as Poland is concerned, the Western Powers, without consulting the Polish nation, made all concessions to the Soviet Union at the expense of Poland in the international agreements concluded with the Soviet Union toward the end of the Second World War and after the cessation of the hostilities. The Soviet Union took advantage of all these concessions and at the same time violated the entire agreements, refusing to fulfill any of its own obligations.

The last concession which the West could still make to Khrushchev would be a silent acceptance of the violation by the Soviet Union of all the international agreements regarding the captive nations, resulting in depriving Poland and the other nations behind the Iron Curtain of freedom and independence, and the invitation to the forthcoming international conferences only and exclusively of the representatives of the Communist parties and Communist regimes to speak in the name of their captive victims.

Question. There is the probability that the true voice of the Polish nation will not be heard at the forthcoming international conferences. What should be done in this situation?

Answer. The present international situation creates an opportunity for the Western Powers—the United States, Great Britain, and France—as well as for the United Nations to initiate action on the basis of existing international obligations and to make some proposals which could lead to realization of the true objectives of the Polish nation.

It is necessary, therefore, to keep reminding the Western Powers and public opinion of the free world of the real aspirations of the Polish nation at the present moment.

Question. What are these real aspirations of the Polish nation at the present moment?

Answer. The basic aspirations of the Polish nation are:

1. The final recognition of the frontier on the Oder and Lusatian Neisse Rivers;

2. Withdrawal from Poland of all Soviet functionaries and military units;

3. Relieving Poland from the obligation of the Warsaw Pact and obtaining from the West guarantees of security against German revisionism and against the possibility of repetition of German aggression, as well as assurances of joint action against a possibility of a new Soviet-German agreement similar to that in 1939;

4. The restoration of freedom of the press, freedom of speech and assembly, and the right of organizing of independent political parties, professional, cultural and youth organizations in Poland;

5. Free democratic elections under the control of the United Nations;

6. Repatriation of all the Poles from the Soviet Union;

7. Assisting the development of the Polish economy which is in the present situation impossible without considerable material aid from the West.

We should all strive for placing these aspirations of the Polish nation on the agenda of the forthcoming international conferences and continually and under any circumstances fight for their realization.

## Pope John Honors Bishop Martin J. O'Connor of Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Thursday, March 12, 1959:

POPE HONORS CITY BISHOP

In confirming the Most Reverend Martin J. O'Connor as president of the reorganized Pontifical Commission for Motion Pictures, Radio, and Television, which now becomes a part of the Vatican Secretariat of State, Pope John XXIII paid an impressive tribute to the former pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Immaculate Conception, Wilkes-Barre, who left here in 1946 to become rector of the North American College.

Thus, Bishop O'Connor is the ranking American prelate in the Curia, the central administration of the Roman Catholic Church, of which the Secretariat of State is the highest administrative office. Also, he serves as an unofficial ambassador in Rome for some 30 million American Catholics.

The late Pope Pius XII appointed Bishop O'Connor to the Pontifical Commission for Motion Pictures in 1947. Later, the Commission was expanded to include television and radio, putting Bishop O'Connor in charge of mass media for the Catholic Church throughout the world, in addition to his duties as head of the North American College.

In 1958, Pope Pius renewed the appointment for a 6-year term and now, in continuing Bishop O'Connor in the presidency, the new Pontiff enlarges his duties and the scope of the Commission. The fact that Pope John, in connection with the announcement, saw fit to issue a pastoral letter, calling on the hierarchy throughout the world to cooperate, emphasizes the importance attached to the Commission.

Wilkes-Barre knows Bishop O'Connor not only as a dedicated and modest churchman, but an administrator of tremendous capacity. His achievement in reestablishing the North American College under the most difficult circumstances, in itself, adds lustre to a career, already outstanding, but, obviously, it is not to be the climax in his case. No distinction that might come to Bishop O'Connor will surprise this community because of its knowledge of his zeal and capacity.

## Bolivians Teach Us a Lesson—Anti-U.S. Riots Prove You Can't Buy Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to bring to the attention of the Members an editorial taken from the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer of March 15:

BOLIVIANS TEACH US A LESSON—ANTI-U.S. RIOTS PROVE YOU CAN'T BUY FRIENDS

(By John S. Knight)

Views on the news:

All who believe in hemispheric unity must be deeply distressed over the recent anti-American riots in Bolivia.

When mobs burn the U.S. flag, wreck Cochabamba's USIS library, stone the point 4 office in La Paz and march upon our embassy, it is fairly obvious that our efforts to promote friendship have failed.

The excuse for the demonstrations was a pettish paragraph in Time magazine which the proud Bolivians regarded as an insult to their country.

But the underlying reasons for Bolivia's sensitivity can be found in the failures of its own economic program.

Bolivia was once a feudal land dominated by the tin barons. Its people were either very rich, or very poor.

In 1952, a revolution ousted the old order and Bolivia's new leaders launched a series of reforms including nationalization of the tin mines.

Bolivia's welfare state was supposed to give the people higher pay, more job security, grants of land and in general, a better standard of living.

Unfortunately, things didn't turn out that way. Tin production dropped, agricultural workers quit when their simple needs were satisfied, inflation got out of hand and welfare costs mounted out of all proportion to the country's resources.

In such a climate of failure, leftist Bolivian leaders visited their resentment upon the United States.

In a land that is 68 percent illiterate, it was fairly easy to incite the people against the "Yankee octupus" and the "imperialists."

Few Latin American countries are prepared to accept the responsibility for their own mistakes, and Bolivia is no exception.

SUBSIDIES BRING FRIENDSHIP?

The Bolivian outbursts against the United States are unfortunate and undeserved.

In the last 6 years, Bolivia has accepted $129 million in U.S. aid. This amounts to $43 a Bolivian, the highest per capita figure of any nation receiving our assistance.

Currently, the U.S. plans to make up a 30 percent deficit in Bolivias budget, so that it may be brought into balance.

The only thing that Bolivia rejects is our friendly advice.

How long must we cling to the fanciful notion that our subsidies bring friendship?

How long must our citizens be taxed to pay for economic mismanagement throughout much of the world?

How long do we bear the insults to our flag, the pillaging of our buildings, the reviling of public officials?

It seems to me that even the most consecrated advocates of foreign aid would begin to question the wisdom of a program which has brought us not friendship, but enmity in many parts of the world.

We are told that foreign aid is essential to combat communism in the underdeveloped countries.

But when we give it, we are accused of having imperialistic designs.

## Socialized Farming Here To Stay?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an interesting editorial appearing in the February 28, 1959, issue of the California Farmer, entitled "Socialized Farming Here To Stay?":

SOCIALIZED FARMING HERE TO STAY?

In this issue you will find the complete text of the President's message to Congress on January 29 regarding the farm program. That message produced very little stir in the press, yet we thought it was one of the most shocking indictments of our price support program that we had ever read.

You might argue with the general philosophy of price supports, but how can anyone argue with the figures?

The President is putting it pretty mildly when he says, "The price support and production control program has not worked." Then he proceeds to outline some of the failures of the program briefed as follows:

We produce some 250 farm crops in the United States, of which 12 are supported at minimum support levels. But of the 12 products, only 3, namely wheat, corn, and cotton, account for 85 percent of the huge rotting stockpile owned by the Government.

Nearly a million and a half farms produce wheat, but half of those farms grab off 90 percent of the price support money.

Nearly a million farms produce cotton, but only a fourth of those farms receive 75 percent of the price support money.

The lion's share of the price support farmers with allotments of 100 acres or more average $7,000 a year in price support money for wheat, $10,000 per farm for cotton, and $10,000 a year for rice.

By the middle of this year, the Government will have $9.1 billion invested in farm commodities. The political "sweetheart" crops of wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco will get $7.5 billion of that $9.1 billion total.

It costs the taxpayers of this Nation a billion dollars a year just to store and manage this huge surplus of food and fiber.

During the present fiscal year we will tax ourselves to buy another $5.4 billion worth of farm products with $4.3 billion going to the favored 12 products.

Eisenhower says, "Heavy costs might be justifiable if they were temporary, if they were solving the problems of our farmers and if they were leading to a better balance of supplies and markets. But unfortunately this is not true."

The President points out that this is the fourth time he has sent a special plea to Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture has hammered the point continuously that we should move ourselves out of this high support program.

It amazes us that this farm program has been tolerated so long by the taxpayers and by the majority of farmers who in no way benefit.

We read a series of interviews with new Congressmen just taking office, as reported in the U.S. News & World Report. The thing that struck us was the way these men reacted to questions about their views on agriculture. There seemed to be a great uncertainty in their minds about the subject of price support levels. We find this encouraging, as previously the uninformed thought the higher the price support the more prosperous would be agriculture. Now they are beginning to look at those huge expenditures and those huge piles of wasted foods in warehouses and they are beginning to wonder about the wisdom of high price supports.

## Commissioner David B. Karrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring to learn that David B. Karrick will stay in public life as one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. To know that the District government will continue to enjoy the selfless service and devotion to high principle embodied in this man is indeed good news. Mr. Karrick takes his job seriously and gives of himself and his talents with an unselfishness that is outstanding. He is aware of the responsibilities that are his and executes them straightforwardly and with keen judgment. He gets things done without noise and ostention and he is unafraid to face any problem.

Mr. Karrick has a host of friends who cherish their relationship with him and who are proud of his loyal service to our Nation's Capital. A man of his character and capabilities is not found often in the public service and by his example he gives others courage to make the sacrifices that are demanded of faithful public servants. He is an inspiration to us all and has done much to benefit the government of the Capital City of our Nation.

I am pleased to include in my remarks the following editorials:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 14, 1959]

GOOD NEWS FOR CITY

It is good news that Washington will continue to have the services of Commissioner David B. Karrick for another year or so, at least. President Eisenhower is to be commended for urging Mr. Karrick to stay on the job at the District Building, and Mr. Karrick deserves the thanks of the community for accepting the appointment tendered him by the President—although with the proviso that he might have to resign toward the end of next year.

Commissioner Karrick's knowledge of District affairs and his valued administrative ability are needed in these crucial days, when vast public works projects are underway or planned and when increased governmental services are in demand, despite a continuing financial crisis. It would have been a serious blow to the city if Mr. Karrick had insisted on returning to private life at the expiration of his term on April 6.

[From the Washington News, Mar. 14, 1959]

THE CITY AND DAVID KARRICK

District Commissioner David B. Karrick's decision to stay on the job—for another 18 months at least—is grand news.

This is a time of many and vexing problems for our town, and we're sure that every thoughtful citizen shares our elation that Mr. Karrick's firm, sensible, modest and extremely able leadership will continue.

It is a tribute—and a justly deserved one—to the man that the very thought of his leaving resulted in an almost universal plea for him to stay, and the draft Karrick movement—we're proud of our part in starting it—finally left him little choice.

"Despite my original reluctance to accept this new appointment," Mr. Karrick told the President, "I certainly will not be a reluctant Commissioner."

From his past performance we know this is true. We hope the things Mr. Karrick can and will accomplish for this city in the months ahead will compensate him for what he must give up in order to respond so selflessly to the almost unanimous plea that he continue his tour of duty.

## Commemoration of the 20th Anniversary of Slovak Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege for me to add my small voice to the growing demands for freedom on the part of the millions of Slovaks and other nationalistic groups who are being kept in a captive status under the Soviet Communist rule.

Although, Premier Nikita Khruschev continues to boast of the military strength and the economic advances of the Soviet, he fails to recognize that this apparent strength is based upon a compulsive labor economy that is held together by fear, by military tanks and guns, and by the cloak, spy, and dagger machinations of the select Communist Party membership and leadership.

I am sure that the spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of the Slovak people cannot be quenched and will continue to grow. The nationalistic spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of millions of people under the domination of the Soviet Socialist Republic will continue to be a fatal weakness in the miscalculations of Mr. Khruschev and his Politburo Bureau.

I join with the Slovak League of America in their celebration of the 20th anniversary of Slovak independence on March 15, 1959. I join with the 2 million Americans of Slovak origin in their aspirations for the liberation of the Slovak peoples.

## H.R. 5549, To Amend the Garnishment Laws of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 11, I introduced H.R. 5549, to amend the District of Columbia code of laws relating to attachment and garnishment of wages.

The following is my statement before the House District Committee today in support of this measure:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE HOUSE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE CONCERNING H.R. 835, H.R. 836, H.R. 2329, AND H.R. 5549, MARCH 16, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to present this brief statement in connection with the amendment of the District of Columbia code of laws relating to attachment and garnishment of compensation of judgment debtors.

H.R. 835, which you have before you, I believe is identical with H.R. 7035 of the 85th Congress. Both bills were introduced by our distinguished chairman, Mr. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina.

H.R. 835 limits attachments of compensation to 10 percent of the judgment debtor's gross earnings. Obviously this is a marked improvement over existing law.

H.R. 836, I think, is the much better statute because it provides for a 10 percent levy on the first $200 a month of earnings, 20 percent on the next $300 of earnings, and 50 percent of any earnings in excess of $500 per month.

H.R. 2329, introduced by our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], prohibits attachments on debtors' compensation. This, I hope the committee will agree, would be a step in the wrong direction.

My bill, H.R. 5549, takes all of H.R. 836 and then adds on to it additional provisions. It is my hope that, regardless of whether the committee goes along with the provisions of H.R. 835 or H.R. 836, it will add as an amendment to whichever bill is reported, the additional provisions of my bill.

I have lifted these provisions bodily from the New York State statute which has worked extremely well since the date of its enactment many years ago. Briefly, what it does is simply this. In addition to the statutory provision permitting a garnishment or attachment of up to 10 percent of the gross earnings of a debtor, as permitted by New York law, any judgment creditor may apply to the court for an order requiring the debtor to pay out of his earnings an additional sum over and above the amount of the garnishment. It does more. It permits the court, upon determining the facts, to require payments by a judgment debtor who, while actually working and earning compensation, pretends to be working for nothing or for unreasonably small compensation for an employer who actually is himself under the guise of a corporation or the business of a friend or relative.

At first blush it would appear that this will load the courts down with additional litigation. In practice it has had the opposite effect in New York. Debtors there have learned that they cannot make themselves judgment-proof and prevent the collection of just debts by doing business under corporate names and paying themselves low salaries, nor can they any longer establish in the name of or transfer to friends and relatives businesses which are actually their own. Upon establishment of the facts, the court is permitted to go behind the shell or color of the transaction and fix a sum to be paid by the debtor commensurate with his earnings and his needs. In cases where the debtor is working for substantial compensation the court has a right to determine how much he needs for the maintenance of himself and his dependents and then fix a fair sum payable out of the excess that he earns, to be paid by him to a judgment creditor.

Knowing that the creditor has these judicial proceedings available to him, the debtor invariably works out a fair settlement with the creditor outside of the courtroom.

I respectfully urge the committee to add the provisions of my bill to any bill that it reports.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this statement.

## From Guns to Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of March 2, 1959, entitled "From Guns to Missiles," giving credit to our friend and colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] for the important part he played in canceling by the Navy Department of the Naval Gun Factory. As the editorial well said, "Credit for the Navy's change in plan should go largely to Representative LANKFORD, of Maryland."

The important part Congressman LANKFORD played in saving the Naval Gun Factory, with continued employment for those employed there, and happiness to their families, as well as the significance of this to the city of Washington and vicinity, illustrates the sincere and effective character of service he renders in the Halls of Congress.

FROM GUNS TO MISSILES

The Navy Department has shown good sense in canceling plans to let the Naval Gun Factory here pass into oblivion, along with the big guns which it once built and repaired. It is good news that the 158-year-old plant on the Anacostia River is to be given new contracts which will keep it busy for at least 18 months and probably for three more years. By that time the factory should have become well established as an essential facility in the age of missile warfare.

The decision by some Navy officials to curtail or abandon operations at the big heavy-machine plant was severely criticized in and out of Congress, in view of naval plans for building new plants elsewhere or awarding contracts to private firms. It was pointed out that the local factory had proved capable of doing complicated work on missile components and that the Government might save money by converting the plant from gun work to missile contracts. Credit for the Navy's change in plan should go largely to Representative LANKFORD of Maryland, the Washington Board of Trade, and various union and civic groups which joined in a save-the-gun-factory drive.

With the conversion to missile operations, the old plant ought to be given a new name, more in keeping with its modern mission. Known originally as the Washington Navy Yard (it then built ships as well as armament), the plant was renamed the Naval Gun Factory in 1945. So a further change of name in tune with the changing nature of naval warfare would follow precedent.

## Doing Well Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Rockford (Ill.) Morning Star, of March 12, 1959:

DOING WELL ENOUGH

American Farm Bureau Federation has made a strong case against an expanded program of Federal aid to education in a statement submitted to a House education subcommittee. The farm bureau recognizes the need for continual improvement of our educational system, and its members are active in the work of school districts throughout the Nation. They are a strong force in the fight to keep the public schools a State and community responsibility.

An important part of the work of the farm bureau is studying educational problems through workshops within the organization and participation in school affairs. These studies have convinced this great farm organization that there is no need for a new program of Federal aid to education. The farm bureau is confident that States and local communities will continue to provide adequately for public education.

Anyone who has traveled throughout the Nation, the statement said, must be impressed by the new schools that are being constructed in almost every community. Counties and communities throughout the Nation, it was pointed out, are spending unprecedented sums for new schoolroom construction and are making earnest efforts to increase teachers' salaries and improve overall conditions of our schools.

Local people, the farm bureau is convinced, understand this challenge and will meet it through local taxation and without Federal controls. The point is made that Federal aid could slow down this process by taking away some of the initiative of local communities to improve their own schools.

Cited in the statement are a report from the U.S. Office of Education that 71,600 classrooms were completed during the 1957–58 school year and figures compiled by the Investment Bankers Association of America showing that local communities issued $2.3 billion worth of school bonds in 1958.

The administration school-aid bill, under which the Federal Government would pay

principal and interest on such bond issues on a 50–50 matching basis, runs the risk of overstepping the bounds of the Eisenhower economy program. The Democrats have a more liberal bill providing for an outlay of $1.1 billion in the next fiscal year.

The farm bureau federation believes that these programs would prove to be a great disservice to our public-school system. Local responsibility, rather than Federal aid and domination, is all important to the good functioning of our schools.

## Robert C. Vance Cited for Nike Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week the Department of the Army will pay tribute to one of Connecticut's distinguished citizens when it awards a citation and medal to Mr. Robert C. Vance, editor and publisher of the New Britain Herald.

The award will be made in appreciation of patriotic civilian service by Mr. Vance in promoting mutual understanding between the civilian population and members of Army Nike units in Connecticut.

Thanks in large part to Mr. Vance's efforts, the relationship between the military personnel and the community and State has been one of harmony and mutual good will.

A veteran of service with both the French and American Armies in World War I, Mr. Vance was one of the founders of the American Legion. He has always maintained a keen and understanding interest in military and veterans' affairs. The New Britain Herald, under his leadership, has earned respect, extending far beyond the borders of my State, for its public service.

I join the Army in saluting Mr. Vance, and in order that this recognition of his work may be permanently recorded, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following account of the award announcement from the New Britain Herald of Wednesday, March 11, 1959:

HERALD EDITOR CITED BY ARMY FOR NIKE AID: HELPED PROMOTE UNDERSTANDING WITH PERSONNEL

The Department of the Army as cited Robert C. Vance, editor and publisher of the New Britain Herald in appreciation of patriotic civilian service.

The announcement was made today by Col. Vester M. Shultz, commanding officer of the 63d Artillery Group, in charge of Nike defense posts throughout the State, with headquarters on Rocky Hill Avenue here.

The citation is the only one of its kind presented through the group in Connecticut, and is signed by Lt. Gen. Charles E. Hart, commanding general, U.S. Army Air Defense Command, and Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army.

A lapel pin is included as part of the citation.

Tentative plans call for official presentation of the award next week.

Colonel Shultz pointed out the citation underscores something relatively new hereabout in an "era of peace with need for strong emphasis on defense"—the stationing of military personnel in the midst of the civilian population.

The colonel was quick to note that mutual understanding is vital to the success of this kind of undertaking.

He added that New Britain and Connecticut are particularly noteworthy in this regard for these reasons:

1. Military installations have not been known to this area for many years.

2. Despite this, civilian-military relations are outstanding.

Another key factor is that newspapers traditionally play an important role in mutual understanding.

With the center of the Nike statewide command located in New Britain, the selection of the editor of the New Britain Herald followed because of the leading role played by the Herald in promoting and encouraging this understanding, Col. Shultz indicated.

The certificate of appreciation reads as follows:

"Mr. Robert Cummings Vance, editor and publisher of the New Britain Herald, New Britain, Conn., distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the U.S. Army druing the period April 15 1956 to January 31, 1959. The acceptance of the U.S. Army as an integral part of his community is attributed largely to the sincere interest and efforts of Mr. Vance. His excellent editorials depicting the organization, purpose and mission of NIKE installations have been invaluable in promoting good will and understanding between the military and civilian population, and have contributed immeasurably to the successful accomplishment of the mission of the 63d Artillery Group (Air Defense).

"In addition to rendering unstinting support in his newspaper and community activities, Mr. Vance has been a stanch and enthusiastic supporter of the U.S. Army in its role in the Air Defense of the New England area. Mr. Vance's outstanding efforts in furthering community relations earned the respect and appreciation of civilian and military members alike throughout the entire State of Connecticut."

Mr. Vance, who served with the French and the U.S. forces in France during World War I, has the distinction of being one of the founders of the American Legion.

One of the first American Legion posters shows three men just returned to civilian clothes. Mr. Vance is one of the trio and his collection of mementos includes the photograph from which the poster was drawn.

Since 1918, Mr. Vance has been active in national, State and local veterans' affairs and, from time to time, has been honored for this activity.

In addition to the American Legion, he has been close to the Veterans of Foreign Wars and other veterans' groups.

His other memberships include the Moose and Elks, along with several other organizations.

## A Farm Poll on Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Des Moines Register of Des Moines, Iowa, relative to a poll that was taken in my own home county among 99 farmers on their ideas relative to farm support.

A FARM POLL ON SUPPORTS

AUDUBON, IOWA.—Future Farmers of America chapter here has completed a survey of 99 Audubon county farmers to get their opinions on Government price supports and farm subsidy proposals.

Five choices were given, and here is how the farmers answered:

The largest group—27 percent— favored removing the Government entirely from the farm program—no price supports of any kind, no controls and free markets.

Twenty-four percent favored only emergency supports, with a suggested price floor, of 50 percent of parity in times of extreme hardship, and no production controls.

Twenty-four percent favored adjustment supports, such as 90 percent of the 3-year average of market prices, and moderate production controls.

The other 25 percent approved production payments, under which the Government would allow farm prices to seek their own level in the market place and then pay the farmers in cash to make up the difference between market prices and the support level.

Results of the survey were announced by James E. Hamilton, FFA chapter adviser.

## A Congressional Report—Private Enterprise and the "Ruble War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT—PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND THE "RUBLE WAR"

(By Representative STEWART L. UDALL)

If there is no thermonuclear war, it is likely that the whole future balance of world power will largely depend on what has been called "the ruble war"—the struggle for supremacy between the two dominant economic systems in the world today.

Nearly one-third of the world's people have achieved independence during the last 15 years. Of course, these people want above all to establish stable governments and develop economic systems which will improve their lot.

The Kremlin is already bidding for the minds of these people by ruble loans, offers of trade, and mission of technicians who invariably speak the language of the host country and are ready with resource development programs.

The central question, then, may well be whether these nations believe our way, or that of the Communists, offers the best hope for a decent standard of living and the solution of their problems.

To date, the free world countries are offering economic assistance at two counters: Hard loans through the World Bank; and soft loans (repayable at low interest rates over long periods of time) from the Development Loan Fund administered by our Government as part of the foreign aid program. The Loan Fund, established by the last Congress, has yet to establish a history that will permit us to pass judgment on its

adequacy, but it is already clear that insufficient development capital is available to underwrite the bare minimum economic growth rate required.

Some students of history point out that the strength of the British Empire last century was due, in part, to the fact that the British businessmen of that era were advanturous exporters of capital—both within and without the Commonwealth. Some of us have been wondering here whether America should not take a cue from the British, and encourage American private enterprise to carry its know-how abroad and help build up the economies of the underdeveloped areas.

Congressman HALE BOGGS of New Orleans pointed out to Congress this year that our foreign investment policy actually discourages expansion by private enterprise abroad. He believes our tax laws should be reconstructed to encourage foreign risk capital as an essential part of our long run national security program.

Last week I joined with Representative BOGGS in sponsoring a bill designed to drastically revise these laws. This legislation would enable private enterprise to do business in foreign countries on a competitive basis with investors from other countries (through a new class of foreign business corporations). If enacted it should galvanize our business leaders toward meeting the Soviet challenge on the economic front by conferring tax advantages on earnings abroad. Its success would make it possible to substitute private investment for some kinds of foreign aid, and thus encourage a new American program of economic aid.

It seems to me that we have become preoccupied with the military race with the Communists, and have neglected competition in economic fields where the ultimate test may come.

Who can say that our businessmen might not hit a homerun in the "ruble war" if we gave them an inning at bat? Indeed, why not give them a chance now?

## Forgotten Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix an editorial from the Washinton Post and Times Herald of Sunday, March 8, 1959, on the remarks made on the floor the other day by the able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. O'NEILL.

This editorial shows that the people of the United States and, indeed, editorial opinion make clear that an investigation of this matter in accordance with the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on the opening day of the First Session of the 86th Congress should be carried out.

FORGOTTEN INVESTIGATION

Representative O'NEILL'S question about what has happened to the proposed investigation of the election of Dr. DALE ALFORD is timely and pertinent. The House's Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures unanimously called for such an inquiry. A majority recommended that Dr. ALFORD be denied a seat until all questions in regard to his election could be cleared up. The House rejected this course, but as Mr. O'NEILL has said, there was an implied agreement that the investigation would go forward. The first week in March has passed with nothing being done. Is the investigation to be delayed until the term of the Congressman from Little Rock has expired?

Mr. O'NEILL reviewed enough of the evidence presented to the special committee to indicate the seriousness of the charges in this case. In fairness to Dr. ALFORD and to former Representative Hays whom he defeated, the House has an obligation to determine whether this derogatory evidence is valid. It has an even greater obligation to protect its own integrity against illegality and fraud in the election of its members. The House has a responsibility to the country to do its duty in this matter in ample time to make its decision meaningful.

## Reply to American Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter addressed to the New York Law Journal in reply to a letter from the President of the American Bar Association addressed to me and published in the March 4 issue of the New York Law Journal. The text of my letter follows:

MARCH 10, 1959.

Mr. JUDSON F. FALKNOR,
*Editor, New York Law Journal,*
*217 Broadway, New York, N.Y.*

DEAR MR. FALKNOR: The March 4 issue of the New York Law Journal carried the text of a letter to me from President Malone of the American Bar Association, in which he challenged my criticism of the recent action by that organization on the report and recommendations of its Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives.

Mr. Malone maintains that the action of the house of delegates in approving a number of recommendations calling upon Congress to overrule by legislation certain decisions of the Supreme Court was a responsible expression of professional criticism. He further maintains that since the house of delegates specifically disclaimed any intention to censure or attack the Supreme Court, my statement condemning the ABA for maligning the Supreme Court was wholly unjustified.

As Al Smith used to say: "Let's look in the record." The recommendations approved by the House of Delegates came before it as part of the report of its Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives. The essence of that report is that communnism is a danger to the United States and that the Supreme Court is soft to Communists, has encouraged Communist activity, and has caused the paralysis of our internal security.

Let me quote directly from the report:

"Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage and increase Communist activity in the United States."

The report goes on to say:

"The paralysis of our internal security grows largely from construction and interpretation centering around technicalities emanating from our judicial process."

Is this the temperate, reasoned, thoughtful approach to difficult problems which we have a right to expect from a convention of lawyers?

I think that it is not and I believe that Mr. Malone agrees with me. Last Friday, he and I appeared over the CBS network on "The Leading Question." I asked Mr. Malone whether he thought the report of the committee represented a fair and justifiable criticism of the Court. Mr. Malone candidly replied that he would not have written the report that way.

Aside from its tenor, the report is objectionable for several other reasons. First and most important, it is unconcerned with the preservation of individual liberties. Here and there lipservice is paid to constitutional guarantees. But unfortunately the Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives, created to deal with the problems of communism, did not allow its thinking to become confused with any real concern for the effect of its solutions on civil liberties.

Secondly, the conclusion of the committee that the decisions of the Supreme Court in the 24 cases discussed in the report have paralyzed our internal security is totally unsubstantiated. Taken either individually or together, it is difficult to see how decisions like *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, *Watkins* v. *U.S.*, *Gold* v. *U.S.*, *Kent* v. *Dulles* could destroy America from within. Rather, I feel that were it not for some of those decisions we might, in our search for complete security, have put ourselves well on the way to destroying ourselves.

Mr. Malone argues, however, that the ABA cannot be held responsible for the report of its committee, since the action of the house of delegates was only on the recommendations. While this distinction may have some relation to the niceties of ABA procedures, it has none to the realities of the situation. The fact is that it is the report which provides the reasons for the recommendations. It is the report which reveals the level of deliberation which produced the recommendations. And it is the rhetoric of the report which characterizes the ABA's attitude in the public mind and in the press. I believe that the report is no more separable from the recommendations than are the roots from the tree, and that the ABA must accept the unhappy responsibility for both.

Very sincerely,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

## Hawaii Statehood

SPEECH
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill ( S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, Hawaii has the population, economy, and proper respect for constitutional government to support statehood. As a Territory, its people have demonstrated a firm adherence to our common American ideals and practices. On the battlefields of Europe, the Pacific, and Korea, the loyalty of the people of Hawaii, as Americans, has been indelibly written into the pages of world history. I am proud to support the bill to admit Hawaii into the Union as our 50th State.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 42

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on pollution entitled "Pollution Wreaks Quick Havoc Here" from the Olympia (Wash.) Olympian of October 16, 1957. Pollution in the Des Chutes River destroyed thousands of salmon. This was waste, not only of an esthetic value or of a thing enjoyed by conservationists and fishermen, but it was waste of a valuable economic resource.

I hope this and other articles which I have been inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subject of pollution in our rivers and streams will have some small effect in making America aware of the need for vigorous action to do away with pollution and the horrible waste and degradation of a vital American asset, water.

POLLUTION WREAKS QUICK HAVOC HERE

(By Mike Contris)

Conclusive evidence was given to all of us here the other day of the destructive force of pollution in our rivers. A few hours of sewage pumping station failure and the toll of migrating spawning salmon was a tragic one. Estimates of the fish that died as a result of having sewage flow directly into the Des Chutes River are staggering ones because only a few days before, those of us interested in this great salmon experiment at Tumwater Falls, had been told that a record number of chinooks was expected to take to the river for spawning.

Previous to the object lesson in pollution, most of us had thought of fish kills by toxic wastes as something that happened elsewhere. Closer to us was the problem of the Olympia oyster and its near extinction from some reason or other. But we had not experienced the devastating effects pollution can have when it fouls up a river or stream and fish become involved, not so close to home anyway.

The pump failure was definitely an accident. There have been similar failures before and accidents will always happen, of course. It is too bad that when the pump fails the wastes should get into the Des Chutes. Perhaps this can be remedied so that future failures do not result in marine life casualties. The accident should point up, too, the reason for the sometimes seemingly overemphasized cautions about pollution in our waters. Capitol Lake, for instance, is eagerly sought as a site for a swimming pool. Now we should realize why health officials are so cautious about declaring it ready for recreational use.

Maybe the pollution that caused the death of the spawning salmon would not cause similar results among humans. We certainly would not want to have our youngsters test to find out. The presence of even a small amount of human sewage is worry enough as a source of potential disease among those who might swim or play in such contaminated water.

And our Capitol Lake is going to have this sort of pollution so long as raw sewage is dumped into the bay. This raw sewage is from a portion of the city's sewer system that is as yet not connected to the sewage disposal plant. And this, in our opinion, almost erases the good that the disposal plant is doing and has done. The job is incomplete and so long as it is incomplete the bay, and now the lake, is not yet the play area it could and should be.

LET'S HOLLER OUT LOUD

From our conversations with many parents and other adults in the community, we gather that there is much disappointment about this continuing pollution problem after the job supposedly was all done. In fact, there is much more than disappointment, there is actual chagrin that this fault should have been allowed to go undetected and unpublicized before this. When lake cleanup men found a sewage outlet in Capitol Lake they were surprised. But they realized that there would be a remedy for it. When Milo Moore took over Capitol Lake as a pilot fish farm, there was considerable unhappiness and grumbling by those who had hoped to turn the lake into a city swimming site for next summer.

These persons were satisfied, however, when Moore said that the mixture of fresh and salt waters should have no effect whatever on the use of the lake for swimming or boating. Almost on the heels of that explanation, however, there came the news that the bay itself was still polluted by raw sewage, especially near the dam where salt water was permitted to move into the lake for the fish farm project. Pollution in the bay now became pollution in the lake.

It is our humble opinion that this killing of salmon and the presence of human sewage in the bay around the Capitol Lake dam will make many parents hesitate about turning to the lake for swimming. Consider, too, that had the pumping station failure in Tumwater occurred last summer when youngsters were swimming at the Deschutes Swim Beach beneath the bridge, there would have been great danger.

We hope there is no one who still maintains that this business of pollution in waters here is overemphasized. It doesn't take much to kill off the fish. And it wouldn't take much to cause serious illness among youngsters of this area, either. We should resolve to urge even tighter control of sewage and other wastes in so far as they concern our streams and the bay.

## Democrats Lack Tax Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I include the following article entitled "Democrats Lack Tax Courage," by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in his column "The Political Mill," in the Washington Evening Star of March 14, 1959:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

DEMOCRATS LACK TAX COURAGE

Democrats are demanding large increases in the national defense program, running from $2 to $5 billion above President Eisenhower's budget. The $5 billion figure was produced by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson of the Democratic Advisory Council. He produced no detailed list of increased expenditures. Just a good round sum.

None of these Democrats has suggested increases in Federal taxes to pay for these additional expenditures, running far beyond President Eisenhower's $40.9 billion defense budget. Deficit spending, with its devastating increases in the $283 billion national debt, apparently means little to them. They merely argue that defense is more important than a balanced budget. They appear intent on convincing the country they are for a strong defense, provided in advance of war, which they failed to provide before any of the last three wars—especially the latest, the Korean war.

This is not all. The Democrats want to increase greatly so-called domestic expenditures above the President's estimates and balanced budget. Already the Democratic-controlled Senate has passed a housing bill and an airport bill exceeding the Eisenhower budget recommendations by hundreds of millions of dollars. The Democratic House may still further increase these items of Federal expenditures. But no one has suggested increased taxes to met these deficit expenditures.

*President gave answer*

President Eisenhower's exasperated comment at his Wednesday press conference, when he had been asked about the Democratic slogan that defense should come before a balanced budget, was well made and well directed. He said, speaking directly of the protest by Democrats against his proposed reductions of 55,000 men in the Army and Marine Corps: "Why doesn't anyone have the courage to get right up and say 'I want 55,000 men'—and maybe they want them sometimes because they will be stationed at nice convenient places—why don't they say: 'But we want the taxes to pay for it (the retention of the 55,000 men whom the President does not believe are needed for our modern day defense)?'"

With an election of national proportions coming up next year, are the Democrats likely to demand increased Federal taxes? They are not—short of war, when anything goes. The President has made it exceedingly clear he does not put a balanced budget ahead of national defense. His defense budget, he insists, is ample—all the money he can spend and believes he should spend. He arrived at this budget after conferences with the best military brains in the country—and after taking an overall look. Indeed, a balanced budget is in reality an important part of national defense. If the credit of the Nation goes up in the smoke of overspending, the Nation becomes weak economically and less able to defend itself or aid its allies. The Berlin crisis is the immediate reason around which the Democrats are building their clamor for billions more for defense. The President replies that we have to learn to live with such crises for years to come, indeed, as long as the Russian Communist dictators wish to create crises.

*Rockefeller sets example*

However, if the Democrats in Congress are intent on big spending, far beyond the present and expected Federal income, they should not let politics interfere. They should submit a program of taxation which will bring in increased revenue to meet their proposed expenditures. They could well take a leaf from the book of a Republican Governor, Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York. Mr. Rockefeller, recognizing that increased revenue is needed to pay the debts incurred by the Democratic Harriman administration of the last 4 years and also to meet expenditures for some improved services to the people of New York, came forward immediately after the opening of the legislature with a State budget in excess of $2 billion—the first such in history—and at the same time proposed a program of increased taxes. This took courage. He realizes as well as any other political leader that spending is always popular and taxation is never popular.

Governor Rockefeller, despite the moans of the taxpayers and the gloomy prognosti-

cations of the politicians, has won a material victory. He has reduced his spending budget a few million, but he has won nearly all the increased taxes for which he asked. He is more fortunately situated than President Eisenhower. He has a Republican-controlled legislature. The President has a Democratic-controlled Congress on his hands. But if the President had a Republican Congress to deal with, he still would maintain his position that the fiscal policies of the Government of the United States must be sound as well as its programs for national defense. The present Democratic program for Federal spending could cause great inflation, and great inflation could be the ruin of us.

## Union Tactics in Princeville, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from Mr. L. E. German, president of the village of Princeville, Ill., together with a resolution adopted unanimously by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Princeville at the regular meeting held Monday, March 2, 1959:

VILLAGE OF PRINCEVILLE,
*Princeville, Ill., March 9, 1959.*

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
*Old Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. MICHEL: I am enclosing a copy of a resolution, passed by the Village Board of the Village of Princeville, which I have been instructed by the board to forward to you.

The local feeling is very much against tactics that are being employed by these unions in forcing this company to meet their demands. We feel local help should be permitted to work on this plant. We feel the unions of Peoria are completely out of line in their demands and their tactics in trying to force themselves upon the people of Princeville.

Princeville, generally speaking, is mainly an agricultural town even though we do have some light industry. Being of this nature, we therefore are not use to having our community upset by tactics used by these unions in forcing their demands.

We feel our situation is not unlike the many situations that are occurring throughout the Nation. Therefore, we would appreciate you as our Representative, make it known to the congressional committee investigating this type of crime of our situation. We would appreciate if you would make this letter known to Congress and if posible made part of the congressional minutes. The citizens of Princeville do not like to have this sort of conditions forced upon them any more than any other peace loving community of these United States.

Very truly yours,
VILLAGE OF PRINCEVILLE,
L. S. GERMAN, *President.*

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the president and Board of Trustees of the Village of Princeville at the regular meeting of said board held Monday, March 2, 1959:

*"Resolved,* That the president of this board advise Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL of the following situation which has developed, detrimental to the best interests of the village of Princeville, by reason of unwarranted labor union activity within the village of Princeville, which area historically has been nonunion:

"1. Through efforts of the community leaders, during the spring and summer of 1958, Lester L. Smith was persuaded to construct a new plant at Princeville for the fabrication of aluminum products. Eighteen thousand dollars of village revenue funds were expended to extend water and sewer facilities to the site, all without cost to Mr. Smith. It had been anticipated that the village of Princeville would benefit from the increased employment and business activity gained through the construction of Mr. Smith's plant.

"2. Construction of the plant was started in the fall of 1958 and contracts let to both nonunion and union contractors and building trade workers in, accordance with the long standing custom followed in construction projects in the community. Specifically, the general contract for the building itself, was let to a union contractor from Peoria, and a contract for all plumbing, heating, and wiring was let to a local contractor. Within the past 4 years a new post office, a library, and a manufacturing plant have been constructed in Princeville through joint efforts of union and nonunion (Princeville) labor.

"3. On Wednesday, February 25, 1959, the building trade unions stopped work of the general contract because of nonunion labor being employed in electrical, plumbing, and heating work which was being carried forward by Princeville workmen. Mr. Smith was advised that work would not be resumed until such time that all nonunion people were withdrawn from the job. In effect, this meant that work would not resume until all Princeville people were put off the job. As a matter of fact, the old contracts have been cancelled and new contracts have been let, so that all local workmen are now denied employment on the job.

"4. Mr. Smith advises he had been forced to cancell the contracts under which Princeville people were employed because of union threats to establish picket lines around the construction project and also around his plant now in operation in Peoria, and further threatening Mr. Smith that his products will be blacklisted from use by union building tradesmen throughout the country. Mr. Smith has further advised he has been warned of future union demands and conditions regarding removal of his operation from Peoria to Princeville."

## Hail to the Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Hampton Union and the Rockingham County Gazette, Hampton, N.H., of March 12, 1959, entitled "Hail to the Chief."

HAIL TO THE CHIEF

Like a breath of spring after a hard winter comes the state visit of President Jose Maria Lemus, chief executive of El Salvador, the smallest nation—but far from the least important—in the continental Americas.

No "banana republic," El Salvador has a stable, thoroughly democratic government that has outlawed communism and enthroned free enterprise and the homely virtues of thrift and economy. President Lemus' country—a sun-filled land of lakes and volcanoes on the Pacific coast of Central America—not only balances its budget, but has stacked up monetary surpluses for many years. Its remarkably stable currency has maintained the same dollar ratio since 1934. And President Lemus did not come here for a handout.

About the size of Massachusetts, El Salvador is one of the world's leading producers of coffee and does most of its business with the United States. With about 2,300,000 people, it is perhaps the most densely populated country in the Western Hemisphere. And with the prospect of all Central America doubling its population in 25 years, the Lemus administration is hard at work developing both industry and agriculture to provide tomorrow's jobs and thus checkmate Communist infiltration.

tIshould be noted also that nowadays the small nations have a big voice in world affairs through the U.N. and other international organizations. El Salvador has consistently supported the views of the West and has not only led the Central American bloc in the U.N. but has also provided the example for expanding democracy in Latin America.

In welcoming President Lemus we do honor to one of our best friends. As he comes here to learn still more about us and our methods, know-how that he can transplant in his own country it is our opportunity to learn more about El Salvador, and to demonstrate to the world that U.S. respect for its littlest ally is as profound and as warm as for the very largest.

## Honors Bestowed on George Peabody, Esq.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting article from the Peabody (Mass.) Times for February 19, 1959, which will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD, about George Peabody, Esq., the man after whom Peabody, Mass., was named.

HONORS BESTOWED ON GEORGE PEABODY, ESQ.

(By Edward J. O'Connor)

Yesterday, February 18, marked the 164th anniversary of the birth of George Peabody, Esq., the man after whom this community was named. In February of 1957, I wrote an article about the solemn funeral of this man and several weeks later a short biography of Mr. Peabody. (Editor's note: These two articles were subsequently reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman LANE.) In 1958 I wrote an article to show the vast extent to which the money gifts of Mr. Peabody were used for public benefaction both in the United States and in England.

This year I would like to point out the high regard in which George Peabody was held by his fellowmen while he lived. This man re-

ceived so many high honors and decorations that it is difficult to know with which one to start. Since we hold in trust the priceless miniature portrait of Queen Victoria in our local Peabody Institute, this seems to be a good one with which to begin.

As Mr. Peabody's life started to draw to a close he wanted to dispose of his fortune in bequests that would benefit large numbers of people over long periods of time. In England, where he made the bulk of his fortune in international banking, he decided to give a large portion of his wealth for the poor of the City of London. To give one's fortune to the poor was practically unheard of at that time.

After George Peabody had made this generous gift of over $2 million, Queen Victoria felt that she must show to Mr. Peabody her gratitude by offering him a title of knighthood. Mr. Peabody refused this honor because of the value he placed on his American citizenship. In the refusal of the Queen's titled gift Mr. Peabody in no way alienated her affection for him. In place of the offer of an English title the Queen decided to have a portrait of herself painted and baked in enamel. To this end, she commissioned an artist to do the work.

After the portrait, mounted on velvet and surrounded by elaborate gold ornamentation, was presented to Mr. Peabody, he decided to place it on public display. He contacted the trustees of the Peabody Institute at South Danvers (now Peabody) and entrusted to their care this priceless work of art. The trustees had a special fireproof brick vault constructed for the reception of the Queen's portrait. Today, if you should pay a visit to the Peabody Institute on the main street of this city, you can view this portrait under glass highlighted by a special spotlight. The portrait itself is on a rolling dolly which is pushed back into the vault each evening. This protective action is to prevent the portrait from being ruined by fire or taken by art thieves.

Along with this priceless portrait Mr. Peabody presented to the trustees of the Peabody Institute, Peabody, Mass., the letter of transmittal that he received from the English monarch, Queen Victoria. This letter may also be seen by anyone if they wish to view an original communication written in the Queen's own handwriting. This letter is locked up in the vault because of its great value plus the all important additional fact that it could never be replaced.

Underneath the Queen's portrait are some of the medals bestowed on George Peabody, Esq., during his lifetime. Included there is the Gold Medal given to Mr. Peabody by the Congress of the United States. This award was accompanied by a congressional resolution of praise for Mr. Peabody's great contribution to help reconstruct education in our Southern States after the Civil War.

Also under the portrait are two gold boxes. The first is the award to Mr. Peabody of the freedom of the city of London. This high honor has been bestowed on only five Americans, namely; George Peabody, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, Gen. John J. Pershing, and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. The second gold box is a gift from the Fishmongers Co., an ancient London guild.

Perhaps some of the less known facts about Mr. Peabody are that the President of the United States, Andrew Johnson, considered him for the position of Secretary of the Treasury in his cabinet; that he received honorary degrees from Harvard and Oxford; and that he had a private audience with Pope Pius IX.

At the Royal Exchange in London in 1869 a statue of George Peabody was erected by public subscription. His Highness, the Prince of Wales officiated at the unveiling ceremonies.

Today in Nashville, Tenn., there is located an outstanding college named George Peabody College for Teachers. Some years after his death Mr. Peabody's name was given to this southern college in appreciation for his contribution to education in the South.

In the year 1900, 29 of the most famous Americans up to that time were elected to the Hall of Fame which is located in New York University. Among the persons elected was George Peabody, Esq.—he ranked 16th from the top of the list, or 15th if you take into consideration that Mr. Peabody was tied with Henry Clay of Kentucky. They each received 74 votes out of a possible 97—showing the high esteem in which he was held by his countrymen years after death.

These were some of the honors received by George Peabody to whom we are endebted for the public library and its many priceless treasures.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 41

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer on December 1, 1957, entitled "'Ohio's Foul Streams."

One particular aspect of pollution in Ohio waters is treated in this particular article, acid mine drainage.

The cost to the citizens of the State was estimated to be $2 million in 1940 from this one form of pollution alone. The article says it is undoubtedly much greater today.

The article closes with one remark which I think characterizes the problem Americans face:

We simply cannot ever learn to live with poisoned water.

However, we can learn to live with better opportunities for all of us if we will but clean up the filth which we constantly dump into our waters everywhere. There will be more and better fishing, hunting, boating, and recreational use of our rivers and streams. The cities will have to spend less on purifying their waters for municipal purposes. Industry will find more needed pure water to use for making better things for all of us. The article is as follows:

OHIO'S FOUL STREAMS

"And all the waters that were in the river were turned to blood. And the fish that was in the river died; and the river stank."

Thus Aaron stretched his rod over the Nile and created, with Jehovah's assistance, what was probably the first historical instance of stream pollution. It was so described in the "Book of Exodus."

In Biblical days they had no idea what caused the phenomenon, and so far as one major source of fouled waters in Ohio today is concerned, we're still almost as much in the dark.

The mystery has been acid mine discharges. Toxic sulfuric pollutants affect streams over an area covering one-fourth of Ohio. From a technical standpoint it has been a baffling problem ever since the 1890's, when fish kills first were noted in Pennsylvania rivers adjacent to mines. And the situation opens up involved questions of legal responsibilities, since acid stems from both active mines and abandoned ones, whose ownership now is debatable.

For southeastern Ohio the situation has turned out to be a sort of Janus-faced monster. The coal attracts new industry which would boost the economic level of this section. Simultaneously coal's unpleasant by-product ruins the fresh water so badly needed by the same operations. They are forced to turn away from where they'd like to be.

That's part of the intangible damage, which also extends into lowered property values along rivers, as well as loss of recreation and wildlife. The direct injury can be measured in costs of obtaining—sometimes by trucking—decent water, or in corroded boats and bridge underpinnings. Back in 1940 these tangible losses were estimated at $2 million yearly for this State; it's undoubtedly much greater today.

Is there any hope of a cure? Happily, yes. Ohio State University, in cooperation with the State Board of Pollution Control and the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, has analyzed the causes and effect. The Ohio State University study found bacteria to be an important contributing factor to the generation of sulphuric acid. It also came up with a series of recommendations as to ways to stop the process; they are now being tested in the field.

Whatever the eventual recommendation, we can be certain that it won't be a simple or cheap remedy. And we can't go running to Washington for help because the U.S. Public Health Service is limited in its efforts.

As we see it, the situation is pretty much like that which existed in this country prior to the passage of the bill authorizing construction of the Federal Interstate Highway System. It became clear to the public that they really were losing more through inadequate roads than it would cost to build new ones.

Once we all arrive at the same attitude regarding pollution, we'll make a major stride toward curing it. So let's make it everyone's business to see that the State pollution control authorities get the money they need, or further legislation if necessary. We simply cannot ever learn to live with poisoned water.

## Foreign Aid and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, today the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee has issued its first report entitled "Foreign Aid and You.

This committee is composed of the following distinguished Americans: chairman, Mr. Walter Harnischfeger, Milwaukee, Wis.; Hon. T. Coleman Andrews, Richmond, Va.; Hon. Spruille Braden, New York, N.Y.; Mr. Frank C. Brophy, Phoenix, Ariz.; Hon. Howard Buffet, Omaha, Nebr.; Mr. F. Gano Chance, Centralia, Mo.; Mr. Robert B. Dresser, Providence, R.I.; Mr. E. M. Elkin, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Hon. Guy George Gabrielson, Benardsville, N.J.; Mr. Luther O. Griffith, Huntington, W. Va.; Mr. Robert M. Harris, Forest Hills, N.Y.; Mr. A. G. Heinsohn, Jr., Knoxville, Tenn.; Mr. R. A. Hummel, New York,

N.Y.; Mr. Clarence Budington Kelland, Scottsdale, Ariz.; Hon. James S. Kemper, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. J. Bracken Lee, Salt Lake City, Utah; Mr. William Loeb, Reno, Nev.; Mr. R. Chesley McCormick, Wichita, Kans.; Mr. William L. McGrath, Cincinnati, Ohio; Mr. Sterling Morton, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Ruth Murray, Oshkosh, Wis.; Hon. Gerald P. Nye, Cooperstown, N. Dak.; Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, Grafton, Vt.; Mr. J. Howard Pew, Philadelphia, Pa.; Chief Justice M. T. Phelps, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mr. Henning W. Prentis, Jr., Lancaster, Pa.; Col. Willard F. Rockwell, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mr. Hubbard S. Russell, Maricopa, Calif.; Lt. Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, Winter Park, Fla.; Mr. Ernest G. Swigert, Portland, Oreg.; Mrs. Garvin E. Tankersley, Bethesda, Md.; Dr. Charles C. Tansill, Washington, D.C.; Mr. E. McL. Tittmann, New York, N.Y.; Gen. Albert Wedemeyer, Boyds, Md.; Hon. Burton K. Wheeler, Butte, Mont.; Gen. Robert E. Wood, Chicago, Ill.; Dean Clarence Manion, legal counsel, South Bend, Ind.; Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, study coordinator, Washington, D.C.

In view of the extremely high caliber of the committee membership, its report should be given careful study and serious consideration by every Member of the Congress before he votes in the next few weeks on the continuation of our mutual security program. This report is most timely in view of the fact that on last Friday the President of the United States submitted his message to the Congress on this subject.

It is my feeling that representatives of this committee should be called upon to testify at the hearings on this year's foreign-aid legislation and that the report which follows should be made a part of the hearings.

The report follows:

FOREIGN AID AND YOU—A FIRST REPORT BY THE CITIZENS FOREIGN AID COMMITTEE

I. OUR FOREIGN AID

We Americans have always had a historic policy of service to mankind. It is part of our heritage and our religion. For a century and a half and to all parts of the world, we have sent funds, supplies, missionaries, doctors, teachers, and technicians to lend a helping hand to those in need.

Reflecting this humanitarian spirit, our Government has extended aid when and where the need arose. As early as 1794 the Congresss voted relief for the victims of the Haitian Massacre. In 1812 relief was voted for earthquake victims in Venezuela. In 1921 to 1923, despite a hostile Kremlin, the Congress authorized relief for Russian famine sufferers. According to Russian leaders of that time this disaster aid, directed by Mr. Herbert Hoover, saved 20 million lives. Although relations with Japan were strained in 1923, the Congress authorized generous relief for victims of Japan's worst earthquake.

Person-to-person aid, together with governmental disaster relief, lifted American world prestige to unprecedented heights.

After World War II, however, our Government's attitude toward aid abroad changed drastically. Its foreign aid is now continuous and has been expanded until it has become global, with heavy commitments made for years ahead.

To rehabilitate the war-torn countries in Europe our Government launched the $13.5 billion Marshall plan. This was superseded by the present mutual security program which extends foreign aid to more than 70 countries. In the process of this expansion, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was created to strengthen Western Europe against the Red threat from the east.

Current fiscal appropriations for foreign aid are authorized under the Mutual Security Act, Public Law 853, 85th Congress. As part of foreign aid, Public Law 480, 83d Congress authorizes disposal of agricultural surplus commodities.

Foreign aid is divided into two major classifications: Military assistance and economic aid.

Military assistance includes: Military hardware, military training, offshore procurement (military material bought in foreign countries), special weapons development in allied countries.

Economic aid includes: Grants-in-aid (cash or commodities), point 4 (technical assistance), contributions to the United Nations, surplus agricultural products, development loans.

President's special assistance and contingency fund. This varied and complex foreign-aid program has now become an instrument of foreign policy. As such it should have one purpose only—to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of the United States. When foreign aid impedes our welfare, the Congress has no lawful power to appropriate.

In 1948 some 450 people were employed to administer and distribute foreign economic aid. Ten years and $41 billion later this staff has grown to 12,000 directing 2,000 projects. In addition, some 9,000 persons are engaged in the military-assistance program which has totaled $23 billion. As of December 31, 1958, there were a total of $6.6 billion in unexpended foreign-aid funds.

II. FOREIGN AID AND DEFENSE

Proponents of foreign aid argue that it offers the best means of avoiding war. They remind us that since NATO came into being the Soviets have not taken one square foot of Western Europe.

Whether or not the Soviets, with their 175 regular divisions and the world's largest air force, intended to occupy Western Europe is not known. Obviously Western Europe's 21 NATO division defense, with insufficient air support, is not an effective war deterrent. If the Soviets ever entertained invasion plans, one weapon alone has deterred them: the U.S. Strategic Air Command (SAC).

Meanwhile Western Europe, more prosperous than before World War II, is not carrying its proportionate share of the NATO defense effort. But we are carrying far more than our share. We have stationed five American divisions and some tactical air units in Europe. These forces spend and require substantial sums for their support and maintenance. This is not foreign aid money but it supplements foreign aid in that it places more American dollars at the disposal of foreign governments.

Despite our huge defense contribution, European NATO strength in comparison to that of the Soviets is almost negligible.

The population of prosperous European NATO countries is 50 percent greater than ours. But our eager assumption of a heavy defense role in Western Europe has caused our allies somewhat to disregard the Red threat and to rearm reluctantly. To stimulate them into creating more military might for their own defense we should advise them that it is not our policy permanently to garrison Europe. There should be a systematic withdrawal of American troops, particularly in the lower echelons, as fast as these can be replaced by European NATO members.

To bolster morale after Sputnik I, President Eisenhower promised nuclear Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles (IRBM) to our NATO Allies. The plan was to establish a line of 36 IRBM squadrons from England through Southeast Europe and on into Turkey. More than a year later only four IRBM squadrons had been accepted. These are being based in Britain. Administration leaders had placed great faith in Europe's use of the IRBM as a war deterrent. This cool Allied reception of the IRBM, Britain excepted, is considered by some military experts as the greatest failure in our postwar defense planning.

There is a good reason for this reluctance. In an allout nuclear war the Kremlin forces, unless prevented by SAC, have the capability of destroying Western Europe in a matter of minutes. The European defense against Red bombers and missiles is inadequate. We cannot afford to provide Europe with even a reasonable defense. Accordingly, this understandable fear of Red nuclear incineration may in the event of war force our European NATO Allies into neutrality. If that happens, we may be denied the use of many of our overseas bases and the United States and Canada would be left to face the Soviets, while the remainder of NATO is neutral.

A number of the Central European, South Asian, and Far Pacific countries have received in all more than $10 billion in military assistance. Yet some of these recipients are hostile to the United States. So it is possible that some of our own weapons might one day be turned against us. This has happened before.

Limited military information makes it difficult for the American people to know our true defense position. It would appear that the Red Air Force challenges SAC; we have yet to gain missile ascendancy; we have undertaken to defend the free world; our forces, deployed globally, are overextended; our own continental defense against bombers and missiles is inadequate.

So far as the survival of the American people is concerned, military assistance to European and Asiatic countries is not essential. Authoritative studies show convincingly that the Western Hemisphere can be defended and made self-sufficient both in peace and in war.[1]

In the past 12 years we have spent about $23 billion for foreign military assistance. In addition, our overseas military men are spending more than $3 billion annually. Suppose dozens of our cities are wiped out in an all-out nuclear war. What excuse can our political leaders who survive offer for such a tragedy, if we continue to arm other nations while neglecting adequately to defend our own people?[2]

III. IMPACT OF FOREIGN AID ON POLITICAL SYSTEMS

One of the main benefits claimed for foreign aid is that it helps prevent the growth of communism. Actually, it has tended to promote philosophies akin to communism.

The Marshall Plan greatly assisted Britain's recovery from war's devastation. But the fact that Britain instituted and carried out her industrial nationalization program at the very time that our foreign aid funds were being received, is more than mere coincidence. The $7 billion foreign aid which we have contributed to Britain's economic program, directly or indirectly, has helped to nationalize the Bank of England, and the gas, electric, railway, canals, and coal mining enterprises of the United Kingdom. Our dollars also have assisted Britain to adopt socialized medicine. Thus, Britain has taken a long stride toward total socialism. Through too much foreign aid, too long continued, we have done Britain, our ally, a great disservice.

But this is not all. In a like manner our aid has helped to strengthen the nationaliza-

Footnotes at end of speech.

tion processes in Norway, Austria, France, Italy, Turkey, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, and even in Communist Poland and Yugoslavia.

Nationalization of industry and state capitalism have been fostered in countries receiving our funds. Our dollars and credits have gone mostly to foreign governments and provided the means to start state enterprises or to take over privately owned businesses. In many cases as a condition upon which we granted foreign aid, we have encouraged the recipient governments to move into industrial operations with programs similar to the Soviet 7-year plan. In so doing, our foreign aid is helping to establish the very system of state slavery we set out to combat.

American-financed nationalization does more than merely put a foreign government in business. It serves to destroy the free enterprise of the recipient country. Nationalization both here and abroad reduces the tax base and therefore raises taxes for others. Government business is subsidized by our continuing foreign aid; most free enterprises do not enjoy such subsidy. For the free enterprises which survive our aid, there is always the threat of expropriation.

By assisting recipient countries to nationalize their industries, foreign aid contributes materially to the creation of governmental systems and institutions hostile to those which have been derived from our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

The argument is advanced that by raising living standards foreign aid prevents the spread of communism. It is a mistaken idea, however, that communism breeds on poverty. There is no proof that a high standard of living is the enemy of communism.

All of the eastern European countries, except Czechoslovakia, have always been relatively poor. Czechoslovakia, however, has long been among the most prosperous countries of Europe. Yet, Czechoslovakia through political intrigue went Communist. In Central and western European countries communism has thrived in the prosperous industrial areas. In the relatively poor countries the population has usually resisted Communist influence.

Communism has been imposed by Red armies aided by local traitors and fifth columnists.

For instance Communists are strongest in Italy and France. In Italy the Communists are stronger in the prosperous northern industrial areas, while in southern Italy, where the people are poorer, the conservatives have built a stronghold. In France the Communists are stronger in the prosperous cities; they are weaker in the poorer rural areas.

In Ireland, among the least wealthy countries of Western Europe, the Communists have made little headway.

In India, which has received substantial aid, between 1952 and 1957 the Communists increased their vote from 4 million to 12 million. Today the Communist Party is the second largest in the Indian Parliament and actually controls the government in the State of Kerala.

Many Americans will be astonished to learn that strong encouragement for foreign aid originally came from Joseph Stalin. His "Marxism and the National Colonial Question," pages 115–116 reads in part:

"It is essential that the advanced countries should render aid—real and prolonged aid—to the backward nationalities in their cultural and economic development. Otherwise, it will be impossible to bring about the peaceful coexistence of the various nations and peoples—within a single economic system that is so essential for the final triumph of socialism."

Through foreign aid the United States is following Stalin's spending prescription for the establishment of "a single economic system that is so essential for the final triumph of socialism." From the start the Kremlin has been determined to make capitalism pay for its own funeral.

IV. FOREIGN AID AND FREE WORLD ECONOMY

In a recent speech Mr. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said:

"One distressing experience (during a recent trip abroad) was to find among intelligent and perceptive men in those countries a growing distrust over the future of the American dollar."

At home, this growing loss of confidence in the dollar is evidenced by the current flight of gold from U.S. ownership. Foreign governments and banks with dollar credits in the United States can demand and receive payment in gold. But our Government will not redeem in gold, dollar credits owned by U.S. citizens.

Foreign governments, partially with the aid of credits made available to them through our foreign aid, have been salting away American gold, or piling up dollar balances in our American banks. In addition, individual foreigners, again with the help of our foreign aid, have become heavy investors in American securities. It is estimated that there are about a billion in market values of U.S. securities held abroad. This could all be converted into foreign central bank demands on our gold stock.

At the beginning of 1958 our gold reserve amounted to $22.9 billion. During 1958 alone, $2.26 billion in gold has been taken from us by foregin countries. Should this loss of confidence in the dollar continue, the gold outflow could collapse our currency.

Since 1950 dollar deposits in this country by foreign governmental agencies have increased from $3.9 billion to $8.7 billion. In addition, foreign individuals and foreign banks now have dollar deposits in our banks of $5.8 billion. This total of $14.5 billion in foreign holdings is convertible into gold upon demand of the holders. In other words, 70 percent of our gold reserve is subject to foreign demand.[3]

There is no evidence in 1959 that this flight of gold has ceased.

Our gold stock reduction menaces our economy. Today the U.S. gold ratio to our own money has actually declined to a figure lower than that during the depth of the 1933 depression.

The Federal budget of the United States has been balanced only five times in the last 27 years. The Federal debt is now $283 billion. This crushing American debt, borne by only 6 percent of the world's population, is greater than the combined national debts of all other countries in the world. More than a fourth of our Federal debt has resulted from budget deficits caused by our foreign aid programs. Annual interest on the aid portion of our debt is about $2 billion. This interest, together with foreign and appropriations totals some $7 billion annually. Thus our past and present foreign aid programs are consuming the equivalent of 20 percent of our personal income tax collections.

It has been reported that a major portion of foreign aid money is spent within the United States and thereby strengthen our economy. Doubtless Government contracts for foreign aid materials have brought profits to U.S. corporations and may have influenced them and their workers to support foreign aid. However, when the manufacturer's product is given away, rather than strengthening our economy, it siphons off our wealth. Money spent for goods and services to be used as foreign aid creates consumer buying power but not consumer goods for Americans. Hence such foreign aid is by its very nature inflationary.

It is alleged that foreign aid is responsible for the employment of 600,000 American workmen. This claim ignores the fact that American workmen are already suffering from unemployment resulting from foreign aid grants to competitive industries abroad. Moreover, the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) purchases frequently discriminate against American production. For example, in 1957, our ICA textile expenditure was $96.3 million, of which only $7.2 million was spent for American textile products. Today we have nearly five million unemployed; foreign aid has been a contributing factor.

Administration propaganda seeks to minimize the impact of our foreign aid burden by emphasizing that it is a mere one percent of our gross national product. What this propaganda does not tell is that foreign aid facilitates the flight of gold from U.S. control and consumes the equivalent of 20 percent of our personal income tax.

The administration is eager to keep foreign aid and all foreign policy strictly on a bipartisan basis in the Congress. In the last three presidential campaigns, candidates of both major parties carefully avoided making foreign aid an issue. As a consequence, taxpayers in our Republic have never had an opportunity to express themselves on foreign aid at the polls.

Unfortunately, our acknowledged Federal debt is only a fraction of our real debt. It has been reliably estimated that our true Federal debt obligations amount to about $838 billion. This figure is reached by totaling existing legislative commitments of $105 billion, social security obligations of $350 billion, and a Federal Reserve contingent liability of $100 billion,[4] together with the Federal Treasury debt of $283 billion.

In addition to the $838 billion Federal debt obligations, our private individual debt is $238.5 billion. Our net private corporate debt is $236.1 billion. The State and public local debt is $50.9 billion.[5]

The inflationary result of these enormous debt burdens, coupled with confiscatory income taxes, is fast undermining our economy.

To illustrate: Because of taxes and inflation, in 1957 it took an income of $4,806 to match in purchasing power a 1939 income of $2,000; $13,004 to match a 1939 income of $5,000; $30,971 to match a 1939 income of $10,000; and $333,377 to match a 1939 income of $50,000.

"If things go during the next 18 years like they went during the past 18—and the spenders seem to be determined to have it that way—the dollar will be worth less (in 1975) than 25 cents and it will take an income of: $10,538 to match a 1939 income of $2,000; $33,240 to match a 1939 income of $5,000; $92,141 to match a 1939 income of $10,000; $835,393 to match a 1939 income of $50,000." [6]

As a result of this dollar devaluation and the increased velocity of money circulation, in the past 20 years the value of fixed incomes, of all bank accounts, insurance policies, Government, State and municipal bonds, and all other indebtedness has been cut in half. Thus the losses already inflicted on the American people are enormous. The same processes continue and the end is not in sight.

The impact of our foreign aid on the economy of nearly all of the recipient countries is likewise inflationary and damaging. Many times foreign aid has financed new producing and manufacturing facilities without coordinating secondary industries and markets. This has resulted in dislocation and the need for further gifts. With the exception of Germany, every country receiving our foreign aid in the past 10 years has found that its currency is softer than before the aid was given.

The initial aid which the United States extended to countries devastated by World War II unquestionably accelerated their recovery. However, it is utterly impossible for the American taxpayer to transfuse the

Footnotes at end of speech.

economy of the free world, with a new money bloodstream, except temporarily. The recipient country begins to live on the transfusion; its economy becomes geared to an income which it cannot, by itself, sustain.

The time has arrived when free world countries must help themselves. They must establish sound, enduring economies of their own lest they perish, the victim of predatory socialistic forces. For us to continue foreign aid is a disservice to the recipients. The longer this aid is extended, the longer will be their delay in establishing self-sufficiency.

V. FOREIGN AID ADMINISTRATION

The field supervision of 2,000 economic aid projects scattered about the globe is a prodigious undertaking. It involves the allocation of large quantities of grant aid (money); it involves engineering and technical assistance. Qualified specialists to manage and operate so many foreign projects of widely varying nature are impossible to obtain.

On the planning and policy level in the ICA and the Department of State, the practical experience of the personnel has not qualified them to manage what is actually the largest engineering, supplying, and banking operation in the world. Men who would be able to handle such jobs enjoy good positions in private enterprise and are unwilling to serve under the direction of Federal bureaucrats.

In the past decade the agency administering economic aid has had its name changed several times, quite possibly in the hope that the American people would forget its past record. During that time, the economic aid agency has had eight directors. No director has held office for more than 2½ years and one served only a few months.

This rapid turnover results in the directors becoming captives of what is now recognized as a self-perpetuating bureaucracy. It operates on the principle that no matter how wastefully money is spent, if enough is spent it will do some good. This lack of competent personnel has resulted in innumerable instances of waste running into many billions of dollars.

A few among numerous examples will illustrate: A total of $3 billion foreign aid funds has been granted to foreign powers to help reduce their national debts and to balance their budgets. To extend this aid, we ironically had to borrow the money. There are instances of U.S. Government checks having been turned over to foreign officials for budget support with no record of how the money was spent. Foreign aid has given more than $2 billion to governments that are hostile to the United States. This includes the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Poland. To build an American exhibit in Moscow to be completed in July 1959, $3.2 million foreign aid has been authorized. Last year India received $325 million in foreign aid. A substantial part of this aid was given to support India's second 5-year plan. Our dollar credits enabled the Indian Government to purchase equipment with limited Indian commitments to buy American goods. Point 4 was originally established to export American know-how to the underdeveloped countries. Instead, point 4 has become inextricably involved with industrial development, lush engineering contracts, and surveys that have no relationship to the original purpose.

From an official report on foreign aid to oil-rich Iran, the "U.S. aid and technical assistance programs in Iran which, between 1951 and 1956, totaled a quarter billion dollars, were administered in a loose, slipshod, and unbusinesslike manner * * * it is now impossible—with any accuracy—to tell what became of these funds." [1] The official in charge of Iran foreign aid was later promoted and is now head of foreign aid in Korea, where our spending obligations are greater.

In 1953 our Government made $745 million, almost three-fourths of a billion dollars, available for the support of the French and their allies in the prosecution of the Indo-China War. Our arrangements with the French for the control and accounting for this money were cumbersome and loose. Only a part of the $745 million had been spent when the French surrendered. Because of poor accounting and auditing the United States does not know how all of the $745 million was spent. After many months of attempted audit and negotiation the United States was able to recover only $95 million.

Our financial support of the British military aircraft program in the fiscal years 1953–54–55 was approximately $450 million. The planes being financed were unduly delayed in development. By the time full production was achieved, the planes were obsolescent. The London Financial Times wrote in December 1954, that our offshore financing of these British aircraft was in fact just a rather clumsy method of making a grant of cash. Actually part of this cash served to make possible a British Government subsidization of its commercial jet transports in competition with U.S. manufacturers.

A New York Times dispatch from Karachi, Pakistan, dated Feberuary 18, 1959, discloses that corruption and inflation are rampant; that "of the $839 million received by Pakistan in foreign aid, of which $703 million came from the United States, only $186 million according to an official admission was utilized on 'constructive works'."

The Development Loan Fund is a new foreign aid device for extending development assistance to foreign countries. It will make what amounts to second mortgage loans and accept soft local currencies in payment for loans in dollars. The Development Loan Fund also lends money to assist American business in the establishment of oversea factories.

The ICA will provide insurance coverage on private oversea investments against certain exchange losses and expropriation and other risks. Thus, American taxpayers' dollars subsidize oversea factories, the products of which compete with those of our American workmen.

The Fairless Committee, which was appointed by the President in 1957 to evaluate the foreign-aid program, adversely criticized the concept of the Development Loan Fund and soft-currency loans.

No comprehensive and independent audit of foreign-aid expenditures seems ever to have been instituted.

The Congress votes foreign-aid appropriations; the executive branch of the Government handles the apportionment and disbursement of funds. Once funds are in the hands of our executive branch it appears that the Congress exercises almost no control over management, expenditures, and projects.

The Congress has a responsibility to its taxpaying constituents. It should assert control over expenditures of foreign-aid appropriations. It should make its appropriations more specific. It should further limit the power of the Executive to effect the transfer of foreign-aid funds. Too much flexibility amounts to writing a blank check.

The Congress should create a bipartisan congressional committee or Hoover-type Commission with sufficient funds to conduct a thorough investigation of foreign aid. This should include a check on the programing and expenditures for foreign-aid projects and should continue until all foreign aid is terminated.

VI. MORAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF FOREIGN AID

A large part of foreign-aid support in the United States stems from some of our religious leaders. Good samaritans that they are, they associate foreign aid with the religious obligation of individuals to help others. It is a moral act for a person to make a voluntary contribution of money or effort to help another person. By extending aid religious leaders seek to kindle an inner light in those to whom help is given.

This is, of course, in accordance with the Christian concept that reform of societies is a revolutionary process which starts by a change of heart from within the individual. However, this Christian teaching is the direct opposite of the Marxist theory, which our governmental concept of foreign aid parallels.

Marx held that societies are changed from without and that individuals change, not from within, but rather in accordance with their external environment through things material.

Frederick Engels, Marx' collaborator, wrote: "The ultimate causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought not in the heads of men, not in their better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in the changes in the methods of production and exchange; they are to be sought not in the philosophy, but in the economics of a particular epoch."

Our foreign-aid program, curiosly for a Christian people, follows the Marxist teaching. Foreign aid is expressed in terms of money, production, and materialism. The money for foreign aid is not a gift from our people to foreign peoples. Foreign aid is money extracted from the American people by confiscatory income taxes and then bestowed by our governmental bureaucrats upon a foreign government to do with it as it pleases.

Missionaries serving in countries receiving foreign aid report grave concern about the adverse effect of our aid among the people with whom they work. One is compelled to conclude that our religious leaders endorse governmental foreign aid only because its materialistic motivation has not yet been disclosed to them.

Americans are crusaders. It is our American trait to endeavor to create others in our own image. Whether or not other peoples want to reflect our image fails to deaden our zeal. Through foreign aid we have attempted to superimpose our modern, highly industrialized, fast moving system upon underdeveloped countries with less complex living standards, slower tempo and different cultures. It has taken us 175 years to reach our present standard of living. Foreign aid seeks to lift underdeveloped countries to a parity with us in a decade or two. It is most unrealistic.

Foreign aid reflects a patronizing attitude toward foreign peoples. It is a sly attempt to buy their allegiance, which is presumed to be for sale.

In the recipient countries, our foreign aid program results in confusion, misunderstanding and sometimes chaos. After nearly 15 years of foreign aid we are probably the most disliked nation in the world.

There is also a human principle which strongly influences the reaction of recipients to our foreign aid program. If one country is made a recipient, how can aid to others be denied? If one recipient is granted more than others, all recipients then clamor for more. The war devastated Philippines, our trusted wartime ally, is now understandably in turmoil for the reason that others less deserving are higher on our foreign aid totem pole.

Unless foreign aid is soon terminated, our country faces economic peril. This peril is inevitable because neither this nor any other

Footnotes at end of speech.

Congress will reduce or restrain spending at home so long as it votes colossal foreign handouts.

Our Congressmen know that so long as they dissipate billions of dollars overseas, to be reelected they must also continue expensive domestic benefits. Foreign aid is a street without end—unless the street is barricaded. If long continued, it will result in an ever-expanding bureaucracy of careerists dedicated to passing out American taxpayers' dollars all over the globe.

The fate of our foreign-aid program is a matter which the American people must decide now. No matter how much we spend, it is clear that we cannot buy world leadership and good will. If we are to lead, we can lead only by example. We cannot force our image upon others. We must resume our progress and pursuit of liberty under the Constitution. Then and only then will others respect us.

VII

From the foregoing, the following facts are inescapable:

1. That our Government intends that foreign aid shall be continuous and global.

2. That the threat of Communist aggression rules out our continuing to dispense lavish foreign aid when our own economy is threatened and our defenses are inadequate.

3. That in a number of recipient countries our foreign aid helps to strengthen political systems hostile to our own.

4. That our foreign aid speeds rather than retards the growth of communism; it inflates our economy; it is partially responsible for the alarming flight of gold from our control; it is destroying our foreign markets and increasing unemployment among American workers.

5. That by the very nature of the foreign aid we extend, it must be inefficient and wasteful.

6. That our governmental foreign aid program is unsound in principle.

VIII

To remedy these conditions we recommend the following:

1. That our traditional generous private charity and governmental grants to relieve disaster be continued; that we encourage the expansion of our private missionary efforts.

2. That in countries which we are morally obligated to defend and which are directly threatened with Red aggression, military assistance—for the time being—should be continued but on a realistic basis.

3. That foreign aid which directly or indirectly promotes governments that are hostile to our constitutional concepts of government be terminated immediately.

4. That so long as governmental foreign aid is continued the recipient should pay a part of the cost of the proposed project; that our aid should terminate when the conditions on which that request is based have been remedied; that private technical, scientific and educational assistance be extended only to friendly peoples who seek our aid on a cash or loan basis.

5. That until foreign aid is terminated, the Congress take steps properly to exercise close supervision and control over the manner in which all foreign aid funds are being spent; that all future economic aid, plus what can be salvaged from unexpended foreign aid funds be diverted to and handled by the Export-Import Bank.

6. That the $3.9 billion requested by the President for the fiscal year 1960 be reduced $2 billion, and that each year thereafter foreign aid be substantially reduced until terminated within 3 years.

---

[1] S. Doc. 83, 84th Cong., "Critical Materials."

[2] Due to rapid obsolescence in weapons, it is of great importance to eliminate waste and duplication and to make every U.S. defense dollar produce the maximum. Our ability to be able to finance an adequate defense program over many years may be the key to our survival.

If our arms program were properly orientated, we could have better defense for far less than we are now spending. See Air Force Magazine, March 1959, "Where We Stand," by Brig. Gen. Bonner Fells, U.S. Army (ret'd).

[3] Data supplied by the International Monetary Fund.

[4] American opinion, "What Is the National Debt?" by Medford Evans. July–August 1957, Belmont 78, Mass.

[5] Department of Commerce, National Income Division, Washington, D.C. Figures as of December 1958.

[6] T. Coleman Andrews, Economic Research Associates, 6 Iris Lane, Richmond, Va.; also see Reader's Digest, March 1959, pp. 79–81.

[7] First Report by the House Committee on Government Operations "United States Aid Operations in Iran," January 28, 1957, p. 3.

## Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported H.R. 1011 the other day to provide for amendments to the Federal Airport Act. This bill would authorize Federal aid for airports in the the amount of $297 million over the next 4 years.

The hearings and the report on this legislation make out a good case for the bill, but I failed to find where the talents of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare have been utilized. Had he been consulted, perhaps we could save almost $300 million.

Secretary Flemming is the author of a formula for the construction of 75,000 of the 140,000 classrooms the children of the Nation need by a Federal program resting upon changes in the State constitutions of many of the States, changes in statutes and debt limits in other States and changes in the whole tax systems of many of the States and and local districts. He anticipates this will be done in time to get some of the boys and girls in school next September even though the elections for the changes won't take place, if at all, until November 1960, and even though many of the State legislatures have completed their legislative sessions not to meet again for 2 years. But these minor obstacles of time and space do not bother Dr. Flemming.

An application of the Flemming formula to our airport problems would take care of the stacking up over airports by simply changing the aeronautical definition of a stall from "the loss of necessary airspeed to maintain altitude and control" to "a place for parking airplanes in midair." This would keep the planes waiting to land from having to circle the field and thus endangering other traffic. Long runways could be eliminated by passing legislation requiring planes to land and take off vertically and much valuable land that is now being used for runways could be used for storage or administration buildings or parking space for automobiles. All that the plane manufacturers have to do is equip their planes with antigravity stabilizers and vertical landing gear and all of our problems will be solved. Or better yet just repeal the law of gravity.

## School Lunch Program Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members certain facts about our school lunch program and its needs. I quote from a letter I have just received from Mr. Charles W. Lilley, Colorado State director and chairman of the State Directors and Supervisors, American School Food Service Association:

I am chairman of the State Directors and Supervisors so I know the situation in Colorado is rather typical of the Nation.

Without additional financial assistance, our schools will have to look for ways to cut costs and raise income. Some schools will lower the quality of the meal or reduce size of servings, others will try to reduce the number being fed free or at a reduced charge, and others will simply raise the charge. Any and all of these devices hit the child from low-income families hardest.

More State funds for education will have to be found for matching Federal funds provided in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which makes it more difficult to get additional State funds for school lunch.

Because of increasing participation, we have been inclined to think that everything was fine in the lunch program. A closer look will reveal that in many instances participation has fallen off in the older established programs as the charge has been increased. Also, quite a number of schools have dropped out of the program, finding it more profitable to operate an independent program with no requirements as to the type of meal served or provision for free meals. These schools are being reimbursed 3 cents for serving only a half-pint of milk, while schools under the national school lunch program agreement must serve a complete type A meal including a half pint of milk and receive only 4 cents reimbursement per meal. Anyone interested in children's welfare could not help but deplore such a trend. There is good profit in pop, potato chips, frozen dairy custards and such stuff, but very little food value.

While the national increase has been under 10 percent, ours has been around 20 percent this year. It takes at least a year, and often two, before increase in population is reflected in an increased allocation of funds. The donated commodities are allocated on actual participation which is adjusted twice a year, so we fare better on commodities than on cash reimbursement. Nationally, daily participation will exceed 12 million children.

We feel that a reimbursement of at least six cents per type A meal is necessary to keep the schools in the program meeting

the meal type requirement, taking care of the needy and keeping the price in the range that the majority can afford. In addition to the six cents, we need donated commodities to the extent that will represent a meal raise of about 10 cents.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 43

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Boise (Idaho) Statesman on April 27, 1958, telling about pollution in the waters of the State of Idaho.

This article just shows how careful we must be of pollution which gets into our waters.

From one simple, small accident which occurred, some hundred people have been taken ill in a wave of vomiting, headache, and diarrhea due to what was apparently a form of dysentery.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman, Apr. 27, 1958]

HEALTH AUTHORITIES TRACE POLLUTION OF WILDER WATER TO HUMAN CONTAMINATION

The water supply at Wilder Saturday night was suspected of contamination from human refuse from the community's jail. A number of children and adults were ill with a diarrhea-like illness.

Samples of water tested by the State health department laboratory at Boise showed presence of an intestinal type of contamination, said A. W. Klotz, lab director.

The town jail is built on a concrete floor above a 72,000-gallon underground storage tank. C. J. Hammond, of Nampa, State health department sanitarian for the southwest Idaho area, said he found evidence of human offal around the edge of the jail building and directly above the tank where the town's drinking and cooking water is stored.

Reports indicated that from two dozen to a 100 persons have been taken ill in a wave of vomiting, headache, and diarrhea that has swept the town since Wednesday. Memorial Hospital at Caldwell reported the 2-year-old child of a migrant laborer in critical condition, and two others who had been taken off the critical list.

DYSNTERY INDICATED

Specimens taken from the patients showed preliminary indications of the presence of bacillary dysentery, Klotz said. He said the illness usually spreads because of poor sanitation.

First of the specimen tests completed late Saturday night in the health department laboratory showed the presence of shigella flexerni an organism causing bacillary dysentery, Klotz said, and a sample of water taken from the Wilder storage tank was contaminated.

Klotz noted that the State laboratories were able to complete the culture tests on specimens so quickly because of some of the preliminary culture work done at Caldwell Memorial Hospital laboratory before the specimens were received here.

No toilet facilities are available in the two cells of the jail, and the human offal left in the cells had been washed out with a hose, Hammond said.

Harlan Formo of Boise, State public health engineer, said the State health department had recommended several times to city officials that the storage tank be abandoned, and that a deep well turbine pump be used to pump water directly into the city water system.

CHLORINATOR INSTALLED

The department had advised against use of the storage tank, he said, and had told the Wilder community it should chlorinate its water. An emergency chlorinator was installed in the system Friday night. Officials warned that for about 5 days, all drinking and cooking water must be boiled. It will take about that time for the system's water to be fully treated.

State Health Administrator Terrell O. Carver said at Boise, "maybe this unfortunate situation will serve to point out some shortcomings in sanitation practices in other cities."

Hammond said he was attempting to collect specimens from a half dozen former inmates of the jail. He said if bacteria found in the specimens are similar to that found in the patient's specimens, a connection could be established.

Hammond said his investigation also showed that one wall of the storage tank was broken and although it had been repaired with boards, it allowed possible contamination from material from animals or surface water.

He said he also found a cross-connection at the Wilder School between a school well which had been contaminated and used only for toilets, and the city water system. There was a possibility of a faulty operation which might allow seepage into the city system, he said.

## Think It Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by E. F. Hutton appeared on the financial page of the New York Herald Tribune on March 14, 1959.

Mr. Hutton spells out the deficits in six of our largest, most populated, most powerful and richest States. The reading is not very cheerful. The idea of putting a bean in the horse's ear to make him forget the pain in his tooth is an interesting comparison.

The State and county taxes and deficits are supposed to make the citizen forget the Federal taxes and deficit. This is fine, but sometimes the horse was driven crazy and smashed the wagon and killed the driver. We may be driving the taxpayer crazy, too:

THINK IT THROUGH

(By E. F. Hutton)

Up in north country, it's a sovereign remedy for a horse with a toothache to drop a bean down his ear. That makes him forget his toothache and pull real good.

And so, dearly beloved, when the pain of Uncle's income tax becomes acute on April 15 think of the many other tax beans that are being dropped down your ear.

States, counties, cities and towns are having hard sledding and need your help real bad. They followed the Pied Piper of Washington to the brink. Look at their deficits: New York, about $191 million; California, $68 million; Massachusetts, $35 million; Michigan, $110 million; Pennsylvania, $100 million; Texas, $65 million.

These are some of the richest States in the Union. They want you who live in them to pay their creditors for them, as they, for a thousand excellent reasons, spent more than they had.

So they, and most of the others, are asking you to kindly pay more taxes on your income, gasoline, cigarettes, pipe tobacco, beer, soft drinks, restaurant meals, horse rake, real estate and your inheritance from Aunt Maud.

By spreading it around thin—this way—you will scarcely feel it! Of course, none of them will reduce spending as they know you want whatever they decide you should have.

But, neighbor, don't worry. If they finally take all you've got, Uncle will take care of you.

## Your Hidden Food Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to a particularly fine editorial from the Monterey Peninsula Herald, Monterey County, Calif., on the subject of "Your Hidden Food Bill":

YOUR HIDDEN FOOD BILL

By June 30 of this year, the U.S. Government will have on its hands surplus crops which it has bought up at a cost of $9 billion.

And for this type of farm relief, it's not only the cost but the upkeep that must be considered. It is costing the Government a round billion dollars a year for the storage, interest, and clerical work on this unwanted food.

These figures mean that every man, woman, and child in the country, on the average, has $51.42 tied up in this food and, not being able to eat it, is paying $5.71 a year storage charges on it.

In 1958 alone, the Government bought 489 million bushels of wheat alone—about one-third of the record total crop. It now owns outright 786 million bushels of wheat, for which it paid $2.2 billions in support money to farmers.

Also placed in storage last year were almost 98 million bushels of soybeans, almost 100 million bushels of grain sorghums, and 108 million bushels of corn.

Government farm relief payments now amount to about 40 percent of the total net income of all farm operators in the country.

Our farm relief program has two net results: (1) It saves farmers from themselves; and (2) it makes the rest of us pay more for the food we buy, in addition to the taxes we must pay to support the system.

Insane as the system seems to be, there are arguments for continuing it in some form. If it were eliminated overnight, a large part of our farm population, numbering 20 million, would be bankrupt and no longer able to buy Cadillacs, TV sets, and red flannel underwear.

This would cause a major depression and bankrupt us all.

It's obvious that we mustn't allow this to happen.

It's equally obvious, however, that our present system of farm relief can't go on forever. If a man from Mars were to show

up, he would hardly rate it as other than incredible.

We shall have to revise our thinking about farmers.

Joseph Alsop is fond of telling us that we must save the small farmer. The farm family is our most valuable asset, he says. The farm family has raised most of our great men, our national leaders.

That is true, but perhaps the main reason for it was that most of them were raised in days when most families were farm families. In 1900, for example, more than half the population of the country was farm population—as against about 12 percent today.

Building character and training leaders among the young people of our nonfarm population is something we must do if we are to survive and prosper regardless of what we do about farm relief. And we know of no reason why young people cannot be adequately trained in cities.

If we are growing 50 percent more wheat than we can possibly use or even dump abroad without upsetting world economy, the sensible thing is to grow less wheat—and not to continue to grow more, have the Government buy it up and store it.

If we are to grow less wheat our wheat acreage must be reduced. And the most sensible way to reduce it is to eliminate the marginal areas where its production costs are highest. This, to a large extent, means eliminating smaller farmers.

This is a sad thing to do. It should be done, of course, gradually and in an intelligently planned way so that it will be as painless as possible. The eliminated farmers must have the possibility of turning to other work.

Despite the pangs that may be involved in tearing families away from the soil, in the long run it will be better for everybody, including the families themselves, than the present highly uneconomic system of farm relief.

## Simpson-Keogh Bill, H.R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, among the progressive groups in the medical field are the Cambria County Medical Associations. Their sincere effort to keep themselves not only well informed on the latest advancements in their own field but also in allied fields is to be commended.

At the meeting of the Cambria County Medical Society in Johnstown, Pa., on Thursday, March 12, an invitation was extended to the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, ranking Republican on the House Committee on Ways and Means, to discuss the major legislation which would be considered by the present Congress.

Representative SIMPSON is the dean of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation and has been the chairman of the Republican congressional committee for several years.

However, Mr. SIMPSON, while a strong party man, has always placed the interest of his country first in attacking any problem. He is a man of strong convictions and one whom I am privileged to call a friend.

In view of the consideration of H.R. 10 by the House of Representatives today, I want to draw attention to the statement made by Representative SIMPSON in Johnstown last Thursday evening, and herewith include it as part of my remarks.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. SIMPSON BEFORE THE CAMBRIA COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY, JOHNSTOWN, PA., THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1959.

I am privileged to express appreciation for the honor that you have extended to me by your kind invitation to visit Johnstown this evening for the purpose of addressing the distinguished membership and honored guests of the Cambria County Medical Society.

When your capable and experienced Congressman, JOHN P. SAYLOR, asked me to come to Johnstown, he had planned to accompany me but other legislative duties have prevented him from being here. As the ranking Republican on the important House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, JOHN SAYLOR'S official duties have placed great demands on his time. You may be assured that if JOHN could have been here tonight, he would have been. He did ask that I convey his regret and he sent to you his warm greetings. As one who knows whereof he speaks, based on personal observation and association, I will categorically state to you that the 22d Pennsylvania District is fortunate to have a man of the stature and dedication to duty that JOHN SAYLOR brings to his responsibilities as your Representative in the Congress of the United States.

In addition to renewing acquaintanceships with the many old friends I have found in your presence and making the acquaintanceship of new friends, my purpose in being here tonight is to discuss with you a legislative subject that is of very genuine interest to all self-employed Americans and their families. Because it represents a matter of tax equity and tax principle, it should also be of interest to every American. I refer to what is presently denominated as the Simpson-Keogh bills, H.R. 9 and 10, legislation to provide deferment of tax liability on earned income from self-employment paid into certain defined retirement programs.

In the next few minutes I would like to present briefly some background information with respect to the proposal and then provide a general outline of the provisions and purpose of the current version of the bill. In parlance of the medical profession I will endeavor an analytical diagnosis as to the identity and then undertake a prognosis as to legislative prospects. I will not endeavor a technical discussion of the bill and I offer that to you as a solemn promise.

The importance of the need for the self-employed to provide for their retirement security is somewhat shockingly demonstrated by a study conducted in the spring of 1958 by the Bank of New York. That study indicated that fewer than 3 of every 10 self-employed taxpayers—by their own admission—now have a planned retirement program of any kind.

The genesis of the Simpson-Keogh proposal can, in my judgment, be traced to two basic causes.

The first of these is the steep progression of the existing individual surtax schedule. If we were blessed with a more modest surtax schedule that did not take one-fifth (20 percent) of a taxpayer's first dollar of taxable income, that did not begin to take one-half (50 percent) of his taxable income at $16,000, and that did not take more than nine-tenths (91 percent) of his taxable income in excess of $200,000, we would not today have the agitation for the type of tax equity proposed in the Simpson-Keogh bills. Thus, the first basic consideration bringing about the creation of this tax deferment idea is the onerous character—the confiscatory character, if you will—of the tax burden that is presently imposed on our citizens.

The second cause on which is based support for the Simpson-Keogh proposal is tax equity—equity that does not exist in the present tax structure with its discrimination against self-employed individuals who by law are not eligible to participate in employer-established qualified pension plans. Under section 404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 an employer deducts as a cost of doing business amounts he pays into a qualified retirement program; the employee is not taxed currently on what his employer pays into the fund in his behalf, even though it is in the nature of additional compensation for his services. The employee is taxed only when he gets the money at retirement, as and when it is received.

The estimated 10 million self-employed persons in the United States, such as farmers, professional people, and shopkeepers, cannot benefit from these tax-favored pension plans since technically they are not employees. It is in the interest of achieving tax equity and opportunity to provide for retirement security for these self-employed that we find the second basic cause motivating support for the Simpson-Keogh proposal.

The impact of these two causes—high taxes and tax equity—can be demonstrated by an examination of a hypothetical but not untypical case. Assume the case of a 40-year-old taxpayer who has a taxable income of $13,000 so that the top tax rate applicable is 40 percent. Assume also that he decides to set aside $1,000 each year until he reaches age 65 and assume an interest rate of 4 percent compounded annually.

The $25,000 of out-of-pocket savings which he would accumulate at the rate of $1,000 a year for 25 years on a tax-deferred basis would grow to $41,646 before taxes. If, on the other hand, tax deferment had not been allowed so that he was saving tax discounted dollars, his accumulation would amount to less than half as much, $20,717. The reason for the disparity in tax-deferred accumulation and tax-discounted accumulation is an obvious one. If tax deferment had not been allowed, his original $1,000 of annual saving would have been reduced to $600 that was left for investment; the investment rate is reduced to 2.4 percent instead of the assumed rate of 4 percent. The tax-deferred dollars would be fully employed at the full assumed rate of investment and would have the privilege of tax-free accumulation. Consequently their growth from year to year would be accelerated.

I would like to turn now to a brief examination of the historical development of the Simpson-Keogh proposal. This examination takes us back for its beginning to the early years of the post-World War II period. At that time a small group of lawyers met informally in New York to consider the problem of the self-employed professional people in providing for their retirement. This group met intermittently during the ensuing few years in an attempt to develop a solution to this problem. Concurrently numerous plans for tax deferment an investment in various forms of retirement security were being developed and publicized.

It was on June 7, 1951, during the 1st session of the 82d Congress, that the original version of what is now known as the Simpson-Keogh plan was introduced. The original proposal would have allowed all taxpayers to deduct a portion of their income paid into a restricted retirement fund, with the limitation that the annual deduction could not exceed the lesser of 10 percent or $7,500. In May 1952 this legislation received its first formal congressional consid-

eration in public hearings held by the House Committee on Ways and Means.

With the convening of the 83d Congress this legislation was again introduced in the House of Representatives. In August of 1953 the legislation again received consideration in public hearings by the committee. Subsequently further hearings were held in 1955 and 1958. In May 1958 I joined as a cosponsor of the bill and introduced it in the House of Representatives. Two months later the Committee on Ways and Means finally favorably reported the legislation to the House and it was passed by voice vote in that body. Regrettably the little time remaining in the session and the resulting adjournment rush did not permit Senate consideration of the proposal.

In the current 86th Congress Congressman KEOGH of New York and I have again joined as cosponsors of the legislation and as you know it was favorably reported to the House of Representatives on February 24, 1959.

Before I undertake the prognosis of legislative prospects that I promised you, it might be well if we look briefly to the substantive provisions of the bill in the form in which it was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

As I previously indicated the basic purpose of the bill is to allow a deferment of tax liability on limited amounts of net income earned from self-employment. Thus, the coverage of the proposal would be limited to self-employed persons and would not be available to any self-employed person who during the taxable year received an amount any portion of which was attributable to an employer contribution under an employee plan. Furthermore, a special limitation on the lifetime deduction contained in the bill is imposed on individuals who have previously received a payment or acquired nonforfeitable rights to employer contributions under a qualified pension, profit-sharing or stock-bonus plan.

The amount on which tax deferment can be claimed has both an annual limit and a lifetime ceiling. The annual deductible limit is 10 percent of net earnings from self employment or $2,500, whichever is lower. The maximum lifetime limit is $50,000. There is a stepped-up annual rate of exclusion for individuals who are over 50 years of age on the effective date of the act. For such individuals the limitation on the annual deduction would be increased by one-tenth for each year that his age exceeds 50 on the effective date so that if an individual were 60 years of age on January 1, 1959, the annual limit on his deduction would be 20 percent of self-employment income not to exceed $5,000.

The participant in this self-employed retirement program has certain prescribed alternatives with respect to the disposition of the annual amounts he is setting aside for his retirement For example, he may undertake to invest the proceeds in an annuity or an endowment policy issued by a domestic life insurance company. If life insurance benefits are included in such a policy, the life insurance features may not extend beyond age 70. This policy must be nonassignable. The deduction annually available is limited to so much of the yearly premium as is allocable to the restricted retirement benefits under the policy.

Such a participant may also invest in what is known as a face-amount certificate as defined in the Investment Company Act of 1940.

The participant may alternatively elect to pursue an investment course of placing deposits in a restricted retirement trust fund with the requirement that the trustee must be a bank. There are of course special restrictions placed on all of these investment alternatives so as to assure the validity of the retirement program and to prevent the tax deferment privilege from becoming a short-term avoidance device. I will not undertake to detail these restrictions other than to the extent that I have already referred to them. You may be assured that the savings institutions such as insurance companies, banks, and other activities authorized under the act to be depositories for these retirement funds will have trained experts to advise the individual participant with respect to the necessary procedures he must follow to stay within the limits of the act.

Having considered the questions of individual eligibility and investment alternatives, it is now appropriate that we should examine the aspect of the proposal relating to when and how the proceeds eventually are taxed. The bill provides rules relating to the income tax treatment of such receipts. Generally speaking, amounts received from the fund or policy are included in gross income when received. Special rules are set forth prescribing when income shall be considered as received and special rules prescribe the tax treatment of such income. If the self-employed individual undertakes to make withdrawals from his accumulated fund prior to reaching retirement age, the bill provides that a penalty tax will apply. On the other hand, liberalized rules are provided in the case of the lump-sum withdrawal after reaching retirement age and in the case of a lump-sum distribution to beneficiaries upon the death of the self-employed individual. The retirement income credit under section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code is not available with respect to amounts received from the restricted retirement fund or policy. No tax deferment on payments into a retirement plan is allowed to a taxpayer for any year beginning after the year in which he attains age 70, and it is required that the individual must begin to take withdrawals from the accumulated fund upon attaining age 70.

I have touched on the general principles and highlights of the proposal contained in the House-passed version of this legislation. I trust that I have outlined the principal mechanics of the manner in which H.R. 10 would at least in some measure add to the retirement security of the self-employed.

To this point I have deliberately undertaken to cast this proposal in a favorable light. However, any frank discussion of the subject requires at least a brief recognition of the factors that argue against its enactment. In the interest of brevity I will mention the two most compelling.

The first of these possible objections to the legislation is the fact that while it tends to correct a tax inequity that exists with respect to self-employed individuals—a group numbering approximately 10 million—it purports to do nothing for the 30 million Americans who are employed but who are not covered by a qualified pension and profit-sharing plan. I am referring to such persons as the employed clerks in a small retail store, an employed filling station attendant, and employed persons in similar occupations. This exclusion is an acknowledged serious shortcoming, and it is a matter to which we all must give earnest attention.

Without disregarding the need for taking care of this latter group, there are at least four reasons why it is appropriate to enact H.R. 10 so as to take care of the self-employed group. The first of these reasons is that many of the occupations covered under this proposal are precluded by the respective State laws from practicing their professions in an incorporated form.

A second reason for enacting this measure in its present form is that to do so will encourage the sole proprietor or partner who cannot benefit from a plan under section 401 to establish a 401 plan for his employees in view of the employer's entitlement to make comparable provision for himself under the terms of this bill.

A third reason for the enactment of H.R. 10 in its present form is that the retirement problems of the low income individual do not stem primarily from his tax burden.

A fourth reason supporting this legislation is that it reduces the number of American citizens who under present law are being discriminated against. The fact that it does not go far enough is a point on which we can agree, but at least it represents a step in the right direction.

The second argument against the enactment of H.R. 10 is the revenue loss that would be entailed. The Treasury Department has estimated a revenue loss in excess of $360 million in the first full year of operation. In this day when it has become fashionable to speak about Government finance in terms of billions, such a revenue loss may not seem a formidable obstacle. However, I would point out to you that the Federal budget projected for fiscal year 1960 is in balance only by a margin of $100 million in surplus and the estimated revenue loss from this bill, assuming all other estimates are correct, would mean another year of deficit financing.

We must also realize that the Congress this year will likely be called upon to provide another increase in the statutory debt limit. This mounting public debt constitutes a deferred tax increase that we are imposing not only on ourselves but also on succeeding generations. When we defer through fiscal policy until tomorrow the bills that we should pay today, we are in effect saying that the taxes of tomorrow will have to be increased to a level in excess of what they would otherwise have to be.

Also, in connection with the consideration of the fiscal implications of this legislation we must realize that if retirement savings are to mean anything in terms of purchasing power, we must protect the integrity of those savings against the onslaught of inflation.

To place this budgetary objection to the enactment of H.R. 10 in some perspective, I would call attention to the fact that the amount of revenue loss is a highly speculative matter. The revenue loss magnitude depends on several variable factors, such as the number of people who will participate, the extent to which they will participate, and the tax brackets in which they find themselves at the time of their contributions. It is my conviction that rather than retain unjustifiable discrimination in our tax structure against any group, we should seek a more equitable apportionment of the tax burden among all the taxpayers.

The revenue loss consequences of this proposal should also be examined in the light of experience with similar measures in other countries of the free world. The previously existing inequity in the position of the self-employed was terminated through legislative action in Great Britain in 1956, and in Canada and New Zealand in 1957. The Honorable Walter Harris, Minister of Finance in Canada, observed in this 1957 budget speech that the annual yield of the income tax could be reduced by as much as $40 million through the enactment of the Canadian plan. The actual Canadian experience was a revenue loss of only $7 million. The English and New Zealand experiences also found the revenue losses less than had originally been projected.

I have mentioned inflation in the context of need to eliminate deficit financing if we were to preserve the integrity of our retirement savings. I would like to mention inflation in another context, this time arguing in support of the enactment of H.R. 10. The distinguished chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, William McChesney Martin, and the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, have both expressed the view that inflation is one of our principal

concerns. Secretary Anderson has gone on to say that savings by the public must be relied on "to the greatest extent possible" to help stabalize the economy. The chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier in a speech before the National Press Club on Friday, February 27, also labeled inflation as one of our greatest dangers and stated that one of the factors necessary to combat it would be an adequate accumulation of funds for capital investment. I submit that the necessary efforts to combat inflation and to provide augmented capital funds are entirely consistent with this legislation and would be strengthened by its enactment.

Money is like any other commodity and the price for its use is responsive to the factors of supply and demand. By encouraging thrift we will be increasing the availability of funds for capital investment and thereby tending to depress interest charges. This will serve to reduce the forces of inflation while at the same time increasing business expansion with the resulting greater economic opportunity for all that results from such expansion.

In closing I have promised to express my prognosis as to the legislative prospects of H.R. 10. For what it is worth, I will express the view that this legislation will pass the House of Representatives and the Senate during the 86th Congress. Because it would be inappropriate for me to do otherwise, I will not speculate as to what action the President might take in the event that the legislation reaches his desk for approval or disapproval.

I will observe that budget-busting and unrestrained spending activity by the "Spendocrats" in Congress will seriously jeopardize prospects of Presidential approval. Accordingly, if the Congress will act with restraint during its consideration of money authorizations and appropriations bills, the chances for approval of this legislation will be greatly enhanced.

I can assure you that consistent with my stand on Government economy in the past, I will vote for sufficient economy in Government to more than make possible the enactment of this meritorious proposal. It is my hope that a sufficient number of my colleagues in the Congress will join with me in this effort for economy so as to make possible the realization of the tax equity represented by the Simpson-Keogh proposal.

May I, in closing, thank you for being a wonderful audience and reiterate my appreciation for your thoughtfulness in permitting me to join with you tonight.

## University of Notre Dame's Laetare Medal Awarded to Career Diplomat Robert D. Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, every years since 1883 the University of Notre Dame has awarded the Laetare Medal to an outstanding American Catholic layman.

Members of Congress will, I am sure, be pleased to learn that the 77th recipient of the Laetare Award will be the distinguished Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. Robert D. Murphy, a career diplomat who has served our country in posts of high responsibility for a period of 40 years.

I am glad to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in the South Bend Tribune of March 8, 1959, containing the announcement by the president of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., of the Laetare Medal for 1959 to Mr. Murphy:

LAETARE MEDAL GOES TO DIPLOMAT MURPHY

Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert D. Murphy will receive the University of Notre Dame's Laetare Medal for 1959, it was announced Saturday night by Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., university president.

The veteran career diplomat is the 77th recipient of the award which has been presented annually since 1883 to an outstanding American Catholic layman. Industrialist Frank M. Folsom received the Laetare Medal last year, and Clare Booth Luce, recently named U.S. ambassador to Brazil, was similarly honored by Notre Dame in 1957.

LONG CAREER

Father Hesburgh, in announcing the selection of the key State Department official, said:

"Robert Murphy's diplomatic career spans 40 years of distinguished service to his country, from World War I to last summer's conflict in Lebanon and the current crisis over Berlin. With brilliance and courage, in peace and in war, he has articulated American foreign policy in posts of increasing responsibility. Moreover, his public record and his private life reflect the highest ideals of his Catholic faith. The University of Notre Dame is proud to ward to Secretary Murphy the Laetare Medal, the highest honor within its power to bestow."

The Laetare Medal is generally regarded as the most significant annual award conferred upon Catholic laymen in the United States. The recipient is named on Laetare Sunday, the fourth Sunday of Lent, but the actual presentation takes place at a later date. Recent Laetare Medalists have included Gen. Alfred Gruenther, labor leader George Meany, actress Irene Dunne and former AEC commissioner Thomas E. Murray.

TOP NEGOTIATOR

Murphy, who holds the rank of Career Ambassador in the Department of State, led negotiations credited with averting all-out war in the Middle East last summer. As America's top negotiator in the Lebanon crisis, he conferred with officials there as well as heads of state in Jordan, Iraq, Israel and Egypt. His recommendations based on these negotiations, formed the basis for American proposals and subsequent United Nations action to bring stability in that area.

A native of Milwaukee, Murphy was educated at Marquette University there and at George Washington University where he rereceived a law degree. During World War I he held a clerical post at the American legation in Bern, Switzerland. His experience there prompted him to take Foreign Service examinations which led to his first diplomatic assignment as vice counsel at Zurich in 1921.

Between the two World Wars Murphy held diplomatic posts at Munich, Seville and Paris where he became counselor of the American Embassy in 1940. With the fall of France in June of that year, Murphy became American chargé d'affaires accredited to the French government at Vichy. He played a key role in making preparations for the Allied landings in North Africa in November 1942. A month later he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and appointed President Roosevelt's personal representative with the rank of Minister to French North Africa.

Murphy became U.S. political advisor on German affairs in 1944, ambassador to Belgium in 1949, and the first postwar American ambassador to Japan in 1952. He was appointed Assistant Secretary of State of United Nations Affairs in 1953 and served as political adviser to the United Nations Command on the Korean armistice negotiations at Panmunjom. In the same year he was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Deputy Under Secretary of State and was given the newly created rank of Career Ambassador, a diplomatic rank equivalent to five-star general or admiral.

Murphy received an honorary degree from the University of Notre Dame last June and has been honored by several other institutions. He is married to the former Mildred Taylor of Kansas City, Mo.

## Construction of the 291-Mile Keystone Shortway in Pennsylvania Would Relieve the Unemployment Situation in 13 Labor Surplus Areas in 29 Counties of the State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with area development legislation occupying a prominent position on the legislative agenda of the 86th Congress, the significance of the 291-mile Keystone Shortway in relationship to Pennsylvania's acute unemployment problem is explained in the following letter I wrote on March 12, 1959, to the Honorable Lewis L. Strauss, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

In a few words, the letter reveals that if the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania agree to construct immediately the Keystone Shortway which cuts directly across Pennsylvania from Stroudsburg to Sharon, the unemployment in 13 labor surplus areas of the 29 counties traversed by the shortway will be alleviated. In my district alone, the construction will cost $1 million per mile, and it will provide employment for 1,200 persons for a 3-year period. In addition, the construction of this 70.2-mile stretch will provide additional employment in industries which manufacture and transport the material.

Mr. Speaker, here is a wonderful opportunity for the Department of Commerce and the Commonwealth to spend funds already allocated for highway construction in Pennsylvania on a project that will alleviate a lot of Pennsylvania's chronic unemployment.

The letter to Secretary Strauss follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., March 12, 1959.*

Hon. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
*Secretary, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SECRETARY STRAUSS: As you know, of the nearly 5 million unemployed in the United States, 508,000 of them are located in the State of Pennsylvania representing 10 percent of its labor force. Most of this unemployment in Pennsylvania has existed for years and is of great concern to the State and Federal Government. The result is that the problem has been attacked on the State and national level and at the present time, this vexing unemployment problem in Pennsylvania is involved in the area redevelopment legislation now being considered by Congress.

The purpose of writing you on the subject of unemployment in Pennsylvania is due to the fact that included in the Department of Commerce is the Office of Area Development as well as the Bureau of Public Roads, with both agencies having a relationship to the proposed construction of the 291-mile Keystone Shortway in Pennsylvania. This shortway with dual lanes cuts directly across Pennsylvania.

According to the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, the Keystone Shortway traverses 13 labor market areas whose unemployment ranges from 8.6 percent to 16.6 percent. In these areas, there is a total of 115,800 unemployed workers, many of whom would find ready employment on construction of the shortway.

According to the Bureau of Public Roads, from a cost standpoint the national average shows 1 mile costing $1 million. Therefore, the immediate construction of the 291-mile Keystone Shortway in Pennsylvania would provide employment to most of the 115,800 unemployed persons in the 13 labor market areas previously mentioned. In addition, Pennsylvania's coal mines, cement plants, steel mills, and other industries including transportation will indirectly provide employment to many of Pennsylvania's 508,000 unemployed.

In my own congressional district in Pennsylvania comprising the counties of Blair, Centre and Clearfield, 70.2 miles of the shortway would be constructed. To give you some idea of the effect such construction would have on unemployment, it will require 3 years to build the shortway and meanwhile provide employment for 1,200 persons for each of the three 9-month years. In a few words, this employment and accelerated employment in related industries could have a tremendous and favorable impact on the unemployment in my congressional district. If this is the case in my congressional district, think of the benefits to be enjoyed by areas with pockets of unemployment throughout Pennsylvania.

According to the Bureau of Public Roads, the Federal Government has allocated to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for highway construction $117,103,237 for fiscal year 1959 and $101,440,250 for fiscal year 1960, making a total of $218,543,487. In general, this amount represents the Federal Government's contribution of 90 cents of every dollar spent by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on its Interstate System of Highways. While this fund will not entirely cover the entire Federal aid necessary in paying the overall cost of the Keystone Shortway, it represents roughly 75 percent of the amount needed.

From the information furnished, you will readily see that the Federal Government's financing of the Keystone Shortway in Pennsylvania could alleviate a lot of chronic unemployment in 13 labor market areas. Therefore, it is my thinking that the U.S. Department of Commerce should prevail upon the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct the Keystone Shortway immediately as part of a Federal-State effort to alleviate chronic unemployment in the 13 areas of Pennsylvania affected.

Over a period of years, former Governor Leader of Pennsylvania advocated area redevelopment legislation and now his successor and present Governor, David Lawrence, is doing the same thing. While it is true that the construction of the Keystone Shortway is not the complete answer to the unemployment problem, it will have a favorable effect on wiping out unemployment in 13 labor markets in Pennsylvania. Therefore, a Federal-State program that would bring about immediate construction of the shortway should merit Governor Lawrence's undivided support.

In conclusion, may I point out that in the northern part of my congressional district and elsewhere throughout Pennsylvania the lack of adequate highway transportation is a handicap to the industries that we now have in that area and if we are to rehabilitate and diversify the economy of the area through an area redevelopment program, modern highways like the proposed Keystone Shortway are the answer to our problem. This is a compelling reason why the Keystone Shortway should be constructed before Congress approves an area redevelopment program because adequate transportation is vital to the development of any area.

Thanking you for the consideration of my proposal and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

---

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 14, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

Hawaiian statehood was the big debate of a lively week. The Territory consists of eight major islands (six well developed) and many smaller ones stretching 1,900 miles, 2,200 miles southwest of the United States. The present population includes approximately 168,000 military and Federal employees and dependent, leaving 445,000 native population of whom 23 percent are Caucasion, 37 percent Japanese, 17 percent Hawaiian, and the rest Filipino, Chinese, Korean, Puerto Rican, or others. Thirty-five percent of the marriages mix races, accounting for the dwindling number of pure Hawaiians.

Arguments for: (1) If Alaska, then Hawaii; (2) they deserve statehood because they want it, the people believe in our Constitution and form of government, and the islands are economically sound; (3) the House previously passed Hawaiian statehood several times (1947, 1950, 1953) and both parties have pledged support.

Arguments against: (1) Islands are spread out and noncontiguous to the United States (also noncontinental, which Alaska is); (2) 445,000 people will have 2 Senators (and 1 Representative) who can nullify New York's 16 million, California's 14 million, Texas' 9 million, or each of the other States; (3) the International Longshoreman Workers' Union leaders are Communist-influenced, if not controlled, and could through strikes cut off and isolate Hawaii, totally dependent on ocean trade (and also our Pacific Fleet Command Headquarters). There were many other able presentations, but these are the basic ones. The bill passed 323 to 89. For my part, the arguments against could not be wished or rationalized away.

The Ways and Means Committee work continues ceaselessly. (1) The minerals depletion hearings ended. I was most critical of the endless litigation of the Treasury Department, whose zeal for collecting revenues transcribed fairness and equity, it seems to me. Additional tax suits were filed repeatedly against minerals industries by the Internal Revenue Service after court cases were lost time after time. This is unfair expense to the Nation's taxpayers and to the businesses sued. (2) The Keogh-Simpson bill (retirement help for self-employed through tax deferment) and temporary unemployment compensation bill will soon be before the House. Our committee agreed to terminate the Federal part of TUC except for tapering off those who have claims filed. Now it's up to the House and Senate to follow through.

Bills I introduced this week: (1) The Defense Facilities Protection Act of 1959 seeks to protect our own defense effort from the subversive efforts and dangers of Communists. Without this bill the Defense Department cannot rid itself of the Communist-controlled union which handles the Pentagon's own messages, coded or otherwise. Nor can the 2,000 or more identified saboteurs employed in vital defense plants be removed. Surely Congress will take action. (2) The natural gas bill is the same one I cosponsored before. It simply will restore Congress' intent (overturned by the Supreme Court) of the 1938 law, specifically exempting gas production from Federal Power Commission control.

The Defense budget debate, and our military preparedness in view of Berlin and other danger spots, has taken on some very political, and therefore dangerous, overtones. Those who seek to discredit the President's leadership for political gain are playing with dynamite. As to the arguments—obviously we cannot match the enemy in manpower, so a cut in our armed personnel is not the crucial point some are seeking to make it. It's our total destructive potential that deters, because this is what wins wars. For the same reason, we cannot agree to fight "brush-fire" type wars with one hand tied behind us, namely, by agreeing not to use our nuclear weapons. On both counts the President deserves our support. Strength not weakness, firmness not vacillation, unity not division, are what are needed now, not political maneuvering for the 1960 election. It's one thing to argue merit of conflicting viewpoints—it's entirely another to criticize loosely or seek political advantage by demanding more expenditures. Forgotten by some is this—our defense strength is no stronger than our economic strength.

Defense needs and their costs come first, completely overshadowing other Federal services, particularly the welfare services so unnecessary by comparison. Here's a partial list of areas where the Democrats are already planning spending beyond the budget, besides defense—housing, airport construction, space, atomic power, public works, school construction and education, depressed areas, water pollution, and educational TV. The total cost—billions beyond the $77 billion budget. Who pays? John Doe. How? Through increased taxes, or, more likely, through Government's deficit financing and a watered dollar, which means less buying power for John Doe. My contin-

uing guidelines: (1) Stop increasing Federal Government size, control and spending; (2) reduce or eliminate Federal Government in places where it has no place being (business operation, for example), (3) return power to States wherever possible; and (4) remember the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

## Indian Problem on South Dakota Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD two letters with regard to the Indian problem on South Dakota reservations. One is from R. P. Benedickt, Hot Springs, S. Dak., the other is from Jake Herman, a member of the Pine Ridge Tribal Council. These two letters shed a little different light on some of the problems than is frequently expressed. The letters are as follows:

BURNETTE CERTAINLY NOT WELL INFORMED

It has been called to my attention after reading the Rapid City Daily Journal, that there are many pointers that could be given to the public relative to the pending investigation of Indian reservations in South Dakota, by a congressional committee.

I feel well qualified to inform you of some of the malfunctions on the Pine Ridge Reservation because I lived there from 1929 till 1956 when I moved to Hot Springs to accept the position of director of equalization for both Shannon and Fall River Counties.

My first conclusion to be stated is, taxpayers should know why a certain race in our State should be chosen to be constantly subsidized by a specific Bureau. In this day and age, it is quite obvious that no group of Americans should be singled out and granted special rights and privileges because of cultural backgrounds or other reasons too numerous to mention.

It also appears that the younger generation of Sioux Indians are no better off than their parents, in spite of the millions of tax dollars spent, because they have been led to believe that they are incompetent, so that more jobs could be created year by year in the Indian Bureau. It has been decided quite recently in Federal courts that the Oglala Sioux Tribe is considered to be a legal governing body within the confines of their reservation. They have levied taxes and are collecting them both from nonmembers and members of their tribe. If this government is this sound, why are the taxpayers paying millions of dollars each year to supervise and subsidize a supposedly sound organization? This again tends to prove the Indian is capable of handling his own affairs.

Mr. Burnette, in recent statements made in Washington, certainly was not informed well enough to appear before an important committee, crying discrimination and should study South Dakota's laws more thoroughly. I am unable to find a basis for his panic, except he is looking for more unnecessary Federal appropriations.

The Indian Bureau, in their spending, are usually criticized by the Indian for supplying too little too late and the lion's share going for salaries. This, I can say, is true in the Bureau's determined efforts to make a rancher out of an Indian regardless whether he was suited for the job or not. Most of the cattle loans would have been nearly impossible for an interested, experienced rancher to accept and work out in these days of high operating costs.

The question of whether full scale State law and order should be applied on South Dakota raises many arguments pro and con. It has been stated by some of the Bureau and tribal personnel that the Indian is not ready to accept the State law. Again they are asking for special privileges to allow more immoral and inhuman ideas to be instilled into the minds of the Indian people. Mr. Burnette states they are confused and don't understand State law and are herded into prison like cattle. I wonder if Mr. Burnette watched Indian people perform and serve, as I did, in our Armed Forces. Military law undoubtedly is the toughest a man can be subjected to and very few Indian Service men had any trouble under the jurisdiction of it. They were proven outstanding in many cases.

The word "discrimination" can be used in many ways and cast blame sometimes in the wrong direction. In my years of association with the Sioux people, I find they did not ask to be placed on reservations and many are now asking to be unharnessed and set free. They have found by working in surrounding cities that the white man isn't necessarily always a green-eyed monster ready to pounce and penalize them because they are Indians. These same people are asking that the barbed wire be removed from around them so they might come into American society and be responsible citizens of both South Dakota and our great United States of America.

In recent findings I know many Indians that would enjoy receiving a final settlement from the United States Government for the many things they say it owes them. I think the millions appropriated to continue and prolong their problems should be used in final payments of claims, if they are considered to have compensatory moneys due them.

Another slant in the meaning of discrimination can readily be detected in the past determination to pay Indian families for damages and hardship they encountered as a result of the military condemnation of the aerial gunnery range in old Washington County, S. Dak. Thirty-five hundred dollars per family was granted to the Indian families and records show many were paid that never lived in the area. Many white families just as bad off in 1941, also were told to move. They received a big round of applause and were told they would receive no compensation to the courts. This action in time of war is considered unpatriotic, consequently damage and hardship payments were not paid because they were taxpayers and should know their rights.

Sentiment expressed by American Indian Councils, church protective agencies and like organizations would have the white farmer and rancher living on Indian reservations classed as criminals and deadbeats, hiding from the law among the Indians.

Many and most of these families are of the same stock that won the West and have taught the Indians by living among them how to work and take care of their families. Some groups feel those same ranchers have stole the land they live on. Again they have been misinformed. The land these people own was sold to them under the Indian Bureau's supervision and they paid a satisfactory price or they wouldn't own it. The policies regarding land purchasing are conflicting, if they don't want the Indian's land sold, why is it constantly being put up for bid?

In summation, it certainly appears as though a great deal of tax dollars are being thrown down a well in South Dakota. The administration's cry for economy certainly can't be taken seriously when the taxpayers of South Dakota see millions spent annually to support and supposedly correct the Indian problem.

The Sioux Indian landowner in South Dakota has asked by petition for the abolition of the tribal councils and have also stated many times they would appreciate handling their own business like any other citizen. It now becomes evident that the Indian is asking to be a full fledged competent citizen of both State and Nation and common sense tells us the supervision and subsidizing should be slowed up and give these people a chance. Final settlements should be studied by Congress and granted, somewhat ending the problems the Government has created for the Indian people.

R. P. BENEDICKT.

HOT SPRINGS, S. DAK.

LITTLE ROCK NOT ON PINE RIDGE RESERVATION

Recently the Rapid Daily Journal carried an Associated Press story about Robert Burnette, chairman of the Rosebud Sioux Tribal Council, who went to Washington, D.C., and testified before a group of Congressmen that the Indians in South Dakota were being shoved around. He got the Congressmen all worked up.

Now the civil rights commission of South Dakota has announced that they will study the two minority groups in South Daokta—the Indians and Hutterites.

Fred Cozad, of Martin, who is the chairman of the civil rights commission, said they will study the Hutterites first, then us poor Lo's are next.

Hey, pal Fred, many of us Indians do not understand our civil rights and know little or nothing about the Hutterites. You've got us fogbound, running in circles like a blind jackrabbit.

All I know about law is outlaws and mother-in-laws.

About Indians marrying whites, history will tell you that shortly after Columbus discovered America came John Smith. A chief gave his daughter, Pocahontas, to John Smith. They got married and since that time there has been intermarriage between the whites and Indians up to now. Why make these romantic love affairs a big issue?

Every white grandmother and every Indian grandmother who ever held a half Indian and half white child on her lap loved these innocent little souls. I am sure every white or Indian grandmother would say this: "I love you even though half of your ancestors came over on the *Mayflower*, while the other half of your ancestors were on the reception committee to welcome them."

I know a grandfather who was talking to his little half Indian and half white grandson. He said, "Remember Jim Thorpe, the great all-American, was half Irish and half Indian, and someday I'll be proud of you if you become a great Thorpe."

There is very little that I know of this religious group known as the Hutterites.

I don't claim to represent the rank and file of Indians here on the Pine Ridge Reservation. This is my own personal viewpoint and I am not authorized by anyone to speak for the Pine Ridge Indians. Just a smalltime hick reporter for the Shannon County News, I have no comment to make on this religious group, the Hutterites, knowing that they have their freedom of religion. I am talking only about the Pine Ridge Reservation.

Within the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation we have one organized county and two unorganized counties. The whites and Indians are both landowners within this reser-

vation. The nonmembers are taxpayers subject to their State laws. Tribal members who live on restricted land held in trust for them by the Federal Government are subject to our tribal Federal laws.

I don't think that it was ever the intention of the whites and Indians to deprive each other of their civil rights.

At least that's the way it should be. We Indians know our tribal members have held important county offices in the three counties—sheriff's deputy, sheriff, justice of the peace, road commissioner, school boards, county superintendent of schools, etc. Every resident of this reservation knows that.

Why, folks, we even had a Sioux Indian boy as a dogcatcher in Rapid City.

We Indians have tribal-owned land on the reservation set aside by the treaties of 1851 and 1868 by the Congress of the United States.

My people gave up 100 square miles of the richest land in the United States so we could make more room for our white brothers. And we want to live together as good neighbors.

Right now we Indians do not have collective ranches or farms, nor do we all eat on the same tables out of one same pot.

We are not conscientious objectors. Our Indian GI's have established a war record of enlistment compared to any group.

Now only us older people have our individual allotments. Our GI sons, daughters, and grandchildren are landless.

Our land is decreasing fast. The Indian population is increasing.

Our hopes and dreams for our younger future generation is that we want them to have land and homes when we are gone, as a last stomping place for them as human beings.

Just the same as the residents of South Dakota who own the State park known as Custer State Game Park, and the Federal-owned park known as the Wind Cave National Park, to preserve the wild game of our noble creatures.

We have a game refuge for wildlife on the Lacreek Dam.

This is one of the reasons why many of the Indians oppose the selling of the tribal-owned land to the State of South Dakota for a park in the Sheep Mountain area.

Grandpa Kick A Hole in the Soup, the grand old philosopher, said, "Remember the war of 1890 when we Indians stomped to the stronghold in the badlands near Sheep Mountain. And," he added, "if the next world war comes, I'll bet my tommy hawk everybody will run for the badlands to hide. Let's keep her that way."

Here in Pine Ridge, every Sunday whites, Indians, halfbreeds, and people of different nationality worship in the same church. The same thing applies to our public school, including the Federal schools and Holy Rosary Mission where nobody is barred—rich, poor, color, or creed.

So, listen, you Congressmen and the State Civil Rights Commission, if someone should ask you where Little Rock is, just say its not on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation.

Yours,

PTA-SAN-WASTA (JAKE HERMAN).

## March 15—Hungarian Freedom Day—A Chance To Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of yesterday's celebration of that day in the 19th century when Hungary proclaimed its independence from Hapsburg rule, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following observations.

One hundred and ten years ago, the Hungarian Parliament dethroned the Hapsburgs, issued a declaration of independence and elected Kossuth, president. As we pause to commemorate that declaration of freedom, we find our feelings mixed; it is difficult to rejoice when, in Hungary today, there can be no rejoicing. Sadly enough, the short lived period of Hungarian independence which we commemorate today is the only real chance for freedom that the Hungarians have had in the last five centuries. It almost seems that the fluctuating factors underlying the world's history have worked deliberately against the establishment of that freedom which Hungarian peoples have so long desired.

The Magyars, as the Hungarians call themselves, settled in the middle Danube Basin at the end of the 9th century. The holy crown which to this day represents Hungarian sovereignty and tradition was obtained from Pope Sylvester II by King St. Stephen in the year 1000. This crown was not only a symbol of "all things Hungarian," but also represented the highly developed level of civilized western culture which Hungary had attained.

In spite of the Hungarian people's desire for continued peaceful independence, there has been little time since 1453 when Hungary has been free from the sound of clashing arms. This stems from the fact that every great continental power with imperialistic tendencies has attempted, in the early stages of its imperialism to dominate the Danube Valley—in which Hungary is located. The Turks of the Ottoman Empire, after fighting the Hungarians for nearly 100 years, defeated the Magyar army in 1526 and occupied two-thirds of Hungarian territory while the Hapsburg dynasty ruled the rest. After the Turks were defeated in 1683, the Hapsburgs extended their power over all Hungary. When in 1849 the Hungarian peoples proclaimed themselves independent, the Austrian Emperor called upon Czar Nicholas to help stifle the insurrection. The Russian efficiency in this type of work has historical roots, and they were successful in defeating Hungary. The odds against her were just too great.

It was within this forced relationship with the Austrian Empire that Hungary entered the First World War, but revolutionary movements broke out in Hungary during those war years. The Communist regime of Bela Kun resulted from the seizure of power by one of these rebel groups which developed leadership restricted to a circle of Lenin's terrorist henchmen. Yet, even though the Communists controlled the Hungarian Government, they could not dominate the Hungarian people, for these people fought in the only way they could—by effective, passive resistance.

After much upheaval, a freely elected national assembly in 1920 repealed the measures of the Communist regime, reverted to the monarchial constitution and established Admiral Horthy as regent. But, the Treaty of Trianon had been imposed upon Hungary. This was based upon the Allies' belief that a defeated belligerent nation should pay for the war (a philosophy stemming from a lack of understanding of the true causes of war). We are thankful that the Western Powers abandoned such a philosophy after World War II for we see the results of the difficulties in which that type of approach had placed Hungary in 1920. The Treaty of Trianon stripped that country of much of her territory, and created a general air of discontent. Essentially it had sown the seeds of the Second World War.

In spite of this, order was restored in Hungary between the wars. Under the premiership of Stephen Bethen, Hungary joined the League of Nations, signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact and concluded many treaties of conciliation and arbitration. But all was not well—the Russians loomed as an ominous shadow on one boundary and the Germans, after the Anschluss of Austria, touched Hungary not only geographically but economically. Nazi political pressure was great—and the final blow to any further independent action on Hungary's part was the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement. This established such a friendly relationship between Hungary's neighbors, that she could move in no direction.

Despite German domination, the bulk of the Magyars openly defied Hitler. As the war progressed, Hungary became a haven for increasing numbers of refugees, especially from Poland; but the Nazis began tightening their control and forcing devastation upon the country. As the Nazis left, the Red army came, bringing with it 160 Communists—Hungarian in origin, but all Russian citizens. These men, known as the Muscovites, formed the Hungarian Communist Party from the remnants of the Nazi Party. The outcome was a form of government detested violently by the Hungarian peoples. They demonstrated their distate by a revolution which shook world communism to its very foundations—revolution so fervent that the U.S.S.R. resorted to outright slaughter to temporarily control the fire of freedom which is demonstrated.

As we look upon Hungary in its historical perspective; as we see it suffering today, we may come close to comprehending the true meaning of the cost of freedom. There is no nation, no group of people, which has paid more dearly for a chance to be free.

## The Steel Companies and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly alarmed by the so-called administered price practice of leading industrial corporations. This is the practice under which corporations raise prices even in the face of falling demand and reduced output. I am convinced that unreasonable administered

price increases by the steel industry, particularly, have been a major cause of both the recent recession and our present inflation. This is the reason for the paradox of recession and inflation.

Following the strike settlement of 1956 which gave steelworkers a wage increase of approximately 19 cents an hour including fringe benefits, the steel companies upped their prices $8.50 per ton. This was done in spite of the fact that wage increase had them only about $2.50 per ton. Yet, 6 months later they added another price increase of $5 per ton and followed with a third increase of $6 per ton in July 1957. Thus, a wage increase costing the company $2.50 per ton was used as an excuse to raise steel prices an unbelievable $19.50 a ton.

In 1956 United States Steel sold 23 million tons of steel for a net profit of $348 million, but when their production declined 2 percent in the following year, profits rose to $419 million, an increase of 20.4 percent.

United States Steel's net profit per ton in 1957 was $17.91 compared to $14.56 in the previous year. The tremendous profit increases in the industry are better realized when one considers that in the decade of the 1940's, excluding the war years, the average steel profit was only $6.78 per ton.

Given the brazen price-gouging practices of the big steel companies, it is not surprising to learn that the directors of these great corporations have compenstated themselves in a most handsome manner. In 1955 the 16 directors of Bethlehem Steel, voted the tidy sum of $5,683,709 to be divided among themselves. Net profits of the corporation that year were $180 million. The following year, the profits of the corporation dropped by $19 million, but the directors saw fit to increase their own personal share of the take to $6.5 million, an increase of $882,618 over the previous year. Little wonder that of the 18 highest paid men in the Nation, 11 were directors of Bethlehem Steel.

In commenting on this situation, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly said:

> An average compensation to each officer-director in a steel company of $468,000 in 1 year acts as a challenge, a red flag, to labor unions and individuals to seek all they can. And it is difficult to persuade labor to hold a wage line when it knows the generous manner in which officer-directors compensate themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the basic cause of inflation is the administered prices of the biggest industries combined with the endless round of wage increases which such price practices cause.

It seems to me that Congress and the administration must take effective action to correct this dangerous threat to our economy. I have introduced legislation which is designed to bring the force of public opinion to bear on this problem by requiring huge corporations to justify proposed price increases in public hearings before the Federal Trade Commission.

I am entirely in accord with the suggestion by Senator KEFAUVER that consumers should use every resource including their pencils to urge steel industry and labor union leaders to hold the line against further wage-price increases at this time.

We all know that every time steel prices jump, the cost of automobiles, farm machinery, refrigerators, washing machines, and countless other items also jump. The combine which cost the farmer $4,500 10 years ago now costs $9,000. Labor and management each blame the other for price increases, and the consumer is caught in the middle. In the long run labor and industry cannot profit from this continuous wage-price spiral which has already had the effect of slowing down our rate of production and putting nearly 5 million people on the unemployment rolls.

Inflation is a threat to every family, but it is especially painful to older persons and white-collar workers living on fixed incomes. It has hit hardest of all our farm families who since 1952 have experienced a 20-percent drop in the prices of what they have to sell while the cost of what they buy has gone up $3.7 billion. It is no accident that 4 million people have left the farms of this Nation during the 5 years following 1952. Thanks to the cost-price squeeze that grips our farm population, net farm income dropped from $15.1 billion in 1952 to $10.8 billion in 1957.

Mr. Speaker, Bernard D. Nossiter, of the Washington Post, has done a remarkable job in reporting on the problems of inflation and administered prices. I call to the attention of the Congress his article appearing in the Washington Post of March 14, 1959, which I include at this point in the RECORD:

INFLATION LAID TO STEEL FIRMS

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

An investment adviser yesterday blamed the recent inflation and recession on profit-minded executives of steel companies.

Eugene Havas drew this conclusion for the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

His views about the importance of steel price increases have drawn partial or full support this week from a wide spectrum of economists. Among them were Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers; John Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard, a key adviser to Adlai Stevenson; Woodlief Thomas, economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board; Gardiner Means, former New Deal economist and author of the administered price theory; and Ralph Young, Research Director for the Federal Reserve Board.

Havas said:

"The steel companies are overtaxing our economy and are responsible for the 1957–58 recession for choking off demand by their price exactings since 1955–56."

Havas said that holding the steel price line was not enough, that steel prices must be rolled back. This, he said, would revive the choked off consumer demand, would relieve unemployment, and would help to find jobs for most of the unemployed of automation.

Havas said the steel company executives had a vested interest in pushing up prices because this pushed up profits. And, he observed, as profits go up, Wall Street puts higher prices on companies' stock. The executives, Havas noted, cash in on this by giving themselves stock options. Thus, the steelmakers can buy their companies' stock at a price far below its market value, sell it and get taxed no more than 25 percent.

In the case of United States Steel Corp., the industry's price leader, Havas said that net profits divided by total shares of stock jumped from $2 in 1948 to $7.33 in 1957 and fell to $5.13 in the slump last year. Currently, per share earnings of United States Steel are estimated at record levels. Meanwhile, the stock has jumped in price from a low of $10.12 in 1949 to a high this year of $99.87.

According to United States Steel's forthcoming annual report, some 258 executives have this prospect—because of stock options outstanding on January 1: They can make a few calls and divide about $19,300,000. And this income of about $75,000 per man is subject to a top tax rate of 25 percent.

Roger M. Blough, whose option claims are considerably higher than the average $75,000 because he is Steel's board chairman, could not be reached for comment on Havas' analysis. Blough's New York office said he was not available.

Havas suggested lowering top bracket personal income tax rates to 75 percent and introducing a graduated corporate excess-profit tax to dampen the increasingly popular stock option device.

Because stock prices and prices generally are driven up, he observed, investors don't want bonds, including the Government's, with their fixed return and price.

Moreover, in the past 7 fiscal years, Havas said, the Treasury has lost $46 billion in taxes it would otherwise have collected because of tax loopholes for corporations.

All these devices, Havas said, make it virtually impossible for the steel companies and other corporations to resist union requests for wage increases.

However, the harassed steel industry finally came up with a defender at the hearings. He was Simon Whitney, chief economist for the Federal Trade Commission. Whitney decried the emphasis on steel because, he said, it accounted for only 3.5 percent of the Nation's total 1957 output.

Whitney blamed price increases on wages and said big steel and auto corporations should not be broken up. His agency is charged with safeguarding the public from monopoly.

John Blair, chief economist for the subcommittee headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, analyzed the price-profit-wage picture. He noted that:

Between 1953 and 1957, the wholesale price per ton of steel went up 30 percent. But the payroll cost of production workers per ton of steel went up 14 percent or less than half.

So, for United States Steel, after-tax profits per ton jumped from $7.47 in early 1953 to $19.31 at the end of 1953. Moreover, steel production was going full blast in early 1953 and was running at about three-quarters of capacity at the end of 1958. Profits went up nevertheless because the industry has become much more efficient through the use of labor-saving machinery.

From the end of 1957 to the end of 1958, productivity, or tons shipped per worker, has jumped 7.0 percent. As a result, even though the industry is now nearing full production, it is doing it with far fewer workers.

## Operation of the Unemployment Insurance System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following study of unemployment insurance which was prepared by the University of Michigan's Subcommittee on Income Maintenance, Mr. William Haber, Fedels S. Fauri, and Wilbur J. Cohen. This study supplements a related study titled "Impact of the 1957–58 Recession in Relation to Unemployment Insurance" and should be read in connection with the earlier study which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, March 13, 1959.

II.—OPERATION OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM

Available information from official governmental sources indicates that about $4 billion was paid out through the various State and Federal unemployment insurance programs (Federal civilian and military personnel and railroads) to unemployed persons during the 12-month period, October 1957–58.

Total contributions collected by all State unemployment insurance programs during this period was $1.7 billion and benefits paid out were $3.4 billion. Total reserves of all States on October 31, 1957, were $8.7 billion Thus there was a total of about $7 billion in unemployment reserves to the credit of the various States as of October 31, 1958. From the standpoint of the unemployment insurance system as a whole, about half of the total benefits paid out during this period came from current tax collections and about half from reserves.

The financial data for State programs for this period are as follows:

| | *Billions* |
|---|---|
| Total State unemployment insurance reserve funds as of Oct. 31, 1957 | $8.7 |
| Plus contributions and interest | 1.7 |
| Funds available | 10.4 |
| Minus benefits paid | 3.4 |
| Total State unemployment insurance reserve funds as of Oct. 31, 1958 | 7.0 |

Financial resources of the State unemployment insurance programs varied widely. All State reserve funds taken together equalled 6.4 percent of taxable wages, as of October 31, 1958. However, this varied from 10 to nearly 12 percent in Montana, (11.7 percent) Washington, Idaho, and Arizona to less than 5 percent in Rhode Island, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Florida, Tennessee, Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Alaska, and Oregon (2.6 percent).

Unemployment insurance benefits averaged $30.45 a week in October 1958 equivalent to about 37 percent of the previous wages of persons covered by unemployment insurance. In view of the fact that over one-third of all the unemployed did not receive any unemployment insurance benefits and many exhausted their benefits, unemployment insurance benefits replaced only about 20 to 25 percent of the wage loss incurred by unemployed persons during the recession.

Over 2,200,000 persons were still out of work after they exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits during the 10 months ending October 31, 1958. The average unemployed worker who exhausted his unemployment benefits drew payments for about 21 weeks.

At the end of October 1958, about 1.2 million persons had drawn temporary unemployment compensation benefits in 36 jurisdictions. About 418,000 of these had exhausted their full entitlement to temporary benefits by the end of October.

III.—THE IMPACT OF THE RECESSION ON DIRECT RELIEF PROGRAMS

Federal grants are available to the States for assistance to the needy aged, blind, disabled and dependent children. The residual category of relief—general assistance, also referred to as direct relief or home relief—is financed solely by State and/or local funds without any Federal aid. In October, 1958 there were about 6.7 million persons receiving some kind of assistance under the five categories of aid.

In October, 1958 1,058,000 persons in 385,000 families received general relief. The average family consisted of about three persons and received $64.27 for the month.

The total number of individuals receiving general relief was:

The incidence of general relief varied widely among States during the recession.

About three-quarters of 1 percent of the U.S. population under the age of 65 was receiving general assistance in June 1958.

Michigan and Indiana had the highest rates—about 2 percent of the population under age 65.

Other States with heavy caseloads above the national average in June 1958 were:

*Percent of population under age 65 receiving direct relief, by State*

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | 1.88 |
| Illinois | 1.19 |
| Rhode Island | 1.17 |
| Washington | 1.13 |
| Maine | 1.04 |
| Delaware | .96 |
| Wisconsin | .88 |
| Connecticut | .85 |
| New York | .80 |
| New Hampshire | .78 |

| Month | 1957 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| September | 679,000 | 1,037,000 |
| October | 713,000 | 1,058,000 |
| November | 777,000 | 1,086,000 |

The number of cases receiving general relief increased 30 percent from October 1957 to 1958. The total amount paid out increased about 45 percent.

About 30 percent of all the direct relief cases in the Nation were in 18 large cities.[1] Over 40 percent of all expenditures in the Nation for direct relief were in these 18 cities.

IV. IMPACT OF UNEMPLOYMENT BY LABOR MARKET AREAS

Reports of the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor show that 83 major labor market areas in November, 1958, in 25 different States, had 6 percent or more unemployment and 188 smaller labor market areas—throughout 35 States also had 6 percent or more unemployment.[2]

In nine labor market areas in November, 1958, unemployment was 12 percent or more. These were: Detroit and Muskegon, Mich.; Buffalo, Altoona, Erie, and Johnston, Pa.; Wilkes-Barre and Huntington, W. Va.

V. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Both unemployment insurance and public assistance programs made an important contribution to meeting some of the hardships and economic losses caused by unemployment during the recession.

Unemployment insurance benefits and all public assistance payments (for all five categories) totalled $7 billion for the 12 month period. About $4 billion was for unemployment insurance and $3 billion for public assistance. The increase in total disbursements above the level of a year before was, however, only about $2.1 billion.

Unemployment insurance benefits in October 1958 were about $2 billion above the annual rate of August, 1957 while general assistance payments were at an annual rate of about $100 million above the August level.

Unemployment insurance benefits, nevertheless, fell substantially below the 50% of average wages recommended by President Eisenhower. The amount and duration of benefits was too limited and coverage too restricted.

While over 2 million persons exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits in the 10 months January–October 1958, the total amount of State reserves for unemployment insurance at the end of October 1958 was $7 billion—or about twice the $3.5 billion in benefits paid out in the previous 12 months.

If unemployment insurance benefits had been paid at a rate of 50% of average wages instead of the approximately 37% actually paid, and, if coverage had been broadened, and the maximum duration of benefits had been 39 weeks in all States for the entire period of the recession—about $1.5 to $2 billion additional would have been disbursed to unemployed individuals.

General relief was not available in all localities to meet the needs of able-bodied unemployed persons. In some localities no relief was available to employable persons. In some communities, residence and settlement requirements made it impossible to give aid to some needy unemployed persons or their families.

In 16 States, the localities had to supply all needed funds and thus the potential expansion of the program to meet the emergency was severely limited by the fiscal resources of the particular locality.

Although Federal funds were available to the States to help persons who became needy through unemployment when the individual was aged, disabled, blind, or where there was only one parent in the home, no Federal aid was available for direct relief to other groups.

*Recommendations*

The experience of the recession indicates that the existing builtin stabilizers in our income maintenance programs were not—and still are not—satisfactory to meet another similar reoccurrence. A free enterprise economy must make more effective provision than we now have for meeting the unemployment hazards which occur from the free play of economic forces in the market place.

The full potential of our unemployment-insurance system was not utilized during the recession for the alleviation of hardship and the support of our economy.

The tragic part of the situation was that there was $7 billion in unemployment insurance reserve funds which were not touched during the recession. If State and Federal unemployment laws had been more adequate and had permitted $1.5 to $2 billion of these reserves to be used to pay benefits to the unemployed, many personal

[1] Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, District of Columbia, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Rochester, St. Louis, and San Francisco.

[2] In Michigan these areas were as follows:

Major areas: Battle Creek, Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Muskegon, and Saginaw.

Smaller areas: Adrian, Allegan, Ann Arbor-Ypsilanti, Bay City, Benton Harbor, Escanaba, Holland-Grand Haven, Ionia-Belding-Greenville, Iron Mountain, Jackson, Marquette, Monroe, Owosso, Port Huron, and Sturgis.

hardships could have been avoided. There would still have been about $5 billion of reserves left if unemployment insurance benefits had been more adequate.

Among the most urgent improvements in Federal and State legislation which are vitally needed while the lessons of the recession are still fresh in our memory are:

1. Coverage should be broadened to cover all persons who have a substantial attachment to the labor force including the 1.8 million persons in small firms who are not covered in 33 States and some of the hired farm laborers and other groups not now covered.

2. The maximum duration of benefits should be increased to at least 30 weeks in a benefit year in all States. Provision should be made for longer duration whenever the average unemployment in a State reaches recession levels of say 6 to 9 percent.

3. Steps should be taken to establish an equalization fund in order to reduce the excessive costs of unemployment insurance in States suffering from a high incidence of unemployment caused by national economic conditions.

4. The great majority of eligible claimants should receive at least one-half of their normal full-time gross weekly earnings. States and employers should be given a period of 6 years to accomplish this objective. The great majority of eligible claimants in a State should receive at least 40 percent of their normal full-time gross weekly earnings for the first 2 years following the effective date of the standards; for the next 2 years, not less than 45 percent, and after that not less than 50 percent. In order to provide benefits at these levels, States would have to make changes in their benefit structure including increasing the maximum weekly benefit amount.

5. The Federal temporary unemployment compensation law which expires March 31, 1959, should be extended until permanent Federal standards and supporting State legislation are enacted to improve the benefit duration and financing arrangements of State laws.

6. Since a major impact of the recession was on younger workers with families, it was especially unfortunate that most State unemployment insurance laws did not provide for benefits in relation to the number of dependents. Only 11 States had such provisions.[3] Dependents benefits should be included as an integral part of each State unemployment insurance program.

7. Because a social insurance system does not protect all individuals from want during extended periods of unemployment, Federal and State funds for direct relief should be made available to assure all needy persons a floor of protection against want in all localities. Such a program should be designed to assist needy individuals to become self-supporting.

*Acknowledgments*

The data reported in part I of this report were obtained from a special survey undertaken in October 1958 as part of the Survey Research Center's "Survey of Consumer Attitudes and Intentions To Buy." George Katona and Eva Mueller directed the survey, and Donna McLeod of the coordinating committee staff, and Robert Hsieh of the center staff, assisted in the project.

The study was the second of a series of special studies on unemployment made possible through the cooperation of the Survey Research Center and the coordinating committee on social welfare of the university, of which Fedele F. Fauri of the school of social work is chairman, and its committee on income maintenance and social security whose chairman is Professor Cohen. A full report on the study will be available in 1959.

The Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, Wayne State University—the University of Michigan and the University of Michigan department of economics initially assisted in financing the project through Professor Haber and the Ford Foundation faculty research funds.

[3] Alaska, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, and Wyoming.

## Columnists Praise Hon. John McCormack's Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I enclose an editorial entitled "The First Blow," written by David Lawrence and appearing in U.S. News & World Report on March 16, 1959. Also, an editorial entitled "Striking the First Blow," which appeared in the Catholic Standard, Washington's archdiocesan newspaper, on March 15, 1959; together with a transcript of certain testimony involving questions by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, House majority leader, and answers thereto by the Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy at hearings held by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, on March 2, 1959:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 16, 1959]

THE FIRST BLOW

(By David Lawrence)

The Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, at a hearing last week, was asked by Representative JOHN MCCORMACK, Democratic leader of the House, whether it is still the military policy of the United States that "under no conditions will we attack first." Mr. MCCORMACK inquired whether this isn't an untenable position in the event of a grave emergency.

The Secretary agreed that it is a very difficult thing militarily. Then he explained that the policy not to attack first is currently true, and added: "Whether that will always be true, I think, could be something else."

Representative MCCORMACK promptly said he was glad to get such an assurance of possible change. For he believes that America should say it reserves to itself the same freedom of action as the Soviets now enjoy.

Thus, at least, there has come into the open a phase of Communist tactics which is largely responsible for the cockiness of the Soviets in the cold war.

For Moscow has known that the U.S. policy is to accept the first blow and that, indeed, Chicago, or Detroit, or New York, or Washington—or perhaps many of our air bases—could be destroyed before any retaliatory blow would be struck.

What is truly involved is the official strategy adopted by the Soviet Union in 1955 when, through the influence of Nikita Khrushchev, the military policy of attacking a potential enemy first was formally decided upon in the councils of the Kremlin. This was not termed preventive war but preemptive war.

The policy has been fully set forth by high military officers of the Soviet Union in its military journals. Excerpts from these articles and comments by western military men were published in U.S. News & World Report on June 10, 1955, December 13, 1957, and February 7, 1958.

The preemptive war doctrine now should also be adopted by the United States in its own defense. This is perthaps the best way to prevent war from ever happening. The doctrine, as the United States could pursue it, was outlined by Capt. W. D. Puleston, retired naval officer, who, in an article in this magazine on December 13, 1957, wrote:

"Our Government should also make it equally clear to the Soviets that we will not stand idly by and wait to be attacked—that we will not permit any nation to prepare and mount a surprise attack upon this country or any of its allies.

"If Russia—or any other nation—should give positive evidence that it is preparing such an attack, the United States should immediately:

"1. Alert its Armed Forces and deploy them for an instant attack upon the threatening nation.

"2. Serve immediate notice upon the threatening nation that, unless it dismounts the attack preparations within a specific brief period of time, the United States will attack in self-defense, without waiting to be hit first.

"Then, if the Russians or their satellites should defy this warning, the United States would be in a position to get at least an even break. If the enemy should attack, we could attack simultaneously. If the enemy should persist in its preparations to attack, we could—with honor—attack first, and thus gain the initial advantage instead of conceding it."

The frank discussion of this terrifying contingency is a healthy sign. There must be a resumption at once of the international conferences, recently suspended at Geneva, dealing with the subject of "surprise attack." Although the United States has said it would accept the "first blow," it is clear now that our Government may wish to consider a change. This fact—even though no change has as yet been decided upon—at least moves the problem nearer to solution.

For at the moment the Soviets have a free hand. They can bluff us out of Berlin and out of our bases in Europe. They can threaten to destroy our big cities. They can threaten us everywhere with their new missiles. And we are supposed to wait for the first blow, however devastating it may be, and then conduct our massive retaliation with most of what you have left, as Secretary McElroy said to Mr. MCCORMACK.

Mr. McElroy told his press conference last week that preparation for an attack by bombers or missiles in the foreseeable future would be so complex that they would most certainly be discovered by the free world before the blow could get underway.

But what do we do when we discover it?

In self-defense, we should announce now that we will interpect or forestall the first blow. We have the same right to apply the doctrine of preemptive force that our adversaries do. To avow this is to hasten the day when an ironclad agreement can be made to insure against the mobilization of missiles and bombers by either side. For such a mobilization itself can be a signal for the outbreak of war, even as it has been in the past. This is the most pressing problem before the world today.

[From the Catholic Standard, Mar. 15, 1959]

STRIKING THE FIRST BLOW

A deadly matter is being discussed these days. Is it morally permissible to strike the first blow in a nuclear war? The recent incisive questions at a hearing, proposed by House Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK

(whose line of questioning we highly approve) focused attention on this point.

Behind the matter stands the erroneous but generally accepted opinion that the first blow will obliterate the enemy population and perhaps a large segment of the nonbelligerent population. Related to this opinion is the false idea that a war must necessarily involve total surrender.

In relation to these questions, the church has always taught that a nation can use sufficient force to repel an aggressor and that if an aggressor shows clearly his evil intentions adequate measures can be taken for thwarting an aggression. This does not mean, even with nuclear weapons, that it is necessary to obliterate the enemy to forestall an attack and many of our experts have spoken clearly and eloquently on this. Thomas E. Murray has steadily contended that a development of a full graduated system of nuclear weapons would enable us to deal with each situation according to its severity and thus relieve us of the awful predicament of a sudden war of obliteration of the enemy. Total annihilation or unconditional surrender is not and should not be considered the only objective in a war. Furthermore, a graduated use of force would be, it is hoped, a sufficient deterrent since the enemy realizes our full potential for destruction. Henry Kissinger, another expert, has supported in general, this thesis. Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., has also written eloquently on it.

The majority leader also indicated at the congressional hearing that it would be better not to inform the enemy that we would never strike the first blow. We feel that this is eminently wise, especially since the first blow need not be total destruction of the enemy but only a stern and adequate warning.

Now is the proper time to think about these grim questions particularly for eradicating the erroneous opinions that a war must be fought to unconditional surrender and must involve, with today's weapons, a holocaust for the enemy.

---

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McCORMACK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, Mr. Secretary, what you have said in substance is that our whole military position is predicated upon the policy that under no conditions will we attack first.

Secretary McELROY. Our policy is that we will not attack, first, Mr. McCORMACK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Rather an untenable one from a military angle in case of grave emergency, is it not?

Secretary McELROY. I think it is a rather difficult one but I think it is the one that would be supported by public opinion in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, public opinion is not going to win wars. We are coming down to leadership.

Secretary McELROY. In any case——

Mr. McCORMACK. Public opinion is important, but other things win wars.

Secretary McELROY. I agree that this is a very difficult thing militarily, Mr. McCORMACK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we are tied to that.

Secretary McELROY. That is our policy.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is described by the President, by the Executive Branch. That is correct, is it not?

Secretary McELROY. That is currently true. Whether that will always be true I think could be something else, Mr. McCORMACK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I am glad to get that latter now because that is a little relaxation. Could you see conditions under which that would not apply?

Secretary McELROY. This would again be a matter of national policy which would take quite high review. I think I must begin back where I began, which is, for the present and the indeterminate future our policy is not to attack with the big weapons first.

Mr. McCORMACK. What do you mean not to attack with the big weapons first, would we attack with other weapons first?

Secretary McELROY. No, I think we would not attack first even with other weapons.

Mr. McCORMACK. So no matter how powerful our military might be we are strictly in a defensive posture.

Secretary McELROY. Yes, because we are not aggressors.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to have that established. Now our main reliance, of course, is SAC. That is correct, is it not?

Secretary McELROY. Yes, our principal deterrent is the Strategic Air Command. We have other very major elements.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, that is true but you have already said on a number of occasions—only in the U.S. News & World Report a few weeks ago, that our principal reliance at this time is on the heavy and medium bomber capacity of the Strategic Air Command, that is certainly number one.

Secretary McELROY. That is correct, that is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, suppose they have a defense against our bombers, what then?

Secretary McELROY. Well, of course, if they have a defense against anything that we have then it makes our problem just that much tougher but I think we have some right to judgments on whether or not they can have a defense against our bombers that will keep us out and I think that the belief of our military people is that they will not keep us out any more than we can keep all of their bombers out if they come at us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, of course it is not a question of keeping them out, it is a question of the attrition rate.

Secretary McELROY. Yes, there would be some attrition.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the rate is too high there is the question of sustaining the attack?

Secretary McELROY. There would be a question of sustaining but I think in this kind of war you are likely to use most of what you have in your initial strike.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are going to strike after we are hit?

Secretary McELROY. Yes, but you are going to use most of what you have left.

Mr. McCORMACK. You have also stated that within a year or two you expect the Soviet Union to be considerably ahead of us in intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Secretary McELROY. I do not expect that they will. I consistently say that they can be. The intelligence that we have, of course, does not get inside the Russian mind to know what they are going to do. The only thing we can judge is what they could do with their facilities of scientists, facilities of materials, their facilities of production, manpower, and so on. Now then, there is one of the interesting points really that is under discussion in this general debate. We do assume in what we are preparing to do with our own forces that they will make use of their top scientists and their material facilities and their production facilities to make this quantity of weapons but we do not say they will produce these. We say they could produce these if they had the national decision to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, it is reasonable to assume they are going to do what they think they ought to do.

Secretary McELROY. Yes, but the interesting point in retrospect on that, Mr. McCormack, lies in the history of what they did on heavy bombers.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know. You refer to that in this article here. You refer to General Twining's views when he came back from Moscow. Is that what you have reference to?

Secretary McELROY. Yes. General Twining—and he can speak for himself at any point here if you would like him to—came back from Moscow feeling that the Russian capability to manufacture heavy bombers was such that we could expect really to have a superiority of heavy bomber capabilities by Russia over the United States. This was very disturbing to the country. He had this capability but he did not produce it. Why, I do not know. Everybody has his own theory as to why he did not do so. In addition to a capability to do you have to have a national decision to do. The only thing we can say in our intelligence is that he has the capability to do; whether he is going to make the national decision to do we do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might it not be that they concentrated on missiles rather than bombers realizing that the perfecting of missiles would more or less outmode bombers?

Secretary McELROY. The thing that makes that doubtful is our observation of new bombers in the air over there, so they have not given up bomber aircraft. They have an advanced bomber, we believe, in test.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to appear to be in a position of cross-examining any of you gentlemen because we are all Americans, we all want to do the best we can.

Secretary McELROY. Surely.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have our limitations up here. We can appropriate money, but we can't compel it to be spent. We have seen that in the Army and the Marine Corps in the last year.

By the way, do you think the reduction in our Army, in the light of the situation today, was wise?

Secretary McELROY. We think the size of the Army is adequate.

Mr. McCORMACK. That isn't answering my question.

I will leave it there.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fulton.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, I have just one or two more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Excuse me.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the benefit of the people, what is your opinion as to the relationship of the Soviet Union and our own country in the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile? Are they ahead of us?

Secretary McELROY. My judgment is—and when I say "my judgment," let me say that this is a distillation of the views of the intelligence community and of our own scientists, so that I am not talking as an individual, I am simply reflecting a combined view—my judgment in that context is that developmentally we are very close to each other in the development stage of the ICBM.

Mr. Khrushchev announced, I would guess maybe a couple of months ago, maybe not quite that much, that their ICBM was in serial production. This was a term not commonly understood here. It was interpreted by some to mean mass production, and you all may have read recently that a Russian scientist who was in this country explained—and this was reported in the New York Times—that "serial production" is not mass production but is production that is in between prototype production and mass production.

I can read it right here, if the committee would be interested.

This is in the New York Times of Friday, February 13, and this was a meeting of scientists.

The questioning lifted momentarily as Mr. Lebedev explained the "serial production" of the intercontinental ballistic missile. He said this was an intermediary stage—I guess intermediate is what should be here—I hate to correct the New York Times. Maybe I better not do that. He said this was an intermediate stage between the "specimen" or "prototype," and mass production. It means, he said, the production of limited quantities.

Now, of course, the Atlas is in serial production in that kind of sense, because I be-

lieve that this committee has visited the production facilities of the Atlas, has it not? I know that you have been down at Cape Canaveral and at Huntsville.

In any case, if you have observed this, the Atlas missiles are moving through on what I would consider in this way serial production, but whether we are in serial production or not doesn't make much difference to me.

I think in answer to your question, sir, that the evidence seems to me to be that there is very little difference in the development stage of their missile and ours from everything that we can judge.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would you express an opinion, either you or General Twining—I know when you express your opinion, it is the collective judgment of many others—as to how long the SAC will be our main reliance so far as retaliatory action is concerned.

Secretary McELROY. Well, in answering this, I think we should make clear that the intercontinental ballistic missiles are being assigned for deployment to SAC, so I think your question has to do with SAC bombers.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talkink about the bombers now.

General TWINING. Well, I think it will be several years, certainly until sufficient quantities of the ICBM's are not only in stockpile but on launchers and of proved dependability. Then it will be a combination of the two. The bombers will stay as the missiles come in. Even though the ICBM's may be perfect, we still want the capability from the manned bombers, for I would say 10 or 15 years, but not just the bomber. It will be the missile too, a combination of both. But SAC will still be the unit, as the Secretary said, that is the deterrent force for the country. It will always maintain the deterrent, with a combination later on of both the missile and the airman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it fair to assume that might be discoveries through tests and a satisfactory bomber might be used more effectively than now; whether there might be a capacity to project a weapon a longer distance than they can now toward the target?

General TWINING. The Hound Dog is an example of that. I am thinking of that when I say the bomber will stay with us 10 to 15 years. The bomber can carry a great load of nuclear power and pinpoint targets, and you will need that capability.

Mr. McCORMACK. The greater the increase in the mileage from the target, the more effective the bomber will be in the future?

General TWINING. It can stand off a thousand miles from a target, keep out of a heavily defended area, and launch a missile from a bomber.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it reasonable to assume there is a capability of 500 miles?

General TWINING. Definitely. We are encouraged on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Secretary, you said a few weeks ago that the danger from the Russian conspiracy is about the same: "I think they intend to destroy us if they can, one way or another."

You remember you said that in the interview with U.S. News & World Report.

Secretary McELROY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is still your opinion today?

Secretary McELROY. It is my belief.

Mr. McCORMACK. Have the events of the past week, the visit of the representative of a friendly ally of ours, caused you to change your opinion?

Secretary McELROY. If anything, it has reaffirmed my opinion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just one more field.

Is there any consideration being given to the establishment of one agency in the field of outer space to take over military and civilian research and development?

Secretary McELROY. There is nothing current in that direction. It is our belief in the Department of Defense that the agency that has been set up, and the Space Council which has been se up to give common direction to the overall program can best do its work along with the military as carrying a portion of this responsibility.

We think that it would be a quite doubtful thing for the military use of space to be assigned outside of the military for development, with all that could mean—not necessarily would mean, but all that it could mean, of difference in point of view on the part of the military and of the other agency as to the importance militarily of certain use of outer space.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, you have used very guarded language, which I understand, I think.

In other words, you think it would be a great mistake if military research and development was to be transferred to an agency embracing both military research and development and civilian?

Secretary McELROY. I think the present setup is a good setup and will be workable.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, there are many twilight zones on some of those questions, I would judge?

Secretary McELROY. Yes, there are, but I don't see why we can't work this out as reasonable men working together, and in the aeronautical field, Mr. McCORMACK, when NACA was the agency, the Department of Defense really had no problem in working out the division of functions as between the two groups.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the powers of the two are different now. You have more power in NASA than in NACA. They are more competitive.

Secretary McELROY. They have somewhat more power, but I think the legislation was very well written to reserve to the military the military use of space.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, take the twilight zone, don't you think the doubt should be resolved in the world of today on the side of the military?

Secretary McELROY. I think I would prefer to say, Mr. McCORMACK, that the President, as the Chairman of the Space Council——

Mr. McCORMACK. I was chairman of the committee.

Secretary McELROY. I know you were, sir. I think it was a wise conclusion that any doubts that there are as to jurisdiction should be resolvable at the highest executive level through the Space Council, of course, which is chairmaned by the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. We put language in our bill that the Congress further declares that such activities shall be the responsibility of and directed by a civilian agency exercising control over aeronautical space activities sponsored by the United States, except that activities peculiar to or primarily associated with development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States, and, in brackets, making it stronger, including the research and development to make effective the defense of the United States, shall be the responsibility of and shall be directed by the Department of Defense, and that determination as to which such agency has responsibility for and direction of such activity shall be made by the President in conformity with section 201(e).

That is pretty strong language there, and we made it just as strong as we could. In other words, if there is a situation that develops in the world of today—tomorrow it might be different, but in the world of today we have to consider these things. What might be military today may not be in a peaceful world, we recognize that, but in case there is any attempt to transfer what is considered to be of vital importance to our country in the military field, are you prepared to fight for the retention by the military of those things you consider to be essential for our preservation?

Secretary McELROY. Without any hesitation, and I think on the other side that I am unlikely to need to fight, because the man who is the head of NASA is a man who is, I think, a very reasonable man and a very good man. I think the point was excellent, and I don't anticipate any problem at all in working these out with Mr. LANHAM. But if for some reason or other there is an honest difference between him and me, I would certainly be quite prepared to fight, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. FULTON.

---

## Correcting Inequities Applicable to Fishing Catch in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, for the purpose of correcting inequities in existing law applicable in Puerto Rico, which I believe were not the intent of Congress when the law was enacted. It is intended also to encourage the development of fisheries and their allied industries in that great Territorial commonwealth, which has encouragement and backing of our Government.

Under sections 931 and 933 of the Revenue Code of 1954, mainland citizens of the United States who establish bona fide residence in insular possessions such as Puerto Rico are entitled to certain tax exemptions, all designed to promote the industry and welfare of the people of such possessions. As a condition under section 931(a)(2)(B), it is required of the citizen to be entitled to this exemption that "50 percent or more of his gross income—computed without the benefit of this section—for such period or such part thereof was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business within a possession of the United States, either on his own account or as an employer or agent of another."

Usually this condition is entirely fair. In the instance of a fisherman catching fish on the high seas, however, the Treasury Department has ruled that the actual catching of fish, the active conduct of a trade or business is not conducted within the possession. The facts that the citizen is a bona fide resident of the possession, sells his fish in and receives payment therefor within the possession, and in every way contributes the economy of the possession just as though he spent all of his time on shore, are disregarded. The unfair consequences are as follows:

(a) The citizen does not receive the exemption from U.S. Federal taxes in accordance with the intent of the law.

(b) The fisherman is subject to having withholding taxes deducted from his wages, salary or other compensation both

under the Federal income tax law and the tax laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Although he makes eventual recovery of the Puerto Rico deductions, he is deprived of the use of his own money until reimbursement is made. This makes it difficult for a boatowner to employ such citizens.

(c) Should the fisherman have income from properties on the mainland subject to Federal income taxes, by the inclusion of Puerto Rican income in his tax return he becomes liable for taxes in higher income tax brackets.

(d) Puerto Rican personal income taxes are somewhat lower than Federal income taxes, which again operates to the disadvantage of the citizen.

(e) Should a fisherman catch all of his fish in waters within the 3-mile limit of the possession, he would receive the full benefits of the exemption. If he spends more than 50 percent of his time outside of the 3-mile limit he is deprived of the exemption.

It is submitted that the fisherman is just as important to the economy of Puerto Rico as the one who works in the cannery that buys and packs such fish; in fact, even more so because without his fish the cannery employee would have nothing to do. For all practical purposes the fisherman's income is derived from sources within Puerto Rico, because that is where his fish are delivered and sold.

The amendment to section 933 has been so worded as to make it clear that the exemption applies to a proprietor or partner as well as to an employee, as is the case under section 931. The requirement of bona fide residence remains unchanged.

Section 3401(a)(8)(C) is amended to conform to the amendment to section 933.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the bill in the RECORD, at this point as a part of my remarks:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to income derived from fishing where the catch is landed in Puerto Rico

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 933 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income from sources within Puerto Rico) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences:

"For purposes of this section, income derived (either on his own account or as an employee or agent of another) from the conduct of a fishing venture shall be treated as income derived from sources within Puerto Rico, if the catch of fish is landed, sold, or delivered in Puerto Rico. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'fish' means fish, whether in the round, gilled and gutted, filleted, split, salted, iced, or frozen, and includes shellfish and crustacea, whether whole, headed, salted, iced or frozen."

SEC. 2. Section 3401(a)(8)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to withholding tax on wages) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) for services for an employer (other than the United States or any agency thereof) performed by a citizen of the United States within Puerto Rico, or in connection with a fishing venture where the catch of fish (within the meaning of the last sentence of section 933) is landed, sold, or delivered in Puerto Rico, if it is reasonable to believe that during the entire calendar year the employee will be a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico; or."

SEC. 3. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

(b) The amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall apply to wages paid on or after the first day of the month after the month in which this Act is enacted.

## A Study of the Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, while the Bureau of the Budget has based 1960 revenues on an expanding economy, indications are that unemployment is rising and today is the No. 1 domestic problem. The regular joint report of the Federal Labor and Commerce Departments showed 4,749,000 unemployed and 62,722,000 employed. The total of idle was 424,000 below the figure for the recession month of February 1958, but 1,628,000 above that for the prerecession month of February 1957.

In the last 14 months of slump and recovery, more than 3 million workers have exhausted all the unemployment insurance to which they were entitled under regular State programs. Nine hundred thousand of these long-term unemployed went on to use up all the extended protection available to them under the temporary Federal program, which went into effect 9 months ago. No official estimate has been made of how many of these workers are still jobless.

The Federal program is scheduled to expire March 31 of this year, and the Ways and Means Committee has recommended a 3-month tapering-off period. This would prevent an abrupt cutoff in payments to the 300,000 who will still be on the emergency benefit rolls at the end of this month. In addition to this group, 2,375,000 workers are registered for regular State insurance checks.

In my opinion, it is not time for us to terminate the Federal unemployment insurance program. The situation throughout the United States is grave and while we see expanding business, we see the ominous situation of increasing unemployment. It behooves us to be careful and to see the signs. We should not terminate this Federal program until we are sure that workers will be employed.

The following article by A. H. Raskin, feature writer for the New York Times casts light upon the situation and will prove interesting and alarming reading. I recommend it to all who wish to be informed:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1959]

PEOPLE BEHIND STATISTICS: A STUDY OF UNEMPLOYED—VICTIMS IN FIVE STATES PUZZLED BY PLIGHT—FAMILY DEBTS INCREASE AMID GAINS IN OUTPUT AT MECHANIZED PLANTS

(By A. H. Raskin)

Unemployment is a figure in a Government report, as dreary and lifeless as the Federal debt or the death rate.

Unemployment is people—the individual hardship and heartache of 4,749,000 Americans, willing and able to work but unable to find suitable jobs.

Unemployment is the husky, fresh-faced college graduate, with 3 years of Air Force duty behind him, being told he is too old for a job with a future—at age 26.

Unemployment is the breezy, blustery executive, accustomed to an income of $50,000 a year, trying to pay his bills on a State job insurance check of $40 a week—an amount he once spent on taxis and cigars.

Unemployment is the head shipping clerk, stranded when his textile plant moved from New York to North Carolina, subsisting on odd jobs of heavy cleaning and reading an inspirational pamphlet. Its title, "Get Rich in Spite of Yourself."

Unemployment is the rhinestone setter, with all her State and Federal benefits drawn, watching a giveaway show on television and murmuring, "It makes me feel bad to see people getting all these nice things."

Unemployment is the electrical worker, fearful that automation has permanently wiped out his chances for reemployment, wondering whether he can volunteer for a space flight to the moon.

To put faces on figures, correspondents of the New York Times have spent the last week talking to idle workers and their families in States where unemployment has remained high despite the general pickup in business.

Their story makes a gray backdrop for reports of higher production, higher sales, higher profits, higher wages and other indices of returning prosperity. It is a story told without bitterness—almost apologetically—even by those who have gone through the last anguishing turn of the wringer and been forced to turn to public relief.

Puzzlement is more apparent than anger in the attitude of men and women who have tramped the streets, month after weary month, with nothing to show for their efforts but holes in their shoes and a growing pile of debts.

In Detroit, capital of the automobile industry, one worker in seven is jobless and cutbacks in the output of some 1959 models threaten to add thousands to the idle lists in the next few weeks. Pittsburgh, crossroads of steel and coal production, is worried that large-scale unemployment will become a chronic drag on its economic well-being.

In the mine regions of West Virginia the specter of permanent pools of idle workers is even more tragically present. Mechanization has cut the need for manpower so drastically that 68,000 men now dig more coal than 125,000 did 10 years ago. The displaced, returning from futile job-seeking expeditions to Cleveland, Columbus, or Detroit, are less disposed to be philosophical about their plight than most of the country's uncomplaining unemployed.

Surplus food—"mollygrub" is what they call it in the Kanawha Valley coalfields—has become a mainstay in the diets of tens of thousands of families, not only in West Virginia but also is every other State. In December, 5,230,000 persons benefited from the Federal dole of butter, flour, cornmeal, and other surplus commodities. The food lines were almost twice as long as they had been a year earlier.

Yet, by the standards of mass misery that prevailed in the great depression of the thirties, privation is a minor problem. What bears most raspingly on today's jobless is the sense of uselessness that comes with being unwanted and unneeded in the world's richest and most productive Nation.

The corrosive effect has been acute among youngsters—high school and college graduates, ex-GI's, and others in the 20 to 35 age group—locked in their first real bout with hard times and deprived of the community of suffering that helped preserve the fabric of self-respect in the depression years when everyone was in trouble.

YOUNG MAN'S RECESSION

In many ways this was a young man's recession, especially in factory industries operating under rigid seniority systems. The most recently hired were the first to feel the layoff ax. Now science, moving with the same breathtaking speed in the improvement of industrial technology as it is in the conquest of the atom and of outer space, is making the day of recall to work more remote.

The harnessing of electronic brains to mechanical muscles has made it possible to produce more goods with fewer workers. Men with 10, 12, and even 15 years of seniority remain on the surplus list while their companies climb past the production peaks they set in preautomation days.

To make the outlook gloomier, other employers hesitate to hire them for fear that their desire to safeguard their pension equities and priority status in their old jobs will cause them to quit when and if the recall whistle sounds.

For men and women of more advanced age among the unemployed, the calendar is an enemy. The piling up in New York and other States of statutory prohibitions against discrimination based on age has brought no abatement in the conviction of those past 35—and even a good many under that age—that their biggest handicap is the years in which they acquired their maturity and skill.

There is little tendency to clutch for the comforts of the welfare state. Confronted with the necessity for going on relief, most workers will grab a job at half or less than the standard they used to enjoy. And there are plenty of employers ready to capitalize on this preference for staying independent of a Government handout.

RELIEF LOAD OF 3 PERCENT

In small machine shops, dry goods warehouses, and other small businesses, the calls are for work at only a few cents above the legal minimum of $1 an hour. Only in the large standardized industries and those under stringent union policing is there no move to pull down pay scales or trim fringe benefits. There the movement is still up—in both prices and wages.

In this city, where 50,000 workers have drawn all the Federal and State unemployment insurance they could get in the last 14 months, fewer than 100 a month have turned to the department of welfare for relief after their insurance ran out. The total public assistance caseload here has gone up less than 3 percent in the last year, and not all of this slight rise is attributable to unemployment.

In contrast to the economic trough of the thirties, when one-fifth of the city's population was on home or work relief, the ratio now is 1 in 23. And many of the family heads now on the rolls are unemployable even by the relaxed tests that would apply in the rosiest flush of full employment.

In Detroit and other centers of "productivity-unemployment," the relief rolls have risen more rapidly. But everywhere the idle, without insurance or other sources of support, echo the remark of the Detroit mother of five, who told a reporter:

"Accepting money from welfare, I feel we're down to the last notch. I don't want the children to grow up with the idea of welfare aid. My parents back in Arkansas raised me never to lean on welfare."

Here are some reports on what unemployment has meant to workers and their families:

NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY

The New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, with its incredible diversity of finance, commerce, entertainment, publishing and manufacturing, is enjoying the seasonal upswing that always accompanies the pre-Easter rush in its largest single field of employment the needle trades.

But the face of joblessness in the metropolis has so many visages that improvement even in a multi-billion-dollar area leaves hundreds of thousands untouched. The last official estimate in mid-January showed 375,000 workers or 1 in 12 looking for jobs in the 5 boroughs.

A reporter who toured unemployment insurance offices, welfare agencies, union hiring halls and armories where the idle queued up for Federal food came away with impressions as diverse as the people he talked to. Visits to the jobless in their own homes merely reinforced his feeling that no shortcut cure by Government or industry, would eradicate the economic sores behind the gleaming new skyscrapers, the flourishing theaters, and restaurants and the other badges of New York's opulence.

WAITING IN THE 'T' LINE

Walk into the job insurance office at 259 West 54th Street and chat with some of the men and women on the "T" line. This is the State labor department's shorthand for temporary unemployed compensation, the emergency program the Federal Government finances for the long-term jobless.

Here is James Matthews, a tall, handsome man of 36, with a shy smile, who won a Rhodes scholarship and studied at Oxford and the Sorbonne after graduating from Columbia. He had 4 years of wartime duty on Navy combat ships and was receiving officer's training when V–J Day came.

He entered the State Department's career Foreign Service and held posts in Europe and the Far East until he resigned in 1953 to become an international marketing specialist for a Standard Oil affiliate overseas. An expert in six languages, he was on his way to a European assignment for International Goodrich last summer when a dip in rubber sales wiped out his $200-a-week job.

His pavement-pounding has convinced him that employers want men in their mid-twenties, not mid-thirties. What depresses him even more is that so many of those he sees going abroad are men whose interest in their foreign trade missions seems to him largely confined to the prospect of hanging around the American bar.

In the meantime Mr. Matthews has a somewhat less global concern. He has just made the transfer from the State insurance lists, where he drew his full quota of 26 $45-checks, to the Federal list. This week red tape connected with the shift will limit his benefit to $11. That means he will have to send a distress signal to his parents in Texas for a fresh loan.

"If Congress doesn't extend the Federal program beyond its present March 31 closing date, I will really be in the soup," he says. His savings are all gone, but his job insurance and help from his family have enabled him to keep quarters at the Columbia Club, 4 West 43d Street.

A few places down the line is Mrs. Sydonia Goodstein, of 340 West 57th Street, an imperious woman in black caracul. She has the air of a grand dame, as befits a couturiere whose shop used to make costly dresses for Saks Fifth Avenue, Bergdorf Goodman, Neiman-Marcus, and other fine stores.

The business she started in 1921 never recovered from a fire that gutted the building 2 years ago. Now, her lease gone and her job insurance expiring this week, she is looking for work. This is her report on her first telephone call in response to a help wanted advertisement:

"The employer said I sounded young and asked how old I was. I am a rabbi's daughter and do not lie, so I said 65. He told me, 'Lady, why don't you go sit in the park?' It reminded me of a book I once read about an uncivilized island where they burned everybody at 50. I thought it was savage, but it doesn't seem so savage now."

The next man asks that his name be kept secret, but it could be Willy Loman, the hapless hero of Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman," whose goal in life is to be well liked. He is a jolly, talkative man of 55, whose sales talent made him head of a ladies' belt business with 80 employees, an annual volume of more than $1 million, and profits in the $50,000 to $60,000 range.

A bankrupt company he bought for tax-loss purposes and then tried to run, plus the advent of the beltless chemise, proved his downfall. The home he owned in Harrison is gone and the lease on his $230-a-month apartment in Riverdale runs out in June. He has been borrowing on the $100,000 in personal insurance he used to carry, but the end of that is in sight.

FUTURE LOOKS BLEAK

"I keep telling my wife it's fortunate that I was born with a strong heart and a weak mind," he says with a melancholy attempt at a salesman's laugh. "But I'm really at the end of my rope. I've been selling all my life; I have a wonderful reputation in the field. It doesn't seem possible I can't get connected. But after 14 months of tramping around, the future looks very, very bleak."

Drop in on Michael Azzata, a well-set-up youth of 26, with glossy black hair and dark, earnest eyes, in his parents' neat apartment in a neat row of identical tan-brick houses at 30–27 41st Street, Long Island City, Queens.

He enlisted in the Air Force after he got out of high school at the height of the Korean war. When he went to Columbia under the GI bill of rights, he took seriously the advice of industrialists and educators that it was wise for young men to get a well-rounded general training in liberal arts, instead of concentrating on specialized technical courses.

Now, with a B.A. degree, he finds himself being told by job interviewers that he lacks the specific instruction or experience they require and that he is too old to get into an executive training program.

It does not help, psychologically, that his own inability to get a job with a future, even at $50 a week, forces his 74-year-old father to keep working at Pennsylvania Station as a bootblack. He will probably settle for a night job as a restaurant supervisor and go back to Columbia to take a master's degree in business administration.

## Tax Exemptions on Public Housing Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE A. KASEM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, it has been related to me that some municipal

authorities have been concerned over the fact that H.R. 5096, recently introduced by my colleague from California [Mr. GORDON MCDONOUGH], would be a step toward eliminating tax exemptions on other bonds. The bill would remove long standing tax exemptions on public housing bonds.

Ever since I can remember, the Federal Government has made interest on local bond issues nontaxable so that local governments and school districts can issue bonds at lower interest rates.

I heartily endorse this principle as it gives the local taxpayer a break on interest payment and the municipalities and school districts much needed advantages in the money market.

Public housing, as the term implies, is a public undertaking for a purpose equally as desirable as other governmental activities—the providing of a minimum standard of housing for American families.

IMPEDE PUBLIC HOUSING

It is obvious that the bill's purpose is to impede public housing rather than to correct any alleged tax inequity. To allow this device to succeed would open the gate to using the removal of tax exemption, which has become an integral part of all local bond issues, to defeat municipal or local projects that a legislator might oppose when he either can not defeat or will not attack the project directly.

This would be a very bad precedent to establish.

## Wild Dentifrice Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William A. Alstadt of Little Rock, Ark., one of the foremost dentists in America today, orthodontist and immediate past president of the American Dental Association, has done much to place in their proper context claims regarding miracle dentifrices and fluoridation.

Dr. Alstadt, who is a native of eastern Arkansas, the First Congressional District, has sought during his presidency of the American Dental Association, to contribute to a better understanding rather than a continuation of misinformation. Dr. Alstadt points out the good and the bad—as a good dentist should, and the account of Dr. Alstadt's approach to this matter, as carried in the Arkansas Democrat of January 25, 1959, will be of interest to every citizen of this Nation.

It is a pleasure to call attention to the conclusions on these important subjects of this excellent citizen and outstanding orthodontist:

WILD DENTIFRICE CLAIMS CALLED ONE CAUSE OF U.S. DENTAL WOES

Advertising agencies for the toothpaste industry will probably avoid calling on a particular Little Rock dentist for recommendation of any of their miracle dentifrices.

Dr. William A. Alstadt, orthodontist and immediate past president of the American Dental Association, yesterday said flatly most of the claims made by advertising agencies of toothpaste manufacturers are either wildly extravagant or pure hokum.

He continued, "this is one cause for the generally poor condition of Arkansas' and America's teeth. The public, lulled into a false sense of security by these claims, accumulates the very diseases it seeks to avoid.

"Dental research has already demonstrated there is no such thing as a miracle toothpaste—whether it be red, blue, green, striped, or other color."

Dr. Alstadt said the American Dental Association is currently conferring with the Federal Trade Commission and dentifrice manufacturers in an effort to tone down these extravagant claims.

For proper care of the teeth he recommends a thorough brushing immediately after eating. If it is impossible to brush, then rinsing out the mouth is the next best thing.

Not brushing or improper brushing can allow food particles to work down between the teeth, Dr. Alstadt said, eventually causing pyorrhea, or periodontal disease.

"These claims that one can safely get by with only one brushing a day are absolutely false," he asserted. "The dental profession has no quarrel with ethical dentifrice manufacturers, because many have made contributions to dental health through educational procedures, but we most emphatically disagree with those who permit wild claims to be made by their advertising agencies."

With the exception of the common cold, dental disease is most widespread, affecting 98 percent of people, Dr. Alstadt said.

Fluoridated water supplies have done a great deal toward prevention of tooth decay, according to Dr. Alstadt, and the dental health picture in Arkansas is a little better than nationally. He attributed this to the fact that there are 34 cities in the State with fluoridated water supplies.

"Of course, fluoridation isn't the only answer to the dental health problem," Dr. Alstadt said. "But use of this treated water, plus a good diet and good oral hygiene, can reduce dental decay by 65 percent."

Dr. Aldstadt said "one of our problems in Arkansas is proportionate distribution of dentists. Everyone in the State does not have the dental care we'd like to see."

Arkansas' ratio of dentists to population is 1 to 3,100, considerably less than the national average of 1 to 1,900.

"But we're working hard to get qualified students into dental schools," Dr. Alstadt said, "and we've added about 300 dentists in the State since World War II.

"We now have 132 students in the 47 dental schools of the Nation," Dr. Alstadt added.

Arkansas has about 550 practicing dentists.

"We are fortunate in Arkansas in having a large group of dentists who are keeping abreast of the latest advances. Almost all of them belong to the Arkansas State Dental Association, and they attend meetings, returning home with new techniques, equipment, and ideas for the better treatment of their patients," Dr. Alstadt said.

"The dental profession has an obligation to the American public to continue getting somewhere," he said. "We still have many unsolved problems but we are trying to elevate the dental health of our people. In so doing we are definitely contributing to the general health advancement of the public.

"Dentistry is a changing profession, and as a major health profession has the obligation of contributing to the general as well as dental health advancement.

"It is amazing to some of us in health fields than an intelligent man will have his automobile checked routinely, will have his refrigerator, floor furnace, and other mechanical gadgets serviced to avoid breakdown, but health, and particularly dental health, is quite often neglected.

"Last year only 46 percent of the American people visited their family dentist," Dr. Alstadt said. "And I would say that percentage is about accurate for Arkansas.

"Fear of pain has been the major reason people neglected their teeth, but with the advent of newer drugs, techniques, and equipment pain has been reduced to an absolute minimum," Dr. Alstadt added. "It no longer should be deterrent to good dental health."

## The Country Elevator Operator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have as a constituent in the Third District of Michigan Mr. Charles S. Force, who is vice president of the Grain & Feed Dealers' National Association. Mr. Force is a partner in the firm of Little Bros., grain elevator operators in Kalamazoo, Mich.

At a dinner given for Members of Congress Tuesday evening, March 10, by the Grain & Feed Dealers' National Association here in Washington, Mr. Force was the principal speaker discussing the role and the problems of the local elevator operator in modern agricultural operations.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Force's speech:

It is my belief that the grain and feed business, or the local elevator, is the most important business in any agricultural community. The country elevator offers to each farm community a very necessary service—a service that most farmers need. Our country elevators vary in size from the small operator with limited facilities in a restricted market doing a limited business to large warehouses with capacities of several million bushels. The larger country elevator organizations may have line elevators doing business over a wide area. They may also operate feed plants at one or more of their locations. The country elevator and feed business may vary from State to State, but basically many of our problems are similar.

These elevators purchase from their customers wheat, corn, grain, sorghums, oats, barley, soybeans, and flax. All of these grains have to be weighed, cleaned, graded and loaded in cars or trucks, and then paid for at the highest possible prices. Usually these same grains are sold on a basis of official weights and grades which may bring discounts and shortages. The country elevators often manufacture feed and retail fertilizers, feed, seed, and other farm supplies. They also extend credit to many customers, and with our new practice of integration, feed customers are financed by one of the following: manufacturers, bankers and country elevators. This plan necessitates a large amount of capital and credit along with a sound helpful service program to make their customers' farm operations more profitable.

Large feeders today are asking for a new service which feed and grain men refer to as the customer grain bank. Under this plan a feeder brings to the elevator feed grains and asks the elevator to store and let the feeder take delivery as needed for his feeding operations throughout the year. This plan enables the farmer to haul grain to the elevator during the slack season. Grain is hauled in large quantities and there is no risk on the part of the farmer of having grain deteriorate in farm storage. The elevator stores grain, grinds and mixes grain with supplements and delivers it to the customer as needed. In many instances the finished feed moves back to the farm in bulk trucks. In addition, they have all the problems and challenges that confront small business. Gentlemen, small business has some serious problems today.

In the Midwest, farmers expect their local grain elevator to also have modern grinding and mixing facilities. They expect to have the homegrown grains ground and mixed and scientifically blended with protein concentrates. The customer expects result feeds and feeding programs to produce milk, meat, and eggs at the lowest possible cost.

The country elevator must have trained people to meet the demands of their customers. Their organization must know and understand farm problems and be anxious to serve in this capacity. A good elevator man must have an agricultural education or experience equal to an agricultural county agent. Good country elevators have tremendous effect on the agricultural programs of a community. Such programs are largely responsible for the increase of agriculture income. Studies have shown that farm customers come to and depend on their country elevator for advice on when to sell their grain, feeding programs, rate of seeding, fertilizer applications, and grain storage problems on the farm. In many instances this information has come from the State agricultural college, but the farmer depends on the country elevator for his information. Because of this, there is a close relationship between State agricultural colleges and grain and feed dealers. Each realizes the importance of the other, realizing that in the end their close cooperation benefits the agriculture college, the country elevator, and the farmer. At our Michigan State University we have an elevator and farm supply course to train young men in this field. This school is now 12 years old and approximately 250 boys have graduated. Practically all of these boys are connected with the grain and feed business in Michigan and adjoining States. For an elevator to have the operation that I have described—it follows that our industry operates on a very narrow margin of profit. A net profit from 2 to 3 percent is average. This narrow margin is caused by very competitive conditions and high overhead.

Along with our usual problems of purchasing, selling, and maintaining equipment, the country elevator now has the problem of operating under changing agricultural conditions that have built up large surpluses of grain. Much of these surpluses have come under CCC ownership because of loan defaults on price-supported grain. The supply for corn, wheat, barley, soybeans, grain sorghums and other feed grains for the 1958–59 marketing year is about 11.6 billion bushels. This is about 1.5 billion bushels larger than for the preceding year and 3.5 billion bushels more than were available during the 1953–54 marketing year. Of these crops CCC owned outright in its inventory 74.3 percent of the carryover stocks. The 1958 carryover was about 3.2 billion bushels. The carryover for grain and oilseed carryover into 1959 marketing year will be approximately 4.4 billion bushels or 1.2 billion bushels more than in 1958. Because of these surpluses there is a continual need each year for more storage for price-supported grain. Farmers have depended upon their country elevator to store their grain or to find storage for them. Warehousemen met the tremendous demands for storage in 1958 by building 600 million bushels of new warehouse space. A release from the USDA on December 16 stated that the 1958 harvest was disrupted less by storage problems than in other recent years. This additional storage was constructed even though warehousemen know that:

1. Elevator storage is over expanded in many area for normal crop production and carryover.

2. Uniform grain storage rates have not increased since 1954 even though our costs have gone up.

3. Responsibility is greater under the stricter requirements of the Food and Drug Administration.

4. Guaranteed occupancy and the rapid writeoff 60 months tax amortization of grain storage facilities are no longer available. I might say that at a recent meeting of the directors of the Grain & Feed Dealers National Association and the State Grain Association officers there was no interest in legislation to renew the rapid writeoff provisions.

In September 1958 the commercial storage was approximately 6 billion bushels. An April 1958 Government estimate of farm storage (based on eight Midwestern States) was approximately 2.5 billion bushels. In addition CCC owns approximately 1 billion bushels of space. Will all of this storage space be needed? Will the increased commercial storage that has been built or is now being built cause storage to be left empty with unpaid mortgages? Already many people foreign to our industry are being attracted by the publicized need for storage.

Our free marketing system that so many men of my age have become accustomed to is being badly disrupted. I believe that I speak for most grain men when I say that this is a condition that is hard to become accustomed to. I do not feel that there is an elevator man in the country that hasn't resented the building of Government-bin sites in his market. The grain placed in these bins was the grain that the elevator formerly purchased from grain producers and was merchandized to realize the most profit to the farmer and the elevator. We are pleased that it was unnecessary for CCC to purchase additional Government-owned storage units during the last 2 years. We also believe that the policy of this administration and the previous administration to fill privately-owned storage before filling CCC storage is sound and in line with the wishes of the Congress. Every country warehouseman shudders when he things of the future with federally-owned binsites in his backyard, and when he healizes that CCC owns a total of nearly 1 billion bushels of grain-storage space. County and State officials also realize that they have no tax revenue future from CCC-owned binsites.

Our farmers, elevator men and terminal operators feel the need for free marketing in the handling of grain. Our accumulation of surpluses by our Government through price support provision of the agricultural program has stagnated grain markets. I feel that the actual accumulation and ownership of grains by the Government has made the Government a competitor of the grain merchandisers and the grain growers.

We do believe, however, that the Department of Agriculture personnel and Members of Congress are to be congratulated for the development and operation of the subsidy in kind export programs for wheat and coarse grains. Under these programs the export demand for all grains is reflected in the market-place. These programs have thus been of distinct pricewise benefit to grain producers. Under these programs the Government has effected sizable savings of Government funds. These programs have afforded all segments of the grain industry an opportunity to revitalize themselves. At country points and interior markets, grain merchandisers have, for the first time since 1946, had a chance to acquire grain for resale for export without fear of Government competition.

Under these programs—for the first time since World War II, coarse grain acquired at country points from private merchants have been sold at the interior markets for export shipment out of those markets. At markets tributary to the Gulf Waterway the competition for grains for resale to private exporters has brought about an increase in the market price received by producers.

Most all elevator men have experienced some difficulty with the regulations of the Food and Drug Administration. We all endorse programs to protect the health of consumers. Programs of grain sanitation should begin at the farm. The elevator operator should not have to be responsible for maintaining and enforcing the entire grain sanitation program. It has worked a severe hardship on country shippers because they do not have the time, the equipment or experience to carefully check every truckload of grain from a farmer. The elevator man is at the mercy of Food and Drug Administration under circumstances where he cannot protect himself.

Gentlemen, I have tried to give you some information and appreciation of how the country elevator serves agriculture. I have tried to tell you of their importance and what they do which makes them of this importance. Also the additional problems which have been imposed on the country elevator through governmental regulations.

## One Hundredth Anniversary of Brooklyn School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, not many private schools in the country can boast of an uninterrupted existence extending over a whole century. The Heffley & Browne Secretarial School in Brooklyn is now celebrating the 100th anniversary of its existence. The citizens of Brooklyn are very proud of this institution. On the occasion of this celebration, I have today forwarded the following letter of congratulations to Mr. George A. Klaum, the principal of the school:

MARCH 16, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE A. KLAUM,
*Principal, Heffley & Browne Secretarial School, Brooklyn, N.Y.*

DEAR MR. KLAUM: I note with a great deal of delight in your letter of March 9 that the Heffley & Browne Secretarial School is now celebrating the 100th anniversary of its existence and that it is the oldest school of its kind in the East.

You most certainly have much cause to be proud of this record of uninterrupted service to the community. Most noteworthy is also the fact that the school has graduated more than 100,000 students, many of whom are serving in important positions in the business world, in government, and in other fields of activity. This, in itself, is

an accomplishment which deserves to be recorded on the occasion of your anniversary.

May I take this opportunity to extend to you, your faculty, staff, students, and graduates my congratulations and sincerest wishes for success and continued accomplishments. We in Brooklyn are very proud of this institution, its past achievements, and its influence to the good in the future. May you continue to help raise and to inspire many more generations of young Brooklynites for the task ahead and for the responsibilities required of them by our community. As you enter the second century of existence, may you find the going easier and the rewards greater.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
*Member of Congress.*

## High School Students Give Their Thoughts on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, the highly controversial subject of foreign aid will be before this House.

Of recent date, the President submitted his estimate of needs and his argument for the passage without reduction of the amount requested. I am bringing to the Congress today, an unrehearsed and unsolicited report by the students of Bell-Avon High School, Salina, Pa. I believe the reading of these statements made by high school students should be a required subject to all of the Members of this Congress. I feel it would be like a breath of fresh air coming into this Chamber because of the fresh and different approaches to the overall subject contained in the frank statements by these high school students. I for one am indebted to their teacher, Craig F. Culp, for sending this message to the Congress, and for his continued interest in the problems of democracy:

I do not approve of this foreign aid program. There are millions of people out of work and the money used for foreign aid could be used for all these Americans. The foreign aid money is increasing year after year and is becoming more uncontrollable each year. This is why I disapprove of foreign aid.

CHARLOTTE CONTO.

Our present $82 billion expense for foreign aid is far beyond my idea of what can safely be thrown away each year. It has been proven in many instances that this program is of little or no value for many countries willingly accept our money but still distrust us. Some of the countries use and need our aid and are also a boon to democracy. I have just read of your fight against the Government taking the bid of an English firm for the hydroelectric equipment. Even if that country did underbid our American firm we should support our American way of life.

NICK ALCORN.

In my opinion, I think that the United States is spending entirely too much money on the foreign aid program. I don't think that the foreign aid program should be stopped entirely but it should be cut down considerably. As long as there are unemployed people in the United States, I think we should help them instead of other countries.

CAROLE NOVOSEL.

I am not sold on this foreign aid policy. It appears to me that the nations receiving this aid don't want or appreciate it. As long as we help these nations, they won't have any ambition to help themselves and work for self-preservation. They rely on America for help. They feel that our country is only helping them because we want something in return. They don't understand that we just want to be friends with them. We in America are educated enough to realize that one cannot buy friendship. It must be earned. I think it's pretty obvious that our foreign aid program is doing more harm than good for all parties involved. Besides having a perverting effect on the countries receiving, it is disadvantageous for us. The foreign imports are crowding our American-made goods from our markets. Instead of buying foreign imports, we should build up our own industries, thus providing work for the unemployed. Education is more essential now than ever before. Nevertheless, many schools are crowded and in some areas, due to existing conditions, the students go to school in shifts. Many teachers are underpaid. Why doesn't our Government start a home aid program and help those who need and would appreciate help.

DAISY MAE COPNEY.

I heartily agree that the huge amount of revenue being spent should be reduced. Many of the foreign countries which receive our aid don't want it. They feel that we want something in return. Instead of pushing our money on them I think we should utilize it where it will do the most good.

EVELYN TRINCLISTI.

I think rather than spend billions of dollars on foreign aid, it would be better to work out some program for the unemployed Americans. I feel that there should be a fund for countries that really need help but there should be some understanding that this is to be paid back after they are on their feet again. In this way they would have more respect for the United States. In my opinion no one has very much respect for someone who is always giving them things for nothing. They will come back for more and walk all over the person who is giving it to them. It is the same way with nations.

BERTHA JEAN KRALIK.

I believe that our foreign aid program has gotten out of hand. The funds that we have sent and are sending in most cases are not even appreciated. What about the poor people of our country that need help? Should we forget about them?

KENNETH DEMYAN.

In my opinion I think we ought to put a stop to this business of foreign countries sending their products over to our country to be sold because right here in our own country we have many people who are out of work. In my opinion I think they ought to try to work out a system to get all men and women back to work and try cutting down on this business of spending money for aid for the foreign countries.

MIKE ORVOSH.

The foreign aid program has many advantages and disadvantages. It has made our countries more closely related in some ways, but countries depend too much on us as if we were their mother country. During the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1954, the United States furnished Western Europe with approximately $2 billion worth of military equipment. In the future will this be used for us or against us?

FRANK MARCHITELLI.

In regard to the foreign aid program, I believe that it should be carried on to a certain extent. I mean to better our foreign relations with other countries, but we should not spend billions and billions of dollars on them. Today many girls and boys getting out of school cannot get jobs, not because they are lazy but because there are no jobs to find. So, I think that the United States should think about its own people first and other countries second. I also think that if the United States helps a country too much, this country will not try to help itself to get back on its feet. We should help other countries, but not with billions and billions of American dollars.

EDWARD G. SEBEN.

I think the foreign aid program is a very good idea. It permits us to help other nations when they need aid and lend money to them when their government does not have sufficient funds on hand to aid their people.

The foreign aid program is a very good step toward having a better relationship with other countries and promoting peace and contentment among nations of the world.

ELEANOR MEAKO.

Instead of using all the money for the people of other countries, I think the Government should use it for the people of the United States.

There are over 4 million people in this country who are unemployed. Some of these funds could be used to make it easier for the unemployed person to keep his family and pay his bills. This money could also be used for more recreation centers, more summer camps for the young people of this country, and for medical research.

CATHY PRUGH.

I don't think that we should aid the foreign countries. There are people in the United States who are unemployed and need help just as badly as the people do in Europe.

The United States should help foreign countries to a certain extent, but I think the United States worries too much about foreign countries and too little about her own people in this country.

WATSON MALOY.

I know that one reason for foreign aid is that we need to keep the other countries as friends but surely we can remain friendly without having to give them money and other aid all the time. Is it not possible that some of this money could be kept here in our country to help reduce the amount of our own national debt, or to help the many jobless people and improve some of the miserable conditions which we have in many parts of the country?

It is hard to believe that our Government cannot see that it is hurting itself more than helping by giving away such large amounts of money which are so desperately needed here in our own country. I do sincerely hope that it will soon begin to realize how much better off we would be if a lot more of this money were kept here at home. However, I do think it is a good idea to continue being friends with other countries if in some way a war should break

out we could depend on these countries to help us.

ALTA MATTHEWS.

I think the foreign aid program is a good idea, but don't you think in some cases we are going to extremes? I think we are sending them too much money. If we keep sending them as much money as we have been we may find ourselves in need of help. On the other hand though they may help us. That is a chance we have to take.

We are even bringing foreigners into this country and giving them jobs. I think that our men should be found jobs first because after all most of them are citizens of the United States.

DONNA CHRISTY.

The United States should help foreign countries to a certain extent. But sometimes they overdo it. They should think about our own country which is in a recession now.

MARY ANN ZAGOZAN.

In regard to our foreign aid policy, I feel that it is a little out of hand. At least part of the large amount of money sent overseas could be used for better schools in this country. I really do believe in helping out other people and other countries, but I am just wondering if they aren't depending on us just a little too much.

LOUISE PERFETTA.

Foreign aid is used to strengthen mutual security and individual and collective defenses to the free world. In my opinion, foreign aid is a very good thing to help the needy people in other countries. It will give the countries a more friendly feeling toward the United States. If we receive a friendly response from the countries receiving our aid, the United States will know that they are doing a good job.

I think that the United States is doing a very big and wonderful job with foreign aid and I think is should be continued.

THERESA MARKUZIC.

In a time when communism is trying to overrun free people, we need all the allies we can get. If sending foreign aid to these countries will keep them our allies, I am all for the program. Cutting our foreign aid spending may deprive many people in foreign countries of the bare necessities of life. I believe we must do something about the millions of Americans out of work, but not at the expense of our foreign aid program.

I feel that if we helped these countries now when they need it, we would be sure of help from them when and if we needed it. Also, I feel our help to them will avoid wars.

BEVERLY DIBLER.

I think that the foreign aid program should be cut down or discontinued for the present time. One reason of course is the amount of unemployment in our own country. I think that it is right to help a counry get back on its feet, but I do not see why the United States has to support it for the rest of its life.

There are many disasters in the United States such as floods, tornadoes, and other disasters. I think some of the money should be used for our own aid, instead of foreign aid.

RICHARD BOTTEGAL.

Foreign aid is all right just as long as it is used correctly and with understanding. Hand across the sea is all right, but my opinion is that if it keeps increasing it is going to cost America more than just money.

JOHN LAYNE.

I think that instead of sending millions of dollars to foreign countries, that it could be used in America for bigger and better school systems. America is a strong country, so let's keep it that way.

RAY MYERS.

From a humane standpoint, I think it is the duty of a wealthy country to help poor ones. Foreign aid makes possible military installations in strategic areas. It is difficult for communism to gain a foothold in countries where our aid provides food and clothing. However, I think too much money is being doled. It would be more effective and sincere to aid them through know-how and guidance. There are only 150 men and women selected for the U.S. Foreign Service. Since there is evidence that these people are doing an excellent job, why not train hundreds more?

Even needy people are suspicious of large gifts of money, but people trust someone who listens to their problems and then works with them to find solutions.

Therefore, I think we should send many more experts in agriculture, industry, and finance to foreign countries.

DOROTHY GLASS.

The foreign aid program got out of control because it went hog wild on lending. Just help the countries that really need it. Foreign aid should come after our own citizens are taken care of. America should come first with Americans.

JAMES CASSA.

The more aid we give to foreign countries, the more taxes will increase here in America. The supply of money aiding foreign countries could be used to make our mines safer, to prevent floods, and schools could be improved.

Regarding the foreign imports of glass, steel, oil, and aluminum products—and the many products that are crowding our American-made goods from our market places, I feel certain that we should cut down on purchasing a lot of products which put many of our people out of work.

SHIRLEY SCHALL.

I am not much in favor of giving money to foreign countries, much of which is obligation free, when we have so many unemployed here in our own country. But I am in favor of sending technicians and teachers into different countries to teach their people how to save for themselves. If the country needed money to get a start I would lend it to them on the condition that they pay it back when they are able to stand on their own two feet.

Recently I heard a report on where our foreign aid money was going and I discovered that only a small part of it was being sent to our South American brothers. In my opinion I think we should first give the top priority on foreign aid to them. Again I would give this aid in the form of trained technicians, teachers, and loans if needed, to help the country establish itself. The Communists are probably trying very hard to get a toehold on the American Continent, and since South America would be their best bet I think we, as a brother nation, should give all possible aid and assistance to these south-of-the-border countries so as to establish good relations with them.

STEPHEN KAPUSTA.

I would like to know if the foreign aid bill could be revised? Billions of dollars are spent each year for this aid.

If communistic countries can sway them just by talking, why can't we? There is not any doubt that these countries do need the aid but so do some of the people in the United States. Thousands of seniors will be graduated this June with no future and no employment. Surely the Government could devise some plan that would reduce our payment so that we could spend the money to build more plants to produce more employment.

CAROL ZARANEK.

The foreign aid program has not worked out at all according to plan. The reason used for giving so much money to foreign countries is that we want to remain on a friendly relations basis. Instead of putting friendly ideas into their heads, we put doubt. It is already known that after money is given to these countries, they want to know what we want for it. The prosperity of our own country should be taken into consideration first. Friendly relations should be obtained in another way and by other means.

CAROL PATTERSON.

Foreign aid in itself, strengthens the standing of the United States with other countries, but why give aid to those who don't want or appreciate it? Later on they may use the strength we are giving them against us. I think aid should be given to those who need it. We just wouldn't be Americans if we left others suffer. However, aid at home definitely comes before foreign aid.

BERNARD WALTERS.

I do not approve of the foreign-aid program that is now in practice. I think that money should be sent to other countries if we have already taken care of the people in our own country. At present there are many slum districts and many undesirable places in the United States that could be fixed up if some of the money that is being used to further other countries was being used to further places here in our own country. While the Government is giving away billions of dollars to other countries, the people in our own country are suffering for it.

I think this country should try and secure friendly relations with other countries, but not try to buy their friendship, because in trying to secure friendly relations through money we very possibly may be making enemies instead of friends.

RALPH K. CULP.

I am not in favor of the foreign-aid plan. I think there should be more money given to the needy in our own country. If more of the money is used for commercial use in this country the people wouldn't be telling stories of how the Government is spending the money carelessly. If more money were given to our industries there would be more work for the people in the United States.

I think the foreign aid program should be slowed down a lot and there should be more peace making by talk and not by money.

RONALD FRASSENEI.

I think the United States is spending entirely too much money on foreign aid. Some of the money should be used right here in our own country to help the many millions of people who are unemployed. Many people in the United States are in distress and need food and clothing just as bad as the people in other countries that the United States is helping.

CATHY DORMA.

Foreign aid has done some good in the past. The foreign aid program is a big problem for if the United States doesn't give aid, the other countries don't think much of us, and if we do give aid some countries don't appreciate it. Therefore, I think that the larger portion of the foreign aid should be given to those nations that appreciate it.

NORMAN BORTZ.

I believe that we should keep up the foreign aid because if we drop it, and the

other countries want any materials, they will go to Russia or some other nation for it. Then if we should happen to get into war we wouldn't have any allies.

As for our unemployment situation I think we should quit bringing in so many foreign people and leave the ones that are already in the United States have the jobs.

MARVYL HEIMBERGER.

## Attack on the FBI—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the eighth and final article in the series by Pulitzer prize winning reporter, Edward J. Mowery. This series deals with the campaign to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The final installment appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 9, 1959:

FBI FOES YELL LOUDEST WHEN REDS ARE PUT ON THE SPOT

(By Edward J. Mowery)

WASHINGTON.—In 1950, a gang of hoodlums wearing garish rubber masks executed the notorious Brink's robbery in Boston, carting away $2,775,000 in loot.

On January 12, 1956 (nearly 6 years later), the Federal Bureau of Investigation nabbed six of the thugs who were convicted.

On a bitter November day in 1955, an airliner exploded over Longmont, Colo., and 44 persons lost their lives. Using its vast scientific and investigative machinery, the FBI unerringly traced the criminal act to John Gilbert Graham, whose mother was among the victims.

In 1956, the Nation was appalled at the brutal abduction of 1-month-old Peter Weinberger from his New York home. After sifting nearly 2 million handwriting specimens, the FBI identified the writer of 2 ransom notes.

And in 1957, the Federal agency crushed the sinister Russian espionage apparatus of "Master Spy" Rudolph Abel, seizing vast amounts of elaborate electronic equipment including coded microdot messages that had been funneled to Moscow.

No cries of "secret police" tactics, "Gestapo" or "incipient fascism" were heard from Communists and their stooges when the FBI solved these cases to protect Americans.

But when the FBI corners subversives or spotlights the activities of (600-plus) Communist fronts, the "liberals" wail and launch a crusade to get both the Bureau and J. Edgar Hoover. This, they say, is "thought control."

What is the function of the FBI? How successful is it?

The agency's jurisdiction covers more than 150 Federal investigative matters ranging from kidnaping to crimes on Indian reservations. One of its primary responsibilities is protecting internal security.

With a total special agent personnel of 6,068, it staffs 53 field offices from Hawaii to Alaska and in the past 3 (fiscal) years has logged 33,632 convictions.

In 1958 alone, the FBI received 84,768 "matters" relating to the internal security of the United States for investigations. They involved individuals, organizations, Red infiltration and plots to overthrow the Government.

Of this total investigations involved 348 specific espionage cases.

The cardinal precepts of the FBI's operation include these A B C's:

The highest standards of personal and professional conduct. Prompt and complete handling of assignments with absolute impartiality; no deviation from full protection of individual rights and privileges, and equal diligence in establishing innocence as in the identification and apprehension of violators.

The effectiveness of the FBI's ethical and procedural standards, its supporters say, is demonstrated in its overall achievement record: 93 percent of those convicted pleaded guilty.

Among the hoodlums bagged by the FBI in the postwar era were Elmer "Trigger" Burke ("killing is my business"), Gabriel Vigorita (the car-thief baron), Joe Levy and Dave Goldreyer (master con men), Clyde Johnson and Gerhard Puff (bank robbers), Nick Montos (escape artist), etc.

In the field of domestic intelligence, an FBI official explained that arrests and convictions alone offer no barometer as to the Bureau's effectiveness.

"Security operations are primarily preventive in nature," he said, "and intelligence (or counterintelligence) information often precipitates diplomatic protests, visa cancellations, denials of access to classified data and other types of nonprosecutive action.

"Soviet espionage operations in the United States have suffered tremendous setbacks in the recent past. For example, since the conviction of the Rosenbergs in 1951, FBI investigations have resulted in: The 1953 arrest of Otto Verber and Kurt Ponger, naturalized American citizens who doubled as U.S.S.R. spies in Austria; the smashing (in 1957) of the apparatus directed by Jack Soble, Myra Soble, and Jacob Albam, and the capture of Col. Rudolph Abel, also in 1957.

"In addition, a number of persons have been indicted and convicted, and others have left the country to avoid prosecution as a result of Soviet intelligence thrusts against the United States. It's all interesting to note that information gathered by the FBI has resulted in numerous Soviet and satellite diplomats being declared persona non grata."

One area in the FBI's war on subversives has been marked by frustration.

Of 109 Communist Party leaders arrested and convicted under the Smith Act upon documented evidence gathered by the FBI, 76 have won reversals because of Supreme Court rulings. (Conviction under the act involved conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government.)

In other security-type cases, FBI charges have stuck. In (fiscal) 1958 false filing of non-Communist affidavits led to 12 convictions and other convictions resulted for failure to admit membership in subversive organizations (on Government security questionnaires) and for perjury.

In the field of kidnaping—one of the Bureau's most active areas—of 570 kidnapings handled by the FBI since passage of the so-called Lindbergh law in 1932, only two major cases remain unsolved.

The two exceptions—they're still "open"—were the 1936 abduction of Charles Mattson, and the 1938 kidnaping of Peter Levine. Both youngsters were subsequently found dead. Thousands of suspects have been eliminated to date.

In the area of cooperative services to municipal, county and State law enforcement agencies, the FBI had tabulated millions of assists.

The FBI made full facilities of its laboratory and identification unit available to local law enforcement agencies in connection with the recent wave of bombings of religious and educational institutions. The Bureau also made arrangements to handle out-of-State leads on the outrages and 176 FBI-sponsored special conferences were held in November and December throughout the United States, Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The conferences were attended by 8,112 law enforcement officers representing 3,687 agencies.

Vast amounts of information concerning local law violations are channeled by the FBI to local authorities. If joint jurisdiction is involved and prosecution looms in a State court, FBI evidence is turned over to local (or State) officials.

In (fiscal) 1958, information from FBI confidential informants relating to other jurisdictions resulted in 1,695 arrests and recovery of $911,508 in stolen and contraband valuables by other agencies.

In FBI cases, informants' disclosures led to 1,478 arrests and $890,000 in recoveries.

Here are some of the other free cooperative services supplied by the FBI in (fiscal) 1958 to local and State enforcement agencies:

FBI Laboratory: Received 34,018 requests for examinations involving 137,142 specimens and requiring 165,462 examinations. (FBI technicians are available to give expert testimony in local courts.)

Fingerprints: An average of 20,000 prints were received daily for processing. The files contain 150,900,000 sets (33,400,000 in the criminal section.)

Fugitives: "Stop notices" placed against the fingerprint records of those sought by other authorities and FBI information on their whereabouts is immediately sent to the interested authorities. An average of 1,300 fugitives monthly is identified by FBI technicians.

FBI National Academy: Since its founding by J. Edgar Hoover in 1935, 3,636 career enforcement officers (local, Federal, and State) have been trained free, 184 completing the course in 1958. Representatives of Scotland Yard and the Royal Canadian Mounted have also taken the course. Special agents qualified as police instructors participated in 2,724 regional and local police training programs in 1958.

As to the FBI's responsibilities and its dedication in protecting Americans, the Bureau spokesman declared:

"If the FBI could single out one objective it would go like this: 'Find the truth, and with strong practicality * * * get the job done.'

It is the FBI's sworn duty to protect with all its facilities and strength the internal security of this Nation. And the fight against subversion and betrayal from within is a relentless struggle.

"Last year (1957) the Bureau received more than 1,180,000 requests for security-type information concerning individuals and organizations from agencies in the executive branch.

"The Bureau's responsibility in enforcing the laws is a sacred trust. No pressure campaigns, no crusades, no amount of invective will have the slightest effect on the FBI's determination to do its job."

## The Face of Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Miss Eve Edstrom, one of the distinguished reporters on the staff of the Washington Post, has written a series

of articles about the hungry children of the District of Columbia. These articles are now appearing in the Post. They are not pleasant reading. In a dramatic way, they highlight the unbelievable spectacle of utter poverty in the midst of plenty, in a city which ought to be an example of what free governments can accomplish. Mr. Speaker, I ask that these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with just one further question of mine. Mr. Speaker, in a time of massive agricultural surpluses, in a time of social awareness, in the capitol city of freemen, how can these things happen?

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1959]

FACE OF POVERTY BEHIND WASHINGTON FACADE

(By Eve Edstrom)

The District's face of poverty—once hidden behind the doors of the poorhouse—now is submerged in the open city because no one will look at it.

It is a stranger even to those who see it daily.

A teacher complains about the constant tardiness of a child. But no one mentions that the child's home has no clock.

A social worker counsels a mother on how to market wisely. But no one mentions that the mother's home has no icebox.

A child care worker deplores the toilet habits of a youngster. But no one mentions that the child's home has no workable lavatory.

UNKNOWN NICETIES

A clock, a refrigerator, and a lavatory are all elementary necessities in this affluent society of ours. Yet they still are unknown luxuries to scores of this city's impoverished families.

In this day of two cars in every garage in suburbia, the meaning of a chicken in every pot is not yet known to many a child of the slums.

City welfare workers, for example, tell the following story to illustrate one of the reasons why the saying of grace was begun at Junior Village, the District's home for homeless children.

"It was to give the children time to pause—before grabbing for bread for fear there would not be enough to go around. These are children who never have known the meaning of having had enough."

ONE IN SIX FAMILIES

To most Washington area residents, the poor are just a statistic—and one which can be ignored, at that.

When 22 percent of the families in the metropolitan area make incomes of $10,000 or more, it is easy to overlook the 7 percent who have $3,000 or less to spend.

It is particularly easy to forget them because five out of every six impoverished families in the area live within the confines of the District.

Almost singlehandedly, the District must assume the burden of poverty for the entire metropolitan area. Therefore the 7 percent becomes 15 percent if viewed against the District's population alone.

Washington's impoverished families, a Board of Trade study shows, total 31,500, or almost 1 out of every 6 families living in the Nation's Capital.

DISGRACEFUL SURVIVAL

As is pointed out by John Kenneth Galbraith in his book "The Affluent Society," the existence of poverty is not remarkable in India but it is remarkable that it has survived in the United States.

"We ignore it because we share with all societies at all times the capacity for not seeing what we do not wish to see," he writes. "* * * But while our failure to notice can be explained, it cannot be excused. 'Poverty,' Pitt exclaimed, 'is no disgrace, but it is damned annoying.' In the contemporary United States, it is not annoying but it is a disgrace."

Living in poverty amid plenty is much more than a statistic.

It is not just the 1,522 families who were evicted here in 1958. It is the 8-year-old boy who went home during the noon school recess to find his bed, his meager clothes, and his few playthings set out on the street—and no parent at home to tell him where he would live next. Our children don't live from day to day, says a school principal; they live from minute to minute.

It is not just the 6,000 families who have waited—waited as long as 10 years in some cases—to move from their overcrowded hovels into public housing. It is the 13-year-old girl who, in desperation, asked police to please find her a home because she was tired of living with 17 persons—her mother, 8 brothers, and sisters, grandmother, mother's friend, 3 aunts, 1 of their children and 2 roomers—in a house unfit for any human.

It is not just the 10,000 to 12,000 families whose gas gets cut off annually. It is the infant crying for milk and the mother with no place to warm it.

It is not just the city's 50,000 drunks. It is the two teenage boys who went home from their afterschool jobs to find that their father had pawned all the family's scant belongings so he could join the winos on the corner.

It is not just the 5,000 who receive food and clothes handouts from the Salvation Army each year. It is the two children who arrived to be outfitted with shoes, coats, shirts, and trousers so they could attend their father's funeral.

It is not just the 44,434 who receive surplus food here. It is the stooped lady who ripped the nondescript covering from her food package, placed the contents in two store-marked shopping bags and said: "I like to have people think I've been shopping."

It is not just the 22,900 unemployed here. It is the father of nine pleading for a $1.10-an-hour porter's job, who doesn't ask whether there is sick leave or vacation benefits but merely: "Can I count on it, will it be steady?"

FILING CABINET FODDER

"We find it nauseating that these families exist," said Elizabeth H. Ross, former deputy chief of the Federal Children's Bureau. "This is because we truly believe that anyone who wants to can get ahead in our society."

But for a variety of reasons, Washington's impoverished families cannot get along. They are handicapped by mental and physical deficiencies, excessive procreation, alcohol, insufficient education, lack of any skills.

Such families usually are referred to as multiproblem families. But as Mrs. Ross points out, they also could be referred to as multiagency families. Every agency has a piece of them, but they are just so many papers in so many case records in so many filing cabinets all over town.

One hospital record, for example, shows that a mother is getting help with her health problem from a visiting nurse. But visiting nurse records show that they bowed out of the case last July.

One record shows that a child is progressing satisfactorily in the fifth grade. Another shows that the same child is in an atypical class doing second grade work.

One worker records that children should be removed from a mother's care. Another worker in a related agency seeks to help the mother keep her children.

These things happen because agency workers throughout the city are responsible for almost double the number of families that they reasonably can be expected to serve. At best, they can give emergency service to meet the crisis of the moment.

"We are so busy putting plasters on cuts that we never have time to see who has been cut," said one welfare worker. "We treat these cases as emergency cases for decades and then it is emergency treatment with no diagnosis."

LONGTIME RESIDENTS

Contrary to a widespread belief, these families have not migrated here in the last few years. Many of them came here from the South a decade or two ago and have remained long enough to produce the hungry children of today's Washington school system.

This is indicated by a new study of those on relief here. Although relief families make up only about one-third of those living in poverty here, the study makes it possible to answer partially the question of where the city's poor came from and when they got here.

Washington, it appears, can thank South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland for being fountainheads of the District's citizens on relief.

These four States turn up most frequently as the birthplaces of those on relief who are not native born. This is true whether one looks at the relief rolls of the aged, the disabled, the blind, or mothers with dependent children.

Mothers and their dependent children make up the largest relief category here. And the study shows that of 2,911 mothers receiving the District's public aid, 34 percent were born in Washington and 66 percent were born elsewhere.

The State which is the source of the largest number of mothers—531—is South Caroline. North Carolina, with 467 of her natives on District rolls, is right behind. And Washington's neighbors, Virginia with 405 and Maryland with 193, rank next.

WARTIME AVALANCHE

The migration began in the depression years, with 21.5 percent of the total coming here in the 1930's, and was accelerated in World War II. About 40 percent arrived in 1940–50 with 25 percent coming between 1940 and 1945.

Since 1950, 27.6 percent have arrived. The record high was 5.1 percent in 1952 while the low of 0.7 was recorded in 1957.

With rural background and limited educational attainments, the bulk of these people are ill prepared for urban living. They remain here because, in the words of a Salvation Army worker, they have "nothing to go back to."

Now they have produced a phenomenal number of children for the District. But Washington has yet to take its first realistic step toward preventing their children from becoming as dependent as they are.

Probably more is know statistically about the families on relief than about any other group of Washington's impoverished families. Yet the man who administers the District's relief program, Bernard W. Scholz, is the first to admit that the District doesn't know as much as it should about these families because his workers are so preoccupied with the minutiae of checking eligibility requirements.

"We know we aid a mother and seven children but we don't know if she has seven dishes, seven plates, or seven sheets," he said. "We don't even know if she has the mental ability to know the difference between a quarter and a nickel.

"We have got to stop talking long enough to look at those we are trying to help. What is the good of talking about family responsibility if it concerns those who still do not have the concept of the family? What is the good of talking about meal planning if it concerns those who still have

no concept of mealtime, who still grab a handful from the communal stewpot, as it were?

"Until we know our impoverished families, we will make no progress against poverty."

Monday: District taxpayers, meet Ginny, one of your burdens, and find out why her children will be just like she is.

---

A CASE HISTORY OF WANT AND FAILURE: STOPGAP AID FOR A DESPERATE FAMILY

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1959]

(By Eve Edstrom)

District taxpayers don't know Ginny but they have spent thousands of dollars on her.

Yet in more than a decade of service to her not one cent has been spent to prevent her children from becoming just like Ginny.

Ginny and her family represent the most corroded of the District's 31,000 impoverished families.

Like so many of them she comes from a rural Southern community. She is mentally limited. She also has been a diabetic all her life.

She constantly goes into diabetic comas and the children call an ambulance to take her to the hospital.

Sometimes Ginny goes out on a stretcher in the morning and is back by afternoon. Other times she spends several days at the hospital. Since mid-December she has been hospitalized three times.

Most of Ginny's diabetic comas are caused by her failure to eat properly.

Quite incongruously, hospital officials have counseled her on how to eat properly while she was dependent on Women's Bureau handouts and neighbors' scraps. She had no icebox to store food in her rat-infested quarters.

Each time Ginny goes to the hospital her four children, led by the oldest girl, now 13, arrive at the Women's Bureau and ask to be transported to Junior Village, the iDstrict's home for homeless children. The oldest girl has been doing this since she was old enough to cross the street.

If Ginny returns home before the children are transported the 13-year-old cries because she wants to go to the Village.

"She has outgrown her mother," the child's case record states. "She likes the experience of all the utilities at Junior Village."

HOME IN A HOVEL

Until recently this family lived in a dark, filthy room infested with roaches and rats. The lavatory in the building didn't work. washing facilities were limited and wood was used for cooking. The family didn't even have bed linen, let alone such "modern conveniences" as a clock or a radio.

Although the children lived next door to a school they seldom got up in time to get there—unless teachers and sometimes the principal arrived to dress them and bring them to school.

"In cold weather you would find them all huddled in the same bed trying to keep warm," the principal said. "It is difficult to tell whether their retardation is caused by limited ability or by their many absences from school."

Neighbors tried to make life more pleasant for the 13-year-old by inviting her to listen to the radio or watch television. But Ginny refused to permit her to do so because she wanted the child to "do the housework and care for the children."

BARRED FROM RELIEF

Although sporadic efforts were made to help the family move, Ginny wanted to remain in her hovel "because of the food neighbors gave her."

She repeatedly applied for relief and hospital officials constantly asked if welfare officials were aware of her health needs.

"While we understand she is ill and the children not properly cared for we do have to be clear about her situation and relationship with Mr. D," a relief worker wrote.

In the District relief is not granted if an able-bodied man is in the home. And Mr. D, native of Spotsylvania County, Va., is the father of Ginny's children.

Mr. D's notion of parental responosibility can be summed up by this story:

When a caseworker discussed with Mr. D his plans for marrying Ginny, he said he had not because there was more involved in marriage than "just marriage," that he would draw a year in jail for not supporting his children if he were married but probably would get only a couple of months if not married. After the children were grown he might marry Ginny, he said.

A MEAL AT A TIME

Ginny's association with Mr. D finally was severed and she was granted relief. But she couldn't seem to manage her grant.

It wasn't until last year that a welfare worker recognized the necessity for Ginny to have a refrigerator so she could plan her food purchases. One was obtained and Ginny found it helpful because she could now purchase enough food for more than one meal.

Long before the refrigerator arrived, however, Ginny's oldest daughter rebelled against her squalid home conditions.

Her aim, she often said, was to become 12 so she could run away from home—and she has, several times. On one occasion she arrived at a city hospital and asked to be placed in a home.

Finally this child and her 10-year-old sister refused to leave Junior Village and return home to their mother following her last hospitalization. The two children, in effect, forced welfare officials to decide whether they should be committed as dependents.

For the first time, some permanent placement plan has been considered for these youngsters whose family situation has been handled on an emergency basis for more than a decade.

This is how Washington progresses against poverty.

THE FACES OF THE POOR

The poorhouse now has left the land;
That symbol of defeat
No longer mocks and shames the few
Who haven't much to eat.
The poor farm visits its reproach
No more on human pride,
Nor lifts to folly monuments
Across the countryside.

Rejoice that such ignoble sights
No more offend the mind;
But not so much that you forget
The poor still left behind.
To tear the poorhouse down is fine,
But mankind still is heir
To faults and ills and sundry woes
That once were tenants there.

The "Ghettoes" where such miseries
Unhappy wretches battered
Have not in utter vanquished fled,
But mostly have been scattered.
The poor are better hidden now;
We've not achieved a cure
For circumstances fell that grind
The faces of the poor.

—J. R. W.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

---

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

---

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

---

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

---

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

## REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 3018 M St. SE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

# Appendix

## George Washington Parke Custis, Orator of Young Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, there has been established in recent years an annual custom of paying tribute to the step-grandson of George Washington at the Custis-Lee Mansion in Arlington Cemetery each year on the Sunday preceding the feast of St. Patrick. George Washington Parke Custis was for more than 40 years a militant voice crying out against the wrongs inflicted upon the Irish people and urged the Irish to follow the example of the American Revolution, if need be, to right those wrongs. On Sunday, March 15, 1959, the third annual pilgrimage was made to the grave of Mr. Custis, and in keeping with an oft-repeated request made by him, shamrocks were planted on his grave. Mr. Custis prophesied that the day would come, when Ireland would be free, and he asked that in that day some Irish heart would come and, dropping a shamrock on his grave, cry "God bless him."

Ireland is not yet fully free, but at least a portion of the country can attest to the truth of the prophecy. So yesterday from northern Virginia came the George Washington Chapter of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, who with Mr. Paul C. Swartz of the National Capital Parks Service annually make the arrangements, to place their shamrocks. The Ancient Order of Hibernians, the District of Columbia chapter of the Friendly Sons, the Irish War Veterans, and others participated.

The president of the Emerald Isle Division of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and a former Member of the House, gave the principal address on this occasion. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include the remarks of Hon. John M. Costello, of California, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

GEORGE WASHINGTON PARKE CUSTIS, ORATOR OF YOUNG IRELAND

(Address by John M. Costello, president Emerald Isle Division, Ancient Order of Hibernians, Custis-Lee Mansion, Arlington Cemetery, March 15, 1959)

I would that we might hear the voice of George Washington Parke Custis as he stood here on the threshold of this stately residence and gave sound to the noble sentiments, with which his mind and heart were filled.

That voice is silent now, for more than a hundred years, and we have no wire recordings or mechanical devices to revive or reproduce his dulcet notes and vigorous tones, which made his oratory so outstanding. We can only turn to the published records which are available to us in an effort to regain something of the depth of his patriotism, the breadth of his loyalty, and the overflowing fullness of his burning hatred of intolerance and persecution. His speeches, poems, and writings all contain a wealth of information concerning the events of his time and particularly concerning the Irish, both individually and collectively, and the parts they played in the formative years of our country.

Who is this man whom we come to honor this day?

Who was this man, who commands our attention and causes us to lay aside other cares and other tasks, that we may pause and pay him homage each succeeding year as we prepare to celebrate the Irish national holiday, St. Patrick's Day?

In 1757, the husband of Martha Dandridge Custis passed away leaving his young widow with two small children. The following year George Washington, upon his marriage to Mrs. Custis, adopted the children, John and Martha Custis, as his own and thus he reared them. It was this John Custis (who purchased this estate from two of the Alexander brothers, who had inherited the land from their father, Gerard Alexander. The latter's grandfather had purchased the property, initially a tract of 6,000 acres, from Capt. Robert Howsing, to whom it had been granted by Governor Berkeley, of Virginia, in 1669.

Upon attaining his manhood, John Custis was married to Eleanor Calvert, granddaughter of the Sixth Lord of Baltimore. John Custis desired this magnificent estate, as it would provide a home close to that of his mother at Mount Vernon, as well as being within easy distance of Mount Airy, where his wife's family resided. Unfortunately John Custis died prematurely, leaving a daughter, Eleanor Parke Custis, who was born on this estate in 1779, and an infant son, George Washington Parke Custis, born on April 30, 1781, the year in which his father died.

Once more George and Martha Washington took two young children to raise at Mount Vernon, and it was there that George Washington Parke Custis grew into manhood. It was at Mount Vernon that he had occasion to meet the national figures of that day and to witness the passing events of history. Through this experience he acquired a fund of knowledge which fills his speeches with countless anecdotes and intimate details of the great events of his day. It was in this atmosphere that he undoubtedly developed his intense patriotic fervor, his devotion to the principles of freedom and justice, as well as his profound detestation of any violation of the individual rights and liberties of man, and more particularly his strong opposition to the subjection of the Irish people to the vicious cruelties and outrageous persecutions being inflicted upon them by the English overlords during this wretched phase of Irish history.

This is the man whom we come to honor here this day.

George Washington Parke Custis was the principal speaker on no less than 27 occasions for St. Patrick's Day celebrations. He constantly deplored the evils of absentee landlords in Ireland, the religious persecutions being inflicted upon the Irish, the horrors of famine in the land, when food from Ireland's soil was being shipped out of the country. He urged the Irish to seek the one means whereby their problem might be solved and their ultimate freedom secured.

"Let Ireland take warning from the history of America's days of trial. Let Ireland cease to bend at the footstool of power, with her honor, her dignity, and her manhood trailing in the dust."

Yes, Mr. Custis urged the Irish to rise in arms, for only in arms could they command the English to yield them back their freedoms and their rights. He knew well that he would not be privileged to see a free and independent Ireland, but he never ceased to urge the example of the American Revolution as a pattern for the Irish. So it has proven in the century that has passed. Only as a result of the constant rising up of valiant Irish revolutionaries, has Ireland won first one right and then another. Not until the Easter rebellion of 1916 was a republic proclaimed in Ireland, proclaimed to the music of firing guns and rifle shots. Mr. Custis had learned well from the lips of Washington himself, that the only redress, which America could obtain from England, was by the use of arms, and it was this sage counsel he urged and insisted the Irish should employ.

Mr. Custis would have delighted to have seen this day, when at least a part of Ireland has gained its freedom. Yet I am sure that he would not be satisfied, realizing that a part of that great isle is still subjected to the oppression and outside rule of the English. Rather would he repeat the words he spoke on March 14, 1829:

"We would, and our humble efforts are directed to that end, that (northeastern) Ireland become regenerate and free in the enjoyments of civil and religious liberty, by means at which millions may rejoice, and humanity have nothing to deplore. We would that the desolating sword of war remain sheathed, and both parties assist to prune the benignant olive of peace. We would that this great and beneficent revolution should be accomplished, rather by the force of opinion, than by the force of arms; and we would that the just and righteous cause of Irish emancipation should shed its clear, yet strong light of truth and conviction, upon the hitherto dark and implacable minds of Ireland's rulers, rather than that the victories of her freedom should shed one drop of blood."

Should the force of opinion fail to achieve the desired end, George Washington Parke Custis would then urge the force of arms to enforce the enlightenment upon the dark and implacable minds of Ireland's rulers. And, if you should wonder why he should champion the cause of Ireland, and ask him why, he would respond:

"Sirs, I make no apology for the sentiments I avow in the capital of my native country. The wrongs of Ireland have called up a voice from the old halls of Mount Vernon, and it shall be heard in our land, though all others were hushed in silence, and Erin will know that she hath at least one friend in that America which owes her many. The apologists for intolerance and corruption ask, why these Irish attachments? why should Protestant Americans be concerned for Catholic emancipation? For myself, I answer, that, 40 years ago, when in life's young and happy day, I played around those

venerated halls, which formed my paternal home, that I beheld the great Chief receive an honored guest, who came charged to declare the unanimous voice of a free people, electing George Washington first President of the United States. This honored, this important trust, was delegated to the good and venerable Charles Thomson, Secretary to the august Congress of the Revolution, and a native Irishman."

Then Custis would relate the story of John Byrne, who fell a captive at the surrender of Charleston:

"His tongue gave him an immediate passport to the prison ship, that floating hell, for which England may claim the sole merit for the discovery."

Then he would tell how he escaped, swam ashore and found his way to the camp of the illustrious Greene, where at the battle of Eutaw Springs, in the words of Byrne: "* * * when our gallant colonel cried to the old line, cease firing my lads, and rush on them with the bayonet, believe me when I say, John Byrne was not idle."

Further would Custis cite the last signer of the Declaration of Independence:

"When this illustrious Catholic grasped the pen to sign the immortal charter of our empire, he gave to the winds all thoughts of the consequences, and pledged, at once, his valued life, his princely fortune, and sacred honor, for the liberties of his country. Revered then be the altar at which a Carroll kneels. In our respect for his religion, we endeavor to honor him, who so much honors us. * * * Yes, Americans, Catholics mingled their blood, and that in no stinted stream, with the Protestant brethren, for those inestimable rights of civil and religious liberty, which we all, as members of one political family, now so happily enjoy."

This was the man, who commands our attention today.

This was the man, who, being challenged as to what England would say to his espousal of the Irish cause, made answer:

"What will England say, forsooth? The time, I trust, has gone by, never to return, when there can be heard from American lips, the monstrous jargon, of 'England the world's last hope, the bulwark of our religion, the fast anchored isle.' As to what the rulers of England, may say to us, or our proceedings, it is a matter of perfect nonchalance; but as to the people, the liberal and noble minded, and England has many such, they will say, brave Americans, you are right. You set a generous example to the civilized world. Blessed above all nations in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, it is feeling, it is magnanimous, that you should wish to see these blessings the lot of all mankind. Again, it was Ireland who cheered you in the dark hour of your trial. Irish hearts and Irish sinews were with you, in your arduous struggle for independence, and now that poor Erin hath her days of trial, your manly and generous efforts to aid her will do you honor in the estimation of the good and liberal minded of all countries, and solve the long-disputed problem, that republics can be grateful."

In the early days of the city of Washington, the month of March each year, would not pass without the voice of George Washington Parke Custis being raised in behalf of Ireland in her struggle for freedom and independence. How he would have been delighted with this historic March of 1959, were he to speak here today and herald the news of the action of the Congress, which has just finished the process of voting the creation of the 50th State in the Union, thereby giving Hawaiians their rightful voice in the Government of their affairs and the Nation's.

Turning away from the Pacific, his gaze would rest on the Isle of Cyprus, which is this month being given the status of a free and independent country. Under the domination of the English, the only solution which their diplomats could recommend was that the island be partitioned—yes, in the pattern of Ireland—the Turkish minority in control of the one end of the island, and the Greek majority controlling the rest; all the while both Greece and Turkey would continue to agitate for full control. Their only thought was more partition, the curse inflicted on Ireland, and imposed on Korea, Vietnam, and Germany—Germany, where a divided Berlin is today the focus of tension, and may well be the trigger for a truly devastating conflict.

Fortunately our own State Department played an important role in bringing about a sound, sensible, and practicable solution of this dispute over Cyprus. As a result the island remains a united country, under the joint protection of Turkey and Greece, and is ready to assume her rightful place among free and independent peoples. The Cyprus solution might well have been applied to Ireland with the same happy results, in place of the shortsighted arrangement now existing, which can only spell disunity, engender friction, and occasion continued bloodshed and strife. Well might our own State Department once more to use their good influence to bring about a sound, sensible, and practicable solution for Ireland, a solution that real statesmanship recommends. That is the outcome, which Mr. Custis would bespeak on an occasion such as this.

Yes; this March is memorable—for at noon on Tuesday, March 17, there will arrive at the airport, the President of Ireland, paying a visit of state to the President of the United States. This is an event for which another 'Custis' of the West, clamored—and how he would have loved to have lived to see this day. Joseph Scott of Los Angeles, like Custis an orator and great lover of Ireland, until his death the president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, besieged the White House and the State Department, urging an invitation for the President of Ireland. He likewise besought His Excellency Sean T. O'Kelly, the President of Ireland, to request such an invitation. It is for us to thrill at this great event, which will demonstrate the fraternity, the unity and Christian charity, that exist between our two great Nations.

Coming close upon the heels of this event, the English Prime Minister is visiting here—to seek a solution of the current crisis of Berlin. He comes urging that conferences and concessions can combat communism and maintain peace. Unfortunately umbrella wielding diplomacy leaves no imprint on the Russian mind—only the show of power and the readiness to use it. To Mr. Macmillan, Mr. Custis would say, as he did in March of 1844:

"The best treaties with tyrants were secured with sword in hand. When the people of Ireland shall have resolved upon this alternative, and be prepared to meet it, and not till then, may they hope to sever the manacles of their bondage, and to rise in the beauty and strength of the sons of liberty."

We too must meet the Russian threats with sword in hand and be prepared to use it.

So it is in this most historic March, we have assembled here to learn who was this man, friend of young Ireland, orator for 40 years and more in her behalf, who often prayed that should he not see the day of liberty and happiness in Ireland, which he predicts, then when it does come, he prayed:

"Perhaps a son of Erin may make a pilgrimage to the prophet's grave. No Irishman, he hoped, would 'cast a nettle' on it, but rather plant a shamrock there, exclaiming as he went his way. 'Peaceful be his rest, he was the friend and orator of Ireland'."

## Anyhow a Timely Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the growing body of favorable response throughout the country to the plan advanced by several Members of this House to create an orderly and systematic plan for paying off the national debt, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Idaho Statesman, of Boise, Idaho, on March 9:

ANYHOW A TIMELY WARNING

Like 'most everybody else who's not entirely bereft of understanding and conscience, Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT, a Texas Democrat, views with alarm the towering national debt that now has reached a reported $283 billion and that seems most likely to keep right on climbing.

But unlike 'most everybody else, Representative WRIGHT, 36-year-old third term Congressman, veteran of World War II combat, two-term mayor of his hometown and partner in a trade expansion and advertising firm, isn't content to merely wring his hands, nor would he stifle his conscience and sweep the whole disagreeable matter under the rug.

He proposes to do something about it and so he has submitted to the Congress a proposal that is so thoroughly steeped in commonsense that in these days it may seem to be almost revolutionary. He's proposing to pay off the national debt, a little at a time but in accordance with a definite program, and to levy a tax specifically for that purpose.

He's proposing payment on the debt at the rate of 1 percent a year. The tax, at first would be a substantial one. If the debt were to go no higher than it now is, the first year's payment would amount to $2.83 billion. But, like the householder paying on an amortization plan for his home, the Government's payments on the debt reduction account would steadily reduce the payments for interest, which now amount to $8.1 billion a year, or substantially more than 10 percent of all the contemplated Federal Government spending for all purposes the coming year.

The Congressman puts it this way: "In 100 years we could completely retire the debt by paying $495 billion in interest and $283 billion in principal, or a total of $778 billion. But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years will be $980 billion and we will still owe the debt of $283 billion, or a total of $1,263 trillion."

That's a conclusion based, of course, on the assumption that for 100 years the Government would have to balance its budget and not go further into debt, and so, lamentably, it runs counter to current Federal fiscal practices.

The principle, at any rate, of Congressman WRIGHT's proposal, is one that commends itself to farsighted conservatives.

It ought, also, to command the attention of the spenders. They haven't so far manifested any great concern about mounting taxes, nor permitted it to interfere with their ever-mounting spending schemes. Certainly they must be somehow aware that we can't go on indefinitely spending more than we take in. That way inevitably leads to destruction of credit so that ultimately the Government couldn't borrow any more and might either have to quit spending alto-

gether, or to take over everything, and even the chief advocates of ever-increasing Government spending might not like that.

Very definitely Mr. WRIGHT is on the right track.

His proposal may, or may not, receive the consideration it so eminently deserves, but it should serve at any rate as a serious warning of the bad trouble we're headed into unless there's a decisive reversal of current policies of spending in excess of income.

## Veterans' Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues the serious situation in my State of West Virginia where mounting unemployment rolls threaten the vested interests ex-servicemen have in their homes purchased through Veterans' Administration loans.

In this connection, I want to call attention to a letter from the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, who has been kind enough to ask the Veterans' Administration for a special survey of the situation as it affects veterans' loans, in West Virginia and what is being done to forestall foreclosures.

I want most of all to commend Chairman TEAGUE's efforts and the efforts of the Veterans' Administration officials to protect the interests of these veterans who, through no fault of their own, find themselves unable to meet their monthly payments. The information contained in Mr. TEAGUE's letter that no foreclosures on these properties will be permitted is reassuring.

Mr. Speaker, at best this is only a temporary arrangement. Should the chronic unemployment situation that exists in my State continue, or possibly worsen, there will come a time when action will be necessary and these unfortunate men will stand to lose the major portion of their investment in their homes.

I am offering Mr. TEAGUE's letter for inclusion in the RECORD beacuse what is happening in West Virginia is also happening in other States, and it behooves the Congress to take immediate action to provide, through public works and other governmental activities, jobs that will enable these veterans to meet their obligations.

Mr. TEAGUE's letter follows:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
*Washington, D.C., March 5, 1959.*

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The committee's investigation of the unemployment condition in the State of West Virginia and its effect on veterans' loans shows that even under adverse conditions the veterans in your State have prevented foreclosures on their homes. The number of current defaults are less than 1 percent of the total loans outstanding in both the direct and guaranteed programs. Although one city in West Virginia—Charleston—has been listed, along with 11 other cities in the United States, as having a high unemployment situation, some of this unemployment being chronic, the overall picture of the veterans' loan program in West Virginia seems stable.

I am attaching a detailed breakdown of the status of the veterans' loan program in the State of West Virginia. You will note that the number of foreclosures, both on direct and guaranteed loans, has steadily decreased over the past 3 years. This breakdown also shows that on the foreclosures which have been made the amount of deficiency claims against the veterans has fluctuated. This is explained that the amount of the claims vary in direct relation to the condition of the property when it is taken over by the Veterans' Administration.

The committee discussed this matter with officials of the Veterans' Administration and found that the central office officials here in Washington are very sensitive to the unemployment conditions that exist today in the State of West Virginia. They have issued instructions to the Veterans' Administration regional office in Huntington that no foreclosure proceedings will be taken on direct loans without prior submission to central office. The regional office has been further instructed to use all types of servicing on the guaranteed loans in an effort to prevent foreclosures. As a servicing technique, the Veterans' Administration is trying to persuade lenders to accept smaller monthly payments or waive payments on the principle, accepting interest payments only, until the veterans can once again resume their regular payments. I have also been informed that no attempts will be made to require the veterans to catch up on their waived payments, because this would add a burden on the veterans when they again become employed.

The officials in the Huntington regional office advise that the unemployment situation is very serious and that indications point to the fact that it may get worse before it gets better. They also feel that with proper servicing they can keep the foreclosures on veterans' homes at a minimum. The officials also state that so far they have had very close cooperation with the lenders who hold veterans' loans. They are firmly of the opinion that under the present conditions in the State it is to the best interest of both the Government and the veterans to postpone foreclosures of any kind.

The following breakdown will give you a detailed picture of the recent guaranteed and direct loan activity in the State of West Virginia:

| County | Guaranteed loans, July 1 to Dec. 1, 1958 | Direct loans, Apr. 1 to Dec. 1, 1958 | Veteran population |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3d Congressional District: | | | |
| Braxton | 0 | 4 | 1,530 |
| Calhoun | 0 | 2 | 1,070 |
| Clay | 0 | 0 | 1,380 |
| Doddridge | 0 | 2 | 900 |
| Fayette | 1 | 5 | 10,110 |
| Gilmer | 0 | 1 | 910 |
| Harrison | 0 | 12 | 9,950 |
| Lewis | 0 | 2 | 1,980 |
| Nicholas | 0 | 4 | 3,100 |
| Ritchie | 0 | 0 | 1,380 |
| Upshur | 0 | 3 | 1,950 |
| Wirt | 0 | 1 | 450 |
| | 1 | 36 | 34,710 |
| Other counties: | | | |
| Barbour | 0 | 0 | 2,060 |
| Berkeley | 0 | 6 | 2,950 |
| Boone | 1 | 16 | 4,560 |
| Cabell | 18 | 56 | 14,370 |
| Grant | 0 | 3 | 710 |
| Greenbrier | 0 | 7 | 5,160 |
| Hampshire | 0 | 2 | 1,210 |
| Hardy | 0 | 0 | 910 |
| Jackson | 0 | 2 | 2,100 |
| Jefferson | 0 | 4 | 2,000 |
| Kanawha | 5 | 32 | 28,700 |
| Lincoln | 0 | 3 | 2,240 |
| Logan | 1 | 10 | 8,060 |
| Marion | 2 | 7 | 9,670 |
| Mason | 0 | 14 | 2,110 |
| McDowell | 3 | 2 | 11,750 |
| Mercer | 1 | 18 | 8,870 |
| Mineral | 0 | 1 | 2,980 |
| Mingo | 0 | 6 | 6,240 |
| Monongalia | 0 | 8 | 8,010 |
| Monroe | 0 | 0 | 1,030 |
| Morgan | 2 | 0 | 1,070 |
| Pendleton | 0 | 3 | 810 |
| Pleasants | 0 | 0 | 850 |
| Pocahontas | 0 | 0 | 1,630 |
| Preston | 5 | 2 | 3,540 |
| Putnam | 1 | 6 | 2,190 |
| Raleigh | 9 | 30 | 11,410 |
| Randolph | 1 | 3 | 3,610 |
| Roane | 0 | 2 | 1,630 |
| Summers | 0 | 2 | 2,800 |
| Taylor | 0 | 8 | 3,150 |
| Tucker | 0 | 2 | 980 |
| Tyler | 0 | 1 | 1,250 |
| Wayne | 4 | 30 | 4,150 |
| Webster | 0 | 5 | 1,840 |
| Wetzel | 0 | 2 | 2,480 |
| Wood | 1 | 87 | 9,810 |
| Wyoming | 0 | 1 | 4,210 |
| Brooke | 2 | 12 | 4,480 |
| Hancock | 19 | 4 | 4,620 |
| Marshall | 4 | 8 | 5,890 |
| Ohio | 9 | 4 | 9,500 |
| State total | 89 | 445 | 243,000 |
| Veterans on waiting list for direct loans as of Dec. 1, 1958 | | | 1,191 |

From the foregoing you will note that there has been very little activity recently in the guaranteed loan program. If it had not been for the direct loan program, very few veterans would have been able to obtain loans during 1958. Your attention is invited to the fact that in the entire State of West Virginia only 89 loans were made by lenders as compared to 445 loans made by the Veterans' Administration under the direct loan program.

I feel that as a result of the committee's investigation of this situation, the State of West Virginia is fortunate in having its veterans cooperate with the Veterans' Administration, thus preventing foreclosures and loss of veterans' homes. I am confident that this record will set an example for other States that have a high unemployment situation.

In the President's economic report to Congress he stressed the need for some type of legislation to aid distressed areas and advised that he planned on submitting recommendations for such legislation at an early date.

I am sure that the foregoing will be of assistance to you in evaluating any legislation that is submitted to assist distressed areas. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*Chairman.*

## When Do We Face Up to This?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the growing body of favorable response throughout the country to the plan advanced by several Members of this House to create an orderly and systematic plan for paying

off the national debt, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram of Kansas City, Mo., on February 25:

[From the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram, Feb. 25, 1959]

WHEN DO WE FACE UP TO THIS?

We'd like to offer a rousing cheer for Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of Texas. He stood up in the House the other day and offered a concurrent resolution calling for beginning a systematic program of reducing the national debt. His suggestion is that we set aside a sum equivalent to 1 percent or more of the national debt each year to retire the principal. That would mean starting with $2.8 billion, since the debt amounts to $283 billion. At that rate it would take something less than 100 years to pay it off. But in the process we taxpayers (and our children and their children) would be saved around $485 billion.

The Congressman should have a pat on the back for daring to propose such a thing. His plan, or something like it, ought to be implemented without delay, while the Nation is in a period of prosperity and can logically contemplate doing something about ridding itself of this monstrous debt which hangs over the heads of us as well as future generations yet unborn.

Some will ask why we should begin to retire this debt. There are many people who sincerely believe there is no point in worrying about it, since Uncle Sam is not broke and can get along as long as his assets and revenues are on such a tremendous scale. They argue that the need for spending is far greater as a stimulant and stabilizer than is the need for debt reduction.

Yes; probably the Nation can continue to live with the national debt. But common sense cries out for a saner course. There may come a day when we can no longer live with it. Why shouldn't we begin at once to prepare for the possibility of such a day, which history tells us is almost certain to come? Why, we may also ask, should this debt with staggering principal and interest be carried along as a permanent burden, when none of us, in his personal or business life, considers such economics sound. As individuals we work, scrimp and save feverishly to reduce the principal of any debt we contract, in order to get out from under at the earliest possible moment.

There are other reasons why it is logical to begin the reduction of this debt. One of them is cost. The interest charges on a debt of $283 billion cannot be minimized—they are immense. During the next fiscal year the interest on the debt will be $8.1 billion. And if the average rate increases to 3.5 percent as seems likely, it will climb to $9.9 billion. Assuming we make no move to reduce the debt, in less than 30 years we will pay as much in interest as the debt is today but we will still owe all of it.

Another reason for concern over the debt is the eroding effect it has on the credit of the Federal Government. There appears to be a growing lack of enthusiasm for Government securities among investors. This is true of both those who buy Government notes and bonds in the Treasury's refinancing activities, and among the general public itself, which buys Government savings bonds.

Representative THOMAS PELLY, of Washington, urging the House to act favorably on the resolution, pointed out that "a policy of balanced budgets, together with regular yearly payments on the debt, could restore confidence in Government securities and the interest rates on Treasury borrowing would decline almost enough to offset the amount of yearly debt reduction."

Isn't it about time we got our collective selves by the scruff of the neck and demand a definite answer as to what we are going to do about this debt?

## Commies Seek To Discredit FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following newspaper article published in the Baltimore News-Post on February 28, 1959.

This article forewarns Americans to be on guard against unjustified attacks on the FBI and its dedicated and able Director:

[From the Baltimore News-Post, Feb. 28, 1959]

COMMIES SEEK TO DISCREDIT FBI

(By Jack Lotto)

The Kremlin has kicked off a global smear campaign against the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

Outright lies, distortions, and half-truths are being used by the international Communist movement propagandists in their campaign—in 19 languages—to paint America, instead of Russia, as a police state.

The drive masterminded behind the Iron Curtain coincided with supposedly unrelated attacks in this country designed to weaken, and undermine public confidence in the FBI and Hoover.

A publication most Americans never heard of, but which is the "bible" for all Communist parties, called World Marxist Review: Problems of Peace and Socialism, laid down the line to be echoed:

"J. Edgar Hoover * * * trampling on the Declaration of Indepedence, harasses the people of America with an army of special agents and professional informers.

"THE BITTER FRUIT

"Fear, hysteria, bookburning, telephone tapping, wholesale victimization, and character assassination—such are the bitter fruits of the inglorious reign of Hoover, the master of deceit."

The voice of the brutal Red freedom repressors concentrated much of its fire on a vital weapon of the FBI against subversive conspirators—the use of informants.

Said the Marxist Review in its current issue:

"The professional informer is the most despised and detested creature in all lands at all times * * * but, lavishly spending the American taxpayers' money, the police chief found creatures for his dirty work * * *."

Reason for the Red attempt to pin an odious label on ex-Communists who helped the Federal agency:

In every successful court case against Communists, the key witnesses were defectors from the Soviet-bossed conspiracy, or undercover agents planted inside Communist ranks.

UNITED STATES WOULD BE HAMPERED

The Reds know the United States would be hampered seriously in its attempts to protect itself against Communist espionage and subversive activities if ex-Communist informants could not be used or trusted as witnesses.

Watch for the Reds, their sympathizers and dupes to start screaming about witchhunts and persecution and against the FBI use of alleged professional liars, falsifiers, and stool-pigeons.

Why? To discredit in advance the testimony of Government witnesses in pending trials, cast public suspicion on any future defectors who may testify against them, and open the door for later frame-up claims for those convicted.

The World Marxist Review is the chief vehicle for published propaganda directives of the world Red movement. It is published in Prague in Russian, French, Chinese, Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, Dutch, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Polish, Spanish, Rumanian, Swedish, and Vietnamese.

An English edition is printed in Canada for U.S. distribution.

## Ireland's Law Has Glorious Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an interesting article by Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of Boston College Law School, which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on March 14, 1959:

IRELAND'S LAW HAS GLORIOUS PAST

(By Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J.)

(March 17 is not only the feast day of the great Irish missionary, it is also the patronal feast of the archdiocese of Boston. In view of this dual significance of St. Patrick's Day, we present here a condensation of an address, "The History of Irish Law," given to the Eire Society of Boston on October 5, 1958.)

The Irish are a race with a deep sense of injustice. No other nation has felt so deeply the injustice of internal division and the sting of an alien government. Long centuries of occupation by a foreign power have deepened and intensified the Irish passion for law and justice.

It is perhaps significant to note in this connection that descendants of Ireland in this country are represented to their full strength or even more so in the legal profession.

The history of Irish law can conveniently be divided into three eras:

The age of the Brehons.

The fusion of the common law of England with early Irish law.

And the full flowering of Irish-English law in the Irish Constitution of 1937.

In pre-Christian Ireland the judges or Brehons were obliged to take a well-defined course and training. There was no legislature as we know it today so that the Brehons not merely interpreted the law but also formed new laws. Two collections of the decisions of the Brehons have been issued: the "Senchus Mor," or the book of civil law, and the "Book of Aicill," which records the criminal law. No nation of Europe can boast of such an ancient and detailed account of its earliest political institutions.

No adequate text, however, of the Brehon laws has been available until recently. During the period of 1865–1901, there was issued the six-volume set of "Ancient Laws of Ireland." Despite this scholarship, basic problems remain in the texts and interpretation of the Brehon law which governed Ireland for over 1,100 years.

Upon the arrival in Ireland of St. Patrick (probably in the year 433) the fusion of pre-Christian Irish or Brehon law and the Catholic outlook was initiated. During the 33 years of Patrick's apostolate in Ireland he did much to achieve a lasting synthesis of the Brehon law with the best traditions of the Roman law which the church on the Continent was baptising.

It should not be inferred, however, that the nine-man law-revision commission that St. Patrick appointed had any radical task to perform upon the Brehon law; pre-Christian Irish law had many fine characteristics including humanitarian provision for hospital care, an advanced outlook on equal rights for married women and sensible regulations concerning criminals.

Here again, however, one must be careful in evaluating the Brehon laws since as the distinguished Irish Justice Gavan Duffy stated in the case of Foyle v. Attorney General (1949—"The (Brehon) law still has to be deduced from elliptical, incomplete and often corrupt texts * * * the study of Irish law, seriously undertaken only in recent times, is still in its infancy."

The fusion of the Brehon law with Christian principles produced a law which governed Ireland for almost a thousand years. Around the year 1200, however, the laws of England began to be accepted in Ireland. From the year 1171 up until the final virtual suppression of Irish law under Cromwell there was a dual system of law in Ireland.

Officially, however, the Statutes of Kilkenny, passed by the Irish Parliament in 1366, reaffirmed the exclusive binding force of Irish law. Despite this decree, however, English law and even English judges were accepted in many regions of Ireland.

With the conquest of Ireland by a foreign power Irish law was destroyed and—the word is not too strong—desecrated. English legal institutions were imposed upon a subject people. The bitterness and the resentment caused in the Irish heart by this destruction of one of Ireland's great cultural achivements—its law—was summed up in 1925 by Mr. Cosgrove, president of the executive council, in these words:

"The body of laws and the system of judging imposed upon this Nation were English (not even British) in their seed, English in their growth, English in their vitality.

"In the long struggle for the right to rule in our own country there has been no sphere of the administration lately ended which impressed itself on the minds of our people as a standing monument of alien government more than the * * * administration of law and justice which supplanted * * * the laws and institutions (which were) a part of the living national organism."

With the liberation of southern Ireland from four centuries of oppression the legal genius of the Irish people once again became evident in the Irish constitutions of 1922 and 1937—documents which will remain as testaments of the passion for justice which St. Patrick discovered already well developed in the Irish conscience.

The Irish Constitution, born in the full flush of modern Celtic nationalism, is a document which synthesizes the best feature of modern democratic institutions with an overall Christian outlook.

Recognizing the Catholic Church as the "guardian of the faith professed by the great majority of the citizens," the Irish Constitution nonetheless affirms that the "state shall not impose any disabilities or make any discrimination on the ground of religious profession, belief, or status."

The Irish Constitution has already had a great impact on the world; its provisions have been copied or used as guides in the new laws of India, Pakistan, and Ceylon. Future decisions of the Supreme Court of Ireland may well have a continuing influence on the jurisprudence of all the nations of the British Commonwealth which follow the common or Anglo-American law.

Although the Irish Constitution and the decisional law construing it have been quite satisfactory, this is not to deny that there are as yet great unknowns in Irish law. For example, the exact status of a marriage contracted by an Irish citizen abroad to a divorced person is not clear in Ireland where divorce and remarriage are disallowed.

In view of the Christian orientation of ancient and modern Irish law, perhaps it is not fanciful to hope that the Irish bench will be able to hand down significant decisions on some of the basic legal-moral problems which trouble mankind today. Perhaps, in fact, one could speculate that this is the new spiritual destiny of the Irish people, to send forth juridical ideas to the world rather than missionaries.

All the work of the great reformers, therefore, is by no means concluded by reason of the independence of southern Ireland. The work of Emmet and Parnell and O'Connell and the Sinn Fein goes on, in the legal institutions which have resulted from their labors.

Consequently, in the words of the Irish Constitution, "gratefully remembering their heroic and unremitting struggle to regain the rightful independence of our nation," we stand in admiration at the work of the architects of modern Ireland. Their achievements will abide forever. Their crusade has resulted in the creation of moral agency which will endure not merely wherever Irish eyes are smiling and Irish laughter rings, but forever throughout the entire civilized world.

## The Red Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of March 13, 1959:

THE RED PARADE

By this time, most of the people of the Pittsburgh district are well aware of the nature of the Communist international conspiracy. They know, from sworn testimony before the House of Representatives' Un-American Activities Committee and other official tribunals, of the plot against the United States and the names of those accused of taking part in it.

Those who remain uninformed may well review the testimony given before a subcommittee of the House committee here in Pittsburgh this week. The hearings started off with the testimony of two brave citizens, Hamp Golden and his wife Mary, of Crafton, who endured the detestation of associates and neighbors to pose as Communists for years while informing the FBI of the machinations of the Reds.

The Goldens gave sworn testimony, naming names, of the workings of the Red conspiracy, right up to last Saturday's caucus meeting held to advise the comrades what attitude to take toward the committee when the hearings began.

Then followed the familiar parade of the Reds, cloaking themselves in the fifth amendment, refusing to answer even routine questions, defying the committee, virtually disavowing any responsibility for the welfare of the Nation of which they are citizens.

The objective of the committee is to obtain evidence on which to base legislation to combat the Red conspiracy. But the hearings have additional value as enlightenment for the public.

We would hope that such enlightenment would fall, full strength, on such misled personalities as those who lend their well-known names to the Red efforts to undermine the work of the committee and induce Congress to abolish it. The Commies parade those names before the public at every opportunity in an attempt to create the impression that the American public opposes the committee.

The Un-American Activities Committee is doing a necessary and important job in exposing the Red conspiracy. It works under many handicaps, one of which is the constant smearing of the committee and its members by the Commie propaganda machine.

The committee deserves the support and confidence of every true citizen, for its revelations are helping to preserve and protect our way of life.

## Court Upholds "Under God" in Pledge to Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as the author of the amendment placing the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, I am most pleased to insert an article from the Daily News of New York wherein Supreme Court Justice Isadore Bookstein dismisses the suit of the representatives of the Freethinkers of America who contended that reference to God and the pledge violates Federal and State constitutional guarantees of freedom of conscience. So right was the learned judge when he said: "The first amendment does not grant disbelievers preference over those who do believe in God, and who, in pledging their allegiance, choose to express that belief."

The article follows:

ALBANY, February 24.—A State supreme court ruling made public today refused to order the phrase "under God" stricken from the pledge of allegiance to the flag as it is recited in the State's public schools.

The ruling came in a suit by Joseph Lewis, of Croton Falls, president of the Freethinkers of America, and Alfred L. Klein, of Staten Island, who contended that reference to God in the pledge violates Federal and State constitutional guarantees of freedom of conscience.

MUST PAY COSTS

Supreme Court Justice Isadore Bookstein, dismissing the suit with costs assessed against the petitioners, declared that inclusion of the phrase "under God" in no way impinges on the guarantees against a church state.

He noted, furthermore, that strict exclusion of references to God from our public papers would invalidate the President's oath of office, the Declaration of Independence, and the oath of the court, all of which carry references to the Almighty.

CITES AMENDMENT

"If I properly apprehend the intent, design, and purposes of the first amendment," Bookstein wrote, "it was conceived to prevent and prohibit the establishment of a state religion: it was not intended to prevent or prohibit the growth and development of a religious state."

The petitioners' argument that children of Freethinkers would be humiliated if they odmitted "under God" from the pledge, Bookstein said, was not relevant.

The first amendment, he said, does not grant disbelievers "preference over those who do believe in God, and who, in pledging their allegiance, choose to express that belief."

## Presentation of Plaque Honoring Late Congressman William B. Oliver, of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, at the seventh annual meeting of the Warrior-Tombigbee Development Association in Tuscaloosa, Ala., on March 6, 1959, tribute was paid to a distinguished Alabamian and former Member of the House of Representatives, the late William Bacon Oliver. Mr. Oliver represented the Sixth Alabama District which has as its able Congressman today my good friend, ARMISTEAD SELDEN.

In 1957 Congressman SELDEN introduced legislation providing that the lock and dam on the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway near Tuscaloosa be officially named the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam in honor of the former Congressman. This legislation was enacted into law, and a plaque inscribed with the law was presented by Mr. SELDEN at the river association meeting to Mrs. William B. Oliver, widow of the great Alabamian. She in turn presented it to Col. R. W. Love, Mobile district engineer of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, who indicated that the plaque will be appropriately placed at the site of the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam

Because there are Members of the present House of Representatives and Senate who knew and loved William Bacon Oliver and will be interested in this event, I am including below Mr. SELDEN's remarks, as well as an account of the presentation ceremony:

Mr. SELDEN. This evening we pause to pay tribute to a distinguished Alabamian whose name is ascribed to the first modern navigational structure built on the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. I refer, of course, to the late William Bacon Oliver, who for almost a quarter of a century represented our State's Sixth Congressional District in the Congress of the United States.

During his dedicated service in the House of Representatives, Congressman Oliver made many lasting contributions to his district, State, and Nation. He was always alert to the needs of national defense, to the potentialities of our youth, and to the problems of workingmen and women. He was a man of keen intelligence, an eminently qualified attorney, and a forceful and highly regarded legislator.

William B. Oliver, or Buck Oliver as he was affectionately known to his friends and constituents, was born in 1867 near the banks of the Warrior River at Eutaw, Ala. He received his education at schools in his hometown, at the Verner College Preparatory School in Tuscaloosa and at the University of Alabama.

He received his law degree at the University of Alabama in 1889 and in that same year, after taking a special law course at the University of Virginia, he was admitted to the Alabama bar. He began active participation in his chosen profession at the age of only 22 here in Tuscaloosa.

In 1898 he was appointed solicitor for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Alabama and served with distinction in that position for nearly 10 years. He resigned as solicitor to become dean of the law school of the University of Alabama.

In 1914 Buck Oliver was elected to Congress where he served 11 consecutive terms, retiring voluntarily in 1937. When he first entered the House of Representatives, he was assigned to the Naval Affairs Committee, a post he held for 6 years. During much of this period, the world was at war and the work of the Naval Affairs Committee was highly important to the United States and to our allies.

When the 68th Congress convened in 1921, Mr. Oliver was appointed to membership on the powerful House Appropriations Committee. He was an outstanding member of this committee for his remaining 16 years in Congress and, among other accomplishments, played an important part in instituting a Federal budgetary system.

Although he had planned to retire when he chose not to seek reelection in 1937, he was called to serve his government once again 2 years later—this time as special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. He held this post until 1944 when, at the age of 77, he retired permanently from public affairs. Four years later, on May 27, 1948, Mr. Oliver died while on a visit to New Orleans. He was buried in the cemetery in Eutaw, the town where he was born and where he grew up.

The ideals of democracy and the principles of the Democratic Party were of the utmost importance to Mr. Oliver throughout his life. In the words of his friend and colleague, the late Congressman Sam Hobbs, of Alabama, Mr. Oliver "was a Democrat without apology, but too much of a gentleman ever to give offense to political foes even in the fiercest fights. His was a perfect voice, and his skill in using it made his forensic ability both feared and admired."

And indeed Buck Oliver was recognized for his great ability as a speaker who never wasted words. He was not noted for giving frequent or lengthy talks; but when he did speak, his remarks were direct and to the point, relevant to the subject matter, and so penetrating that it was obvious they were backed up by clear understanding and forethought.

Mr. Oliver was blessed with the attributes of high character, integrity, honesty, and faith in God, as well as in his fellow man. He was a devout member of the Presbyterian Church which he served as an elder and as the moderator of the synod of Alabama.

The high qualities Mr. Oliver possessed were clearly recalled by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, the present chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, when he said: "He was a man of lofty ideals and strength of character, tactful, considerate, and courteous, and generous in his friendships. He measured up in every respect to the high standards of his native State which has sent more than its share of able and distinguished statesmen to the two Houses of Congress. His State is honored and the annals and traditions of the House of Representatives enriched by his service here."

Among Mr. Oliver's many contributions to our district was his successful effort to obtain the initial appropriation to construct a new lock and dam on the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway at Tuscaloosa. This structure was the first link in the modernization of the great water artery that connects north central Alabama with the port of Mobile.

As a tribute to Mr. Oliver, his many friends throughout this area held a ceremony upon the completion of the lock and dam in 1940 and designated the new structure as the Oliver lock and dam. Mr. Oliver had no knowledge of the plans to name the new facility for him until he and Mrs. Oliver, who were in Washington at the time, received an invitation to attend the dedication ceremony.

In early 1957, it was called to my attention that no action had ever been taken to officially name the structure in his honor and that legally its name was still the Tuscaloosa lock and dam. Accordingly, I introduced a bill which was subsequently enacted into law officially designating the fine navigation structure here at Tuscaloosa as the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam.

And now I would like for Mrs. William Bacon Oliver to come forward so that I may present to her a plaque on which is inscribed the public law honoring her late husband.

(Mrs. Oliver comes forward to receive plaque.)

Mrs. Oliver, the designation of a great navigation structure as the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam is an effort by those who knew and respected your late husband to express our appreciation for his many years of distinguished public service.

Mrs. WILLIAM B. OLIVER (accepting plaque). To those who loved him and have wished to honor him, may I say, thank you. Please carry on.

(Mrs. Oliver then presents plaque to Colonel Love.)

COL. ROBERT W. LOVE. I am pleased to receive this beautiful plaque inscribed with the public law naming the navigation lock and dam here at Tuscaloosa the William Bacon Oliver lock and dam for public display at the structure. We have already prepared a glass-covered case for it, so that it can be readily seen but will be protected from the weather. The case is mounted on a low post on the lock mound at the top of the steps leading down to the esplanade. In this position it will be seen by everyone visiting the lock.

I will see that the plaque is placed in the case immediately and that it and the case are maintained in first-class condition. The plaque will be a constant reminder to all who pass of the great services rendered the State of Alabama by her distinguished citizen and public servant, William Bacon Oliver.

## Dramatic Presentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the growing body of favorable response throughout the country to the plan advanced by several Members of this House to create an orderly and systematic plan for paying off the national debt, I am including an editorial which appeared in the South Bend Tribune, of South Bend, Ind., on March 9:

[From the South Bend Tribune, Mar. 9, 1959]

DRAMATIC PRESENTATION

The monumental size of the Federal debt and the desirability of whittling it down in-

stead of always increasing it are dramatized by Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR., a Texas Democrat.

How effective his dramatization may be, however, in inspiring Congress to face up to the need for debt-paring action remains to be seen. The experience during the great depression, the great war, and the great boom that came in that order doesn't indicate that Congress is about to do anything sensational where hacking away at the debt mountain is concerned.

Nevertheless, Representative WRIGHT deserves thanks for the concise manner in which he has called attention to the debt and what it means to taxpayers even if nothing is done to trim it on a methodical basis.

It may be assumed, too, from his presentation of the facts that Representative WRIGHT henceforth will continue as a champion of the philosophy that the Federal Government should live within its means and put aside money to shrink the debt and, in the long run, save money for the taxpayers.

He advocates a 100-year plan. His idea is to pay off one-hundredth of the debt annually, come what may.

In this way, he calculates, paying off the debt, even if it becomes no larger, and meeting interest payments will take $778 billion. The alternative—and this is frightening—is to shell out $980 billion in interest alone in the next century if the debt is not reduced, even if it does not grow.

Faced with these startling fiscal facts, it would seem Federal debt reduction needs high priority in congressional business.

## The Law Is the Law Is Nuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial from the Birmingham Post-Herald of March 7, 1959, entitled "The Law Is the Law Is Nuts." This editorial points up graphically one serious inequity of the current farm program. I commend it to the attention of every Member of this House:

THE LAW IS THE LAW IS NUTS

Evetts Haley, Jr., owes the Government $506.11 because he harvested 473 bushels of wheat without the Government's permission. And he'll have to pay, or else, because the Supreme Court has just brushed off his argument that he had a right to grow grain to feed his own cattle.

Out in Michigan another farmer has paid the Government $2,643 in fines for raising his own chickenfeed. (The Government already has grabbed his $1,701 bank account.) So this farmer, Stanley Yankus, is selling his farm and taking off for Australia, where he hopes he can run a farm his own way.

This punishment for small farmers is being levied under the same law which permits the Government to pay out nearly $1.5 million to a single corporation farm to prop up the price of the rice it produced. It is the same law which got a California corporation farm $854,450 in 1957 for growing cotton—and the same corporation another $125,942 for not growing cotton.

It is the same law which in 1957 gave sums ranging from $10,000 to $322,000 each to 2,422 large-size farmers who took land out of production. It is the same law which has piled up such a hoard of surplus crops that it costs the taxpayers $1 billion a year just to store them.

The farm bloc diehards who insist on keeping this anticonsumer, antitaxpayer, antifarmer law on the books loudly proclaim it is for the benefit of the little farmer.

It sure is.

A small farmer in Indiana had his tractor seized because he planted 16 more acres of wheat than the Government said he could. A small farmer in Pennsylvania was fined $404 for raising 24 acres of wheat to feed his cattle, and threatened with sale of his farm if he didn't pay. Mr. Haley is being socked for raising 43 acres of wheat and Mr. Yankus is leaving the country because the Government wouldn't let him run his egg farm the best way he knew how.

It's the law, all right. But it's crazy.

## Address by the National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in these critical times there is greater need than ever before for the American people to inform themselves and to debate the problems confronting our country. In a recent address before a Boston, Mass., audience, Hon. Preston Moore, national commander of the American Legion, made an outstanding contribution in this field. I am sure all Americans will find his remarks of particular interest, and am, therefore, including the full text of this timely and important address in the RECORD. It follows:

ADDRESS BY PRESTON J. MOORE, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1959

Theodore Roosevelt, looking into the future a half century ago, made this statement:

"The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and the love of soft living."

Nikita Khrushchev, addressing the nations of the West in a more recent day, declared: "We will bury you."

Roosevelt spoke out of love for America, Khrushchev out of hate. I suggest we consider this evening whether by disregarding the warning of the one we are lending substance to the threat of the other.

As national commander of the American Legion, I speak for men and women who care greatly for their country. We do not have all of the facts and intelligence that are available to those high in Government. We do not profess to have nearly all of the answers. But we do have eyes and ears and a right to insist that national policies reflect the people's will and command the people's understanding.

Many of us seriously doubt that current national policy in the field of security and international affairs meets either of these standards. On the contrary, there appears to be a desire to blunt the people's will and to spare us full knowledge of the danger we face.

Our Government worries, and with reason, about the impression it makes upon peoples abroad. Let us hope that it has equal concern about the impression it makes upon its own people. For the image that is beginning to take shape now is one of indecision and drift.

Our leadership appears to be telling us in all earnestness that if we keep calm, guide right, and maintain 120 steps a minute, we'll march into a brighter tomorrow.

I submit that something more is required.

The Soviet Union is committed by word and deed to world domination. The United States, for all practical purposes, stands alone in her path. If communism is to be stopped, the superior forces—moral and physical—must come from us.

The advantage at the start of the cold war 12 years ago was clearly ours. While the Soviet Union looted and enslaved conquered lands, our policy was to rehabilitate and liberate. Russia's economy lay partially devastated; ours was unscarred and primed for pent-up peacetime demands. We had the bomb; Russia did not.

Today, by any objective measure, the advantage has swung the other way. The Kremlin has added to her domain, without bloodying a single Russian division, vast territories and hundreds of millions of subjects. Her prestige and influence in still neutral countries have increased; ours have waned. In the newly decisive field of space exploration, she has produced results exceeding our best efforts. The bomb of 1947 now takes the form of the intercontinental ballistic missile—the ultimate weapon. Russia has it; we don't.

The how and why of this incredible shift in the balance of power can be argued, perhaps to good purpose, in another day. There is no time for it now. Clearly, the important—the imperative—need is for an all-out national effort to make up lost ground.

The American people, I am convinced, are aware of this need and braced to meet it. Most of us expected that the summons would come with the convening of Congress and the announcement of the administration's new program.

Yet when it came, with the shock of the Soviet moon shot still reverberating and with responsible sources attesting to the depth of our peril, what did it tell us? It told us that the most important thing we have to do is balance the budget. It told us that we can solve our defense problem for the next year by spending exactly what we can afford to spend within the limits of normal income.

Now this could result from nothing more that a remarkable coincidence. There is mounting evidence, however, that it actually resulted from a willingness to subordinate defense to dollars.

The Rockefeller studies group, a nonpartisan advisory unit, recommended in 1958 an immediate increase of $3 billion for defense and similar increases each year for the following 6 years. The defense budget now before the Congress proposes not an increase but a reduction of one-fourth billion dollars from the current year's total.

Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau is Chief of Research and Development for the U.S. Army. In a public address on January 14 of this year, he stated: "We can't compete in quantity with the manpower of the Soviet bloc, so it is necessary to be superior in weapons and material * * * we don't have the funds to develop one-third of the projects that are presented to us."

The Soviet military threat, now and for the indefinite future, lies in intercontinental aircraft and missiles. It stands to reason that an effective deterrent force must be built around the same type of weapons.

Last spring the Congress appropriated a supplemental fund of $90 million earmarked for ICBM development. Not 1 cent of that fund was spent.

In recent months the men responsible for our missile program have admitted that the Russians are ahead of us in this crucial race. While estimates of the Soviet lead vary, there is agreement that we are behind and that it will take from 1 to 3 years of intensive effort to catch up.

And yet, the President's current budget request for missile procurement is $600 million less than last year's.

How are we to understand and support such a program? If balancing the budget is our No. 1 objective, then it's dead on target. But if our prime goal is to regain the balance of striking power as insurance against Soviet attack, then it spells deadly peril for America.

Prosperity at the price of national sovereignty is a bad buy.

Of course, the package is not being presented in just that way. It comes wrapped in assurances of our overall capabilities and coated with references to our great industrial and scientific potential. The magazine, Aviation Week, in its issue of February 2, observed: "* * * There is a somewhat pathetic attempt to substitute bold ringing phrases in the budget message for the vital dollars and priorities in the budget itself."

Gen. Curtis Lemay, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, recently told a congressional committee that he believes any general war will be won or lost within 2 or 3 days by forces in uniform when it breaks out. I question very seriously whether in deciding to launch such a war the Soviet leaders would be deterred one bit by the retaliatory power of balanced budgets and unbuilt missiles.

Another aspect of this limited defense planning that challenges public understanding is the role of the Chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Each of these distinguished military leaders has dutifully testified that the requested program is generally adequate. According to the Secretary of Defense, they even endorsed in writing the spending totals approved by the Pentagon and Budget Bureau, with some reservations.

How deep those reservations are, we do not know. We do know, from their own testimony, that each requested a larger total as a minimum need for his respective service and that their requests were whittled down first in the Pentagon and then again by the noted military strategists in the Bureau of the Budget.

The one authoritative spokesman who broke ranks in public, to my knowledge, was Mr. Roy Johnson, Chief of the Advanced Research Projects Agency within the Defense Department. Under questioning before the Senate Preparedness Committee, Mr. Johnson stated that his original budget request was cut 30 percent before it reached Congress. He said it was his personal conviction that an additional $150 million should be provided for the total space effort.

Information of this kind, in my opinion, is due the Congress and the people. Sure, it rocks the boat. But if rocking is needed to make the boat go, then we can stand lots more of it.

What is at stake now is not bureaucratic harmony—not political advantage—not the peace of mind of fiscal experts—but the peace of the world and America's survival.

This is not my conclusion. It is the hard, inescapable fact of the times in which we live.

A bipartisan committee of the House of Representatives, after studying the space exploration field all of last year, reported as follows:

"Outer space is fast becoming the heart and soul of advanced military science. It constitutes at once the greatest threat and defense of man's existence on earth. Only a bold and dynamic program employing the total talents and the greatest strength of the United States and its friends is competent to meet a challenge so overwhelming."

And the committee raised this clear warning: "The strategic balance of power can shift to the nation first achieving operational usability of new scientific developments. Neglect of new developments may create a time of weakness for a nation long enough for a strong rival to overwhelm and destroy it."

Whether through neglect or a wrong guess or what-have-you, our time of weakness is here. A policy of business almost as usual can only prolong and increase our vulnerability.

The Communists have tried for years to make the world believe that Americans worship only the dollar. Now, after giving away billions of dollars to our friends and some of our enemies with practically no strings attached, it would be a tragic thing to prove the Communists right at the expense of our national defense.

Fighting the cold war is expensive. The American people know that. Fighting it to win will be more and more expensive. We're ready for that, too.

But what of the peace talk? Lately, we've been hearing it from all sides: "The Russians aren't so bad—we've got to get along with them sooner or later * * * all Mikoyan wants is free trade * * * why spend all this money on an arms race, anyway?"

Mr. Khrushchev said he will bury us, and I believe he means to try. Mr. Mikoyan's visit was intended to serve, and did serve, that purpose.

Mikoyan used our airwaves and front pages to preach the Red gospel and blame tensions on our leaders. He told us there was no reason why his country and ours couldn't be friends, if only our leaders would play fair. When questioned about the fate of 11 American airmen unreported since their transport plane went down in Soviet Armenia, he complained that we didn't trust him. Mikoyan knew the answer to that question. While pretending to speak for mutual understanding and good faith, he knew our Government had absolute proof that Soviet fighter pilots used that unarmed plane for target practice and sent it crashing in flames.

Mikoyan no doubt succeeded in influencing world opinion against America. Perhaps there are some in our own land who now hope for good results from negotiations and treaties with the Communists. For my part, I pray that whoever represents the United States at such meetings will remember well the radio conversation of Soviet pilots closing in for the kill:

"The target is burning, 582 * * * look at him, he will not get away, he is already falling * * * I will finish him off, boys, I will finish him off on the run."

Do we advance the interests of America when we attempt to do business with these people? Or do we solicit peace at any price?

Russia wages the cold war all the time on all fronts. The worldwide pressures we must meet come not only in the military and space lines but also in the psychological, economic, and social fields. They all require expert, aggressive handling and they all require substantial expenditures.

The return on our investment in some cases seems pitifully small. In others—the military assistance program, for example—we have received far more than we have given.

Our military assistance program has made possible the organization, training, and arming of the present NATO forces. If we had to provide the same degree of security that our NATO European allies are providing for the United States, we would have to spend an additional $2½ billion a year just for the pay of personnel in combat forces. If we had to supply the manpower now furnished NATO by European allies, we would have to more than double the active-duty strength of our Military Establishment.

More important, we maintain through NATO a series of missile and aircraft bases that we would not otherwise have. Today, these advanced bases represent a very large part of our Sunday punch.

Those who will soon be flashing their economy knives at this program also ignore or forget the fact that our military help is predicated upon self-help. The 12 European countries which have received military assistance have spent more than eight times the dollar value of equipment we have supplied them.

By our standards, Spain is a poverty-stricken nation. Yet, the Spanish people support five divisions of troops. We would be foolish indeed not to join them in a mutual security effort.

I have tried to summarize in simple terms the enormous challenge we face at this moment. No matter how you size it up, there is no soft, easy, economical way to keep America the home of the free and brave.

We can afford to do what we have to do.

If higher taxes are needed for a realistic defense effort, the people will pay them. If it takes a compulsory program of belt-tightening, let's have it. We can do too much, and live with the consequences. If we do too little, Mr. Khrushchev will execute our will.

Six years ago, the then national commander pledged to President Eisenhower the prayers and understanding of American Legionnaires as he assumed the Presidential responsibilities. I renew that pledge today. The men and women who served with him in World War I and under him in World War II and Korea would not add to his burden. We ask, instead, that he add to ours.

We are a mature, competitive people. Our faith is firm and our spirit strong. A generous God has blessed us with bountiful resources. Let us assert our power now—boldly and vigorously—in the place where danger lies.

## Big Savings Shown in Switch From Oil Heat to Anthracite Coal Heating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of Monday, March 9, 1959:

PLANT CHIEF SWITCHES TO COAL—AMAZED AT SAVINGS IN HEAT COST

The president of a Taylor, Pa., textile plant decided that his plant was spending too much for oil heat. He called on a local coal producer, the Moffat Coal Co., and inquired about hard coal heat.

As a result of data furnished by the Moffat Co., the textile plant decided to try automatic anthracite. A fire jet was soon installed, and the textile man waited to observe the results.

After noting the savings that coal brought about for the first 3-month period, Mr. J. W. Smith, president of the Lackawanna Textile Co., dictated a letter to the president of the Moffat Coal Co.

"We are amazed," he wrote, "at the savings in the cost of heating our factory by the use of rice anthracite and feel that you would be interested in the following com-

parative costs: During the 3-month periods of November 1 through January 31 in the years of 1956, 1957, 1958, we paid $1,543, $1,755, and $1,836 for No. 2 fuel oil to heat our factory.

"After we switched to anthracite, for the same period November 1, 1958 to January 31, 1959, we paid only $1,105.65 for heat." This figure is all the more remarkable because the number of degree days for the coal heat period was 13 percent higher than similar period in the previous heating season.

If the degree day increase were applied to the last oil-heat year, the cost for oil would have been $2,075.29, instead of $1,836, which means that coal heat for the 3-month period would have cost less than half as much.

## Has Blight Fallen on "Wearing of the Green"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article of interest to Irish readers, by the Very Reverend Monsignor Francis J. Lally, which appeared in the Pilot, published in Boston, Mass., on March 14, 1959:

HAS BLIGHT FALLEN ON "WEARING OF THE GREEN"?

(By Very Rev. Msgr. Francis J. Lally)

I have never been in Ireland on St. Patrick's Day, but I am informed that it is a Holyday of Obligation and a legal holiday as well.

An inquiry from your paper suggests that Irish readers may have some interest in the way the day is observed elsewhere, and especially the popular attitude toward it in America. For my part, I can only speak of the part of our country that I know best which is Massachusetts with its neighboring States, and the predominantly Irish flavor of so much of this area makes the day and its celebration somewhat significant.

There has been some observance of St. Patrick's Day in our part of the world since the Irish first came here in large numbers over one hundred years ago. In a sense we may say that it was observed from the earliest days of the Republic when General Washington, out of consideration for the Irishmen serving in his army, used the name of the Saint as the password in Boston on March 17, 1776.

In later years the celebration had a decidedly religious flavor with solemn Masses and appropriate sermons in the morning with a parish party of some kind in the evening. Along with this there were many galas of one kind or another, also with a good deal of speechmaking, under the auspices of the local Irish societies. It was traditionally a festive day, and it had its full share of sentiment and nostalgic references to the "old country."

For the most part, in those times, it was men and women born in Ireland, or their children, who arranged the celebrations and they doubtless partook of much of the quality of similar activities at home.

The passing years have not been kind to the old familiar gatherings; they have changed their ways as indeed those taking part in them have also changed. St. Patrick's Day is now something halfway between Mardi Gras and Hallowe'en and, like the two of these, only a small percentage of those involved in its celebration understand any of its religious significance.

Radio and television, merchants and advertisers, all allow anyone who can get himself into something green and speak with what passes for an Irish accent to have his say on St. Patrick's Day.

In the meantime, of course, there has developed the so-called civic celebration. One may wonder why the civil authorities feel an interest in a religious holiday but, in Boston at least, they use it as civic excuse for a St. Patrick's observance. It was on March 17 that the British were driven from Boston by American forces and, since this was a step forward in the achievement of American freedom, we have a proper title for rejoicing.

Not many people these days, however, think much about the retreating British on March 17, and in the course of the oratory a reference to "perfidious Albion" takes care of that part of the observance. For the rest, there is generous praise of Irish virtues and Irish valor, and this is also likely to have a more historic than contemporary emphasis.

We should mention also the parades. Several cities have St. Patrick's Day parades, and the one in New York is famous. In Boston the parade makes its way through the less elegant thoroughfares of the city keeping carefully to that section which once boasted an almost total Irish population, but which now, with changing economic and social conditions, contains a rather mixed middle income population.

From an impartial judgment, one would have to admit that the principal excellence of this parade is the presence of several topnotch Catholic Youth Organization bands; without these it would be tedious indeed. By tradition it does bring out many prominent political figures, some of whom, it appears, know very little more about St. Patrick than his name. The New York parade, by contrast, marches up Fifth Avenue, but even here observers have been critical in latter years of what is traditionally a high quality parade.

This brings us to the point where we must acknowledge that the last years have seen the expression from many quarters of a general dissatisfaction with much of the observance which surrounds St. Patrick's Day. There are, of course, many very well conducted ceremonies, especially those sponsored by organizations of Irish background and interest. Also we must mention the efforts of church authorities to restore the religious observance to its central place, which is bound to have a good effect. In spite of all of this, the public ritual which emanates from press, and radio and television, from advertising and professional comedians, from civic celebrations at various levels, and should know better, is very nearly appalling.

Five years ago this time the Catholic Free Press of Worcester published in its pages a letter from St. Patrick himself in which he mentioned certain dissatisfactions with our local celebration. Among other things he spoke of the "waves of oratory flooding St. Patrick's Day." St. Anthony, who appeared to be discussing the topic with the saint of Erin, suggested an old Italian proverb which says "Passata le festa, garbato il santo." Speaking then of St. Anthony, "I know he remembers election day on St. Patrick's Day, but on election day does he remember St. Patrick—and that flaming integrity, passionate faith, stubborn fidelity and purity which are Patrick's heritage to the Irish and to the world." The implication is precisely what you are thinking.

A couple of years ago Father Manton, the eloquent redemptorist of Boston's famed Mission Church, touched upon this topic in his characteristic and picturesque way by referring to the "bogus bogtrotters," "the sham shamrocks," "the psycho Patricks," and "the synthetic Sinn Feiners." Just a year ago the Pilot, of Boston, with all of its Irish history, called for a new look in the observance of the annual feast of St. Patrick. This was the tenor of its language:

"The stage Irishman at his worst was no more stupid and offensive than the TV Irishman who has now unhappily succeeded him. Some of this must seem to be amusing to some people in America—for those who can claim any Irish ancestry it is most unfunny. The Irish should be mature enough to enjoy a laugh or two at their own expense—this we would allow—but to be mocked in terms of bucolic idiocy is too much.

"Somehow the word has spread about that it is profitable for merchants and practical for politicians to drape themselves in green and to talk and act in general as if those of Irish origin by some kind of fantastic miracle became simple-minded children just for the day, preoccupied with nothing more serious than extravagant emotions about Ireland. If this ever made any sense, and that is to be doubted, it makes sense no longer and the Irish should have the wits to know when they are being ridiculed and insulted in terms of what should be and properly is a dignified and glorious tradition.

"In simple terms, let us see some dignity and respect enter upon a celebration, now very near a mockery, which marks the feast of one of Christianity's greatest missionaries and which is intended to honor a historic people who deserve better."

Now there are many people who have an explanation of our problem in simple social terms: the Irish in America are merely coming of age. It is, however, not so easy to dispose of as that. No one pretends that the Irish in America have not been prompt to take advantage of the social mobility characteristic of our country, and there is no question about tastes changing with a change of status. We do not speak of this. The celebrations on March 17 in times past suited the people they were intended for; they were very often simple but they were not vulgar; they may have been sentimental, but they were not ridiculous; they doubtless were not professional, but they were not contrived for the convenience of politicians.

Without suggesting that we become stuffy about the whole business, it is possible for us to restore dignity and sincerity to what has become mere sham and sentiment. The real Ireland, so familiar to her friends, is better served by this refocusing of values now too long delayed.

When we can manage to persuade Americans that Ireland is not a semimagical island, populated by light-hearted and by light-headed people, it will be easier for them to take seriously the impressive role she is now assuming as a leader among the smaller nations of the world.

## Sensible Proposals on the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the growing body of favorable response throughout the country to the plan advanced by several Members of this House to create an orderly and systematic plan for paying off the national debt, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Courier-Times-Telegraph, of Tyler, Tex., on March 8:

[From the Tyler (Tex.) Courier-Times-Telegraph, Mar. 8, 1959]

SENSIBLE PROPOSALS ON THE NATIONAL DEBT

Two youthful Texas Congressmen have introduced a bill in Congress that offers a slow but sure solution of the financial dilemma that faces our Federal Government on the issue of the national debt.

At the end of February, our national public debt stood at the staggering figure of $285,495,075,863—and that, ladies and gentlemen, is just about $285.5 billion, if the long string of numerals throws you.

Representatives JAMES C. WRIGHT, of Fort Worth, and FRANK N. IKARD, of Wichita Falls, are authors of the new bill. It is a simple one.

It would require the Secretary of the Treasury, by law, to budget a 1 percent payment on the national debt every year.

It would not preclude, of course, a larger payment when such larger payment was made possible by surpluses—which are rarities in these days of big Government.

Approval of this bill, plus adoption of a pay-as-you-go plan for the Federal Government similar to that used by the State of Texas and several other States and long urged by this newspaper, would be big steps forward in putting our Nation back on a sound fiscal footing.

With only the 1 percent payment made every year, we would be out of the red ink in 100 years. That's 1 percent per year on the present debt, of course. Payment of 1 percent per year on the balance would leave more than $100 billion still due at the end of a century, and mathematically the debt could never be retired in this manner.

By making a payment of $2.85 billion a year for a whole century, we can correct the mess we've gotten our Government into in the relatively short span of less than 30 years.

Representatives IKARD and WRIGHT have come up with some rather astounding figures in applying the rule of common sense to our national debt—an approach, let us hasten to add, that is all too rare in governmental circles.

As you must surely know, it takes a whopping amount of money every year from our national budget just to service the debt we've already accumulated—that means pay the interest on it. Payment of this interest now makes up the second largest item in the national budget—second only to the national defense.

You may not believe this, but the cold figures as cited by Messrs. WRIGHT and IKARD prove it:

"If we pay 1 percent of the present debt each year for 100 years, plus interest on the balance, it will cost us a total of $778 billion to retire the debt completely.

"If we pay nothing but the interest on the debt each year for 100 years—and our Government has to do that—we will pay out a total amount of $980 billion in 100 years, and still have that same $285.5 billion debt hanging over the heads of our great-grandchildren."

This mandatory debt retirement policy, plus a mandatory requirement of a balanced budget in each subsequent fiscal year after this one, would constitute one of the cheapest and soundest investments this country ever could make in our national defense against communism.

Why?

It is well known that the Kremlin is depending upon the ultimate economic collapse of the Western democracies for final Communist victory. That is elemental Marx—let the capitalists spend their way into bankruptcy.

That is the "why" of the economic cold war.

Nothing can help an economy collapse more rapidly than a staggering load of debt. Ask any man in business—or ask anyone who has to struggle with a household budget.

Now our public debt could be retired more rapidly than can be accomplished through the Wright-Ikard proposal. And it should be, with adequate attention to the fact that overly drastice measures could likewise wreck our economy.

But the 1 percent per year retirement plan would be only an annual drop in the budget bucket. To make such a gentle approach to fiscal soundness mandatory is certainly good sense—with every effort also being put forth to increase the debt retirement payment when it can be logically done, as so often is the case.

The Wright-Ikard proposal should go hand in hand with a law—or constitutional amendment, if that be required—that would put the National Government on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The two would go far toward curing our hot national case of Federal fever. They would bulwark our Nation in what figures to be a long economic struggle with the Communist dictatorships. They make sound fiscal sense.

If you think these measures have merit, it might help if you clip this editorial and mail it to your Congressman and Senators with a note that you approve of them. If Congress gets a clear idea that this is the way American people feel about our mounting debt burden, chances are better that they will take action along the lines outlined here.

## China Mainland People Despise Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Dr. Dison Hsueh-feng Poe, of the Chinese delegation to the 10th session of the General Conference of UNESCO:

In the name of my government and of our delegation to the General Conference, I wish to express our heartfelt gratitude to the French Government and the French people for their warm reception and kind hospitality. We take pride in the fact that UNESCO is holding the 10th session of the General Conference in its new headquarters here in this illustrious city of Paris.

As you are aware, I am sure, Mr. President, we of the Chinese delegation have come a long way from a region where Communist guns for the past 2 months and more have been pounding some of our offshore islands. Just a few days ago, as the newspapers reported, 36,000 rounds of shells were hurled at our Quemoy (Kinmen) Islands within 6 hours. Does it not sound ironical that from this very rostrum we heard it described that the Communists on the mainland of China are peace loving?

Permit me to tell you, fellow delegates, that the Communist regime has been detested and hated by the 500 million people on our mainland. The Communist regime represents nobody but its alien master; it is un-Chinese in origin, and un-Chinese in nature and purpose.

Do we have proofs? Yes, fellow delegates, plenty of proofs. When the Chinese prisoners-of-war in the camps of the United Nations command in Korea were asked whether they wished to return to the so-called happy Communist China, 14,000 of them, that is, 75 percent of the total number of Chinese prisoners-of-war, chose to go to Taiwan (Formosa), free China. Such a fact is clear proof of whom the Chinese people really prefer and of who represents China.

There is another indication. All these years there has been a steady, continuing flow of refugees fleeing from the China mainland to nearby Hong Kong and other parts of the free world. What does this mean? It means this: Refugees are people who vote with their feet. That is to say, the oppressed Chinese on our mainland, being unable to change their regime by ballot, have no alternative to a geographical change.

One more unmistakable illustration may be given. The number of overseas Chinese students going to Taiwan from southeast Asia for the purpose of pursuing higher education is steadily increasing year by year. At present there is a total number of 10,000 overseas Chinese students in Taiwan. On the other hand, the number of overseas Chinese students going to the Communist mainland is greatly decreasing each year.

Suffice it to say, the 500 million Chinese on our mainland, deep in their hearts, want my government to represent them.

One word more. My government is the legitimate government of China, freely chosen by the 500 million people on the mainland. True, the Kuomingtang is the dominant party, the party in power. But our legislative assembly consists of members of different parties. Certain delegates seem to imagine that by mere repetitious distortion they can turn white to black. No. One hundred lies cannot add up to a single truth.

Mr. President, it is duty to my government and loyalty to UNESCO that compels me to deplore the obnoxious attempts made, and the provocative and slanderous things said, by delegates of the Soviet clique.

I shall now turn to a brief presentation of the progress in the Republic of China of educational, cultural, and scientific work. According to the constitution of our Republic, not less than 15 percent of the national budget, not less than 25 percent of the provincial budget, and not less than 35 percent of the local budget are to be spent on education. Despite financial difficulties at trying times like these, my government has each year fulfilled these constitutional requirements. This fact demonstrates how much importance my government attaches to educational, cultural, and scientific work.

As a result of our continuous exertion, our educational development at different levels may stand comparison with that of any country. Quantitatively, here are some statistical figures. Ninety-five percent of our children of school age are attending primary schools. Relative to the whole population, 152 out of every 1,000 are primary pupils; 30 out of every 1,000 are middle-school students; and 3 out of every 1,000 are college and university students.

Qualitatively, we have also taken strides forward, in the training of better teachers, in the improved methods of teaching, in the bringing up to date of teaching materials, in the revision of the curriculum for institutions of high learning, etc. The most noteworthy point is that Chinese education, stemming from Chinese culture, teaches the respect for human dignity and human worth, stresses individual morality and social ethics, and champions justice and peace. Such an educational program is completely in line with what UNESCO proclaims to be its purposes and objectives.

Need I add here parenthetically that the Communist regime on mainland China is doing just the opposite? The Communists there are doing everything possible to destroy human dignity, to deny human worth, to uproot morality and ethics and, in a word, to undo Chinese culture.

As to the preservation of the visible, tangible forms of our glorious ancient heritage, such as rare books, ancient manuscripts, and

precious works of art, I am glad to inform you that over 90 percent of these priceless treasures have been removed to, and preserved in Taiwan. Taiwan has verily become the living symbol and the true center of Chinese culture. And here again shall I not remind you that the mainland Communists are doing the very opposite, such as burning ancient books and even mutilating our written language? Ladies and gentlemen, is it not queer to hear the question raised as to who is, or what is, representative of the Chinese?

In the carrying out of UNESCO programs and activities such as the exchange of publications and the exchange of students and scholars, my government has also done its part to the best of its ability. The UNESCO scholarships granted to Chinese students, though scanty in number, are made the best use of. We have also sent representatives and contributed our ideas to the different UNESCO regional conferences. UNESCO's cooperation with China in the promotion of our science education, in the holding of public exhibitions, and in the translation into Chinese of UNESCO publications is very much appreciated by us. Our hope is that in years to come UNESCO's cooperation with us will become increasingly closer in ways many and varied.

Speaking of UNESCO programs and activities from now on, may I venture to suggest that the Organization should concentrate its endeavor to the main purpose and function for which UNESCO has been brought into being. Let me quote from the preamble of the constitution: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed. * * * The great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality, and mutual respect of men * * * (and UNESCO is created) for the purpose of advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its charter proclaims."

UNESCO, Mr. President, was founded on recognition of the vast diversity of traditions and cultures. One of its preliminary functions is to find a common ground for understanding between diverse philosophies and systems. This is manifested in particular by UNESCO's major project on mutual appreciation of eastern and western cultural values.

Before we can have mutual appreciation of eastern and western cultural values we should seek first of all to ascertain what eastern or western cultural values are. Now eastern cultures are many and diverse. There is no gainsaying, however, that Chinese culture is a dominant type of eastern culture. The essence of Chinese culture is embodied in the teachings of Confucius. There is the Doctrine of the Golden Mean. There is the cardinal principle of benevolence and righteousness. There is the established convention of five relationships in human society, namely, the relationships between the governor and the governed, between father and son, between husband and wife, between brothers, and between friends. There is the universal ideal to cultivate moral virtue oneself, to keep the family relationship healthy and sound, to govern the nation wisely, and to bring peace to the whole world.

Where are these Chinese cultural values to be found today? They are to be found in free China, where my Government and our people are cherishing these values and are endeavoring to translate ideal into action. On the China mainland under the Communist regime, these traditional Chinese cultural values are being liquidated by an alien force. Indeed, the Communist regime denies everything Chinese. It is un-Chinese. Nay, it is anti-Chinese. For instance, there is no intellectual freedom whatever on China mainland. If anyone entertains doubt about my statement, please find out for his own satisfaction what has happened to the hundred flowers in Mao Tse-tung's garden.

Chinese culture, Mr. President, is basically moderate, self-respecting, and peaceloving. It is opposed to regimentation and aggression. It aims at unity, not uniformity. Unity is cohesive and leads to human solidarity and peace. Uniformity, on the other hand, is coercive and leads to social conflicts and war.

The traditional Chinese way of life is to attain harmony and peace. Its inner norm is the natural law, so splendidly described by Mencius. The Communist way of life is exactly the opposite. The Chinese are at peace within themselves, with the social order, with the universe and with God. Indeed, something like this may be said: if one is honest and a Communist, he is not Chinese. If one is Chinese and a Communist, he is not honest. If one is Chinese and honest, he cannot be a Communist. The Communist regime on China mainland is certainly only a passing phase.

The Chinese delegation realizes that great progress has been made with regard to the major project of mutual appreciation of East and West. However, one cannot deny that China assumes a major role in the cultural system of the East. No cultural program will be adequate and effective without the active participation of China, especially in the planning and formation of the project. It is with real regret we say that the Republic of China is not represented on the advisory body. Some kind of remedy should be, and I hope, will be made.

In conclusion, I wish to make one more observation. The promotion of international morality should receive the joint attention and deserve the common endeavor of Unesco. As a term, international morality is perhaps out-moded. In substance, international morality serves as the only solid foundation of international law and international peace. Mere scientific development, and mere material progress do not suffice to bring salvation to mankind. As a matter of fact, there is the same central core in Eastern, as well as in Western, cultures. For instance, there is very much in common in Confucianism and Christianity. It is only with the untiring, unceasing promotion of international morality that hypocrisy and aggression and war may be averted.

## That Glorious Apostle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to include an article honoring St. Patrick which appeared in the Lawrence, Mass., Sunday Sun on March 15, 1959.

The late Attorney John P. S. Mahoney, the writer of this excellent editorial entitled "That Glorious Apostle," which originally appeared in the Telegram-Sun of Lawrence, Mass., on March 17, 1929, 30 years ago, was not only editor and publisher of the Telegram-Sun but he was also one of the most able, capable, and outstanding trial lawyers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during his lifetime. He was an energetic, forceful, and dynamic leader in the civic and municipal affairs of his home city, Lawrence, Mass., loved, respected, and admired by all of us in that community.

The article follows:

THAT GLORIOUS APOSTLE

(An extract from an editorial by the late John P. S. Mahoney, editor and publisher of the Telegram-Sun, St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1929)

Irishmen the world over do well to celebrate the birth of St. Patrick, whose noble work has done more to mould the Irish character than any other influence. For what would the Irishmen be without that undying religious fervor which still lives in the hearts of all true Celts. That reverence for all that is holy and sacred which is one of the marked characteristics of our race springs from the soil which St. Patrick blessed.

It is that deep respect for the teaching of that holy apostle of the Emerald Isle which has enabled the Irish race to hold fast to those fundamental principles of morality which are accorded to it by all who have studied their national characteristics. Then let us say, "All hail to that glorious apostle."

The celebration of St. Patrick's Day is peculiar, in that it is not only a religious celebration, but a patriotic one. It is interesting to know that the earliest celebration of St. Patrick's Day in America, of which a record has been found, took place in 1737. On March 17 of that year, the Charitable Irish Society was organized in Boston by a number of leading Irish Protestants, the same society, which is still in existence, but without any religious qualifications, the society now being almost wholly composed of Catholic members. From this time on until the Revolutionary War St. Patrick was honored by Irishmen in America. It is again interesting to know that the British evacuated Boston on St. Patrick's Day, 1776, and the Americans took possession under command of Sullivan who had been put in charge that day. Washington in the camp at Cambridge authorized as parole for the day "Boston" with countersign "St. Patrick."

St. Patrick anniversary meetings ought to be inspiring, encouraging, filled with hope for the future. Although the Irishman is the product of Ireland, his field of operation, unlike the native of most other countries has been the wide world. What the Irishman has been prevented from accomplishing in his own country, he has accomplished in others. Most men achieve greatness in their native land. The laws of most countries of the world are made for the benefit of their citizens, protecting their rights, fostering their industries, and developing the genius of their sons. Ireland's story is the only exception to that rule. The Irishman alone has had to transplant his genius from his native soil to cultivate it in new and unknown lands.

## Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been much interested in the newly

independent nation of Ghana and I contacted the International Cooperation Administration to obtain information thereon. Because I felt that each Member of Congress should be apprised of the response, I have requested permission to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Guilford Jameson's letter of February 27, 1959. It follows:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., February 27, 1959.*

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSSMAN CURTIS: This is in further reply to your letter of January 27, 1959, inclosing a page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing certain observations by Mr. GROSS. You had previously called Mr. Smith's attention to Mr. GROSS' statement during a January breakfast meeting at the SOS Club.

Mr. GROSS states that Prime Minister Nkrumah calls himself a Marxist Socialist and that he has recently purchased a $750,000 yacht from the British which will be used to entertain distinguished foreign visitors. He further states that Prime Minister Nkrumah received the red carpet treatment when he came to Washington on a money raising junket.

It should be pointed out that Mr. Nkrumah as Prime Minister of the newly independent nation of Ghana, came to the United States as an invited guest of this Government and was extended the usual courtesies extended to heads of foreign governments while here as official guests. Prior to his visit to the United States, he had been the official guest of the United Kingdom. Subsequently, he paid an official call on Prime Minister Nehru in New Delhi.

While questions of economic aid were discussed with the Prime Minister during his stay here last July, his trip was essentially a good will mission and not for the purpose of money raising. As is the case with a number of other less developed countries in Africa, the United States is providing Ghana with limited assistance through the technical cooperation program. This assistance is primarily aimed at overcoming Ghana's shortage of technical and administrative manpower needed to improve the functions of government and to increase the ability of Ghana to raise the living standards of its people.

It is true that Prime Minister Nkrumah calls himself a Marxist Socialist. We believe, however, that the actions taken by his Government are more significant than what he calls himself. Since achieving independence, Ghana has demonstrated its eagerness to attract both foreign and domestic capital into private investment and has taken legal and administrative steps to foster this end.

The yacht *Radiant* was purchased in December 1958 for use as a training vessel for Ghana's new nautical college and will be manned by members of its faculty. Whether or not it will also be used for entertaining visitors we do not know. The ship is berthed in Ghana's only present port capable of handling a vessel of its size, Takoradi, 142 miles from the capital. No U.S. assistance was given in the purchase of the vessel and no naval training is offered under the technical cooperation program. There is no U.S. military assistance program for Ghana.

Ghana is a country friendly to the United States. It is exerting a strong influence on the future course of political development in a continent now in ferment, whose people and resources may play a vital role in the history of the next several decades. Prime Minister Nkrumah was educated in the United States and remembers this country with fondness and respect.

Independence, though highly prized, presents recently freed peoples with many new problems of governmental policy and program. All of the actions of the Government of Ghana are not, nor could they be expected to be, actions which the U.S. Government would take. In its 2 years of independence, Ghana has, however, carefully husbanded its economic development resources. The United States through its technical cooperation program is helping to reinforce Ghana's own plans and ambitions toward raising the living standards of its people.

Sincerely,

GUILFORD JAMESON,
*Deputy Director for Congressional Relations.*

## United Mine Workers of America Highly Displeased Over West Germany's Tax on Coal Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Hazelton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of Monday, March 9, 1959:

KENNEDY SAYS UMWA FAR FROM PLEASED SINCE WEST GERMANY TAXED COAL IMPORTS

The United Mine Workers of America, like American coal producers and exporters, is far from placated since West Germany slapped a $4.76-ton tax on coal imports from this country, UMWA Vice President Thomas Kennedy said yesterday.

Kennedy made the statement in the wake of published reports abroad that affected American interests have been "reasonably placated" since the import duty was imposed by the West German Government last month.

"The words 'reasonably placated,'" asserted Kennedy, "also are definitely contrary to the truth insofar as the United Mine Workers are concerned." He added that "the UMWA and the coal industry are on the contrary even more resentful than ever before at what can only be considered an arrogant breach of contract."

The UMWA official cited a recent statement by UMWA President John L. Lewis in which he vigorously protested against the import duty, pointing out that "motivation on the part of the German Government is political in nature and not, in itself, economic," adding: "Germany is planning to increase its trade with Russia, East Germany, and Poland on a barter basis and now has pending requests from Russia for additional barter deals."

Kennedy stressed that the coal industry was in dire need of its export business; the railroads needed the revenue derived from shipping the coal to the east coast and the "impoverished and unemployed coal miners and railroad workers are in dire need of thee employment dependent upon this export business."

Reiterating that the UMWA was not placated, Kennedy said that "in fact, we are, if possible, more determined than ever before that the Government of the United States should use every means at its disposal to urge the removal of this prohibitive tax on an American product which can be sold in Germany cheaper than the Germans can produce it themselves."

## East-West Trade Fight Lurks in Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article entitled "East-West Trade Fight Lurks in Berlin Crisis," which appeared in the March 15 Los Angeles Times.

I believe this article, written by Robert Hartmann, Times Washington bureau chief, assesses very well the meaning and goal of the Soviet trade offensive and its overall significance in the Communist struggle for world dominance, and will be of interest to the Congress.

EAST-WEST TRADE FIGHT LURKS IN BERLIN CRISIS—COMMERCE MAY BE SECRET WEAPON OF KHRUSHCHEV AT SUMMIT CONFERENCE

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—Just below the surface of the Berlin controversy, all but drowned out by its melodramatic overtones of countdown and showdown, is a question even more complex and divisive: East-West trade.

Commerce, rather than an unknown number of intercontinental missiles, may well turn out to be Khrushchev's secret weapon at the summit conference he—and it now appears Macmillan as well—is anxiously seeking with President Eisenhower.

The President will tell the Nation Monday that he does not expect war, large or small, over the Kremlin-created situation in East Germany. The other two leaders have been saying the same. Everybody wants to settle things by negotiation—the argument is who and where and when and what about.

SOMETHING MUST GIVE

In an international impasse, to use an old phrase, something's gotta give. Actually, unless one side gives under pressure of force, settlement by negotiation becomes a matter of two-way give and take.

President Eisenhower has flatly stated that the United States will not give one inch on its rights in West Berlin. The whole western alliance, while less adamant about the untenable old German capital itself, cannot yield West Germany to the Communists and survive. If we are not to fight, where do we give?

LEAVES NO DOUBTS

There is no doubt at all where Khrushchev wants the West to give. He has spelled it out as clearly as Hitler did.

"We will bury you," he warned, "not with bombs but with economic competition." Ruling half the world, he just might.

When Prime Minister Macmillan arrived in Moscow for his exploratory talks with Khrushchev, this is what the rigidly controlled Soviet press told the Soviet people: "Many Britons connect hope for the establishment of normal Anglo-Soviet commercial relations with Macmillan's journey. They understand that this would help Britain to put right its rather shaky economy. The British people, like all peace-loving peoples of the world, demand that the leaders of Britain and other western powers should strike a course of businesslike cooperation and peaceful coexistence with the U.S.S.R. and other Socialist countries."

HEARD TIME AGAIN

This might be taken for pure Pravda drivel if this report had not heard it substantially

paraphrased time and again by Englishmen thoroughly familiar with British Government objectives. It must always be remembered that Britain is a nation of traders to whom foreign commerce is not merely a bonus but an absolute necessity.

Trade is good in itself to an Englishman, while Americans can afford to consider both commodities and customers, and this accounts for the basic difference in the two nation's China policies from the opium wars to Quemoy.

In the closest parallel to Macmillan's reconnaissance in Russia since Khrushchev cooked up the Berlin crisis, Deputy Soviet Premier Mikoyan came to the United States (at Moscow's request) and hastened to assure Americans that May 27 was not intended as an ultimatum at all. Mikoyan is the Kremlin's top expert on trade or, more precisely, economic war.

VISITS BUSINESSMEN

Mikoyan put in most of his time here, not with the proletariat, but with U.S. businessmen who are interested in foreign markets. He failed to find the enthusiasm for free East-West trade that prevails in Britain (more among Macmillan's conservatives than the somewhat sterling bloc isolationist Laborites) and even Canada, but he betrayed his main mission on his last day in Washington.

TURNED DOWN COLD

Having endured Hungarian demonstrators and other democratic annoyances with something like a smile, Mikoyan really blew his stack when the big pitch he had been saving for the finale met with flat refusals from the two top U.S. officials in the foreign trade field.

First, C. Douglas Dillon, Undersecretary of State for economic affairs, turned Mikoyan down cold on his bid for U.S. financial credits, lowering of strategic restrictions and more trade with the Soviet Union. Word leaked from this closed-door meeting that Milkoyan was so mad he subjected Dillon to a storm of abuse quite out of character for an affable goodwill salesman, and his anger still showed in his National Press Club speech immediately afterward.

So well briefed was this top Communist official on American affairs that he tried again after lunch at the Department of Commerce, where a running jurisdictional feud has been going on between its foreign trade experts and Dillon's shop in the State Department. But Mikoyan got an even more frigid reception from the new Secretary of Commerce, Lewis L. Strauss, who quoted George Washington—a revolutionary more to his liking—and admonished the seminary-schooled atheist on religion.

LITTLE RELATION TO NEED

The intense desire of Khrushchev and Mikoyan to trade with the United States and do away with strategic controls imposed in 1947 and 1948 by Congress bears little direct relation to the Soviet Union's economic needs. If commerce were completely free it probably would not be in great volume, for the simple reason that Russia produces very little Americans want to buy.

The real reason is psychological—U.S. trade bans are a symbol the Soviets want to destroy. Then they can say to all free world countries who are wary of their offers: "Look, the Americans do business with us, why shouldn't you? Besides, we can beat their best price."

PRICE NO OBJECT

Undoubtedly they can, too, because price is really no object in the Soviet Union. The state produces everything and arbitrarily sets a price on it. Internally, this must bear some relation to cost with most commodities, but in foreign trade it is fixed to serve the purpose of each transaction. Official U.S quarters put it this way:

"The U.S.S.R. has always used trade as a political instrument to further its internal economic plans and foreign policy strategy. The state has a foreign trade monopoly and can bargain with individual buyers abroad. The basic Soviet objective has always been autarchy—self-sufficiency in order to improve its power position."

AIMS AT INDEPENDENCE

An official Soviet publication, Foreign Trade, has this to say:

"The main goal of Soviet import trade policy is to utilize foreign products and, above all, foreign machinery for the technological and economic independence of the U.S.S.R. The import policy of the U.S.S.R. is so organized that it aids the speediest freedom from imports."

As an example of this, before recognition the Soviet Union bought considerable quantities of tractors and trucks from American firms. With the help of American engineers, they built factories to duplicate these and other farm machines, and now they import none at all.

NO PROFIT MOTIVE

Using trade as a weapon of foreign policy, Khrushchev is unhampered by the British motive (profit) or the American need for secure sources of supply. The Soviets use trade to reward (Egypt, India, and now, perhaps, Britain), to punish (Yugoslavia, Finland), to infiltrate and disrupt (South America and Africa). The United States is almost the only major trading country which has not signed a trade agreement with Moscow.

In 1958, taking the Sino-Soviet bloc as a whole, 70 percent of its total trade was internal and 30 percent with the free world. But this was a significant gain from an 80 to 20 ratio when Stalin died.

TRADE NEVER LARGE

Direct United States-Soviet trade, except during the wartime lend-lease period for which the Russians never settled up, has never been large. U.S. imports (furs, chemicals) amounted in 1957 to $16,775,000 and U.S. exports (tallow, industrial machinery) to less than a third of this, $4,481,000. The Soviets made up the balance from their $4 billion gold reserves or through triangular trade.

The Soviet share of total world trade in 1957 was 3.6 percent, about the same as Czarist Russia had before World War I.

MAKE NO SECRET

British circles make no secret of their hope that a relaxation of East-West trade barriers will be a major result of any summit conference. On the American side, where the summit idea is less popular, here is what Secretary of Commerce Strauss has to say:

"The fact that a trade war is less dramatic than a shooting war does not mean its outcome would be less disastrous. Until very recently, world trade generally was in historic profit patterns. The sinister novelty introduced by the Kremlin is the use of trade solely as a political weapon. It is not in business for business but for economic warfare."

## St. Patrick's Day, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick is loved and admired the world over, but most of all, I think, by three nations: Ireland, whose apostle and patron saint he is; America, where his fame and glory have been growing since Revolutionary times; and Poland, where his stalwart faith and courage, his lifelong warfare on behalf of the enslaved and oppressed, seem to cry out for love and admiration and emulation. Some seem to think we do not know much about St. Patrick, just because we do not know the precise time and place of his birth, and are a little less than sure of the date of his death. But time and place, chronology and geography, are not the prime essentials of a man. What we need to know of St. Patrick is precisely what we do know, with the ringing clarity of a trumpet call. For we have from St. Patrick what is sadly lacking in the vast majority of the saints, his own words of exhortation and remonstrance, words in which his character appears plainly and even the tone of his voice seems to come through, and even an account of his life in his own words. Back in the fourth and fifth centuries, when St. Patrick lived and wrote, time seems to have meant less to people than it does today, and the only date we can be anything like sure of is the date of his death, March 17, 493—and some historians give dates as much as 30 years off from that. But we do know the facts of his life, as narrated in his autobiography, and his humility and piety, courage and vigor, as they appear in the manner of his narration.

The world knows well, and will never forget, that Patrick, seized by pirates and sold into slavery at the age of 16, served a heathen Irish master as herdsman for 6 years, escaped to the Continent, and, after long wanderings, returned to his home. May the world never forget, too, how the divine call came to Patrick, at home and in safety, to plunge himself again into the discomforts and dangers of pagan Ireland, and to save those very people who had been his masters. Whether at Auxerre or under St. Martin at Tours, he studied for the priesthood, was ordained, and sent as a missionary to Ireland, in accordance with his call and desire. With his burning love for God, and his self-sacrificing devotion to the people of Ireland, he threw himself heart and soul into the task of bringing his beloved people to the foot of the cross of Christ. In this task, he succeeded so completely that today, in the eyes of the world, the patriotism of Ireland, and the catholicity of Ireland, are alike personified and typified in the well-beloved figure of St. Patrick.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 49

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Lodi (Calif.) News-Sentinel on January 12, 1959, entitled "Fish Dying From River Pollutants":

FISH DYING FROM RIVER POLLUTANTS

Tens of thousands of young salmon are dying because of pollution of the waters of the Mokelumne River, according to Howard Babcock, president of Lodi Sportsmens Club.

Babcock, who was in the Camanche area of the river yesterday afternoon, said the stream "is in a bad state of pollution."

"Today," he said, "We lost tens of thousands of our little salmon fingerlings that had just hatched out—about an inch long, just out of the sac stage—due to this pollution.

"I looked at the river with a member of the fish and game department, and we found other fish dead besides salmon. Steelhead, sunfish, and every type of fish that was in the river.

LOOKED MILKY

"The river looked like somebody had poured milk in it, it was that white.

"I was told that some of the pollution was coming from the Penn Mines, and the other source was the Pacific Clay Products Co.

"If a sportsman is out fishing and they catch him with one fish over the limit, he's fined probably $25. Yet industry can pollute the stream and kill literally tens of thousands of fish.

"The fish and game department have the power to cite them for polluting a stream, but the most they ever fine them is $50—something like that.

URGES ORGANIZATION

Babcock urged that sportsmen "organize and pass the proper legislation to give the pollution control board laws with teeth in them to stop this."

"To do this is going to take a lot of work on the part of organized sportsmen throughout the entire State. But I believe it can be done."

Babcock said many streams throughout California are faced with severe pollution problems.

In addition to the tens of thousands of dead fish he saw yesterday, Babcock said that they are still dying right along.

"Many little fish were coming up to the surface for air.

"You see, what pollution does, besides putting poisonous chemicals in the water, it takes oxygen out of the water. They were coming up to the surface for oxygen."

The local sportsman, noting that Pardee Dam's outlow yesterday was only 50 cubic feet per second, said a greater outflow would dilute the harmful wastes, and thus give the fish a better chance to survive.

## The Columbia River Regional Library Demonstration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial by Mr. Wilfred R. Woods, editor and publisher of the Wenatchee Daily World, Wenatchee, Wash. In Mr. Woods' column "Talking it Over," he has some interesting and very readable comments on their regional library demonstration. The editorial follows:

TALKING IT OVER

(By Wilfred R. Woods)

There's a quite revolution going on in north central Washington.

It's a revolution without smoke and gunfire, where the weapons are paper and ink.

We refer to the change in reading habits that is taking place thanks to the experiment in library service being undertaken.

This experiment is the Columbia River regional library demonstration. It is the product of State and Federal funds, to demonstrate what can be done to provide first-rate library service to a widely scattered population.

And this is exactly what is happening: first-rate service is being provided.

The figures of growth tell the story. There was a 68-percent increase in book use during April to November of last year over the same period of the previous year. A total of 444,596 books were circulated during these months of 1958 as against 263,892 in 1957.

Omar Bacon, head of the demonstration, tells us the goal of the library demonstration is to have 80,000 books on hand. At the present time he has less than 60,000. These are not kept in the regional center in south Wenatchee, but are virtually all in the various libraries throughout north central Washington.

The demonstration library bought three bookmobiles, stationed at Wenatchee, Omak, and Moses Lake. These serve the scattered communities and centers which do not have established libraries. There are 20 people on the staff, the majority at the center in Wenatchee.

The various communities with libraries which have joined in the demonstration include Bridgeport, Ephrata, Grand Coulee, Moses Lake, Omak, Oroville, Pateros, Quincy, Republic, Soap Lake, Tonasket, Twisp, Waterville, Winthrop, and Chelan County's library setup.

This demonstration is bringing to mind that a community without books is a poor community indeed. And the availability of books is an asset that cannot be reckoned in dollars and cents.

## The Military Pay Act Does Injustice to Retired Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post dated March 21, 1959:

THE MILITARY PAY ACT DOES INJUSTICE TO RETIRED SERVICEMEN

The recommendation by a committee, headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, which was assigned by the Defense Department to investigate service pay, was that pay for naval, military and air men who have earned their retirement should be geared to the current pay which is received in active service. In other words, if the pay for an admiral or an Army sergeant on active duty is increased 10 percent, his pay after he retires will be increased by 10 percent. Up to this point, this is how service retirement has been handled for many years, and that is how it is treated in the Military Pay Act of 1958, as to those retired after its effective date, June 1, 1958.

However, in the bill passed at the last session of Congress, this relationship between active-duty pay and retired pay is, with certain exceptions, not applied to men already retired. They were given a flat 6 percent increase across the board. This results in all sorts of anomalies, including one mentioned by the Washington Star in which a major general who retired a few months before the bill became law received approximately $1,900 a year less than an officer of equal rank who retired after the effective date.

A difference between military retired pay and civilian retired pay, which stays put no matter what happens to the pay of active workers, is that the retired military man is not really retired at all. He is still subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice; he is subject to recall in emergency or at the pleasure of the Defense Department. Thus it is logical that his pay on the retired list should be geared to his pay when on active duty. But the central reason is that pay in the armed services is generally less than for the same grade of ability in civilian life, and some added compensation at retirement is fair and just.

It seems to us that restoration by the new Congress of the traditional relationship between the pay of active-service officers and men and the pay of retired military personnel would pay dividends in several respects. In the first place, of course, it would correct an injustice to the officers and enlisted men already retired, who are certainly hit as hard by inflationary prices as will be the men to be retired later. But the change could also have an important effect on the ability of the services to persuade men to make military service a permanent career.

## More Aid for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 1, 1959, Los Angeles Times concerning a plan for improved health insurance for the aged, which is expected to be made available by the physicians of California in several months.

I believe the efforts by the California physicians group in this regard is to be commended and hope the plan is successful in bringing about improved health care for the aged.

The editorial follows:

MORE AID FOR THE AGED

California physicians are about to add to their service for the aged with a prepaid insurance plan. The move serves to justify the contention of medical men that they can provide adequate service to obviate the necessity for socialized medicine.

FOR THOSE PAST 65

Working through their California Physicians' Service, the State's medical fraternity expects to make available in a few months a plan for which basic principles already have been established for benefits covering professional services for persons over 65 years of age.

The move itself fulfills the basic principle of offering service on a private basis. This should satisfy those critics who oppose Government plans as bureaucratic or an invasion of private rights.

The CPS president, Dr. A. A. Morrison of Ventura, in announcing progress to the annual convention of the House of Delegates of the California Medical Association in San Francisco, indicated that the plan will be introduced as an experiment. He made it clear that continuation and progress would be governed by results. If the plan works well in its initial form, no doubt wider service for additional care will be offered.

Thus the Blue Shield movement in this State continues its efforts to meet the critics who have contended that the private system of health insurance is too slow and covers too little of necessary medical expenses for too few benefits.

PROGRESS REPORTED

The California move is part of the progress to be reported to Congress soon by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The report, to go to the House Ways and Means Committee early in March, specifies that little progress has been made in the last 5 years in providing health insurance at costs poor families can afford. But it notes progress in enlarging types and duration of benefits and most recently in providing for health needs of the aged.

One area of progress is in wider availability of noncancellable insurance offered by reputable companies. Previously, companies exercised freely their right to cancel or refuse renewal of policies when the insured showed declining health or reached a higher age bracket.

The most striking experiment in insuring the elderly is the 65-plus plan, launched in 1957 in Iowa. Being extended by the sponsoring company to other States, the new service offers a policy without restriction as to age and without medical examination. The only out reserved by the company is to cancel or modify all policies in a State if heavy losses materialize.

This policy provides benefits of up to $10 a day for hospital care for a maximum of 31 days for each confinement, up to $100 for miscellaneous hospital expense, and up to $200 for surgeon fees. The premium is $6.50 per month per person.

REINSURING PROPOSED

This program also has been tailored to the electronic age: policies offered by newspaper coupon ads only, applications processed by machine and commissions limited to 1 percent, all of which should help check the upward trend of premiums.

The Welfare Secretary's report recalls that President Eisenhower recommended to Congress 5 years ago that Government reinsure any special risks assumed by insurance groups willing to experiment with greater protection against high medical bills. The President had averred that such a plan would put the Government neither in the insurance nor the medical business.

However, the American Medical Association, which had helped defeat President Truman's plan for compulsory medical insurance, helped defeat the Eisenhower plan as an entering wedge for socialized medicine. The House voted against it in July 1954, almost 2 to 1.

As part of the AMA the CMA is fulfilling part of the obligation to provide an adequate alternative to socialized medicine. To stimulate private action, some credit can be given those who sincerely felt that Government-in-medicine was the only way to provide medical care quickly enough. Certainly the CPS-Blue Shield plan is superior in theory to socialized medicine. It only remains to be proved in practice.

## H.R. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions prior to yesterday's vote on H.R. 10, I expressed my support for legislation of this kind which would provide a tax incentive to encourage and promote long-range private planning for old age.

This principle has for some time been accepted by the Government in the case of employer contributions to pension programs. Under our present tax laws, an employee covered by an approved pension plan pays no current income tax on his company's contribution to his retirement fund, and neither does the company, which deducts its pension costs as business expenses.

H.R. 10 simply seeks to extend this principle to the self-employed who wish to make financial provision for retirement, by providing them with tax treatment no less favorable than that already enjoyed by individuals employed by others.

I supported H.R. 10 because of a conviction that it is highly desirable to encourage thrift, saving, and long-term private planning for the later, less productive years of life. Such planning over a long period reduces dependence upon the Federal Government in old age and furthermore—and just as important—it stimulates a sense of pride of accomplishment on the part of those who do not have to depend on others in their golden years.

But though I supported this measure, Mr. Speaker, I must object strenuously to the method by which it was presented to us for action. I have not served long in the Congress, but in the short span of time that I have been here I have been impressed by the need for orderly rules of procedure, and I was more than a little distressed yesterday to find the majority leadership resorting to the rather spurious and questionable parliamentary technique of calling for a suspension of the rules in order to rush this legislation through the House without proper consideration.

I have just recently received a copy of Jefferson's "Manual of Parliamentary Practice." The very first section of that master work contains an admonition on the "Importance of Adhering to Rules." Because of the seriousness of this matter, I would like to quote a few paragraphs from section I of Jefferson's manual.

So far the maxim is certainly true and is founded in good sense, that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check, and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities.

And whether these forms be in all cases the most rational or not is really not of so great importance. It is much more material that there should be a rule to go by than what that rule is; that there may be a uniformity of proceeding in business not subject to the caprice of the Speaker or the captiousness of the Members. It is very material that order, decency, and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body.

I am definitely opposed to riding roughshod over the established rules of the House, regardless of the merits of the particular legislation being considered, and I trust that yesterday's action will not start a trend in that direction. I know of no legislation so important that we cannot continue to conform to the rules which have guided the actions of the Congress for so long, and I certainly hope that in the future we will see fit to restrain our enthusiasm sufficiently to give deference to these normal procedures.

## Slumbering Must Cease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, of Lynn, Mass., on March 12, 1959:

SLUMBERING MUST CEASE

Let's turn off the TV set, put the car in the garage, sit down and face the harsh, painful, urgent facts.

The big one:

The showdown with Russia over Berlin and Germany is the worst crisis we've had since the firing stopped in World War II. And it won't be solved by throwing out the first baseball in mid-April.

The intense pressure Soviet Premier Khrushchev is applying carries great peril of a ruinous nuclear war, by accident or miscalculation if not by design.

Yet we Americans neither feel nor show any real sense of urgency. Perhaps we are calloused by so many manufactured Russian alarms. Last year the Middle East, this year Berlin. Same old boring show. We give it a bad rating and switch to our trusty westerns.

In one breath the Eisenhower administration says any conflict over Germany almost surely would be nuclear, but the President talks of balancing the budget, cutting the Armed Forces, seeing no need to step up our lagging missile pace.

Mr. Eisenhower tells us not to get too stirred over this crisis. The words might sound better if we were awake at all. In the circumstances they amount to patting a

sleeping head, putting a cautionary finger to the lips, and tiptoeing out of the room.

We're not alone in our slumber. The vaunted NATO never has risen to more than a fifth of its planned strength. British leaders keep a constant weather eye on the next elections. Other allies are reducing their armed forces or slashing the draft term at the very moment when the West's great verbal posture is firmness.

In all the complex maneuvering between East and West, we appear to pay slim heed to the often critical uses of psychological warfare.

Endlessly we stress negatives, the things we can't or won't do. We find no advantage in trying to push the Reds off balance as they so frequently do us. We blandly assume we can only lose propaganda combat at a summit or other conference, and fear we will be "taken" no matter what is done or said.

Are we so unintelligent, so naive, so lacking in faith that we must conclude this?

And are we so wrapped up in personal and national concerns that we refuse to see danger until it stands on our doorstep? Will we talk of balanced budgets until the day the Russians balance them for us?

We've got to cut through Khrushchev's soft purring of "peace, peace" and find the tough, unsoftened core of his demands.

We've got to look hard, too, at what exactly we have on hand or in prospect to deal with this threat, if the worst should come.

And we've got to grasp once and for all why Berlin and Germany mean so much to us. Why would we ask the destruction of New York, Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles and many other cities to keep Berlin free?

The truth is not new, but it's still devastatingly important. West Berlin, just part of a divided city, is a great political and economic entity.

An island in the East German Communist sea, it is a showcase of liberty. More, it is a bastion, a forward outpost. Yield so huge a prize and you cast into the black the morale and spirit of resistance not only of Germans but Frenchmen, Britons, Hollanders, Belgians, Greeks and others. You may lose the game in Europe.

When that happens the orbit of freedom will be crucially narrowed, and our own safety infinitely more imperiled than ever in our history.

## A Round-the-Clock Scholar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article regarding an outstanding scholar, whom I have the privilege of calling my friend, Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University.

The article appeared in the New York News of Sunday February 15, 1959:

A ROUND-THE-CLOCK SCHOLAR

(By Don Nelsen)

The term "gentleman and scholar," has been kicked around so frequently that it has ceased to have much meaning. Nowadays, it is usually applied to a person who has just loaned you five bucks. There are a few men, however, who qualify for the accolade in its traditional sense and one of them is gray-bearded Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University.

At 48, Samuel Belkin is one of the youngest of college chief executives, but this fact is hardly unusual. What is unusual is the age at which he received the office. He was not yet 32 when he was handed the reins in 1943, just 7 years after he had come to Yeshiva as an instructor in Greek.

Dr. Belkin, however, has made a career of doing things at tender years. He was a rabbi at 17, a Ph. D. at 24 and a full professor at 29.

"It would be something of an impossibility for a boy to become a rabbi at that age today," the doctor observed in his office recently. "In Europe, in my time, studies were much more concentrated than they are here today. Now a boy has the advantage of a more extensive preparation for the rabbinate."

Dr. Belkin's "time in Europe" consisted of the first 18 years of his life. He was born in Svislocz, which was then in Poland but is now part of the Soviet Union. Even then, however, the opportunities for Jews were severely limited. Where could a brilliant lad, who obviously had much to offer, go? The answer was as plain as the nose on Horace Greeley's face. He went west—to America.

Belkin's landing occurred in New York in 1929, to which he had come under the sponsorship of relatives in Philadelphia. At the time, young Samuel could speak Polish, Yiddish and Hebrew, but these were as useful to him in his adopted country as a harp in a Dixieland band. His corrective was to whip into some English language courses, the better to find his way through this new land. Within 2 years he had found his way to Brown University, where he began his Ph. D. work.

"I came to Brown with $5 in my pocket," Dr. Belkin recalls. "I really didn't know how I was going to get through. But then I met a family—I think it was during the Jewish holidays—and they took me in and paid my way for the first semester. They did out of the generosity of their hearts. They were wonderful people."

Later, a scholarship and monthly checks from an aunt in New York kept him going till he received his degree in 1935.

"My field was Greek and Hellenic literature. It was close to my heart because it embraced a good deal of old Hebrew scholarship. I enjoyed my years at Brown immensely," he said nostalgically. "The people there were exceptionally considerate toward me."

Dr. Belkin remains a scholar to this day, though pressed with a mass of administrative detail. A Phi Beta Kappa, he has published a host of books and articles on rabbinic and Hellenic literature and has served as an associate editor of rabbinics for the Universal Jewish Encyclopedia. His views on education are widely sought and his reputation as a man of principle and action has called him to membership on many civil and educational bodies.

Last year the State Department selected him, along with Presidents Hesburgh of Notre Dame, Pusey of Harvard and three other outstanding educators, to explain the purposes of higher education in the United States to the Russian people. The medium for this was America, the Russian langauge magazine issued by the U.S. Information Service in the U.S.S.R.

Dr. Belkin presides over his academic dominion of 17 schools and 4 community centers from a Spartanly furnished office on the first floor of Yeshiva's main building at Amsterdam Avenue and 186th Street. Unlike many college presidents, he does not live on the school grounds. He and wife, Selma, whom he met as a young visitor to Philadelphia, have an apartment in the East 90's. His daughter Linda, on the other hand, lives close by Yeshiva with her husband, who is a student at the university, and their baby son, Alan. Dr. Belkin's son, however, is still further away in Stamford, Conn., where he attends a private elementary school.

Each morning the president repairs to his seat of government in a car supplied by the university. This could be termed riding in style, but in reality it's more or less of a necessity. The component schools of Yeshiva are located in six widely separated areas of the city. To get around to each of them and to the other appointments that fall inevitably on the shoulders of a college president, he needs either a car or a durable pair of roller skates, and there's no question as to which is the less taxing.

Actually, this back-and-forth traveling is the result of the good doctor's own doings. Under his dynamic hand, Yeshiva has expanded tremendously. Among other advances, it has gained university status, founded the first medical school and the first college for women under Jewish auspices, and established two graduate schools for education and mathematics. The only trick Dr. Belkin couldn't manage was a central location for all.

Together with Belkin the builder, Belkin the scholar, and Belkin the educator, there is Belkin the man. He speaks quietly and firmly, his sentences occasionally punctuated by flickering smiles or slight frowns as he pauses to consider his train of thought. He is gracious and charming, too. A photographer was shooting pictures of him when a recalcitrant flash gun refused to function.

"———," swore the piqued photog and then, looking sheepishly at Rabbi Belkin, apologized for using such a term in so religious an atmosphere.

"Perfectly all right," smiled the doctor, amused at the photog's plight. "Great men have always said what they thought."

It would appear that pulling a man gently off a hook and salving the wound at the same time is another of Samuel Belkin's myriad talents.

## Ireland and Poland on St. Patrick's Day, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the world today pays tribute and homage to the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick. While St. Patrick was a son of Ireland, people of good will of all ethnic backgrounds join in paying tribute to the great son of God. Even though my own heritage finds its roots in my grandparents who migrated from Poland, I join in paying tribute today to St. Patrick, and I wish to call the attention of the House to the striking parallel between the struggle for freedom by the Irish and the similar struggle for freedom by my own ancestors, the Poles.

This day honors St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, on the anniversary of his death, March 17, 493. St. Patrick's Day has long been celebrated by Christian and freedom-loving people, not only in Ireland but throughout the world.

Since the early history of the United States, Americans have commemorated the ascension of this great servant of God from his calling here on earth.

The life and accomplishments of St. Patrick exemplify the great human struggle to surmount oppression which stands in the way of advancing the work of God. As a youth St. Patrick was captured, sold as a slave, and held in bondage for 6 years. After escaping he entered a monastery and began to prepare himself for his divinely inspired mission. During his life of preaching, teaching, building churches, organizing parishes, and performing miracles, he was taken prisoner 12 times and was once loaded with chains and condemned to die.

In our time when much of the Christian world is enslaved by Communist totalitarianism, the Christians of the free world help to keep alive the hopes of their oppressed brethren within the Soviet bloc for the restoration of religious liberty and national independence. On hallowed days such as this, when free nations are especially thankful for their liberties and subjugated people are denied their rights to human dignity, we are profoundly impressed by the parallel struggle of the now independent Irish nation and downtrodden nations like Poland for religious freedom and national independence.

Both the Irish and the Poles are rightfully proud of their ancestry. Neither would be worthy of their heritage if they were not. Every people should preserve those memories which are peculiar to them and commemorate those events which have molded their heritage. It is as right for us to emulate our historic virtues as it is for us to criticize and overcome the mistakes of the past.

Both Poland and Ireland are among the greatest daughters of the Catholic Church. Under British domination, the Irish people suffered the supression of their rights to freedom of worship. In Poland the persecution of the church has been carried out by the Communists since 1945, with the intent of eventually uprooting all religious faiths and institutions.

Both Ireland and Poland have long and invincible traditions of greatness, which cannot be extirpated by foreign conquest. The union of the Polish and Irish minds with Christianity has yielded marvelous fruits. Poland by the end of the Middle Ages, was a large kingdom, forming an integral part of Western Christendom and contributing to the common cultural and religious life of Europe. Ireland, already a rich culture at St. Patrick's birth, became an island of Christian saints and scholars. Christianity inspired both the Irish and the Poles with a collective dynamism, a great national purpose, and an inspired sense of destiny.

Ireland endured exploitation for centuries before her fight for national independence triumphed in 1922. Poland has several times undergone and is now suffering the hardships of being ruled by alien despotism.

When Henry VIII withdrew from the Church of Rome, a program was inaugurated to confiscate the estates of the Irish noblemen. As this campaign was pursued more vigorously, Englishmen who loaned money to the Crown to defray the expenses of subjugating the Irish were repaid with grants of landholdings in Ireland. In 1649 Oliver Cromwell invaded Ireland with a large army that was followed by a horde of fortune seekers. The oppressive domination of Ireland by the English landlords, known as the plantation system, became solidly entrenched. Thereafter her people were ruthlessly exploited, starved, and decimated.

Virtually all of Ireland was Catholic at this time. Catholics were not permitted to own land or to hold seats in Parliament. The Irish Parliament could not consider any legislation without the approval of the British Privy Council. There emerged an organization whose membership was comprised primarily of the descendants of those who followed Cromwell, and this group was fostered and protected by the British rulers.

Throughout the period of British rule, the Irish people clung to their forbidden language, stoutly resisted political domination and economic oppression, and remained loyal to their Catholic faith, against whatever repression their masters might devise. The deeply symbolical Easter Rebellion of 1916, the brutal methods used to crush it, and the execution of its leaders aroused in Ireland a national spirit of revolt which had been dormant but never dead since the time of the great O'Neill. Ultimately, the cause of freedom and independence was victorious in Ireland.

Poland was divided among Russia, Prussia, and Austria between 1772 and 1795. From 1795 until 1918, the Polish state disappeared from the map of Europe, but the Polish Nation, like the sons of Eire, remained alive and vigorous. The Poles never accepted the dismemberment of their country and took every opportunity to fight for the restoration of their national independence. Inside Poland there were insurrections in 1831 and 1863, both of which were suppressed with savage reprisals. Many Poles took refuge in exile during the time when Poland was yoked by foreign rule. After 123 years of enormous effort and sacrifice, Poland was restored as an independent country in 1918.

In 1939 Poland was again partitioned, this time by its totalitarian neighbors, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. After the German offensive was launched against the Soviet Union, all of Poland was occupied by the Nazis, who methodically proceeded to liquidate a large part of the population by massacres, starvation, and extermination in concentration camps. Five million Poles, including three million Jews perished. At the end of the war, there were 1½ million orphans in Poland.

Like Ireland, Poland was forced to fight for its independence. To combat the Nazi reign of terror during the World War II occupation, the Poles organized a powerful underground state with secret courts, a secret administrative apparatus, a secret press, secret schools, and a brave partisan army which grew to considerable strength and conducted guerilla warfare against the Nazi oppressors. Then, toward the end of the Second World War, the Soviet Union drove the German armies from Poland and then aborted the restoration of freedom and national independence for Poland by installing in power a stooge government of Polish Communists loyal to Moscow.

Now Poland is shackled by the Red chains of Communist tyranny. But neither the brave and fearless people of Poland nor the conscience of the free world will rest until the bonds of slavery are broken. The Polish people have risen before. They will rise to freedom again.

Today we honor the saint who escaped from slavery and, armed only with the love of God, returned to his former masters and conquered them. We honor, too, all people who have maintained their national faith under alien control. May all oppressed nations now enslaved by foreign dictatorships soon breathe the free air that blows over the Republic of Ireland.

---

## Connecticut "King" Helped Form Probable 50th State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William A. Garrett, of the Hartford Times news bureau. Bill Garrett has done a wonderful job of research in compiling a story of the way the Binghams of Connecticut, one of them a former Member of Congress, have played a part in the early history of our 50th State:

CONNECTICUT "KING" HELPED FORM PROBABLE 50TH STATE

(By William A. Garrett)

WASHINGTON.—Hawaii, now probably closer to statehood than ever before, once had a "King Hiram"—from far-off Connecticut, where his grandson Hiram was to become Governor and then U.S. Senator.

This writer first learned about King Hiram from Delegate JOHN A. BURNS, Democrat, Hawaii's only Member of Congress. The island Territory was greatly influenced in its formative years, Mr. BURNS says, by this Connecticut leader of a mission band which set out for the South Seas 139 years ago.

The "king" was the Reverend Hiram Bingham, whose son Hiram, father of Governor and Senator Hiram Bingham, also was to spread Christianity among the Hawaiians.

Great and great-great-grandchildren of the Binghams now populate Connecticut, and beyond.

Mr. BURNS, a Montanan, has offices next to those of Representative FRANK KOWALSKI, Democrat, Meriden, and down the hall from those of Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat, of Hartford. Both Connecticut Congressmen, incidentally, are prostatehood.

Mr. DADDARIO's Hartford County District has roughly the population of Hawaii, which has about as much land area as Connecticut and Rhode Island combined.

The delegate points out that Connecticut also has made a recent contribution to Hawaii—in the person of Frank Fasi, formerly of Hartford, in the Territorial senate. Fasi is a former Marine officer and Weaver High athlete who married a Hawaiian girl and adopted her homeland after World War II.

Thrice, if unsuccessfully, Senator Fasi sought the mayoralty of Honolulu, Hawaii's top city, where the second and third Hiram Binghams were born. Senator Bingham, noted explorer, author, teacher, and aviator, was born there 84 years ago. He died here in 1957.

King Hiram, who died in New Haven in 1869 at age 80, was the seventh of 13 children and a native of Bennington, Vt. He and his fellow missionaries sailed from Boston on October 23, 1819. They were sent out, with their families, by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

J. C. Furnas' book on the South Seas, "Anatomy of Paradise," says that Honolulu then was a hard-looking, flat, dry, ugly and jerry-built settlement. The island archipelago had been isolated from the world until 42 years before. The Binghams lived in a native hut a year until a frame house was shipped from the States.

The missionaries, the book tells, made Hawaiians "one of the world's most literate peoples, although in an obscure dialect." They also "trained the natives to wear clothes, to sing, and to go through the motions of congregationalism."

French Catholic and other missionaries came later. Some mission churches still stand in this pineapple paradise. The missionaries won their war with heathenism but the principal mark they left was economic.

Today Hawaii does an annual business of $1.8 billion a year. It is at the sea and air crossroads of the Pacific. Its few early churches, established by the Reverend Mr. Bingham and the missionaries of all faiths who followed him, have grown to more than 500.

The Binghamites had liaison with the natives through Hawaiian youths sent to Connecticut to be educated at a special school in Cornwall. There, in an old, hilly graveyard, lies one of these youths, Henry Obookiah—who, Furnas writes, "probably still wonders at the snow that clogs the dark conifers in this strange country."

The Obookiah boy is felt to have died of civilization. Once one of his fellow Cornwall pupils was found, bitterly weeping, on the Yale steps in New Haven. The lad cried, legend has it, "because his people were ignorant and nobody was doing anything about it."

King Hiram got only grudging permission at first to bring the Gospel to Hawaii, then under King Kamehameha 3d. But the missionaries brought their women and children, and among the child-loving natives kids were a mollifying influence. And the white man's medicine did wonders too.

Besides, Mrs. Bingham—the former Minerva Clarissa Brewster—toiled night and day to sew for the natives. She and other mission wives had reason to wish themselves back in Connecticut, but seldom complained.

The Binghamites founded Oahu College, which Senator Bingham was to attend. They could have made easy livings with high prestige, Furnas notes, as Connecticut pastors. But they stayed, King Hiram until 1840. His departure was due to his wife's illness.

On the Honolulu waterfront the missionary became known as King Hiram. Some colleagues entered the native government and "thenceforth bullying man-of-war captains, intriguing foreign consul or corner-cutting trader found himself dealing not with confused Polynesians (natives) but with persistent and self-righteous Yankees."

The missionaries crusaded against vice in familiar Yankee style. They decried tobacco so loudly that the natives thought "Thou shalt not smoke" was 1 of the 10 Commandments.

## "Boys Will Be Big Shots"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to Hon. James A. Farley by Mrs. A. N. Goodwin of Topeka, Kans., with reference to his article "Boys Will Be Big Shots":

TOPEKA, KANS., *December 29, 1958.*
Mr. JAMES A. FARLEY,
*New York City.*

DEAR MR. FARLEY: I am writing to you because I believe you may be interested in a discussion of your article "Boys Will Be Big Shots" published in "Faith Made Them Champions."

The Kansas State Boys Industrial School, an institution of correction for convicted juvenile delinquents is located in Topeka. About 6 years ago the Protestant chaplain instituted a Sunday school there, attendance on a voluntary basis. Student priests from St. Marys College minister to the Catholic boys. Mr. Goodwin and I volunteered to teach a class in the Sunday school and one or both of us have continued ever since except for a very short time.

In our current class we have 16 to 18 boys about 12 and 14 years old, all convicted in their home counties for some misdemeanor. The fourth Sunday of each month we let the boys take over for a study of living Christians and the effect religion has had upon their lives. They choose their own personality and present it in their own way. Yesterday, December 28, they presented your article—and did a very thorough and fine job of it, too. Because of the nature of your story we, and the chaplain, were rather surprised but interested in their thinking in their choice and also their presentation of it and the discussion that followed. We thought you would be, too.

After the two boys who had volunteered to lead the lesson had read the article to the class, we discussed it and made a listing of their findings. I will list their statements, in the order of statements.

"You can't get along without God."

"You can't get along without working; you can't get anything for nothing."

"Can't get along without love."

His (your) life was different—he had to go to work when his father died—and didn't get much money.

Made a promise not to smoke or drink—and kept that promise.

"Boys have the wrong leader."

"Boys want to be accepted."

"Delinquency is caused by lack of love, broken homes, and adult indifference." (They repeated this many times.)

"Boys want attention."

The boys were very pensive and thoughtful during the reading of the article and during the discussion. They, of course, knew more about a lot of the reasons than you and I.

Too many times, I think, people are prone to pass along only the critical thinking of an article when it should be easier and more pleasant to pass along the positive side of a reaction. For that reason we felt we would like to let you know of this lesson. We felt the boys had certainly heard every word that was read and absorbed it. We can but hope that some of it will linger with some of them when they are released and again are confronted with the complex problems of society.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. A. N. GOODWIN.

## Civil Rights Junket Wasted Time and Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been first obtained, I wish to call to the attention of the House, a rather interesting editorial appearing in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner relative to the appearance in Nashville of the Civil Rights Commission.

This editorial suggests that the visit of the Commission to the Athens of the South was a junket, and the money spent on the visit was wasted time and money.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Banner, Mar. 10, 1959]

CIVIL RIGHTS JUNKET WASTED TIME AND MONEY

If, as some members seem to feel, the Civil Rights Commission is not accomplishing very much, the group could have saved the taxpayers quite a bit of money by calling off the Nashville junket, as this newspaper suggested.

The point is that the Commission members did not learn anything new, if they have been reading the Southern School News, to which all subscribe. This monthly newspaper is produced by the Southern Education Reporting Service, an impartial and fact-finding organization with headquarters in Nashville.

A subscription to the Southern School News costs $2 a year. But because the Civil Rights Commission takes five, they get it for $1.50 each. The paper keeps the desegregation picture up to date with interviews, objective reports and documents gathered by professional newspapermen in all the States affected.

The Commission also has Facts on Film, produced by SERS. This mile of microfilm contains all that has been reported by American newspapers and magazines about desegregation since the Supreme Court ruling in 1954.

The Commission has plenty of money at its disposal, of course. President Eisenhower gave it $200,000 out of his emergency fund in January 1958. Then Congress came along in June of the same year and appropriated $750,000 for the work that the membership now seems to have little heart.

However, the members get $50 each per day when they sit, plus travel and living expense. They have a staff of 50, about 10 of whom usually go along for the ride when a hearing is held.

The home of this organization, which decided to find out why school integration isn't going any better, is a five-story building of rather plush offices near the White House.

Nevertheless, the trip to Nashville was deemed a must. And it must have taken quite a hunk out of the taxpayers' $750,000 for the membership and staff safari to the Athens of the South. In addition, of course, the same taxpayers paid the expense of those 18 or 20 who came to testify from the border States to the West and North.

It would have been less expensive to bring school representatives from the Deep South States, but these officials chose not to take part in the junket.

If the Commission members had stayed in their fine offices in Washington and read Southern School News or consulted Facts on Film, they could have saved a lot of money for the Federal budget.

In addition, they could have found out from the above media what the Deep South is thinking and doing about desegregation. That's where the greatest problem lies, of course.

## National Cowboy Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota was honored recently by the inclusion of Ben C. Ash in the National Cowboy Hall of Fame. Ash, a frontiersman, trailblazer in the Black Hills, wagon boss for Gen. George Custer, outstanding law-enforcement officer, and a man who lived as a child in one of the first four frame houses in Yankton in Territorial days, will join two other great South Dakotans in the hall of fame. They are G. E. "Ed" Lemmon and James "Scotty" Philip. The following brief biographical sketch appeared in the Yankton Daily Press and Dakotan of March 14, 1959:

Ben C. Ash, 1851–1946; frontiersman, fearless law-enforcement officer; cattleman; trailblazer in the Black Hills; leading figure of Dakota Territory and South Dakota.

Born in Indiana, Ash was taken in 1859 by his parents to Yankton, D.T., as the town was founded, and they lived in one of the four cabins that made the town. As a youth he was a horsebreaker and trader. At 17 he became an assistant to the U.S. marshal and on reaching legal age was a deputy marshal for 12 years. Later he was sheriff of Hughes County.

In 1872 Ash supervised laying 50 miles of track on the Northern Pacific east of the present Bismarck. In 1873 he joined Custer's command as wagon boss of forty-four 6-mule hitches on the expedition that was to explore the Yellowstone country in Montana. This was featured by discovery of gold on French Creek in the Black Hills in 1874. In 1875–76, Ash explored the Black Hills and marked a trail from Bismarck.

He filed on a claim near Pierre, and was in the livery and grocery business. In 1885 he bought a ranch near Fort Pierre, sold it when elected sheriff; later he was agent for the Lower Brule Reservation under Cleveland's administration.

In the late 1890's Ash had a horse ranch with up to 3,500 head, selling out in 1903. He then stocked the ranch with cattle under the C–Cross brand, ranging from upper Rabbit Creek to Faith, and had up to 10,000 head. Homesteaders shrunk the range so he pulled back to his 5,000 deeded acres, the last big spread outside the reservation to cut back to fee land.

As towns grew along the railroad he engaged in banking and other types of business. He sold the ranch in 1917; helped found the stockyards in Sioux City; returned later to South Dakota; had some reverses; spent his last years at Federal soldiers' home; has been honored with a monument for work in Black Hills; and is regarded as one of the State's early leaders and developers.

## Elton Howard Brown—Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1959 issue of the Lion magazine, circulated internationally, appeared an article about a distinguished fellow member of the Lions Club. This is Elton Howard Brown, known as Brownie to many hundreds of thousands of persons who visit the searchroom at the U.S. Patent Office here. This article was written by the noted writer, Larston D. Farar, who is well and favorably known to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It is the story of a Government servant who is performing his duties ably in a position of great responsibility and trust. If we had more Government servants like Brownie, who always smiles when he greets the public, and has served Uncle Sam perhaps longer than any other man on the Federal payroll, I feel sure there would be less cause for complaints by our taxpayers.

The article follows:

The next time you go to Washington, D.C., you may want to meet Elton Howard Brown * * * at 66 a big, friendly lion with a thick mane of wavy white hair and twinkling bluish-grey eyes, who heads the Patent Reference Branch, or search room, at the U.S. Patent Office.

This room, with 336 places for searchers and the records of almost three million inventions, is usually busy with patent lawyers with fat briefcases and inventors in sometimes shabby clothes who come each day hoping not to find an invention like the one they are searching. The room is, in effect, a proving ground for the Nation's basement wizards whose bright ideas often end in the discouraging discovery that somebody else thought 'em up first. At desks that resemble church pews, attorneys and inventors flip endless patent cards, muttering to themselves and shaking their heads.

Yet, as one of them said: "If it weren't for the inventions listed in this room, we would be running around naked, chasing each other with clubs."

In mammoth stacks flanking the room are records of the legacy of the few celebrated and the multitude of unrecognized inventors who have contributed to our industrial advancement and comfort since the Patent Office began in 1790.

Here are the major inventions of Elias Howe's sewing machine, Cyrus McCormick's reaper, Eli Whitney's cotton gin, Samuel F. B. Morse's telegraph, Alexander Graham Bell's telephone, Otto Mergenthaler's linotype and the thousand creations of Thomas Alva Edison. The inventions run the gamut of life from the cradle to the grave—an infant's crib, a schoolboy's bike, an old man's cane and a coffin with bell attached so that the "corpse" can ring it in case of premature burial.

In a typical year, inventors and their lawyers bring about 350,000 ideas to the room in the Department of Commerce Building for study. They quickly abandon about three-fourths of them as having been already registered. About half of the 85,000 remaining are rejected as useless, unworkable or old. Patents are granted in 346 classes and 53,000 sub-classes of inventions, but less than 20 percent bring the inventor enough money to trouble him when he pays his income tax. To date, 2,830,000 individual inventions have been patented.

In all likelihood, if you have ever been in the search room, you have seen Elton Brown, or "Brownie," as he is known to the thousands who use the room, to his fellow Lions and the countless other citizens whom he has helped in his various civic duties.

"He is the inventor's best friend—but get one of them to admit it," a patent lawyer remarked, smiling wryly. "He shows them that what they think is new was invented 40 years ago."

A patent agent put it this way: "Brownie knows more about our Nation's inventions than any other living man, including any inventor, but he has never invented anything himself—except a unique way of serving the public."

Brownie himself doesn't know how many persons he has directed to the proper place to search for patents. But simple arithmetic applied to the number of searchers who come to the Patent Office indicates that it easily must run into the millions. Not content merely with searching for patents and viewing models, he frequently spends his vacation time in industrial centers viewing at first hand the inventions at work. "They look better in action than they do on cards," he says.

When the talk turns to inventors, Brownie is filled with memories of the great—of today and yesteryear. He has seen 'em all, from Charles Kettering to Henry Ford and many another who has contributed mightily to the upbuilding of our civilization.

He remembers young Glenn Martin coming to check on his first tentative ideas on the airplane, and tall, nervous Charles E. Duryea, inventor of the first American automobile, who came in when an old man and died poor. He knew O. U. Zerk, who invented a lubrication fitting. When Zerk first appeared in the search room, he merely gave his initials. When he returned years later and worth a fortune, he identified himself as Oscar Ulysses Zerk.

During his three-and-a-half decades as chief of the search room, Mr. Brown has learned more tricks of his trade than any other living man. He knows that ballpoint pens are classified under "Brush-Scrubbing and General Cleaning Instruments," and that a hangman's gallows is filed under "Surgery," or "Neck Stretching Devices."

He has heard and seen so many fantastic ideas it would be difficult for anyone to startle him. One time, an erratic inventor came to him with plans to make Washington an aerial city, supported 3,000 feet above the Potomac by inflated balloons.

Finding out whether or not an invention already has been invented is almost as easy for him as finding Times Square is for a Manhattanite. He possesses a remarkable memory. When you sit down with him and say, "Stop me if you've heard this one," he usually could stop you quickly. However, he will hear you out and then go to the files and come up with the evidence that purposely or not, you are a copycat.

Brownie knows virtually every patent lawyer who is licensed to practice before the

Patent Office, plus the patent agents and their associates and assistants. The lawyers and agents love him, but the inventors usually suspect him.

"An inventor almost always thinks I'm trying to steal his invention, although I must learn something about his invention in order to help him," Brownie points out. "Sometimes, to get his confidence, I must even get him angry with me or use some other means to get him to shake his idea loose. After getting the idea, I don't say, 'Oh, that is old,' or 'I've seen this somewhere before.' That alone would make me a marked man."

But with incredible speed, out of the millions of inventions, he can understand a gadget, turn to his classification manual and find what field of search the inventor should cover. Sometimes he pinpoints in a few minutes the very idea the inventor thought was novel. He lets the printed page prove the point, volunteering no other information since he doesn't want to make it seem that he wished the potential inventor hard luck.

Once an inventor sat down at Brownie's desk and declared that, due to a sad experience, he had developed a new invention. The inventor said he had been driving in a heavy rainstorm on a dirt road and had a flat tire. In order to change the tire, he had to wallow in the gummy red muck. In a flash, he had an idea for a pushbutton, automatic jack that would be standard equipment on every car.

Sympathetically, Brownie referred him to "Pushing and Pulling Instruments," where the inventor found 115 similar devices already patented. But to his astonishment none of them was in use. All had proved to be too expensive.

Brownie has been in the Patent Office for more than 53 years, longer than any other employee in the Department of Commerce and possibly longer than any of Uncle Sam's other 2,300,000 Federal workers. He started in October 1905, as a copyboy, was promoted to typist, and later moved to the patent delivery room. In 1923, Brownie was named assistant to the head of the search room, and 4 days later when the chief died, he was appointed to the job he still holds.

His career as a Lion is somewhat shorter, though nonetheless distinguished. It wasn't until Brownie was over 50 that his son, Elton, Jr., a former president of the north Washington club, got him interested in the work of the association. But when he did, Elton Brown père went to work with the same enthusiasm that has marked his work in the Patent Office for so many years. Brownie is a charter member and past president of the Mount Rainier-Brentwood, Md. club and has a 10-year perfect attendance record .

He has 3 years more to go before reaching the Government's mandatory retirement age, and when he does, Brownie has a few ideas for inventions of his own, he admits with a smile. "But I hope they don't duplicate any of the whacky ones I've seen."

## Luigi Luzzatti in 1925

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting excerpt from the dairy of Luigi Luzzatti appeared in the Carolina Israelite, January-February 1959 issue. I commend its reading to the attention of our colleagues, as follows:

LUIGI LUZZATTI IN 1925

On May 30, 1925, the great Italian scholar Luigi Luzzatti visited Palestine and wrote in his diary—

"Oh, if agrarian reawakenings instead of exciting envy of the Arabs, may avail to transform those Semites too into brave farmers; the Jews of Palestine, saving themselves from the perils of their race—excessive humility in misery, pride in the days of good fortune—would bring about a revival of western Asia. If the Arabs would greet the new, and at the same time ancient children of that land as brothers who are helping them to develop the hidden wealth of the soil; if Christians, Jews, Mohammedans would persuade themselves that their creed invokes and requires reciprocal justice, and that God, the father of races, wishes to be worshipped in good will and not in persecutions; what light would be released once more from Judea, the redeemer of four continents."

## Winning Essay on Hiring the Handicapped, by Betty Ann Thompson, Centennial Senior High School, Compton, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of the recent winning essay in the essay contest in the southeast district, Los Angeles County, Calif., significantly and appropriately entitled "Hiring the Handicapped in Our Town," of which essay contest a very distinguished but handicapped veteran, Lillian M. Karnes of Compton, Calif., was chairman. The $40 fund, divided into three awards, was contributed by the following groups, to wit: The Compton, Calif., Disabled American Veterans; Veterans of Foreign Wars; the American Legion; and individual members of Veterans Employment and the Committee to Employ the Physically Handicapped. The winner was Miss Betty Ann Thompson, 1202 East 123d Street, Los Angeles, Calif., and she received the award of a $25 U.S. savings bond and her essay is hereinafter set forth. The second-place winner was Mary Helen Hines of 1854 East 121st Street, Los Angeles, Calif., who received $10. The third-place winner was Carolyn Jackson of 1408 East 122d Street, Los Angeles, Calif., who received a $5 award.

Because Miss Thompson was first-place winner, her essay has been forwarded to the State Committee for the Employment of Physically Handicapped appointed by the Honorable Pat Brown, Governor of the State of California, and, Mr. Speaker, the winning essay of all those forwarded to the Governor's committee will be forwarded to Washington, D.C., to there compete at the national level with like essays from throughout our beloved Nation with the final winner to receive at the personal hands of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, a $1,000 U.S. bond.

The Disabled American Veterans National Foundation is supplying the $1,000 bond for the best essay nationwide and for the cost of the trip to our Nation's Capital from whatever State produces the national winner.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and all the other Members of this distinguished legislative body join with me in complimenting the sponsors of this particular essay contest, as well as congratulating the winners thereof as hereinbefore set forth.

I am pleased to say that Betty Ann Thompson, first-place winner attends the Centennial Senior High School in Compton, Calif., as well as residing in the important city of Los Angeles, Calif., and that her teacher of English composition and literature is Miss Catherine C. Devine.

Her winning essay follows:

HIRING THE HANDICAPPED IN OUR TOWN

I have a job, and you have a job to do, but there are so many who have nothing. What accounts for this? Is it that most people aren't interested in their own welfare? Is it because they aren't interested in their family's welfare? No, it is because most of these people are in some way physically handicapped. How can this word do so much to disturb the minds of more than 15 percent of the people in the United States who are handicapped? It's simple—the handicapped are in need of jobs. This group of people know too well the meaning of insecurity, for the problems they face are numerous.

The problem of hiring the physically handicapped is of national importance. America's progress depends on each and every individual. This includes also those who are handicapped physically.

When it comes to hiring people for jobs, in some cities the physically handicapped are turned away. It is this problem that we as American citizens face. However, special employment agencies have been set up to aid those who are in some way physically handicapped. Primarily, the work of these agencies is to educate those who are handicapped, so that they will be able to compete on a more equal basis with physically normal people of our community in securing a job.

In Los Angeles County, the ratio of the handicapped is 6 to 2. In the areas surrounding our community 3 to 6 is the ratio of the physically handicapped employed. Comparing Los Angeles County with statewide statistics, approximately 3,300 physically handicapped persons are unemployed. Nationally we stand at 8 percent unemployed handicapped persons.

Ducommon, Harvey Aluminum, and Robert Shaw Fulton are to be commended for paying particular attention to this group of people. These companies employ handicapped persons and find them to be very fine employees. It is companies such as these which give these persons the opportunity for a better life.

In every case of a handicapped person, one will find that they tend to do a better job than those who are not handicapped. The handicapped appreciate the opportunity to work, so they tend to be better employees. You will not find in any instance a person handicapped physically staying home from a job because of a minor sickness. Their skill is like that of the architect who laid plans to build the Golden Gate Bridge, always stable.

It is our duty as Americans to see that each citizen has some means of support whether he is handicapped or not. Americans are not to judge whether a person is fit for something; rather, we are to assist in rehabilitation so that they are fit and able to accomplish something in life. When this is done, America will be more prosperous in everything that she does, and America will truly be the greatest Nation in the world.

## Achievement in Realism at St. Olaf College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANK M. COFFIN**
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and I have recently returned from St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minn., where we had the honor of participating in its political emphasis week.

Because we feel that what we saw and experienced would be of great interest to the Members of this House, we shall try to convey something of the atmosphere of their mock house of representatives. So closely did the students emulate the form, spirit, and substance of this House, that we had the uncanny feeling that Congress had moved westward and grown younger. Mr. Speaker, we think it is of some significance that over 200 students at this fine liberal arts college should enlist in and carry through an intensive 4 months preparation for the 4 sessions of the mock house of representatives which were held on February 27, March 12, 13, and 14. The students were not drawn solely from the political science department, but included a balanced cross section of majors in science, literature, and other disciplines. Their preparatory work included exhaustive study of such fields as agriculture, labor reform, foreign aid, and civil rights. Each participant represented a particular State and tried faithfully to reflect the probable points of view of a Representative from his area. The house parliamentarian and speaker had to become intimately acquainted with Cannon's Rules and Procedure to an extent not usually approximated by anybody but a House veteran. All of this work was done without credit and after regular study hours.

Somehow the enthusiasm was maintained until the climax of the entire exercises which was political emphasis week. The St. Olaf gymnasium was transformed into a smaller but realistic house of representatives, complete even to the mace at the speaker's side. The three work sessions of the mock house then began to grind out the grist of the several committees. The legislative agenda from any point of view was an overpowering one including civil rights, farm policy, Federal aid to education, foreign aid, labor reform, Supreme Court limitations, and abolishment of right-to-work laws.

The debate proceeded hot and heavy with tempers occasionally running high and with floor leaders and whips constantly directing their parties as groups from particular areas held frantic caucuses to determine their position as the issues changed. The speeches for and against each measure showed a depth of knowledge and understanding about those issues which demand the utmost of us in this Chamber. Even the students who were not speaking sat at their seats in rapt attention for 3 to 4 hours—the average length of each session. The ability of these students to sustain both their attention and their enthusiasm for such an extended period of time impressed us and gave us no little inspiration. If American college students enjoy stimulating leadership of this kind in exercises in citizenship, we need have no final doubts about our future.

We understand that the gentle but persistent guidance of Dr. James R. Klonoski of the political science faculty of St. Olaf has been in large degree responsible for perhaps the most remarkable shadow congress which has been held. The student chairman, David Brye, and his excellent steering committee followed through with the arrangements in a manner to be envied.

Mr. Speaker, what began as an effort in education proved to be an achievement in realism.

## Recent FCC Ruling Will Force Broadcasters to Distort the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM**
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from today's Washington Post and Times Herald on the recent Federal Communications Commission ruling on section 315 of the Federal Communications Act.

DISTORTING THE NEWS

The absurdity of requiring equal time on the air for all candidates for a political office when any one of those candidates is heard or seen in a newscast is brought into sharp focus by the Lar Daly case. Mr. Daly is a perennial officeseeker who obtained free time on Chicago television stations because they had broadcast news films showing the incumbent mayor, a Democrat, and his Republican opponent. The Federal Communications Commission ruled that Lar Daly was entitled to equal time on a regular news broadcast.

Officials of the National Association of Broadcasters rightly see in this decision a grave threat to radio and television coverage of political events. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, pointed out that during the 1956 presidential campaign the CBS Television Network devoted about 20 percent of its television newscast time to the presidential and vice presidential candidates of the two major parties. If it had been required to give equal time to all the 24 presidential and vice presidential candidates of the 12 parties which participated in that election, there would have been a complete blackout of other news and even then the requirement would not have been satisfied.

The source of this straight jacket imposed on radio and television news is, of course, section 315 of the Federal Communications Act. It requires that any station which permits any legally qualified candidate for any public office to use its facilities must afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office. This attempt to put candidates of the Prohibition Party, America First, and other insignificant political groups on a par with the major Democratic and Republican Parties is in itself ridiculous. We have previously pointed to the urgent need for modification of this provision so that television and radio can do their essential job of presenting the major candidates to the people without having to clutter their programs with meaningless harangues that no one wants to hear.

Whether the statute requires the FCC to extend this principle of equal treatment for the unequal to newscasts is a highly controversial issue. The language of section 315 is indeed sweeping; yet it speaks of permitting a candidate to use a broadcasting station. When a candidate who happens also to be the President of the Uniteed States or the mayor of a city is shown in a newscast, he is not using the station in any literal sense of the word. Rather, the station is using him to present the news to the people.

In any event, the ruling stands as a gross encroachment upon freedom of information in a democratic country. The broadcasting industry has an obligation to fight it in the FCC, in the courts, and in Congress. Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM has offered a bill to draw the proper distinction between political broadcasts as such and the appearance of candidates in legitimate newscasts. Certainly that step will have to be taken if the Daly ruling is not changed by the FCC or the courts. But Congress should not stop there. It should also recast section 315 so as to require fair play among the major candidates without trying to thrust minor factions and local crackpots into the major political leagues.

## Our Constitution—Worth Having, Worth Defending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CARL ALBERT**
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an original oration by Charles E. Puckett, a student in Wilson, Okla., High School, in the Appendix of the RECORD. Entitled "Our Constitution—Worth Having, Worth Defending," the oration won first place in both county and district contests.

The oration follows:

We Americans have, on numerous occasions and by many persons, been accused of being a people who know the price of everything and the value of nothing. In an attempt to reevaluate some of the things that underlie our American way of life, I have chosen as the subject of my original oration, Our Constitution—Worth Having, Worth Defending.

Underlying every law made, every act of government—yes, even the Constitution itself—is the will of the people of the United

States. The Constitution came into being as a result of the people's will. Today it exists as the symbol of their basic beliefs.

Human freedoms and the rights of the individual are set forth in the Constitution of the United States. These rights were important when the Constitution was new, they are important today, they shall be important tomorrow. Our Constitution is dedicated to the proposition of promoting the welfare of the individual, as one of the many individuals who make up this great Nation.

Our Constitution's worth lies in the fact that it recognizes men's rights—God-given rights—and realizes that only a free individual operating in a free society can make a real contribution to that society. Nowhere else in this world is the freedom of the individual stressed as it is in America.

The American Constitution is the ablest of the written guides to government of the people that the world has ever known. Its greatness lies in its basic ideals: all men are created equal, all men have certain basic freedoms, all men are individuals and deserve to be treated as such.

Government logically exists for only one purpose, to protect these ideals. People do not exist for laws, laws exist for people, laws exist to guarantee freedom for people.

A democracy is the best form of government that a freedom-loving people can have. No other form of government can provide so fully for the freedom, success, and happiness of its citizens as can a democracy.

The Constitution plays a vital role in our American democracy. Every bit of work performed by the Government of the United States, from the President in the White House to the constable in an isolated village, is subject to a written instrument, the Constitution. This instrument guarantees that men shall be ruled by law and not by the whims of men.

Without this guarantee of freedom and individual rights, democracy in the United States would wither away and die. And yet some of the very people benefiting from the Constitution often question it and the authority of the Supreme Court to interpret it. They refuse to believe in its ideals or uphold its guarantees. Today, all across the South—in Little Rock, in Virginia, in Alabama—there is racial strife and prejudice because people have forgotten the basic ideals of the Constitution, because people have forgotten that all men are created equal. They have forgotten that this document came out of centuries of bitter struggle, a search by men to find a way of combining order, liberty, authority, and freedom. They have forgotten the proud heritage of freedom under the law for which this document stands. They would tear it down, but in trying they will only tear themselves down, for the Constitution stands for our American way of life. It is the way of individual liberty, of the free market, of private property, of personal initiative. It is the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, the freedom of worship. It is the great heritage that has advanced from our Founding Fathers to the atomic scientists of today. The Constitution is America.

Defense of the American ideals began before the first shot was fired at Concord. In two World Wars and various revolutions, America has defended her beliefs in freedom—usually, before the attack has come from the outside. Today, the forces of destruction strike partly from within.

The Constitution has upheld our best interests for nearly 175 years. Are we going to allow these attacks to continue unchallenged? Are we going to raise neither arms nor voice in defense of the one thing that has guaranteed our liberty? Will we fail our duty now? The Constitution is still the basis for the American way of life. We must not—we cannot—we will not—allow erosion to eat away at its ideals. Our enemies are lies, misconceptions, and prejudice. Our best defense is truth. Anything worth having is worth defending—defending with action, both physical and intellectual. Not all of us are called upon to defend our country with physical action. But, our citizenship places upon us the duty of defending our beliefs with intellectual action. Every individual must realize that he has not mastered the subject of liberty until he practices those things which guarantee freedom to others.

Today our Constitution can be defended with ballots or with bullets. Few times in its history, however, has it become necessary to defend it with bullets. But we are regularly called upon to defend it with our ballots. In every election, one party or the other is more nearly concerned with the general welfare of the people. To adequately defend our Constitution, we must first understand its ideals and then recognize the issues involved. For it has been proven that he fights best who knows why he fights.

All men are created equal. All men have certain fundamental liberties. All men have importance as individuals.

These things the Constitution guarantees, and these things we must defend. Upon their establishment and their maintenance rests the American way of life.

These guarantees mean more than all the material possessions of America, for these guarantees have made it possible for Americans to obtain and enjoy their material possessions.

Too often we tend to place value only on the things which we see. Too often we tend to forget the intangibles. But, in light of the struggle by the peoples of the world to obtain those things which the Constitution guarantees, we realize that the Constitution is worth having, it is worth fighting for. Our forefathers died to secure its blessings. Their descendants died to protect it. People in other parts of the world are willing to give their lives to obtain the same benefits that it guarantees the people of America. As the beneficiaries of all who have struggled for human freedom, can we do less than these? Is it too much to ask that we give our time, our interest—our very life blood if necessary—to defend this precious heritage? In time of calm, our apparent unconcern may seem to answer, "Yes." But in times of stress, we know our answer will be different.

For, as James Mussatti has said, "Our most formidable fortress of defense in time of stress will remain the Constitution of the United States. But it is only as good as our understanding and defense of the purpose for which it was drafted. Eternal vigilance and personal responsibility are still the price of human liberty."

"Yes," I say. Our Constitution is worth having. It is worth defending.

## Low Farm Price Supports and Their Effect on Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, at another point in the RECORD, my friend, Hon. PAUL JONES, has inserted a clipping from the Washington Post, which contained a letter by Mr. Joseph Alsop. I, too, had asked that this article be inserted, but Mr. JONES' request preceded mine. In that letter Mr. Alsop points out his dissatisfaction with policies of the present Secretary of Agriculture and cites his reasons.

While I have, from the very day when Mr. Benson turned his back on Candidate Eisenhower's Kason and Brookings promises, expressed my disagreement with his low support philosophy, it has only been recently that the public has come to realize that this Benson policy has failed completely. Farmers have long realized that it has reduced the average income of farm people to one-half that of nonfarm people even while the Secretary was talking self-righteously about the great increase of per capita farm income in 1958. This was largely due to the great movement of farm families to the cities.

Most people have, however, completely overlooked the fact that Mr. Benson's policies have resulted in cost far and away beyond anything ever experienced under the much higher rigid supports of previous administrations. The public is just now beginning to recognize that flexible supports, which were advanced to save money for the taxpayer and to reduce our surpluses have failed to do either. The cost of operating the Department of Agriculture is today just about four times what it was under Mr. Benson's predecessor, and the surpluses on hand have grown so that the President tells us that it will soon cost a billion dollars a year just to store them.

Mr. Alsop brings out this with his usual clarity. He says:

I myself was a strong supporter of Secretary Benson when he took office. Like many others, I supposed that he had the determination and the courage to remove the anomalies of the earlier, Democratic farm program. I am only ashamed that it took me so long to notice that Benson's long suit was pious talk rather than positive performance. His efforts to remove past anomalies and extravagances have in fact produced even greater present anomalies and extravagances.

Again he states:

He has permitted the total cost of the farm program to double and then triple, while prating about economy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a word of explanation is in order. Mr. Benson's policies seem quite consistent to most people who are not acquainted with farming in one-crop areas—the areas in which most of our surpluses are produced. Mr. Benson says that if you drop the support price on any commodity that farmers will next year quit growing that commodity. That sounds reasonable, but it simply does not work out that way.

Doubtless, Mr. Benson believes his assumption to be true, but I ask you to place yourself in the position of a cotton farmer who has been growing 10 bales of cotton—above the average—and getting $160 per bale—about what he got last year. This meant your gross income from cotton was $1,600. And in most of the Cotton Belt that is no comparable cash crop to which you can turn. Suppose now that Mr. Benson can prove that you as a cotton farmer will, next year, get only $80 per bale. What would

you do? I think it is clear that in the absence of controls, you would try to grow 20 bales. This is the only way you have of maintaining income. It is the only way most farmers who grow our basic crops have of supporting their families. Therefore, when confronted with lower supports, farmers grow more, not less.

This is exactly what farmers always try to do. Our largest cotton crop was grown when support prices were only 52 percent of parity. According to the Secretary, we should have imported cotton that year. When cotton supports and prices went up, the pressure was off and farmers grew less, even when there were no controls.

For low prices to reduce production they must be so low and continue so long that they force farmers off the farm.

Mr. Benson seems perfectly willing to use this drastic starvation method of moving farming operations into larger and larger units. Fundamentally, this is the real farm problem. Do we want more farmers forced into town to compete on an already overfilled labor market? Do we want to aggravate industrial unemployment, and place a still further burden on our already overtaxed relief rolls? Do we want our farms to become rural factories owned by absentee corporate operators? Will such a situation help any substantial group of our citizenship? Will it give us cheaper food? Will it give greater purchasing power with which to buy the products of our factories? Will it help us to maintain that unyielding opposition to communism which all over the world has had its roots on the farm?

May it not well turn out to be as poor a long-time investment as Mr. Benson's administration of the Department of Agriculture has turned out to be on a short-time basis? These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the very real questions involved in the farm problem.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, that all may see the record and evaluate it for themselves, I include some tables prepared by the staff of our Committee on Agriculture just about 1 week ago. I believe that it is fair to state that these figures show that never has so little been accomplished with so much:

FARM FACTS AND FIGURES

Total realized net income of farmers after deducting agricultural production expenses from the total cash income from farm marketings:

| | |
|---|---|
| Last 6 years: | |
| 1953 | $13,809,000,000 |
| 1954 | 12,201,000,000 |
| 1955 | 11,470,000,000 |
| 1956 | 12,111,000,000 |
| 1957 | 10,840,000,000 |
| 1958 | 13,060,000,000 |
| Total | 73,581,000,000 |
| Six previous years: | |
| 1947 | 17,304,000,000 |
| 1948 | 16,057,000,000 |
| 1949 | 13,789,000,000 |
| 1950 | 13,185,000,000 |
| 1951 | 15,158,000,000 |
| 1952 | 14,416,000,000 |
| Total | 89,909,000,000 |

During the last 6 years farmers marketed 15 percent more food and nonfood products than in the 6 preceding years, 1947–52 inclusive. Had farmers been paid for the larger volume of food and nonfood products marketed in the last 6 years at the same rate as in the 6 immediately preceding years their net income in the last 6 years would have been $96,700 million, which is $23,109 million above what they actually received. If farm prices, instead of declining, had increased in proportion to all other prices during the last 6 years, then the income of farmers would have been much greater than $96,700 million.

*Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture*

| | |
|---|---|
| Last 6 years: | |
| 1954 | $1,782,300,000 |
| 1955 | 2,026,500,000 |
| 1956 | 1,601,900,000 |
| 1957 | 3,583,100,000 |
| 1958 | 6,870,900,000 |
| 1959 | [1] 5,888,600,000 |
| Total | 21,753,300,000 |
| Six previous years: | |
| 1948 | 1,224,500,000 |
| 1949 | 1,183,500,000 |
| 1950 | 1,503,800,000 |
| 1951 | 1,375,900,000 |
| 1952 | 1,817,800,000 |
| 1953 | 1,510,400,000 |
| Total | 8,615,900,000 |

[1] Estimate. Actual expenditures in fiscal 1959 now estimated at $7,341,000,000.

NOTE.—Appropriations are for fiscal years. Appropriation bill of 1952 covered period of July 1, 1952 through June 30, 1953.

*Farm price-support losses—(Commodity Credit Corporation)*

| | |
|---|---|
| As of Jan. 1, 1953 | $1,064,617,225 |
| As of Jan. 1, 1959 | 5,853,292,744 |

NOTE.—The losses in 6 years, from January 1953 through 1958, were more than 4 times the total of losses during the previous 20-year history of Commodity Credit Corporation price-support operations.

| | |
|---|---|
| 20-year loss (1933–52) | $1,064,617,225 |
| 6-year loss (1953–58) | 4,788,675,519 |

*CCC price-support operations for basic crops only—(wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts)*

| | |
|---|---|
| To Jan. 1, 1953 (at end of 20 years) (profit) | $13,011,290 |
| To Jan. 1, 1959 (6 years later) (loss) | 2,528,607,297 |

NOTE.—The CCC price-support program for cotton, over 20 years, showed a profit of $268 million. But this profit has been wiped out, by cotton program losses of approximately $850 million during the last 3 years.

*Losses on dairy products*

| | |
|---|---|
| Up to Jan. 1, 1953 | $132,523,383 |
| Since Jan. 1, 1953 to Jan. 1, 1958 | 1,511,038,079 |
| Dairy program total losses | 1,643,561,462 |

*CCC investments*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total CCC investments (inventory and loans) as of Jan. 1, 1953 | $2,452,000,000 |
| Total CCC investments (inventory and loans) as of Jan. 1, 1959 | 8,716,071,000 |

*CCC investments in major crops*

[Inventory and loans]

| Crop | Unit | Amount | Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cotton: | | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | Bales | 1,097,000 | $166,779,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1959 | do | 6,564,000 | 1,092,991,000 |

*CCC investments in major crops*—Continued

| Crop | Unit | Amount | Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wheat: | | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | Bushels | 267,847,000 | 1,081,545,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1959 | do | 1,250,919,000 | 3,057,506,000 |
| Corn: | | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | do | 368,349,000 | 587,274,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1959 | do | 1,416,534,000 | 2,351,273,000 |
| Rice: | | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | Hundredweight. | 168,000 | 878,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1959 | do | 13,719,000 | 92,980,000 |
| Peanuts: | | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | Pounds | 192,528,000 | 22,644,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1959 | do | 287,208,000 | 30,647,000 |
| Tobacco: | | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | do | 544,067,000 | 250,373,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1959 | do | 966,661,000 | 621,137,000 |
| Dairy products: | | | |
| Jan. 1, 1953 | | | 8,445,000 |
| Jan. 1, 1959 | | | 62,612,000 |

*Farmers (1952 and 1958)*

| | 1952 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| Farmers' net income (billions) | $14.4 | $13.05 |
| Farmers' share of food dollar (cents) | 47 | 40 |
| Prices paid by farmers, index (percent of 1910–14 average) | 287 | 293 |
| Prices received by farmers, index (percent of 1910–14 average) | 288 | 250 |
| Parity ratio | 100 | 85 |
| Number of farms | 5,421,000 | 4,750,000 |
| Farm population | 24,283,000 | 20,800,000 |

COMPARISONS (1958)

*Per capita income*

| | |
|---|---|
| People on farms | $1,068 |
| Nonfarm people | 2,034 |

*Hourly earnings*

| | |
|---|---|
| Farm workers | $0.757 |
| Factory workers | 2.13 |

FARM PRICES AND INCOME

Average of farm prices in 1958 down 13 percent from 1952. Net form income in 1958 was 9 percent below 1952.

CONTRAST

Hourly earnings industrial workers in 1958 up 28 percent since 1952. Corporation dividend payments in 1958 up 37 percent since 1952.

*Farm prices (as percentage of parity)*

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| 1942 | 105 |
| 1943 | 113 |
| 1944 | 108 |
| 1945 | 109 |
| 1946 | 113 |
| 1947 | 115 |
| 1948 | 110 |
| 1949 | 100 |
| 1950 | 101 |
| 1951 | 107 |
| 1952 | 100 |
| 1953 | 92 |
| 1954 | 88 |
| 1955 | 84 |
| 1956 | 83 |
| 1957 | 82 |
| 1958 | 85 |

*Cash receipts of farmers (not including Government payments)*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1932 | $4,748,000,000 |
| 1947 | 29,620,000,000 |
| 1948 | 30,227,000,000 |
| 1951 | 32,958,000,000 |
| 1952 | 32,632,000,000 |
| 1955 | 29,556,000,000 |
| 1956 | 30,539,000,000 |
| 1957 | 29,757,000,000 |
| 1958 | 33,206,000,000 |

*Net income of farmers (including Government payments)*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1932 | $1,928,000,000 |
| 1947 | 17,304,000,000 |
| 1948 | 16,057,000,000 |

*Net income of farmers (including Government payments)*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| 1951 | $15,158,000,000 |
| 1952 | 14,416,000,000 |
| 1955 | 11,470,000,000 |
| 1956 | 12,111,000,000 |
| 1957 | 10,840,000,000 |
| 1958 | 13,060,000,000 |

*National income*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1932 | $43,049,000,000 |
| 1948 | 210,098,000,000 |
| 1951 | 253,304,000,000 |
| 1952 | 268,805,000,000 |
| 1955 | 302,493,000,000 |
| 1956 | 320,024,000,000 |
| 1957 | 333,856,000,000 |
| 1958 | 333,863,000,000 |

CONSUMERS

During the quarter of a century the farm program has operated the consumer has gotten better food at an expenditure of a smaller part of his income. Although costs of hauling, processing, handling, and merchandising food have increased substantially in the last few years, the average wage paid to factory workers in the United States would buy in 1958 almost twice as much food as the average hour's pay in 1929.

*Consumers: Quantities of foods purchased by 1 hour of factory labor*

| | In 1929 | In 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| Bread, loaves | 6.4 | 11.0 |
| Steak, pounds | 1.2 | 2.0 |
| Milk, pints delivered | 7.8 | 16.8 |
| Butter, pounds | 1.0 | 2.9 |
| Bacon, do | 1.3 | 2.7 |
| Eggs, dozens | 1.1 | 3.5 |
| Potatoes, pounds | 17.7 | 33.8 |
| Oranges, dozens | 1.3 | 2.8 |

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

## Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has brought to Congress a proposal which he says will help meet the current shortage of more than 140,000 classrooms. However, to build the 75,000 classrooms which Dr. Flemming says will be built under his formula, State constitutional and statutory debt limitations will have to be changed, basic tax concepts will have to be revised, and the States will have to match the Federal funds with money they do not have.

On this St. Patrick's Day, Dr. Flemming's famous formula can be modified slightly. Those fabled little rascals, the leprechauns, can be put to work. The Secretary could change the necessity for matching funds by the States to matching by the leprechauns. All each State would have to do would be to convince a leprechaun to come forward with his pot of gold. The Federal Government would match every pot with an equivalent one from the Federal Treasury. Those who disbelieve in the existence of the leprechauns may not have too much faith in the ability of this proposal to build classrooms but as many scoili—schools—could be built for the cailini—girls—and buachallai—boys—under this method as would be under Dr. Flemming's original formula.

## Statement on the Berlin Crisis by Wisconsin Conference of Methodist Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the Berlin crisis as adopted by the world peace commission of the Wisconsin Conference of Methodist Churches, and sent to me by Mr. Lawrence Giese, of Milwaukee, the commission chairman. This thoughtful statement can, I believe, be read with profit by Members of Congress and others throughout our Government:

STATEMENT ON BERLIN CRISIS

The Berlin crisis calls for fresh and creative thinking. Neither the cause of peace nor the welfare of the German people will be served by a rigid adherence to fixed positions.

To be acceptable and workable, any new plan offered must meet the minimum legitimate needs of the West, central Europe, and Russia. Russia, who lost 20 million people in the last war, must feel her future will not contain a nuclear-armed Germany leading a united Europe in attack against her.

Czechoslovakia, Poland, and East Germany need an end to Russian-armed domination. West Germany wants West Berlin protected against seizure by East German Communists. The West must feel that any new proposal would not encourage Russian armed aggression.

The answer to these requirements, we believe, may exist in large part in current proposals of British Labor Party, German Social Democrats, and the Polish Government for disengagement of military forces in Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia with neutralization and substantial demilitarization of that area under international inspection and control. These proposals were given additional meaning when Khrushchev told the 21st Soviet Congress he would be willing to withdraw Russian troops from that area in a central European area disengagement.

We believe that those proposals would be strengthened if they clearly stated that the goal in that three-nation area would be the reduction of all arms to the level necessary only for domestic order, carried out and maintained under adequate U.N. inspection.

To prevent a "power vacuum" into which either side might return, we believe a United Nations armed force should be stationed in those three countries, backed by a declaration from the West and the U.S.S.R. that each side would consider any military operation against that U.N. force by the other as an attack upon itself.

Substantial benefits would come to all concerned from such a plan, namely:

1. Both Russia and the West would be freed from a possible resurgence of militarism in a nuclear-armed Germany.

2. Russia would get a dependable neutral buffer zone in place of satellites that are dangerously unreliable.

3. Sixty million Poles, Czechs, Germans freed from U.S.S.R. armed control.

4. The future of West Berlin and of German reunification would be much brighter in an atmosphere removed from the arena of the cold war.

5. The armed forces facing each other in central Germany would be separated, reducing the possibility of incidents that could provoke war.

Perhaps most important, this proposal would institute in the vital central European area the principle of effective disarmament under United Nations inspection and control, which must eventually extend to the whole world if lasting peace is to be secured.

## American Legion's 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an address to my fellow Legionnaires on the occasion of the American Legion's 40th anniversary:

Fellow Legionnaires, this occasion marks an important date in the history of our organization. Forty years ago today the American Legion came into being at caucuses of the first American Expeditionary Force held in Paris on March 15–17, 1919. We do not meet here to boast or cast bouquets at ourselves—we leave that to others—but it is only proper that we should remind ourselves, more than a generation and two world wars intervening between the founding of our organization and the present that (I quote from the "Brief History of the Legion" prepared by the national headquarters in Indianapolis) today, 40 years after its inception, the American Legion is "the only major American veterans' association which was formed overseas by fighting men and women. It includes more combat veterans, more disabled veterans, more winners of the Congressional Medal of Honor and other decorations than all other veterans' organizations combined."

There has never been anything like it in American veterans' history save only the Grand Army of the Republic: In its scope and influence the American Legion is to the 20th century what the Grand Army was to the preceding one, but we flatter ourselves that our own legislative history is a bit more savory than that of the older organization which flourished in the heyday of what might be termed the lush era of log-rolling and back-scratching. It reached an all-time high in the first administration of Grover Cleveland when it ran headlong into that formidable and entirely immovable character. Here are two or three examples of the pension bills of Civil War veterans with which Mr. Cleveland had to deal by the hundreds, if not the thousands, back in 1886. One claimant had fallen over a fence with absolutely no injury to his person; but he was a veteran and therefore, on the strength of this shocking calamity, must have a pension. Another demanded a life pension because he had hurt his ankle while intending to enlist. Still another had broken his leg while gathering dandelions long after the war. And so forth and so on. For such claims the Grand Army of the Republic fought with a zeal and valor worthy of a better cause. In contrast to such pre-

posterous goings on, the record of the American Legion in respect to needy veterans offers a bright and lustrous page of solid, enduring achievement. For our legislative record, State and national, we need apologize to none. Our contributions to hospitalization, education and all manner of public welfare where we can with propriety act, stands, and speaks for itself. But all this is as well known to you as to myself.

It is, however, a great pleasure and satisfaction merely to rise and remind you of that splendid record which first began to be written 40 years ago. May we, one and all, everywhere in this beloved land of ours, continue the good work so proudly begun many years ago and so faithfully and stanchly maintained ever since. May we ever live up to and be worthy of the title of our organization—the American Legion.

## An Exile's Rambles Through Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include in the RECORD a very interesting recital of a trip made to the Old Sod by one of my constituents, Mr. Jeremiah J. Riordan, a resident of Peabody, Mass., and a very popular Irishman who has been most active down through the years as a sincere and conscientious member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, division 11, in Essex County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This outstanding Irishman has established an enviable record as a writer and author of Irish subjects, and is held in high repute in his community:

AN EXILE'S RAMBLES THROUGH ERIN

(By Diarmuid O'Riordan)

'Twas on June 7, 1956, that my wife and I boarded a plane (TWA) at Boston, Mass., U.S.A., for Shannon Airport in Ireland, to satisfy a desire we had hankering in our hearts for a number of years, to once again see the hills and valleys of Ireland and visit the scenes of our childhood days and, if possible, visit some friends of our youth. It was 49 years since I had looked back from the deck of a White Star liner at the last glimpse of Erin as it sank below the horizon when the good ship *Cymric* headed her way across the broad Atlantic for the shores of the United States, now the land of our adoption.

My wife, Annie (Moran) Riordan, although a few years my junior, was absent from County Mayo, Ireland, for 50 years. I had kept in touch with my relatives through correspondence down through the years until at last they had all gone to the great beyond. So I did not expect any great reception on my arrival, although I knew I would meet some schoolboy chums to remind me of the dim past. On the other hand, my wife had lost all touch with her relatives in Ireland. She had left behind her in 1906, an aunt and her three sons. At this stage it would be well to state that she was born in England. Her parents died while she was still an infant, so her aunt in Ireland was given the responsibility of bringing her up. She had a brother in England with whom she had kept in touch, and the desire to meet him and his family was part of the hankering in her heart, besides her not forgotten relatives in County Mayo.

That was the picture facing us as we walked up the gangway to the huge bird of the air that was to take us back to Ireland in as many hours as it took days to bring us away from there 50 years ago. Neither of us had ever attempted to fly before and though I was not afraid for myself, as I knew I could acclimate myself to anything. I was anxious about my companion as she is of a nervous disposition. We walked in and sat down as if it was an everyday occurrence. There were about 50 passengers aboard but at one glance I knew they were not all going to get off at Shannon. It was a Trans-World Airways plane and would keep on going to other airports in the worldly course. It was now 10 p.m., the time scheduled for departure, and as the great motors began to hum loudly, I kept watching my wife and she did not seem to mind it. In glancing out the window of the plane I knew we were moving rapidly as I observed objects flying backwards and very soon there was nothing visible but complete darkness, so I concluded we were up near or over the clouds. We laid back in our seats and tried to get some sleep but, try as I might, slumber would not come to me, but lo and behold, Annie started to snore loudly and she kept it up until we reached Gander Airport at Novia Scotia, where we stopped to refuel. After 30 minutes we heard the motors again starting up and again we were in the air, this time facing the broad Atlantic. It was then 1 o'clock a.m. American time and very soon it was bright daylight as we were going to meet the sun in its course around the planet earth. Annie again was soon fast asleep but beyond a few odd winks there was no slumber for me so as that when about 9 a.m. American time, 2 p.m. Irish time, we were told to get ready to land at Shannon. I had to shake her gently to awaken her. I then told her we were in Ireland, she just smiled and said, "Don't be silly, we can't be in Ireland yet; we just left Boston."

II

We came to a stop and those of us who were to visit Ireland got off and after going through the usual formalities, we were free to go to any part of the Emerald Isle which we liked best. I, myself, had a hankering for County Cork, where I spent the first 24 years of my life, but I thought if I went there first I could not stay long enough to satisfy my years of longing, as I would have to yet visit Mayo and England. So if we visited those places first and curtail our stay as much as possible, I would have more time at my disposal to spend among my haunts in Inchigeela, County Cork, than if I went there first. We were scheduled to go back to the land of the free and the home of the brave on August 13. The visit to County Mayo and to England was a must, so it was better to get it over with at once and then return to God's own country (County Cork) as soon as possible. After changing my American dollars to £5 notes at Shannon, I said, "Now show me the way to Ballyhaunis, County Mayo." The employees at the airport were more than obliging to guide us right, and a young girl wearing a uniform immediately pointed out a bus that would take us to Ennis, County Clare, where we could contact a train that would take us to Ballyhaunis, County Mayo. In fact, together with pointing it out to us, she contacted the conductor of the bus and requested him to wait until we could get our baggage aboard, which he very obligingly did.

We started out on our first tour through Ireland on the 8th of June 1956. The ride from Shannon to Ennis gave me my first impression of my native land. I had not seen much of it in my youth, first, because there was no means of transportation in those days; secondly, money was scarce, and thirdly, my occupation was too steady to allow time off. (I was a letter-carrier since I left school until I came to America in 1907.) So in that bus ride from Shannon to Ennis I covered more ground and saw more of Ireland than I had during the first 24 years of my life. That part of Clare, covered by the route of that bus, was not very encouraging to any exile in his rambles through Erin. The land was not of the best, though the residences were almost modern-looking in appearance, there didn't seem to be any people working in the fields. I did see a number of men digging a trench along a road. It looked like a sewer or a watermain. That was the only activity I observed in County Clare until we reached Ennis railroad station. Well, here we are at Ennis depot, waiting for a train to Ballyhaunis, which will arrive in 30 minutes.

I have read in some book or other periodical that Ennis is a very ancient city. Well, that is the impression it gave me that day as I sat in a seat on the platform waiting for the train. Not only did the city look ancient, but the people looked ancient, the few of them that were there in and out of the ancient-looking waiting room. I don't mean that they looked old in years. Some were young men and women; still somehow they looked ancient. However, the train arrived on schedule and I was surprised to step into a nice comfortable compartment. We soon started on our rambles through Erin. There was a passenger across from me whom I recognized as one who got off the plane at Shannon. However he got to Ennis, I don't know. I tried to get him into conversation, but I could only learn that he did not get on at Boston but came from the Middle West and he was going to Westport, County Mayo, which was as far as this train goes. So I gave up trying to talk to him and got to converse with an Irish lady, who was going home after doing some shopping in Ennis. She was very interesting and gave me my first inkling of the Irish Republic, for when I left Ireland the country was under British rule. The natives were subjects of English-made laws and they were afraid of their rulers. They were crushed by English landlords. They were timid of making improvements on their land or their homes for fear of their rent being raised. They were bowing and lifting their hats to the landlord and his agent. But in this woman, who kept up a conversation with me, I could see she was different from the people I once knew. She spoke with a spirit of independence like the American people, and I knew she was not going to bow to any man or woman. In one word she was independent. She was a specimen of Irish womanhood. A specimen of an independant Irish Republic, who felt and knew she was as good as anybody. From then on I felt too that I was no longer visiting a subject people but an independent and proud people, who were willing to receive an exile with a "Cead Mile Failte." My interesting passenger got off at a small station in County Galway. She wished us good luck and safe journey. We thanked her and then I turned my attention to the passing scenery. It was not very encouraging. The land seemed poor and very stony ground. The fences, dividing the fields, were a single stone structure of a temporary nature, which looked as if a bull or a cow could tumble them over with their horns. But the cows or cattle were very scarce along that stretch of country. Sheep seem to be the prevailing stock of the farmers in Galway and Mayo, the next county in our rambles. Soon the train stopped at Claremorris, where we were told we are to change for Ballyhaunis. Ourt wait at Claremorris was 30 minutes and the place seemed deserted as we walked up and down the platform. Soon we heard the puffing coming and we got our baggage ready to board. We got in the same compartment with a young priest.

Here I must explain that some of the cars of the trains in Ireland are all one compartment of passengers, like the one we got on at Ennis, while other cars are divided into several compartments to hold six or eight passengers, a door from the platform to enter each compartment. This train we got at Claremorris was of the divided variety. So we got on to accompany Father Reilly. He told me his name after looking at the tag on one of my bags and his remarking, "Riordan, that is a good Irish name." I said, "Yes, Father, and what would your name be?" He said, "Reilly, just as good as Riordan anyday." I thought to myself more of that independent spirit and I liked him for it. It turned out that he belonged to the Columban Mission, and was a visitor at Boston 2 years ago. I told him I knew Father McGrath of Milton, and that we, often in Peabody, ran parties for him and his Columbia Mission. So we were the best of friends before we reached Ballyhaunis. Ballyhaunis, the home of my wife's ancestors, is a nice town, composed of very friendly people. After procuring a taxi to take us to a hotel and supper, it was then about 8 p.m. An acquaintance of mine in Peabody asked me to call to an address in Knox Street, Ballyhaunis, if I had time to just step in and say "Hello" for him. So, after having supper I walked out front and there was somebody standing at the door of the hotel; so I said, "What street is this?" "This is Main Street." "Where is Knox Street?" "Right around the corner." So around the corner I went to Knox Street.

I soon found the address I wanted. It happened to be a grocery and bar combined. So in I went and asked for the proprietor. I said, "Martin Waldron from Peabody, Mass., asked me to drop in here and say hello." After a certain amount of humming and hawing and further identification they know who Martin was, so I was a friend of everybody there. There were a number of men drinking beer standing at the bar and they all had a welcome for the Yankees (Annie was with me). Then I explained my mission to Ballyhaunis, looking for relatives of my wife, and I asked them if they knew where a place called Cappagh was and if there were any Morans there. A taximan happened to be in the crowd. He said he thought he knew them. He know where Cappagh was, anyway. It was about 3 or 4 miles out in the country toward County Sligo. "Well," I said, "will you come to my hotel in the morning at 9 o'clock and we will take a ride out there." He said, "9 o'clock." I said, "Yes." He said, "why can't you wait until they get out of bed? I laughed and said, "will 10 o'clock do?" He said, "that would be better, you won't get anybody around here up at 9 o'clock in the morning." So, to make a long story short, he came in the morning to take us to Cappagh and we rode out with him about 3½ miles out a nice road through a farming district and he stopped at a house about 20 yards in from the road. A little gate opened at a convenient distance from the road, then a path to the front door of the house. On each side of the path a bed of flowers was very conspicuous. We entered the house and introduced ourselves to a young woman, who could not have been born before my wife had left Ireland. There were five or six young children in the kitchen. They all looked to be less than 8 or 9 years old and an older woman sitting near the fire. The younger woman, who afterward proved to be the mother of the children, told us her name was Moran before she was married; she was now Mrs. Kelly. Her father's name was Tom Moran. I explained about my wife's cousins as being Tom and Willie Moran. So she pointed out Willie's house farther back from the main road, to be reached by a lane about 200 yards long.

So we proceeded up to Willie's house accompanied by one of her boys. The lady in charge there did not seem to know anything about us, but she dispatched a little boy down to the fields, where her husband, Willie, and his brother, Tom, were working. She told him to tell them there were some Yankees here to see them. We went out to the taxi, which was parked in the lane, to await their return. In the meantime, our actions had aroused the feminine curiosity of another neighbor in a nearby farmhouse. She came out to the rick of turf, which was situated near our parked car, with a basket as an excuse, to satisfy her curiosity. She apparently was minding her own business by coming for some means to replenish the fire in her kitchen. I quickly filled in the gap left vacant in her bewildered mind by going over and telling her of my problem. I said my wife, who was born in England was brought up in this locality and left here about 50 years ago, was back now trying to locate her relatives. She paused and looked me over and said, "Your wife would not be Ann Moran, would she?" I said, "Come over here and talk to her." So they talked and renewed acquaintance and found they were girlhood friends 50 years ago. Ann Morley, that was her girlhood name, was delighted to meet one she thought dead and gone. She promised to call at our hotel in Ballyhaunis on next Tuesday, market day, and as she said it, "We will have a drop together."

Then we suggested to drive back down to the main road to meet Willie and Tom on their way back to meet the Yanks. Very soon we saw two old men and a young man coming along the road. The two were Willie and Tom, my wife's cousins and the young man was Willie's son. We went in then to Tom's house and talked about old times. We had tea, and as my taxi was still waiting on the road, we started back to Ballyhaunis. While we were riding back to our hotel, I remembered that the now well-known apparition at Knock and County Mayo were always associated in my mind. On asking the driver how far we were from that famous place, he said it was only 7 miles away. On talking it over with my wife, I engaged the services of the taxi for Sunday afternoon, to avail ourselves of this opportunity to visit the shrine at Knock, where the church had it recognized as an established fact that the Blessed Virgin appeared there in 1879. It was early in the afternoon when we arrived at our hotel. So after refreshing ourselves we went to a travel agency and booked passage from Dublin to Manchester, England, for Monday afternoon and sent a telegram to my wife's niece, Lizzie Price at Bacup, Lancashire, informing her of the time we expected to arrive at Manchester Airport. We then had a few hours to kill in Ballyhaunis, so we started out to see the town. Our first stop was to the Catholic Church, where we said a prayer and made a wish for the assistance of God and the Blessed Virgin for our safe journey through Ireland and England, and our safe return to the United States, the land of our adoption, and the home of our 5 children and 10 grandchildren. In our travels through the town, we were greeted by several people, as the good friendly Irish had a "Cead Mile Failte" for all strangers, especially Yanks that are returning Irish exiles, as whom we were at once recognized. I expect it is from the cut of our clothes, because it could not be from our accent, as I had never lost my Munster brogue. We soon saw another Catholic church, where we made another visit and the same request as before. I once was told by someone that in the first visit to a church, any request asked for in good faith, would be sure to be granted, and on more than one occasion I had reason to believe the truth of that statement. We returned to our hotel about 8 o'clock, but it was bright daylight and likely to be for a few more hours; however, we were both tired and we retired early as we had to be up for Mass on Sunday morning before our journey to Knock.

We woke up in time for 8 o'clock Mass, and went to the parish church on Main Street. A beautiful edifice built in 1921, but as we approached the church door we noticed a blackboard with a notice written in chalk, "collection for the Pope today." I said, "Ho, ho, they must know we were coming." (we had already contributed to the Pope's collection in Peabody.) The Mass was celebrated by the oldest priest I have ever seen active in the service of God. I judged he must be at least 90 years old and he appeared to be very feeble too. After Mass, we had breakfast at our hotel and went out for another walk among the friendly people of Ballyhaunis, as we had a few hours to kill before our appointment with our taxi driver who was to take us to Knock. He came to the hotel at the appointed time of 1 o'clock. We intended having dinner at Knock, as we had a late breakfast and did not feel like putting down another meal just then. We arrived at the village of Knock after a ride of 7 miles of good smooth level roads, well paved with crushed rock. We approached a restaurant and were lucky in getting a table for two immediately, as the place was crowded. Our waitress was a pretty Irish coleen, not yet 18 years, and she was very much interested in us. I don't know whether she used all her customers like she greeted us or not, but I thought she believed us to be her long lost relatives from the United States. I asked her if she would like to go to America. She told me she had a chance to go there once, but she didn't and if she would get the same chance again, she would be off. I gave her a substantial tip and after she had thanked me profusely, I began to think that she was working toward that all the time, for they can tell a Yank a mile off over there. The scene around the village of Knock was something which will remain in my memory for a long time. The large crowd of people assembled there, numerous buses from all parts of Ireland. All the stores were temporarily set up for the sale of religious articles. The devotion and sincerity of the people, pilgrims they are commonly called. There were the stations of the cross outdoors. Mass was celebrated out in the field adjoining the church at 4:30 p.m., followed by Benediction of the Blessed Sacrement and a sermon. Some pilgrims were carried on stretchers, others were in wheelchairs, while more had to use crutches to help them to walk.

The remarkable incident and the more noticeable to us was the true devotion and the apparent faith of the people as they prayed aloud, going through the stations of the cross and answering the rosary, which was said after the sermon. The day was very warm and I'm afraid I did not gain any indulgence that day as I did not expect any heat like that in Ireland. I was wearing heavy underwear, a heavy suit of tweed and a top coat. I was afraid of catching cold and I, being subject to bronchial asthma, I was prepared for colder weather and I could not keep my mind on the devotions of the day, on account of the intense heat. We arrived back in Ballyhaunis at 6 o'clock or 6:30. While driving along the road toward the town I satisfied my curiosity of something that was troubling me for 2 days. On Saturday when we started out with the taxi driver, I noticed every once in a while he made the sign of the cross going back and forth to Cappagh, and today back and forth to Knock, he was doing the same thing until I began to think he might be a little bit touched. At first I was afraid, but then I

saw the poor fellow was harmless, so before we reached Ballyhaunis I got courage and asked him why he was doing it. He said, "you Yankees are all the same. You have no religious principles. We, in Ireland make the sign of the cross whenever we pass a Catholic church or a cemetery." I then paid him off and asked him to come up in the morning to take us and our luggage to the railway depot, as we were taking a train to Dublin so as to get a plane for Manchester, England. That night we had a visit from Willie Moran's son from Cappagh. He told us his folks thought that our visit was too short and they would like to have us call on them again before our return to the U.S.A. I promised him we would after we had visited England and my own County Cork. So he bade us goodbye and said he'd hope to see us again.

In the morning of June 11, I said adieu to Ballyhaunis. I did not expect to see it again and I entered a train bound for Dublin, the capital city of Ireland.

The journey by rail from the west of Ireland to Westland Row Station is full of interest. The railroad passes through some historic places. The scenery, as we proceed along gets more beautiful as we get away from the rocky and barren land of Galway and Mayo, Roscommon, Westmeath, the Curragh of Kildare, Longford, and the plains of Meath are wonderful to behold. Our first stop was Mullingar and from then on we could see the richness of the land. The nice, well-kept houses, the landscaped grounds, the beautiful flower gardens in front of each habitation, the nice cultivated fields and the fat cattle browsing in the green pastures make it look a contented land and a prosperous community of independent people, though it is only 35 years since they started to enjoy that freedom which they had won from a mighty empire by sacrificing the lives of some great Irish patriots, such as Padrig Pearse, Tom Clarke, Terrance McSweeney, Thomas MacCurtin, Harry Boland, Cathal Brugh, Michael Collins, Peter O'Neill, Crowley, and several others, too numerous to mention. As we reached Athlone, our next stop, I could not but think, as I looked on the bridge of the great battle that was fought there in the 17th century between De-Ginkel, general of the English army, and the Irish, led by General Costume. An Irish bard, telling of that battle in a thrilling ballad often recited and sung at many a gathering of Irishmen and women, says:

"Twas well Horatious guarded
The Roman bridge of old,
And well was he rewarded
In riches, land, and gold.
And freedom points forever
To thy pass Thermopilee,
Which teach mankind that tyrants
Cannot subjugate the free.
But there were men as dauntless,
And hearts as true and brave,
By Shannon's gushing waters,
As e'er by Tiber's wave;
For never yet has freedom
More brave defenders known,
Than those brave hearts who guarded,
The old Bridge of Athlone."

Portarlington was our next stop after we had crossed the River Shannon and from then to Dublin. The prosperity of the country was manifest and when we pulled into Westland-Roe Station we felt that our rambles through Erin would be full of thrills and in contrast to the land we left behind 50 years ago, our visit will be a complete, pleasant surprise, our meeting with a free and independent people, instead of a subjected population will be a great comeback. We got a taxi at the Westland-Roe Station for the airport and as we rode along through many principal streets, I had my first view of that wonderful city. Arriving there, we were in time to board an Air Lingus plane for Manchester, England, and as the title of this tale is "An Exile's Ramble Through Erin," our visit to England must be told in another chapter.

III

The Air Lingus line planes are somewhat like the TWA's. We were soon flying across the Irish Sea. It was 5:50 p.m. when we got aboard and we were due in Manchester at 8:50. In a very short time we could see Holyhead on the shores of England. Then we flew over the farming district of Cheshire and Lancashire and shortly the city of Liverpool and Manchester hove into view and we were told to prepare to make a landing and in less time than it takes to tell it, we were descending the ladder at the airport. After a short customs examination we were conducted to a bus, our luggage was put aboard and we were told we were being conducted to the air terminal at Manchester, which is about 20 miles from the airport. My wife and I were sitting in the front of the bus and as we pulled in near the terminal I saw two girls standing on the sidewalk and one of them started jumping while her face was wreathed in smiles. She was Lizzie Price, my wife's niece and she recognized us as she had a picture of us which we sent her some time ago. So we got our luggage out of the bus and as the girls had a car we put it aboard and started for Bacup.

We arrived about 9:30 p.m. Lizzie's companion was her sister Agnes, Mrs. Geoghan. They were two lovable girls and we at once felt as though we had known them all our lives. Waiting for us at 5 Bowker Street, Bacup, was Lizzie's husband, Joe Price, her sister Katie (Mrs. Russell) and Mr. Russell, my wife's brother, Patrick Moran, 79 years old, and his wife, Mrs. Moran. We stayed up late that night, the time slipped away and before we knew where we were 'twas 1 a.m. So we retired and I spent my first night in England.

The reader must excuse me for deviating from my rambles through Erin while telling of my English visit but I assure you my association with people in England will be all Irish or of Irish descent, and also I found that the average Englishman is a lover of freedom and believes that Ireland was worthy of the freedom she had won at such great sacrifice. The next day, Agnes, Lizzie, my wife and I procured a car and went visiting other relatives. John Moran and Willie Roe, two nephews of my wife, who live in a town called Bury. After visiting with them we came back to Bacup and called it a day. The following day I booked passage from Manchester to London for the following Thursday, as I had two nephews there that I had never met. So I was sorry to say goodby to our friends in Bacup and I promised to see them again someday and again went on the air for London, where I visited my two nephews and said a prayer at my sister's grave. I went to the top of Westminster Cathedral, visited the American Embassy, saw Scotland Yard and the royal residence. In all we spent a few hours touring London in company with my nephews and prepared to fly back to Manchester on Monday, 18th of June and from there to Dublin where we landed on Tuesday, June 19, 1 week and 1 day since we left Ballyhaunis.

IV

Back in Dublin and again ready for an exiles' rambles through Erin. We took a taxi to King's Bridge, where we were to board a train for Cork. Our taxi driver was a talkative fellow and he said if we were going to Cork he would recommend the Windsor Hotel. We arrived at King's Bridge and boarded a train for Cork at 4:30 p.m. Every car in the train was pretty well filled. Opposite us sat two young girls and when we chanced to exchange greetings, I guessed they were unknown to each other as they did not board the train at the same time. One, who was more friendly, told me she was a married woman and lived in the city of Cork and on my asking if she was born in Cork, she told me she was born in Seattle, Wash. I noticed she blushed as she said it, so I didn't further question her. She then said she had a cousin in Boston and wondered if I ever met him. I said the chances are that I did not as Boston was a big city and I lived 25 miles from there. "Well," she says, "did you ever hear of a Paddy Moynihan?" That name rang a bell in my memory, as I knew of a Mr. Moynihan, who had been in the State of Massachusetts Accounting Department. So I said, "was your cousin a schoolteacher in Ireland before he went to America?" She said he was. "Well," I said, "he did not come from Cork." "No," she says, "he came from Kerry." I said, "I met your cousin and I shook hands with him." The scenery along on both sides of that railroad on the east coast of Ireland is beautiful. The valley near the Galtee Mountains as viewed from the train that evening, as the sun was moving toward the western horizon is a picture that no artist can paint. The weather was beautiful. Our company was delightful and the train was nearing my native County Cork, where I had not been for 49 years and my excitement grew momentarily.

After we had left Limerick Junction and I saw Mallow Station I knew the hour I had longed for had arrived and soon we were going through the tunnel and into the Glanmire Station at dear old rebel Cork. Hustle and bustle followed our arrival at Cork and soon I was in a taxi bound for the Windsor Hotel. On entering that famous inn, I was told if I had not booked ahead I could not be accomodated. It was the same at Corrigans Hotel next door. So I came back to my driver and said we will have to try somewhere else. He said, "Would you like to go to a guesthouse? I know a very nice woman who goes to Mass every morning," and he spoke with a nice blarney accent. I said, "Take me there." So he drove us to Mrs. Ryan's, 4 Mt. Verdon Terrace, Wellington Road.

V

I had intended to stay in the city only until the following day as I wanted to visit my native Inchigeela. There I was in Ireland. Nearly 2 weeks had gone by since I alighted at Shannon, and yet I had not seen the cottage in which I was born. Nor the church where I was baptized and received my first communion. I had not visited the scenes of my childhood, nor met any of the friends of my youth. But in talking to Mrs. Ryan, she persuaded us to rest up for a few days, as she said you people have done a lot of traveling and you need a rest. So I consented, as I felt as if I needed a rest and as I wanted to call on a Mrs. Healy in Boreenamana Road. This will give me an opportunity to do so. It happened that Mrs. Ryan knew Mrs. Healy well, as they were old friends. She told us the best way to get there. Mrs. Healy was in the States but came back to Ireland 20 years ago and settled down in Cork City. Her maiden name was O'Neill, a sister of one of my neighbors in Peabody, Mass., and when we called on her, and recognized each other I asked her if I would get a taxi tomorrow would she go out to Mourn Abby with us. (A village bordering on the town of Mallow and her native place.) As I said I heard so much about that place from exiles in Peabody that I wanted to see it. She said she would be delighted. So I got in touch with my taxi driver with the blarney accent, a Mr. Coogan by the way, and we again called on Mrs. Healy the following morning. Our first stop that day was a visit to the bells of Shandon, made famous by the lines of Father O'Mahony (Father Prout) "The Bells of Shandon that sound

so grand on the pleasant waters of the River Lee."

Then Blarney Castle was the next place of interest about which so much has been written that I don't feel competent to do full justice to that beautiful place, but I will say I did not kiss the blarney stone, for to accomplish that it was necessary to climb to the top of the castle, and being troubled with bronchial asthma, I thought it wiser not to do so. We set out for Mallow and Mourne Abbey. We visited the O'Neill homestead at Ballyhilloge and the Walsh's cottage and a Mr. and Mrs. Coleman at Grenard. When we got to Coleman's they were getting ready to go to a funeral, a Mr. Buckley, who was an I.R.A. man. He had fought for the freedom, which the people now enjoy and was to go to his last resting place, with military honors. So we too proceded to Ballinamona Cemetery and I witnessed my first I.R.A. funeral. No need to describe that here, as the Irish appreciate what those boys have done during those 5 glorious years, and as they are now dropping from us one by one. They are all given a military farewall worthy of the sacrifices they have made. We came back to Cork that day through Fermoy, though a little longer route, it was worth the extra time as we passed such places as Rathcormac, Watergrass Hill and Glanmire. During the Marian year, several grottos were set up in Ireland, out in the rural districts by voluntary labor. In Glanmire, I think, there is the finest in all Ireland. It is cut out of solid rock and no words of mine can describe it here, but I will just say it is magnificent. We arrived back at Mrs. Ryans and I made arrangements to go to my native Inchigeela on Fridy. I notified the Lake Hotel, in the village, to that effect.

VI

On Thursday, July 21, we rested all day and on Friday the 22d we boarded a bus at 6:30 p.m. that would take us to my native village of Inchigeela about 30 miles away. Well, here I was at last steering westward to fulfill a desire existing in my heart for a long time. A hope, yes a cherished hope, I often thought in vain, now at last to come true. A dream I sometimes felt would be only a dream. No pen can portray my feelings on that occasion, rather I would say with the poet Locke, "This one short hour pays lavishly back, full many a year of mourning. I'd almost venture another flight, there is so much joy in returning. Watching out for that hallowed place, all other attractions scorning. Oh, Inchigeela, don't you hear me shout, I bid you the top of the morning."

When we got to within about 5 miles of the village, I started to look for familiar places and scenes. Yes; here was Toonsbridge. I wonder who has the "Public Hours," here now Dan Dineen's farmhouse on the left. The hill of Millen, Herlihy's lived here on the right. Oh, oh, Dan the Logg's house is torn down. Rossmore Hill don't seem so steep, and on reaching the top, I can see the village. "Oh, Thaneem An Die," but there it is. Yes; there it is "my native Inchigeela, near the town of sweet Macroom." From now on the ghosts of my ancestors, I expect, will be greeting me. As I am passing Joss Kellehers I can hear him singing in his fine rich voice, "Ma vesteen Leigh" although I know he is gone to the great beyond these many years. Here we are at the hotel. I am greeted first by Timmy Sullivan, proprietor of the hotel, a schoolmate of mine, his wife Mrs. Sullivan too welcomes me, and Neilus Kelleher, ex-postman comes sauntering in to bid me a "Cead Mile Falte," a member of the guard NA Seactna, and Paddy Casey drops in later and we sit and talk late into the night. We are shown our room and we prepare to retire, but as I had a great desire to satisfy an impulse I had when a boy I always thought I would like to stand inside this hotel and look out instead of standing outside and looking in. I now was in a position to satisfy that desire, so I strolled over to the window, raised the shade and looked out. I did not believe my eyes. I rubbed my optics, as I thought indeed I was observing an optical illusion or maybe twas all a dream. Yes; it must be a dream. This could not be true. Perhaps this whole of my rambles through Erin is just a dream and I'll soon wake up at home in Peabody. I pinched myself. No; it is no dream, here was my wife in the room with me. There is Deleas Hotel across the street (now Creedons Hotel). There is Quinlan's house, and Thade Ahern's and Joney Barry's and the post office where I worked. No; it can't be a dream. But if anybody told me they saw the streets of Inchigeela lit up with electric lights, I would not believe them. Yes; there is my native village all lit up. I wonder is it because I'm returned, they are lighting the place up. I ran downstairs and inquired what is the cause of the illumination. They told me the place has been lit up for the past 6 months.

The following morning after breakfast, our first visit was the chapel where I received my first Communion and got Confirmation. In this chapel there is a statue of the Blessed Virgin. I had always thought of that as being the largest I had ever seen. I carried a picture of that in my mind during my years of exile and I could see no other as large as it until I began to think it is because I saw it with my childhood eyes, where it looked very big then. I was anxious now to see it again. I expected it would not look so big, so on my first visit I went before the altar of the Virgin Mary. Yes, the same statue was there and, yes, it still is the largest I have seen in all the years of my travels. I roamed along through the village and went along until I came to the cottage I was born in. I went in and explained my visit to a young mother. She was very courteous and asked me to sit down. I had great difficulty in suppressing my emotion as I thought of my dear father, my good stepmother, and a fond brother whom I left here 50 years ago.

I proceeded on further up the road to view some more familiar scenes and, yes, to see someone I once knew. Someone who was once very dear to me. Moor said, "There is nothing half so sweet in life as love's young dream." Yes, I wanted to see the girl I left behind. We got back to our hotel at 1:30 and had dinner. That was Saturday, and I spent the remainder of the day catching up on my correspondence. On Sunday morning we went to 8 o'clock Mass. There was a time when I knew every man, woman, and child that went to this chapel. As I wended my way among the people to Mass this morning, I knew no one. No one greeted me with a "Hello" or a "Quinas tha, an Thu." But, again, they must know we were coming for there is the blackboard that I saw in Ballyhaunis, "collection for the Pope today." This is the third contribution I have made to the Pope this year. The following Saturday, my wife and I went to confession and on Sunday morning we received Communion in my native place, at the same altar rail where I knelt as an innocent gossoon when receiving my first Communion. We stayed at the Lake Hotel 3 weeks. I made some new friends, they who were too young to be acquainted with before I emigrated, Paddy Casey, Paddy Joe Reilly, Dermot Kelleher, Timothy Galvin, John Mick Galvin, Eugene Corcoran, Shawn Rou Sullivan. I went back to see Carrig An Aferin and the scene of the Kilmachel ambush, where the South Cork Brigade, under Tom Barry, annihilated two lorrys full of auxiliary police one Sunday afternoon.

We also paid a visit to Dunmanway to visit some people and we spent a whole day in Macroom renewing acquaintances. I had always a desire to spend a night in lone Gougane Barra to see what it looked like in the darkness of the night, so after I spent 3 weeks in Inchigeela. I booked at Cronin's Hotel for July 13 and 14. The bus goes by Inchigeela on Saturday evening and I can get picked up at Gougane for the city of Cork on Monday morning, July 15. When leaving Inchigeela that evening, my thoughts went back to that memorable evening, now nearly 50 years ago, when "O'er Muskery's heights and Sheha's slopes the waning moon shone pale as I clasped her to my heart that night near Keimeen's emerald vale, and when inside the cottage door her nimble form did pass, the last I saw of my colleen Bragh, my Inchigeela lass."

We arrived in Gougane Barra that evening at about 8:30 p.m., brought up our luggage to the hotel, and, as it was still bright daylight, we went to visit the little chapel on the island. That was not the first time I visited there as I was present at the opening Mass of that little edifice at the beginning of this century. It was built under the direction of Father Hurley, then parish pastor of the parish of Iveleary (Inchigeela), whose body now lies buried there alongside the poet Callan, who wrote about Gougane Barra and made it more famous by his verses, "There is a green island in lone Gougane Barra. In Deep Valley Desmond a thousand wild fountains come down to that lake from their home in the mountains." I said a prayer at Father Hurley's grave and we walked back to Deep Valley Desmond, which is now taken up by the Irish Forestry Department, and will in a few years more be a dense forest. I think that walk was almost too much for me, as I almost got an attack of an asthmatic nature. So I retired early and I had yet to see Gougane Barra by moonlight.

The following day, Sunday, it poured rain something terrible and we just ventured out to attend Mass at the little chapel where there were about 50 present and we had a full house. We sat in the lobby of the hotel all day looking out at the rain and the summit of the mountains were invisible owing to the fog. We listened to the radio broadcast of the all Ireland final football between Cork and Kerry and in the last few seconds of the game twas announced, "well, there are only seconds left in the game, Cork is the winner by three points. Oh, Oh, Kerry scored a goal, 1 second before the final whistle. It is a draw." What a game. It was still raining in Gougane Barra, so we went to our room and soon retired. Monday morning on July 15, the bus drove up to Cronin's Hotel at Gougane bound for Cork City. I checked out at the office and a porter put my luggage aboard and soon we were on our way to the city of the rebel county. The historic village of Ballingeary was our first encounter on our return journey. Here you can hear the Gaelic language spoken fluently and the natives prefer to converse in Irish than the "bearla." The names over the doors of the few stores there are in the village are in the Gaelic tongue. "Slan Leath Anoiss." A passerby shouts at an occupant of the bus, "Go Maneigh Ola." "Ouit" was his reply.

VII

As we were leaving Ballingeary behind and going on towards Inchigeela, here I must say something about the Inchigeela lakes, as the road between the two villages skirt along those lovely expanses of water for a distance of about 5 miles and the scenery was never so nice than what it appeared to be on that morning. The sun was shining brightly and after yesterday's downpour, the fields and valleys on the far side of the expanse of water was a scene that artists rave about. The verdant countryside, the nice smug looking farmhouses in the valleys and in the glens. The cottiers cottage surrounded by marigolds and rose bushes and

the new growth of fir trees sloping down to the water's edge, gave me something to ponder over as I rode along that Monday morning, and realizing that my holidays would soon be over (4 more weeks). I prayed that never again would Irishmen and women have to fight and shed their blood to preserve that peace which they now enjoy after 700 years of persecution, bloodshed, and sorrow. We arrived at Inchigeela at 9 a.m. I had to stop at the Lake Hotel to pick up a piece of my luggage and I found a little crowd gathered there to bid us goodby. But it was nothing like the American funeral of bygone days. As then, when any young man or woman was going to America, it was the custom for them to leave the village about 7 o'clock in the morning in order to catch the 10 o'clock train at Macroom, so as to get to Queenstown (now Cobh) in time to book passage on the liner leaving the following morning. When leaving the village, all the villagers would turn out in a body and march as far as the graveyard, about a half a mile east of the village toward Macroom, where they bid the youthful travelers goodby, and many a tear was shed there in days gone by as the boy or girl was getting into the cart to take them away to the train. We called it the "American funeral," and many is the one I attended until at last it came to be my own turn to face the villagers at the church gate and tearfully bid all the good folks goodby; that was in 1907. Today 1956, there will be no "American funeral," and transportation is different now, this bus runs right to the city as no more trains are running from Macroom. So I must just watch the village fade away after saying a fond goodby to those folks here. I will be alone with my thoughts as the bus flies quickly onwards toward Macroom, where we stop for a short while and then we will be in Cork at Wellington Road, with the lady that "goes to Mass every morning." I learned while at Inchigeela that the bus company sponsored tours from the city every day which I now can take advantage of as I am living in the city. I have 4 more weeks to see Ireland. I have visited all my old friends that I knew in the olden days except one, who I found out at Macroom lives in Dublin. So I can kill two birds with one shot, as I promised them in Ballyhaunis that I would call back. I now can go to Dublin and see my friend there and again run across Ireland to Ballyhaunis.

So leaving the most of my luggage at Mrs. Ryan's at Cork, we got a train for Dublin on the 18th of July, arriving at the capital city early in the afternoon. I taxied to the address of Mrs. Cronin, my friend from Macroom. She received us very hospitably and gave us the use of her car and chauffeur, and herself accompanied us in a tour of the beautiful city of Dublin. We had 3 hours at our disposal and we visited all the interesting places. I was impressed at the cleanliness, beauty and newness of the capital of Ireland. At 10 o'clock we put up at a hotel and were at Westlandrow station in the morning at 9 o'clock waiting for a train to take us back to Ballyhaunis. We had only 20 minutes to wait and I noticed several young men and women also waiting, some young couples with 2 or 3 children. They all had luggage and seemed to be going to or coming from somewhere. We boarded the train bound for the west of Ireland, and nearly all the young people referred to got on. In our compartment there were a young man and his young wife and two children. I should say between 4 and 7 years old. I soon learned they were traveling all the previous night from England. They had arrived at Dunleara this morning. They were going back to their old home in County Mayo for a month's vacation from their place of employment in England. They had no sleep all night and very soon the children closed their eyes and were dead to the world, and afterwards the young father and mother did likewise.

I had another chance to see the beauty spots going through the middle of Ireland, and as each town or village hove into view, I was again impressed by the scenery. I have a habit of sitting on the right side of a train and as we go along I keep looking out over my right shoulder so as that now when I am riding toward the west of Ireland I am looking at scenes I had not observed when going the other way some few weeks ago. I could not but notice again the garden of flowers at almost every homestead. Mullingar, Athlone, Rosscommon, Ballinlough, and Ballyhaunis, here is where we get off. We said goodby and safe journey to our young friends, who were now awake and were going on to Westport. I had only a handbag for luggage, so on alighting I ignored the offers of all taximen as I now knew my way around and proceeded out of the depot and along down the street that would take me to the hotel. One taximan who was more ambitious than the rest drove after us and stopped as he was passing and he says, "If you are going to the hotel you may as well ride with me. It won't cost you anything as I am going that way anyway." So we got in and I engaged him to take us to Cappagh in the afternoon. The proprietoress of the hotel was glad to see us as she knew us from our previous visit and we had no trouble in getting accommodations. We rode out to Cappagh that afternoon and this time we had tea at Willie Moran's house. They seemed glad to see us. We dismissed the taxi and asked him to come back at 6 o'clock to drive us back to our hotel. The following morning found us at the depot again and I requested two tickets for Cork, as I did not want to go to Dublin again. There were two more ladies and a little girl who also requested tickets for Cork. We received our tickets but were told to change at Portarlington. So we got on all together and settled back waiting for Portarlington. This was a fast train and did not stop at any small places.

Our first stop was Athlone. The conductor came around and punched our tickets and he said Portarlington was the next stop, so on we went waiting for Portarlington. But we were in for a big disappointment, for yes, you guessed it, the next stop was Dublin. Here we had an argument with railroad officials. We would have to have taxi service to Kingsbridge station where we would get a train for Cork. We also needed tickets for Portarlington for five people, but we could get no satisfaction and the transportation to Kingsbridge was 9 shillings plus the price of tickets for Portarlington, all through no fault of ours. The other two ladies and the little girl were bound for Cobh, where they were to board a liner for Chicago. We thought we were all over our troubles but we had another fight with the conductor of this train as he said we could not travel on the tickets in our possession and the ladies appealed to me to present their argument for them. So I took the floor and called on all my persuasive ability to my assistance and I soon had that conductor throwing up his hands making a hasty retreat out of our compartment. The ladies smiled and the litle girl wittingly said, "So much for Portarlington."

We arrived at the rebel city and at Mrs. Ryan's in time for tea and tomorrow we were to start patronizing the bus tours from Cork for various places in Munster.

VIII

Here it is July 20 and we are going back home to the United States of America on the 13th of August. I must take a ride down to Cobb to see what changes are there since 1907, as it was there I saw from the tender taking us out to the big ship, a group of men and women on the quay waving handkerchiefs to their loved ones, who were bound for the broad Atlantic. So we took the train for Cobb that afternoon. In our journey I got to converse with a very interesting lady. She seemed a regular Mother Machree, and she talked about her family a lot and mentioned some historical facts that made me remark, "I did not get a chance to learn anything of that nature, as I am a product of the so-called National schools under British rule." Her answer was, "I too am a victim but I had a patriotic father." I said, "Was he a fenian"? She nodded her head and tears were glistening in her eyes, so I did not pursue the matter further, but just then the train was passing a ruined tower. She placed her hand on my shoulder and she said, "Did you ever hear the song about the tower that 'Captain Mackey robbed down Erins lovely Lee.'" I said "I did." "Well," she says, "there it is now." She left the train at Cobb without my learning her name.

We turned our attention now to real sightseeing. All our obligations were completed. We had satisfied all our desires. We had 3 weeks left to see Ireland without visiting anybody. So on July 22, we went on an all day tour to Tralee and Killarney, leaving Cork at 9:30 a.m. by touring bus, speeding out through Carrigrohane on a fine glorious morning with not a care in the world. A bus load of people seeking enjoyment, everybody happy and gay and willing to fraternize, were good omens for an enjoyable trip. The bus was equipped with a loud speaker and the conductor, through a microphone, described the places of interest as we went along to Leemount Cross, Healys Bridge, Barrahaurin, Banteer, Ballymaquirke, Boherbue, Kiskeam Castleisland, and Tralee.

The town of Castleisland's main street is as wide as O'Connell Street in Dublin. Every now and then while needing topic for his description of interesting places, the conductor would sing a song or request a passenger to sing and then sometimes everybody was singing, so after leaving Castleisland and while approaching Tralee everybody sang:

"The pale moon was shining above the green mountain. The sun was declining beneath the blue sea. When I strayed with my love through the clear crystal fountain that lies in the beautiful vale of Tralee. She was lovely and fair as the rose is in summer. Yet it was not her beauty alone that won me. Oh, No! Twas the truth in her eye ever beaming which made me love, Mary the Rose of Tralee."

We had a 2 hour stop at Tralee. We had lunch at a hotel and had time to see the town. My wife and I as usual paid a visit to the beautiful Catholic Church and visited some of the big stores, as it was near time for us to be picking up souvenirs to bring back to the States for all our grandchildren. The Irish merchants are really wide awake for that line of business. As almost in every store, you can find article marked, "souvenirs from Cork, from Ireland, from Killarney," so as that there is no excuse for those going back to the States but that they can find plenty of presents appropriately described as gifts from the Emerald Isle. On our return journey we came through Castlemain, and as we were going through the main street of that town, a passenger took the mike and sang in a fine rich voice: "There was a wild colonial boy, Dan Dillon was his name, he was born in Ireland's sunny clime not far from Castlemain."

The people in the street stopped and looked and waved their hats at us as we rode by in our merry mood. Killorglin was our next town and we stopped there for a short time at the scene of Puck Fair (they were making preparations then for that event, as it was to take place on the week of August 6). Our next stop was the famed Killarney where we had tea at the great Southern Hotel. We visited the cathedral and had a ride in

a jaunting car through the Kenmare estate. When we left Killarney we had a long ride through the Darranasogarth Mountains, which divide Cork and Kerry and we soon dropped down on Ballyvourney in County Cork. Another Irish-speaking district like Ballingeary. At an Oireachtas in Dublin in 1905 there were five first prizes went to that village for Irish storytelling, Irish stepdancing, Irish conversation, Irish recitation, and an exhibition dance of the eight-hand reel. Soon we were rolling through Macroom and famed Inniscarra, arriving in Cork at 10 p.m. Our next trip was a half-day tour to Mount Melleray and Youghal leaving Cork at 2:30 p.m. We rode out through Glanmire to Fermoy and Lismore making a short stop at Cappoquin, t'was a warm day and being thirsty, I went for a drink. I asked my waitress, "What is there about this town that keeps running in my mind?" She said, "maybe you are thinking of that song, In Sweet Cappoquin." I embraced her and called for a Cruiskeen lawn. I said "that is it," and I went out and got on the bus for Mount Melleray. We had an hour's stop there. There was a book where you could register if you wished. So I wrote my name and address as Peabody, Mass. Very soon a man walked up to me with an extended hand and said "pleased to meet you, I am Hayes from South Boston." We talked for a while and I found out he knew some of my friends in South Boston.

We came back through Cappaquin, Lismore, and then Youghal, where we stopped for 2 hours. We arirved back at Cork at 10:30 p.m., and on the way back everybody was singing. There were several solos and as there were several nations represented some sang "Down by the Tanyard Side." Some sang "Bonnie Doon," some sang the "Star-Spangled Banner," that good old yankee tune, some sang the "Marseillaise," and some "God Save the King." Then t'was up to me to sing a song and I knew not what to sing. Then I thought of all those songs that my daddy oft had sung when he placed me on his knee when love and life were young and I sang that old "Come All Ye" that he often sang so grand, "Sure I met with Naper Tandy and he took me by the hand." We had reservations made for the next day for an all-day tour to the Glen of Aherlow and Shannon Airport. This bus left at 9:30 in the morning of July 24, via Fermoy, Mithelstown, Galbally. As we were passing through Galbally, I had to think of my father as I often heard him singing, "I Wish I Never Saw Galbally Town or the Sky Over Darby O'Leary." There are many songs sung concerning the Glen of Aherlow, but I am not going to quote them here, for as I gazed on that beautiful spot from the side of the Galtee Mountains, where the bus was parked, I was spellbound by its magnificence and I said out loud, I did not care who was listening, "There is a land worth fighting for." There was a man standing near me who evidently knew the district better than I did. He took a hold of my arm and whispered in my ear, "Yes, it is worth fighting for sir, for 'tis many is the good drop of potten was made down there." The town of Tipperary was our next stop and then the historic city of Limerick and the treaty stone. On our return to Cork we went by many places of interest in County Limerick including Buree, where DeValera was brought up and the school he attended. The house where Archbishop Mannix, of Australia, was born, Bathluric Buttevan and Mallow. On July 25 we slept late so we took a half-day tour to Glandore. On that day, leaving Cork at 2:30 p.m., we went along seeking the valley of the Bandon River by Bellgooly, Innishannon, Crossbarry, Kinsale, Bandon, Owenachincha, Rosscarbary, and Glandore. As we were going by Crossbarry, the conductor, through the mike, told of the great fight made by Tom Barry and the South Cork Brigade here during the black and tan war and how "Flur" Begley played his bagpipe all during the battle.

"The tune he played that day of
Fate shall never wholy flee,
For the piper of Crossbarry boys
He piped old Ireland free."

Glandore has been sadly neglected by historians and writers. The praises of Killarney are given us in song and story. Glengarrif has been written about as one of the beauty spots of Ireland. The meeting of the waters has been made famous by Tom Moor. The grandeur of the Glen of Aherlow has been praised in prose and poetry. Whilst the lovely Glandore has been jealously guarded, as if its inhabitants were fearful that some one would come and do something to mar its beauty. Yes, it is hidden away in a southwestern corner of County Cork. On arriving there that evening, I was spellbound by its grandeur and after taking in its beauty by long and loving observations, I walked over to a man whom I took to be a native, sitting on a wall whittling a stick. "I said you have a nice place here, sir." He looked at me and said after a pause, "if you had this place overs in the States, the common people could not go near it." And he spoke with an air of superiority, so I questioned him further. I said, "Maybe you are right but that is no reason why you should hide it over here and keep it all to yourself." He answered, "Now you make me feel guilty, I was 34 years in the States. I served 20 years in the New York police force and when I got my pension, my wife and I came back here to this. We never had any children, so we are living here in the midst of all this. It may seem selfish to you, but to us it is perfectly legal."

IX

On July 26 we took the combined cruise and motor coach tour through the Golden vale and Lough Derg via Fermoy, Mitchelstown, Ballylanders, Knocklong, Limerick and Killaloe. The bus arrived at Killaloe at 1:15 p.m. By the way there were three bus-loads of tourists in this tour and we boarded the launch immediately after arriving as we were told we could procure lunch on board. It was a beautiful day and we settled down in the top deck of the boat for a 3 hours cruise of Lough Derg, which is situated between the counties of Tipperary and Galway. As the boat proceeded along from Killaloe the Golden vale of Tipperary was on our right and I began to think of Charles Kickam's "Knocknagow" or "The Homes of Tipperary" written about 100 years ago, and I thought if Kickham could only see the homes of Tipperary today, he would write in a more inspiring manner. There would not be so many tears shed while reading his version or "The Homes of Tipperary." In those unhappy days, while landlordism ruled the country, eviction after eviction took place, whilst the down-trodden tenant farmer struggled to pay an exorbitant rent. The humbled homesteader would not dare have a flower garden in front of his door. If so, his rent would be nearly doubled as the landlords agent would consider him too "well off." Today as we ride along through Lough Derg, Tipperary presents a different scene, a peaceful prosperous-looking stretch of farmland, well cultivated fields, and happy looking homesteads, with a variation of flower gardens, scattered here and there, made it a scene opposite to that which painted by Kickam in his masterpiece, "Knocknagow." If I could only hear "The Knocknagow Fife and Drum band" so well depicted by Kickam. But I hope there is another band there to take its place, not only in the village of Knocknagow, but in every town and village in Tipperary, to keep alive the glorious Irish airs, the Irish National spirit, and that love of freedom for which the boys of 1916 and the men of the five glorious following years fought and died. "Benacht De Le Nanim."

After about 1 hour and a half sailing north along the shores of Tipperary, our boat turned back and then we were closer to County Galway. It was the haying season and farmers were busy in the numerous fields, as seen from the lake, "saving the hay," and I said to my wife, "here is a wish fulfilled" she says, "what wish," "that wish expressed in the song Galway Bay."

"And someday I may go back to Ireland, if 'twas only at the closing of my day, once again to see the ripple of the trout stream, And the workers in the meadow saving hay. To sit beside a turf fire in a cottage and to watch the barefoot gosoons at their play. To see again the moonlight over Cladagh and to watch the sun go down on Galway Bay."

That started the singing in the boat and a fellow tourist sang the next verse in fine style.

"And if there is going to be a life hereafter and sometimes I think there is going to be, I'll ask my God to let me make my heaven in that little Isle across the Irish Sea."

We arrived back at Killaloe about 4:30 p.m. We boarded our buses and started back through Birdhill and Limerick. We stopped at Limerick for an hour and as Mrs. Ryan and her husband were along with us on this trip, Mr. Ryan being a native of Limerick, he showed us around to many interesting places including a special visit to the treaty stone of Limerick upon which was written the now notorious broken treaty. On leaving the city of Limerick, we came by Rathluric (Charliville) Buttevant, Mallow, and came into Cork City by Blarney and Blackpool arriving in Cork at 10 p.m. That was the last of our tours through Cork and Munster. There was another, the first one we took, about which I have not written. We took that one while we were staying in Inchigeela. We met the touring bus at Macroom on its way to Killarney and as we had reservations, our seats were vacant. That day we went through Ballyvourney over the hills of Kerry into Killarney. On the return trip we were to come through Glengariff and Gougane Barra. We were rolling along nearing the border of County Cork when I noticed a tunnel in the rocks ahead and our conductor, who was a very able entertainer that day announced, "we are still in the kingdom of Kerry but as soon as we get through this tunnel you see ahead we will be in County Cork. So away we went and through the tunnel and just as we emerged on the other side on the first flash of light, I yelled, "Up Cork," and 50 voices chorased, "Up Cork." Then somebody sang that song, "The boys who licked the black and tans were the boys of the County Cork." We went through Glengarriff, the Pass of Keimeneigh and Gougane Barra without incident. We left the bus that time at Inchigeela as we were then staying at the Lake Hotel, conducted by a schoolmate of mine, Timothy Sullivan.

X

The city of Cork is a beautiful city and on the few occasions that I visited there before I emigrated, the red uniform of the English soldier was very conspicuous. A regiment was kept there by the English Government to preserve the peace, along with a large contingent of the R.I.C., roaming the streets of the city with heavy clubs or batons hanging from their belts.

Today with the exception of some traffic officers, there is no police visible and Cork in a crimeless city. The Cork County gaol is closed for good. "No business" as a member of the local guards put it when I asked him why. While we stayed in Cork, there was a by election for a member of Dail Erin and one night in Patrick Street, I attended a political rally in which De Valaria was the principal speaker. 'Twas very largely attended, all traffic being stopped during the proceedings. De Valaria's party candidate was elected the following day. We had only a short time left until we would be going back to the United States of America. Day by day our vacation was drawing to a close. I had guaranteed my reservations with TWA. I had all my shopping done to take back mementos of the Emerald Isle to those at home in the United States, but there was a friend of mine in Carrigaline, whom I had not yet met. This was a man to whom I said farewell in Inchigeela 49 years ago and when I was back there he was among the missing but I got his address as Shannon Park, Carrigaline.

So I took the Carrigaline bus one day and told the conductor I was a stranger and requested to be left off near Shannon Park. Before reaching the village of Carrigaline, the bus stopped, the conductor informed me, "This is Shannon Park now and do you know where you are going?" I said, "I don't but I'll have to inquire when I get off." He said, "Well, do you see those two men sitting on the stone wall down there?" I said, "I do." "Then go and ask them for any information you desire, they are oldtimers here and they will be able to direct you." I thanked him, got off and walked over toward my two friends and I said, "Good morning, men." They answered "Good morning." "Is this Shannon Park?" "Yes, it is." "Well do any of you men know a man around here named Tim Leary." "I am your man" said one of them and he looked me straight in the eyes. I said, "Are you Tim Leary formerly of Inchigeela?" He said, "Yes, I am." "Don't tell me 'tis as easy as this to find you; I thought I would have a hard time." So after telling him who I was we both felt like shedding tears when we went back 50 years to discuss ancient history on the banks of "my own lovely Lee."

Before going home I paid a visit to Kimsale to see Canon Duggan, who was in Peabody a few years ago to seek assistance for the Cork church building fund. The Canon was gone on his vacation, so I did not meet him. Mrs. Healy and Mrs. Ryan expressed a desire to go to Shannon to wave us goodby, as we would be getting on the plane for home on August 13. So again I contacted Mr. Coogan, my taxi man with the blarney accent, and we left the rebel city at 6 o'clock on August 13. Arrived Limerick at 9, boarded the TWA plane at 10, and set out for the United States, where we arrived at 8:30 a.m. American time, August 14.

As we were proceeding toward Logan Airport I recognized Revere Beach Boulevard and soon we were picking up our bundles getting ready to land. (I had 10 bottles of Irish whiskey.) As we were coming down the gangway from the bird of the air I could hear my daughter Catherine yelling a hearty welcome, as she was waiting for us with our two grandchildren, Net and Jackie. She had a car and in less time than it takes to tell it, we were in Peabody. Yes, we were driving in Ethel Avenue. She was blowing the horn, as much as to tell the neighbors we are here. All our good neighbors were outdoors in a minute—Jewish, French, Finnish, Irish, English, and Scotch, all Americans. As we all salute the starry flag and said "Hail, Columbia," may the day never come when you cannot strike a blow for liberty.

## Levittown Plans School-Cost Curb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in the arguments which have been raised against H.R. 22, there have been many people who contend that there is no need for Federal aid, that the States and districts can handle the problem by themselves.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times last Sunday. This article shows the plight which faces one district in a relatively well-to-do area. Such situations could be duplicated all over the country, and comprise one of the major arguments for real Federal support of public education.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1959]

LEVITTOWN PLANS SCHOOL COST CURB—CURTAILED PROGRAM OFFERED AS METHOD OF PREVENTING A METEORIC TAX RISE

LEVITTOWN, L.I., March 14.—Officials of Long Island's largest school district are considering the curtailment of school programs to prevent a meteoric rise in school taxes.

Arthur T. Thibadeau, president of the Levittown School Board, said the proposed cuts would offset inadequate State aid upward-climbing enrollment and increased expenses. He indicated, however, that some tax rise was inevitable.

"We are straightforwardly facing the fact that the 1959–60 budget cannot include everything educationally desirable for this community and at the same time stay within tax limits which are realistic for the average homeowner," Mr. Thibadeau said.

The current tax rate is $5.54 for each $100 of assessed valuation, based on a total school budget of $10,162,442. Taxpayers recently have twice voted down proposed school expansion plans.

Among the programs to be eliminated in the forthcoming budget are a $16,500 driving course and foreign language classes for elementary school children. Special classes for advanced pupils will be curtailed.

The board plans to cut its $30,000 recreation budget in half by pruning all special events, discontinuing special programs for handicapped children and limiting summer activities to pupils in the elementary grades.

Although additional speech teachers, psychologists, nurses and art and music teachers would be required to maintain the present pupil ratio in the face of expanding enrollments, such personnel will not be hired in the forthcoming fiscal year, Mr. Thibadeau said.

Additional teachers will be hired he said, but an average of 4 years of professional experience will be required instead of 5 years as at present.

No additional custodians or maintenance men will be employed, he continued, and $130,000 is expected to be cut from the capital outlay budget for items such as furniture, machinery and playground equipment.

"We are extremely reluctant to propose such measures," Mr. Thibadeau said, "but we apparently have no alternative. Our real estate taxes have already reached a prohibitive level."

A tentative estimate of the new school budget is expected to be made on Thursday. The school board has scheduled three public meetings to discuss the budget with taxpayers prior to a referendum in May.

More than half the proposed budget will be for teachers' salaries, Mr. Thibadeau estimated. The board has approved $100 rises for teachers in the first salary grades, effective next year.

## Maintaining Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of March 16, 1959:

MAINTAINING SECURITY

Congress, impelled by alarm over Berlin, appears ready to increase the defense budget of more than $40 billion. It would be a strange thing if at the same time it reduced the mutual security budget of less than $4 billion. Yet the threat of this is so great that President Eisenhower has sent up a special message emphasizing that mutual security is an equally vital part of defense.

Mutual security funds are often called "foreign aid," although 70 percent of them are spent on American goods and services. Moreover, it can be reasonably argued that they aid the United States more than they aid any recipient nation. For in armed manpower they buy many times the force the same funds could obtain if spent on the United States' own armed services.

The President's message makes a strong case. He points to the practical help mutual security has supplied in three crises in the last year. As he says, in the Lebanon crisis Jordan would probably have collapsed without the aid program. And only support furnished by the United States enabled the Chinese Nationalist regime to stand up to Red China over Quemoy. Likewise in the Berlin situation, aid previously furnished NATO allies has helped knit a stronger shield against the Soviet.

The mutual security program should and can be improved. Too often funds have helped officials rather than the whole people. Better planning is needed to make aid for economic progress fully effective.

We should like to see more emphasis on economic aid. We believe too much money is going to Spain, Korea, and Formosa in military aid. The program may be too thinly spread; it might be better not to dribble funds into 40 nations but instead put enough into a few key spots to insure the success of democratic regimes. And trade can be better than aid.

But most of those seeking to cut funds for mutual security are not trying to make it stronger; they are trying to make it weaker. And they seem to miss entirely the fact that the security of the free world today is a web of mutual helpfulness. The fact that the United States has 250 overseas bases is one measure of the help it gets from allies. And its aid to them adds up to only one-sixth of their expenditures on the web.

Let those who now seek to cut the mutual security program face up to the President's statement:

"Dollar for dollar, our expenditures for the mutual security program, after we have once achieved a reasonable military posture for ourselves, will buy more security than far greater additional expenditures on our own forces."

Unless they can disprove that, their efforts to cut the mutual security program must be regarded as efforts to weaken American defense.

That is the immediate danger. The long-range danger comes in turning the back on the fate of a billion people in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Whether they take the path toward despotism and darkness or the path toward freedom and enlightenment could be decisively influenced by what the United States does. And their choice can decisively affect America's own future.

## Address by the Honorable William M. Tuck, of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, Monday, March 16, memorial ceremonies were held for the late Edward Wren Hudgins, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

A portrait of Chief Justice Hudgins, painted by Hugo Stevens, was presented by George D. Gibson, Richmond attorney, on behalf of the Virginia State Bar Association. It was accepted by Mr. Justice C. Vernon Spratley, who spoke for the court in accepting the portrait. The portrait was unveiled by Edward Wren Hudgins II, grandson of the late chief justice.

James W. Blanks, president of the Mecklenburg County Bar Association, presented a resolution from the Mecklenburg County Bar Association lauding Judge Hudgins' services.

The Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, spoke in praise of the chief justice.

Unfortunately for me and much to my disappointment, I was unable to attend the ceremonies due to important legislative business requiring my presence in Washington. I had the pleasure and the privilege of knowing Judge Hudgins for a long number of years. He was one of my dearest friends. I learned to love him. He was a great justice and an even greater chief justice. He was learned in the law and had the respect and admiration of all of the attorneys of the Commonwealth of Virginia. To know Judge Hudgins was to admire him. He was a man of great ability. He knew his duty and discharged it fearlessly. He loved Virginia and her traditions and took the lead in upholding the laws of the Commonwealth and dispensing justice with dignity and according to the statutes and the Constitution without interjecting his own personal theories and philosophy.

Judge Hudgins was a devoted husband, a kind and loving father, a real Christian gentleman, an outstanding Virginian, and a great American. He was a lawyer and a scholar.

The Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, former Governor of Virginia and now a Member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia, spoke on behalf of the 34th Judicial Circuit over which Judge Hudgins presided so ably for 14 years.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include this able address of Representative TUCK which expresses in such a fine way the sentiments of so many of us who loved, honored, and respected Judge Hudgins:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK, OF VIRGINIA, IN THE COURTROOM OF THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA, IN THE CITY OF RICHMOND, ON MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1959, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF A PORTRAIT OF THE LATE MR. CHIEF JUSTICE EDWARD WREN HUDGINS

Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Justices of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, it is a distinct privilege and a high honor for me at the invitation of the distinguished presiding officer of this body, to come on this occasion as a practicing attorney of the 34th judicial circuit, and as a friend of the last Mr. Chief Justice Hudgins, to participate in these memorial exercises. I come with a heart filled with love and emotion and with unbounded admiration for the qualities of character of the late chief justice. I lack the powers of speech to give expression to the thoughts which crowd the mind, and the sentiments which evolve around the heart on this occasion, or to properly portray the true manly worth and the nobility of character of the late Chief Justice Edward Wren Hudgins, in whose memory we meet today.

My acquaintanceship with him began nearly 40 years ago shortly after I was admitted to the practice of law at the bar of the county of Halifax. He was then a young but able, successful, and learned attorney of our judicial circuit, and was thoroughly established in the confidence and esteem of both bench and bar. The acquaintanceship then formed, shortly ripened into a long and enduring friendship increasing with the passing years.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States House of Representatives, I was in a distant State on official business when the news came advising me of the passing of Virginia's chief justice. The news was saddening and shocking and brought a poignant sense of personal loss. I was conscious also that in the passing of this distinguished jurist, Virginia, too, had suffered, possibly in the hour of her direst need. I returned to Virginia by airplane at the earliest practicable moment in order to join with his family and his many friends at the final rites and thus pay respect to the memory of one of Virginia's noblest sons.

As we gathered on that occasion in the First Baptist Church of Chase City, Va., of which Chief Justice Hudgins was for so many years a faithful member and worker, one was constrained to reflect upon the rich, useful, and lasting contributions he had made to the progress and welfare of his community. The hearts of his friends swelled with pride in the knowledge that he had done so much to enhance and expand, not only the usefulness of his church, but the betterment of his community, his State, and his Nation as well.

Edward Wren Hudgins was born in Buckingham County, Va., on the 17th day of January, 1882, and breathed his last at his home in Chase City, Va., on July 29, 1958. He came from a sturdy southside Virginia family. He was born and reared not far distant from Appomattox Court House, where the gallant army of the matchless Lee was surrendered less than 20 years before. The period into which he had come was one which challenged and tried men's souls. It was a time of great poverty and hardship in southside Virginia. There was little or no industry. Our resources were exhausted. Our manpower was depleted. Our fields were impoverished. Our travail was indescribable. And about all that our people had left in that great area of Virginia at that time was the marrow in their bones. It was under such conditions and in these surroundings that Chief Justice Hudgins was born and grew into manhood and usefulness. The hardihood so characteristic of the citizenry of that day was such as to dispel the clouds of disaster and ruin and to resolve the problems confronting them in keeping with the honor and the determination of a proud people.

The county in which the late chief justice was born is in the very heart of what has been known for so many years as Randolph's district. He labored and served and spent his entire life in that region of our Commonwealth noted for its climate, free of the roughness of winter and the mugginess of summer, for the productivity and fertility of its soil, for its beauty and simplicity, for its flowers and for its birds, for its peaceful and tranquil homes, and for the gentility, the culture and the patriotism of its citizenry. The qualities of this region are described in a scholarly manner by Mr. Bruce, himself a native of Staunton Hill, in his erudite and interesting biography of John Randolph, of Roanoke.

Practicing the industry and the perseverance characteristic of his family and of the county of Buckingham from whence he came, the future chief justice achieved his academic and professional training at Richmond College (now the University of Richmond). All of this by working and without the aid of such modern-day educational devices as have been hatched up by the present generation for the acquisition of a modicum of knowledge—much of it superficial. The University of Richmond later conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. At college it was said of him in the history of the class to which he belonged that "he worked hard, played hard, and enjoyed every minute of it." These words were so characteristic of the full duration of his somewhat long and exceedingly useful life.

In 1908 he commenced the practice of law in Chase City, Mecklenburg County, Va., in partnership with the late Prof. W. S. McNeil and the late Honorable Thomas W. Ozlin. Almost from the first it became apparent that he possessed those qualities which would bring him to the forefront as one of the most eminent attorneys of Southside, Va., if not indeed of our whole State. From these early beginnings he demonstrated sterling qualities of character and leadership which were manifest throughout his entire life. He was thorough, diligent, and conscientious in the performance of every task, duty, and obligation.

He became interested in and associated himself with all worthy phases of activity of the community in which he lived. The professional, the social, the religious, and the political life of Mecklenberg County was improved because of his interest and activity in it. Every endeavor in which he engaged throughout his entire career was in keeping with the highest traditions of our great Commonwealth.

No doubt the happiest occasion of his life was the 16th day of March 1910, when he became united in marriage to Miss Lucy Henry Morton, of Charlotte County, who like the future chief justice, came from a long line of distinguished Southside, Va., ancestors, who had fought our wars, who had charted our course, and who had been responsible for the development and improve-

ment of our part of Virginia. She was one of the most beautiful and attractive young ladies in that whole area and her great devotion as wife and mother inspired him to noble achievements. This happy marriage was blessed with two fine sons—Edward Morton Hudgins and William Henry Hudgins—both of whom are members of the Virginia bar, and both of whom served with distinction as commissioned officers of high rank in the Armed Forces of our country during the recent turmoil and conflicts in which the Nation has been engaged. The older son, the Honorable Edward Morton Hudgins, has represented Chesterfield County in the House of Delegates of Virginia since 1952. The relationship which existed among the members of this family during the lifetime of Judge Hudgins was beautiful to behold and the love and devotion of the late chief justice for his wife and sons was evidenced by his unsullied domestic purity and fidelity.

In 1915 he was elected to represent the county of Mecklenburg in the House of Delegates of Virginia. He served in that body during the regular sessions of 1916 and 1918 and the special session of 1919. It is interesting to note that there were many members of the general assemply associated with him during that period who were destined to be called to high public station. In addition to the future chief justice, there were among the membership of this body, three future governors of Virginia, and two future U.S. Senators. And among that number who took office with the future chief justice in January 1916, was another Virginian who likewise achieved a position of great prominence and usefulness, the Honorable H. F. BYRD.

Years after he left the service of the house of delegates, there still remained among the membership many able Virginians who spoke admiringly of his knowledge, his parliamentary skill, his devotion to the public service, and his zeal to serve the best interests of Virginia.

The late chief justice was in many respects a most unusual man. He was endowed with talents and qualities of character which would have enabled him to achieve distinction in any line of human endeavor to which he may have directed his energies. He possessed a pleasing personality and attractive appearance. He was of a strong and virile body, of tireless energy, and extraordinary intelligence. He had a resolute and courageous heart. He possessed business sagacity and marshaled his resources and powers with dexterity and skill. Had he chosen to go into business, or into politics, the possibilities of his achievements would have been boundless. Though he devoted little of his time to business matters, his acumen was such that he enjoyed the confidence and the esteem of the business leaders of Southside, Va., and many are they who consulted with him from time to time and who earnestly sought his advice and counsel. In public affairs his limitless storehouse of wisdom was drawn upon heavily and his advice very generally followed by both officeholder and citizen.

In 1926, the General Assembly of Virginia created the 34th judicial circuit comprised of the counties of Halifax, Lunenburg, and Mecklenburg. These counties are bound together by sentiment, by political attitudes and considerations, by family ties, by economy, and by a firm determination to preserve the best and finest traditions in Virginia. These three Southside Virginia counties are blessed with a citizenship unsurpassed by that of any other section of Virginia, a Commonwealth which can rightfully boast of the courage and the patriotism and the intelligence of her people.

Among the contemporaries of the future judge in the 34th judicial circuit at the time it was created, were such men as Hiram Wall, E. C. Goode, Irby Turnbull, and Sterling Hutcheson of Mecklenburg; Thomas W. Ozlin, Needham S. Turnbull and George E. Allen of Lunenburg; and John Martin, Frank L. McKinney, James S. Easley, and Marshall B. Booker of Halifax, as well as many others of rank, distinction and ability. It was from such a company of lawyers and citizens that the young, able, and dependable Ed Hudgins of Mecklenburg was unanimously chosen to preside over our new judicial circuit. It was an appropriate and meritorious recognition of his character, ability, and fitness to administer impartial justice.

The distinguished members of this court, who have formerly presided over rural circuits, need not be reminded of the close and cordial relationships which normally exist between the presiding judge and the officers of his court, particularly the clerk. When Judge Hudgins ascended the bench of the 34th Judicial Circuit, he thus became associated with the Honorable John Leroy Yates, of Lunenburg; the Honorable Ernest Crews Lacy, of Halifax; and the Honorable Herbert Farrar Hutcheson, of Mecklenburg; whose memories are cherished by thousands of our people and whose names are inseparably linked with the life and the culture of those three counties. The longevity of service in public office of the distinguished gentlemen whose names I have just called is evidence of a most convincing nature that in that section we have been blessed with the highest and most fruitful type of leadership, and that our people are of a conservative disposition and nature and stability of character. In Southside, Va., the office of county clerk frequently is passed on from father to son to grandson, and in the more than 200 years of history of these three counties, and with the exception of the Civil War and reconstruction periods, less than 10 people have served as clerk in one of these counties, and practically the same situation obtains in the other two counties.

The new judge was courteous but firm in his dealings with court attachés, with witnesses, jurors, and attorneys, and particularly sympathetic with and considerate of the younger attorneys who were either obtuse or inexperienced in procedure and in pleading and practice. From the very first it was obvious that the 34th Circuit had chosen an outstanding judge of extraordinary ability who would preside with dignity, efficiency, and fairness and in whose strong and determined hands the administration of justice would be safe.

These were among the happiest years of his life, although his accomplishments and attainments as a justice and as a chief justice of this honorable body are such that he could not have achieved such success unless he had been in love with the work he found as a member and chief justice of this honorable court.

The Virginia constitutional changes of 1928 provided for increasing the number of justices on this court from five to seven. The general assembly on January 17, 1930—by coincidence the 48th anniversary of the birth of Judge Hudgins—elected him to one of the newly created associate justiceships, and he joined the court on February 1, 1930, taking his seat at the March session. He served continuously on this court for 28 years and 6 months, becoming its chief justice in October 1947, to succeed the late Chief Justice Henry W. Holt. He enjoyed the longest continuous service on this court of any jurist in the last 105 years. In the entire history of Virginia, only three others have had longer consecutive tenure on the State's highest court. They are William Fleming (1779–1824); Spencer Roane (1789–1822); and William H. Cabell (1811–53). He presided over this body as chief justice for a longer period than any other individual with the single exception of the late Honorable Preston W. Campbell, of Washington County.

He was indeed impressive on the bench. His opinions touched every conceivable field of State appellate law and were replete with simplicity, directness, force, wisdom, and justice. When he spoke or wrote, he was clear and concise and to the point. He was earnest in his convictions. He said what he meant and meant what he said. He expressed himself clearly, concisely, and directly. He was so sincere in his convictions that it never occurred to him to stoop to the employment of the cheap and paltry decorations of discourse, a fault of speech to which so many are addicted.

He participated in more than 8,000 cases. He rendered a total of 534 opinions, the first on June 12, 1930, *Voyentzie* v. *Ryan* (154 Virginia 604), and the last was adopted as the opinion of the court and handed down on September 10, 1958, *Robinson et al* v. *Peterson* (200 Virginia 186).

Many of his decisions were notable and attracted widespread attention and interest, but time permits a brief reference to only a few of them:

In his decision in *Hall* v. *Commonwealth*, he drew an incisive line between the right of an evangelist to practice his religion and a homeowner's right to privacy.

In *Zirkle* v. *Commonwealth*, he demonstrated his innate knowledge of people by reversing the conviction of a defendant whose good reputation had been challenged by the Commonwealth's introduction of evidence of a previous driving conviction. "One swallow maketh not a summer—one drink maketh not a drunkard," so said the chief justice.

Unlike the present Supreme Court of the United States, his decisions were based upon what the law is and not what he thought the law ought to be.

In the Daniel case, decided in December 1957, a suit brought by a party badly injured in a power line accident was denied. The plaintiff had failed to file notice within the time prescribed by law. The late chief justice said that the legislature had the power to make special rules for particular claiments, but such power was legislative, not judicial. "If exceptions are made by statute, they exist, if not, they do not exist," he said.

He possessed judicial wisdom and the courage to act upon it. He refused to surrender to the legal lilliputians north of the Potomac who will unless curbed, obliterate our system of jurisprudence as we have known and loved it since the foundation of the Republic.

Lovers of liberty were pleased with the per curiam holding of this court under his great leadership in the case of *Naim* v. *Naim*.

In that case reported in 350 U.S. 891, 76 S. Ct. 151 (1955), the Court above referred to undertook to vacate a final decision of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia which had held invalid the marriage of a white woman to a man of another race. The U.S. Supreme Court then remanded the case to the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia in order that the case might be returned to the circuit court of the city of Portsmouth for additional facts to be incorporated in the record. The Virginia court met the situation without equivocation. When this order was received the Virginia court held that there is no provision in Virginia law by which it could send a case back to the circuit court of the city of Portsmouth to be reopened. And this honorable court stated: "The decree of the trial court and the decree of this court affirming it have become final so far as these courts are concerned" (*Naim* v. *Naim*, 197 Va. 734 (1956); 90 S. E. 2d 849). The effect of the ruling of the Virginia court was to fail or refuse to obey the preverse and obdurate order of the Supreme Court of the United States.

His activities in life were so varied that all of them cannot be adverted to within the

confines of a short address. Aside from his general worth as a judge and as a chief justice, his work in the reorganization of the administration of justice within the courts of this State constitutes possibly his greatest contribution. It is believed that he accomplished more in this field than any other individual in this or any other previous generation. He was also instrumental in organizing the conference of chief justices. I have some firsthand knowledge of his interest in his reorganizational work and of the monumental proportions of his efforts. I am sure that he would regard his accomplishments along these lines as certainly one of the greatest achievements of his useful career.

Whatever he did was well done. He was a man in every sense of the word. He was a sturdy oak and a tower of strength. Those who were interested in promoting the welfare of our State and Nation, naturally gravitated to him. He will be greatly missed as one of the great Virginians of his generation. Let us hope that the example of his life will animate us all to a higher and a renewed consecration, to worthy and unselfish devotion to our country and to our kind, and that we may all become stronger and better and more effective by reason of having known and been associated with him.

"God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking:
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds—
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice sleeps!"

It is difficult for those of us who knew the late chief justice to associate him with those whose duties and earthly labors have ended and who have passed on into other realms.

As we reflect upon the many events in his full and useful life, we become conscious of the rapidity of the movement of the sands in the hourglass of time and of the swift falling of the leaves of life. "The wine of life keeps oozing—drop by drop, the leaves of life keep falling—one by one," and so it is with us.

But despite these somber thoughts, and the interest and admonition with which this hour is freighted, it is not altogether one of sadness. For we do appreciate the privilege of having known and lived and served with the beloved late chief justice in whose cherished memory we are here assembled. We take comfort in the knowledge that he devoutly practiced the faith he embraced, and when on that July day his immortal soul winged its way into a boundless eternity, he carried with him the faith of our fathers. He will continue to live in the hearts and minds of those who knew and loved him and in the great institutions he loved and served with such ability and devotion. May we be taught to so number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom, and, at last, like him, enter into the inheritance reserved for the faithful.

"Green be the turf above thee,
Friend of my better days!
None knew thee but to love thee
Nor named thee but to praise."

## The Miracle of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are all pleased to see the 50th star added to our flag and we welcome our new citizens of Hawaii.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of March 13, 1959, together with an article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 15, 1959:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 1959]

THE MIRACLE OF HAWAII

The miracle of Hawaii is not that, as a result of yesterday's House vote, she is now to become the 50th State of the American Union. It is, rather, that this State has been created under great difficulties in mid-Pacific, 2,000 miles from the American mainland. Here is a community of eight main islands and about a dozen smaller ones about equal in area to the two States of Connecticut and Rhode Island and something more than 1 percent of the area of her newest sister State, Alaska.

When Captain Cook passed that way 181 years ago, Hawaii had about 300,000 people. Now she has about one-half million and of that one-half million perhaps 12,000 are of pure Hawaiian stock. The others are of a dozen or more principal nationalities and a great many subsidiary ones. They come from China, from Japan, from the Portuguese Islands, from the Philippines, from the American South and from almost any accessible country with exportable labor that one can think of.

The miracle is that this astounding mixture is becoming not a new nation but a new version of the American people. For what are the American people but a mingling of most European races and of some oriental races, bound together by a common language and by common traditions rather than by racial origin?

Hawaii was not a deliberate ethnic experiment. The modern Hawaiian people were produced by what the sugar planters and the pineapple farmers took to be economic necessity. Their ancestors were brought in when it was discovered that the original Hawaiians not only were becoming scarcer, but did not see the reason for working as contract laborers on the plantations. There were some evils, some exploitations, but out of it all has come an intelligent, healthy, and even beautiful race of people who are just as capable of governing themselves as are the people of New York, California, or Texas.

The battle is over now, although some formalities must still be complied with. The President will sign the statehood bill, the people of Hawaii will approve it unless they have changed their minds, and the wide blue water that separates San Francisco from Honolulu will shrink in its political dimensions to a river boundary line.

There are those who look with apprehension to some unhappy moments in Hawaii's labor history, as when a dock strike in 1949 tied up the islands for 6 months. Yet there is no reason to believe that the State of Hawaii will have any more difficulty handling such crises than the Territory of Hawaii did. Why should we expect second-class citizens, which is what the people of Hawaii have been, to stand up for their rights as effectively as do first-class citizens, which is what the citizens of Hawaii are about to become?

There was one more argument, besides the argument of justice, for voting Hawaii as an equal into the Union. This was that, like Alaska, she stands on the front line of our defense. Her great industries, sugar, pineapples, and tourists, taken together, do not quite equal what the Government spends in the islands. It was said a long time ago, "Put none but Americans on guard." This we have done in Alaska. This we are now doing in Hawaii. Long live the 50th State.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 15, 1959]

MEET HAWAII—FIFTIETH STATE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—There will soon be 50 States in the Union—100 Senators and 1 or 2 more Members of the House of Representatives.

It is more than 100 years since President Franklin Pierce suggested that Hawaii be incorporated into the Union.

Now, after 22 formal hearings since 1935, producing 6,400 printed pages of testimony and exhibits totaling some 3 million words with 900 witnesses being heard in the Territory and in Washington, the State of Hawaii is being welcomed with open arms.

For the first time in history the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee unanimously recommended a State for admission, and Senate bill 50 will make Hawaii the 50th State with the notable high of seven southern Senators joining in approval.

Here are the principal factors and facts behind this action:

Is Hawaii contiguous? Hawaii doesn't touch continental United States but is nearer to the main body of the Nation than many other States, including California, were when they were first admitted. In travel and in communication Hawaii is closer to Washington, D.C., than Boston and New York were when the Republic was founded. Certainly the United States must control the sea and the air from Puget Sound to Pearl Harbor as long as there is a nation.

Can Hawaii pay its way? It has a population of 600,000 people—larger than the population of any State at the time of admission, except Oklahoma. Its population now is larger than that of Vermont, Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, and Alaska. It has a strong economy and for years has paid into the U.S. Treasury more taxes than nine States of the Union.

Who are the Hawaiian people? At least 90 percent of them are American citizens. The population consists of approximately 37 percent Japanese ancestry, 23 percent Caucasian, 17 percent Hawaiian ancestry, 12 percent Filipino ancestry and 6 percent Chinese ancestry. They have a strong, stable, modern democratic form of government—offering the groping peoples of Asia a look into the parlor of true democracy.

Are they loyal? The late Senator Hugh Butler, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, made this report after an on-the-spot study:

"If there is such a thing as a supreme test of loyalty to an ideal, then a willingness to serve in battle in support of that ideal is entitled to such a description."

There were 426 Hawaiian boys killed in Korean action.

Not one case of a Hawaiian soldier's desertion to the enemy was recorded.

Not one case of a successful Red brainwashing of a Hawaiian soldier was recorded.

Of the 22 American servicemen who went over to the Chinese Communists after the Korean armistice, there were turncoats from Texas, Georgia, Minnesota, Louisiana, Illinois, Virginia, Rhode Island, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Mississippi—but not one from Hawaii.

What about communism? In 1950 the House Committee on Un-American Activities estimated that there were 90 known Communists in Hawaii. Later J. Edgar Hoover put it at 36. There are no Communists in the Hawaiian Legislature and when one sympathizer of Harry Bridges ran for mayor of Honolulu in 1956 he was administered the worst defeat in Hawaiian history.

What of Hawaiian politics? The two-party system prevails. It has been traditionally Republican. In 1956 Hawaii elected its first Democratic delegate to Congress since 1934 and reelected him last year. Recently Hawaii has reflected the national voting pattern and since 1954 Democrats have controlled the Hawaiian Legislature for the first time.

Hawaii is ready for admission, and the Nation is ready for Hawaii.

## A Badly Needed Change in the "Equal Time" Section of the Federal Communications Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the recent ruling by the Federal Communications Commission in interpreting section 315 of the Federal Communications Act—the "equal time" section—has caused great concern in the broadcasting industry and by many other persons who are concerned about future news reporting of Government and political news.

This past Saturday, the president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Dr. Frank Stanton, chose to let other pressing problems wait until later while he spoke on this matter to a general conference of representatives from CBS television network affiliated stations.

I found in Dr. Stanton's remarks a clear analysis of the situation that confronts the broadcasters and the public if the FCC ruling is carried through. Everyone concerned with letting the public know the facts and issues in any political campaign will do well to read these remarks and ponder the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the body of Dr. Stanton's remarks and point out that this situation is of such importance that Dr. Stanton abandoned a previously prepared speech to give this address:

STANTON'S REMARKS

The problem which I want to discuss today has very serious implications not only for broadcasting but for the whole question of the effective working of democracy under the pressures of modern life. This is a matter of such urgency, in my judgment, that we should all give it the fullest attention possible. I refer to the construction put upon section 315 of the Federal Communications Act by the FCC in the Lar "(America First)" Daly case here in Chicago.

Mr. Daly, a perennial but unsuccessful office-seeker, late last year announced himself a candidate for both the Republican and Democratic nominations for mayor of Chicago. Two men prominent in the news, Mayor Richard Daley and ex-Congressman Timothy Sheehan, were the major candidates in the Democratic and Republican parties. During the course of its daily news coverage, WBBM–TV exercised its news judgment by including significant news of the mayoralty campaign. This includes the mayor and Congressman Sheehan, the chief Republican candidate, filing nomination papers, as well as Mayor Daley greeting President Frondizi of Argentina on the latter's arrival at the Chicago airport, and Mayor Daley, with his wife, opening the March of Dimes campaign.

On February 19, 1959 the Federal Communications Commission ruled, in perhaps the most severely crippling decision ever to be handed down with regard to broadcast journalism, that this news coverage must be matched by alloting equal time to Lar Daly on a regular news broadcast—even though the original appearances of the mayor and the Congressman were obviously unavoidable in any adequate television coverage of news of wide general interest to the people of the Nation's second largest city.

We propose to appeal this decision with all the force and vigor at our command. We have asked the Commission to reconsider and to reverse itself. If it does not, we are going to appeal to the courts; we are going to appeal to the Congress; and we are going to appeal to the people.

Let me make it clear that this fight will be directed only to this extraordinary ruling that section 315 is applicable to newscasts. We have said many times in the past that section 315 is, in any case, an abomination—that its ultimate results are to suppress and not to expand political affairs on television and radio. We have held that it is a disservice to the public because it keeps broadcasting from making the contribution which it can uniquely make in presenting leading candidates of major parties in face to face debates. But for the present we are focusing not on the broader faults of section 315 but only on the issue of applying that section to regular newscasts.

Now I would like to talk with you briefly but most earnestly about the significance of this construction of section 315.

If upheld, the decision will have two inevitable results. One will be an immediate practical effect on news broadcasting that can abridge radically both the usefulness of radio and television to our society and their total freedom as media. The second will be to set loose a thoughtless slide rule theory governing the role of journalism in a democracy that can be described only as a wholesale negation of principles that have been safeguards and supports of our democracy from its beginnings.

Let's take a look at this decision and see what it means.

The most important story in this democracy, for very nearly 1 year out of every 4, is the nomination and the election campaigns for the Presidency. This has been true since the founding of the Republic, for our political campaigns are more than the choice of leadership. They constitute a ventilation of policy, an expression through major candidates for high office of the views, the objectives, the values of all of us as a nation.

Now are we to be told that, so far as the uniquely immediate and direct qualities of television news go, this story of dominating importance in our country is forbidden territory? That you cannot in your regular news programs cover State and municipal campaigns for governor and mayor as you see fit? That congressional elections cannot be covered in newscasts with the actual appearances of candidates for Senator and Representative? Or that you can cover such top stories in your own way only if you give equivalent time to every legally qualified candidate who asks for it—even if he is an unheard of aspirant in an obscure party?

Make no mistake about it: the Daly decision, for all practical purposes, makes it a mathematical impossibility for broadcasting to report any political campaign in its own way and take advantage of its own technical capabilities.

Consider for a moment the mathematics of television and the news of a presidential election campaign. The CBS Television Network alone devoted about 20 percent of our television newscast time during the 1956 campaign period to the presidential and vice presidential candidates of the two major parties. Some time on virtually every newscast—from Labor Day to election day—was devoted to the campaign. Under the Daly decision we would have been required to give equivalent time on these regular newscasts to all candidates of all parties who asked for it. There were—as near as can be calculated—24 presidential and vice presidential candidates of 12 parties. To furnish them all with equivalent time would have taken some 38 hours, or approximately 20 percent more than all the time spent by all our television network newscasts on all the news.

The absurdity of this can be multiplied by almost any factor you choose when you apply the Daly ruling to primaries, where you may have a dozen or a score of candidates for a single nomination—and many more than a dozen or a score once the crackpots learn the implication of this decision.

This projection leaves no doubt of where the Daly decision puts us. It simply deprives us of the right to use the distinctive capabalities of television and radio to report directly and vividly the news of political campaigns to the American people.

The Daly ruling would prohibit radio and television from bringing some of the greatest moments in history to the American people: Franklin Roosevelt's declaration for a third term, President Eisenhower's 1956 decision this his health would permit him to run for reelection. Such major news events as an assassination attempt on a candidate for public office could not be shown on a television newscast—unless the attempt succeeded and the victim was therefore no longer a candidate. We would simply not have the freedom to report such events on the ground of their own newsworthiness—which ought to be the sole criterion.

We ought not to underestimate the gravity of this abridgment of our freedom. We are being denied the right to assume and exercise the responsibility for editorial control of our own news program. The Daly decision does not speak of the use of television as a medium for political campaigning. It addresses itself, with deadly effect, to the use of television as journalism. It attempts to substitute a ridiculous mathematical formula for the responsibility of news editors in handling the news of political campaigns.

I am firmly convinced that if we are deprived of this responsibility, we have opened the door to all kinds of invasions, restrictions and harassments of our news function. Responsibility and freedom go hand in hand. If responsibility is taken away from us in this important respect, what other freedom we have left will soon disappear also. The atrophying of so important a part of our news functions as reporting campaigns will inevitably diminish the wholy body. We cannot let this happen. As broadcasters we are often accused by our critics of lacking the guts to handle anything smacking of controversy on the air. These critics ought to be the first to rise up and declare themselves against the Daly ruling, for this would not only discourage the inclusion of highly controversial material in our newscasts but it would actually outlaw it except under conditions impossible to meet.

I think, however, that something greater is involved in this erosive process launched by the Daly ruling than just the strength and

usefulness our our own industry. It seems to me that the ruling spawns a monstrous idea in a democratic society—the idea that quantitative mechanics are more important than the qualitative considerations of the degree to which the people are informed during the critically important period of election campaigns. The idea is promulgated that the freedom and enterprise with which information is garnered and dispensed are less important—and that the access of the people to the direct experience of seeing political candidates and hearing their declarations first-hand in new broadcasts are less important—than rigid, unrealistic mathematical equations. Yet when we talk of these things, we are talking of our health and survival as a democracy. At no time in the democratic experience is a fully informed people more important than in making their electoral decisions. In fact the whole genius of a democratic people rests on this one proposition. We are now witnessing the introduction of the revolutionary idea that informing the people is a secondary matter.

We are also witnessing, in this tortuous construction of section 315, the novel reversal of a principle inherent in the protection extended the free press in the first amendment: That you can trust the people, in Jefferson's words, better than the magistrate in judging the press. Television and radio are constantly exposed to the critical attention of tens of millions of people. Obviously any unfair political use of newscasts would unleash a fury of protests on any station or network that tried it. In fact, 30 years of broadcasting have shown this to be true. In spite of this record, the Daly decision not only distrusts the broadcasters as journalists, it distrusts them as businessmen, implying that they would not have the sense to see the fatal dangers of playing politics with the medium.

We need to remind ourselves, as the Washington Post-Times Herald said editorially after the NAB meeting last year, that there is only one reason for regulating broadcasting at all: the technical need to avoid chaos in the spectrum. That's all. It is not regulated because the regulation of any medium is a social good. On the contrary, as the Post pointed out, it is regulated in spite of the fact that regulation of a medium can be a social evil. It seems to me, then, that there is a danger to all our journalism—printed as well as electronic—if a regulatory power that exists for one reason is applied for purposes other than that requiring the regulation in the first instance.

Look for a moment at the situation of printed journalism. Because of special mailing privileges, vital to the economic health of most periodicals and many newspapers, there is an avenue of approach for attempts to apply mathematical formulas to the editorial contents. A case—utterly outrageous yet no more outrageous than the Daly ruling—could be made for the notion that if a magazine or a newspaper has a partially subsidized circulation through mailing rates and records the words of one political candidate, then the other candidates should be entitled to equal space.

We know that any such idea would be wholly repugnant to traditional values that we, as a democratic society, have put upon freedom of the press. We know that it would so hamper the daily working of a free press that for all practical purposes there would be none during the times it is needed most—political campaigns. Yet once you adopt an idea as having validity, where do you stop in applying it? How do you shut off, how do you halt, a drift that could inundate the most important single aspect of election processes in America—the right to know that has made those processes work in the face of the most staggering crises?

And once more I repeat that the Daly ruling is not about political campaigns. It's about how regular news programs handle political campaigns. It tells the broadcasters the conditions under which they can report campaigns—indeed in a quantitative sense even the contents of the news programs. I say flatly that you cannot have any such halfway, cripplingly conditioned freedom of the press in America. Once the idea is established that the contents of news programs can be tampered with, restricted, harassed, controlled or regulated by an governmental agency in any medium during a political campaign, you open up a Pandora's box that can bring all kinds of harassments and restrictions.

The idea must be rejected now. It must be rejected decisively. It ought to be rejected unanimously.

I have told you that CBS is going to fight the Daly ruling in the courts. It is going to put the issues involved before the people. It hopes for wide support and prompt passage of the remedial and clarifying legislation introduced by Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM in H.R. 5389. This bill simply adds a single sentence to section 315(a): "Appearance by a legally qualified candidate on any news program, including news reports and news commentaries, where the format and production of the program are determined by the broadcasting station, or by the network in the case of a network program, and the candidate in no way initiated the recording or the broadcast, shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection."

We should all take great comfort that these very basic principles and dangers to all of the press have recently been recognized and articulated not by a broadcaster fighting for his own skin but a respected and outstanding member of the print medium—Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press. Not in connection with section 315, but as to the basic issues involved, he said over the facilities of KYW that "as television increases as the basic medium of communications in some form or another, and it is essential that the newspapers make use of electronic facilities * * * then does it not logically follow that communications will be found to be licensed by the U.S. Government and will that not inhibit, hurt, frustrate and dangerously impair the right of people of America to know freely and fully about events in their country?"

If we do not reject such doctrines as the Daly decision, we are going to wake up some day and find that the unbounded promise of a great medium for the betterment of democratic living has been reduced to impotence. We will discover too late that somewhere an idea got loose and gained such ascendancy over traditional safeguards that as a result, in an age when we needed most desperately a fully informed people making responsible choices, we ended up with a people so immunized by regulation against the stimulation of knowledge and ideas that they became incapable of wise democratic action.

Nobody wants that. Nobody ever wants negation and paralysis. But that is where the doctrine of section 315 as it is now applied will inevitably lead. We have to stop the drift in that direction right now, and stop it for good.

## The Assassination of Mr. Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an interesting editorial from the Economist, published on April 29, 1865, in London, England, entitled "The Assassination of Mr. Lincoln."

I am indebted to one of my constituents, Mr. F.O. Billings, Newport, Wash., for having brought this to my attention.

I think that this is a thoughtful summary of the situation as the English looked at it at the time, and the way they felt about our President.

The editorial follows:

THE ASSASSINATION OF MR. LINCOLN

The murder of Mr. Lincoln is a very great and very lamentable event, perhaps the greatest and most lamentable which has occurred since the coup d'etat, if not since Waterloo. It affects directly and immensely the welfare of the three most powerful countries in the world—America, France, and England—and it affects them all for evil. Time, circumstances, and agent have all conspired as by some cruel perversity to increase the mischief and the horror of an act which at any moment or under any circumstances, would have been most mischievous and horrible. It is not merely that a great man has passed away, but he has disappeared at the very time when his special greatness seemed almost essential to the world, when his death would work the widest conceivable evil, when the chance of replacing him even partially, approached nearest to zero, and he has been removed in the very way which almost alone among causes of death could have doubted the political injury entailed by the decease itself. His death destroys one of the strongest guarantees for continued peace between his country and the external world, while his murder diminishes almost indefinitely the prospects of reconciliation between the two camps into which that country has for 4 years been divided.

At the very instant of all others, when North and South had most reason to see in his character a possibility of reunion, and to dread the accession of his inevitable successor, a southerner murders him to place that successor in his chair, gives occasion for an explosion of sectional hate, and makes a man who has acknowledged that hate master of armies which can give to that hate an almost limitless expression in act. At the very moment when the dread of war between the Union and Western Europe seemed, after inflicting incessant injury for 4 years, about to die away, a murderer deprives us of the man who had most power and most will to maintain peace, and thereby enthrones another whose tendencies are at best an unknown quantity, but who is sure, from inexperience, to sway more toward violence than his predecessor. The injury done alike to the North, to the South, and to the world, is so irremediable, the consequences of the act may be so vast, and are certainly so numerous, that it is with some diffidence we attempt to point out the extent of the American loss, and the result that loss may produce.

The greatness of the American loss seems to us to consist especially in this. To guide and moderate a great revolution, and heal up the wounds created by civil war, it is essential that the Government should be before all things strong. If it is weak, it is sure either to be violent, or to allow some one of the jarring sections of the community to exhibit violence unrestrained, to rely on terror as the French convention, under a false impression of its own dangers, did, or to permit a party to terrorize, as the first ministry of Louis XVIII did. The reign of terror and the terreur blanc were alike owing, one to an imaginary, the other to a real weakness on the part of the governing power. There are so many passions to be restrained, so many armed men to be dealt with, so many fanatic parties to convince, so many private

revenges to check, so many extralegal acts to do, that nothing except an irresistible government can ever hope to secure the end which every government by instinct tries to attain, namely, external order. Now, the difficulty of creating a strong government in America is almost insuperable. The people in the first place dislike government, not this or that administration, but government in the abstract, to such a degree that they have invented a quasi-philosophical theory, proving that government, like war or harlotry, is a necessary evil. Moreover, they have constructed a machinery in the shape of States, specially and deliberately calculated to impede central action, to stop the exercise of power, to reduce government, except so far as it is expressed in arrests by the parish constable, to an impossibility.

They have an absolute parliament, and though they have a strong Executive, it is, when opposed to the people, or even when in advance of the people, paralyzed by a total absence of friends. To make this weakness permanent they have deprived even themselves of absolute power, have first forbidden themselves to change the Constitution, except under circumstances which never occur, and have then, through the machinery of the common schools, given to that Constitution the moral weight of a religious document, therefore, i.e. of a Government able to do great acts very quickly, is really impossible, except in one event. The head of the executive may, by an infinitesimal chance, be a man so exactly representative of the people, that his acts always represent their thoughts, so shrewd that he can steer his way amidst the legal difficulties piled deliberately in his path, and so good that he desires power only for the national ends. The chance of obtaining such a man was, as we say, infinitesimal; but the United States, by a good fortune, of which they will one day be cruelly sensible, had obtained him. Mr. Lincoln, by a rare combination of qualities—patience, sagacity, and honesty—by a still more rare sympathy, not with the best of his Nation but the best average of his Nation, and by a moderation rarest of all, had attained such vast moral authority that he could make all the hundred wheels of the Constitution move in one direction without exerting any physical force. For example, in order to secure the constitutional prohibition of slavery, it is absolutely essential that some 48 separate representative bodies, differing in modes of election, in geographical interests, in education, in prejudices, should harmoniously and strongly cooperate, and so immense was Mr. Lincoln's influence—an influence, it must be remembered, unsupported in this case by power—that had he lived, that cooperation, of which statesmen might well despair, would have been a certainty.

The President had, in fact, attained to the very position—the dictatorship, to use a bad description—required by revolutionary times. At the same time, this vast authority, not having been seized illegally, and being wielded by a man radically good—who for example really reverenced civil liberty and could tolerate venomous opposition—could never be directed to ends wholly disapproved by the ways of those who conferred it. It was, in fact, the authority which nations find it so very hard to secure, which only Italy and America have in our time secured—a good and benevolent, but resistless temporary despotism. That despotism, moreover, was exercised by a man whose brain was a very great one. We do not know in history such an example of the growth of a ruler in wisdom as was exhibited by Mr. Lincoln. Power and responsibility visibly widened his mind and elevated his character. Difficulties, instead of irritating him as they do most men, only increased his reliance on patience; opposition, instead of ulcerating, only made him more tolerant and determined. The very style of his public papers altered, till the very man who had written in an official dispatch about "Uncle Sam's web feet," drew up his final inaugural in a style which extorted from critics so hostile as the Saturday Reviewers, a burst of involuntary admiration. A good but benevolent temporary despotism, wielded by a wise man, was the very instrument the wisest would have desired for the United States; and in losing Mr. Lincoln, the Union has lost it. The great authority attached by law to the President's office reverts to Mr. Johnson, but the far greater moral authority belonging to Mr. Lincoln disappears. There is no longer any person in the Union whom the Union dare or will trust to do exceptional acts, to remove popular generals, to override crotchetty States, to grant concessions to men in arms, to act when needful, as in the Trent case, athwart the popular instinct.

The consequences of this immense loss can as yet scarcely be conjectured, for the one essential datum, the character of the President, is not known. It is probable that that character has been considerably misrepresented. Judging from information necessarily imperfect, we have formed an ad interim opinion that Mr. Johnson is very like an average Scotch tradesman, very shrewd, very pushing, very narrow, and very obstinate, inclined to take the advice of anyone with more knowledge than himself, but unable to act on it when opposed to certain central convictions, not oppressive, but a little indifferent if his plans result in oppression, and subject to fits of enthusiasm as hard to deal with as fits of drunkenness. Should this estimate prove correct, we shall have in the United States a government absolutely resolved upon immediate abolition, whatever its consequences, foolish or wise according to the character of its advisers, very incapable of diplomacy, which demands above all things knowledge, very firm, excessively unpopular with its own agents, and liable to sudden and violent changes of course, so unaccountable as almost to appear freaks. Such a government will find it difficult to overcome the thousand difficulties presented by the organization of the States, by the bitterness of partisans, or by the exasperated feelings of the Army, and will be driven, we fear, to overcome them by violence, or at least to deal with them in a spirit of unsparing rigor.

It is, therefore, we conceive, prima facie probable that the South will be slower to come in, and much less ready to settle down when it has come in, than it would have been under Mr. Lincoln; and this reluctance will be increased by the consciousness that the North has at length obtained a plausible excuse for relentless severity. It will also be much more ready to escape its difficulties by foreign war. Beyond those two somewhat vague propositions, there are as yet too few data whatever for judgment. Least of all are there data to decide whether the North will adhere to the policy of moderation. Upon the whole we think they will, the average American showing in politics that remarkable lenity which arises from perfect freedom, and the consequent absence of fear; but he is also excitable, and it is on the first direction of that excitement that everything will depend. If it takes the direction of vengeance, Mr. Johnson, whose own mind has been embittered against the planters by family injuries, may break loose from his Cabinet; but if, as is much more probable, it takes the direction of overreverence for the policy of the dead, he must coerce his own tendencies until time and the sobering effect of great power have extinguished them. He is certainly a strong man, though of rough type, and the effect of power on the strong is usually to soften.

## Another Summit Conference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

ANOTHER SUMMIT CONFERENCE?—PROPAGANDA SHOW FOR RUSSIANS SEEN IF UNITED STATES GIVES IN TO WIDESPREAD DEMANDS

(By David Lawrence)

Is the world about to witness one of the biggest hoaxes of all times—another summit conference?

Although a Foreign Ministers meeting is to be held in Geneva in May, its failure is anticipated already as the cry is raised for a summit conference.

Dispatches from abroad indicate that Prime Minister Macmillan has been forced into a political corner on the issue and favors a conference of heads of states. Also in the United States certain antiadministration spokesmen who are gullible enough to believe the Soviets will make concessions are speaking out in favor of summit conferences. In fact, it now is being suggested by Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that such conferences be held twice a year as a regular procedure.

But the average man will ask: "What is there about a summit conference that makes it such an attractive idea to its sponsors?"

So far as the Soviets are concerned, it gives them a propaganda show. The men in the Kremlin can thereby demonstrate to their own people how the rest of the world comes to them begging for crumbs at the table of discussion. As for the allied side, it's a political issue in Great Britain, where the Labor Party pounds away at the Macmillan government by giving the impression that acceptance of a summit conference invitation means peace and that a refusal could lead to war.

Something of the same attitude characterizes the views of some opposition party leaders in the United States. Thus it is asserted Nikita Khrushchev has so much power that it is useless to talk to anyone else, and it is being said in addition that there is no No. 2 man. The inference is that Khrushchev must be humored, and that he alone can make a deal.

Actually, a summit conference is about the last place in the world that any deal can be made between governments. It isn't a quiet, deliberative affair held in a secluded spot where there is an opportunity for reflective discussion by the four top men concerned. On the contrary, at a summit conference each of the heads of state has at his side half a dozen people—aides and advisers—plus clerks and stenographers. There's not much that's private when there are 30 or 40 people in a room. Surrounding the conference outside are at least 1,000 newsmen, photographers, and broadcasters demanding public statements and picture. It isn't a conference, but a carnival of publicity.

If the Soviet Government really wants to draft some kind of agreement to settle the Berlin controversy, it needs only to call in the American or British or French Ambassador at Moscow, and the way could be paved for such an accord. Also, a Foreign Ministers' conference furnishes every opportunity for an agreement to be consummated. Unless the one to be held in Geneva in May is successful, President Eisenhower sees little value in a summit conference later on.

The Soviets fully expect the West to yield to their demands. They look on democracies as weak, unstable, disunited countries which care more for material comforts than they do for principle. Unfortunately, this was the way things looked to the dictators in Europe in the 1930's. But when the chips were down the Allies fought a World War and won it.

History is repeating itself. A dictatorship is again miscalculating the strength and spirits of its adversaries.

Weak-kneed persons on our side are giving aid and comfort to the Soviets by sniping at their own Government from positions of prominence and influence in parliaments abroad and in our Congress at home. This is giving our potential enemies a basis for miscalculation. It could lead to the war everybody on the western side is anxious to avoid.

Whatever agreements might be proclaimed by the summit conference would not be worth the paper they would be wirtten on. The 1954 summit conference agreed solemnly that there should be free elections to reunify Germany. Now, after nearly 5 years, the Soviets have torn up that pledge and are brazenly threatening war if their new demands for keeping Germany dismembered are not accepted.

Firmness by the West alone will save the world from another war. There is a stanch and courageous will to resist at the White House and in the leadership of our Armed Forces. But despite the honeyed words about unity that lately have come from Capitol Hill, the Soviets are convinced that the opposition party in the United States isn't really back of the American Government. It's a mistaken belief, but, judging from the utterances of some of the Democratic leaders and the qualifying phrases they use in giving lipservice to national unity, the Moscow chieftains can readily get the idea that there's a real chance to wring concessions from the West. This could mean surrendering the military position which NATO has hitherto maintained in Western Europe as a safeguard against potential aggression.

Summit conferences should be realistically labeled surrender conferences. For that's why the Soviets keep pressing for them to be convened.

## Hungarian Freedom Day: A Living Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Hungarian Freedom Day commemorates a political event which fills many pages in the book of freedom. No one devoted to liberty and the dignity of man can forget the day 111 years ago when the Hungarian people, under the leadership of Louis Kossuth, recaptured from the Hapsburg dynasty many of their inalienable rights.

Had the Hungarian nation's struggle for freedom ended on March 15, 1848, Hungarian Freedom Day would still be a milestone in mankind's march toward liberty. But the Hungarian people did not long enjoy the victory of 1848. Nor was another victory of the Hungarian nation, the independence it achieved after World War I, its final release from the chains of oppression. Twenty-five years later, the boots of the Red army trampled on and suppressed Hungary's independence.

Thus, Hungarian Freedom Day, 1959, does much more than commemorate the history of a glorious nation. It also serves notice on the leaders and quislings of communism that the Hungarian people have never in the past and will never in the future surrender to alien governments and alien creeds.

Hungarian Freedom Day is a living symbol for all Hungarian people, wherever they may be. It is a living symbol for all peoples whose backs are bent under the yoke of communism.

As long as there is a Hungarian Freedom Day, every foe of liberty must fear the date, March 15. The Ides of March brought the death of Caesar. Just as surely does the symbol of another March 15, Hungarian Freedom Day, portend the death of Caesarism.

## Report to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present the report which I rendered as president to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the annual convention of the Congress held in the city of Washington, D.C., on May 16, 1958.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

(By Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana)

Members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and friends in all of the 57-year history of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, this past year probably has been the most momentous. We have been confronted with more problems affecting the water development program than ever before. We have had to make quick decisions to protect our program. I trust we have acted wisely for we have had to shoot from the hip, so to speak.

The basic event of the last year which affected our flood control, waterway, harbor, irrigation and water supply program, was the launching of Sputnik I by the Russians on October 4, 1957. Speaking as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I should like to express the opinion that this was one of the major historic developments of our entire era. If I may draw an analogy, I should say that the launching of an earth satellite into outer space was of far more long-term importance to all of us than the invention of the automobile and Marconi's development of radio.

Of course, we were stunned that the Russians beat us to the draw. It was a disturbing development that sharply jerked us up to the realization that the Russians have scientific and technical skills that are far greater than we had previously dreamed possible. May I call your attention to the exhibit of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in the State Room. We have titled the exhibit "Russian Pork Barrel." It is an imposing display of what is being done in the way of water development on the other side of the Iron Curtain. We are not presenting this display to advertise or to propagandize for the Russians; but to remind ourselves in sober fashion that if the Russians can launch sputniks and missiles and improve their internal economy all at the same time, we should certainly be able to do the same thing.

National defense goes hand in hand with the orderly development of the water resources of this country. Defense and water resource development cannot be separated arbitrarily by men who do not comprehend how closely interrelated are these twin aspects of our national security and our general well-being. This interrelationship is the theme of our convention.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress moved into high gear when sputnik was launched. It was immediately obvious to us that we might become so obsessed in pumping funds into the satellite-missile program that we would forget some of the day-to-day problems that remained down here on earth.

Let me recall chronologically the sequence of events that followed Sputnik I and what the National Rivers and Harbors Congress did to meet the threat to the river and harbor program.

1. On October 29, 1957, I addressed the Inland Empire Waterways Association at Longview, Wash. This fine group is directed by Mr. Herbert G. West, who is a member of our board of directors.

In this speech I warned that the launching of sputnik by the Russians would bring about a drastic reappraisal of our budget for waterway development. I also observed that efforts would be made to divert funds which Congress had appropriated for flood control, river and harbor, and irrigation work to the development of satellites and missiles. I observed that we might be threatened with the prospect of getting along with the crumbs that dropped from the table.

2. Through various reports from headquarters of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, we analyzed the threat to our program. We were first among the organizations in this field to report that there would probably be a 20 percent cut in the budget estimates which would be presented to Congress in January 1958 and that a ban would be placed on the start of new projects in the water development field. There were some who thought we were alarmists in this matter, but events have proved the general accuracy of our fears and predictions.

3. On November 29, 1957, our national headquarters sent out a memorandum to officers, national directors, regional directors, and State vice presidents about the threatened cut in appropriations and in future construction.

This report was circulated to some 150 key Members of Congress who are interested in the overall waterway development program. We had an amazing response from this memorandum—a response that showed that these key Members of Congress were also concerned that the water development program might be scuttled and tossed overboard under the guise of providing funds for the satellite-missile program.

4. In early December, the national headquarters became concerned about the recession. There were several headquarters reports and press releases which carried a survey of news stories appearing in papers all over the country, indicating that we were headed toward hard times. I mention this because we felt that a cutback in construction of public works would further add to the present disturbing business decline.

5. On December 5, 1957, the Bureau of the Budget issued a secret order to the Army Engineers to review the expenditure of the

appropriated funds in the light of new budgetary considerations. This meant simply that the Bureau of the Budget was delaying and deferring and obstructing the flow of appropriated funds into projects which were already under construction. We objected strongly to this action and, as a result, the Bureau of the Budget has released all of these funds that had been held virtually in escrow.

6. As the rumor of cutback, delay and ban on new starts persisted through November, I called a special emergency meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress board of national directors, which was held in Washington on January 4, 1958. Seventeen of the twenty-one members of the board gathered at the Mayflower Hotel and produced a remarkable set of recommendations, opposing these antagonistic acts toward the water development program.

I wish that each of you would take the time to read a copy of these recommendations.

7. On January 13, the Bureau of the Budget sent to Congress its figures for flood control, river, harbor, navigation, and irrigation work. Due to the opposition that we had expressed to the Bureau of the Budget, the cuts in construction funds were not as great as the 20 percent that had originally been considered within the Bureau of the Budget. However, the budget did contain a ban on the start of new projects, as we had predicted.

8. On the same day, January 13, I issued a release to the press in which I labeled the budget provisions as the "liquidation of the water development program." In my statement, I predicted strong congressional opposition to the cuts and the deferment of new starts, especially in view of the growing business recession.

9. On March 7, President Eisenhower issued a statement releasing some of the appropriated funds for the waterway program. The ban on new starts remained, however, on the flood control, navigation, and irrigation-reclamation program. I will say that we strongly resist this effort to throttle the program by slow strangulation.

I hope that our resolutions committee will bring out a firm statement in opposition to this effort to sabotage the water development program of the United States. We cannot stand still and see our money being spent on dubious foreign-aid projects while we are being denied the funds to keep abreast and apace of our growing national water needs.

America cannot stand still. The times will not await indefinite delay in this highly important defense and economic matter. The time to meet our needs is now.

10. On March 11, the House passed the 1958 Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control bill by an impressive majority of 321 to 81. The Senate had previously passed the measure. This was merely an authorization bill, but it is necessary before the appropriations can be made to start the projects that are required to keep abreast of our national water needs.

11. On April 15, President Eisenhower vetoed this bill. We hope that Congress will either override the veto or assert its prerogative to plan the future water needs of the Nation without undue obstruction. I also expect our resolutions committee to bring in a strong recommendation on that subject—and the stronger, the better.

While all of these hectic developments were taking place, we were stepping up our activity in the matter of publicity and membership. We have prepared a new pamphlet which I hope you take the time to read: "The National Rivers and Harbors Congress—What It Is—What It Does."

You will have a report later on the matter of membership. I wish to commend the efforts of our directors from all over the country. They have all worked hard and are entitled to our appreciation for a job well done. We are growing soundly and steadily, not only in membership, but in effectiveness in our cause.

I think I would be derelict in my duty were I not at this time to make certain recommendations to this organization. I think our country should adopt three basic principles as fundamental parts of our water utilization program. They are:

1. The Nation needs and should have a stabilized program for the purpose of water development, including reclamation and all types of river and harbor development. This program should be set at a definite dollar amount, always taking in consideration the decreased purchasing power of the dollar and the increased population of the Nation, with concurring increased need for flood control, navigation, reclamation, recreation, and industrial and municipal use of water.

2. We should have a definite and dependable program of new starts, and no agency of government should be allowed to strangle our program for internal development by direct or devious means.

3. Present projects under consideration should be speeded up to the time when they are completed and useful to our people, and a reasonable backlog of new projects should be authorized by the U.S. Congress.

The adoption of such a program nationally would serve to relieve those of us who have worked hard and hazarded greatly of the constant annual uncertainty, and would permit us to look forward with more assurance to the future. America, the richest land on earth, has a right to expect reasonable internal development and reasonable programs of projects which create wealth in themselves and make our land more livable for its people.

During the course of the last year, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has made tremendous progress. I am delighted to be able to report to you, from your officers and directors, the fact that during the course of this year we have moved the offices of this organization from the third-story-garret on M Street to the modern LaSalle Office Building across Connecticut Avenue from the Mayflower Hotel. Although our space was ample enough at the time of the move, it already has become crowded and too small, and we are looking forward to the time when we will double the size of these offices. I hope that all of you will seek an opportunity to visit your headquarters there during the course of this convention.

During the course of this year, our membership has increased enormously; and this means expanded influence and expanded activity. Keeping up with the increase in membership has been an increase in the total receipts for the organization. This, in turn, has permitted us to increase our budget without going in the red 1 cent. We have added to our staff, as head of the department of public information, Mr. Lacey Reynolds, formerly a newspaperman. His vitality and his alertness have given strength to our program of publicizing the affairs of your organization.

We now have in mind that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress will soon begin to edit a newsletter at regular intervals and will mail this newsletter to our entire membership. This will give us another way to keep in better touch with those throughout the entire Nation who are interested in water utilization and rivers and harbors development.

In the final analysis, we realize that this organization is the oldest national organization for water development in the United States. It was organized in 1901, and is growing in strength today. In the light of the growing demand upon our water resources, I see no reason why this organization should not continue to keep the lead in this program which means everything to the progress and development of our land, and, in fact, to the very survival of our people.

As this year ends, I sense a quickening of activity and energy on the part of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I tell you that your organization is accepted throughout the U.S. Congress and the Nation with more respect and with growing admiration for its activity and its accomplishment. With your continued help and support, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress will move on to goals yet unsought and as of this date undreamed of.

---

## The Situation in Bolivia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this country were terribly shocked to learn last week of mob violence in Bolivia against American officials, which was based on an alleged remark by a U.S. official that Bolivia should be divided up among its South American neighbors. I cannot imagine any American in his right senses making such an uncalled for and downright stupid remark which was intended only to hurt the United States and damage its prestige in Latin America.

Our relations with Bolivia have always been cordial. We have tried to help that country attain a high degree of economic development and a higher standard of living. Bolivia is beset with special problems, the magnitude of which we realize and are willing to do all in our power to help find a logical and satisfactory solution.

Last year and again this year, I introduced in Congress a resolution to establish a Pan American Parliamentary Association for the purpose of seeking better understanding among the nations of the Western Hemisphere, cooperate in the solution of social and economic problems, assist in attaining a higher standard of living, better education, improvement of trade relations, modernization of agriculture, and other problems. I believe that if such an organization would be in existence today where the representatives of the 21 American nations could meet to discuss these problems on a people-to-people basis, we could have avoided such misunderstanding and friction as we have just witnessed in Bolivia.

In connection with the Bolivian situation and possibilities for economic development and investment in that country, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief article which appeared in the issue of March 6, 1959, of Business International, a weekly publication on business abroad:

BOLIVIAN BALANCE SHEET: WHY THE ODDS ARE FAVORABLE

Mob violence against U.S. Government officials in La Paz, set off by one such official's reputed remark that Bolivia and its

problems should be divided up among its neighbors, shook the confidence of many people in the United States this week. Fears arose that Bolivia in actuality was not making economic progress, that the austerity program essential to it might topple along with the government pushing it, and that the Bolivian people are basically antagonistic to the United States. Qualified observers in La Paz, Washington, and New York, however, dismiss these views as exaggerated.

Item: Two years' frustration of severe austerity have not swung Bolivians against their government leaders, who rule without help of army or, in reality, police power. The very fact that it exploded—harmlessly—against the United States as a scapegoat is reassuring.

Item: The cost-of-living index and the exchange rate of the boliviano are no higher today than in December 1956, when Bolivia's rigorous stabilization program (BI, Feb. 13, 1959, p. 2) went into effect. The country has met its foreign debts, and foreign oil firms have been and are investing a considerable amount of dollars in its oil fields.

PROGRESS MUST BEAR CROSS OF TIN

On the other hand, neither the Bolivian Government nor U.S. aid officials (whose tone has become increasingly petulant in the past year) have faced up to the major drag on economic progress: unproductive, subsidized tin mines (some miners are really only moving rocks). Instead, the effort is to hold the line desperately (and so far unsuccessfully), hoping against hope that the big oil companies will strike it rich. Even if they do, however, it will be years before the results show up on Bolivia's P & L statement.

Further, the Bolivian Government itself is uncoordinated, rushing off in all directions. It has not clamped down on labor agitators (though this may be wise), and some of its leaders showed themselves irresponsible in broadcasting, for political gain, the U.S. official's purported remark—and then trying to put the lid back on. Yet the government has accepted U.S. demands that private enterprise be fostered and austerity imposed.

When all is said and done, however, faith in this potentially rich country rests in its people—whose capacity for work and suffering is demonstrated and whose political maturity, in finally recognizing that constant changes in government solve nothing, has amazed objective observers.

## Cure for Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include Sylvia Porter's column from the March 10 issue of the Washington Evening Star.

Miss Porter's column is a startling commentary on one of the more recent tragic developments in our economy—permanent high unemployment even when business is good.

CURE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Sylvia Porter)

It was a private luncheon and the executive in charge of hiring for one of the Nation's giant corporations was speaking freely:

"Sure, we expect better business and our sales are going up. But while we're producing more than at this time in 1958, we're doing it with—thousands less on the payroll. It's really amazing how much we were able to tighten up on costs in 1957–58 and how handsomely our more efficient plants and machinery are paying off now.

"And I'll tell you this. I'd rather have our employees work a longer week and pay overtime than add one more man than necessary to the payroll. We got such brickbats thrown at us when we had to lay off men last year that I'm going to do everything I can to avoid taking on new ones whom I might have to lay off later and invite the brickbats all over again. It's cheaper to pay the extra expense of overtime than to pay the extra expense of a public relations drive to explain a layoff."

I gulped. "Granted that it makes sense on the balance sheet. But what about the unemployed and the new workers seeking jobs in your area? Don't you feel any responsibility to them? Don't you see yourself benefiting if they have jobs and can buy your products and those of others?"

He didn't gulp. "It is not the responsibility of individual corporations to employ more than we need nor to guarantee full employment at all times. It is my responsibility to my corporation to try for maximum production and for a maximum—although reasonable—profit."

There you have it—a key, straightforward, ungimmicked explanation why unemployment is remaining millions above normal.

And don't kid yourself. The unemployment statistics will continue mighty disheartening at least until well into spring.

Translating the unemployment explanation into simple terms.

(1) Corporations have greatly improved their efficiency of operations and they're aggressively pursuing ways to turn out more goods with fewer workers.

(2) Many feel that while overtime is expensive, it's cheaper in the short run than training workers who might be only temporary and who, if laid off later, would give the corporation a sour reputation the Nation over.

(3) New workers are constantly entering the workforce, threatening to swell the jobless ranks.

Today's jobless problem is not a superficial thing. It is a byproduct of the new age of automation. It is a result of the huge investment corporations have made in plant improvements and expansion. It is a reflection of the sharp, although short, 1957–58 recession.

The superficial cures lie in extension of jobless benefits, aid for depressed areas, major relocation efforts. But the basic cure lies in only one thing:

More growth to absorb the unemployed and new job seekers.

Which means new industries and more production and consumption of such things as autos, houses, appliances, soft goods, public works, services—in short, more of enough things and nonthings to create jobs for all able, willing, and seeking work.

## Weary Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Weary Waters" by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute. This article appeared in the November 1957 issue of Clubwoman:

WEARY WATERS

(By Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson)

If the otherwise neighborly Mrs. Roe should take it into her head that the easy, quick and practical way to dispose of the Roe family refuse would be to toss it over the fence into the next-door yard of the equally neighborly Mrs. Doe, and should act on the idea, there would be some sort of ruckus. If Mrs. Doe couldn't make her protest stick the authorities would be stepping in, and Mrs. Roe might be having her head examined.

Substitute for the outlandish behavior of the fictional Mrs. Roe that of neighboring communities along a present-day watercourse, and one will have a fairly realistic picture of something going on every day our country over. In spite of our enlightened progress in other directions, more than half of our sewered communities and a comparable proportion of our industries still hold to a free and easy practice of more rough and ready days, just dump the wastes of their homes and factories into a handy stream, and leave it to the stream to take care of them with its biochemical miracle of self-purification.

Days were when no great harm was done that way. No more. Water shortages caused by loading streams with more impurities than they can take care of are appearing in too many localities. Some are becoming critical.

Days were when we felt no urge but to give thanks for our rich farmlands; our growing cities, thriving towns and mushrooming industries; our sparkling lakes, placid rivers and tumbling streams; our fish, birds, and other wildlife; the romance of boyhood's swimming hole, our playgrounds in the great outdoors, our sportsmen's paradises. No more. A shadow of water poverty has been cast across our life as a prospering Nation. Yesterday is yesterday. The urge of today is necessity's urge for action. Thanksgiving is no longer enough. Water pollution is killing our fish, starving our birds, turning swimming holes into cesspools, making disease traps of our beaches, spoiling our inland playgrounds, driving the game from our sportsmen's paradises, threatening our farmlands, our industries, and the health of our communities.

Days were when we could afford to think of water as unlimited and free, like the air we breathe. No more. It was a pretty illusion, but now we have to deal with the hard fact that nature's endowment of water for the area that is the United States, generous as it is, is fixed; that there isn't any more, and we have to make it do. We are face to face with the cold reality that with our rapid increase in population, its shift from country to city, and the even more amazing growth of our industries, our available supply of water for all our needs is being squeezed tighter and tighter between a mounting demand on the one hand and increasing pollution on the other. A spreading awareness of what this means lies back of the broadened and strengthened water pollution control program authorized by Congress last year and now being developed by our Public Health Service.

Every man, woman, and child of the U.S. national family is going to have to have this year, on the average, at least a million gallons of water fit to use. He is going to need more next year, and more and more in the years beyond. Statistics spell out the endless story of how Yankee ingenuity, new inventions, and new conveniences in a rising standard of living mean new uses for

water, and demands for it increasing even faster than the number of our people and their industrial activities.

Looked at one way, the problem of making sure of enough water to go around is a housekeeping problem on a national scale. We as a people are going to have to be more thrifty, and a lot tidier. Figures may be cold, but they can be eloquent too. For instance:

In 1900 our 75 million people were using only 41 billion gallons of water a day. By 1950 a population which had only doubled was using about five times as much. Today our statistical forecasters are predicting that by 1975 our people will need at least 350 billion gallons a day.

In 1900 we had about 4,000 waterworks supplying our cities and larger towns. Today we have four times that many, with some cities having need for twice as much water as they did only 10 years ago.

City shortages are recurring problems from coast to coast. In 1953 the U.S. Geological Survey found a thousand cities resorting to restrictions on water use. As their populations have grown and their water needs mounted even faster, and as nearby sources have become too limited in quantity or too polluted for use, cities have had to reach further and further out for their water supply. New York City, for example, draws its water from the Catskill Mountains, more than 100 miles away, while across the continent Los Angeles has to get its supply from the Colorado River nearly 300 miles away.

Why are water needs so far outstepping growth in population and industry? A look around a modern dwelling, house, or apartment, will indicate part of the answer.

Piped-in water and conveniently placed outlets have taken over from the town pump and spring hole.

The modern washbasin and bathtub do a much quicker, easier, and cleaner job than did the old washstand, pitcher, basin, and slop jar, but they use a lot more water. So do the automatic washers for clothes, linens, and dishes, which have supplanted the cistern, wooden tub, and dishpan.

And the modern counterpart of yesterday's crescent-windowed outdoor retreat—it takes about 5 gallons of water for a single flushing. Multiply by 5 the number of flushings per day in a country of 170 million people, and one has an approximation of only 1 incidental in the skyrocketing per capita consumption of water as the American standard of living goes up and up.

Large-scale air conditioning calling for enormous quantities of water; more and more water for washing the picture windows of homes and the great glass-expanses of modern offices and public buildings; irrigation spreading from West to East; new products making new demands: 300 gallons of water for a pound of synthetic rubber; 100 to 200 gallons for a pound of synthetic dress fabrics; technical advances, new methods, increasing volume in the production of items not new but basic; 65,000 gallons of water to turn out a ton of finished steel; 500 gallons for a yard of woolen cloth; 20 gallons for a pound of finished paper—the list of new or stepped-up uses for water is next to endless.

So it goes and so we grow in prosperity and power. Farms, factories, families; cities, towns, villages; schools, laboratories, playgrounds; businesses, hospitals, governments—all needing, and using, more and more water to produce and enjoy the fruits of American genius and enterprise. And all the while largely preventable pollution is progressively cutting down the natural endowment which has fixed the limits of our water resources. Water shortages haunt America from east to west, not because we have outgrown the supply, but because of the way we have wasted and despoiled it.

OUR WASTE BURDENED STREAMS

Today about 100 million of our 170 million people are living in sewered municipalities—cities, towns, villages, sewer districts, institutions. Into their watercourses their sewage systems are pouring their bath and wash water, kitchen sink garbage, toilet flushings, restaurant and laundry washings, hospital and mortuary refuse—in fact the whole gamut of things mentionable and unmentionable which can be got rid of by dumping them down a drainpipe. The same is true of the acids, chemicals, grease, oils, animal and vegetable matter and all the other objectionable or dangerous substances being discharged into our streams by our industrial plants. Some are poisonous, some corrosive, some merely offensive to see and smell.

Streams are too often contaminated beyond their capacity to purify themselves, especially when they are sluggish, shallow, or small, or when their volume of flow has been reduced by long dry spells. At a point where the load of inpurity has become greater than the stream's capacity for self-purification, the pollution concentration reaches the dangerous and destructive level. From that point on downstream the usefulness of the watercourse to man and beast, farm and factory has been destroyed. Pollution has robbed the Nation of that much of its total available water supply.

In spite of notable advances in recent years in control of pollution with waste treatment plants, the demands for water continue to outrun measures to conserve supply by removing impurities before they reach the stream. Today pollution control is 50 years behind. If we are to bring construction of waste treatment works up to a level where we can merely keep even with pollution, we must be prepared to spend for this alone an estimated $400 to $500 million a year for the next 10 years.

When it comes to its needs for clean water, the national family is faced with a collossal job of housecleaning and home management. That's what its water pollution problem adds up to.

A HOUSECLEANING DRIVE IN THE MAKING

It was congressional recognition of a threatening situation that resulted in the Water Pollution Control Act of 1956. By this act provision was made for a start, under the direction of the Public Health Service, toward a concert of effort by Federal, State, and local governments, public and private agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals, all working together to the single end of protecting the national water supply against further inroads by pollution.

A truly cooperative drive, nationwide, was made possible by authorizations for broadened research; the finding and dissemination of more basic information about the volume and nature of pollution; more technical assistance to States and Federal grants for State programs; encouragement of interstate agreements and uniform State laws; simplification of procedures in Federal abatement actions against interstate pollution; a National Water Pollution Advisory Board made up of specially qualified members not connected with but cooperating with the Federal Government; and for immediate action a half-billion-dollar, 10-year program of Federal grants to assist communities in the construction of sewage treatment works.

The construction grants program is well launched and under full steam. The act limits individual grants to 30 percent of the estimated cost of a project or $250,000, whichever is less. The grantee must provide the rest. During the first fiscal year—more correctly the first 8 months—of the new Federal water pollution control program, a total of $37,942,326 was granted to 446 municipalities to help them build sewage treatment plants.

To this amount, communities added $128,856,364, to bring the total estimated costs of all the program's projects to $166,798,690.

The average Federal grant was about $85,000. Population of the average community served was 22,000.

As of July 1, a total of 1,075 applications for $97,889,447 in grant funds had been received by the Public Health Service and State agencies, with an estimated construction cost for the projects of $677,131,972, if all had been approved.

It is in our history that when our people understand a wrong situation and a need for action, they act. Concerted action on a national scale to safeguard our water supply is overdue; for pollution is adding daily to the burden on already weary waters. It bears directly upon the farmer and his livestock; those who live in urban and rural communities alike; on the conservation of our seafood and wildlife; the beauty and healthfulness of our recreation grounds; upon the health, prosperity and way of life of every last one of us. A way to stop it is ours by law. The rest is up to us.

## Seeds of Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling to the attention of Congress and the American people the worthwhile voluntary program of winning new friends, and at the same time doing a really good turn.

Do you feel good about spring coming? Why do we not share it in American friendship gardens all over the world?

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 16, 1959]

SEEDS FOR OVERSEAS

The annual seeds of friendship collection for overseas, is announced by the All-America Friendship League, with the 1959 goal for spring planting 1 million packets of vegetable and flower seeds. Seeds, in packets or bulk from groups and individuals, are being received now at Friendship Headquarters, 118 West 57th Street, New York 19, N.Y.

Until May 15, the seed committee will send weekly shipments to Britain, France, Western Germany, and Italy; and special shipments will go to Mexico, and Japan. In each country, agricultural and educational committees will supervise the distribution.

Schools and churches, civic and service groups, garden clubs, seed growers, and individuals are all urged to help in this project. Food in the form of seeds can be sent overseas at minimum cost and garden success depends on good seeds. Gifts of money are used to buy seeds at wholesale; packages are marked as gifts from the United States and names of donors forwarded.

The League chairman, Mrs. Edmund H. Cahill, says: "American Friendship Gardens coming to life all over the world are a constant reminder of our friendship, and seeds are living, growing things that will grow on and on in the years to come. These gift seeds from every part of the United States have brought joy to many thousands overseas and are living proof that understanding and

kindness still exist in this world. One garden may not seem important, but millions of persons growing their own flowers and vegetables can transform the morale and health of an entire country."

Early contributors to seeds of friendship were Mrs. D. W. Eisenhower, mother of President Eisenhower, whose seeds came from her own garden in Abilene, Kansas, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and Mrs. Thomas E. Dewey.

The following are typical comments from participants in the plan:

Sussex: "The seeds of friendship were planted in the school garden by the garden clubs recently formed. Many thanks from all."

Yorkshire: "The young farmers of the school planted the seeds of friendship. Will you please thank the children of America for saving their money to buy seeds for us."

Kent: "Our teacher was so pleased with the seeds that he ordered a special plot prepared to be called the American seed plot. Our thanks to all."

French school: "I hope, as the flowers grow, the friendship will grow between the French and American children. I send thanks to the children and hope the friendship between our two countries will never be broken."

## The Acid Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to the thought-provoking article by Dr. Wernher von Braun, "The Acid Test," which appeared in VFW magazine for March 1959.

To my mind Dr. von Braun is one of the few men who has grasped not only the nature but the full sweep of the challenge of our times. For all business as usual, budget as usual, smugness as usual Americans, I heartily recommend Von Braun's article, which follows:

THE ACID TEST

(By Dr. Wernher von Braun)

The acid test of nations—and men—is the measure of their courage and resourceness in the face of adversity and peril. Those nations which have survived crises have exerted the most profound influences upon mankind's destiny. Those which failed did so largely because they could not manage abundance and power.

The United States has faced agonizing tests more than once during its relatively short history. It has emerged each time from the crucible not without scare but with greater confidence and richer maturity. America survived its crises because it knew what had to be done and did it without regard to consequences and with faith in its own judgment and resources.

Even now, we are experiencing yet another test. Historians may record the present time as one of the most fateful intervals of the 20th century. The early days of October 1957 marked a turning point in our destiny, and in the destinies of other nations, large and small. An unprecedented technological achievement suddenly transformed a troubled but familiar world into one of strange and foreboding aspect. I refer to sputnik, Russia's first satellite. As it has since the dawn of the industrial revolution, science had once again influenced history—and directly shaped the lives of men.

The reaction to sputnik in America was profound. It triggered a period of self-appraisal rarely equaled in modern times. Overnight it became popular to question the bulwarks of our society: our public educational system, our industrial strength, our international policy, our defense strategy and forces, the capabilities of our science and technology. Even the moral fiber of our people came under searching examination. However, since the evident threat was to our security, our initial preoccupation was with modern weapons and our means of defending against them. The Damoclean sword menacing us consisted—and still consists—of the monstrous destructive force inherent in automatic missile-delivery systems, which are capable of transporting thermonuclear warheads over thousands of miles, in any weather, across all geographic and political barriers, at velocities of such magnitude as to imply total destruction without advance warning.

Perhaps it is time now, without muddying the waters further, to determine whether we have correctly assessed the total threat represented by a totalitarian regime whose end objective is world domination.

The Soviet challenge is by no means restricted to military technology. It goes far beyond the realms of politics and armies. No longer is the task of coping with the Red menace the exclusive responsibility of generals and statesmen. The acid test involves every facet of our civilization: religion, economics, politics, science, technology, industry, and education. Freemen everywhere have been caught up in this grim competition. We who enjoy our homes, drive the family car, spend more time in leisure and less in work, who pay less attention to national affairs than to television shows are faced with a decision. Will we do whatever is necessary to win this struggle, or will we continue in our comfortable illusion and thus court the risk of a defeat which would forever eliminate freedom and place our children and their children under the control of an all-powerful state? What we are about to discover is whether a nation which has rated its homerun sluggers and its fullbacks above its scientists and philosophers can meet the total competition of aggression communism and still preserve its way of life.

It will not be enough to perfect weapons systems to equal those of a potential aggressor. It is argued that the deterrent effect of these machines of war may cancel the possibility of total conflict. Consequently, this will turn aggression in another direction: the perimeter or brush type war in which huge rockets of great range and mass destructive capability would not be employed. Against this estimate, the Army has reshaped its striking forces and equipped them with battlefield rockets and guided missiles. This urgent need of a defense capable of dealing with any type of emergency has met a rare degree of unanimity here and abroad.

In sharp contrast, however, wide disagreement has developed over the real significance of the best-publicized exploit of Communist engineering—the earth-circling satellite whose monotonous signal was intentionally audible to listeners everywhere on earth. Skeptics, who refuse to accept the possible until it is demonstrated, are clouding the issue. This is a dangerous state of mind in a day when breakthroughs occur so rapidly that obsolescence of complex weapons systems has become a primary concern.

Perhaps the launching of Explorer helped to redeem our promises, but no amount of explanation or justification can show why we did not do it ahead of the Soviets—and no amount of mutual backslapping that we succeeded with Explorer on the first try can hide the fact that we had lost a round. It was a grave error in judgment to fail to recognize the tremendous psychological impact of an omnipresent artificial moon, visible to anyone with a good pair of eyes and audible to anyone with a simple radio receiver.

More recently we lost another round when our success with the giant Atlas 10–B satellite was immediately and completely overshadowed by the Russians' triumph in placing a manmade object in orbit around the sun. Our incredulous dismay at this feat stems directly from our failure to evaluate realistically the research, development, engineering, and production capabilities of a totalitarian state. This had lulled us into complacency and had led to an underestimate of our adversary, risky business in any competition.

Since I had the dubious privilege of living and working under a totalitarian government for many years, I should be able to evaluate this topic with some degree of competence. Anyone who says that science and technology cannot flourish in a police state does himself and his country a great disservice. It is generally recognized, of course, that personal freedom of movement and thought, and a free exchange of ideas are essential to scientific advance. From this, however, many people erroneously conclude that genuine scientific work is impossible in the climate of dictatorship. Let me clear up this notion once and for all, in the interest of arriving at an honest appraisal of our situation, by citing my personal experience at the Peenemunde rocket center in Hitler's Germany.

Neither I nor any of my associates was ever required to submit a travel itinerary in advance, whether for a short business trip or a vacation lasting several weeks. Throughout the war we had intimate, continuous contact with 36 universities and technical institutions. They performed research in support of our missile programs under contracts so broadly worded that they permitted the institutions an extremely wide latitude in implementation.

Discussions and symposia were held frequently. Many ideas were generated in this truly liberal academic environment. True, these ideas related exclusively to our technical problems and not to politics, but they are successfully applied even today in rocket and missile activities. As far as personal freedom of movement is concerned, as well as free exchange of ideas in the strictly scientific and technological sphere, it would thus simply be misleading to assume that things were much different than in a free country.

The heavy hand of dictatorship is rather felt in another area. In Peenemuende, the security police kept dossiers on all of us, listing all the things we might have said about the regime or individuals of the upper hierarchy. Personal vices and weaknesses were cataloged in the files. But they left us alone as long as our usefulness, in their opinion, was greater than our debit account. Once they felt they could do without you, and you were in their way, they'd call for the dossier and destroy you.

I realize that this sounds quite awful to men who have never experienced it. But the sober fact is that people, whether scientists or candlemakers, learn to live with such a situation. We don't deny ourselves weekend auto trips because of the National Safety Council's warning about multiple deaths. Just so the man living under dictatorship adjusts himself to business as usual, whether he likes it or not, because he must, in order to survive. Something like 700 million people are living today under Communist rule and, in all probability, they have learned to live in the face of such possible "road accidents."

Consequently, we should disabuse ourselves of the dangerous myth that the impotent Russian scientist bends over his

slide rule with a gun at his head. It appears that he enjoys at least as much reward as the American scientist and that, until quite recently, he had even greater latitude in his selection of resources and assistance.

When we consider the Russians' low general technological status during the last war, plus the tremendous physical damage inflicted upon Soviet industry by the war itself, it becomes frighteningly clear that their rate of progress greatly exceeds ours.

The real peril lies in the enormous momentum they have built up, which certainly will yield other dramatic byproducts along the way. They have long since embarked upon a dynamic program to achieve supremacy in science and technology. Their state-controlled educational system is turning out competent engineers and scientists in greater numbers than ours. It is upon this broad foundation that the Russian is waging his effort and not upon the gleanings of the brain-picking of some captive foreign scientists, as many people in this country still seem to believe. Clearly we must accelerate our effort at a rate calculated to overtake and surpass the Russian advantage. And this calls for sacrifice on an unprecedented scale.

It must be understood also that the Soivets have grasped the significance of man's imminent conquest of space and have proceeded well along the road in that direction. A current estimate of the situation would include these possibilities:

First, the Russians probably used a multistage rocket to launch their satellites, a rocket originally designed to carry a thermonuclear warhead over intercontinental range.

Second, the same rocket configuration, with minor modifications, can place a payload of from 50 to 100 pounds on the moon.

Third, the rocket can also put up a satellite capable of military reconnaissance, equipped with a television playback feature. A few such orbital devices can keep track of the progress of all surface construction projects, ship movements, and airbase operations anywhere in the world. Once they achieve this, and I am convinced that it is only very few years off, open-skies inspection for purpose of disarmament becomes academic.

Fourth, the Russians have a sound program designed to solve the question of safe return from orbital flight and related space-medical problems, with the purpose of preparing for manned space travel.

Now there is a made-in-Russia planet orbiting the sun; and I would recommend that we brace ourselves for other Soviet firsts in the new field of astronautics. We are behind and we cannot catch up in a day or two, since major technological projects necessarily involve lead time. It will require several years of concentrated effort to come abreast, and even longer to pull ahead.

We can waste no time commiserating over the sorry lot of the Russian worker or peasant, comparing his lack of freedom and creature comforts with our prosperity. We should also shuck off another illusion—that of thinking the Russian people will rise up to overthrow the Kremlin and thus relieve us of all our worries.

Perhaps a dream of freedom does exist in the Soviet Union. Perhaps, by exposing more young people to scientific training, a search for truth will eventually react against the dictatorship. But we cannot stand around, hands in pockets, waiting for others to do what can be accomplished only by us. I am convinced that it is man's destiny to enter space and that he who controls the open space around us is in a position to control the earth. All that is left to us is to accept the Soviet challenge or else pay the piper.

I certainly do not suggest that we move into space with any belligerent intentions. To be consistent with the fundamentals for which the United States stands, we should propose to the United Nations the universal acceptance of the principle of freedom of outer space—in analogy with the principle of freedom of the seas.

But any such doctrine would be void and meaningless if we cannot back it up with a position of relative strength.

It has been said that Khrushchev and company launched their eventual downfall by the sputnik, because this country reacted by firing up its missile and space programs.

And indeed, in more than one aspect, this may be our last chance. In the First World War, as well as after Pearl Harbor, the United States had time to marshal her resources. Even in Korea and later, after sputnik, we had time to initiate the necessary counteraction. Next time, in this world of long-range ballistic missiles and thermonuclear warheads, we may not have time. Either we will be ready at a moment's notice, or historians may conclude over the ruins of our cities that we were weighed and found wanting.

I hope that we will not conclude that money alone will turn all the tricks. There are other factors involved which cannot be settled so easily. It would be presumptuous for me to offer school solutions, or even to list all the things which must be considered; but there are some minimum requirements which can be identified and which demand prompt attention.

Our educational offerings must come under scrutiny, since it is tomorrow's generation which will have to cope with the problems developing today. If their preparation is to be compatible with the kind of world they will inherit, our young people must be taught basic and essential knowledge at the earliest practicable age in the elementary schools. We have got to disabuse ourselves of the idea that school is a place solely to teach boys and girls how to live together. They must understand mathematics and the physical sciences, which means more and better teachers and expanded offerings both in scope and number. Better salaries, improved professional status, and more adequate classroom and laboratory facilities are essential to obtain the kind of teachers we need, those who can provide the inspirational leadership to interest young minds in facts.

We want no dictator telling us what to believe and what to do. But we must set about learning the facts and, when we have understood them, buckle down to the challenging tasks which confront us.

We should stop telling the world what we are against. We should tell the world what we are for. We must not fight the Communist ideology with negative statements but with the lofty ideals of the founders of this great Republic. The antidote to communism is not anticommunism but the belief in God and the dignity of the individual. Let us not deceive ourselves; the Communist ideology has a powerful appeal to the have-nots, the uninformed, and the desperate. But ideas are fought not with material means but with superior ideas. And where should these ideas be found in this world today if they cannot be found in this glorious land of the free? The flag of leadership of the free world has been thrust into the hands of Americans. Let us live up to the historical challenge.

We must think in terms of long-range objectives, not on the time scale of next year's automobile models.

It is disquieting to be asked, "But what will all this profit us?" Such questions betray a lack of confidence and, even more serious, the kind or unenlightened approach which has hamstrung our progress in the past. No man can say with assurance what benefits will accrue from our discoveries. With Explorer we made a modest beginning. We have stepped into a new high road from which there can be no turning back. As we probe further into the area beyond our sensible atmosphere, man will learn more about his environment; he will understand better the order and beauty of creation. He may then come to realize that war, as we know it, will avail him nothing but catistrophe. He may grasp the truth that there is something far bigger than his little world. Before the majesty of what he will find out there, he must stand in reverential awe. This, then, is the acid test as man moves into the unknown.

---

## The Face of Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third in a series of penetrating articles by Eve Edstrom, of the staff of the Washington Post, at the end of my remarks. Like the two articles which I asked to be printed in the RECORD for March 16, this third column is not cheerful reading. Again I am moved to point to the paradox of such poverty as is herein described in the showplace of democracy:

THE FACE OF POVERTY: ABANDONED BUT RETURNED TO PARENTS, CHILDREN PAY FOR THEIR ELDERS' SINS

(By Eve Edstrom)

(Third in a series)

The official police record on the abandonment of Billy and Betty begins in 1958.

Women's Bureau officers found them alone in a filthy apartment with beer cans strewn everywhere. The youngsters had a rash and inch-thick dirt on their necks.

After they were treated at District General Hospital, however, they were described as extremely attractive, outgoing, and beautiful.

But last December, when their parents finally agreed to relinquish them for adoption, Billy and Betty were described as "wild, not toilet trained" and having "eating problems."

The police record, so filled with repeated complaints about the care of Billy and Betty, no longer mentions them. Instead the other names, Gerry and Tommy, are entered.

Just 10 days after the parents agreed to give up Billy and Betty so they could give better care to Gerry and Tommy, the latter two were picked up by police for having been left alone.

Yet when these parents pleaded for "one more chance" before Acting Juvenile Court Judge Austin L. Fickling last month, they were permitted to take Gerry and Tommy home.

Whether this will be one more chance for the parents to make good or one more chance to damage their children is anybody's guess.

This family makes up one side of the District's face of poverty. Their lack is not so much money as maturity and morality.

The father is a marginal worker who sometimes earns $60 a week but more often than not is jobless and drunk.

His wife—only 23 and the mother of five children has yet to learn to care for herself, let alone her children.

For a decade, ever since she was 13 and know to juvenile court, she has been pleading for and getting one more chance.

She first was given a chance on probation, then was placed in two institutions after she was brought before the court in 1949 for a series of drinking and sex episodes. Not long after she was returned home with promises of good behavior she was in the Florence Crittenton Home where she gave birth to her first child who always has been cared for by the maternal grandparents.

Then in a tavern one day she met a man whom she married about a month later. The first born of her marriage was Gerry, a girl now going on 5. In rapid succession she had Billy, Betty, and Tommy.

Billy and Betty repeatedly were left alone. After they first were picked up by the Women's Bureau in 1956, they were placed in emergency care of foster homes.

What happened then became the pattern for the future. The parents stopped drinking, the father got a job and the children were returned home.

Three weeks later, a welfare worker reported, the case broke wide open. The mother suffered a miscarriage, had been drunk for 2 weeks, had left Billy and Betty alone for 3 days.

ANOTHER TRY FAILS

To win the children back this time the mother sought treatment for alcoholism and the family moved into public housing. But after Billy and Betty were returned home, the mother discontinued her clinic visits, the family lost the housing unit and the mother ultimately deserted. Billy and Betty went back into emergency care.

This type of upheaval went on until last September when the Women's Bureau found Billy and Betty in a dark basement apartment where a man was beating a woman too drunk to identify herself.

The children were placed in Junior Village, the District's home for homeless children. When the parents next contacted the Welfare Department they expressed interest in placing Billy and Betty in adoption. Even then a welfare worker was reluctant to break up this family.

By December the parents agreed to release Billy and Betty for adoption so they could do right by Gerry and Tommy. But when the father's unemployment compensation check arrived he stranded his family and Gerry and Tommy soon were in Junior Village after having been found alone.

When welfare officials brought this case to court in February, however, the parents were back together, the father had held a job for a month, the mother had resumed treatment for alcoholism and there was no evidence of physical damage to their children. Gerry and Tommy were returned home over Welfare Department protests.

"Who protects the interests of children in cases like this?" one welfare worker asked. "Now we must wait until these parents fail again."

And that is the story of how the District deals with many of its impoverished families. It waits for failure after failure—until no one can turn these tragedies into success stories.

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

## LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

# *Appendix*

## Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was pleased and gratified to learn recently that American industry employs between 7 and 8 million workers who are physically handicapped.

In a recent issue of Performance magazine, Mr. Dudley Coursey, assistant vice president of personnel for Texas Instruments, Inc., of Dallas, Tex., writes about the many advances in programs for employment of the physically handicapped. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EMPLOYER'S VIEWS ON EMPLOYMENT OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Dudley Coursey, assistant vice president, personnel, Texas Instruments Inc., Dallas, Tex.)

In America today I think you'll find the attitude of industry toward the physically handicapped applicant or employee might well be summed up in the statement, "It's Ability, Not Disability, That Counts."

It is currently estimated that between 7 and 8 million handicapped are in today's work force, with another 2 million capable of being employed. Where did all these disabled persons come from? Why are they so much more readily accepted by industry today than they were, say, 20 years ago? How do their work records compare with those of fellow employees? What are some of the special problems involved in the employment of such individuals? These and many other questions must immediately come to mind as you seriously consider the possibility of hiring and working with a deaf mute, a paraplegic, a blind man.

Let's define a "handicapped" person as one who requires special job placement and who, because of some physical disability, cannot easily be shifted from one job to another. Apparently, the first really sizable influx of such handicapped persons into American industry can be attributed largely to the manpower shortage created by World War II. Further, recent advances in medical science are partially responsible. For example, people are living longer and therefore are more likely to acquire the disabling diseases of adult life. (Little chance a caveman had of living long enough to suffer from hardening of the arteries—he was lucky to make it to the ripe old age of 18.) Moreover, medical science is now so much better able to save lives of accident victims. These victims survive—though they're often physically disabled.

SAFETY RECORD EXCELLENT

Now let's talk about why industry is so much more willing to hire handicapped workers today. Previously it was believed that hiring physically defective individuals would reduce a company's production rate, increase its absenteeism, lower morale, and, of course, of great importance to both employer and employee, cause a rise in company insurance rates. This last fear has been proven practically baseless. Insurance companies repeatedly have stated that insurance rates are influenced by the relative safety hazards and accident experience of each individual company. They emphasize the fact that, generally speaking, the safety record of physically handicapped workers is excellent—often better, in fact, than that of the nonhandicapped. Thus, employment of physically disabled individuals actually may tend to lower insurance rates. Further, rehabilitation and subsequent employment of disabled individuals saves money by exempting them from support through employee benefit programs. This money again results in lower—not higher—insurance rates to customer companies.

As for the actual work records of handicapped employees—their production generally is equal to or better than that of fellow employees. In some cases a disability actually may be an advantage, such as deafness in a work environment of highly distracting noise. In our own company there are several deaf people working on our assembly lines. Their supervisors say that their handicaps have definitely kept them from being distracted on the job. For example, we have a deaf boy at Texas Instruments whose job consists of weighing minute amounts of silicon. He does his job expertly and attentively, even though there are many activities going on around him.

HANDICAPPED WORKERS ARE MORALE BUILDERS

Absenteeism, we find, generally is equal to or lower than that of coworkers, and morale is not more of a problem with these people than with any others. In fact, we can report that handicapped workers actually are morale builders. As previously mentioned, the excellent safety records of handicapped individuals are generally recognized. Our own industrial nurses at Texas Instruments report that they rarely are called for by a handicapped employee, and we employ a good many of such people.

Other factors partially responsible for the increasing employment of physically disabled individuals include: Public pressure (the work of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped in sponsoring employment drives, etc.; our own Governor's committee, which is doing such a fine job); a sense of obligation to the community on industry's part; availability of increasing numbers of productive handicapped; our awareness of the increased burden to the taxpayer of unemployed, disabled workers; and, most important of all, it is now recognized that the hiring of physically handicapped people is an economically sound practice. Good employer experience over the years has proven this, and, as a result, hiring of the handicapped definitely is no longer considered "a last resort."

Let's look at a case in point, one of our own employees—let's call him Bob Edwards—who has worked for Texas Instruments for over 2 years and is now a senior inspector in quality control. Bob is only 28, but he has a systolic heart murmur and curvature of the spine which has left him with a short left leg. He can perform only a job which requires no lifting or extreme exertion. He had had considerable experience in the type of work for which he was hired and is fully qualified for his present position. His physical condition is in no way a handicap to his job performance. In fact, Bob's supervisor reports that his productivity rates well above the average of other performing similar duties. Further, Bob's attendance record has been excellent, and his safety record has been flawless. He is exceptionally well adjusted to his work situation and gets along well with both fellow employees and supervisors.

In some instances a job may actually have to be tailored to fit the individual disabled worker. In such a case special attention should be given to the exact physical demands of the job, and every effort should be made fully to utilize the individual's physical and mental capacity and his background of work experience. At Texas Instruments we have an employee who must have his work set up for him because of his lack of mobility, and another who is provided with a constant escort whenever she's in the plant to minimize the danger of her falling. For one assembler, a polio victim with both legs in braces, we changed a manual foot pedal to an electric hand control, and though this causes some loss of speed, her production record is still satisfactory.

On occasion, special arrangements may need to be made to provide personal conveniences to disabled workers. At Texas Instruments we reserve for them special parking spaces close to plant entrances. Some are encouraged to use elevators normally restricted to transportation of freight. It's suggested that they start early for the coffee bars and bring their lunches to avoid cafeteria congestion, etc.

If possible, it's best to give work to a disabled employee similar to the type he's done before. But remember you can kill a man with kindness. It's essential to make him understand that his employment is strictly a business proposition, and thus make him realize that he's still worth something and not just a beneficiary of charity.

There are many factors essential to a successful program of hiring handicapped individuals. First of all, proper attitude on the part of management toward this program must be evidenced. Interest and enthusiasm and respect will then be communicated to the handicapped's supervisor and coworkers and these make for a healthy, cooperative work situation. With backing from above, the idea is much less likely to seem a threat to a supervisor's production record or simply an additional chore in his already overcrowded schedule. He should be well informed about the case and know what to expect.

CAREFUL PLACEMENT ESSENTIAL

Careful placement of the individual in the job is a second essential. It must be remembered, of course, that every single case requires an individual evaluation. Time consuming? Yes—but well worthwhile.

Further, an effective safety program is necessary to keep the handicapped from being a

hazard to himself and others and to keep his coworkers from creating hazards for him. But a good safety program is now an essential part of the management responsibility in a modern industry.

And finally, frequent checks should be made on the handicapped employee to determine both his physical condition and his psychological adjustment to his job.

Perhaps this sounds like a pretty sizable undertaking. Undoubtedly, it is. However, this is a program from which not only the handicapped individual and our community will benefit, but as proven in thousands of cases, our company benefits as well.

## Tribute to the Late Eugene Favell, of Lakeview, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all people in our State of Oregon are indebted to Thomas B. Watters and Eugene Favell, the management specialists named by ex-Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay to supervise liquidation of the vast Klamath Indian Reservation.

Under adverse circumstances, they performed creditably and with integrity. On many other occasions I have saluted their record; and I do so again.

Last week, Eugene Favell died in Arizona, where he had gone in an effort to regain his health. He literally gave his life for his region, because he carried on as a management specialist when a grave heart condition long earlier had dictated his retirement.

The Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin for March 10, 1959, paid tribute to the outstanding career of the late Eugene Favell and to the equal devotion of his associate, Tom Watters. I know that many Senators who have joined with me in struggling with the thorny Klamath Reservation issue will want to read this moving tribute. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It should be added that Mr. Watters resides in Klamath Falls, while Mr. Favell was a resident of the neighboring southeastern Oregon community of Lakeview.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUGENE FAVELL

Gene Favell, one of the three management specialists named to work out the troublesome termination of Federal control over the Klamath Indians to the south of us, is dead. Favell died the other day in Phoenix, Ariz., where he had gone in an attempt to regain his health.

Three men were appointed to supervise the termination program, to work out its details, and to inventory tribal property.

One resigned rather shortly thereafter to manage a political campaign. Favell and Tom Watters served considerably longer—Watters until the end of the assignment.

Favell was forced by ill health to resign before the end of the program, although the work was substantially done when he quit his post.

Gene and Tom Watters both had guts. They took the course which was in large measure unpopular, instead of trying to do the job the easy way. They recommended Federal acquisition of the tribal timberlands.

Few central Oregonians knew either man. But those who drive south along Highway 97 through the big stretches of timber and beside the big Klamath Marsh, will have reason to remember both of them for many years to come.

## Visit to India by Paul Robeson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, for a long time there has been a good deal of discusion as to whether or not it is wise to continue the substantial foreign aid we have been granting to India.

In the light of this, I think is it important to call to the attention of the American public the recent visit to India made by Paul Robeson, American Negro leftist. Indian Prime Minister Nehru and other dignitaries honored this visitor who seized upon the opportunity to focus attention on the problems of Negroes in this country.

An editorial, entitled "Nehru's Glass House," published in the March 16th edition of the Manchester Union Leader of Manchester, N.H., draws an interesting parallel between the domestic situation and the problems of the so-called untouchables under the Indian caste system.

Because I think it is particularly appropriate at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEHRU'S GLASS HOUSE

When Indian Prime Minister Nehru and other Indian dignitaries went out of their way to honor Paul Robeson, American Negro leftist, much was made of the Negro problem in America. At that time this newspaper pointed out that—at its worst—the treatment received by the Negro in America in no way compared to the degradation of India's broken men, the untouchables.

Elie Abel, writing in the March 1 edition of the New York Sunday Times, presents a highly informative and interesting description of the Indian caste system. He tells how an orthodox highborn Hindu will not allow an untouchable to enter his home, except to clean the latrine. Abel describes the construction of Indian homes which force untouchables to use only the door which enters into the bathroom.

Abel writes also of the "highborn Hindu's abhorrence of outcasts. * * * Every society had dirty jobs to be done, but (the) Hindu society alone treated its sweepers and scavengers as men whose very touch was defiling."

It would also appear, according to the late Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, India's first great Harijan (untouchable) leader, that this fate was suffered by the broken men because, about the year 400, the Gupta kings declared cow slaughter a moral offense. The broken men continued to eat beef, probably because they were too poor to forswear eating the carcasses that they handled as scavengers and tanners.

There has been some breaking down of this class barrier, but as in the United States, this has been the result of government intervention, rather than a change of fundamental attitudes. Recognizing this aspect of the problem, the late Mahatma Gandhi taught that the solution depends upon a change of heart among the majority of Hindus. And, as Elie Abel emphasizes, "the fact that (discriminatory) practices are againts the law of the land has not, so far, changed the attitude of the average Indian villager toward the outcast."

Indeed, in some areas untouchables are forbidden to draw water from public wells, to carry umbrellas, to ride horseback, to enter certain Hindu temples, or to refresh themselves at a tea stall.

It would thus appear that Prime Minister Nehru and his cohorts should be the last to cast aspersions on the role of the Negro in American society.

## Security in the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, President Eisenhower's report to the people on Monday night, March 16, over all American networks, on the subject of Berlin and security in a free world, was tremendously reassuring. I ask that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITY IN THE FREE WORLD

(Text of the report to the American people by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, delivered in the President's office in the White House and telecast and broadcast by all American networks from 9:30 to 10 p.m. e.s.t., Monday, Mar. 16, 1959)

Tonight I want to talk with you about two subjects:

One is about a city that lies 4,000 miles away.

It is West Berlin. In a divided world it has been, for a decade, a symbol of freedom. But recently its name has come to symbolize, also, the efforts of imperialistic communism to divide the free world, to throw us off balance and to weaken our will for making certain of our collective security.

Next, I shall talk to you about the state of our Nation's posture of defense and the free world's capacity to meet the challenges that the Soviets incessantly pose to peace and to our own security.

First, West Berlin.

You have heard much about this city recently, and possibly wondered why American troops are in it at all.

How did we get there in the first place? What responsibilities do we have in connection with it, and how did we acquire them?

Why has there developed a situation surrounding this city that poses another of the recurring threats to peace that bear the stamp of Soviet manufacture?

Let's begin with a brief review of recent history.

We first acquired rights and responsibilities in West Berlin as a result of World War II. Even before the war ended, when the de-

feat and capitulation of Nazi Germany were in sight, the Allied Powers, including the Soviet Union, signed agreements defining the areas of occupation in Germany and Berlin which they would assume.

As a result, Germany and the city of Berlin were each divided into four zones, occupied by American, British, French, and Soviet troops.

Under the wartime agreements I have mentioned, the Western Allies entered into occupation of West Berlin and withdrew our Armies from the Soviet Zone. Accordingly, the boundary of the Soviet Zone, like our presence in Berlin, was established upon the basis of these same agreements.

Also by agreement among the occupying powers, the Western Allies—the Unitd States, the United Kingdom, and France—were guaranteed free access to Berlin.

Here in my office is a map of Germany. The light portion of the map is West Germany—the darker portion is East Germany. The lighter gray lanes are the air corridors to Berlin—and the dotted lines show both the main roads and railroads that give access to the city. Notice that the city of Berlin is 110 miles inside East Germany.

Shown also is the territory, now in East Germany that was taken by our Army in World War II and was turned over to the Russians by political agreement made before the end of the war.

At the end of World War II our announced purpose and that of our wartime associates was the pacification and eventual unification of Germany under freedom.

We jointly agreed to undertake this task. Ever since that time, the United States has continuously recognized the obligation of the Allied Governments under international law to reach a just peace settlement with Germany and not to prolong the occupation of Germany unnecessarily.

The public record demonstrates clearly that such a settlement has been frustrated only by the Soviets. It quickly became evident that Soviet leaders were not interested in a free unified Germany, and were determined to induce or force the Western Powers to leave Berlin.

Ten years ago Senator John Foster Dulles, now our great Secretary of State, called attention to the basic purpose of the Soviet Government. He said that purpose was "no less than world domination, to be achieved by gaining political power successively in each of the many areas which had been afflicted by war, so that in the end the United States, which was openly called the main enemy, would be isolated and closely encircled."

The current Berlin effort of the Soviets falls within the pattern of this basic purpose.

The first instance of unusual pressure, clearly evidencing these purposes, came in 1948 when the Communists imposed a blockade to force the protecting Western troops out of Berlin and to starve the people of the city into submission.

This plan failed. A free people and a dramatic airlift broke the back of the Communists' scheme.

In the end the Communists abandoned the blockade and concluded an agreement in 1949 with the Western Powers, reconfirming our right of unrestricted access.

Then last November, the Soviets announced that they intended to repudiate these solemn obligations. They once more appear to be living by the Communist formula that "Promises are like pie crusts, made to be broken."

The Soviet Government has also announced its intention to enter into a peace treaty with the East German puppet regime. The making of this treaty, the Soviets assert, will deny our occupation rights and our rights of access. Both morally and legally it is, of course, clear that no so-called "peace treaty" between the Soviets and the East German regime can have any effect upon our rights.

The Soviet threat has since been repeated several times accompanied by various and changing suggestions for dealing with the status of the city. Their proposals have included a vague offer to make the western part of Berlin—though not the eastern part, which the Soviets control—a so-called free city.

It is by no means clear what West Berlin would be free from, except perhaps freedom itself. It would not be free from the ever present danger of Communist domination. No one, certainly not the 2 million West Berliners, can ignore the cold fact that this part of Berlin is surrounded by many divisions of Soviet and Eastern German troops and by territory governed by authorities dedicated to eliminating freedom from the area.

As a matter of principle, the United States cannot accept the right of any government to break, by itself, solemn agreements to which we, with others, are parties. But in the Berlin situation, both free people and principle are at stake.

What, then, are the fundamental choices we have in this situation?

First, of course, there is the choice which the Soviet rulers themselves would like us to make. They hope that we can be frightened into abdicating our rights—which are indeed responsibilities—to help establish a just and peaceful solution to the German problem—rights which American and Allied soldiers purchased with their lives.

We have no intention of forgetting our rights or of deserting a free people. Soviet rulers should remember that freemen have, before this, died for so-called scraps of paper which represented duty and honor and freedom.

The shirking of our responsibilities would solve no problems for us. It would mean the end of all hopes for a Germany under government of German choosing. It would raise, among our friends the most serious doubts about the validity of all the international agreements and commitments we have made with them in every quarter of the globe. One result would be to undermine the mutual confidence upon which our entire system of collective security is founded.

This, the Soviets would greet as a great victory over the West.

Obviously, this choice is unacceptable to us.

The second choice which the Soviets have campelled us to face, is the possibility of war.

Certainly, the American and western people do not want war. Global conflict under modern conditions could mean the destruction of civilization. The Soviet rulers, themselves, are well aware of this fact.

But all history has taught us the grim lessons that no nation has ever been successful in avoiding the terrors of war by refusing to defend its rights—by attempting to placate aggression.

Whatever risk of armed conflict may be inherent in the present Berlin situation, it was deliberately created by the Soviet rulers.

The justice of our position is attested by the fact that it is ardently supported with virtual unanimity by the people of West Berlin.

The risk of war is minimized if we stand firm. War would become more likely if we gave way and encouraged a rule of terriorism rather than a rule of law and order. Indeed, this is the peace policy which we are striving to carry out throughout the world. In that policy is found the world's best hope for peace.

Our final choice is negotiation, even while we continue to provide for our security against every threat. We are seeking meaningful negotiation at this moment. The United States and its allies stand ready to talk with Soviet representatives at any time and under any circumstances which offer prospects of worthwhile results.

We have no selfish material aims in view. We seek no domination over others—only a just peace for the world and particularly, in this instance, for the people most involved.

We are ready to consider all proposals which may help to reassure and will take into account the European peoples affected.

We are willing to listen to new ideas and are prepared to present others. We will do everything within our power to bring about serious negotiations and to make these negotiations meaningful.

Yet there must be a clear understanding of what we cannot do.

We cannot try to purchase peace by forsaking 2 million free people of Berlin.

We cannot agree to any permanent and compulsory division of the German nation, which would leave Central Europe a perpetual powdermill, even though we are ready to discuss with all affected nations any reasonable methods for its eventual unification.

We cannot recognize the asserted right of any nation to dishonor its international agreements whenever it chooses. If we should accept such a contention the whole process of negotiation would become a barren mockery.

We must not, by weakness or irresolution, increase the risk of war.

Finally, we cannot, merely for the sake of demonstrating so-called flexibility accept any agreement or arrangement which would undermine the security of the United States and its allies.

The Soviet note of March 2 appears to be a move toward negotiation on an improved basis. We would never negotiate under a dictated time limit or agenda, or on other unreasonable terms. We are, with our allies, however, in view of the changed tone Soviet note, concerting a reply to that note.

It is my hope that thereby all of us can reach agreement with the Soviets on an early meeting at the level of Foreign Ministers.

Assuming developments that justify a summer meeting at the summit, the United States would be ready to participate in this further effort.

Our position, then, is this: We will not retreat 1 inch from our duty. We shall continue to exercise our right of peaceful passage to and from West Berlin. We will not be the first to breach the peace; it is the Soviets who threaten the use of force to interfere with such free passage. We are ready to participate fully in every sincere effort at negotiation that will respect the existing rights of all and their opportunity to live in peace.

Today's Berlin difficulty is not the first stumbling block that international communism has placed along the road to peace. The world has enjoyed little relief from tension in the past dozen years. As long as the Communist empire continues to seek world domination we shall have to face threats to the peace, of varying character and location. We have lived and will continue to live in a period where emergencies manufactured by the Soviets follow one another like beads on a string.

Whatever the length of that period, we shall have to remain continuously ready to repeal aggression, whether it be political, economic or military. Every day our policies of peace will be subjected to test. We must have steadiness and resolution, and firm adherence to our own carefully thought-out policies.

We must avoid letting fear or lack of confidence turn us from the course that self-respect, decency and love of liberty point out. To do so would be to dissipate the creative energies of our people upon whom our real security rests. This we will never do.

To build toward peace and maintain free world security will require action in every field of human enterprise. It can only be

done by the nations of the free world working together in close cooperation, adjusting their differences, sharing their common burdens, pursuing their common goals. We are carrying out just such an effort. We call it mutual security.

We recognize that freedom is indivisible. Wherever in the world freedom is destroyed, by that much is every free nation hurt.

If the United States, alone, had to carry the full burden of defending its interests from the Communist threat, we would have to draft a much larger portion of our manhood into the armed services, spend many more billions of treasure, and put a more intense strain on all our resources and capabilities. We would become more and more like a garrison state.

Fortunately, we do not have to adopt such a desperate course. Nearly 50 nations have joined with us in a cooperative effort to protect freedom.

This system of mutual security allows each nation to provide the forces which it is best able to supply.

What is the strength of these forces? What are we contributing to the joint effort? What can we count on from our Allies?

Let's look first at our own contribution. Let us look at it from the viewpoint of our own security.

Of late I—and I am sure the American people—have heard or read conflicting claims about our defenses.

We have heard that our military posture has been subordinated to a balanced budget, to the jeopardy of our national defense.

We have heard that our defenses are presently—or they will be sometime in the future—inadequate to meet recurrent Communist threats.

We have heard that more manpower in our forces than I have recommended is essential in the present circumstances, for psychological reasons if for no other.

My friends, such assertions as these are simply not true. They are without foundation. It is not likely, however, that such assertions will lead the Soviet Union to miscalculate our true strength—and this is indeed fortunate.

The design of our defense is the product of the best composite judgment available for the fulfillment of our security needs.

We are devoting great sums for the maintenance of forces capable of nuclear retaliatory strikes. This capability is our indispensable deterrent to aggression against us.

The central core of our deterrent striking force is our Strategic Air Command with its long range bombers. They are reinforced by naval aircraft and missiles of varying types, and tactical fighter bombers. This array will soon include weapons of even greater power and effectiveness.

The capacity of our combined striking forces represents an almost unimaginable destructive power. It is protected by a vast early warning system and powerful air defense forces.

More and more this great retaliatory force will feature intermediate as well as long range missiles capable of reaching any target on earth. As we steadily go through the transition period from bomber to missile as the backbone of this striking force, we nevertheless continue replacing bombers, powerful as we know them now to be, with others of greater power, range and speed. In this way we take care of the needs of this year and those immediately ahead, even as we plan, develop and build for the future.

We are engaged in an endless process of research, development and production to equip our forces with new weapons.

This process is tremendously costly, even should we consider it only in terms of money. If we are to master the problems of security over a prolonged period of time, we cannot forever borrow from the future to meet the needs of the present.

Therefore, we must concentrate our resources on those things we need most, minimizing those programs that make less decisive contributions to our Nation. Effective defense comes first.

Today there is no defense field to which we are devoting more talent, skill and money than that of missile development.

I'd like to have you look at three lists of missiles.

The first list shows 17 different types of missiles now in use by our Armed Forces.

The second list shows missiles that will be available for use in 1959. There are 11 different types.

The third list shows 13 more types of missiles now in the research and development stages. In all there are 41 types of missiles.

There is, of course, a constant parade of improvement, with newer and better weapons constantly crowding out the older and less efficient ones.

The first model of any new piece of equipment is always relatively primitive. The first sewing machine, the first typewriter, the first automobile—left much to be desired. And even the rockets that dazzle us today will soon become the model T's—the tin Lizzies—of the missile age.

We must never become frozen in obsolescence.

In addition to the forces comprising our retaliatory striking power, we have potent and flexible naval, ground and amphibious elements. We have a growing array of nuclear-powered ships, both submarines and surface vessels.

Worldwide deployment of Army divisions, including missile units, increases the ability of the U.S. Army and the Marines to rapidly apply necessary force to any troubled area. At home, the Strategic Army Corps is ready and able to move promptly as needed to any area of the world.

I believe the American people want, are entitled to, can indefinitely pay for, now have and will continue to have a modern, effective and adequate military establishment. In this overall conviction, I am supported by the mass of the best military opinion I can mobilize, and by scientific and every other kind of talent that is giving its attention to a problem to which I personally have devoted a lifetime.

As all thoughtful citizens know, our own security requires the supplemental and reinforcing strength provided by the free world's total.

In the Far East, nations with which we are associated in a common defense system have over a million trained soldiers standing watch over the free world frontiers.

In Europe, the efforts of 15 nations are united to support freedom.

In global totals, our friends are contributing over 200 ground divisions, 30,000 aircraft, and 2,500 combatant naval vessels to the task of defending the free world.

For every soldier we have under arms, our free world Allies have five.

Through each of these stout efforts we strengthen the bonds of freedom.

Our mutual security program supports this joint undertaking by helping to equip our partners with the weapons they cannot by themselves provide, and by helping them keep their economies strong.

This mutual effort provides a constructive, long-term answer to the recurrent crises engineered by the Communists. It strengthens the stability of free nations, and lessens opportunities for Communist subversion and penetration. Its supports economic growth and gives hope and confidence to the cause of freedom. It is America's strongest instrument for positive action in the world today.

Last Friday I sent to the Congress a special message presenting my recommendations for this important part of our defense and security program for the coming year. In my judgment, there is no better means of showing our resolution, our firmness, and our understanding of the Communist challenge than to support this program in full measure.

These funds are vital to our national and free world security.

Any misguided effort to reduce them below what I have recommended weakens the sentries of freedom wherever they stand.

In this conviction, also, I am supported by the military experts of our Government.

Fellow Americans, of one thing I am sure: that we have the courage and capacity to meet the stern realities of the present and the future. We need only to understand the issues and to practice the self-discipline that freedom demands.

Our security shield is the productivity of our free economy, the power of our military forces, and the enduring might of a great community of nations determined to defend their freedom.

We have been, from the beginning, a free people—people who by their spiritual and moral strength and their love of country provide the mainspring for all we have done, are doing, and will do. In these truths we place our faith.

Together with our allies we stand firm wherever the probing finger of an aggressor may point. Thus we lessen the risk of aggression: thus we shall with resolution and courage, struggle ever forward to the dream of a just and permanent peace.

God helping us, we shall stand always equal to the challenge.

Thank you, and goodnight.

| Type | Now in use | Available in 1959 | Active research and development |
|---|---|---|---|
| Air to air | Genie.<br>Sidewinder.<br>Sparrow I.<br>Sparrow III.<br>Falcon GAR I.<br>Falcon GAR II. | Falcon GAR III.<br>Falcon GAR IV. | Falcon GAR IX.<br>Falcon GAR XI.<br>Eagle. |
| Air to surface | Bullpup. | Zuni. | Corvus.<br>Hounddog.<br>Quail. |
| Surface to air | Nike-Ajax.<br>Nike-Hercules.<br>Terrier.<br>Talos. | Hawk.<br>Bomarc. | Tartar.<br>Nike-Zeus. |
| Surface to surface | Honest John.<br>Corporal.<br>Redstone.<br>Regulus I.<br>Matador.<br>Thor. | Little John.<br>Lacrosse.<br>Mace.<br>Jupiter.<br>Snark.<br>Atlas. | Sergeant.<br>Pershing.<br>Polaris.<br>Titan.<br>Minuteman. |

## Address by Senator Moss Before the Hibernian Society of Savannah, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. TALMADGE. One of the principal annual events of the historic city of Savannah, Ga., is the St. Patrick's Day celebration of the Hibernian Society of Savannah. This year the society had the good fortune to have as its principal speaker for this colorful occasion the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. His excellent address was enthusiastically received, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH, BEFORE THE HIBERNIAN SOCIETY OF SAVANNAH, GA., MARCH 17, 1959

One of the most pleasing aspects of my work in Washington is the opportunity it gives me to widen my acquaintance with people from every part of America. And I am looking forward to other occasions like this one which will enable me to come to know firsthand some of the intensely interesting areas of our great Nation. I am mindful of what day this is, and of the honor bestowed on anyone invited to participate with the Hibernian Society in the celebration of St. Patrick's Day.

And as a native of the 46th State to enter the Union, I appreciate this opportunity of coming again to Savannah, and of addressing your distinguished society in this, the 4th State to ratify the Constitution.

A new Senator in Washington is particularly conscious, often for the first time, I suspect, of this difference in the years in which the States were admitted to the Union. There is a very good reason for this; so many prerogatives in the Senate are based on seniority. Everything from membership and position on committees of the Senate, to choice of office space, even to parking space for your car, is decided on how long a Member has served. As between those elected the same year, other things are taken into consideration: Whether he served as a Governor of his State, or as a Member of the House of Representatives—and, finally, the year his State was admitted.

Now it just so happens that Utah was almost the last to come in—only Aklahoma and Arizona were admitted later. Many portions of the original Utah Territory became States sooner—Nevada, Idaho, Colorado, California, Wyoming. But a little difference of opinion as to how many wives per husband was in the public interest made it hard for Congress to decide what to do with Utah. We thought the question was one for the men of Utah to decide—women didn't vote then—and we weren't suggesting that men in other States should have more than one wife, you understand. But Congress apparently thought the idea might catch on, so through 40 years of trying, and on six separate occasions, we were denied statehood, and it was not until 1896 that a star went into the flag for Utah.

Despite my friendship for Joe Ryan, and my previous visit to Savannah, I must confess that my knowledge of the Hibernian Society has been sketchey indeed, and it has been a matter of great interest to read—all too briefly, I must say—of the very high purpose—that of aiding your fellow countrymen who were less fortunate—that led to its founding 147 years ago today.

As you know, the tendency to organize groups of citizens for all kinds of purposes is peculiarly American, and is restricted to no part of the United States. The French writer, Alexis De Tocqueville, who came to this country during the presidency of Andrew Jackson, and who wrote the famous volume, "Democracy in America," recognized this organizational tendency as something he had not seen in Europe.

He mentions it in these words: "In no country in the world has the principle of association been more successfully used or applied to a greater multitude of objects than in America. Besides the permanent associations which are established by law under the names of townships, cities, and counties, a vast number of others are formed and maintained by the agency of private individuals."

De Tocqueville visited Georgia during his travels, and, since your society was already in existence, it may well have been one of those upon which he commented so favorably. And it may interest you to know that the Hibernian Society of Savannah is 35 years older than the first settlement in the Salt Lake Valley, the place from which I come.

Anyone who has been active in politics and public service as I have all my life would, of course, be fully aware of the great contribution the Irish have made to government and politics in their adopted land. Being energetic, personally engaging and eternally interested in public affairs, and—particularly in our large centers—being anti-English foreigners who still spoke the prevailing language—they have been in positions of power in American Government since the first Irishman set foot on the continent.

Which reminds me of the story of the businessman of British extraction and the name of Cromwell who had wares to sell to the state and municipal governments of one of our populous States. Since Irishmen were in control of the government, he had his problems, and finally concluded that a change of name might help.

Accordingly, he petitioned the court to change his name from Cromwell to O'Brien. His petition was granted, and he went forth to do business.

About a year later he petitioned to have it changed again, this time to O'Flaherty, and found himself facing the same judge.

"Aren't you the man that wanted to be O'Brien only 1 year ago?" asked the judge. O'Brien admitted that he was.

"Didn't the change help your business?" asked the judge.

"Well, Your Honor, said the petitioner, "O'Brien is a fine name, and I am very happy with it. But when I call on my prospects, they ask me two questions. The first is 'What's your name?' When I say 'O'Brien,' they ask: 'What was it before it was O'Brien?'"

It has likewise been pleasant to refresh my memory on the founding of Georgia and Savannah, of the activities of Gen. James Oglethorpe, of his wise measures for governing the colony, of its growth and prosperity, and of the courageous actions of your patriots during the struggle for independence.

And, in preparing remarks on my subject, "The United States," my thoughts turned to the adoption of the Constitution, the effects of the formation of the Union, and the subsequent rise of America to the position and responsibilities of a world power.

As the framers foresaw, ratification of the Constitution gave the Nation the strength it needed. With an effective National Government, it was less temptation to the grasping nations of Spain, France, and England. The removal of trade and exchange restrictions between the States was a great economic stimulus, preparing the way for the development of the greatest market and the most productive economic system the world has known. And other quarrels, such as those over the division of the territory to the west, were speedily settled.

So, for 150 years, our isolated position and our great productive machines rendered us invulnerable to successful attack from without, and gave us the opportunity to devote our energies exclusively to internal problems and development.

The new Republic became a model for liberty-loving peoples everywhere. The royal houses of Europe were quickly overthrown, and following our example, constitutional governments were set up. Our economic influence likewise began to be felt abroad, and our methods copied, and it appeared that the adoption by all nations of what we call the American system would be only a matter of time.

Now, in our lifetimes, a profound change has occurred. No longer may we rely on our geographical position as the cornerstone of our defense. No longer do we expect that our way of life will be, as a matter of course, adopted by the rest of the world.

The most famous of living English historians, Arnold Toynbee, has pointed out how the formerly backward nations of the world are beginning to use the mass-production methods developed by the West; and how—if they succeed in developing productive economic systems—their tremendous advantage in numbers is bound to tell against us.

In one of his articles advocating ratification of the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton noted that the people of this country and of his time had had it fall to their lot to decide whether societies of men are capable or not of establishing good government by reflection and choice, or whether they must always depend on accident and force for their political constitutions.

In the same way, it has fallen to our lot to decide whether a Republic like ours can build a military machine capable of defending us against a ruthless dictatorship armed with modern weapons, and still preserve the individual liberties of the people. It has fallen to our lot to lead the effort to preserve the free world.

If we are to succeed in this endeavor, we must divest ourselves of emotionalism. We must face our world as it exists—not as it used to exist, or as we would like it to exist. We must develop our program in specific terms.

First, we must realize that the greater part of the effort must be made through the instrumentality of the Federal Government. Defending ourselves in the age of nuclear bombs means great power in Washington, and large Federal expenditures, much as we may dislike seeing them.

It is the worst sort of complacency to allow ourselves to be deluded into thinking that the great expansion of Federal expenditures in the last decade and a half has been the result of a plot to destroy our liberties. The great bulk of those expenditures are for war or result directly from the war and subsequent defense measures.

It is also a delusion to suppose that we can substantially reduce those expenditures until we solve the problem that gave rise to them. We must cure the infection, not rail at the symptoms. And the infection in this case is the explosive international situation.

This is not to say that the great Federal budget is no problem, or that we should not make every effort to reduce it where such reduction will be in the public interest.

One change that might help us to see the Federal financial picture more clearly, and an idea that is getting some attention in Washington these days, is a more business-like accounting system for the Government.

The plan is to separate, as businesses do, items that represent capital investments and self-liquidating projects from expenditures for regular expense items. It might be that defense items could be placed in still a third category. This would make discussion of budget items more specific, and enable us to comprehend this complicated subject more clearly. It is hoped that it would promote greater public understanding and interest in the Government's fiscal affairs.

Since World War II, the Soviet Union has increased its territory, expanded its world influence, and greatly improved its productive capacity. Such victories as we have had have been purely defensive.

The men in the Kremlin know what kind of world they want it to be 20 years from now. They boldly plan for that world, and channel their resources, their educational facilities and their diplomatic maneuvers to making it that kind of world.

It is true we have made efforts—great efforts—to stem the totalitarian tide. And in these endeavors the statesmen of the South have been among the wisest and most farseeing of our leaders. Yet most of our actions are taken on an emergency basis. When the Kremlin strikes, we react; and we approach the problem each year as though we expected that year to end it.

But it well may be that neither the decision by arms which we all fear, nor the collapse of the Soviet system which would solve our problem for awhile, may occur. It is possible that our condition for the next many years may be just what it has been for the last 10—a continuing struggle to decide—through economic and political pressure whether our system or theirs will win. Perhaps we should emulate the Soviet example and make an all-out effort to win without a war.

If we are to win in this kind of struggle, we must project our program ahead—we must decide what kind of world we want it to be 20 years from now. And within the framework of democratic individual liberty, make the necessary effort to create that kind of world.

In any case, in the next very few years we are going to have to decide—or let someone else decide for us—such vital questions as what will be done about providing nuclear weapons to Germany, whether we are to be equipped to fight smaller or all-out wars, and how great an effort we are to make to rescue the backward nations from poverty and communism.

Another question that must be decided, and one that is very much in the news just now, is whether we are going to try to become first in the development of missiles and the conquest of space.

We must also make some decisions on the direction American economic policy is to take. I am sure there is no question that the great development of the South and the West will continue and be accelerated—merely our population increase would make that inevitable. And this very growth in population itself complicates our problem.

We must decide whether our irreplaceable resources upon which our prosperity has been built—land, water, minerals, forest, and the others—are to receive the attention they must have to retain and enlarge their productive capacity. We must decide whether the American city is to be allowed to continue to decay, or whether Federal and State Governments will allow sufficient tax sources, grants-in-aid, and political autonomy to allow that problem to be solved.

Coming from an area which must carefully use its water to survive, I am particularly conscious of the necessity of preserving this resource. Water was once an exclusively western problem. Our falling water table has now made it a national one. The Congress wisely decided to build the great Colorado River storage project which will enable the basin States to get many times the value from that river resource than is now realized, and to develop great power, industrial and recreational facilities in the West.

Gentlemen, I have stated our problem as I see it. I am aware that many of the things I have said are not the most pleasant to think about. But we are in a giant struggle—not of our making—not of our choosing. The men in the Kremlin care nothing for cost accounting, nothing for human liberty. They are interested only in results.

In Washington and elsewhere we hear the questions asked, "How much does it cost?" "Can we afford to keep ahead in all the weapons?" "Will our economic system stand it?" Let me remind you that the patriots of the War of Independence did not ask the cost. They had lived under tyranny. They wanted freedom, and whatever the cost, it was worth it. So with us. The cost of winning this struggle can never be as great as the cost of losing it.

Our task may be burdensome—but our resources are great. We have 50 States instead of 13, 150 years of experience with democratic government, and the most advanced economic and educational systems in the world. With them—if we have the will—we can win. We can bequeath to our posterity our most precious possession—the blessings of liberty.

---

## New Goals for Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the most able authorities on the social security program in the United States is Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of the department of social security of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. Mr. Cruikshank is a keen student of the subject, has taken part in many advisory committees of Government, and has a progressive, yet sane, point of view on the entire system.

I ask unanimous consent that a paper which he prepared, entitled "New Goals for Unemployment Compensation," which he presented at the 58th annual meeting of the National Consumer's League in Washington, D.C., on Friday, December 5, 1958, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW GOALS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

(Paper by Nelson H. Cruikshank, director, department of social security, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, presented at 58th annual meeting, National Consumers' League, Washington, D.C., December 5, 1958)

While the passage of the Social Security Act preceded by 3 years the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act, it is appropriate at this time to take an inventory of unemployment insurance as well as wage and hour legislation, since it was not until 1938 that the program was in full swing. Nineteen thirty-eight was the first year in which benefits were paid, and the first year for which there are any date on which comparisons can be based. In effect, therefore, we can say that we have had 20 years' experience with the program of unemployment compensation.

During this time the system has acquired experience under varying levels of economic activity. The legislation itself was depression-born. In 1938 the effect of the defense activity had not yet been felt, and there were still 10.4 million unemployed. The system continued through the period of feverish wartime activity, when the number of unemployed fell to the bare minimum of less than one-half million. It has survived the upheavals incident to conversion and postwar reconversion, and the swings in employment levels from the recessions of 1947–49 and 1953–54, to the peak employment periods of 1951 and 1956.

With all its weaknesses and shortcomings, the unemployment compensation system now plays a significant role in our economic life and serves a social purpose in helping unemployed individuals and their families tide over periods of temporary unemployment.

Even as conservative a source as the First National City Bank, testifies to the importance of unemployment insurance along with the other welfare and benefit programs in the manitenance of consumer purchasing power. The following is taken from the June 1958 Letter of Business and Economic Conditions.

"So far the overall decline in consumer income has been relatively slight—1.3 percent from the August 1957 peak through April 1958—but uneven in its impact. The importance of the 'automatic stabilizers' is demonstrated by the fact that fully half of the $8.4 billion drop in wages and salaries has been offset by increases in unemployment insurance, social security, and veterans' benefits.

"These stabilizers do not continue indefinitely, however, as the 230,000 jobless persons whose unemployment benefits expired in April are well aware. (In April, 1.9 million persons—almost 4 of every 10 unemployed—had not worked since late 1957.) The wonder is that heavy and prolonged unemployment has not affected buying more than it has."

During the first 6 months of 1958, a total of $2,447 million was paid in benefits to unemployed workers under the program, in addition to the $61.5 million paid under the special program for unemployed veterans. At the sharpest point of the present recession, in the single month of April, $403.8 million was paid in benefits to nearly 3 million unemployed, who averaged $30.88 per week in benefits.

These benefits were paid as a right, with no means test in any case. When we think of benefits totaling in a year of recession, upward of $4 billion, with the peak of unemployment less than 6 million, we can see that 20 years marks a great advance. Those of us who recall the struggle of getting a $2 billion or $3 billion appropriation for a work-relief program, with benefits paid only in cases of proven need, when there were more than 12 million unemployed, can see that, with all its faults, the present system marks a distinct advance over the programs to which we had to resort 20 years ago.

While we have made some progress, at this 20-year mark as we are setting new goals, it is well to face up to a searching appraisal of the system—if indeed it can be called a system—of unemployment compensation as it now operates. An analysis of the program reveals certain basic structural weaknesses which stem from the original concepts that found their way into title III of the Social Security Act and the provisions of the Internal Reevnue Code, under which the taxes for unemployment benefits are collected.

The basic difficulty arises from the fact that we have not, in this country, made the fundamental policy decision as to what kind of a program we want to have in order to meet the problems of unemployment. The provisions of the present law, in fact, attempt to incorporate two approaches to the problem. First, there is a program of employment stabilization, relying on a set of built-in tax incentives for employers. Secondly, there is a program of social insurance designed, under limited circumstances, to pay under carefully prescribed conditions, benefits designed to cover a part of the wage loss by workers who are involuntarily unemployed for short periods of time. The stresses and strains and many of the glaring inconsistencies of our system arise from the fact that these two are not always compatible.

At the time the Social Security Act was passed in 1935, the contradictions of these two aims were not apparent, and many people, including outstanding liberal leaders of the time, supported the effort to combine them. The representatives of organized labor who sat on the original Citizens Advisory Committee in 1934, which made the recommendations out of which our Social Security Act was developed, did not agree to the introduction of the tax incentive for employment stabilization—popularly known as employer experience rating. The experience of 20 years has shown that they were right, for it is now clear that the two are to a large degree incompatible, and at points mutually destructive. Lest we be too critical of those who 20 years ago thought the oil of social insurance could be mixed with the water of employment stabilization, we must recall that the amendment which introduced experience rating into the unemployment compensation law, was by none other than Senator LaFollette of Wisconsin.

If we were to measure the unemployment compensation system by the generous rewards it has offered and paid to induce employers to level out the peaks and valleys of employment, we would have to award the system an "A" for effort. In the 12 years, from the end of World War II through 1957, a total of $143\frac{1}{4}$ billion has been granted to employers in the United States in terms of tax reductions and rebates and distributions of surpluses. This compares with a total of $15.1 billion paid in benefits under the system in the same period of time. In other words, the cash benefits of the system to the employers has equalled 97.5 percent of the total amount of benefits paid to unemployed workers in this 12-year period. That the stabilization for which such a staggering amount has been given in reward, has not in fact been achieved, hardly needs any comment. In 1949, and again in 1954, 1 in every 18 of the civilian labor force was out of a job. In 1958, 1 out of every 13 was unemployed.

While the system has failed to produce the promised stabilization, it has produced some of the weirdest financial phenomena to be found in any governmental operation in the history of this country.

For example, let us look at the different levels of the average unemployment taxes in the various States in the year 1957. The average for the whole country was 1.31 percent of taxable payrolls. However, the variation as between States ranged from 0.53 percent in Virginia to a standard rate of 2.7 percent in Rhode Island and Alaska. Note that this is a variation of over 500 percent in tax rate. It by no means reflects in direct proportion the amount of unemployment as between Virginia on the one hand, and Alaska and Rhode Island on the other.

The division of the tax burden within the individual States is equally fantastic and irrational. Here the tax rate applied to individual employers ranges from zero (and incidentally, isn't that a nice contradiction in itself—a zero tax rate) to 4.5 percent of the taxable payroll. In the 49 States having a sliding scale in effect, 6 percent of all employers were rated at the zero rate in 1957, and just about one-half of employers were rated below a 1 percent rate, with 4.6 percent of employers paying taxes from 2.75 percent to 4.5 percent on their taxable payrolls. The distribution of the tax burden within some of the States is even more weird. In Colorado, for example, in the year 1957, 94.4 percent of the employers were given a zero tax rate. In other words, 5.6 percent of the employers paid the entire cost of the unemployment compensation program in Colorado, excepting the amount of income from interest on the State's reserve. In Iowa, 50.5 percent of the employers had a zero tax rate, and in South Dakota, 78.4 percent enjoyed a like privilege. In fact, throughout all of the 49 States having the variable tax rate, only 12.7 percent of the employers paid the standard rate of 2.7 percent.

Perhaps the most fantastic fiscal operation in this whole outlandish system was incorporated in the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act passed in June of this year (1958). At the time unemployment in the 1958 recession reached its peak and Congress was considering some emergency action, the amount of the unexpended reserves in the State accounts, totalled nearly $8 billion. Governmental leaders, both in Congress and in the executive branch, had for years been relying on the States to meet the problem of unemployment. However, with exhaustion of unemployment benefit rights mounting rapidly, and with $8 billion available for benefit expenditures, the Federal Government appropriated $665,700,000 to enable the States to extend the duration of their unemployment benefits. In addition, the Federal Government will pay in the neighborhood of $220 million interest this year to the States for the funds which they are presumably holding in reserve to pay unemployment benefits.

The explanation of this operation, of course, lies in the fact that, in effect, the reserve funds of the States have now been assigned to a purpose other than that of paying benefits to the unemployed. Every State has a provision in its law that when the reserves fall to a certain level, a different scale of employer taxes automatically goes into effect. So now the funds are held in reserve to protect the favorable tax rates given employers. The Federal Government pays interest on the reserve funds, and when there is a threat of depressional unemployment, the Federal Government bails out the States—or to be more accurate—bails out the employers and saves them from having to pay the taxes the State laws require them to pay when their reserve funds are low.

Perhaps even more fantastic than the financial arrangements—and certainly more serious in terms of the social damage—are the distortions of the intent and purpose of unemployment insurance that have resulted from the interpretations applied to the State laws. Of course, any good unemployment compensation law has to have provisions designed to limit the payment of benefits to those who are genuinely unemployed after an actual attachment to the labor market. It cannot pay benefits immediately to the man who, in a moment of pique over some real or imagined grievance, walks off the job. Nor should it pay benefits to the man who willfully provokes his own discharge, or who after a lay-off from one job refuses to accept another just as good.

But take a look at how, under our present system, these legitimate safeguards are distorted.

Here is a case of a millworker in South Carolina who had worked more than 5 years in the mill. On a certain date, all employees were instructed to visit a community clinic for a chest X-ray. This millworker didn't want an X-ray, and considered the order an infringement of his right as a citizen to decide for or against such an examination. As a result of his refusal to obey the order, he was discharged. On applying for unemployment benefits he was denied such benefits for 6 weeks. Now, regardless of the wisdom or lack of wisdom in this worker's decision, certainly his refusal had nothing to do with his work. His unemployment grew out of the employer's wish, as the record in the case states, to have a perfect record of cooperation with the health clinic. But the worker found that unemployment following his discharge was not insured. Incidentally, South Carolina has a so-called right-to-work law. Where was this person's right to work? He found he lost even his right to the meager benefits of South Carolina's unemployment compensation law, when his employer disagreed with him about the desirability of a chest X-ray.

The Iowa law has a provision that a worker loses all his benefit rights if he leaves his job voluntarily without good cause attributable to his employer. A generous exception is made if the worker leaves his job to accept a better job, providing he remains continuously on the new job for not less than 12 weeks. There is on record a case of a construction worker who left one job to accept a better one, and actually worked on the second job for 14 weeks, after which he was laid off. He applied for unemployment compensation benefits and his claim was denied. It seems that while working on the second job his employer completed one construction project and moved his equipment to another. On the moving day, the worker in question was told not to report for work. This day occurred in the 11th week of his employment. Result: he did not work on the second job continuously—as the law requires—for 12 weeks. He was not only denied his unemployment benefits, but under the Iowa law (as indeed under eight State laws) all his wage credits on previous jobs were wiped out. In this case, the credits amounted to $720.

Here, ladies and gentlemen, is experience rating in full flower.

But just one more example of hundreds that are on record:

A woman worker in Dayton, Ohio, claimed benefits for a 12-week period of unemployment from March to May 1956. The employer appealed and a hearing was finally set for January 9, 1957. Now, the Ohio law has been interpreted to require that the burden of proof is upon the applicant for benefits to establish compliance with the law and the court of appeals has ruled that this means evidence given under oath and subject to cross-examination. In the instance case, the court ruled the claimant not eligible, not on the merits of her claim, but based on the fact she did not appear at the hearing. The reason she didn't appear was that she died during the 6 months she was waiting for her case to be heard.

These are admittedly isolated cases, though they are typical of hundreds that could be cited. Most State laws do not contain such extremely harsh disqualification provisions, and some States that have them do not interpret them so heartlessly. But the potential exists in almost every State. The root of such absurd distortions of the purpose of unemployment compensation lies in employer experience rating, which is now operative in 49 of the 51 jurisdictions.

The most serious inadequacies of the program are reflected in the small portion of the total wage loss, during a recession period, that is recovered by benefit payments. There are various methods of measuring the wage loss. Depending on which one is used, the portion of wages lost by unemployment that is recovered by benefits, ranges from about 20 to 29 percent. Accepting the most liberal

of these measurements, an insurance program that covers less than one-third of the loss incurred, is pretty poor insurance. We agree with the statement from the First National City Bank letter quoted above, "The wonder is that heavy and prolonged unemployment has not affected buying more than it has."

From the very inception of the program, it was generally agreed that the weekly benefit amounts for unemployed workers should represent at least one-half of their weekly earnings when employed. This standard was much more nearly achieved 20 years ago than it is today. In the first year of the program, the average benefit paid to the unemployed represented 41.7 percent of his average weekly wage, whereas in 1957, it represented only 34.8 percent. Of course, benefits amounts have increased, but wages have increased at a much more rapid rate. We have failed to do for the unemployed what any prudent householder or businessman would do as he sees the dollar value of his property increase; namely, increase our insurance coverage at the same ratio.

A major factor in holding down the benefit amounts is the arbitrary upper limit placed on them. While most States include in their formula a requirement that benefits be at least 50 percent of regular earnings, they also place an arbitrary maximum on the benefit which is unrelated to past earnings. These maximum benefit amounts are so low, that in the period of April to June 1958, about one-half of the claimants in the country as a whole were at the maximum, while in three States the proportion at the maximum was 80 percent or more. For the 80 percent of unemployed workers in these three States, and for 50 percent in the country as a whole, it can be said we have departed from a wage-related benefit system, and thus have violated a basic principle of social insurance.

Beginning in 1954, the President in his annual Economic Report, and the Secretary of Labor by letters to the States, have repeatedly called for the raising of these maximum limits to a level that would permit the great majority of unemployed workers to receive at least 50 percent of their regular earnings in benefits. At that time, one State met the standard in this respect, called for by the President and the Secretary of Labor. Four years have passed since the first of these exhortations. Now, no State meets this standard.

Another major factor in the total picture of the inadequacy of the unemployment insurance program, is the limitation on the duration of benefits. The clearest evidence that the duration of benefits provided under the State laws is inadequate, is found in the fact that during the first 10 months of 1958, when the average duration throughout the country was about 21 weeks, upward of 2,200,000 individuals were still out of work and unable to find jobs when their regular unemployment insurance benefits had run out. Even in such prosperous periods as 1956 and the first three quarters of 1957, the number of unemployed persons who exhausted their benefit rights before finding a new job, exceeded a million.

Here again, the administration's contribution to meeting this problem thus far, has been to call on the States to extend the duration provided in their laws. The President, in his Economic Reports, backed up by letters from the Secretary of Labor, beginning in 1954, called on the States to take action by establishing a potential uniform duration of 26 weeks. Since the first appeal from the President, there has been a net gain of three States which met the recommended standard. In the 6 years that this administration has been in power, the average potential duration for the country as a whole has been increased by 1.4 weeks. The average potential duration of all benefit claimants in 1957 was still only 23.4 weeks. This is, of course, not including the additional weeks of benefits made possible by the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958.

In the light of these glaring shortcomings, inadequacies and contradictions now characterizing our unemployment compensation system, the logical goals for legislation in this area are obvious.

First, as a nation we should make up our mind whether we should go ahead with our attempts to stabilize employment by the application of a variable excise tax. Actually, that decision has been made, as even the most ardent supporters of employer experience rating no longer attempt, in the face of the record of 20 years of failure, to justify it on these grounds. The decision before us is really whether we should attempt to maintain the fiction of stabilization and to develop additional rationalizations to justify keeping the variable tax schedules in effect.

Once having faced up to the realities in this area we should logically set about designing a system of social insurance adequate to tide workers over periods of involuntary unemployment and broad enough in its coverage, and liberal enough in benefits to sustain purchasing power so that each dip in economic activity does not run the danger of a major downward spiral. Recognizing that the causes of unemployment are deep in the structure of our national economy and that its cures are not within the competence of a single employer or industry, nor within the boundaries of any State, we should logically approach this national problem with a program designed on national dimensions.

These are the logical goals. I'm quite sure, however, they are not the next steps. We seldom do the completely logical thing. With respect to unemployment compensation legislation there appear to be three chief reasons why we will not take the necessary corrective steps within the forseeable future.

1. The system with all its faults is such an improvement over the relief programs it has largely displaced, that people accept it, not realizing how much better it could be.

2. The inherent evils, though obvious to the thoughtful student, are too deeply imbedded in the system and the rewards are too great for those segments of the community who still represent the predominant political power, namely, the employer group.

3. The public is not sufficiently informed of the inequities of the system to be aroused to corrective action. They hear about the exceptional cases of fraud where an undeserving person is paid a benefit, but they are not told of the thousands of cases of disqualification based on arbitrary and capricious provisions of State laws.

In the years just ahead, labor, supported by other liberal elements of the community, will concentrate on patching up the present system. The Federal-State program will remain for some time, but within a very short time, I predict success in our efforts to enact standards which the Federal Government will require all the States to meet. These will erase many of the irrational differences in protection afforded workers in one State as compared with others. It will reduce, though not eliminate, the element of tax competition between States. Gradually, after the advantages of the minimal implementation of the Federal Government's interest in meeting the national problem of unemployment have been become apparent, we shall move toward a national program of unemployment insurance.

## New Record Set in 1958 by Farm Income Per Person

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, from the American Farm Bureau Federation Newsletter of March 16, 1959, under the title "Farm Income Per Person Sets New Record in 1958."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM INCOME PER PERSON SETS NEW RECORD IN 1958

Farm income—per person on farms—reached a new high in 1958, USDA has reported.

Per capita income from farming was $770, compared to the previous high of $765 in 1948.

Income per person on farms from all sources was also at a new high, although the nonfarm income of farm people declined slightly. Total income per person on farms was $1,068—10½ percent above the 1957 level of $967.

Gross farm income—including Government payments—was $37,965 million in 1958. This was a record high and was $3,635 million above the 1957 level. It averaged $7,993 per farm, a record high.

Farm production expenses reached $24,905 million in 1958. This was a new high record and was $1,415,000 more than in 1957. Average production expense per farm was $5,243.

Realized net income is what is left after production expenses are subtracted from gross income. It totaled $13,060 million last year—a gain of $2,220 million over 1957.

The average realized net income per farm was $2,750—more than $500 above the 1957 figure.

While the per capita income of farm families was at a record high in 1958, there is plenty of evidence in the Department's report that it could have been much higher if two forces had not been at work.

Surpluses, which held down prices received by farmers for several commodities, kept gross income from being higher.

Inflation—which raised production costs—reduced net income substantially.

The accompanying USDA graph shows how production costs have taken an increasingly large share of the gross income of farmers in the past 11 years.

With gross income in 1958 increasing considerably more than expenses, farmers retained as net income 34.4 percent of their realized gross farm income, compared with 31.6 percent in 1957. However, last year's increase in the ratio of net to gross income regained only a small part of the long-run decline in the ratio.

If costs had represented only half of gross income (as in the 1943–47 period) farmers would have had a net realized income of $18,982,500,000 in 1958—or $3,996.50 per farm.

These figures illustrate why inflation and high costs are a major concern of farmers in 1959.

As in any year, there was wide variation among the States in farm income and in the relative change from 1937.

Arizona had the highest net income per farm. West Virginia had the lowest.

Kansas had the biggest gain over 1957. Nevada had the biggest decrease per farm.

Vermont was alone among the States in experiencing a decline in production costs.

## Ten-Cent Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently there appeared in a number of publications an advertisement, over the signature of the president of the Hancock Bank of Gulfport, Miss., under the caption "Ten-Cent Dollars." This is a rather hard-hitting statement which should be of interest to every citizen in the land who values our stability and our fiscal integrity. I ask that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN-CENT DOLLARS

Speaking before the American Bankers Association in convention at Chicago, William A. Burkett, superintendent of banks for the State of California, predicted that we will have a 25-cent dollar in this country before too long if the Federal Government does not do something to check inflation.

"If the history of the last 100 years teaches us anything," he said, "it is that inflation is more dangerous to a people than any other thing except war."

We who have lived to see a 50-cent dollar well know that some of us could live to see a quarter dollar or a dime dollar, if the Government and its people continue to spend beyond their means and keep going deeper into debt.

The French franc that was worth 5 to a dollar in 1917, and recently revalued, is now worth 493 to the dollar, or 5 francs to a cent.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman William C. Martin, speaking in Chicago, expressed concern over what he called a breakdown in confidence abroad in the American dollar.

This was timely warning, for when the economy of a country cracks, its other defenses crumble. A sound dollar is as essential to our national strength and security as atom bombs and missiles. The people's savings, their life insurance, their investments, their pensions, all depend upon a shock-proof currency.

The integrity of the American dollar at home and its reputation abroad depend upon economy in Governments, Federal, State, and local. There are but three ways to meet the unpaid bills of government—taxation, inflation or repudiation. An individual or a government that continues to borrow to spend creates an artificial prosperity that leads to insolvency, bankruptcy, and chaos.

A nation that piles debt upon debt, refuses to balance its budgets and continues to run in the red, inflates its currency, circulates phony money, undermines its defense and destroys the security of its citizenship.

We the people, dedicated to the preservation of this Republic, will live within our income or perish. Only a government that conserves can survive. We will save or sink. Only the strong stay free.

LEO W. SEAL,
*President, Hancock Bank, Bay St. Louis, Gulfport, and Pass Christian, Miss.*

## Conquest of Illness by Associate Justice Douglas of the U.S. Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we of the State of Oregon are very proud of the illustrious career of Justice William O. Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice Douglas spent part of his youth in our State, and a great deal of his recreation during the summer is taken amidst the scenic grandeur of Oregon.

In the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 11, 1959, appeared a most thoughtful and informative article, by Irving Dilliard, of the Post-Dispatch staff, describing how William O. Douglas overcame the handicap of infantile paralysis, which he suffered as a small boy. Mr. Dilliard, in addition to being a brilliant journalist, is one of the foremost authorities of our Nation on the history and development of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I ask unanimous consent that his article, entitled "Supreme Court Justice's Boyhood Struggle," in tribute to the career of Justice Douglas, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE'S BOYHOOD STRUGGLE
(By Irving Dilliard)

Riffle back the pages of the calendar almost 50 years to an incident in Yakima, Wash., where the streets stretch toward the foothills and the foothills shoulder up to the mountains. Watch and listen because the episode will have consequences to last a half century and to spread out across the continent.

A 13-year-old boy is walking to school, a stack of books under one arm. He wears knee breeches, knickerbocker style. Black cotton stockings cover spindly legs, left like pipestems by an attack of infantile paralysis when he was a small child. He owes his life to a far-sighted doctor who prescribed frequent salt water massages for weeks and to a widowed mother who kept vigil at 2-hour intervals day and night.

The youth is sensitive to his condition and uses many a stratagem to cover up his physical weakness. But his schoolmates observe it only too readily. A group of boys is walking behind him. As they come near one of them says, "Look at that kid's skinny legs. Aren't they something? Did you ever see anything as funny?"

The boys in the group laugh and one says, "Sure would cover them up if they were mine."

The words are a lash across the face of the boy a few steps ahead. The laughter burns like an iron on his neck. The boy with the thin legs is humiliated. He wants to retort but is too ashamed to answer. Then comes a flood of tears. And the tears only confirm the charge that he is a weakling.

The boy becomes self-conscious and shy. He wants to stop school. He asks his mother for long trousers to cover up his legs. But gradually the tension gives way to revolt. He resolves to prove his superiority in the schoolroom since that field of achievement was open to a boy with weak and puny legs as well as to the strongest.

Good grades in his studies helped, but personal difficulties remained. Close at hand were the mountains and he read what happened to crippled animals in the wilds. Then one day he met a husky boy coming back from a fast walk in the country. He learned that this boy climbed in the foothills every day to develop his legs and lungs.

He resolved to do the same. At once he began to use the foothills as others would use weights or bars in a gymnasium. After a fall and winter of daily hikes, his legs began to fill out. By the next spring he had new confidence in himself and a new boy was replacing the one who had been shy and ashamed.

That transformed boy was William Orville Douglas who as one of the senior Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court was in St. Louis today to deliver the annual Tyrrell Williams lecture for the Washington University School of Law.

For more than 40 years he has been a vigorous outdoorsman, at home in the saddle and in fishing boots, in the summertime often sleeping under the stars, for weeks at a time shut away in the wilderness around Lostine, Oreg. There he built a large mountainside cabin for his family. He did much of the work himself, handling heavy tamarack logs and large stones for the big fireplace.

Since World War II, Justice Douglas has made his own personal, nonjudicial contribution to cooling off the cold war by frequent trips to remote parts of Asia, also to Russia. Expeditions which would have taxed the endurance of many a strong man have become the basis of books some of which have appeared on the best seller lists.

Following "Of Men and Mountains" which told the story of the recovery from polio, these other books have included "Strange Lands and Friendly People," "Beyond the High Himalayas," "North From Malaya" and "Russian Journey."

But the humiliating experience of the 13-year-old schoolboy in Yakima, Wash., did more than start him on the road to robust, energetic manhood. It taught him to endure the isolation of being alone and to see the value and necessity of thinking and acting for himself.

This latter lesson has supported him many times in the 20 years—next April 17—that he has been on the Supreme Court. Appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt in early 1939, Justice Douglas was then only 41 years old, the youngest Supreme Court member since Justice Joseph Story took his seat in 1811.

Successor to the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis who so often dissented with the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Douglas has oftentimes been linked in dissent with Justice Hugo L. Black, and, while they lived, with Justices Wiley B. Rutledge and Frank Murphy.

Since the appointment by President Eisenhower of Earl Warren as Chief Justice and William J. Brennan Jr., as Associate Justice, Douglas has appeared in dissent with them. In a 5-to-4 division which goes against the application of the Bill of Rights the dissenters are likely to be Warren, Black, Douglas, and Brennan.

But like the lonely schoolboy—his Presbyterian missionary father died when Douglas was only 6 years old—he can stand all by himself on the Supreme Court when he believes he is right. Such an occasion came last January 26 when he was the solitary dissenter in a narcotics case in which the decision for the majority was written by Missouri's first Supreme Court Justice, Charles Evans Whittaker, appointed from Kansas City.

The case was that of James A. Draper who was convicted in Federal court after his arrest in Denver in 1956. A Federal narcotics agent was tipped off by a paid informer that Draper was peddling narcotics to addicts in Denver and that he would return from Chicago on a certain train with heroin. Using a detailed physical description of a man they had never seen, the agent and a Denver policeman arrested Draper without a warrant as he got off the train. A search yielded a quantity of heroin and a syringe.

Draper contended that the search was illegal and the evidence not subject to use in court. He was found guilty and the conviction was upheld in the Court of Appeals. In the Supreme Court, six justices with Justice Whittaker speaking for them, sustained the arrest and conviction, Chief Justice Warren and Justice Frankfurter did not participate.

Justice Whittaker held that the arresting officer had "probable cause" and that the apprehension therefore was legal even though there was no search warrant. He cited the Narcotics Control Act of 1956 which authorizes arrests without warrent when the arresting officer has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested, has committed or is committing a law violation.

But Justice Douglas did not allow the offensiveness and criminality of the narcotics traffic to keep him from dissenting on the grounds that Draper, law violator though he was, had rights under the Constitution that should be observed in behalf of a society based on law.

"The education we receive from mystery stories and television shows teaches that what happened in this case is efficient police work," Justice Douglas said. "This is the familiar pattern of crime detection which has been dinned into the public consciousness as the correct and efficient one. It is, however, a distorted reflection of the constitutional system under which we are supposed to live."

Justice Douglas then showed how King George III, of England, had sought, in 1777, to get a bill through Parliament which would have allowed arrests in the American Colonies on suspicion of treason. The Justice summoned John Adams, James Otis, Patrick Henry, and other patriots of the Revolutionary times to testify that arrests based on suspicion alone are illegal.

Quoting Professors Hogan and Snee of Georgetown University Law School, Justice Douglas put these words into his dissent:

"The finger of suspicion is a long one. In an individual case it may point to all of a certain race, age group, or locale. Commonly it extends to any who have committed similar crimes in the past. Arrest on mere suspicion collides violently with the basic human right of liberty. It can be tolerated only in a society which is willing to concede to its government powers which history and experience teach are the inevitable accouterments of tyranny."

Saying that no magistrate would have issued a warrant because the agent could not have presented facts required for a warrant, Justice Douglas concluded:

"We are not justified in lowering the standard. With all deference I think we break with tradition when we sustain this arrest. We said in *United States* v. *Di Re*: 'A search is not to be made legal by what turns up. In law it is good or bad when it starts and does not change character from its success.'"

The Di Re opinion was written by the late Justice Robert H. Jackson and only the late Chief Justice Frederick M. Vinson and Jusice Black opposed it.

The Draper case happens to be only one of the latest of many scores of cases in which Justice Douglas has placed the Bill of Rights higher than the immediate end of locking up some offensive person such as the dope peddler. His position is that if the rights of the least desirable members of society are not secure then the rights of all are also insecure.

The lectureship which brings Justice Douglas to St. Louis was established 11 years ago in memory of the late Tyrrell Williams, much-esteemed professor of law at Washington University. Solicitor Leonard W. Brockington of Canada launched the series in 1949. Four of the lecturers have died: Prof. Max Radin of the University of California, Federal court of appeals Judge John J. Parker of North Carolina, Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt of New Jersey, a past president of the American Bar Association, and Federal court of appeals Judge Armistead M. Dobie of Virginia.

Justice Felix Frankfurter of the Supreme Court gave the lecture in 1952. Other lecturers have been: Dean Erwin N. Griswold and Prof. Paul A. Freund of Harvard, Prof. Wesley A. Sturges of Yale and Dean Robert G. Storey of Southern Methodist University, a past president of the American Bar Association.

Dean Milton D. Green describes the purpose of the Tyrrell Williams memorial this way: "These lectures are part of the program of the Washington University Law School to bring inspirational figures to our students to imbue in them the proper sense of professional responsibility."

In William O. Douglas the lectureship brings a man who had to triumph over physical handicap and economic hardship—he rode a freight train east to enter the Columbia University Law School—before he could do anything about raising the sights and standards of the legal profession.

## Importation of Russian-Made School Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on March 12, I made some remarks in the Senate with respect to the importation of Russian-made laboratory equipment for use in American educational institutions. I pointed out at that time the particular significance of this action as part of the overall plan of economic warfare being waged by the Communists. The Manchester Union-Leader of Manchester, N.H., published an editorial on March 16 on this subject entitled "Red Microscopes for Johnny?" which, I think, is a very clear and concise analysis of this particular situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with my remarks on this matter.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED MICROSCOPES FOR JOHNNY

Senator STYLES BRIDGES is a man who does not shun taking the unpopular position on an important issue. A good case in point is his recent Senate speech attacking the plan to send Russian-made equipment into American high schools. The natural unthinking reaction to this plan would be that if American schools can purchase much-needed equipment in Russia cheaper than here, and if the equipment is of good quality (as it is), then the equipment should be purchased since this would in no way aid Soviet aggression.

This line of reasoning, of course, is as full of holes as the moon is full of craters. As Senator BRIDGES observed, the plan is part and parcel of the economic war that has been declared on this country by Russia. As in the case of the deliberate low pricing of Communist textile products, the plan is to unbalance first one, then another segment of the United States business community.

Since cost or profit is of no concern in the Soviet Union, where the government can manipulate the economy without fear of public protest, it is the height of lunacy for American educators to aid the Communist strategy by purchasing Russian-made equipment for our schools, to say nothing of the poor psychological effect on the students who use these materials.

Senator BRIDGES might be accused of belaboring the obvious. But, unfortunately, in this crazy world today the obvious often needs reemphasizing.

## Importation of Russian Films

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion of late concerning the importation of Russian films to this country as part of the so-called cultural exchange program. I am among those opposed to this plan because, as I see it, while the program will serve no useful purpose for our Nation, it will allow the Soviet Government a further means of channeling their propaganda into this country.

It is interesting to note that a film has recently been completed in the Soviet Union which is based on the life and work of Paul Robeson. An editorial on this subject entitled "Paul Robeson Film" was published in the March 16th edition of the Manchester Union Leader of Manchester, N.H., and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL ROBESON FILM

Those who would protest this newspaper's assertion that films imported from Russia under the so-called cultural exchange program will contain subtle, although not necessarily viciously anti-American propaganda, should pay heed to the recent dis-

closure that a film on the life and work of Paul Robeson has just been completed in the Soviet Union.

Could this mark the beginning of a series of films glamorizing American subversives which will be foisted on the unsuspecting American public in the name of cultural exchange?

## The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WAYNE MORSE**
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Berlin Crisis."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BERLIN CRISIS

Why should the American people be asked, in the name of patriotism, repeatedly to unite behind an immoral foreign policy. Yet that is exactly what our State Department is proposing, and what a compliant and wishy-washy Congress may approve by voting blank-check authority to the President in the present Berlin crisis.

The real issue, as we pointed out in an editorial in the December issue, is not the status of Berlin. This is a phony, designed by the State Department to hide the real issue which is whether or not Germany should be armed with nuclear weapons.

The U.S. State Department, under the leadership of Mr. Dulles, has based its whole German policy on a German military revival. The German militarists are determined to have nuclear weapons—and Mr. Dulles is equally determined to see that they get them. But our safety, as well as the safety of the German people themselves, requires that there be strict provisions against allowing the Germans to have atomic, bacteriological, or chemical weapons. Nothing must be left undone to prevent a third try on their part to embark another world war.

The Russians, having seen their countryside devastated twice in the last 40 years by German militarism, are determined that it will not happen again. This is the crux of the dispute over Berlin. The Russians would gladly compromise at Berlin if the West would settle for a neutralized, demilitarized Germany. A paragraph from Mr. Khrushchev's note of November 27, carefully suppressed by most of the American press, clearly indicates that the Russians are thinking of the German military menace in their concern over Berlin. Said Mr. Khrushchev:

"The best way to solve the Berlin question would be for a decision to be taken, based on the enforcement of the Potsdam agreement on Germany. (Editor's note: One of the principal points of the Potsdam agreement which the United States signed provided for a demilitarized Germany and for keeping her disarmed by prohibiting war industries.) In the present circumstances, this would mean the withdrawal of the Federal Republic of Germany from NATO with the simultaneous withdrawal of the German Democratic Republic from the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and the achievement of an agreement whereby in accordance with the principles of the Potsdam agreement, neither of the two German states would have any armed forces in excess of those needed to maintain law and order at home and to guard their frontiers."

I. F. Stone's Weekly in its current issue (Feb. 23) states the matter succinctly:

"All the talk here (in Washington) of a new flexibility on the part of Mr. Dulles reveals when examined only a deft reshuffling of the same stale cards. The strategy is to give the appearance of flexibility without the reality. For all our supposed concern with free elections, the one offer we will not make is to demilitarize and neutralize Germany in return for them. This would liquidate the East German dictatorship, open the way for disagreement, and allow East Europe to breathe more freely again. The choice is between East European liberation and German military revival. The two are incompatible. The latter has been Mr. Dulles' real concern. His retirement might make possible a shift toward wiser policies."

Senator MORSE is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. During the Formosa crisis, it was his lone voice which aroused the American peoople to a realization that Mr. Dulles was again taking them to the brink of war. Public opinion spoke with a mighty voice against "brinkmanship"—and Mr. Dulles grew more flexible.

We call on Senator MORSE again to speak out and give the people the facts on the newest Dulles-inspired crisis. And the American people had better start raising their collective voices for a peaceful settlement—or this phony issue on Berlin could be the spark to set off world war III.

## The Kennedy-Ervin Labor Bill Is Not a Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. BARRY GOLDWATER**
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been engaged for the past 12 days in attempts to report a labor reform bill to the Senate.

Mr. President, across the Nation in increasing numbers are being published editorials which are critical, and rightly critical, of the bill which will be reported by the committee, the so-called Kennedy-Ervin bill.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Jeffersonian Democrat of Brookville, Pa., in which it is stated:

Whatever you may have heard, this is no reform bill. It does not strike down the vicious and indefensible secondary boycott, under which unions may attack at will any customer of any business against which they claim a grievance, real or fancied.

Mr. President, because the editorial well expresses criticism of the proposed legislation in an intelligent manner, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CRY FOR HELP

Congress, we are told, is in a mood to enact labor legislation. As for what kind it may be, there is the distressingly likely prospect of getting the ineffectual, labor-dictated, 1959 version of the Kennedy-Ives bill—now known as the Kennedy-Ervin bill or S. 505. Debate on this innocuous measure begins any day now, and—in the absence of protests from home—there is good reason to expect passage.

A vote for the Kennedy bill is an easy out for the nervous lawmaker who, for a number of reasons, may prefer not to irritate the labor bosses, and whose constituents are uninformed or indifferent or both. He can then please the labor barons and pose at the same time as a champion of labor union reform. On the other hand, the conscientious Congressman or Senator who realizes what a phony this bill is must be a very brave man to vote against it when there is no hint of support or appreciation from the home folks.

Whatever you may have heard, this is no reform bill. It does not strike down the vicious and indefensible secondary boycott, under which unions may attack at will any customer of any business against which they claim a grievance, real or fancied. It does not outlaw organizational or recognition picketing, whereby unions may victimize a business and abuse workers who have previously voted against unionizing. It does nothing to wipe out in free and democratic America the double standard of conduct under which the plain people are expected to be lawabiding and labor goons have come to be considered as having extra-legal rights in the departments of intimidation, skull-cracking and the destruction of property. It does not even protect union members against the very sort of exploitation revealed in the McClellan labor rackets hearings.

But, once this bill is passed, it will be seized upon by union gauleiters as a new Federal health certificate, as evidence that they have been purified and as a new weapon in more aggressive membership drives than we have yet seen. Correction and control of racketeering, hoodlumism and assorted mayhem will be farther off than ever. Historically, labor legislation is passed by Congress approximately every 10 years.

Useful as this bill could be to the union hierarchy, whose "fat cats" will bring every pressure to bear for its passage, it is a disservice to the rank and file union member and an insult to the public at large.

It is therefore the privilege of the people to resent the Kennedy bill. And it is their duty to demand of their servants in Congress that it be thrown out—bodily. They now have the choice of acting immediately—or repenting at long leisure.

## Jobs and Government Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.**
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the

RECORD, an editorial from the Camden Courier-Post of Thursday, March 5, 1959, dealing with the policies of the Federal Government in relation to the unemployment situation in Pennsylvania and in my own State of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBS AND GOVERNMENT POLICIES

In spite of general recovery from the recession, unemployment remains high in New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

In January the national average of joblessness was 6 percent, but in Pennsylvania it was 10 percent. Labor Department statistics showed 508,000 unemployed during the month, which was only 12,000 fewer than at the worst part of the depression last June.

Pennsylvania's unemployment figures were believed to be the highest in the country, but New Jersey was not much better off. The State division of employment security says those out of work in January numbered 221,000, or 9 percent of the State's labor force. This was a sharp increase from the December total of 188,000 jobless, and only 1,000 fewer than the peak mark of 222,000, which was touched in 2 months last year—March and June.

According to Carl Holderman, State commissioner of labor and industry, new workers are also invading the New Jersey labor market at the rate of 50,000 a year. Regular unemployment compensation payments of $186 million last year set an all-time high mark, while a special recession program extending payments for 13 weeks to those who had already received the maximum amounted to another $31 million. Payments in January totaled $16,238,052, a 12-percent increase over December.

In the face of unsatisfactory employment conditions such as these, appropriate branches of the Federal Government might be expected to take corrective action or at least abstain from doing anything to make conditions worse. However, several moves have been made by Federal officials that will hinder rather than help employment recovery in this area.

The Philadelphia Naval Base is gradually and in part being deactivated and work it has done in the past is being scheduled for other Navy installations. This means the loss of jobs for skilled Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware workmen.

A realignment of district boundaries by U.S. Army Ordnance is taking place, with the primary consideration theoretically to give all possible assistance and service to industry. Actually, Philadelphia Ordnance Workers charge through their Civilian Employees Council, this realignment will transfer much work from Philadelphia to Birmingham, Ala., and this area's industry and business will suffer in the long run. The transfer, it is alleged, means that the South rather than the Delaware Valley will reap the advantage of missile programs totaling over $100 million.

Of most direct impact to Camden is the holdup of the $130 million superliner contract which appeared set for New York Shipbuilding Corp. a few months ago. President Eisenhower has objected to the plan approved by Congress for financing the ship, and has blocked it from going into effect. Congressmen CAHILL and GLENN and Senators CASE and WILLIAMS are cooperating with officials of the shipyard and employees in efforts to get Mr. Eisenhower to reverse his stand and allow work on the big ship to proceed. It will mean an estimated 4,000 jobs for a period of 3 years, which would be a big help in relieving the unemployment situation in the area.

No one who has the slightest respect for the principles of economy can ask the Federal Government to adopt policies or spend large sums of money on projects of dubious benefit. On the other hand, anyone has the right to ask the Federal Government not to adopt policies that will retard economic recovery or produce the same effect by cancelling worthwhile projects.

The Delaware Valley, with a serious unemployment problem on its hands, is not asking Washington for any special help in our own efforts to combat it, but does ask Washington not to hinder us.

## Issues at Stake in the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Berlin Is Not Munich," from the March 13, 1959, edition of the Manchester Union Leader. This editorial comments favorably on a statement made by Prof. John Holden of the University of New Hampshire, an outstanding authority in his field.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN IS NOT MUNICH

Prof. John Holden, of the University of New Hampshire, in the third of his recent series of lectures at the Institute of Arts and Sciences on "Russia, China, and the United States," displayed a keen understanding of the central issues at stake in the Berlin crisis when he said that "the power that controls Berlin will control Germany."

Professor Holden was speaking not only of the importance of this piece of land from a military point of view, but also from a political and psychological point of view. "Germany," he said, "is the symbol to both the Communist and the free world * * * a refutation to the power of the Soviets * * * Khrushchev has no desire to free either Germany or Berlin. He seeks to vitiate the promise of NATO, the threat of European federation in the economic life of the continent (also apparently feared by the British—editors) and the promise of a more active political union of the German, French, and British."

This newspaper firmly believes that no American worthy of the name will favor an American retreat from Berlin, no matter how carefully such a suggestion is camouflaged by such deceptive phrases as "disengagement" and "flexibility."

As Professor Holden emphasized, "The United States must adopt a posture that indicates that Berlin is not Munich. Berlin is the symbol to the West that communism can be stopped and turned back."

## Labor-Management Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of editorials dealing with proposed labor-management reform legislation.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Carlisle (Pa.) Sentinel, Feb. 13, 1959]

GOOD CHANCE FOR LABOR BILL

Chances appear good for passage of a labor bill at this session of Congress. If one is approved, it will be the first such legislation in 12 years, the first since the disliked Taft-Hartley law was approved by a Republican-controlled Congress.

The Kennedy-Ervin measure seems to us to be a better one than that proposed by the administration, but both call for a strict accounting of union funds, both crack down on labor bossism, and both give rank-and-file members more control of their unions. The principal differences involve secondary boycotts and picketing. The Kennedy-Ervin bill would make no change in boycott restrictions and would apply but limited curbs on certain picketing practices. The administration bill would contain provisions to ban secondary boycotts and picketing. The real difference is that the Kennedy-Ervin legislation might be said to be slanted a little more to the side of labor, and the administration bill is designed to give more support to the employer.

Senator KENNEDY and the CIO–AFL maintain that mixing antiboycott and picketing provisions with anticorruption remedies, as does the administration bill, might mean no legislation at all. That is what happened in the last session. The Ives-Kennedy bill passed the Senate, but through maneuvering of Secretary Mitchell the labor bill failed of passage in the House. This must not happen again. The McClellan committee has presented ample proof of the need for anticorruption legislation. The need is clear. If necessary, let there be a compromise bill drawn.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Jan. 30, 1959]

KENNEDY'S BILL DESERVES PRIORITY IN CONGRESS

So far two programs for labor legislation have been handed to Congress. One, a relatively mild measure designed primarily to curb racketeering inside unions has come from young Senator KENNEDY, the Massachusetts Democrat who almost got through a similar bill last year. The other program is the administration's broad 20-point plan which embodies many of the features of KENNEDY's bill but goes much farther. Still a third program, one likely to contain even stronger curbs, is expected to come from Senator MCCLELLAN, head of the Senate rackets subcommittee.

There is, then, no lack of ideas about what should be done in the field of labor legislation. There is, however, a very strong doubt that any really radical legislation favoring either labor or management can be enacted. Ever since 1947, when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, Congress—whether Republican or Democrat dominated—has been most reluctant to act in this field. Just a decade ago, Harry Truman's presidential victory was supposed to assure repeal of Taft-Hartley, but it did not. Just a year ago, the disclosures of the McClellan committee were supposed to assure passage of a labor reform bill, but no bill was passed.

In this Congress, as a result of the November elections, labor will have many friends. Union leaders assert that labor backed 25 of 32 winning Senators and 70 percent of the winning Representatives. This, coupled with labor's influence in the defeat of five State right-to-work proposals, indicates a political punch that should be able to knock out any new legislation labor does not like.

The prospects, consequently, are that the only legislation which stands a chance is

that on which there is already a large area of agreement. The only field in which labor, industry, and the public are agreed on the need for reform is in curbing racketeering.

KENNEDY's program is designed simply to meet this need. It would attempt to assure democratization of union affairs and would require a strict accounting of union funds. The AFL–CIO wants this reform, the public wants it, and industry wants it.

Because this reform is needed and because it has a good chance of passage, we hope Congress concentrates on the Kennedy bill and refuses to be sidetracked into arguments over other issues. That is not to say that other measures might not be needed (we believe some points of the President's program are desirable) or that the Kennedy bill will cure all ills.

But to tie KENNEDY's measure up with other plans might well mean that no labor legislation would be enacted. Let us have the Kennedy bill first and go on, if possible, from there.

---

[From the Erie (Pa.) News, Jan. 27, 1959]

CONGRESS MUST PASS SOME KIND OF LAW TO CURB RACKETEERING

One of the most disappointing episodes of the last congressional session was the failure of labor reform legislation, as exemplified by the Kennedy-Ives bill.

It will be recalled that public pressure for such legislation had been generated by extensive committee investigations, but when the Kennedy-Ives bill came to its test in the House, it was scuttled by a singular amalgam of forces, including some big-business and big-labor interests, plus Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

Now Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY has come up with another bill with approximately the same objectives.

It would bring union finances out into the open by requiring public accounting and establishing penalties for mishandling of union funds. It would promulgate ground rules for democratizing union elections. It would specifically par persons with criminal records from high union offices. It would prohibit the payment of union funds to criminals.

It would also make several non-controversial modifications of the Taft-Hartley law.

In the opinion of most observers, these changes would go a long way toward eliminating the grosser abuses uncovered in the labor racket hearings.

KENNEDY is more specific. He believes they would mean the end of the road for James R. Hoffa and his unsavory crew. For, he says, even the strongly entrenched bosses would find it more expeditious to bow out.

In an apparent effort to modify those critics who see his bill as a new primer of labor-management relations in the Taft-Hartley tradition, KENNEDY emphasizes that the bill's primary concern is with labor racketeering. It is not a full-scale updating of labor legislation, but a circumscribed attempt to deal with known abuses.

This emphasis is expected to draw the sting from some of the opposition furnished by business groups the last time around.

Whether the new Kennedy bill is the best one that could get through Congress in this session is, of course, less certain. There will be other bills in coming weeks, formulated by Mitchell and Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, among others.

Yet there should be no doubt that some sort of legislation is in order to establish democratic processes in all unions and protect union members against their occasionally crooked leaders.

If the Democratic-controlled Congress is still unable to pass the Kennedy bill or something akin to it, then the public may justifiably wonder how the party could face up to even greater tests after 1960.

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News, Jan. 27, 1959]

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—Miami's sunny real estate has not seen its last tycoon. A fellow by the name of Jim Hoffa has just put $4 million into the refurbishing of the Everglades, a residential hotel on the mainland. It is some distance from the Gold Coast's motel row where the teamsters already have put $1,250,000 into a sandlot drive-in palace called the Castaways. All this is atop some $4 million in a west coast housing project and some $12 million deposits in as many Midwest banks.

So when Senator JOHN KENNEDY says he has a law to put Hoffa out of business—it's a pretty big business, for there are other millions I've not listed here and tens of millions more in welfare funds still available. Some experts put these funds at a billion dollars for Hoffa's dollar diplomacy.

But Senator KENNEDY's proposals are big enough to contain even Hoffa.

This antiracketeering bill will get more kicking around than an English soccer ball. But if it survives as the minimum law we, the people, get this year, this is how KENNEDY believes the public can win this final conflict:

There are nine main assaults on racketeering. KENNEDY's most dramatic proposal calls for the summary dismissal of all ex-convicts from their union posts. This means that any union leader anywhere with a long police sheet which has a conviction for arson, larcency, extortion, narcotics pushing, mayhem, or any other major crime must be dropped from his post the moment the Kennedy bill becomes law. If the ex-convict stays in office, the Justice Department can automatically move in, demand his ejection, and bring criminal proceedings against the union leaders. The union itself can also be fined heavily.

No union official ever will be able to draw dues money for yachts, homes, or major items like convention hotel bills without everybody getting a real X-ray look at his personal accounts. KENNEDY's bill calls for full public disclosure of all salaries, expenses, and other disbursements of every single official and employee who receives more than $7,000 annually from a union. This will include virtually every paid national and local labor leader.

In the past, the looting crowd has been able to cover up by passing by-laws enabling leaders to hide or destroy union books each year. If the Kennedy bill passes, it will be a Federal offense, punishable by a 5-year jail term and heavy fine, to steal, deface, or destroy union records.

Believe it or not, embezzlement of union funds is not a Federal offense. Under this bill, it will be illegal to steal union funds. That's progress. Imagine having to fight to pass such a law in the Congress of the United States.

Under the bill, the rank-and-file can go into a State or Federal court and sue the till thieves for recovery of union money even if the union itself does not act to recover the stolen funds. This means that a rank-and-file committee can ask the court to turn boats, cars, country homes, furniture, and even clothing back to the union if officials simply paid for the comforts out of expense accounts or just lifted union dues.

There are other powers for the rank-and-file. If they believe there's been a crooked election, the bill gives them the right to ask the Secretary of Labor of the United States to investigate. He would have subpena powers. He could seize all records affecting the election (any records for that matter). He would then have the right to set the election aside—whether a local or an international union was involved.

The proposed law would give him the power to call new elections. He could see to it that no intricate union statute kept any member from voting or running for office so long as his dues were paid on any day of the month, not just on the first of each month as is called for in the Teamster by-laws.

There are 6 specific rules against any union official, who earns more than $5,000 a year, buying into companies which deal with his labor outfit, thus causing a conflict of interest. There are proposals against union loans to officials of more than $1,500; proposals against employer loans to union men, and proposals against the use of picket lines for extortion.

If we, the people, get all this written into law this year, some of our heartaches will have been worthwhile.

---

[From the Garden City (N.Y.) Newsday, Jan. 21, 1959]

PASS THAT BILL

If Congress were a rational body, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY's labor-management reform bill, introduced yesterday afternoon, would now be on its way to the President with a rousing okay from both the House and Senate. Instead, it is likely to languish in committee for weeks to come, with the eventual result uncertain. This bill does no damage to honest unions; it could put crooked unions such as Jimmy Hoffa's Teamsters out of business by forcing disclosure of all business dealings, ousting criminals, and requiring genuine, democratic relations.

We think it ought to be passed.

---

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Jan. 29, 1959]

IKE'S PROPOSED LABOR BILL AN ALL-OR-NOTHING GAMBLE?

President Eisenhower asked Congressional action Wednesday on a 20-point program to eliminate union abuses and uproot some of the existing snags in the collective bargaining process.

His plan embodies, in less specific terms, most of the reforms proposed in the Kennedy-Ervin bill to curb labor racketeering.

But it goes much further.

The President would amend the Taft-Hartley Act in several particulars. In addition to less-controversial changes he would:

1. Ban secondary boycotts aimed at forcing firms not involved in a labor dispute to cease doing business with firms that are.

2. Outlaw picketing to force recognition of a union that has not clearly and legally established its right to represent a group of employees.

The President's program has obvious merit. It represents the much stronger labor bill desired by critics of the Kennedy-Ervin measure. But its strength may prove to be a fatal weakness.

The danger is that a predominantly Democratic Congress, many of whose Members owe their election to union support, will extend their fight against the Eisenhower proposals to the retaliatory point of opposing any labor legislation whatever.

Senator KENNEDY recognized this possibility when, in submitting his racket-reform bill, he warned:

"This is primarily a labor-management reform bill, dealing with the problems of dishonest racketeering—it is not a bill on industrial relations, dealing with the problems of collective bargaining and economic power. The two areas of legislation should not be confused or combined.

"If this Congress, in its consideration of anticorruption legislation, becomes bogged down in acrimonious controversies over

broad and controversial Taft-Hartley revisions—in technical and emotional issues such as boycotts and picketing—then we can only delay and defeat a vital measure already thoroughly considered and debated."

KENNEDY proposed that the antiracketeering law be adopted as a first order of business and that the Taft-Hartley revisions (which have been neglected too long) be incorporated in a second labor bill later this year.

But the stancher critics of labor unions are attacking the Kennedy-Ervin bill in much the same terms that they attacked the Kennedy-Ives measure, rejected by the House at the last session.

They call it a weak bill that will effect no substantial reform * * * a mild wrist tap.

The charge is unwarranted.

The proposed act will not destroy organized labor, if that is what the critics desire; it will eliminate some of the artifices under which labor corruption thrives.

Its major provisions:

Election of union officers, at stated intervals, by secret ballot.

Full public disclosure of all union financial data, including salaries, expenses, and other disbursements.

Barring union offices to all ex-convicts.

Making it a Federal offense, punishable by a 5-year jail term and heavy fine, to steal, deface, or destroy union records.

Prohibiting any union official from buying into companies which deal with his labor outfit.

Employing the rank and file to sue for the recovery of embezzled funds if the union itself fails to act.

Making such embezzlement a Federal offense.

Extending to the Secretary of Labor the power to institute court action to set aside improper union elections, and to conduct new elections.

Establishing strict standards for the imposition of trusteeships, and limiting such regimes to 18 months duration.

Prohibiting picketing for purpose of extortion or to obtain payoff from employer.

Prohibiting solicitation or payment of fictitious fees for unloading cargo.

These are some of the curbs the bill proposes—restraints that are now nonexistent.

Labor columnist Victor Riesel, long an archenemy of the union crooks, says the measure is "big enough to contain even Hoffa," and adds:

"If we, the people, get all this written into law this year, some of our heartaches will have been worthwhile."

The estimate is sound.

---

[From the Ogdensburg (N.Y.) Journal, Feb. 4, 1959]

KENNEDY TRIES AGAIN

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts is trying again this year for a Federal law to curb racketeering in labor. Those who recall the fate of the Kennedy-Ives bill, of which this is a refinement, will believe such legislation can be passed only when they see it.

Last year's Kennedy-Ives bill, passed by the Senate 88 to 1, couldn't have had much wrong with it. But in the House it was ganged up on by (1) prolabor Congressmen and (2) the bitterly antilabor faction in the House which thought that by killing it they could get right-to-work bills passed in the various States where such legislation was then pending. As it turned out, right-to-work laws were snowed under in the States where it mattered, notably Ohio and California, and they wound up with nothing.

After that experience, this unholy alliance of extremists shouldn't be in operation again this year. But the ways of politics are sometimes dark and inscrutible; Congressmen who pay their first allegiance to labor bosses may find other allies during this season; conceivably even the same ones.

In any event, while it clearly is possible to lift out and criticize segments of this bill—something that's true of all but the simplest pieces of legislation—this fundamentally is a good measure. Had it been in effect over the last few years, either Jimmy Hoffa would have acted differently or been in jail right now—and it's hard to find many impartial observers who don't believe that's where he belongs.

Among other things, the Kennedy measure would impose criminal penalties for false reports on union fiscal affairs and punish the misuse of union funds, require secret ballot elections of officers at regular intervals, prohibit shakedown picketing and the solicitation or payment of extortionate fees for unloading cargo from interstate carriers.

It looks like a list of the offenses with which Hoffa was charged.

Maybe that isn't a good way to arrive at legislation. But Hoffa represents a distillation of just about everything that's wrong with the labor movement. Laws that will block him will trip up most of the unscrupulous labor leaders.

---

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Republic, Jan. 24, 1959]

LABOR CONTROL BILL SHOULD BE PASSED

The new labor control bill introduced by Senator JOHN KENNEDY and which will be pushed by Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN in the House should be passed by this session of Congress, regardless of what other changes in the Taft-Hartley law are proposed during the year.

The only way they can be passed is to keep them separate from other controversial labor issues. We sincerely hope that President Eisenhower and his administration will recognize this fact by backing the Kennedy bill ahead of their own proposals.

This legislation is similar to that which passed the Senate a year ago but was defeated in the House. It is aimed primarily at cleaning up labor unions such as the Teamsters and elimination of such labor bosses as Jimmy Hoffa of the Teamsters.

It is stronger than some labor groups want and it is far weaker than antilabor segments of the Congress desire, but in the face of last year's elections it is about the only compromise that has a chance of passage this year.

The most important feature in the Kennedy bill is the guarantee that rank and file members shall have the right to vote regularly and secretly for their officers. Other points would provide criminal penalties for mishandling of union funds.

Given the opportunity to select their own leaders in secrecy and without fear we believe the labor union members will go a long way in eliminating some of the abuses of new power-hungry, unscrupulous leaders. No one can deny that members should have this right. That is why the Kennedy bill should be handled ahead of other proposals dealing with collective bargaining and economic power now held by unions.

---

## Junior Colleges Called Next Step in U.S. Education

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about the public junior college in Quincy, Mass., which was written by Glenn A. McClain, an assistant professor at the college, and was published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 18, 1959.

Quincy Junior College was formed as a result of the initiative and effort of citizens of Quincy, without Federal or State financial subsidies of any kind. It is a heartening demonstration of energetic local self-reliance which deserves the attention of all of us who are concerned with how our Nation can best perform the task of furnishing adequate school facilities for our young people. I am proud of what the citizens of Quincy have done, and I urge that their efforts be imitated in communities throughout the Nation which are suffering from a shortage of adequate school facilities.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUINCY, MASS., ILLUSTRATES JUNIOR COLLEGES CALLED NEXT STEP IN U.S. EDUCATION

(By Glenn A. McLain)

Pioneering educational efforts of citizens' groups in this city have finally resulted in the establishment of the third publicly controlled junior college in the Bay State.

The other two, Newton and Holyoke, have firmly rooted programs which have contributed much to the educational and business resources of their cities.

Publicly controlled junior or community colleges sprang up in the United States in 1902 to provide transfer courses for 4-year colleges, terminal programs beyond high school, and adult education.

New England, and especially Massachusetts, lagged behind the rest of the Nation in these developments apparently because of the historical educational strength of its private schools and colleges.

Postwar changes in Quincy started community plans in 1945 which gradually materialized in 1954 when Dr. Frank Wiley of Harvard University issued a report which spotlighted the new educatfonal needs of the area. The survey stressed changing social, economic, and educational patterns which were forcing new answers to the old issue of what to do with the graduating class each year—shall it be work or college?

EFFORTS MOBILIZED

Immediately, citizens from all walks of life mobilized their efforts to study developmental plans, to backstop the school committee and the city council in this direction, and to place these problems before the general public.

Critics of the plan doubted the need for a new tax burden; whether or not instructional standards could be kept high, and whether or not the program should be supported from the city budget.

From 1954 until the first experimental program began in 1956, an imaginative citizens' committee of 100 moved steadily to educate the general public concerning the issues at stake. The lively community debate which followed was in the true tradition of Quincy's educational greats—John Adams and John Quincy Adams.

The two courses offered in the local high school in 1956 grew to a full-scale program of 11 in 1958 with an enrollment of 83.

LESSONS LEARNED

High peak of this cooperative community effort came on December 18, 1959, when the Massachusetts Board of Education approved the 2-year Quincy Junior College program. Citizens see important lessons in the Quincy record for other civic groups which might

wish to move in similar directions. These lessons involve community leadership, financial planning, and institutional control.

The action of Quincy citizens in mobilizing public opinion to support a vital community project shows that civic leadership resources must be fully utilized for final success. Communities in favor, and those against, such plans must be careful to give the other side their day in court, it was pointed out. Steamrolled blueprints rushed through city governments in the name of educational expediency are not the answer to our pressing problems, the leaders said. The free flow of public debate is the best way in the long run.

Quincy learned that it is essential to use caution and a great deal of old American horsesense in planning new educational programs such as public junior colleges. In these days of skyrocketing tax rates it is fundamental to move with calculated speed.

PART-TIME BASIS USED

Experimental programs started on a part-time basis until exact needs appear are good ways to build for a permanent future, they discovered. Once community demands and resources are professionally analyzed then a full-speed-ahead program might well be in order.

Institutional control is an important matter for any community to consider. New England traditions force community leadership to view critically any possible State or Federal control of school programs. It is important to note that few junior or community colleges have existed for any long period of time without State sanction, however.

In Quincy, State approval has been received for course development and it may be necessary to get State financial support to expand facilities in the future.

It will not curb or change local control in any way if State aid is received in the future by Quincy Junior College. In the more than 660 junior colleges in the United States all types of combinations of local-State authority exist without any loss of local educational freedom, it is pointed out.

Finally, these Quincy leaders assert that the junior college movement in the United States is such a fast-moving and vitally challenging one that all citizens must keep their minds alive to these exciting new educational possibilities. Community cooperation backed up by available State resources can further help to make the junior college a flexible, expanding educational growth in the true American tradition.

## Uruguayan Subsidies for Wool Tops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate who represent States in which the growing distribution and manufacture of wool are important industries were deeply disturbed by the recent decision of the Secretary of the Treasury to remove the countervailing duty on wool top imports from Uruguay, which has been in effect since 1953. Recalling the devastation wrought in the U.S. wool industry by the flood of wool top which entered this country in the years immediately preceding imposition of the countervailing duty, we are distressed to anticipate a recurrence of this situation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a significant news dispatch from Montevideo which was published in a textile industry trade paper, the Daily News Record, on March 9, 1959. It reports that the wool trade in Uruguay considers that the U.S. Treasury erred in concluding that the Uruguayan Government has ceased to subsidize exports of wool tops to the United States. According to the article, the Uruguayan industry itself recognizes that the subsidy has not only been maintained but actually increased in the years since 1952.

Another significant point raised in the article emanating from Uruguay is the fact that a recent decision of the Uruguayan Government to permit imports of certain nonessential articles into that country is apparently the reason why, under our Treasury's weighted average formula for determining the existence of a subsidy, the Treasury concluded that the subsidy on wool top exports no longer exists. It is difficult to understand how the Uruguayan action concerning imports of nonessential goods could bear any possible relation to the question whether a subsidy on exports of wool tops continues to exist. A nonpartisan group of 10 Senators who participated in a hearing held recently on this subject by the Senate Finance Committee advised the Secretary of the Treasury that in their opinion his Department's formula is inconsistent with law and logic and is not consonant with commercial reality, and urged him not to revoke the countervailing duty. With that position, I am in complete accord.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREDICTS ACTIVITY FOR URUGUAYAN WOOL TOPS IN UNITED STATES

MONTEVIDEO.—Nicolas Duran y Veiga, president of the Uruguayan Wool Board, stated at the weekend that removal of countervailing top duties meant for Uruguay the reopening of the American market, hampered since 1952, when the United States acquired $22 million worth of Uruguayan tops.

Waiving of these duties is interpreted here as a friendly gesture and a sign of economic cooperation in this hemisphere. It will redirect Uruguayan top exports from Eastern countries, especially Red China, to the United States.

Trading with Eastern countries is complicated, since many of their products find no ready market in Uruguay, while the situation with the United States is just the opposite.

The local trade believes that the Treasury Department erred when assuming that Uruguayan subsidies for top exports had been discontinued. They were maintained and even increased since 1952. However, it is believed that the Treasury Department's decision to waive countervailing duties was based on the figuring of an average foreign exchange rate for Uruguayan exports and imports of all classes of goods.

Due to the recent granting of import permits for nonessentials of the so-called second and third categories at the free financial rate of around 9 pesos a dollar, the average exchange rose substantially, thus justifying top duty removal. The Uruguayan peso continues firm.

## All or Nothing in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial, "All or Nothing in Berlin?" which appeared in the Boston Herald on March 13, 1957, in which, among other things, the editorial pointedly stated:

What is needed now is not another off-the-cuff session with reporters, but a considered, open, comprehensive statement on American military policy in Europe.

The air must be cleared.

The editorial follows:

ALL OR NOTHING IN BERLIN?

President Eisenhower raised more questions than he answered in his press conference this week.

His warning that the United States would not fight an old-fashioned ground war against the Soviet Union over Berlin made sense. Western troops now stationed in Europe are no match for Russia's 175 divisions there, and we would be hopelessly outmatched in a conventional struggle.

But must we assume, as the President seemed to do, that the only alternative is nuclear war? Is there no in-between response to Red aggression in Berlin?

Mr. Eisenhower didn't rule the possibility out. But he ridiculed the idea that strengthening our troop commitments would help. "What would you do with more ground forces in Europe?" he asked. "Does anyone here have any idea?" If we are to enforce our will in Berlin, he said, "we must go to other means."

The other means? Apparently the big bombs, the ultimate force.

If this is indeed the choice, perhaps it is well for the President to let the Russians and the rest of the world know. There is less apt to be a misunderstanding and an accident which will bring everything down around our ears. But most people have assumed there were other choices.

The initial challenge on Berlin is expected to come from the East Germans and not the Russians. Are we going to react to this by dropping bombs on Moscow or are we going to make a limited answer to a limited challenge on the spot? And if the Soviets intervene with token force, are we going to answer with more than token forces or feel the situation out?

Only a few years ago we were talking of fighting a ground war in Europe with tactical atomic weapons. Admittedly the strategy has changed somewhat since then. But are these weapons obsolete?

We don't believe the President meant to say that our first, or only, response to aggression in Berlin would be massive retaliation. But our NATO allies may interpret his remarks that way and for them it would be even more startling than for us. Why should the Germans or the French struggle to meet their troop quotas for NATO, if troops are no longer important? What, indeed, becomes of the whole notion of collective defense if the only significant weapon is the bomb and that weapon is under the exclusive control of the United States?

The President's frankness at his press conference was laudable. But he didn't go far enough. Only more frankness can clear up the misconception and ambiguities which his first answers have created. What is

needed now is not another off-the-cuff session with reporters, but a considered, open, comprehensive statement on American military policy in Europe.

The air must be cleared.

## Classes for Blind Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mrs. Wilberta L. Woods, braille teacher in the Braintree, Mass., public schools, which was published in the Massachusetts Teacher for February 1959. I take pride in the educational leadership of Massachusetts, as reflected by the fine work which is being done in Braintree in teaching blind children with sighted children.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLASSES FOR BLIND CHILDREN

(By Wilberta L. Woods, braille teacher, Braintree public schools)

Perhaps you have wondered about classes for the blind in the public schools; maybe there have been many questions on your mind concerning this program. Some of the questions which are consistently brought up by lay leaders are: How can blind children be educated in a public school? How can they be integrated and become oriented? What can the sighted children offer to the blind children? What can the blind offer to the sighted? Why should the blind be integrated in a public school when there are residental schools especially for the blind?

The answers to these questions were revealed in an intangible manner in 1956 when this program was introduced in the Braintree public schools. This marked the beginning of teaching the blind with the sighted in the public schools in the South Shore area. It was a challenge in which the public schools in Braintree met, under the leadership of Superintendent Ralph W. Proctor, to recognize increased facets of an educational program in a period of social change.

SETTING TO WORK

After the program policy had been worked out by the school officials, the superintendent appointed the writer as the resource teacher for the blind students. The Perkins-trained resource teacher (who had previously taught sighted children in the Topeka, Kans., public schools) immediately began to carry out the school policy concerning this program.

The class began with five children. There were two in the first grade, one in the second grade, and two in the sixth. They were the pioneering students in this new special-education progrom on the South Shore, and they were the kind of students who were able to take their places in this new program with the sighted. Otherwise, the program would have faced obstacles at the beginning.

The first-grade pupils who began this class had attended public kindergarten, but had not received any braille instruction. The second-grade pupil had also attended a public school, with the advantage of braille training under a resource teacher. Both sixth-grade pupils had attended the Perkins School for the Blind. So it is obvious that the group was composed of pupils with varied backgrounds. The program was underway.

EXPLAINING THE PROGRAM

However, this program in special education for the blind, like any new venture, had to be explained to the school publics. It was imperative that the program win acceptance in the community. Therefore, it was necessary to bring together the attitudes, opinions, and ideas of all school publics and the community through an educational public-relations program.

Since this program was beginning in a public school, the logical place for the winning of acceptance was the teachers. Consequently, the resource teacher prepared the following statement for distribution to the teachers:

"Integration of the blind and the sighted in the Donald E. Ross School:

"There are five blind children in the program of this school, two of whom are members of the first grade and will become integrated into the first-grade rooms, one in each room. One child is a second-grade pupil and will become a member of that classroom. Two of the students are members of the sixth grade and will likewise become members of the sixth-grade classrooms, one in each room.

"It is the duty of the resource teacher to meet and greet the blind children as they arrive each morning. It is also her duty to dismiss the children each afternoon as they leave school. She will orient the children to find their way in and out of the building, and once she is positive that they are familiar with it, it is their responsibilty to go to and from their classes, unaided.

"She will expect full cooperation from each member of the faculty, but she does not expect any sympathizing, overprotective help from them. The work will be explained to the children and the braille will be taught in the resource room so that the children will be able to do the same type of work as the pupils in the regular class.

"The fundamental teaching of the blind children is done in the resource room with the braille equipment. The purpose of this equipment is to create an individualized and enriched program. This tends to orientate the child with experiences with braille in order to pave the way for regular academic work. The goal for the blind child is—as for all children—the growth and development of the whole child.

"The classroom for the blind children is known as the resource room. By referring to the homeroom of the blind as a resource room, it tends to give the blind children a feeling of being a participating group in the total school program. It has a tendency to remove the feeling of being somethings special in the overall program. This feeling could quite well become prevalent without the efforts of all concerned to avert this group thinking. But at the student level, the blind children are referred to as the children of the braille class."

OTHER DETAILS

The training for this facet of special education in our system ranks along with the regular academic staff. The writer prepared for this service at Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas, at the Perkins School for the Blind, and at Boston Universsity, where she received a master's degree in special education.

In the Braintree system, each child is assigned a "buddy" at the beginning of the school year in order to help both children become acquainted with each other. Subsequently, as the school year progresses the "buddy" is no longer needed.

The following is a typical school day of a second-grade pupil of the braille class, whom we shall call Marie. She is age 7. Her school schedule is a flexible one; however, she is always informed about a program change and the reason for it.

When Marie arrives at school in a taxi (the expenses are borne by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts) she places her wraps in the place assigned to her. The racks are marked with the names in braille. But in the event that Marie arrives before time for school to begin, she utilizes the time in the resource room by playing games, listening to the talking book, or writing on the blackboard. She is free to select the type of play which she desires.

Subsequently, when the bell rings, she places the playthings back in their places and proceeds to her second-grade classroom. She participates in opening exercises in the regular classroom. Consequently, Marie has the regular academic studies in the same regular classroom as the sighted children. However, she returns unescorted to the resource room throughout the day for spelling, reading, writing, and arithmetic, which may be written or oral according to the needs of the pupil. Frequently, she has finger painting in the resource room.

LUNCH AND RECESS

Marie has lunch with the braille teacher, and during her recess period is always under the supervision of the braille teacher. However, during lunch and recess she is encouraged to associate with the sighted children. At the close of the schoolday, she returns to the resource room and is dismissed there.

During the last school year, we had two blind girls enrolled in the South Junior High School. They were honor students and participated in extracurricular activities, including dramatics and the glee club. Outside of school, the girls learned to roller skate, were members of the Girl Scouts and worked toward the Marian award (a medal given to Catholic Girl Scouts). They were active members of a church choir. In addition, one girl played the piano while the other played the organ.

They gave various demonstrations to sighted students at the junior high school. In their regular classes, the girls took dictation on a braille writer and, during study periods, they transcribed the braille into print with the standard typewriter. Typing is taught to all braille students, beginning with the fourth grade.

EQUIPMENT

The equipment furnished by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the town of Braintree includes braille writers for each child, slate and styli, standard typewriter, talking book with records, recording machine, radio, braille books, and games. The desks and other furniture are furnished by the Braintree school system.

The integrated program of teaching the blind with the sighted will tend to enable the blind children to adjust socially, intellectually, and physically in the overall school program. This will lead to an acceptance and a contribution to our society.

## Food Storage Depots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the problems we must consider in case of a major war, which we all hope and pray will not occur, is the destruction or

breakdown of our transportation system.

This would leave many sections of our country without access to food or fuel. The lack of fuel in our northern States, such as my own New England area, could have as devastating an effect as the lack of food because of the rigors of the northern winter climate.

I believe that a plan could be worked out for surplus food use by the creation of big food storage depots strategically located where food, which could be protected against radiation and nuclear fallout, could be stored.

I feel that those who are studying our agricultural surplus problem, as well as those who have the responsibility for the civil defense of this Nation, should give this their early attention.

To this end, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Concord (N.H.) Daily Monitor of Thursday, March 12, 1959, which discusses in a general way this subject that I commend for consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

War talk is being discouraged by the President, but if there is a war, New Hampshire would be hard hit. Not, perhaps, by enemy attacks, but by the sudden and acute lack of food and other essential items.

In this State stores and warehouses carry limited amounts of food and these could be used up rapidly in an emergency. Some military leaders are of the opinion that in the next war transportation on the eastern seaboard could be seriously crippled or eliminated.

The Government has huge stocks of surplus food and some thought might be given to what can be processed and made available for storage against an emergency in this area.

This might, in part at least, ease a food crisis. But New Hampshire still would face the monumental task of heating homes and buildings. Now there is widespread reliance upon fuel oil and these supplies could be used up quickly.

President Eisenhower has asked for a food for peace campaign in which the United States would distribute food to reinforce peace and well-being of peoples throughout the world.

Admittedly, nobody has worked out a plan yet on what to do with this Nation's huge stocks of surplus foods. There may be some merit in the suggestion food depots be set up at strategic points around the world so no one would be hungry.

This might be a happy solution for the complex and politically-dominated farm crop surplus problem. It might even build friendship instead of the resentment America's easy flow of dollars abroad is creating.

While Washington is scanning the globe as it considers what to do with surplus food, some official should find time to take a look at the eastern seaboard and more particularly at New Hampshire.

Some of the surplus food would be gratefully received in this State if and when there is a war and if there were stockpiles available that could be drawn upon.

One of the Nation's biggest chemical firms reports it is working with the Atomic Energy Commission and is irrigating a high intensity cobalt source to be used for food preservation for the Army. These experiments at DuPont might be worth examining to determine whether they can benefit New Hampshire as well as the military services.

## St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding St. Patrick's Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

Yesterday all America celebrated St. Patrick's Day. All Americans, regardless of their creed or land of origin, paid their respects by the wearing of emerald green in their hearts and on their clothes.

Today, we in Congress have been honored by the presence of that great representative of the Emerald Isle, President Sean T. O'Kelly of the Republic of Ireland. I have had the distince pleasure of meeting President O'Kelly, and can therefore testify at first hand to his wit, his charm and his general embodiment of the fine characteristics we have come to associate with his justly famed native land.

President O'Kelly's visit to the United States will do much to strengthen even more the already firm bonds of friendship between Ireland and the United States. This recognition and mutual liking results from our understanding of the great contributions made by peoples from both lands to the progress of each land. We in this country have been blessed with many hearty sons of the Emerald Isle. In every walk of life, they have made valuable contributions to the building of America.

Among their greatest qualities, the Irish have brought to our land a deep and reverent love of God, and a firm resolve to oppose all philosophies and forms of government which seek to destroy man's faith and freedom. They have brought their unique qualities of humor and musical talents. And they have infused into all sections of our land their infectious laughter.

While we pause to pay tribute to the Irish who have done so much to help establish our Government, it would be well also for us to pause in recognition of him whose name March 17 bears. St. Patrick's selfless devotion to his fellow men—a quality so often reflected in his countrymen—has served as an inspiration to men the world over.

For surely, St. Patrick belongs to all the world, not just the Irish alone. He belongs to all men who look upon service of good and love of man as our chief duties on this earth. The evocation of his name, and the observance of the day which bears his name, thus carries the deeper significance that every man should give of himself so that others might benefit.

That is the great lesson of March 17. That is the great lesson we would all do well to ponder and put into practice throughout the year.

## Need for Limitation of Governmental Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Life Line Foundation, a religious and patriotic educational movement, produces a daily radio program featuring Mr. Wayne Poucher, a minister who has a keen insight into the nature of the threats of our traditional American freedoms.

Life Line broadcasts are carried by a large number of radio stations all over the country and are rendering a fine service to combat the dangers confronting out Nation. A recent broadcast dealt forthrightly with the need for a limitation of governmental power, and I ask unanimous consent to have the text of that broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the radio transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One has only to observe the everyday workings of government in Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capitol, to understand the wisdom of the statement that the history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power.

As government grows bigger, individual freedom grows smaller. As government becomes more powerful, human liberty shrinks in like proportion. When governmental power becomes absolute, human liberty disappears completely.

Liberty therefore depends absolutely on the strict and enforceable limitation of the powers of government. This truth was well known to the men who founded this Nation of ours. That is why the Founding Fathers carefully inserted in the Consitution a series of enforceable limitations, checks and balances upon every branch of our government. In our Constitution, man was given the means of defending his God-given rights, not only against his fellowman, but also against his own government.

What have we been doing in recent years to preserve this precious gift?

What have we done about the personal liberty of the American farmer when the right and the power to control production and prices are placed in the hands of an anonymous bureaucrat in Washington?

What have we done about the preservation of the constitutional limitations on governmental powers while the courts were ruling that 10,000 international agreements could increase the powers of the Government at will without regard for the traditional system of limitations, checks and balances?

What have we done about our own liberty when our earnings are confiscated and our cash reserves reduced in value in order to finance fruitless adventures in foreign lands?

Have we been asleep? Are we sleeping still?

You know and I know that when our forefathers threw off the yoke of tyranny they were seeking freedom.

Let us read the Declaration of Independence and learn again the conditions from which those early Americans sought relief.

They sought relief from oppressive centralized government, from back-breaking taxes,

from judges and courts with unbridled powers, from swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

Where do we stand today with respect to those matters?

We have a powerful central Government that every day reaches out for more power.

We have the heaviest taxes in our history.

We have a Supreme Court that has exceeded its jurisdiction, assuming for itself the powers given by our Constitution to the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

And certainly we have swarms of officers—read bureaucrats for officers—to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

Is it true that we have become so accustomed to losing our liberties that we scarcely know that they are being stolen? Have we become so hardened to big government's constant push for more power that we no longer care very much whether or not we remain free?

No. This cannot be, must not be.

Liberty is something that is bred in the bones of Americans. The love of freedom is immovable in our hearts as the majestic mountains are immovable in our land.

This is what we must always remember that liberty is never won or lost in a single day. Liberty is won always by a continuing struggle. Whenever it is lost, it is lost by a continuing negligence and complacency.

So finally, the answer comes down to you, to all of us. And the question we must answer is whether the ever-quickening process of power concentration in Washington foretells the ultimate wreck of American freedom.

That trend, if continued, could foretell the death of freedom. This we know to be true. History teaches its truth.

The only sure way to preserve the liberty which God intended men to have on earth is to make freedom flourish here in its homeland * * * in America. The only sure way to accomplish this is to begin, quickly and effectively, to drain off the deep pool of concentrated bureaucratic governmental power that threatens to engulf us.

That, again, is a job for all Americans who love freedom.

## Salute to the Campfire Girls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have prepared a brief statement regarding the 49th anniversary of the founding of the Campfire Girls. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

Yesterday marked the 49th anniversary of the founding of the Campfire Girls. From modest beginnings, this outstanding organization has grown to the point where today it has over 500,000 members.

By providing recreational programs for girls between the ages of 7 and 18, the Campfire Girls not only teach valuable skills, but encourage these young people to contribute innumerable services to their communities. They learn in many ways how to become useful and valuable citizens.

Of particular concern to this organization is the preservation of our natural resources and the protection of our wildlife. All too often, these valuable aspects of our national life are overlooked in the hustle and bustle of our everyday activities. The Campfire Girls' theme, "She cares—Do you?" helps teach these young people the tremendous need for conservation in our land.

I am pleased to join with their many friends and admirers in saluting the Campfire Girls on the occasion of their anniversary. May this fine organization and all its members continue to grow and prosper in all their endeavors which are doing so much to make a better America in which to live.

## Need for Continued Sacrifice in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding editorial published in the March 16 Boston Herald. This editorial presents most effectively the need for continued sacrifice in foreign aid and the need to consider very carefully whether or not we are making sufficient efforts in meeting those economic needs for nations that give promise of developing independent and growing economies. This editorial points out, too, how the Development Loan Fund must be the central instrument of our economic assistance program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHARED STRENGTH

There was a time when foreign aid was looked upon as a temporary expedient, a means of helping the older nations recover from the war and the newer nations get on their economic feet.

Now, however, it is clear that foreign aid must be considered a permanent claim on our resources. Military aid has become an essential and highly beneficial part of our defense program. And economic aid has become an investment in the future stability of uncommitted Africa and Asia. We need both now, and we shall continue to need both at least as long as the cold war continues.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that Congress will take seriously the President's plea that his $3.9 billion foreign aid program for 1959–60 be passed without cuts.

Congressmen are acutely conscious of the heavy burden U.S. taxpayers are now carrying. And when they look around for places to reduce, the foreign aid item always looks tempting. No large group of voters is directly benefited by this spending. There is no powerful lobby to push it. Yet realistically, as the President says, this is one of the bargain items in the budget. It is one of the last places we should economize.

During the past 10 years the United States has spent a total of $54.8 billion on various aid programs, mostly to bind up the wounds of war and guard against the outbreak of a new war. But in 1945 we spent twice that amount ($114 billion) to prosecute 1 year of war. And wars come higher all the time.

The question which agitates many people is whether the President has put enough in his budget for foreign aid. Mr. Eisenhower himself has hinted that the real struggle between East and West may be going on in the economic field. Not only is the Soviet Union making a strong bid to overtake the United States in overall production, but Red China is competing with free India, and all the Soviet-bloc nations are vying with all the western-bloc nations in wooing the neutrals of Asia and Africa with economic aid. This is a struggle we can't afford to lose.

Mr. Eisenhower's budget requests for the coming year are actually less than they were for 1958–59, although his program calls for some increases in subsequent years. Foreign aid supporters in both parties have advocated higher appropriations for economic aid this year and hereafter, particularly for the development loan fund. The President is certainly not being spend-thrift.

We can afford to spend what the President asks and more. We cannot afford to spend less. The United States is still the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. But we won't remain in that enviable position unless our friends grow along with us, offsetting Soviet growth. We must lend a helping hand lest, in the President's vivid phrase, we become "the richest Nation in the graveyard of history."

A $3.9 billion aid bill is a small price to pay for survival.

## The North Atlantic Treaty Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article about NATO, written by its Secretary-General, Paul-Henri Spaak. The article appears in the March 30, 1959, issue of Life International. Next month, NATO will be 10 years old. The reasons for its existence are just as compelling today as they were when it was formed in April of 1949. There must be no relaxation of joint effort on the part of the United States and the 14 other members of NATO to assure that our alliance will serve as effectively in its second decade as it has during its first decade, to deter Communist expansion in Europe and North America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUCCESS OF NATO—REAL VICTORIES HAVE MARKED ITS 10 YEARS

(By Paul-Henri Spaak, Secretary General of NATO)

Early in 1948 a bold coup d'etat had brought the Communists to power in Prague. A democracy ceased to exist. The work of Masaryk and Benes was wrecked. This political and human tragedy, by shaking the free countries out of their easy going optimism, was to have significant repercussions.

It was the Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia which marked the decisive turning point of foreign policy after the

end of the Second World War. Until then, the United States and the free countries of Europe, with infinite patience, a number of illusions and a certain lack of courage, had stood by passively and watched the process which, even viewed dispassionately, can only be called the expansion of Soviet imperialism.

The scales fell at last from the eyes of the Western Powers. Warned already by Churchill in his prophetic speech at Fulton, Mo., the political leaders now realized that, if they failed to react energetically, the blow which had just fallen on Prague might be repeated in other parts of Europe, and that it was urgently necessary to raise a barricade against the Communist drive which was engulfing a whole continent against the clearly expressed will of the immense majority of its inhabitants. Early in April 1949, 1 year after the Prague coup d'etat, the Atlantic Alliance was born.

This defensive Atlantic alliance, designed to deter communism in Europe and on the North American Continent, has a record of success. Without having to resort to force, by its mere existence and by its efficient presence, it has halted Soviet imperialism in Europe. Since 1949 the latter has made no further progress.

This fact cannot be overemphasized. In this one corner of the world, as a result of the union of the free countries of the West, not only has Soviet diplomacy failed to score a single point for 10 years, but the influence of communism has perceptibly declined.

It is this spectacular success which we are preparing to celebrate in Washington in April on the 10th anniversary of the Alliance.

This short account points to two conclusions. It is understandable why the mere mention of NATO so infuriates the Communists and why they regard the Atlantic Alliance as enemy No. 1, which must be overthrown and destroyed. Their acrimony is all the greater because they are aware that it is their bad foreign policy which has made the Alliance necessary. They detest NATO, for NATO's success is their greatest defeat and this defeat is demonstrably due to their own mistakes.

But it is also necessary to realize fully how dangerous the disappearance, or even serious weakening, of the Alliance would be. Should the Alliance disappear, Europe would revert to the conditions which permitted the steady advance of communism between 1939 and 1958. Without the Alliance, Europe could not defend itself against an attack made with either atomic or conventional weapons. All the countries of free Europe, even combined, would be incapable of carrying this task to a successful conclusion.

The Atlantic Alliance is a defensive military alliance. It respects both the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter which, in Article 51, recognizes the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense. This defensive character of the Alliance must be highlighted since the Communists repeatedly refer to NATO's aggressive policy.

The countries which brought the Atlantic Alliance into being formed their own group only when it became apparent that neither the disarmament they had sought, the United Nations they had set up, nor the alliance with the U.S.S.R. they had hoped to preserve after the war could be achieved. In every possible situation the Russians, who had maintained their army intact, or even increased its power, had sabotaged the United Nations by abusing the veto and had not shown the slightest respect anywhere in the world for the most vital interests of their war allies.

The one and only reason why the countries of the Alliance have united is their determination to resist a possible Soviet attack. For their part, they have never thought that their differences with the U.S.S.R. could be settled by force. They have always been resolved to negotiate, to seek reasonable compromise solutions and to practice, even before the term was invented, true peaceful coexistence.

In reality, the Soviet Union cannot accuse them of a single act which could be described as aggressive or even provocative. But, although this is the truth, the Soviet leaders continue to give free rein to their imaginations and to seize every pretext for protests., complaints, and threats.

It is first and foremost the very fact of the alliance which the Soviet leaders cannot stomach. Already opposed as they are to any union of the European countries, they naturally find it still more intolerable that the latter should be joined by the United States and Canada, since it is to the membership of these two countries that the alliance owes it efficacity.

The Russians have not yet understood that the free countries are prepared voluntarily to forego part of their liberty and independence rather than to lose all. Western Europeans are neither humiliated nor apprehensive when American and Canadian troops join them to mount guard on the eastern frontiers of the free world. On the contrary, they welcome this proof of fearless solidarity.

The Russians find fault with the countries of the alliance for having decided to equip their forces with atomic weapons. They believe—or at least pretend to believe—that this proves the aggressive aims of NATO.

It is indeed a curious situation. They, who claim to be stanch partisans of peace, have no hesitation in proclaiming that they possess all the atomic weapons, including the most deadly and those with the longest range. What they consider to be perfectly right and natural for them becomes a mortal sin for the western democracies.

It would be absurd and even criminal, however, for us to equip our armies in a way which we know to be ineffective and to compel our soldiers to fight with the obsolete weapons of the Second World War.

As a matter of fact, the very idea of offensive weapons is contrary to NATO's philosophy because we do not intend under any circumstances to take the initiative of opening armed hostilities. On the other hand, should we be attacked. I confess that I can see no political, strategic, or moral reason why we should not employ the most efficient weapons to repulse the aggressor and why we should not destroy the far-off bases from which the attack would be launched.

Language such as this is not really as warlike as it sounds. The determination to build up a powerful defense system against a possible aggressor and even, or above all, the determination to possess a deadly instrument of retaliation, far from bringing war nearer, makes it more difficult and perhaps impossible.

It is the number and wide dispersal of the reprisal bases which are likely to make any warmonger think twice and draw back. The aggressor's problem is not how to drop a few isolated bombs, however devastating, on his enemy's territory. His problem is far more complicated and fortunately more difficult to solve; he must be capable of destroying at one fell swoop, all the points from which possible retaliatory action can be taken. Consequently, the more bases there are and the more widely they are dispersed, the fewer chances the aggressor has of solving the problem and the more likelihood there is of the establishment of a lasting peace.

I readily admit, however, that this equilibrium is precarious—we must always reckon with madmen and accidents—and we should try to find an alternative.

What alternative? General and controlled disarmament would obviously be the ideal solution. There is little hope of achieving this, however. The Soviet rulers have a highly individual approach to the question of control. In their view, control can only be exercised on their territory by themselves; any other form of control is merely a cover for military or economic espionage. Mr. Khrushchev has repeatedly expressed this view.

What confidence can we have in a system of this kind? Absolutely none. This explains why, as long as the Russians persist in their peculiar theory, no great progress can be expected in the matter of disarmament.

This must not prevent us, however, from seeking a solution to the most urgent problems confronting us, which implies that the foreign policy of the countries of the Atlantic Alliance must be, if not united, at least genuinely coordinated.

In this we have one of NATO's essential tasks.

The time is over when a great alliance could be exclusively military. It can be military only if it rests on sound political foundations. We cannot hope to fight successfully one day against a common enemy unless we have first learned to live together during the years of peace, to understand and respect each other in full awareness of all we have in common.

These truths, all the more fundamental because they are simple, are accepted by NATO. During the past few years, therefore, the chief concern of the western leaders has been to strengthen the political aspect of the alliance.

In 1956, 3 wise men—Gaetano Martino, Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Lester Pearson, Canadian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Halvard Lange, Norwegian Minister for Foreign Affairs—were chosen by their colleagues to study the problem. Their conclusions were adopted all the more readily because, in the course of that year, the alliance suffered its most serious upheaval on account of the Suez crisis. So serious was it, in fact, that any repetition of it would gravely compromise the alliance.

Their conclusions were simple, but audacious in their very simplicity. They recommended that every member of the organization, from the smallest to the most powerful, refrain from doing or saying anything in the field of international politics which might be prejudicial to, or create difficulties for, one of its partners until it had consulted all other members of the alliance.

The idea of diplomatic consultation is obviously not a new one. But the idea of prior, systematic, loyal and exhaustive consultation among 15 countries as different in size as the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, or with such different traditions as Turkey and Greece, is more than an innovation, it is a diplomatic revolution.

This revolution is taking place as all revolutions take place, accompanied by a series of disappointments and even setbacks but nevertheless making very definite progress towards the goal. Public opinion is not yet fully aware of what is happening. It does not know that the NATO Permanent Council, which meets at least once a week, now discusses all problems of world policy. It does not know that, in the specific case of relations between Western countries which are members of the alliance and the U.S.S.R., not a single diplomatic note was dispatched during 1958—and heaven knows there were many such—until the Council had discussed, analyzed, criticized its contents, and until the result of this consultation had, in the vast majority of cases, been taken into consideration.

It is clear that a new form of diplomacy is being evolved: a collective diplomacy.

We cannot deny that we need it. In the face of the numerous Soviet initiatives, frequently demagogic and therefore dangerous, we often give the impression of being grievously irresolute. We match our individualism against the unity of concept and action of the Communist world. Admirable, but not always effective.

Ten years ago I was already defending the ideas of European union and, eventually, of Atlantic union. Ten years of wide experience have convinced me that I was not mistaken.

It becomes clearer every day that the global challenge—political, military, economic, social—which communism has thrown out to the free world can only be taken up globally. This is a task which is too great for even the strongest of us working alone.

If we could organize our forces effectively, put an end to clostly duplication, not indulge in rediscovering in Europe what has already been discovered by the Americans, and no longer hide from our friends secrets known to our enemies, I should be far less anxious.

Shall we have the courage to do all this?

We have undoubtedly made some progress in Europe and in the Atlantic community. If we had eternity before us and had not an adversary of the stature and inventiveness of the U.S.S.R., I should be satisfied with our slow but steady progress. But I sometimes feel that events are outstripping our progress.

Too many people in our camp still refuse to realize the true meaning and the precise magnitude of the threat hanging over us.

A vast country—with a population of over 200 million—possessing virtually unlimited material riches and with docile allies under its yoke in every corner of the world, dreams of imposing its authority over the whole earth and of subjecting the world to its laws.

Not only does Russia trust in its strength, which is immense, but it is inspired by a deep-rooted faith, one of whose main tenets is that communism must necessarily and inevitably triumph, that its victory is predestined and that nothing can stand in its way. Russia's ambition is not to carry out certain social reforms or to live by the rules of a planned economy, but radically to transform the most fundamental principles of our civilization. In short, it is indefatigably opposed to our conception of man and human dignity, as well as to our idea of human relations and of the relation of the individual to the state.

A policy such as this does not make for progress. It is reactionary in that it denies the spirit of freedom and tolerance the political democracy which has been brought to fruition after centuries of strife and sacrifice.

The struggle between the Communist world and the free world can and must be a peaceful one. This does not depend on us. But even if it is peaceful, it will be relentless; and what is at stake is of immeasurable importance.

If we remain united, I am convinced that we shall triumph and we shall belie all the pessimistic prophecies foretelling our decline. But it is essential that we remain united.

During the last 10 years the Atlantic alliance, as a primarily military organization, has fulfilled its main purpose: It has halted Communist expansion. This is, of course, a great achievement, but it is not enough. Our alliance must maintain its military strength with the most modern weapons of warfare and avoid being lulled into smugness by its past successes. Equally as important, the Atlantic alliance in the next 10 years must become a true community. It is this community of resources, interest, and ideals which alone can remove the threat of communism forever.

## What the Constitution Means to Me—Prize-Winning Essay by Charlotte Jo Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the term "good citizenship" can imply either a pleasant-sounding philosophy, or a working practice of devoted citizens.

One example of turning the philosophy into a working practice is carried on each year in the Daughters of the American Revolution good citizenship contests.

Typical of these events is the DAR program in South Dakota, where school children participate in writing essays on good citizenship. I think that providing our youngsters an opportunity to express themselves on the fundamental concepts of our democracy accomplishes more than mere writing exercise.

It provides the stimulus to these young Americans to not only learn more about the great heritage that has been given us, but also to take an active part as good citizens in preserving this heritage.

South Dakota's winner of the DAR good citizenship award this year is Miss Charlotte Jo Pearson, of Sisseton, S. Dak.

I believe students such as Miss Pearson typify the youth of America rather than do the stories of juvenile delinquency which so often appear in our newspapers these days. The delinquents may make the headlines, but their number is small; while it is the Charlotte Jo Pearsons who truly represent the great body of American youth standing ready to assume the tremendous responsibilities of good citizenship which will be thrust upon them as they step into their roles as responsible adults.

Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD the prizewinner essay in South Dakota's DAR good citizenship contest.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS TO ME

(By Charlotte Jo Pearson)

As an American citizen I have always taken our way of life for granted. Now, through education, I'm just beginning to realize why living in America is a precious privilege.

The Constitution, our plan of Government, was written over a century and a half ago. Through the years this amazing document, needing very few changes, has given individuals the opportunity of fulfilling their lives' goals.

My goals in life are not unlike those of other girls. After graduation from high school I plan to enter college and pursue the career of my choice. Eventually I hope to marry and raise a family. I am eager to take my place in society because there is so much to be seen and done, so many challenges to be met, and so much to be learned in a relatively short period of time.

Under the Constitution our basic freedoms of religion, press, speech, assembly, and petition as found in the first amendment are guaranteed. Our Government of the people recognizes the dignity and worth of each citizen. Because I live under this democratic Government, I have the opportunity of accomplishing my goals. It is now my duty to take advantage of my opportunities, to do more than is expected of me, and to be a good American.

## American Bar Association Criticisms of Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "American Bar Does Civic Service Specifying Supreme Court Wrongs," published in the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of February 21–27, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR DOES CIVIC SERVICE SPECIFYING SUPREME COURT WRONGS

The board of governors of the American Bar Association late last year made certain pointed criticisms of the Supreme Court and its capricious decisions of recent years, particularly as to the High Court's invasions of States rights and the powers of Congress.

Meeting in Chicago, this week, members of the house of delegates adopted the report. As a result, the Supreme Court of the United States stands indicted before the American Bar and the Congress is asked to enact such legislation as will put a halt to the vagaries of an errant court.

In clear, sober language, the report demands of Congress that whenever and wherever the High Court rules in such manner as to weaken the internal security of the Nation remedial legislation be enacted forthwith. This recommendation comes out of a Snrpeme Court opinion which reversed the Pennsylvania conviction of a Communist conspirator and the subsequent necessity of dropping other prosecutions based elsewhere on State security statutes. Specific legislation is asked to give State security statutes concurrent jurisdiction and enforcement.

Of even greater gravity is the delegates' resolution asking that the "House continue to maintain a committee to investigate matters relating to national security with particular emphasis on Communist activities." As far back as the days of Representative Martin Dies, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been a special target of leftwing and Communist criticism. The bar's strong support of the House committee is invaluable.

Nor is the bar association content to let the consequences of erratic Supreme Court decisions stand. It recommends prompt and careful study by Congress of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court and passage of amendments to the laws involved so as to remove any doubt as to the intent of Congress.

The house of delegates of the American Bar Association has done the American people a great and timely service, not only in spotlighting the errors of the Supreme Court and the dangers to which these errors expose us, not only in memorializing Congress for relief, but in informing the great mass of

the people specifically what is wrong and specifically what is neded to make our future secure from the conspiracy which is boring from within.

## Needed: An International Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the March 1959, issue of Parents' magazine contains a very interesting article entitled "Needed: An International Language." The article has been written by George J. Hecht, publisher of Parents' magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: AN INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE
(By George J. Hecht)

History tells us that in ancient Babylon the people who cradled our civilization tried to build a tower to reach heaven. But the tower became the Tower of Babel, according to the Bible, for "a confounding of the language of the people took place." In modern New York, a new tower, that of the United Nations, thrusts its shining mass skyward. But the realization of its aspiration—and with it the aspiration of the world—is threatened by our contemporary Babel: About 3,000 different languages are spoken in the world today, without counting the innumerable dialects that confound communication between peoples of the same land. In China, for example, hundreds of different dialects are spoken. In the new African State of Ghana, 5 million people speak 50 different dialects. In India, more than a hundred languages are spoken, a mere 14 of them official. What's more, as the old great empires break up and new states are spawned, new official languages are created at an increasing rate.

Thus, in a world recently made smaller by jet travel, man is still effectively isolated from his neighbors by the Babel-barrier of proliferating languages. Meaningful communication is blocked daily in scores of ways: travelers are handicapped; scientists in one country are unable to read and benefit by the work of scientists in another; the ways of international trade, world accord, of conferences between nations, scholars, technologists, humanists—are blocked at every turn. Even in the shining new tower in New York, speeches and discussions have to be translated and printed in the five official U.N. languages: English, French, Spanish, Russian and Chinese. Confusion, misunderstanding, delay, suspicion and hostility follow in the wake of our modern Babel.

How much dimmer are the chances for world understanding, if in the literal sense of the phrase, we all don't speak the same language? We stand in urgent need of a common tongue, an international language, one simple enough to be learned by travelers, businessmen, Government representatives, scholars and also by children in school.

Of course, this proposal isn't new. Just as everybody is against sin, so everybody is for an international language. But what with one thing and another—our natural state of drift as human beings, our rivalries, resentments and jealousies as nations—we have so far failed to do anything effective. I propose that we stop just talking about it, as Mark Twain said of the weather, and do something about it; that we make the concerted, massive effort it takes to reach international agreement on the adoption of a single, common, auxiliary tongue.

But first, let's take a quick look at the realities of the problem today. One of the principal barriers to the adoption of an international language is the fact that there is Babel even among the candidates for choice. A number of different simplified languages vie for the spot of the language, and their respective advocates defend and attack with the fervor of political campaigners. Basic English, for example, with its vocabulary of only 850 words with which virtually anything can be expressed, has many advocates. But the Soviet Union and many nations of Asia and South America object to it. Why English? they ask. Why not basic Russian, basic Spanish, even basic Latin?

In addition to basic's of the so-called natural languages there is another category—the so-called constructed languages of which some 600 more have made their appearance since the end of the 19th century, only to be doomed to almost immediate failure. The two best known survivors among them are, of course, Esperanto and Interlingua.

Esperanto was developed in 1887 by a Russian-Polish physician named Zamenhof who gave it to the world not under his own name but under a pseudonym, "Doktoro Esperanto" or "Doctor Hopeful." For 10 years before he published it, Zamenhof had worked on Esperanto which is based on absolute regularity and ease of grammar plus a Romano-Germanic vocabulary. By 1896, Esperanto had taken hold in Western Europe.

Interlingua made its appearance much more recently—in 1951—although its development took a group of international linguists nearly 30 years. In effect, Interlingua is Latin stripped of its difficulties—its introducer, Dr. Alexander Gode, refers to it as "a kind of 20th century kitchen Latin." And indeed, Interlingua can be read by most college-trained people almost at sight.

I am by no means an authority on the relative merits of the various proposed international languages. But Professor Mario Pei of Columbia University, New York, who is, and who has written a fine book, "One Language for the World" (published by the Devin-Adair Co., New York, $5), believes that it makes little difference which language or what kind of language becomes the international language, so long as agreement can be reached on any one.

For my own part, it seems to me that the main requirements of an international language are that it be easily learned, with the simplest possible spelling and grammar, phonetic pronunciation and the smallest possible vocabulary. With several hours of study daily, an adult should be able to master such a language within 3 months.

What can be done specifically to achieve the goal of a working international language? In my opinion, this: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) should call a conference of leading linguists from each of its 80 member nations. (This includes virtually every major populated area of the world except the Peoples' Republic of China.) The purpose of the conference would be, as Dr. Pei recommends, to choose an already existing language agreeable to the preponderant majority of the nations represented. Such an agreement won't be easy. It may take more than one conference.

A first such conference should be called promptly. We are sorely in need of such a first step. Only with an international language in effect, with children learning it as their second language in schools all over the world, with the proceedings of the United Nations and UNESCO eventually being published in it, can we close the gap between the one world so recently established in terms of travel time, and the one world we hope for in human terms.

Because I strongly believe that the closing of this gap is an imperative without which international accord remains only a pious hope—I've taken it upon myself to try to implement this proposal. Since it's most unlikely that either UNESCO or the nations involved have funds available to finance the linguists' conference, I feel that one of the great philanthropic foundations, such as the Ford, Carnegie or Rockefeller Foundations, should make it possible.

I have already approached one of these foundations for such a grant—and been turned down. I shall approach the others in turn. If I am turned down by all, I shall look for other ways of making this conference possible.

I urge you as parents to do whatever you can in your communities to make this goal of one language for one world, a living reality for our children.

## Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-eight Highlights of Activities in Nicolet National Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I received a résumé of the highlights of the 1958 activities in the Nicolet National Forest in Wisconsin.

These activities have included a variety of constructive accomplishments—similar, of course, to the activities in other forest areas across the Nation.

We recognize that over the years the preservation of our forest lands has made an important contribution to the economy, as well as to the enjoyment of our people.

During 1958 in the Nicolet Forest, for example, considerable progress was made toward timber harvesting and tree planting, development of recreational sites within the forest, constructive fish, game, and wildlife projects, participation in educational tours to interested students, teachers, and other groups, and other constructive activities.

Significantly, the management of our national forests is not, as some might think, solely a matter of cost to the taxpayer. As a matter of fact, it is a pleasure to point out that within the past 10 years, the income from the Nicolet Forest program has amounted to about $1.7 million. Of this, about 25 percent goes to the local counties in lieu of taxes; the remaining portion is turned over to the Treasury.

Currently, there are a number of measures before Congress relating to forest preservation, improvement, and expansion. To provide wider familiarity with the constructive accomplishments now

being achieved within our forests, I ask unanimous consent to have the résumé of the highlights of the Nicolet National Forest received from Mr. K. P. Butterfield, forest supervisor, of Rhinelander, Wis., printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF SOME OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE NICOLET NATIONAL FOREST IN 1958

Markets for wood products in 1958 were poor compared to previous years. Consequently, we did not make much progress toward attaining our goal of a harvest of 66,000 cords of pulpwood and 5,200,000 board feet of sawtimber. However, we were able to do about the same amount of business as we did in 1957. The situation for 1959 looks considerably better and we hope to increase timber production considerably in the next 12 months.

Other timber management activities were carried out at a more or less normal rate. These include tree planting, timber stand improvement, insect and disease control. The Saratoga spittlebug and pine sawfly continue to give us trouble in our red pine plantations. It was necessary to spray 4,239 acres in 1958.

I am happy to report that we had no serious fire situations during the year. Thirty fires burned 143 acres during 1958, compared to the average during the last 5 years of 26 fires and 79 acres. Although, as can be seen from these figures, the 1958 fire occurrence was greater than the 5-year average, it is not serious considering the unusual amount of severe fire weather that we had.

Considerable progress has been made on Operation Outdoor during the year. Thirty-two new camping and picnicking sites were established. In addition, 40 sites were rehabilitated and modernized. One new area on Seven Mile Lake in Forest County containing 11 camping and 6 picnicking sites will be ready for occupancy at the beginning of the camping season. Visitors continue to increase. There were an estimated 47,000 recreational visits in 1957 and 56,000 in 1958 at camping and picnicking areas alone.

The work in game and fish management has been given a boost by the employment of a wildlife biologist. He is Mr. Roger Kirkman, who has been with us since September. All of our work continues to be done with the excellent cooperation of the Wisconsin Conservation Department. Together we have been able to survey 145 miles of fishing streams which are now being classified as to suitability for trout management. As soon as the data collected has been compiled and analyzed we will have a good base for planning a stream improvement program.

Deer harvest increased slightly over 1957 under the party permit law, but it was not great enough to reduce the herd to a point where it can live safely on the available range. Some additional access roads have been built to provide access into the more critical areas as an inducement to hunters. A great deal more needs to be done. The inadequate harvest of deer continues to be our greatest land management problem.

No annual report about the Nicolet would be complete without mentioning Trees for Tomorrow. In cooperation with that organization the National Forest Rangers conducted some 1,500 students, teachers and other groups to points of interest throughout the forest.

The attached fact sheet gives some statistics on the national forest and its activities:

*Some facts about the Nicolet National Forest, 1958*

| | |
|---|---|
| General information: | |
| Gross area of forest (acres) | 988,853 |
| Net national forest ownership acres | 638,923 |
| Area protected from fire (acres) | 937,453 |
| Number of developed recreation areas | 28 |
| Fishing streams (miles) | 840 |
| Lakes (number, 207) (acres) | 34,614 |
| Yearlong employees | 28 |
| Seasonal employees | 60 |
| Area planted to date | 69,614 |
| Accomplishments during the year: | |
| Timber sold (pulpwood) (cords) | 39,000 |
| Timber sold (sawtimber) (million board feet) | 2,400 |
| Timber harvested (pulpwood) (cords) | 53,000 |
| Timber harvested (sawtimber) (million board feet) | 2,500 |
| Tree planting (acres) | 203 |
| Timber stand improvement (acres) | 6,107 |
| Insect and disease control (acres) | 4,239 |
| Roads maintained (miles) | 416 |
| Roads constructed (miles) | 10 |
| Number of recreational visitors to the forest | 301,000 |
| Number of hunters | 49,000 |
| Number of fishermen | 83,000 |
| Total national forest receipts | $179,753 |
| Receipts per acre | $0.28 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Receipts returned to counties for local schools and roads: | |
| Florence | $5,691 |
| Forest | 23,533 |
| Langlade | 2,181 |
| Oconto | 9,585 |
| Oneida | 703 |
| Vilas | 3,245 |
| Total | 44,938 |

## Administration of the REA Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me recently, from a lady in the State of North Dakota, in regard to the REA program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

We members of the Vesta Farmers Union Local, Walsh County, gathered in the city hall at Adams, N. Dak., for the regular monthly meeting on February 20, after discussing the attacks made by the present administration on our REA program passed the following resolution:

"Whereas electric power is of utmost importance in our lives on the land and its use is being greatly increased every year to the extent that present REA equipment must in many cases be replaced by more adequate facilities and as many rural areas are developed requiring REA service; and

"Whereas REA is bound by its area coverage covenant to serve all rural areas regardless of location; and

"Whereas REA came to the rescue of our rural people when private utilities ignored this segment of our population even when low-cost Government funds were made available to them: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge our entire delegation in Congress to:

"1. Support legislation which will make adequate Federal funds available to REA for lending purposes.

"2. Continue the present 2-percent interest rate as provided by the Pace Act of 1944.

"3. Return the lending authority to the REA Administration as provided by the original REA Act.

"4. Impose no unfair income tax on REA or other nonprofit cooperative association."

Respectfully,

Mrs. JOHN L. JOHNSON,
*Secretary.*

## The Communists' Most Deadly Weapon: Brainwashing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address given by Mr. Edward Hunter, who first analyzed for the world in his classic book, "Brainwashing in China," the diabolical use of psychiatry, not to heal mental illness, but to produce it. The Communist objective is not that of former conquerors—to seize land and possessions. It is to gain control of man—the mind of man, the soul of man, the whole of man. It cannot be denied that they will continue to make gains, here as well as elsewhere, until we wake up as a people, analyze this new type of total warfare, develop effective countermeasures to defeat its program of subversion and positive measures to further our own philosophy of freedom. It is for the accomplishment of these all-important tasks that the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy are proposed in H.R. 3880 and H.R. 3881 introduced by Congressman HERLONG of Florida, and myself.

The address by Mr. Hunter follows:

MILLIONS OF CHILDREN BRAINWASHED—TO DESTROY AMERICA

There is something particularly reprehensible about taking helpless babies and trusting children, with their truly pure minds, and deliberately planting evil ideas into them, deceiving them into accepting falsehood and crime as good and true.

Dickens' character, Fagin, is a particularly loathsome creature to us, but far more loathsome is he who goes even further than Fagan, and teaches not only the tricks of thievery but calculatingly deforms little minds into unnatural, sick patterns. We do not even attribute such bestiality to the devil.

Yet the Reds are doing it. It is the smaller children now, those still babies in arms, against whom the Communist hierarchy aims

its most intensive propaganda pressures, literal braining of a clinical, hospital nature.

Children have always been the target of the Red network, but usually after they reached school age. Never before have they been so methodically seized while so very young, out of the very arms of their parents; never before with such mad singleness of purpose.

We know that students who had never been taught anything but communism fought it in Hungary with their bare hands. We should know that never before did a people cast a greater vote of nonconfidence in a regime than did the Chinese, in the brief period of the "Hundred Flowers" movement of plain-speaking, during the less than 6 weeks before the Communist Party angrily called it off, replacing it by a purge.

As a consequence of these setbacks, the Peking-Moscow Axis made a cold reapprisal of tactics. They should have taken a new look into the rationality of communism, to determine whether it wasn't fundamentally wrong and unworkable. Instead, they made a study of the strategy used in enforcing it, "the better to devour you with, my dear little children," as the wolf said to Little Red Riding Hood.

The world has seen the burning hatred displayed against the Reds by the Hungarian people in their revolt. But too few of us know that Red China is a land of continuing revolt. During the "Hundred Flowers" movement, instead of criticizing inside of the approved political framework of all roads leading to socialism (by which communism is meant), the Peking Government was denounced and cursed and warned that the people would rise up and kill the Communists.

A flood of hatred poured like hot lava out of every stratum of Chinese society, in the professions and among the students and intellectuals, even among Communist functionaries, some holding high positions.

Editors who ran stories about it later confessed that they had opened their pages freely to this material because it represented their own sentiments, too.

FOREIGN AID CANNOT COMPENSATE FOR U.S. INDIFFERENCE

What was the reaction of our country, which we proclaim the home of the brave and the land of the free?

Put yourself in the place of people abroad, and you will understand why our stock has fallen so low, after the way we let down the Hungarian freedom fighters, and the way a concerted campaign attempted to hush up the anguished Chinese cries with indecent demands that we even turn over more Chinese people to the Red maw. We haven't enough dollars to funnel out in our aid programs to counterbalance the reputation thus sadly lost.

Meanwhile, the Red hierarchy resorted to new control measures, setting up a network of communes in China that spelled out the utter destruction of the family—not merely the family system—but the family as such.

All women were sent into the fields and factories to labor and into dormitories to sleep. The line between the person called prisoner and the individual called free was erased in China; the same collective prison life was imposed on both. Slave labor took over from the prison and the village alike. Babies were taken from their mothers, to be raised and indoctrinated collectively.

Children between 9 and 13 were organized into supplementary youth production corps and males of 13 to 60 were put into work battalions, all militarized. One estimate by Taipei says that 25 million children were taken from their homes and placed in state nurseries.

This is the Pavlovian system, now applied generally and cunningly throughout the Soviet Union, from Leningrad to Tashkent. It is being applied even more rigorously, but sloppily and much less scientifically, in these new Chinese communes.

Pavlov showed that predetermined reactions could be induced in dogs and monkeys by ringing bells and flashing differently colored lights. For humans, the Reds have substituted words and slogans—often along with the bells and lights. A controlled environment is absolutely necessary for this.

It goes back to Marx's mad vision of a so-called "New Soviet Man," who would rise almost overnight—and naturally. Lenin, who saw that nothing of the sort could happen, took recourse in Pavlov's experiments, to try to bring it about by force.

But, Hungary and China are evidence that, even when people are brainwashed for years, if given the chance, they will destroy the Red network. Realization of this was what made the power-mad Red leaders extend their psychological warfare all the way to the cradle.

They intend to raise a generation that can have no memories except false ones, that will be utterly insectivized, expecting nothing as individuals, everything only in the collective, that will look upon the Communist Party as mother and father, and the sole repository of faith.

Of course, this is sheer madness and cannot work. Left to itself, it would explode. Only by inducing the free world to betray its own principles and to doublecross the tortured peoples in the Red lands can communism save itself.

This is the task it has given to us. This is the mission of the Mikoyans; he is the perfect emblem, a murderer in Budapest and the gigolo in American economy.

With all the toadying we did for Mikoyan, and all the opportunity we gave him to soften up the Americans during his recent visit, he couldn't control our environment—and that was his Achilles heel.

Our Hungarian and other refugees awoke us from our trance state by constant reminders who he was. These refugees from Communist horrors might yet save America. They, at least, have saved our honor. What more wondrous repayment could they make for the haven our country has given them.

Our softening up, as part of the brainwashing pattern, is the objective of the pro-Red coexistence movement, in which cultural exchanges work out as a pro-Communist operating arm. We had an introduction to it in the Bolshoi Ballet with its accompanying horde of secret agents, and in Mikoyan's barely concealed anti-American propaganda while a guest of the United States Government.

Is anyone fooled by the obvious hoax that he came uninvited, as a tourist? He engaged scathingly in overt and covert psychological warfare while on our shores. Why blame Moscow and Pekin for it? We let them get away with it.

Haven't the Red theorists all along maintained that we will dig our own graves? Isn't this exactly what the free world has been doing? It is a matter of character, of convictions. These examples of how easily we bite at the Red bait are powerful pressures exploited by the Reds against their own peoples, to deprive them of all hope.

REDS PLAN A ROBOT ARMY

Meanwhile, babies and the youth generally in Red China are being brainwashed by Pavlovian techniques into regarding the free world as a symbol of everything that makes them unhappy, of what must be wiped out before they can enjoy the Communist paradise. Persia's "Old Man of the Mountain" perpetrated no greater deceit.

The Hungarian revolt rid communism of its ideological mask, and showed it nakedly as a sheer power system, the hordes of Genghis Khan all over again.

This new Pavlovian rape of the children's minds reveals the objectives of the revised Red strategy as the formation of new janissaries, a robot army, that will be available to march or fly anywhere, against any part of the earth that remains uncommunized by then.

The children on China's mainland are given texbooks that teach hygiene of the body on one page, and political hygiene on another page, representing ourselves as the bacteria.

This is no new policy. We have tried to forget it, and to hush up the books that told us. Try to get them at your bookshops. Have we forgotten the kidnapped Greek children, and the so-called Little Devils recruited by kidnaping by the Chinese Red armies? And the little boys and girls in Korea who were taught that American soldiers were handing out poisoned candy? And the classroom songs that breathe the hatred of America?

Woe be to whatever man or nation collaborates wittingly or unwittingly in such an evil design. We will not be able to hide behind any such flimsy diplomatic evasion as the Communist code word of noninterference, which Adlai Stevenson found out in his interview with Khrushchev meant only one thing to the Reds—noninterference in Communist intrigue, espionage and expansion anywhere in the world, even on American soil.

Stevenson said that events inside the Communist world are none of the West's business, Khrushchev told him it must stand aside while his new system of society exploits the nationalist awakening and social unrest in the world, and spreads from country to country.

When Red leaders expose their doublethink so openly, how can any man or woman claim ignorance as an excuse?

The longer we ignore, the more the cancer spreads. Face to face with this sickness in our world, no man can call himself guiltless who does not oppose it every way he can, and no man can hope to escape the price for his sins of omission.

## West Point Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement regarding the celebration of March 16 as West Point Day throughout New York State. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

March 16 was celebrated throughout New York State as West Point Day. Carrying on the tradition of his predecessors, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller issued a proclamation in honor of the anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Military Academy.

We in the Empire State are proud that this bastion of our military strength is located in our midst. We are proud of the fine record established by graduates of the Academy, for over the years they have written their names boldly and gloriously on the pages of our Nation's history. In war and in peace, their distinguished performances have reflected great credit on their alma

mater. For at West Point, these young men learn not only the skills of war, but the ability to lead in time of peace.

Often, I believe, we tend to overlook the many, many ways in which our Army contributes to the Nation's welfare in peacetime by means other than strictly military activities. Through the Corps of Engineers and numerous other programs, the Army contributes greatly to our internal strength.

As Governor Rockefeller noted in his proclamation:

"In the new challenges which confront us, West Point men are in the vanguard of those not only coping with today's problems, but also preparing to meet those of tomorrow."

We in the United States can truly look to the future with confidence, secure in the knowledge that West Point graduates, in cooperation with their fine brothers from the other service Academies, will be constantly on the job.

I am proud to take this opportunity to salute the men and traditions of the U.S. Military Academy. As we pause to observe another West Point Day, we can be confident that the Academy's future graduates will continue to hold high the famed heritage which has brought security and progress to our Nation.

## Tribute to Representative Leo W. O'Brien, Sponsor of Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, with Hawaii approaching the hour when she assumes her well-deserved membership in our Union of States, I am sure we all share the pride and the pleasure of her people and her many friends in this great accomplishment.

It was my privilege last fall to visit Hawaii, with a five-member delegation from the Senate and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, and I returned more than ever convinced that Hawaii should become a State.

A member of that delegation was Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York, the articulate and determined voice for Hawaiian statehood in the other body. No man could have been a more delightful or interesting companion, and it was my pleasure to enjoy his company much of the time the delegation was in Hawaii.

While we were there, the Honolulu Advertiser of November 28, 1958, published what I consider to be an excellent word portrait of LEO WILLIAM O'BRIEN of New York's 13th Congressional District. I take this opportunity to request the insertion of this news article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII WILL COST O'BRIEN JOB

(By Al Goodfader)

LEO W. O'BRIEN, a smiling Irishman from upstate New York, has taken over the headlines here in his efforts to work himself out of a job.

He's the man who will spearhead a drive to make Hawaii a State within the next 2 years. If he's successful, he'll lose his job as chairman of the Territories subcommittee of the House Interior Committee. The committee won't have any business to conduct.

O'BRIEN is determined to finish a double play that will place his name in American history books. He was successful last year in leading Alaska to statehood. He's confident Hawaii will become a State within 2 years.

He and his colleagues are here informally investigating Hawaii's fitness for admission.

At 58, O'BRIEN has spent more time writing about the news than he has in making it.

He was a newsman for more than 30 years before his first election to Congress.

He's worked for the New York Times and other papers in New York State. He headed the International News Service bureau in Albany, the capital of New York, for 25 years.

He covered the presidential campaigns of Al Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Thomas E. Dewey.

When he branched out into television commentary, he won the Sigma Delta Chi (professional journalism society) and Ohio State University awards for excellence as a commentator.

Then, in April 1952, the Democratic Party in Albany offered O'BRIEN its nomination in a special congressional election. He's never looked back.

He beat his opponent for reelection to his fifth term this year by more than 50,000 votes. He credits his statehood activities for part of his election bulge.

But his manner probably helped also. He's a quiet man who unleashes the force of his convictions indirectly. He makes his points with a quip. But if they are challenged, O'BRIEN's ruddy face draws into earnest lines and he leans toward the speaker to reason intently.

His path and that of Hawaiian statehood endeavors crossed accidentally. When he first went to Congress he was stuck on the Interior Committee because there weren't any other committee assignments open.

He first became concerned with Alaska's and Hawaii's cause when two bills proposing their admission were being debated on the floor of the House.

"I noticed that they were defeated largely because a man from New York pinned the Communist tag on Hawaii," he says. "I thought that rather unfair when you consider the number of Communists in New York State."

The man from New York was Representative JOHN R. PILLION, O'BRIEN says. They became antagonists on the statehood question although a previous personal friendship has remained unshaken.

That 1955 experience also convinced O'BRIEN that the two bills should be separated.

He followed that conviction last year, leading off with the Alaska bill. The plan then was to pass the Alaska bill in 1957, then bring in Hawaii.

His newspaper friends told O'BRIEN he was naive in thinking he could pass either.

It took some doing. He ran into a filibuster in his own committee. He says he made a mistake in giving Alaska opponents free rein to maneuver against it.

Then the Rules Committee of the House dragged its feet. By the time O'BRIEN had outflanked that road block in 1958 it was late in the congressional session. Too late, he says, to try for Hawaii.

The decision to wait until next year was his, O'BRIEN says.

He wants the bill to be a fresh issue. He's sure it would have been defeated if it entered the last minute-log-jam as Congress was heading home this year.

He hopes to have the Hawaii bill up for a vote in the House before the Easter recess of 1959. Then, he thinks, senatorial opponents won't be able to filibuster it to death when it reaches the Senate the same year.

"It's possible the Senate could block it during the first year (of the next Congress)," he says, but not in 1960. He feels there are enough votes in the Senate to pass Hawaiian statehood after the filibuster ends.

What's in it for him?

He's happy about the fact that Alaska is going to name a small body of water "Terence Lake" after one of his grandchildren.

"I just happen to have some other grandchildren," he told a reporter.

"If you happen to have an unnamed small volcano over here——"

## Extravagant Handouts by the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the California Grange News. This editorial endorses my position that there should have been a limit on payments to large farmers under our agriculture program.

Our present agriculture law is underwriting the expansion of the large corporate type farming at the expense of the small family type farm.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HURRAH FOR SENATOR WILLIAMS

The revelation that 10 large farm operators in 1957 received a total of $500,000 from the Government in soil bank payments plus an additional $3,500,000 in price support loans comes as something of a shock to a number of Congressmen.

One of them, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has made two speeches in the past few weeks on the extravagance of these Government handouts.

He cites a large operator in Stratford, Calif., who in 1957 received $854,450 of price supports on cotton and another $129,942 for placing 1,293.9 acres in the soil bank.

WILLIAMS points out that the purpose of these programs is to help the family farmer, yet actually the opposite is the inevitable result. "The time is long overdue," he said, "when Congress should recognize the unfairness of the present program not only from the standpoint of the American taxpayers and the American consumers but also from the standpoint of the bona fide family farms."

This kind of talk from a Congressman is precisely the sort the California State Grange likes to hear. For the past 3 years State Grange Master George Schlmeyer, in all parts of California and the Nation's Capitol as well, has been thumping upon this point.

Whatever the program adopted to relieve the economic pressure on the farmer, the Grange leader has said, a limit must be placed upon the amount any one producer

may receive. Otherwise, the program planned to aid the small will only further enrich the big operator.

This rule, the State master has emphasized, applies equally to the soil bank, acreage reserve program, price support, any form of the Brannan plan—and any other new idea which comes along.

## Effects of the New Farm Law on Cotton Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George C. Cortright of Rolling Fork, Miss., is one of the outstanding agricultural leaders in the country. I am proud of the recognition he has received in being named president of the American Cotton Producer Associates, and I am sure he will have a distinguished record as head of that group. As chairman of the agriculture committee of the Delta Council, and as president of the council for 1 year, Mr. Cortright has given valued service to the Nation's agricultural community. In these many capacities he has appeared before several congressional committees, and he is well known in agricultural circles, currently serving as a member of the Cotton and Cottonseed Research and Marketing Advisory Committee.

Mr. Cortright published an article in the Cotton Trade Journal on the effects of the new farm law on cotton producers, and I think it is one of the best brief summaries of this law that I have seen. I am glad to have this statement in behalf of the bill, which we worked out last year after so long a struggle. I think everyone who is interested in agriculture will be interested in Mr. Cortright's article, and under unanimous consent I include it here:

EFFECTS OF THE NEW FARM LAW ON COTTON PRODUCERS

(By George C. Cortright, president, American Cotton Producer Associates)

Many Members of the Congress when engaging in between-session discussions of the Agricultural Act of 1958 with their constituents, began by saying "I voted for S. 4029; but—." One would infer that they were half apologetic for their support of this act, and had serious misgivings as to the wisdom of its enactment. True, the new farm bill is not perfect, not a panacea for all of cotton's ills, but it represents a major step toward meeting cotton's problems in a realistic manner. While all of no one individual's thinking is incorporated into the bill, it contains the composite best compromise of ideas in the Department of Agriculture, farm organizations and the cotton industry. Such legislation often serves the national interest better than that developed by single individuals or interest groups.

No producer, indeed no segment of the cotton industry, is due an apology for anyone's support of the bill. Its merits, as the merits of any situation, must be judged on a basis of the alternatives. How then does it affect producers and what were the alternates?

A drastic cut in acreage at the national level that was inevitable under the then current law was avoided. This cut would have been 22 percent below the 1958 allotments, which many producers believed was too small to permit development of efficiencies. The provision pertaining to the national reserve for small farms expired in 1958, so the actual cut to individual farmers in States having a large number of small farms would have been still greater. For many this would have meant the end of cotton production as a major farm enterprise. Additional reductions of 22 to 25 percent would have forced some farmers out of business.

By providing a choice program, the bill enables farmers to make their own decisions in 1959 and 1960, and those who feel that they can produce cotton with less price protection can expand their acreage. It seems a dilemma has been created by permitting producers to have a free choice between two options. The mental gymnastics and contortions some are subjecting themselves to are ludicrous. For them though, this is a healthy dilemma for it forces a thorough reappraisal and reevaluation of all phases of their operations. Farmers who choose to increase acreage will still have a stop loss loan that can be used as an orderly marketing tool. An expanded acreage will permit those who have good land, equipment, and labor available to lower per unit production costs provided that yields can be maintained.

The acreage reduction required by the bill for farmers who do not feel that it is to their advantage to increase acreage has been minimized. An inevitable 22 percent cut in the national allotment has been reduced to about 8 percent. Little change will therefore be required in their farming operation as compared to 1958. Then, too, these farmers will be insured a price about equal to that for the 1958 crop.

The provision in the bill providing that any farmer who had an allotment of 10 acres or less in 1958 will not have to take a reduction in future years is of major political, economic and social significance. Sixty-six percent of the farms growing cotton in the United States had allotments of 10 acres or less in 1958. In some States this figure exceeded 80 percent, and in one State it amounted to 98 percent. The cotton acreage, however, on farms of this size group accounts for only 16 percent of the total cotton acreage. This provision therefore virtually solves one of the greatest headaches connected with the cotton program. While many of these small producers will probably go out of production as a result of the soil bank termination and for other reasons, they will not be legislated out of the picture.

Cotton has suffered sharp losses in markets under current pricing policies. The domestic consumption has declined steadily in recent years, primarily because of market losses to rayon, which has sold for a cheaper price. This trend gave every evidence of continuing at an accelerated pace until only 5 to 6 million bales would be consumed annually in the United States. Cotton farmers therefore faced dwindling markets and continued reductions in acreage. The new farm bill will make cotton more competitive price-wise with rayon. It will also guarantee a more stable supply of the grades and staples needed by the mills. At the termination of the option features in 1960 and with the institution of a single support level for all, 70 percent in 1960 and 65 percent thereafter, based on the average grade and staple of the crop; cotton should then be fully competitive with domestic rayon. Instead of dwindling markets, there is now hope for expanding markets in the future.

The bill also safeguards the export program by providing that nothing in the act should be construed to affect or modify the provision of the Agricultural Act of 1956 which directs that such a program be initiated and that such quantities of cotton be offered and sold as will reestablish and maintain a fair historical share of the world market for U.S. cotton. This section is of major importance to producers since it specifically gives the Secretary of Agriculture full authority ever to maintain foreign markets on which the U.S. cotton producer is dependent. This provision becomes even more significant in the light of the trade war that is now taking shape between Communist-dominated countries and the free world. It could well be the deciding factor in the battle for markets through which the Communist bloc seeks to extend its sphere of influence. Should such a battle for markets develop, producers could not pay the price for fighting it alone since two-fifths of their market would be involved.

Those sections of the act that deal with the method of determining the national marketing quota will give much stability to the level of planting on individual farms in future years. With average yields per acre advancing rapidly the minimum allotment consistent with 10 million bales appeared extremely low. This minimum was changed to set the national marketing quota at the greater of:

1. The number of bales needed to provide a normal supply of cotton (the basic formula).

2. Ten million bales or one million bales less than estimated domestic consumption plus exports.

3. Bales required to provide a national acreage allotment of 16 million acres.

Thus, after 1961 the annual variation of farm allotments should not exceed 7 percent and never be below the allotments offered under the A option in 1959.

It is true that the new farm bill will not immediately solve all of cotton's problems. It will not regain markets overnight. It assures manufacturers that the price of cotton will be more competitive in the future and that the supply will be more stable. It gives hope to the volume-dependent segments of the industry: ginners, crushers, warehousemen, shippers. It permits the futures market to fluctuate in a wider range and should stimulate hedging opportunities. It provides producers with a transition period during which they can make needed adjustments, and enables each to plan his production for the next 2 years based on his own individual capabilities and desires. It is constructive, forward-looking legislation. It deserves the support of the entire industry.

## Rockland Plans Tests for Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the New York Times of March 12. I know it will be of great interest to us all, because we are all deeply interested in anything that can help us to eradicate one of the greatest scourges in our midst: cancer.

Mr. Speaker, the plan described in the article is being carried forward in Rockland County in my district. The plan is a detection plan and we know that the early detection of cancer is essential to its cure. Lawrence deNeufville, Mrs. Coyle, and Mrs. St. Lawrence are to be congratulated, as are many others in Rockland County, who are working for what we all hope will be a most successful

program. It is something that may well sweep the country if it proves to be as successful as the sponsors and workers believe it will be.

ROCKLAND PLANS TESTS FOR CANCER: MASS DETECTION PROGRAM TO BEGIN IN APRIL, WITH COST CUT TO $25 A PATIENT

SPRING VALLEY, N.Y., March 11.—Plans for a countrywide cancer detection service were announced here tonight by Alan Stevenson, executive director of the New York State division of the American Cancer Society.

Rockland County has been selected for the experiment, which it will begin in April and will be carried out by the Rockland County Medical Society in collaboration with the Rockland County unit of the American Cancer Society.

Only Rockland County residents who are free of symptoms, regardless of age, will be eligible for the detection examination, which may be arranged at the Friendly Red Door in New City. Mrs. Harry Coyle, county director of the Rockland unit, will set up the program.

The medical society has assembled a panel of physicians to perform the examinations. The patient may select any physicians to perform the examinations, from an alphabetical list. The doctor's office will be the focal point for the examinations, which include X-rays, blood studies and smears.

This type of screening examination ordinarily would cost more than $75, according to Lawrence deNeufville, president of the Rockland County unit. In this project, however, the cost will be $25.

The applicant must fill out at home a history sheet. He also will receive a specimen kit and will arrange for a lung X-ray. All specimens will be examined in either the Nyack Hospital or Good Samaritan Hospital in Suffern. Reports will be made to the physician selected by the patient.

Mrs. Joseph I. St. Lawrence, a director of the local unit, will be in charge of publicizing the drive and organizing large groups such as employees of the larger local industries to participate in the program. The American Cancer Society will send observers, who will prepare for the installation of the program nationally.

---

## Danger: Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the International Operating Engineer of October 1958 entitled "Danger: Pollution."

DANGER: POLLUTION

Signs such as the above are appearing with greater frequency along some of America's streams. These signs spell out the unpleasant fact that water pollution is one of our most critical problems. Behind these signs is a long and complicated story, a story of population growth, industrial expansion, waste of resources and a failure of America to keep pace with its needs for one of our simplest but most important resources: Clean water.

Most people realize the importance of water in every day living, but few realize its importance in industrial use. The growth in demand for good water is spelled out in figures of astronomic magnitude.

In 1900 our 75 million people were using about 41 billion gallons of water daily. A half century later, the population had doubled, but the demand for water had risen to 185 billion gallons a day—almost 5 times as much as in 1900. Today our population is 175 million and our industry is expanding tremendously to meet the greater stepped-up demands.

Water is the most important single resource in industrial manufacture. It takes 18 barrels of water to refine a barrel of oil and 300 gallons of water to make a barrel of beer and 10 gallons of water are used refining a gallon of gasoline. Some 250 tons of water are used in handling a ton of sulfate wood pulp and from 600 to 1,000 tons of water are used for each ton of coal burned in a steam powerplant. A large paper mill will use more water each day than a city of 50,000.

While our industry is growing and our population is exploding all over the landscape, another heavy demand is growing in the use of water, the water of our streams and lakes. This use is the composite of needs shown by the recreation industry—fishing, swimming, boating. Recreation in these days of shortened workweeks and increased leisure through union-won vacations has become a major American industry. The sales of fishing licenses is growing with astonishing degree. In the most recent national survey by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service almost 12 million people hunt and 21 million people fish.

The number of boats being used is increasing year by year as more and more water enthusiasts take to the water for power boating or sail boating. And swimming has always been a popular sport in America.

The whole business of water use is complex. Irrigation uses billions and billions of gallons daily in what the experts called "consumptive use" whereas those engaged in recreation are both "nonconsumptive" and "nonpolluting." On the other hand, cities and towns and industries consume water and pollute it. The conflicts arising over the many and complex needs for water is leading to serious problems in the availability of good water.

While these many demands for water have been growing another development of almost tragic proportions has been taking place: pollution. Water is polluted by soil runoff caused by erosion or careless land use. Erosion grows progressively and as the runoff increases so does the silt which is taken to the streams to pollute the streams and fill up reservoirs behind our great dams.

The other form of pollution are wastes—sanitary sewage and industrial wastes. Sanitary sewage includes most of the material which goes down the drain through the sewer system: water from toilets, bathtubs, sinks, washings from restaurants, laundries, hospitals, hotels, etc. Industrial wastes include oils, greases, chemicals, animal and vegetable waste discharged by America's factories.

America used to be a rural Nation, but today most of our people live in city or urban areas. This means that a heavier burden is imposed on our sanitary system. When our population was smaller and largely rural, our streams were able to handle the burden of waste. But when the streams are overloaded they cannot handle the burden. The wastes thrown in the rivers use up the oxygen in the water and when the oxygen is gone, life is gone. Thus with pollution comes death to aquatic life and an end to fishing. In other words the water is dead.

Polluted water is dangerous water—dangerous to health and in most situations worse than no water at all. One of the most telling effects of pollution was stated by Charles H. Callison, director of the National Wildlife Federation in testifying before a House committee. He said:

"The contamination of the public water of America by dumping untreated sewage and industrial waste into the water is nothing more than literal, physical destruction of natural resources. What happens when a stream is befouled and poisoned by pollution?

"Industries requiring clean water for their processes have to seek plant sites elsewhere.

"The water cannot be safely used for swimming, boating, water skiing, or other forms of aquatic recreation. Parks and playgrounds along the shoreline must be posted with warning signs.

"Farmers cannot use the streams to irrigate their fields or water their livestock.

"Fish die in these waters. Waterfowl and other wildlife shun them.

"Real-estate values decline along the polluted river, because no one wants to live above the stench of an open sewer * * * all this is sheer waste. It is worse than waste; it is needless destruction of natural resources that this Nation can no longer afford."

America is faced with the water pollution problem which demands attack on a broad front. We have only so much water. We will not have more. We must make better use of what we have and quit wasting it through destructive pollution. The cities and towns which have been polluting the streams are awakening to the problem as is the Federal Government.

In 1956 Congress passed the Federal Water Pollution Act to be administered by the U.S. Public Health Service and here is the way we stand on the construction program encouraged by the practical application of the act.

As of the first of this month 1,203 offers of grants under the law had been made to cities and towns. These Federal grants provide 30 percent of the eligible cost of sewage treatment plants or $250,000, whichever sum is less. This may not seem like a large grant and it is not to cities, but to smaller areas $250,000 is a substantial lift.

By the first of this month $101,330,686.24 had been made in grants under the Federal Water Pollution Act. These grants will aid in the cost of about $464 million in treatment plants. Almost 600 plants are actually being built in the United States and about 200 have been completed with Federal aid. These range in size from small plants serving a local community to facilities of substantial size in our major metropolitan cities.

But these figures do not tell the whole story. Public health experts who live with this problem of pollution says that we should spend $575 million a year on sewage treatment plants each year for the next 8 years—just to catch up with the need and to handle the expanded needs and growth during this 8-year period. If we ever do catch up, no one will hazard a guess or an estimate as to how much will be needed to keep abreast of needs.

Conservation of the Nation's water supply for all needs is a problem of top priority, experts agree. A recent Rockefeller study of the national economy gives an estimated expenditure need for water supply and disposal at from $2.7 billion to $3.5 billion by 1967—which is at the rate of triple the 1957 expenditures.

The construction industry and construction tradesmen have a great stake in these needs. We are told that $1.4 billion is needed now for completely new treatment plants and another $321 million for enlargements and additions.

The cities and States are becoming alarmed at the pollution problem and a host of committees, authorities, organizations, and special groups have been created to do research,

activate legislation, and do what it takes to attack the pollution problem.

As the cities clean up their problem, attention on antipollution efforts will be directed to industry. And the story in industry is spotty indeed. Some forward-looking industries have realized that it is plain good business to look after pollution problems immediately while others have lagged. No one knows, not even the U.S. Public Health Service, how good a job is being done—or how bad.

If no one knows how much industry is spending, there are those who will hazard a guess. W. F. Bixby of the B. F. Goodrich Co., speaking before the Kentucky-Tennessee Industrial Wastes & Sewage Works Association last year said that 50 companies, according to a survey, are spending $18 million a year on water and air pollution elimination. "If this activity is typical," adds Mr. Bixby, "industry as a whole may now be spending $300 to $500 million per year to prevent the contamination of air and water. These figures constitute a powerful answer to the charge that industry, as a whole, does not want to participate in the program to clean the country's atmosphere and streams."

It would constitute a powerful answer, if true, but in this uncertain area of estimating what is being done, one wonders how many will accept the big figure which the speaker projected. The same speaker did outline in his address basic points essential for industry to pursue. He said that industry must maintain a realistic attitude toward waste disposal; it must use expert advice in designing, installing, and operating pollution control equipment and must be willing to install pollution control equipment in spite of the fact that investment return is limited; it must insist that pollution control equipment be properly used and finally plant management must insist that extreme care be used to prevent the discharge of objectionable material.

These are fine points—if carried out by all industry. That some steps are being taken is shown by the work of the National Technical Task Committee on Industrial Waste, a group organized several years ago to work with the U.S. Public Health Service. These task groups cover food industries, mineral products, chemical processing, and general industries. As technical advances are made in disposal problems, they are compiled in guides or booklets for the particular industries.

A constant body of technical knowledge is brought home to the technicians and management personnel of industry through professional publications, a leading one of which is the Journal of the Federation of Sewage and Industrial Wastes Association. This is an excellent publication, but as good as it is or as fine as the speeches are the ultimate success of industrial pollution control rests with what management does.

Spokesmen of the U.S. Public Health Service are encouraged by industry's steps and a realization by management that sheer economics is compelling practical attention to industrial wastes. Examples are cited whereby a chemical company dominant in a community has set up a control project which even handles city waste in the small area where it operates since it is the principal pollution agent. A paper company in West Virginia has built a plant to handle the waste of three small communities. These projects may be setting a laudable pattern for attacking the pollution problem.

A new type of waste problem is adding to the headaches of industry and government: radioactive waste. They cannot be oxidized or destroyed like ordinary wastes, nor do we know how deadly or how long these wastes may be lethal. Attention to this problem is one of immediate and critical importance.

In the meantime, sportsmen look with regret at the diminishing areas of fishing and boating and are determined to lend their influence to public agencies in saving our most precious asset—clean water.

---

## Ireland's Future Related in St. Patrick's Story by William James Conlon of Lynn, Mass.

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article on Ireland's future by my constituent, William James Conlon of Lynn, Mass., as it appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News on March 15, 1959:

IRELAND'S FUTURE RELATED IN ST. PATRICK'S STORY BY CONLON

(Ireland's future in the world and its place in the present crisis and the future struggle is related in the following St. Patrick's Day feature story by William J. Conlon of 23 Breed Street, outstanding scholar of Irish history. In this interesting article, Mr. Conlon places the ancestors of the Irish in the context of our times and points out what he thinks they would say on these matters. The article follows:)

In the course of my 40-odd years, I have attended a great many St. Patrick Day celebrations—listened to a great many speeches in praise of St. Patrick in particular and the Irish, God love-em' in general. I have even made a few myself. Looking back on them now—my own included—I think they may have been bad speeches, although they went over big. They were pretty much the same. They recounted the glorious history of St. Patrick, followed up with the accounts of the Irish heroes of history and their heroic deeds and then the speaker sat down with his audience emotionally charged and cheering.

I think now that those speeches may have been bad. Not because they were not oratorical masterpieces, nor because they were not true—but because they dwelt too much on the glories of the past and said nothing constructive about the future in which we and our children and their children must live.

Now I do not intend to ignore St. Patrick—he wasn't the kind of man you can ignore. Neither do I intend to forget the countless other Irish heroes, saintly or warlike or both. What I want to do is to place those ancestors of ours in the context of our times and to say what I think they would say about the future of Ireland and the world and Ireland's place in the present crisis and the future struggle.

The age in which St. Patrick lived was one in which the ancient institutions were breaking down and confusion reigned in men's minds. The Roman Empire was disintegrating and with it the political structure of the civilized world. Fear and uncertainty were everywhere in that chaotic time. Into his part of that world—into Ireland St. Patrick brought two great and related ideas—faith and freedom. He was first and foremost an apostle of the Catholic faith. There were apparently Christians in Ireland, but he made the country dominantly Christian and so thoroughly that Ireland became for the next several hundred years a center of learning and a center of missionary activity. It remained so in fact until the energies of the people were consumed in fighting off the attempts of their neighboring island to conquer them and they had no more left for teaching their arts and ethics to others. Up until that time Irish missionaries had gone to Scotland, to northern and central Europe, and Ireland was a kind of headquarters of culture and religion for western Europe. As well as being an apostle of faith and quite as logically, St. Patrick was an apostle of freedom. He had been a slave.

He endeavored to make people free. He challenged the royal authority of the pagan chieftains, protested and opposed raids by British bands, who carried Irish captains off into slavery and raised money for the ransoming of these captains. Ladies and gentlemen, the story of St. Patrick has peculiar relevance today because we live in a chaotic age. When the old structures, political and otherwise, on which humanity rested, are breaking down under the force of wars and history. Fear and uncertainty reign in many places and in many minds. Moreover, there is a great and powerful concerted attack on just the things for which St. Patrick stood. The specter of Soviet communism, which is stalking over the world today, is the denial of religious faith and at the same time the denial of human freedom. (Communism is Godless.) It is also a system of slavery, based on contempt for and oppression of the common man.

But there are weapons which will defeat Stalinism and Khrushchevism. They are the same weapons as those wielded by St. Patrick in his fight against false gods and inhuman men. On the one hand he held to his faith in God. On the other to his faith in human freedom and the human will to be free. These are indestructible and when we cling to them we are indestructible, too. That is the lesson of St. Patrick for this year, 1959. We know how these weapons served the Irish people—helped along, it is true, by other weapons which Irish courage saw fit to use—in the long struggle against domination, a struggle not yet completely won from the three O'Neills to the days of the immortal Wolfe Tone, from O'Connell and Parnell to the immortal Terrence McSwiney.

The Irish have kept their faith and freedom of spirit and their fists alive to fight against religious persecution and foreign control. The present government in Dublin is only a hindrance to complete freedom of all Ireland as advocated by the immortal Wolfe Tone and the united Irishmen of his time. Though the illegal wall built by the English stooges and partitioners is a scourge inflicted upon the Irish by the puppet stooges known as the Stormount clique and dictated to by England temporarily casts a gloom over Ireland. But the Almighty God never put a dividing line around the six northern counties.

Therefore it must definitely be wiped out. The coming generation of Irish youth will take care of and see to it that the six northern counties will be part and parcel of an all Ireland. As the immortal Mohart Emmett and Wolfe Tone advocated that it should be. There we will have a sovereign Irish state as the Almighty God left it by his own hands. The Irish have not fought for freedom in Ireland alone. The United States can count an endless number of heroes of Irish birth or descent. Charles Carroll, founder of the State of Maryland, was one of these and it was in Maryland that religious freedom was really born in this country. Twelve signers of the Declaration of Independence were Irish.

Eleven Irish generals of the Revolutionary Army, including a Sullivan and a Conway. The American Navy's Barry and McDonough and thousands of others who were either of Irish birth or descent, who fought to set this

country free from British tyranny and domination. Andrew Jackson, great defender of democracy, was of Irish descent. The list goes on through Gen. Phil Sheridan to Alfred Emanuel Smith, ex-Governor of the great State of New York, and the many Irish heroes of World War I and II, including General McAuliffe who said "Nuts" to the Germans at Bastogne. Cohen Kelley, who gave us renewed courage after Pearl Harbor, and the five Sullivan brothers who gave up their lives when the crusier *Juneau* was sunk by the Japanese in the Pacific. Now the achievements of these men were remarkable but they did not achieve what they did simply by sitting in admiration of St. Patrick. They followed the old precept of "go thou and do likewise." The glory of St. Patrick was reflected in their deeds but they also infused something of their own spirit. They took the good saint's principles and they fitted them to their own hour and their own need.

There is a lesson in that for we Irish, both here in America, in Ireland and throughout the world. Ireland and God knows our hearts are with her is now in what may be hoped are the last stages of the fight to end the pernicious partition and to become what Cardinal O'Connell referred to as "Ireland, one and indivisible, though the heavens fall. The opposition to partition—the fight for a United Ireland—are in the very best of Irish tradition. It has been a bitter war marked by British deceit and brutality and by typical Irish courage and patriotism.

It should not be forgotten nor should it be shelved. The world today has great need for the courage and faith in God and His principles that St. Patrick gave to the Irish. The whole world is now lined up in a cold war in which the issues are clear. The choice is between Western democracy and man's right to his belief in his God, on the one hand, and godless communism on the other. A world conflagration may break out at any moment.

In such a situation, I have no doubt at to what St. Patrick would do or say. He would be in the vanguard of forces for freedom and christianity leading the drive to rid the world of the serpent of communism. St. Patrick did not do his fighting from the sidelines, he led the way. It may be a bitter pill for the people of Ireland and for its leaders to realize that while the United Nations with the United States in the lead, are throwing the weight of the Western World into the battle in Korea, in an effort to throw out a foreign power occupying a part of the nation and to end the partition if possible. Ireland herself suffers under a no less unjustifiable occupation and partition and the rest of the world does nothing about it. England is left to work her will in the six stolen countries against the overwhelming majority of the Irish people in all Ireland.

In spite of this, we of Irish blood cannot afford to ignore our obligations to the principles laid down by St. Patrick, the principle that faith and freedom must be fought for if they are to be won and held. Communism has made fewer converts in Erie than anywhere else in the civilized world in proportion to population. It is up to Ireland to beat down the English threat which faces it and please ladies and gentlemen believe me very sincerely, this won't be accomplished by the tactics of the present Dublin government in power. DeValera and his spineless crew in the Dail in Dublin are holding young Irishmen in the Curragh Internment Camps in County Kildare without a trial. This is the exact same thing that Khrushchev is doing in Hungary and England is doing the self same thing in the six counties of Northern Ireland.

And remember ladies and gentlemen DeValera fought side by side with those young men he is holding in the internment camps in the Curragh Camps in Kildare. It means just one thing, that DeValera and England are working in conjunction with each other to keep Ireland a mutilated nation as she stands today and to think of what The Easter week martyrs died for. The late Gen. Michael Collins was shot in his own native County Cork for signing the so-called Free State which split Ireland into two parts, because England wanted it that way. The mutilated portion of Ireland now known as Eire has a delegate sitting in the United Nations for the past 6 or 7 years and he never opened his mouth about what England is doing in the 6 stolen counties. This delegate is just a dummy in the United Nations. He is not telling us what the government is doing in the 26 counties. Frank Aiken, Minister of External Affairs in the Dublin government came to the United Nations in New York and officially voted for the admission of Red Communist China into the United Nations and all this was taking place.

When His Eminence John Cardinal Dalton and Eamon DeValera were in Vatican City Rome, Italy having an audience with the late Pope Pius XII, and when Eamon DeValera returned to Dublin he stood up in the Dail and defended Frank Aiken's un-American and un-Irish tactics in the United Nations. So both DeValera and Aiken are looked down on in this country. Ireland and the Irish all over the world are disgusted and disgraced with this un-American and un-Irish job in the U.N.

Both Aiken and DeValera have lost all their millions of friends in these United States. In the city of New York, where DeValera was born, he has lost all of his hordes of friends over this matter. It's high time we had a new election in Eire and let DeValera retire to private life and the members of the Dail government should retire also. The present government is doing nothing only England's police work in Ireland. Their activities are a disgrace to the memory of the Easter week martyrs of 1916, who were executed by the British Government because they represented a free and independent Ireland. We have been thrilled by the details of the battle around Dublin Castle, and the heroism of the martyrs of Easter week. We have grieved over those who died in the uprising, or were executed afterward.

We know that though the uprising failed of its immediate purpose, it lit fires in the hearts of Irishmen everywhere which have not yet been extinguished. For 2 years thereafter the civil conflict continued with the Sinn Feins leading the way and leading the Irish people in their resistance to British rule. Eventually in December of 1918, a general election was ordered for the whole of Ireland, supposedly to settle once and for all the question of independence for Ireland.

The costly attempt to maintain control by force and the weight of world opinion as varied in the proclamation of the night to self-determination by the victorious democracies in World War I, has forced England to this step. Despite the fact that the election was carried out while a British army occupied the whole island, the result was overwhelmingly in favor of national independence. Out of 105 electoral divisions 79 voted for independence and only 26 against. The popular vote was over 80 percent in favor of complete independence. In response to this expression of the national will, the elected representatives of the people of Ireland assembled in Dublin on January 21, 1919, and declared Ireland an independent nation and established a government, and the Dail Eireann, the national legislature.

The English, going back on their promises, refused to recognize this action and thus a virtual state of war broke out between the Irish Republic and Great Britain. The British sent in their Black and Tan's, imposed martial law, and tried to force Ireland to give up her national independence. Ireland of course continued the battle. Finally, as a last resort, the British Parliament, on December 23 ,1920, without an Irishman voting, passed a Government of Ireland Act—the Act of Partition—whereby the six stolen counties were cut off (from the homeland) by England, of course without a political mandate of the people of Ireland.

The Irish people rightfully refused to accept this settlement. The Sinn Feinn again led the war against the Black and Tans that constituted the British occupation forces and the attempt to force the acceptance of the British was wholly unsuccessful in the greater part of Ireland. Despite the fact that a Northern Ireland Parliament was set up in Belfast, even this was the will of the English Government only and was opposed by the majority in the six stolen counties cut off by England. It was during this period that the heroic hunger strikes took place and Terence MacSwiney, in giving up his life, brought world sympathy to the Irish cause.

In the partition election of May 1941, intended to put the Government of Ireland into effect, out of a total of 186 seats in both the north and south parliaments, 140 won by the Republicans. Thus Ireland, as a whole, repudiated the act. The British again set up martial law and bitter fighting again took place. Finally on December 6, 1921, after 6 months of negotiations between the leaders of Sinn Feinn and the British, a treaty was signed establishing the Irish Free State and partition became an absolute fact. Even with this, the English deceit was not ended. Since the treaty called for raising the boundary between Northern Ireland and the Free State to free some of the Irish Republicans who form a majority in four of the six stolen counties, and this was never done.

England's latest act, intended to cement her position in Northern Ireland, was to pass the so-called Ireland bill in May of 1949. In this bill they presumed to declare that Northern Ireland would never cease to be a part of the United Kingdom, without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland.

Incidentally this is a fine time for England to begin to worry about obtaining the consent of her northern subject Government, when questions of how they are to be ruled came up. This Ireland bill has served to keep Ireland out of participation in the North Atlantic Defense Treaty. Since one of the purposes of that treaty is to preserve the territorial integrity of participating nations and Ireland fears that her adherence to the pact would be interpreted as recognizing England's claim, that Northern Ireland is an integral part of the United Kingdom.

That is where the matter stands today. Despite protest after protest, the English have refused to concede that by any standard. Ireland should be one and united. Irishmen in either north or south, consider themselves as Irsh and not English or British, or anything but Irish. The population is homogeneous. The island is one geographic unit. Her history and traditions are distinctly national and even her churches, whether Catholic or Protestant are organized on a national, all-Ireland basis. Her learned bodies and her sports organizations are nationwide. Ireland is divided only in the minds of the Government of England and in measures England has forced upon that gallant little nation. What can we here do to end this intolerable situation?

It is true that our State Department has said that we should be concerned. But I say that is no more internal than South

Korea and we are certainly involved there. It is no more right that the island of Ireland should be divided, than that the Korean peninsula should be.

Fortunately we Americans of Irish descent or birth do have a program for putting the great moral weight of the United States behind the fight to end partition in Ireland and to end English rule there forevermore. In April of last year the committee on foreign affairs of the House of Representatives held hearings on a number of resolutions which had been introduced in the House and which would have put the United States solidly on record as favoring the unification of Ireland. Some of these resolutions provided means for our active participation in action leading to unification. Those resolutions had been introduced by Members of Congress of Irish descent and received strong support in the hearings on the subject. Unfortunately the Foreign Affairs Committee did not see fit to report any of them to the floor of the House. You may be sure, however, that this program will not be allowed to die and we hope that the U.S. Congress will eventually take action, placing this country in the fight to end partition and leading this fight as it should. Ireland has made great contributions in culture and leadership to the United States. She has given the same strong support to democratic ideals. It is high time that the United States do something to help Ireland gain her complete freedom.

We of Irish blood in Congress did something else last year to open the eyes of the English to how strong the feeling in this country is in opposition to the partition of Ireland by England.

On March 29 of last year or I should say 2 years ago when the Foreign Assistance Act of 1950 was under consideration by the House, an amendment was introduced by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, and was accepted. This amendment was designed to withhold assistance to the United Kingdom until partition in Ireland was ended. Although the amendment was later stricken from the bill it did awaken England to some consciousness of American and world feeling on the matter. As a matter of fact, there was much scurrying about the Capitol and the State Department by worried British diplomats during the period of debate on the bill. These actions have forced England.

To take a new look at her policy in Ireland, you may be sure and all the other Congressmen who have engaged in this fight until England does more than simply take a new look. We want her to take positive action and get out of Ireland and we will not be satisfied until she does so. If Irish people everywhere get behind this program of pressure on England from the United States we may be able ot write a new page in Irish history for our grandchildren to read. The story of how the English were finally driven out of Ireland knowing this history of persistent courage and remarkable leadership on the part of the Irish people who can doubt that their full participation in the titanic world struggle now shaping up would provide inspiration for the rest of the democratic world. Inspiration, which might spell the difference between victory and defeat.

I realize however, quoting an official Irish Government memorandum, that although "Ireland is earnestly desirous of playing her full part in protecting Christian obligation and the democratic way of life. * * * (She) is faced with grave difficulties from the strategic and political points of view." This is true, both because the continued partition of Ireland is naturally and bitterly resented by the Irish people and because without a single integrated authority either the defense, or the effective utilization of the island's capacities are impossible.

Therefore call upon the Irish people at home to stop hobknobbing with the enemy (England) and come out for a general election. Clean out the present government DeValera, Aiken & Co. Ltd. Liberate the Irish freedom fighters in the internment camps and let nature take its course. You cannot stop the onward march of any nation that wants to be free. Sinn Fein and the IRA won a complete victory in the 26 counties. Now for God's sake, stop quibbling with England in the six stolen counties. The only language that England understands is the language of the IRA. But before this is done the Irish people will have to elect a government in Dublin with a determination to be absolutely free and let them recall their delegate in the United Nations who represents a mutilated Ireland and not a nation (as such). Then when this is done the millions of Irish in the United States and all over the world will be with them to a man. And by this constructive change in policy you will make the soul of our immortal St. Patrick happy in heaven forever afterward.

I am respectfully yours,

WM. JAMES CONLON.

23 BREED STREET, LYNN.

---

## Real Progress in Laos Despite Communist Intrigues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor. When we started our mutual security program in Laos 2 or 3 years ago, many believed it was a hopeless task. Two Provinces were occupied by Communist forces. The economy, with the withdrawal of the French, was practically nonexistent. Yet with a cause to fight for—freedom; strong leadership within; and effective support from a strong friend and ally, the United States—the picture has been greatly improved. There are always losses as well as gains in such a worldwide program, and it is gratifying to see Laos now in the winning column. The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 5, 1959]

LAOS RED GAINS REVERSED

(By Gordon Walker)

HONG KONG.—It is not very often that a reporter on the rim of Communist China can write of definite progress in the continuous struggle against Communist aggression and infiltration. But the tiny kingdom of Laos, wedged in between Communist North Vietnam and with an undefended common frontier with mainland China, offers such an opportunity.

While this corner of Asia may not make the headlines that are common to Formosa, Japan, or South Korea, it now is taking actions which provide poignant lessons for Western capitals, and which may well have a salutary effect upon other nations of southeast Asia.

The story really begins after the collapse of French resistance in Indochina, when the armistice provided for an international commission to supervise the armistice in Laos and block any further fighting between the Royal Laotian Army and the so-called Pathet Lao Communists.

DEAL ARRANGED

Negotiations between government and Communists failed to achieve any tangible results under this setup, and so the government in 1957 chucked out the international commission and made a new deal with the Communists to take them into the government and to integrate their military forces.

For a time it looked as though Laos could be crossed off the list of loyal anti-Communists allies in Asia. Not only did many observers here feel that Laos was misusing U.S. aid, but it puts administration of U.S. aid into the hands of Prince Souphanouvong, leader of the Pathet Lao, and one of two Pathet Lao chiefs taken into the Cabinet.

Then in July 1958, something clicked. A sudden spurt of anti-Communist nationalism, spearheaded by youth groups, took place. Premier Prince Souvanna Phouma resigned, saying he had lost faith in the Pathet Lao leaders he had brought into his government. His successor, Phoui Sananikone, made it clear that he intended to cut the rug out from under the Communists in every way possible.

Alarmed, the Communists sought to call an emergency session of Parliament in January, hoping to capitalize on gains which they had made in previous elections. But the government blocked this move and clearly indicated that if the Communists pressed the matter it would result in a military coup along the lines of those which have occurred in Pakistan, Burma, and Thailand—with adverse results for the Communists.

BATTALIONS LOCKED UP

As things stand today, the Communists are at bay and losing ground rapidly. A border tour de force mounted by Communist North Vietnam has failed to shake the stand of Premier Phoui, backed by strongmen Crown Prince Savang and Army Chief of Staff Ouan. Communist Pathet Lao battalions, which were supposed to be integrated into the Royal Laotian Army, are being held indefinitely in what amounts to a concentration camp outside of the northern city of Luang Prabang.

Any overt move by the Communists might result in an immediate military coup, which would be greatly to their disadvantage. And to tidy things up, Premier Phoui has minimized misuse of U.S. aid funds by inaugurating a more realistic revaluation of the local currency, the kip.

INTERFERENCE RESISTED

Foreign observers recently in Laos report that all of this has been undertaken without United States interference or advice—except for the revaluation of the currency. It has been a spontaneous movement, undoubtedly inspired by the recent experiments along the same lines in Burma and Thailand. And U.S. officials are delighted to see the doughty little "kingdom of a thousand elephants," as it is called, refusing recognition of or aid from Communist China, and even indicating a desire to extend recognition instead to Chinese Nationalist Formosa.

A cynic might say that what is happening in Laos is merely an effort by entrenched vested interests to eliminate any threatening opposition. But there is more to it than that. The Laotians are a proud though normally docile people. They want an easy-going life and they do not want anyone coming in and telling them what to do.

## David Dubinsky Speaks on Small Business Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my pleasure to hear a distinguished labor leader, Mr. David Dubinsky, deliver an address which speaks very wisely of many of the problems facing small business. And in this address Mr. Dubinsky, who is president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, reminds us most persuasively of the reasons for small business—the reasons for opportunity, for independence, initiative, and growth.

This was an address delivered to the national executive board of the national coat and suit industry recovery board at Miami, Fla., on February 4. The cloak and suit industry is an industry of small-business firms. It has a record of many firsts, not the least of which is its record of pioneering in the field of worker-employee relations.

The system of labor-employer relations in this industry was fathered by the late great Justice Brandeis, and it was advanced and refined in many respects by a special commission appointed in 1924 by the late and great Gov. Al Smith.

Many of the Members of the House will, I know, be keenly interested in Mr. Dubinsky's speech, and I invite their attention to it as follows:

ADDRESS BY DAVID DUBINSKY, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE NATIONAL COAT AND SUIT INDUSTRY RECOVERY BOARD, AT THE HOTEL EMPRESS, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., FEBRUARY 4, 1959

I always feel particularly good when I come to the annual meeting of the recovery board. As head of an organization representing all the branches of the women's apparel industry I should probably be impartial but I confess to a specially warm feeling for the cloak industry. It is because the cloak trade is the oldest organized branch of our industry. It was the first to inaugurate collective bargaining, to establish impartial machinery to resolve differences, the first to introduce higher work standards and industrial reforms and to set the pace for all branches of the women's apparel trades and for industry generally.

The cloak industry was the first of the apparel trades to obtain an NRA code. This code was the first to provide for labor representation, an industry label and a 35-hour workweek. The cloak industry was also the only one in the country, after the Supreme Court in 1935 nullified the NRA, to carry on the NRA principles of labor-management cooperation through the establishment of the national coat and suit industry recovery board, a national institution which is unique and has no parallel in American industry.

Yours is the industry in which factory production of ready-to-wear first made its appearance a century ago and it is the industry which has reached maturity in the field of industrial relations. The pages of your history are replete with many innovations, many reforms, many accomplishments, many problems which you have successfully met. But as is always true in life, the problems are never fully resolved and there are always new ones that come to the fore.

It was a hard, rocky road you traveled marked by great industrial conflicts.

The industry has gone through many stages of development both in its industrial structures and its worker-employer relations. At the turn of the century the industry was plagued with sweatshops, with tenement-house production, with workers toiling from sunrise to sunset, with pitiable wages and a dog-eat-dog struggle with many casualties and meager returns for employers. It required all the ingenuity of the best and most farsighted elements among the empolyers and the union, as well as outside distinguished citizens, to deal with these problems. The industry can take great credit for eradicating these conditions.

In the early years, large shops took the place of tenement sweatshops but it was not long before contracting and the jobber-submanufacturing system developed. The auction block approach to the handling of jobber-contractor relations set in motion destructive competition which in the end not only ruined the contractor but drove the manufacturers to the wall and, in the process, undermined the living standards of the workers and the health of the industry.

The protocol of peace in the New York cloak industry fathered by Justice Brandeis was a milestone in industrial statesmanship. Aside from setting minimum work standards it sought to resolve day to day grievances and provide arbitration for their ultimate disposition. This nobly conceived early pioneering effort faced many roadblocks for neither the industry nor the union were as yet accustomed to working or living together. Like a young married couple, they found that the first few years of mutual adjustment were the hardest. The early arbitration system, therefore, failed to prevent bitter disputes and strife. But the desire to find solutions to mutual problems continued to persist both in the ranks of management and of labor.

When Governor Smith appointed a special commission in 1924 to study the problems of the coat and suit industry, the parties gave it their cooperation. As a result, the Governor's commission was able to provide the first full-scale review of the many vexing problems of the industry and to come forth with a far-reaching basic program of reforms for the well-being of all factors.

The Commission recognized that the continuance of an uncontrolled outside system of production was ruinous to the maintenance of decent standards and that its unrestrained operation was contrary to the public interest. This is why the Commission in 1926 recommended that jobbers and manufacturers in the industry be limited in their use of contractors and submanufacturers to their actual needs. Unfortunately, the internal situation in our organization coupled with the great economic depression prevented full implementation of the Commission's program. It was not until 7 years later that these reforms were made part of the coat and suit NRA code and the collective agreements.

During and after the NRA period the union and the employers showed an increasing understanding of each other's problems. Each of the parties, of course, continued to pursue its own interest but gradually learned to adjust their differences so that the end result would be beneficial and not destructive to the parties, to the industry, and the public.

All of us have reason to feel gratified because there was no general strike in the cloak industry during the last 25 years. It was not because we always saw eye to eye on every matter, but rather because we both shared the sincere desire and will to resolve our differences. On the one hand, the union took account of existing industrial conditions while framing its proposals for improving the working conditions of its members. We did not hesitate to restrain our demands on the employers at times when depressed conditions prevailed in the industry even though we felt that workers were entitled to improvements in their standards, and bided our time until conditions in the industry were more favorable. This we have done even at the time when large segments of American industry were granting large-scale wage increases. On the other hand, the industry was ready to recognize its obligations to workers when conditions were proper and the union did not have to invoke its economic power to cease work.

The cloak industry can take full credit for pioneering in the field of pensions by its adoption of marketwide retirement funds. It can take credit for providing for its employees health and welfare benefits. These accomplishments, attained not by threats but through discussion, do not constitute the last page in our efforts to improve the conditions of those who invest their health and labor in the industry just as employers invest their capital. As you know, several other branches of the garment industry have recently established severance pay benefits. In the light of its record I am confident when the cloak industry begins negotiations for new agreements in the coming months, it will give sympathetic consideration to this and other just and necessary proposals. After all, the industry would surely not wish to fall behind in this field.

I do not want to suggest by this brief review that virtually all the problems facing the industry have been resolved. Sometimes when problems are solved they create in their wake new problems. Thus, for example, when the retirement fund was established in our industry we were all gratified that it helped to cope with the problem of the older workers. But now we realize that the pensioning of older people has created a new problem—obtaining skilled workers to replace the retirees. There are problems that exist. They cannot and should not be overlooked or minimized. They deserve attention, study, and action.

The cloak industry is plagued by problems peculiar to small business. It is predominantly composed of small units. When the Federal Government speaks of small business it includes firms with as many as 500 employees. In our industry a firm which employs 400 to 500 workers is not considered small—it is a giant. The average shop in our industry employs around 40 workers. When the Government made a study of concentration of business in the different industries it discovered that the women's garment industry generally and the women's coat and suit industry more particularly had one of the lowest rates of industrial concentration.

In our present day economic climate, operation of a small business is beset with many difficulties. In recent years there has been a rash of official pronouncements giving lipservice to the need to aid small business but precious little has been done. I understand that, although a Small Business Administration was created in 1953, its accomplishments to date are small, for our industry in particular. The agency was supposed to aid small business financing but its efforts in that direction are only a drop in a bucket. Furthermore, hard-money policies—tighter credit and higher interest rates—placed their heaviest burden on the smallest business units in our country.

Despite the growth of large corporations and their predominant power in our economic life, small business continues to be an important factor in our economy. There is urgent need for special consideration for small business. It is important to create a

climate which would enable it not just to barely survive, but to prosper, to expand, and to retain its ability to operate on a par with larger concerns. There should be no further delay in enacting additional legislation for special tax consideration for smaller enterprises to encourage their stability and expansion. Provision should be made to give smaller units greater access to ample credit at normal and reasonable interest rates. They should not be hampered by the preferences which are normally given by lending institutions to their larger customers.

More also needs to be done for small business in the field of Government procurement. Some consideration is being given but not enough. Incidentally, I want to tell you our union has succeeded in getting some action favorable to women's garment manufacturers in connection with Government contracts. At conferences held with Department of Defense officials, they informed us that they are ready to recognize that women's wear producers who are capable of manufacturing to Government requirements in their plants, will no longer be barred simply because they did not previously manufacture men's wear. Firms interested in this type of work should request to be placed on a qualified bidders' list.

In view of the existence of a large number of small business units in the women's garment industry there is active competition among manufacturers for the favor of the retailers and of the ultimate consumers. However, notwithstanding the generally recognized fact that the industry is highly competitive, it is surprising to find that some governmental agencies do not, or choose not, to understand the background, the needs and the problems of the garment industry. This is incredible. Contractor designation, for example, is made to appear as an effort to restrain competition instead of a means to protect the fair work standards of the industry's workers, as was originally recognized by the commission created by Governor Smith.

Monopolistic practices generally tend to increase the cost of products to consumers. The garment industry, of course, has no such practices and the consumer continues to get some of his best values when he purchases its products. Figures compiled by the Government clearly prove this point. While wholesale prices of all manufactured goods rose from 1947 to date by over 33 percent, the wholesale prices of women's garments actually dropped by 2 percent. What industries other than apparel can match this showing? The lack of significant advance in the prices of women's wear is all the more remarkable because in the interim period our members did get a number of wage adjustments as well as improvements in fringe benefits. The consumer clearly benefited by the statesmanlike approach to pricing exhibited by this competitive garment industry. It did not pass on all of its cost increases to consumers. Instead, the industry seems to have exerted every effort to provide its customers with garments at reasonable prices. How different are these policies from those which typify some other American industries. The automobile industry, for example, deliberately, as a matter of policy, seeks ways to load its products with more gadgets, more frills, in order to exact an ever higher price from the consumers.

The businessmen responsible for the production of women's apparel deserve public commendation for their restraint and responsibility to the public in pricing their products.

In 1932 when we were at the bottom of the depression, the industry worked on a one-fourth of 1 percent net profit on sales; between 1935 and 1939—on an even smaller margin. At its peak in 1946 the industry's return was 7¼ percent. From then on it dropped substantially. Between 1951 and 1957 it fluctuated at around 1 percent. Last year in 1958 it was only one-half of 1 percent. This is the industry's average. Some firms, of course, are more prosperous than others. What these figures demonstrate, however—and they are typical of all branches of our industry—is that the keen competition in the trade, fostered by the smallness of powerful retail interests, have kept both prices of the industry's products and profits of its firms at a minimum.

It is high time that governmental agencies cease their search for a ghost of restraint of trade in—of all places—the coat and suit industry, with its thousands of small firms and its sharp competition. Surely this is a case of misdirection—they are after the wrong target. Apparently, however, they prefer to squander their energies by going after the little fellow rather than challenging the giants. The Government, instead of harassing small business should instead give it all possible assistance.

One example of a constructive approach was the enactment of the Robinson-Patman law. I cannot enumerate its specific benefits to small business, but of this I am convinced: That during the past 20 years, without the moral strength, without the legal support of that law the plight of the small businessman would have been unbearable. It is the obligation of Government to create an economic climate in which small business not only can survive but which will encourage it to flourish and to prosper. Maybe the subject requires further study, but in my opinion the facts are clear: We need understanding, we need prompt, speedy, and effective action.

Now there is a curious paradox in the way certain people look with suspicion on the generally harmonious relations which have developed between labor and management in the cloak and the other branches of the garment industry. You would think that labor-management relations are sound only if there is continuous strife, a wave of disputes, an avalanche of strikes. To their minds, so it seems, the absence of industrial strife spells collusion. Though most of these individuals would pride themselves on being the firm supporters of our economic system, in effect what they indirectly advocate is class warfare, in the manner visualized by Karl Marx.

Now what is the current state of the cloak industry in terms of its volume of business?

During the war years, unquestionably the coat and suit industry, together with other women's garment trades, enjoyed peculiar advantages. Women entered the work force of the Nation in large numbers. Incomes were expanding. Due to the virtual stoppage of residential construction and restriction of the production of hard goods, apparel provided an important outlet for consumer spending. As a result, we witnessed an abnormal spurt in the demand for coats and suits and other apparel. This period of abnormal prosperity obscured actual trends in the industry. Many people measure the prosperity or decline of our industry by comparisons with these abnormal levels. Of course, by wartime standards, the industry is definitely down. But all this is highly misleading.

No one could expect the wartime levels of demand for coats and suits to persist after the reappearance of hard goods and the introduction of many new products in the postwar era. All of these commanded their share of the consumer dollar. It was inevitable that clothing should yield, to some extent, to the lure on consumer pocketbooks exercised by these other products. In addition, coats and suits had to face competition by allied apparel lines.

I suggest that a much longer perspective is needed to obtain a realistic evaluation of the current state of the industry. If we take 1929 or 1939 as a point of departure, we will find that on a per capita basis, American women bought more coats and suits in 1958 than in these 2 preceding prewar years. This is no idle statement. Last year, in 1958, this industry produced, on the average, 43 coats per 100 potential consumers. In 1929, 40 coats; and in 1939 only 36 coats. Normal variation in per capita production of coats is not great. The examination of past trends indicates that we can expect, at the worst, that coat production over a period of years to come will expand in line with the growth of our population. I am not suggesting that the industry should be content with this normal development. But I will speak about this a bit later.

Now I want to take a look at suits. Here, too, we will find that the per capita production in 1958 was higher than before the war. To be exact, 18 suits were produced per 100 potential customers in 1958, sharply contrasting with only 9 suits in 1939 and only 4 suits in 1929. Variations in the production of suits showed extreme changes in development over the last 40 years. It rose prior to the twenties, declined thereafter until the great depression set in, began to grow again, advanced all through the war years, and receded in the postwar period. The swings in the demand for suits are clearly cylical. In the past the decline in the popularity of suits lasted for about a decade and was followed thereafter by a revival. Currently, the decade of decline is about up. If history is any indication, a rebirth of suits is not too far off. As a matter of fact, I understand, this spring is witnessing a revival of suits.

Of course, as I have already intimated, the industry cannot sit still and merely hope that historical forces, such as the long term increase in our population and general well-being of our economy will keep the coat and suit trade on an even keel. Though I have indicated the need for some governmental action, reliance on government alone does not suffice. In the final analysis, the initiative, drive, and momentum must come from within the industry.

This industry should not remain content to see its volume expand over the long pull merely by one and one-third percent a year—the tempo at which our population grows. It should raise its sights. The industry cannot rest content with the knowledge that every woman, whatever her age, must at one time or another replace her existing coat or suit. It is necessary to induce her to seek a larger wardrobe of coats and of suits and not mere replenishment. This may possibly involve further search for styling ideas away from the traditional and even new and diverse functions for garments. The industry has, I know, been striving to do this of late, not always with satisfactory results. It should not, however, allow itself to be discouraged. As the industry knows by experience, while newness involves a risk, it also provides the major hope for better business.

Fashion, however important, will fail to realize the industry's objective of higher sales volume unless it is coupled with mass promotion activity. I am aware of the advertising or publicity by individual firms and, of course, this must go on. And needless to say retailers, too, are performing an important task in publicizing specific garments they have to offer. But, as I see it, all these efforts are inadequate. It is ironical, for example, to note that advertising lineage devoted to coats and suits in daily newspapers declines at the very time when the demand for the industry's products weakens. One would expect just the opposite, a strong advertising effort to combat downturns in sales and not the reverse.

An entirely different approach to advertising the industry's products is therefore needed, a collective effort devoted to institutional promotion in addition to the efforts

of the individual firms promoting specific styles.

This calls for a concerted effort, for concerted planning, for concerted action on an industrywide basis. I want to remind you of my standing pledge, on behalf of our union, to share with you in the development and financing of such a promotion program.

Long-term forces favor the growth of the industry's volume but its full sales potential cannot be realized without action on the part of all who are concerned with the welfare of the industry. The union will give its full cooperation to the industry in obtaining necessary governmental action and in the development of an industry promotion program designed to expand markets for its products. We are hopeful that we can count on the industry's cooperation in recahing a mutually satisfactory renewal of the collective agreements that are soon to expire.

The union has long recognized that the industry must be prosperous to provide a good living for its workers. Let us continue, therefore, to work together for a healthy and prosperous industry which will be able to improve the conditions of the workers, provide management with a fair return and enable the coat and suit industry—the oldest trade, the pioneer and trailblazer in industrial relations—to keep pace with changing conditions.

## The Importance to the United States and the World of a Free, Democratic China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 1959*

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given recently at Marquette University, Milwaukee, by Honorable George K. C. Yeh, Chinese Ambassador to the United States:

THE IMPORTANCE OF A FREE, DEMOCRATIC CHINA

It is both a pleasure and a privilege for me to address this distinguished gathering of professors and students of Marquette University and those who are interested in current world problems. I am particularly glad to find among the sponsoring organizations the Institute for Asian Studies of the University, which is headed by such an eminent Chinese scholar as Dr. Wu Yuen-li who is also an expert on the Communist problem in China.

I have chosen as the subject for this evening "The Importance of a Free, Democratic China." It is my purpose within the limited time at my disposal to state briefly certain important facts in relation to events in Asia and particularly the problems arising from the continuing Communist rule on the Chinese mainland.

For centuries, China, with her vast territory and population and her highly developed art and culture, has occupied a pivotal position in Asia. Although the Chinese people are not by nature a seafaring race, they have always been eager and expert traders with their neighboring countries. Chinese porcelain, jade and ivory carvings, silks and embroideries, and other handicraft products had found their way into the countries of the Near and Far West even before the visit of Marco Polo. China has also been a great importer of foreign goods and raw materials, including spices, precious stones, pearls, various species of hardwood and jade. Many of the famous art works now usually associated with China were for centuries wrought on raw materials not found in China, but imported from other parts of the world. For instance, neither jadeite nor nephrite is found in China, but it is in China where so many lasting objets d'art in jade have been produced.

I have brought out these simple facts just to show that China was not, as is often supposed to be, an isolated country. In fact, China's history has undergone a long continuous process of mutual exchange and enrichment of religious, cultural, and moral ideals with her neighbors. No people, for instance, have devoted so much time and effort in translating the religious books of Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity as the Chinese. For a period of almost 300 years, with short intermittent intervals, the translation of the Buddhist scriptures was the main cultural effort of the Chinese people. There exists today, for instance, at least two complete Chinese translations of the Tripitaka. Similarly, the translation of the Old and the New Testament into Chinese was an epochmaking enterprise which ranged over a period of at least half a century. One may indeed say that the cultural strength of the Chinese people, coupled with China's vastness in population and in territory, was for many centuries an important determinant for peace or for war in Asia, depending largely upon the type of government or leadership that existed in the country. During the Mongol dynasty when she was ruled by the Khans, China became undeniably a great conquering power. In short, if China is to serve the best interests of peace, she must have a peace-loving, free, and democratic government. This is a basic factor for peace not only in Asia, but in the world as a whole.

Let us briefly consider China's history from this point of view. The results of the Opium War of 1839–42 had led to rapid exploitation by a number of European powers, each seeking to establish an exclusive sphere of influence. To be sure, the impact of western commerce also had its beneficial aspects. An increasing number of Christian missionaries came to China and brought in science and modern political ideals. Christian schools were established. Modern methods of production and transportation were introduced in the treaty ports. But toward the end of the 19th century China was quickly becoming a bone of contention, an adventurers' paradise and a breeding ground for international conflict. It was clear that China was quickly losing her independence, and her internal weaknesses were providing causes for serious conflicts among the Western Powers. It was to avert the danger of international rivalry in China that the American Secretary of State, John Hay, formulated his famous "open door" policy to "preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity." John Hay no doubt realized that if China should be dominated by, or placed under the exclusive influence of, any single European power, she would be an interminable source of conflict and war.

But just to keep China's door open to all was not, as history has shown, an adequate solution to the Chinese problem. China's newly awakened sense of nationalism must find concrete expression. Her desire to become industrialized and thus to be on an equal footing with the Western Powers became an irresistible national aspiration. When Dr. Sun Yat-sen led the revolution which overthrew the Manchu dynasty in 1911, he laid down the blueprint for the establishment of a republic in China. One of his master plans was the international development of China. Before and during the First World War, he and many Chinese patriots had earnestly hoped that after the war China's unequal treaties could be abolished and that western financing in cooperation with Chinese capital could be made available in order to set China off on the road to industrialization. Dr. Sun's ideas of government and society were basically western, though not without some elements of modified socialism. He was, above all, a stanch patriot and a man who had sought to preserve the best of China's own cultural heritage, while introducing western ideas of popular government and social justice.

Unfortunately, the Western Powers paid little attention to Dr. Sun's ideas and plans. At the peace conference after World War I, China's rights and interests were blandly ignored. The hopes of the Chinese people for complete independence and for industrial development were tragically shattered.

It was at this time when the Chinese people were in a mood of despondency that the Soviet Union entered upon the scene by offering to renounce its special rights and interests in China and to return without compensation all the concessions, including the Chinese Eastern Railway which czarist Russia had seized. A Soviet emissary by the name of Joffe was dispatched to China at this time to negotiate with Dr. Sun Yat-sen for a coalition between the Soviet Communist Party and the revolutionary party led by Dr. Sun. The purpose was to help overthrow the then Peiping government, denounce the West, and place China on the road to independence. This was, of course, a strategic and sinister move on the part of the Soviet Union, but it had the ring of hope and it captured the imagination of the Chinese people.

Dr. Sun, who was a realist as well as a revolutionary, was not so gullible as to believe that communism was a solution to China's problems. In the agreement he made with Joffe in 1923, it was specifically stated that the "Communist order or even the Soviet system cannot actually be introduced into China, because there do not exist here the conditions for the successful establishment of either communism or socialism." In the same agreement it was also made clear that Chinese Communists, who were then under the direction of the Russian Communist Party, were to give up their identity and ideology and join with the Kuomintang in a combined effort to support a new national program for unification. Subsequent events proved that Chinese Communist members operated as Communist cells within the Kuomintang and continued to promote the cause of communism in contravention of the Sun-Joffee agreement. The result was that Russian advisers and Chinese Communists, working hand in glove, almost turned the nationalist movement into a Communist revolution.

I do not wish to burden you with details, but it is important to realize that President Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Government now in Taiwan or Formosa have had over 30 years' experience in fighting communism and that they had tried more than once to practice peaceful coexistence with the Communists but found to their chagrin that this was not possible. The loss of the Chinese mainland to communism was, indeed, a world tragedy of the first magnitude. It tipped the balance in favor of communism. Since then, hundreds of millions of the Chinese people have been subjected to the worst forms of Communist rule, and the Chinese Communists have become the watchdog and the aggressor for international communism in Asia.

If the Chinese mainland had not been lost to communism, there would not have been the Korean war and the 130,000 American casualties would have been spared. There

would have been no division of Vietnam. Malaya and Singapore would not have been threatened by the existence of Communist bandits. And elsewhere in Asia, there would certainly not have been the degree of Communist infiltration and subversion as is found today.

The Chinese authorities in Taiwan today are ready to admit the mistakes they made on the mainland. They do not disown the responsibility for the loss of the mainland. But there is one factor in the episode of the Communist take-over in China which may serve as a useful lesson to us all today. It is the fact that for quite a number of years the Chinese Communists with their independent army and their own government within China were regarded not as true Communists but as agrarian reformers.

The sad thing was that even on the eve of the fall of the Chinese mainland, many people in the West, among them some high government officials and leading parliamentarians, still believed that the Chinese Communists were social or agrarian reformers and that they were, in fact, the liberal progressive elements of the country. The fight between the Chinese Government and the Chinese Communists was widely believed by many people in this country as one between the corrupt reactionary forces of the Government and the liberal progressive reformers of a new China. As a result, the position of the Chinese Government, after V–J Day, became virtually isolated. This was at least a contributory factor to the defeat of the Government on the Chinese mainland by the Communists. This defeat brought to a temporary halt the efforts of the Chinese people to achieve unity and gradual democratization by peaceful evolution.

We are witnessing today a phenomenon which is almost reminiscent of the epoch of Chinese history. It is true that the nature of international communism is now perhaps better understood, but it is equally true that much wishful thinking continues to influence our conduct in international affairs. In a sense, the type of wishful thinking today is even more dangerous because, while it does recognize communism as such, it continues to indulge in the thought that we have to find a way to coexist with Soviet Russia or with communism, and that Soviet Russia or Communist China, in fact, so desires.

Let me quote to you a short paragraph from a well-known speech by Dimitri Z. Manuilsky, one-time Foreign Minister of the Ukraine and for many years a spokesman of the Comintern, delivered at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1931. He said: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists." These words, spoken almost 30 years ago by the leading Communist authority at the time, remain perhaps the best proof that in Communist eyes there can be no meeting ground between our way and the Communist way of life.

I have no desire to take an alarmist view or to dwell on a danger which does not exist. The terrible thing about communism, as it has been practiced in the last 30 years in Asia, is that it is relentlessly persistent. Like a plague, it is not something you can live with and hope for the best. You either have to fight it or you will eventually succumb to it. This has happened to the people of the Chinese mainland, of Korea, of Vietnam and of Germany—the four countries which remain today divided as the result of international Communist aggression. The captive peoples of these four countries are now under one rule of communism—in spite of minor differences that exist between these regimes in their methods of regimentation.

Let us have no illusions about the immutable character of communism: its ultimate aim of world conquest, its exploitation of any political dissidence, and the unity of its members when confronted with the free world. When the people's communes were started last April in Red China, and there were subsequent reports of adverse commentary by Russian and Polish Communists, the free world was again speculating that the Chinese Communists were falling out with Russians, and that eventually Mao, instead of Khrushchev, would lead the Communist world. All this is now settled by an unmistakable statement appearing only a few days ago in the Chinese Communist Party magazine, Red Flag, which reads: "All the Communists of the world wholeheartedly acknowledge the great historic role of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist party," the journal said. "The Soviet Union is the first shock brigade of the International Proletariat to scale the heights of communism."

Both the Russian and the Chinese Communists admit that they are still in the stage of socialism, but they are both determined and dedicated to advance to pure communism. The real question for us in the free world is whether we should change our system so as to go along with them, or how we can resist this type of communism which seeks to overwhelm us all. I for one do not consider it practicable to adopt peaceful coexistence as a policy. For basically, this is something alien to communism, and even if we were to practice it ourselves, it would not achieve the purpose of peace. In short, coexistence means for all of us a slow surrender by installment.

It is not the purpose of my talk this evening to deal with the larger problems of how the free world as a whole should act in order to deter and fight communism. I have sought to establish the fact that there cannot be peace and freedom in Asia unless there is a peace-loving, free and democratic China. That is my firm conviction and also the belief of the 23 million free Chinese in Taiwan and other parts of the world.

Based on this belief, the Government of the Republic of China on Taiwan is maintaining a nucleus of freedom for the Chinese people. We have implicit faith that the cause of freedom will eventually triumph. We are certain that the Chinese people on the mainland will not long endure communism. They have demonstrated their abhorrence and opposition to Communist rule in the past 9 years in their continuing struggle against it. Since their occupation of the mainland nearly 10 years ago, the Chinese Communists have tried and have failed in all their methods of regimentation. The early purges and public trials, followed by the setting up of farm cooperatives and collectivized farms, failed to extinguish the fire of opposition. On the contrary, following the "100 flowers bloom" movement, the outburst of criticism and opposition was so violent that the Communists immediately reverted to more brutal and repressive measures. The system of the communes was adopted as a quasi-military form of control because all the previous methods and measures of control had proved ineffective. For lack of time, I do not intend to go into details regarding the people's communes. Many news stories and articles have been published about them in this country, and most of them based on Communist reports and statistics. I am concerned here chiefly with the fact that the Chinese people on the mainland, the overwhelming majority of whom are, of course, not Communists, cannot long endure this form of rule which is totally alien to their heritage and their character. For instance, the commune has practically done away with the family system as it has existed for centuries in China. According to reports from official Communist sources, a large number of the listed complaints from those who dared to speak out were connected with the family. Another example of the continuing opposition on the part of the people to the communes is the complete elimination of the professional guilds and organizations and their replacement by a centralized control of forced labor. Although trade unionism had not been developed to a great extent in China when the mainland fell, there had existed for many centuries trade guilds which, among other things, had helped to perpetuate the high standards of craftsmanship in China. Now, in a Communist commune, a man is a mere laborer. He is trained quickly to do a job. But he is liable to be shunted to other jobs before he learns enough of one job and does it well. There is, of course, a tremendous waste of labor and material implicit in this system. One of the reasons why agricultural production is claimed to be on the increase is because by far the largest number of people were they could still continue to use their skill born and brought up as farmers and as such and experience to some advantage.

It may be too early to say whether the communes will be a success or a failure. One thing is, however, certain. It is a system calculated to facilitate intensified aggression abroad and oppression at home. Communism might not be as harmful as it is if it could be confined within certain limits. But this is not possible. Let me explain what I mean. You have all heard that since the occupation of the Chinese mainland by the Communists, there has been an officially conducted hate-America movement. This movement reached its height on the eve of the invasion of Korea by the Chinese Communists. This movement is being intensified following the adoption of the commune system. In fact, the anti-America policy has been formally written into the preamble of their rubber-stamped constitution and is considered prerequisite to socialism. This is to say that the people of China, as long as they remain under Communist rule, will be required to hate America and Americans forever. Americans are depicted by Chinese Communist leaders as imperialists, aggressors, warmongers, but, nevertheless, "paper tigers" whom they would sooner or later crush and bury even if, as the Communist Minister of Defense Peng Teh-huai said last October, they, the Americans, "take to hiding in the moon." The truth is that like Hitler both Khrushchev and Mao must artificially create in the people a sense of insecurity in order to justify the oppressive measures that are imposed on them. Just as Hitler used to falsify to the German people the increasingly threatening encirclement of Germany by the democracies, Mao has been drumming daily on the ears of the captive Chinese people the danger of an attack by the United States. This naturally falls in line with Communist policy because the United States is the leading capitalist power in the world and, therefore, the archenemy of the Communist world. But Mao has turned the hate-America feeling into one of national movement. It has been suggested that if the United States should recognize Red China, this hate-America movement might be dropped. This is, of course, wishful thinking, because the hate-America policy has become a necessary part

of the Communist system of control and regimentation in the mainland.

A little while ago, I was referring to the purpose of my Government on Taiwan. I think it is fortunate for the free world that there exists outside of the Chinese mainland a rallying point for the Chinese people in their defense of freedom. The continuing existence of my Government serves as a beacon of hope for the millions of enslaved Chinese on the mainland. This is particularly important as the Chinese people's hatred of communism is mounting. Despite the "3-anti" and "5-anti" campaigns which resulted in the mass murder of some 20 million people and the herding of another 30 million into slave labor camps, widespread uprisings are still being reported in the Communists' own papers. The chief of the Communist scret police himself admitted in January 1958, that during a period of 2 years his men had found it necessary to investigate 18 million workers for counter-revolutionary thoughts, had smashed 3,000 reactionary groups, and had uncovered 100,000 active counterrevolutionaries, of whom 5,000 were in the Communist Party itself.

In sharp contrast to what the Chinese Communists are doing, my Government on Taiwan is trying its utmost to preserve the best features of China's cultural heritage and, at the same time, to achieve progress and change within the framework of a social democracy with particular emphasis on the welfare and living standard of the people. To confirm my point, I need only quote you a few passages from a New York Times report, carried in its issue of February 11, 1959:

"Taiwan's economy has attained its most stable level since 1952. * * * Industrial production has risen 80 percent since 1952. * * * Last year saw a big increase in the output of chemical products, textiles, hardwood, and machinery."

"Living standard is high by Asian level. To the visitor, clothing, food supplies and housing all seem to be adequate."

"The Government has carried out a land-reform program and adopted other progressive plans, but at the same time it has kept a steady eye on promoting family solidarity and maintaining Chinese traditions. Religious freedom has been safeguarded."

"Unexpectedly, life in small villages appears more comfortable than in the larger cities. Without exception, the cheerful young women of the village wear lipstick of various shades. * * *"

"Every town and village has its schools. Books, printed by the Government and furnished at nominal cost, are available to all."

Yet, however bright these spots may appear, the prospect for the reemergence of a free, democratic China on the Asian continent would soon be lost if the Western Powers fail to maintain their solidarity against international communism. Recent history has shown us that whenever there is a weak link in the free world, the rescuing efforts being put in often entail concessions to the Communists.

Let us remember that the Communist nations are united by one ideology and their movements are coordinated. On the other hand, the free world is not even united. In addition, there are certain neutralist or neutral countries which are playing the game of simultaneously bargaining with both the West and the East. It is my considered opinion that we must achieve greater solidarity before we in the free world can deal effectively with the Communist countries. Above all, we must not increase the prestige of the Communist world by recognizing the fruits of its aggression or by being a party to any arrangements which may raise the prestige of any Communist regime in the eyes of the people whom it seeks to control. Above all, let us not yield one further inch of free territory or surrender another free soul to Communist rule.

Mr. President, we have just celebrated the sesquicentennial of Abraham Lincoln's birthday. Let me conclude my remarks by invoking a famous saying of Lincoln: "A house divided against itself cannot stand," and the world "cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." We, who are yet free, owe it to ourselves and to posterity to help restore freedom to the enslaved.

I thank you.

---

## The Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, last evening I was indeed happy to attend the annual dinner of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at the Mayflower Hotel. This society antedates the American Revolution, having been founded in Philadelphia on March 17, 1771. Three Presidents of the United States have held or hold active honorary membership in this historic and great society: George Washington, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

President Eisenhower was present at the dinner last evening when the president of the society, James Francis Reilly, bestowed honorary membership on the Honorable Sean T. O'Kelly, President of Ireland.

The society's annual citation was awarded to its secretary, Simon F. McHugh, Esq.

In my opinion, however, the highlight of this fine dinner was the inspiring, dynamic and challenging address of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable BARRY M. GOLDWATER. In all my experience and public life, I have seldom seen a speaker receive such attention from his audience or the lengthy standing ovation which he received at the conclusion of his speech. I am proud to insert Senator GOLDWATER's address in the RECORD and urge all my colleagues to read it.

President Reilly, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Secretary McHugh, on introducing Bishop Hannan, Jim mentioned something to the effect that he was concerned over what his father in heaven might be thinking with him being president of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, when his father was a good Hibernian. I couldn't help wondering what some of my ancestors in heaven might be thinking with one of their brethren addressing this group. I wonder, for instance, what that Russian Jew who came to the shores of California 110 years ago, and to Arizona 100 years ago, would be thinking of his grandson addressing this auspicious group of Irishmen; and then I could not help but wonder what my uncle, whose only mistake in life was to found the Democratic Party in our territory, might be thinking of his nephew, a Republican. I have come to the conclusion that they would both be happy.

It has been said that this is the one day of the year when the world is divided into two classes—those who are Irish and those who would like to be Irish.

To me, a festive occasion such as this is a display of Americanism at its best. For here we are—men whose forebearers came to this land from all parts of the world—helping to celebrate the feast of St. Patrick with our friends of Irish descent in our own American way.

This is, indeed, the fabric and pattern of our great country.

And I pray that good people everywhere, armed with the love of God and following the example of St. Patrick, can provide a stimulus and a hope to those less fortunate in other lands so that they, too, may one day breathe the grand, free air that blows over Ireland.

I am sure you know that scholars still wrangle over the subject of just exactly where St. Patrick was born. Some say France. Some say Scotland. Some say Wales. It is definitely known, however, that he spent his young manhood in Ireland.

Fourteen centuries have passed and yet the memory of St. Patrick remains as green as the living shamrock itself.

It was St. Patrick who changed the character of the Irish people from pagan to Christian; from a chaos of marauding bands under rival chieftains, stealing and destroying, to a land of order and peace.

This proves conclusively to me that if St. Patrick was not indeed an Irishman himself, he was at the very least a Republican.

Now, those Republicans of Irish descent in Congress may be outnumbered, but they yield to no one in being endowed with the missionary spirit of St. Patrick.

Actually, they have so much missionary work to do before 1960 that they're plugging hard for a divine intercession.

As a matter of fact, right now you can't find an unlit candle in any church in town.

In this respect, I would like to counsel moderation among those of you who are Democrats of Irish descent.

Just because a fellow named Kennedy will be in the picture, there's no reason to lose your heads.

And to those of you who happen to be Republicans of Irish descent, I give you my solemn word that among the membership of the United States Senate, you can count on O'JAVITS, O'DIRKSEN, O'BRIDGES, and O'GOLDWATER to be in there pitching for the cause.

And I would also tell you this: Lest there be overconfidence on the side having the greater numbers, let it be said that the fighting Irish may be outnumbered, but never outfought.

St. Patrick's Day is a day for remembering. Today across our land and around the world, the hallowed names of Ireland will be honored, honored as they rightly should be. The towns and villages, the lakes and the rivers, the names of her scholars, her patriots, and her leaders will be properly called to the attention of the world—Donegal and Tyrone; Kildare and Dublin; Limerick and Galway; and the names of men who made the Irish proud: Cormack, O'Conner, Murray, Plunkett, Hyde, and all the other leaders of Ireland.

Today the world will remember and more greatly appreciate the great loves of the Irish, out of which the rich character of her people has grown. Their love of their native land, of its towns, and its people. The love of political freedom and the love of learning. Their love of things spiritual. The love of religion and their recognition of its place in their lives. We will remember those loves, because love is a sacred tenet of religion and a charge of God.

People are prone to recognize their own assets, but the rest of the world will pay tribute to the meekness and humility that mark the virtues of the Irish. Because in these times when more stress and value are placed on the material things, we should rightly remember that St. Patrick conquered Ireland meekly, and made of those conquered humble champions of Christ, men who, with these virtues, went forward with nothing but the Cross and their faith and conquered and made friends.

Here in America today the contributions of the Irish to our freedom can most properly and thankfully be recognized. It would take days to recite all the contributions, but I mention just a few. It was an Irishman named Patrick Henry who said, "Give me liberty, or give me death."

It was a group of 29 Irishmen, all members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, in the city of Philadelphia, who gave a half-million dollars when it was sorely needed to our fight for independence.

To mention a few of the Irish signers of the Constitution we recall Pierce Butler, who was born in County Carlow; Daniel Carroll, an ardent supporter of the Constitution's first amendment, which provides for religious freedom; Thomas Fitzsimmons, who recruited and led a patriotic band of volunteers; James McHenry, who was born in County Antrim, as was William Patterson; George Read of Maryland, whose father was an Irishman; and Richard Spaight of North Carolina, who was also the son of an Irishman. These are names connected with our early fight for independence, and in just recent days Gen. "Wild Bill" Donovan, a hero and a leader in two wars for the preservation of freedom, passed on to his Maker.

Thus, today, as the world stands troubled and quaking in fear, we can remember Ireland's long fight for freedom. Seven hundred years of invasion by the Danes, the Normans, and the English, during which time her answer was to absorb the invader and make him more Irish than the Irish themselves.

All of these are hallowed memories of name and places and deeds and they will be dealt with by voices far more able and eloquent than mine, so to them the challenge of adding luster to the names and history that already shines with the brilliance of a midday desert sun in my Arizona.

This evening I suggest that all Americans might learn something from the Irish, and it is to this that I wish to direct my remarks. That something would be gathered and constructed from the many facets of Ireland and her people on which I have briefly touched. It would include the love of her people for their country and their love of political freedom. It would include the virtues of humility and meekness, and it would include what to my mind is already a distillation of those virtues and loves—a determination expressed in her fight for freedom. This something would become a lesson to us all in that area in which we profess such devotion and yet display such apathy.

The freedom of America has the same fundamental and basic sources that freedom everywhere achieved has had, including the freedom of the Irish. That is man's instinctive desire to be free; to be able to say what he thinks; to be able to print what he says, to be able to worship in the religion he chooses; to be able to associate himself with those of his picking; to be able to earn property and retain it; and to be able to walk God's earth with dignity because of the possession of these freedoms.

Like the Irish, our forefathers knew what they wanted and what they sought, and they knew this from the oppression they had lived with. Our forefathers came to a raw, new country, and fought those forces from abroad who would deny them success in the achievement of freedom. The Irish for 700 years devoted themselves to that fight on the soil of their homeland, and won. Our forefathers devoted themselves to this same fight on our new soil, against the same forces, and won. In our determination to rid ourselves of oppression and achieve freedom, we accepted as freedom's source the words of Thomas Jefferson, in the Declaration of Independence, "That we hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with cerain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

We based our freedom, then, on the same grounds on which the Irish had fought for many years before we found that base ourselves, namely a spiritual one. In less than 200 years we have, through this spiritual strength acquired freedom never before known by any people, and because of this freedom a material power that has never been known by any civilization in history.

Strangely, though, as we were enjoying the heights of this freedom and its many benefits, at about the same time the Irish won their freedom, we began to lose ours. We fought and won wars for freedom and then lost them at the peace table, mainly because of a misunderstanding as to what kind of peace the world was looking for. Ours was a conception of material peace, when the world wanted the comfort and assurance of a spiritual peace, out of which a material one could grow.

People have always wanted liberty, and people today want liberty. They want us to show them the way to liberty and the peace that comes under it, rather than to show them how to obtain more dollars, more automobiles and the other hard goods materialism.

This weakness of the material has been further manifested by more and more of our people looking to a paternalistic government to do for them those things they could better do for themselves.

Slowly materialism began to be our goal, and even to some of our people, their God, and we find ourselves more and more willing to sacrifice our basic principles for the material attainment our people would settle for.

We laugh at laws, and coddle the hoodlums, the gangsters, and the crooks. We allowed the Communists to crawl into our lives. Then when their intent became evident, those who spoke out against them and would have removed them were chastised. You know of whom I speak: John Flynn, Dean Manion, Frank Hanighen, every one is an Irish name. And then there was another Irishman, Joe McCarthy.

There is a peculiar difference in this situation involving these Americans of Irish name and their ancestors, because instead of acting together as their ancestors did in fighting a common enemy—the English—these Americans are arguing with other Americans over how an announced enemy and destroyer should be treated. Should he be coddled and banqueted and respected, or should he and his forces be denied access to American soil and American people?

We have come to that point where we blandly and rather ignorantly say that a little socialism isn't bad; that a little inflation won't hurt; and that an already tax-sick people can be taxed more.

Public servants who swear on the Bible to defend and protect the Constitution have allowed the freedom of association, the freedom of choice, and the freedom of property to be denied the working people through an act of compulsion that requires membership in an organization regardless of the desires of the workingman, in order that that man may support himself and his family.

By this same action, they have legalized violence and corruption and graft; and yet Americans ho-hum the whole dangerous display, admitting that something is wrong but being afraid to do anything about it, and putting off the time for decision until their children and grandchildren will be concerned, this despite the fact that one of the basic desires of all people, be they Irish or not, is to leave for their sons and daughters something good and fine and decent, by which they will be remembered.

Instead of that drive today in this country we find weak-kneed excuses as to why fathers and mothers will not rise up and demand a stand of courage on the part of our leaders in order that these things be corrected in our time before the devastation cannot be corrected in the time of our children.

We hear the taunts of people who have been lied to by Communists about us. We have witnessed our Vice President spat upon by people the Communists have brainwashed. We have not helped those who would stand up to this godless philosophy. Yet we propose further meetings with these devastators, when in practically every instance of agreement and promise—in fact, all with the exception of two—they have lied and cheated their way out of their responsibilities.

Yes, our freedoms are slowly being whittled away, and yet we, as a people, go on and on like the country boy who never learns that the pea isn't under any of the shells he is playing with.

The frightening thing about our situation, both within our country and without, is that history records that every government since man's first attempt to govern himself as having approached the identical situation and not having had the courage to make the proper decisions and movements. There is no new magic we have discovered that can bridge this crossroad. There is no new formula that has been devised by which our path can be made easier and at the same time our freedoms more secure. Ours is the greatest philosophy of government ever developed, and it was developed by people from every country and added to during the years when the friendly invasions of peoples added to what we called, "the melting pot."

Today, though, there are those among us who feel that we have an entirely different situation; that man's problems are now material problems and not problems of the spirit. Those are the people who look upon the harnessing of the atom as being so fearful that no force of the spiritual can overcome it, forgetting at the same time that problems of equal importance have come before man during our history and they have been conquered by the faith of man in his God, his country, and himself.

So I wanted to talk briefly tonight about what we Americans might learn from the Irish, and I think that it can be summed up by saying that we can look across the waters to that green island and to her people, and to the great lesson that freedom is not only man's goal—it is God's goal for man. That we have had freedom and we still have a large share of freedom, we know, but that we are losing it, and that it will not be lost in one afternoon or morning by the appearance of material forces from the outside, but that it will be lost by the termite-like chewing away from the inside by people who have lost faith in their God, their country, and themselves, we won't recognize.

We again look to Ireland's 700-year struggle for freedom and recognize that freedom is something that must be fought for to be attained, just as our forefathers discovered the same thing. Then we can look to Ireland and see a people who have not gone on the American dole, who have built up in their country a free economy, and who have maintained the spiritual ideals which gave them the strength to fight a desperate battle for freedom for more than 700 years.

Yes, we can learn from the Irish. We can learn to defeat the enemies of religion and our Republic. We can learn to protect our Constitution. We can learn from them how to perpetuate liberty. If we study the Irish and their many attributes I think we will find that dominating their lives is a sense of love, not only for their fellowmen but for the principles of life and for the country in which they live, be that Ireland or America.

We need men of that quality; men who love their God and who love their country; men who are proud of our Nation and who do not hesitate at any moment to extoll its virtues, even though they may be criticized for feeling too deeply about their country. Today people who feel too strongly that the United States is the best country in the world are actually criticized. They are told that national feeling should be subjugated to one of broader vision. Well, I say to you I will take the Irish approach and join with them in declaring to all that America is the best place to live.

We need men who feel so deeply about principles that they will not compromise for evil for one moment's delight. We need men who believe that, simple as it is, the spiritual basis is the only basis on which true liberty and freedom can live. We need men whose eyes will moisten as they see their flags pass by, men who do not require the reminder we see on the parade ground at West Point, "Gentlemen will remove their hats when the flag goes by." We need men who are strong and who will never bow down to an aggressor be that aggressor weak or strong.

These lessons are the lessons of the Irish. They are the lessons drawn from everything that has made the Irish and their sons around the world what they are today—men of warmth, men of love, men who are humble and meek, but men in whom these qualities have developed a strength of character that is reflected down through history in man's search for freedom. I, as a descendant of a family who came from another part of the world but who, nevertheless, became just as strong Americans as I am today, join with those not of Irish extraction in offering a prayer to God that the qualities of the Irish will be forever perpetuated on this earth, so that liberty may have a chance to live forever, and be born where it does not live today. The lessons of the Irish are truly lessons of liberty.

---

## Statement of Vice President Jerome J. Keating, National Association of Letter Carriers, Before the House Committee on the Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting statement given by Jerome J. Keating, vice president of the National Association of Letters Carriers, before Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Judiciary Committee in support of H.R. 3283.

STATEMENT OF JEROME J. KEATING, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON MARCH 18, 1959

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jerome J. Keating. I am vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, an organization representing 110,000 letter carriers throughout the United States.

We are very much interested in H.R. 3283, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, EMANUEL CELLER. When one says "letter carrier," undoubtedly you think of the foot carrier with the load on his back; however, letter carriers deliver parcel post; they make collections, and drive mounted routes. All in all, in the city delivery service, we have 36,898 men driving motor vehicles. The present mechanization program will mean more and more letter carriers being placed on a mounted basis. We have approximately 3,300 letter carriers delivering mail from the three-wheeled vehicle known as the mailster.

The problem of driver protection is a very real one. The present method of solving claims of citizens who are involved in accidents with Government-operated vehicles is a most unsatisfactory one and decidedly unfair to the drivers of Government vehicles. In every State in the Union, there is some law providing financial responsibility for those who operate motor vehicles. The laws operate in a variety of manners, but in every instance, the responsibility is placed upon the owner of the vehicle. Perhaps the most popular method now in operation is the so-called fleet plan, in which the operator of a fleet of vehicles assures the responsible law-enforcement people that he will assume all liability where any of his vehicles are involved in accidents.

Prior to the passage of the Torts Claims Act in 1945, the person involved in an accident with a Government motor vehicle had no recourse except to sue the individual driver. He could file a claim against the Government only if the Government agreed to it. With the passage of the Torts Claims Act in 1945, an aggrieved individual was then permitted to file a claim with the department or agency and, if the claim amounted to less than $1,000, the department or agency could make settlement without recourse to court action. If the claim was in excess of $1,000, then the plaintiff could bring action under the Federal Torts Claims Act. After the law was passed, it was apparent that either many people did not know about the act, or they still were of the opinion that they had a more fertile field in suing the individual driver, because for a long period of time after the pasasge of this act, the claims against the individual drivers continued. I am happy to report that, within the last few years, there are not as many actions brought against the individual drivers.

When an individual driver is involved in court action and judgment is rendered against him, the only recourse he has is to take the matter up with his Congressman and have a private relief bill introduced, which bill is referred to and acted upon by this committee. This committee has always been most cooperative in the treatment of such claims, but for more than 3 years, the Senate committee refused to take any action on such bills. At the end of the 85th Congress, we were successful in prevailing upon the Senate committee to change their policy and, as a result, a number of private bills were passed at the end of the last session.

The Senate committee established its policy because some members contended that it was not proper to authorize a private claim bill when court action had been secured against the individual. In studying these cases, however, we find that many, many times judgments were rendered against the individual when all signs pointed to the fact that the individual should be absolved of all responsibility in the matter. A major factor involved in accidents in a fleet of motor vehicles such as operated by the Post Office Department is that these vehicles are required to maintain the same schedule, regardless of the weather or the condition of the streets. Accidents frequently occur due to icy streets, even though the operator is shown to be operating the vehicle with the utmost of caution.

On many occasions, the driver of the Government vehicle is referred to the U.S. district attorney and, evidently in many cases, is of the opinion that with such a referral his responsibility ceases. It has been our experience in studying these cases over a number of years that many of the judgments that have been secured are secured because of inadequate representation. This is not meant to be a criticism of the U.S. district attorneys. We are fully aware of the fact that they have a very heavy load and, obviously, first consideration would naturally be given to suits wherein the U.S. Government is the defendant. The claims referred to them for individual drivers are obviously odd jobs. An additional factor is that the normal work of U.S. district attorneys does not take them into State courts and, when they leave the familiar Federal court to look after a case in a State court, to many of them it is a strang manner of operation. Many drivers are adequately represented but, in many instances, the cases are not thoroughly or expertly prepared.

It is extremely unfair to the drivers of Government motor vehicles to place them in a position where they must stand suit for from $5,000 to $50,000 in some instances for accidents incurred while they were zealously performing their duties as letter carriers employed by the Post Office Department. It is also unfair to require these men to put out substantial sums of money and then have to wait from 2 to 6 years to be reimbursed through action of the Congress for their legitimate claims.

The Celler bill will provide a better form of relief for the private citizens who are involved in accidents with Government motor vehicles, and this will be particularly true if the Congress concurs in legislation being proposed by the administration wherein the amount of money that can be paid without litigation for a claim by a department or agency would be increased to $3,000. Obviously, such legislation would help to break the logjam that is now found in every Federal court, and it would provide a more satisfactory way for the aggrieved individual to have his or her claim taken care of promptly.

We believe that the passage of H.R. 3283 is justice long overdue. To indicate the type of action that has been taken against the drivers of post office vehicles, I am attaching to my statement brief synopses of some of the details of accidents where the driver has been compelled to pay and where the Congress in its wisdom has seen fit to pass remedial legislation.

We sincerely hope that this subcommittee will favorably recommend H.R. 3283 and that the bill will become law at this session. Mr. Chairman, you and the members of this committee have always been most considerate and I am sure that we will receive that favorable consideration at this time. I appreciate having had the opportunity of presenting this testimony.

SAMPLE CASES

1. Letter carrier was driving truck going east; other party was going north. At a blind corner, the driver of the other car hit the right rear fender of the post office truck with his left front. The other car hit with such force that the truck was forced over the curb into a picket fence. The other party left skid marks 40 feet in length before he hit. In court he testified he was only going 20 miles per hour. The case was tried in a judge's court before a lady judge who had the reputation of disliking drivers of Government vehicles. It is reported that the lawyer for the other party was greatly surprised when a judgment for $251.19 was rendered in favor of his client.

2. On a wet rainy day, a letter carrier driving a post office truck was returning to the garage; the driver of a truck ahead suddenly put on his brakes; the driver of the post office truck did likewise but, due to the condition of the streets, skidded into the other truck. The carrier was sued for $5,000. The U.S. district attorney recommended that he settle, which he did for $442. The letter carrier, fearful of a large judgment against him, paid the claim. The accident occurred early in 1952, a relief bill was approved in September 1958.

3. A carrier driving a post office truck was involved in an intersection accident on the ice and snow. The driver of the other car was traveling at a higher rate of speed. Counsel was assigned from the U.S. district attorney's office. He immediately tried to work out a settlement. After the trial, the attorney from the district attorney's office made an off-the-record statement that he should have prepared a better case.

4. A carrier attempting to make a left turn from a busy street into a side street was struck from the rear. The Post Office Department absolved the carrier from blame. The party who struck the mail truck sued the letter carrier. The driver of the other vehicle was fined for careless driving, as well as for operating without a permit. The defense attorney did not prepare his case well, claiming that he did not believe that the plaintiff would let the matter go to court. The plaintiff did and secured a judgment against the letter carrier driver.

## The States and the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday I asked for the inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an article appearing in the March issue of the American Bar Association Journal, written by the Honorable Charles H. Davis, associate justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, on the subject "The States and the Supreme Court."

Because the article is at once timely and scholarly, it is a valuable contribution to a subject that has received much attention during the last several years.

I learned on submission that the article is estimated to make 3¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $263.25, and I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding this fact it be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: THE STATES AND THE SUPREME COURT

(By Charles H. Davis, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois)

(A Federal system of Government of necessity involves areas of penumbral jurisdiction between National and State Governments. Even before the ratification of the Constitution, this problem was recognized, discussed, and analyzed. Now, more than a century and a half later, the line between State and National authority is still often disputed, sometimes heatedly. Justice Davis discusses recent decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States that illustrate the difficulties of this perplexing problem.)

Under the American scheme there are two complete structures of Government, one for the Nation and one for each State. Each of these dual sovereignties, with its executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government, is supreme in its own sphere of activity, and thus complements the other, but there are also areas of overlapping authority which give rise to complex Federal-State questions. The Supreme Court of the United States stands at the apex of the Federal-State judicial branches of our Government and, while the State-Federal judicial systems are separate, the ultimate power of review rests in the U.S. Supreme Court and, to this extent, the total judicial system of the Nation and States is integrated.

The prime question of the power of the Supreme Court to hold unconstitutional and judicially unenforceable an act of the President, of Congress or of a constituent State of the United States rests, at least, on logical inference. This thought was succinctly expressed by Alexander Hamilton in "The Federalist," No. 78. Many authorities urge that such a power is explicitly granted by the supremacy clause of article VI and section 2 of article III of the U.S. Constitution.

Early in the history of our country, these powers were recognized and exercised by our Supreme Court. In 1803 in the case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*,[1] and act of Congress was held to be unconstitutional; in 1810 in *Fletcher* v. *Peck*,[2] and in 1813 in *Fairfax's Devisee* v. *Hunter's Lessee*,[3] acts of the legislatures of the States of Georgia and Virginia were held to be unconstitutional; and in 1821 in the case of *Cohens* v. *Virginia*,[4] the Court reviewed and set aside a criminal judgment entered in the State court where a Federal question was involved. These early cases established the power of the U.S. Supreme Court in these areas. By necessity, as well as by almost universal accord, these powers are regarded as vested in the Supreme Court. Any other allocation of such power would seem to lead to chaos.[5] Thus, it is no longer a question of the power of the U.S. Supreme Court to act in these areas, but rather the delicate question of the proper use of such power.

Since the adoption of our national Constitution, there has been a continuous expansion of the exercise of the powers of the National Government and a consequent contraction in the employment of the powers of the State governments. This centralization arose from the necessity for a strong central government in our ever-shrinking world. It resulted from the increased interdependence of the people within this Nation and the world at large, from the aggressive and continuous exercise of power by the Federal authorities in the many areas properly designated as State-Federal areas, and from the unwillingness or inability of the States generally to shoulder the responsibilities that are properly theirs.

In a limited manner, I shall discuss State-Federal relations as affected by judicial decisions in the areas of subversion and loyalty, criminal law, labor law, occupational discrimination and segregation.

STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS IN SUBVERSION AND LOYALTY

The Federal Government bears the primary obligation of defending the Nation from internal subversion and external aggression. However, since colonial days, the States have acted in the areas of subversion and loyalty and have never left such issues to the Federal Government.[6] In recent years, long standing State legislation of this type was refurbished and expanded. The Federal Government since World War II has likewise enacted comprehensive new legislation in this field. Under this background, *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*,[7] reached the U.S. Supreme Court.

Nelson, a member of the Communist Party, was convicted in a State court under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act which sought to impose a penalty for conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence. On review, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court found that the case involved only sedition against the United States, reversed the conviction and held that the Smith Act of 1940 had superseded the enforceability of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act.[8] The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed, applied the doctrine of Federal preemption, which had its origin in cases decided under the commerce clause, and held that the Smith Act[9] and other Federal statutes,[10] dealing with communism and other loyalty problems preempted the field and thereby invalidated or suspended the Pennsylvania Sedition Act. Apparently, this was the first case in which the Court held that a Federal criminal statute, not involving a regulatory scheme under the commerce clause, in the absence of conflicting provisions, superseded the enforceability of a concurrent State criminal statute. The Court based its preemptive holding on the dominance of the Federal interest, the pervasiveness of the Federal scheme and the possible conflict in the administration of State and Federal laws in this area. It also suggested that the possibility of double punishment was a factor in its decision.

However, in 1920, in the case of *Gilbert* v. *Minnesota*,[11] the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the conviction of Gilbert who had been prosecuted and convicted in the State court pursuant to a State enactment against interference with military enlistments during World War I, conduct which was proscribed by the Federal Espionage Act.[12] In that case the Court emphasized the cooperative nature of the Federal and State interests in the preservation of the Federal governmental structure and added that the State statute was also justified as a local police power measure designed to prevent breaches of peace. A similar conclusion could have been reached in the Nelson case.[13]

The effect of the Nelson decision on State criminal prosecutions for other overlapping offenses in connection with State Communist control measures, State loyalty oath programs, and State legislative investigations is uncertain. The Nelson decision announced that the States cannot punish for sedition directed against the U.S. Government, but remain free to punish for offenses involving a local breach of peace. Situations intermediate between these penumbral extremes can be rendered clear only by the progressive course of litigation.

Had Congress incorporated in the Smith Act itself a saving clause in substantially the language of the second sentence of section 3231 of the Criminal Code,[14] its intent would have been crystal clear and the Supreme Court would have been precluded from basing its decision on the theory of Federal preemption. A present like amendment to the act would nullify the decision prospectively. Through better legislative draftsmanship, and the amendment of existing statutes, Congress may prevent and correct erroneous decisions of the Supreme Court predicated on congressional preemptive intent. Thus, greater congressional awareness of the implications of its legislation on the State as well as the Federal system of government is desirable.

While it was early established that U.S. courts had no jurisdiction to try persons for common law crimes not proscribed by any specific Federal statute,[15] our Federal Code is replete with criminal statutes prohibiting specified conduct and creating substantive

Footnotes at end of speech.

crimes independently of any administrative or statutory regulations. Such legislation is found in the Mann Act,[16] the Harrison Act,[17] the Dyer Act,[18] the Lindbergh law,[19] the Fugitives From Justice Act [20] and many others which create Federal crimes out of activity either criminal at common law or under State statutes. However, I cannot believe that the theory of preemption should or would be applied by the U.S. Supreme Court to invalidate State statutes which prescribe punishment for murder, the robbery of a national bank, kidnapping and other crimes, which are recognized as crimes against both the State and Nation. In these areas, as in the Nelson case, the doctrine of concurrent cooperation would seem more desirable than that of Federal preemption.

In 1951, the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire enacted a subversive activity statute which imposed various disabilities on subversive persons and organizations [21] and in 1953 adopted a resolution which constituted the attorney general a one-man legislative committee to investigate violations under the act and recommend additional legislation. Sweezy, summoned to appear at an investigation, testified about various matters but refused to answer inquiries concerning: (a) The activities of the Progressive Party in the State during the 1948 campaign, and (b) a lecture he delivered at the University of New Hampshire in 1954. He was thereafter adjudged in contempt by a State court, and his conviction was affirmed by the Supreme Court of New Hampshire.[22] The U.S. Supreme Court reversed the conviction in *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire*,[23] without a majority opinion. Four justices, after reaffirming the position established in *Watkins* v. *United States* [24]—that legislative investigations can encroach on First Amendment rights—then attacked the New Hampshire act by holding that the definition of subversive persons and organizations was so vague and limitless that it extended to "conduct which is only remotely related to actual subversion and which is done free of any conscious intent to be a part of such activity."

Heretofore the power of State legislatures to compel testimony during the conduct of legislative investigations had been unquestioned and the constitutional limitations on this power had not been explored. This decision recognized the right of a witness to remain silent before a State legislative committee and suggested that free expression of ideas outweigh a State's need for information in the area of subversive activities. It provides but little guidance relative to the controlling factors in balancing the interest of the State in obtaining information by legislative investigation as against the constitutional rights of the individual. The decision leaves clash and confusion in the State-Federal interest in this area.

STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE AREA OF DUE PROCESS

It is only in recent years that the Supreme Court of the United States has extensively exercised Federal power as it relates to local criminal law and its administration. In 1915, in the case of *Frank* v. *Mangum*,[25] the problem of mob domination of a trial reached the Court; in 1932 in *Powell* v. *Alabama*,[26] the Court held that failure to furnish effective assistance of counsel to defendants unable to procure counsel in a capital case is a denial of due process of law; in 1935, in *Mooney* v. *Holohan*,[27] the Court announced that the knowing use of perjured testimony by a prosecutor violates the concept of fundamental fairness and due process of law; in 1936 in *Brown* v. *Mississippi*,[28] the Court reversed a conviction wherein a confession obtained by physical violence had been admitted in evidence; in 1946 in *Carter* v. *Illinois*, and in 1948 in *Young* v. *Ragen*,[29] the Court held that each State must afford prisoners "some clearly defined method by which they may raise claims of denial of Federal rights" and have "an opportunity to open an inquiry into the intrinsic fairness of a criminal process even though it appears proper on the surface," so that "questions of fundamental justice protected by the due process clause may be raised * * * dehors the record"; in 1956 in *Griffin* v. *Illinois*,[30] the Court adjudged that Illinois must henceforth furnish an indigent prisoner a complete transcript of record without cost in order to meet the requirement of the equal protection clause, as well as the due process clause, of the 14th amendment; and in 1958 in *Eskridge* v. *Washington State Board of Prison Terms and Paroles*,[31] the requirements of the Griffin case were given retroactive effect. In each case the strong local interest in the enforcement of criminal law was subjected to the Federal counterbalance of a general ideal—fundamental fairness at the trial. The transcendency of the ideal inevitably left dissatisfaction in its wake.

In all of these cases except Griffin, the Federal referrent was the due process clause, one in which a greater generality exists than in any other area of federalism. In this area Congress has not acted and the U.S. Supreme Court has no choice other than defining due process in the light of the cases presented for decision. In thus determining due process, the Court defines an ideal for the future without the benefit of past precedent. Conformity to the new concepts of due process created by the Supreme Court requires constant changes in the State criminal procedures. While few quarrel with the concepts of fundamental fairness at the trial established by these decisions, many disagree with the manner in which the Supreme Court has applied these and other principles of criminal law to cases before it. The main thrust of the criticism is that the Court disproportionately exalts the facts which pertain to the rights of the individual and thereby disregards the rights of the public to be safe and secure in person and property.[32]

STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS IN LABOR MATTERS

The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 or the Taft-Hartley Act,[33] superseded the Wagner Act,[34] and in, general, had as its purposes, among other things: (a) Protection of employee self-determination against union pressures as well as those brought by the employer; (b) protection of the public interest and the interests of neutral employers against the disruption flowing from certain improper practices by unions; and (c) a general increase in the power of employers relative to that of unions whose power had been extended during the war and postwar period. To achieve these aims, the Taft-Hartley Act regulated picketing, boycotts, and strikes, and sought to protect the integrity of collective bargaining agreements. It thus dealt with matters which heretofore, except for the impact of the Sherman Act, had been left wholly to State regulation. The act did not define the standards for distinguishing between protected and unprotected conduct, and its provisions failed to specify the areas in which the States may act and where State action is forbidden.[35]

At the risk of oversimplification, it may be stated that under the decisions of the Supreme Court, State action is permissible where actual violence is involved in a labor dispute, and in other areas under the act, uncertainty exists. The Supreme Court has endeavored to fill in the interstices in the legislation, but in certain areas the gaps are too wide and the task amounts to fashioning a new body of Federal labor law by the slow process of judicial decisions. The Court has identified many of the major problems and the act should be supplemented by Congress. Failure in this respect causes further strain on the judiciary and increases the confusion now existing in State-Federal relations in this area.

STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS IN THE RIGHT TO PRACTICE LAW

In general, the supreme courts of the various States license individuals to practice law after proof of requisite academic achievement and good moral character. In *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California*,[36] and in *Schware* v. *Board of Bar Examiners of New Mexico*,[37] the Supreme Court held that freedom of occupational choice is an important freedom which is within the protection of due process of law.

At his hearing before the bar examiners, Konigsberg refused to state whether he was a member of the Communist Party, or whether he had ever been a Communist, or whether he belonged to various organizations, including the Communist Party. However, he denied any present advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of California. The bar examiners refused to certify him to practice law in that he failed to prove good moral character and to establish that he did not advocate overthrow of the State and National Governments by unconstitutional means. Without opinion, the Supreme Court of California declined to review Konigsberg's petition. The U.S. Supreme Court found that the evidence did not support the findings of the bar examiners and reversed and remanded the action.

Schware admitted membership in the Communist Party at a time when it was a recognized political party in the United States and refused to answer questions relating to his past affiliations and beliefs. The board of bar examiners denied him permission to take the bar examination on the ground of failure to prove good moral character. The State supreme court affirmed and the U.S. Supreme Court reversed. In each case, the respective bar committees pursued questions along the lines of past political affiliations and beliefs in order to test the truthfulness of the respective petitioner's denial of advocacy of the overthrow of State and national governments. Two quotations from the dissenting opinion in Konigsberg point up the inherent conflict as follows: "The case involves an area of Federal-State relations—the right of States to establish and administer standards for admission to their bars—into which this Court should be especially reluctant and slow to enter," and "What the Court has really done, I think, is simply to impose on California its own notions of public policy and judgment. For me, today's decision represents an unacceptable intrusion into a matter of State concern."

STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS IN THE AREA OF SEGREGATION

While we must remember that it is a constitution which is being expounded and that it is intended to endure for the ages,[38] there is no clear historical evidence that the 14th amendment, when adopted, was intended to apply to jury service, voting rights, or segregation. Public education after the adoption of the amendment continued on the same segregated basis as had been the pre-Civil War practice, and the doctrine of separate but equal facilities was merely confirmed in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*,[39] wherein the Court held that the furnishing of separate but equal facilities in connection with passenger transportation complied with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

The 14th amendment was adopted in 1868 and its fifth section provides:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

Yet Congress has never legislated concerning segregation in the public schools.

Footnotes at end of speech.

In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*,[40] and in the companion case of *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*,[41] decided that in the field of public education, the doctrine of separate but equal facilities had no place, and that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. In the second decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*,[42] the Court remanded the respective cases to the courts of origin and stated that these courts in fashioning and effectuating decrees should be guided by the practical flexibility of equitable principles, give weight to public and private considerations and require the defendants to make a prompt and reasonable start toward compliance with the court decree.

The decisions in the school segregation cases could reasonably have been forecast. In 1889 in the case of *Strauder* v. *West Virginia*,[43] the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that selection for jury service could not be made on the basis of race. In *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*,[44] judicial enforcement was denied to restrictive covenants between private persons where segregated housing was the objective. This case was cited by the Supreme Court in its recent decision in *Cooper* v. *Aaron*,[45] as authority for the proposition that the prohibitions of the 14th amendment extend to all actions of the State denying equal protection of the law. Segregated transportation was condemned in *Gayle* v. *Browder*,[46] and segregated recreation, in *Mayor and City Council* v. *Dawson*.[47] In the field of higher education, the Court abandoned the doctrine of separate but equal facilities in the cases of *Missouri* ex rel. *Gaines* v. *Canada*,[48] *Sipuel* v. *Board of Regents*,[49] *Sweatt* v. *Painter*,[50] *McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma State Regents*,[51] and *Lucy* v. *Adams*.[52] Thus, in the school segregation cases, it was not surprising that the Court renounced the doctrine of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* and applied to the area of primary education the principles announced in its prior decisions which dealt with secondary education. While the decisions pertaining to higher education were exoteric in nature and received but little attention, those affecting the basic local school units were exoteric and struck at the heart of local administration in the field of public education. It is in this area of State-Federal relations that perhaps the most emotional and violent reactions exist. The public response to these decisions has varied throughout the Nation and the problem of enforcing the decrees which supplement these decisions will vary in proportion to their conflict with the customs, mores and public conscience of the people of the areas involved. It is a truism which cannot be ignored, that the people, and not the courts, are the ultimate guardians of the Constitution.

As a result of the foregoing and other decisions in the delicate area of State-Federal relations, public criticism, both constructive and otherwise, has been heaped upon the U.S. Supreme Court. Such censure reached into the Halls of the 85th Congress. In its original form, the Jenner-Butler bill,[53] removed from the Supreme Court jurisdiction to review (1) any function of a congressional committee or any proceeding against a witness charged with contempt of Congress, (2) any action of any officer of the executive branch of the Federal Government in regard to security cases; (3) any statute or executive regulation of a State aimed at the control of subversive activities; (4) the rules and regulations of a school board regarding subversive activities; and (5) any rule of a State board of law examiners pertaining to the admission of persons to the bar. The bill was aimed at Supreme Court decisions and denied appellate jurisdiction to the Supreme Court in these five fields. Under its provisions, the decisions of the 11 U.S. Courts of Appeals would be final in such cases. This bill was amended by a proposal submitted by Senator JOHN M. BUTLER, of Maryland, which denied appellate jurisdiction to the Supreme Court in admission cases, but relaxed its provisions in the other four areas. In its amended form, the bill was defeated on the floor of the Senate by a motion to table, which carried by a vote of 49 to 41. On August 21, a bill reached the Senate which had passed the House by a vote of 241 to 155 and would have altered the so-called Federal preemption doctrine by providing that no past or present Federal law should be construed to preempt and exclude State laws on the same subject unless Congress specified such an intention or there was a direct and positive conflict between the Federal and State laws. This bill was offered as an amendment to a narrower preemption bill which applied only to the field of State subversion legislation and would, in effect, have overruled the Court's decision in *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*. The narrower bill would probably have carried, but the broader measure, which was opposed by the Department of Justice was defeated by a 41 to 40 vote.

Many other bills were introduced which reflected disagreement with Supreme Court decisions and attempted to restrict the Court's appellate jurisdiction in various areas. Further bills were aimed at the political method of selecting Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, one of which provided for such selection by a vote of the judges of the highest courts of the several States. Various constitutional amendments were presented to Congress which provided for specific terms of 4-, 10- and 12-year periods for such Justices.

The worth of such proposals should be viewed in the light of a recurrence to the fundamental principles of our civil government. America was conceived in the philosophy "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. * * *"[54] Under this concept it is recognized that men have rights because they are men and these rights are bestowed by our Creator and not by government. Our forebears adopted written State constitutions which vested all powers in the States that were not expressly reserved in the people; they then adopted a Federal Constitution which delegated specific powers to the central government. And, during the first session of the First Congress, a resolution was adopted which provided for submission to the respective legislatures of the States of 12 proposed amendments to the Constitution "in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers"[55] Ten of the twelve amendments were adopted on June 15, 1790, and are commonly called the American Bill of Rights.[56]

It was provided in both the Federal and State constitutions that the powers of government should be divided among the legislative, executive and judicial branches. The constitutional authors knew the tyranny which had existed where too much power was vested in one branch of the Government and therefore separated such powers. They understood the desirability of friction between the authority of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the governments and between the States and the Nation.

While I would recommend the enactment of amendments to existing statutes to correct an existing erroneous statutory construction by the U.S. Supreme Court and to clarify and make certain the intent of Congress in reference to the preemption of State power, I believe that it is unwise to tinker with the established division of powers which exists between the coordinate branches of our Federal Government by restricting the reviewing power of the Supreme Court. A change in these balances may well cause greater difficulty, confusion, and loss of individual rights than that occasioned by any of the protested opinions.

Abraham Lincoln, in discussing the Dred Scott decision,[57] after affirming his belief in obedience to and respect for the Supreme Court, stated: "But we think the Dred Scott decision is erroneous. We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this. We offer no resistance to it."[58] The decisions of all courts should be submitted to the light of public scrutiny and criticism. If unsound in principle, they will not survive; if sound, they may become lasting precedent.

The recent "Report of the Committee of the Conference of Chief Justices on State-Federal Relations as Affected by Judicial Decisions" made no reference to segregation or the segregation decisions. While it found fault with many decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in other State-Federal areas, it was not critical of the Court as a part of the judicial department of the Federal Government.[59] While I do not know the thoughts which impelled the chief justices of other States to vote for the adoption of the report, my vote was based upon a belief that either sincere and articulate criticism of judicial decisions, or action by Congress to amend existing legislation and thereby correct any erroneous statutory interpretation by the U.S. Supreme Court, affords a better method of shaping its policy of future action than does legislation withdrawing from it appellate jurisdiction in given areas.

In passing judgment upon the right and propriety of the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, and in voting for the adoption of the Report of the Committee on State-Federal Relations, I realized that the conference, in urging the desirability of self-restraint upon the Supreme Court of the United States in the exercise of the vast powers committed to it, might well be violating the precept which it was entreating the Justices of that Court to observe. And I likewise recognize that the Conference may be in error in its analysis and conclusions concerning the propriety of such decisions. However, while the activities of the Federal and State judiciary are correlated in certain respects, it is wholesome for our States and the Nation that each branch of the judiciary zealously guard its own prerogatives and areas of activity, and stand ever ready to be critical when there is an apparent invasion of the judicial domain of the other. In all branches of Government, eternal vigilance is the price of freedom from encroachment; and freedom of expression, even though critical in nature, is a requisite to vigilance.

Courts generally have been guilty of errors, occasionally have sought to wield more power than was proper and, as all other human institutions, are fallible. Yet courts, and particularly the U.S. Supreme Court, have been a vast agency for good, have averted many a storm which threatened our peace and welfare, and have greatly aided in unifying our people in law and justice. There is no other agency to replace them. Strip them of their power and you have discord and confusion; unrestrained power within the legislative and executive branches of the Government; statutes and laws without observance; court orders and decrees without obedience; and ultimately Government by men and not by law.

In the past, the public has sustained the bench when under frontal attack. It will do so again if the courts will recognize that their goal is to make the administration of justice as near perfect as the frailties of human endeavor will permit; that the greatest power within the domain of the judiciary is that of self-restraint; and that their obligation is to serve mankind through the administration of justice and thereby leave order where they find chaos, peace where

Footnotes at end of speech.

they find strife, and confidence where they find doubt and suspicion. This is the road which leads to public approbation of the judiciary and to the private dignity of its judges. May the judiciary of our Nation and its States have the wisdom and courage to travel this course and may it ever by zealous that these coveted attributes are maintained.

[1] 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137.
[2] 10 U.S. (6 Cranch) 87.
[3] 11 U.S. (7 Cranch) 603.
[4] 19 U.S. (6 Wheat.) 264.
[5] See Judge Learned Hand's lectures on the Bill of Rights.
[6] See *People* v. *Lloyd*, 304 Ill. 23.
[7] 350 U.S. 497.
[8] 377 Pa. 58, 104 A. 2d 133.
[9] 18 U.S.C. 2385.
[10] 50 U.S.C. 781 et seq. and 50 U.S.C. 841.
[11] 254 U.S. 325.
[12] Now 18 U.S.C. sec. 2388.
[13] Cf. *People* v. *Von Rosen*, 13 Ill. 2d 68.
[14] 18 U.S.C. 3231 which provides as follows:
"The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of all offenses against the laws of the United States.
"Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."
Since the Smith Act is contained in that title, this section itself could have been a basis for a different conclusion in the Nelson case, however, the majority opinion, in a footnote, held the saving clause merely limited the effect of the jurisdictional grant of the first sentence and was not intended to "resolve particular supersession questions."
[15] *United States* v. *Coolidge*, 14 U.S. (1 Wheat.) 415.
[16] 18 U.S.C., sec. 2421 et seq.
[17] Act of December 17, 1914, ch. 1, 38 Stat. 785.
[18] 18 U.S.C., secs. 2312, 1213.
[19] 18 U.S.C., sec. 1201.
[20] 18 U.S.C., sec. 1073.
[21] N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. 1955, ch. 588, secs. 1–16.
[22] *Wyman* v. *Sweezy*, 100 N.H. 103, 121 A. 2d 783.
[23] 354 U.S. 234.
[24] 354 U.S. 178.
[25] 237 U.S. 309.
[26] 287 U.S. 45.
[27] 294 U.S. 103.
[28] 297 U.S. 78, reversing 173 Miss. 563, 161 So. 465.
[29] *Carter* v. *Illinois*, 329 U.S. 173, 175, 91 L. ed. 172; *Young* v. *Ragen*, 337 U.S. 235, 239, 93 L. ed. 1333.
[30] 351 U.S. 12.
[31] 357 U.S. 214, 2 L. ed. 2d 1269.
[32] (a) Cf. *Gryger* v. *Burke*, 334 U.S. 728, and *Townsend* v. *Burke*, 334 U.S. 736.
(b) Cf. *Wolf* v. *Colorado*, 338 U.S. 25, and *Rochin* v. *California*, 342 U.S. 165.
(c) *Moore* v. *Michigan*, 355 U.S. 155, 2 L. ed. 2d 167.
(d) *Lambert* v. *California*, 355 U.S. 275, 2 L. ed. 2d 228.
(e) *Giordenello* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 480, 2 L. ed. 2d 1503.
(f) *Miller* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 301, 2 L. ed. 2d 1332.
(g) *Jones* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 493, 2 L. ed 2d 1514.
[33] 29 U.S.C., secs. 141 et seq.
[34] 29 U.S.C., sec. 151.
[35] "The National Labor Management Relations Act * * * leaves much to the States, though Congress has refrained from telling us how much. We must spell out from conflicting indications of congressional will the area in which State action is still permissible." *Garner* v. *Teamsters, C. & H. Union*, 346 U.S. 485, 488.
[36] 353 U.S. 252.
[37] 353 U.S. 232.
[38] *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 407, 415.
[39] 163 U.S. 537.
[40] 347 U.S. 483.
[41] 347 U.S. 497.
[42] 349 U.S. 294.
[43] 100 U.S. 303.
[44] 334 U.S. 1.
[45] Supreme Court of United States, Advance Sheet No. 1, August Special Term, 1958.
[46] 352 U.S. 903, affirming 142 F. Supp. 707.
[47] 350 U.S. 877, affirming 220 F. 2d 386.
[48] 305 U.S. 337.
[49] 332 U.S. 631, 92 L. ed. 247.
[50] 339 U.S. 629.
[51] 339 U.S. 637.
[52] 350 U.S. 1.
[53] Senate Bill 2646, 85th Congress.
[54] Preamble: The Declaration of Independence.
[55] Resolution proposing submission to legislatures of several States, articles in addition to and amendment of U.S. Constitution.
[56] Amendments I through X of the U.S. Constitution.
[57] *Dred Scott* v. *Sandford*, 60 U.S. (19 Howard) 393.
[58] "The Supreme Court in United States History," Charles Warren, vol. III, pp. 52 and 53.
[59] The report adopted on a vote of 36 to 8 by the chief justices of the States at the 10th annual conference at Pasadena in August of 1958 reviews many recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, and in summary states:
"It is our earnest hope, which we respectfully express, that that great Court exercise to the full its power of judicial self-restraint, but adhere firmly to its tremendous, strictly judicial powers and by eschewing, so far as possible, the exercise of essentially legislative powers when it is called upon to decide questions involving the validity of State actions, whether it deem such action wise or unwise."

## Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has devised the now-famous Flemming formula whereby he says 75,000 classrooms will be built to alleviate partially the need for 140,000 classrooms to properly house our boys and girls. Dr. Flemming's formula is to change the constitutions, statutory debt limits, and tax procedures of the various States. But these are minor obstacles according to Dr. Flemming and with their change, thousands of classrooms can be built next year.

Now that he has solved the classroom shortage, Dr. Flemming can put his considerable talents to work in other fields. One of the sports that has enjoyed a rapid growth in popularity is golf, perhaps in some measure due to the interest Dr. Flemming's boss takes in the game. But hundreds of new players have to forgo the pleasure of making a hole-in-one. Applying Dr. Flemming's formula, by changing golf rules slightly and modifying the equipment somewhat, all players can make a hole-in-one. Each golf ball is to be equipped with a guidance mechanism modeled after that in our most advanced missiles, and each hole on the golf course will be outfitted with radar and tracking devices that will guide the ball to the hole. Golf is an ancient game so the rules are obviously obsolete and it will not be difficult to change them in order to use this improved mechanism. But getting the guidance mechanism down to the size and weight of a golf ball; and the radar and homing devices to a size that will fit in the hole on the green will be a little more difficult. But these are minor obstacles and it can be safely predicted that millions of golfers on every modern and properly equipped golf course in America will be making holes-in-one next summer.

## Let's Face Our Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the Employment Act of 1946 it was recognized that the Federal Government has a responsibility to promote maximum production, employment and purchasing power. To achieve these goals requires policies designed: First, to promote adequate growth and productive capacity; second, to insure high and steady use of labor and natural resources; third, to maintain reasonable stability in the general level of prices.

These are coordinate objectives of public policies, however, and undue emphasis on one without regard for the others is detrimental to the public interest. Changing economic circumstances require shifts in the relative emphasis to be given these objectives.

At the present time we are in a recession. Almost half of the major labor markets of the Nation are suffering from substantial unemployment. Our rate of economic growth has come to a virtual standstill. The concensus of expert opinion is that we can expect relatively stable prices in the coming months.

Refusing to take cognizance of these facts, the administration places absolute priority on balancing the budget. They say that to do otherwise would be inflationary. I recognize the danger of inflation, but it is not the danger that is confronting us. The problem is not the level of government expenditures but the character of the activities for which the budget provides.

Unless the Federal Government follows policies which result in expansion of employment and production, it will be derelict in its duties under the Employment Act of 1946. It will have abdicated its responsibilities to provide for the Nation's security. It will have relin-

quished the leadership of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment in February again showed an increase over the preceding month. It now stands at 4.7 million which is in excess of 6 percent of the total labor force. Adding to this, the full-time equivalent of involuntary part-time unemployment raises that total by another million. Over 7.2 percent of our labor force is therefore currently unemployed. These alarming statistics are further evidence of the critical situation of our Nation's economy in spite of the rosy predictions regularly published by the administration. The time for action was yesterday and tomorrow may be too late.

Since the administration has refused even to recognize the existence of this problem much less recommend measures to effectively deal with unemployment and economic stagnation, it is incumbent upon the Congress to act and to act now.

A few days ago we passed a measure extending, for a short period, temporary unemployment compensation benefits. This legislation, which I supported, does nothing for those who have already exhausted temporary benefits or for those not presently covered by unemployment compensation insurance.

It is no substitute for long overdue reforms in the unemployment compensation system. The Karsten-Machrowicz bill to establish Federal standards for unemployment compensation is needed more now than ever before. I am hopeful that there will be no unnecessary delay in bringing this measure before the House.

But Federal standards for unemployment compensation are not a cure-all. It is but one of a battery of measures that should be brought to bear upon the stagnation afflicting our economic life. National bankruptcy will not result from Federal expenditures and capital outlays that recognize the needs of a great people, but it can result from reliance upon an outmoded economic dogmatism having as its first principle a belief that the best course of action is no action at all.

We must adopt a program to meet two imperative needs.

First. Alleviating the effects of unemployment.

Second. Eliminating the unemployment.

The first involves measures to cushion the hardship, misery, and economic impact of unemployment. The need for overhauling our unemployment compensation system has been mentioned. The distribution of surplus commodities has been of assistance but leaves much to be desired. Enactment of a workable food stamp plan to improve distribution of a greater variety of foods, including meat, poultry, and other items acquired through surplus removal programs is badly needed. A review of surplus food distribution eligibility standards should be undertaken by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

However, these steps are no substitute for full employment, production, and purchasing power. If we face up to our responsibilities in the fields of education, water resources, defense, public health, resource development, public facilities, and economic and technical assistance to undeveloped nations, we need not fear underemployment of America's productive resources. Here, too, Congress must take the lead and I am confident that the American people, when the facts are made known to them, will applaud our efforts.

I am convinced that such a course of action is more apt to balance the Federal budget than is a program of retrenchment. The Members of this body need not be reminded that the huge Federal deficit for the current fiscal year is principally attributable to the decrease in tax revenues resulting from underemployment. The administration's budget proposals would, if anything, intensify this unhappy situation.

The most promising of the measures designed to promote economic growth and prosperity is the Douglas-Flood area redevelopment bill. This measure, with a relatively small Federal investment, would give impetus to the industrial redevelopment programs of communities which because of industrial migration, technological change, or other reason are suffering serious and persistent unemployment. It is in the enlightened self-interest of the Nation as a whole to expedite the implementation of the depressed areas legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the sentiments expressed in this short statement are shared by almost every Democratic Member of Congress, and I am confident that the 86th Congress will realize its obligation to exercise the vision, resolution, and courage expected of us by the people who elected us and that it will provide the public framework within which America will realize its greatness.

## Who Pockets the Profits on the Food Dollar?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the Wisconsin Farmers Union held its 28th annual meeting in Wausau, Wis., the end of February, delegates went on record in favor of a congressional investigation into the causes behind the ever-widening spread between the prices farmers receive for their products and the money consumers have to pay for food. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the resolution on this subject passed by the Wisconsin Farmers Union in the RECORD:

PRICE SPREAD INVESTIGATION

Whereas there is a great difference in the amount of money received by the farmer for his products as compared to the amount of money that the consumer pays; and

Whereas the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is getting less and less; and

Whereas there are excessive price spreads, increases, and profiteering in business and industry causing the present high cost of living: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the delegates attending the 28th annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention at Wausau, Wis., February 22–24, 1959, go on record demanding of the Congress of the United States that it conduct an investigation into the cause of the widening price spread between the farmer and the consumer, and the excessive profit-taking in business and industry, for the purpose of formulating legislation to be acted upon by the Congress to correct these abuses.

## What Is Nasser Doing With His Egypt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the RECORD an article from the Western World of December 1958, entitled, "What Is Nasser Doing With His Egypt?"

WHAT IS NASSER DOING WITH HIS EGYPT?

(The Cairo-Moscow financial agreement for the Aswan Dam should not blind us to certain facts of present-day Egypt. The author of this article is an American residing in Egypt. We recognize that an unsigned article loses its effectiveness. But signing, the writer might well have landed in one of Nasser's jails. We prefer to print his contributions anonymously and, on his leaving Egypt, to let our author write a signed sequel.)

An appraisal and a forecast. Gamal Abdel Nasser—leader of pan-Arabism, pan-Africanism, and pan-Moslemism—has passed the peak of his popularity and influence in Egypt. His failure to carry out promised reforms and improvements at home is already beginning to tarnish his luster as a two-continent leader. In chalking up his impressive international gains, Nasser keeps notably silent about his internal record with his several 5-year plans.

Nasser is still the personification of many emerging peoples' dreams as the great leader. To the Arabs he sold himself as a fellow Arab; to the Africans as a fellow African of color, and to the West as their understanding friend. We Americans need not feel superior about this because we fell for his universal pretentions more heavily than most. Our erstwhile Ambassador, Jefferson Caffery, accredited Nasser with doing in 2 years more than any ruler of Egypt had done in 2,000 years. John Gunther found as early as 4 years ago that Nasser had done more for Egypt than any Egyptian king in the last 150 years.

Nasser, with a dictator's vanity, displays his photo in color anywhere and everywhere, including plastering it on the public monuments of other Egyptian heroes. His favorite photo is the one with the confident smile, gleaming teeth, and smart western clothes. His picture is displayed on walls of souks and in the humble huts of peasants across Africa and Asia. The same picture, circulated as propaganda in the States, ends up on the walls of many Negro housewives who identify Nasser as an attractive fellow African of color. In a crowd of his drab and physically handicapped fellow countrymen Nasser looms up impressively. To them he personifies concretely all that they have lacked: power, a fine athletic build and smart clothes. He talked their vernacular

and identified himself with them and promised them anything, everything. But today both his glamor and his promises are wearing thin. Those living in places remote from Nasser are the most impressed partly because they are the least able to check up on his actual performance.

WHAT NASSER COULD HAVE DONE

Nasser could have become the Ataturk of Egypt. He had a free field to carry out a bold and daring program. For a time the West gave him a free hand in pulling the Arab nations together. The monarchy had crumbled of its own decay. There was no serious political party opposition to his taking power. No leader ever received more enthusiastic and widespread support. What an opportunity Nasser has had—and may still have—to deal with Egypt's underlying problems of health and education and to bring his people into the modern world. Nasser could have put through a national agricultural program, more far reaching and efficient than his limited land redistribution. He could have tackled a whole range of population problems more urgent in Egypt than almost anywhere in the world. With over 80 percent of the population illiterate, he could still come up with a national program to do away with illiteracy in our time. He could undertake long-term slum clearance plans and gradually relocate or rebuild the mud villages. All these would be preliminary steps toward improving the health and well-being of the entire nation—programs which could readily win support from the Western World. But no such large imaginative projects are being put into operation.

It should be noted that Nasser and his Junta early in office discussed many of these needs and ways to meet them. For example, one of his associates, Rashid el Borawi gave an outline which today can serve as a convenient checklist of Nasser's defaults. He wrote:

"The achievement of social justice is possible only by relieving the middle and poorer classes by carrying on a campaign against the high cost of living * * * Among the Army's principal aims is to stamp out corruption in all its aspects. * * * Introduce efficiency, speed and precision in the discharge of official business, establish a decentralized system."

Borawi indicated what Nasser should do further.

"Abolish martial law, lift censorship on correspondents and the press, shatter the system of political police, restore constitutional life and strengthen the bonds between those in authority and the people."

Let us check Borawi's list against Nasser's actual performance in several of his 5 year plans now that more than 5 years have elapsed.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

Egypt has long been notoriously overstaffed with civil servants. Nasser promised to reduce the number and to instill efficiency. Instead, he had added a new layer of bureaucrats on top of those already existing. A quarter of them, if organized, could do the work more efficiently than the whole lot. Nasser gave new offices and housing to loyal civil servants. There has been no noticeable speeding up in transaction of State business except perhaps the substitution of bicycles for donkeys in mail deliveries in the countryside. It should be observed, however, that some of Nasser's political promises were too grandiose to have been realized within a few years anyway, even though he had made a serious effort. Instead of decentrallization of official business there has been intensified centralization with Nasser's own desk the principal bottleneck. Martial law was abolished but other restrictions were clamped on. Censorship of the Egyption press is complete. The blight to independent thinking is as withering as in any of the Soviet countries. There is no independent political writing coming out of Egypt today. Journalists land in jail on the slightest provocation. A Communist taint to Egyptian utterances is in part due to the fact that Nasser released a number of ex-Communists from jail and they are now writing for government newspapers and radio programs.

Any campaign against the high cost of living in Egypt is bound to fail because many goods are still imported and in the last 3 years alone the Egyptian pound has lost half its free market value. There are several policies of Nasser's which have driven prices up: Outlays for armaments far in excess of Egypt's capacity to pay; a continuous flood of hostile Nasser propaganda against precisely those Western nations, including the United States, best able to give Egypt financial aid. Foreign tourism is discouraged, yet of all countries, Egypt is one of the three in the Mediterranean area which has the most to offer tourists. Political unrest and threat of war are the principal deterrents. Secondary ones are petty bureaucratic annoyances and local police harassment.

THE POLITICAL POLICE

"Shatter the system of political police," recommended Borawi. This Nasser did, but he set up a bigger and more efficient system for his own use. The old leaders of the Kremlin installed commissars in the army to keep tab on the generals. Nasser has gone them one better by using officers in his personal spy service to spy on officers.

"Restore constitutional life," recommended Borawi. But since then Nasser has suspended parliament and stopped members' salaries.

"Strengthen the bonds between government and the people," Borawi advised. One of the major defects in Egyptian social life has been precisely the gulf between the few haves and the many have-nots. Government and city people kept as far away from the villages as they possibly could, and still do. Fellaheen, disease ridden and huddling with their cattle in mud hovels, always seemed a hopeless gigantic problem. But for social progress this gulf must be bridged. Nasser with his small village origin, and his mass backing was the one best placed to bridge it. Instead Nasser has fallen into the traditional antisocial pattern of sacrificing his people for grandiose schemes abroad. He has made the rich poorer, but he has made the poor still poorer so that the gulf is as wide as ever. He made frustrations greater by giving privileges to a new middle class, his supporters.

The weakness in Borawi's recommendations came to light later. He had advised that the army's principal concern should be to stamp out corruption in all its aspects. But since writing the book Borawi himself has gone to jail on charges of corruption. There are still many of Nasser's associates in high places involved in corruption. Perhaps Nasser also did not like Borawi's views.

EDUCATION AND THE PRESS

Nasser seemed to think education a good idea, but has so little notion of how to implement it that his educators are unhappy and frustrated. He emphasized that he wanted to enlarge and build up the University of Cairo and the other two secular universities. But he put so little money into them that highly trained educators today are the lowest paid professionals in Egypt.

He talked of modernizing education, but at the same time he increased the subsidy to the old Moslem university of El Azhar with its 12-year courses based principally on memorizing the Koran. Actually it receives almost as much in government grants as does the University of Cairo. Thus Nasser seeks to emphasize both the traditional Moslem and modern ways of thought, and has failed to support either adequately. As a result, Egypt has large numbers of frustrated students ill nourished and ill taught, wondering where and how they can exercise their talents.

In true dictatorial tradition Nasser sees to it that only favorable things are published in the Egyptian press. There is a line of prudent doubletalk lauding Nasser which Egyptians on first meeting with foreigners now use. Americans particularly, get a strong pro-Nasser line at first, because Egyptians credit Americans with helping to build up Nasser in the first place, and with helping to keep him afloat since.

A visitor, however, who stays longer and seems to be openminded, attracts an unsolicited flood of anti-Nasser sentiment. The quantity, variety, and intensity are startling. Many of those who display the most conventional pro-Nasser sentiment at first meeting, on further acquaintance turn out to be actively plotting against him.

WITHIN HIS OWN CAMP

The fact which is now causing Nasser most anxiety is the hostility growing up against him inside his own camp. Those who benefited most by his favors are the young officers. But among them are idealists who expected great social changes through his reforms. But now they see nepotism and graft carried on much as before but by different people. The young idealists feel frustrated. The older professionals also feel frustrated because they see young officers being advanced ahead of them. Some of these were old fellow conspirators of Nasser's in the Moslem brotherhood. Some of the police were also in the brotherhood. Nasser knows that he has mortal enemies among them.

In view of Nasser's complacency toward Moscow, it comes as a surprise that there is a militant group of Egyptian Communists who are also bitterly anti-Nasser. They resent the fact that so many of their followers are still in jail while Nasser let out those who are willing to collaborate and gave them good jobs.

Then there are Egyptian nationalists who feel that Nasser, because of his shortcomings at home, is defeating their nationalist movement abroad. Many feel so strongly about this that they are working against Nasser in existing international organizations like the Arab League and the United Nations delegations. Some would even welcome foreign intervention to put an end to Nasser's domination and express the wish that the British and French had held on a day or two longer and ousted Nasser. Treason has a different ring when it challenges tyranny.

Nasser had the choice of attempting to meet reasonable grievances by satisfying them or by cracking down on the complainants. He chose to crack down. He has created a large army of Nasser spies estimated now at over 30,000. In addition to those in the army and in the police Nasser has even built up a large force of what are called 20 piastre, 5-cent spies: doormen, waiters, tax drivers, and the like.

In best Hitler style people unfriendly to Nasser disappear. Interment camps have been reopened. Remote oases are also used for political prisoners. Bodies are found floating in the Nile. Families are left in the dark as to whether the arrested are dead or alive.

While Egypt has become a police state, it is fortunately not yet an efficient totalitarian one. Egyptians are great talkers and are reckless about expressing their opinions. This could be disastrous to many. But fortunately the Egyptian police are also casual, and are less efficient in political arrests on a wholesale scale. Typical of a police state,

guesses vary widely as to how many people have been put away. Estimates run from 5,000 to 20,000, the smaller figure being more likely.

This is the sad picture of Nasser's Egypt. Nasser had a wonderful opportunity to lead his people by the hand into the modern world. Instead he has them by the throat. He looks more and more like the kind of military dictator who from the times of the Pharaohs down has oppressed his Egyptian people to satisfy a thirst for power. One wonders how much longer they will put up with him.

## Lipscomb and the Trade War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues this editorial from the Los Angeles Times, of Tuesday, March 17, 1959:

LIPSCOMB AND THE TRADE WAR

Representative GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB has pointed at an international sore that does not heal and wants the doctors of Congress to make a thorough clinical examination.

DISTURBING INCREASE

The Los Angeles Republican is concerned about the trade with the Communists which, he finds, grows disturbingly and in violation of the spirit of the congressional act of 1949. Lipscomb has uncovered some recent trade with Russia and its satellites, not imposing by the cash measurement ($4,951,522) but disturbing because of its strategic nature.

Export licenses are issued deep in the bureaucracy of the Commerce Department, and when Admiral Strauss, the Commerce Secretary, discovered what was going on, he cut off further shipments of fabricated copper, in wire and other forms—the stuff that is essential to electronic and missile manufacture. Mr. LIPSCOMB wonders whether the Commerce Department ought to be the place where export licenses to the Communists should be issued, inasmuch as the Department's prime function is to promote trade, not to weigh its implications in the cold war.

Perhaps it shouldn't be, but perhaps the Commerce Department would be as good a bureau as another to issue export licenses if the public received through Mr. LIPSCOMB's proposed inquiry a thorough understanding of the nature of Communist trade both ways. LIPSCOMB thinks that American companies which receive licenses to export to Communists should be publicized and it would be well, too, if we knew which American companies are receiving Communist goods.

RED TRADE WEAPON

Mr. LIPSCOMB understands, as all of us should, that Russian trade is never the innocent exchange of goods that is usually meant when we speak of international commerce. The Russians use trade as a weapon. They do not import consumer goods, only the items which aid Communist industrial and military power. They can't come into the international market for all kinds of goods which may be in demand by the Russian people because they don't have enough foreign exchange and have never attempted to acquire it by normal trading.

They always know exactly what they want, and their desire usually involves techniques of design or manufacture in which they have been behind. About 10 years ago the British sold the Russians some Nene jet engines, and when Americans lifted an eyebrow the sellers protested that the engines were becoming obsolete and had no strategic importance. Then came the Korean police action in which Russian Mig jets were the premier plane—at least the fastest. Our side captured one of these Mig's after much trouble, and when the engine was examined it was found to be based on the Nene, with some plumbing innovations.

Trade the other way, from Russia to other parts of the world, is usually a cold war operation. There are exceptions, of course, as when they are bartering for something they themselves want very much. If we remember correctly, the Nene engines were paid for with timber and like materials the British needed. But the normal Russian export operation is the dumping operation.

ADVERSE EFFECTS

Mr. LIPSCOMB cites some examples. Last year the Russians dumped platinum on the market and so depressed the world price that the normal producing sources suffered. They have done the same with manganese and with tin. They have even done it with benzene. Price seems to be no object, and of course costs of production in the U.S.S.R. have no relation to costs in the western world. As LIPSCOMB says, "This is not trade, be it ever so sweet and ever so cheap. This is an economic war."

Our NATO partners in the Coordinating Commitee on International Export Control have been more guilty than we in trading with the Communists. Their pressures are in large part responsible for our own relaxation from the congressional intent of 1949. But it is a serious question whether we should be so complacent about our allies' acts, and there is no question at all about us ourselves lowering our guard. We have the most to lose and the occasional bargains offered this country comprise a piddling compensation to throw into the opposite side of the balance.

The Lipscomb investigation would be a good thing. We ought to know more about this trade war and how we can lose ground in it. The Russians would rather wage economic war than war with rockets and we seem to be letting them choose all the battlefields.

## Establishing Cooperative Research Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies within his Department to enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, colleges, and universities, State and Territorial fish and game departments, and nonprofit organizations for the conducting of research, training, and demonstrational programs through the establishing of cooperative research units, which may be named for the various States and Territories in which they are formed.

The research work authorized under this program definitely would constitute valuable training for graduate students who are required to perform field research as part of their formal educational training. This kind of a program, confined largely to wildlife units and which was started in 1935, now is in operation in 16 of the land-grant colleges and universities—among them Montana—throughout the United States. My bill would stabilize, strengthen, and broaden this program.

The present cooperative research unit program, which has been operating successfully for more than 23 years, has proved itself to be a highly valuable and economical method of getting research work done while training men for future professional careers in fish and wildlife research, management, and administration.

The 16 colleges and universities affiliated in the present cooperative research unit program have bestowed 2,964 bachelor, master, and doctor degrees upon wildlife students since the program started. A high percentage of these graduates are employed in State and Federal agencies and educational institutions in all parts of the country. The existing unit program, which merits greater stability, has created splendid cooperation between the Federal and State agencies and colleges and universities. Such local units are effective and have functioned in the public interest.

## The Need for a Strong Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have read and heard a great deal in recent weeks of the responsibilities of Congress in the creation of our Nation's military policy. We have read and heard some misinformed commentators who seem to believe that the responsibility for the military policies and posture of our armed forces rests solely on the Executive. As we know, nothing could be further from the truth. The Constitution makes the role of this great body perfectly clear.

I know of no finer example of the marked success Congress has enjoyed in its rightful role of military policy making and in creating forces to implement that policy than the United States Marine Corps.

As all of you know, we don't maintain the Marine Corps, the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force out of pure sentiment. In today's market military power is far too expensive to be perpetuated for reasons of sentiment or in memory of past glories.

Congress has insisted upon maintaining a Marine Corps—and an Army, Navy, and Air Force—because we know they are needed. We know that these forces are necessary tools in a world where the survival of freedom must depend upon our ability to meet the challenges of Communist aggression with determination, but also with precision and restraint.

What do we demand of these forces which we create? In particular, why do we insist upon a Marine Corps of three combat-ready Marine divisions and three air wings? What place does the Marine Corps hold in our military posture?

The United States is an island nation. Our land borders are touched by only two nations, Canada and Mexico, both good friends and good neighbors.

The most easily used, the most economical, and the most practical highways between us and the rest of the world are the seas. The seas of the world are the arteries along which flow the commerce and the strength which bind the countries of the free world into the great alliance it is. The seas of the world are the highways over which we can come to the aid of our friends with supplies and military power in meaningful quantities.

We must control and use these highways of the free world is to survive.

We control the seas through the intelligent use of seapower. But without the ability to project that power ashore, promptly and efficiently, the meaning of seapower is lost; these great highways are useless. Amphibious operations are the means by which we project navalpower a shore and secure the benefits of these highways.

Without this ability to project our power from the sea to the land, much of the significance of seapower is lost—to our friends and our enemies alike.

The key to victory in our last two wars lay in our ability not only to control the seas, but to project our military might from the sea onto the land.

Our ability to do this rested upon the doctrine and the techniques developed by the Marine Corps between World Wars I and II. These techniques must change constantly with the refinement of weapons and machines. The necessity for maintaining this art is not gone. If anything, the need is greater than ever before.

Congress decided after World War II, with the lessons of that great conflict still vivid in its mind, that the continual development of the art of amphibious warfare was a full time job—not a sideline for one of the larger services, but a job for a comparatively small organization that could devote its full efforts to the art and always be ready to use it at a moment's notice.

In an effort to insure that we would continue to develop new techniques and doctrine for this highly specialized military art and would continue to have a force constantly ready to execute such operations, the Marines were assigned this mission by law after World War II.

Assignment of this function to the Marine Corps was and is a perfectly natural solution to the problem. This mission involves a close and absolutely unique association with the Navy; one that makes the business of getting aboard ships and away—fully ready for combat—an instinctive thing. This unique relationship is the product of over 175 years of close association. It's the result of living with the problem for generations.

In developing this capability over the course of many years, the Marine Corps became the Nation's force-in-readiness.

This too was a natural development. In its close teamwork with the Navy and its increasing efforts to provide amphibious forces that were always trained and ready to go, the Marines provided a force that was expert and available in one package. Their forces did not need to be collected, trained, and equipped as each emergency arose. They were in existence, fully trained, and an integral part of the fleet. To put it simply they filled a need in our defense structure.

Congress was quick to recognize that our country has a continuing need for such a versatile, highly trained, always ready force. But, for various reasons, there have been those outside Congress who refuse to recognize this need, or claim that the need can be filled by other forces. As a result, in spite of the clear prescriptions of law, the Marines were steadily whittled down after World War II until by 1949, on the eve of the Korean conflict, they had been reduced to six battalions.

With the lessons of Korea unmistakably clear to all who would learn, Congress sought again in 1953 to insure that the country would never again be without the services of an amphibious force in readiness.

In approving legislation that would require the maintenance of a Marine Corps of a specified combatant size and capability, the House Armed Services Committee made the intent and the aims of Congress clear beyond argument. The committee stated the purpose of the legislation as "to require the maintenance of a versatile expeditionary force in readiness, always combat ready."

To further expose the need for such a force the committee stated:

> American history, recent as well as remote, has fully demonstrated the vital need for the existence of a strong force in readiness. Such a force, versatile, fast moving, and hard hitting, will constantly have a very powerful impact in relation to minor international disturbances. Such a force can prevent the growth of potentially large conflagrations by prompt and vigorous action during their incipient stages.

These reasons for maintaining a strong Marine Corps are just as valid today as they were when they were written in 1952.

The need for a Marine Corps of not less than three combat divisions and three air wings is, if anything, greater today than it was in 1952.

The place of the Marines in our national military posture is best expressed in simple terms. If we did not have a Marine Corps—we would have to go right out and get one.

They provide, as an integral part of the balanced fleet, the force-in-readiness which is essential to a flexible military and foreign policy.

## Education Act Test Oath Ineffective and Detrimental

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 16 I introduced a bill to repeal section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This section requires a person obtaining payments or loans under the act to swear to an affidavit that he does not believe in, or support any organization that believes in, the violent or unconstitutional overthrow of the United States Government.

Why, it might be asked, should anyone want to eliminate this provision from the act? Certainly, it has a valid purpose—to prevent the granting of benefits by the Government to persons bent on destroying it. I am in complete agreement with that purpose. However, I do not think that the disclaimer affidavit will accomplish that purpose. Moreover, I believe that if the provision is allowed to remain, it will do more harm than good in carrying out the general purpose of the act in stimulating and helping to satisfy the educational ambitions of the country's youth.

The justification for any law's existence should be found in the answer to the question: "Will it promote the general welfare?" Unless this can be answered in the affirmative, a law has no reason for being and is better off repealed. Clearly, a law which is ineffective—which is destined not to accomplish its purpose—cannot meet this test. Section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act is such a law.

I agree with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare when he said that the requirement of section 1001(f) will not uncover any persons who seek or who belong to organizations that believe in or teach the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. For, as Secretary Flemming further pointed out, such persons have no scruples about signing an affidavit or taking an oath.

Moreover, I believe that this section, in addition to being ineffective, is actually detrimental. Some colleges have refused to participate in the programs offered under the act because they find this section so obnoxious. The students at these colleges have thereby been denied the benefits offered them under the act, principally those contained in the student loan program.

I have not, by the way, been able to find a satisfactory answer as to how this provision found its way into the act or who is responsible for its being there. All that the legislative history shows is that it first appeared in the bill produced by the committee of the opposite body. My guess is that some clerk in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare thought that this would be nice to

have in the act, and that this suggestion was passed on and accepted without receiving proper consideration by the committee members.

I see no reason why students and educators should be put in the position of affirmatively denying subversive affiliations in order to participate in the programs available under the act. The natural implication of this requirement is that they are a particularly suspect group. I have not been shown one shred of evidence to back up this implication. I can justly sympathize, therefore, with the many objections which they have raised against the affidavit.

This is why I have introduced my bill and I intend to offer my complete support to the present effort to delete this ill-conceived requirement from an otherwise outstanding piece of legislation.

## Political Emphasis Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentlemen from Maine [Mr. COFFIN], yesterday on the floor of the House presented an excellent report on the Political Emphasis Week which was held at St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., March 12, 13, and 14 It was our honor and pleasure to attend and participate in certain portions of this excellent program. I can assure each of you that both of us, one representing the Democratic Party and the other the Republican Party, were tremendously impressed with all aspects of this interesting and enlightening effort to create among our youth of today, the leaders of tomorrow, a more vital interest in State, National and international politics.

The gentleman from Maine, [Mr. COFFIN], most ably described the atmosphere which prevailed and the workings of the Mock House of Representatives. I join him in commending the 200-plus students of this fine liberal arts college who diligently and intelligently studied seven major issues now before the U.S. Congress—all basic problems which must be considered and be resolved by the 86th Congress. However, I sincerely believe that Dr. Clemens M. Granskow, president of the college; Dr. James R. Klonoski, head of the political science department; and other members of the faculty deserve high praise for initiating and successfully guiding this overall effort.

In 1958 the political emphasis week concentrated on the United States in the Middle East. The program a year ago included three sessions of a mock United Nations General Assembly with three major addresses by authorities in the field of the Middle East. The lively student interest and the constructive results prompted the college officials to continue the political emphasis week in 1959 with mock house of representatives sessions.

In addition to the actual mock sessions of the house of representatives, I found the entire atmosphere and activities at St. Olaf very stimulating. It was my pleasure to attend a political science class under Dr. Shepherd where our Nation's mutual security program was discussed in considerable detail. The informal Thursday luncheon with student questions and answers by Dr. Stephen Bailey, professor of Public Affairs, Princeton University and myself was very interesting. The afternoon tea and reception at one of the dormitories illustrated the intense faculty and student concern with the problems on the agenda of political emphasis week.

In closing my remarks may I congratulate Dr. Bailey who gave the convocation address and Dr. Robert E. Van Deusen of the National Lutheran Council office in Washington, who was also a principal program speaker. Their contributions were outstanding. The combined efforts of many made this a memorable experience for me, and I am deeply indebted to those who invited me to be a participant. I wish to reemphasize and reiterate my praise for those at St. Olaf, both students and faculty, who made such a tremendous effort for a most worthwhile project.

## Shame on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, and now we have come to this. Trafficking in other people's rings and watches. Intruding into the intimacies of family relationships. Taking heirlooms.

These tawdry personal effects, confiscated private property, are being sold in America's name. Your name and mine.

The guilt of the former owners? Principally, being born German or Japanese.

Our guilt? So far—idly standing by.

At what point should revulsion begin to set in?

OFFER FOR SALE BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Notice inviting citizens of the United States of America to make offers to purchase from the Attorney General all his rights, title, and interest in and to seven lots of personal property vested in the Attorney General pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, described as follows:

Lot 1. One man's watch, yellow metal.

Lot 2. One man's watch, yellow metal with chain and Masonic emblem set with six diamondlike stones.

Lot 3. One Zeiss Ikon camera with leather case. One tripod in leather case. One box of camera filters.

Lot 4. One lady's yellow metal ring set with a diamond-like stone.

Lot 5. One cocktail shaker (stainless chrome). One matching tray and four cocktail glasses, one broken.

Lot 6. One man's diamond ring.

Lot 7. One man's diamond ring (about 1½ carat). One lady's diamond ring, Tiffany setting (about 1½ carat).

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 3d day of March 1959.

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
*Attorney General of the United States.*

## Admission of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is a heartwarming experience to witness this historical culmination of the aspirations of the people of the Territory of Hawaii for statehood. I have long supported this deserving cause, and I say with all humility that it is a truly memorable experience as a freshman Representative, to participate in history in the making.

As a Representative from 1 of the original 13 States, I welcome our newest sister. This moment of profound importance to the Nation provides an opportunity to reflect with pride upon our magnificent national heritage, for the admission of Hawaii is inseparably linked to every event in our past by which this mighty Republic was irretrievably forged into a whole.

Numerous speakers have already eloquently referred to the many, strong arguments supporting Hawaiian statehood. I do not propose to retrace the ground which they have so ably covered.

What is especially important to me are the consequences and benefits which will accrue from this momentous action.

Mutual interests and growing common ideals have bound the mainland and Hawaii increasingly together for over 100 years. Now, at last, Hawaiians will have the opportunity to wholly establish their own State government, and to participate, through their elected representatives, in the Government of the United States. They will now have the chance to vote for a President and Vice President. They will attain the full rights of citizenship.

These blessings of freedom are particularly significant at a time when the world is engaged in a desperate struggle to contain the dark forces of totalitarianism.

For the rest of us and for the peoples of the world, the admission of Hawaii is graphic and striking evidence of the dynamism of the great principles of the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution. This is living proof of the vitality of our belief that all men are created equal.

This is our faith and our message. Let the rest of the world perceive and rejoice.

The dignity of man, good will, and democracy under law will take on new meaning, new clarity, new luster to those who can see their reflections among the peoples of our newest State.

This is the clarion example of the dynamic strength of freedom. Let it be a beacon and an inspiration for all mankind.

## Democracy Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD**
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mrs. John P. McKinley of Midland, Tex., I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article "Democracy versus Communism". This article was written by Stephen Driscoll, son of Dr. and Mrs. E. T. Driscoll of Midland, Tex., and won first place in the annual Americanism contest conducted by the Lt. William Brewer Chapter, DAR, of that city.

The article follows:

DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM OR THE EAGLE VERSUS THE HAMMER AND SICKLE

In these troubled times of the sputnik, world tension, the cold war, and the struggle for survival the United States of America symbolizes democracy and the U.S.S.R. symbolizes communism. Democracy versus communism is freedom versus tyranny, religion versus atheism, and morality versus evil.

As Lincoln said in a democracy the government is a "government of the people, by the people and for the people." The power rests with the people. Under communism the power rests with government. Communism is a totalitarian government by which a few have unlimited, concentrated power.

In a democracy the government is the servant, not the master, of the people. In Russia the government is the master of the people and the people, except for the Communist leaders, are virtually slaves.

Here in America we are free to think, act, and speak as we please; we have the right to attend the church of our choice, and choose the medical care we want. Our choice prevails in the selection of our political party, our occupation, and the locality in which we live. We also have the right to own our home, business, and private property. In Russia the government under the Communist party owns practically all land, minerals, resources, and controls all means of production. Only a select few own property. It is true the people can vote, but there is only one legal party in Russia, the Communist party. Only in very recent years have Russian people been able to go to church; it is under Communist domination. Medical care is also under Communist control.

In America the people choose the field of work they want. They are able to develop their talents according to their abilities. In Russia they do what the Communist Party tells them to do. It's true that those who do the best in school get the best jobs, but they have little real choice.

Under a democracy the schools are under local control. The teachers and principals have latitude in curriculum and teaching methods. Under communism the schools are under complete government control. The government dictates exactly what the teachers must teach. Students are not allowed to think for themselves; they must go along with the party ideas.

A democracy is based on a recognition of the rights of the individual and a belief in God. As Jefferson said in the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." In other words, these rights that God gave no man can take away. The Communists do not believe in God. They do not believe that anyone has any individual rights. They believe a dictator has the right to control the lives of the people. What the government gives it can also take away.

The men who wrote the Constitution were far seeing patriots who had lived through England's unjust rule and had fought through the Revoluntary War. They knew what it was to want freedom. Once free they wanted to preserve freedom for future generations. These statesmen wrote the Constitution with great care. It gave some power to the Federal Government, some of the States, and some to the people. It set up a system of checks and balances by which no branch of the Government can gain too much power. Early in this century the Russian people revolted against the Czars. A period of confusion followed. A small group of Communists took over the government. Then followed murder and bloodshed. They liquidated millions and put about 15 to 20 million more in slave labor camps. Never have so many suffered as at the hands of the Communists.

Our Government has helped 72 countries in the world. It is not trying to enslave anybody. The Communists have shown plans for enslaving the world. They now have about 900 million people under their tyranny. Most of these people are living under horrible conditions. At one time Khrushchev said to an American ambassador, "Whether you like it or not history is on our side. We will bury you." This means that the Communists intend to destroy democracy.

Which shall survive? It would seem that democracy should. But history shows that great civilizations and principles do not always survive because the are good and right. Can the Americans keep their freedom, made possible for them by the men who wrote the Constitution? Can they keep their own Government under control? The threat to our freedom is not only from the Communists but also our own Government is a threat with its growing power.

We can remain free only if the President is restrained from usurping power not granted to him, if the Supreme Court is limited to interpretation of the law, if the Congress is limited to its function of passing laws, and if the States keep the powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government (the 10th amendment).

Wilson said, "Concentration of governmental power always precedes the death of human freedom."

## Full of Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER**
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, our social agencies and those who give thoughtful consideration to the problems of others, are increasingly aware of the many and varied difficulties that become a part of growing old.

The proposed White House Conference to be held in 1961 under authorization of Congress is a very worthy project and I am pleased to include a pertinent editorial that appeared on March 17 in the Newark Star Ledger.

It is, I submit, important for all of us to be ever conscious of our responsibilities in this vast area of human interest.

FULL OF PROBLEMS

A White House Conference on the Aging will be held in 1961 under authorization of Congress.

Our senior citizens, who know only too well how numerous and serious these problems are, will applaud the decision to hold the conference.

While a White House conference cannot be expected to result in any immediate action it will draw nationwide attention to the subject and help in drawing up a program which may elicit nationwide support.

Some senior citizens may ask, Why wait until 1961 to hold the conference? It's a good question. Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that this is a relatively new field and one with so many problems that it will take time just to get the conference organized.

## Flexibility Means More Cowardly Appeasement, Nothing Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI**
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, for a thousand years the leaders of Irish independence declared they would stand by their principles "Until hell freezes over." It was a picturesque way of saying "never."

Now we would like to suggest a modern paraphrase: "When Pope John goes to Moscow, that will be the day." It, too, means "never."

Nobody in this world expects Pope John to go to Moscow to beg for peace or negotiate for mercy or to plead for cooperation. And why do they not? Because they know that to try to make a deal directly with atheistic murderers, mass killers, unprincipled destroyers of the people's liberties, liars, and persecutors of religion would be unthinkable for the pope, the leader of Catholic Christianity.

This is so because the pope has taken an inflexible, unchangeable and absolutely firm stand on the question of the existence of God. He does not believe there could be any compromise on that important matter. Any flexibility on that issue would of course destroy the church, the Christian religion and indeed our whole civilization. There can be no coexistence agreement between God and Satan, and you cannot reconcile good with evil. Neither can you reconcile democracy and freedom with communism and slavery.

But if it is unthinkable for the pope, why is it not for the leaders of Christian

nations, of religious peoples, of free institutions? Why does Prime Minister Macmillan trot obligingly off to Moscow at the behest of the evil Khrushchev and permit himself to be slapped in the face with insult and treachery? Why does President Eisenhower even consider going to Moscow or sending Vice President NIXON as his emissary to the Kremlin to receive the same rough treatment? Why does Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, plan a trip to Moscow where he, too, can only expect to be received with calumny and sneers?

Do you know why? Because they are afraid not to go. That is all there is to it. Khrushchev, the dictator of a backward and brutal tyranny, has become like a Roman emperor in our world, calling in the neighboring kings to be exhibited scornfully to the jeering crowd of onlookers just to prove that he is master of the world.

By these craven missions to Moscow the leaders of the free world are acting like those European and Asiatic ambassadors who trekked across the Russian plains to the abode of the great Khans to grovel and beg for mercy when these Mongol tyrants were sweeping half the world before their murdering cavalrymen. But Khrushchev is no Ghengis Khan. Nor is his force so irresistible. As Adm. Arleigh Burke told us the other day, the United States of America has the power to destroy the Soviet Union should Khrushchev trigger an attack. Our Nation is the most powerful nation, with or without allies, in the world.

But power, without the will to use it when necessary, is useless. The British and French discovered this when they faced a daring and rearming Hitler across the Rhine—and ended up with appeasement at Munich and war. The Romans, centuries before them, discovered this when their great and glittering empire was assaulted by the barbarian tribes from the north who coveted their riches. The Babylonians, with their brilliant but decadent civilization, had the same experience when the Assyrians came down like a wolf on the fold, their helmets all gleaming with purple and gold.

Are Americans or Europeans no different from these faded civilizations which have risen to the heights only to die in the depths when they lost their will to independence and freedom from barbarous tyranny? Will we, too, quail before the rough and arrogant barbarian ruler who now tells us that he intends to bury us and all we hold dear?

The Communists in the Soviet Union are openly bent on the destruction of free Europe and the United States. They have told us, as repeatedly as Hitler told his neighbors what he intended to do to them, that they will make us Communist captives if they can. Yet while we still have the power to resist and defeat them, while we have the strength to protect our liberties and secure our nationhood against these terrors, we accept with honor and hospitality Khrushchev's suave and cunning Ambassador Mikoyan, the murderer of thousands of Hungarian patriots. The British Prime Minister went on his pilgrimage to Moscow only to be rudely insulted while he was forced to listen to our own leaders being reviled. And still some of our legislators in Washington entertain thoughts of accepting this tyrant's term for a summit conference and the Berlin seizure, calling it flexibility. There can be no flexibility when compromise and surrender mean tyranny and slavery.

Flexibility is just a new diplomatic word for cowardly appeasement.

It is better to die on your feet, if you must, than to live on your belly. It is better for the United States to revive its old Revolutionary slogan, "Don't Tread On Me," and face the consequences of a brave and determined policy against communism than meanly to give away, a bit at a time, our pride, the liberties of our friends, our treasure, and finally our independence as a nation.

## "Meet Me in St. Louis" Set as TV Spectacular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that the Columbia Broadcasting System on Sunday, April 26, plans to present a 2-hour spectacular based on the motion picture, "Meet Me in St. Louis," which we in St. Louis feel was just about one of the best pictures ever produced.

The people connected with the CBS show assure me the TV production will be modeled closely after the Judy Garland movie. The cast sounds wonderful—Tab Hunter, Jane Powell, Myrna Loy, Ed Wynn, Walter Pidgeon, and Jeanne Crain.

Normally, I would not utilize the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to call attention to an entertainment on television, but it seems to me—in view of the many Federal programs now under way in the St. Louis area including some of the largest and most ambitious urban redevelopment projects in the Nation—that Members of the Congress and others will find it well worthwhile to watch this TV program for an indication of the spirit and warmth of a great city where friendliness and neighborliness are traditional.

As I remember the 1944 movie, centered in the Kensington Avenue section of St. Louis in my congressional district, I was struck by the similarities in outlook and attitude of our present day St. Louisans with the delightful family scenes of 1903 depicted in the movie. Yes, we still feel the same way about St. Louis—as the best place in the world to live.

May I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge that every Member of Congress who is able to do so that evening, watch the CBS production of "Meet Me in St. Louis" on Sunday, April 26. If they do, I am sure we will have no difficulty at all in convincing the Congress that a city with that kind of spirit and friendliness well merits the cooperation we are receiving from the Federal Government in flood control, urban renewal, and the majestic Jefferson National Expansion Memorial commemorating the Louisiana Purchase and the opening of the great West.

## An Address by Hon. Beverly Briley, County Judge, Davidson County, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, a most thought-provoking address was delivered by the very distinguished county judge of my county of Davidson, in Tennessee, the Honorable Beverly Briley, before the Urban County Congress of the National Association of County Officials, here in Washington.

This very capable county official is probably the best informed man in the Nation on this subject and the very fine address he delivered should be read by all of the Members of the Congress. Unanimous consent having been first obtained to insert the same in the RECORD. It follows herewith:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the response of so many county officials and national leaders to the call for this conference is most encouraging. Those of you present here today represent a cross section of those most closely acquainted with local level governmental conditions in the United States.

Your very presence is evidence of an awareness of problems and of opportunities so great that they demand the attention of every public agency.

Once a problem or a set of problems is recognized and fully understood, progress toward eventual solutions tends rapidly to accelerate.

Since this is the first conference of its kind ever held by leaders from the county level of government, and since we have the assistance here of many experts participating in our program, I believe there is good reason to expect our proceedings and conclusions may stimulate the thinking of people across the Nation. Furthermore, I believe there may grow out of this meeting the plans and procedures that will go far to solve some of the basic governmental questions that challenge our local jurisdictions.

Frequently, the political scientists have stated, and from our own experience, I believe we can agree, that no single formula possibly can solve the problems of each and every American community.

It seems to me that our chief benefit as participants in this first meeting will come from observing the experiences of others and analyzing our own situations in relations to those described here. It is I hope possible, that through discussion of the factors contributing to our local problems, we can come to some common agreements as to the basic nature of these problems. With the addi-

tional stimulation that will come from contributions by those who have succeeded in their home areas in changing concepts of county government and of local government generally, we may be able to approach all the problems of providing services so necessary for our local existence. We may even be able to approach some wise solutions.

It is understatement to say that universal use of the motor vehicle, better highways, and even commuter railways have established the background for the problems that perplex us and the people whom we serve. The surge to suburban living of the past two decades and its acceleration in the past decade can only amaze us all. A study of the recorded history of man discloses no comparable change in mass living habits, unless it was the original mass movement to the cities. The movement out of the cities into the suburbs creates impacts upon local government even more formidable than the impacts of the original clustering of population.

The exodus of people from the central city has wrought mighty changes in population densities. Many of the resulting problems are clear to all. Many other problems certain to rise are only dimly visible over the horizon to the most discerning of us.

Quite naturally, public administrators all over America are deeply concerned. Historical policies of the governments that always have existed to serve the people in areas that now are called suburbs, their tax base, and their fiscal problems also begin to attract the attention of the scholar, the researcher, and the theoretician of local government.

The hard-pressed economies of these local governments and their questionable ability to withstand the shock of this change, unaided, merits attention from both State and Federal Governments. Today, interest shown by these two levels of Government is slight. Indications of effective action or the possibility of effective action are very few and far between.

We may not all be able to agree that interest and effective action taken to date by officials of State and Federal Governments may have been due in some measure, at least, to complacency on the part of the county officials who might have prodded them to awareness.

But all of us can agree to this. We can agree that in our democracy people have the basic right to seek and to achieve the kind of living conditions they desire, with the single qualification, their ability to pay for what they seek—on a credit, if you please.

What has been the attitude and the appraisal of the more professional observers of this vast change in America's living habits called the march to the suburbs"?

May I say, parenthetically, before answering this question—the practice of kidding, ridiculing, or baiting a sizable population minority in this country at least is generally considered to be immoral and antisocial. It is likely to get the practitioner into serious trouble.

Currently, I know of only one exception to that rule. It is open season on one king size minority. I refer to the millions of people who live within a few miles of the corporate limits of the great American cities.

Sophisticated magazines like the New Yorker, Atlantic Monthly, Harpers, and Time Magazine outdo each other in coining names for this class of Americans. Terms like "commuter" and "suburbanite" have given way to slur words like "exurbanite" and "urban irresponsibles."

Many of the college professors of government and public administration have outdone the magazines.

Whatever you may call him, I remind his detractors that there are nearly 100 million of him in this country, a minority large enough, if well organized, to answer back in a thundering voice.

Why even the planners Mr. Suburbanite pays to diagnose his problems and recommend solutions refuse to take him seriously or even sympathetically. He has become the target of their abuse and the whipping boy of the sophisticates.

If within the sound of my voice there is one of these sneerers, let him be reminded that 100 million people cast a lot of votes. That, if still an undirected force, Mr. Suburbanite is potentially most powerful. By March of 1959, after this great decade of migration, he may be fed up with all this cartooning and joking, may be on the verge of recognizing his mass identity, and may prove more than willing to defend himself and demand that his interests be looked after.

Would that be good for the country?

I am convinced that the answer is "Yes." And most particularly at this time. I'll tell you why.

Right now the American governmental system of checks and balances is having its difficulties. For many, many years after industrialization swept our country and the race to the cities began, the American farmer existed as the great third force that could exercise compromising restraint on the two other great forces in our economic and political life. By switching judiciously from one side to the other when either threatened to assume a dangerous level of power, the farmer helped vastly to keep our country a stout, free democracy.

Capital, management, or big business, or whatever you want to call the monetary power in our society, could not pinch the workingman, wage earner, or union member too hard. Likewise, a restraining hand could be used on labor at the right time, because the farmer, sensing the need for a balance, would join with management and tilt the scales in the needed direction. In each crisis the shift of the weight of the farmer restored the equilibrium of this Nation.

It does not take a particularly discerning man to see that the day of the American farmer as a balancing wheel in the politics and power struggles that are inevitable in a democracy is done with. Today there are so few of them. Some 11 or 12 million, and his number is diminishing so rapidly that he soon will exist as a powerful force only in the imaginations of some older politicians.

If we are not exaggerating the role he played, we think there is a serious question raised. What happens to the country, and to this highly desirable political balance as the farmer fades from the scene?

The prospect that big business and big labor would set out in the absence of some new third force to kill each other off is distressing enough.

The additional prospect that big business and big labor might choose to sit down together and split up the economic pie with no aggressive third party to intervene becomes even more frightening.

In my opinion the giants of capital and labor already are getting too close for the comfort of those of us who individually enjoy our democracy. The labor strike to accomplish a specific bargaining task is one thing. But a national strike just for window dressing to provide an alibi for industrywide price increases is quite another thing. We have evidence in recent years that such an act has been put on by a few of these giants. In our economic system that could become a trend and a custom that would threaten the economic balance of our country. Think of what the upcoming steel strike will do to the price of your next new car.

Like most politicians I cannot claim to be very profound or very courageous. You may be assured that I would not have dreamed of raising such questions unless I felt that there are some ready answers.

I believe that the mass might of the American suburbanite, America's greatest consumer, and also producer, will act as the new balancing force. If we can agree that he possesses this potential for great service to our country in its hour of need, we need to understand him better. We need to try to learn why and how he got to be what he is. What are his problems and how can we, of his only local government better help improve and preserve his sound judgment.

First, because in the American tradition he worked hard—got ahead, or at least got a line of credit and enough cash for a down-payment on a house, we must admire him. I don't think this should make him a subject of ridicule. In Davidson County, Tenn., I won't stand for such ridicule.

Next, when he moved out of the crowded residential area of every American city and settled in his time payment home outside of the city limits, was he really the refugee from reality, ducker of citizen responsibility, tax dodger, or something for nothing sponger and snob his critics have claimed?

I say, "Absolutely no."

I think that potentially at least he is aware of his civic responsibilities. I am absolutely certain from my 9 years experience as an administrator of county government that he recognizes his own needs, and the needs of his community for a variety of urban type services. I am convinced that he is willing to pay his reasonable share of these services.

Furthermore, with the least bit of encouragement I believe that he is thoroughly capable of moving intelligently to solve his problems and to fully assume his citizenship responsibility.

In fact, he is doing just that all over the country. In many cases he is doing it with a degree of ingenuity and quality of imagination never exhibited by the leadership and certainly not by the average citizen of the big cities.

I cite a few examples that each of you know from your own home communities: the activities of the civic and service clubs that rise out of the neighborhood centers and schoolhouses of the respective areas. I cite you the further effort of the volunteer service and functional companies that have been established within these areas on a private or nonprofit basis to solve the essential problems of each neighborhood adjusting to local needs and demands.

One thing is most certain, and all must realize it. And when I say all, I means the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the Federal Government. This citizen we are describing is never going to voluntarily move back inside the city limits again. Neither will his children.

One authority writes:

"These new living conditions mean less congestion and tension—gives more privacy and safety for children. Gives further escape from the problems created by high density of population.

"This provides more opportunities for hobbies and more of the broader opportunities from living than can ever come from past city living."

In this realistic flight from these things that do exist this citizen has found from his experience with his county government that he is closer to his government, and has more to say about his governmental services than he ever did in the city.

This is especially important to him in connection with his schools, police, and the complete freedom he has from the regimentation that has so frequently come from the city regulations and inspectors.

There is a feeling in the suburbs that county schoolteachers, the county police force, and all the other county officials know

him better and are more interested in his problems than he believed was apparent in the big city.

As he considers his economic condition he feels that he gets more for his money in the suburbs. He gets more house, more land, more up-to-date living, and far more opportunities for recreation than he can get within a central city.

Further, he feels he gets better services and better education for his children and thereby is saving money.

It is obviously easier to get more in the way of housing, and more mortgage money available in the suburbs; and I believe sometimes the salesmen are even more persuasive in this area in which he has settled.

In many instances it is even easier to get to and from his work than from the crowded areas rapidly becoming slums where he lived in the central city.

This citizen finds that he lives in a more genial atmosphere of people of his own kind that are culturally, racially, religiously, politically, and otherwise of his own group than he could find in most of the residential areas available in the central city.

In general he has a stronger feeling of belonging to his community and to its social, church, and political life in this new place that he calls home.

There will be additional factors nourishing his developing sense of community identification. These will rise from the additional leisure time that is working itself into the economic and social structure of the Nation. With less and less time necessary to spend in employment, more and more time will be spent in the homes and the activities surrounding this more abundant family community life.

All of the urban renewal programs—all of the expressways, all of the air pollution, all of the cleanups, paintups, slum clearing in the central city, and all the king's horses and all the king's men can't drag him back to live inside again.

The quicker the leaders of the local governments of these geographical jurisdictions recognize this condition, and the sooner they wake up to the fact that this citizen wants urban type services and, furthermore, is willing to pay for them, the better off we will be.

If we don't wake up to the opportunities, we can expect a crop of new leaders to replace us who are more in tune with the thinking among the citizenship of our respective communities.

What he has been fleeing from, is in truth a reality rather than the fictional flight from reality that his critics allege. The day to day experiences that the suburbanite left behind him in the central city, indeed, were enough to leave him somewhat suspicious of what any government might try to do to him under the guise of providing services.

Personally, if we are realistic we will not blame him for this reaction.

Let us think what he left when he moved out. Substandard housing, spot zoning, many times the rule of machine politics with it handouts, special favors at the expense of the total community. The political direction of affairs often controlled by a hodgepodge of minorities. Publicity of these conditions over the years gives support to the reputation of high cost of city services whether deserved or not.

Who can blame him when he says, I want no more of it?

Who can blame him when he became dissatisfied with the makeshift metropolitan area authorities or the special districts that were created to provide urban services when in practice the control forces of these boards turned out to be only additional layers of government.

He wants no more of makeshifting. I believe he wants the county government where he lives to undertake to provide a sufficient number of the genuine, necessary, and needed urban services at their cost and no more.

He has had a dose of the word "city" and the things it connotes. By his own experience he is convinced.

He therefore dreads annexation by any city, and will consider, and has formed satellite city governments, not to furnish services, but solely to prevent the city from reaching out to grab him.

Although the students of government cry, "Shame, shame," this citizen as we observe him is perfectly willing to see the old central city ringed in by a county government providing the same, or even duplicating, services. His reasons may seem irrational, subtle, and in cases totally incomprehensible. But whether or no, we are not going to change him. I think we need to stop wasting the time in trying. Certainly, the city governments of this country are doing little to inspire a renewal of his confidence.

But in understanding this typical citizen of an urban county our responsibility is to establish for him a capable government that can render the services necessary for his existence and the opportunity for him to survive and to enjoy the domestic tranquility pledged in our Constitution. This includes the right to be let alone.

Many of America's county governments have started performing a series of governmental services normally considered the exclusive province of city governments. Groups of several metropolitan area counties have gone together to provide services for an area much greater than that of any single county. We are familiar with the many instances of this kind of thing. Names such as Baltimore County, Multnomah County, Jefferson County, Cuyahoga County, Fulton County, Baton Rouge Parrish, have become famous across the country because of their pioneering in the field of low-cost but high-quality services. Other pioneers are represented here but their names are too numerous to mention.

If any of us here fail to accept the similar challenges offered in our own counties and fail to understand these conditions, future generations will pay a price in discomfort, uneconomic living, frustrations, and even indignities.

While it is true that the State government has the responsibility of giving us through legislation the powers to establish suitable and efficient forms of local government, I believe lack of State action has been due to our failure to present the problem adequately.

Since the best of county governments can only exercise those functions which have been delegated and assigned by the respective legislatures, we must learn to tell our story better.

We must alert the people of the suburbs, including the business, labor, professional, educational, and religious leaders, and even the editors and the owners of TV and radio, we must solicit them to present and demand a consideration of their problems. The problems of county government services, indeed, are their problems, because 95 percent of all these leaders live outside city limits. Legislative authority or the granted power of home rule should be employed to create countywide agencies to provide the essential services for this new way of life.

New governmental machinery is required at this local level. We have a need of both Federal and State consideration for the problems. Nationwide and statewide attention must be focused upon the pattern of urban development in these metropolitan and urban counties.

We must seek the administrative controls to efficiently manage the affairs of these areas both in regard to local planning and services. All the functions a rural American required were offered by the original county system of government. We must expand these functions in line with the needs of this date and time.

I would like to quote some observations from an editorial recently appearing in Better Roads, the national highway magazine.

"Probably the most defeating part of the entire urban situation is the complexity of urban governments. In the 174 metropolitan areas listed by the 1957 census, there were 3,422 municipalities, more than 1,000 of less than 1,000 population and underlying them 2,317 townships.

"States have so far failed to take the leadership in finding a basic solution to the urgent problems of metropolitan areas. Whether representation is to blame or not is a question that will never be answered satisfactorily. But certainly the representation controversy is part of the whole problem.

"The State must take the lead in finding a way to integrate metropolitan communities, to change the very structure of local government if need be, to establish a unit that can deal adequately with the manifold problems of urban communities without regard to politics and the preservation of traditional but often outmoded forms of government.

"No other agency but the State can do the job of integrating metropolitan communities to eliminate countless overlapping areas of responsibilities. It is no longer a matter of denying anyone the privilege of self-government.

"It is a matter of making local self-government the unified voice of strength instead of a babble of many voices."

I agree with the editor of Better Roads. I say that the way to focus the babble of voices into a single strong voice is to make county government in this country once again the dominant local government. I say this is the only way.

To begin with the dominant forces in the legislatures of all the 49 States still are the so-called rural forces. Reapportionment of legislative representation can never come quickly enough to gain for city governments collectively the friendly reception that county governments traditionally have enjoyed, even the county governments of the giant urban areas.

If there is a potential governmental vehicle for efficiently serving the governmental needs of these urban areas with a sympathetic ear in the seats of existing legislative power it is the county governments. Let us now organize by States and across the Nation to take advantage of this sympathetic ear. That we have failed up to now to organize and strike for what our people want and need is, I am convinced, our own fault.

Let us make sure that nobody can say the same thing 10 years from now.

There are forces at work, powerful forces, to enhance the sense of common identity that already exist between urban and rural counties. I refer to the massive super highway construction program. The burden of right-of-way acquisition, large scale right-of-way acquisition, is new to both urban and rural county governments. The tools for assuming this burden must be jointly forged by both. A common effort in this direction can lead to common efforts in the entire area of providing services for the mass populations that will spill out of the urban counties first onto the counties immediately adjacent and then out farther onto the second, the third, and even the fourth tier of rural counties.

The program for this first Urban County Congress will review a dozen different improvised solutions to the problems of services for suburban areas. The list is long: reallocation of functions, federations, metro government plans, consolidations of city and county, contractural arrangements of various types, metropolitan districts, all the best

possible for local communities under existing legislative authority.

If they share a single weakness, I would be tempted to identify that weakness as failure to assume the existing county government as far the most suitable vehicle to which all needed additional functions might be entrusted.

Such improvisations will cease to be necessary, if the county governments will recognize the opportunity for service and the call for them to assume power raised by the suburban citizen when he cries for somebody, anybody, even a brandnew hodgepodge of governmental agencies to provide him with the sewers or the urban services he must have.

If county officials are found willing to assume the responsibility for providing for such services and willing to organize on a statewide basis to obtain the legislative enabling act or even the constitutional amendments necessary to clothe their governments with new authority and new taxing power, the vacuum that demands makeshift solutions will cease to be a vacuum. The suburban dweller will waste no time in designating the governmental agency he prefers to serve his needs. It will be a county government or perhaps a combination of two or even three county governments.

Already, county government has the geographical jurisdiction over these suburban areas. In the minds of the average citizen we have the jurisdiction. The citizen who would rise up in holy horror at any suggestion that a city government or any hybrid county-city arrangement of government be given jurisdiction over his courts of law infinitely would prefer that his county government provide him with water and sewer and other services.

Often he is mystified that he must turn elsewhere in order to be assured of these latter services. Although I admire the ability and the political sagacity of every county official present in this room. I would suggest that in Davidson County, Tenn., and in too many other counties across the Nation, the average citizen does not know that his county must have assurance of greatly broadened taxing power, before it can more fully serve his needs.

One very competent political scientist recently made this observation:

"Unless fairly drastic remedies are applied soon the financial plight of many local governments in metropolitan areas will be aggravated to the point of crisis. Basic troubles here seem to be three: (1) The regressive inflexible character of the principal sources of local tax revenue; (2) antiquated, unrealistic debt limitations; (3) the Balkanization of local government jurisdiction that result in (a) many local areas that are uneconomic for the provision of at least some services, and (b) often great disparities in tax paying and borrowing capacity from local jurisdiction to local jurisdiction. To this is now added substantial higher costs of money to local government. It is urgent that we develop our programs of metropolitan planning and servicing on as broad an areawide base as is possible to reduce costs and to obtain substantially higher levels of service at the lowest possible cost."

This is the story we must get across to our people. Everybody must be taught that the real property tax long ago ceased to be a tax base adequate for supporting any but the least expensive services. Rural legislators must be informed that counties need enabling legislation to enter the modern fields of consumer taxation, a right they began to grant the cities more than 50 years ago.

Once the broader taxing power is achieved, county governments can assume new functions and discharge them with their characteristic efficiency and economy. That is the first door we must open. That is the solid base upon which all the desirable assumption of urban-type service must rest.

Let us begin at once the educational effort that will win for county governments, the broadened taxing powers that will clear the way for greater achievement in all other fields.

A modern variation of county government can continue to administer the State affairs and at the same time through local initiative develop the service institutions that are necessary for the preservation of the homes and institutions that are the interest of this new type of living.

I believe that experience and adoption of a modern home-rule principle will bring cooperation with the central city and satellite cities around our Nation to develop an areawide allocation of functions that will ultimately bring about a functional consolidation. We can better serve and finance the needs of the total area in such a program.

In conclusion I am taking the liberty of paraphrasing the eloquent words of our own Mr. William R. McDougall. When the county governments of this country acquire the needed authorization for raising substantial new moneys, expand the needed services on an areawide basis, then, indeed, will:

"The dark continent of American politics" quickly become "the Shangri-La of local democracy."

## Court Again Criticized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of March 14, 1959:

COURT AGAIN CRITICIZED

The criticism of the Supreme Court from the American Bar Association, at its recent meeting in Chicago, is the latest evidence that the highest Court is seriously out of step with the vast majority of legal experts in the United States today.

The latest criticism, concerning Supreme Court decisions favorable to Communists, followed a repudiation of the top Court by the supreme court justices of the various States. It also follows criticisms made by the Governors of the various States.

Considering, also, the fact that many of the controversial decisions differ from the traditional concepts of past Supreme Courts, one wonders what further evidence be needed to prove the case against the present top Court—the charge that judicial training and experience is lacking and needed among the Big Nine.

Congress, and the President, should see to it that qualifications for membership on the to Court are carefully raised. For example, there is little in the present plan of bestowing Supreme Court appointments as political plums to commend itself.

Just as Chief Justice Earl Warren won his appointment because of his part in getting the California delegates at the 1952 Republican Convention to support Mr. Eisenhower, other inexperienced men have won seats on the High Court as a payoff for some political service rendered to the right person at the right time.

To be a Supreme Court Justice one should have judicial training on a high level over a number of years. This should be an inviolate prerequisite. The least Congress should do at the current session, or this Congress is to pass a bill, or constitutional amendment, requiring such qualifications.

## Egypt and the U.S. Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the importance of a free press and unhampered communication between nations is graphically underlined by an American correspondent in Egypt. Frank Kearns, in an oversea broadcast for CBS, describes the problems and difficulties that confronted him when he tried to report the news through Egyptian censorship.

I include here the text of the broadcast as it appeared in the Near East Report of February 2, 1959:

EGYPT AND THE U.S. PRESS

Several days ago, Gamel Abdel Nasser's Ambassador to the United States, made some remarks which have just reached this part of Africa. His remarks reflect seriously upon those of us who work as American reporters in the Middle East and upon our employers.

First of all, the Ambassador, Dr. Mustafa Kamel, is reported as charging that many American newspapers and radio stations are owned by or, as he puts it, "have fallen under the influence of forces which would distort news of the United Arab Republic."

Being a diplomat and in the United States, Dr. Kamel obviously is being indirect. In Cairo, he would, I'm sure, identify these so-called forces as pro-Zionist or pro-Israeli. Yet, after almost 6 years out here, I know of no reputable American correspondent in all the Arab world who has ever received orders to slant in any way a single story—pro-Israel or anti-Arab. Or, for that matter, pro-Arab or anti-Israel.

The American tradition of journalism is to present the facts—in this case, from both Israel and the Arab world—and let the reader make up his mind. Dr. Kamel reportedly declared Americans are not correctly informed and advised of true conditions in the United Arab Republic. We correspondents do our best or, in the old American way, we would be fired.

But in one way Dr. Kamel is right: We cannot always inform Americans of true conditions in the U.A.R. because of something Dr. Kamel neglects to mention: censorship. I've talked to three correspondents who worked in both Moscow and Cairo, and all agree it's tougher to work in Cairo than in Moscow. In Moscow, for example, you're advised if something is cut from your press cable. In Cairo, a sentence, a paragraph or an entire section may be sliced out of a press cable, perhaps changing the point of the entire news story, then dispatched without the correspondent knowing anything of the change. It's called "blind censorship." Sometimes a whole dispatch is withheld.

For radio, we have to submit four copies of each script before broadcast time. The connection to New York sometimes is unusable because too many persons are listening in, or too many tape recorders are attached.

One day, for example, when several young kids stoned the USIS library in Port Said, we were unable to inform Americans of its true condition. I tried 3 days straight; each

day it was censored from my script. I've had the censor delete any reference to enemies, even opponents of Gamel Abdel Nasser.

Everyone in Egypt and Syria knows that Nasser has opponents and enemies, but Dr. Kamel is right. We cannot correctly inform Americans of this true condition in the UAR. We cannot even refer to Cairo's controlled press; the word "controlled" is censored out.

Yet, if ever a nation's press were controlled, it is Cairo's. Every day Cairo's newspaper editors receive official direction on handling of the day's news, especially editorials, right down the line: one, two, three, four.

Reaction to major news developments is occasionally delayed 24 hours or more until editors get the official line from above. Sometimes local news is blacked out completely in the local press by direct order as though it never happened. No Cairo editor has ever had the courage of Beirut editors, who during last summer's troubles often left big white spaces to show where the censor's pencil had murdered sentences or entire stories.

Perhaps courage is not the right word. In Cairo, such a paper would never even reach the streets. And papers which do reach the streets carry news distorted by propaganda, even by imagination.

To document this statement, it would take hours. Offhand, I can remember fantastic outright lies about King Hussein, the late and murdered Nuri-as-Said, Camille Chamoun, a long detailed interview with an American ambassador who had never even met the reporter. I can remember charges that UNRWA doctors were trying to kill off Palestine refugees in Gaza by fatal injections. Untruths, half-truths, fabrications, distortions without number.

Yet Dr. Kamel, Cairo's Ambassador to America, charges it is Americans who are living under the biggest propaganda curtain which has ever been made over world history, a curtain which he says is distorting news from the Middle East. Anyone living in Cairo or Damascus, including the foreign Communists, knows which country is living under this propaganda curtain, and its initials are not U.S.A., they are UAR (United Arab Republic).

Furthermore, the only reason I can say all this is that I'm in Khartoum, over 1,700 miles up the river from Cairo censors.

## Northern Textile Association Endorses the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Special Senate Subcommittee on the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association:

NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION,
BOSTON, MASS., *March 16, 1959.*

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The members of the Northern Textile Association are wholly in agreement with the conclusions and recommendations of the special Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which recently concluded hearings on the textile industry.

Our board of directors has adopted a formal resolution on this matter urging our New England Senators and Representatives to assist where possible in the implementation of the recommendations of Senator PASTORE's subcommittee. A copy of our resolution is enclosed. Your assistance in these matters as they develop will be greatly appreciated by all in the industry.

Sincerely,

BILL SULLIVAN.

---

The Northern Textile Association endorses the conclusions and recommendations of the Special Senate Subcommittee on the Textile Industry, and commends Senator PASTORE, the chairman, and members of the committee and the staff for a comprehensive, timely, and constructive report.

The sympathetic and thorough hearings conducted in key textile areas have been effectively distilled in the report to bring the problems of the industry clearly and forcibly into focus, and to demonstrate the harmful results of Government policies. The report is a significant contribution to a better national understanding of the textile industry.

The recommendations, if carried out in good faith by the executive departments and implemented where necessary by legislation, should solve the major problems imposed on the industry by Government.

We urge our Senators and Representatives to assist in the implementation of the recommendations of the subcommittee, including the appointment by the Senate of a Textile Subcommittee within the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

We also urge the Secretary of Commerce, in accordance with the recommendations of the committee, to establish forthwith a Textile Interagency Committee and an Advisory Committee as a first step in carrying out the other recommendations of the committee.

## Birthday of Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the supposed rivalry between Christopher Columbus and Amerigo Vespucci has too long been allowed to stand in the foreground of our view of Vespucci, and block out our true view of him. Really, Columbus and Vespucci were no rivals, but close associates and intimate personal friends, throughout the period from 1492 to Columbus' death in 1506, and the bitterness and detraction common in later historians writing about Vespucci is completely absent from the testimony of the sons of Columbus. It is difficult to imagine a warmer tribute of personal friendship, or of trust, than is contained in Christopher Columbus' letter, written shortly before his death, introducing Amerigo Vespucci to his son Diego. And this, it must be borne in mind, was written 2 years after Vespucci had published his generalized account of the New World, called Mundus Novus, and a year after his letter to Piero Soderini describing his four voyages.

On the birthday of Amerigo Vespucci, more than half a millennium after he came into the world, let us remember and repeat in his honor the warm words spoken of him by the great navigator and discoverer, Christopher Columbus: "The bearer of this, Amerigo Vespuchy, is going there to the court where he has been summoned in connection with matters of navigation. It has always been his desire to give me pleasure; he is a man of good will; fortune has proved contrary to him as to others; he has not profited from his labors as justice would demand. He is acting on my behalf, moved by a great desire to do something which shall be to my benefit if it lies within his power. From here I do not know what I can enjoin upon him that will be to my benefit, because I do not know what they want of him there. See there what would be advantageous, and work toward that end, and he will do everything and talk and put it into effect; and let all this be done secretly so no one gets wind of it."

Amerigo Vespucci lives today in the name given in his honor to two continents, North and South America; let him live also in our hearts as the man to whom the great and good Christopher Columbus paid this tribute of confidence in his discretion, in his judgment, in his good will and personal affection. Nowhere on the continents named for him is there a monument to Amerigo Vespucci, and our historians speak of him with scorn and disbelief. Perhaps what Columbus said is still true, after the passage of almost five centuries: "He has not profited from his labors as justice would demand."

## "Not an Inch"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States on Monday night, March 16, 1959, gave a very frank report to the citizens of the United States on the Berlin crisis. It is my belief that the people of the United States stand firmly behind the President.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which appeared in the Tablet proposing a free world meeting in Berlin on May 27, 1959, under the slogan: "Not an Inch." I believe that there is great merit to this suggestion which would demonstrate to the Soviet that we of the free world are united on the Berlin issue.

The letter follows:

[From the Tablet, Mar. 14, 1959]

SUGGESTS FREE WORLD MEET IN BERLIN MAY 27

DEAR SIR: As the Berlin crisis gets worse and worse and Mr. Khrushchev's well-calculated war of nerves with its present and future zig-zags threatens to befuddle a great many people, the world, the free as well as the enslaved, needs nothing more urgently

than a dramatic and convincing gesture of the leaders of the free world.

May I therefore suggest such a free world performance under the slogan: "Not an inch."

The free world should convoke a Berlin free world congress, starting at noon May 27 in the American-built new Congress Hall of Berlin.

This congress should last at least 3 days with a selection of American, British, French, and German speakers, among them President Eisenhower, Mr. Macmillan, General de Gaulle, and Dr. Adenauer, professing the iron resolve of the free West not to yield an inch.

That congress should also hear, besides the above-mentioned leaders, many others, among them Messrs. Churchill, Truman, Acheson, Senators, Congressmen, British MPs and last but not least Germans.

Such manifestation, broadcast in 60 languages to the entire world, whether free or oppressed by Communist tyranny, would find a tremendous response and could not fail to impress the Pankow regime.

By organizing such an historical manifestation of the free world, unprededecented in its entire history, the United States would undoubtedly earn the gratitude of the free as well as of the oppressed peoples who have already been longing for far too long a time for such dramatization of our will not only to defend West Berlin, but the whole orbit of freedom still left in this world.

Such a demonstration would, of course, only make sense if we are really unitedly resolved to defend West Berlin's freedom at any price, including the horrors of nuclear warfare, and if we are not using President Eisenhower's most wonderful remarks about "not an inch" as just another empty propaganda slogan without any backbone.

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

## The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an exceptionally fine address by Representative PHIL WEAVER, of Nebraska, delivered before a Foundars Day luncheon at Lincoln, Nebr., on Monday, March 16, 1959:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE WEAVER

In just 72 days we will face a major crisis in Berlin. Last August it was Beirut. Next September it could again be Formosa.

Every time a crisis arises, there are those in the Senate and House, and the calamity columnists and commentators who plead hysterically for a national mobilization—a nationwide girding of our loins.

But unlike the men of the Old Testament, too many of these latter-day prophets of calamity would have us abandon principle. They would have us go to Berlin shaded by Neville Chamberlain's umbrella.

We have faced crises before. Yet under the leadership of that valiant fighter, John Foster Dulles, who is even now demonstrating that his physical bravery matches his moral courage, we have come through because we have held steadfast to the right. We have placed freedom for ourselves and all who love freedom as our goal and the only solution for which we will settle.

There are those who plead for flexibility at any price. My call is for freedom at any price.

What, really, is flexibility? If you listen to some in the Senate and to some of our nationally syndicated faint-hearted friends, it means a readiness to compromise other people's freedom—and eventually our own. Is this flexibility? Or is it moral cowardice?

To my mind, flexibility does not involve the ability to concede on principle. We had that kind of flexibility at Yalta and at Potsdam. But rather it means the ability to change the rules of the game to force the Communists to meet us on our own terms—whether in Berlin—or Formosa—or Beirut—or wherever they attempt to launch their next regional or limited war of nerves.

The arena will change—but the game and the players—and the coach—will be the same. This is a dirty game, and so far they have made the rules to suit themselves. Their ambition is to bleed us white at every point—to force us to spend our productive genius in every little skirmish. Then when they choose to push the button, we will be exhausted. We will have spent our main energies and be at their mercy.

To play in this game and win, we will have to have two things—

One, a diamond-hard adherence to the principle of freedom. And by that I mean a stanch belief in the ideals that forged this Republic and made it great, the things our fathers had—and which we want our children to enjoy.

Secondly, we must enter the arena strong—with a good team and plenty of trained reserves on the bench—including a strong National Guard.

As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, it is my grave responsibility, along with 16 others, to see to it that we are strong and remain that way.

We are spending a great deal of money for defense. I want that money to go for building real strength to defend America to keep the pace and keep the peace against all aggressors. I do not want one dime to be spent on building a private empire for generals and admirals who practice a kind of nepotism based on a class ring from Annapolis or West Point or, now, Colorado Springs.

I do not want a single dime to go for buying new fleets of Cadillac limousines—and one day recently I saw nine of them lining the curb near the Capitol.

I do not want one nickel to go for paying the salary of a full colonel who came before our committee—to run a motion-picture projector at a cost of $55.97 a day—when a private could have done the same job just as well. I don't believe it takes a West Point education to learn to run a motion-picture projector.

Nor do I want your defense dollars to pay the salaries of the 24 commanders I saw trailing an admiral and two captains to a committee hearing.

I don't believe your tax dollars under normal circumstances should be used to establish huge public housing projects on military bases. Good homes are available for sale or rent to military personnel in many communities near the bases. To have mutual understanding between our friends on the base and the people in our towns, they should join together in community life whenever possible and help save tax dollars.

I want a strong defense, but I don't want to see a bumbling bureaucratic military empire waste us away and fumble our chance of survival down the drain.

If it comes to a choice between the kind of defense we need and some project here at home, I am going to choose defense every time. I am not going to play politics with the freedom of generations of Americans still unborn.

We can have that defense. We are in the process of developing the kind of defense that has the courage and imagination to put aside that which is outmoded. We can also have an America which is developing with imagination and determination our productive power—our natural resources.

We can have both.

We cannot have either if we allow ourselves through vacillation to play into the hands of an aggressor who has no principles of his own—but fears those who do and who will stick by them.

We cannot have either a strong defense or a vital, growing America if we allow waste and the frittering away of our resources by a military which has adopted a do-it-as-usual philosophy.

We have at present in the White House in Dwight D. Eisenhower a man who will not sacrifice the principle of freedom simply to satisfy those who have placed the flexibility of compromise and equivocation above every American ideal.

I can assure you—there are still some of us in Congress who want a national defense that doesn't bulge at the waistline with self-satisfied generals and admirals whose main worry is to expand their own domain.

These, I think, should be the goals of the Republican Party.

These are the goals for which I am fighting in the 86th Congress.

These are the principles on which I am willing to stake my political life. These are the principles upon which the life of America itself must depend.

Any man in Washington fighting for these goals needs support—not only political support but also moral support. As loyal Republicans, here today, I know you will provide this kind of staunch support from the very grassroots of America.

With this kind of solidarity, let our enemies not be in doubt.

## How Deeply Do You Believe in America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1959, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield addressed the distinguished membership of the Sales Executives Club of New York.

Mr. Summerfield's courageous talk emphasizing the Nation's struggle against inflation, the need for tax policies that can bring greater opportunity to every American, and his demand for adequate legislation to control labor monopolies and its abuses by labor bosses deserves wide circulation and careful consideration by thoughtful Americans irrespective of party affiliations.

So, too, does his plea for more active participation in the affairs of Government by businessmen, union members, farmers, the 42 million housewives who pay grocery bills every day, teachers, professional men, students, and retired people.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Summerfield's remarks in the RECORD:

HOW DEEPLY DO YOU BELIEVE IN AMERICA?

It is good to be here today with so many of you who represent the sales leadership of American business.

I remember with deep pleasure my visit with you several years back. And I cherish greatly the honor you bestowed upon me at that time.

As you may know, I have spent the greater part of my life in businesses in which the sales activity was vital.

I need not tell you that selling in our great, competitive economy is challenging and rewarding—and more, it is the very dynamo of our whole enterprise system.

You also know, of course, that a dedicated salesman really never stops selling, regardless of where he may be. I suspect, therefore, it is no surprise to you that I am still selling.

I am selling a modern, efficient postal service.

I am selling the maintenance of peace and national safety in a troubled world.

And I am selling, with all my heart, the sound growth of our country under a philosophy of government that can provide the greatest opportunity for all our people.

Today, if I may, I should like to lay before you some thoughts on our national security, and our philosophy of government. They are, of course, entirely interrelated.

We must begin with the premise that we are today engaged in a great economic struggle with the Soviet Union. It is not a shooting war, and we pray to God that such a dread resolution will never come.

Neither is this conflict of our own choosing. The Soviets are pushing it for the express purpose of imposing Communist rule throughout the world.

But the struggle nevertheless is a hard, inescapable fact we must recognize and meet.

There is no shooting war only because the Soviets have not dared to launch such a holocaust. Whatever initial success they might have, they know that retribution from the free world would be swift, terrible and decisive.

They have resorted to bold threats of a shooting war, in the hope of dividing the free world alliance and leaving us to face encirclement alone.

But here they have been firmly rebuffed by the supreme statesmanship and courage of our leadership—our President and Secretary of State—and the steadfastness of our friends around the globe.

Nevertheless, the Soviets appear today to be as confident of ultimate victory as ever. Why? Because they are now concentrating on all-out economic war, and they believe they can defeat us in such a war without risking their own destruction.

They boast that they will overtake us in industrial production in 10 years. Their entire economy is aimed at surpassing us, not only internally but in total influence on a world scale. Their Premier has just told the party congress in Moscow: "The time will come when we shall have the decisive edge."

We dare not look cynically on their determination. They are gearing the whole massive Communist society to that objective. They are moving with grim and confident purpose. And the undeniable fact is, they are gaining.

We still, of course, are well in front. But they expect the very demonstration of their ability at closing the gap to win world opinion to their side.

Ironically, they are counting on us to help. While they are pushing the Soviet economy faster, they expect the American economy to falter on at least two rocks of huge and disastrous proportions:

1. runaway inflation; and

2. political unwillingness to hold to the basic principles that have made our country so powerful and so great.

I believe their hope will be in vain. I believe we shall continue to build the strongest, finest, freest way of life the world will know.

But, my friends, this I also believe:

To do so, America must maintain a sound economic philosophy, and sound policies firmly based on such philosophy.

This is why I am selling, with all the energy and devotion I possess, the sound growth of our country under a philosophy of government that can provide the greatest opportunity for all our people.

What is this philosophy?

I think it can be simply stated:

It is a government that discharges every legitimate obligation to its citizens, but does so within the framework of a responsible fiscal policy.

It is a government that recognizes our free enterprise system—our industry and agriculture—as the very wellspring of prosperity and opportunity for all our people. It is a government, therefore, that promotes the sound growth of this system and its service to the people.

It is a government determined to place the best interest of all its citizens above special interests of any selfish group.

Such a government is essential to deal with the problems of these times. It is vital in fighting inflation and in grappling with our tremendous problems of taxation.

For, make no mistake, we are at grips with deadly inflationary forces. We are under the gun of onerous taxation—taxation that can effectively prevent the accumulation of private capital and the incentive for productive expansion.

In our battle against inflation, two facts today stand out very clearly:

The first is, that if public spending soars far beyond the revenues of Government, inflation will infuse itself more deeply and dangerously throughout economy.

Unrestrained spending can only result in deficit financing, higher taxes and cheaper dollars. And in such event, who must bear these burdens? You. You and your family—and every other citizen of our country.

Inflation feeds on the income and the savings of every individual, every enterprise, in America.

It eats away the savings we cherish for our family's security. It robs us of the real value of the dollars we earn. A quick glance at the family food basket can make that point painfully clear.

In 1939, a dollar would fill the basket with potatoes, bread, coffee, cabbage, milk, and eggs. Today's dollar will buy only the cabbage, milk, and eggs.

Twenty years ago, you could buy a pound of round steak, a pound of bacon, a pound of pork chops, and a pound of sugar for what it costs you today to buy just the pound of steak alone.

And so it goes with everything we buy.

Every American, therefore, has compelling reason to be concerned over the gigantic spending schemes that already have been voted by one House or the other of the present Congress. Together, just to date, these schemes represent several billion dollars of needless, unjustifiable spending. And more of the same are in the offing.

All are the creations of political pressures of special groups.

But if they become law, it will be every American whose dollar is cheapened—every American whose paycheck must yield steeper taxes— and every American whose children must bear the future debt.

The second fact in the inflation battle is the vast monopoly power of a handful of union dictators. This is the very core of our inflationary struggle.

Eighty percent or more of the cost of what we buy is labor. Obviously, industrial wage costs have a very direct bearing on everyone's cost of living.

Wage increases have been fundamental to the rising living standards of our people, and the vitality of our economy. They should continue to be. And they will be, so long as they are related to increased productive efficiency.

But when union dictators force wage costs far outrunning productivity gains, inflation is inevitable. With each round of wage and price increases, our dollar drops another notch in purchasing power. The wage earner who gets the increase soon finds that his new dollars, too, are siphoned off by a higher cost of living. And union members everywhere are hurt as badly as everyone else.

In the past 10 years, a 28 percent gain in industrial productivity has been overwhelmed by a 67 percent rise in wage rates. The difference between these figures is wage-push inflation. Inevitably, this has priced more and more American products out of export markets, and reduced our ability to meet foreign competition in our own domestic markets.

The Nation has been shocked by the colossal labor racketeering and corruption revealed in the hearings of the McClellan Committee. Our people—including the great body of union members—want these terrible abuses stopped, now.

But let us recognize that these abuses are but symptoms of a much greater problem.

Why are union racketeers contemptuous of public opinion? Because they operate within the framework of a tremendous concentration of power which aims to control the laws, and lawmakers of our land, and eventually the White House itself. Thousands of our businessmen and workers have been partially "brainwashed" into believing these influences cannot be successfully challenged, thereby weakening their will to resist, to stand up and fight for what is right.

This is a union boss monopoly power that equals any accumulation of vested interest to be found in history.

This monopoly draws upon huge financial resources—almost equal to the total resources of all the Nation's life insurance companies combined.

It is a power that permits a few entrenched bosses to spend millions of dollars of union dues money for political purposes, exactly as the leaders see fit, with no choice given the dues payers.

It is a power to impose at will an ever-rising cost of living upon our people.

It is a power than can systematically bludgeon American business until free competitive enterprise can no longer survive in America as a vital force.

This is a grave moral and economic problem to which our Congress should address itself with all earnestness. Many alarmed Members of the Congress are doing so. But, quite obviously, too many others presently are more concerned with the wrath of the union dictators than their duty to the American people.

Now, of course, whenever anyone questions abuses of union power, the affected bosses and their political cult rush to denounce him as antilabor.

But union members are no longer accepting that deceit. The overwhelming majority of workingmen and women and their leaders are devoted, self-respecting Americans. They know that anyone who is for a strong America, as I am, is for a strong union movement. They know that cleaning up union abuses is no more union busting than the legal cleaning up of pernicious business practices—years ago, was corporation busting.

They have had enough of union rackets, and corrupt unions, and corrupt and power-hungry union leaders. They have had enough of union elections rigged to deprive

members of their rights. They do not want their own dues payments used to further political ideologies to which they may be firmly opposed. And they know that anyone who urges Government help to rid them of these abuses is prolabor in the deepest sense.

Fortunately for America, in these eventful times, there is wise leadership in our Government.

The fight to hold inflation in check, to keep our business economy growing, and to root out corrupt union elements, is being led by the President of the United States.

President Eisenhower prevented wild public spending from wrecking the economy when frantic pressure developed during the recent business slowdown. He insisted instead upon sound measures, with the result that our economy has moved soundly forward ever since. And, of most importance, our cost of living has been checked and has leveled off.

Our President is fighting to prepare the way for tax policies that can bring greater opportunity to every citizen through the sound growth of our economy.

He is standing firmly for realistic legislation to assure America's union members honest and responsible union leadership.

Our Vice President, many Members of Congress, and many others in the Government, are equally vigorous in behalf of these issues.

Much, for example, will be accomplished by the President's new Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. Good progress is being made under the able chairmanship of Vice President NIXON. I am proud to be a member of this Committee, and look forward to the work to be done.

We hear the question raised in Washing, from time to time, as to what constitutes bold leadership. That is a fair question. Let us take a look at it.

Which calls for the boldness of genuine personal courage and vision? To insist upon a balanced budget and a sound dollar—or to yield to the noisy pressures of special groups for more and bigger spending?

To seek diligently a fair tax code that will inspire our whole economy to grow—or to go along in order to placate everybody with a hand in the pork barrel?

To insist firmly upon labor laws the people desire and the Nation needs—or to try to fool the public with so-called labor legislation dictated by the union monopolists themselves?

These are the choices of leadership offered the American people.

Actually, commonsense policies are the policies the great majority of Americans want.

That fact is demonstrated by several recent polls of public opinion.

In one of the largest, these findings were made:

The large majority of citizens interviewed said the first requirement of responsible national leadership for 1959 is to help check inflation.

The three items they listed as most important for Congress to work on were: Holding down prices; prevention of inflation; and laws to clean up labor monopoly evils.

A higher percentage of union members listed these commonsense objectives than did even the general public.

In view of all these indications, then, why do the spenders, the taxers and the apologists for union abuses dominate the Congress?

The reason is just this: Far too few people take the trouble to let the Congress know what they think.

Congress is responsible to the will of the people. But how can the individual Congressman determine whether the public agrees with a particular proposal unless he hears from the public?

I think you will agree that this is an extremely critical problem. But let me ask you:

Have you let your Congressmen know where you stand?

Did you write to them when the big spending bills were up for debate?

The Members of Congress received plenty of letters, telegrams, telephone calls and personal visists. From whom? From the American people? Or from those groups who had a special interest?

The truth is that the Senate and House were bombarded by energized special interest groups. The arguments that poured in were one-sided. And the special interest groups won the first round.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am a Republican. But I am under no delusion here that I am speaking to the East Side Republican Club. Some of you are Republicans; some of you are Democrats. Some are independents. But what I am urging is not a partisan proposition. I am not asking for partisan expression.

What I am asking, what I am saying, is simply this: Speak out. Let your voice be heard.

Not only to you as businessmen, but also to union members, farmers, the 42 million housewives who pay grocery bills every day; to teachers, professional men, students, retired people—to every citizen, I say:

How deep is your belief in this land of ours? Deep enough to speak up in its behalf?

Is it deep enough to give of your substance, your time and your genius to preserve it?

A hard and fateful struggle is being waged. Your voice and efforts are more than important, they are vital.

They are vital on specific current issues. They are vital on long-range issues. They are needed at campaign time, and between campaigns.

Sound political leadership must have the active support of those who want sound government.

Some State governments today face virtual financial collapse.

Why?

Because those believing in sound political leadership have stood aside as spendthrift politicians have joined forces with labor bosses in an orgy of reckless spending and more and more taxation.

And what permanent solutions are being suggested by those in control?

The only suggestions so far have been the wornout, old-fashioned soak-the-rich ideas; specifically, a call for a corporation's profit tax, and an income tax on so narrow a base that only a small percent of the citizens would have to pay the bills.

Nothing is being done to reduce expenditures. No studies are underway to see where the tax dollars of these States have gone and are going. Nothing is being done through long-range State tax reforms to make these States attractive once again to business and industry, and to help provide more jobs.

My friends, the citizens of these States are learning the hard way that more huge spending programs mean that the Government has to collect more in taxes to pay for them.

The more American business has to pay in taxes, the less it has left to invest in new products and new plants.

And certainly, the less business is able to invest in new production, the less it is able to create new jobs.

It is that simple.

Peaceful coexistence may have its virtues in some fields. But the welfare state and virile free enterprise cannot exist side by side within the same economy. And I don't believe for one minute that the union members of our country, any more than the rest of us, want to surrender their freedom to a welfare state.

Instead of increasing the tax burden, we need to carry out an essential revision in our Federal tax structure.

This task, we know, will be tremendously difficult. But it is part and parcel of the basic solution for stopping inflation and spurring our economic growth. It must be done.

We need to relieve the tax load being carried by the individual citizen and by our business system.

This great Nation has been built on the motivation of high levels of individual achievement. We have encouraged, with material reward, each citizen to perform to the best of his capacity.

Even the Soviets have taken note of this historic process. Russia, despite its Communist doctrine, now offers high incentives for outstanding individual performance in industry, science, and other areas of its society.

Consider, against this, the fact that we have been moving in the direction of destroying personal incentive.

We have steadily compressed the reward for doing something thereby encouraging many to do little or nothing.

Take notice, for example, of what happened to the head of a family of four with an annual income of $5,000. Today he is paying almost 10 times as much in Federal income taxes alone as he did in 1939. And if he strives to increase his income, the penalty of taxation becomes increasingly severe.

Of equally great consequence is the effect of ponderous taxation on business initiative.

Our population is growing rapidly. In the years ahead, our people will need greater opportunities and millions of new jobs. Business is expected to create most of these jobs. Business expects to create jobs. Corporations today provide nearly three-quarters of all the nongovernment wages and salaries paid.

But new jobs can come into being only as billions of dollars are invested in new tools and capacity. Now, where is this money to come from? In the end, it must come from the earnings a company saves after paying all its taxes.

Today Federal taxes alone can take more than half of many a company's net income. Then follow State and local taxes. There are over 100,000 taxing authorities in our country. Their weight can seriously restrict the ability of business to meet its job-creating capital needs.

Much of our Federal tax code was hastily adopted during times of war.

A sensible, equitable, dynamic tax program is needed in its place. Such a program will keep Federal revenues up, not by taxing away incentive and means of growth, but by steadily increasing the tax base.

The present administration has made this clear. It has already embarked on a program of tax reform and reduction with the Revenue Act of 1954. The President's insistence on a balanced budget in 1959 is related directly to this goal. Putting our fiscal house in order, he has emphasized, is essential to a sound, progressive program of tax reform.

Obviously, this program cannot call for immediate and sharp reduction in all income tax rates. It calls for gradual reform and reduction. And it calls for equitable reduction for all taxpayers, large and small.

The ultimate tax pattern, in short, must be a completely integrated program that will meet the real needs of a dynamic economy.

And this kind of program will be achieved only if we avoid the pitfalls of grandiose spending for nonessentials, and other inflationary pressures which swell the costs of Government.

In summary, let me leave these thoughts with you:

We must maintain our initiative in military and world political strength.

We must be equally vigilant against the Soviet determination to defeat us politically with economic strength. This may well be the ultimate battleground the Kremlin has chosen.

To succeed, we must promote the sound growth of our whole economy—we must maintain a philosophy of Government that provides the greatest opportunity for all our people.

We must keep the cost of living in check, while our standards of living go up, with a stable dollar. This means a balanced budget, and control of pressure on prices resulting from the irresponsible demands of a few union dictators.

We must take steps to correct the union abuses that the great majority of working men themselves want corrected.

We must revise our tax system to permit our people to create the great economic expansion of which we are capable.

Here in this room today is a gathering of the finest sales abilities in America. Here are the executives who represent the sales genius of many of our Nation's leading corporations.

Competition is your life. You are constantly devoting your best brainpower and energies to competing with others in your industry, possibly the fellow sitting at your same table today.

But may I suggest an even greater competition exists, in which there is more at stake for you, your company, its stockholders, and its employees?

It is the ever-pressing, huge and deadly competition you face with forces dedicated to Government by pressure groups and labor monopolists. It can defeat you, destroy you, as no industrial competitor could ever do.

There is nothing more important you can do than to devote some of your sales genius and best techniques to fighting this battle. Nothing is more essential to your company and its future.

Thousands of corporate mailings are made to stockholders every day. Why not employ these mailings to enlist their active support? Pressure-group Government and labor monopoly power are definitely contrary to their interests.

I would dare to suggest that your companies, in these communications, tell your stockholders clearly how this struggle affects them, both as citizens and as owners of business. There are also many hard-hitting articles, speeches and other materials that could be included. Mailed regularly to the Nation's 10 million stockholders, they could be of ever-expanding influence throughout the country.

The same can be said of communications with employees. They, too, can see this great competition in progress, and they need to know from you exactly what is at stake and they should be told the truth.

What do you want for America? How deep is your belief in America? It is very deep, I am certain. But it can be effective only as you let it be known.

I urge you to take your place among those who will speak, and work, and fight for sound Government and a stronger America in the years ahead.

My friends, the greatest era in history—the Golden Era of unlimited opportunity, lies ahead.

We can make it mankind's most fruitful period if we but solve the problems we face and move forward, as we can, united for the well-being of America.

We will do so if we but realize that the all-out economic war with the Communists calls for just as much unity of purpose, just as much devotion to country, just as much selfless effort, yes just as much old-fashioned patriotism on the part of every American, as any military war ever did.

I am certain we can and will meet this challenge. We will do so best, I feel sure, by following the program of true liberalism I have outlined here today—a program based on free men organizing and conducting their lives in freedom and spreading freedom to everyone everywhere.

We have inherited the glory of this Nation, its strength and its freedom. Let us protect it—let us perpetuate it—and let us bear it proudly forward into the hands of our children.

## Social Security "Illusion"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced several measures which seek to better the plight of our citizens who receive social security. One of these bills which should be enacted at an early date is H.R. 598 which would remove the limitation on outside income an individual may earn while receiving his social security benefits. I believe that the present limitation of $1,200 per year is unrealistic.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Sylvia Porter which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 16, 1959:

SOCIAL SECURITY "ILLUSION"

(By Sylvia Porter)

How much is the retired worker dependent on social security benefits for food, shelter, and clothing really suffering from the inflation?

It is obvious that Americans hurt most cruelly by inflation have been those living on fixed incomes—people who have no more dollars today than they had 10 or 20 years ago, but who must pay more for everything they need and want.

Responsible sources have stated repeatedly that senior citizens now drawing social security benefits are the worst sufferers. In its last monthly bulletin, for instance, the First National City Bank of New York declares flatly that the social security "pensioner's gains, because of inflation, are an illusion. * * *"

PROTEST SUGGESTED

And taking the point 1 step further, authorities urging strong anti-inflation actions insist that if just those already getting social security pensions—about 12.5 million—could be stimulated to organized protest against swelling Government budgets, we'd be well on way to victory over the spiral.

Here's a comparison of benefits and living costs today with 20 years ago, 10 years ago, and last year.

In 1940, the first year of social security benefits, the maximum check a single retired worker could get was $45.60 a month. Today, the maximum for that worker is up to $116. The increase in benefits over the year has been 154.4 percent.

Simultaneously, though the cost of living—as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index—has soared 108.4 percent.

Clearly, a giant part of the social security gains has been dissipated by rising living costs. But even over this period, which includes the violent inflation right after World War II, the rise in benefits substantially exceeds the rise in prices.

In 1950, the maximum check a single retired worker could get was up to $80, and that, in turn, is now up to $116. The increase in benefits in this decade has been 45 percent.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT FIGURES CITED

Simultaneously, the cost of living has risen 23.4 percent. Again, much of the gain has been wiped out by climbing prices, but a 45-percent rise in benefits is still a lot bigger than a 23.4-percent rise in living costs.

In 1958 the maximum check was $108.50. The rise to $116 is amost 7 percent. In this past year, living costs have risen a bit more than 1 percent.

Once more, the point can be properly made. The pensioners' gains are not, as the First National City claims, an "illusion."

And the straight statistical comparison doesn't tell the full tale. For the man or women over 65 depending on social security benefits does not buy many of the items that have ballooned most in cost—such as new cars, quality meats. This individual does not use the same quantity or quality of goods and services as the average city worker's family upon whose spending patterns the official price index is based—such as daily trips on the bus or subway. Finally, a person over 65 today vividly recalls the pay levels of the thirties and whether or not a younger person can understand it, $116 a month feels a lot bigger than $45.60 even though the larger check doesn't buy much more than the small one.

"We used to get a lot of complaints about benefits," said a spokesman for the Social Security Administration when I called to check my figures. "We don't any more. People seem to feel they're getting a fair deal."

"You don't get lots of mail grumbling about what inflation has done to the benefits and demanding 'you do something about it?' "

"No."

## Educational Television—The Opportunity and the Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as a strong advocate of realizing the unlimited opportunities offered by educational television I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, two recent articles and a letter pertaining to this subject.

The first article, taken from the Wednesday, March 11, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, describes just one of the many uses to which educational TV can be put. The second is a letter of March 11 addressed to the Federal Communications Commission, from supporters of the plan for educational TV in Delaware. The third article, a reprint of a letter appearing in the Tuesday, March 10, edition of the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening, will bring to the attention of my colleagues an example of the serious obstacles facing those who attempt to make educational TV a reality.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 11, 1959]

EDUCATIONAL TV GROUP PLANS SUMMER SERIES

The Greater Washington Educational Television Association, now boasting membership by all six area universities, is planning a series of summer programs which would give educational content to recreational programs such as music and gardening.

Mrs. Edmund D. Campbell, president, said the series would be designed for family viewing.

She emphasized that the plan is still in the formative stage and will depend largely upon whether television time and money can be obtained. The cost would be $1,000 a week for five 30-minute programs.

The association reached its membership goal Monday when the University of Maryland Board of Regents voted unanimously to join.

It was also announced that five universities will present a series titled "Understanding" on 5 weekdays starting March 27. The programs will be the Easter recess replacement for the association's "Time for Science," normally seen at 11:30 a.m. daily on WTTG (channel 5).

The schedule and participating schools are: March 27, "The Corridor—the Story of Communications," American University; March 30, "The Wonders of Words," Georgetown University; March 31, "The Layman and Chemistry," Catholic University; April 1, "Understanding through Music," Howard University; and April 2, "The World of the Slavic Peoples," George Washington University.

"Understanding" will be aimed at the 41,000 fifth and sixth graders who now see the "Time for Science" series in 1,239 classrooms in the area.

---

MARCH 11, 1959.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
*Washington, D.C.*

GENTLEMEN: At a meeting held on February 25, 1959, the Wilmington section of the National Council of Jewish Women, an organization of over 200 young women, passed a resolution urging the Federal Communications Commission to assign channel 12, formerly in Wilmington, Del., as an exclusively educational outlet.

We believe that there is a great need in Delaware for educational television. This area is served by the three major commercial television networks. The availability of channel 12 at this time offers a tremendous opportunity to improve the quality and widen the scope of local television fare.

We urge you to allocate channel 12 for solely educational purposes. Educational television, regardless of its point of origin, will benefit all Delawareans.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ALBERT GELB,
*Vice President in Charge of Education and Program.*
Mrs. LEONARD LANG,
*Social Legislation Chairman.*
Mrs. STANLEY BELL,
*Legislative News Reporter.*

---

EDUCATIONAL TV

TO THE EDITOR:

Several weeks ago, you wrote a splendid editorial dealing with the gradual decrease in the number of newspapers and the heavy responsibility which falls upon a newspaper which is the only one in town. I was impressed by your realization of the responsibility which your power placed upon you.

Since then, I have been measuring your performance by the standards which you have set up. The subject is your treatment of the proposed allocation of channel 12 for educational television. I shall not discuss its obvious merits, but only your handling of it.

The allocation of channel 12 for educational television is opposed by a strong politico-economic combination in the State. Educational television can, at present, do little to bring profits to commercial interests or to elect Governors, or to satisfy the ego of the scant population in southern Delaware (who, incidentally, can get ETV from Maryland stations). The proponents of educational television need a real opportunity to present the facts to the newspaper reading public. That is where you could have rendered a public service.

The two articles by John G. Craig (Journal-Every Evening, Jan. 26, 27) appear to me to be an attempted coup de grace after the Governor's committee refused to give even moral support to the cause. An unbiased writer, which he pretended to be, would have pointed out the inherent flaws in the conclusion of the Governor's committee.

Front page space was given to the opposition in articles quoting Rollins and Dr. Ward Miller but not to equally qualified educators such as Mr. Shue, superintendent of the Newark public schools, or Dr. Heiney, superintendent of schools in the Mount Pleasant special school district, who strongly favor educational television for channel 12.

I understand that no reporter was sent to the recent board meeting of the Delaware Educational Television Association on February 19. That evening, however, the Journal had an editorial entitled, "From Cloud 7 to Channel 12." This not so subtle satire by title was worthy of Time magazine whose smart-alecky style was once described by a British court as a "magazine of unequaled scurrility directed against all manner of persons.

Please, Mr. Editor, search your conscience and decide whether you have given the subject of channel 12 for educational television a fair break. Telling only some of the facts can be as deceptive as a deliberate falsehood. I think the least you can do is to give equal emphasis to information and arguments from members of the Delaware Association for Educational Television (I don't belong to it). If you did this, Wilmington stores would not cancel their multipage ads. Where else could they advertise as effectively?

While Delaware quibbles over which State would control the educational television channel, our enemies, the Chinese Communists, are using education by radio to jeopardize our way of life. (Journal-Every Evening, Feb. 16, 17, 18, "Red China Today," by Sripati Ghandrasekhar.)

ROBERT W. NOLAN.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—We have searched both our conscience and our files and can find no clear evidence of an uneven break. The viewpoint of the proponents of educational TV took the initial front page play in these newspapers back in September. News stories of developments in support of those aims have appeared frequently since, both on p. 1 and in inside columns. The meeting on Feb. 19 of the Delaware Educational Television Association was covered in a comprehensive front-page story in the Wilmington Morning News of Feb. 20. Mr. Craig's two-part series was an objective appraisal of the situation, one part outlining the views of the proponents, and the second part of the opponents of educational TV. His job was to report the views of each side with objectivity—certainly not to advance his own conclusions or to inject his own opinions.)

## Gov. Foster Furcolo's Proposal To Assist Individual States in Providing Needed Educational Facilities

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter sent by the Honorable Foster Furcolo, one of our former colleagues and now Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to the President of the United States, in which Governor Furcolo requests the President to initiate a study by appropriate executive action on his proposal which he believes may assist individual states in providing needed educational facilities:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
*Boston, Mass., February 27, 1959.*

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
*President of the United States,*
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Confirming my recent conference with you with reference to educational institutions—college and high school—may I briefly summarize some of the facts and views which were presented for your consideration:

(1) The student population and the trend toward more and more education is rapidly increasing. The existing shortage of teachers becomes doubly important as the student population increases. Therefore, the main problem is to provide enough good teachers which poses the subsidiary problem of using them most effectively.

(2) There are approximately 2,000 public and private colleges and universties in the Nation. About 1,300 of these institutions belong to some regional accrediting associations.

(3) There are six regional accrediting associations. (These are not established by law, but are merely voluntary groups):

New England Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges.

Middle States Association.

Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Western College Association.

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Three of them have no specific teacher-student ratio as a criterion for accreditation. The New England Association has a ratio of 15 students to 1 teacher for 4-year, degree-granting colleges, and a ratio of 20 to 1 for 2-year colleges. The Northwest Association has a ratio of 13 to 1, and the Southern Association has a ratio of 20 to 1 for 4-year colleges, and 25 to 1 for 2-year institutions. The academic standing of any institution of higher learning is largely dependent upon whether or not it is an accredited school.

(4) A college or university is not accredited unless it abides by the standards set by its regional accrediting association. Accreditation is important to the student, because it often determines whether he can be ad-

mitted from a nonaccredited school to an accredited one. It is also important in transfers from one college to another, the value of a diploma, and so forth.

(5) Education is one of the most expensive items and a most important item in the budget of any community, State, or nation. The problem becomes greater as the population increases—and as the pay of teachers increases. It is clearly evident that education will continue to be a more and more expensive item.

(6) It is obvious that the lower the teacher-student ratio—the greater the cost. I wish to again emphasize that which I stressed so much to you in our conference, namely, that under no circumstances do we want any action taken that would impair the quality of education. We must maintain standards of high quality.

(7) For many generations, most educators and virtually all other people of the nation have accepted as incontrovertible that the fewer the number of students per teacher, the better the educational achievement of the students. It does not seem wise to accept this premise without a thorough study by an unquestioned authoritative source.

This almost universally held belief requires examination, particularly in view of the development and extensive use in the last decade of many new teaching methods—including film, television, radio, tape recordings, and so forth.

(8) I have just completed a survey of dozens of studies that have been made that unfortunately are either not widely known or may not be called "authoritative" because of their somewhat limited scope. They all cast serious doubt on the widely held theory that the quality of education improves as the ratio of teacher to student decreases. I discovered that most recent studies indicate that there is no relationship or that student educational achievement actually improves with classes that are larger than the generally accepted models.

For example, the more important of more than two hundred research studies of class size and pupil achievement that were undertaken in the past 50 years were reviewed by the Encyclopedia of Educational Research. It found that 40 percent of the research reports favored large classes, and only 22 percent favored small classes. The more recent studies showed 50 percent favored large classes, and 21 percent favored small clasees. The remainder felt there was no significant difference either way. Factual research studies found better than 2 to 1 that pupil achievement is higher in larger than in smaller classes.

The encyclopedia summarizes: "The general trend of evidence places the burden of truth squarely upon the proponents of small classes * * * on the whole, the statistical findings definitely favor large classes at every level of instruction, except the kindergarten." (Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1950 rev. ed., pp. 212–215.)

The Connecticut State department of education study of 1957 reported that "the correlation between achievement and pupil-teacher ratio is practically zero."

(9) A very thorough and exhaustive study of the entire subject is being completed by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, chairman of the department of economics at Harvard University. While the study will not be completed or published for another few weeks, there is a published quotation of his that bears on the ratio of college student to faculty. The September 1958 issue of the American Association of University Professors has this quote by Professor Harris:

"There is nothing sacred about the 10 to 1 ratio. In fact, when it is considered that in elementary schools the ratio is 30 to 1, and in secondary schools, 22 to 1, one is puzzled by the 10 to 1 ratio in higher education." Professor Harris then goes on to point out the millions of dollars that could be saved by a changed ratio.

(10) Prior to my trip to Washington to outline my proposal to you, it was discussed with three of the most distinguished educators in Massachusetts and the Nation—State commissioner of education, Owen B. Kiernan; University of Massachusetts president, J. Paul Mather; and Prof. Seymour Harris, chairman of the economics department at Harvard. All three believe this situation merits thorough exploration. Neither they nor I make any specific recommendations other than to say that a full-scale review of the teacher-student ratio appears advisable.

(11) I believe that it should be authoritatively determined whether or not the almost universally held teacher-student ratio theory is sound, in view of the many new teaching methods. We should know whether this aids or hinders the educational achievement of our students. This is a duty we owe, not only to the taxpayers who pay the bills and to those who consistently and conscientiously support the costs of private education, but also to the students themselves.

(12) As was suggested at our conference, I recommend that the education experts in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be requested to carefully review the situation. If it be determined that the situation warrants exploring, then I urge you to name a committee of distinguished citizens, including well-known educators, to head up a task force survey, and then make recommendations to you. I am certain that such findings or recommendations will have a very persuasive effect on all public and private colleges and universities.

(13) I would like to have it noted that our conference in Washington was limited to educational institutions beyond high school.

(14) I stress the fact that at this time I am not suggesting anything more than exploration of the situation, for it appears that the teacher-student ratio theory may be a limiting factor based on outmoded preconceptions and, therefore, should be explored.

(15) If full and careful investigation by an unimpeachable survey establishes that the teacher-student ratio should be revised upwards, resulting in more students per teacher, it will unquestionably mean:

(a) Greater educational opportunities for more students.

(b) Improved educational achievement by students.

(c) Better pay for teachers and more effective utilization of qualified teachers.

(d) An easing of the teacher shortage problem.

(e) A saving to Massachusetts taxpayers and to every city and town in the State of many millions of dollars a year and every year in the future—thus saving Massachusetts hundreds of millions of dollars.

(f) A similar saving to every State in the Nation, which means the taxpayers of the Nation will be saved billions of dollars.

In conclusion, I believe that anything that even offers the possibile solutions outlined in paragraph 15 certainly merits profound consideration.

Please be assured that my staff and I will be more than pleased to work with any of your staff who may be assigned to this problem. We have had considerable research done on it that we are glad to make available.

With all good wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FOSTER FURCOLO.

## How Much for Foreign Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of all Federal expenditures proposed in the President's budget, it is important that we keep in mind the limitations of our national economy with respect to the financing of Federal spending programs. A dollar spent for foreign aid is a charge against this economy, just as is a dollar spent for airports, housing, or defense. Extravagance or waste is no more defensible in the case of foreign aid spending than it is in the case of any domestic spending program.

In this connection, I include an editorial which appeared in the Richmond Times Dispatch of March 14, 1959:

In a carefully worded special message to Congress the President yesterday asked for $3.9 billion minimum for military and economic aid to free and friendly nations.

He warned against reckless cuts, lest the United States become "the richest Nation in the graveyard of history." His sales talk was factual, compact, and persuasive.

He said that the proposed expenditures for mutual security "are fully as important to our national defense as expenditures for our own forces"; that they are, in fact, indispensable.

He said that the proposed expenditures premise:

(1) The threat of some 400 Russo-Chinese divisions comprising more than 6,500,000 men;

(2) The dangers inherent in the disruptive population explosion and subsequent worldwide, revolutionary repercussions.

(3 The fanatic ideological conspiracy which has overrun, in whole or in part, 17 countries in the past 40 years; and

(4) "The interdependence of the military position and economic prosperity of the United States with those of the rest of the free world."

Foreign aid expenditures, he said, are essential to realization of the free world's paramount objective: to prevent general war, and to deter Communist local aggression.

He indicated that he would make recommendations for additional expenditures for military assistance, "primarily for weapons to the NATO area," after receiving a pending report by a bipartisan committee of prominent and competent citizens.

Just how many more millions this will add to foreign aid is conjectural, but underlines the reality, that the Government will go deeper and deeper into the red—unless liberal spenders in Congress withdraw (or the President vetoes) demands for public power projects, schools, aid to depressed areas, and the housing and airport bills already on their way to the White House.

The grassroots uprising against deficit spending, called for by Mr. Eisenhower last January, has not materialized.

Exposures of flagrant waste in foreign aid have dimmed public enthusiasm for this form of security spending, but it is doubtful that Congress will trim the President's request by more than a few million. Apprehension over the Berlin crisis will assure priority for any spending relevant to defense.

The administration will be able to claim, with some justification, that any sizeable cut in foreign aid will jeopardize our occupancy of some of the 250 Army, Air and Navy bases on which we depend to deter Soviet expansion.

But Congress should not sign a foreign aid check without submitting each individual item to careful scrutiny. It should determine precisely how the money is to be spent.

Rumors that previously distributed billions have found their way into the pockets of top politicians and big business within several countries, need looking into. Specific uses to which economic aid billions are to be devoted must be established, and every effort made to reduce total aid as much as possible.

It is the President's place to propose such expenditure. Their disposition is the responsibility of Congress.

The President was remiss in failing to warn Congress that the expenditure of the requested foreign aid billions—in addition to the almost $6 billion appropriations demanded by congressional liberals, will necessitate an equivalent increase in tax revenues, in order to balance the budget for fiscal 1960.

In his state of the Union message he said: "If we cannot live within our means during a time of rising prosperity, the hope for fiscal integrity will fade."

When that hope fades, the credit of the Nation will slump to a point where, as he told his Wednesday press conference, "it will be increasingly difficult to market Government bonds."

What will it profit this country to distribute billions in foreign aid, if in doing so we sap our own economic strength?

## Resolution To Increase Number of Judges in U.S. District Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Brooklyn Women's Bar Association, Inc., a copy of a resolution which was passed unanimously at the March 3, 1959, meeting of that organization, and I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

RESOLUTION URGING THE 86TH CONGRESS TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF JUDGES IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURTS IN ORDER TO RELIEVE THE UNPRECEDENTED CONGESTION IN THESE COURTS

Whereas according to a recent report by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the Federal district courts are experiencing the heaviest workload and resultant court congestion in recent history, and

Whereas the Judicial Conference of the United States has called for the creation of 45 additional judgeships to provide the judgepower needed in areas of critical court congestion, and

Whereas the southern and eastern districts of New York are among the areas seriously affected by the continual growth in the backlog of judicial business, Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, by the Brooklyn Women's Bar Association, Inc., in regular meeting assembled at 123 Remsen Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., this 3d day of March 1959,* That the 86th Congress be and hereby is urged to create immediately, the additional judgeships necessary to cope adequately with and relieve the mammoth caseload and congestion existing in the southern and eastern districts of New York, and thus speed the administration of justice in these courts, and it is further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the chairmen of the Senate and House of Representatives Judiciary Committees, the Members of the House of Representatives from the New York area, the chairman of the Executive Committee of the U.S. Attorney General's Conference on Court Congestion and to all other appropriate public officials and agencies.

## The Cost of Fending Off War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star, March 17, 1959:

THE COST OF FENDING OFF WAR—CRITICS OF FOREIGN AID CALLED BLIND TO HEAVY OUTLAY IT SAVES NATION

(By David Lawrence)

If the American people could express in a single sentence their most important wish today, it would be: "Keep us out of war at any cost."

Yet, when out of a national budget of $77 billion, the President asks for $3,930,000,000 to keep American boys from fighting abroad, and calls for a mutual security program to bolster our allies, this is derided as a foreign aid program or a giveaway.

The label is wrong. It's really keep-us-out-of-war program.

Few of the critics realize the explosive situation that exists in the world today or how interrelated America's fate is with the other free countries—or, if they do realize it, they fail to see how many billions more our defenses would cost if America had to do the job alone. That's why President Eisenhower's television address last night was so important to the country.

For the President had no sooner announced last week that he was asking Congress for $3,930 million when from Capitol Hill—mostly from Democrats—came predictions that the expenditure would be cut by a billion dollars. Acting Secretary of State Herter promptly said that if any such reduction were made it would "serve notice on the world that we are weakening in our determination."

Just why some of the legislators regard any money spent abroad as either a gift or a throwaway is hard to understand unless they think the American people really can be misled by such distortions. Certainly, as sometimes charged, there's waste in the spending of American funds in other countries, because the United States cannot always control how other governments disburse the money they receive. But, conceding that there is some waste, it is a fact that in war itself there is even greater waste. The true test is whether, on the whole, war is prevented, and thus far the United States has managed with the help of strong allies to keep out out of a third world war.

It sometimes isn't realized how much America's own allies have been spending since the close of World War II. Rather, the impression is fostered by the critics that the United States is putting up all the money for international defense or mutual security. The President in his message to Congress a few days ago said:

"Over the years of our combined efforts, these allies and friends have spent on these forces some $141 billion, more than six times the $22 billion we have contributed in military assistance. During calendar year 1958, they contributed $19 billion of their own funds to the support of these forces. * * *

"Without the strength of our allies, our Nation would be turned into an armed camp and our people subjected to a heavy draft and an annual cost of many billions of dollars above our present military budget."

What perhaps isn't generally understood in America is that economic assistance plays a vital role in maintaining the stability of other nations. If there were no stable governments among our allies, America would not have strategic bases overseas. The President said on this point:

"Through the Mutual Security Program our friends among the free world nations make available to us for the use of our forces some 250 bases in the most strategic locations, many of them of vital importance. They support ground forces totaling more than 5 million men, stationed at points where danger of local aggression is most acute, based on their own soil and prepared to defend their own homes. They man air forces of about 30,000 aircraft, of which nearly 14,000 are jets, 23 times the jet strength of 1950 when the program started. They also have naval forces totaling 2,500 combat vessels, with some 1,700 in active fleets or their supporting activities."

Dissenting members of Congress often concede that the military program is logical, but they claim the economic support abroad is questionable and this they would cut. In doing so, they would strike a blow at the morale of the countries affected. For without economic stability, political chaos ensues, and then the Communists find fertile ground for exploitation or even overthrow of existing government. The Communist intrusion in Iraq lately, for example, has unsettled the entire Middle East. The Communists' tactics in Africa, Asia, and Latin America have been supported by Soviet measures in the economic field.

So it's a dangerous international situation which calls for American expenditures to bolster here and abroad our defense—politically, economically and militarily. From a strong alliance, moreover, come firmness in a crisis as is the case today when Moscow is testing the West. The President says the West will not surrender. He can say this convincingly because the Western alliance in the last 10 years has been built on a strong foundation. It is to maintain that strength that the Mutual Security Program, or what might better be called a keep-us-out-of-war program, is really directed.

## Tribute to the Late Benjamin F. Feinberg, State Senator, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include a committee report and resolution of Joel Lodge No. 118, B'nai B'rith, commemorating Benjamin F. Feinberg, late State senator of New York.

The State of New York has sustained a great loss in the passing of Senator Feinberg. He will be missed by his friends and by the people of the State. All who knew him knew that he was a man of integrity and a man of high honor. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word.

COMMITTEE REPORT AND RESOLUTION OF JOEL LODGE NO. 118, B'NAI B'RITH

The committee of Joel Lodge, B'nai B'rith, appointed to select a person as the 1958 citizen of the year, respectfully submits the following report:

As a result of several meetings held in January 1959, the committee chose as the person to be honored, Senator Benjamin F. Feinberg. In view of the senator's confinement to his home and the hospital, preparations were made for the conferring of the award in Montreal, or at his home if his attendance at a formal dinner during Brotherhood Week could not be arranged.

The late Senator Feinberg's name has long been favorably considered by the committee for the award of citizen of the year, but previous committees had deferred plans in anticipation of the year of his retirement. The prior committees had felt that such time would be most fitting as the culmination of his career of outstanding public service.

The committee feels that the year 1958–59 should be designated as a year of memorial to Senator Feinberg and the award made posthumously by means of a resolution duly adopted by the lodge convening as a whole.

The text of the resolution as adopted by the lodge at its February 17 meeting follows:

Whereas the late Senator Benjamin F. Feinberg, has throughout his lifetime displayed the attributes of selfless devotion to this community and the public which he served so long and so well; and

Whereas such devotion is exemplified by his many accomplishments—

(a) in the field of education, by his fostering and advancing the State University Teachers College; in establishing Champlain College, forerunner of a low tuition State-supported college system; and his promotion of legislation to improve the salaries and working conditions of schoolteachers and encourage qualified persons to enter this profession;

(b) in the realm of government, by his inspirational leadership while serving as State senator, senate majority leader, and confidant of Governors;

(c) in the field of public utilities by his outstanding record as chairman of the Public Service Commission of the State of New York and president of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners;

(d) in his service of God, as life trustee of the Beth Israel congregation of Plattsburgh and president and lifelong member of this lodge of B'nai B'rith; and

Whereas he has displayed heartfelt conviction in the principle of the brotherhood of man as demonstrated by his active participation in social and fraternal organizations devoted to charitable purposes such as the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, where he served as exalted ruler; and Free and Accepted Order of Masons where he rose to the office of worshipful master of his lodge; Rotary where he was chosen for the presidency of the Plattsburgh Club; and, in furtherance of such conviction and his belief and dedication to this principle of brotherhood, he has been a lifetime true friend of all men and all mankind; and

Whereas Senator Feinberg's ascendancy through life from his humble origin as the son of immigrant parents, through his formative years as a diligent student, devoted teacher, and school principal, distinguished attorney and counsellor, held in high esteem by his fellow members of the bar, and an outstanding member of the New York State and American Bar Associations, a fair and just judge and legislator, has exemplified the American tradition of freedom of opportunity for all regardless of race or creed; and

Whereas his unshakeable faith in democracy and his unflagging determination to preserve and strengthen it was exhibited by the legislation which he sponsored and authored in the State legislature; now therefore in recognition of this record and example of Americanism and brotherhood, be it

*Resolved*, That the award of citizen of the year for the year 1958–59 be conferred posthumously upon Benjamin F. Feinberg; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the year 1958–59 be set aside in the annals of the citizen of the year awards as a year of memorial in his honor, and that a record of these proceedings be suitably inscribed and presented to the members of his immediate family.

The foregoing resolution, upon motion duly made and seconded, was unanimously adopted by the Joel Lodge No. 118, B'nai B'rith, of Plattsburgh, N.Y., convened as a whole at its regular meeting held February 17, 1959.

---

## St. Patrick and the New Barbarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered in Cleveland yesterday on "St. Patrick and the New Barbarians":

On this St. Patrick's Day it is our time-honored pleasure and privilege to lay aside the cares and worries of the day as we proudly wear the green. Our songs and cheers, parades and banquets, boasts and tears, all bear testimony to a rich heritage bestowed upon us by our patron saint. But it is more than that. Beneath the precious sentiment we express so well today, there stirs in the heart of every Irishman a gentle reminder of the special mission in life that is his by birthright. That mission is the spiritual enrichment of all mankind.

For 15 centuries the Irish have been faithful to that mission. In the Dark Ages when all civilization in Europe, the cradle of Western culture and thought, seemed certain to perish, it was the Irish who lighted the way out of the darkness. An island of saints and scholars, she has given her sons and daughters to almost every quarter of the globe. They have carried with them the same light and word which St. Patrick brought to Ireland so long ago, that all mankind might be lifted up to the dignity which befits his nature. In keeping faith with this noble purpose in life, the Irish have prospered wherever they have raised the banners of St. Patrick. So, too, have the many lands to which they have gone prospered under the watchful care of this great saint.

This, then, is the unending mission of the Irish to the world. It is unending because the lessons of the ages teach us that from time to time evil forces arise which challenge the dignity of man and seek to overthrow the divine plan which secures that dignity.

In our times we are faced with this challenge, on all sides we find evidence of the dark ages in this 20th Century. The human values which mankind has won at such great sacrifice are being trampled under the heavy boots of Russian barbarians. At this turning point in history we are faced with a series of choices at the core of which rests the fundamental question, "are we willing to sell our birthright for a mess of pottage?"

In a world torn by strife and tension we are told we can have peace if we are willing to pay tribute to the new barbarians. The peace they offered in return, is no peace at all, it is the strange peace of human slavery. Justice, the only basis upon which peace can be built, is rapidly losing its place in the affairs of nations, because it permits no compromise on the dignity of man. A peace without justice is the certain formula for war, a war which no thinking man may countenance.

What is the tribute demanded of us by the new barbarians as the price for an unjust peace?

First, they are asking freemen, particularly the United States, to acquiesce in their enslavement of 35 percent of the people who inhabit the earth. They are trying desperately to drag the spokesmen for the western world into another summit conference. At this conference they expect to force recognition of a status quo, that is, recognition of their right to enforce the darkness of despotism and slavery upon humanity. They want freemen to guarantee to them that their evil work will go unmolested, that the conscience of the West will not be moved by the sad plight of so many of their fellowmen. As they hear the millions of our brothers, now persecuted as martyrs to our cause, cry out for justice, they are fearful that these cries will be answered by a world enraged by man's inhumanity to man. Evil works quietly in the shadows, always fearful of arousing the forces of righteousness.

That is what lies back of the present Berlin crisis, precipitated by the barbarians of Moscow. First we are told that unless we desert the people of free Berlin we will be driven out by force. When we responded to the threat by declaring our intention to stand fast in our defense of freedom, the Russians began a series of retreats. Pressed by the deadline which they were so bold to make, and in the face of our determination to be firm, they have now taken the position that if we agree to a summit conference they will not cause a war over Berlin. This is apparent from the fact that only a few days ago the Kremlin spokesmen stated the deadline of May 27 would be extended if preparations were underway for such a meeting. But, as always, there is a catch. The continued Russian insistence that no agenda be prepared in advance of the conference gives ample evidence that they intend to limit discussion to those items which force recognition of a status quo.

It is strange indeed, that at this point in our history, when free men have advanced so far in knowledge and accomplishments, we should be ordered about by the crude barbarians. We must ask ourselves, has our civilization lost its sense of high purpose, have we surrendered our mission to the world? There is mounting evidence that something is missing from our national life which, in past generations, made our country the beacon light and great hope of the world.

Not many months ago we had a strange visitor come to our country, allegedly on a vacation. He was the eyes, the ears, and the spokesman for the new barbarians. Every

school child in America knew who he was and what he represented. Yet, this same individual was wined and dined by influential segments of our national life. He shrewdly dangled the prospects of huge profits before the eyes of those industrialists and businessmen who willingly paid him homage. He made no mention of the fact that he was simply carrying out the orders of Lenin who held that when the time came the biggest capitalists would be anxious to provide the rope with which they were to be hanged by the new order. Nor did he mention the plan to destroy the hard won gains of free labor in the United States by putting it in competition with the products of his slave empire. Few voices were raised in protest to this spectacle and those who did raise their voices to the danger were branded as extremists and not representative of traditional American hospitality. Few asked, since when has it been the tradition of our free people to extend hospitality to a person who has the blood of martyrs on his hands, to a person whose whole life has been dedicated to the destruction of those priceless values which we hold to be as dear as life itself? This emissary of evil left the United States with the false impression that we are a divided people, that we are more interested in material things than in spiritual and human values. He could no more understand the American people and our way of life than could Hitler in his time. The tragedy is that the false impressions gathered during Mikoyan's short visit to our country will make our role in world affairs more difficult and increase the dangers of war.

Now one hears the call for compromise on Berlin from quarters and individuals who should know better than to ask the impossible. What do we have to compromise? All we have ever asked for is the right of the German people to determine their destiny by the process of free elections. We are fully prepared to accept the results of these elections because we believe in the right of all people to self determination. It is the Russians, the new barbarians, who refuse to accept the verdict of the people directly involved. How can we compromise this position we have taken? There is nothing to compromise unless we are prepared to abandon our position of moral leadership in the world.

There are other disturbing signs of freemen growing weary and tired of the struggle for survival. For the many years of the cold war it has been our national policy to bring comfort and hope to the oppressed through the media of international broadcasts. Broadcasting to the people in the countries now overrun by the new barbarians in their native tongues, we have been able to keep alive their hopes for a better life, and a return to the civilization of which they are a part. This has proven to be a work of peace, because, so long as they could hope, they could not abandon the heritage of freedom, they would not, in desperation, accept things as they are and make accommodations with the despots. Now, we see this policy in the process of change, a change which bodes evil for the future. Gradually there are being eliminated the many voices which carried his mesage of hope. The Russian language, the language of the oppressor, is beginning to monopolize the "Voice of America" programs beamed to the darkened lands behind the Iron Curtain. This tactic can only alienate our proven friends in these many lands and drive them into the camp of the enemy. Frequently I have asked myself whether this results from ignorance or from a secret agreement already entered into by the Eisenhower administration to accept a status quo; that is, to recognize the permanent occupation of these once free lands by the new barbarians.

There are ominous signs of the times; they threaten the precarious peace which now hangs over a tired and weary world. They are dangerous because the appetite of the aggressor cannot be satisfied by concessions, he must have everything or nothing. He understands firmness and courage, though he lacks it himself. The bully is always a bluffer and he dominates none but the timid.

But there are other signs of our times in which we can take comfort. A very large segment of our people have come to recognize the full meaning of the crises of our times. This awakening to the harsh realities of our divided world is being stimulated by the growing pressures put upon us. More and more our people are seeking their strength of purpose from that deep spirituality which is our heritage. When all is said and done, the strength of our country rests firmly in the hands of our people. It is within their power to use that strength as we face the test of our worthiness to lead the cause of peace, with justice. In generations past we have not feared to face responsibilities, nor have we feared the threats and boasts of tyranny on the march. We as a nation have learned well that man lives not by bread alone.

So, on this St. Patrick's Day let us, one and all, rejoice in the knowledge that the spirit of our patron saint has a place in the hearts of all who know the blessings of human freedom. This gift shall give us strength as we carry on our happy mission to bring spiritual enlightenment to all mankind. We must be doers of the word, carrying the light which shall take all mankind out of the darkness of materialism.

## Defense Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article from Air Force magazine by Mr. John F. Loosbrock is most worthy of the consideration of every Member of this Congress during this great debate on defense:

HOW MUCH CALCULATION—HOW MUCH RISK?

The initial skirmishes on the annual battle of the Potomac, otherwise known as the budget debate, have quite clearly indicated the views and the strategies of the opposing camps, with few uncommitted neutrals.

The lineup, as might be expected, closely follows party lines. With the Democrats in the saddle on Capitol Hill and the Republicans in power at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, headon clashes are the order of the day, rather than the more subtle maneuvers that occur when the same party controls both the executive and legislative branches.

In broad terms the defense issues boil down to a conflict of opinion as to what threat offers the greatest danger to the Nation over the next several years. The view of the Hill, by and large, is that the military might of the Soviet Union presents the clearest and most immediate danger. Administration spokesmen admit a sizable military threat but, either explicitly or by implication, hold that the military problem must take second place to the fiscal problem—that inflation is more to be feared than Soviet missiles.

A smaller and more daring splinter group in Congress feels that both problems can be licked but only through the politicalily unpopular—some would say politically suicidal—device of increasing taxes.

The latter solution, according to many impartial observers, has the weight of logic on its side, a disadvantage which will prove tough to overcome. In fact, the average person instinctively fears higher taxes more than he fears either the Soviets or inflation.

At the moment the debate centers on the so-called missile gap—whether or not the budget for fiscal 1960 will allow the Soviet Union a sizable numerical advantages in intercontinental ballistic missiles through the next 3 years.

That such a gap will exist has been admitted by the administration. Mr. McElroy, the Secretary of Defense, indicated that the U.S.S.R. may have as much as a 3 to 1 advantage by 1961, by which time the dispersed and hardened Minuteman and the mobile Polaris would begin to redress the balance. (Richard Rovere, writing in the New Yorker, points out, however, that "we have no solid-fuel or mobile base missile operational now, and the only one that is in an advanced state of development—the Navy's Polaris, designed for release from a submerged submarine—has a short range, a low accuracy rating, and not very much of a warhead.")

The 3 to 1 ratio is disputed by a number of experienced citizens. Their estimates range from a sanguine 4 to 1 to a gloomy 10 to 1.

We are not trying to match the Soviets missile for missile, the administration is saying, because we are able to take up the slack with long-range B–52's of the Strategic Air Command, SAC's B–47's and B–58's, and the Thor and Jupiter intermediate-range ballistic missile squadrons now being emplaced in Great Britain (and later in whatever other NATO nation may be willing thus to embellish their attractiveness as targets).

The other side of the argument is that intercontinental ballistic missiles represent the one category of weapon systems in which a 1 for 1 match is the irreducible minimum. This theory holds that the Soviets are not only making ICBM's faster than we are but also faster than we can multiply and/or harden the targets that the U.S.S.R. would have to take out in an initial attack. Thus our preponderance in long-range bombers would lose its significance—a majority of them would be destroyed on the ground. The balance of the SAC force would probably do no better than match the Soviet manned bomber force plane for plane. Further, our own air defense system would have been punished in the initial attack while Soviet air defense systems would be alerted and ready to welcome SAC's aircraft.

No number of IRBMs deployed in Western Europe will influence the outcome of this kind of battle. In fact it can be argued that such deployment actually increases the requirement for a U.S.-based intercontinental force. The shorter-range missiles will be only as effective as the long-range umbrella permits them to be. Otherwise we will be in the position of an Army commander who emplaces his artillery in the front lines with inadequate provision for long-range counterbattery fire. It is a good way to get pounded to pieces without ever hitting back. Certainly, as the accompanying editorial from the Boston Herald suggests, if our long-range posture deteriorates vis-a-vis that of Russia's, our Western allies may reply to our offers of more IRBM's, "No, thanks. We just had some."

To rectify the situation obviously calls for more money than the administration is willing to spend. Congress is chafing at the bit, and the chairman of the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee has predicted that some $500 million will be appropriated over and above what the President has requested. He further said that this sum is only one-half to one-quarter of what he thought should be added. GEORGE H. MAHON.

Democrat of Texas, is a veteran of appropriations battles and is not noted for being an exceptionally free spender. His predictions are not to be taken lightly.

More money would certainly help the Air Force at this juncture. Maj. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, who runs the USAF ballistic missile program, has pleaded on the Hill for more production of Atlases as the fastest way to reduce the missile gap. Atlas is proving a reliable weapon; the hard work of development is past, and it seems a shame not to cash in on our investment.

True, the Atlas at this point cannot be hardened by going underground like Titan or Minuteman, but progress has been made in reducing its vulnerability through so-called "toughening" (raising the missile to its upright firing position only at the last minute).

There are other areas besides ICBMs that need a financial shot in the arm. Housing at operational bases is one. More B–58's to replace the aging B–47's is another. Air defense, because it offers no answer to Soviet ICBM's as yet, is dwindling in effectiveness and popularity.

The Bomarc program has been cut in half, and we are buying no manned interceptors with fiscal year 1960 money. Yet, as pointed out above, the Soviet manned delivery system remains formidable under the way we have elected to play the game. Any kind of airborn alert, although not contemplated for the immediate future, will require money to prepare for it and in the long run will call for more aircraft, more crews, more fuel, more tires, more of everything.

The current debate on the Hill is a useful exercise in airing the issues publicly, even though the taxpayer finds it difficult to pick out the grains of truth that are hidden in the welter of conflicting claims and opinions. Unfortunately, the history of the past several years, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, indicates that congressional action has little positive effect on our defense programs. Knowledgeable Senators and Representatives, who are honestly concerned about our military position undoubtedly are vexed at this, and it will be interesting to see what they attempt to do about it.

Quite a long time ago, Mr. Truman made headlines when he impounded (refused to spend) $800 million that Congress had appropriated for the Air Force. Impounding was news in those days.

Now it is so common as to be accepted as a normal way of doing business. Many times $800 million have been appropriated but not spent for national defense over the past several years. The closest to any explanation ever vouchsafed was a recent remark by the Pentagon's moneyman, Assistant Secretary of Defense Wilfred McNeil, who said, in reference to money ticketed in the last budget for acceleration of Minuteman:

"Oh, we spent it all right. But we took it out of another pocket."

Abraham Lincoln once told another Congress, "The dogmas of a quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves."

Now would appear an appropriate time for Congress to rise up in righteous wrath. Congress represents the duly constituted voice of the people, but in the context of the times it has become largely a voice crying in the wilderness of bureaucracy.

We chatter about how much the country can afford while there are twice as many people unemployed as there are under arms. We counter intercontinental missiles with aircraft that may never get off the ground. We woo allies while denying them the long-range protection that makes their help meaningful. We talk of calculated risks in the face of weapons that make such risks unacceptable.

A little more calculating and a lot less risking would seem to be in order.

## The Jewish Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction that I speak again of the Jewish Memorial Hospital—one of the great voluntary health institutions of the city of New York and of the District which I have the honor to represent here.

This institution will observe the 54th year of its founding at a dinner to be held in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on Saturday evening, April 4.

This event, which draws the outstanding citizens from the great metropolis of New York, is one of the high points in our city's community life. Men and women who have demonstrated their civil leadership, and sense of philanthropic responsibility, overflow the dinner to mark their personal tribute to a rare hospital institution. I say rare, because along with its high and highly regarded services for the healing and health of all of the people of the area in which it is located, Jewish Memorial Hospital is noted, and distinctively so, as "The Hospital With a Smile."

Since its founding in 1905, the hospital has grown some 900 percent beyond its first modest beginnings. Yet community demands on the hospital continue to mount. As a result, a new building program is underway that will enlarge the hospital's facilities still more. This building program, developed under the leadership of Jesse H. Barkin, president of the Jewish Memorial Hospital board of trustees, promises to be a shining example of the American pattern of volunteer humanitarian achievement.

Mr. Barkin is fortunate in having associated with him a group of outstanding New York citizens, selfless in their devotion and generous with their time, money, and effort for the hospital.

Jewish Memorial Hospital looks ahead. As one aspect of its forethought, it constructed a special research and laboratory building several years ago in which research is being carried on today for advances in the medical and surgical achievements of tomorrow. A group of dedicated doctors, surgeons, technicians, and researchers are here gathered in an impressive human brotherhood of healing and mercy.

Outstanding in the work of this research laboratory is an extraordinary organization known as the Marcia Slater Society for Research in Leukemia. Its origin is itself a deeply stirring story of courage and aspiration. Its achievements are a unique expression of the human capacity to evoke creative values out of deep personal tragedy.

The Marcia Slater Society for Research in Leukemia was founded in 1950 following the death by leukemia of a child of 8 named Marcia Slater. In the clouded years before she passed into the Great Beyond, Jewish Memorial Hospital mustered every resource of medical skill to prolong her life. Outstanding in this effort was Dr. Harry Wallerstein, now the president of Jewish Memorial Hospital's medical board. So impressed were the parents and friends of the tragically ill Marcia, that they set out to organize a group that would contribute to the study of leukemia and, hopefully, learn to deal with this dread killer.

The group, which called itself the Marcia Slater Society for Research in Leukemia, is not composed of men and women of great wealth. On the contrary, here are average American men and women, with all of the responsibilities of earning a living, of maintaining a harmonious family life and of contending with the problems that face each and every one of us. But this condition does not prevent their fervent and enthusiastic support of a program to make possible substantial research in leukemia. So dedicated, so devoted was and is this group that, as of today, it has been able to contribute $90,000 to the research program in leukemia, headed by Dr. Harry Wallerstein.

Here I want to pay particular tribute to those who have inspired and guided its work.

Dr. Harry Wallerstein, himself, and the officers of the society, Miriam Kaufman, president; Helen Canter, vice president; Evelyn M. Riskin, treasurer; Florence Rosenwasser, financial secretary; Bea Rubine, recording secretary; Frances Edenberg, corresponding secretary; Edythe Willen, auditor; Evelyn Slater, honorary president; Dorothy Silverman, honorary past president; and Gussie A. Wallerstein, honorary vice president.

I believe that my colleagues in Congress agree with me in my regard for this organization of average American men and women, as a shining example of the best and noblest in our American tradition.

## Saving Soil by Making Running Water Walk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, economic studies made by the agricultural colleges have proved many times that farmers who practice soil conservation realize more income per acre

than farmers on similar land who do not try to save the soil. The small watershed program provides an opportunity for farmers to work together with their neighbors in town to prevent devastating floods and conserve the soil by bringing the entire area's water under control. Once the planning has been started locally and has been approved by the State, the U.S. Department of Agriculture helps the local group carry out this water management work.

I am proud that my home district in Wisconsin has six of these watershed projects in various stages of development. My only regret is that we do not have more of them going. One of these projects is in the Lost Creek watershed, which covers 5,000 acres and all or part of 42 farms.

In a recent issue of the Durand, Wis., Courier-Wedge, Editor William Ender described the way running water is being made to walk in the Lost Creek region of Pepin County. This story presents a comprehensive case history of a watershed project, so, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include portions of Editor Ender's article in the RECORD:

TRIP THROUGH SCENIC LOST CREEK WATERSHED AREA PROVIDES EDUCATION IN SOIL CONSERVATION PRACTICES

Do you want to take a pleasant and scenic trip in the country to observe what a community can do to conserve natural resources? A drive-it-yourself tour through the Lost Creek watershed project area north of Pepin shows what has been done and what still needs to be done to some one of our most precious assets, our soil. Traveling up Lost Creek from Lake Pepin, here's what you'll see:

(1) Three sheet piling grade stabilizers and silt traps have been installed near the outlet of Lost Creek by the State highway department and the Burlington Railroad. Above this point, 1 mile of channel improvement work will be completed during the summer of 1959.

(2) Contour strips on the east side of the road, at the Budd Milliren farm, are about a mile long. The channel of Lost Creek shows bank erosion and meandering. A good sod waterway could be built here.

(3) Renovated pasture and contour strips on the Grant Erickson farm help control erosion by reducing the speed of runoff waters. A sod waterway will be constructed on the site of the old Lost Creek channel.

(4) Two grade stabilization structures and a section of channel improvement are located across the highway from the Lost Creek school.

(5) Above the school is the area where State Highway 183 is being relocated and improved. This work was planned and supervised by the Wisconsin Highway Department as part of the watershed work plan.

(6) A water-retarding structure, located about 2 blocks east of the highway, controls water from a drainage area of 200 acres. The dam is 29 feet high and contains about 10,000 cubic yards of fill.

(7) A little to the northwest is another dam, which is 26 feet high, contains about 23,000 cubic yards of fill, and controls floodwaters from approximately 1,000 acres of land. This dam will have a pool of water only during flood periods.

(8) On the other side of the highway, you'll find a dam which has a permanent pool of water. This dam stands 32 feet high and has about 36,000 cubic yards of dirt. Floodwaters from 650 acres of land will be impounded by the structure.

(9) Examples of good forestry practices are seen on the west side of the highway. One woodlot is protected, and a good stand of trees is on the land. An adjoining woodlot shows poor management. Cattle are pasturing the woods and very little new growth can be seen.

(10) A good example of contour stripcropping can be seen on the Willard Johnson farm.

(11) Conture stripcropping protects land on the Glen Moline farm.

(12) Roland Johnson has built a farm pond and gully control structure on his farm.

(13) A complete soil and water conservation farm plan is in effect on the Lewis Jahnke farm. Erosion has been halted on this land.

## We've Been Down This Road Before

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We've Been Down This Road Before," which appeared on March 6, 1959, in the Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz:

WE'VE BEEN DOWN THIS ROAD BEFORE

Arizona school officials should take another look at public ethics. With the best intentions in the world, some of them are helping the Federal empire builders in a creeping campaign to dominate American education. How it is being done is told in a story on page 1 today.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has made sure that State and local school authorities hear of the benefits they can get by qualifying under Public Law 815. Doctrinaire educationist groups such as the National Education Association have enthusiastically spread the news. The result is that a good law is being put to bad use. It eventually could be twisted to become a vehicle for achieving federalized school objectives which have been bitterly resisted in Congress and out.

There was virtually no opposition when the law was passed by Congress in 1953. Many of the most dedicated opponents of Federal aid to education favored it. The object was to allow the Federal Government to provide school funds in places where extraordinary concentrations of Federal employees put an unjust burden on local facilities. Locating a great airbase in a small community, for example, might double or triple school enrollment overnight without providing compensating taxable resources. Obviously it was right that the Federal Government should carry a share of the load it created.

But look what is being done. A clause in the law recognized that Federal contracts, such as those bringing in great numbers of people to work on, say, military aircraft production, could create an impacted area. Now we find such firms as Arizona Sand & Rock, the Cudahy Packing Co., and the Caterpillar Tractor Co. included. We find a school district counting noses of parents employed in the U.S. courthouse, the post office, the Veterans' Administration hospital, the Southwest Poultry Experiment Station, on Indian reservations, and on long-established reclamation projects.

Commercial or public, these organizations have one thing in common. They are integral parts of the community. For the most part they were here long before federally impacted areas were dreamed of. They provide services which are largely for local benefit. The community never has considered them to be superstructures imposed by Washington, and it never will. If the commercial firms employ a few more men because they have Federal contracts, well—it is nothing that has not been going on for years.

The law was never intended to cover such established, already as simulated institutions. They pay their own way in the local economy. They do not make Federal aid to education necessary or desirable. To use them as alibis for dollar grabbing from the Federal Treasury is immoral, even though legal. We don't need money so badly that we must sacrifice principle and deny the municipal kinship of our own people.

This is a road that has been traveled before, and its end is plain. Once the intent of a law is destroyed by bureaucratic expediency, there is no stopping the encroachments made in its name. It was done a quarter of a century ago with constitutional provisions governing interstate commerce, and today a bootblack could be subjected to Federal control because his wax is manufactured in another State. Schools could go the same way through distortion of the law's intent.

How? Today one out of every six wage earners in the United States is employed by some branch of Government. State and local governments all have contracts with the Federal Government. They all exist under the Federal Constitution. Therefore, it could be reasoned at some later date, every school district in the United States is automatically a federally impacted district. Any agile attorney could detail for you the tortuous reasoning that could lead to this conclusion—and cite existing precedent.

Of course it might not make any difference by the time the end is reached. Congress spent our money last year at the rate of more than a million dollars for every minute it was in session. This year's Congress will spend it even faster. Next year, well—there will be no stop sign on the road to inflation and bankruptcy unless the people themselves put one up. A good place to start erecting it is in our own school boards.

They need to be reminded that the dollars they get from Washington are not free. They come from the people, minus about 25 cents each for bureaucracy's handling charge.

A few Arizona school districts are actually impacted by large Federal installations. Most of them are not. We have a problem, but let's be honest about it. It is largely a local problem caused by our rapid growth. We are not helping our school districts when we encourage evasions which could eventually destroy all local control over them.

## Yazoo City High School Wins Freedoms Foundation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call Members' attention to an editorial which appeared in the October issue of Flashlight, the Yazoo City High School student body publication, written by Spencer Gilbert, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. S. Gilbert, Jr., of Yazoo City. The editorial won the Yazoo City High

School $100 and the George Washington Honor Medal. The award was made at the 10th annual Freedoms Foundation on February 22, 1959.

The Yazoo City superintendent of schools, Mr. Fred W. Young, made the following comment relative to this award:

I do not know what kind of country the United States will be 50 years from now. However, I am sure of one thing; it will be the kind of country that most of the people of the United States want. It may not be what you and I would want, but it will be what most of the citizens in that day want. It, therefore, gives me great pleasure to see fine, intelligent, energetic, patriotic young Americans thinking constructively, as Spencer Gilbert is doing. It required an intelligent mind and a patriotic young American to write this editorial. The principal of the high school, the high school teachers, and the entire student body are justifiably proud of the fact that our program of secondary education is producing fine American citizens who will have much to say in determining the kind of country America will be 50 years from now.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to commend Spencer Gilbert on his thought-provoking editorial and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

MAN MUST PROTECT RIGHTS OF INHERITED LIBERTIES

(By Spencer Gilbert)

Current events, both domestic and foreign, reveal to the American that a battle is raging in the world. Not a physical battle with guns, tanks, and planes, but a battle for men's minds. A tug-of-war with the freedoms of men on one side opposed by the servitude of men on the other; one nation under God and one godless nation; the American credo and communism. This battle, which for centuries has pitted advocates of tyranny and freedom against each other, is being continued by these relatively new forces.

The entire American way of life is founded on the principle of a fundamental belief in God. On this foundation are built the constitutional government designed to serve the people and the political and economic rights which protect the dignity and freedom of the individual. These rights cannot be cherished enough by Americans today. It is the responsibility of every true American to maintain our way of life and to pass it to succeeding generations. In order that these freedoms may be preserved, our faith and trust in God must never falter—it is the rock on which our country and its traditions are placed.

It is our privilege to worship in our own way, as set forth in the first amendment to the Constitution, free from any persecution because of religious belief. For this reason alone, many of the first Americans came to this new, wild country.

Since our Government is of the people, for the people, and by the people, primary importance is placed on the people of America—not the state. Many have lost their lives because they have dared to express their opinions openly. We in America enjoy a freedom of speech and press that allows a liberal flow of ideas and, therefore, an unlimited development of knowledge. This right of expression serves to keep the people informed about the affairs of the country and in this manner places a system of checks and balances on Federal authority.

The right to own private property, which is fundamental to each of us, is being denied to many people of the world because socialism with its superficial ideals has been tantalizing to nations. This partial government control of property is a step toward communism. Constraint and complete absence of competition in an economic system, besides creating an injustice toward the individual, substantially mitigates progress that is so vital to our capitalistic system.

These are but a few of the precious freedoms that have been accrued over the ages and have been passed to us to enjoy. Since it is a responsibility to maintain these rights for future generations it is also our duty to further these rights in the tradition of our forefathers who made our way of life as we know it today. Shall we pass into complete oblivion of the rest of the world—these peoples who are seeking a doctrine to follow? The first to confront these uncommitted nations with a plausible policy will be certain of their support. These political vagabonds are playing an important role in world affairs. The cold war rages on with its barrages of propaganda on all sides. Innocent bystanders attempt to separate food for thought from the bologna of propaganda.

The battle for men's minds continues. In our hands lies the potentiality to dissolve a way of life that so many have entered martydom to establish, or to carry it on in the splendor of our heritage.

---

## TVA Develops Program for Reducing National Flood Danger by Local Action

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, for some years now the TVA has pioneered in a new program of meeting the menaces of flood control through local action. The Tennessee River is the most completely controlled river in the world. Nevertheless, even a completely controlled river does not eliminate all flood risks. Such risks, however, can be greatly minimized and often eliminated by wise planning on the part of localities lying near the areas of flood danger. The TVA program has addressed itself to offering assistance to these local communities in understanding their own local flood problems and in taking measures to protect themselves against damaging floods.

The TVA program is widely applicable throughout the entire Nation. Accordingly, the TVA has prepared a summary of the operation of its program and recommendations, pointing out how the procedures developed in the TVA area may be applied profitably throughout the Nation.

Because of the wide interest in dealing with the flood menace throughout the country, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of this report.

The report follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
*Knoxville, Tenn., March 9, 1959.*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority is pleased to submit for the information of the Congress a report entitled, "A Program for Reducing the National Flood Damage Potential," which has been prepared pursuant to section 22 of the TVA Act and executive order No. 6161 (June 8, 1933) providing for "* * * surveys of and general plans for said Tennessee Basin and adjoining territory as may be useful to the Congress and to the several States. * * *"

Communities throughout the Nation are engaged in a new contest with their rivers and they are losing. They will continue to lose unless steps are taken to provide a new perspective—and a new channel of action—with respect to floods.

The problem arises from the basic fact that there are some floods which cannot be prevented and many cities that cannot be fully protected economically with artificial works such as dams and levees. Coupled with this fact is the rapid growth of urban communities, creating new pressures to utilize inviting but hazardous flood plains for subdivisions, shoppng centers, commercial establishments, and other improvements. This mushrooming trend is creating new flood damage potential faster than construction works can add to existing protection. New demands for Federal flood control expenditures thus are created.

TVA believes that local communities have the responsibility to guide their growth so that their future development will be kept out of the path of flood waters. With the States and communities of the Tennessee Valley, TVA has developed a means of putting this proposition into action. This experimental program has operated successfully for six years. It incorporates the concept of flood damage avoidance as a partner of flood control just as forest fire prevention is an indispensable arm of forest fire control. It is saving lives and property in the area while diminishing the future demands on the Nation for flood relief and flood control expenditures. We believe the same results can be accomplished by adapting this experience to other areas throughout the United States. The pace of river control development in relation to the even greater rate of urban encroachment makes it urgent that this broader concept be made a part of our national flood control policy.

The key to the success of the TVA plan lies in the cooperation of State and local agencies. They are the bodies which must make the basic decisions to guide the growth of their communities so as to avoid the low-lying areas vulnerable to floods. They must, of course, be able to obtain and use adequate technical data on storm probabilities and the behavior of flood waters. The sciences of meteorology and hydrology long have been capable of supplying such information, and much of this kind of data is already aavilable from the activities of several Federal agencies, in addition to TVA. To put the information to work, therefore, it is essential that a working relationship be established between Federal agencies which can furnish and interpret the data, and State and local bodies which can use it in preparing their development plans.

TVA believes the findings of this report and the program which it recommends will be useful to the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, as well as the States, in seeking to reduce the national flood damage potential.

The report has been submitted to the Office of the President. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has replied that "while the administration is not prepared at this time to recommend additional legislation to put into effect all the aspects of the program suggested in the TVA report, we believe that the report is a valuable contribution and should be submitted to the Congress for its consideration." We are forwarding the Director's letter, together with the comments of other interested Federal agencies.

We submit the report for appropriate reference and hope it can be published, to-

ogether with appendixes, as a public document for wide distribution.

Respectfully yours,

HERBERT D. VOGEL,
*Chairman of the Board.*
ARNOLD R. JONES,
*Director.*

---

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—A PROGRAM FOR REDUCING THE NATIONAL FLOOD DAMAGE POTENTIAL

I. INTRODUCTION

No major section of the Nation is immune to flood hazards. The floods in recent years in New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, Virginia, Kentucky, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and California illustrate the fact that the flood plains of American rivers—both along the main streams and extending up the smallest tributaries—are potential danger areas. And along many of the low-lying coastal areas abnormal tides and waves pushed onshore by hurricanes batter and flood those structures built close to the sea. The disasters which occurred in Rhode Island in 1954, in North Carolina in 1955, and Louisiana in 1957, are examples.

There are two basic approaches to the problem of flood damage prevention. One is to control the extent of flooding by the construction of dams, reservoirs, levees, and other protective works. The other is to reduce the damages by adjusting the use of land to the flood hazards. Up to now, attempts to solve the problem have been directed almost exclusively to the use of flood control structures. This was a natural development. In our early history it was convient and often necessary to build homes and factories in the flood plains along rivers and streams. Our ancestors depended on the streams for drinking water, food, and transportation, and also for power for their mills and factories. As a result, the earliest towns and communities sprang up along the river banks and large portions of them were built on land which was subject to periodic overflow.

While the communities were small, the damages from flooding were correspondingly small and little effort was made to guard against them. As communities grew and the flood problem became greater, the people turned to the State and Federal Governments for help and billions of dollars have been spent in providing dams, levees, and other protective works. These works protect the existing investment in many industrial centers which are vital to the Nation's economy, and they produce large flood control benefits. However, they provide only a partial answer to the flood problem. There are many urban communities where flood problems still exist and the flood damage potenetial continues to grow. In many of these cases protective works are economically infeasible.

Modern advances in the technology of power, transportation, communication, and water supply have eliminated the need for most types of buildings to be located in flood hazard areas. In spite of these technological advances an increasing number of new residential subdivisions and commercial and industrial establishments are being built in areas unprotected or inadequately protected from flood hazards. New flood problems are thus being created at the same time that vast expenditures are being made to alleviate existing problems. Because these new developments are so extensive, major sections of the Nation are actually losing ground in their efforts to reduce the potential flood damage.

The Tennessee River with its system of dams and reservoirs is one of the best controlled rivers in the world, but we are finding in the Tennessee Valley that flood control works alone are not enough. Such works are essential to protect the existing investments and to provide for full use of valuable lands in flood hazard areas. However, they need to be supplemented by other measures which will result in the adjustment of land uses and future developments to flood conditions in the hazard areas. TVA has found that through cooperation by Federal, State, and local governments a plan of adjusting to floods can be put into effect which holds promise for reducing the flood damage potential and thus lowering the cost of flood control to the American taxpayer by reducing the need for additional protective works.

This report briefly traces the history of Government participation in flood control works, outlines the comprehensive program begun 5 years ago in the Tennessee Valley, and suggests lines of action by which the program could be implemented on a national scale.

II. FLOOD CONTROL AS A NATIONAL PROGRAM

*Early State and local efforts to protect against floods*

The first protective works of any consequence in the United States were the levees along the banks of the Mississippi River at New Orleans, started in 1717 by the plantation owners. By 1812 about 340 miles of river were leveed on both banks. Levee construction by non-Federal interests continued until 1917, with the peak of construction occurring in the 1850's.

The Miami and the initial development of the Muskingum Conservancy Districts in Ohio, the Hudson River Regulating District in New York, and projects undertaken by the State of Pennsylvania are other examples of early efforts by local groups to prevent flood damage. Other State and local agencies have undertaken flood protection works, but in the past 20 years the Federal Government has borne most of the expense.

*Federal flood control activities*

In 1879 Congress created the Mississippi River Commission. The Commission operated under the Secretary of War and was charged with preparation of plans to improve the Mississippi River channel, protect the banks, improve navigation, prevent destructive floods, and promote and facilitate commerce and the postal service. This was the first direct Federal participation in flood protection.

In 1917 Congress appropriated $45 million for flood control, the first Federal appropriation specifically for that purpose. The policy of local cooperation was affirmed by requiring substantial local contributions to construction costs. This legislation also recognized the multiple-purpose concept by specifying that flood control surveys should include power and other functions. These activities were place under the Corps of Engineers.

In 1924 Congress authorized flood surveys on many streams. These surveys were extended by the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1927, which adopted the provisions of the historic House Document 308, and authorized surveys of navigable streams in the United States except the Colorado for the purposes of navigation, waterpower, flood control, and irrigation. The 1927 act was of far-reaching significance in that it laid the groundwork for the later adoption of the 1936 Flood Control Act.

Following a disastrous flood on the lower Mississippi River in 1927, Congress adopted a comprehensive flood protection plan for the Mississippi in May 1928. This plan included new and strengthened levees, channel improvements, bank protection, cutoffs to shorten the river channel, emergency spillways to discharge excess floodwater into floodways, and reservoirs. The entire cost of $325 million was to be borne by the Federal Government.

In 1933 Congress created the Tennessee Valley Authority and directed that the control of floods in the Tennessee and Mississippi River drainage basins be one of its primary objectives. Under this act TVA has built a system of multiple-purpose reservoirs at a cost of about $744 million, of which approximately $184 million has been allocated to flood control.

Three years later Congress passed the Flood Control Act of 1936. That act provides for Federal participation in the cost of flood control projects "* * * if the benefits to whomsoever they may accrue are in excess of the estimated costs, and if the lives and social security of people are otherwise adversely affected." The work was to be done in cooperation with the States and their political subdivisions.

The Corps of Engineers was given general responsibility for planning and constructing the control works—dams, reservoirs, channels, and levees. A total of about 1,000 flood control projects, estimated to cost approximately $11 billion, has been authorized by the Congress under this and subsequent acts and amendments.

The Congress authorized a Federal flood insurance program through passage of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956. The program was to be underwritten in part by the Federal Government and ultimately in part by the States. In 1957 Congress failed to appropriate funds for operation of the program and it was therefore abandoned. Under the proposed program insurance rates were not related to flood risk. The cost of insurance to the owner of property located on high ground and subject to only occasional flooding would have been the same as to the owner of property located on lower ground and subject to frequent flooding. This would have tended to encourage development of the more vulnerable areas, thus increasing the flood damage potential and the cost to the Federal Government when floods occurred.

In summary, the Federal Government in recent years has assumed the major role in planning and financing the flood control program. The historic approach to the flood problem has been to construct flood control structures and protective works with little or no attention to the approach of land use adjustment.

III. NEED FOR ADDITIONAL MEASURES TO MEET THE TOTAL FLOOD PROBLEM

The Tennessee River system of main stream and tributary dams and reservoirs provides flood relief to a composite area of 264,000 acres within the Tennessee Valley and some 4 million acres of unprotected land in the lower Mississippi River Valley. In some areas, complete protection has been afforded, while in other areas the depth and frequency of flooding have been materially reduced. Yet, there is evidence that the flood damage potential of the Tennessee Valley is increasing. This is largely due to expansion of cities and communities brought about by industrial development of the valley and decline of farm employment.

Since 1930 farm population in the valley has declined by nearly 400,000, while the number of nonfarm people—most of them living in or adjacent to cities—has increased by 900,000. Today, this urban group is 65 percent of the population. Nearly every city has experienced major expansion in its residential, business, and industrial plant. Many of these expansions have been within flood hazard areas, creating additional flood problems.

What is now happening at Chattanooga, Tenn., illustrates this point. In the 20-year period following 1937 there has been a net increase of more than 900 residential, and over 300 commercial, industrial, public, and other types of structures in areas subject to floods. The TVA reservoir system can reduce a flood of the same magnitude as the maximum of record (1867) by about 18 feet,

and can reduce other great floods by substantial amounts. However, larger floods which even when regulated will produce stages as high as the record flood are still possible and levees are needed to supplement the reservoir system in order to give complete protection. Nevertheless, construction of homes and commercial buildings has been allowed to proceed in the potential flood damage areas and damages during great floods would amount to many millions of dollars in spite of protection afforded by the reservoir system. The city is beginning to meet the problem by restricting new development in the lower sections of the flood plain.

The increase in the flood damage potential of the valley is not confined to areas along the Tennessee River and its major tributaries. Cities throughout the valley are growing. Many of these are upstream from the reservoirs themselves, and much of the new growth is occurring in flood hazard areas. Examples are Kingsport, Gatlinburg, Bristol, and Dayton, Tenn. As growth continues the flood damage potential becomes greater.

These trends will continue as the Tennessee Valley becomes more and more urbanized. It is estimated that by 1975 some 80 percent of the population will be nonfarm. On the record of past experience this can only result in greater development of flood plain areas unless steps are taken to hold the development in such areas to a minimum.

The movement of new development into flood plain areas in the Tennessee Valley is not unique. The spread of development into flood hazard areas along the coasts and rivers of the United States is increasing to such an extent that the flood damage potential of the entire Nation is growing despite large Federal expenditures for flood control. Review of the 50-year record of flood damages since 1902 shows that average annual reported losses have increased and that losses during the last half of the period were twice as great as those in the first half, after allowing for changes in the value of the dollar. Part of the increase is accounted for by the somewhat greater amount of flooding which occurred in the last half of the period, but this is offset to some extent by the expenditure since 1936 of several billions of dollars for flood control works.

According to Gen. S. D. Sturgis, then Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army ("The Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science," January 1957), some 1,000 flood control projects have been authorized under the 1936 Flood Control Act and subsequent acts and amendments. The estimated cost of these projects was $11 billion, including the $6 billion spent on 400 projects completed or under construction as of 1956. Some 300 additional projects are active and ready for construction at an estimated cost of $3 billion, and 300 more costing $2 billion are inactive or subject to review.

The Sturgis report estimated that the average annual flood damage potential in the project areas alone as of July 1954, without Federal protective works, amounted to $911 million. Works in full or partial operation would prevent damage of $491 million; works under construction but not in operation would prevent damage of $83 million; and works authorized but not started would prevent damage of $137 million, leaving a remaining damage potential of some $200 million for which no protection has been considered. The present Federal program of protective works may therefore prevent about three-fourths of the damage potential for existing development of the flood plains in these project areas. Of course the project areas do not encompass all flood hazard locations within the Nation and consequently the damage potential is much greater.

At present rates of construction the existing program might be completed in from 25 to 30 years. But in the meantime new flood hazard areas will be developed. It is estimated that by 1975 the national population will have increased by 55 million with most of the increase in urban areas. This continued national growth and resultant development of flood plain lands will require additional protective works which were not included in the foregoing estimated costs.

Recent studies by the University of Chicago point out that between 1937 and 1957 development in the flood hazard areas of the Nation has increased substantially. Further, present information indicates that development taking place in the flood plains of major sections of the Nation is outstripping the current flood control program and the Nation's ability to pay for the protection of these newly developed flood hazard areas. These data also indicate that flood protection structures alone cannot do the whole job. If the growing flood problem now facing the country is to be solved, the program must be reinforced by other methods and techniques which will prevent the flood damage potential from increasing.

### IV. THE TVA APPROACH TO LOCAL FLOOD PROBLEMS

In 1953 TVA began a cooperative program in which flood damage prevention is considered a problem of adjusting the use of the land to the conditions existing in areas subject to flood. Viewed in this manner, the prevention of local flood damage becomes an essential part of community planning and development. It means giving adequate consideration not only to dams and other protective structures, but also to the use of zoning and subdivision regulations, to land acquisition for parks and open spaces, to planning of streets and utilities, and to construction standards for buildings which must be located in flood hazard areas. It requires cooperative effort on the part of Federal, State, and local government groups, but places in local hands the responsibility for solving the problem.

The various cities and communities have been advised that TVA will assist them, at their request, in making a study of their particular flood problems. When a community requests information on its flood situation, TVA draws on the large amount of flood data which it has already assembled in planning and operating its system of reservoirs. It supplements these data wherever necessary and prepares a report outlining the flood hazard for the particular locality. (See app. A.) The completed report is furnished to the State planning agency and its technicians then assist the local planning commission in using the data. The report provides information on historical floods and estimates the size of floods that may be reasonably expected in the future. The report does not attempt to recommend plans for solving the flood problem but provides a basis for further study and planning on the part of the community itself.

In the past, local governments have asked Federal agencies for reports directed toward the single purpose of justifying protective works. Such reports usually do not give a community sufficiently detailed data to appraise its overall flood problem. On the other hand, the flood data in the TVA reports are presented in a form useful to Government agencies, industries, financial institutions, local officials, and private individuals interested in adjusting their activities to the flood conditions. Flood profiles showing the slope of the stream and the height of the flood crest, as well as maps and cross sections showing areas flooded, are included in the reports.

More than 50 communities in 5 States have requested such assistance of TVA through their respective State planning organizations. Flood reports have been prepared for about 35 communities. Approximately 10 reports are completed each year.

Planning studies by State and local planning agencies (see appendix B) resulting from TVA's flood reports have been completed for 10 communities. These planning studies usually lead to a proposal for establishment of a floodway for the stream in which structures that would block or unduly interfere with flood flows would be prohibited. Permissible uses of the floodway might include parking lots, outdoor theaters, and similar facilities not subject to severe flood damage. Buildings along the fringes of the floodway would have floor levels at an elevation which would be above the flood stage for which the zoning was adopted.

Six cities have officially adopted flood plain zoning. In each case the new zoning ordinances were approved by the local planning commission and the city council. Other communities are now making planning studies to determine how improvements in flood hazard areas should be controlled.

A variety of uses have already been made of TVA's flood reports. At Lewisburg, Tenn., the city, the Federal Housing Administration, and Veterans' Administration used TVA's flood data as a basis to prevent the opening of two subdivisions already laid out in areas subject to frequent flooding. Without the data, the subdivisions would have been approved and financing would have been arranged. Twenty or more houses would have been completed in time to be flooded 4 or 5 feet deep during the flood of March 1955.

City officials in Cleveland, Tenn., expanded their purchase of a school site to include flood-free land suitable for buildings. The land which is subject to flooding is being used for playgrounds. Also, officials of Chattanooga, Dayton, and Spring City, Tenn., have used flood data in planning new school buildings.

Maggie, N.C., a community with a high potential as a mountain tourist center, is using TVA's flood data in planning its development without the force of official zoning or other regulations.

Shelbyville and Knoxville, Tenn., have used flood information in planning urban renewal projects which include relief from flood damages.

The Veterans' Administration, Federal Housing Administration, Public Housing Administration, and Urban Renewal Administration have all used the flood reports in processing home loans and planning public projects. Highway, industrial development, and other departments of the States make use of the flood information in carrying out their programs.

Significant reduction in flood damages through these means is necessarily a slow process. However, once local communities understand the problem they can accomplish a great deal through a program of land use controls for developments in lowlying areas. The acceptance that local governments have accorded the concept of land use regulation in the Tennessee Valley indicates it would have successful application in other regions.

An important aspect of this approach is the placing of responsibility for solving local problems in local hands. Federal initiative in this field has led to Federal responsibility for the total problem, including project justification, design, construction, and financing, as is so well illustrated by events since passage of the Flood Control Act of 1936.

### V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The historical approach to the reduction of flood damage has been to construct protective works—dams, reservoirs, dikes, and levees—with little or no attention to preventive measures. In the past 20 years the Federal Government has been responsible for constructing and financing most of these

projects. Although they protect existing developments, the total flood damage potential of the Nation continues to grow each year. It would be uneconomical to protect all newly developed areas, and at present rates of construction, it could never be accomplished. A new approach is needed.

TVA has found that a comprehensive plan involving Federal, State, and local government cooperation can be put into effect which will control the growth of the flood damage potential. This plan is one of adjusting the use of floodable lands to the local conditions and requires that new emphasis be placed on three major points:

A. An expanded program for collection, analysis, and wider use of flood data.

B. A broad approach to flood damage abatement which includes preventive as well as corrective measures.

C. More active participation by State and local governments in solving the flood problem.

*A. An expanded program for collection, analysis, and wider use of flood data*

Fundamental to a flood damage abatement program is an understanding of the nature and extent of the flood problem. This means that adequate information about storms and floods must be available. TVA's reports suggest one approach to the type of flood study needed. Desirable information would include the magnitude, height, areas of inundation, duration, and other characteristics of both historical floods and floods that may be expected in the future. Once collected, the data must be presented in a form which can be easily understood.

The present programs for collecting and analyzing flood data need to be expanded areawise and placed on a continuing and more systematic basis. These programs are of wide regional significance and therefore should be sponsored by the Federal Government either directly or in cooperation with the States.

*B. A broad approach to flood damage abatement which includes preventive as well as corrective measures*

Except for a few instances, current flood control activity is centered on corrective measures—dams, reservoirs, and local protective works built by the Federal Government. These are oriented almost exclusively to the correction of existing problems resulting from intensive use of flood-hazard areas. They have successfully reduced the heights and frequency of floods; but economic considerations place limitations on the extent of protection which they can give. Usually a residual flood problem remains.

Understanding this limitation is important. Present emphasis on corrective structures alone seems to be predicated on the assumption that areas which need protection will not expand. With the dynamic and spectacular changes taking place in the shift from an agrarian to an urban-industrial economy, the number of new homes, stores, and factories built in flood-hazard areas is increasing greatly. These developments extend the problem to new areas and bring demands for additional protective structures.

To meet this situation present activities need to be supplemented by measures which will prevent the flood-damage potential from increasing. This means preventing the creation of new flood problems by the use of zoning, subdivision standards, land acquisition, urban renewal, and occupancy standards for flood-hazard areas. Ways must be developed through which all of these possible remedial actions may be considered in a comprehensive program for drainage basins of the country.

*C. More active participation by State and local governments in solving the flood problem*

Under the policies established by the Flood Control Act of 1936 and its subsequent amendments, the Federal Government assumed major responsibility for planning and financing protective structures. The role of the States and local communities became that of approving and supporting Federal projects.

Yet, the powers to adopt land-use regulations belong to State and local governmental units. These powers must be used if new developments are to be prevented from spreading into flood-hazard areas and thereby increasing the Nation's flood-damage potential. Use of these powers depends upon States and localities assuming a greater share of the responsibility for meeting the flood problem.

In general, State and local responsibilities would fall in two classes. The first involves the exercise of police powers to prevent the use of flood-hazard areas in a manner which will increase the flood-damage potential. The second involves the assumption by State and local governments of responsibility for planning and developing local protective works. This would mean increased financial participation on the part of the States and localities in single-purpose flood-protection projects whose benefits are primarily local. It would also require local initiative and responsibility for studying the total community flood problem. The community would assume responsibility for preliminary surveys as well as for the more detailed design as a preparation for construction of specific projects approved as part of the total local flood damage abatement program.

Because of the national interest and concern with water resources, Federal planning and development of projects which are parts of major stream regulation systems are essential. These systems, as under present programs, should continue to be financed largely by Federal funds.

*Recommendations*

To implement this program the following recommendations are submitted for consideration by the executive branch, the Congress, and the States:

1. A national flood damage prevention policy should be developed. The objectives of the policy should be (a) to prevent the unnecessary spread of buildings and other improvements to new flood hazard areas, combined with continued efforts to alleviate damages in those flood hazard areas which have already been developed; and (b) to encourage appropriate State and local bodies to assume the responsibility for initating and developing plans and programs for local flood damage abatement through construction of protective works and establishment of land use controls as necessary. The policy should also provide a basis for technical and financial assistance by Federal agencies.

2. If protective works are economically justified as a part of the local program for flood damage abatement, the Federal financial contribution to such projects should be contingent upon the requirement that the city or State initiate and prepare engineering plans of the proposed works and that the plans be submitted to an appropriate Federal agency for review and approval.

3. As a prerequisite for the contribution of Federal funds to local flood protective works, State and local governments should be required to adopt and administer flood plain zoning and other such controls as are needed to prevent the unnecessary spread of buildings and other improvements in areas subject to flood damage.

4. Provision should be made to insure that all Federal agencies having responsibility related to site selection or financing of physical structures observe local flood plain zoning and other standards in carrying out their responsibilities, and in cities without land use controls but subject to flood damage require establishment of such controls before Federal programs are approved and put into execution.

5. An expanded and systematic program of collecting and analyzing basic flood information by existing Federal agencies should be authorized which will meet the needs of States, local communities, industries, and others in adjusting to flood conditions.

6. For the purpose of providing cities and communities with basic flood information on which to prepare plans for growth and development and for the prevention of local flood damages, appropriate Federal agencies should be authorized, where such authorization is necessary, to prepare upon request local flood studies which would describe and analyze the local flood situation.

## The Face of Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is with a continuing sense of disbelief and shock that I ask that this fourth in a continuing series of articles by Eve Edstrom, of the Washington Post be printed following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE FACE OF POVERTY—SOME ARE TOO POOR FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

(By Eve Edstrom)

The record begins with some hope: "Applied for National Capital Housing."

But it continues: "Won't accept. Eleven in the family."

And it may end: "Children found in deplorable private dwelling. No ceiling in the kitchen, hole in the front door, odor vile. Children taken to Junior Village."

Incredibly bad housing and no hope of leaving it is what faces the bulk of Washington's impoverished families.

Ironically even public housing shuts out many of those who need it most.

LIMIT ON OCCUPANCY

The family of 11 is an example. They include one more person than is allowed in a five-bedroom public housing unit.

So they must live—and sometimes the city, through relief grants, pays for them to live—in foul, decayed private dwellings.

This is because the National Capital Housing Authority has no units larger than five bedrooms and has no plans to build any larger ones in the future.

Furthermore, both the four- and five-bedroom units operated by the Authority are limited. They comprise less than 10 percent of the 6,400 units now operated by the Authority and will comprise no more than 12 percent even after 1,700 units are completed this year.

Therefore families of eight or more have practically no chance to get into decent public housing.

In addition the rent range selection formula keeps many of the poorest out.

NO VACANCY FOR THE POOR

Mrs. Jones is an example. She is trying to raise a family of 5 children on $80 a month. That is all her husband sends her for support after deserting the family to go back to North Carolina.

On paper she is eligible for a 3-bedroom $31-a-month public housing unit. But the Federal housing program requires National Capital Housing to break even on all its projects.

This means the Authority can accept only a certain percentage of families unable to pay more than minimum rents. With one-third of the public housing families now paying $36 or less a month, Mrs. Jones and those like her must wait forever for a vacancy.

So now Mrs. Jones pays $50 a month for a rat-infested dwelling—and tries to feed her children, ages 5 to 10, on $1 a day.

The housing ills of the poor are not only a blight in themselves but they blight everything from children's schooling to their morality, school principals report.

They speak of losing children throughout the city because their families constantly are on the move. A mother, for example, pays $15 a week for 1 room, then hears of a basement with 2 room for $15 and off the family goes.

And they also tell of findng children in intolerable situations, living in rooms which are more like closets but which are filled with men and women of questionable character.

Yet families have been taken out of situations like these, placed in public housing and often have made good. But they need help at the outset of the move and not after they get there.

The Fletcher family is an example. A homemaker from the new Homemaker Service of the National Capital Area literally carried the Fletchers' 4-month-old infant and led the rest of the family by hand from their condemned Southwest dwelling to a Greenleaf Gardens public housing unit.

The homemaker remained in the Fletcher home for a month teaching the mother how to use cleaning utensils, how to keep her children clean, how to feed them nutritiously.

When the homemaker returned for a visit she found that the mother, considered to be a limited person, was genuinely in charge of her household. The mother offered the homemaker a cup of tea, then showed her through the row house.

The floors were highly polished, the beds were neatly made—and the homemaker learned the father of the household held nightly inspections to make sure none of the children marred the walls.

The new Greenleaf Gardens is full of such little miracles as this. It also is full of families who, for the first time, are gaining a measure of self-respect.

A LIFETIME OF DUMPS

Take Doreen, age 16, seventh of her mother's 11 children and 1 of the 5 who still are in the home. This family sometimes made out on as little as $6 a week. They never lived in anything but dumps.

After school the other afternoon Doreen brought a friend to her home in Greenleaf Gardens. When the friend left, Doreen turned to her mother and said:

"Do you know what she told me? She said I live in a pretty house. That's the first time anyone has ever told me that."

"Thats' because this is the first time that you ever lived in a pretty house," her mother replied.

But there is little hope that the thousands of Doreens who need pretty houses will ever get them.

The National Capital Housing Authority constantly has been stymied in its efforts to obtain public housing sites. The cost has been too rich for the Federal Government's blood.

But no one has figured out how much the Nation's capital gains when the Doreens are salvaged.

## Studying the Effects of Pesticides, Herbicides, and Other Chemical Poisons on Fish and Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to increase the amount authorized by the act of August 1, 1958, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to accelerate the studies of the effects of pesticides, herbicides, and other chemical poisons on fish and wildlife. The purpose of the 1958 act, which I cosponsored, is to prevent losses of invaluable fish and wildlife resources following application of poisonous materials for insect and plant control and to develop basic information on the various chemicals so that forests, croplands, wet lands, rangelands and other lands can be sprayed with minimum losses of fish and wildlife, barnyard poultry, cats, dogs, and other farm animals.

My bill would increase the amount authorized for these needed investigations from $280,000 to $2,565,000 annually. This is the sum that actually is needed to enable the Secretary of the Interior to study various aspects of the pesticides problem in order to assure that the future use of chemical controls shall not inflict irreparable damage on the Nation's fish and game resources, and farm animals. This amount is by no means inordinate; it represents less than 1 percent of the wholesale value of the chemical sprays that were produced commercially in this country in 1956. It is a modest investment for the protection of fish and wildlife resources which, in 1955, generated nearly $3 billion in sales of goods and services to the Nation's more than 30 million hunters and fishermen.

The use of sprays for forestry, agricultural and other purposes has grown phenomenally since 1940. Chemical controls that year had a wholesale value of $40 million. Their 1956 wholesale value was $290 million, and is expected to rocket to more than $1 billion by 1975.

About 3.4 million acres of forest land were sprayed in 1956 and more will be treated in coming years. In 1956, more than 55 million acres of croplands—no less than one-sixth of the national total—were treated with some 3 billion pounds of pesticides.

These figures illustrate only part of the story of the tremendous upsurge in usage of those powerful chemicals. This increased use has been accompanied by the development of poisons that are many time more lethal than earlier commercial products. Before World War II relatively small amounts of only a few chemicals such as nicotine, rotenone, pyrethrum, and some arsenicals were used for insect control. More recently developed chemicals, which are being used in control programs ranging over millions of acres, are from 15 to 200 times more toxic than earlier formulations. Many have an added killing effect in that they remain toxic in the soil for 3 to 5 years after application. More than 200 basic pesticides and more than 6,000 brand-named products now are on the market.

Some of the more potent formulations are being used by agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in large-scale insect control and so-called "eradication" programs. Early, but very limited research by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service showed that the maximum amount of DDT, the first of these new types of insecticides, that could be applied in control programs without massive mortality to animal life was 2 pounds per acre. Heptachlor, an insecticide which is from 15 to 20 times more toxic to wildlife than DDT, now is being used at the same rate—2 pounds per acre—in the controversial multimillion-acre fire ant "eradication" program in the South.

The act which my bill would amend came into being largely because of widespread public alarm over the loss of fish and game resources following several large-scale insecticidal operations. In two areas that were treated with heptachlor for eradication of the imported fire ant, birds were reduced 75 to 85 percent—quail and rabbit populations were virtually wiped out. Fire ant eradication work in Monroeville, Ala., last July was reported in the Montgomery Journal to have resulted in the deaths of hundreds of chickens, more than 50 dogs, many cats, some birds, and and undetermined number of turkeys, ducks, and squirrels. Veterinarian O. L. Poitevint, of Climax, Ga., has stated that the deaths of upwards to 100 head of cattle and large numbers of chickens, turkeys, goats, and sheep, and reproductive failure in 100 to 150 brood sows, resulted from fire ant treatment around that community. No similar deaths occurred in surrounding, untreated areas, the veterinarian said.

Experimental work has shown that pheasants and quail, when exposed to sublethal quantities of commercial poisons in food materials subsequently have a greatly lowered reproductive capacity. The young produced by the experimental birds are weak, and most failed to live more than a few weeks. Larvae of aquatic insects and earthworms, which are foods of many fishes and birds, concentrate some of these poisons in their bodies. The tissues of some fish have been found to harbor high levels of DDT many months after temporary concentrations of the poisons were introduced into their stream environments.

These are a few examples of why biologists, sportsmen, naturalists, and a large segment of the general public are concerned about the pesticides-wildlife problem. Millions of acres of land are scheduled for aerial spraying in the next

few years in the fire ant eradication program. Gypsy moth spraying in New York and New England, Dutch elm disease control in the Midwest, forest insect control in many parts of the Nation, and grasshopper poisoning in the Great Plains show what is in store. Additional millions of acres of private crop and timber lands will be sprayed by individual landowners.

Let there be no misunderstanding, no one thinks that the Federal agencies or private groups are deliberately setting out to kill fish and game with pesticides. The use of economic poisons for insect and pest plant control is an accepted and necessary agricultural and forest management practice. What I am saying is that some control programs have resulted in alarming losses of fish and game. Insect control personnel presently have little knowledge of how the toxic materials can be used to achieve desired results without causing serious and perhaps prolonged damage to fish and game resources. This factor alone justifies enactment of my bill.

This obvious lack of knowledge was brought out in hearings held by House and Senate committees last year on the act which I now seek to amend. Little acually is known about the relative and actual toxicities of commercially available poisons, the proper times and methods of their use so as to minimize loss of fish and game; the direct and indirect effects of poisonous materials on those animals; and many other factors.

We are fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the 85th Congress initiated a few studies and provided a little money to get them going. I say we are fortunate because that action has enabled the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to get a clearer and more definite view of the serious problem that faces the Nation. For the first time that agency was able to survey the magnitude of the danger, designate logical areas of investigation, and estimate program costs. I now find that the annual cost of a basic program of investigation and research both for sport fisheries and wildlife and for commercial fisheries is $2,565,000. This figure represents an investment of less than 1 percent of the wholesale value of all commercial pesticides produced in 1956.

My colleagues should know that the sum of $280,000 per annum as provided in the act of August 1, 1958, was recommended to the House by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as a provisional and initial sum to get the program underway. That committee in its report, No. 2181, advised:

The committee in its considerations of the bill, amended it to provide an authorization for an expenditure of $280,000 per year. That was done for two reasons: First, that it is unlikely that the program could be started at a higher level than that set by the amendment, and second, that its inclusion will insure that the Congress will be furnished with prompt and specific information as to the progress of the program if the Department wishes to expand it beyond the maximum figure specified. Although the Department of the Interior in its report recommends against the inclusion of such an authorization on the ground that an adequate program might exceed such cost in certain years, it does not appear to be unreasonable to require the Department to seek additional moneys as an alternative to giving it a blank check. Also, it should be noted that departmental witnesses testified at the hearing on the bill that the specified amount would support a minimum research program.

It is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that the planning and programing in the Department of the Interior has reached the point where this increased appropiration is in order and will be put to good use. The act of August 1, 1958, was invaluable in permitting that department to focus its attention on the pesticides problem and to formulate a specific program to obtain the basic information needed to protect fish and game resources by the development of guides for the proper use of pesticides. The time has come for the Congress to expand the program, as suggested by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, because the need for such expansion has been manifested over and over during the past few months.

Considerable aerial spraying has been done over salt water marshes, particularly in the South. Important commercial and sport fishes such as menhaden, shad, striped bass, croakers, and weakfish spend their early stages of life in the coastal shallows. Shrimp, crabs, oysters, and clams are present in this inshore environment during a part of their lives.

There are four major lines of scientific investigation that should be pursued by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. These and their estimated annual cost are as follows: laboratory research on toxicity and tolerance levels for chemicals now in use, $85,000; field tests of chemicals now in use, $105,000; the effect of present insect and pest control programs on fishery resources, $170,000; and testing new chemicals, $65,000.

Increased appropriations would facilitate a 14-point program for wildlife research by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The areas of investigation and the amounts that would be required initially are: the effects of fire ant control formulations on animal life, $175,000; the effects of rodenticides on important mammals and song birds, $75,000; the effects of chemicals applied in the Dutch elm disease control program, $60,000; studies of forest insect programs, $125,000; the effects of orchard spraying on animal life, $25,000; the impact of formulations used for mosquito control on fish and wildlife, $75,000; crop and forage treatment with pesticides other than grasshopper control, $50,000; study of the effects of herbicides on the habitat of birds and mammals, $70,000; the relationships of fungicide, nematocide, and miticide treatments to wildlife, $50,000; pesticides and migrational movements of birds, $150,000; pesticidal contamination of water areas, $25,000; the effects of chemicals on food chain organisms and their storage by resistant invertebrates, $75,000; penned animal experiments, $100,000; and the relationship between sterility in the bald eagles and pesticides, $50,000.

A nine-point investigation program is suggested for sport fisheries research. Major areas of study and the estimated annual costs are: determination of toxicity and tolerance levels for fish and fish-food organisms, $100,000; bioassays for ingested pesticides, $90,000; identification of pesticidal products in the tissues of fish and other aquatic organisms, $60,000; development of techniques to measure pesticide concentrations in the tissues of fish, $70,000; the effects of temporary and sustained exposure to pesticides on the habits, reproduction, growth, and vitality of fish, $80,000; studies of the absorption, concentration, and storage of pesticides by fish, $65,000; determination of the immediate and long-range effects of pesticidal programs on fish, $200,000; experimental application of chemicals in field tests, $85,000; and coordination of the research program and publication of the results of the investigations, $80,000.

These research projects would give us the kind of information that is so desperately needed. As it stands, there is no assurance that we are not poisoning all living creatures to a point of sterility. If this Nation is determined to use billions of dollars of highly toxic chemicals each year, then we better be finding out how those powerful poisons should be handled. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is charged with the responsibility of conducting these studies, and it is imperative that this essential research is started without further delay.

---

## Government Inflation and Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter from John C. Sparks, chairman of the national affairs committee of the Canton Chamber of Commerce offering a number of suggestions on Government inflation and spending. The letter follows:

THE CANTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Canton, Ohio, March 9, 1959.*

HON. FRANK T. BOW,
*Representative in Congress,*
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BOW: We urgently ask your careful consideration of the recommendations and suggestions on Government inflation and spending offered by the national affairs committee of the Canton Chamber of Commerce. Much time was given by the members of a special task force on "inflation and spending control" in the study and preparation of the ideas presented here.

We believe "you can't for long take out of the bag more than you put in." Past majorities of our Congress have swindled us by

saying in effect "we will spend, but we will not have to pay."

Our national spending has exceeded income in 22 of the last 27 years. One-ninth of the annual Federal budget goes for carrying charges on past reckless spending. Our national debt amounts to $1,600 for every man, women and child. Citizens are refusing to subscribe to or renew their Government bonds. Confidence in the financial integrity of our Government is dwindling.

The legislators who hadn't the courage to lay taxes have instead stolen our savings by stealth. This is the cruelest tax of all—a tax on thrift, levied on those least able to pay, often those no longer able to work. Our savings accounts, life insurance proceeds and pension funds will buy only 53 cents worth, though we are scrupulously paid in dollars.

Specifically, we can see no reason for the recent unwarranted increases in or continuation of much of the nondefense spending, including the following:

1. Subsidies to local or sectional projects.

(a) In this we include aid to education (including vocational).

(b) Plus courthouse planning, sewerage systems, slum clearance, college housing, and airport planning and construction.

These local projects benefit specific localities and should be paid for locally.

2. Payments for the benefit of special groups.

(a) We see no reason for treating nonservice-connected ailments of veterans.

(b) Subsidizing the farming few by taxing the consuming many and then additionally jacking up the prices of their food. A free market will direct farm production to needed items.

(c) Highway and waterway construction. These improvement costs should be assessed on users of these facilities through tolls or fuel taxes.

(d) Foreign aid should be terminated, and any assistance to these countries should be derived from private investments and normal interchange.

(e) Low rent housing and direct loans to veterans for housing.

While we recognize the need for the best and most advanced national defense, we also wonder whether the Defense Department does not continue to defend unnecessarily its right to spend. Specifically, when a weapon or procedure is outmoded by newer atomic and space developments, is the old one scrapped, or do we now buy and support both?

Do we get an honest day's work from all administrative employees? Are their rates not unrealistically high compared to similar jobs in business? Are not sick leaves and fringes overgenerous?

Many departments of Government, diligently, yet wastefully, use up their budgets late in the year to justify their original fund requests—and to justify still further increases in the future. Many of us as businessmen have been given rush orders for an assortment of any old thing—an obvious attempt to use up a budget.

To encourage governmental thrift, we suggest that no department be permitted to spend at a faster rate in the last two months of a fiscal year than it did in the first 10 months.

Furthermore a system of incentive should be developed which will provide a reward in the form of an annual bonus for a percentage of the budget unexpended and unencumbered at the end of the year. This incentive should apply to key administrative personnel in control of expenditures.

We feel sure that many commercial and manufacturing functions performed by the Government are not only costing more than necessary—but denying to the Government the tax revenue which would accrue from their operation by businessmen. Why not sell TVA and similar functions to private investors, and apply the proceeds on the national debt?

At the 150th anniversary of Lincoln's birth, all legislators should reread his famous quotation.

Abraham Lincoln said:

"You cannot bring prosperity by discouraging thrift.

"You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

"You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

"You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

"You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

"You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

"You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.

"You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

Sincerely yours,

J. C. SPARKS,
*Chairman, National Affairs Committee.*

(Members of special task force: F. T. Dannemiller, president, Convoy, Inc.; C. C. Martin, vice president, Harter Bank & Trust Co.; F. A. Ceckler, vice president, Hardware & Supply Co.; C. I. Taggart, vice president, Canton Malleable Iron Co.; L. C. Dubs, president, Canton Pattern & Manufacturing Co.; R. W. Gillman, public relations manager, Hoover Co.)

---

## Program of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I submit the program of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of New Jersey, presented this morning to the New Jersey congressional delegation following a breakfast at the Congressional Hotel. The program was outlined by Department Commander David W. Smith, of Redbank, N.J., and Legislative Chairman John W. Bill, of Clifton, N.J. An honored guest and speaker was National Commander David B. Williams, of Massachusetts:

1. Multiple sclerosis, 7 years: the Disabled American Veterans of New Jersey request that serious consideration be given at this session of Congress to extend the law on multiple sclerosis from 2 to 7 years. This is borne out by competent medical authority and leading medical centers, also by Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, who declared in a statement on October 11, 1958, before the National Multiple Sclerosis Society at the Statler Hilton Hotel in New York City and by Dr. C. A. Dean, M.D., who issued a statement on Wednesday, March 4, 1959, to the effect that multiple sclerosis is a mysterious disease; since the cause is not known, there is no specific treatment. There are, however, many forms of supportive treatment. Maintenance of adequate nutrition including all vitamins, the proper use of physical and rehabilitation therapy and avoidance of chilling and physical and emotional strain are all used, and in view of the numerous bills being sponsored by Members of Congress as indicated in the legislative calendar.

2. Hospitals: We are vitally interested in obtaining a new hospital in south Jersey. The records will prove that a hospital is needed in that location, due to the expansion of homes and industry. The distance from south Jersey to Philadelphia is 80 miles and to Delaware is 110 miles and unless a veteran has a car, it is difficult for him to reach either point for hospitalization. It is the firm conviction of the Disabled American Veterans of New Jersey that with the ever increasing veteran population in that area, they will definitely require a hospital both for general medical and surgical treatment.

It is further our opinion that a new wing should be added on to the Veterans Administration hospital in East Orange to take care of the heavy load of veterans who request neurological treatment. Dr. M. Herbert Fineberg, manager of the East Orange Hospital, corroborates that he is in need of 250 beds for neurological patients: This would allow 250 additional beds for general medical and surgical.

It is our opinion that several new wings should be erected at the Veterans Administration hospital, Lyons, N.J., as the records indicate there is a waiting list for admission of over 700 veterans: In some cases they have been waiting several years.

Unless immediate action is taken, the entire burden will fall upon the municipalities, that are now heavily burdened with taxation. New Jersey is not equipped to take care of its New Jersey veterans who require this treatment.

3. Widows' pensions for World War II and Korean conflict: We also reaffirm our request, that Congress, at this session, will enact a law to equalize widows' benefits. It is noted from the February 1959 issue of the leigslative calendar published by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that there are numerous bills to extend these benefits to the widows of World War II and the Korean conflict veterans. We feel that these widows have been discriminated against and that this injustice should be corrected.

4. Reinstatement of national service life insurance to all GI's: We reaffirm our previous stand that Congress, at this session, enact a law to permit World War II and Korean conflict veterans to reinstate their Government insurance. We feel that an opportunity should be extended to all veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict at least 1 year from the date of enactment of such law. This would be considered good business, as it would assist thousands of widows who are left without insurance and have no means to take care of themselves and their children, and the Government would be repaying a debt to those who suffered some disabilities and never filed claims, and were not able to obtain insurance. We believe this is a step forward.

5. To protect service connection after 10 years: We continue our stand, that a law be enacted, at this session of Congress, so compensation received by a veteran for a period of 10 years, for his service incurred disability should not be discontinued unless same was obtained by fraud or misrepresentation.

6. Discontinue VA review as per directive of December 14, 1954: We reaffirm our stand, that Congress give serious consideration at this session to discontinue the review of claims where thousands of veterans of World War I, World War II and the Korean conflict have lost their service connection based on

the theory that these disabilities were supposed to have existed prior to their time of induction or enlistment and were not aggravated by their military service. It is absolutely unbelievable that a person with a disability would be accepted for military service and that the said disability would not be aggravated. It is hard to understand why a draft board or enlisting officer would have inducted a person who was inflicted with a disease or whose disability was noticeable at the time of induction or enlistment. We contend that if they were inducted into the military service, after a physical examination, they were presumed sound in mind and in health. This is the only medical theory that can be assumed. We, therefore ask that the directive authorized on December 1, 1954, be discontinued by law, without further delay, as this is a violation of the veterans constitutional rights.

7. Presumption of soundness on induction or enlistment: It is felt that a veteran's examination at the time of induction or acceptance, and then a full 90-day period under intensive training should be adequate to determine the persons fitness for service. If a disease or disability has not developed within this period, then it would seem only reasonable that the Government assume responsibility for disablements that develop subsequent to that 90-day period, unless it can be established by tangible or concrete evidence of its preservice existence and not aggravated beyond the natural progress, and where the Armed Forces state that the disability existed prior to the time of induction, but was not found in the physical examination at induction. This proposed legislation is designed to insure application of laws and facts in determining the veteran's entitlement, and would curtail some of the present rating practices of speculative and promiscuous use of the now abused term "medical principles and practice," unless a law is enacted at this session of Congress to prevent a discrimination of the veteran's constitutional rights.

8. Income limitations for veterans and widows: The income provisions to qualify for non-service-connected pensions be increased to $2,400 without dependents and $3,600 to veterans with dependents.

9. Disabled veterans preference in Federal employment: That permanent employment in civil service be granted to all disabled veterans who have been employed for 1 year, and who have qualified for the said position. That no action be taken to consolidate a position held by a disabled veteran, with another position, for reason of economy and to recreate the same by a new title—a process used to eliminate disabled veterans from employment.

Unless the Federal Government takes the leading step in offering opportunities of employment to disabled veterans, it will be impossible to expect business and industry to employ disabled veterans. There is considerable discrimination against disabled veterans in Federal, State, county and municipal employment. We make this statement based on our experiences. The solution to this problem is not by proclaiming Physically Handicapped Week or Employ the Physically Handicapped Veteran. It must be done by the Government, taking the lead in employing the disabled veteran or other persons, wherever possible. We are advised by leading medical experts that physically handicapped are the best persons to employ and there is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of accidents among those employed; this statement is based on a survey of industrial concerns, one is the Du Pont Co.

10. Directive to Army Review Board for sympathetic understanding: That legislation be enacted directing the Army Review Board to review all cases of veterans who received discharges other than honorable, and who were denied benefits because of the said discharge by the Veterans' Administration, that provisions be made in the said law so that the Review Board will appear in each State to give the veteran an opportunity to present his case by counsel to the Review Board, as it is a known fact that many veterans received discharges other than honorable because of some misunderstanding and not serious violation of the Army or Navy regulations.

And, the same provision be made that all officers who had disabilities at the time of their release from service be given the right to appear before the Army Review Board and present their claims for direct retirement, and be permitted to be represented by counsel, if so desired.

These two points are of importance to enlisted men and officers, and to widows and orphans of those who have departed this life, since their release from military service.

11. Court of appeals: That there be created by law, a court of appeals, whereby decisions shall be reviewed after the Board of Veterans Appeals review a claim for service connection, or an increase in compensation, on the evidence of record. If the said courts are created they should travel from State to State, so that the veteran's claim may be presented to the said court of appeals, and be represented by counsel, who will present the claim for him. This is necessary, since the veteran is denied his constitutional rights to present his case to a court for further consideration of his claim, for injuries sustained during his military service.

12. Widow's discrimination: That Congress consider enacting a law, at this session, to permit a review of all discharges, of persons who died and whose widows filed claims for whatever benefits may have been due them, and be then advised that their husband received other than an honorable discharge. It is our belief that the veteran had paid a sufficient penalty during his lifetime, and that his widow should not be penalized and denied benefits, unless the veteran was tried by a general court martial and found guilty and sentenced for a crime against the Government of the United States. This should apply to all veterans and their dependents.

13. U.S. Supreme Court decision affecting veterans: That Congress consider the latest decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, wherein it held that the Army could not penalize one who served for a period under honorable conditions, because he had activities with, or was a former member of the Communist Party. This decision should apply to any veteran who served with the military forces and was later discharged and denied benefits by the Veterans' Administration.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

1. Protects service connections of 10 or more years duration, except where fraud is involved.

2. Permits waiver of insurance premiums for total disability cases regardless of age.

3. Death benefits at service-connected rates if the veteran has a service-connected 100 percent disability.

4. Permits payment of dependency allowance from date rating is increased from less than 50 percent to 50 percent or more.

5. Invokes conclusive presumption of service-connection for disability noted in service after first 90 days.

6. Increases to 2 years presumption in cancer cases.

7. Increases to 2 years presumption for psychoses.

8. Permits application of presumption for service connecting reinfection type of active tuberculosis.

9. Would "freeze" the VA schedule for rating disabilities.

10. Separate statutory awards—one eye and one limb.

11. Dependency allowances for ratings under 50 percent.

12. Federal reimbursement to State workmen's compensation funds, to encourage employment of disabled vets.

13. Sliding scale of additional retention credits for service-connected compensably disabled veterans.

14. To provide a 1-year probationary period for veterans leading to permanent status in Government employment.

15. Compensation increases in certain categories.

16. Increase of death benefits for dependent parents.

17. Exclude commercial life insurance up to $10,000 in computing income for pension purposes.

18. Increase statutory income limitations (pension).

19. Reelection right for widows and parents as to which service-connected benefit is more advantageous.

20. To restore to certain veterans a 1-year period in which they can apply for national service life insurance.

21. To provide a 7-year presumptive period for service connecting multiple sclerosis.

22. To authorize increase in Federal payments to State homes from $700 annually to $1,000 annually, per veteran.

## Civil Responsibilities Are as Important as Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Editor of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, James M. Ward, has written an excellent editorial on the subject of civil responsibilities. There are groups in this country constantly screaming for civil rights, but these groups absolutely refuse to accept civil responsibilities.

As an example of major newspapers' evading their responsibility in the field of race relations, the Washington Post and Times Herald is currently running a series of articles on poverty and lack of civil responsibility in the District of Columbia. In line with its usual practice of keeping the truth from the public, the Post refuses to mention race in these articles. Perhaps it is assumed that readers are aware of the racial identity of the persons involved, but one would never know it from reading the Post.

It is to be hoped that metropolitan newspapers will start a crusade on the subject of the necessity of Negroes to assume civil responsibility and conduct themselves in accordance with the rules of organized society. Such a crusade would be far more beneficial to the colored race than the constant agitation for Federal force legislation misnamed "Civil Rights."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Ward's editorial:

(By Jimmy Ward)

There is a powerful amount of chatter these days about "rights." There are civil rights, constitutional rights, minority rights,

military rights, alien rights, religious rights, the Bill of Rights. There are so many rights and lefts until the average man has little left.

Let's go a bit more on rights before we get to responsibilities.

There was a snooping agent of the Civil Rights Commission out of Washington in Mississippi last week. He wanted to sign up a Mississippi advisory board to determine the best, fastest, quickest, most sudden method of granting every living soul in these United States a flashing, dramatic amount of equality in the voting booth, in housing, in the classroom, in church, in swimming pools, in dining halls, restaurants, toilets—and we suppose in the bedroom. Hurrah for equality and equal socializing everywhere for everyone. That is the theme of the day.

Television is full of it. Pulitizer Prizes are awarded for espousing it. Politicians shout it. Statesmen advocate it. Foreign countries insist upon it—so long as it is to be a policy for somebody else, and that somebody is the people of the South.

This matter of "rights" is on the radio; it's on the lips of people; it has the imagination of this Nation lit up like the eyes of a professor of a pinball machine playing class. The subject glows on film; it sticks out from headlines; it is debated in Congress; it is discussed at diplomatic cocktail parties; students at universities throughout the world harp on it as though it was more vital than the atomic bomb.

The topic of all these rights is a great concern of politicians on the stump; pressure groups thrive on it; rights have become a bogey of the Western World.

All right with rights. What about responsibilities?

We have a neighbor. He is saddled with the same expenses of big government and inflation as are you and I. He operates a home on a salary. He's perfectly sane. He's a leader in the community. He's got a mortgage on his home. He buys groceries. He pays interest, taxes, and he's loaded to the gills with insurance. Now we're getting to the big point.

He has liability insurance.

The law requires people like my neighbor, myself and you to foot the bill of liability insurance or else we lose a driver's license to operate a high-priced, well-taxed, gas-consuming, frequently greased, well-maintained, Detroit-made automobile on the streets and highways of Mississippi—for which you, my neighbor and myself have supplied the money to build. Right? OK.

Now you are driving down the street—as was the case of a neighbor's daughter.

The driver of an opposing automobile was in a bright, new, gay vehicle with a squirrel tail flying from the radio pole. He had himself a gal friend in the car. It was Sattidy night. He had his rights and a Federal agent was in town a few hours before to be damned sure he had all his rights.

What happened?

The man with the "rights" used every ounce of 'em and plowed right across the street beneath a red light.

He hit the 6-year-old automobile driven by the daughter of the neighbor who had accepted his "responsibilities" by investing in insurance, by trying to raise a legitimate family, by supporting the community, by paying school bonds to help educate the children of the city of Jackson—please get this—without regard to race, creed or color.

The opposing automobile clobbered his family car. There was a certain amount of Sattidy night giggling and jibberish going on. The cops came.

The driver of the opposing car claimed all the "rights" under the sun and there are a lot of rights under the sun in these United States of America.

But did he have any responsibilities?

The neighbor's child narrowly escaped death. The neighbor had liability insurance. His car had no squirrel tail flying from the flagpole, but there was an insurance policy in the glove compartment.

The man with responsibility is in a pretty bad mood now, but this doesn't count because there are no Federal agents snooping around in the South to espouse the cause of a man with responsibility.

Federal agents are snooping around in the South on behalf of the man with rights. All kinds of rights.

Read your Monday newspaper, week and week, and see who is being killed on the highways. Also check into who is responsible. Check closely, week and after week, the cause and effect.

This is a political campaign year in Mississippi. Politicians are looking for issues. An equal effective responsibility is needed.

This country has a Bill of Rights. We buy that completely.

This country could well use a bill of responsibilities.

It is strange, indeed, when a nation goes completely beserk about civil rights and not give a hoot in hades about civil responsibilities.

---

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

---

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

---

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

---

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

---

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

## SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

## STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

*Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences*

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

*Committee on Agriculture and Forestry*

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

*Committee on Appropriations*

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

*Committee on Armed Services*

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

*Committee on Banking and Currency*

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

*Committee on the District of Columbia*

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

*Committee on Finance*

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

*Committee on Foreign Relations*

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

*Committee on Government Operations*

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs*

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce*

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

*Committee on the Judiciary*

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

*Committee on Public Works*

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

*Committee on Rules and Administration*

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

## UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

## UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

*District of Columbia:* Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

*First judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

*Second judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

*Third judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

*Fourth judicial circuit:* Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

*Fifth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

*Sixth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

*Seventh judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

*Eighth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

*Ninth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

*Tenth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

# *Appendix*

## Tribute to the Late Cecil B. DeMille

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have just had an opportunity to read a moving tribute to the late Cecil B. DeMille, written by a member of his staff for 14 years, Mr. Donald Hayne. It is a colorful description of a great genius in our motion picture industry, whose unique artistry produced the most spectacular kind of entertainment on film.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the eulogy be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is dated January 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hollywood today pays final tribute to its best known and least known citizen.

Words of eulogy for Cecil Blount DeMille have been flooding the wires from all over the world, from leaders in motion pictures, religion, education, industry, and government, but there will be no eulogy delivered at his funeral. There will be only the simple service from the Book of Common Prayer, conducted by the young rector of his parish, in the little Episcopal church from which his mother and his grandmother were buried years ago.

And that is what Cecil B. DeMille would have wanted, for this master of the colossal and the spectacular, this "Mr. Hollywood," was essentially a simple and, incredible as it might seem to those who knew only the DeMille of press agentry, a humble man.

Hollywood knew about and smiled at the chair-boy who followed DeMille around on the set, carrying a chair so that the imperious director could sit down anywhere, any time, without bothering to look behind him. Most of Hollywood never knew the DeMille who, when he was told that one of his chair-boys had worked for a famous German director, said in all seriousness, "Maybe I can learn something from him."

A great editor who knew him well once said that DeMille could be summed up in one word, without adjectives: he was a gentleman. That was the greatest surprise to many meeting him for the first time, to find that he did embody the old-fashioned, untarnished meaning of that now little-used word.

His family was one of the oldest in America, having come from Holland to New Amsterdam in 1658. One of his ancestors, from whom he got his middle name, was William Blount, a signer of the Constitution. His grandfater was mayor of Washington, N.C., and an officer in the Confederate Army. Both his parents were teachers at Lockwood's Academy, Brooklyn, when they met and married. His father, a scholarly and deeply religious man, was also a student for the ministry of the Episcopal Church, until he decided to become a playwright and reach a larger congregation from the stage than he could reach from the pulpit.

Next to his father, the greatest influence upon DeMille's thought and work came from his father's collaborator, David Belasco, who practically lived with the DeMille family during his early creative years in the New York theater. Belasco, a brilliant, flamboyant showman, had a genius for detail and for theatrical effects which brought the American stage to a degree of authentic realism which only motion pictures could surpass. DeMille surpassed it, through the more flexible medium of the motion picture camera and screen.

The last 46 years of DeMille's life were the history of Hollywood. Yet in a sense he never left New York or the theater of the 1890's and early 1900's. Last month, when he was given a luncheon in New York by the American Academy of Dramatic Arts, which his father had helped found and from which he was graduated in 1900, he spoke less feelingly about his achievements of the past half-century than about the fact that, as a small boy, he had once dined with Edwin Booth.

DeMille always thought of himself as primarily a dramatist. Mrs. DeMille said to him once, in her quietly incisive way, "It can never be said, Cecil, that your pictures are lacking in plot." To DeMille, sound dramatic construction was the essential framework of a film. All the rest, the gigantic sets, the thousands of extras, the overwhelming special effects, were, as he put it, only frosting on the cake. He hated the word "spectacle." No director ever had a cannier sense of how to fill the screen and the eye of the beholder with spectacular action, but whenever DeMille heard or read that "spectacle" was the outstanding characteristic of his work, he felt that the main point had been missed.

He was a dramatist with a purpose. There his father's influence lived in him. If Belasco taught him much of the "how" of drama, his father had taught him, indelibly, the "what" to say through the medium of entertainment. The primary purpose of entertainment, DeMille insisted, was to entertain. He had no sympathy with propaganda pictures. But even in his so-called bathtub cycle of the 1920's he had a serious social purpose; and in his historical and religious films of the last three decades he was very much his parents' son, a teacher.

In that, more than in the big money his pictures made or the honors heaped upon him in his latter years, DeMille found his deepest satisfaction. He had a keen eye to the box-office always and he enjoyed the esteem represented by the almost embarrassing accumulation of decorations, degrees, plaques, statuettes, and embossed resolutions given him by governments, universities, and societies of all kinds, but the "awards" he was most likely to carry in his pocket and show his family and staff were the letters he received from schoolchildren in Texas or nuns in Iowa or prisoners in Utah or just people everywhere, who told him that "The King of Kings" or "The Ten Commandments" had made God more real to them.

It was characteristic of DeMille that every letter he received, unless it was obviously a "crank" letter, had to be answered. Probably few, if any, prominent public figures spent more time and care on correspondence with total strangers. Some of DeMille's staff helped him draft his huge correspondence, but no letter ever went out over his signature that he had not at least edited and approved; and he would spend as much time and thought on a letter to an unknown fan as on one to a prime minister. Last month, while DeMille was in New York, a letter reached him from a New York man, a complete stranger, who told about his 6-year-old son's nightly prayer for a dog for Christmas, a prayer that the father had not money enough to answer. DeMille was even then so ill that every interview, every telephone call, every letter cost him an exhausting effort. But the little boy got his dog, in time for Christmas.

When DeMille had a job to do, the job was all that counted. He could be ruthless in his demand for perfect work and roughshod in his scorn for incompetence. There was no inconsistency between that and his innate gentlemanly respect for every human being with whom he came in contact. His staff knew that, even if many in Hollywood did not. The proof is in the fact that some of his staff worked with him 10, 20, 40 years and more, with a loyalty and affection nothing could shake. He once said to a newcomer on his staff, "I want you to know that sometimes I can be very disagreeable. But if I am ever unfair, I want you to tell me."

DeMille had a genuine instinct for freedom, not only his own but that of everyone. The man who introduced him on his last television appearance, during the political campaign of 1958, could say, with truth and pride, that in 14 years of working for DeMille, they had often differed sharply politically, but DeMille had never once asked him to do one thing or say one word for a cause in which he did not independently believe.

Contrary to legend, DeMille had no use for "yes men." He had the ability to stimulate in other minds enthusiasm for his ideas and projects, but he wanted the clash of mind with mind, to strike the spark of better ideas than either mind might generate on its own. He would put up a good, and sometimes a tricky, fight for his ideas, but if one could really best him with better arguments, he was quick to acknowledge and accept them. A sure way to make him impatient was to agree with him simply for the sake of being agreeable.

On his last day at his studio office, 12 days before he died, DeMille remarked, as he was leaving to go home, "We have a lot of work to do in the next 3 years." He was thinking of his next two pictures, "On My Honor," and the one he planned as his last and greatest, which he called "Project X." "Project X," DeMille's greatest film, will never be made. Except for a few indications given to his closest coworkers, the secret of its theme died with him. But perhaps there is a hint in a note DeMille scribbled on an airplane last year, when "Project X" was taking shape in his mind. He wrote: "The Lord was expressing something to us far greater than the simple words he spoke to make simple fishermen understand that there is a God far greater than the mind of man can conceive." That is where the mind of DeMille was ranging, in the last months of his life.

It was not unfamiliar ground. He glimpsed it first 70 years and more ago, around the lamp in the old house in Echo

Lake, N.J., when his father read aloud every evening a chapter of the Old Testament and a chapter of the New. He explored it deeper in his studies for his great religious films; and he saw new vistas of it in the hearts of men, women, and children touched by those films. His love of freedom was at bottom a recognition of the image of God in man. He was a man of prayer. The well-worn, well-marked Bible went with him, wherever he went. It was near him when he died. More than once in his lifetime he said, "Father, forgive them," when it was hard to say.

He was human. He had faults, irritating smallnesses, blind spots, vanities—and a prince's grandeur, and astonishing humilities. Famous in every corner of the world, he was unknown to most, misunderstood by many, cordially disliked by some, beloved by those who knew him best. He sought perfection in everything, from the details of his conservative, meticulous dress to his creative work and his mind's outreach to the divine. The perfection he sought often eluded him. But he was a man of unquenchable faith and hope and a courageous heart. Those near him have been saying to each other, these past few days, that they feel numbed more than sad, unable to believe that that heart failed at last. He was a man of vision. Now he sees.

## Statement by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent statement by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government entitled "On the Fixing of Boundary Lines. I hope that every Member of the Congress will read this statement most carefully because of the very able presentation which it makes in favor of the principles of constitutional government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE FIXING OF BOUNDARY LINES—A STATEMENT BY THE VIRGINIA COMMISSION ON CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

The human conflicts present in the controversy over the South's public schools are real, are complex, and cannot be minimized. Yet the public attention concentrated upon these social problems unfortunately has obscured a towering question of constitutional government, and this question transcends the immediate and personal issues of particular children in particular schools. It is in the hope of encouraging consideration of a basic concept of the American Republic that this commission, created by the General Assembly of Virginia in 1958, offers this statement.

This basic concept cannot be understood without some recognition of unalterable facts of history and long-establish principles of law. Our Union is a union of States. That is what it was in the beginning and that is what it remains today. In this Union, all power to govern flows from the people in their States. Some powers the people have delegated, under the Constitution, to Federal authority; all other powers they have reserved, under the Constitution, to themselves.

WE ARE NOT THE SAME

There are sound reasons for this. The States are not all the same; their economies, societies, interests, resources, are not all the same; customs and traditions vary enormously from State to State, and laws that might be wise and useful in one area may be demonstrably needless or even harmful in another. This diversity is part of the strength of the Union. It has been recognized as such from the very beginning of our history, and the underlying theory of the Constitution is that the States are left free to govern themselves, subject only to the prohibitions they have expressly imposed upon themselves by the Constitution.

The States manifest their individual powers in many different ways. Each State, for example, fixes a minimum age at which its citizens may vote; and though some may believe it unwise to permit 18-year-olds to vote, nothing in the Constitution prohibits a State from thus extending its franchise. Similarly, many persons may doubt the soundness of a State law providing for rent control, but a State may adopt such a law if its people choose. Two States, Oklahoma and Mississippi, regard traffic in intoxicating liquors as immoral, and they have prohibited it; but the other 46 States are not compelled to accept this view. Half the States permit parimutuel gambling on horseraces; the other half do not. The point we seek to emphasize is that a practice which many people may regard as unwise, or unsound, or immoral is not unlawful until it is made so by a lawful process. That which some persons conceive to be socially or economically wrong may still be constitutionally right.

THE KEY QUESTION

Acceptance of this plain truth of our Government is vital to any proper understanding of the constitutional issue at stake in the South's public school crisis. The Southern States, or some of them, do not conceive the maintenance of racially separate schools to be morally wrong; on the contrary, they believe this policy to be in the best interest of all their people. That many persons strongly oppose this view is not to be doubted. But the question is not whether the Southern States, in exercising a power to maintain such schools, are acting morally or immorally; the question is whether they are acting constitutionally. Distasteful as the conclusion may be to some critics of the South, the conclusion cannot be escaped that the Southern States are fully within their constitutional rights in the position they have taken.

The conflict here, fundamentally, is one of the rights of the citizen and the powers of a State. Whatever the rights of the individual are, these rights cannot be infringed; correspondingly, whatever the powers of the State may be, these powers may be exercised at the State's discretion. In this controversy, as in countless others, the problem rests in determining the line at which rights end, and powers begin; it is a problem in the fixing of boundaries.

We must look to the 14th amendment to determine where this boundary lies. The 14th amendment, leaving aside all questions of the validity of its adoption, was conceived primarily as a prohibitory amendment: It was intended to prohibit to the States certain powers they had exercised in the past; specifically, the States were prohibited from denying to any citizen the equal protection of the laws. Beyond question, the effect of the amendment also was to vest in the newly freed Negro people certain rights they had not enjoyed before—the rights, for example, to own property, to enter into contracts, and to sue and be sued.

WHAT ADDED? WHAT SUBTRACTED?

The constitutional issue now before the country, in this context, is simply stated. So far as public schools are concerned, what individual rights were created? What State powers were reduced? If in 1868 certain rights were added to those possessed by the citizen, then in 1868 certain powers must have been subtracted from those held by the States. What did the amendment mean in terms of public schools?

Clearly, the Congress that framed the 14th amendment, and the State that ratified it, never intended for an instant that a guarantee of equal protection of the laws was to affect the operation of separate schools in any way. Long after the amendment was ratified, States both North and South continued to maintain racially separate institutions. It is unthinkable that they understood the amendment to prohibit them from the exercise of powers they were daily exercising.

The correctness of this understanding was confirmed repeatedly by the highest State and Federal courts in an unbroken line of decisions stretching over many years. It was confirmed, also, by the tacit acquiescence of the States themselves: When the doctrine of separate but equal was sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1896, not a single State voiced a protest or asserted a misinterpretation of the amendment. And Congress, from the date of the amendment until the date of the school segregation cases, demonstrated its understanding of the amendment by actively maintaining separate schools in the District of Columbia. Thus the boundary line was fixed. By what authority may it now be changed?

THE LAW OF THE CASE

The position of the Southern States today is that the governmental power they exercised constitutionally for so many years—the power to maintain racially separate schools—cannot be prohibited to them by mandate of the Supreme Court. Many persons, it appears, believe that the Court has the right, as well as the power, to impose this prohibition upon the States as an addition to the law of the land. In actual fact, the Court's mandate is no more than the law of the case in which it is handed down; the Court's power is a judicial power, not a legislative power, and it is worth emphasizing that there is now no law and no provision of the Constitution requiring racially integrated schools. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that some observers believe this to be the effect of the Court's opinion in the school cases. For our own part, we hold that in attempting to prohibit to the States the power to operate separate schools, the Court usurped the amendatory power that constitutionally is vested in three-fourths of the States alone. In effect the Court sought not merely to interpret the Constitution, but substantively to amend the Constitution, and this the Court has no authority to do.

The Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government respectfully urges the people of every State to reflect thoughtfully upon these matters. There are two questions involved in this struggle. The only question properly before the Supreme Court of the United States was whether a State's maintenance of separate schools is constitutional. The other question, whether such schools are morally and socially right or wrong, is a question of policy, not of jurisprudence.

It is our prayer that the people of the United States, whatever their views on segregation, will reflect carefully upon the consequences of entrusting the formation of national social policies to a judicial body appointed for life. We cannot believe that our sister States, viewing the matter dispassionately, will fail to perceive the grave

danger to all State powers that lies in the Court's drastic action here.

IT IS NOT FOR THE COURT

These apprehensions are not peculiar to the South in 1958; Washington voiced them in his Farewell Address. Lincoln many times emphasized the same points. More recently Mr. Justice Black has asserted that it is not for the Supreme Court "to roam at large in the broad expanses of policy and morals, and to trespass on the legislative domain of the States." Mr. Justice Douglas has warned that "instability is created" when "a judiciary with life tenure seeks to write its social and economic creed into the charter." Mr. Justice Frankfurter has declared that, "As a member of this Court, I am not justified in writing my private notions of policy into the Constitution, no matter how deeply I may cherish them or how mischievous I may deem their disregard." The late Chief Justice Vinson emphasized that because the Court must rest its decisions "on the Constitution alone, we must set aside predilections on social policy and adhere to the settled rules which restrict the exercise of our power to judicial review." Holmes, Hughes, Sutherland, Harlan, Taney, among a host of great jurists, have insisted down through the years on strict adherence to the rule, in Hughes' phrase, that "it is not for the Court to amend the Constitution by judicial decree."

We should like also to direct attention to the words of Elihu Root, recently proclaimed as "sound doctrine" by the conference of Chief Justices of the several States:

"If the people of our country yield to impatience which would destroy the system that alone makes effective these great impersonal rules and preserves our constitutional Government, rather than to endure the temporary inconvenience of pursuing regulated methods of changing the law, we shall not be reforming. We shall not be making progress, but shall be exhibiting * * * the lack of that self-control which enables great bodies of men to abide the slow process of orderly government rather than to break down the barriers of order when they are struck by the impulse of the moment."

Let us not abandon these wise admonitions in the passions of a turbulent hour.

## How About the District of Columbia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Congress can be justifiably proud of passage of legislation to make Hawaii the 50th State. History books will record as one of the great accomplishments of this Congress its action in admitting Hawaii to statehood.

I hope, Mr. President, that the history books will also record that the 86th Congress also enacted legislation to grant home rule to the District of Columbia. Such legislation is long overdue.

The Minneapolis Tribune of March 14, 1959, contained an excellent editorial urging the granting of home rule to the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "How About District of Columbia?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ABOUT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA?

With Hawaii now following Alaska into statehood, it is time for Congress to turn its attention to a case closer to home that involves a much more serious negation of democracy. We refer, of course, to the granting of home rule to the District of Columbia.

The District now contains an estimated 855,000 people in a metropolitan area of just over 2 million. Yet the people living in the District have no vote, no representation, and no way in which to make their voices directly heard with reference to the conduct of their public affairs.

The City Commissioners now are appointed by the President, and Congress, sitting occasionally as a city council for the city of Washington, appropriates funds for and takes other necessary actions to run the city. But members of the District of Columbia committees—who include Representatives WIER and NELSEN, of Minnesota, usually have other more important assignments and thus can afford to spend little time on District problems. Even the Washington School Board is appointed on the recommendation of Federal judges in the District who may or may not be well informed about school problems.

The vote was taken away from Washington 79 years ago, in part to protect the lawmakers in the Capital from the political connivings of a Federal bureaucracy. Yet since 1951 the number of Federal employees in the District has been declining and the number of living in suburbs in Virginia and Maryland increasing. The time will come when the suburban counties will have more Federal employees than the District. So the old argument no longer holds, if it ever did.

What is proposed now to remedy this blot on American democracy is a territorial form of government. There would be a Governor and a secretary appointed by the President, a popularly elected assembly of 15 members, and a popularly elected nonvoting delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Similar legislation has cleared the Senate in the past. But it has bogged down in the House because of southern fear that Negroes, who now constitute a majority of the population of Washington, would elect members of their own race to public office. Yet wouldn't just such an action be a significant symbol to the entire world that we mean what we say when we talk about democracy?

The proposed legislation still would not be full enfranchisement of the people of the District. But it would finally give more than 850,000 Americans the right to rule themselves in local matters. It would provide a more efficient government for the city. It would relieve Congress of the task of handling the details of District affairs. It would be a logical followup to Congress' action in voting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

## Assistance for the Physically Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, bravery is an American tradition. I am certain that practically all citizens of our Nation are anxious to recognize great bravery and to see that it is properly rewarded.

Some of the finest examples of courage in the United States today are found in the physically disabled citizens of our country. In spite of their handicaps, many of them have, through special hard work, not only become self-supporting, but have, in many instances, become highly successful business men and women. These people provide a wonderful example for all of us.

These people's handicaps cause them special, unusual expenses. Many physically disabled citizens, for example, cannot use public transportation going to and from a job. Special attachments for automobiles are needed. Wheelchairs or crutches are often a necessity. And constant contact with braces, wheelchairs, and similar items causes clothing to wear out much faster.

The Alamo Handicapped Association of San Antonio, Tex., a State-chartered, nonprofit corporation, on February 8, 1959, adopted a resolution calling the attention of the Congress to these facts. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY ALAMO HANDICAPPED ASSOCIATION, INC.

Whereas the United States Internal Revenue Code of 1954 fails to allow income-tax deductions for special transportation expenses incurred by the physically disabled to and from his place of employment; and

Whereas the present code also fails to allow deductions for other extraordinary expenses, e.g., wheelchairs, crutches, automotive hand controls, necessary to the sustenance of employment by the physically disabled; and

Whereas many physically handicapped persons are not motivated to seek employment because of their inability to use public transportation facilities and because of the high cost of private transportation; and

Whereas other physically disabled persons, are unable financially to purchase and maintain special orthopedic appliances necessary to gainful employment, or are unable financially to purchase and keep in repair necessary clothing which has an exceptionally short life because of constant friction with orthopedic appliances and/or a wheelchair; and

Whereas the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH of New York has introduced a bill (H.R. 134) in the 86th Congress of the United States proposing to alleviate the situation now prevailing; and

Whereas this bill does not constitute a handout for the physically disabled but only recognizes that such expenses do, in fact, exist and provides an opportunity for equal competition in employment between the disabled and his able-bodied counterpart: Be it

*Resolved*, That this association go on record as favoring passage of House bill 134 during the current session of Congress, and be it

*Resolved*, That this association and its taxpaying members urge in the strongest manner that said bill be reported favorably out of the House Ways and Means Committee to which it has been referred, and be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to the following Members of Congress: Senators LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and RALPH YARBOROUGH; Congressmen PAUL KILDAY, House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, WILBUR D. MILLS, EUGENE J. KEOGH, FRANK IKARD, DANIEL A. REED, and BRUCE ALGER.

## Address by the Honorable John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, Before the National Association of County Officals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday morning of this week, the National Association of County Officials was privileged to have Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, address them on the very vital subject of urban problems and the place of the county in helping to solve these problems. I would like to call the attention of the Members to this address and urge them to give serious consideration to the proposals contained in the talk.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am very happy to include this distinguished address by the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 18, 1959

It is a real privilege and a great honor to have this opportunity to participate in the Nation's first urban county congress. I know that this historic meeting will be of tremendous benefit to our Nation, its county government, and its urban citizens—and I am grateful that your executive director, Bernard Hillenbrand has asked me to participate in this meeting with you. I particularly appreciate your hospitality at this hour of the morning—in Massachusetts such a gathering would not be possible on the morning after St. Patrick's Day. But I will do my best to turn my attention from the old days in County Cork to the new problems of county government.

I do not, however, pose here today as an expert on the intricacies and organization of county government. In my own State of Massachusets, local government is more prominent at the town and city level than in the county. And much of my life is spent here in the District of Columbia—which is not only countyless but voteless. In short, there is much I want to learn from you, in my visits with you today, about the problems and needs of county government.

But the entire Congress is particularly concerned this year with the problems of our metropolitan regions. No more difficult challenge confronts us on the domestic scene. The need for new legislative programs—to meet the growing problems of our growing cities—is becoming increasingly pressing. Already, 60 percent of all Americans live in urban counties—more than 100 million people. By the year 2000, it is predicted that this figure will rise to more than 300 million. The problems created by this tremendous population explosion, with literally hundreds of thousands of people spilling over from the cities into the counties, constitute a formidable challenge for the 86th Congress.

Thirteen million housing units occupied today by American families—living mostly in urban areas—are judged by objective census criteria to be substandard, unsafe, or unsanitary. In city after city, traffic is strangled—public transportation offers less service for higher cost—schools, hospitals and public health clinics are dangerously overcrowded—the air we breathe and the water we drink are dangerously polluted—and so on down a long list already familiar to you.

The growth of urban areas, spreading into the counties—and the growth of urban problems, also spreading into the counties—are both reflected in the dull, dry but revealing statistics of county government in this country. We see it in the tremendous increase in your payrolls with the great bulk of employees engaged in such activities as health and hospitals, highways, public welfare, police and correction, parks and recreation, libraries and education. Many county governments have for the first time been forced to borrow money—learning to their sorrow that it now costs more to obtain such funds while the money doesn't go as far when it is spent.

This means many services are cut back and others denied at a time they should be expanding. It also means long hours and low pay for yourselves and your associates and your employees.

The Congress is aware of these problems, though not always sufficiently aware of their magnitude. And those of us in the Congress who come from urban areas have worked on programs to aid our cities in the solution of these problems. But the point I want to make today is that these are no longer strictly city problems. The Congress should no longer think in terms of city needs alone. We must look also to the county and to combined city-county cooperation.

For the stream that pollutes the city's health pollutes the county as well. The airport that serves the city also serves the surrounding area. The deadly blight we call slum housing spreads slowly but inexorably to the city limits and then to the suburbs. The decline of public transit harasses commuters from the country as well as shoppers in the city. The highway clogged in the city is soon clogged out in the county. Hospitals, libraries, parks, schools, clinics, and civil defense programs—these and other important governmental services concern needs which extend beyond outmoded city limits.

In short, it is only on the TV western that a city can solve its problems by ordering a gunman to be outside the city limits by sundown. Pushing a problem outside the city limits is no longer a solution. For today the city and the county are inextricably linked—they face the same problems and the same pressures. We can no longer collect garbage in the city and dump it in the county. We can no longer use tax gimmicks in the county to bring industries out from the city. Neither our cities nor our counties can avoid their problems by shifting them upon the other—the problems must be faced together or not at all.

Certainly the primary responsibility cannot rest upon our State legislatures, which have proved themselves to be too frequently unresponsive to the needs of our urban areas; for in the absence of real and effective reapportionment our gerrymandered State legislatures will continue to reflect the rural dominance of the 19th century. Nor can complete responsibility be placed upon the Federal Government, which will never be as effective as local government in meeting your needs or even in being alert to them.

In short, it is clear that our city governments cannot always assume the sole responsibility for the solution of these pressing urban problems. I repeat, they cannot. our State governments will not, the Federal Government should not, and, therefore, you on the county level must. It is up to the counties and similar area governments to play a more important role in the solution of these urban problems.

The exact nature and design of those solutions have already been thoroughly discussed in your earlier meetings. The question remaining is: what will be the role of the Federal Government in helping you on the local level meet these pressing needs? You are already familiar with the restrictions placed on your efforts by State governments.

Similar problems are encountered on the Federal level. Federal aid funds, which are largely raised by taxes in these very urban areas, are not always distributed fairly to such areas of the basis of need and numbers. Federal and state governments combined have preempted the best sources of tax revenue—our counties are still largely dependent upon the property tax, with all its limitations—and, to add insult to injury, the continuing growth of Federal installations at the same time removes the property from your tax rolls while as yet no equitable method of payments in lieu of taxes has been devised. I hope this Congress will come up with an equitable payment in lieu of taxes proposed, and end this constant confusion and inequitable hardship for once and for all.

But how large a role should the Federal Government play? I recognize the complaints among local government officials against centralization in Washington. I myself am not a believer in the omnipotence of Federal bureaucracy. I see no magic attaching to tax money which has flowed to Washington and then back again. But whatever current political arguments may rage about spenders versus savers, about balanced budgets versus deficits, I believe any objective student would agree with this one basic premise—a premise which has been true through the years regardless of which party is in control—and that is that Congress assumes responsibility for only those problems which state and local governments have been unable or unwilling to handle themselves.

In short, if we are to obtain a greater degree of responsibility for local government, then it is up to you on the local level to demonstrate that you are able and willing to assume that responsibility. It is not enough to say that you are willing to take on new assignments. The Congress will not yield vital public functions affecting our Nation's strength to uninterested State legislatures—they will not yield them to ineffective, hamstrung city governments—and neither will they yield them to inefficient county governments.

For I know that you will be the first to agree that there are too many county governments in this country that were designed by their legislatures for a simpler rural atmosphere. There are too many counties in this country which are organized in an almost headless and formless fashion, with no single executive responsibility for effective coordinated administration. There are too many counties in this country where—just as 50 years ago—the spoils system is still rampant, the voters are still indifferent and the public business is still neglected.

I realize that the fault lies more with our State legislatures than with the county governments themselves. And I realize that it is up to the voters of each State to demand for themselves the kind of efficient, well-organized government they deserve. But I am addressing this appeal to you—because your attendance here demonstrates your enlightened leadership in the solution of these problems. You are demonstrating that county governments can be alert to the needs of its citizens—that it can plan for the future growth of this Nation—that it can emphasize cooperation, instead of duplication, with other counties and other levels of government. If this same kind of spirit can prevail throughout the more than 3,000 counties

of this Nation, then we will be well on the road to achieving a larger role for local American Government.

In short, it is not enough to complain on the State and the local level about the growth of Washington bureaucracy—about the size of the Federal deficit—or about the number of hands through which each tax dollar must pass. For the answer to these problems to a large extent rests with our State and local governments, themselves, and their ability to adapt themselves to the challenge of the mid-20th century. I know that those of you who are here today will do your utmost to live up to your trust and meet this challenge.

Let me conclude by emphasizing one point. These problems of streamlining our Government, making the most of our potential growth, strengthening the core of our Nation and building a better, wiser, stronger America—these are not merely questions of party politics or even governmental philosophy. Today they affect the very question of survival itself.

That, after all, is the real question of our time. The hard, tough question for the next decade—for this or any other group of Americans—is whether any free society—with its freedom of choice—its breadth of opportunity—its range of alternatives—can meet the singleminded advance of the Communists.

Can a nation organized and governed such as ours endure? That is the real question. Have we the nerve and the will? Can we carry through in an age where we will witness not only new breakthroughs in weapons of destruction—but also a race for mastery of the sky and the rain, the ocean and the tides, the far side of space and the inside of men's minds?

We travel today along a knife-edged path which requires leadership better equipped than any since Lincoln's day to make clear to our people the vast spectrum of our challenges.

In the words of Woodrow Wilson: "We must neither run with the crowd nor deride it—but seek sober counsel for it—and for ourselves."

## Proposed Abolition of Loyalty Oaths Required of Recipients of Certain Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on January 29 I introduced a measure to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to divest it of a provision which would require recipients of Federal loans under the act to file an affidavit and take an oath declaring that they do not believe in, belong to, or support any subversive organization.

Since then I have been heartened by the nearly unanimous editorial support this proposal has received. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the Williamson (W. Va.) News and the Asheville (N.C.) Times, which express very concisely and with cogent reasoning why Congress should abolish the unnecessary and offending oath.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Williamson (W. Va.) News, Feb. 11, 1959]

SHAM SECURITY

This newspaper never has had much sympathy for the attitude that the man of science is a person apart; that because of the type of mind he possesses and the work in which he is engaged he should be freed of the fetters of conformity which restrain lesser beings. We believe, specifically, that a man can be a scientist or an educator and a patriot at the same time, and that the requirements of good citizenship need not interfere with his work.

Nevertheless, we agree with those who would strike from the National Defense Education Act a requirement that those receiving Federal aid under it take a loyalty oath. Leading educators and associations of educators have denounced the provision, and at least two institutions, Harvard and Bryn Mawr, have declined to participate in the program unless the requirement is dropped.

In proposing legislation to delete the oath provision, Senator KENNEDY (Democrat of Massachusetts) points out that it might defeat the very purpose of stimulating scientific progress by excluding some of the most inquiring minds, by repelling nonconformists and dissenters and those who find oaths distasteful or who are opposed to them for reasons of conscience.

This newspaper is not too much impressed by this argument and is inclined to suspect that some educators take themselves and their academic freedom a bit too seriously. But it is impressed by the other argument of Senator KENNEDY that the oath provision should be eliminated because the really disloyal would have no hesitancy about perjuring themselves.

The loyalty provision should be dropped—and this goes for labor relations as well as for educational aid—not so much because some sensibilities might be offended, but because it is worthless as a security measure.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Times, Feb. 7, 1959]

LOYALTY OATH ISN'T HELP TO EDUCATION

As the new National Defense Education Act goes into full operation, Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts is moving to divest it of a feature that could limit its effectiveness. With the cosponsorship of Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, KENNEDY is introducing a bill to repeal a requirement of a loyalty oath by recipients of Federal aid under the act.

The loyalty oath provision was tagged onto the bill from the floor at the last moment before passage, with scant debate and little publicity. Since its existence has become more widely known, it has been criticized by Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and by the presidents of quite a number of the Nation's outstanding institutions of higher learning, including Harvard, Yale, and Princeton universities.

The American Association of University Professors has called for elimination of the oath, and several colleges have refused to participate in the education aid program unless the requirement is dropped.

Seantor KENNEDY stated the reasons for repeal clearly and forcefully. He said it would not keep out actual members of the Communist Party because they would "have no hesitancy about perjuring themselves." At the same time, he added, it might defeat the very purposes of the act by excluding the most inquiring minds, by repelling nonconformists and dissenters and those who find test oaths distasteful or who are against them for reasons of conscience.

Now that it has had time to reconsider what it adopted so hastily, Congress should abolish the unnecessary and offending oath.

## Prize-Winning Speeches in Contest Sponsored by the Minnesota 4–H Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service and the Minnesota Jewish Council this year sponsored the 17th annual 4–H radio speaking contest for members of Minnesota 4–H clubs. The theme of this year's contest was "The Brotherhood of Man—Where Have We Failed—What Can I Do?"

This year 820 4–H Club members wrote and presented talks in 89 county contests.

The grand winner of the State contest was Miss Kathleen Kajer of New Prague, Minn. Miss Kajer is 17 years old and a senior at New Prague High School. Her father is one of the leading farmers in the New Prague area.

The second-place award in the State went to Miss Coralie Christianson of Roseau, Minn. Miss Christianson is 16 years old and a junior at Roseau High School. Her father is the Roseau County superintendent of schools.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the award-winning speeches of these two fine young women be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN—WHERE HAVE WE FAILED—WHAT CAN I DO?

(By Kathleen Kajer (champion), LeSueur County, New Prague, Minn.)

Do you ever say, "Mr. So-and-so is a tribute to his race"? Do you feel it necessary to praise members of another race when you speak of them? Have you friends only among your own racial, religious, and occupational groups? Perhaps you refer frequently to your freedom from prejudice, but if you answer "Yes" to these questions, your prejudice does show through, even though you may not be conscious of it.

Just as sturdy, lasting buildings must be built on firm foundations, so does world brotherhood depend on nations of individuals free from prejudice. I believe we cannot have world brotherhood until we act constructively to dispel our country's prejudice against color, occupation, and religion.

Foremost in the mind of every U.S. citizen is the current Negro problem. The decision of the Supreme Court that segregation was unconstitutional caused a great disturbance in the South. Although equally good education was supposed to be provided for all, it was not done. Segregation also caused great confusion in transportation facilities, and in business circles. Money was need-

lessly wasted in providing duplicate schools and places of business, and Negroes and white people were not treated alike.

Not only in the South have Negroes been degraded and ostracized, but also in Chicago and New York there have been unpleasant incidents, in which Negroes failed in their attempts to purchase homes, or obtain employment because of racial discrimination.

With the Indian we find a highly different situation, one in which we really should hang our heads in shame. Since Sir Walter Raleigh founded the first colony in America, the Indians have been cheated out of what was rightfully their own. In the last century they were herded together like animals, and were literally exiled from their native lands. Despite our idealized democratic equality, we expect them to survive with a hoe in a technological age.

We have a surplus of food, and yet, only a few months ago, Indians were starving in the Dakotas. There is little logic in this.

Here in Minnesota, job discrimination is the most common form of prejudice. We do not care to associate with John because he comes from a farm; Jim's father is merely a janitor; and Joan's mother is only a clerk in a store. Do we ever stop to realize that a farm is actually a big enterprise, requiring great skill and knowledge to operate it successfully? Jim's father is earning an honest wage, and Joan's mother is doing something she really enjoys—helping other people find what they want.

Hard feeling over religious questions is another sore spot. We tend to choose our friends from among those of our own beliefs and in this way we avoid differences and arguments. However, we fail to understand and appreciate the religions of others.

This is what I believe to be the whole key to brotherhood. Each individual person should be judged for himself—for his own honesty, integrity, citizenship, dependability and intelligence, and not by his race, creed or occupation.

What can I do about the brotherhood of man? I must examine facts with an open mind, judge as I see fit, and then follow through with constructive action. When investigating, I must really want to know the truth; I should be willing to learn and accept new ideas. If I find that my present conviction, traditions, and customs are wrong, I should be willing to discard them. Let me exmaine my mind completely to find the true reason for my most cherished opinions.

Love is the basis of brotherhood, and where will we find love if not in the home, the foundation of our society? It is there we learn to love and live with our brothers and sisters. Just because sister Jenny gets on my nerves occasionaly is no reason to embarrass her in front of others and make her feel inferior. I probably get on her nerves too.

It is the same with people outside the family circle. Discussion makes us aware of the point of view of others, but heated arguments between headstrong opponents are senseless.

By following the Golden Rule, doing unto others what we would have them do unto us, we can further the cause of brotherhood.

I ask myself, can I, just one person, affect the lives of others? The answer is not hard to find. One hundred thousand people jammed the Los Angeles Coliseum one starless night. Suddenly the speaker said, "Don't be afraid now. All the lights are going out."

In complete darkness he struck a match, and said, "All who can see this light say 'Yes.'"

There was a deafening roar. So shines a good deed. Then he asked them all to light a match, and the Coliseum was flooded with thousands of litle lights.

I will light my candle, and perhaps others will follow my example. I will not say "Mr. So-and-So is a tribute to his race." I will not use the words "Bohunk," "Nigger," "Polak," or "Jap." I will not speak of other racial and religious groups as "they" and mine as "we." Instead, I will become acquainted with the individuals and their beliefs.

Edgar A. Guest has summed it up in a poem called "When You Know a Fellow." He says:

"You begin to understand him, and you cease to scoff and sneer,
For with understanding always prejudices disappear.
You begin to find his virtues and his faults you cease to tell,
For you seldom hate a fellow when you know him very well."

---

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN—WHERE HAVE WE FAILED—WHAT CAN I DO?

(By Coralie Christianson (reserve champion), Roseau County, Roseau, Minn.)

America has always been proud of the democratic ideals which were set up with the founding of our country and which have developed down through the years. She has always taken great pride in these ideals, which have truly shaped the destiny of our great democracy. These ideals, based on the rights and privileges of man, have been eloquently expressed in many important documents and have been written in the hearts of men ever since the birth of our country. We stand ready to defend these ideals at any threat to peace.

And yet, one of the most important of these ideals which has helped to shape our country's destiny, the ideal from which all others stem, has been misused, violated, and neglected. This ideal is the equality of man.

We in America have always been proud that our country was the first Nation of the world to offer equal rights to all men. Are we justified in our pride? Are we being hypocritical—professing to believe in something we do not even practice?

The cold war, with its ever increasing tensions, progresses to the brink of possible world conflict. Others choose to think the greatest danger lies in the undermining powers of Russia through means of propaganda. Whichever the threat, the end results would be equally disastrous. With the increase of power, ruthless aggression, ever increased war weapons, we cannot, must not, rely on our military strength alone. There has to be another solution. And as is often true with intricate problems, the very simplicity of the right solution may become apparent to us. Brotherhood—brotherhood of man regardless of race or religion is the only solution.

The Bill of Rights, in which many of our personal rights are stated, was drawn up for the purpose of serving as a personal charter of liberty bestowed on each person living in this country. Yet, has the Bill of Rights, along with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, safeguarded the liberties of all men living in our country? The answer, it is apparent, is "No."

Ever since our country began, there have been constant racial differences among men. In the past, these differences nearly led to the destruction of our Union. Even yet, we have not completely solved our problems with our first brothers, the American Indians.

Racial differences are evidenced strongly at the present especially by the crucial situation in the South and all over the United States. Negroes, who, by the Constitution are granted equal rights along with all citizens, are being barred from restaurants, schools, hotels, and the better residential areas. Men, who, by the grace of God, have been created on an equal basis with all men, are being denied rights belonging to all human beings. And these facts are being used by the Russians as propaganda to spread the cause of communism—that we claim equal rights to all men in the United States and we can't even settle our own racial problems. It is not any wonder the world doubts our sincerity.

Secondly, we have other problems lying within our country which bear the mark of suppositions of human superiorities. One of these, perhaps the most crucial and deplorable situations at the present, is the numerable slum areas which exist in all the larger cities across our country. Is this truly a democratic way of living for us to turn our heads away from these people and their lowly conditions? These people, living in stark poverty and filth in a country of health and prosperity, are ready and ripe for communism. Certainly, we must extend our hand, helping these people who surely are our brothers whatever race, color, or creed. Situations such as these are what may lead to the downfall of our great Nation if they are not checked. For history offers many examples of countries which became careless about their democratic practices and therefore lost their freedom. Our solution again: the extension of a brotherly hand toward those in need.

What can we, as concerned Americans do about these problems? What can I do, as a 4–H member and future citizen of this great country?

The first step is really the most difficult. We must come to realize and accept the fact that we, on this earth, from the beginning of time, were created equal; therefore, we form one huge family of brothers who are all basically the same, regardless of the race or nationality into which we were born. When we have come to realize this fact, then we shall feel the desire to reach out to help those in need as well as accept and befriend those who are now shut out because of race or color.

Secondly, it should be up to us as true Americans, and especially to us as students and future citizens, to delve into the histories of the many nationalities making up America, the melting pot of nations. From this study we can come to understand more fully the peoples of our Nation and of the world.

Thirdly, by encouraging a more thorough program of foreign languages in our schools, we can develop more fully the understanding of nations, binding the ties more closely in this family of brothers.

And so, by practicing these three steps and by putting our trust in God, we shall march forward, striving to reach our goal of national and international peace and of a democratic nation strengthened through the common effort of its people to practice the brotherhood of man.

It is like the little boy who was carrying his brother. A stranger stopped to say, "Son, isn't he too heavy a burden for you to carry?" The little boy answered, "He's not a burden, he's my brother."

So may we truly know, believe, and practice that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

---

## Young Scientists Proving Their Worth Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently a Corpus Christi, Tex., business was having difficulty because an exces-

sive foaming of soap used in cleaning brake shoes was clogging machinery.

Miss Kay Vreeland solved the business problem. She also won one of two top awards at a recent south Texas Science Fair, for her work. Miss Vreeland is a high school student at Incarnate Word Academy in Corpus Christi.

A 16-year-old high school sophomore from San Benito, Tex., Charles Deyo, exhibited a sonar oscilloscope at the same science show which so interested naval authorities that he was offered a Navy cruise next fall.

These are just a few of the many complicated and learned projects which were displayed by high school students at the science exhibit. These young people are excellent examples of the type who do not make headlines for juvenile delinquency or gang wars. The teen years are usually thought of as the years of preparation—of getting ready for a career which is still ahead. These young students are doing more than just prepare for the future. They are demonstrating their worth now, proving themselves good citizens and good students, aiming to make this a better world today and tomorrow.

Mr. President, in special recognition of the long hours of work which many of this Nation's young people are putting in on studies and worthwhile activities of many kinds today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report of the South Texas Science Fair held in Corpus Christi, Tex., on Sunday, March 15, 1959. The story, written by Edward H. Harte, was published in the Corpus Christi Caller for Monday, March 16, 1959, under the heading: "Thousands Attend Science Fair; Local Girl Top Winner."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUSANDS ATTEND SCIENCE FAIR; LOCAL GIRL TOP WINNER

(By Edward H. Harte)

A little girl looked at the cage of leukemia-ridden mice at the South Texas Science Fair yesterday and wailed, "Daddy buy me some white mice."

Parents and teachers congratulated one another on the high quality of junior's work. And the general public, which turned out by the thousands, admitted by word or look that it didn't understand much of what it saw.

But the Ph. D.-studded panel of judges understood, and yesterday their decisions were announced.

TOP WINNERS

Top winners, entitled to compete in the National Science Fair: Kay Vreeland of Incarnate Word Academy, Corpus Christi, and Fred Parce of Harlingen High School.

Top junior high exhibitor: Celso Guzman of Cathedral School, Corpus Christi.

Navy Cruise winner and two alternates: Charles Deyo of San Benito High School; David Alexander of Harlingen High, first alternate; and Hal Russell of Kingsville High, second alternate.

Medical Society awards: Barbara Ann Bryant of Ursuline, Laredo, senior high winner, and George Duncan of Gay Junior High, Harlingen.

Dental Society awards: Wanda Lee Kendey of San Benito High School and Rene Garcia of Falfurrias Junior High.

Junior Museum award: Kathleen Kennedy of Cathedral School, Corpus Christi.

FIRST LOCAL WINNER

Miss Vreeland is the first Corpus Christi contestant ever to win top honors in a science fair here. In the past 4 years, the Corpus Christi show has sent to the national fair three winners from Harlingen, two from Beeville, and one each from Kingsville and Raymondville.

The local fair also sends two teachers to the national fair. This year they are Sister Jeanne Francis, of Incarnate Word, general chairman of the fair and teacher of prize-winning Kay Vreeland, and Miss Mary Lee Grabowske, of Crockett School, here, for 4 years chairman of the elementary division in the fair.

ACCLAIMED AS BEST

Yesterday's large crowd moved slowly through the exhibits which teachers acclaimed as the best in the history of the south Texas fair.

Laymen who looked about could pick up all sorts of useful information.

For instance, an Incarnate Word entry proved that you can root your geraniums best in plain tapwater. The students also tested the rooting qualities of Corpus Christi Bay water and Lake Mathis water. Tapwater's best. And although the roots will be bigger if you use a rooting hormone, they won't appear any faster.

If you're worried about droughts, remember that the sun's heat will distill fresh water from sea water. Kathleen Kennedy's exhibit showed how simple it is. What could be more practical—after all, isn't this the land of sun and surf?

ALGAE'S SPACE ROLE

You may not care about algae, but space scientists and young Tommy Kantz, of Kingsville High School, do. They know that algae may provide the essential carbon dioxide-oxygen exchange that will be necessary if man is ever to go up in a spaceship. Kantz proved that light was necessary for motion of algae oscillatoria.

Aspirin does not retard the wilting of your cut flowers. This is the conclusion of Rachel Garcia, Eudelia Garcia, and Velma Oliver, all of Ella Barnes, who conducted scientific experiments on the subject.

PHYSICAL SCIENCE

Both the top exhibits were in the physical sciences and were practical answers to real problems. Kay Vreeland's father was losing soap and clogging machinery due to the excessive foaming of soap he used to clean brakeshoes at his business. She discovered that sulfates would control the suds, and recommended either magnesium sulfate (epsom salts) or sodium sulfate.

Fred Parce, who was last year's Navy cruise winner from the South Texas Science Fair, exhibited a Remodified pi-Z Match Network which he assures confused adults is eminently practical for military communications outfits and ham radio operators.

CRUISE WINNERS

Charles Deyo, 16-year-old San Benito sophomore who won a Navy cruise next fall, rigged up his own oscilloscope in a sonar-principle exhibit. Navy men, most of the students, and the few adults who understood were impressed.

First alternate on the Navy cruise, David Alexander, of Harlingen, designed and built a closed-circuit television system that projects its picture on a sphere.

Although candy-machine sales at Exposition Hall probably didn't register any change, Barbara Ann Bryant, of Laredo, winner of the medical society's citation, showed that a diet of sweets will make rats sick, sick, sick. From September until February she fed some rats cookies, crackers, cherries, candies, cakes, pies, and other delicacies. Then she killed them. Their organs, she said, were something to behold. And their bones, too. Yellow and weak.

OTHER RATS

Meanwhile she was feeding other rats a salubrious if uninteresting diet of such things as powdered milk, yeast, cornmeal, etc. At the time of their death, their organs looked good and their bones well formed and strong. The skeletons were right there to prove it.

Wanda Lee Kenedy exhibited sections of healthy and diseased teeth which won her the dental society's citation in the senior division.

Celso Guzman at Cathedral School is a stargazer, but he noticed that because of humidity, some nights in Corpus Christi were better than others for celestial observation. He set up a small weather station, with his own wet- and dry-bulb thermometers. Checking the humidity, he also noted the visibility of the stars. He found they are still visible at humidity as high as 92 percent. He wants to check at humidities of 92 to 99 percent to discover at what point the stars disappear.

Judges did not know the identity of any exhibitors. Until after judging all exhibits were identified only by number.

This year's National Science Fair will be held May 6 to 9 at Hartford, Conn.

## North Atlantic Treaty Organization Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with several other Members in introducing a resolution proposing the calling of a convention of delegates from the North Atlantic Treaty Nations to explore how the NATO nations may, acting within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States, achieve more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common interests.

The governments of the NATO nations have been seeking greater unity since NATO was founded 10 years ago.

The communiques of the North Atlantic Council have shown the importance which our governments have given to this vital objective.

The legislators of the NATO nations have likewise sought to bring about greater unity since 1955, meeting each year for this purpose in the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

Meanwhile the need for closer unity has grown, not diminished. The Communist threat to the United States and to NATO has become political and economic as well as military with accelerating speed ever since the death of Stalin.

This resolution would extend the quest for greater unity among NATO nations to a third level, the level of their peoples. It would bring about a comprehensive survey of this overriding problem con-

ducted by the best minds among our peoples. It can be expected to produce some constructive recommendations, and even chart a fresh approach to the solution of this problem.

This exhaustive survey by a body of leading citizens from the NATO countries would complement the efforts which our governments and our legislators are making; it would neither conflict with them nor interfere with them. The convention proposed in this resolution could in no way commit our governments to any action; its function would be solely to study and report.

Mr. Speaker, in our own country we often turn to a body of distinguished citizens when we have a complex problem to solve, appointing a commission to study the problem and reports its recommendations. The convention proposed in this resolution may be likened to such a commission on an international scale, on a NATO scale, which takes account of the disparity in size of the NATO countries.

The Berlin crisis and the periodic crises which have preceded it in recent years have demonstrated that our unity within NATO needs to be preserved and strengthened if we are going to successfully meet, and properly deal with, Communist pressures.

It is high time that we enlist leading citizens among our nations in this crucial search for greater unity, realizing, as we do, that effective unity among democratic nations must be based on their peoples.

## Mr. Khrushchev and Post-Stalin Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a brilliant and penetrating summary of the political situation in post-Stalin Russia written by the distinguished Protestant theologian, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, which appeared in the March 2, 1959, number of Christianity and Crisis. Dr. Niebuhr rightly insists that:

> The competition between the democratic and Communist worlds for winning the loyalty of the nontechnical nations of Asia and Africa by helping them achieve technical competence * * * will dominate the history of the next decades.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Niebuhr's editorial, "Mr. Khrushchev and Post-Stalin Russia," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS—MR. KHUSHCHEV AND POST-STALIN RUSSIA

The 21st congress of the Communist Party presented the world with a good opportunity to appraise the trends of history in Russia in economic and political affairs, in domestic and foreign policy since the death of Stalin and—more significantly—since the rise of the ebullient first secretary of the party who is now also Premier (having banished his old travelling companion, Mr. Bulganin, as one of the antiparty group of conspirators).

Mr. Khrushchev used the congress to crow triumphantly over his enemies at home and abroad. The crow lasted 6 hours. The congress was undoubtedly his day of triumph. Only 2 years ago he engaged in the hazardous gamble of exposing Stalin's crimes both for the sake of disassociating himself from the horror of those crimes (though he was Stalin's hatchet man in the Ukraine) and for the purpose of assuring the various rising bureaucrats that no such arbitrary rule would be established again. It is one of the achievements of the post-Stalin era that Khrushchev has gained his triumph over his foes without terror. He has merely banished them to Outer Mongolia or to equally remote places. This represents a real gain.

The disquieting side of the picture is that a dictatorship still seems to require a dictator, and that Khrushchev's triumph was symbolized by the uncritical obeisance made by all the lesser henchmen, even to the point of including him among the great theoreticians of the party. It was as if in our own history after President Jackson's triumph, the cabinet members had attributed to him philosophical achievements equal to those of Thomas Jefferson.

Undoubtedly a new cult of personality is developing. This euphemism is used by the Communists for the fact that men of absolute power become immune to criticism and are the beneficiaries of uncritical adulation by the bandwagon occupants.

In analyzing the development of Communist politics it is well to remember that Khrushchev has packed the mighty Presidium with his obedient henchmen and that his victory represents the triumph of the political oligarchy over the managerial and military oligarchies. This is a fact that rules out, for the moment, the slow growth of freedom by a process with which Western history has made us familiar, namely, the conflict between competing oligarchies. But again it must be recorded positively that this triumph was achieved not by terror but by shrewd political maneuvers.

Khrushchev defeated the managerial oligarchy, which supported Malenkov, by fanning the fears of the military oligarchy that Malenkov's program for increasing consumer goods was dangerous to the development of heavy industry upon which military might depended. Having gained this triumph with the help of Marshal Zhukov, Khrushchev subsequently cashiered the helpful marshal who had unwisely tried to use his prestige for gaining independent status for the military oligarchy.

In short, the party—that is, the political leadership—is still supreme in Russia. It has distinguished itself from all previous dictatorships by avoiding the supremacy of military men. The new and yet old democratic centralism means that the system is still totalitarian but it is not under the control of a single despot and probably can never again come under such control despite Khrushchev's great power.

At this point, we should again make a positive note: Khrushchev could defeat his foes only by taking the unprecendented step of appealing to the central committee from the Presidium, where the group now dubbed anti-Party men had outvoted him by either a 6 to 4 or 7 to 3 majority. These are small details, but they are important if it should be true that in Russia, as in the West, liberty may slowly broaden down from precedent to precedent.

The field of economic development gave Khrushchev the real opportunity to crow, to mix promises of the tremendous possibilities of the 7-year plan with self-congratulations about past achievements. The promises were a mixture of the probable and plausible with the improbable and the implausible, thus showing a similiarity between the Russian Premier and the politicians of the Western World. The total economy is to be increased by 80 percent in 7 years, or roughly 10 percent a year, compared with Russia's present 5 percent and our 2 to 3 percent rate of increase. The generation of electricity is to be doubled, wages are to be increased by 40 percent, and work hours reduced to 40 or even 35 per week.

The phoniest promises were the pledge to eliminate income taxes (which means exactly nothing in a regime that politically controls every economic transaction) and the promise to increase the agricultural yield by 70 percent in some crops and 100 percent in others. This latter promise is regarded by experts as strictly propaganda, particularly in view of the long series of failures in agriculture in Russia, including Khrushchev's own virgin land scheme.

Nevertheless, despite the transparent dishonesties in reporting past achievements and recording future hopes, we must not lose sight of the tremendous achievements of the Russian economy, both in the past and those that seem likely to come in the future. They have enabled Khrushchev to make the plausible claim (plausible at least to the non-technical cultures of Asia and Africa) that communism is superior to capitalism in productive energy.

It is the impression technological advance of Russia, vividly revealed in the launching of Lunik, that not only sealed Khrushchev's triumph over his Russian foes but also altered the power balance of the world. Khrushchev boasted that Russia now had intercontinental ballistic missiles in mass production that would invalidate all our carefully established advance bases for bombing aircraft. This is probably an overstatement, but not more seriously wrong than Secretary McElroy's defensive denials.

The resulting gap in the balance of terror by which a precarious peace is maintained is serious; it will undoubtedly tempt the Russians to push us strategically very near to the edge of disaster, as they are now doing in the Berlin crisis. But this fact must not obscure the greater issue emerging from the undoubted Russian technical achievements. That issue is the competition between the democratic and Communist worlds for winning the loyalty of nontechnical nations of Asia and Africa by helping them achieve technical competence.

That competition will dominate the history of the next decades. In it, Russia has many advantages over us. Even if her achievements are not as great as she boasts, she always has the advantage of lower living standards that give her greater power to maneuver in foreign aid, space exploration and military expenditures. The Russian leader is not under the necessity of coming to terms with the passion for a balanced budget, nor the desire of a pampered electorate for the highest possible standards of comfort and luxury, including the annual new automobile model.

## Facing Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an informative and constructive editorial which appeared in the Christian

Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., on March 18, 1959:

FACING UNEMPLOYMENT

Congress is at least moving to ease somewhat one of the emergency needs of jobless Americans. The House of Representatives has passed the bill to continue for 3 months the Federal program of emergency aid designed to help States with their unemployment relief payments. This is much more reasonable than the year's extension proposed earlier, and we trust the Senate will quickly concur.

It is reported that more than 400,000 persons will benefit by this extension. But there are other hundreds of thousands who have now been jobless so long that both the regular and extended periods of relief payments for them have already run out. They have to look elsewhere for help, and for many it is a grim time. In some areas near starvation is reported—yes, in these United States in 1959.

Many who are not so desperate are still deeply troubled at the stretchout of unemployment. For in large areas of industry employers are simply not taking back men and women laid off when the recession came. They have adopted new methods or machinery to cut labor costs. They have rehired only the most efficient. Indeed, figures just released show a further gain in national product—even while unemployment registers little change. In January 1959 there were actually more jobless than in January 1958.

Most of the measures being proposed are little more than palliatives. In fact, demands for a higher minimum wage could easily result in more unemployment. And the same thing applies to some unions' wage demands. They are giving impetus to the very steps toward automation that many workers fear. Probably the worst unemployment in the Nation is in the coal fields. There a combination of John L. Lewis and of operators bent on mechanization has left no jobs for multitudes of miners.

Certainly improved man-hour productivity is highly desirable. But the coal fields are a good example of the need for private and public efforts to help retrain and relocate men so displaced by progress. The proposals for a 35-hour week surely hold no great promise. For their first result would be to increase costs and prices—and quite possibly consumer resistance. Such resistance is widely held accountable for reduced car sales and Detroit's 12 percent of unemployment.

Increased productivity which is passed on to the consumer in better or cheaper products seems more promising as a cure for unemployment. Here is the most direct and efficient way to increase effective purchasing power—and inclination. Neither wage nor price increases can so widely distribute purchasing power and stimulate markets.

We need much better figures on unemployment. For instance, there may be an increase in figures for employment without showing any decrease in unemployment. Some unemployed were never more than partially employed. Some States report more accurately than others.

But unemployment is much more than statistics; it is people, and aid should be shaped to help people help themselves. Long-range planning is needed. But right now in several depressed areas especially bad conditions exist and may well require special measures. Spot treatment of these areas—with Federal loans, if necessary—would be wiser than general Federal spending programs to stimulate the economy. Washington may be the ultimate backstop for unemployment relief, but it should not be looked to as the primary provider of employment.

## Unfinished Business Outdoors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very fine article by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] entitled "Unfinished Business Outdoors," from the New Republic of March 9, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OUTDOORS

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

Jefferson may have ruminated on the incredible outdoors as he rode his stallion Eagle through the Virginia woods, but there was then time for such contemplation. Franklin D. Roosevelt could identify each tree in his green arboretum at Hyde Park. When he was in the outdoors he said he felt exactly like Antaeus, the mythical giant of old, who gained strength just by touching the earth again. Yet would F.D.R. have felt this way had he not been bound to a wheelchair?

Today, a public personage must worry about headlines and press releases, about TV shows and shaking the right hands, about banquet speeches and political rallies, about using every moment at cocktail parties for a contact which will further his career. Who can think of robin redbreasts or pronghorned antelope? Teddy Roosevelt might have been a man who liked to ride his favorite mustang counting the few remaining bison of the plains; he even could make a lonely bivouac in the Yosemite with bearded John Muir—while his Secret Service guards had been banished to the inn, far away. But there were sophisticates who insisted that Teddy Roosevelt never really grew up.

True, President Eisenhower likes to cast a dry fly and flush a covey of quail, but not under the circumstances required of most of those who put him in the White House. The private hunting preserves and exclusive ranches of his wealthy friends have been the locale of most of Mr. Eisenhower's forays into the outdoors. The average fellow would be a poacher if he invaded these precincts. The President, for all his love of the open sky, likes to be back at a candle-lit manor house by nightfall. His is not the language of the man who must share a crowded public campground, stake to stake with the other fellow's pyramidal tent.

For some inscrutable reason, the question of conservation lacks glamor. It may be that protecting birds and bees is too unsophisticated for the editors, columnists and VIP's by whom most politicians set great store. The fate of a salmon pilgrimage, waterfowl flock or spruce forest looms as pallid fare to people who think they carry the fate of nuclear testing or a balanced budget on their shoulders. One rarely can cause a ripple at a Washington reception by expressing concern over the destiny of moose grubbing for algae in an upland lake. Indeed, I rather fear that a political leader who talked about such things might be written off as a backwoods yokel by those who have custody over who gets banner headlines or billings on the TV panel shows.

Yet the issues in the outdoors mean a great deal to many less exalted citizens. Last year 59 million people visited the national parks and 68 million migrated to the more numerous national forests. Some 20 million Americans hold fishing licenses; 15 million having hunting licenses. Despite the inevitable duplication in such compilations, the totals are impressive. And to these must be added the millions active in the Audubon Society, garden clubs, Boy and Girl Scouting and similar projects. Izaak Walton League chapters in my State often have more sustained attendance at meetings than either chambers of commerce or trade unions.

I remember the grizzled Idaho frontiersmen in the Lochsa River country who told me how they had killed off the mountain lions that were devouring their herds and flocks. With the lions gone, deer multiplied astronomically. When the forage ran out, the multitude of deer was driven to eating bushes and young saplings. Flash floods surged off the denuded hillsides, destroying infinitely more livestock than ever the mountain lions had taken. Nature's delicate balance had been upset.

The issues are of far greater complexity today than on the old frontier. Can we safeguard crops from insects without eliminating birdlife? If adequate financing is not assured for dams and reservoirs, will we make effective use of our cheapest and most perpetual source of energy—plumes of tumbling water? If we sacrifice the outdoors to subdivisions and supermarkets, where will 200 million Americans take their leisure in 1975? Are television sets and concrete stadiums to be our sole recreation?

And always there is the specter of the Soviet Union—with forests and mines that have never been tapped, with four dams under construction to surpass our own Grand Coulee, with its trunkline railroads being electrified in order to save precious petroleum, with fisheries and waterfowl marshes beyond measurement.

If I were one of the politicians who aspired to lead the United States during the next 8 years (which I am not), these are a few of the issues in the realm of conservation which I would be thinking about very intently:

Some 68 million Americans camp, fish, or hike each year in our national forests. Yet, when private lands surround these public preserves, people have been assessed entrance fees as high as $25 to enter their own domain. The Government has authority to prevent this, and it should be used. More than 1.5 million acres in Colorado alone are dominated by private interests, and similar situations exist in other Western States.

Such pesticides as dieldrin have been effective in destroying plant pests like fire ants, but often all birds and small game animals perish in the process. Doves, bobwhites, rabbits, and even deer are dying with the gypsy moths. Dieldrin is said to be five times as deadly as DDT, which already had caused concern over its lethal impact on geese, ducks, quail, and similar birdlife. A lot of research by Federal agricultural scientists is required, because some rural counties are literally being saturated with pesticides sprinkled from planes and helicopters. The Boston Herald has warned that these poisons may do more harm than good.

President Eisenhower's famous $77 billion budget is bad news for the American outdoors. Funds are cut for grants to clean up stream pollution, although pure water supplies are an ever-increasing national need. Forest Service funds for recreation and public use have been reduced 15 percent, despite more extensive pressure than ever on campgrounds, roads, and trails. Cooperative tree-planting funds, between Federal and State agencies, are trimmed in the President's budget by approximately 33 percent. Fisheries research is given only a lick and a promise, although migratory salmon runs are in constant peril.

The wilderness preservation bill, which would give statutory protection to the relatively few scenic acres still as primitive as when Lewis and Clark went west, deserves earnest consideration by the Senate and House. Senator MURRAY and I held hearings in the Western States on this legislation last November. Its support came mainly from recreationists, the opposition from those who would fell the trees or mine the land within wilderness solitudes. The bill needs modifying amendments but its purpose is right. Why not spare a few museum pieces of the original America? Central Park might bring a lot of money to city hall's coffers if sold for real-estate promotion, but what New Yorker sound of mind would trade Central Park for such a quid pro quo?

After a terrific battle with the outdoor-advertising lobby, Senator KUCHEL, of California, and I were successful last year in having adopted a bill to provide a bonus for any State which would accept Federal standards for safeguarding scenery along the 42,000-mile Interstate Highway System. This struggle has now shifted to State legislatures, where the signboard owners and their trade-union associates continue high-pressure tactics. Despite our victory in Congress, this will be meaningless unless legislatures take the carrot of the one-half of 1 percent bonus offered for keeping Federal-aid roads free of the clutter of billboards.

The great river-valley experiment along the Tennessee is in danger of stagnation because the administration has been loathe to recommend the appropriations necessary to build steam plants to keep pace with load needs. A self-financing bill sponsored principally by Senators HILL and GORE passed the Senate last year but was held up in the House Rules Committee. Renewal of this legislation is essential to survival of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In the Pacific Northwest, where the mighty Columbia River contains 40 percent of the country's latent hydroelectricity, a somewhat similar program is urgent. This would be a Columbia River Regional Power Corporation bill, permitting the system of Federal dams like Grand Coulee and Bonneville to use their own revenues for the purpose of adding new and desperately needed powerplants. In spite of the fact that existing dams on the Columbia have collected gross revenues to date of more than $500 million, they still must go hat-in-hand to the Budget Bureau for funds. This has retarded development, and has caused the country's highest rate of unemployment in a region which should have unlimited quantities of low-cost power for new industrial payrolls.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S Youth Conservation Corps bill, creating a revival of the CCC, would furnish a contingent of young Americans to help restore the facilities which furnish recreation in the outdoors. Our National Parks and Forests received their greatest rehabilitation a quarter of a century ago when F. D. R. organized the Civilian Conservation Corps and sent them into the western fastnesses with trail-building equipment and mobile kitchens.

The agenda of unfinished business is long, but I believe these few items are illustrative. Even a bus driver in Brooklyn, who may never see the Yosemite or Mount Hood, does not want such places defiled or exploited. He feels better about his country when he knows that these places exist and are protected. Both in 1952 and 1956, some of my friends and I tried to get a major role for conservation speeches on the agenda of the Democratic National Convention. Obviously, we failed. Yet, I think it would have been good for the country, and it might even have been good politics.

## Importation of Crude Oil and Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the effect of the President's action a week ago on imposing drastic curbs on the importation of crude oil and residual oils has resulted in widespread criticism throughout New England. The unsympathetic attitude of the present administration toward my own State of Massachusetts has been evident for many months. The administration is engaged in a policy of creating unemployment on one hand and now we find the President making a decision that will result in increased fuel costs to industry in my area.

The pleas made by Massachusetts Congressmen including myself have fell on deaf ears. Responsible businessmen have made their feelings known to the administration. The leading newspapers in the Greater Boston area have written sound editorials pointing out the fact that this act of the President will do more harm to the New England area than any other by the administration.

It is my firm belief that the President should reconsider his action on this matter. Certainly, decisions of this kind which have such a far-reaching effect on the economy of the entire New England area should be given full consideration.

My responsibility is to the people of my district. I strongly object to the action of the President. If he were a member of my political party I would be sitting on the steps of the White House waiting to inform him in no uncertain terms of my strong feelings on the matter.

The time has come for the present administration to take a look at New England and readjust its views toward its economy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials, telegrams, and letters:

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot-Ledger, Mar. 9, 1959]

POOR REPRESENTATION

New England Members of Congress have failed miserably to protect the welfare of their region.

From all indications, President Eisenhower is going to extend restrictions on oil imports—this time by making voluntary ones permanent.

To be sure, New England Members of Congress have protested. They have even begged. But still they have failed.

Few, if any other, measures undertaken by the Eisenhower administration have done as much harm to the northeastern United States as the imposition of oil import quotas.

And the tragedy is they cannot be justified on any grounds.

Disregard, for the moment, any arguments about the need to preserve domestic oil for national defense and to trade with other countries.

If oil import restrictions could create more jobs in Texas and Oklahoma than they jeopardize in New England, the Eisenhower administration would have a case.

But this is not the situation at all. Texas and Oklahoma oil producers simply want to market all the petroleum they can find.

They claim that it is necessary for the United States to have a large oil producing capacity in case of war.

This is merely propaganda to conceal their desire for bigger and bigger profits.

The United States has sufficient oil producing capacity right now for a big war. For if a big war were started, it would be over quickly.

In case of a limited war, the United States would not be cut off from all foreign oil sources. In fact, in the case of oil from Canada, it is piped in and therefore free from enemy action on the high seas.

As long as foreign oil is available, the United States should burn as much of it as possible in order to conserve the domestic supply.

Defense purposes aside, the existence of a large supply of domestic oil prevents foreign suppliers from raising their prices unnecessarily.

The relatively few jobs oil import quotas may provide in Texas and Oklahoma are being far outweighed by the penalty forced upon New England.

New England has few natural resources. Its only indigenous source of energy is waterpower and this is not sufficient when converted to electricity to run all its factories.

If New England is to avoid decay, it must have another inexpensive source of power. Fuel oil meets this requirement better than coal. And energy from atomic power at competitive prices is still a long way off.

Oil import restrictions force New Englanders to pay higher prices for fuel to heat homes and run factories.

We do not know if New England Members of Congress could have persuaded Mr. Eisenhower to change his mind on this matter.

But we believe that they could have tried harder.

Little attention appeared to be given by New England Congressmen until Mr. Eisenhower extended the temporary restrictions briefly until permanent ones were ready.

Various explanations have been given for Mr. Eisenhower's stand. Cynics say that he is still paying off his election debts to Texas oil interests.

It is true that Texas does wield a great deal of influence in Washington. Both Houses of Congress are controlled by Texans.

President Eisenhower must deal with Senator LYNDON JOHNSON and Speaker SAM RAYBURN in order to get his legislative program through Congress.

But we believe that if New England had an impressive spokesman, particularly in Republican ranks, the administration would have had a difficult time maintaining its position.

Granted there would be fewer jobs in the oil industry in Texas and Oklahoma if there were no restrictions on petroleum imports.

But this is more than counterbalanced by any one of the number of elements in the picture.

The United States must trade with other nations if it wants to check the spread of Russian influence and to raise its own standard of living. We know of no better commodity to import than oil.

In order to appease Texas oil interests and their representatives in Congress, the Eisenhower administration hurts relations with friendly foreign nations, permits the depletion of U.S. reserves, and harms the economies of densely populated seaboard States.

Ineffective as they have been to date in this field, New England Members of Congress must continue to fight oil import restrictions.

Their region's very economic health depends upon their removal.

---

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot Ledger, Mar. 17, 1959]

FIGHT MUST CONTINUE

It is probably belaboring a point to continue to protest the oil import restrictions that the Eisenhower administration has seen fit to perpetuate.

Spring is around the corner and soon New Englanders who use fuel oil to heat their homes will forget about the price of petroleum.

Nevertheless, the long-range effect of these oil import restrictions upon New England is so serious that every member of this region's congressional delegation should be working to get rid of them.

Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts, is not exaggerating when he says that New England could become the Nation's No. 1 economic problem if the Federal Government's economic policy continues to work to the disadvantage of this region.

No realistic person can expect the speech Mr. CONTE prepared for House delivery this week will change the situation.

The Congressman from the westernmost district in Massachusetts, is only a freshman lawmaker.

Moreover, he has spoken after the Eisenhower administration has made up its mind to continue these oil import restrictions.

His speech will take its place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD next to hundreds of other offerings from Members of Congress that are presented on any given day when Congress is in session.

It is significant, however, that a Republican Congressman has attacked a decision of a Republican President. This shows that the issue transcends party lines.

As far as Massachusetts is concerned, the persons who should be in the forefront against this outrageous action of the Eisenhower administration are Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY.

Of the two, SALTONSTALL should be in the stronger position since he is not only a Republican but also a Republican up for reelection next year.

At one time or another every section of the United States has asked Congress to pass legislation that is detrimental to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

New England has been as guilty of this practice as Texas and Oklahoma have been in the case of oil import restrictions.

New England, for example, has sought Federal action to protect the textile industry from foreign competition when such protection could not be justified.

Members of Congress from New England have intervened on the behalf of New England shipyards that were being underbid by more enterprising shipyards in other parts of the country.

But in the case of oil imports, New Englanders have no apologies to make.

As we pointed out in an editorial March 9, a day before the Eisenhower announcement, oil import restrictions cannot even be defended on the grounds they protect more jobs in Texas and Oklahoma than they imperil in New England.

In the long run, New England will only prosper if there is freer trade among nations. New England does not have many natural resources. It does not produce a basic farm crop, with the possible exception of potatoes in northern Maine.

If it is to support large numbers of people, New England must import raw materials and engage in manufacturing that requires relatively high degrees of skills.

The New England textile industry, for example, cannot even compete with other sections of the country much less the Japanese because it is not a skilled manufacturing process.

New England does have a great asset in its seacoast. This enables it to import raw materials from all over the world cheaply.

New England should be allowed to import oil without restrictions as long as the domestic oil producers are not suffering.

And, rest assured, the domestic oil producers are not suffering. They merely want to increase their profits at the expense of the rest of the country and to the detriment of American foreign relations.

We congratulate Congressman CONTÉ for placing himself on record against the Eisenhower oil import restrictions.

We hope that other Members of Congress from New England will show signs of waking up.

They will get nowhere if they limit their efforts to roundrobin letters sent to the White House at the last, futile minute.

---

FEBRUARY 26, 1959.

ADMINISTRATOR,
*Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of a telegram received from the vice president of the New England Council with reference to the proposed action of including residual oil in import quota restrictions.

I would like to go on record as being strongly opposed to this proposed action.

Would you keep me advised as to the developments on this matter.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. BURKE, *Member of Congress.*

[Enclosure.]

---

BOSTON MASS.,
*February 19, 1959.*

Hon. JAMES A. BURKE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Rumored that Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and Gerald Morgan, White House staff, now planning inclusion of residual oil in import quota restrictions. New England Council opposes such inclusion and urges your help.

GARDNER A. CAVERLY,
*Executive Vice President,*
*New England Council.*

---

WELLESLEY, MASS.,
*March 4, 1959.*

Hon. JAMES A. BURKE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Understand White House presently considering mandatory restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil. At the least this will be an economic blow to New England due to increased fuel costs. One percent shortage in winter of 1947–48 drove New England fuel costs up at rate of at least $100 million annually. In addition with domestic oil industry incapable of making up artificially created shortages and oil burning equipment unable to use substitute fuels parts of New England may be completely without suitable fuel. Urge your intervention to prevent this action which could seriously damage New England economy.

JOHN P. BIRMINGHAM,
*President, White Fuel Corp.,*
*Boston, Mass.*

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
*Boston, Mass., February 11, 1959.*

To: New England delegation.

From: Gardner A. Caverly, executive vice president.

Subject: Residual fuel oil importation.

I am enclosing for your interest and information a copy of a recent letter to Mr. Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, concerning residual fuel oil importation.

As you will note from the letter, the membership of the New England Council is deeply concerned about this matter and vigorously opposed any restrictions on the importation of residual oils.

If we at the council may be of any help to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact us.

[Enclosure.]

---

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
*Boston, Mass., February 10, 1959.*

Re: Residual fuel oil importation.

Mr. LEO A. HOEGH,
*Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. HOEGH: We are advised that your office is once again conducting an investigation of imports of crude oil and products and their impact on national security. We would appreciate your including this statement in the RECORD.

The New England Council, a nonpolitical, privately sponsored economic development organization for the six-State area, and composed of approximately 3,000 members, has been historically opposed to any restrictions curbing the importation of residual fuel oils. Our area is one of the most heavily industrialized sections of this country and one of the largest users of residual oils.

The following statistics on the consumption of residual oil in New England are taken from U.S. Bureau of Mines:

| State | Barrels | Percent of New England |
|---|---|---|
| Connecticut | 12,712,000 | 21.0 |
| Maine | 5,063,000 | 8.0 |
| Massachusetts | 28,744,000 | 48.0 |
| New Hampshire | 2,096,000 | 3.5 |
| Rhode Island | 11,114,000 | 18.5 |
| Vermont | 380,000 | 1.0 |
| Total, New England | 60,109,000 | 100.0 |

District 1, the east coast, consumes approximately 289,324,000 barrels of residual oil annually. Of this amount, New England alone consumes almost 30 percent. Total U.S. sales of residual oils amount to 540,460,000 barrels and district 1 consumes roughly 54 percent of the U.S. total. It is obvious, therefore, that the economy of the six New England States is extremely sensitive to any price fluctuations or differentials of residual oil.

Because of the multiplicity of our small industrial concerns and our great distance from fuel sources, the cost of fuels are a real factor in our economy.

We would like to quote for the record, the following policy statement concerning residual fuel oils, adopted by the board of directors of the New England Council on September 12, 1957.

"The economy of New England is heavily dependent upon an ample supply of fairly priced fuels. These fuels are vital to the healthy condition of this area, which has long suffered a substantial rail and freight

disadvantage for its raw materials and manufactured goods.

"Therefore, the New England Council vigorously opposes artificial controls which tend to increase the price of fuels or curtail the amount of fuels entering New England. The council specifically opposes any restrictions curbing the importation of residual oils."

Sincerely yours,

GARDNER A. CAVERLY,
*Executive Vice President.*

---

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND
DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
*Washington, D.C., March 5, 1959.*

Hon. JAMES A. BURKE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. BURKE: This will acknowledge your letter of February 26 with enclosure, expressing your interest in the oil imports matter. Your views have been made a part of the record.

Careful consideration has been given to the problems of the citizens and of industry in the New England area during the course of our investigation.

My findings and recommendations have been presented to the President. He has directed a continuation of the voluntary oil import program so that he may study the report. Any information must emanate from the White House.

Sincerely,

LEO A. HOEGH.

---

## Visit of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan—Letter of Ukranian Congress Committee of America

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on March 18, 1959, the Ukranian Congress Committee of America, through Dr. Leve Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, wrote a letter to the President of the United States in connection with the forthcoming conference of the President with Prime Minister Harold Macmillan.

Because of the pertinency of the letter to the general problems under consideration, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA,
*March 18, 1959.*

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
*The White House,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your momentous meeting with Prime Minister Harold Macmillan will constitute the fourth important Anglo-American conference in the past 5 years. On each of the previous occasions this committee prayerfully hoped for the full success of the meeting. With reverent emotion in the present crisis it now does so again.

As in the past, we wish also to take this opportunity to briefly express certain views concerning the major subjects that will be discussed at this meeting. In our judgment, despite the technological space and missile novelties of the past 2 years, the paramount foreign policy problems we face today are essentially no different from those in 1957 when the third Anglo-American conference took place. In our communication at that time (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 2, 1958, pp. A3180–A3181) we strongly urged that systematic steps be taken to realize and implement the proposal made on April 22, 1957, by Secretary of State Dulles. His proposal was: "Let us also make apparent to the Soviet rulers our real purpose. We condemn and oppose their imperialism. We seek the liberation of the captive nations." Unfortunately, little was done in this respect. The truly ultimate weapon, freedom-seeking men, has scarcely been utilized.

However, circumstances today are such that a powerful reassertion of this proposal, in the name of world peace with justice, is desperately needed. Along with countless patriotic Americans, we earnestly hope that the results of this conference would underscore this proposal and that dedicated efforts would be made to further our real purpose through the rich variety of peaceful means at our disposal. This can be done with great measure of success, but it requires sustained effort and detailed planning. Nevertheless, at this moment a verbal reassertion of the proposal would in itself decisively rebuff the devious propaganda offensive of Moscow on the Berlin issue and would appropriately give the lie to Mikoyan's latest statements that we are prepared to accede to the status quo of Eastern Europe and Asia.

The manifold significance of a policy statement along these lines, and particularly at this time, may further be seen from an enumeration of the following views. These present views still receive their main logical support from the more extensive observations and explanations presented in our three previous memoranda:

1. Berlin. Your firm position on our interest in the permanent freedom of West Berlin cannot but draw the respectful admiration of every freedom-conscious person, here or abroad. The united support of this position by our Congress reflects the healthy mood of our people. To yield on principle in this case means to irreparably corrupt our general moral posture in world leadership.

In our view, so long as our position regarding the captive nations is clearly and unequivocally maintained, Moscow can ill afford a global conflict now or in the future. History more than adequately demonstrates that imperialist Russia has always hesitated to commit its captive forces in any major war. Three times in this century alone its multi-national forces disintegrated early in the war. The factors accounting for this repeated phenomenon apply today in the face of Moscow's characteristic campaign of bluster about ICBM's and the like. Prior to World War I the Muscovites scared Europe with their alleged military steamroller.

The evidence supporting this view leads one to seriously question, and even reject, the notion that the West could not successfully meet the enemy in any ground war. Actually, this notion is only another product of our false conception of the Soviet Union. As witnessed so often in the past, the qualitative spirit of men is far more determinative than the quantitative number and arms of men. With a sound and strong foreign policy in relation to the substrate empire known as the Soviet Union our fear of Moscow plunging us into war would even be less than what is suggested here. Insecure multinational forces are hardly a basis of calculation for Moscow to risk any major conflict.

2. Flexible tactics. Diverse experience has always proved that the discipline of sustained principle insures the broadest flexibility of tactics and technique. In reality it affords the widest latitude for initiative and courses of offensive action. Thus, in the present crisis we should immediately settle for only a foreign ministers' conference and be pliably prepared to cover all aspects of the German problem as a necessary and inseparable part of the more fundamental problem of a divided and partly captive Europe. Our goal in these negotiations must steadfastly be the expansion of freedom. Anything less would be a compromise of principle. Serving this goal, therefore, flexible tactics can well strive to place all of Berlin and accesses to it under U.N. jurisdiction with strictly neutral forces and airtight guarantees.

These tactics can accommodate, too, a bold airing of the disengagement proposals. To prove that we uphold the principle of national freedom for all aspiring peoples, there is no rational cause for us to hesitate equating Western Germany with a comparable unit like Ukraine which Moscow claims is independent. Poland, Czechoslovakia and other smaller units may then be equated accordingly. Here, too, full guarantees at risk of total war must be sought. Such refreshing tactics of offensive action, rooted in the principle of expanded freedom and also in the knowledge of Moscow's gravest weaknesses, would stultify Moscow's campaign on Berlin.

3. Summit conference. Beneath all of Moscow's created crises and propaganda campaigns is its chief motivation of realizing a summit conference on its own agenda terms. The views we subscribed to in the memorandum submitted to you on the prospect of another summit conference (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 16, 1958, pp. A6375–76) are equally and cogently applicable to the present situation. Although Secretary Dulles approved of these views last April, the U.S.I.A. has taken the foolish course of reducing our broadcasts to several captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. This action has doubtlessly satisfied the strategists of Russian Communist imperialism who have consistently sought the exclusion of any discussion on the captive nations in a summit agenda.

Hoping that the war threat surrounding the Berlin crisis would catapult us into an immediate summit conference, Moscow could successfully insist on this exclusion and attempt to include representatives from its various puppet regimes for the ostensible purpose of dealing primarily with the German issue. If we were to walk into this diplomatic trap, the Russian Communists could then rejoice at their greatest victory since 1920. Regardless of any advance declarations we might make, the captive non-Russian nations, for whom the goal of national independence is supreme, would virtually have their patriotic will sapped as the Moscow propaganda machine would overstress the factual omission of Western concern about them at the summit. This outcome would be one of the most unforgettable tragedies. It would immensely facilitate the consolidation of the Russian Communist empire and unquestionably embolden Moscow's penetrations into the free world.

4. The Middle East. The planned Berlin crisis is not only a springboard for this sort of summit conference but also a smokescreen for Moscow's infiltrative operations in the Middle East. We might well prepare for the next crisis in this area. Historically, the Russian imperialist advance in the Middle East is only a repetition of cycles witnessed in the 19th and preceding centuries. In all these cycles, including the present one, this advance would not be possible if the non-Russian nations in the Caucasus, Ukraine, Turkestan and others were free and independent. Thus, once again, the strategic importance and value of these non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. can be observed. But

again, unfortunately, we not only choose by far more expensive and less effective ways of trying to thwart the imperialistic advances of Russian communism but also practically ignore and event counteract the value of this strategic factor.

5. Actionism against reactionism. We heartily applaud the moral stand you took in your address to the people last Monday evening on the Berlin crisis. As free men and a free nation we cannot but face the realities you described so well with firm principle and fearless resolve. However, we should begin to face up to the nature of our enemy realistically and knowledgeably. We should have no fear whatsoever to designate things by their proper names. To designate our adversary as "the Soviets" is not only inaccurate and misleading but also unfair and unjust to the 110 million non-Russian captives in the prison of nations called the Soviet Union. Our intellects cannot escape the determining facts that the controlling center of this basic imperium is Moscow; that it was the invading Russian hordes under Trotsky who destroyed the independent non-Russian Republics in 1920; that the policies of the U.S.S.R. are dictated by the Russian Communist Party. The same enemy that challenges us is the enemy that destroyed the independence of these non-Russian nations; namely, Rusian Communist imperialism. We faced up to the fact of German Nazi imperialism with no common guilt placed upon the German people. Why now are we so squeamish about the real identity of our present enemy?

Mr. President, your remarks about the future of tensions and challenge that faces us were sobering and sound. For us they implicitly affirmed the fact that cold war activity is inherent in Russian Communist totalitarianism. They clearly indicated an awareness that the deceitful pleas for peace and coexistence by the Kremlin colonialists are only integral parts of this activity. In fact, historically, the unprecedented Russian Empire was largely built upon the techniques and weapons of such neither war nor peace activity—indeed, from Ivan the Terrible down to Nikita the Sanguine.

Nevertheless, these unremitting probings and tests, taken in the cumulative aggregate, will always result in some net gain for Moscow, so long as we passively confine ourselves to our side of the 50-yard line. In the long run, by only continually reacting to situations created by them, we scarcely face a hopeful prospect. No team has ever won anything on the complete defensive. Our recent signing of bilateral pacts with Iran, Turkey, and Pakistan was necessary and commendable, but this was still defensive and reactionist. We possess all the plentiful resources of actionism for expansive freedom and yet, pitifully, allow them to fall into disuse. Last September the Vice President actually said as much when he stated that "It is ironic in the extreme that the United States should ever be cast in the role of opposing legitimate nationalist movements." In no area is this impression more felt than in that of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., the one area which affords the most significant psychological, diplomatic, cultural, and political possibilities for us. Prime Minister Macmillan on his visit to Kiev talked with Ukrainian officials. In this connection, it is hoped that his reactions may somehow become known.

Once again, we wish you and the Prime Minister the fullest measure of success in this fourth Anglo-American conference. We hope that some of these views will receive your due consideration. We are among many who do not think a nuclear war is unthinkable or a ground war cannot be successfully waged against colonial Moscow. But, in total agreement with the recent special committee report of the American Bar Association, we are convinced that neither is necessary if we support a strong independence movement bebind the Iron Curtain.

With God's many blessings upon your health, work, and leadership, I am

Sincerely yours,

LEV. E. DOBRIANSKY,
*Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.*

---

## As the First Step Toward National Unity on the Labor-Management Front the New Jersey Labor Herald Proposes a Statewide Conference in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech at the University of California, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor Millard Cass pointed out that labor and management can and should do more for themselves and for our country by trying to get along together than by trying to harm each other.

Now the New Jersey Labor Herald, a splendid publication officially endorsed by the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, has called for a statewide conference in New Jersey as a first step toward national unity on the labor-management front.

It is expected that in the near future representatives of management and labor in New Jersey will meet on an informal basis for the purpose of laying the groundwork for a statewide conference. I want to say that I welcome such a conference and wish both management and labor every success in this great endeavor.

I include here an editorial from the February 1959 issue of the New Jersey Labor Herald on this subject:

NOTHING IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR MEN OF GOOD WILL

Since its inception more than 20 years ago, the Labor Herald has consistentlly advocated a commonsense approach to the complex problem of labor-management relations. We've not only preached a policy of live and let live, but the record will show that we sincerely practiced that constructive philosophy.

This writer, while a member of the New Jersey Legislature, not only conceived the idea of creating a State-sponsored instrument designed to bring together these two important elements in our society, but also had the privilege of piloting to enactment the necessary legislation for the project.

The result, achieved with the aid and encouragement of former Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, stands today, after more than a decade of service, as a signpost pointing toward the ultimate goal—industrial peace.

We refer, of course, with pardonable pride, to the Institute of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers University; the only educational enterprise of its kind in this country.

In the December edition of the Labor Herald we once again, in the spirit of Christmas, addressed ourselves editorially to the masters of industry, in a sincere effort to penetrate the synthetic barrier that for so long has delayed labor-management accord, without which there can be no lasting prosperity in America. The editorial in question is reprinted below.

Former efforts to reach into the hearts and minds of our industrial leaders proved fruitless. Antagonism, generated over the years on both sides of the industrial relations question seemed to have become chronic. However, our most recent effort found a responsive chord in the heart of the newly elected president of the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Stanley C. Hope, whose reply to our proposal is submitted herewith.

The mechanics of bringing together the leaders of labor and management, on the national level, we have submitted to AFL–CIO President George Meany, where it rightfully belongs. Mr. Meany has often evinced his readiness to meet with the leaders of NAM and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, more than half way, in the interest of more friendly relations.

We feel confident that Mr. Hope's desire for a frank and factual discussion of the ingredients for industrial peace, will be entirely satisfied.

In the meantime, after listening to the excellent address on this very subject by President Lansing Shield, of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce, at the recent congressional dinner in Washington (published elsewhere in this issue), we respectfully submit that a real beginning can be made by implementing the "meat" of that speech on the State level.

The forum of the Institute of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers would be an ideal locale for such a Garden State industrial conference.

The editorial of last December follows:

"THE WITHERED OLIVE BRANCH

"In the spirit of 'The Prince of Peace,' whose birth is celebrated at this season, we once again etxend a sincere invitation to the masters of American industry, to cease sharpening their spears, and agree to confer with leaders of organized labor, in the hope that our tremendous joint powers may, at long last, be devoted to the future welfare of our country.

"Surely, the millions of dollars wasted by the National Association of Manufacturers and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in financing hate-labor campaigns, could more profitably be utilized in helping such fields as higher education, or, even the sincere enhancement of sound labor-management relations. To fair, hard-headed business executives this certainly must appeal as good business.

"The only losers when and if labor-management peace is finally achieved, would be the hired mercenaries of NAM who would lose their soft jobs. These parasites thrive solely during travail, generated mostly by themselves.

"In a recent speech at the University of California, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, Millard Cass, pointed out that 'Labor and management, can and should do more for themselves and for our country by trying to get along together, than by trying to harm each other.' Such desirable cooperation should not be too difficult of achievement, he said, when one considers the fact that over the past decade the total working time lost by strikes, has been only one-third of 1 percent.

"This is a remarkable record when more than 80,000 collective-bargaining contracts are negotiated annually, 95 percent without a strike or lockout.

"Labor-management accord could usher in a new era of enlightened capitalism that would excite the admiration of the entire world. In fact, it is the sole hope for the survival of free enterprise in America, as organized labor is the greatest bulwark against the Communist menace.

"An excellent beginning has already been made in several important industries of

national magnitude, including the sprawling electrical field. It is interesting to note the success of periodic conferences, on the national and regional levels, by the National Electrical Contractors Association and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which deal with every phase of the industry through a council on industrial relations. There are a number of other industries in which joint energies are being channeled into plans for the common good.

"They are succesful because they spell good business, higher production and better profits and wages, without benefit of Government meddling.

"We respectfully submit the suggestion for convening of a semiannual labor-management assembly, preferably in Washington, sponsored but not dominated by Government composed of 10 representatives each, from labor and management. We are confident that AFL–CIO President George Meany would welcome such an opportunity.

"Here is a major objective for the newly elected president of the NAM, Mr. Stanley C. Hope who, because of his long and distinguished business career, must realize the potentialities of such an accord. Benefits that could flow from it, for the workers, for management and, what is of utmost importance, for this last bastion of freedom, in a world torn asunder by power-maddened tyrants parading under the blood-soaked banner of communism, stagger the imagination."

THE NAM RESPONSE

"Dear Mr. Hermann: I appreciate the spirit which prompted your editorial 'The Withered Olive Branch,' and your letter to me of January 5. In common with virtually all employers of labor that I know, I believe that labor and management can do more for themselves and for their country by trying to get along together than by trying to harm each other, as Under Secretary of Labor Millard Cass so correctly pointed out.

"However, I am compelled to take issue with you on the basic premise of your editorial. You say that the National Association of Manufacturers wastes millions of dollars on hate labor campaigns, which benefit only the hired mercenaries on the NAM staff. This association does not and will not engage in hate labor campaigns. However, we do uphold the principles of a free, competitive economy and attempt to create public understanding of sound fiscal and economic policies.

"American management, and NAM, would be more than happy to see such differences as exist discussed on the basis of fact and not fiction. We believe that if both sides of the bargaining table will acknowledge truth when it is presented, and then be willing to go where the facts take them, the kind of cooperative effort for the good of everyone which you hope for will become a reality.

"It cannot become a reality, however, if both sides continue to insist that only their own views are right, regardless of the facts, and insist on complete acceptance of their own viewpoints as the price of cooperation.

STANLEY C. HOPE,
*President National Association of Manufacturers.*
NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 28, 1959.*

## National Rice Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Wynne Progress, a weekly newspaper printed at Wynne, Cross County, Ark., has for its editor Mr. W. M. (Bill) Courtney, one of those newspapermen who feel that their newspaper should carry both the news and the editorial comment to render the greatest service to its readers.

Bill Courtney has written a splendid editorial on the wonder food, rice, which is a part of the observance in this country of National Rice Week. This editorial points up the importance of rice as a food and as one of the most valuable segments of our American agricultural economy.

Alluding to the fact that rice is a $235 million crop to American farmers, Bill Courtney points out that—

If the American public would serve rice only three times a week, surpluses will disappear, acreage allotments will increase, and prosperity will be increased for rice growers, millers, dryers and all in businesses related to rice.

Bill Courtney's splendid newspaper was one of the many in the Nation which reprinted the zestful and tasty recipes for rice dishes which were gathered by me several years ago to show the various ways rice might be used in the American diet. Bill Courtney's editorial carries on this campaign to increase the American consumption of rice and to encourage and support this important agricultural endeavor. It is a pleasure to call attention of the Members to Mr. Courtney's full editorial:

[From the Wynne (Ark.) Progress, Mar. 12, 1959]

NATIONAL RICE WEEK

This is National Rice Week and a good time to give due recognition to one of the most interesting and fascinating of agricultural pursuits in the United States—the growing of rice.

To many of us the word "rice" brings to mind paddies in a far-off land with men and women laborers standing knee-deep in water, planting or cultivating the world's most important food crop.

The picture of rice growing in this country is more modern—about as different as a cave man's drawing and a Walt Disney production. The U.S. rice industry has become the world leader in the technology of rice growing and marketing. Here rice is produced from airplane seeding through mechanized harvesting. Modern methods have increased yield, brought new quality to the grain, and introduced milling and packaging processes before undreamed of.

But of the most importance to this area of the country is the fact that rice is a leading crop and its economic importance is steadily rising. It is the No. 1 food crop in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi. The total rice crop in the United States is now about 4.7 billion pounds annually from 1,431,200 acres under cultivation. About half of this is exported. But it is high time that more attention be given to the value of rice as a food in this country.

An association called the Rice Industry was formed a little more than a year ago at a meeting in Houston to do just that. A group of 100 rice leaders, including most of the leading producers, millers, and dryers of this area, joined together to increase the present U.S. consumption of rice so that its domestic use will be doubled. They have a promotion program to introduce rice to more people everywhere in our Nation. The per capita consumption of rice as a food in the United States is now about 6 pounds, or 1.6 servings per week. If the American public will serve rice only three times a week, surpluses will disappear, acreage allotments will increase, and prosperity will be increased for rice growers, millers, dryers, and all others in businesses related to rice.

Rice is a $235 million crop in America and is of particular concern to this area. The efforts of food nutritionists to call the attention of the American people to the food values of this native crop and to the attractiveness of rice as a tasty table dish should have the support of everyone.

## Small Business Administration 11th Semiannual Report, December 31, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, following 5 years of existence as a temporary agency the Small Business Administration was granted a permanent status by the 85th Congress. President Eisenhower had urged this status for the Small Business Administration. The President has further evidenced his confidence in the work of this agency by designating its Administrator, the Honorable Wendell B. Barnes, a member of the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business and on all important interagency groups which either directly or indirectly deal with matters affecting small business.

The SBA Administrator is chairman of the Loan Policy Board which has progressively and affirmatively broadened the scope of the agency's lending activities within the proscribed limits of the Small Business Act, as amended.

The 85th Congress added many important duties and responsibilities on the SBA in the amended Small Business Act of 1958. The last half of 1958 saw the Small Business Administration get started on a pioneering effort in the financing of small-business enterprises through creation of privately-owned and privately-operated small business investment companies. This activity is the outgrowth of enactment by Congress on August 21, 1958, of the Small Business Investment Act. The Congress also added authority to the Small Business Act in the fields of Government procurement, Government disposal of property, research, and development, and cooperation with State agencies and public and private educational institutions, with limited grants for research into problems of small business. Of course, amendments increasing the ceiling on loans to single business organizations to $350,000 and the lowering of the interest rate to 5½ percent on SBA's share of loans, either direct or in participation with local banks, are important to small business.

These duties which have been added to the Small Business Administration's responsibilities and the granting of a permanent status are achievements of lasting benefit to the small-business sector of our economy. Hence, the semiannual reports of the Small Business Administration take on an added interest and im-

portance not only to Members of Congress, but to businessmen throughout our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Small Business Committee which has played an important role in the establishment of the Small Business Administration and as the senior Republican Member of that committee, I am pleased to call attention to SBA's 11th semiannual report. I also request that the Small Business Administration's release describing a few of the important areas covered in the report be included at this point. The release follows:

Activities of the Small Business Administration in the 6-month period ending December 31, 1958, rose to new heights, Administrator Wendell B. Barnes reported to President Eisenhower and Congress today.

BUSINESS LOANS

The agency received a record number of business loan applications—4,981 requesting $282.8 million. The agency also approved a record number of loans—2,626 for a total of $119.7 million. These totals compared with 3,200 applications for $190.7 million and loan approvals for $73.4 million in the same 6-month period of 1957.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT—SBA SETASIDES

Government purchases set aside for small business in this 6-month period by the Small Business Administration, the Department of Defense, and cooperating Federal civilian agencies totaled $428.5 million.

This was the greatest dollar amount of small business setasides in the first half of any fiscal year since start of the agency, Mr. Barnes said. It was almost $50 million more than the setasides in the first half of fiscal 1958.

The setaside program also resulted in 10,521 contract awards totaling $316 million to small business concerns in this reporting period as compared with 5,705 contract awards for $222 million in the same period of 1957.

NEW BUSINESS INCORPORATIONS

The number of new business incorporations reached a record high of 150,263 in 1958. The previous record was 140,775 in 1956. The report states that, although not all incorporations are of newly formed businesses, some being established businesses which formerly were operated as proprietorships or partnerships, the number of incorporations is a significant indicator of the rate of formation of new businesses, particularly small ones.

MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS

In the first 5 months of fiscal 1959, military prime contract awards to small business were approximately $180 million higher than in the comparable period of 1958, increasing to $1,203 million from $1,023 million. Although the dollar volume increased, the small business percentage of military awards was 16.8 compared to 17.2 percent in the same period of 1958.

This lower small business percentage was due to the increased awards for guided missile systems and research and development and to the emergency procurement of petroleum in the Lebanon crisis.

DISASTER LOANS—APPROVALS AND SERVICING

During the period covered by the report—July through December 1958— the Small Business Administration also approved 422 loans totaling $4,841,548 to assist victims of disasters, including small business concerns which had suffered substantial economic injury because of drought or excessive rainfall.

SBA now is servicing approximately 17,000 business and disaster loans, including loans which were made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and which have been transferred to the agency for servicing.

The rapid increase in SBA's loan portfolio has added to the loan servicing problems. To meet these problems, the agency's regional offices are giving increased attention to streamlining of procedures and training of personnel. Greater stress also is being placed on financial counseling and preventive measures to forestall loan delinquencies.

APPROVAL OF LOAN APPLICATIONS INCREASES

The ratio of approvals to loan applications acted upon in the first 6 months of fiscal 1959 was 58.1 percent, compared with 52.4 percent in the same period of the previous year.

The report states that 58.3 percent of the business loans approved by the Small Business Administration in the last 6-month period were in participation with banks.

Although the ratio of participation loan approvals to total loan approvals declined slightly, the percentage of deferred participation loans increased, reversing a downward trend which has prevailed since 1955.

BANK PARTICIPATION FEES REDUCED

In April 1958, the SBA Loan Policy Board reduced by 50 percent the fees charged banks for agency participation in loans on a deferred basis. This reduction has enhanced the attractiveness of deferred participation loans to banks and is partially responsible for the increased percentage of deferred participation loans during this reporting period.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT PROGRAM

The last half of 1958 saw the Small Business Administration get started on a pioneering effort in the financing of small business enterprises through creation of privately owned and privately operated small business investment companies. This effort is the outgrowth of enactment by Congress on August 21, 1958, of the Small Business Investment Act.

Designed to provide equity-type capital and long-term loans to small business concerns, the act also grants to SBA new authority to assist State and local development companies. Numerous details incident to operation of the Investment Division have been largely cleared and final regulations were issued on December 4, 1958, slightly over 3 months after enactment of the law. It then was announced that applications for licenses would be accepted.

The regulations issued by SBA emphasized the great importance of sound management of investment companies to insure accomplishment of the aims of the act. In the short time remaining in 1958, after the regulations were published, a number of applications were received by SBA and given careful review.

SMALL BUSINESS EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

During the 6 months which ended December 31, 1958, the Small Business Administration and 45 leading educational institutions cosponsored 58 courses in administrative management for small business owners and managers.

About 1,500 small businessmen attended the courses. On a cumulative basis, the Agency has cosponsored 477 administrative management courses attended by about 15,000 small business officials since start of the program in 1954.

## Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare finishes marking up the so-called labor reform bill, I believe it to be appropriate that we keep up to date with the editorial attitude of the press around the country.

The press, as is true also of the American public in general, is beginning to become aware of the fact that the bill which will be reported by the committee in this Congress will be a hope, but will not cover the field as completely as it should. In that respect, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with the subject.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABUSES OF PICKETING

All the sponsors of reform legislation in the labor-management field agree that some additional curbs on picketing are essential. The mildest of the measures before Congress, the Kennedy-Ervin bill, would prohibit what Senator KENNEDY has described as "shakedown picketing", the use of picket lines to force an employer to buy off a union boss. The need for such a provision is self-evident. Controversy has arisen because this very limited curb would not touch various other abuses that are no less despicable than a shakedown.

The McClellan Committee has brought to light numerous cases in which picketing has been used as an instrument of blackmail. In Flint, Mich., a Teamster Union local began picketing an employer to force him to sign a collective bargaining contract even though none of his employees belong to the union. When he refused, a fire bomb was tossed into his store, sugar was poured into truck gasoline tanks and employees were assaulted.

It is a common practice for the Teamsters to tell small employers to deliver their employes into the union—or else. The or else may be either blackmail picketing or a secondary boycott against the victim, or both. A small employer has the alternative of yielding or of watching his business destroyed. If he yields, of course, the rights of his employees to join a union of their own choice or not to join any union are grossly violated.

Under the present law employees have a right to vote in a NLRB election on whether they wish to be represented by a union. If they reject the union, however, it may nevertheless picket the plant and perhaps destroy the business and wipe out their jobs. Even in cases where the employer has recognized a union composed of his employees under the terms of the National Labor Relations Act, a stranger union is free to picket the business if the union already established there does not happen to have been certified by the NLRB.

Protection of these collective bargaining rights of employees is no less important than the protection of employers against shakedown picketing. Secretary of Labor Mitchell has proposed amendments to the Kennedy-Ervin bill that would strike at these additional abuses of the picket line. His suggestions are moderate and reasonable, but of course not sacrosanct. If any legislator, labor leader or employer can produce better or more effective methods of curtailing blackmail picketing, it is certainly his duty to do so. But these abuses ought to be dealt with (without impairing any of the legitimate rights of organized labor), and in our opinion an overwhelming majority of the American people want Congress to do its duty in this particular.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 9, 1959]

UNIONS AND THE LAW

Senator MCCLELLAN, whose committee has turned up so much of the corruption and strong-armism in unions, has introduced the first of five measures designed to cure some of the labor movement's ills.

His first bill sets standards to protect the union members' rights to know what goes on in their union and to require financial responsibility from all union officers charged with handling union funds. His other four bills will cover such union practices as secondary boycotts, hot cargo, picketing for purposes of organizing, and certain areas of union-management relations where the National Labor Relations Board declines to exercise jurisdiction and the States, by law, cannot. This creates a no man's land where neither Federal nor State law applies.

Unquestionably, acceptable legislation in these fields, some of it also urged by the administration bill, ought to be adopted in the public interest. There are not many well-known labor leaders, aside from Mr. Hoffa who says no new labor laws should be enacted at all, who would openly oppose more fiscal responsibility for themselves and say-so for the members, and there are a number who would be glad to see these particular reforms come about. As to some of the other restrictions Senator MCCLELLAN proposes, one may be sure a large and vocal number of labor officials will not like at all suggestion that such tools as the secondary boycott and organizational picketing should be taken from their hands.

It is not difficult to understand why they feel that way. Unions have for a very long time operated with a sort of Government carte blanche, because unions are above some of the laws, notably the antitrust statutes, to which all other citizens are answerable. Neither the McClellan nor the administration bills, for all their other merits, touch this basic area.

The freedoms from the Federal laws that restrain all the rest of us are reflected on other levels of government, too. It is not at all strange, really, that when union organizers know they are above some laws that they come to believe they are above almost all law. Not only does this attitude affect the unions; it affects local law authority as well. Police sometimes apply different standards to the law when a union is involved than they do when an individual is involved.

It is this atmosphere that needs to be changed before union leaders can be expected to acknowledge that the public interest is paramount to union interests. But before it can be changed, there must be voices in Congress and elsewhere making clear that the public interest is paramount.

There must, in fact, be many voices like that of L. R. Curtis, the attorney general of Newfoundland, who spoke out recently against violence in a loggers' strike in Canada. He said:

"As the Queen's attorney, I have nothing to do with the right or wrong of the strike. My only duty is to see that the law is not broken by either side. When there is no strike on, no citizen has any right to hold up a truck or a car on the Queen's Highway. No citizen, when there is no strike on, has a right to interfere with another man's property. No citizen, when there is no strike, has any right to obstruct another citizen.

"A thing that was unlawful before the strike is unlawful when the strike is on."

It seems to us that this view expresses a responsible understanding of the relationship of union interests and the public interest. U.S. citizens deserve no less protection. And not only the Nation, but the unions, too, would be better off for equal laws equally applied.

---

[From the Washington Daily News, March 12, 1959]

BILL OF PARTICULARS

Members of the Senate Labor Committee are working on legislation to curb the labor rackets exposed by the MCCLELLAN investigation. So far, the action does not point toward a very strong bill.

The reluctance of the Democrats on the committee, under pressure from the union lobby, to write a tight law is frightening, in view of the MCCLELLAN disclosures. Surely they can hear what Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the investigating committee, has been saying.

Just this week in a New York speech, the Senator spelled out a bill of particulars in support of stronger measures he himself has proposed to correct the abuses revealed by his long inquiry.

"The instability or lack of integrity prevalent today in labor-management relations in this country is appalling," he said.

In the investigation, we have had to deal constantly with people of low character or no character at all. Of 1,200 witnesses so far summoned, more than 200 ducked behind the fifth amendment for fear of incriminating themselves. The evils which have been exposed, he said, are outrageously cruel, corrupt, and contemptible.

"No legitimate union, properly administered by honest and decent officials, would be penalized to any extent or degree whatsoever," the Senator said. "If these provisions are enacted into law, however, the power and opportunity of crooked labor bosses and criminal elements to continue the abuse and exploitation of union members and working people in this country will be substantially curbed and reduced."

That's the issue: Whether union members and their families, the public and decent union officials will be protected; or whether, by not passing such measures, Congress continues to protect the mobsters, thieves, extortionists and murderers exposed by the McClellan committee.

How can any honest and decent union officials, or Senators of like attributes, not know on which side to stand?

---

## Indian Economic Development and U.S. Aid

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in connection with the current efforts of the Government of India to secure from $650 to $800 million in loans from the United States, the World Bank, the United Kingdom, West Germany, Canada, and Japan, to underwrite the hard currency requirements of its second 5-year development plan, I ask unanimous consent that my article, "Indian Economic Development and U.S. Aid," which appeared in a special India supplement of the New York Times, January 25, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND U.S. AID

(By the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

India is a land of great economic and industrial potential. Her vast natural resources fairly cry out for development. Her people are willing and able to work. And her Government recognizes the economic and political necessity of raising living standards through greatly increased production.

In November 1957, Prime Minister Nehru said that India's second 5-year plan would help her to move out of the cow dung age into the sputnik age. When Mr. Nehru speaks of the urgent need for basic economic development he is expressing the authentic aspirations of his 380 million fellow countrymen.

India is at the crossroads. She has chosen democratic institutions to govern her life and her leaders have twice taken their policies to the people in the largest free elections in the world. But if her current 5-year plan fails, one of history's greatest experiments in government by consent may fail. This would be a disaster for India, for Asia, and for the entire free world.

PIVOTAL POSITION

Mainland China has cast her lot with the Soviet Union. Japan has cast her lot with the West. India is in a pivotal position as the most powerful and influential Asian nation unalined in the cold war. This does not mean that India is neutral in the struggle between totalitarianism and democracy, because a strong, democratic and genuinely independent India is an asset to the free world, to international peace and security and to the United States.

If India is to remain free and become economically strong, her second 5-year plan, now in its third year, must suceed just as her first plan succeeded. India's first 5-year plan proved that she was capable of steady economic growth by establishing a sound economic base in which the private sector plays a large and expanding role and by avoiding an excess of governmental regimentation and controls. She succeeded in creating a healthy environment for economic development without employing the totalitarian controls. In India's drive for development she placed primary emphasis on moving toward agricultural self-sufficiency and she made substantial progress in that direction. In contrast, China emphasized heavy industry. China put steel before rice, machines before men.

Placing men and machines in proper balance, India was able to increase her national income by 18 percent, 5 percent beyond the target, by 1956 when the 5-year period ended. In the same period her per capita income rose in spite of a continuing rise in population. Educational opportunities were also extended.

During the first 5-year plan the United States provided about $300 million in aid to India in addition to the special wheat loan of $190 million and World Bank loans totaling about $30 million.

SECOND 5-YEAR PLAN

Today the second 5-year plan is in great peril. It cannot succeed without substantial help from the United States. This presents the American people with a chal-

lenge and an opportunity. In the face of India's great need our compassion and our national self-interest impel us to respond with generosity and realism.

In March 1958 the Department of State announced that the United States had agreed to lend to the Republic of India $225 million to help finance its second 5-year plan. Of this amount $150 million was to be made available by the Export-Import Bank and the remaining $75 million was to come from the Development Loan Fund established by Congress.

This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. The second 5-year plan will breathe a little easier because of it, but it does not guarantee success. Late in 1957 when the Indian Finance Minister visited Europe and the United States he was seeking $600 million in immediate foreign credit to save the plan. The practical alternative to such credit was and is the abandonment of much of India's projected development, with all of the tragic consequences which might follow. Our $225 million loan falls far short of the demonstrated need.

India launched her present 5-year plan in April 1956, at an estimated cost of $15 billion. Of this amount, $12 to $13 billion was to be raised within India in local currency. The remaining $2.5 billion was to be in hard foreign currency which is needed to purchase machinery and supplies from abroad. In the remaining 3 years of the plan $1.4 billion is the absolute minimum required from foreign sources if the plan is to meet its 1961 goals. Not all of this, of course, would have to come from the United States, but much of it will.

In May 1958 the Government of India announced that the second 5-year plan would have to be substantially cut back, perhaps as much as 15 percent, for lack of funds. One of the projects that will suffer in the cutback is the quietly revolutionary community development program which is raising the standards of farming, health, and education in the villages. Since the goals for agriculture—by far the most important sector of the economy—had not been reached in the first 2 years of the present plan, it was announced that food production for 1957–58 would be 2 million tons less than in 1956–57.

ISSUES AT STAKE

The issues at stake are so crucial that an effort on the scale of the Marshall plan is required over and above the aid provided by the mutual security program, the Development Loan Fund, and the Export-Import Bank. The task is beyond these agencies, separately or together.

There are two problems confronting the second 5-year plan. The first and most important problem is the critical need for the foreign exchange necessary for basic industrial development. This will be necessary until India can reduce substantially her present balance of trade deficiency. The second problem is to find a solution for the continuing food crisis in India. Fortunately the United States has the resources and the instruments for helping to solve both of these problems.

Using the rockbottom estimate of a $1.4 billion gap in foreign credits over the next 3 years, it is clear that much remains to be done. After allowing for the $225 million loan announced in March, the possible conversion to rupees of the 1952 wheat loan, additional aid which can be granted through existing U.S. channels and possible funds from non-American sources, there still remains a gap of $900 million.

The U.S. Senate on June 6, 1958, acknowledged the problem when it added to the Mutual Security Act of 1958 a statement of policy declaring that the "Congress recognizes the importance of the economic development of the Republic of India to its people, to democratic values and institutions, and to peace and stability in the world. Consequently it is the sense of the Congress that it is in the interest of the United States to join with other nations in providing support of the type, magnitude, and duration, adequate to assist India to complete successfully its current program for economic development."

This bipartisan Senate declaration is to be commended, but it will become as a sounding brass if it is not translated into bold action by the administration and Congress. I have proposed on the floor of the Senate that the United States attempt to help meet this $900 million deficit by a judicious mixture of direct economic loans and grants. It is clear that if these funds are to be utilized effectively they must be allocated sooner rather than later. In this connection it is encouraging that the Government of India itself seems to prefer working on the basis of long-term low-interest loans than on the basis of grants. Whatever method is used, however, must involve amounts larger than any assistance currently contemplated. I hope that the administration will come up with appropriate proposals and the necesssary leadership to insure their careful consideration.

INVESTMENT ATMOSPHERE

Supplementing all types of aid provided by The U.S. Government, everything possible should be done to build an investment atmosphere in India that will attract private capital from abroad. The Government of India should be commended for the recent steps it has taken to deal with this problem. Modern investors should know by now that they cannot and should not make a killing by putting their money in less developed areas. But any investor has the right to expect a reasonable return for the risks he takes. I believe India has the stability which will make private investment increasingly attractive, especially in certain heavy industries, although friendly governments will need to provide direct loans for some time to come.

Industrial expansion in India depends upon the expansion of basic transportation and communication facilities. These things cannot be accomplished by private enterprise alone any more than the Erie Canal could have been built by American private capital, or our transcontinental railroads built without heavy Government subsidy in the form of land grants. Further, much American industrial development depended upon substantial private investment from abroad.

FOOD SURPLUSES

The United States is also uniquely endowed to help meet India's food crisis. Blessed with a surplus of food and fiber, we can use our surpluses to help fill the need for food and thus contribute to the economic stability necessary for the most effective utilization of the aid we provide.

Many times I have suggested that we transform our domestic surplus problem into a constructive foreign policy asset. Some time ago the Senate passed a bill, which I sponsored, to extend and broaden our agricultural export program under Public Law 480. Unfortunately the House has not yet acted because many of its Members want to make their decision in the context of overall domestic farm legislation.

DOUBLE OPPORTUNITY

The double crisis facing India's 5-year plan presents us with a double opportunity. What we need is a dramatic new Marshall plan of funds and food for India. This plan will contribute both to agricultural and industrial recovery in the United States at a time when our own economy needs a shot in the arm. A substantial portion of any credit extended to India will return to the United States to purchase the tools of economic development. Today a Marshall plan for India will benefit the United States as much as India, just as the European recovery program helped us and our allies. Enlightened self-interest bids us to accept the challenge before us.

## Tax Exempt Status of Certain Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the March 9, 1959, issue of the Lancaster (S.C.) News entitled "Off the Record." This editorial points up the need for denying tax-exempt status to such groups as the Fund for the Repubic because some of their activities do not entitle them to the exemption offered under the Internal Revenue Code.

The Lancaster News is under the able direction of Messrs. Bright, Tucker and Julion Starr, of Lancaster, S.C.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFF THE RECORD

South Carolina, along with some 17 other States, has a right-to-work law. Although they vary somewhat from State to State these laws generally safeguard the right of an individual to hold a job regardless of his membership or nonmembership in a union. Because they make closed or union shops impossible to enforce, right-to-work laws are feared and detested by labor bosses who think less of an individual's rights than the dues they can extract from him under compulsory unionism.

One of the legislative goals of organized labor is a change in the Taft-Hartley law to take away from the States this power to guarantee freedom of employment to their citizens. Because it involves so clearly a genuine freedom, congressional leaders have not responded with enthusiasm to the prodding of labor. Consequently, other and more devious pressures are being massed to force the issue.

Just recently the Fund for the Republic spent a pot full of tax-free foundation money to finance and distribute a report on "Right To Work in Practice," by Frederic Meyers of the University of California. It might be noted that the Fund for the Republic, established originally with Ford Foundation money, almost lost its tax-exempt status for its propagandizing of the leftwing line. It has been repudiated by members of the Ford family, as well, but continues on its way with a slight shift of emphasis to preserve its foundation status.

In sponsoring the Meyers report, the Fund for the Republic is offering a biased, opinionated study calculated to do nothing but confuse the right-to-work issue. Meyers chose for the subject of his treatise the law in Texas, which, as the editor of the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette was quick to point out, is not a typical right-to-work law. The Texas law goes beyond that of other States in that it is designed also to bar collective bargaining by employee majorities.

Why Meyers should use this untypical law as the basis of a study of the wholé subject is known only to himself and managers of the Fund for the Republic, who commissioned him to do the job.

"One would think," continued the Phoenix Gazette editorial, "America would applaud a law which makes it possible for individuals to live up to their moral principles without suffering economic reprisal. Meyers does not think so. He tips his hat politely to the idea that minority rights should not be disregarded, but then creates something he calls an industrial citizen—that is, some-

one who works for a living—and remarks that this industrial citizen can be reasonably required to assume the responsibility of citizenship.

"In case you hadn't guessed, he means union membership when he says citizenship. In other words, Meyers thinks it reasonable to force workers to join a union.

"His entire report is little more than an argument trying to justify this belief. He speaks of the duty of participation in unions. He even indicates that those who abstain from union membership are infringing the rights of others—although what rights these are, he does not specify. And, at the end, he makes the flat statement—a dead giveaway of his own approach—that those who support right-to-work proposals wish essentially to make a public demonstration of the power to defeat the labor movement in the political arena. Nuts. Right-to-work laws are intended to permit the individual, even if he is one out of a thousand, to exercise his liberty, if he wants to. The United States Constitution strives in the same direction."

We have written rather lengthily on this for a simple reason. Unless something is done quickly to unfrock the Meyers report, it is going to be foisted on the public as an example of pure research with foundation sponsorship. Once it has acquired that sanctity, its fallacies will be almost impossible to overtake.

If and when this report reaches Washington legislators would do well to take a closer look at the Fund for the Republic. Is such propagandizing a proper function of a tax-exempt foundation?

## A Colorado Wheat Farmer's Analysis of Farm Income and Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a competent wheat farmer in my district has submitted the following analysis of farm income and expense.

It shows that present price levels give him, as an operator, a 1.1 percent return on his investment if you compute his subsistence or personal income at $3,600 per year.

These calculations appear very modest and reasonable. I commend them to study by those interested in being fair to farm operators.

A COLORADO WHEAT FARMER'S ANALYSIS OF FARM INCOME AND EXPENSE

Here is an example of actual income and actual costs. It is based upon experience of a farm, consisting of 960 acres of good hard land, in the hard-wheat section of northeastern Colorado. This is an owner operated unit, using modern equipment.

The operator is in compliance with the ASC program, planting his aloitted acres to wheat and his excess acres to barley.

The operator combines all of his grain, but hires barley windrowed. He hires extra trucks during harvest. He does all of his own work, except that he hires one extra man during harvest.

He does nearly all of his own repair work and utilizes some work of children during summer. He does his own tax and accounting work.

*Analysis for owner-operator*

| Investment | Real estate | Equipment |
|---|---|---|
| 960 acres land, at $150 per acre | $144,000 | |
| Tractor | | $5,300 |
| Combine | | 8,300 |
| One-way | | 1,000 |
| 2 rod weeders | | 600 |
| 1 chisel | | 1,000 |
| 2 grain drills | | 1,600 |
| 1 truck with hoist | | 4,000 |
| 1 pickup truck (used) | | 1,000 |
| Shop equipment | | 1,000 |
| Shop and storage building | 9,000 | |
| ½ of automobile ($3,000) | | 1,500 |
| Total | 153,000 | 25,300 |
| Total investment | 178,300 | |
| 6 percent interest on investment | 10,698 | |

*Operating expense*

| | |
|---|---|
| Taxes | $1,518.00 |
| Labor | 200.00 |
| Seed | 700.00 |
| Supplies purchased | 200.00 |
| Repairs and maintenance | 750.00 |
| Gas, diesel fuel, oil, and grease | 1,212.80 |
| Insurance | 159.85 |
| Electricty and telephone | 150.00 |
| Trucking | 456.00 |
| Automobile upkeep (farm share) | 100.00 |
| Repairs to wells and buildings | 50.00 |
| Food for hired help | 15.00 |
| Small tools | 5.00 |
| Bookkeeping supplies | 5.00 |
| Total operating expense | 5,521.65 |

*Depreciation*

| | |
|---|---|
| Farm equipment, $25,300 at 10 year life | $2,530.00 |
| Shop and storage building $9,000, 30 years | 300.00 |
| Total depreciation | 2,830.00 |
| Total operating expense | 5,521.65 |
| Total operating expense and depreciation | 8,351.65 |

*Gross income and net income*

| | |
|---|---|
| Income at present prices: | |
| 300 acres wheat, 20 bushels per acre at $1.60 per bushel (6,000 bushels) | $9,600.00 |
| 180 acres barley, 30 bushels per acre at 80 cents per bushel (54,000 bushels) | 4,320.00 |
| 480 acres summer fallow (no income). | |
| Total gross income | 13,920.00 |
| Total operating expense and depreciation | 8,351.65 |
| Net operating income | 5,568.35 |

NOTE.—This is the amount the operator has for his management and labor, for his living for himself and family, to pay income tax, personal tax, car expense, etc., and for interest on his investment.

Allowing nothing for his own labor, and the costs of subsistence, his return is only 3.12 percent on his investment:

Net operating income, $5,568.35, divided by his investment of $178,300, shows that his interest on investment would be only 3.12 percent.

Assuming the labor of the owner is worth $300 per month to manage and operate the farm, which would be $3,600 per year, the net operating income as a return on investment would be only 1.1 percent.

Net operating income, $1,968.35, divided by investment, $178,300, equals interest on investment, 1.1 percent.

It would take a price of $2.60 a bushel for wheat and $1.35 per bushel for barley if the farm income is to cover all costs, or to meet operating expenses, to provide a living for his family, to pay 6 percent interest on investment, and to replace equipment by allowance for depreciation. Here are the calculations:

*Income*

| | |
|---|---|
| Wheat, 300 acres (6,000 bushels at $2.60) | $15,600 |
| Barley, 180 acres (5,400 bushels at $1.35) | 7,290 |
| Total income | 22,890 |

*Expense*

| | |
|---|---|
| Total operating expense and depreciation | $8,351.65 |
| Living expense, $300.00 per month | 3,600.00 |
| 6 percent interest on investment | 10,698.00 |
| Total expense | 22,749.65 |

ANALYSIS FOR LANDLORD AND TENANT OPERATION

In the second example which follows, the same farm operation is analyzed under the premise that the farm is operated by a renter who owns the equipment, and pays the landlord one third of the crops raised as rental.

He also pays $1,200 a year for the use of the buildings.

(NOTE.—The cost of owning a $9,000 quonset-type building is $1,129.80 a year. Forty-nine dollars and eighty cents insurance, $240 taxes, $300 depreciation, $540 interest on investment.)

The operator has a net income, for his labor and investment, at present prices, of $1,614; the landlord gets 2.53 percent return on his investment.

| | |
|---|---|
| Investment by landlord: | |
| 960 acres, at $150 (includes house, well, etc., valued at $9,000) | $144,000 |
| Storage building erected | 9,000 |
| Total investment, landlord | 153,000 |
| Investment by operator: | |
| Tractor | 5,300 |
| Combine | 8,300 |
| 2 rod weeders and hitch | 600 |
| 1 chisel | 1,000 |
| 2 grain drills | 1,600 |
| 1 truck with hoist | 4,000 |
| 1 pickup truck (used) | 1,000 |
| Shop equipment | 1,000 |
| Automobile ($3,000), 50 percent | 1,500 |
| Total investment, operator | 25,300 |
| Combined investment | 178,300 |

*Operating expense (operator)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Taxes and licenses | $332.16 |
| Labor | 200.00 |
| Seed | 700.00 |
| Supplies purchased | 200.00 |
| Repairs and maintenance | 750.00 |
| Gas, diesel fuel, oil, and grease | 1,212.00 |
| Insurance | 159.85 |
| Electricity and telephone | 150.00 |
| Trucking | 456.00 |
| Automobile upkeep (farm share) | 100.00 |
| Repairs to wells, etc. (minor) | 25.00 |
| Rental of buildings (farm share) | 600.00 |
| Machine hire (windrowing) | 225.00 |
| Food for hired help | 15.00 |
| Small tools | 5.00 |
| Bookkeeping supplies | 5.00 |
| Total operating expense | 5,135.81 |

*Depreciation (operator)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Farm equipment ($25,300 at 10 years) | $2,530.00 |
| Operating expense | 5,135.00 |
| Total operating expense and depreciation | 7,665.81 |

*Gross and net income (operator)*

| | |
|---|---|
| 300 acres wheat, at 20 bushels per acre, 6,000 bushels; ⅓ rent, minus 2,000 bushels; operator's share, 4,000 bushels, at $1.60 per bushel | $6,400.00 |
| 180 acres barley, at 30 bushels per acre, 5,400 bushels; ⅓ rent, minus 1,800 bushels; operator's share, 3,600 bushels, at $0.80 per bushel | 2,880.00 |
| Gross income (operator) | 9,280.00 |
| Less operating expense and depreciation | 7,665.81 |
| Net operating income | 1,614.19 |

NOTE.—This is the amount the operator has for his management and labor for, his living for himself and family, to pay personal taxes, car expense, etc., and for interest on his investment of $25,300 in equipment.

*Gross and net income at present prices (landlord)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Income: | |
| 2,000 bushels wheat, at $1.60 per bushel | $3,200.00 |
| 1,800 bushels barley, at $0.80 per bushel | 1,440.00 |
| Rental on buildings ($100 per month) | 1,200.00 |
| Total gross income | 5,840.00 |
| Expenses: | |
| Taxes on land, storage, house, etc | 1,185.84 |
| Insurance on buildings ($12,000 value) | 91.20 |
| Depreciation, 30-year basis | 600.00 |
| Repairs to buildings (½ of 1 percent value) | 90.00 |
| Total expenses | 1,967.04 |
| Net income from investment | 3,872.96 |
| Percentage of interest on investment | 2.53 |

SUMMARY

At $1.60 per bushel for wheat and 80 cents per bushel for barley the owner-operator would have a net operating income of $5,568.35. His income should be $3,600 for wages and $10,698 interest on his investment, which would be $14,298. In other words, he would have an income deficit of $8,729.65.

At $1.60 per bushel for wheat and 80 cents per bushel for barley, a renter-operator would have a net operating income of $1,614.19. His income should be $3,600 for wages and $1,518 interest on his investment, which would be a total of $5,118. In other words, he would have an income deficit of $3,503.81.

At $1.60 per bushel for wheat and 80 cents per bushel for barley, the landlord would have a net income of $3,872.96. His income should be $9,180. In other words, he would have an income deficit of $5,307.04.

Each individual farmer should figure his own farming operation on the basis that has been used in this computation. He should make the proper allowance for depreciation; make an allowance for his wages (if he is the active operator); and make an allowance for interest on his investment, all before figuring his profit.

It is a very common error of farmers to believe that they are profiting on their farm operation, when actually their income is from the depreciation on their equipment, the interest on their investment, and from their own labor and the labor of their family.

## Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement I made before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives on H.R. 1253 and related fair trade bills, on March 18, 1959. The statement follows:

I want to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify on H.R. 1253 and the related bills which would have Congress enact a Federal fair trade law. Since these bills will have a direct effect on the distribution of virtually every commodity purchased by the consuming public, your hearings are very important. Before Congress takes any action, it is essential that there be a thoroughgoing study of the impact of fair trade legislation on the public welfare.

In my view these bills contain a complete reversal of congressional policy on resale price maintenance. They will have the effect of an atomic bomb on long established principles that support a competitive free enterprise system.

As you know, I have long been an opponent of the system of price fixing that is permitted by the so-called fair trade laws. The present collapse of fair trade, its repudiation by many States and its rejection by manufacturers that formerly supported it, vindicate the position I have taken.

Notwithstanding our experience with fair trade, however, its advocates persist in their efforts to have the Federal Government assure their private profits at the expense of the consumers and efficient economic progress. Their persistence is all the more amazing in the face of the fact that fair trade, because it shackles wholesalers and retailers to prices that have been established by manufacturers for their own purposes, has been demonstrated in the long run to be detrimental to the best interests of the very groups that support it.

The history of fair trade in the American economy has been a history of failure. Before World War I and for more than 20 years associations of brand-goods manufacturers, led by the American Fair Trade League, unsuccessfully sought a Federal fair trade law. Although Federal price maintenance bills were introduced in every session of Congress from 1914 to 1930, none were passed.

In the panic of the depression years, leadership of the fair trade movement was taken over by wholesale and retail merchant associations, primarily the National Association of Retail Druggists, who concentrated their effort at the State, rather than the Federal, level. By organizing a powerful lobby of druggists under captains in each district, in the 10 years following 1931, the NARD was able to pressure 45 States into accepting its draft of a fair trade bill. Only three States out of the first 32 that passed the druggists fair trade act had held public hearings.

In 1937, however, the NARD lobby contended to Congress that the States had carefully considered the issues and had adopted fair trade to support the public welfare. Congress nonetheless refused to exempt fair trade practices from the antitrust laws in a separate bill. The NARD was only able to secure enactment of the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Act through the device of attaching it as a rider to the appropriations bill for the District of Columbia.

After World War II the proponents of resale price maintenance received one setback after another. In 1951, the U.S. Supreme Court in the Schwegmann case ruled that Congress in the Miller-Tydings amendment had exempted only those price fixing arrangements which had been agreed upon by the parties. The coercive provisions in the state laws to control the prices of sellers who refused to sign fair trade contracts could not be enforced. Although Congress in 1952, in the McGuire Act, expressly exempted the nonsigner clause, fair trade since has been repudiated in an increasing number of States and abandoned by the manufacturers that were its strongest adherents. At the present time, the Supreme Courts of 16 States have stricken down all or part of their fair trade laws on the ground that they contravened fundamental principles guaranteed by their State constitutions.[1] When you add the States that never did accept fair trade (Vermont, Misosuri, and Texas), there is a total of 19 States opposed to this type of subsidy, which is exacted from the general consuming public.

The principal evil that results from fair trade—the maintenance of artificially high consumer prices—has been exposed in State after State. After the Supreme Court of Ohio ruled the nonsigner clause unconstitutional, for example, prices on automatic coffee-makers quickly dropped from the $39.95 fair trade price to a $29.97 competitive price. Electric frying pans, which had a list price of $19.95 were reduced to $13.87. After an initial flurry of reduced price sales, in Ohio as in the case of other states that outlawed fair trade, the market soon became stable. The dire consequences that had been predicted by the fair traders—widespread business failures, increased concentration, and predatory excesses by monopolists—did not occur. The only result was that the consuming public received the benefit of having prices settle in the competitive market at about 20 percent lower than the former fair trade list prices.

During the debate in the House on the McGuire Act in 1952, I compared prices of identical articles purchased in Peoples Drug Stores in the District of Columbia, a non-fair trade area, and Arlington, Va., and Montgomery County, Md., fair trade areas. This statement shows prices are 20 to 50 percent higher in fair trade stores and is appended to my statement.

Legal rulings, however, have not been the primary causes that have lead to the abandonment of fair trade. Consumer resistance to high prices, mounting unemployment, warehouses stocked with unsold merchandise and the relentless pressure of substitute merchandise from competitive distribution channels were equally as important. Fair trade simply doesn't work. The enormous costs involved in comparison shopping, legal fees and policing fair trade enforcement, alone, have been major causes for its abandonment by the manufacturers.

Fair trade essentially is a system of price-fixing at the retail level which is directly contrary to Federal antitrust principles. As the Supreme Court said in the Schwegmann case, unless expressly exempted by Congress, all fixing of retail prices, whether by agreement or by coercion through the nonsigner clause, is inherently an unreasonable re-

[1] Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, Kansas, Kentucky, Ohio, West Virginia, and Nebraska.

straint of trade. For this reason the Congress has never permitted fair trade to operate in the District of Columbia.

All that Congress has ever done in the past for fair trade is to enact enabling legislation to suspend the Federal antitrust laws in those instances where the States have permitted fair trade. To overcome the manifest failure of fair trade at the State level, now its supporters, again led by the National Association of Retail Druggists, seek to override the States and have the Federal Government proscribe fair trade on a nationwide basis. In this effort they are resurrecting attempts at Federal legislation for resale price maintenance which were abandoned in 1930 after nearly 20 unsuccessful years. This new effort would have Congress enact for the first time, a substantive Federal fair trade law.

H.R. 1253, for example, would amend section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act by adding express authority for a manufacturer "* * * to establish and control, by notice to his distributors, stipulated or minimum resale prices. * * *" In addition, H.R. 1253 makes it unlawful "* * * for any distributor with notice * * * to sell, offer to sell, or advertise * * *" at a different price from the stipulated price or at a lower price than the minimum resale price. In this bill an inherently unreasonable restraint on trade, complete foreclosure of price competition at the retail level, would become an integral part of substantive Federal law. It would repeal the basic antitrust policy that has been embodied in more than half a century of Sherman Act enforcement. It would overturn and sweep away a multitude of court decisions. Even more significant, departures from prices fixed at the whim of manufacturers would constitute a positive violation of Federal law. We cannot scuttle the antitrust laws and abandon the very source of this country's economic well-being to gratify the misguided yearnings of the retail druggists.

Another consequence of H.R. 1253 is that it subjects the Federal Trade Commission to an untenable position. This bill makes the FTC responsible for preventing both unfair methods of competition and deceptive trade practices and, at the same time, for maintaining the prices fixed by all the manufacturers subject to its jurisdiction. H.R. 1253 makes unfair methods of competition and departures from the manufacturers' stipulated or minimum resale price equally unlawful under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Despite the averments of the NARD to the contrary, how can there be any doubt that the FTC would be obliged to enforce and police the fair trade prices authorized in this bill?

It is indeed anomalous that an agency created by Congress to protect and preserve competition should, after a life of 45 years, be converted to an instrument to police and perpetuate unreasonable restraints on trade. And what of the cost? How much is Congress expected to appropriate to enable the FTC to maintain manufacturers' fair trade prices?

It is no answer to say that the FTC would have discretion as to the extent of its activities under the provisions of H.R. 1253. Can there be any doubt that the supporters of fair trade and this bill would severely criticize the FTC in the event it did not discharge its responsibilities as to all of the business conduct the bill makes unlawful?

H.R. 1253 also contains confusing contradictions that will require many lawsuits to resolve. In the bill, section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, contains the enabling provisions of the McGuire Act, carried forward in subsections 5(a)(2), (3) and (4). At the same time, subsections 5(a)(5), (6), (7), (8) and (9), superimpose the provisions that make it a violation of Federal law for a retailer to vary the price charged to the consumer from the price fixed by the manufacturer. There is no indication in the bill as to whether the State law or Federal law is to prevail. If the State law has been held to violate the State constitution, will the Federal law be operative? Can a manufacturer select some States in which he will fix prices and select others in which he will not fix prices? Must the price he fixes be the same in every State, or can he vary it State by State, or even fix differing prices within one State?

The bill authorizes the manufacturer to "* * * establish schedules of resale prices differentiated with reference to any criteria not otherwise unlawful." Does this permit a manufacturer to discriminate between different types of stores in the same State or city on the basis of size, volume of purchases from his competitors, location, or for a host of other reasons?

It is clear that enactment of H.R. 1253, in addition to its price-fixing evils, will open a Pandora's box for litigation. Years would be required to define the commercial and governmental relationships that are affected by this bill.

In addition to the incorporation of resale price maintenance into Federal law for the first time, H.R. 1253 has another innovation that is even more dangerous. The bill delegates to private parties the determination of the content of Federal law as well as the determination of the acts that constitute a violation of Federal law.

H.R. 1253 is tantamount to making the breach of a private commercial contract a Federal offense. The bill would punish those who sell beneath prices established by private individuals.

Under H.R. 1523, the manufacturer is delegated the power to make illegal today what was legal yesterday. Since he can impose or remove fair trade on his goods at his sole discretion by the mere giving of notice, the manufacturer can determine when the retailers' actions are lawful or unlawful. Federal law is made a matter of the will and whim of any manufacturer who makes branded merchandise. The manufacturer can determine whether this particular retailer is to be bound by Federal law, but that another is not to be bound. Moreover, the FTC, an agency of the Federal Government, will have its jurisdiction dependent upon the uncontrolled discretion of mere private parties, the manufacturers.

Surely such a sweeping delegation of the commerce powers of the Congress will never be permitted. Its mere proposal is shocking.

Although the power of Congress under the Constitution to regulate interstate commerce is plenary, I do not think we have the power to abandon its regulation to the extent permitted by H.R. 1253. I believe the factual situation in this instance is comparable to that presented to the Supreme Court when it considered the constitutionality of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Under NRA, legislative power had been delegated "* * * not to a public official responsible to Congress or the Executive, but to private individuals in the industries to be regulated."[2] The Supreme Court ruled: "Such a delegation of legislative power is unknown to our law, and is utterly inconsistent with the constitutional prerogatives and duties of Congress."[3]

When Congress was considering the McGuire Act in 1952, the Judiciary Committee conducted extensive hearings on the effects of fair trade. In this investigation I found that resale price maintenance has the following results:

"1. Concentration of economic power is promoted. The small merchant, with his prices rigidly fixed by fair trade, cannot meet the competition offered by his powerful competitors, the chains, the department stores, and the mail-order houses. Fair trade aids big business at the expense of small business, promotes the growth of monopoly power, and relegates the independent merchant to a subservient position in the economy.

"2. Violations of the antitrust laws, particularly boycotts, intimidation, and discrimination are fostered. Manufacturers have been coerced to maintain fair trade by campaigns to put the offender's merchandise under the counter. Price-cutting outlets have been persuaded by organized pressure to revise their policies. Wholesalers have been exhorted in trade publications to boycott retailers who refuse to conform. Even its stanchest advocates admitted that resale price maintenance programs cannot work effectively in the absence of collective action among retailers, and between retailers and manufacturers.

"3. The consumer is treated unfairly and is required to submit to the artificially high price umbrella that protects the inefficient retailer."

In the face of all these facts, why do the advocates of fair trade want this legislation? They claim they want it to prevent loss-leader sales. Just how extensive are loss-leader sales? The District of Columbia has no fair-trade law, but I have heard no complaints that retail business here is jeopardized by sales below costs. Small business failures in the District of Columbia are no higher than in the States that have fair trade.

There have been no serious studies of the extent of loss-leader selling in the United States in recent years. In 1955 the Canadian Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, however, conducted an extensive investigation of this problem in markets which are comparable to those of the United States. The Canadian Commission found:

"That the practice of selling articles at prices below net purchase cost is not prevalent in any of the lines of trade for which information was obtained in the inquiry. In fact, it appears that sales on such a basis are made infrequently and the evidence does not suggest in any way that selling of this sort is a practice in any line of trade, even among a minority of the dealers."[4]

The cry of "loss-leader" is no more than an epithet applied to a person who sells below the high fair trade markup. There is no evidence that sales below actual cost of acquisition are frequent in either fair trade or nonfair trade States. The high markups of 40 percent to 50 percent on some fair trade goods, however, are notorious. Protection of these high markups from the competition of efficient retailers who are willing to do a profitable business on a lesser margin, is the real objective of fair trade, not the eradication of the loss-leader sellers.

In any event, it is not necessary to impose the fair trade straitjacket on all business to meet this problem. It would be sufficient to pass a law that restricted price cuts on goods to some minimum markup over invoice cost if real objective was to solve the loss-leader problem.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize my opposition to fair trade and to the enactment of these bills that would include it in Federal law. I believe fair trade is bad for the consumer, and for the small retailer. A Federal fair trade law would negate the most fundamental principles that have sustained

[2] *Yakus* v. *United States*, 321 U.S. 414, 424 (1944).

[3] *United States* v. *Schechter Poultry Corp.*, 295 U.S. 495, 537 (1935).

[4] Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, "Report on an Inquiry Into Loss-Leader Selling" (1955) p. 244.

our economy under the free enterprise system.

---

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to read from remarks I have made which were the basis of a minority report on fair trade submitted by certain members of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am going to read in part from that minority report.

"While resale price maintenance injures competition and promotes the concentration of economic power, its most immediate impact is felt by the consumer. Any comparison shopping tour will readily disclose the large savings which can be had on purchases made in the District of Columbia, as against those made across the District line in the fair trade jurisdictions of Virginia or Maryland. Numerous studies have been made which bear these conclusions out. The consumer will no doubt be surprised to discover that Congress intends to prohibit efficient retail establishments from reducing prices on his wares. It will also certainly appear anomalous to the voters of the United States for Congress, during a severe inflationary period, which has necessitated rigid governmental controls to prevent prices from going up, seriously to consider legislation which, under the penalties of Federal law, prohibits the prices of many important commodities from coming down."

I went on one of those shopping tours referred to, and I want to give you the results, in terms of the prices of certain ordinary articles that are purchased at a drugstore, and indicate to you how the public is getting a rooking from so-called fair trade.

I purchased 10 cubic centimeters of u.40 protamine zinc Lilly insulin, used by diabetics. The price in the District of Columbia was 98 cents. The price in Maryland was $1.29. The Maryland price was 32 percent above the District price. In Virginia, in Richmond, for example, the same article, Lilly's insulin, was sold at $1.48. If you can tell me that the public is protected by fair trade, I would like to know why those differences in prices.

I purchased a BD Yale 26-gage, one-half-inch hyponeedle, used to inject insulin into a sick person's body. In the District of Columbia the price was 15 cents. In Virginia the price was 20 cents—33 percent higher in Virginia. In Maryland the price was 23 cents—53 percent more in Maryland.

I purchased 100 Bayer aspirin tablets in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia, the price is 46 cents. What was the price in Virginia? The price was 59 cents. I paid 28 percent more for the same article in Virginia. What was the price in Maryland? Fifty-nine cents. Again, I paid 28 percent more for the same article in Maryland.

I purchased some 12-ounce bottles of Phillips milk of magnesia. Here are the bottles. In the District of Columbia, the price was 34 cents. In Virginia, it was 14 percent higher, or 39 cents. Similarly, in Maryland it was 14 percent higher, or 39 cents.

I purchased some large tubes of Ipana toothpaste. See the difference in these purchases. I paid 27 percent more for the Ipana toothpaste in Virginia than I did in the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia, the price was 37 cents. In Virginia, the price was 47 cents; and likewise in Maryland, it was 47 cents.

I purchased packages of 20 Gillette blueblades. In the District of Columbia, the price was 87 cents, whereas in Virginia I paid 11 percent more, or 98 cents, and also 11 percent more in Maryland, namely, 98 cents.

I purchased 50 cubic centimeters of Mead's Oleum Percomorphum. These are baby vitamins which are very essential to the health of infants and growing children. It is a very, very important product. I paid in the District of Columbia $2.63. When I went to Virginia I had to pay not $2.63 but $3.29, or 25 percent more. In Maryland I had to pay 32 percent more, or $3.49.

Take a laxative like Ex-Lax. In Virginia the price was 25 cents, and in the District of Columbia the price was 19 cents. In Maryland, the price was 28 cents. To take a laxative costs you 47 percent more in the State of Maryland than it does in the District of Columbia. And it costs you 32 percent more in the State of Virginia.

Here are some Dr. West toothbrushes. They were the same price in all three States, an indication that I am not guilty of any particular selectivity to indicate deliberately that the prices are more in one place than in another. When it came to Dr. West's toothbrushes, the price in all three locations was 59 cents.

Now, take the large-size Mennen baby powder. Here they are. In the District of Columbia, the price was 47 cents. In Virginia it was 49 cents, and in Maryland 49 cents.

Mr. Chairman, these are 10 ordinary articles that are everyday needs for housewives, diabetics, and others. The total price in Virginia is $8.23. The total price in the District of Columbia is $7.05; and the total price in Maryland is $8.80. On these 10 articles in Maryland, I paid 25 percent more than I did for the 10 articles when purchased in the District of Columbia. When I went into Virginia I paid 17 percent more for these very same articles that I had purchased in the District of Columbia.

Here is a recapitulation:

| Item | Virginia price | Virginia percent increase over District of Columbia price | District of Columbia price | Maryland price | Maryland percent increase over District of Columbia price |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 cubic centimeters U. 40 protamine zinc Lilly insulin | $0.98 | 0 | $0.98 | $1.29 | 32 |
| | [1] 1.48 | 51 | | | |
| BD Yale 26-gage, ½-inch hypo needle | .20 | 33 | .15 | .23 | 53 |
| 100 Bayer aspirin | .59 | 28 | .46 | .59 | 28 |
| 12 ounces Phillips milk of magnesia | .39 | 14 | .34 | .39 | 14 |
| Large Ipana toothpaste | .47 | 27 | .37 | .47 | 27 |
| 20 Gillette Blueblades | .98 | 11 | .87 | .98 | 11 |
| 50 cubic centimeters Meads oleum percomorphum (baby vitamins) | 3.29 | 25 | 2.63 | 3.49 | 32 |
| 18 Ex-Lax | .25 | 32 | .19 | .28 | 47 |
| Dr. West toothbrush | .59 | 0 | .59 | .59 | 0 |
| Large size Mennen baby powder | .49 | 4 | .47 | .49 | 4 |
| Total | 8.23 | 17 | 7.05 | 8.80 | 25 |

[1] Richmond, Va.

Now I hesitate to place in the well of the House two whisky bottles that I purchased, but I did purchase the whisky, and I have the bottles in this basket.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On the items you have just mentioned, did that include tax, or was that the price without the tax?

Mr. CELLER. That, I understand, is without tax.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. Did the gentleman ever hear of the expression "loss leaders"? I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is the practice in many, many stores, not only in the District of Columbia but throughout the country, in order to induce people to come in and purchase in that store, to have articles on which they obviously lose money. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on many other articles in the same store the purchaser pays a great deal more.

Mr. CELLER. I am going to offer a substitute which gets at the evil of loss leaders, but let us not burn down the house to roast a pig. Let us not indulge in price fixing, which in contrary to the very concept of our antitrust and antimonopoly laws, just to get at loss leaders. In these bills you have a cure worse than the disease. To get at loss leaders you usher in all the evils of price fixing, an evil for worse than loss leaders. In other words, make a direct attack on loss leaders. Do not seek to protect those who want to garner in these huge profits by virtue of vertical as well as horizontal price fixing. Horizonal price fixing is permitted indirectly under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but on that particular point the gentleman has for the first time just advised the House that he proposes to offer a substitute in which he will get at loss leaders. Now, the gentleman is chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Has he at any time proposed any such bill to get at loss leaders?

Mr. CELLER. Of course. The bill has been in the hopper for a long, long time. Certainly I have offered it, and it has been considered. The bill is H.R. 6986, and was introduced on March 11, 1952, some 2 months ago.

As to the whisky, I will not exhibit it. The bottles may disappear too rapidly. But, in any event I purchased a fifth of Black Label Schenley whisky in the District of Columbia at $3.23. What did I pay in Maryland, just across the border, for the same identical bottle? I paid $4.32, a difference of $1.09. So that where fair trade prevails for that particular article, the public has to pay $1.09 more. If you can tell me there is anything fair in that kind of practice, I fail to see it. If you can call that fair trade, then I do not know what the meaning of fair trade is nor does anyone else.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Does the gentleman have any information indicating whether a part of that difference was due to the State tax in the State of Maryland?

Mr. CELLER. No. That has nothing to do with that tax. This was on a straight retail. I am not saying there is no license tax. Naturally, you cannot buy without paying the Federal tax. The Federal taxes are uniform. The Federal and State taxes are involved, but the State tax in those States is of no consequence. Actually the tax in the District of Columbia is 15 cents a fifth, in Maryland the tax is 19 cents a fifth—just

4 cents difference—the total retail price difference due to fair trade is $1.09.

Mr. PRIEST. But the gentleman knows there is a difference in the State taxes.

Mr. CELLER. A very trifling difference, only 4 cents a fifth.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman mind yielding to let the gentleman from Arkansas tell what the difference is?

Mr. CELLER. I am agreeable to having him tell it.

Mr. HARRIS. I will get that and give it to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I will put the information in the RECORD; namely, that the Maryland tax is only 4 cents higher.

I do not care what the tax is; the difference is so inconsequential as to nullify any argument that we are helping the general public by this kind of legislation.

## Mr. Herter's Qualifications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert an article from the Boston Daily Globe for March 6, 1959, about Under Secretary of State Christian Herter, one of our former colleagues who served with honor and distinction as a member of this body and former Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

MR. HERTER'S QUALIFICATIONS

To his press conference, Mr. Eisenhower seemed inclined to promote the Acting Secretary, Under Secretary Christian Herter, to Secretary of State, if that post becomes vacant. The President said that Secretary Dulles "has been, over the years, himself, selecting and training a team. There is a tremendous depth in the State Department of knowledge and understanding and capacity."

Commenting on the immediate situation, Mr. Eisenhower pointed out that "we do have an Acting Secretary and he is responsible until I have designated someone else or designated him in another capacity."

These remarks created the impression that the President would follow in the State Department the same policy of promotion that he has pursued in selections for the Bench. His mention of the Acting Secretary indicates that he has Mr. Herter in mind.

Such an appointment would appear best caculated to serve the interests of the United States at a dangerous time. Among those who have been mentioned, Mr. Herter seems to have the qualifications best suited to the post.

That is no reflection on others. Ambassador Lodge, whose performance at the United Nations has never received the public recognition it deserved, already sits at Cabinet meetings. Under Secretary of State Dillion has served as ambassador at Paris and is the State Department's leading expert in economic matters. There are other distinguished possibilities.

But Mr. Herter's experience is broadest and goes deepest. He was secretary to the American delegation which negotiated the Versailles Treaty after World War I. He headed the congressional committee which toured Europe before funds were appropriated under the Marshall plan. He has been Under Secretary for 2 years.

A Secretary of State is head of a large department. Mr. Herter has had administrative experience during four years as Governor of Massachusetts. As a lawmaker on Beacon Hill, as speaker of the Massachusetts House on Beacon Hill and as a member of the national House of Representatives, he is bound to have learned much which would be of value in the important matter of dealing with Congress.

Mr. Herter has been frequently elected to public office, something neither Mr. Dulles nor Mr. Acheson have ever done. As Secretary of State he might have happier public relations than either of his predecessors enjoyed. His greatest liability is arthritis, which makes him uncomfortable when he walks a distance or stands a long time. He uses crutches and sometimes a wheelchair. But his condition is local, and would hamper him much less in office than polio did Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Herter would enjoy the additional advantage that he is now Acting Secretary, working in direct cooperation with Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eisenhower, who, some believe, is beginning to operate increasingly as his own Secretary of State. Promotion of the Acting Secretary would create the impression of continuity and tend to inspire confidence at home and abroad.

Mr. Herter's experience has given him a grasp of the problems a Secretary of State must face. It is easy to see why the President may consider him as the man best qualified for the post, as he appeared to do at his press conference.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

## Bank Merger Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement I made before the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, on S. 1062, Thursday, March 19, 1959. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, ON S. 1062, MARCH 19, 1959

INTRODUCTION

I appreciate the opportunity to present to this distinguished committee my views concerning S. 1062 which would provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking. I would point out that the views I express are based in considerable part on extensive studies, hearings, and reports of the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee, dealing with the competitive aspects of bank mergers. To summarize my position, I recommend favorable consideration of S. 1062 provided it is amended in the following respects:

First, by prohibiting the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency from approving any bank merger or consolidation where, in any section of the country, the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly;

Second, by requiring the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to give notice to the Attorney General of a proposed merger and to enable him to intervene or offer his views respecting the competitive phases of the transaction;

Third, by requiring notice with opportunity to be heard to the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State in the event the transaction involves State banks;

Fourth, by adoption of a so-called antitrust savings clause for a merger between banks similar to that governing a merger between a holding company and a bank under section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, thus making it clear that applicable provisions of the antitrust laws pertaining to banks are not to be superseded;

Fifth, by adoption of provisions for a hearing on the record.

As background for these legislative recommendations, I propose to discuss first the trend of bank merger activity and the resulting concentration in banking facilities; second, the present provisions of Federal law dealing with bank mergers; and finally, the reasons why the recommended changes in the bill are necessary.

CONCENTRATION OF BANKING FACILITIES

At the outset I would emphasize that enactment of S. 1062 with the recommended amendments is the minimum necessary to maintain a sound, vigorously competitive unit banking system in this country and to arrest a trend which is concentrating control of the Nation's banking business into the hands of fewer and larger financial institutions. At the present time, while there are approximately 13,500 commercial banks in this country, the 100 largest control approximately 46 percent of the Nation's total bank assets, and more than 48 percent of the bank deposits. In 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks own more than 80 percent of all commercial assets. Furthermore, in nine of these financial centers, two banks own more than 60 percent of all commercial bank assets. Again in each of the 16 leading financial centers, as indicated by the following table, the first 2 banks own more than 40 percent of all the commercial assets, the first 4 banks 60 percent.

*Percentage of total assets owned by largest banks in principal financial centers*

| | 4 largest | 2 largest | Largest |
|---|---|---|---|
| New York | 60 | 41.6 | 22.0 |
| Providence | 98 | 93.3 | 57.7 |
| Pittsburgh | 87 | 79.2 | 61.0 |
| Minneapolis | 87 | 76.0 | 39.7 |
| Cleveland | 97 | 72.3 | 74.7 |
| Boston | 83 | 71.6 | 52.2 |
| Chicago | 84 | 66.9 | 34.1 |
| Detroit | 90 | 65.9 | 46.5 |
| Dallas | 84 | 64.9 | 32.8 |
| Atlanta | 92 | 63.9 | 33.2 |
| Richmond | 84 | 55.9 | 33.2 |
| Kansas City | 75 | 53.7 | 34.3 |
| St. Louis | 68 | 53.5 | 28.0 |
| Baltimore | 77 | 44.9 | 24.0 |
| Philadelphia | 69 | 44.6 | 24.7 |
| Washington | 60 | 43.0 | 26.3 |

Source: Superintendent of Banks, New York State. See interim report of the Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on "Corporate and Bank Mergers," p. 30 (84th Cong., 1st sess.). See also House Judiciary Rept. No. 1417 on H.R. 5948, "Bank Mergers", p. 8 (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

Further indicating the degree of concentration is the following table (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 14, 1957, p. 3317) showing as of June 30, 1956, the proportion of assets for each of 54 cities which are classified as central reserve and reserve cities by

first, the largest commercial and second, the 5 largest commercial banks:

*Assets of (1) the largest commercial banks, and (2) the five largest commerical banks as percentages of the total assets of all commercial banks in Central Reserve and Reserve cities—1956*

| City | Percentages as of June 30, 1956 | |
|---|---|---|
| | Largest bank | 5 largest banks |
| Birmingham, Ala | 63.35 | 99.33 |
| Little Rock, Ark | 33.92 | 99.38 |
| San Francisco, Calif | 58.71 | 92.95 |
| Los Angeles, Calif | 39.19 | 93.44 |
| Denver, Colo | 22.48 | 75.80 |
| Pueblo, Colo | 50.42 | 100.00 |
| Washington, D.C | 30.51 | 74.41 |
| Jacksonville, Fla | 34.76 | 94.90 |
| Atlanta, Ga | 35.19 | 93.71 |
| Savannah, Ga | 60.15 | 97.33 |
| Chicago, Ill | 25.78 | 66.61 |
| Indianapolis, Ind | 41.09 | 96.54 |
| Des Moines, Iowa | 31.17 | 91.09 |
| Cedar Rapids, Iowa | 66.04 | 100.00 |
| Sioux City, Iowa | 25.63 | 94.05 |
| Kansas City, Kans | 24.15 | 69.37 |
| Topeka, Kans | 28.73 | 92.37 |
| Wichita, Kans | 47.60 | 94.37 |
| Louisville, Ky | 30.70 | 88.93 |
| New Orleans, La | 39.93 | 100.00 |
| Baltimore, Md | 23.14 | 86.53 |
| Boston, Mass | 54.03 | 90.20 |
| Detroit, Mich | 46.23 | 96.68 |
| Minneapolis, Minn | 38.31 | 87.95 |
| St. Paul, Minn | 55.65 | 83.95 |
| Kansas City, Mo | 34.79 | 78.80 |
| St. Louis, Mo | 27.79 | 73.21 |
| Helena, Mont | 55.85 | 100.00 |
| Omaha, Nebr | 47.93 | 93.92 |
| New York, N.Y | 20.99 | 65.84 |
| Buffalo, N.Y | 52.72 | 100.00 |
| Charlotte, N.C | 50.21 | 97.30 |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 33.77 | 97.50 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 46.91 | 97.74 |
| Columbus, Ohio | 53.46 | 97.26 |
| Toledo, Ohio | 59.12 | 97.61 |
| Oklahoma City, Okla | 48.31 | 88.19 |
| Tulsa, Okla | 42.27 | 92.20 |
| Portland, Oreg | 47.83 | 99.78 |
| Philadelphia, Pa | 25.23 | 79.66 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa | 60.04 | 93.19 |
| Memphis, Tenn | 45.73 | 98.97 |
| Nashville, Tenn | 38.58 | 99.62 |
| Dallas, Tex | 35.84 | 90.75 |
| El Paso, Tex | 47.10 | 100.00 |
| Fort Worth, Tex | 37.39 | 88.33 |
| Houston, Tex | 32.90 | 83.07 |
| San Antonio, Tex | 27.72 | 81.91 |
| Ogden, Utah | 67.54 | 100.00 |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | 24.47 | 92.64 |
| Richmond, Va | 29.60 | 92.64 |
| Seattle, Wash | 49.14 | 99.67 |
| Milwaukee, Wis | 48.19 | 83.10 |

Source: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

The increase in banking concentration has been coupled with a comparative contraction in the credit extended to borrowers by the banking system. As banks have grown larger, they have tended to have fewer dealings with smaller businesses. A study conducted by the Federal Reserve Board demonstrated that the very large banks with deposits of $500 million or more had the least number of loans with small business of all classes of banks, the next to lowest dollar volume of loans with small business, and the smallest percentage of dollar volume of al loans with small business.[1] Considering the decrease in the proportion of small banks in the financial community, the overall drop in credit extended, and the frequent resort to Government agencies for funds, it seems likely that the increasing trend toward concentration has at times entailed credit shortages especially for smaller enterprises.[2]

Moreover, the present degree of concentration is contrary, I think, to the fundamental premise that the banking system of the United States should rely for its vitality on vigorous competition by a multitude of independent banks, locally organized, locally financed, and locally managed. Unlike other countries, such as Great Britain and France, where a few mammoth institutions control nearly all the banking facilities, the American system is based on unit banking—that is, strong, growing community banks which provide a wide range of financial services to the people in the area. It is the unit banking system which has played a key role in the economic development of this country. And it is this kind of system, premised on independent banks effectively competing with each other that must be perpetuated and preserved. For independent banks not only act as a necessary balance wheel to offset the power of big business, they tend to provide a much healthier basis for effective community organization than does the absentee ownership of giant banking institutions. In fact, the independent bank—not the mammoth financial house—provides in many cases the new ideas from which widespread innovations originate.

I am constrained to conclude that unless additional legislative precautions are taken of the kind here recommended to preserve the competition that still exists, there is the very real possibility that banking credit wil be dominated to an ever-increasing extent by a small, tightly knit group.

BANK MERGER ACTIVITY

Largely responsible, in my judgment, for the concentration that now characterizes the banking system, has been a rapidly accelerating trend toward bank mergers which has been a major development in banking over the past 8 years. As shown by the following table, in the period 1950 through 1958, some 1,330 of the Nation's commercial banks have disappeared by way of mergers and consolidations:

*Decreases in number of commercial banks because of consolidations and absorptions*

| | Number |
|---|---|
| 1921 | 305 |
| 1922 | 394 |
| 1923 | 329 |
| 1924 | 373 |
| 1925 | 363 |
| 1926 | 462 |
| 1927 | 567 |
| 1928 | 534 |
| 1929 | 636 |
| 1930 | 769 |
| 1931 | 798 |
| 1932 | 433 |
| 1933 | 322 |
| 1934 | 231 |
| 1935 | 160 |
| 1936 | 176 |
| 1937 | 186 |
| 1938 | 100 |
| 1939 | 119 |
| 1940 | 96 |
| 1941 | 59 |
| 1942 | 89 |
| 1943 | 86 |
| 1944 | 72 |
| 1945 | 79 |
| 1946 | 93 |
| 1947 | 84 |
| 1948 | 75 |
| 1949 | 77 |
| 1950 | 91 |
| 1951 | 82 |
| 1952 | 100 |
| 1953 | 116 |
| 1954 | 207 |
| 1955 | 232 |
| 1956 | 189 |
| 1957 | 162 |
| 1958 | 151 |

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

Of these 1,330 mergers and consolidations, 731 or over one-half involved national bank transactions approved by the Comptroller of the Currency. Total resources of the banks absorbed in these national bank mergers amounted to $11,303,146,733.

Another matter that I know is of interest to this committee is the gradual decline in the total number of banks in the Nation. During the last 35 years the banking population of the Nation has been reduced by more than half; in 1921 there were more than 30,000 banks serving the Nation's creditors and depositors as compared to approximately 13,500 at the present time. True, a large share of the Nation's losses occurred prior to 1933 because of the depression when approximately 9,000 banks were forced to suspend operations during the 4-year period between 1930 and the end of 1933. However, as Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board testified "since 1933 the merger movement has been the major factor in the gradual decline in the total number of banks."[3]

The fact is that the banking population of our country is at a 35-year low despite the postwar boom, despite the 286 percent growth in bank assets, despite the new high level of loans and deposits, despite the greatly increased use of banking services, and despite the enormous growth in the number of depositors.

The continued downtrend in the number of the Nation's banks is even more striking when examined on a regional basis. In New York State, for example, where New York City is widely recognized as the financial capital of the world, there were 611 State-chartered banks in 1926. The State's banking structure weathered the depression with the loss of less than 100 banks between 1929 and 1933, and by 1935 New York State had 471 chartered banks in operation. Yet the number of banks kept decreasing until there are now less than 380, a loss almost as severe as that suffered in the depression years.

Let me make it clear that I would not quarrel with the reduction in the number of independent banks, if thereby only weak banks were eliminated. The fact is, however, that the banks that have been absorbed in merger activity during the past number of years have not been for the most part the financially weak. Nor have they been, in the main, the specialized, the poorly organized, or the inefficiently managed. On the contrary, most of the banks that have been absorbed have been growing, efficient, profitable, vigorously competitive banks taken over at peak earning capacity. In short, the merger pattern is not predominantly a situation where two or more small, inadequately financed or managed banks, falling behind in the competitive race, seek by merging to form a big integrated institution, able to compete on equal terms. Indeed, a large percentage of mergers involved one or more giant banks having assets of $100 million or more. And a large percentage of the absorbed banks had assets in excess of over $50 million.[4] Furthermore, many of these mergers have been primarily the outgrowth of a deliberate effort on the part of certain banks to expand their banking facilities, add to their capital and depositors, and, in general, increase their overall financial strength in the economy.

Take New York City, for instance, where there occurred in 1955 the three largest mergers in the history of the country in terms of total deposits. In March of that year the Chase National Bank with total assets of $5,669 million merged with the Bank of Manhattan Co. with assets of $1,629 million, and the Bronx County Trust Co. with assets of $76 million. This merger provided the new entity, the Chase Manhattan Bank, with total assets of $7,374 million or 21.7 percent of the total assets of all banks in New York City and jumped it to first place in New York City and second place in the Nation.

Also in March 1955 the National City Bank of New York, previously the second largest bank in the United States, with assets of

Footnotes at end of speech.

$5,767 million, took over the First National Bank of New York, which had total assets of $713 million. The new combination, the First National City Bank, then ranked second in the area, with assets of $6,480 million, or 19.1 percent of the total.

Less than a month later the Bankers Trust Co., with assets of $2,207 million, acquired the Public National Bank & Trust Co. of New York, which controlled assets comprising some $562 million. This was only the last of a series of acquisitions by Bankers Trust Co., which has been taking over other banks at a rapid rate for the last several years. Thus, since 1950 Bankers Trust has absorbed such substantial banking institutions as the Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, the Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank.

In December 1954 the Chemical Bank & Trust Co., with assets of $2,081 million, combined with the Corn Exchange Bank & Trust Co., which had assets of $821 million, to form the Chemical Corn Exchange Bank, which now has total assets of $2,902 million.

In part, because of this merger activity, New York City now has only 56 commercial banks, whereas at the opening of the century it had 127. Further, the city's 4 largest banks control 61 percent of all deposits, whereas in 1900 the 4 largest had only 21 percent of the total deposits.

Nor is merger activity in New York City at an end. Of great competitive significance is the proposed merger between the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York and J. P. Morgan & Co., both of which are engaged in commercial banking in the city of New York, primarily as wholesale banks. Guaranty Trust is the 9th largest bank in the Nation, while J. P. Morgan is the 22d largest. This merger not only would result in the new entity becoming the fourth largest bank in the Nation; it would accelerate the merger trend among other city banks. As reported in Business Week of January 10, 1959, "New York bankers predict that if and when [this] merger goes through, a series of competitive realinements will result that won't end until a new 'balance of power' is established among New York banks."

I would emphasize that the New York situation is by no means a local phenomenon. Other leading financial centers have likewise experienced a similar rash of bank-merger activity. In Philadelphia, Pa., for example, the Pennsylvania Co. for Trusts & Banking, the second largest bank in the area, with total assets of $805 million, merged with the First National Bank, which was fifth in size, with total assets of $218 million. The consolidated bank had total assets of about $1,023 million, making it the largest banking institution in the area, with control of 25.3 percent of total banking assets. Prior to that, in 1953, the Tradesman's National Bank & Trust Co., with total assets of $139 million, merged with the Land Title Bank & Trust Co., which had assets of $96 million. Also in 1953 the Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank, with assets of $579 million, acquired the National Bank of Germantown, with assets of $39 million. The Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank itself resulted from a merger in 1951 between the Girard Trust Co., one of the hundred largest banks in the United States, and the Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust Co., another leading bank.

In Pittsburgh, Pa., the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. has risen after a long series of mergers to a point where it has assets of $1,861 million representing 61 percent of the total assets in that area. Between January 1950 and the end of 1954, Mellon National had absorbed at least 13 other banks, many of them small, independent banks which had previously served depositors and borrowers in the suburban communities in the Pittsburgh area. In 1948, eight banks had merged or consolidated by Mellon National and in 1947 it had absorbed two large banks in Pittsburgh and seven banks in the adjacent suburbs.

In Providence, R.I., the Industrial Trust Co., with assets of $312 million, merged in 1954 with the Providence Union National Bank, with assets of $168 million, which gave the resultant Providence Industrial National Bank control of some 57.7 percent of all banking assets in that city.

In California the First Western Bank & Trust Co., of San Francisco, a subsidiary of Tranasamerica Corp., absorbed 14 other California banks in 1954 and increased its assets in the process from $333 million to $798 million.

Many other cities have also experienced analagous bank-merger activity in the last several years; for example, Boston, Cleveland, Dallas, Kansas City, Mo., Cincinnati, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Houston, Indianapolis, Hartford, Portland, Oreg., and Wilmington, Del.[6]

As a result of the depletion in the ranks of the country's banks through mergers, competition among banks has been lessened in communities throughout the Nation. What is more, over 76 counties in the United States have no commercial banking facilities whatsoever, while more than half the counties in the United States have only three or fewer banks serving the needs of the community. Hundreds of small, rural American communities have become bankless towns and many others are served by only one bank in place of two or three which existed in the 1920's.

The conclusion is inescapable, as the Federal Reserve Board testified before our Antitrust Subcommittee, that the bank merger trend is a matter of deep concern. This is particularly true since competition is one of the strongest factors safeguarding a sound banking system. To quote from the testimony of the Chairman of the Reserve Board in June 1955: [6]

"The CHAIRMAN. And would you say, as a very distinguished and very efficient head of the Federal Reserve Board that this merger movement is a matter of deep concern to you and your colleagues on the Board?

"Mr. MARTIN. It is, indeed, Mr. Chairman. As we note in a later paragraph, it is a matter that we have given a great deal of thought to."

Mr. Martin added:

"I would like to reiterate, Mr. Chairman, that this is a trend which has given us very serious concern. * * *" [7]

In March 1957, Mr. Martin of the Reserve Board again emphasized that the bank merger trend was a matter that gave the Board very serious concern.[8]

PRESENT PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW DEALING WITH BANK MERGERS ARE INADEQUATE

Under the National Banking Act, approval of the Comptroller of the Currency is required for any merger between national banks, or between a national bank and a State bank, where the resultant institution is a national bank.[9] In addition, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act [10] requires that approval of certain mergers must be obtained from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency or the Federal Reserve Board, as the case may be, but only where the capital stock or surplus of the resulting bank will be less than the aggregate stock of the two institutions combined. Also, approval of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is required for mergers between insured and noninsured banks.[11] None of these Federal banking statutes applicable to mergers, deals substantively with competition in the field of banking, and in no case is the competitive impact of the merger a necessary element to be considered by Federal banking officials in deciding whether or not to grant approval.

Bank mergers are also circumscribed by the provisions of the Sherman Act of 1890 which prohibits combinations in restraint of trade, attempts to monopolize, or monopolization of trade or commerce. Illegality is established by proof that the merger has actually resulted in an unreasonable lessening of competition; it is immaterial whether the merger was accomplished by stock or asset acquisitions.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act of 1914, on the other hand, deals specifically with corporate and bank mergers and bans those achieved by stock purchases where there is a reasonable probability of a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. Responsibility for enforcing the section insofar as banks are concerned is vested concurrently in the Attorney General and the Federal Reserve Board.

Section 7 was designed to stop mergers beyond the reach of the Sherman Act, but its failure to include mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions resulted in a loophole which so far as nonbanking corporations are concerned was closed by passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950. However, because of revisions made in subsequent versions of various antimerger bills, it became impracticable to include within the scope of the Celler-Kefauver Act corporations other than those subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. This left asset acquisitions by banks unaffected by the new law, since authority to enforce the provisions of section 7 dealing with banks is vested in the Federal Reserve Board and not in the Federal Trade Commission.

Beyond this, virtually all bank mergers are accomplished by asset acquisitions by virtue not only of provisions of Federal law prohibiting member banks of the Federal Reserve System, with a few exceptions, from purchasing corporate stocks, but also of various State statutes prescribing similar limitations. For these reasons, section 7 of the Clayton Act has little value in coping with the mounting trend of bank merger activity. In fact, since section 7 was adopted in 1914, only one proceeding has been instituted—that a case brought by the Federal Reserve Board against the so-called Giannini group controlling Transamerica.

To close this loophole in section 7 and provide Federal enforcement agencies with the same authority to move against bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions, I introduced H.R. 5948 in the 84th Congress. This bill was adopted by the House without dissent on February 6, 1956, but was not brought up on the Senate floor for vote.[12] I might add that the measure was in accordance with the President's recommendations submitted to the Congress in 1956 and repeated in 1957, 1958, and 1959, calling for revision of antitrust legislation to cover bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions.[13]

One month after House passage of H.R. 5948, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to the Senate and House proposed legislation to amend the banking statutes (specifically sec. 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act) so as to give Federal banking agencies sole jurisdiction to approve or disapprove bank mergers. This Treasury Department recommendation was designed, I believe, to head off Senate passage of H.R. 5948. Moreover, it was contrary to the President's recommendation seeking revision via antitrust legislation to cover bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions as envisaged by H.R. 5948. In any event, a Senate bill embodying the Treasury proposal was adopted by the Senate in the 84th Congress and again in the 85th Congress as section 23, chapter 5, title III of the proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957. S. 1062, the subject of the

Footnote at end of speech.

present hearings, is identical with these earlier proposals.

Let me make it clear that despite the foregoing considerations, amendment of the banking laws in this area would not be inconsistent with amendment of the antitrust laws to cover bank mergers accomplished by asset acquisitions provided that changes as here recommended are made in S. 1062. Indeed, to assure against the Judiciary and the Banking Comittees working at cross-purposes with each other in respect to this problem, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee is deferring temporarily consideration of H.R. 4152, a bill I introduced last month which would plug the banking loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act.

SUMMARY OF S. 1062

It is against this background that I turn to S. 1062. That bill would, first, expand provisions of existing law so as to require prior approval by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency for every merger or consolidation involving insured banks. Second, in granting or withholding consent, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as the case may be, would be required to consider not only the usual banking factors, but also to "take into consideration whether the effect (of the proposed transaction) may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly." Finally, the appropriate supervisory agency would be required to consult the other two Federal banking agencies on the question of competition and "may also request the opinion of the Attorney General with respect to such question," although there would be no requirement to do so.

COMPETITIVE CONSIDERATIONS ARE VIRTUALLY IGNORED

Under the bill, competitive considerations would be only one of the various factors that would have to be taken into account by the appropriate Federal banking agency in scrutinizing a proposed bank merger. Beyond this, an entirely novel test is proposed, namely, whether the acquisition "may lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly." Indisputably this proposed standard is far weaker than that of section 7 of the Clayton Act which applies to other businesses and prohibits any merger where the effect of the acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly. Moreover, in the 69 years since passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act no suggestion has been made that its provisions designed to prevent clogs on competition did not apply equally to banking and nonbanking corporations. Nor are the characteristics of the banking industry so unique as to justify such departure. As the Comptroller of the Currency has testified, "It is no less important to have competition in banking, when this can be done soundly, as it is in other fields of commerce and industry." [14] In these circumstances, I must view with the utmost gravity a proposed standard that would provide for the banking industry a preferred and favored position.

It will be recalled that the term "substantially lessen competition" has been imbedded in Federal jurisprudence for 45 years in the course of which it has received judicial content via numerous court interpretations. If we discard this standard for the vague [15] and novel standard of "unduly," we would find ourselves in a sea of trouble. It took years and years to determine through court interpretations what the term "substantially to lessen competition" means. Should S. 1062 be adopted in its present form, not only would the courts have to start all over again in interpreting a vague and untested term, there would be created—and without justification—a dual standard, one for banks, another for nonbanking corporations. The force of these considerations was noted by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. He testified:

"We recognize * * * that you have a legal groundwork for substantial lessening competition already in the framework of the law and that it may not be possible to use unduly lessening competition." [16]

Indeed the present Comptroller of the Currency testified before our Antitrust Subcommittee as follows:

"We have no objection to the principle that the acquisition of one bank by another through purchase, merger, or consolidation should not be permitted if the effect of the acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition. It is no less important to have competition in banking, when this can be done soundly, as it is in other fields of commerce and industry." [17]

Beyond that, it must be recognized that if the Congress should adopt the standard here proposed and proscribe only bank mergers which tend unduly to monopoly, then the Congress in effect, would, be placing its imprimatur of approval on mergers which tend to monopoly. Stated otherwise, adoption of the unduly standard would mean that it is the policy of Congress that a bank merger which tends to monopoly is in the public interest; that only if it tends unduly to monopoly should it be banned. Apt in this connection is the comment of Judge Barnes, former head of the Antitrust Division: "I think that when we talk about 'tendency unduly to create a monopoly' it seems akin to speaking of a man that is not 'unduly dishonest.' I think that we have to pause a little bit to consider if that is exactly what we mean." [18]

Pertinent in this regard also is testimony by the Comptroller of the Currency before our subcommittee:

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Comptroller, as I get it, you would proscribe a merger which tends unduly to monopoly.

"Mr. GIDNEY. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is that right?

"Mr. GIDNEY. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then, the converse, it strikes me, would be true: that in your judgment, then a bank merger that tends to monopoly only, is in the public interest.

"Mr. GIDNEY. I don't——

"Mr. KEATING. Watch out.

"Mr. GIDNEY. I hear something I don't understand too well.

"The CHAIRMAN. I want you to watch out and listen very carefully. You would proscribe or prevent a merger that tends unduly to monopoly——

"Mr. GIDNEY. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then it strikes me if that is sound, then the converse must be true; that in your judgment a bank merger that only tends to a monopoly is in the public interest?

"Mr. GIDNEY. Well, we merely have to find it is not contrary to the public interest, don't we?

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes, you have got to find it; but when you say it is 'unduly,' then it is against the public interest——

"Mr. GIDNEY. Yes; that is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. If it is not 'unduly,' then it is in the public interest and you let it go on.

"Mr. GIDNEY. Well, do we have a neutral position somewhere there? Are we——

"The CHAIRMAN. At least you do not take any action then.

"Mr. GIDNEY. That is right. We have a certain amount of free enterprise, even in the banking system, and if it is not against the public interest, why should we——

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you figure that in the interests of free enterprise, you would allow the thing to go along, even if it tends to monopoly so long as it does not 'unduly'——

"Mr. GIDNEY. I won't accept that, because my difficulty is this 'tends' business.

"Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is that not what you really say? You say you only prevent it when it 'unduly' tends to monopoly.

"Mr. GIDNEY. That is to give us——

"The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, if it does not 'unduly' tend to a monopoly, then in the interests of free enterprise you let it go on without taking any action, even if it only tends to a monopoly and does not tend unduly to a monopoly.

"Mr. GIDNEY. Well, things are a matter of degree. I think we want the word 'unduly' in there so that this 'tends' word is something that we can live with and understand. In other words, we can have——

"The CHAIRMAN. Then your answer is 'Yes,' is that it?

"Mr. GIDNEY. I don't think I want to say 'Yes' on that, sir. I don't understand it well enough." [19]

In these circumstances, I am constrained to agree with the Attorney General who testified on a previous bill identical with S. 1062:

"First, the proposed banking legislation prescribed for bank mergers would weaken section 7 standards. The factor of competition would be only one of numerous considerations to be taken into account by a banking agency in scanning a merger. Beyond that, the competitive considerations of section 23 specified, whether the acquisition may 'lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly' are completely novel and are intended simply to be less stringent than those specified by the Clayton Act, section 7 for other American business. As the result, not only does that proposal prescribe pale antitrust standards, but even that lesser standard is only one of many factors banking agencies must consider. All told, then, that proposal does little more than give 'lip service' to insure competitive enterprise in banking. Banking agencies themselves recognize inherent difficulties in construing this jerry-built standard. While relevant language of the Clayton Act, section 7, has been on the books for almost a half century, proposed section 23's 'unduly' phrasing is completely novel." [20]

The short of the matter is that as former Assistant Attorney General Barnes testified the "proposal does little, if anything, to insure competitive enterprise in banking. Any pretense that it does seems to me hardly more than sham." [21]

The contention has been made that a test of "undue lessening of competition" would provide greater flexibility by permitting the approval of mergers and consolidations which for particular reasons would not be contrary to the public interest. It must be recognized, however, that in some circumstances a transaction may not be contrary to the policy of the antitrust laws even though it may lessen competition. Thus, in the *International Shoe Co.* case (280 U.S. 291), the Supreme Court held that where the concern acquired is: "a corporation with resources so depleted and the prospect of rehabilitation so remote that it faced the grave probability of business failure * * * the purchase of its capital stock by a competitor (there being no other prospective purchaser), not with a purpose to lessen competition, but to facilitate the accumulated business of the purchaser and with the effect of mitigating seriously injurious consequences otherwise probable * * * does not substantially lessen competition or restrain commerce within the intent of the Clayton Act."

On the same principle, the acquisition by a bank of the assets of another bank would not be precluded under the "substantially" test where otherwise there would be a reason-

Footnotes at end of speech.

able probability of the ultimate failure of the acquired bank or where, because of inadequate management, the acquired bank's prospects for survival seem dim.[22]

In addition to the acquisition of a bank which otherwise would be faced with a possibility of failure, there are other circumstances in which, from a banking standpoint, the acquisition of a bank by another bank may be in the public interest. For example, where the acquisition is the most practicable means of dealing with a problem bank having inadequate capital or unsound assets or where the acquired bank has not adequate provision for management succession. Also, where several banks in a small town are compelled by an overbanked situation to resort to unsound competitive practices which may eventually have an adverse effect upon the condition of the banks, the merger of two or more of the banks may well be in the public interest. The same principle applies where there are not adequate banking facilities. These various situations are illustrative of the circumstances where the consummation of the transaction would not be contrary to the public interest and not be banned under the "substantially" test. However, should there be any doubt in this respect, I would recommend that the report of this committee on the proposed legislation make this crystal clear.[23]

Manifestly, therefore, these banking factors do not make necessary abandonment of the "substantially" test. In addition to that, adoption of "unduly" would mean that there would be one standard for bank acquisitions by other banks, another for bank acquisitions by holding companies even though there is no real distinction between the two kinds of transactions. It will be recalled that under the Bank Holding Company Act, section 3,[24] the applicable standard for bank acquisitions is whether in any line of commerce in any section of the country the effect of such acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly. This is indicated by the following extract from a letter which the Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board sent to me on January 18, 1957:

"Section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 provides that nothing therein shall be interpreted as approving any action which may be in violation of existing law, nor is anything herein to constitute a defense to any action or proceeding on account of any prohibited antitrust action or conduct. Also, as you indicate, under the Celler-Kefauver amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act the test is whether the effect of the acquisition may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country.

"Section 3(c) of the Bank Holding Company Act requires the Board, in passing upon each application by a bank holding company for approval of its acquisition of bank stock, to consider certain specific factors, including whether or not the effect of the proposed acquisition would be to expand the size or extent of the holding company system beyond limits consistent with the public interest and the preservation of competition in the field of banking. The concept involved in this factor is a broad one, and in the Board's opinion adequate consideration of the facts in this regard necessarily involves consideration of the standards mentioned in section 7 of the Clayton Act; that is, whether in any line of commerce in any section of the country the effect of such acquisition might be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly." [25]

On the other hand, the test for an acquisition of one bank by another would be whether the effect of the transaction may be to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly. Beyond the fact that there is no basis for such distinction, the Federal Reserve Board would be faced with the grotesque task of having to administer dual standards involving similar types of transactions. Thus, in the case of a merger where the resulting institution is a State member bank, the Board, as the appropriate Federal supervisory agency, would be obliged to follow the "unduly" test. But in the case of a merger involving a bank holding company, the Board would be obliged to follow the "substantially" test. The short of the matter is that confusion would be compounded on confusion.

There is yet another consideration, namely, that the proposal would weaken the competitive standards which the Comptroller of the Currency now professes to follow with respect to bank mergers. As previously indicated, approval of the Comptroller of the Currency is required in all cases of mergers between national banks, or between a national bank and a State bank where the resultant institution is to be operated under a national charter. I point out that the Comptroller of the Currency has stated on numerous occasions that before granting merger approval, he will determine whether its effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly; that he will determine, in short, whether the transaction is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Act. Moreover, the Comptroller has stressed that he would not approve any bank merger or consolidation which he thinks would be a violation of the principles of this act. Thus, in a letter to me dated March 14, 1955, the Comptroller of the Currency stated in part:

"In determining whether the approval of this office will be given to any merger or consolidation, the Comptroller considers, among other things, how the proposed merger will affect the particular banks involved, the soundness of the national banking system, and the convenience and needs of the community concerned. There may be a technical question as to the specific application of section 7 of the Clayton Act to these mergers. However, it has been the practice of the Comptroller before giving his approval to determine whether the effect of the merger, 'in any section of the country * * * may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.' " [26]

Again in March 1957, the Comptroller testified as follows:

"Mr. MALETZ. Is it your practice * * * not to approve any bank merger where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly?

"Mr. GIDNEY. I say, that has been our practice. We have not approved any where it could be.

"Mr. MALETZ. That is your practice?

"Mr. GIDNEY. We have not approved where it could be shown." [27]

The fact is, however, that from 1950 through 1958, the office of the Comptroller approved 731 bank mergers and consolidations involving in respect to banks absorbed total resources of approximately $11 billion.[28] During the period from 1950 to May 1955, that office did not disapprove a single merger application on the basis of competitive considerations. The report of our Subcommittee on Corporate and Bank Mergers issued in December 1955, made the following comment in this connection:

"Comptroller of the Currency, Ray M. Gidney has indicated that before giving his approval to any bank merger or consolidation coming within his jurisdiction, he will determine whether its effect in any section of the country may be substantially to lesesn competition or tend to create a monopoly; in short, he will determine whether the merger is violative of the policy of the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act. Mr. Gidney has stressed that he would not approve any bank merger or consolidation which he considers to be in violation of the principles of this act. But what does the record show? It shows that from 1950 to May 1, 1955, the Comptroller and his predecessors have approved 376 bank mergers and consolidations involving total resources of $7,464 million. It also shows that since 1950 the Comptroller's office has not disapproved a single merger application on the basis of a possible substantial lessening of competition. This is not surprising since the Comptroller's office has 'not issued anything specific to the examiners' in regard to considering anticompetitive factors; it has never notified national bank examiners or 'given them any specific admonition' that it is the Comptroller's policy to disapprove any bank merger violative of the Celler-Kefauver Act. Nor has it required examiners to make findings of fact with regard to competitive considerations in recommending approval or disapproval of proposed bank mergers." [29]

It should be added that within a few weeks after issuance of this report in December 1955, the Comptroller's office promulgated standards for considering the competitive consequences of bank mergers.[30] Furthermore, after the subcommittee hearings, the Comptroller's office in June 1955, for the first time, informally disapproved a merger application because of competitive considerations and followed that up in November 1955 by refusing, for similar reason, to approve certain proposed mergers in cases involving 11 banks. However, in 1955 the office approved 126 bank mergers involving, in respect of banks absorbed, resources of $2,015,225,452. In 1956 it approved 105 bank mergers involving banks absorbed having total resources of $2,380,816,965 and informally disapproved 8 applications for competitive reasons.[31] In 1957 it approved 83 mergers involving banks absorbed having resources of $1,142,000,000, without disapproving any application for competitive reasons. In 1958 it approved 83 mergers involving banks absorbed having resources of $1,704,000,000 while disapproving 2 mergers for competitive reasons.

In sum, during the period from 1950 through 1958, the Comptroller of the Currency approved 731 mergers and disapproved 22 for competitive reasons. This is indicated in greater detail in the following table:

| Year | Mergers approved by the Comptroller of the Currency [1] | | Mergers disapproved by Comptroller of the Currency on basis of competitive considerations | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of absorbed banks | Total resources of absorbed banks | Number of cases | Total resources of banks which would have been absorbed |
| 1950 | 52 | $576,464,143 | 0 | 0 |
| 1951 | 30 | 384,389,647 | 0 | 0 |
| 1952 | 59 | 517,662,108 | 0 | 0 |
| 1953 | 67 | 523,680,925 | 0 | 0 |
| 1954 | 126 | 2,058,262,234 | 0 | 0 |
| 1955 | 126 | 2,015,225,452 | 12 | $182,712,000 |
| 1956 | 105 | 2,380,816,965 | 8 | 355,018,675 |
| 1957 | 83 | 1,142,000,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 1958 | 83 | 1,704,645,259 | 2 | 198,985,000 |
| Total | 731 | 11,303,146,733 | 22 | 736,715,675 |

[1] See hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), pp. 146-171, 171 (85th Cong., 1st sess.). Data for 1958 was supplied to the Antitrust Subcommittee by letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, dated Mar. 16, 1959.

Source: Comptroller of the Currency.

Without in any way singling out the present incumbent—my remarks are applicable to his predecessors as well—it would appear, as the Attorney General has testified, that the office of the Comptroller of

Footnotes at end of speech.

the Currency has tended to give little or no consideration to the question as to whether or not competition would be substantially lessened.[32]

THE APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANK SUPERVISORY AGENCY MUST BE REQUIRED TO GIVE NOTICE TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The obvious reason for failure to take competitive considerations adequately into account is lack of expertise in the antitrust field on the part of Federal bank supervisory agencies. The Comptroller of the Currency has stated and I quote him: "I have no competency in that (the antitrust) field. I do not know what the courts have done."[33]

Similarly, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board pointed out that administration of the banking laws was in an entirely different sphere than enforcement of the antitrust laws. He testified:

"The principal functions of the Federal Reserve System lie in the field of monetary and credit policy and bank supervision. The prosecuting and adjudicatory functions involved in the enforcement of the antitrust laws are only indirectly related to the Board's principal responsibilities. They are of a character quite different from the functions normally exercised by the Board in passing upon particular transactions in the bank supervisory field. In other words, enforcement of the antitrust laws and the function of bank supervision represent, we believe, different spheres of governmental operation."[34]

As the Department of Justice has observed, failure to insure informed advice on competitive factors could have effects far beyond the banking field. Without (the Department's) right to intervene in bank mergers there might be as many different views of section 7 standards and scope as there were agencies charged with this enforcement. The result could well be disparities in view, which in turn, spell real enforcement inequities. Enforcement effectiveness as well requires some procedure for (the) Department's intervention. Otherwise in its overall responsibility for section 7's enforcement—outside of the banking area—(the) Department would be bound by bank merger precedents (it) had no voice in picking or shaping."[35]

In these circumstances, it would be little short of folly to require the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency to obtain the views of the other two banking agencies, but not impose the same requirement in respect to seeking the informed advice of the Department of Justice—the agency specifically charged by Congress with responsibility for examining into competitive implications of proposed mergers. Actually, the Comptroller of the Currency testified before our subcommittee that he didn't really object to a provision requiring him to obtain the opinion of the Attorney General as to the antitrust implications of a proposed merger, provided it was submitted promptly or within a designated period.[36]

Furthermore, on the basis of past experience, unless a requirement of mandatory consultation with the Department is written into law, there is little, if any, likelihood that the Federal banking agencies will seek the informed advice of the Attorney General. Consider, for example, that although the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency approved some 731 mergers in the period from 1950 to 1958, many involving acute competitive problems, in only one instance did the Comptroller seek the Department's advice on the competitive effect of a particular bank merger problem. This was made clear in a letter from Assistant Attorney General Hansen to me, dated March 20, 1957, which reads as follows:

"In Attorney General Herbert Brownell's appearance before your subcommittee on March 6, 1957, it was requested that the Department furnish you with instances in which Comptroller of the Currency Ray M. Gidney sought advice from the Antitrust Division as to whether the effect of a given merger may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. We have reviewed our records and find that in only one instance was the Department's advice sought on the competitive effect of a particular bank merger problem. In that instance, members of the Comptroller's staff conferred informally with the Division around the end of September 1956 on the proposed acquisition of the Peoples Saving Bank of Port Huron (Mich.) by the Michigan National Bank. This proposed acquisition has been subject to a rather thorough investigation because of Sherman Act as well as Clayton Act problems.

"In two other instances, the Comptroller's Office has forwarded information to the Division on bank mergers. On August 8, 1956, the proposed merger of Farmers & Merchants National Bank of Los Angeles and Security First National Bank of Los Angeles was brought to the Division's attention before the Comptroller had given his approval. It was with respect to this merger that I personally talked to Mr. Gidney on the telephone. Lack of section 7 jurisdiction because this transaction was consummated by an acquisition of assets precluded the Department from considering this matter under section 7. On August 17, 1956, the Comptroller called the Division's attention to his approval of the merger of the Delaware Valley Bank & Trust Co. of Bristol (Pa.) and the Philadelphia National Bank of Philadelphia.

"In three other instances, our records show that the Comptroller's office was notified of our interest in certain bank merger problems. Notice was given on January 5, 1955, on the Chase-Manhattan Bank merger; March 7, 1955, on the National City-First National Bank merger, and around the 1st of December 1956, on the pending New York bank holding company formation which is now before the Federal Reserve Board for approval. In the Chase-Manhattan and National City-First National Bank mergers, this Department specifically requested from the Comptroller's office information or data relating to competitive aspects of these mergers. In the pending holding company problems, our requests for information have been mainly channeled through the Federal Reserve Board, the agency with primary jurisdiction over this matter under the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. However, a recent information request has been made directly to the Comptroller's office."[37]

As the Comptroller himself stated in a letter to me dated March 16, 1959:

"We have no established procedure with respect to obtaining the views of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice concerning the competitive consequences of bank mergers, but have on occasion, written to the Department. Should a situation arise in which we deemed it necessary to consult the Antitrust Division we would address a letter to it setting forth the facts. This office would seek the views of the Department of Justice in respect of competitive considerations in cases in which it appeared that there might be involved a violation of the antitrust laws. During the years 1957 and 1958, we had no liaison with the Department of Justice with respect to competitive consequences of a proposed transaction."

WHERE THE CONTINUING INSTITUTION IS TO BE A STATE BANK, NOTICE TO THE STATE BANK SUPERVISOR SHOULD BE REQUIRED

The foregoing considerations are equally applicable in respect to obtaining the views of the appropriate State banking supervisor when the continuing institution is to be a State bank. In such cases it is as necessary to obtain the views of the appropriate local official as it is to obtain the views of the other two Federal banking agencies since the State supervisor usually will have special knowledge of local banking and other matters—factors which are of the highest degree of relevance to a determination as to whether final approval should be granted or withheld. Consequently, I deem it important that the bill be amended to require notification to the appropriate State bank supervisors where the proposed merger will result in creation of a State bank.

NEED FOR ADOPTION OF AN ANTITRUST SAVINGS CLAUSE

Section 11 of the Bank Holding Company Act provides that:

"Nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct."

Purpose of this section is to insure that no provision of the Bank Holding Company Act is to supersede any provision of any other Federal law, particularly those "designed to control monopoly or break up trusts." To quote from the Senate report on the bank holding bill.

"The bill provides that none of its provisions are to be construed as approving any act, action or conduct in violation of existing law. It also provides that nothing in the bill shall constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or later instituted on account of any prohibited anti-trust or monopolistic act, action or conduct. In the opinion of your committee, approvals granted and action permitted under the provisions of this bill are not to supersede the provisions of other Federal laws, particularly those designed to control monopoly or break up trusts. For example, the Clayton Act has been judicially determined to apply to banks. Under the provisions of that act, the Federal Reserve Board has an administrative role to play in determining whether banks comply with the requirements of the Clayton Act. Under the provisions of this bill, any action taken by the Federal Reserve Board in accordance with its terms is not to interfere in any manner with the performance by the Board of such functions as may be assigned to it under the Clayton Act."[38]

Unless this same antitrust savings provision is made applicable to bank mergers, the contention would be advanced that S. 1062 has nullified the strictures of the Sherman Act forbidding any bank merger which results in an unreasonable restraint of trade or monopoly.

What is more, absence of such provision might perhaps render nugatory action that might be taken by the House Judiciary Committee in recommending legislation to plug the loophole in Clayton Act, section 7 so as to cover bank mergers accomplished by asset as well as stock acquisitions. This would necessarily follow if failure to include a savings clause was construed to mean that section 7's provisions dealing with bank mergers had been superseded by the present legislation.[39]

THE BILL SHOULD CONTAIN PROVISIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

In its present form, the bill, S. 1062, makes no provision for public hearings upon applications which may be filed. I am strongly of the opinion that the bill should be amended to include such a provision, at least in cases of disagreement between interested governmental bodies.

The role of the public hearing in modern regulatory procedure is so fundamental as to require a little exposition or defense. A

Footnotes at end of speech.

public hearing serves as a safeguard against arbitrary action; it assures interested parties of an opportunity to present their views, consonant with the dictates of due process; it provides a basis for evaluating the manner in which an agency applies the statutory standards under which it acts; it tends—especially in the circumstances envisaged by this bill, in which three different agencies will simultaneously carry out the objectives of the act—to encourage the development of uniformity in decisions. Most important, a public hearing provides the only adequate basis for judicial review—a testimonial record. In these respects, a public hearing both protects applicants against discriminatory denial of meritorious applications and safeguards the public interest against erosion of vital national principles.

Without provision for hearings, the public is deprived of its only practical opportunity for appraising the quality of regulation; interested parties may or may not be adequately heard; uniformity of regulatory policy is most difficult to achieve, and effective judicial supervision of agency action is greatly hampered. Arbitrary decisions could flourish virtually unchecked. Congress could have no assurance that the standards it promulgates would be administered in accordance with the Congressional intent.

Presumably for all these reasons, the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 does provide for public hearings in cases in which a governmental body expresses disapproval of a proposed acquisition of bank shares or assets. The provision for public hearings of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 should, I believe, be adapted to and included in S. 1062. As so amended, S. 1062 would provide that the federal banking agency with which the application has been filed shall notify both of the other federal banking agencies, the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State, and the Attorney General, and that if any of these bodies or officials within thirty days disapproves the application in writing, the agency before which the application is pending shall schedule a hearing, at the conclusion of which it shall by order grant or deny the application in writing, the agency before which the application is pending shall schedule a hearing, at the conclusion of which it shall by order grant or deny the application upon the hearing record.

In conclusion, I am enclosing as an appendix to my testimony an amendment which contains the changes which I have recommended.

APPENDIX—RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT OF S. 1062

On page 2 strike out the entire sentence beginning with the words "In the case of a merger," on line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "; and for that purpose shall give notice to the other two banking agencies referred to herein and to the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State if the resulting bank is to be a State member bank (except a District bank) or a State nonmember insured bank (except a District bank) and shall allow thirty days within which the views and recommendations of such supervisory authorities may be submitted. The Comptroller, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall not grant consent under this section to any merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities, where in any section of the country the effect thereof may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly, and shall not approve any merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities without first obtaining the views of the Attorney General with respect to such question. In each case the Attorney General shall submit his views and recommendations to the appropriate agency within thirty days.

"If either or both of the other banking agencies or the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State or the Attorney General disapproves the application in writing within thirty days, the Comptroller, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall notify in writing the applicant and the disapproving agency or agencies, or authority, or Attorney General of the date for commencement of a hearing by it on such application. Any such hearing shall be commenced not less than ten nor more than thirty days after the Comptroller, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the Corporation, as the case may be, has given written notice to the applicant of the action of the disapproving agency or agencies, authority, or Attorney General. The length of any such hearing shall be determined by the Comptroller, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the Corporation, as the case may be, but it shall afford all interested parties a reasonable opportunity to testify at such hearing. At the conclusion thereof, the Comptroller, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall by order grant or deny the application on the basis of the record made at such hearing.

"Nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct."

---

[1] See Bank Mergers and Concentration of Banking Facilities, a Staff Report to Subcommitte No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, p. 48 (1952).

[2] Ibid.

[3] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on Current Antitrust Problems, p. 2177 (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

[4] For a list showing the resources of each bank absorbed in a merger transaction approved by the Comptroller of the Currency in the period 1950–56, see hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), pp. 146–171 (85th Cong., 1st sess.). See also hearings before House Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1451 and H.R. 7026 (Proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957), pp. 581–614 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[5] See Interim Report of the Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on Corporate and Bank Mergers, pp. 28–30 (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

[6] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on Current Antitrust Problems, p. 2159 (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

[7] Id. p. 2165.

[8] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), p. 229 (85th Cong., 1st sess.). For a contrary view that the merger trend is not a matter of serious concern, see testimony of Comptroller of the Currency before House Antitrust Subcommittee in March 1957. Id. p. 182.

[9] 40 Ctat. 1043, Public Law 420, 65th Cong., 2d sess. (1918), 12 U.S.C. 33; 44 Stat. 1224, Public Law 639, 69th Cong., 2d sess. (1927), 12 U.S.C. 34a. Approval of the Comptroller of the Currency is not required where a national bank leaves the national system by consolidation or merger with a State bank.

[10] 64 Stat. 873, Public Law 797, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950), 12 U.S.C. 1828(c).

[11] 64 Stat. 873, Public Law 797, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950) 12 U.S.C. 1828(c).

[12] During the 84th Congress, I sponsored a subsequent bill dealing with premerger notification (H.R. 9424) which incorporated the provisions of H.R. 5948. H.R. 9424 was passed by the House without dissent on April 16, 1956, and was reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee on July 27, 1956, too late for final Senate action.

[13] See Economic Report of President, January 23, 1956, pp. 78–9; Economic Report of President, January 23, 1957, p. 51; Economic Report of President, January 20, 1958, p. 64; Economic Report of President, January 20, 1959, p. 53.

[14] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 5948 (bank mergers), p. 71 (84th Cong., 1st sess.). Similarly, in radio and television broadcasting, while licensing by the Federal Communications Commission is required as a condition of entry and while the Commission has detailed statutory power of regulation over broadcast stations, the antitrust laws are fully applicable. See *U.S. v. Radio Corporation of America* (U.S. Supreme Court, Feb. 24, 1958) holding that approval by the Commission of a station exchange does not bar the transaction from attack by the Attorney General under the antitrust laws.

[15] The following illustrates the vagueness of the proposed standard: The Comptroller of the Currency was requested to supply the Antitrust Subcommittee with a list of the types of bank merger situations his office would approve under a test based on a statutory provision requiring that consideration be given to whether the effect thereof may be "to lessen competition unduly or to tend unduly to create a monopoly" but would not approve under a test based on a provision reading "substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly." In reply the Comptroller advised the subcommittee that after having studied the matter carefully, "it was not feasible to supply such a list in the form suggested." Hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), p. 194 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[16] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, Senate Committee on the Judiciary on S. 3341 et al. (Premerger Notification, p. 52) (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

[17] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 5948 (Bank Mergers), p. 71 (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

[18] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary Committee on S. 3341 (Premerger Notification), p. 157 (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

[19] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), p. 73 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[20] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143, p. 73 (84th Cong., 1st sess.). To similar effect, see testimony of Assistant Attorney General Hansen, hearings before House Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1451 and H.R. 7026 (Proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957), p. 1031 (85th Cong., 1st sess.); testimony of Assistant Attorney General Barnes, hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary Committee, on S. 3441, et al. (Premerger Notification), p. 156 (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

[21] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on S. 3341 et al. (Premerger Notification), p. 157 (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

[22] The Department of Justice has given firm assurance that such mergers would be permitted under the "substantially" standard. See testimony of Assistant Attorney General Hansen before House Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1451 and H.R. 7026 (Proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957), pp. 130–131 (85th Cong., 1st sess.) See

also testimony of Attorney General Brownell, subcommittee, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, on Proposed Financial Institutions Act, p. 1014 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[23] See House Judiciary Report No. 1417 on H.R. 5948 (Bank Mergers), pp. 5–6 (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

[24] Proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957, subsec. (c), sec. 54, ch. 9, title II (p. 141).

[25] See opinion of the Federal Reserve Board In Matter of Application of Firstamerica Corporation, Docket No. BHC–46, pp. 22 et seq. See also dissenting statement of Gov. J. L. Robertson.

[26] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, part 3, pp. 3307–8, (84th Cong., 1st sess.). See also Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on Current Antitrust Problems, pp. 452–453, 493, (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

[27] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification); p. 143 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[28] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on Current Antitrust Problems, p. 451 (84th Cong., 1st. sess.). This information has been brought up-to-date in a letter I received from the Comptroller of the Currency dated March 16, 1959.

[29] Interim Report Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on Corporate and Bank Mergers, p. 36 (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

[30] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), pp. 175–176 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[31] Id., pp. 171–172. Attorney General Brownell testified on this point as follows:

"Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Brownell, when the same proposal was up before us last year I gathered some figures from the records of the Comptroller of the Currency on approving and disapproving mergers since 1950. My figure showed that there were 6 years, from 1950 to 1955, inclusive, in which he had approved 460 mergers, had formally disapproved 9, had informally disapproved 13; therefore, he had approved between 96 and 98 percent of all mergers during those 6 years.

"Could you tell me if these figures which I collected are approximately accurate, according to your knowledge?

"Mr. BROWNELL. Yes; they are. And I am not so sure that the 22 that were turned down were turned down on the ground of competitive factors."

Hearings before subcommittee, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on Banking Laws, Financial Institutions Act of 1957, p. 1027 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[32] The Attorney General testified in part as follows:

"Senator DOUGLAS. In other words, up to date the Comptroller of the Currency has tended to give little or no weight to the question as to whether or not competition would be substantially less?

"Mr. BROWNELL. I believe that is a fact. And I think his own testimony indicates that."

Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), p. 177 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[33] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on S. 3341 et al (Premerger Notification), p. 80 (84th Cong., 2d sess.).

[34] Id., p. 49.

[35] Testimony of the Attorney General before Subcommittee, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on Proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957, p. 1032 (85th Cong., 1st sess.). See also testimony of Assistant Attorney General Hansen, hearings before House Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1451 and H.R. 7026 (proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957), p. 131 (85th Cong., 1st sess.); testimony of Assistant Attorney General Barnes, hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary Committee, on S. 3341 et al (Premerger Notification), p. 160 (84th Cong., 2d sess.); testimony of Attorney General Brownell, hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), p. 74 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[36] Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, House Committee on the Judiciary on H.R. 264 and H.R. 2143 (Premerger Notification), p. 131 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

[37] Id., pp. 25–6.

[38] Senate Banking and Currency Rept. No. 1095, p. 10 (84th Cong., 1st sess.).

[39] See hearings, House Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 1451 and H.R. 7026 (proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957), p. 134 (85th Cong., 1st sess.). See also hearings before Subcommittee, Senate Committe on Banking and Currency on Proposed Financial Institutions Act of 1957, p. 1034 (85th Cong., 1st sess.).

---

## Adlai Backs Ike on Berlin: No Knuckling Under Threats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting article which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on March 6, 1959:

ADLAI BACKS IKE ON BERLIN: NO KNUCKLING UNDER THREATS

We meet as Democrats, but the grave crisis in Berlin reminds us again that we must think as Americans; indeed, our parties exist and should exist only as they serve the Nation.

After so much peace talk and propaganda, the Russian leaders have set the stage for another showdown in Berlin—the one place in Europe where the Western Powers are at an extreme tactical disadvantage.

The Soviet plan to maneuver the Western garrisons out of free Berlin was first thrust at us in such an uncompromising and abrupt manner that one could well question whether negotiations with Russia at any level could be anything but fruitless.

Not only were Mr. Macmillan's quiet efforts to sound out Russia's intentions drowned in a tirade of abuse and threats, but senior Russian officers chose this moment to boast of Russia's superiority in death-dealing missiles, and even the talks at Geneva on the control of atomic testing have, at this very time, reached a deadlock on the key issue of inspection.

All the talk of peace, of relaxing tensions, and of better relations hardened into cold uncompromising willfulness and power.

What purpose is served by this sudden return to the brutal hostilities of the cold war? Are such threats and bullyings the language of responsibility when the survival of humanity is at stake? Has Mr. Khrushchev no compassion for the feelings and the fear in so many human hearts? This was not the language of a man of peace. It was the deadly old jargon of the man of power.

IS KREMLIN MAKING TYRANTS' OLD ERROR?

But now, in the last few days another miraculous and sudden change in the Russian climate has taken place, and we are assured that this tough talk was only for campaign purposes. I haven't noticed that the Communist Party needed much help in Russian elections. And I get cold comfort from the Kremlin's fleeting flirtations with sweet reason.

This isn't a time for capricious talk and arbitrary positions by anyone, let alone the heads of states charged with preserving peace. And we are all grateful to Mr. Macmillan for his contrasting restraint, openmindedness, and firm dignity during his trying visit to the Soviet Union.

But why has this crisis been thrust upon us? Why is Mr. Khrushchev stubbornly insisting on his unilateral solution of the German problem? Why is he taking risks of such enormity?

I wonder if the dictators in the Kremlin could be making the mistake that has destroyed nearly all the tyrants of this time—the mistake of underestimating and misunderstanding their opponents? Has Mr. Mikoyan taken back from America the impression of a people enervated by comfort and the foolish slogans of "peace and prosperity"? Has he mistaken the voice of free debate for the expression of doubt and division?

I talked with him (Mikoyan) when he was here and detected no such confusion. But if this is by any chance an element in the Russians' sudden disregard for all save their own interests, let me add my voice at once, with all the energy and conviction that I can command, to warn them not to drive this Nation too far and not to mistake the underlying temper of our people.

KNUCKLING UNDER IS NO SOLUTION

The memory of Hitler is much too fresh for citizens in this country, whatever their political convictions, to believe that knuckling under to threats can pave the way to a lasting settlement.

Munich was the prelude to total conflict, not to peace in our time.

I would plead with the Russian leaders to remember their own terrible experience with appeasement of Hitler—or to recall the more recent miscalculation which sent North Korean troops into South Korea in the belief that the Americans, once out, would never come back.

These are not partisan memories in America. They are the very stuff of our most recent historical experience. When the President says we will not give in to force, he speaks for all of us. I pray that there are no illusions in Moscow on this vital score.

But Russia's new pressure may not spring simply from a miscalculation of the American mood. I believe the men in the Kremlin also suffer from some acute political compulsions which may be driving them to bring the situation in Germany to a head.

The satellite empire in eastern Europe is unstable. Tito's declaration of independence is now 10 years old. The East German outbreak of 1953, the riots in Poland and the Hungarian revolt of 1956 point to the insecurity of these minority Communist governments and the whole Soviet position in eastern Europe.

Whatever the other reasons for precipitating a crisis over Berlin, it doubtless reflects their fear that this island of freedom through which tens of thousands of Germans flee from East to West creates a special degree of instability in a generally unstable area.

IN ORDER TO TAKE WE HAVE TO GIVE

For this reason I trust that we shall not show too much unwillingness to negotiate at the summit or at any other level. In the critical field of popular support we play from strength in Europe. No bayonets prop up Western governments. They are rooted in the assent of the peoples. But in eastern Europe only Soviet military dominance insures Moscow's control.

Don't we have a supreme interest in reducing that control by gradual withdrawal of Russian forces? Have the eastern European countries any other hope of national freedom? Don't we in the West, and I include West Germany, have a supreme interest in exploring new ideas on the possible future shape of a European settlement?

Because of the dependence upon their garrisons in eastern Europe I doubt if the Russians will negotiate seriously on the possibilities of withdrawing their forces.

But if despite all their protestations and propaganda about peace, self-determination of peoples and noninterference, they dare not risk serious negotiation, we shall at least have recovered the initiative and made clear our own readiness for a more stable and hopeful settlement.

While under no circumstances will we forsake the people of free Berlin or compromise on the question of free access, we must face the fact that no Russian withdrawal can be secured without a modification of the Western position.

In order to take, we will have to give. And one must equally face the widespread fear in Western Europe that any search for an alternative to the status quo ultimately entails a total American retreat—back to isolationism and fortress America.

FORTRESS AMERICA OBSOLETE CONCEPT

We cannot dismiss this sense of insecurity, especially among our good friends in West Germany. But I wonder whether this fear of American withdrawal from Europe and its affairs is not becoming a real enemy to thought, maneuver and flexibility on the Western side?

Actually in the age of missiles, supersonic flight and lunik, the concept of fortress America is wholly obsolete. We cannot escape the human situation. It involves us all. The America of 1959 is not the America of 1939. And the deterrent in Europe today is not just the six American divisions stationed in Germany but the knowledge that a Russian attack means retaliation by America's strategic airforce.

The Russian leaders must know this. And I would urge them to ponder the Korean crisis of 1950. In that case, in a genuine effort to reduce tension, America withdrew its troops. The Communists misread the signals and evidently took this for an expression of American disinterest.

But the North Korean invasion brought America promptly back—fighting.

Though Korea is, in contrast, of marginal strategic importance, the American response was clear and immediate. Who can suppose it would be less so if the vital security of Europe were at stake?

I repeat, I do not believe we Americans can ever again stand aside while aggression attempts to take history by force. We are involved permanently in mankind's efforts to evolve a workable security system, and our concern is far too deep rooted to depend only upon the location of American soldiers. Any negotiated settlement in Europe would have behind it the full weight of American commitment and the full strength of our arsenal and our economy. In the missile age, fortress America is no more.

LET US YIELD NOTHING TO FORCE

So I would say: let us yield nothing to force in this Berlin crisis. But I don't think the issue of who stamps the passes is important. If the Russians hand over their control functions to the East German Government or sign a separate peace treaty, I cannot see that any great harm is done.

The East Germans are so blatantly and totally dependent upon Russian military support that no ceremonial dickering about their status or functions will change them from puppets even to puppies. I am reminded of the Finnish Communist Republic established by Stalin which so failed to command popular support that in the end the Russians forgot about it too.

Any interference with the West's freedom of access to Berlin must be understood by the Russians to entail the risk of war. But with this position clear, let us seek to explore with the Russians the possibility of a settlement in Europe less unstable and explosive than the present situation—one that gives some hope to the millions from the Baltic to the Black Sea who yearn for freedom again, one that is based upon the tremendous asset of freedom as a popular force, and one that is finally rooted in America's lasting commitment to Europe, whatever the local pattern of security may be.

DEMOCRATS MUST AVERT DEFICIENCIES

I would hope in this supremely difficult time, when Secretary Dulles' illness has deprived our Government in Washington of its only active practitioner in the field of foreign policy, that the Democratic Party, as a responsible opposition, would use its influence to focus public opinion, to make good the perilous deficiencies of the executive branch and provide a little of the leadership an uninformed and bewildered public so desperately needs.

I would trust that our distinguished Democratic leaders in the Senate would consult together and bring their collective weight and wisdom to bear responsibility on the crisis. This opportunity for a demonstration of party responsibility is matched only by the urgency.

We are fortunate that we have a number of Democrats in Congress, like Senator FULBRIGHT, with exceptional experience and wisdom in foreign affairs. And I trust that the administration too will draw upon these resources at this time so that we can face what may be the greatest test of this decade in a mood of national determination and unity.

The months ahead are far too grave for partisan bickering or for personal competitiveness in political influence. I believe the whole country would respond to a Presidential lead, telling us of both the danger and the opportunity we face. And if the administration is silent let us, as the loyal opposition, speak with all the gravity and wisdom that we possess. This crisis can still be a focus for new greatness. And the greatness of America is the greatest purpose of our great party.

## James S. Hunter, Legislative and Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening of this week, I attended a testimonial dinner in the city of East Chicago, Ind., for Hon. James S. Hunter, one of Indiana's outstanding legislators. Representative Hunter has served the Calumet industrial area of Indiana for over 20 years and during this period of time he has been recognized by State legislators of both parties from districts throughout the State as an honest, conscientious, and sincere public servant.

At the mammoth testimonial banquet in East Chicago last Monday evening, leaders of both political parties, businessmen, labor officials, and other citizens paid much deserved tribute to his record as a public official. Mayor Walter Jeorse of East Chicago was toastmaster of the banquet and he joined with others in reviewing Jim Hunter's record as a public servant and recalled the great debt that the citizens of East Chicago and Indiana owed to Representative Hunter for his service, not only as a State representative but as a member and director of the Public Welfare Board of Lake County for a great number of years.

Governor Handley of Indiana in his message stated: "It can truly be said that James S. Hunter loves his fellow man".

Other tributes to the guest of honor were paid by Mr. Fred Steininger, Director of Public Welfare, State Senator William Christie, Mr. Lester Thornton, director of AFL–CIO, State Representative Howard Steele of La Porte, Ind., and Mrs. Jessie Jacobs of Indianapolis, Ind. East Chicago Councilman James L. Dent introduced the Honorable Mercer Mance, superior court judge of Indianapolis. Other guests were introduced by Mr. Henry Walker, prominent East Chicago lawyer. Mr. Benjamin J. Wilson, lawyer and Gary City councilman introduced the main speaker of the evening Mr. Robert C. Weaver, educator, lecturer, and author, and also a resent member of New York's Governor Harriman's cabinet. Congressman J. EDWARD ROUSH of Indiana's Fifth District, who served with Representative Hunter in Indiana State Legislature, paid the following tribute to the guest of honor:

I learned with great interest that the folks of Lake County are giving a testimonial dinner for my good personal friend Jim Hunter. I have known Jim for over 10 years, having first met him during my term in the Indiana Legislature in 1949.

He was one of the finest legislators of that session, commanding the respect of people from both sides of the asile. We all respect his intelligence, commonsense, his great knowledge and humble spirit. Certainly the honor which Lake County is bestowing upon Jim Hunter could not come to a finer man.

In honoring this man I have the feeling that you are honoring the things which he stands for, namely good government, integrity in government and political honesty. I join with his many friends in wishing him well in the years to come feeling that his contributions have not yet ceased and that we will all benefit, as we have in the past, by his future services.

Hon. George Chacharis, mayor of the city of Gary, Ind., in presenting a plaque of appreciation to Representative Hunter, made the following remarks during his presentation address:

This is a great occasion.

It represents a tribute to a great man.

But it is not greatness alone that we acknowledge tonight.

Present with us tonight, as suggested by the character of our honored guest, are other qualities also—wisdom, compassion, and self-sacrifice.

Here in America, we stress service as the principal purpose of government. That is why we are here tonight. We have come to honor service as embodied by a man.

We are saying to him that you served with dedication, that you served the highest purposes of democracy.

And that the people of Lake County and Indiana rise tonight to express their heartfelt and their immeasurable gratitude.

Not infrequently and often erroneously, it is said that a membership in the State legis-

lature is a minor political office, that it is of no consequence, that it is unimportant.

That evaluation has been rejected by James S. Hunter.

He feels, as I do, that there is no such thing as an unimportant office—that any public honor conferred by the votes of the people is a solemn one, a sacred one, one which at all times calls for devotion and understanding.

Because he gave it the strength of his character, because he invested it with his heart and soul, because of his unsparing sacrifice or energy in the fulfillment of his duties, James S. Hunter brought meaning and dignity to the tasks he performed.

Working for the people was the most important job in the world for him.

Ours is a profound, and irredeemable debt to him. His achievements in economic, social, and educational legislation brought assurance of greater security and the promise of a brighter future to 4 million people in Indiana.

To speak of James S. Hunter, we need to rely, with some variation, on the superb language of Winston Churchill:

Never has one done so much for so many.

And now, godspeed, Jim. May your future abound in the blessings you labored to bring to others in the past.

Now, may I present you with this plaque, which will give permanence to the words in our hearts here tonight.

We present it as a token of our esteem and appreciation for statesmanship and eminent public service.

Inscribed on this plaque are these words:

"To James S. Hunter, dean of Lake County's State representatives. In grateful appreciation of 20 years outstanding service to his county and State.

"Presented by Mayor George Chacharis on behalf of the citizens of Gary, Ind. Dated: March 16, 1959."

## Closure of Bristol Bay Salmon Fishery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the recent announced intention of the Department of the Interior to close the Bristol Bay Salmon Fishery is a severe blow to the residence of the Bristol Bay area in southwestern Alaska. This is so because fishing is the principal means of livelihood for the people of that area. They are in deep economic trouble and understandably indignant and angry. They have helplessly watched the fine resource of the Bristol Bay red salmon runs decline through the years because of Federal mismanagement and resultant overfishing. They have watched the situation get progressively worse since the Japanese started their high-seas fishery for salmon in the North Pacific, in 1952. Although only 2 million fish were taken by the Japanese in that year, their activity grew rapidly until they took 64 million salmon in 1955, and the catch has fluctuated between this figure and about 40 million since then. Although only a portion of the salmon caught by the Japanese are spawned in American streams, the area in which the Japanese fishing is conducted is an area in which there is intermingling of Alaska spawned salmon and Asian spawned salmon. This has been ascertained through scientific research by Canada, Japan, and the United States under the terms of the North Pacific Convention entered into between those countries 5 years ago. This is the treaty wherein the Japanese agreed not to fish east of 175° west longitude and which treaty will not expire for another 5 years. Although this dividing line is admittedly provisional and subject to modification by mutual agreement of said three countries on the basis of knowledge obtained through research, there is nothing in the treaty which would compel the Japanese to agree to any change. Thus, by staying on their own side of the line they are living up to the letter of the treaty, but not the spirit thereof. Furthermore, their miles of seines with mesh too small for conservation purposes are catching over 1 million immature salmon every year which were spawned in the streams flowing into Bristol Bay. Accordingly, the treaty also needs changing to avoid the destructive effect of catching immature salmon.

As a result of these events, including the bumper catch by the Japanese in 1955, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service estimates a low-cycle return of salmon into Bristol Bay during the coming 1959 fishing season, so small, in fact, as to not allow the catching of any salmon by American fishermen in Bristol Bay this summer. Unless estimates change, all of the salmon which reach Bristol Bay during the pending season must be allowed to go up the streams to spawn in order to perpetuate and improve this great American resource.

From what I have said, it is apparent that unless the Japanese relent and cooperate in negotiating a new abstention line at least 5° farther west than the present line, along with improved conservation standards, the United States will be in the position of doing all the conserving while the Japanese catch all the fish.

The only alternative, if the present arrangements persist, would be for the United States to decide to let the tail go with the hide, so to speak, and let our American fishermen participate in the virtual liquidation of this otherwise great replenishable resource. In that event the Japanese would be in the position of having improvidently forced the destruction of a vitally valuable asset, as important to them, if properly conserved, as it is to us.

This statement would not be complete without my saying that a research program still in its infancy shows that salmon from our west coast other than those spawned in Bristol Bay, and other than red salmon, also mingle in the same north Pacific feeding grounds about which I am speaking and it might well be that the entire west coast salmon fishery all the way from Oregon to Alaska's Seward Peninsula on the Bering Sea is being adversely affected.

In view of the fact that this untenable situation is of national importance, Congressman Thomas M. Pelly from the State of Washington, and others have joined with me in the introduction of bills which would ban the import into the United States of Japanese-caught salmon until such time as the Japanese cooperate with our State Department in renegotiating the North Pacific Fishery Convention for the long range mutual benefit of all concerned. As the situation now stands, and unless there is an early change for the better, it is going to be necessary in the national interest to enact such legislation.

In closing, I wish to say that I am not of the school of thought which advances the idea of terminating the treaty with Japan and Canada either by mutual consent or unilaterally, for to do so would remove the abstention line now existing and open the way for the Japanese to fish all the way to our 3-mile limit. We must vigorously press for adjustment of that line and better conservation restrictions in accordance with existing knowledge on the subject, which knowledge was not available at the time the treaty with Japan and Canada was consummated.

## Michigan's Eighth District Opinions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the results of my annual questionnaire which was mailed to 30,000 of my constituents. I was very pleased to have a return of about 30 percent—9,314 replies—which I feel speaks very well for the interest my constituents have in national affairs. I believe all Members of the House will find these results of considerable interest:

Out of some 30,000 questionnaires which were sent out in January, 9,314 were returned for a gratifying percentage of 30 percent. Here is the way the eighth district voted:

1. Do you believe that continued prosperity requires continued inflation? Yes, 6.8 percent. No, 88.7 percent. No answer, 4.5 percent.

2. To combat inflation, would you favor price, wage and rent controls? Yes, 51.1 percent. No, 40.3 percent. No answer, 8.6 percent.

3. Do you think the Federal Government should spend more for welfare pensions? Yes, 22.6 percent. Schools? Yes, 38.6 percent; housing, 13.7 percent; hospitals, 22.9 percent; agriculture, 8.7 percent; veterans, 17.6 percent. No answer, 25.7 percent.

4. If tax reduction becomes possible where should it come first? More liberal treatment for small business? Yes, 41.5 percent. Cut individual rates? Yes, 43.8 percent. Cut corporate rates? Yes, 6.2 percent. Cut excises? Yes, 20.7 percent. Do you believev any present rates should be increased? Yes, 6.3 percent. No answer, 23.7 percent.

5. Would you favor a national sales tax collected at the manufacturer's level (except food, clothing and medicine) if addi-

tional revenue is needed? Yes, 44.8 percent. No, 37.8 percent. No answer, 17.4 percent.

6. Do you agree with those people who say that organized labor is becoming too powerful? Yes, 81.2 percent. No, 13.1 percent. No answer, 5.7 percent.

7. Do you favor extension of coverage and increase in the minimum wage? Yes, 38 percent. No, 48.4 percent. No answer, 13.6 percent.

8. Do you favor hospital and surgical care for social security beneficiaries with an increase in the wage basis for social security taxes to $6,000? Yes, 42.6 percent. No, 46.4 percent. No answer, 11 percent.

9. Do you favor Federal aid to education in school construction grants and teacher pay? Yes, 39.8 percent. No, 51.8 percent. No answer, 8.4 percent.

10. Instead of a Federal aid to education program, would you prefer permitting taxpayers to take a credit aganist their Federal income tax for new or additional school taxes paid? Yes, 51.6 percent. No, 32 percent. No answer, 16.4 percent.

11. Do you feel that the small businessman needs more and bigger loan programs, protection and benefits to aid him to compete? Yes, 59.3 percent. No, 26.9 percent. No answer, 13.8 percent.

12. Do you feel that Federal action is needed in these fields? More guarantees of larger mortgages at lower interest rates? Yes, 30.6 percent. Public housing for middle as well as low income families? Yes, 24.7 percent. Problems of social delinquents in slum areas? Yes, 38.4 percent. Aid to the elderly? Yes, 47.4 percent. Aid to the handicapped? Yes, 54.3 percent. No answer, 30.5 percent.

13. Do you think that support prices on farm commodities should be tied more closely to market prices? Yes, 60.6 percent. No, 17.7 percent. No answer, 21.8 percent.

14. In foreign aid would you favor more emphasis on economic and less on military assistance? Yes, 64.3 percent. No, 17.9 percent. No answer, 17.8 percent. Do you favor gifts and sales of surplus farm commodities to underdeveloped countries? Yes, 73.6 percent. No, 15.9 percent. No answer, 10.5 percent.

15. In the field of public versus private power would you favor expansion of TVA? Yes, 16.4 percent. Large-scale Federal construction of power projects? Yes, 16.9 percent. More public projects in the development of atomic energy? Yes, 41.7 percent. Would you favor legislation to relax Federal controls over independent natural gas producers? Yes, 24.3 percent. No answer, 40.4 percent.

16. Do you think that more federally administered programs should be turned back to State control? Yes, 62.6 percent. No, 19.7 percent. No answer, 17.7 percent. Do you favor more Federal grants-in-aid? Yes, 16.6 percent. No, 52.3 percent. No answer, 31.1 percent. Do you believe that the State and local governments should have more powers? Yes, 49.2 percent. No, 24.3 percent. No answer, 26.5 percent.

17. Do you favor repeal of section 14–B of the Taft-Hartley Act which permits the States to enact right-to-work laws? Yes, 36.5 percent. No, 50 percent. No answer, 13.5 percent.

18. Do you favor Federal spending programs such as long-term, low-interest Federal loans for local public works or Federal aid to centers of chronic unemployment for plants and public works to attract new industry? Yes, 61.9 percent. No, 25 percent. No answer, 13.1 percent.

## The U.S. Air Force Band Good-Will Tour to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the U.S. Air Force band for making what is probably the most effective goodwill contribution ever made in the history of United States-Latin America relationships. Having recently completed a 3-week, 18,000 mile tour of Latin America, this visit proved to be the best example of the worthiness of President Eisenhower's people-to-people program for creating better international understanding. The overwhelming success with which this great musical organization has met in terms of strengthening the ties of friendship between the people of the Americas must be recorded as being a most positive, lasting, and vital one.

Although the record books show that the U.S. Air Force band has previously made 8 preeminently successful tours of 44 different countries on 4 continents, its most recent one stands in a class by itself and is unquestionably the most triumphant one it has ever made. The fact that it took place at a crucial time when renewed or reawakened friendship with our Latin American neighbors is of utmost importance, its tremendous impact is doubly valuable.

Commencing in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, on January 31, and continuing through Ascuncion, Paraguay; Montevideo, Uruguay; Santiago, Chile; Lima, Peru; Quito, Ecuador; Bogota, Colombia; Managua, Nicaragua; San Salvador, El Salvador; and Panama City, Panama, the tour was an unvarying series of cultural triumphs and friendship-winning manifestations. Playing to a total of 243,500 people of divergent racial, economic, and political backgrounds, the tour was made conspicuous by the absence of jeers or reference to "gringos." Instead, America's musical ambassadors of goodwill were referred to as the "band of friendship" and were received with a sincere and unprecedented enthusiasm at each point on their itinerary.

A typical example of the prevailing enthusiasm was demonstrated at Santiago, Chile. Col. George S. Howard, the band's eminent conductor, and his airmen-ambassadors-musicians arrived in that most delightful city at a most inopportune time. Pro-U.S. sentiment was at a low ebb due to a most unfortunate circumstance which had occurred the previous week. An inferior basketball team representing the United States had suffered an ignominious defeat at the hands of a superior Russian team. Since the game of basketball was invented and first played in the United States, the sight of a U.S. team taking such a humiliating beating from the Russians was more than some Santiagoans could bear. Accordingly, they booed the North American team. To make matters worse, a leftist Santiago newspaper editorialized:

> Whether it comes to shooting baskets or sputniks, the United States just cannot keep up with Russia.

Such was the atmosphere in Santiago at the time of the band's arrival. That condition notwithstanding, the Air Force Band drew a total of 105,000 people during its 3 performances. However, that only tells part of the story because the important issues were how was the band received and what did Santiagoans think of its performances? As for the former, I have been assured by both officers and enlisted men alike that the organization has never played before a more wildly enthusiastic audience. Not only were its ovations tumultuous but their regard for the individual bandmembers bordered on hero worship. Upon the conclusion of its concert before 50,000 people at the National Stadium, a huge throng swarmed on the field to get a closer look at the players. Some of them sought autographs. Some of them just wanted to touch the North Americans. But most of them wanted some souvenir or memento of the occasion.

In most cases this amounted to a fragment of paper torn from the program but they would not depart until they had received it. One of the string bass players told me that it took him 1 hour to get his string bass case which was some 50 feet away. As for their opinions of the performances, here is what their music experts said:

> Our people which is authentic, uncontaminated, spontaneous, virile, and cultured, applauded with enthusiasm the interpretations of the "Band of Friendship." They left a mark of pleasant sentiment and memories. Chile and the United States are joined by a new tie, the soft emotions of the spirit.—El Diario Ilustrado. The beautiful spiritual success of the USAF Band has forged delicate but strong threads of union.—La Nacion. We all come out ahead and the friendly ties which has always united us with the United States has been greatly strengthened.—Ultimas Noticias.

These well-deserved plaudits are not peculiar to Santiago alone. In Asuncion, according to our official State Department report, the U.S. Air Force Band's appearance is generally regarded here as the most successful cultural event ever presented by the United States in Paraguay. Of their Managua performance, the official report says:

> Embassy personnel have been told by many Nicaraguans that this was the finest entertainment they had seen on the part of touring U.S. talent.

In Montevideo, where 5,000 people tried to break down the doors of the concert hall in an attempt to gain entry, a high-ranking government official told a large radio audience upon the conclusion of the program that the U.S. Air Force Band was the best of goodwill ambassadors.

As our Air Force ambassadors continued to play themselves into the hearts and minds of country after country, the results of their efforts were from time to time observed by highly qualified U.S. citizens. One of these, an American businessman with financial interests in Latin America had this to say in Lima:

I've been coming down here at least three times a year for the past 10 years. In that time I have seen many efforts on the part of the United States to assist our southern neighbors and to win their respect, admiration, and friendship. I can truthfully say that in my opinion, none mean as much to them as what they had seen and heard tonight.

In Santiago, a visiting American newspaper editor from Pittsburgh expressed himself this way:

This is the greatest thing I have ever witnessed. We should do more of it. If I could be certain the money would be spent for efforts like this, I would pay my taxes much more happily.

In the final analysis, though, it is the impression that these efforts make on foreign nationals is what counts. That this impression never fails to be an ideal one is best exemplified by an editorial in the same Santiago leftist paper which 1 week earlier made the United States-Russian, basketball-sputnik rejoinder. Only this time it had this to say:

We hope that the change over from arms to violins, clarinets, and so forth, continues to grow and that the men of the world, and a French poet once called for, form a circle around the earth hand in hand united by music, and that luck accompany these aviator-musicians who travel around the world with melody and good will.

## DAV Services in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Colorado citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Colorado, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer N. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris, all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of fulltime trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and three district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV national service officers in Colorado are Mr. Frank M. Cain and Mr. Lowell McGowan, located in the VA Center, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colo. VA hospitals coming under the jurisdiction of this office are: A 530-bed GM hospital at Denver, a 681-bed NP hospital at Fort Lyon, and a 152-bed GM hospital at Grand Junction.

The offices of the Department of Colorado, Disabled American Veterans, are located in room 116, State Office Building, Denver, Colo.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $60,101,000 for its veteran program in Colorado, including disability compensation to its 20,440 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Colorado furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

Only about 29 percent—6,002—are members of the 26 DAV chapters in Colorado.

This 29-percent record is the best among all States but, nevertheless, not good enough in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Colorado veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

| | |
|---|---|
| Claimants contacted (estimate) | 56,243 |
| Claims folders reviewed | 46,869 |
| Appearances before rating boards | 22,166 |
| Compensation increases obtained | 4,982 |
| Service connections obtained | 1,558 |
| Nonservice pensions | 899 |
| Death benefits obtained | 385 |
| Total monetary benefits obtained | $2,950,547.20 |

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Colorado veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranteed loans for homes, farms, and businesses and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult, too many times impossible. A Claims and Rating Board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his

skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued; and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1 percent—.0099—of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Colorado with a consequent loss of about $2,677,200 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Colorado to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nation-wide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag (miniature automobile license tags) Project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentlly, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag Department, 6,029 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Colorado residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nation-wide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all "serviced" claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund ranging from $100 to $1,000, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member.

As a DAV life member, I am pleased to enroll as one of the benefactors on the memorial honor roll of the DAV Service Foundation, with the realization that only the interest earnings therefrom will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in continuing to maintain its national service officer setup in my State of Colorado.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Colorado by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such "serviced" claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice, the DAV.

## Views on Proposed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following text of an interesting and detailed letter I recently received from Mr. Walker L. Cisler, president of the Detroit Edison Co. I believe Mr. Cisler's letter should be of considerable interest to all Members of the House since it concerns his company's views on proposed labor legislation now before the Congress.

THE DETROIT EDISON CO.,
*Detroit, Mich., March 12, 1959.*

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of the pendency before Congress of numerous proposals to enact legislation in the labor-management field, and particularly the so-called Kennedy and administration labor reform bills (S. 505 and S. 748) we would like to tell you about certain experiences of our company under existing legislation, and our reaction, based on these experiences, to three pending legislative proposals.

By way of preface we should say that we have two strong unions in our company which represent about 4,500 of our employees. Our relationships with these unions have been good.

We are generally in favor of the enactment into law of the reporting requirements of the two bills. It seems to us that most of these requirements, if properly enforced, will go a long way to curb the activities of thieves, racketeers, and gangsters in the labor movement as well as restrain conduct by employers which violates the spirit and language of the National Labor Relations Act.

Of the two bills mentioned, we prefer that proposed by the administration because it appears to contain better and more effective enforcement provisions. Both bills would create a new bureau in the office of the Secretary of Labor, but the administration bill gives this bureau the necessary power and procedures to effectively enforce the act. For example, the administration bill would preserve the rights of union members under existing laws to require their officers to observe the constitution and bylaws under which they serve, and add a new power in the Secretary to investigate and take appropriate action to secure compliance, including the setting aside of the election.

The Kennedy bill, on the other hand, would restrict the right of the Secretary to act except upon petition of a union member who has first exhausted his remedies within the union, and would provide only one type of remedial action, the setting aside of the election and conducting a new one. This remedy would be exclusive, and union members would thus be deprived of their existing rights and remedies. Under the Kennedy bill, the present monitorship of the Teamsters Union would not have been possible, as it resulted from an action by union members.

These are general comments. The experience we have had relate to three specific proposals that have been brought before Congress:

1. Restricting the definition of supervisor.
2. Requiring certain reports by employers.
3. Strengthening the prohibitions against secondary boycotts.

RESTRICTING THE DEFINITION OF SUPERVISOR

In our opinion, management can operate effectively only if all persons from the top to the bottom who are connected with the responsible direction of employees and the carrying out of management policies are management people and have loyalties only to management. There can be no dilution of this principle. The functioning of management authority will be impeded and greatly hindered if it is not preserved wholly.

We did not always feel this way. Prior to the Taft-Hartley amendments, we recognized the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers as bargaining agent not only for the rank-and-file employees of our overhead lines department, but also for the first line supervisors of this department, called "A foremen." This arrangement went back long before the enactment of the Wagner Act. When the Taft-Hartley amendments were passed, we saw no reason to make any change in this arrangement. Our relations with the Brotherhood were good, and no problems arose from the representation of our A foremen by the union.

However, a few years ago the union fined one of our A foremen because he had carried out the policy of our management with respect to outdoor work in inclement weather. It had been provided in our agreement with this union that employees will not be required to work outdoors in inclement weather except in case of emergency and other stated situations. By this disciplinary action imposed upon our A foreman, who was also a union member, the union attempted to impose its interpretation of inclement weather upon this representative of management.

This incident brought to our attention very vividly the fact that a man cannot serve two masters, and emphasized that management cannot hope to have its policies carried out unless all persons connected with the administration of those policies, from the highest to the lowest supervisor, are unaffected by union loyalties and disciplines.

We are unaware of any hardship upon unions or employees that has resulted from the present definition of supervisor. It was the considered opinion of Congress in 1947 that all persons who responsibly directed the work of others should be excluded from the term "employee" as used in the act. This was a sound conclusion then and remains sound today. It should not be changed.

REQUIRING CERTAIN REPORTS BY EMPLOYEES

The second specific proposal about which we desire to comment is section 103(a)(2) of the Kennedy bill which would require employers to report expenditures for the purpose of inducing employees to refrain from joining a union. We see no purpose in this proposal as written and strongly oppose it. If enacted, this requirement would create a serious problem. How could we be sure we were complying with the law?

Some of our employees are represented by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, some are represented by the Utility Workers Union of America, and the rest are unrepresented. We constantly communicate with our employees, both represented and nonrepresented, concerning a great variety of subjects. We attempt to keep them informed of management policies and decisions. We think we do a good job in this respect. And we have been charged before the NLRB only once in our history with engaging in unfair labor practices, and this charge was dismissed by the NLRB after a full hearing.

Nevertheless, if this proposal should become law, we would be hard put to know what communication of ours might be considered as designed to influence the union affiliations of our employees. Furthermore, the right of any person, be he an employer or not, to express his opinions concerning unions and union affiliations of his employees is expressly guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act and by the first amendment. So long as such expressions of opinion are lawful and protected acts, there should be no requirement that they be reported. The current labor reform proposals pending in Congress are designed to prevent improper conduct by requiring that it be reported. To require that lawful and protected conduct be reported would place a stigma on such conduct and tends to discourage it. There should be no restraints upon the freedom of any person to discuss the vital and controversial subject of union affiliation.

STRENGTHENING THE PROHIBITIONS AGAINST SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Finally, we strongly urge the enactment of the provisions of the administration bill which further regulate the secondary boycott, but without the exemption of construction site picketing, which is proposed in that bill. The Taft-Hartley amendments have been construed to prohibit secondary boycotts only when accomplished by influence executed directly against employes. Secondary boycotts accomplished by threats against and coercion of employers have been construed to be beyond the scope of this act. The Teamsters Union and the various building trades unions have taken advantage of this construction, and by coercing employers regularly carry on secondary boycotts which are as injurious to the public as those proscribed by the act.

Due to the disclosures of the McClellan committee, the common tactic of the Teamsters of organizing from the top, and coercing employers to place their employes in that union by use of threats against other employers is well known. We have been the victim of a secondary boycott accomplished by coercion of employers which was as pernicious in its effects upon the economy and the right of employees to organize freely and without coercion as anything the Teamsters have attempted.

In 1956 we were engaged in building a huge new powerplant at River Rouge, Mich., and were soliciting bids for the construction of a vast extension of our existing powerplant at St. Clair, Mich. The general contractor on both of these projects was the same. Both plants involved the fabrication and installation of large quantities of piping and a great deal of work for pipefitters both at the sites of the plants and in the factory where much of the fabricating is done. As a practical matter, on-the-site fabrication of pipe for an installation as large as this can be accomplished only with workmen who are members of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada. It is impossible to secure enough skilled pipefitters for such an installation except through this union and its locals.

A Detroit mechanical contractor who was interested in bidding for the piping contract at the St. Clair plant proposed to subcontract the off-the-site pipe fabrication to the Crane Co. in Chicago. The employees of the Crane Co. are organized and represented by unions other than the United Association. The Crane Co. competes with other pipe fabricators whose employees are members of the United Association.

On January 21, 1957, the first of the three generating units at the River Rouge plant had been finished and was in operation. Work on the second was well under way and the third had been commenced. Steel for the St. Clair addition was being erected. Suddenly, and without warning, the United Association, acting through its Detroit local, withdrew its men from the work of installing the pipe furnished by Westinghouse Electric Corp. as part of the turbogenerator portion of the second River Rouge unit. The immediate excuse for this strike was the fact that this pipe had been fabricated by workmen who were not members of the United Association. The Westinghouse plant in which this pipe had been fabricated was represented by the United Electrical Workers.

Within a few days the United Association sent a field man to the job and he frankly informed the general contractor, United Engineers & Constructors, Inc., that the real reason for the strike was the fact that Edison was contemplating the use of pipe fabricated by Crane at our St. Clair addition. He informed United Engineers that the entire dispute could easily be settled if we would agree to give the contract for off-the-site pipe fabrication for St. Clair to some fabricating shop which dealt with his union.

It has been our longtime policy to build our plants and facilities as cheaply as good engineering will permit, and to procure the materials, supplies, machinery and equipment which go into these plants from the supplier who gives us the best quality at the best price. We saw no reason to abandon this policy and to assist the United Association in its obvious attempt to monopolize the pipe fabricating business for its members and the employers with whom it dealt. We refused to make the requested agreement.

Instead, we filed a charge with the National Labor Relations Board alleging violation of the secondary boycott provisions of the act. The district director investigated our charge, filed a complaint, and petitioned the U.S. district court at Detroit for an injunction. After a long and bitterly contested hearing, the court issued its injunction on May 10, 1957, and the strike at the River Rouge powerplant against the Westinghouse turbine pipe was terminated.

However, the United Association was not through. On May 20, 1957, it called our general contractor, United Engineers, to a meeting. We do not know what happened at that meeting, or what threats were made and what coercion was applied. We do know that United Engineers, which had theretofore cooperated with us in our attempts to get our powerplants built, signed an agreement that it would not request pipefitters from the United Association or any of its locals for the installation of piping at the St. Clair plant, that it would not request any subcontractors to do so, and that it would not transfer to St. Clair any pipefitters presently working for it at River Rouge, until we agreed to have the piping for St. Clair fabricated in a United Association shop. This was all done under the pretext of complying with the provisions of a "hot goods" clause in the contract between United Engineers and the United Association.

Again we refused to be coerced into changing our purchasing policy. We removed United Engineers from its position as our general contractor at St. Clair and have been able to proceed with this project through other contractors who have been able to secure pipefitters.

This is a brief statement of a very complicated situation. It has, in our opinion, two significant and very pernicious aspects. United Engineers is one of the largest national contractors in the utility field and had been doing business with us for years. It had a valuable contract with us. Nevertheless, it was unable to withstand the threats of the United Association and endangered and ultimately lost its contract with us rather than run the risk of this

union shutting down the numerous construction projects in which it was engaged throughout the country. The power of the great international unions has become so great that even the largest and presumably the strongest employer must bow before it.

Secondly, we do not believe it is or should be the policy of our law to permit any group of men who follow a particular trade to band together in a labor union and monopolize the work of that trade. The employees of Westinghouse and of Crane have the right, under the Taft-Hartley Act, to choose the union they prefer. This right is jealously protected by that act. Yet it would seem that under the same act, these employees may be deprived of their work by a union which they did not choose, and which says, arbitrarily, no person can work upon pipe unless he pays dues to it.

In brief, our experience and we are sure the experience of many other employers show that secondary boycotts can and are carried on successfully without inducement of employees, and by means of threats against the coercion of employers. This should no longer be permitted.

EXEMPTION OF PICKETING AT CONSTRUCTION SITES

The proposed exclusion from the secondary boycott provisions of the administration bill, of strikes at construction sites, would largely render nugatory these provisions. Experience has shown that the secondary boycott is the favored tactic of the Teamsters and the construction trades. This exclusion would have the effect of permitting what the balance of section 8(b)(4)(B) of the proposed bill would forbid.

Under existing law, a construction union can effectively withdraw workmen in its own trade from almost any construction job, and such job cannot proceed until settlement has been made. We see no reason why, by the express permission of on-the-site picketing, these powerful and well disciplined unions should be added economic weapon of shutting down the entire project. It is hard to see how on-the-site picketing of a construction project can be any other than the unlawful inducement of employees of other trades under the secondary boycott provisions that exist. To legalize such conduct would largely nullify these provisions.

"HOT GOODS" CLAUSE

There has been much litigation in the courts regarding the effect of "hot goods" clauses which are used by many unions in an attempt to legalize secondary boycotts. The Supreme Court has held that "hot goods" clauses are no excuse for secondary boycotts effected by inducement of employees. However, the courts have not ruled that "hot goods" clauses are void and unenforceable. We believe that Congress should expressly declare such clauses to be contrary to public policy and void.

We trust that you will give serious consideration to the points made in this letter.

Sincerely,

WALKER L. CISLER.

## Joe Farrington, Pioneer for Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, March 12, 1959, I voted for statehood for Hawaii. I did so partly because of my marvelous memories of one of the finest Members ever to sit on the floor of the House of Representatives—the Honorable Joseph Rider Farrington, Jr.

The vote last week culminated the groundwork that had been laid over the years by one whom I consider the real pioneer of statehood for Hawaii, Joe Farrington, assisted by his lovely wife, Betty, who also served as a Delegate in Congress from Hawaii.

## American Medical Association Dedicated To Improve Health Care of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILBUR D. MILLS**
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Leonard W. Larson, M.D., chairman of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association:

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
*Chicago, Ill., March 5, 1959.*

Representative WILBUR D. MILLS,
*Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: You will recall that while testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington last June, I pledged the American Medical Association to a dedicated and continuing effort to improve the health care of the aged.

Speaking as chairman of the AMA board of trustees, I said:

"I shall devote all my energies to solving this problem and other problems of medical care plans in general. This is my primary interest."

The purpose of this letter is to summarize some of the forward steps we are taking. We will continue in the months ahead to send you similar reports.

I believe this first report will make it evident that we are making sustained and encouraging progress.

In particular, we wish to emphasize these developments:

The AMA's policymaking body—the house of delegates—took a big step when in December 1958, it unanimously approved a resolution urging "That the American Medical Association, the constituent and component medical societies, as well as physicians everywhere, expedite the development of an effective voluntary health insurance or prepayment program for the group over 65 with modest resources or low family income; that physicians agree to accept a level of compensation for medical services rendered to this group, which will permit the development of such insurance and prepayment plans at a reduced premium rate."

The AMA is working closely with Blue Shield Medical Care plans in implementing this proposal. The Blue Shield Commission has received approval by the AMA on a recommended scope of benefits for consideration by local plans to stimulate the availability of coverage for persons over 65 at reduced premiums. These plans would incorporate adjusted fees for physicians in accordance with the AMA recommendation.

State and local medical associations also are moving promptly and decisively to make this policy effective in the various States.

I will list here only a few examples:

The West Virginia State Medical Association's committee on Blue Shield has gone on record as recommending that physicians accept 50 percent of their normal fees for Blue Shield clients over 65 who have an income not exceeding $3,000 per annum, provided such Blue Shield insurance is the client's sole coverage for medical services rendered in hospitals.

In addition, the West Virginia committee went on record as recommending that hospitals in West Virginia accepting patients under the Blue Cross program adopt a similar policy with reference to the hospitalization of subscribers over 65.

The Medical Society of New Jersey, by action of the board of trustees, recorded its approval and support of the AMA resolution and recommended that the medical-surgical plan of New Jersey (Blue Shield) act with all possible speed to prepare a contract offering coverage at reduced premiums to people over 65 with reduced income, and that the proposed contract be submitted promptly to the State Commissioner of Banking and Insurance for his approval. The board of trustees also supported the recommendation that physicians of New Jersey accept the levels of payment established in the proposed new contract.

The California Medical Association, which established its California Physicians Service (CPS) 20 years ago and thus pioneered health insurance by the medical profession itself, approved a recommendation of its special committee on aging to move ahead with a positive program to meet the proved needs for medical and hospital care for the aged. Editorially, the San Francisco Chronicle described this action as "another progressive step in the field of prepaid medical care" and said that it "promises to contribute substantially toward solution of the difficult and increasing problem of medical care and attention for the aged." The editorial added: "The California Medical Association has displayed commendable zeal and wisdom."

The Voluntary Health Insurance and Health Care Costs Committee of the Texas Medical Association adopted a recommendation "that Blue Cross-Blue Sield of Texas be requested to prepare a program as a pilot plan for providing health care services to Texas citizens over the age of 65 on a prepaid service plan basis and that said program be presented to the house of delegates at the next annual meeting for consideration and action." The recommendation added: "It is understood that the plan is to be a joint endeavor of the Texas Medical Association, the Texas Hospital Association and Blue Cross-Blue Shield, and that both hospital and medical services be provided on a corresponding basis. It is also to be understood that the services or full indemnity feature would apply only to the low income individuals in this age group."

The Committee on Care of the Aged of the Ohio State Medical Association and Ohio representatives of the American Hospital Association, Blue Shield and Blue Cross voted to move promptly ahead with expanded and improved programs designed specifically to meet the needs of those 65 and above.

The Committee on Aging of the Florida State Medical Association approved the AMA policy declaration and Blue Shield contributed $5,000 to aid in a survey of the economic aspects of health needs of the Florida aged.

The Michigan State Medical Society's Executive Committee adopted a resolution identical to the one adopted by the AMA House of Delegates and urged its Medical Care Insurance Committee immediately to

study and develop a contract to care for persons in this group.

This AMA policy recommendation will be a primary item of business at the annual meetings of 34 State medical societies this spring. Other state societies, normally meeting in the fall, have indicated their intention of calling special sessions to expedite this policy.

In fact, the House of Delegates of the Iowa State Medical Society, in special session in late February, voted to develop a pilot program whereby persons 65 and over will be able to budget in advance for their medical needs at a cost in keeping with their financial resources. In making this announcement, the Iowa State Medical Society stated: "It is anticipated that this unique plan will provide broad full-service coverage. This means that a participating physician in Blue Shield will not make an additional charge to the patient beyond the Blue Shield allowance for those professional services specified in the contract. Under this program, a man and wife over age 65 whose combined income during a year is less than $3,000 a year will be entitled to full service coverage. In most cases, the financial return under the program will represent no more than the physician's actual overhead expenses."

The AMA is also working closely with commercial insurance organizations to encourage the development of new insurance programs and expansion of existing lower cost protection for persons over 65.

Among the many private hospital, surgical, and medical insurance policies available to persons over 65, the following are important examples: Guaranteed renewable contracts of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York Life Insurance Co., and Prudential Insurance Co. of America, and paid-up-at-65 policies offered by the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. and the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. Some significant developments are:

Continental Casualty Co., Chicago, has offered its 65-plus policy to all persons over 65 in 12 States and the District of Columbia. This offering of hospital and surgical coverage to individuals, guaranteed renewable except in the event of withdrawal for the whole State, was accompanied by an intensive advertising and publicity campaign to assure maximum public knowledge of the plan's availability.

Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association, Omaha, has introduced a senior security contract providing hospital, surgical, and medical coverage for individuals over 65. The original offering was scheduled in four States different from those covered by Continental.

The American Association of Retired Persons (membership open to anyone over 65) provides the advantage of hospital and surgical coverage on a group basis. Present membership of this association is now reported in excess of 300,000.

To further strengthen and improve private insurance coverage for those over 65, the Health Insurance Association's board of directors has forwarded the following recommendation to its 265 member companies:

1. Every insurer offering health insurance coverage, among the types of insurance contracts it offers, should promptly make available to insurable adults policies that are guaranteed renewable for life.

2. Every insurer offering individual family and hospital-surgical-medical care coverage should promptly take steps, if it is not presently doing so, to offer insurance coverage to persons now over 65.

3. Every insurer writing coverage on a group basis should develop and aggressively promote soundly financed coverages that will continue after retirement.

4. Every insurer offering coverage on a group basis should enocurage the inclusion in the group contract of the right to convert to an individual contract on termination of employment.

Clearly, real headway is being made as a result of AMA efforts. It is now evident that protection to persons in this age bracket is already in existence and is being broadened and improved even faster than many of us would have dared hope only a few months ago.

Solution of financial problems relating to health care of the aged depends, however, as much on reducing the costs of services as it does on developing financial mechanisms. One alternative to high hospital costs is the nursing home.

The AMA has long recognized the importance of proper nursing home facilities. It has made it clear in congressional testimony that it approves and vigorously supports a Government-insured loan program of the FHA type for nongovernmental hospitals and nursing homes whether their ownership is of a nonprofit or proprietary character. The AMA also has recommended changes in the Hill-Burton Act to make it possible for States to put more money into nonprofit nursing homes. We have taken these positions because we believe there is an undeniable need for new and improved facilities tailored to the specific health requirements of many older citizens.

This problem of additional facilities has a bearing, of course, on the availability of benefits for nursing home care. It is noteworthy that one insurance company (Mutual of Omaha) is now expanding its senior security policy in Nebraska, to provide benefits for nursing home care, in hope that it can be extended to other States in the near future. Further development of these programs will be facilitated by the following actions now under way:

1. Development of a program for classifying and listing nursing homes in accordance with the service each provides. (Such a classification program is now being worked out by the AMA, the American Hospital Association, the American Nursing Home Association, the U.S. Public Health Service and other groups.)

2. Development and acceptance of medical standards for nursing home care. The AMA has recommended minimum standards which are now awaiting approval by the American Nursing Home Association.

Both these actions are tied in closely with a recent survey of nursing homes throughout the United States—a survey conducted jointly by the AMA and the American Nursing Home Association. This survey has made available urgently needed information on the cost of care, the type of care and the kind of patient in the nursing homes, as well as other pertinent information. Details of the survey will be published soon.

As another means of reducing not only the need for high cost hospital care but even nursing home costs to the chronically ill and the aged, the AMA has moved to develop additional alternatives to institutional care. Among those alternatives are home care programs (to extend some hospital services into the home) and homemaker services (to provide a trained person in the home to handle household duties, thus permitting many patients to leave the hospital earlier and convalesce at home). These services have a common purpose: to reduce the length of hospital and nursing home care by permitting earlier discharge of patients or to avoid the need for such institutional care.

The AMA has now completed a careful analysis of all home care programs. This analysis has been distributed to medical societies and it is serving as a guide to the establishment of effective programs of this type in communities throughout the Nation.

The AMA sponsored (with the Public Health Service, the American Cancer Society, the Salvation Army, and others) a national conference on homemaker services in Chicago, February 9–11. The basic objective: extension of homemaker service programs from the present 150 communities to every community—and as quickly as possible.

Regrettably, too few people are fully aware of the home care, homemaker and similar services which now exist in their own communities. Dissemination of such knowledge often requires creation in the community of a central information agency. The AMA has just completed a study of such organized central service programs for the chronically ill. This study is now stimulating the establishment of these centers in more communities.

Further, the AMA feels strongly that major emphasis should be given to health maintenance; to medical, social, and economic steps that will help a majority of older persons who are well to stay well.

This demands intensive efforts to educate physicians, hospital administrators, nurses, employers, and others for the new era of aging.

This theme was emphasized to physicians at AMA's Planning Conference for Medical Society Action in the Field of Aging last September. This conference was attended by official representatives of 46 State medical associations and 27 State health commission officials. It will be reemphasized to other health authorities at the first national conference of the Joint Council To Improve the Health Care of the Aged in Washington, June 12–14. (The joint council consists of the AMA, the American Hospital Association, the American Dental Association, and the American Nursing Home Association.)

It obviously is no accident then that the first of six points in the AMA health program for older citizens calls for stimulation of a realistic attitude toward aging, nor that the second point calls for promotion of health maintenance programs and wider use of restorative and rehabilitation services.

Copies of this program, "Medicine's Blueprint for the New Era of Aging," and the report on the September conference are enclosed.

These two documents are serving as guides to the 45 State medical society committees on aging. A partial list of activities of these committees is on pages 88–89 of the report of the September conference.

They include:

Strengthening licensing requirements for nursing homes and similar institutions.

Sponsorship of homemaker service programs.

Pilot action studies in home care programs.

Surveys of hospital utilization and its relationship to the aged.

Planning of adequate housing and nursing facilities for senior citizens.

Development of rehabilitation activities in and outside institutions.

Statewide programs of annual physical examinations in the over-50 age group for health maintenance and disease prevention.

Above all, we hope and believe that the AMA has brought increasing public acceptance of the fact that whoever we are, we all share the social obligation of giving aging people a chance to lead rewarding and productive lives. The AMA has hammered hard at this theme; it is continuing to do so. We are seeking, with all the means at our disposal, to make it clear that those people reaching an age of 74 or 63 or 60, with their capabilities and desire for productive work still alive and strong, should not and must not be fenced apart from everyone else by artificial barriers, either for their sake or the sake of the economy. Certainly, ability found at any age is worth saving, and this emphatically applies to those with ability

backed by years of experience, by a deep knowledge of living and by the wisdom of knowing human problems.

These are some of our fundamental goals and what we are doing to reach them. We would be deluding only ourselves if we maintained that all of these problems can be solved overnight. They cannot, now, nor can they ever be solved by any waving of a magic wand. Yet it seems to me these facts are inescapable: We have made solid progress; there is much still to be done; we are in the process of helping to do it.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD W. LARSON, M.D.

## New Giveaway Plan Has Doubtful Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an editorial which appeared in the March 5 issue of the Saginaw News regarding Senator DOUGLAS' proposed bill to provide Federal funds to help certain depressed areas find jobs for their unemployed. This is indeed a heartening and encouraging indication that certain communities in my State of Michigan are ready and willing to solve their own problems without Federal doles which would only temporarily relieve the situation, not solve it.

NEW GIVEAWAY PLAN HAS DOUBTFUL BENEFITS

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, held a 1-day Senate subcommittee hearing in Detroit Monday, with the very apparent hope of building up support for his bill, now before the U.S. Senate, to provide $389 million in Federal funds to help the Nation's depressed areas find jobs for the unemployed.

As expected, he got ready testimony from Gov. G. Mennen Williams and UAW President Walter P. Reuther that Michigan needs and would welcome this Federal help. Naturally, too, they blamed Michigan's unemployment not ony Michigan shortcomings but on what they termed the "national recession." Even while calling it national in scope, they said that Michigan had been hit much harder than most other States by it.

What Senator DOUGLAS did not expect, however, was the testimony of representatives of Battle Creek, Muskegon, and Jackson that the problem of industrial development was a State and local matter, and that Federal aid was not needed, nor would it help.

It would be only a drop in the bucket, anyway, since the hearing disclosed that the most Michigan could expect would be $13½ million. And Michigan's share, in Federal taxes, to pay the $389 million would be considerably greater than that. It always is, in any Federal aid plan.

The Douglas-Williams-Reuther philosophy of Federal aid for everything, as a means of redistributing the wealth of the Nation, got quite a shock when F. Joseph Buckley, managing director of the Battle Creek Area Development Corp., told Senator DOUGLAS, "Each community should roll up its sleeves like Battle Creek has and organize an area development corporation. They should take good care of the industry they have and create a good local business climate."

Certainly, there was no call for Federal aid in this statement.

Then Mr. Buckley declared further: "If our State would be as active as my community, there would be little need for an area redevelopment act. (That's what Senator DOUGLAS calls his bill.) If Lansing would drop its political axes and become Michiganders and Americans instead of Democrats and Republicans, the fundamental problems would be licked."

Among the fundamental problems was the big difference between Michigan and Indiana taxes on business, as poitned out by Robert J. Mason, vice president of the Muskegon Manufacturing Association. Mr. Mason's solution of Michigan's unemployment problem was a climate of good labor relations and taxes reasonably apportioned. The proposed Douglas bill, he declared, would be of no benefit to his city.

Muskegon, he pointed out, has an industrial development fund which has made 43 loans to industry, which helped to locate them in Muskegon, and helped to put 12,000 men on payrolls.

That, we must say, is a pretty good record of self-help.

A danger in the Douglas plan was cited by James O'Neil, of the Jackson Development Corp. Mr. O'Neil suggested that Federal aid for so-called distressed areas could backfire on nondistressed areas by helping the former take industries away from the latter. This eventually could make distress areas out of the nondistressed.

Senator DOUGLAS hastened to tell Mr. O'Neil that this was not the intent and purpose of his bill. But he could not guarantee that it might not be one of the consequences.

Senator DOUGLAS, we suspect, will interpret the Detroit hearing as an endorsement of his bill, inasmuch as Governor Williams, Mayor Miriani, of Detroit, and Mr. Reuther supported it.

But there will be many who have their misgivings about the ultimate accomplishments of this Federal giveaway bill, especially in the light of its rejection by communities who have had the gumption to roll up their sleeves and do something about their own problems.

Those problems will be settled—not just momentarily relieved—by this energetic, on-the-scene, local self-help method much better than by any handout from Washington, which would be only, at best, a drop in the bucket.

Michigan can work its way out of its employment, or unemployment, problem. And it will be a sounder State for having done so itself.

## Equal Time Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News commented in its usual straightforward editorial manner Monday on the recent Federal Communications Commission ruling on the Lar Daly case in Chicago.

I urge my colleagues to pay special attention to the last two paragraphs of this editorial. The danger of government tampering with news program content is brought home most clearly.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial from the Daily News:

EQUAL TIME NONSENSE

Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, has asked the Federal Communication Commission to reconsider a ridiculous ruling it made last month.

The ruling compelled Chicago TV stations to give equal time to a rival candidate for mayor because Mayor Richard J. Daley, also a candidate, had been shown briefly on newscasts.

There was a flash shot of the mayor filing his nomination papers, a 22-second glimpse of him greeting President Frondizi of Argentina at the airport, and a 1-minute shot of him opening the March of Dimes campaign.

These were not pictures of the Mayor making a political speech. The Mayor didn't ask for the time, it wasn't given him, he didn't buy it. It was part of a general news program.

But Lar Daly, a perennial candidate for whatever is going, demanded equal time and the FCC, by a 4-to-3 vote, said he was entitled to it. This is the same Daly who once announced he was a candidate for President, then sued the TV networks for equal time with Ike. A judge threw out the case.

The law, in what the trade calls the ulcer section, requires TV stations to give equal time, if asked, to political candidates who "use" the facilities. That is, if a candidate buys or is given time for a political broadcast, his rival may have a like time under like conditions.

The FCC frivolity in the Daly case goes way beyond that—it tampers with the news. Mr. Stanton says if the FCC doesn't reverse this nonsense, he will appeal to the courts, to Congress and to the public. It's a question of self-preservation. If the Government bureaucrats get to telling the news media what they must broadcast or print, it won't be long before they are dictating what they cannot broadcast or print.

Then, friends, we will have had it.

## Limitation on Advancement of PTS Substitutes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1959, I introduced H.R. 5337 which would remove from the Postal Classification Act a serious inequity affecting only a very small group of postal employees. That group is the Postal Transportation Service substitute, whose position is allocated to salary level PFS–5 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office.

When the Postal Classification Act became law in 1955, all Postal Transportation Service substitutes were limited to step 4 of level 5. In November 1957, the Post Office Department placed some Postal Transportation Service substitutes in postal field service level 4, and gave them dual appointments.

A few weeks ago, the Post Office Department again found that the limitation on advancement would not apply to Postal Transportation Service substitutes performing service as transfer clerks under key position 15.

The opposition by the Post Office Department to amending Public Law 68 by striking out this limitation has centered upon a fear that if Postal Transportation Service substitutes were able to advance to the top step of level 5, they would be reluctant to accept regular positions, and that this would be particularly true if the position to be accepted was assigned to postal field service level 4.

In view of the fact that the Post Office Department by its own actions has now very notably moved away from its original conclusion about the problems that would be developed, the restrictions are not now appropriate. Further, in view of the fact that by giving dual appointments to the top step of level 5 in some cases, and to the top step of level 4 in other cases, there is no longer any sound reason for withholding advancement to the top step from substitutes in railway and highway post offices.

I hope that my bill can be brought up for speedy action in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and that my colleagues in the House will support the legislation when it comes to the floor.

## Fortieth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's outstanding organizations is celebrating its 40th birthday this week. I am speaking of the American Legion which was organized in Paris in March 1919, by men from all ranks and from all services in the AEF of World War I. They dedicated their organization to God and country, and the American Legion has honored this dedication ever since that day.

From this little group in 1919 the American Legion has grown to be the largest veterans' group in the world with more than 17,000 community posts throughout the world. In many of these communities the American Legion post is the center of patriotic, civil and social activities. Its members are in all walks of life: educators, lawyers, laborers, scientists, industrialists, farmers, athletes, clerks, clergymen, and yes, Congressmen. Along with a number of my colelagues in the Congress, I have had the privilege and honor of being a Legion member since the time it was founded.

In its relatively short history, the American Legion has served admirably as the champion of the veterans of our wars, and has served just as admirably the best interests of the Nation as a whole. It pioneered in obtaining deserved rehabilitation assistance for those who suffered physical disabilities in military service. It led the fight for deserved assistance to widows, orphans, and dependents of those who gave their lives in military service. It obtained increased educational and training opportunities for veterans with its sponsorship of the GI bill of rights for World War II veterans and the Korean GI bill. And, of course, the American Legion played a prominent role in the creation of the Veterans' Administration in 1930.

Very well known, too, are the American Legion efforts to maintain adequate national preparedness for our Nation, and its efforts in opposition to communism. Though these are perhaps the best known of the Legion programs, it has promoted many other activities, too, in the interest of better America. The Legion is in the fore of programs of child welfare, the training of youth for good citizenship and leadership, and the support of national medical programs. The American Legion spends about $8 million a year for its child welfare programs alone. Its youth training program is one of the Nation's largest, including junior baseball, sponsorship of Boy Scout troops, Boys State and Boys National government, and oratorical and essay contests on patriotic themes.

The American Legion has established an outstanding record of service to God and country during its 40 years of existence and looks forward to many more years of leadership and service. Though its founders knew the destructiveness of war, the American Legion is a vital force for building and strengthening the human resources of our country.

## President Carlos P. Garcia of the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interesting and enlightening letter which I have just received from Mr. P. W. Reeves, an old friend who has spent the past several years in the Philippines. I am sure the facts which Mr. Reeves has pointed out about President Carlos P. Garcia and the Philippines will be of interest to all of my colleagues. Having been a personal friend of President Garcia for many years, and having visited many of the islands of the Philippines, I can attest to those things which Mr. Reeves sets forth in the following letter:

MARCH 15, 1959.

Hon. JAMES B. UTT,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UTT: I believe in fair play and justice and feel that I am warranted in making this rebuttal to the criticism which has been systematically leveled at President Carlos P. Garcia and his administration by certain periodicals in the United States during the past few months. I feel sure that your colleagues will be interested in hearing the other side. I hope, therefore, you will help in bringing to their attention the following facts.

One of the charges made was that the wife of President Garcia accepted gifts. Another charge was that Mrs. Garcia displayed her jewelry at receptions. The asininity of these attacks demonstrates the extent to which political enemies will go in order to smear a faithful public servant whose life has never been touched by the breath of scandal.

The wife of the head of state in every country in the world accepted gifts from friends and admirers. Ambassadors and Ministers from foreign countries invariably present gifts to the wife of the head of state. The wife of every President of the Philippines accepted gifts. The political enemies who have penetrated the sacred and personal domains of President Garcia's life, and the life of his charming and gracious wife, never uttered one word of criticism against former Presidents of the Philippines whose wives accepted gifts.

Another charge against President Garcia is that he brought forth an omnibus claims bill against the United States in the sum of $972 million. President Garcia did not manufacture this omnibus claims bill since he became President of the Philippines. He did not pull it out of a hat. Requests for payment of that old claims bill have been discussed in the Philippine Congress for many years. Four former Presidents (Osmeña, Roxas, Quirino, and Magsaysay) pressed for payment of those old claims. Why should so much criticism be leveled at President Garcia at this time because those old claims have been revived?

Another complaint set forth in American periodicals in recent months is that President Garcia stated in a public address that the Filipinos must stand on their own feet and be self-sustaining and not depend indefinitely on assistance from outside of the Philippines. That statement of President Garcia was a laudable one and worthy of commendation rather than condemnation. Perhaps the critics of President Garcia would have preferred that the President tell his people to sit down, stop producing, stop saving, and spend all they have because financial help is on the way to the Philippines from abroad.

Certain American periodicals criticized President Garcia because some emotional Filipino congressman proposed a bill in the Philippine Congress to change the name of Dewey Boulevard. The bill in question was proposed by a congressman of the opposition party, a man who fought President Garcia when he was a candidate for President in 1957. No sane person would hold former President Truman responsible for the introduction of every bill in the American Congress. Certainly, President Eisenhower cannot be blamed for the introduction of certain bills in the American Congress since he has been President, regardless of how obnoxious some of the bills happened to be. The American people did not turn on France when MacArthur Street was abandoned; nor did they turn on Japan for changing the name of MacArthur Boulevard.

An American magazine complained because the Philippines sought a loan to stabilize the peso because reserves were low. Under the

administration of the late President Magsaysay, the reserves were low. President Magsaysay sent the governor of the Central Bank to the United States for help. No complaint was made against the late President Magsaysay.

President Garcia is also blamed by certain American writers because the value of the peso (in the black market) is about 30 or 35 cents in U.S. value. The present value of the peso did not reach this low level just since President Garcia has been in power. The value of the peso was at the same low level during the administration of the late President Magsaysay.

In the opinion of certain American writers, President Garcia committed an unpardonable blunder when the Philippine Ambassador in Washington was instructed to return to Manila for conferences in February 1959. Before President Garcia instructed his Washington Ambassador to return to Manila, President Eisenhower called his Ambassador in Manila to Washington for conference.

The most baseless of all charges made against President Garcia in the U.S. periodicals refers to the stalemate in connection with the U.S. bases in the Philippines. This same stalemate existed during the 6 years President Quirino was in office; and it also during the 3 years and 3 months President Magsaysay was in office. Apparently the writers who are so hostile expected President Garcia to wave a magic wand and immediately dispose of the long-discussed U.S. bases problem. It is obvious that this bases problem was a hard nut to crack even before Garcia became President. I recall that during the second year of President Magsaysay's term, a group came from Washington headed by Mr. Bendetsen and this group had daily meetings with the Filipino group for many, many months without arriving at any satisfactory solution. President Garcia assumed office on March 18, 1957, and for the following 9 months he meticulously carried out every policy and every action which had been inaugurated by his predecessor (Ramon Magsaysay). Therefore, when these attacks were made on President Garcia, he had been president on his own less than 1 year. The critics must have thought President Garcia was a miracle man and could accomplish within a period of less than 1 year what former Presidents Magsaysay and Quirino had been unable to accomplish in a total of 9 years.

Two prominent periodicals in the United States have emphasized in bold type that President Garcia's popularity has plunged downward. Certain Filipinos who are conducting this tirade, this carefully conceived attack, against President Garcia, were opposed to President Garcia in 1957 and they did all within their power to prevent his election in November 1957. Unquestionably, the ammunition against President Garcia by certain writers in the United States has been supplied by certain individuals in Manila who opposed President Garcia in his bid for election in November 1957, and a number of the enemies of President Garcia at this time also opposed the team of Ramon Magsaysay and Carlos P. Garcia in November 1953.

The Philippines and America are bound by strong ties historically, politically and economically. The mutual feeling of friendship between the two countries stood the test of a bloody, devastating war. America has helped the Philippines and America should continue to help the Philippines. The best way to preserve a democratic way of life in the Philippines is for America to continue to assist her friendly ally. Lasting world peace can be made possible only through economic stability in all parts of the world.

The Filipinos gained political freedom and now their goal is economic freedom. The Philippines has vast undeveloped mineral resources in unlimited quantities. Capital is needed to develop these mineral resources. Lumber is one of the five major industries in the Philippines. This industry could be expanded. There are vast potentialities for the development of waterpower. The Filipinos are a proud race. They are filled with pride. The road which they have traveled has been long, rugged and uphill. They are striving to make new paths toward economic stability and abundance. America's friendship and financial assistance is needed in the Philippines at this time more than at any time in her past history. The Filipinos need encouragement and cooperation now as never before. Now is not the time to rock the boat as some writers in America are now boldly trying to do. We must help the Philippines strengthen its economy and by so doing we will help the Filipinos in their drive to prevent the spread of communism in their country.

Carlos P. Garcia has spent his entire life opposing everything which communism stands for. President Garcia believes in and worships God and he knows that the Communists strive by force to drive God out of the hearts of all men. The scatterings of Huks in the Philippines received their orders from the Communist leaders in China. In the early stages of the war with Japan, the Huks in the hills and mountains caused a lot of trouble. Everybody knows that during the Japanese occupation of the Philippines there were many Filipinos who surrendered. There were many Filipinos who accepted assignments by the Japanese to serve in various capacities. Carlos P. Garcia was one outstanding man who defied the orders of the Japanese high command to surrender. He fled to the hills and he led the resistance movement.

President Garcia is not a "Johnnie come lately" who has just been called into service by his people. He has served his people faithfully in the following capacities: 6 years as congressman, 9 years as governor of his home province of Bohol, 13 years as senator, 3 years and 3 months as vice president, and since March 18, 1957, he has served as president. Thus he has served his people almost 34 years. He has never been defeated for any office to which he aspired. In the November 1957 election, Carlos Garcia did not defeat a "stick-in" candidate or a dummy. The candidates for president in 1957 were outstanding men. Jose Yulo was the nominee of the Liberal Party. Senator Claro M. Recto was the nominee of the Nacionalist-Citizens Party. Manuel Manahan was the nominee of the Progressive Party. Antonio Quirino was another nominee on an independent ticket. President Garcia received 43 percent of the vote and the other 57 percent was divided among the other four presidential candidates. It is utterly absurd to say that President Garcia is not the choice of a majority of his people. To make such a statement is to imply that all of the voters who voted for Yulo, Recto, Manahan, and Quirino were against Garcia. If Recto had not been a candidate a large percentage of the Recto vote would have been cast for Garcia. If Yulo had not been a candidate, certainly a percentage of the Yulo votes would have been cast for Garcia. If Manahan had not been a candidate, a conservative estimate is that 25 percent of the Manahan vote would have voted for Garcia.

From the time he entered congress in 1925 until the present moment, the thought uppermost in the mind and heart of Carlos P. Garcia was how to strengthen or improve Philippine-American relations.

When I was in the States in August 1958, President Garcia wrote to me under date of August 7, 1958, about his trip to the United States in 1958. He closed his letter in the following manner:

"If only for the reason that I was able to win more American friends for the Philippines, I believe my visit was sufficiently fruitful from the standpoint of better Philippine-American relations."

Those of us who have lived in the Philippines know that when the bombers and Zero fighters from Japan finished their deadly work at Cavite, Olongapo, and Manila and forced the United States Asiatic Fleet to withdraw from Philippine waters, and when enemy bombs were destroying lives, churches, houses, schools, and business edifices, the Filipinos stood their ground and did not waver in their steadfast loyalty to the United States of America. On Bataan there were seven Filipino soldiers for every single American soldier. The Filipino and American soldiers battled against an enemy army three times their size. The indomitable courage, the unparalleled heroism, the devotion and loyalty to America displayed by the Filipino people and their never-say-die soldiers furnish proof of the wisdom of our American policy in the Philippines during the past 50 years. Bataan revealed to the world the genuineness and depth of Filipino-American friendship.

The superb stand made against impossible odds on Bataan gave America 4 months to recover from the staggering blow which was dealt to us at Pearl Harbor. The defenses at Hong Kong, Singapore, and Java surrendered with little delay when the first blows were struck by the Japanese. The Filipinos and Americans stood their ground on Bataan for 4 long months. The free world shudders when we think of what would have happened to us and to all civilization if the defenses of Bataan had crumbled and surrendered under the terrific onslaught of the Japanese. Yes, indeed, a receipt in full for all that America has done for the Philippines has been written in blood by the Filipino people whose loyalty to America never faltered. I do not think the Americans have forgotten so quickly.

The Philippines is America's friend, and has always been our friend in war and in peace. Philippine-American friendship matured through a period of 50 years. The crucibles of fire test was applied on Bataan, Corregidor, and Leyte. The Philippines has served as America's show window of democracy in Asia. The Philippines has done more than any other country to help America's prestige in Asia. If America were to turn thumbs down on the Philippines at this time, it would be very difficult for America to sell democracy to any other country in Asia.

President Garcia has made an excellent President. He is doing his utmost for his people. He loves his country. He is a man of great learning and high ideals. During the 34 years he has served his people in public office, he has used his wisdom, experience, influence, and energy to help make his country a better country. No man has done more than President Garcia to help his country gain its place in the society of nations of the free world.

President Garcia's philosophy has taught him that triumph always comes to the side of truth. He is frank and straightforward in all of his decisions and dealings with his fellow men. He does not resort to subterfuge, camouflage, or deception. He answers any question propounded to him without the slightest equivocation. There is no part of his makeup which even approaches demagoguery. He is not a glory seeker.

Some men are not dismayed by defeat or disappointment. Some men do not surrender their convictions when a majority of his friends suggest a different course of action. Such a man is Carlos P. Garcia.

Leadership is that rare and elusive quality by which some men are destined to lead. If a leader is fortified with truth and given the proper cooperation he can lead his people to limitless horizons of happiness, prosperity, culture, and morality. Carlos P. Garcia is endowed with this type of leadership.

Members of the President's own party often differ with him but never question his integrity and honesty of purpose. No man in the Philippines is more highly respected than the even-tempered President Garcia.

The enemies of President Garcia have lost sight of the fact that the will of God cannot be arrested. It was the will of God that Carlos P. Garcia became the President of the Philippines. When the vice president took over the job left unfinished by the late Ramon Magsaysay, he brought with him to Malacañang a wealth of experience in the guiding, shaping, and managing of public affairs. The Filipino people were, indeed, fortunate to have on hand and ready the right man to carry on. With his distinguished public service record, both in the legislative and executive branches of the government, Carlos P. Garcia was well equipped to guide the ship of state. There are legions of Filipinos who look upon President Garcia as a man of destiny, but these poor common folks do not have the benefit of a powerful magazine to tell the world what they think of their God-fearing, faithful, sympathetic, intelligent, and distinguished President who has rendered conspicuous service since he was a young man when he was elected to the House of Representatives.

President Garcia stands for progressive ideas in government, in economics and in world affairs. He is a man of culture, a scholar, a gentleman, a statesman of the highest order. His courage, foresight, strength of will, his patience under adversity, his unwavering conviction on all matters and his sterling integrity stand out like the Rock of Gibraltar. Fortified with this armor, he can with absolute ease weather the storms of opposition.

Most of the countries of the world are experiencing difficulties. Certainly the countries in Asia have many problems at this time. President Garcia cannot perform miracles and turn the Philippines into an Utopia or a paradise. He does not have a panacea for all aches and pains. He cannot arrest every ill wind which blows. Give him time and he will disappoint his critics. He assumed office on March 17, 1957. The term of the late President Magsaysay had 9 months yet to run. President Garcia did not make any changes in the cabinet or government personnel. He did not change any of the policies or plans formulated by his predecessor until January 1958. Thus he has had only one year as President in which to formulate his own plans and policies. He has never failed his people in the past. I am sure he will not fail his people now as President.

There is something all-compelling about this man Garcia. He is one of the truly great men of the Philippines—the attacks against him to the contrary notwithstanding.

I am an American citizen. My father, my mother, my paternal grandfather and my maternal grandfather were born in the United States of America. My legal voting residence is in the United States.

I am not now and have never been employed by President Garcia or the Philippine Government in any capacity whatsoever. I am not now and have never been engaged in any kind of business ventures in the Philippines.

I have never sought a favor at the hands of President Garcia or any of the former Presidents of the Philippines—and I have known all of them personally from the late Manuel L. Quezon to President Carlos P. Garcia.

It was my good fortune and rare privilege to meet Hon Carlos P. Garcia for the first time in the spring of 1937. My admiration for him increased with each succeeding year. I have presented the foregoing facts because I am his friend, because I am an American and want to see the friendly relations between America and the Philippines continue, and because I believe in fair play.

Sincerely,

P. W. REEVES.

---

## The Success of the Export-Import Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the United States in the Export-Import Bank has an excellent agency not only to assist our U.S. relations abroad, but to finance transactions of U.S. industry. This has helped many U.S. areas in expanding their business which has added to the employment and prosperity of many U.S. industrial communities.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington:

FOREIGN TRADE AND FOREIGN AID—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL C. WAUGH, PRESIDENT, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB OF AMERICA, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 19, 1959

A week ago today the Export-Import Bank reached its 25th anniversary. In observing this event, we issued a brief statement summarizing our loaning operations which this year crossed the $10 billion mark. The Export-Import Bank, our statement pointed out, "became the first public agency, either national or international, to arrange credits for large-scale economic development throughout the world."

The Bank was founded February 12, 1934. For 11 years it was a small institution, exploring and pioneering new programs in support of U.S. foreign or overseas trade. It made its first credit of the type which has come to be known generally as a development loan in 1938. In 1940 it authorized the first of a series of loans to Brazil which made possible the establishment of the now famous integrated steel mill at Volta Redonda.

Until 1945 the amount of funds available for lending by Eximbank, as we are known, was only $700 million. But in that year the Bank was enlarged, made an independent agency responsible directly to the President, and its lending authority expanded to $3½ billion. Today the Bank is authorized by Congress to have loans outstanding at any one time up to $7 billion.

When the Export-Import Bank became a multibillion dollar institution in 1945, it was the only institution of its kind. It was, and it is today, a unilateral agency and the principal international lending arm of the U.S. Government. Since 1945 a variety of banks, funds, and agencies have come, or are coming, into being to provide loans or grants for purposes generally similar to those financed by Eximbank. Some of these—particularly the U.S. agencies—already have passed from the scene or been greatly reorganized. Others, especially the international agencies, are growing. We have today in Washington in addition to Eximbank:

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; the International Monetary Fund; the International Finance Corporation; the Development Loan Fund; the Commodity Credit Corporation; the foreign currency lending program of the United States under Public Law 480 (which Eximbank directs and executes); the International Cooperation Administration (successor to the Economic Cooperation Administration which administered the Marshall Plan); and the President's Emergency Fund. And today still more institutions are in sight, such as the Inter-American Development Bank and, possibly, a Middle-Eastern Development Fund.

Secretary Dulles told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently, "The demand for economic and social betterment is now universal." This is the philosophy, at least in part, for the creation of additional lending institutions.

The problem with which the administration is confronted, in my opinion, is the extent to which support should be given the international type of agency as compared with the wholly owned U.S. agencies, all of which are loaning in the international field. In other words, the question is bilateral or multilateral loaning, and the relative degree to which both should be supported, realizing, of course, our Government is definitely committed to both types of agencies. The final decisions rest with the Congress.

From my experience during these past 6 years—first in the Department of State as Assistant Secretary and later as Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, during which period I served as Deputy U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and then for the past 3 years plus as President of the Export-Import Bank—I have had an opportunity to study both phases of this problem.

There is one point upon which I believe we will all agree, and that is that the international loaning agencies could not or would not endure without the generous dollar support of the United States. This support to existing institutions, in my opinion, should be continued. I do firmly believe, however, that every effort should be made to—and here I am using a mild word—encourage our fellow members of these international organizations, particularly those where the recovery has been marked, due in part to U.S. aid in one form or another, to carry their full share and in certain instances to pay their back dues.

The importance of the role of the Export-Import Bank in the international lending field has not been sufficiently appreciated in the United States, in part, I believe, because its activities have not been sufficiently understood.

This is due possibly to the fact that the art or profession of making loans for economic development—whether from a national or international source—is not well understood even by many knowledgeable people. I speak with experience on this point for I have devoted a large share of my time since I came to Eximbank explaining to private financiers, industrialists, businessmen, exporters, and students of Government and foreign policy, what I shall call the philosophy and practice of sound lending.

In the past 6 years as a Government official I have visited 37 countries, talked to the representatives of many more, traveled 330,000 miles, and have come into direct connection with most of the different types of financial and economic problems facing the various governments of the world. From this experience I have learned one lesson thoroughly: the fundamental basis of the economic strength of the free world today rests upon the United States.

If this country continues to maintain a strong and vigorous economy, our friends

and allies abroad will be able to grow and develop in accordance with their broad aspirations. To be sure, this rate of growth will not be uniform because of the various types of national economies. The problems of Latin America today are indicative of uneven situations and varying economic foundations. But, as a dictum, we may say that the economic stability of the United States is vital to the free world.

On the contrary, if the U.S. economy is not maintained at a high level most countries of the free world will be in serious difficulties because the United States is either their best customer or their source of important financial support by one means or another.

This point was emphasized recently in a speech by Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs Douglas Dillon, on the subject of what he called "Imperatives of International Economic Growth." Here is what he said:

"The first imperative—and a major one—is to maintain a sturdy, growing economy in the United States. Our ability to extend aid, to offer the capital which is so badly needed in the newly emerging countries, is conditioned upon our domestic strength. Our prosperity also helps to assure them a market for their output. The movement of goods is, of course, closely related to the movement of capital. Not only must we import in order to export. We must import to keep investment flowing overseas. For without the prospect of returns, the expanding flow of private investment is impossible."

We see, therefore, why the stability of the United States is economic law No. 1 and why it is necessary to maintain a high level of business activity, or trade, both with ourselves domestically and with our friends and allies overseas. It is in support of the latter activity that the role of the Export-Import Bank has been paramount for many years.

Eximbank sometimes has been questioned for making "tied loans," meaning that its loans are restricted to purchases of equipment and goods manufactured in the United States. In this sense Eximbank loans are "tied." But let me give you another perspective. Our loans are "tied" for the purpose of assisting the U.S. economy which, as we have just seen, is of vital importance to our friends abroad. I submit, therefore, that "tied" loans in the sense the term is used here, are a blessing to our borrowers overseas. Criticism of this policy probably arises largely out of misunderstanding.

When in India in October of last year, I was asked both at Bangalore and Madras whether or not it would be possible to use a portion of the Eximbank credit for purchases to be made either in Europe or Japan. My answer was that we certainly had no objection to the purchases being made in the areas referred to, but that we felt that the countries in question had made sufficient recovery, in part due to U.S. aid, that they were now in position to finance the purchases made in their respective countries. I submit this is not an unreasonable position to be taken by the directors of the Export-Import Bank.

It is difficult to estimate with pin-point accuracy the extent to which Eximbank credits benefit the U.S. economy but rather easy to understand that the benefit has been great. The following analysis, with examples, will demonstrate this point.

Let us take a credit for the establishment and expansion of a steel mill. From purchasing agents' records available on our credits of $61.5 million to the integrated steel mill at Huachipato, Chile, we know that for every dollar which the Bank loaned for development of that mill, its owner—Compania de Acero del Pacifico, S.A.—spent an additional $2 for supplies and services in the United States. That means that the Bank's loan of $61.5 million brought orders to this country totaling $184.5 million.

To express the point in another way, the Bank's assistance to the Chile steel mill resulted in the placing of 7,807 individual orders with 780 suppliers in the United States.

Incidentally, when this company received its first loan from the Bank in 1951, it was largely owned by the government. Gradually ownership has been transferred and today the mill is controlled by private enterprise.

Less than a month ago, or to be precise on Saturday, January 31, two of our directors were in Pittsburgh and made an inspection of the Lewis plant of Blaw-Knox. There we found orders for steel mill equipment in various stages of manufacture and for shipment to Monterrey, Mexico; Huachipato, Chile; and Donawitz, Austria.

I asked the plant manager what percentage of the work in the plant was represented by these orders, all under Eximbank financing. The answer was 90 percent. The president of Blaw-Knox, without hesitation, said that this plant would not be operating if it did not have the three orders referred to. He then went on to say that the following Monday another plant that had been closed for some time would be reopened and reemploy some 600 men as a result of a recent order for steel rolls to be shipped to Spain, also under Eximbank financing.

When you recall that Eximbank has assisted the development and/or expansion of steel mills in Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina—as well as Chile—in Latin America, and in Japan, Spain, Italy, and Austria, you begin to understand the strong support which Export-Import Bank credits give to the U.S. economy.

Here are a couple of other examples: The Bank has made a number of credits in Japan to assist the expansion, greatly needed, of electric power in that country. We know that two of these credits, totaling $16.5 million, generated orders in the United States for approximately $25 million. These orders were distributed among 40 companies in 15 States.

In Brazil a year or two ago we extended a credit of about $1 million for grain silos, desperately needed in a relatively poor section of the country to enable farmers to store their grain crops which, until now, have often rotted before they could be sold. This credit brought orders to 29 plants in 16 States, and affected 80,390 Americans employed in those factories.

Taking these examples, you can see from the following two figures how important the Bank has been to the U.S. economy. In its 25 years the Bank has made some 1,600 individual credits and disbursed some $6.6 billion (an additional $1.6 billion is committed for disbursements). Obviously, these credits have generated orders of additional billions which have contributed to U.S. business activity in recent years, including the past rather difficult year, 1958.

In Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Oceania, the Bank has assisted the development—in addition to steel mills and electric power—of iron, copper, nitrate, manganese, and uranium mining; cement mills; fertilizer plants; chemical plants; innumerable types of industrial plants; large-scale irrigation projects; highways; ports; and public works. As we have seen by example, the immediate result of these credits has been to provide hundreds of thousands of orders for U.S. industries throughout the country and many millions of hours of employment for American workers.

But this is not all. While the Export-Import Bank by statute is directed to make loans which offer "reasonable assurance of repayment," the Bank has made it a policy for many years to make loans which would improve the borrower's economic position, and, wherever possible, increase his country's ability to earn dollars in their trade with the United States. Thus, our development credits have resulted in economic growth abroad which has expanded U.S. oversea markets permanently.

From this rather brief report you may be able to visualize the importance of a national institution such as the Export-Import Bank to a country's foreign trade. I hope I have been able to make clear how the Bank's development credits have been designed for the dual purpose of assisting borrowers abroad, by leaving them in a stronger position than before the loan was made, and by improving U.S. oversea markets. This Bank accomplishes, therefore, the same goal as other lending institutions of assisting the economic aspirations of other countries; but, in addition, it does so in a way that strengthens the economy of the United States, and this, as we have seen, is of the greatest importance to our friends and allies.

Having said all this, I do not mean to imply that I think the Export-Import Bank is the only type of agency that should be in the business of international lending for economic purposes. We all know that the economic needs of the world are very great, and in some regions, desperate. These areas require, therefore, varying types of financial assistance.

There is, in my opinion, still a need for grants or so-called soft loans in our foreign economic assistance program. An effort has been made, through the creation of the Development Loan Fund, to make project loans on a soft-loan basis in areas not covered by either the Export-Import Bank or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. To my orthodox training, in certain instances grants are preferable to soft loans—that is, very long term loans made in dollars but repayable in local currencies and at low interest rates.

There is no loaning agency today, either United States or international, to make loans in the field of so-called social overhead purposes, that is, low-cost housing, schools, hospitals, and so forth. The President's Emergency Fund is the only source available at present for grants, and this is, of course, definitely limited in amount.

You appreciate the impossibility of discussing the broad question of economic development lending in any full or comprehensive sense in the limited time of 15 or 20 minutes. You undoubtedly will have many questions unanswered, so let us now go directly to the questions and I will answer them to the best of my knowledge and ability.

## Illegal Secrecy in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, it seems that every few days brings us new evidence of a bureaucratic determination to withhold from the taxpayers, nonsecurity information with respect to how Pentagon, where there is some valid basis for secrecy as to the details of our readiness to defend ourselves, there seems to have developed a fixation as to the absolute necessity of placing everything under a security classification, even

though many matters so classified contain no data important to be protected from potential enemies.

In this connection, I include an editorial which appeared on March 17, 1959, in the Richmond, Va., Dispatch:

ILLEGAL SECRECY IN WASHINGTON

The U.S. Navy has joined the Air Force in illegally refusing to make available to the General Accounting Office, vital, but unclassified, information concerning its expenditures.

Our readers are doubtless familiar with the fact that the International Cooperation Administration, which spends billions of the taxpayers' money overseas for foreign aid, has likewise refused to cooperate with the GAO. Its cooperation seems to mean working with the Vietnamese and the Filipinos, but only to a minimum degree with its own General Accounting Office.

President Eisenhower's Federal budget is under fire from various directions—partly because of such attitudes as are being manifested by the Navy, the Air Force, and the ICA.

Clark Mollenhoff, able Washington correspondent of the Cowles newspapers, writes in the latest Bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

"The Navy has put such a tight secrecy around its contracting and procurement reports that it is impossible for the Comptroller General to fulfill his responsibility to audit Navy financial affairs. * * * WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, has instructed Representative JOHN E. MOSS to prepare for public hearings on this matter.

"'I am sure everything possible will be done to overcome the repeated arrogance of Federal executive officials whose denials of information to the General Accounting Office flout the clear law of the land,' DAWSON has written Comptroller General Campbell."

Thus we have one more clear example of a Federal department head (this time Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas), arbitrarily refusing to permit the Comptroller to study records to which he is entitled by law, and which nobody claims involve national security. Specifically, the Comptroller wishes to look at procurement and contracting practices of the Military Transportation Service. The Navy has come up with the amazing thesis that under executive privilege it can refuse to let the GAO see these records.

This despite the fact that it is required by law to do so.

The forthcoming hearings before the Moss subcommittee should focus the spotlight on this arrogant bureaucratic attitude. It is to be hoped that the hearings will, by implication, teach other Federal departments that the country isn't going to put up with this sort of thing.

Inability of the General Accounting Office to exercise the controls given it by Congress is one of the best reasons why taxes keep going up and the Federal budget is seldom balanced. Federal departments which are illegally thwarting the GAO must be forced into line.

## Oregon Centennial Highlights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 16, 1959*

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following news release regarding some Oregon centennial highlights.

As many of the Members already know, Oregon is this year celebrating its 100th birthday as a member of the Union. Numerous events are planned throughout the State and I am hopeful that many of my colleagues will be able to visit Oregon during 1959 to join with us in commemorating our anniversary.

The news release follows:

CENTENNIAL HIGHLIGHTS

Throughout the State, churches are setting certain Sundays apart as Centennial Sundays with sermons and services built around the 100th birthday theme. In many localities, the centennial year is serving as a springboard for church school and adult programs dealing with the early days of their denominations and the coming of their faiths to Oregon. Many churches have colorful stories to reveal through the history of early-day missionaries, priests, and circuit riders.

In Pendleton, the residents are planning to don western dress May 1 and will continue to wear it through September 18. A national Indian encampment from July 18 to 26 will offer eastern centennial visitors a glimpse of Indian life as authentic Indian dances and games are presented for the public.

More than 2,000 Indians, representing every tribe in the Nation, are expected for the encampment which will commemorate the signing of a treaty in 1855 between the United States and the Walla Walla and Umatilla Tribes.

Oregon's Van of History, a mobile display of the State's history, continues its travels to acquaint the population with the dramatic story of the pioneer days. The van is a truck trailer 40 feet long, outfitted with exhibits ranging from the tomahawk that killed Marcus Whitman, an early Congregational missionary, to the diary of John Hoskins, supercargo aboard the ship *Columbia*, when it discovered the Columbia River in 1792.

This week the van left Springfield Monday for Cottage Grove. On Wednesday it makes a stop in Yoncalla and arrives in Sutherlin for showings on Thursday and Friday. Next week it will be in Roseburg Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, leaving Thursday for Myrtle Creek and moving on to Canyonville on Friday.

Beaverton's post office is displaying an original Pony Express saddle. Weighing only 31 pounds it is constructed in a light and comfortable fashion with a wide scoop to allow air under it. This was used for the U.S. Continental Express, established April 3, 1860, and continuing until October 1861, when it was replaced by the telegraph system. Starting point was St. Joseph, Mo., and it took 9 days for a rider to travel the 1,966 miles to San Francisco. Cost of mail was $5 per half-ounce.

On June 7 and lasting through the summer, the Pony Express will ride again in Oregon. Two trunk lines with feeder lines will connect all parts of the State and it will be possible to mail a letter anywhere in Oregon and have it actually carried by horsemen to any destination in the State or to the edge of the State for transfer to trains.

Inspired by the Indian teepee of the Umpqua Indians, Douglas County is building what is expected to be the largest county exhibit at the centennial exposition in Portland. It is the only county exhibit to be on the grounds outside the exposition building.

The structure, 40 by 70 feet in dimensions, is being built of plywood with precut sheets used for both roof and siding. Modern techniques are being used to duplicate Indian architecture with interesting results, according to Roy Cornwell, Roseburg architect who was awarded the contract for the exhibit.

County organizations, civic groups, and municipal agencies in Douglas County are cooperating to keep the cost at $18,000, although construction, if done through the usual channels, would run close to $24,000.

Roseburg Chamber of Commerce is arranging for direct teletype service from the building. This will enable Roseburg area residents to make personal reservations for visits to the exhibition.

## Kennedy-Roosevelt Bill "Ambushed" by a Western Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will agree with me that the many lengthy, detailed and technical proposals that are introduced in Congress offer problems of interpretation and understanding by our fellow citizens, although many of them are indeed proficient in analyzing measures. But, in any event, I would venture to say that none of us becomes annoyed or disturbed by letters from individuals accusing us of legislative intent quite apart from the real intent or purpose of a given proposal. Personally, I am more than pleased to have the opportunity to clarify the issue and gratified to see public interest in a given matter.

However, I do not think I am alone in this body when I say I am duly concerned about and disturbed by misrepresentation of proposed legislation by a person, group or organization that has the responsibility to know better, and to compound the dilemma, is in a position to foster misconceived conclusions or misrepresentations through the means of public media.

I make this point because on March 12 a community paper in Los Angeles County, the Whittier News, carried an editorial in which it presented erroneous information about the Kennedy-Roosevelt bill to increase the minimum wage and expand coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The editorial claims that our proposal would make it impossible for a lad of less than 16 years to be gainfully employed in many businesses. Of particular concern to the editor, based no doubt on his own hasty conclusion, was that this meant no newspaper carrier boys could be less than 16 years old.

As I explained in a letter to the editor, this bill in no way precludes ambitious youngsters under 16 years of age from engaging in the proud American tradition of helping to distribute the words of the free press. Unfortunately in this instance the words were not true. Nor does the bill prevent a lad less than 16 years old from mowing lawns or from engaging in other activities in which young boys have long excelled.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of my colleagues who may be receiving inquiries on this or similar points made about the bill and to allay

any future misinterpretation that may possibly be generated through the mass media.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for insertion in the RECORD the complete text of the editorial and my reply to the editor:

[From the Whittier News, Mar. 12, 1959]

GIVE THE BOY A CHANCE

For a long time it's been a firm conviction with a lot of people that a busy boy is not likely to end up among the delinquents. Keep a young fellow busy doing something he likes to do and, even though he has only limited parental guidance, or possibly none, his chances of getting in with the wrong crowd are considerably lessened.

This is the principle upon which many of the youth organizations and welfare groups base their programs. They keep boys and girls busy doing things and thus curb delinquency.

Furthermore, under the American system by which we've been living for a long time, it has been proven wise to introduce youngsters to the free enterprise system as early as is practicable. This means getting jobs and earning money. Once the thrill of such achievement stirs a youngster, he often has no time left for dillydallying.

Such facts are what make the current efforts of a couple of famous Americans despicable, in our opinion.

The famous Americans are Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who aspires to be President of this country, and Congressman ROOSEVELT, of California, who owns a fairly well-known name.

They have introduced identical bills in Congress to expand the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Such extension would, in many instances, be helpful.

But one of their proposals would make it impossible for a lad of less than 16 years to be gainfully employed in many businesses. We happen to know about it because, among others, no newspaper carrier boys could be less than 16 years old. The principle is the same whether it's carrier boys or grocery boys or errand runners or lads ambitious enough to mow lawns.

This business of saying that no person less than 16 years of age may be gainfully employed is a bunch of rot.

The movement has already gone so far that many youngsters even now seek employment in vain until they pass the magic mark of 16. Ask the parents of 12- to 15-years-olds what they think of such legislation.

Misguided do-gooders who think they are still saving children from sweatshops need to reevaluate their crusade. Thousands of communities throughout the country could be aided in their campaigns against juvenile delinquency by a repeal of the laws that make work impossible for many under 16, rather than an extension of this foolishness.

Many of today's business leaders weren't hampered by such rules and they have done fairly well.

---

MARCH 18, 1959.

Mr. MYNATT SMITH,
*Editor and associate publisher, the Whittier News, Whittier, Calif.*

DEAR MR. SMITH: One of your readers was good enough to send me your editorial of Thursday, March 12, 1959, which attacks certain portions of my proposal, and that of Senator JOHN KENNEDY, to increase the minimum wage and extend coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I am gratified to note that regarding the extension of coverage, you state that "such extension would, in many instances, be helpful."

However, I am dismayed by the fact that you apparently have not carefully read the proposal because you come to the following conclusion, and I quote from your editorial:

"But one of their proposals would make it impossible for a lad of less than 16 years to be gainfully employed in many businesses, We happen to know about it because, among others, no newspaper carrier boys could be less than 16 years old. The principle is the same whether it's carrier boys or grocery boys or errand runners or lads ambitious enough to mow lawns."

I am enclosing a copy of the proposed minimum wage bill, and I direct your attention to section 9 (c) and (d), page 12, which you may have read but inadvertently misinterpreted. One line 5 you will observe that reference is made to provisions of section 12 of the present act (Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended), which attempts to prevent oppressive child labor practices.

Reading further, you will note that the child-labor provisions, as set forth in section 12, shall not apply to children employed in agriculture "outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while so employed, or to any employee employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions." Certainly this does not in any way preclude a youngster under 16 years of age from engaging in such activities.

I think the real confusion lies in the fact that the language regarding newspaper delivery employees was not carefully read and analyzed. It was never my intention to preclude youngsters under 16 from participating in the proud American tradition of helping to distribute the words of the free press.

Starting on line 15, page 12, of the bill, you will note that provisions of certain sections of the present act shall not apply to those engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers at their residences. These provisions of the present act cover minimum wage, maximum hours, and child labor, respectively. I call your attention to the fact that section 12 (the child labor provisions of the present act), according to the language of the bill, shall not apply (1) to any employee engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers when such an employee is employed outside of school hours, and (2) to such employee if he is 16 years old or older.

This language is important because it in no way states that a child under 16 cannot deliver newspapers. It merely states that a person over 16 would not come under the child-labor provisions of the present act, and those under 16 would come under the said provisions of the act and thus would be protected from oppressive child-labor practices.

Since your editorial was a complete misinterpretation of certain sections of the measure, which certainly would not prohibit an ambitious youngster under 16 from delivering newspapers, mowing lawns, delivering groceries, or running errands, I felt it necessary to write to you so the public record will be set straight in this matter.

I realize that this letter is somewhat lengthy, but I am hopeful that it may be printed in your newspaper in its entirety.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

## Speech and Hearing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for the 15 million Americans handicapped with hearing and speech defects who cannot speak for themselves or hear your answer to their pleas for help.

It is no wonder that over 3 million of these are children, since more children are handicapped from hearing and speech defects than from any other single cause. Many of these children have neither heard their mother's voice nor learned about God. Yet they have received scant attention from the public because their plight is not dramatic. Since they neither speak nor hear they are considered dumb and stupid. Other physical ailments, being self-evident, have attracted sympathy and received considerable help from individuals and agencies, yet those children who live in a silent noncommunicative world have had little thought or opportunity given to them.

Ten thousand children are forced to leave grammar schools each year because of hearing or speech defects. The rehabilitation potential of those pupils makes this waste a national tragedy.

The problem is farreaching. The economic loss alone is staggering. Servicemen, particularly those flying the jets, veterans, labor in the noisy industries, and certain research workers, are debilitated from hearing losses. With the present lack of facilities, many of the above persons receive no help. Consequently, many are forced to retire or change jobs. It is conceivable that these losses could affect our defense effort. To say the least, millions of dollars are required to train new personnel.

The effects of hearing and speech defects are also widely felt in medicine and dentistry. No program for the treatment of cerebral palsy, polio, mental health, cleft palate, hairlip, and some other diseases can function adequately without a companion hearing and speech program.

There is necessarily great interest in the aged at this time, 10 percent of whom have an incapacitating hearing loss. Cancer takes a toll of 2,000 or more voices each year, necessitating the removal of the vocal box. These laryngectomized patients can talk again, provided you give them the means.

I am advised that there are only 4,000 professionally trained audiologists and speech pathologists in this country, many of whom are without adequate training. It is conservatively estimated that 20,000 additional postgraduate students need education training in this

field. Until this figure is approached, hearing and speech centers will be unable to expand and few new centers will be established. Until expansion is possible, research for the numerous problems discussed above, will continue to lag, the teaching programs for this needed graduate personnel will remain under par and the growing rehabilitation problem cannot be met.

With the purpose of alleviating this situation I have introduced a bill which would make grants to institutions of higher learning for the instruction of graduate students in the field of hearing and speech. The bill provides that the program is placed under the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary will be assisted in determining policies and programs by an advisory committee serving without compensation and appointed by the Secretary with the approval of the President of the United States. This committee is to consist of outstanding individuals from specific groups, competent to render advice.

Institutions would be required to meet certain standards as outlined in the bill in order to participate in the program. Funds granted to institutions, meeting requirements as may be determined by the Secretary and the advisory committee, shall use funds in a hearing and speech program as defined in this bill solely for: first, salaries for members of the faculties teaching graduate students; second, payment of stipends to college graduates who are awarded fellowships; third, the acquisition of equipment as needed for teaching purposes; and, fourth, the administration of such a program. The bill also would make it possible for persons in allied fields, such as many branches of medicine, physics, psychology, and so forth, to receive training.

With the broad concept of this bill the great needs of approximately 10 percent of our population, those people handicapped with hearing and speech defects, would be served.

Mr. Speaker, I plead for urgent passage of this measure. In addition to the great humanitarian need, immediacy is important to the Nation. The lack of trained personnel is largely responsible for: first, the discontinuation of over a thousand pupils from public schools monthly; second, incurable deafness in a number of children living noncommunicable lives who should have received treatment before the age of three, if they were to be enabled to communicate with other people; third, the failure to rehabilitate 80 percent of the remedial cases of children who daily are becoming less able to absorb training because of age; fourth, the lack of one or more comprehensive speech and hearing centers in many States; fifth, labor, veterans, members of the aged, research men and women, industry, the Government, and society as a whole, are daily paying heavy penalties through the lack of an effective program of assistance.

The precepts of this bill are humanely just and economically sound. Prevention of deafness and restoration of millions of individuals to usefulness is cheaper than any form of charitable maintenance. A normal life, including the ability to pay taxes, is their right and their wish.

## My Citizenship in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs sponsored a citizenship essay contest for high school juniors. The Seventh District of the Federated Clubs consists of 32 counties in western Kansas and Miss Marilyn Miller, of Larned, won the contest out of 571 entries with her essay entitled "My Citizenship in Action." I would like to bring this essay to the attention of this esteemed body:

Today, our local football team won the championship of our league. What lies behind this victorious achievement? I believe citizenship in action accounts for the successful record.

A player on a winning team must endure rigorous training. He must often deny himself pleasures which others regard as a birthright. He must eat temperately. He attends social functions but excuses himself at an early hour to get adequate rest. Each day he practices to perfect his skills. In short, he masters the art of self-discipline which is citizenship in action.

My citizenship in action is likewise characterized by self-discipline. It implies social obligations. It is like the regimen demanded of the athlete who plays the game of football to win. I must regulate my life carefully, develop my skills diligently, not as an end in itself, but in order better to serve my home, my school, my community, my State, and my country.

First, I must take my schoolwork seriously. I must learn as much as possible, and this learning process must continue throughout life. I must know something of the governmental processes on all levels. I must know the basic history of my home town, my county, my State, and my country. I must read widely that I may be well informed. I must avoid making decisions until I have the facts necessary to make them intelligently.

In a football game the boys play according to the rules. Our public laws are the rules of the game of life. I must obey them because I believe Theodore Roosevelt was correct when he said, "No man is above the law."

A successful football coach must have the full cooperation of all the boys on the team. Every boy is expected to do his part. My citizenship demands similar dedication. I, therefore, must take an active part in church, school, and community enterprises. I must cast an intelligent vote in school elections. This is democracy in action. I must help to elect honest, faithful, capable class officers who will do their jobs well. Justice Brandeis has said, "The greatest menace to freedom is an inert people."

The cheering section at a game is a great help to the team. My citizenship in action will applaud those who are giving their best in their work. I must encourage those who work for peace, and those who stand ready to perform a national service in time of war. I must assist those who would improve our tax-supported schools and those who work for a well-balanced, productive, and free economic system.

A football game is an exercise in the art of fair play. My citizenship in action must stress courteous, friendly, unselfish relationships. I must appreciate what others do for me and I must be ready to return such kindnesses.

I shall put my citizenship in action by playing the game of life fairly, by living the golden rule, by doing my work well, and by cooperating with others whose ideals are worthy of my support. This I am sure will bring me a victorious citizenship.

## India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to salute the people of India, their Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, and His Excellency the Ambassador to the United States, as that country moves into its 12th years of independence.

Though only half the size of the United States, India is the home of every sixth person in the world, ranking it as the second most populous nation. Its people present a colorful mosaic of races, religions, and cultures. Centuries before the birth of Christ, India gave to the world the first discoveries in science, mathematics, and metaphysics; the first classics in literature, art, and law. Five thousand years ago a highly developed civilization flourished in India, and there is evidence today of once well-planned cities, sanitary underground drainage, baths, wide roads, and houses made of burnt brick. Moreover, findings reveal that the Indian people even then were skilled in many arts and crafts and had developed a form of writing.

If modern India is viewed today against this historical background rather than its past independence, development, and maturity the richness of her philosophy and the significance of her tradition will offer greater meaning to a disordered world.

India has never embarked on a war of conquests, her leaders maintain. Moreover, they add, through all the centuries of her life, India has usually lived at peace with her neighbors, and her only relationship with them has been one involving an exchange of culture through pilgrims and peaceful delegations. This is not to imply invaders have not come to India and effected conquests, but the Indians remind they have been absorbed by her and have become Indians.

So when India came face to face with the community of nations for the first time in 1947, she presented a curious blend of the old and young: old because of the traditional values which direct successfully her destiny through the ages and young because she was free of a

background of aggressive conquest or any other such inherited legacy of behavior. Thus, Nayantara Sahgal, the daughter of Madame Pandit, wrote in 1953:

Hers was the unique and happy position of launching into international affairs with a blank slate, of regarding the whole world with friendship, and announcing that her own moral sense and no other consideration would be her future guide in matters of policy.

Madam Sahgal admits, however, the handicap that is India's, having so recently awakened in a highly industrialized world climate and finding herself so far behind her Western neighbors in many important respects. She is concerned with immediate survival—food, housing, health, and education of her people with which she must cope while attempting at the same time to pull her weight around with the politically mature and highly industrialized nations while attempting to adjust herself to the international scene.

In response to Western demand for India's abandonment of neutralism that the countries of its hemisphere may successfully grapple with "the resulting disturbance in that carefully contrived centuries-old balance of power, the author gave the following response:

When a European or an American friend asks me, "Where does your country stand?" I can only reply, "Just where your country stood at the dawn of her nationhood, with perhaps many similar problems." I would say to America, for example, "In 1776 you became a sovereign, independent nation. Yet it was 1917, and three-quarters of a war involving the entire world was over, before you allowed yourself to be drawn into it. Up to that time you were occupied in consolidating your frontiers and your independence. Are you not better equipped than any country to understand India's position?"

India, with her reverence for her own traditions and culture, has at the same time a tremendous admiration for the scientific acumen of the Western nations. She sends her young people abroad to study medicine, science, and technology. She employs foreign experts and seeks foreign advice for her irrigation and other large-scale projects. She invites foreign investment and welcomes foreign aid. The self-sufficient attitude is not hers. She is an active member of the United Nations, and her helping hand has been outstretched wherever it could be of service. Her good neighbor policy extends around the globe, for in this atomic age every country is a neighbor.

But the spirit of satyagraha which accomplished a unique revolution is a justly proud spirit. It seeks friendship rather than favor, it wishes to learn but not to imitate; it will take advice but not dictation. It will continue to work out its salvation in its own serene way, and by its example, perhaps, accomplish an even greater revolution—that of making nonviolence as real and workable a creed on the international plane as it has proved in India's national life. Only if this comes to pass, will the world have taken it first step toward making peace an abiding reality.

If the above quotation of this, the brilliant young Indian woman becomes a part of our thinking when discussing policies and devising programs for not only India but all other members of the Afro-Asian bloc nations, we will become increasingly enlightened and the world may know peace everlasting.

One can hardly touch any aspects of India without absorbing particles of the noble ideals of Mohandis K. Gandhi and the aspiration for peace which motivates the Prime Minister. For today we have chosen two such reminders:

From Gandhi:

Hatred ever kills, love never dies. Such is the vast difference between the two. What is obtained by love is retained for all time. What is obtained by hatred proves a burden in reality, for it increases hatred. The duty of a human being is to diminish hatred and to promote love.

From Nehru:

We have seen in the last year or two that it is not easy for even great powers to reintroduce colonial control over territories which have recently become independent.

Whatever we may think about it, we have arrived at a stage in the world when an attempt of forcible imposition of ideas on any large section of people is bound ultimately to fail. In present circumstances, this will lead to war and tremendous destruction. There will be no victory, only defeat for everyone.

Prime Minister Nehru's remarks before the British House of Commons January 22, 1947, grow in meaning with the years—we want to be friendly to all. We want to be friendly with the British people and the British Commonwealth of Nations. What I would like this House to consider is this: when these words and these labels are fast changing their meaning—and in the world today there is not isolation—you cannot live apart from the others. You must cooperate or you must fight. There is no middle way. We wish for peace. We do not want to fight any nation if we can help it. The only possible real objective that we, in common with other nations, can have is the objective of cooperating in building up some kind of world structure, call it One World, call it what you like. The beginnings of this world structure have been laid in the United Nations Organization. It is still feeble; it has many defects; nevertheless, it is the beginning of the world structure. And India has pledged herself to cooperate in its work.

India can add meaning, give directions to a world adrift—maybe not in things, but ideas. After all, "Man cannot live by bread alone."

## The Need To Do Something About Our Classroom and Teacher Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my statement, "In Support of the School Support Act of 1959," presented to the General Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, March 6, 1959:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT BEFORE THE GENERAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the General Education Subcommittee, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join with my other colleagues who have appeared before you to ask for a realistic approach to offset national educational deficiencies in the richest Nation in the world.

The need to do something about our classroom and teacher shortages existed before Sputnik I beeped overhead, but it is apparent that this scientific achievement spotlighted the need. Last year, the United States Commissioner of Education undertook an on-the-spot study of the Soviet Union. He offered this telling observation:

"We are today in competition with a nation of vast resources, a people of seemingly unbounded enthusiasm for self-development, and fired with conviction that future supremacy belongs to those with the best-trained minds, those who will work hard and sacrifice."

Yet, notwithstanding the views or observations of one of its own top officials, the administration has failed to offer leadership in meeting this challenge on the education front. Thus, the conclusion is obvious: This Congress must alone carry the full responsibility to fill an unfortunate void created by the administration's inaction and failure to present a workable program—the plan offered by the administration and made public February 9 of this year is not a workable, realistic program and in my mind is a means to go on record that the administration is concerned, while at the same time offering a program that is destined for defeat. It is a program aimed not at helping financially destitute States and communities, but rather one aimed at helping moneylenders. Its features would require constitutional amendments by many States that have constitutional limitations on bonded indebtedness. State action to overcome this would be most difficult; thus the administration's proposal to underwrite bond issues would be of no help to such States.

It is unfortunate, to put it mildly, that the state of the Union message does not contain a solitary word on the critical classroom shortage; a shortage that States and communities have not been able to alleviate properly, not because of a lack of concern and effort, but because of a lack of adequate public finances. As a matter of fact, the President evaded the whole issue in his message by the less than concrete remark that the Nation's schools "conform to no recognizable standards."

Equally disturbing is the intent of the administration, as expressed in the budget message, to work toward eliminating or cutting Federal funds to education in fields where Federal participation is well established. The message calls for ending in fiscal 1931 the Federal grants for vocational education, although a $63 million grant is proposed to continue Federal participation in this and other areas through fiscal 1960. If the vocational education program is worth keeping in fiscal 1960, why not in fiscal 1961 and thereafter? I think it is worth keeping and improving. With automation forging a new technological revolution, it seems imperative that workers learn new skills in order to be gainfully employed. Presently, vocational education programs in most local communities are inadequate in intent and scope, but even these inadequate programs will suffer materially if present limited Federal funds are denied.

And a most alarming suggestion of the President, contained in the budget message, is to cut off aid to impacted areas. This would be a grave mistake. Many cities are plagued by the increase in school enrollment resulting from Federal employees coming in to work on Federal projects. The problem of increased school enrollment is compounded by the fact that Federal property is tax exempt, so the city is forced to stretch its tax income not only to take care of the additional burden on its schools but to expand its city facilities to serve the new residents.

In view of these proposals, it really should come as no surprise that the administration has offered no budget item for Federal aid to education.

With its fixation on classical economics, the administration has retrogressed on its approach to education, at least as the approach appeared to be some 2 years ago. It will be recalled that at that time the President's White House Conference on Education called for Federal aid in the field of education, and when Sputnik I made known its presence in the ether, the administration noted the need for Federal action; congressional programs were advanced by members of both parties.

And 2 years ago, the administration's Department of Health, Education, and Welfare highlighted the crisis proportions of our educational plant deficiencies when it noted the Nation was short some 159,000 classrooms. At this time the need to do something was further accented by the assertion of the National School Boards Association that a new classroom was needed every 10 minutes to meet the Nation's growing population requirements.

Now 2 years later—1959—despite record building at the local level, the problem is still with us and crying out for solution. The January 28 report of the U.S. Office of Education gives factual testimony that this is the case. The States reported they needed 140,500 more instruction rooms; of these, 65,300 are needed to take care of enrollments in excess of normal capacity to handle, and 75,200 to replace unsatisfactory or obsolete school facilities.

Because this committee is well apprised of further data in this regard, I shall not press the point, but I do wish to stress that the teacher shortage has reflected itself in all too many instructors teaching on substandard credentials. The reason is that we have failed to offer financial incentive and security and due recognition to the teacher in the community.

The fact that the Metcalf bill covers both the school plant and teacher shortages makes it the most comprehensive approach offered to date. Parenthetically, I wish to point out that another school construction measure which I have also introduced in no way conflicts with the Metcalf proposal which I cosponsored—rather, it supplements the Metcalf bill by providing for a general authorization for Federal financial assistance to build schools, with no amount specified.

If the issue is going to be joined on monetary considerations, I think then that it is important to point out that the present position of the administration is based on false economy. To economize at the Nation's expense—at the expense of both parents and their children—is a classic example of sophistry. Federal expenditures for assistance to education would be the soundest, safest investment the Government of the United States could make, for it would bring in dividends from the Nation's economic, cultural, and social progress that would ensue. Not to invest in an adequate school program is a dangerous risk.

The "economy" brigade—and I use the term "economy" advisedly—in the administration has its supporters, of course. Prominent among these is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. I only wish that this organization would declare that it objects to Federal aid to education because it doesn't want to see the money expended, rather than using the old bromide that Federal aid means Federal control of education at the local level. Neither the intent of the supporters of the Metcalf proposal nor the intent of the measure itself is to bring Federal policy into school administration, curriculum, etc. And I have an idea the chamber of commerce really knows this.

I think the chamber of commerce ought to have the courage of its convictions to tell the American people and schoolchildren now attending half-day sessions or crowded into classrooms like sardines that Federal funds should not be spent to help them because it would upset the economy, create inflation, ad infinitum. At least the education bill now before the committee could be argued on its merits, its real effect on the economy and fiscal policy, rather than becoming the means to evade the central issue by using it as an example of Federal usurpation of local education.

Since this perennial argument is still with us, I think it might be well to note, in brief fashion, that Federal aid is not a new or startling concept. A check into history will prove this. Such a check would show, for example, that Federal aid has existed in one form or another since the year 1785, 2 years before the adoption of our Constitution. Other facts to note:

1. In the 1930's the Federal Government aided in the building of many needed schools under the PWA and WPA programs.

2. In the 1940's more aid was given under the Lanham Act.

3. In the 1950's Public Laws 815 and 874, which continue the principles of the Lanham Act and under which aid is given for the construction, maintenance and operation of schools in federally impacted areas.

Can the opponents lay claim, much less prove, that any of these measures resulted in Federal control of education? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the need to meet the Communist challenge by educating our young people in adequately constructed, well-spaced facilities with a sufficient number of well-qualified teachers, I think there is another compelling reason for enactment of Federal legislation that will permit this objective to become a reality. And this reason is a positive one; I say "positive" because it is not based on our reacting to another nation's actions, but rather the reason stems from our concept that a free, well-informed citizenry is the prerequisite for the survival of democratic institutions. This is part of our thinking; this is part of our proud heritage. This whole concept was set forth with clarity in 1830 in "A Plea for Public Education," prepared by the Philadelphia Working Men's Committee:

"The original element of despotism is a monopoly of talent, which consigns the multitude to comparative ignorance and secures the balance of knowledge on the side of the rich and the rulers. If then the healthy existence of free government be * * * rooted in the will of the American people, it follows as a necessary consequence, of a government based upon that will, that this monopoly should be broken up and that the means of equal knowledge (the only security for equal liberty) should be rendered, by legal provision, the common property of all classes."

It is my hope that our concept of the importance of public education will be implemented by the passage of legislation based on this concept: the Metcalf proposal.

## Need for Enlightenment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who voted against statehood for Hawaii have been rather severely criticized by some people.

I call to the attention of these critics the column of highly competent and respected Victor Riesel which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 18. With more enlightenment such as Mr. Riesel and the able JOHN PILLION, Congressman from New York, are giving the American people, it will become more and more apparent that those of us who opposed Hawaiian statehood at this time were not entirely wrong.

NEED FOR ENLIGHTENMENT

(By Victor Riesel)

There is no pretender to the throne of Queen Liliuokalani, unless it's Harry Bridges. Hawaii always has been the pineapple of his eyes. He has poured more money, time, and talent into tightening a labor vise on the island outpost than Dole has juice. So it came as startling news that some Congressmen meeting Tuesday behind the House Rules Committee closed doors put themselves on the secret record with statements that Hawaiian labor was free of pro-Communist influence.

In the Rules Committee meeting, they were battling over Hawaiian statehood. Congressmen were trying to beat down charges by some of their colleagues that the 50th star in the flag may glow a little red. Friends of Hawaii pointed to the report of a special three-man House Interior Committee which went out to Honolulu last winter—a delightful voyage. They returned with news that they had been told that pro-Communist influence was just as solid as a grass skirt.

Those three men were asked by Congressman WALTER ROGERS, of Texas, who had given them the glad tidings about the islands, through which pass more than 1,000 of our most strategic ships each year. The retort, born of great philosophical introspection, was: "We can only tell you this—it wasn't Santa Claus."

This was of great cultural value to my friends at the National Geographic, for they may have thought the old boy winters there—as who wouldn't. What the three travelers had put into the record—and what apparently was the basis of the Rules Committee decision that there was little pro-Communist influence in Hawaiian labor—was this:

"We were told that the FBI investigation, plus the Federal Court action, crippled the Communist apparatus in Hawaii and with the continued white light of publicity and the alert citizenry, it would remain crippled. We were also told that no proof exists of Soviet espionage contacts on the part of Communists in Hawaii."

No one raises the question of proof of Soviet espionage contacts. Nor can anyone quote the FBI on this particular matter. It has issued no statement. That is not the Bureau's practice.

The point is that one member of the House Rules Committee, RICHARD BOLLING, Kansas

City, Mo., told the group he had it on good authority that there was no substantial pro-Communist influence in the unions. Representative BOLLING, a former teacher, was asked on what he based his information. He told the off-the-record Rules Committee session that he had a letter from a reliable source. The one-time teacher should find it fascinating, therefore, to sit in on a session of the House Un-American Activities Committee on March 24. Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, has been subpenaed to appear before it to answer questions on his recent conferences with Communist leaders in Rome, Prague, Moscow, and East Berlin.

For example, Bridges will be asked to explain why he said the Soviet labor unions are more democratic than some U.S. unions—when virtually all students of Russian trade unions see them as State-controlled production speedup mechanisms without the right to strike.

It is anyone's privilege to be uninformed. But it doesn't appear to be the right of those making our laws to abuse that privilege. The question of statehood is one thing. But a realistic analysis of union power is another.

It was Bridges' union newspaper which printed a big two-column spread friendly to those U.S. soldiers who turncoated against us in Chinese prison camps. It was Bridges' union which was tried by its peers in the CIO 9 years ago and found to be following the Communist line. It is this union chief who has blistered U.S. positions, and talked warmly of Soviet China. It is Bridges who met regularly with the pro-Communist bloc inside the old CIO.

It is this man and many of his followers who are sufficiently powerful to paralyze the Hawaiian economy and who have considerable influence inside the island legislature. That is fact. The rest is rhetoric and a prelude to history.

---

## What Conservationists Expect of Water Pollution Control Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a paper presented at the conference of State sanitary engineers in Washington, D.C., on May 8, 1958, by Carl D. Shoemaker, conservation consultant of the National Wildlife Federation entitled "What Conservationists Expect of Water Pollution Control Authorities":

Gentlemen, for me to tell you about water, its abundance, its pollution, its need for the existence of every living thing on this earth, its distribution and its purity is like bringing coals to New Castle. It is your life. You live with it every day of every year. You are confronted with its problems in an expanding population and the ever-increasing needs of industry, agriculture, mining, and recreation. Because of this some of us may not be able to see the forest for the trees. We have a tendency to narrow our vision, lower our sights, see only the most important facet of the problem and confine ourselves to providing pure water for drinking and other domestic uses.

That is good as far as it goes but it does not go far enough. It does not take into account the other facets which society in general has come to believe are next in importance in our everyday life.

There is one truth that we often fail to consider. It is that there is only so much water—and no more—on this globe and every day there are more and wider uses for it.

During the past half century there has developed a new philosophy—a new concept about the use of water in our country as well as many other parts of the world. It is that everyone has a stake in our water supply and it is not always the same stake. The steelmaker knows definitely how much water he will need and how clean it must be. The farmer cries constantly for more water to use on his cropland—and he is going to ask for more—not less. We know almost to the gallon what amount of water—clean, pure water—is daily required by every person in the home.

And the recreationist, an important and growing segment of our population, is on the prowl for clean water in which to swim, fish, and boat. And we must not forget he is most vocal in his demands and is not afraid to register them at the polls. I am not here to say that he is always 100 percent right, but he constantly points his finger at the problem and his insistence usually gets some official response.

Secretary of the Interior Seaton at a meeting of the American Forestry Association in Madison, Wis., last October, in discussing various conservation aspects of his Department said, "The Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers now have underway nearly 300 projects for flood control, water supply, irrigation, navigation and power. * * * The present program will not be the final step, by any means. Within a relatively few years, water may well be our No. 1 domestic problem." He continued by saying that the Interior Department has "entered into 49 research and development contracts with individuals and private organizations" to make sea and brackish water into usable water. He said that there is a "reasonable expectation" of bringing the cost down to 60 cents a thousand gallons. And it will have to go still lower. And this figure assumes production at the sea level.

Almost every use of water is dependent to a greater or lesser degree upon the cleanliness of that water.

And, gentlemen, that is your job.

Have you measured up to that responsibility? Have you had the vision—and, yes, have you had the courage to face it in all of its conflicting and complexing aspects?

Have you too often based your decisions on purely engineering judgments instead of considering the human and cultural sides as well?

Have you seriously planned and developed a positive long-range program for presentation to the people of your State?

Have you used to the best advantage your presently existing powers of enforcement?

Positive answers to these questions apply generally throughout your membership, but enough are negative, to cause a louder and louder demand to transfer to some other agency the administrative responsibilities of the health authorities in water pollution control.

The sanitary engineer can no longer sit in his ivory tower and complacently be content with his fine record of reducing waterborne diseases. His pollution problems is far from solved. As a matter of stark reality it is getting worse and more complicated. A distinguished engineer has said that "right now about 90 million people are drinking water taken from the same streams into which they dump their slop buckets and garbage pails." "Furthermore," he said, "the health aspects of radiation contamination in water is a completely unknown quantity at the present time. Some authorities predict that if we do not solve this problem soon, there will be a tremendous increase in the total number of lukemia cases. They also predict that radiation contamination of our water supplies may cause a marked increase in our mental diseases and even in the physical makeup of the human being." You may or may not agree with these statements. However, there is widespread public concern about them.

One fact we must face. No longer can the health authority nor any other agent of the State look upon water pollution control with one single purpose in view. The day has come when we must recognize the multiple use of water—and that includes conservation right along with agriculture, industry, and mining. Of course domestic use has first priority, but we must fit into the picture these other uses or we will lose the battle.

I don't need to tell you that the sportsman—conservationists are swarming over the States in their zeal to get clean water—not alone for themselves, as recreationists, but for all the people for all of their needs and uses. They are the crusaders to conserve all of our natural resources—and those of you who have followed the work of Congress and the State legislatures are aware of this. "Better fishing conditions" is no longer their battle cry. It has changed to "clean water for everyone." They are interested in the humanities and the well-being of their fellow men.

They expect you to have and they will help you to get adequate legislative authority, sufficient appropriations, personnel, and the technical assistance to plan, develop, and carry out a positive water pollution control program.

They expect you to control water pollution in your State, and to control it for all uses—not just to provide a safe domestic water supply. They expect you to keep the other public officials, including the conservation departments, informed with respect to your problems, your accomplishments and your plans.

They want to keep in touch with your problems in the hope that they may be able to help. They will not hear the excuse that you cannot get the job done because you do not have adequate resources to do it.

There are a number of States in which the water pollution control agencies are carrying on water pollution control with antiquated laws, inadequate appropriations, and personnel which are not technically competent. There are also a number of examples where the State water pollution control agency had the vision to call upon the conservationists regarding their problems, and secured their help and influence with other public officials and the public generally.

Adequate laws and appropriations followed. These are tools you must have to carry on a successful program.

I do not need to tell you that in a number of States the authority over pollution has been taken away from the State health departments and placed in a separate State agency to control pollution for all legitimate water uses.

I hope that you will not misunderstand me if I call to your attention these facets of the vital story of pollution. I know that considerable progress, knowledge, and know-how has been made in the past generation. Your organization was formed some 20-odd years ago for the purpose of exchanging ideas and profiting from the experience of each other. This you have done well.

In the final analysis construction of corrective treatment plants is what is required to clean up the waters in your State. This is true and I know it is. Clean water is the yardstick by which your efforts are measured.

You know the magnitude of the problem in your State. The problem is not decreasing. Each year the load becomes heavier.

I suggest you ask yourself the following questions:

1. Do you know how much new pollution will be added in the next 10 years? In the next 25 years?

2. Is the rate at which corrective measures are being taken in your State adequate to show substantial gains on overall pollution control?

3. Are you making plans to control it and are you telling constantly and everlastingly the people of your State the truth about your needs?

If you cannot answer these three questions in the affirmative then you are not adequately doing your job.

The conservationists are behind you and when approached will give you substantial and affective support. They will help you make the people of your States aware of your problem and help provide the tools that you need to do your job. It is a long-time program and as long as there is a human being alive, a mill in operation or a plow in the ground there will be work to be done in this matter of supplying clean, pure water to the people of this country.

I am reminded of the lady who for 35 years worked in the State Department and then announced one day that she was going to retire. Her assistant said, "Why, Miss Blank, how can you retire now with the crisis that exists in Greece?"

"My dear," the lady replied, "when I came into the State Department 35 years ago there was a crisis in Greece. I expect that 35 years from now there will still be another."

This is probably true of the pollution problem, however, our people are demanding that we do everything that can be done now, to provide clean water for all uses.

I may have been a little too harsh in some of my comments but I feel that the time has come when we must marshal every force to control this increasing menace of polluted waters.

## Salute to St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no more fitting way to commemorate St. Patrick's Day than by calling attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Jersey Journal of Jersey City, N.J., on March 17, 1959:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

(On St. Patrick's Day in Hudson County the principal editorial should discuss the occasion. However, no editorial could improve on Hal Boyle's column; first published here 7 years ago today. So here it is again.—THE EDITOR.)

What is it to be Irish?

On 364 days of the year being Irish isn't visibly different from being Scottish, French, Italian, Jewish, Serbian, Dutch, or—yes—even English.

The Irishman pays his bills, complains against his taxes, does his work, listens to his wife like the man of any other race.

But on this 1 day of the year—holy St. Patrick's Day—the Irishman becomes an Irishman.

And on this day you have to be Irish to know what it is to be Irish.

The other signs, of course, can be seen by all. The Irishman overnight grows a foot taller and stalks the earth like a giant. All traffic signs turn green for him, and if they don't he sees red.

But this air of majesty is only a token evidence of internal change. The men of other races who envy the Irishman his bearing on St. Patrick's Day would envy him for more if they could look inside the Irishman's soul.

What is it to be Irish?

How can you put the wonder of it into words?

If a psychiatrist stretched himself out on his own warm couch after his last customer had gone home, and he dreamed of the man he himself would most like to be—well, he might be perfect, but he'd still be only half an Irishman on St. Patrick's Day.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to have an angel in your mouth, turning your prose to poetry. It is to have the gift of tongues, to know the language of all living things. Does an Irishman pause and turn an ear to a tree? It is because on this day he hears what one sleepy bud says to another as it opens its pale green hands to the warm sun of spring.

What is it to be Irish?

Oh, on this day it is music, not just the cornet in the parading high school band, but the deep, deep music of living, the low, sad rhythms of eternity. The Irishman hears the high song of the turning spheres, the dim lullaby of the worm in its cocoon. All the world is in tune, and he is in step with the tune, the tune that only he can hear.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to live the whole history of his race between a dawn and a dawn—the long wrongs, the bird-swift joys, the endless hurts of his ancestors since the morning of time in a forgotten forest, the knock of his heart that is a part of his religion.

What is it to be Irish?

It isn't only the realization that he is descended from kings. It is the realization that he is a king himself, an empire on two feet, striding in power, a strolling continent of awe.

Why on St. Patrick's Day, to be Irish is to know more glory, adventure, magic, victory, exultation, gratitude, and gladness than any other man can experience in a lifetime.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to walk in complete mystic understanding with God for 24 wonderful hours.

## UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled UNESCO from the Pilot of January 24, 1959, published in Boston, Mass.:

UNESCO

Unfortunately there are still places where the word UNESCO is considered to be a bad word. The very title—United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—is enough to send some people into a frenzy, since to them it is perfectly plain that anything so high sounding must be subversive. Now that the new UNESCO headquarters have been permanently established in Paris, it is about time that even the diehards came around to the understanding of the organization and its aims.

To be sure, the UNESCO beginnings were not on every account promising. It was, and is, a mammoth undertaking requiring the cooperation of many divers peoples and attempting the solution of problems never before encountered in just this fashion. In those early days the remarks of certain UNESCO leaders were mistakenly taken as general UNESCO policy, which they were not, and there were also some efforts to cause partisan views to prevail in certain UNESCO programs. All of this was contrary to the meaning of UNESCO itself and the imbalance of those early days was corrected with the passing of time. Not before, however, certain spirits were alienated and the oversanguine discouraged.

Now 10 years have passed and these first hazards are far behind; for some, nonetheless, the memory lingers on, and this is very unfortunate indeed for UNESCO deserves far better. It deserves better primarily because its purpose is so genuinely good; it seeks international cultural and educational cooperation through the ready exchange of thought and ideas. This is the road to true understanding among men and no one who seeks a better world can hold back without blame from a project so necessary. Everyone will agree that not all the UNESCO programs carry out this purpose with equal validity. Some indeed by almost any standard have something of the zany about them—perhaps this is inevitable in a group representing so many different and often conflicting traditions.

At the same time, UNESCO has set in motion operations which are bound to be successful in bringing nations closer together and in assisting underprivileged peoples. The work being done to combat illiteracy and promote the translation of classics, as well as the collaboration on scientific research, already is beginning to show results. The program to foster better understanding between East and West is a long-range cultural effort which aims at healing one of the sensitive sore spots in contemporary international life. The very existence of UNECSO as an international clearinghouse for educational scientific and cultural materials is itself a milestone and its ability to act as a catalyst for many kinds of worldwide cooperation is bound to increase as the years pass. When its charter was first discussed back in 1945 only 44 nations were represented; today 81 nations make up the UNESCO family.

Catholics have been active in UNESCO from the beginning, despite the reservations of those who sought to remain aloof and leave the field to others. It should be recalled that the present pontiff, Pope John, was a delegate observer at UNESCO for 7 years and he was the first permanent observer from the Holy See appointed in 1952. The present nuncio in Paris, Monsignor Marella, celebrated a mass opening the 10th general conference last fall and Monsignor Perozzi is now permanent observer for the Holy See. Moreover the new Director General, UNESCO's top position, is Vittorio Veronese, Italian head of the world organization of the lay apostolate. Perhaps it might be added that the present U.S. delegate is the esteemed Dr. George Shuster, one of our country's best known Catholic laymen.

It is possible, we might say that it is even likely, that UNESCO will make some mistakes in the years ahead—nearly everyone who does anything makes a certain number—but it is at the same time set on a road that is full of hope for men and nations. It should receive the attention and support of all men of good will everywhere, and if this support is given, our generation will be blessed in time to come for having dared to set up an ideal so high and for having had the patience and zeal to make it work.

## H.R. 3610: A Bill To Amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this morning Mr. M. James Gleason, a member of the Board of Commissioners of Multnomah County, Oreg., appeared before the Committee on Public Works. His appearance before that committee was in support of the bill introduced by the able and devoted gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. Commissioner Gleason, speaking for the Tri-County Authority of Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas Counties, as well as for his own colleagues on the Multnomah County Board, presented a detailed and, I hope, persuasive statement in favor of the passage by the Congress of this important legislation, which will go far toward helping local governments throughout the Nation meet the costs of waste disposal plants. The time and energy which the gentleman from Minnesota has given to the cause of preserving and restoring the purity of the Nation's water supplies are a tribute to his foresight and to his deep interest in the public well-being. I am proud that a commissioner of the county which I call home has spoken out in support of the legislation offered by my respected colleague, JOHN BLATNIK.

STATEMENT FOR NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS ON H.R. 3610, A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT TO INCREASE GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SEWAGE TREATMENT; TO ESTABLISH THE OFFICE OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

(By M. James Gleason, commissioner, Multnomah County, Oreg., and chairman, Tri-county Authority, before the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess., Thursday, March 19, 1959, 10 a.m.)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is M. James Gleason. I am a commissioner for Multnomah County, Oreg., and chairman of the tricounty authority, comprising the Oregon counties of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington. I am a member of the National Association of County Officials (NACO), vice chairman of its natural resource committee, and vice president of the NACO western regional district. I appreciate your kind invitation to testify this morning on behalf of the nearly 6,000 elected and appointed county officials from 47 States who compose the membership of NACO.

The National Association of County Officials speaks, essentially, for counties and their citizens. However, we at once recognize that the crucial subject of these proceedings touches and affects the health and welfare of every American. This committee has earned the gratitude of the people of this Nation by its unwaivering dedication to the program embodied in the subject legislation. Having seen firsthand the great and almost immediate benefits of that program, I firmly believe that these sessions will make further contribution to the life abundant for all our people.

The bill, H.R. 3610, would double the size of the present grant program for the construction of waste treatment plants by increasing the maximum grant for any one project from the present $250,000 to $500,000 and by increasing Federal appropriations to a rate of $100 million a year each year for a 10-year period. This should perpetuate and bolster the program by increasing construction to the $575 million level necessary to adequately abate water pollution in this country. By thus breathing new life into the fight on water pollution the bill H.R. 3610 seeks to achieve a goal long and steadfastly advocated by NACO as an unwaivering policy. The NACO American county platform (sec. 8–3) recommends:

"Stream pollution: Stream pollution is a national problem that has greatly reduced the amount of usable water available for agriculture, industrial and local water supply purposes. In many cases this pollution is of an interstate nature and quite beyond the economic capacity of local governments to control. Therefore, we believe that there is justification for Federal assistance to counties and other local agencies in the construction of local sewage treatment facilities and we strongly recommend that the Congress and the Federal administration make available sufficient funds to implement this part of the Water Pollution Control Act."

I might say too, Mr. Chairman, that we feel that the provisions of H.R. 3610 which would allow reallocation of funds into other States in those cases when a State did not use its total allotment is a significant step forward. Likewise, the provision which would permit local units to band together to construct a single areawide sewage treatment facility and receive Federal aid proportionally is a much-needed and foresighted development. NACO heartily endorses both vital measures.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this week while in Washington attending the historic sessions of NACO's first national Urban County Congress, I had the brief opportunity to look through two new Government publications concerning sewage treatment works in the United States. The studies cast some interesting additional light on the stimulating effect Federal grants have had on the construction of vitally needed pollution abatement facilities. The first of these publications is Public Health Service Publication No. 609 entitled "Statistical Summary of Sewage Works in the United States." On page 27 of this report, for example, I find that in 1957, 99 percent of all sewered communities in the United States had populations of less than 100,000. The second publication I refer to is Public Health Service Publication No. 633 entitled "Sewage Treatment Works Contract Awards, 1952–57." On page 13 of this publication I find that contract awards for sewage treatment works serving communities of less than 100,000 population jumped from a 1952–56 annual average of $106 million to $193 million in 1957. Significantly, 1957 was the first full year of the grants-in-aid program. This represents an increase of 82 percent over the previous five-year average and 56 percent over the previous high of $124 million experienced in 1956. Since over 95 percent of all Federal grants have gone to communities in this population group, there can be no doubt but that this substantial increase in construction has been due to Federal grants-in-aid.

It was my privilege to preside over a hard-working panel at the Uurban County Congress devoted to water pollution control facilities. I can assure this committee, after hearing 2 solid hours of discussion by county leaders from all over the country charged with the responsibility of protecting the people from the menace of polluted water, that county officers feel that it is absolutely imperative that the program go forward as revitalized in the bill H.R. 3610. The urgent deliberations of the Urban County Congress demonstrated only too clearly the belief of county water pollution control officials that any program providing less stimulation than H.R. 3610 would create a real health hazard to populous urban counties.

My experience as a commissioner in Multnomah County, Oreg., and a chairman of the tricounty authority (Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington) testifies conclusively to the real grass roots value of the Federal water pollution control program. Frankly, it is not too pleasant to think what the picture might now be in our area were it not for the impetus provided by Federal assistance in combating water pollution.

Since 1957, Multnomah County, acting for the tricounty authority has—

1. Purchased capacity and operates two small sewerage plants.

2. Enlarged a trunk in cooperation with the city of Portland and private developer to provide capacity for a suburban district.

3. Formed four sewage districts which are now under construction or in operation.

4. Contracted with the cities of Gresham and Fairview and the Union Pacific Railroad, to provide service to 1,000 acres of residential and industrial development.

5. Purchased land for the pumping station site and the permanent treatment plant site.

6. Purchased land for a 15,000 population capacity interim treatment plant site.

7. Completed contract discussions with the West Slope Sanitary District to jointly build an interim treatment plant and sewers and connecting interceptors for a potential 10,000 population.

8. Begun contract discussions with the cities of Beaverton and Portland to treat some of their sewage.

9. Completed engineering contracts for the design and inspection of one 15,000 population and one 10,000 population treatment plants, and the intercepting sewers for them.

10. Begun planning with the Oak Lodge sanitary district to provide them with pumping and treatment facilities.

The total cost of this construction is in excess of $4.5 million. Because of the staggering cost burden financing is, and probably will continue to be our most complex problem. And that is why the help provided by H.R. 3610 means so much to us. At the same time, we believe that local communities must not depend entirely on Federal aid for needed public projects and in line with that outlook we have endeavored to secure State legislation allowing adequate financing on the local level. The funds provided by H.R. 3610 will assist us and stimulate us to vigorous action when our own finances are strained to the breaking point but with the public health and safety still in jeopardy because the job is not finished.

CONCLUSION

The bill, H.R. 3610, is a vitally needed measure and should be enacted to insure that the American people will no longer be confronted with the peril of contaminated water. The National Association of County Officials supports and recommends its passage. I thank you again for this opportunity to appear before you. I will endeavor to answer, to the best of my ability, any questions that you may have.

## Equal Time Ruling Called Slightly Silly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the recent ruling by the Federal Communications Commission giving equal newscast time to America First candidate Lar Daly in Chicago has caused the Washington Star to comment editorially:

Applied nationally, this ruling strikes us as being worthy of some sort of prize for utter impracticality and unreasonableness.

The Star also urges a reversal by the FCC or appropriate corrective action by Congress or the courts. I have introduced H.R. 5389 to eliminate the equal time requirement from newscasts and news commentary programs. It would not alter the equal time requirement for paid political broadcasts, panel shows, or discussion programs.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the entire editorial from the Washington Star, which appeared Monday:

SLIGHTLY SILLY

President Frank Stanton, of the Columbia Broadcasting System, is on sound ground in attacking the Federal Communications Commission for its decision in the so-called Lar Daly case.

Mr. Daly is a perennial candidate for public office. Politically speaking, although he has sought both the Democratic and Republican nominations for mayor of Chicago, he has no real strength or standing in either party. Despite this, the FCC has handed down a ruling entitling him to as much time on television news programs as that accorded the major figures in the race.

Thus, when Chicago's mayor appeared recently on a TV newscast having to do with the official reception of Argentina's President, the FCC decided that Mr. Daly had to be granted the same amount of news time. Applied nationally, this ruling strikes us as being worthy of some sort of prize for utter impracticality and unreasonableness. Consider, for example, the 1956 political campaign. In Dr. Stanton's words:

"Under the Daly decision we would have been required to give equivalent time—on these regular newscasts—to all candidates of all parties who asked for it. There were—as near as can be calculated—24 presidential and vice presidential candidates of 12 parties. To furnish them all with equivalent time would have taken * * * approximately 20 percent more than all the time spent by all our television newscasts on all the news. The absurdity of this can be multiplied by almost any factor you choose when you apply the Daly ruling to primaries, where you may have a dozen or a score of candidates for a single nomination—and many more than a dozen or a score once the crackpots learn the implication of this decision."

The public interest, and not just the interest of networks like CBS, NBC, or ABC, is clearly involved here. As far as political campaigning goes, the American people are concerned only with the significant candidates. After all, when we turn on our radio or TV sets, we do not want to be bored or afflicted with every Tom, Dick, or Harry who may take it into his head to run for office on platforms (such as compulsory vegetarianism for everybody) which no sane party would indorse.

Certainly, considered against this background, Dr. Stanton's complaint is wholly justified. The FCC, as he has urged, ought to reverse itself accordingly. Otherwise, appropriate corrective action should come from Congress or the courts.

## H.R. 3505: The Area Redevelopment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Banking and Currency Committee in favor of H.R. 3505:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE IN FAVOR OF H.R. 3505, THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT, MARCH 19, 1959

Mr. Chairman, seasonal unemployment in the rural areas, and brief layoffs in the industries that are usually located in cities and towns, have gone hand-in-hand with the development of the American economy. We adjusted ourselves to these variables, and took it for granted that there would always be a low level of unemployment due to shifting changes within the labor market.

In fact, unemployment compensation was conceived and put into operation for the purpose of providing some income for people who were in between jobs. Since the end of World War II, however, we have been confronted with a new economic problem; namely that of areas where unemployment has far exceeded the normal level, and has persisted for a long time.

These are not temporary, local recessions. They indicate serious weaknesses in the basic economies of these areas. New economic problems require new remedies.

Communities where people live and work, were never intended to be unchanging clusters of factories and stores and homes and public buildings and utilities and services. They are living organisms, responding to change and challenge, or failing to adjust themselves to economic realities because of reasons beyond their control.

Buildings and factories grow old and die. Industries come and go. Through its slum clearance and urban renewal programs, the Federal Government has recognized its responsibilities. Communities are being encouraged and assisted in tearing down and rebuilding the deteriorated areas that are no longer fit for human habitation or for retail enterprise.

It owes a similar responsibility to help in the reconstruction of those ancient, rundown, and abandoned industrial areas of those communities where there is a chronic labor surplus, in order to revitalize their economies.

The decline of some local industrial economies followed by the tragic inertia of heavy unemployment, is a postwar problem that cannot cure itself. It continues, in spite of national prosperity, and this fact alone should convince us that the problem is not transient, and that time alone will not solve it.

Some of the affected communities, based upon an older industry that is steadily contracting, or has moved away, or has simply died, have been bogged down in the labor surplus category for the past 7 years. Meanwhile, the empty and obsolete multistoried factory buildings are a drag upon the life of the whole community. Modern industry will have no part of these ancient plants. The small and struggling enterprises that sometimes avail themselves of this space, usually pay substandard wages.

Our experience with this problem has proved that local groups and local initiative, despite valiant and partially successful efforts, cannot complete the heroic task of redevelopment without help from outside. Show me just one community, suffering from prolonged labor surplus, that has managed to lick this problem entirely by itself. Neither municipal government, nor private groups, are equipped to do this job.

The danger of industrial blight is one that, sooner or later, could affect the economic health of any community. That is the fundamental reason why we must have a national policy and national legislation, providing adequate remedies, to help the distressed areas of tomorrow as well as those in need of immediate assistance.

The older textile, coal mining, and railroad centers, have been in the doldrums for some time. Statistics from the Bureau of Employment Security reveal unemployment in these communities considerably in excess of 6 percent for year after year. And these figures do not reflect the unknown thousands who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, and have had little or no opportunity to build up reentitlement, because there are no work opportunities for them.

The depressing effect on business is a natural consequence. Check along the main streets of these communities and you will find a number of empty stores. Check with the local governments and their shrinking tax base. Observe that some recovery has been made, through local effort alone, but that it has not been enough, because local resources, unaided, cannot cope with the whole problem.

Look at the middle-aged displaced workers in these communities who have given most of their lives to an industry that has gone. It is inhuman and unrealistic to suggest that they should move to another community where the invisible barrier of age-discrimination would stand in the way of reemployment. These people need new and growing industries in their own communities, and a program of retraining to fit them for new occupations.

If there is a fault in the proposed legislation, it is the failure to recognize and to eliminate the prejudice that will operate against the employment of middle-aged or older workers, in the new plants that will be built in labor-surplus areas, as a result of a redevelopment bill.

These people are the chief victims of the economic-readjustment problem. Due to the intricacies of insurance and pension plans, they will be politely discriminated against when they seek employment in the industries that are encouraged to locate in the areas we intend to help. The occupations to which they have given two-thirds or more of their lives have vanished. Some of these people in their late forties or early fifties, will be artificially considered as unemployable by replacement industries, and will have to wait out the years until they become eligible for social-security benefits—a burden to their families and crushed by the loss of their own self-respect—unless, through this bill we make provisions that will give them a fair share of the jobs that become available.

Social scientists are aware that we must reduce the hours of the workweek in order

to spread employment opportunities because of our increasing population and the development of automation which is ever reducing the number of workers required by industry.

This is a longer range problem on the national level, but I bring it to your attention because it is affecting—right now—the middle-aged displaced workers who must be our primary concern in this area redevelopment problem. As long as they cannot get work, we shall achieve only partial success in our efforts to put these areas and their people, back on their feet again.

You see, gentlemen, why local resources do not have the capacity to meet all angles of this problem. Any political or economic system that neglects this problem, or fails to solve it, is suffering from a basic weakness that could hurt larger areas of our economy. As slums spread the cancer of deterioration, so too can rundown and obsolete industrial areas affect other enterprises in their neighborhood.

When I first introduced an industrial redevelopment bill in 1953, due to the collapse of the textile economy in my home city, the suggestion for remedial action was slow to win support. There was the understandable hope that so-called natural economic forces would bring about a short and painless transition to the replacement industries that would move in and take up the slack.

Within a few years, however, as the problem continued to plague a number of other communities, public opinion has awakened to the fact that energetic measures are required to restore these areas to economic health.

A pledge to enact legislation along these lines was written into the Democratic and Republican Party platforms. In 1958 the House and the Senate passed an area redevelopment bill that was vetoed by the President. Events since then have but reinforced the need for this pioneering type of legislation. The only question is: "How soon and to what extent?"

This is not a bill to help communities suffering from seasonal or temporary unemployment. That is a separate and far less critical issue. The yardsticks determining eligibility under this bill are clear and definite. Its purpose is to help only those communities where unemployment is a nagging and chronic problem. It calls for a gradual but major shift in the economic base of these areas so that they will have the diversification necessary for programs. In the past, they were built around one industry and were completely dependent upon its ups and downs. We have learned that communities cannot afford to put all of their eggs in one basket, and through the proposed legislation we intend to help them toward a new economic life that will be productive and prosperous in its variety.

The administration proposes a $53 million program which is hardly better than no program at all. The target of $389 million is far more realistic.

The latest available information indicates 23 major areas, and 110 smaller areas with substantial and persistent unemployment, that would be helped by S. 722 and H.R. 3505. In Massachusetts alone, we have four major areas that have been in this category for a number of years. More than half the States have one or more areas with substantial and prolonged unemployment.

The Area Redevelopment Act faces this problem squarely and realistically. It limits eligibility to those areas that cannot find any other way out of their predicament. When its mission has been accomplished, and economic recovery has been achieved, there will be no need of further Federal participation. Bear in mind also, that the major emphasis is on loans, which, as they are repaid, will revolve to assist other affected communities in the future.

This is the type of legislation that proves the values of cooperation.

I am convinced that the Area Redevelopment Act, H.R. 3505, will assist depressed communities so that they will share as equals in our national progress.

## College Boom Is Nearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Des Moines Sunday Register, Des Moines, Iowa, contained some valuable information concerning the impending boom which is facing Iowa colleges. Needless to say, Iowa's situation is not unique, for nearly every other State is facing the same problem.

I think it particularly noteworthy that the largest percentage increase in enrollment in Iowa's institutions of higher education occurred in the public junior college. As pointed out in the Register's article, this enrollment during the present year increased 13.8 percent. Here again is further support for much needed expansion of public junior community colleges as well as further support for a sound program of Federal aid for the expansion of such institutions.

The article follows:

COLLEGE BOOM IS NEARING

The enrollment in Iowa colleges and universities this year has increased about as expected.

The statistics prepared by the Association of Iowa College Presidents show a total of 49,648 students enrolled this year. That's an increase of 5.3 percent (2,511 students) over 1957. The percentage gain is more than twice that of 1957 over 1956.

But the biggest increase in college enrollment is still to come. This is what worries the leaders of both private and public colleges: Will they be prepared to provide high quality education when the youngsters born in 1946 and 1947 are ready to go to college?

The 13,754 freshmen who have entered Iowa colleges this year are mostly the youngsters who were born in 1940. The number of births in Iowa in 1940 was 45,000.

The number of births continued about the same from 1940 through 1945. Then it jumped tremendously—to 56,000 births in 1946 and to 63,000 in 1947. These 1946 and 1947 babies will be of college age in 1964 and 1965.

Dr. Gaylord M. Couchman, president of the University of Dubuque and head of the Association of Iowa College Presidents, points up very well the significance of the increase in college enrollment this year.

"With the total number of high school graduates at a relatively low figure, the enrollment in Iowa colleges and universities continues its steady rise," he says. "Very soon the percentage of enrollment will rise phenomenally and the situation confronting the citizens of Iowa will become critical."

Dr. Couchman stresses that both private colleges and the State institutions of higher education are being asked to assume responsibility for greatly increased numbers of students. The planning is based on the expectation that private colleges will take care of about 50 percent of the students. If they don't—and a few of them do expect to put maximum limits on enrollment—the State's problem will be more acute.

This rough 50–50 split of students between private colleges and tax-supported colleges has existed for about 25 years. This year 47.3 percent of all students are in the State University, Iowa State College, and Iowa State Teachers College. Another 5.9 percent are in public junior colleges. The rest are in private colleges. The percentage increases in enrollment this year were highest in public junior colleges, 13.8 percent, but the total is only 2,913. The increase in private colleges was 9 percent compared with a 1-percent increase in State institutions.

The major problem in assuring continued educational opportunities for Iowa youngsters is the same for both State and private colleges. This is adequate financing to provide the needed classrooms and to pay the salaries essential to get good teachers.

We agree with Dr. Couchman that it is an obligation of the "citizens of Iowa, through the legislature, to provide State institutions with the financial resources for that quality in higher education of which Iowans may be proud."

We also agree with his statement that it is "necessary for private citizens and corporations to increase their financial support to help the independent institutions meet the tremendous financial burden which they have been asked to assume."

Iowans must keep the door of educational opportunity open by giving increased financial support to both private and State colleges.

## Across Antarctica in Sno-Cats Made in Medford, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the only automotive industry in the Fourth District of Oregon is the Tucker enterprise in Medford. The factory makes Sno-Cats and Mud-Cats, the like of which are made nowhere else and which are known over the entire world for their ingenuity and durability.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article appearing in the Sunday Oregonian of March 1, 1959, by Leverett Richards, aviation editor of the Oregonian, who was in the Antarctic when the Sno-Cats helped Sir Vivian Fuchs and Sir Edmund Hillary make history.

The article follows:

STORY OF ANTARCTICA CROSSING REALLY STARTED IN MEDFORD

(By Leverett Richards)

"The Crossing of Antarctica," by Sir Vivian Fuchs and Sir Edmund Hillary, just off the presses of Little Brown & Co., at $7.50 per copy, is a book to remember. Here is living history.

This story really starts in Medford, although the authors neglect to note this fact specifically. For the sno-cats that purred and growled across the Antarctic continent on this last great adventure of all time on this earth were made in Medford by the Tucker Sno-Cat Co. As Sir Vivian Fuchs told J. M. Tucker in London, June 1958, at the end of this epic: "We couldn't have made it with any other known equipment.

This story might also be said to end in Oregon. Sir Vivian—"Bunny" to all who know him—was so grateful for Oregon's contribution to his expedition that he donated one of his trans-Antarctic sno-cats to the Tucker Co., the one called Rock and Roll, the one that hung by its toenails over a bottomless crevasse to pose for a portrait that is becoming world famous.

David Pratt, energetic young engineer for the expedition, spent 3 weeks in Oregon studying the sno-cats before accepting them. For 2 days he ripped and snorted recklessly around the slopes of Mount Hood in August 1955, putting the ungainly vehicle through its paces.

Two weeks he virtually lived with the vehicles in the Tucker factory at Medford. "Pratt is the livest wire I know," J. M. Tucker recalls. "He didn't give us a minute's rest. Wanted to work all night. Wanted to know everything, even the composition of the metal in every part."

This knowledge paid off when repairs had to be made on the sno-cats at 30 and 40 below zero on the 2,158-mile trip across the bottom of the world. All four sno-cats completed the record journey. Two are still at McMurdo Sound in the Antarctic. One is in Europe. The other is at Medford.

"The Crossing of Antarctica" is a well-organized, compact, matter-of-fact account of an adventure that was anything but matter-of-fact. Told with British restraint it reduces to the casual many a blood-chilling misadventure which would be enough to leave a TV audience limp with excitement if treated with dramatic skill.

Fuchs casually mentions that "twice in one day we nearly lost Ken Blaiklock" in crevasses. These crevasses, up to 50 feet wide and of unknown depth, are not gaping cracks, as pictured by Buz Sawyer in the comic strips. They are covered by bridges of snow, which gave way scores of times beneath the weight of the expedition's 6- to 8-ton vehicles.

Sometimes they gave way beneath the skis of the adventurers who went ahead to probe the snow for a safe route. It one case the snow gave way beneath John Stephenson "and left him hanging by one elbow over a deep dark hole from which it is doubtful if anyone could have been recovered, even if he had survived the fall."

It is something of a miracle of courage, and luck, that not a man was lost in either the British or the New Zealand expedition, despite the grim determination with which Fuchs pushed his vehicles through glacial icefalls over snow bridges that repeatedly trapped his rugged Sno-Cats. The four-tracked Weasels didn't make it.

Yet, Fuchs complains, worst hardship of the epic was the lack of sleep and the ordeal of greasing the vehicles every third day at freezing temperatures in slimy, slippery overalls. Exploration, which used to be hard on the feet, is now harder on the seat. Nearest the expedition came to disaster was from carbon monoxide from the engines, which struck down both David Pratt and Ed Hillary in the closed cabs of their vehicles at different times.

Sir Edmund Hillary, conqueror of Mt. Everest, leader of the New Zealand expedition, starting from Ross Island on McMurdo Sound, two miles from the U.S. base, crossed the Ross Ice Shelf, climbed the Skeleton Glacier and laid down depots of food and fuel for Fuchs with nothing more than a lone single-engined airplane and five Ferguson farm tractors.

Hillary, who could step over the Ferguson without stretching his long stride, regarded the garden tractors, a gift to the modestly financed New Zealand party, with ill-concealed doubt at first. But when they performed impossible tasks during the first winter without so much as skipping a beat he gained sufficient confidence to take them 700 miles to the last depot on the polar plateau.

The expedition committee had made it plain in the New Zealand press that Hillary was under orders to leave the glory of the pole to Sir Vivian, head of the overall British Trans-Antarctic Expedition. But when we of the press at McMurdo Sound asked Hillary what his intentions were, he laughed in a way that made it plain nothing was going to stop him from getting to the South Pole. He felt he owed it to the thousands who contributed their pence to the New Zealand expedition.

He did, on January 4, 1958, 16 days before Fuchs and his Sno-Cats, accompanied by 2 dog teams, reached the pole from the Weddell Sea side of the continent. That made Hillary the first man to reach the pole overland since Scott, who perished on his return from the pole in March 1912, 47 years ago.

Fuchs was a month behind schedule by that time and Hillary, with the unanimous backing of all the polar experts, advised him to stop at the South Pole and let the U.S. Navy fly him out, resuming the crossing next year, lest he be caught in the howling blizzards and 60-below temperatures which cost the lives of Capt. Scott and his 4 companions 47 years before. But Fuchs pressed on, and, guided and supplied by Hillary, completed the 2,158-mile journey in 99 days, just in time to ship out for England before the sea froze.

These were major crises at the time, but in the backlight of history they are lost in the major theme of the book—the conquest of the last great unknown area on earth. Purpose of the crossing was not only exploration, but scientific probing of the extent of the ice, the shape of the mountains buried under the ice, magnetic and meteorological studies.

These were well and thoroughly pursued, but little is reported in this volume of the scientific findings, beyond the bare fact that 26 miles from the South Pole on one side mountains rise to within 2,000 feet of the 10,000-foot surface of the ice cap, then drop to an altitude of about 2,000 feet above sea level at the pole where the surface of the snow is about 9,200 feet above sea level.

Most of the scientific data obtained on the trip must be studied and correlated before being published. The crossing did prove, however, that the Antarctic is indeed a continent, not a series of islands under the ice, as had been surmised.

The book avoids the usual fault of expedition books by segregating into appendices the technical data on the vehicles and equipment of the expedition and skipping much of the usual detail on preparations for the expedition.

The monumental modesty of the authors tends to minimize the full magnitude of their courage, skill and fortitude. But the pictures scattered throughout the book pull no punches.

They tell as no words could the full magnitude of the achievement of Fuchs, Hillary and the determined men who risked their lives literally scores of times on a journey equal to the greatest epics of human history. Some 59 black and white pictures and 33 in full color paint the sinister beauty of the Antarctic in all its glory—and show the hazards as words cannot.

## Statement by Hon. Fred Wampler, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement which I made today before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in support of my own area redevelopment measure and all similar measures.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE FRED WAMPLER BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL H.R. 4048 AND SIMILAR MEASURES, TO ESTABLISH AN EFFECTIVE PROGRAM TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before your distinguished committee today in support of my bill, H.R. 4048, and all identical measures, which would establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in the economically depressed areas of the United States.

The bill, H.R. 4048, Mr. Chairman, is identical to the bill, S. 722, authored by Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois, which was approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, March 11, 1959, and ordered reported to the Senate with certain amendments which I understand do not affect the essential features of the program.

The program proposed in both measures is, I'm sure, quite familiar to all. However, in the interest of a complete record, the program, in brief, contemplates the establishment of three revolving loan funds of $100 million each to assist private firms and public agencies in their industrial redevelopment activities, both in urban and rural areas. In addition, a $75 million fund would be set up to make Federal grants to areas which are so underfinanced that they cannot contribute their share to the loan program. The measure also authorizes $10 million for subsistence payments for vocational retraining, and $4.5 million for providing technical assistance, that is, technical information, market research, etc., to economically depressed areas.

Under the terms of the bill, the Federal Government would provide up to 65 percent of the cost of each area project—land, buildings, equipment, and machinery, etc.—and the State or locality would contribute 10 percent; private sources would make available 25 percent of the costs; at least 5 percent must come from non-Government sources.

Loans made from two of the $100 million revolving funds—one for industrial projects in industrial redevelopment areas and the other for industrial projects in rural redevelopment areas—are to be made for 30-year periods. Loans made from the third $100 million revolving fund, to be established to improve and develop depressed area community facilities so as to enhance the opportunities in the area for the attraction or expansion of industrial or commercial plants and facilities, will run for 40 years.

Loans made will bear interest at the rate of one-half of 1 percent above the Treasury's borrowing cost.

I have been informed by the Department of Labor, Mr. Chairman, that in the State of Indiana there are 12 labor market surplus areas which, as of March 18, 1959, based on January 1959 ratings, suffer from a 6-percent-plus ratio of unemployment to the total labor force.

These 12 areas, which I feel would surely benefit extensively from the proposed area-redevelopment program, are at the moment areas classified in Department of Labor categories D, E, and F, and are, therefore, sufficiently depressed to meet the requirements for designation as areas of substantial labor surplus, or areas of substantial unemployment for purposes of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, the policy on accelerated tax amortization for labor surplus areas, and Executive Order 10582, implementing the Buy American Act.

Labor Department area classification criteria places a surplus labor market area in class D when the ratio of unemployment to the total labor force stands at 6 percent or more, when jobseekers are in excess of job openings and that situation is expected to continue during the succeeding 4 months. Class E areas fall in the 9 to 12 percent unemployment ratio category, and class F in the 12 percent or more ratio group.

Major and smaller labor surplus areas in the State of Indiana include Evansville, with 9.7 percent of the total labor force unemployed; Fort Wayne, where 7.4 percent are unemployed; South Bend, where 7.4 percent are unemployed; and, Terre Haute, where 10.5 percent of the total labor force is unemployed. In Anderson, the unemployment ratio stands at 8.9 percent; in Columbus, at 7.0 percent; in Connersville, at 8.9 percent; in the Michigan City-La Porte area, at 10.9 percent; in Muncie, at 10.3 percent; in New Castle, at 13.3 percent; in Richmond, at 7.6 percent; and, in Vincennes, at 9.6 percent.

I think the extreme economic seriousness of the Nation's unemployment problem and the necessity for effective, farsighted remedial action can be graphically illustrated and understood when one reduces to bread and butter terms the daily privation and distress faced by America's 4,724,000 jobless, but potential breadwinners who comprise 7 percent of the Nation's total labor force of 67,430,000.

By comparison, of Indiana's total labor force of 1,725,900 7.3 percent or 126,400 are unemployed.

To take the illustration a step farther, Mr. Chairman, in 1950 the Census Bureau estimated that the median annual income in the Nation was $1,917, and the median annual income in the State of Indiana was $2,116. The Bureau informs me that the national annual median income for 1957, of persons who had income, was $2,452. By arithmetically projecting these figures, the annual median income in Indiana for 1957, of persons with income, is computed to be $2,706. Now assuming that the State of Indiana's total labor force was active, or that the 126,400 Hoosiers currently jobless were gainfully employed, Indiana payrolls would be expanded by the sum of $341,938,400, or, in other words, practically the entire cost of the proposed area-redevelopment program, estimated to be $389.5 million.

Granted, Mr. Chairman, that full employment represents the ideal labor picture, that full employment is perhaps a bit utopian; it is nonetheless exactly what we are striving for. And, when the above formula is applied on a nationwide scale, the total loss in gross national income and economic strength, is absolutely staggering.

The Department of Commerce has announced that personal income, which is a measure of the dollars people receive, jumped $1.5 billion in February, to a yearly rate of $364.5 billion. However, it is reported that there are strong indications that that one-half of 1 percent gain is due largely to fatter dividend checks and more overtime pay. Thus, leading many economists to the conclusion that merely regaining old output levels won't have much effect on current unemployment levels.

As I've stated before, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my unqualified support for this and all similar measures introduced by Members of both bodies, from both sides of the aisle.

These distressed communities in Indiana, and elsewhere in the country, are in dire need of assistance if they are to regain their economic health and thereby be in a position to contribute materially to our national industrial strength.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to be heard.

---

## Statement Before House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, by Judge David B. Williams, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, BY JUDGE DAVID B. WILLIAMS, NATIONAL COMMANDER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, may we first express our appreciation for this opportunity—annually accorded to the national commanders of the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations—to present the viewpoints of the Disabled American Veterans, as to the relative merits of proposed legislation referred for disposition to your committee.

May I remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that the DAV—as the Disabled American Veterans is usually referred to—is the only congressionally chartered organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. The DAV is therefore composed only of America's disabled defenders.

Increasing thousands of war-handicapped veterans soon learned, following World War I, that there was then no nationwide setup of experts to advise and assist them in the solution of their service-incurred disabilities, and to obtain needed medical treatment, hospitalization, and suitable physical and vocational rehabilitation, as well as disability compensation to compensate them for their war-incurred physical handicaps.

Five different governmental agencies were then administering the inadequate Federal laws pertaining to veterans and their dependents, and the widows and orphans of those who had made the supreme sacrifice.

Group efforts, here and there—particularly among vocational trainees—to solve the problems of distressed disabled veterans, developed into the formation, early in 1920, of the organization first known as the Disabled American Veterans of the World War. Granted a congressional charter in 1932, its name was shortened by congressional amendment in 1942, to Disabled American Veterans, and its membership eligibility thereby extended to all of America's disabled defenders.

Ever since its formation in early 1920, the DAV has emphasized, and specialized in extending, much needed rehabilitation service, advice and assistance to, for and by America's war-disabled veterans. The DAV has continually insisted that our Nation owes a primary obligation to those citizens who have sacrified parts of their bodies or of their health by reason of active service in its Armed Forces during war periods.

It is strange, but true, that because legislation originally enacted has included many deficiencies and inequalities, each successive Congress has enacted some liberalizing amendatory legislation affecting the welfare of disabled veterans and/or their dependents.

Realizing that legislative enactments frequently fail, in their administration through governmental agencies, to match up technical legal entitlement with equitable entitlement to benefits provided for under certain specified circumstances, the DAV has had the distinction, during all of the intervening years, of having maintained the largest staff of full-time national service officers, located in the regional, district, and central offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, of any veteran organization.

Although the DAV continues to have financial difficulties to maintain them on an adequate basis, the DAV is determined to continue their personalized rehabilitation services in future years. Very much does the DAV desire to be enabled financially to maintain at least 1 full-time national hospital contact service officer in each of the 173 hospitals of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, where they could accomplish so much for so many discouraged and disheartened disabled veterans.

Despite some disappointments, much progress has been made in the liberalization and administration of laws intended for the benefits of war-disabled veterans and their dependents, by reason of the understanding cooperation of the members of this committee and of the U.S. Congress.

Incidentally, the DAV was the first organization, I believe, to advocate consolidation of all House committees, dealing with veterans' legislation, into one major House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Probably largely by reason of such consolidation, many successive enactments occurred, gradually uniformizing the benefits of service disabled veterans and their dependents of all of America's wars, and finally, as long advocated by your committee and the DAV, in the codification in 1958 of all such laws, into Public Law 85-857, now known as title 38, United States Code.

The guiding principles of the DAV, as to proposed legislation affecting veterans, have been much the same throughout the years. As adopted by the national executive committee of the Disabled American Veterans on January 30, 1959, its guiding policy was then enunciated as follows:

"Because the Disabled American Veterans was founded on the principle that this Nation's first obligation is to its war disabled veterans, and their dependents, the DAV believes that our Government should provide:

"1. Proper medical care and treatment of veterans for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by active service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"2. Adequate disability compensation for service-connected disabilities.

"3. Vocational rehabilitation and education to restore employability of war-disabled veterans in gainful, useful employment; and

"4. Adequate death benefits for the widows, minor children and dependent parents of veterans who die as the result of service-connected disabilities and of veterans who were handicapped by service-incurred disabilities.

"It therefore follows that the DAV believes that the Congress of the United States (1) should extend priority of consideration of proposed legislation which aims to provide benefits for veterans, with service-incurred disabilities, and for their dependents, and (2) that the DAV will consider giving its support to proposed legislation for the benefit of other veterans, and their dependents, only if convinced that its enactment will in no way jeopardize existing or proposed benefits for veterans with service-incurred disabilities, and for their dependents."

Long before my time, a review of past history discloses that following the Civil War governmental benefits were originally provided only for those who could establish the fact that their wounds and disabilities were incurred during their war service. Increasing scores of thousands found it impossible technically to prove service connection of their disabilities, mostly because of the lack or loss of medical records. No service officers were then maintained by any organization. Technical assistance was obtainable only through pension attorneys, who collected fees equivalent to 10 percent of whatever they procured.

As a consequence of such distressing conditions, a general pension law was enacted, about 25 years later, as to all Civil War veterans, based upon attained ages or degree of disabilities, regardless of their service origin. No further liberalizing legislation affecting those with service-connected disabilities was thereafter enacted.

The same pattern was followed after the Spanish-American War, with the same results, with a similar general pension law being enacted in 1918—about 18 years later. Free technical assistance to distressed disabled veterans was still not available. It is significant, I think, that following each such war, no organization existed composed exclusively of the wounded and disabled veterans of such war. Thirty dollars per month payable for permanent-total service-connected disability, in effect prior to the Spanish-American War, was still in effect in 1918 and 1919. Then, in 1920, such basic rate was changed to $100 per month.

Although no increases in basic disability compensation payments were provided for prior to 1930, it is very significant to note that the pensions payable under the general pension laws were periodically liberalized, both as to veterans of the Civil War and then of the Spanish-American War.

Looking back, it is apparent that the same pattern might have followed World War I, as was put into effect following the Civil War and the Spanish-American War, stopping any liberalization of benefits for the service-connected disabled veterans and submerging their benefits under periodic liberalizations of the general pension laws, if it had not been for the guiding principle—as repeatedly emphasized by the DAV—that priority of consideration should be given as to proposed legislation affecting veterans with service-incurred disabilities and their dependents.

In this connection, it is important to keep in mind that inflation is not something new in this Nation. Costs of living have followed an upward trend with some deflationary periods in between—ever since the formation of our Nation. As the cost of living goes up, the purchasing power of monetary benefits received by service-connected disabled veterans obviously goes down. A DAV past national commander after detailed studies, came to the conclusion that the cost of living has doubled about every successive 25 years.

Finally realizing the probability of the continuance, indefinitely, of such upward trend in our American cost of living, the DAV first adopted a resolution at its 1941 national convention insisting upon legislation whereby all monetary benefits for disabled veterans and their dependents should be geared upward in accordance with increases in the cost of living. Three years later, after our bigger brother veterans organizations had adopted somewhat similar resolutions, Public Law 312 was enacted, providing for a 15-percent increase in the basic rate of disability compensation.

Although such basic rates have been increased several times since then, the cost of living increase has been still higher. Relatively, therefore, the purchasing power of disabled veterans, who are dependent upon their disability compensation payments has not kept up with increases in the cost of living.

Consequently, the DAV fervently believes that primary consideration should be given to proposed legislation now before this committee, H.R. 3508, introduced by your respected chairman, in effect to increase the basic rate of compensation for permanent and total disability from $225 to $250 per month, and for other lower ratings to amounts equivalent to their percentages of $200 per month—in effect about a 10 percent increase in such disability compensation payments.

The DAV has also long maintained that extra allowances should be granted to such disabled veterans, based upon their dependents. Although Congress has granted such dependency allowances as to those disabled to the extent of 50 percent or more in degree, the DAV sincerely believes that dependency allowances should also be extended to all war-handicapped veterans with lesser degrees of disabilities, proportionate to the rating percentages of their service-connected disabilities, as would be provided for by enactment of H.R. 930.

These two important legislative proposals deserve priority of consideration and enactment into law, by this session of Congress.

The primary purpose of providing governmental benefits to service-connected disabled veterans, is, of course, to enable them (and their dependents) to live in the American way, for which they acquired vocational handicaps, which have limited their opportunities for suitable, useful, and continuous employment.

Inasmuch as more than 90 percent of our compensated disabled veterans are rated as less than permanently and totally disabled, it is obvious that they must necessarily be enabled to supplement their disability compensation by other income, preferably through useful and suitable employment.

Too many of them, unfortunately, are unable to procure and to retain suitable, useful employment, in part because of their handicapping disabilities, but, in too many instances, because of the unwarranted fear, in the minds of potential employers, that they would thereby run the risk of increasing their State Workmen's Compensation premium rates.

The DAV therefore ardently advocates the enactment of H.R. 931, in effect to provide for VA reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid out on account of death or disability arising out of on-the-job injuries or disabilities.

Not only do we believe that the enactment of such a legislation would greatly facilitate the useful suitable employment of war-handicapped veterans, with benefits thereby accruing to such handicapped veterans, and their families, but also to their communities, and certainly thus making them much less interested in trying to prove their entitlement to higher rates of disability compensation.

Canada has, since 1920, found such legal provisions to be very helpful, in facilitating the suitable employment of its war-handicapped veterans. Every handicapped veteran is intensely desirous of being self-sustaining—as so much emphasized during the last 10 years, by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Nevertheless, more than 1 million veterans are now registered with public employment offices as being unemployed, including 92,500 who admit having physical handicaps.

Unfortunately, an increasing number of war veterans are also being adjudicated as unemployable by reason of permanent and total disability, non-service-connected, and therefore awarded pensions of $66.15 as to those less than 65 years of age; $78.75 as to those so rated for more than 10 years, or 65 or more years of age, or $135.45 for those in need of constant aid of an attendant, provided that their incomes from other sources do not exceed $1,400 per year, if single, or $2,700, if married or having dependents. Many of these unemployable war veterans are required, under existing law, to forfeit entitlement to their disability compensation, particularly those with partial ratings of less than 40 percent. This forfeiture requirement is not fair and equitable, because he earned the right to receive his disability compensation.

No veteran should be required to forfeit any disability compensation for a service-connected disability because of becoming unemployable, in part, certainly, because of such service-connected handicaps, and possibly in part because of age and/or some other non-service-connected disability. Rather, his basic disability rating should be increased on the basis of the factors of age and unemployability, as I understand is the situation in other countries, such as Australia and New Zealand.

Moreover, if, on top of his service-connected disability, he has become unemployable because of the combination of some other non-service-connected disability and/or his age, then in addition to his disability compensation he should also be awarded the pension benefits payable for permanent total non-service-connected disability, or at least such portion thereof as, on a sliding scale, would not exceed specified totals, the details of which would need to be determined on the basis of careful studies and analyses.

Inasmuch as intensive studies are, we understand, now being made by this committee and its staff, as well as by VA officials, as to proposals for changes in the income limitations as to eligibility for pensions for permanent total disabilities, we are not in a position to furnish our reactions, except generally to assert that relative needs should be taken into consideration. On the contrary, no needs clause should ever be required as to disability compensation.

In connection with all non-service-connected benefits the DAV must be ever mindful of the fundamental consideration as previously set forth in our current and historical policy statement, to wit:

"That the DAV will consider giving its support to proposed legislation for the benefit of other veterans, and their dependents, only if convinced that its enactment will in no way jeopardize existing or proposed benefits for veterans with service-connected disabilities, and for their dependents."

Your committee was previously furnished with a volume of all the resolutions, both administrative and legislative, adopted at

the 1958 national convention, and it is not my purpose or desire to impose upon your time by reading at length from the voluminous record in this connection. I do, however, wish to dwell briefly upon certain items of proposed legislation we believe should be enacted at this session of the 86th Congress.

H.R. 113 has for its purpose the protection of service connections in effect for at least 10 years, except where fraud is involved. It has been our experience that, over a 10-year period, the cases with service-connected disabilities of compensable degree are reviewed by the Veterans' Administration anywhere from 2 to 10 or more times and if rating boards cannot find clear and unmistakable error in a grant of service connection over that lengthy period of time then any severance after 10 years would almost assuredly be based on opinion, or a change to less liberal policy, or some other reasons that should not be allowed to have the attributes of an ex post facto law.

H.R. 283 would simply pay two statutory awards instead of one only where the veteran has the loss or loss of use of both an eye and a limb. We know your committee is in sympathy, in view of your action on a similar bill before the 85th Congress which, however, failed to become law.

H.R. 282 would freeze the VA schedule for rating disabilities and its extensions in their present forms and would permit changes or modifications, and so forth, to be made only with the approval of the Congress. There is a very interesting history behind this proposal regarding which your committee and staff are thoroughly familiar. In the interest of protecting veterans and their ratings, the national convention mandated this proposed legislation.

H.R. 268 is a bill of unusual appeal especially to anyone related to or closely associated with a veteran suffering with the great handicap comprised in total deafness, bilateral, with absence of air and bone conduction. One of our most intelligent and literate members, himself a victim, has well expressed the impacts of such an impairment upon daily living in substantially the following words:

The totally deaf veteran, in the complete absence of air and bone conduction, is practically isolated from the social and entertainment world of sound and this includes his loved ones and his church. He is unemployable in industry and other systems because of insurance laws. Such a veteran is deprived of governmental schooling of his choice and aptitude because schools and resident colleges do not have facilities to accommodate the deaf. He is considered an assigned risk to automobile insurance companies, regardless of his accident-free record or driving skill, and his State issues him a restricted operator's license. This veteran is informed by the VA loan guarantee officials that it is doubtful if he can qualify to build a home because of his unemployability and the amount of his income, regardless of his credit rating. He has been told by VA physicians and other top ear specialists that his hearing is gone forever and that no medical or mechanical help or treatment known by science can restore that loss. It is, therefore, deemed only right and proper that a veteran with service-connected total deafness of both ears, with absence of air and bone conduction, should receive additional compensation in the form of $47 monthly statutory award, which award is now payable by law in cases involving certain other conditions which quite often are not nearly as incapacitating and distressing to the individuals concerned as is the type of handicap contemplated by H.R. 268.

With reference to death pensions, you have copies of our convention resolutions on this subject. We advocate placing the widows and children of deceased World War II and the Korean conflict on a parity with those of deceased World War I veterans, for pension purposes, and we believe that this is a worthy adjustment that is long overdue. This would eliminate the requirement that the survivors of the above mentioned later war and conflict must show service connection and ascertainable residuals in the cases of their deceased veteran relatives. As this is not required of World War I survivors the discrimination is obvious and should be corrected.

H.R. 3060 would provide a 1-year probationary period for veterans leading to permanent status in Government employment. This would change the present 3-year career-conditional requirement.

The Disabled American Veterans is strongly opposed to any weakening of the Veterans' Preference Act but would, however, favor granting preferential treatment to those persons who entered upon service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, and who sustained service-connected disabilities after that date, as long as the Selective Service Act is in full force and effect.

The DAV is naturally interested in the appropriation of adequate funds for Government agencies dealing with veterans, on the subject of employment, and these include the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, the Federal and State employment agencies, and the Department of Labor.

This organization, as you know, supported the House versions of direct loans-to-veterans legislation, both in the 85th Congress and during this first session of the 86th Congress. We know that this legislation is needed by veterans residing in many areas and we hope that final congressional action thereon may be completed with a minimum of delay. When it is borne in mind that the money thus loaned will eventually be returned to the Government, and most certainly with a sizable profit, some of the arguments made against the veterans' loan program, in the press and elsewhere, are unreasonable indeed and at variance with the facts.

Your committee has before it a number of bills that would extend eligibility relative to vocational rehabilitation and education benefits to former members of the Armed Forces who entered service subsequent to January 31, 1955, as long as the Selective Service Act remains in full force and effect. We endorse such an extension of the VR and E program as to those otherwise qualified peacetime veterans under the conditions cited, where disability in line of duty was incurred during service subsequent to January 31, 1955, and prior to the termination of the draft.

In passing, permit me to say that the Disabled American Veterans, as a patriotic organization of the wartime disabled, was extremely gratified at the expedited action accorded H.R. 2260 by the House in passing and sending to the Senate for action this bill so vital to the Nation's defense. The extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to July 1, 1963, is indeed a must if we are to survive the Communist threat to existence.

The question of permitting judicial review of the VA decisions subject to appellate review has been one that has come up through the years and has resulted in controversial expression of reviews. The DAV strongly supports legislation of this nature.

At this time there are several bills before the Judiciary Committee and your committee and there are at least three different approaches advocated by the proponents of these bills. It is my understanding that a bill will be brought out from your committee on the subject and you may be certain that it will have our most careful study and consideration. The problem sought to be solved is appreciated and it is realized that there are many difficulties in the way of coming up with a satisfactory formula. Certainly, a specialized court to hear such litigation would be greatly preferable to a system opening wide the whole Federal courts setup to veterans' appeals.

Lastly, I wish to leave with you my thoughts on a subject of paramount importance. The DAV believes that a primary obligation of this Republic is to see that men disabled in service have fine hospitals, the best of medicine and drugs, and the finest doctors and surgeons this Nation can provide. These the VA hospital system must provide.

We believe that the service-connected disabled must have a priority. We are pleased that care can be given to the nonservice connected. We are delighted that the President has signed a policy that will make more beds available to the nonservice connected in the future. But I offer one word of caution. We must insist that VA always leave adequate beds for the service connected, that the quality of care for them not be diluted nor reduced because others have been given equal priority.

I certainly want to commend the chairman of this committee and all its members for the vigorous conduct of the hospital hearings a year ago. The DAV is pleased that the 125,000 authorized bed plan originally proposed by the previous Administrator, Mr. Harvey Higley, came into being. We believe this a great step forward.

We certainly think that this committee's insistence upon highlighting the problem of how many beds were available for veteran care was most helpful. We understand this has resulted in more accurate statistics being used which will provide a good starting point for further progress.

Much as I would compliment this committee for the vigor of its action, much as I would compliment the President for his signature on this policy, I must add that I feel it only a beginning.

There are needs in many places. Populations have shifted. Florida and California are most outstanding examples where the increasing populations will demand additional beds, but there are other places in the Nation where waiting lists are rising and where the DAV believes additional beds must be provided.

It is not readily possible at this time to tell whether 125,000 beds will meet the expanding needs. The DAV intends to watch the correlation between waiting lists and available beds with great care and it may be that the 125,000 total will have to be changed upward to really fit the true needs of America's veterans. We will watch the operation of the new policy with great care and scrutiny to see whether the new freedom to convert TB beds to other uses, to transfer beds and hospitals as needed will actually take care of the needs as they develop.

I must point out, however sound the new policy, it can be nullified and vetoed by a limitation on the expenditure of funds. The DAV firmly believe in adequate appropriations for the hospital system.

We are pleased that additional funds were requested in the 1960 budget for additional staffing. This is a step forward. We believe that beyond these forward strides of the present year there are higher goals in staffing which much be reached, and we shall support money for additional employees in the hospital system.

I recognize that the cost of hospitalization in all hospitals, private and public, has gone up severely under the impact of inflation. Then too, the improved drugs are very expensive. The DAV believes that the hospitals of the VA must have adequate funds for the best possible medicines. We recognize that the appropriations for the hospital system have been rising steadily, but the question we must ask is not have the appropriations gone up, but have they gone up enough to take care of the galloping effect of inflation? Unless the amount required to meet these rising costs is provided as a minimum the system cannot take steps forward in progress.

We believe that the managers of the hospitals should have adequate funds for maintenance. Some of the newer VA hospitals are splendid, but many of the hospitals in the system are old and need additional funds for repair and refurbishing. We believe this is the No. 1 need of the program at this moment and the DAV strongly supports more money for addition maintenance.

It is penny wise and pound foolish to defer maintenance. Yet this is the area most frequently used to make savings. If you do not repair a building this year, you will have to provide a whole new building before long.

We believe in medical research by the VA. We certainly feel that at least the $15 million granted by the Congress last year should be continued. The magnificent research done by the VA in the field of chemotherapy as applied to tuberculosis has shown dramatically its value. This contribution has saved many lives, reduced the time in hospitals for many patients by years and months, and has served all mankind. Indeed it has made many beds available for other types of patients. This one contribution undoubtedly has saved more than enough to pay for all that has been spent by the VA on research.

Adequate funds must be provided for outpatient care for disabled. This year the shortage of outpatient funds resulted in many difficult and serious situations. We note with interest that additional funds are provided in 1960 for these services.

We have read that some Members of Congress are considering policies which will cut back and permit the filling of only 1 job out of 4 vacancies. We are not opposed to saving money if it can be properly and wisely accomplished but we believe any such policies applied to the hospital system would be false economy at the expense of our disabled veterans and we would oppose its application to the VA medical system.

To supplement the foregoing the DAV is sponsoring H.R. 3752, which would increase the Federal aid to State homes from the present $700 per annum to $1,000, for the maintenance of each veteran therein.

In concluding this statement I wish to again thank you and the distinguished members of this committee for your patience and kindness, and to assure you that if there are any questions I shall do my best to answer them, or have one of my staff members do so. We are most appreciative of your kind attention and fine cooperation.

## Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Flemming, has developed what he claims is a formula for solving the nationwide classroom shortage. In order for the Flemming formula to work, however, some States would have to amend their constitutions; some would be forced to raise their statutory debt ceilings; some would have to change basic tax concepts.

Daily, for several weeks, I have been calling to the attention of my colleagues that Dr. Flemming was wasting his talents operating in only a single field—that his famous formula, which would work if only we change the rules, has a much wider application.

I applied the Flemming formula to the Agriculture Department, and developed a square egg that would be easy to store in the refrigerator and would not roll off the table when the children were coloring it for Easter. We developed a cow that only required milking once a day, 5 days a week, so our dairy farmers could have their weekends off. And we applied the Flemming formula to our lagging space program—and showed how, by announcing a new ratio of translation between Soviet kilograms and American pounds, which by a simple shift of two decimal points would make the U.S. payloads heavier than the Soviet performance.

All these wonders, and many more, could be accomplished by changing rules, and constitutions. These changes Dr. Flemming says are minor obstacles when he seeks to apply his formula to the States in connection with classroom construction.

Yesterday I got a close look at the new penny—and I was gratified to note that Dr. Flemming also realizes that his formula has a much broader application. That he has been down at the mint is evident from the inscription on the back of the new penny. It reads "UNITED STATES oF AMERICA." With application of the Flemming formula to the rules of capitalization, we capitalize the last letter of a word instead of the first.

## The Golden Years?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent article by John L. Springer in the New York Times magazine for February 15, 1959. This article deals with the extremely important question of the problems of those who have retired, but who are ill-prepared for this great change in their lives.

The article follows:

WHAT IS THE RIGHT TIME TO RETIRE?

(By John L. Springer)

Twenty-four years ago an alluring vision was added to the American dream. It was the vision of happy, carefree retirement for the working masses. Aided by old-age payments under the Social Security Act of 1935 and by corporate pension plans newly added to work contracts, the average employee could look ahead to years free from want and tension. He could fish, hunt, travel, or enjoy other activities he had always lacked the time or money for. Retirement would be his "golden years." So the vision ran.

Today, however, social scientists, doctors, corporation executives, and many retired persons themselves are no longer convinced that retirement is the happiest, or even a happy, time of life. In fact, increasing numbers are convinced of the opposite. They center their fire mainly on the common rule in business and industry which says that when an employee reaches a fixed age—usually 65—he must quit working and accept a pension. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, recently has called compulsory retirement at 65 "a lazy man's device for dealing with a difficult problem."

The rank-and-file opposition to compulsory retirement was summed up by one man who was forced to quit work 3 years ago after 44 years with a large electrical concern. "When I was 45, the thought of moving to Florida and sitting in the sun was a beautiful dream," he said. "Ten years later, it still seemed like a good idea, but I had begun to wonder whether I'd really enjoy loafing all day long. When I reached 65, I was almost sure I'd be bored to death, but I was willing to try. Now I'd work for $10 a week if I could get a job."

Of course, many persons do adjust well to retirement and live happily ever after. But if you consult social scientists who have studied what enforced leisure does to people who do not want to retire, you find that their records bulge with examples like these:

A vice president of a large corporation retired at 65 because company rules said he had to. After 11 months in which a sense of uselessness and loneliness mounted, he killed himself.

Soon after retiring, Mr. A. began developing aches and pains. Friends who see him now cannot believe that this semi-invalid is the same person they knew. His doctor can find no physical cause and puts the blame for all the ills on one factor—boredom.

A retired factory worker goes from door to door in his community pleading for work, any work. He does not need the money, and those who give him small jobs are often embarrassed because he is so patently grateful for the chance to serve.

The problem of what to do with aged workers is not, of course, a private one between the employer and employee. It is society's problem, and a growing one. Latest available estimates indicate that 15 million Americans—about one-twelfth of our population—are covered by private pension programs, almost all of which State that employees must put down their tools at a specific age. In addition, 50 million Americans are covered by Federal old-age insurance under the Social Security Act.

The number of Americans at retirement age increases by almost half a million every year; in 1965, persons in this category will constitute a population equaling that of the United States in 1858. And while the number of oldsters increases, the percentage of those employed is declining. In 1920, before social security and pensions, 55 percent of men 65 and over were at work. In 1940 the rate was down to 42 percent. At present only about 30 percent of men 65 and over are in the labor force.

An irony of the present disenchantment with rigid retirement programs is that those who once agitated for them—like social scientists and labor leaders—are now most vocal concerning their defects. G. Warfield Hobbs, chairman of the National Committee on the Aging, says that compulsory retirement and pension plans have robbed the Nation of skilled technologists at a time

when we need them in the missiles race with Russia.

A survey by Hobbs revealed that half of our 32,500 engineers and 9,000 scientists over 65 are retired. "We talk of educating youngsters in science," he says, "but we neglect the obvious truth that a scientist in the hand is worth two in the cradle." Despite shortages of science teachers in the schools, thousands of pensioners who might be utilized remain on the sidelines.

Other critics say that the folly of forced retirement at 65 is proved by the success of organization which hire only those required to stop working elsewhere. Hastings College of Law of the University of California adds to its faculty only professors retired by other law schools. The average member of the faculty is 73, but Roscoe Pound, dean of Harvard Law School from 1916 to 1936, has called it the strongest faculty in the country. Dozens of organizations—like one headed by Walter D. Fuller, former chairman of the Curtis Publishing Co.—make the services of pensioners available to industry on a part-time basis. Fuller has a list of 500 high-level executives with invaluable experience—and their talent is in constant demand.

However, there is a severe drawback to a part-time employment program for oldsters. It lies in the provision of the Social Security Act that, when women reach 62 and men 65, they must not earn more than $100 per month or they will forfeit their retirement benefits.

The regulation exists partly to create employment opportunities for the young by pressing retirement on the old. But it penalizes industrious older persons who seek to supplement their income. If, psychologically, the Social Security Act offers them the security of knowing they will not be destitute in their declining years, it may also promote insecurity by forcing them into a life of inactivity.

Gerontologists—medical men who specialize in problems of old people—have testified that forced leisure often results in retirement shock—a numb inability to adjust that leads to depression, illness, and premature death. Dr. Don E. Johnson, of Philadelphia, say that some persons are emotionally equipped for work only, and seem unable to turn their interests elsewhere. They have "more time and plenty of energy for previously latent maladjustment to come to full bloom and dominate all spheres of living." They become anxious, depressed, self-critical—and miserable.

If compulsory retirement systems have proved so defective in practice, why were they adopted in the first place? Basically, their sponsors made a fundamental error in assuming that the average person views loafing as a more desirable way of life than working. As Dr. Gunnar Gunderson, president of the American Medical Association, said recently, they ignored the basic fact that productive work is the very heart of life.

Personnel managers who still favor compulsory retirement often argue that the older employe has more accidents, lower productivity, and higher absenteeism than the younger one, and that younger employees deserve to be promoted to positions held by older workers. Social scientists reply that statistics prove the average employe over 65 is more responsible and careful and is absent from work less than the average younger one and that most old persons would gladly take lesser responsibility so that younger ones could advance.

How can we correct the obvious defects which have come to light with experience? A few farseeing employers now do three things: (1) Recognize that some men are still physiologically young at 65 and are more capable of productive labor than prematurely old men of 45; (2) utilize the services of older workers, even in part-time work, where possible; (3) try to minimize the "retirement shock" of those who willingly retire or who are severed from their jobs because they can no longer do their work.

Some employers have adopted "do-it-yourself" retirement programs. Thus, Carson Pirie Scott, the Chicago department store, has no compulsory retirement age. But each year every person 65 or older receives a physical examination, and a company official reviews his work record. When facts suggest that the employee should retire, he is encouraged to make his own decision to do so. In this way, says a company official, "the dignity of the individual is spared."

To the objection of management men that this method might result in an accumulation of employees who have outlived their usefulness, the store personnel counselor replies that when a worker is given the facts and helpful guidance, he makes the decision that is best for him—and the company.

Other firms make retirement optional—on their part as well as their employees—at 65 or later. Last year the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York adopted a policy of annually reviewing work records of employees from 65 to 68. About 95 percent of the workers are given the option of staying on after 65 if they desire. Dwight Sargent, personnel director, says that those who remain earn more than twice what they would receive in pensions and their morale continues high because they are making a useful contribution to society. The company profits from their know-how and reliability, and the drain on its pension plan and on social security is relieved.

Many large corporations—the General Electric Co., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, United States Steel Corp., Con Edison, and others—try to find part-time jobs for retired workers. In some concerns, business fluctuates on a seasonal basis and extra workers often are needed for a few months. Retired persons often substitute for regular employees during vacation periods, and may work in retail stores during the Christmas season.

Along with several small firms, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is studying plans to enable older workers to taper off—to do less work as they advance in age. Such plans may ultimately be adopted on a wide scale.

Tapering off takes several forms. If 65-year-olds wish to continue working in one firm, they must take an extra month's unpaid vacation. At 66, they take 2 months; at 67, 3 months, and so on. In another firm, older employees work only in alternate months. Under other programs, workers may taper off by working fewer days per week, fewer hours per day, or both.

These programs seem to be more closely related to reality than those which say that a man is capable of working 1 day before he reaches 65, but incapable of it a day later. Humans do not lose their touch that suddenly. There is, instead, a slow loss of energy.

Tapering off also enables a worker to taste retirement without swallowing it all at once. He has more time to accustom himself to increased leisure—and to a lower income. He can experiment with various kinds of retirement living.

One couple had planned for years to move from the New York area to Florida after the husband retired. They intended to buy a trailer, set it up at a park permanently, and lead a life of indolence. Not until he began to taper off did the man have a month in which to test that kind of existence. The couple rented a trailer but within 3 weeks were convinced that their best chances for happiness lay in their own neighborhood, among their lifetime friends. Had they been denied the opportunity to experiment, they probably would have sold their furniture, bought a trailer, and made a costly and perhaps permanent mistake.

Tapering off also helps in another area which has been found to be a source of trouble in retirement—the husband-wife relationship. As Dr. William Menninger commented recently, the modern man often is a bigamist; he is married to a job as well as to a woman. Many men, abruptly retired, discover with a shock that their wives are strangers. They need time to reestablish the close relationship which may not have existed since they were first married.

An indication that many corporation policymakers realize the shortcomings of compulsory retirement is the elaborate effort they now make to persuade employees to like getting paid without working. "Planning for happy retirement" is a phrase you hear more frequently in personnel offices.

One corporation urges employes to begin thinking of retirement when they have completed 15 years of service—and perhaps 30 years before the compulsory retirement age. Others gently call the employe's attention to his future about 5 years before he will retire, and interview him each year thereafter to get him ready for his last day. Many personnel officials have been impressed by reports by Cleveland sociologists (and others) that the happiest retired people generally are those who kept occupied with personal interests during week-ends and vacations when they were employed. The retired-to-be are therefore strongly urged to develop off-job interests.

Some personnel men advocate group therapy: prospective pensioners and their spouses are invited to attend meetings on company time with others who will soon, or have already, quit work. There is a frank discussion and exchange of experiences about all aspects of life without work.

Despite progress in preparing the rank-and-file for retirement, much remains to be done in preparing executives for the step. Presidents and vice presidents often prefer to look the other way when they see the ax hanging over one of their own.

"I can't bring myself to discuss the awful subject with a man on my level," one personnel executive commented. "I'd as soon ask him what arrangements he's made for his death."

The cause of this may be that one type of executive virtually lives his job. He often drives himself through a 6- or 7-day week and his hours of recreation are spent only with business associates or customers. Such a man faces an almost overwhelming task of adjusting to new conditions when he leaves his desk for the last time.

Obviously, most of the responsibility for a successful adjustment to changed conditions rests upon the individual. No amount of effort by employers or social institutions will help if he himself resists the need to prepare—psychologically, financially, and in other ways.

Since the basic trouble afflicting the retired is that they have leisure time which they do not know how to employ satisfyingly, it follows that the man who develops absorbing interests outside his work is likely to make the best adjustment. Traditionally, these absorbing interests have been taken to mean hobbies. But they need not be; anything that keeps the mind and body active will serve. One man began helping his wife with her housework when she was incapacitated by arthritis. After his retirement, he found himself preparing meals, washing clothes, and cleaning rooms. Cleveland researchers came across him in a survey of retired persons and, by all appearances, he was one of the happiest individuals they met.

At 60, one corporation executive undertook to repair a brick planting box outside his

home. He became so intrigued with the results he achieved that he decided to build a brick wall around his entire property of 1 acre. The last month of his working career was painful to him—not because he dreaded the end of paid employment, but because he could hardly wait to devote full time to his wall.

Most employees may not be so fortunate. The errors of compulsory, abrupt, and unplanned retirement will not be corrected suddenly. Widespread adoption of new policies is not expected for many years, just as today's fairly universal pension plans were many years in the making. But many experts also believe that changes are inevitable, for society's well-being as well as for the happiness of millions.

## Phillips Petroleum Officials Say Higher Prices Likely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the President's March 10 proclamation restricting oil imports for the benefit of the "poverty-stricken and depressed domestic oil industry" is without question the most inflationary and arbitrary action executed by the President during his term of office.

The obvious purpose of the Executive order is to prop up and support the domestic prices of oil and petroleum products in a sagging world market. While import controls close out competition from abroad, the Texas Railroad Commission, controlling most of the domestic oil production is limiting production to 11 days per month. The combination of controlled imports and controlled domestic production results in controlled supplies and controlled consumer prices. The only thing that remains uncontrolled is the stranglehold which the oil industry has on our economy.

There is no doubt of the inflationary result of the oil import control order. The price of oil and petroleum products will soon rise—and every American will be called upon again to increase his Texas tribute. The following news article which appeared today in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Phillips Petroleum Officials Say Higher Prices Appear Likely" is proof of the new and unreasonable demands which will soon be made on the American consumer:

PHILLIPS PETROLEUM OFFICIALS SAY HIGHER PRICES APPEAR LIKELY—FIRM'S NET, GROSS REVENUES SHOULD TOP 1958 IF RISE IN DEMAND CONTINUES, REPORT STATES

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.—The best balance of product inventories to demand in several years now offers "prospects for higher prices in the oil industry," officers of Phillips Petroleum Co., said in the annual report.

"For years prices for the industry's products and raw materials have lagged far behind ever-rising costs of wages, supplies and equipment," the officers stated, adding: "Higher prices are needed now to recover the general 5 percent wage increase of early 1959."

Discussing 1959 business prospects, the officials stated if the pickup in demand for petroleum products continues, Phillips' 1959 earnings and gross revenues "should be higher than those of 1958." They predicted an increase in 1959's total U.S. petroleum demand of 5 percent over last year.

As released earlier, the annual statement reported net earnings of $84,236,994, equal to $2.45 a share on gross revenues of $1,072,867,267. This was a decline in earnings of 12 percent from $96,209,353, or $2.80 a share, on revenues of $1,136,892,901 for 1957.

Phillips' natural gas liquids production in the United States increased 3 percent to 90,000 barrels daily last year from the 1957 rate, the report said, but crude-oil production, affected by reduced State allowables, declined 10 percent to 118,600 barrels a day. As a result, total net domestic production of the company's basic liquid raw materials decreased 5 percent, it added.

At the Phillips' refineries, the recession limited crude runs to an average of 218,000 barrels a day, 8 percent below 1957, the report said. It noted, however, the company's capacity to handle crude oil had been increased by the end of 1958 to 266,500 barrels daily compared with 258,500 barrels a year earlier.

In 1959, the report said, Phillips expects to start receiving income from the sale of crude oil from Venezuelan reserves discovered last year. Phillips owns about 50 percent interest in these concessions. Despite the recent Venezuelan income tax increase, the "substantial cost of the new concessions already has been justified," the report said.

Capital expenditures in 1959, the officials stated, are expected to be "slightly in excess" of the $138,818,000 spent last year. They stated there "would be no need for outside financing."

## Fate of the City Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by the distinguished development coordinator of the city of Philadelphia, Hon. William L. Rafsky. Mr. Rafsky's letter, written in reply to a recent editorial, appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on Saturday, March 14, 1959. It clearly shows the need for urban renewal and public housing programs in the cities of the Nation:

Your February 27 editorial "Mysterious Mandate," questions whether there is really a demand for urban renewal and public housing programs. The American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which speak for the bulk of the Nation's urban communities, both testified to the need for significantly larger appropriations for these programs. A survey jointly sponsored by these organizations indicates a backlog of $600 million in pending applications and a need for at least $500 million a year for each of the next 6 years for urban renewal.

Nor is there any mystery about Philadelphia. Applications pending for center city redevelopment alone will require more Federal funds than Philadelphia would be eligible for during the first year of the program as envisioned by either the Senate or House bills. Any reduction in the amounts will delay the needed redevelopment around the State Mall off Independence Hall and the proposed industrial park around Franklin Square. This is exclusive of applications pending to conserve sound residential neighborhoods in south and west Philadelphia. It does not include long standing programs for the city's universities, Temple, Pennsylvania, Drexel, as well as planned work for such hospitals as St. Luke's in north Philadelphia.

When one considers that urban renewal produces on the average $10 of private investment for every $1 of public investment as well as adding to the city's tax base, it can hardly be considered inflationary. Even public housing is essentially self-supporting with less than 5 percent of its total cost in the form of subsidy.

Opposition to public housing, except for real estate interests, is confined to choice of sites. People who do not want public housing in their neighborhoods proclaim they are for the public housing program and do not hesitate to suggest other locations. Because of the large number of low-income families scheduled to be displaced by slum clearance and code enforcement, low-rent public housing is necessary if these programs are to succeed. Incidentally, the investigation by Congress to which you refer is aimed at the hardship redevelopment causes small businesses, and not to the storm allegedly produced by Eastwick redevelopment.

The fate of the city depends on adequate appropriations for these programs. The city is in danger of losing its economic strength, its tax base, and its most productive population. Since the Nation must depend on the vitality and prosperity of its metropolitan centers, this is not a local but a truly national concern.

WILLIAM L. RAFSKY,
*Development Coordinator.*

## Practical Defense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, of the Gary, Indiana Post Tribue, offers some practical suggestions on foreign-aid legislation. The space age does not mean much to underdeveloped nations. They need food and education more than supersonic weapons.

The editorial follows:

[From the Gary Post-Tribune, Mar. 16, 1959]

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

President Eisenhower has sent a $4 billion foreign aid proposal to Congress. The emphasis is heavily on military assistance programs, and the President's message warns of the "growing Communist potential to launch a war of nuclear destruction."

The President probably has great justification for the military funds he is asking—$1.6 billion for weapons and equipment and $835 million for defense support. Whether or not our own military budget is large enough or properly distributed, we should be giving material assistance to a number of our allies. We should enable them to maintain good defense establishments of their own; they are of value to all members of NATO.

What is a matter of regret is that military programs take up 62 percent of the whole foreign aid program. There is only about $1.5 billion for all other forms of assistance. It is regrettable, too, that the overall emphasis is so much on our defense against communism rather than on our brotherly desire to help underprivileged nations strengthen themselves and provide more abundant lives for their peoples.

The largest item on the nonmilitary part of the program is $700 million for the Development Loan Fund. There is $272 million for aid in such fields as health and education, $211 million for technical cooperation, $200 million for emergency projects, and only $112 million for such projects as the U.N. Children's Fund and our atoms-for-peace program.

In the past the President has found it easier to sell foreign aid to Congress on the basis of the military support it would buy, and that is the sales pitch again. But that is not always the best way to sell the program to the other nations.

Military aid is for right now. Economic assistance is of more value for the long pull. If we can enable a have-not country to lift its living standards, improve its national health and build a stable economy, we will have a more substantial friend than if it is bent over trying to support a military establishment larger than its resources provide for.

## President Eisenhower Calls Present Equal Time Provision Ridiculous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President has joined many others in and out of Government in criticizing the equal time provision as it pertains to political candidates appearing on regular radio and television newscasts.

He has asked Attorney General Rogers about the need for remedial legislation, and I have notified the Attorney General of my bill, H.R. 5389, which would exempt newscasts and news commentaries from this equal time provision. My reading of congressional committee reports in the past has convinced me that the Congress has never intended that the equal time provision include newscasts.

Chairman OREN HARRIS, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has written me of his concern over this situation and has stated that this committee will consider remedial legisiation such as the Cunningham bill as soon as it can be worked into the committee schedule.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of an article in yesterday's Washington Star by Garnett D. Norner:

PRESIDENT CRITICIZES "EQUAL TIME" PROVISION

President Eisenhower today described as "ridiculous" any requirement that television and radio newscasts give equal time to all political candidates asking for it.

The President asked Attorney General Rogers to consider whether any remedial legislation should be drafted or whether any other appropriate action can be taken to correct the situation.

His concern arose from a Federal Communications Commission ruling February 19 that under the law all political opponents must be given equal time on newscasts as well as for regular campaign appearances.

In announcing the Persident's reaction and instructions to Mr. Rogers, White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty emphasized that Mr. Eisenhower "is not criticizing the FCC decision under the law."

REFERS TO NEWSCASTS ONLY

Mr. Hagerty also said the President's concern is directed at the equal time requirement as it affects newscasts, and that his action has not gone beyond this to question the requirement for equal time in political campaigns for even what a reporter termed "crackpot candidates."

"The emphasis in the President's discussion with me," Mr. Hagerty said, "is that this is news and he thinks it is ridiculous to have the law tell radio and television stations that they have to give equal time to all candidates in coverage of the news."

The FCC ruling, which has stirred a storm of protest from broadcasting officials and in newspaper editorials, was handed down in the Lar Daly case in Chicago.

ALL-OUT FIGHT PLANNED

Mr. Daly is a perennial unsuccessful office seeker who announced himself as a candidate for both the Republican and Democratic nominations for mayor of Chicago.

Chicago television newscasts showed both Mayor Richard Daley, Democratic candidate for nomination, and Timothy Sheehan, his Republican opponent, filing their nomination papers.

Mayor Daley also was telecast greeting President Frondizi, of Argentina, when he visited Chicago.

The FCC held this news coverage must be matched by allotting equal time to Lar Daly on a regular newscast.

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of Columbia Broadcasting System, announced last week an all-out fight will be waged against the ruling.

## North Dakota Contractors Support Legislation To Keep Hoodlums Out of State Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Associated General Contractors of North Dakota have endorsed, in a letter to me, the bill recently passed by our State Legislature to keep racketeers from gaining control of labor unions.

The association is aware, as are most North Dakotans, of the threat of racketeering and corrupt practices to the ultimate welfare of organized labor. Certainly no one has any quarrel with the right of labor to organize, bargain collectively, or to strike. The general public has come to wonder, however, as to whether or not the rank and file members of unions, in many instances, were given any choice in making decisions. It, too often, appears that a small group controls the union completely and exploits its position of power for the benefit of a few leaders, rather than the welfare of the entire membership of the union.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include here, the letter received from the Associated General Contractors of North Dakota, together with the text of the bill passed by our State legislature. I commend this information to my colleagues:

ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS
OF NORTH DAKOTA,
*Bismarck, N. Dak., March 11, 1959.*

Hon. DON L. SHORT,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SHORT: We are pleased to enclose a copy of a bill recently passed by the North Dakota Legislative Assembly. Obviously it it the hope that this Act will prevent the racketeers, hoodlums, and gangsters from gaining control of labor unions in this State as has already happened in so many areas. This bill passed both houses of the legislature by votes of 70 to 40 and 37 to 12 and with members of both political parties voting in its favor.

Despite the many declarations by organized labor that they want to "clean up" and avoid the very thing which this act is intended to accomplish, they vigorously opposed this bill. Why? Obviously because they have but one objective in mind, the complete control and domination of the political and economic forces of the country, and they want no restrictions on any means to that end. Openly they avow to dominate and control every elected official or have his job. Even in North Dakota where there is less organization of labor than in most States, the great majority of people are afraid to speak out in opposition to their acts and their objectives.

It is a tribute to the courage of the legislators of North Dakota that this bill was enacted into law. They have seen the writing on the wall and, as one Senator said, "We are going to lock the barn before the horse is stolen." If labor is to have the rights they demand and the position they seek politically and economically, then it is only fair, reasonable and right that they be made to assume equal responsibilities for the public welfare. If they are to be permitted to dictate to management, then they must assume equal responsibilities of management and be subjected to the same controls and restrictions. Above all, such power should not—must not—be permitted to fall into the hands of criminals, racketeers and gangsters whose only concern is their own wealth and power.

It is our hope and prayer that the Congress of these United States will face the obvious facts—have the courage to do all those things which are so apparently necessary for the protection and welfare of the greatest Nation on earth, and "lock the barn before the horse is stolen".

Respectfully yours,

C. L. HOFFMAN,
*Manager.*

---

A BILL TO CREATE AND ENACT SECTION 34–01093 OF THE 1957 SUPPLEMENT, RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS TO HOLD OFFICE IN LABOR UNION OR LABOR ORGANIZATION

*Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota:*

SEC. 34–01093. Qualifications to hold office in labor union or labor organization: No person who has been convicted of any crime involving moral turpitude or of a felony, excepting traffic violations, shall serve in any official capacity or as any officer in any labor union or labor organization in this State. No such person, nor any labor union or labor organization in which he is an officer shall be qualified to act as a bargaining agent or representative for employees in this State. Such disqualification shall terminte whenever such officer is removed or resigns as an officer in such labor union or labor organization.

## The Face of Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the last in a series of articles by Eve Edstrom of the Washington Post be inserted in the Appendix at the conclusion of these remarks. Miss Edstrom's articles, which have been appearing in the Post each day this week, have been a revealing and a sobering picture of the effects of poverty upon the people of the District of Columbia and upon their children. To read them all numbs the sensibilities and makes any comment seem anticlimactic. Miss Edstrom's superb talents have, I believe, never been put to better use than in beating these cold, cruel, shameful facts into the consciousness of those of us who may yet retain some smugness about conditions in the Nation's capital and the need for social welfare services. As Professor John K. Galbraith is quoted as saying at the end of this article, "We will hear much of the corrupting effect of help. It would be well if it were compared to the corrupting effect of ignorance and starvation."

The article follows:

(By Eve Edstrom)

For the District's dependent children there was no more room at the inn last month.

And so 47 children were moved to the District's facilities for delinquent children.

In many instances the most serious "crime" committed by these children was being born to inadequate parents

Yet welfare officials had no other placement choice for the 47. The population at the city's only public home for homeless children, Junior Village, recently soared as high as 392. Its planned capacity is 240.

DOOMED TO INSTITUTIONS

"Many of these children face life in institutions until they come of age because cities lack imagination in solving the problems of hard-to-place youngsters," states Joseph Reid, executive director of the Child Welfare League of America.

Recognizing the great lack of adoptive home placements for Negro children, he suggests cities could hire adult Negroes to serve as parents for these children.

Other children remain in institutions because of what Reid calls the blind and unrealistic protection of parental rights. These children, he notes, frequently are not visited by their parents in a year or more and should be released for adoption.

What parental right, for example, does Mrs. Jones have?

Her two sons have lived most of their young lives in a children's home here. Each week she telephoned the boys to say she would visit them but more than a year elapsed before she did.

She arrived the day the boys went on an outing with a childless couple. Mrs. Jones waited for the children to be returned so she could scold them for going out on "her" visiting day.

Or what "right" does Mr. Smith have?

In freezing weather at 11 p.m. he took his two youngsters—one just recovering from pneumonia—to a downtown restaurant. He bundled himself in a heavy overcoat, but the children wore only soaking wet diapers. When asked why he took the children out in this condition, he said it was his "right" because he wanted to embarrass his wife who was with her boy friend at the restaurant.

RESPONSIBILITIES URGED

Both public and private welfare agency workers—far from being babysnatchers—attempt to work with such parents in the hope they will assume responsible behavior toward their children.

But as Jule Bouchard, executive director of the Southwest's Barney Neighborhood House, asks:

"How can these parents assume something that they have never known themselves? Family responsibility is not built in."

Quite similarly, Bernard W. Scholz, who heads the District's relief programs, asks: "How can we help families when we never see the fathers?"

"We close shop at 4:45 p.m.," he said. "We should have workers on duty from noon to 9 p.m. in the neighborhoods where the families live, so we can get to know all of the family, not just a part of it."

MANPOWER NEEDED

Welfare Director Gerard M. M. Shea believes a partial answer may be the establishment of team of workers—professionals as well as volunteers, those from public as well as private agencies—to work with these families at the neighborhood level.

But beyond what can be done by any local community many welfare experts believe no substantial help will be forthcoming for the Nation's impoverished families until the Federal aid to dependent children's program is broadened to give aid to all children in need, not only those whose fathers are absent from the home.

It has been more than two decades since Franklin D. Roosevelt saw one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished.

Since then enormous progress has been made. In Washington, for example, the number of low-income families has been reduced almost by one-half in the last decade.

But it still is estimated that one-fifth of the District school children under 16 years of age live in poverty and one-sixth of the families in the Nation's Capital live on substandard incomes.

This is not peculiar to the Nation's Capital. Throughout this country, it was reported in 1956, there were more than 10 million families attempting to live on incomes below $2,000.

CALL FOR A PROGRAM

Nor is it peculiar to this city that there is no overall plan for attacking the problem of poverty. Just a few weeks ago in a speech here, John K. Galbraith, author of "The Affluent Society" and professor of economics at Harvard, stated that as a nation "our greatest need is for a plan—a design—for the final elimination of poverty."

"We need to know who our poor are and where they are and why they remain excluded from the richer current of our economic life," he said.

"And we need a solid design for seeing that they, and above all their children, are rescued from this now anachronistic privation.

"Nor should we be bound by ancient notions as to how this may be done or what can be afforded. The problem must be attacked in a large and generous frame of mind.

"It means much better schools and health and welfare services and help to communities that do not have these in adequate quality and quantity and which cannot afford them.

"Almost certainly it means supplementary income for families that cannot afford proper care and education for their children.

"We will hear much of the corrupting effect of such help. It would be well were it compared to the corrupting effect of ignorance and starvation."

## Face to Face With Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1959, Mr. Arthur V. Wiebel, president of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Division of the United States Steel Corp., in my district, addressed the national directors meeting, National Society of Professional Engineers, in Birmingham. Mr. Wiebel's speech, which has been well received throughout the country, points out that current critical reports on the South have tended to obscure a much bigger story—that of the great economic and social progress which is being made in the Southern States. Mr. Wiebel outlined some of the outstanding advances which our section has made in recent years.

With the thought that Mr. Wiebel's speech would be of great interest to our colleagues in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, I am pleased to insert it herewith in the RECORD under leave heretofore granted:

FACE TO FACE WITH TOMORROW

(By Arthur V. Wiebel, president, Tennessee Coal & Iron Division, United States Steel Corp.)

I am glad that you chose Birmingham for your meeting place this year, for several reasons. The fact that you are meeting here probably had something to do with the invitation having been extended to me to talk with you. And I do like to talk. Also, Birmingham is the industrial capital of the southeast—and in what more appropriate place could a group of engineers choose to gather?

Finally—and by no means least important—you from other sections of the Nation are having an opportunity to see for yourselves a region, a State and a city which have figured prominently in the headlines recently. And I'll wager what you have seen thus far is entirely different from the impression of our area that you had previously gathered from the various news media.

Something over 300 years ago, a rather well-known playwright—who has since also gained a reputation as an outstanding amateur psychologist—had one of his characters to observe: "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." As usual, William Shakespeare knew whereof he spoke. It is a sad commentary on human nature that evil always attracts more attention than good. This has certainly been the case with the South. Since so many readers, listeners and viewers are inclined to pay more attention to stories of tragedy, catastrophe and misfortune than to those of a more cheerful nature, that is what the news media tend to stress. It's natural, I suppose. All of us who are in business concentrate our efforts on our most popular products.

Then, too, in this present situation one is tempted to suspect that some selfish per-

sonal, professional, and sectional axes are being ground to razor edge.

THE REAL PICTURE

Be that as it may, the end result has been that the critical reports about the South have obscured what in the longer run is a much bigger story; and certainly a brighter one. I think I could attempt no more worthwhile task than to use this occasion to tell that other story. It is my sincere hope that you will take it back with you to your respective homes and businesses. You can help us to set the record straight.

The plain truth of the matter is that the South is going to live down its present rash of bad publicity; and ultimately the more important story—the story of tremendous advancement—will be the big news, as it should be. There is a revolution going on in the South, but it has nothing to do with courts or Congress, laws or legislatures. The revolution of which I speak is economic in its nature, but it has sociological implications which far outweigh anything you may have been reading about us recently. This region today is fast moving out of the agrarian blind alley in which it has been trapped for so long, and is moving toward that position of economic leadership to which its geography, its climate, and its natural resources entitle it. And that should rate a banner headline in any newspaper of the Nation.

Before I tell you that story, you have a right to know why I consider myself qualified to tell it. Where did I get my information? Am I trying to sell you a bill of goods, or are my conclusions solidly based on facts? What axes am I trying to grind?

First, let me assure you that I am a Southerner—and proud of it—although I cannot lay claim to being a native of the Deep South. As a matter of fact, I was born so near the North that as a child I could have played hopscotch across the Mason-Dixon Line. It has been my privilege to be associated with United States Steel's operations in the Birmingham district for only a little more than a decade. But during that time, I have come to have a deep understanding of the problems of the people in this region, and a great admiration for the courage and determination they have shown in their efforts to catch up with the economically better developed sections of America. Such understanding and admiration is not based on the bias of a native son.

Second, in conducting the business affairs of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Division, my associates and I travel frequently the length and breadth of the South. We have talked at length with people in all walks of life—other businessmen, professional men and women, educators, civic leaders, men in political life—people with varied viewpoints and interests. From all of those conversations, one point has made itself crystal clear: Today there is a new South which sees its fortunes at its own doorstep and finds its hope for the future in the abilities of its own people.

Third, the industrial organization with which I am associated has for the better part of a century been an integral part of the southern business scene, and has participated fully in the development of this region. As the South's first and largest commercial steel manufacturer, it has been sensitive to every bump and lurch on the rocky road of progress. It can be said truthfully and without exaggeration that the Tennessee Coal and Iron Division has not only been influenced by—but has in a very real way influenced—the industrial growth of the South. It is interesting, but certainly not surprising, that one can almost chart the progress of these States by the record of growth and expansion that comprises the history of TCI. Steel, of course, is fundamental to the modern industrial structure. Little can be accomplished without steel. Thus I propose to discuss with you the birth and growth of the new South generally in terms of steel and specifically as it relates to Tennessee Coal and Iron.

GEOLOGY OF THE SOUTH

Some have said that the South is not a place; it is a state of mind. To a degree, this is true—although there is room for considerable disagreement as to just what this state of mind may be. But it is very definitely a place and, as a matter of fact, a pretty big spot on the map. In land area, it comprises about one-quarter of the United States, not counting Alaska. Populationwise, it has about one-quarter of the Nation's people, even counting Alaska. Climatically, it is probably the best spot in the United States, insofar as business is concerned. Its relatively mild temperatures and short winters make it ideal for both industry and agriculture.

But where the South really shines is in its geology. Although we are only one-quarter of the land area of the 48 contiguous States, we produce approximately one-half of America's minerals. The South has 48 percent of the Nation's clay, 53 percent of the coal, 65 percent of the petroleum, 76 percent of the natural gas, and 100 percent of the bauxite and naturally occurring sulfur.

With the greatest average rainfall, we are better fixed for water than any other region, for industrial usage, for electric powerplants, for transportation. Alabama ranks second in the Nation in miles of navigable waterways.

Minerals are irreplaceable. Once they have been used they are gone. But there is a natural resource which can be renewed over and over again. That, of course, is timber—and the South has 40 percent of the Nation's forest area. In 1953, there were in these States more than 14,000 manufacturing and processing concerns based on our timber resources, and they employed half a million people. Trees are grown as crops in the South today, just as cotton has been grown for so many years.

STOREHOUSE OF WEALTH

With the South sitting atop a vase storehouse of natural wealth, one is inclined to ask why its development came so late. Why should New England, for example—with its harsh climate, its rocky, inhospitable soil, and its relative lack of raw materials—have so far preceded us in the development of business and industrial accomplishment? The reasons are far too many and varied to be compounded into a simple answer. One of the more obvious, however, is that the pre-1865 South was built upon an unsound system—*and the abrupt destruction of the plantation system gave southerners neither the time nor the means to evolve a more soundly based business system.

Another highly important reason for our lag is simply that until comparatively recent years, we have not been aware of the natural and personal resources we have had at our disposal. A century and a half ago, a traveler stopped on the crest of Red Mountain—which forms the southern boundary of this city—and curiously examined some reddish stones he found there. When a bearded, weatherbeaten mountaineer wandered up to see what he was about, he inquired what the peculiar rocks might be.

"Red dye rock," was the brief reply.

"What's it fit for?"

The answer to that one was even shorter: "'Taint fitten."

Even the mineral around which the predecessor of TCI was built was largely unrecognized or ignored by the pioneers of Tennessee's Cumberland Mountains, where it was discovered. The outcrop of coal into which the Sewanee Mining Co. sank its first shaft about a century ago was discovered by two farm boys as they attempted to dig a fox from beneath a stump. They had no idea what the substance was, but its shiny black appearance appealed to them, so they took some sample back to their father, who correctly identified them.

Obviously, the boys were not exceptional in their lack of knowledge. Until outsiders hit upon the idea of opening a mine, the original owners could not find buyers for the coal-bearing lands at the asking price of 12½ cents an acre. And when the mine was opened, prospective customers showed what might be termed an enthusiastic disinterest in the product. The company could not sell even two carloads of coal a day—and in 1 year the company commissary made more than twice as much profit as the firm realized from its coal sales.

A GRAND AWAKENING

But probably the greatest drawback to southern progress has been its people's lack of awareness and belief in their own inherent capabilities, which prevented the most effective use of their personal resources. In just about two decades, there has been a grand awakening to the potential of the South, and a new aggressive attitude is fast supplanting the apathy that was for so long the hallmark of this region.

Pick up any business or trade periodical, and within its covers you will find one to a half-dozen advertisements designed to sell the South as an ideal place to establish plants and offices. Cities, States, and aggregations of businessmen are working hard to bring new business to the area. Less noticeable but more significant is the fact that a tremendous proportion of the new business concerns of Dixie are completely southern concerns—conceived and established by southerners and largely financed by southern capital. That is particularly apparent to us at TCI, because an overwhelming percentage of our customers are in the small business category, and a majority of those are home owned and home operated.

The course of progress at TCI has been shaped, to a great extent, by this division's policy of offering the best practical service to the many and diverse small business firms which comprise the major portion of southern industry. Since its advent into the Birmingham district, TCI has sought out the steel needs of southern industry, and has endeavored to meet them. As a result, our product range is almost as wide as that of any single primary steel manufacturer in the world.

In the waning months of the 19th century, TCI tapped the Birmingham district's first commercial heat of steel, and thus became the South's pioneer steelmaker. At the turn of the century, the South had 9 percent of the Nation's manufacturing facilities. Today, the South has 22 percent of American manufacturing facilities, and TCI has an annual net ingot capacity of approximately 4 millions tons—with a product range of about 100 items of steel and steel byproducts. Step by step, the growth and expansion of our division has paralleled the industrial growth and expansion of the South * * * and more often than not, our entry into new phases of steel manufacture has served as the stimulus for the creation of new industrial enterprises.

GROWTH AND EXPANSION

As the 20th century dawned, a vast network of railroads began to grow rapidly across the face of Dixie * * * linking formerly isolated communities and providing the facilities of transportation and communication so vital to the establishment and growth of business. Just 3 years after it tapped its first heat of steel, TCI installed a rail mill, to supply the requirements of southern railroads. That was no mere expansion of plant and facilities. In undertaking rail manufacture, the division shattered technological precedent. For the first time in the history of steelmaking, TCI

demonstrated that rails of suitable quality could be made from open hearth steel as well as from Bessemer steel. It was a bold step, but subsequent experience has proved that it was well worth the risk. Since 1907, we have turned out several million tons of rails and accessories for southern railroads.

About 10 years after the rail mill was installed, our division was among the first to install facilities for recovery of the gases driven from coal during the coking process, and for the conversion of those gases to crude chemicals. Since that time, coal chemicals have formed the basis for the establishment of southern plants for the manufacture of an amazingly wide variety of products—running the gamut from the new manmade fibers to industrial solvents and high explosives.

Coal chemicals and petrochemicals form the major basis for the Southern chemical industry—which in the post-war period has expanded at an almost unbelievable rate. Thirty-nine percent of American chemical manufacturing is now in the South, and the percent is still rising. Nylon, the first true man-made fiber, was introduced just 20 years ago, but it and its first cousins—orlon, dacron, acrilan, and the like, have already wrought a revolution in the clothing industry. The bulk of production of man-made fibers is in the South. Synthetic rubber and plastics of every description are turned out here in great volume.

AMAZING PROGRESS OF A REGION

At approximately the same time our coal chemical plant was constructed, a wire mill was also added to our complex of steel plants. Although one of the major products of that plant is nails—vital to construction—the significant factor in establishment of the wire mill was that it coincided roughly with the great national change in agriculture and livestock farming, in which fenced fields and pastures supplanted the open range.

If fencing worked a great transformation on the West, its effect upon the South has been even more drastic. The enclosure of fields and grazing lands has gone hand-in-hand with the application of scientific methods and efficient business procedure to reshape entirely the agricultural situation of Dixie. When cattle and hogs were allowed to roam free, they were more often than not scrub stock, almost valueless to the meat and dairy markets. The bony, nondescript cow and the razorback pig were almost the trademark of southern farming. At the same time, cotton was a king—reigning over sterile and gullied fields.

Now, if you drive across the South in almost any direction, you will pass farm after well-kept farm where pure-bred or scientifically cross-bred cattle are being grown for the markets of the Nation. It is not necessary to leave the highways to see evidences of rural prosperity which border on affluence. As much intelligence and effort are being devoted to the maintenance of grazing lands as to improvement of the bloodlines of the cattle. Formerly, livestock got its forage if, as, and where, it could find it. Today it is standard practice to fertilize, condition, and rotate grazing lands. Application of modern techniques, coupled with our long green seasons and ample rainfall, is shifting the livestock business away from the West and into our own region. The growing of cotton is going west, and we consider the exchange of cotton for cattle one of the best bargains the South has ever struck.

DIVERSIFIED INDUSTRIES

Until World War I, the United States was not a major maritime Nation. With our entry into the war, it became necessary for us to overcome our shortage of merchant ships with extreme speed. To aid in that effort, TCI built a shipyard near the port of Mobile. But to build ships, plates and structural shapes were needed; and so the Fairfield steelworks, one of the Nation's most modern and diversified steel plants, was constructed. Only 14 ships were built at the Mobile facility. Then, with the passing of the national emergency, it was closed. But the installation of plate and structural production equipment at Fairfield had given fresh impetus to the southern shipbuilding industry—which today leads the field in American ship construction. From Maryland around the Atlantic and gulf coasts to Texas, and at various inland ports, plants are building vessels of every size and description: shrimp boats and tugs, tankers and barges, luxury liners and atomic submarines. During the World War II emergency, approximately half of all American merchant ships of greater than 2,000 tons gross weight were built at southern shipyards.

But the output of our Fairfield steel plant has by no means been limited to supplying the shipbuilders. With the closing of its shipyard, TCI built at Fairfield a railroad car plant, to be supplied with plates and structurals from the steelworks. That plant was later purchased by the Pullman-Standard Car Manufacturing Co., at nearby Bessemer, Ala. Steel for its operations is still furnished chiefly by our division. Also, the steel plant was augmented with the addition of blast furnaces, open hearth furnaces, and additional rolling mills for a diversity of products. It also supplies intermediate shapes for two other TCI plants which were later built to meet the changing and growing needs of southern industry.

In 1925 TCI's Fairfield Sheet Mill was put into operation, to supply sheets for a fast-increasing number of manufacturers of consumer products. Almost as soon as southern-made sheets became available, there was a great upsurge of plants manufacturing all sorts of metal products: such things as toys, kitchen appliances, bus bodies, street signs, porch furniture, and automobile parts. As we foresaw the demand for new or improved products, and as more efficient manufacturing techniques have evolved among sheet-metal fabricators, we have been quick to alter our manufacturing facilities and methods to supply steel best suited for the job. When it was seen that customers might advantageously use galvanized sheet steel in coils rather than in individual sheets, continuous galvanizing lines were installed so that steel could be delivered in coil form. At the same time, we began producing a better zinc coating, more resistant to breakage and flaking in drawing and forming processes. Helping to promote further advances in southern consumer manufacturing, we also found it advisable to install—at considerable expense—facilities for the production of cold-reduced sheets. The availability of cold-reduced sheets has led to the formation in the South of a great many types of fabrication for which hot-rolled sheets are not suitable.

With the decline of cotton, and with the advent of diversified farming, the production of fruits and vegetables is gaining ever-greater dimensions in the South. Because of its geographic and climatic advantages, this area has long been a chief supplier to the dinner tables of America. Food processing in the South is an $11 billion industry, and the prospects for future growth are excellent. A generation ago, TCI recognized the growing importance of southern fruit and vegetable production and processing. Acting on faith that the trend would continue, our division 21 years ago put into operation the South's first tin mill. The largest single portion of our ingot production now goes into the manufacture of tin plate. With the establishment of the tin mill, the major can manufacturers located plants in this and adjoining States. Today there are almost 12,000 food-processing plants in the South employing almost a half-million people.

OUR HEADLINE STORY

It is generally believed, even by southerners, that World War II was directly responsible for the South's rise toward economic equality with the rest of the Nation. That, happily, is not the case. During the war, that part of the South which comprised 17 percent of the total population, received only 6 percent of defense expenditures. A few months ago, at a conference on the economic future of this region, it was pointed out that in the postwar decade from 1946 to 1956 factory employment in the Southeast rose 22 percent, as compared with only 9 percent for the Nation as a whole.

During that period, Tennessee Coal & Iron undertook a major expansion program, to supply the additional steel required by the growing number of manufacturing plants. Since the war, our rated annual ingot capacity increased by 50 percent—and within the last few months we have announced several programs for the addition of several items to our product list to improve still further the quality of our steel and to provide products in the new forms and dimensions as required by our progressing customers.

And that, my friends, is the story that has not made the headlines. If events of a more emotional flavor push it from the front pages today, you may be sure that historians of a later time will give it the recognition it deserves. Whatever dissensions and disharmonies may beset us from time to time, the course toward the future is set; and nothing can check our progress toward a better day. The busy humming of our factories and the ringing of our cash registers are going to overwhelm the clamor of hysterical debate.

Take that story back with you. Tell your associates that under all the mountains of bombast and oratory there are cold, hard facts and figures that reveal a South with which the world has not yet become familiar. And tell them for me that the conscientious, levelheaded citizens of the South may one day hold the destiny of America in their hands.

When you came to visit the South, you came face to face with tomorrow.

## Hawaii Greets Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. JOHN A. BURNS

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, press reports circulating the reactions of the people of Hawaii to the final passage of S. 50 by the House of Representatives indicated that the people of Hawaii quite naturally demonstrated their exuberance in many ways.

However, in justice, it should be told that a great many people of Hawaii reacted in an entirely different way. For, according to numerous reports received, the most immediately spontaneous reaction of the people of Hawaii was one of prayerful thanksgiving to the Almighty and of seeking His guidance in meeting new responsibility.

One of Hawaii's news reports contains the story of an unplanned service held at Kawaihao Church. This church is the denomination of the missionaries who came to Hawaii in 1820. A crowd of more than 1,000 people, including the Honorable Neal Blaisdell, mayor of the city and county of Honolulu, gathered and paid respect to the Divine Provi-

dence within minutes of the news being received that the bill was passed by the House.

The next morning, thanksgiving services were held at this same church. The Reverend Dr. Abraham Akaka, pastor of Kawaihao Church, gave the sermon, which is included here:

STATEHOOD SERVICE, KAWAIAHAO CHURCH, MARCH 13, 1959

"One Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all". These words have a fuller meaning for us all in Hawaii today. And we have gathered in this mother church of Hawaii, our Westminster Abbey of Hawaii, to give thanks to God, and to pray for His guidance and protection in the years ahead.

Our newspapers have been full of much valuable historical data concerning Hawaii development and growth and aspirations. I will keep the copies of these stories as long as I live, and for my children and grandchildren after them. For they have called to our minds the long train of those whose prayers and hopes and sacrifices through the years were fulfilled yesterday. There remains the formal expression of our people for statehood, and the entrance of our islands into the Union as a full-fledged member.

I would like to speak the message of self-affirmation this morning, that in the days ahead, we take courage to be ourselves, to be the Aloha State.

On April 25, 1820, 139 years ago, the first Christian service of worship was conducted in Honolulu on this very ground. Like our Pilgrim Fathers who arrived at Plymouth, Mass., in 1620, so did the fathers of a new era in Hawaii kneel in prayer to give thanks to God who had seen them safely on their way after a long and trying voyage.

Gathered around the Rev. Hiram Bingham on April 25, 1820, here at Kawaiahao were a few of our kupunas who had come out of curiosity. The text for the sermon of that day, though it was April and near Easter time, was from the Christmas story. And there our people heard these words for the first time: "Mai Makau Oukou, No Ka Mea, Eia Hoi, Ke Hai Aku Nei Au Ia Oukou I Ka Mea Maikai, E Olioli Nui Ai E Lilo Ana No Na Kanaka A Pau. No Kai Mea, I Keia La I Hanau Ai, Ma Ke Kulanakauhale O Davida, He Ola No Oukou, Oia Ka Mesia Ka Haku. (Fear not, for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour which is Christ the Lord)."

Although our grandfathers did not realize it then, the hopes and fears of all their years through the next century and more, were to be met in the meaning and power of those words, for from that beginning, a new Hawaii was born. For through those words, our missionaries and people following them under God became the greatest single influence in Hawaii's whole development—politically, economically, educationally, socially, religiously—so that Hawaii's real preparation for statehood can be said to have begun truly on that day 139 years ago on this spot.

Yesterday when the first sound of firecrackers and sirens reached my ears, I was with the members of our Territorial senate in the middle of the opening prayer for the day's session. How strange, and yet how fitting it was that the news should burst forth while we were in prayer together. Things had moved so fast. Our mayor, a few minutes before, asked if the church could be kept open, because he and others wanted to walk across the street to the sanctuary here for prayer when the news came. By the time I got back from the senate, this sanctuary was well nigh filled by people who happened to be near when the sirens started ringing, people from our government buildings nearby. And as we sang the great hymns of Hawaii and of our Nation, and lifted up our voices in psalms and prayers, it seemed that the very walls of this church spoke of God's dealing with Hawaii in the past, of great events both spontaneous and planned that they had seen here. For the love and power of God has been a refuge and a guide for our people through the past century and more.

There are some of us to whom statehood brings great hopes; and there are some to whom statehood brings silent fears. One might say that the hopes and fears of Hawaii are met in statehood today. There are fears that statehood will motivate economic greed toward Hawaii, that it will turn Hawaii into a great big (as someone has said) spiritual junkyard filled with smashed dreams, worn-out illusions—that it will make us a lonely, confused, insecure, empty, anxious, restless, disillusioned—a wistful people.

There is an old Mele that reminds me of fears such as these, and the way God leads out of these fears. "Kaku'i I ka uahi O Ka lua, Pa I Ka Lani, Haahaa Hawaii, Moku O Keawe I Hanau Ia, Po Puna, Po Hilo, Po I Ka Uahi O Kuu Aina, Ola Ia Kini, Ke A Mai La Ke Ahi" (there is a fire underground but the firepit gives forth only smoke, smoke that burst upward, touching the skies, and Hawaii is humbled beneath its darkness. It is night over Hawaii, night from the smoke of my land, but there is salvation for the people, for now the land is being lit by a great flame).

We need to see statehood as the lifting of the clouds of smoke, and the opportunity to affirm positively the basic gospel of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We need to see that Hawaii has potential moral and spiritual contributions to make to our Nation and world. The fears Hawaii may have are to be met by men and women who are living witnesses of what we really are in Hawaii, of the spirit of Aloha, men and women who can help unlock the doors to the future by the guidance and grace of God.

Self-affirmation is the need of the hour. And we can affirm our being, what we really are, as the Aloha State by full participation in our Nation and world. For any collective anxiety, the answer is collective courage. And the ground of that courage is God.

We do not understand the meaning of Aloha until we realize its foundation in the power of God at work in the world. Since the coming of our missionaries in 1820, the name for God to our people has been Aloha. One of the first sentences I learned from my mother in my childhood was this from Holy Scriptures: "Aloha ke Akua." In other words, Aloha is God. Aloha is the power of God seeking to unite what is separated in the world—the power that unites heart with heart, soul with soul, life with life, culture with culture, race with race, nation with nation. It is the power that can reunite where quarrel has brought separation; it is the power that reunites a man with himself when he has become separated from the image of God within.

Thus when a people or a person lives in the spirit of Aloha, they live in the spirit of God. And among such a people whose lives so affirm their inner being, we see the working of the Scriptures: "All things work together for good to them who love God. From the Aloha of God came His Son that we might have life and that we might have it more abundantly."

Aloha consists of a new attitude of heart, above negativism and legalism. It is the unconditional desire to promote the true good of other people in a friendly spirit, out of a sense of kinship. Aloha seeks to do good to a person, with no conditions attached. We do not do good only to those who do good to us. One of the sweetest things about the love and Aloha of God is that it welcomes the stranger and seeks his good. A person who has the spirit of Aloha loves even when the love is not returned. And such is the love of God.

This is the meaning of Aloha. I feel especially grateful that the discovery and development of our islands long ago was not couched in the context of an imperialistic and exploitive national power, but in the context of Alaho. There is a very deep correlation between the charter under which the missionaries came—namely, "to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to cover these islands with productive green fields, and to lift the people to a high state of civilization"—correlation between this fact, and the fact that Hawaii is not one of the trouble spots in the world today. Aloha does not exploit a people and keep them in ignorance and subservience. Rather it shares the sorrows and joys of people; it seeks to promote the true good of others.

Today, one of the deepest needs of mankind is the need to feel a sense of kinship, one with another. Truly all mankind belongs together, for from the very beginning—all mankind has been called into being, nourished, watched over by the love of God who is Aloha. The real Golden Rule is Aloha. This is the way of life we must affirm.

Let us affirm ever what we really are—for Aloha is the spirit of God at work in you and in me and in the world, uniting what is separated, overcoming darkness and death, bringing new light and life to all who sit in the darkness of fear and the shadow of death, guiding the feet of mankind into the way of peace.

Thus may our becoming a State mean to our Nation and the world, and may it reaffirm that which was planted in us 139 years ago on this grounds: "Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

## Wrapping Our Flag Around Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Albert Emmet Reitzel, formerly Assistant General Counsel of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and now chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Nationality of the American Bar Association, has written an article entitled "Wrapping Our Flag Around Communists," which is quite pertinent to some present-day problems. Mr. Reitzel is a distinguished lawyer, originally from North Carolina and now in active practice in Washington. His article is as follows:

WRAPPING OUR FLAG AROUND COMMUNISTS

(By Albert E. Reitzel)

It is difficult to accept the fact that the 85th Congress, 2d session, adjourned without passing any law which would prohibit the issuing of passports to American citizens who refuse to make affidavit as to present or past membership in the Communist Party. All this has happened in the face of a law of Congress of 1954 which declares that the Communist Party of the United States, which claims to be a political party, is in fact an active part "of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States."

More than a month before Congress adjourned in August 1958, the Secretary of State urged the passage of a law to give him authority to refuse to issue passports in such cases; but Congress failed to do so. The result of these decisions is that the Secretary of State is required to issue passports to American citizens even though there may be evidence of Communistic affiliations.

At the present time the Passport Division is operating under the continued existence of the national emergency declared by presidential proclamation during the Korean war (1950). The regulation prohibits any citizen without a passport, with some exceptions not in point here, to go or attempt to go from the United States during a national emergency, or in time of war, to any country outside of this hemisphere. The special law prescribes a severe penalty on any citizen who violates the regulation. The passport does more than say that the person named in it is a citizen of the United States. In the passport the Secretary of State requests "all to whom it may concern to permit safely and freely to pass, and in case of need, to give all lawful aid and protection to" the citizen. This request from the Secretary of State clearly shows under international practice an intention of our Government to extend reasonable protection to the citizen. At any time passports are considered so much convenient proof of the name and citizenship of the owner that transportation lines generally require American citizens to have U.S. passports for trips between the United States and countries overseas.

The decisions of the Supreme Court on June 16, 1958, in the suit of Weldon Dayton against Secretary Dulles and the suit of Rockwell Kent and Walter Briehl against Secretary Dulles, compelled the Secretary of State to issue passports to them. In each case the opinion of the majority of the Court was by Justice Douglas, Chief Justice Warren and Justices Frankfurter, Black, and Brennan concurring. The dissenting opinion insists that Secretary Dulles had authority to deny the passports. It was by Justice Clark joined by Justices Burton, Harlan, and Whitaker, and applied to both cases. In short, five of the Judges decided the two cases in favor of Dayton, Kent, and Briehl; and four judges were in favor of Secretary Dulles. Every patriotic citizen should strive to understand these two five-to-four decisions and their menace to our safety just as they are being studied and used by citizens to obtain passports for trips abroad to aid the Communist movement.

In the Dayton case the opinion of the majority of the Court states that Congress had not authorized the Secretary of State to deny a passport to Dayton on the ground that its issuance would be contrary to the national interest. The opinion includes a copy of the decision by Secretary Dulles in which he had refused to issue the passport. Mr. Dulles said, "I have reason to believe on the balance of all the evidence, that the applicant is going abroad to engage in activities which will advance the Communist movement for the purpose, knowingly and willfully of advancing that movement." That view is amply supported by facts stated by the Secretary in that copy.

In the case of Kent and Briehl the opinion of the majority of the Court was in their favor for three reasons: A passport is necessary to travel abroad; the right to travel is a part of the liberty of which a citizen cannot be deprived except by a law of Congress; and Congress has not authorized the Secretary of State to withhold a passport from a citizen who refused to submit an affidavit as to his past or present membership in the Communist Party.

Kent had been informed by the Director of the Passport Office that the issuance of a passport was precluded on two grounds: "(1) that he was a Communist; and (2) that he had had a consistent and prolonged adherence to the Communist Party line"; and that before a passport could be issued, it would be necessary for him to furnish an affidavit as to present or past membership in the Communist Party. Briehl, after his application for a passport had been temporarily denied because of allegations as to his Communist activities, had been informed by the Passport Office of the State Department that it would be necessary for him to file such an affidavit. Both refused to furnish such an affidavit. The refusal was described in the opinion of the majority of the Court as a "refusal to be subjected to inquiry into their beliefs and associations." It must have been forgotten by the majority of the Court that a law of Congress of 1950 and one of 1954 make clear that membership in the Communist Party means more than having beliefs and associations. The 1950 law states that "the nature and control of the Communist movement itself, present a clear and present danger to the existence of free American institutions"; and the 1954 law says that the Communist Party of the United States, which claims to be a political party, is in fact an active part "of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States." These two statements had been cited in the brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of Secretary Dulles.

The regulations of the Secretary of State, which had required the passports to be denied, are consistent with a law of Congress of 1926 and were issued by Presidential proclamations which are within the terms of a law of Congress of 1952. The law of 1926 declares that the Secretary of State may grant and issue passports "under such rules as the President shall designate and prescribe for and on behalf of the United States." The law of 1952 declares that "While the United States is at war or during the existence of any national emergency proclaimed by the President it shall be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter, or attempt to depart from or enter, the United States unless he bears a valid passport." The law prescribes a serious penalty for a violation. That law merely repeated a law of Congress of 1918 as to requirement of passports in time of war and a law of Congress of 1941 as that requirement during a national emergency. The view of the majority of the Court was that at the time this 1952 law was passed by Congress it intended only to authorize denial of passports in two classes of cases; they are cases involving questions of citizenship or criminal or unlawful conduct. None of these matters, the opinion said, were involved in these cases.

The dissenting opinion of Justice Clark, joined by three other Justices of the Supreme Court, insists that the law of Congress of 1952 had authorized denial of passports in these cases. That opinion is based on these points: At the time that law was passed by Congress there was in effect a Presidential proclamation declaring a national emergency caused by the Korean conflict, and that proclamation is still in effect. The travel restrictions of that law were put into effect by a proclamation of the President in 1953. The proclamation pointed out that it did not revoke any regulations "heretofore issued relating to the departure of persons from, or their entry into the United States." Among the regulations were those under which passports were denied to Dayton, Kent, and Briehl; and those regulations had been issued to be effective August 22, 1952, which was before the date on which the 1952 law came into effect though after the passage of that law. Thus, the dissenting opinion asserts, Congress by the 1952 law has approved "whatever use of his discretion the Secretary had made prior to" that law. Hence, the opinion describes as nonsense the statement in the opinion of the majority of the Court that the Secretary's wartime exercise of his discretion, while admittedly more restrictive, is not relevant to the practice which Congress can be said to have approved. The statement in the opinion of the majority of the Court that the Secretary's denial of passports in peacetime extended only to two kinds of cases, those involving allegiance and those involving criminal activity, is described in the dissenting opinion as "contrary to fact." In support of that view, the dissenting opinion states that the peacetime practice of the State Department indisputably included denial of passports for reasons of national security. That statement is proved by excerpts in the report of the Commission on Government Security from documents of the State Department. The excerpts are quoted in the dissenting opinion and show these facts: Shortly after the 1917 Russian revolution, the State Department "became aware of the scope and danger of the worldwide revolutionary movement and the attendant purpose to overthrow all existing governments, including our own."

From that time until 1950 the practice of the State Department as to denying passports to Communist sympathizers was not consistent. However, beginning with September 1950, the Department consistently denied passports to American citizens with Communist affiliations, after it was pointed out that the Internal Security Act of 1950 clearly showed the desire of Congress that no Communists should be issued passports of this Government. The State Department's legal adviser agreed that it was the duty of the State Department to refuse passports to all Communists, including journalists.

In January 1958, several months before the above decisions of the Supreme Court, Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, introduced a bill, H.R. 9937, in Congress to authorize the Secretary of State to deny passports. Some of the provisions of the bill were broad enough to authorize denial in such cases as those of Dayton, Kent, and Briehl. Many of the provisions are based on recommendations made in the report of the Commission on Government Security which was sent to Congress and the President on June 21, 1957. The Chairman of the Commission was Mr. Lloyd Wright, formerly president of the American Bar Association. On the day after the two decisions were handed down by the Supreme Court, Congressman WALTER introduced H.R. 12989, a bill to permit the Secretary of State to deny passports to Communist sympathizers.

The President sent a message to Congress on July 7, 1958, referring to the two decisions of the Supreme Court and urgently requesting legislation to authorize denial of passports where their possession would seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States or would be inimical to the security of the United States. He said the lack of that power is exposing us every day and week to great danger. The following day Senator GREEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, introduced S. 4110 at the request of the Secretary of State. S. 4410 (same as H.R. 13318 introduced by Congressman KEATING, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee) was written by the State and Justice Departments; these bills had practically the same provisions as those introduced previously by Congressman WALTER.

At this time Secretary Dulles sent a letter to the Vice President of the United States as the Presiding Officer of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The letter said: "The international Communist movement seeks everywhere to thwart United States foreign policy. The issuance of United States passports to supporters of that movement fa-

cilitates their travel to and in foreign countries. It clothes them when abroad with all the dignity and protection that our Government affords. Surely our Government should be in a position to deny passports to such persons."

Mr. Robert D. Murphy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, included the following points in his argument before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 16, 1958: The legislation proposed in S. 4110 is based on the existence of a national emergency. The international Communist movement eagerly seeks the use of the citizens of the free countries wherever possible. Contacts with such citizens are necessary and travel by them is essential. Party conferences in many countries and meetings of a host of front organizations throughout the world are an essential part of the movement. Those who attend meetings of the front organizations may be ardent Communists; others may be innocent persons who lend themselves, their prestige and facilities to the development of contacts and operations so necessary to the international Communist movement. Laws to prevent Communist couriers and agents from going abroad would deal the Communist movement a very serious blow, just as the McCarran-Walter law of Congress has in prohibiting the travel of Communist aliens into this country. Even the Magna Carta recognized the obligations of a government to exercise some control over the issuance of passports in time of war and national emergency. The need for action by Congress is urgent.

Since the 2 decisions of the Supreme Court, passports have had to be issued by the State Department to 60-odd applicants with proved records of Communist activities; thus, they are in a position to travel abroad and aid the International Communist movement. Seventy more applications of people of this sort are pending in the State Department. Many more such applications must be expected. Mr. Murphy assured Congress that under this bill the State Department will not be in a position to deny passports to persons whose sole activities abroad would be to voice their own opinions and even to criticize our foreign policy, if they be so inclined. He said that the executive branch of our Government is convinced that our national security is threatened by the free issuance of passports to American supporters of the International Communist movement who wish to travel abroad. Without congressional authority, he said, such passports cannot be denied, and Congress is being requested to give that authority on an urgent basis. He stressed that our national security requires no less.

Doubtless, it was in view of the present open gate to citizens with Communist affiliations to go on visits to foreign lands that Attorney General Rogers, in July 1958, urged Congress to amend our laws against spying to include violations against the United States by our citizens while in foreign countries. Such an amendment was passed by the House of Representatives but failed to be voted on in the Senate.

On August 8, 1958, after hearing a number of witnesses, the matter of new legislation to give authority to deny passports to Communists and Communist sympathizers was shelved by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. On August 13 a bill, H.R. 13760, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman SELDEN of Alabama, states that Congress finds that the activities of the international Communist movement constitute a clear, present and continuing danger to the security of the United States. The bill would give authority to the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. The bill would require that no person be denied a passport on that ground except after opportunity for a hearing and that a denial of a passport on that ground shall be subject to be canceled in the district courts of the United States, whenever the denial is contrary to law. The bill was approved on August 23, 1958 by the House of Representatives by a voice vote. The bill is without effect because no action in favor of that or any other bill relating to denial of passports was taken by the Senate committee.

We are in these critical times with an international Communist conspiracy against us that causes our Government to draft every year thousands of men from their homes and chosen pursuits to serve in our Armed Forces anywhere in the world. The Secretary of State has been left in a straitjacket of law that requires him to issue passports to citizens with Communist associations to make visits anywhere abroad, thus free to aid the conspiracy. Verily, the Stars and Stripes are being wrapped around them. This danger to our country is all due to the two 5-to-4 unconvincing decisions of the Supreme Court and to the incredible, and terrifying failure of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to give the Senate a chance to vote on and approve any of the bills.

## American Good Government Honors Senator McClellan and Admiral Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the annual George Washington Day dinner sponsored by the American Good Government Society, of which I have the honor of being a trustee, has assumed increasing importance and has become one of the high points of the year for the many who attend.

This year, the dinner will be held on April 30 in the Sheraton Park Hotel. The date is the 170th anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as first President of the United States.

At the dinner the society will present its two annual George Washington Awards for distinguished service and contributions to good government to two outstanding Americans, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss. The speech of the evening will be delivered by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

I feel that the society's selection of Senator MCCLELLAN and Admiral Strauss for its awards is on the same high plane that has characterized its selections in past years. Many of you will recall that past recipients of the awards include such distinguished Americans as the late Senators Walter E. George and Robert A. Taft, former President Herbert Hoover, Senator Harry F. Byrd, and such distinguished Members of the House of Representatives as the Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER and the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH. Last year, the awards were given to Senators William F. Knowland and RICHARD RUSSELL.

With pardonable pride, the American Good Government Society reports that both Houses of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas adopted unanimously, a few days ago, a resolution commending the society for its good judgment in selecting Senator MCCLELLAN as one of its 1959 honorees. This resolution read:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14

Whereas the American Good Government Society of Washington, D.C., commemorates the anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States, and the enduring contributions made to good government by its first President, George Washington, by holding an annual anniversary dinner and reception in the city of Washington, D.C., which event is known as the George Washington Day dinner; and

Whereas a part of the ceremonies of said George Washington Day dinner is the presentation of the George Washington Awards to two Americans for their outstanding contributions to good government in our times; and

Whereas the selection of these two Americans from the entire Nation is made after full and complete deliberation concerning those considered for this high honor and award; and

Whereas one of those designated and selected for this high honor and award to be made at the George Washington Day dinner on April 30, 1959, commemorating the 170th anniversary of the inauguration of George Washington as first President of the United States, is the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, senior Senator from the State of Arkansas—(the other one being the Honorable Lewis L. Strauss, Secretary of Commerce of the United States): Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Arkansas, in legislative session (the House concurring therein), as follows:*

1. That the State of Arkansas and its people applaud the selection of its distinguished senior Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN as one of the recipients of this coveted award.

2. That the State of Arkansas and its people express their great satisfaction in knowing that the contributions to good government made by Senator MCCLELLAN are worthy of national note and repute.

3. That the State of Arkansas and its people rejoice in the great esteem in which Senator MCCLELLAN is held not only by his constituents at home, but by the Nation as a whole; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Good Government Society be commended for its program which gives recognition and encouragement to outstanding national leaders for their contributions to good government.

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

# Appendix

## Address by Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, at Jefferson-Jackson Dinner, Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last night in Hartford, Conn., our great majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, was the principal speaker at the annual Jefferson-Jackson dinner of Democratic Party in Connecticut. This was his first public appearance in New England, and the reception which he reecived there must have cheered him greatly because it was further evidence of the esteem in which he is held all over the country.

From the moment of the announcement that Senator JOHNSON would appear, the success of this important fundraising dinner was assured. The Democrats of Connecticut stood in line to pay $100 to hear LYNDON JOHNSON speak.

More than 1,600 persons crammed into every nook and cranny of the great ballroom of the Statler-Hilton and overflowed into all other dining rooms. This crowd surpassed by far any dinner attendance in the history of either party of Connecticut, and the hotel management announced that it was the greatest turnout of any kind in its history.

From the moment the Senator from Texas entered the banquet hall, the reception accorded him was tumultuous. Hundreds crowded close to the head table to shake his hand and wish him well.

Connecticut newspapers report this morning that Senator JOHNSON captivated with his warm personality the largest political gathering of this kind ever assembled in Connecticut, and that he then moved and inspired it with a masterful address. His speech was perhaps the most eloquent statement of principle and policy that I have heard. In it he sets forth, in words which will not be forgotten, the goals of our country and our party.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator JOHNSON'S compelling address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE WAY OF STRENGTH

(Address by Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON at Jefferson-Jackson Dinner, Hartford, Conn., March 19, 1959)

Governor Ribicoff, Senator DODD, Chairman Bailey, fellow Democrats, Thomas Jefferson was a partisan. So was Andy Jackson. The world barely remembers what they were against. The world will never forget what they were for.

This lesson is eternal. History measures men by what they support, not merely by what they oppose. It is by this standard that we should measure what we do—and what we say.

### RESPONSIBLE PARTISANSHIP

This is a partisan gathering. I come with a partisan title. It has always been my belief—and my guide—that the first rule of responsible partisanship is responsible citizenship. By this rule the Democratic Party has served and by this rule we now shall abide.

No one man speaks for the Democratic Party.

One man does speak for the United States.

In those concerns of war and peace—addressed to other nations—his voice is our voice and the voice of all Americans.

We want neither our friends to misunderstand this nor our enemies to misinterpret this.

For those vital meetings underway now, our President has our support as Democrats, Mr. Macmillan has our warm welcome as Americans, and the statesmen of the free world have our prayers as freemen.

### FREEDOM'S DEADLINES

Tonight the world is little concerned with Democratic headlines.

The world is much concerned with freedom's deadlines.

It is to this concern we speak, for there is before us all a fundamental decision of our times:

Shall freemen live their lives under deadlines?

This is not complex or complicated.

The choice it presents is simple.

Which do we value most?

Western freedom or Khrushchev peace?

### THE ROAD TO BUDAPEST

Like all tyrants before him, Khrushchev offers the peace of darkness. We know that to accept it we would have to put out the candles men have lighted through centuries past—and stumble blindly down whatever road Khrushchev might lead.

That road would not be the road to Berlin.

It would be the road to Budapest.

This is not a road down which freemen of the free alliance will ever turn. I say it is not a road down which we are forced to turn.

### THE WAY OF STRENGTH

There is another way—a way more worthy of the West.

That is the way of strength. I speak not alone of the strength of arms but, in a greater sense, of the strength of freedom unbound.

Men speak of lost initiative, of new approaches, of flexibility. These would seem to be the consuming anxieties of Western freedom today. I do not believe this needs to be—if we face squarely the basic fundamentals.

Freedom has no flexibility when it has no strength.

Give freedom strength and it will make again the approach no tyranny has ever successfully resisted.

Give freedom strength and it will have again the initiative that has remade and reshaped the world.

The point is this: When we add strength to our freedom, most of the anxieties which consume us disappear.

This is the way the West must choose. This is the way we must walk once more—proudly and uprightly—with confidence in ourselves and faith in our cause.

### BERLIN: OUR IMMEDIATE CONCERN

Our immediate concern is Berlin. None can know and none can presume to say what will be the ultimate consequences of the trial we face. I will say what we have learned from the expert witnesses who have testified before our Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

Our best military minds believe we now have in the Armed Forces of the United States the strength that will be necessary to meet any situation in Berlin.

The Commander of NATO wants more of our strength deployed to his command. If he wants such strength, I believe it is the will of the American people that he should have it.

It is a fundamental beyond debate that freedom is going to remain in Berlin.

Finally, we are going to maintain the men, equipment, supplies, and, above all, the will to support the foreign policy of the United States.

These points relate to the present. They deal with Berlin.

But I would emphasize the point that is often overlooked.

### BEYOND BERLIN

Freemen—if they are to respect their freedom—must think and plan beyon Berlin. If we do not, the drama being enacted now will become the continuing serial of the world stage.

We have now the capacity for one Berlin. But the Communist nations have the capacity to impose upon us a dozen Berlins—or more.

We can respond, and will respond, with strength at Berlin. As we do so, we leave the position of freedom at its other outposts exposed and freedom stands at those points not by the strength of its defenders but the grace of its foes.

Neither freedom, nor freemen, can long live in such a world. There are limits to the advantages prudent men can afford to concede to their enemies, and there are limits to the concessions proud men will ever make against their freedom.

I do not believe that the people of the West, and most certainly the people of America, are prepared to concede first place in strength to the Communist powers.

I will say to the Communists, and I will say to our own allies, that whatever the race, Americans reject second place as our goal.

Most assuredly in the building of missiles, and the maintaining of strength, we reject the conception that for a decade or for a day second place can be the place of freedom.

### FIRST PLACE IS OUR GOAL

The fundamental truth, beyond Berlin, is that the sights of America and the sights of the free world must be raised.

What is first in our hearts must be first in our policy.

Freedom is first in our hearts. The strength of freedom must be first in our policy always.

This raises a basic point. The strength of tyranny is always, and only, the strength

of arms. With freedom this is not so, for freedom draws on many sources for its strength. This we must never forget.

We and our allies are partisans of freedom. As such we must remember that history will measure us by what we support, not merely by what we oppose.

We talk now at length of what we oppose. At home we are against recession and depression, against inflation, against unbalanced budgets, and unsound dollars. Abroad, all members of the free alliance are against war and aggression, and beyond question against retreat and surrender.

Of these things there has never been doubt and there is none now. Of all issues we might choose to debate, these are the least rewarding, for on these there are no differences among us, and our debates in no way delineate what we are for.

The statesmanship of the times is not the reaffirming of what needs no affirmation. The leadership of the West is not to extricate ourselves from the impossible but to involve ourselves in the probable.

NEW DIMENSIONS OF FREEDOM

I say let us willingly and enthusiastically involve ourselves in the probability that freedom is the way the world will choose if freemen give to freedom the fullness of its meaning.

We have united against aggression.

Let us unite now as well against poverty, against illiteracy, against disease, against injustice. Let us unite to trade, unite to educate, unite to offer opportunity. Let us add new dimensions of freedom by adding new dimensions to our treaties and make them into treaties of prosperity and compassion and human dignity.

It is with works like this—as well as with armed strength—that we should give our answer to Mr. Khrushchev.

Yes, this is new. This is a new reach. I would call to mind, though, a brief stanza which Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the Chaplain of the Senate, recently quoted:

"Some men die by shrapnel,
Some come down in flames;
But most men perish inch by inch
Who play at little games."

Freemen must not in these times play at Mr. Khrushchev's little games, for if we do we shall perish inch by inch.

The outer limits of human freedom remain unexplored. The challenge there awaits. For our times—beyond Berlin—we must have a sense of adventure to carry us across the threshold of glory—not to leave us standing, wondering if this is the doorstep of bankruptcy.

I say freemen must act because they want to act—not merely because they are forced to act. This is the creed by which the West must now live.

WHY SAY THESE THINGS?

Why do I say these things at a party meeting now? There are two reasons. I have tried, first, to speak as an American, not as partisan, because that is the only context in which we should speak tonight.

Secondly, I remember 20 years ago—in 1940—a great American President called me to the White House. He said, "LYNDON, I have accepted an engagement for you—to keynote the convention of Young Democrats at Louisville, Ky. What I want you to tell those young people is this: There will be no danger to freedom in America if young Americans are as fanatical about freedom as Hitler's young Germans are about nazism."

That I believe remains true today. We face a resolute and zealous foe. We and all freemen must match that resoluteness and that zeal with a sense of adventure into the new dimensions of freedom.

In these things, there is no party and no partisan concern.

The line we defend is not the line across the heart of Berlin. It is the line across the heart of freemen—the eternal line between freedom and serfdom, honor and shame. As we will not retreat a literal inch in Berlin, so we will not retreat a figurative inch from the line across our hearts.

LET US MOBILIZE FOR PEACE

There is no thought of retreat in the minds of freemen and no room for retreat in their hearts. We know that and we want the world to know it. But the world must know something more.

Standing against retreat is not the only stance of freedom.

Freedom is more than a fortress. Freedom is the fountainhead of peace—and freemen must stand willing and able to carry forward the cause of honorable peace.

This is our cause and this is our calling.

Let the free nations of the world, in this hour of challenge, respond as only they can respond. Let us now mobilize our resources and our strengths and our will in a grand mobilization for peace. Peace is the work of all. Let us make room in this work for all our people—every veteran, every parent, every man, every woman, every child.

That is the real statesmanship of the West in these times.

To a waiting and watching and wondering world, let us—and all free nations—offer the leadership only we can offer by uniting our forces in a great adventure for peace.

Mobilize for peace—mobilize all that we have, our talents, our minds, our spirit as well as our force—and this generation will be honored in history as responsible partisans of freedom.

---

## The Works of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to address the National Council of Jewish Women here in Washington on March 10, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that my address, entitled, "The Works of Peace," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, MARCH 10, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Even as we demonstrate to the world that we are utterly determined to resist Communist aggression, in this latest Soviet-precipitated crisis over Berlin we must be alert to the opportunities to wage peace—consistently, vigorously, and dramatically.

We must constantly seek to express the American dedication to people, peace, and progress throughout the world—not only in the words of peace, but in the very deeds and works of peace.

American foreign policy must recapture the initiative. And it must be reoriented to make better use of America's natural advantages.

With our magnificent food and fiber production in a hungry world, with our leadership in medicine in a world filled with disease and suffering, we are in a magnificent position to spearhead an international drive to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, heal the sick, and to teach the illiterate.

The works of peace: Food for peace, health for peace, education for peace, science for peace, atoms for peace.

The works of peace ought to be as conspicuous in American foreign policy as the Washington Monument in our Capital City.

We must hammer away on this theme unrelentingly—and develop a whole series of specific, concrete programs to implement—generalities are not enough.

The Senate will shortly take favorable action on one such concrete program—the proposal by LISTER HILL, myself, and others to establish an International Medical Research Institute.

Here again is an example of constructive programing, with dramatic impact—the kind of action and program that cannot be effectively disparaged or destroyed by the most virulent Communist propaganda attacks.

As another example of how we could dramatically underline a constructive American foreign policy founded on health and education and food for peace, we could develop with a small expenditure of funds a new American white fleet of hospital ships and disaster relief vessels—as a dramatic symbol of American intentions and American concern with the well-being of other peoples.

I intend shortly to introduce legislation to provide two such white fleet task groups of presently mothballed U.S. Navy ships—designed to be operated partially by Government and partially by voluntary agencies—as disaster relief and technical assistance units along the coasts of Africa and Asia.

For a maximum cost of between $10 million and $15 million per year, the United States could provide effective—and vivid, easily recognized—relief to coastal areas which are the victim of earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, famine or disease epidemics; and in between they could carry on a dramatic program of medical and public health training and technical assistance.

Each of these white fleet task groups—composed perhaps of one 800-bed hospital ship, two cargo vessels for emergency supplies and food, and a converted electrical power ship, could throw into an emergency situation 800 to 1,000 hospital beds, operating facilities and laboratories, power for a good-sized city, and emergency rations for 300,000 to 500,000 people for a full week.

An earlier American White Fleet was used by President Theodore Roosevelt to dramatize to the world the emergence of the United States as a world power. Today a White Fleet of mercy, armed with food, clothing, and medicine, literally stretching out the hand of friendship and compassion to other peoples, would do more to bring home to the peoples of Asia and Africa the real spirit of the American people than 10 years of broadcasting of American good intentions. Outstanding progress of health and medicine in Israel is one of the great achievements of the Jewish culture—a vivid example of what can be done through the words of peace, a dramatic beacon light to encourage similar achievement throughout Asia and Africa.

OUR SENATE WORLD HEALTH STUDY

As you know, it is my privilege to serve as chairman of a Senate subcommittee which is making a study of international health. We have invited judgment of the great medical leaders of the world.

Included in the responses have been many messages from outstanding medical leaders of Israel, including, of course, from the famed Weizman Instiute and other facilities.

Israel has, as you know, perhaps the greatest and most favorable ratio of doctors to population anywhere in the world. It has a reservoir of scientific talent which is proportionately unmatched in almost any other country.

I know that Israel is going to play a great role, therefore, in expanding international medical research. Expansion of research was my topic in testifying this very morning on our farsighted bill to create a new International Institute of Medical Research. I know, too, that in the International Public Health and Medical Research Year, commencing in mid-1961, Israel can become a great radiating center of health works of peace.

SEPTEMBER 1959 CANCER MEETING IN ISRAEL

Let me cite a specific illustration. In September of this year, there will be held an International Symposium on Cancer Causation. The International Union Against Cancer has an International Cancer Research Commission which is the sponsor of this meeting. This commission selected the Weizmann Institute as the site for the symposium. Eleven countries will be represented, including: Canada, Great Britain, France, Finland, India, West Germany, Holland, New Zealand, U.S.S.R., Israel, and ourselves.

A moving figure in the plans for the symposium is the distinguished head of the experimental biology department of the institute, Prof. Issac Berenblum.

I cite this symposium as one excellent illustration of what the United States and Israel can and should do to multiply the works of peace.

Here in the United States, cancer wipes out a quarter of a million lives a year. In the Soviet Union, as I pointed out in Moscow to the Soviet authorities in December 1958, another quarter of a million lives are snuffed out by cancer. In the State of Israel, a somewhat proportionate toll is taken. And the Arab States as well, are hardly immune to cancer.

What I am saying, in effect, is that Israel can spearhead international medical research.

It can also spearhead international medical assistance. Why? Because it is one of the few nations which has a relative surplus of doctors which it can make available to other less fortunate countries.

You are all familiar with Israel's technical assistance program which is already under way—ranging from its agricultural help to Burma, to its maritime help to Ghana.

I would like to see Israel's medical technicians working throughout the developing world. And I envision the day when its medical know-how will become available throughout the Arab countries as well. You and I are aware that today the Arab population within Israel receives the benefit of Israel's high health standards. This should become just as true within the Arab countries themselves.

But this is more than a matter for Israel itself; it is a matter for action throughout the free world.

PHILANTHROPIC TRADITION IN JEWISH FAITH

Welfare work is a special tradition of the Jewish people and of Jewish women, in particular.

I need not remind you of the hundreds of hospitals, homes for the aged, organizations for the orphaned, for the blind which Americans of Jewish faith, yes, which you of this audience serve in your respective communities.

The dedication to philanthorpy is a deep tradition among the Jewish people, and I say that the world is in great need of further like-minded efforts among all faiths.

From the standpoint of American foreign policy, however, it is absolutely essential that we make available more of the scientific, medical, educational talent from the free countries to the underdeveloped world.

You and I read each day of riots sweeping Africa, Nyasaland, the Belgian Congo, and other areas.

The answer to riots and rioters is not clubs and police; the answer is housing and doctors and schools and jobs and equality and basically freedom.

I want the U.S. Government to help make available this answer to Africa and South Asia.

HOW TO AVOID MORE DYNAMITE IN AFRICA

Colonial Africa will explode in more violence unless the fuse is put out and unless the TNT of bitterness and frustration and fear are converted into a new and more stable type "chemical."

I refer to the chemistry of hope and growth, fulfillment and pride. This is the social chemistry from which will come not explosions, but peaceful development and building.

I point out, therefore, to the colonial powers that they may keep the lid on temporarily if they fly in more armed troops and tear gas and if they fly out into exile more native leaders.

But this is not the answer to statesmanship. It is not a permanent answer, nor one compatible with the Judao-Christian heritage.

Colonial Africa needs more point 4, not pointblank fire of water hoses or rifles. It needs additional responsible leaders, and not to be deprived of the few native leaders which it already has.

It needs the spirit of Tom Jefferson and Abe Lincoln and Chaim Weizmann—builders, creators, men of uplift and inspiration, not overseers of downgrading and repression.

This, then, is the challenge to the United States and to all like-minded nations.

## High Rigid Support Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the February 27, 1959, issue of the New York World-Telegram and Sun.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAKE AND TAKE, YOU PUT

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS has put another silly face on the farm laws.

Earlier in the week he gave the Senate a list of 54 corporation-size farming outfits each of which—quite legally—had collected $100,000 or more (up to nearly $1.5 million) as price supports on crops grown in 1957.

Now he informs the Senate that 10 of these same corporations also had collected—quite legally—amounts ranging from $20,761 to $125,942 in the same year for taking land out of production.

In sum, 10 corporations got nearly $3.5 million for growing crops and the same 10 got an additional $557,000 for not growing crops.

Most of them got paid for not growing the same crops they got paid for growing. Four got checks from Uncle Sam for not growing different crops.

The corporations take their crops to Government storehouses and take home a check, charged to you taxpayers. The Government rents the storehouses; you taxpayers pay the rent. Corporations take some of their land out of production; you taxpayers pay them for that.

This is supposed to stabilize agriculture and save the family farm. But the big farms get the most subsidy because they raise the most crops. And they get the most from the soil bank because they have the most land to spare for it.

## Wayne Parrish, Man of the Month of the National Aviation Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a close personal friend and one of the leaders in the field of aviation, Mr. Wayne Parrish, was honored on Wednesday of this week when he was selected as Man of the Month by the National Aviation Club.

Mr. Richard Fell, president of the club, made some interesting and complimentary remarks on behalf of Mr. Parrish's accomplishments in the field of aviation at the reception honoring Mr. Parrish. I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY RICHARD E. FELL, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL AVIATION CLUB, IN HONOR OF WAYNE W. PARRISH, MARCH 18, 1959

Ladies, gentleman, fellow members, as we are assembled at the National Aviation Club, I know that most of us think of Aviation Daily. However, as I was en route to the club this evening, I was thinking particularly of American aviation and the tremendous advances that airlift has made from the crude designs of the Wright brothers to the highly technical missiles and rockets of the present day. In fact, this industry has grown to the extent that it would be difficult for most of us to make contact with many of our associates without the aid of the World Aviation Directory.

My opening remarks have been made to emphasize the names of a few publications that are the very pulse of our industry because of Wayne Parrish, the man we welcome tonight. The National Aviation Club is honoring him for his truly magnificent contribution to the advancement of aviation through the publication field.

For a brief background, Wayne graduated from the University of Illinois and received his master's degree from the Columbia University School of Journalism. He spent a few years as reporter, correspondent and staff writer for leading newspapers and magazines. In 1937 he established American Aviation magazine; and for the past 20-odd years, except for the years 1944–45 when he distinguished himself as a war correspondent in the Pacific and European theaters, has devoted his talents to building the American aviation publications of today.

Among other honors, Wayne has received two coveted awards. He is the permanent winner of the TWA aviation writing trophy, and receive the Strebig-Dobben award for distinguished aviation reporting in 1939, 1943, and 1944.

The road to success is sometimes hard, and for Wayne it has been no exception. He has been a crusader to bring about beneficial changes in aviation and, although at times he did not see eye to eye with all in the industry, fought his battles through to the finish and stimulated the minds of many for the general advancement of the industry.

On the lighter side, his friends know him as an independent thinker with a keen sense of humor. For example, many people collect items such as lighters. Not Wayne, he collects airports—and there are few in the United States where he has not made a landing. Even his car is a conversation piece, and he has sold his enthusiasm for the Bentley to many a diehard. His editorials and articles are anticipated for his subjects are varied from politics to bidets, but whatever—each carries the Parrish touch that has built a following of ardent fans. As evidence, the wonderful attendance tonight.

My enthusiasm for the accomplishments of this grand guy challenges the time limit I have imposed for this introduction.

So, in conclusion, let me say that Wayne has been a spirited supporter of the National Aviation Club since its inception, serves on the board of governors, and has given time and counsel toward the club's development In spite of this, because he is the outstanding publisher in the aviation field, our wall plaque in the entrance hall listing notable aviation personalities we have honored would not be complete without his name.

Wayne, it is sincerely a great pleasure to award you this plaque as aviation's man of the month for March 1959.

## Tribute to Dr. John I. Kolehmainen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to honor a constituent who has rendered outstanding service in his profession or contributed to the general knowledge of humankind. An example of this type of service which has received recognition is the recent presentation of the decoration of the Order of the Finnish Lion, First Class, of the Republic of Finland to Dr. John I. Kolehmainen, professor of political science and director of integrated studies at Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short account of Dr. Kolehmainen's accomplishments be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the account was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. John I. Kolehmainen was born at Conneaut, Ohio, of Finnish parentage. He received his doctorate of philosophy at Western Reserve University, and significantly, his doctoral thesis was on "The Finns in the Western Reserve."

He is presently chairman of the department of political science and director of the program of general studies, Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio. He has been honored as visiting professor of history, Suomi College, Hancock, Mich., 1945–46; visiting lecturer, program in Scandinavian area studies, University of Minnesota, 1951–52; Chief, Finnish Service, International Broadcasting Service (Voice of America), Department of State, New York, 1952–53; and Fulbright lecturer, University of Helsinki and the State Teachers College, Jyvaskyla, Finland, 1956.

He has received the following scholastic honors and fellowships: Social Science Research Council grant, 1945–46; American Philosophical Society grant, 1948; Committee on Wisconsin Economy and Culture, University of Wisconsin, 1949–50; Regional Writing Fellowship grant, University of Minnesota, 1950–51; Social Science Research Council grant, 1955–56; Ford Foundation grant (through the Library of Congress, for microfilming historical materials in the State Archives of Finland), 1955–56, grant renewed 1956–57; and corresponding member, Finnish Literary Society, 1956.

Dr. Kolehmainen has published in English the following books dealing with the Finns: "The Finns in America: A Bibliographical Guide to Their History" (Hancock, Mich., 1947); "Haven in the Woods: The Story of the Finns in Wisconsin" (with George Hill, Wisconsin Historical Society, 1951); "The Scandinavian Countries in International Affairs" (with Folke Lindberg, University of Minnesota program in Scandinavian area studies, 1953); and "Sow the Golden Seed: A history of the Finnish-American newspaper, the Pioneer, 1905–54" (Fitchburg, Mass., 1954); and is author of many articles appearing in both English and foreign language publications.

In presenting the decoration, the Finnish Vice Consul, Joel Allan Pekuri, said, "If cultural exchanges have been of vital importance in the good and hearty relations between our two countries, I cannot refrain from mentioning especially today also another factor which is evident in the living bond that the people of Finnish descent form between Finland and America.

"As early as 1638, the first Finnish settlers came to this country. The number of their descendents is now about 400,000. Many of these people, although being good Americans, have not forgotten their origin and the northern country of their fathers. Without sparing time and effort, they have often made most valuable contributions in spreading general knowledge of Finland in America and creating good will toward it. At the same time, they have been, through their personal qualifications, advocates of the American way of life in Finland.

"One of these men is Dr. John I. Kolehmainen, professor of political science and integrated courses at Heidelberg College.

"As an outstanding American scholar, Dr. Kolehmainen has devoted an important part of his research work to Finland and Finnish culture. The varying phases of the Finnish immigration and settlement in America have found in him a persevering and able historian whose publications have received wide recognition in Finland.

"As Fulbright exchange professor in Finland, Dr. Kolehmainen was known as an excellent lecturer. His educational work as well as his labor in furthering the good relations between Finland and the United States are greatly appreciated in both countries.

"In recognition of his distinguished services for Finland, the President of the Republic of Finland has granted to Dr. Kolehmainen the decoration of the Order of the Finnish Lion, First Class."

## Improvement and Development of the Philadelphia Port Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Joint Executive Committee for the Improvement and Development of the Philadelphia Port Area concerning appropriations for Delaware River Waterway projects for fiscal year 1960.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DELAWARE RIVER WATERWAY APPROPRIATIONS, CIVIL WORKS, FISCAL YEAR 1960

At the regular meeting of the joint executive committee on January 21, 1959, Col. William F. Powers, Jr., Philadelphia district engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, reviewed the status of waterway projects in this area and discussed the appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for continuing progress during fiscal year 1960 (July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960). The discussion covered the work performed over the current fiscal year, anticipated progress during the coming fiscal year, and goals for the future. In the interest of unanimity of thought and action with regard to appearances before the congressional Appropriations Committees to request civil works funds for fiscal year 1960, we are relating what we believe to be the salient features in the programing of the projects under consideration.

DELAWARE RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, PHILADELPHIA TO TRENTON

Based upon valuable experience gained this fiscal year in the initial rock removal from the 40-foot channel, the Corps of Engineers has revised the total cost of the project downward from the previous figure of $110.8 million to $96 million. This reevaluation of the difficulties and expense of rock removal—and the subsequent reduction in total cost of the project—is significant and is very encouraging to port interests. We interpret the change to mean that greater annual progress can be realized with the same number of dollars, and, therefore, the completion date will be advanced effectively by about 1 full year. Colonel Powers estimates the project will be completed to Newbold Island by the summer of 1963 and all the way to Trenton by the summer of 1964 providing, of course, that capability sums are forthcoming each year.

A capability sum may be defined as the amount of new money which can be spent in any given fiscal year in addition to any carryover from the previous fiscal year. Whereas $15 million represents a capability sum for fiscal year 1960, the $13.5 million recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is considered a reasonable sum for the work programed this year under the revised estimate of total cost. It will permit desirable progress in an efficient manner. Additional

monies would result in having additional pieces of dredging equipment on the river, and this could result in hazards to shipping. Further, addditional contract awards may not be properly economic because, with the limited specialized equipment which is available, the corps may not be able to obtain the same favorable price structure which now prevails. We understand that an additional $1.5 million would be spent for additional dredging of soft materials, but this would not hasten the ultimate completion of the project as the rock removal effectively sets the completion date for the project, and this work is proceeding at a maximum economic pace.

The reconstruction of the railroad bridge at Delair is scheduled for completion in the fall of 1960. There will be $4.5 million spent on the Delair Bridge in fiscal year 1960—this is the maximum which can be spent because the contractor is working at maximum speed in conjunction with procurement of materials. The remaining $9 million, out of the $13.5 million for fiscal year 1960, will be directed to rock removal and dredging activities.

We believe the schedule is realistic. Together with the $28 million previously appropriated, the $13.5 million for fiscal year 1960 will permit a 43 percent completion of the full project (based on $96 million total cost). Whereas, we had been hoping originally for $16 to $20 million for fiscal year 1960, the greater sums were premised on a different set of conditions than now exist. We shall support the recommended sum of $13.5 million as being practical, economical, and sufficient to maintain steady progress.

DELAWARE RIVER WATER RESOURCES SURVEY

The sum recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is $330,000. This is the amount requested by the district engineer; it will permit the completion of the survey late in calendar year 1959 or early in calendar year 1960. The joint executive committee has promoted actively this 5-year survey since its inception. We look forward to the content and recommendations as far-reaching steps in all phases of planning for the effective control of Delaware Valley water resources.

DELAWARE RIVER ANCHORAGES

Under the present policy of not permitting any new starts, there are no funds recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the $24,447,000 anchorage improvement program authorized by Congress during calendar year 1958. The Corps of Engineers has noted that the improvement, while justified on the economics of delays, groundings, and collisions, is "principally warranted for the safety and convenience of navigation by the intangible benefits accruing to the project due to the elimination of hazards to life and property in the Delaware River." We are anxious to commence these needed improvements and, therefore, plan to press next year (fiscal 1961) for a substantial appropriation to initiate the authorized anchorage improvements.

CHESAPEAKE & DELAWARE CANAL—SUMMIT BRIDGE

Work on the Summit Bridge, a sorely needed improvement, should be completed in the fall of 1959. The sum of $3,090,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is satisfactory for the purpose at hand. It is hoped that subsequent years will witness dredging appropriations for the authorized enlargement of the canal. In the meantime, the district engineer is employing maintenance funds to hold a reasonably satisfactory condition in canal width and depth.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS

The budget recommendations for funds for the operation and maintenance of navigation projects are not broken down by district or by project. These funds always have been shown in a total for all projects across the Nation. The fiscal year 1960 recommendation shows $54,600,000 for channels and harbors and $23,650,000 for locks, dams, and canals. We are confident the corps will be able to meet our local operation and maintenance requirements out of these recommended sums.

## Preserving Our Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by William E. Bohn from the March 16, 1959, New Leader entitled "Preserving Our Wilderness" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this article, Mr. Bohn reports on the National Wilderness Preservation Act, S. 1123, which I introduced on behalf of myself and several Senate colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING OUR WILDERNESS

(By William E. Bohn)

Uncle Sam is by far the greatest real estate owner in this country. I am told that the National Park Service manages about 25 million acres. And that includes only the main set of parks, monuments, memorials, and historical sites. Beyond these, and separate from them, are the national forests, the fish and wildlife reserves, and the vast areas controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. These various sorts of holdings are under the management of different boards—some of them connected with the Department of Agriculture, and some with the Department of the Interior.

There is nothing wrong with all this. As far as I know, these pieces of property are all managed conscientiously according to the principles laid down by Congress. But they all contain wild and unspoiled stretches of virgin wilderness.

Last week I quoted some paragraphs from letters written by one of my favorite authors, Joseph Wood Krutch. He was lamenting to all the world the fact that in our national parks and forests precious remnants of wilderness are in danger. The ontramping millions, he complained, are treading down dainty plants, scaring away timid animals and, in general, with their improved highways, automobiles, and airplanes, putting an end to the conditions which have furnished the quiet and meditative nature lover an opportunity to escape from steel and cement smog.

Well, 15 U.S. Senators have had the same idea. Perhaps they want to preserve a few spots where they can escape from the voters and the journalists and think of something besides ballots and budgets. The 15 wilderness-loving Senators, led by HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat of Minnesota), have introduced what is known as the wilderness bill. It seems to me a measure aimed at definitely civilizing objectives.

The wilderness spots which are to be designated and protected will not be placed under the authority of any new commission. In general, they are to be under the eye of an authoritative but inexpensive Council made up of the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, a Smithsonian Institution representative and three citizens appointed by the President with the help of the Senate. The members are to receive no pay—only expenses when actually in service.

The Council, which has an initial appropriation of only $100,000, is expected to report annually to Congress. When Senator HUMPHREY introduced the bill, he made a great point of the fact that it provides for no new administrative body to mess things up and demand additional appropriations. The bodies which are now administering these beauty spots will go on administering them. The only change will be that when the bill is passed, they will manage them according to new rules. And the Council will do nothing except to see that the rules are being enforced and report on how the whole project is working out.

And what are these rules? They sound as if they had been designed precisely to rejoice the heart of my mob-fearing friend, Krutch. There are to be "no permanent roads, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, motorboats or aircraft, and no structures or installations, including temporary roads, in excess of the minimum required for administration."

No roads. If you enter here you will travel on your own feet, in a canoe, or on a horse. There will be no restaurants, hotels, or shops heaped with postcards or souvenirs. You will have to tote with you whatever you need. That is what I did when I was a boy in the blessed woods of Canada. And we never suffered for lack of anything. As long as there were fish, we could eat. As long as we had a blanket, we could sleep warm. There were, thank God, no motels.

My readers will have guessed that this elaborate and well-considered bill did not spring full-grown from the fertile brain of the active senior Senator from Minnesota. He and other men now supporting it have been busy with it since 1955. The first bill dealing with the subject was introduced in 1957. Since then, well-advertised hearings have been held in Washington and at strategic points in the West. Criticisms have been made, and some of them have been adopted. The bill has been revised again and again to make sure that it will not injure any honest and legitimate business interests.

In the course of these 2 years an encouraging amount of support has been assembled behind it. Senator HUMPHREY'S address introducing the new bill, shored up by all the materials on the subject which he introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, constituted quite an event. The wilderness bill starts under favorable auspices. Some of its liveliest enemies disappeared in last November's Republican cataclysm. On the contrary, a number of good friends are found among the freshmen Congressmen. My guess is that it will pass at this session of Congress.

## Forty Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, throughout the Nation, our citizens stop to salute the American Legion on its 40th anniversary. I think it is fitting that we take time out to recall the significant contributions this

veterans organization has made to the American way of life—not only in the interest of veterans but, in the many, many civic works in which it has been involved.

I should like to add my own personal congratulations to the American Legion on 40 years of outstanding accomplishment and my hope and confidence that it will continue in its true dedication to our beloved country. To commemorate this milestone in a special way, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call of Saturday, March 14, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY YEARS OF SERVICE

The American Legion, largest veteran organization in all history, celebrates the 40th annniversary of its birth tomorrow through Tuesday. It is a signal observance. It marks the completion of 40 years of service by the American Legion to its communities, its States, and the Nation.

The 17,000 posts of the American Legion and their 14,000 auxiliary units, have a right to be proud of their accomplishments during the past four decades. The American scene and the world have undergone profound changes since the American Legion was founded at the historic caucus of delegates from the first AEF in Paris, France, March 15 to 17, 1919. The American Legion has changed too, but only in its dimensions.

It is today a three-war organization. It has not changed in its patriotic character, in its ideals, in its objectives and in its integrity. Keeping America always American is still its continuing goal. It is still true to the original purposes set forth so vividly in 1919 in the preambable to its constitution.

The good impact on the American scene of the American Legion is immeasurable. It has been an important factor in the defense of our free institutions, in keeping love of country at a high premium, in raising the popular level of education, in the great increase of home ownership, in the modern care of the disabled and physically handicapped and in the Nation's preparedness against aggression.

Thousands of American communities are better places in which to live and raise children because of the civic works of 17,000 posts. We salute our local American Legion posts and wish them many happy returns as this great organization starts on its fifth decade of service to God and country.

On its 1959 anniversary. The American Legion here and everywhere rates a 40-gun salute.

---

## Speech by Congressman Carl Albert, Democratic Whip, Third District, Oklahoma, at Grover Cleveland Democratic Club, Bethlehem, Pa., March 17, 1959

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of March 17, 1959, at Bethlehem, Pa., in the district represented by our outstanding and distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the Grover Cleveland Democratic Club held a banquet at which the distinguished Democratic whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma, made a truly great address.

In my extension of remarks I include the address made by our friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN CARL ALBERT, DEMOCRATIC WHIP, THIRD DISTRICT, OKLAHOMA, AT GROVER CLEVELAND DEMOCRATIC CLUB, BETHLEHEM, PA., MARCH 17, 1959

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be here tonight.

I am honored to be a part of this meeting in a great Democratic community in a great Democratic State.

I am happy because we are meeting on the feast day of St. Patrick, the great patron saint of Ireland. No segment of our population has contributed more to the spirit and vitality and life of our country, or more to the leadership of the Democratic Party, than the sons of St. Patrick.

I am happy to be here, too, because this is a great club honoring the name of Grover Cleveland, and meeting on the eve of his birthday.

I am happy to be here because this is the congressional district of my distinguished colleague, your great Congressman FRANCIS WALTER.

You people of Pennsylvania's 15th District know as well as his colleagues in the Congress the quality of this man who has spent 26 years in your service.

You have recognized the mettle of a man who spotlighted the Communist Party as an international conspiracy designed to overthrow democratic government.

You have recognized the compassion of a man who fought for quota free entrance of alien wives, husbands, and children of United States citizens.

You know the intellectual stature of a man who fused into a single statute the 200 existing laws dealing with immigration.

You know the tolerance of a man whose determination broke down the final barriers of discrimination against admission of Asiatics to the United States.

As chairman of the great Committee on Un-American Activities, and ranking Democrat of the powerful Committee on the Judiciary, your Congressman is one of the great leaders in the House of Representatives.

Author of the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946, the Internal Security Act of 1950, and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, he has given this country some of its most monumental landmarks of statutory law.

Big enough and strong enough to hold any position in the Congress, or in any other branch of the Government, your Congressman is not only an outstanding legislator, he is one of the great Americans of our time.

We meet on the eve of the birthday of one of our greatest Presidents, Grover Cleveland, author of modern American democracy. Cleveland applied Jeffersonian principles to new problems. It was he who bridged the gap between the agrarian democracy of Jefferson and Jackson and the industrial democracy of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman. His policies are current policies. His influence transcends his time and is manifest in the dominant position of the Democratic Party in the statecraft of this country today.

The success of a political party in the final analysis depends upon the extent to which it serves the interests of the people. That means you and you and you and your families.

The 86th Congress has the largest Democratic majority of any Congress in more than 20 years because the 85th Congress wrote the finest legislative record for you and you and you than any Congress in more than 20 years.

The 85th Congress has been heralded editorially across the country as a do-something Congress, and indeed it was.

It passed the first Department of Defense reorganization bill in more than 10 years.

It admitted a new State to the Union for the first time in more than 40 years.

It passed the first civil rights bill since reconstruction days.

It created a new science agency and a new space agency.

It passed the first general aid-to-education bill in all history.

It passed a new social security bill, a new atomic energy bill, a new public works bill.

It appropriated more money for national defense than any Congress since the Korean war and more money for public roads and highways than any Congress in history.

Another page in this record of constructive service for you and you and you is being written in the 86th Congress. The job is underway. The Hawaiian statehood bill has already passed. The 50th star will be added to Old Glory before the 49th star is an official part of the American flag.

A new and far-reaching airport bill may well become law by Easter.

A new gigantic omnibus housing bill will be sent to President Eisenhower in a matter of weeks if not, indeed, of days.

In the 86th Congress we are going to extend unemployment benefits.

We are going to enact an area redevelopment bill.

We are going to pass a labor reform bill and not a labor persecution bill such as Republican spokesmen are demanding.

We are going to pass a new school bill.

We are going to pass a new civil rights bill.

We are going to provide adequate funds for both the development and the defense of our country.

These things and many more we are going to do in the 86th Congress, and we are going to do them in spite of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican leadership in Congress.

Ladies and gentlemen, while the 86th Congress is thus engaged in a constructive program on behalf of the American people, what is the Republican Party offering? What is the Eisenhower administration doing? Let's look at the facts:

On the home front the administration has been blind to the problems of unemployment and to the growing crises which now exist in many depressed areas. With nearly 5 million unemployed, and with over 400,000 jobless workers facing the loss of their unemployment benefits by April 1, this administration has not even attempted to offer a solution.

The gray specter of hunger and deprivation persists in many States. What has President Eisenhower done about it? He vetoed the area redevelopment bill by a pocket veto in September 1958. Although the depression has deepened in many areas in almost every State in the Union, his administration has not offered one single recommendation to cope with this economic blight. In many communities people are out of work. Their needs are not satisfied by the administration's claim that we are on a curve of rising prosperity. These words smack of Hoover days. They remind us of the days when prosperity was just around the corner. They bespeak a callousness to the welfare of human beings, American men, women, and children, unbecoming to the role of any administration charged with the responsibility of governing this great Republic.

This lack of leadership pervades every facet of the Eisenhower administration. It enfeebles our military posture. It cripples our diplomatic leadership. When President Truman was in the White House he met the Communist threat with vigor and imagination on every front. Not one important new idea has been added in over 6 years of the Eisenhower administration.

Herein lies our great problem, our principal difficulty. Our trouble at home and abroad is not with our scientists or military leaders. Our trouble is at the summit. It is the lack of effective leadership at the top management level of the Government.

The experts tell us that defensewise we are in mortal danger. Yet defense since World War II has cost us over $441 billion. Our strength or lack of it cannot be measured in terms of dollars spent. The only realistic way to measure our defense is in terms of the power of our potential enemy. During the last three or 4 years warnings have been sounded by scientists, military men, and congressional investigating committees that we were falling behind Russia in the race for ballistic missiles. These warnings failed to jolt the White House or the Secretary of Defense into action.

In 1952 the combined military strength of the United States was greater than that of any other nation. Today we are winning the race for second place. On every single day during the Truman administration the lead time of American arms over Russia was maintained on the side of our own safety. Every day since the Eisenhower administration took over, Russia has been closing the gap.

The Roosevelt and Truman administrations developed the A bomb, the H bomb, the atomic cannon, the jetplane, sonar, radar, and proximity fuses. They developed guided missiles and atomic submarines. They made outstanding advances in landing craft and in aircraft carriers.

In 1952 the United States was the undisputed leader of the world in scientific knowledge. Today we find ourselves wearing an international dunce cap, while the rest of the world concludes that our short-sighted policies have almost given the game to the Kremlin.

The mounting crisis in Berlin reemphasizes the importance of our military preparedness or the lack of it. We agree with President Eisenhower that this country must stand firm and united in this crisis. We insist, however, that our firmness must be predicated upon strength and not upon weakness. In the Berlin exchanges, Khruschchev has displayed a cool confidence and single mindedness which did not characterize his past dealings. It may be that he has mistaken debate for division. We make this unmistakably clear to Mr. Khrushchev that Democrats in Congress will cooperate with the President in resisting Kremlin ultimatums anywhere in the world. Where we differ from this administration is in our conviction that firmness should be supported by preparedness.

Our position is the position of the Senate Armed Services Committee which has recommended that we put more emphasis on the missile program and on increasing the strength of the Strategic Air Command by adding more B–52's, B–58's, and tanker planes. Our position is the position of our military leaders who believe that our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps should not be reduced. Our position is that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of confidence to the Western Powers in their discussions on Berlin and in other clashes between the free world and the Kremlin.

Ladies and gentlemen, meeting in these perilous times as we do tonight on the eve of the birthday of a great American President of another day, we cannot help but be reminded that the age-old differences between the two major political parties still exist. The same differences still distinguish the followers of Jefferson on the one side and of Hamilton on the other. It is the never-ending struggle between action and reaction—between government devoted to the few and government dedicated to the many. Our party since its foundation has been the party which, in each succeeding generation, has adopted the principle of positive action on behalf of the American people. It was the Democratic Party in the time of Thomas Jefferson that gave us our Bill of Rights. The Hamiltonians opposed the Bill of Rights. Had it not been for Thomas Jefferson you would have had no habeas corpus or trial by jury. You would have had no right to freedom of speech or to freedom of the press. You would have had no right to petition Congress, no right to religious freedom.

It was the Democratic Party in the time of Andrew Jackson that rescued control of the Government from the banking interests and gave it back to the people to whom it belonged.

Let me say to the members of this great Grover Cleveland Democratic Club that it was the Democratic Party in the time of Grover Cleveland that gave us our first anti-trust laws, the forerunners of the great social and economic reforms of the generations that were to follow.

It was the Democratic Party in the time of Woodrow Wilson that carried this country through World War I and with the League of Nations gave us the chance to avoid World War II.

It was the Democratic Party in the time of Roosevelt and Truman that brought this country out of the deepest, darkest depression in history, strong enough to win World War II. From soup lines to production lines, from relief rolls to pay rolls, from closed banks to guaranteed deposits, was the indisputable record of the Roosevelt-Truman administration.

This country needs Democrats in public office throughout the land. This country needs a Democratic President in 1960. This is the answer to Republican ineptitude. The Democratic Party and the Democratic Party alone can supply the leadership, the formula, and the program that will make this country strong and will keep this country free, prosperous, and at peace.

## He Wants To Pay 1 Percent of the Debt Each Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the continuing and growing editorial interest in the necessity for a systematic program of national debt reduction and eventual retirement, I am taking the liberty of including here for the reading of those Members who are interested, an editorial published by the Cleveland Plain Dealer on March 18, 1959.

HE WANTS TO PAY 1 PERCENT OF THE DEBT EACH YEAR

We all know persons who have borrowed money under terms that, in retrospect, seemed pretty steep. By the time the debt was cleared up, the borrower may have found that his interest payments and other charges amounted to 50 percent of the loan, even 100 percent or more—that is, he had to pay back half again as much as he had borrowed, or twice as much.

But few individuals, even Congressmen, are weighing the consequences of the weight of the interest bills which Uncle Sam is having to pay. That interest bill in the administration budget for the coming fiscal year is set at $8.1 billion, or more than 10 percent of the $77-billion spending proposed. That means 10 percent of all the withholding and other Federal taxes you pay, 10 percent of the U.S. taxes paid by corporations in which you may own stock, 10 percent of all the taxes paid by companies whose products you buy, all those 10 percents just go to defray that whopping interest bill.

Uncle Sam, true, doesn't have to pay the interest rate that an individual does to get a loan. But his interest rates have been going up, nevertheless.

And the amazing fact is that Uncle Sam, if his nephews in Congress and elsewhere don't correct their fiscal practices, is going to have to pay nearly a trillion dollars (that's $1,000 billion) in interest alone in the next 100 years—and still have on his shoulders the whole national debt of $283 billion, or whatever it will have grown to.

One Congressman who is worried about this arithmetic is Representative JIM WRIGHT of Texas who has introduced a House Concurrent Resolution (No. 79) laying down the principle that the Nation should pay off, besides the interest, 1 percent of the total present national debt of $283 billion each year for the next 100. Here's what he says the consequences will be:

"In 100 years we could completely retire the debt by paying $495 billion in interest and $283 billion of principal, or a total of $778 billion. But if we pay nothing on the debt itself, the interest alone for 100 years will be $980 billion, and we will still owe the debt of $283 billion, or a total of $1.263 trillion."

WRIGHT's proposal makes so much sense that a lot of people ought to be writing their Congressmen telling them to pay some attention to it rather than to seeing how they can run up an extra deficit of 2, 3, or 4 billion in 1959–60 fiscal year.

A late New Dealer once uttered a statement to the effect of "What's a few lousy millions?" One day soon a Congressman is going to say: "What's a few lousy billions?" unless the people demand more financial responsibility.

## One-Hundredth Anniversary of Founding of Guttenberg, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the community of Guttenberg, N.J., is marking its 100th anniversary this year. This is a record of which the community, Hudson County, and the State of New Jersey are very proud. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation by Mayor Herman G. Klein.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR OF THE TOWN OF GUTTENBERG, N.J., REGARDING CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF GUTTENBERG, N.J.

Know all men by these presents that—

Whereas the town of Guttenberg in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey was incorporated by official act of the New Jersey Legislature as an incorporated town in 1859; and

Whereas the said town of Guttenberg has been in continuous existence since 1859 so that appropriate centennial observances are fitting and proper in this year of 1959; and

Whereas it is the unanimous desire of the people of the town of Guttenberg to commemorate this 100th anniversary of the founding of the town by appropriate events and observances; and

Whereas the people of the town of Guttenberg have lived and prospered through this century under the blessings of our American liberties which inspired our centennial slogan, "A century of progress and freedom through democracy," and have earned the affection and respect of our neighbors and fellow citizens and desires to express their friendship and announce the centennial observance; and

Whereas appropriate plans are progressing under the leadership of the Guttenberg Centennial Committee to make the centennial celebration a memorable one and to invite thereto various friends and representatives from the Federal, State, and local governments:

Now, therefore, as mayor of the town of Guttenberg, N.J., I do hereby proclaim, by virtue of the authority vested in me, that the official Guttenberg Centennial Observance will be held on May 3—May 17, 1959, and all official departments and agencies of the town of Guttenberg are authorized to participate and cooperate in such observance, with the fervent hope that, under God, the people and the town of Guttenberg will continue to develop and prosper in the coming years and centuries.

HERMAN G. KLEIN,
*Mayor, Town of Guttenberg, in the County of Hudson, N.J.*

## New Jersey Job Emergency Declared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the unemployment situation which is receiving wide attention across the Nation has not left my own State of New Jersey unscathed. This fact has been clearly pointed out by Governor Meyner, who has declared that a real emergency exists. In connection with our thinking along this line, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor of March 6, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY JOB EMERGENCY DECLARED

(By Harry C. Kenney)

TRENTON, N.J.—New Jersey is no longer hiding from the disturbing fact that it has a high level of unemployment and the time has come for broad State action and possibly for increased Federal aid.

This situation has been jolted into the open by Gov. Robert B. Meyner, who declared that a real emergency exists in the State. During 1958, when New Jersey, like so many other States, was hard hit by the recession, there was a heavy drain on moneys devoted to unemployment benefits.

And now the Governor is moving in the direction of urging the Federal Government to establish a nationwide standardized unemployment benefits program. The limitation of benefits and the restricted time elements are causing jobless-aid chaos.

PROBLEMS LURK

According to the State's department of labor and industry, there were 208,000 unemployed at the end of February. This is 8.8 percent of the total labor force. When a State or the Nation has a 5-percent unemployment figure, the red flag goes up. The present national figure for unemployment is hovering around 6 percent.

Actually, New Jersey's unemployment was worse in January when 221,600, or 9.3 percent, were unemployed. While this fact would normally indicate recovery, officials say this is not presently the case. There are too many economic, industrial, and tax problems existing in the State to be optimistic, spokesmen for the office of the State commissioner of labor and industry say.

One of the reasons for the immediate emergency is the heavy unemployment benefits, including temporary unemployment compensation. For instance:

| | Total unemployed | Percent of labor force |
|---|---|---|
| December 1958 | 188,300 | 7.9 |
| January 1959 | 221,600 | 9.3 |
| February 1959 | 208,200 | 8.8 |
| THE PREVIOUS YEAR | | |
| December 1957 | 152,000 | 6.5 |
| January 1958 | 206,950 | 8.7 |
| February 1958 | 210,900 | 8.9 |

New Jersey paid out $100 million in unemployment benefits in 1956, $126 million in 1957, and $200 million in 1958.

The problems of unemployment compensation tend to raise a number of broad economic and political issues, such as desirable industrial balance. This industrial balance within the State has been jolted by various types of corporate taxes.

An inquiry into various New Jersey and private industrial organizations as to the size and number of companies that have left the State came to no clearly defined conclusions. This information still needs to be gathered.

There are indications that some industrial executives shudder when they think of certain prolabor bills now before the legislature. Some officials are apprehensive that other industrial firms may leave the State.

SEASONAL FACTOR WEIGHED

Officials agree there is great need in New Jersey for sharper consideration of interstate competition for industry and the maintenance of purchasing power during economic downswings. Another necessity: A closer examination of means to stimulate employment opportunities in line with a proper goal of proper industrial, economic, political, and employment balance.

New Jersey's Economic Watchdog Committee is a hopeful organization. It reports that unemployment always rises in January because business and industry inevitably let down after the rush of the Christmas season, and worsening winter weather progressively retards construction, seashore, agriculture, and other outdoor employment.

This year the December–January seasonal rise in idleness—33,000—was of normal proportions. Even in the highly prosperous years of 1956 and 1957 there were unemployment increases of 33,000 and 36,000, respectively, at this time of year.

But then the committee points out that every labor market area had more unemployed in January than in December, forcing the percentage of the State's labor out-of-work up from 7.9 percent to 9.3 percent. And this is critical, it says.

## Hon. Robert A. Everett Complimented for Aid in Obion-Forked Deer Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, ROBERT A. EVERETT, who is now in his second term of service, is proving one of the finest Members of Congress. It has been my pleasure to know him through many years of service to his State and country.

He has been devoted to the affairs of his district for a very long time.

Serious damage has resulted from floods on the Obion and Forked Deer Rivers. Painstakingly, he has convinced the Corps of Engineers of the importance of corrective measures, and has now been successful in seeking legislation in this session of the Tennessee Legislature, which will permit the State to become a major participant in this needed project.

Recently, the Commercial Appeal, influential and widely circulated newspaper in the Midsouth, paid him a compliment in an editorial which I am including in my remarks.

OBION-FORKED DEER PROJECT

Legislation which will permit the State to become a major participant in the Obion-Forked Deer flood control and drainage project has been introduced in the general assembly. It seems to us to be a sensible way to break an impasse which has existed since the project was authorized 11 years ago.

Until the impasse is overcome the economic progress of a vast West Tennessee area is going to be retarded, highways and communities will continue to be exposed to blighting overflows and project estimates and actual costs will continue to rise. Had the work been undertaken when Congress authorized the project, completion costs would probably have been in the neighborhood of $3 million. A fourteen-to-fifteen-million-dollar cost estimate is not reasonable now. It is a costly example of the folly of footdragging in the public works field.

The Federal Government will bear the major portion of the cost and supervise construction through the Corps of Engineers, but the State, or some other agency, must first guarantee rights-of-way and adequate maintenance after the project is completed. A way to do this is provided in the pending general assembly bill. Responsibility would be assigned to the Department of Highways and Public Works.

That this sorely needed Obion-Forked Deer improvement plan is being moved from dead center after a decade of time-wasting and futile argument is due chiefly to the efforts of Representative ROBERT A. EVERETT, Demo-

crat of Tennessee, and his determination to get the work started. West Tennessee is indebted to him for it. The project is of as much importance to Memphis and Shelby County as it is to the immediate project area. That is the light in which the Shelby delegation should consider the pending bill and give it support.

## Disillusion With the So-Called Farm Program of Secretary Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter dated March 12, 1959, from Mr. Noel Cover, of Cozad, Nebr., which is further evidence of the growing disillusion with the so-called farm program of Secretary Benson.

COZAD, NEBR., *March 12, 1959.*
Hon. WAYNE L. HAYS,
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am Noel Cover, Dawson County, Cozad, Nebr. I have been one of the big meat producers of the country. Have bred, raised, grown, fed, and marketed large numbers of cattle, hogs, and sheep running into millions of head. Never bought on order nor sold on commission.

In these operations would feed over a million bushels of corn and thousands of tons of alfalfa hay each year. Buying 80 percent more than I produced.

In the thirties bought hundreds of thousands bushels of good sound corn for 8 to 15 cents a bushel. Also thousands of tons of alfalfa hay at $2 to $5 per ton, also other feeds on same price level.

While I buy many times more corn than I produce, I would rather pay $1.60 bushel for corn to feed than any price less than $1.60. In doing so I am not being a philanthropist.

Dawson County stands in the first 100 agriculture counties in the United States. There is more irrigation in Dawson County than any county in the State.

Farm sales are many, many times greater this winter and spring than at any time in the past. Farm tenants are throwing in the sponge.

I have some choice irrigated farms that I have been unable to rent, not even a prospect since September. There has always been more renters than farms.

I am a Republican. Have never complied with the farm program. Even though the farm program was set by the Democrats it was the greatest thing, not only for the agriculture, but for all the people. Until President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson took over.

Secretary Benson started at once to destroy the farm program. His answer to the agriculture problem was farmers cooperative.

Shipping millions of bushels of corn and wheat on the open market. He puts forth every effort to injure, damage, and destroy the farm program.

Having enough wheat in the bins now to carry us a year, and 300 million bushels over—without a crop this year—is a wonderful position to be in, especially at this time.

Even though the farm population is down to 15 million we are dependent upon agriculture for our very existence and the most important segment in our economy where new wealth comes from.

If there was 90 percent to 100 percent parity on cotton, wheat, and corn, set to run until Congress could make any changes, giving the Secretary of Agriculture limited power and directions in disposing of the surplus. This would be an answer.

If the agriculture program was put to where it was when President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson took over, even if it cost $15 billion a year, every dollar would go into channels of commerce and taxes. It would not cause inflation, it would be prosperity.

I am from the grassroots—with agriculture experience second to none—successful to a degree. If there is any possibility I can do agriculture any good in appearing before committees or hearings, I will be glad to do so at my own expense. I want no job nor publicity.

Secretary Benson and his agriculture program and the 5 million unemployed is what put the Democrats in the saddle.

Thanking you, I am,
Yours truly,

NOEL COVER.

## Montgomery County Supervisors Vigorously Protest TVA Turbine Contract Award Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, my mail continues to include official protests from citizens and governmental groups within the 32d Congressional District of New York against the action of the TVA in awarding a steam turbine contract to a British firm rather than to those American firms which are located in areas of severe unemployment.

Whether this contract would have gone to the General Electric Co. in the 32d Congressional District of New York or to the Westinghouse Co. in Pennsylvania, as some have suggested, the principle is the same. If this present trend toward the purchasing of these heavy electrical machines abroad continues, as has been the case with the TVA and the city of Los Angeles, there will surely be economic disaster in both manufacturing areas. The people of my district are deeply concerned, and this concern is well shown in the following resolution adopted unanimously by the board of supervisors of the County of Montgomery in the Empire State of New York:

RESOLUTION PROTESTING AWARDING A CONTRACT FOR VITAL MACHINERY TO A FOREIGN POWER BY THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Whereas the United States has three manufacturers of large electrical apparatus with service facilities, and in the event of national emergency can be depended upon to restore damaged equipment in our country's defense; and

Whereas American tax money is being used to put Americans out of work by purchasing foreign equipment for a public utility; and

Whereas American bids to build this equipment were high as contrasted to the foreign bids, one factor influencing the difference in bids was the difference in wages here and abroad; and

Whereas several thousand residents from Montgomery County work in Schenectady for the General Electric Co., the low domestic bidder for this equipment: Now, therefore be it and it hereby is

*Resolved*, That the Montgomery County Board of Supervisors urge United States Government officials to do everything possible to have this contract awarded to a United States manufacturer; and it is further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Leon Hoegh, Chief of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; Hon. Herbert Vogel, chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority; Congressman SAMUEL STRATTON; Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING.

## Carleton Putnam Writes Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1959, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a letter which Mr. Carleton Putnam, of Washington, D.C., had written to President Eisenhower on October 13 of last year. This letter stated in a very forceful manner the South's postion in the segregation-integration controversy. The letter has been well received all over the country.

Last Monday, March 16, 1959, Mr. Putnam sent a letter to the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. William P. Rogers, stating in detail strong arguments supporting the case for the South in the maintenance of its time-honored traditions and customs of segregation.

Mr. Putnam, a member of the famous New England Putnam family, is a native of New York City, a graduate of Princeton and Columbia, and founder and president of Chicago and Southern Airlines, 1943–48. He is presently on the board of directors of Delta Airlines. In addition to being an outstanding business executive, Mr. Putnam is also a writer of note. He recently published a widely praised biography of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Because of the critical importance of the subject which Mr. Putnam discusses in his letter to the Attorney General, I am privileged to insert the letter herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave heretofore granted.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 16, 1959.*
The Honorable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
*Attorney General of the United States,*
*Department of Justice,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL: Following my correspondence with your Department in December, I have had a chance to review your briefs in the school desegregation cases and also to scan, as carefully as time permitted, the nine relevant volumes of the Supreme Court's records and briefs. I hesitate to impose further upon your kindness, but my survey has left one question in my mind upon which the record does not appear to touch, and which you may be able to answer.

I turn to you for the reason that, as a nonadversary party to these proceedings, I understand you to have represented the people of the United States. Since a majority of the population of the South are obviously against integration, and since the Gallup poll for September 24, 1958, indicates that 58 percent of the white population of the North would not put their children in schools where more than half the enrollment is Negro, it becomes a close question whether the decision of the Supreme Court in these cases was not in fact contrary to the wishes of a national majority. While I recognize that this would in no way affect the validity of the decision, it would seem to have placed a peculiar responsibility upon you.

The matter which I find curious is the omission in your briefs of any challenge to the authorities cited by the Court in footnote 11 to their opinion of May 17, 1954. I assume there must have been some indication, in argument or elsewhere, that these authorities were to be used. They appear, in large measure, to form the foundation of the decision. They reflect a point of view rooted in what I may call modern equalitarian anthropology—a school which holds that all races are currently equal in their capacity for culture, and that existing inequalities of status are due solely to inequalities of opportunity. While the briefs for the State of Virginia touch upon the qualifications of some of the individual psychologists who testified in the lower courts, they contain no examination of the underlying anthropological theory. It seems to me that such an examination should have been made. I have a science degree, I have read with some diligence in the field of anthropology and I have discussed the subject with competent anthropologists. It is my considered opinion that two generations of Americans have been victimized by a psuedoscientific hoax in this field, that this hoax is part of an equalitarian propaganda typical of the left-wing overdrift of our times, and that it will not stand an informed judicial test. I do not believe that ever before has science been more warped by a self-serving few to the deception and injury of so many. On this subject there may be disagreement. But it is clear to me the Court should have been invited to examine the question.

Allow me to give my reasons for this opinion. The Court says in footnote 11, "see generally Myrdal, 'An American Dilemma,'" and I start with this book. I need hardly dwell upon the highly socialistic bias of its foreign author, and the startling remarks with which his text is peppered, such as his comment that the American Constitution "is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions," that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 "was nearly a plot against the common people" and that in the conflict between liberty and equality in the United States, "equality is slowly winning." A foreign socialist could not, perhaps, have realized that Jefferson's statement "all men are created equal" was a corruption from the Virginia Declaration of Rights, where the original wording read "all men are created equally free," nor that if equality (in any sense other than equality of opportunity and equality before the law) is defeating liberty in the United States, then everything America has stood for is in jeopardy, but certainly it was essential that these matters be called to the Court's attention in evaluating Myrdal's book.

I hasten, however, to the basic hypothesis underlying Myrdal's 1,400 pages. On pages 90–91 he introduces the doctrines of Franz Boas, a foreign-born Columbia University professor who arrived in the United States in 1886, who was himself a member of a racial minority group, and who may be called the father of equalitarian anthropology in America. From these pages forward, Myrdal's dilemma is founded upon the philosophy of Boas and his disciples. Thereafter, one constantly finds in Myradal such sentences as these:

"The last 2 or 3 decades have seen a veritable revolution in scientific thought on the racial characteristics of the Negro. * * * By inventing and applying ingenious specialized research methods, the popular race dogma (that races are not by nature equal in their capacity for culture) is being victoriously pursued into every corner and effectively exposed as fallacious or at least unsubstantiated. * * * It is now becoming difficult for even popular writers to express other views than the ones of racial equalitarianism and still retain intellectual respect."

If you have not already read him, I invite you to a thorough and impartial study of Boas. I am confident you will find his views wholly unconvincing, his doctrines more unsubstantiated than those he attacks, and his approach so saturated with wishful thinking as to be pathetic. In even the most superficial analysis of the subject, Boas should have been challenged and his more obvious errors exposed. Boas, for example, may have been convinced that the average African's improvident indifference to tomorrow is just a healthy optimism, but I dare say the proverbial reasonable man on a jury would think of it less charitably.

If the deceptions of the Boas school were unconscious, they were nevertheless serious. People, for instance, were induced to believe that because early anthropologists put emphasis on brain pan size in their studies of race, and brain pan size was later proved to be an invalid criterion, this automatically made all races equal. No one took the time to point out that not only is brain pan size not a final test of intelligence, but that, even if it were, equal brain size would not prove equal capacity for civilization. The character-intelligence index—the combination of intelligence with all of the qualities that go under the name of character, including especially the willingness to resist rather than to appease evil—forms the only possible index of the capacity for civilization as Western Europeans know it, and there is no test for this index save in observing the native culture in which it results. Such observation does not sustain the doctrine of equality.

Indeed, the entire foundation of the Boas theory rests on sand. It is based on the assumption that present day cultural differences between the Negro and other races are due, not to any natural limitations, but to isolation and historical accident. This theme has been taken up again and again by later anthropologists, such as Kluckhohn, of Harvard, and repeated as established scientific fact. I may illustrate the argument by comparing the condition of the white tribes of northern Europe just before the fall of Rome with the Negro tribes in the Congo. Both were primitive and barbaric, both were isolated from civilization. With the conquest of Rome by the white barbarians, the northern tribes were brought in contact with the ancient Greco-Roman civilization and gradually absorbed its culture. The Negro, on the other hand, lacked such a contact and therefore remained in status quo.

This was Boas' historical accident, and his explanation of the Negro's present level of civilization in Africa. Boas had various additional points and refinements of his thesis, such as the advantage the white barbarians enjoyed in contiguity of habitat and the more moderate differences in modes of manufacture in earlier times, which made it easier for backward people in those days to compete commercially with more advanced cultures than was the case in later centuries when our white civilization invaded Africa, but these arguments hang on the first point. In other words, had the Negroes shown the enterprise and initiative of the white barbarians, the Negroes themselves would have established a contiguity of habitat and had the advantage of more moderate differences in modes of manufacture.

As far as isolation is concerned, it hardly seems necessary to point out that the Alps did not keep the white barbarians out of Italy, and that the Nile Valley was open to the Negroes into Egypt. One observer, recently returned from an intensive tour of Africa and himself apparently a racial equalitarian, nevertheless feels compelled to include these sentences in his report:

"Why, when in China, India, Mesopotamia, and on the Mediterranean coasts and islands, men isolated almost completely from one another, during some 5,000 years independently developed writing and metal tools, invented compasses, built temples and bridges, formulated philosophies, wrote books and poems—why, then, did similar progress not occur in Africa?

"I posed the question to many Africans. Their answer: The desert, the heat, disease, isolation—and always these words: 'For centuries our most vigorous young men were taken off as slaves.'

"The answer falls short. China has a desert; India's climate is as hot and as unhealthy; Mesopotamia indeed is hotter—and was surrounded by deserts. As for the slave trade, why were the Africans not making slaves of the Portuguese and the Arabs?"

This report, prepared by the assistant to the publisher of Time magazine, goes on to seek justification for the equalitarian viewpoint in the modern intelligence test and the modern performance of the exceptional Negro, answers which fall as far short as the others. The field of the intelligence test, like the field of Boas' anthropology, is filled with wishful thinking, with comparisons of the better Negroes and the poorer whites, with studies of mulattoes whose successes are largely proportionate to the admixture of white genes, and with similar avoidance of the essential point, namely, that in matters of race either the average of one must be compared with the average of the other, or the best of one must be compared with the best of the other.

If we are to compare averages, there is probably no better laboratory than the rural area around Chatham, Ontario, Canada. Chatham is a town at the northern end of the pre-Civil War underground railroad where a community of the descendants of escaped slaves has existed for 100 years. The social and economic situation of Negroes and whites in the rural area around Chatham is approximately equal. The schools have always been integrated, yet the tests of Negroes in these rural schools show them, after 100 years, to be as far below the whites in the same schools as the Negroes in the schools of the South are below the whites in the schools of the South. Dr. H. A. Tanser, now superintendent of schools at Chatham, published a study of this matter in 1939. The study is never mentioned by the modern school of equalitarian anthropology, but you will find it in the Library of Congress. Did your Department give it consideration?

In this connection, you are perhaps aware that Dr. Audrey M. Shuey, chairman of the department of psychology at Randolph-Macon Woman's College, published a report in 1958 surveying and summarizing the results of 40 years of intelligence tests involving whites and Negroes. Dr. Shuey took her B.A. at the University of Illinois, her M.A. at Wellesley, and her Ph. D. at Columbia. Her book contains a foreword by Dr. Henry E. Garrett who was formerly president of the American Psychological Association, the Eastern Psychological Association, the New York State Association of Applied Psychology and the Psychosomatic Society. In his foreword, Dr. Garrett says:

"Dr. Shuey finds that at several age levels and under a variety of conditions, Negroes

regularly score below whites. There is, to be sure, an overlapping of scores, a number of Negroes scoring above the white medians. This overlap means that many individual Negroes achieve high scores on the tests. But the mean differences persist. Dr. Shuey concludes that the regularity and consistency of the results strongly imply a racial basis for these differences. I believe that the weight of evidence supports her conclusion."

Dr. Shuey states that "the remarkable consistency of test results * * * all point to the presence of some native differences between Negroes and whites determined by intelligence tests," and she adds the significant comment: "The tendency for the IQ's of colored children to become progressively lower with increase in age has been reported by a number of investigators who tested Negro children * * *. One is confronted with the probability of a continuance during adolescence of what seems to be a widening gap between the races." I recognize that Dr. Shuey's report was not extant at the time of the Brown decision, but a large part of her material was available, and in my opinion should have been submitted to the Court. I repeat that I do not consider the intelligence test decisive, as I believe character to be more important than intelligence, but in answer to those who use the intelligence test to support theories of racial equality, surely Tanser's and Shuey's material belonged in the record.

If, on the other hand, we compare the best with the best, the discrepancies are even clearer. I had occasion to ask Kluckhohn a question with respect to a statement in his "Mirror for Man" at page 126. This statement reads: "It is true that the total richness of Negro civilizations is at least quantitatively less impressive than that of Western or Chinese civilization." I asked Kluckhohn if he would mind defining in what respects he found it qualitatively as impressive. I told him I was curious as to one poem equal to Milton's "Paradise Lost," one history equal to Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," one novel equal to Dickens' "David Copperfield," one playwright equal to Shakespeare, one philosopher equal to Aristotle, one medical discovery equal to Salk's polio vaccine, one military leader equal to Napoleon, one inventor equal to Edison, one physicist equal to Einstein, one pioneer equal to Columbus, one statesman equal to Lincoln, one composer equal to Beethoven, one painter equal to Rembrandt. I have received no reply, but Kluckhohn's at least quantitatively seems to me typical of the deceptive words used by our modern equalitarian anthropology. The Court should not have been left in the dark on this tendency. Although they do not specifically cite Kluckhohn, he is one of the leaders of the modern school on which Myrdal rests his case.

I have found that a favorite method used by Boas and Kluckhohn for throwing dust in the eyes of the public is to create an impression that there is really no such thing as race. Although Kluckhohn begins the third paragraph of the fifth chapter of his "Mirror for Man" with the sentence "There are undoubtedly human races," he nevertheless entitles this chapter "Race: A Modern Myth." His thesis is that culture, not race, is what makes human beings what they are. Yet nowhere is the obvious fact examined that culture is absorbed, refined and advanced in proportion to racial capacity. There are, of course, certain modifying variables, among the chief of which are climate and economic conditions. The white culture of New England differs from the while culture of the Deep South, but not as much as the white culture of southern Florida differs from the black culture of Haiti, where the climate is approximately the same. That is to say, the effect of the variables is clearly less decisive than the fundamental difference in race.

Undoubtedly an individual or group, taken out of the cultural environment of their own race and brought up in that of another, will sometimes absorb some features of the culture of the new environment, but in such instances they become parasites upon the culture of the second race. They are carried up, or carried down, as the case may be, by the overwhelming impact of the environment of the second race. Their own capacity to contribute to, and to sustain, a culture can only be judged by the performance of their own race in its native habitat. And if that capacity is low, then too many of them, too freely integrated, must inevitably in the long run lower the culture of the second race.

There have, not unnaturally, been situations in wihch a race has captured the spark of culture in one habitat but not in another. In the case of the fall of the Roman Empire, the barbarians were, broadly speaking, members of the same race as the conquered. Here we find two branches of the white race, one of which had produced a culture while the other had not, and here the Boas theory of historical accident is tenable. Similarity of tinder permitted passage of the spark. It was still the white race that absorbed, and eventually carried forward, the Roman culture.

The essential question in this whole controversy is whether the Negro, given every conceivable help regardless of cost to the whites, is capable of full adaptation to our white civilization within a matter of a few generations, or whether the record indicates such adaptation cannot be expected save in terms of many hundreds, if not thousands, of years, and that complete integration of these races, especially in the heavy black belts of the South, can result only in a parasitic deterioration of white culture, with or without genocide. I am certain neither you nor the court, nor any significant number of Northerners would knowingly shackle upon their racial brothers in the South against their will a system which would produce either of the latter results. The sin of Cain would pale by comparison.

Yet to my mind it seems obvious that all the facts, and a preponderance of theory, are against Myrdal and his authorities. I would go so far as to say that in the last 50 years anthropology has been drafted to serve the demi-goddess of equalitarianism instead of the goddess of truth, and that the modern school in this field has a stern judgment to face, both at the bar of American public opinion and at the hands of two generations of youth whose thinking has been corrupted by it. One does not build a healthy society on error. One faces the truth, and deals with it as best one can.

I pass now from Myrdal, and the sources upon which his more general assumptions rest, to the remaining authorities cited in footnote 11. All of these deal primarily with the adverse psychological effect of segregation upon Negroes and only secondarily with its alleged adverse effect upon white children. Nowhere is any study cited of a third question, namely, of the quite possible adverse effect of integration upon whites in schools with large percentages of Negroes. Was any such study made and presented to the Court?

The third question was well put by William Polk in his book "Southern Accent": "If the Negro is entitled to lift himself up by enforced association with the white man, why should not the white man be entitled to prevent himself from being pulled down by enforced association with the Negro?" This question seems particularly important in view of the patent partiality of the authorities cited in favor of integration. The majority of these appear either to belong to Negro or other minority groups, or to have prepared their studies under the auspices of such groups. To expect these groups to present impartial reports on the subject of racial discrimination is like expecting a saloonkeeper to prepare an impartial study on prohibition, or a meatpacker to pass an unbiased judgment on the humane slaughter bill. Their point of view is important and deserves consideration. Many of them are brilliant and consecrated men. But to permit them to provide the overwhelming preponderance of the evidence is manifestly not justice. If this is compounded by an absence of any consideration of the damaging effect of integration upon white children, it becomes doubly serious. While the brief for the State of Virginia touches upon the subject, it seems to me that the people of the United States, whom you represented, had a particular interest in seeing it more fully developed. I would appreciate your directing me to such a study, if one was made, and, also, your providing me with some explanation as to why the evidence on damage to the Negro was from such partisan sources.

Any American worthy of the name feels an obligation of kindness and justice toward his fellow man. He is willing to give every individual his chance, whatever his race, but in those circumstances where a race must be dealt with as a race, he realizes that the level of the average must be controlling, and that the relatively minor handicap upon the superior individual of the segregated race, if it be a handicap at all, must be accepted until the average has reached the point where the desire for association is mutual.

This leads me to my final query. I will be frank to say that I was startled at the uncritical manner in which the Supreme Court was allowed to accept one phrase in the language of the lower court, to wit: "A sense of inferiority (produced by segregation) affects the motivation of a child to learn." Did neither you nor counsel for any of the appellees take occasion to point out that if a child is by nature inferior, enforced association with his superiors will increase his realization of his inferiority, while if he is by nature not inferior, any implication of inferiority in segregation, if such there be, will only serve as a spur to greater effort? Throughout history, challenges of this sort, acting upon individuals, groups and races of natural capacity, have proved a whip to achievement, times without number. The point was one of the legal hinges on which the case turned. In fact without it the decision falls apart, for there is no other even remotely arguable excuse why separate facilities cannot be made equal within any possible stretch of the meaning of the 14th amendment. Consequently, I would have thought it imperative that you raise it.

Sincerely yours,

CARLETON PUTNAM.

---

## Waste? Don't Mention It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial dated March 19, 1959, from the Miami Herald entitled "Waste? Don't Mention It."

This editorial and the many letters I am receiving indicate that I am not alone in believing that more publicity on our foreign military aid expenditures would be in the public interest.

WASTE? DON'T MENTION IT

Any 1 of the 18,000 spies Life magazine reports in the service of the Soviet Union could, with pencil and paper, a nodding acquaintance with figures, and a copy of the U.S. budget, quickly determine what this country spends on defense by specific categories.

What happens to the billions spent on foreign military aid, however, is a secret. It is a secret from the American people themselves.

These expenditures, country by country, are a mystery for security reasons. Now, no one can object to security if it's buttoned up all four ways. But we are thinking of the security of these tax dollars themselves; specifically, assurance that they are being spent properly.

The mournful evidence suggests that in some areas quite the reverse is true. "A congressional committee," reported our Washington bureau recently, "has found new evidence of stealing and waste in the foreign military assistance program."

The few vague disclosures of a House foreign affairs subcommittee may only scrape the well-paved surface. Without cost or scenes of the crime, they are:

A motor pool in a friendly foreign country equipped with enough U.S.-made truck tires to make 44 available in 1 year for every vehicle.

Apartment houses erected in a nameless client country with material and equipment supplied by the United States for military construction.

Aircraft material diverted from military planes to private planes maintained by certain foreign generals.

The subcommittee ruefully concluded, however, that it couldn't name names. It was informed that this would reflect unfavorably on officials or policies of allied nations and provide the Communists with material which would be used to create dissension among our allies.

Protocol, we'll concede, is peachy. But is the taxpayer to be stolen blind in order to protect the tender sensibilities of allies who, in some instances, let their venality betray their very weakness as allies?

We think not. A great deal is at stake. Here in Florida, for example, postwar foreign aid has cost the taxpayers of this State $1,572,438,400 on a population basis since July 1, 1945.

Not all, or nearly all, of this was wasted. But it represents in money what Florida must raise to operate its State government for the next 4 years.

A little publicity, we think, might take the blush off this unconscionable bloom. We are sympathetic with Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, of the selfsame House subcommittee, who threatens, just for a starter, to disclose what some dictators got.

The irony of it all is that the dictators are threatened militarily by no one save their own people.

---

## Address by John A. McCone, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 last, John A. McCone, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, delivered a speech at the Westinghouse 18th annual science talent search banquet at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., which was not only intensely interesting to the young and mature who were gathered there but was also inspiring to all who heard it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that I be permitted to include Mr. McCone's remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. McCone envisioned a day when biological research will take over the central problems of agriculture, when techniques of irradiation are developed for ridding the soil of the diseases that plague it, and when eventually cheap and simple techniques of irradiation will greatly diminish the need for costly refrigeration, thus making it possible for vast numbers of people to enjoy good foods.

Mr. McCone's speech gave the intelligent young people who were the award winners of the talent search program a new and broader horizon to look out upon, and his comprehensive pronouncement gave the young winners increased confidence in looking toward the future.

Mr. McCone's remarks follow:

Reflecting on the circumstances that brought you to the Capitol, to be honored for what you have done in competition with your gifted contemporaries, and to be applauded and encouraged by your elders for having chosen science as a career, I was reminded of Max Planck's bitter commentary on the state of science in an earlier day. "New scientific truth," the famous physicist complained, "does not triumph by converting its opponents and making them see the light. It triumphs because its opponents eventually die."

It is no longer thus. Surrounding science today is a prestige brighter than that attaching to any other profession. One distinguished scientist stands foremost among the President's advisers, to counsel him on the vast national programs upon which rest our security and our technical progress. Another is a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, coequal with his colleagues. Other scientists sit in the Pentagon councils of the civilian secretaries and at the elbows of the generals and admirals who together guide our defense programs. Science is penetrating ever more deeply into industry, in all of its more revolutionary manifestations. The voice of the scientist everywhere commands respect and widening authority.

In electing science and engineering as a life pursuit, you have wisely entrusted your fate to a lifting wave. May all good fortune attend you, for your country stands in urgent need of the talents which you embody. I propose, too, to extend my congratulations to Science Service and the Westinghouse Electric Corp. for their wisdom in seeking out and giving a helping hand to boys and girls with your precious talents. In recent years, and especially since the Soviet sputniks, we have heard much about the so-called crisis in the scientific side of our educational system. It is to the everlasting credit of Science Service and Westinghouse that they, in partnership, have for nearly two decades, in this real and constructive way, prepared against the occurrence of such a crisis.

It has been said that youth is much too good to be wasted on the young. That cynicism of middle age may not, however, apply to those endowed with a scientific turn of mind. Whatever else it may be, science, like youth, is venturesome; and while the scientists is expected in the nature of his discipline to be humble in the presence of truth, he is seldom humble in its pursuit. The finest work of many of the world's outstanding theoretical physicists, we are told, was done before they were 30. I am not suggesting that any of you need burn yourselves out so soon, but rather that you have chosen a field where the gifts of youth, its courage and drive, and its imagination—are more swiftly appreciated than may be the case elsewhere.

Give thought to what awaits you. In my youth, the moon in its heavenly firmament represented something that was remote and utterly unapproachable. Now, technicians not much older than yourselves are shooting rockets at it. I was still a boy when, after demonstrations of courage and endurance that seemed at the time to exemplify the farthest reaches of the human spirit, the poles at the opposite ends of the earth were gained by small parties of men, thrusting forward with dogs, sledges, and ponies. Now, your contemporaries and mine are reaching into space, as confidently as if it were hardly farther away than tomorrow. They are pondering the strange signals emanating from the outermost galaxies. They are experimenting with machines which, before long, I am sure, will enable man to touch the stars. Your generation could well be the one that will usher in another of the mighty climaxes in the human experience—the discovery of worlds and systems beyond our own.

The stars beckon. Let us not forget, however, that this tired, old planet that we call the earth will continue to stand in need of constant thoughtful attention. You will not lack here, when your time comes, for opportunities that will put a high premium on audacity and imagination. Our cities and countryside groan under the weight of traffic that may eventually choke our growth, unless our engineers come up with automatic systems for regulating it. Our air is becoming crowded; the task of controlling the future vast flow of air traffic, in the interest of safe and orderly movement, will call for inventions and techniques which now at best are only dimly surmised. Hunger and disease plague many parts of the world. Too much of mankind is condemned to dull, dispirited toil. To improve the lot of many by banishing hunger, easing pain, and mitigating toil, while broadening man's store of knowledge—here lie opportunities and, it seems to me, duties that must hold your minds and hearts for the rest of your days.

I should like to tell you about some of the things that the great Federal Commission, with which it is my honor to be associated, is attempting to do about these vast human needs. While the development of nuclear weapons for the defense of the Nation is the principal responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission, it is by no means our only interest. Under our charter from Congress, and at the direction of President Eisenhower, we are also charged with finding and encouraging peaceful uses for the atom. The Government, no less than the universities and industry, recognizes the importance of basic research. The scientists associated with the Atomic Energy Commission are not bound only to projects aimed at some immediate and wholly practical end. On the contrary, the Commission sponsors many hundreds of research projects in both the physical and life sciences, and in collaboration both with industry and the universities. Our research programs in the physical sciences range across physics, chemistry, and metallurgy, and inevitably engage us in that most fundamental of scientific studies—the structure and behavior of matter. Under these programs the Commission has sponsored the construction of several large particle accelerators—for example, the Cosmotron at Brookhaven and the Bevatron at the University of California's E. O. Lawrence Laboratory at Berkeley. Previously unknown nuclear particles are being produced in considerable variety by these

machines; they are to be thought of precisely as tools for exploring more deeply into the mystery of matter. A still more powerful machine is being built at Brookhaven which will accelerate particles to energies of perhaps 30 billion electron volts. That is five times better than the existing Bevatron can do. The world's fastest runner could not sprint around the half-mile circumference of this machine in much less than 2 minutes. A football field could be laid out inside with room to spare.

In a field as broad and new as nuclear energy, the line between basic and applied research is of necessity often a dim and wandering line. For example, in the course of seeking a more efficient reactor fuel element—in itself a utilitarian goal—we stand a good chance of coming up with a new finding in the fundamental properties of matter.

I emphasize this agreeable coexistence of applied and basic research under the Atomic Energy Commission's roof for the reason that some of you may, as I would hope, be attracted to this field. The research projects which we sponsor at many universities make use of graduate students as research assistants. The Atomic Energy Commission also offers certain specialized training courses at the graduate level, and you may be drawn to them. Beyond that, our laboratories have need for scientists in many disciplines. Let me hasten to add, however, that I am not trying to place a recruiting blank in your hands. You will do well, I am sure, wherever your bent may lead you. My only purpose in advertising the attractions of nuclear science is to suggest the excitements of discovery, the breadth of learning, that it offers to an active scientific mind.

Much has been written about the grievous problems with which the military atom has confronted civilization. Not enough has been said about the enhanced dignity and amelioration which its other implications can and will bring to the lot of mankind. The process of nuclear fission, in addition to making available unprecedented amounts of energy for military purposes, also makes possible, among other things, the production of large quantities of radioactive materials, called isotopes.

Almost every common element has one or more radioactive counterparts. Occasionally some of these may occur freely in nature. More often they can and must be produced by exposing materials to nuclear particles in accelerators or reactors. No doubt some of you have already used small quantities of radioisotopes in your laboratory work. As your scientific education continues you are certain to encounter them again. Radioisotopes are versatile tools. In research they are widely used as tracers for tracking the progress of specific batches of atoms through various processes in living and lifeless material. Through their use we have come to have a much more certain knowledge of many biological processes, such as cellular metabolism and photosynthesis. As did the microscope, the radioisotope has given science a means for peering into the workings of nature that have heretofore been hidden from us.

Some of the basic research sponsored by the Commission in biology and medicine has, for its end, the exploration of means for curing disease and mitigating pain. If men are wise, the benign influence of the atom will eventually dwarf its military implications. One of our tasks is to determine the beneficial effects of nuclear radiation on living things. Our studies here are taking the Commission's scientists and the staffs of the universities associated with us into wholly new fields of inquiry relating to the causes and treatment of cancer and similar diseases; into the effects of radiation on heredity and, of course, the protection of our own workers, as well as the public, from the hazards of radiation.

We shall presently put into operation at the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island a medical research reactor, in association with a 48-bed research hospital. Patients whose afflictions have defied the conventional resources of medicine will be exposed, under careful controls, to beams of radiation from ports in the reactor. All this, I grant, is in the early stages, yet already we sense that the products of fission, once they are better understood, will give the medical profession a new means of abating man's agony of pain.

These same products promise to be no less useful in helping to banish the age-old spectre of hunger. Our biological research is taking us ever deeper into the central problems of agriculture. Techniques of irradiation are developed for ridding the soil of the diseases that plague it; for improving fertilizers and further increasing the productivity of the land; and also for the longer preservation of its products. The time may not be far off when comparatively cheap and simple techniques of irradiation will greatly diminish the need for the costly processes of refrigeration and thus benefit vast populations in remote areas.

The Commission is also deeply engaged in the business of finding new ways of reducing the misery of toil. That will come about, in due course, as our scientists and engineers together with their counterparts in other countries, develop reactors for converting the great energy of the atom into industrial power at an economical cost.

The dramatic discoveries that were set in train by the construction of the first atomic pile in 1942 have paralleled your own brief lives, your own introduction to science. You will know, without my reminding you, that a working reactor can be designed according in any one of literally hundreds of ways; that it can be fueled with uranium 235, or uranium 233, or plutonium; that its fuel may come in a solid state or as an aqueous slurry or as a metal liquid compound; and that a wide variety of materials, from water to highly complex organic fluids, can be used for carrying off the heat of the reactor. It is this very plenitude of possibilities that currently somewhat confounds us. Somewhere among them are certain combinations and permutations that will be more efficient, and, therefore, more economical than the rest. For these, our physicists, chemists, metallurgists, and engineers are always searching.

In our country, for example, the search for an economical power reactor is concentrated, for the time being, on what might be described as six fundamental concepts. All six are being carried through the research and development stage by the Commission, in collaboration with private industry and public power interests. Once we learn what we need to know about them, the choice will be further narrowed to the few types that prove to be most efficient, and around these, no doubt, the national power program will develop. At this stage, however, with ample sources of relatively cheap energy, the American approach to nuclear power is chiefly along the path of finding the best scientific solution. In Europe, by contrast, where the cost of energy is rising as the existing sources of fuel begin to diminish, or else have become vulnerable to political action, the economic logic is forcing an earlier commitment to large relatively inefficient plants. Dramatic developments, then, are in the making—developments that will test the ingenuity and imagination of your generation.

As you must also know, the Atomic Energy Commission is also sponsoring basic research into practicable methods for the controlled release of energy from fusion—an enterprise which we call "Project Sherwood." The known methods all employ the principle of heating a thin gas to about the temperature of the sun and holding the gas in position by electromagnetic fields. It is a bold concept and a risky and fantastically tricky one, and it would be a rash man who claimed that a demonstration of its practicality, at least in an economic sense, was imminent. Yet, we must thrust toward this prospect with all possible diligence—the volume of energy waiting to be released by the discovery of controlled fusion is so great as to make all the other means available to us seem insignificant by comparison. If we succeed in tapping this source of energy, our civilization may never again have cause to worry about the supply of energy-producing fuels.

Distant as this possibility may be, it nevertheless is there—a challenge to engage the imagination. Achievement of this goal could conceivably transform the lot of modern man quite as dramatically as the discovery of fire and the wheel enriched the lot of primitive man. Meanwhile as we search for this solution, you and I have much to learn about putting to peaceful and creative work those forces of the atom which we now control.

The AEC's Plowshare program is another first step in that direction. Our scientists are convinced that nuclear explosions will be safely utilized before long for blasting out harbors in places where nature failed to provide a harbor; for breaking open mountains laden with otherwise inaccessible minerals; for shattering deep deposits of shale and releasing the oil locked up in them; and even for generating heat energy that can be transformed into electricity. All this, to be sure, is hardly more than a gleam in the scientific eye; the logic nevertheless is plain. The need exists, and if anything in this world is certain, it is that the idea embodied in Plowshare will one day draw a straight and fruitful furrow across an earth that craves energy to liberate man from toil and physical frustration.

I wish all of you well. You start your education in the scientific disciplines with the advantage of unusual endowments of the mind and spirit. May I, as one who was trained as an engineer in a less exacting era, suggest that you do not overlook the other equally rich disciplines with which the interests of science intermingle. To be a specialist and know just about everything about one segment of the physical universe may make for a successful career; it is scarcely enough, however, to make for a successful life.

The 18th century venerated the encyclopedic man as the finest expression of civilization—the man equally at home in philosophy, the sciences, art, and politics. That ideal has all but disappeared, except in specimens that have become exceedingly uncommon—men, say on the order of Winston Churchill, whose grounding in the sciences was intuitive, and of the late Albert Einstein, whose grasp of the humanities was spacious.

The everexpanding regions of knowledge make it impossible for even the most learned mind to grasp more than a fraction of what is significant. At the same time, the pressure for specialization tends to make a specialist hermetic and, perhaps, too well satisfied within the bleak limitations of his specialty. The life of the fully developed man, the truly cultured man and woman, is characterized by an articulation of knowledge linking the physical sciences with the humanities and the social sciences.

I leave with you Dr. Conant's definition of the meaning of an education:

"Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest number of our future citizens an appreciation both of the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are American and free."

## The United West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 18, 1959, the New York Times published an excellent editorial on the subject of the President's Berlin speech. I have taken the liberty of including the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD as it points up the importance of the speech in setting the stage for Prime Minister Macmillan's visit.

The editorial follows:

THE UNITED WEST

President Eisenhower's excellent speech of Monday night has won such a warm welcome at home and abroad as to demonstrate anew the basic solidarity of the Western World. The speech is being hailed both for its clear warning to the Soviets that the West is determined to stand fast in Berlin and for its renewed declaration of Western willingness to negotiate "at any time and under any circumstances," even at the summit level, as the better alternative to war.

At home, where it was supplemented by Senator FULBRIGHT'S equally able speech, the President's address is being endorsed by spokesmen of both parties. Abroad, the British welcome the speech as a good preparation for Prime Minister Macmillan's visit to Washington because it shows the difference between negotiations and appeasement. The Germans, especially the West Berliners, take new confidence from it. The French emphasize their solidarity with NATO, and even statesmen as far apart as Prime Minister Nehru and Japanese Foreign Minister Fujiyama see new hope in it.

It is clear that if Premier Khrushchev's tactics were intended to drive wedges between the Western allies and between their governments and their people they have failed. The Kremlin can no longer have any illusions on that score.

President Eisenhower has put the Soviets on notice on two points particularly which the Western World will have to keep in mind. One is that the American Government has no illusions about the continued Soviet drive for world domination, in which Berlin is merely a steppingstone toward further conquests. We are therefore determined, together with our allies, to defend free Berlin not only for the sake of its free people but also to preserve the alliances on which our own security and that of the West depends.

The second point is that the American Government will not negotiate under a time limit, or limited agenda, or any other unreasonable terms dictated by the Soviets. It will attend a summit meeting willingly, but only if a foreign ministers' meeting opens up the way of "meaningful," "sincere" and "serious" negotiations, with the promise of worthwhile results. Whether the way for such action is so opened is up to the Soviet leaders.

If the President's speech fell short in any respect it was in the lack of a positive political program to oppose the Soviet program. But while he excluded a "flexibility" that undermines our alliances and security he did declare himself ready not only to consider any new ideas but also to "present others." In this lies the promise that a positive program will begin to emerge after Mr. Macmillan's visit.

Meanwhile, Congress could well take positive action to back up the President in this crucial time by supporting the mutual security program and by a specific resolution placing itself and the people of this Nation behind the President's stand on Berlin.

## Land Promoters on the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, may I draw the attention of my colleagues to the following timely statement and warning on land promoters appearing in the January issue of Our Public Lands, a publication of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

A serious situation exists today in California and some other States from the entrance of unethical speculators and promoters into the public land locating business. The perils of dealing with a public land locator were pretty well known 50 years ago, but in the upsurge of demand for public lands today people tend to be unsuspecting. Some promoters—not the ethical ones—prey on the natural desire of people to acquire a public land tract and their inexperience in public land matters. Advertising widely, and issuing vague promises, promoters have induced tens of thousands of people to pay exorbitant fees for professionally inadequate services in making out applications that have little or no chance of success.

Actions taken by better business bureaus and State officials, in cooperation with Federal departments, are helping to remedy this problem. The Nevada Legislature in 1957 brought public land locating within the State real estate code. However, the only certain way for an individual to escape entanglements with unethical promoters is to refuse to do business with them in the first place.

The statement follows:

WHAT ABOUT LAND LOCATORS?

Every day scores of people ask the Bureau of Land Management about so-called land locators and filing services.

Land locators and filing services are people or businessmen who perform various services for public land applicants for a fee. None of these people or businesses is licensed or regulated by the Federal Government. Land locators often perform such jobs as examining the status of lands on the public land records, inspecting the character of public lands on the ground, filling out application blanks, or preparing supplementary information that may be required with an application for public lands.

The Government does not require anyone to hire a land locator or a filing service. All that is necessary is that the applicant comply with the laws and regulations and submit a proper application.

Whether a person wishes to hire a land locator or filing service to assist him in finding a suitable tract of vacant public land, and in preparing an application, is strictly a matter of choice for the individual.

The Bureau of Land Management neither encourages or discourages the use of such services, and BLM cannot furnish the names or addresses of any people or firms doing this kind of work. However, anyone who is thinking about hiring a land locator or filing service should make absolutely sure he is dealing with a reputable organization. Above all, anyone who employs a land locator should find out exactly what services the locator will do in exchange for his fee—sometimes people have paid exorbitant sums for the doing of something which they could have done themselves at a nominal cost.

The regulations usually require that an applicant be personally acquainted with the land sought. If a locator prepares an application for your signature without first taking you to the land, and identifying it from survey markers, you should hesitate to sign the application.

All applications received by the Bureau of Land Management are considered on their own merits. No one would receive any kind of special treatment or consideration simply because he had filed his application through a land locator. All BLM information, data, records, maps, and other materials which are available to land locators and filing services, are also available to anyone who is interested in filing an application. Land locators receive no special or inside information that is not available to anyone else.

Though some land locators are completely honest businessmen who perform services for the public, some other land locators and filing services have engaged in land promotional schemes that, while staying just within the letter of the law, border on unethical or fraudulent practices. When in doubt, an applicant should contact the local better business bureau or real estate regulatory agency and obtain their opinion.

In general, most locator services complete their contract with an applicant when he receives the official receipt from the Land Office.

Some people have mistakenly thought that this receipt meant their application had been approved. The Land Office receipt is not an approval of the application or a permit to occupy or use the land. The receipt is only an acknowledgment that the application and service fees have been received by BLM and are now on file. The receipt in no way implies that an application will eventually be approved.

In the real estate business realtors do not usually earn their fee until the final sale has been completed. Up until that time, a person only makes a deposit of earnest money to show his good faith. If the deal later fails, through no fault of the prospective buyer, the realtor will return the money deposited. People doing business with land locators or filing services would do well to obtain similar agreements. This would mean that a person would not lose his money if his application is later denied. Such arrangements, of course, would have to be worked out directly with the locator or filing service.

Anyone who is planning on filing an application with the Bureau of Land Management, should, of course, fully inform himself about what it is necessary for him to do. He should also find out how much the Government will charge for filing the application, and also how much the land or resources would cost if he dealt directly with the Government. In general, the service fee for filing an application with BLM is $10.

As far as filling out an application is concerned, BLM employees will be happy to assist anyone by answering questions or furnishing information, either in person or by mail.

Only if people are fully informed about their rights and about the requirements of the law and the regulations can the public be sure their interests are fully protected—and only in that way can the Bureau of Land Management effectively perform its public service responsibility.

## Pennsylvania Badly Needs Enactment of Sound Distressed-Areas Legislation as Embodied in H.R. 3466 and S. 722

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following area redevelopment factsheet compiled by the Area Employment Expansion Committee with headquarters in New York City. This particular report deals exclusively with the distressed economic areas of the State of Pennsylvania.

AREA EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION COMMITTEE,
*New York, N.Y.*

AREA-DEVELOPMENT FACTSHEET NO. 53—PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania ranks among the first of the States troubled with problems of urban distressed areas. Six major labor markets and 11 smaller labor markets meet the requirements for assistance in removing distress under the formula of S. 722. Under the administration bill, S. 1064, four major labor markets and two smaller would be eligible. Under the Senate committee bill, S. 722, four major labor markets and five smaller labor market areas would be eligible for assistance.

Of the seven labor markets which now have substantial labor surpluses but are not eligible under S. 722, six will be entitled to benefits later in 1959, and one in July 1960 if unemployment continues at present levels. As for S. 1061, in addition to the six labor market areas currently eligible, three labor markets will become eligible in 1960, six in 1961, and four in 1962. Under S. 722, in addition to the nine currently eligible, six will meet the qualification in 1960, and four in levels (table I).

In November 1958, the total unemployed in the State were 452,000, of whom 155,500 were in the distressed labor markets (under S. 722) and 312,700 were in the substanial labor surplus areas. Less than 10 percent of the Pennsylvania labor force is in labor markets with unemployment rates under 6 percent.

The total number of jobs which would have to be created in the currently distressed labor markets (under S. 722) to reduce unemployment below the 6-percent level would be 56,474 (table II).

In table III, we report for each area separately the unemployment rates for distressed areas qualifying under S. 722.

In table IV, we report for each area separately the unemployment rates for other areas of substantial labor surplus.

In table V, we report the annual averages of unemployment rates for the years 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 for areas of substantial labor surplus.

Pennsylvania has made persistent efforts to help the individual communities to remedy their structural unemployment. Local development agencies have applied themselves assiduously to this task. Several have been given awards for their efforts. Pennsylvania has been a State which has striven arduously to remedy the conditions. But the best local efforts have not been sufficient. The problems have grown in size and scope. These areas need a Federal program to provide them with technical assistance, to guide them in their planning, to help them with grants for public facilities and loans for public facilities and industrial and commercial structures.

The problems of Pennsylvania's distressed communities are largely those of communities which are undergoing vast structural changes as new industries have appeared and displaced older ones. The coal mining industry has lost out to oil and to other areas with more accessible coal; railroad repair shops have been closed as diesels have displaced steam engines, textile mills have been shut as the silk industry has given way to synthetics; apparel shops have migrated as cheaper labor markets lured away the employers; the demand for railroad transportation has been curtailed by the growth in the use of the automobile and the airplane.

The distressed areas must be redesigned in order to prepare them to receive and attract new industries and employments. Such an effort requires new public facilities, and the retraining of workers, and the upgrading of communities. This task can be undertaken and successfully completed with the aid of the Area Redevelopment Act.

TABLE I.—*Pennsylvania—Areas of "substantial labor surplus," March 1959, by status of current eligibility and earliest date of future eligibility under S. 1064, S. 722, and committee S. 722*

| Labor market areas | Status of current eligibility | | | Earliest date of future eligibility | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | S. 1064 | S. 722 | Committee S. 722 | S. 1064 (before 1963)[1] | S. 722 | Committee S. 722 (before 1962)[2] |
| A. Major: | | | | | | |
| Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton | | | | | July 1959 | |
| Altoona | X | X | X | | | |
| Erie | | X | | 1961 | | 1960 |
| Harrisburg | | | | | July 1960 | |
| Johnstown | X | X | X | | | |
| Philadelphia | | | | | July 1959 | |
| Pittsburgh | | | | 1962 | April 1959 | 1961 |
| Reading | | | | | July 1959 | |
| Scranton | X | X | X | | | |
| Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton | X | X | X | | | |
| York | | X | | | | |
| Youngstown, Ohio-Pa. | | | | 1962 | July 1959 | 1961 |
| B. Smaller: | | | | | | |
| Berwick-Bloomsburg | | X | X | 1960 | | |
| Butler | | X | | 1961 | | 1960 |
| Clearfield-Du Bois | | X | X | 1960 | | |
| Lewiston | | X | | 1962 | | 1961 |
| Lock Haven | | X | | 1961 | | 1960 |
| New Castle | | X | X | 1960 | | |
| Oil City-Franklin-Titusville | | | | 1962 | April 1959 | 1961 |
| Pottsville | X | X | X | | | |
| Sayre-Athens, Towanda | | X | | 1961 | | 1960 |
| Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel | | X | | 1961 | | 1960 |
| Uniontown-Connellsville | X | X | X | | | |
| Williamsport | | X | | 1961 | | 1960 |

[1] All cities without dates won't be eligible before 1963.

[2] All cities without dates won't be eligible before 1962.

TABLE II.—*Pennsylvania—Labor force and unemployment in labor markets, January 1959*

| Labor market area | Labor force (civilian) total | Unemployment total | Number in excess of 6 percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. State, total [1] | 4,664,000 | 452,000 | |
| B. Distressed areas [2] | 1,019,095 | 155,500 | 93,534 |
| Major | 597,100 | 92,300 | 56,474 |
| Altoona | 53,600 | 7,700 | 4,484 |
| Erie | 100,000 | 16,900 | 10,900 |
| Johnstown | 98,300 | 16,500 | 10,602 |
| Scranton | 103,100 | 17,400 | 11,214 |
| Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton | 138,800 | 24,800 | 16,472 |
| York | 103,300 | 9,000 | 2,802 |
| B. Distressed Areas—Continued | | | |
| Smaller | 421,995 | 63,200 | 37,060 |
| Berwick Bloomsburg [1] | [3] 21,600 | 2,700 | 1,404 |
| Butler [4] | [3] 34,848 | 4,600 | 1,609 |
| Clearfield-Du Bois [3] | [3] 36,764 | 5,000 | 2,791 |
| Lewistown [1] | [3] 21,929 | 2,500 | 1,184 |
| Lock Haven [4] | 15,517 | 1,800 | 869 |
| New Castle [4] | [3] 37,333 | 5,600 | 3,440 |
| Pottsville | 78,400 | 14,500 | 9,796 |
| Sayre-Athens-Towanda [4] | [3] 20,618 | 2,000 | 763 |

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Pennsylvania—Labor force and unemployment in labor markets, January 1959*—Continued

| Labor market area | Labor force (civilian) total | Unemployment total | Number in excess of 6 percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| B. Distressed areas—Continued | | | |
| Smaller—Continued | | | |
| Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel [4] | [3] 64, 563 | 6, 650 | 2, 776 |
| Uniontown-Connellsville | 47, 400 | 12, 300 | 9, 456 |
| Williamsport [5] | [3] 43, 023 | 5, 550 | 2, 969 |
| C. Substantial labor surplus areas | 3, 218, 106 | 312, 700 | 115, 294 |
| Major | [6] 3, 188, 200 | [6] 309, 500 | [6] 113, 888 |
| Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton | 215, 800 | 21, 800 | 8, 852 |
| Harrisburg | 159, 800 | 10, 700 | 1, 112 |
| Philadelphia | 1, 791, 600 | 150, 600 | 43, 104 |
| Pittsburgh | 972, 200 | 117, 000 | 58, 668 |
| Reading | 120, 800 | 9, 400 | 2, 152 |
| C. Substantial labor surplus areas—Con. | | | |
| Major—Continued | | | |
| Youngstown, Ohio-Pa. [1] | [3] 220, 885 | 20, 000 | 6, 207 |
| Smaller | [3] 29, 906 | 3, 200 | 1, 406 |
| Oil City-Franklin-Titusville [4] | [3] 29, 906 | 3, 200 | 1, 406 |
| D. Other labor markets with nonsubstantial labor surpluses [7] | 115, 700 | 5, 900 | |
| Major | 115, 700 | 5, 900 | |
| Lancaster | 115, 700 | 5, 900 | |

[1] November 1958.
[2] Eligible for assistance under the Douglas bill; i.e., unemployment of 6 percent or more in at least 18 of the previous 24 months.
[3] Estimated.
[4] September 1958.
[5] July 1958.
[6] Excludes Youngstown, Ohio-Pa., labor market area.
[7] Information not available for the following labor market areas: Smaller: Indiana, Kittanning-Ford City, Bellefonte, Bradford, Chambersburg-Waynesboro, Lebanon, Meadville, Saint Marys, Warren. Very small: Bedford, Carbon (residual), Clarion, Coudersport, Dushore-Laporte, Forest City-Montrose, Gettysburg, Huntingdon, Honesdale, Newport, Punxsutawney, Stroudsburg, Tunkhannock, Waynesburg, Wellsboro.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Industry, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

TABLE III.—*Pennsylvania—Unemployment as percent of labor force in distressed areas, 1957–59* [1]

| Labor market area | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Annual average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Major: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Altoona: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 9.1 | | 9.4 | | 10.3 | | 11.7 | | 10.4 | | 11.7 | | 10.4 |
| 1958 | 13.4 | | 16.6 | | 17.1 | | 18.1 | | 17.3 | | 16.6 | | 16.5 |
| 1959 | 14.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Erie: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 6.1 | | 6.2 | | 5.3 | | 5.9 | | 5.1 | | 8.5 | | 6.2 |
| 1958 | 12.2 | | 13.7 | | 13.1 | | 13.7 | | 12.9 | | 14.1 | | 13.3 |
| 1959 | 16.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Johnston: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 7.4 | | 7.0 | | 6.6 | | 5.7 | | 5.7 | | 7.1 | | 6.6 |
| 1958 | 11.3 | | 13.6 | | 15.5 | | 17.8 | | 17.3 | | 16.8 | | 15.4 |
| 1959 | 16.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scranton: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 11.2 | | 11.0 | | 10.2 | | 11.0 | | 11.3 | | 12.5 | | 11.2 |
| 1958 | 15.4 | | 16.8 | | 16.9 | | 18.1 | | 15.7 | | 15.6 | | 16.4 |
| 1959 | 16.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 10.6 | | 11.7 | | 11.8 | | 11.9 | | 10.0 | | 12.2 | | 11.4 |
| 1958 | 16.0 | | 17.5 | | 17.3 | | 18.2 | | 15.9 | | 15.9 | | 16.8 |
| 1959 | 18.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| York: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 5.6 | | 5.9 | | 6.0 | | 6.3 | | 5.3 | | 5.9 | | 5.8 |
| 1958 | 8.0 | | 7.9 | | 7.6 | | 7.9 | | 6.6 | | 7.5 | | 7.6 |
| 1959 | 8.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Smaller: [2] | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Berwick-Bloomsburg: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | | | 8.5 | | | | | | 9.9 | | 9.2 |
| 1958 | | | | | 16.7 | | | | | | 12.5 | | 14.6 |
| 1959 | (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Butler: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | 3.5 | | | | 2.9 | | | | | | 3.2 |
| 1958 | | | 12.3 | | | | | | 13.2 | | | | 12.8 |
| 1959 | (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Clearfield-Du Bois: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | 7.0 | | | | | | 6.1 | | | | 6.6 |
| 1958 | | | 14.8 | | | | | | 13.6 | | | | 14.2 |
| 1959 | (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lewistown: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | 7.4 | | 4.6 | | | | | | 9.1 | | 7.0 |
| 1958 | 4.6 | | 9.1 | | 14.6 | | | | | | 11.4 | | 9.9 |
| 1959 | (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lock Haven: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | 6.0 | | 7.2 | | | | | | 10.7 | | 8.0 |
| 1958 | | | 10.7 | | 12.9 | | | | | | 11.6 | | 10.6 |
| 1959 | (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Castle: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | 4.7 | | | | 4.8 | | | | | | 4.8 |
| 1958 | | | 15.4 | | | | | | 15.0 | | | | 15.2 |
| 1959 | (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pottsville: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 14.1 | | 14.3 | | 15.8 | | 15.1 | | 10.8 | | 13.7 | | 14.0 |
| 1958 | 18.1 | | 20.6 | | 17.9 | | 19.9 | | 15.8 | | 18.5 | | 18.0 |
| 1959 | 18.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sayre-Athens-Towanda: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | | | 3.6 | | | | | | 6.9 | | 5.3 |
| 1958 | | | | | 14.1 | | | | 9.7 | | | | 11.9 |
| 1959 | (3) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sunbury-Shamokin-Carmel: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | 9.4 | | | | | | 5.7 | | | | 7.6 |
| 1958 | 5.7 | | 13.1 | | | | 13.3 | | 10.3 | | | | 10.6 |
| 1959 | (4) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uniontown-Connellsville: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 14.7 | | 14.3 | | 13.6 | | 14.4 | | 14.7 | | 17.0 | | 14.8 |
| 1958 | 23.4 | | 26.3 | | 25.8 | | 25.1 | | 22.4 | | 23.7 | | 24.5 |
| 1959 | 25.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Pennsylvania—Unemployment as percent of labor force in distressed areas, 1957–59* [1]—Continued

| Labor market area | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Annual average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sayre-Athens-Towanda—Con. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Williamsport: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | 7.2 | | | | | | | | 7.8 | | 7.5 |
| 1958 | | | | | | | 12.9 | | | | [2] | | |
| 1959 | [2] | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[1] Eligible for assistance under the Douglas bill, i.e., unemployment of 6 percent or more in at least 18 of the previous 24 months.
[2] Data for smaller areas available only for those periods when these areas where classified as "smaller areas of substantial labor surplus."
[3] Information not available.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor; annual averages calculated from these data.

TABLE IV.—*Pennsylvania—Unemployment as percent of labor force in areas of substantial labor surplus, 1957–59*

| Labor market area | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Annual average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Major: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4.4 | | 3.8 | | 3.1 | | 4.6 | | 2.9 | | 3.5 | | 3.7 |
| 1958 | 6.0 | | 7.5 | | 7.9 | | 9.1 | | 8.2 | | 8.6 | | 7.9 |
| 1959 | 10.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Harrisburg: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 3.7 | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | | 3.1 | | 2.7 | | 4.3 | | 3.4 |
| 1958 | 6.1 | | 6.5 | | 5.7 | | 5.8 | | 5.2 | | 5.3 | | 5.9 |
| 1959 | 6.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Philadelphia: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 5.6 | | 5.5 | | 4.8 | | 5.3 | | 4.7 | | 5.1 | | 5.2 |
| 1958 | 7.6 | | 8.4 | | 7.8 | | 8.3 | | 7.4 | | 7.0 | | 7.8 |
| 1959 | 8.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pittsburgh: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4.9 | | 4.7 | | 4.0 | | 4.3 | | 3.7 | | 5.5 | | 4.5 |
| 1958 | 9.2 | | 11.7 | | 11.2 | | 12.0 | | 10.6 | | 11.4 | | 11.0 |
| 1959 | 12.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4.5 | | 4.6 | | 5.4 | | 6.0 | | 4.8 | | 4.2 | | 4.9 |
| 1958 | 7.5 | | 10.5 | | 9.8 | | 9.0 | | 7.3 | | 6.4 | | 8.4 |
| 1959 | 7.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Youngstown, Ohio-Pa.: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 3.1 | | 2.9 | | 2.9 | | 3.5 | | 3.2 | | 5.4 | | 3.5 |
| 1958 | 10.0 | | 11.9 | | 12.6 | | 11.9 | | 10.5 | | 8.7 | | 10.9 |
| 1959 | [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Smaller: [2] | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Oil City-Franklin-Titusville: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | | | | | | | | | 4.3 | | | | |
| 1958 | | | 12.0 | | | | | | 10.7 | | | | 11.4 |
| 1959 | [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[1] Information not available.
[2] Data for smaller areas available only for those periods when the areas where classified as "smaller areas of substantial labor surplus."

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor. Annual averages calculated from these data.

TABLE V.—*Pennsylvania—Annual averages of unemployment as percent of labor force in areas of substantial labor surplus, 1955–58*

| Labor market areas | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 | Labor market areas | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Major: | | | | | Major—Continued | | | | |
| Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton | 3.9 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 7.9 | Reading | 5.6 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 8.4 |
| Harrisburg | [1] | [1] | 3.4 | 5.9 | Youngstown, Ohio-Pa | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 10.9 |
| Philadelphia | 5.3 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 7.8 | Smaller: Oil City-Franklin-Titusville | 7.8 | [1] | [1] | 11.4 |
| Pittsburgh | 6.1 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 11.0 | | | | | |

[1] Information not available.

Source: Calculated from Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor and Bureau of Employment Security Commonwealth of Pennsylvania data.

## Connecticut's Stake in Area Redevelopment Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing interest in Connecticut over the area redevelopment legislation now under consideration in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

This morning the Connecticut General Assembly's Joint Committee on State Development held public hearings on a resolution relating to the legislation. I prepared the following statement for that hearing. It deals with the general aspects of area redevelopment legislation, the situation in Connecticut, and how our State would benefit from the proposed legislation.

This statement expands the testimony I gave to Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Banking and Currency Committee yesterday and includes up-to-date statistics on Connecticut unemployment.

STATEMENT BY CHESTER BOWLES ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION TO CONNECTICUT JOINT COMMITTEE ON STATE DEVELOPMENT IN HARTFORD, MARCH 20, 1959

I am very glad that the Joint Committee on State Development is undertaking a study of area redevelopment legislation at a time when hearings are being held in Washington with widespread interest in the legislation developing here in Connecticut.

Because of its great importance to us in Connecticut, I shall go into the legislation in some detail.

I shall describe what I believe are the broad merits of my bill, H.R. 3450, what the situation is here in Connecticut and how it would benefit from the legislation. I shall also take up some of the questions and objections that have been raised concerning the legislation.

A FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

The extent of our recovery from last year's recession is a debatable point. For the nearly 5 million people still unemployed, the recovery has been very slight, indeed.

This bring us back to one of the main pieces of legislation passed since World War II—the Employment Act of 1946. This legislation recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government to help assure maximum full employment.

This new area redevelopment legislation—which Senator PAUL DOUGLAS introduced in the Senate and which I and others introduced in the House—recognizes our responsibility to alleviate unemployment of a per-

sistent and chronic nature wherever it exists.

The President, too, has given verbal support to this responsibility in his economic reports to the last three Congresses. The administration bills that have been offered to Congress have accepted the principle, though the effort to make the principle an actuality is a very limited one.

Very simply the motivation of this legislation springs from a natural instinct to help eliminate innocent suffering.

In my mind, there is a close analogy between the reasons for extending Federal aid to communities stricken by the sudden disaster of a flood or tornado and the reasons for extending aid to communities stricken by a more gradual disaster—whether it be the exhaustion of a coal mine that had previously been a primary source of employment, or the closing of a railroad line or the transfer of a textile mill hundreds of miles away.

In both situations, the men and women in these communities are faced with suffering and hardship through no fault of their own.

In eastern Connecticut and in other parts of the State, many people have lost their jobs because a textile mill closed down.

These are people who have worked for many years, who have developed very high skills. They have sunk deep roots into their communities. Their children are in school, their homes are paid for, their friends and relatives live nearby.

Yet all of a sudden they find themselves out of work. And they wonder what happened to the opportunity and bright future they had dreamed about.

Sometimes you hear the statement that in time these problems will work themselves out, that the people will sooner or later move elsewhere and find work.

I reject that philosophy. I think we have moved far beyond the harsh laws of economics reflected in statements of this sort. Such an answer to our problems would not only inflict great hardship on the individuals involved and uproot their lives, but it would also foster a costly and totally unnecessary wasting of human and material resources that have been built up over the years. It would be a waste of the potential and skills of the people, and it would be a waste of the schools, stores, hospitals, banks, office buildings, homes and churches.

THE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGES

When you look at the economic side of this situation, the reasons for area redevelopment legislation become even more compelling.

With the threat to our security from the Soviet Union growing more critical and with the needs for schools, roads, hospitals in this country becoming increasingly great, we cannot afford the continued wasting of our vital human and material resources.

By attacking this problem of chronic unemployment head on wherever it exists, we can greatly increase our national productivity and job opportunities.

At the same time, by putting our idle plant and human capacity to work, we can greatly increase the tax revenue needed to keep our economy on an even keel. Consider how much revenue we are losing by allowing 10 percent of our plant capacity and 6 percent of our human capacity to lie idle.

By putting these wasted resources to work, we can also cut down on the amounts that the Federal, State and local governments now have to spend in providing unemployment compensation and other relief measures.

CONNECTICUT CONDITIONS

Now let me briefly sketch the situation here in Connecticut.

This is, of course, a highly industrialized State with one of the most progressive administrations in the country. Under the dynamic and farsighted leadership of Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, we have made tremendous strides in improving our living and working conditions which, in turn, have attracted many new industries to the State.

Our roadbuilding, slum clearance, law enforcement, and unemployment compensation programs are among the most progressive in the country, and the citizens of Connecticut can be justly proud of their accomplishments.

Yet, like many other States, we have problems that require Federal assistance to bolster our vigorous State and local efforts.

One of the most pressing of these problems is that of alleviating the chronic unemployment that has been caused by our hard-pressed textile and related industries.

At present, the three areas having the most serious difficulties are those of Danielson, Norwich, and Bristol, including the surrounding communities. Danielson, which is in my own district, has been the hardest hit of all for the longest period of time.

In 1955 the population of the Danielson area—which includes Putnam, Brooklyn, Canterbury, Eastford, Killingly, Plainfield, Pomfret, Sterling, Thompson, and Woodstock—was a little more than 47,000. The textile industry provided more than 40 percent of the total manufacturing employment of 11,460.

Since 1955, however, the area has been practically denuded of this vital industry with the closing of more than 18 textile plants.

As a result, the per capita income has dropped in this area to the lowest in the State and this has caused a decline in business generally throughout the area. Fewer new homes are being built and fewer cars are being bought. Unemployment, as of this last January, was twice as high as the national average.

The people of Norwich, many of whom I know very well, have had similar though less severe difficulties.

In 1954 the textile industry accounted for more than half of the manufacturing employment in that area—which includes Bozrah, Colchester, Franklin, Griswold, Lisbon, Preston, Sprague, and Voluntown.

In the last 10 years, the textile employment declined from 6,500 to 2,200. Here too the total unemployment is nearly twice the national average.

Bristol has been hard hit by the decline in the nonelectrical machinery, brass, instruments, and clock industries. By last January its unemployment had risen to almost three times the national average, with 16.7 of the labor force out of work.

Other areas are also suffering similar difficulties. The Thompsonville area, for instance, lost nearly 1,000 jobs with the closing of the wool, yarn, and velvet carpet mills of the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co.

BENEFIT TO CONNECTICUT

Now how would this area redevelopment legislation help us?

There has been some talk that Connecticut cities and towns would benefit very little from the legislation.

This depends on which bill is passed.

Under the administration bill, only two areas—Danielson and Bristol—would qualify.

However, under my own bill, which is similar to the one introduced by Senator DOUGLAS, Connecticut would be eligible for much greater assistance.

If this bill is passed and signed, more than half of those now unemployed—48,400 people—would be included in the cities and towns that would be eligible for assistance by this July unless there is a marked upturn in employment between now and then.

Looking at it another way, Connecticut is made up of 18 labor market areas. By July 14 of them would be eligible for assistance.

Right now, according to the Connecticut Development Commission, 55 Connecticut cities and towns are eligible under my bill. These communities are included in 8 labor market areas designated by the Department of Labor as: Ansonia, Bridgeport, Bristol, Danielson, Meriden, New Britain, Norwich, and Torrington.

Unless employment improves by July, 78 more communities will have been added. These are the communities surrounding the labor market areas designated as Danbury, Middletown, New Haven, Thompsonville, Waterbury, and Willimantic.

From this standpoint, Connecticut's stake in the program makes the legislation a matter of vital State interest.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Briefly, this is what the legislation would provide:

Loans of $100 million for the construction and expansion of factories and other industrial projects in the eligible urban areas.

Loans of another $100 million to communities for the construction of public facilities. This would help these communities with land acquisition and the development of such facilities as access roads and sewer and industrial water supply systems to make the communities more attractive to new industries.

Loans of $100 million for the development of rural areas.

An additional $75 million in grants for the construction of public facilities.

Grants of $4.5 million for technical assistance to help communities and businessmen plan for coordinated development and growth.

Finally, it would provide $10 million in subsistence payments for 13 weeks to those undergoing vocational retraining.

At this point, I would like to call attention to a provision which I have also introduced and which I believe is of the utmost importance in speeding the development and revitalization of our hard-pressed areas.

This is a provision which would give tax relief to those manufacturers in the eligible areas who are willing to invest their own capital in expanding their facilities.

It would allow them to amortize the cost of expanding and constructing new facilities over a period of 5 years rather than over the useful life of the building, which may run to 40 or 50 years.

This rapid tax amortization provision is similar to the incentive now available to defense industries.

I have talked with a number of industrial leaders from my district and all of them have told me that of all the suggested methods of help, tax incentives would be the most effective.

Such a provision, it seems to me, would greatly encourage the investment of private capital. It would give the manufacturers greater flexibility. I believe we would get much quicker results and, in the long run, we would be more than compensated by steadily increasing tax revenues. Therefore, I plan to press for the inclusion of this provision in the final bill as hard as I can.

These, then, are the main provisions, and they are substantially greater than those provided by the administration bill.

At the same time, three quarters of the money that would be expended under the provisions of my bill are in the form of loans. These loans would be fully repaid over a period of 30 years with interest.

In other words, the bill is not a dole; it is an investment in the future.

It would go a long way toward helping these communities to help themselves to a brighter future in an economy that is constantly expanding with a population that is increasing by nearly 3 million a year.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE BILL

This brings me to some of the fears and questions that have been raised concerning this legislation.

Some people have expressed a belief that aid to one community will only hurt some other community.

I think this is a baseless fear. It seems to me that we should be worrying whether these people who have been capriciously thrown out of work will be able to fully share in the expanding opportunities that lie ahead.

They have worked hard, and so have the local and State governments, to adapt to changing economic conditions. Area redevelopment legislation would help them realize their full potential, which might otherwise go to waste.

Second, it has also been said that many of our local communities which would be eligible for help are not now prepared to participate in the program under the formula stipulating that the State and local governments must contribute a share to any loan that is made.

This is, of course, no reason to oppose the legislation. Certainly our Connecticut communities are just as well prepared to take advantage of the program as the communities in any other State. What we should be doing is making plans to get prepared, rather than spending our time fretting about the difficulty.

Third, there is a suspicion that Connecticut might not get as much aid as the other States, so that any Federal assistance would work to our disadvantage.

I covered this point earlier with the fact that 14 of our 18 labor market areas would probably be eligible for assistance by July. You couldn't ask for much more. It is obvious that Connecticut would be as eligible for as much aid for urban industrial development as any other Northern State, and far more than any Southern State.

Finally we come to an argument that apparently has caused some confusion here in Connecticut.

ANTIPIRACY PROVISION

This has to do with the so-called antipirating provision of the legislation. Very simply, it is argued that if we pass this bill, other States, particularly those in the South, will use the Federal assistance to steal industry away from Connecticut.

I must say here that this is a completely irrelevant concern.

In the first place, all the proposed area redevelopment bills, including my own, contain antipirating provisions which would prohibit the use of Federal funds to assist industries in relocating when such assistance would result in a detriment to the original area by increasing unemployment.

Now there have been some semantic arguments over exactly how this provision should be worded. Many of the proponents of the bill are worried that some of the amendments that have been proposed would invite a lawsuit each and every time someone makes an application for a loan. If this happened, the whole program might be wrecked.

But the worry that the bill would allow other States to steal industry from Connecticut is groundless on the face of it.

Of course, there are going to be a certain number of transfers of industry from one State to another. There always have been in this competitive world of ours, and there probably always will be.

But the allocation of funds under this area redevelopment program is not going to encourage industries to leave New England or Connecticut one bit. On the contrary, the bill can only work to our advantage.

In the first place, our State has more to offer than any other I can think of. We have progressive and friendly State and local governments. We have many cities with excellent facilities, many beautiful communities to live in, and an abundance of every kind of skilled labor. For these reasons alone, there is every reason to face the future with confidence.

The provisions of the area redevelopment bill would only enhance the prospects of a bright future for us in Connecticut.

The whole purpose of the bill is to help us restore and revitalize industrial and public facilities in certain handicapped communities, to make them once more attractive places in which to live and work.

By so doing, we will encourage, not discourage, the location of new industries in Connecticut. By improving our community conditions, the bill would also provide an incentive for our existing industries to stay and expand their operations.

Looking at it from another angle, I mentioned before that $100 million would be available for the development of urban areas. Another $100 million would be available for the development of rural areas.

Now almost all the eligible urban areas are located in the northern States, and I have already pointed out that Connecticut would participate as fully as any other northern State. Only a very few eligible urban areas are located in the southern States.

On the other hand, most of the eligible rural areas are located in the South, with only a few in the North. So that the South, of course, would receive most of the $100 million for rural development, to enable them to form farm cooperatives, or develop timber resources, or limestone quarries, or what have you.

The important fact, however, is that almost all of the funds for industrial development would go to the northern States.

With this being so, how can anyone say that the area redevelopment program would help the South in an effort to steal industry away from Connecticut? It just isn't so.

I hope this clears up some of the misunderstandings and questions that may have arisen over area redevelopment.

The legislation is perfectly sound in its conception, generous and sympathetic in its motivation, and fair in its application.

Last year the legislation received broad bipartisan support in Congress and from our Connecticut Representatives. It would be deeply unfortunate if such support should be lost through political division.

Connecticut has too much to gain from this legislation to let this happen.

Following is a list of the Connecticut cities and towns which are, or may be, eligible for area redevelopment assistance, and three tables showing the unemployment in the major labor market areas:

The labor market areas now eligible, according to the Connecticut Development Commission, are: Ansonia, Bridgeport, Bristol, Danielson, Meriden, New Britain, Norwich, and Torrington.

These areas include the following surrounding communities:

Shelton, Derby, Oxford, and Seymour in the Ansonia area; Easton, Fairfield, Monroe, Stratford, and Trumbull in the Bridgeport area; Plymouth in the Bristol area; Brooklyn, Canterbury, Eastford, Killingly, Plainfield, Pomfret, Putnam, Sterling, Thompson, and Woodstock in the Danielson area; Southington and Wallingford in the Meriden area; Berlin and Plainville in the New Britain area; Colchester, Franklin, Griswold, Lisbon, Preston, Sprague, and Voluntown in the Norwich area; and Burlington, Hartland, Barkamsted, Canaan, Colebrook, Cornwall, Goshen, Harwinton, Litchfield, Morris, New Hartford, Norfolk, North Canaan, Salisbury, Sharon, and Winchester in the Torrington area.

The following areas will have become eligible by next July if unemployment does not improve: Danbury, Middletown, New Haven, Thompsonville, Waterbury, and Willimantic.

These areas include the following surrounding communities:

Bethel, Brookfield, New Fairfield, Newtown, Redding, Ridgefield, Sherman, Bridgewater, Kent, New Milford, Roxbury, Warren, and Washington in the Danbury area; Chester, Clinton, Cromwell, Deep River, Durham, East Haddam, East Hampton, Essex, Haddam, Killingworth, Middlefield, Old Saybrook, Portland, Westbrook, and Marlborough in the Middletown area.

Bethany, Branford, East Haven, Guilford, Hamden, Madison, North Branford, North Haven, Orange, West Haven and Woodbridge in the New Haven area; East Windsor, Enfield, Suffield, Windsor Locks, Ellington, Somers, Stafford, Tolland, Union, Vernon, and Willington in the Thompsonville area; Bethlehem, Thomaston, Watertown, Woodbury, Beacon Falls, Chesire, Middlebury, Naugatuck, Prospect, Southbury and Wolcott, in the Waterbury area; and Lebanon, Andover, Columbia, Coventry, Hebron, Mansfield, Ashford, Chaplin, Hampton, Scotland, and Windham in the Willimantic area.

TABLE I.—*Connecticut.—Ratio of unemployment to the labor force in distressed areas* [1] *1957–59*

| Labor market area | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Annual average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Smaller: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bristol: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 7.6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 6.6 | 8.1 | 9.5 | 11.3 | 7.5 |
| 1958 | 17.1 | 16.7 | 18.0 | 21.8 | 20.9 | 23.4 | 27.8 | 19.0 | 17.9 | 16.5 | 14.5 | 13.1 | 18.9 |
| 1959 | 16.7 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Danielson: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 10.7 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 9.2 | 11.8 | 12.4 | 8.4 |
| 1958 | 13.7 | 14.5 | 14.4 | 15.0 | 15.3 | 14.7 | 15.4 | 12.3 | 10.7 | 10.2 | 9.5 | 9.7 | 13.0 |
| 1959 | 12.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Norwich: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 7.1 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.9 | 7.7 | 10.0 | 6.0 |
| 1958 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 12.3 | 11.4 | 10.3 | 12.9 | 13.8 | 11.1 | 10.0 | 9.1 | 10.5 | 10.0 | 11.1 |
| 1959 | 11.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[1] Eligible for assistance under the Douglas bill, i.e., unemployment of 6 percent or more in at least 18 of the previous 24 months or 9 percent for 15 out of 18 months.

Source: Connecticut Department of Labor.

TABLE II.—*Connecticut—Ratio of unemployment to the labor force in areas of labor surplus, 1957–59*

| Labor market area | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Annual average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Major: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgeport: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 6.1 | 7.4 | 4.0 |
| 1958 | 9.3 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 10.8 | 12.4 | 13.0 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 10.9 |
| 1959 | 11.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Britain: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 6.4 | 4.0 |
| 1958 | 8.6 | 9.8 | 10.4 | 11.0 | 12.9 | 14.4 | 13.6 | 12.8 | 11.2 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 9.2 | 11.2 |
| 1959 | 10.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Haven: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 4.3 | 2.6 |
| 1958 | 5.4 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 7.0 |
| 1959 | 7.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Waterbury: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 6.7 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 6.4 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 6.5 | 5.5 |
| 1958 | 9.5 | 9.6 | 10.5 | 13.2 | 13.4 | 13.9 | 13.7 | 11.9 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 9.0 | 8.2 | 11.1 |
| 1959 | 10.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Smaller: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ansonia: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 6.6 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 6.7 | 4.8 |
| 1958 | 9.5 | 11.4 | 11.9 | 13.8 | 13.7 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 14.4 | 12.4 | 12.0 | 10.5 | 10.8 | 12.5 |
| 1959 | 14.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Danbury: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 5.4 | 6.4 | 4.3 |
| 1958 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.3 | 7.9 | 9.0 | 9.4 | 6.7 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 7.9 |
| 1959 | 9.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meriden: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 3.8 | 6.0 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 4.7 |
| 1958 | 9.8 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 13.0 | 12.5 | 13.8 | 17.9 | 12.1 | 9.9 | 11.9 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 11.9 |
| 1959 | 10.8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Middletown: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 3.7 |
| 1958 | 7.7 | 9.4 | 9.1 | 10.1 | 9.4 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 9.4 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 9.0 |
| 1959 | 10.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Thompsonville: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.6 | 7.2 | 8.2 | 3.8 |
| 1958 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 12.6 | 11.6 | 12.5 | 12.3 | 10.3 | 9.7 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 8.7 | 10.2 |
| 1959 | 11.4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Torrington: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 8.2 | 4.7 |
| 1958 | 11.2 | 12.5 | 13.4 | 14.2 | 14.7 | 15.1 | 15.9 | 11.4 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 12.4 |
| 1959 | 12.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Willimantic: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1957 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 5.2 | 6.5 | 3.5 |
| 1958 | 9.8 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 9.8 | 10.6 | 11.3 | 14.1 | 9.1 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.2 | 9.7 |
| 1959 | 10.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

NOTE.—4 labor market areas were not in surplus category as of January 1959: 1. Hartford. 2. New London. 3. Norwalk. 4. Stamford.

Source: Connecticut Department of Labor.

TABLE III.—*Connecticut.—Labor force and unemployment in labor market areas January 1959*

| Labor market area | Labor force total | Unemployment total | Number in excess of 6 percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. State, total | 1,045,200 | 92,300 | |
| B. Distressed areas [1] | 57,100 | 7,800 | 4,374 |
| Smaller | 57,100 | 7,800 | 4,374 |
| Bristol | 19,800 | 3,300 | 2,112 |
| Danielson | 15,400 | 1,900 | 976 |
| Norwich | 21,900 | 2,600 | 1,286 |
| C. Other labor surplus areas | 598,000 | 61,800 | 25,920 |
| Major | 409,700 | 40,500 | 15,918 |
| Bridgeport | 141,000 | 16,000 | 7,540 |
| New Britain | 46,700 | 4,900 | 2,098 |
| New Haven | 145,000 | 11,500 | 2,800 |
| Waterbury | 77,000 | 8,100 | 3,480 |
| Smaller | 188,300 | 21,300 | 10,002 |
| Ansonia | 20,300 | 3,000 | 1,782 |
| Danbury | 28,000 | 2,700 | 1,020 |
| Meriden | 39,000 | 4,200 | 1,860 |
| Middletown | 30,500 | 3,100 | 1,270 |
| Thompsonville | 28,900 | 3,300 | 1,566 |
| Torrington | 26,300 | 3,400 | 1,822 |
| Willimantic | 15,300 | 1,600 | 682 |
| D. Other labor market areas | 390,100 | 22,700 | |
| Hartford | 248,200 | 14,900 | |
| New London | 39,400 | 1,900 | |
| Norwalk | 34,000 | 2,400 | |
| Stamford | 68,500 | 3,500 | |

[1] Eligible for assistance under the Douglas bill, i.e., unemployment of 6 percent or more in at least 18 of the previous 24 months or 12 percent for 12 months.

Source: Connecticut Department of Labor.

## Farmer Needs a Road to Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the settling of our Nation, our forefathers often faced a dead-end road. However, this did not stop them from going forward. Where the road stopped, they pushed forward unafraid and by their hard work carved a new road out of the wilderness.

Today, legislation affecting American agriculture needs the same type of pioneers. A recent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says American farm policy has come to a dead end. The end has come in an impenetrable forest of policies of the Eisenhower-Benson guidance which have done nothing but drive the family sized farmer off his land.

Yet, as the late Theodore Roosevelt expressed it, "It is not the critic that counts." We cannot merely criticize the Eisenhower-Benson farm policy mess; we must act.

Even as we deliberate here, the situation on the farm worsens. And having been brought up on an East Texas farm myself, I know from experience what this means. Secretary Benson is still cutting at the price support levels. More and more people may be forced off the small farms, and into cities which cannot provide jobs for them.

The challenge is for us to come up as quickly as possible with a farm program which will not only bring the farmer out of the difficulties in which he has been placed during this administration, but will assure him of a fair share of the food dollar in the future.

Mr. President, I highly commend to the attention of the Congress the editorial I mentioned earlier, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 26-February 1 under the heading "Dead End on the Farm."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAD END ON THE FARM

Nothing emphasizes the dead end to which American farm policy has come so strikingly as President Eisenhower's message on the subject. Mr. Eisenhower demonstrates beyond doubt the bankruptcy of the present program, based upon price supports and a vain attempt to limit production by acreage controls. But there he stops. He has no new or better program to suggest as an alternative. He merely proposes to tinker with the parity formula and other regulations so that the existing program might not cost so much.

There are two basic errors in this approach. One is the wishful thought that if we can just keep whittling the price support pro-

gram down each year, eventually the Government can get out of farm policy altogether and leave agriculture to the joys of "free" supply and demand. This has always been the philosophy of Secretary Benson and it is the most gossamer moonshine on all counts.

Economically it would be unjust as well as impractical to require agriculture alone to operate in a free market while big business administered its prices and big labor bargained its wages. From the standpoint of the long-term national welfare, it would be unwise to cut agriculture adrift; the national economy cannot permanently prosper with the farm economy permanently depressed.

Politically, also, any hope of substituting no farm program for the present farm program is unrealistic: agriculture's power, though shrinking, is still big enough to forestall complete abandonment of national concern for farm income and welfare.

The second false premise of the Eisenhower-Benson approach is the belief, reiterated year after year, that by just reducing the level of price support bit by bit the surpluses of unwanted farm products can be eliminated. Mr. Benson has been picking at the price support levels for 6 years now, and today's surpluses are bigger than they ever were. Is it not clear that marginal reductions in the guaranteed price do not significantly reduce production, but on the contrary add an incentive to produce more in order to offset the lower price level? The enormous gains in farm productivity have far outstripped any restraints on production imposed by lowering the support levels, and can be expected to continue to do so.

But if price supports don't work, as the President rightly says, the practical remedy is not merely to whittle them down but to devise a farm program that will work. Admittedly this is not easy. But there is no question that the Democrats face a great opportunity for the display of a creative statesmanship which the Eisenhower administration has been unable to muster.

The difficulty is that if the Democrats do devise a new program they will be tempted merely to superimpose it upon the present program. That is the way of politics. We believe there must be a strenuous effort to construct a substitute, not merely a supplemental, farm policy. If production payments are adopted for one crop, then price supports should be abolished for that crop. There can be no thought of increasing a subsidy which now amounts to 40 percent of net farm income. If anything the total subsidy must be cut, and at the same time made more effective.

Two basic principles, it seems to us, should underlie a new farm policy: first, the wise use of our farm productivity to relieve hunger abroad and to raise living standards at home; second, the dedication of government effort to the support of farm income rather than prices. In the first case, we must be careful not to injure other food producing countries or disrupt the regular channels of trade; in the second, we must guard against unlimited subsidy and interference with the steady increase of farm productivity. These problems need not be insoluble if agreement can be reached on the broad principles.

## A Defense of the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for the 14th of March of this year there appeared a news story entitled "A Defense of the Farm Program," by Lauren K. Soth, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, which covers in part an address which he made in Minneapolis.

I think it is important to call this article to the attention of the Senate, not only because of the esteem and prestige in which Mr. Soth is held in the Midwest, but because—and this is personal—he is going to occupy the chair in journalism at the University of Montana at Missoula very shortly.

In defense of the farm aid program, Mr. Soth points out the cost to the public in the form of taxes. The Department of Agriculture budget is one of the largest nondefense items in the Federal budget—in recent years it has amounted to from 5 to 7 billion dollars a year. This huge sum often is labeled as a farm subsidy, and despite attempts by some farm leaders to put the facts straight, the myth still lives on.

The greater part of the budget goes for general services which are of benefit to the entire population, not to just farm people. These services inclu'e scientific research, education, grading of farm and food products, market reporting, the Forest Service, soil conservation work, and a great many other activities. The budget also includes such things as the rural electric cooperative loans, which are being repaid on schedule and can hardly be lumped off as a subsidy.

According to the Department of Agriculture's calculation, the cost of programs for stabilization of farm prices and income never amounted to as much as $1 billion a year until 1955. In 1955 it amounted to $1.4 billion; in 1956, $1.9 billion; and in 1957, $3.3 billion. The 1958 figure may be still higher, but it will be a long way from the $7 billion often labeled as farm subsidy.

Even these Department of Agriculture figures on cost of farm income supports are somewhat misleading. The $3.3 billion for 1957 include more than $600 million loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation from sales of farm commodities to foreign countries. There is a question whether this loss should be called farm subsidy or foreign aid. The Commodity Credit Corporation also lost $171 million in 1957 from the sale or donation of farm products in this country, including distribution in the school lunch program. Is this general welfare program all to be charged as subsidy to farmers?

The American consumer has done very well under the farm programs. The proportion of his income spent for food has declined steadily. It is true that people buy more packaging, more precooking and other services with their food. But they spend relatively less for the food itself than they did before the farm programs began.

The average income of farm people, including money value of house rent and food and fuel consumed on the farm, was about half the average income of city people in the midthirties. Farm income per person today is about half of nonfarm income per person. So farm people are no better off compared with the rest of the population than they were in the midthirties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which was originally given by Lauren K. Soth, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune in an address in Minneapolis, Minn.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEFENSE OF THE FARM PROGRAM—IOWA EDITOR SAYS POLICY HAS FED NATION, LOWERED FOOD COSTS WITHOUT UNDUE SUBSIDY

(By Lauren K. Soth, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, in a Minneapolis address)

Our kind of farm problem, overproduction, is a serious one for farmers, to be sure. But from the general public point of view, it is not a problem at all; it is a mark of magnificent achievement. The American people have no worries about being short of food. Agriculture is not a limiting factor on economic growth in this country. Yet many Americans seem to have the idea that farming is a horribly inefficient industry, heavily subsidized and mismanaged by the Government.

First, let's look at the cost to the public in the form of taxes. The Department of Agriculture budget is one of the largest nondefense items in the Federal budget, in recent years it has amounted to from $5 to $7 billion a year. This huge sum often is labeled as a farm subsidy, and despite attempts by some farm leaders to put the facts straight, the myth still lives on.

The greater part of the budget goes for general services which are of benefit to the entire population, not just to farm people. These services include scientific research, education, grading of farm and food products, market reporting, the Forest Service, soil-conservation work, and a great many other activities. The budget also includes such things as the rural electric cooperative loans, which are being repaid on schedule and can hardly be lumped off as a subsidy.

In the last 25 years the Federal Government has been trying to protect agriculture against the effects of its own abundance, by price supports, direct payments for making acreage adjustments, putting land into soil conserving uses, and so on. How much have these subsidies amounted to? According to the Department of Agriculture's calculation, the cost of programs for stabilization of farm prices and income never amounted to as much as $1 billion a year until 1955. In 1955 it amounted to $1.4 billion; in 1956, $1.9 billion; and in 1957, $3.3 billion. The 1958 figure may be still higher, but it will be a long way from the $7 billion often labeled as farm subsidy.

Even these Department of Agriculture figures on cost of farm income supports are somewhat misleading. The $3.3 billion for 1957 include more than $600 million loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation from sales of farm commodities to foreign countries. There is a question whether this loss should be called farm subsidy or foreign aid. The Commodity Credit Corporation also lost $171 million in 1957 from the sale or donation of farm products in this country, including distribution in the school lunch program. Is this general welfare program all to be charged as subsidy to farmers?

The reason why price supports cost the Government so much money is that farm production controls have not worked. The drive to improve farm technology, spurred by Federal and State research and educational programs, has been a far more powerful force. Or, to say this the other way around: If farm production controls were effective, market prices of farm products would be above the support levels. So the cost of farm income supports would not ap-

pear in the Federal budget. Instead it would appear in the price of food, and the public would pay all of it in the food bill instead of partly in the tax bill. That's the way tariff subsidies are paid, of course they don't loom up in the Federal budget.

One more point should be mentioned. A sizable proportion of the cost of farm programs consists of payments to private warehousemen, exporters, and other handlers of grain, dairy products and cotton. No one should assume that all the money for farm programs goes to farmers.

The American consumer has done very well under the farm programs. The proportion of his income spent for food has declined steadily. It's true that people buy more packaging, more precooking and other services with their food. But they spend relatively less for the food itself than they did before the farm programs began.

The average income of farm people, including money value of house rent and food and fuel consumed on the farm, was about half the average income of city people in the midthirties. Farm income per person today is about half of nonfarm income per person. So farm people are no better off compared with the rest of the population than they were in the midthirties.

Far be it from me to defend all the farm acreage-allotments, price-support and other programs. Many of them have been ill conceived. The price supports on a few basic crops have been a clumsy way of trying to protect farm income in a period of overabundance. Acreage controls haven't worked well and have led to some distortions in production. We need to be looking for better ways of stabilizing farm income.

But a good case could be made, I think, that the net effect of acreage changes under the allotments, plus incentive for better land use through conservation programs, plus the reduction of uncertainty through price supports, have advanced the overall efficiency of agriculture, increased total output and lowered food costs to consumers.

## Hawaiian Statehood—Self-Determination at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State demonstrates to the world that America continues to adhere to the important concept of self-determination. In an editorial on March 16, the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle underscores the value of Hawaiian statehood as an object lesson to the world which the United States would do well to disseminate far and wide abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII BOLSTERS U.S. PRESTIGE

The obvious joy with which Hawaii is welcoming statehood does far more than bolster the prestige of the United States. It is a comforting development at a time when the tides of nationalism are running badly in the opposite direction.

When our country acquired Alaska, the Philippines, and Hawaii, there were charges that we wished to become an imperial power. In recent years the Communist propagandists have kept this myth alive.

We have denied the accusation and have backed our sincerity with deeds. The Philippines have become an independent Republic. That was what the Filipinos wanted. Alaska has become a State. The Alaskans asked for it. Now the Hawaiians will shortly become the 50th State. It was their wish. Could there be any better evidence of self-determination at work?

Even more heartening is Hawaii's object lesson to the world. As a number of examples in Asia and Africa have taught us, the eagerness of many countries for independence and freedom pathetically exceeds their readiness to assume the attending responsibilities. The obvious happiness of the Hawaiians testifies against an ill-advised nationalism, to a choice freely made and to the good intention of the United States to share its strength with this newest of States.

Let us hope our Government makes the most of this unexcelled opportunity for American propaganda.

## Proposed Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Here's an Idea That Could Help East Kentucky," from the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., of February 25, 1959.

The editorial praises our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for developing and introducing his bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps.

The editorial points out that while providing employment and educational opportunities for 150,000 young men, it would also give great aid in the protection, preservation, and improvement of our natural resources. It says that if the matter is handled with good judgment, its cost must be regarded as an investment rather than as a simple expenditure.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERE'S AN IDEA THAT COULD HELP EAST KENTUCKY

In considering projects which might bring help to the distressed areas of eastern Kentucky, a proposal by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, should be put high on the list. His proposal is known as the youth conservation corps bill.

In brief, what he proposes is creation of a 150,000-man organization made up of youths between 16 and 22 who would work in the Federal and State forests and parks and on other publicly owned lands.

Purpose of the corps would be twofold. First, it would provide a work force which would narrow the gap between what needs to be done to protect, preserve, and improve our natural resources. Secondly, it would provide employment and educational opportunities for these youths.

Both these objectives are badly needed in eastern Kentucky. Private landholders working in cooperation with Government agencies have been doing an excellent job in recent years in that area to get trees planted and to protect the steep slopes against washing. In the Cumberland National Forest and in the State park and forest areas other projects have been carried out.

But the potential for improvement and development of natural resources, especially trees and recreation areas, still remains tremendous. As Robert F. Collins, supervisor of the Cumberland forest, has pointed out in the past, recreational facilities in that area alone could attract 2 million to 4 million visitors a year if they were developed properly. At present there are practically no facilities of this sort in that area. In addition, there are serious problems resulting from strip-mining operations.

We know, too, that a greater percentage of the forest area of Kentucky is occupied by various species of oaks than any other type of forest. This is a valuable asset. But this resource is being threatened seriously by the dread oak wilt disease. Unless it is controlled, there is a danger that oaks will disappear as the chestnut did.

These are just a few of the projects that need immediate attention. Foresters and conservationists could expand the list manyfold.

The creation of such a Youth Conservation Corps would cost money. The proposal is to pay the youths $78 a month, provide food, clothing, medical care, transportation and education.

But the possibilities for return on such an outlay are so obvious that the cost, whatever it might be, must be regarded as an investment rather than as a simple expenditure.

## The Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Congress is on the verge of taking action for or against several measures which would do something about unemployment. I have seen no more eloquently expressed reason for congressional action than an editorial that was published in the New York Times of yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNEMPLOYED

The complex human reality behind t[he] unemployment statistics was spelled out soberingly in these pages a day or two ago. The picture painted has nothing in common with the ancient stereotype of the unemployed as the shiftless and the lazy.

The former Rhodes scholar who can speak six languages, the West Virginia coal miner with 8 children who has not had work since December 1957, the 22-year-old steelworker who hitch-hiked back to Pennsylvania from California in 5 days when mistakenly he was told he had been recalled to work, these and many more like them want to work but cannot find jobs. For the individuals affected there is not only economic distress, but also loss of self-respect and a growing alienation

from our otherwise prosperous society. For the Nation as a whole the millions of unemployed represent an enormous loss every day their energies, their talents, and their knowledge go unused.

The basic answer to the unemployment problem, of course, must be the revival of demand for goods and services to a level high enough to provide employment for the majority of the almost 5 million persons out of work. Whether such a revival will take place this year when Government and Federal Reserve policy are centered primarily upon efforts to restrain inflation is a hotly debated issue. But it is clear that if the present relatively high level of unemployment—high in relation to postwar experience though far below that of the 1930's—continues for long there will be powerful pressure for Government action to assure jobs for all who want them, regardless of the consequences for the price level.

But, beyond the basic issue of resumed economic growth, attention also needs to be directed at the special problems of important groups of the unemployed. Should special economic stimuli be applied to specially depressed areas, or should efforts be made to retrain surplus workers, say in the coalfields or in Detroit, and to help them move to other areas where expanding output provides new opportunities? What can be done for the elderly unemployed—say those over 35 or 40—who are turned away time and again on the ground they are too old? These and related prolbems need serious thought and not-too-long-delayed action. The unemployed are our fellow Americans and their desire to work is a legitimate desire and one which our society must satisfy.

## Radio Anniversary in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a fascinating new chapter in the romantic history of radio broadcasting is being written in my State of California.

Recent research has established that the first regular transmission of programs of news and entertainment by radio occurred from a pioneer station in San Jose, Calif. Previously, the historians of broadcasting had agreed that this activity and characteristic American enterprise, which has become an invaluable medium of mass communication in every civilized country, had its beginnings in the early twenties at station KDKA, in Pittsburgh, Pa.

Out of tattered pages and personal memories have come facts which establish the claim of station KCBS, the San Francisco outlet of the Columbia Broadcasting System network, that its direct predecessor, station KQW, in San Jose, first started sending its programs over the airwaves in January 1909.

The year 1959 is, therefore, the golden anniversary of broadcasting. This is truly a historic occasion, which is being appropriately celebrated with ceremonies in California. The observance will be climaxed on April 3 by placing a plaque on the American Trust Bank Building, in San Jose, the site of what a half century ago was the home of Herrold Station, San Jose.

Painstaking research to verify the claim of this station to the title of the world's first broadcast transmitter was done by Gordon B. Greb, assistant professor of journalism and advertising, at San Jose State College. A gripping narrative of his digging into the past is the lead article in the winter edition of the Journal of Broadcasting, published at my own alma mater, the University of Southern California.

Because of the significance of this discovery, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story summarizing his findings, as published in the San Francisco Chronicle on February 15, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN JOSE SLATES RADIO ANNIVERSARY

The golden anniversary of broadcasting will be celebrated in April at San Jose, site of pioneer radio station KQW.

A plaque will be placed on the American Trust Co. Building in downtown San Jose where in January 1909, Charles D. Herrold first started broadcasting music and news over a 15-watt transmitter audible to crystal set owners within a 15-mile radius of the town.

Known simply as Herrold Station, San Jose in the days before call letters were assigned by the Federal Communications Commission, the station later became KQW, and remained so until 1949, when it was bought out by KCBS.

Herrold died in Hayward in 1948.

The San Jose station's claim to first place in broadcasting was recognized by Dr. Lee de Forest in a speech at the World's Fair on Treasure Island in 1940. Dr. de Forest had used the station's regular music schedule at the Panama Pacific International Exposition here in 1915 to demonstrate his receiving set. Herrold broadcast 6 to 8 hours a day at that time.

(Most authorities have overlooked Herrold's pioneer broadcasting, usually naming station KDKA, of Pittsburgh, Pa., as the first broadcaster in 1920.)

Herrold's broadcasts incorporated the basic elements of radio: He borrowed records from a San Jose music store, in return for advertising plugs over the air; his news reports were taken from the headlines of the San Jose Mercury; and he even had the world's first female disc jockey—his wife, now Mrs. Sybil M. True, of San Jose.

The civic celebration in San Jose, planned for the first week in April, is sparked by Gordon Greb, journalism professor at San Jose State College, who has spent considerable time digging up proof of Herrold's pioneer broadcasting activities.

NEW "FIRST" CLAIMS KCBS PREDECESSOR BEGAN IN 1909—GREB

Another claim to the honor of the "first" broadcasting station was entered Sunday (February 15) on behalf of KCBS, San Francisco, in an article in the current issue of the Journal of Broadcasting, Technical Journal of Broadcast Educators. KCBS now is owned and operated by CBS, Inc.

Writing in the University of Southern California publication, Gordon E. Greb states, "Notwithstanding the many claims to 'first broadcasting' * * * there is considerable evidence supporting a California station's claim as being the granddaddy of them all because of its 50th birthday this year."

To support his thesis, Mr. Greb utilizes personal papers of the station's founder, Charles David Herrold; conversations with his contemporaries, and a speech by radio pioneer, Dr. Lee de Forest.

According to Mr. Greb, Mr. Herrold opened his radio school in San Jose's Garden City Bank Building January 1, 1909. "From the first, broadcasts were a part of my routine," Professor Herrold wrote in a letter to Lee de Forest in 1940. "In spite of continual changes in apparatus there was always music of some sort coming from my station."

These first broadcasts were more than 3 years before Congress enacted the Radio Act of 1912. The radio law then required licenses and call letters from voice transmitters. Prior to this time, Mr. Herrold's operators simply announced, "This is San Jose calling" and went into their news and music.

The article states that early in experimental stages, the call FN was used. Experimental land licenses 6XE and 6XF preceded the call SJN which was first used in 1913. And, in 1921, when licenses were first issued under the classification of broadcasting, the San Jose station became KQW. Later it moved to San Francisco and in 1949 the call letters were changed to KCBS.

In 1948, Mr. Herrold, who was a classmate of Herbert Hoover at Stanford University, died at the age of 72.

Ray Newby, Mr. Herrold's assistant and an instructor in his school, when interviewed recently by Mr. Greb, stated the station early in its operation went on a prearranged schedule so "we would have listeners that could report to us." At first the schedule was a half-hour every Wednesday evening on which news, records, and voice were broadcast for a half-hour and sometimes longer if the microphones and everything didn't get too hot. Later, the station went on a daily schedule.

Mr. Greb writes that Mrs. Sybil M. True, Mr. Herrold's first wife, told him the station aired records borrowed from a local store, directed to teenage amateur set operators. She said "They would run down the next day to be sure to buy the one they had heard on the radio. We would ask them to come in, and sign their names. And, unintentionally laying claim to radio's first giveaway program, she added. "And we would give a prize away each week."

The Panama Pacific Exposition in San Francisco in 1915 gave Mr. Herrold an opportunity to demonstrate his arc system of broadcasting, a system which operated on the same principles that cause streetlamp arcs to hum and sing. Mr. Herrold's programs were picked up by receivers at a Government booth at the World's Fair, and when Dr. De Forest found his tube-transmitter would not work, he tuned in Mr. Herrold's San Jose station to demonstrate his own receiving set.

To conclude substantiation of his claim, Mr. Greb cites a 1940 incident at the San Francisco World's Fair. Dr. de Forest, in an address to the Veteran Wireless Operators Association on Lee de Forest Day, said, "Very appropriately, the rebirth of my earliest broadcasting began here on the Pacific coast when * * * station KQW at San Jose maintained regular transmissions. * * * That station KQW (now KCBS), can rightfully claim to be the oldest broadcasting station of the entire world * * *."

Another honor will be bestowed on Mr. Herrold on April 3, 1959, at the site of his old spark transmitter, when the San Jose State College undergraduate chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic fraternity, places a historic marker on the Garden City Bank Building, stating that it was here that the "World's first regular broadcasting station" had its beginning.

## Biographical Sketch of Milan D. Smith, Leader of Mormon Church in Washington, D. C., and in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an excellent biographical sketch appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of October 25, 1958, regarding Milan D. Smith, leader of the Morman Stake, in the District of Columbia, and formerly an outstanding foodpacker and civic leader in my home State, at Pendleton, Oreg.

Milan D. Smith originally came to Washington as an assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, and he is known throughout the Nation as a noted religious and spiritual leader.

I ask unanimous consent that the article about Milan D. Smith, entitled "Head of District Mormons Is Also Top Businessman," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAD OF DISTRICT MORMONS IS ALSO TOP BUSINESSMAN

(By Kenneth Dole)

When the Salt Lake Mormon Tabernacle Choir, one of the great choirs of the world, comes here next week, three former presidents of the Washington Stake and the current president will be on hand to greet it.

They are:

Ezra Taft Benson, 1940–44.

Edgar B. Brossard, 1944–48.

J. Willard Marriott, 1948–57.

Milan D. Smith, 1957– ——.

Benson is Secretary of Agriculture; Brossard, Chairman of the Tariff Commission; Marriott, founder and president of Hot Shoppes, Inc.

Smith, a man of middle height with wavy brown hair and a dark lens covering an eye blinded in an accident, has gone far and fast in 39 years in government, civic life, industry, and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

His manner is precise and self-contained, giving an impression of an efficiently functioning mechanism and hardly hinting, except in courtesy, that his leading motivation is religious. Except when he is in the West directing his business, he spends 40 to 50 percent of his time on church affairs. As President of the Stake, he is both administrator and high priest.

Mr. Smith was born in Clearfield, Utah, son of the owner of a canning company. His grandfather, a native of Corby, Lincolnshire, England, was converted to Mormonism and came to Utah in the 1860's. His mother is a sister of a former Governor of Utah, Henry Blood.

Because of the ancestral loyalty inherent in Mormonism, Mr. Smith this summer made a pilgrimage to Corby. He photographed the churches and baptismal fonts where his grandfather and great-grandparents were baptized and undertook a brief genealogical investigation. The ancestors whose names he learned will receive Mormon baptism and and be sealed in Mormon marriage in proxy temple rites.

Elder Smith first developed the speaking skill his work demands in high school, where he was a debater and school officer. After 2 years at the University of Utah (1937–39), where he specialized in business administration, he came east as a missionary.

Working out of New York, he sowed some "seeds of interest" and baptized several persons. On an errand to Washington—the shadow of a coming event—he was concerned in the creation of the Washington Stake: he turned over to Elder Benson and other Stake officials the records of missionary activity here. In 1940 there were 2,000 Mormons in the Washington-Baltimore area; since then the number has swelled to 6,300.

This has been partly due to Mormon obedience to the commandment to "multiply and replenish the earth." Mr. Smith, with nine children, has set an example. He was married in 1941 to Jessica Udall, daughter of a notable Arizona Mormon family, a year and a half after meeting her in missionary work. Their children are:

Milan D., Jr., 16; Melanie, 15; Charlotte, 14; Gregory Udall, 12; Kathleen, 11; Nicholas Albert, 10; Michael, 7; Gordon Harold, 6, and Lisa Ellen, 4.

Taking his wife to Pendleton, Oreg., he rapidly carved out a career in business, church, and civic life. With $30,000 as a borrowing base, he obtained enough bank credit to buy a $150,000 freezing tunnel. Concentrating on frozen peas ("We pride ourselves on the speed we get peas from field to freezer," 2–3 hours), and corn, he has become a leading independent frozen food processor. He also has plants in Milton-Freewater, Oreg., and Lewiston, Idaho.

A year after settling in Pendleton, he was ordained a bishop—at 23 the youngest in Mormonism at the time. At 31, he became the youngest Stake president. He retained his presidency until he came to Washington 3 years ago as Benson's executive assistant.

## Texas Senate Resolution on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the secretary of the State Senate of Texas has transmitted to me a certified copy of a resolution adopted by that body on March 12, 1959, petitioning the Congress of the United States to eliminate grave and wasteful expenses in the foreign aid program.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 191

"Whereas we are aware of the enormous sums of money required for this year's Federal budget; and

"Whereas we have become acutely aware of the problems involved in financing operations of the State of Texas and our local communities; and

"Whereas we hereby petition our National Congress to do all within their power to eliminate the grave and wasteful expenses that have been brought to our attention in the foreign aid program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we hereby send copies of this resolution to the National Congress petitioning their attention to this matter.

"BEN RAMSEY,
"*President of the Senate.*"

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on March 12, 1959.

[SEAL] CHARLES SCHNABEL,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

## Is the Pentagon Sacrosanct?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, when acting upon appropriations for national defense, it might be well for us as Members of Congress to consider the matters raised in the following article which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 16, 1959, titled "Pentagon's 'Loss' 7½ Billion in 1958":

PENTAGON'S "LOSS" 7½ BILLION IN 1958—CANCELLATION OF PROGRAMS AND DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOODS THE MAJOR ITEMS

WASHINGTON, March 14.—The Department of Defense, which spends a huge share of the Nation's budget, wrote the equivalent of at least $7,500 million off its books last year.

A billion of that was spent for goods the military did not need and could not use. And, though brandnew, the stuff was ultimately sold for about 8 cents on the dollar.

Most of the $7,500 million "loss" was spent on weapons and equipment that the services considered as either obsolete or wornout, and therefore useless.

For example, a "technical change" prompted the Air Force to dispose of 1,500 flight helmets for which it paid $550 apiece. Private dealers in war surplus sold them for $75 each.

About $1,500 million represented aircraft and missile programs that the military, principally the Air Force and Navy, officially abandoned as miscalculations.

SIX BILLION SEEN THIS YEAR

Further, if past experience is a reliable guide, the Pentagon will write off $6 billion worth of goods this year as "surplus."

The buying and selling of surplus military goods, incidentally, has become a $750 million a year enterprise for private industry.

Such sums aren't piddling even against the background of the administration's proposed $41 billion defense budget, now before Congress.

The question is not about whether the $41 billion is too much, but whether it's too little.

Representative GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, and chairman of the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, believes it is too little. "We can't afford to be caught short," he said.

At the same time, he noted that the military "make a lot of mistakes, tremendous mistakes, but they are largely mistakes in judgment."

CONGRESS SEEKS ANSWER

Congress has been struggling for years with the question of whether the taxpayer is getting his money's worth out of the Defense Department. The lawmakers also have been trying to persuade the military to use more businesslike procedures. It has been like pouring water on a duck's back.

The Mahon subcommittee reports that none of the services has an adequate inven-

tory system and thus has no precise idea of what it owns. Some instances were found where inventory information was 12 months out of date.

One result is that nobody knows whether the property held by the services is worth $50 billion or $60 billion.

The cost ascertainment method of the services on negotiated contracts leaves something to be desired.

Last year the military spent $23 billion on procurement and 84 percent went into negotiated contracts made without competitive bidding.

Negotiated contracts usually are on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis and, supposedly, the manufacturer has to explain and justify his costs.

As for the abandoned programs:

Over the last 12 months the Air Force decided that the future belonged to ballistic missiles and abandoned the Navaho program, into which it has pumped $750 million. The Navaho was a jet missile.

The Air Force also abandoned its air-to-air missile program known as the Rascal, which cost $374 million. It dropped the diversionary missile program called the Goose project after spending $70 million.

The Navy gave up on the jet-type anti-aircraft missile, the Regulus, after spending $78 million. The Navy also abandoned its seaplane experiment, into which it had poured close to $200 million.

The $7,250 million written off by the department does not include the money spent by the various services duplicating each other's work.

One illustration of this: the Army spent $700 million developing the 1,500-mile-range missile, the Jupiter, before turning it over to the Air Force, which in turn has spent as much or more developing a similar missile, the Thor.

## Freedom Begins Right at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER**
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have introduced bills to give self-government in some form to the people of the District of Columbia. There has been newspaper comment, including editorials, all over the country about such a bill. I append herewith the following editorial from the Bloomington Pantagraph of Saturday, March 7, entitled "Freedom Begins Right at Home":

FREEDOM BEGINS RIGHT AT HOME

While we talk of freedom and self-determination in this country Congress has repeatedly refused to grant the basic right to vote to a large sector of our population. That is the District of Columbia.

A District home rule bill was passed last year by the Senate by the one-sided vote of 61 to 22, but it was bottled up in the House.

In the meantime the people of the District have no vote on any issue. Yet they pay $170 million in local taxes levied upon them by Congress. They have no say as to how their money is spent.

Whatever the national emergency, be it the Berlin crisis or sending troops to Lebanon, 31 Members of the House and Senate who constitute the District "city council" must take time to deal with the purely local issues of a big city. They were not elected by the people of the District and they are not responsible to these people.

This inefficient and undemocratic practice should be ended by granting to the people of the District of Columbia the home rule they seek and deserve. A new home rule bill has been introduced. The Senate looks favorably upon the bill. It stands just a bare chance of getting by the District Committee and onto the House floor. If this happens, the chances of passage are good.

None of us is entirely free as long as Congress denies freedom to people of an entire area in which the National Capital is located.

## Congratulations to the Post Office Department and Our Good Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JAMES G. FULTON**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the American people send and receive two-thirds of the world's mail.

This astonishing volume now totals 61 billion pieces of mail plus a billion parcels a year.

As the Nation grows and its economy expands, the number of pieces of mail per person per year, now averaging 350, is expected to double to 700 within the next 25 years.

The major bottleneck to better and faster mail service is the time now required to sort and distribute mail in the large gateway post offices of the United States.

In most post offices mail is still sorted and distributed by costly tedious hand methods and procedures that have not changed much since Ben Franklin's day.

Until recently little or no effort was made to speed the sorting and distribution of mail in post offices by machines and methods commonly used by American industry.

The Washington, D.C. Post Office—now the world's most mechanized post office—is the latest answer to an ever-increasing problem of moving an increasing volume of mail efficiently and rapidly through a big city post office.

Major features of the first of the country's big post offices to have all possible automation and mechanization installed are:

First. A mile-long conveyor system to move 5 million pieces of mail daily in and out for more than 650 planes and trains every day and for many trucks.

Second. Five miles of "Mail-Flo" conveyor belts to move mail swiftly between mail sorting areas on the post office workroom floor.

Third. Semiautomatic letter sorting equipment to sort up to 18,000 letters an hour.

Fourth. Semiautomatic parcel post sorting equipment to handle up to 14,400 parcels an hour to 32 destinations.

Fifth. A postal laboratory for continuous development of even more advanced "postal machines of tomorrow."

These include even faster letter sorters; machines to "cull" mail—separate according to types—at high speeds; machines to "ready" addresses on letters; others to cancel and to sort letters even faster.

The modernization work in Washington, D.C., Post Office will provide mechanization experience to convert other post offices, and will be a testing ground for postal machines of tomorrow.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the National Rural Letter Carrier:

THE WORLD'S MOST MECHANIZED POST OFFICE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

President Eisenhower pushed a button at the White House at 10:45 a.m., March 3d and placed the world's most mechanized post office in official operation in the Nation's Capital.

At the same time, in dedication ceremonies in the newly-modernized Washington City Post Office itself, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield declared the 1914 building, which has had a complete interior face lifting, has now become a "postal showcase" that has far-reaching significance for the entire Nation.

In addition to speedier mail handling, many other improvements have been provided, Mr. Summerfield observed.

In the new "around-the-clock" lobby, he noted, open bank-type service counters greet the mailer. Nearby, machines sell stamps and postal cards, and make change. New fluorescent lighting improves efficiency, and the building will be air conditioned, with modernistic coloring. And, already, there are escalators to upper stories.

"The introduction of mechanized mail handling devices here in the modernized Washington, D.C. Post Office opens a new era in the postal service, fully as important as the start of railroad service for mail in 1831, or the inauguration of regular air mail service in 1918," Mr. Summerfield said.

Declaring the Washington, D.C. office will "produce benefits for the entire Nation," he said it will provide experience in moving the mails continuously, with minimum interruptions, in making better use of work space and in planning for the future.

The world's most mechanized post office each day will handle mail that each day arrives and departs on about 250 planes at National Airport, and will handle mail from 46 inbound and 42 outbound trains, along with other surface transportation.

Mr. Summerfield noted also the official start of the world's most mechanized post office marks the end of an era of old-fashioned post offices with methods that "have not changed much since Ben Franklin's day." These old-fashioned offices have been the "major bottlenecks to better, faster mail service," he observed.

"That is why," he explained, "this Washington, D.C., post office, with its promise of better mail service, is so important. That is why the developments that will take place here, in this working postal laboratory, have great significance for every American."

The ceremony was attended by Members of Congress and many notables. In addition to Mr. Summerfield, others who spoke included Washington, D.C., Postmaster Carlton G. Beall; Washington Postal Regional Director Malcolm R. Clarke; Victor O. Schinnerer, president, Washington, D.C., Board of Trade, and Robert E. McLaughlin, President, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners.

## European Peace Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum by the Assembly of Captive European Nations concerning the problem of a European peace settlement. The memorandum is dated February 17, 1959:

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE PROBLEM OF A EUROPEAN PEACE SETTLEMENT

With its ultimatum on West Berlin, dated November 27, 1958, the Soviet Union flung a new challenge at the West. Yet this Soviet diplomatic offensive, sustained by thinly disguised threats voiced by responsible statesmen of the Soviet Union at the 21st Congress of the Communist Party, has at the same time provided the West with an opening for new efforts to establish a just and lasting peace after the holocaust of World War II.

In the present political situation, Berlin has become a transcendental issue. At stake is not the fate of a city or of a country, or even of a continent, but the whole future of freedom. And, as Dr. Charles Malik, President of the 13th General Assembly of the United Nations, rightly observed on January 31, 1959, "freedom is more fundamental than peace. Peace is breached when freedom is violated".

Mindful of the opportunities the Berlin crisis presents for an attempt to extend the area of freedom and thus improve the outlook for peace, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, the free voice of the Soviet-subjugated peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania, respectfully submits its views concerning the vital necessity of seeking at this time a settlement of all the European problems deriving from World War II, including the question of the freedom and independence of the nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

I

Any overall western peace plan for Europe must provide for an equitable settlement of the political problems stemming from World War II, namely, the problem of Germany and that of Central and Eastern Europe. These problems constitute the major cause of the present international tension and of the armaments race. By their very nature, they are interconnected and indivisible.

It is generally admitted that the issue of Berlin cannot be isolated from that of the reunification of Germany. By the same token the problem of Germany cannot be isolated from that of Central and Eastern Europe. Any overall European peace settlement which would deal only with the first of these problems would soon aver itself unrealistic and would inevitably be doomed to failure.

II

The Kremlin's peace program for Europe is contained in its proposed draft of a peace treaty with Germany. This document is a mere compilation of previous Soviet proposals which the Western Powers had rejected as entirely unacceptable. It is characteristic of the persistence with which the Soviet Union seeks to impose her will upon Europe and to extend her rule over the whole continent. The very enumeration of the potential parties to such a treaty is indicative of these Soviet intentions.

All the nations represented in the Assembly of Captive European Nations were involved in one way or another in World War II, which was unleashed by the Hitler-Stalin conspiracy. They are vitally interested in peace negotiations with Germany and are entitled to participate in such negotiations. But they have an indisputable right to insist that such participation should be open only to freely elected governments.

In proposing that the Soviet-imposed Communist regimes in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and East Germany be included among the signatories of a peace treaty with Germany, the Soviet Union aims at endowing with international respectability the puppet regimes it has foisted upon the formerly free and independent countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It seeks to induce the Western Powers to act in disregard of the pledge contained in the Potomac Declaration (June 23, 1954) "not to be party to an agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the unwilling subordination of formerly sovereign states, now in bondage."

The list of formerly sovereign states now in bondage comprises, it must be stressed, not only the nations enumerated in the Soviet proposal, but also Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, which were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union proper during World War II.

The position of the Western Powers remains that a sine qua non of any peace negotiations with Germany is its reunification by free elections, and that peace negotiations could be conducted and a peace treaty concluded only with the government of a united Germany—deriving its mandate from free elections. This position is unchallengeable, both legally and politically, and as a matter both of justice and of political realism it should be applied to all the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

III

Western statesmen have rightly emphasized in some of their recent public pronouncements: (1) That the Berlin issue is merely part of the problem of German reunification; and (2) that, in turn, the problem of the reunification of Germany is part of the broader problem of Europe and can only be solved in the framework of an overall European settlement.

Yet, in the concrete plans or proposals that are being advanced in the West, the requirements of a European settlement are narrowed down to self-determination for Germany and to comprehensive security arrangements. The latter are obviously designed as means to induce the Soviet Union to soften her stand on the reunification of Germany.

The issue of the captive nations, in terms of their right to self-determination, is entirely absent from these plans. The nations of Central and Eastern Europe appear only as potential participants in a European security system. In the Soviet proposals this patricipation would assume a collective form. The security pact would be concluded between what the Soviets call the Warsaw Treaty Powers and the NATO Powers. The western proposals provide for the participation of only some of the captive countries. Whether accomplished in one way or another, such participation would signify not only the international legalization and factual consolidation of Soviet conquests in Central and Eastern Europe, but also a Western commitment to protect the Soviet hold over the captive nations, against their will and in spite of their efforts at self-liberation. It would demoralize the forces of resistance in the captive nations which have constituted through the past years one of the most effective deterrents to further Soviet adventures in Europe. It would, moreover, generate a false sense of security in the West. The net effect would be to weaken the already inadequate defenses of Western Europe.

IV

As a further means of inducing the Soviet Union to agree to the reunification of Germany, various plans of an overwhelmingly military and technical nature have been put forward in the West. These provide for such measures as military disengagement by means of demilitarized or denuclearized zones in Central Europe, a symmetric withdrawal of Soviet and Western armed forces, or a thinning out of foreign forces in Germany.

All these plans are predicated on the highly questionable assumption that the negative Soviet policy on Germany is motivated by considerations of security, and not by plans of further expansion. The consequences of their adoption would be detrimental to the security of Western Europe.

It stands to reason that the deterrent effect of the American nuclear power of retaliation and of the resistance of the peoples of Eastern Europe has been in the postwar years, and still is today, the mainstay of Western European security. According to competent military opinion, the effectiveness of the first of these factors is, however, being gradually impaired by the growth of Soviet nuclear striking capacity, by what is commonly and often prematurely called the nuclear stalemate. The vital problem with which the West is confronted is, therefore, that of endowing Western Europe with a defense system less dependent on nuclear retaliation, a security system that makes the defense of Western Europe possible at a lesser cost than an all-out nuclear war. This obviously requires the building up of an adequate counter-weight to Soviet conventional forces. It also requires more depth than is today available to carry out successfully a strategy of defense.

The weakness of all disengagement plans is that they fail to meet these requirements. They all imply a further contraction both of the sources of European military power and of the geographical area on which such power is to be based. The result can only be a growing imbalance that would place an increasingly large part of Europe in the shadow of Soviet military power.

It should also be noted that, like the proposed European security system, any disengagement agreement would be essentially of a non-self-enforcing nature. Constant alertness and unswerving willingness to employ force would be required to ensure its observance. And, since the disengagement schemes would inevitably bring about a weakening of local means of defense, the burden of enforcement would necessarily fall upon the United States. The paradoxical result would then be that the scope of American commitments would have to be enlarged at the very time when the approaching nuclear stalemate portends an increasing tendency to envisage nuclear retaliation only as a means to deter the enemy from a surprise nuclear attack and, conversely, an increasing reluctance to consider it as a necessary response to aggression on the part of a superior land power.

It is submitted that the proposed military and technical measures are no substitute for political solutions. Some of them might be considered as additional safeguards of a sound political settlement but the political solutions, based on respect for the right to self-determination of all European nations, must come first if such settlement is to be lasting.

The problem of Europe is a political problem. And the first answer to this problem

is free elections in the countries in which nations have been forcibly deprived of their rights.

V

The record proves that the Soviet rulers are only interested in a European settlement on their own terms. This means, of course, a settlement which, on the one hand, would give formal sanction to their past conquests and, on the other hand, would undermine the foundations of the free part of Europe to such an extent that a Communist political conquest will only be a matter of time.

Every sign of Western hesitation, every call for more flexibility, every proposal which, in effect, would weaken the power of resistance of the West or is calculated to bring the Western position closer to the Soviet terms—far from generating more reasonableness only strengthens the conviction of the Soviet rulers that their own inflexibility is paying handsome dividends. Such attitudes and moves confirm indeed the Kremlin in its belief that an unyielding position on the substance of the European issue, combined with tireless agitations for "peace" and "negotiations," will compel the West to pass from one concession to another until the acceptance of the Soviet terms, in a facesaving formulation, will appear the least dangerous course.

The practical result of Western peace plans which, in return for some form of German reunification, would sacrifice the rest of Central and Eastern Europe and, at the same time, cripple the defenses of Western Europe—would be to sow confusion and distrust in the free world, and to weaken, both in the free and the captive part of Europe, the will to stand up to Soviet Communist expansion and domination.

VI

The firmness the Western Powers have shown on the Berlin issue is apt to lead to a turning point in the contest between the forces of freedom and those of Communist slavery. A clear political victory on the Berlin issue would provide the Western Powers with a most favorable psychological moment for a new approach to the problem of peacemaking in Europe.

Discarding some of the theories on which negotiations with the Soviet Union were conducted in the past seems to be the first requirement of a new approach. It has now been proved that the Soviet Union is only interested in a settlement on its own terms which would be tantamount to a Western surrender. It has further been demonstrated that the only practical result of Western proposals designed to meet half-way the Soviet terms is to whittle down the determination of the free and the resistance of the enslaved. The West should therefore no longer adjust its plans and proposals to what appears as realistic and reasonably acceptable to the Soviet Union. The practice of entering negotiations with minimal positions, often at the expense of principles, has been tried. It has failed and should be abandoned.

The positive aspects of a new approach would consist of the proclamation of a forthright, inspiring and comprehensive Western plan for a just and lasting European settlement, to be followed by persistent efforts to put it into practice. Such a plan would reaffirm the right of all European nations to independence and freedom, and would indicate procedures to restore these rights to nations which had been deprived of them.

In the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration of the United Nations, the Declaration on Liberated Europe, in the United Nations Charter, in the Universal Declaration and the European Convention of Human Rights—the Western Powers already possess the legal and political foundations of a just European order. For greater impact the principles could be solemnly reaffirmed in the form of a charter of the rights, duties, and aims of the peoples of Europe. The principle that the will of the people, as expressed in periodical free elections, is the only legitimate basis of government—would become the law of Europe. And as a further guarantee of the observance of the principles of self-determination a European electoral code could lay down the conditions in which elections must be held to qualify as free.

The proposed plan of a European settlement would have to deal specifically with the application of these principles to divided Germany and to the captive nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. It would have to provide both for the reunification of Germany in freedom and for the restoration of freedom and independence to the captive nations through free and unfettered elections under international supervision, after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents from their territories. Lastly, it would have to contain both safeguards against attempts from the outside to obstruct the process of European integration and provisions for an effective mutual security system which would afford equal help and protection to all concerned.

The successful promotion of a European settlement along these lines puts great demands upon the Western Powers. It requires from them a consistent, firm and coordinated policy and a great effort both in diplomacy and in political warfare. It enjoins them never to permit Soviet military power to remain without an adequate counterweight. It impels them to keep in mind all the objectives of the plan and never sacrifice one in order to achieve another.

But the successful promotion of the proposed plan promises as an early reward, to strengthen the moral position of the Western Powers and to restore confidence in their steadfastness. It promises as the next reward, to bolster the resistance of the captive peoples and to set in motion political pressures that could create the conditions in which the Soviets would feel compelled to yield. And as the crowning reward, it promises to establish European peace on a solid basis and thus chase away the dire alternatives of war or step by step surrender.

## National Congress of American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to remarks made by the Honorable Joseph R. Garry, president of the National Congress of American Indians, on March 19, 1959, at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH R. GARRY, PRESIDENT OF NCAI, MARCH 19, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Toastmaster, honorable Members of Congress, Mr. Commissioner, guests, friends, and my fellow American Indian tribesmen, it is with deep pride and gratitude that I am privileged—as president of the American Indians' only national all-Indian organization—to honor the U.S. Congress, the officials of our Federal Government, on behalf of our membership.

We are especially gratified this evening to see such a large attendance from Capitol Hill.

By taking time out from your heavy schedule to meet with us tonight reflects your appreciation for our faith in you.

This is the third year in a row we have met here to pay our respects to the Nation's lawmakers. In the 15 years of our history as a national Indian organization, we have repeatedly paid tribute to Congress. The turnout tonight is one of the largest we have enjoyed. I know I speak for all of our members when I say we are glad to have you with us. You are our first line of defense. We have confidence in you. We have brought our problems to you many, many times in the years past, and you may be sure that we will continue to do so.

While we may seem to be in disagreement with certain policies of the Government, and while we come to you time and again for one measure after another, you can be sure we appreciate what you do accomplish for us. You are our representatives in our unique relationship with the Federal Government. Our purposes in NCAI are constructive purposes. We have always contributed to American society. We want to develop our resources, improve our conditions, and maintain the values and beauty in our culture, not only because we are proud of them but also for all America to enjoy.

And we want the BIA to work with us in the great tasks ahead. We want it to continue and to do a better and better job as partners with us in improving our communities and contributing to the total society in which we live.

The constructive and friendly nature of our organization, therefore, makes it distasteful to deal in negative attacks. However, we take this opportunity to set the record straight. We want the entire Nation—even the whole world—to know that the real American Indians deplore the tactics which were used in this Capital today by the misguided group which staged a demonstration at the White House.

We are pleased that Voice of America people are here to meet the official Indian leadership.

We fear that uninformed persons received a wrong impression from that demonstration and the statements made by the persons who purported to speak in behalf of the American Indians.

I want to make it unmistakably clear that we deplore the publicity stunt of appealing to foreign nations for settlement of American Indian affairs.

We strongly endorse the United Nations. We look upon it as a major contributor to preserving peace in the world. We give it our full support.

But we do not regard the United Nations—and we are sure the U.N. does not so regard itself—as an appropriate forum for deciding our American Indian questions.

The American Indian is an American citizen. He is an American in the fullest sense of the word.

In fact, I venture to say that Indians have a love of this great land of ours unexcelled by any other Americans.

There is frequent reference to our record of voluntary enlistments, war bond purchases, and Congressional Medals of Honor as the highest per capita of any group in America.

We are enormously proud of that record. We refuse to have it besmirched by outsiders who attempt to use our people for their own selfish purposes.

It was a disappointment to us that any Indian people became involved in this regrettable spectacle. We are confident they have been misguided, and even victimized.

I am informed that the Bureau of Indian Affairs received a telegram today. Over the signatures on it was this line:

"Signed by the duly elected chiefs."

The wire said the group which disgraced itself here today is a self-appointed faction which does not represent the St. Regis Mohawk Tribe of New York. The wire said the leaders of the group are not members of the tribe, that they secured signatures to their petition on the false grounds that it was a school census, and that due to publicity they received today, "the widespread harm they are doing reflects on innocent people and we bitterly oppose such tactics."

I want to make it crystal clear that the general does not speak, as he claims to speak, for the Indian people in America. On the contrary, he is doing them a great disservice by casting a cloud on their unswerving patriotism.

The National Congress of American Indians repudiates his astonishing lack of responsibility. We deplore, as our brothers everywhere deplore, such harmful actions. Our organization has achieved magnificent accomplishments by working with and through the branches of our Federal Government.

We have won these gains, not by rabble rousing, but by legislation—with the help of you, the Members of the U.S. Congress; by negotiation—with help from you, who are officials of the executive branch of the Government—and by orderly court procedures, with the help of you who are our attorneys and officers of the courts, the judicial branch.

This is our own Government.

Through our treaties, we enjoy a unique relationship with our Government. We cherish every opportunity to preserve the special responsibilities which our country has assumed for us under these treaties.

We have only one obligation of loyalty that is greater than that to our country. That loyalty is to our Creator. As to our earthly citizenship we who are American Indians are the first Americans. Any man who raises his hand against this country raises it against us. Let there be no doubt whatsoever that we reject him.

## Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include copy of my newsletter for this week:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

What is it like to dine on surplus agricultural commodities—the sole source of food supply for about 300,000 unfortunate West Virginians?

Members of the West Virginia congressional delegation found out at its weekly delegation breakfast in the Vandenburg Room of the Capitol recently. The meal was prepared exclusively from the food items which are now available to recipients of surplus commodities.

Each breakfast consisted of 1¾ ounces of flour, three-quarters ounce of meal, two-thirds ounce of powdered milk, one-third ounce butter and one-third ounce of rice. But the breakfast served to each of the two Senators and six Members of the House was equivalent to a one-meal ration for an entire family up to three persons.

As I ate the breakfast I could not help but think of the thousands of families who have nothing more to look forward to each day than the skimpy meal which can be prepared with available commodities. And I was further reminded of how tragic it must be for a family of three to have to make an entire meal from the amount which I was eating for breakfast.

The diet of surplus commodities is wholly inadequate, especially for growing children. It provides only 26 percent of the needed calories, 36 percent of the necessary protein, and 46 percent of the necessary calcium.

Yet, many families have to depend entirely upon the commodities made available to them from Government warehouses. They do not have the means to supplement them in any way.

Members of the delegation hoped, by dining on the surplus commodities, to dramatize the plight of so many of our people. It is a part of our campaign to convince leaders in the executive branch of our Government and in the Congress of the need to start a coordinated program to provide both immediate and long-range help to West Virginia.

We have hammered away at this one thing ever since Congress reconvened. We are working as a team to bring flood control and other public works projects to the State to create desperately needed jobs. We are demanding that other commodities be added to the list which is now available to our unfortunate families. And more importantly, we want an economic redevelopment program under which West Virginia can attract new industries and businesses to provide permanent jobs for our people.

It is tragic that with warehouses literally bulging with surplus commodities of all kinds a more adequate diet cannot be provided to people who are unable to find employment. This is not a problem confined to West Virginia. Other States, in all sections of the country, are also suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment.

In West Virginia able-bodied men simply cannot find work. At the end of January 67,928 active applications for employment were on file. Regular State unemployment benefits had been exhausted by 47,432 of our people, and 19,468 unemployed had exhausted benefits under the temporary extension program. Thousands of others have joined them in the last 3 months.

People should not be permitted to go hungry in this land of plenty. I am more convinced than ever now that people who must live on the skimpy diet surplus foods provide are hungry citizens. And I am afraid that their children will carry through life the effects of the insufficient diet they are now forced to eat.

## Our Country's Scientific Manpower Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent controversies concerning our country's scientific manpower shortage, I wish to submit for my colleagues careful inspection a most interesting speech on this subject by Mr. William A. Douglass before the Scientific Manpower Commission, here in Washington on February 5, 1959. I believe Mr. Douglass' views on this subject will be of interest to all Members of Congress, Government officials concerned with scientific manpower and leaders of industry. It should be of particular interest to those who are members of the House and Senate Armed Services, Government Operations, and Post Office and Civil Service Committees—and, especially, to those who are members of the special House Armed Services Subcommittee recently named to study all phases of defense manpower utilization.

Mr. Douglass is president of Careers, Inc., which publishes the trade magazine Career: For the Experienced Engineer and Scientist and operates the National Manpower Register, as a national clearinghouse for information on scientific and engineering openings and personnel. He has written a number of articles for general circulation magazines on his specialty, scientific manpower. He has spoken before many scientific groups and has appeared both on radio and TV as a manpower expert.

The speech follows:

A SPEECH BY WILLIAM A. DOUGLASS, PRESIDENT OF CAREERS, INC., BEFORE THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER COMMISSION, FEBRUARY 5, 1959

We are all familiar with Aesop's fable of the shepherd boy who cried wolf. He cried wolf so often that when the wolf did in reality appear among the flock, nobody paid any attention.

I wonder if those of us concerned with the Nation's scientific and engineering personnel have cried our nuclear era counterpart of wolf to the point that no one any longer pays any attention. Our wolf is, of course, the claimed shortage of scientific manpower, and the dangers that deficiency holds for us as free people.

If only to be heard, I am going to suggest today that this scientific manpower shortage is not as great as we perhaps believe, and that an immediate improvement of this situation can be found in the better placement of existing manpower. It is an anachronism of our age that it is still so difficult to get the right man and the right job together.

I would not suggest for a moment that here lies the entire answer, for obviously placement does not affect the education and training of scientists, the numbers entering the field, and so on. At this level the danger signals are indeed great. Education Commissioner Lawrence Derthick, figuring that the need for scientists and engineers in this age of technology increases about 20 times as fast as the general population increases, has claimed a shortage of 9,000 engineers a year for our country over the next 10 years. Dr. Ray C. Maul, of the National Education Association, has revealed a quality shortage, too. His statistics show a steady deterioration in the academic achievement of newly employed teachers. And Dr. James Killian, Jr., using figures which I presume were supplied by Dr. Armsby, poses more problems for the future with his statement that after 7 years of rising enrollments, the number of college freshmen entering engineering courses this year dropped 11 percent. This was in the face, by the way, of an overall rise in enrollments for all courses of 7 percent.

The question of effective placement of manpower is an area in which I and my associates at Careers, Inc., work every day. It is an area in which American business spends some $2 billion a year. But, I'm getting ahead of my story. Placement is

only part of the picture, important as it is.

I would like, today, to consider first the role of education and then the engineer and scientist himself.

First, I think, we must admit that we have a problem and that we are going to have to effectuate programs not with the idea of some quick solution but with the idea of some consistent solution.

No one likes problems. I was told recently that people are tired of hearing about manpower shortages. I just hope that such ostrich opinions do not prevail. A basic ingredient of our capitalistic system is the ability of private enterprise to recognize and meet its needs. If we are to successfully meet the challenge of these times, we must not wait until the crisis has reached a point of no return. The need for realistic, consistent, and far thinking action has become our mandate for survival.

How can we improve our scientific manpower situation? Well, now, gentlemen, I can tell you this. It is very quick and easy to say, "What can we do about it?" But there is no quick, easy, newspaper headline answer. Economists Keezer and Chartener of McGraw-Hill hit the nail on the head sometime ago when they called for concerted efforts on the part of business, Government, and education at several stages. In an able, enlightening presentation before the American Management Association, they indicated that we must attack also with patience. The war front ranges from the improvement of grammar school arithmetic to getting more money for the exploration of the upper reaches of nuclear physics.

Let's begin with education. I once ran into a publication called Adventures Ahead. It seems to me this title might well be the guide rule of all education in the sciences. This means for teachers—and those who educate teachers—a willingness to change, a willingness to dramatize in modern ways, a willingness to participate both in school and out of school in activities which will bring home to young people and their parents the adventures ahead in science, not how hard it is to learn arithmetic. This calls for educational leadership which thinks young, leadership, which is able to sell its programs to Government, industry, and the people.

I was present when Dr. Maul told the American Association for the Advancement of Science of the steady deterioration in the academic quality of newly employed teachers. A questioner at the time asked Dr. Maul if leadership was not, after all, a more important quality for teachers than advanced degrees. The question is picayune. The field of education needs men with both leadership and the highest level of academic excellence. I see no valid reason why the greatest and wealthiest Nation in the world should have to face any long-term acceptance of mediocrity. It's about time we learn on which side our bread is buttered. Deterioration of education means deterioration of everything we stand for.

Now, let's talk individuals—individual scientists and individual engineers—the prime concern of my being here with you today. Engineers or scientists are truly professional persons. If we are to derive the maximum benefits of their labors, and further encourage youth to join in their labors, we must be fair with them in this regard. What are the roots of professionalism? I submit that the answer lies in two big S's—status and security. Status denotes position and recognition. Security means peace of mind. The possession of both allows for the highest level of professional motivation.

Let's dwell on these for a moment.

Dignity and integrity, without which there can be no status, are amongst the inherent desires of all engineers and scientists. As professional men, their motivation lies ideally along the same lines as that of educators, doctors, government career men, and the like. And just like these people, engineers and scientists cannot thrive under managements which push them around like so many production personnel.

John Flynn of the College of Industrial Technology at Boston University expressed my sentiments well in a paper before the American Management Association, in which he stated that while industry is willing to spend time and money to attract needed engineers, it tends to neglect the fact that successful employment of engineering talent is dependent on what happens to the man when he goes on the job. Mr. Flynn suggests that more attention be given to the professional motivation of the engineer on the job.

We must welcome and encourage those recruiting efforts which emphasize the development of scientific and engineering careers along professional lines. We must make sure that these programs do not live or die in direct correlation to the successes and failures of Soviet sputniks and luniks.

It is gratifying to see our Federal Government take the lead in a sound recruitment policy. Mr. N. J. Oganovic of the Civil Service Commission told some of us the other day about their recruiting emphasis on such things as the integrity of scientific research, the challenging problems being tackled daily by Government facilities, the growing use of noncollege graduate technical assistants to aid graduate and advance degree engineers in their work, and the exceptional facilities and working conditions available to those who want to learn more.

You perhaps have noted that I have skirted the subject of money so far. I submit that employers who use money in the form of sky-rocketing starting salaries and endless fringe benefits in order to lure men into a profession are doing that profession no good. They are trying to "buy off" a problem instead of thinking it through. It seems ridiculous to me that engineers and scientists should be literally bought out of college at levels far, far higher than any other form of professional personnel. Any employer who intimates to a young engineer that he can both have professional status and the income of an entrepreneur has not only grossly misled that young person, but is already asking for future personnel trouble.

Security is a more difficult subject. Intellectuality thrives on security and therefore scientists and engineers being of the academic world also thrive on it. The great majority of our country's engineers and scientists work directly or indirectly for the Government. That is, they work within the armed services, or as civilian employees of the Government, or for private companies working on defense contracts. The amount of Government expenditure on their particular activity depends on such outside forces as world events, the politics of budget planning, and the ability of their employer to stay up to date, well organized, and with a good backlog of orders. Frictional unemployment—the giving in to change—is an unfortunate but necessary aspect of the capitalistic system. Private enterprise thrives on mobility. It is dynamic.

Employment changes are, therefore, constant.

If the mobility of private enterprise and the security of engineers and scientists are to be made compatible with each other, we must facilitate switches from unneeded to needed forms of employment with the greatest ease possible. On this subject, gentlemen, I would like to say a word about the efforts of my organization.

Ten years ago my college classmates and I needed employment ourselves. Korean war shortages brought every day a host of companies to our campus. The multiplicity of opportunity was itself confusing. This may at first seem a bit paradoxical to those of you who had to look for your first jobs in harder times, but job offers and beautiful women have one similarity. It is easier to choose from a choice of one than of many.

Our answer to this situation, as undergraduates, was to publish page-long comparative profiles of every company coming to our campus before it came there. In this way we hoped to eliminate some needless blind alleys and facilitate our concentration on those employers with real appeal to us. The idea was evidently a good one. It was the beginning of Careers, Inc. More than 1 million copies of our annually revised publication have now been distributed without cost to college seniors.

Employers pay the entire cost of our work, so over the years we have become most responsive to the nature of their needs also. Last year we began distributing a new publication specifically for experienced engineers and scientists. Some 60 leading companies now support this project on annual contracts. Their needs are released quarterly in the form of a publication and at 6-week intervals in the form of a newsletter. Through the magnificent cooperation of people at the National Science Foundation, we have been able to adapt their thousand-digit code of technical proficiences into the daily service of getting men and jobs together. One hundred and twenty-five thousand copies of this new publication have already been distributed.

We, therefore, feel that the work of our organization both recognizes the essential mobility of private enterprise and the best interests of those who need authoritative job information.

To conclude, we have challenged the immediate presence of a scientific manpower shortage in this country because of the gross inequities in placement of available personnel which myself and my staff discover daily in our travels, our surveys, and our mailbox.

We have further asked for recognition of the long-term shortages which do indeed face us and which can be avoided only by inspired and consistent action on the part of our educators and our employers.

Can all this be done? Are we naive to talk this way in a country where the academically excellent are often tabbed "eggheads"?

Let's inspect the competition. The Russians in 50 years have taken a largely illiterate population and developed an education system that rivals ours. How insurmountable the task must have seemed in the beginning. They are, furthermore, from all reports, far advanced in the creation of a society where scients and engineers at all levels enjoy national recognition.

Recognition in this country will mean so much more. Our secret weapon is that free society communism can never offer. Without this freedom their recognition of scientists and engineers becomes a mockery.

I hope our leaders—leaders in government, business, education, labor, the press—will once and for all recognize the long-term nature of this serious problem. Its very magnitude presents a great opportunity for a long-needed "new look" in the American way of life—the emergence of the scientist as the equal partner of the entrepreneur.

## Record of Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that today the Nation faces the

challenge of creating an improved farm program.

Despite the high costs of the current program, surpluses continue to pile up, and the American farmer still is not receiving a proportionate share of the national income.

Unfortunately, the continuation of this situation dims the outlook for farming and greatly reduces the opportunity—as well as the prospects for success—for youth interested in making agriculture a career.

According to surveys, about 65 percent of the young people now growing up on America's farms will have to look outside of farming for a career.

Today, however, I want to pay tribute to the membership of a fine program who—despite the problems and challenges in agriculture—are training themselves for careers in agriculture—that is the Future Farmers of America.

In Wisconsin, for example, membership in our 283 FFA chapters totals more than 14,000.

Under the constructive leadership of our State and local officers and leaders, these chapters are engaging in a wide variety of constructive programs for the development of skill, training and education in farming, as well as training and experience in personal development and citizenship.

Currently, plans are being made for a State convention of our Wisconsin FFA for June 8–11 at Green Lake, Wis. The goal is to make the convention itself a success, as well as include efforts to expand and improve the State FFA programs.

We recall, of course, that the FFA proram is an outgrowth of the overall vocational education program first established in 1917 by the enactment of the National Vocational Education—Smith-Hughes—Act.

As I have stressed previously in the Senate, I believe that the strengthening of this overall vocational training program—as well as the expansion of FFA work—is vital to the future of agriculture in the United States.

To give my colleagues the benefit of the size, scope, and activity of our constructive FFA programs in Wisconsin—to emphasize the need for improving and expanding constructive efforts in this field—I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the 1957–58 annual report of the Wisconsin Association of Future Farmers of America printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

A. ORGANIZATION

*Size and scope*

1. Total number chartered active local chapters, 283.

2. Total active membership in chartered chapters, 14,022.

3. Total number eligible departments of vocational agriculture without FFA chapters, 2.

B. MEMBERSHIP DISTRIBUTION AND STATUS

*Present distribution of active membership, by degrees*

1. Total number of active members now holding green hand degree, 5,499.

2. Total number of active members now holding chapter farmer degree, 8,245.

3. Total number of active members now holding State farmer degree, 242.

4. Total number of active members now holding American farmer degree, 36.

5. Total active membership, 14,022.

6. Total number of honorary chapter farmers elected during the year, 107.

7. Total number of honorary State farmers elected during the year, 10.

C. PARTICIPATION IN THE NATIONAL PROGRAM OF WORK

*I. Supervised farming*

1. Number of members who have a comprehensive farming program in operation, 13,594.

2. Number of members who received FFA Foundation Medals for outstanding achievement on a local level in: Farm mechanics, 283; dairy farming, 283; farm safety, 283; soil and water management, 283; farm electrification, 283; chapter star farmer, 283.

3. Number of chapters that conducted activities specifically designed to improve livestock production of FFA members, 214.

4. Number of chapters engaged in organized activities designed to promote livestock loss prevention, 132.

5. Number of chapters that conducted activities specifically designed to improve crop production of FFA members, 232.

6. Number of chapters that sponsored activities specifically designed to improve the keeping of farm records and accounts, 203.

7. Number of chapters that sponsored activities specifically designed to provide proper training in farm mechanics, 194.

8. Number of chapters that sponsored activities that helped FFA members build or improve home farm shops, 161.

9. Number of chapters that conducted tours of FFA members farming programs, 132.

*II. Cooperation*

1. Number of members who were provided experience in local chapter: (a) Livestock cooperative activities (i.e., pig chain), 2,332; (b) crop cooperative activities (i.e., buying seed corn), 4,066.

2. Number of chapters that provided cooperative activities that involved group planning, group financing, and group participation, 226.

*III. Community service*

1. Number of members completing home beautification or improvement projects, 3,262.

2. Number of chapters completing school beautification projects, 133.

3. Number of chapters that conducted a safety campaign, 125.

4. Does State association have a safety program in operation? Yes.

5. Number of chapters engaging in organized conservation work (with soils, water, trees, protection of wildlife, prevention of forest fires, vital materials, etc.), 220.

*IV. Leadership*

1. Number of members who participated in a public speaking contest, 4,163.

2. Number of chapters that held a public speaking contest, 156.

3. Number of chapters using accepted form of parliamentary procedure in conducting chapter meetings, 238.

4. Number of chapters participating in a parliamentary procedure contest, above the chapter level, 0.

5. Number of chapters having revised, written, continuing program of work, 229.

6. Does the State association have a revised, written, continuing program of work? Yes.

7. If the State association provided leadership training schools or conferences for local chapter officers and members please indicate. Yes. Total member participation, 1,842; total number of chapters participating, 205.

8. Total number of chapters within the State visited by State boy officers during the past year, 86.

*V. Earnings and savings*

1. Number of chapters that prepared a budget, 186.

2. Number of chapters that earned enough money to finance chapter activities, 236.

*VI. Conduct of meetings*

1. Number of members who have access to the latest revised official manual, 10,916.

2. Number of chapters using official chapter secretary's book, 219.

3. Number of chapters using official chapter treasurer's book, 210.

4. Number of chapters possessing full meeting equipment as listed in the manual, 233.

5. Does the State association possess full meeting equipment as listed in the Manual? Yes.

6. Number of chapters using the official opening and closing ceremonies for regular meetings, 224.

7. Number of chapters using official degree ceremonies, 201.

8. Number of chapters holding regular meetings at least once per month during school term, 218.

9. If the State association held a convention, please indicate: Delegate attendance, 402. Total attendance, 9,000. Number of chapters represented at this convention, 201. Did State association officers use official opening and closing ceremonies? Yes. Did State association officers use official State farmer degree ceremony? Yes.

*VII. Scholarship*

1. Number of chapters that conducted activities specifically designed to stimulate members to improve their scholarship, 208.

2. Number of chapters having libraries with 5 or more different FFA books, 220.

*VIII. Recreation*

1. Number of chapters that provided supervised recreation for its members, 210.

2. Did State association have a State camp in operation during the year? Yes. Name and location of camp: Jag Lake Camp, Vilas County. Length of camping period: Each group 4 days. Number of members attending State camp, 150. Number of chapters represented, eight.

3. Number of chapters conducting an educational tour (i.e., group attendance at livestock show, tour of packing plant, experiment farm, etc.), 219.

4. Number of chapters conducting an organized society activity (i.e., FFA-FHA party), 188.

*IX. Public relations*

1. Number of chapters preparing publicity material regularly, 194.

2. Did the State association put out a State paper, periodical, or news letter? Yes.

3. Number of chapters that have participated in one or more radio programs, 54.

4. Number of radio programs arranged by the State association, 26. Number of radio stations used, two.

5. Number of chapters that have participated in 1 or more TV programs, 27.

6. Number of TV programs arranged by the State association, seven. Number of television stations used, three.

7. Number of members showing livestock at fairs, 3,027.

8. Number of members showing crop products at fairs, 2,089.

9. Number of chapters preparing educational or promotional exhibits for public display (including open house), 177.

10. Number of chapters presenting one or more programs to a civic club or other organizations, 96.

11. Number of chapters presenting high school assembly programs, 57.

12. Number of chapters conducting a parent-son banquet, 163.

13. Did the State association conduct a good-will tour of State officers to promote the FFA program in the State? Yes.

D. PARTICIPATION IN STATE AND NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. Number of chapters submitting applications for 1 or more candidates for the State farmer degree, 141.

2. Number of chapters nominating candidates for the American farmer degree, 25.

3. Number of chapters submitting applications for the following FFA foundation awards: Farm mechanics, 8; farm electrification, 5; dairy farming, 12; farm safety, 35; soil and water management, 7.

4. Percentage of State membership subscribing to the National Future Farmer magazine, ?

5. Number of chapters participating in the FFA calendar service, 49.

6. Number of chapters participating in the purchasing of supplies from the Future Farmer Supply Service, 235.

7. Number of members participating in judging contests sponsored or supervised by the State association, 1,309.

8. Number of chapters that participated in National FFA Week, 210.

9. If the State association planned and participated in National FFA Week please indicate. Association provided suggested materials to chapters.

10. Number of members attending last National FFA convention, 102.

11. Number of chapters having members attend the National FFA convention, 30.

E. FFA COLLEGIATE CHAPTERS

1. Number of collegiate chapters, 3. Total membership: River Falls, 194; University, 44.

## Congratulations to the Allentown Morning Call, Allentown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, at a time, in our history and the affairs of the world when it was never more important that the American people be well informed, it is regrettable that the number of daily newspapers in the United States has been declining.

As the result of high costs of production and newsprint, as well as competition for the advertisers' dollar from other media of communication, many newspapers have ceased publication or been merged with others, in spite of the country's increasing population.

In view of this situation, Mr. Speaker, it is particularly heartening to note a landmark in the history of the Morning Call and Evening Chronicle, of Allentown, Pa.

The Call-Chronicle newspapers have just passed a mark of 100,000 in their daily net paid circulation—a position achieved by less than 10 percent of all daily newspapers in the Nation, either individually or in combination.

This puts Allentown with Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Harrisburg as the only communities in Pennsylvania, with newspapers that reach more than 100,000 homes.

The paper is subscribed to by thousands in the Lehigh Valley. We have many common interests in the welfare of the entire Lehigh Valley and I am happy to congratulate the management of the Call-Chronicle upon its achievement.

May it continue to prosper and serve the people of this area for many long years to come.

## The Larger Meaning of Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a splendid editorial in the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union recently pointed up the larger meaning of the enactment of the Hawaiian statehood bill. The addition of this 50th State to the Union gives eloquent testimonial to the continuing vitality of the American credo of equality for all men, regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

The moral of Hawaiian statehood will not be lost on the peoples of the Pacific area, who are today seeking new means for progress and development. Hawaii as a State shows these emerging peoples that America continues to hold high the banner of freedom—freedom for all men who are willing to work and fight to earn it.

I ask unanimous consent to have the excellent Times-Union editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Times-Union, Mar. 16, 1959]

FIFTIETH STAR COMPLETES CYCLE, ONE FLAG FOR ALL RACES

The 50th star in the flag has a special meaning. It will stand for the State of Hawaii which is no greater or no less than any of the 49 States, all being exactly equal in rights and privileges within the Union.

SINGLE ORIGIN

But in a significant way the 50th star completes a cycle. The United States sprang from English colonies planted on the eastern seaboard. They were homogeneous in blood and in political and cultural background. The framework of our institutions was built around the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

As the Nation expanded westward it absorbed Spanish colonies in the Southwest—one of them antedating Plymouth Rock—and French settlements, partly composed of exiles from Acadia. Immigration brought all the races of northern Europe at first and later all those of southern Europe. Africans were brought unwillingly and in time became full citizens.

The flag covered them all. But Asians were rare, usually unwelcome, and commonly became citizens only in the second generation by right of birth within the United States. Yet they dug the tunnels and ran the steel rails over and through the high Sierras that tied the country together.

The sons of once unwelcome Asian settlers, American citizens, fought in the Second World War with a combat record unequaled by any other American unit.

The 50th star is a sharp break with this tradition of limited opportunity for Asians. Its special luster is that it spectacularly affirms our national belief that a form of government built on Anglo-Saxon rights and duties, and under which so many races have become free men, is applicable also to people who look west for their origins instead of east.

The varied races of Hawaii have been Americans as citizens of the Territory. As citizens of the State of Hawaii, the Polynesians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Portuguese, and mixed bloods become self-governing people whose privileges and immunities under the Constitution may not be abridged.

So at last the flag that began with 13 stars representing a homogeneous people becomes well-nigh universal, not territorially, but sheltering under its folds individuals from all the races of men who dwell upon all the face of the earth, with equal standing for all.

FULL SCOPE

There is far more significance in this than in the creation of a State by simply running survey lines. It gives the flaming testaments of freedom of the American Revolution their full scope and meaning.

## New Jersey Soldiers Sit on "World's Powder Keg"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have become accustomed, perhaps, to thinking of the Berlin crisis in terms of diplomatic meetings, high-level policy, and negotiations among nations. I should like to submit an article to remind us of the American man in uniform who are stationed in Berlin. The wallet card the men carry tells what they are doing there:

To show the Berliners, your allies, and the the Communists, the best soldiers in our Army.

To protect U.S. lives and property.

To help the West Berlin police to keep law and order.

To fight like hell, if necessary, for U.S. rights and a free Berlin.

This story deals only with men from New Jersey. They, and the soldiers who represent other States, are closest to the fighting we hope and pray will never come.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Newark Sunday News of March 8, 1959, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY SOLDIERS SIT ON "WORLD'S POWDER KEG"

(By Stuart H. Loory)

If, within the next 2 years, fighting breaks out between Western and Communist troops in the divided city of Berlin, a small tough sergeant from Asbury Park, N.J., will be in the forefront as the leader of a U.S. Army machine-gun squad.

Sfc. Joseph L. Daudier, 34, the New Jerseyan, can be expected to make the most of the battle for two reasons: Fighting is his job and he relishes a job well done; he has much at stake, since his wife and four sons live with him in this enclave of freedom 110 miles behind the Iron Curtain.

As residents of West Berlin, the Daudiers live in the world's most dangerous powder keg. For a few weeks last fall it appeared that the keg might suddenly go up in a world-shaking explosion. But as Russian policy twisted into a less immediately dangerous line, Daudier and the rest of the GIs began to call the Russian statements "just a bluff."

"I do not think the Russians are ready for war," Daudier said.

Nevertheless, Daudier and his men work hard at maintaining bayonet-sharp combat skills. They train within gunshot of the boundary line between West Berlin and the Soviet Zone of Germany. One American rifle range is no farther away from the border than the length of a football field. Curiously, though, the close proximity of a potential enemy has little effect on the troops.

Training here is a game, although certainly a deadly serious one, in which men killed or wounded (theoretically) become points in a squad's score much the same way a football team wins points for scoring touchdowns.

After training, the GIs take part in the civilian life of deceivingly gay West Berlin. For Daudier, the hours between afternoon dismissal and 5:30 a.m. reveille are devoted to a family life no different from the one he might lead in Asbury Park.

The family lives in a comfortable seven-room apartment in a handsomely landscaped garden-type development for married military personnel. From the Army commissary supermarket in which Mrs. Daudier, the former Clementine Virgilio, of Asbury Park, shops for groceries, to the modern brick and glass building in which the children attend school, the military community resembles a New Jersey residential suburb.

For the unmarried enlisted men, after-hour activity includes promenades on the Kurfurstendamm, the 2-mile-long boulevard that is West Berlin's answer to both Fifth Avenue and Broadway, or a stop in one of the hundreds of bars or a movie (American films are shown in English in the five theaters on the base and in German in the plush, brandnew downtown cinemas).

Perhaps one of the things that keeps the crisis so psychologically remote from Daudier and his men is the fact that they can, if they choose, lead a completely normal American life right down to frozen TV dinners and soft drinks (imported from the United States) in a land where hot wurst and Pilsener beer are standards.

Despite the fact that the men live in a city where the loose nerve endings of East and West rub perilously, where Russian and American troops brush elbows in crowded subways, where world war III could have its beginning, the troops here worry not about a great issue of our time in which they, more than any Americans, are involved. They worry, instead, about the small things in life.

Pvt. Ernest R. Williams, 19, of 672 Springfield Avenue, Newark, a rifleman in the 2d Battle Group, arrived in Berlin from Fort Dix, where he recently completed his basic training. "I haven't been reading about the situation here," Williams said, "and I'm not worried about it." His concern was whether the noncommissioned officers in his company would be "RA (for Regular Army) all the way." If they were, Williams knew he would be in for a strictly disciplined tour of duty.

Pfc. Henry T. Cohen, 19, of 109 Hudson Street, Hoboken, is an expert senior rifleman in the 2d Battle Group. Unlike most of his comrades, he said he had been "following the situation pretty carefully" and added with the optimism that is so noticeable here that the crisis "is just another thing that's going to work itself out."

The big concern for Cohen, a former high-scoring center on the St. Peter's Prep basketball team in Jersey City, was how he could fulfill his military obligations and still play a good game of basketball on the post team. "It's just too much for a guy to train and play ball both," he said.

Despite their concern over such things as basketball and the nature of a squad leader, the men still have a mission that is monumental. Defined by the Army, their task is:

"To protect U.S. lives and property."

"To help West Berlin police to keep law and order."

These two roles stem from the status of the troops here as the last occupational forces from World War II still in Europe. Since there is no civil turbulence to speak of in West Berlin, the occupational duties present no problem. In fact, GI's say "technically, we are an occupational Army," stressing the word technically.

As U.S. Government employees in the West Berlin showcase of democracy, the troops perform a third part of the mission:

"To show the Berliners, your allies and the Communists the best soldiers in our Army."

The ticklish part of the mission is point four:

"To fight like hell, if necessary for U.S. rights and a free Berlin."

It is toward possible fulfillment of this last role that the soldiers work with a seriousness and a pace that belie their calm. Berlin command headquarters says there has been no increase in training for the men since the beginning of the crisis last November.

But Daudier has noticed a new emphasis in the training. "Lately," he said, "we've been getting more training in combat in cities. We've been going through the course once a week since the fall." Previously, he said, training in close-in street fighting was given only sporadically.

This type of training, in view of the fact that West Berlin is a heavily settled area of 2,150,000 people, is among the most important through which Daudier leads his squad. But the men are also trained in open-area combat that would be important if they had to defend the road, rail, and canal links that run through Communist territory from West Germany to West Berlin.

Exercises, from small squad tests up to full-dress battle group maneuvers and sometimes even joint American-British-French maneuvers are held in the Grunewald, a large park and woods stretching from downtown Berlin south into the wealthy suburban residential areas. In the spring and summer the troops must share the park with young German lovers and picnicking families.

Through these woods Daudier and his men crept on a recent winter morning. The sky was gray and the wet cold was penetrating. A freezing rain made the matted leaves under foot crunchy. Atop a knoll, an "enemy" machinegun nest held a commanding position over the woods.

Daudier and his squad, divided into two teams of five men each, edged toward the nest to destroy it. Three hundred yards from their target, they were fired upon by blank ammunition from the guns.

The sergeant directed one of the teams to return the fire and then led the other on a flanking movement. Over a walkie-talkie he called for a two-minute concentration of mortar fire on the nest. During the barrage he prepared his five men for an assault on the enemy. Ten seconds before the assault all 10 squad members laid down a rifle barrage. Then, with fixed bayonets, Daudier and his men charged.

They took one wounded "prisoner" and "killed" one man in the skirmish. Eight of the "enemy" escaped. Daudier immediately ordered his men to dig in for a counterattack. It came and the squad held.

Suddenly the reality of the situation was broken when an officer yelled: "That's all."

Umpires went to work tallying up the score. Daudier had theoretically lost two of his men—one wounded and one killed. The squad had withstood the counterattack, had taken a prisoner and had captured important documents. Its score was the highest in the company, beating an 88 percent that had been the previous high. Daudier and his men had performed a good day's work.

That evening, Daudier sat in his living room talking with his wife and playing with his four boys, Richard, 10; Frank, 8; Joseph, 7, and Michael, 3. The conversation ran to whether the family should go to the movies, what they would have for dinner, how expensive or inexpensive things were in Berlin compared to home and what Daudier would do after he retired from the Army 6 years hence.

There was no talk of the sergeant's day except in reply to a visitor's questions, and then the replies were as brief as possible, indicating this was not a fit conversation for the family hearth.

The feeling that there will never be an attack predominates. Air Force Sgt. Thaddeus Kochanski, 28, or 154 Tonnelle Avenue, Jersey City, is a flight engineer stationed at Templehof Air Base, the West Berlin terminal of the 1948–49 airlift. If there ever was another airlift, he would probably be pressed into service on the "raisin bombers," as the Berliners dubbed the planes that kept them alive and free 10 years ago.

Round-faced and jovial, Kochanski smiled at a questioner and said, "So they're worried about us back home, are they? Well, I guess I better write and let them know I'm fine and that there isn't anybody coming over to kidnap us."

---

## Endorsement of the President's Budget Plan for Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. Martin K. Saethre, Pelican Rapids, Minn., enclosing a petition signed by himself and 145 others regarding the President's budget program.

The petition follows:

*To Whom It May Concern:*

We, the citizens and taxpayers in Otter Tail County, State of Minnesota, do hereby

wholeheartedly endorse President Eisenhower's budget plan for economy.

The views expressed in this petition are further substantiated by a volume of letters received from other individuals throughout my district.

## Still the Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Wednesday, March 18, 1959:

STILL THE GAP

President Eisenhower said nothing in his radio-television address Monday evening that is likely to dispel the grave doubts about the administration's deliberate decision to accept a period of marked inferiority to Russia in long-range missiles. His confident reassurances that American bomber striking power will bridge the gap in first-generation missile strength are disputed by many military experts who believe that production of the Atlas ICBM ought to be increased. Unless it is, this country faces the prospect of a Russian lead of at least three to one in long-range missile strength by 1961 or 1962.

If Soviet claims concerning the accuracy of their missiles are correct, America's intermediate-range missile bases in Britain and Europe and its bomber bases at home and overseas would be exposed to the threat of obliteration in a sudden Soviet strike. These bases are not "hardened," and there is no system to detect or to destroy incoming enemy ballistic missiles. Even with the maximum warning which later systems may provide, bomber and intermediate-range missile bases would have little chance to escape destruction.

The intercontinental-range Atlas, to be sure, is not wholly invulnerable. But the most advanced models can be protected against all but direct hits until shortly before actual launching. They are to be guided entirely by an inertial system, independent of ground controls which might be wiped out. Untried and cumbersome as the Atlas is, it may still give us the best chance of deterring an attack or of surviving an attack and penetrating enemy defenses during the early 1960's.

Perhaps it is a safe bet that as of now American bombers still constitute a solid deterrent to Soviet attack. Perhaps it is a reasonable speculation that 5 to 10 years hence advanced missiles like Polaris and Minuteman, coupled with improved warning and air defense systems, will make any enemy attack in that period unthinkable—although the budget for some advanced weapons development still seems inadequate. But in the early 1960's, the period for which procurement funds voted today will tell the story, the Soviet Union may well find itself in a position to risk all on a war. If at that time it should come to believe that American deterrent power would never be weaker, and should the internal Soviet power struggle produce a reckless or imprudent leader, the United States could face an impossible situation in which the only alternatives would be submission or annihilation.

If the cost of avoiding this risk were $50 billion or $100 billion, it might be reasonable to contemplate the disadvantages of diverting so much of our resources and to take the gamble. But the cost of maintaining something like parity in first-generation ICBM's, the most fearsome weapon man has yet contrived, is not $50 billion. It is, perhaps, a tenth of that sum. In a $500 billion economy, the cost is clearly bearable. Measured against the potential weakening of our diplomatic position, against the unthinkable consequences of war or surrender, the price of parity in long-range missiles looks like very cheap insurance, indeed. So far, the administration has failed to show why this price should not be paid. We think it should, and that this Congress ought to bend every effort to make such a policy effective.

## Attorney Charles H. McGlue Tells of Irish Fight for Freedom and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very learned and informative article written by Attorney Charles H. McGlue, a prominent attorney in Boston, Mass.

There is no doubt in my mind that Attorney McGlue has spent a great deal of time and effort in research in preparing material for this excellent statement on the Irish fight for freedom and liberty.

The writer is not only known for his interesting newspaper writings but no doubt is the one man in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who has more knowledge and is better advised on the primary and election laws in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I know that the Members of Congress will find this article most illuminating.

The article follows:

MCGLUE TELLS OF IRISH FIGHT FOR FREEDOM AND LIBERTY

(Charles H. McGlue, well known political figure in Massachusetts, tells of the battles for Liberty and Freedom by the Irish people in the following St. Patrick's Day article, "Irish Freedom Trail.")

My good friend over the years, the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York, once said that Patrick of Tara, saint and apostle of Ireland, by force of the very qualities of his saintliness, had made himself for 1,500 years the ruler of the hearts of the Irish people, and that it was no accident that the Irish people in turn should develop an unrivaled genius in the art of free government.

Let that thought set my theme and let us go along with the words of that great musical composer, the Dublin-born Irishman Victor Herbert. "It's a great-great day for the Irish, tonight," and so in memory, we will be with the ghosts of the galloping Gaels who fought their way, through six continents in order that all people everywhere might enjoy freedom from oppression and liberty to enjoy life as their Creator intended.

IRISH IMMORTALS

The pages of Ireland's fight for freedom has been illuminated by such names as Rory O'Moore in 1576, and Roger O'Moore in 1641; in 1778, Henry Grattan; the valaint Wolfe Tone in 1798; in 1803, the martyr Robert Emmett, and then came the great leader Daniel O'Connell, who secured Catholic emancipation for the people of Ireland; John Mitchell in 1848; James Stevens in 1865; the great parliamentarian Charles Stewart Parnell in 1881; and in 1916, the Easter Sunday martyrs Sheehy Skeffington, Thomas McDonough, Patrick Pearce, James Connelly, and Sir Roger Casement.

Very few are the countries on whose rolls of honor do not appear the names of Irish heroes and fighters for freedom. Although the Irish missionaries of religion and learning carried the torch of civilization and culture to all parts of Europe during the Dark Ages, following the fall of the Roman Empire, very little publicity has been given to the role of the Irish in the history of other nations.

IRISH FLEUR-DE-LYS

From 1692 to 1792, there was an Irish brigade in the French Army and over 500,000 Irishmen died in the service of France during that time. When King Louis XVIII dissolved the brigade in 1792, so as not to offend his English allies, he presented each regiment with a farewell banner, embroidered with an Irish harp, surrounded with shamrocks and fleur-de-Lys, and the motto inscribed thereon, "Semper et Ubique Fidelis" (always and everywhere faithful) a rare tribute.

During Napoleon's first empire, Henry Clarke, Duc de Feltre, and an Irishman, was the minister of war. Later, Marshall McMahon, a member of a famous Irish family, became the President of the French Republic, and to complete the French-Irish history, let it be stated that at Waterloo, it was an Irishman, the Iron Duke of Wellington, who defeated Napoleon and his armies.

SPANISH SHAMROCKS

Hibernia and Iberia have always been kin to each other ever since the reign of King Milesius, as well as the time when the Spanish Armada was sunk in the 16th century, and many Spaniards found the welcome mat awaiting them in Galway and the Aran Isles.

Not so well known, however, is the fact that Richard Wall, an Irishman, as Prime Minister of Spain under both King Ferdinand VI and King Charles III.

MIXED BOUQUETS

The Irish, however, were always good mixers and they appeared in many countries and in many causes. Naples was the base of an Irish brigade. The Austrian Army had hundreds of Irish recruits, many of whom reached the highest rank. Count Taafe, a member of a very distinguished Sligo family, played a very important role in Austro-Hungarian politics. In the olden days of the Russian Czars, Peter Lacy of Limerick became a brigadier general in the army of Peter the Great and later was made governor of Livonia.

LATIN AMERICAN GAELS

In the civil as well as in the military life of the 20 Latin American Republics which lie to the south of our continent, the Irish have played a very prominent and important role. When the Latin American wars of liberation got underway early in the 19th century, the two great Latin military leaders were Simon Bolivar and Joe San Martin.

CHILE AND O'HIGGINS

Gen. San Martin's right-hand man was Bernardo O'Higgins, son of Ambrosio O'Higgins, born in County Meath, Ireland, and the last viceroy to Chile and Peru by appointment of the King of Spain. In the chief square of Santiago, capital of Chile, stands a statue of Bernardo O'Higgins, the liberator of Chile. The second brigade of O'Higgins was led by General MacKenna, another fighting - for - freedom Irishman. General O'Higgins' good right arm in political mat-

ters was another Celt by the name of John McNamara. In October of 1814, a movement for the complete independence of Chile from Spain was headed by the same Bernardo O'Higgins. He joined forces with Gen. Sam Martin and they routed the Spanish Royal Army near Chababuco. A cabildo abierto was held at Santiago and San Martin was elected governor of the country. The Wars of the Liberation were still unfinished. San Martin declined the honor and asked that it be given to O'Higgins, one of his chief officers in the liberating army. General O'Higgins was made supreme director of Chile in 1818.

ARGENTINA AND ADMIRAL BROWN OF COUNTY MAYO

Cross the high Andes from Chile and you come upon the fair country of Argentina. The freedom trail there was followed by many Celts. Admiral Brown, born in County Mayo, Ireland, has often been called the savior of Argentina. The Gaels, Brown, Fleming, Gahan, Haggerty, Morris, and Shannon, greatly contributed to the liberation of Argentina. The Irish people have always been affiliated with the life and the times of the Republica de Argentina. There are many Irish societies in Buenos Aires and Rosario, and you may be sure that St. Patrick's Day is properly celebrated in the Argentines.

COLOMBO AND O'LEARY

In the struggles for independence of Colombia, Gen. Simon Bolivar was aided by many Irishmen. One of them was the son of the great Irish patriot and fighter for Irish freedom, Daniel O'Connell. Daniel O'Connell's wife presented a tricolor to these Irish expeditionnaires. Another interesting fact about Colombia's fight for freedom is that General Bolivar's own aide-de-camp was Daniel F. O'Leary. In the capitol at Bogota, a historical painting of him hangs there for all Colombians to remember the debt they owe to the spirit of the Irish.

PERU AND O'CONNOR

One of the great national heroes of Peru in its struggle for independence was a Colonel O'Connor, who more than a hundred years ago found his way up into the highest part of the Andes and did his part in bringing freedom to the white man and the Indian in that section of Latin America.

MEXICO AND O'DONOJU

Our last stop in Latin America on the Gaelic Freedom Trail will be Mexico. The very last viceroy to Mexico from Spain was named Juan O'Donoju (here we would call it John O'Donohue). Viceroy O'Donoju arrived in Mexico from Spain in 1821 but was intercepted at Cordova by Agustin de Iturbide, a leader of the Mexican revoluntionary forces. O'Donoju's signing of the treaty of peace paved the way for Iturbide's triumphant entry into Mexico City as liberator of Mexico on Sept. 27, 1821.

AMERICAN FREEDOM TRAIL

Space does not permit me at this time to extoll the great Irish leaders who contributed so much to the development of Australia and Canada, but the leaders in the crusade for freedom and liberty in these United States of America must be given proper recognition.

The birth of our Republic was sparked by the fiery utterance of a very distinguished Irishman, when as a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, Patrick Henry said: "As for me, give me liberty or give me death."

It was Capt. John Sullivan whose daring capture of Fort William and Mary in December of 1774, provided the arms and ammunition which compelled the British to evacuate Boston on March 17, 1776, and also gave the Colonial troops the wherewithal to put up armed resistance at Bunker Hill on June 17, 1775.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Don't forget that it was Michael O'Brien and his six sons, of Machais, Maine, who captured an English convoy, and for this act of gallantry, the Continental Congress ordered the first ship of the American Navy be christened Liberty, under command of Jack O'Brien, and the second ship be called Hibernia and captained by his brother, Jerry O'Brien. Remember also that the first commodore of the American Navy was John Barry.

Keep in mind that Gen. George Washington, father of our country and commander in chief of the Continental Army, placed General John Sullivan in command of the Continental forces at Dorchester Heights on the eve of St. Patrick's Day in 1776, and gave the password for that memorable occasion as "St. Patrick". Such prominent figures in the siege of Boston as Morgan, Knox, Stark, and Moylan were of Irish ancestry or birth.

Let it not be forgotten that the secretary of the first Continental Congress was an Irishman named Charles Thompson; that 10 of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were of Irish blood, including John Hancock, of Massachusetts, and Charles Carroll, of Maryland; that at the Battle of Lexington and Concord, 142 of the Minute Men were of Irish extraction; that 228 of those who fought the British at Bunker Hill had Irish blood in their veins.

Also keep in mind that the White House at Washington was designed by William Hogan; that the present site of our Government in the District of Columbia was originally the farm of Daniel Carroll, brother of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton; that the Irishman Crawford designed the Statue of Liberty which surmounts the National Capitol; that an Army engineer named Casey was the designer of the magnificent Library of Congress building.

So, it can truthfully be said that in the planning stages, as well as in the fighting areas, and later in constructive beginnings of our American Republic, men of Irish blood and Irish ancestry, gave every assistance in furthering the cause of liberty and freedom.

AMERICAN HISTORY

In every war since the founding of our Republic, wherever the freedom of men was at stake, whether it be the War of 1812, Mexican War, Civil War, Spanish-American War, World War I, or World War II, the fighting Irish were always in there on the side of the oppressed. It was Gen. Andrew Jackson, later President, who drove the British out of New Orleans. A distinguished line of Irish heroes followed the pattern of Jackson through the generations until in the recent World War II we became familiar with such outstanding Irish fighters as Rear Adm. Daniel J. Callaghan, Comdr. John J. Shea, Capt. Richard E. Fleming, Lt. "Butch" O'Hare, Flight Comdr. Paddy Finucane, Capt. Mike Moran, Capt. Colin Kelly, Sgt. Charley Kelly, Lt. Col. Thomas Lynch, Chaplain Arthur C. Lenaghan, 12th chaplain of Irish extraction to die in action, as well as thousands of other Irish fighters for freedom. It sure is a grand and glorious record of courage, loyalty, and devotion to freedom.

ERIN GO BRAGH

So, be proud of your Irish blood and ancestry. You have a high mission to perform. Do honor to your Gaelic heritage and lineage in your every endeavor. Let me conclude this article with a few lines sent to me recently by the Columban Fathers of Milton, Mass., entitled "An Irish Wish":

"May the road rise to meet you; may the wind be ever at your back; may the good Lord ever keep you in the hollow of His hand; may your heart be as warm as your hearthstone; and when you come to die, may the wail of the poor be the only sorrow you'll leave behind.

"May God bless you."

---

## Pentagon Stresses Total Cost of Missile Warning Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, "Pentagon Stresses Total Cost of Missile Warning Project," by Allen M. Smythe, which appeared in the March 15 issue of the New York Sunday Herald Tribune. The author, who has specialized on military procurement subjects, brings out the efforts of President Eisenhower to hold down unnecessary defense spending and balance the budget.

The article follows:

PENTAGON STRESSES TOTAL COST OF MISSILE WARNING PROJECT

(By Allen M. Smythe)

President Eisenhower's efforts to have a balanced budget and hold down defense spending have produced new and revealing fiscal reports on military procurement. A reluctant Pentagon is now giving out figures on weapon systems based on total expenditures rather than latest—and lowest—production costs.

Defense Secretary Neil M. McElroy and members of his general staff have supported the White House viewpoint in closed congressional hearings and more recently in public statements.

The present effort to have Congress add $700 million to the 1960 fiscal year budget so that the Army can put into production the top priority Nike-Zeus anti-missile missile brought a quick response from Mr. McElroy, who said the project could cost the taxpayers a total of $7,500 million to $10 billion. He advised further evaluation.

Pentagon officials say supplementary projects might make the total $13 billion for anti-missile defense. The bulk of the project would be handled by electronic firms. Present warning lines would not be adaptable to handle the new system.

The congressional effort to close the missile gap with the Soviet Union by doubling the production of Atlas and Titan intercontinental missiles would add several billions to their present programed estimate of $7 billion. The President has indicated he would not spend the appropriation if voted by Congress.

Mr. McElroy would wait for the development of the solid propellent Minuteman ICBM. Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, in a recent speech said we now have the power to destroy the Soviet Union several times over. The top Navy Chief maintains our deterrent power is sufficient now.

Administration officials point out that 4 or 5 years ago the Nation became emotional

about—and Congress voted huge sums for—early warning systems and bomber defense because of reports of the building of thousands of Soviet long-range aircraft. Soviet propaganda and flights over May Day parades and Moscow proclaimed the four-engined Bison as another Russian scientific achievement.

Pentagon officials estimate we have a capital investment of $23 billion in our early warning and defense systems against enemy aircraft. These include the DEW, Mid-Canada, Pinetree, and SAGE systems. If maintenance, aircraft, missiles, and other supplementary costs are included the total expenditures would approach $60 billion.

The Army has spent over $6 billion for city protection by the Nike-Ajax missile, which uses conventional warheads. It is being replaced by the Nike-Hercules, using atomic warheads and on which more than $2 billion has already been spent. Several more billions will be spent before these two point defense weapons lose their contractual momentum.

Defense technical experts now believe the Bison bomber to be an inferior weapon and say that less than 150 have been built. The cost to Russia is reported to be very small. Premier Khrushchev recently stated that bombers are obsolete and is now stressing Soviet successes in ballistic missiles.

## The Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Congress will soon be facing one of its really crucial tests when it comes to grips with the Mutual Security bill. Each year, as this program is considered, its short-sighted critics attempt to distort its objectives and achievements. Extreme charges are leveled which tend to befog the fact that the mutual security program is an absolute essential to maintaining the strength of the free world and that without it, our defense budget would have to be increased by untold billions.

Roscoe Drummond, the able and astute columnist of the New York Herald Tribune, this morning etched sharply the great issues at stake in the forthcoming congressional debate on mutual security legislation. He underscores adroitly the fact that nothing could be more costly or more dangerous to our national security, than serious slashes in the mutual security program. He urges particular care be exercised in the light of recent developments which spotlight again the Communist military threat to the United States. Particularly for those who have been screaming about America's defense posture, Mr. Drummond's reasoned words bear close study.

I hope every Member of Congress will take a few minutes to read this column. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHALL UNITED STATES GO IT ALONE—DECISION IS BELIEVED NEAR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It is time to get ready for the most significant debate and the most fateful decision which will be taken at this session of Congress.

The debate is whether to seek survival by helping our allies do what they cannot entirely do themselves, or to turn into a fortress America and try to do it all alone.

The decision is whether to approve the President's minimum mutual security program of $4 billion or to hack it to pieces in order to spend it some other way.

The opponents of the mutual security appropriation are counting on you to be adequately gullible, uninterested and misinformed so that it can be slashed with impunity.

The unanimous conclusion of the Draper Committee, a panel of distinguished and knowledgeable Americans who have earned the right to be heard, is that nothing could be more wasteful and so imperil the national interest than to enfeeble the mutual security program so that it can't do the job.

I am not suggesting that the President's military and economic aid request should slide through Congress without being questioned and without being argued. There should be debate, very earnest debate. It seems to me that the debate is coming at a good time and under circumstances which will enlist the largest public interest.

It comes at a time when the Communist military threat is greater than ever before and when, because of events in Berlin and Iraq, the Communist threat is more visible than ever before.

The debate comes at a time when we must either rescue the mutual security program from being gradually choked to death by inadequate funds or given the resources equal to the need.

It comes at a time when the Democratic leaders of this Democratically controlled Congress—who almost unanimously say they want to put more into our defenses—can show whether they really mean it. The mutual security appropriation puts the issue squarely and fairly before the Administration's defense critics. If they want stronger defense, as they avow they do, they must either support the President's mutual security appropriation or be prepared to spend at least three times as much as they cut from it in order to get the same military result.

Let us not forget that the mutual security program brings into being many times as much military strength as the United States pays for and—despite some admitted waste, despite some bad administration—is the economizer's way of getting the greatest security for the free world at the least cost.

At stake is not whether a half billion or a billion dollars will be struck from Mr. Eisenhower's request. For several years now Congress has so cut back and truncated the mutual security program that it can neither be planned well at home or used to best advantage by our allies.

At stake is not a little trimming here, a small cut there; at stake is the basic decision whether the United States is going to seek survival in isolation or in a common effort with our allies. On this point the Draper Committee says:

"The choice our country faces is very real and near at hand. In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security policy to death.

"What we do this year is an important step in one direction or the other. By forthright and affirmative action we can set the example expected of us. The penalty for failure to do so can well be the beginning of the end of the free world coalition."

Those in Congress who are willing to bring about this result are counting on you not to care.

## Labor in the Old Bay State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very informative and interesting article written by J. William Belanger, president, Massachusetts State Labor Council, entitled "Labor in the Old Bay State." Mr. Belanger has been an active, sincere, and conscientious labor leader for a good many years; and he has always maintained the respect and admiration not only of those in the labor movement but representatives of management have always considered Mr. Belanger as a fair, reasonable, able, and capable person in handling the affairs of labor.

The article follows:

LABOR IN THE OLD BAY STATE

(By J. William Belanger, president, Massachusetts State Labor Council)

The Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, came into being last December when 1,500 delegates from the former State federation of labor and the former State CIO council convened in Boston and adopted a constitution for the new organization.

The trade unionists who shaped the Massachusetts labor merger were men of long experience, men who had one objective—to combine the best qualities of their respective organizations to create a new Massachusetts State Labor Council that would be second to none in its potential for efficient service.

The State labor council is the official voice of some 600,000 trade unionists. It is an organization which will be able to carry out, to the satisfaction of the membership of its affiliated local unions, the functions for which it was set up.

Four executive officers and thirty-one vice presidents comprise the elected personnel of the Massachusetts State Labor Council. They are charged with the responsibility of administering the affairs of the council between conventions and of carrying out, through its newly formed departments, implementation of the organization's programs.

Four departments have been established. They were set up to operate in the fields of legislation, political action, education and research, and public relations. The creation of the departments stemmed from a desire among our affiliated unions to build an organization equipped to give the best possible service.

The delegates who brought the State labor council into being were fully aware of the urgent need for stronger bonds of unity in the American trade union movement. The greater challenges of today demand of working people not only more strength but more determination and a more consistent efficiency than was required even at the height of labor's long struggle for recognition.

We can and must organize the vast army of unorganized workers which remains as a constant drag on our economic and social progress. In Massachusetts more than 1 million workers, mostly of the white-collar cate-

gory, are still outside the ranks of organized labor. It is our duty to convince these unorganized workers that they are endangering their own security and also that of every union member by failing to enter the organized labor family.

The Massachusetts State Labor Council has the task of urging, encouraging, and assisting our affiliated unions to conduct intensive drives to organize all workers who are eligible for membership in unions, whether craft, industrial, service or professional.

The oft-repeated admonition that we must be ready to face greater challenges cannot be shrugged off. Let the cynics have priority in warning the world that mankind is too scattered politically, economically, emotionally, and spiritually to adjust itself readily to the incredibly rapid changes being wrought by 20th century science and technology. We in the labor movement must lead the way toward adjustment, which can be achieved only through unity of purpose as well as unity in practice.

Much will have to be done through legislation. The State labor council has adopted a broad legislative program. The legislative department was instructed at our first meeting to integrate AFL and CIO bills which had been filed prior to the merger by the two former organizations in order to meet the deadline for filing.

The liberal sweep in last November's elections accentuated the prolabor complexion of our legislature. But our program is not a narrow one. It is a program designed to bring about needed changes and improvements in our laws to benefit everyone. Bay State labor expects to make substantial gains.

Among the bills in which labor is directly interested are proposals for the improvement of the minimum wage, unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation laws and for the betterment of the economic status of teachers and other public employees. These advances are necessary if we are to eliminate the lag in purchasing power which contributes to a high rate of unemployment and to the continued existence of depressed areas in Massachusetts.

The State labor council is fighting to get economic relief through our Employment Security Act for wage earners who are forced to stay out on strike more than 6 weeks. We are also pressing efforts to win unemployment compensation for workers idled by sickness and for setting up a State workmen's compensation fund.

Other bills in which Bay State labor is interested call for the abolition of industrial homework, amendment of anti-injunction laws and uniformity in the rules of arbitration.

The major legislative battle shaping up for labor revolves around the administration's request for more taxes to meet an unprecedented budget. While labor recognizes the need for more revenue to maintain and improve vital services provided by the State, unionists find themselves in disagreement with a friendly administration on the issue of a sales tax.

The State labor council was unanimous in a vote to oppose imposition of a sales tax in any form and to support no changes in the tax structure which are not based on ability to pay.

The battle over the sales tax may well prove a test not only of the strength of the Massachusetts AFL–CIO but also of labor's ability to maintain its integrity and remain united while resolving a highly controversial issue. Legislators friendly to labor are found on both sides of this issue.

The State labor council supported the withholding system for collecting the State income tax which was recently enacted into law. We are urging the legislature to take the first step for the eventual enactment of a graduated income tax. We shall not oppose any reasonable tax proposal, but we must fight any attempt to impose taxes that bear too heavily on the low-income groups.

A series of legislative conferences in all sections of the State has been planned. Through such conferences we intend to keep our membership thoroughly informed at the grassroots level.

A department to carry on political education effectively 12 months a year has been established. Political education committees are being set up in the affiliated local unions to keep the members informed and active. We intend to conduct comprehensive campaigns to register all eligible voters in our plants and districts.

The Department of Education and Research is reaching the next generation of workers with a scholarship program in which all high school students in Massachusetts are invited to compete. We plan to broaden the scope of this program so that more of our young people may have an opportunity to learn about and better understand the labor movement.

The department of public relations is charged with the responsibility of keeping our membership and the general public informed on the policies and objectives of the State labor council.

Our first statewide conference after merger attracted more than 350 delegates from all sections of the State. The conference was called for the purpose of instructing local union officers regarding the requirements of the Federal and State laws on health, welfare, and pension plans.

Work in the community service field is being expanded to every community. We recognize our responsibility to help people who face difficult problems.

Massachusetts trade unionists are fully aware that there will be many obstacles to overcome in the years ahead. Many unsolved problems have harassed wage earners for years. Unemployment that continues to rise, distressed areas that create economic imbalance—these are only a few of the serious Bay State problems that must be tackled and solved.

Labor is ready to work with business and Government in any effort to marshal energies and resources for the launching of programs designed to cure chronic economic ills. Labor expects employers to assume some responsibility for keeping the wheels of industry humming at top speed, and labor expects that the Government, at the Federal and State levels, will regard the existence of areas of instability and unemployment as a real threat to the whole economy.

The Massachusetts AFL–CIO will not abdicate its responsibility, but it will not accept the role of a narrow pressure group. The problems we face as a labor organization are problems that affect the entire community. The State labor council will face up to its moral and social obligations in relation to local communities and to Massachusetts, and it expects other groups to do likewise.

The merged State body is working closely with affiliated local unions and city centrals. The activities of labor in Massachusetts are being consolidated. This makes for utilization of the full strength acquired through merger and benefits everyone.

We have created a bigger and stronger organization with faith and confidence. We are ready not only to erase the fears that have haunted Massachusetts toilers for many years but to confront our enemies and work in complete unity for the implementation of programs designed to achieve a better life for all of our people.

## The Problem of Continued Railroad Passenger Service in the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the genuine problems of our era is to keep railroad passenger service in operation. We want this service continued under private enterprise. We realize that abandonment of passenger accommodations would place an intolerable burden on public roads, highways, parking facilities, and city streets.

An informative article on this whole question appeared in the December 20, 1958, issue of the Nation by Fred J. Cook, under the title "Railroads Versus the Commuter." While I do not subscribe to all of Mr. Cook's detailed views, I agree with his general conclusion that the public will be sattled with far higher costs for highway construction if railroad passenger trains are allowed to expire. People must travel somehow, and our population continually expands. If travelers are forced off of privately maintained railroad rights-of-way and onto public highways, the public inevitably must foot the expense.

Mr. Cook has stressed several instances in which improved railroad service, faster schedules, more frequent trains, and more modern rolling stock and other equipment resulted in attracting more passengers to the rails. These examples are related to the problems which have been studied by Members of the Congress, especially by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], whose subcommittee in 1958 did so thorough job in probing the financial plight of many railroads.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the December 20 issue of the Nation on railroads and passenger service be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROADS VERSUS THE COMMUTER

(By Fred J. Cook)

For 15 years to my knowledge, the 5:30 commuter to the New Jersey shore had left New York at 5:30. It does so no longer. From midtown Manhattan, one night recently, I hurried downtown to catch the 5:30 ferry at Liberty Street. I hustled through the gate at 5:29½ and breathed the commuter's sigh of satisfaction at having beaten time again. In Jersey City, my satisfaction evaporated. A glance at the train departure board showed that the 5:30's time had been shoved back 10 minutes; a check of the new timetable showed that some extra stops had been added. The ride home from the day's work, already long, promised to be even longer.

This is an experience that is being repeated almost daily in the lives of America's 500,000 railroad commuters. In the age of jet air travel, when London is only some 6 hours

from New York, the American commuter is worse off today than he was a half-century ago. And the future looks even gloomier.

Item: The commuter pays more and gets less. My own experience is typical. In 1944, a monthly commutation ticket to New York, good any day of the week, cost me less than $18. Today, for a 5-day ticket (not good on weekends), I pay $32.40—and I'll soon pay around $40 when the mechanics of the latest fare increase have been ironed out. Some minimal improvements have been made, but for each improvement there has been a retrogression. Diesel locomotives have replaced the old steam engines, and indisputably they give a smoother, more comfortable ride. But this has been offset by the increasing roughness of the roadbed, the elimination of some trains and the piling of new stops on the schedules of others.

Item: Skimpy maintenance adds to commuter discomfort. In a massive economy effort, railroads have slashed jobs and maintenance. For the past 5 years, it has been estimated, layoffs have proceeded at the rate of 5,800 a month nationally. Essential safety standards are maintained, but there maintenance generally ends. The result is that many commuting trains tend increasingly to resemble Balkan cattle cars. On one major line servicing New York, it is not exactly a novelty to find cars in which the lights do not function or with no heat in zero weather. On the New York, New Haven & Hartford, which admits it has cut out the frills in maintenance, commuters complain of the increasingly jolty roadbed and long delays in repairing broken windows. On the Jersey Central—that's my line—commuters often sit drenched as in a steam bath. Conductors explain that it is impossible to regulate the heat. "These coaches are 40 years old," one conductor explained recently. "The seats of the valves are all worn out. They're turned off tight, but they're all shot. The steam comes right on through."

Item: Doubling or tripling commuter fares and cutting costs do not solve the railroad's problems; indeed, there is some highly credible evidence that these twin approaches only increase them by stimulating competition. For example, in one Chicago suburb last year, plans were announced for a chartered bus running nonstop, with individual reclining foam-rubber seats, windows with draw curtains, television, two electric razors, hot coffee, and orange juice for morning bracers. The price of this plush 20th century commuting was roughly comparable to the charge on the outclassed local railroad. In some of the New York suburbs, less fancy chartered buses make commuter runs more swiftly than the trains, and car pools sometimes represent a pennywise saving. Neither method, actually, should compete with the railroads. Unless you are on an absolutely regular-hour schedule, you can be in trouble if you miss the chartered bus. Travel by car is subject to the maddening frustrations and delays of city traffic. And neither method of travel compares in comfort and reliability with train service at its best. Yet the decade from 1946 to 1956, the decade that saw the greatest expansion of suburbia in America's history, witnessed these alternate and intrinsically less satisfactory means of travel slashing into the business that should go to the railroads. In this period, rail commuting travel dropped from 340 million to 247 million yearly.

Item: The inevitable result is crisis. Railroads throughout the Nation insist (their figures, it must be pointed out, have to be evaluated with considerable skepticism) that they lost a staggering $723.5 million in passenger operations during 1957, with commuting service the principal budget-breaker. Losses are expected to be even greater for 1958. The railroads contend tht the inevitable result of this continuing trend is bankruptcy, and they are now mounting a campaign of ultimatums; let us drop commuting service, even perhaps all passenger service, or subsidize us to the tune of millions, they are telling harassed local, State, and Federal Governments. Spearhead of the new campaign is George Alpert, president of the New Haven, who caused consternation in Massachusetts last July when he abruptly announced cancellation of rail service on the Old Colony division, servicing the suburbs south of Boston. By this drastic step, he wrung a $900,000 subsidy from Boston and suburban municipalities. And now, using the same tactic, he is threatening to abandon commuter service to New York unless the city and three suburban counties in New York and Connecticut grant his line a $1.9 million annual subsidy.

This is little more than a bare outline of an infinitely complex public problem. Abandonment of commuter service by the railroads would create traffic and parking chaos. The Wall Street Journal recently estimated that if New York's 208,000 daily rail commuters all drove to work, 20 percent of all Manhattan south of 60th Street would have to be converted into one huge parking lot. Chicago would need 375 miles of city streets for parking. And this, remember, would be the situation now; the future would be worse. Population in the Nation is expected to grow another 40 to 50 million by 1975; the peripheries of cities are expanding at a rate of a million acres a year; the near suburbs are becoming choked and the more distant countryside of farm and field is being turned constantly into new commuting suburbias. Abandonment of rail service in the face of these well-defined trends would confront us with the preposterous necessity of leveling cities to park cars for workers who would then have no cities in which to work.

Obviously, rail passenger and commuter service must be maintained, but the question is, How?

There seem to be only two choices: public ownership or subsidy. Cedric A. Major, president of the Lehigh Valley Railroad, startled the brotherhood of railroad executives December 1 when he announced that his line would apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission to abandon all passenger service. He startled the fraternity even more, however, when he conceded in a press interview that Government operation of the passenger lines, following the practice now in effect in most of Europe, may turn out to be the only solution. Since Government in business is anathema to the overwhelming majority of businessmen, Major stands virtually alone in this opinion. Most of his fellow rail executives want to temporize still further or hope, like Alpert, to cash in on subsidies.

The propaganda for subsidies necessitates an examination of the validity of the railroads' position. The railroads, let it be said at once, have a case. One of the strongest angles of this case is the tax situation. This is a legacy from the days when railroads were virtually the only means of travel and waxed so rich that they represented a veritable gold mine for local taxing authorities. Now they are hurting financially; but a tax, once imposed, is hardly ever reduced. The New York Central, which owns New York's huge Grand Central Terminal used by it and the New Haven, last year paid New York City alone $16 million in taxes, making it the city's third largest taxpayer. New Jersey railroads this year paid local communities some $12 million—and warned they won't be able to pay it again. The New Jersey tax was so stiff, in fact, that the Pennsylvania Railroad actually paid out more in taxes than it earned in the State.

The railroads contend—and almost every student of the problem agrees—that the onerous taxes imposed upon them are crushingly discriminatory. They point out that literally billions of dollars in public funds have been poured out on throughways, tunnels, and bridges—facilities for which trucks and buses pay little more than token taxes, but which enable them to undercut the railroads. Airports and airlines are likewise the beneficiaries of whopping public subsidies. Only the railroads are compelled to pay their full way and to shoulder back-breaking taxes.

All of this is true, but government, like the railroads, is caught in a financial snarl. If New York and three suburban counties, for example, grant the New Haven a subsidy by cutting some $1.9 million off its tax bill, the money is going to have to come out of the pockets of the average taxpayer, whose back is already no less overburdened with taxes than is the railroad's. Many rail executives themselves feel that it would be unfair to impose this burden on the overtaxed citizen who does not use the railroads, but they can see no other solution.

On the surface, then, it might seem that the railroads are entitled to subsidies and inevitably must get them; but judgment in such a complicated jungle as this should not be formed on surface indications. Primarily, the public and its official representatives should decide just how much of the railroad's anguished bleat is fact and how much is propaganda. Commuters protesting the unceasing fare increases have long contended that the railroads gimmick their accounting procedures, loading an unfair proportion of costs on passenger service as compared to freight.

The railroads' estimate of a $723.5 million loss on passenger service in 1957 is based on a formula approved by the ICC. This Federal regulatory agency, however, has long been suspected of being too closely in cahoots with the lines it is supposed to regulate, and recently it has even placed its official imprimatur on the railroads' own cries of doom. Many independent rail experts hold a sounder formula than the ICC's would water down the staggering passenger loss to no more than $100 million; and some believe that the railroads actually continued to make money on passenger service until just a few years ago.

A specific example of the kind of financial hot air that occasionally balloons railroad statements of fantastic losses was furnished last spring when the New York Public Service Commission turned a spotlight on the New Haven. In December 1957, Alpert, the line's president, had said the road was losing $15 million annually on its passenger operations. On another occasion, the loss was put at $12 million. Still a third figure was given by Alpert in January 1958, testifying before a Senate subcommittee: he said the New Haven was losing $8 million annually on commuter service. Subsequently, New Haven official spokesmen corrected the figure to $7.7 million. Yet even the $7.7 million "loss" was arrived at only by ignoring some impressive millions in income. For example the New Haven had collected $2.6 million from the sale of 186 pieces of property in 1957, but this little item was omitted in arriving at the loss figure because it wouldn't be proper accounting procedure to regard it as revenue. Under some prodding from the PSC, it turned out that these millions had some equally unacknowledged company. The New Haven admitted that it had collected $2 million in rentals from four major New York hotels and some apartment houses built on its property; but this, said the railroad, was nonoperating revenue and therefore it would be obviously unfair to consider it in calculating profit and loss from passenger operations. The fact remains that a loss figure that had started out at $15 million had been steadily watered down until only $3.1 million was left. What other less obvious items might be turned up in a minute analysis of the New Haven's ledgers, no one knows; but it would seem the public

ought to know—and know definitely—before it agrees to tax itself another $1.9 million annually for the New Haven's benefit.

If one needs further proof of the necessity for extreme caution in assessing railroad figures, one has only to consider disclosures made this fall on a petition by the New York Central Railroad to abandon its station at Philipse Manor, a growing commuting area in rich Westchester County north of New York. The railroad tried to show that the station was a financial drag by listing, among other expenses, $3,710 for local real estate taxes; but at a public hearing it developed that this was a bloated figure. Taxes on the station itself were just $900; the $3,710 figure was arrived at by adding taxes on 9.323 acres of choice real estate belonging to the railroad.

Even more embarrassing for the Central was the way its carefully compiled figure on Philipse Manor commuter travel boomeranged. In a day-by-day compilation, the Central attempted to prove that one train was boarded by just 30 persons, another by 20, another by a mere 4. Unfortunately for the railroad, the day for which the traffic was listed was May 30, Decoration Day, a holiday when the trains that the Central had said carried this little handful of commuters weren't even running. The same tactical error was repeated by the Central when it listed traffic for July 4. This double blooper suggested to some unkind souls that the entire schedule had been faked; but the Central angrily said not so, some minor stupid clerk had just become confused copying off the figures.

In any event, the crudity of some of these financial distortions seem reminiscent of the days when railroads bought up entire State legislatures and rode roughshod over public opinion. Obviously, some basic changes are needed in this attitude before the railroads are permitted to tap the public till for subsidies.

What is basically needed is a full, Kefauver-type investigation to peel away the layers of phoniness from the railroad financial maze and to get at some basic truths. Even beyond this, railroad executives must be willing to make some radical changes in their thinking before heavy subsidies could conceivably be justified.

Granting the tax situation is inequitable, granting that commuter service is a drain because the roads must pay idle train crews for the lay-over time that separates night and morning rush hours, the basic flaw in the railroad picture is the frozen mentality of most railroad executives. Rail passenger service simply cannot continue to exist if the railroads insist on committing suicide by raising fares to the point where they are no longer competitive with buses and airlines.

As Robert E. Bedingfield pointed out in the New York Times, "The business of the Pennsylvania and the Central has shrunk each time fares have been raised." And the Journal of Commerce, expressing the view that further hikes in commuter fares might be necessary, acknowledged the danger that this might only make a bad situation worse. "With each fare increase, traffic by rail dwindles and more spills out onto the highways," the Journal conceded sadly.

It seems obvious that what is needed, before subsidies, before anything else, is some daring and imagination on the part of railroad executives. There are some encouraging signs that an approach designed to make rail service faster, cheaper, more competitive, may woo back lost business and even in time restore profits.

The Missouri Pacific this year slashed fares, offered cut-rate sleeping accommodations, improved service and served low-cost meals to coach passengers on its streamliner, the Colorado Eagle. The Wall Street Journal, reporting on this experiment at the end of July, noted: "Mopac is pulling passengers from competing railroads, buses and even airlines in this mid-America area." With reference to the railroad's reduction of round-trip coach fare, first-class fare and Pullman charges on its Houston-to-Brownsville run in May, the Journal said: "In the first month passenger revenues jumped around 20 percent above a year earlier. And the gains are continuing.

A similar experiment is now being attempted on commuter lines serving Philadelphia—so far with a similar result. Philadelphia appropriated $160,000 on the promise of the Pennsylvania and the Reading to step up commuter and off-hour service to the northern residential suburbs. The Philadelphia city fathers explained that they did not regard the $160,000 as an actual subsidy, but merely as an underwriting of increased operational costs to see if improved rail service would take some of the clutter of cars off city highways. If this could be done, the pressure for ever larger highways, ever more bridges and tunnels, ever increasing parking facilities would be eased, and a subsidy to the railroads, even from the taxpayers' standpoint, would justify itself.

The New York Herald Tribune reported last month on the Philadelphia experiment at the end of the first month of a 6-month test period. The Pennsylvania had increased the number of trains on its Chestnut Hill run by 33 percent to 36 daily; service was stepped up to every 15 minutes in rush hours, every half hour in off hours. The Reading boosted the number of its trains from 33 to 36 daily. Saturday service on both lines was almost doubled, and cheaper fares were tied in with busline transfers. The result: In the fourth week of operation, the Pennsylvania carried 4,133 more passengers than it had in the test week of October 6, before the plan went into effect, a gain of 14.8 percent; and the Reading picked up 2,422 passengers in the same week, an improvement of 7.6 percent over its test week in May. For the entire 4 weeks, the Pennsylvania gained 11,128 additional riders; the Reading 7,099. The effect on city traffic already was observable; 600 fewer automobiles a day were coming into the city from the suburbs.

Philadelphia hopefully assessed the advantages of the plan this way: Cheaper fares mean a saving, for the individual commuter, of 90 cents a day over automobile operation (including parking fees, insurance, and fuel costs), or a total of $100 in the 6 months of the test period. This saving to the individual driver is projected into a much greater saving to the city. It means, Philadelphia estimates, that about $1 million annually can be saved on the cost of maintaining existing roads and providing police protection. And this is apart from the merry-go-round cost of building ever more and wider highways.

The Mopac and Philadelphia plans, if they continue to grow and fulfill their promise, offer this hopeful ray of light in an otherwise grim picture; the railroads could recoup their losses, regain lost business; they could receive the tax relief to which they are entitled (and this could be given without cost, perhaps even at an ultimate saving, to the taxpayer); and lastly, the commuter and the shopper could be given some of the 20th-century creature comforts and service to which they are entitled.

But all of this can happen only if railroad management exhibits the kind of vision that will bring rail travel in line with the realities of the 20th century. Subsidies are not justified and should not be given merely to allow a bad situation to continue to deteriorate. Even with subsidies, a continuation of present trends on most lines would mean steadily dwindling traffic, steadily declining revenues, and the ultimate inevitability of Government operation. If this should happen, the railroads should not be permitted to shuck off on Government the unprofitable passenger business that they have helped to run into the ground while retaining the freight haulage on which they may still make a profit. For the public's welfare, if Government operation has to come, it should embrace both passengers and freight.

Since the railroads obviously do not wish to be put completely out of business, they should be induced to accept the alternative of sensible, forward-looking cooperation. Let's find out what is the real truth behind the maze of propaganda figures that paint a horrible specter of colossal railroad losses. Let's find out what the railroads intend to offer in the way of more modern and complete service before we embark on a round of ever-increasing subsidies. And let's make sure that the railroads do offer what they should offer—the kind of service that will lure back the riders they should logically have and that will reduce the ever-mounting expenses of superhighways, traffic policing, and parking. Only such a policy can insure the continued existence of the railroads as a private enterprise, operated with benefit to all.

## Imitation of the United States by Nations of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the East-West struggle of freedom versus slavery has resulted in a great deal of critical self-analysis in the United States.

We recognize, of course, that we have shortcomings. To correct these, we need, from time to time, to put ourselves under the analytical microscope.

At the same time, however, we realize that overemphasis on weakness, without a proportionate recognition of our strengths, might well result in pessimism, low morale, and, in the extreme, defeatism.

That is why it is particularly heartening to read reports that our policies, programs, and way of life also are making progress and creating constructive impressions on the world.

The March 23 edition of the fine publication U.S. News & World Report contained a refreshing article entitled "Is the World Going American?" The article outlines a wide variety of ways in which nations around the world, even inside the Iron Curtain, are "going American" in their activities. To give my colleagues the benefit of examples in which our way of life is being emulated around the world, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE WORLD "GOING AMERICAN"?—HOW UNITED STATES IS BEING IMITATED ABROAD

Something like a modern revolution—a switch to the American way of doing

things—is stirring the world. The daily lives of millions of people in one nation after another are being changed.

This is happening at a time when Communists—both Chinese and Soviet—are driving hard to sell their system. In day-to-day affairs, close to peoples' lives, Reds are having scant success.

Regional editors for U.S. News & World Report, stationed abroad, now find that American ways of buying and selling, American habits in eating and dressing are being widely accepted and imitated. The same is not true of Soviet manners and customs. Even in countries where the Communist vote is high—such as France and Italy—the very people who vote Communist are showing a preference for the American mode of living.

Everywhere people are demanding—and getting—more of the things that have given Americans the highest standard of living in the world. As a result, vast, untapped markets are opening up. American ways of reaching these markets are being adopted.

Installment buying, almost unknown to consumers in Europe and Asia a short time ago, is becoming commonplace. Assembly-line production in country after country is being geared up to meet the rising demands, set free by credit buying, for goods that will make life easier and pleasanter: home appliances, automobiles, radio and television sets. Shopping has become simpler through supermarkets, self-service stores and mail-order firms, as merchants compete for their share of the boom.

You see signs everywhere that nations abroad are moving into a period of growth not unlike that which spread through the United States with the birth of the motor age early in the century. And the tempo of change is increasing.

BRITAIN: U.S. STYLE GOODS ON U.S. STYLE CREDIT

The speed with which Britain is becoming Americanized surprises many Americans and annoys some Britons.

Basically, the big changes in the British way of life in the past decade hinge on two ideas, common in United States: self-service shopping and liberalized consumer financing.

* * * * *

FRANCE: READY-TO-WEAR DRESSES, PACKAGED FOODS

The "American revolution" is taking place in the stronghold of French tradition, the French home. Labor-saving devices, mostly French made but based on American ideas, are replacing hand drudgery.

Production and sales of such items as refrigerators, washing machines, electric coffee grinders, mixers and blenders, vacuum cleaners, floor waxers and electric blankets—all rarities in France before World War II—are booming. In 1957, for the first time in French history, more dresses were sold off the rack than were handmade for French women. And the ready-to-wear trend is continuing to spread.

Shopping customs are changing, too. About 2,500 stores in France, mostly groceries, have converted to self-service. And the American supermarket idea is slowly catching on. Hand in hand with this development has come the increase in use of packaged foods and the decrease in time-consuming marketing trips in which a dozen or more shops had to be visited before the components of a meal were assembled.

* * * * *

Along with these great changes in the way the French spend the working days have come equally great changes in the way they spend leisure hours. French factories, using the latest automation devices and assembly-line techniques, are turning out a million cars a year. And Frenchmen are buying them at a great rate—many of them through a French version of the installment plan. One French family in three now owns an automobile—the highest ratio in continental Europe. Roads and city streets are crowded with French motorists on the move for business or pleasure. Motels are beginning to appear. So are American-style shopping centers in city suburbs. Superhighways are planned.

WEST GERMANY: STREAMLINED KITCHENS, SHOPPING CARTS

Perhaps the most American thing about West Germany is a sense of bustle and urgency in the cities. People are busy and they act as though they enjoy it. This is a marked contrast to the sullen, driven attitude with which the people in Communist East Germany plod about their daily tasks.

A good place to get this sense of busyness is in one of the many big department stores that have sprung up in West Germany since the end of World War II.

In arrangement of shopping area and in variety of merchandise and services offered, these stores closely follow the American pattern. The household-goods and kitchen departments feature vacuum cleaners, washing machines, pressure cookers, electric dishwashers, mixers, grills and food freezers. Completely streamlined kitchens, modeled after American types, are on sale. So are barbecue grills. Plastic coverings for floors and furniture are available.

*Milk bars, "pop" records*

One of the most modern of the department stores, opened recently in Duisburg in the Ruhr, has a supermarket offering 2,300 prepacked food items, 100 types of frozen food. Its shopping carts have baby seats. Elsewhere in the store are restaurants. There is a milk bar and, conveniently near, a teenage shop where U.S.-style clothes and American records are fast-moving items.

Germany's excellent system of express highways is being expanded, and along these roads U.S.-type gas stations and motels are beginning to spring up. Even at small inns off the beaten track, the tourist is likely to find American-type bars dispensing cocktails.

Also off the beaten track, the visitor to a German farm—14 percent of the West German population is engaged in agriculture—is likely to find it as mechanized as its American counterpart. This is particularly true of the large dairy farms, representing a great change from prewar days. Mechanization of dairy farms has led to another American phenomenon: West Germany periodically has a worrisome surplus of milk and milk products.

ITALY: SUPERHIGHWAYS ALONGSIDE ROMAN ROADS

In Italy, it is in cities and industrial areas that U.S. influence is most evident, even though, in many cases, these are the same places where Communists are politically strong.

Life is changing, becoming more American, for young and old alike. Women are enjoying increased freedom. More of them are taking jobs in commerce and industry, fewer are hiring out as maids, cooks, and seamstresses. They drive cars, wear slacks, smoke in public—all things that would have been strange 10 years ago. Family arranged marriages are not so common as they used to be, and the American custom of dating is being accepted. The first drive-in movie has just started outside of Rome. It is a success, and more are planned around other urban centers.

* * * * *

On Italian farms, Americanization appears in improved seeds, stock and poultry strains, better irrigation and sanitation. The small size of farms, coupled with an abundance of labor, makes U.S.-style mechanization impractical at this time.

ALL EUROPE: NEW IDEAS, IMPORTED FROM THE UNITED STATES

The export of American ways is not confined to a few countries of Western Europe. Each nation shares in some degree.

In Spain, for instance, American ideas are just beginning to gain acceptance. There's a supermarket operating in Barcelona. Cafeterias have sprung up in Madrid and are doing well. A school in techniques of industrial and commercial management, based on American patterns, was started with American help in Madrid a year ago. And an agricultural extension service, similar to those conducted by States in the United States, has been operating in Spain for the past 3 years.

In Belgium and The Netherlands, subsidiaries of U.S. firms, including pharmaceutical firms, tire manufacturers, makers of office equipment, have set up factories combining America's latest automation techniques with locally developed ideas. The result: U.S.-type assembly lines.

Switzerland, a traditional banking center, has adopted the idea of mutual funds for small investors, as have financial organizations in Britain, Germany, Italy, France, and Sweden. Switzerland, too, is one of the centers for organizations carrying on market research in the American manner.

*"Honor" for "honour"*

Adoption of American ways of doing things has meant some adoption of American ways of saying things. American business English is taught in Norway, for example. And young Norwegian students are not marked wrong, as they used to be, if they write honor instead of honour, favor instead of favour, tire instead of tyre. To Norwegians, whose ties with Britain go far back in history, this represents as great a change as the fact that their children wear blue jeans and their wives shop at self-service stores.

* * * * *

JAPAN: TOLL ROADS, BLUE JEANS, AND POTATO CHIPS

Nowhere in the Orient have American ideas been more enthusiastically adopted than in Japan. Sparked by the introduction of installment buying, one out of three Japanese bought something on credit last year. Total sales of consumer goods on credit last year came to more than a billion dollars. Television sets accounted for a lot of that. Next came automobiles, refrigerators, radios, and sewing machines.

* * * * *

AFRICA: PARKING METERS, SKYSCRAPERS, U.S.A. LABELS

There are traffic jams and parking meters now in Nairobi, capital of Kenya in East Africa, where Mau Mau terrorists raged only 2 years ago. Americans are popular. One nationalist leader, who seeks independence from Britain for the natives, has said: "Africans like the personal attitudes of Americans—they find Americans easy to get along with."

Johannesburg, in the Union of South Africa—with its skyscrapers, miles of modern apartment buildings and industrial suburbs—looks more like an American city than any community in Europe or elsewhere in Africa.

Johannesburg department stores remind the visiting shopper of stores in Detroit and Chicago. Stocks are big, many items of merchandise are labeled "Made in U.S.A."

Helicopters, using American crop-dusting techniques, spread DDT to destroy the malaria-bearing mosquitoes that are one of the scourges of Leopoldville, capital of the Belgian Congo. The city, gateway to the African jungle, boasts 15-story buildings, supermarkets, and air conditioning.

American teams of farm experts and public-health workers have taught peoples of the East new ways of making life easier, crops better. More important, they have persuaded many officials to adopt the U.S. practice of rolling up their sleeves and going to work when there's a job to be done.

LATIN AMERICA: U.S. MUSIC, GOODS, AND WORKING HOURS

In the Western Hemisphere, Soviet agents are at present concentrating their subversive drives on the countries of Latin America, including the islands of the Caribbean. Large "have not" populations in these lands would seem to furnish good ground for Communist propaganda and infiltration. But here, as in the rest of the free world it's the American influence which is creating a real revolution in the daily lives of people.

This resolution is most apparent in the large cities—capitals and seaports. Here you see many signs of American ideas at work, American ways being copied. American-style clothing is worn by men and women. American cars crowd the streets, looking for a spot by an American parking meter.

* * * * *

RED EMPIRE: A MARXIST RUSH TO IMITATE LIFE IN UNITED STATES

In the Soviet Union and its satellites, people are being offered the hope of some day owning some of the things that make life pleasant in the free world: radios, household appliances, automobiles. This hope comes from an American commercial idea—installment buying—which is catching on behind the Iron Curtain.

Time buying was introduced in Communist countries last autumn, spread quickly. On March 3, the Reds said qualified buyers in the Soviet Union could now get watches, radios, cameras for 20 percent down, with 6 months to pay.

To students of marxism, this represents a complete somersault in thinking. Marxists talk a great deal about the elimination of the debtor class, but, through installment buying, the Marxist masters of the Soviet world are creating a debtor class. And the people are jumping at the chance to buy on time.

In lesser ways, too, Iron Curtain countries are copying the United States when they can. American jazz is popular. Many youngsters imitate costumes popular 10 years ago in the United States—the zoot suit for instance. They have their own versions of American dancing, which they call boogie woogie.

You get an idea of the lure of America from a recent incident in a little border village in Poland. It was rumored there that visas to the United States could be had free from the American Embassy. Almost 1,500 villagers trooped to Warsaw to try to leave for the United States.

THE AMERICAN WAY: WAVE OF THE FUTURE?

Most United States spokesmen who carry on the fight of ideas against Communists agree that the success of the American revolution abroad represents a victory in the cold war. But the victory may have its price, they warn.

George V. Allen, the career diplomat who heads U.S. Information Agency, has this to say:

"People may feel their way of life is being insidiously undermined by what they regard as irresistible encroachments by America on their way of doing things. We are not consciously pushing this Americanism as an instrument of the cold war. It's just happening.

"But," Mr. Allen goes on, "to the extent that the so-called American cult does represent the real attitude and progress of the United States, I welcome it, because I like America to be regarded as 'the wave of the future.'"

And the wave seems to be gathering force and speed.

## That All May Learn To Survive and Stay Free—Junior Colleges: One Answer to Higher Education for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the American Association of Junior Colleges held its 39th annual convention last week in Long Beach, Calif. Representatives from colleges all over the Nation were present at this convention to discuss how to realize the ideal of providing higher education for all and the best methods for accomplishing this.

Junior colleges, registering with the office of education, have grown from 10 in 1920 to 667 today. One out of every four college students is enrolled in a junior college, with the total junior college student body at over a million students.

Considering the practical, economical and varied education the junior college is able to provide, it is easy to understand the reason for this unprecedented growth and why this type of college will be one of our major solutions to providing higher education for the flood of students which will soon converge upon the colleges.

The dream of the ages has been to establish a society of cultural achievement and economic abundance with individual liberty. Our Western civilization has nearly succeeded in converting this dream into a reality, but only through a series of bold revolutions and hard-won victories over ignorance and autocracy.

WESTERN CIVILIZATION IS IN PERIL

Now western civilization, so worth saving, faces by far its most perilous challenge—that of communism. We have been able to withstand the Dunkirks and Pearl Harbors of the past, but whether we can withstand disciplined men in a far superior geopolitical position who are armed with the best tools and weapons tyrants have had in the history of the world, will depend on our ability to learn to survive.

In the national monument area near Vernal, Utah, archeologists dig up the fossil remains of the dinosaur. His tragic story is that he was unable to adjust to a new set of conditions and a new environment. He did not learn to survive. He became extinct in spite of an advantage he had in the structure of his central nervous system. The curator at the monument told me years ago that the dinosaur had a brain in his cranium and one at the base of his spinal column, so when an idea missed his first brain he had a saving afterthought.

Many pessimists say that western civilization, like the dinosaur, is in the Mesozoic Saurian era of man and that centuries from now whatever is left of civilization may be picking over our remains and pondering our downfall.

This is not hard to imagine in light of Communist accomplishments to date and Khrushchev's dramatic threat to the West that, "We will bury you." Since this has been the cry of Communist doctrine for more than a century, it would be a grave error not to take this threat to western civilization seriously.

THE IDEOLOGICAL CHALLENGE

The lethargy and indifference on the part of many leads me to think there is altogether too much truth in the challenge that one of the Red leaders threw at us, when he said:

In Christianity you of the Western World have a far better and nobler philosophy than we have in atheistic communism, but we will prevail nonetheless for wherever there is a Communist there is a dedicated ambassador of communism. Western civilization lacks both this vitality and dedication.

With this missionary-like zeal, backed by military force, the Communists have made great strides.

Dr. Daryl Chase, president of Utah State University, recently asked an alumni group:

What will historians record as the most important world development in the next 50 years? Will it be man's mastering the weather or perhaps learning to reap prodigious quantities of food from the sea?

Neither—

Was his answer.

It will be whether freemen continue to be free. In only 40 years Communists have taken control of 1 billion of the earth's people. There has never been anything like it.

THE MILITARY CHALLENGE

While Western civilization is in peril, I do not believe we are in imminent danger of a military attack. Our power of mass retaliation is still far too great for that. But we cannot shut our eyes to the Russian military crash program designed to surpass the United States in atomic power or to the fact that they have surpassed us in the thrusting power of their jet engines and are apparently ahead of us in intercontinental ballistic missiles and intermediate range ballistic missiles.

THE CHALLENGE OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

I believe, too, that the Reds still think they can bring us to our knees through other means, such as destroying capitalism and free enterprise through an economic war.

I observed their efforts in this regard first hand a month ago when I went to the Far East as a representative of the House Agriculture Committee at a conference of U.S. agricultural attachés at New Delhi, India.

Most Far East countries secured their independence at one sudden blow within the last 15 years without the century and a half of preparation that America had before we obtained independence. Though they fear communism, they detest even more the colonial nations which kept them in bondage and suspect the motives of western countries. They haven't the widespread literacy, education, technical training, and the capital to step up their productivity and living standards, but their people are demanding these high living standards. So they

are restive and the countries are in turmoil.

The Communists exploit this great unrest by promising pie in the sky if the people will accept their political belief. I saw evidence of this wherever I went.

I saw countries in the Soviet orbit dumping products into the Far East markets at prices much lower than we can produce them in the United States just to strangle our trade—determined to capture our markets at any cost.

I saw Russians trading arms to eastern countries. These arms are followed by thousands of Russian technicians who in turn believe in the Soviet doctrine as strongly as men of the Western World believe in their way of life.

I saw evidence that Russia had provided India with 500 trained steel technicians, when at the same time we had promised 700 but could furnish only 100.

I saw American private industry virtually at a standstill in the Orient, whereas it used to be expanding. Soviets will step in where our firms fear to tread. They will risk heavy economic loss for strategic political gains, whereas our private industry cannot take such losses. If the Reds are selling at a loss, all they need do is to make their people, virtually in servitude already, work longer hours, accept less food and fewer of the necessities of life. They can cut the costs of production in ways that our private industry could not and would not do.

I saw Red China playing with Hong Kong as a cat toys with a mouse. Red China is the source of nearly all Hong Kong wood for fuel. China cut off the source completely without warning. In desperation Hong Kong business people ordered shipments of wood from Borneo and other places. Upon the arrival of this wood, the Red Chinese flooded the market at prices so low that it bankrupted many of the Hong Kong merchants who had come to the rescue of their people.

I saw Chinese textile workers slaving 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, every day of the year except two holidays for Chinese new year's, in textile mills every bit as modern and mechanized as the best we have in America and for a smaller weekly wage than we pay for a single day. At the same time our labor leaders are calling for a 35-hour week and vastly higher minimum wage laws.

EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGE

We are far ahead of Russia educationally. However, her program is moving ahead at a faster rate than ours, especially with respect to producing exactly the sort of trained men her rulers want for achieving scientific and technological supremacy.

Rickover says our educational perils are as follows:

First. Russia has virtually wiped out illiteracy in 20 years. Twenty years ago her educational system was in ruins and at the time of the revolution 70 percent of the country was illiterate.

Second. Russia puts a larger percentage of her smaller income into education than does America. We spend 3.5 percent, while Russia spends 6 percent.

Third. The European high school graduate has learned more fundamentals and the teacher spends too much time helping dullards and neglecting the capable.

than most of our college graduates. An hour at school means an hour of uninterrupted serious work; here there are assemblies, errands, play, short school year.

Fourth. Russia has made the rewards of scholarship so attractive that her children are working their heads off to keep up with an extraordinary tough curriculum—often at the cost of their health.

Fifth. Russia has few substandard teachers. Their standards are high. Their load is heavy. Their honors and pay are high. In America the beginning salary of the college teacher is the same as a factory worker. In Russia it is eight times as great. In America a full college professor averages twice as much as the beginning teacher. In Russia a successful professor can be paid 15 times as much as a beginner.)

Sixth. In America the major share of research has gone into making life pleasant and comfortable and increasing the material well-being of the individual. In Russia research goes into physics, chemistry, astronomy, and missiles. Chemists are diverted from research to cure diseases to studies which can improve metals.

Seventh. In America we discourage young men from scholarly pursuits by calling scholars "egg heads, "long hairs," and "little men with the beards." In Russia scholars are the best paid and most revered men in the community.

I could go on at great length on the Communist challenge, pointing out for instance the fact that in the 40 years since the revolution Russian production has doubled 22 times, but I am sure the facts presented prove that the peril to western civilization is real.

WE CAN LEARN TO SURVIVE AND STAY FREE

As Shakespeare says, "We are living, we are walking in an age of awful time. But to be living is sublime." In facing the Communist threat we must not lose our heads. We must learn to live with the danger and overcome it.

Our situation calls to my mind a conversation between two Negroe in a Nashville, Tenn., barbershop during World War II when I was teaching at Peabody College. One of them said, "We sho am in a crisis." The other replied, "This ain't no crisis, it's only a crissis."

"Well, what's the difference?" asked the first.

"Here's the difference," said the second. "A crisis is when yo' all loses yo' heads—a crissis is when yo' all puts yo' heads togedder."

In the last great war our armed services had to teach men how to live in new circumstances and under extreme conditions. Aviators had to be taught how to live if shot down at sea. Soldiers had to be taught survival techniques in the jungle, in Alaska and in the Arctic.

We can take to heart some of the survival instructions given to our boys in desperate situations in World War II. I recently gleaned a few cryptic statements from these little survival pamphlets:

First. Read this booklet—it may save your life.

Second. Size up the situation and plan your course of action. Avoid panic and use your head.

Third. If they can do it, you can too.

Fourth. Take inventory yourself, don't let George do it. It is you who may be cold and hungry.

They learned to survive, and I have the unshaken conviction that Western civilization can learn to survive if we are willing to pay the price. The desperation of the Japanese threat in World War II forced industrial and military miracles; the Russian threat might well stimulate miracles, too.

SLOWNESS OF DEMOCRATIC ACTION

In sizing up the situation and planning our course of action in America we face the anomaly where the slowness of democratic action is possibly a hazard to freedom in time of stress and crisis. Yet, at the same time, this slowness is a protection to our freedom.

One of our great historians has said:

A totalitarian state is like a full-rigged ship which moves with great speed majestically out of the harbor, but if it hits a rock it sinks. Democracy is like a raft. It doesn't move so fast, but neither does it sink. But—darn it—your feet are always wet.

For instance, America's public schools are in the hands of local school boards where the State has slight control and Federal help is mistrusted. When I was in the schools, there were some States that had from 1,000 to 3,000 school districts and almost as many school board members as teachers. It is almost impossible to get through these thousands of boards and administrators anything like a national policy to meet an emergency.

Admiral Rickover says that Russia does not have this problem of ponderous slow-moving action.

One man can institute a crash program for his government—

He said—

and force the immediate support of the schools, the public and the scientists. The cost in time and money of congressional government is eliminated * * *. Authoritarian control and the low standard of living make the running of the civilian sector simple and cheap. There is no need for attractive stores, service industries, advertising—no chain of service stations, garages, auto dealers—only a few cars for the elite.

Such a government presents a real challenge to a free people who nurture the individual not alone for the contribution he may make to the national welfare but for the realization of his own potentialities and desires as well.

Since a free society cannot commandeer action, our fate rests on how well we can educate the people to act of their own accord. All groups must work together in informing citizens of the gravity of the Communist threat to Western civilization, in inspiring them with a sense of common purpose and in influencing them to subordinate individual desires temporarily to the welfare of the Nation.

CULT OF EASINESS

It has been frequently stated in recent months that some of our most discerning critics are uneasy about current aspirations and values of Americans.

The president of Notre Dame has said:

I think we have a kind of cult of easiness today. There is an easy way to cook a meal; there is an easy woy to drive a car; there is an easy way to get a vacation; there is an easy way to pay your bills; there is an easy way to save your soul.

Recently the editor of Life magazine stated:

Leaders in the United States are worried about Americans—undereducated, overentertained, tossing uneasily in sophisticated vulgarity.

He infers that we have forms of a free society but maybe the spirit is dying and wonders if a nation that consumes more drink and tranquilizers than any nation in history and a nation glued to television is not simply at a disadvantage before the iron pioneers of the new collective society.

The Reds cannot stay glued to radio or television, because they must work 12 hours a day. Even if they could stay glued to these instruments, they would have blasted in their ears over the radio and television the importance of the 7-year program, winning the war for scientific and economic supremacy and crushing capitalism.

How does this cult of easiness handicap the schools? Principal Edwin Anderson of the Prosser, Washington, High School recently made a survey after a lot of parents had complained because of the failing marks their children were getting.

His findings—an educational mixture too rich with gasoline. Of seniors with A and B grades, only 11 percent owned cars or had the use of them regularly. Among C grade seniors 33 percent had cars, and 62 percent of the C-minus to failing seniors were motorized. Cars owned by juniors with A and B grades, none; with C grades, 31 percent; and with C-minus to failing grades, 39 percent. The University of Virginia faculty is grounding 77 percent of last year's car-owning students.

This cult of easiness, combined with the small group consciousness of the segments of our economic society and the greedy habits of individuals and groups whose major question too frequently is what can they get out of our country instead of what can they give constitutes a serious threat. This must be altered if we are to survive and stay free.

BETTER TO LIGHT A CANDLE

Secretary Flemming of Health, Education, and Welfare tells about leaving their children with a babysitter. When they arrived home, the babysitter appeared disturbed because the power had gone off, leaving the place in darkness and frightening the smaller children.

One small boy came downstairs and screamed:

There is too much dark here.

The older children, however, scurried about looking for candles and flashlights. The old Chinese proverb says:

It is better to light a candle than to curse in the darkness.

The Psalmist said:

I will lift my eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord who made heaven and earth.

The Lord has not failed this Nation. Neither will he ever fail it if we look to him. And how does the Lord give us help? It is through Christian education and Christian living which made men free and will keep men free. I have unbounded faith that the candle of Christion education definitely will dispel the gloom caused by the perils which threaten our free society.

For this reason in this crisis it is to the teachers, more than any group, that we look to light the candle of the Lord to help us learn to survive. It is in the classrooms, home, and churches that the future of the world is largely going to be determined.

This is why we must look our times and our school system searchingly in the face. This is why we must reexamine our objectives, our methods, and our facilities in light of the crucial role teachers are called upon to play.

Let us define specifically what the objectives of education in a democratic society should be. A statement which appeared in the May 1957 issue of the Junior College Journal defines it very beautifuly, I believe:

It is to teach the people to understand. It is to teach the people the real meaning of freedom, for it is a complex concept to master, not a simple one. It is to equip the people to govern themselves, for govern they must. It is to charge them, at least at the college level where the most significant learning must occur, with a meaningful acquaintance with the history of our civilization, with the nature of free government under law, and with a general knowledge sufficiently broad to induce them to discharge intelligently their responsibilities as free citizens.

People ask me the question:

"Why should we pay taxes to support public education?"

The answer is, briefly, to develop an enlightened citizenry. American schools do not give this aim sufficient priority to make it stand out in letters of gold before the public.

I recall a reliable study in which more than 6,000 high school graduates were asked the question:

What does America mean to you?

The vast majority defined America in terms of its blessings and what they get from the country. Only a very few defined it in terms of what they should give in return. This notion of all getting and little giving to our country is so prevalent even among adults that it imperils our society. It all goes to show that every class period should in some way contribute to a deeper love for our country and a greater willingness to sacrifice to keep it free.

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Fortunately for America our concept of equality of educational opportunity is a far cry from the program of European universities which are essentially concerned with preparing youth for the learned professions and whose student bodies are a highly select group. The selection begins toward the close of the elementary school at which time not more than 20 percent of any age group is privileged to attend the pre-university schools and thence to college and the selection is often influenced by the class system. The remaining 80 percent, except for a comparatively few, go to work and complete their full-time education at age 14.

As a result only one out of very five or six European boys and girls attends college, whereas one out of approximately every three American boys and girls attends college.

Dr. James Conant in his splendid book, "The American High School Today," points out the tremendous waste in undeveloped talent in Germany, France, Italy and Switzerland as a result of the selective character of their student population. This is a waste which America cannot afford. In fact we cannot afford the waste of our own present system in which fully one half of the top 25 percent of our high school graduates never attend college.

Equality has come to mean in America not only political equality but equality of educational opportunity as far as the individual can profit from such opportunity.

The story is told about Lincoln stopping on a crowded street to pick up a beetle that was on its back and struggling to get on its feet. When he was chided by his companion for causing such a scene on a crowded street, he said, "I wanted to give that beetle the same opportunity as all other beetles."

This great emancipator not only detested African slavery, but the far commoner bondage—that of ignorance. That same Abe Lincoln during the Civil War in 1862, when the Union defeats were pressing the North, signed the Morrill Act (which Buchanan had vetoed because the Nation could not afford more colleges and because the land grant colleges would compete with the liberal arts colleges) and founded the land grant college for the liberal and practical education of the industrial (as distinguished from the professional) classes.

Dr. John A. Widstoe, former president of Utah State University and the University of Utah, said:

For the first time in the history of the world the common man, to which class we all belong, was given access to the great heritage of learning of the ages, and for the first time an attempt was made to lift the common, necessary pursuits of life to a professional dignity.

The American junior community college program and philosophy conforms very closely to the program and philosophy of the land grant colleges—namely the liberal and practical education of the common man and constitutes the second great legal step in that direction.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE MEETS THE CHALLENGE

People all over the Nation agree that the junior colleges are destined to grow rapidly both in number and in size. Predictions are that by 1970 they will enroll more than half of the Nation's total freshmen class—even last year they absorbed one out of every four students who entered higher education. In 1920 there were only 10 junior colleges and in 1929, 129. Today there are 667 junior colleges with an enrollment of more than a million students.

The Truman Commission said that the junior college should absorb the bulk of the increased college enrollment during the next decade. At the time the Commission was accused of being starry-eyed and visionary, when it predicted that by 1960 there would be 2.9 million students. It now appears that by 1960 enrollments will exceed 4 million.

The church-supported junior colleges, bless them, are carrying a great share of the load and are doing a most effective job in developing enlightened citizens and furthering Christian education. They, too, are growing.

While in Honolulu recently I visited the $3 million junior college under construction by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. I was so taken up with the beauty of this institution and the vision of its sponsors that I wrote their commissioner, my former student president, Ernest Wilkinson, for the present enrollment and expenditures of the church's junior colleges and the projected expenditures and enrollment.

At the present time the Mormon church has 1,275 students enrolled in two junior colleges and is spending $991,000. Commissioner Wilkinson estimates that the proposed Ricks College in Idaho, the proposed junior college in Salt Lake City and four junior colleges in areas of large church population will enroll 30,000 students by 1975. He says within the next 5 years the church will probably spend $10 million on the construction of junior colleges and by the year 1975 will likely have spent $30 million on junior colleges.

As a result of their surveys, authorities give five chief reasons why 50 percent of the top 25 percent of the high school graduates never attend college. These reasons are: first, lack of finances; second, lack of motivation; third, distance from college; fourth, ineligibility for matriculation; and, fifth, the nature of the college program.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE MAKES HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCIALLY AVAILABLE

The present distribution of family income reveals sobering inequalities. Seventy percent of the families of the United States have an income of $5,000 or less and 15 percent have a total income of under $2,000 which you will admit barely covers necessities. How many of their children, I ask you, can they send away to college these days on such a salary?

A U.S. Office of Education study shows that trends in tuition charges and fees increased 89 percent in public colleges and 83 percent in private institutions between 1940 and 1957. For example, tuition costs at Yale have jumped from $645 to $1,250 a year and total cost per student went from $1,557 to $2,300 per year. At Harvard tuition jumped from $400 in 1945 to $1,000 in 1959, with total costs $940 to $2,300 per year. Columbia tuition in 1945 was $380—in 1959, $974, with total costs increased from $1,090 to $2,084.

Student costs are much less in the junior college. W. Hugh Stickler made one of the most reliable studies of student costs, in which he included tuition, fees, room rent, board, books, supplies, clothing, transportation, and miscellaneous expenditures. His results are as follows: Public senior college, $1,304 per year; public junior college, $1,062; private senior college, $1,531; and private junior college, $735.

In other words it costs the student about $242 more per year to attend a public senior college than to attend a public junior college and $800 more per year to attend a private senior college than to attend a private junior college.

Further evidence that the community college makes college available to more people is produced by Coleman Griffiths in his book, "The Junior College of Illinois."

He found that only 19.7 percent of high school graduates went on to college when there was no junior college in their community as against 53.5 percent when the junior college was present. In the latter case also 46.7 percent of the graduates of lower income status families were found to be attending the junior college.

Strayer found that nearly four times as many children of families in the lower income bracket attended college where there was an institution at home as attended when they were required to go away to attend college. By attending college at home the student is also able to find part-time work with his friends and neighbors and combine education and work.

I believe that it costs the public or the church much less money to build and operate a junior college than a senior institution. A considerable portion of the expense of the senior institution is spent in research. The junior college does not have this expense. Again the senior institutions must spend huge sums to build dormitories and dining halls. These on the contrary are not necessary in most junior colleges because the students come from a nearby area and live at home. Journalist Louis Cassel cites Government studies which reveal costs of $6,000 per student for necessary buildings in a senior institution while comparable buildings costs in the community college are $3,000.

TRANSITION FROM HIGH SCHOOL TO JUNIOR COLLEGES MORE EASY

Students do not experience the strangeness and homesickness when they live at home and go to a local institution that they suffer in entering a huge institution away from home.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CATERS TO A WIDELY DIVERSIFIED STUDENT POPULATION

It requires an IQ of approximately 115 to get a "C" grade in the professional courses of the senior institutions of the United States. Approximately two thirds of the American college youth have not IQ's that high. That is one reason why one half of the students are eliminated from the universities by the end of the sophomore year.

The Truman Commission found that at least 32 percent of our population has the ability to complete an advanced, liberal or specialized professional education. And, after spending thousands of dollars to calibrate the Army test scores of 10 million servicemen into college aptitude indexes, the Commission said further:

At least 49 percent of our population has the mental ability to complete 14 years of schooling (the junior college program) with a flexible curriculum of general and vocational studies that should lead either to gainful employment or further study at a more advanced level.

The junior colleges, therefore, offer educational opportunity to about 17 percent more American youth than even our senior institutions.

If the colleges are to educate the great body of our country's youth, they must provide programs for the development of other abilities than those involved in academic aptitude and they cannot continue to concentrate on students with one type of intelligence to the neglect of youth with other talents.

Special artistic ability, creative genius, mechanical skills and abilities not measured by our verbal tests represent valuable abilities not fully recognized by the traditional university. This is another cause of our large student mortality. The technical curriculum of the junior college on the other hand is designed especially for the semiprofessions and the highly skilled occupations. American industry and our defense plants are crying for these people. We can use five semiprofessional engineers for every graduate engineer.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE HAS WORKED MIRACLES IN ADULT EDUCATION

The junior college goes into all of the homes that do all of the work of the community and with its diversified program and practical bent teaches the parents, as well as the youth, to do that work better and to live more happily in those homes.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE HELPS PROVIDE THE WILL TO LEARN

Psychologist Flemming says, "Show me a boy's IQ and I will tell you roughly what he might be able to do. But show me what he wants to do and I'll tell you what he will do." In order that all may learn to survive and stay free we must develop in them the will to learn.

The will to learn is influenced to a considerable extent by family tradition, but family tradition is changing rapidly. Families are finding out now that it requires education beyond the high school to understand the front pages of the newspaper, to understand our international relations, our new hopes, our new fears, our new political developments, and even to get a job.

NEW HELP IS COMING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Education has always been of uppermost importance in achieving political and moral objectives in western civilization, but never have we looked upon it quite as we do now in terms of our very survival. So it is not strange that these crucial times have resulted in the Federal Government taking more of an interest in the Nation's schools and playing an increasingly important role.

One good example that the Federal Government has recognized that education, as well as missiles, is essential to our national security was the enactment last session of Public Law 85-864, the National Defense Education Act, authorizing something over $1 billion in Federal aid. In its 10 titles it touches every level of education, public and private, from the elementary school through the graduate programs.

The success of the college student loan plan, which we substituted for a scholarship program, has surprised even educators. Before, many college loan funds had gone begging. In the first 4 months after the bill was passed, 1,230 colleges and universities applied for participation asking for $62 million. Congress had appropriated $6 million to get the program started this year.

Of the 1,227 institutions which have received college loan funds, 224 have been junior colleges, technical institutions or normal schools offering 2, but less than 4, years of work beyond the 12th grade. According to the Office of Education, they have received $354,883.

In addition to the $6 million for the student loan section of the bill $20,350,000 was provided for science, mathematics, and foreign language, $800,000 for national defense fellowships, $7,400,000 for guidance, counseling, and testing, $800,000 for advanced training in foreign areas and languages, $500,000 for educational media research, $3,750,000 for grants to States for area vocational programs and $400,000 for grants to States for statistical services.

Supplemental appropriation requests for $75,300,000 for the National Defense Education Act are now pending before Congress.

Other areas in which the Federal Government is participating or is expecting to participate are school construction, aid to rural libraries, providing surplus commodities—such as tools for technical training—to the schools and Public Law 480 which makes foreign currencies available for such things as the financing of chairs in America studies in foreign universities, exchange of persons, workshops presented by American leaders abroad and assistance to American schools abroad.

Some suggested ways in which we might speed up our educational efforts and at the same time develop more enlightened citizens are:

First. Decide now to have a far superior school system and declare our willingness to pay the price. The sacrifice would be small in proportion to the returns. For example, the automobile industry spends $1½ billion every year to bring in its new models with different colored paint and styling so the American people will be enticed to spend 10 percent of their entire income for cars. If the money saved by bringing out a new model every second year, instead of every year, were given the public colleges and universities, it would increase their income by three-fourths.

Second. Reorganize and streamline the present slow moving, ponderous school system. The further consolidation of small, inefficient, expensive school districts would be a good beginning. Encourage American education to join together to form large research institutes and coordinate their research efforts. Also, State coordinated programs of higher education which will save money, help prevent wasteful competition, and keep higher education better aware of its aims should be encouraged.

I hope that Congress will soon pass H.R. 5467, which I have introduced, to stimulate State action to meet burgeoning needs in higher education by appropriating $2½ million to the States to enable them to survey present facilities and make plans for future higher education needs.

Third. Speed up the educational process by lengthening the school year on all levels—as they do in Europe—by using school buildings where necessary for more than one school shift—as they do in Russia—and by inviting gifted teenagers and the unemployed to college adult evening classes.

Fourth. Make the program tougher for the gifted students. While we cannot educate young people by merely scowling at them, I think Rousseau's advice to young Emile is still good advice today. He said:

Think like a philosopher and work like a peasant.

Fifth. Either improve the present school situation by eliminating some of the more enjoyable and time-consuming offerings in favor of the more demanding mental disciplines or establish institutes which will challenge the gifted.

Sixth. Provide better counseling and guidance on both levels of the secondary school and at the university to screen out and give special encouragement to the diligent and the superior student.

Seventh. Reverse the present trend where teachers and counselors spend an unwarranted amount of their time and the State's money polishing cobblestones and dimming diamonds.

Eighth. Take greater advantage of the ability of the junior college to provide a general and practical education at home for all youth at considerable less expense to the student and the public. Our times demand even more 2-year technically qualified graduates than graduates of the professional schools.

Ninth. Establish more private, industrial and State fellowships, jobs, loans, awards and incentives to attract gifted youth to college and keep them longer in college. If the former are not adequate, Federal help may also be necessary.

Tenth. Exalt the role of the outstanding teacher by according him greater social prestige, better salary and tax deduction on money spent for professional improvement. It took a terrific struggle to get this deduction, but even that encouragement will help to transform many a teacher's attitude.

I have injected in my remarks the element of fear. I have done this to make the challenge more urgent and more purposeful. Extrinsic motivation, such as fear, punishment or rewards, is usually not as abiding as intrinsic motivation which springs from a love of the cause itself. One should act not because he is afraid not to or feels he ought to, but because he wants to.

Western civilization is definitely in peril. Our greatest defense is Christian education. But this system of education has many weaknesses and there is some room for fear that we cannot learn to survive in time to avert disaster. But people adjust to fear very readily. The fear of sputnik was partly displaced by the fear of the recession and the loss of jobs and now by the fear of a conflagration over East Germany. So we cannot place too much reliance upon fear alone causing us to enlist in a crusade to eliminate the weaknesses of our system in order that all might learn what they should learn.

Our school system is not a second rate affair. It is by all odds the best system known anywhere or at any time. The great reason is easy to be found. It is thousands of dedicated people who have made it their first love and the center of their lives.

They didn't teach—

Says Secretary Arthur Flemming—

to become wealthy but for the love of their neighbor and their country. We can be indicted for penalizing our teachers for their loyalty.

Secretary Flemming says further that the great commandment, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," does not mean that we like him or that we even agree with him in all instances. It does mean that we love him enough to help him realize his greatest possibilities.

Jesus of Nazareth was confronted with terrible trials and sorrows; yet he triumphed over far greater obstacles than we ever dream of. He said:

My soul is troubled and what shall I say? Father deliver me from this hour—but for this cause come I unto this hour.

He forgot himself in His great dedication to the cause of His Father.

And a vision appeared unto Paul in the night. There stood a man of Macedonia and praying him saying: "Come over into Macedonia and help us.

That is what Western civilization and its youth are saying to educators today.

## The State of Mind That Makes America Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to insert the sermon given by Rabbi Richard E. Singer, of the Lakeside Congregation for Reform Judaism, at the interdenominational community Thanksgiving service held at the Highland Park Presbyterian Church, Highland Park, Ill., on November 27, 1957. Following its nomination by the pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Dr. William A. Young, this sermon by Rabbi Singer was recently awarded the Freedoms Foundation award. Those who have been privileged to read this sermon, with its strong exposition of the history and future of a free country, can readily

understand why the Freedoms Foundation gave the award:

THE STATE OF MIND THAT MAKES AMERICA GREAT

(Sermon by Richard E. Singer, Rabbi, Lakeside Congregation for Reform Judaism, at the Community Thanksgiving Service, Highland Park Presbyterian Church, November 27, 1957)

We come together for our community Thanksgiving worship grateful for the abundance of this good land in which we live. Its fields and forests, its lakes and sparkling streams, its great cities and rolling plains, its snowcapped mountains and warm ocean-washed sands, are loved by us, for this is home.

When we are far away we remember home with deeper feeling. We know that we are without something of ourselves.

And yet, the material blessings for which we give thanks, the richness of this land, the bounty of its harvests, the fullness and goodness of the lives we live, is not the power that makes the eye of the traveler returning home blur with happiness at the sight of the symbols of America.

For many nations have known and know abundance. Many peoples taste the ripe and sweet savoured fruits of the good earth and know the emotion of well-being and satisfaction.

But abundance is not America. And its material richness did not make this Nation what it is.

We need not search far for the thoughts and goals that have created the character of our Nation. They run through our history, a mighty stream, nourishing succeeding generations of our countrymen. As children we learned about this spiritual quality of America when we went to school. And sometimes we do well to remind ourselves of lessons grown hazy with time, faded, perhaps, by the unfortunate corrosions of maturity's cynicism.

We think now of the first Thanksgiving and the Pilgrims.

The Pilgrim fathers are well known not only because they led the Puritan vanguard to New England but through the moving history of their adventures and sufferings written by their leader, Governor Bradford.

They were a small group, humble people, leftwing Puritans of East Anglia. There the modest religious meetings they attended were so hampered by their neighbors that they left for Leyden, Holland, in 1609, and formed an English Congregational Church. After 10 years of exile they decided to move to America.

Sir Edwin Sandys recognized the quality of these people, even though he did not share their religous faith, and arranged for a grant from the Virginia Company then active in encouraging emigration. A group of English merchants financed the trip. After long delays the *Mayflower* set sail in the worst weather of the year and after a rough passage anchored on November 11, 1620, in the harbor of Cape Cod, outside the Virginia jurisdiction. And with an instinct for self-government that anticipated the future the Pilgrims signed a compact to be governed by the will of the majority until permanent provision should be made for the colony.

The situation of the group of settlers was grim, almost desperate. They had arrived at a harbor enclosed by barren sand dunes at the beginning of a New England winter. Their food supplies were limited. Governor Bradford described their position vividly:

"For summer being done, all things stand upon them with a weatherbeaten face; and the whole country, full of woods and thickets, represented a wild and savage hue. If they looked behind them, there was the mighty ocean which they had passed, and was now as a main bar and gulf to separate them from all the civil parts of the world. * * * What could now sustain them but the spirit of God and his grace? May not and ought not the children of these fathers rightly say: 'Our fathers * * * came over this great ocean and were ready to perish in this wilderness; but they cried unto the Lord, and he heard their voice, and looked upon their adversities. Let them, therefore, praise the Lord, because he is good, and His mercies endure forever.' "

There never was a group of settlers so ill-fitted by experience and equipment to cope with the wilderness. Peasants, city workers, petty bourgeoisie, they did not know what they faced. And yet, none came through so magnificently.

For, as Bradford put it: "They knew they were pilgrims, and looked not much on those things. * * * It is not with us as with other men, whom small things can discourage, or small discontentments cause to wish themselves at home again."

One bit of luck they did have. They found some deserted fields ready for plowing at the harbor already named Plymouth by Capt. John Smith. And they were joined by Squanto, the Indian, who acted as a sort of scoutmaster. He taught them how to catch fish and grow corn.

But half the company died the first winter.

In November of 1621 it was a small group that met to celebrate the first Thanksgiving feast. The ship *Fortune* had arrived with provisions. They had reaped a fair harvest. There was a large number of wild turkeys and considerable venison. So, the Pilgrims, in the words of their Governor, "* * * exercised (their) arms, amongst other recreations; many of the Indians coming amongst us, and among the rest their greatest king, Massasoit, with some 90 men, whom for 3 days we entertained and feasted."

The entertainment was expensive. With more mouths to feed short rations were again routine. For the first several years of existence the colony ran neck and neck with famine. But the people never lost heart. They did not consider giving up and going home. These simple folk were exalted to the stature of statesmen and prophets in their narrow sphere, because they ardently believed, and so they greatly dared; and they firmly endured.

They set forth in acts as in words the kind of stouthearted idealism that we Americans admire. And this is why Plymouth has become a symbol. And this is why Thanksgiving is so beloved.

And Governor Bradford wrote: "Thus out of small beginnings greater things have been produced by his hand that made all things of nothing; and as one small candle may light a thousand, so the light here kindled hath shown unto many, yea in some sort, to our whole Nation."

If courage, stark and determined, formed the beginnings of this Nation, courage growing out of desires for personal freedoms impelled the next great American achievement.

In 1775 the idea of independence from Britain was not acceptable to many Members of the Continental Congress and to a large number of the American people. The two Continental Congresses which had been convened had as their purpose the repeal of the Coercive Acts and the restoration of imperial relations. Thus both war and independence would have been averted. As late as the autumn of 1775 the legislatures of North Carolina, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Maryland were on record against independence. Public opinion was not ready for any drastic action.

At the same time it was understood that the colonies could not forever remain half in and half out of the Empire, professing allegiance while refusing obedience. Moderates persuaded themselves that they were not fighting the king or the mother country, but the "unprincipled hirelings of a venal ministry." They referred to the enemy as the "ministerial," not the British Army. They hoped for a political crisis in England that would place their friends in power. As late as January 1776, the king's health was toasted nightly in the officers' mess presided over by General Washington.

But no compromise came from England and on the 22d of December 1775, in an action not known in the colonies until weeks later, all trade and all relations with the Thirteen Colonies was interdicted by Parliament.

And the next month Thomas Paine's pamphlet, "Common Sense," was published.

This book was to the American Revolution what "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was to the Civil War. It swept aside dialectic and sentiment. Paine stated the case for independence in crisp, vigorous language that appealed to the ordinary American. He presented in popular form the natural rights philosophy that was to be embodied in the Declaration of Independence. Paine stated: "Society in every state is a blessing, but Government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst an intolerable one."

Paine attacked the monarchy, the British Constitution, and the Empire. He stated that monarchy itself is an absurd form of government. One honest man, he said, is "worth all the crowned ruffians that ever lived." George III was the "Royal Brute of Great Britain—the worst of monarchs."

These were sweet words to democratic ears. How absurd it was that a continent should be governed by an island. Such an unnatural connection merely subjected the colonies to exploitation and involved them in every European war.

Paine presented the alternatives: continued submission to a tyrannous king, an outworn government, and a vicious economic system; or liberty and happiness as a self-sufficient, independent republic. He lumped the loyalists together and denounced them as "interested men who are not to be trusted, weak men who cannot see, and a certain set of moderate men who think better of the European world than it deserves." He wrote these eloquent words:

"O! ye that loved mankind! Ye that dare oppose not only the tyranny but the tyrant, stand forth! Every spot of the old world is overrun with oppression. Freedom hath been hunted round the globe. Asia and Africa have long expelled her. Europe regards her as a stranger and England hath given her warning to depart. Receive the fugitive and prepare in time an asylum for mankind."

The influence of this amazing pamphlet can hardly be exaggerated. Within a few months almost every American had read it or had it read to him. It rallied the undecided and the wavering. It was a trumpet call to the radicals.

John Adams said joyously: "Every post and every day rolls in upon us independence like a torrent."

The Declaration of Independence was inevitable.

The political philosophy of the Declaration is set forth in its familiar second paragraph:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying

its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

The nature of this ideal government, motivated by man's desire for freedom and liberty, was created by social compact, by agreement among men. Originally, so Locke and Jefferson held, men lived equal in a state of nature. When necessity required some form of control, they got together and set up a government by popular consent. It is the function and purpose of government to protect men in their life, liberty, and property. Jefferson substituted for the term "property" the phrase "pursuit of happiness", an illuminating stroke on the part of this social philosopher who all through his life placed human rights first. If government fails to perform these functions "it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it altogether, and to institute new government"—as the Americans were doing. To the troublesome charge that such popular power would lead to anarchy Jefferson replied: "All experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer which evils are sufferable, than to right them by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."

Most of the great liberal reform movements of the 19th century—abolition, universal suffrage, labor laws, popular education; most of the nationalist freedom movements in Ireland, Finland, Italy, Germany in 1848, Czechoslovakia—based their philosophy on the Declaration. Its doctrines are timeless. The beauty of its phrasing and its sure appeal to the innermost desire of man for liberty make it immortal.

But America could not know only intoxicating success and the accomplishment of visions and the joys of opening up a continent. There is agony in growth as well as in birth. And the Civil War tried our Nation, tested its ideals, burned it in fire so that it might show its true measure of devotion to principle.

And out of American courage, and love of liberty, and the willingness to fight for the idea of freedom there came another quality into the spirit of this Nation, a quality represented at a little courthouse, that has become part of American folklore.

On April 9, 1865, Sheridan closed the only avenue of escape westward for Lee's tired army. Whether he could have cut his way through to the mountains and continued guerrilla warfare is uncertain. At any rate, Lee wrote: "It is our duty to live, for what will become of the women and children of the South, if we are not here to support and protect them?"

And so General Lee ordered a white flag to be displayed and requested an interview with his opponent. It was granted.

Lee appeared in the new full dress uniform with jewel-studded sword that he had saved in the retreat. Grant was in his favorite private's blouse, unbuttoned, and without a sword, his feelings sad and depressed at the downfall of a foe who had fought so long and valiantly.

There were formal greetings. There was small talk of other days in the old army. And then Grant wrote the terms of surrender in his own hand, officers and men paroled, arms and materiel surrendered, not to include the officers' sidearms and "Let all the men," he wrote, "who claim to own a horse or mule take the animals home with them to work their farms.

"This will do much toward conciliating our people."

The conference was over. Lee paused for a moment in the doorway, looked out over a field blossoming with the Stars and Stripes. Slowly, three times, he struck his fist into the palm of his gauntleted hand. And then he mounted his horse, Traveler, and was gone.

A sound of cheering spread among the Union lines.

Grant ordered it to cease. He said: "The war is over; the rebels are our countrymen again."

And his words were repeated by Lincoln who said:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Thus ended the second inaugural and began a new chapter in our history.

The will to endure, the firm faith, the surpassing goal of freedom was joined by the ideals of understanding and compassion and love.

And here we are today with the memory of the centuries washing over us—aware of the ideas and dreams and visions and sacred principles that have made our Nation what it is.

We tell ourselves that we know what has been. But we wonder what can be, what will be in this new world when wars are battles of technologies and the spirit of man has grown weary.

For we live in times when security is man's greatest goal, in times when man's fear overcomes his beliefs, his daring, his very endurance.

We fear the technologies. We fear the threats—economic and social—of conflicting ideologies. We fear that we may lose all this we know and love. We fear the whirling satellites in the skies and we fear the competitive educational systems that prepare the children of our enemies.

We fear—and yet we need not fear.

We need not fear because we have something here in our land that should be saved. We have something that must be saved if a world of men is to know the basic promise of its humanness.

Our faults, we acknowledge, are many and glaring. Indeed, it is the very recognition of our faults that so affects our self-confidence and our daring. We have permitted ourselves to be bowed beneath the very emotional weight of our knowledge of imperfection. Nevertheless, though we have often failed, though we have failed to be what we might be, we have something to offer to the world now, and to the future, something precious, something life-giving, something creative and inspiring.

This that we have and which our traditions so revere, is freedom—freedom touched by human understanding and compassion, freedom motivated by great dreams and stark courage. We have freedom, and we believe that to repudiate freedom even for the supposed comforts of security is to abandon western civilization.

The founders of this Republic held this faith so firmly that its guarantee was imbedded in the very first amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

We have known, since the days of the Second World War, and we know today, challenges to our freedom. The energy-sapping sickly cloud of conformity shrouds too much of what we do. Our young people are fearful of being different. As adults we seek for concensus of opinion. We are fearful of the unusual, of the comment causing. As a Nation we are turning into followers of Russian initiative—the Soviets set the stage for competition; they produce a challenge—we, as Johnny-come-latelys try to find the answer. We have lost the spiritual initiative of our liberty-loving background. For there was a day when America so greatly believed that it dared to do the impossible, and because it dared, it did, and because it was willing to do, willing to try, because it would not be deterred even by the knowledge of possible failure, our Nation endured.

What we face today is not our battle alone. We realize that our way of life and the way of all of western civilization is challenged. If we go down, it all goes down. And we can go down unless we recognize what it is that we have to fight for, and then have the courage to fight—even the kind of courage that surpasses balanced budgets and waste-free economies. What makes all this worth saving is the ingredient of freedom, this magnificent state of mind that has made our Nation so great and so filled with promise.

Soon after the departure of the ship *Fortune* in January of 1622, the grand sachem of the Narragansett Indians, Canonicus by name, sent a messenger to the Pilgrims. The messenger bore a great bundle of arrows, tied about with a huge snakeskin. Squanto interpreted the message and told his friends that it was a threat and a challenge.

In reply, after taking counsel with the others, Governor Bradford answered: "That if they would rather have war than peace they might begin when they would; they, the Pilgrims, had done them no wrong, nor did they fear them nor would they be unprepared."

And by still another messenger he sent back the snakeskin filled with bullets. And we are told that the blustering Canonicus refused to receive this messenger; he sent him away, and at the same time the Narragansetts ceased their warlike noises.

This Republic was not established by cowards. Cowards will not preserve it.

We have a vision of liberty that the world has respected and loved and dreamed to achieve. But freedom is a hard-won thing, and the winning never ends. Each generation must prove itself worthy of the heritage of its fathers.

Our fathers never lost heart. They created all this we know and love because they ardently believed in what they did. And so they greatly dared. They greatly dared. And because they believed and because they dared, they firmly endured.

Can we do less than they?

Amen.

---

## United States Stands Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Tuesday, March 17, issue of the State Journal, published in Lansing, Mich. I believe the writer has very well captured the spirit of a united and determined American people who agree wholeheartedly with their President that we cannot knuckle under to Russia's outrageous demands in Berlin. The editorial follows:

UNITED STATES STANDS FIRM

The American people Monday night heard President Eisenhower state the reasons the United States and its free world allies must stand firm in support of their right to re-

main in West Berlin and to have free access to that city.

At the same time, the Soviet Government received notice of this country's determination to resist the Kremlin's efforts to force the Western Powers out of West Berlin where they have a right to be under agreements to which the Soviet Union was a party.

Mr. Eisenhower placed responsibility for the Berlin crisis squarely where it belongs—on the Soviet Government which seeks by unilateral action to change the status of West Berlin in a way that would be a grave threat to the freedom of 2 million residents of the city.

The President also made it clear that if the Soviet demands resulted in war the responsibility would be that of Russia, and Russia alone.

Mr. Eisenhower evidenced confidence in the ability of this country and its allies to defend themselves against the possible use of Communist force in support of the Russian demands.

In reply to congressional critics who have contended he is more interested in a balanced budget than in a strong Military Establishment to the jeopardy of national defense, the President said such assertions are simply not true.

He told his nationwide audience that he is sure of one thing—"that we have the courage and capacity to meet the stern realities of the present and the future."

While Mr. Eisenhower expressed firmness and confidence there was no hint in his speech of the truculence that marks most of the utterances of Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

The President said that "we will not retreat 1 inch, from our duty" and "shall continue to exercise our right of peaceful passage to and from West Berlin" but that this country is also "ready to participate fully in every sincere effort at negotiation that will respect the existing rights of all and their opportunity to live in peace."

He suported the pledge of readiness to negotiate by offering Premier Khrushchev a summit conference this summer if a preliminary foreign ministers' meeting indicates that a meeting of the heads of government will serve a worthwhile purpose.

In calling for firmness against the Soviet demands, the President said war would become more likely "if we gave way and encouraged a rule of terrorism rather than a rule of law and order."

The President emphasized the fact that the United States does not seek to dominate anyone and is not interested in material gain but that this country's position is based solely on principle and justice.

Mr. Eisenhower has made a firm statement of America's position to the rest of the free world and to Russia. It should remove any doubts at the Kremlin as to the United States determination and ability to defend its rights in West Berlin. By so doing it should give serious pause to any Soviet leaders who may be thinking of resorting to military power in an effort to enforce their wholly unwarranted demands.

## Firm, but Ready for the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the March 18, 1959, edition of the San Francisco Chronicle, entitled, "Firm, but Ready for the Summit."

FIRM, BUT READY FOR THE SUMMIT

President Eisenhower's statement on the Berlin crisis was clear and firm yet not inflexible. It was just what the confused situation called for, and it presented the President in a strong and forceful light that is all the more reassuring in the absence of Secretary of State Dulles.

"The risk of war is minimized if we stand firm," the President said. History underlines such a statement. If anyone in the West had stood firm in 1936, it might never have been necessary to fight what Churchill has called the "unnecessary war" of 1939–45. So firmness within our rights is our No. 1 position.

What comes after firmness in sticking up for our rights? This is the area of negotiation about which the President spoke. He did not say what would be negotiated. But he did say very clearly to Premier Khrushchev that if the Soviet Union keeps on talking in the improved tone of its last note, March 2, the move toward negotiations can continue right up to the summit. "We would never negotiate under a dictated time limit or agenda," he said, but he went on to promise that if developments at the Foreign Ministers' conference, already agreed to by Khrushchev, should "justify a summer meeting at the summit" he would go.

This was the chief point he had to communicate to the Soviets. Some observers believe the President was reacting to the word brought from Moscow by Prime Minister Macmillan, who apparently concluded that there is not much point in negotiating with any Russian except Khrushchev. Since Khrushchev wants a summit conference (not the least of his purposes being to bolster his own standing in the eyes of 200 million Russians, 600 million Chinese and 100 million satellites), a summit conference there will be.

The firmness of intent to stick by our rights in Berlin is not an issue in Congress or among a majority of people in the country. What is at issue is the adequacy of America's military defense. On this the professional soldier spoke with square-jawed certainty. His denial, as "simply not true," that the country's defense is being subordinated to balance the budget, that it is inadequate, or that more manpower is essential leaves the admirals and generals and Senators in an awkward debating stance. Meanwhile, the public will undoubtedly continue to trust the judgment of Eisenhower as against that of his critics.

## Retirement of Federal Civil Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today in the House of Representatives a bill which will provide for retirement for Federal civil service employees after 30 years of service, regardless of age.

Much consideration has been given during the past few years to a liberalization of retirement benefits. However, at the present time an employee must have reached the age of 60 before he can qualify for a full retirement annuity after 30 years of service.

In checking into the situation we find that many employees started their Government careers immediately after completion of their schooling, and would thus actually be eligible for retirement after 30 years' service before they reach the age of 60. Of course, under the present law, they can retire between the ages of 55 and 60 after 30 years' service, but on a reduced annuity. In this day and age, with increased living costs, it is neither practical nor possible to attempt to live comfortably and securely on such an annuity.

In addition, statistics show that the percentage of older citizens is steadily growing, and that within a period of 20 years we will have over 20 million Americans over the age of 65. Another factor to be given serious attention when studying this problem is the increasing labor force in this country. With more young people and women becoming available on the labor market, our industries cannot absorb all these potential workers without the necessity for some adjustments. We hear many suggestions urging early retirement, and our older workers are encouraged to retire from private industry as quickly as possible to make way for the younger employees. The Federal Government could take the lead in setting such an example by permitting retirement of its employees after 30 years' service.

May I urge my colleagues to give this matter serious consideration, with a view toward enacting such legislation in the very near future.

## Amendments to Federal Airport Act

SPEECH

OF

### HON. FRANK M. COFFIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1011) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1011. This legislation, as reported by the committee, represents a sound investment in the economic development of our Nation. It is directed toward the whole Nation, taking into account the needs of large cities with airports designed to handle continental and international aircraft in the jet age, and small communities providing needed air service in areas remote from urban centers.

I have received five telegrams from town officials in five counties in my district, a telegram from the Governor of the State of Maine, and a telegram from the executive secretary of the Maine Mu-

nicipal Association in support of this legislation. In fact, several officials preferred the Senate bill, with recommendations for the full $100 million annual authorization.

One month ago, Scott K. Higgins, director of the Maine Aeronautics Commission, advised us that the minimum amount to meet rockbottom rural State needs would be a $65 million authorization.

Recent studies indicate that 50 airports are needed for general and commercial aviation needs in the State of Maine. Thirty-nine of these airports are in existence and 11 new fields should be constructed. The total estimated cost is $9,928,400.

The bill which is before us today falls within the President's budgetary proposals. In fact, as reported by the committee, it is $2 million less than the President's proposal for fiscal year 1960.

We have then a bill which will provide for a basic and much-needed program to maintain, modernize, and improve airport facilities in all areas of our country. We can do this within the most conservative estimates of our fiscal requirements. If we do take this necessary step we will be making an investment in improved and safer transportation along the airways of the United States. I urge adoption of H.R. 1011 at least at the minimum level recommended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## Five Billion Dollars More for Defense Urged by Gen. Maxwell Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Marquis Childs which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, March 18, 1959:

URGE $5 BILLION MORE FOR DEFENSE

(By Marquis Childs)

Thanks to the Pentagon censor and the inevitable restraints imposed by the Berlin crisis, the current inquiry into our defenses is unlikely to bring into focus the real nature of the dispute over our preparedness or lack of it.

Put in the simplest possible terms the question posed is: Have our conventional forces been so cut back for reasons of economy that our capacity for limited war has been reduced dangerously close to zero and our entire reliance placed on nuclear retaliation? In other words, is the choice between suicide and surrender?

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chief of Staff of the Army, believes that the defense budget must be $45 billion a year for 5 years if the Army is to overcome the grave deficiencies of recent years.

This is $5 billion more than is in the President's defense budget for 1960. In General Taylor's view it would enable the Army to carry out a minimum modernization.

Some of this he spelled out in his testimony before the Johnson Preparedness Subcommittee. But the basic contention he put on the record in a speech last December. He said that 70 percent of the equipment of the Army was of World War II or Korean war vintage or older.

As a result, he told an audience in Pasadena, Calif., the Army needs second-generation missiles, light atomic weapons, improved conventional weapons, many new types of air and ground vehicles, and improved and newly designed electronic communications equipment. It is vital also to plan the contingent use of air and sea lift for limited war. In short, the Army is equipped with the weapons of the last war to fight a new war on the ground. In contrast, the Russians have pushed modernization very far in their 175 ground divisions.

Of the four members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Taylor is the only one due to retire, after two terms as Chief of Staff. The others as continuing members of the Eisenhower team have a demand on their loyalty.

When he retires at the end of June General Taylor intends to take his case to the public. He will argue first in a series of magazine articles and then in a book that "massive retaliation" is a strategic trap into which the United States has fallen.

The odds would seem to be against his success. The power of the aircraft industry is very great and if the Eisenhower economy wall is to be breached, with or without the President's consent, it would seem likely the additional money would go into missiles or aircraft.

Yet, General Taylor's effort should not be entirely discounted. His predecessor as Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew Ridgway, more than any single individual blocked those who were bent on an atomic strike when the French had dug themselves into the futile jungle post of Dienbienphu in the Indochina war. The country's debt to him on his one score alone is great.

General Ridgway also made the case for a modernized Army of reasonable strength. While he was not reappointed to a second term as Chief of Staff he had had a wide and respectful hearing.

Before he retires, at the end of his second term, General Taylor will go to Europe for a lengthy meeting of NATO military planners. About mid-May he will be in Berlin. Ostensibly this will be for a formal farewell to the American troops stationed there.

In fact it will be a morale booster for the garrison. From 1949 to 1951 General Taylor was commander of the American contingent in Berlin and he has a deep attachment to the city. When this spare, handsome soldier inspects the troops in battle formation with the deadline of May 27 only a few days away, it will be a moment of high emotion.

What is coming out of the current preparedness hearings should leave Moscow in no doubt—this country will not retreat from Berlin no matter how grim the choice. But a choice between suicide and a border province in Iran or the China offshore islands is something quite different.

It is the case for readiness to meet the limited challenge that General Taylor wants to carry to the court of public opinion.

## Dr. Flemming's Famous Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 10, 1959*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, proposes to build 75,000 classrooms by the simple device of altering State constitutions, State debt-limitation statutes, and basic State tax principles. Secretary Flemming has been so successful in his crusade to doctor the laws of the States that he has been given an honorary doctor of laws degree by Georgetown University.

Dr. Flemming, in the process of doctoring the laws under his new franchise, could help the medical doctors of the Nation solve the Nation's health problems and stave off the awful specter of socialized medicine at the same time he is building classrooms. Simple extension of Dr. Flemming's formula would have the States that are rewriting their constitutions or their statutes in order to build classrooms also incorporate a provision that all germs, viruses, bacteria, and Ezra Taft Benson are persona non grata in those States.

## Soviet Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an article appearing in the March 15, 1959, Washington Post and Times Herald on the subject of trade with the Soviets.

There are many pressing questions involved in this area. Should we trade with the Soviets? Is it safe and desirable? Who should establish United States trade control policies? How should our trade-control program be administered?

This article contains a discussion touching on these problems and I believe it will be of interest to all Members of Congress:

COMMERCE'S "NO" BARS PIPE ORDER—DEPARTMENTS AT ODDS OVER TRADE WITH SOVIET

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

The question of whether it is safe or desirable to trade with Russia is still being debated in the U.S. Government. It also is a question the Government is constantly debating with its principal allies, which are more eager to trade with the Communist bloc than Washington.

The State Department favors somewhat more liberal rules governing trade with the Communists than the Defense and Commerce Departments. It was the latter two which prevailed this week in a decision to deny a license for the export of $2.5 million worth of steel pipe to the Soviet Union.

The importance of the decision is not that Russia is denied access to the pipe, which would be sufficient to build a pipeline of less than 45 miles, but that it again shows that this country has not, after nearly 15 years of postwar debate, been able to make up its mind as to the precise policy which should be followed.

ACTION RECONSIDERED

Twice the Commerce Department, without consulting the State Department, turned down an application for a license to export 26-inch steel pipe to Russia. After the visit here early this year of Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, the Commerce Depart-

ment decided to reconsider its decision and to seek the advice of other departments.

But despite some uncertainty by the State Department, the decision was finally made to deny the license.

When Mikoyan was here, he and C. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, had a heated argument over American restrictions against trade with the Communist bloc, and Dillon said afterward that Mikoyan really was not very serious about wanting to improve trade relations.

Dillon said he invited Mikoyan to begin trading. The reapplication for the license for steel pipe was one result of the invitation, and now it has been turned down.

It has been reported that the Soviets recently placed orders for 85,000 tons of steel pipe valued at $19 million in West Germany. The question thus arises as to why this country should refuse to do business with Moscow if the same order can be filled elsewhere.

The Commerce Department explanation is that there is a difference in the kind of pipe purchased in Germany and the kind sought here. West Germany is supplying 24-inch pipe; the Russians wanted to buy 28-inch pipe here. The Department thinks that Russia will have a hard time finding the 28-inch pipe outside the United States, but whether this is true or not remains to be seen.

Under Commerce regulations, pipe that is 24 inches or less in outside diameter is not on the positive list, but larger pipe is.

What this means is that there is a presumption for denial of an application for an export license if the item is on the positive list and a presumption for granting an application if the item is not on the list.

Export licenses must be obtained for practically everything exported to Soviet bloc countries, whether the item is on the positive list or not.

Moscow no doubt will denounce the decision on the steel pipe and attempt to make propaganda capital out of it.

Most officials here would reply that Moscow's chief interest is not in normal trade but in sporadic trade, the purchase of steel pipe today, of a chemical factory tomorrow, of some new technical development the next day, all designed to further Russia's industrial expansion with the least possible commitment to the establishment of continuous trade patterns.

The differences in the administration are between those, on the one hand, who believe that there should be virtually no trade with Russia, because any trade helps its industrial expansion, and between those who believe that the best way to bring about more normal political relations is to coax Russia to become more dependent upon foreign trade.

## Draft Admiral Rickover?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, my answer to the urgent need of prompt action to rush development of nuclear powered space craft is to draft Admiral Rickover at once. Put him in charge of a program to convert nuclear engines for use in space vehicles and watch our U.S. progress skyrocket.

Let us face it, we cannot run a space vehicle for any time or with effective power for any appreciable time once we get it up in space.

My congratulations to the forward looking editorial staff of the Twin City Sentinel of Winston-Salem, N.C., for their editorial of March 17, 1959, captioned "New Assignment for Rickover." This editorial points out in remarkably clear terms the need for a man of Admiral Rickover's stature and accomplishment to develop nuclear powered space craft.

As I think the problem is one that should be brought to the attention of the American people, I am submitting this answer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the letter of March 18, 1959, of Robert F. Campbell, associate editor of the Twin City Sentinel, and I also include this thought-provoking editorial:

WINSTON-SALEM JOURNAL,
TWIN CITY SENTINEL,
*Winston-Salem, N.C., March 18, 1959.*

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: You may be interested in reading the enclosed clipping of an editorial which appeared in the Twin City Sentinel of March 17.

We would be delighted to receive from you, preferably for publication, any comment you might wish to make about the editorial or the subject with which it deals.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. CAMPBELL,
*Associate Editor.*

NEW ASSIGNMENT FOR RICKOVER?

The proposal by Representative JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, that Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover be drafted to rush development of nuclear-powered space craft calls attention to a critical problem in the advancement of space flight.

Progress in designing and building powerful rockets to lift vehicles into space has been rapid. Only a little slower has been the development of controls to guide a rocket's thrust and to hold a vehicle steady in its course.

But once that short surge of rocket energy is spent lifting a vehicle into its desired path, very little power is left in the vehicle itself—either for sustained propulsion or for the vehicle's internal needs. The Pioneer IV, for example, was given a mighty boost into a solar orbit. But it could carry only enough power supply to operate its tiny radio transmitter for 60 hours. Several satellites are still coasting around the earth, silent and essentially useless because their meager energy supplies are exhausted.

For space vehicles to stay in business doing jobs that require more than trickles of electricity, some real progress must be made in developing power sources for them. Conventional sources appear hopeless. An electric generator would require a fuel-burning engine to turn it, and fuel would have too much weight to lift. As our satellites have shown, even the best batteries we have for space applications, those that pack a maximum of punch in the smallest and lightest possible package, fall far short of what will be needed for practical weather observation or communication satellites.

There are two possible answers to this energy problem. One is to convert the energy found in space—the harsh glare of sunlight—into electricity. The other is for vehicles to carry a nuclear power supply with them. For some purposes solar energy may be the answer, but the light of the sun, even in outer space, is not sufficiently concentrated to be easily gathered in amounts to produce high-volume power. In short, the sun could be used for watts, but not for kilowatts.

This leaves nuclear energy as the only presently known source of plentiful power for use in space. The trick is to devise a nuclear plant that is small, light and sturdy enough for space applications and that has a high energy output. At the present, our best nuclear power sources are still very heavy or very weak. In fact, according to the Rand Corp.'s "Space Handbook," we are probably farther away from a spaceworthy nuclear power plant than any other technological requirement of interplanetary flight.

If this need is to be met quickly, bold and imaginative research and development work is required. And that brings us back to Admiral Rickover. He is the man who pushed atomic submarines to success against many heavy obstacles—both technical and political. If given the chance with his hands not tied by administrative redtape in the complicated jumble of space agencies, Admiral Rickover might well earn the title of the father of nuclear spaceships.

## The Flight Safety Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the election of Ansel E. Talbert to the vice presidency of the Flight Safety Foundation is very pleasing to the people of South Carolina as well as his many friends in the great city of New York and throughout the country. Colonel Talbert's uncle, for many years, represented South Carolina in the U.S. Congress with honor and distinction. Mr. Speaker, as you know Adm. John H. Cassady, retired, is the president of this great organization. Admiral Cassady is loved and admired by the Members of this Congress. I am happy to report to you that Colonel Talbert will assist him in his great work.

Mr. Speaker, the following article about Colonel Talbert and the Flight Safety Foundation will be of interest to the entire country:

FOR SAFER FLYING

A brief notice appeared in the February View concerning the election of Mr. Ansel E. Talbert of The Manor to the vice presidency of the Flight Safety Foundation, Inc. Every prospective airplane passenger can find significance in Mr. Talbert's new assignment after the tragic accident last month in the waters off La Guardia Field. For this nonprofit organization is concerned with the promotion of safety in all forms of flight, including space operations and conventional flying. Its 10 regular publications and reports which Mr. Talbert will edit, are distributed to military and aviation personnel at flight bases and aeronautical centers, both in this country and abroad for the use of private and business fliers, airline pilots and mechanics. They are also available to all others interested in aviation safety.

This foundation was organized by Laurence and Winthrop Rockefeller and it is still largely aided financially by the former as well as by aircraft and missiles industries and associated services. One of its execu-

tives is Mr. Harper Woodward, Mr. Rockefeller's chief legal and aviation adviser. It is headed by Adm. John H. Cassady, USN, retired, former Commander in Chief of U.S. Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean, and it is directed by Jerome Lederer, international authority on the safety aspects of jet-powered transports.

Mr. Talbert is exceptionally well-equipped for his new duties because of his aviation experience and journalistic background. During World War II, he served as air intelligence officer and as assistant military attaché in the American Embassy, London, and as Chief of Liaison and Special Reports in the Eighth Air Force Intelligence, England, under Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle. Later, he was a member of the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, Europe and the Far East. In the course of his military services, he rose from the rank of private to that of lieutenant colonel. For several years, Mr. Talbert was military editor and columnist for the New York Herald Tribune and its News Services. He is also the first newspaperman to have flown over both the North and South Poles.

In 1957, Mr. Talbert received the Strebig Trophy of the Aviation Writers Association of North America for the year's outstanding writing on aviation by a newspaperman. He has been awarded the Legion of Honor by the French Republic, with the rank of Chevalier for "outstanding contributions * * * to friendship and communication between France and the United States."

## Pennsylvania's Public Libraries: What We Have and What We Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARY SURVEY—A STUDY OF LIBRARY SERVICE IN PENNSYLVANIA WITH A PROPOSAL FOR A STATEWIDE PLAN OF PUBLIC LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT

(By Dr. Lowell A. Martin, dean, Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers University, with the assistance of an advisory committee appointed by the Pennsylvania Library Association)

INTRODUCTION

Public Library Service should be the basic foundation for knowledge, human understanding and constructive entertainment in the community. Beyond the high school and the university, the library is society's most effective weapon for continuing education.

Today, however, 2,161,526 Pennsylvanians lack local public library service.

Even those 5,771,527 citizens of the Commonwealth who have some library service actually are using facilities that are antiquated and grossly inadequate for meeting their subject and information needs.

An estimated 7,400,000 Pennsylvanians lack reasonable access to the specialized research materials they want and need.

A series of recommendations contained in the recently-completed Pennsylvania Library Survey are aimed at correcting these and related deficiencies in library services.

A summary of those recommendations is given in this article. For those who wish to study the complete, 2-volume survey report, copies may be found in each public library in Pennsylvania after January 1, 1959.

*Background of the survey*

A comprehensive study of Pennsylvania's public libraries was begun in October, 1957. It was financed by funds from the Federal Government.

Dr. Lowell Martin, Dean of the Graduate School of Library Service at Rutgres University was director of the study and Miss Grace Estes, formerly librarian of the Osterhout Library in Wilkes-Barre served as assistant director. Mr. David Palmer, formerly with the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, was executive secretary.

Reports of progress were made periodically during the year to an advisory committee of the Pennsylvania Library Association. These conferences, held in Harrisburg, also gave the study staff the benefit of valuable advice from committee members.

The report of the study has been approved by the Pennsylvania Library Association and by the Governor's Commission on Public Library Development, headed by Mr. Albert M. Greenfield, Philadelphia financier.

*Plan for development*

A plan for statewide library development has been drawn from the general survey.

It recommends basic minimum standards of library service which are not being met at present by a great number of libraries. These standards deal with: matters of accessibility; the number and quality of library staff; minimum resources of books and materials; minimum service and the number of hours libraries are open each week; and minimum financial support which will assure service which meets present-day needs in Pennsylvania.

There are many recommendations in the report. Essentially, they call for a coordinated library system to provide a service which is useful to every person and every phase of activity in the State.

Cost of this service, compared with total governmental expenditures, is relatively small. The total is $24 million annually—slightly over 1 percent of public expenditures in Pennsylvania.

At present about $9 million is being spent in Pennsylvania for public library service. The State contributes about 1 percent. It is proposed that the State carry slightly more than 25 percent of total expenditures for library service.

The per capita public library expenditure in Pennsylvania now is 83 cents—among the lowest spent by any State in the Union. The report recommends that this be raised to about $2. This figure is well below the $2.60 to $3.41 per capita recommended in the national standards of the American Library Association. Yet even at this lower cost Pennsylvania can have a good minimum level of service because there are a number of built-in economies in the proposed plan.

*Proposed organization of library service*

Major recommendations contained in the report are these:

Establishment of 27 district systems providing complete library service and their coordination by the State library.

Maintenance of three distinct levels of library service:

1. Local service to be provided by the 367 public libraries now in existence.

2. Stronger specialized services would be provided through the 27 district library centers.

3. Special resource service would be given through four very large libraries in strategic locations.

Formation of libraries would be encouraged in unserved areas by the State library, its staff and other local and district libraries.

The plan attempts to build upon strength now available. Only minimum reorganization of the present structure of libraries in Pennsylvania is involved.

Each library would maintain its own independence and identity. However, there would be close cooperation between local libraries in combination with a district center to form 27 true systems. The State library would serve as the coordinating agency for the statewide plan.

Major advantages of the plan are these:

Local day-to-day service would be available to every resident of the State within 15 to 20 minutes of his home.

A library with broad subject content and professional staff would be within an hour's distance of each resident.

A research library would be located within 1 day's round trip of every resident, allowing some time to consult materials.

The most important element in the proposed plan is the designation of 27 district library centers which would open their doors to everyone within their range free of charge. In all but five areas, these units would be built upon existing public libraries which are conveniently located within an hour of all people in their districts.

In five districts college libraries are proposed for district library centers. These are areas in which they are the only agencies of sufficient strength to assume responsibility for central library service. In these areas, the extension function would be directly administered by the State library.

It is proposed that State aid be given the district centers for extending their service areas. Each district library would be required to maintain an extension service to help local libraries to attain minimum standards.

Coordinating local libraries into a cooperative system, it would extend loan of materials, special reference, and professional service to all the libraries in the system in addition to deposits of books. Each system would be encouraged to develop joint selection of books and to experiment with centralized processing of materials.

Supporting these 27 units would be 4 regional resource centers—the Philadelphia free library, the State library, the Pennsylvania State University library, and the Carnegie library of Pittsburgh.

The facilities of these four major centers would be always available to district libraries for specialized material and professional aid. The State library would coordinate the 27 districts and 4 resource centers into a statewide system.

*Proposed financing of libraries*

A combination of increased local and State support of libraries would be used to finance the $24 million needed for the program.

It is proposed that an expanded program of State financial assistance be adopted. Such funds would be used for four related purposes:

To aid libraries in communities which make a reasonable local effort to maintain service.

To aid especially those districts which have the least capacity to help themselves.

To aid libraries selected as district centers.

To aid four major research libraries which stand as specialized collections in regions.

To receive State aid, each level of library service—local, district, and regional—would be required to meet these basic conditions:

1. A minimum local financial effort.

2. Achievement of standards outlined for each service level.

3. Cooperation within library systems.

*State share of local service*

To qualify for State aid under the proposed plan, each local library is obligated to meet a minimum share of its own support. This "local effort" would be equal to ½ mill on market value or $2 per capita, whichever is lower.

The term market value applies to taxable real property in the library's service area. Information on market value in individual districts is supplied each year by the State Tax Equalization Board.

Libraries may secure such information through consultation with the board of school directors, the county school office or school administrators in their own service area. When asking for figures on market value, State Tax Equalization Board figures should be specified.

The sum of money required for local effort may be derived from any source or combination of sources. It may be secured through public funds (tax levies or appropriations from municipalities or school districts) or through private endowments, gifts, etc. As a general, rule, however, the only reliable source of income is tax revenue.

If the library's total income equals the one-half-mill level, it is entitled to $0.25 per capita for the population of its service area. This would eventually require $2,758,000 in State aid.

*State equalization aid*

When the minium local share of library support produces less than $1.25 per capita, it is proposed that additional funds be provided by the State.

This additional equalization aid would be the difference between the amount actually produced by the one-half-mill rate and $1.25 per capita up to a maximum of $0.25 per capita. This feature of the library plan would cost a little over $700,000 per year at 1957 valuation and population levels.

While this is only a fraction of the total to be spent for libraries, it would have a highly desirable strategic effect. It would apply in precisely those places which would lag most if they were not given special assistance.

Since it is the goal of the plan to provide better and more efficient service for all areas of the State, this section of the program offers every community a financial foundation for an indispensable local library as a vital force in the public interest.

*State share of central service*

The 27 central libraries designated in the plan would serve their entire district. Because of this, each would receive additional State aid.

This would amount to $0.25 per capita for the people served in the extended district outside the immediate service area of the library. Again, certain conditions would have to be met.

These conditions pertain to standards rather than fundraising. Each district center would raise no more money than that needed to qualify it for local service aid.

However, each center would be required to meet minimum standards for district libraries. It would open its doors to all residents in the district for circulation and reference service and assume the extension function for the district.

This portion of the program provides the focal point for distribution of services and materials between the State or regional centers and the local community. It would require $1,760,000 per year in State aid.

*State share of regional service*

The proposed plan calls for four regional resource centers. They are already established in strategic geographical locations across the State.

Like the district centers, they would be called upon to open service to people from far beyond their normal boundaries. For this State-level service they should receive additional State aid.

The proposed amount is $100,000 annually for each of the libraries. This amount should be reviewed after 5 years to be sure that it pays a considerable part of the extra costs imposed on these resource centers.

*The 5-year leeway period*

There would be a 5-year "leeway" period for compliance with the conditions of local financial support and meeting of standards required for local and central libraries.

The specific proposal is that full State aid be made available if the locality comes up to one-half of the fair share of local financial support, a sum equal to ¼ mill on market value, or $1 per capita, whichever is lower.

The library would have 5 years in which to bring its local effort up to ½ mill on market value. If it had not achieved this level in the 5-year period, it would no longer be eligible for State aid.

This leeway period is designed to make a definite improvement in library service immediately and to provide an incentive to localities to assume their fair share of library support.

It is recommended that each agency applying for State aid submit to the State library a plan for the use of these funds so that State money would be used wisely and effectively for definite improvement of service.

Approximately $5,700,000 in State aid would be needed each year to carry this program. In addition it is proposed that the State provide a $1 million matching fund to aid communities in construction of library buildings and in making necessary capital improvements.

*Promotion and demonstration of library services*

The survey report asks that $300,000 be appropriated to the State library during each of the first 5 years of the program. It would be used for promotion and demonstration of library service.

Such stimulation where library service is now completely lacking or substandard could take a number of forms. It might be bookmobile service to an area which had none before.

It could be used to provide a professional children's librarian in a district. In cases where a library has concentrated its service on children, a demonstration of information and reference service for adults in the county library system would stimulate interest and increase use of the library.

Such demonstrations would be financed, staffed and materials would be supplied by the State library for a limited period to show aspects of modern library service.

There are several ways in which a community without service may establish its own library facilities and still qualify in the total program.

It may take steps to have a county library established, with service to the locality as part of the county program.

It may contract for service with the district library center or with another existing library of some strength in its own area.

It may start a local library and affiliate with either a county library or a district library center.

Any community organizing a new library would have the assistance and the advice of the extension librarian at its district library center and also the services of the State library extension division.

*Pennsylvania State library*

In regard to the State library, the survey makes the following recommendations:

That the present law regarding the functions of the State library be clarified and strengthened so that this agency may assume its role as coordinator and administrator of the statewide plan envisioned.

That the administrative position of the library within the department of public instruction be strengthened or an alternative placement for it in State government be found.

That the budget for the State library be almost doubled so that it can carry out its necessary functions in a statewide library program.

That it move rapidly toward meeting standards as one of the four regional resource centers called for in the plan. This would involved building up its book collection significantly, hiring specialists in those subject areas for which it takes responsibility, and generally increasing its staff and services.

That it expand its services to Pennsylvania libraries, administer demonstration programs for developing library service in areas where it is weakest and establish a continuous program of study of library problems in the State.

*Personnel*

Without qualified personnel who are devoted to the high standards of their profession no program such as this can be successful. Once the proposed plan begins to have its desired effects in stimulating greater interest in the library and broader use of its services, more trained personnel will be needed.

It is recommended that every effort be made to assist in the education and training of qualified personnel to fill these additional library positions called for by the plan. There should also be a program aimed at raising the level of training of present personnel.

There are several ways in which this may be accomplished. The survey makes these proposals:

1. That the State give financial assistance to at least three graduate library schools in Pennsylvania.

2. That the State make scholarship funds available to encourage and enable more students to enter the library field.

3. That undergraduate colleges provide introductory courses in librarianship to recruit personnel to the field.

4. That inservice training programs be made available and that the State library participate in their development for the education of librarians on the job.

It also seems obvious that some action is needed in the establishment of professional standards. Therefore, the survey recommends that State certification of librarians be established by law providing for three levels of personnel: Library assistants, provisional librarians, and professional librarians.

There is great need for a program which would aid local library trustees in their search for better understanding of library needs and in their desire to implement improved systems within their own communities.

Library trustees occupy an important and powerful position in relation to the proposed program. Many of these men and women feel a need for broader education in the new methods of library service. They want, also, to be able to use their own talents and abilities more forcefully.

At present they have the potential to act in the public good in all communities, but in some they are ineffective.

It is the purpose of the proposed State library plan to coordinate all library functions within the Commonwealth so that they may serve the greatest number of persons in the most efficient manner.

This goal can be accomplished best and most economically through a program which will include all the major recommendations contained in this summary and the full report of the library survey.

CONCLUSION

We have heard much during recent months of the need for renewed interest and greater support for education. Informed and enlightened public support is indispensable to a constantly improving education system.

Certainly no other single element works more conclusively toward broadening and strengthening the mind outside the school

than does the public library. In no other community agency is the course of human aspiration and understanding more firmly conceived.

During recent years in Pennsylvania there has been a tendency toward sloughing off the importance of the library within the community. With public support lagging, library physical plants have deteriorated along with their supplies and resource material.

As a Commonwealth we are spending $750 million each year to educate Pennsylvania children. This sum helps to pave the way for better citizenship, for a greater cultural background and a general elevation of the public welfare.

Yet we have done little or nothing to insure this education we have given our children against the dry rot of stagnation and disuse. The fact is that education is never a completed action of the human mind.

To be genuinely educated, the mind must be constantly invigorated both by new ideas and by a restatement of those which are timeless. After high school and college, Pennsylvania has neglected to preserve its greatest instrument for the encouragement of learning—the library.

There is no greater investment in the search for knowledge than the public library which is well equipped and staffed by qualified personnel. There is no better insurance that the money we have spent to educate our children has been wisely used.

The Pennsylvania Library Survey demonstrates dramatically that there is a need for greater public support of library facilities. This support must come from all levels of Government and from the hundreds of enlightened, civic-minded community organizations for whom the constant improvement of human life is the central goal.

---

## Fourfold Increase in Funds Is Needed for United States To Retain Ocean Study Lead

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the United States must begin to face the facts of life. We cannot enjoy security without expending the necessary funds required to insure ourselves against sneak enemy attacks. There are no shortcuts. Oceanic research, perhaps more than any other defense requirement, has been sadly neglected. The Russians have not been sleeping at the switch. They are way out ahead in this field and there is no sign that the Soviets intend to slow down. The following article fully describes the magnitude of the task that our country faces:

SEA BATTLE, 1958: KEY TO SURVIVAL (II)—FOURFOLD INCREASE IN FUNDS IS NEEDED FOR UNITED STATES TO RETAIN OCEAN STUDY LEAD

(By Everett S. Allen)

The United States present level of financial support for the marine sciences is about one-fourth of what is actually needed if this country is to prevent Russia from overtaking and surpassing America in this field. This means it is up to the Government, for the Department of Defense dominates marine science; private funds constitute only about 10 percent of present expenditures.

Whether it should remain Government dominated, in view of its wide-ranging peacetime and wartime applications, is a moot question—maybe Federal funds should just be applied to prime the pump in this much neglected area.

That it is neglected is obvious. Marine science in the United States presently is the concern of only a few hundred persons, led by such dedicated scientists as Dr. Maurice Ewing, director of Columbia University's Lamont Geological Observatory, and Dr. C. O'D. Iselin, director of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. Yet it is the basic science of three-fourths of the earth's surface.

RUSSIANS FORGE AHEAD

The Russians now are forging ahead of the United States in oceanography and its closely allied, and equally important, earth science, meteorology.

The Soviet Union may very well be close to an important breakthrough in the frontiers of scientific knowledge in these and related fields.

This is the opinion of Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Sciences Foundation, the newest U.S. Government agency for the promotion of basic research. In oceanography, Dr. Waterman declared, America is equipped with a few out-of-date vessels and a couple of modified Navy tugs, while the Russians are employing a first-class fleet of oceanographic ships.

To buttress Dr. Waterman's opinion, the Standard-Times interviewed exclusively some of America's top-level scientists engaged in oceanographic work. Included are ranking members of the staffs of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and of the Lamont Geological Observatory at Palisades, N.Y. Personnel of these two organizations constitute nearly one-half of the total U.S. deep-sea oceanographic plant—the only other principal component is the Scripps Institution of Oceanography on the west coast.

REDS WELL-EQUIPPED

Here, in substance, is what the men have to say whose opposite numbers, Soviet marine scientists, are at this moment scattered from the Indian Ocean to the Arctic with more equipment and better ships than can be had in the United States.

Whatever may be said for Russian oceanography, they are beginning it with plenty of facilities. Eight to ten years ago, somebody in the Kremlin said, "Let's do it," and pushed the button that started the present crash program in marine science. Americans do not know how close the Russian Navy is geared to oceanography; maybe to a high degree. The ocean scientists from the Soviet that Americans do know are still engaged in catching up, although their rate of advance is greater than ours.

But the worry is that there is a whole additional crowd of Soviet marine scientists, maybe in the Navy, engaged in the practical application of oceanography—peaceful, or otherwise. This much is certain: 10 years ago, there were no Russian oceanographers in the open ocean; now, they have stopped being provincial and they are scattered to the world's far corners.

Only in the last 3 years have the Russians allowed their oceanographers to come to international meetings. When they get up and talk, it's usually pretty naive stuff, but it is interesting to note that a half-dozen of the younger, obviously capable marine scientists invited to an international meeting at Toronto last fall, did not show up.

FACTS ARE NEEDED

When you compare Russia and the United States in oceanography, you really are talking about expeditions. The person who gets ahead is the person who looks, who gets the opportunity to look; at this point in ocean study, facts are needed more than contemplation.

The United States has three major institutions—Lamont, Woods Hole, and Scripps. Woods Hole has the *Atlantis* and the *Crawford*, for vessels; Scripps has four ships, and Lamont has the three-masted schooner, *Vema*, for deep sea research. That is the total U.S. fleet; the Navy abandoned its deep sea program 3 years ago.

The *Vema* stays at sea 300-plus days a year; that is more than any other American oceanographic vessel does. And bear in mind, with U.S. ships in this field, you are talking about vessels from 300 to 600 tons, with 6 to 10 scientists each, and a cruising range of 3,000 to 6,000 miles.

The Russian effort began in earnest in 1949, with the construction of the *Vitjaz*, a 6,500-ton vessel accommodating 70 scientists, and with a cruising range of 25,000 miles. She stays at sea as many days a year as does the *Vema*. Originally, Soviet oceanographers operated mostly in the Kurile-Kamchatka areas, but now they are going into the Southwest Pacific.

SHIP COMMISSIONED

This year, the Russians commissioned the *Monomosoff*, a 7,500-ton oceanographic ship operated by the Soviet Institute of Oceanography. The Russian icebreakers *Ob* and *Lena*, each of 12,500 tons, carry staffs comparable to the other two ships, and work in arctic and antarctic waters. The Russian also are continuing a new study program in the Indian Ocean, apparently extensive.

Apparently the Russians have no trouble getting money or scientists for oceanography. Their marine scientists appear very well-informed, even though they have been at sea for a year; the Soviet Union has an efficient communication service for keeping them up to date on scientific papers published after they sailed. The United States does not have such a program.

Everybody admits the Russians are going places in oceanography and soon will have a lot of data. The nation with the most data is ahead in this business at this time; later, it will be the nation with the most ideas, but not now, because overall knowledge of the ocean is too scanty.

In Arctic work, the United States is terribly behind the Russians. Our only Arctic station, known as T–3, was established a couple of years ago, and we had one more, set up as part of the International Geophysical Year (IGY) program last year.

ICE PACK STATIONS

The Russians, by contrast, have had as many as 9 or 10 stations drifting in the ice pack, as is T–3, set up on an ice floe. At the international meeting of scientists in Toronto last September, the Russians showed a chart of the places where they had landed on the ice pack with planes and an authoritative American observer said wryly, "It looked like a severe case of freckles," it was so spotted with landing sites.

American landings of this type total only about 25. The Russians have put out a whole stack of publications just on a single Arctic station, as an illustration of the quantity of their effort and, at least since 1936, when they established a North Pole station, they have led America in this area.

Most scientists, although not directly concerned with the military aspects, concede it would be of considerable strategic value for American defense-planners to know as much as possible about the Arctic Ocean. Lack of such knowledge, from which we presently suffer, could be gravely dangerous.

One of the big bottlnecks in oceanography is meteorology. An ocean scientist remarked, "We can predict the sea better than we once could, but weather usually determines

what happens in the sea, and our failure to predict the weather accurately is a scientific scandal."

AN ALARMING PICTURE

Dr. A. V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, described a 3-day session of meteorologists in Russia last year as presenting an alarming picture for the free world.

The race in the ocean sciences is essentially between the Big Two, the United States and the U.S.S.R.; this is not to demean the efforts of any of the other free nations, but it takes men and money that smaller and harder-pressed countries just don't have.

## DAV Services in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of New Jersey citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations which have State departments and local chapters in New Jersey is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx; DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer N. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization of full-time trained national service officers—138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration and in its central office in Washington, D.C., They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV national service officers in New Jersey are Mr. John W. Bill, Mr. Alexander M. Zbylut, and Mr. George Gregor, located at the VA regional office, 20 Washington Place, Newark. The department commander is Mr. David W. Smith, 63 Circle Place, Red Bank, and the department adjutant is Mr. William J. Dodd, War Memorial Building, Trenton. The VA hospitals coming under the jurisdiction of the national service office are a 950-bed general medical hospital at East Orange and a 2,009-bed neurophychiatric hospital at Lyons.

Mr. James F. Patten, 1075 Maurice Avenue, Rahway, is NEC from the second district and Mr. Joseph Burke, 38 East 34th Street, Bayonne, is a past national commander.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $141,671,000 for its veteran program in New Jersey, including disability compensation to its 76,150 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in New Jersey furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

Only about 7 percent—4,919—are members of the 67 DAV chapters in New Jersey.

This 7 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of New Jersey veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

| | |
|---|---|
| Claimants contacted (estimated) | 118,057 |
| Claims folders reviewed | 98,381 |
| Appearances before rating boards | 45,752 |
| Compensation increases obtained | 6,538 |
| Service connections obtained | 2,513 |
| Nonservice pensions | 1,252 |
| Death benefits obtained | 276 |
| Total monetary benefits obtained | $3,773,424.18 |

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for New Jersey veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civic service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before pressenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 3 percent—0.036—of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in New

Jersey, with a consequent loss of about $840,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in New Jersey to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54.00 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 428 of whom, during the last 8 years, were New Jersey residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member.

As a DAV life member, I am pleased to enroll as one of the benefactors on the memorial honor roll of the DAV Service Foundation, with the realization that only the interest earnings therefrom will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in continuing to maintain its national service officer setup in my State of New Jersey.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in New Jersey by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

## To Correct an Inequity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith an editorial taken from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Military Pay Act Does Injustice to Retired Servicemen." My bill, H.R. 2973, is designed to correct the situation presented in the editorial and I feel this is a matter which deserves serious consideration by the Members. The editorial is as follows:

THE MILITARY PAY ACT DOES INJUSTICE TO RETIRED SERVICEMEN

The recommendation by a committee, headed by Ralph J. Cordiner, which was assigned by the Defense Department to investigate service pay, was that pay for naval, military, and air men who have earned their retirement should be geared to the current pay which is received in active service. In other words, if the pay for an admiral or an Army sergeant on active duty is increased 10 percent, his pay after he retires will be increased by 10 percent. Up to this point, this is how service retirement has been handled for many years, and that is how it is treated in the Military Pay Act of 1958, as to those retired after its effective date, June 1, 1958.

However, in the bill passed at the last session of Congress, this relationship between active-duty pay and retired pay is, with certain exceptions, not applied to men already retired. They were given a flat 6 percent increase across the board. This results in all sorts of anomalies, including one mentioned by the Washington Star in which a major general who retired a few months before the bill became law received approximately $1,900 a year less than an officer of equal rank who retired after the effective date.

A difference between military retired pay and civilian retired pay, which stays put no matter what happens to the pay of active workers, is that the retired military man is not really retired at all. He is still subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice; he is subject to recall in emergency or at the pleasure of the Defense Department. Thus it is logical that his pay on the retired list should be geared to his pay when on active duty. But the central reason is that pay in the armed services is generally less than for the same grade of ability in civilian life, and some added compensation at retirement is fair and just.

It seems to us that restoration by the new Congress of the traditional relationship between the pay of active-service officers and men and the pay of retired military personnel would pay dividends in several respects. In the first place, of course, it would correct an injustice to the officers and enlisted men already retired, who are certainly hit as hard by inflationary prices as will be the men to be retired later. But the change could also have an important effect on the ability of the services to persuade men to make military service a permanent career.

## All Safety Is Relative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial carried by the radio and television stations subscribing to Broadcast Editorial Reports caught my attention. This great editorial organization is headed by Mr. William F. Brooks and I commend this excellent editorial to the entire Congress:

ALL SAFETY IS RELATIVE

Airline flying, which is just now seeing the introduction of 600-mile-an-hour jet passenger planes on world air routes, is well

within the normal risks of living today. This is what can be considered a relative measure of safety.

All living is to some degree hazardous, all safety is relative. When a tragic aircraft accident occurs, the public too often is inclined to overlook the ordinary facts of life—that over 48 million passengers were carried by the U.S. airlines last year with a loss of 124 lives; that the one most exposed to whatever hazards modern commercial flying has to offer is the airline pilot who enjoys a piloting life expectancy of about 1,500 hours as a pilot and who today can obtain life insurance at ordinary rates. Your chances of surviving an airline trip are somewhat greater than those for a bus trip of similar length. They are 20 times better than for a trip by private auto.

But, as the Flight Safety Foundation, an independent, nonprofit organization having for its sole purpose the improvement in safety in all forms of flight, points out, statistics can never be used to excuse an accident. Aviation will never be safe enough—even though it may become the safest form of transportation. This is because we in the United States put a high value on human life and never will accept a Russian or statistical point of view.

Right now the new jets are taking up large amounts of the Nation's vanishing airspace, especially at high altitudes. Here, where these aircraft fully utilize their extremely high speeds, airplanes are spaced 10 minutes apart to reduce the possibilities of a midair collision to a statistical fraction.

For jets flying at nearly 600 miles an hour this means 100 miles of clear space ahead and 100 miles behind, on airways 10 miles apart. Each jet now requires a protective cushion of 2,000 square miles of airspace—an area about the size of Delaware—as it speeds along. If it has to wait at altitude before descent, it requires an area about the size of Rhode Island in which to circle. All aircraft flying at high altitude along the airways are under continuous control from the ground with information on their location supplied constantly by radio communications and long-range radar on the ground. Improved radar and related devices in the future will make possible better control in less space.

There is not yet enough of this radar and other electronic aids, because the Nation's air traffic control system is suffering today from aviation development budget cuts made several years ago. At present, however, the situation is improving steadily as more ground radar becomes available, more traffic controllers are trained and more electronic equipment installed through the ample funds finally made available.

A lesson to be remembered in connection with aviation safety improvement is that even unlimited money won't solve everything overnight because it takes time to spend it intelligently and constructively.

## The American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion will celebrate its 40th anniversary March 15 to March 17 of this year. In tribute to this outstanding organization, the Clarksville Leaf-Chronicle, an exceptionally fine newspaper published in my district, recently carried an editorial of unusual merit. I would like to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress; and, therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD.

The editorial follows herewith:

THE AMERICAN LEGION

The American Legion, largest veteran organization in all history, celebrates the 40th anniversary of its birth, March 15 to 17, 1959. It is a signal observance. It marks the completion of 40 years of service by the American Legion to its communities, its States and the Nation.

According to Legion historians, the Legion idea was born originally of talks at a convalescent hospital in France between Lt. Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and a sergeant later killed in action. The March 15–17 meeting was planned by 20 officers gathered February 16 at the Allied Officers Club.

The Legion showed its political power strikingly in 1924 by putting across, over President Coolidge's veto, adjusted compensation for war veterans. This was to help atone for their low military pay compared with the high wartime civilian pay. In 1936 the Legion put across, over President Roosevelt's veto, immediate full payment of the compensation certificates.

These were like 20-year endowment insurance policies, with the face amount not due, in most cases, until 1945. But the typical veteran thought the Government had awarded him this amount (average, around $1,000) in 1924 while refusing to pay it for 20 years.

The 17,000 posts of the American Legion and their 14,000 Auxiliary units, have a right to be proud of their accomplishments during the past 4 decades. The American scene and the world have undergone profound changes since the American Legion was founded. The American Legion has changed too, but only in its dimensions. It is today a three-war organization. It has not changed in its patriotic character, in its ideals, in its objectives and in its integrity. Keeping America always American is still its continuing goal. It is still true to the original purposes set forth so vividly in 1919 in the preamble to its constitution.

The good impact on the American scene of the American Legion is immeasurable. It has been an important factor in the defense of our free institutions, in keeping love of country at a high premium, in raising the popular level of education, in the great increase of home ownership, in the enlightened streamlining of child welfare concepts, in pioneering in the modern care of the disabled and physically handicapped and in the Nation's preparedness against aggression.

Thousands of American communities are better places in which to live and rear children because of the civic works of 17,000 posts. We salute the local American Legion post and wish it many happy returns as this great organization starts on its 5th decade of service to God and country.

## Gangsters Murder While America Sleeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker on March 3 I introduced H.R. 5186 to curb national gangsterism and racketeering conspiracies. It creates a new crime to be known as a terroristic offense. The definition of a terroristic offense is—

any offense proscribed by the laws of or the common law as recognized in any state relating to extortion, blackmail, murder, racketeering, narcotics, maiming or assault with intent to inflict great bodily harm and punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary or by death.

And it becomes a Federal offense when it is perpetuated through the use of interstate commerce or communications.

I feel highly complimented today to report to my fellow Members that a similar bill, S. 1132, has been introduced in the other body by our former associate from New York, Senator KEATING.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], has introduced my bill and joined me in sponsorship of it and I can think of no higher honor. As we all know, no Member of this House, past or present, ever experienced the anguish and torture that Mr. BENTLEY suffered at the hands of terrorists from Puerto Rico who conspired to turn a session of Congress into bloody and murderous chaos. Consequently, I take this occasion to thank our associate from Michigan and to express our gratitude that his recovery from those wounds is complete.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] has also joined in the growing demand that effective legislation to curb national gangsterism be enacted by introducing my bill as H.R. 5796.

He joins with me, I know, in hope that the Judiciary Committee of which I am a member will see fit to hold hearings soon on our bill.

In my own district, on Sunday night of March 8, just a few days after H.R. 5186 was introduced and I discussed its importance before this House, a prominent citizen who had no apparent gangster ties, Bennie Lazzara, was murdered in typical gangland fashion on the front driveway of his own home. So far, the local authorities have failed to report any effective progress in solving the crime; there has been no suspect found to date. This citizen was killed in the presence of his wife as he returned home by a shotgun fired point blank at close range into his face. Immediately the murderer disappeared into the shadows of the night. The following headlines from the Tampa Tribune tell the sordid story:

Police Seek Motive in Ambush Killing of Wealthy Tampa Produce Dealer—Times, March 9.

Check for Underworld Ties—Police Stymied on Motive in Gang-Style Murder of Wealthy Produce Man Here—Tribune, March 10.

Scant Hope Seen in Solving Lazarra Murder Seen—Tribune, March 11.

Killing Arouses Talk of Action by Citizens—Times, March 13.

Police Are Completely Baffled by Lazzara Murder—Tribune, March 13.

Ten Thousand Dollars Put up for Word on Slayer of Lazzara—Tribune, March 21.

We have previously had 19 unsolved gangland type murders in the city of Tampa during the past 28 years which have remained unsolved; which I point-

ed out in my remarks on March 3 when I introduced my bill.

Bad as this terrorism is in my own district, the reign of brutality and conspiracy exists in many other areas of the United States and in many areas on an even broader scale.

Testimony before the McClellan committee of the Senate proves beyond a doubt that gangsterism is also infiltrating certain labor activities. I intend to discuss this national problem at greater detail in future remarks in the House. America must be awakened; Congress must act; national gangster syndicates must be put on the run; and the moral fiber of our Nation must, thus, be strengthened. America has been asleep too long, while gangsters murder and get away with it.

In conclusion, I repeat my regard for the gentlemen from Michigan and Oregon and other Members who have joined us in introducing this bill. What the local press thinks editorially of the situation and the proposed legislation is given in the following editorials from newspapers in my district.

[From the St. Petersburg Independent, Mar. 10, 1959]

A SHOTGUN SUPPORTS CRAMER IN HIS DRIVE AGAINST CRIME

Tampa newspapers have been giving Congressman BILL CRAMER a pretty hard time since he introduced a bill to enable Federal law enforcement agencies to help local police fight organized crime.

In support of his bill, CRAMER gave some crime figures on Tampa, biggest and maybe bloodiest city in his district. With true parochial pride, the press of Tampa came out shouting: "It simply ain't so—at least not now."

CRAMER spent considerable time on the TV Sunday in a forthright approach to the problem of crime and its cure in this and other areas of the Nation.

Early Monday morning Mr. CRAMER's position was emphasized by a shotgun blast which left a Tampa citizen dying in his driveway and the Tampa press stumbling around in the fresh gun smoke to find more adjectives to support their loyal but lame defense of Tampa's record of violence, past and present.

This newest killing, whatever its cause, follows the pattern of crime which has caused Tampa to look like a city which could stand a little help from the kind of bill Representative CRAMER is trying to get enacted. It reminds us, too, that it was only 8 months ago that one Joe Diaz, a bolita racketeer and former sheriff's deputy, bit the dust from shotgun blasts.

We have no bits of moral wisdom to dispatch to the newspapers of our neighboring city and certainly have no intentions of forming a committee of vigilantes to go galloping across Gandy Bridge. We have troubles of our own.

But we might suggest with modesty and neighborly friendliness that the power of the Tampa press could be used as well for a cleanup as for a coverup.

Why hang Congressman CRAMER? If Tampa is too pure to have need of his crime bill, the proposed legislation can't hurt anything.

---

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Mar. 10, 1959]

MATCHING FORCES WITH THE HOODLUMS

Tampa's pious indignation over having its bad crime record cited by Representative BILL CRAMER probably deflated very rapidly yesterday when another citizen fell victim to a ganglike shotgun murder.

True, there has been some improvement in law enforcement across the bay in recent years. But the point made by Mr. CRAMER was valid. No community is immune to crime. Without pride we point to Pinellas' $200,000 robbery last week at Safety Harbor.

Just how tightly organized the syndicate or the Mafia may be—just how much centralized direction and control either of these bodies, or a combination of them with other groups, may exercise, is clouded in mystery. But again this is not important.

What is important is the common knowledge we have of the extent and power of organized racketeering.

The McClellan committee today is uncovering facets to add to the unpretty picture developed by the Kefauver committee a few years ago, and those of other crime investigating bodies.

Some of the stories which have been unfolded in the inquiry into juke box racketeering have been almost unbelievable.

And, as AFL–CIO President George Meany heatedly pointed out recently at Miami, this is a matter of criminal organization, not of labor organizations.

Some of the hoodlums, as Mr. Meany admitted, have taken on the protective coloration of phony unions. In some cases recognized unions, such as Jimmy Hoffa's Teamsters, have cooperated with the phonies, either mistakenly or because some local union officials have been reached.

Again, however, as Meany also points out, wherever there is organized crime, whether it is extortionate operations such as the McClellan committee has been spotlighting, operation of illegal slot machines, gambling houses, prostitution, or vice of any kind, either the law enforcement agencies have been corrupted or else they are powerless against the superior forces of the hoodlums.

This, plus the inescapable conclusion that the criminal organizations do operate on an interstate basis, gives validity to Mr. CRAMER's bill to make terroristic activities—extortion, blackmail, murder, racketeering, maiming and assault—Federal crimes.

The "Feds" certainly are not afraid of the mafia or the syndicate. And, to the best of our knowledge, they are incorruptible.

Law-abiding citizens would rejoice at having the forces of racketeering and hoodlumism matched by equal power on the side of law and justice. If Tampa's being cited as a horrible example can contribute toward that end, our friends across the bay should rejoice.

---

[From the St. Petersburg Evening Independent, Mar. 12, 1959]

PRESS GETS BUSY ON TAMPA CRIME

We are right proud of our journalistic neighbors across the bay.

When crime started to pop right on top of their cries of innocence, they didn't hop behind the fifth amendment. They started doing a little blasting of their own.

Tampa is on the spot, the Tampa press said, and it is time the chief of police, the sheriff, and the State's attorney, start doing something about it.

Tampa, which tried to tell Congressman CRAMER that Tampa law enforcement is on the ball, now has a fine chance to show him just how hot they can make it for hoodlums.

Tampa law-enforcement agencies seemed all too eager to slip this new gang killing into their unsolved murder file and forget about it. But the press is now on them and they may do something about it.

While they are at it, they might dig out some of the old murders and solve them too. That would be a fine way to get back at the critical Mr. CRAMER.

---

[From the Tampa Tribune, Mar. 13, 1959]

TWO MOVES AGAINST MURDER

Bennie Lazzara's ambush murder, the second of its kind here in 8 months, calls for some extraordinary measures on the part of the city of Tampa to prevent this case from joining others in the crowded file marked "unsolved."

Two measures are worth consideration at city hall.

Step 1. The posting of a substantial reward—say, a minimum of $10,000—to be paid for information leading to the arrest of the killer.

Relatives and friends of Lazzara, a produce dealer with no known racket connections, already have offered about $11,000 in reward money. They are to be commended for this step. But their action does not relieve the city of Tampa of the obligation to show its own concern over this crime.

Moreover, because of the traditional reluctance of Latin witnesses to tell what they know or suspect in murders of this character, normal reward offers never have proved very effective in loosening tongues.

The city's reward therefore ought to be offered on the secret witness basis which has been used in Chicago and some other cities. Under this procedure, the tipster is permitted to submit his information anonymously, in writing, accompanied by a code symbol—the torn half of a dollar bill, for example. If the tip breaks the case, the information then can step forward with his code identification and collect the money.

If this sounds like cloak-and-dagger stuff, let us remember that there are cloaks and daggers involved in the 20 unsolved murders of members of the Latin colony in the last 30 years. And none of the usual police methods have produced results.

Step 2. The creation of a permanent assassination squad in the police department to devote full time to investigation of the Lazzara murder and any others of like nature which may occur in the future.

This unit—two picked investigators could staff it—would not be diverted to routine crimes but would stick doggedly to the trail of murderers who leave an underworld trademark.

Uninterrupted hammering on a single case might eventually crack it. And there would certainly be an advantage in having a specially-trained unit move immediately upon the scene when an assassination occurred. A plan of operation which could be put instantly into effect, rather than awaiting the coordination of three different law enforcement agencies, ought to produce better results.

Tampa has some highly competent and experienced law enforcement officers. It's not reasonable to assume that they can be consistently outsmarted by professional killers. The trouble lies, we think, in the fact that the police department, sheriff's office, and State attorney's office have dealt with these murders in the routine way. But they are not routine—they require special handling.

The two measures we have suggested would cost some money. Including an adequate reward and the assignment of two top men to the assassination squad, the cost might run to $20,000 or $25,000. Some at city hall may protest that no money is available.

Well, Mayor Nuccio and the city board of representatives recently scratched up an extra $10,000 for a fancy bandstand at Lowry Park. If they can find money to provide music, they can certainly find money to combat murder. The sweetest music this side of heaven won't be sufficient to quiet the chorus of criticism if Tampa continues to appear helpless against the shotgun assassins.

---

[From the Sarasota News, Mar. 11, 1959]

THE TAMPA GANGLAND

Not so long ago many readers of the News wondered why this newspaper spent the money and time to reproduce Ed Reid's famous book "Mafia."

We did so to renew the facts concerning how crime in this Nation is controlled so skillfully by an organization that is as ruthless as is communism.

Now we have, right on our doorstep, the possibility of another Mafia crime—the shotgun killing in Tampa of Bennie Lazzara—for reasons unknown to police. We are not saying that Lazzara was a member of the Mafia—but that the killing has the earmarks of a Mafia job.

The killing came just at the time that the Tampa Tribune was saying what a clean city Tampa is—because Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER had said just the opposite on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington.

For it was on March 3 that CRAMER very wisely introduced a bill to outlaw national conspiracies perpetrated by gangsters and hoodlums, such as the Mafia, who cross State lines or even use the telephone in their terroristic activities.

CRAMER told the Nation—for it's in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "The city of Tampa in my district has one of the worst crime records in the United States. There are 19 unsolved sawed-off shotgun gang murders credited to gangsterism. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, tells me that Tampa is one of the principal ports of entry for the dope-peddling traffic in the United States. This $2 billion illicit business which ruins our youth and wrecks so many lives is controlled to the point of monopoly by the Mafia."

Now there have been 20 unsolved sawed-off shotgun murders in Tampa.

Important is CRAMER'S statement that some of the killings in Tampa have been identified with what calls the multi-million-dollar bolita racket in Florida.

It is no secret that one of the kingpins in Tampa is Augustine Primo Lazzara. And Benie Lazzara, the night he was slain had been at a party at the home of Augustine's brother, John Lazzara, vice president of the Columbia Bank and a respected citizen of Tampa.

How about the rumbling in Ybor City about a rumor prior to the killing that an Italian was to be murdered?

Yes, Congressman CRAMER'S bill is most timely.

It would allow the Federal Bureau of Investigation to immediately step into the Lazara killing to follow all the angles.

It would permit the FBI to clean up the Mafia in the United States.

And don't kid yourself—if the Mafia exists in Tampa it reaches into Saratoga via the bolita rackets controlled in Tampa by those whose names now crop up in the latest shotgun killing.

We need to write to Congressman WILLIAM CRAMER, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., and urge him to press for immediate action on his bill that will help cripple the Mafia and Jimmy Hoffa and his union gangsters.

## Labor Speaks Out for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CHARLES O. PORTER**
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the chief groups in the forefront of the fight against dictatorships in Latin America and throughout the world have been the free press and the free labor unions. At the recent meeting in Puerto Rico the executive council of the AFL–CIO made a statement to the Organization of American States making abundantly clear the opposition of its members to tyranny and dictatorship. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the lead article of the March 1959 issue of the Inter-American Labor Bulletin, whose editor is Serafino Romualdi.

The article follows:

SUSPEND DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, OTHER DICTATORSHIPS, AFL–CIO URGES OAS

The executive council of the AFL–CIO urged the Organization of American States (OAS) "to isolate diplomatically the Dominican Republic, as well as other dictatorships, by suspending their membership until such time as a democratic regime, freely elected by the people, is installed in their place."

The occasion was the first of the periodic thrice a year meeting of the executive council which met the latter part of February in San Juan, P.R., at the special invitation of Governor Luis Muñoz Marin.

Branding the Trujillo dictatorship as not only a blot on the honor of the American family of nations, but a constant threat to the peace of the hemisphere, the executive council urged the U.S. Government to take the lead in the OAS to bring such needed action against the Dominican Republic and the other dictatorships.

The council expressed its satisfaction at the overthrow of the Cuban dictator, Batista, and offered its cooperation to the Cuban labor movement in whatever effort might be required to maintain it free, independent, and democratic. It also called on the Duvalier regime of Haiti to restore political rights and freedom of press and assembly as well as the return of the National Union of Haitian Workers (UNOH) to its legitimate leaders who were illegally deposed by government interference and police intervention.

The full text of the AFL–CIO executive council statement is as follows:

"THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE CARIBBEAN AREA

"The wave of democratic resurgence which has swept from power in the last few years the military dictatorships in Argentina, Peru, Honduras, Colombia, and Venezuela has now reached the Caribbean area with the overthrow of the Batista regime in Cuba. Popular pressure is mounting against Duvalier regime in Haiti, while the democratic forces in the Dominican Republic, encouraged by the recent events and supported by the public opinion of the whole Western Hemisphere are closing their ranks for the final effort to destroy the oldest and most hated dictatorship of the American continent.

"The labor movement of the United States, in line with its traditional opposition to every form of dictatorship, views with satisfaction these developments in the Caribbean area and hopes that they will bring about the establishment of sound democratic regimes, in which the labor movement will have an opportunity to exist and operate in complete independence and freedom, and civil rights will be firmly restored and protected.

"The executive council of the AFL–CIO extends to the Cuban people its best wishes on their efforts to rebuild their country's political structure on the basis of freedom, civic morality and human rights. It also offers its neighborly cooperation to the Cuban labor movement in whatever effort might be required to maintain it truly democratic, free and independent, and solely responsible to the will of its members.

"The situation in Haiti, which since the accession to power of the Duvalier regime in 1957, has steadily deteriorated, is now approaching a climax. Violent upheavals in that country, which has suffered so much in recent years as result of dictatorships and civil strife, can only be avoided by the prompt implementation of President Duvalier's recent pledge to restore political rights and freedom of press and assembly. We demand also the return of the National Union of Haitian Workers (UNOH) to the control of the legitimate leaders who were illegally replaced last year through government interference and police intervention.

"The dictatorship of the Trujillo family in the Dominican Republic has been for several decades a source of friction, conflicts, and threats to peace in the Caribbean area. The oldest of the few remaining dictatorships in the Americas has not only distinguished itself for its brutal suppression of every dissenting view inside the country, but has steadily engaged in conspiracies to overthrow the governments of those American countries that dared to oppose or simply criticize it.

"The collective conscience of the Americas considers the continued existence of the Trujillo tyranny not only a blot on the honor of the American family of nations but a constant threat to the peace of the hemisphere. We therefore urge the Organization of American States (OAS) to isolate diplomatically the Dominican Republic, as well as the other dictatorships, by suspending their membership until such time as a democratic regime, freely elected by the people, is installed in their place. Such action, now widely demanded by the democratic public opinion of Latin America, would be consistent with the charter of the OAS, which declares that its membership consists of representatives of legitimate democratic governments.

"The AFL–CIO supports the Caracas declaration which authorizes collective action by the OAS to protect any American country against the threat of subversion or domination on the part of the international Communist movement. We believe, however, that time has come to take also collective action to restore freedom and human rights in the Dominican Republic as well as in the few other American countries still under the yoke of a military Fascist dictatorship.

"We urge the Government of the United States to take the lead in the OAS to bring about such needed action against the Dominican Republic and other dictatorships. In this way, our country will give to the people of Latin America another demonstration of our sincerity in actively promoting the cause of freedom and human dignity throughout the world."

## The Assault on America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. THOMAS M. PELLY**
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the March 16, 1959, issue of the Wall Street Journal.

The indictment by this newspaper of the philosophy of big spending is in line with my own thinking and while I do not question any other Member's actions or motives I do raise the issue as to who is right.

I hold that the overall need of the Government living within its means exceeds in importance the collective benefits of many individual bills which would in-

crease the national debt. Furthermore, let me say I intend to continue supporting moderation in Federal spending because, as I have said before, this Nation cannot afford not to reduce taxes and cut down Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the vast assault on America's future as referred to by the following Wall Street Journal editorial:

SALESMEN OF ILLUSION

There is a relentless, almost paralyzing political narcotic in the campaign the spenders, in and out of Congress, are putting on. Consider just a few recent statements:

"The consensus of our meeting is that the high level of unemployment is not likely to get any better so long as the administration worries about inflation and balancing the budget." (Prof. John Galbraith, chairman of the Democratic National Committee's economic council.)

"All this talk about spending ourselves into bankruptcy is sheer nonsense." (Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State.)

"We are being told that if we attempt to meet our urgent needs, we will have a hair-raising inflation as bad as any hair-curling depression * * * we are being bombarded with pieties and slogans that, in effect, are telling us, 'Stagnation is good for you'." (Representative CHESTER BOWLES.)

"The entire case of those who say we cannot afford the things we must have to protect our civilization falls to the ground the moment we discard the myth that America's economy cannot, or must not be allowed to, grow. * * * I am not endorsing inflation. * * * We can grow, if we will overcome our fear of our growth." Gov. G. Mennen Williams.)

"A public policy aimed at promoting maximum employment and production and vigorous expansion of the economy should not be unduly deterred by the possibility of future inflation." Majority opinion, report of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee.)

These samples exhibit a remarkable unity of viewpoint. And that viewpoint is bound to be appealing to many people, for it is telling the people: Come to us, and all your troubles will be over and a whole new life will open up; fear not bankruptcy, for we will take care of everything by the simple expedient—and what could be simpler?—of much more Government spending.

But though the pitch is simple, the execution is skillful. The campaign is carefully compounded of nonexistent equations. Note, for instance: Balancing the budget equals unemployment; the Eisenhower administration equals economic stagnation; financial prudence equals nonsense. Conversely, the spending philosophy equals full employment and economic growth.

These propositions can be refuted; indeed, all history has always been refuting economic charlantanism, often with a vengeance. Take this business of growth. Inflation—and that is what these men are talking about, as some of them do not even bother to conceal—can for awhile cause the appearance of economic growth, just as marihuana can induce a temporary supereuphoria. But inflation's letdown can be fierce and sometimes economically fatal.

What these politicians, then, are really offering—whether they know it or not—is not the good life that can be achieved only by individual initiative and a firm hand on Government spending; they are offering a prospect of future depression. They are not offering full employment but the real danger of future mass unemployment.

Unfortunately, as in so many other aspects of human existence, the illusion is easier to sell than the reality. We are all in the same boat and all men always have been; we all want to believe that life can be easy—that foreign policy solutions exist where none in fact do, that there are shortcuts to prosperity unlimited, that there are pleasant alternatives to the bitter fact of work and the hard truth of human responsibility.

It is on these strong emotional strings that today's spenders play their siren tune. And the fact that the appeal is so deeply emotional is what makes it so hard to combat; it's easy to combat on rational grounds but not on its own chosen ground of sentimentality. The realist is almost always hard put to argue against the romanticist.

Yet, there must still be those who can see that a vast assault, both witting and unwitting, is being made on America's future, and that there is not much time left to start resisting it. There must be those—besides a precious few in public life—who discern the fool's gold in the wares the salesmen of illusion peddle.

But where today are those clear voices of reason?

## Memorandum of Hungarian Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the memorandum of the Hungarian Committee concerning the Hungarian and other central-eastern European problems in the framework of a European peace settlement. The memorandum follows:

AIDE MEMOIRE OF THE HUNGARIAN COMMITTEE CONCERNING THE HUNGARIAN AND OTHER CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN PROBLEMS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF A EUROPEAN PEACE SETTLEMENT, MARCH 10, 1959

The unilateral Soviet move on Berlin has challenged the West to make joint efforts for a comprehensive settlement of the political problems of Germany and Eastern Europe. These problems, constituting the major cause of both the present international tension and the armament race, are by their very nature interconnected and thus indivisible.

The Soviet Union's peace program for Europe is virtually contained in its draft-peace plan for Germany, from which it clearly appears that the Soviet Union seeks to impose her will upon West Germany in order to disintegrate the Atlantic Alliance and to prepare the extension of her rule to the remaining part of the European Continent.

For this preparation Moscow needs the official Western acceptance of the status quo in order to consolidate her satellite empire and to use it as a springboard for further expansion. Therefore, it seeks to induce, by threats, the Western Powers to accept the puppet regimes of the captive countries as equal partners to the German peace treaty and to a European security system.

Since apart from the American nuclear power of retaliation, the deterrent effect of the determination of the captive nations to regain their freedom is the mainstay of Western European security, the Soviet Union is striving by such means to eliminate definitively the captive peoples' hope placed in the solidarity of the West.

Unfortunately, the Western European peace plans that have emerged so far, are strictly limited to the reunification in freedom of Germany in return for which a European security system would be set up embracing all members of the NATO and Warsaw Pacts. Members of both pacts would be united to defend those members of the security system which would be attacked by an aggressor.

Therefore, this security scheme would mean the perpetuation of the enslavement of central and eastern European and the Hungarian people, since under the terms of such a security pact the West would grant not only political guarantees, but even military protection to the Communist satellite regimes, including the Kadar regime in Hungary which was branded by the U.N. General Assembly as placed in power by the Soviet army.

The Hungarian committee refuses to assume that the Western Powers which have fought two world wars for the freedom of mankind, might be induced to seal the enslavement of the Hungarian people who rose so spontaneously as a man against Soviet and Communist domination in 1956.

Therefore, the Hungarian Committee respectfully requests, as the spokesman of the silenced Hungarian people, that the Western Powers raise the Central and Eastern European and first of all the Hungarian problem at the Foreign Ministers and summit conferences as one of the crucial problems which demands a just and durable solution.

It is the most revolting injustice of the century that the Hungarian pople with a record of a thousand years independence, is languishing in the colonial bondage of the Soviet Union, while thanks to the understanding of their civilized foreign rulers, even backward peoples are obtaining nationhood and independence one after another.

Even the preservation of the prestige of the United Nations requires that the Hungarian question be placed on the agenda of any East-West conference, since the Soviet Union which was condemned by the U.N. for her aggression, has provocatively flouted all U.N. resolutions on Hungary.

For all these reasons it would certainly appear as a marked western weakness to negotiate with the Soviet leaders without demanding forcefully the just settlement of the Hungarian question.

No real European peace settlement and security system is conceivable without the solution of the Central Eastern European problem, especially the Hungarian question, as only a truly representative, freely elected Hungarian Government would be a reliable and honest party to any East-West security pact or other agreement. Longing for peace and freedom, the suffering Hungarian people are extremely eager to obtain the status of internationally guaranteed neutrality as it was proclaimed by Premier Imre Nagy in his dramatic appeal, addressed to the Western Powers and to the United Nations on November 1, 1956.

The so-far emerged security and disengagement plans for Central and Eastern Europe are not the substitutes for political solutions, because they are based on both the division of Europe and the enslavement of former free nations which are and will remain the main source of international tension.

Disarmament and disengagement are not the prerequisites, but the very consequences of a comprehensive political settlement.

## Courage in a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following article from the Havana Times of March 7, 1959, reprinted in the Washington Daily News for March 12, 1959:

COURAGE IN THE FACE OF DEMAGOGIC HATE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The free world was shocked when Fidel Castro, in his role of revolutionary leader, ordered a retrial of Cuban army fliers after his own revolutionary court had acquitted them, and told the new handpicked court to find them guilty, which it obediently did. What the free world doesn't know is that it also shocked many Cubans, some of whom were supporters of Castro's revolution. Therefore, as an eloquent example of journalistic courage in the face of dangerous demagogic emotions fanned by the very leader of the revolution himself, we reprint below a Cuban article denouncing Castro's action. This article was printed in the Times of Havana, immediately after Castro had nullified the court's original decision, and even before his second court could sentence them. Havana has 17 newspapers. Only three refused the ousted Batista's graft. The Havana Times is one of the three. We believe our readers will salute this newspaper and its columnist for dauntless devotion to justice and free opinion, no matter who is boss.)

(By an old Habanero)

I saw a frightening thing on television yesterday afternoon. The Prime Minister of the Republic of Cuba, Fidel Castro Ruz, in violent harangue (there is no other word), asked the people of this country to disregard the verdict of one of his very own revolutionary tribunals that acquitted a group of 43 flyers of Batista's air force accused of genocide, murder, and assassination.

He stated flatly that in Cuba, today, you are either for or against the revolution. I am not against the revolution, but I reserve the right that that same revolution has granted me to write as I think; and I think that the Prime Minister has made a very great mistake in losing sight of the basic argument that has arisen from the revision of the trial of the acquitted flyers, a revision whose outcome is a fait accompli against the aviators after Dr. Castro's televised talk.

This unfavorable revision is termed justice by Dr. Castro.

Fidel Castro had an opportunity of becoming great yesterday.

If he had merely criticized the decision of the court that acquitted the flyers, and allowed it to stand, without insisting on a revision and demagogically and violently bringing enormous pressure on the decision of the revisory court against the accused, he would have shown himself to be a man who respected the tribunals of his own government and who adapted himself to their decision.

But Dr. Castro, from the very beginning, has always had it in for the flyers and the decision of the court has thrown him into a frantic rage that imposes his will upon the matter.

Reprisal, reprisal, reprisal is the theme that ran through Castro's words. He accused the defending lawyers of pettifogging, he accused them of using the trial, not to state their juridicial position, but to further their political aims.

In an unparalleled attack against the moneyed classes of the country, in an attack on money per se, he accused the defending lawyers of becoming tools of these interests and serving counterrevolutionary groups.

Time and again he gave the impression that all criticism of or opposition to the Government is necessarily against the revolution and against the people.

Forgotten were the scenes in Santiago de Cuba this week when the new prosecutor, no less than Minister of Defense Dr. Augusto Martinez, excoriated Defender D'Acosta, accused him of being a Batista man.

Forgotten was the fact that the court refused to allow Dr. D. Costa the right to defend himself of these charges and allowed a public demonstration to reign unchecked in the courtroom against the hapless defense lawyer.

Violent attacks were launched by Dr. Castro yesterday on both defense lawyers, D'Acosta and Pena Justiz. Dr. Castro called D'Acosta a tool of Batista, and accused him of going to Santiago without permission. A strange thing to say when the revolutionary courts themselves have appointed D'Acosta defender in such prominent trials as that of Sosa Blanco and Morejon.

A strange thing to say when the chief justice who presided at the Sosa Blanco trial warmly praised D'Acosta for doing a job nobody wanted to do.

A strange thing to accuse D'Acosta to being passionate in his defense when D'Acosta only acted in the light of the highest traditions of the legal profession.

To the Prime Minister it does not matter that one of his own tribunals, following the dictates of the laws that govern the land, has acquitted the flyers. The only thing that matters to Dr. Castro is that the decision is diametrically opposite to his opinion, and he has promptly set about to correct such a disgraceful state of affairs.

Dr. Castro does not stop to realize that the fate of the flyers is not the question under debae. Dr. Castro, a lawyer, refuses to see that it is the decision of one of his own tribunals that is the all important bone of the argument.

Dr. Castro refuses to admit that tampering with that decision in an unequivocal way is tampering with the guarantees that the law gives to the "people" to whom he constantly refers.

Dr. Castro will not see that he is imposing his will, and his alone, on the people of Cuba.

To rationalize his position Dr. Castro, with his considerable powers of persuasion, went before the people of this country, and in an enormously long and repetitious talk confused the issue, blew a blinding smokescreen in front of the real crux of the matter, and gave a polititcal tone to a purely juridicial process. We find that the defending lawyers are tools of counterrevolutionaries, that money, and only money, is protecting the flyers; that the bar associations are a party to this frightful plot, and that only rich lawyers are the ones protesting.

Dr. Pena Justiz, an eminence in Cuban law, told the tribunal after the disgraceful scenes that occurred in Santiago that they were paving the way for another Napoleonic strongman. Dr. Castro savagely tore into Pena Justiz with the familiar counterrevolutionary aspersion.

The Prime Minister even took the trouble to instruct the revisionary tribunals (who are trying men twice for the same offense) just how to render a verdict. No death penalties, please. That might bring an explosion of criticism from the entire world. Do not make these men martyrs, he ordered; jail is just the thing for them. We do not even have to guess what the verdict of these men will be. The Prime Minister has spoken. His will be done.

The violation of several cardinal principles of law is not a matter that seems to weigh heavily on the Prime Minister's conscience. Indeed, he tolerantly admitted that this was the only mistake that had been committed so far by a revolutionary tribunal. Let it not happen again, he seemed to say. Justice, yes—but Castro justice only, please.

Dr. Castro, by his action, has denied the people the very rights that he says that he fought for.

Dr. Castro by his action, has demonstrated that he can reverse any decision of a court of the land at will.

Dr. Castro has given due warning that his will is the deciding factor in the government of the land.

Dr. Castro has shown that double jeopardy is an active legal horror in Cuba.

Dr. Castro is serving notice to the whole country, that he, with all his whims and caprices, is the boss.

---

## Sammy Davis, Jr., Receives Mnookin-Brown American Legion Post's Americanism Award for Distinguished Service in Bettering Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Mnookin-Brown American Legion Post of Kansas City, Mo., performs a great service to my district and the country as a whole in the presentation of their annual Americanism award for distinguished service in bettering human relations.

In 1948 the Mnookin-Brown American Legion Post No. 468 established its annual memorial scholarship awards to honor those men and women who gave their lives in World War II to preserve the four freedoms and for the purpose of recommemorating the cause for which they died. The awards are made to high school seniors in the Greater Kansas City area who have distinguished themselves in the field of human relations in home, school, and communal life.

As a result of this scholarship program and other human relations work, the Mnookin-Brown Post is one of the most active organizations in Kansas City, having this highly worthwhile project as its driving force. The post is constantly striving toward the establishment of more human relations instruction in the regular school curriculum in Greater Kansas City. It has become known throughout the United States for its work in this field and should be commended therefor.

On March 30, 1959, this post will honor Mr. Sammy Davis, Jr., by presenting to him the coveted 1959 Mnookin-Brown Americanism award for distinguished service in bettering human relations. Mr. Davis will interrupt his film and nightclub commitments to appear in Kansas City and receive this award. All America, as well as the entertainment world, should be deeply proud of Mr. Davis for his tremendous gifts of time and talents to philanthropic, civic, and humanitarian causes. His help has brought comfort and health to countless thousands of adults and children. In the last 4 years alone he has received more than two dozen major public service awards in the field of interfaith understanding and assistance to wounded

veterans, orphans, youth, and the aged. He is recipient of the fight-for-sight award and numerous citations for fighting muscular distrophy, cancer, asthma, and juvenile delinquency. This record speaks for itself and more than indicates Sammy Davis, Jr.'s worthiness to receive the Mnookin-Brown Americanism award for 1959 for distinguished service in bettering human relations.

## Lt. Gen. S. T. Williams, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Neil McElroy, in his recent defense posture statements prepared for this Congress, paid a splendid tribute to the noteworthy progress being made by the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam. The Secretary, while visiting Vietnam, learned that this Nation is determined to remain a free Republic despite what faint hearts consider its precarious location on the edge of the Communist sphere of influence in southeast Asia and despite its exposure to Red military might which could come at any time by direct land routes and over short air and sea distances.

Certainly, the reassuring words of the Secretary were good to hear. I submit that he genuinely meant that Vietnam's Armed Forces were, to some degree, relatively exceptional. In the brief 4 years since the 1955 armistice terminating the French Indochina war and starting from less than nothing—indeed, from the ashes and ruins of the holocaust itself—the Army, Navy, and Air Force of Vietnam have come a long, long way toward fulfillment. To the point, in fact, where Mr. McElroy took special note of their capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, behind this mighty effort and achievement there must have been good counsel and leadership of the highest order of modern military times. For a fact, there was. This land could be saved by sound assistance and advice to its newly created armed forces. The emergency arose and we had the man for the job. On November 15, 1955, a great American and truly outstanding general officer was named Chief of the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group for Vietnam. That man was Lt. Gen. Samuel T. Williams, U.S. Army, in whom we can surely take abundant pride.

General Williams went out to far-off Vietnam in 1955 and brought to that war-torn nation his invaluable combat experience, his sagacity for planning, his indomitable spirit and vigor. Side-by-side with the Vietnamese, he organized, he trained, he built, and he stayed with the job and thus has struck a real blow for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I know whereof I speak about Vietnam perhaps better than most. I had personally seen the situation in Vietnam in 1955. Then in October 1958, it was my great privilege to visit that country again to participate in ceremonies commemorating Vietnam's third anniversary of the proclamation of the constitution of that country. The military took a prideful part in these ceremonies.

I could scarcely believe that so much could have been done so quickly.

But it was there for all to see, a magnificent modern military achievement, a testimonial to the tireless and unpublicized efforts of General Williams.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the House and our colleagues in the Senate to know of General Williams' unselfish and remarkable service in Vietnam. In a larger sense, I would like also for the Congress to note the long and honorable service of this fine officer and gentleman. In these days, we seldom see personal records of such devoted service to one's country. As times goes on, we shall see less and less. While we can, let us note this great soldier's record, a saga of over 40 years with the colors. It was a lifetime spent, and still being spent, all in America's name and in Freedom's name.

This is General Williams' outstanding service:

General Williams was born and raised in Denton, Tex. He attended the First Officers' Training Camp at Leon Springs, Tex., in 1917 and was commissioned a second lieutenant of Infantry with assignment to Company I, 359th Infantry 90th—Texas-Oklahoma—Division. He served with the 359th Infantry in the Toul Sector and in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne Battles and in the Army of Occupation.

Between 1920 and 1942 General Williams served in various infantry regiments as a company commander and regimental staff officer and graduated from the Infantry School, the Command and General Staff College, and the Army War College.

During World War II, General Williams held assignments as Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, 95th Infantry Division; regimental commander of the 378th Infantry Regiment, 95th Division; G-3 XXII Corps, C/S XXII Corps; and assistant division commander of the 90th Infantry Division, participating in the Normany landing and five campaigns in Europe. From 1946 until 1950, General Williams commanded the First Military District in Germany, the 26th Infantry Regimental Combat Team, and was Acting C/S and Assistant Division Commander of the First Infantry Division.

Returning to the United States in 1950, General Williams served as Assistant G-3, Office, Chief Army Field Forces, until 1952. He then commanded the 25th—Tropic Lightning—Division in Korea during the last year of that war. During this period he also served as deputy corps commander of the II Republic of Korea Corps of the Republic of Korea Army during the last great Chinese offensive. After the armistice, he was sent to northern Japan to command the XVI Corps and was charged with the defensive plans of that part of Japan north of Tokyo.

In April 1954 General Williams returned to Korea to command the IX U.S. Corps and the V Republic of Korea Corps. During this period he also served as deputy Army commander of the Eighth U.S. Army in addition to his duties as a corps commander. Returning to the United States, he assumed his duties as deputy Army commander of the Fourth Army, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., in January 1955. He assumed command of the Fourth Army on June 17, 1955, and retained that command until named Chief, Military Assistance Advisory Group, Vietnam, on November 15, 1955.

General Williams' decorations include the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star with oak leaf cluster, the Soldier's Medal, Bronze Star, Purple Heart with oak leaf cluster, French Legion of Honor, French Croix de Guerre with palm, the Korean Taeguk with silver star, and Ulchi Medal with gold star for his services to the Korean Army during the Kumsong Bulge Battle in July 1953, and other high decorations of our allies.

## Editorial in California Dairyman in Support of Continuance of Special Milk Program for Schoolchildren—It Gives Pertinent Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to include to the attention of your own distinguished self and my colleagues in this great legislative body, what appears to me to be a pertinent editorial in the California Dairyman for March 14, 1959. This very highly respected magazine is printed at 16280 South Paramount Boulevard, Paramount, Calif., which is one of the important and beautiful cities in the great 23d District. The editorial deals with the special milk program for schoolchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you know I have supported that program in the past; I do again. I think it is one of the most worthy, sensible and sound programs of Congress and of the States cooperating.

The said editorial presents factual data and arguments with which I believe every Member of this great legislative body should be familiar, if not already so.

The editorial follows:

DOLLARS NEEDED FOR MILK PROGRAM

In a few weeks the highly successful special milk program for schools may be canceled in California unless united, prompt and active support is given by the dairy industry.

The problem is simple. The program has been so successful that we're running out of money. California's 1958-59 allocation of

funds was $6,781,409. At the current rate of expenditures, California's funds will be exhausted as of May 11, 1959, and as agreements with the schools require 10 days' notice before cancellation, the State Department of Education has advised that unless they have assurance that the funds will be made available, notice of discontinuance of the program will be made as of April 24, 1959. Source of these funds is the Commodity Credit Corporation which has a $75 million annual allocation from Congress for the program for the 3 years 1958 to 1961. According to W. B. Woodburn, manager, California Dairy Industry Advisory Board, the State needs an additional $1,110,680 to finish out this school year. The CDIAB has been the major expediter of the program in California and unanimously has endorsed the program and its continuance.

It takes a great lever to speedily move such a giant as the National Government's Commodity Credit Corporation. Yet, as haste is what is vitally necessary to get these additional funds approved prior to April 24, we feel that the best and strongest lever available is direct requests from all phases of the industry to Congressmen in Washington, D.C. Write a letter or send a wire. Don't minimize the important of action—and don't let the other guy do it, just hope that he will do it too.

Not only does the special milk program in California market a lot of milk, but on a higher plane than just economics, it provides health for every youngster provided milk through the program and nutritionists across the Nation have turned up alarming facts about the inadequate diets of the majority of America's youth.

California's promotion of the program through the California Dairy Industry Advisory Board has resulted in sales in 1957–58 school year of 293 million half-pint equivalents, with approximately 65 percent being in one-third-quart containers. The one-third-quart container innovation was accomplished after considerable work by the CDIAB staff with cooperation of the State board of education.

Ground lost through any cutback or halt in the special milk program in California will be extremely difficult to recover.

Proof that just such industry efforts as outlined here will be effective is borne out by promise of $500,000 of the needed funds as a result of recent endeavor by the CDIAB committee on the special milk program under guidance of Ned Clinton, chairman of Westminster, Calif.

Address California's Senators CLAIR ENGLE and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., and/or your Congressmen at the House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

---

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

---

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

## LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

## SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.....2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

---

## STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

*Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences*

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

*Committee on Agriculture and Forestry*

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

*Committee on Appropriations*

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

*Committee on Armed Services*

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

*Committee on Banking and Currency*

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

*Committee on the District of Columbia*

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

*Committee on Finance*

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

*Committee on Foreign Relations*

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

*Committee on Government Operations*

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs*

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce*

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

*Committee on the Judiciary*

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

*Committee on Public Works*

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

*Committee on Rules and Administration*

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

---

## UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

---

## UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
### JUSTICES ASSIGNED
### TERRITORY EMBRACED

*District of Columbia:* Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

*First judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

*Second judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

*Third judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

*Fourth judicial circuit:* Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

*Fifth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

*Sixth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

*Seventh judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

*Eighth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

*Ninth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

*Tenth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

# Appendix

## Easter Letter From Representative James C. Wright, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the ablest Members of the Texas delegation in Congress is Representative JIM WRIGHT, of Fort Worth. Representative WRIGHT is making a fine record, not only by the farsighted, responsible way in which he is serving his district, but also through the outstanding newsletters which he sends each week to the people he represents. His most recent letter is such a beautiful and inspiring Easter message that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WRIGHT SLANT ON WASHINGTON

EASTER WEEK, 1959

(A report from JIM)

Congress hurries to complete its work for a brief Easter adjournment. Like the long stream of generations before us, we seek throughout the land to review again the events of those 7 days which changed the world and split history into two clearly definable parts. It seems almost a sacrilege to write of other things.

Never before nor since has there been a week so fraught with meaning, so supercharged with drama, so interladen with pathos, and yet so tremendous in triumph as that first Easter week.

The familiar story never grows stale in the telling. Like springtime, it is always new. After 2,000 years it still has the power to arrest our thoughts and even change the pattern of our lives. Yet, but for the one exception, there is nothing unusual about the people who parade through the pages of the Easter story. They were real people, ordinary people, very much like you and me. Perhaps we can even see ourselves in some of them.

There were the crowds—the glad crowds that lined the streets and filled the temple square on that Palm Sunday—and the angry crowds that jostled one another in Pilate's courtyard on Friday. With wild abandon, they cheered the Carpenter of Nazareth as he rode into the city. They threw their clothing in the street and tore the branches from the trees to wave in tribute, and 5 days later some of the same people stood in front of Pilate's palace and shouted "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!"

They were real people all right. Like the people we know. Like the people we are. The public is still said to be fickle. Yesterday's hero is today's villain and tomorrow's forgotten man. Even today, the mob spirit that flamed them into unreasoning condemnation still smoulders about us at times, needing but a sudden breeze to burn afresh and to destroy whatever lies in its path. Like the people of ancient Jerusalem, we are susceptible to mass psychology. Like them, we sometimes find it simple and convenient to find a scapegoat to condemn without comprehending. It is easier than trying to understand. Have you ever been in that crowd? I am afraid that I have, at times.

And there was Judas Iscariot, the zealot, the treasurer of the little band, he who sold the hope of the world for 30 pieces of silver. History has dealt harshly with Judas, for deliberate treachery is a trait we universally condemn. Yet think of Judas for a moment. He wanted to overthrow the Roman invaders by force of arms. At last it became obivous to him that this was not the plan. He saw the powerful forces being arrayed against the Nazarene and his followers. He felt that the movement was doomed * * * a lost cause. The chief of priest and the leaders of his people were determined to destroy it.

How crass was his betrayal and how empty his reward. Yet in all of history practical men have abandoned lost causes, have deserted sinking ships. And this still goes on today.

Pontius Pilate was the procurator, his business to administer the Roman law. He didn't understand the people in this obscure province and didn't particularly care to. He'd rather be back in Rome, but his career had led him here. Little did he realize he was judging history's most famous case, or that by a strange twist of irony it was he himself who was being tried and found wanting.

As the accusers hurled their denunciations and spat out their poison stream of invective, there came to him the clear conviction that if ever in his life he had seen an innocent person, this prisoner who stood before him now with the strange light shining in His eyes was the most innocent of all. Three times Pilate tried to release Him, once to give Him an easy way out. But finally, confronted with the threat of being reported to Ceasar, his will crumpled like a heap of ashes. He took the course of least resistance and tried to wash his hands of the matter, allowing the Christ to be crucified.

Have you ever been cast in the role of Pilate? Have you ever been convinced in your mind that a thing was not right and yet reluctantly assented to it because everyone else seemed so determined? Have you ever known the right decision but found it too hard to make—and let others make it for you? Have you ever tried to wash your hands of a difficult situation by pretending it was not your responsibility—when you knew in your heart that it was? Could there be a lingering touch of Pilate even in you and me?

Not all of the characters of Easter week, of course, were villains. There were the faithful ones. There was Joseph of Arimathea, who provided a tomb for the lifeless body of the Son of God. Speculation has identified this Joseph as a member of the Sanhedrin. A legend has grown up connecting him with the rich young ruler who had been willing to go so far but only so far.

Now, at the last, the fire that burned in him had erupted to the surface. He offered to share his family vault with Him who had no place to lay His head. Is there the spirit of Joseph of Arimathea in us today?

Or of Mary of Magdala, who had been healed of her afflictions? The New Testament refers to her maladies simply as "demons." In our age, when mental illness has become a fad and the psychiatrist's couch the altar of its faith, we find it easy to believe that she had been beset by neuroses and nervous disorders. It matters not at all the nature of her earlier life. What matters is only that she was healed, redeemed, and grateful with a boundless love. What matters is the adoration that brought her to the tomb that Sunday morning.

What matters is the unquestioning faith, as she stood there in the softly breaking dawn, to recognize Him risen, to see the transformation taking place and to feel that transformation in her own soul, and to return at His command with a shout of triumph to tell the glad news of the resurrection. Can you see yourself in Mary Magdalene?

Or in Simon of Cyrene, who bore the cross of Christ up the long, steep pathway to the hill of Golgotha?

Crosses still there are to bear. The hill we climb to a peaceful world where men may beat their swords into plowshares and each may know in his heart the peace of God that passes understanding, is a steep hill. The crosses of selfishness, of avarice, of hatred and revenge, are heavy crosses, and He staggers under their weight. Must He bear them unassisted, or can we see ourselves in Simon of Cyrene who picked up the burden and carried it?

In each of us there dwells the same human nature which motivated them in that Easter week in old Jerusalem. If He who was perfect should come to earth today, He might be crucified again.

Yet, even so, He would live again. And with Him would live the hopes and dreams of a better world which moves, ever so imperceptibly, nearer and nearer to fruition.

## Four Major Problems Face the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of my Washington newsletter which has been released today.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART)

In my opinion, four major problems face this Nation.

In these columns, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, in public addresses and a series of weekly radio broadcasts, it will be my pur-

pose to analyze, discuss and present suggested solutions for each of them.

As I see these problems they are:

1. The threat of Russian communism, both military and economic.
2. The farm problem.
3. Labor problems.
4. Inflation.

These problems must be solved.

These problems, in one form or another and in varying degrees, have been with us for many, many years. Thus it would serve no purpose to attempt to place the responsibility for them on either of the major political parties. They are our problems, not partisan political problems.

Your Government, meaning the administration and those of us who represent you in the Congress, needs your help and your suggestions in arriving at solutions.

It will be my purpose to offer some concrete suggestions.

I hope you will help me, and through me the administration and the Congress, by presenting your ideas.

Certainly no one man is wise enough to have all of the answers.

I am so thoroughly convinced, however, that the future of this Nation and the free world depends upon sound solutions of these problems that I propose to seek out, with the help of others whose responsibility it is also to try to solve these problems, concrete programs aimed at their solution.

It is my duty to do so because that is what you elected me to do.

Some of my suggestions may be partly or wholly unsound. In any event I am going to speak out with my ideas and it will be the prerogative of those who read what I have to say or hear my broadcasts and telecasts to be the judges.

Someone must come up with the right answers and soon.

It is my best judgment that we just cannot go on as we have been without risking real difficulty.

I foresee the possibility of:

1. A third world war.
2. Ruinous inflation.
3. Unbearable taxes.
4. Huge governmental expenditures.
5. A bankrupt agriculture.
6. Chaos in labor-management relations resulting in great suffering on the part of our people.
7. The adoption of socialistic schemes.

Let me discuss in a little more detail the particulars involved in each of the major problems.

1. The threat of Russian communism, both military and economic, of course, involves the possibility of war.

(a) It likewise involves the possibility that Russia could force us through her cold war tactics to bankrupt ourselves with resultant socialism.

(b) Somehow, someway, the Berlin situation must be solved.

(c) So must the problem of the division between West and East Germany.

(d) So must the problem of the control of atomic weapons.

(e) Should we consider trade with Russia?

2. Our farm problem must be solved.

Look at these facts:

(a) Our agricultural program this year for every purpose will cost over $6 billion.

(b) Yet we have in storage $9 billion of surplus.

(c) It is apparent that the price support program yet has failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended.

(d) Farm prices today are much too low.

(e) We continue to involve farming, strictly a private enterprise, with politics.

3. The seriousness of our labor problem is generally recognized.

Look at these facts:

(a) Labor and management in many instances are not working together.

(b) Much of this difficulty is due to existing Federal laws and/or the failure of local law enforcement officers to enforce existing laws.

(c) Approximately 4 million are unemployed despite an otherwise very high level of economy.

4. Inflation is a real danger.

(a) We continue deficit spending.

(b) Governmental expenditures on all levels—local, State, and Federal—continue to increase.

(c) Taxes continue to go up and up—local, State, and Federal.

(d) The purchasing power of the dollar continues to decrease.

These are the problems I propose to attack. If you should disagree with me, as many of you will, I hope you will at least give me E for effort along with your own ideas.

The solution of these problems is the responsibility of every American, regardless of politics.

## Western Defense Pays Off Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, for a long time California's Coach Pete Newell has clung obstinately to his belief that defensive basketball is the best basketball. His conviction paid off again over the weekend—it won for a California school the national title for the third time in 4 years. As an alumnus of the University of California, I was pleased to read Mal Florence's story in the Los Angeles Times describing the hard fight last Friday between the University of California Bears and West Virginia's Mountaineers. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 22, 1959]

CAL HOLDS OFF RALLY BY WEST VIRGINIA

(By Mal Florence)

LOUISVILLE, March 21.—California fought off a determined West Virginia rally to win the NCAA basketball championship here tonight by a score of 71 to 70.

Trailing by 10 points early in the game, the Bears swept to a 39–33 half-time lead which they expanded to a 13-point margin in the second half. The Mountaineers, however, nearly caught the Californians at the finish.

West Virginia's smooth star, Jerry West, gave the Bears fits during the first few minutes of the contest and led all scorers with 15 at the break.

The Mounties shot 56.5 percent in the first half, compared to Cal's 41.7 percent, but West Virginia was limited to 23 shots from the field while Cal was taking 36.

FAST START

West Virginia started fast and, after 9 minutes of play, had built up a 23–13 advantage over California.

The Mountaineers were particularly quick at following their own shots and their work close in under the bucket accounted for the lead.

The Mounties were also employing a zone press on defense but the Bears kept their heads and managed to bring the ball down court.

CAL CUTS LEAD

West Virginia, and especially its All-American West was more than matching Imhoff and company on the boards during the early going.

The Bears called time when down by 23–13 and when play resumed a push shot by Dalton and follow bucket by McClintock cut the lead to 23–17.

West broke free on a drive to score but it was the last bucket for the Mountaineers for quite a spell. Cal, now playing tough defense, gradually overhauled West Virginia.

Doughty, replacing Imhoff, canned a short jump to tie the score at 25–25 with 6:45 left in the half. West sent West Virginia ahead with a free throw but another jump by Doughty and a push by Grout left Cal in charge, 29–26, with 5:03 to go.

## Press Release Relating to Address by Hon. Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I note that on Thursday the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] commented on a brief newspaper account of a speech delivered recently by my Wisconsin colleage, Representative HENRY S. REUSS.

The minority leader used this five-paragraph news article, which appears on page 4109 of the RECORD for March 19, 1959, as a basis for defending the administration against Mr. REUSS' charges of "politics as usual." The fact is that the Reuss speech covered a good deal more ground than that.

I think the minority leader ought to have the opportunity to reply to the other points made by Representative REUSS. Also, the readers of the RECORD ought to have a more complete account of the speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the text of a press release issued by Mr. REUSS on March 11, 1959, covering his speech of that date.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"UNITED STATES MUST GIVE UP ECONOMICS AS USUAL, POLITICS AS USUAL TO SURVIVE," CONGRESSMAN REUSS DECLARES

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 11, 1959.—"If the United States is to survive and to win in the mounting struggle of international competition, we have to give up two luxuries—economics as usual, and politics as usual," Congress HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said Wednesday morning.

REUSS spoke to the second annual National Workshop for Religious Liberals at All Souls Church in Washington.

"It is ironic that the administration which, quite rightly, declares itself ready to stand up to danger in Berlin, is so Milquetoastish about our own economy," REUSS declared.

"In practicing economics as usual, the administration is declaring itself afraid to try to make our economy work on the full employment-full production basis that is obviously required to meet our international responsibilities.

"It submits to some 5 million unemployed, and about one-fourth of our productive capacity at a standstill, and an annual

growth rate in our economy of only 2 percent, while the Soviet Union advances at a rate of 8 to 10 percent a year.

"Growth through bold economic policies, not drift, is what the United States must have, both for our own defense and to make an effective contribution to the democratic advancement of the uncommitted, underdeveloped countries of the world," REUSS declared.

REUSS noted that Secretary Dulles, Undersecretary Dillon and other administration officials "have been saying, rightly, for some time that the Development Loan Fund needs $1 billion a year for 5 years, to do a good job."

"But what happens when Ike-the-Economizer gets through preparing his flimsily, fancifully balanced budget? The Development Loan Fund comes out at $700 million for 1 year—and that's all.

"This is but one example of economics as usual that has to be discarded. Just as worshipping the golden calf was almost the end of the children of Israel, so worshipping the unrealistically balanced budget may be the end of us."

Turning to "politics as usual," REUSS asserted that "American foreign policy needs a new face—the face of the ugly engineer and the Iowa chicken expert and the Wisconsin powdered milk master in the Ugly American.

"It's not enough to have a sound diplomatic, military and economic policy, even if we did. In addition to having policies, we must stress the character and quality of our American representatives abroad," REUSS said.

"We can't afford the luxury of having ambassadorships purchased with campaign contributions.

"We can't afford the luxury of refusing to appoint the best qualified man to head our foreign aid program because he's not a card-carrying Republican. (In passing, let's note that Paul Hoffmann was chosen Marshall plan chief by President Truman because he was the best man. The fact that he was a Republican was no disqualification.)

"We can't afford the luxury of having the State Department becoming a wastebasket for schedule C political appointees, and having these spoils-seekers turn up later Wristonized into the Foreign Service where they can hurt us forever.

"We can't afford the luxury of encouraging two-way international trade, and having a reasonably sincere reciprocal trade program, and then kick low foreign bidders in the face when a Republican senatorial candidate says his election depends on giving the contract to an American high bidder.

"If we want loyal friends and allies, we must treat them with consistent fairness, not inconsistent churlishness. If we want to win the peoples of Asia, and Africa, and South America to our side, we must send out the kind of men Abraham Lincoln would have chosen for the job—humble, friendly, knowledgeable and eager to learn—instead of arrogant men such as King George sent to keep the Colonies under English control."

## Critical Importance of West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the March 16 issue of the Nashua Telegraph, New Hampshire's second largest daily newspaper. This editorial, entitled, "Our Slumbering Must Cease," warns Americans of the critical question of West Berlin and its great importance to the United States and our allies. I commend it to the reading of all Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashua (N.H.) Telegraph, Mar. 16, 1959]

OUR SLUMBERING MUST CEASE

Let's turn off the TV set, put the car in garage, sit down and face the harsh, painful, urgent facts.

The big one:

The showdown with Russia over Berlin and Germany is the worst crisis we've had since the firing stopped in World War II. And it won't be solved by throwing out the first baseball in mid-April.

The intense pressure Soviet Premier Khrushchev is applying carries great peril of a ruinous nuclear war, by accident or miscalculation if not by design.

Yet we Americans neither feel nor show any real sense of urgency. Perhaps we are calloused by so many manufactured Russian alarms. Last year the Middle East, this year Berlin. Same old boring show. We give it a bad rating and switch to our trusty westerns.

In one breath the Eisenhower administration says any conflict over Germany almost surely would be nuclear, but the President talks of balancing the budget, cutting the Armed Forces, seeing no need to step up our lagging missile pace.

Mr. Eisenhower tells us not to get too stirred over this crisis. The words might sound better if we were awake at all. In the circumstances they amount to patting a sleeping head, putting a cautionary finger to the lips, and tiptoeing out of the room.

We're not alone in our slumber. The vaunted NATO never has risen to more than a fifth of its planned strength. British leaders keep a constant weather eye on the next elections. Other allies are reducing their armed forces or slashing the draft term at the very moment when the West's great verbal posture is firmness.

In all the complex maneuvering between East and West, we appear to pay slim heeed to the often critical uses of psychological warfare.

Endlessly we stress negatives, the things we can't or won't do. We find no advantage in trying to push the Reds off balance as they so frequently do us. We blandly assume we can only lose propaganda combat at a summit or other conference, and fear we will be "taken," no matter what is done or said.

Are we so unintelligent, so naive, so lacking in faith that we must conclude this?

And are we so wrapped up in personal and national concerns that we refuse to see danger until it stands on our doorstep? Will we talk of balanced budgets until the day the Russians balance them for us?

We've got to cut through Khrushchev's soft purring of "peace, peace" and find the tough, unsoftened core of his demands.

We've got to look hard, too, at what exactly we have on hand or in prospect to deal with this threat, if the worst should come.

And we've got to grasp once and for all why Berlin and Germany mean so much to us. Why would we risk the destruction of New York, Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles, and many other cities to keep Berlin free?

The truth is not new, but it's still devastatingly important. West Berlin, just part of a divided city, is a great political and economic entity.

An island in the East German Communist sea, it is a showcase of liberty. More, it is a bastion, a forward outpost. Yield so huge a prize and you cast into the black the morale and spirit of resistance not only of Germans but Frenchmen, Britons, Hollanders, Belgians, Greeks, and others. You may lose the game in Europe.

When that happens the orbit of freedom will be crucially narrowed, and our own safety infinitely more imperiled than ever in our history.

## High Cost of Federal Government Blocks Efforts on Local Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we hear and read comments from time to time about the need to shift various programs away from the Federal Government to the States and localities. Such comments have been made particularly with respect to urban renewal. I am certain many persons would take the same attitude concerning the very bill which is under consideration. Similar comments have been made about Federal aid to airports and many other Federal aid programs.

The Mobile Register of March 15, 1959, published an article entitled "High Cost of Federal Government Blocks Efforts on Local Level," written by John Will, one of its outstanding reporters. The article relates something of the difficulty which city and other local governments have nowadays in raising sufficient revenue to finance necessary programs. I think it may very well demonstrate, also, the unreasonableness of the point which is often made that local governments should participate more fully in the various aid programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH COST OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BLOCKS EFFORTS ON LOCAL LEVEL

(By John Will)

There is growing agitation in these days for more local effort in Government financing, with the obvious purpose of cutting Federal control and restoring local self-determination.

This is a worthy objective. Each State and each community within the State knows its own problems and how best to meet them. But in the last analysis it takes money to solve those problems. And if most of the money is to come from Washington, then Washington is going to lay down the general policies.

Now we may as well be realistic about it and admit that under our present economy and with the world situation still unsettled, we cannot free ourselves of a certain measure of Federal taxation and the consequent Federal regulation. In this day and age, we cannot function as a lot of separate little units with no coordination. That would make us sitting ducks for the Russians.

There must be continuing military expenditures at a high level and they must be handled by the Federal Government. Probably some savings could be accomplished in this field by better planning and management. But whether we like it or not, we must maintain preparedness for almost any eventuality in the world. And we simply have to depend on the judgment of the Nation's military and diplomatic leadership, even though the cost may seem excessively high.

Furthermore, there must be broad coordination of certain facilities within the country from a defense standpoint. For example, the new Federal highway system cannot be built according to local desires. It must be planned and constructed on a national basis. There is no other way to do it.

Furthermore, being realistic again, each community naturally strives to get its full share of every Federal program. The money spent in such programs helps local business and it is argued that since we pay Federal taxes, we may as well try to get back all we can. Of course, this leads to the encouragement of more Federal spending on the assumption that more will come back to the local communities.

Nevertheless, it is clear that unless the cost of Federal Government is substantially reduced, there is not much hope for greater local effort. When the combined taxation of all governments—Federal, State, and local—reaches a certain point, the effect on the economy is bound to be harmful. Industry and business have to channel funds into taxes which they otherwise might use for expansion. The spending power of people for goods and services is restricted. Excessive taxation eventually dries up the sources of revenue.

The fact is that if this move for greater local effort is ever to come to anything, the States and communities must stop running to the Federal Government for all sorts of help. And that is not so easy. The trouble is that if we stop taking it, that will be just so much more for other sections of the country. So the temptation is strong to join the others in line at the Federal pie counter.

Talking about the need for economy in government is a waste of time. The real need is for the people of Mobile and Alabama and every part of this country to get out of the habit of expecting government to provide everything they think they want. Until people are ready to curb their wants and put up with less, the cost of government will keep on its upward spiral.

It seems unless for Federal officials to preach more local effort to States and communities until Congress makes a really serious effort to pare down Federal spending. And even in that highly unlikely event, there will have to be careful figuring to determine what new local taxes are best suited to replace the Federal taxes that may be taken off.

We have only tried to point up the complexity of the problem. There should be more local effort and less Federal control. But we will be honest and say that until there is a fundamental change in the public attitude, the prospects for such a change are virtually nonexistent.

## The American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, merchant ships as well as warships and overseas bases share equal valuation in the equation for effective and adequate seapower.

Unfortunately, this essential point is frequently overlooked by our citizenry. However, Rear Adm. Roy S. Benson, USN, deputy commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, in an address last week before the antisubmarine warfare symposium of the Navy League, persuasively set forth the value of the American merchant marine, and I ask that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY AN AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE?

(Address by Rear Adm. Roy S. Benson, USN, deputy commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, before the antisubmarine warfare symposium of the Navy League, Washington, D.C., March 4, 1959)

Since World War II there have been expressed two points of view as to the functions of the Navy.

One stemed from the teachings of Mahan; in a few words, that sea power consists of merchant ships, overseas bases and warships, and that warships have as their purpose the protection of the sea lines of communication so that the bases can be maintained and the merchant shipping can ply the trade routes unhampered. Those who subscribe to this theory, and exclude all other needs for warships, would reduce the Navy to an antisubmarine force. Presumably, naval ships of various merchant ship types to lift troops, petroleum products and other supplies would be included and would be afforded protection. Purely naval types, however, would be antisubmarine forces. The function of naval forces would be to fight only on the high seas.

The other opinion of the functions of the Navy stemmed particularly from World War II experience; shore-bombardment with guns and planes, and amphibious attack. These had been done in previous wars but not to the extent that they were done by the U.S. Navy in World War II. Directly from them comes the thought that the purpose of the Navy is to land troops and their support, and to attack the enemy homeland with nuclear and other weapons. Included here is the Polaris program. Those who subscribe only to this opinion would limit antisubmarine warfare to protection of the forces which can carry this attack to the enemy. In the extreme case, there are perhaps those who would limit naval attack to submarine launching Polaris missiles and there would be no antisubmarine warfare program. Their Navy would fight only from the sea.

Which opinion is correct? As with so many other things, both are correct. Naval forces are so versatile that they are useful for both and needed for both.

I do not need to make a case for the Navy's usefulness to fight from the seas nor to fight on the seas as necessary. The emphasis is on the last word, "necessary." Obviously, we must have naval antisubmarine forces capable of protecting other naval forces and ships of the American merchant marine, but they must not be utilized to protect anything unless what they protect is necessary.

The task I have been assigned is not to tell you how to protect merchant ships from enemy submarine attack. That is part of the task of other speakers. My task is to explain why we have and should continue to have our American merchant marine.

It really seems unnecessary for me to explain why we have and should continue to have an American merchant marine. General Twining has recently explained that it is incredible that anyone would think that new concepts of warfare obviate the necessity of further fostering a merchant fleet. Admiral Burke's speeches are full of support for our merchant marine.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, sometimes referred to as the Magna Carta of the merchant marine, gives as reasons for the merchant marine, national defense and the development of foreign and domestic commerce. As I am sure you all know, the merchant marine gets Government subsidies. They are for the building of ships and for their operation. The principle is that, due to these subsidies, our operators can compete financially with foreign operators. If a ship has defense features, the Government pays for them. Also, the American merchant marine gets a great deal of U.S. Defense Department business. In fiscal year 1958 funds for subsidies amounted to about $150 million; for defense features about $1 million; defense business some $300 million. These last two are, of course, not subsidies.

Rapid, emergency shipbuilding during World War I cost $3 billion; during World War II, $17 billion. Costs of this kind could pay for subsidies at our present rate for 100 years.

Lack of shipping nearly lost us both World War I and World War II. The turning point in each was reached when we built ships at a greater rate than German submarines were sinking them.

What does the United States get in return for paying subsidies and for defense features? If the American merchant marine can be justified either economically or for defense, it is worthwhile. It can be justified both ways.

Complete justification can be made economically during peacetime. Time does not permit me to cover it here. All I can do is assure that it is definitely worth it, in dollars and cents in peacetime operations, for the American people to support their merchant marine. It is a real bargain. I consider that the American merchant marine should do more to make this known to the public.

The justification during peacetime is not what we are talking about here today. We simply do not want to provide antisubmarine protection for anything unless the units protected are necessary.

The costs to the taxpayer can also be justified because of the wartime use of the merchant marine. Again we have a bargain. Obviously, if you are going to have merchant ships, their crews, building and repair yards on short notice for wartime use, they must exist in peacetime. For either limited or general war we get for our tax dollar, ships which can be quickly converted into naval auxiliaries or used as they exist by the Military Sea Transportation Service. Ships of the American merchant marine carried most of the supplies to troops during World War II, the Korean war and even recently in the Lebanon crisis. Without them we could have been severely handicapped. Without them I simply have no idea how the supplies would have reached the theater of action.

There are two other wartime uses of ships of our merchant marine during wartime. One is to assist to meet civilian needs of our allies. They cannot remain allies for long if they need imports of foodstuff and other items for civilian consumption and if these supplies cannot be delivered. It is not our job, but if not done we can lose our allies.

Finally, and a book could be written on this, the United States is not self-sufficient. We have to import in order to keep our industrial might going. Even jet aircraft are not homegrown. U.S. industrial might was the real secret weapon of World War II. We cannot keep our industry going without imports either in peace or war. We tell ourselves this repeatedly but I think the facts deserve a real campaign to explain it to the American public. The sources of the materials must remain in friendly hands and we must vouchsafe their movement by sea.

The ships of merchant marine, our own and those of our allies, must fill the needs. If the ships are to arrive safely they must be protected from enemy attack.

It is not enough then to provide antisubmarine protection for naval task forces and the ships carrying troops and their logistic support. We must have adequate antisubmarine warfare protection for ships supplying our allies and American industry. In addition to Atlantic and Pacific routes, I am referring to the routes leading to and from Middle East and southeast Asia. The routes are worldwide. The anitsubmarine warfare problem thus is worldwide. The difficulty is great. The price of failure would be greater.

What have I said in this brief talk? I have tried to urge that—

1. That a greater effort be made by the American merchant marine to get over to the public that as a peacetime operation they are definitely worthwhile on a dollars and cents basis.

2. The fact that the United States is not self-sufficient but must import from the corners of the earth, both in peace and in war, in order to survive must be proved again and again.

3. That our antisubmarine theater of action is, of course, worldwide and is not limited to areas in which naval task forces operate.

## Understanding the Wilderness Preservation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my home city of Portland, Oreg., is privileged to have an outstanding civic organization dedicated to better understanding of public issues and policies. This is the City Club of Portland. On March 13, 1959, the club's program was devoted to discussion of the value of wilderness to modern man. The City Club was indeed fortunate to hear on this occasion a most able spokesman for the wilderness principle.

The remarks were made by Mr. David R. Brower, able executive director of the Sierra Club. Mr. Brower knows America's wilderness firsthand. He has explored much of it on foot with knapsack and bedroll. But he has other qualifications which add value to what he has to say about the untrammeled parts of our Nation. Dave Brower is a sensitive individual who can articulate the spiritual impact of wilderness, the need to preserve it as an element in human survival.

I recommend the reading of excerpts from Mr. Brower's address, "Conservation: The Wilderness Bill," to all those who seek understanding on the proposal now before Congress to establish a wilderness area preservation system. He has synthesized the extent of the problem, the meaning of the legislation and the everlasting value of its adoption. I ask consent to include with my remarks some portions of Mr. Brower's speech of March 4, 1959, to the North American Wildlife Conference.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION: THE WILDERNESS BILL

(Talk by David R. Brower, executive director, Sierra Club, before the City Club of Portland, March 13, 1959)

It is much to be regretted that the official leaders of the conservation movement—than which nothing is more important to the country—have never shown a cordial, much less an aggressive, interest in safeguarding our great scenery, or in promoting, in general, this part of their admirable program. * * * The fact is, there is no more popular and effective trumpet call for the conservation movement than the appeal to the love of beautiful natural scenery. In this matter the idealists are more practical than the materialists, whose mistake is that they never capitalize sentiment. A money valuation of the uses of our gerat natural scenery, attracting, as it does, a vast number of summer sojourners and the traveling public in general, would make an astonishing showing.

It could be easily proved that the fear of offending the hardheaded and practical man by such an appeal is without foundation. The first thing that a man does after he obtains a competence is to invest his money in some form of beauty, and it is in the interest of good citizenship that he should have a plot of ground to be proud of. He settles in some town, suburb, or other region mainly because it is beautiful, and he is all the happier if his home can command an attractive natural view. * * * The American still apostrophizes his country with the lines: "I love thy rocks and rills. Thy woods and templed hills," and he is not willing that this sentiment shall be changed to read: "I love thy stocks and mills, Thy goods and crumpled bills." * * *

What is needed is the inculcation, by every agency, of beauty as a principle, that life may be made happier and more elevating for all the generations who shall follow us, and who will love their country more devotedly the more lovable it is made.

I don't know how much you believe of what I have said. I don't happen to believe all of it myself, for part of it no longer applies. It was written in 1910—not by me—as part of an editorial appearing in the old Century magazine. I imagine the author was Robert Underwood Johnson, who was still concerned that at the Governors' conference of 1908, and in action subsequent to it, there had been so much ado about the practical utilization of commercial resources, and so little about the beauty of America. It was as if man worshipped no other gods than productivity and the market place, as if he never expected to lift up his eyes unto the hills, but always to look down at the spinning lathe. This seemed to be the compulsion then. How far has a half-century brought us?

I'm not going to answer this question. I'll just ask it and let you think about it. You see, I feel a little uneasy—a little the way I felt 10 days ago in New York. There it was a little like proposing a toast to the WCTU, bourbon and all. For I found myself standing up and asking the question "Where should management stop?" at a conference called by the Wildlife Management Institute. And here I am today, at a meeting in the lumber capital of the United States, in effect asking the question, "Where should logging stop?" My answer will be that logging must stop at the borders of wilderness, and we must save sizable areas of wilderness within those borders.

To risk alienating my audience completely, I will suggest this definition for wilderness: Wilderness is not for lumbermen, but for people. For people willing to accept what God has done with a piece of land. It happens that many a lumberman uses and enjoys wilderness, and wants to share the advantages he finds there with his children and his children's children. But he knows it will be there to share only if he travels into it minus his chainsaw. Only if he leaves behind one of his favorite beasts of burden—the bulldozer.

To help explain my answer, let me say a little about the Sierra Club:

For 16 years before the word "conversation" became popular, the Sierra Club was practicing it, just as John Muir had before the club was founded. Conservation has meant many things, and through the years members of the club have individually been interested in all of them, including the conservation of soil, water, forests, and materials in general—conservation in the sense of wise use, with minimum waste, of the resources the earth affords for man's economy. The club itself, however, has never been more than indirectly concerned with the economics of resource conservation. From the beginning its specialty has been the preservation of natural scenery, in national parks and monuments, in national forest recreation areas, in wilderness under whatever jurisdiction, in State and local parks, together with a deep interest in the wildlife that makes these places complete. Whether justifiably or not, those who work for conservation of natural scenery and wildlife have come to be known as conversationists, a term which excludes the people who have a role in managing a resource for profit, even though they may conserve it in doing so.

Thus the Sierra Club is a group of conversationists, active and potentially active, whose interest in the cause of conservation has received its impetus from direct knowledge of scenic America which the members have acquired in the club's program of outings and other outdoor activities. This, at least, was the principal stimulus of conservation interest in the early decades of the club. More recently there has been a pronounced rise in the number who support the club solely to further its public-service program, only rarely to enjoy its activities.

In all its program, the club has carefully avoided taking action that would benefit itself or its members any more than it would benefit the public as a whole.

The club, in its conservationist role, has placed special emphasis on wilderness preservation in the last quarter century because wilderness, after all, is the most precious of our scenic possessions. It is least likely to get support from the branch of conservation devoted to resource management. And it can never be replaced if the resource managers covet it successfully.

Which brings us, as conservationists, full circle—back to where we collectively need to keep our conservation interest broad enough to be aware enough of resource-management needs to preserve wilderness from management. For instance, wilderness will be safest from exploitation by lumbermen if the extensive tree-bearing areas that need not be wild are managed with maximum long-range efficiency. It behooves us, then, to know enough about the technique of forestry to know when it is not efficient—to be able to point out to the lumbermen who cover the wilderness forest that there are other ways, if they operate efficiently, to get the lumber dedicated forests could produce but should not. You can understand, therefore, how pleased we were to read these remarks by Robert Ingram, NLMA president, made 4 days ago in Mobile, Ala.:

"Despite the many encouraging statistics in its Timber Resource Review, the Forest Service somehow has concluded that this Nation will be hard pressed to meet its timber demands by the year 2000.

"To the Forest Industries Council, the American Forest Products Industries, Inc., the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, and other reputable trade groups, the Timber Resource Review means something else.

"It means that we have adequate supplies of timber to meet all present needs and that every indication points to more-than-adequate supplies for all future requirements.

"Actually, those who have analyzed the situation closely suggest that our danger is more an oversupply, rather than an undersupply of timber.

"Those who have studied market trends, applying commonsense and logic to our problems, believe the lumber industry must take decisive action—not in the year 2000 or in 1975 or even in 1965—but immediately, right now, in order to avoid a catastrophic situation where our mills are glutted with timber but starved for lack of markets."

So we say amen, and let's don't glut the market further—or ever—with timber that should stay in wilderness, for reasons I'll try to develop later.

* * * * *

To compress the history of wilderness into a few lines: The Middle Ages tell us nothing. In the Renaissance, Conrad Gesner found reason for the admiration of mountains. Then very little until William Blake worried about those dark, Satanic Mills. More recently, Olmstead, Emerson, Thoreau, and Muir. Finally the explosion of man across the earth, and here, in the United States, wilderness vanishing so fast that we know, inescapably, that man alone is responsible for the loss. The 1920's and the Forest Service trying hard, led by Aldo Leopold and Robert Marshall, to define wilderness in terms of what man should find in wilderness, ought to find, had to find, if the spirit that has stood him upright was not to perish in an overcivilized, lukewarm world.

Marshall used the word wilderness "to denote a region with no permanent inhabitants, no possibility of mechanical conveyance, and spacious enough that a person crossing it must have the experience of sleeping out." Survival in it, he said, is up to you. Find environment in it; don't bring one with you.

This idea of wilderness, new though it is, is now quite widely accepted. It isn't yet underwritten by Federal law, but it does appear in an international treaty we signed 18 years ago.

Let me add one more definition from the wilderness bill: "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." This is a lot of detail about definition. Why? Because there is a sophistry abroad which completely obscures the meaning of wilderness. There is a proliferation of nonsense about wilderness use which a friend of mind describes this way: "It is like comparing Beethoven with Elvis Presley and proving it with last year's record sales."

Howard Zahniser explains what is really at stake: "We work for wilderness preservation, he says, not primarily for the right of a minority to have the kind of fun it prefers, but rather to ensure for everyone the perpetuation of areas where human enjoyment and the apprehension of the interrelations of the whole community of life are possible, and to preserve for all the freedom of choosing to know the primeval if they so wish."

And we work hard, with a sense of urgency. The wilderness we now have is all the wilderness we shall ever have in America. There is little left—less than one-third acre per person in the United States, if you count all the wilderness that has any administrative protection in our national parks and forests and wildlife refuges and on Indian lands. One-third acre person today; less as our population expands, all of it completely vulnerable to the administrator's pen.

So wilderness can no longer be abundant enough for everyman to walk on it. Some people will be able to walk on it, and most of them will be the better for it. Some may wish to but never make it. Some people may not care to go there at all. But their sons may wish to. And wilderness must be there or the world's a cage. You don't have to walk on the Mona Lisa to enjoy it. You just need to look. And it's no good to look at the blank wall where once it was displayed.

I say all this about wilderness because it is the essence of the wilds we need around us. Since it lives but once, there should be ample opportunity to review the death sentence so many people in the chambers of commercialism would like to inflict upon wilderness.

Many of us feel that wilderness should have an automatic stay of execution, and that Congress should provide it.

Hence the wilderness bill—the proposal to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System.

* * * * *

In short, opponents are attributing monstrous powers to a council which has no powers, but would merely try to keep a horizontal route open across the vertical channels of the bureaus concerned. Finally, they attempt to assign the consideration of permanent protection of wilderness to a temporary group that was not created to protect anything, but rather to study and recommend, the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Let me clarify this point if I can. Supporters of wilderness protection welcome all the attention the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission can give to the subject. They do not, however, want to see the Commission used as a device for delaying protection which is needed now.

There has already been a decade of careful study leading up to the present wilderness bill. There is immediate need for what William H. Whyte, Jr., calls retroactive planning—for protecting now the land we think is needed, then rationalizing later how right we were all along to have done it. If too much wilderness is protected this way, we can always correct the situation later. If too little is protected, if too much has been turned over to exploitation, then we cannot unfry the egg.

The Commission was never conceived of, by its originators, as a device to delay protection, but rather as a way to defer destruction, and to find an equitable basis for halting that which studies should demonstrate to be needless. We knew that the scenic resources—wildlife, wilderness, parks, and the outdoor recreation deriving from them—were getting short shrift. Millions upon millions of dollars were available for planning the Nations' future commodity programs, next to nothing for recreation. It was time to start balancing this; hence the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Wilderness protection must not be delayed. If you will remember your first aid course, you will remember the priorities of treatment. It does little good, if a patient is bleeding to death, to sit down and study objectively what kind of bandage will be needed on the wound. You get in there and stop the bleeding. Otherwise you'll have nothing to bandage but a corpse.

The best way to help the Commission in its study is to keep some living wilderness for it to count upon. The wilderness bill can check the bleeding.

For all the opposition furor, there is an amazing body of public opinion supporting the wilderness bill and its provision for an automatic congressional stay of execution of moves to obliterate designated wilderness. That opinion was represented in a 50-to-1 ratio of letters sent to the Senate Interior Committee for inclusion in the record of last fall's field hearings on the bill.

Support comes from no hastily organized battalion of rugged hikers, no wilderness lobby; it reflects broad public concern about direction. It reflects growing conviction that the Nation does not exist to serve its economy; that there must be more public participation in the treatment of the single heritage of land that must serve all the generations, and that to leave these things to the experts is to resort to absentee citizenship.

It also reflects the dawning realization that growth without end is soon monstrous, then malignant, and finally, lethal—than an economy based upon incessant growth may well turn out, in the long run, to have been a chain-letter economy, in which we pick up the handsome early returns, and either our children or theirs find the mailbox empty, their resources having been expended by us.

I was trying to make this point in Berkeley a short time ago and a question came up from the floor: could we afford to do anything less than keep growing incessantly, inasmuch as that was what the Russians were doing. While I struggled ineptly with a reply, a chemist came to my rescue. "You've heard of the game of chicken, haven't you"? he asked. "It's a sort of Russian roulette on wheels. Two juveniles head directly toward each other at high speed on the highway, and the first one who turns to avert the crash is chicken. We frown on such behavior in adolescents, but we seem to accept it as national policy."

Supporters of wilderness—and of the restraint that is inherent in preserving it—also like civilization. They like it well enough not to want it to take too many steps, with the bland leading the bland, down the road paved with good intentions, on which there may be no turning.

So don't look for the words "wilderness lobby" on the door of some office near Capitol Hill. Look instead at the land—all the land the country is ever going to have for all the U.S. citizens ever to be born—and the rapidity with which many of its resources have been used up for so few.

---

## The Challenge of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of of the RECORD an article entitled "The Challenge of Inflation," published in the March 28, 1959, issue of National Review. The author, Howard Buffett, a former Member of Congress from Nebraska, analyzes our current economic instability and proposes a straightforward approach to this problem in an effort to prevent State-controlled capitalism in America. The au-

thor and the editor of National Review magazine are to be commended in their efforts to enlighten the American people to the destructive results of malignant inflation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From National Review, March 28, 1959]

THE CHALLENGE OF INFLATION

(By Howard Buffett)

"Lenin is said to have declared that the best way to destroy the capitalist system was to debauch the currency. By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens."—JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES.

The top protagonists of communism, Lenin and Stalin, recognized America as the key stronghold of capitalism and individual liberty. If they were alive today, how would they regard the situation in the United States? It requires little imagination to conclude that they would be well satisfied. For our Government is herding us down the road to inflation, debauching the currency, devaluing the savings of the people, and thus undermining the economic, political, and moral foundations on which the Nation was built. Unpleasant as this appraisal may sound, it is buttressed by sobering evidence.

One event of 1957 illustrates the gravity of the situation. The Presirent sent a budget to Congress calling for the expenditure of $72 billion in the fiscal year beginning July 1 of that year—a budget 80 percent larger than that of his Democratic predecessor, President Truman, just 10 years earlier.

A grassroots protest quickly spread across America against the spending plans of the administration, totaling $200 million a day for every day of the year. Thousands of letters and telegrams poured into the offices of Congressmen and Senators, demanding a substantial reduction in Federal spending. Veteran Capital reporters, who had seen previous economy drives blossom and fade, were amazed at the size and duration of the taxpayers' protest of 1957. The immediate result was that leaders in both parties solemnly pledged that Federal spending would be reduced.

That was the promise. What was the performance?

Instead of going down, Federal spending went up! During the fiscal year ended June 20, 1958, it came to almost $72 billion—$2,463 million in excess of spending during the previous fiscal year. A $2,800 million deficit was recorded. These figures show the futility of letter-writing campaigns as a defense against inflationary spending.

PRESSURE GROUPS

What explains this failure? The simple truth seems to be that the American people have lost control over their government. Both political parties are no longer responsible to the people. Instead they are subservient to pressure groups which profit from Socialist spending policies that depress the value of the dollar.

What is more important, in the process the lights of human liberty in America are going out one by one. That is the history of the inflation sequence: liberty disappears simply because the vast majority become in one way or another dependent on government favors or subsidies. That is the danger, and that is the prospect unless conservative leadership develops an effective cure for inflation and makes national acceptance of that cure the paramount goal of all its political efforts.

The words "paramount goal" mean just that. Those who defend continuing inflation plead the hostility between the United States and Russia. We are brainwashed into believing that unrestrained spending at home and overseas is the necessary answer to the Russian threat. Yet the actual truth seems to be that inflation, unless it is soon brought under control, will lead to a complete victory for communism in America—whether from within or without is of little importance.

If this forecast seems too alarmist, let us consider our recent history and our present prospect.

In 1933 our Government repudiated the gold standard, and thus eliminated the decisive bulwark that had historically prevented disastrous governmental inflation. In another unprecedented action it repudiated and outlawed a basic freedom—the right of the American citizen to own gold. This action placed us in strange company. At that time, among major nations, only Russia, Germany, and Italy forbade private ownership of gold. Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini had each called in all the gold (aside from that in jewelry and other nonmonetary uses) that was in private hands.

Twenty-five years have passed since then. During this period the cost of living has risen until today it is well over 200 percent higher than in 1933. And a new and frightening spiral of inflation has already taken shape.

Dr. Howard Kershner recently made a study of the record of irredeemable paper currencies in many lands. He found none that retained any semblance of the original value longer than 42 years—that was the outside limit. We have had gro ing inflation for 25 years. If history repeats itself, the value of our irredeemable dollar will approach zero by 1975.

A NEW LOOK

To be sure, our great productive system suggests a slower deterioration in America. On the other hand, never were the floodgates of inflation opened to the world as they are here. Congress today, frightened by the late 1957 business downturn, is eagerly pushing old schemes and concocting new ones to step up inflation via the issuance of bonds and Government guarantees. Generally these have a new look so as not to remind the citizenry of the PWA and WPA of the Rooseveltian era.

One example of Federal inflation is the gigantic highway-building scheme called the Interstate Highway System. This multibillion-dollar outlay resembles Hitler's autobahn project of the late thirties. Another is the countrywide Federal building program, financed by guarantees to private capital so that the outlays do not appear in the public debt. This pattern was used by Mussolini two decades ago. No wonder columnist Dorothy Thompson once exclaimed: "This country is moving toward State capitalism (along with the rest of the world) and communism is just state capitalism with longer experience."

RESTORE THE GOLD STANDARD

The mounting inflation since 1933, and the collapse of fiscal responsibility in Government, should convince any thoughtful conservative that managed irredeemable money is the road to totalitarianism, here as elsewhere, and that it is imperative that we find an effective cure. Unless someone has a better answer, restoration of the gold standard would seem the intelligent solution. When the people can demand gold for paper money, the Government cannot long spend irresponsibly. If it does so, its gold holdings will disappear and its borrowing power will end.

How can we get back on the gold standard?

The answer is obvious. Congress took us off the gold standard. Only Congress can again make our currency redeemable in gold.

Of course Congress will not, of its own volition, restore the gold standard. Congress will always talk economy, and it may even set up another OPA to regiment us again as inflation gets worse. But it will not voluntarily restore the gold standard, for politicians take the course of least resistance—and today that means "just one more round" of inflation.

The gold standard will be restored only if American citizens make it clear that they will drive from office all elective officials who will not face up to this issue promptly and courageously. This means either to make our currency redeemable in gold, or to legislate an alternative cure for inflation, if there be one. In the absence of such action, the bipartisan tactics of tranquilizing talk about economy and stabilizing the cost of living will continue until State capitalism, the refined label for communism, has completely engulfed us.

That tragedy need not happen. It will not happen if American conservatives have the wisdom to concentrate their patriotic efforts on the decisive issue—sound money. Victory on this battlefront is the key to America's future as a free land.

---

## Administered Prices, Wages Kill Markets, Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mr. Harold B. Dorsey has written an interesting and thoughtful article on the economic impact of administered prices and wages which was published in the business section of the Washington Post and Times Herald of Monday, March 23, 1959.

The importance of a solution to administered prices is being thought of more and more by those dealing with the problem of inflation.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dorsey's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTERED PRICES, WAGES KILL MARKETS, JOBS

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

"The objection to administered prices and wages is not so much that they create inflation, but they tend to retard growth and to increase unemployment." (Woodlief Thomas, economist at the Federal Reserve Board.)

The use of the present tense in this economist's astute observation is most appropriate. Administered prices and wages have now continued long enough to permit some of their adverse effects to become visible. High prices for automobiles—as well as styling—must have something to do with the fact that our exports of cars this year are expected to be down about 20 percent from 1958 and less than half the 1955 figure, while imports, only about 57,000 cars 5 years ago, are expected to be about 450,000 this year. Unquestionably these facts also have something to do with the unemployment situation in Detroit today.

The adverse effects of the whole gamut of administered costs and prices was illustrated again in an airing last week of the difficulties of the machine tool industry, which is recording not only a loss of export markets to

foreign producers, but also an increasing loss of domestic markets to the same competitors. The prices of some of the foreign machines were reported to be 25 to 40 percent below the comparable U.S. products.

Administered prices and administered wage and tax costs must be associated with a decline in steel exports from some 5.2 million tons in 1957 to 2.7 million in 1958, while there was an increase in imports from 1.2 million tons to 1.7 million. These figures are only a small percentage of the industry's total, but the trends are sharp and significant.

While the current mounting criticism of administered prices and wages is leveled at the auto and steel industries and at big labor, the supply-demand-price principles of a competitive economy are being violated in many other quarters. The prices of most foreign commodities are being administered—supported—at tremendous expense to the taxpayers. Imports of lead, zinc, electric power equipment and oil are being restricted for the purpose of supporting the prices of these commodities.

That commodity indices did not record a natural corrective reaction in the postwar recessions was not entirely the fault of administered labor costs and administered prices in the auto and steel industries. The causes are much broader than that. In addition to the above noted examples of deviation from the principle of permitting supply-and-demand relationships to determine prices, we have to recognize that tax costs are constantly being administered to higher levels.

The virtue of mentioning so many examples of administered costs and prices is the fact that it makes one realize the degree to which the condition has already reached the breeding stage. An unjustified increase in the income of any one favored sector of the economy becomes a higher cost and a consequent pressure for higher prices for other sectors. Higher prices for goods and services purchased by the Federal, State, and local governments caused their expenditures to rise. So taxes have to be raised again and this further increases the tax cost imposed on the economy's productive effort.

While this leapfrogging of labor costs, prices and taxes is in operation—some call it creeping inflation—and it is an unfortunate fact that the real purchasing power of one sector after another cannot keep up the pace. Higher costs for steel and copper at the next midyear labor negotiations naturally will tend to increase the cost and prices of motor vehicles, machinery, and other fabricated metal products.

The loss of real purchasing power for the fixed income groups is apparent. Less obvious perhaps, but illustrating the point nevertheless, is the position of the group comprising nearly 2 million textile and apparel workers. Last December their gross weekly earnings were about $58, only half of the $116 received by the steelworkers and less than the $118 for autoworkers. Higher wages and benefits for steel, copper, and auto workers, and the consequent higher prices for steel, copper, cars, toasters, washing machines, and so forth, will not improve the standard of living for that substantial portion of the working population represented by the textile and apparel workers. In fact, their ability to buy their share of hard goods has already been reduced by the rising prices of the metal products. And this failure of their demand is retarding the growth and employment of the hard goods industries.

Why not raise the wage rates of the textile workers so that they may have a better real purchasing power? The profit margins of the textile industries are so thin—for many concerns it is nonexistent—that noticeably higher wage rates would mean bankruptcy. Current wages—comparatively low as they are—are still high in relation to the labor costs of foreign producers. The latter also have the benefit of the lower cost cotton which we dump abroad in order to make our own manufacturers pay a higher price to the farmer.

The point is that the breeding process inherent in creeping inflation ultimately collides with the sterile groups whose incomes cannot rise for various reasons and whose purchases of products of the administered wage and price industries have to be reduced.

It may not be too early to suggest to the advocates of creeping inflation: "Don't look now, but your slip is beginning to show—in the form of increasing evidence that creeping inflation is pricing American products out of markets and American labor out of jobs."

## Visit to the Senate by John H. Reagan Senior High School Red Coats of Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the John H. Reagan Senior High School Red Coats of Houston, Tex., are visiting in the gallery of the Senate today as one phase of their annual tour. This opportunity for these fine young ladies from Texas to visit the Capital and see the city's points of great historic interest will be an invaluable adjunct to their regular courses of governmental study. The Red Coats are accompanied by six of their teachers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the names of the John H. Reagan Senior High School Red Coats and their teachers.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE JOHN H. REAGAN RED COATS

Anderson, Judy; Ayers, Patsy.

Bartlett, Gwen; Befeld, Norma; Berman, Ida Sue; Bettell, Linda; Beutel, Sherry; Bond, Judy; Brandvik, Betty; Broker, Jeanne; Brown, Shelia.

Capps, Jeannie; Casselberry, Leigh Jean; Chapo, Carole; Chinn, Judy; Cleland, Virginia; Collins, Ada; Collins, Delores; Costlow, Anne; Covington, Joyce.

DeMarco, Jackie; Dickey, Janda; Dockal, Cynthia.

Fielding, Gaynelle; Froehner, Marilyn.

Galyean, Pat; Garza, Patsy.

Higgs, Beverly; Hillyer, Glenda; Holloway, Emily; Hulme, Anne; Hunt, Helen.

Ingram, Betty.

Jack, Betty Jo; Jaenecke, Shirley; Jones, Linda; Jones, Nancy; Jones, Sandra.

Kiesling, Fay.

Lawless, Zerlene; Long, Mary Alice.

Mata, Maria; Mathis, Sharon; Medley, Sandra; Menefee, Jane; Milkovisch, Marcia; Miller, Marilyn; Morgan, Jeannette.

McCallum, Karen; McLeod, Anne; McLerran, Kaye.

Patterson, Karey; Pechacek, Patsy; Pflueger, Judy; Phillips, Carole; Poston, Julia.

Ray, Jerry; Rogers, Sandra.

Skrove, Linda; Smith, Marijo; Smith, Shirley; Stroud, Dalana.

Tucker, Lyndel; Tull, Carolyn; Tungate, Barbara; Turner, Yvonne.

Ware, Douglas; Westbrook, Caolyn; Westmoreland, Ela; White, Mary Alta; White, Sandra; Wilson, Linda; Woods, Sherry; Word, Norma; Wren, Sandra.

Teachers: Mr. Frank Cobb, in charge of party; Mrs. Mary Connally; Mrs. Freytag; Mrs. Bernice B. Gale, dean; Miss Katharine Keller, counselor; James M. Ikaines.

## Statement by T. Keith Glennan, Administrator, NASA, Before Electronics Industries Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I had the privilege of attending a meeting last Thursday of the Electronics Industries Association, at which time T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, made a very fine address.

Dr. Glennan is the Director of the new agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. He and his staff and coworkers are making a splendid start in a very difficult field, where they are having to do pioneer work, in large measure.

I thought his address was splendid and contained much valuable and constructive thought. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Public Printer that it will require approximately 2½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to print the address, at an estimated cost of $180.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY T. KEITH GLENNAN, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE ELECTRONICS INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 19, 1959

If I were to claim affiliation with any one industrial group, I suppose by virtue of my formal education and early experience, I could claim to be an alumnus of the electronics industry. Like many of you, I started with the industry in its infancy and have watched it grow into a lusty giant. As I look out over this audience tonight, I am happy to see quite a few friends of many years standing who now are playing an important part in the management of some of your leading companies.

Since World War II, this era we live in has been called variously the atomic age, the age of automation, and now the space age. And playing a significant part in the development of each of them, we find the electronics industry. Important as have been your contributions in the past, it seems to me that you hold some of the trump cards in the fast moving game in which I now find myself engaged, the space business.

I know the people in the electronics industry are vitally interested in knowing what role they will be playing, what contributions they will be asked to make, what requirements they will be asked to fill in this latest, most exciting of our "ages." I am going to address myself to these questions, but before I do, let me tell you something about the

National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Ours is an independent Government agency, with full responsibility, under the direction of the President, for space research and operations of a scientific and technological nature which should lead to an increase in various fields of knowledge and to the application of that knowledge in the development of our society for the benefit of mankind. There is necessarily a close relationship between the work of our civilian agency and the space activities of the Defense Department. Obivously, space vehicles and the information gathering techniques that must be employed will be suitable both for scientific exploration for peaceful purposes and for military systems of various kinds—just as aircraft can be suitable both for civilian air transportation and for military use.

According to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, "it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind." The act says that these activities are to be conducted by a civilian agency, which is NASA.

At the same time, the act makes an important exception to this provision. It reserves the conduct of space activities having to do primarily with the development of weapons systems, with military operations, or with the defense of the Nation, to the Department of Defense. Provisions are made in the act for close cooperation between NASA and the Department of Defense in the interests of avoiding unnecessary duplication and providing complete interchange of information between the two agencies. The Space Council, chaired by the President, and the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee are the formal mechanisms established to help accomplished this purpose. But the day-to-day contacts at every level are the most important continuing elements in insuring this collaboration.

The Space Act provided for the absorption by NASA of the personnel and facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—some 8,000 scientists, engineers, and supporting personnel—and the great laboratories, now known as research centers, at Langley Field in Virginia, Moffett Field in California, and in Cleveland, Ohio. Smaller, but very important activities, are the High Speed Flight Station at Edawrds Air Force Base in California, and the rocket launching facility at Wallops Islands on the Virginia Coast.

On the first of October 1958, we officially set up shop, absorbed the NACA and accepted the transfer of the Vanguard project from the Naval Research Laboratory. Before the end of November, more than 160 able scientists had transferred to NASA from the Naval Research Laboratory, including the bulk of the Vanguard project personnel and some very fine scientists interested in upper atmosphere research.

On December 3, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, Calif., was transferred to NASA from the Army by a Presidential Executive order. Operated by the California Institute of Technology under contract to NASA, this laboratory employs 2,300 people on a variety of projects. These include guidance and control systems, tracking, telemetry, the development of instrumented payload packages, and rocket propulsion. Thus, JPL, along with the Vanguard group, are our principal centers for electronic research.

Excluding the personnel at JPL which I previously noted as a contract operation, NASA expects to have about 9,000 employees by the end of June 1959. Our budget for the next fiscal year contemplates an increase of slightly more than 1,000—mainly scientists and engineers—by June 1960. Our present plan is to keep NASA as small as we can, consistent with our ability to manage our programs in a purposeful and efficient manner. This means that a large part of our research and development activities will be carried out under agreements with other Government agencies, with scientific institutions, universities, and, most importantly, with private industry.

This policy represents a departure from the practice followed in the past by NACA. Our predecessor organization last year had a research and development program amounting to about $100 million, virtually all of it carried on in NACA's own laboratories. The 1959 budget for NASA, including a supplemental request which is now before the Congress, comes to some $385 million. Of this total, approximately $250 million has been earmarked for contracts outside of our agency, most of it already committed.

The President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1960 asks that $485,300,000 be granted to NASA. Of this amount, some $350 million is intended for work to be performed by others—again, principally industry.

Contracting with industry on a multimillion dollar scale requires us to seek the highest quality of American scientific and industrial skill, as well as the best capabilities of Government laboratories. We must draw on these outside resources, if we are to develop and produce the tools needed to establish our leadership in space research.

These tools include booster and upper-stage rockets of much greater size and thrust than any we now have; ultimately, entirely new generations of space vehicles must be developed and placed in use. Such vehicles must be provided with guidance and control mechanisms capable of much greater accuracy and reliability than those we now use. Tracking and data acquisition systems must be improved and many new stations installed in various parts of the world. Scientific experiments will increase in complexity with a resultant increase in the demand for more complex payload instrumentation. Capsules and cabins for manned space exploration in which astronauts can be sustained for days, weeks, or months must be developed. As you look at this list—and it is not, by any means, an exhaustive one—you find one common denominator—electronics.

NASA procurement policies incorporate, as a principal ingredient, the armed services procurement regulations. But there are some differences between our overall procurement program and those of the Armed Forces. One of the most significant is the fact that we do not follow up our research and development contracts by entering into agreements for large-scale production. Each experiment in space is characterized by a high degree of attention to individual design and assembly. Even in a series of projects having the same general purpose—such as the Pioneer space probes or the Explorer and Vanguard satellites—the payload packages vary according to the data-gathering experiments planned. Stated simply, we are in the research and development business. Seldom, if ever will any two of our flights be identical.

In another important respect, the contractual authority of NASA differs markedly from that of the Department of Defense. This divergence is in the field of patent rights. The National Areronautics and Space Act specificially requires that when inventions grow out of the work performed for NASA under contract, we must acquire the title to them for the Government. As you know, this is quite different from the procedure followed by the Department of Defense. Operating under no such statutory requirement, the Armed Forces normally confine their property interest in inventions to a royalty free license.

I think it obvious that two such contrary patent policies, followed by Government agencies working in closely related fields of research and development, can be detrimental to the kind of cooperation that we must have from industry if our joint efforts are to go forward with effectiveness and urgency. We are quite aware of the attitude of industry—your industry in particular—on this matter.

On the other hand, you must realize that these rules are written into the law, and we cannot ignore them. The Administrator of NASA has authority to waive these patent rights, but only if he judges this action is clearly in the public interest. As an interim measure, we published recently in the Federal Register a statement of conditions under which requests for waivers of the patent clauses might be considered. As I think you know, NASA will hold public hearings on this matter of waivers in mid-May. In due course, I am sure, the Congress will want to review this entire matter. In the meantime, we are going to make every effort to administer the legal requirements in the patent field fairly and objectively, with due regard for the interests of both Government and industry.

Now that I have talked about my favorite subject, let me turn to yours, the electronic industry. In this space business, we depend upon you to make vital contributions to three major areas: design and fabrication of certain of our payloads; tracking, data acquisition, and reduction; and guidance and control of booster rockets.

A specific example will illustrate how great is our dependence upon high-quality, special-purpose electronic gear. A few minutes after midnight, the morning of March 3, our U.S. team of NASA, the Army and JPL launched from Cape Canaveral a deep space probe, Pioneer IV. Its conical payload weighed 13.4 pounds and measured 20 inches in length and 9 inches in diameter.

Within those limits of weight and size, there was packaged the following: two Geiger-Mueller tubes to measure radiation—one of these was shielded with lead to cut out all but high energy radiation—a photoelectric sensor, shaped like a pistol, to test its effectiveness near the moon in activiating picture-taking mechanisms in future space mechanisms; a despin mechanism, to slow down the spinning of the payload package so the above-mentioned sensor could perform its mission, and telemetery equipment.

The telemetry equipment included a battery-powered radio transmitter, with three subcarriers, designed to transmit continuously on a frequency of 960.05 megacycles for about 90 hours, using 180 milliwatts of power. The transmitter had to telemeter information about radiation, about operation of the photoelectric sensor, which, incidentally, didn't operate because it was set to work only after the probe got within about 20,000 miles of the moon. Actually, the closest approach was 37,000 miles. There was also a monitor device, incorporating a germanium diode, to report on the radio beacon's transmitted power at the source, and an independent arrangement whereby operation of the despin device was telemetered to the ground station.

I have gone into all this detail, because I think it important to emphasize our dependence upon good communications between our space payloads and data-receiving stations on earth. It has been widely reported that Pioneer IV continued to send back data until it had traveled more than 406,000 miles from the surface of the earth, the longest communications link in history. Since then, of course, it has continued its flight into orbit around the sun. I hope I may be forgiven if, in this connection, I note that the 406,000 miles was a distance approximately 32,000 miles greater than that an-

nounced by the Russians for their lunik—with an advertised payload of almost 800 pounds.

The useful life of Pioneer IV, however, lasted only as long as the transmitter's signals were received intelligibly on earth, and not one second longer.

Today, unfortunately, our rate of progress in exploring space is handicapped by our lack of an adequate payload capacity. Even with the exceptional efforts you and others have made to miniaturize experiments and the equipment to transmit data back to ground-receiving equipment, there are very real limitations to the scope of the experiments we can mount upon the presently available launching vehicles. Essentially, we are limited to first-generation experiments for the next 12 months.

To remedy this situation, we are working with great determination and vigor to improve present systems and to develop larger boosters and upper stage rockets—in fact, complete vehicle systems—designed specifically for their space misisons. Money spent now for propulsion systems development will make more certain and more economical the work we want to do in space in the years immediately ahead.

The ratio of weight between the launching vehicle of Pioneer IV and its payload was 10,000 to 1, and even when we begin using the launching systems of the Atlas class, the ratio will still be about a thousand to one. The new engine systems we will be using some years from now, will have a ratio between launching weight and payload of about 200 to 1, for interplanetary missions, and perhaps as low as 50 to 1, for satellite uses.

Today's payloads, on a per pound basis of useful instrumentation are enormously expensive. This is forcing us to perform our planning operations very carefully. Frankly, I think the program we have laid on for the next 2 or 3 years is more realistic and is really a better program from almost every point of view because of the need for this critical examination of both the technology and economics involved in maximizing the efficiency of use of payload packages during the period prior to the availability of more adequate propulsion systems.

As we press forward in our efforts to achieve more thrust and maximum reliability in these propulsion systems, we find ourselves smack up against another area in which we need very expert assistance. As I see it, we will be requiring very great contributions from the electronics industry to improve our means for guidance of space vehicles systems, not only for the aiming of them during the period of takeoff, but also, and perhaps more importantly, during the powered flight of the upper stages, midcourse guidance in the vernacular of the trade. When we begin sending space probes toward the planets, we are faced with the fact that we don't know precisely where these planets are, out in space. Right now, for example, we don't know where Venus is within 50,000 miles; this is the accuracy of our astronomical data. And we don't know yet how to gage our vehicle velocity with the precision that is required. Assuming perfect initial guidance, an error of only 1 foot per second in launch velocity would result in a miss-distance from Venus—if we knew where the planet was—of 25,000 miles.

The guidance and control problems are enormous; so are the contributions needed from men and organizations skilled in the art of electronic applications to these problems.

In the all-important effort to advance basic knowledge, it is, of course, impossible to predict the precise nature of what will be learned. But there are already visible ways in which we as a nation are bound to benefit from our space activities—in a dollars-and-cents way—and sooner than many would have imagined possible even a short time ago.

The two most frequently cited examples are the Vanguard II, the cloud cover satellite that sent back over a quarter of a million feet of taped signals. Although it was only a faltering first step on the road to development of a global weather forecasting system, Vanguard II was a very great accomplishment. The scientists and engineers involved now have a much clearer understanding of what must be done to develop a practicable system and we are planning the followon program with greater assurance than we had before that flight.

Communications satellites also offer great promise. The need for rapid and reliable global communications for the military is obvious; and studies have shown that there is bound to be a great increase in requirements for commercial global communications also. Independent analyses have predicted an increase in the total of overseas messages from the 1,500,000 level which existed in 1950 to 3 million in 1960, and to 21 million by 1970.

The use of satellites offers the possibility of solution to this growing problem of world communications. Using existing microwave techniques, a satellite system could be provided with almost unlimited bandwidth. Television, which requires the equivalent of 1,000 voice channels, would find great utility in this feature. There are several possible techniques for such use of satellites; they differ markedly in the complexity of the electronics carried in the satellite and in the size and extent of the ground-based equipment which will be required.

A technique we are going to explore will be a so-called passive system, with neither receiver nor transmitter being carried by the satellite. The transmitted energy can be beamed at the satellite, but the reflected energy will spread out in all directions, and because of this, very weak signals must be detected by the receiving antenna.

The requirements placed on ground station equipment in this system, of course, will be tough. High-powered transmitters will be needed to send as much energy up to the satellite as is practicable. Low noise or very sensitive receivers to detect the very small amounts of power reflected from the sphere also will be needed. We will have to have large, steerable directional antennas to gather as much of the reflected power as possible, and computers to calculate the path of the satellite and point the antennas.

On the other hand, the passive communications satellite, because it carries no electronics, lends itself to multiple simultaneous party-line use. Also, because there are no frequency determinants in the satellite, the bandwidth or amount of intelligence carried would not be limited as it would be for some other systems.

We plan to launch a 100-foot-diameter sphere into orbit this fall to study this passive communications technique. The sphere will be made of plastic with a vapor-deposited aluminum coating to provide a radiowave reflectivity of about 98 percent. At 1,000 miles altitude, the sphere will be brighter than the North Star. In 1960, we expect to launch two more of these giant size satellites which, incidentally, weigh 150 pounds, and communications will be established using the NASA-JPL antenna at Goldstone, Calif., and Bell Telephone laboratory's equipment at Holmdale, N.J. It is our hope that additional industrial organizations may want to participate in these experiments.

Another system, perhaps farther off, would involve use of satellites carrying both a receiver and a transmitter. Signals beamed from the earth would be received and then immediately rebroadcast on another frequency. If the satellites can be placed in orbit at an altitude of about 22,000 miles, its speed will be such as to cause it to appear to be stationary in space with respect to a point on the earth's surface. Such a system would permit use of very large fixed antennas. But there are very difficult engineering problems to be solved. Among these will be the provision of means for precise positioning of the satellite in orbit, for attitude control and for supplying power to the receiver-transmitter over a long period of time.

Another area of interest to the electronics industry is data acquisition and computation. These past few weeks my associates and I have appeared before Congress to explain our need for a $48 million supplemental to the fiscal year 1959 appropriation. About $12 million of that sum will be used for increasing and improving our tracking facilities. Extension of the minitrack electronics tracking system by establishment of four new stations, located in Alaska, the northern part of the continental United States, Newfoundland, and Northern Europe, together with installations of improved equipment at other stations, will cost $3,300,000. Installation of 85-foot radar dishes, similar to our Goldstone Station, in Australia and South Africa will enable the tracking of probes sent deep into space, $3,350,000 will permit initiation of the procurement of these units. The remaining $5,250,000 is for precision radar acquisition, tracking, communications, and associated systems, at a location in southern Texas, for tracking midcourse reentry and landing of the Project Mercury orbital capsules. Project Mercury is the name of our program aimed at placing a man into an orbit around earth and returning him safely.

As I mentioned before, Pioneer IV established a record communications link of over 400,000 miles. But that was a fairly short transmission link when we consider probes traveling far beyond the moon. That is why we are looking forward to the installations of MASERS and parametric amplifiers for use in connection with our big dishes. We must learn how to maintain communications up to 40 million miles in 1960 and to hundreds of millions of miles as soon thereafter as possible.

As for data handling, some experiments will require the transmission of raw data half way around the world from tracking stations to computation centers in the United States. Other experiments may require the partial reduction of data at the receiving site before transmission.

In general, we will utilize data reduction centers in the United States to analyze the data and yield usable scientific information. We are well along in this respect. We have the Vanguard computing center here in Washington which will be expanded substantially in the next few years, another computing center at NASA-JPL in Pasadena, and we plan to use the Defense Department's space track installation at Cambridge and the computing center at the space-technology laboratories in Los Angeles.

To sum up, it has been my privilege to be associated with the development of a number of new fields of technology during the past 32 years—first, the sound motion picture business, then the antisubmarine warfare game, then the atomic energy program and now the space business. Each of these has required the ingenuity, the services and the dynamic drive of this great industry of yours. Whatever the immediate task may be, your contributions will doubtless be just as applicable to the strengthening of military technology as they will be to the development of our greatest human resource—knowledge. In this spirit of high adventure I look forward with you to the exciting days ahead. I do this with the fervent hope that our pursuit of the unknown in space may prove to be important mechanism for bringing men and nations together for peaceful collabora-

tion and competition rather than as an added element in the cold war which is draining the world of energies that ought to be put to use for man's benefit everywhere.

## Democratic Congressional Policy on Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Roscoe Drummond, in his New York Herald Tribune column this morning, has criticized the Democratic majority in the Congress for failing to give the American public a clear-cut budget alternative to the Eisenhower budget which the Democratic Congress has obviously rejected.

Mr. Drummond makes sense. We, as a majority party, have failed to put together at the beginning of the Congress at least a tentative fiscal framework within which we can responsibly determine our airport, housing, military, agricultural, foreign aid, and other spending. This failure prevents us from making financially responsible decisions when each of these authorization measures comes to the floor of Congress, or indeed when we send the authorizations on their way from committee.

Mr. Drummond suggests "the Democratic majority or the Democratic advisory council" should decide our Democratic congressional policy on a Federal budget.

I feel very strongly that only the Democratic majority in the U.S. Congress can do this responsibly; but I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Drummond that we Democrats in Congress "owe it to the country to show openly what we want the public to approve rather than to remake the budget piecemeal behind the curtains."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Drummond be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET BLUR: DEMOCRATS AREN'T MEETING ISSUE HEAD ON

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Are the Democratic leaders going to be willing to face the Eisenhower balance-the-budget issue head on and soon in order that the voters may have some say in the outcome?

They are not doing it so far.

The effect of Democratic speeches and Democratic maneuver is to blur the issue, confuse the issue, and so delay the issue that it will be difficult to determine who has unbalanced the budget, where, and for what reason. And it will come so late in the session that public opinion will have little chance to make itself felt one way or the other.

If the Democrats are going to meet the Eisenhower hold-the-line budget issue and give the voters a chance to support or reject an alternative policy, they must do two things:

1. They must quit jiggering the budget piecemeal, adding a hunk here, chipping off a corner there, and, instead, offer Congress and the country a coherent, total spending program which they can look at whole and decide whether they want it.

2. Do it soon enough so that the consequences of the Democrats' national budget—good or bad—can be seen and judged in comparison with the Eisenhower national budget.

When the President sent his budget to Congress—precariously balanced, but still balanced, with an estimated $70 million surplus—he was beginning to point up a real, fundamental, and philosophical difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Mr. Eisenhower, even in the face of a $40-billion defense program, was proposing to hold the line on a great deal of Federal spending; he was freezing some programs, cutting others, and proposing little in the way of new or increased public services. He emphasized balancing the budget as a vital end in itself and as a measure to hold inflation. If he could get a surplus, his priority was to use it either to reduce the debt or cut taxes.

Here, at last, there appeared to be in the making a basic party divergence of both principle and practice. Most of the Democrats said they wanted to spend more for defense, more for housing, health, aid to education, airports, roads, and aid to distressed areas where unemployment is still high. At the same time many Democrats argued that more Federal spending would promote economic growth and that an unbalanced budget might even be beneficial.

There is no doubt, I think, that a pretty sizable gulf spreads out between the two parties on this budget-spending issue. But so far it is being fogged by a piecemeal approach and the prospect is that it will be cleared so late in the session that neither Congress nor the country will quite know what's happening before it is too late.

Either by default or by design, the Democrats are tending to conceal the issue rather than clarify it.

Obviously the very methods of congressional operation contribute to blurring the issue. By long habit and by the jealously guarded division of authority between committees, Congress always considers and acts upon the spending side of the budget item by item—and never in total and never in relationship to revenue.

The appropriation committees and the tax revenue committees consider spending and revenue separately—never together.

This means that in the upcoming airport and housing bills, which the Democrats have somewhat cut back under White House pressure, the Democratic majority is already in process of unbalancing the budget—but no one will know for sure until Congress is nearing adjournment. The reasons will be blurred, responsibility will be blurred.

The only way Congress and the country can intelligently choose a Democratic Party alternative to the Eisenhower budget is to have a chance to look at it whole soon.

It seems to me that the Democratic majority—or the Democratic Advisory Council—owes it to the country to show openly what they want the public to approve rather than to remake the budget piecemeal behind the curtains.

## The Education of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my attention was recently called to an address given by Dr. Roland R. Renne, president of Montana State College at a meeting of the Montana Veterans of Foreign Wars. Dr. Renne's speech contains an excellent review of the education and training programs under the GI bill of rights, and points up the tremendous influence such programs have had upon our society. I commend this address to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDUCATION OF VETERANS—A GREAT EXPERIMENT

(Address by Roland R. Renne, President, Montana State College, to the mid-winter meeting of district No. 2 of the Montana Veterans of Foreign Wars, Memorial Hall, Conrad, Mont., January 24, 1959)

I am happy to speak to you tonight and to the listening audience throughout Montana on the education of veterans under the so-called World War II GI bill in which the United States embarked upon the largest veterans training program the world has ever seen.

Montana can be very proud of the record of its veterans, not only in their war services in which they fought to defend the basic principles of our democratic society, but in the very active part which they have taken in helping to build finer communities wherever they live.

I understand that the No. 1 goal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is community service, and I am informed that the Freedoms Foundation Award for community service has been won by the National VFW for the seventh consecutive time. This certainly speaks highly of the strong community service program developed by the VFW. I also understand that Montana is one of only five States that has had two national commanders of the VFW. These records bespeak the competent leadership which the Montana VFW has been privileged to have.

All of us who are fortunate to share the many privileges of our democratic society are indebted to all of those who have fought for our country or served in the Armed Forces. Each of us, I am sure, is anxious to see to it that our war veterans are provided basic health, educational, and related services in the amount and quality which is their due.

The recent information that the go-ahead signal has been given for construction of a new multimillion dollar replacement hospital at Fort Harrison and to use the present structure as an administration building is indicative of the desire of our people reflected in the actions of our elected representatives to provide the medical facilities and related essential services for our veterans.

Although the record of the United States and Montana in providing for the basic

needs of veterans is unexcelled, the programs for education and training of veterans begun toward the close of World War II are on a scale unheard of previously. Public Law 346, commonly referred to as the GI education bill and the Servicemen's Rehabilitation Act of 1944, provided for the Federal Government, through the Veterans' Administration, paying the institution a veteran wished to attend for the customary costs of tuition, related fees, books, supplies, and equipment necessary for pursuing the desired course of study. These benefits were available to any person who served in the active military or naval service on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to termination of the war, who had an honorable discharge, and who was not over 25 years old when he entered the service.

The amount of training which a veteran could receive depended upon the length of his war service. He was allowed as many months training as months of war service. The veteran had to begin his education or training within 2 years after his discharge or termination of the war, and such training or education had to be completed within 7 years after the close of the war.

Veterans were required by the provisions of Public Law 346 to maintain a satisfactory grade average based on the standards and practices of the institution he attended. It is interesting to note that at Montana State College, for example, veterans maintained very satisfactory grade records on the average. In fact, veteran students averaged approximately a point higher than the average of all students. (In a sample study covering the academic year 1947–48, with nearly 1,700 veteran undergraduate students enrolled out of a total of some 3,100 in the institution, the veteran average was 78.495, and the all-student average was 77.42).

In addition to having all of his tuition, fees, books, supplies, equipment, and related costs of schooling paid by the Government, the veteran received $50 per month subsistence allowance if he had no dependents, and $75 per month if he had one or more dependents. Later, veterans were granted a larger subsistence allowance, the amount for veterans with no dependents being increased to $105 per month and those with dependents increased proportionately.

The number of veterans who took advantage of this unprecedented federally financed educational and training program was over 7,800,000 or just over half (51 percent) of the 15,400,000 World War II veterans. Of the 7,800,000 who took advantage of the provisions of the act, 29 percent, or not quite one-third, attended a college or university; 3½ million or approximately 45 percent, attended institutions below the collegiate or university level, and the remainder or slightly over 2 million, or about one-fourth, took on-the-job training. About 700,000 of these more than 2 million took on-the-farm training.

The total cost of this great educational program was $14½ billion, of which approximately 5 percent was for administrative costs. Fourteen and one-half billion dollars is a lot of money but, compared with our annual expenditures for defense, the total cost of this unprecedented educational program amounts to less than one-third of the current annual expenditure of defense.

What evidences are there that this program was worthwhile or that the veterans really benefited from this federally financed training and education in return for their war services? Records show that the median income of veterans during the past 6 years is up 51 percent compared with only a 19-persent rise for nonveteran males in the same group. The average veteran's educational level is better than 4 years of high school, while the level of nonveteran males of the same age group is but 2 years of high school. Thus, we have a very high direct correlation between the extent of education and training and the average income earned. It would seem then, without any question of doubt, that the veterans' educational program, as provided by Public Law 346, increased the earning power of the veterans appreciably.

It is interesting to note the fields of study undertaken by the veteran students. Out of every 100, one-third or 33 aimed at a highly skilled trade and industrial job; 10 pursued scientific studies, including engineering and medicine; 10 took courses in management and business administration: 10 took scientific farming; 6 studied humanities; 5 took sales and clerical courses; 3 took courses preparing them to teach; and the remainder, or 23 percent (approximately one-fourth) prepared for a wide variety of occupations.

In addition to being good students in terms of satisfactory grades and averaging generally higher than the nonveteran students, what kind of students were World War II veterans in college? Studies show that veteran students had a greater inclination to complete their education and carried heavier course loads than nonveteran students. Also, many veteran students carried part-time jobs while in school. Many of them participated in extracurricular activities, especially in leadership training roles, and brought to the campus a greater degree of mature judgment and varied experiences which made the student body generally more serious-minded. Veteran students were somewhat less inclined to go for all the rah rah of the typical College Joe, but they, nevertheless, did participate in those activities which they felt were desirable, and in general were loyal, cooperative, friendly students.

A significant percentage of World War II veterans, after finishing their college education, chose to follow research or teaching work. For example, at Montana State College 73, or approximately one-fourth, of the present teaching faculty are veterans.

In addition to Public Law 346, or the so-called GI bill of rights, there have been four other laws passed by the National Congress concerned with the education of veterans. One is Public Law 16 which provides for the education of service-incurred disability or rehabilitation cases; Public Law 550 provides for the training and educational program for Korean war veterans; Public Law 894 provides for the training and educational program of Korean rehabilitation cases; and Public Law 634, known as the War Orphans Act, provides for educational benefits for sons or daughters of deceased veterans.

This year, 761 veterans have enrolled at Montana State College to date; 12 of these are attending under Public Law 894 (Korean rehabilitation veterans); 16 students who are sons or daughters of deceased veterans are receiving educational benefits under Public Law 634, and the remainder, or some 733 students, are enrolled under Public Law 550, known as the Korean GI law. The greatest number of veterans attended under the provision of Public Law 346 (World War II GI's) with the peak of more than 2,000—or approximately two-thirds of the total student body—such veterans enrolled at MSC in the academic year 1946–47, but this program came to an end for practically all veterans of World War II in 1956. There have been no students under this program enrolled at Montana State College since the 1956–57 academic year.

Veterans' Administration figures show that the percentage of veterans enrolled in insituations of higher learning is considerably greater for Korean war veterans than for World War II ex-servicemen. Of some 4½ million Korean veterans eligible for schooling, 1½ million, or one-third, entered training. More than half (51 percent), or some 765,000, of these Korean veterans who entered training enrolled in a college or university, and 10 percent enrolled in a graduate-level program. This compares with less than one-third (29 percent) of World War II veterans who took training who enrolled in colleges or universities. The Korean bill, Public 550, expires in 1956. It provides for payment of $110 per month to the veteran who has no dependents; $135 per month if he has one dependent; and $160 per month if he has more than one dependent. He is allowed a period of training equal to 1½ times the duration of his active service but not to exceed a total of 36 months. Korean veterans pay their own fees, books, and other expenses from their subsistence allowances.

Nearly 10 million individuals have been provided training and education under the five congressional acts providing for education of World War II and Korean veterans and sons and daughters of deceased veterans. Obviously, this great educational program of veterans has had and will continue to have a tremendous influence upon our society, making possible increased production of goods and services as a result of the increased training and education, and making possible an even higher standard of living for Americans.

Three major effects or contributions of the veterans' educational programs can be summarized:

(1) The Nation gave training and education a new and higher value in public esteem by so rewarding veterans. It is a revolution in thinking; it affects the teaching profession, the educational aspirations of our people, and the investment of our national wealth. The whole concept of support or financial aid for education underwent a change. Education now is something for which the Nation produces its wealth in order to purchase.

(2) The veterans' education program proves that a higher percentage of the population can, with profit, benefit from higher education. Talent will continue to be searched out in the lower economic strata, since brains are no respecter of persons, areas, or economic status.

(3) The veterans' educational program demonstrates that we cannot escape the national obligation to provide training and education to those who cannot afford such education and training. Only in this way can we equalize training and educational opportunities for all those who have the ability to benefit effectively from such opportunities.

The new National Defense Education Act passed by Congress in the summer of 1958 to strengthen our American system of education so it can meet the broad and increasing demands imposed upon it by considerations of basic national security provides for student loans, national defense fellowships, guidance institutes, language development programs, grants to States for services, mathematics and foreign language instruction, area vocational programs, and other important educational and training activities. Authorized appropriations are $47½ million for 1959; $75 million for 1960; $82½ million for 1961; and $90 million for 1962. Montana's allotment for 1959, out of $47½ million, is $186,431.

Thus the program of Federal aid undertaken most extensively in the education of veterans in the last 14 years is being applied more generally than formerly and reflects the evolution of increased Federal concern and greater responsibility—especially with higher education. This would appear to be a natural development to meet the increasing demands imposed by the space age, modern technology, and our basic national security.

In closing, it can be said that the veterans' educational and training program financed by the Federal Government for World War II and Korean war veterans has been a major factor in building the background for more responsible and adequate Federal participation to assist our American educational system to meet the increasing demands placed upon it in the interests of our national security.

## Nomination of Lewis Strauss To Be Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Should the President Want To Bring Back Lewis Strauss?" published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of October 27, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SHOULD THE PRESIDENT WANT TO BRING BACK LEWIS STRAUSS?

President Eisenhower has appointed Lewis Strauss to succeed Sinclair Weeks as Secretary of Commerce. A more ill-timed and injudicious appointment can hardly be imagined.

To say that Mr. Weeks has been an undistinguished Secretary of Commerce is charitable. To be equally generous, it might be said that Mr. Strauss will not enhance the record.

As Secretary, Mr. Weeks first came to public attention when he announced, to the astonishment of laborers, farmers, and white-collar workers that this is a businessman's administration. He then began a concerted effort to give away public holdings to private utilities, climaxing this questionable undertaking by surrender of the Hell's Canyon site, and a fringe involvement in the Dixon-Yates scandal.

He further distinguished himself by becoming the champion of a so-called additive which was supposed to restore vigor to dead batteries. And when his own Bureau of Standards tested and labeled the additive "useless," Mr. Weeks hounded from office the Bureau chief, the noted scientist, Dr. Edward Condon, helping in the process to smear Mr. Condon's reputation and cast public doubt on his patriotism. He continued to champion the battery "goat gland" even after private testers had admitted it was something less than efficient.

ALWAYS THE GRAB FOR POWER

Mr. Strauss will be remembered, though not fondly, for his unique performance as the arrogant, power-hungry boss of the Atomic Energy Commission. Under his chairmanship the Commission became the center of suspicion, bickering among the members and a running controversy between Strauss and Members of Congress. Impatient with the opposition of the other members of the Commission, Strauss asked Congress to give him powers of principal officer or dictator of the Commission, which would have permitted him to act without consulting his fellow members. Congress refused so Strauss simply usurped the powers, acting in matters vital to our national security without the knowledge of the other members.

Congress then passed a bill specifically forbidding one-man rule of the Commission, but that did not stop Strauss. The later Kefauver investigation showed that Strauss, despite the orders of Congress, had consistently acted without the knowledge or approval of the Commission, had concealed information from the other members and had often acted against their expressed opposition. He was a prime figure in the Dixon-Yates scandal.

As Chairman of the AEC, Strauss insisted on handing over to private utilities the development of atomic reactors, though both Congress and scientists warned that we were lagging behind other countries in this research. Strauss was instrumental in driving Dr. Robert Oppenheimer from Government service. When employees of AEC differed with him, Strauss harassed them with security checks, inquiries, and investigations, and even pursued them into civilian life after he had driven them out of AEC.

WILL THE SENATE CONFIRM HIM?

One by one, he drove able members out of the Atomic Energy Commission. A great part of his last 2 years in office was spent before congressional committees, explaining why atomic research was not progressing more rapidly, and why he had consistently denied to Congress vital information about our atomic-energy status. He earned the enmity of powerful figures in both parties and both Houses to such an extent that President Eisenhower, knowing that his reappointment would not be approved, persuaded him to leave.

He has continued, however, to exert an influence on government as a financial adviser to President Eisenhower and as a member of that shadowy group around the now discredited Sherman Adams that has wielded such questionable power in Washington. Now he pops up again, to take over the reins of Commerce from the ham-handed Mr. Weeks. It must have been difficult to find a man who will grace the Secretary's office even less than Sinclair Weeks, but in Lewis Strauss the President has found him.

Getting him confirmed will be something else again. Members of the Joint Atomic Energy Commission can hardly have forgotten Strauss' pompous, high-handed conduct in dealing with them. Members of the House are not likely to have forgotten his insulting refusal to turn over needed information. To the Democrats, who will undoubtedly control both Houses of Congress by considerable margins, his appointment is an open slap. Nor are Republicans apt to welcome back another public reminder of old scandals and our embarrassing lag in atomic development. Why the President should choose thus to antagonize the very men whose help he is going to need so much in the 2 years ahead is anyone's guess. But there is at least one bright note in this appointment—it isn't likely to stick.

## TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 21, 1959, the New York Times published an editorial entitled "TVA as a Business." There are some very pertinent and potent thoughts expressed in the editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA AS A BUSINESS

Over the more than 25 years of its existence the Tennessee Valley Authority has been criticized by its natural enemies as battening on the taxpayer's money and competing unfairly with private utilities. As far as the taxpayer's money is concerned, TVA has had the use of about $1.2 billion, of which about $300 million has been paid back into the Treasury. TVA has also benefitted by cheap credit and its payments, in lieu of taxes, have been somewhat lower than the prevailing rate in the southeastern part of the United States.

At the moment, however, TVA is not asking to borrow money from the Federal Government. It is proposing, as it has done before, to issue revenue bonds expanding its power facilities—and mainly its steampower facilities, since the waterpower of the Tennessee Valley has been pretty well developed.

At present the situation is that a bill has been introduced into the House, and approved by the House Public Works Committee, to permit TVA to raise $750 million and spend the proceeds on new steam-generating equipment. There is not much chance that the demand for power in the Tennessee Valley will fall off. TVA's spokesmen have pointed out that this demand is increasing by 10 to 12 percent a year and that new construction, costing about $180 million a year, is necessary to keep up with the demand.

In this great power market there are farms and homes that have benefited immeasurably by new sources of energy, but more than half of all the kilowatt-hours sold goes to Federal agencies, among them the Atomic Energy Commission. TVA helped save the Nation during a second World War by producing airplane materials and by its help in developing the atomic weapon and atomic energy. The wars, we hope, are over, but TVA still works for defense and still works for the improvement of living conditions everywhere.

The way in which TVA shall do this needful work is a practical issue, not an ethical one. This newspaper believes that the authority should continue to function like any other going concern within the area it now serves—that is to say, the familiar butterfly pattern that comes around in a great sweep from the Kentucky Dam on the west to the dams on the tributaries of the Tennessee, coming down out of the northeastern mountains. We do not believe this service area should be expanded, or needs to be. There should be ample space outside this pattern for private enterprise to profit by what TVA can teach and to teach lessons from which

TVA may gain. This ought not to be a war between public and private power. It should be a friendly competition with cooperation wherever cooperation will be mutually beneficial.

We therefore hope that the revenue bond proposal will pass both Houses of this present Congress and become a law. New Yorkers, who are accustomed to the way in which our own port authority and triborough bridge authority operate, will see nothing revolutionary in this practical policy.

## Debate on Administered Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., one of the able financial reporters of the New York Times, wrote an article titled "Debate on Administered Prices," which was published in the New York Times of Sunday, March 22, 1959.

I commend Mr. Dale upon the technical expertness of his article. The article discusses the charts of Gardiner Means, a well-known economist, which were presented to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. It is unfortunate that the charts cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but they are very well described by Mr. Dale.

I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBATE ON ADMINISTERED PRICES

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—A term created a quarter century ago, debated vigorously among economists at the time, then quiescent for most of the decade after World War II, has returned to the news and to the attention of Congress.

The term is "administered prices." It was devised by an economist, Gardiner Means, to help explain the way prices behave in the economy.

The elementary textbooks say that prices vary according to supply and demand, with the seller having only very limited control over what he charges. If demand is sluggish, he must usually cut his price.

The reason he must cut his price, according to the textbook explanation, is that one of his competitors will do so to get more business.

In the case of farm prices and securities on the stock market, where the number of sellers is, in effect, infinite, the seller has no say over his price at all. It varies hourly with varying offers to buy and sell.

Mr. Means accepted the textbook explanation for a wide variety of prices in the economy. But he found that it did not hold true for many other prices. His test was the frequency with which prices change.

INFREQUENT CHANGE

Mr. Means found that an important group of prices in the economy changed very infrequently. He knew that demand for these items was moving up and down like demand for everything else, but the price did not respond. Thus his first definition of an administered price was one that changed infrequently, presumably on the ground that the sellers were largely immune to changes in demand.

Mr. Means and others soon concluded, formally or informally, that the power of sellers in the administered price area stemmed mainly from the fewness of their numbers. That is, prices were most rigid in concentrated industries—either those with few concerns overall or those dominated by a very few companies. Steel and automobiles, needless to say, were perfect examples.

There, for practical purposes, the case rested in the late 1930's.

Then came the somewhat puzzling rise in prices from 1955 to 1958. It was a time of budget surpluses and tight money and, most important of all, peace. The classical source of inflation—excess demand—seemed not to exist. There were few shortages of supply.

KEFAUVER INQUIRY

A curious Senator, ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, believed the explanation might be found in Gardiner Means' long-neglected theory of administered prices. So he started an investigation and set off a debate among experts and politicians that is still continuing.

Senator KEFAUVER's inquiry appeared to be running out of steam until the events of last year's recession. But the prices in some key industries went up in spite of extremely slack demand, with steel and autos again the most-mentioned examples.

Even persons who had long believed the administered price problem was of no great importance—such as the brilliant collection of staff economists at the Federal Reserve Board—sat up and took notice. And Senator KEFAUVER returned to the attack.

Early this year he struck gold. The strike took the form of a set of charts prepared by, of all people, Mr. Means. The two most telling are reproduced on this page. They have caught many an eye.

Mr. Means sought to show that practically the entire rise in prices in the recent period occurred in the administered price area. The lack of a general excess of demand is proved, he believes, by the failure of demand-sensitive items to rise.

He concluded that demand-repressive measures, particularly tight money, are useless against this type of inflation, and indeed actually harmful. He thought the administered price problem should be tackled directly.

Critics of the Means analysis have usually accepted his figures. But they make three main counterarguments.

LABOR BLAMED

The first is that it is the power of organized labor in these sectors that is the real cause of the upward price movement. True, the industries have pricing power, this argument goes, but the prices were actually increased mainly because of higher costs.

Basically, the critics here charge that the pricing power of an industry could be inflationary only if the industry actually used that power to increase profit margins substantially on each item produced. They give figures showing that even where profit margins have risen, the effect on final prices is very small, particularly compared to the effect of the rise in total costs (labor and others).

The second main counterargument is that the Means chart can be almost wholly explained in terms of classic demand theory. That is, the areas that rose most in price—metals and motive products and machinery—were precisely the areas under the heaviest pressure of demand in the 1955–57 boom when most of the price increase took place.

MEANS' FIGURES

Mr. Means produces figures of his own, mainly involving the use of industrial capacity and the labor force, aimed at refuting this idea. The demand theory has trouble explaining some of the price increases in 1957 and 1958 when demand was falling off, though it appears that the increases in the administered sectors were less in those years than in the previous two.

Finally, the critics say that the Means theory offers very little help in explaining the rise in consumer, as distinct from wholesale prices. Mr. Means concentrated heavily on steel, for example. One critic, Simon Whitney of the Federal Trade Commission, sought to show that the entire steel price increase since 1953 would have added only about six-tenths of 1 percent to the consumer price index.

The reason is that consumer prices are heavily dominated by food, services and soft goods. Food and soft goods are generally competitive.

RETORT MADE

The retort of the Means backers here is that a steel price increase eventually is reflected in practically everything consumers buy. It pushes up medical care through the cost of equipment, food through the price of cans. It remains true, however, that the whole steel industry accounts for less than 4 percent of the total value of the Nation's output of goods and services.

There is also, of course, debate on just how widespread the administered price problem is. No statistics are more tricky than the statistics on concentration of industry. There is by no means unanimous acceptance among experts, for example, even of the generally held public belief that concentration has been steadily increasing.

And so it goes. The Means attack on traditional theory, backed by the Kefauver hearings, has by no means torn down the barricades as yet.

But if the prices in the administered area continue to march upward at anything like the pace of the last few years, there is a real prospect that Congress will demand direct action. And that would mean some form of price, and probably wage, control—the very thing President Eisenhower has repeatedly said is incompatible with a free economy.

## Analyst Finds Economic Recovery Sluggish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in an article printed in the Washington Post Sunday, March 22, Mr. Bernard Nossiter, the distinguished staff reporter for that newspaper, compares the rate of recovery from the 1958 slump with recovery in 1949–50 and in 1954–55.

He reports that the present recovery is the slowest of the three according to results of most economic measurements. He further advises that many experts say unemployment has actually grown progressively worse.

This data is especially pertinent to various legislation being considered at this

time. I wish to include Mr. Nossiter's article in the RECORD so that it will be available for the careful study of all Members:

RECOVERY RATE FOUND SLUGGISH

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

The national economy is moving out of the worst postwar slump at a sluggist pace.

A comparison with the recoveries from the two earlier recessions shows:

The present recovery is much slower than the 1949–50 revival.

The present recovery is somewhat slower than the 1954–55 comeback.

Moreover, a new method of calculating jobless rates—a method which many experts now favor—shows that unemployment has not simply held at an uncomfortably high level in the last 3 months. Instead, it has grown progressively worse.

Under the new method, unemployment, corrected for seasonal factors was 5.8 percent of the labor force in November; 6 percent in December; 6.2 percent in January and 6.4 percent in February.

Any five economists will offer at least six mutually exclusive methods of measuring recovery. And some will insist that by any standard the present recovery is satisfactory. This contented group argues that the fact that the recovery appears uninterrupted for 10 months after the recession hit bottom last April is the really significant feature.

Moreover, some contend that a comeback as fast as the one in 1949–50 would breed other evils. A snapback of that sort, it is argued, would quickly press output up against capacity, create shortages and put pressure on prices.

It is this group also that generally argues (in private) that relatively high unemployment is unfortunate for those out of work but useful to temper union wage demands.

Finally, some economists say that the current recovery is so close to the pace of the 1954–55 affair that the differences are unimportant. However, that earlier comeback followed a mild dip. So, a more proper comparison, another school asserts, is with the first, more severe postwar slide. On that basis, this recovery is substantially slower.

To measure recovery, four key indicators were compared for the three periods: Gross national product or total output, corrected to eliminate price changes; the jobless rate; personal income, the sum of payments to people; and industrial production.

The recent slide in unemployment, reflected in the figures used here and compiled by the Committee for Economic Development, will come as a surprise to some.

Published Government figures show no change between December and February. However, the Census Bureau is privately measuring jobless rates in the same fashion as CED and is expected to publish this new approach.

Some economists argue that the recent worsening in unemployment reflected in the numbers is illusory. This group holds that the figures result from an extraordinary expansion in the labor force—that is, a rush of new job seekers in the last 3 months.

However, in the nine preceding months, the labor force, corrected for seasonal changes, actually declined. It normally increases by 800,000 over a year; from February 1958, to February 1959, it increased by only 300,000.

Therefore, the rates showing a worsening of unemployment are compiled against a less-than-normal increase in job seekers. A normal increase would make the picture look blacker.

Another unusual factor is supporting current production, employment, and incomes. Perhaps 20 percent of the recent buying of steel is inspired by strike threats. Customers are building inventories to tide them over an emergency predicted by the industry as early as last September. If this scare buying were not in the picture and steel output were tailored to real demand at the current price, the production index would probably show not even the modest increase registered in the past 3 months.

Here's how much each of the three postwar recoveries had come back after each slump had hit bottom as shown in the four indicators: (The numbers are the percent gain or loss for the tenth month after each slump hit bottom—February 1959 for the current recovery. Gross national product is measured quarterly so the comparisons are for points three quarters after each slump touched bottom. This GNP for the first quarter of 1959 is estimated to have increased by 10 billion unchanged dollars from the fourth quarter.)

Industrial production: First postwar recovery, 15.4 percent above the preslump peak; second recovery, 1.5 percent; current, 0.7 percent below the preslump peak.

Personal income: First, 7.9 percent; second, 6.7 percent; current, 3.5 percent.

Jobless rate: First, was 4.5 percent 10 months after trough or 10 percent worse than preslump peak; second, 4.2 percent or 61 percent worse; current, 6.4 percent or 49 percent worse.

Gross national product: First, 9.5 percent above preslump peak; second, 4.4 percent; current, 2.1 percent (estimated).

Another method of comparison would be to measure how much each indicator had climbed from the trough.

On this basis, the first recovery was again the best for all four indicators. But the current recovery is about the same as the 1954–55 comeback in one measurement, faster in one and slower in two others.

To sum up: In all eight measurements, the first recovery was the fastest. The second leads the current comeback in five, is even in one and trails only in two.

## Student-Aid Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fealty Furor," written by William Henry Chamberlin, and published in the Wall Street Journal of March 20, 1959. The article discusses a legislative accomplishment of our colleague, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEALTY FUROR—ACADEMICIANS WHO BATTLE STUDENT-AID LOYALTY OATH MIGHT BETTER RAIL AGAINST MORE REAL THREATS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The insertion, at the initiative of Senator KARL MUNDT, of loyalty provisions into the National Defense Education Act has aroused a considerable storm in the normally placid groves of academe. Cries of "McCarthyism" and "thought control" are heard in the land.

Some colleges have decided, as a matter of principle, to refuse to accept the benefits of the act. Presidents of others have indicated disapproval without going so far as to deny their students the scholarship advantages which are made available.

The act provides funds for scholarships to students of merit, to be repaid later at a nominal interest charge. The recipient is required to affirm his loyalty to the U.S. Government and also to give assurance that "he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods." It is this last requirement that has drawn the outcry of "thought control" in campus circles, student and professorial, that like to think of themselves as liberal.

CAUSE OF LIBERTY

In this age of totalitarian states, mass pressures and big organizations, Government and private, the cause of individual liberty deserves every consideration. But is it really monstrous, impermissible tyranny if a government makes as a condition of helping students that those who receive its help shall not be dedicated to its destruction?

A student could make the required affirmation with a clear conscience and still be able to hold and advocate a very wide range of dissenting opinion. Like some of his professors and others who are old enough to know better, he could advocate unilateral nuclear disarmament for America and its allies, one-sided retreat on every disputed issue with the Soviet Union.

He could recommend, as the wave of the future, a system under which the Federal and local governments would take not one-third, as at present, but two-thirds or three-fourths, or nine-tenths of every citizen's earnings for the supposed needs of foreign aid and the welfare state. He could be in favor of maintaining full employment by issuing fiat money so that everyone could receive a check for $10,000 from Uncle Sam for extra spending money.

He would be just as free as the rest of us to play around with and sympathize with any kind of utopian scheme for the reorganization of American society, subject only to the reservation that this did not involve trying to overthrow the Government with one hand while accepting its handout with the other.

Actually the number of prospective applicants who should be inconvenienced by taking an affidavit renouncing sympathy and participation in any organization committed to violent overthrow of constitutional government in the United States would be extremely small. It would boil down to a handful of dogmatic Communists with enough integrity, or fear of legal consequences, to boggle at swearing falsely.

A sizable segment of public opinion is probably represented by an alumnus of one of the colleges which decided to reject participation in the scheme because of objection to the affidavit.

He wrote to his college newspaper: "To assert this is thought control is ridiculous. It requires the recipient to conform to a reasonable standard of good citizenship at the time of the affidavit.

"As a taxpayer, I respect the sound judgment of the Members of Congress who approved this provision. It is designed not to spend my money on educating someone who, when he receives my bounty in one hand is,

at the same moment, determined to destroy me with the other. I must also applaud those who supported Senator MUNDT's addition to the act for the very practical reason that a conviction on the score of a false affidavit is cheaper, easier, and speedier to obtain than is a conviction under the various anti-Communist statutes. Thanks to the U.S. Supreme Court, the FBI's, and others' vast expenditures of money, effort, and time in an attempt to eliminate the subversive elements have been nullified."

There is always room for crusaders for freedom. But they should always be sure that the cause is genuine and worth the effort. A far more real case of tyranny is the experience of a Michigan poultry farmer named Stanley Yankus. Mr. Yankus has been assessed fines of $4,500 for not observing the wheat quota, although he has never accepted any Government subsidy and never contracted to take part in the price-support program.

GOVERNMENT REGIMENTATION

Mr. Yankus is so fed up with his experience that he proposes to migrate to Australia. It would be interesting if some energetic researcher would get to work and find out how many Stanley Yankuses there are in a system where Government subsidization equals Government control equals regimentation of the individual.

Still another promising field of study for a champion of freedom would be the experience of the individual worker who holds out against joining a union, perhaps a union run by obnoxious underworld characters. There are dark spots in American life, where freedom ought to ring loudly. But the individuals who have been sounding off against the affidavits in the National Defense Education Act seem like Don Quixotes, charging furiously at windmills.

## Results of 22d Congressional District of Ohio Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the results of my third annual opinion poll, which was recently sent to every household in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio, have just been tabulated. Replies to this questionnaire were received from 17,000 families which comprise a well-balanced cross section of the various economic, racial, political and religious groupings of the 22d Congressional District of Ohio. Since this district represents a sizable portion of the Greater Cleveland area, I believe the results of this poll will be of interest to the Congress in revealing public opinion on certain issues in one of our large metropolitan areas.

The fine response received from my constituents is deeply appreciated. The many detailed explanations and helpful suggestions received are very reassuring, and indicate the serious thought being given by my constituents to some of the vital domestic and foreign issues of our Government. The results of this poll follow:

| | Percent | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | No opinion |
| 1. Do you favor a relaxation of the trade barriers imposed by the United States against Soviet Union? | 25.5 | 63.5 | 11.0 |
| 2. Would you favor diplomatic recognition by the United States of Communist China? | 22.8 | 68.1 | 9.1 |
| 3. Do you favor continuation of our mutual security (foreign aid) program at approximately the same cost as the past several years? | 43.0 | 45.7 | 11.3 |
| 4. Do you favor gifts of surplus farm commodities to underdeveloped countries? | 76.9 | 17.4 | 5.7 |
| 5. Would you favor price, wage, and rent controls if our economy is faced with a period of accelerated inflation? | 70.3 | 24.5 | 5.2 |
| 6. Do you favor Federal programs, such as the proposed community services legislation to provide long-term, low-interest-rate, Federal loans for local public works projects? | 59.0 | 29.4 | 11.3 |
| 7. Do you favor legislation to provide lower downpayments, and smaller monthly payments through larger and longer mortgages on FHA insured homes? | 59.3 | 31.7 | 9.0 |
| 8. Would you favor larger Federal participation in local slum clearance and urban renewal projects? | 51.6 | 41.0 | 7.4 |
| 9. Do you favor Federal aid to needy States for school construction? | 61.4 | 33.2 | 5.4 |
| 10. Do you favor Federal aid to needy States for increased teacher pay? | 49.4 | 43.4 | 7.2 |
| 11. Do you believe Federal aid to education will result in Federal control of education? | 41.0 | 46.9 | 12.1 |
| 12. Do you favor continued Federal aid to local airports? | 30.7 | 55.1 | 14.2 |
| 13. At present a person drawing social security benefits is prohibited from earning in excess of $1,200 yearly. Do you believe this limitation should be removed? | 72.9 | 22.9 | 4.2 |
| 14. Do you favor a Federal program to provide hospital and surgical care for social security beneficiaries by increasing the wage base for social security taxes to $6,000? | 48.5 | 38.9 | 12.6 |
| 15. Would you favor extension of coverage, and an increase in the $1 per hour minimum wage law? | 62.3 | 27.1 | 10.6 |
| 16. Would you favor legislation during the present session of the Congress to grant statehood to Hawaii? | 82.9 | 7.5 | 9.6 |

## Grain Terminal Association "Daily Radio Roundup," March 18, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Grain Terminal Association "Daily Radio Roundup" for Wednesday, March 18, 1959.

There being no objection, the Grain Terminal Association "Daily Radio Roundup" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Why did Fidel Castro win in Cuba? And what was behind the recent flareup in Iraq?

There's always a reason for revolts and uprisings. Remember, we had one back in 1776—and with good reason. People don't like to die. So if they are willing to fight and risk dying, they must feel that there are some serious wrongs that might be righted.

In Cuba the revolt came from the back country, from the provinces. Two-thirds of the men in Castro's army were poor peasants—farm people. In common with many other Latin American dictators, Batista had favored the big landowners and big industrialists.

In the countryside, Castro offered the only answer that had any meaning. That was land reform. That revolutionary promise is as old as history, and with it he won over the peasants who went hungry between the sugarcane harvests.

It was this motley lot of untrained peasants, led by intellectuals, that defeated Dictator Batista's professional army and police force. The promise was land and farms for the peasants who had been little more than plantation laborers.

And what happened just last week in the Middle East's Iraq, far across the sea and far removed from Cuba? Again, land was the issue. Associated Press correspondent Stan Carter, who was there, says the landowning Arab sheiks suffered a crushing defeat. They had lost ground in the change of government a few months ago and this was to be their comeback.

A Catholic priest told the news correspondent that the wealthy sheiks were behind the uprising because "they were afraid they would be dispossessed." They were going to lose some of their land because of the new agrarian reform law. That law limits ownership to 600 irrigated acres or 1,200 unirrigated acres. The rest of the land is to be sold to the peasants, with 20 years to pay. The rich sheiks didn't like that, of course, because for centuries they had been the landlords, taking up to nine-tenths of the crops in rent.

So here are two bloody episodes in today's history. And like so many before them the cause, in both cases, was the desire of the people to be free and own land and till it for themselves.

Here in the United States we can thank our forefathers for their wisdom in encouraging family agriculture with property laws and the Homestead Act. But in their day, our forefathers got the same kind of harsh and unthinking criticism that is being heaped today on efforts to preserve family farming.

We notice in the newspapers that a top official of a big international private grain business says we ought to forget about our small farmers. He has written an article in a publication called Business Horizons in which he recommends that the United States do away with all farm aids and let the so-called free market weed out the farmers who can't live with disaster prices.

But in view of history around the world, yesterday and today, most people will consider that a pretty shortsighted point of view.

## Federal Support for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram I have

received from Eula May Taylor, northwest regional director of the department of classroom teachers, in support of the School Support Act of 1959, S. 2.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., *March 17, 1959.*

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

Participants at Northwest Regional Conference of Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association meeting at Boise passed the following resolution on March 14.

Urge continued Federal support for present well established and useful program such as, but not restricted to, library services vocational education school lunch program and others. Believe that Federal support should be given to the State to meet emergency and continuing needs of public school construction and salaries, that these funds should be distributed to all States through an objective allocation basis, and that the administration of the funds should be under the control of regular educational authorities within the State. Further recommend the support of the entire Murray-Metcalf bill which provides Federal funds for each school child with local control and oppose any efforts to substitute lesser provision.

EULA MAY TAYLOR,
*Northwest Regional Director.*

## Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration of Sigma Delta Chi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Sigma Delta Chi, men's professional journalistic fraternity, CBS has scheduled in 2-hour-long TV shows a week apart, an appraisal of American journalism, including print and broadcast media. The discussion will be on "The Great Challenge" series Sunday, March 29, and Sunday, April 5, with Eric Sevareid as moderator. In order that Members of the Senate may have the information about the speakers discussing two very vital topics, I ask unanimous consent to have a description of the program printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIGMA DELTA CHI PROGRAMS

A two-part appraisal of journalism in this country today—including both printed and electronic media—will be presented in hour-long symposiums on "The Great Challenge" series Sunday, March 29 and Sunday, April 5, on the CBS television network 2:30–3:30 p.m., eastern standard time.

The two programs, "Is American Journalism Meeting Its Responsibilities?" (March 29) and "Is the American Public Getting the Information It Needs?" (April 5), are being produced by the public affairs department of CBS news in cooperation with Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic fraternity, on the occasion of the fraternity's 50th anniversary.

Examining the responsibilities of journalism in the modern era and the degree to which today's journalists are meeting those responsibilities, will be Barbara Ward, noted author and formerly foreign affairs editor of the Economist of London; John Fisher, editor in chief of Harper's magazine; Engene C. Pulliam, president and publisher of leading newspapers in Indiana and Arizona and head of station WIRE, Indianapolis, and station WOAV, Vincennes; J. Russell Wiggins, vice president and executive editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald; and Sig Michelson, vice president, CBS, Inc., and general manager of CBS News.

Exploring the subject of barriers that limit a journalist's accessibility to vital news will be James C. Hagerty, Presidential news secretary; James Reston, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times; noted historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.; Robert D. Swezey, executive vice president and general manager of WDSU Broadcasting Corp., New Orleans, La., and chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the National Association of Broadcasters; and Charles A. Sprague, former Governor of Oregon and publisher of the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman.

Eric Severeid, CBS News chief Washington correspondent, is the moderator for "The Great Challenge" symposiums.

Sigma Delta Chi was founded by 10 undergraduate students at DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind., April 17, 1909. It now has approximately 17,000 members in 116 undergraduate and professional chapters and is the largest as well as one of the oldest organizations in journalism. Mr. Pulliam, a member of the March 29 symposium on "The Great Challenge," was one of the 10 founders and this year is national honorary president of the fraternity.

"The Great Challenge" is produced by James Fleming. Av Westin and Michael Zeamer alternate as directors for the series.

## National Park on Padre Island, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the first bill which I introduced in this session of Congress was S. 4, a measure to establish a national park on Padre Island in Texas.

Since that time, I have on several occasions brought to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the necessity for the establishment of such a park both to keep its long, sandy beaches as a public playground on a shoreline which is fast becoming privately owned, and to preserve the island as a place of natural beauty where many species of wildlife have their habitat in unspoiled surroundings.

Special studies of other national park areas, principally Gettysburg, Pa., have shown that the longer the acquisition of land of natural beauty and historical significance is postponed, the more expensive it is when purchase is finally made.

I feel we should delay no longer in providing for a national park on this island in the Gulf of Mexico which can easily become a winter playground for the Nation.

Mr. President, in support of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from Mrs. E. L. Crumpacker, Sr., corresponding secretary of the Rivercrest Garden Club in Houston, Tex., evidencing the support of this fine group of farsighted citizens for Padre Island National Park.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARDEN AND CIVIC CLUB,
*Houston, Tex., March 16, 1959.*

The Honorable RALPH M. YARBOROUGH,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: At the regular March meeting of the Rivercrest Garden Club, we had a discussion of the bill that is coming before you, concerning establishment of Padre Island as a national park. As a club, we wish to go on record as being wholeheartedly in support of said measure, feeling it is for the benefit of all, that it is passed.

Thanking you for your support.

Respectfully,
Mrs. E. L. CRUMPACKER, Sr.,
*Corresponding Secretary.*

## America's Attitude Toward Poets and Poetry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a poem written by one of my constituents, Mr. Earl Cuevas of New Orleans, La. It is being included in order that it might, in the words of Mr. Cuevas, "strike the fancy of some imaginative person who would be interested in poets and poetry."

Mr. Cuevas' plea, in the form of a poem, for a deeper appreciation and better understanding of the finer arts in America, follows:

THE REVOLT OF THE MUSES
(By Earl A. Cuevas)

Apollo's heart is filled with ire.
He belches words like flames of fire
While Vulcan hurls them far and near
To fill the land with dread and fear.
He calls for Castor's aid.
The hundred-headed Typhon too,
The god now welcomes to his crew
And hurried plans are made.
He calls the muses to his side.
And tells them truths he'd rather hide.
Before he speaks he makes his plans
To place his case in Jove's own hands.
The mighty Jove consents.
A nation's life is now at stake—
A people's conscience must awake.
America has roused the wrath
That blocks the mad god's peaceful path
And causes his laments.

With thundering voice and tear-stained eyes
He takes the rostrum and he cries:
"America, my grief is great
To see my love has turned to hate.
When first your continent was found
I knew the wealth that did abound
Upon your lovely shore.
I then agreed with Mercury
That he should rule instead of me—
Four hundred years—no more.
During the time that Mercury reigned
A vast amount of wealth was gained.
'Twas then, and not until that time
That I should reign and rule sublime
With all the muse's aid.
But now, behold! you have denied
The bond by which we both were tied
When this contract was made."
With this he ceased and then surveyed
The strange effect his words had made.

America in silence sits
In hope that she may gain her wits
And then defend Apollo's charge
Through counsel bought with gold.
Now there she sits, both fair and large
And tragic to behold.
The mighty Jove, to save her name,
In these few words addressed the dame:
"America, we find you fair.
Your comely face, your lovely hair—
Your womanhood deserves my praise.
Can you not here defend your ways?"
A thought now flashes to her mind.
Her unjust acts are thus defined:

"Behold the gold I have in store,
And see the art from shore to shore
My youthful sons have made.
My ships now ply the seven seas—
No nation has such industries
Of equal size or grade."
She points with pride to piles of stone
And boasts that she and she alone
Has not a counterpart.
She mentions that her men of state,
Since nineteen ten (a recent date),
Have added to the nation's slate
An art bureau, both broad and great—
To show the nation's art.

The muses smile, their smiles are broad
Because they know this is a fraud.
The bureau which the lady named
Is one of which she is ashamed;
But yet, she seeks to now appease
The angry god with further pleas.
"See what I've done in recent years.
My cities boast of rows and tiers
Of paintings we have made.
Each building where this art's in store
Has cost ten-thousand-grand or more,
And others are being made.
Each edifice the state constructs
Has paintings of the vast products
The nation makes to sell.
Now, twenty-seven-million "sheks"
Are set aside for art projects
I think that this is swell."

Apollo scans the lady's pride
And tries in vain a blush to hide.
Confused with wrath and pity too,
He tries to give the dame her due.
He speaks, and in these words explains
The reason why he now complains:
"My dear, the school where you were taught
Has much confused and placed at naught
Your knowledge of the arts.
The works that you have now displayed
Deserves the praise that should be made
From all your nation's part;
But those who worship at my shrine
I wish to here and now define.

"I speak of poets and not of art,
For poetry is a thing apart
And should not be by you confused
With minor terms the gods have used.

"Before Saturn was overthrown—
Before the time Jove took the throne,
Man spoke, if but in groans.
The golden age was ushered in
And man, as yet, was free from sin
And spoke in clearer tones.
'Twas even then that ancient man
With new formed words his poems began.
So how can you today decree
That painting passes poetry?
Did not Apollo, poetry's king,
From Phoebe's own dear daughter spring?
When Jupiter, my sire and pride,
Surveyed the heavens far and wide
To find himself a worthy bride,
He called Latona to his side.
Now Phoebe was Latona's dame
And Coeus was her father's name.
Before Diana learned to spoon,
My mothers' mother ruled the Moon.
It should be plain that I am sprung
From gods who were the first among
The heaven's mighty race.
My father Jove had made a vow
That he would find a bride somehow,
Both fair of form and face.
The son this happy union bore
Was called 'Appollo'—nothing more;
And as the fates had long decreed
He was the one they chose to lead
The muses into space.
"I sent them to your lovely shore—
Erato, Euterpe, Terpsichore—
But in your rush for gold and gain
Their mission there has proved in vain
It is for this I now complain
And seek to ruin your vast domain.
The shame that you have meted to
My muses shall be dealt to you.

"What have you done for such as Poe
But let him perish in his woe?
And there is Maxwell Bodenheim
Who starves the while he writes in rhyme.
Sara Teasdale put out the flame
Because you so disgraced her name
Hart Crane sought solace in the sea
And thus returned his soul to me;
And Lindsay took the poison vial
To end the misery of his trial.
Now add to this that Egan hung
Because he found no place among
His fellowmen to ply his trade
And stooped to crimes of lowest grade.
Fred Landon lost his active mind
Because your people proved unkind.
The ones whose names I mention here
Are but a few of my career
Who ended life in suicide
Because you shunned them from your side.
How many now are doing time
In prison walls because the rhyme
The muses melted in their brain
Cannot the needs of life sustain?

"America, my plans are these:
I'll seek the aid of Hercules
And bring your nation to its knees
For such atrocious crimes as these.

"Erato sought to write of Love
(Antheme inspired by gods above)
But she was soon denied.
Then Calliope, in epic style,
Had hoped to pen a poem worth while,
With Clio's help, to make your name
Immortal in the realms of fame,—
And this, was set aside.
I take the matter in my hand.
Both muse and theme I now command.
Now when I bring you to disgrace
Because of follies of your race,
The tragic muse, Melpomene,
Shall stand right here with me and see
A sight to make a theme.
The generations yet unborn
Shall learn how you were shamed and torn,
My prestige to redeem."

Before the god of poetry ceased
His sobs and tears had both increased.
With shaking frame and wetted eyes
He sees, beyond the heaven's skies,
The lovely land he hoped to praise
With poetry in a thousand ways.

When Jove beheld his wretched son
His thought was one and only one—
To bring peace to his breast.
With this thought foremost in his mind
He frames his words and seeks to find
If any plan might yet exist
By which Apollo could desist
From acts he should detest.

These were the words, both firm and kind,
The fairest queen of all mankind
Heard Jove speak clear and loud:
"America, the case is clear.
I know that humans all will err.
Too much is now allowed.
But do you think that sins of yours
Should reach beyond your native shores?
The crimes that echo in your ears
Have been going on for many years,
And those who suffered in your land
Are pleading now with outstretched hand
For justice from my throne.
Before I pass upon your guilt—
Before your youthful blood is spilt—
Call on your worthy men of state.
Make known to them their future fate
And ask them to atone.
The evidence shall thus remain.
Until your case is called again.
Your fate shall be your own."

---

## Knights of Columbus Hear Stirring Talk on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a learned, informative, and stirring address delivered by Rev. Father Henry A. Kane, C.Ss. R., a member of the Redemptionist Mission Band of Buffalo, N.Y., at the annual communion breakfast of the Lawrence, Mass., Council 67, Knights of Columbus, held in the St. Mary's Auditorium in that city on March 15, 1959.

Attorney Reno J. Orlando, grand knight of the council, headed the group both at the communion rail and at the breakfast that immediately followed. In a few well chosen words, he expressed his thanks to the members of the organization for their attendance in such goodly numbers and following his outline of the past accomplishments of the organization during his service as grand knight, he informed the gathering of the program plans for the remaining months of his term in office.

The Very Reverend Edward J. Carney, O.S.A., pastor of St. Mary's Church of Lawrence, Mass., and former national chaplain of the American Legion, in his talk to the gathering stressed the needs of the Knights of Columbus in these

days of uncertainties. Monsignor Joseph P. Burke, J.C.D., of St. Patrick's Church in that city, and chaplain of the council, cited the members for their example in their Catholic action not only in their religious endeavors but also for the contribution to the civic and community life of that area.

Deputy Grand Knight John J. Hart, 3d, filled the post of toastmaster most fittingly and his introductions of the various speakers were well prepared and most interesting to his audience.

The following were the head table guests: Attorney Reno J. Orlando, grand knight; John J. Hart, 3d, deputy grand knight; Rev. Fr. Edward J. Carney O.S.A.; Monsignor Joseph P. Burke, J.C.D.; Rev. Fr. George J. Callaghan, O.S.A., chaplain of Crusader Circle 651, Columbus Squires; Arthur J. Scott, past grand knight; Congressman THOMAS J. LANE; Hon. John J. Buckley, mayor of the city of Lawrence; Martin J. Killourie, district deputy; Paul H. Phaneuf of Dracut, Mass., district deputy; John Quinn, warden to the district deputy; State Senator William X. Wall; J. Ronald Boutin, chancellor; James T. Early, Sr., financial secretary; Samuel A. Reitano, treasurer; Joseph T. Hayes, trustee; William McIntosh, ticket chairman; Ralph Diodati, outside guard; Nelson J. Blouin, warden; Peter A. Hewett, lecturer; Albert J. Peterson, recorder; and William Licata, inside guard.

The following past grand knights were in attendance: Hon. John E. Fenton, chief judge of the Massachusetts Land Court; James A. McGrogan; Dr. Timothy Fleming, William A. Toye, James J. Regan, Joseph A. Comber, Superintendent of Schools James F. Hennessey, Joseph T. Harty, John T. Finn, Daniel F. Glynn, Charles H. Flathers, and John D. Sands, past grand knight of Dover, N.H.

About 2 years ago, there appeared in our newspapers and magazines a dramatic picture. Before a long, low table stood a cassocked figure. His hands were raised, like the prophet of old, in the familiar manner of a priest celebrating mass. And yet the setting was different than that to which we are accustomed. He was not garbed in colorful vestments. No golden chalice, studded with jewels, rested upon the simple table. In place of the round, spotless host was a small piece of bread. In the background was a flag, the proud and glorious Stars and Stripes of the United States of America. Was this humbly clad figure really a priest offering up the holy sacrifice of the mass in these unfamiliar surroundings? Indeed, he was a priest, a great priest, reliving the precious moments of the Last Supper by mandate of his Divine Master. You may have already surmised that this was a picture of Cardinal Mindszenty, persecuted, imprisoned prince of the church pleading with God for peace in the world through the power of this mass celebrated in the American Embassy in Budapest, Hungary.

This picture was worthy of your thoughtful study then; it merits your serious consideration this morning, because it graphically narrates a story rich in meaning. Clearly it points out the godless viciousness of communism that has relentlessly persecuted this dedicated man of God these many years. Sternly it warns us that the Communist considers nothing sacrosanct and nobody sacred. Hopefully it comforts us with a deeper realization of the power of prayer and the value of devotion to God, in whom we shall find abundant strength to resist the diabolical forces of atheistic communism. Forcibly it reminds us of a truth which the Communists understand only too well: That the might and power of America are today the backbone of the free, Christian world and the hope of God-fearing people everywhere.

In the mind of each man before me this morning there is another picture, the picture of a Communist. What image is reflected upon the screen of your mind when you draw a mental picture of a true Communist? Is he an uncouth, unkempt, wild-looking man standing upon a soapbox in a park denouncing social injustice? Or is he a cleverly trained professional spy operating with the efficiency of a Houdini? Is he rich or poor? Educated or illiterate? Man or woman? Does he speak with a foreign accent, or was he born in Brooklyn or Boston or Buffalo? Does he belong to either of our major political parties and, if so, in which one is he more likely to be found?

If the picture of your Communist is characterized by these features, and these alone, your image of a Communist is both incomplete and distorted. On occasion any one of us here this morning could be unkempt and wildeyed as denouncing, as we do, the evils of social injustice. A Communist could be, and in many instances is, a well-trained spy, but he could also be a mere tool in the hands of professionals. Today there are Communists among the rich and poor, among the educated and illiterate. A Communist could have been born across the seas or in the house next door. And, despite the accusation of some politicians, he may be found equally as well in either of our major political parties, for the Communist Party is too shrewd to build up its strength in one party, only to see the other come into power.

WHAT IS A COMMUNIST?

What, then, is a Communist? A true Communist is anyone who believes in the principles of dialectical materialism taught by Karl Marx and condemned by Pope Pius IX as early as 1846. To the Communist everything in the world is basically material. There is no God, there is no difference between soul and body, there is neither survival of the soul after death nor any hope of a future life. Human society is a form of matter which has evolved through conflict. This conflict must be sustained and, indeed, accelerated by man. Hence, the Communist must, and does, sharpen the antagonisms which arise between the various classes of society. Hatred, violence, and destruction become part of a crusade essential to the progress of humanity. Whatever advances the cause of communism, be it war or massacre, starvation or bloodshed, becomes moral and good. That which retards the cause of communism, be it the Catholic or the Protestant church, America or Hungary, must be destroyed as an enemy of the human race. In the light of this doctrine, why did the statement of Khrushchev that he would bury America shock so many Americans? It shocked only those who do not truly understand the Red menace—and their number is legion. In this the Communist believes, nor does it make any difference whether he was born in Russia or the United States, whether he is a leading industrialist or a lowly lackey, whether he graduated from Harvard or barely slid through grammar school.

MUST RESIST

At this point you may have decided that this doctrine of communism is purely theoretical and makes little difference to you here in the safety of America. So, let me ask you a few questions. Do you believe in the authority of your Government? Do you believe in your authority as a parent? The Communist rejects all authority, civil or parental. Do you own a home? Have you built up a business of your own? Would you resent it, if your home and business were stolen away from you? The Communist would approve of it, provided that it was beneficial to the Party. Do you love your family, your wife, your children? Communism is bent on the destruction of the family. If your wife were sent to work in an airplane factory in California, your children to the coal mines in Scranton, while you remained here in Lawrence, would you rebel unto death against such tyranny? In the doctrine of the Communist, your family belongs to the state, must be educated by the state and produce for the state. Have you a child who is in any way defective? Wouldn't you love that defective child more than one who is healthy, because it needs you so much? Such a child, says the Communist, is a parasite upon society and deserving only of liquidation for the betterment of the state. In these teachings the Communist believes and by them he lives. This is not mere theory, it is current Communist practice in Russia and the satellite nations. Witness, if you will, Russia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Korea, and Red China. These barbarities have happened; they are happening this very day in some parts of the world; and they will happen here, unless we are, all of us, courageously determined to resist communism under any guise and to resist as well those duped by the Communists who make the work of the party easier to accomplish in our land.

THREE CATEGORIES

Following closely the words of Pope Pius XI in his encyclical on atheistic communism published in 1937, we have drawn a clearcut picture of the true Communist. Perhaps it is of even greater importance in our day and age to consider this morning those who have been deceived by communism. These are men who proclaim their sincere interest in the cause of freedom, yet who make the task of the Communist easier to achieve because, in the name of freedom, they push the Communist line. They may be grouped into three categories. There are those who advocate an excessive freedom of speech and action tantamount to license. There are those who minimize the danger of Communists because they are few in number. Finally, there are those who claim to be American citizens and yet will not openly declare their loyalty to this Government.

Let us remember that true freedom for society never admits of license. We do not allow our teachers to instruct your youngsters in the art of committing crime. Are we, therefore, guilty of a breach of freedom? Preposterous. We do not allow criminals to invade our homes and snuff out the lives of our children. Is this a violation of the principles of freedom? Incredible. Why, then, should we allow the Communist Party to teach the violent overthrow of our Government? To do so would be equally preposterous and incredible. And if one were to object to the comparison of a Communist with a criminal, I should like to remind him that the teeth have been restored to the Smith Act by our current Congress, thank God, thus ranking Communists with criminals. Moreover, the Communists have consistently, of their own volition, grouped themselves with criminals by hiding behind the first and fifth amendments. These amendments to our Constitution are supposed to guarantee the personal liberties of the decent citizen. They have been abused by members of the Communist Party, who are therefore guilty of license.

As for those who ridicule the danger of communism and smear our FBI as well as its illustrious chief, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, they are either liars or they do not understand the idea of communism. Lenin wanted members of the party to be an elite and dedicated few, for the obvious reason that

a small group is controllable. Stalin taught that the Communist Party must be small and should function by making transmission belts of non-Communist countries, groups, or individuals such as Cyrus B. Eaton of Cleveland. On January 1, 1957, Mr. Hoover estimated that there were 17,360 members of the Communist Party in this country. For every member of the Party, there may be 10 non-Communists willing to push the work of the party. In 1945, when the Communist Party was at its peak in the United States, it had a membership of 64,600 and was, therefore, stronger in numbers than the Soviet Party was at the time it seized power in Russia. That seizure occurred in 1917 when the Russian Communists numbered a mere 40,000.

NO PLACE FOR NEUTRALIST

Finally, we come to those who will not declare their allegiance to their country, while pretending not to be Communist. To such disloyal Americans—and I definitely include Cyrus Eaton—I address this morning the scathing words of Christ: "He who is not with Me, is against Me." In this day of unspeakable peril, there is no place for the neutralist. Now is the acceptable time for all of us to declare ourselves completely Christian, completely American, completely anti-Communist. We therefore wholeheartedly oppose the current Communist line which follows:

1. We must recognize Red China.
2. We must eventually surrender at Quemoy, Matsu, and Berlin.
3. We must abolish all laws curbing communism.
4. We must support the 24 decisions of the Supreme Court which favored communism and which have been so deeply regretted by the American Bar Association.
5. We must sponsor cultural exchange.

These five points constitute the current Communist line as sent out from Red Moscow.

It is, therefore, our high resolve this morning to oppose the Communist line by the following resolutions:

1. We will not recognize Red China.
2. We will not surrender at Quemoy and Matsu, nor will we be blackmailed by a fear of war to surrender in Berlin.
3. We are delighted with the regret expressed so strongly by the American Bar Association, to its everlasting credit, and we urge this loyalty of jurists to campaign ever more vigorously for laws that will effectively curb communism.
4. We are opposed to cultural exchange between Russia and America, since it is a means of infesting our Nation with trained agents of the Russian Communist Party.
5. We will pray daily for peace, as Our Lady of Fatima requested. Through these resolutions and the power of Mary's intercession with her Divine Son, may we soon see the dawn of peace on earth, ueace in our minds, and peace with God for all eternity in the Kingdom of Heaven.

## Future of Timber Supply in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding authorities in the Pacific Northwest on forest management is David T. Mason of Portland, who also has been a leader in the Oregon Historical Society. Mr. Mason is optimistic with respect to the continued source of supply for Oregon's basic lumber industry, and Oregon produces more lumber than any other State in the Nation. Because many problems of the lumber industry are involved in Federal legislation I think that an interview with Mr. Mason by Bob Sever, of the staff of the Portland Oregonian, will be of significant interest to many of my colleagues. Therefore, I ask uanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article by Bob Sever from the Oregonian of March 8, 1959, entitled "Portlander Sees Timber as Principal Source of Income in Oregon for Another Century" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLANDER SEES TIMBER AS PRINCIPAL SOURCE OF INCOME IN OREGON FOR ANOTHER CENTURY

(By Bob Sever)

Will timber continue to be Oregon's chief natural resource as well as its principal source of income during the next 100 years of statehood? A man who well could bear the title of "Mr. Forester" of the United States believes that it will.

He is David T. Mason, of Portland, who for much of the last half century has waged a tireless crusade to bring about reforms which will assure longevity to the State's timber resources.

A consulting forester, Mason commenced his career in the early 1900's when the timberlands of the West were considered to have an unlimited supply of producing trees.

He was on hand to watch both big and little operators in the industry cut massive swaths through the lush forests of the region with little thought for the day ahead when there would no longer be any trees.

And such might have been the case had it not been for Mason and other energetic sustained yield evangelists who foresaw the danger to Oregon's economic crown jewels in the swashbuckling harvest of its timber stands.

Mason is quick to emphasize that sustained yield management of forests should not be confused with mere selective cutting. Sustained yield management, he explained, involves a much broader scope which includes protection of forest lands from fire and disease, reproduction measures such as reseeding and replanting and the proper quantity cutting at appropriate times.

Turning back to the early-day concept of timber cutting and management, Mason recalled:

"The people thought of forests as they did of coal and copper mines—you might just as well go ahead and use up the timber. They didn't think what we would do after that was gone."

Recognizing the economic danger involved in the cut-it-all concept, Mason seriously turned to the task of promoting sustained yield forest management in 1927.

"The thing I was trying to do was to get the interest of private forest owners in managing lands on a sustained yield basis so they could permanently support the mills," he said.

Sustained yield management was a very old idea, Mason explained, but he pointed out that its application in the United States was new in private lands.

"Theoretically," he added, "the national Forest Service managed its forests on a sustained yield basis but there was so little demand for public timber in the early days that the Federal stands were undercut.

"Soil has a growing power to produce just as the Columbia River can produce electrical power," the forester noted, "but if you don't build a dam, that potential will go to waste, and the same is true with a forest potential which is not properly developed."

In the early days of the industry in Oregon, Mason recounted, there was great economic pressure to cut all the timber and each producer had a tendency to overcut.

Fortunately, progressive operators have accepted sustained yield management of forests through the years and have restrained the unlimited cutting. This has resulted in a much stronger economy in the industry which has been reflected all over the world.

Scientific forestry now is practiced by many of the large operators which have major holdings in the State, and cooperative programs between private owners and Government foresters continue to pay dividends to the Nation and the State.

"Oregon has a great deal of land which is valuable primarily for trees," Mason pointed out. "Forest management is improving right along and no doubt will continue to improve."

Because of this Mason believes that timber will continue to be Oregon's chief natural resource and its main source of income.

One of the most graphic measures of the success of the efforts of Mason and others to bring about a truly enlightened approach to timber management is the large number of tree farms which now exist on private lands in Oregon.

As of the end of 1958, there were 349 such farms covering 4,031,301 acres which represents about two-fifths of the total private forest land in the State.

It is such projects as these privately operated farms which will help keep Oregon's timber resource a major asset of the State during the next 100 years and will provide a continuing flow of income to its residents.

An integral part of sustained yield management of forests is tree farming—growing repeated forest crops on the same land—just as farmers grow crops. Tree farming in Oregon started in 1941. Following are some 5-year figures on private tree farms in Oregon, including number and acreage: 1943, 14 farms, 1,063,703 acres; 1948, 39 farms, 1,705,771 acres; 1953, 112 farms, 2,990,409 acres; 1958, 349 farms, 4,031,301 acres.

## How Well Are We as a People Meeting Demands of Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently, Mr. McClellan Van der Veer, editor of the Birmingham News, was given an award by the Freedom Foundation, based upon an editorial which he had written sometime before that, and which appeared in the Birmingham News. The editorial is entitled "How Well Are We as a People Meeting Demands of Freedom?"

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WELL ARE WE AS A PEOPLE MEETING DEMANDS OF FREEDOM?

For a nation or an individual a declaration of independence can be a basically important act, but freedom is never a fixed and completely achieved reality for men. It is some-

thing that must be constantly guarded and achieved over and over again. It is an ever rising goal. No human being is wholly free.

In "The Protestant Era" Paul Tillich, the eminent theologian, wrote that "the depth of reality is freedom, the ultimate power of being is power over itself." Men, of course, are far from that freedom possessed by the ultimate power and reality controlling all things. Nevertheless, they can achieve great and significant realities of freedom. The founding Americans achieved freedom from foreign rule, from "taxation without representation". Ever since all Americans have been facing the unceasing challenges involved in maintaining and extending their freedom.

On this Fourth of July 182 years after the Declaration of Independence, the anniversary, as is the case every year, is most fittingly observed by rededication to the spirit and the responsibilities of freedom. In this growing complex age we should strive to conceive as clearly and comprehensively as possible what are the current costs and demands of freedom.

We have many great liberties—political, social, religious, economic—in this fortunate country. We are free from tyranny. We are free from many practices and conditions that have limited men in other times, that now limit them in other lands. But as individuals we are not free from human weaknesses of many sorts, weaknesses often causing us to fall short of the standards of conduct and achievement we would like to exemplify constantly.

As a people, we are subject, as is the individual, to weaknesses and shortcomings. We are free in a very real sense to the extent that we achieve power over ourselves—power to attain the high goals we set for ourselves in our finest aspirations.

As a people we should be reflecting deeply on this Independence Day how free we are in this basic regard. How free are we from the domination of—

Self-seeking that seriously limits our growth in freedom, that may even endanger our possession of the basic liberties that are ours?

Apathy and indifference as to the great fundamentals of truth, justice, and integrity upon which any system of freedom must so greatly depend?

The cynicism that testifies to grave lack of that faith in men so essential to the effective working of democracy, to the support of real liberty?

The fears, the hatreds, the intolerances, that can undermine the freedom of a nation as well as the freedom of an individual?

The thoughtful citizen can readily add to questions of this kind. And he can readily see that, as a people, our security and our growth in freedom basically rest on how, as individuals, as a nation of individuals committed to a common cause and enterprise, we measure up to the demands of true freedom, the wise and humane control of ourselves that is imperative to strongly established and growing liberties.

## A Southerner to the Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Southerner to the Court?" from the March 22, 1959, issue of the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOUTHERNER TO THE COURT?

Can a citizen of the Deep South who is opposed to forced mixing in the schools be appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court?

At first, the idea seems so farfetched, in the present climate of opinion, as to be hopeless. Yet, on second thought, it may conceivably not be so farfetched after all.

Consider the fact that the honest, conscientious anti-integrationist viewpoint is not represented on the present Court. That tribunal rendered a unanimous decision in 1954 in favor of forced race mixing, and last September the three Justices who had been appointed since 1954 were said by Chief Justice Warren to have associated themselves with the other six in that opinion.

Yet there is substantial opposition in the North and West, to say nothing of the South, to compulsory mixing of the races in the schools. Appointment to the Supreme Court of a respected man from the Deep South would give this large and growing element a voice.

Such an appointment would not only help to redress the one-sided balance of opinion on the Court, but it would be worth considering by the White House, from a political standpoint. (The President's appointments to the Supreme Court are supposed to be wholly nonpolitical, of course, but actually politics cannot be kept out of these selections.)

Suppose that when the next vacancy on the Court occurs—and the time may not be far away—Mr. Eisenhower were to name, say, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, to that tribunal. Such an appointment might go far to allay the intense feeling of resentment occasioned by the President's dispatch of armed paratroopers to Little Rock in 1957.

There is no more respected Member of the Senate than JOHN STENNIS. A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Virginia Law School in 1928, he served 10 years as circuit judge in his native Mississipi before his election to the U.S. Senate in 1947. He succeeded the demogogic Senator Bilbo in that body, but he has refused to indulge in Bilboesque rabble-rousing and race-baiting, either in his campaigns for the Senate in 1947 and 1952 or in his service as Senator.

Admittedly the idea that Senator STENNIS could ever be named to the U.S. Supreme Court seems at first to be almost absurd. The odds are definitely against it. At the same time, so fair-minded a man as President Eisenhower might see the justice, even the necessity, of giving the strongly-held, sincere, views of a whole section of the country representation on the Nation's highest tribunal. Certainly no such representation is to be found there now.

## United States Must Remain Firm on West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 16 issue of the Laconia Evening Citizen, an outstanding daily newspaper published at Laconia, N.H., by Edward J. Gallagher.

I am very pleased to have this endorsement of my position that the United States must remain firm and be ready to fight if necessary, to maintain free access to West Berlin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Laconia Evening Citizen, Mar. 16, 1959]

SHOULD NOT SIT STILL

We hope the men in the Kremlin are taking note of the many statements being made by our high officials that this country is ready to fight over the question of Berlin.

We heartily support Senator BRIDGES' position disagreeing with those who hold we should not be the first to use nuclear weapons. The New Hampshire senior Senator wisely declares we should not sit still and see our country devastated by letting Russia make the first attack.

We would add that for Russia to feel the impact of hot war on her own territory might be the best thing that ever happened.

## The Troubles of Bolivia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Times of March 23, 1959, entitled "The Troubles of Bolivia."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TROUBLES OF BOLIVIA

Taking the 20 Latin American countries and applying all the good will in the world, one would have to say that 2 of them present exceptionally baffling and even exasperating problems to the U.S. Government. These are Bolivia and Haiti.

In recent days Bolivia has been much in the news. The outburst of anti-American hostility that followed the publication of an item in Time magazine a few weeks ago focused some unfortunate attention on the country. In business, diplomatic, and Latin American circles generally, Bolivia has been a constant source of argument. Now we hear that the United States is making some adjustments in its $3 million-a-year technical-aid program (not the much larger program of aid through the Technical Cooperation Administration, which exceeds $20 million a year).

Some argue that Bolivia is not making good use of U.S. aid. Some say the economic, social, and political situation is so hopeless that the United States should give up. Others urge Washington to be tough and demand compliance with rigid standards of finance and economy. And then there is the blithe but deeply and understandably resented theory of the geopoliticians, which Time magazine quoted, that Bolivia should be abolished altogether and divided up among her neighbors.

None of these solutions or criticisms helps in the slightest. Any Bolivian Government

today faces desperately difficult problems. To supplant the present moderate Government with either a rightist or a leftist regime would solve nothing and doubtless make things much worse. The Siles Zuazo M. N. R. government must be encouraged to take as strong measures as possible to bring economic health. If it is pushed too hard it will collapse. If it shows too much friendliness or gratitude to the United States and too little national pride, the leaders will be labeled as Yankee stooges.

U.S. help is not going to be reduced, according to present plans. What is equally important is that the understanding, sympathy, and patience shown by our Government toward Bolivia is also going to continue.

## Draftee Versus Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Draftee Versus Volunteer; Lack of a Full Congressional Debate on Military Manpower Is Deplored." The article was written by Hanson W. Baldwin, and was published in the March 12 issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be published in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFTEE VERSUS VOLUNTEER—LACK OF A FULL CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE ON MILITARY MANPOWER IS DEPLORED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—The draft got terse and perfunctory approval in the Senate today.

The bill for extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act for 4 years from its present expiration June 30 had already passed the House—in slightly different form—with even less debate than it inspired in the Senate. Thus, after a routine House-Senate conference and foregone approval of the result, the Nation will be committed to compulsory military service at least until 1963.

In both Houses there had been a sense of apathy, a feeling of inevitability that forecast the affirmative votes long before they were taken.

But the debate, or rather the lack of it, is, in view of the history of the principle of compulsion for military service, one of the more unusual political-psychological phenomena of our times.

Not so many years ago the mere idea of conscription—except during shooting war—would have been howled down by Congress and our legislators would have been flooded with letters of protest. Today, the public seems as apathetic to the issue as Congress.

FAR FROM UNIVERSAL

This is all the more curious, in the opinion of observers here, since the draft has been far from universal and since it has produced major uncertainties in the lives of our young men, and many inequities.

The size of the armed services has been reduced by a million men since the Korean war and today the Army is the only service that uses inductees directly, although "the hot breath of the draft down their necks" undoubtedly increases the voluntary enlistments in the other services.

Both Congress and the services have spared neither effort nor expense to reduce the personnel turnover in the services, much of it due to the draft, and have offered increased pay and other benefits to induce men to become professionals and to increase the incentives for service careers.

Thus, two systems—conscription and professionalism, compulsory service and voluntary service—have been operating side by side with all the personnel difficulties this entails.

The far higher elan and efficiency of the voluntary units, such as the Navy's submarine crews, the pilots and paratroopers, supports the contention of many experts that Armed Forces composed completely of volunteers would be of higher quality, better morale and more effective than unwilling time-servers, or a mix of both.

Others deny this, but nearly all admit, that regardless of the combat efficiency of the services themselves, the application in practice of the draft law has been far less than universal and that the Nation's young men are faced with so much uncertainty and so many options as to ways to serve that they are justifiably confused, and many are resentful.

Thus, a Senate attempt, defeated by a large vote today, to appoint a special civilian commission to study alternatives to the draft had some merit.

But the overwhelming congressional approval of the draft extension and the defeat of proposals to postpone the extension or to modify it were based, not so much on objective analysis of the draft itself, as upon other factors.

The Berlin crisis looms large in legislators' thoughts and all of them were impressed, quite logically, with consideration of the adverse phychological effect that failure to extend the draft might have.

Then, too, Congress has sharply criticized the administration for cutting back the strengths of the Marines and the Army, and many of its members, strongly advocating in increase in strength, are threatening to impose legislative personnel "floors" of 900,000 or 930,000 men for the Army and 200,000 for the Marine Corps.

Thus failure to extend the draft by the very men who were advocating increases in our armed strength would be politically inconsistent.

NEED CALLED APPARENT

A third and persuading factor was the flat assertion of the administration, the Defense Department and both the majority and minority leaders of Congress that the draft was essential to maintain our armed strength, that the services could not be maintained even at their present strength of 2,500,000 without the draft.

These factors, plus a public resignation and congressional lack of interest in the issue, explain the cursory course of the draft law through this session of Congress.

Nevertheless, the terse and inadequate hearings and debate were unfortunate. For the present, personnel procurement policies of the armed services are a hodgepodge, and a new look is undoubtedly needed.

## Mutual Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 13, the President of the United States sent to the Congress his message on mutual security, in which he stated that—

We cannot safely confine Government programs to our own domestic progress and our own military power. We could be the wealthiest and the most mighty Nation and still lose the battle of the world if we do not help our world neighbors protect their freedom and advance their social and economic progress. It is not the goal of the American people that the United States should be the richest Nation in the graveyard of history.

This eloquent statement by the President, made in his request for mutual security authorizations for fiscal 1960, has expressed for all of us the real issue before the Congress and the country in the annual mutual security program requests.

In an editorial on March 19, the New York Times points out that the $3,930 million is the absolute minimum to meet absolute requirements, and that the only alternative is the abandonment of the rest of the world and a retreat into a "Fortress America."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR MUTUAL DEFENSE

At a critical moment in history the Eisenhower administration is forced again to engage in an annual batle before Congress to save from suicidal destruction an essential and integral part of our own defense structure and that of the free world. This part is represented by the mutual security program, mislabeled "Foreign Aid."

In this effort President Eisenhower has assumed personal command. He has the support of Acting Secretary of State Herter, Defense Secretary McElroy, General Twining, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a distinguished panel of military and civilian experts in this field.

All these experts emphasize that the $3,930 million requested for this program for the coming fiscal year is an absolute minimum to meet absolute necessities. Indeed, the panel headed by William H. Draper, Jr., calls for an increase of $400 million in immediate military aid to our allies to help modernize NATO defenses and urges putting the whole program on a continuous long-term basis for greater effectiveness and greater economy.

Like the President, the panel also makes it plain that the Communist challenge is both continuing and increasing and that this leaves us with only two alternatives. One is to seek safety and peace in mutual and collective security in company with our allies and friends, who can serve that cause only if they are both strong and stable and with whom we must therefore share that part of the common defense burden which they are unable to bear. The other alternative is to abandon the rest of the world and retreat into a "Fortress America."

Obviously, the first alternative is the one we must embrace. It is not only in keeping with all our interests and ideals; it is also by far the most effective and even economical. As Acting Secretary Herter points out, the mutual security program has bought us no less than $141 billion worth of additional security provided by allied forces for an investment of $22 billion, which, as the Draper panel emphasizes, runs at the annual rate of less than 1 percent of our gross national product and 5 percent of our budget.

Let those who harp on the inevitable errors in detail, minor compared with greater errors in our own Defense Establishment, suggest a better way to peace and security before they ditch a program that has already proved its worth in the preservation of the free world and peace.

## Tabulation of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, one out of every four registered voters in the Fourth Congressional District of California was invited to respond to my annual questionnaire on some of the important problems confronting our Nation. To date over 15 percent have replied, including a considerable number of detailed comments indicating careful thought.

The following tabulation may be of interest to my colleagues:

1. The President's budget for the year beginning next July 1 calls for expenditures of $77 billion and an estimated income of $77.1 billion. Additional expenditures totaling several billions are being proposed by some Members of Congress. How would you vote on the following:

| | Amount | Percent | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | No opinion |
| Aids to housing | $1,000,000,000 | 47 | 50 | 3 |
| Added payments under Soil Bank | 700,000,000 | 12 | 81 | 7 |
| Increased payment to civil service retirement fund | 600,000,000 | 33 | 62 | 5 |
| Aid for school construction | 480,000,000 | 69 | 29 | 2 |
| Postal subsidy (above amount proposed in 1960 budget) | 350,000,000 | 21 | 74 | 5 |
| Payments to highway-building fund | 250,000,000 | 51 | 44 | 5 |
| Aid to minerals industry | 160,000,000 | 21 | 73 | 6 |
| Financing community facilities | 150,000,000 | 27 | 68 | 5 |
| Grants for airports | 110,000,000 | 41 | 55 | 4 |
| Aid to depressed areas | 100,000,000 | 66 | 30 | 4 |

2. Of those who answered "yes" to one or more of the items listed above (88 percent), payment for the project(s) by an increase in taxes was favored by 62 percent. Adding to the national debt was recommended by 29 percent, while 9 percent expressed no opinion.

| | Percent | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | No opinion |
| 3. Do you favor a substantial reduction in the 27.5 percent oil and gas depletion allowance permissible under current tax laws? | 45 | 37 | 18 |
| 4. Do you favor a freer flow of political leaders, students, farmers, businessmen, etc., between the United States and the Soviet Union? | 68 | 29 | 3 |
| 5. Do you favor a trial test for pay TV? | 34 | 62 | 4 |
| 6. Do you favor increasing the Federal gas tax from 3 to 4½ cents per gallon to maintain pay as you go in building Federal-aid highways? | 62 | 36 | 2 |
| 7. Do you favor legislation providing that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas the following year? | 45 | 52 | 3 |
| 8. The prices of 12 farm commodities (wheat, corn, cotton, etc.) are supported by Federal law at prescribed minimum levels. In general, do you approve of the support program? | 20 | 78 | 2 |
| 9. Would you favor a national fair trade law permitting establishment of a minimum price on trademarked or brand-named merchandise? | 26 | 71 | 3 |
| 10. Do you favor Federal legislation raising the minimum wage from the current $1 an hour? | 60 | 37 | 3 |

## Justice Jesse W. Carter, California's Outstanding Jurist, Lawyer, and Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. CLAIR ENGLE**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in these days of increasing social uniformity and organized mass advocacy, the rugged individualist is a rare creature. California last week lost a distinguished rugged individualist in the death of State Supreme Court Justice Jesse W. Carter, whose brilliant career as a legislator and a jurist is worthy of note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Justice Carter believed, as I do, that a free society is founded upon individual liberties. He worked all his life to preserve individual rights and to oppose mass regimentation. He was, in effect, California's own "great dissenter," as our supreme court champion of the Brandeis philosophy, that is, tolerance for all shades of opinion, persecution for none.

Justice Carter took pride in his record of dissent. He once wrote, "The dissenting opinion is a forecast of things to come." I am sure that will be true of many of his courageous minority stands for the common citizen. The justice leaves a distinguished son, Federal District Judge Oliver J. Carter, of San Francisco, who, I am glad to say, is ably carrying forward on the bench his father's great liberal record.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Justice Carter, from the Redding Record-Searchlight of March 17, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARTER CHAMPIONED INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Jesse W. Carter, one of Trinity County's most distinguished natives and one of Redding's most noted public figures, was also one of California's most distinguished men.

In the 70 years from his birth in Carrville, Trinity County, until his death Sunday from pneumonia and a blood clot, he had packed enough careers and enough battles for several lifetimes.

As an attorney, as a State senator, and as an associate justice of the State supreme court, he was known as a rugged, independent champion of individual rights.

The one achievement that gave him the most pride was his victory, on behalf of Fall River Valley ranchers, in a water rights suit against the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. some 30 years ago.

On the State supreme court he became known as a frequent and vigorous dissenter. His dissents usually resulted from his concern for individual rights. He was sometimes responsible, too, for court majority decisions in favor of individual rights. One of the most famous was the Cahan case, in which the conviction of a bookmaker was reversed beacuse the police had obtained evidence illegally by planting a microphone in Cahan's home.

Carter opposed the loyalty oath for State employees as being unconstitutional, and he contended that taking blood samples from an unconscious man in a drunken driving case was unlawful search and seizure.

Jesse Carter was one of our great men. Like most great men who do things, he developed foes as well as friends. He wouldn't have had it otherwise. He wasn't afraid to speak up for what he felt was right, regardless of how unpopular his stand might be at the time.

As a result, all Californians are more secure in their individual rights.

## Equal Time on the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ALEXANDER WILEY**
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that there is a serious issue pending before the Federal Communications Commission relating to the reporting of political activities in news broadcasts.

The Commission is currently studying the application of the equal time provisions of the law.

Over the years, there have been serious problems relating to requirements by which radio and TV stations, giving time to one candidate in a political contest must also provide matching time for opponents.

The big question in the present situation is the degree to which this statute is applicable to news broadcasting.

We recall that the President indicated recently that he felt a New Look should be taken into the equal time provisions of the statutes.

Recognizing that there is indeed a need for clarification of the situation, I respectfully urge, also, that our colleagues on the Interstate Commerce Committee closely reexamine the law.

I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate two editorials on this issue: First, an editorial from the March 20 edition of the Christian Science Moni-

tor, entitled "Equal Time Abuses," and, second, an editorial from the New York Times of March 22 entitled "Equal Time on the Air."

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 20, 1959]

EQUAL TIME ABUSES

President Eisenhower has set Justice Department wheels in motion to obtain a revision of the equal time provisions of the Federal Communications Act. This requires radio or TV stations which give time to one candidate in a political contest to provide matching time for opponents.

The provision was intended to prevent use of national resources (wavelengths) to give any political party or candidate an advantage. It has been most often applied to speeches. But now the rule has been run into the ground. As Mr. Eisenhower says, it has reached the ridiculous stage.

He was stirred to action by a ruling of the Federal Communications Commission in a Chicago case. News pictures of the mayor of the city taken when he welcomed the President of Argentine and opened a March of Dimes drive were shown during a primary campaign in which he sought reelection. A third-party candidate claimed equal time. The FCC ruled that under the law he should have had it. The Columbia Broadcasting System, through the vigorous spokesmanship of Dr. Frank Stanton, has made an issue of the case, demanding a more reasonable rule.

For years there have been complaints about this requirement. Often in campaigns there are many candidates, some making only a token race for a minority party. If equal time must be given each of them whenever an incumbent official appears on a news program, TV stations could easily decide to keep all candidates off their screens.

Certainly the rights of minority groups should be safeguarded. But why should not Congress give the FCC power to permit commonsense interpretation of the rule? Should there then be abuses, could we not rely on the public sense of fairness to require redress?

---

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1959]

EQUAL TIME ON THE AIR

It is a good thing that the recent Chicago case has brought out into the open the question of equal time on the air for opposing political parties or candidates. If it is applied rigidly its results can be just what the President called them, "ridiculous." This is a clear instance of a situation in which the letter of the law killeth.

Theoretically, a man or a party seeking public office should have no unusual advantage in air time that is denied to the opposition. This is all to the good and few persons would quarrel with this thesis. We believe in fair play. If a candidate employs air time for the direct purpose of getting votes his opponents should not suffer because commensurate time is denied. They, also, are entitled to try to get votes.

But when this presumptive principle of fair play is broadened out to the point that it covers the presentation of news that is news for its own sake, and not for the sake of a party or a man, and the result is a partisan demand for equal time, the end product can be really ridiculous. If an eminent Democrat appears for the Red Cross or greets a foreign visitor, presumably an equally eminent Republican should have the same opportunity to be seen and heard on the air. This is nonsense, on the face of it.

Many persons in public life are news because of the offices that they hold or because of traits in personality. To suggest that a counterweight air time should be set up in each case is absurd. The political affiliation of the individual may have nothing whatever to do with the element of news in his appearance.

What is obviously needed here is flexibility in the law and commonsense in its application.

---

## The U.S. Defense Policy—Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the transcript of the American Forum of the Air in which Congressmen JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, participated, which deals with a very vital subject, "The U.S. Defense Policy."

TRANSCRIPT OF AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR, WITH CONGRESSMAN JOHN W. MCCORMACK AND CONGRESSMAN LESLIE C. ARENDS, SUBJECT: THE U.S. DEFENSE POLICY—WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The ANNOUNCER. The American Forum of the Air, produced by the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. in association with Theodore Granik.

Tonights' guests are Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, who will discuss "The U.S. Defense Policy—Where Do We Go From Here?"

Our guests tonight are two of the most experienced and respected Members of the House of Representatives.

Congressman MCCORMACK is the Democratic majority leader and has been in Congress since 1928. He serves on the Government Operations and Space Committees.

Congressman ARENDS is the Republican minority whip in the House and has been a Member of Congress for 26 years. He serves on the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MCCORMACK and Mr. ARENDS are here tonight to discuss one of the major arguments of the 86th Congress, "Is our defense program adequate?"

Mr. SNYDER. Gentlemen, everyone in Washington seems to have taken sides on the running argument on our defense program.

Congressman ARENDS, as a veteran Republican Congressman, how do you feel about our defense program? Is it adequate?

Mr. ARENDS. I shall base my answer on my experience on the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives for many years.

During the session of Congress beginning in January, our committee set up hearings as to our military posture, our present-day defense forces.

We started by having the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the various chiefs of staff of the respective services who both on and off the record gave us a very factual and informative outlay of what our military posture is at the present time.

Frankly, let me say that I was reassured as to our capibilities in strength, that I feel today that we have the necessary military posture to carry out any assignment that may come to us for one reason or another.

In other words, putting it this way, I think we have the capabilities to combat any such thing as a brush war, or we have the retaliatory forces necessary to combat an all-out war.

In other words, putting it in one sentence, I think that we are ready and able to meet any contingency that might arise at this particular moment.

Mr. SNYDER. Congressman MCCORMACK, I won't ask you to agree with Congressman ARENDS. I will ask you on what points do you disagree with him

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am not in sharp disagreement with Congressman ARENDS as of today, but there are some sharp differentiating considerations that must be borne in mind.

When you ask is our defense adequate, it is a relative term. Adequate in relation to whom? Little Liberia? Oh, it is too adequate.

We don't have it too strong in relation to Britain because we have no fear from Britain or France or any other country. Our military strength could be sharply reduced if it was relative to countries like that, but national defense is relative to the Soviet Union as everyone knows and the question is is it adequate in connection with the Soviet Union?

Now, I am one of those Members of Congress, and one of those Americans, whether one agrees with me or not, it is my sound judgment, and it is consistent with my conscience that I, in the world of today, believe the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear.

That is military power and strength greater than they possess themselves.

If I am going to err, I would rather err on the side of strength than on the side of judgment.

Now, my friend from Illinois has said we are adequate for brush wars. Well, the President ruled that out in his press conference the other day. He said, "We are not going to have any ground affairs."

Brush war means essentially foot soldiers, the Army and the Air Force in cooperation with the Army. It is therefore the objective analysis of what the President has in mind is, we are not going to commit ourselves against large masses like the Soviet Union, either in Europe where they have unlimited reserve strength from a military angle, or in Asia, so far as the Soviet Union and Red China is concerned.

Mr. SNYDER. Are you questioning the President's military leadership?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am just commenting. You asked me the question, is our defense adequate? And therefore, it means that we are going into an all-out nuclear war from our angle. That is our policy now.

Now, the question is, are we adequate?

Well, it is known we are behind the Soviets so far as the intercontinental ballistic missile is concerned. I think with time we can catch up and go ahead of them, but as of today we are behind them.

Furthermore, we find our Army being reduced from 900,000 to 870,000. I honestly question that. If not from a military angle, from a psychological angle, at this particular time.

Mr. SNYDER. Congressman ARENDS, how do you feel about the reduction in forces?

Mr. ARENDS. Let me cover a couple of points my good friend, Congressman MCCORMACK, has made.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I have only started, of course, but go ahead.

Mr. ARENDS. I think what you say in part is true, but I do think there is still a possi-

bility of some brush wars like we have had in the past and which we are capable to cope with almost immediately.

I think the thing we overlook in this question of whether we have sufficient missiles of one kind or another—and it is true that we possibly are behind to a small certain degree in the ICBM's—the fact remains that in the matter of defense as far as the United States of America particularly is concerned, it is a question of balance.

In other words, a balanced offense necessary at a particular time.

Now, in looking at both the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, we have that type balance in this country today which is so vital, I think, to prosecuting anything that might happen in the way of aggression on the part of, let's say Russia, and therefore I think the need for being comparable in every respect to them is not as great as it might be in their instance, and so with this balance defense, I think we are able to cope with this situation and will be able to cope with it.

Looking at these charts and the information that has been given to us, as I say, both on and off the record, I can visualize the picture as the Joint Chiefs of Staff see it as to their capabilities and really I must repeat, I feel better about it than I did prior to the time we had these hearings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, of course, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not happy. You know that, because they have all made reservations, every one of them now. They agree to the budget figures with reservations.

In other words, they said, "We have to agree to it, but we are making the record as to what we ought to have."

They are not satisfied, my good friend from Illinois, and you know it. Let's give the public the truth now because the American people ought to have the information.

Mr. ARENDS. As many years as I have been on that committee, never yet once have I heard any one of the chiefs of any single service say they had enough. That is true. But the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, through the respective chiefs, has said that they could and would do the jos necessary under the provisions in this budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a different proposition. As good soldiers and good officers, they would say that if they are ordered to do a certain thing they will do the best they can. But they are not satisfied with it.

Now, the question was asked, Are you satisfied with the reduction in the Army from 900,000 to 870,000?—by our friend and I haven't heard you answer that yet.

Mr. ARENDS. I will be glad to answer just as quick as I can get the time.

I thought the President handled that very well the other day in his press conference, and I was pleased to have him state as he did, for the American people to learn and to understand what his position was; namely, that it is wholly impossible for us to fight a ground war in Russia.

In other words, we are not going to accept the type war that Russia might want us to fight.

Mr. McCORMACK. So you agree with my interpretation that the only thing left is a nuclear war.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me complete if you will. In other words, we are going to fight the kind of war necessary to win a war if it comes about.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in accord with that.

Mr. ARENDS. Let's finish the other question first.

The reduction of the Army from 900,000 to 870,000, a matter of 30,000 people; in the Marine Corps a matter of 20 of 25 thousand which the reduction may be, as the President said the other day, how could you particularly use those people at this moment? How are we going to get them over there? What could they do?

If we are not going to fight a ground war, and these people are mainly ground soldiers, then what good are they at this particular time?

Now, I am not averse to building up the kind of defense we need in this country; in fact all of us do. We are all loyal, patriotic American citizens and we want to appropriate every dollar we need in this country to do the job. It is a matter of difference of opinion. And the other angle of it is, I certainly have a wholesome respect for the President because of his background, his ability—I don't think he knows as much about politics maybe as I do, but I certainly do not know as much about the business of being a military man as he does with 40 years background and experience, and I think he is trying to do the kind of a job that needs to be done in view of the world conditions as we see them at this moment.

Mr. SNYDER. There are many Congressmen questioning the President's military judgment.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are more than Democratic Congressmen, too.

You rely on the President and, of course, I agree that the President is a great military man, but General Taylor is a great military man. He is the Chief of Staff of the Army. He says the Army ought to have 925,000 officers and men.

General McC. Pate is a great man, the commandant of the Marine Corps. He says the Marine Corps ought to have 200,000 officers and men.

Do you throw their views out the window, my friend?

Mr. ARENDS. Not entirely, no. And they sit around the table with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and they reach a final agreement as much as we do up here on the hill. Many times we pass pieces of legislation which we think are inadequate as far as the House is concerned; the Senate does likewise, and eventually around the table we reach a conclusion and a determination is made that although we do not get all we want yet this will suffice and do the job, and therefore we proceed and, as a rule, if it needs correction, later on it is corrected, the legislation.

So, I think what we are doing today in view of the whole world situation, in view of the situation we are in, as far as dollars and cents are concerned in this country, that we are on good sound ground and we are moving right ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, you are telling the American people that you are happy and you are pleased and you are contented, and they just simply sit back in their seats and say, "Don't worry, my friend, my fellow Americans, everything is all right."

Mr. ARENDS. I am not saying that at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose President Eisenhower is wrong, my friend. When you rely on the judgment of one man wholly. I understand a man making a decision, but we now know that every Chief of Staff doesn't agree with him.

Mr. ARENDS. Without being too political, let me say this, Mr. McCormack.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are no politics in this.

Mr. ARENDS. If we are going to question the President of the United States' capacity to make a determination on what is good militarily, certainly the individuals who may be candidates for the presidency or for public office, I would have the right to question them first.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, you are the only one who is throwing politics into this discussion at this time.

Mr. ARENDS. No, I don't mean to do that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said the President has to make a decision but there is the views of the others and you and I have got to consider all views.

Now, you talk about a balanced defense. There is a very nice, beautiful phrase. It is pretty much like when I read some speeches made to the effect that "overall we are military strong" but the word "overall" is a word most of us overlook and which interests me.

Our balanced strength can disappear overnight in connection with the Soviet Union if they perfect the intercontinental ballistic missile, its reentry and hitting the target—and they are ahead of us, you know that—before we do and if at the same time they have a defense against our intercontinental bombers, and you know they are trying to prepare one, then we are in the defenseless position and they won't let us catch up and we can never let ourselves get in that position.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say that your statement right now wholly disagrees with what has been said by some of the Members before the Armed Services Committee as to our capabilities in the way of defense.

That goes to our standpoint of position of strength throughout the whole wide world. Our Air Force, our alertness of the Air Force wherever it may be; our flattops, wherever they may be; our submarines, wherever they may be, and which we on the Armed Services Committee happen to know about at this particular time, this whole program of being ready to do what has to be done, let me say that what you have just said, Mr. McCORMACK, in my humble opinion, is a contrary opinion to what these people have told us before our committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well now, Mr. ARENDS, you are just telling the people that I am wrong.

Mr. ARENDS. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, you are just seriously mistaken because I have asked General White, I have asked everyone who appeared before the Science Committee of which I am a member. You were a member of the select committee last year, and we are a rather important committee—the Armed Services Committee, you know, hasn't got the omnipotence of brains in the Congress of the United States on military matters.

Mr. ARENDS. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Some of us have a little commonsense and the Committee on Science has pretty much the same availability for executive session and public session testimony as your committee, and I have asked everyone the question, assuming—they admit that the Soviets are ahead today in intercontinental ballistic missiles.

They don't know how far they have gone in connection with defense against our bombers because our Central Intelligence hasn't ascertained that yet. They admit they are trying to perfect a defense.

Then I say, "Well, suppose they perfect their intercontinental ballistic missile before we do? And they perfect a defense against our bombers, and we lose our retaliatory power. Where are we?"

And they all admit we are in bad condition.

I think you will agree with me that we can never afford in America to lose a retaliatory power.

Mr. ARENDS. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. The ability to hit back.

Mr. ARENDS. That is right, and at this moment I don't think we are going to. I just don't think we are going to.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope so and I agree. I agree with you that we have the men, we have the men and women, we have the brains, we have the facility in America, the facilities. What we need is coordinated leadership. We are talking as of today.

Now, we just have to be practical. Now, you are talking about tomorrow and that is a different proposition.

Mr. SNYDER. Gentlemen, I don't think there is any question now where each of you stand on this defense argument. Let's move on.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I know that my friend is one of the most powerful national defense men in the Congress. I think he knows I am. And might I give this message to the American people as the Democratic leader: Our country is in very fortunate condition because whatever differences of opinion there might be between the Democrats and the Republicans, the difference is not on the side of weakness where we Democrats are advocating weaker defense.

We are advocating greater defense. So I think our country is in a very fortunate position because we Democrats agree with the President, only we say a little more, plus.

Mr. SNYDER. I think that is an excellent and reassuring point.

Mr. ARENDS. I think I should interject here that that goes for the Republicans as well as for the Democrats because we are all motivated by the same thing necessarily: "Be prepared to do what has to be done. Pray God nothing happens."

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thoroughly subscribe to that.

Mr. SNYDER. It is nice that you agree with each other. Let's move on to a topic upon which I am sure you will disagree again. Labor legislation.

Are you in favor, Congressman MCCORMACK, of the Kennedy-Irvin labor bill and do you think it will get through the House this session?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why, yes. Of course, there are two bills there and they are separated. It is a question of whether there should be one bill or two bills. That is really the basic question.

I think the other questions involved could be quickly ironed out by reasonable Members in both branches and I think that the protection of the welfare funds is of such paramount importance that it might be wise to put through two bills, to put that one through first, because if you combine them all together, you are going to get into a lot of difficulties and it might end up with road blocks being thrown in the way to the point where nothing might come through. So I think Senator KENNEDY's approach to two bill is probably the best.

Mr. SNYDER. How do you feel about the Kennedy-Irvin bill, Congressman ARENDS.

Mr. ARENDS. It is always difficult to determine what the Senate may do. Last year the Senate passed the Kennedy bill by 88 to 1 and it came to the House and nothing was done.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, yes; something was done. We had a vote.

Mr. ARENDS. We failed to pass it under suspension.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I voted for suspension.

Mr. ARENDS. And it voted against it because it did not incorporate all the things I felt was necessary to do the kind of job the American people expected to be done. Due to the revelations before the McClellan Committee, but over in the Senate this time I think there is some reason to believe as we read the press that they are trying to do a better job this time in perfecting the bill and incorporating therein certain amendments which are necessary if, I repeat, a good comprehensive bill is written.

Over in the House at this time I wouldn't even want to predict what our Labor Committee in the House is going to do and what will be in the bill if they report a bill, so I am just going to have to bide time on that and see what, I hope, if action is taken, if final conclusive action is taken in the Congress, that we write the kind of bill that will protect not only the workingman himself as to his rights, but also the public and just make a good fair bill out of it.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I think that is as fair a statement as any openminded member could subscribe to.

Mr. SNYDER. Gentlemen, there is another issue that is concerning the American people quite a bit these days. It doesn't involve legislation. It is this whole matter of nepotism.

There has been so much publicity lately about this subject. What message would you have for the American people in view of all these revelations that have come out?

Mr. MCCORMACK. How much time is left on this?

Mr. SNYDER. One minute.

Mr. MCCORMACK. It would take more than a minute to adequately answer that. I have no hesitancy in saying that I think it is perfectly all right for a publisher of a newspaper to hire his son or daughter or the editor of a newspaper to hire his son or daughter.

If I heard they refused to hire them because they are a son or daughter, I would say they are no good. I think it is all right for the president or vice president of a corporation to hire a son or daughter, and I think it is all right for a Member of Congress to hire a son or daughter.

Mr. SNYDER. Congressman ARENDS, what do you have to say on that?

Mr. ARENDS. I somewhat agree with Congressman MCCORMACK.

If these people are hired by their parents to work in their office and they work there, well then, that is their business.

The ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK and Congressman LES ARENDS for being our guests today on the American Forum of the Air.

---

## Underinvestment in People Called Free World's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that over the years the free world's economic system, particularly ours in the United States, has done an outstanding job of providing the material things of life for our people.

The underlying strength of any society, of course, includes not only the material things, but the ideals upon which our society is established.

The free West has within its arsenal the most potent weapon available to appeal to the minds of men—that is, freedom itself.

Today, when the Communist system is challenging the free world on a variety of fronts, including the ideological, social, economic, and cultural, as well as the military, there is a real need to reemphasize the idealistic as well as to realistically strengthen the human foundation of our system.

Inherent in this challenge, of course, is the need to assure that all our people are sharing proportionately in the benefits of our free society. This means, among other things, employment—a chance for a worker to provide for himself and his family the good things of life.

Unfortunately, in the United States, though it has attained a substantial degree of recovery from its economic setback, there are still about 4.7 million people out of work. This, of course, is a serious problem, which arouses deep concern in the Congress as well as in the Nation as a whole.

The March 20 edition of the Christian Science Monitor carried a thoughtful article by A. E. Grauer, president, British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd., entitled "Underinvestment in People Called Free World's Problem." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDERINVESTMENT IN PEOPLE CALLED FREE WORLD'S PROBLEM—GRAUER SEES FULL EMPLOYMENT BULWARK

(By A. E. Grauer, president, British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd.)

VANCOUVER.—The major aim of businessmen "should be to so improve the effectiveness of our system that it will yield everincreasing opportunities for more and more of our people." This is a remark of Paul J. Hoffman, Managing Director of the United Nations Special Fund. He went on to say that we would have to take a hard look at our system to find out what has made it strong and wherein lie its weaknesses.

Since Canadians and Americans are forward-looking people, emphasis has tended to be placed on our strength. We have been reluctant to examine, let alone admit, our weakness.

DISPROPORTION SIGHTED

But pressure of events, and especially the fact of a strong, rival system—authoritarian communism—working determinedly and with considerable skill to undermine our system, forces us to shore up our internal defenses; and our most durable defense, surely, is a community with strong feelings of unity and loyalty to its free institutions.

The pace and complexity of present-day affairs, and the punitive rivalry of the other system, have brought doubts and confusions in many minds which could lead to serious divisions and cross-purposes in our society. We must reduce these difficulties.

Business, traditionally, has confined itself to producing the things by which we live. In our part of the world it has fulfilled this narrower role with remarkable success. But we have not done so well in dealing with other real needs of people as individuals. We have had a woeful tendency to overinvest in things and underinvest in people, and this has caused a serious disproportion in our society which we are far from correcting.

FULL EMPLOYMENT KEY?

If the main activity of people is strengthened and made more satisfying in this way, it is bound to support more firmly other institutions and expressions of life in free societies. We know this is so from work already done on these lines in busines life, but this work must be enlarged. The future of freedom rests with individuals and its chances are improved when the healthy aspirations of ordinary people are reasonably satisfied.

Another obvious bulwark of freedom where the influence of business is all important is full employment. Our employees, collectively, are our customers. The vast complex of goods and services which we produce need millions of customers with enough money to buy the things they need and want.

The value of education is also beginning to be more widely recognized by business. Industry in this scientific age requires better educated personnel in all phases of its operations—a requirement which will grow as science advances and technology becomes more an integral part of things.

We are realizing as never before that the protection of freedom requires a widespread

appreciation of its qualities and a consequent willingness to protect and extend it. This latter reason alone is sufficient for insistence on first-rate educational institutions and processes.

SURVIVAL SAFEGUARD

This brings us to an even wider responsibility, to which business in countries such as ours must apply itself. We must work to extend the material and other benefits of our system to peoples of underdeveloped countries, so that freedom's boundaries may be firmly and surely enlarged in the modern world. Two-thirds of the world's people are looking for such help and guidance.

Let us remember that the free world is a small segment—albeit a vital one—of the whole human race. Extending our outposts is no longer a matter of altruism alone. It is a necessary safeguard for our survival.

We do not yet properly appreciate the power of our rivals, the intensively organized Communist movement in this field. What we have to offer, while it may be infinitely superior, in many ways, is much harder to promote and establish in lands where people are harried by hunger and poverty and have never known real freedom. The rival system offers these people relief from ordinary anxieties, through at the cost of freedom.

If we are to hold our own in this grim competition, we must give far deeper thought and attention to framing effective policies that will advance freedom's case.

Therefore, a main goal of business in the future must be to bring about more stability in our own countries, put them on a more vigorous and able footing to compete with the rival system, and attempt to spread benefits of our way of life as widely as possible among less favored people.

John Donne's classic line—"no man is an islande unto himself"—therefore takes on fuller meaning in our troubled times.

---

## An Analysis of the Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith an address, given last week by the junior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, at the annual National Farmers Union convention, held at Springfield, Ill.

Senator SYMINGTON, with a business background and with an illustrious record as a devoted public servant who rendered an outstanding service in many branches of the executive department of our Government, before being elected to the U.S. Senate, has within a very brief period become one of the recognized exponents of a sound agricultural program. He has a faculty of analyzing the problem, and then being capable of expressing this analysis in simple terms that can be understood even by those who have little or no knowledge of what is admittedly one of the more pressing problems of this era.

Mr. Speaker, it is for this reason that I have requested permission for the printing of this speech, which I hope all of the Members of Congress will read. It does point up the problem; it explains why we are in the position we now find ourselves, but more important it suggests some of the things that can be done to alleviate the situation.

It gives hope, as indicated in the very title of his address, which I am informed was enthusiastically received by these in attendance at the Springfield convention.

AN EFFECTIVE FARM PROGRAM POSSIBLE

It is a privilege to be with you at your annual convention—to see farmers here from all over the country, working together.

You have an ambitious schedule ahead for the next 4 days. I know you will be working hard to prepare a program which will meet the common needs of the farmers of America.

I wish I could stay with you all week, to hear your advice on what can be done in Congress to write a constructive program.

We of the Senate Agriculture Committee know that the members of the Farmers Union are dedicated to the service of farm families, first, last and always.

Your president, Jim Patton, and I have been friends for many years.

We served together in the National Security Resources Board. I found out then what we all know, that Jim is an experienced analyst on the farmers' problem, the finest type of leader American farmers could have.

I am also delighted to see your general counsel, my old colleague, Charlie Brannan.

Charlie and I used to work together for a great dirt farmer, a man people respect primarily because he respects people, the No. 1 citizen of my State, Harry S. Truman.

We of the Agriculture Committee also think a great deal of your Washington representative, John Baker.

John gets just about the most done, with the least words of anybody in Washington.

Before coming into Government most of my experience was in business. But my brother and I raised cattle for many years.

During that time I learned that, fundamentally, farming is a business too, involving such matters as inventory, and assets and liabilities, and of course profit and loss.

My State of Missouri is one of the largest farm States in the Nation.

Agriculture is our largest single industry—in fact, our only billion dollar industry.

One-fourth of the people of Missouri live or work on the farm.

When I came to the Senate, my mail proved that no people in our State have greater troubles than the farmers.

So it seemed right for me to work to get on the Agriculture Committee. I have been there now, for some years, watching the incredible approach of this administration toward the problems of the family size farm; and doing my best to correct them.

I try to look at this problem as a businessman; therefore from the standpoint of what we would call good business practice under sound accounting principles.

If any businessman tried to run his plant or office the way the Department of Agriculture has been run in recent years, he would promptly go broke.

Secretary Benson has spent nearly $30 billion of the taxpayers' money on a farm program that hasn't worked.

And they said the Brannan plan was expensive.

Since the Department of Agriculture was created in 1889, there have been 14 Secretaries of Agriculture plus Secretary Benson.

If Mr. Benson continues to operate at the present rate, by the end of the next fiscal year he will have spent more money than all his 14 predecessors combined.

Let some of the figures, his own figures, speak for themselves.

This Administration has raised the cost of administering the price support program from $34 million in 1952, to $364 million in 1958 an increase of 954 percent.

Twenty-two thousand employees have been added to the payroll.

What worries me more than the past, however, is the growing realization that the people now running the Department of Agriculture simply do not know where they are going.

As example, consider the current problem of Government farm inventory.

Any businessman knows that excess inventory can be his Achilles heel.

If a concern is to be successful, inventories have to be moved.

In 1952, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned some $1 billion of farm commodities.

Today, six years later, it owns over $5 billion.

But that is far from the whole story.

According to the President's budget message, by June, 1960, the total CCC investment—inventory and loans—will be over $10 billion.

And let me make this prediction today. Based on the current Government corn support policy, price supports on corn with no controls of any kind whatever—that inventory estimate of the President's is going to turn out to be plenty conservative.

A few weeks ago, when Mr. Benson came before our committee to ask for authorization for more billions, we asked him questions any banker would ask any businessman who requested a loan.

I asked him whether he had any definite plans to move this gigantic inventory out of Government warehouses.

The Secretary said he did not.

I asked him how much inventory he could move this year.

He said he did not know.

I asked him how long it would take to move it.

He said he didn't know that either.

On that basis, if it were your money, would you loan him any more?

But it is your money, and my money, and the money of millions of other Americans.

Maybe the men in charge of our farm policies are not good businessmen but they are very good advertising men.

They plant their propaganda into city newspapers and weekly magazines favorable to their cause. In this and other ways they have been highly successful in influencing city folks who do not have access to the facts.

If these people had been half as successful helping farmers as they have been spreading fairly tales about farmers, we would have a far better farm program today.

One of the stories these bureaucrats try to sell is that the farm problem is the result of the inefficiency of our farmers.

That is just not true.

American farmers are the most efficient and productive farmers in the world.

As illustration, here are a few figures.

Last year, average per acre yields on nearly every major commodity set new records.

We now produce the same amount of food and fiber on 57 acres that in 1940 we produced on 100 acres.

This Nation produces more pounds of meat, with less feed, than ever before.

Since 1944, milk production per cow has increased 39 percent.

And who have reaped the benefits of this great productivity?

Primarily the American consumers, the best-fed and best-clothed people on the face of the earth.

Another misconception, currently cultivated by some, concerns how hard farmers work.

I don't think the average city family has any real idea about the expense, the work, the risk that farmers put into the loaf of bread, or the thick steak, or the quart of

milk which shows up so miraculously on the kitchen table.

It takes a lot more than pushing buttons on some automated farm gadget.

It takes hard work, 12, 14, sometimes 16 hours a day.

How many people know how it feels to lose a prize calf, or suffer prolonged drought, or see a whole year's investment destroyed by one June hailstorm, or one late-season frost?

And I am sure few of those city people have any idea what it is like, in terms of trial, tribulation, and heartbreak, to live through 6 years of Ezra Taft Benson.

There is a third misconception which stands in the way of public acceptance of a good farm program. It is that farmers occupy a privileged position in the Federal Government.

That is not true.

They are supported some, but so is every other segment of our economy.

And the supports are not nearly as much as the Department of Agriculture continues to assert and imply.

A study of the budget of this Department was made at the request of your and my good friend, Senator MILT YOUNG, of North Dakota.

This study showed that of the total expenditures of the Department in the fiscal year 1958, considerably less than half went primarily for the benefit of farmers.

The rest—some $2.8 billion—went for programs chargeable to everybody: overseas food programs, defense, milk for school and school lunches, research, meat inspection, forest management, and the like.

Reduced to its actual size then—$2 billion—how does the farm support program compare with supports or subsidies to other parts of our economy?

Since the end of World War II, this Government has allowed tax writeoffs and other tax privileges to mining and manufacturing industries which total $43 billion.

Many billions more have been earned by industry as the result of tariffs imposed against low-cost goods anxious to come in here from foreign lands.

In the last 10 years, this administration has given over $6 billion in subsidies to magazines and newspapers.

We have a minimum wage law.

We have a social security program.

We have unemployment compensation.

We have insured savings.

We have many other Government programs which assist and support other groups in our economy.

We know we can afford these other programs.

Surely therefore we can also afford a program which will give a fair return to those who produce our most important commodity—food.

The trouble with fairy tales is that, if they are retold often enough, people soon get to believe them.

And that is true about the fairy tale that the way to lower farm production is to reduce farm prices.

In fact, that tale has been the basic premise behind the farm programs of the past 6 years.

The programs have failed because this premise is 100 percent false, and here is the reason why.

We all know there are fixed costs connected with farming: payments on notes and mortgages, installment payments on equipment, out of pocket costs for fertilizer, seed, fuel, and such.

In recent years, these costs have been steadily going up.

To meet these fixed and out-of-pocket expenses, and at the same time take care of family expenses, a farmer must have a minimum income.

That income, of course, is derived from price times volume minus costs.

If your price goes down at the same time your costs go up—and that has been the case in recent years—you have only two choices: Increase your volume, or go broke.

In the past 6 years, nearly 4 million farm people have been forced off our farms.

But the rest of our farmers have taken the other course. You have taken advantage of every new technique of farming to vastly increase your production.

Let's look at the record.

During the past 6 years, farm prices have averaged 15 percent below the 1952 level.

But farm production has gone up in each of these 6 years; and is now 15 percent greater than in 1952.

So you can see that efforts to reduce production by reducing prices have failed completely.

The men behind this policy did not appreciate the strength and the determination of the ordinary American farmer to stay in business.

The present program has been bad for the farmer, bad for the consumer, and bad for the Government, because it has caused lower farm prices, higher food prices, and costly surpluses.

It is time this administration got back to sound economic principles.

Only then will we be able to get out of the mess we are in.

A basic principle of farm economics is that a relatively small increase in production and marketing causes a much larger drop in farm prices.

Some of the top farm economists, including Professor Cochrane, who will speak here later this week, tell us that a 1 percent increase in the total marketing of farm products results in a heavy drop in the farmer's price.

This concept has been the backbone of nearly every farm program that has ever worked.

Despite all the sweet talk about freeing the farmer to produce unfettered by controls, experience has proven the following:

For most farm products, price supports, without effective production or marketing controls, just do not make sense.

And we taxpayers now have this $8 billion inventory to prove it.

A good specific example is the corn program.

In 1956 the Department of Agriculture told farmers that in order to get the $1.50 support price, they would have to comply with acreage controls.

Later on they turned around and gave those who did not comply $1.25.

This was the beginning of the end for the corn program.

In 1957, compliers were given $1.50, noncompliers $1.10.

In 1958, compliers got $1.36 a bushel, noncompliers $1.06.

Is it any wonder that last year only 12 percent of our corn was produced under acreage allotment?

Last November 25, there was a corn referendum. To the farmers who had not been complying, the Agriculture Department said:

"Vote for our program and we will raise your price supports at least 6 cents a bushel.

"Vote against us and you won't get any support at all."

To the producers who had complied, the Department said: "If you don't vote for our program, we will cut your acreage and cut your price."

Secretary Benson's program carried, and he reported with pride that he had won a great vote of confidence.

Now Mr. Benson has his corn program.

But what is he going to do with it? If weather conditions are normal this year, he will end up with at least a billion dollars more corn to add to his already gigantic inventory.

My friends, when the American people come out of this farm binge, they are going to have a hangover the likes of which have not been seen.

This surplus hangover is going to be with us long after the present farm policies are buried.

It is going to prove a grave handicap to any new program, no matter how sound and effective.

That is why we should make the control and liquidation of this inventory our first order of business.

To do this, we first need an overall program designed to bring farm production more nearly in line with our needs.

We must begin to use the sound economic principles that have been ignored in recent years.

There are 5 million farms producing over 200 different commodities. Therefore no single, simple program will work.

For some commodities, the direct payment plan offers many advantages.

For other commodities, price supports through nonrecourse loans may still be the best answer.

The continued success in certain commodities of marketing orders, and marketing or bargaining co-ops, provides a base from which a similar approach might be extended to many other commodities.

Used properly and where best adapted, each of these can contribute to the ultimate objective.

What is that objective?

A situation in which farmers are able to compete favorably with the other, more closely organized segments of the economy—and thereby earn a return on their investment, labor and land comparable with the returns in other areas.

Any sound program must also provide for the varied and growing credit needs of farm families.

It must stress improved quality of product and more efficient, effective marketing.

It must deal with the special problems of the chronic underemployed, low income farm families.

These families need more than just the talk, plans, meetings and moral support now being provided under the Department's rural development program.

If time permitted, we could go into many other problem areas; such as the need for improved conservation of our natural resources, greater use of democratically elected county committees.

You members of the Farmers Union are familiar with these areas.

In nearly all cases, the legislative authority for a fair and workable farm program is now on the books.

But this does not guarantee that authority will be used.

The best farm program written into the law does not guarantee a prosperous agriculture.

You must have a sympathetic and understanding administration which believe in farmers and will fight for the farmer's interests.

But even with a sound, effective farm program we must face up to the problem of moving the current huge and growing inventory.

Here are some suggestions.

Part of it should be set aside as insurance in case this country was ever attacked with modern weapons.

I have introduced a bill to stockpile food, medical supplies and other basic items necessary for survival.

Some of the inventory can be well used to alleviate hunger and malnutrition in our own country.

I was in West Virginia just last week, where conditions are truly tragic.

One hundred thousand children in West Virginia have only one-third of the calories and proteins they need.

We can do far more than we are doing to move our surplus food into our own areas of economic distress.

And last, but not least, we can and should use the productive genius of American farmers to promote our goals in the world.

What do all of us want more than anything?

A just and lasting peace.

We want the kind of world in which we can farm and raise our families, free from the dreaded fear of nuclear war.

We can have that kind of world if we use our national strength in the most effective manner.

This Nation is strong in many things—not only in faith, but also in food.

This food can be used to strengthen our ties with the underdeveloped countries of the world.

It has been suggested that the free nations set up a world food bank, in which storable food could be deposited, withdrawn, or loaned, in order to meet emergencies of member nations.

As long as we are going to be in the righteous business of strengthening countries to resist communism, why not do much of it with food, of which we have plenty, instead of dollars, with which we are having increasing troubles?

This is not only good foreign policy, it is the humane and right thing to do.

It is a sin to waste food when people are hungry.

But it is worse than a sin when this food could have been used to help build a peaceful world.

In closing, let me state my confidence that the farmers of America, with the cooperation of their Government, will develop an effective farm program at a greatly reduced cost to the American taxpayer.

The work you are doing here this week will contribute to that goal, to a strong America, and to a peaceful world.

## Another Strauss Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Another Strauss Controversy," which was published in the Toledo Blade of March 1, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANOTHER STRAUSS CONTROVERSY

The Senate very rarely refuses to confirm men the President appoints to positions in his Cabinet. It is a wise policy because the Chief Executive ought to be able to pick his key assistants without the sort of legislative interference which, under conditions of extreme partisanship, could degenerate in mere harassment.

Nonetheless, President Eisenhower himself invited a departure from the customary, routine senatorial accommodation in the matter of appointees when he named as Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss, the controversial former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Strauss' confirmation is being held up at the instance of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who wants a close examination of the former's role in the Dixon-Yates affair, a near-scandal involving the granting and later cancellation of an AEC contract to private utilities interests.

It would not be surprising, however, if the senatorial hearings ranged over the whole manner in which Mr. Strauss performed as AEC Chairman. In that post, he displayed a positive genius for dissension. His mania for secrecy, his authoritarian manner, his bias, his lack of candor made it a positive relief to Congress, to the country, and, we daresay, to some of his colleagues, when he retired last June at the end of a 5-year term.

In shifting Mr. Strauss to another high post, the President did not shake off the Strauss liabilities. He is retaining in his official family a man who, whatever his other accomplishments, hasn't demonstrated a temperament particularly adapted to public office. In the end the Senate will no doubt confirm, as it usually does, but it could scarcely be expected to do so without some expression of displeasure from Democratic foes in that body at finding the arrogant "Admiral" Strauss still on the administration's quarterdeck.

## What of Tomorrow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What of Tomorrow?" by L. Nelson Bell, M.D., F.A.C.S.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT OF TOMORROW?

(By L. Nelson Bell, M.D., F.A.C.S.)

The writer was recently invited to sit in a group called together to hear a recording produced by some Army officers to whom had been assigned the task of ascertaining why so many American prisoners of war in Korea succumbed to brainwashing, and as a result collaborated with their captors.

It was a depressing experience. This report is the result of several years painstaking study; of personal interviews with hundreds of our men; a study of the backgrounds of these men; and also an appraisal of Communist reports and material which fell into the hands of our intelligence.

Several things stand out in these findings.

Thirty-two percent of those captured died under the rigors through which they passed. Of the remaining number 33 percent eventually collaborated with the enemy.

A study of the latter group revealed a number of startling facts; conditions which can well have a serious effect on the future of our Nation, either in peace or war. The majority of these men seemed to have lacked: (a) Spiritual and moral conviction; (b) understanding and appreciation of the American heritage; (c) discipline in the sense of a basic concept of right and wrong; (d) an understanding of communism and its propaganda methods.

Many of these men came from broken homes while few of them had church training or religious ties.

It is interesting that this report repeatedly laid stress on the value and importance of home and church training, repeatedly speaking of the Sunday school and church and urging a return to both the values of the past and the effective means of transmitting those values.

As we listened to this report (which lasted for an hour and a quarter), there gradually developed in our mind some steps which seem imperative for us to consider. These fall into the physical, political, and spiritual fields.

PHYSICAL

We hate to admit it but America has become a land of softness. Easy living, transportation by car, long hours before a TV or watching sporting events, all have conspired to take the hardness from our muscles while other things have taken the convictions from our souls.

During our visit to Korea last winter we visited one of the Turkish units near the DMZ (demilitarized zone) and heard tales of the hardness of these troops. In one POW camp in North Korea it was reported there were 1,657 American prisoners of war and 300 Turkish soldiers. Four hundred and fifty of the Americans died from the rigors through which they passed. Not one Turk died although subjected to the same privations.

Some months ago one of our leading news weeklies gave a report showing how greatly European youth excels American youth in health and stamina. There young people walk to school or travel for miles by bicycle. Few of them know the luxury (?) of sitting at home watching TV and eating ice cream. America may have the highest standard of living in the world but it is not necessarily the best standard for the developing of youth.

POLITICAL

By a strange change in emphasis in history, patriotism has become passe in some circles. Love for country, pride in her achievements and a patriotic thrill at the sight of the American flag is something which in past generations was encouraged and without which man became suspect. Much of this has changed and it is not good.

Little wonder that young men brought up without proper indoctrination in American tradition and national appreciation fell prey to the clever propaganda of the Communists. Confronted with allusions to "capitalistic dupes," "slaves of Wall Street," etc., etc., these young men did not know how to answer. Too few of them had learned that while the workers of Russia may own the factories it is the workers of America who own the things produced by the factories.

In fact, much in American education which leads to a proper appreciation of our land had been left out; and, along with superficial education there has gone in hand a lack of those disciplines which strengthen both body and mind.

SPIRITUAL

The most significant part of the report referred to at the beginning of this editorial had to do with the recognized need for spiritual and moral training.

Such training begins in the home and is augmented in the Sunday school and church. That the Army should turn to the Christian home and the church for help is a credit to those who have made this study and a tribute to our historic faith.

Shall we fail our young people and our Nation in this? Few there are who would wilfully neglect a responsibility but as we look at our land today, with its millions of broken homes, its emphasis on sex, its glorification of crime and brutality on TV and over the radio, its book stalls crowded with young people (and older ones too), avidly reading the lewd literature to be had for a price, what are we doing to effectively combat this degenerative process?

We would not for one moment minimize the much fine work which is being done already. But we must not be blind to the fact that the conditions faced by this hard-

boiled Army study are not yet being met head on. Nor do we believe they will be met until we begin as individual Christians, trying by God's help to make our own homes as Christ would have them be, then as local churches and communities take steps to make an impact for Christ and His Kingdom.

A HERCULEAN TASK

The future is not bright because that which we face is so difficult. A pattern has been set, a trend established and the pattern must be broken and the trend reversed.

Instead of physical softness we need hardness.

Instead of political ignorance we need a genuine patriotism for which men will die.

Instead of spiritual and moral decay we need good soldiers of Jesus Christ.

Can such a change take place? Yes, but only by the grace of God coupled with the determination of men and women who see the situation for what it is, the future for its inevitable debacle, and the Christ who can make all things new.

## Rips New Fair Trade Bill as Incurably Defective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the December 8, 1958, Drug Topics entitled "Rips New Fair Trade Bill as Incurably Defective," by Essell Thomas.

The article concerned refers to an earlier version of the Harris fair trade bill, but in the language of its author H.R. 1253 is substantially identical to H.R. 10527 of the last session. Accordingly, the comment is germane to the bill presently pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RIPS NEW FAIR TRADE BILL AS INCURABLY DEFECTIVE

(By Essell Thomas)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal fair trade bill (H.R. 10527) sponsored by the National Association of Retail Druggists is incurably defective and will fail if enacted and tested in court, according to John W. Anderson, president, American Fair Trade Council.

American Fair Trade Council, it is reliably reported here, has a fair-trade bill of its own drafted which it plans to push in the new Congress. In a telephone interview from Miami, Mr. Anderson refused to verify the report. However, he authorized the following comment:

"We (American Fair Trade Council) are advised by counsel that the Harris bill is incurably defective and will suffer the same fate as the Miller-Tydings Act and the McGuire Act if it is enacted and later meets a Supreme Court test."

TIED TO TRADEMARK LAWS

It is not known what approach the American Fair Trade Council bill follows but speculation ties it to the trademark laws. Capitol Hill sources say only that it differs considerably from the Harris bill which is an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act.

American Fair Trade Council this year announced its preference for an antimonopoly amendment to the Lanham Trademark Act, but no bill embodying this idea was introduced.

American Fair Trade Council's absence from the congressional fair-trade fight this year was noted by Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, who introduced H.R. 10527, in his recent speech before the NARD convention at Philadelphia.

He ended his talk by mentioning some opposition fair-trade promoters can expect to meet in 1959. Then, throwing an obvious barb American Fair Trade Council's way, he added:

"The American Fair Trade Council which has always promoted fair-trade legislation, curiously enough, is standing on the sidelines this time. They are neither supporting nor opposing the bill. The council didn't even testify during the hearings on the bill."

Entrance of a new fair-trade bill in the legislative arena might delay progress of any fair-trade legislation if it splits backers of the principle, observers here believe.

Even without this divisive element, supporters of the Harris bill don't expect final congressional action until 1960. An extended delay might be fatal, they say.

Fair-trade opponents, some of whom claimed this year they were not given sufficient time to be heard, are expected to be more vocal and active in 1959.

They will include affected Federal agencies, discount stores, various economists and lawyers, and organized labor. However, the bill's backers are still confident they can win.

Present plans call for House action first, then Senate action. The House hearings are not expected to start until late February or early March as it usually takes at least 2 months to reorganize each new Congress.

There is also speculation the House hearings may be broadened to include a Federal antiloss leader bill and the American Fair Trade Council bill, if introduced.

Meanwhile, it was learned that the special Fair Trade Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is not expected to hold further hearings this year.

Subcommittee Chairman ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, earlier said additional hearings might be scheduled after the November elections on S. 3850, the fair-trade bill introduced jointly by Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

## Placing of Statue of Charles M. Russell in Statuary Hall in Honor of the State of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many in the Senate join in congratulating our distinguished colleagues from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD] upon placing in Statuary Hall, as a representative and symbol of the State of Montana, a statue of the great and authentic cowboy artist, Charles M. Russell.

In my native city of Portland, Oreg., on March 20, 1959, the Oregonian paid tribute to the artistry and genius of Charles M. Russell. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Immortal West," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 20, 1959]

IMMORTAL WEST

Congress took a few minutes off this week to pay tribute to a great American, Charles Russell, the Montana cowboy whose paintings are unsurpassed as a record of the Old West.

Charlie Russell's work hangs in saloons as well as the most exclusive museums. He was no impressionist, no abstractionist. But like all great artists he painted his subjects as he saw them through an artist's eye. And his eye could see things hidden from the best of cameras—the tragedy of the American Indian, the loneliness and ruggedness of the life of the cattle range, the majesty of the common features of a western landscape, the poetry in the flowing lines of a fine animal.

This week his likeness in bronze was placed in the U.S. Capitol along with the statesmen, the soldiers, the writers, and others whose deeds are immortal, but none more immortal than the West which lives in Charlie Russell's brilliant canvases.

## Obligation of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include a very fine editorial, "Obligation of Defense" appearing in Washington's Archdiocesan newspaper, The Catholic Standard, and in its issue of March 22, 1959.

OBLIGATION OF DEFENSE

To answer the questions prompted by last week's editorial stating that unquestionably this Nation has a right to repel an aggression by striking a first blow, it is necessary to indicate the right of a nation to defend itself.

Actually, a nation has the same right and obligation to defend its citizens as the father has to defend the members of his family. He cannot deny that obligation. His only excuse for not fulfilling his obligation is his inability to do so. So with the nation. The Government is absolutely obliged to defend the rights of its citizens and those who are dependent upon it, even by treaty obligations. General Maxwell Taylor was unquestionably correct in stating unequivocally that this country has a solemn obligation as a result of its agreement to defend the citizens of Berlin. Obviously, it has the same obligation toward the rights of all citizens in the United States.

It is immoral for the country not to defend its citizens. The only excuse for not so doing is inability to defend them. Although the Government obviously felt that it could not vindicate the rights of its airmen shot down by Russia and by Yugoslavia, it was departing from a more cour-

ageous concept of its power in former generations. In past years there would have been a more resolute solidarity and demand for justice whose diminution we can only lament.

The increase in the menace to our rights and the increase in strength of the Reds does not diminish or change the obligation of this Government to defend its citizens. The menace to our rights only increases the obligation. The fainthearted who say that any attempt at defense will only destroy us, must remember that any war we ever entered entailed some risk. The great risk of defeat did not deter us from gaining our independence in 1776 nor should a less risk deter us from keeping it.

## George P. Monaghan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a dedicated and efficient public servant is George P. Monaghan, New York commissioner of harness racing. He is my friend and I am pleased to assemble for the RECORD numerous ecomiums published concerning him as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram, Feb. 14, 1959]

NEW YORK HARNESS DISCIPLINE FIRM UNDER MONAGHAN BIG STICK

(By Lou Miller)

The annual New York State Harness Racing Commission report, besides revealing new alltime highs for 1958 in total atendance, betting and revenue to the State, also shows that 153 suspensions were handed out by Commissioner George P. Monaghan, his judes and others making up the sport's so-called little FBI.

While temporary or permanent revocation of licenses did not reach the record category, it came within three of equaling the high, achieved in 1957.

Monaghan has steadfastly insisted:

"The welfare of the public must be paramount. Public confidence must be created where it never before existed prior to 1953. Investigative alertness will be kept on a high plane and there will be no 'kicking under the rug.' The facts always will be available to the public."

There were some critics among horsemen who insisted Monaghan's judges often were too hasty handing out sentences on such nebulous charges as "inconsistent driving."

Many other substantial personalities in harness racing, however, insisted that the numerous suspensions had a large, direct relationship to the tremendous rise in the popularity of the sport.

BOOM DUE TO MONAGHAN

Among the commission's foremost boosters were officials at Yonkers Raceway, which last year set a world's record for harness racing handle with a mark of $190,684,574 in 104 nights of activity.

"The big boom in harness racing in this State is due mainly to the leadership and administration of Commissioner Monaghan," exclaimed Marin Tananbaum, Yonkers president.

"The public has more confidence in the sport with Monaghan and his stewards and judges on the job. People feel they are getting a fairer shake than ever before because the commission men are on the lookout all over the scene.

"Tom Dewey did a very wise thing, when he was Governor, in appointing Monaghan his harness commissioner. He knew the kind of supervision George could give, having observed him as member of his own staff when he was district attorney and as police commissioner of New York City. Who could do a better job of patrolling the harness beat than a good old honest cop with a stout nightstick?" Tananbaum concluded.

SUSPENSIONS WERE FEW

Before Monaghan, suspensions for on- and off-track violations were few and far apart. In 1953, his first year in office, there were 75 revocations of varying duration.

During 1955 the number rose to 117, then 149, and in 1957 there were 156 suspensions. Last year's 153 may be the first signal of a turning point downward because of the constant vigilance of the "little FBI."

There were several particularly significant cases turned up by Monoghan's officials last season:

Driver Sid Moiseyev suspended for life for alleged attempt to fix a race at Monticello, with drivers James Curran and Joe Cardana assessed 30 days each for giving false information during the investigation.

Charles Wingate and Harry Burright suspended indefinitely for allegedly fixing another event at Monticello and wagering on horses other than their own. Wingate has since been indicted by the Sullivan County grand jury.

Revocation of licenses of owner Tom Loss and his groom, suspension of driver-trainer Howard Beissinger for balance of year when saliva test of Widower Creed showed traces of atrophine after race at Yongers Raceway. Beissinger was held responsible, although it was shown he probably was unaware of the doping.

Driver-Trainer Charles Amachie suspended 1 year for illegal possession of hypodermic syringe.

REVISED CONCEPT

Insisting that his most important duty was to keep harness racing clean, Monaghan has changed the general concept of the duties of a track steward. Almost all of his stewards are outstanding graduates of the New York Police Department.

These include Tom Burke, at Roosevelt and Yonkers, Jack Sheridan, at Monticello and Batavia and Rudy McLaughlin at Buffalo Raceway and Vernon Downs. All turned up vital evidence in one or more of last year's big cases. Although the stewards soon learn everything necessary about actual racing problems, Monaghan leaves this phase of the work to his stand judges, all sharp-eyed and expert horsemen.

Among crackerjacks on the Monaghan little FBI staff are Deputy Commissioner Mike Monz, Anthony Perone, chief of investigation, and Sam Rosenberg, accountant. The latter did much of the spade work on the old DeKoning case involving labor abuses at Roosevelt Raceway. All are prior members of the staffs of Dewey and District Attorney Frank Hogan.

From the time Monaghan took over in 1953 things began to get rough through tighter licensing rules for questionable characters who had been hanging on. Of 15,443 occupational license applications processed by a small staff of 30 to 40, as many as 206 were denied for various reasons, including criminal records.

Since 1953, through 1958, there have been 99,832 sets of fingerprints taken by the commission. Besides their use for harness racing, they have been sent to local, State, Federal, and international law enforcement offices. As a result, a working arrangement with these worldwide groups has been effected. Thus, notice of arrests of any of the harness licensees is promptly made to Monaghan's office.

DOPE TESTS DOUBLED

Another result is that New York now is used as a clearing house for information on applicants by all States and even ruling bodies in France, England, and Italy.

From 1953 to date, 515 license applications have been denied and 538 revoked or suspended from such widely varied activities as horse ownership, driving, training, grooming, mutuel clerking, working in restaurants, parking lots, etc.

From a total of 5,062 saliva and urine tests taken in 1953, Monaghan has multiplied the checks on possible doping so that 10,753 specimens were taken in 1958.

Many of Monaghan's procedures have been adopted by commissions throughout the country. Certainly they must have helped bolster public confidence in the sport. Otherwise, it would have been impossible for New York State to come up with such record highs last year as $465,384,651 in handle, 7,050,002 in attendance and total revenue to the State of $36,829,304.50.

[From the New York Mirror, Feb. 21, 1959]

A WASTEFUL IDEA

Harness racing is a big and growing business. In 1958, New York harness tracks returned in revenue to the State and to those cities and counties in which the sport is conducted a record $39,181,718, which was an increase of $4,507,113 over the previous year.

Now a couple of upstate legislators are proposing that harness racing be ruled not by a one-man commission, as at present, but by a three-man commission.

The idea, in our opinion, is cockeyed.

Of course it would create a lot more jobs for politicians to fill, but that is inconsistent with Governor Rockefeller's pledges of economy.

The fact is that the sport has thrived and been cleaned up under a one-man commission, headed by George P. Monaghan, former New York City police commissioner and one of Tom Dewey's aces in the old racket-busting days.

It is just as silly to water down commission authority among three members as it would be to have three men running a police department or fire department.

We believe Monaghan has done an outstanding job. But personalities are beside the point.

The principle should be one-man control and responsibility.

The legislature should ignore the proposed, wasteful net setup.

[From the Batavia Daily News, Feb. 24, 1959]

ONE-MAN RULE PROVED BEST

(By J. E. Brown)

When Charles A. Lindberg landed his Spirit of St. Louis plane in Paris a good many years ago, making it alone, someone hailed the accomplishment in an unusual way. He summed it up cleverly when he noted that the Lone Eagle could never have made it if he had a committee.

The story is recalled with the current efforts in Albany and beyond to replace a one-man accomplishment with a committee or commission of three and ousting an appointee in 1953 of former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. The official is George P. Monaghan, who has served efficiently in the role of commissioner for harness racing.

Mr. Monaghan replaced a three-member commission and then proceeded to do with the harness racing sport what Keneshaw Mountain Landis did for baseball. The records prove that and the public has responded with a new interest, new support, and new respect for the official.

Senator Frank Van Lare, of Rochester, has introduced a bill in Albany to put harness

racing under a three-member commission instead of the one-man rule of Commissioner Monaghan. The bill, which could be pushed by the U.S. Trotting Association, would bring back to harness racing the part-time rule and which most claim was far from satisfactory.

Mr. Monaghan, an ex-New York City police commissioner and a competent attorney, was named by Governor Dewey to clean out the undesirables and to protect with an iron fist if necessary the public's interest in harness racing.

Revenue to New York State has increased 62 percent in the 5 years Monaghan has ruled harness racing. Revenue to cities and counties up 19 percent in 1958 and has showed a 40-percent boost in the past 2 years.

Mr. Monaghan obviously has the respect and confidence of other State racing officials. He recently was elected president of the new National Association of Harness Racing Commissioners. Most States have patterned their administrative controls and operations of trotting after the highly successful system evolved by Mr. Monaghan.

Apparently, the public has confidence in the job being done.

With but 33 percent of the racing dates allotted throughout the entire United States, New York last year accounted for 55 percent of the national attendance and 65 percent of the national parimutuel handle.

There appears to be no reason except politics for a three-man commission. Besides these three appointments (and political affiliation is not specified in the Van Lare bill), the door would be open to political deals in naming racing officials. Racing, if it is to continue enjoying public confidence (the confidence that put $37 million in the State treasury last year) must have officials with knowledge and experience, not political assets.

Under the Van Lare bill, the commission chairman would get $15,000 a year and two other members would each receive $10,000. It is doubtful if men of stature, men with the necessary background, could be obtained to devote full time to a job at these prices.

It's peculiar, too, at a time when Governor Rockefeller's tax and budget problems would seem to indicate economy that a proposal for a lot of extra jobs would even be entertained.

There is a feeling that the USTA, a private Ohio corporation which dominated harness racing throughout America for many years, is behind the move to take from Mr. Monaghan's achievements. Mr. Monaghan figured that horsemen shouldn't race under officials which the horsemen's organization had selected. The legislature agreed and struck out a State law that required racing officials to be USTA members.

In harness racing, they still tell the story about an Illinois commissioner, one of three. When Mr. Monaghan adopted a slow down racing rule a few years ago, the Illinois official complained bitterly. He said a three-member commission would never allow such a stupid rule. If one member suggested it, the other two would surely be smart enough to knock it out, he boasted.

New York had copied its slow down rule from the Illinois Harness Racing Commission's rule book. The part time commissioner didn't know his own rules.

---

[From the New York Journal-American, Feb. 21, 1959]

GEORGE DID IT

(By Warren Pack)

Someone was saying the other day that New Yorkers would really be facing even tougher tax bills if it weren't for the $80 million the State picks up from betting on horse racing. It would break down to something like $20 more per taxpayer.

The fact that harness racing will probably produce more than the thoroughbreds this season is due in great part to a guy who has been the target of a nasty hate compaign, George Monaghan, the commissioner of harness racing. His lead in getting aid for the tracks to build new plants has resulted in the State's revenue jumping each year.

"When the tracks have finished paying off their new plants," Monaghan said, "the State will get another $8 to $10 million a year."

Monaghan's main accomplishment, however, has been the cleaning up of the sport, which was rocked by scandals 5 years ago.

"I'd say the biggest thing I've been able to do is to free the judges from the pressure of horsemen's groups like the U.S. Trotting Association and made them responsible to the State and to the public," the commissioner said.

HOW HE BECAME TROT CZAR

"Before we passed New York State racing rules, the judges were under pressure from the USTA, which licensed them. Here was a case of a private organization, with headquarters 700 miles from New York, employing powers which belonged to the State."

The USTA is in a lot of trouble with the Federal Government trying to force it out of business under the antitrust laws. Monaghan has suggested to the USTA that it comply with the Government's orders and revert to the role of a recordkeeping and information organization.

"We recently formed an association of harness racing commissioners, which may be the first step toward getting independent commissions in other States, where the USTA still rules," Monaghan added.

He recalled the way he became head of the trotting sport in the State.

"I was police commissioner here," Monaghan said, "when I got a message that Governor Dewey wanted to see me in Albany. Well, I had no idea what it was all about. I was working on a big investigation here and thought he wanted to talk to me about that.

"I got to Albany and the Governor said to me: 'How would you like to be commissioner of harness racing?'

"I didn't know what to say. It was such a surprise. But I had always thought that being a sports commissioner was a good job and told Mr. Dewey I'd have to think it over.

"He told me that I would have complete authority, that he felt that a one-man commissioner could do the job best, especially if the right legislation were passed. And he promised that the legislation would be passed.

BROKE IN COLD, GOT HOT QUICK

"'Why not go home and talk it over with your wife, Helen?' he said to me.

"The Governor's thoughts that scattered powers would not be conducive to supervising the sport, and my thoughts that one man should be responsible, were important to me. I felt that if one man couldn't do the job, then they should get rid of him."

Monaghan finally took the job and has provided New York bettors with the best racing in the country. Of course, in enforcing the rules strictly, he has run up against the horsemen, who have been trying to knock him out of office for some 4 years now. Two of his main opponents are Frank Wiswall, who runs Saratoga Raceway, and Octave Blake, formerly head of Vernon Downs and an important breeder of harness horses.

He has made mistakes as he has gone along, but they are minor compared to the valuable contributions he has made to this sport, an amazing record considering the fact he broke in "cold" and had to make an immediate cleanup under orders of the Moreland Act Commission.

His top credential is the fact that he now is being compared to Kenesaw Mountain Landis, who performed similar chores for baseball 38 years ago. And Landis, we recall, had a lot of enemies, too.

---

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Feb. 2, 1959]

IN THIS CORNER

(By George Beahon)

THE "GET MONAGHAN" MOVEMENT

George P. Monaghan, since his appointment by then Governor Tom Dewey in 1953, has done relatively as much for harness racing as Kenesaw Mountain Landis did for the sport of baseball.

Since he became State commissioner of the sulky sport the former New York City police commissioner has done more for the game than any one person or any one group in its entire history. This is a matter not of opinion, but of record.

It follows, therefore, that a "let's knock success movement" against Monaghan is on the march. There is a strong suspicion that the bill introduced in Albany to put harness racing under a three-member commission, supplanting Monaghan's rule, is fostered, or at least inspired, by the U.S. Trotting Association, which openly advocated in the past a return to the part-time rule and divided authority which nearly brought a downfall to the State's biggest sports enterprise.

It was Monaghan who freed the game's judges from the pressure of horsemen's groups like the USTA, thus making the judges responsible only to the State and to the public. Previously, the judges were responsible to the USTA, which licensed them, even though its headquarters were 700 miles removed from New York. This was a private organization, to quote Monaghan, "employing powers which belonged to the State."

OTHER STATES CHEER HIS SYSTEM

The USTA currently is facing antitrust action by the Justice Department, which is trying to force it out of business. Monaghan, who all but tossed the USTA out of New York on its ear, suggests that it revert to the capacity of a recordkeeping organization.

Meanwhile, Monaghan recently was elected president of the new National Association of Harness Racing Commissioners. Monaghan hopes this will be the first step toward getting independent commissions in other States, where the USTA still rules.

Obviously, Monaghan has the respect and confidence of racing officials in other States. Most of them have patterned their administrative controls and trotting operations after the unparalleled system evolved by Monaghan.

Dewey appointed Monaghan with express orders to clean out the undesirables and to protect with a policeman's nightstick if necessary the public's interest in harness racing.

VIOLATIONS SHRINKING

Evidently the public also has some confidence in his work. Because while New York State has only 33 percent of the racing dates allotted throughout the United States, New York last year accounted for 55 percent of the national attendance—and 65 percent of the national parimutuel handle.

When he first began swinging the big stick, Monaghan's critics complained that in some instances his judges were too quick to hand out stiff sentences on such nebulous charges as "inconsistent driving." Before that, and since, Monaghan has had to fight to make his sentences stick.

He has suspended horsemen because they won. When in winning, their racing time moved up incredibly from what were apparent "fresh air outings" in previous races,

just a build a price. He sustained severe criticism for some of these rulings. The net result was that such flagrant violations all but vanished.

In 1953, his first year, there were 75 revocations. In 1955, there were 117. In 1956 there were 149 and in 1957 there were 156 suspensions. Last year there were 153, possibly a sign that Monaghan's "messages" are getting through to the cheaters.

In the process of setting up what the horsemen call his little FBI, Monaghan has named as stewards former policemen—nearly all of them, including Jack Sheridan at Batavia Downs, former standouts on the New York City Police Department.

THE LAW IN ACTION

Since Monaghan took over, his outfit has recorded 99,832 sets of fingerprints. These have been sent to local, State, Federal and international law enforcement agencies, for double checking, past, present and future. The controlling bodies in France, England and Italy now use Monaghan's office as a clearinghouse for information on license applicants. In this regard, Monaghan's office has denied and revoked or suspended over 1,100 licenses in all categories—owners, drivers, trainers, grooms, mutuel clerks, etc.

Add to his little FBI work the fact that Saliva and urine tests on horses have more than doubled since 1953, now more than 10,000 per season.

In too many other States, political affiliation, rather than knowledge of racing or experience in police and security work is the qualification for a racing commission plum. Quite possibly this is why racing does not flourish in these other States.

Under the three-member system being proposed, the door might be open to political deals for racing officials. Under the proposed bill, the commissioon chairman would get $15,000 and two other members $10,000 each. Where do you find the men of proper stature, with necessary background, to devote full time to a job at these prices?

Nearly everyone connected with the game agrees that Monaghan has done an exceptional job and that his solid administration, free from outside interference, has been the very best harness racing in New York ever enjoyed. So much the best that the rest of the world is copying Monaghan's program. Why mess with success?

It may not be important that the public supported harness racing in greater numbers and in greater betting volume than it did flat racing in New York State last year. It may not matter that harness racing contributed $37 million to the State treasury (more than the flats). This is an all-time record.

But it should matter here (and this comes from one who has done more than his share of criticizing) that a man who has contributed more to his sport than any other individual dead or alive today is being kicked in the teeth at the very time when he should be drawing applause.

---

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Feb. 19, 1959]

SECOND GUESSING

(By Frank Lillich)

THE RAILBIRD

When the Justice Department cracked down on the U.S. Trotting Association, the feeling here was that most of the detractors of the able State harness racing commissioner, George Monaghan, would be discredited, and the shameful campaign of vilification carried on against him would die a natural death.

Not so, however. A bill has been introduced in Albany which would replace Monaghan with a three-man commission, recalling the pre-Monaghan days of confusion—and worse—which led to his appointment.

The proposal, on the face of it, is ridiculous. Since then Gov. Thomas E. Dewey decided to "let George do it," harness racing has become a cleaner, pleasanter sport. Monaghan has attacked the multiple problems with efficient and courageous honesty.

He has weeded out the questionable elements and punished transgressors with severe impartiality.

He has campaigned for safety devices, such as the crash helmet which is credited already with saving several drivers from death or crippling injuries.

He has withstood pressure groups and gone ahead with the formation of rules which have helped racing—many of which have been adopted by other States.

He has been a major factor in encouraging the growth of the sport, through better-equipped and cleaner plants which, in turn, have resulted in increasing revenues for the State.

He has, first and last, protected the public. That has been paramount objective ever since he took the job.

For all this, he should be replaced?

---

## President Garcia of the Philippines Salutes America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the United States is justifiably proud of its historic part in protecting the Philippines and in helping that democratic country achieve its independence.

That friendly sentiments between the Philippines and the United States of America are a two-way street is clearly illustrated in a recent letter which I received from Mr. P. W. Reeves, of Manila. Mr. Reeves is a former administrative assistant on Capitol Hill, where I came to know him. He has spent many years living in the Philippines; and I take pleasure in sharing his letter with those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANILA, PHILIPPINES,
*March 15, 1959.*

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Press dispatches reaching Manila during the past few days indicate that some badly written and badly timed articles by writers representing periodicals in the United States have caused anti-American demonstrations in Bolivia. The riots and bloodshed in Bolivia were widespread.

In recent months a number of articles have appeared in Southeast Asia which caused considerable friction and ill feeling toward America. It is difficult for me to figure out why American writers desire to turn nationals of other countries against America.

The Philippines has served as America's show-window of democracy in Asia. The Philippines has done more than any other country to help America's prestige in Asia. If the Filipinos were to turn against America, or if America were to turn thumbs down on the Philippines at this time, it would be very difficult for America to sell democracy to any other country in Asia. That part of Asia which remains free is watching the Philippines. If the friendly alliance between the United States and the Philippines should be abandoned—or even temporarily interrupted—the rest of free Asia will be lost to the Communists. This fight against President Carlos P. Garcia is a subterfuge. The masterminds in this tirade of vituperation and conspiracy against President Garcia are willing to accept any expedient in order to discredit the President of the Philippines.

If attacks on President Garcia and the Philippines continue, foreign investments will have rough sailing here. An occasional article can be overlooked and the people will conclude that the writer was misinformed. The unpleasant article will soon be forgotten. However, commencing in August 1957, one periodical in the United States viciously attacked President Garcia in particular and the Philippines in general. The same magazine followed up that first attack in August 1957 by attacking President Garcia and the Philippines on April 21, 1958; and another attack on February 2, 1959; another attack on February 16, 1959; and another attack on February 23, 1959. Unquestionably, a diabolical scheme is in operation to drive a wedge between America and the Philippines when the same magazine in the United States makes five vicious attacks on a country and its President. Also, under date of December 4, 1958, the Associated Press dispatch to Manila carried almost a full column about graft and corruption in the Philippines which appeared in a leading Washington, D.C., newspaper of the same date.

What will American newspapers and magazines gain by insulting other countries of the world and their Presidents? And why should anybody in America want to turn the Philippines against the United States?

Throughout his entire life, President Garcia has been a friend of the United States. On March 6, 1959, the United Press International news service carried a dispatch to the effect that Gen. Douglas MacArthur stated in New York that he held President Carlos P. Garcia of the Philippines and his administration in the highest regard. General MacArthur also mentioned that during World War II, Carlos P. Garcia was the leader of the resistance movement and rendered excellent service. No man on earth is in better position to pass judgment on Carlos P. Garcia and the Philippines than Gen. Douglas MacArthur. General MacArthur was stationed in the Philippines for many years—from the time of President Quezon in the Commonwealth days until the beginning of World War II.

Just to remind the American people about President Carlos P. Garcia's feelings for the United States, I quote the following from an address which President Garcia made in New York City on June 24, 1958: "I give this pledge on behalf of the Filipino people that we shall stand with the American people in defense of freedom as we have stood with them in the past loyalty without counting the cost.

"It would appear that a policy of neutralism has the net effect of abetting the aggressive purposes of international communism, whether it seeks to achieve these by armed attack or by subversion. The proof of this is to be seen in Asia and Africa where neutralism is a much favored philosophy, and where, consequently, communism has been encouraged to make heavy inroads by stealth or by armed intervention. On the other hand, in Western Europe, where neutralism has been rejected, communism has found it less easy to pursue its objectives.

"I dare to stand and be counted with the American people on the side of freedom."

Speaking at the Memorial Grandstand in Manila on July 4, 1957, President Garcia stated:

"Our relations with the United States are particularly noteworthy. With this onetime conqueror of our land we subsequently developed a warm and sympathetic friendship which reached its highest expression in the peaceful yielding to us of sovereignty on this date 11 years ago. Our relations since that date might well serve as a pattern for the world community. Assistance has been extended and accepted by us in the spirit of friendship rather than subservience. We have cooperated in the achievement of common objectives and due respect for each other's views, freely exchanged as equals, and with the course of each party determined solely by sovereign initiative in serving the best national interest. Our policies have paralleled those of America only when it served our national interest to do so, on other occasions following an independent course. And be it said to America's credit that no pressure ever has been exerted to have us do otherwise. To that great Nation which today celebrates its own achievement of independence, I know our people extend heartfelt greetings and a reaffirmation of our dedication to common ideals of peace, justice and liberty * * *."

President Garcia is fully aware of what the United States of America has done for the Philippines and, like the overwhelming majority of the Filipinos, he is truly grateful. In his speech to the Rotary Club in Manila, July 5, 1956, Vice President Garcia stated:

"Filipino and American statemen, educators, soldiers, businessmen, scientists, and industrialists have worked in complete cooperation and understanding to rebuild the Philippine nation on the basis of freedom and democracy * * *. The United States fought victoriously two world wars. In the first one, the United States fought to make the world safe for democracy. We offered the cream of our youth for military service under the American flag. In the second, our country was invaded and the Americans and Filipinos heroically fought side by side in defense of country, freedom, and democracy, under the mingled shadow of American and Filipino flags. American blood flowed freely in Bataan and Corregidor and other places. We fell under the Japanese occupation forces for 3 bloody and frightful years. But our love and loyalty to the United States remained steadfast in those gloomy year. When almost everything was lost to us, home, liberty, hope, and happiness, the immortal pledge of the American people through President Roosevelt 'that our freedom will be redeemed and our independence established and protected,' revived our dropping national spirit and galvanized us into new unity and solidarity to continue fighting for the cause of democracy, the cause of the United States and her allies * * *. America kept faith with the Filipino people and strictly in accordance with her pledge, established our independence on July 4, 1946 * * *. This deed of mighty America whereby she redeemed in all good faith and fidelity her plighted word of honor to the Philippine nation will endure forever with the pulsing of eternity * * *."

President Garcia's tender affection for America was not born after he became President. While he was Vice President, on January 19, 1954, he made a public address, from which I quote the following:

"The new administration will continue and improve on the keystone policy to preserve and maintain the most friendly and cordial relations with the Government and the people of the United States of America. As the most enlightened and altruistic champion of democracy and democratic dealings with others, we look up to America, the sponsor of the international idea of live and let live. The spiritual affinity of the American and Filipino peoples, established by 50 years of association and forged on the anvil of war and sufferings, cannot be assessed in terms of dollars however astronomical the amount may be. Corregidor and Bataan, the twin summits of glory where American and Filipino soldiers fought side by side and fell in common graves, symbolizes the spiritual solidarity of American and Filipino peoples * * *."

These people who are making the attacks from the United States certainly do not know President Garcia, the man they are trying to crucify. No scandal or smear has touched him since he became a congressman in 1925. His record for honesty, integrity, statesmanship, and faithful service is unimpeachable. He served 6 years as a congressman, 9 years as Governor, almost 14 years as senator, 3 years and 3 months as Vice President, and 2 years as President.

President Garcia is one of the kindliest of men. Incidentally, he is a devout admirer of the Great Emancipator. On February 12, 1959, President Garcia sent me a beautiful letter about our immortal Lincoln. Knowing that you, too, are a devoted follower of Lincoln and what he stood for, I shall quote three lines from President Garcia's recent letter:

"Lincoln's deeds will long live in the hearts of peoples everywhere who cherish the dignity of the human person and the equal opportunities afforded by a democratic society."

When I saw President Garcia a few days after the receipt of the above-mentioned letter, I thanked him; and then President Garcia said: "It appears that some of your American writers do not like me. I shall borrow the words of the immortal Lincoln by saying, 'I do the very best I know how, the very best I can, and I mean to keep on doing so until the end.' "

President Garcia has not lost any of his popularity in the Philippines. The little group now attacking the President in 1959 also opposed his candidacy for Vice President in 1953 when he was the running mate of the late Ramon Magsaysay. The same group opposing President Garcia in 1959 also bitterly opposed his candidacy for reelection as President in November 1957. By the will of God, Vice President Garcia became President of the Philippines on March 17, 1957, when the late President Magsaysay lost his life in a plane crash. Almighty God who controls the destinies of men and nations willed that Carlos P. Garcia should become the President of the Philippines. It is unthinkable that the little group now opposing the President and trying to discredit him in the eyes of the world will be able to defy the will of God.

Sincerely,

P. W. REEVES.

439 ARQUIZA (ERMITA).

## Why Unemployed Still Do Not Have Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our people have been given some reassuring statements by the administration about increased business activity but very little, except misleading slogans, about the conditions of unemployment.

There are at least two amazing phenomena in connection with the present recession.

First. As business improves, unemployment remains at a high level.

Second. The price level has increased during the recession. This is strong evidence of a controlled economy by big business.

In my extension of remarks, I include an interesting and informative article appearing in the Business Week of March 7, 1959:

WHY UNEMPLOYED STILL DON'T HAVE JOBS

Paul Henly, Lindbergh Evans, Domian Almaguer—on one day or another last year, each of them knew the panic and shame that hit a man as he first tries to adjust to the bitter truth: "I've lost my job." And there were more than 5 million like them.

At first, after the initial shock, most of the 5 million found unemployment a nuisance, but little more. They couldn't fight it—men were being laid off all around them—so they took life easy. Their unemployment benefits had many weeks to run.

Besides, everyone knew the Government wasn't going to let a real depression develop. Just as in 1949 and 1954, things would be tough for a little while. Then business would start improving again, and there would be plenty of jobs at good pay.

IT DIDN'T HAPPEN

Henly, Evans, and Almaguer have learned by this time that the script has been changed. Sure, business got better, and those who were still working made out fine. But employers didn't take back many of the people they had laid off, nor do they show signs of doing so in the near future. This is the tragedy of Henly, Evans, and Almaguer.

Henly is 56 years old. When he was laid off by Dodge on January 10, 1958, he had 11 years' seniority; now he fears no one but Dodge will ever give him a job again. At his age, who else would want to put him into a pension program, to take a chance on his health or on his ability to learn a new job better than a young fellow could?

Almaguer, 24-year-old Mexican spot welder, has the opposite problem. Being young, he has had no chance to build up seniority. How can he get into a steady job when guys with 10 or 15 years' seniority are still waiting to be rehired? Almaguer has worked only 8 months of the last 24.

Evans, 22, has the same problem of youth and lack of seniority—plus the worry that the color of his skin has something to do with his troubles. It just doesn't seem as if there's going to be much work around Chicago for fellows like him for a while.

THEIR PREDICAMENT

These three men and Charles Kamm, Celia Wisniewski, Steve Rozboril and Leon Elstner are all suffering from the most frightening disease of a free economy: unemployment. Is it one disease that strikes them all, or is it several different ailments that have the same effect? And, their personal hardships aside, is the present unemployment situation worse than it was in the previous postwar recessions and recoveries?

The answers come partly from statistics, partly from a study of technological and social changes that are just beginning to be recognized and understood.

I. WORST SINCE THE WAR

Unquestionably, the unemployment problem this time has been worse than in other postwar recessions. The figures show it in a number of ways.

Most obviously, unemployment rates have been higher. Adjusted for seasonal factors, unemployment last August reached a peak of 7.5 percent of the labor force. In 1949–50, it didn't quite reach 7 percent (unless you count the one-month bulge caused by the

1949 coal strike), and in 1953–54, it barely touched 6 percent.

More alarming, unemployment has stayed high despite rising business activity. From the August peak of 7.5 percent, the rate dropped to 5.7 percent in November. Then it moved back up to 6 percent in December and 6.2 percent in January.

In January, 4.7 million workers were jobless. That's 200,000 more than a year earlier, when gross national product was running about 6 percent lower in physical volume. Through the postwar years, an unemployment rate of 4 percent has come to be regarded as "normal." Now, even with business continuing its moderate improvement (Business Week, Feb. 21, 1959, p. 23), it looks as if the norm may be shifting upward—to 5 percent or higher.

In cold fact, we would have to add some 2.2 million jobs in 1959—with the labor force growing all the time—just to get unemployment down to a 5 percent rate. In 1955, a great boom year when gross national product jumped 10 percent in volume, we added only 1.9 million jobs.

*Hurting more*

Moreover, total figures don't reveal the full severity of today's unemployment problem. Long-term unemployment has hurt more people than in earlier postwar cycles. Last spring, about 2 million people had been without work for 15 weeks or longer, and that was roughly twice as many as in 1949 and 1954.

Recovery since then has reduced the number of long-term unemployed, but less than could be expected. At the turn of the year, there were at least 1.3 million long-term unemployed, and 800,000 of them hadn't worked for 6 months or more.

*Hardest hit*

This recession worked the greatest hardship on the core of the labor force—men, heads of families, in their best working years. Layoffs were broadest among men in their twenties, thirties, and early forties; older men had seniority rights. But whenever older men did lose their jobs, they had the greatest trouble of all in finding work.

Among men in their most productive years, Negroes were the worst affected. Negroes make up only 10 percent of the labor force, yet during the recession and so far during the recovery, one out of every five unemployed has been a Negro.

Unemployment among women and teenagers also rose, but this wasn't so much the result of layoffs from regular jobs as from the entry of wives and children into the labor force to earn what they could when the men were laid off.

II. NATIONAL SORE SPOTS

What accounts for the remarkable severity and persistence of unemployment during this recovery? The explanation isn't to be found in any one factor but in a whole array of factors that go to the very heart of the change in the American economy.

The most direct way to an explanation is to pinpoint the areas of most concentrated unemployment. These are:

Michigan chiefly because of autos.

Pennsylvania, chiefly because of steel, coal, and railroads.

New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Maryland, and Alabama, because of a variety of hardgoods industries.

Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, chiefly because of a decline in textile industries.

West Virginia, Kentucky, Montana, Colorado, and Minnesota, because of troubles in mining.

Thus you see the persisting unemployment as Murray Wernick, Federal Reserve Board economist, sees it: "A cluster of localized problems rather than a general problem." Last week, Business Week reporters all over the country tried to isolate the key factors in each locality.

Detroit: In Michigan's auto centers, for example, employment has been sliding not just during the recession but for at least 5 years, ever since defense production was cut off. Many factors have been at work: rising productivity, diversification in the auto industry, some flight of nonautomotive plants to warmer climates.

Employers say business caution has held down rehiring. They cite two reasons: (1) Bad public relations if they have to lay off again after a brief time; (2) the steep cost of SUB and other fringe benefits that have been written into auto labor contracts.

Primarily, though, rehiring has been slow because auto demand is tepid and workers simply aren't needed in mass for extra shifts.

Unemployment in Michigan is still well about last year's rate. Employers and union leaders agree that even getting back to past peak levels of production would leave a sizable pool of men made jobless by more efficient use of machines or better planning.

For example, Chrysler Corp. reorganized all its machine shops in the Detroit area into one new shop; only 400 of the 1,400 workers in the Dodge machine shop found jobs in the new operation. In another plant, back-to-back lines of drill presses were turned to face each other across an aisle where one man can operate two machines, eliminating half the work crew.

Only 2 years ago, the United Auto Workers had 1.4 million members at work nationally; now it has less than 1 million.

Philadelphia: In the Philadelphia area, production has climbed a lot but employment has improved little. Businessmen admit they're being cautious.

"Why shouldn't we be?" asks a spokesman for an appliance manufacturer. "The consumer is—he certainly isn't going overboard. And suppose autos are in for another bad year. Besides, we are expecting a steel strike."

Manufacturers of hardgoods are doing the least hiring, are getting more production out of reduced work forces. "People are scared and are working harder to keep their jobs," says one man. And they are being worked longer hours.

This can go on, business economists say, only so long, perhaps only until the last half of the year. Even then, though, they don't expect the free and easy hiring of prerecession days.

Rest of Pennsylvania: Overall, Pennsylvania is still one of the worst hit States with about 10 percent out of work.

In most depressed areas—Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Scranton, and Wilkes-Barre—unemployment runs about 12 percent. Some of this is chronic unemployment. Scranton and Wilkes-Barre are centers of the anthracite coal region, Altoona has the Pennsylvania Railroad shops, Johnstown is a steel town, Erie produces heavy machinery.

Pittsburgh, of course, is in a ferment about unemployment, with a critical labor negotiation fast approaching. The steel companies argue that rising productivity has been achieved without causing real job losses—only a slowing of growth in their work forces. President David McDonald of the United Steelworkers stresses that 155,000 United Steelworkers members were jobless last April and that about 100,000 are still unemployed.

In 1958, McDonald says, steel employed 411,565 hourly paid workers—an average of 14 percent less than in 1937—yet steel shipments in 1958 ran 56 percent higher than in 1937.

Cleveland: In the Cleveland area, there's unemployment in the machine tool industry chiefly because volume of machine orders hasn't followed the general comeback of the economy. Because the industry is predominantly job shop, there hasn't been much increase in productivity to eliminate workers. When capital spending snaps back, the jobs will be there.

California: On the face of it, California's worst labor troubles are over. Employment has returned to prerecession highs. Even here, though, signs of the new technological unemployment are showing up, especially in the aircraft industry and its suppliers.

Even if total spending on defense remains near its Korea peak, technological unemployment seems bound to increase in the aircraft industry:

Planes are giving way to missiles as the big procurement items, and missiles require fewer workers than aircraft do for the same dollar volume.

Defense hardware is being ordered in smaller quantities. It requires a smaller but more skilled work force; research and development make up a higher proportion of product value.

Commercial aircraft show a similar trend. Each new jet transport does the work of several piston-engined airliners that it replaces, so fewer planes will be built. In the first 10 years after World War II, for example, Douglas Aircraft Co. built an average of 100 transport planes a year; now it has orders for only 140 jet liners, to be delivered over the next 3 years or so.

III. DRAWING CONCLUSIONS

From the mass of reports from around the country, several general conclusions can be drawn:

Employers are unusually cautious about rehiring workers they have laid off. The recession forced them to make changes to cut cost—and jobs; the increasing burden of labor costs per worker, including fringe benefits, discourages them from hiring as many people as they might like.

The public's lack of enthusiasm for autos and other durables continues to depress metalworking industries.

Despite the Nation's march to peak levels of income and consumption, capital spending still hasn't revived. That's because excess capacity is hanging over industry from the recession, particularly in the heavy goods industries east of the Mississippi.

The rapid advance in technology both increases output per worker and cuts down employment of unskilled and semiskilled workers (a large proportion of whom are Negroes).

*Service industries next*

So far, advances in productivity have been concentrated in the goods-producing industries (manufacturing, mining, construction, agriculture), giving them more and more output with fewer workers.

Meanwhile, employment in the service industries (trade, finance, transportation, public utilities, Government, and such miscellaneous services as domestic work, teaching, hospital work) continued its long and relentless climb.

Now, however, automation and advanced techniques have spread to these industries, and they may not be able to create as many jobs as they have in the past. They're just about holding their own at the moment in number of employees.

*One growth area*

The one real growth area on the job front is among the professions—scientists, engineers, highly trained people of all kinds.

Within manufacturing employment [chart, not printed in RECORD], you can see the rise of so-called nonproduction jobs, pushed by new emphasis on research and development, even as production jobs decline. The United States is in the full swing of its "brainpower revolution" (Business Week, Apr. 27, 1957, p. 176).

Shifts in the employment market are going to put a high premium on education, retraining, and other measures to upgrade workers into new jobs.

Labor Department experts don't expect geographical mobility to contribute much to reducing unemployment. Mainly, it is young

male workers who will shift from one region to another; others are bound by families, homes, and other community ties. At present, geographical mobility wouldn't help much. No area is expanding fast, and most already have a surplus of labor.

Basically, where rising productivity can be expected to increase pressure is in a search for ways to multiply the Nation's total demand for goods and services, to keep the whole labor force employed. And if demand can't be increased, there'll be still more cry for a shorter workweek.

## Ten Years Are Needed for the United States To Top Russia's Fleet of 460 Submarines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Russian submarine fleet at this very moment poses a most serious threat to our national survival. This threat increases by the hour, while we hesitate to launch a program of oceanic research necessary to counter Soviet advances.

Experts have advised that it will take the United States 10 years to formulate a foolproof defense system which would insure the United States against sneak enemy submarine attacks. This 10-year estimate is based on the assumption that our country will roll up its sleeves and launch a comprehensive program of oceanic research.

The following article which appeared in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times emphasizes the pressing necessity for an immediate increase in our program of oceanic research:

TEN YEARS ARE NEEDED FOR UNITED STATES TO TOP RUSSIA'S FLEET OF 460 SUBMARINES

(By Everett S. Allen)

It will take 10 years of the hardest kind of work before the United States can be sure it has gained clear and overwhelming technical superiority over Russia's existing fleet of 460 submarines. This estimate, based on sound evidence and authoritative opinion, does not take into consideration radically-improved U.S.S.R. subs that might appear during this period. Presumably, they would be too few in number to affect the overall situation, and most of the existing submarines still would be in service.

In 1956, the National Academy of Sciences sponsored an intensive summer-study group at the Whitney estate on Nobska Point in Falmouth. The specific subject matter of the discussion remains top secret, but it had to do with the sea and national security, and the scientific approach to this general field.

The military aspects of the ocean were thought to present a situation sufficiently serious so that 60 to 80 very important persons gave up their summer to think about it.

REPORT GATHERS DUST

The report embodying the recommendation of this highly qualified group of specialists—which has been allowed to gather dust thus far—is in the hands of the NAS and available to Congress, upon request. It is to be hoped Congress will make such a request and consider its contents carefully when it formulates U.S. policy in the marine sciences in this post-sputnik era.

What did they talk about? Here are some good bets:

The true submarine presumably is just around the corner. To date, the sub has been merely a surface ship that could submerge, but as it advances in technique, it will operate deeper and deeper. Even now, some of them stay under water for 2 weeks or longer.

In a military deterrent system, staying hidden is perhaps the most important factor. U.S. subs, therefore, must learn to navigate without coming to the surface, must learn to deal with deadreckoning problems under the sea. This means their navigators must have a knowledge of all three dimensions of the ocean, including its underwater areas.

CHARTS NEEDED

The Navy now has surface charts of the sea. What it needs for the immediate future are charts of the ocean bottom, and charts showing how the waters of the seas circulate.

U.S. oceanographers already are engaged in the long, slow task of gathering this data. At intervals of roughly 80 miles, their little ships make 5-hour stops to take soundings, check temperatures, salt content, currents, bottom sediment, and to record their position. It takes a long time to cross the ocean this way, but it is the only means by which the vitally needed information can be obtained.

The submarine of the future will be specialized, not an all-purpose fleet vessel as in the past. The Navy already has a fighter sub, the first step in this direction. Part of the problem of new sub design is acoustical, since operating at greater depths, that is, down to 1,000-plus feet, is an evolution in the direction of utilizing concealment. If they want to remain hidden, even though deep, American subs must cut down on the noise they make.

Principally, this noise stems from the propeller; when shaped for greatest efficiency, it is somewhat noisy. A propeller can be designed that isn't noisy, but it would lose an estimated 5 percent of its efficiency.

NEED IS CHANGED

The design of sub propellers has not been emphasized because up to the present moment, fuel has been a big problem. Since carrying enough fuel, and refueling, have been major considerations, the most efficient propeller was desired, in order to get the most out of the fuel supply.

With atomic fuels, subs can carry a sufficient supply for months, and this is no longer a problem. Despite this, the traditional concept of the most efficient propeller still is adhered to, even though there is no need of it. In consequence, the brand new, atomic-powered Navy sub *Nautilus*, though fast, is noisier than need be. There is no present indication that the Russians have been so short-sighted as to make their new subs unnecessarily noisy.

Surface ships, such as destroyers and destroyer escorts, one of whose principal functions is to attack submarines, also have a noise problem. They can't hear subs well on their underwater gear because of their own commotion. As they operate faster, they make more noise. Marine scientists are trying to help the Navy avoid a situation in which an enemy sub can detect a destroyer long before it is aware of the sub's presence.

SUGGESTIONS OFFERED

What can you do about it?

Two dollars and fifty cents worth of rubber in the right places made autos quiet; this is one approach that might help destroyers. Engines can be wrapped up, too, with sound-isolating material, or they can be remounted higher, nearer the center of gravity. More drastic, steampower could even be substituted for diesel, if necessary.

Adoption of any of these measures undoubtedly means a slight efficiency loss, as in the case of the sub propeller. Therefore, they aren't adopted, because they constitute what is considered a step backward and what consequently is a move against all the traditions and training of marine engineers and architects.

But the fact is, the Navy as a whole, not just its subs, needs to become the silent service.

SECURITY IS PROBLEM

For most objective observers close to the situation agree that the Russian subs look good and that any tricks the United States has, it will undoubtedly need, if it is ever matched against them.

This brings up the question of security and sharing of information, and opinions vary greatly on these. Maybe two out of five marine scientists are irked by security regulations. Most scientists have a tendency to want as free an exchange of information as possible.

One of the aspects that bothers some marine scientists is that they believe America's present lead in nuclear propulsion for ships could gain this country a new and commanding position at sea comparable to that held in the days of the Yankee clipper and the New Bedford whalers. But they insist that secrecy and redtape are preventing technical breakthroughs in this field, even though it holds promise of immediate efficiency, since any ship that can carry long-range fuel supplies is potentially efficient.

But the military facet of the situation involves different factors. Although the United States possesses some good systems of antisubmarine warfare, they can all be circumvented by a clever person, especially if he has some idea of the principle on which they operate. The same holds true for any nation's anitsub systems. You will, therefore, find the more outspoken marine scientists reluctant to come clean entirely with all of America's NATO allies, as has been suggested from time to time.

Quite frankly, they figure America can't tell everything—not quite—even to the British, whose security system has been somewhat leaky in late years. As for the French whose Government is loaded with Communists, most prudent U.S. scientists believe if France knew all about American antisub tactics, the Soviet Union would know also, within a matter of days.

The fact is, however, Congress and the military set the security rules and scientists have nothing to do with decisions about passing classified information—so such opinions among scientists are no more than academic. Very little oceanographic information as such is classified; its application to warfare is mainly the business of the Defense Department laboratories.

## The Oregon Association of Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the press of important legislative business, such as we have dealt with already this session, and that with which we have

yet to come to grips, it is easy to overlook some happenings which are not news, but which in the long run are perhaps even more important than some of the measures we scrutinize in this Chamber.

One such important event, which took place on March 18 through March 21 in Corvallis, Oreg., was a convention of young men who were gathered together to hear speakers, present awards, and exchange experiences. A very special group of young men met on the Oregon State campus, for they are members of the Oregon Association of Future Farmers of America.

They are, along with their younger friends and colleagues in the 4–H Clubs, the seed corn of our future America, for they typify the best that rural communities all through our country produce each year. They are our most precious natural resource, for they, and those like them, will be the ones whose production of food and fiber will feed and clothe the America of the future. I salute them in their State convention, and I extend to them every good wish for success.

Mr. President, Bill Kessi, of Scappoose, Oreg., was honored by the last national convention of the FFA, in St. Louis, Mo., by being selected for the top degree of the national organization. Because his story represents a model for the aspirations of his coworkers, I think it fitting that this tribute be paid to him and, through him, to the other 377,922 future farmers in the 8,933 local chapters of his organization.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President that a news article on his achievements which appeared in the February issue of the Oregon Future Farmers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL KESSI RECEIVES AMERICAN FARMER DEGREE

Bill Kessi, Scappoose chapter young farmmer, received the American farmer degree at the last national FFA convention in Kansas City, Mo. Bill was one of the four young farmers in Oregon selected to receive the top degree in the future farmer work.

Bill started his farming program at the age of nine by going into partnership with his father and brother, Bob. They bought two cows and started raising heifer calves. Then they rented barns and pasture to grow the young stock until they had enough cows to justify buying land and building a barn. In 1952, when Bill started high school they put in a grade A dairy. For his first 3 years in vocational agriculture, Bill kept records on his individual projects which had grown to seven registered Jerseys, eight acres of Ladino pasture, three beef animals and 10 acres of cabbage. In his senior year Bill included his one-third share of the 57-acre farm and 40 milking cows in his recordkeeping, and has continued to farm since.

Bill's labor income for the 6 years on his individual projects and one-third farm interest amounts to more than $28,000, most of which he has put back into the farm, equipment, and livestock.

In addition to maintaining a high scholarship record, he was class valedictorian. Bill's school activities won him the coveted outstanding boy award for his senior class. His activities included: Freshman representative to the student council, catcher of varsity baseball team for 4 years, vice president of the international League, treasurer of the honor society, president of his church youth group, a lead in the senior class play, charter member of the Kay Club, and catcher for the American Legion and Connie Mack baseball teams.

In his 2 years of college he received the Lewis and Clark chemistry award, was a member of the Lewis and Clark National Science Club, and was catcher on the Lewis and Clark varsity baseball team, and at the same time living at home and doing his part of the work on the dairy.

Bill was secretary and then president of his Future Farmer chapter and was a leader in many chapter projects during his school years. He won the Northwest FFA District Better Farming contest and was a finalist for the State Star Farmer award. Bill participated in State and county fairs as an exhibitor and contestant in livestock judging contests. He was a member of a third place team in the State Dairy Judging contest. In addition, he received many individual honors in judging. Bill represented the Scappoose chapter in district speaking contests, and was chairman of their parliamentary procedure team for 2 years.

A stanch believer in Future Farmer activities, Bill tries to show through his example what other boys may accomplish through the Future Farmers of America organization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am also especially proud to inform the Senate that the national president of the Future Farmers of America, Adin Hester, hails from Canby, Oreg. He will participate in the Oregon Association convention this year as an inspiration to the delegates and members.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a list of the officers of the Oregon Association of Future Farmers.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

STATE OFFICERS

President, Edward Manary, Route 1, Box 308, Sheridan; vice president, Jerry Justice, Box 397, Enterprise; secretary, Roger Schoenborn, Route 1, Box 338, Molalla; treasurer, Roger Rothrock, Route 1, Box 57, Adams; reporter, Don Franzen, Route 5, Box 136, Salem; sentinel, LeRoy Lim, Route 2, Box 101, Canby.

DISTRICT PRESIDENTS

Northwest district, Donald Bischof, Route 2, Box 43 A, Sherwood; south central district, James Klukkert, Star Route, Redmond; Rogue-Umpqua district, Allen Barnes, 1576 Beall Lane, Medford; Snake River district, Paul Seaquist, Route 2, Box 92, Vale; Upper Willamette district, Eugene Maahs, Route 1, Harrisburg.

DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Blue Mountain, Hadley Akins, McEwen; Capitol, Alton May, Gervais; Columbia River, Ray Reif, Canby; Eastern Oregon, Norman Koopman, La Grande; Lower Willamette, Cliff Wirfs, Yamhill; Northwest, Bill Sawyer, St. Helens; Rogue-Umpqua, Ed Griggs, Central Point; Snake River, Charles Witty, Adrian; South Central, Bob Sawyer, Prineville; Upper Willamette, Roland Hendricks, Halsey; advisor, Ralph L. Morgan, Salem.

## Statement of Rev. Robert J. McEwen, S.J., on Fair Trade Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permision to extend my remarks I include a statement made by Reverend (Father) Robert J. McEwen, S.J., chairman, Department of Economics, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass., and chairman, advisory consumer council to Hon. Edward J. McCormack, Jr., attorney general of Massachusetts, before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Fair Trade Legislation, March 23, 1959.

TESTIMONY OF REV. ROBERT J. MCEWEN, S.J., CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, BOSTON COLLEGE, CHESTNUT HILL, MASS., BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, IN HEARINGS ON FAIR TRADE LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert J. McEwen. I am an associate professor of economics and chairman of the department in the university at Boston College. In addition, I am the chairman of the advisory consumer council to the attorney general of Massachusetts, the Honorable Edward J. McCormack, Jr. For the record, the membership of this advisory consumer council is as follows: Mr. John Cort, Newspaper Guild; Dr. Virginia Galbraith, Mount. Holyoke College; Prof. Phillip Gamble, University of Massachusetts; Prof. Joseph Golemme, Northeastern University; Attorney John Graham, Northeastern University; Prof. James R. McPherson, Boston College; Mrs. Martha O'Neil, Teachers Federation; Prof. Arnold M. Soloway, Harvard University; Prof. Colston Warne, Amherst College. I may say that our position on the question of fair trade is a unanimous one.

I myself have specialized in teaching courses in social responsibilities of business, in the socioeconomic teaching of the churches, and in business ethics. On the subject of fair trade legislation, I have been doing research and writing for the last 9 years.

My testimony will bear witness to the fact that philosophers and economists in the Judaeo-Christian tradition are vitally interested in the practical problems of the business civilization and in governmental interventions with business activity.

Political and economic policies and actions, particularly those dealing with the rights and wrongs of business conduct, are fundamentally moral and ethical decisions. If right principles of justice and honest objectives guide us to the selection of correct and just practical policies, the moral tone of our society will remain healthy. On the other hand, a dangerous cynicism will pervade the minds and souls of the people if they are told that practical decisions of government are based solely or mainly on narrow or selfish pressures.

The specific focus of my testimony will be on the aspect of desirable public policy for governmental action in this area of price regulation. My viewpoint will blend economic, social and ethical considerations.

THE KILLING OF THE PRICE SYSTEM

We used to think that in any discussion of American business problems it could usually be assumed that all participants would agree on the desirability of a functioning price system. It is most discouraging, therefore, to find that leading economists and governmental officials have been forced in recent days to warn U.S. business that a return to wage and price controls by the Federal Government was probably necessary as a solution to the problem of administered prices and inflation. Such despair in the possibilities of a pricing system and a market system, manifested by this call for price-fixing laws and wage and price controls, makes one wonder about the traditional conservative opposition to all forms of socialism. By and large, it is the traditionally conservative groups that are now clamoring for these price-fixing laws.

I have no hesitation in stating bluntly that those businessmen who are thus advocating a uniform price for every product in every store where it is sold, and who are thus cooperating in stifling the price system and the market system as the regulator of our economy—such men are leading us into the socialist state economy by the back door.

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

At this point, I wish to summarize for the committee the conclusions of my study of fair trade laws in the following five points:

1. There is no sufficient justification for lending public legal support through price-fixing laws to the objective of protecting trademarks or channels of distribution for the private manufacturer. While these may be legitimate private goals, there is no evidence that they constitute such a valid object of public concern that prices must be fixed by law.

2. The consumer protection argument cannot be taken seriously. Consumer organizations deny such a need. The sponsors of fair trade have not been recognized as champions of the consumer. No independent evidence of the need for consumer protection of this nature has been found. The statistical evidence advanced by fair trade advocates was found to be inadequate, false or misleading. Errors of statistical procedure have vitiated every attempt to produce statistical proof of the necessity for Federal fair trade laws.

3. There is merit to the argument that small business must be given some form of special assistance. Fair trade laws are not the proper instrumentality to give this aid to small business. They probably do the small man more harm than is realized, particularly because they raise the general cost of doing business and invite chainstore competition with specialty shops.

4. The concept of competition in business that is found to be implicit in the fair-trade position is distorted and deficient. It is inadequate to fulfill the function of competition as conceived by Christian price-justice doctrine. It is deficient because (a) it excludes seller competition completely from the retail level; and (b) it really makes possible the exclusion of price competition even at the manufacturer level in many industries. The fair trade position implies the desirability merely of interproduct competition. Both Christian price justice and the United States antitrust laws imply interseller competition. Only the latter is able to supply a theory of the function of the retailer that makes it clear that distributors perform a real economic service to society worthy of a justified financial reward.

5. The inadequacies of legal measures which attempt the direct control of prices and the undesirability of adding public law sanction to privately fixed prices supply further motives for concluding that fair trade laws are not in harmony with the principles of price justice.

Before I go any further let me emphasize that the first principle I teach my students with regard to retail business is the following proposition: By and large, the only real protection for the consumer is his own knowledge and trust in the skill and integrity of the retailer from whom he makes a purchase. I realize that there do exist certain unethical practices by a small minority of retailers. I realize, too that frustration at the unfairness of some of these tactics has been partially responsible for the demand for governmental protection such as is thought to be given by fair trade laws. For that reason, I have some sympathy with the small businessman and his emotional demand for price-fixing laws.

THE CONSUMER PROTECTION PURPOSE

An evaluation of the consumer protection purposes of the fair trade laws is a difficult and complicated task. The difficulty comes not so much from the problem of deciding the economic effects of fair trade on the consumer, but from a host of noneconomic considerations.

First, these are laws allegedly designed to protect consumers and the public interest. But they are violently opposed by the recognized consumer organizations and the labor organizations and by the departments of the Federal Government that are specifically charged with safeguarding the consumer interest and that of the public in general.

Secondly, the objects from which the consumer is to be protected seem to vary with the case in hand—and in general seem to embrace the whole world with which the consumer comes into contact. He is to be protected from himself, from his unscrupulous retailer, from the manufacturer who deteriorates quality, from a dealer who does not give service (which the consumer may not want but apparently should have), from high prices, from low prices, etc. Furthermore, in the case of the liquor fair trade laws, the consumer is to be protected from the moral degradation involved in the overindulgence which would be stimulated by lower prices.

Finally, most of the so-called statistical evidence that this writer found in the literature of the proponents of fair trade is to be viewed with extreme skepticism, particularly evidence purporting to show that polls of consumers reveal support for fair trade.

HIGH PRICES

The argument on consumer protection from high prices through fair-trade laws is also marked by doubtful statistical data. One NARD representative has made the assertion that: "To mean anything, comparative price figures must present averages not exceptions". Statistically, however, that proposition is open to question. For some purposes averages may be the best comparative measure. But they are incomplete without an added measure of dispersion. For other purposes, the range of price quotations may be the really significant item. For the protection of the consumer who is willing to look around and compare prices in different stores, the possibility, or mere availability of a low price is extremely important. This is the precise difference between a fair-trade and a non-fair-trade area. Even if the average price in a non-fair-trade area should be higher, and the range or spread of prices greater, the consumer who was interested in getting the most for her money would be better off because she at least had a chance of finding the lowest price. In a fair-trade area, even with a lower average price, the consumer would be deprived of this advantage.

On the face of it, therefore, the argument that fair trade prevents exorbitant prices from being charged the consumer is a little difficult to accept in view of the fact that fair-trade laws set minimum and not maximum prices. The proper way to prevent high prices, as is evident from war-time price controls, is to set maximum limits. This is now permitted in England and Canada, and this writer would suggest that the same permission be given manufacturers in the United States—if any power over price is to be given them.

QUALITY

The consumer is also supposed to be protected by fair-trade laws with regard to the quality of products. A congressional friend of fair trade has put the matter thus:

"The consumer has confidence in brand merchandise, he has the desire to purchase brand merchandise, and if he can have confidence in a uniform price, he will trade in many instances with the small businessman.

"If he desires to buy unbranded merchandise, he also has this field to explore but he does so on his own judgment and at his own risk."

The implications of this last statement for the retailing profession are both manifold and dangerous. Either, (1) the retailer also is incapable of judging the intrinsic merits of unbranded goods, or (2) if he is capable of so doing, he is unwilling to act as the consumer's guide in the selection of such merchandise. Otherwise, why must the consumer act on his own judgment and at his own risk?

If the retailer is an expert in his field, the customer should be able to depend upon that expert knowledge to make intelligent purchases of both branded and unbranded goods—but it should be especially valuable in the case of the latter.

A curiously twisted argument is advanced by fair-trade proponents. They say that products are very complex, sales people are unskilled in technical details of product qualities, and consumers are completely ignorant—therefore, brand reputation is important to establish consumer confidence either in the manufacturer or in the retailer, or both. Therefore, the price of the brand must be set and fixed. This is a truly remarkable nonsequitur. All the argument can legitimately prove is that consumers' ignorance leads them to try to supply for their lack of knowledge by trust in the knowledge and integrity of the seller or maker. Prices are not directly involved at all in this line of reasoning.

But the fair-trade proponents are aware of this and they try to show that the consumer really has some choice about price. He can always buy the product of some other manufacturer—who, also, presumably, will be setting his own price. And in a large sense, all articles are in competition with one another, diamonds compete with Cadillacs. This is somehow supposed to prove that in a system such as ours the consumer is the final arbiter in the market.

It is necessary to emphasize that what this type of argument involves is simply a denial that the consumer market should have a say in determining the prices of individual brands. Price is not to be one of the considerations subject to consumer voting in the market.

There is an element of subjectivism and relativism in these arguments about brand reputation that is quite alarming, especially when it is used as a basis for national legislation. In view of money and time spent by a manufacturer in establishing the consumer acceptance for his brand, he has provided the consumer with some standard measure (imagined or real) which enables the consumer to make his choices with greater confidence. It apparently matters little whether this confidence is well founded or not. As long as the manufacturer has spent a lot of money creating it, it must be protected.

This attitude, too, amounts to a denial of the possibility of any retailer acting as the

eyes and ears of consumers in helping them make reasonable choices of competing commodities and prices. Their function as reputable advisers to their customers is abolished and they are reduced to vending machines, puppets on the strings of the manufacturers. Above all, the customer must be preserved in that comfortable feeling of getting full value for his money. This is really the economics of illusion. What possible objective meaning can the maximization of welfare have under such circumstances?

Furthermore, even if some of these contentions on the subject of loss leaders and consumer knowledge are true, are such irrational reactions justification for legal action to perpetuate them? Especially when, in large measure, they are due to the advertising by the makers?

The slur to consumer knowledge and intelligence that is implicit in the loss-leader argument was recognized by Mr. McGuire during the House debate. One of the very few speakers to bring the point out into the open, he said:

"It can be argued, I suppose, that Mrs. Smith may be smart enough and determined enough to buy only the customer-bait items. If she does, she will get a bargain; but Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Brown and all the other customers will surely pay for Mrs. Smith's bargains. If all customers were smart enough and determined enough to see through the price-juggling tricks of retailers who prefer to compete unfairly, you can be sure that loss leaders would no longer be profitable and would, therefore, immediately disappear from the market place."

If that is an accurate statement of the problem, and this writer agrees that it is, there are two avenues of solution open. One is the way of intelligence and freedom—let Mrs. Smith obtain the reward for being a smart shopper. Meanwhile, use every means to increase the knowledge and sharpness of Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Brown so that they will become like Mrs. Smith. Thus, the natural forces of the market, namely, intelligent buyers and sellers, would soon tell the merchant whether loss leaders were profitable and desirable or not.

The other way, which is the solution reached by fair traders by some miracle of twisted logic, is the way of ignorance and compulsion. Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Brown are to be left alone in their ignorance, simplicity, and laziness while Mrs. Smith is to be prevented from receiving a reward for diligent shopping, because storekeepers must offer to each and all identical prices. By all standards of justice, this is a further deterioration of the perfection of the natural forces operating to make a correct market.

Such tremendous distortions introduced into the economic system as a consequence of the fair trade laws completely overshadow the private advantage of some individual manufacturers which may be served by the system. Therefore, on balance, the consideration of the trade-mark protection and the consumer protection arguments must conclude that no moral or economic justification for Federal fair trade price fixing can be found in those objectives.

Several further points have been raised in my mind as a result of listening to these hearings. The first relates to the financial burden of this law. The bill will make it an unfair practice under the Federal Trade Commission Act to deviate from the price arbitrarily set for the retailer in sales to consumers. The Federal Trade Commission therefore is obliged to prosecute violations of manufacturer-set prices. Is it fair to ask to general consuming public, which will have to bear the burden of these higher prices for branded goods, also to pay higher taxes for the prosecuting costs of the Federal Trade Commission? Is it right to shift these enforcement costs from the private companies to the general taxpayer of the United States?

I think not. Therefore, if this law is passed, I suggest that a substantial franchise tax be levied on all companies availing themselves of the Federal privilege granted by the Government through this bill. Before any company could fix prices, it would have to pay this yearly franchise tax.

Something like this will surely be necessary if Congress in going to be asked to add millions of dollars annually to the budget of the Federal Trade Commission to take care of prosecution of fair-trade cases. One company alone used to spend about a million dollars annually to bring such fair-trade suits. Will Congress want to spend an extra million dollars annually out of the taxpayers' money to help this one company police its fixed prices? And how many additional millions of dollars will be required for all the other companies in the United States?

This point, I think, has not been sufficiently discussed in this hearing. Under State fair-trade laws, the private companies bear the enforcement cost. Under Federal fair trade, the taxpayer will have to pay it. Secondly, I have a great deal of sympathy for the objections of manufacturers who wish to prevent certain practices by retailers which are thought to be destructive of brand reputation. This has led to the Boykin bill. I would suggest a modification of that bill which will, I think, accomplish the desired result without directly giving price-fixing power to private manufacturers. Give the manufacturer permission to enjoin or forbid any seller, who has obtained merchandise without the manufaoturer's knowledge and consent, from any further retailing of the branded article—provided only that the manufacturer stand ready to buy back the goods at the seller's cost.

This has the virtue of avoiding direct interference with the price system. It is this feature of fair trade which makes it so abhorrent to any trained economist or businessman who appreciate the central and sensitive role the price system must play in an economy which is satisfying the needs of the people at the minimum level of socially necessary costs.

---

## Great Achievements in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following notes used in an address by Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse before the awards banquet of the Michigan Junior Chamber of Commerce recognizing winners of the four outstanding young farmers' contest in Michigan. I believe Mr. Morse's timely remarks regarding our farm situation today will be of considerable interest to all Members of the House.

GREAT ACHIEVEMENTS IN AGRICULTURE

During my first years in the agricultural service business, I had the privilege of being a member of the junior chamber of commerce. It was a rich experience. The young men with whom I was associated as jaycees have moved up into important positions of responsibility in businesses, in the professions, and in continuing community and citizenship activities. I recommend that young men become jaycees when they have the opportunity.

It is especially appropriate that this achievement award banquet be held in the hometown of a young man who is making an outstanding record. In 1952, this district elected ALVIN M. BENTLEY, then only 34 years old, to the Congress of the United States. He had already distinguished himself with the diplomatic corps and in helping alert the United States to the menace of communism. This is the seventh session of Congress in which I have been able to observe at first hand his good work in Washington. AL BENTLEY has the moral fiber; the intellectual capacity; and other abilities needed in government.

We are living in a fast moving atomic and space age. It is fascinating. It is challenging.

In no segment of the economy are the wheels of progress turning faster than in agriculture. There has been more farm progress in the past 50 years than in all prior recorded history. This terrific surge forward will continue—as the technological revolution rolls ahead.

It has brought problems along with the great benefits. For example, how to adjust to these rapid changes—surpluses are most conspicuous. Those who resist progress or fail to adjust to it become part of the problems. It has always been thus.

There are two broad groups of farmers and farm families. These will become even more distinctly different in the future.

Now 2 million farms produce as much as we consume—and a surplus. These are the commercial farms. They are predominantly family farms. They have grown much larger, and will become even larger.

These farms are less than one-half of all farms in number—yet they produce about 90 percent of all farm products marketed. We consume about 90 percent of all the farm products this Nation produces. About 10 percent is exported.

These commercial farms—with the larger incomes—produce most of the products for which the Government spends billions of dollars for price supports.

Farms grow larger by farmers buying neighboring farms and additional land. Many commercial family farms now include the land which was formerly two farms or several farms. In major grain and cotton growing areas small farmers have charged that governmental price support money has enabled the larger farmers to buy up the smaller farms.

Ninety percent of the expenditures for price support on wheat result from about half of the farms growing wheat—the largest ones.

Seventy-five percent of expenditures for cotton price support result from production on about one-fourth of the cotton farms—the largest ones.

For other supported crops, a similarly disproportionate share of the expenditure goes to the large producers.

The tremendous progress of the 2 million larger commercial farms and ranches is apparent as you travel through the more prosperous farming areas. It shows in statistics and financial statements.

Since these 2 million farms produce 90 percent of the farm products marketed they have accounted for most of the new all-time high records set by all farms.

The value of property owned by farmers is record high—now about $200 billion.

The net value of farmers' property is record high—$177 billion after deducting bills owed and other debts.

Gross farm income was record high in 1958—$37.6 billion.

Income from all sources per person on farms for 1958 was the highest on record. It is higher as compared with incomes of nonfarm people than in 1952.

Farm land values are record high. Farm ownership is record high. Farm foreclosures are extremely rare—near the all-time record low. Farms are better equipped and are more mechanized than ever before. Crop yields per acre keep moving up to set new high records.

Total crop output last year set a new all-time high, with new records for 14 important crops. Output per sow, per cow, and per hen keeps moving up to new highs. Income from dairying continued near-record high last year.

The level of living on farms is the highest in history. This is measured by such factors as the percentage of farms with electricity, telephones, water systems, central heating, electrical appliances, and automobiles, and the purchasing power of the average value of farm products sold or traded.

There are 2.7 million farms that produce only about 10 percent of the products marketed. That is about the proportion of our farm output that is exported—sold abroad.

These are small-scale, part-time, and residential farms. Incomes are low. There are too few acres, soils are often poor, frequently one-half of even the small acreages are in timber or brush and in many areas there are other farming handicaps—like hills, mountains, and rocks.

Many of these poorer farm families produce no price-supported crops. Those that do produce such crops market so little that governmental price-support programs can never solve their income problems.

Each of these 2.7 million farms has on it a farm family. They represent millions of fine rural people—and it is people and their opportunities that are our major concern. People are America's most vital resource.

Since most of the billions of dollars of Government price supports "are spent on the production of a relatively few large producers" (President's message to Congress, 1959; see also message of 1954), it was important to develop a program that would bring greater opportunities to the farm families with the lowest incomes. The resulting rural development program that got underway in 1955 is now bringing more income to farm families on small farms—those who need help most.

Wholesome country living on the farm is being combined with other employment or sources of income. Areas are developing mixed incomes or diversified incomes, and becoming more prosperous.

Michigan has been helping give strong leadership to the new rural development approach. In this great State you are showing how local, State, and Federal leadership can work together in more complete resource development to get higher incomes for rural families.

This is in keeping with the activities of the outstanding young farmers we honor here tonight. They have made significant contributions in community, State, and national affairs, in addition to having made great progress in their agricultural careers and with good farm practices.

A new rural America is emerging rapidly. Areas adapted to commercial farming are becoming more efficient and productive. The small and residential farms have their place, too. It is good to have families living on the land, if there are adequate employment and sources of income. Total rural or resource development will bring great new achievements for the future. The vigorous intelligent leadership of young farmers and organizations like the Junior Chamber of Commerce must understand the progress underway and help push it ahead to build a stronger America.

Prosperity of Michigan farmers does not depend on price supports for the basic crops. Only about 13 percent of their cash farm incomes is from these six crops.

In fact, taken as a whole, Michigan farmers have probably been hurt much more than helped by such price supports. The reasons are simple. Farmers of this State sell meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables—most of them buy feed.

They pay taxes—and it takes taxes to maintain the present program, "which is excessively expensive." President Eisenhower in his message to Congress further said, "By the end of this fiscal year it is estimated that there will be in Government hands, surplus farm products worth about $9 billion.

"And by July 1, 1959, Government expenditures for storage, interest, and handling of its agricultural inventory will reach a rate of $1 billion a year.

"We need new legislation. The situation calls for prompt and forthright action."

The outlook for farming is good. A major reason is the favorable economic outlook. The strong demand and expanding markets for farm products will continue.

Dr. Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, says, "The economic outlook, to the extent that we can see very far ahead in these matters, is good. We have had a broad-based and generally healthy recovery and it is entirely reasonable to expect it to continue through the year and into 1960. Indeed, there are good grounds for believing that 1960 will be a year of considerably higher production and employment than 1959.

"Whether this proves to be the case or not will depend in the main on how steady our recovery is in 1959 and how successful we are in avoiding increases in costs and prices. The prospect is rather good at the moment, but we must have the right combination of governmental and private policies to obtain the best results."

The Congress of the United States has two major problems before it which will have major impact on the future of our economy.

I have already referred to the urgent need to change farm price support laws. Will there be prompt and forthright action?

The other problem to which I refer is that of balancing the Federal budget. The Constitution places upon Congress the responsibility for determining the scope and amount of Federal spending. As the President has said, "We must avoid any contribution to inflationary processes which could disrupt sound growth in our economy."

The Illinois College of Agriculture points out that inflation "is a cruel tax because it weighs heaviest upon those least able to pay—widows, orphans, and older people who have worked hard to save for their later years.

"It is a dangerous tax because it has toppled democratic governments, bred dictators, and led to wars and destruction.

"Inflation hurts almost everyone. It cuts the value of life insurance policies, savings deposits, bonds and social security, and other retirement credits."

Bringing farm program expenditures under control is important to achieving balanced Federal budgets.

Your Government—our Government in Washington—is in the process of deciding whether as a nation we will live within our expected $77 billions of Federal income. It is the way to greater progress, more jobs, more farm progress, and a better life for all our people.

I have emphasized progress and change, but there are certain basic and enduring values that do not change.

We tend to forget them under the pressures and rush of this atomic and space age. Yet they are basic to our Christian and American way of life.

They have given us our great America. They have led us into the spiritual, cultural, and economic growth that has given us the abundant life which we enjoy.

I am referring to the ideals we live by—the faith by which men and women of character live. They were present in the minds and hearts of our forefathers, they exist in our form of government, and we must be ever vigilant to protect and hold fast to them.

Our honored and cherished American system of free enterprise is founded on spiritual values—not material values.

It assures us of an ever new and expanding, limitless dimension for our abilities and for the future of agriculture and of all of America.

Furthermore, we here in this country, as President Theodore Roosevelt said a half century ago, "hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years—and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed, if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men."

---

## The Crisis in Outdoor Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CLEMENT W. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly instructive on the day we consider the Interior budget to include this commentary by a leading expert in recreation showing how we are lagging in providing for our needs.

THE CRISIS IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

(By Marion Clawson)

If you are one of the growing majority of Americans who go outdoors for recreation on annual vacations and on weekends, chances are that your patience has been tried by all those other people who like the same things you do. Having to reserve cabins that you used to just drive to on the spur of the moment; pulling into crowded camp sites where your neighbors' smoke gets into your eyes, their radios into your ears, and their children almost into your laps; perhaps actually being turned away by a full camp sign; working reaches of a stream where there seem to be more fishermen than fish; lining up to wait your turn for communing with nature at a once-quiet scenic spot; these are only some of an all too familiar set of frustrations.

The chances are, too, that you have met with more of these exasperating circumstances in 1958 than in 1957, more in 1957 than in 1956, and so on. Unless your experience has been very different from the average, this will not have been just because your temper has grown shorter. Recreational use of all kinds of public lands has more than trebled since the end of the war, and is still rising. Despite strenuous efforts, new recreation facilities are not being added nearly so fast.

None of this, of course, is exactly news to the general public, much less to the people who use recreation areas or are responsible for providing and administering them. The growth of outdoor recreation and the attendant squeeze on recreation facilities is just about the most open secret of our time. What is happening is clear enough. The question is: What does it mean? Are we suffering a natural, healthy spell of growing

pains, or are we working up to a crisis in outdoor recreation?

To me, the evidence suggests that we are approaching a grade-A crisis, unprecedented in both size and character. In saying this, I am fully aware of the earnest and well-directed efforts that are being made to provide more and better facilities for outdoor recreation. At least two of these—Mission 66 of the National Park Service, and Operation Outdoors of the Forest Service—are on a considerable scale. In addition, there are several other Federal programs; numerous State, county, and city programs, many of which are well conceived and well led; and some very effective work by private groups like the American Forestry Association and the National Recreation Association, and by a handful of large private landholders, chiefly timber companies. All these activities add up to a very large total effort. But it is not nearly large enough.

Each year the gap between the active demand and the opportunities for outdoor recreation grows wider, and the gap between potential demand and opportunity wider still. The result is not merely a larger problem, but a quite different problem. As Luther Gulick has recently pointed out, changes in scale can be large enough to change the whole nature of problems or even to create problems where none existed before. He used an example from engineering of the critical speed at which a plane must cease trundling along on its wheels and become airborne. From all signs, outdoor recreation in the United States has reached the take-off point. What up until now has been largely a matter of inconvenience to an increasing number of individuals is turning into a serious national problem that concerns not only the use of many million acres of land but also a large segment of our whole national pattern of life. It is no longer enough just to do more of the same kind of thing we have done in the past.

The situation calls for a fresh look, from a broad viewpoint. That is what gives so much significance to the recent creation of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Establishment of this distinguished group, under the chairmanship of Laurance Rockefeller, would be a notable action under any circumstances. Coming last fall, by an act of Congress signed by the President, it is an encouraging sign of an awakening nationwide concern, and of a comprehensive new approach to the recreation problem. The commission is directed to survey present needs and opportunities, to look ahead to the prospects for the years 1976 and 2000, and to outline policies and programs for meeting current and future needs. Its report, expected in 1961, could be a landmark.

One of the first great contributions that the Commission can make is to chart the present situation more accurately than is now possible. Having recently tried, with the aid of a number of governmental and private authorities on various phases of recreation, to bring together the statistics that are available, I can speak of this at first hand and with some feeling. The result of our effort, recently published by Resources for the Future as "Statistics on Outdoor Recreation," though it does present a more complete picture than has heretofore been assembled, is nearly as useful for what it doesn't say. The gaps and inconsistencies are rude reminders of the work still to be done before we can really see the current position and try to understand how and why we got there, and where the main trends are leading.

But I believe that enough of the facts are already known to give at least an approximation of the situation the Commission will be grappling with, and perhaps a preview of some of the forces and issues involved. The remainder of this article will seek to establish some rough measures of the size of the nation's total problem of outdoor recreation. In a succeeding article I hope to lay out for examination of a few of the specific problems and some of the ways in which they might be resolved.

In our quick survey of the situation and the outlook, let us first remind ourselves of the tremendous importance of outdoor recreation, and how deeply it is imbedded in the American way of life. We are not dealing here with any passing popular fad or with the demands of a fortunate minority, but with a set of continuing forces that will find expression in one way or another. If their direct course is blocked, we may be sure they will find other outlets, with perhaps unexpected and not always pleasant results.

I am not thinking primarily of the strictly commercial importance of outdoor recreation, although that, too, is already great and constantly growing. Here, as with so many aspects of our subject, there is a sad lack of realiable statistics. But there have been some responsible estimates of consumers' expenditures for all recreation. The Commerce Department's estimate for 1956 is slightly more than $13 billion. A Fortune magazine estimate for the year 1953 was $18 billion; if extended to 1956 the figure probably would be around $20 billion. Apparently between 5 and 8 percent of all family spending is for recreation. How much of this total is for outdoor recreation is anybody's guess, but such breakdowns as are available for large items like sports equipment and travel suggest a level of at least $4 to $5 billion. In any case, it is perfectly apparent that in many communities recreation has become a leading industry, sometimes the leading one, and that the rise of winter sports is making this more and more of a year-round situation.

The main point goes much deeper. We Americans don't just want outdoor recreation; we need it. Moving from farms to cities and suburbs has not meant turning our backs on land and water and open sky. As a people, we don't feel right unless we can get back from time to time to the out-of-doors. If we should ever lose this urge, there will have been a profound change in the national character. Meanwhile, it is abundantly clear—even if not subject to statistical proof—that outdoor recreation is not just one alternative use of family income and leisure time that rises and falls automatically with changing costs and fashions. Meeting the demand for such recreation is a national problem of the first rank.

For all these reasons, social and economic, recreation is becoming one of the chief uses of land, along with farming, forestry, and grazing.

To get some idea of the dimensions of the coming crisis in recreation, let us pick as a definite date the year 2000 which, remote as it may sound, is only 41 years away. Anyone can see that the problem will be much bigger than it is today, if only because there will be about twice as many people. In addition, an even larger proportion of us will be city dwellers who will have to go looking for our outdoor recreation rather than find much of it at home. It is almost certain, too, that we will have more money to spend and more leisure time away from the job. Nevertheless, it is hard to grasp how much bigger the demand for outdoor recreation is likely to be. At first glance, the best figures that can be worked out seem too big to be believed.

I find it hard to grasp, too. So that you can see for yourself, let us go through the essential steps in the best scientific tradition without, however, getting bogged down in too many technicalities.

Any professional economist who wants to look forward nearly always starts out by looking backward. So let us begin by glancing at the record of the past to see what the main trends are and where they are likely to lead.

Consideration will be limited to public land use for recreation purposes, partly because better records are available for such lands, and partly because they are today much more extensively used than private lands for recreational activities other than hunting and fishing. Private lands, however, are a potential recreational asset of great value, and their intelligent use can do much to meet future needs. For example, a recent industry survey showed that some form of recreational activity is carried on on 42,737,567 privately owned woodland acres, with some of their programs being outstanding.

As an example of public land use, let us see what has happened in the national parks. (Chief reason for choosing the parks is that they were started first and are devoted wholly to recreation of one kind or another; comparable statistics run back over a longer span. In recent years the national forests have been just as important in the outdoor recreation picture; their story is equally interesting and, in its main outlines, quite similar.) Until 1910, one of the great problems was to make the general public more familiar with the parks, and to encourage them to use the parks then in existence. In no year up to that time had there been a total of as many as 100,000 visits to the whole system.

From 1910 until 1918, there was a more rapid climb in the number of visits, but still nothing sensational; the total at the end of the First World War was under 50,000. But from then on the brakes were off—a million visits in 1920; 2 million in 1925; 3 million in 1928; and so on up to last year's figure of about 60 million visits. Moreover, the increases in use come faster and faster. In the 1920's, the increase from year to year was from 100,000 to 300,000; in the 1930's, from 500,000 to 1 million; and in the late 1940's and 1950's, from 1 to 2 million. The more people come to the parks, the greater the increase, it seems.

It is clear in retrospect that the sharp changes in rate were closely connected with the rise of the family automobile as as American institution. Before 1910, there weren't many cars on the roads, and not many roads fit for them to be on. People came to the parks by train and were driven to and from their hotels in horse-drawn stages. Trips around the parks during their stay were also by stage, or on horseback. In any case, the adventurous few who might have reached the parks by car would have had to leave their vehicles at the gates. Automobiles weren't allowed inside, for the good reason that the roads were crooked and narrow and the horses scary. By the beginning of the first war, when it was clear that the horseless carriage was here to stay, the regulations against its entering the parks were rapidly cleared away, and the tempo and pattern of public use of the parks began to change.

One small but troublesome fly in the ointment is the suspicion that never, since the horse-and-buggy days have the statistics on park attendance been quite dependable. In the days when a train journey was required, plus some rather complicated arrangements after reaching a park, it was a safe bet that in the great majority of cases a recorded visit meant that one person had been at one park during a year. It was also probable that he had made considerably more than an overnight stay. In recent years, thanks to the mobility that the family car has bestowed upon the vacationing family, we are not nearly so sure what a visit means, whether it be to a national park, a national forest, or some other kind of public recreation land.

Nowadays a visit can equally well represent any one of a variety of circumstances: A long journey to spend several days at

some one place, as in the told times; a half-day of sightseeing as an incidental part of a trip to see distant friends or relatives; one of a number of stops of varying length as part of a tour of half a dozen or so parks, monuments, or forests; one of several trips made each year; and so forth. One of the first things that must be done in dealing with the coming problem of outdoor recreation is to collect better statistics on attendance, and gain a better understanding of what they mean. We need to know much more than we do today about who uses the outdoor recreation lands, where they come from, what they come for, and how long they stay. It already is clear, however, that there are a great many more recorded annual visits than visitors. My own guess is that the combined total of nearly 120 million visits to national forests and national parks last year represents no more than 12 to 15 million people, and the 200 million visits to State parks between 15 and 25 million.

Whatever the relationship may be, there is no reason to think that it has changed materially over recent years. Therefore, although we cannot measure the intensity of use of recreation lands we can, through the increase in the number of visits, approximate the increase in use that has been occurring.

The charts on page 30 give the year-to-years story of increasing use of the national park system, and of two other important kinds of public recreation lands—the national forests and State parks. The climb in attendance has been amazingly persistent and consistent. Although attendance fell off sharply during the Second World War when gasoline, tires, new cars, and many other things were scarce, the war was no sooner over than the upward thrust began again. For both the national parks and the national forests, the long-range trend took up almost exactly where it had left off. The picture is not so clear cut for the State parks, because prewar figures aren't detailed or accurate, but obviously something of the same sort happened there, too. In the postwar years, the rate of increase in attendance has been 10 percent a year in the national forests and State parks, and 8 percent in the national park system.

Gains in the number of annual visits to other recreation areas can be shown most quickly in a small but instructive table:

| Area | Number of visits in 1958 or last year of record | Percentage rate of annual gain during postwar years |
|---|---|---|
| Federal wildlife refuges | 8.5 million | 12 |
| TVA reservoirs | 40 million (1956). | 15 |
| Corps of Engineers reservoirs. | 71 million (1956). | 28 |
| Municipal and county parks. | Over 1,000 million. | 4 |

The rates vary, but the direction is every where the same—up.

What can these historical trend figures tell us about the future, specifically the year 2000? Literally and directly applied, not much. Simple extension of trend lines, which under some circumstances is sound economic procedure, in this instance give answers that are nonsensical. If, for instance, in the chart that shows visits to national forests from 1924 to 1956, the recent slant of the trend line were extended to the year 2000, an extra-large page would have to be used, for the line would finally come to roost at a point above the present top of the printed page. There are, of course, space-saving ways of graphing rises of such steepness. One of them is used just as an exercise: A semilogarithmic chart in which the scale becomes progressively smaller as the numbers grow larger, so that the interval between 10 and 100, say, is the same as between 100 and 1,000. This kind of chart, which is used mainly for showing rates of increase, tells us where a yearly 10 percent increase in the number of visits to the national forests would lead by the year 2000. The answer would be 3.4 billion. It is all very simple: A 10 percent annual increase means a doubling every 7 years. Just start with 60 million in 1958, and keep going. The result would mean an average of 12 visits a year to the national forests by each man, woman, and child in the country, assuming a population of around 310 million. Unless everyone stopped working, this would not leave much time for the additional recreational traveling that would have to be done to all the other areas, including an average of more than 40 visits a year to State parks.

Clearly this won't do; our careful calculations have only led down the same blind alley that sometimes tempts playful statisticians to prove by trend lines that some fast-growing town will in a certain number of years have more people than the whole State, and in a certain number of added years, than the entire country. But let us not throw out the baby with the bath; the historical figures, and the current trends that they indicate, are full of meaning that can be ignored only at our own risk. Use of our great public recreation areas has actually been, and still is, increasing at rates of 8 and 10 percent and more a year. The pace will slacken some day, but nobody knows when, or how much. The sober statistical evidence points to a snowballing demand for outdoor recreation beyond anything we have yet experienced.

As for establishing at least a rough measure of the potential demand for outdoor recreation over the next four decades, a more roundabout method than extending trend lines seems to be more trustworthy. Let us examine the four factors that appear to be the main components of total demand.

1. Population. There will be about twice as many people in the United States in the year 2000 as there were in 1950. This is, of course, not a flat prediction; projecting future birth rates is a tricky business, and experts in the business have been very cagey since nearly all of them were caught flat-footed by the upsurge in births during and after the last war. On the other hand, the prospect of a doubled population is much more than an educated guess. The figure already has risen from 151 million in 1950 to 175 million in 1958. Many of the people who will make up the population in the year 2000 already have been born, and the stork still is working overtime. It is reasonable to expect a national population of 240 million in 1980 and 310 million in 2000. We know, too, that an even larger proportion of the future population will be city people who will have to look to specialized areas for getting outdoors.

2. Buying power: People will have more money to spend—perhaps twice as much per person in 2000 as in 1950. This will greatly stimulate use of recreation areas, especially when admission is free or at nominal rates. Vacation travel costs are a large consideration here; so are costs of equipment for camping, hunting, fishing, boating, etc. Income after taxes averaged about $1,600 per person in 1956. A reasonable estimate for the year 2000 is in the neighborhood of $3,600.

3. Leisure: People will have more time for outdoor recreation. The average number of hours worked per week has been dropping steadily, from around 70 in 1850 to around 40 in 1950. Part of the reduction has come through shorter working days, part through shorter working weeks, part through more general adoption of paid vacations. The 8-hour day, 5-day week is by now nearly standard, and its relation to the great rise in all kinds of outdoor recreation is obvious. The future prospect is for still shorter working days and weeks, and for longer and more widespread paid vacations. A reasonable estimate for the year 2000 may well be an average workweek of about 28 hours.

4. Mobility: People will travel more. In 1900, when steam and electric railroads were the chief forms of transportation (together with the horse, which had not yet himself become a rather expensive form of recreation), the average traveler covered about 500 miles a year. Today, with the airplane and the family automobile, the yearly average has risen to about 5,000 miles. Although part of the growth represents a great increase in commuting, there still is a large gain left over for leisure travel. A reasonable estimate for the year 2000 is an average of about 9,000 miles a year for each traveler. In addition, there will be an increase in mobility due to psychological causes which are impossible to measure, but nonetheless important. As a people we are less and less likely to stay in one place all of our lives. Opportunity for outdoor recreation will increasingly be an inducement for moving and for travel.

All four of these forces are pushing in the same direction, and all reinforce each other. To get some idea of the total effect, we need to multiply rather than to add. Twice as many people, twice as much income per person, 1.5 times as much leisure, and nearly twice as much travel comes out to roughly 10 times as much demand for outdoor recreation in the year 2000 as in 1950. The word "roughly" is used advisedly. We don't know that the estimates for 2000 will turn out as projected; we don't know exactly how they will act upon each other. The total increase in recreational demand might be as small as 5 times or as great as 15 times. But a tenfold increase seems the best single figure. There is another important qualification: The projection we have just made is for demand and thus is an index of potentiality rather than a prediction of how much outdoor recreation there actually will be at the start of the next century. The potential will not be realized unless there are more recreation areas and facilities than exist today. The past 40 years' growth in outdoor recreation could not have taken place if the areas and facilities of 1956 had been no better than those of 1916.

What would a tenfold increase in the demand for outdoor recreation mean? There are such great differences in the types of recreation land and their uses that an estimate merely of total demand does not tell us much. But if we make a very simple breakdown into three categories, the picture begins to grow clearer.

One of these categories we might call user-oriented recreation areas, whose most important characteristic is accessibility. Whatever the facilities are—children's playgrounds, tennis courts, golf links, swimming pools, or just green space for strolling and picnicking—they must be located close to the people who use them. Such areas do not have to possess any original beauty or other unique natural qualities. Trees and grass can be grown, playing fields laid out, pools and artificial lakes created, on very ordinary kinds of land. Practically all of the user-oriented classification consists of city and county parks.

At the other extreme are the resource-based recreation areas. With them it is the natural qualities that are important; nearness to users counts for little. The people who do happen to live near by may use them as they would use city parks after hours or on weekends, but the great majority come from considerable distances during their vacations. The average visitor to Grand Canyon National Park, for instance, makes his

stop there as part of a 3,000-mile round-trip journey. Most of the resource-based areas have been chosen as outstanding examples of natural beauty, whether of mountain, lake, forest, or desert. Others are unique as historical or scientific sites. The principal areas in this category are the national park system and the national forests.

In between the two extremes are some important recreation areas that are best described as intermediate. These are relatively easy to get to—no more than a couple of hours driving for most users, and usually less. Scenic beauty and other natural advantages are desirable, but not all important; the aim is to get the best facilities that are available without sacrifice of accessibility. If necessary, quite ordinary land can be made into attractive and useful intermediate recreation areas. All-day outings are the most common form of use, although some people stay overnight and a few spend whole vacations there. Boating, swimming, hiking, picnicking, and fishing are among the most common activities. State parks and the reservoir areas of the TVA system and the Corps of Engineers are the principal lands in this category.

There are overlaps, of course, among the three classifications. A few of the larger and wilder State parks spill over into the resource based category, an occasional county park may be more of an intermediate than user-based variety, and so on. But for the most part the three main categories have quite distinctive qualities of use, size, and degree of artificial improvements.

Now let us try to see what a tenfold increase in demand for all outdoor recreation might mean for each of the three types of area. The estimates that follow, I should point out in advance, are strictly unofficial. I have worked them out myself on the basis of the figures that are available to anyone, with much painful cogitation on how the statistics and projections might best be interpreted. In recent months I have tried out my conclusions on a number of Federal and State specialists in outdoor recreation. Some of these experts, I must confess, have been startled, especially at first, by the size of my estimates, but thus far no one has blown them out of the water. One man with whom I talked recently said that his estimates were quite a bit lower than mine—but then conceded freely that his past calculations of that kind had always turned out to be far too low.

Demand for user-oriented recreation would be likely, I believe, to be four times as large in the year 2000 as in 1950. Larger urban population and more leisure time are the two factors that will make for an increase here. Higher incomes and greater travel will be of little importance; in fact, both might tend to divert seekers of outdoor recreation to places farther from home.

A much greater increase seems likely in the potential demand for intermediate recreation areas—perhaps as much as 16 times. Rises in average income and annual travel should both tend to stimulate interest in these areas.

The greatest increases in demand are likely to arise for the resource-based recreation lands. Lack of time and money still keeps many families from trips to distant national parks and forests. With higher family incomes and longer vacations, the potential demand in the year 2000 may well be 40 times what it has been in the recent past. If this demand were met, it would result in an annual use of the resource-based areas about two-thirds as great as the astronomical figures we arrived at (and rejected) earlier by extending the present trend lines.

Let me repeat that all of these projections are extremely rough. It is not only that we can't predict the future; there is still much that we don't know about what is going on today. It is safer to think in ranges. Even so, the estimates we have arrived at point rather conclusively to what may well be a coming crisis in outdoor recreation.

The prospects for the future suggest many problems: How much additional land should be acquired for public recreation areas? How much would it cost? How can intelligent use of private facilities alleviate some of the pressure? What can be done to protect recreational values, particularly in wilderness areas, that already are threatened by overuse? These and other issues that will have to be dealt with in one way or another will be examined in a second article next month.

## Two Men and Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great personal pleasure to insert an editorial from a recent issue of the Honlulu Hawaii Times with regard to the Honorable JOHN A. BURNS.

The contribution made by JOHN BURNS in the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill is inestimable. History will record that when JOHN BURNS made the difficult decision to let the Alaska statehood bill be brought up first for floor consideration, he sealed statehood for both Territories. In so doing, he was willing to sacrifice his own future. But this was the greatest single contribution to the enactment of the legislation which he and his people had cherished for so many years.

I am pleased to note that the Hawaii Times has recognized his efforts in behalf of the statehood legislation.

The editorial follows:

[From the Hawaii Times, Mar. 17, 1959]

TWO MEN AND STATEHOOD

A quiet, unassuming man who played a leading role in the final and crucial phases of Hawaii's successful struggle for statehood has been all but forgotten in the tumultuous excitement of victory.

He is Hawaii's last Delegate to Congress JOHN A. BURNS.

An obviously publicity-eager man who can lay no valid claim to any unusual efforts to gain statehood for Hawaii has been in the center of the statehood victory spotlight.

He is Hawaii's last appointed Gov. William F. Quinn.

BURNS has been twice elected by the people of Hawaii to represent them in Washington and to spearhead their statehood efforts—duties which he has most succesfully carried out.

Quinn has never been elected to any office by the people of Hawaii. He was appointed from Washington—without the people being asked whether or not they would like to have him as Governor.

Yet, news stories from Washington on official activities concerning Hawaii and statehood have mostly featured Governor Quinn, the appointed politician, and ignored Delegate BURNS, elected representative of the people.

It is obvious that Republican administration leaders in Washington have deliberately used their political positions and power to overemphasize Governor Quinn's connection with statehood for the islands, while keeping Delegate BURNS from receiving due acclaim for his leadership and successful tactics.

But will the people of Hawaii be fooled? We think not.

## Research Program for Cotton Ginning and Mechanization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article by B. F. Smith, executive vice president of the Delta Council, in regard to the urgent necessity of an improved research program for cotton ginning and mechanization:

MECHANIZATION RESEARCH—ANSWER TO QUALITY, PRICE COMPETITION?

(By B. F. Smith, executive vice president, Delta Council)

A lot has been written about the plight of the U.S. cotton industry. From between every line, two primary facts are glaringly evident: First, cotton production costs must be reduced still further in order to meet competition pricewise; and, second, quality of the raw fiber must be preserved, even improved, to meet competition qualitywise.

It is equally as evident that mechanization research is the key to these locks.

Development of equipment for obtaining more dependable stands, better tools and techniques for the application of agricultural chemicals, increased efficiency and economy in machine harvesting. These are citical areas of mechanization research which need increased attention—immediately.

Also urgent is redoubled research effort in ginning. Ginning may rightly be considered as the last operation in cotton production. It is of as much concern to cotton growers as to ginners. Until ginning is completed correctly, the producer does not have a profitably salable product.

These and other needs for additional cotton mechanization and ginning research are being emphasized by the Delta Council Advisory Research Committee. Headed by a former Delta Council president, J. R. Flautt, the committee is composed of agricultural leaders from throughout the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta area.

Primary function of the group are to point out suggested research work needed for the betterment of agricultural enterprises of the area; to help make available research data developed by the station to delta farmers; and to act as a clearinghouse for suggested research, recommending only work which will be of maximum benefit to the entire area.

After conferences with Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, chairman of the House subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and with Congressman FRANK E. SMITH, the advisory research committee developed specific recommendations for vitally important research efforts in mechanization and ginning.

The almost explosive expansion of cotton production outside the United States in recent years poses a serious threat to the industry in this country. In most foreign countries where expansions have taken place, la-

bor is cheap and plentiful. Since labor is neither cheap nor plentiful in the United States our hope for survival depends upon immediate advances in mechanized production and processing.

Revolutionary changes in cotton production since World War II have resulted from publicly and privately supported research. Reductions in labor requirements have come about almost entirely through substitution of machines and chemicals for men and animals. Significant progress has been made. Much remains to be done to enable cotton farmers to produce more efficiently and economically, and thereby meet competition. Gaps in the cotton mechanization and ginning programs must be closed as quickly as possible. Practical answers to some of these most important problems will greatly improve and strengthen the entire cotton industry. Failure to achieve needed breakthroughs in production and ginning barriers will mean that cotton production in many parts of the Nation will be a dying industry.

Research programs in cotton mechanization and ginning have already demonstrated that new and improved techniques and machines can be developed. Results have made it possible for cotton to fight back successfully on a broad front and to hang on tenaciously to a large part of the textile market. There is now a pressing need for additional research efforts directed toward finding answers to specific problems.

Need for these answers is of the utmost urgency, not only to cotton farmers and ginners of the Midsouth, but to the entire industry.

Mechanization research has suffered from lack of facilities for conducting basic research and a lack of manpower to do things which need to be done. There has been such a constant and pressing demand for solutions to problems associated with the transition to mechanized production that little time has been left for research which could result in marked basic improvements in machines and methods. Too much time of trained engineers has been required for routine tasks, such as developing and providing test equipment for conducting weed and insect control research programs.

Three areas of mechanization research demand immediate increased emphasis. These areas are: (1) machine harvesting; (2) the application of agricultural chemicals; and (3) the development of equipment for obtaining more dependable stands.

To illustrate the problem in only one of these areas of needed research, let's look at machine picking. Field losses in machine picked cotton range from 5 percent to more than 15 percent. Grade loss due to machine picking usually amounts to one full grade. In addition to grade loss, there are wide differences in characteristics of machine harvested material which affect processing and costs. If these losses could be reduced by only 50 percent, production costs could be cut at least 3 to 4 cents per pound. Also, additional basic knoweldge of this kind would greatly improve the possibilities for developing a simpler machine which would be better suited to smaller farms.

The ginning research program has made many significant contributions to the cotton industry. These contributions, ranging from the development of seed cotton drying systems to lint cleaners and automatic samplers, to mention only a few, have been or immeasurable value. But we have experienced marked changes in harvesting, production, and processing practices and these changes have tended to offset some of the gains made through improved ginning equipment. It should be pointed out, however, that savings of labor afforded through changes in harvesting practices made possible by improvements in ginning have helped to maintain the competitive position of cotton while enabling cotton farmers to realize a net return from their operations.

Although the list of accomplishments resulting from the work of the ginning research program is impressive, it is a fact that improvements in ginning afforded through research have not kept pace with the problems imposed by changes in production, harvesting, and manufacturing practices. Grades of American cotton have continued to decline slightly with increased use of mechanical harvesters of all types. Also, changes in spinning mill practices, brought on by the increased cost of labor used in processing cotton through spinning and weaving, have placed further burdens upon requirements for processing at gins.

Complaints by mills to the effect that modern cottons are not processing through their plants satisfactorily have opened the eyes of research workers to the role that both mechanization and ginning play in maintaining quality from field to spinning mill.

A closer look at the problem would indicate that modern mill requirements are far in excess of those existing prior to World War II. This is evidenced by the fact that spindle speeds have been increased from 7,000 r.p.m. to 10,000 or better r.p.m.; carding rates have been increased from six pounds per hour to 12–15 pounds per hour in commercial production, and competition of rayon has alerted the spinning industry to the fact that waste in cotton is a serious loss to them and that blends of synthetics with cotton make it possible to increase the output of the spinning process.

The No. 1 problem demanding expanded work at the Cotton Ginning Laboratory at Stoneville covers a specific project for developing instruments and controls which will reduce or eliminate damage now occurring to cotton during ginning due to overdrying. There is immediate need for relief in this field. At the Cotton Spinner-Breeder Conference held in Lubbock, Tex., in October of 1958, almost every speaker on the 2-day program emphasized this problem of overdrying.

The heating system and power expended for drying and cleaning in the early days were so limited that there was very little danger of overdrying. Driers of today, however, are equipped with burners of 3 million B.t.u. capacity, dual fan systems, etc., and are capable of seriously overdrying cottons. This extra drying capacity must be controlled if serious fiber damage is to be avoided. The point is that in solving one problem, development of the drier by the Ginning Laboratory has created another. The simple development of the drier must be followed by the more complicated development of controls. These controls need to be much more than simple thermostats for controlling temperature. They will have to sense moisture of the incoming seed cotton and send a signal to regulate temperature and exposure. Lint will then be measured for moisture content and a correction signal will change conditions to suit.

Detailed sections on both mechanization and ginning are included in Delta Council's Advisory Research Committee's recommendations, along with a breakdown of funds needed and estimates of the time required to complete needed projects.

The very modest increase in funds requested for mechanization research will pay big dividends to the entire cotton industry.

## TVA Yardstick Works Again in Measuring Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent interest in the award of a contract for turbo-generators to A. C. Parson, Ltd., I include in the Appendix of the RECORD my recent newsletter which comments on this award and its significance, and also an editorial comment by the Reporter magazine in its current issue on this award. My newsletter and the article follow:

TVA YARDSTICK WORKS AGAIN IN MEASURING COSTS

(Capitol comments by JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

The TVA has served the public interest of the entire Nation in many ways since it was established 25 years ago. One of the greatest of these has been the yeardstick measure of cost of producing electric power and also the cost of producing fertilizers with resulting savings to farmers, power consumers and others.

Recently we have seen another example of TVA's use of a yardstick measuring of costs. There are only three companies in the United States who manufacture large turbo-generators for power plants; these companies are the giant General Electric Co., Westinghouse, and Allis Chalmers. During recent years these three companies have built not only all of the generators that TVA has purchased, but also all the big generators for the private utilities and for other Federal power projects. Almost one-third of all the funds the TVA has spent have gone to States in which these three companies are located, largely to pay for these turbo-generators. For example, $350 million has gone to New York, the home of the General Electric Co.; $190 million has gone to Pennsylvania, the home of Westinghouse, and some $64 million to Wisconsin, the home State of the Allis Chalmers Co.

The bids of these three companies have always been remarkably close—usually the spread between the lowest and the highest has been less than 1 percent—so close as to raise a suspicion in some instances of bid rigging. Over the last 8 years these firms have boosted their prices for these big generators by more than 50 percent although the average wholesale price for all commodities has increased by only about 5 percent.

In view of these facts, and especially the increasing costs, when the TVA last year was ordering one of the largest turbo-generators ever built in the world, the TVA decided to invite bids also from qualified foreign suppliers.

Under the terms of the Buy American Act, purchases may be made from competing foreign firms if the domestic prices are unreasonably high. Purchases are required to be made from domestic sources if the domestic price is no more than 6 percent higher than a foreign price, or 12 percent higher if the domestic bidder is in an area of substantial unemployment. Leaning over backward, the TVA said in its invitation for bids that it would accept an American bid if it was no more than 20 percent higher.

TVA received three bids: One from General Electric, one from Westinghouse, and one from A. C. Parsons, Ltd., the largest British manufacturer of turbogenerators. The bid of the Parsons Co. was the only legally acceptable bid because it was the lowest and the only bid responsive to the specifications in the invitation. The TVA has had much trouble with late delivery of turbogenerators in the past. As a result of late deliveries, the TVA has had to buy power from private companies at high prices. Therefore, the invitation for bids called for payment of damages in the event of delays in delivery. Only the Parsons Co. bid included this guaranteed prompt delivery. In addition, the American bids were some $6 million or 50 percent higher than the Parsons bid. American wages are higher than British—about 40 percent higher in this industry. But this difference in wage scale accounts for only about $1½ million in increased labor costs, and this difference the British firm has to make up by paying an import duty of the same amount.

One of the greatest problems in our economy, which in many instances is dominated by giant corporations, is that these giants no longer compete with each other in the old-fashioned free enterprise way. There exists a need for some device to measure their costs. In addition to all the other services TVA performs, this great agency is also providing a yardstick of cost in many fields—power, fertilizer, electric generating equipment—and, in keeping costs down, benefits accrue both to the taxpayer, the consumer and the entire Nation.

---

[From the Reporter magazine]

THE YARDSTICK THAT WORKS

The Tennessee Valley Authority, whose continued growth our President once characterized as "creeping socialism," has gotten out its yardstick again, much to the embarrassment of certain leading private enterprisers. Last month, TVA awarded a contract for a half-million-kilowatt turbogenerator to the British firm of C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., after having received bids from General Electric and Westinghouse. The two American companies promptly announced they were appealing to Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to invoke the Buy American Act and revoke TVA's purchase in the interest of national security. To their workers the two companies brought the sinister news that British labor, paid only 40 percent of the comparable American wages, was depriving them of more than a million man-hours of work. Rumbles of protest began to mount of Capitol Hill.

A short time ago TVA, whose Chairman, Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, is an Eisenhower appointee, issued an explanation of its decision to buy British. For some time TVA has been disturbed by the fact that over the last 8 years American firms manufacturing large turbogenerators have boosted prices by more than 50 percent, while the average wholesale price of all commodities has increased only about 5 percent. When it sought a foreign bid, TVA had announced that it would accept the lowest bid from a U.S. manufacturer if it did not exceed the lowest foreign bid by more than 20 percent. (The Executive order issued under the Buy American Act ordinarily requires only a 6-percent preference.)

But when the General Electric and Westinghouse bids, which fell within 0.4 percent of each other, were analyzed, it turned out that they were nearly 50 percent higher than the Parsons bid. The Parsons bid was the only one of the three not containing an escalator clause to provide for future price increases; it also was the only one to accept TVA's requirement of a penalty clause in the event of tardy delivery. By accepting the British bid, TVA stood to save over $6 million.

The TVA yardstick revealed still other interesting comparisons. Taking the General Electric and Westinghouse estimate for the wage differential and multiplying this by the number of man-hours involved in the project, the TVA analyst discovered that the British firm's saving in labor cost, in comparison with American wages, amounts to $1.5 million, which, incidentally, is the amount it will pay in U.S. import duty. There still remains a discrepancy of $4 to $5 million between American and British bids, once the labor-cost factor is eliminated. As the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers pointed out: "This means that if General Electric and Westinghouse had gotten their labor completely free, they would have had difficulty in competing."

This raises some interesting questions. Despite cutbacks in older plants in Schenectady and East Pittsburgh which have caused unrest among the workers, the capacity of the hydraulic-turbine industry in this country increased by 50 percent from 1950 to 1957. Sales of electrical equipment abroad have been running about 10 times our imports. Last year's third-quarter profits for General Electric were the highest for any third-quarter in its history; Westinghouse's third-quarter earnings were its second best. Neither company appears in imminent danger of collapse because of British competition.

The real problem for our private-enterprise economy is how to devise suitable yardsticks by which the performance of our industrial leviathans can be measured. In addition to all the other services it performs, TVA, which is one of the electrical industry's biggest customers, proves its usefulness in this respect, too.

Unless, of course, we decide that a nation's security is endangered whenever it buys generators from foreign firms. If this is true, General Electric, Westinghouse, and all the big exporting companies should try to sell as much as they can to China.

---

## Our Mammoth Foreign-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information concerning our foreign-aid program:

MARCH 23, 1959.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUES: As chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations, I feel that it is my duty to place in the hands of every Member of Congress as much official information as possible on our mammoth foreign-aid program.

On Tuesday, there may be an attempt to include in the supplemental appropriation bill additional funds for the development loan program for which there is no real need. The reaction of high public officials, including some 1960 presidential candidates, to the committee's action in disallowing the supplemental request would indicate that it was an act akin to another Pearl Harbor. Now, let us go to the record for facts and not be persuaded by oratory and last-minute departmental revisions intended to sway the Members.

The attached reproduced letter gives you factual information on the Development Loan Fund and the figures have been brought down to the last accounting period, February 28, 1959. Also it shows the total amount of MSA funds unexpended as of December 31, 1958.

I should like to point out the amount of foreign aid funds available in all categories on July 1, 1958, the first day of the present fiscal year. I quote verbatim from information furnished by the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, and published by the Library of Congress: "Thus, the carryover funds of 9.5 billions, plus new funds of 6.1 billions, provided an estimated availability of 15.6 billions for foreign aid during fiscal year 1959."

Item 1 in the attached letter shows only MSA unexpended funds for foreign aid as of December 31, 1958. It does not include other categories such as Public Law 480 and overseas military construction, etc.

Expenditures for the foreign aid program in the postwar period through June 30, 1958, amounted to $71,551,940,000. Now, add the available as mentioned in the above paragraph for the total foreign aid funds expended and available.

Do you not agree that the foreign-aid program should be operated on the basis of need and not on the basis of bureaucratic demand or political expediency? We are the board of directors of a $75 billion annual business (the U.S. Government), representing 175 million stockholders. Should we not take into account that in this day of great prosperity, to some extent political expediency and bureaucratic demands for excessive spending prompt our action? Is it not true that during this fiscal year we will spend $13 billion more than revenues collected, or, as we would say in private business, more than the net profits?

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
*Member of Congress.*

---

## Poison in Your Water—No. 44

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Tampa, Fla., Tribune of February 19, 1959:

MOSQUITOES SAID BREEDING AT SARASOTA SEWER PLANTS

SARASOTA, February 18.—Increasing effluent caused by the growing number of sewage disposal plants is causing a big jump in the breeding of mosquitoes, Sarasota County Commissioners were advised Tuesday by J. Melton Williams, director of the mosquito control department.

Williams asked the board not to approve any more sewer plants until his department has an opportunity to make a determination on the proper disposal of the effluent.

Since the inauguration of plans several years ago by developers to construct sewer plants, Williams has warned that the improper disposal of the effluent could increase the number of mosquitoes.

The mosquito official said the effluent should be dumped into oxidation ponds,

which would be the responsibility of franchised sewer firms to maintain in a proper manner. The other alternative would be to dump the effluent into a flowing stream. Williams maintained the effluent would not be harmful to fish life.

Williams told commissioners that when the State health department checks a set of plans for a sewer plant it does so from the standpoint of proper operation, but not for possible effect on mosquito breeding.

The director had several bottles of culex larvae to show the commissioners the breeding brought on by the effluent. One of the samples he displayed was from the plant of the city of Sarasota.

Commissioners agreed to cooperate with Williams and will make a further study.

## A Teenager Looks at Our Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in virtually every edition of our newspapers there are ugly and disturbing stories about juvenile delinquency.

Yet, I have just received eloquent proof from my district not once, but twice that by and large there are far more fine, wonderful young teen-age boys and girls who are serious-minded, clear-thinking, alert, good God-fearing and decent citizens.

For example, I have just received a letter from a young constituent of mine named Thomas M. Shaw of Greenwich, Conn. It was a letter on foreign aid, a subject hardly associated with the thinking of a juvenile delinquent.

Thomas is only 14 years old—yet in the intelligence of his thoughts and the forcefulness of his argument, he is quite mature.

This fine young man is very interested in government and is opposed to any cuts in foreign aid funds.

In his letter to me, Thomas wrote:

I was surprised to find out that a large part of this foreign aid is military aid. I do not think that we should place such an emphasis on military aid.

Starving children cannot eat guns and bullets, nor can farmers plow their fields to grow needed food with tanks and bombs.

I think such interest in government on the part of a 14-year-old boy is highly laudable and speaks volumes for those who feel, as I do, that the vast majority of young American boys and girls are fine, clean cut, and clear thinking.

Only a small, misguided few contribute to the juvenile delinquency harassing so many of our communities in the United States.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is a young man from Bridgeport, Conn., named Neil Harding who is my second example of youth at its best.

Neil has just been selected as the North End Boys' Club Boy of the Year and will be honored by his Bridgeport friends at a dinner on April 9, at which I will be privileged to be one of the speakers.

This young man, 16 years old, is the choice from more than 3,000 other boys in the club. He is a third-year student at the University School in Bridgeport.

Neil has volunteered many hours of service to his club as an aid to the swimming instructor, teaching younger boys how to swim. And despite his youth, he has coached the club's swimming team, being active as a member of the basketball team, and is an officer of the club's senior council. Neil also serves as an altar boy at St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church and is a member of its CYO group.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that America can have too many boys like Thomas Shaw and Neil Harding.

Boys of this caliber are in the vast majority among our youth and we need have no fears of their becoming juvenile delinquents so long as they maintain an intense interest in sdo many activities.

I want to extend my congratulations to these fine young men, Mr. Speaker, and to all the other millions of American boys and girls like them.

Youngsters like these are a credit to their families, their schools, their churches, and certainly to their country.

## Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 21, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH 21, 1959.

H.R. 10 and 11, the Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act of 1959, to encourage the establishing of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals, passed after spirited debate. The bill permits an income-tax postponement on retirement savings. Thus the self-employed are given the retirement tax relief which employees now enjoy. Providing for one's own future is an old American concept, rooted in tradition and our forefathers' concepts of individual responsibilities and obligations. These are supported by the spiritual beliefs, out of which grew our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. This bill makes an interesting comparison to the relatively new concept of Federal social security, with the individual's increasing dependence on Government. A debate sprang up between those who felt the revenue loss to the Government of approximately $350 million was untimely and those who felt the inequity between employed and self-employed should be corrected. The latter view I shared, outweighing the former.

The temporary unemployment compensation (TUC) bill was passed terminating the Federal part of the program, except for the tapering off which permits those whose claims are recognized by the end of April to receive compensation. Since few emergency Federal activities are ever terminated, this action is surprising and refreshing. Only 17 States participated in the program. Texas was among those States decrying the need for Federal participation, maintaining this is a State function, to which view I subscribe.

The Federal airport bill amendment to continue Federal grants brought on the year's first knock-down political fight. By the time of final passage with debate and amendments completed, possibly a voting pattern for the year emerged. The debate centered about three aspects: (1) Would the amount of Federal money be $297 million or $200 million for 4 years; (2) would the formula for payout be 75–25 or 50–50, the 25 and 50 figures being the percentage amount of the total solely at the discretion of the FAA (Federal Aviation Agency) Administrator to allocate; (3) would the Congress insist on regular appropriation procedures or permit direct expenditures out of the Treasury. The first two were combined (becoming $200 million at the 75–25 ratio), making for a clear-cut choice of economy versus spending, since some Democrats disapproving the Republican 50–50 could now have both economy and the formula they preferred. So it was that 57 Democrats joined 137 Republicans for econmy while 209 Democrats and 5 Republicans voted for bigger spending. The liberals or big spenders won. (Nine Texans, including myself, voted for economy.) Secondly, on the vote for closing the door to the Treasury and returning to constitutional appropriation, 53 Democrats joined 138 Republicans for it, and 212 Democrats and 4 Republicans teamed up to defeat this one, too. Five Texans, including myself, voted for the amendment. The Democrat leadership worked hard on the floor to line up the votes, and succeeded. Since these amendments failed, I voted against the bill. The bill passed by a vote of 272 to 134. Seven Texans (out of 22) opposed the bill. The record is now clear as to who is for bigger spending and constitutional appropriation. The coalition of Democrats and Republicans at full strength no longer outnumbers the liberals or big spenders. Only a veto can same the day—there aren't yet enough votes to override the veto. This will be a rough year. This test demonstrates that the Democrat leadership is not worried about balanced budget, inflation, or preserving the value of our money.

The Joint Economic Committee Report on the President's 1959 Economic Statement establishes the battlelines between Republicans and Democrats as to economic philosophy and the role of Federal Government. No shred of conservatism remains on the Democrat side. A study of this report's majority and minority views should be mandatory reading for members of both parties in Texas.

An amendment to the agriculture bill was my legislative contribution this week. This bill would permit a farmer to grow wheat on his own land for his own use without Federal control or fine. This supports Judge T. Whitfield Davidson's decision concerning Evetts Haley, Jr's, right to grow wheat, a decision the Supreme Court summarily reversed. I join Judge Davidson and Evetts Haley in branding unconstitutional the Supreme Court decision. The attacks on the rights of property ownership have become all too similar to the aims of the Socialist and Communist doctrines.

Urban renewal repeats the attacks on property ownership in various ways. First, your property can be seized through eminent domain, the result of a redevelopment board's judgment of spiritual or esthetic values in community planning.

Secondly, Government public housing, the antithesis of home ownership, goes along hand in glove with urban renewal. I presented a thorough study of urban renewal in the House this week. (Tuesday, Mar. 17, pp. 3906–3921, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.) I forewarned Members of the heavy expenditures for urban renewal and public housing in housing bills now pending. Forecast: Bigger spending and inflation unless people demand economy of Senators and Representatives.

## Cordell Hull Birthplace, a National Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Tennessee in 1953 created the Cordell Hull Birthplace Memorial Association and the Tennessee Legislature has made appropriations for the purpose of restoring the birthplace of this great American. Many believe that in view of the great contribution Cordell Hull made to our Nation and particularly in the area of improving our relations with the other nations of this hemisphere, it would be appropriate to make a national shrine of his birthplace. Recently the Senate of the Tennessee Legislature adopted a resolution to memorialize the Federal Government to this end. Under unanimous consent I insert this Senate joint resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD. The resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 22

Resolution to memorialize the Federal Government to make a national shrine of the Cordell Hull birthplace in Pickett County

Whereas the State of Tennessee created the Cordell Hull Birthplace Memorial Association in 1953 and appropriated the funds and authorized the purchase of the Cordell Hull birthplace in Pickett County, Tenn.; and

Whereas additional appropriations were made thereto in 1955 and 1957 for the purpose of restoring said birthplace to its original form as nearly as possible and to take measures for preserving the same; and

Whereas such has now been done and the property has been purchased, the log cabin restored to its original form, and improvements have been completed thereon; and

Whereas there has been some indication that the Federal Government, through the efforts of the Tennessee delegation in Congress, representing the State and the district wherein such property lies, has become interested in making such birthplace a national shrine and otherwise pay tribute to the memory of that great Tennessean; and

Whereas the attitude of this State on such project has been solicited by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and others interested therein: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the senate of the 81st general assembly*, That Tennessee's delegation in the U.S. Congress be urged to continue its efforts in securing this tribute to the memory of Judge Hull, and that it is the expressed thinking of this body that should the Federal Government see fit to develop this historic spot as a national shrine, the State should vest title in such birthplace in the Federal Government and cooperate with it in any way toward the full development thereof; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Senator ALBERT GORE, and Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee.

Adopted March 19, 1959.

WM. D. BAIRD,
*Speaker of the Senate.*

## Foreign Aid Used To Keep United States Out of War, David Lawrence Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress considers President Eisenhower's request for approximately $4 billion in foreign assistance funds, I believe that the following article by the noted columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, is most pertinent. The article appeared in the Sioux City Journal of March 20, 1959. I include it in its entirety as follows:

FOREIGN AID USED TO KEEP UNITED STATES OUT OF WAR

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—If the American people could express in a single sentence their most important wish today, it would be: "Keep us out of war at any cost."

Yet when, out of a national budget of $77 billion, the President asks for $3,930 million to keep American boys from fighting abroad, and calls for a mutual security program to bolster our allies, this is derided as a foreign-aid program or a giveaway.

The label is wrong. It's really a keep-us-out-of-war program.

EXPLOSIVE SITUATION

Few of the critics realize the explosive situation that exists in the world today or how interrelated America's fate is with the other free countries—or, if they do realize it, they fail to see how many billions more our defenses would cost if America had to do the job alone. That's why President Eisenhower's address Monday night was so important to the country.

For the President had no sooner announced last week that he was asking Congress for $3,930 million when from Capitol Hill—mostly from Democrats—came predictions that the expenditure would be cut by a billion. Acting Secretary of State Herter promptly said that if any such reduction were made it would "serve notice on the world that we are weakening in our determination."

Just why some of the legislators regard any money spent abroad as either a gift or a throwaway is hard to understand unless they think the American people really can be misled by such distortions.

TRUE TEST

Certainly, as sometimes charged, there's waste in the spending of American funds in other countries because the United States cannot always control how other governments disburse the money they receive. But, conceding that there is some waste, it is a fact that in war itself there is even greater waste. The true test is whether, on the whole, war is prevented, and thus far the United States has managed with the help of strong allies to keep us out of a third world war.

It sometimes isn't realized how much America's own allies have been spending since the close of World War II. Rather the impression is fostered by the critics that the United States is putting up all the money for international defense or mutual security. The President in his message a few days ago to Congress said:

"Over the years of our combined effort, these allies and friends have spent on these forces some $141 billion, more than six times the $22 billion we have contributed in military assistance. During calendar year 1958 they contributed $19 billion of their own funds to the support of these forces.

ARMED CAMP

"Without the strength of our allies our Nation would be turned into an armed camp and our people subjected to a heavy draft and an annual cost of many billions of dollars above our present military budget."

What perhaps isn't generally understood in America is that economic assistance plays a vital role in maintaining the stability of other nations. If there were no stable governments among our allies America would not have strategic bases overseas.

Dissenting Members of Congress aften concede that the military program is logical but they claim the economic support abroad is questionable and this they would cut. In doing so they would strike a blow at the morale of the countries affected. For without economic stability, political chaos ensues, and then the Communists find fertile ground for exploitation or even overthrow of existing governments.

## West Berlin's Mayor Willy Brandt Says: "Never Let the Russians Think You're Weak"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great symbols of freedom in the world today is Willy Brandt, the courageous mayor of West Berlin, a city of free people encircled by communism.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an article by Willy Brandt published yesterday in This Week magazine:

NEVER LET THE RUSSIANS THINK YOU'RE WEAK

(By Willy Brandt)

BERLIN, GERMANY.—I am the mayor of a unique city. There is no other like it anywhere. It lies 110 miles behind the Iron Curtain—a lonely but solid outpost of the freedom that we, like you, cherish so deeply.

My city has been split in two: As mayor of West Berlin I preside over the 2,200,000 inhabitants of our zone, spread over 184 square miles of territory, but I have no jurisdiction over the 1,200,000 Berliners who live in the eastern part of our city, allotted to the Russian conquerors. We are completely surrounded by Soviet-occupied territory. We can cross it by car, over certain highways, by rail or by air, but we are not allowed to stop or visit our friends on the way. We cannot wander at will in our city's outskirts.

NO PLACE TO GO

The countryside around Berlin is dotted with lakes, forests, and rivers. But on a warm summer Sunday there is no place for a Berliner to go, except to the suburban lakes of Wannsee and Tegel. You can see us on summer weekends, creeping bumper-to-bumper to Wannsee. A Berliner can go to Wannsee or Tegel—or stay home. He is barred from the forests, right at his very doorstep, where he used to spend his weekends camping, fishing or swimming. This makes for claustrophobia and a feeling of isolation, which depresses us now and then.

"Divided she stands" has been said of Berlin. This city has two currencies and two regimes, based on mutually hostile ideologies. We receive refugees (from 100 to 500 a day). We shoulder the burden of being a showcase of freedom in a partitioned nation.

The Free University in West Berlin, which you have helped us to build, has now the largest enrollment in all Germany (almost 12,000). More than a third of the students are refugees from East Germany and the influx continues. What would you say to a boy who comes to you, having risked his life by escaping, and says: "I want to live in a free world." You would not send him back. We do not. We give him a free education and subsistence.

Because of the division many special tasks have been added to the usual problems of a big-city administration. We now in West Berlin have our own gas, electricity, heat, and our own transportation system. But we are dependent on our neighbors' permission for problems connected with shipping, air traffic, sewer system and even our own railroad station.

Trains run in and out of Berlin to West Germany every day. By a fluke in the four-power agreement of 1945, our station in West Berlin was left to the administration of the East Germans along with the rest of our railroad system in Berlin. It has only recently been rebuilt. The bomb-ruined hulk of the station had been such an eyesore to us in the midst of our orderly streets that our newspapers began to needle the East German administration about it. They suggested we should rebuild the station and make a gift of it to our neighbors. That did it; the East German administration promptly set to work and rebuilt it.

ALWAYS, THE GREAT UNCERTAINTY

Since the blockade 10 years ago, when for 11 months all surface traffic was stopped, and we were fed by you through the airlift, the flow of freight to and from the West has proceeded without a really serious hitch. Only on a few occasions have trucks and trains been delayed or goods confiscated by the East German police at check points. But we can never be sure what their next move will be. Supposing an epidemic broke out. Would they work hand in hand? If a fire spread across the boundary zone, would our fire brigades be allowed to proceed unimpeded? We do not know the answer.

I have never met my opposite number—the mayor imposed on East Berlin by the Russians. His name is Fritz Ebert; he is the son of one of the founders of the Weimar Republic. It is sad that a man of such distinguished heritage should find himself in the enemy camp. I have found out there is no sense meeting him.

I am certainly proud to be mayor of West Berlin. Our people are among the finest in the world. They have the kind of courage that comes from constant exposure to danger. They also are fun-loving and witty.

HE KEEPS A MEMORY ALIVE

Though now I am a Berliner, I was born 45 years ago in Lubeck, the old Hanseatic town near the Baltic Sea. I spent most of the years between 1933 and 1945 in Norway and Sweden and returned to Berlin in December 1946. Soon after I had the great privilege of meeting a man many of you have heard of and admired—the famous mayor of Berlin, Ernest Reuter. I met him in the house of a friend on a snowy February evening in 1947. I have been his disciple ever since. His death in September 1953 was a great personal loss to me, as it was to all German people and the world. In October 1957 my turn came to fill in his job. It is a great responsibility to live up to his beloved image.

Demanding as my job may seem, I have one great compensation, and I wish every politician had the same luck as I had. My wife is my greatest asset and help. Rut is Norwegian; we met during the war and were married right here in Berlin in 1948. We have two sons, and one firm resolution I have is to reserve at least an hour for my family every day.

I have often been asked what is my most recurrent nightmare. The answer to that is quite simple. It is that one day, because of some slight mistake on our part, the Russians may miscalculate the attitude of the West and our determination to remain in Berlin at all cost. This would be a fatal mistake, and the consequences would be tragic. We must never let the Russians think we are weak. We are not. Even here, behind the Communist guns in this encircled city, we feel confident and strong, because we belong to the West, and we know that we will continue to belong to the West.

## Statement on the Development Loan Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

MARCH 23, 1959.

Memorandum for Congressman PASSMAN:

In accordance with your request, the following information has been obtained from the International Cooperation Administration (Comptroller's Office):

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. As of Dec. 31, 1958, the unexpended balance of all MSA program funds was | | $6,671,156,582 |
| 2. In connection with the development loan fund: Total appropriations | | 700,000,000 |
| | Fiscal year 1958 | 300,000,000 |
| | Fiscal year 1959 | 400,000,000 |
| Total obligations (as of Feb. 28, 1959) | | 409,300,000 |
| | Fiscal year 1958 | 102,100,000 |
| | Fiscal year 1959 | 307,200,000 |
| Total expenditures (as of Feb. 28, 1959) | | 21,983,804 |
| Loans | | 21,486,305 |
| Administrative expenditures | | 497,499 |
| Unexpended balance (as of Feb. 28, 1959) | | 678,016,196 |

*Clerk and Staff Director.*

## Foreign Aid Needs Cleaning Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. William S. White's column appearing in last Friday's Washington Evening Star entitled "Foreign Aid Needs Cleaning Up." This is a sober, thoughtful and intelligent article pointing out what needs to be done with the foreign aid bill so that the Members may vote for it with some confidence:

FOREIGN AID NEEDS CLEANING UP—ACTION URGED ON COMPLAINTS OF WASTE, LEST CONGRESS TOSS OUT PROGRAM

(By William S. White)

The warning bells for the future of foreign aid are ringing with rising stridency but there is little indication that the administration generally is paying much heed.

The program no doubt will survive the short run—this year and next at least—if only because of the Soviet Union's habit of fomenting crises like Berlin. Its most effective, if unwitting, lobbyists, indeed, have been the Russians. They largely caused foreign aid to be adopted in the first place, in its initial form known as the Marshall plan.

Less than tactfully, they overran Czechoslovakia just as Congress more than a decade ago was being asked by the Truman administration to face up for the first time to the postwar economic and military vacuum left in Europe. Congress was understandably weary of shoveling out the billions as it had done all during the war. But it simply could not look the other way in the fact of this brutally candid disclosure of Russian intentions.

The longer outlook for foreign aid, however, is far from good. President Eisenhower himself has put more heart into backing the program than into anything else in his tenure. No one familiar with the inner situation denies him good marks here. Down below, however, where actual operations go on, the administration's leadership is progressively less impressive.

In the first place, there is massive, cumulative evidence—not merely the prejudiced evidence of isolationists—that there is a good deal of waste and bureaucratic nonsense in foreign aid.

The President's own distinguished advisory committee, headed by industrialist William H. Draper, Jr., has more politely now said just about as much. Foreign aid's best friends in Congress have been saying the same thing for years, and for the same reason. They hope, and so does the Draper commission, that the administration can be prevailed upon to clean up this situation before Congress becomes completely fed up and throws out the baby with the bath water.

Complaints about waste have been treated as though they were merely irresponsible attacks on the principle of the program. Some of them have not been in good faith, but many have been. And these need urgent attention; the time for alibis is running out fast.

In the second place, the present mixture of military and economic assistance in a single congressional bill and program is a case of oil and water. There is a world of difference in the two objectives. The one, military security, is totally intertwined with our national security. Military aid thus could be more rationally handled by simply and

frankly throwing it all into the same large pot with the Pentagon's functions. One bazooka is pretty much like another, no matter the nationality of the corporal who fires it.

The second objective—economic aid—is both economic and political in purpose. It is unwisely involved now with our purely military planning.

Again, in its longer meaning economic aid to our friends is only our present substitute for a fully rational policy of freer world trade. And it is at this point that the whole of the administration, this time including the President as well, is performing in what can only be called an odd way. More and more we are puting petty protectionist devices on world trade. Here we deny to a foreign firm a construction contract it has won in open bidding. There we lay down import restrictions.

Thus, one hand of the Government assists other countries in foreign aid. The other hand hampers them in foreign trade. And foreign trade is, after all, the oldest and cheapest of all forms of foreign aid, and the best in the end for both parties to the transaction.

Finally, to one who has watched the program from its very beginnings it increasingly appears that the administration officials before Congress are putting the secret label on too many things too often. For years we have been spending X millions on foreign military installations, some of which are right next door to Soviet or satellite territory. It is not likely that the Russians have got to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to discover as much.

## In One Field We're Beating Paul Bunyan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial that appeared in the March 18, 1959, edition of the Ventura, Calif., Ventura County Star-Free Press.

IN ONE FIELD WE'RE BEATING PAUL BUNYAN

The tales told about Paul Bunyan make up one of the most enlivening chapters in our authentic American folklore.

On one occasion, as we recall it, Paul accidentally or carelessly dropped a kernel of corn on a fertile spot somewhere, probably in southern Minnesota or Iowa. Within a matter of days, the resulting cornstalk was reaching, like a giant Douglas fir, for the sky. Soon, the demands of its root system were lowering the level of the river nearby and threatening to dry the stream completely.

Paul sent one of his reliable loggers to fell the stalk. But in one of his mighty swings the blade stuck tight in the spongy trunk. In struggling to release the ax, the man was carried upward by the steady growth; before long, he was far above the earth and felt obliged to let the tool go and look after his own safety.

However, no matter how fast he was able to scramble down, he remained even further from terra firma, so rapid was the growth made by the tall corn.

There probably was some later ending to the tale, but it escapes our memory, and this is a good place to leave the situation anyway, because that seems to be approximately the dilemma our good Uncle Sam presently faces.

By July 1, Editorial Research Reports tells us, the U.S. Government will hold, outright or through loans more than $9 billion worth of surplus farm products that have come up like Paul Bunyan's cornstalk out of our rich farm soil. And no matter how energetically we try to get rid of them, the more they pile up. The hoard now includes: Wheat $3.2 billion, corn $2.4 billion, cotton $1.2 billion, etc., etc.

The Government wheat would supply all the nation's consumption, export, and carryover needs for a whole year if not a single new bushel were harvested. Storage alone on all Government crop holdings is costing close to $1 billion a year.

Paul Bunyan was not familiar with the word "productivity," but that was exactly what caused his problem then and the problem of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the rest of us now. American cotton fields are yielding 10 times as much per acre as they did 30 years ago; the average cow gives up one-fourth more milk daily than her mother did even 10 years ago.

If the story of Paul verges on the slightly improbable, what can be said of today's even more colossal cropgiantism?

## Dr. Moses Waddel and Willington Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, John C. Calhoun received a classical and formal education at the feet of Dr. Moses Waddel, one of the greatest teachers in the history of the United States. After 2 years at Dr. Waddel's Willington Academy, John C. Calhoun entered the junior class at Yale and graduated with distinction in 2 years.

Dr. Waddel first established a log-cabin school in 1794 at Appling, Ga. In 1801 he established another log-cabin school at Vienna in South Carolina. In 1804 he established the famous Willington Academy for Boys at Willington in the Old Abbeville District—now McCormick County, S.C. He taught at Willington until 1819 when he became president of the University of Georgia.

Dr. Waddel's Willington Academy was a log-cabin building in the midst of the woods on the frontier. He opened each day's recitation with prayer and closed with prayer. He believed in strict discipline, hard physical labor, and classical studies. He taught his pupils how to think for themselves. He instilled in them ambition, pride, and individuality. He taught Latin, Greek, French, geography, history, and the basic fundamentals. More of his pupils became famous nationally than those of probably any teacher in the history of our country.

Being a Presbyterian minister, as well as a teacher, he trained scores of famous ministers of the Gospel, doctors, and educators. The following is a partial list of his pupils who became famous as public servants:

John C. Calhoun, spokesman for the ante bellum South, vice president.

William H. Crawford, U.S. Senator, Minister to France, Secretary of the Treasury.

Hugh S. Legaré, U.S. Attorney General, eminent scholar, Secretary of State.

George McDuffie, U.S. Senator, Member of Congress, and Governor, South Carolina.

A. B. Longstreet, college president, eminent lawyer, clergyman, author.

James L. Petigru, attorney general, South Carolina, brilliant lawyer.

Eldred Simkins, Member of Congress, South Carolina.

W. D. Martin, Member of Congress and judge, South Carolina.

Andrew Covan, Member of Congress, South Carolina.

George B. Gilmer, Member of Congress and Governor, Georgia.

George Carey, member of Congress, Georgia.

John Walker, Member of Congress, Alabama.

Henry W. Collier, Member of Congress, chancellor, and Governor, Alabama.

Geo. W. Crawford, Member of Congress and Governor, Georgia.

Patrick Noble, Governor, South Carolina.

A. P. Butler, U.S. Senator, South Carolina.

Preston Brooks, Member of Congress, South Carolina.

W. J. Grayson, Member of Congress, South Carolina, author.

D. L. Wardlaw, judge, South Carolina.

F. H. Wardlaw, chancellor, South Carolina.

Thomas W. Cobb, Member of Congress and Governor, Georgia.

P. M. Butler, Governor, South Carolina.

William Harper, judge, South Carolina.

Lawrence E. Dawson, judge and distinguished lawyer, Alabama.

John S. Hunter, judge and lawyer, Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, the following description of the Willington Academy is taken from "History of South Carolina," by Dr. David Ramsay:

Besides what has been done by the State and by religious sects and private societies for the advancement of learning and the diffusion of religious knowledge among the inhabitants, there are several private schools, both in Charleston and the country, for teaching classical and mathematical learning. Among these, one, under the care of the Reverend Dr. Waddel, of Abbeville district, deserves particular notice. In it from 70 to 80 students[1] are instructed in the Latin, Greek, and French languages, and in such of the arts and sciences as are necessary to prepare a candidate for admission into the higher classes of the northern colleges. The schoolhouse is a plain log building in the midst of the woods, in a high and healthy country, and too small to accommodate all the scholars in the hours of study. To obviate this inconvenience, they are permitted and encouraged to build huts in the vicinity. These are the rough carpentry of the pupils, or constructed by workmen for about $4. In these, when the weather is

[1] The number grew afterward to 180.

cold, and under the trees when it is warm, the different classes study. To the common school or recitation room they instantly repair when called for, by the name of the Homer, the Xenophon, the Cicero, the Horace, or Virgil class, or by the name of the author whose writings they are reading. In a moment they appear before their preceptor, and, with order and decorum, recite their lessons; are critically examined in grammar and syntax, the construction of sentences, the formation of verbs, the antiquities of Greece and Rome, the history and geography of the ancients, illustrative of the author whose works they recite; and are taught to relish his beauties and to enter into his spirit. Thus class succeeds to class, without the formality of definite hours for study or recreation, till all have recited. In the presence of the students assembled a solemn and appropriate prayer, imploring the Eternal in their behalf, begins and ends the exercises of each day. In this manner the classics are taught 190 miles from the sea coast. The glowing periods of Cicero are read and admired. The melody and majesty of Homer delight the ear and charm the understanding in the very spot and under the identical trees which, 60 years ago, resounded with the war whoop and horrid yellings of savage Indians.

Of the large number that attend this school 9 in 10 are as studious as their health will permit, and as orderly in their conduct as their friends could wish. Far removed from the dissipation of cities, and among sober, industrious and religious people, they must be studious, or lose all character, and be pointed at by the finger of scorn. If disposed to be idle or vicious, they cannot be so otherwise than by themselves; for the place will not furnish them with associates. Monitors are appointed to superintend each subdivision of the students; and such as transgress the rules of the school are reported once in every week. Over them a court is held. They are allowed to justify or extenuate. A summary decision is made. Though corporal punishment is not excluded, it is rarely inflicted. The discipline of the school respects the pride of youth, and is chiefly calculated to repress irregular conduct by attaching to it shame and dishonor. The sagacious preceptor quickly finds out the temper and disposition of each student, and is the first to discover aberrations from the straight line of propriety. By nipping mischief in the bud, he prevents its coming to any serious height. By patience in teaching and minutely explaining what is difficult, he secures the affections of his pupils and smooths their labors; while at the same time judicious praise rouses ambitions and kindles in their breasts an ardent love for improvement and an eagerness to deserve and gain applause.

## Area Redevelopment: Antidote for Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 20, I was privileged to appear before a joint committee on State development of the Connecticut General Assembly in Hartford, Conn.

Along with some of my congressional colleagues from my home State, I was asked to present my views on area redevelopment legislation under consideration by this Congress.

This, Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to do, for I believe strong area reedvelopment legislation—legislation with substance—is needed to eradicate joblessness and to help remove economic waste.

I think that my colleagues in Congress would be interested in my comments before the Connecticut Assembly's Joint Legislative Committee on State Development, and, therefore wish to introduce my statement before that group into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DONALD J. IRWIN, BEFORE JOINT COMMITTEE ON STATE DEVELOPMENT OF CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13, MARCH 20, 1959

It gives me special pleasure to appear before this committee to present my views on legislation now pending before Congress relating to redevelopment and the alleviation of unemployment in this country and in Connecticut and my district in particular.

As the congressional Representative from the Fourth District, which as of yesterday had 14,000 unemployed, I am vitally concerned with the passage of legislation that will help put these thousands back to work.

In the entire State of Connecticut, according to the March 19 figures released by the employment security division of the Connecticut Labor Department, there are presently 52,067 unemployed.

My district, with 14,000 jobless, therefore, has well over one-fourth of all the unemployed in this State.

Obviously, I am extremely anxious to do whatever I can, as their Representative in Congress, to put this vast number of idle people back to the business of drawing regular pay checks.

Legislation now before Congress which will stimulate area redevelopment unquestionably will contribute materially and effectively to the alleviation of such substantial and persistent unemployment as now exists in Fairfield County.

The city of Bridgeport, for example, second largest in this great State, has nearly 9,000 jobless walking the streets looking for work. Stamford, Danbury, and Norwalk—other cities in my district—have approximately 5,000 more of the unemployed in Fairfield County.

We must do something drastic to wipe out such situations as this—and I repeat that area redevelopment designed to eliminate economically depressed areas should go far toward achieving that goal.

I feel very strongly that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the Nation, the State, and, of course, my own district.

But only yesterday I heard of layoffs in three cities in my district. A transportation equipment manufacturer in Bridgeport laid off more than 100 people. There were 30 people idled in the hat industry in Danbury, while an electrical products firm in Norwalk furloughed 35 more.

And I think the mere fact that the House Banking and Currency Committee in Washington is plowing through some 50 bills calling for area redevelopment programs throughout the country is proof positive of the seriousness of the problem all over America and not only in Connecticut.

Before leaving Washington, I was informed that the House Banking and Currency Committee intends to conclude its hearings today on all these bills. A committee report will be forthcoming within a few days, I understand.

What will emerge from committee, undoubtedly, will be a compromise bill embracing, certainly, many of the provisions contained in H.R. 2969 and H.R. 3450, which are under discussion here today.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has already completed action on area redevelopment legislation and has voted 9 to 6 a bill authorizing $389.5 million for redevelopment of chronically depressed areas. This is a bill similar to the one which President Eisenhower pocket-vetoed in 1958.

I firmly believe the area redevelopment bill which will emerge from the House Banking and Currency Committee (in probably a compromised version of H.R. 2969 and H.R. 3450, sponsored by Congressman BOWLES) is must legislation to bring renewed industrial vitality and thus full employment to such surplus labor areas of Connecticut as Bridgeport, Stamford, Danbury, and Norwalk, where, as I have said, there are now 14,000 jobless.

Other surplus labor areas in Connecticut—Bristol, Danielson, Norwich, Ansonia, Meriden, New Britain, Torrington, Thompsonville, Waterbury, Middletown, Willimantic, and New Haven, to name them—will, of course, similarly benefit.

Proponents of Federal legislation to alleviate unemployment in economically depressed areas—and I am such a proponent—argue quite logically, I think, in claiming that the Federal Government has a clear-cut obligation to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

This obligation, I maintain, is not being fulfilled, is not being met, so long as we have critical pockets of unemployment in communities such as Bridgeport and the other Connecticut communities I have mentioned.

I further maintain that unemployment such as now exists in Connecticut generally and in my district specifically is a threat to the stability of our entire economy.

A depressed area—such as the one in Bridgeport right now—is much like the proverbial acorn which grows into a big oak tree. The local depression, unchecked and unresolved, also can grow and spread to surrounding communities, since the purchasing power of residents in a depressed area is cut below adequate levels.

Something much more than a shot in the arm is needed to restore employment and to encourage the establishment of new industry.

The passage of appropriate legislation by Congress to alleviate unemployment in economically depressed areas will, I believe, provide the industrial stimulant necessary to revitalize the economic health of such cities as Bridgeport and other hard-hit communities of this State and my district.

My esteemed colleague, Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, has opposed area redevelopment legislation, I understand, because of fears that it would stimulate the highly unethical practice of industrial pirating.

H.R. 3450 contains an antipirating clause which, if retained in the final bill brought to the floor, should eliminate Senator BUSH's fears.

In section 6(a) of H.R. 3450 it is stated specifically that "financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriments to the area of original location by increasing unemployment."

In summary, I would like to reiterate my belief that adequate area redevelopment legislation is required in the national interest.

The restoration of economically sick areas is essential to the national welfare. Putting these regions back on their feet is an urgent necessity. The Nation and Connecticut need their productive capacities to fight inflation and to maintain the posture of economic strength essential to our survival as a free country.

I maintain that we must not allow the Soviet Union to outstrip this Nation in economic progress.

Consequently, it is dangerous folly to consign millions of Americans to unemployment. Our country and our State must have their fruitful labors and appropriate area redevelopment legislation will go far toward putting the legions of jobless back into the Nation's work force.

Joblessness in large numbers is costly. It cuts heavily into tax revenues. It denies to the market billions of dollars' worth of goods and services. It accounts for large outlays of public funds for unemployment benefits and direct relief.

And vitally necessary as these programs may be, it would be much better for all concerned if the jobless had the opportunity for gainful employment.

We need strong area redevelopment legislation—legislation with substance—to eradicate joblessness and to help remove economic waste.

I thank you most sincerely for inviting me to appear before this committee and I hope my remarks have helped you understand why I feel substantial and appropriate area redevelopment legislation will be good for Connecticut generally and revitalizing for my own district in particular.

## National Church Leader Praises Rural Electric Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring gatherings in the Nation's Capital in many years was the recent annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Some 7,000 delegates from all parts of the country met in Washington to discuss the achievements and problems and the future course of rural electrification in America.

The REA cooperatives have won the respect and appreciation not only of millions of rural families who have been blessed by the comforts of electricity, but also our country as a whole has been invigorated by this stirring experiment in grass roots democracy.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, dean of the Washington Cathedral, and one of the principal speakers at the NRECA meeting, offered a challenging portrayal of the spiritual and social setting in which rural electrification has gone forward. Believing that the dean's remarks will be of interest to the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD:

EPISCOPAL LEADER LAUDS COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT: TEXT OF HIS REMARKS AT NRECA MEET

(By Francis B. Sayre)

I'm grateful to Charlie Hooper and Clyde Ellis and my other friends among the Rural Electric Cooperatives for letting me share in the 17th annual meeting of your association.

You may not realize it, but assembled right here in this armory is just about the finest witness our Nation could ever hope to present to the world. Here, in this great gathering of managers and members of 950 service systems, all brought here in the companionship of a common enterprise, is America's best foot put forward; not the marching feet of soldiers which usually echo in an armory and which all too readily remind the world of the power of death; but here, in the paths of peace, is power for life.

Mankind must thrill to the achievement of electricity carried to the humblest cabin, conferring there not merely some respite from toil, but the self-respect of jointly owning the instrument which can so bless a whole community.

I wish the Russian Ambassador were with us now, to see in your faces the faith and strength which have made this cooperative movement a true arsenal of human freedom. Lenin once said that communism is just socialism plus electricity. Well that may be, but this convention can with far greater truth proclaim that democracy is faith plus electricity. When those two precious commodities are put together, then you have the stuff of which freedom is made.

After all, it was God who first put body and spirit together to make man in God's own image. And is this not the glory of your cooperative association? Will courage of the spirit and the workaday force of electricity you have forged a power for life that is the strength of our Nation and the hope of mankind everywhere.

"Oh well, now," I suspect some of you may be thinking, "let's not exaggerate. Those are flowery words about being the hope of the world and all that, but really what we've been doing all along in this electrification program is just trying to improve our farms and get our wife's elbow out of the washtub. The amenities of life, but hardly the hope of the world."

If you feel that the battle these cooperatives have been fighting is as humdrum as that, then I have a story for you—about a lady happily pursuing her own little way, who was suddenly given a much greater vision. It happened in the great cathedral which perches on top of Mount St. Alban in this city.

A couple of years ago the National Geographic magazine wanted to get a full-page picture in color of the great church full of people to publish as part of its inauguration issue. Now it's no mean task to set up for such a picture.

I don't know how many millions of candlepower were required to illumine the vaulted ceilings 100 feet from the floor. The photographers went through many a rehearsal with their remote-controlled cameras and their carefully placed lamps, until all was in readiness on Easter morning. Naturally on that day the cathedral was packed, and the service, televised across the Nation, proceeded with all the panoply and majesty possible in such a place. Just as the service concluded I observed a little lady pushing her way through the standing crowds until at last she stood in the opening at one side of the high altar. This was heaven as far as she was concerned. She'd never seen anything like it. Mecca. She reached into her handbag and drew forth a tiny Brownie camera with flashbulb attached. Just as she was focusing for her little picture, Brrm—the whole cathedral went off in a blaze of light. I'll never forget the look on her face. She stared in astonishment at her little bulb and visibly wondered how her tiny snap could have conjured up such a blinding light.

I don't know how many have come to this meeting with their little Brownie cameras, thinking of rural electrification in the terms only of kilowatts and interest rates on Government loans, and new deep freezers in the back hall. But I hope when you leave here you will have caught some new glimpse of the wider glory that lies in your joint stewardship of this mysterious power which we call electricity—power that God gives us not just to operate dairy machinery and chicken brooders, but power that can give leisure and quality to life, bringing us together in the enjoyment and use of it.

For it is true that just as a cathedral gives scale to the eternal majesty of God, so this meeting, 7,000 strong in the Nation's Capital, bespeaks the determined unity of country people and those in small towns, to band together on a scale and with a force comparable to any of the other vying forces of society; and to do it for the good of all, not just of some.

The Bible says that man cannot live by bread alone. And thousands of greedy advertisers have seized on this to persuade us that besides bread we must also have the latest cake mix, and a mixer to stir it up, and a streamlined stove to bake it in, and a fancy dining room set on which to serve it, and a veritable host of other things. But this isn't the conclusion of the Bible. For the Scripture says "Man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." And God's word is not the shallow quickness of instant coffee, but the abiding trust of a people who have learned to dwell with one another in peace, sharing the power of life as they break bread together day by day.

How much mightier is this saving word of God than all the babbling voices of men, which would divide us, smother us, and finally dismiss us with an imprecation because we persist in believing in the wider truth of brotherhood and will not give in to the littleness of private greed.

There is another way of seeing the importance of going forward together. It lies in the fact that everywhere in the world the barriers that divide men are rising higher and higher. Far from walking together, people are increasingly staring at one another across all sorts of borders. Misunderstanding and hostility have the world in the grip of cold warfare, and even in this democracy the ramparts of race and section and economic status hold people apart in disturbing ways.

Several months ago I stood in a place that made this vivid for me. It was in a lovely little valley of China, about 50 miles from the city of Hong Kong, where East faces West across a little winding stream running through the rice paddies. Nothing could be more peaceful than the stillness of gentle hills on either side, and the farmers about their business in the quiet fields. The border is marked by a wooden bridge across the stream. On the little bridge there is nothing more than a plain sawhorse to signify the place where the world is cleft in twain. The bridge is guarded by Chinese on either side. On the British side they wear blue, and carry pistols. On the Communist side they wear khaki, and carry rifles. The tragic truth of all mankind seemed to be pantomimed by those guards on either side of the sawhorse; men of the same race and blood, yet not able, because of the difference in dialects to speak to each other but only to stare dumbly and in enmity at one another. Human hostility in a valley which God had planted with peace; such is the sorry state of our world today.

Now there are others, as we all know, on the other side of that Chinese fence who have seized upon electricity as an instrument of power in the brutal arsenal of absolute control. Electricity in itself is neither good nor bad. In the hands of an irresponsible government, or even of some avaricious private power combine, it can be used for devastating oppression. This is when the people blow up the dams, preferring darkness at their lamps to slavery in their souls.

But when people take this power into their own hands; dig the post holes and string the wire and share the electricity as a trust that God gives them in common, then the ramparts are bridged, and understanding begins to grow, and there is healing in the world.

I do not know of any movement of people anywhere that is capable of giving more realistic hope to other people than this cooperative movement of yours. In it I have seen every kind of barrier torn down, and people of every religion and race and economic standing, joining to gether to bear a witness that is like living water to a thirsty world. What could be more important than that, either to them or to us.

I don't know whether you read about the Moslem delegate who came to New York to attend a session of the United Nations. He didn't dare wear his fez, for fear it would be out of place in that bustling city. But it made him sad to have to renounce, even temporarily, the symbol of his creed. However, as he walked down Madison Avenue, he was overjoyed to meet whole groups of men wearing jaunty red fezzes. It was a bunch of Shriners on a spree. So the U.N. man went happily back to his hotel to don the headpiece that told the world what he was, in the providence of God.

If others in the world could know what you are doing in the rural electric cooperatives, I think they would take it as a true sign of our faith; like a fez proclaiming what we are. For we are a people on this continent who really care about the marginal areas of our land, and the lesser fellows who are obliged to live on it, and the women and children who look to it for nourishment. The homeliness of our life is not the fat complacency of the ugly American whom some have seen abroad, but rather the sturdy honest plainness of a face like that of Abraham Lincoln, born 150 years ago this week, who suffered and fought and died lest this country be divided.

You men and women of the cooperatives are called upon to show us all how to hold it together, with faith and hard work.

## The South Bend Tribune Supports Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting editorial published on March 20, 1959, in the South Bend Tribune, a Republican newspaper, in support of the foreign aid program:

BASIC FOREIGN AID ELEMENTS

The Acting Secretary of State in Secretary Dulles' absence has described the value of the foreign aid program, in principle, with exceptional pungency.

Testifying in the House Foreign Affairs Committee hearings on the aid bill, Acting Secretary Christian A. Herter said: "Militarily it supplies the shield. Politically it promotes freedom and stability. Economically it improves conditions of life. Psychologically it displays our determination to continue in a role of leadership in the fight for free world objectives."

The fact that most of the foreign aid budget has a military stamp may not be understood by most people in this country. So Secretary Herter's emphasis on that is timely. Actually protection also for Americans is a purpose of this. Our domestic military budget would be much larger if this program were not in existence.

His emphasis also on the psychological meaning of the program should impress his fellow countrymen and their representatives in Congress. A decisively reduced foreign aid program undoubtedly would have bad effects. It would be interpreted elsewhere in the world as an indication of U.S. determination to cut back responsibility for free world conditions in this terribly disturbed period.

The foreign aid program isn't perfect. Nobody says it is. But a reliable substitute, with due consideration of the military, economic, political and psychological conditions, isn't in sight now.

In detail, the proposed 1959–60 program is debatable. Some changes in it might be justified. But there should be agreement that it should not be changed so that any of the four basic elements emphasized by Secretary Herter would be adversely affected.

## The Oder-Neisse Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum prepared by the Polish American Congress regarding the problems of the Oder-Neisse frontier and its relevancy to the European peace settlement.

The Polish American Congress represents more than 7 million Americans of Polish descent in the United States. The president of this organization is Mr. Charles Rozmarek, who is also the president of the Polish National Alliance, the largest Polish-American fraternal organization in this country.

During its 2-day session of the board of directors of the Polish American Congress, held here in Washington on March 16 and 17 at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, the following memorandum regarding the western boundaries of Poland on the Oder-Neisse River was adopted.

This memorandum was prepared by the Polish American Congress as a sincere contribution toward resolving some of the problems regarding a lasting peace in Europe. It was presented to the U.S. Department of State and to Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee because, as American citizens, the executive board of the Polish American Congress sincerely believes that resolving the problems of the postwar boundaries between Poland and West Germany would help strength the U.S. foreign policy, which has as its basic goal preservation of peace in the world.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROBLEM OF THE ODER-NEISSE FRONTIER AND ITS RELEVANCY TO THE EUROPEAN PEACE SETTLEMENT, PRESENTED BY THE EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AND TO SENATOR J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1959

Final recognition, acceptance, and guarantee by the Western Powers of Poland's western boundary along the Oder-Neisse River is crucially relevant to the Berlin crisis and European peace settlement. This question cannot be separated from the central problem of peace and security faving the United States, Great Britain, and France, as the immediate respondents to the Soviets' challenge.

We beg to submit our considered opinion in this vital matter as follows:

I. SOVIET PRESSURES AND ADVANTAGES

The Western policy of keeping the final recognition of the present Polish-German frontier in abeyance plays directly into the Soviet hands. The Kremlin, falsely acting as the sole guarantor of said boundary, exerts pressures and blackmail not only on the Polish people, but on other nations of east central Europe as well. These nations are justifiably apprehensive of recurrent German revisionism and irredentism, which is being emboldened to stir international turmoil by the vacillation of Western statesmen in this all-important matter of the Polish-German boundary.

At the same time, this uncertainty as to the jure status of said boundary enables Russia to attempt to lure many West German elements from their loyalties to the West with promises of a deal with the Soviets at the expense of Poland for an obvious price: Withdrawal of Germany from NATO, and forgoing a new Russo-German pact designed for domination either through military forces or joint economic offensive. The possibility of such a deal is inherent in the present situation in which Russia appears to be the sole protector of Poland's western territories, and could, in her perfidious diplomacy feel free to barter east central European stability for drawing Germany on her side.

II. MAJOR LIBERATION

Recognition of the Oder-Neisse line by the West, on the other hand, would have tremendous impact on all the peoples of east central Europe as proof of the implementation of Mr. Dulles' policy of liberation; it would deprive Russia of the role of sole protector of nations subjugated behind the Iron Curtain; it would prevent Russia from tempting Germany with a deal for a price; and to Poland itself, it would mean a major liberation, as a recent editorial in Life magazine eloquently stated.

III. ACCOMPLISHED FACTS

It is inconceivable that the United States, Great Britain, and France, as signatories of the Berlin Conference of July 17–August 2, 1945, would now reverse the process initiated and approved by them, in which the remnants of the German population in the former German territories (east of the Oder-Neisse line) were removed to the four occupational zones in Germany proper. Such reversal would be cruel and inhuman both to the Poles and the Germans. The mass movement of population, started by the Germans in the 1940's, had been completed by the Berlin agreement in wartime conditions, the recurrence of which is unthinkable now.

Practically no Germans are now living in Poland's Western Territories (east of the Oder-Neisse line) which have been settled by 7 million Poles since 1945. Tragically,

however, these Poles now live in a state of uncertainty, waiting for the West to give them aid and comfort in their heroic travails and strengthen their resistance to Russian domination. The removed Germans have been meanwhile absorbed and integrated within the economic and social order of the German Federal Republic.

IV. END OF COLONIALISM

Poland's western territories along the Oder-Neisse line have never been regarded by Poles throughout the world, and by 7 million Americans of Polish origin, in whose name the Polish American Congress acts, as a compensation for lost provinces in the East.

These western provinces were originally Slav-Polish, forcibly colonized and conquered by German armed invasions and regarded even by the Germans themselves as eastern colonial lands; they were never wholly integrated into the German economic, political, and social structure; on the contrary, they were the source of constant German worries as the springboard for Ostflucht, i.e., the flight from the east which has been in progress for decades preceding World Wars I and II.

The end of this German colonialism in the heart of Europe has been brought by the Germans themselves who started the war of aggression and annihilation against Poland in 1939; destroyed or plundered at least 38 percent of Poland's national wealth and, in a planned genocidal fury, killed over 6 million Polish civilians. The total defeat of Germany by the Allied powers brought about the dissolution of the Prussian state which has been the driving force of German aggrandizement for long periods in history.

On the other hand, geographically, the lands along the eastern banks of the Oder and Neisse Rivers belong to the economic and demographic unity with Poland.

We respectfully call your attention to two scientific theses, based on historical, economic, and demographic facts, and published by Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1957, entitled "On Polish Provinces East of the Oder-Neisse Line and Economic, Historical, Legal, and Political Aspects Involved" (pp. A6718–A6725) and of August 25, 1958 under the title "The Polish-German Settlement in the Light of International Law" (pp. A7829–A7833).

We firmly believe that it is in the best interest of the United States and its European allies to recognize unequivocally and finally the Oder-Neisse line as an already accomplished and irreversible fact.

Recognition de jure of the situation created de facto by the Berlin Conference of 1945 would quiet down the small but vociferous group of German Irredentists, now emboldened by the absence of a clear Western declaration, who refuse to recognize the Oder-Neisse line as the final boundary between Poland and Germany.

As we have already pointed out, such recognition would have tremendous impact on not only Poland, but on other subjugated nations in East Central Europe—an aggregate of 100 million people. These people want to return to the European family of nations, and the recognition of the Oder-Neisse line would keep their hope of liberation alive.

In their psychological resistance to Soviet domination, they constitute even now, a major deterrent to the outbreak of world war III as the Kremlin fears a series of revolts which, in case of armed conflict, would create a dangerous situation for the Soviet armed forces in their westward drive.

## A Party of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 24, 1959*

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD the thoughtful and constructive address "A Party of Principle" which was delivered last Friday evening by the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES of Wisconsin to a meeting of Republicans in the 15th District, N.Y., which I have the honor to represent.

A PARTY OF PRINCIPLE

As Republicans, we have been going through a period of critical self-examination. The crushing defeat we suffered in the national and State elections last fall requires a searching look at our party. The main emphasis of our studies and discussion has been on making our party a more effective political mechanism, on the organization we must create to win elections. Certainly there is much that must be done in this area.

I do not want my remarks tonight to be misconstrued as quarreling with that objective. As a partisan Republican, and an officeholder, I want our party to win elections, too, and I have been tremendously encouraged by the earnest enthusiasm which has gone into reorganization efforts since November.

My principal point tonight, however, is that the major concern of the Republican Party cannot be just to win the next election. Our principal job is, and must be, the preservation of our Nation and its institutions.

It is to that job we must dedicate our principal effort. For, if we fail in it, there will not be much need to worry about elections. And, if we succeed—by awakening the American people to a recognition of their peril—victory at the polls will follow.

We must bring to our task more than just an urge to take power. A political party enters this fray ill-equipped unless it is armed with basic principles—unchanging beliefs so precious they cannot be sacrificed for any political victory. Without such principles, a political party is nothing more than a gathering of office seekers and their friends. Without principles, a poltical party, in the words of our President, is only a conspiracy to gain power.

We must face up to the fact that a party without principles has captured control of the most important branch of our Government—the Congress. The Democrat Party today is a party, not of principle, but of expediency. Its method of gaining power is to divide the people into groups, to appeal to their special interest, promising special largeness from their government.

Such a party can have no principles, except to assert, in order to make good its promises, that the answer to any problem, real or fancied, is massive governmental action or massive Federal spending. Without principles to guide it, the Democrat Party cannot concern itself with preserving this Nation and its heritage. It is guided only by the day-to-day demands of its own lust for power.

The Republican Party, on the other hand, no matter what its other failings, is a party of deep-seated principles and it must remain so. It is true that any party representing a broad cross section of the American people will encounter differences of opinion as to details and method. That is true of our party. In fact, I suggest that we Republicans have permitted these differences to become so magnified in our own minds and the public mind that the principles which unite us have been forgotten or ignored. As a result there has been all too much talk about hyphenated Republicans—liberal-Republicans, conservative-Republicans, modern-Republicans. It is time—if we are to face the challenges that confront us—that we start thinking, talking, and acting as Republicans—period.

Let us heed the words of Lincoln when he said: "I'm afraid of the result upon organized action where great results are in view—if any of us allow ourselves to seek out minor or separate points in which there may be differences of views as to policy and right, and let them keep us from uniting in action upon a great principle in a cause on which we all agree."

Let us remember that our strength can stem only from the basic principles which unite us.

These principles are so deep and instinctive that we have unfortunately too often felt it either unnecessary or too difficult to put them into words. But they must be put into words; they must be enunciated over and over again. Our beliefs and principles must be articulated so clearly and forcefully that there can be no doubt as to where we Republicans stand and why.

Let me presume here tonight to make a modest beginning at putting into words what we so deeply and firmly feel.

We believe, we Republicans, that no generation can live solely for itself but rather that it has the heaviest of obligations to preserve the Nation and its institutions, strengthened and improved, for those who follow. We know that our heritage was won only by the sacrifice of those who preceded us. We have the high moral duty to sacrifice, if need be, to preserve and protect it.

We know, as we face the problems inherent in preserving our society, that the right way is not always the easy way, but that we have no choice except to take the hard way if it is, in truth, the right way. We recognize that we will find ourselves frequently bucking the popular tide, for we know, just as surely as the Democrats, that there is little political appeal in self-denial. If we accept the responsibility of leadership, however, and that is one of the functions of a political party, we must serve as stern guardians of the national commonsense.

We accept, as part of the responsibility of leadership, the duty of making clear to the people that the easy way, if it is wrong, leads only to the misery of retraced steps or the finality of disaster. Championing what we believe to be right may at times lose us political battles; but we are supremely confident it is the only way to a clear conscience and ultimate victory.

We believe in a government of laws which have as a principal aim the prevention of the seizure of dominant power by any man, or group of men.

We believe that the political and economic strength of a nation depend upon the genius of its people and that genius cannot flourish wrapped round with the chains of an all-powerful state or an all-powerful minority.

We believe that liberty is man's most precious possession and that it includes the freedom to have an incentive to produce. This has led to our faith in the soundness of an economic system based upon man's

universal urge to better his lot. We believe that success, if it is to be the incentive for all, cannot be mocked and scorned and discouraged in an appeal to the envy of others.

We believe in a limited government as the best means of preserving individual freedom and initiative, but this does not blind us to the legitimate needs of our citizens or the challenges which confront our Nation.

We insist, however, that the needs the Federal Government is called upon to meet be real needs which cannot be met by individual initiative or by the unit of government closest to the people, and particularly, that they are not needs manufactured by those looking for special advantage or power.

We believe that the challenges to our Nation's survival can best be met, not through ill-considered actions based on fear or emotion, but by a nation which itself is guided by basic principles, proceeding confidently because it is physically strong, morally right, and carefully prepared.

It is because of these beliefs, these principles, that the Republican Party is called upon by its own conscience to move vigorously to the task of preserving our Nation against the present-day threats to its survival.

In my book there are today three great threats facing us as a people and as a nation.

The threat of communism.

The threat of inflation.

The threat of the new monopolies.

Each must be met head on. Each must be fought relentlessly if what we call the American way of life is to survive.

The first threat is the most dramatic and the most apparent. It stems from the rapid rise of Soviet military and economic power. We have seen the Soviet Union ruthlessly trample on the rights of its people and other nations in its drive to rule the world. By concentrating on the means to produce military power, it has rapidly industrialized its economy and achieved far-reaching scientific advances, a combination which has made it a real threat to world security. We may deplore their methods, but we ignore, at our own peril, the presence of vast military and economic power in the hands of a small group of men imbued with a fanatic belief in the inevitability of communism's world conquest.

The reaction of the Democrats to the more dramatic evidences of Russian military power has been characteristic. Conditioned from habit, their immediate response has been that we outspend the Russians and achieve victory through sheer weight of the American dollar. Democrat spending bills followed quickly in the orbit of the first Russian satellite and every new announcement from the Kremlin quickens their flow.

It would indeed be wonderful if all we had to do to preserve our Nation against the Rusian military threat was to turn on a spending spigot. It is not that easy, and the political party which tells the American people that it is, is gambling recklessly with the future of our Nation. If, as a nation, we rely solely on scattering our national wealth to the winds in order to quiet every fear, we can lose this fight before we start.

We cannot meet the Russian military challenge by siphoning off and diluting our available resources, both of brains and materials. Yet, the numerous critics of our defense policies insist, when you put all their charges together, that we engage in just such a scatterbrained effort. The net effect of following the advice of a Symington who wants more money for one missile, a Johnson who wants more money for shooting at the moon, an Anderson who wants more money for one kind of airplane, a Vinson who wants more money for one branch of service, and a Jackson who wants more money for submarines, would be weakness through dissipation of our strength. It would be a defense based not on the best estimates of our National Security Council, the entire intelligence resources of the Nation, and the expert advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and our President, but on the worst fears of our most frightened politicians.

What it will take to beat the Russians at this gruesome game is a government and people ready, of course, to sacrifice whatever is needed for our overall superiority, but determined at the same time to proceed only on the basis of sound estimates, rational thinking, and carefully conceived plans which look not just to today but also to tomorrow. This is the hard road, and only a party of principle has the courage to stand up to the fearmongers and tell the American people it is the road we should follow.

It is clear, too, that only a party of principle can furnish the kind of leadership which stands fast against those Democrats who would sacrifice our world position in the face of the potent power of the Soviet Union. When it is all boiled down, the constant carping over the inflexibility of Mr. Dulles, the demands for a new approach to the Soviet Union, and the laments for the lack of viability in our foreign policy are nothing more than a frightened unwillingness to face up to the fact that you can't appease the Russian without losing your shirt in the process. We are confident the American people won't soon again be led down the so-called easy road of appeasement.

The second threat to our security as a nation is the insidious menace of inflation. Our response to inflation is not only significant in its own right but it cannot be divorced from the challenge of the Soviet Union.

No greater test of the principles of the Republican Party can be provided than in the fight against inflation. It cannot be successfully undertaken unless we are willing, as a nation, to think more of the future than of ourselves and to take the hard but right way so that our Nation and its institutions can be preserved.

As we move positively against the threat of inflation, we Republicans are accused of being preoccupied with balanced budgets, of being negative when we oppose unessential spending programs, and of having a narrow bookkeeping attitude toward the problems of our Nation.

I say to you: There can be no more positive programs, for our party or any party, than to try to save this Nation from the disaster which will take place if inflation, through habitual spending beyond our income, becomes the national way of life.

As we oppose programs which individually have vote appeal but which taken together lead swiftly and surely to national bankruptcy, we lay ourselves open, of course, to the demagogue's cry. But what we seek is more important than any single spending program. Unless we can maintain the stability of our currency, we will not have the strength to support any governmental program, no matter how desirable—be it for defense, for scientific advance, or for human welfare. Bound up in the fight for a balanced budget is the question of whether our economy will have the strength and stability to maintain us in the battle for survival.

Let it be remembered that we have been living beyond our income in 23 of the last 28 years. The credit of the U.S. Government is at the breaking point.

It is not just the national budget that is involved in the Democrat spending programs. The personal budget of each and every individual and family is involved. An unbalanced national budget means unbalanced family budgets; it means loss of credit, of earnings and savings, insurance, pensions and annuities. When unbalanced national budgets and inflation become our national way of life, they all go down the drain together.

There is also a moral issue.

The time has come to end the completely immoral practice of passing on to our children the debts we incur for our own immediate benefit. We could at least have respect for the morality of the spenders if they would suggest that this generation pay, through higher taxes, for the cost of the programs they so glibly propose. They lack the courage for that, and in many cases, like the junior Senator from my State, they not only beguile the people with vast spending programs but promise simultaneous tax reductions. Let us call a spade a spade. Mortgaging our children's future is basically immoral.

There is the question of equity.

The first obligation of government is to treat its citizens equally. There is no equity when a government spends to provide special benefits for some of its citizens, because they are politically powerful, at the expense of all other citizens. But, the inequity is tragically multiplied when a government must borrow and inflate its currency to do so. For inflation does not strike all citizens an even blow; it hits hardest at the weak, the unorganized, at those who lack the means to protect themselves from its subtle and devastating robbery, the widow living on insurance, the aged living on pensions. No government which pretends to serve all the people can retain their confidence if it promotes wholesale inequity by choosing the easy road of unbalanced budgets.

There is the issue of survival.

I have spoken of the military challenge of Soviet Russia and the kind of response we must make to it. Will we have the sheer physical strength for that challenge—no matter how many missiles are on the launching pads—if our underlying base of a sound fiscal structure and a strong economy are rotted away by inflation?

The answer, of course, is no, but the Soviet challenge is more than military: it is a total challenge on the military, political, economic, and moral fronts. Can the United States meet that total threat with its currency debased, its credit gone, its economy in turmoil, its citizens divided and its morality compromised, if we adopt inflation as a way of life? Of course not.

Politically, can we hold ourselves up to the nations of the world as a shining alternative to communism if we are unable to keep our own house in order, if we display a fatal political weakness in our form of government by casting aside principle for the fatal charms of expediency? How can we be an example to the world if we cannot in times such as these even meet our current needs out of current income?

Can we meet the Communist economic offensive if through inflation we price our goods out of the world market and if the American dollar becomes a currency to be shunned rather than desired?

And morally, where does this Nation stand as opposed to immoral communism if it succumbs to the immorality of inflation?

Let no man tell you that those who fight against the unbalanced budgets which cause inflation are preoccupied with the mechanics of bookkeeping. We are preoccupied, but our preoccupation consists of the most urgent and positive program this Nation can undertake—the prevention of a national disaster. It is our job as Republicans, as a party of principle, to awaken the Nation to this clear and present danger.

The President has presented the Nation with a balanced plan for security and public welfare. He has presented a plan balanced as to income and expenditures. It is a truly Republican program. It is our job as Republicans to exert every effort to make this plan a reality.

I mentioned earlier that one of the basic principles of the Republican Party is the belief in a government of laws which have as a principal aim the prevention of the seizure of dominant power by any man or group of men. Because of this principle, the Republican Party is called upon to meet the threat of the new monopolies, powerful labor organizations under the domination of a handful of men.

Under Republican leadership, this Nation met the challenge of the seizure of dominant power by a few industrialists and financiers a generation ago. It curbed the power of the trusts when in the public interest it enacted antimonopoly legislation under Republican leadership.

Today similar power rests in the hands of men who dictate the policies of our national labor unions. It consists of vast economic power, the power to cripple an industry or a nation. It is economic power which has reached out so successfully for political power that it has taken over, for all practical purposes, the Democratic Party and now controls the Congress of the United States. It is a combination of economic and political power which threatens the national interest because it is a power which places its own interest above the interest of all citizens.

Curbing the power of the new monopolies will be infinitely more difficult than dealing with the old industrial and financial monopolies, for the new monopolists have wrapped themselves in the cloak of the so-called common man. They have been careful to inculcate the doctrine that their monopoly interest is identical with the interest, only only of union members, but all working men and women. No attempt can be made to curb the power of the new monopolies without incurring their charge that it is a move against the public interest.

But the public—the consuming public—does not benefit from the exercise of naked monopolistic power to raise wages, and hence prices, beyond the level justified by increased productivity—nor from the extortions of a Hoffa made possible by the power his monopoly gives him.

The public—the union worker public—does not benefit when its dues are stolen, or frittered away, or spent for propaganda or political activity against its wishes.

The public—the taxpaying public—does not benefit when the political power of the new monopolies is used to extract special benefits from a pliant Congress or legislature.

The public—the small-business public—does not benefit when its choice, confronted with the overwhelming power of a giant union, is to accede to its demands or go out of business.

The public—the farm public—does not benefit when the new monopolies drive up farm costs far beyond the ability to increase farm prices.

Nor can the public—all of us as free citizens—benefit when dominant political and economic power rests in the hands of a few men, no matter how much they claim to have our best interests at heart.

Let there be no mistake about it. The evils which have arisen because of the emergence of the new monopolies are the result of the power they hold in their hands. We cannot eliminate the evils until we restore the balance of power and to do so, we must curb the powers of the new monopolies even as we protect the very legitimate rights of working men to organize for their own protection and own welfare.

As a party of principle, we cannot dodge this issue. The Democrats must avoid it at the peril of their extinction as a political force. They are incapable of going beyond what the new monopolies will permit, and this consists only of wiping the smudges off from the faces of those union leaders who have gotten dirtiest in their greed for power. It's up to us to take the lead in a sustained effort to curb this threat to the stability of our Nation. It will in the end earn us the gratitude of the vast majority of the American people who, even now, sense the danger involved in letting unbridled monopoly power run loose in our land.

In these great tasks, then, in meeting the Communist threat, in fighting inflation, in curbing the new monopolies, we Republicans have a job to do. At stake is the future of our Nation and the security and happiness of our people.

There is only one way we can go about this task and that is to devote our every resource to it. We cannot succeed, in the face of an overwhelming Democrat majority in the Congress, unless we arouse the American people to the dangers which confront them and unless we imbue them with a belief in the principles we uphold. We must, through them, make it politically impossible, for any party or group, to lead this Nation down the easy road to its downfall.

We need to make our party an effective political organization. We need to enlist in our ranks the millions who believe, as we do, in the principles we uphold. We need the devotion, discipline and dollars without which a party cannot function. We need to tell our story, clearly, unhesitatingly, forcefully so there is no man in this land who does not know our party's principles, program and goals. We need, in short, to get down to work.

And, as we set upon this noble task of saving a nation, should the path look dim, the goal remote and the obstacles insurmountable, we can do no better than take courage from the faith that: "Right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

## Senator Karl E. Mundt Salutes 40th Anniversary of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, this past week the Nation saluted the American Legion in recognition of its 40th anniversary. Among those joining in the tribute was South Dakota's senior Senator, KARL E. MUNDT.

In view of the recent recognition of this notable occasion, and particularly since South Dakota's American Legion posts have made major leadership contributions through establishment of such youth programs as Boys' State and American Junior Legion baseball, I think it is appropriate to call attention to the remarks of Senator MUNDT and a letter from the American Legion to the South Dakota Senator.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include at this point in the RECORD, the brief remarks of Senator KARL MUNDT and the letter to Senator MUNDT from the Honorable Preston J. Moore, National Commander of the American Legion.

SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT SALUTES THE AMERICAN LEGION

(By Senator MUNDT)

The American Legion has always been in the forefront of community activities and patriotic endeavor. All Americans can join in saluting this great veteran's organization on its outstanding record of achievement. The American Legion, along with other veterans organizations, has made tremendous contributions to the welfare of the Nation.

The 40th anniversary is particularly significant to South Dakota, because our State has been a national leader in American Legion affairs. Through able, imaginative, and dedicated leadership of South Dakota Legion members, the Boys' State program was developed. Junior American Legion baseball was also a South Dakota Legion invention.

South Dakotans can take pride in their 259 Legion posts for their many activities which reflect the devotion and recognition of Legion members to those fundamental principles which have kept America free.

The American Legion deserves the highest commendation for its many efforts to help America remain alert to the dangers of communism and the subversive agents in our midst.

The Legion has continually encouraged Americans to spend that amount of money and effort necessary to keep America strong in the realization that our only hope for peace is to remain strong.

The American Legion rightfully advocates that our strength is the convincing argument to dictators and potential enemies that war against freedom and America would be both futile and fatal.

Mr. Speaker, the letter from Comdr. Preston J. Moore follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
*March 20, 1959.*

The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT,
*U.S. Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: Your generous letter of congratulations to the American Legion on the occasion of its 40th anniversary is sincerely appreciated by the officers and members of our organization.

South Dakota can well be proud of its part in pioneering several of the Legion's outstanding programs of youth training that exist in our country today.

Thanks to the vision of South Dakota Legionnaires, a million boys will be playing baseball on sandlots throughout the United States under the auspices of the Legion's junior baseball program. In addition, over 18,000 high school students will be attending Boys' State throughout the Legion's departments, learning the fundamentals of American citizenship and government.

These annual events are but a part of our basic Americanism program which for four decades has attempted to instill in all Americans a genuine love of country and a true appreciation for the sacred obligations of citizenship. The realization of these ideals constitutes a living memorial to the wisdom and foresight of the Legion's founders who met in Paris just 40 years ago this week.

I enjoyed seeing you during the affair at the Army-Navy Country Club, and was proud to have the Washington Post carry the picture of you, Ce Gunn, and myself.

Sincerely yours,

PRESTON J. MOORE.

## New State Slogan for Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DENVER D. HARGIS
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial, entitled "New State Slogan," from the March 19 issue of the Independence (Kans.) Daily Reporter:

NEW STATE SLOGAN

The timeworn slogan "The Wheat State" that has appeared on Kansas vehicular license plates lo these many years is about to be replaced. The 1960 tags will have instead another reading "Midway U.S.A."

"Midway U.S.A." was the brainchild of an 11-year-old schoolboy from Hutchinson. It won the contest sponsored by the Tourist Promotion Council of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce. It says more in those 9 letters of the alphabet than the experts take in 25 words or less to win contests.

It signifies Kansas is at the center of things—at the crossroads of the Nation. This slogan "Midway U.S.A." should have value in promoting industry as well as tourist traffic.

Kansas has far too many attributes to offer than to be simply identified with a single agricultural product like wheat that is consistently in oversupply and a drug on the market. We are gaining industry and lakes. We are also constantly uncovering additional tourists attractions that are of interest to all.

"Midway U.S.A." tells the story in catchy, rhyming manner.

## TVA Wins a Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the dean of the Democratic delegation from Tennessee, CLIFFORD DAVIS, has worked faithfully for 4 years in seeking to report from the Committee on Public Works a satisfactory Tennessee Valley Authority self-financing bill. Working by his side has been our colleague, ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, who is as well-informed as any other in the country on electric power matters. Both were aided by many members of the Committee on Public Works, and on last Tuesday, March 17, the committee reported a bill which will permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds in the sum of $750 million to provide additional generating capacity in the area which it was serving on July 1, 1957.

The President of the United States, on four different occasions, has recommended to the Congress a self-financing bill. No appropriations have been allowed TVA to meet the power needs since 1953. This bill should be passed. All of us in the valley are indebted to CLIFFORD DAVIS for his constant, wholehearted support of this bill.

On March 19, the Commercial Appeal, an outstanding newspaper, published in the city of Memphis, included an editorial in support of this bill, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including it.

The editorial follows:

TVA WINS A ROUND

A bill to allow the Tennessee Valley Authority to finance the generating plants it needs to serve its present area has finally won approval in the Public Works Committee of the House.

It is a proud occasion for CLIFFORD DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, the representative from Memphis. Although the bill has had support of President Eisenhower for years, none of the Republican members of the House committee supported this law. It also has the support of the two Republican Members of the House from Tennessee but they were unable to influence party members on the committee.

Instead the loud and high-priced voice of the private power company lobby was heard. It is a voice that once said TVA was unable to support itself, and now is afraid TVA will demonstrate that it can.

The next step is the Rules Committee and then the House floor, and Representative DAVIS is confident of two more victories.

Technically TVA has had authority to expand its electric service over about 300,000 square miles, that is to any place within about 150 miles of a TVA dam where there is hydrogeneration. Giving up this geographical expansion has been opposed by many friends of TVA.

Actually, the restriction on area accepted to obtain this committee approval preserves to TVA about 105,000 square miles, which is all it now serves, plus expansions under negotiation at the Kentucky end of the Tennessee River and at the Chattanooga edge of Georgia. It also preserves the interchange of power with neighboring power systems, such as Memphis.

More territory is a secondary consideration with TVA. Its great unsolved problem has been enough generators for the territory it already has. Congress has taken more than half of TVA's electricity for national defense purposes, and stopped the old method of 40-year loans from the Treasury for replacement generators.

With a majority of House and Senate approving, Mr. DAVIS' proposal will allow TVA to sell as much as $750 million in bonds for building more generators as needed.

## Chelsea, Mass., Chamber of Commerce Opposed to Supreme Court Ruling That Corporations Doing Business in Interstate Commerce Are Subject to Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Chelsea, Mass., Chamber of Commerce:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently ruled that corporations doing business in interstate commerce are subject to income tax in the various States to which they ship merchandise.

Therefore, the board of directors of the Chelsea Chamber of Commerce, believing that the cost of complying with this law will prove to be excessive and burdensome; that, in many cases, particularly with small manufacturers, these costs will be greater than the taxes involved; that because each State will have its own rate and governing rules, an individual study of the law of each State will be required, entailing excessive labor and expense, has passed the following resolution:

*"Be it resolved by the board of directors of the Chelsea Chamber of Commerce, in meeting assembled on March 18,* That this ruling creates an excessive burden and expense on interstate commerce; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the press, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress."

## The Largest Explosive Plant in the World Remains Idle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Midwest many civic-minded professional and businessmen are wondering why the expansive and valuable Sunflower Ordnance Works, near Lawrence, Kans., remains in mothballs and is idle.

Especially are they concerned because of the large number of unemployed throughout the area. The citizens of both Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., join with those of Lawrence, Eudora, DeSoto, Shawnee, Independence, Mission, Bonner Springs, and other cities in the two States in wonderment and astonishment at the failure of the Department of Defense to utilize this vast and expensive facility.

A large labor pool is available in the area. For example, the city of Lawrence, only 13 miles from Sunflower and the home of Haskeel Institute and the University of Kansas, has splendid and progressive leadership but it also has a number of unemployed. Even more industry would no doubt locate in this forward-looking city did not the Kansas River occasionally overflow its banks—a danger not pertinent to Sunflower.

With the rapidity of missile development and with Sunflower equipped and ready to produce solid propellants, the failure of the Government to put this facility in operation certainly appears to be an economic waste—not only of the ordance works itself and the millions of dollars invested in that plant, but of the available manpower ready and anxious to go to work.

The present situation was anticipated by Dolph Simons, the publisher of the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, when he outlined his thoughts in a front-page editorial on February 1, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include this prophetic editorial which was published over a year ago.

WHY HALT SUNFLOWER IN CRITICAL PERIOD?

(By Dolph Simons)

Sunflower Ordnance Works, the largest explosives plant in the word, is scheduled to be shut down completely in 5 months—in spite of the fact the United States apparently is about to embark upon its greatest peacetime military preparedness program.

The great military effort is primarily concerned with missiles and rockets which require special explosive propellants—the very thing Sunflower is equipped to produce

efficiently and rapidly. Why, then, is the Pentagon shutting down this great plant which has maintained a superior production program since first opened early in World War II?

Today, the sprawling ordnance plant 13 miles east of Lawrence employs approximately 1,000 persons engaged in production of small rocket propellants, triple-base cannon powder and carpet roll powder which is processed by the Navy into various sizes for various uses. Much of this material is of the very latest type, with new performance qualities. It makes older explosives in the same category almost obsolete.

If the Nation should be at war within the next year, every ounce of explosive that S.O.W. could produce would be urgently needed.

If S.O.W. is closed, several of these important propellants will go out of mass production unless much equipment from the plant is moved into another operating location, or the Government decides to build entirely new plants and production lines

Perhaps Sunflower Ordnance is even more important to the security of the Nation in an entirely new field—the process of restraining the enemy through launching of intercontinental missiles, satellites, and sputniks—the giant rockets. These rockets, now in the experimental stage, require special fuels, both liquid and solid propellants. Today these fuels are being made only in research centers and on custom order in limited amounts—not on great production lines.

The baby moon launched Friday at Cape Canaveral, and now orbiting around the globe, got its final boost into outer space from a solid powder propellant.

Military experts apparently believe the Navy Polaris is one of the hottest weapons the Nation will have for some time. It has a range of 1,500 miles or more and it is propelled by solid fuel, which means great chunks of the type of powder which can be made in assorted sizes and shapes at S.O.W. The Army's Redstone presumably is designed to be pushed into space by giant grains of solid rocket powder.

If the Pentagon plans to create a stockpile of Polaris and Redstone missiles, it will be necessary for some great explosives plant to produce those giant grains of powder which provide some of the tremendous thrust of the missiles.

Why not manufacture this powder at Sunflower Ordnance, a plant which is all ready to go on brief notice on the manufacture of any type of solid propellant?

Sunflower his the largest nitroglycerine plant in the world, and nitroglycerine is an essential part of a solid propellant. Sunflower has a huge production potential on guncotton, another essential ingredient.

The great plant, which during World War II produced more powder in 1 week than the entire British Empire could produce in a full month, has a well-planned 15,000-acre site—something which cannot be acquired and prepared overnight. It has all the buildings and most of the equipment needed to produce any type of powder or solid propellant now in use or on the drawing boards.

Sunflower has a tremendous water plant which is essential to powder manufacture. It can produce about 60 million gallons a day from dug wells and from the Kaw River, almost 6 times as much as the city of Lawrence has ever used on the hottest and driest summer day.

Most important, Sunflower Ordnance has the trained personnel which could go to work on a minute's notice on any needs the Government might have for additional or new types of explosives, not only the 1,000 people now at the plant, but several thousand more in the drive-in area who are skilled in powder production and who could be called back to their old posts on short notice.

Here there would be no need for schooling or training sessions for raw recruits; these people have the know-how and are ready to get back to the lines when needed.

Sunflower isn't an antiquated operation. The Army and the Hercules Powder Co. have kept it up to date. In fact, one of the several production lines has been completely automated, resulting in increased production, fewer operating personnel, and more economical operation.

If the United States should have another Pearl Harbor, the one automated line could be worth more than its weight in gold—and yet the Pentagon apparently wants to turn off the heat, lock the doors and let the equipment begin to gather dust.

Surely military officials have given much serious thought to the closing of this huge plant, which at one time employed 12,000 people in operation and another 14,000 on construction. But to the average citizen, the decision is puzzling. No patriotic American would want the plant continued in operation simply to create jobs, but if more rocket fuels are going to be needed why not produce them where the Nation already has a well-equipped plant and trained personnel.

Logistically the plant is well located, as far inland as possible from vulnerable coast areas and in the center of transportation facilities.

The Journal-World would have no sympathy for an effort of workmen or labor leaders in attempting to prolong employment solely for continued salary checks of no benefit to the government. But it most earnestly believes that all public information indicates S.O.W. should on some going basis be maintained during these critical months.

Washington is going to look silly if Sunflower is shut down tight this summer and then in a few months land appraisers are sent to some other part of the country to assemble new corn fields into a new site, where another $200 million ordnance plant can be constructed to manufacture explosives. Production would be many months away.

Hercules apparently has had a superior record of operation of this plant, but Hercules could share the operation with some other company that might have more know-how, or it could step aside completely if that seemed the better thing to do. The plant is large enough that different companies could operate different lines with full independence if that seemed best in the overall military program.

The two Senators from Kansas and our Congressmen probably can have more effect than anyone in urging military authorities to reconsider. It is hoped they are genuinely concerned and will not procrastinate.

---

## Address by Hon. Victor L. Anfuso Before Space Law and Sociology Conference, American Rocket Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I am pleased to include a splendid address made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] at a luncheon held on March 20, 1959, by the Space Law and Sociology Conference of the American Rocket Society in New York City. The subject that my distinguished friend, Mr. ANFUSO, discussed is one in which he is well versed. There is no more serious Member of the Congress than the gentleman from New York, [Mr. ANFUSO], who, as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, is rendering outstanding service to our country:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE VICTOR L. ANFUSO, MARCH 20, 1959, BEFORE THE SPACE LAW AND SOCIOLOGY CONFERENCE, AMERICAN ROCKET SOCIETY, UNITED NATIONS PLAZA, NEW YORK

Fellow astronauts, it gives me great pleasure to address you on this historic occasion. This is the first instance, I believe, of formal participation by a congressional committee in a meeting of the American Rocket Society. This partnership of the American scientific and industrial community on the one hand and government on the other is a good augury for the success of our efforts in creating an adequate space program and devoting its fruits, in concert with other nations, to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

There is no need to repeat in this company that space development and exploration are important to the peace and prosperity of the world. Many of you, no doubt, believe as I do that they will inevitably become a joint international enterprise.

Space flight is inherently international. Many space activities require the cooperation of other nations for technical reasons, e.g., the use of tracking or telemetering equipment or geographically suitable launching sites. Costs which are too great for one nation can be shared with others. Human and other resources and facilities can be pooled in a common effort.

You are already familiar with the economic benefits to be expected from the peaceful use of space—for example, in communications, navigation, and weather satellites. There will doubtless be even greater savings and benefits than anyone can now foresee, just as radio-isotopes resulting from the atomic energy program have yielded unexpected economies which already amount to roughly $500 million a year.

The peaceful exploration of space will also make possible many kinds of basic investigation—in geophysics, astrophysics, astronomy, and other fields of science. For example, Dr. Hynek of the Smithsonian Institution recently predicted that observations in outer space will do as much for astronomy as Galileo's original invention of the telescope. Dr. Alan T. Waterman, the Director of the National Science Foundation, has stated:

"There is no question whatever that scientific experiments and observations conducted with satellite and space probes will disclose a far-reaching understanding not only of outer space but of conditions upon the earth itself which will progress toward consequences of enormous importance to mankind."

Much of the benefit to be gained from the use of outer space will be lost, or at least limited, unless space development and exploration are carried out as a joint international enterprise. A military race to dominate outer space must be avoided. It will be far less likely if the use of space for peaceful purposes is international, so that national rivalries will not be extended to science or economics nor projected into outer space.

In this connection, let me say a few words about the prospect that within a matter of months the Soviet Union may launch a manned satellite and will represent it to world opinion as a great military achievement. I am not making any prediction out of my personal knowledge, nor am I the

first to call attention to this possibility. Almost a year ago Dr. Walter Dornberger, of Peenemunde fame, stated that in 1½ years a spaceship could be built that would carry a man around the globe. In its space handbook the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration predicted that the Soviet Union would put such a vehicle into orbit soon. In another report of the same committee, Dr. Frederick Durant expressed his belief that the U.S.S.R. would send a man into orbital flight and recover him several times during 1959. In a recent speech, Dr. Hugh Dryden, the Deputy Director of the NASA, referred to the same event, which he appeared to regard as probable. Earlier this month Dr. Fred Singer said the Soviet Union may put two men into orbit during the middle of the year.

In view of this chorus of opinion in qualified quarters, there seems to be a good chance that the prediction may be accurate.

Putting one or more men into orbit around the earth would certainly be an admirable achievement for which Soviet scientists and engineers and the brave men who first risk their lives in outer space would richly deserve congratulations. At the same time, such a feat, while involving great effort and expense and advanced technique, would not require any great extension of the state of the art nor have any direct military application. It is the responsibility of the ARS members, I suggest, and of others whose expert knowidge and experienced judgment in astronautics entitle their opinions to respect, to help prepare the American public for this possibility and to put the matter in proper perspective. I recognize that the Government shares this responsibility. It also behooves us all to consider appropriate means of preparing world opinion—which has shown itself to be too impressionable and too ready to ascribe immediate military significance to Soviet astronautical feats.

As an American, and especially as an elected official, I am happy to say that Congress and the administration have foreseen with approval the peaceful international development and exploration of outer space. As long ago as January 10, 1957, in his state of the Union message to Congress, President Eisenhower proposed mutual (i.e., international) control of space missiles and satellites. His suggestion was incorporated in formal disarmament proposals submitted by the U.S. delegate to the United Nations 4 days later, calling for the dedication of outer space exclusively to peaceful and scientific purposes and for international responsibility and control of satellites and space missiles. This proposal was sanctioned in December of 1957 by resolution of the General Assembly. In a letter dated January 13, 1958, to the Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers (at that time Bulganin), the President offered to agree that outer space be used only for peaceful purposes. Both Houses of Congress unanimously adopted a resolution (H. Con. Res. 332) in June of 1958 calling on all nations to join in the peaceful exploration of outer space. The National Aeronautics and Space Act itself expressly authorizes the Space Administration to engage in a program of international cooperation in peaceful astronautical activities.

More recently, as you know, the General Assembly of the United Nations has voted favorably on a U.S. proposal to establish a study committee on the peaceful uses of outer space. The opening statement of the United Nations resolution recognizes the common interest of mankind in outer space and proclaims that it is the common aim that it should be used for peaceful purposes only.

It is my firm belief that the United States must take the lead in a peaceful and productive international space program.

At present only the United States and the Soviet Union have made the quantum jump into outer space. Soviet cooperation in astronautics with countries of the Western World has been thus far limited, and it is my opinion that division in blocs is not justified when we are concerned with peaceful endeavors destined for the benefit of all. The Soviet Union has cooperated in the IGY program and has agreed to cooperate in the Committee on Space Research (Cospar), established in October 1958 by the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU).

We must continue to seek the Soviet Union's cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space for the benefit of all mankind. It is our hope that their cooperation will be more extensive in the future because of their invaluable knowledge and experience in this field. To give up hope at this time of reaching an agreement with such an advanced nation in the field of science and astronautics is to admit that a conflict is inevitable and that there is no hope for the world.

Certainly, the foregoing declarations of principles and intent by Congress, the President, and our actions of the United Nations manifest the willingness of the United States to join such a partnership. I believe that the scientists, engineers, technicians, industrialists, and industrial workers of the entire world would rather put their ingenuity to work for an abundant world than one reduced to shambles by total war.

An illuminating example is the nuclear burst in outer space announced yesterday. The American people would doubtless prefer to share the planning of such experiments—and the burden of their execution—with other nations for the benefit of mankind. The announcement of this great achievement, and the indication that its results will be released in accordance with the IGY Agreement, confirms again the willingness of the United States to cooperate as a partner in utilizing the limitless possibilities of outer space.

It is true that a good deal of work in astronautics is already underway in many countries of the free world. In general, however, high costs have deterred both Government and industry. Many foreign scientists and engineers looking for an outlet for their creative abilities and energies are hampered by lack of equipment, facilities and financial support, and are frustrated by lack of Government encouragement.

The situation is ripe for an internationally coordinated astronautics program. Initially, specific astronautical projects could be conducted as joint ventures utilizing the specialties of other countries in scientific talent or other facilities. Plans should soon be made for exchanges of scientific, engineering, and technical personnel among all countries willing to cooperate in a common space effort. American training facilities in the space sciences should provide increasing opportunities for talented foreign students.

Let me emphasize that the measures I have described would be no more than first steps. They can and should be taken now within the authority granted by the National Aeronautics and Space Act to engage in a program of international cooperation.

Beyond such immediate steps there is a clear need for a common space effort among free world governments, as well as among individual scientists and scientific societies. Sooner or later there must be an international organization for space development and exploration, open to all the world's scientists as working participants. I should think that an organization of this kind might develop under the United Nations, perhaps as a result of recommendations to be made by the study committee to the General Assembly in the fall of this year. I am hopeful that the Soviet Union and other bloc countries will cooperate in this great humanitarian effort. Meanwhile, the free world should take the initiative and set an example in demonstrating the feasibility and fruits of international space cooperation, which will bring greater and greater benefits with every passing year to everyone on earth.

## H.R. 5894, a Bill To Clarify and Strengthen the Escape Clause in the Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill, H.R. 5894, which will clarify and strengthen the escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act. Considerable litigation, uncertainty, and hardship have resulted and may continue to result from various attempts to interpret the language of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 with the many amendments that have been added since that time.

My proposal will, if enacted, make unnecessary costly and time-consuming reviews by the courts. It will clarify the escape clause and will remove serious legal clouds from the actions of the President with regard to past escape clause cases.

My bill in the nature of an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act is designed to do two things:

(a) Permit the President, as he has in the past, to reject the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, or to put them into effect in whole or in part, or to take other action aimed at the remedying of the injury found to exist.

(b) Permit the establishment of a firm date for the termination of escape clause cases so the Tariff Commission could entertain a new application. Under this amendment the Congress would be able to participate in escape clause decisions pursuant to the amendment in the 1958 extension legislation which gave to the Congress authority to apply the Tariff Commission recommendations if it could do so by a two-thirds majority. A third benefit that would result from this amendment is that affected industries would not be left indefinitely hanging in the balance wondering what the final decision, if any, might be.

Although these proposals are largely self-explanatory, I might say just a word about the circumstances that make these amendments necessary.

The President has, in a number of escape clause cases, followed the recommendations of the Tariff Commission only in part, or has used other measures not recommended by the Tariff Commission which he hoped would remedy an injury found to exist. All of these actions have now been brought under a legal cloud by a decision of the customs court which said, in effect, that the

President had exceeded his delegated authority. Specifically, the President's action in the so-called bicycle case was held to be in excess of the powers granted to him by Congress in the Trade Agreements Act. That case is being appealed and in due time may be decided by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. In the meantime the validity of all similar actions by the President have been placed in question.

My amendment would remove this legal cloud on his current actions as well as those of the past. It would remove the necessity for much legal maneuvering. It is true that the administration has not accepted the finding of the customs court and hopes that the decision will be reversed. Such reversal is by no means certain, in fact some highly respected and experienced lawyers have indicated to me that the language of the present act would hardly permit a reversal. In any event a decision appears to be several months away.

Some of my colleagues may object to this possible broadening of the powers of the President with regard to the escape clause. I hope they will consider the great confusion that would result if the appellate court should uphold the lower court. I suggest they consider the probability that seldom, if ever, would any remedial action whatsoever be taken if the President had only the choice of accepting the Tariff Commission recommendations in full, or of doing nothing.

With regard to the second aspects of the proposed amendment—serious criticism has been directed toward the long delay in executive decision as to final disposition of specific escape clause cases. For example, in one recent rejection of an application for an escape clause study, the Tariff Commission asserted that it had no authority to initiate an investigation because a prior one on the same subject had never been concluded even though that investigation was already 2 years old. In this case the Commission had found unanimously that serious injury had resulted from a lowering of a rate of duty in a trade agreement. The industry had painstakingly proved beyond any doubt that it was being seriously injured and that the tariff reduction in the trade agreement concerned was the cause of the injury.

The President took no action. Neither did he close the case, but kept it open and asked the Tariff Commission for further study of the matter. Even if the President should eventually conclude the case, and even if, at that time, he should take some modified action aimed at remedying the injury, the customs court ruling could render such action an invalid one. If there were an appeal of such a decision an already suffering industry would be forced to go through a long period of further indecision, great expense, and, in the end, the possibility of losing everything.

Under existing law the President is granted 60 days to make up his mind in these cases—an ample time to review the Tariff Commission findings and recommendations and he should not be permitted to extend beyond that period the uncertainty.

We have another major problem in such cases. Such unilateral extension of the 60-day period might remove the Congress from participation in escape clause cases even though a year ago we definitely legislated so that Congress, by two-thirds majority, could put into effect the findings and recommendations of the Tariff Commission should the President refuse to act. Congress and the affected industry should be given clear opportunity to act at the end of the 60 days, and it should not be possible to block the entrance to a new action.

It is only in unusual cases where an industry would want to institute a new investigation immediately after one was concluded, but I have already mentioned one such case. My bill would not require the Tariff Commission to act unreasonably and begin a new study before there was time for any new information to be available. Nevertheless, in the interest of clearcut legislation, the Congress should require that executive action be taken within the time authorized.

I shall press for the consideration of this amendment to the Trade Agreements Act and hope my colleagues will join me in the clarification of what now seems to be serious problems in this area. In taking this action I am not unmindful of the fact that there are other defects in the trade agreement program.

---

## Freedom—Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am more than pleased to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, an address delivered by Rabbi Franklin Cohn of Temple Beth Zion in Los Angeles, Calif., before the student body of Los Angeles High School on March 18, 1959.

The message, given before 2,400 young people, is universal in appeal, universal in its application to all those who have suffered oppression, and indeed universal in its emphasis on faith in freedom.

Rabbi Cohn's address follows:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

Mr. President, distinguished colleagues, students, I am grateful for you invitation to speak to you, students of Los Angeles High School, on the concept of Passover, a festival observed and celebrated by Jewish people since time, almost immemorial. While it is true that the festival has its background in the religious culture of the Jewish people, I deem it very fortunate that the celebration of the festival in our days has expanded to the concept of observing it as a universal freedom festival. I deem it fortunate because I do not need to refer here this morning to a purely religious observance which would bring me into conflict with my conviction that the American principle of separation of church and State must be maintained at all costs and, therefore, religious teachings shall not be discussed in a Government-supported public school.

On the Passover festival, Jews read from an ancient book, called "Haggadah," relating the stories of the exodus of Israelite slaves from the bondage of ancient Egypt. It is perhaps no coincidence that I am speaking to you this morning of this story in a different vein because I have just published a dramatized version of the "Haggadah" under the title "Freedom—Our Heritage," because that is what I want to see Passover to be: a festival celebrating the ability of men to strive for freedom and independence, for liberty and human dignity. It is also no coincidence that my congregation, Temple Beth Zion, will observe this year the Passover holiday by giving its annual Passover-liberty award to the distinguished Governor of California, the Honorable Edmund G. (Pat) Brown in recognition of his dedicated stand against discrimination of all kinds.

The story of Passover began 3,500 years ago. It is a story of migration. It began when Jacob and his family left Canaan because of famine, and traveled to Egypt. First allotted the land of Goshen, a province in Egypt, the children of Israel prospered as shepherds. But as the Jewish people enjoyed their prosperity, there was darkness around them. The Pharaoh who had welcomed them was replaced by another, who forgot the work of Joseph and how once in famine he had saved the people of Egypt from starvation.

Seizing upon the blind hatred of the Egyptians, a hatred born out of misery, desperation, and envy, he saw in the Jews a scapegoat and an abundant supply of slave labor. Dispossessed of their lands, deprived of their rights as citizens, these Hebrews were driven to work in the fields, in the building of cities. They pulled rocks from the quarries to build the pyramids. Deprived of the life of free men, they engaged in backbreaking toil, building tombs to insure a Pharaoh's immortality. From the bitter past of working under the blazing Egyptian sun, under the surveillance of guards brandishing whips, they had nothing left but dreams, dreams of a future, dreams of freedom from bondage. These dreams stoked the inner fires, the fierce pride, the strength, the courage to continue their battle against the humiliation that came with the cruelty of the whips.

Four hundred years rolled by, four hundred years of slavery, of hunger, four hundred years with nothing but a dream. Like slaves from time immemorial they wore the mask of servility, but in their hearts they sang silently a freedom song.

Proud courage is like a fire. Draw a curtain around it and the glow can still be seen. Pharaoh then decided to exterminate these slaves who with bowed backs bent in toil only camouflaged their will to live.

The Hebrews multiplied; they became a challenge to Pharaoh and to Egypt. In terrible silence they marched to their slaves' work. But this silence of the slaves was more frightening than any manifesto or proclamation. It was more eloquent than any inflammatory speech calling for revolt. In our days, the Reverend Luther King, of Montgomery, Ala., and the Negro high school students in Little Rock, understand that story so well, they are living it.

The Israelite slaves, 3,500 years ago, were emancipated by a great leader, Moses. This emancipation of the slaves, the exodus from Egyptian bondage, is the background story for our celebration of Passover in 1959.

We remind ourselves of the struggle of the ancient Hebrew slaves year after year because their liberation was not yet the end of slavery and oppression for all people.

The age of darkness and persecution continued throughout the centuries and in many lands. Only gradually there came changes. When a New World was discovered,

a change took place. Or, when the Renaissance revived once more the faith in man, when science came into being. Yet, at the same time the tyranny of despots continued as well. So unconsciously the spirit of Passover crept into the souls of other people.

The unwanted of Europe ventured into the New World, and it was in the spirit of Passover when on July 4, 1776, Thomas Jefferson proclaimed:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

It was the Passover spirit within the Jew Hayim Solomon when he gave generously to bring the men at Valley Forge through that terrible winter.

Abraham Lincoln, a man who like Moses, fought the good fight for the liberty of an oppressed and enslaved people, said in our Passover tradition:

"Until all men are equal and all men are free, there can be no peace. As long as there are chains, and whips, and men to wield them, there can be no peace. When the chains are broken and the men who wield the whips are dead, the freemen can have a freeman's peace."

The Passover spirit crept into the Atlantic Charter when Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Winston Churchill proclaimed the four freedoms.

Whether it be the Red Sea or the Delaware, the hope was and still is always the same. The early Americans read the Old Testament and looked upon the people of ancient Judea as their spiritual ancestors. Thomas Paine even devoted a whole page of his newspaper to a Jewish prayer proclaiming the love of freedom and the hatred of bondage.

The old story of the exodus from Egypt was and is now being told by another people in search of freedom. You hear it in that inspiring spiritual, so often sung on the cotton plantations:

"When Israel was in Egypt's land
Let my people go."

Greece, Rome, Assyria, Babylonia, ancient Egypt are mere relics today. Their civilization lives only in the museums and in the classrooms of universities; their culture remains in the notes of scholars and not in the lives of people.

For the faith in freedom, in man's respect for his fellow man, the longing for peace, the belief in a God whose word is law of kindness, not vanity; these alone will survive the long trail of migration.

We shall celebrate the coming Passover as a festival dedicated to freedom, liberty, and justice for all men.

---

## As Republicans, How Do We Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent address by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, at the annual banquet of the Kansas Day Club, Topeka, Kans., January 29, 1959. The address follows:

AS REPUBLICANS, WHERE NOW DO WE STAND?

The pessimists among us may answer: "These are days of black defeat—an unpalatable foretaste of what is to come."

I do acknowledge that not since the avalanche of 1936, when only 89 Republican Members of the House and 17 Republican Senators survived, has our party's representation in Washington been so shrunken.

A second view, hopefully expounded by our opposition, is that these are the days of the great divide—days when the Republican Party is hopelessly split between two wings, each at the throat of the other with such all-out ferocity as to preclude mutual understanding and combined effort.

Whatever the correct appraisal of our situation may be—and everyone is, of course, entitled to his own—I say this: "Where the Republican Party is today is the place to start, not the place to quit."

I refuse to believe that no matter what we do we can't win in 1960, or that we are so hopelessly divided as to make even the effort unworthwhile.

As Republicans, we can unite. Moreover, we've got to unite. We have no other choice if we are devoted to the salvation either of our party or of our country.

Of course, the job won't be easy.

According to a recent Gallup poll, if all American voters—including self-described independents—now were asked to register as party members, 54 percent would line up as Democrats and only 36 percent as Republicans. (Ten percent couldn't bring themselves to express even an academic preference for either party.) Yes, even with our 36 percent as a solid phalanx, our job as of today is rough enough. If that 36 percent were torn into shreds, our job, frankly, would be impossible.

A split party is a luxury only Democrats can occasionally afford. We Republicans can't afford it at all. In our party today a wing doesn't even have a prayer, much less a chance of victory.

We are in the third month of the campaign of 1960.

Now, how do we go about turning to advantage the instruction of defeat?

First, it seems to me that we have to revolutionize our thinking about politics and campaigning.

You and I know some Republicans to whom politics is a four-letter word. You and I know a lot of people who regularly vote Republican but won't run, work, contribute, or sometimes even talk Republican. Unfortunately, there is much to be said for the generalization that while many Democrats make politics a career, too many Republicans view it as a sacrifice.

We must begin now to recruit for every senatorial and congressional seat, for every governorship, and for every state and county office the most capable and articulate candidates we can find. Notwithstanding the fact that a good candidate does not necessarily insure victory, and that good Republican candidates were defeated last November (as witness what happened here in Kansas), it is an unassailable rule of politics to have the best candidates—if you can. Any political party owes that obligattion to itself. It owes that to the country even more.

By revolutionizing our thinking about politics—by getting superior candidates and enthusiastic party workers into action day and night now—we can help make sure that we will have turned a dark 1958 into a much brighter 1960.

There is a second much-needed Republican revolution: the shift from negative to positive thought, from reverse to forward drive. We must not limit ourselves to telling people what we are against. We must also tell them what we are for!

Sure, we know our Party's purposes and our Party's accomplishments. We have kept the peace, we have kept the Nation's defenses strong. Since 1953, with the leadership of a Republican President from Kansas, the American people have earned more, built more, saved more, and invested more than ever before; they have enjoyed the biggest tax cut and the biggest advances in social security in American history.

If I may paraphrase a man who ought to know, George Meany, the head of the AFL–CIO, "We have never had it so good." Yet in political debate, what happens? Time and again we Republicans find ourselves cleverly maneuvered into seemingly supporting reaction and negation because of our valid and necessary resistance to the wild, even if oftentimes politically appealing, proposals of the Democraat opposition.

You know, it is a wonderful political advantage to be against nothing except higher taxes.

While it isn't even responsible politics, much less responsible government, it is a fact that up to now many—though not all—Democrats have seemingly found the royal road to political success in advocating just such a program.

The Democratic party's record is there for everyone to see if we just make it plain.

They are for more Federal airport money, road money, welfare money, small business money, urban renewal money, and agricultural price support money while they simultaneously advocate low Federal interest rates, lavish tax cuts, and a Federal budget always in the black. The Democratic National Advisory Council only the other day proposed that Federal interest rates be cut and inflation brought to a halt—simultaneously. It would be quite a trick if they could just do it. In fact, if their being allowed to try wouldn't be so disastrous to the country, it would be to our selfish political advantage to stand aside and let them make the attempt. That, of course, we simply can't do.

To sum it up, those opposition salesmen have been getting away with peddling a unique political model car—one which has two forward speeds, left and right, and a reverse; one which will go in all three gears, forward and backward simultaneously.

Do you remember the state of the union message—not President Eisenhower's, delivered on January 9—but Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S own unique innovation, delivered 2 days earlier? As I understand his thesis, it was this: The President's spending proposals would be inadequate no matter what they turned out to be.

Self-convinced, the distinguished majority leader proposed a series of Federal programs, all without benefit of dollar figures or without indication of who would pay the bills, if indeed he had in mind that anybody would without resort to increasing the Federal debt and thus helping create more inflation.

In his speech, Senator JOHNSON charged that the President and the Republican Party suffers from a "deficit of vigor." Well, my answer is that Senator JOHNSON and his party have an unusual vigor for deficits.

Sure, you and I know the political flivvers of the opposition are phonies. But have we really proved it to the American people? The answer is obvious. We haven't—yet. Nor can we do it by simply digging in to resist one politically appealing spending scheme after another. That simply makes our opponents look great hearted and makes us look stingy. What we have got to do is to climb out of our defensive trenches, go over the top and launch an offensive onslaught of our own.

One thing is certain. If we are to get our message across, we must translate it into words and terms that are commonly understood. Above everything else, we must translate it into local terms—words and facts which make our thesis crystal clear in every locality in America.

After all, most people don't care what happens to the Republican Party as such, our job is to show that when we lose, they also lose.

For example, take the proposal for a Federal dam at the Hells Canyon site on the

Snake River in Idaho. We are told that issue will be raised again in the new Congress, and raised for the sixth time.

The fact is, the proposal for a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon is the reclamation fraud of the 20th century. Not one single acre of irrigated land has ever been directly connected with it.

It would cost the taxpayers of America nearly $600 million, exclusive of any damage claims paid to the Idaho Power Co. Non-Federal development of the same stretch of the same river, which began in 1956, will produce roughly the same results in power production and all the flood control needed in that area, and it costs the taxpayers nothing.

Now, to some people an additional $600 million may not seem to be of much consequence when included in a Federal budget of billions. But consider it this way: $600 million would pay for the Almena Unit of the Missouri River Basin project nearly 40 times, it would pay for the Kanopolis Unit more than 40 times. It would buy more than 50,000 miles of Kansas primary highway or 15,000 elementary and high school classrooms.

Of course, you could save the $600 million altogether, use it to reduce the Federal debt or reduce taxes. Some would call that old-fashioned, but it's an idea, anyway.

When you put the facts that way, people understand what such wild spending schemes mean to them in terms of what they desire or need from Government.

Then ask them this: What happens if all these new and renewed spending proposals become law—those which are vital, those which are nice but not absolutely necessary now, those which are ludicrous?

Who pays?

You know the answer: Every man or woman who makes out a Form 1040 between January and April.

But suppose the greathearted spenders on Capitol Hill just don't have the heart to raise taxes? Suppose they just increase the Federal debt?

The answer's the same: We—you and I—will pay anyway, and our children will pay, and we'll pay in a rougher and more dangerous and costly way: Through inflation, plus more taxes in the end.

For a family or a government, it's always easy in the beginning to spend all your income and then go borrowing. What's hard is to stay in the black, to put something aside. If the Federal Government can't do so now, in a time of high and rising prosperity, when can we citizens hope for relief from the crushing burdens of an ever higher Federal debt or high taxes? You and I know the answer—never.

Time and again the President has put just that question to the American people and the Congress. It lies behind his presentation to the Congress of a 1960 Federal budget which is in balance.

He knows, as you and I know, that unless people throughout America wake up to the renewed threat to the buying power of their dollar which is involved in the Democrats' congressional program, a lot of Americans are going to get hurt, and the country is going to suffer, and deeply. That is just as inevitable as death and taxes.

Oh, yes, some people doubt the danger. Even some of those who stand to get hurt the most say: "Let prices go up, my union will protect me; I'm on an escalator clause." To be sure, there are 4½ million workers who have some such assurances that they can keep their heads above water—so long as their employers are in business—though they may not gain against the tide. But in the total civilian labor force, a worker on an escalator is 1 man or woman in 16. What about the other 15? For them, wages are on the ground, while prices will be in an elevator headed for the roof.

Not only that, all 16 workers will one day probably living in part on social security payments: Already there are 14 million Americans receiving benefits under various Federal pension plans, plus another million and a half under private plans. When retirement time comes, escalator clauses are worthless. The dollar bill, I remind you, is neither Republican nor Democrat. When it goes sour, people of either political affiliation—or none—who are on fixed incomes, suffer.

The grim reaper also has no politics. One hundred twenty-four million Americans now own life insurance policies. If you, for example, should die tomorrow, would you want your wife and children to face certain inflation while subsisting on fixed payments from the insurance company, to have the digits on the monthly payment check never change and the prices on tags in every store keep increasing?

You know people who say, well, it did happen in Germany, and only recently in France; but it can't happen here.

Can't it? Think back to the Truman years, 1945–52. The Consumer Price Index went up 18 points. To be sure, that's a statistic. Putting it in plain, everyday language, what it means is that the price of a pair of overalls went from $2.10 to $3.46—an increase of 65 percent; that the price of a pound of white bread went from 9½ cents to 16 cents—an increase of 68 percent; that the price of a 10-foot two-by-four went from 45 cents to 84 cents—an increase of 88 percent; and the price of a two-bottom plow went from $136 to $255—another increase of 88 percent.

Price increases at the same rate, beginning now, would, within 7 years, take the pair of overalls to $5.77; the price of bread to 31 cents a pound; the price of lumber to $263 per thousand board-feet; the price of a plow to $525.

And I'm sure you remember another thing: The controls that went with this seemingly uncontrollable upward-thrust in prices. I'm sure you remember the Office of Price Stabilization, which fastened small white tags to items after item you had to buy—socks and shoes, toasters, and frying pans.

The Eisenhower administration, I can assure you, is still dead set against controls. And it's still dead set against the weakening of your dollar's buying power. It's against the return of either the disease or the proposed remedy.

That's why the President wants a balanced budget.

That's why, in his state of the Union message, he urged the Congress to amend the Employment Act of 1946 in order to declare it the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to combat inflation.

That's why we in the administration will fight with all our ability against every spending proposal of those who think that now is the time to launch a new, New Deal.

By taking the offensive, we Republicans can show that contrary to some pundits of political persuasion, being for the dollar is often the best way of being for the man—including the wage earner, the farmer, the housewife, and their children.

What good are wage or profit rises if offset by continual price increases and more taxes? What good is it to talk about bigger and better insurance policies, or higher pensions, when their value is constantly being eaten away by the cancer of inflation?

Don't ever let anyone get away with saying that your party—the Republican Party—yields to any other on the face of this land in its concern for every working man and woman. Since 1953, all American wage earners, organized or not, have made unprecedented gains. And remember, with this record to run on in 1956, a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, won from 30 percent to 50 percent of the labor vote in one major industrial center after another—an even higher percentage than he had won in 1952.

If we'll just hammer and hammer and hammer those facts across; we shall go far toward victory in a third Republican revolution. By ripping off once and for all the false labels our opponents have pasted on us, we can reveal the true image of the Republican Party as the party of the American people—all 175 million of them.

Can we accomplish these three revolutions—the revolution in our attitude toward politics, the shift from negative to positive thought, the restoration of the Republican Party's true image? Of course we can. The unanimous adoption of the Des Moines conference last week of Chairman Alcorn's plan for revitalizing the party is a heartening indication we're already moving in the right direction.

Every Kansan surely remembers the Republican resurgence of 1952 with a man from Abilene leading the fight—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

We should never forget what he did that year under his leadership. Nor should we forget what happened in England the year before. The two, taken together, point the way for us between now and 1960.

Following the defeat of 1945, the British Conservatives rebuilt British conservatism. They got rank and file party members to make regular contributions to the party, invigorated its appeal to labor, to intellectuals, and to the young; and started campaigning the year 'round to bring to everyone its principal product, fact.

And in 1951 they won.

The moral for us is clear. Here in the United States in 1958, 1959, and 1960, we Republicans can and must build on fact for victory. We can and must put fight and heart into our party. Once we've accomplished that, we will win, and we will deserve to win.

The time to begin moving is now.

---

## Kidnaping Our Cars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 11, 1959*

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an outstanding editorial from the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., regarding the annual boxcar shortage in the Pacific Northwest. I feel this editorial very clearly points up the reasons for the shortage and its remedy.

KIDNAPING OUR CARS

If it were possible to rent a $20,000 house for $85 a month, there would be little incentive for the average person to build a $20,000 house. This simple economic truism does much to explain why a recurring freight car shortage has plagued the Pacific Northwest in times past and is about to do so again.

The price tag on a modern railroad boxcar is about $20,000. Such a car, built by a western railroad and loaded with lumber from a western mill, may roll eastward in a freight train and disappear. It may spend weeks, months, or the rest of its useful life shuttling back and forth on eastern railroads, which can keep it for the nominal $2.75 daily car rental charge specified in the car service rules of the Association of American Railroads.

There are several reasons why western railroads, which spend enormous sums building fleets of new freight cars, perennially find themselves short of cars when it is time to move large quantities of grain and plywood and other products of western farms and forests. A basic one is that the natural flow of freight in the United States is from the South and the West to the more populous East. There is a natural tendency for cars to pile up on eastern roads.

One effort to correct this imbalance has been the rule that an empty car is supposed to be loaded only with a shipment bound in the general direction of the railroad which owns the car. Another is the per diem rental charge, which has been raised from its prewar level of $1 per car per day to the present $2.75 level. But these measures have not proved adequate.

The Southern Pacific Co. last year built 2,349 new freight cars, raising its total fleet to more than 81,000 cars. It expects to build 1,450 more in 1959, at a cost of some $22 million. The Union Pacific is engaged in a $17-million freight car construction program. Under the present circumstances east coast shippers rather than west coast shippers will get most of the benefit from these programs.

During last year's business recession, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Nation's biggest carrier, cut its car-building program to the bone. It did not even repair its old cars. About 25 percent of the Pennsy's fleet of 174,000 freight cars presently stand idle on the rip tracks with flat wheels, faulty brakes, or broken couplers. Officials of the railroad frankly admit they couldn't afford to spend the money on repairs or a car-building program when they could use the cars of other railroads for $2.75 a day.

The western railroads have been doing their best to serve their shippers. The percentage of "bad order" cars awaiting repairs on the SP, for example, is a trifling 1.5 percent. If the eastern railroads would observe the elementary principles of fair play, the western shortage of freight cars would be much less serious. One good way to encourage them in this respect would be to jack up the rental on freight cars so that it no longer will be cheaper for eastern railroads to rent our boxcars rather than build their own.

## National Historical Significance of the Old Mint at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no man better qualified to discuss the old mint in San Francisco than Mr. Augustin C. Keane, who has generously sent me a copy of a paper that he recently filed in connection with the retention of the mint as a national historical shrine.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the paper as follows:

NATIONAL HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD MINT AT SAN FRANCISCO

(By Augustin C. Keane)

San Francisco's 90-year-old United States Mint teems with stories of coining for hard metal economies, of the lure of gold in California, of the development of the Pacific slope, of treasure that aided to save the Union and restore its prosperity. The mint building tells of the noble idealism of the American people. To preserve that building the law requires an official finding that it possesses national historic significance. Questions of cost and of eventual use may be considered only after the fact of national significance has been established.

For an extreme example of this legal position, take the case of the Declaration of Independence. When proclaimed in 1776, that instrument had a vitality and force greater than any message ever given by man and barely short of gospel. But by 1781 and the adoption of the Articles of Confederation of the United States, the Declaration of Independence had served its whole purpose, its intended functions had been discharged. The paper on which the Declaration was engrossed, with the signatures of patriot founders attached, had become merely a document of historic significance. But of what significance. There could be no question of the need or propriety of its preservation, nor of the cost of safeguarding, certainly none as to whether enough quarters or half dollars might be collected from the curious willing to pay to see the document so that the expense of saving it might be defrayed or possibly even show a profit. The significance is all that counts, all that should be considered and, under the act of Congress, all that is to be determined.

What then is the national historical significance of San Francisco's old mint?

The mint has especial historic consequence because it is practically the last such building erected and in all probability another such will never again be built. The old mint stands for the end of an era which began in the eighth century B.C. Throughout that era mints served the hard metal economy of the civilized world. Woodrow Wilson's Federal Reserve Act of 1912 brought the era to a close, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt finally rang its death knell when he recalled gold from circulation. Five dollar gold pieces and beautiful ten dollar eagles and superb double eagles have disappeared, rarely to be seen except as curios with increasing collector's premiums. They were typical of the coast, typical of the Golden State of California, and their production an unsurpassed achievement of the San Francisco Mint. But mints were no longer needed to coin them. With their passing, an ancient system closed. This old mint stands a subline monument to the long era out of which our present practices in money and finance have grown.

The western land, the irrepressible outward drive of pioneers, the times and the march of events placed the Old Mint in San Francisco. When its building was begun in 1868, other mints were coining bullion in other parts of the country. Twenty years earlier the rest of the United States had known of the Pacific Far West only as distant, inaccessible, savage, and darkly forbidding. Discovery of gold in California bedazzled America. Gold seekers surged to the Far West. That discovery quickened growth. Bullion shipments began to flow to the Atlantic seaports. Southern politicians intrigued to make California a slave State. In 1861, President Lincoln instructed Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy, who had only 40 ships with which to blockade the thousands of miles of coastline of the seceding States, to be sure to protect the "treasure-ships" from California from capture by the Confederates. Treasure from California helped save the Union. After the Civil War it helped stabilize the country. That treasure had too great value to be risked in overland transportation for minting in the East lest the stagecoaches west of the Mississippi or such railroads as there were beyond the river to carry it become a prey to highwaymen, road agents, or Indian raids.

The precious metals of the West must needs be coined in the West and so the great western mint was built in San Francisco and began producing coins in 1874.

The initial operations of the San Francisco Mint became so effective and of such great volume that the newly established mint quickly ceased to be subordinate to the U.S. Mint at Philadelphia, as were the mints at New Orleans and Carson City. The San Francisco Mint, from being an independent mint, rapidly grew to be the principal mint of the United States. Within 3 years of its opening, it was producing $50 million of coins a year. Because of its location and the strength of the structure, the Government made it a depository for the country's gold reserve. Toward the end of its service the Old Mint's receiving room was taking in over a million dollars a day of gold bullion. When finally Fort Knox was designated for the safekeeping of bullion, more than one-third of the Nation's gold reserve was stacked in the vaults of the San Francisco Mint.

Nor should it be forgotten that great political battles had raged about the operations of the mint. The Populist Party had rampaged through rural areas with its demand for "the free and unlimited coinage of silver." William Jennings Bryan's rousing peroration, "Thou shalt not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold," set off the 16-to-1 issue for 3 presidential campaigns. Throughout generations American national politics revolved around the operations of the mint.

To the world at large the Old Mint personified the cosmopolitan city of San Francisco. Not only did the mint issue the lovely silver and gold pieces we knew so satisfying to see, to feel, and to possess, but it served foreign governments as well. There Japan, then newly taking a place in the civilized world, had its bullion coined into money for modern commerce. There also many Latin American governments had their coins minted in order to establish and maintain monetary standards. From the Old Mint coins of unexcelled beauty went into ciculation around the world. The institution won a significance that was even more than national.

While notable movements of American history were actuated by operations of which the old San Francisco Mint was the center, its actual significance to the people of the Pacific coast and in particular of San Francisco caused them to glow with affectionate pride and gratitude. Those people, before the mint opened in 1874, had been resentfully conscious of their distance from the Government in Washington, had felt that their public opinion counted for little and could hardly be expected to affect far-off decisions —they felt that they were out of things. Then the Federal Government established this important institution in their midst. To Californians and to the entire coast, the building of the mint meant, as the San Francisco Morning Call put it, that although more than 3,000 miles from Washington, "the people living on the Pacific slope were citizens of the Union." The noble mint structure evidenced the regard of the Government for the people of the coast and made them sense the Government about them and of being a part of the whole Nation.

The possessory confidence which San Franciscans had enjoyed in having the mint at the heart of their city gave way to terrifying shock in the shaking catastrophe of April 18, 1906. As San Francisco burned in the great fire, enveloping conflagration consumed every building surrounding the mint. Flames caught at one corner of the building. The city's water pipes had been broken in the earthquake. Fire hydrants were dry. Employees within the building fought valiantly to save it. U.S. troops arrived to aid. Fortunately, there were two wells on the mint grounds, and having only a 1-

inch hose and dauntless heroism, the employees fighting around the clock succeeded in putting out the flames and preserving the building. For long months thereafter when all about it was in ruins and leveled, the old mint stood out alone, undamaged, certifying to the courage and devotion of the men who had saved it. More than that, they saved the mint's gold supply valued at $200 million. It was that gold supply which later stimulated the city's economy which made survival possible and gave assistance to construction for the San Francisco of today—a city proud and grateful for its old mint.

The very structure of the old mint presents a significance to arrest attention and evoke acknowledgment. The unsurpassed perfection of the design of the building has won it a place among the outstanding buildings upon this continent. The facade of the old mint exhibits the peak of architectural design achieved by the classical revival of the 19th century. The initiation of that revival has been credited erroneously to the influence of one or another planner of buildings who sought to perpetuate the architecture of ancient Greece by copying the designs of its temples and public structures. But the classical revival in architecture throughout the United States was no mere academic mimicry of antique forms. Instead, that revival came as the spontaneous expression of fraternal enthusiasm inspired throughout the United States by the revolutionary outbreak of Greeks fighting to cast off the tyranny of the Sultan of Turkey in order to set up a free and independent government of their own.

To patriotic Americans of the early 19th century, the modern Grecian heroes were champions of liberty—the liberty which had been announced to the world by American revolutionaries less than 50 years earlier, the liberty proclaimed by our Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights. Already the Latin American countries had adopted that liberty and freed themselves from Spanish despotism. Now the spirit of independence and self-government (perhaps in those days more vivid and vital in the minds and hearts of men than it may be today) had spread to Europe and far-off Greece. Americans were fired to cheer and advance the cause of freedom for the Greeks. Daniel Webster, in Congress, urged aid to Greece. President Monroe made the United States the first country to recognize Greece as a sovereign State. Monroe did so in the famous message in which he declared that America would stand with those peoples who by the exercise of their own free choice are in independent control of their own destinies. Americans felt exalted in fellowship with the Grecian champions of liberty. In our fervor of a common cause with Greek revolutionaries we launched the great classical revival. It became a tribute to the principles which had brought into being and sustained American democracy. In architecture the great revival became visual, seen by all. As the high point of its achievement the revival produced the architectural masterpiece which is San Francisco's old mint. Designed by A. B. Mullett, architect of the Treasury Department, the building embodies in its beauty the political and spiritual ideals of freemen.

"Significance" is a weak word with which to try to classify the noble and momentous things for which the old mint stands in the history of our Nation.

When it is officially established that the old mint at San Francisco is of national historic significance, the building will then be available for appropriate public use. It has been suggested that it may be developed as a museum. It has likewise been suggested that it may be put to a more practical use to supply needed office space for Federal departments, including the National Park Service. The California Supreme Court has expressed an interest in the possibility of being housed in this structure. At the moment the important question, however, is the preservation of the building. Whatever its use, it will always be a monument to the vital spirit of the tried, independent, self-reliant, imaginative individuals whose lusty determination brought about the development of the West and the western contribution to the saving of the Union and the national economy—the pioneers who built their city to match the supreme beauty of the hills and of the great bay of San Francisco.

---

## "I Think That I Shall Never See"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker on March 2, I had the privilege of sending to Members of Congress do-it-yourself kits containing baby Douglas-firs. This tree-planting equipment was supplied through the courtesy of the Blitz-Weinhard Co., Oregon's only—and largest—brewery.

The special Oregon kits are designed to help spread the word about my State's 1959 centennial. The word has been spread, indeed, it has been planted, on all parts of Capitol Hill and in a good many States.

This amusing and worthwhile promotion by the Oregon firm found 534 worthy friends. The warm, friendly and humorous thank you's from "parents" of the Douglas-fir seedlings made good reading. I would like to include all of them in the RECORD. Space limitations make this impossibile, but I do want to cite some unidentified samples.

Furthermore, I am ready to dispute any skeptic's contention that Members of Congress lack a sense of humor. Nonsense.

Let me quote:

So far, it (fir tree) seems to be doing quite well in my office, but before it get uncontrollable I hope to have it placed in a more permanent location.

* * * * *

I want to take this opportunity to thank you and the Blitz-Weinhard Co. for presenting me with the toddler Douglas-fir. My family and I shall do our best to give the baby a good home and to protect it from the Maryland snows.

* * * * *

We would like nothing better than to plant your 2-year-old Douglas-fir at my home in Maine. Unfortunately, it would not be likely to survive, for I could not guarante one of the ingredient of T.L.C. prescribed in your letter, namely, "no deep snow." I am, therefore, turning it over to one of my staff members to try in Maryland soil and climate.

* * * * *

COMPLAINTS WILL BE REFERRED

I have already planted the tree on the grounds of the apartment building where I live here in Washington. If in a few years the Park Commission begins to complain, I will refer the complaints to you.

* * * * *

I am planting it in a flower pot, and before it breaks through my ceiling, I will replant it in my yard in South Carolina.

* * * * *

Being an old do-it-yourselfer from southern California, you can bet your boots I'll plant this Oregon fir tree in a prominent place at my home.

* * * * *

Now I know whom to contact for shade. Come and sit with me in the shade.

* * * * *

I do hope I will prove to have a green thumb.

* * * * *

I would like to assure you that I will give it only the tenderest care and treatment during its adolescence.

* * * * *

Mrs. ——— and I will certainly enjoy having a little bit or Oregon around the house.

* * * * *

The Douglas-fir will be planted, and eventually, I shall have you out to properly christen it and give it the good word that it should be happy in the backyard of a Californian trying to make it grow in Maryland soil.

* * * * *

Frankly in view of the size of the yard, it might be best not to give this fine Douglas-fir too much nourishment.

* * * * *

We are very anxious to see what this Oregon tree is going to do in Illinois.

* * * * *

My whole staff is cooperating in giving tender and loving care to the little fir.

* * * * *

REPORT PROMISED

I will let you know how it is doing after the 100 years have passed.

* * * * *

We will have a little bit of Oregon green in the office until it gets too big, then it will be sent to my ranch in Kansas.

* * * * *

I am seeing that it is planted right along side a Louisiana magnolia. It strikes me that they should make very good running mates.

* * * * *

My wife has always wanted a fir, and I know she will be delighted with this one.

* * * * *

Of course, I'll just have to take your word that it'll grow taller and sturdier than the mighty oak.

* * * * *

I appreciate your thoughtfulness, although I feared the mink coat scandal of a few years back might have made a Congressman afraid to give firs to anyone.

* * * * *

THANKS FOR THE TIMBER (J.G.)

Thanks for the timber (j.g.), and will you join me in a chorus of "Mountain Greenery"?

* * * * *

I assume you provide an ironclad guarantee that it will be about 100 feet tall in 100 years. On the lapse of such period, I will measure it and make claim against you for any deficiency.

* * * * *

I look forward to the day when Oregonians will come to New Jersey to see my fine fir tree.

* * * * *

I have just received the Douglas-fir. Frankly, it looks pretty sick. However, I am giving it a water treatment here in my office and as soon as I get home I plan to plant it.

* * * * *

Oregon has a fond place in my heart, not only because it is a beautiful State, but

also because several members of my family tree helped settle it.

* * * * *

A TALLER TREE TALE

The do-it-yourself kit is much appreciated, particularly in view of the fact that I am unable to bring one of Idaho's world famous "white pines" to Washington to plant in my yard—they are so large, even at birth, it is impossible to put them in a pot or planter.

* * * * *

Thanks for the tree, sent me. Fir free.

* * * * *

Does it grow mink?

* * * * *

Now another tree will grow in Brooklyn.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 45

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Livingston (Mont.) Enterprise, on February 14, 1959, entitled "Pollution of Streams Robs State of Water Resources" by C. W. Brink, Director, Division of Environmental Sanitation State Board of Health.

[From the Livingston (Mont.) Enterprise, Feb. 14, 1959]

POLLUTION OF STREAMS ROBS STATE OF WATER RESOURCES

(By C. W. Brink, director, division of environmental sanitation State board of health)

Montana's water frontiers are closing.

Not tomorrow—or next week or even next year, but the time is coming when the "Shining Mountains" of the State will no longer provide sparkling, clear water for fish, wildlife, cities, industries, and agriculture.

The danger lies not in a diminishing supply of water from its mountain headwaters, but in the failure to provide adequate legislation which will protect this essential liquid against pollution, from its source to its ultimate consumption.

At the present time, the sole controlling factor in Montana against pollution is the State board of health. This agency with limited funds and even more limited authority, is unfortunately unable to employ enough personnel or call for necessary measures for the widespread control of pollution.

A working appropriation for domestic pollution control agencies has been estimated to cost only about 5 cents per person per year, based on total population of the State. Adequate sewage treatment facilities in every community can be installed for about 3 cents per family per day.

Since May 1951, the State board of health has followed a policy of not approving any new or additional disposals of raw sewage in any Montana stream, except under unusual circumstances.

But directing long-range programs toward the solution of the domestic sewage problem is not enough.

Statewide and nationwide, populations are mushrooming and industries are expanding at a rate unprecedented in history. Industrial pollution alone in the Missouri River Basin (eastern portion of Montana) has been estimated to be equivalent to a domestic pollution of 900,000 people. Including the small industries which have not as yet been completely studied in the area, the total population equivalent for Montana industries in the Missouri River Basin would exceed 1 million people.

If this is the picture now what will it be in 1964—or 1984 or 50 years from now when the calendar proclaims the 21st century?

Water is essential for life and it is also one of the essentials of industry production. The sugarbeet industry alone consumes 3,400 gallons of water in the processing of 1 ton of beets, another 17 gallons for the production of 1 pound of sugar, and the four plants in the State have current operating capacities of 8,860 tons per day using over 30 million gallons of water. Approximately 770 gallons of water are required in the refining of a 42-gallon drum of crude oil and 20 gallons are needed in refining a gallon of gasoline. Other industries use proportionately large amounts of water in the manufacture of various commodities.

With increased industrial production, Montana can look forward to increased pollution unless the proverbial ounce of prevention is administered.

Montana's economy needs new industries and expansion of existing establishments but not at a cost paid by the industrial eastern States. There, flagrant examples of pollution clearly point up the necessity for pollution control measures to prevent a repetition in the West.

Water pollution in Montana deserves a close examination and attention should be focused on this potential danger. More than attention, action must be taken to assure adequate legislation to protect water—one of Montana's most precious heritages.

## Protection of the Fisheries of the North Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of the King County Labor Council of Washington, AFL–CIO, in support of protecting our Pacific coast salmon fishery resources. Passage of my bill, H.R. 4293, to ban the fish products of nations not practicing conservation, would seem to be the only answer to this problem.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the fisheries are considered a great natural resource, representing hundreds of millions of dollars per year if properly operated; and

Whereas treaties have been consummated in regard to these fisheries and, through these treaties or otherwise, fishing is being allowed on the high seas by certain nations, when by law the North American fisherman cannot fish with nets on the high seas for salmon, thereby allowing big operators to take advantage of the situation; and

Whereas scientists and fishermen are all in agreement that this resource of North America, in regard to the salmon in particular, faces possible destruction; and

Whereas this resource is not being destroyed by natural causes, but by individuals who have been too much interested in selfish gain; and

Whereas congressional hearings have been held in the past and committees have been appointed to try to find a remedy to save this resource, still the destruction of our salmon fisheries is going from bad to worse; and

Whereas on account of this condition and the unfair foreign competition, resulting in cheap imports, thousands of our Americans are being deprived of their livelihood: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Bering Sea Fishermen's Union proceed immediately through congressional channels to eliminate destructive methods of fishing for salmon on the high seas by all nations; therefore be it further

*Resolved*, That when rebuilding this resource by North American taxpayers, proper steps will be taken for their protection in the future, and that copies of this resolution by sent to U.S. Senators and Representatives.

## Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note today that the 1959 platform of the Mississippi Valley Association, adopted at the association's 40th annual meeting in St. Louis, Mo., February 1959, among other equally laudable resolutions, calls for "a full measure of flood protection" for America's expanding population.

I must agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Daniel O'Toole, president of the MVA, that the association's platform, representing the combined thinking of leaders from all parts of the midcontinent and southern sections of our country, is a carefully analyzed program of continued progress in developing the Mississippi Valley's and the Nation's water and soil resources in order to maintain a prosperous, expanding economy; and, that in this year of 1959 it is particularly urgent that Americans remember that water resource development is a capital investment in the future of this Nation, essential to our internal economy as well as to our national security.

Of signal importance is the association's stand on flood control:

We consider the catastrophic loss of lives and property due to floods to be an unnecessary drain upon the resources of this Nation. We recommend that flood control projects be vigorously prosecuted to completion, with particular efforts to expedite projects which will also contribute to the development of navigation, the security of municipal and industrial water supplies, the reduction of stream polution, the development of irrigation and the incidental generation of hydroelectric power.

The association's recommendation for the development of the Wabash River Basin deserves special recognition and praise:

We urge the early completion of the investigation and survey to determine the feasibility of providing a commercial barge channel on the Wabash River.

We urge that Congress provide funds in the 1959–60 budget for advanced planning for the Mississinewa, Salomonie, and Huntington flood control reservoirs in the upper Wabash River Basin and the Monroe multiple-purpose reservoir on Salt Creek, a tributary to White River in the Wabash River Basin, and the Mason J. Niblack and unit No. 5 levee on the Wabash River.

We recommend that funds be made available to the Corps of Engineers to complete at an early date the investigation and survey for flood control and other purposes in Illinois and Indiana of the Wabash River Basin with particular attention to expediting the reports on the Wildcat, Big Pine, Sugar Creek and Wolf Creek flood control reservoirs and the local protection of Mount Carmel, Ill.

## Strontium 90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, herein are certain letters to the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy; letters that the Defense Department apparently wanted kept secret because they present certain disturbing facts; namely, that more fallout exists over the United States than any other country and that strontium 90 contaminates the earth at a faster rate than was originally conceived by scientists.

I might add in passing that one of the most insidious results of the continuing crisis with the Soviet Union is the subtle change that has occurred in the United States in the field of public information. The refusal of the executive branch to keep the public informed of scientific data concerning radioactive fallout and other science and defense subjects has resulted in an uninformed and unaware public in issues which are life and death matters to the public. We are all aware that rational decisions on science and defense policy can only be made when facts are available. If these facts are not available to the general public, the public cannot participate in making decisions which concern their destinies. Decisionmaking falls to fewer and fewer men who cannot be questioned or criticized because the people do not have the facts. This false security consciousness must be stopped before the public loses all power over its servant, the Government.

We in the United States have prided ourselves on our right to know, on freedom of the press, and on freedom from censorship. It is a terrifying thing to think that we may be losing the fight against tyranny internally because we are not forever aware and vigilant in protecting these basic rights.

The letters follow:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1959]

TEXTS OF DOCUMENTS MADE PUBLIC BY ANDERSON ON FALLOUT OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS

STATEMENT BY ANDERSON

In commenting the other day on the Defense Department leak of classified information on the Argus shots—high-altitude nuclear explosions in the South Atlantic in September 1958—I pointed out that it was curious that the Defense Department at the same time was gagging the Joint Committee on making public some important data on fallout from weapon tests.

The Defense Department and the AEC (Atomic Energy Commission) have now released their fallout correspondence with classified deletions, and it is made public in the attachments. First is a letter to me dated February 19, 1959, by the Defense Department revealing new data from classified sources on the residence time of fallout in the stratosphere, and the areas of maximum dripout. Next is a letter from the AEC spokesman, Dr. W. F. Libby, commenting on the Defense Department letter and research project on which it is based. Then there is a transmittal letter from AEC stating their official reservations. Finally there is a brief chronology of our attempts to make this information public.

The process of making public any fallout information is an example of how difficult it is to make available to the public the information it is entitled to have.

The February 19 Defense Department letter states that their measurements indicate that the radioactivity in the stratosphere has a residence half life of 2 years, instead of 7 years as had previously been assumed by AEC. It also indicates that there is a latitude band of maximum dripout of the fallout from the stratosphere which occurs from 35°–50° north or south. This area includes the northern part of the United States, and the letter states that the concentration of strontium 90 on the surface of the earth is greater in the United States than in any other area in the world.

In laymen's language, it looks like strontium 90 isn't staying up in there as long as AEC told us it would, and the fallout is greatest on the United States. Perhaps this information may account, in part, for the recent higher readings of radioactivity in soils and plants.

This new data appears to further contradict the official doctrine of AEC spokesmen as to residence time of fallout in the stratosphere and the theory that stratospheric fallout tends to drip out uniformly throughout the earth. The AEC letter of February 27, 1959, ought to be checked for consistency with the speech of the same AEC spokesman on March 13, 1959, at Seattle.

The Joint Committee will look into these matters when it holds its fallout hearings in May of this year under the chairmanship of Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD (Democrat, of California) of the special subcommittee on radiation.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT LETTER

FEBRUARY 19, 1959.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following is a brief status report outlining the present programs for analyzing and evaluating the radiation hazards resulting from atomic detonations:

Fallout reports from Operation Redwing (1956), Plumbbob (1957), and Hardtack (1958) are currently under preparation.

The hazards of local contamination from nuclear-weapon detonations have been fairly well delineated. However, the difficulty in accurately predicting the rapidly varying atmospheric conditions results in uncertainties as to the area of fallout. Predictions of local fallout contours from enemy bombs must be based on a large number of assumptions, such as the type of weapon, height of burst, and yield. These unknowns do not allow accurate prediction of fallout from enemy bursts during wartime. Delineation of contaminated areas by airborne radio instruments after deposition of the fallout is presently practicable and will be of considerable military and civil value during wartime.

The deposition of worldwide fallout or worldwide surface contamination is now beginning to be accurately measured * * * (classified portion deleted) * * *. Recent indications are that the radioactivity in the stratosphere has a residence half life of 2 years (in contrast to the previously assumed value of about 7 years) and the present amount of strontium 90 in the stratosphere would be maintained by the injection of about 6 megatons of fission products per year. The concentration of the strontium 90 on the surface of the earth is greater in the United States than in any other area of the world. The danger of carbon 14 and cesium 137 has been examined and the immediate probability of any one individual being affected is about 1 in 500,000.

The risk of damage resulting from the testing of weapons is, therefore, extremely small and much less than other common day occurrences such as X-rays, contaminants, household cleaners, etc. However, the probable casualties attributable to radioisotopes from weapons testing when summed over the populations of thousands of years create a moral issue that could be of considerable propaganda importance.

The distribution of the radioactive debris in the stratosphere as a result of detonations to date is not clearly defined as to its altitude and latitude variation. The altitude dependence partially determines the dripout rate and the latitude dependence influences the extent to which the worldwide fallout is uniform over the earth. Tentative conclusions to date indicate that three-tenths of the quantity of radioactive debris leaves the stratosphere each year, that the north-south diffusion of radioactive particles in the stratosphere does exist, and that in both hemispheres there is a latitude band of maximum dripout which is from 35° to 50° north or south.

There is a need for more experimental and collecting programs in the following areas of the effects and behavior of fallout from nuclear weapons:

(a) Amount of fallout deposited locally from a low height of burst.

(b) More accurate determination of the drip-out rate of radioactive particles from the stratosphere.

(c) Further define the estimate of the amount of radioactivity formed per kiloton of fission yield.

(d) The refinement of measuring techniques to account for all radioactivity produced from a nuclear yield.

(e) Advancements in the knowledge of fireball chemistry, physics, and particle behavior.

(f) Response of biological systems to radiation.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT B. LOPER,
*Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy).*

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
*Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.*

LETTER FROM DR. LIBBY

FEBRUARY 27, 1959.

Hon. HERBERT B. LOPER,
*Chairman, Military Liaison Committee.*

DEAR GENERAL LOPER: In connection with your letter to Senator ANDERSON of February 19, 1959, concerning radiation hazards resulting from atomic detonations, I have just completed a study of data which you kindly made available to us last December. I am sorry that, because of the complexity of the problem and my preoccupation with other duties, I have been so slow in finishing my consideration of the data and in sending on my comments.

I think your letter to Senator ANDERSON is an excellent exposition of the present position we are in. There are, however, one or two points you make, on which I believe fur-

ther words are necessary in order to resolve some questions.

The extensive data that have already been published by Project Sunshine and the United Kingdom study group, together with your beautiful * * * work, still leave us, despite their great volume and complexity, in some uncertainty, as you say, as to the distribution of the radioactive debris in the stratosphere to both altitude and latitude variation, since the altitude variation determines in part the dripout rate and thus the residence half life in the stratosphere, this quantity is left in some doubt. My own present conclusion is in agreement with yours as stated in your letter, in that my previous value of 7 years for this important number is too long and that it should be reduced. In a restudy of this question, being released March 13 in Seattle, a copy of which will be sent you as soon as it is printed, a new value of about 4 years rather than the earlier 7 is arrived at. I find it difficult to push it down to the 2 years you give as an indicative value.

On the amount of strontium 90 in the stratosphere, at the present time there is a somewhat larger difference in our estimates which may be due to your not having included the Russian series of last October which in itself alone, according to my estimates, increased the stratospheric inventory by about 50 percent You give the present inventory as requiring 3 megatons (megatons fission equivalent) per year to be maintained at its present level. For a half-life of 2 years this corresponds to only 17 megatons total and appears to leave too little room for the injections from tests before last October, which I estimate still have left some 25 to 30 megatons and a corresponding required rate of injection for steady maintenance of about 7 megatons per year. The closeness of this figure to your 6 megatons per year number shows how badly we need further information on the actual stratospheric content.

*Evidence increasing*

You indicate that the stratospheric fallout occurs at maximum rates in the 30°–50° bands of latitude in both hemispheres. This old argument still is not quite settled, I believe, although the evidence in favor of your conclusion is increasing. My principal difficulties with it at the moment are that we know that a considerable part of the peak in observed fallout in these latitudes in the Northern Hemisphere is due to tropospheric or local fallout which was never in the stratosphere and the evidence for a corresponding peak in the Southern Hemisphere seems to be rather weak.

With respect to the carbon 14 and cesium 137 hazards, the laboratories measuring radiocarbon dates in various parts of this country, in Europe and New Zealand have sent me data on the present increase in the carbon 14 content of living matter which amounts to about 10 percent of the natural level of carbon 14 from the cosmic rays which in itself corresponds to about 1.5 milliroentgen per year—about 1.5 percent of the average total natural dose rate. Turning to cesium 137, Dr. E. C. Anderson in the Health Division at our Los Alamos Laboratory has just reported data on the human level in the United States and Europe for the late summer and early fall of last year which amount to an average of about 75 micromicrocuries per gram of body potassium for an internal dose rate of about 3 milliroentgens per year. The total cesium 137 fallout in the United States now amounts to about 50 millicuries per square mile. This adds about 1 milliroentgen per year of external dose for a total of about 4 milliroentgens per year due to cesium 137 which is about 3 percent of the natural average radiation dose rate from natural radioactivity and the cosmic these numbers are in strict keeping with your estimate that the immediate probability of any one individual being affected by bomb test carbon 14 and cesium 137 is about 1 in 500,000 but I think your estimate looks reasonable.

On the many other points in your letter I find myself in complete agreement, particularly about the importance of more experimental and collecting programs on the amount of fallout deposited locally from a low height of burst. Since it may be that we will not again have the opportunity to test devices, at least above ground, it is particularly important to consider whether we may not collect more information at this point from past tests. I believe there are some possibilities of doing this and I suggest that we undertake such a program jointly right away.

W. F. LIBBY,
*Commissioner, Atomic Energy Commission.*

AEC LETTER

(From the General Manager to the Joint Committee, received March 21, 1959.)

This is in reply to your letter of March 9, 1959, by which you forward a copy of General Loper's letter to Senator ANDERSON dated February 19, 1959, and requested our comments thereon.

Commissioner W. F. Libby has written his comments to General Loper in a letter dated February 27, a copy of which was sent to Senator ANDERSON at that time. For your convenience another copy of Dr. Libby's letter is attached.

The revised estimates of stratospheric burden and the residence time presented by General Loper are consistent both with the data referred to by General Loper and with the "Ash Can" data obtained by the Atomic Energy Commission in its ballon sampling up to 90,000 feet. However, it should be kept in mind that knowledge of the stratospheric content alone is not sufficient to determine retention time. In addition, one needs the knowledge of either the stratospheric injection or of total stratospheric fallout as a function of time. Within the range of accuracy with which fallout has been measured, observed fallout to date is not incompatible with General Loper's estimate of the injection rate which would be required to maintain the present stratospheric burden.

The two main reasons for the uncertainty in the stratospheric burden and residence time are (1) that the entire stratosphere has not been adequately surveyed from pole to pole and up to altitudes beyond which the overlying radioactive debris can be confidently neglected and (2) that the data obtained at the higher altitudes by balloon only are subject to sizable sampling errors, uncertainties of collection efficiency of the sampling filters, and radiochemical analysis errors due to the small amounts collected.

As a consequence of these uncertainties we do not consider that the data now available are sufficiently decisive to resolve the differences between the estimates of stratospheric content and retention time made by General Loper and the higher estimates given by Dr. Libby in his letter to General Loper. It may be observed that on the basis of the estimates made by General Loper the total worldwide fallout of long-lived radioactive fission products anticipated from all tests up to date would be roughly two times the total deposition so far and that on the basis of Dr. Libby's estimate the total would be roughly three times.

We concur with General Loper in recognizing the need for further investigation along the lines suggested in his letter. We plan to continue our efforts in all these fields. In particular, we hope to be able to differentiate Operation Hardtack surface-burst debris and high-altitude debris, by analysis of tungsten and rhodium isotopes respectively, and, in turn, to distinguish these from the recent U.S.S.R. debris. In this way it should be possible to obtain a much better picture of the actual patterns and rates of spread of stratospheric debris originating in different latitudes and altitudes.

The information bracketed in red on the first page of the attached copy of Dr. Libby's letter of February 27, 1959, is considered by the originating agencies to be confidential defense information. With these deletions Dr. Libby's letter is declassified.

Sincerely yours,

(S) A. R. LUDECKE,
*General Manager.*

CHRONOLOGY

Brief chronology of action by Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to make public Defense Department report on fallout:

December 1958: Dr. Libby furnished new data by Defense Department indicating that the radioactivity in the stratosphere has a residence half-life of 2 years instead of previously assumed value of 7 years.

February 20, 1959: Joint Committee received fallout report by the Department of Defense dated February 19, 1959 classified "Confidential—Restricted Data."

February 27, 1959: Confidential letter sent to Defense Department by Dr. Libby with copy to Joint Committee chairman in which Dr. Libby arrived at new value of 4 years instead of previous 7 years.

March 9, 1959: Joint Committee by letter this date to the Defense Department questioned the reasons for the confidential classification of the report and inquired as to what extent the information could be discussed in public without compromising classified information. A separate letter this date was also sent to the AEC requesting the Commission's views on the report and to what extent the conclusions affected previous assumptions and statements.

March 13, 1959: Restudy by AEC of worldwide stratospheric fallout released at Seattle, Wash., in which no mention of Defense Department study is made and which maintains position of a residence time of 5 to 10 years, selecting 6 years as the mean residence time of stratospheric fallout. Results of another AEC analysis Project Ash Can which indicated a residence time of 3 years was discounted as being doubtful. No mention was made that the Department of Defense conclusions of residence of half-life of 2 years tended to support results of Project Ash Can.

March 18, 1959: By letter, the Defense Department advised the Joint Committee that only one sentence in the report contained classified information and after identifying it went on to state:

"Although the remainder of the letter is unclassified, the Department recommends that it not be discussed in public because there is not full agreement as to the interpretation of the data that has been obtained so far. We believe it would be far better before the date and conclusions are made public that there be a close agreement amongst the investigators concerned. Therefore, we believe that until the results are more than preliminary, the confidential classification should remain on the letter."

March 20, 1959: Letter received by Joint Committee from the Defense Department advising the report could be made public with deletion of the one classified sentence.

March 21, 1959: Letter received from AEC stating what portion of Dr. Libby's confidential letter of February 27, 1959, to the Department of Defense does not contain classified information.

Letter and report released by Joint Committee after deletion of classified information.

## Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing is a man to whom the country owes a vote of thanks. For the past 6 years Joseph Swing has held one of the most difficult posts in Government—Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. This is a job in which there are only heartaches, headaches and brickbats. It takes a man with a tough skin and a steady hand. Such a man is Gen. Joseph M. Swing.

What is little known about this man, however, is that he has a heart as big as an elephant and has administered a difficult law liberally, fairly, and with as much compassion as the law will allow. He showed his toughness and his ability to get a job done when he took by the horns an appalling situation along the Mexican border where the so-called wetback invasion had assumed unbelievable proportions. The Commissioner, acting swiftly but carefully, and without additional cost to the taxpayers, reversed this avalanche and not only stopped a tide that was daily in the thousands, but made it possible for Mexicans here illegally to return to Mexico of their own accord and without penalty. In the summer of 1954 about 65,000 illegal aliens returned to Mexico of their own accord. This was a situation which nobody liked and which demanded correction and control. The Mexican and the U.S. Governments both have been grateful to General Swing for bringing this unhealthy situation under control.

This man is responsible, probably more than anyone in Government, for taking action at all levels to facilitate travel—all to the advantage not only of the United States but also commerce and industry, including, of course, the transportation industry.

There is much left to be done in this regard and I assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that Commissioner Swing is not resting on the improvements thus far achieved. Within the executive branch of the Government he has fought to eliminate redtape and senseless procedures which have proven so embarrassing and annoying to international travelers. His efforts contributed to a change in the law permitting a waiver of the fingerprinting requirement of people coming temporarily to or through the United States. He is presently seeking to obtain a waiver of the visa requirements for tourists and visitors coming to the United States, as permitted by law in certain cases with respect to neighboring countries and contiguous islands. He lent support to legislation enacted by the 85th Congress which corrected a number of hardships that had been encountered in the administration of the immigration laws.

When the October revolt broke out in Hungary, General Swing was among those in the forefront pressing for the immediate participation of the United States in a crash program designed to relieve the misery of anti-Communist refugees and escapees from Hungary and pressures on Austria. He was quickly on the spot in Austria and Germany and took extraordinary measures to expedite the processing of emergency admission of 30,000 deserving Hungarians to this country.

General Swing is a West Point classmate of President. Eisenhower. Although he was the youngest member of this distinguished class he achieved in his career preeminence and excellence in his chosen profession. It would take far too long, Mr. Speaker, for me to recount to this Chamber the whole history of General Swing's professional achievements. It is enough to point out that he achieved distinction as one of the foremost experts in this country on airborne tactics. In December 1943, he planned and conducted the first airlift by planes and gliders of an entire division. Thereafter, in the Pacific theater, General Swing proved himself one of the most skillful, effective, and courageous combat officers of World War II.

General Swing has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross; Distinguished Service Medal; Silver Star with two Oak Leaf clusters; Legion of Merit; Bronze Star Medal with one cluster; Air Medal with one cluster; French Legion of Honor; and Chief Commander, Philippine Legion of Honor.

I had the pleasure of working with Commissioner Swing in my capacity as executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States in 1955 and 1956. He is a devoted and effective public servant. All who strive toward the improvement and betterment of the public service can look to men like Joseph M. Swing for inspiration and leadership.

## Family Service Association of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Capital will be the scene from April 1 to 3 of a biennial meeting of an organization that is outstanding in its contribution to the human welfare. I refer to the Family Service Association of America.

This is a growing federation of almost 300 family counseling agencies in the United States, Canada, and Hawaii, which annually serves nearly 1 million people. This service is rendered mainly through case work help for marital, parent-child, and other family-living problems.

The agencies are supported largely by local united community campaigns, and this is but another reason for all of us to take an active and intense interest in our local fund-raising campaigns conducted yearly by United Funds and others of similar goals.

The Family Service Association of America national headquarters, staffed as it is with highly trained professional people, provides a variety of central services to help local agencies and communities develop effective family service programs for strong family life.

If you have been privileged to observe the conscientious and never-ending efforts of the agencies to cope with the manifold problems of our complex existence, you could not help but be impressed by the devotion and skill of those who render this service.

Additionally, there are hundreds and hundreds of citizens who serve on the boards that direct the agencies' work, without compensation other than a reward for contribution to better living.

It is my hope that these few words will in some small measure emphasize the very greatness of the Family Service Association of America and will point out to the devoted people who work so untiringly in its behalf that those of us who are in the Congress appreciate this great effort on the part of private citizens.

We salute the Family Service Association of America and wish it a very long and successful future career.

## An Appreciation of Charles M. Russell, Montana's Famed Cowboy Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I believe I speak for all Montana when I say that our famed cowboy artist, the late Charles M. Russell, is truly emblematic of our great Treasure State. The statute of Charley was placed in Statuary Hall here on March 19, 1959. The speaker we of Montana obtained for that solemn occasion was Dr. K. Ross Toole, former head of the Montana State Museum, at Helena, Mont., now director of a museum in New York City. His tribute was so well-stated, so true, that I ask that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

AN APPRECIATION OF CHARLES M. RUSSELL
(By K. Ross Toole)

When a man becomes a myth it is difficult to get at him. It is as if his figure stood behind an opaque screen. No matter how intently you peer, the outline is blurred. The truth about any man is difficult to ascertain. The truth about a complex man( who died 33 years ago) and upon whose image myth and legend have encrusted themselves, is even more unascertainable.

Sometimes what is not true about a man is more revealing than what is true. And sometimes an appraisal of what a man was not strips off more misconceptions.

Charles Marion Russell was not, in the proper sense of the word, ambitious. In a

peculiar way he had what he wanted at a very early stage in his life—and he never entirely lost it. It is true that he lost the land as he first knew it and loved it, but he never lost it in his heart, or in his mind's eye, and it was from these wellsprings that his talent rose. Ambition is a thing that drives men to attain what they want and do not have. Russell was not a driven man.

Charles Russell was not a hail fellow well met. He was extremely gregarious. He enjoyed people and they enjoyed him. But the story of his life is interspersed with long periods away from people and close to the land. He had to revive himself in quiet. The too common picture of Russell always in a crowd, always grinning, always joking is but one small facet of a man who was essentially a quiet man—and almost always a contemplative man.

The difference between Russell and his friends and contemporaries was not merely that he happened to be able to paint—while in every other respect being a regular kind of fellow; the difference lay in the fact that beneath the surface he carried on a lifelong love affair with mountains and plains, with the wind that was born in the canyons and the grass that bent on the hills. Perhaps no man of his time ever understood so thoroughly the uncommon land in which he lived. And no American has ever peered quite so deeply into the Indian heart.

Russell was not a joyful man with unfailing cheer to spread among his fellows. Nor was his humor simple; it had heavy undertones of the ironical and the satirical. He was an inveterate teller of jokes and stories. But they almost always had bite, and often even anger in them.

In short, Charles Marion Russell was a most uncommon man who found himself at home only in the most uncommon land of his adoption. He not only spoke of that land but for it. No one has ever spoken so articulately since, and—because all but its shadow is gone—no one ever will again.

It is a fine thing that Montana has placed the statue of Charles Russell in National Statuary Hall. The statue belongs here. Russell doesn't. Maybe he belongs where most of us think he is: in the places he painted; in the fierce ecstacy of Montana's sunsets; in the mountain meadows, and knee-deep and alone in prairie grass.

But if you look westward from where Charles Russell is buried you can see Square Butte, his butte—purple in the morning, red at noon, and blue in the evening. And it is always far away; it seems to retreat even as you move toward it. That is what Charles Russell does.

Maybe it is that way with all great men. Maybe they don't really belong to any place at all. Maybe they belong to time.

## Dividend Day at Kodak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we hear so much about the many problems which exist between labor and management, it is refreshing to find a situation such as that which prevails at the Eastman Kodak Co., in my home city of Rochester, N.Y.

Eastman Kodak, one of the great companies of this country, has established a truly wonderful relationship with its employees, a relationship which is reflected in the continuing high quality of the products which Kodak produces, in its consistently fine earnings record, and in the almost complete absence of the kind of labor-management problems which seem to plague some industries.

Typical of the type of thing that has made Eastman Kodak a shining example of what labor and management can do when they pull together was this week's announcement of a recordbreaking $28 million wage dividend which will be distributed to the 31,000 Kodak employees in Rochester. This wage dividend plan was begun almost half a century ago, and is based on the amount of cash dividends declared on the common stock during the year and on the recipient's earnings over the last 5 years. It is to my way of thinking a wonderful way of sharing corporate profits.

We in Rochester are proud of Eastman Kodak, and we are proud of the generally fine labor-management relationships which exist throughout the city. I would like to include in the RECORD a newspaper article concerning the Kodak wage dividend.

IT'S DIVIDEND DAY AT KODAK TUESDAY

A record wage dividend of approximately $28 million (before taxes) will be paid Tuesday to the 31,000 Eastman Kodak Co. employees in Rochester.

The total wage dividend to about 47,000 Kodak employees in the United States amounts to approximately $40 million.

Fifteen branches of Rochester banks will extend banking hours until 6 p.m. for the convenience of Kodak employees Tuesday afternoon. In addition, offices of the Eastman Savings & Loan Association at both the Kodak office and the Kodak Park Works will be open to 6 p.m. Tuesday and Wednesday to help with the cashing of wage-dividend checks.

The wage dividend is based on the amount of cash dividends declared on the common stock during the year and on the recipient's earnings over the last 5 years. Next week's payment will be the largest since the wage dividend plan was begun in 1912. Eligible employees will receive $32.625 for each $1,000 they earned during 1954–58, inclusive.

Kodak's highest previous wage-dividend payment in the United States was made a year ago and amounted to $38 million. The rate for that payment was $32 per $1,000 earned over 5 years.

Because the wage dividend is related to the cash dividends on the company's stock, the formula for determining the rate was adjusted after the recently announced Kodak stock distribution to assure that any wage dividend declared by the company in the future will not be reduced because of the stock distribution.

## Aid Comes From Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DENVER D. HARGIS**
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas City Daily Traveler, which I feel effectively calls attention to certain objectionable aspects of this country's present foreign aid program, and also outlines the goals of a worthy organization, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee:

AID COMES FROM TAXES

Politicians at all levels try to leave the impression that they alone can bring special benefits to certain groups; that under their wing there will be protection. What they haven't succeeded in doing is convincing all people that they will not share the costs of government. Taxes are paid by the masses.

If elected officials engage in programs that are folly the poor man and the rich man pay the costs. That is the reason people want to know and should be told how public money is spent. When this information is not made available it is reasonable to assume that everyone pays for the benefits that go to a few. Aid comes from the people or the politicians.

When a citizen is in distress he is not without sympathy. Americans are noted for their service to mankind. In this country the people don't have to know the resident who has suffered from disaster. If he is hungry and without food and a home there is a tendency to gather around him and ease the condition.

That citizen immediately responds and is thankful he has good neighbors and that other citizens are thoughtful.

Away from home our acts of humanity are not so rewarding. That is, the money spent on foreign aid doesn't bring a friendly reaction. Americans think they are helping the destitute in other lands, but when the results are tabulated there is an element of hate that has been generated in the heart of the foreigner.

Part of every man's taxes goes to foreign aid. More money is sent abroad each year and more is asked. But the reaction to charity abroad is not what the American gets at home when he helps a fellow citizen. Outside official political circles a campaign is underway to stop the flow of foreign aid within a period of 3 years rather than increase it.

A citizens foreign aid committee has been organized. It has studied the foreign-aid program and is making an effort to stem the flow of money from the taxpayer's pocket to the foreigner.

These reasons were given by the committee for halting the giveaway foreign-aid program:

"The threat of Communist aggression rules out our continuing to dispense lavish foreign aid when our own economy is threatened and our defenses are inadequate.

"In a number of recipient countries our foreign aid helps to strengthen political systems hostile to our own.

"Our foreign aid speeds rather than retards the growth of communism; it inflates our economy; it is partially responsible for the alarming flight of gold from our control; it is destroying our foreign markets and increasing unemployment among American workers.

"The administration of foreign aid is inefficient and wasteful.

"Our governmental foreign-aid program is unsound in principle."

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

# *Appendix*

## Human Rights Are Everybody's Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 22, it was my privilege to address the Chicago Conference for Brotherhood at the Shoreland Hotel, Chicago, Ill. The theme of my address was that Human Rights Are Everybody's Problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, BEFORE THE CHICAGO CONFERENCE FOR BROTHERHOOD, FEBRUARY 22, 1959, CHICAGO, ILL.

Throughout our country people have been meeting this past week in commemoration of National Brotherhood Week.

Such gatherings reflect a growing awareness of the importance of human brotherhood and understanding in a free and democratic society. As never before in our history, there is a recognition that suspicion and prejudice stand as a mortal threat to the political and social health of the Nation. Discrimination, bigotry, and prejudice are the dangerous subversive forces at work in our society.

The denial of equal rights to so many of our citizens, as a result of such prejudice, is the reason that we are gathered here tonight. The denial of the God-given right to freedom is the No. 1 moral and political issue which we face today in America and in the world.

The present struggle between the free world nations and the Communist bloc is, after all, based upon the fundamental issue of man's right to freedom. This is what the present conflict, when all is said and done, is all about. The issue is whether government should be the servant of the people or master of the people.

In such a basic and crucial struggle we cannot afford to ignore denials of freedom right here in America. We must put our own house in order if we are not to be considered hypocrites when we point an accusing finger at the Soviets for their denial of human rights.

And may I add that the problem we face right here at home is not a regional problem only confined to the South. We know this only too well from firsthand experience. Minority groups still face employment barriers and by gentlemen's agreements a system of restrictive covenants is effectively maintained in many towns and cities of the North.

At the conclusion of the recent New York hearings of the Civil Rights Commission, Father Hesbergh, president of Notre Dame, speaking on behalf of the Commission members, said that it had been demonstrated beyond a doubt that the problem of discrimination in housing is nationwide in scope.

"We are talking about the face of America," said Father Hesbergh, "and that face must have the beauty and dignity and harmony of the Constitution." Equal protection of the laws, he said, must begin in the homes of all Americans.

In spelling out the problem which we face, I do not wish to leave the impression that we are not making progress. Advancements in the field of civil rights and human understanding are being made every day.

I was heartened to read only the other day that your new State superintendent of public schools here has announced that he intends to take affirmative action against segregation in certain schools in southern Illinois.

Yes, more and more jobs are opening to qualified Negroes. Fewer and fewer trade unions maintain color bars. Progress is being made, slowly to be sure, toward nonsegregated housing.

And in the South there is encouraging progress also. The recent opening of integrated schools in Virginia is a milestone. Its significance cannot be overestimated. The doctrine of massive resistance in that historic State has collapsed completely.

In Kentucky, 85 percent of the schools have been integrated.

In the border State of Maryland, integration of schools is almost complete and has taken place without any difficulties.

Tennessee is in the second year of a start with its capital city integration plan as accepted by the court.

In North Carolina, its largest city, Charlotte, is proceeding with an accepted plan; its fine university has for years had Negro students.

In Texas, Negroes were admitted to the university several years ago, and many of its towns and cities have integrated their schools.

Louisiana admitted Negroes to the State University 2 years ago, and this year admitted Negroes to its undergraduate school in New Orleans.

In Florida, a Negro has been admitted to its law school, and Governor Collins, a courageous and good man, has proposed the abolition of all Negro graduate schools and the admission to the regular university of their students this coming September.

There are only four States in the South which have made no start toward integration and in which a policy of massive resistance continues unabated.

So progress is being made. And this is the encouraging thing to remember. The job remaining to be done is still tremendous, but we have every reason to feel confident that we have reached the time in our country's history when the goal we seek of first-class citizenship for all our people is in sight.

Both as mayor of Minneapolis and as a U.S. Senator I have worked for legislation to protect the rights of all the people. I have advocated civil rights legislation on the basis of the moral law and the constitutional guarantees of freedom to all citizens.

I would like to set forth to you these basic and fundamental principles upon which I have based my stand. Emotional outbursts and arguments of those who oppose civil rights must not cloud the basic issue; namely, the moral and constitutional duty of the State to protect and to guarantee the rights of its citizens, regardless of their race, religion, creed, color or national origin.

In the year 1896, a great American wrote the following words on this duty of the Government:

"The sure guarantee of peace and security of each race is the clear, distinct, unconditional recognition by our Governments, National and State, of every right that inheres in civil freedom, and of equality before the law of all citizens of the United States without regard to race. We boast of freedom enjoyed by our people above all other people. But it is difficult to reconcile that boast with a state of the law, which, practically, puts the brand of servitude and degradation upon a large class of our fellow citizens, our equals before the law."

These are the words from the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan in the historic case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. As we all know, Justice Harlan's colleagues on the Supreme Court rejected his defense of man's rights under the Constitution by adopting the "separate but equal" doctrine.

However, Justice Harlan's dissenting opinion was finally accepted in 1954 in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* in which the Court stated: "We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

Justice Harlan had been a slaveholder himself, and an opponent of the 13th amendment. He was, however, a just and righteous man with a deep reverence for the Constitution, and he clearly understood what was intended by the 14th amendment. As his biographer stated:

"The simplicity and directness with which he viewed it approaches that of a layman. He believed that it should be construed in accordance with the views of the framers and the dictates of commonsense."

Justice Harlan's opinion should be read and heard today by every citizen in the land. It demolishes the emotional arguments which have been raised in an effort to bury the simple and fundamental constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the law.

Yes, it is this guarantee which we must constantly keep in mind. We must not let it be pushed aside and obscured. The 14th amendment is clear:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

When the Supreme Court in 1954 overthrew the "separate but equal" doctrine, it breathed new life into the Constitution. Such a decision was inevitable in an age when second-class citizenship can no longer be tolerated. There can be only one class of citizens permitted under our legal structure; and those who argue otherwise are in opposition to the supreme law of the land and the basic and fundamental principles upon which our Nation was founded.

The framers of the Declaration of Independence laid down the basic philosophy of our Government when they wrote:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

In these short sentences is summarized two great and abiding ideas which have served to guide our country for almost 200 years.

First of all, that man has certain rights under the natural law; rights given to him not by the government, but rights given to him by God, Himself. As such these rights are unchangeable and everlasting and above the power of Government to destroy or deny.

Second, governments are established by the people for the primary purpose of securing these natural rights—which include that of liberty—and to protect the individual in their enjoyment.

This indeed was a radical philosophy of government in the 18th century, and there were many who deemed it both dangerous and visionary. But this doctrine has served us well and under it our Nation has grown and prospered and government has remained the servant rather than the master of the people. Unfortunately, however, this great concept of a government established to protect the rights of all the people is still not accepted by all. There is still a denial of freedom and equality to many of our fellow citizens—particularly those of the Negro race.

To the extent that our Federal, State, and local governments fail to protect the natural rights of the citizens, such governments are failing to fulfill their function according to our basic philosophy of the role of government.

Human rights are inalienable rights. They are God's gift to man—and their protection and advancement is the first obligation of organized society.

Government at all levels must give constructive and imaginative leadership in the effort to overcome discrimination throughout the Nation.

Protection of human rights is the moral responsibility of government officials in a free and democratic society. They have the obligation to establish standards and practices of equal rights and equal protection of the law for all citizens to follow.

However, action of representative government generally reflects moral and political standards of its citizenry. For that reason fulfillment of civil rights and civil liberties is the continuing responsibility of every community, of every civic organization, and of every individual. Action in Congress is vital and important, of course—but it is not enough alone.

Leadership from the President, the executive branch of our Federal Government, from our Governors and from our mayors is equally important, of course—but it too is not enough alone.

We need courageous leaders in behalf of human rights in every community. We need local action, as well as national action. We need private action as well as public action.

The cause of civil rights should enlist the active support of government, of voluntary organizations, of religious groups and institutions, and of civic bodies. Only by such unified action can we truly fulfill mankind's inalienable rights.

Great progress, as I have already noted, has been made in recent years in the field of civil rights, but we still have a long way to go.

So long as segregation is practiced in schools, parks, libraries, hospitals, buses and trains, we will not have achieved true freedom. So long as color bars exist in housing, hotels, restaurants and theaters, we will be short of the goal. So long as citizens are denied the right to vote or denied the right to a job because of their color, we will have failed to live up to our announced principles.

Those of us who maintain that it is the obligation of government to protect the civil rights of all citizens are proposing no new or radical idea. Our position is as old as the Declaration of Independence itself; founded on the basis of faith in the natural rights of man and in the Constitution of the United States.

I realize only too well that segregation cannot and will not be wiped out overnight. Prejudices which have developed over scores of years cannot simply be ignored in working toward the goal of equality under the law. But these very real problems and roadblocks to understanding should not and cannot be permitted to serve as excuses for refusing to act.

It is my firm conviction that government must give constructive and imaginative leadership in this endeavor. This will require patience, understanding, and a determination on the part of men of good will to cooperate in a dispassionate manner.

This is no time for name calling or for emotional tirades or for holier-than-thou attitudes. It is the time to calmly and rationally discuss and work out methods whereby equality under the law shall be assured to all citizens in as orderly and civil a manner as possible. I am convinced that it can be done if we but put our minds and our hearts to it.

We in the Congress have a grave responsibility to aid in protecting the rights of all the people. And we are making headway.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 was the first civil rights legislation passed by Congress since 1875. It added greatly to the excellent record of the 85th Congress. While it failed to contain many of the proposals that I, and many of my colleagues, had hoped and worked for, it was a positive step forward. Under this act there was created a Commission on Civil Rights, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and most important of all, the Attorney General was empowered to seek an injunction when a person was deprived or about to be deprived of his right to vote. These were provisions which many of us had striven for many years to achieve.

This civil rights record of the 85th Congress, however, should not serve as an excuse for failing to take further action in the 86th. And I am confident that we will have reason to be proud of the civil rights record of this Congress.

As you know, a number of civil rights bills have already been introduced in the Congress this year.

Senator JOHNSON has offered a bill which would (a) make it a Federal crime to bomb schools, churches and other buildings; (b) grant the Attorney General subpena power in investigations of violations of voting rights; (c) extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission another two years; and (d) establish a Community Relations Service to provide conciliation service to communities involved in civil rights disputes.

The administration's proposed bills would (a) make the use of force or threat of force to obstruct court orders in school integration cases a Federal offense; (b) provide funds for education of the children of members of the armed services in areas where the public schools have been closed; (c) make it a Federal offense to travel in interstate commerce to avoid prosecution for the bombing of religious or school property; (d) prohibit the destruction of voting registration lists and make such lists and records available for examination by the Department of Justice; (e) authorize appropriations by the Federal Government to assist local school agencies in desegregation programs; (f) extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission 2 additional years; and (g) create a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity under Government Contracts.

Your own Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and I, joined by several other Members of the Senate, have introduced a bill which (a) endorses the principle of the antidiscrimination decisions of the Supreme Court; (b) provides that the Attorney General may institute a civil action for the purpose of preventing any interference with a person's right to equal protection of the laws; and (c) authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to (1) render technical assistance to aid in school desegregation; (2) provide grants to areas where desegregation in public schools is being carried out; (3) prepare plans for the elimination of segregation in public schools where no effort has been made to comply with the Court's decision; and (4) institute legal proceedings to enforce compliance when such plans are rejected by State or local officials.

I personally feel that the most meaningful legislation is that which Senator DOUGLAS and I are sponsoring. This is not to say that the bills as offered by Senator JOHNSON and by the administration are not desirable. I think that they are. They would be steps forward. Not as long strides forward as I and many of my colleagues in the Congress favor, but forward strides nevertheless.

Senator JOHNSON is to be commended for offering his civil rights bill and for indicating that he intends to push for its adoption by the Senate.

I think it is significant that under the leadership and direction of Senator JOHNSON, a Senator from a State which was part of the Confederacy, no less than 5 of the 22 southern Senators voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1957. For the first time the solid South split on the civil rights issue.

There is general agreement that the 86th Congress will pass further civil rights legislation. And it will be significant action.

Yes, we are moving forward. We are making progress on wiping out the great evils of discrimination and segregation. The gap between the flowing words embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and the denial of first-class citizenship to so many of our people, is being faced up to. This gap is slowly but surely being closed.

The words of a distinguished American, a former Senate colleague from North Carolina, Frank P. Graham, summarize the opportunity which we now have to advance the cause of freedom:

"With human liberty in peril around the earth, may the people of the United States, in cooperation with free nations, light up the wide heavens of the hopes of all peoples with another great declaration of the equal freedom and dignity of all people. Now is the time to make clear to the friends of freedom in the East and West that freedom, due process of equal justice under law, and the equal opportunity for all people are the historic and living sources of the faith of the American people in themselves, of the world's faith in America, and of America's moral influence and power in the world."

## Carbon-Schuylkill Jobless Total 25.3 Percent of Labor Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from

the Lansford, Pa., Record of March 17, 1959:

CARBON-SCHUYLKILL JOBLESS TOTAL 25.3 PERCENT OF LABOR FORCE

Idling of 1,200 workers in the temporary shutdown of the Coaldale Mining Co. operations has zoomed unemployment in the Panther Valley-Tamaqua labor area to the catastrophic figure of 25.3 percent of the total labor force, according to a survey of the labor market compiled today by the Tamaqua office of the State bureau of employment security.

The survey does not so state, but the 25.3 percent of unemployment, which means one out of every four workers is idle, is believed to be the highest for any section in the United States.

ELEVEN THOUSAND, TWO HUNDRED HAVE JOBS

The survey states that out of a population of 40,500, there is a total labor force of 16,600 persons, both male and female. There are 11,200 persons employed in this area, another 1,200 commute to jobs outside the region, and 4,200 are idle.

Compiled by Harold Katz, manager of the Tamaqua office, with the aid of John F. Cooney, district labor market analyst of the district office, BES, at Stroudsburg, the survey takes in the area from New Ringgold eastward to Jim Thorpe, and Lansford, Summit Hill and Jim Thorpe boroughs, and Mauch Chunk Township, in the Carbon County portion of the report.

The survey points up favorable assets attractive to new industries. These include, in addition to a work force the major part of which is in the 20-45 young-age bracket, an abundant water supply, excellent highways, ample housing, and close proximity to consumer markets.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The complete report follows:

The constant decline of anthracite mining and the reduced employment in that industry in this area, once wholly dependent upon mining for its entire economy, projects the necessity for the area to redevelop its industry.

Probably, the decline in population is one of the many items that could be used to describe the situation, which is present in this once prosperous area.

In 1940, the official U.S. Census gave Tamaqua borough a population of 12,486. By 1950, that had declined to 11,508, a net loss of 978 or 7.8 percent. Assuming a continued population loss of 1 percent per year since 1950, current population of the town probably is in the neighborhood of 10,500.

Most of the population loss was incurred by entire families moving from the area to work in other areas along the Eastern Seaboard. In addition, workers are commuting long distances from this area to work daily but principally to points in the Lehigh Valley. Currently there is estimated to be approximately 1,200 persons commuting to work daily to jobs outside this area.

For the purpose of this appraisal, this entire Tamaqua labor market area is being considered. The following political subdivisions comprise this area:

Schuylkill County: Tamaqua, Coaldale, and New Ringgold Boroughs; and Schuylkill, Rahn, Ryan, Rush, Walker, East Brunswick, West Brunswick, and West Penn townships.

Carbon County: Lansford, Summit Hill, and Jim Thorpe boroughs; and Mauch Chunk township.

Population in this area in 1950 is estimated at 44,800. Current population probably does not exceed 40,500. It should be noted, however, that population does not leave the area until economic necessity forces it. It has been established that most of those who left the area would gladly return if suitable work was available to them.

Current labor force is estimated at 16,600. This compared with an estimate of 17,200 10 years ago. Labor force has not declined comparable with population since the economic situation has compelled many females to reenter the labor market and take the place of the male breadwinner of the family who lost his means of livelihood.

EMPLOYMENT

Current employment is estimated at 11,200 with approximately 4,400 of these being females. Of the total females employed, slightly less than 50 percent are employed either in apparel or textile industries.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Current estimate of total unemployment for the area is 4,200. Ten years ago, this estimate was only 1,400. One out of every four unemployed is a female.

CHARACTERISTICS OF LABOR

Classified by broad occupational skills, the unemployment may be identified as follows:

| | *Percent* |
|---|---|
| Professional and managerial | 3 |
| Clerical and sales | 8 |
| Service | 6 |
| Skilled | 25 |
| Semiskilled | 30 |
| Unskilled | 23 |
| Other | 5 |

It is estimated that approximately 60 percent of all unemployed are between the ages of 20 and 45. A very desirable labor pool is available for prospective new industries locating in this area.

Other desirable characteristics of the labor supply of this area include versatility, adaptability, easily trained, a willingness to work and ingenuity. Employees recently locating in this area have found this large supply of easily trained male labor one of the area's foremost assets.

SUMMARY

The current shutdown of Coaldale Mining Co. affecting approximately 1,200 men aggravates an already serious unemployment condition. This number adds to the approximate 3,000 hard core unemployed which has existed for some time.

*10-year comparison*

| | September 1949 | January 1959 |
|---|---|---|
| Population | 44,800 | 40,500 |
| Total labor force | 17,200 | 16,600 |
| Commuters | | 1,200 |
| Unemployment | 1,400 | 4,000 |
| Employment | 15,800 | 11,200 |

OUTLOOK

Despite the difficulties that have beset the area, there is a hope for the future. Chambers of commerce, service clubs, industrial development organizations, and many other groups are working diligently to attract new industries employing males to the area to replace the loss occasioned by the decline in anthracite mining and are meeting with some means of success.

The area has many favorable assets with which to attract new industry including the following:

1. An abundance of water supply.
2. Excellent highways.
3. Ample housing.
4. Already established community facilities and services as such medical, shopping, religious, social recreation, educational, etc.
5. Highways, railroads, air freight, and passenger facilities.
6. Close proximity to consumers markets.
7. Abundant, flexible, and immediate labor supply.

## Statehood for Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a week ago last Sunday I delivered an address in New York City before a group who are interested in statehood for Puerto Rico.

At the same time an address was delivered by Mr. Luis Ferre, vice chairman of the Republican Party of Puerto Rico.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY LUIS A. FERRE DELIVERED BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STATEHOOD OF PUERTO RICO DURING THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 42D ANNIVERSARY OF THE GRANTING OF CITIZENSHIP TO PUERTO RICANS, LAW SCHOOL OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, MARCH 7, 1959

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a significant coincidence that today, when we gather here to celebrate the 42d anniversary of the granting of American citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico under the auspices of the National Association for the Statehood of Puerto Rico, should also be the closing day of the Puerto Rican Week as proclaimed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, to underline the fact, as he himself expressed it, "that the American citizens of Puerto Rico have gained the right to equal rights and equal opportunities" in the great State of New York.

Nothing less could have been expected from a man of great moral stature, devoted here in America and also all over the world, to free humanity from suffering, poverty, ignorance and prejudice. Nothing less could have been expected from a great American, who has devoted his life to secure the principle of freedom and equality upon which our Nation was founded, for all its citizens, without distinction of race or social standing. Nothing less could have been expected from the Governor of this great State of New York, to whose development and progress so many good and hard-working Puerto Ricans have contributed with their honest toil and intellectual and cultural achievements.

But it is not enough to guarantee the political rights and equal opportunities of the Puerto Ricans who live in New York State, if it is desired to truly assert their rights to equal opportunities and equal political participation in the life of our Nation. In my opinion, it is the duty of every American who wants to be true to the great tradition of respect for the basic principles of our Government as expressed in the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, to assure that the American citizens of Puerto Rico are given besides the opportunity to achieve statehood for the island, so that they may also assume their full responsibilities and enjoy all the rights that accompany such citizenship.

It is true that this is a matter for the people of Puerto Rico to decide. But most certainly, the admission of Puerto Rico as a State of the Union, will give greater sense of belonging to those of you who have made your homes up here, either permanently or

temporarily, and will help to assure the respect of your fellow citizens and to guarantee your opportunities for progress and improvement, for as natives of a State you will be looked upon as full-fledged members of the great American family, with right of participation and responsibility in national affairs.

Arguments have been advanced to prove that statehood is not economically advantageous to Puerto Rico and the present status of a Commonwealth has been described as one of great advantages for the island. I have time and again argued that such is not the case. That even though it might appear from a superficial analysis of the question that Puerto Rico is at present enjoying a privileged economic status, because the residents of the island do not pay Federal taxes, such advantages are offset by the loss of Federal appropriations, which accrue to the States and not to Puerto Rico, and also because the sense of political insecurity is a barrier to the investment of capital in the island. Such investment of capital, in amounts large enough to absorb the great labor supply which is available, would create sufficient jobs in Puerto Rico to substantially reduce the migration of Puerto Ricans to the mainland in search of jobs which they cannot find there.

Statehood for Puerto Rico would also be of great advantage to the United States in its great global effort to meet the challenge of the Communist nations. In the first place, it would be a direct denial to the charge which is often made by Russia, that the United States is a nation where racial prejudice is rampant. The admission of a community of 2½ million in habitants of a different ethnic origin as a State on equal footing with the other States of the Union, would be a conclusive proof to the contrary.

In the second place, the United States would enlarge its boundaries and population substantially. During the last 50 years and up to the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union, the democratic areas of the world had been shrinking, while Russia had been expending its boundaries and absorbing population of different languages and ethnic origins in order to increase its manpower and resources. Should this trend continue of the next 50 years, Russia might become the largest single power in the world, while the United States might become a second-rate nation. Those, fortunately few, Americans who make public utterances poisoned by prejudice and parochialism, and who forget the principle of equality which has made America great and also forget that our Nation was strengthened and enriched by its continuous expansion during the 19th century, should look back to our history and see how their shortsightedness is endangering the position of leadership of our Nation, both in the realm of ideals which inspire confidence and respect, and in the wealth of material resources which give the Nation its sinews for progress.

In the third place, in its international relations with the South American Republics the United States would gain greatly in respect and confidence, if it were to grant statehood to Puerto Rico, which comes from a common ethnic and cultural origin with these Republics. How can the United States expect the Latin American nations of South America to believe in the good faith of its verbal expressions of friendship and mutual consideration, when its apparent refusal to accept Puerto Rico as a State of the Union denies the sincerity of such assurances? How can the people of the South American Republics help but resent such statements, as have been recently made by men in high office in our Government, that after Hawaii becomes a State of the Union the door is closed to Puerto Rico, as if our people were unfit to be the peers of the rest of the citizens of America?

We, of course, realize that this is not the opinion of the vast majority of Americans who are inspired by a clear sense of justice and an honest respect for the rights of equality and freedom which is the patrimony of our citizenship. Nor do we, the American citizens of Puerto Rico, believe that this is the case. We are proud of our citizenship and we are proud of the part we have taken in securing its freedom. Our men have served in the Armed Forces to do so. And our people have laboriously worked in fields and factories to create the goods and services that have added to the wealth and prosperity of our Nation. In those essential respects, we have done as much as any other fellow citizens.

But precisely because we have done our part proudly, and with laboriousness and responsibility, we feel that we are entitled to full equality within the Nation. We have accepted the present Commonwealth status of Puerto Rico as a temporary status to better equip ourselves to assume the full responsibilities of statehood. But we do not submit to it as a permanent status, because it does not have the attributes of equal rights and equal dignity to which we as American citizens have the right to aspire and the duty to demand. We reject any status which might be accused of being as Rexford Guy Tugwell accused recently the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico "one of exploitation of one group of citizens by another." And we reject any status which will not give the American citizens of Puerto Rico the full measure of dignity and equality which is the natural right of a freedom loving people.

That is why it is so important that this association be expanded and strengthened with members all over the country. You, who have had the chance to see from personal experience what America is really like, what political strength really means, are the ones to carry the message to your relatives in Puerto Rico of the importance of making statehood the clear and only objective of Puerto Rico. You, who realize what it is to yourselves to be able to say that you were born in the State of Puerto Rico, should assume the responsibility of creating public opinion in the mainland favorable to granting statehood to Puerto Rico.

This is an urgent matter. It cannot be postponed because Puerto Rico must move forward politically in one of two directions: Either statehood, or by default, it will inevitably move toward independence. There is no position in between that can be permanent. At this very moment, the Governor of Puerto Rico is sponsoring amendments to the Federal Relations Act which pose a great menace to the bonds of union between Puerto Rico and the United States. In this respect, Judge Calvert Magruder, of the U.S. Circuit Court of Boston, said recently at the University of Puerto Rico:

"Public Law 600 having been adopted by the Congress, as proposed by the Puerto Rican leaders, I do not expect to see Congress modify the terms of the compact substantially in the direction of cutting down the Federal activities here as they now exist. If the proposal is that Federal activities be reduced to a pale residue, while the citizens of Puerto Rico retain all their present advantages as citizens of the United States, and Puerto Rico retains all its present advantages under the compact, then I would expect the Congress to say, 'All right, if that is what they want, let us cut Puerto Rico loose and give it complete independence.' "

The Governor of Puerto Rico, Mr. Luis Muñoz-Marín, has expressed himself publicly as being firmly and irrevocably opposed to statehood. He has also refused to let the people of Puerto Rico express themselves in a clearcut referendum as to their preference with respect to the political status of the island. In the meantime, he is requesting amendments to the Federal Relations Act which, in the opinion of men who are in a position to judge, will inevitably lead Puerto Rico toward independence. We must act therefore and act fast. You should ask your Congressmen and Senators to vote against these amendments. And you should continue to strengthen this association and help to create public opinion here and in Puerto Rico to demand that Puerto Rico be granted statehood with all its rights, its duties, and also its dignity.

---

## Comments by Representative Joe L. Evins of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Representative JOE L. EVINS, the very able Representative from the Fourth Tennessee Congressional District, wrote a splendid newsletter on the commemoration of the 170th anniversary of our Constitution, and on the occasion of the congratulation of the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, on his long tenure of service in the Congress.

This thoughtful and well prepared newsletter appeared in a number of Tennessee papers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newsletter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Chronicle, Mar. 14, 1959]

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District Tennessee)

The House last week, on March 4, paused in its deliberations to observe two historic events. First, the 170th anniversary of our Constitution—that historic document which has provided the framework for our Government; and, secondly, to congratulate the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, on his long tenure of service in the Congress.

The 170 years that have passed since our Constitution went into effect have seen the Nation expand and grow from Thirteen Colonies on the Atlantic seaboard to 49 States stretching from coast to coast. Today America is the most highly developed nation in the world, covering half the continent and reaching into the Arctic Circle. From a thin population of 3 million it has grown to its present teeming 175 million.

The problems of today are far different, and many feel far more numerous, than they were 170 years ago; but the Constitution still stands with only a few amendments, still successfully guiding the course of our Nation and still preserving the freedoms that are our tradition. Our Constitution is the oldest living and active document of its kind in existence today. Never in the history of the world has a constitution served a nation so long and so well.

CONGRATULATE RAYBURN

While celebrating the anniversary of the Constitution, several Members took occasion at the same time to congratulate Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who on March 4 completed his 46th year of service as a Member of the House of Representatives. Speaker RAYBURN has already held this office longer than any man in our history. In entering his 47th year of service, he now has also exceeded all previous records of service in the Congress. So far as is known, this record is also unprecedented in the history of the entire world.

William Gladstone served in the Parliament of Great Britain for 60 years and Winston Churchill is serving his 54th year. But both these great English statesmen were elected to Parliament for only a limited period and later appointed to the House of Lords in perpetuity. So that it appears that Mr. RAYBURN has served as an elected member of a national legislature longer than any man in the history of modern democracies.

Our great State of Tennessee may rightfully take pride in this unprecedented achievement because SAM RAYBURN was born in east Tennessee, in Roane County, adjoining our own Fourth District. The Speaker is one of the many distinguished men whom our great State has contributed to the history of Texas—a list that includes Sam Houston, Davy Crockett and many others. Our State has contributed three Speakers by election—John Bell, James K. Polk, and Joe Byrns; we can add with pride the name of SAM RAYBURN by nativity.

Although the principal duty of the Speaker is to serve as the presiding officer of the House, the office carries with it many other exacting duties, great power and responsibility. In his ability to influence the course of our Nation, the Speaker is probably second only to the President.

Speaker RAYBURN has served our Nation well and uses his great office with a high sense of public duty. Though the leader of the Democratic Party in the House, he has discharged his official duties as an American, without narrow partisan consideration, and always with a truly national rather than provincial point of view. Tennessee, Texas, and all America may take equal pride in his record of service in the public interest.

## The Area Redevelopment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Banking and Currency Committee in favor of the area redevelopment bill.

STATEMENT OF HERMAN TOLL, SIXTH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, ON THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT, MARCH 19, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity of presenting this statement in behalf of the Area Redevelopment Act. I have introduced a companion bill (H.R. 5330) to the Douglas-Flood bill.

We hear again and again from the executive branch that cities and States should try to help themselves to the greatest extent possible. Unfortunately, the tax structure leaves to the cities only a small portion of the total tax dollars. The only method which would enable cities to take care of more of their problems is to give them a chance to increase their tax base—as the possibility of raising the tax rate or adding new taxes is virtually exhausted. The imaginative aid which would be given to my home city, Philadelphia, for instance, through the various provisions of the bill before us would do just that.

While it is true that Philadelphia, or for that matter any diversified metropolitan area, is not as badly off as the chronically depressed coal or textile areas, it is also true that Philadelphia is in a worse economic condition than the Nation as a whole. Among the reasons are that some industries, such as textiles, have left the city over time, that there are, among a large number of different industries in an old manufacturing center, always some which are in a weak competitive position, or are losing employment due to automation; and that manufacturing employment in an older area like Philadelphia declines due to its congestion, its built-up character, and the fact that it does not have space for industry to expand in, or for new industry to find attractive places in which to build new plants. This situation, as well as transportation difficulties and obsolescence, is particularly bad in and near the core of the city where small but intensive manufacturing establishments would like to locate from the point of view of their consumers, their suppliers, or their labor force. The decline of this type of manufacturing industry and of associated business services in the core of the city, which is serving the entire metropolitan area, endangers the function of the center as a cohesive force, and thus Philadelphia's entire tax base.

Section 5E of the bill is specifically designed to help this type problem by permitting not only entire metropolitan areas, not only entire counties, but clearly defined portions of an area, county, or municipality, to become eligible for help under the Area Redevelopment Act if the problem clearly lies within such a portion of the city. This should not be understood as giving an opening to arbitrary gerrymandering. The center city of Philadelphia, for example, where many of the problems lie for which the Area Redevelopment Act can provide some help, is clearly defined by the proposed expressway loop, as well as by certain economic characteristics. The importance of this provision lies in the fact that due to it an entire metropolitan area will not be judged ineligible just because the suburbs are sufficiently well off to balance the unemployment rate of the problem areas and thus put the total area beyond eligibility, while the problems are concentrated in one particular portion of the area, which need the help this bill can provide.

Philadelphia is typical of older cities which suffer from obsolescence and congestion. Neither the municipality nor private enterprise have the funds to tear down obsolete buildings at these expensive locations and make more room for existing industry, for expansion of off-street loading, for parking, and so forth. Yet the industrial slums created over time by increasing age and progressing technology near the center of cities must be elliminated and new industrial areas must be developed in order to give the city a tax base which can sustain the necessary municipal services without having to go hat in hand to the State and Federal Governments for emergency help just to keep up with current needs.

Section 14 of the bill, by explicitly removing some of the restrictions which have so far inhibited industrial redevelopment under the existing urban renewal legislation, makes it possible to do some redevelopment of industrial slums along with residential slum clearance. It will still be up to the local authorities to decide what the best balance should be between industrial redevelopment and other kinds of slum clearance; but the provision of this section gives the city a chance to redress this balance on the basis of its own best judgment and thus to make room for new industry and for an increased tax base.

Philadelphia has been consistently concerned over the last several years with the problem of a declining industrial base. It has done everything within its power to remedy that situation. The city administration has joined with the chamber of commerce in founding a non-profit corporation for the retention of industry in the city, and the attraction of new industry into the city which, although it has only been in actual operation for a few months, has already shown some remarkable successes. The State has spent millions over the last few years for bringing industry into Pennsylvania, and Philadelphia has received a portion of this help. There again, however, the limits of available private and public funds are very evident.

The Area Redevelopment Act provides funds for all kinds of remedial action on this problem, and makes it possible to dovetail these remedies with particular problems involved. It provides for example, for loans for developing land for industry, for building plants, and even for machinery and equipment for industry. This last possibility is particularly important, as our experience shows that the financing of construction of new buildings and equipping it with the necessary new machinery presents a major stumbling block for attracting new industry or for giving a chance of new ventures to industry already here. As for the development of older industry, particularly in loft structures, which cannot afford or do not need entirely new buildings, the Area Redevelopment Act provides for loans for rehabilitation of old buildings, for their conversion or enlargement (section 6). The flexibility of this section is of signal importance for the complicated and varied needs of different industries within as diversified an area as Philadelphia.

The demands from many sides upon the capital expenditures of a city such as Philadelphia makes it very hard to support industry with the public facilities which are in many cases a prerequisite for enlarging the city's economic base: Section 7 provides for loans to any eligible jurisdiction for those public facilities needed to develop the land for industry, as well as for the alteration and improvement of existing public facilities for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial plants or facilities. Section 8 even provides for grants for this purpose. In many cases the improvement or extenssion of existing utilities must precede the successful location of industry. The building of parking lots or parking garages will make it possible for a large labor force to be available to new industry locating within the city. A new grid of streets adapted to truck use around an industrial area may be necessary before loans to industry are of practical use, etc.

Philadelphia, as mentioned before, has lost industry in the past. This leaves a number of workers with obsolescent skills. Under the present system these men retrain only if it can be proven that a job is waiting for them after their training period. Sections 16 and 17 of this bill provide for training and retraining of workers and for payment of subsistence to them while they train. This is also of great use for workers who lack industrial competence and the basic knowledge of working in an industrial society (because they come from rural areas, largely in the South). As the number of workers without skills or with obsolete skills in Philadelphia is great, this provision of the bill,

which helps overcome the rigidity of the existing training apparatus, would make it possible for more workers to be equipped with the kind of skills useful in today's and tomorrow's labor market—which in turn makes the location a great deal more attractive to industry.

The Area Redevelopment Act would give Philadelphia a chance to fully use the great locational advantages and the splendid community spirit it has to offer to old and new industry, by making it possible to offer industry the public facilities, the necessary loans, the training of workers, etc., all of which adds up to a persuasive argument for old firms not to leave the city and for new firms to build plants here. It so happens that the city's efforts in this direction show clearly (and chapter and verse can be cited) that the best will in the world and great community efforts time and again flounder on the difficulty of obtaining financing for clearing out industrial obsolescence, of being unable to provide needed public facilities in time, etc.—all problems which in each case could be solved by the help promised in the Area Redevelopment Act. It is therefore not only of great importance for the chronically and deeply depressed areas of Pennsylvania, but also of vital importance to the well-being of the 2 million residents of the city of Philadelphia that this bill be passed.

## Proposed Change in Election of Presidents and Vice Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on March 9, 1959, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 72, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of President and Vice President. This resolution, if adopted, would abolish the electoral college and replace it with a much more democratic method of selection of our President and Vice President. It would divide the electoral vote in direct proportion to the popular vote in each State. It would also minimize the possibility of the election of a President or Vice President with fewer popular votes than another candidate.

Recently, Mr. Harry J. Carman, cochairman of the American Liberal Association, had a letter on this subject published in the Christian Science Monitor. He explains the need for such legislation in a most succinct and cogent fashion. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Carman's letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 16, 1959]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

The present method of electing Presidents by the electoral college is defective because the unit vote system does not necessarily represent the will of the majority of the voters accurately. Under the present system the total votes of minority parties might actually add up to a majority of the popular vote and nevertheless fail to effectuate the will of the majority, therefore being essentially undemocratic.

A Georgia Republican or a Vermont Democrat cannot make his vote for President count—in fact, minority party members actually aid the opposition since the number of electoral votes which a State casts is relative to the size of its population. For example, although in 1944 Roosevelt received only about 10 percent more votes than Dewey in New York State, he had the benefit of its total electoral vote. This system could break down if the people felt that they had been deprived of victory because of faulty machinery. Like the human appendix, the electoral college is useless and a possible source of inflammation.

There have been various proposals for changing the present system. The most radical proposal is that Presidents be elected directly by popular vote. There is theoretical justification for this method from the standpoint of the democratic principle. The election of a President by a vote which ignores State lines and without the interposition of the electoral college between the people and the successful candidate would have much to commend it logically and would offer no serious mechanical difficulties.

But for the present such a change is politically impossible as it would eliminate the States as political factors. The less populous Western States would oppose such a change lest the voters in the more populous Northeastern States dominate a popular election. The Southern States would oppose it because it would compel them to permit Negroes to vote so that these States might continue the influence to which they would be entitled on the basis of their populations.

Another proposal provides that the 531 members of the electoral college be chosen as are the Members of Congress; that is, 435 representing one from each congressional district and 96 consisting of 2 from each State. However, this plan would not eliminate the possibility that the popular vote and the electoral vote might produce different results, permitting the election of a President representing a minority of the popular vote.

The most reasonable proposal calls for a constitutional amendment eliminating the electoral college and providing for the division of the electoral vote in direct proportion to the popular vote in each State. This method would minimize the possibility that the electoral vote would result in a different selection than the popular vote. In time of crisis, both accuracy of representation and stability of government are vital, and reform of the electoral college would strengthen both these pillars of our democracy.

HARRY J. CARMAN,
*Cochairman, American Liberal Association.*
NEW YORK, N.Y.

## Could Be a True Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, you are a retailer and the manufacturer sets your prices on the merchandise you handle and sell. You must sell at that price. The manufacturer thus protected then makes the same product for a big chain or department store who puts on the product his own trademark or brand. This he sells at a price of his own choosing—let us say a six-tube radio—considerably below your identical radio.

You cannot lower your price—your prices are controlled by the manufacturers. You lose your customers to the department store or chainstore. You go broke. Why?

Because Congress changed the entire free enterprise system, and did it to help you, the little retailer.

Fantastic? Yes, but it could be true. This is exactly what the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, will do.

## The Basis of East-West Agreement on the Use of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a timely and cogent address made by Spencer M. Beresford at the First Conference on Space Law and Sociology held by the American Rocket Society, on March 20, 1959, in New York City. Mr. Beresford, who served as special counsel of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, of which I was chairman during the last session, and now holds the same position on the staff of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, has given a great deal of thought to the subject. His address should be of special interest to everyone who has felt the need for international regulation of space activities—a need that was recently dramatized by the announcement of nuclear explosions in outer space:

THE BASIS OF EAST-WEST AGREEMENT ON THE USE OF SPACE

(Remarks of Spencer M. Beresford, special counsel, House Committee on Science and Astronautics, at the first conference on space law and sociology of the American Rocket Society, New York City, March 20, 1959)

Although the United States and the Soviet Union have not achieved any greater cooperation in the use of outer space than in most other matters, there are signs that some mutually advantageous agreements may be possible. The purpose of this talk is to explore the kinds of agreement that may afford a basis for accommodation and compliance. My views on this subject are personal and not official.

To prevent misunderstanding, I hasten to say that free-world cooperation in outer space should be pursued with all possible speed. Free-world agreements with the Soviet bloc, on the other hand, should not be negotiated without careful preparation and would scarcely be worth making unless they are likely to be kept as a matter of self-interest or can be enforced.

In the "Survey of Space Law" (H. Doc. 89 of the 86th Cong.) the conclusion is reached that space law can be developed most rapidly by concentrating upon the most urgent matters which show some promise of settlement and deferring the question of national sovereignty.

The most likely alternative to sovereignty as the basis for the legal control of outer space is a classification by international agreement of proscribed activities in space according to their purpose and effect. Several commentators on space law have pointed out this possibility. Professors McDougal and Lipson, in an article published in the July 1958 issue of the American Journal of International Law, observed that it may be questioned whether physical boundaries are as relevant to the purposes of human control and planning as would be an arrangement based upon types of space craft, probable functions, and potential dangers.

In speaking at the 1958 annual meeting of the American Bar Association last summer, I suggested that the proper test is not distance but time and causation. Only a few days ago Mr. John A. Johnson, the General Counsel of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in testimony before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, called for a more fruitful emphasis on the nature and purpose of the specific activity in space, how it affects the security interests of individual nations and the international community as a whole, and the relative importance of other interests, such as scientific and commercial, to be served by the activity.

It is true that space activities are hard to classify as harmful and innocuous since many lend themselves to hostile as well as peaceful purposes. The military and civilian uses of given devices or activities in outer space are characteristically inseparable. For example, a radio satellite could be used not only for private and commercial messages but for military communications, for monitoring or jamming foreign radio stations, and for broadcasting propaganda. An observation satellite equipped with photographic, infrared, or television cells would lend itself to military reconnaissance as well as forest-fire patrol.

But the classification of proscribed activities in space, though difficult, is by no means impossible.

Radio transmissions can be protected against jamming and interception. The use of radio for military communications and propaganda (not to mention advertising) is already widespread. There is little reason to doubt that agreements on frequencies, call signs, and signal strengths can be reached for vehicles in space as they have been for radio stations on the surface of the earth.

Observation satellites present a greater problem, yet our Deputy Secretary of Defense testified last year that the Defense Department would not object to Soviet satellites' taking pictures of the United States. (See hearings of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration (1958), p. 1102). Furthermore, the Soviet legal scholar, E. Korovin, writing in the January 1959 issue of International Life, indicates that the sending of an American reconnaissance satellite through outer space above Soviet territory would at least not be regarded as an act of war. His comments are worth quoting:

"Two groups of acts should be differentiated from the standpoint of world relations and international law: acts in the Cosmos that are acts of war and those that are not acts of war but serve in international relations as expressions of mistrust, ill will, and similar cold-war consequences.

"Clearly one cannot lump together the destruction of another country's sputniks by means of antimissile missiles with the presence of photo and TV equipment in a satellite, even if employed for reconnaissance."

Limited practical agreements on the use of outer space have often been proposed in the free world. Though numerous, these proposals agree in certain particulars not only with one another but with similar proposals emanating from the Soviet bloc. In this fact there may be some basis for early and useful East-West agreements.

For example, last year an article by A. Galina in Soviet State and Law (No. 7, pp. 52–58) concurred in the following proposals for international agreement on the use of outer space:

1. Supplying satellites with identifying signs.

2. Agreement on radio frequencies and the elimination of interference.

3. Space vehicles to remain the property of the launching state.

4. Prohibition of the use of outer space for warlike purposes.

5. By implication, liability for injury or damage caused by space vehicles (since the stated reason for putting signs on satellites is to identify the responsible states in case sputniks should fall to earth and cause damage).

Korovin, also, in the article to which I have previously referred, states that the government concerned bears full responsibility for personal or property loss caused by satellites or other space vehicles. He looks forward to the solution of such problems as identification markings for scientific apparatus launched into space, and their registration; the elimination of radio and TV interference in outer space and, in a word, the institution of what might be provisionally called cosmic space safety rules.

The same areas of agreement have been proposed in the free world, and could serve as starting points for the rule of law in outer space. We could reasonably expect, in working from these proposals, that the resulting agreements would be mutually advantageous and likely to be observed for reasons of self-interest. For example, there is now no obligation under international law for the return of a fallen space object to the launching state. This is an agreement the Soviet Union appears to desire.

Certainly any free-world negotiator would like to make certain additions. Liability for injury or damage caused by space vehicles should include collisions with aircraft. It should be possible to reach agreement on exchanges of navigation and signal codes and fuller exchanges of data obtained by space vehicles.

Prior notice and coordination of launchings would reduce the dangers of mistaken identification. From the free-world point of view, however, such notice must ultimately include reliable information of capabilities and payloads. As the President has proposed to the Soviet Union, nuclear warheads must be prohibited. The enforcement of this prohibition implies inspection prior to launching. It may or may not be possible to separate the inspection of payloads from the general question of nuclear disarmament.

In any event, the present Soviet position appears to be represented by the remarks of G. Morozov, who said on November 27, 1958, in a talk on the Soviet home service radio:

"Rockets are not dangerous in themselves, but their danger is to be found in the charge which they contain. The prohibition of nuclear weapons, therefore, would automatically settle the issue of the peaceful use of cosmic space."

East-West agreement on the use of space is a matter of some urgency. If no agreement is reached, unwritten rules may become established which would be hard to change. The ground is already shifting under our feet. It may be later than we think and growing later faster. The tempo of events is not only rapid but accelerating.

The crescendo of space development is witnessed by the fact that as recently as 1953 the British Interplanetary Society, which can hardly be suspected of slighting the prospects of space flight, predicted that the first satellite would be launched in 1965 and the first lunar probe in 1985. As everyone knows, both events have now occurred. Note that while the first event was only 5 years earlier than predicted, the second was more than 25 years earlier.

Many specific dangers also impel both sides to come to terms—for example, the risk of touching off a general war through mistaken identification of a space vehicle as a ballistic missile unless there is an appropriate agreement for prior notice of launchings.

The United Nations study committee on the problems of outer space will report to the General Assembly in the fall. Meanwhile, we have the opportunity of threshing out the issues on which early agreement may be possible.

---

## Fighting Progress and Committing Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, when chainstores and mail-order houses came into the retail sales field there was great resistance to them. They offered better service and lower prices. Is this bad? No; the consumers liked them fine. Some merchants resented this intrusion, however, progress notwithstanding, and forgetting that most businesses start as price cutters and offerers of unusual service, decided to eliminate this new threat. First, there were horizontal conspiracies where dealers got together to blacklist the offenders. Ninety such suits are contained in Antitrust Assistant Bicks' brief—1958 Senate Select Committee on Small Business, appendix I—wherein the Government had to prosecute the dealers and others who endeavored to enforce an economic blockade in one way or another.

Then came another effort or reaction—the vertical price-fixing attempt to eliminate the new upstart business wherein manufacturers, distributors, and dealers variously conspired with each other. Here again antitrust action by the Government was necessary. Fifty-three such vertical combinations were prosecuted and are listed in Mr. Bicks' brief—appendix II. Finally, these new businesses were accepted by merchants because of consumer acceptance. A new, more efficient distribution and sales effort had won out.

But today the lessons are forgotten. Now once again retailers resist new and tough competition, only now they want a so-called fair trade law with the antitrust law set aside so that prices can be set by manufacturers, thus assuring the same price by force of law for every retailer. Aside from depriving consumers of lower prices, these retailers seeking this fair trade law are asking, first, Federal intervention which is bad enough; and second, the curses of planned economy rather than the blessings of a free market; and third, worst of all are unbeknownst to themselves trying to commit suicide by holding an umbrella over the big retailers who can market their own brands at their own

prices. The smaller retailers will not be able to compete because the fair trade law will not permit it. Fair?

## Legalizing Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Boston Sunday Herald of March 15, 1959, entitled "Legalizing Price Fixing":

LEGALIZING PRICE FIXING

Again Congress is being called upon to decide between all the people and some special interests. This time the issue is fair trade, the device by which manufacturers are given legal sanction to fix retail prices on trademarked goods.

This week the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will hold hearings on two bills which would, for the first time, establish fair trade as a Federal law, thus overriding even those States that have consistently rejected the system for themselves.

Fair trade is anticonsumer. It is promoted largely by certain retail groups which are interested in establishing the same, fixed profit margins in as many lines as possible for all stores.

The fair-trade backers insist that they have the interest of the consumer at heart; that they merely seek to prevent cutthroat competition and loss-leader practices which are said to be harmful to the consumer. But their insistence has a hollow ring.

Low prices do not hurt consumers very often, and it is pretty hard to prove otherwise.

Price fixing, however, in the particular interest of the retailer, can hurt.

Let's say a particular trade-marked product can be sold by retailer A for a dollar less than the price retailer B must get. This doesn't mean cutthroat competition. It may mean that retailer A has a cash-and-carry store on a back street with the simplest of furnishings and a minimum of service, while retailer B supplies all sorts of services, with every sale in gracious and attractive surroundings.

Fair trade would deny the consumer the cash savings obtainable by trading with retailer A. It would end price competition at the retail level.

But this is not the only drawback. The manufacturer is likely to believe that the larger the profit he gives to the retailers (within reason), the greater will be the effort made by these retailers to push his product. So the fair-trade fixed price may prove to be even more than enough to assure retailer B his extra dollar.

So the consumer suffers even more.

As a matter of fact, fair-trade price fixing is likely to encourage bootlegging to favored customers at below the marked price. It will encourage more firms to enter retailing until the falling volumes of sales for all retailers will nullify the profits guaranteed by fair trade. Even the retailers themselves will find fair trade no help.

But the straight moral issue is whether Congress is to serve 175 million people or the misguided interests of a few groups of retailers. Unfortunately, the loudest noise in Washington next week will be made by the latter.

## Teaching Conservation in Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that one of the most important problems confronting America is the task of preserving and conserving its natural resources.

The challenge is particularly significant in the face of an ever-expanding population—estimated to be about 220 million by 1970.

The unprecedented growth of cities, overflowing into our countryside, also is literally wiping out the last vestiges of natural outdoor areas in many sections of the country.

Fortunately, constructive conservation programs by States, conservation groups, and conservation-minded individuals—along with assisting Federal programs—have helped tremendously in preserving our outdoor heritage.

In the face of ever-greater utilization and, in some cases, unfortunately, depletion of our natural resources, stepped-up efforts for preservation of these resources is essential for the future of America.

In Wisconsin, we have great out-of-door areas which, through the constructive work of conservation-minded citizens, have been preserved for the benefit and enjoyment not only of Wisconsin citizens, but also of visitors from throughout the country and from abroad. For example, we have more than 16 million acres of forest land, 8,700 interior lakes, 33,000 miles of water courses, and 978 miles of water frontage on lakes and streams. In addition, we have constructive programs of fish and wildlife preservation which help to provide refuges for fish, birds, and more than 650 kinds of animals.

I should like to point out, too, that Wisconsin is the only State with a natural resources committee, with a subcommittee on conservation education, established by legislation. However, a number of other States have similar coordinating groups, either appointed by Governors or inaugurated through voluntary programs.

In the March 15 edition of Conservation News, published by the National Wildlife Federation, I was most interested to read an article entitled "The Need for Teaching Conservation in our Schools." The article contains thoughtful suggestions for teaching conservation in our schools and, as a result, broadening the concept of conservation among our people. I request unanimous consent that excerpts from the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR TEACHING CONSERVATION IN OUR SCHOOLS

National Wildlife Week, now being observed under sponsorship of the National Wildlife Federation, features the theme: "Conservation in the Schools." While Wildlife Week focuses attention to conservation education, it is hoped that particular emphasis can be directed to the subject during all of 1959 and on into succeeding years.

This subject is of particular importance because, generally speaking, the resource conservation concept is not receiving adequate attention in U.S. schools.

Conservation is a philosophy—an approach to life. The conservation concept calls for the adoption of an attitude of wise use of natural resources. While some early leaders had this approach, only in the last few years has the general public begun to become aware of the need for abandoning a policy of lavish wastefulness of soil, water, woods, and wildlife. A full acceptance of the conservation philosophy, as prevalent in some European countries, is the ultimate goal.

How can the philosophy of an entire populace be changed? While the scattergun approach of utilizing all informational media produces favorable results, the most effective means is by teaching conservation in the schools. Children properly indoctrinated carry the conservation principles into their adult life. However, while many educational institutions perform admirable jobs, all too few teachers are adequately equipped for teaching conservation. Thus, a "teach the teacher" process is necessary in many areas. In turn, many educators in teacher-training colleges first must be converted and sold on the importance of resource conservation. This procedure is long and laborious.

It is generally agreed that conservation is best taught when integrated into other school subjects. Conservation of natural resources can, and should be, taught as part of science, history, economics, and most other subjects. This approach also is the most feasible because school administrators at all levels are beset by pressures to insert this or that special subject into already crowded curricula.

Conservation agencies and organizations, on the whole, are progressing well in conservation education but, due to budgetary limitations, their contributions are a mere drop in the bucket to what might be accomplished if school systems took the ball and ran with it.

Dr. Richard L. Weaver, associate professor of conservation and conservation education at the University of Michigan, recently published results of a study on leadership in State agencies covering the period 1956–58. He found only five State departments of education had full-time conservation staff supervisors. Eleven had part-time conservation supervisors and nine more employed people who were designated as such even though little effort beyond leadership could be spared. Departments of education in the remaining States saw no need for special conservation leaders. Many States, in fact, rely upon conservation agency personnel as consultants or advisers. The situation was such in six States that conservation agencies employed suitable people and assigned them to their departments of education. Thirty-two State conservation agencies are actively engaged in school visitation programs.

Wisconsin is the only State with a natural resources committee (and a subcommittee on conservation education) established by legislation, but four other States have similar coordinating groups appointed by Governors. Eleven States have voluntary or self-created resource coordinating groups which deal with conservation instruction. Twelve States have permanent curriculum committees and 13 assign temporary groups to prepare materials.

The Conservation Education Association is a voluntary national organization of educators, conservationists, other scientists, and laymen. The CEA's major objective is to stimulate the teaching of conservation in the schools. It serves as a coordinating and information disseminating group.

## Wisconsin's New Lobbying Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we are very proud in Wisconsin of the record of our State government as a trailblazer among all the States for clean and responsible government in the public interest.

Two years ago Wisconsin went farther than any other State in the Union in the regulation of that issue which is the crux of the public interest versus the special interest, that is, lobbyists and their relationship to legislators. The State of Wisconsin went the whole way. Our State government enacted a law which flatly prohibited permitting lobbyists to provide directly or indirectly, anything of value for the Governor, any legislator, any officer or employee of the State, or any candidate for State office or for the legislature. This drastic Draconian measure has to the surprise of many cynics worked with amazing efficiency.

Both political parties claimed credit for this measure. Both in fact had a good deal to do with it. We Democrats in Wisconsin used the lobbying issue in campaigns against entrenched Republican officeholders for a number of years. The effect of this issue was apparent to both Democrats and Republicans in the great gains our Wisconsin Democratic Party has made in recent years in Wisconsin elections. It is undeniably true however, that it was a Republican legislature and a Republican Governor who were in office when this issue which we Democrats had pushed so strongly, was in fact enacted into law.

Many individuals and institutions deserve credit for this enactment, but two newspapers should be particularly singled out. The Capital Times, of Madison, has carried on a relentless, militant, hard-hitting campaign for this lobbying legislation for many, many years. The Milwaukee Journal has also never let up in its drive to secure the most stringent lobbying regulations which would be workable.

Mr. President, yesterday's Milwaukee Journal carried an excellent report on the full consequences of this newest experiment in this country on absolute, better than Ivory-soap purity in government.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 22, 1959]

LIFE IN CAPITAL IS CHANGED BY NEW LAW ON LOBBYING—DAYS OF ENTERTAINING LEGISLATORS AT BARS ARE OVER; CAUTION IS WATCHWORD

(By Willard R. Smith)

MADISON, WIS.—A widely known Wisconsin attorney, never before identified as a lobbyist, appeared at the capitol in that role recently.

"I didn't want to register as a lobbyist, but a client insisted on my representing him over here," the attorney said.

Addressing a State official who is his fishing companion and close family friend, he said, "Do you know what this means to us?

"This means I can't even given you a ride from home down to work, or have you and your family over to our home for dinner as long as I am registered as a lobbyist."

THINGS HAVE CHANGED

There well may be some question whether Wisconsin's law against lobbyists giving legislators or State officials anything of value is being observed that closely all the time. However, there is no question about the law having completely changed the whole social aspect of the current legislative session as compared to those of the past.

Veteran lobbyists with a long time reputation as free spenders, who formerly bought drinks and steaks for parties of legislators night after night, are not operating that way now.

Lobbyists are seen eating with lobbyists, and legislators with legislators. Neither group patronizes the steakhouses as heavily as when the lobbyist was host and the lawmakers were guests.

IT'S MURDER

"It's murder," the proprietor of one of Madison's finest dining places said in describing what the new law is doing to his business.

The lobbyists, or at least the veterans in this field, appear to be taking the law most seriously.

"My organization has advised me that I would no longer be of any use to them if I lost my license," said the secretary of an industrial group who has represented it as a lobbyist for many years.

Other companies which have their own employees serving as lobbyists have issued similar warnings about strict observance of the law so that the company does not incur unfavorable publicity through a violation of it.

Some amusing incidents have been observed as a result of their adherence to the letter of the law.

A lobbyist and a senator chanced to be standing side by side at a bar, each paying for his own drinks, but talking to the other. The lobbyist insisted upon the senator being given a receipt to prove that he had paid his own bill in case anyone saw them and suspected that the lobbyist was violating the law.

CIGARETTE REQUEST IS TURNED DOWN

Perhaps the best illustration was one previously reported in the Journal, when a legislator, begging a cigarette from a lobbyist in the corridor of the senate, received only a polite "Sorry, senator, nothing of value, you know" as the lobbyist lit his own cigarette and replaced the pack in his pocket.

A few hungry legislators are complaining. They are, for the most part, of the type that in the past had no hesitancy about "sticking" a lobbyist for a meal if they spotted "a live one" wherever they were dining.

They simply would point out the man and tell their waitress to give him the check. It usually worked then, but it does not now.

The lobbyist makes himself liable to a year in jail if he fails to report such expense, and if he does report it he gives evidence that he has violated the law and can have his license revoked for 3 years.

District Attorney Joseph W. Bloodgood of Dane County told the Journal he had received "no complaints—not even tips"—regarding possible violations of the law.

"And I have some good sources that can give me tips on such things," he added.

EASIER TO ENFORCE

Legislators know this. One of them disclosed that he had observed a person at one of the capital's most popular places for legislators and lobbyists in past sessions sitting at the bar throughout the evening, watching closely who paid for the drinks.

Bloodgood, a Democratic assemblyman before becoming district attorney, said he still maintains contacts with his former colleagues and gets around to various night spots patronized by them.

"As far as I can see, the law is being observed," Bloodgood said.

The district attorney said the lobby law was much easier to enforce now than it was previously. Even then Wisconsin's control of lobbying was considered outstanding among the other States.

EARLY TO BED

There are lobbyists who like it this way. They get to bed earlier and get up with a clearer head in the morning. Most of them make their contacts with legislators in the capitol before the houses convene, during the interval between morning sessions and afternoon committee hearings, and at the close of business.

The older lobbyists in point of service, who have a reputation for obtaining the ear of a legislator while providing sumptuously for his stomach, continue to operate on the strength of that reputation.

Members who have been here before remember me for my largess, one veteran lobbyist said, adding that establishing an equally favorable acquaintance with newly elected legislators was his major problem now.

NEWCOMERS IMPATIENT

Some of the legislators concede that they prefer the present system. They point out that now they can choose congenial company from among their own number or acquaintances in Madison—outside the legislature—for their luncheon and dinner companions and not be roped in with a party of some lobbyist's choice.

Evidence of impatience is being shown by newer lobbyists, possibly acting in that capacity for the first time. They probably have employers willing to provide liberal expense accounts which they are anxious to exercise, but they find themselves in a legal straitjacket.

Rumors about a couple of affairs for legislators have been checked as far as possible. It was learned that a number of directors of a trade association were urged by their secretary and lobbyist to take legislators from their respective districts out to dinner when attending the monthly meeting of their board of directors in Madison They have been doing just that.

PRINCIPALS DOING THE ENTERTAINING

If a new pattern is evolved out of the present law, it probably will be one of entertainment by principals, or employers, instead of by lobbyists.

The cheese buffet enjoyed by legislators once every session with the Wisconsin Cheesemakers' Association is traditional.

The Fleischmann Malting Co., a supplier to the entire brewing industry, offered a buffet dinner and beer to legislators last week and showed a film on brewing from ancient to modern times. Numerous legislators ignored it.

Other affairs of this type may be expected before the session adjourns, and it begins to look like a long one.

WAIT UNTIL I SEE

A veteran lobbyist who was complaining at the start of the session that he did not see how it would be possible to operate under the restraints of the new law was asked last week whether he had changed his mind yet.

"Wait until I see how my bills come out," he replied. "I can tell you better then."

Awkward situations have been created, especially for established Madison attorneys who serve regular or special clients as their registered lobbyists. This position immediately restricts their everyday relations with acquaintances and even family friends who happen to work for the State, however remote their field of activity may be from the interests of their lobbyist friend.

It actually affects buying the next round of drinks at a weekly poker club, or a gift to a new baby in a friend's family if a lobbyist-State employee situation exists.

Wisconsin law prohibits any person other than a licensed lobbyist to attempt personally or directly to influence any member of the legislature for or against any proposed or pending measures, excepting by appearance before legislative committees or through other restricted means of communication.

The lobbyists, registered and licensed by the secretary of state, still are required to make monthly reports to him on their expenditures under the headings of meals, drinks, and entertainment for legislators.

Jail sentences are provided for failure to report or for false reports. In the past, these reports were under close scrutiny by the press and were subject to wide publicity. Although the requirement remains in the law, to report such expense now would be an admission of guilt under its new provisions.

NEW PROVISION ADDED

The 1957 legislature, not without reluctance, added a new provision to the definition of unprofessional conduct for which a lobbyist's license could be revoked. This definition was broadened to include:

"Directly or indirectly furnishing or being concerned in another's furnishing to the governor, any legislator, or to any officer or employee of the State, to any candidate for State office or for the legislature, any food, meal, lodging, beverage, transportation, money, campaign contributions, or any other thing of pecuniary value. This does not apply to entertainment by a nonprofit organization at a bona fide social function or meeting of such organization."

With the force of public opinion behind him, Republican Governor Thomson in 1957 virtually shoved down the legislators' throats his bill to prohibit lobbyists from providing anything of value to lawmakers.

Democratic Governor Nelson, then a member of the senate, amended Thomson's bill to apply also to the Governor, other State officials, candidates for State office and State employees. He thereby claimed credit for the end result.

---

## America's Defense Posture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Mr. Paul Martin, the Gannett News Service's Washington bureau chief, and an alert, informed journalist, recently interviewed Dr. Herbert F. York on the subject of our Nation's defense picture. Dr. York, who is director of military research in the Defense Department, is a native of my home city of Rochester, N.Y., and a highly regarded leader in America's scientific and technological effort.

In his interview with Mr. Martin, Dr. York outlines many of the complexities which marked the development of our present Defense Establishment, and deals with some of the future problems we will face. It is an important contribution to public understanding of the enigmas in this terribly important and complicated field.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Mar. 15, 1959]

ARE WE AHEAD IN ARMS RACE?—ROCHESTER EXPERT GIVES VIEWS

(By Paul Martin)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—The Nation's top research expert on military systems says "we have had and we do have an aggressive program" in development of advanced weapons such as rockets and missiles.

He is Dr. Herbert Frank York, a graduate of the University of Rochester and Ph. D. from the University of California, who at 37 is regarded as a "boy wonder" in the field of science and engineering.

Dr. York is the overall director of military research for the Defense Department.

"There is nothing esoteric about rockets," says Dr. York. "What costs money and time is their complication. They are a large collection of gadgets, valves, electric parts, etc.

"Getting them to work is merely having experience with them. There is no great engineering magic, no problem in science. There is no substitute for experience."

If one is going to compare the United States and Soviet position in military missiles, there are quite a number of questions that must be asked. Dr. York answers them in this fashion:

Propulsion: "The Russians are probably ahead in large reliable engines" for long-range rockets.

Guidance and control: "We are probably ahead, although it is hard to tell."

Reentry: "We know we can do it; there is no reason to believe the Russians can't; there is no point in arguing who is ahead."

(This refers to the problem of bringing a missile warhead back from outer space, and having it reenter the earth's atmosphere without being destroyed by friction.)

Warheads: "We are probably ahead." This refers to thermonuclear payloads which military rockets would carry.

Reliability: "The Russians are probably ahead, because they have fired more big rockets."

Dr. York believes that the Soviets have had a number of rocket failures, the same as the United States. Russian mistakes have not been advertised because of internal police state controls of the Communist system. American failures have been out in the open for all to see.

He says it is foolish to claim the Russians have made progress in rocketry because of "captured German scientists," or because of "defense secrets they stole from us."

"The Russian scientists are good," he says. "The best in Russia are as good as the best in America. It is impossible to say whether they are better."

The controversy over the so-called missile gap that has developed since the Russians fired their first sputniks in the fall of 1957 it quite simple, according to York.

The argument, which has been advanced in Congress by political opponents of the Eisenhower administration, runs like this:

Taking the maximum production which our intelligence shows the Soviets might be able to attain in big intercontinental ballistic missiles, and comparing that with the presently planned procurement rate of missiles by the Defense Department, you arrive at a point in 1963 where the United States would have 200 ICBM weapons on launchers and ready to go, compared with a possible 600 behind the Iron Curtain.

"There is nothing we can do about this in research and development," said Dr. York. "That is a matter of production, procurement, and deployment. If there is a missile gap, the way to fix it up is to go to the factories and order more missiles. The argument is over how many we should produce not how many we can produce."

The question of force strengths and deployment in the armed services is up to the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. President Eisenhower, Defense Secretary McElroy, and the Joint Chiefs have taken a position to this effect:

1. It would be foolish to order more first generation, liquid-fuel Atlas and Titan missiles at the present stage of development in the missile art, when the solid-propellant Minuteman is coming along faster than previously expected, and there are still more advanced long-range weapons on the drawing boards.

2. The total defense capability of balanced U.S. forces, including strategic bombers, jet fighter-bombers on forward bases carrying nuclear weapons, missile-carrying ships and submarines, intermediate range rockets on NATO installations, and ICBM's in position in this country, will be adequate to deter Soviet aggression in 1963, or to wreak such havoc in retaliation as to make war unprofitable for the Communists.

"We are turning our attention to improving rockets in the areas of simplicity and reliability," said Dr. York. "We are developing more powerful fuels and engines. We are laying a firm groundwork of technology to have a further generation of long-range missiles."

Deployment plans call for hardening and dispersing missiles to make them less vulnerable to enemy attack. This means placing them underground in protected capsules on missile farms covering miles of territory, with perhaps 50 missiles on each farm.

Solid-fuel missiles will be easier to handle and quicker to fire than the cumbersome first-generation missiles employing highly explosive liquid oxygen, with their time-consuming and countdown process.

That's one reason why the Defense Department wants to move ahead with Minuteman and its successors, keeping only a standby capability in the presently operational liquid-fueled missiles.

If a mistake was made in the past in failing to push missile development—and most sources agree that there was—then it was a common mistake shared by the best scientific and military brains available to the Pentagon.

The mistake also occurred during the administration of former President Truman, and not during the tenure of President Eisenhower.

Here is what happened:

Immediately after World War II, the Russians with the aid of German scientists who had worked on Nazi V-1 and V-2 rockets, plunged into a full-scale program to develop bigger missiles in the 600 to 1,000-mile range, thereby hoping to be able to blanket targets in Western Europe.

The United States, 5,000 miles away and with a different strategic problem, concentrated on manned aircraft. The Army decided it preferred atomic artillery to rockets. A proposal in 1946 for an earth satellite which could be put in orbit by 1952 was not funded because no one could show a "military requirement" for it.

Before the Korean war broke out in 1950, a top civilian scientist advised the Pentagon that it would be foolish to work on an ICBM. He claimed it would be destroyed by the sand-blasting effect of meteorites in space.

The scientific breakthrough that gave practical military effect to long-range missiles—and made the Russian gamble pay off—was the U.S. discovery in 1951 of the hydrogen bomb, followed by the baby H-bomb in 1953. The Russians got their H-bomb in 1952.

This big increase in explosive capability made it possible to eliminate tons of weight in the warhead of a missile. With the same amount of thrust, an intermediate range missile (1,000 to 1,500 miles) was transformed overnight into an intercontinental weapon (5,000 miles or more) which could carry greater destruction to a broader enemy target area with less need for missile accuracy.

"Our systems analysis people outsmarted themselves in this period," said Dr. York. "That rectification took place in 1953–54. The Ballistics Missiles Division was formed, and told to go ahead. All stops were pulled out at this time. We started on ICBM's before IRBM's. The Russians did it in a more orderly progression.

"We went all out in 1954. It would be difficult to have a more aggressive program than we have had since then in missile development. It is not a matter of money. It is a matter of time and experience."

The clamor for more defense spending today seems to be a combination of politics, interservice rivalry, competition among manufacturers for more Government contracts, and some genuine concern over the status of national defense.

* * * * *

Some voices calling for more missile procurement today were advocates of a bigger Strategic Air Force in 1950–53 to offset the Soviet "Bison," a new long-range bomber. The Russians never produced the Bison in quantity. They dropped it, and skipped a whole generation of manned aircraft, while the United States was spending $3 billion on the now obsolete B–36.

In research, Dr. York says, "people working on these things tend to become enthusiastic about them. We find it very hard to do an exploratory development, just a reconnaissance, without having the people turn into zealots. They think each new thing is the final answer for saving the country."

For instance, the Army is pressuring Congress for a go-ahead to build the Nike-Zeus as an antimissile missile to shoot down any incoming enemy rockets.

"I am in complete agreement with the Army on the priority and necessity for an antimissile missile system," Dr. York said. "I disagree on production. We believe this is not the right time. Everyone knows it is easy to make the missile. That's the cheapest and simplest part of the system.

"The real trouble is the discrimination problem. How do you build the detection and computer, or fire control system, to get anywhere near the right target to make an intercept? It would be easy to foul up Nike-Zeus with decoys."

He said an enemy could break up the incoming stages of a missile into 100 parts, only 1 of which would be carrying the warhead. More sophisticated decoys could be built to fool the antimissile missile system, which must be able to accurately detect and intercept the warhead.

These are some of the complexities in an extremely complex art. President Eisenhower contends that the best policy is to keep an adequate and balanced national defense, which the Nation could support over a long period of time without going broke.

## The Real Truth About Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in recent weeks the State of Michigan has been much in the news.

Ordinarily, this would please me very much, because there are so many good things to say about Michigan. Michigan has that ideal combination of natural resources, natural beauty, and industrial might that makes the State a tremendous asset to our Nation.

Unfortunately, however, the news that has been appearing about Michigan elsewhere in the country recently has not been about Michigan's assets.

These stories have sought to portray Michigan as bankrupt, as a welfare state, as a State that is unfriendly to industry.

There is no truth to any of this. Yet, the stories persist, and many of them border on outright slander. They usually are written by those who have made absolutely no effort to find out the truth.

What is the truth? The truth is that these stories were first begun inside Michigan for political reasons.

As such attacks often do, this one soon got out of hand. The unsupported charges were picked up by others outside of Michigan, embellished and circulated with no regard for the facts—again for political reasons.

Soon, those who had given birth to this lie found that what they were doing was causing irreparable damage to their own State. By then, they could not halt what they had started.

Now, however, a Detroit newspaper has undertaken to clear the slanders and the lies from the record—and to set forth the facts about Michigan.

These articles are being carried in the Detroit Times, and I ask unanimous consent that the first of the series, which appeared Sunday, March 22, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORY OF THE SLANDERS AND LIES—THE REAL TRUTH ABOUT MICHIGAN

(By John Creecy)

"You gotta be brave to move to Michigan."

So goes the word among today's industrial pioneers, the men who decide where new plants shall be built.

So went the word a century and a half ago—when a $5 bounty was offered for the scalp of any American settler, of any age or sex, who had the temerity to move into Michigan.

There were many brave ones then. There doesn't seem to be too many brave ones now.

Whenever one ventures this way, through the dark forest of economic uncertainty, pranksters in scaremasks pop up from the bushes and whisper the chilling phrases:

"Welfare State."

"Unhealthy business climate."

And with a flourish of their ghostly sheets they intone the three witching names:

"Williams, Hoffa, Reuther."

Like any good Halloween stunt, this is fakery.

But—like any good Halloween stunt—it can be pretty terrifying. It can be scary enough to make the victim trip over his own feet in headlong flight.

It started apparently as good clean fun. But it's gone pretty far. Somebody could get hurt.

In fact, it seems clear Michigan already has been hurt. Over the last year or two our State has failed to show the industrial gains that reasonably and logically should have come our way.

Some disturbing charges have been made against Michigan, its economic climate, its labor situation, its tax structure.

Williams, belatedly, has refuted some of them.

Others have been cleared up by census data and other objective reports. Some of the sources that were spreading calumnies about Michigan have come up with polite retractions.

But the facts seem to bear relatively little weight.

Most of the damaging charges against Michigan never were true. The harm was done because people were led to fear that they were true, or that they might become true.

Let's review the charges.

Then, in this series to which several Times writers will contribute, let's take a detailed look at the truth.

The result, we believe, is no gloomy picture—but a bright one for Michigan's future.

First, let's look squarely at that magic incantation "unhealthy business climate," which has done so much lately to ward off prosperity for Michigan.

Turn it over carefully. Don't be frightened.

Remember when it first came to widespread attention? It was about a year and a half ago.

An air rifle firm in Plymouth notified its 700 employes it was moving to Arkansas.

Williams hadn't done anything to the owner, except fail to reappoint him to the state aeronautics commission.

THE WORKERS MIGHT JOIN UNION

Hoffa and Reuther hadn't done anything to the company. The employees were nonunion.

But they were making $2.24 an hour, counting fringe benefits. And if the wages were reduced there was danger that they might join a union.

Down in the Arkansas hills, the owners felt, they could find people willing to work for $1 an hour less, who would be able to meet the company's standards.

So they moved—and all over the United States the case is being cited by editorial writers and other spokesmen as exhibit No. 1 in the case against Michigan's "business climate."

There had, it is true, been complaints from other industrialists to the effect Michigan taxes on industry were out of line with those in other States, and were discouraging the location of new plants here.

What state, what city, hasn't had such complaints?

And what state wasn't jealous of Michigan—the acknowledged champ of the Industrial League?

Every such complaint was a great break for Michigan's rivals.

Drumbeaters for competitive states picked up such things, magnified them, put them to use as propaganda to lure plants to their states.

OUR TAX CRISIS ADDED DRAMA

Then came Michigan's current "tax crisis."

It added drama and an air of plausibility to the propaganda barrage of our rivals.

It mattered not at all that other States were facing tax troubles, too, that about four States out of five faced situations similar to Michigan's.

In most cases these other States tackled the problem, as every State in the Union has countless times tackled the same chore. And they worked out solutions, as Michigan could easily have done if the Governor and legislature had worked together.

But our politicians—on both sides—played right into the hands of the rival States.

They staged a boyish brawl that, while leaving the home folks unimpressed, tended to scandalize the neighbors.

Sanctimonious fingers were pointed from some of the most unlikely quarters.

From smogbound California—where the taxes are really something to scream about—came the unctious prate that things have grown blacker and blacker in Michigan as the State moved farther and farther into the red.

SMUG SERMONIZING IN HARTFORD

With a doleful shake of its ancient head the Hartford (Conn.) Courant sermonized on the downfall of Michigan's Governor and expressed grave doubt that even now, with the State treasury empty, he sees any error in his ways.

And the Chicago Tribune:

"Gov. 'Soapy' Williams' Michigan welfare state is bankrupt, from overspending its revenue."

The Kansas City Star likewise finds text for a sermon in Michigan's plight:

"So the bubble of the welfare state bursts, and as it does, we see a pointed lesson for the nation. * * *"

Kansas City, the home of the late Boss Pendergast, has always considered itself a good judge of efficient government.

As the Los Angeles Times sees it:

"A substantial rise in population accounts for part of the 100-percent increase in State spending during Williams' regime * * * but the remainder is due to the highly advanced concept of paternalism in which the State has greatly increased its support of various welfare programs and taken over the responsibilities of local governments."

(Statistics: In Michigan, State and local taxes total $181 per citizen. In California they total $237 per citizen, according to the latest report of the U.S. Department of Commerce.)

The so-called 100-percent rise in Michigan's budget is a recurring theme in the many outstate newspaper and national magazine articles that have dealt with Michigan conditions.

The U.S. News & World Report says:

"Over the past decade—the years in which the Williams administration has been in office—total State spending has gone from about $500 million annually to more than $1 billion."

Then look a few pages further back in the same (February 13) issue of the same publication.

Without reference to Michigan it discloses that State spending—for all States—now totals more than five times as much as it did in 1946.

And it says:

"Put your finger anywhere on a map of the United States and odds are that you'll find a State in serious financial difficulty.

"The chances are about 4 to 1 you will point to a State in which people are about to be asked to pay higher taxes, perhaps sharply higher ones.

"State spending is soaring. * * * Deficits in State budgets are common."

OUTLOOK FROM DIFFERENT VIEWPOINTS

In succeeding articles in this series, Michigan's outlook will be probed from the standpoint of business, labor and other interests.

But as a starter, lets take a look at the most prominent anti-Michigan allegations, and see how they hold up under preliminary examination:

Indictment No. 1: Michigan is a welfare State.

This is a potent brickbat to throw at a rival. What does it mean?

Does it mean public welfare in the standard, conventional sense: "Institutional and noninstitutional aid to the needy?"

If so, there's no need to be vague. A new U.S. census report shows what this cost—in terms of both State and local taxes—for each Michigan citizen, * * * and for the citizens of every other State. (The figures, latest available, are for 1957.)

Welfare cost each Michigan citizen $16.30.

It cost each Ohio citizen $17.71.

In Arkansas—where some businessmen dream of finding respite from the welfare State—it was $19.17.

In California—where they are so shocked over Michigan's plight—the welfare cost for each citizen is $29.19.

And in Oklahoma it is $47.73. Anyone for Tulsa?

MICHIGAN RANKS 34TH IN COST

Among all the States, Michigan ranked 34th in this respect.

Indictment No. 2: Taxes are out of line.

Again let's take a look at California. That State is enjoying a huge industrial boom, while businessmen are asked to tremble in fear at the thought of Michigan taxes.

California is the most heavily taxed State in the Nation. The average citizen pays $237.87 in State and local levies, according to the latest census study.

In New York the average citizen pays $229.31.

In Wisconsin, famous for the Kohler Co.'s war against the unions, it's $184.47.

Michigan? It's $181.13 per citizen. We rank 12th among the States in this regard. When taxes are considered as a percentage of personal income we rank 31st.

Indictment No. 3: Unhealthy business climate.

If this diagnosis has any validity at all, it would seem to concern mental health rather than physical health.

Until recently, Michigan was acknowledged to have just about the healthiest business climate in the world.

Its tremendous resources of technology, skilled manpower, finance and management produced sensational results.

They still can. They will, once the goblins are exorcised.

A big element in the fear, one astute business analyst observes, is that labor leaders Reuther and Hoffa are linked with Detroit in the mind of the average out-of-State businessman.

When he thinks of Michigan and/or Detroit it isn't the charms of our water wonderland that dance before his dreamy eyes. It's Jimmie and Walter.

He gets an unpleasant psychological reaction—though his conscious mind well knows that Jimmie and Walter are omnipresent on the American industrial scene, and that they aren't likely to bother him any more in Detroit than they would in Wetumpka, Ala.

## Curbstone Observations From a Yankee Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the best known newspaper editors in New Hampshire, Earl S. Hewitt, of Hanover, has humorously, but accurately, portrayed the spirit of town meeting and late winter which governs much of the March news in New Hampshire and New England. His interesting article was published in the American Press for March 1959, an independent magazine for hometown newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURBSTONE OBSERVATIONS

(By Earl S. Hewitt)

It is the tough month here in Yankeeland and if one can weather town meeting and all that comes along one is probably a good insurance risk, relatively speaking.

A lot of oldsters still show up and fulminate over rising taxes. They can't seem to do much about it, since they lost control over expenditures long ago when the State and Federal Government sold them on the idea of "papa knows best". Right now legislatures are considering bills to restore home rules and fundamental rights. It is a time of confusion which makes it normal, everything considered.

The local editor is sounding off and continues to make his irritating comment. He can't understand why people won't register and vote. Even when they do he thinks they are cockeyed, but standing to be counted gives them stature in his eyes. He says they are doing the only thing they can do to save their country from the decline and fall, and they can't be sure about that. The point is they can try and be respectable.

Editing and publishing, according to the editor, becomes more competitive and complicated all the time. He thinks it is due more to gadgets than to the art of gathering and spreading the news. He says a good story and good writing makes a weekly newspaper. His favorite crack is that when you read it in the Gazette you can believe it. As for the satisfactions to be enumerated after 25 years he says they are too numerous to mention. He knows of no editor here in New Hampshire who would do differently given a second chance.

The future is something else again, but relatively unimportant to the editor who has a philosophy and pursues a routine. The editor of the Hanover Gazette, Hanover being the home of Dartmouth College, likes to think of himself as being a curbstone listener and observer. He knows he is in an argumentative frame of mind most of the time and that it constitutes his editorial capacity, such as it is. He thinks son David should assume the same attitudes.

The space age coming up will present new challenges for editorial comment. The present editor hasn't yet become fully conscious of the implications of gross national product. As for space travel, he says it is too astro-

nomical for his blood pressure and besides he has a coronary to consider. Right now, he insists it is the month of March and if you have anything to say, address the moderator.

## Address by John C. Weaver, Dean of Graduate School, University of Nebraska, Before Graduate Convocation of Purdue University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the March 19 issue of the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal. This editorial comments upon a recent address of John C. Weaver, dean of the Graduate School of the University of Nebraska, before the graduate convocation of Purdue University.

Mr. Weaver's observations on what is happening to higher education through the impact of Federal grants, research scholarships, and so forth, are well worth sober reflection. It is particularly refreshing to note that he apparently does not subscribe to the view that there is nothing wrong with education that only a great deal of money can cure.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE OR LESS PERSONAL

"More than one person has, with some reason, observed that under the influence of Federal grants, made in response to national necessity, the Russians are doing more to shape our universities than we are. In any event, we have been caught up in what has overtones of a huge academic WPA."

Those are the words of John C. Weaver, dean of the Graduate School of the University of Nebraska in an address to the graduate convocation of Purdue University last week. This thought-provoking speech deserves a wide audience.

Dean Weaver is well qualified to take an informed look at what is happening to higher education through the widespread granting of scholarships and grants. Under a Carnegie Corp. traveling fellowship, he has visited nearly 2 dozen leading Canadian and American universities and their graduate schools, from British Columbia to North Carolina and from Harvard and MIT to California Tech. and UCLA.

He is convinced that "one of the greatest strengths of American higher education is the diverse character and behavior of the institutions that comprise our system."

But in preserving this he is not unmindful that education must keep up with the times. He says, "I do sense a variety of barnacle-encrusted traditions or presumptions that call for thoughtful reevaluation.

But he is looking with some concern on the impact of Federal grants, research scholarships, industrial and technical demands. He points out that according to recent data from the National Science Foundation, two-thirds of all research expenditures in our American institutions of higher learning this past year came from Federal grants. Despite all of the obvious advantages, he feels that this vast involvement in Government-sponsored research is not a completely unalloyed blessing.

Nonuniversity agencies whose goals are of necessity not coincident with those of the universities, come into a position to influence such basic university functions as research and graduate education. He says, "At best we have as a Nation only a limited number of men of high-level creative talent in sciences and technologic arts. If able research people of our universities become so encumbered with specific project work that they are largely unavailable to students, no matter how important and urgent the investigation, a real question of the long run national interest is clearly involved."

The National Defense Education Act provides support for new graduate programs and the expansion of the old ones. Dean Weaver believes that a careful inventory would reveal that the top 50 graduate schools could, with a reasonable distribution of enrollment, double the total number of graduate students, at present levels of instructional quality, without major expansions of either staff or physical equipment.

He says the extremely uneven use now being made of available facilities has been aggravated by major national fellowship plans. He asks, "If Federal aid is to be extended to graduate education, why should it be given only to students?"

Present legislation being what it is, a university can neither provide a place for students receiving Federal fellowships, nor can it become eligible for any aid itself. Dean Weaver would thus provide assistance for existing respected graduate schools rather than promoting a few famous graduate centers as the individual grants have a tendency to do.

## Indians and White Southerners Find Scant Regard in the U.S. Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, editor Thomas R. Waring of the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier compares the U.S. Indians and white southerners in a March 22 editorial. As he puts it, "the Great White Father" is not very much interested in the welfare of either group.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Waring's editorial, entitled "Indians and White Southerners Find Scant Regard in the U.S. Capital," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANS AND WHITE SOUTHERNERS FIND SCANT REGARD IN THE U.S. CAPITAL

When a small band of Indians went to Washington last week to complain of broken treaties they met rebuffs at the White House and in the office of the Indian Affairs Commissioner. The Great White Father was not interested in their grievance.

White southerners can sympathize with the redmen. South Carolinians are in much the same dilemma as the Iroquois. Proud people who have known independence and glory, today both are at the mercy of massed majorities and politicians with their ears glued to election returns.

Emphasizing the quaintness of the Indians' simple approach to government, the News and Courier chose an antique headline style yesterday to caption an Associated Press account of the visit.

Perhaps our editorials, reflecting traditions of a republic founded before the West was pioneered, seems as archaic as the type format that we long ago abandoned in favor of streamlined journalism. But we are sufficiently egotistical, or stubborn, or dedicated to believe that some ideas remain fresh regardless of fashions in rhetoric or typography.

Among the ideas we espoused is the notion that too much government is not good for people or countries. The U.S. Constitution was designed to protect people against too much government. In effect, the Constitution is a treaty between the Federal Government on one hand, and the States and the people on the other.

Through various means, including Supreme Court decision on race, subversion, and other issues, Federal Government has usurped more than its share of power over the States and the people. Though troops of bluecoats no longer are required to carry out the adage that a "good Indian is a dead Indian," Federal arms and ammunition still are being stored in the stockades for possible use against white southerners.

The same day the Indians were trying unsuccessfully to make themselves heard in Washington, Attorney General William P. Rogers was defending before a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate his Department's request for money to recruit and arm U.S. marshals to quell souther resistance to mixing races in the southern public schools.

U.S. Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., of North Carolina, complained, the Associated Press reported, "that the administration was proposing to single out violence in school cases for prosecution, without paying any attention to violence in labor troubles, etc."

Labor union goons are not in the same segregated category as Indians and white southerners. The Government has no intention of dispatching marshals to protect workers who want to cross picket lines.

The Indians might as well retreat to their reservations and bid their time. As to white southerners, we are still hopeful that they will find ways to become more effective than the noble but conquered Indians.

## Oregon's Scenic Beauty Adds to 1959 Centennial Attractions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this year Oregon is celebrating 100 years of statehood. Hundreds of thousands of persons will visit my native State in 1959 to attend the Oregon Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair and to view the many local pageants, programs, and promotions planned by local communities and State officials. Many will linger in our State to appreciate the beauty of the Oregon landscape.

The Christian Science Monitor of March 3, 1959, contains a brief article entitled "Oregon Rides Majestic Trail"

which describes the enjoyment which awaits visitors to the Beaver State. I ask unanimous consent that this vivid word picture of Oregon's vacation offerings be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON RIDES MAJESTIC TRAIL

SALEM, OREG.—Oregon's vacation offerings are so many—and to most Americans so undiscovered still—that the best thing to be said is a hearty, "Come and see."

This State can be a magnificent interlude in a west coast journey from San Diego to Seattle, a driving distance of 1,290 miles or so. It can be viewed from the dome car of Southern Pacific's Shasta Daylight by the traveler in a hurry. Or for anyone wanting an idyllic change, a pause in the fast tempo of modern life not undetached from modernity, Oregon is a wonderful holiday goal all by itself.

Oceans and lakes, valleys and mountains, wilderness trails and scenic highways, bubbling streams rushing through forest glades—they are all here, with a hospitable State playing host and friendly people in all the towns and cities.

Actually, Oregon folks seem a little reserved about boosting their State travelwise. In Eugene, handsome and comfortable University of Oregon community, they tell you stories about how much nicer the country seems without crowds. Even so, their welcome is warm and lovely, and here in Salem, the State capital, the Oregon State Highway Department is prepared to give willing help through its travel-information division.

There's a touch of New England about the Oregon scene, and a New England solidness about the people. A seaside hotel at Gearhart looks as down Maine as can be, and the appearance is heightened by the salty tang in the morning mist and the circling seagulls above the wide, white beach.

Portland, of course, flatly contradicts Oregon protestations of liking things the old way, for it plans to become this summer's center for the State's centennial celebration. It expects to draw 8 million visitors.

And Portland is no mean city. It has stunning views, including Mount Hood in the distance. Its restaurants are international and good—French, German, Japanese, Mexican, Hungarian, Italian, with one that allegedly serves every kind of pancakes known to man or woman. The annual rose festival, lavish with flowers, gives eloquent support to Portland people's contention that there is no lovelier place, anywhere, to live.

For the auto traveler, the Old Oregon Trail, followed more or less by U.S. 30 from the eastern part of the State to Astoria in the west, unfolds a scenic panorama that is breath taking. It shows off the Wallowa Mountains, some of them 10,000 feet high and more, the Snake River and Hells Canyon, Pendleton where the famed roundup takes place, and one State park, forest camp, and roadside rest area after another.

HISTORY RECALLED

U.S. 30 comes to Portland, follows the Columbia River west again, and ends at Astoria. And the Astor Column, rising 125 feet high from one of the city's highest points, recalls events of consequence to the whole United States—the discovery of the Columbia in 1792, the Lewis and Clark expeditions, and restoration of Fort Astoria to the United States.

What interests many travelers, though, is Oregon's sufficiency of good hotels and motels. It makes pristine wilderness, for many of them, easier to look at.

For anybody who wants to camp, Oregon country can only be called superb. The State maintains some 400 forest camps and more than 160 State parks. Most of the parks are for day use only, but some provide clean overnight camp sites, and a number have completely modern connections for trailers.

Indeed, Oregon's coast unfolds a continuous vacation paradise, from the Chetco River in the south to Gearhart in the north, with sandy beaches, mostly State owned and open to the public, backed by farms, rugged promontories, and forests.

There are all sorts of things to do in the coastal region—swim, fish for salmon, ride horseback and bicycle.

MODERN BACKWOODS

From Wedderburn, an inexpensive trip aboard a U.S. mail boat takes the traveler upstream 32 miles to the modern backwoods town of Agness.

Near Florence, a 12-mile drive to Sealion Point makes possible a visit to the only mainland sealion rockery in the Nation. At Tillamook, center of a rich dairy section, one can tour the Tillamook cheese factory. At Seaside, one can enjoy the west coast's finest boardwalk, as it is called there.

---

## Mrs. Eugene Talmadge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Atlanta Journal and Constitution magazine of March 22, 1959, contained an article on one of the most amazing women of our time. She is the widow of a former Governor of the State of Georgia, and the mother of a former Governor and the present most able junior U.S. Senator from Georgia. I speak of Mrs. Eugene Talmadge, who, at the age of 77 years, is still actively engaged in the management of her 800-acre farm in Georgia.

Her life is a story of contributions to her fellow Georgians and to Americans. Her example should be an inspiration to all women. She has excelled as a wife and mother, as demonstrated by the record of her able husband, Eugene Talmadge, and the distinguished career of her son, the junior Senator from Georgia, and the accomplishment of her other children.

It is with great pride that I ask unanimous consent that this article about Mrs. Eugene Talmadge, of whom I am privileged to be a kinsman, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON PIGS OR POLITICS, MISS MIT SPEAKS HER MIND

(By Katherine Barnwell)

The only woman in Georgia today whose husband and son both served as Governor of the State prefers working on a south Georgia farm to loafing in the Nation's Capital.

Mrs. Eugene Talmadge, 77-year-old widow of former Gov. Eugene Talmadge and mother of former Gov. HERMAN TALMADGE, lives simply in a 12-room, red-brick, white-columned home on Sugar Creek plantation near McRae, Ga. And she personally directs the operation of her sprawling, 800-acre farm in Telfair County with remarkable business know-how.

Mrs. Talmadge, known familiarly throughout Georgia as "Miss Mit," says her son HERMAN wants her to give up farming, take it easy and spend more time at his home in Virginia near Washington, D.C., where he's now in the U.S. Senate.

"But I enjoy working on my farm," Miss Mit doggedly insists. "I like to see things grow, and I like to feed farm animals. I'm going to keep right on working as long as I enjoy it. * * * In Washington I couldn't do anything but loaf and go to parties."

Silver-haired Miss Mit is not a woman to spend her time in idleness or party-going.

"Mama has always taken life seriously," Senator TALMADGE says. "She regards it as a matter of survival and views every problem and challenge in life in terms of fundamental values. There is nothing frivolous or artificial about her. I've never known her to play bridge, go to a dance, drink anything stronger than coffee, or take so much as an aspirin tablet."

Although she loves farming, her interests are not confined to corn growing and chicken raising. When we visited Miss Mit at her home recently she discussed everything from pigs to politics. She has definite ideas on many subjects—and she expressed them candidly, sometimes bluntly.

Here are some of her comments:

On the Supreme Court: "Something's got to be done about the Supreme Court. It has too much power."

On her son: "I think HERMAN is doing a wonderful job in the Senate. He keeps dropping new bills in the hopper. They won't ever get out, I reckon, but he keeps trying. I don't see how anyone could object to his constitutional amendment, giving every State the right to run its own schools."

On Senator RUSSELL: "DICK is going much better now that HERMAN is up there in Washington to help him. A lot of times Senator GEORGE didn't vote like the southerners did."

On integration: "You know it wouldn't do to mix the schools. * * * The Negroes down here don't want mixed schools."

On the next President of the United States: "He will be a Democrat I'm sure. I think LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas is about the best we can get. He doesn't always vote the right way, but then he knows he's got to get votes from the North, too, to be President. * * * I like Senator KENNEDY all right, but I think a southerner who sees things like we do would be better.

On Georgia politics: "I don't think Marvin Griffin will run for Governor again after all the bad things that have come out about his administration. I don't believe he could win without the help of the Talmadge people. The Talmadge supporters are stronger than ever in Georgia."

Miss Mit thinks Ernest Vandiver is going to be a fine Governor. And she's proud that she was for him at least 4 years before he ran for office. She recalls that she gave Mrs. Vandiver some good advice just after her husband was elected lieutenant governor. "I told Betty to travel around with Ernie," she pointed out, "and to shake hands with all the country people. I told her to tell 'em what a fine Governor he would be."

Miss Mit recalled that she herself took part in the Vandiver-Bodenhamer campaign. "In the last days of the race," she related, "the Bodenhamer people were saying that HERMAN TALMADGE was not taking sides. So the Vandiver people asked me to go up to the rally for Ernie in Gainesville and sit on the platform.

"When I walked out on the platform I got a big ovation and the band started playing 'Happy Days Are Here Again.' Everybody knew for sure that TALMADGE was on Vandiver's side. That was the only rally I attended."

"Miss Mit's" keen mind is brimming over with memories of past political races in Georgia. Her husband served three 2-year terms as Governor in 1933–37 and 1941–43. He was elected to a fourth term but died in 1946 before taking office. HERMAN TALMADGE was Governor from 1948 to 1955 when he was elected to the Senate.

GENE TALMADGE gave his wife her nickname. "My first name was Mattie," she explained, "but he started calling me 'Miss Mit.' Then everybody took it up. I've always spelled my nickname with one 't,' but lots of people write it with two 't's'. It really doesn't matter to me how it's spelled."

"Miss Mit" confessed that she didn't want her husband to get into politics in the first place.

"When GENE first talked about running for commissioner of agriculture I was against it," she recalled. "But after I knew he was determined to do it I helped him all I could. He was commissioner of agriculture from 1927 to 1933 when he became Governor."

Mrs. Talmadge said she also was against HERMAN running for the Senate after he served as chief executive. "I wanted him to wait 4 years and run for Governor again. Then he could have stayed in Georgia. Now I guess he'll be in Washington from now on—unless he makes some bad mistake."

Although "Miss Mit" has six scrapbooks crammed with clippings about the Talmadges, she never looks at them.

"I don't live in the past," she said emphatically. "All that is water over the dam."

Asked about the possibility of political careers for Senator TALMADGE's two sons, Eugene and Bobby, "Miss Mit" commented:

"Well, little Gene is getting more interested in politics. He's 16 now and he's been on several debating teams. Gene is a genteel boy. He looks a little like his granddaddy, and he might get into politics someday. I don't know what Bobby's going to do. My daughter Margaret wants one of them to be a doctor. It would be nice to have a doctor in the family."

"Miss Mit" is just as concerned about the price of hogs and the location of her sweet potato patch as she is about politics, past or future.

"We're clearing some ground now for our sweet potato patch," she said. "You should move your patch every year to keep the potatoes from getting diseases."

Walking over her farm Miss Mit came to a board fence about 4 feet tall. When magazine photographer Floyd Jillson asked how we were going to get on the other side of the fence to make a picture, Miss Mit snapped: "I can climb over that fence, can't you?" But out of deference to her visitors, Miss Mit decided to use a gate. Later, when we were walking down a steep bank she spurned offers of assistance.

"Shucks, I don't need any help," she retorted. "I'm just as able-bodied and energetic now as I was at 50."

Miss Mit proudly showed off her Duroc-Jersey hogs and pigs. She has between 200 and 300 of them. "Unfortunately," she sighed, as she shelled some corn for her pigs, "the price of hogs is way down. They are so cheap right now that we hate to sell them."

Miss Mit also has nearly 300 head of cattle, mostly Hereford. She has so many chickens that she has lost count of them, but she gets 8 to 10 dozen eggs a day. She gives many of them to her friends and the workers on her farm, but she also has some to sell.

Her senator son points out: "Mama regards energy and talents as gifts to be utilized to the fullest and gives herself wholeheartedly to whatever task she undertakes. To her a full life is a productive life. Having lived on a farm all her life, she always has some fruits of her labor to sell if nothing more than a basket of turnip greens or a dozen eggs."

Besides cattle, hogs and chickens, Miss Mit raises feed crops, tobacco, vegetables and pine trees. She says turpentine from her trees makes it possible for her to farm. "I put 300 acres in pines last year," she remarked. "We make money on the turpentine. You have to have some income from something to be able to farm these days."

Miss Mit has lived by herself since her daughter, Mrs. Vera Smiley, was killed in an automobile accident in 1952. Another daughter Margaret (Mrs. Scott) Shepherd, lives in Ponte Vedra, Fla., but frequently visits her mother in McRae. Mrs. Talmadge also has a son, John Peterson of Atlanta, by her first marriage. She has two Peterson grandsons and six great-grandchildren.

"I love for my grandchildren to visit me," she said. "They all like the farm. I built a 15-acre fishing lake for them here last year. Some folks say it's the prettiest fishing lake in the county."

After Vera's death, Huley Purvis, longtime overseer of the farm, and his wife, Rossie, moved into a garage apartment just behind the Talmadge home. They planned to stay a few weeks to keep an eye on Miss Mit—and they have been there ever since. Mrs. Purvis drives Mrs. Talmadge to McRae whenever she wants to go.

"I drive around the farm myself," Miss Mit said, "but I don't like to drive to town. I used to ride horseback all over the farm until my horse died about 3 years ago."

Although Mr. Purvis is an invaluable overseer, Miss Mit insists on supervising the overall farm operation. "I get up at 6:30 or 7 every morning to go out and get things started," she said. "I've got to set a good example for my farm hands." About a dozen men work for her.

The Talmadge home is about 5 miles south of McRae on U.S. Highway 341, a heavily traveled route to Florida. Miss Mit recalls that she built the house "with cotton money the first year that Ed Rivers was Governor."

Miss Mit sometimes forgets dates, but she quickly associates happenings in her life with Georgia political events. Thus in 1937—or "the first year Rivers was Governor"—she and Gene Talmadge moved into their large Sugar Creek home which cost between $15,000 and $20,000. "Of course, we couldn't build it for $50,000 now," Miss Mit pointed out.

A plaque on the highway identifies the two-story house as the Talmadge home, and sightseers often stop to inspect it. "They just want to see where Gene Talmadge lived," Miss Mit explained. "Sometimes they want to come inside, but I don't fool with them. This is just an old farmhouse." The old farmhouse has beige wall-to-wall carpeting on the first floor and traditional furnishings. Portraits of Gene and HERMAN TALMADGE hang in the library, and Miss Mit's portrait is over the mantel in the living room.

One of Miss Mit's prized pieces of furniture is a long, marble-topped table with a large ornate gold mirror placed over it in the living room. In the dining room is a large breakfront in which she keeps much of her silver. "I have a lot of silver given to Gene by the Governor's staff, and I don't know what to do with it," she mused. "HERMAN already has so much."

She has a wood stove as well as an electric stove in her kitchen. "I like a wood stove," she explained. "It makes the kitchen nice and warm. Most of the people who visit me come in through the kitchen."

There are two large television sets in the house, but Miss Mit says she enjoys her radio more. "If I had to choose between the two, I'd take radio," she remarked. "I like the news programs best."

Mrs. Talmadge says she never gets lonely in the big house. She has two large hunting dogs, Lady and Wici, which she says are not only pets but good guards. She also has seven cats. And she has a lot of visitors. She doesn't go to many social events in McRae—"I'm too busy," she says—but she does go to the McRae Baptist Church almost every Sunday.

Miss Mit is a native of Edgefield County, S.C. The former Mattie Thurmond, she is a first cousin of U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, a former Governor of that State. She came to Georgia as a girl and was a railroad telegraph operator at Ailey, Ga., when she was only 16. At 18, she married John Peterson. When their son was about 3 months old, Mr. Peterson died of typhoid fever.

The young widow and her baby lived with her mother-in-law, the late Mrs. John A. Peterson, Sr., in Ailey. While Miss Mit was there an ambitious young lawyer named Eugene Talmadge boarded in Mrs. Peterson's home. "Eugene and I used to go horseback riding together," Miss Mit recalled. "Then he started asking me to go to parties in Ailey with him. I wouldn't go, so he stayed home to be with me."

Mattie Thurmond Peterson and Eugene Talmadge were married in 1909—when she was 27 and he was 25. They lived in Mt. Vernon for about a year and then moved to a farm in Telfair County near McRae, Ga., which has been Miss Mit's hometown ever since. "At one time Gene wanted to move back to Ailey, but I wouldn't do it," she reminisced. "I loved the farm. Even after Gene was elected commissioner of agriculture I stayed on the farm and he came from Atlanta every weekend."

When Gene Talmadge was elected Governor Miss Mit agreed to go to Atlanta. Of course, the Talmadges took along a cow and some chickens when they moved into the executive mansion in Ansley Park, startling some of their citified neighbors. "I cleaned up that old mansion," Miss Mit said. "It was a terrible place when we moved there."

Miss Mit thinks Georgia badly needs a new Governor's mansion. She says there's no use spending any more money "on that old house that is hardly big enough for a good sized family." She added that she had planned to get a new mansion built the last time her husband was elected, but he died before she had a chance to push the project.

Mrs. Talmadge recalls that she enjoyed entertaining legislators and other politicians in the mansion.

Equally at home in a ballroom or on a tobacco field, Miss Mit now spends most of her time on things agricultural. "I've learned about farming from the men who work for me. I always asked them, 'How would you do this?' You can't beat these old-timey people when it comes to farming."

Miss Mit seldom travels, except to visit her children. She has never been to Europe and has no real desire to go. "I get more pleasure out of making money and putting it away than I do out of spending it," she says.

She has a few expensive clothes, including two fur coats, but she wears old clothes around the farm. She like pert, flower-decked hats and laments that people "don't wear hats much any more." She has not cut her long hair since she was very young. She wears it in soft waves, with a braided coil at the back of her neck.

Miss Mit is one of two Georgia Governors' wives immortalized in bronze on the State capitol grounds. A plaque affixed to the statue of Eugene Talmadge shows "Old Gene" tenderly embracing Miss Mit at the edge of a cattle field. The other husband and wife commemorated in bronze on the capitol square are Governor and Mrs. Joe E. Brown.

Senator TALMADGE says no man ever had a more loyal or devoted wife than his father. "Mama was never too busy to help him in his work," the Senator recalls. "She encouraged him in all his undertakings and was unquestionably obedient to his decisions.

She was completely loyal to him in victory and adversity.

"Four simple words describe Mama," Senator TALMADGE went on. "They are character, courage, work, and thrift in that order. She believes in Christian, moral living and has little faith in quick remedies, medical or otherwise. She taught her children to avoid evil, to have faith in God and themselves, to work hard, to be self-sufficient, to rely on no one, to look to none for favors, and to treat everyone as we would want ourselves treated.

"Her philosophy is that the future is what one makes of it."

## Traffic Accidents on Public Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from A. A. Ramstad, manager of the Ramstad Agency, in Minot, N. Dak., discussing the subject of accidents on the public highways.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAMSTAD AGENCY,
*Minot, N. Dak., January 28, 1959.*

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Committee on the Judiciary,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: From time to time, I do receive from you letters relative to your committee. I do note in your letter of December 26, 1958, you invite our suggestions for legislation for measures to be prepared by January 7, 1959. However, be that as it may, I believe you can do something about this awful appalling slaughter on our highways.

The timetable says it should be done now.

Here is the main text of a letter I have written to one of our outstanding leaders in the auto industry. For confidential reasons at this time, I shall not disclose his name. Here is the text of the letter, which is as follows:

"Knowing that you enjoy a position of national reputation and international reputation relative to the auto industry, writing this personal letter to you, I know will receive your personal attention.

"With the above in mind, I will launch right into the ever-growing serious problem of traffic accidents on public highways. The idea is not to build automobiles with less speed, but here is where you can play an important part.

"Through your engineering department, you can be first in taking a forward step in cutting down this hazard. Psychology plays an important part in this.

"Everyone wants to be a careful driver, the driver that keeps within the law; that is, as long as no one can see the speedometer he is driving by.

"Now, through your engineering department, would it be possible to install a sign with numerals the same size as our license plates that could be synchronized with the speedometer and could be read at the same distance as the license number and installed in the rear window or in the rear part of the automobile.

"This, I feel would be a challenge to anyone who then would deliberately exceed the speed limit as set forth by the highway signs. He would be telling the world how fast he was going and he could not argue about it because too many people have already seen the exact speedometer speed he was driving.

"So, knowing this, the psychological tendency would be to stay within the prescribed speed. You see, he wants to be the good driver within the law.

"If you would back me up on this, I shall be glad to write to each head of the traffic departments in every one of our States.

"I trust you will be the one who will take the first step in that direction. It is not cutting down the engineering speed of your automobile. It is just a device to help people think. It will show that they, the public, are thinking out loud, so to speak, or not thinking at all.

"Over 2,448,000 were injured due to motor vehicle accidents in 1957. Over 40 percent was due to exceeding the speed limit.

"Now, I sincerely believe that the human reaction to a device that tells others the speed they are traveling will help cut down accidents due to the high percentage of speeding which causes these accidents.

"Before I write to other leaders in the auto industry, I shall be awaiting a reply from you at your very earliest convenience.

"Something must be done immediately and I trust you shall be the first to make the installation."

Now, Mr. LANGER, after you have read the above, what do you believe could be done relative to legislation as to make it a law relative to each motor vehicle should have this speedometer visible to the public at all times, the same as the license number?

Engineering skills these days should not stand in the way, but certainly should enhance the creating of a speedometer of such a type. Just how, I am not to say, but I am sure it can be done, and behind it all is the psychological reaction of the driving public, which I really believe would cut down these horrible accidents.

I will await your reply with interest. I thank you personally.

Sincerely,

A. A. RAMSTAD, *Manager.*

## Poison in Your Water—No. 46

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Green Bay, Wis., Press-Gazette of February 3, 1959, entitled "No Relief Seen Soon for East River Odors."

NO RELIEF SEEN SOON FOR EAST RIVER ODORS—RESIDENTS IN AREA TO GET SMELLS FOR AT LEAST ANOTHER SUMMER, COMMITTEE TOLD

Residents living in the area of the East River are faced with at least one more summer of pungent odors from industrial wastes and sanitary sewer discharges.

That was the conclusion of members of the East River Water Pollution Committee Monday night after hearing suggested methods to improve the condition of the river.

T. F. Wisniewski, director of the State water pollution committee, said detailed reports on methods to reduce the amount of industrial wastes being dumped into the East and Fox Rivers had been received in his office by the December 31 deadline. The reports were from papermills throughout the Fox River Valley.

Wisniewski said they "will receive thorough study by our engineers, and a report should be ready for the State committee at its March 17 meeting."

TO ISSUE ORDERS

He said he expected new State orders to the mills and some municipal bodies would be issued around March 25.

Wisniewski said even if the contemplated orders were complied with by next summer, it would be another year before the river was cleaned sufficiently to remove the cause of odors.

Alderman Don Tilleman, chairman of the City Council Water Pollution Committee, said the group will meet in the near future to determine whether any action should be taken this year to alleviate East River odors on a temporary basis.

That was unsuccessfully attempted last summer when a chemical was sprayed on the river's surface to overcome odors.

MUST ACT ON PLANS

Wisniewski said the State has the responsibility of accepting or rejecting the reports submitted by the paper mills. It was pointed out that a plan submitted by Northern Paper Mills, a division of Marathon Corp., would eliminate the discharge of industrial wastes into the East River and pump the aftertreatment into the Fox.

Construction of four lagoons on property owned by Northern in the area of the Green Bay Yacht Club has been suggested by the company. All the bleach water and fibrous material would be pumped into the lagoons and separated.

The solids would be used to fill low property owned by Northern and the pure water would be discharged into the Fox.

Last summer's study of the East River conducted by the city health department, metropolitan sewerage district, and State Water Pollution Committee, revealed that Northern discharged 13,092 pounds of suspended solids and 12,456 pounds of oxygen demanding wastes into the East River each day.

CHARMIN TOTALS GIVEN

Charmin Paper Products, the report revealed, discharged 1,718 pounds of suspended solids and 779 pounds of oxygen-demanding wastes into the river each day. Other pollution was caused by intermittent discharges from the city's sanitary sewers.

Wisniewski expressed the opinion that when the industrial discharges are eliminated from the river the undesirable odors should end a short time later. However, he doubted that would be accomplished this year.

George Martin, manager of the Metropolitan Sewerage District, reported use of overflow stations along the two rivers is being eliminated with the separation of sanitary and storm sewers.

As an example, he said, last year stations were taken out of service at Porlier Street at East River, either Grignon or Eliza Street at Fox River, and several on the West Side.

HELPS REDUCE LOAD

"Each time this is done it reduces the load at the disposal plant and at the same time the discharge of sanitary wastes into the rivers is being lessened."

Martin said 6 of the 24 water drainage basins in the city now have the storm sewers separated from the sanitary sewers. Two drainage basins were completed this past summer.

Mayor Otto Rachals noted that the entire city separation program would not be completed for another 10 years at the current rate of construction.

"The costliest and most extensive work remains to be done, and that is in the downtown area," Rachals said.

## Catholic Sentinel Points to Moral Responsibility of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the question of assistance to underdeveloped nations will soon be under discussion again by Congress. As a supporter of the concept of economic aid to less fortunate countries, I am hopeful that Congress will act affirmatively and vigorously in implementing this policy.

Walter Lippmann—whose insightful columns have contributed so much to public discussion of our foreign policy—said recently upon his return from a visit to Russia:

I submit that we shall not meet the Soviet challenge unless we stop looking at the underdeveloped nations as military bulwarks and bastions and adopt a new and different objective in the uncommitted world. The Communists are expanding in Asia because they are demonstrating a way of raising quickly the power and standards of living of a backward people. The only convincing answer to that must be a demonstration by the non-Communist nations that there is another and more humane way of overcoming the immemorial poverty and weakness of the Asian peoples.

Within the past few weeks Mr. Lippmann has again thrust through the veneer of rationale surrounding this subject to state bluntly the crux of the matter. He said:

The question is whether we are ready to recognize the principle that rich nations in the world community, like rich individuals in their own communities, have a duty to help the poor to raise themselves out of poverty.

Mr. President, in the February 19, 1959, issue of the Catholic Sentinel, a weekly newspaper published in my home city of Portland, Oreg., there appeared a thoughtful editorial commenting on Mr. Lippmann's recent statement. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Rich and Poor Nations," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICH AND POOR NATIONS

An article by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Oregonian of February 1, 1959, deserves wide attention. Mr. Lippmann has raised a point that we hear too little about when the question of foreign aid is discussed.

He says: "The question is whether we are ready to recognize the principle that rich nations in the world community, like rich individuals in their own communities, have a duty to help the poor to raise themselves out of poverty."

Last year, when the U.S. foreign aid program was in danger of being rejected by Congress, the administration called various civic and religious leaders to Washington to urge the continuation of American oversea aid. At that time the address of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, national director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, received widespread and favorable comment in the daily press. His point was precisely that brought forward by Mr. Lippmann. The wealthy, nations as well as individuals, do have an obligation to their less fortunate brethren.

But, as Mr. Lippmann also points out, this has not been adopted as a part of our official policy of foreign aid. Although the United States has made substantial contributions to foreign countries, the money has not always been spent wisely. Cuba is a glaring example of this fact. But as Mr. Lippmann says: "What matters most is that Congress has voted these contributions on what is humanly speaking a self-defeating principle. They have not been voted on the principle that the rich have a duty to the poor but on the theory that we are subsidizing our allies in the cold war." This explains why South America has received a comparatively small portion of our foreign aid. Perhaps it also explains Mr. NIXON's less than triumphant reception by our neighbors to the south.

## Mexico: New Spokesman for Latin America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very pertinent article entitled "Mexico: New Spokesman for Latin America?" The article was written by Daniel James, and was published in the New Leader of March 16.

Mr. President, it appears that this particular article augurs a new high in the relationships between the Republic of Mexico and the Republic of the United States of America. It is my hope that the move started under the leadership of the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who traveled to Mexico at the express request of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, will continue, and that the relationships between our two Republics will be closer and more intimate with the passage of time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO: NEW SPOKESMAN FOR LATIN AMERICA

(By Daniel James)

MEXICO CITY.—President Eisenhower's recent meeting in Acapulco with President Adolfo Lopez Mateos may well have marked the emergence of Mexico as the spokesman for Latin America.

Many Latin American leaders have expressed this opinion. Ex-President José Figueres of Costa Rica, for example, has called the Acapulco meeting an "interview between the United States and Latin America." In the view of Figueres and other Latin leaders, decisions taken at and after Acapulco will presumably be regarded by the rest of Latin America as an indication of U.S. intentions toward the whole continent. Also, Washington itself appears to be of the same belief.

Mexico is the only Latin country that President Eisenhower has ever paid a state visit to, and he has done so twice since taking office in 1953. (He went to Panama in 1956, but that was to attend the meeting of American Presidents.) This, plus the fact that Eisenhower's health does not make hectic trips abroad desirable, points up the significance of his Acapulco sojourn.

Nor is Eisenhower the only ranking American who has visited Mexico recently. He is merely the latest of a parade of American VIP's who have come here in the past few months, including the three most powerful men in the United States.

The parade began in late November, when Senate majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON met Lopez Mateos, also in Acapulco. It was a strange meeting, for the position each man occupied precluded fruitful discussion. Lopez Mateos was then only President-elect and hence unable to speak for Mexico or reveal his program; JOHNSON's party had just won a smashing electoral victory but he had not yet begun to function as majority-leader of the new Congress.

Still, the JOHNSON-Lopex Mateos meeting was important on two counts: It opened up a pipeline between the Democratic party and the Lopez Mateos administration—a pipeline which presumably will function throughout the rest of Eisenhower's term, and of course will take on considerably more importance if the Democrats win in 1960. It also gave the Democrats an initiative insofar as the current Latin American debate in the United States is concerned and promptly stirred up rivalry with the Republicans for Mexico and, in general, Latin American affections. This rivalry will continue through the Presidential campaign, what with prominent Democrats and Republicans headed this way in the future.

One of them is Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, who is scheduled to deliver the commencement address at Mexico City College in June. The fact that he heads a Senate subcommittee which is studying our Latin American policy will not be overlooked—least of all by the Senator himself. In addition, his subcommittee report will be issued in mid 1960—just in time for the election campaign.

Only the growing interparty rivalry for Mexican (read always: Latin American) affections can explain why, hard on Johnson's heels, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles himself came to Lopez Mateos' inauguration on December 1, although he was then ill. He headed up a VIP-studded delegation which included Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother, and several important Senators, including MORSE, BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, Arizona, and RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat of Texas. (In contrast, Thomas Dewey was dispatched to the inauguration of Venezuela's President Romulo Betancourt.)

I have it on excellent authority that a prime mover in the decision to send Dulles here was the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, who argued that after Johnson's visit it was imperative to have top Republican brass attend the inauguration. Hill, a Republican who leans toward Nelson Rockefeller and has had his share of troubles with State Department antediluvians, also influenced President Eisenhower's decision to see Lopez Mateos. Ike, however, had earlier expressed a desire to meet the new Mexican Chief Executive.

Hill was not simply trying to get his party in on the act; he was trying to sell the administration on Mexico's importance to the United States. That he has succeeded almost beyond expectation is borne out not only by the Dulles and Eisenhower visits, but by the covetous eyes which several administration Latin American hands are casting on Hill's Mexico City job.

Why all this attention to Mexico?

In a quiet way, Mexico is becoming the top power in Latin America. Argentina, Cuba, Venezuela, and others may periodically capture the headlines with revolutions and assassinations, but it is Mexico which is by far the most important country south of the border—for the latinos as well as for us. The Latins have, in fact, taken to calling Mexico, in the friendliest spirit, the Colossus of the South.

One thing that makes Mexico a colossus is that, within the past 15 years or so, it has accomplished the feat of graduating from an underdeveloped country into a semi-industrialized one. None of the other 19 Latin Republics have managed to do this. I described this evolution in a previous New Leader article ("Is Mexico Going Capitalist?" July 21–28, 1958).

Simultaneously, too, the Mexicans have succeeded in diversifying their economy—an object of particular admiration in a continent where monocultural economies are the rule. That this has paid off handsomely was demonstrated only recently, when Eisenhower's lead-zinc quota dealt a serious blow to mineral-dependent Peru but caused barely a ripple in the Mexican economy.

It is not Mexico's economic performance alone, however, that Latin America admires and wants to emulate. Perhaps even more attractive is its continuing political stability, and growing democracy. Too often, industrialization in Latin America has been accompanied by strong-arm rule which assumes that you can build a country only by oppressing its people. This is how Perez Jimenez industrialized Venezuela, the industrialization consisting largely of a speedway to the capital's airport and fancy buildings for the rich. Inevitably, as we have seen in Venezuela, Colombia, Argentina, and other countries, revolution or chaos follows.

In Mexico it is different. Underpinning industrialization—a true and not a spurious industrialization—are years of political continuity, stability, and maturity. Not since 1920, when Alvaro Obregon seized power from Venustiano Carranza, has a Mexican Government been ousted by force or violence. Even after Obregon was assassinated in 1928, at the hands of a religious fanatic with no political motives, the succession of governmental crises that followed never resulted in revolution. Since 1934, when Lazaro Cardenas became the first to serve under the newly stipulated 6-year presidential term, every Mexican President has completed his term and has peacefully handed over power to his legally elected successor.

Thus a whole generation of Mexicans has known only peaceful and orderly Government, even though the word "revolution" figures constantly in Mexican politics. This cannot be said for any other Latin republic. Even Uruguay and Costa Rica, often cited as examples of democracy, have had their upheavals in the recent past. And, of course, only within the last 4 or 5 years some of the biggest Latin countries—e.g., Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela—have experienced coups or revolts.

No wonder, then, that Latin America looks up to Mexico and says: "Why dont' we follow the Mexicans and maybe we'll get where they are?" Few thinking persons doubt that the rest of Latin America would be extremely happy if the southern collossus sought to give it active guidance. Will Mexico take on this leadership role?

There was a time when Mexico did claim to speak for Latin America. The revolution of 1910 put it in the vanguard of progress, and Latin Americans everywhere looked to the Mexican example. They do to this day—although sometimes, unfortunately, half-baked leaders, l'ke Fidel Castro understand by revolution a technique for seizing power rather than a means for reorganizing society. But in recent years Mexico has been content to leave the leadership of Latin America to others. It has concentrated its energies on strengthening its own economic and political institutions. This ingrown nationalism has proved eminently sensible, for it has enabled the Mexicans to set their house in order.

The country's basic problems are by no means solved, but they are well in hand. Mexican leaders can now pay attention to hemispheric issues without fearing that, once their backs are turned, trouble will flare up at home. As a result, more and more Mexicans feel that the time has come to assert their leadership in inter-American affairs. After all, they argue, with a population of 33 million Mexico is the largest Spanish-speaking republic and therefore the natural leader of the other 17, if not of Portuguese-speaking Brazil and French-speaking Haiti as well. The only conceivable rival for this leadership, Argentina, has been rendered temporarily hors de combat by Juan Perón.

"Why not accept the leadership which Latin America has always offered us?" asks a leading young Mexican thinker, Dr. Leopoldo Zea. He asked this question in an article that appeared, significantly, only 2 or 3 days after the Eisenhower-Lopez Mateos Acapulco meeting. Interestingly, too, the article was published on the editorial page of Novedades, a Mexico City newspaper owned by powerful interests close to Lopez Mateos. In fact the paper's director, Ramon Beteta, a former finance minister, was one of the handful of Mexicans Lopez Mateos selected to join him in his talks with Eisenhower.

The Zea article is only one recent expression of a mounting consciousness among Mexicans of their destiny to lead the Latin countries. And this could well be Mexico's moment, for not only does the internal situation allow it the time and energy to play a hemispheric role, but in the present government it might find the perfect instrument for essaying that role.

Having already met both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles less than 3 months after taking power, Lopez Mateos has made it very clear that he will take a greater interest in hemispheric affairs than his predecessors. That interest has now received new emphasis with his acceptance of Eisenhower's invitation to pay a visit to the United States, which he will do in April.

The Mexican President actually served notice in his inauguration speech on December 1 that henceforth Mexico would direct her gaze outward. The first section of the speech was devoted to international affairs, expressing Mexico's affinity with her sister Latin republics and stretching out a friendly hand to the United States. The latter was unprecedented; no other Mexican chief executive has ever referred to the United States in friendly terms at his inauguration.

With a rich family heritage which has produced many famous Mexican leaders, including a close collaborator of Benito Juarez, and with some previous experience in foreign affairs as a Senator, the young and dynamic Mexican President appears cut out for the role of Latin American spokesman. Or course, it is too early to tell whether or not Lopez Mateos will attempt the role, but he has the equipment and the time is ripe.

From the U.S. viewpoint, Mexican leadership of the Latin American community could prove highly beneficial—or highly disastrous. Mexico is the Latin country most strategically place vis-a-vis the United States. She is our only contiguous Latin neighbor and shares with us a long frontier. No other Latin state has had as long and as close contact with us as Mexico, and the fact that in the past it was often abrasive does not negate its profound value.

Nowadays, life along the U.S.-Mexican border is practically a family affair. Whether you poke about Loredo, Tex., or Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas, you are likely to find in each of these twin border towns just as many Mexicans as Americans, just as much Spanish spoken as English, just as much Mexican food eaten as American food. You find it much the same when you travel somewhat further inland on both sides, and of course the Mexican communities deep inside the U.S. border States are growing apace. So much so that Mexicans quip about the peaceful reconquest they are making of the territory we took from them in 1836–47.

Nor can one overlook the border's importance defensewise. One little-known but grave problem we face, for example, is to get Mexican permission for Air Force jets to fly over Mexican land just south of the Rio Grande. We have a DEW line beyond the Canadian border, to the north, but none on the Mexican, to the south—and this is a weak spot in our national defense which has security planners intensely worried.

Mexico's strategic position in relation to the United States and in relation to Latin America as well, could make it an ideal bridge between Latin America and the United States. But there are those who see Mexico capable of playing another role, that of the colossus of the south as a buffer against the colossus of the north. They see Mexico in this role because it is the only Latin power capable of standing up to the United States. If it did so in 1914–16 against President Wilson's attempts to foist a government of his choosing upon it, and again in 1938 when the oil companies and Washington ganged up on it, how much more capable of resistance is Mexico today. So, at any rate, goes the reasoning.

It is quite possible that Mexico may find itself playing a dual role. As the leader of Latin America, it may at times have to act as interpreter between Latin America and the United States; at other times it may have to act as the aggressive leader of the Latin bloc against some particular U.S. policy.

Whether or not she will fulfill such a dual role, and where she will place the main emphasis, are questions that will test both Mexican maturity and our own mettle. In any showdown with European or Asian powers, as the prophetic Mexican thinker Andres Molina Enriquez wrote in 1909, Mexico will side with the United States and other American republics; she proved this in World War II, and the dominant thinking today is anti-Communist (though it differs from our official anticommunism). So that is not the issue.

The issue is simply whether we, at long last, are going to come to grips with the realities of Latin America instead of continuing to pursue mirages. Eisenhower made a good beginning at Acapulco. I can testify that the President has lost none of his greath warmth and simplicity, and was an instant hit with Mexicans high and low. They reveled in the thought that the President of the mighty United States had come so far inside Mexico, farther than any predecessor, to be with their President and with them. But that, while creating a healthy psychological climate, is only a beginning.

Now words must go down the line to follow through on the President's achievement. Congressional leaders should be thoroughly briefed and their aid enlisted in a continuing effort to encourage Mexico to become a bridge. And, of course, appropriate economic and similar measures should be drafted, for the bridge can never be strong or secure as long as its construction is weak or faulty.

But we should not imagine that economic measures alone are sufficient. Of paramount importance just now is something noneconomic: United States understanding of Mexico's coming leadership of the Latin American republics. Without that, any measures taken must become reduced in their value and any overhauling of our Latin American policy must fall short of its objective.

## Outrage in Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from Barron's, National Business and Financial Weekly, of March 16, 1959, entitled: "Outrage in Oil." This article describes the recent import quotas on oil imposed by President Eisenhower. As the Members of the House will recall I was one of the first to protest this outrage perpetrated upon the consuming public of this country. I need not remind the House that this will result in substantial increases not only in oil but in other competing fuel costs.

OUTRAGE IN OIL: IMPORT QUOTAS WILL HARM PRODUCER AND CONSUMER ALIKE

In the voluminous annals of American industry, the 27th of August, 1859, enjoys a special place. On that red letter day Edwin L. Drake, exrailroad conductor and entrepreneur extraordinary, made the first commercial discovery of oil, not on some vast Texas plain, as might be expected, but near the quiet little farming town of Titusville, in western Pennsylvania. The epochmaking event already has been celebrated, in story if not yet in song, by publication of an entertaining book aptly titled "The Great Oildorado." In coming months, if all goes according to plan, the centennial also will be marked by the proclamation of Titusville Week, the issuance of a commemorative stamp and, tentatively at any rate, the sealing of a time capsule in a replica of the original well.

Such gestures are a fitting tribute to a remarkable fuel, which, since its discovery, has played a vital part in the mighty U.S. economic and military machine. Unfortunately, however, owing to the untimely intrusion of the Federal Government, the occasion has lost some of its luster. For in a year dedicated to the power and glory of domestic petroleum, Washington perversely has chosen to underscore its growing competitive weakness. Last Tuesday the White House imposed mandatory quotas on imports of crude oil and refined products. According to a proclamation of the President, the move was made to safeguard the national security. More jaundiced observers tend to view it as a political gift to U.S. oil and coal producers, thoughtfully wrapped in the flag. While the causes may be murky, however, the probable effects are all too plain. Import quotas will damage American prestige abroad. They will hurt the consumer at home. In the end, they are likely to lead to outright Federal control of an industry which once was famous for its flaming independence.

This mess of protectionist pottage has been threatening to boil over for a long time. It started to simmer 5 years ago, when Congress, at the behest of domestic producers of coal and oil, passed a special amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Specifically, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization (then known as ODM) was given authority to decide whether imports of any commodity constituted a danger to the country. With this club in the closet, to change the metaphor, the agency soon persuaded the importers (who include not only the major integrated companies, but also a growing number of smaller operators) to embrace a system of voluntary import restraints. Though fairly effective, the velvet glove policy failed to satisfy the protectionists. Under their relentless pressure, the White House last week finally was persuaded to bare its iron fist. Complete details of the mandatory scheme are not available; the harsh outlines, however, may be discerned. To begin with, it covers not merely crude, but also, for the first time, residual fuel oil and other products. Effective immediately, moreover, all imports will be reduced, by as much as 20 percent in some cases. In a new and disturbing departure, finally, the Government plans to act as a kind of watchdog over petroleum prices.

To justify its outrageous program, the administration, as noted, has taken refuge in the plea of national security. Specifically, it cites the decision of OCDM that oil imports, at recent levels, constitute a threat to domestic producers, whose well-being, in turn, is viewed as a strategic imperative. Despite its impressive authorship, this finding is clearly suspect. Imports, to begin with, have not throttled the domestic industry; at worst they have tended to slow its growth. From the military standpoint, moreover, Canadian oil, the flow of which also has been curtailed, is surely neither more vulnerable nor less valuable than its U.S. counterpart. Finally, the OCDM seems absurdly out-of-date in its whole approach. Like the proverbial generals, the defense officials are preparing for the next war with the tactics of the last. Yet, if one is to credit the testimony of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces (given the very day after he issued his proclamation), the United States never again will fight a major war with anything but atomic weapons. In such a holocaust, oil in the ground is a dubious asset.

The advantages of the mandatory program thus are illusory; the drawbacks, contrariwise, are very real. For consumers, the bill already has begun to mount: scarcely had the new curbs been announced when one Midwest refiner, the forerunner of others throughout the country, raised the price of gasoline. As to the industry, some producers, notably those misleadingly known as independents, may enjoy a temporary windfall. Their gains, however, in part at least, will come out of the pockets of other oil concerns, notably large refiners such as Tidewater (which estimates its losses at roughly $25,000 per day). What is worse, they will be at the expense of the very system of free enterprise under which the venturesome oil business, perhaps more than most, has grown and prospered. Among other things, the new decree will mean Federal licensing and inspection; freezing of competitive status; and, if history be any guide, trafficking in quotas and bootlegging of crude. Sooner or later, it could lead to price controls, all the way from wellhead to pump. Two years ago, a high-ranking bureaucrat warned that "if mandatory curbs were initiated, there would be no assurance that they would not eventually blanket the industry." Unlike most forecasts out of Washington, his grim prophesy shows signs of coming true.

While the outlook, then, is none-too-bright, all is not yet lost. According to reports in the trade, several leading companies are planning to challenge the new controls on constitutional grounds. Perhaps in the courts they will succeed in defending the rights which Congress and the White House have overridden. One can only wish them success in their quest. Meanwhile, as the industry prepares to observe its centennial, it will do well to ponder a homely truth. Since 1859 the oil business has thrived on individual risk and reward, not on Government largesse. Willingness to venture remains its best hope for the next 100 years.

## Panama Canal: Communists Entrenched On Southern Flank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a number of addresses on the Panama Canal, I have invited attention to the growing menace of communism in the Caribbean areas with special reference to the countries bordering the approaches to the Panama Canal and on the Central American Isthmus.

An informative news story by Edward Tomlinson, distinguished Latin American correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, on current political developments in Venezuela, was published in the March 17, 1959 issue of the Washington Daily News.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the indicated news story:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 17, 1959]

A DANGEROUS SITUATION FOR UNITED STATES—COMMUNISTS ARE STRONGLY ENTRENCHED IN VENEZUELA

(By Edward Tomlinson)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, March 17.—The Communists not only are strongly entrenched here, they enjoy more prestige and respectability in Venezuela than in any other Caribbean country.

What makes this significant, even dangerous to us, is the fact that Venezuela, next to the United States, is the biggest oil producing country in the world. Our citizens have invested more than $2.5 billion here.

Geopolitically, Venezuela commands the Caribbean approaches to the Panama Canal. The big airfield at La Guaira, 30 minutes from downtown Caracas, is the aviation gateway to eastern South America. From there the stratoliners and jets take off for Rio, Sao Paulo, Montevideo, Buenos Aires and other big southern cities.

If Moscow, through its Red puppets, could dominate such a strategic and rich domain they would control one of the keys to the hemisphere.

PLENTY OF MONEY

The local Communist Party is efficient and businesslike, with plenty of money to spend. It rolled up 150,000 votes in the recent general elections, and put two senators and five representatives in the new Democratic Congress. Red candidates also won several seats in the Caracas City Council.

The party boss, Gustavo Machado, and other important leaders are well educated and come from some of the country's oldest families.

As everywhere else, Reds have infiltrated labor unions. The big oil workers' federation and several smaller interior groups have joined with ORIT, the Inter-American regional organization of workers, which is backed by the AFL–CIO. They still are fairly free of Communist influence at the top, although numerous Reds are in lower echelons.

SPOKESMAN

One of the chief Red spokesmen in educational circles is Hector Mujica, secretary-general of the student union in the university's school of journalism. Marxists as well as avowed Communists occupy prominent positions on various faculties. Only last

week leftist, Yankee-hating former President Juan Jose Arevalo, of Guatemala, now in exile, arrived to begin a year's lectureship at the school of economics.

It generally is thought that Reds are not tolerated by military and strong man governments. Yet they were among the most ardent Peron supporters throughout that dictator's rule in Argentina. Here in Venezuela they operated almost openly under the dictatorship of Gen. Marcos Perez Jiminez.

Although President Romula Betancourt has taken a strong anti-Communist stand, the party is in a position to whip up powerful opposition. It has leftist sympathizers, if not members, in the editorial departments of most leading newspapers.

DISLIKE PRESIDENT

The Reds have no love for the new President. Senor Betancourt was a party member in his youth. Therefore they look on him as a renegade.

But they also fear him. They realize he understands the fine points of their strategy and tactics. And they are still smarting from his campaign declarations against them.

Most of all, they are angry because he spurned their offer of cooperation when he was forming a coalition cabinet with members from other opposition parties as well as his own Action Democratic Party.

Experienced observers here believe the comrades are waiting for some critical national issue, or some serious blunder of the administration, to launch an all-out attack on the new government.

## Price Fixing—Vertical Becomes Horizontal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, vertical price fixing is illegal according to antitrust law. Collusion or conspiring to set prices by manufacturer, distributor, or dealer is declared illegal by antitrust law serving as a protection to businesses in healthy competition. Horizontal price fixing is illegal, too. Manufacturers, distributors or dealers respectively must not get together to set prices. No one questions the need for such protection. Not until now, that is.

Now, the terms of the proposed fair trade bill H.R. 1253 are simple—set aside this antitrust protection of business and permit vertical price fixing by the manufacturer stipulating the retailers' price.

Well, there's a sleeper in this one. Problems of definition always trip up the bureaucrat or economic planner trying to control the uncontrollable, namely the market place of healthy competition. Vertical price control will result in horizontal control too. As Stewart Lee, chairman of economics at Geneva College points out:

If the owners of pharmacies would agree to sell all brands of toothpaste at the same price to avoid price competition, the law would declare this horizontal price fixing. But if the pharmacists would persuade each manufacturer to fair trade his products, the end result is horizontal price fixing.

Thus, vertical and horizontal price fixing both result and declaring one legal or illegal in this case necessarily affects the others. Simply saying this is not so in a bill. Fair trade will not change the result.

## The Universal Training and Service Act: Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an opinion poll sponsored by the International Relations Club of Monmouth College, and carried out by students of government. This poll relates to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINION POLL

Explanation: After making a study of the proposed 4-year extension of the Universal Training and Service Act, using Government documents and reports of various nongovernmental organizations, IRC decided that the public should be asked where it stands on this very important, but little discussed and little debated bill H.R. 2260 now before Congress. They thought our Senators and Representatives, too, might like to know.

Would you, as a U.S. citizen, kindly indicate: What in your opinion should be done about the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the expiration of the draft on July 1, 1959?

Which of the following alternatives do you think Congress should follow? (Please mark your preference with an "X" in the parenthesis.)

Total answering questioner, 387.

1. I favor extending the present law for 2 years only as the representatives of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and of labor urged at the hearings of the House committee: 15.

2. I favor letting the peacetime draft lapse, as Great Britain is planning to do by 1960, and see whether enough continue to volunteer for the purely military jobs, while letting civilians do the purely civilian jobs now being done by draftees. (See the Cordiner Commission report): 124.

3. I favor extending the peacetime draft 4 more years as suggested by the Pentagon and urged by Representative VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee and passed by the House. (It is now in the Senate): 54.

4. I am not satisfied that this bill which Representative VINSON called one of the most important to come before the House in this session was debated only 4 hours by that body: 27.

5. I favor a more thorough debate and more careful study of the numerous possible alternatives to the present law to ascertain what is best for our Nation and its defense needs in this rapidly changing age: 129.

6. Gave their own suggestion: 38.

## Government Educational Policy in International Affairs Should Be More Clearly Defined and Directed by One Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker the educational policy in international affairs of the Federal government should be more clearly defined and it should, in addition, be directed by one Federal department.

Legislation for this purpose has been introduced in the Senate and House. This legislation would, in addition, provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and the equitable budgeting of exchange-of-persons programs and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY have jointly sponsored this legislation in the Senate. In the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] have joined me in sponsoring this significant legislation.

I include here the text of a supporting letter I have received from the Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., as well as an excellent article written by George W. Oakes which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star of March 22, 1959. The text of the bill we are sponsoring is also included here:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, December 8, 1958.*

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Last year the Department endeavored to obtain, through legislation which you sponsored, the establishment of the position of a Special Assistant to the Secretary for International Cultural Relations. As you know, the Department has for some time recognized the need for the creation of such a high level position, to be filled by Presidential appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in order to achieve the important objective of having a coordinated, Governmentwide effort in the field of our exchange-of-persons and other cultural programs with foreign countries.

In the last session of Congress S. 3112 (companion bill to H.R. 10031), providing for the establishment of such a position, passed the Senate but was not acted upon by the House. The urgent need for having a Special Assistant to the Secretary, however, remained.

In order to deal with the problem on an interim basis, and until legislation can be obtained which will give this position the status which the Department believes it should be accorded, there has been created within the Department by Executive order the position of Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Coordination of International Education and Cultural Relations at the

GS–18 level. The Honorable Robert H. Thayer, former Minister to Rumania, who has more recently served as special assistant to the Director of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research in the Department, has been selected to fill this position.

It is our hope that legislation similar to S. 3112 can be obtained in the next Congress. Knowing of your deep interest in this matter, I hope that we may continue to look to you for assistance in this regard.

If you should wish to discuss this matter at further length, I shall be happy to meet with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
*Assistant Secretary.*

---

H.R. 286

A bill to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of exchange of persons programs and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) there shall be in the Department of State an assistant to the Secretary of State to be known as the Assistant for International Cultural Relations (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "assistant"), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) The annual rate of basic compensation for the position of assistant created by subsection (a) of this section shall be established by the Secretary of State in an amount not to exceed the annual rate of basic compensation established by section 106(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 for Assistant Secretaries of State.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the assistant, under the general direction of the Secretary of State, (1) to coordinate the international exchange programs of the Department of State under section 32(b)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, or other provisions of law relating to the exchange of persons, with a view to assuring joint policy and planning and equitable budgeting of such programs, and administrative cooperation between staffs engaged in carrying out such programs, and (2) to perform such other functions as may be assigned by the Secretary of State or prescribed by law.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Mar. 22, 1959]

SCHOLARS AT HOME ABROAD—FOREIGN EDUCATION A BIG BUSINESS TO UNITED STATES

(By George W. Oakes)

International education has become such an extensive activity in Government that the need has arisen for its operations to be concentrated in one spot. The State Department has accepted the responsibility for dovetailing all the programs involving scores of governmental agencies, thousands of American and foreign exchange students. In money about $150 million a year is involved.

The State Department last December appointed a special assistant to the Secretary to fit together the many and varied programs now in operation and to devise ways of making them more effective.

Congress is interested too. During this session, under the leadership of Senators FULBRIGHT and HUMPHREY and Representatives FRANK THOMPSON, JR., JAMES G. FULTON, and STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, legislation is expected that will give the State Department statutory authority over other departments, to try to assure joint policy and planning of these multifarious international education activities.

The U.S. interest in international education dates from 1938 when the State Department formed a Division of Cultural Affairs. During the early war years Nelson A. Rockefeller put great stress on cultural and scientific exchanges with Latin America and thus laid the foundation for the present activity.

In 1946 Senator FULBRIGHT established an extensive academic program outside Latin America by using funds obtained from the sale of surplus war property. Two years later Congress authorized a permanent global education exchange program.

In January Representative PORTER HARDY, JR., of Virginia, chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee of the House, published a voluminous report describing in detail present Government programs. It suggested that Government policy in international education be more clearly defined and directed by one department.

Now the State Department is collecting data from all agencies concerned and also is informing itself on the many private operations carried out for many years by foundations like Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller.

THE LARGEST PROJECTS

The Government's two largest programs are conducted by the State Department's International Educational Exchange Service and the International Cooperation Administration.

In the State Department the Fulbright and leader-grant programs, in operation for a decade, bring annually to the United States about 4,000 foreign students, teachers, lecturers, and specialists from 80 countries and send about 2,000 Americans overseas.

The ICA technical assistance program arranged last year for some 5,600 foreigners from about 60 countries to receive special training in the United States and sent 500 non-Government specialists abroad.

Yet these Government programs, plus those conducted by such diverse organizations as the Defense Department, Public Health Service, Atomic Energy Commission, National Science Foundation, and Library of Congress, are responsible for only a small proportion of the 47,000 students, 7,500 doctors, and 1,400 faculty members who will be studying in the United States this year.

Nearly 70 percent of these visitors will be supported by their own funds or by private organizations, according to the Institute of International Education, the chief organization in this country concerned with both Government and private programs.

Although the present number of foreign students in the United States is almost twice as many as 10 years ago, it still is only 1.5 percent of our total higher education student population. In Britain, for example, 12 percent of the students are from foreign countries. To have the same proportion of foreign students enrolled here as in England or France would mean a foreign student population of 400,000.

A third of all foreign students in the United States come from the Far East. Twenty-one percent come from Latin America. As might be expected, Canada, with over 5,000, sends more than any other country.

EXCHANGES WITH RUSSIA

The State Department's most significant exchange activity this past year has been the new program with Russia.

Here is the way it has developed—January 28, 1958, to January 26, 1959:

| | Americans to U.S.S.R. | Soviets to United States |
|---|---|---|
| Scientific and technical | 392 | 267 |
| Cultural, including sports and entertainment | 355 | 254 |
| Academic | 205 | 44 |
| Total | 952 | 565 |

These exchanges ranged from cotton growers to pediatricians, from geologists to foresters, from architects to veterinarians. Most of them stayed for relatively brief periods of time, varying from days to a few weeks. However, there are now 22 American graduate students enrolled in two Soviet universities for the 1958–59 academic year and 17 Russian students in 5 American universities. At Columbia, for example, three are studying American history and one journalism.

In many ways the international education activities of ICA—largely of a technical training nature—are the most widespread in that they affect more different U.S. Government departments. Hence this may be the area in which the State Department may have the widest scope. Essentially, ICA's education activities involve training foreigners in the United States and third countries, as well as supplying U.S. technical advisers and funds to foreign education systems and institutions.

The program whereby American universities, under contract with ICA, loan their outstanding experts to guide the economies and governments of underdeveloped countries is perhaps one of the most useful, as well as least expensive, of any now in operation. These specialists conduct education research and training programs in economics, engineering, medicine, agriculture, public and business administration.

Acting on the conviction that many Far Eastern countries must develop a competent civil service in order to survive, University of Indiana professors in Thailand have been trying to revise concepts of civil service and public administration. Also, in the Philippines, the University of Michigan and the University of the Philippines have established an Institute of Public Administration to instruct officials and render advisory services to the Government.

TRAINING IN TAIWAN

In Taiwan Purdue University has trained hundreds of Chinese engineers to assist its industrial development. This project meant furnishing engineering professors to advise Cheng Chung University in modernizing its courses, laboratories, textbooks, and library facilities.

In India, where basic knowledge of nutrition is hardly known, University of Tennessee specialists have helped Indian educators improve college curricula in home science and train hospital dietitians and home economics workers.

However, many opportunities are missed because American university faculties, hard pressed by increasing student bodies, meet considerable domestic resistance to detaching their staff for overseas duty. It is estimated than 300 from the University of California faculty alone are now abroad.

Not long ago an Indonesian Government request to the University of California for six government administration specialists to work with their cabinet secretariat had to be refused. Yet participating American universities have found that such foreign experience has broadened the knowledge of their faculty and thus improved their teaching and research performance at home. From a practical viewpoint, Cornell University learned certain agricultural tech-

niques working in southeast Asia that have ben useful in upstate New York.

Educators believe it important to mesh the technical training and academic programs. For example, more Indian philosophers, poets and intellectual leaders should come to the United States not only to widen our horizons but also to make Indians feel that we are not trying to dominate their culture but that we recognize that education exchange can be mutually beneficial.

As the State Department prepares to exert its leadership role, it faces the task of devising an international education policy that will develop fully our national potential—both public and private—in line with our foreign policy without impairing our long-range cultural programs that have won worldwide recognition.

## The LULAC's Advocate a Bridge at El Paso, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the term "citizen" has a multitude of meanings. It can mean simply a resident of a particular country, or the word can denote a person who takes his responsibilities to his Nation and his neighbor seriously and earnestly works at living a life which will make the world a better place.

It is in the latter category that the members of the League of United Latin American Citizens are placed. This organization is composed of men and women who take their citizenship seriously. They studiously keep themselves informed on the activities of their local, State, and National governments and carry on a number of projects for the betterment of their communities and their country.

Mr. President, as an example of the interest which the members of LULAC take in civic affairs, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution set out in a letter, dated February 21, 1959, which I received from LULAC Council No. 132 in El Paso, Tex.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZEN,
*El Paso, Tex., February 21, 1959.*

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: At our regular meeting today, a motion was unanimously passed to write to you regarding the need for another bridge between El Paso and Juarez.

We feel that there are selfish interests that for years have caused undue hardship on the people of our city, as well as on our friendly neighbors to the south.

It is our understanding that those opposed to another bridge have powerful lobbies both in Washington and in Mexico City. However, we believe that in this great country of ours, the lobby of the people is still the strongest lobby, and that you will put forth every effort to see that permission is obtained to open another port of entry, and we feel that the Cordova Island entry is the immediate solution to the problem.

Yours sincerely,
RAUL O. REYNA,
*President.*
A. F. KENNARD,
*Chairman, Public Relations Committee.*
DR. FRANCISCO LICÓN,
*National Director of Health for LULAC.*
CONRAD P. RAMIREZ,
*Trustee.*

## Celebration of the 41st Anniversary of Byelorussia's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 22, Americans of Byelorussian descent celebrated the 41st anniversary of the independence of Byelorussia.

The history of the struggle for independence by Byelorussian people was long, constant, sacrificial, dedicated and determined, marked with armed uprisings and reflected in most of the Byelorussian literature as well as being led and inspired by all of the national leaders and supported morally by many neighboring countries.

On March 25, 1917, the Byelorussian Rada assembled in Minsk declared an independent Byelorussian Democratic Republic, thus marking the end of occupation.

Unfortunately the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was short lived. Once again the Russian Army under a new slogan of communism overran the country and forced the first Byelorussian Government into exile. However, neither the difficult path of exile nor countless persecutions that followed on Byelorussian territory swayed the firm stand of the Byelorussian people.

The declaration of independence gave to every Byelorussian a special sacred meaning of freedom, a special respect and loyalty to all free nations seldom experienced by other peoples.

So this year on March 22, Americans of Byelorussian descent, marked the day of the independence of Byelorussia extending their brotherly hand to all men of Byelorussia who never yielded to the will of any aggressor.

I hope that Byelorussian Independence Day will be celebrated each year not only by Americans of Byelorussian descent but by all citizens and all men who value, respect and jealousy guard freedom.

## Hon. John H. Dent Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of personal pride and admiration that I ask the Members of the House to bear with me in this request to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD touching upon the recent affair given in honor of the ever popular Pennsylvanian, Congressman JOHN H. DENT, by his fellow townsmen.

We have every right to celebrate with him on this occasion of his public acceptance and acclaim. Recently it has been rather difficult to bow acceptance to the publicity tending to fordo the political future of its victim. The Congress applauds Mr. DENT with a cheer and a prayer—Well done, my lad.

The distinguished reporter, Jack Carlton of the Greensburg Tribune-Review issue March 20, covered the banquet with the superlative zest of the master in painted words of human praise:

JEANNETTE HONORS CONGRESSMAN DENT—FAVORITE SON FETED AT BANQUET—JAMES ROOSEVELT IS TOP SPEAKER; DENT GIVEN GIFTS

(By Jack Carlton)

More than 1,200 persons, including national, State, county, and municipal leaders, jammed the Jacktown Hotel last night to help the community of Jeannette pay high tribute to a favorite son—Congressman JOHN H. DENT.

Occasion for the ringing salute was the Jeannette Chamber of Commerce-sponsored DENT testimonial dinner—an affair that was billed as the community's way of telling the dapper ex-glassworker—"JOHNNY, we're proud of you."

Jeannette paid its tribute to the county Congressman with gifts, a pictorial narration of his life, and a long list of outstanding speakers headed by DENT's colleague, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT.

ROOSEVELT APPLAUDED

ROOSEVELT, son of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Representative of the State of California, climaxed the evening's program with an applause-punctuated address. His remarks ranged from verbal salutes to DENT to reflections upon the national and international scene.

The visiting Congressman told the overflow audience that this Nation has overcome great difficulties in the past but today is again being challenged. "We are now engaged in a fight for freedom," he warned.

The United States greatest need is to be strong at home, ROOSEVELT held. He charged that the Nation's chief challenge is to find ways to gain this internal strength, saying, "We must be strong first at home."

WANTS JOBS PROTECTED

ROOSEVELT revealed that he plans to join with Congressman DENT in the battle to see that peoples from overseas do not take jobs away from Americans.

There is presently a bill before Congress, ROOSEVELT said, which would encourage American investment and industrial build-

ing abroad. He held that this bill, if passed, would mean that the investor will grow rich while Americans grow poor.

"This will not happen as long as JOHN DENT and people like him are on guard in Congress," ROOSEVELT said.

ROOSEVELT voiced his support of the Eisenhower administration's stand on the Berlin issue. He said he believed all Americans were behind the U.S. position.

TRIBUTE TO DENT

In paying tribute to DENT, ROOSEVELT pointed out that tradition holds a man is never honored in his hometown. DENT has broken this tradition, he said.

The California Democrat pointed to the story of DENT's rise to Congress as the story of the United States. He concluded by saying that he hoped he might have the honor to serve under Congressman DENT in the future.

Ginger Joyce, executive director of the Jeannette Chamber of Commerce, served as narrator for the pictorial story of Congressman DENT'S rise from glassworker to the Nation's Capitol. Pictures of DENT and his family were shown throughout the narration.

COLORFUL CAREER

Miss Joyce, who referred to DENT'S career as "so colorful that it rivals the TV westerns," concluded by telling the honored guest: "You have built a monument to your city, your family, your country, and yourself which the sands of time cannot erase."

Gifts were presented to the former State senate minority leader throughout the narration. Included in the presentations were: A key to the city, awarded by Jeannette Mayor A. B. Elias and a certificate naming DENT ambassador No. 1, presented by William Smith of the Greater Jeannette Chamber of Commerce.

Robert Ivanoff, vice president of the Jeannette Junior Chamber of Commerce, gave DENT a certificate naming him Jaycee international senator, an honor held by only six other Pennsylvanians.

PLAQUES PRESENTED

Plaques were presented to the Jeannette man by President Dick Rhea, of Greensburg, for the Central Westmoreland County Labor Union Council, AFL–CIO; Willis Gilkey, for the Jeannette Teachers' Association, and Louis Castellano, for the United Rubber Workers Local 22, of Jeannette, which DENT formed.

A camera, projector, screen, and film showing proceedings at the entire dinner were presented to DENT by James Abraham, general chairman of the event, on behalf of the Congressman's friends.

Gifts were also given by M. G. Shevchik, for the Jeannette District Memorial Hospital, and Mayor R. E. Gardlock, for the city of New Kensington.

Gardlock also gave gifts to ROOSEVELT and Allegheny County Judge Samuel A. Weiss, toastmaster for the evening. The same two men also received gifts from the Jeannette Chamber of Commerce.

WEISS TOASTMASTER

Weiss, in his role as toastmaster held that "DENT'S humility is unchallenged." He told the audience that it was a deserved tribute to a fine fellow.

The toastmaster called on A. B. Elias, mayor of Jeannette, who praised the honor guest and pointed out that JOHNNY has come a long way since leaving the council chamber of Jeannette.

Remarks were also made by James Abraham, general chairman of the event, and Norman Berger, president of the Jeannette Chamber of Commerce.

Congressman DENT, obviously moved by the salute, also spoke briefly. He told his audience that Jeannette had meant a great deal to him. "I'm proud of this town," he said.

The former State lawmaker held that he has always felt that what was good for Jeannette was good for all Americans.

DENT also extended his grateful appreciation to JAMES ROOSEVELT, the son of a great man, for taking the time to appear at the affair.

"If a man could live forever," DENT concluded, "I would want to live it with you."

J. H. Millstein, cochairman of the dinner, introduced the honor guests at the speaker's table. They included: Father James Imhof, OSB, of the Ascension Church, Jeannette; Dr. R. W. Huntsman, of the Jeannette First Methodist Church; Rabbi Cadish Waldman, of the Chevra Sholom Synagogue, Jeannette; William Smith, of the chamber of commerce; Mrs. Donald Sarp, DENT'S daughter; DENT'S son, Fred, and wife, Margaret "Babe" Dent; Norman Berger; Mayor Elias; Jim Abraham; Judge John M. O'Connell, and Mrs. Samuel Weiss, wife of the toastmaster.

MANY INTRODUCED

Representatives of more than 40 labor groups, municipalities, State legislative bodies and departments, and various other local and county organizations were also introduced during the program.

Toastmaster Weiss paid high tribute to the Westmoreland County Common Pleas Court during the dinner. In an unusual gesture, the Allegheny County judge called for a moment of silent prayer in memory of the late Judge Edward G. Bauer.

The St. Vincent General Assembly, Knights of Columbus, served as color guard for the banquet. John Umek led the audience in the singing of the national anthem to open the program.

Preceding the dinner, a press conference was held in the basement of the hotel.

Congressman ROOSEVELT, key speaker at the banquet, was delayed in his arrival. Jeannette Chamber of Commerce officials explained that he had been forced to postpone his departure because of key legislation on the floor of Congress yesterday afternoon.

## How Business Operates Not by Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fair trade, the setting of retail prices by manufacturers would be a death blow to free enterprise, and the countless blessings enjoyed by consumers because of mass production, efficiency, research, streamlined operation—all resulting from competition between manufacturers, where all take risk and some make it, some do not.

If the manufacturer is assured a certain price by law where then is the incentive to discover and remove inefficiency, ingeniously to devise new systems, new manufacturing procedures, techniques and tools, more production, more efficient distribution? In free enterprise competition keeps the industries on their toes. Sure, it is a battle for survival. The customers must be pleased—a better product at a lower price with quicker delivery with better service and warranties, countless courtesies, advertising schemes, window displays. From raw material to customer's home competition drives each manufacturer, distributor, and dealer to do his best to please the consumer, who must be pleased at the right price or no sale.

Well, we can set prices by law but they will not stick. Before John Doe rebels the damage will be poorer products at higher prices, slower service, less striving to please, less volume, less efficiency and finally more bureaucratic laws to undo the damage of bureaucratic laws until in the struggle the whole system slips beneath the quicksand. Fair trade? Hardly.

## Unemployment Situation Remedies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting, forthright, and truthful editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune of Lawrence, Mass., on March 21, 1959:

UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION REMEDIES

The Eisenhower administration is counting on a spring and summer boom to reduce unemployment. Even if this materializes, it will not help the many areas with chronic unemployment conditions. These include Lawrence, Lowell, Fall River, and North Adams in our own State, all of which, at last reports, had 6 percent or more unemployment. Haverhill and Newburyport also are listed as having a labor surplus.

This much is encouraging. President Eisenhower is awaiting the advice of nine Governors before deciding whether to favor proposals concerning an extended Federal-State unemployment compensation program.

Behind the scenes is U.S. Labor Secretary Mitchell seeking administration support for Federal action to improve this method of helping the jobless.

Mitchell will get plenty of support. A conference of trade union leaders from all parts of the Nation, including 250 from New England, will take place in Washington on April 8 to seek action by Congress and the administration to alleviate unemployment.

Federal aid is being sought for a number of labor surplus areas. Legislative ears in Washington are bound to listen more than in previous years to the argument that chronic industrial blight has hit these sections through no fault of their own but because of shifts in the economy. They should.

In Congress, the pressure is on to renew last year's unemployment insurance extended benefits, due to expire at the end of this month. If they end 350,000 unemployed, including thousands in Massachusetts, will lose their payments.

In addition, there are two so-called area redevelopment bills pending in Washington which would help to lighten the burden of chronic unemployment. Mayor Buckley appeared in the Nation's Capital recently as a

representative of the U.S. Conference of Mayors in support of such legislation.

It is paradoxical that while the Nation's economy seems quite healthy, there are important areas of serious and sustained unemployment. New England, which contributes more to the Federal coffers than it receives, has plenty of communities which need assistance.

Affirmative decisions furnishing such aid may run counter to the views of Republican conservatives in Congress, and it's the type of situation that may hatch liberal measures. However, such legislation would be popular. Vetoes would be unpopular.

The AFL–CIO's demonstration in Washington early next month on unemployment can be expected to carry much weight. It will put the spotlight on communities where plenty of people are jobless, smack in the middle of recovery and prosperity for the country, generally. It is hoped that Congress can and will do something about the chronic unemployment situation.

## Mutual Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Moline Daily Dispatch of March 18, 1959:

MUTUAL SECURITY

President Eisenhower, in his address to the Nation Monday night, made reference to the need for continuing military assistance to other nations.

He said: "If the United States, alone, had to carry the full burden of defending its interests from the Communist threat, we would have to draft a much larger portion of our manhood into the armed services, spend many more billions of treasure and put a more intense strain on all our resources and capabilities.

"We would become more and more like a garrison state.

"Fortunately we do not have to adopt such a desperate course. Nearly 50 nations have joined with us in a cooperative effort to protect freedom. This system of mutual security allows each nation to provide the forces which it is best able to supply."

Behind these words lies a very important aspect of the U.S. foreign aid program. In this respect, foreign aid is a misnomer.

The aid the United States extends to other countries for military purposes is calculated to protect the United States as much as those countries. The money goes to garb and equip fighting men of other nations, to provide them with ordnance and vehicles and to assist in training them. The general idea is that if soldiers of other nations were not set up to fight, their places would be occupied by American fighting men. As it is, hundreds upon hundreds of Americans in uniform are scattered about the globe.

Why are any soldiers needed to protect American interests in foreign lands?

First, they protect American property and American lives, not only governmental property and lives but also commercial property and private lives. American interests and holdings overseas are enormous.

Second, they discourage border aggressions in the hundreds of spots in the world where the Communists seek the weak places in the armor.

Third, they constitute a ready force for retaliation should war come.

The American fighting man is the most expensively equipped and expensively maintained in the world, commensurate with the high American living standard. As high as 10 fighting men in other nations can be equipped and maintained for the cost of 1 American. Taxwise, it makes sense to get the most protection for the least cost.

Then too, the more foreign nationals the United States can arm in their own countries, the better it looks for the United States from the standpoint of imperialism.

And the political pressures against sending many more American boys overseas in uniform in peacetime would probably be too great to withstand.

As long as there is need for mutual security, it is fitting that is is mutual. The alternatives—either man the world's outposts with Americans or pull American interests and defense structures back into Fortress America—are only academically interesting.

## Uncle Sam Was Real

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam was a real person who lived and died in Troy, N.Y.

This lovable character, so close to our deepest patriotic feeling, was not a creature of a cartoonist's pen, but a man who loved and was loved; a man who served his country and helped to develop its strength.

The people of Troy, in a patriotic endeavor, are urging this Congress to recognize that their Uncle Sam Wilson is and was our Uncle Sam. In that connection, a recent editorial in Life magazine is apropos. It follows:

UNCLE SAM ON TRIAL

THE COURT. Defendant will take the stand and be sworn.

DEFENDANT. My name is Uncle Sam, sometimes called U.S. for short.

THE COURT. The prosecutor will read the indictment.

PROSECUTOR. Now comes Allan Nevins, professor of history at Columbia University, who deposes and says of Uncle Sam (cf: New York Times magazine, March 1, 1959), "It is time the most complicated nation on earth disowned this crude stereotype. * * * Invented during the war of 1812, he is altogether too much the rural Yankee or Yorker type. He is obviously of the same breed as the men who marched to Concord and Saratoga."

UNCLE SAM. I was there. Right by the rude bridge.

PROSECUTOR. "* * * as the deacon who built the one-hoss shay * * * and David Harum.

UNCLE SAM. Knew David well. Cheated him on a horse trade.

PROSECUTOR. "He is out of date because his world is gone. * * * He lacks the grace [of] a southern gentleman * * * the breezy buoyancy of a Texan * * * the concentrated energy of the modern industrialist."

UNCLE SAM. Sam Houston was my nephew. Andrew Carnegie was my adopted son.

PROSECUTOR. "Nobody can believe that the Declaration of Independence, Gettysburg Address, and Second Inaugural are bottled up in that prosaic figure."

UNCLE SAM. These Congress gaiters are a bit worn.

PROSECUTOR. "In him we see no sublime rages, no wild aspirations. He is obviously a plain democrat."

UNCLE SAM. I plead guilty to that.

PROSECUTOR. "When stereotyped thinking and cheap prejudices are cast on the rubbish heap, the belief that an infantile folk image like Uncle Sam has any meaning will follow."

THE COURT. How says the defendant?

UNCLE SAM. Sometimes when a fellow likes a job real well he outgrows his usefulness without realizing it. Maybe I'd better hang up my old stovepipe hat, wrap these tattered stripes around me, and lie down to pleasant dreams. But who can dream during this Berlin thing? Not me. Anyway I've got to attend a couple of christenings, in Alaska and Hawaii. Somehow my family keeps growing.

THE COURT. How says the jury?

JURY. We find the defendant guilty of patriotism, devotion to duty, Yankee thrift, native shrewdness, stubborn pertinacity, mechanical ingenuity, bighearted generosity, hard work, calluses, and raising a free nation out of a wilderness.

THE COURT. Uncle Sam, I sentence you, at 12:01 a.m., on July 4, 1959, to raise a flag containing 50 stars above Fort McHenry, Md., to hang there in your charge day and night, so long as you shall live.

## The Good Old Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has sent me a document which is a mute but effective commentary on the state of our Federal finances. It is a Federal income tax form for 1913, the first year for which such a tax was levied, pursuant to the 16th amendment to the Constitution.

In contrast to the involved forms with which we have to struggle today, the 1913 return was fairly simple. The personal exemption was $3,000 in the case of a single person and $4,000 in the case of a married individual. All dividends were deductible. The basic tax rate was 1 percent on net taxable income. The surtax rate was 1 percent on net taxable income over $20,000 but not exceeding $50,000; 2 percent on net taxable income over $50,000 but not exceeding $75,000; 3 percent on net taxable income over $75,000 but not exceeding $100,000; 4 percent on net taxable income over $100,000 but not exceeding $250,000; 5 percent on net taxable income over $250,000 but not exceeding $500,000, and 6 percent on net taxable income over $500,000.

As a sidelight on tax history, Mr. Speaker, I include the first page of the Federal income tax return form for 1913:

TO BE FILLED IN BY COLLECTOR.

List No. ----------

---------- District of ----------

Date received ----------

Form 1040.

INCOME TAX.

THE PENALTY

FOR FAILURE TO HAVE THIS RETURN IN THE HANDS OF THE COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE ON OR BEFORE MARCH 1 IS $20 TO $1,000.

(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE 4.)

TO BE FILLED IN BY INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU.

File No. ----------

Assessment List ----------

Page ---------- Line ----------

UNITED STATES INTERNAL REVENUE.

RETURN OF ANNUAL NET INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS.

(As provided by Act of Congress, approved October 3, 1913.)

RETURN OF NET INCOME RECEIVED OR ACCRUED DURING THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 191....

(FOR THE YEAR 1913, FROM MARCH 1, TO DECEMBER 31.)

Filed by (or for) ---------- of ----------

(Full name of individual.) (Street and No.)

In the City, Town, or Post Office of ---------- State of ----------

(Fill in pages 2 and 3 before making entries below.)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. GROSS INCOME (see page 2, line 12) | $ |
| 2. GENERAL DEDUCTIONS (see page 3, line 7) | $ |
| 3. NET INCOME | $ |

Deductions and exemptions allowed in computing income subject to the normal tax of 1 per cent.

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. Dividends and net earnings received or accrued, of corporations, etc., subject to like tax. (See page 2, line 11) | $ |
| 5. Amount of income on which the normal tax has been deducted and withheld at the source. (See page 2, line 9, column A) | |
| 6. Specific exemption of $3,000 or $4,000, as the case may be. (See Instructions 3 and 19) | |
| Total deductions and exemptions. (Items 4, 5, and 6) | $ |
| 7. TAXABLE INCOME on which the normal tax of 1 per cent is to be calculated. (See Instruction 3) | |

8. When the net income shown above on line 3 exceeds $20,000, the additional tax thereon must be calculated as per schedule below:

| | INCOME. | TAX. |
|---|---|---|
| 1 percent on amount over $20,000 and not exceeding $50,000 | $ | $ |
| 2 " " 50,000 " " 75,000 | | |
| 3 " " 75,000 " " 100,000 | | |
| 4 " " 100,000 " " 250,000 | | |
| 5 " " 250,000 " " 500,000 | | |
| 6 " " 500,000 | | |
| Total additional or super tax | | $ |
| Total normal tax (1 percent of amount entered on line 7) | | $ |
| Total tax liability | | $ |

## Payments in Lieu of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the city commissioners of the city of Fargo, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commissioner Hagen offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

*"Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo:*

"Whereas there is now before the 86th legislative assembly of the United States of America a bill providing for payment in lieu of taxes which would authorize payments to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal property, being Senate bill No. 910, upon which hearings have been scheduled for March 19 and 20, 1959, before the Senate Government Operations Committee; and

"Whereas the passage of said bill will be of great benefit to all municipalities of the United States of America, Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, N. Dak., hereby strongly endorses said bill and urges its passage, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, to the office of the American Municipal Association, Washington, D.C., and to the North Dakota legislative delegation in Washington, D.C., and that telegrams be dispatched to the above urging the passage of said bill."

## Fair Trade a Misnomer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fair trade, the setting of consumer prices by manufacturers under Federal mandate, is a misnomer. The language is as unfathomable as Washington gobbledygook can contrive. What means "unfair and deceptive acts" or "satisfy the needs of ultimate consumers" or "prices that are adequate"? Unscrambling the meaning and intent will assure all attorneys more business than they can handle and be a field day for the courts, and they do not need the business.

Heavy litigation and court redefining or legislating the intent of Congress will be the end result if Congress passes the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253.

## Fair Trade Anachronism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the fair trade is a legislative anachronism. The language of the bill would do credit to the Government control of socialism. At the least it contains the bureaucratic dictation of the planned economy concept, not free enterprise. What is meant by such phrases as "prices that are adequate to stimulate said distribuion and low enough to enable distributors of such identified merchandise to compete effectively with those market-

ing goods of the same general class and to satisfy the needs of ultimate consumers."

Now, what does this mean? Prices "high enough to"—"or low enough to"—and who is so wise to know what to prescribe by legislative edict? What means the phrase "of the same general class" or "to satisfy the needs?" And who will play the Almighty in giving the answers?

The answers can be found only in the market place where merchandise in competition is selected or rejected for a price or for bargaining between seller and buyer. Thousands of transactions daily provide the answer—not a bureaucrat, nor we in Congress assembled.

## Farmers Union Seeks Agriculture of Farm Families on Family Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the National Farmers Union held its 57th annual meeting in Springfield, Ill., this month, the delegates adopted a statement of purpose which sums up their—and my—belief in the dignity of the individual, family-type farmer, a man who seeks nothing but a chance to use his abilities to the fullest in his own behalf as a useful member of our democratic society. This statement has special significance in these confused times when bigness is frequently mistaken for greatness. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the National Farmers Union's statement of purpose in the RECORD:

THIS WE BELIEVE

The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union) is a private association of farm operating and other rural families. We are joined together to do in combination what we would be unable to do separately.

AIMS AND PRINCIPLES

The basic aims of National Farmers Union are derived from our understanding of the laws of nature and of God. Living in rural America, we live close to nature. Our occupation depends on its life-renewing forces. Our livelihood requires its understanding. Our observation of nature's work gives us a thoughtful respect and a profound regard for the essential dignity of the individual human being. We reaffirm our convictions of the truth and rightness of the ideals expressed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights. We are opposed to the principles and practices of totalitarian dictatorship whether in Communist, Fascist, or any other form.

*A. Inherent human rights*

We, in Farmers Union, are convinced that all men are created equal; that each is born important in his own right, without distinction or discrimination.

1. Freedom of expression: We shall strive to preserve and expand freedom of thought, freedom of speech, radio, television, and press, freedom of the secret ballot, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom to organize, and freedom to petition the Government for redress of grievances.

2. Equality of opportunity: We assert the right of each person to an equal educational opportunity, and to an equal opportunity to choose his own living; to spend, save, invest, and own property, to make his working and saving efforts and his property count for the benefit of himself and his family toward the attainment of their aspirations to the extent of his ability to do so without encroaching upon the equal opportunity of others.

3. Adequate standards: We are convinced that in this land of plenty, no person should be compelled by circumstances beyond his control to fall below an adequate standard of the necessities, conveniences, and comforts of life.

*B. Family is basic*

We are convinced that the family is the primary and basic unit of human society and should be preserved, strengthened, and enriched.

*C. Democracy essential*

We are convinced that the inherent rights of man can be attained and protected only in a self-determining, self-restrained democracy. We recognize the need of government, the one cooperative endeavor embracing us all, to protect the rights of expression, to ensure equality of opportunity and to perform such service as can more efficiently be performed by people as a whole, rather than as individuals, private groups, or cooperative business activities.

It is our abiding determination to preserve and further improve the democratic nature of our governments. To safeguard our representative democracy, we believe in government by law, not by men outside of law. We reject completely the idea of government by any elite managerial, scientific, military, or any despotic group or totalitarian dictatorship. We shall continue to oppose all the efforts of all who seek to retain or impose dictatorship government on this or any other nation.

1. Equal voice: Democracy is designed to give each person an equal right to take part in making governmental decisions personally and through representatives of his own selection. We are convinced that all the people should have a voice in determining our laws and selecting the leaders of government. Each person is the best judge of his own best interests.

2. Responsive government: Democratic government is the only form of government through which the people by peaceful means can maintain freedom of expression and equality of opportunity. It is the only form of government that takes on new jobs and drops outmoded activities solely in response to the expressed needs and desires of the people. The checks and balances, the division of governmental powers, are necessary to the preservation of responsive representative government. By such means, we protect the rights of minorities, guard against the development of a totalitarian or despotic elite, and prevent the concentration of economic and political power in a few hands, thereby preserving the opportunity of our people to preserve their rights and freedom.

3. Citizenship: We, in Farmers Union, assert our willingness to assume the full citizenship responsibilities involved in the exercise of our democratic rights.

*D. World affairs and U.S. foreign policy*

We are convinced that the foregoing principles have universal application, that these are aims which reflect the aspirations of people everywhere.

Farmers Union will continue to strive for the earliest possible attainment of a democratic world brotherhood of nations, operated on principles consistent with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, living at peace with one another in a United Nations that derives its just governmental powers directly from the people of the world and provide the basis and opportunity for constantly increased production and improved living standards.

The trend of world events has thrust the responsibility of world leadership on he United States. We reaffirm our support of United States' efforts to assist in expansion and strengthening of the productive capacity and living standards of other nations in ways that will help them move toward democratic form of government. We emphasize the great importance and decisive role that abundant U.S. food production can play in the implementation of these policies. Until such time as a world brotherhood is fully established, a free democratic nation has the responsibility, through the United Nations, to protect itself and weaker nations against aggression.

*E. Expanding economy of abundance*

We are convinced continuously expanding national and world economies of ever greater abundance are absolutely essential to the improvement, extension, and preservation of representative democracy and to the ultimate atainment of permanent world peace. Democracy must, and ultimately will, extend enriched individual dignity, expanded economic opportunity and increasing material well-being to all people. Governments, private groups, families and individuals should continually promote the ever-greater attainment and ever-wiser use of growing abundance. We need to improve family living conditions in the United States and throughout the world.

*F. The land: Heritage of an entire Nation*

We believe that the land, water, and other natural resources should be used and conserved by its owners and operators in a manner to pass it on undiminished to future generations.

*G. Family farming bulwark of democracy*

We are convinced that farm families on family farms are an esential balancing force in the social and political structure that is vital to the stability, preservation, and improvement of representative democratic government, of an efficient and productive economic system, and of a satisfying world society.

On the family farm, the business and home are one. The family is owner of capital, borrower of funds and accumulator of savings, manager of home and business and the major source of labor. The child grows up with opportunity for well-rounded knowledge of life, nature, business, and home. He learns the meaning of ownership and the security of place called home.

Grave danger to democratic institutions would result if we allow our entire population, including agriculture and small business, to become divided into separate groups of owners, managers, financiers, and workers.

*H. Parity farm income*

We assert the right of farm families to earn and receive income from their work, management, and property ownership equivalent to that earned and received by people in walks of life from similar productive resources.

*I. Enriched rural neighborhoods and communities*

Successful rural family living depends upon the existence of strong rural neighborhoods and communities. We will work for the development in rural areas of adequate cultural centers including: stronger churches and other religious centers, improved local governments, better schools, provisions for local discussion forums for all citizens, rural libraries and art centers, and healthful rural recreation centers.

*J. Cooperatives*

We are convinced that cooperatives and the cooperative technique and other nonprofit forms of private corporate economic organization have a uniquely significant role to play in building a better world and better farm life as well as to strengthen the economic position of farmers and other citizens.

*K. Rural organization*

We shall strive to preserve and strengthen National Farmers Union as a farm organization. We invite all farm families and all groups and persons who share our goals to join us in cooperative efforts to build better rural communities, socially and economically. We assert the right of rural people to set up organizations, under their control, to provide for themselves an informational and educational service supplemental to public schools and other educational activities and to serve as a major channel through which the right to petition government may be exercised.

*L. Summary*

We seek an agriculture of farm families on family farms, prosperous, efficient, masters of themselves, good stewards of the soil they till, standing on their own feet and seeking nothing of any man except a fair and equal chance to use their abilities to the fullest in their own behalf as useful members of a democratic society. We seek a like opportunity in life for our fellow man, both within our own country and in other lands. We believe that these aims can best be attained through combined individual and cooperative private action with and under programs of democratic government.

We seek this manner of life because it answers the need for a world that recognizes the equal dignity of every person as a means of fostering his unique worth and confers upon all alike the right to expression in word and deed without fear of unjust reprisal.

## Movement of Aircraft Across an International Border

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution recently adopted by the State Legislature of Minnesota, a border State. This resolution represents the best thought of the legislature on the movement of aircraft across an international border:

RESOLUTION 2

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to insure that private aircraft flying into or out of Canada be subject to the same inspection fee regulations of the U.S. Customs and Immigration Services as automobiles

Whereas private aircraft in increasingly large numbers are crossing Minnesota's northern border to and from Canada for business and recreational purposes; and

Whereas private aircraft crossing the border on Sundays or legal holidays are required by the U.S. Customs Service and U.S. Immigration Service to pay special overtime rates for crossing inspections, regardless of whether or not the port of entry is open; and

Whereas private automobiles are not required to pay special overtime rates so long as the port is open: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota*, That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States, do all in their power to remove the special charges affecting private aircraft which cross the border, and provide a uniform system treating aircraft and automobiles on an equal basis; be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

E. J. CHILGREN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
KARL F. RALVAAG,
*President of the Senate.*

Passed the house of representatives this 4th day of March 1959.

G. H. LEAHY,
*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*

Passed the senate this 9th day of March 1959.

H. Y. TANEY,
*Secretary of the Senate.*

Approved March 13, 1959.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
*Governor of the State of Minnesota.*

Filed March 13, 1959.

JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
*Secretary of the State of Minnesota.*

## Proposed Wage and Hour Legislation as It Might Be Applied to Agriculture Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include a letter to me from one of my many esteemed farmer friends, Mr. Herbert Pike, of Whiting, Iowa. In this letter he explains why the proposed increase in farm labor pay would be detrimental to all parties concerned. His letter follows:

WHITING, IOWA, *March 18, 1959.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. JENSEN: You asked that I express my views on the proposed wage and hour legislation as it might be applied to agricultural labor. First, may I say that farm wages have strengthened to the point where a farmhand is living better than the operator of a below-average farm, and that will include about half the operators in a given area.

Typically, a farm worker in this area will get $200 a month the year around, plus a modern house, milk, some meat, feed for chickens, possibly vacation time, and a year-end bonus of $100 or more. It easily adds up to a $3,000-a-year job in town. He works probably 60 hours a week in summer, but much less in the winter.

Combination of small farms in Iowa has made many houses formerly occupied by tenants, and even owners, available for hired help, and this improvement in housing is all to the good. Farm employees in this community expect a modern house, and usually get it.

One reason I stay with a diversified livestock-crop program is to provide a year-round job for three married men and keep a crew together for the crop season. Winter chore work is not profitable to me, but I am in a sense paying overtime and housing them for the work they do in the summer.

If I were forced to pay overtime in the summer, I believe I would cut out livestock, specialize on crops, increase my machinery investment, decrease the size of crew, and lay them off in slack seasons as do employers in construction work. Even with unemployment compensation and overtime, I doubt that the workers would be any better off than under a straight year-round wage. Certainly there would be a greater turnover of labor, which would be wasteful to both employer and employee, and unsettling to the workers' families.

Agriculture offers good summer employment and work experience for high school and college students. Parents of city youngsters often ask me where they can place a boy in a good situation for the summer, and we have taken some on an apprentice basis. However, a high minimum wage would make it impractical to use this inexperienced help. Older men, not able to work to full capacity, would tend to be laid off, too, under a high minimum wage setup.

Minimum wages, in general, I think, tend to make the poorest quality, inexperienced labor relatively more expensive than the best and encourage, of course, mechanization at the expense of labor.

Present wage-and-hour legislation has had the effect of raising the cost of everything a farmer buys, even service at his local co-op elevator. At a time when farmers are being asked to tighten their belts and get along with less Government help, I think it would be most unfair to impose restrictive labor legislation upon them. Farmers can't pass these costs on with cost-plus contracts.

If the administration is really serious about balancing the budget and halting inflation, it would seem that a halt in wage increases and wage-and-hour coverage would certainly be in order.

Thanks again for your hospitality while in Washington. I always come home with more respect for our Congressmen and the part they play in making democracy function.

Sincerely,

HERBERT PIKE.

## A Lifetime of Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, farming is living close to the soil. Ira M. Krall, Route 2, Myerstown, Pa., was written up in the Lebanon Daily News as a longtime farmer who is retiring and perhaps like the story of the retired mailman who still enjoys a long hike, Mr. and Mrs. Krall indicated their continued fondness for farming.

They sold their farm which has a history all the way back to William Penn but as the article states:

He and Mary have their noses in house plans, and they expect to build a little place in the country sometime, where they can hear the rustle of tall corn.

With his experience in farming it is interesting to note also his estimation of governmental intervention in the field he is leaving.

The newspaper article follows:

RURAL RAMBLINGS WITH LEON MILLER

Ira M. Krall has been farming so long he could plow a straight furrow on a foggy night with both eyes shut, if he had to.

But Ira had both eyes and ears open a couple of months ago when opportunity came knocking at the door of his place on Myerstown Route 2, and he sold all 138 acres.

After 30 years in the cow, sow, and plow business, Ira is retiring. He'll stay at the farm for another year, renting it from the new owner, Howard W. Patches.

And after that, move to town? "Not by a long shot," he said. He and Mary have their noses in house plans, and they expect to build a little place in the country sometime, where they can hear the rustle of tall corn.

"Farming was getting to be just too much," he said. "I've been mostly alone since Monroe went to Penn State; it's hard to get help, and I'm not getting any younger."

The decision to sell didn't come easy. He, Mrs. Krall, and son, Monroe, mulled it over a long time before making up their minds. Ira's mother was born there, and his father just across the way, so the roots are deep.

William Penn's name is on the deed, with those of the Krall ancestors, Christian and Mathias Krall. Ira's father acquired the place in 1912.

In spite of the ups and downs (every occupation has them) there are still many opportunities in farming, Ira believes. "And if I were 30 years younger I wouldn't have sold at any price."

Agriculture would be in better shape if the Government would allow it to work out its own problems, he believes. "As soon as Uncle Sam allows us to decide for ourselves what to plant, and how much, the better it will be for all concerned."

And then he made a point to show how large the hand of the taxers has grown:

"The Government takes more from Mrs. Krall's salary in a year than I earned in a month as a teacher back in 1923."

## Management's Mission on the International Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by T. S. Petersen, president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, before the Harvard Business School Club, of New York, on January 26, 1959, entitled "Management's Mission on the International Scene":

MANAGEMENT'S MISSION ON THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

(Remarks by T. S. Petersen, president, Standard Oil Co. of California, before the Harvard Business School Club, New York, N.Y., January 26, 1959)

Good evening, and thank you for asking me here tonight to address you members of the Harvard Business School Club, of New York.

This club has provided a forum for some of the most provocative comment uttered on the workings of American industry and finance. I count it a privilege to take part in your discussions.

I also take special pleasure this evening in congratulating you alumni on the 50th anniversary just observed by Harvard Business School. Businessmen everywhere in the world salute your school for its research, for its practical and philosophical contributions, and above all for its trained and able graduates.

Looking back for a moment, we find that almost fantastic changes have taken place in American economic life in the crowded 50 years since Harvard Business School opened its doors.

Fifty years ago, the Pacific coast was 5 days away from you here; it is now 5 hours away. California—if you will bear with the commercial—is on its way to becoming the largest of the 49—perhaps soon to be 50—States.

We are all of us aware that in this past half century, American business has broken regional bounds. It is no longer wholly profitable or efficient to restrict major business to limited geographical regions of the country. Production and distribution systems have been enlarged to enable managements to enter and develop, serve, and expand a nationwide market.

This coast-to-coast view of the American market is taken for granted by most industries—and by most of our citizens; although, to be sure, some lawmakers, and now and then attorneys in the Antitrust Division, express their distaste for the concept.

Indeed, American business, in a mighty surge of development mainly confined to the last quarter of a century, has become global. During this time many of the leadership functions once performed by 19th century British commerce have been assumed, in much altered relationships, by us. And so American management now has an international mission. I shall try to define it.

THE INTERNATIONAL MISSION IS THREEFOLD

Reduced to its simplest terms, as I see it, this international mission is threefold: First, we retain the basic mission and responsibility of any manager—to run successful businesses; to make money. That may seem like stating the obvious, but I want to be explicit so that there will be no doubt concerning my views on the significance of profit-making to progress. We could not accomplish any of the other useful objectives of our mission without first operating successful businesses.

Second, I believe our mission includes the responsibility and obligations to develop the natural resources of less developed free countries, for the joint purpose of assisting their economics, and to make their resources available for the continued economic progress and security of the United States and the rest of the free world. I cannot stress this point too much for, as I shall discuss later, the United States is dependent on foreign sources for many of its strategic raw materials. We are not totally self-sufficient.

And third, we have the mission of strengthening the economies of the Free World countries, in order to advance the development and military security of all free nations, ourselves included.

This part of the mission, I feel, also includes something of a moral responsibility for assisting the Free World's less developed areas to elevate their standards of living. I have in mind the kind of services performed in the Middle East by American oil companies, which have helped the governments there to build roads, hospitals and schools, and establish training and education programs for the people.

As you can readily see, the three parts of this mission are closely interrelated. Our pursuit of these objectives amount to enlightened self-interest. The strengthening of the U.S. economy and defense, the developing of free foreign economies, the making of a profit, all contribute to the mutually desirable objective of peace and prosperity for all. I am perhaps inviting personal criticism in linking the words "profit," "peace" and "prosperity" so closely, in view of the distaste with which the concept of profit is held in some quarters. But nevertheless I'll take that risk; I firmly believe we cannot have one without the other.

The mission that I speak of is one that we have had thrust upon us, whether we like it or not. Even if we wished to, we could not avoid taking part in it. Our Government vitally depends upon the contributions of American management for the realization of its peaceful policies. Without the understanding of management, without the exports of investment capital which management risks, without teh economic trail blazing that management carries on, I believe our Federal Government would be seriously handicapped in attempting to stabilize and hold together the free world bloc of nations.

THE FIELD OF CONFLICT IS INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

If anyone doubts this—if they would deny that American management has a key role to play in implementing the policies of our Government—let them listen to Nikita Khrushchev: "In the peaceful field of trade we will bury you," he told Western diplomats at a Kremlin reception. In other words, the field of conflict now between the Soviets and the democracies is international business; and management has been drafted to serve.

I welcome this challenge from Mr. Khrushchev: I am hopefully relieved that he has turned his attention to peaceful ways of making war on us. I also welcome this opportunity for a practical showdown between our two systems. The Kremlin proclaims to the world that a slave economy can outproduce a free economy. It promises that the Communist system can realize the hopes and aspirations of the people of less-developed countries in a shorter time than the system of private enterprise can.

Make no mistake, we have to do something more than merely toss our helmet on the field to win this contest. It is easy for us to believe and to tell ourselves that free men in the long run outproduce a slave economy. But we must demonstrate that fact to the one and a half billion people on this earth who still remain skeptical.

In getting on about this business of outdoing the Communists in the international economic arena, we unfortunately find ourselves starting out with a serious handicap. Maybe we don't have one hand tied behind us, exactly, but at least its use is restricted. I refer to the misunderstanding that exists concerning our mission abroad.

It seems decidedly obvious to me that the successful overseas ventures of American businessmen should be praised for their contribution to the economy and security of all the free world. Yet this is certainly not always the case—nor even most of the time.

Instead, what you hear are suspicious mutterings about the supposedly exorbitant profits these ventures bring, about how they threaten the livelihood of American workers, about how they enable corporations to evade just taxation. The average American is fed a great deal of antibusiness propaganda, none of it more distorted, I think, than this false propaganda about foreign profits.

I know something about this from painful experience. The business in which I am engaged, the American oil industry, has far more invested abroad—nearly $10 billion—than any other industry.[1] That's out of a total investment of $25 billion.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Our job is to discover, produce, and market oil for the use of the free world. I could dwell at length for example, upon how the Middle East has advanced to a new scale of economic and social life through the benefits accruing from development of its oil resources. This is not the place for that story, but the record will bear the most critical inspection. It is a splendid record, yet it has been maliciously distorted in some quarters.

The disturbing conviction settles upon the mind of anyone examining the record of American private investment abroad that many people, both in and out of Congress, are somehow blind to the great risks involved; the need for incentives to justify them; and the modest character, on the average, of the profits of overseas investments.

ANTIBUSINESS BIAS IS A HANDICAP TO THE FREE WORLD

These prejudices and distorted conceptions, often fostered by people with an antibusiness grudge or bias, are handicapping the United States and the free world in their competition with the Communist sphere.

We of business, it seems, must shoulder at least a significant share of the blame for this situation. We apparently haven't done enough to tell the citizens of this country what our foreign ventures have meant to the less-developed countries of the free world and to this country itself.

Before we can even begin to accomplish our mission then, it's apparent that we'll have to start explaining ourselves and what we're trying to do. Only through development of public understanding in this manner can we expect to get the kind of understanding in and out of government that we must have to do the job.

Backing off from the generalities, just how do we go about this? It is basically a communications problem and I believe business and industry must begin right now to carry this message to the public through the various media available. You and I, for our part, can contribute by telling this story to our friends, our business associates, anyone who will listen. Public opinion is, after all, only the sum total of what you and I think individually. If we, personally, convince enough individuals, and they in turn convince others, we can alter these distorted concepts now held about this management mission on the international scene.

That then is one of the broad approaches to accomplishment of our mission—the development of public awareness and support for our objectives. More understanding, however, will not accomplish the mission itself. And so I turn now to how I believe this important task should be approached.

There are, I think, two routes to follow. Neither is at all revolutionary; they are quite fundamental. First, I believe we must stimulate foreign investment by U.S. investors, to a considerably greater degree than now exists. Second, I firmly believe we must continue to reduce all the various barriers now restricting international trade.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT UNDERPINS OUR TOTAL EFFORT

Foreign investment, to consider that in detail first, emerges clearly as the underpinning of our total effort. A little over a year ago in San Francisco we had the rewarding experience of playing host to some 600 of the world's businessmen from 56 free countries. This was the International Industrial Development Conference, sponsored by Time-Life, Inc., and the Stanford Research Institute. No one who was present at that extraordinary meeting could fail to acquire a new appreciation of how great is the responsibility of American management on the international scene.

No banker in history, I suppose, has invented more public money in the less-developed parts of the world than Eugene Black, the president of the World Bank. Yet he reminded us at San Francisco that public investment sources, national and international, would not likely provide the steady growth of foreign investment that is needed.

There was general agreement in the conference roundtable discussion on this point: That the economic and political strength of the free world requires a strong partnership between private enterprise, Government and free labor—supported by science, technology, productivity, and the spirit of free people.

In discussions about the economic race with communism, you will frequently hear it said that the Government, both Congress and the executive branch, would like to be able to put primary reliance on private enterprise to win the race.

"The whole free world needs capital, and America is its largest source," said President Eisenhower in a message to Congress on foreign economic policy. "In that light, the flow of capital abroad from our country must be stimulated and in such a manner that it results in investment largely by individuals or private enterprises rather than by Government."

One of the President's specific proposals stemming from his conviction that the flow of capital abroad "must be stimulated" has been for legislation that would provide for a 14-point tax allowance. This means reducing United States taxes on corporation income from foreign sources to 38 percent, where on domestic income the rate is of course 52 percent.

OTHER PROPOSALS TO STIMULATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT

To that proposal I would add these others, which have been endorsed by our company:

1. All United States companies operating abroad, whether directly or through foreign-based subsidiaries, should be permitted to defer payment of United States taxes on foreign income until the earnings enter this country. As things now stand, a United States company operating directly in a foreign country must pay taxes on its income currently, while income earned through a foreign subsidiary is not taxable by the United States until the subsidiary pays a dividend to its parent.

This gives the foreign subsidiary a decided advantage, in that it may choose to reinvest all or part of its earnings tax free, rather than paying a dividend, while the United States company must pay taxes at home whether or not it reinvests.

I do not believe an American investor should have to resort to a foreign subsidiary to be competitive with foreign capital. If we continued to give domestic companies abroad the protection of our tax laws,[2] but at the same time permitted them to defer taxes on foreign income, it would serve as a powerful incentive to foreign investment. We would be putting our domestic companies on a far more competitive footing with their foreign competitors in a foreign jurisdiction.

2. The United States should allow a credit for taxes waived by a foreign country, where the purpose of the waiver is to stimulate business in the foreign country. Under our present tax structure the waiver in effect is absorbed by the United States and the incentive is eliminated.

3. Another area where remedial legislation is needed is in the section of the Internal Revenue Code (367) governing reorganization of foreign corporations. These corporations are presently severely limited in the moves they can make to reorganize or consolidate foreign holdings, because of the heavy taxes on liquidations or transfers of ownership that apply.

By contrast, wholly domestic companies are free to make such moves without incurring a tax liability. I feel therefore that if these same tax benefits were extended to foreign corporations, it would provide an important stimulus to further investment abroad.

It is gratifying to note that these proposals, as well as the 14-point reduction recommended by the President, have been incorporated in a bill submitted to the present Congress by Representative HALE BOGGS of Louisiana. This is H.R. 5, the proposed Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act; I believe it is most deserving of our support.

IMPORTANT TO KEEP INCENTIVES ALREADY ON THE BOOKS

I might stress, also, that it is vital to keep on the books those already existing tax provisions which are now helping importantly to stimulate foreign investment. These include the credit for taxes paid to a foreign country, percentage depletion for extractive industries, and the so-called Western Hemisphere trade corporation provision of the tax law. This is the provision which grants a 14-point tax reduction to U.S. corporations engaged in trade or business outside of the United States in the Western Hemisphere. It has served effectively to promote trade between the United States and other countries of this hemisphere; in fact, extending its provisions worldwide would have an extremely salutary effect on investment.

Foreign countries, of course, must likewise contribute to the encouragement of U.S. investment abroad. The waiver of taxes is one way to do this; in general they should adjust their tax rates to compensate for the risks that may be run by the foreign investor.

It is essential that they provide means for the repatriation of capital and profits without undue penalties in the form of currency restrictions; and they should provide safeguards assuring that control of the management will remain in the hands of the investors.

An obvious incentive to investment, too, is a demonstrably high standard of business ethics. Those countries which scrupulously adhere to their agreements with foreign investors, whether written out or tacitly understood, are most likely to attract the capital they need. Conversely, an investor, once burned by a country which fails to live up to its part of a bargain, will probably seek other climes.

Now, as I remarked earlier, there are two clearly marked routes to the accomplishment of management's international mission. One of these is through further stimulation of foreign investment, as I've attempted to point out, and the other is through freer trade, a subject which I would like to focus on now.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF FREE TRADE IS ESSENTIAL

The stimulation of freer trade fits very precisely and logically into the total fabric of our mission. There is nothing mysterious or particularly technical about it. Obviously our allies need access to our markets in order to encourage their economic growth and enhance their standards of living—and in the process strengthen the economic sinews of the free world as a whole. Perhaps less obviously, we need—and, it appears, are going to need more and more—their markets as an outlet for our own economic energies.

Here again we are confronted by often discouraging obstacles—obstacles which are as old as international trade itself. Just how do we go about establishing this mutual accessibility to each other's markets.

The answer involves thorny issues that have been, and will be, debated in the U.S. Congress, British Parliament, and in other legislative bodies for generations to come. But it is heartening to witness that a start

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

has been made. Our own Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which has provided a sort of "road back" from the depths of McKinley protectionism, is part of that start. While some of us, perhaps, might have wished for something more, the renewal of this act in the last Congress provided more than a little encouragement.

More recently, we Americans have been watching with varying degrees of anticipation and approval the steps being taken by the Western European countries toward freer trade. One cannot help but experience a feeling of gratification and new hope as a result of the currency exchange decisions taken by 10 Western European nations.[3]

Here were the leading trading nations of Western Europe asserting their confidence in their economic future by allowing external convertibility of their currency, or in other words permitting nonresident foreigns to convert into dollars and other money the currency which is earned in those countries.

This liberalizing of European currency exchanges should be helpful in enlarging purchases from the United States by European businessmen.

Best of all, these economic developments in Western Europe should have an instructive effect in this country. They should help to deflate the arguments of those who have been reluctant to see the United States lead the way toward freer world trade.

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET—AN ACT OF ECONOMIC STATESMANSHIP

The adoption of the European Common Market on January 1 was a rational and farsighted act of economic and political statesmanship.

The six[4] countries of the Common Market have a population almost equal to that of the United States, a gross national product of about $180 billion, and a potential capacity to absorb imports that may be even greater than the huge import capacity of the United States.

Those Europeans who have long been accustomed to walling themselves up behind barriers, in order to secure the imagined benefits of protection of national industries, are coming to the realization that these walls are the very obstacles that have stood in the way of economic advance.

It is possible that this realization will result in the working out of a free trade area among the nations surrounding the Common Market countries, so that we shall ultimately see a 17-nation[5] bloc concerting their trading arrangements.

The obstacles remaining to be overcome before this 17-nation economic union can be achieved are formidable ones. But it is encouraging that the nations involved have been making a very determined effort toward that end.

We were told at the International Industrial Development Conference at San Francisco that the 17 countries of Western Europe do set up such a free trade area, it will become possible for American business to establish a plant anywhere in the 17 countries and enjoy free trade over the whole market area, including parts of Africa.

And these markets are attractive ones. Consumer demand has been growing rapidly in Western Europe since that region's recovery from war dislocation was completed along about 1950. It is a familiar fact to you, I'm sure, that labor productivity has risen there at a higher annual rate than in the United States. Europeans have money to spend for cars, TV sets, radios, and refrigerators.

LIBERALIZATION OF TRADE BARRIERS MUST BE MUTUAL

All of this offers comforting prospects to American business, but it also poses something of a challenge. This liberalization of trade restrictions, it goes without saying, must inevitably be a mutual thing. If we expect to take advantage of Europe's increasingly enlightened outlook, we must prescribe for ourselves some proportion of the same remedy of tariff cuts.

Two basic facts of economic life dictate such a course. First, there is a new factor in the picture that works against the traditional American tendency toward overprotectionism. It is this: The United States, really for the first time in almost half a century since the start of World War I, is about to experience competition and rivalry from a single market area of comparable size to ours, and with a potential approaching ours. We shall find that to hold and develop foreign trade in the face of this European potential will require what Mr. Dulles has referred to in another context as "an agonizing reappraisal."

Remember, as I said at the outset, that our mission abroad includes the development of outlets for our own excess economic energies. We cannot open an advantageous access to Europe's markets for this purpose, unless, to some equitable degree, we reciprocate.

The second of the economic facts-of-life that obtain here has to do with one of the great delusions that has a baffling degree of acceptance in some quarters. This is the delusion of national self-sufficiency. The deadweight of tradition is difficult to throw off, but the fact is that in raw materials we have largely changed from a "have" to a "have-not" nation.

A half century has seen that transition. Where formerly we had relative self-sufficiency in raw materials, we have come to the point that ours is now the greatest importing Nation in the world. Our position has swung 180 degrees around the compass.

Consider some of these imports figures, from the latest international trade statistics compiled by the United Nations:

In 1957 our country's imports totaled about $13 billion, well ahead of the next largest importer, the United Kingdom. We imported $2.7 billion in raw materials, exclusive of fuels, second only to the United Kingdom.

We ranked first again in imports of fuels, lubricants, and related materials, with close to $1.6 billion; first in chemicals, with $390 million. We were well ahead in the nonferrous metals such as aluminum, lead, zinc, and tin—all highly strategic; and, exclusive of machinery and transport equipment, we are also first in imports of manufactured goods.

It has been estimated by Percy Bidwell, the noted economist, that between 35 and 40 percent of the free world's output of raw materials is consumed by U.S. manufacturing industries.

We must, in short, allow and encourage an increasing volume of imports, not merely as a lever to pry open foreign markets for our own products, but because we are deficient in many of the basic raw materials that are vital to our domestic economy.

NOT ALL PROTECTIONISM IS BLIND

Few people, certainly, would propose on the basis of these dual objectives that we totally lower all tariff barriers. A very real need continues to protect within reason certain of our essential industries against the possibility that we be cut off from foreign sources of the same product. Not all protectionism is blind or undesirable per se. We must safeguard such strategic industries as optics, precision instruments and others which, experiecne has demonstrated, often cannot withstand the rigors of competition from abroad.

But at the same time we must, in all realism, make provision for the importation of some commodities and finished products which are competitive with our own domestic output. The degree to which we can safely expose ourselves to this necessary competition from abroad is, obviously, not simple to determine. But we do have the means for such determination, in the machinery of the Reciprocal Trade Act.

As I have pointed out, this is not only desirable but essential in the case of raw materials. By 1975, according to the Paley Commission on raw materials resources, the United States is going to require double the output of goods and services that it had in 1950. The raw materials required for a doubled output of goods and services must largely come from abroad.

In passing, I might mention that oil provides a very immediate and practical example of the problem with which we're confronted. We need oil from abroad to supplement our domestic supplies; also, in our own self-interest it is essential that we maintain friendly relations with oil-producing countries in the Middle East, Far East, South America, and elsewhere, and this means buying some of their oil. At the same time, it is in our own self-interest to maintain a healthy domestic oil industry.

How to compromise this dilemma is a troublesome question. But compromise it we must, for a decision tending toward either extreme of the question can only be destructive of our Nation's best interests.

Such are some of the opportunities and some of the problems confronting management as it seeks to achieve its international mission.

THE CHALLENGE HAS BEEN ISSUED

If I may restate that mission for you, it is to develop foreign resources to the mutual benefit of the United States and the free world; to develop an understanding in the United States of these benefits; and to build an awareness in the United States of the necessity for give-and-take between our Nation and free foreign countries in order to promote mutual security.

Our Communist competitors have issued the challenge. The conflict for the time being—and we hope permanently—is to be in the peaceful realm of trade and commerce. But it is conflict nonetheless. We of the business community are, perforce, deeply involved. Foreign investment and international trade, as I see it, are the most effective weapons in this contest. No one is better equipped to deploy and use these weapons than American business management.

That then is our mission; and it is a vital and historic one.

We are told that we are not far from the day when the United States will put men into space. Upon the achievement of flight by man in space, we shall be tempted to consider that the greatest event in our lifetimes.

And yet I wonder if the supreme drama of the 20th century will truly be the orbiting of a space traveler? Is not the great event of our lifetimes already taking place? Isn't it the tremendous economic revolution going forward in every continent and in the less developed countries?

A whole generation of men and women is orbiting into a better life. Their ancient fate was to remain hopeless, doomed to hunger, privation, disease and early death. By the means entrusted to advanced industrial management, these men and women have been encouraged to turn their backs on that fate.

The spread of private American enterprise into the far parts of the world has helped to alter the terms of life for, literally, billions of people. To participate in the emergence and development of whole human societies of this sort is a wonderful and exciting privilege. The enlargement and expan-

Footnotes at end of speech.

sion of these world developments and potentialities is, I believe, the highest mission of America's economic freedom and strength.

[1] Source: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, September 1958.
[2] Specifically, operating loss carryovers, the right to deduct intangible development costs, and percentage depletion. These tax benefits are not available to a foreign-incorporated subsidiary.
[3] United Kingdom, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg.
[4] France, West Germany, Italy, Beligum, Netherlands, Luxembourg.
[5] The 10 mentioned in footnote on page 12, plus Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Iceland, Greece, Switzerland and Austria.

## Jefferson on Public Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from my hometown newspaper, the Owego (N.Y.) Gazette of February 25, 1959.

JEFFERSON ON PUBLIC DEBATE

Last week we published some words of guidance uttered by George Washington regarding public debt, Government living beyond its income and related subjects, which we believe to be especially timely in view of the present rate of tax boosts and rising Government expenditures.

The week before we published some of the thoughts of Abraham Lincoln on these same subjects, including the usurping of obligations of private citizens by Government through the medium of Federal assistance.

Today, we would like to present what our third President, Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic Party, had to say on the same subjects.

Let Jefferson speak to our hearts and minds and let us be wise and take heed. Here is what he said:

"I place economy among the most important virtues and public debts as the greatest dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt.

"The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying money, forbids it in the disposition of public money. We must endeavor to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principle of government.

"The multiplication of public offices, increase of expenses beyond income, growth of the public debt, all are indications soliciting the employment of the pruning knife.

"It is incumbent on every generation to pay its own debt as it goes."

About everyone will agree most heartily with Jefferson's philosophy, but no one ever does anything about it. And so we continue our merry but crazy policy of tax and spend, spend and tax. Only now, it's reached the point where we're spending even more than we tax.

## USDA Announces Development Program for National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, steps to provide more timber, water, recreation, wildlife, and other renewable resources from the Nation's increasingly valuable national forest system were proposed today by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

With special letters to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, Secretary Benson submitted a program to advance management and increase facilities of the national forests during the coming years to meet needs of a growing population and expanding economy.

The statement follows:

PROGRAM FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS: COMMUNICATION FROM THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, TRANSMITTING A REPORT RELATIVE TO A PROGRAM FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, D.C., March 23, 1959.*

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A report entitled "Program for the National Forests" is transmitted herewith for information of the Congress and appropriate reference.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message in February 1953 called attention to the vast importance to this Nation, now and in the future, of our soil and water, our forests and minerals, and our wildlife resources. He indicated the need for a strong Federal program in the field of resource development.

On July 31, 1953, the President supplemented that message by sending to the Congress a special message relative to a program designed to conserve and improve the Nation's natural resources.

In referring to the national forests administered by this Department and to other public lands, the President stated in that special message that the Federal Government has a responsibility to manage wisely those public lands and forests under its jurisdiction necessary in the interest of the public as a whole. Important values exist in these lands for forest and mineral products, grazing, fish, and wildlife, and for recreation. Moreover, it is imperative to the welfare of thousands of communities and millions of acres of irrigated land that such lands be managed to protect the water supply and water quality which comes from them. In their utilization of these lands, the people are entitled to expect that their timber, minerals, streams, and water supply, wildlife and recreational values should be safeguarded, improved, and made available not only for this but for future generations. At the same time public lands should be made available for their best use under conditions that promote stability for communities and individuals and encourage full development of the resources involved.

Accordingly, provisions for a marked increase in management activities on the national forests have been made in recent years. These Federal properties have been substantially improved. The flow of values stemming from them has markedly increased. Our management experience clearly dictated the need for still more intensive development and management.

As a result, in 1956 I asked the Forest Service to develop a long-range conservation program for national-forest resources. The first result of this request was a 5-year program, Operation Outdoors; the second is the enclosed "Program for the National Forests."

This conservation program embraces all the renewable resources of the national-forest system—water, timber, recreation, forage, and wildlife habitat. It includes both long-range objectives and interim proposals. The program provides for the continued, orderly use and development of the renewable resources of these Federal lands in accordance with the basic conservation principles of sustained yield and multiple use. What is done in the next 10 to 15 years will largely determine whether these vastly important public lands will contribute by the year 2000 their fair share to a greatly expanded national economy.

The national forests are widely scattered throughout the United States, occurring in all but 10 States and in Puerto Rico. They are of direct benefit to millions of people. From them are derived an impressive portion of the Nation's supply of meat, fiber, shelter, water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic purposes, hydroelectric power, feed for livestock and wildlife, and outdoor recreation.

These national forests belong to all American citizens. Their resources and services are available for use by everyone. In recent years the use of these lands has been increasing steadily. Demands are now such that a comprehensive program for the orderly growth of development and management activities is of demonstrated urgency. Our rapidly growing population and expanding economy indicate mounting and competitive pressures for national forest resources.

Legislative authorities for the recommended program are generally adequate. Supplemental legislation will be proposed as the need arises. Appropriation requests to implement the program will be submitted to the Congress in future years in connection with budget presentations after due consideration of the overall fiscal needs and resources of the Federal Government.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
*Secretary.*

PROGRAM FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS [1]

There are presented herein long-range objectives and a short-term conservation program for the national forests and associated lands. The long-range objectives are related to the year 2000 and the short-term program to what needs to be done in the next 10 to 15 years toward meeting current needs and attaining long-range objecives.

This program has been developed after much study. The Department of Agriculture has recently completed an exhaustive study of the U.S. timber situation entitled "Timber Resources for America's Future." Operation Outdoors is a 5-year recreation program for the national forests. Research needs are based in part on the findings of a departmental committee on research evaluation. The Forest Service has long maintained a project work inventory for the national for-

[1] Prepared by the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

ests. These and other studies are the background for the objectives and program herein developed.

The statutory authorities under which the national forests and associated lands are administered, and under which research is conducted, are generally adequate to permit carrying out the program subsequently outlined. Additional legislation which would be helpful in carrying out the program will be recommended as needed, particularly legislation to facilitate development of an adequate road system.

*The national forest system*

The national forests of the United States are invaluable national assets. These Federal properties, consisting of forest and rangelands and high mountain watersheds, occur in 39 States and Puerto Rico. There are 181 million acres of national forest land grouped into 148 national forests. Eighty-seven percent of national forest lands occurs in the West.

Of the land area of the continental United States, 1 acre out of every 12 is in national forest. In the West it is about 1 acre out of every 5. Every citizen owns a share of the national-forest system. It might be said that every man, woman, and child in the United States owns 1 acre of national-forest land.

The national forests consist largely of land reserved from the public domain by Presidential proclamation under the act of March 3, 1891. These lands have always been in Federal ownership. President Theodore Roosevelt proclaimed 148 million acres of public domain as forest reserves—far more than any other President. In 1905, the forest reserves were placed under the administration of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Forest Service was created to administer them. Later their name was changed to national forests to reflect a conservation policy of resource utilization rather than of preservation.

Most of the national-forest land in the East was purchased under the Weeks law of 1911, as amended in 1924, which authorized purchase of lands to protect the watersheds of navigable streams and for timber production.

Pursuant to the act of June 4, 1897, the 1911 act, and others, the national forests have been administered under the dual policies of sustained yield and multiple use of resources. Research has been conducted mainly under the act of May 22, 1928, as amended.

The national forests yield water, timber, forage, recreation, game and other wildlife, and minerals. Western agriculture and industry are dependent on water flowing from national-forest watersheds; hundreds of thousands of people earn their livelihood processing timber grown on national forests; millions of domestic livestock graze national-forest ranges; and many millions of people seek the national forests for rest, relaxation, and spiritual uplift. All of the renewable resources are to be utilized at a high sustained level of productivity and in harmonious relationship each with the other. This is the basic policy.

Most national-forest resources and services, such as recreation, wildlife habitat, waterflow, and scenery cannot be evaluated in monetary terms. There is no known way to measure the multiple intangible values and services of the national forests; but the timber, forage, and land alone are appraised at well over $7 billion.

The national forests are revenue-producing properties. Twenty-five percent of such revenues is distributed to counties in which national-forest lands are located in lieu of direct taxes. Current annual revenues are about $100 million and more than $1 billion has been received in total from the sale of national-forest goods and services. National-forest payments received by the counties, coupled with Federal expenditures for roads and fire control which States or counties would otherwise make, substantially exceed the taxes that the national forests would pay if subjected to ordinary assessment and levy.

In addition to the national forests, the Forest Service administers some 65 land-utilization projects totaling over 4.5 million acres in 27 States. These are largely forest and rangelands, submarginal for private ownership and acquired by the Federal Government during the 1930's for purposes of conservation and rehabilitation. The lands are administered under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, and with the same general sustained-yield and multiple-use objectives as the national forests.[2]

*National forests in a changing world*

Rapid change in the United States is everywhere evident. Highway construction, housing developments, and expanding urban areas are prevalent throughout the land. The two foremost economic indicators of these and other changes are population and gross national product.

In the 13 years since the end of World War II population in the United States has increased 32 percent. An estimate of 332 million persons by the end of the century is more than double the 1950 census. In the same half century, gross national product is expected to increase more than five times. Furthermore, in the West, where most national forests are located, population growth is even more phenomenal. The estimate for the 11 Western States is for a tripling of population in the last half of the 20th century.

Another indicator of special significance from the standpoint of recreational impact on the national forests is the increase in leisure time. The average individual today has about 50 percent more leisure time than in 1920. By the turn of the century an individual may have a third more leisure time than he has today.

The impact of this national growth upon the national forests already has been tremendous as evidenced by recent trends in use. The impact will be even greater in the future. No longer are the national forests the inaccessible and distant hinterlands they were when the system was first established. No longer can the Forest Service be primarily a custodian whose principal function is protection of national forests from fire. Barriers of time, distance, and inaccessibility have been fast fading, especially in the last two decades. The people have found the national forests; and their vast resources are in great demand. Management must become progressively more intense and more adequately supported by research findings if the national forests are to keep pace with economic needs and national growth.

The role of the national forests in the national economy, and especially in that of the Western States, cannot be discounted. Nearly half of all softwood sawtimber in the Nation and more than half the commercial forest land in the West is found in the national forests. About one-fourth of the timber cut in the West comes from the national forests.

Nearly one-fifth of the 11 Western States is national forest land and these lands, because of their mountainous character and generally high elevation, receive one-third of the precipitation and furnish over half the streamflow. Western national forests are major sources of water for 1,800 towns and cities including such major metropolitan areas as Salt Lake City, Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Phoenix. Over 600 hydroelectrical developments depend on the national forests for water.

Irrigation accounts for one-half of the Nation's consumption of fresh water. By 1975 daily use of water is expected to nearly double, an increase which would be equivalent to the daily flow of over 13 Colorado rivers. Inevitably, western national forests will continue their indispensable role as regulators of the kind and amount of fresh water available to western people.

Similarly in recreation the national forests are of increasing importance because of more leisure time, greater mobility of the average family, increased accessibility of the national forests, and the relatively low cost of a national forest vacation.

In the West, despite downward adjustments in the numbers of permitted livestock, over one-fifth of the sheep and one-eighth of the cattle graze national forest ranges. Over one-third of all big game in the Nation is found on the national forests along with 81,000 miles of fishing streams and over 2 million acres of natural lakes and impounded waters.

*National forest progress since 1953*

In his first state of the Union message on February 2, 1953, the President called attention to the vast importance to this Nation now and in the future of the soil and water, the forests and minerals, and the wildlife resources. It was recognized that the Federal responsibility in the field of resource development called for a strong program.

Since that time, substantial and gratifying progress has been made, both financially and physically, in the development and management of the national forests and associated lands.[3] Some of the outstanding achievements that have been accomplished since 1953 should be mentioned.

In timber resource management, the funds available for sales administration and management have risen from $5.9 million in fiscal year 1953 to $13.5 million in fiscal year 1959, and those for reforestation and stand improvement have risen from $1.2 million to $3 million. In 1953, 5.2 billion board-feet of timber with a stumpage value of $70.6 million were cut. After reaching a previous peak in 1957, 8 billion board-feet with a stumpage value of more than $100 million are expected to be cut in 1959. At the same time, the number of timber sales rose from 24,300 to an estimated 36,000 in 1959. In 1953, the area planted or seeded to trees was 51,200 acres. Almost double that amount is now being planted annually. Timber stand improvement work was done on 387,300 acres in 1953. Today this work is being carried out on approximately 800,000 acres annually.

In 1953, the sum of $2.4 million was available for range resource management: $1 million being for range management, $763,000 for range revegetation, and $658,000 for range improvements. In fiscal year 1959, the sum of $4.8 million is available, $1.7 million being for range management, $1.5 million for range revegetation, and $1.6 million for range improvements. During this period, reanalyses and revised range management plans were completed on 2,150 or nearly one-fourth of the 8,790 range allotments. The rate of range reseeding has practically doubled the 53,600 acres reseeded in 1953. During the period 1953 through 1958 nearly a half-million acres have been reseeded. During the period 1953 to 1958 inclusive, about 1,600 range water developments have been constructed. Annual rate of construction is double what it was in 1953.

[2] The statistics used in this report relate only to the national forests unless otherwise specified; but the objectives and program presented apply to both the national forests and associated land-utilization projects.

[3] Hereinafter referred to as the national-forest system.

The Federal financing of the construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance of recreational developments has increased from $3.1 million in fiscal year 1953 to almost $10 million for fiscal year 1959 and the amounts for wildlife habitat management increased from $223,000 to $805,000. During this same period, the recreation visits rose from 35.4 million in 1953 to 68.5 million in 1958, one-fourth of these being visits from hunters and fishermen. The number of developed campground and picnic sites in 1953 was approximately 4,600, containing 41,100 family units. Most of these were constructed in the mid 1930's and were badly in need of rehabilitation. Although the work of rehabilitating these areas had begun a few years earlier, the program for the recreational development of the national forests called "Operation Outdoors," was prepared and initiated in 1957. As a result, good headway has already been made in the rehabilitation of the developed campground and picnic sites and some new sites have been developed. There are now 5,100 developed campground and picnic sites containing 46,700 family units.

For soil and water management the sum of $137,000 was available in 1953. This has been increased to $1.4 million in fiscal year 1959. The number of national forest watershed rehabilitation projects increased from 12 in 1953 to 145 in 1958. This work is done specifically to improve and protect watersheds, lessen flood damage, or restore damaged and eroding lands, over and above that normally being done in connection with other national-forest activities.

In fiscal year 1953, there were $22 million of Federal funds available for the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails. The amount for fiscal year 1959 for this purpose is $35.4 million. In 1953, there were constructed with Federal funds 728 miles of forest development roads. In the 1953 through 1958 period, 5,289 miles have been constructed and it is estimated that 1,062 miles will be constructed in fiscal year 1959. In addition, purchasers of national-forest timber during the period 1953 through 1958, constructed 12,570 miles of forest development roads, with allowances therefor in timber appraisals.

One of the most troublesome problems was the need for housing, particularly to provide suitable housing for field personnel. In 1953, the amount available for structural improvements for fire and general purposes was $3.1 million, practically all of which was for maintenance. This has more than trebled and for fiscal year 1959, the amount is $10.6 million. Since 1953, there have been constructed 602 dwellings and related improvements, 769 service buildings, and 139 lookout structures.

In 1953, the total receipts from the sale of timber and from the use of the range and other surface resources was $76 million. It is anticipated that these receipts for fiscal year 1959 will be about $110 million. With these anticipated receipts for 1959, almost $600 million will have been received by the Federal Government since the close of 1953. This is almost 60 percent of the first billion dollars of national-forest receipts reached on November 21, 1958, after the national forests were placed under the administration of the Secretary of Agriculture in 1905. Twenty-five percent of these revenues were distributed for the benefit of schools and roads in the counties.

Federal financing of research bearing on national-forest problems in 1953 was $6.2 million. In 1959, it was $16.5 million, including $2.5 million for construction of research facilities. Any precise allocation of the benefits of forestry research to the support of management and development of the national-forest system is difficult. Generally, research projects benefit anyone who protects and manages forest resources regardless of landownership. Thus it serves private as well as public forestry. During this period, forestry research has made substantial and significant contributions to the development, management, and protection of the national-forest system. These include, to name only three, (a) development of a new aerial forest fire control method, with the result that in 1958 more than 1.4 million gallons of chemical fire retardant were dropped on 320 fires in the national forests with a high degree of success; (b) a new technique for fumigating tree nursery soils was perfected in 1957, increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of seedling production; and (c) a patch-type of cutting for lodgepole pine timber was developed for high, mountainous national-forest areas of the Rocky Mountains which increases late spring water yield by 25 to 30 percent because of its influence on snow accumulation and rate of melt.

There have been many other major conservation accomplishments in the management of the national-forest system. New or revised policies have been adopted since 1953 in order that the management of the national forests would be more responsive to the needs of the users. As a result of cooperative effort with both the forest and mining industries, authority was enacted in 1955 and procedures developed to provide for the multiple use of the mineral and surface resources. In 1958, "Timber Resources for America's Future," the most comprehensive study of the timber resources of the Nation, was published and as a result the timber goals for the national forests have been raised substantially. Changes have been made in national-forest grazing policies to give permittees increased stability in the utilization of the grazing resources. The number of public advisory committees at State, regional, and local levels, advisory to the Forest Service on activities covered by this program, has been increased to 170.

The national forests are clearly national in significance because of their impact on our people in both their work and their play. Wood and livestock products from the national forests enter into the commerce of every State; waters flowing from the national forests cross State boundaries; and the millions who hunt, fish, camp, picnic, and ski on the national forests come from every State and every walk of life.

The national forests are federally owned and their multiple-use management to produce a sustained yield of services and products is a Federal responsibility. Despite the splendid progress that has been made since 1953, these properties with their current assets and enormous potential must be responsive to national needs. In addition, there are opportunities for development primarily of localized significance in collaboration with non-Federal groups, both public and private.

Past trends, present use, and future expectations indicate clearly the need for a planned program of development and use supported by essential research. Resource development is a long-time proposition. What is done in the next 10 to 15 years will largely determine the heritage that our children and their children will receive from the national-forest system.

*A national-forest conservation program*

The program presented herein is geared to meeting the needs of this short-term period and to preparing the national-forest system to contribute its fair share to the national well-being at the end of the century.

The program is described in terms of both long-range resource objectives to be accomplished by the year 2000, and the specific work which will need to be done in the short-term period to attain these objectives. The program will be carried out as rapidly as possible within the overall budgetary requirements and financial resources of the Federal Government.

Resource Development and Management

The basic renewable natural resources of the national-forest system upon which the Nation will rely to an increasing extent in the years to come are the timber, water, range, and the recreation and wildlife habitat resources. Their intensive development and management is truly a conservation program of great significance to the continued development, prosperity, and welfare of the Nation.

Timber Resources

The long-range timber goal for the national-forest system is an annual harvest on a sustained-yield basis of 21.1 billion board feet of sawtimber by the year 2000. This goal is about 3 times the 1957 timber cut. Total sawtimber growth estimated to be needed in the year 2000 to meet national demands is 105.4 billion board feet. The national-forest goal is that portion of the national need which the national forests could reasonably be expected to produce under intensified management.

The objective is to reach this goal by: (a) Intensifying the management of existing stands, including measures to assure stand improvement and regeneration; (b) growing more and better trees on the lands that are not producing their full capacity today; (c) reducing losses from disease, insects, and fire; and (d) improving utilization. The short-term program steps to further items (c) and (d) are covered later under the headings "Protection and Research."

The program proposals for the short-term period are:

1. Harvesting will be increased toward the goal of full sustained-yield cut on all working circles so that annual cut will reach 11 billion board feet.

2. Harvesting will be developed in a manner that will, to the extent possible: (a) Accelerate cutting of stagnant stands, release advance reproduction by removing overstory of old growth, and increase the salvage of dead, dying, and diseased trees; and (b) encourage reasonable distribution of sales among small, medium, and larger operators.

3. Develop and apply on sale areas higher standards of regeneration, hazard reduction, salvage, and erosion control.

4. Up-to-date inventories will be obtained for all commercial forest lands and timber management plans will be completed for all working circles. When completed, they will be maintained by periodic reinventories and revisions.

5. Approximately three-fourths of the 4.4 million acres of nonstocked and poorly stocked plantable lands will be seeded or planted.

6. The productive condition of over 11 million of the 30 million acres of less than saw-log-size stands will be substantially improved by plantation care, pruning, weeding, thinning, release cutting, reinforcement planting of lightly stocked areas, and planting new burns in these stands.

Water Resources

In continuing their role as regulator of waterflows, national forest watershed will continue to be managed in accord with two principal long-range objectives: (a) Protection of the watershed by stabilizing the soil and thereby preserving and improving water quality; and (b) management of the area to increase the quantity of water.

Protection of the watershed and water quality will continue to be a primary objective. Quantity of water yielded will receive major consideration in the multiple-use management of national forests.

To accomplish these objectives, an accelerated program of watershed management, rehabilitation, and protection will need to be

carried out, including the application of new methods and practices as they are developed and proved.

Program proposals for the short-term period include:

1. More intensive management activities to assure full protection of the hydrologic condition of watersheds in the management and use of other resources. Management plans for other resources that involve manipulation of plant cover will adequately consider watershed management needs.

2. Reasonable protection to, and minimizing damage from the greatly increasing number of water development projects in and adjacent to the national-forest system.

3. Preparing and maintaining watershed management plans for areas which are the sole or major source of municipal water supplies.

4. Initiating field inventories of water supplies and yield with comparative data as to effects on water yield and quality of range, timber, and other uses and management practices.

5. Complete soil surveys on about 33 million acres, or 22 percent of the total area in need of survey.

6. Watershed rehabilitation measures to stabilize gullies and channels, control sheet erosion, stabilize dunes and earth slides, control erosion on roads and trails, and accomplish water spreading will be done in varying degrees ranging from one-tenth to one-third of the total work needed. Work scheduled includes 10,000 miles of gully and channel stabilization; 1.3 million acres of sheet erosion control; 20,000 acres of dune and blowout stabilization; erosion control on 14,000 miles of substandard roads and trails; 5,600 acres of water spreading; 535 structures for flood prevention; and 170 stream pollution control projects.

Range Resources

The development and management of the 68 million acres of rangeland in the national-forest system has two major long-range objectives:

(a) Proper stocking and improvement of the range resource to achieve desirable watershed conditions and sustained high-level production of forage. Over many years the Forest Service has attempted to bring livestock numbers into balance with available forage. This is being done by building up forage production through reseeding, other range-improvement measures, and better management. Where this is not sufficient, necessary adjustments to grazing capacity have been made in either numbers of permitted livestock or season of use.

(b) Making lands suitable for livestock grazing available for use under conditions that promote stability for communities and individuals, and encourage full development of the range resource with due regard to other resources and uses.

These policies can be furthered by intensifying management of all range allotments; obtaining and maintaining desirable forage to high capacity; constructing, rehabilitating, and maintaining range improvements needed to attain intensive management on all ranges; and making adjustments in numbers of livestock or seasons of use when necessary.

In order to make substantial progress toward the long-range objectives, the short-term program proposals are:

1. Complete and thereafter keep current range analyses and management plans on all range allotments.

2. Where stocking adjustments are necessary to balance utilization and available forage, these will be carried out as rapidly as practicable bearing in mind the needs of the range and other factors.

3. Separation of cattle and sheep grazing on common use areas, and substantial reduction of livestock trespass.

4. Properly cordinate all range use with other resource use.

5. Revegetation and control of noxious or poisonous range plants and farm weeds will be undertaken on about 4.4 million acres of rangelands needing one or both treatments.

6. Reconstruction or rehabilitation of presently deteriorated range improvements will be completed; other improvements will be maintained.

7. Construct 18,000 miles of fences and 9,500 water developments to initiate programs of intensive range management for control of livestock and more efficient use of forage.

Recreation and Wildlife Habitat Resources

As previously described, the growth and development of the Nation already has had a terrific impact on the national forests in increased use of the recreation and wildlife habitat resources. It is estimated that these uses will rise from the 68.5 million recreation visits of 1958 to 130 million visits by 1969, with a continued rapid annual increase to a possible 600 million visits by the year 2000. This expected increase to nearly double the present use by 1969 and about nine times the present use by the year 2000 is far in excess of the expected rate of increase in population.

The long-range objective is that: (a) National-forest recreation resources will be so developed and managed that the kind, quality, and quantity of their development and maintenance will be sufficient to keep abreast of this tremendously increased demand; and (b) the wildlife habitat will yield a fish and game population adequate to meet the equally tremendous increase in sportsmen use.

The program proposals for the short-term period are:

1. Complete part 1 of Operation Outdoors, which is a 5-year program initiated in 1957 to reconstruct and rehabilitate the then-existing recreation facilities consisting of 4,700 campgrounds and picnic sites containing 42,400 family units, construct additional facilities, and adequately maintain and service these facilities to meet the existing and predicted situation.

2. Complete inventory and evaluation of recreation and wildlife habitat resources. This will be done partly in cooperation with the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and with respect to wildlife habitat resources, in cooperation with the States.

3. Revise and complete recreation management plans for all administrative units and thereafter keep them current.

4. Prepare and execute development plans on 10,000 new campground and picnic sites containing 102,000 family units.

5. Repair and reconstruct dams and spillways as necessary in order to place them in a safe condition for recreational use.

6. Provide adequate sanitation, cleanup, safe water, fire prevention, and public safety at all developed recreation sites and in heavily used unimproved areas.

7. Protect and manage wilderness-type, roadside, and other special areas.

8. Review at least 30 of the remaining 41 primitive areas as to their wilderness characteristics and reclassify them accordingly.

9. Revise and complete wildlife habitat management plans for all administrative units, assuring proper coordination between uses of wildlife habitat resources and other resources.

10. Participate in planning, inspection, and control phases of all habitat improvement projects conducted on lands of the national-forest system by States and by other Federal agencies to insure that the projects will benefit wildlife and be in harmony with other resource values.

11. Improve food and cover on 1.5 million acres of key wildlife areas.

12. Develop wildlife openings, food patches, and game walkways in dense vegetation by clearing or controlled burning on about a half million acres.

13. Improve 7,000 miles of the 81,000 miles of fishing streams and 56,000 acres of lakes by stabilizing banks, planting streamside cover, and constructing channel improvements.

*Protection*

The total adverse impact of disease, insects, fire, weather, destructive animals, and other forces on the uses and values of forest resources is not generally recognized. They kill and destroy, retard or prevent reproduction and growth, impair and damage values, and disrupt uses.

The total growth impact on sawtimber from destructive agencies in the continental United States and coastal Alaska in 1952 was estimated to be equal to 92 percent of the net sawtimber growth. Cause of the impact on sawtimber growth was distributed 45 percent to disease, 20 percent to insects, 17 percent to fire, and 18 percent to all others.

These destructive forces also have a seriously adverse effect upon the watersheds and their life-supporting waterflows, and upon the other renewable forest resources.

The long-range objective is to hold the damage from destructive agencies below the level which would seriously interfere with intensive management of the national-forest system under principles of multiple use and high-level sustained yield of products and services. This can be accomplished substantially by a continued trend toward better facilities and techniques for fire control and more resources to cope with critical fire periods, and a more intensive application of a program of prevention, detection, and control of insect and disease infestations. In addition to direct protection measures, more intensive management of timber resources will result in reduction of losses from insects and disease.

Protection From Insects and Disease

In the short-term period, it is proposed that insect and disease control on the national-forest system be stepped up to a level of prevention, detection, and control of insect and disease infestations that will substantially reduce the occurrence of large infestations toward the end of the initial period. This will require about a 50-percent increase over the present level of protection. The work will consist of:

1. Intensification of present activities through (a) quicker, more extensive, and more thorough surveys to detect incipient outbreaks; (b) more reliable evaluation of the potential of initial outbreaks to cause widespread damage; (c) quicker and more effective control action in the initial stages to prevent a large-scale epidemic. The initial suppression activities would cover about twice the acreage currently being treated.

2. Continuation of present blister rust control work plus extension of control to 250,000 acres not now protected but which should be managed for white pine production. The objective is to achieve sufficient effectiveness of control on all of the area now under treatment plus the additional acres so that after the initial period only maintenance control will be needed.

3. Initiating a program to control dwarf-mistletoe on several hundred thousand acres of selected better stands of young softwood sawtimber on better growing sites.

4. Coordination of timber harvesting with pest control objectives in order to reduce the loss from high-risk old-growth trees and to reduce the possibility of old-growth stands serving as a focal point of infection.

Protection From Fire

It is proposed that by the end of the initial period all commercial timberlands, all critical watersheds, and other lands in the national-forest system developed or proposed

for intensive use will be given protection from fire adequate to meet the fire situation in worst years and under serious peak loads. This will include 125 million acres compared to 23 million acres now receiving such protection. An additional 15 million acres will be given a lesser degree of protection but adequate to meet the average fire situation.

Meeting these levels of protection from fire calls for:

1. Expansion, modernization, and development of fire control to a proficiency and strength of force which will prevent as many fires as possible and suppress fires before they spread beyond permitted standards. This is to be accomplished by nearly doubling the present level of preventive effort, detection, skilled firefighting crews, training, supervision, and equipment.

2. Development and use of new and modern techniques for prevention, for suppression of fires while small, and for stopping large fires while running and burning intensely.

3. Reduction of hazardous fuel conditions to minimize the chances of large fires developing and spreading to high-value areas. This work will cover the most serious one-fourth of all land needing such treatment, and will consist of burning 300,000 acres of highly hazardous debris concentration, felling snags on 320,000 acres of high lightning-occurrence areas, prescribed burning on 3.5 million acres, removing roadside fuel on 37,000 acres, and clearing and maintaining 12,000 miles of firebreaks.

Protection From Other Damage

Rodent control work for the short-term period will be aimed at control of the most serious infestations of harmful rodents, such as porcupines and mice, on high-value areas of forage and commercial timberlands. These areas comprise about half of the total area of rodent infestation on the national forests. Approximately 1.8 million acres of rangelands and 9.4 million acres of timberlands would be treated in this period. Control would be limited to those rodents for which economical means of control are known.

*Roads and trails*

The road and trail system which serves the national forest lands is a complex of highways and access roads and trails under various ownerships and jurisdictions. This transportation system is vital to the multiple use of all the resources of the national forest system.

For administrative purposes, the road and trail facilities are grouped into a forest highway system and a forest development road and trail system. All these facilities benefit the national forests. There are now 24,400 miles of forest highways; 149,700 miles of forest development roads, and 112,200 miles of trails. When fully installed, there will be about 70,000 miles of forest highways; 542,000 miles of access roads, and the trail network will be reduced to about 80,000 miles.

The forest highway program is administered by the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce. The forest highways are therefore not included in the program herein outlined.

An adequate system of roads and trails is essential to proper management of forest lands. The presence or lack of access roads has a direct and controlling influence on many phases of forest management, such as the volume of timber that can be marketed; the size, duration, and distribution of sales within working circles; the level of salvage cutting; protection of national-forest resources from fire, insects, and disease; and recreational and forage use.

Financial losses occur every year to the Federal Government through inability to market mature timber now inaccessible but in need of harvesting, and to promptly and completely salvage losses resulting from fire, windstorms, insects, and diseases. As the road and trail system is expanded the revenue to the Government increases, primarily through expanded timber sales. Timber access roads for the national-forest system are investments which will pay for their own way over a period of years.

The long-range objective is to have and maintain a system of roads and trails to service the national forests adequately at the levels needed to meet expected demands. Such a system will not only make that possible, but will at the same time enhance the value of the timber and other resources being utilized.

Construction of about 392,600 miles of new roads and 6,000 miles of new trails will ultimately be needed, along with reconstruction of about 112,600 miles of roads and 11,300 miles of trails. Also about 41,400 miles of existing trails will be replaced by construction of new roads.

In the short-term period the program proposals are:

1. Complete construction and reconstruction of about 90,000 miles of access roads and 8,000 miles of trails. This constitutes about 19 percent of roads and trails included in the long-range objectives. Approximately half of the value of the work on timber access roads planned for this period will be constructed by national-forest timber purchasers, but paid for by the Government through adjustment of stumpage prices.

2. Provide maintenance to full standards on the 261,900 miles of existing development roads and trails and on 58,600 miles of new construction.

*Land adjustment and uses*

Effective management of the national-forest system requires reasonable consolidation of ownership where there are intermixed public and private lands. Accomplishment of these ownership adjustments will contribute much toward meeting resource demands by the year 2000 and will be largely accomplished by that time.

In the initial period, national-forest boundary and ownership classification studies will be completed for all national-forest lands as the basis for landownership adjustment. Such adjustments will be brought about mainly by exchanging on a land-for-land basis approximately 1.4 million acres of scattered or checkerboard national-forest parcels for other lands needed to consolidate the national-forest land pattern. This will (a) enable national-forest boundaries to be modified to exclude about 11 million acres of private and State land from within national-forest boundaries; and (b) materially reduce the checkerboard pattern of ownership. Special attention will be given to completion of consolidation of national-forest ownership in the boundary waters canoe area and in certain key watersheds of the Cache National Forest in Utah. In addition, about 217,000 acres of land utilization project lands will be exchanged in the initial period to promote more effective management of such projects. Thereafter there will be a continuing program in the national forests and related areas to adjust ownership problems and further consolidate these public properties.

There must also be accomplished in the short-term period: (a) Development of an improved and more adequate land status record system with provision for continuous maintenance; and (b) establishment and marking of public property corners and the surveying and posting of over 100,000 miles of property lines between national-forest and other lands which now are inadequately located and marked.

The uses of national-forest lands for many special purposes, including the extraction of mineral resources, will continue to increase at a rapid rate. The supervision of these uses will need to keep pace in order that such uses can be properly correlated into multiple-use management of the national-forest system, and to prevent unauthorized use. The program for the determination of surface rights which has been underway since the approval of the act of July 23, 1955, will be completed.

*Administrative structures and equipment*

To facilitate the resource management and development work, construction and maintenance of administrative and fire-control improvements will need to be provided at an increased rate in the short-term period. This will consist of completing the present backlog of housing needs for field officers and of administrative and fire improvements, and the construction of additional housing and improvements. New construction needs include 2,730 dwellings and related improvements, 2,710 service buildings, and 530 lookout structures. Completion of the communications system needed for protection and management of the national forests will require 2,000 additional radios and replacement of 9,000 radios and 3,000 miles of telephone lines. The increasing use of aircraft as an efficient and economical means of transportation for protection and management of wild lands will require an additional 25 landing fields and reconstruction of 37 existing fields.

*Research*

Forestry and allied research is needed to keep the national forests and the utilization of their resources moving ahead on an efficient, effective, and economical basis to play their proper role in the progress and development of the Nation. Resource managers and administrators need answers to their everyday problems. Resource development, management, protection, and utilization have an additional need, and organized research has an additional objective to achieve significant breakthroughs that will show the way to new methods and new horizons in the management of timber, soil and water, forage, wildlife habitat, and recreation resources. The short-term research program is needed to yield both quick results of applicability during the initial period, and information of value in attaining long-range objectives.

The research proposals for the initial period embrace work that should yield information of wide application of high value. These proposals include—

1. Accelerated research in forest genetics to produce trees superior to present ones—in growth rate, wood quality, resistance to insects and diseases, and other special qualities—for use in the needed planting programs on national forests.

2. Development of new cultural practices to increase the production of high-quality seed through establishment and management of seed orchards; better methods of harvesting, storing, and processing of seed; and more efficient planting practices, including direct seeding with aircraft.

3. Better implementation of the national-forest pest control program by developing a broader knowledge of the life histories of damaging insects and diseases and of new methods for controlling them through use of diseases and predators of the pests themselves, as well as through improved selective chemicals for use in direct control action.

4. Better implementation of the national-forest fire control program by developing a better understanding of fire behavior and new techniques and equipment needed to eliminate the runaway fires now responsible for 90 percent of fire losses in the national-forest system.

5. Development of new and improved practices required to facilitate good watershed

management so vitally important to the management of national-forest timber and range resources. This will include studies of water yields, both quality and quantity, and management of snowpacks at high elevations and soil stabilization.

6. Design and evaluation of new and improved equipment for logging without damage to watershed values—as by an overhead cable system in order to extend harvesting operations into steep mountainous slopes not now operable by ground skidding methods; and equipment to increase the efficiency of woods utilization of forest products.

7. Improvement of volume and yield tables, rotation age data, and other information for regulating timber growing-stock levels for use in the national-forest timber-management plans.

8. Development of silvicultural bases to guide timber harvesting and regeneration practices in new forest types and areas, particularly in Alaska and the more remote areas of the western national forests to be newly reached in sustained yield operations.

9. Continuing investigations of the physical and chemical properties of wood and of processing methods to increase the efficiency of forest products utilization from national-forest timber sale areas.

10. Development of new uses for the large volume of low-quality timber, for logging and milling residues, and for thinnings in order to broaden the utilization and market base, and to facilitate timber sales and sustained yield management.

11. Development of log and tree grades and other information needed in the marketing of national-forest timber.

12. Development of improved livestock grazing management practices on the national forests to increase forage yields and to protect watershed values.

13. Develop methods of improving national-forest wildlife habitat through modified timber and range management practices, as well as through development of special measures such as propagation of browse and other game foods.

14. Determination of the needs and preferences of recreational uses of the national forests, and of the carrying capacities of campgrounds and other recreational areas in order to guide the development and management of the recreational resources.

15. Provision for laboratories, greenhouses, and other facilities, including modern scientific equipment, required to adequately implement the research program. This will consist of expansions through new construction and betterment of existing facilities. The needs include 17 specialized laboratories and related greenhouse and service facilities for the basic research on forest insects and diseases, tree genetics and physiology, forest soils and hydrology, forest fires, and forest products, and for development of new equipment for firefighting and for harvesting timber; 5 office-laboratory buildings at regional headquarters of forest and range experiment stations; 25 office-laboratories at centers of field research, and minor structures, fencing, stream gages, and other research installations that will be required on about 100 experimental forests and ranges.

*Program benefits*

Under the proposed program, management and utilization of national-forest resources will keep pace with population growth and national economic development and needs.

Many of the benefits from the program for the short-term period will carry over or will be delayed until after the end of the period. Investments in such measures as roadbuilding, tree planting, range reseeding, water conservation, research, recreation, and other improvements proposed in the initial period are geared not only to short-term needs, but also to the longer-range objectives of meeting expected demands on the national forests during the remainder of the century.

Benefits include direct financial revenues, secondary benefits, and intangible values.

Direct financial revenues from the national-forest system will rise to about $210 million annually by the time the short-term conservation program is completed, or double current receipts. Over 90 percent of such revenues will continue to come from the sale of standing timber. By the year 2000 national-forest timber sales should reach 21 billion board-feet of sawtimber worth $350 million at 1958 prices.

Payments from national-forest revenues for county schools and roads will increase correspondingly. These increased payments to counties coupled with increased national-forest expenditures for roads and fire control, will exceed the taxes that the national-forest system would pay, if subject to local taxation, by an even greater margin at the end of the initial period than at the present time.

The capital value of the timber, forage, and lands of the national-forest system will have increased by about a billion dollars as a result of the short-term conservation program.

In addition to direct financial income to the United States as a result of the national-forest conservation program, there will be both substantial secondary benefits and very real intangible benefits.

Secondary benefits include such things as numbers of people employed in the harvesting of national-forest timber and other products and the value added to those products by manufacture, distribution, and marketing.

In timber alone, it is estimated that for every dollar of national-forest stumpage sold the end products wil be worth $20 by the time they reach the ultimate consumer. This means that the annual sale of 11 billion board-feet of sawtimber expected to be reached by the end of the short-term period will have a total consumer value of $3.7 billion.

Furthermore, some 620,000 people will derive their livelihood from the harvesting, processing, hauling, and merchandising of national-forest timber and the products made therefrom. This wil be an increase of 60 percent over the current level.

Similarly, the value of meat, hides, wool, and other livestock products increases with reprocessing and handling as do the numbers of dependent people.

It is estimated that reactional use of the national-forest system will reach 130 million visits by 1969, in contrast to the 68.5 million visits in 1958, and a probable 600 million by 2000. The recreationists making these 130 million visits will put into trade channels a total of nearly a billion dollars for sporting equipment, transportation, licenses, lodging, and other items.

Most of the truly intangible values of the national forests are experienced by those millions of people who use the national forests for reasons other than commercial utilization of resources. No measure of value expresses the worth of the relaxation, pleasure, rest, spiritual satisfaction and improvement in health derived from the national forests.

No realistic dollar value can be placed on water from the national forests. Water is already the most precious commodity in the West and over half of all waterflow in the West originates on the national forests. These lands will continue indefinitely to be indispensable regulators of the kind and amount of fresh water available to western people. The national-forest conservation program will improve soil stabilization, result in more regular streamflow, and enhance water quality. It will foster infiltration of water in underground storage. These results will lessen the need for construction of surface reservoirs, settling basins, and other water construction works.

Nor can there be any complete assessment in dollars of the lives saved, damage prevented, and resources preserved by improved accessibility, suppression of insect and disease epidemics, fires prevented or controlled when small, and reduction and prevention of floods. All of these are benefits of the conservation program proposed for the national forests.

Substantial progress has been made. The foundation for progress is in place. This program builds on that foundation. The result will be full development of these extensive and valuable public properties.

## If You Want the Services, Someone Has To Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, while all of us in this Chamber are wrestling with problems of the Federal budget, I believe attention should be called to an editorial appearing in today's issue of the Baltimore Sun.

This editorial points up the sensible Republican approach to budgetary problems in my State of New York. We often hear that the public is demanding the additional services and programs we are asked to enact. This demand may or may not be factual, but assuming for the moment that it exists, then the bill has to be paid by someone and the municipalities, other governmental units, and individuals who seek benefits of some sort from the Federal Government should be made to realize this simple fact.

In New York State, the fact is being brought home rather dramatically that because of the continuance of programs during the past administration in Albany without a commensurate tax increase to cover additional cost, the State of New York was faced with prospects similar to those now plaguing the State of Michigan. Therefore, on the theory that the people want the additional services and are willing to pay for them, the New York State budget will be balanced this year.

If the day comes when the individual taxpayer believes that their heavy taxes are too great a cost for the services he receives, presumably this demand will be changed to a demand for less services resulting in less taxes.

NEW YORK MODEL

Still betting that the people want unbalanced Federal spending and more inflationary depreciation of the dollar, a group of House Democrats have put in a bill for another billion-dollar program outside the Eisenhower budget plans. This would go for loans at low interest to municipalities, mostly for water and sewage systems. The plan would supersede the present Housing and Home Finance Agency program, which, to be sure, has only $100 million lending power. The House Democrats would lend

the new Federal money at 2⅞ percent interest.

But on the very day that these new spending plans were reported, the Government itself was borrowing money. What's more, it had to offer 4 percent for it—4 percent on $1.5 billion in 4-year notes and 4 percent on $500 million in 10-year bonds. In other words, the backers of the House bill ask the Treasury to lend money at 1⅛ percent less than the money costs to borrow. This, obviously, is no way to balance budgets.

The wistful explanation of the House bill's backers is, however, that many municipalities want services which they can't supply out of present revenue. That is undoubtedly true. But there are ways of meeting the problem other than new assistance from Washington. One such way has just been demonstrated all over again in the General Assembly of New York. There a new State tax program of $277 million has been enacted to support the new and costlier services demanded by the people of the State. And the assembly also approved an additional $125 million in New York City taxation for more municipal spending.

It is true, of course, that New York State and city are rich communities. And, rich or poor, communities have to have water, sewage, and other such services. But also important is firm Federal budget practice, with the stable dollar and the secure handling of the prodigious national debt which only firm budget practice can assure. Certainly localities should never be permitted to forget the steady—and still preferred—alternative to leaning on Washington. That is, leaning on themselves.

## Marketplace, Not Manufacturer Nor Congress, Sets Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what Congressman, bureaucrat, judge, or jury can tell you the "prices that are adequate to stimulate—and low enough to enable"—page 2, H.R. 1253, fair trade bill.

They cannot. It takes thousands, even millions of buyers, a free people in a free society freely bargaining for competitive merchandise at a mutually agreeable price. The price naturally results then like water seeking its level.

Now comes Congress to tell the public that from now on by Federal decree, we will let manufacturers tell the retailer what price they must charge. Are manufacturers all-knowing? Can they set the prices substituting the resale price maintenance of the fair trade bill for the spontaneous price setting of people in the market place through supply, demand, and competition? Yes, anyone can set a price, but who will buy if the price is too high? And if they do not buy who is hurt—the consumer?

Possibly so, but most hurt will be the retailer for whom the fair trade bill is intended. Meanwhile, the big competitor chainstore or department store with his own brand merchandise cleans up. Fair trade indeed.

## West Virginia's Request for a North-South Route To Be Included in the Interstate High System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, last week, on March 19, it was my privilege to attend an important conference here in Washington with reference to West Virginia's urgent request for the addition of a north-south route to be included in the Interstate Highway System.

Present for this conference, which was conducted under the chairmanship of Representative ARCH A. MOORE, JR., of West Virginia, were Commissioner E. L. Armstrong and other officials of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads; State officials and citizens of the State of West Virginia under the leadership of Gov. Cecil H. Underwood, officials and citizens of the State of Pennsylvania under the leadership of the Honorable Parke Martin, who attended both as secretary of highways and the authorized representative of Gov. David L. Lawrence; interested Members of the Congress from the State of Pennsylvania; and our West Virginia congressional delegation under the leadership of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH and Senator ROBERT C. BYRD.

Representatives and spokesmen from both Pennsylvania and West Virginia were unanimous in recommending an extension of the interstate route from Washington, Pa., to Beckley, W. Va., and to continue to the West Virginia-Virginia border in the immediate vicinity of my home city of Bluefield. This requested extension will connect the Great Lakes and Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel that the benefits which may be derived from allocating the some 200 miles requested for this specific route fully justify this request.

In addition to the advantages this route would provide for national defense—the closest available sheltered north-south route in the East, protected by the Allegheny Mountains—the availability of adequate underground area for protecting industrial facilities, and so forth, this route would help West Virginia's present industries to expand and help West Virginia attract new industries and create vitally needed new productive payrolls.

West Virginia suffers more from unemployment and lack of prospective job opportunities than any other State in the Union.

Mr. Speaker, nature has given West Virginia some of the most beautiful scenery to be found in the world. One of our brightest economic spots lies in the attraction of tourists. One of our difficulties today is the lack of adequate roads and highways. This proposed route would provide an accessible avenue which would greatly benefit our entire State. Even with the present handicap, tourism now ranks in dollar value as the third most important income producer in West Virginia, following mining and manufacturing. I understand that $240 million was spent in our State by tourists during 1958.

Additional highway construction would provide employment for thousands of our presently unemployed. Private industry would then be able to develop facilities to better accommodate the traveler who would enjoy the great natural beauty of our State of West Virginia.

While I deeply appreciate the careful consideration that will be given by officials to this request—in the event mileage should become available in the interstate program—the fact remains that 41,000 miles have been allocated, with the exception of a small amount reserved for contingencies. Therefore, I am happy to introduce in the House a bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 89) to provide additional funds for the construction of highways in labor surplus areas. This measure is identical to S. 423 which is presently pending in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that similar legislation will be passed by this Congress, and I am grateful to be privileged to give this proposal my full and complete support.

## Free People Need Free Prices for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is argued that the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, will give the price protection needed because there are other forms of Manufacturers' control of prices at retail such as selling on consignment and manufacturer-owned retail stores. If a manufacturer is really interested in controlling the retail price, then maybe that same manufacturer should assume some of the risks which manufacturers assume when selling on consignment or when owning the retail outlet. Risk and responsibility are part of consignment selling and owning retail outlets, but what are the additional responsibilities and risks which will be assumed by the manufacturer under this resale price maintenance bill?

The rise of the so-called discount house is used as an argument for enacting a Federal fair trade bill, but a study of the discount house indicates rather strongly that State fair trade laws stimulated its growth. A high, well advertised price with a wide profit margin naturally stimulates such competition. Since when is Federal law designed to assure a guaranteed fat profit?

The truth of the situation concerning the entire fair trade genesis may be

found to be resistance to better merchandising, a fighting of the progress in more efficient merchandising and distribution. But progress we will, with or without the Federal mandate of a fair trade bill, conceived in shortsightedness. Customers will demand greater efficiency, better production, distribution, and merchandising—that is, so long as they are a free people.

## Brave Men and Great Captains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eugene F. Kinkead, of South Orange, N.J., has kindly sent me the following extract from the review of "Brave Men and Great Captains" in the New York Times, March 12. I agree with Mr. Kinkead that this is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Perhaps some reader of this RECORD will know the identity of this hero still unknown. I am also asking the Department of the Army whether their efficient record system can produce any information on him.

At any rate, let us hope that this man was given in peacetime the opportunity so freely given him in war to demonstrate his qualities of leadership, courage, and tenacity. As Mr. Kinkead observes:

We must aid our colored citizens in securing the place in our country to which they belong.

The excerpt reads as follows:

Well, the theory and the art of war have had many manifestations in our history. One of the most moving examples cited by the Dupuys concerns an episode during the Battle of the Bulge in World War II when two regiments of the 106th Infantry Division were having a rough time of it in the Schnee Eifel hills.

A HERO STILL UNKNOWN

"A group of infantrymen," the Dupuys tell us, "shocked by the sudden burst of enemy fire all about them, huddled in a daze. Out of the woods behind them stalked one lone, large, Negro soldier, tommygun nonchalantly tucked under an arm laced by a corporal's chevrons.

"He approached a wounded officer,

" 'Colonel, sir, you-all seem to be alone here. I'm from the 333d Field (an artillery unit also smashed in the action). Anything you want me to do?'

" 'Get that platoon organized, corporal. Move north, covering the flank.'

" 'Yes, sir.'

"And magically, it seemed to that watching officer, to the booming voice of a corporal who knew when he was in command and knew his trade—leadership—the demoralized platoon fanned out and moved forward, fighting men once more."

The corporal's deed epitomizes, the Dupuys add, the will to win. They would like to know his name. Surely, somewhere in the mountainous records of the War Department, in the memories of men who were in those outfits, it can be found. We may need a good many men like that still nameless corporal in the years ahead.

## What Are the Farmers Really Getting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Spotlight column in the March 1959 National Grange Monthly made a number of telling points in answering some of the most common pieces of misinformation that are currently making the rounds about farmers. For example, the columnist pointed out that while the cost of eating has increased in the past 10 years, the cost of food has risen very little.

In 1948, farmers received 51 cents out of every dollar spent by the consumer for food, with the other 49 cents going for processing, transportation, retailing and other farm-to-market costs. By 1958, the farmer's share of the food dollar had shrunk to only 39 cents, while marketing costs had increased to 61 cents. Figures like this dispel the myth of the farmers getting fat at the expense of the consumers.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this column from the National Grange Monthly in the RECORD:

SPOTLIGHT ON AGRICULTURE

A good coondawg is a noble animal and ought never to be kicked in the slats. It discourages him and gives him an inferiority complex, and pretty soon he will just bay at the moon and let the coons be.

Any good coonhunter knows that. And, where do you suppose this country would be today if it had not been for coondawgs. Why, it would be overrun with coons, of course. Even as it is there will always be some coons.

We like to hunt coons; always have. That's one of the reasons why this column is called the Spotlight. When you hunt coons you take along a spotlight, and when the dawgs have treed the varmint you shine the light in his eyes.

Then when you have the critter in range you take dead aim and you pick that ringtail right off the limb. We like to skin 'em and nail their hide to the barn door. Some think that is not a very sporting thing to do, but the coons we've known are no friends of farmers. They raid his chicken coop and stead his hens.

The coons we are gunning for are those who attempt to convince the country that farmers, under present programs, are spending their winters in Florida and robbing the country blind through huge farm subsidies. The woods are full of them.

Some of the big city magazines and newspapers, probably more out of ignorance than malice, have been repeating and enlarging on those falsehoods. The Grange knows that many of our present farm programs are far from perfect, and it has been doing its best to promote sound programs.

Before that can be done we may need to clean some coons out of the woods. We've got plenty of facts for ammunition, if we only use them. Facts are the only thing they are afraid of, and the only thing that can undo some of the damage they are causing.

Congress' job in developing sound farm programs is made immeasurably more difficult by the misunderstandings being created in the minds of people who do not know the facts. The vacuum we leave by indifference to these falsehoods is being filled by demagogs who peddle misinformation.

One of the worst of those canards is the oft repeated statements that the Government is spending $7.4 billion a year to guarantee farmers high prices and huge payments out of the Treasury. That has been repeated so often it is beginning to be believed by too many people.

The fact is Government supports do not guarantee high prices. If farm prices had gone up by as great a percentage as either industrial wages or farm costs in the past 10 years the Nation's food bill would be at least $10 billion a year larger than it is.

The subsidy charge is equally false. The cost of price supports is charged against farmers when, as a matter of fact, the commodities accumulated by the Government have been distributed almost entirely through such programs as foreign aid, the school lunch, and distribution to needy city people in this country.

Direct payments to farmers are almost exclusively for soil conservation; for the preservation of our irreplaceable national resource. That is no more a subsidy than the huge sums spent for improvement of our rivers and harbors are a subsidy to shipping companies, to mention only one example.

We spend billions a year for slum clearance and other programs to help raise the living standards of people in cities. We've never heard a farmer complain that their taxes are going to subsidize poor people in cities.

Our only complaint about the money being spent in the name of agriculture is that it is not doing the job of correcting the situation that exists in agriculture. It would be as foolish to abandon our efforts to develop a sound program as it would be to continue indefinitely the present programs.

There is no need to wreck agriculture in order to get rid of some of the faults in our present programs. It would make just as much sense to abandon our public schools because we think they are not all they should be.

There has been a lot of misinformation spread about farmers, but there is a Wall Street tycoon who writes a daily, front page column for the New York Journal of Commerce who takes the door prize for being out on the longest limb.

He has found a way to blame farmers for the increase in wages of industrial workers. High food costs, he says, are the explanation. If that isn't putting the cart before the horse, it'll do for a start.

The high cost of food has been played up so much that most people are misled. The cost of food has gone up very little in the past 10 years, though the cost of eating has increased, but only because a greater part of our diet is made up of better and more expensive foods and fancy packaging.

In 1948, the USDA reports, the retail cost of the family food market basket (the amount spent for typical foods by a family of four) was $982. By late 1958 that had increased to $1,049, a rise of only a little more than 5 percent.

The farm value of that food in 1948 was $497. By late last year it had declined to $407, a drop of almost 20 percent. During the same period farm prices declined from 100 percent of parity to 80 percent of parity.

In 1948 the processing and handling costs, made up largely of wage costs, of the basket was $481. Latest figures for 1958 show the costs from farmer to consumer was $642, an increase of more than 30 percent.

In 1948 farmers received 51 cents out of each dollar spent by consumers for food, and 49 cents for processing, transportation, retailing and other farm-to-market costs. In 1958 farmers' share had shrunk to only 39 cents, and marketing costs—chiefly higher labor wages—had increased to 61 cents.

To rob a farmer's chicken coop and then try to place the blame on that farmer, is a trick no self-respecting coon would think of. For all their sneakiness, they have some decency.

A four-legged coon is supposed to be a smart animal, but some of the two-legged breed are imposing their ignorance on others. There can be no excuse for that.

---

## Noise Could "Blind" Enemy Subs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, comparing our present oceanic research program with that of the Soviets is similar to comparing a molehill with a mountain. We have recognized the advent of a technological revolution in outer space and have invested vast sums in attempting to unlock scientific secrets. In underseas research, far-sighted scientists have also recognized the importance of new technologiacl discoveries; however, our country has neglected to invest enough funds to finance the effort that is needed to overtake and surpass the Russians.

The following article which originally appeared in the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, fully describes the magnitude of the task that our country faces. Not only are we already behind in this deadly race, but it is estimated that adaptation of new scientific advancements to the fleet's operating equipment takes 4 to 5 years longer in the United States than it does in Russia. Thus our country is like the baseball player who starts out with a count of two strikes against him. If we wish to survive, we can't afford to continue our ostrichlike attitude but must immediately launch an all-out oceanic research program as soon as possible.

I would like to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate Mr. Everett S. Allen, author of the following article, who recently was awarded the National Headliners' Club silver medallion for his series on oceanography. This series of 13 articles was selected as the best domestic news series or feature published in 1958 by daily newspapers in the 50,000 to 100,000 circulation class. Mr. Allen's series deserves recognition not only for its journalistic excellence but also as a service to our country in publicizing the necessity for an accelerated program of oceanic research.

(The article is as follows:)

NOISE COULD "BLIND" ENEMY SUBS

(Whether it be for war or peace, the oceans of the world probably hold the secret to humanity's future. The nation that unlocks those mysteries first will direct the future course of mankind. One of the world's outstanding ocean-study centers is the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. There and at other marine-science research centers in the East, the Standard-Times conducted a 2-month study to determine who is ahead. These stories tell the results of that research.)

(By Everett S. Allen)

The United States could overcome the military advantage of 460 Soviet submarines by flooding the ocean with sound to make them "deaf," rather than by attempting to build 460 subs of its own. Any submarine operates principally by listening, from a position of concealment, with its underwater sound gear, until it picks up the noises of a target—the propeller thrash, for example, of a transport or cargo vessel.

Remaining submerged, the submarine uses its electronic, radio, or mechanical "ears" to check the course and speed of the target. The data it obtains by listening governs the torpedo settings.

Fill the ocean with sound, just as Russia now jams the airwaves behind the Iron Curtain to interfere with Voice of America broadcasts, and the submarine's "ears" would be rendered useless. It would have to surface to find its targets, and once it has done that, it has sacrificed its principal advantage—the ability to operate in concealment.

OTHER DEFENSES SEEN

A lot of official thinking, by both marine scientists and military planners, has gone into this matter of how to meet the Russian sub fleet effectively if it becomes necessary. Making them deaf is just one of the approaches that could be used. Here are some of the other related topics that very likely were discussed at the National Academy of Sciences conference in Falmouth in 1956:

Not long ago, there were those in high places who believed the surface ship was finished, because of its vulnerability to air attack. Indications now are that this view has been shelved and there are good reasons why the surface vessel still has a major role to play in any future war.

Although the Navy very likely will lay emphasis on going underseas, the sub has some fairly serious Achilles heels. It cannot, for example, carry as big a weight of weapons and countermeasures as can a surface ship.

But if the surface vessels are going to manage to get ahead of the submarine, they are going to have to know a lot about the probable tactics of the sub, tactics that depend on and are related to environmental factors. That's where oceanography and meteorology can help the Navy, if given a chance.

NEW DATA NEEDED

In terms of undersea knowledge, the game of subchasing in the United States still is being played largely according to what was known at the end of World War II. What is needed is much more data on what exists and happens in the deep sea, so that new subchasers can be built with design and equipment aimed at making use of this knowledge.

The environmental factors are vital in several weapon systems and in several aspects of military operations afloat. American sea transport systems must be maintained; nothing is cheaper for this job of supplying allies than surface ships. Undersea transport is 30 times as costly—nearly as expensive as air.

Marine scientists can get the information, given time and support, that will enable the military to make this transport system work most efficiently. As an example, if science found out a ship following the axis of the gulf stream could make an average of 3 extra knots, it would be of inestimable value to Navy convoy and routing officers.

Could surface ships defend themselves against aircraft?

Those who know ships best say they can. The basis of a good ship defense against planes might well incorporate short-range antiaircraft weapons with atomic warheads, homing devices and a good detection system.

STRATEGY CRITICIZED

Some authorities believe the defensive use of atomic weapons has not been considered adequately because so much emphasis has been placed upon deterrent warfare by the U.S. Government. In other words, the whole armament technology has been channeled into offensive weapons which we don't really need, because we don't intend to start a war. If we had spent as much time and money on a good defense, we might be much better off.

How much time do we have to overcome the Russian lead as represented by its submarines?

The big key is how fast the Navy can go undersea—not only in its own subs, but in acquiring vast amounts of knowledge of what goes on in the deep ocean. Figuring how much time we have to catch up with the Russians also involves leadtime, that is the time it takes to get an idea from the laboratory into the fleet's operating equipment.

Informed authorities say in Russia, this is 5 to 6 years; in the United States, it is 10 years. This is not a science lag, but the result of procurement and training policies. Americans believe in making everything safe—the Russians aren't so particular. It is estimated lead time in the United States could be cut down to 7 years, if we had to.

WEATHER KNOWLEDGE VITAL

Basically, the faster the Federal Government strenghtens and buttresses the marine science sources that must provide it with the information needed to give it an undersea Navy, the faster Russia's lead in ocean war potential will be diminished.

Weather knowledege is one of the biggest factors in this picture. Oceanographic laboratories should pay an increasingly important role in weather research. Marine meteorology should get more money and more attention.

You can't beef up oceanography abruptly, because there are only 300 oceanographers in the country and you would run out of qualified persons. But there are perhaps 5,000 persons in meteorology, some of whom could be made available for this type of project.

U.S. inability to predict weather is regarded as absurd. We have licked many harder problems. In war, particularly, weather is critically important. All detec-

tion systems are weather limited in one way or another. The whole antisubmarine warfare business is dependent on weather. As it deteriorates, ships get deaf on their listening devices, and aircraft see whitecaps instead of the sub's snorkel in their radar.

FORECASTS NEEDED

The commander of a task force needs the best weather forecast possible, not only tomorrow, but maybe for 2 weeks from now. He needs to know what the weather will be, not only where he is, but maybe 500 miles away, where his sonar buoys (sound-emitting buoys utilized in sub detection) will not work if it's too rough. Wave forecasting alone is an important factor for the antisubmarine warfare aircraft system.

Beneath the sea, there is a kind of weather, too, that plays an important part. You can hide in it, and so can the enemy, and therefore, you need to know about it. Even now, when our subs go to a strange area, oceanographers brief the skipper and navigator, so they will know what to expect.

But even the Navy isn't always appreciative of this important job of oceanography. Many Navy officers above the rank of commander still think they can bull through by brute force, and many admirals are former aviators and therefore think only of weather above 30,000 feet.

In reality, however, the air and ocean act as a heat engine, deriving its energy low down, near the water surface; it is this relationship of air and water that makes the sea a major factor in weather influence.

OTHER VITAL FIELDS

There are other vital fields in which marine scientists can help this country get ready for, or prevent, world war III by aiding the Navy's progress in going undersea.

In World War II, sea fighters were concerned with the top 1,000 feet of the water "column" in the oceans. When undersea warfare becomes established, the problem is much more complex, because the entire water column, and the ocean bottom, are involved.

Hearing, by devices, is the key to tracking down subs, or, if you are in a sub, tracking down ships. Sound is bent in water because of differences in temperature, salinity, and pressure. If you don't know these factors as they pertain to wherever in the ocean you may be, you can't correct for the error of bending—therefore, when you get ready to fire at the enemy, your bearing and range calculations will be off.

In World War II, an antisubmarine vessel literally threw depth charges on top of a submarine to attack it; the lethal range of such charges is only about 30 feet, and you almost have to hit the sub to destroy it.

By contrast, if future seafighters put an atomic weapon within a halfmile of an enemy sub, it probably will mean a kill.

Further, it will be necessary to throw the atomic weapon much farther than this because you do not want to be too near it yourself. Thus, subs and destroyers of the future will be fighting each other at ranges of 30 miles or more.

Since ocean fighting will take place at much greater distances, small errors become increasingly important, and precision of greater necessity; seafighters must, therefore, know everything possible about the water in which they are operating.

Marine science must provide all of this data referring to undersea conditions all over the world, so that it can be "cranked into" undersea weapons of the future to make them effective.

This takes time. It would take less if America gave marine scientists more to work with. Whether we can afford the luxury of the leisurely pace we now are forced to adopt is highly debatable.

## Who Is Freeloading on Central Valley Project Power Output?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present an editorial from the Sacramento, Calif., Bee of March 16, 1959 relating to the proposal of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to buy the falling waters of the Trinity River project from the Federal Government.

This timely editorial, in my estimation, is indicative of the way a majority of the residents of the great Central Valley of California feel about the brazen and continued efforts of the P.G. & E. to exploit this federally owned project under the guise of a misnamed "partnership."

The editorial is as follows:

WHO IS FREELOADING ON CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT POWER OUTPUT?

In introducing new legislation for the misnamed Trinity River power "partnership" with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Congressmen CHARLES S. GUBSER, of Santa Clara County, and JAMES B. UTT, of Orange County, charged the Sacramento Municipal Utility District has been freeloading on the Central Valley's project.

GUBSER and UTT must be sadly misinformed about the facts of Central Valley project operations. For if there has been a freeloader in respect to getting Central Valley project power at low rates, it has not been Sacramento Municipal Utilities District but the Pacific Gas & Electric. On this the record is abundant and official.

When Central Valley project came into power production in 1944, only the Pacific Gas & Electric was in a position to take the hydro output. This was due in large measure to the fact the power lobby in Washington had been able to thwart the construction of transmission lines to carry the electricity to the centers of population.

The Pacific Gas & Electric got this power at low rates, some of it at dump prices, for the Government was caught in the bind of either delivering the energy to the Pacific Gas & Electric at a price the utility was willing to pay or letting it go to waste.

Subsequently Sacramento Municipal Utilities District arranged to buy Central Valley project power. In 1956, according to a report of the Comptroller General of the United States, Sacramento Municipal Utilities District paid 4.26 mills per kilowatt-hour for 23.8 percent of the Central Valley project energy. The Pacific Gas & Electric paid 2.97 mills per kilowatt-hour for 30 percent of the project output.

In 1957, the last year for which full figures are available, Sacramento Municipal Utility District paid 4.08 mills for 1,126,000,000 kilowatt-hours and the Pacific Gas and Electric paid 3.66 mills for 1,071,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

If buying power at 4.08 or 4.26 mills makes a free loader of Sacramento Municipal Utility District, what would GUBSER and UTT consider buying energy at 3.66 mills or 2.97 mills makes of the Pacific Gas and Electric?

Moreover, the comptroller general in an audit report to Congress stated the Pacific Gas and Electric has received several hundred thousand dollars worth of Central Valley project energy above the amount it has paid for. He also said the company receives free energy from the project by overcharging for losses on its transmission service. He further stated the company has been excessive in its wheeling charges.

The crowning absurdity voiced by GUBSER and UTT is their statement Sacramento Municipal Utility District seems to be getting more than its share of handouts from the Federal Treasury and from water users of the Central Valley project.

The fact is power sales account for 97 percent of the net revenues of Central Valley project, water sales somewhat less than 3 percent. On this basis it appears Sacramento Municipal Utility District currently is providing about 60 percent of the project's net revenue and in reality is subsidizing the cost of water. Oddly enough, no complaints are forthcoming from the water users.

## Crop Surplus: Pathetic, Fantastic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the March 19, 1959, edition of the Rome Daily Sentinel.

This editorial expresses succinctly and forcefully a deep concern regarding the high cost of governmental storage of our mounting farm surpluses:

CROP SURPLUS: PATHETIC, FANTASTIC

"Fantastic," Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson himself calls the Government program of buying and storing crop surpluses. Uncle Sam will hold by July 1, outright or through loans, over $9 billion worth of farm products. Of the total $3.2 billion represents wheat, $2.4 billion corn, $1.2 billion cotton.

The Government wheat would supply all the Nation's consumption, export and carryover needs for a whole year if not a single new bushel were harvested. Storage alone on all Government crop holdings is costing close to $1 billion a year.

In every way he can devise Secretary Benson tries to dispose of the hoards: Donations to school lunch programs, institutions, persons on relief rolls, relief programs at home and abroad—barter and sales deals with other countries—barter with U.S. firms providing foreign strategic materials—domestic sales that won't depress market prices.

Yet the surpluses grow and grow and grow. The chief reason is that our agriculture becomes more productive all the time. For only two examples: Cotton yield per acre is 10 times that of 30 years ago, the average cow produces one-fourth more milk than 10 years ago. And a well-off family doesn't consume twice as much milk, or steak, or bread if its income has doubled.

It's all pathetic as well as fantastic. There's pathos in the underfed peoples of the world needing the U.S. surplus food, and more, if only it could be got to them feasibly. And there's pathos in realizing that if even all our own people had adequate incomes, we'd probably consume 10 percent or so more food right at home. But long-range factors don't solve an immediate crisis.

## Favors Consigning Uncle Sam to Rubbish Heap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I view with alarm the ever-increasing work of those who would destroy our traditions, patriotic symbols, and love of the principles on which this Nation was founded. Uncle Sam is familiar to every citizen of the United States, and I am sure that his symbolism is recognized throughout the world. I can no more visualize any other symbol for the United States than I can a flag of the United States without a red and white stripes and the stars upon a blue field.

A recent article entitled "Let's Disown Uncle Sam" appeared in the magazine section of the March 1, 1959, edition of the New York Times, and to say that I was astounded is to put it mildly. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which appeared in the March 7, 1959, edition of the Tablet answering the aforementioned article. I commend this letter to the attention of by colleagues:

FAVORS CONSIGNING UNCLE SAM TO RUBBISH HEAP

DEAR SIR: True to the reputation which the New York Times has acquired in many circles, the paper printed an article in the magazine section of March 1, 1959, which should add considerable to this reputation. It is entitled "Let's Disown Uncle Sam," by Allan Nevins, a former professor of American history at Columbia College.

A shocking article with this slant would have been taboo in most any reputable publication in the country not too many years ago. In it, Uncle Sam is attacked and torn into shreds. Since Uncle Sam is, in a way, symbolic of our country and our past traditions, and in an endearing way has stood for our "American way of life," a phrase we seldom hear today, he has represented, figuratively speaking, practically what our flag has symbolized.

Here are some of the attacks on Uncle Sam: "He encourages loose thinking the world can no longer afford." We pause here to ask, Is the "loose thinking" done by Uncle Sam, or by those who try, through such articles as this, to undermine our American traditions? Now other quotes are, "It is time the most complicated Nation on earth disowned this crude stereotype * * * he is totally archaic * * * he is altogether too much the rural Yankee * * * he is obviously the same breed as the men who marched on Concord." As to the last quote, we ask what the author means by "breed" in this reference? "The men who marched on Concord" were the valiant men who won our American independence during the Revolutionary War. Is that a breed to belittle and disown? I'm afraid the author may be challenged on that one, by a large segment of our American people.

The article further states, "He is out of date because his world has gone." Does he infer that our American Republic is gone, or should be finished? What other interpretation could one give? "He" (Uncle Sam), the author says, "seems to carry too much Yankee cuteness * * * too much rural limitations, too much marked air of manifest destiny jingoism." Then after continuing about Uncle Sam being outdated, gone, past, archaic, he complains that he does not represent the southern gentlemen of the old school, and thereby contradicts his own objection. It is evident Nevins has no love for the Yankee.

Nevins then says Uncle Sam does not suggest the cosmopolitanism and internationalism that marks the American outlook today. So it seems, we must scrap our beloved Uncle Sam, like so many other traditions, and adopt an international symbol because Mr. Nevins says so. The answer he says is obvious, and then adds that when a nation wishes to distill its finest attributes into an emblem, it selects a female figure. It could be interesting to learn what the author's concept would be, if a female figure such as he might suggest, should replace Uncle Sam and also represent internationalism. For early in his article, Nevins refers to Uncle Sam as a "libelous caricature" out of date in an era of television, airplanes, and United Nations. Must we then disown Uncle Sam and adopt a symbol of the United Nations?

Mr. Nevins states that "American democracy has long been an object of suspicion in Europe," yet our forefathers established a Republic here, and any such thing as suspicion, is a product of the human mind. Suspicions or malicious distortions to which he refers, are bound to be rampant as long as there are people in the world to create them. But a falsity, a suspicion, or malicious distortion, never alters the truth one iota. Any such distortions concerning Uncle Sam are conceived in the minds of people, and do not in the least change the true ideas of Uncle Sam. They are but the product of the person who expresses them.

"When stereotyped thinking and cheap prejudices are cast on the rubbish heap, the belief that an infantile folk image like Uncle Sam has any meaning, will follow," Mr. Nevins says. To sum up, this diatribe seems to advocate casting on the rubbish heap American traditions symbolized by Uncle Sam. He refers to his garish and flamboyant garb of striped trousers and star-decked vest. Are the Stars and Stripes depicted in Uncle Sam's garb so distasteful to Mr. Nevins? If so what about those in our flag of red, white, and blue? And why should he have had any interest in helping write a booklet, "The Untold Story of Our Flag?" Mr. Nevins is also one of the editors of the expensive magazine, American Heritage. What kind of heritage does he represent judging from this article?

I prefer the kind of heritage expressed in a writing by Elias Lieberman who said, "I am an American. My father belongs to the Sons of the Revolution; my mother to the Colonial Dames. One of my ancestors pitched tea overboard in Boston Harbor; another hungered with Washington at Valley Forge. Every drop of blood in me holds a heritage of patriotism. I am proud of my past. I am an American. 'See,' my father said, pointing to the flag that fluttered there, 'that flag of Stars and Stripes is yours; it is the emblem of the promised land'."

Our Uncle Sam shares with our flag in all this, and to Americans, like millions today, he still is and always will be the same Uncle Sam, regardless of propaganda to the contrary.

HELEN P. LASELL,
*Chairman of the U.S. Flag Committee.*
JACKSON HEIGHTS.

## Great Potential in Northwest Navigable Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, recent hearings of the Corps of Engineers review of the 308 report have brought forth overwhelming support, but also some statements of opposition to navigation recommendations of the report. Because I believe this opposition has based its arguments on some faulty reasoning, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in Congress to an excellent analysis of the situation which was written by Mr. Herbert G. West, executive vice president of the Inland Empire Waterways Association of Walla Walla, Wash. Mr. West has devoted many years of service to the development of our waterways in the Pacific Northwest. The following article appeared in the Log, a publication of the association:

INLAND EMPIRE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION
(By Herbert G. West)

For the past several years, the tempo on revision of transportation laws and criteria has stepped up gradually to the point that in 1957 congressional hearings were held and even more extensive hearings were held by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. Senate in 1958.

A great deal of information has come over my desk regarding waterway transportation, rail and truck. Many times, in the past, I have been rather confused in an attempt to digest logically the arguments that have been presented on all sides. I thought if I were confused that, possibly, some of the members of the Waterways Association would, likewise, be confused. Therefore, this is an attempt to bring about some clarity to the situation as it affects our Columbia-Snake River Water Resources Development program.

The Dalles-Celilo Canal was completed and put into operation in 1915, and I quote from the official program as follows: "Removing the last barrier to free navigation of the Columbia River and its tributaries from the Pacific Ocean, 500 miles inland, will be formally opened during the week of May 3–8, 1915, in a series of celebrations from Lewiston, Idaho, to Astoria, Oreg."

At the time of the completion of the Dalles-Celilo Canal, we had relatively few ports—in fact, only four from the mouth of the Columbia River to Kennewick, Wash.; namely, the Port of Portland organized in 1891; Astoria, Oreg., 1910; Vancouver, Wash., 1912; and Kennewick, Wash., 1915 (undoubtedly the result of the enthusiasm created by the Dalles-Celilo Canal).

The record discloses that during the first year after completion of the Celilo Canal, some 4,000 tons of cargo passed through the canal; and, in the next 17 years of operation, approximately 1,100 tons passed through the canal. In other words, what appeared to be a golden future for water transportation from the mouth of the Columbia River to Lewiston, Idaho, in 1915, did not materialize—due mainly to the fact of disastrous rate wars with land transportation facilities. However, in 1933, when talk of the building of

the Bonneville Dam got underway, tonnage started to come up and total tonnage for the 2 years 1933 and 1934 was approximately 39,000 tons and then dwindled down again to 4,000 tons in 1935. Again, most of this tonnage originated right on the Celilo Canal itself. This is the record of disastrous rate wars on the Columbia River.

River transportation has been threatened many times by the advent of disastrous rate wars and attempts at abortive legislation. Nevertheless, each year has seen a substantial increase in tonnage and an increase in the formation of port districts. Until January 1, 1958, there were 22 port districts in Washington and in Oregon from the mouth of the Columbia River to the confluence of the Columbia and Snake rivers at Walla Walla, Pasco, and Kennewick, Wash. With the creation of these port districts, we saw inland waterway transportation on the Columbia River somewhat stabilized for we then had 22 municipal corporations in Oregon and Washington charged with and dedicated to the development of industry and commerce and the construction of public port facilities for the interchange of cargo.

Only five port districts had been in operation prior to the opening of Bonneville Lock and Dam in January of 1938. However, in the year 1958, with 10 port districts located above Bonneville Dam, a total tonnage of 1,750,528 tons was locked through the dam. That period from 1938 to 1958 represented a fabulous 20 years for the Pacific Northwest. Industries started to grow on the banks of the Columbia River through the deepsea tidal area and upstream on the inland waterways of the interior. More tonnage was being carried by northwest railroads—more tonnage carried by our trucklines.

There are now 36 port districts—one organized under Washington State law by special election in May of 1958—and the remainder, in the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, formed in the November elections.

The assessed valuation of the property within the 36 port districts, reaching from the mouth of the Columbia River to the foot of Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia (approximately 545 miles from the mouth of the Columbia River) and on the Snake River to Lime Point, Idaho (approximately 491 miles from the mouth of the Columbia River) approximates $1,750 million. It is estimated by reliable economists that an investment approximating one-half billion dollars is located on, or near to, the banks of the Columbia and Snake rivers above the tidal area.

The firms investing in this reach of the Pacific Northwest are doing so primarily because of the incentive of low-cost water transportation and are representative of national and international companies, not newly-formed stock companies, but representatives of the blue chips of American industry. Just a few years ago, Pacific Northwest headlines heralded the fact that the aluminum industry was locating in the area—primarily because of low-cost power. I have just read a very interesting article by Prof. Joseph R. Hartley, presented to the annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association on October 16, 1958. Professor Hartley had just completed an objective report on the benefits of water transportation, "How Widespread Are These Benefits?" It is most interesting—very factual. Professor Hartley, through his paper, passed on a few words regarding aluminum and I would like to quote, "Aluminum is a newcomer to the Ohio Valley. The story of its arrival is simple: it needed cheap power. In the past 3 years three major smelters have been started under construction along the Ohio, which previously had no aluminum reduction capacity. Kaiser Aluminum's plant at Ravenswood, W. Va., and Olin Mathieson's plant at Clarington, Ohio, are both operating. Alcoa's plant near Evansville, Ind., is in an advanced state of construction. When the three smelters reach full capacity, they will be producing one-fourth of the country's aluminum."

The story repeats itself over and over. Improvement of inland waterways and investment of industrial dollars—mean payrolls, more taxes, employment, and benefits to the Nation, both during peacetime and for national defense and security.

Low-cost water transportation is threatened—not by economics—not by the great technological revolution that we have experienced in the past 20 years. Rather, it is threatened by boring from within the legislative halls of the State legislatures and of the Congress of the United States. The American Association of Railroads has announced a six-point program, two points of which are, (1) "Impose user charges on publicly provided transportation facilities, such as waterways, highways and airways" and (2) "Permit railroads to carry more agricultural commodity exemption from rate regulation or extending the exemption to rail carriers." A third threat is the continued proposal to make changes in the ratemaking relationship between modes of transportation.

Every student of transportation and of history knows that in the interest of national peacetime prosperity and national security all forms of transportation have been subsidized—from the early wagonroads, canals, river improvements, railroads, highways, and airways.

These railroad land grants were first issued in the United States in 1850 and ended in 1871. During this period, a total of almost 153 million acres was granted in the United States. This is equal to an area slightly less than the size of Texas and only slightly less than the total square-mile area of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho combined. It is significant to note that among other reasons these three held a very prominent place in the discussion.

1. The acceleration of the settlement of the country and the development of its natural resources.

2. The enhancement in value of adjacent Government and private land, and the increase of taxable wealth generally.

3. The strengthening of the national defense.

Certainly, no one will argue against the reasons for, or the value received from these railroad land grants. However, I do believe that the grants—not necessarily in land, but in dollars to aid in the development of water transportation, truck transportation and airways are for the same direct purpose—for the advancement of our national defense, the development of our natural resources and the increase of taxable wealth, generally. The basic economic and geographic structure of America was developed with reference to water transportation. The country's historical dependence upon its navigable waters is reflected by the concentration of large cities and communities along the waterways today.

The policy that "Navigable waterways * * * shall be common highways and forever free * * * to citizens of the United States * * * without any tax, impost or duty therefor" was established by compact between the original States and the people and the States. It was adopted along with the guarantees of religious freedom, trial by jury and habeas corpus of 1787.

President Hoover made this comment in an address at Louisville, Ky., on October 29, 1929, on completion of the Ohio River project: "And the new waterways are not competitive, but complementary, to our great and efficient railways. It is the history of transportation that an increase of facilities and a cheapening of transportation increases the volume of traffic."

We all have heard considerable regarding so-called geographic price discrimination. That means in very few words the fact that the railroads are able, in the noncompetitive territory not reached by water transportation either directly or by joint rates, to increase their rates and make up for their losses sustained in a competitive area of water transportation. Naturally, the one having the greatest backlog of noncompetitive traffic is the one which generally wins out. It might take months, sometimes years, but history has repeated itself time and time again.

It is my desire in writing this bulletin to try to be constructive. We are all working for the same purpose, a more prosperous America, a freer America, free from within, as well as from without.

I would suggest that all of you who have not read the hearings before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. Senate, under date of March 1958, get copies from your Senator or Congressman for it would be very worthwhile reading.

I have read and reread many times the statement of Mr. C. E. Childe, transportation consultant for the Inland Waterways Common Carrier Association, testifying before Senator SMATHERS on March 17, 1958. I should like to quote just a little bit from Mr. Childe's statement: "We now have studies conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission's Cost Fnding Section, comparing rates and revenues with costs, by regions and for the United States as a whole, which throw new light on the problem. Looking merely at the averages, 75 of the commodity classes, 66 percent of the tons, and 49 percent of the total ton-miles, are carried at a loss. To this should be added the less-carload traffic, which is not shown on the chart, but on which the Interstate Commerce Commission's figures show a loss of approximately $100 million a year. Obviously, it is possible for the railroads to carry such a large percentage of their traffic at a loss only because the remaining traffic * * * pay higher rates than would be necessary if it were not for the losses incurred on the commodities below the costline."

On the question of out-of-pocket cost, this rate is not supposed to return any profit to the railroads, neither is it supposed to be carried for less than actual cost. The items run: explosives, 551 percent ratio to out-of-pocket cost; wheat, 223 percent; oranges and grapefruit, 103 percent; cattle and calves, 90 percent; from anthracite to washers 19 percent of out-of-pocket costs.

These reports can be secured from the ICC, "Statement 5–57, Distribution of Rail Revenue Contribution by Commodity Groups, 1955."

In the days ahead, when you hear so much and read so much about tolls and user charges, and about destroying the national transportation policy which now provides for the ICC "to protect the inherent advantage of each form of transportation," I hope that possibly we may have contributed something to your thinking. I cannot resist the temptation to make a constructive comment—meant in all sincerity The railroad rate structure, in my opinion, is the major reason for inadequate railroad earnings. Study the railroad pricing system looking merely at the averages; 75 of the commodity classes, 66 percent of the tons, 49 percent of the total ton-miles, are carried at a loss. No other important industry in the country, to my knowledge, does business or attempts to do business with such disregard to cost.

Support strongly opposition to destruction of low-cost water transportation and the elimination of the trucking industry which notably provides speed and flexibility of service.

Always remember, any government that is big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take everything you have got.

## Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend to the House's attention a provocative speech made by Miss Kay Jackson, an 11th grade student at Crosby High School, Crosby, Miss. Miss Jackson's address was delivered before the Crosby Rotary Club on March 12. The speech follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE

(As presented in speech by Miss Kay Jackson, junior, Crosby High School, before Crosby Rotary Club, March 12, 1959)

Since I was asked to choose my own subject for my talk today I have thought of several but the one I wish to talk on interests me greatly as I'm sure it does all freedom loving Americans. This is the advantages of the American free enterprise system. To me this system covers every field of free enterprise and especially do I think of the medical profession when I think of it—of the many advantages of private medical care. There has been and still is an effort to create public sentiment in support of a Government controlled medical program. A very distorted picture of the health and medical situation in this country has been drawn. It is true that there are problems to be solved but these problems make greater progress each year in being taken care of. To lose perspective is to lose pudgment. Many critics indicate that increased medical costs are proving financially disastrous to families faced with illness or accident. It is true that medical costs, like all other costs have risen in the last few years. The American Medical Association realizes this. They have advocated and strongly promoted the sale of voluntary health insurance as one of the aids to cushion the economic shock of illness. The great majority of American people do want to pay their own way and a certain amount of medical care is an expectable item on any family budget. Services of a doctor to those that were unable to pay has been vigorously promoted by the medical association. Great Britain and France have socialized medicine. In neither country has it come up to expectations. Neither have what we would consider adequate standards of medical and hospital care. Popular opinion of both countries favored government control of health insurance. As a result there has been a broad trend toward a nonfree enterprise system of much more than the health field. We in American couldn't want the Government to control our doctors and hospitals. This would be a grand way to drag our medical profession down to a low level of mediocrity.

There is really no such thing as free medical care or any other free benefits from the Government. Somebody pays for it. Under Government management the medical profession would be greatly impaired. Look at what has happened to the once rugged and independent farmer. He was the backbone of our Nation. The Government's planned economy has almost made a puppet out of him. Today the farmer plants whatever crops the Government decides upon. They market their products in a manner carefully prescribed and rigidly administered by the Government. They have surrendered much of their freedom. The same thing could happen to our medical profession. The Government is also getting more and more control over employment and wages. Our Constitution does not say that the Federal Government acting in the capacity of an economic manner shall promote the welfare of one person at the expense of another. The Government has no right in times of peace to take the fruits of one person's labor and give it to another. The Federal Government cannot make people rich. But it can make the rich poor by taxing away their substance and by stifling their incentive to work and to save. The only thing the Government can distribute evenly is poverty and enslavement. The real destroyer of the liberties of the people is he who spreads among them bounties, donations, and benefits. By their voice and their vote the people of America should insist that our Federal Government cease distribution of bounties, donations, and benefits. There has been no real opposition to the numerous projects the Government promotes—these projects eat up millions in taxpayer's money—worse still it's a giant step in taking away more and more of our freedom. It's time we as a people ask ourselves are we turning our backs upon our system of free, competitive enterprise. Some may deny that we are but our actions belie our words. Under our free competitive enterprise system we have amassed the greatest productive power the world has ever known. No planned economy could do this.

Many of our Founding Fathers fled their native countries to escape the serfdom which such planning imposed. For several years more and more people are becoming alarmed at the tendency of the Government to impose restrictions on business. We don't argue the fact that government has its place in our democracy. We need it for our protection but business should be free to control its own activities except when they violate the rights of others. Many fear that that Government misuse of controls will destroy our free enterprise entirely. Free enterprise provides more benefits for more people than any other system devised by man. It raises the standard of living. It makes no difference whether one believes in free enterprise or not; it works. An excellent example to prove this is the German miracle. In 1948 West Germany had to make an economic choice. They chose the free enterprise economy, and as a result have risen from the rubble of World War II to economic and financial preeminence in Western Europe. Then take a look at what has happened to Great Britain in this time. They do not seem to be able to shake themselves loose from the tentacles of socialism fastened upon their economy under Labor government. Is there moral in this? Yest. Nations which abandon free enterprise are doomed to decline. Nations which adopt it are bound to ascend.

Let us all remember that at the feet of the Statue of Liberty lies a broken chain that is seldom seen, but this broken chain is a symbol of the bonds which chained a people struggling for freedom. The torch of this statue burns bright; shedding light upon the world, proclaiming freedom for the great democracy of America and all the people that want freedom. Here people can live and make their living under the free enterprise system—that is, if they don't allow the Government too much control and remember there is no such thing as "Federal funds." That term is a wolf dressed up in sheep's clothing and it deceives a lot of people into feeling that whatever we get from the Government is free. It is time for all freedom-loving Americans to realize there is no primrose path to easy money or to a more abundant life. Let's safeguard and treasure our free enterprise system, for it is the backbone of our great Nation. Eternal vigilance is the price of free enterprise. Then let's not let the Government take the first great step in destroying it by forcing upon us socialized medicine. If we do, soon we will have lost the freedom that millions of Americans have fought and died for.

## Domestic Enemy No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, inflation ranks high among the more serious and pressing problems confronting the Nation today, for, unchecked, it could bring ruin to the people and the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 23, 1959, Los Angeles Times, written by Mr. Norman Chandler, publisher of the Times, which contains a thoughtful and timely discussion of this problem.

Among the high points of the editorial are the recommendations given for moves to take, and those not to take, to place a checkrein on the forces of inflation. The time for action is now, and I believe Mr. Chandler's recommendations should receive serious consideration:

DOMESTIC ENEMY NO. 1

(By Norman Chandler)

Sometimes a transaction right here in Los Angeles tells us more about a national or international problem than all the spilled ink and oratory of Washington.

I am thinking about the contract our board of water and power commissioners recently awarded to the Brown Boveri Corp. of Switzerland for two turbine generators for the Haynes steam power plant near Long Beach.

QUESTIONS OF SECURITY

This contract and another for similar heavy machinery, made by the Tennessee Valley Authority with a British company, have caused the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization in Washington to order an investigation. Some people say the national security is involved when such machinery is purchased from foreign companies.

When the power commissioners contracted with the Swiss company the lowest American bid was more than half again as high. The Swiss got the business for $9,260,800.

The lowest American bid contained an escalation clause—and this is very significant to what I am writing about. This clause provided that the bidding price on the first turbine generator could be increased by 30 percent before delivery and the second by 40 percent. For an American company this escalation clause was a necessary hedge against inflation of the costs of materials and labor between 1959 and 1963, when the second unit would be delivered.

The Swiss bid contained no escalation clause and neither did three British bids. But all three American bids did.

It seems plain to me that American manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment—a very important area of production—are being priced out of their own market, and the world market, too, by factors beyond their control.

IN CASE OF WAR

The chief argument against accepting foreign bids on heavy generating equipment is security, and that is why the OCDM is going to look into the matter. The American companies say that in case of war or other serious international difficulties spare parts for the machines which produce a critical amount of our electric power would not be quickly available if the parts had to be made abroad.

The Los Angeles Haynes plant eventually will produce 16 percent of our power. If that were cut out for a considerable length of time, the loss might be crippling.

But I think all Americans can find a greater cause for concern than the security argument important as that may be. Let me get back to that question of pricing ourselves out of markets here and everywhere.

In some lines we have been able to compete in the world because of our mass production techniques and the labor-saving devices which continually increase output per man in the labor force. We can make some things so fast and so well that, in spite of high wages and expensive materials, we can satisfy domestic customers and sell surpluses abroad.

But not everything can be made on a production line. In heavy industry, of which electric power equipment is our example, many items are custom built. When a piece of equipment is engineered and manufactured to special requirements, the labor-saving devices of, say, the automobile industry cannot be applied.

In such heavy industry the manufacturers feel the pinch of the American wage differential and the higher prices of materials. Average hourly earnings in the United States range from 2½ to 5 times those of Europe. Moreover, American wages continue to rise, as witness that 30 to 40 percent escalation clause in the low American bid on the Los Angeles equipment.

Now, certainly nobody in his right mind would propose that American wages be cut to European levels to put our heavy industry back into domestic or world competition.

And nobody who thinks about our delicate position in the world and our expensive nursing of industrial development in the backward countries would like to see our Government embargo foreign manufactures just so our inflation whirl can continue up and up.

THE SUBSIDY PROPOSAL

Some of the more advanced free traders have proposed that we subsidize our own manufacturers so they can compete, but the thought should give the horrors to anybody who has watched our farm price-support programs through a generation.

Some of our manufacturers are building plants abroad to take advantage of lower costs, but that is no solution for this country. What would happen to hundreds of thousands of American workmen if the heavy electric industry, just to name one, took flight to Europe and Japan?

I don't think there is any simple or quick solution of this very serious problem, but I do think something can be done which will improve our position slowly.

When firefighters cannot put out a forest blaze they build a backfire to check the advance. It seems to me the best we can do now is build a backfire against inflation.

Government can help by living within its means, because its manipulation of interest rates and its borrowing are the beginning, or the trigger mechanism, of inflation.

But Government fiscal policy is not the only cause of inflation. There is something called the wage-price spiral.

Productivity of the American working force increases at a historical rate of 2.3 percent a year but wages have been increasing in recent years at about double that rate.

BALANCING THE INCREASES

There is the key. We do not have to abolish wage increases; we have only to get the increases in a just balance with the increase of productivity.

I'm sure Vice President NIXON is thinking very hard on this subject. He is spokesman for the Cabinet committee against inflation, and neither he nor the committee can overlook the things I have been talking about here. If we want to stop inflation, what else is there to talk about?

## Huntington Park Daily Newspaper Editorial Says "A Firm Stand Well Taken" by President Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 17, 1959*

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for the reading of yourself and all the other Members of this distinguished legislative body an editorial in the Daily Signal, a newspaper serving the greater southeast communities in Los Angeles County, Calif., and including the great 23d Congressional District which I represent in this my 13th year. I know you will agree with me that same is very timely and very pertinent, as well as a very valuable brief comment upon a subject about which all of us are prayerfully concerned:

A FIRM STAND WELL TAKEN

Men who cherish freedom in every corner of the globe cannot but rejoice today in the firm and positive stand taken by President Eisenhower last night in his speech to the Nation on the Berlin crisis.

The President, while he left the door open for reasonable negotiation, made it equally clear that this country is fast in its determination to stand and fight, if necessary, to preserve our pledge to the free people of West Berlin.

"We have no intention," the President said, "of forgetting our rights or of deserting a free people. Soviet rulers should remember that freemen have, before this, died for so-called scraps of paper which represented duty and honor and freedom."

ONLY POSSIBLE STAND

The President's stand on the Berlin crisis is, of course, the only stand this Nation with conscience can take. It is the same stand we had to take in Korea 9 years ago and it is the same position we should have held with firmness in our dealings with the Soviet Union throughout.

Basic Soviet gains, it must be remembered, have been made when the free world weakened and failed to resist. When the bluff has been called the Soviet strategy has been to withdraw and await an easier time.

SOME GRAVE DOUBTS

And while all freemen must rejoice in the stand Mr. Eisenhower has taken on Berlin, grave doubts, despite his assuring words last night, have been raised as to this country's ability to make our position stick.

By the President's own admission a very few days ago the United States is in no position successfully to wage a ground war in Europe. And in his speech last night he made it graphically clear our basic defense is based on our retaliatory power with nuclear bombs and missiles.

The question is yet unanswered by the administration is what this country's response is to be should the Soviet Union decide, as certainly is most likely, to attack in Europe on the ground. Will the United States then wage an all out retaliatory nuclear war? Or will we rely on our admittedly inadequate ground forces and those of our allies to wage what we already concede will be a losing war?

## Farewell, Murderer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 26, 1959*

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to include the editorial by David Lawrence of the U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Farewell, Murderer."

FAREWELL, MURDERER

(By David Lawrence)

Anastas Mikoyan was not officially invited to visit the United States. He obtained a visa for the purpose of visiting the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

But, for all practical purposes, the journey was a carefully planned maneuver by the Soviet Government adroitly designed to test out whether the American people, by their overwhelming vote against the Republican Party in the last congressional election, had in fact repudiated the leadership of President Eisenhower in world affairs. If so, then, by driving a wedge between the American people and their Government, the Soviets hoped to pursue their campaign to oust allied forces from West Berlin and gain another victory in the cold war.

A Democratic Senator assured the Soviet Deputy Premier that there is unity in Congress on world policy.

Mikoyan was feted by some businessmen and some labor leaders. He was, on the whole, treated courteously by the people. He was given lengthy audiences by the President and the Secretary of State. The American press gave him headlines and plenty of space, as did television and radio.

But, while our Government officials were scrupulously polite because they had to be, it is a matter of considerable puzzlement that the American press fell down so badly in exposing Mikoyan. Only here and there did editorials appear referring to the record which shows his hands dripping with the blood of Hungarian patriots.

Basil Brewer, publisher of the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, felt so badly about the lack of attention to the facts that he bought advertising space in several newspapers in the East to reprint his editorial entitled "This Monster, Mikoyan." The editorial said in part:

"Deputy Premier Mikoyan was sent to Budapest to take charge for Moscow, when the freedom fighters deposed the puppet regime and set up a new government under Premier Imre Nagy.

"On October 31, 1956, Mikoyan personally assured Zoltan Tildy, minister of state of the new Hungarian government, that Soviet troops would be withdrawn from Hungary. This welcome news was announced over the Budapest radio by General Maleter, defense minister in the new Hungarian government,

and reported from free-world news correspondents on the scene.

"Even as Mikoyan gave his pledge, however, he was calling for Soviet troop reinforcements to mass outside Hungary, in preparation for the attack of November 3–4.

"Having put the Hungarian leadership off guard, Mikoyan arranged a series of conferences between Soviet and Hungarian military leaders, 'to plan the withdrawal.' After several sessions, an emergency parley was arranged for 10 p.m., November 3, at Soviet military headquarters outside Budapest.

"Once inside the conference room, General Maleter and his aides were arrested, and immediately, the signal was given for a massive Soviet tank and infantry attack on Budapest. While Premier Nagy, unaware of the trap, implored over the radio for General Maleter to return to his post, the Soviet forces moved in for the kill.

"A few days later with Mikoyan still in full charge for Moscow, Nagy himself was tricked into leaving asylum in the Yugoslav embassy and taken prisoner.

"Mikoyan's vital role in this bloody chapter of history has not been as widely reported as it should have been. The Soviet Government has never mentioned it, and witnesses who would have testified to it have gone—by death in the fighting, by deportation and by execution. The voices of General Maleter and Premier Nagy were silenced by firing squad. As is his custom, Mikoyan tried to leave no trace.

"It is an insult to the American people for this archmurdered Mikoyan to pretend to be a good-will ambassador to the United States. Only disaster can come from American businessmen and officials fawning over this Machiavellian monster."

Our State Department has confirmed the facts related above.

The Soviet Deputy Premier surely didn't convert many American businessmen. Most of them attended the social functions out of curiosity.

Why, however, was Mikoyan given the red carpet treatment by any private organizations or persons? Why were the few pickets and demonstrators who did appear reprimanded in our press?

Can it be that we haven't enough proof yet of the perfidy of the Communist regime? President Eisenhower did not hesitate to say in his message to Congress just after Mikoyan arrived:

"We have learned the bitter lesson that international agreements, historically considered by us as sacred, are regarded in Communist doctrine and in practice to be mere scraps of paper."

That's why we cannot trust the Soviet regime. That's why we must remain armed to the teeth.

Recalling the tragedy in Hungary, we say to our departed guest Mikoyan: "Farewell, murdered."

## Graduate Fellowship Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a telegram from the Honorable Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor of the University of Kansas, in which he clearly and unmistakenly indicates the vital need for the restoration of funds for the graduate fellowship program as provided for in the National Defense Education Act:

LAWRENCE, KANS., *March 23, 1959.*
Representative NEWELL GEORGE,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

Have just learned of action of Appropriations Committee in eliminating graduate fellowship program for National Defense Education Act for fiscal 1959. Such action if sustained by Congress would be unbelievably shortsighted and would represent real violence to both short- and long-range developments of scientific and educational resources in this country. The only gainers by such action would be the Communist countries. How complacent can we get? Urgently urge House reversal of committee action.

FRANKLIN D. MURPHY,
*Chancellor, University of Kansas.*

## Federal Tax on Telephone Service—Resolution To Repeal by the Mississippi Public Utilities Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill to repeal the Federal excise tax on telephone service.

This tax was originally imposed for purposes other than the raising of revenue, in a time of emergency when it was necessary to discourage the use of telephone for purposes not related to the war effort. It is my belief that continued imposition of this wartime tax as a revenue measure is, in a sense and to some degree, a dishonest act on our part. If this revenue is needed, and the original purpose of the tax is no longer existent, it should be repealed and subsequently reenacted as a revenue producing measure.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a resolution on this subject recently adopted by the Mississippi Public Service Commission. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Congress of the United States during World War II levied the Federal excise tax on local telephone service and greatly increased the tax rates on other communication services as a temporary, wartime emergency measure to raise money for the war effort and to discourage unnecessary use of services and materials in critical supply; and

Whereas the national emergency created by those hostilities ended more than 13 years ago and the original purposes of the tax have long since disappeared, and there exists no other emergency to justify the continuation of this tax; and

Whereas while historically a Federal excise tax on communication services has never been imposed on the American public except in times of emergency, this tax is still imposed upon and collected from the communications users of this country; and

Whereas in 1958, the Federal excise tax on telephone services took more than $4 million from the pockets of telephone customers in Mississippi alone or approximately $14.50 per telephone; and

Whereas Congress has removed the excise tax on electricity, and since gas and water services have never been so taxed, telephone service is the only household utility service that is subject to a Federal excise tax; and

Whereas the Federal excise tax on communication service is unjustified, unfair, discriminatory, and contrary to the best interests of the communications users of the State of Mississippi and of this Nation, and should be repealed; and

Whereas there are now pending in the Congress of the United States certain bills which would effect the repeal of the Federal excise tax on communication services: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Mississippi Public Service Commission does hereby petition and respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States repeal the Federal excise tax on communications services; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate, and to each member of the Mississippi delegation in Congress.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Mississippi Public Service Commission on this 17th day of March 1959.

NORMAN A. JOHNSON, Jr.,
*Chairman.*
W. E. MOORE,
*Commissioner.*
THOMAS HAL PHILLIPS,
*Commissioner.*
O. B. MARSHALL,
*Secretary.*

## Political Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the basic flaws of reasoning behind the fair trade bill, which would permit manufacturers to go around antitrust and set retail prices, will come to light sooner or later. Sometimes the obvious is difficult to see.

Imagine asking that antitrust price conspiracy laws, originated to protect businessmen and consumers alike, be set aside. Imagine, trying to eliminate the need for women shopping around. Imagine, eliminating competition in a free enterprise market system.

Fair trade is a contradiction, is self-defeating and will hurt most those it is designed to help. One has but to study the bill and understand marketing and merchandising to see this.

When the fatal flaws are clearly seen, the consumers will not be forgiving of these Federal representatives who put this law on the books. It is not unlikely that even those manufacturers and retailers who thought they wanted fair trade price fixing will turn against those legislators who accepted their earlier advice and passed this law.

## The Constitution: Rights and Duties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, has recently through its official oratorical judicial staff, under the auspices of the Americanism committee, made its selection of the 1959 oratorical winner's speech entitled, "The Constitution: Rights and Duties."

The American Legion has fostered and promoted many patriotic movements among our youth, such as Girls and Boys States, Poor Boys Camps and welfare and charitable programs, but none are as far reaching as the oratorical and essay contests.

The thousands of youngsters throughout the public and parochial students of the primary and high school grades in Illinois compete for this high honor.

The hours spent in research of patriotic subjects and historical works stimulate patriotic thoughts and knowledge of both our patriotic leaders and their concept of our Constitution in its use and control of our Government.

We thus give our youth an opportunity to study our Government and the intricacies of its constitutional operation. This training is of tremendous value in molding our future citizens for their civic responsibilities in the future.

The State finals of the department of Illinois were held in Springfield, Ill., on Friday, March 13. My friend, Frank Bottigliero, assistant department adjutant, formerly chairman of the State Americanism committee, formerly trained under my deceased brother, Elliodor, chairman of the Americanism committee for many years before his death, who was responsible for many of the American Legion's Americanism programs, sent me the following letter:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS,
*Chicago, Ill., March 23, 1959.*

Hon. Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
*Old House Building*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR LIS: Enclosed herewith please find the 1959 department of Illinois State oratorical winner's speech entitled "The Constitution: Rights and Duties."

The State finals of the Department of Illinois were held in Springfield on Friday, March 13, and Roger Majak, representing the eighth district of the first division, department of Illinois, attending the Thornton Fractional South High School, 18114 Ridgewood Avenue, Lansing, Ill., was judged the State winner and will represent Illinois.

Would you please be kind enough to have the oration printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

FRANK C. BOTTIGLIERO,
*Assistant Department Adjutant.*

[Enclosure.]

THE CONSTITUTION: RIGHTS AND DUTIES

(By Roger Majak, Thornton Fractional South High School, Lansing, Ill.)

Recently, I read an interesting short story which made a great impression upon me. It was taken from an ancient legend and is called "The Country of the Blind." It seems that nestled among the snow-capped peaks of the majestic Andes Mountains of South America, there was a legendary valley completely apart from all the world of men. The valley was a beautiful place; it was situated in such a way that the surrounding mountains protected it from the weather—thus there was perpetual summer. Bright sunlight during the day and silvery stars at night shone down upon this Utopian paradise, the Shangri La of the Andes.

And yet, there was something strangely wrong with the people who lived in that valley—you see, they were totally blind. A strange disease had run its course among the people so that gradually, each generation saw less clearly than the preceding one. After many years the old became groping and uncertain, the young saw but dimly, and the children born to them never saw at all. Finally, their sense of sight was lost forever.

It is a sad tale, isn't it? And yet, I feel that this story is representative of the greatest danger that exists in America today—a danger which could actually destroy the Constitution of the United States and the way of life which that Constitution represents.

This country of ours is, in a way, a utopia. It is the finest civilization ever created by man. It has been described in thousands of ways by many persons far more eloquent than I; and yet they all say the same thing, "America is the greatest land of all." Like the towering Andes mountains there stands the Constitution, protecting and guiding us in the valley of life. But what about the people? In the "Country of the Blind" the people could not see, and thus the beauty of their valley was wasted, for what is beauty without men to see and enjoy it, and to fight, if need be, to preserve it? Here, ladies and gentlemen, lies the danger against which we must guard. We must be always alert lest we become blind to the greatness of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, lest we become so intent upon gaining our constitutional rights that we become blind to our constitutional duties, lest we become indifferent toward life in America. For the greatness of America, like the beauty of that legendary valley, is wasted without the true appreciation of its citizens; the Constitution, without men to defend and uphold it, is but a useless piece of parchment; and the Bill of Rights, without citizens who accept its challenge and respect its authority, is but a group of meaningless words.

I often wonder as I observe the workings of this Nation, whether its people are actually conscious of what is going on around them. I often wonder if they see the marvelous system of which they are a part. I wonder if they ever stop to think about the things which make America possible.

I have often thought it would be wonderful to be able to call America to a sudden halt; to have the farmers in the field, the secretaries in the offices, the housewives in the kitchens, and the laborers in the factories stop—for a moment; to silence the wheels of industry and the hum of business; to be able suddenly to freeze the entire panorama of life in America. If I could do that I would ask each man to think about the true meaning of the Constitution and its effect upon his life.

I should ask each man to think briefly about the history of the Constitution, for the past is the key to the present. I would ask him to recall the golden age of American government when a group of colonists, working together for a common cause, constructed a system of government from the lessons of their experience and from their shear determination to enjoy the blessings that God had created for them. They devised a method of government which has lasted, relatively unchanged, until today. There were the Thomas Jeffersons, the George Washingtons, Madisons, Monroes, Adams, and countless others whose dedication and energy were limitless, whose wisdom and personal sacrifice have been unequaled to this very day.

And then I would ask the people of America to note the significance of the Constitution today. I would ask them to consider carefully their inalienable rights and duties under the Constitution. It occurs to me that, in respect to rights and duties, the Constitution and the bill of rights are like a pendulum. Have you ever watched the pendulum of a "grandfather clock"? It is a basic law of physics that the pendulum swings an equal distance to each side of the perpendicular. That is, it swings just as far to the left as it does to the right. And so it is with the Constitution. For every constitutional privilege, there is a corresponding duty. So that, just as we have the right to vote, so we have the duty to vote wisely; just as we have the right of free speech, so we have the duty to extend that same right to others; just as we have the right to worship as we please, we have the duty under the Constitution to tolerate the religious choice of others; and just as we accept the protection and services of the Government, so should we respect our duty to pay our just amount of taxes to make those services possible. Yes, I would ask the people of America to examine carefully their patriotic attitudes and their American sense of values. I would have them ask themselves if they are doing their part in upholding the principles and responsibilities of a free society.

And then, I would have them look at the Constitution of the future. Of course, we cannot know what the future of the Constitution might be. But we can plan and resolve; we can hope and dream; we can invest our faith in the future of constitutional government. The Constitution is more than a political document; it is an act of faith—faith in its people to uphold and defend it. And so to all Americans I would suggest that we stop, renew our faith, and invest our energies in the future of the Constitution.

And then the throbbing, bustling, seething life of America in action could resume.

Of course, we cannot make all Americans pause and think. We can only hope that through improved education, through contests such as this one, through the work of patriotic organizations and civic-minded industries, we Americans will come to an unprecedented knowledge, respect, and confidence in our great Constitution. There is a deep underlying sense of patriotism in the heart of every American, but sometimes that patriotism becomes lost in the personal cares of everyday life. Sometimes our constitutional sense of duty becomes passive, and we forget our responsibilities. Sometimes it takes a Kaiser Wilhelm, a Pearl Harbor, or a Russian sputnik to rekindle our patriotic fire and enthusiasm.

But because I feel that basically we Americans are the most patriotic people in all the world, although at times we do not outwardly show it, I am optimistic in the future of the Constitution, as old Ben Franklin was when he made his famous constitutional prophesy.

It was the last session of the Constitutional Convention. Their work completed, the Delegates had gathered for the final time to sign their names to the document which represented the fruit of months of labor and years of personal thoughts, dreams, and ambitions. The new Constitution of the United States was ready for presentation to the public for its approval. But a strange atmosphere of gloom and despair hung in the air of that tiny courtroom in Philadelphia. For, despite the fact that they felt they had done their very best, many of the Delegates believed that their work was doomed to failure. Their only joy seemed to be in the fact that their work was done and they could now return to their homes and families.

As each Delegate came forward to sign his name, the members talked noisily among themselves about the possibilities of success or failure. Finally, it was Ben Franklin's turn to sign. As he approached the table his eyes fell upon the high-backed chair in which President Washintgon was seated. And there he saw, carved in the back of the chair, a familiar sight to him. It was a half-sun peeping over the horizon. A broad smile suddenly lightened the face of the eldest Member of the Convention, and, having signed his name, he turned and faced his colleagues. Immediately there was a hushed silence and all eyes were turned upon the little man with the fragile bifocals who had so often been the inspirational peacemaker for the group during their long hours of spirited debate. Slowly he turned and pointed at the emblem carved in the oak chair, and he said: "I have often looked at that sun behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now at length I have the happiness to know that it is rising."

As the sun was rising then, it is still rising today. And constitutional government shall continue to rise in the annals of history as long as men continue to pledge themselves to its cause. It shall continue to rise as long as we cherish our rights and faithfully execute our duties. If we each stop for a moment in our busy lives to recall the importance and greatness of the Constitution, if we briefly recall our golden heritage, if we remember that its future depends upon us, then the Constitution is as safe as anything in this hectic world can be. Yet, lest we become too confident, it is well to remember that ancient legend I mentioned a few moments ago, for should we ever forget the Constitution ours would become the "country of the blind."

With a public attitude of responsibility and confidence in the future, and caution lest we become blindly indifferent, the Constitution, like the rising sun, will continue to climb to new heights of peace and justice, and the government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

## Correct List of Those in Attendance at the Mass Media Committee of the Consultative Conference on Desegregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on March 13 I inserted an article from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, which contained the minutes of the Mass Media Committee of the Consultative Conference on Desegregation, Wednesday, February 4, 1959. In the first paragraph of this article there was a list of persons in attendance. A printing error occurred in the first paragraph. The correct list of those present should read as follows:

Arnold Aronson, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Gunther Lawrence, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Henry Moon, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Alex Morisey, American Friends Service Committee; Guichard Parris, National Urban League; Alan Reitman, American Civil Liberties Union; Ed White, United Steelworkers of America; chairman, Ali Bernheim, American Jewish Committee; secretary, Harry Fleischman, National Labor Service.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to make this correction for the RECORD.

## Back to the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1959, we all applauded the President's speech in which he made our position on Berlin clear. He stated that we would "not give an inch." I hope in the talks about a summit meeting we are not encroaching on that "inch." Before we enter any summit meeting there should be a definite agenda set up which reiterates the Atlantic Charter, self-determination for all peoples, reunification, and, at long last, the foundation for a just and equitable peace. Only if these are agreed on can any good, based on past experiences, come out of another summit conference.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Daily News of March 24, 1959, which is worthy of our attention:

BACK TO THE SUMMIT

The weekend huddle of President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Harold Macmillan brought one major decision. We now seem committed to a meeting of the Big Four (United States of America, Britain, France and the U.S.S.R.) Foreign Ministers. Then, if the foreign ministers are able to agree on topics, Messrs. Eisenhower, Macmillan, de Gaulle and Khrushchev will sit down for a top confab, some time this summer. Macmillan even talks of a whole series of these conferences.

Some such summit event has long been craved by Khrushchev, who yearns for international respectability; and by Macmillan, who possibly could do with a little extra prestige and publicity in advance of Britain's next election.

COMMUNIST DOUBLECROSS

But what will happen, actually? The only precedent came on July 23, 1955. That summit conference in Geneva (Eisenhower, Eden, Faure, Bulganin) agreed in a solemn communique that "the settlement of the German question and the reunification of Germany by free elections shall be carried out. The Foreign Ministers will make whatever arrangements they may consider desirable."

But on November 16, 1955, V. M. Molotov, then the Soviet Foreign Minister, blandly refused to agree to any German vote whatever which might free East Germany from its Red satellite category.

The conference order may be reversed this year. Khrushchev rather than his present Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, may pull the rug from under the West. Only one thing's certain: you can't trust any Soviet agreement, no matter which slippery Commie does the signing.

Added thought for our conference agenda: Even Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, urges that Secretary of State Dulles should stay at the diplomatic helm though he may be physically unable to attend the Foreign Ministers' meeting. We agree, enthusiastically.

## Need for an Overall Science and Technology Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the first sputnik aroused great public and congressional concern over the state of American science and technology. That event served to alert us and to spurt us on to action, with the result that during the past year and a half we have made considerable progress and scored some notable achievements in these fields.

There is some evidence, however, that as a result of our own recent successes in astronautics we are once again lapsing into a state of complacency. The Eighth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation warns us as follows:

We have only made a beginning; the major job is still to be done. As a nation, we appear to forget that we live in a competitive world and shall continue to do so. It seems abundantly clear that we shall rapidly lose in competition, unless we can show more determined and constructive efforts than we have during the past years.

This is a warning we should heed. It deserves our fullest attention. I have given it considerable thought and it is as a result of this warning that I was prompted to take the action described in the succeeding paragraphs.

A vital element in an adequate science program is, to my mind, the creation of a single agency in which the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other existing Federal science agencies can be gathered together under one roof. This would make for efficiency, economy, better coordination and cooperation, and above all for greater achievements in less time.

At the present time, our Government administers a vast and highly diversified research and development effort in science. This, in itself, is a task of almost incredible complexity. Considering the dimensions of this task, it is not surprising that we have as yet not been able to devise the most effective ways and means for managing such a gigantic and varied program. To be sure, there have been attempts in the past to relate the research and development activities of various government agencies to each other, as well as to research activities being carried on outside of the Government. These efforts, however, have had limited objectives and even more limited results. Consequently, the fundamental problem, that is, to devise effective means to manage our scientific research program, remains unsolved.

In order to help solve this problem and to establish the means whereby effective management of our science program could be obtained, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 5612, which calls for the creation of a Science and Technology Agency. It is to be known as the

"Science and Technology Agency Act of 1959."

The bill would create an independent Science and Technology Agency for the coordination and improvement of Federal functions relating to the conduct and support of scientific training and research. It takes the first necessary step of reorganizing and integrating the various science programs of the Federal Government. The Science and Technology Agency is to be headed by a Director appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

To this new Science and Technology Agency shall be transferred certain existing agencies and functions of the Government, together with their personnel, property, records, et cetera. Specifically named in the bill are the following agencies: National Science Foundation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Bureau of Standards, and such other agencies as the Congress believes should be incorporated in the overall agency.

Such additional matters as the processing and distribution of scientific information, educational grants and loans, national institutes of scientific research and cooperative international programs may later be incorporated in the bill, or discussed in the committee's report to the House, as the recommendations of the Executive agencies and the testimony at the hearings on the measure would demonstrate their need. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and I trust the committee will place it high on its calendar for early hearings and due consideration.

## Lesson From Vassalboro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, government by the people is evidencing itself in Maine towns currently holding their annual town meetings. Recently at the town meeting of Vassalboro a young father of three preschool daughters eloquently, courageously, and with strong conviction presented to his fellow townsmen a plea to curb unnecessary spending.

The Daily Kennebec Journal of Augusta, Maine, the newspaper serving the area, dealt editorially with that aspect of the town meeting in its edition of March 11, 1959. The editorial which follows merits the attention of every American:

LESSON FROM VASSALBORO

Is the Ship of State in real distress?

Well, is a national indebtedness of $280 billion anything to shake a stick at—or is it not?

The voters in Vassalboro saw these questions graphically presented and dramatized at their town meeting.

They saw the American flag displayed upside down, as it would be flown by a vessel in distress. And they heard criticism of such use of the flag—and were given an explanation.

The explanation was that nothing in the way of disrespect was implied, but that the idea was to dramatize the need to economize on expenditures of their own town money. The point was that the ship of state, wallowing in a sea of debt at a time when this country is engaged in a literal death struggle with international communism, really is in distress.

Where is the place to call a halt to the spending spree that adds constantly to our astronomical national debt?

The place to start—the Vassalboro town meeting was told—was right there.

And, wherever you live and exercise your voter's right, you could amend that, merely by substituting the name of your own city or town.

The place to start calling a halt to further reckless spending, deeper indebtedness, higher taxation—is right where you have your own small voice in local government.

This doesn't mean that towns and cities must or can't call all necessary spending. They can't, of course, and they won't.

But the Vassalboro voters heard this—and it is a truth which also applies everywhere else:

There are some things the voters need and must have and pay for. There are some things they need but can postpone buying for awhile. And lastly, there are some things—luxury-spending measures—which they do not really need but which merely appear desirable to some (it could even be a majority) of the voters.

We won't get out of debt, we won't live to see tax bills reduced, if at every opportunity we continue clamoring and voting for those things which are desirable but which we can do without.

That was a worthwhile lesson, from Vassalboro.

It was a lesson we should like to see equally well dramatized in every State capital in the land, in every city hall—and in both Houses of Congress.

## Reducing the Staggering Federal Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, many Americans see our staggering Federal debt as an ominous threat, not only to our Nation's fiscal integrity, but to the very survival of our free enterprise system and our democratic way of life. I can appreciate their concern. I share it. I am especially concerned over the magnitude of our debt, rather than the fact of the debt.

Mr. R. S. Shade of Tulsa, Okla., has drafted a provocative proposal for retiring the Federal debt. His proposal will, I believe, interest every American who shares the honest desire to reduce the debt. His proposal follows:

OUR $280 BILLION NATIONAL DEBT—IT IS OVER $485 BILLION CHEAPER TO PAY IT OFF THAN TO PAY THE INTEREST

When we consider our national debt, we wonder how and when it can ever be paid. No voice has been raised in the Halls of Congress, or among the financial leaders of our country, proposing any specific plan for its liquidation.

The average man realizes that if he has a mortgage on his home, or any other type of debt, that there must be a plan for the regular payment on the principal and the interest due, in order to pay it. If this is not done, he knows that serious trouble will ensue, with bankruptcy in the end. His history has taught him that numerous nations have fallen into decay and ruin through their blithely ignoring sound financial principles.

There is a plan which our great nation can follow which will pay this national debt, and at the end of 29 years the amount required for payment on the principal and interest would be less than the annual interest we are now paying. This plan would cover a period of 100 years, which in the life of our Nation is much shorter than an individual carrying a mortgage of 25 years, or a corporation with one of 50 years.

A payment of 1 percent of the principal would be paid each year, plus the interest due. At the end of the first year, we would pay 2.8 billion on the principal, plus 9.8 billion in interest. At the end of the 100th year, we would pay 2.8 billion on the principal, plus about 98 million in interest. The average amount of the interest over the 100 years would be 4.949 billion per year, or 494.9 billions for the 100 years. This amount, plus the debt of 280 billions, would make a total of 774.9 billions, and the debt would be completely wiped out.

Now, if we continue our present policy of paying the 9.8 billions in interest each year, we will then have paid 980 billions in the 100 years, and the debt of 280 billions would still be there. These two amounts represent a total of 1,260 billions, which is 485.1 billions more than the 774.9 billions required to pay both the debt and the interest. This is a saving of 4.851 billion per year, or enough to pay the principal payment of 2.8 billion and have 2.051 billion to pay on the interest each year. What prudent nation could overlook such a golden opportunity to save 485.1 billions, and still pay off its debt?

Our Nation is now, and has been, in a cold war with an implacable enemy, who would delight in destroying us, and the other free nations of the world. We are gradually winning in this gruelling struggle, but we can do much more. Lenin and Stalin taught their dupes that they would compel us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy and ruin. In the last 18 years our dollar has depreciated over 50 percent in value, and is now selling at a discount in several nations of the world. However, we can spread dismay in the ranks of our enemy when we proceed to balance our national budget and set up a sound plan to retire our national debt.

The Russian Government induced its people to purchase its savings bonds for their future welfare, but under Khrushchev they heartlessly repudiated them all.

By putting our plan in effect:

It would be a shining example to all the world as to what our Government considered to be its sacred obligation to its people.

It would restore confidence at home and abroad in the stability of our dollar.

It would convince our people that we are no longer drifting past the point of no return in our national fiscal affairs.

It would slow down the scared flight from the dollar into stocks and other equities.

The Treasury would be able to sell long-term bonds, and thus avoid the prevalent danger that is so inherent in short-term securities.

With such a plan in operation, each succeeding administration would be under obligation to the people to keep it in effect.

Let our great Nation quit its drifting and face up to its responsibilities; otherwise, what was set up by our Founding Fathers and others, through blood and sacrifice, will sink into ruin and end up in communism itself.

## Population Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the United States is the first, and apparently the only, country in the history of the world to consider its agricultural abundance as a curse instead of a blessing. I wonder if all the public weeping and wailing about our farm surplus is a very complimentary tribute to our national intelligence in the light of the facts that two-thirds of the world's population goes to bed hungry every night. I am not referring merely to an inadequate diet from the nutritional point of view, but hunger-of-the-belly kind that makes kids cry. I have seen this kind of hunger on the march in the Orient, where the life expectancy is from 28 to 30 years.

We know that communism travels on empty stomachs. The Congress now is being asked for some $3 billion to be added to some $6 billion already authorized but unexpended as foreign aid for the alleged purpose of winning the minds of men and women in foreign lands. I wonder how effective these dollars, wrung from the taxpayers of this country, can be when the people starving overseas hear of the food rotting in our storehouses? How long will it take us to learn that food has a universal appeal that breaks through any language barrier? A few days ago I appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and urged an extension of Public Law 480, believing that we could turn our agricultural resources into an American asset in international economic and political relations.

The following article entitled "Population Explosion," by Neal Stanford from the March 21, 1959, edition of the Christian Science Monitor points up the appaling figures of the world's population growth, suggesting, I submit, it may not be many years until our great problem will not be one of food abundance but one of scarcity and want. I trust my colleagues in reading this factual account will find encouragement to consider a more realistic attitude toward the great blessings of our land:

POPULATION EXPLOSION
(By Neal Stanford)

What about this "population explosion" which President Eisenhower considers just as challenging and threatening as the military power of the Sino-Soviet bloc, and the fanaticism of international communism's conspiracy?

As the President told Congress in his message on the mutual security program: "As a result of lowered infant mortality, longer lives, and the accelerating conquest of famine there is underway a population explosion so incredibly great that in little more than another generation the population of the world is expected to double. Asia alone is expected to have 1 billion more people than the entire world has today."

Yes; it is difficult to grasp the immensity of this population explosion and few people are aware of it. Yet during 1957 and 1958 some 90 million people were added to the world's population. This is about equal to Japan's present population, and twice that of France.

The Population Reference Bureau here in Washington has made a study of this coming "population explosion" that is without doubt the basis for the President's comments and warning. Says the bureau: At the rate the world's population is growing there will be nearly 7 billion people on earth by the year 2000. Today there are some 2,800 million.

The population of both the world and of the United States is growing at the rate of 1.7 percent a year. Most underdeveloped countries have a growth rate of 2 percent or more—and some 3 percent.

According to the Bureau's study it is not so much any increase in birth rates that accounts for this zooming growth rate. It is rather the rapidly falling death rates. Concludes the study: "This sudden and sharp drop in mortality has set off the jet-propelled surge in population growth since World War II."

China's population, it is estimated, is growing at the rate of 2 percent yearly. With a population base of some 650 million, that means that there are each year some 13 million more Chinese on the mainland.

In the period between 1959 and 2000 the marked growths in population will occur in Asia, Africa, South America. By 2000, it is estimated, Asia will have nearly 62 percent of the world's population; Latin America will have 9.4 percent; Africa 8.2 percent. North America's percentage will decline from 6.7 percent now to 5 percent. And Europe's percentage (the U.S.S.R. included) will drop from 23 percent to 15 percent.

It is the implication of these figures and growth rates that is so impressive—if not alarming. Involved are present world trade patterns, raw material, and finished products markets.

This population problem becomes even more astonishing and alarming when viewed from the perspective of history. It took 200,000 years for the world's human population to reach 2,800 million. Yet in another 40 years that may more than double. With the present rate of increase, it is not difficult to figure that give the world another 600 years or so and there will hardly be standing room on this planet—about one square meter per person.

Of course such a situation is fantastic—and unimaginable. Something will have to happen to break or resolve this population spiral that has President Eisenhower listing it as one of the four major social or political realities of the present world.

Then there is the related problem of feeding this expanding explosive population. That is one reason why the fast-growing underdeveloped countries continue to remain underdeveloped. In the race between population and development, these new countries have a hard time making any progress.

Already some two-thirds of the human race is underfed. The population explosion threatens to make it impossible for the world to produce food increasingly fast enough to keep up with the population growth.

Some people think that flight into space may be the answer to the population problem and algae farms will be the answer to the food problem. But while those afford fascinating subjects for speculation, they are not seriously considered as real answers to these serious problems.

## M Men Basketball: Bulwark of Spirituality and Clean Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the senior tournament of the largest basketball program in the world is being played this week in my district, on the campus of the Brigham Young University, at Provo, Utah. Its junior counterpart was played last week in Logan, Utah.

These tournaments are the annual all-church basketball tournaments of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The participants represent the best of more than 2,500 teams and 25,000 players scattered throughout the 49 States, Canada, and Mexico.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is the ideal and the program behind the tournaments, and not their size, which compels me to call them to the attention of my colleagues. In a Nation deeply disturbed over the growing menace of juvenile delinquency, this program represents a shining example of wholesome and constructive youth activity which has taught thousands of young Americans a respect for good health, clean living, morality and chastity, and, at the same time, has given them a deeper love of God.

This program is carried out by the Mutual Improvement Association of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, which was founded by Brigham Young. This great western colonizer, who was the second president of the Latter-day Saint—Mormon—Church, saw the teen-age problem in his own day. In 1869 he called together his teen-age daughters and, through them, established an association to give effective supervision and direction of young women of the church in their use of leisure time. In 1875 he founded a similar organization for the young men.

The wisdom and vision of Brigham Young were apparent in the associations from their beginning. An early issue of the magazine which the young men established soon after they were organized observed:

> The organization spread with astonishing rapidity, and in a few months, towns where there had been crowds of uncouth boys loitering around the stores, holloaing in the streets and breaking horses on the Sabbath day, a change was seen. In some cases, the roughest of these boys had been chosen presidents of associations.

In this century, as the delinquency problem has grown, these organizations have grown in both size and influence. Their total membership has passed 355,-

000 in some 2,000 wards and branches of the church throughout the world.

The scope of the program has broadened over the years, but the purpose has remained constant: the constructive use of leisure time in wholesome recreation, study, social, and athletic activity, and, above all, in religious training.

A lack of religious training has been a major cause of delinquency. This fact has been asserted repeatedly by J. Edgar Hoover, a peerless authority on the problem.

This celebrated director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has said:

The churches are in the front trenches of America's crime prevention crusade * * * I have been profoundly impressed with the fact that the churchgoing people are the most substantial group of citizens in the Nation. Church attendance and crime appear to be like * * * oil and water—they do not mix. * * * The greatest single factor in crime causation among juveniles today is the disintegration of the American home.

Mr. Hoover has also observed:

Juvenile delinquency is always rooted in adult delinquency, and only through general acceptance of higher moral values can we solve the problem entirely. The easiest way to bring this about, in my judgment, is through a return to religion. For several decades the general trend has been away from the age-old belief that man is God-centered and responsible for his thoughts and behavior to a higher power as well as to his fellow man. The resultant materialism has emphasized the values of expediency, shirking responsibility, and selfishness.

The Mutual Improvement Associations offer instruction and supervision for every teenage group, and for young men and women. It also encourages the participation of parents.

At the local level, the associations meet weekly throughout the year—usually on Tuesday nights. The meetings open with a song, prayer, and with other appropriate devotional exercises. Later the members separate for classwork, project activity, and special events.

Variety and flexibility are cornerstones in the program's success. Members have ample opportunity to express and cultivate their special interests and talents—including athletics, public speaking, and the cultural arts.

In the winter months, the young men organize basketball teams. The winners in league play advance to division tournaments, and the division champions become the participants in the all-church tournaments.

The senior tournament, which is being played this week, is held annually in the spacious George Albert Smith Fieldhouse at Brigham Young University, which is the largest church-operated university in the Nation. With pride and enthusiasm, Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, Brigham Young University president, and the school's 10,000 students serve as hosts and provide cheering sections for the 32 teams. Thousands of spectators annually see the tournament, whose championship game traditionally is televised to western audiences.

In other seasons the young men and boys play softball and volleyball. MIA athletics are a year-round program which stresses the blessing of good health and the value of physical fitness. The all-church championships are cherished prizes. But the emphasis lies not alone upon winning. In every all-church tournament a prize more coveted than the championship itself is the sportsmanship trophy, whose winners are rousingly applauded as the real champions in their own right.

In the local league play, and in the tournaments, the players invariably convene in prayer. Under no circumstances is profanity countenanced.

Only the boys who are morally clean and who live a strict health code—known among the Latter-day Saints as the word of wisdom— are eligible to play. The code permits no smoking and no drinking and urges members to practice temperance and moderation in personal habits as well as in diet. Chastity is a strict requirement.

The former middleweight boxing champion of the world, Gene Fullmer, himself a product of the program, has said that MIA athletics and the word of wisdom are all that a young man needs to keep in good physical condition.

Perhaps the best measure of the success of the MIA is the appeal it holds for outsiders. Visitors are encouraged to participate—and often do. They are welcomed into every activity and are eligible for basketball, softball, volleyball, provided they respect the word of wisdom.

In Japan the MIA meetings have attracted more nonmembers than members. In 1956 the average attendance at the meetings in Japan was 760 Latter-day Saints and 1,500 nonmembers.

Rebecca Franklin, writing in the New York Times Sunday magazine in 1955, gave the program this tribute:

Undoubtedly one of the most efficiently organized youth movements in the world, MIA provides spiritualized recreation for its members through music, drama, speech and athletics, a never-ending round of carefully supervised activities. For 100 years the Saints have been keeping 'em busy and out of mischief.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I find the reason for the success of this program very clear—it holds the key of genuine happiness and has given that key to young Americans. It has shown them that lasting success and happiness do not lie in the pleasures and temptations of the material-rich world which surrounds them, but lie instead in the spiritual treasures in which home and church and faith and service abound.

## Pricing Ourselves Out of Business and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is a cause for great concern that every day we are finding more and more evidence that America is succeeding in making its economy very nearly untenable in the international competitive world.

An example of this is reflected in this editorial item from the March 21–22, 1959, issue of the Bangor Daily News, which I am submitting to the RECORD.

PRICING OURSELVES OUT OF BUSINESS AND JOBS

Various national business leaders recently have been warning that American goods are pricing themselves out of the market.

An example of what they meant was evidenced close to home this week, when the low bidder for the U.S. Navy radio station project at Cutler offered to reduce its figure $200,000 if it could use Italian-made steel for the towers. This isn't an isolated case: A large amount of Japanese and Italian steel went into building the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

American steel is not the only industry hurt by the lower prices of foreign competitors. The housewife need look no further that her favorite shopping places to find a variety of foreign goods on sale—Japanese sewing machines, textile products, cigarette lighters and many other articles.

A British firm's $13 million bid was $6 million below the lowest of American firms bidding for a contract to build generator equipment for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

If foreign firms can undersell U.S. products in this country, it is a sure thing they can do so abroad, and with greater ease. They have us going and coming.

The resultant loss in American sales means reduced production, which in turn means increased unemployment. This should be of serious concern to U.S. union leaders who currently are campaigning for a new round of wage increases.

It is understandable that labor chiefs want the best contracts they can obtain. But their responsibility today goes far beyond this single, narrow objective. They should be doing something about preventing American goods from being priced even further out of the market. They should recognize that production cost determines price and that by far the greatest production cost is the payroll.

What use wage boosts, shorter working hours, and increased fringe benefits if American industries are forced to curtail production and lay off workers because their products are too high priced to meet foreign competition even in our own land?

## CVP Profits Climb to Record High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a factual and highly significant news story from the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of March 19, 1959, entitled "CVP Profits Climb to Record High." This story points out that net earnings from the famed Central Valley project in California reached an all-time high in 1958 of $9,233,396.

The article states that Bureau of Reclamation officials estimate the total net income to date from CVP operations has reached $82,181,520. This money, as you know, goes into the Federal Treasury to be applied toward repayment of the

cost of Federal construction of the project.

In view of the current insistence of the Secretary of the Interior that a so-called power partnership with a local California utility would save the Federal Government considerable money on the Trinity Power project, it is most illuminating and interesting to note in the figures released by the Bureau of Reclamation that CVP power sales grossed $13,227,240 last year, while power sales in 1957 total $11,442,835.

The report shows 1,689,487,361 kilowatt-hours of electric energy produced at the Shasta, Folsom, Keswick, and Nimbus plants was delivered to more than a score of public agencies, entitled by law to preferred use of CVP power, including the Sacramento municipal utilities district.

In comparison, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. got 1,794,677,132 kilowatt-hours of the output. Additionally, the Bureau of Reclamation paid the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. $524,171 for transporting CVP power to preferred customers over the power company's lines.

The text of the news story follows:

CVP PROFITS CLIMB TO RECORD HIGH

Net revenue from Central Valley project operation in 1958 was $9,233,396, the highest net earnings in the 14 years the giant reclamation works has been serving the people of California and the Nation.

B. P. Bellport, Sacramento regional director of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, which operates the CVP, noted the net revenue was 34 percent higher than the $6,895,131 earnings of last year.

TOTAL TOPS $82 MILLION

Total net income to date from CVP operations, Bellport reported, has reached $82,181,520. This money goes into the Federal Treasury to be applied toward repayment of project construction costs.

Gross revenue from all sources totaled $17,966,444 for 1958, bringing the gross revenue since the start of operations to $146,943,306.

MEETS EXPECTATIONS

The financial picture of the CVP was described by a Bureau official as meeting all expectations.

"The wealth production capacity of Central Valley project is its greatest asset," Bellport said in his annual report.

"The availability of water for irrigation, municipal, and industrial use and lands protected from floods makes the Central Valley one of the Nation's great agricultural and industrial areas.

"The increased wealth of farm and orchard products and the associated general increase in the economy of the area, is a gratifying result of project operation.

"Over 800,00 acres of valley lands received a full or supplemental water supply from the Central Valley project. In addition, 629,500 kilowatts of electric generating capacity are producing low-cost power to supplement the growing needs of the area."

The wide flung CVP system in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys includes 5 dams and reservoirs, 10 pumping plants, 364 miles of canals, 25 miles of wasteways, 390 miles of operating roads, and radio and telephone communications systems. Operating and maintenance costs in 1958 totaled $5,623,162.

ELECTRIC ENERGY UP

Bellport reported power sales grossed $13,227,240 last year. The electric energy production, highest since the Shasta Dam powerplant began operating in 1944, totaled 3,880,603,800 kilowatt hours.

Power sales in 1957 totaled $11,442,835. The increase last year was attributed to the fact that an idle generator was restored to operation at Shasta and there was a generous supply of water for generating electricity.

Irrigation water deliveries total 2,541,837 acre-feet, a record, and brought in $4,194,418 compared to $3,743,613 in 1957.

Municipal and industrial water revenue was $455,676, approximately the same as in 1957.

TO PUBLIC, PRIVATE USE

The report shows 1,689,487,361 kilowatt-hours of electric energy produced at the Shasta, Folsom, Keswick, and Nimbus plants was delivered to public agencies, entitled to preferred use of CVP power, including the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

However, the privately operated Pacific Gas & Electric Co. got 1,794,677,132 kilowatt-hours of the output.

In addition, the bureau paid the PGE $524,171 for transporting CVP power to preference customers over the power company's lines.

The bureau's report shows construction advanced rapidly during 1958 on the Trinity River division, which will add 865,000 acre-feet of water annually to CVP supplies and produce 369,850 kilowatts of power.

POINTS TO GROWTH

Bellport noted one of the greatest westward migrations of population in U.S. history is now taking place and the ability of California to absorb this increase will depend, in large measure, upon the provision of an adequate water supply.

He emphasized the bureau is investigating several additions to the CVP works intended to stabilize water supplies in areas of ground water overdrafts and to conserve surface water supplies as well as provide flood protection and opportunities for hydroelectric power generation.

"Of primary importance," he stated, "are studies of progress to develop plans for meeting the increasing needs for water in the east side of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys extending from the Yuba River on the north of the Tehachapi Mountains on the south.

"Requests for water totaling approximately 1,500,000 acre-feet have been received from organized districts in that area which extends from the Sierra Nevada foothills to the trough of the valley and covers some 3,500,000 acres."

## American Education in the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech which I delivered March 20, 1959, to the first meeting of new Space Law and Sociology Committee of the American Rocket Society. The speech, entitled "American Education in the Space Age," follows:

AMERICAN EDUCATION IN THE SPACE AGE

It is no secret that there has been a good deal of dissatisfaction with American education in recent times.

The question as to how much of it may be warranted is, no doubt, open to dispute. But the dissatisfaction is there, and I believe it merits a long, hard look. Let us take a moment to explore the reasons for this phenomenon.

Educators say that this era of scholastic sour-searching has been consistently picking up steam ever since World War II, which—like all wars—initiated a strong trend toward social introspection. World War II and the Korean war disclosed weaknesses and soft spots in many phases of our civilization. And so we became conscious of certain rips and tears in our educational fabric. This is one reason for the dissatisfaction.

Another is that we have reached a point in the evolution of history where rates of change and the tempo of events have speeded up tremendously, and are steadily gathering more speed. What was good enough yesterday will not be good enough tomorrow. Scarcely any social facet of our civilized world either was or is prepared to adjust rapidly enough to match the whirling pace of invention, of science and of population. Education is one of those social facets.

A third reason, of course, has been the overnight appearance of the specter of Soviet science, which—like the genie from the bottle—materialized on the world's political horizon with the launching of Sputnik I. This sudden realization that the Soviets were not only playing in the same technical league as the United States but, in some respects, were leading us by a disturbing margin was a rude shock to our superiority complex.

Such was the picture as we entered the space age 17 months ago. I need not describe the berating which American education has taken since then. At times the flaying has assumed almost hysterical proportions. And, while subsequent spectacular demonstrations of our own aptitude for space have quited the clamor to a degree, it can still be heard. Our educational system remains under a blanket of heavy criticism, and the conviction is still general that we must do something about it.

This leads to the key question: Is all this concern and criticism a healthy thing?

Generally speaking, I believe that so long as we do not undermine public confidence in our school system the answer is, yes. The reasons for the conclusion will be presented later. First, however, let me say that I do not hold myself out as a professional educator or education expert. However, I have taught school. My native State has a fine reputation in education. And I have always been deeply interested in the general problem.

More important, perhaps, I have listened ot many scores of hours of testimony from those who are educational experts in this matter of where-we-stand on education today, and from them I draw certain conclusions.

One of those conclusions is that the present disposition of the American public to cast a critical eye on its educational process is more than justified. Improvement would seem essential to our continued role of leadership in the world community.

At the same time, my plea is for balance. If, for example, we go on a nationwide educational binge which favors only the natural sciences—we shall almost certainly be as poorly off as if we totally ignored the need for more and better scientific training. Clearly we cannot do the latter. Nor can we do the former.

All the science in the world will not achieve the fine destiny most of us visualize for our country if we do not also continue to nourish our gifts of philosophy, law, and effective self-government—to show sustained progress in the social sciences and the humanities and, above all, in spiritual values. These are

areas in which we have a strong lead, I believe, over all but a very few of the homogenous, highly civilized small nations; and the gap between the Soviets and ourselves in these areas is pronounced.

Nevertheless, the social sciences are no more static than the physical ones. They call for continuing research and application of trained effort. Otherwise, we shall not be able to make maximum use of them in the cause of world leadership.

This is something the Russians seem to have learned very well in regard to the natural sciences. While it has become trite to call attention to the great efforts the Soviets are making in education, I am, nonetheless, impressed with the uniform observation of American educators, scientists, and lawyers who have recently spent time in the U.S.S.R., studying their institutions, an observation to the effect that education has become almost a fetish in the Soviet Union.

"Education," says U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence Derthick, "is paramount in Russia. It is a kind of grand passion—this conviction that children, schools, and hard work will win them their place in the sun, and on the moon. We are tday in competition with a nation of vast resources, a people of seeemingly unbounded enthusiasm for self-development, and fired with conviction that future supremacy belongs to those with the best-trained minds, those who will work hard and sacrifice."

I am not one of those who believes we must emulate the Soviets in all things. So far as education is concerned, it seems clear that they are, in many ways, trying to emulate us—whether or not they know it or will admit it. As one recent visitor to the U.S.S.R. put it: "Everywhere in Russia are evidences not only of passionate love of country but of a burning desire to surpass the United States in education, in production, in standard of living, in world trade, and in athletics. The slogan we saw most, in posters, films, and everywhere, was 'Reach and overreach America.'"

In this quest, Russia has followed the United States example. It has adopted philosophy of mass education, to attempt to raise the knowledge level of all its people, and not simply to educate a chosen few.

But if the Soviet emphasis is different from ours, and if (as our experts allege) it is topheavy in the physical sciences, stereotyped in the arts, and rigidly controlled in other ways for political purposes—still we cannot afford to ignore what is proving effective in their system.

Obviously the Soviets are making prodigious strides in science, in mathematics, physics, biology, astronomy, chemistry, nucleonics, electronics, and other sciences. And their great achievements in rocketry and the aeronautical and space sciences leave little doubt of a growing proficiency in engineering and technology. So while I believe in balance and scope for American education, a look into the future assures the high strategic importance of physical science to our national security, our prosperity, and our international preeminence. We cannot afford to lag in this direction.

After mulling over Soviet school curriculums and the reports of competent educators who have made careful studies of the Soviet educational system—what it is accomplishing and how—I am convinced that we can find in the Russian effort much that is worth serious reflection. We might even take a few leaves from their book on such points as these:

1. Provide wider and better basic scientific training at the elementary and secondary school level, using revised and up-to-date text and learning aids.

2. Emphasize languages at these same levels. I am informed that by the time a Russian youngster completes his 10th year in school, he not only reads but has conversational competence in a foreign language. Significantly, 45 out of every 100 students at this level know English, 35 know German, and 20 know French. Common sense suggests the great advantage of this in reaping the benefit of knowledge which others have acquired in other tongues.

3. Step up rapidly the translation of foreign scientific writing into English, especially Russian ones, and insure their dissemination. We may as well face the fact that Americans do not have the same everyday necessity for foreign language as Europeans, and therefore we will probably never have the same language proficiency no matter how much educational emphasis we place upon languages. We must offset this with translations. Some are being done now at Government level by the Library of Congress, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of Commerce. But for the most part our translations seem to be a matter of too little and too late, with a circulation that is far too limited. The Russians' astounding progress in science is undoubtedly due in part to their assiduous work in translating scientific publications. They translate our scientific articles, journals, and textbooks into Russia soon after they are published. And their translations of our work are widely circulated among their scientists. We accept a serious handicap in the technology race when we fail to take similar advantage of their scientific publications. Naturally, not all of their scientific publications are available to us, but we are making no consistent effort to translate and distribute those which are.

The best example of this was the sputnik surprise. In scientific publications available to us, the Russians announced, some 90 days before they shot their first sputnik into orbit, the very date on which the satellite would be launched. Because we had failed to translate this information, the sputnik caught us by surprise.

4. Elevate the stature of our teaching profession. This is probably the most important and, at the same time, the most difficult of all our educational problems. Somehow it must be done.

Perhaps the root of the problem lies in the public attitude toward education. I sometimes wonder whether we Americans have the respect for education and educators that we imagine we have. If our respect were as great as we imagine, our teachers already would enjoy the professional stature they deserve. Instead, we often find them in the embarrassing plight of being their own best advocates, of waging their own fight for a comfortable living standard which would allow them to give their undivided attention and energy to training our children.

I firmly believe that in the lives of our children, education should have first priority. But in American homes I find that schoolwork is seldom given proper priority—that it must compete for time and attention with television, radio, and recreation, with social engagements, and with the preparations for those social engagements. Too much emphasis is placed on fun. Not enough emphasis is placed on the orderliness and stern self-disciplines without which there can be no significant progress in any academic field of endeavor.

In an age when the volume of man's knowledge is growing at a fantastic rate, at the time when our need for intellectual discipline has never been as great, we surround our children with temptations and distractions which obscure the importance of learning and the value of a cultivated mind. Yes, any reformation of American education, if it is to be successful, will have to begin at home.

In Russia the teacher is at the top of the professional ladder, on a par with the scientist and the party leader. He is more highly regarded than the doctor, the lawyer, the journalist, the entertainer or the artist. No doubt this is why the Soviets now operate 484 teachers colleges not counting their universities.

In the United States there are 332 accredited teachers colleges, public, and private, including the universities. While I am rarely moved by comparative figures, this, I submit, is a rather significant fact. We are having real trouble getting enough good teachers. The Russians are not. And we cannot put the blame on our educational system per se when it belongs to us, the public. So long as we make personal distinction and recognition synonymous with acquisitiveness, so long as we place teachers low on the success scale by paying them low professional salaries (far lower than comedians, ballplayers, and nightclub singers), we are going to continue to have difficulty recruiting good ones. In view of the immense importance of the teacher in our modern world and of his even more critical role in the future, this is, truly, an agonizing situation.

In conclusion, I reiterate my belief that our current penchant for criticizing American education is a good thing. It shows a flexibility in our makeup that is highly utilitarian; and it does not mean that we are not proud of our educational process which, on a broad scale, neither the Soviets nor any other people have yet been able to match.

If I may borrow words from one of this country's most experienced and penetrating educators, Byron Hollinshead:

"It would be strange if an educational system designed to carry out the democratic idea or ideal did not have defects and difficulties. No nation at any time in earlier history has ever tried to give everybody educational opportunity. But it is not only that we have tried to follow a great ideal. We can be genuinely proud of what our schools and colleges have accomplished, proud of their present efficiency, variety, and scope, and particularly proud that the professional conscience of our educators has given them the humility to see faults and the desire to correct them."

## The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Mansfield (Ohio) News-Journal for Saturday, March 21, 1959, entitled "Landlubbers No Longer."

This editorial relates to the St. Lawrence Seaway, which has been called the engineering feat of the century. As my colleagues know, the seaway will be opened to seagoing traffic in June, with impressive ceremonies in which President Dwight D. Eisenhower, England's Queen Elizabeth II, and Prince Philip, and Canadian Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker will participate. The seaway will make it possible for ships from the principal cities of the world to dock at Cleveland, which is, as this editorial points out, only a relatively short distance from Mansfield, and other cities and towns in my congressional district.

We are convinced that in the long future, the St. Lawrence Seaway will

prove a boon not only to the great Middle West, but to Canada, and indeed to the whole world, in that it will increase communications and trade among all people.

The editorial follows:

LANDLUBBERS NO LONGER

Beginning next month, Mansfield and Richland County and their environs will be within 75 miles of the seacoast.

The St. Lawrence Seaway will open.

Deepwater ships, our of world seaports like Liverpool and Hamburg, will find Cleveland is suddenly closer than Baltimore; Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, and Duluth will be as handy to Europe as Miami and New Orleans.

To shippers and manufacturers in the United States and Canada, it means the sudden addition of 8,300 miles of coast accessible to large ocean vessels—a stretch longer than the whole U.S. Atlantic seaboard.

Together, Canada and the United States poured more than a billion dollars into the 4-year undertaking. At peak effort, 22,000 men worked on the venture.

Men marshaled along the river the most fantastic array of excavating, hauling, and construction equipment ever brought together for a peaceful enterprise. With $70 million worth of machines, they cut canyons through earth and rock, and moved whole villages to make way for a broad new lake.

They dredged mountains of muck and glacial till, and pumped dry the raging Long Sault Rapids that have been the scourge of the St. Lawrence since colonial times. One 19th-century visitor remarked that he would rather cross the Atlantic thrice than travel the rapids.

In addition to making the St. Lawrence navigable for big ships, the river has been harnessed for electric power. The energy comes from 246,000 cubic feet of water which flows out to sea each second through the St. Lawrence. That is enough water to give every man, woman, and child in the United States 61 large baths a day.

The Moses-Saunders power dam below Long Sault—a single structure built half by the United States and half by Canada—is already delivering about 50 percent of its total planned output of power. When all generating units are installed, it will normally drop the whole flow of the St. Lawrence through 32 turbines and develop up to 1,880,000 kilowatts of electricity.

In June a gleaming yacht will lead a procession of ships into the new waterway at Montreal. Aboard the *Britannia*, will be Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip, on their way to the international section of the St. Lawrence. There the Queen plans to join President Eisenhower and Canadian Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker.

By then, a new era in history for mid-America will have begun.

## Mutual Security Gives More Security at Less Cost Than Standing Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. WALTER H. JUDD**
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roscoe Drummond:

ALLIANCE VERSUS FORTRESS—DECISION ON MUTUAL AID CALLED MOST FATEFUL

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is time to get ready for the most significant debate and the most fateful decision which will be taken at this session of Congress.

The debate is: Whether to seek survival by helping our allies do what they cannot entirely do themselves or to turn into a Fortress America and try to do it all alone.

The decision is: Whether to approve the President's minimum mutual security program of $4 billion or to hack it to pieces in order to spend it some other way.

The opponents of the mutual security appropriation are counting on you to be adequately gullible, uninterested, and misinformed, so that it can be slashed with impunity.

The unanimous conclusion of the Draper Committee, a panel of distinguished and knowledgeable Americans who have earned the right to be heard, is that nothing could be more wasteful and so imperil the national interest than to enfeeble the mutual security program so that it can't do the job.

I am not suggesting that the President's military and economic aid request should slide through Congress without being questioned and without being argued. There should be debate, very earnest debate. It seems to me that the debate is coming at a good time and under circumstances which will enlist the largest public interest.

It comes at a time when the Communist military threat is greater than ever before and when, because of events in Berlin and Iraq, the Communist threat is more visible than ever before.

The debate comes at a time when we must either rescue the mutual security program from being gradually choked to death by inadequate funds or given the resources equal to the need.

It comes at a time when the Democratic leaders of this Democratically controlled Congress—who almost unanimously say they want to put more into our defenses—can show whether they really mean it. The mutual security appropriation puts the issue squarely and fairly before the administration's defense critics. If they want stronger defense as they avow they do, they must either support the President's mutual security appropriation or be prepared to spend at least three times as much as they cut from it in order to get the same military result.

Let us not forget that the mutual security program brings into being many times as much military strength as the United States pays for and—despite some admitted waste, despite some bad administration—is the economizer's way of getting the greatest security for the free world at the least cost.

At stake is not whether a half billion or a billion dollars will be struck from Mr. Eisenhower's request. For several years now Congress has so cut back and truncated the mutual security program that it can neither be planned well at home or used to best advantage by our allies.

At stake is not a little trimming here, a small cut there; at stake is the basic decision whether the United States is going to seek survival in isolation or in a common effort with our allies. On this point the Draper committee says:

"The choice our country faces is very real and near at hand. In our fascination with our own mistakes, and the constant use of foreign aid as a whipping boy, we may be gradually choking this vital feature of our national security policy to death.

"What we do this year is an important step in one direction or the other. By forthright and affirmative action we can set the example expected of us. The penalty for failure to do so can well be the beginning of the end of the free world coalition."

Those in Congress who are willing to bring about this result are counting on you not to care.

## M. W. Thatcher: National Farm Champion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN**
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable and courageous men that I have been privileged to know is Mr. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn. He has been a tower of strength in the agricultural heartland of America.

Some of the highlights of Mr. Thatcher's inspiring career have been presented in an article by Russell Asleson, Minneapolis Tribune staff writer, which were reprinted in the Aberdeen American-News of Sunday, March 8, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

DURABLE GTA EXECUTIVE SURROUNDED BY CONTROVERSY

(By Russell Asleson)

MINNEAPOLIS.—The durability of M. W. Thatcher, 75-year-old dynamo of the sprawling Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, is a boon to his boosters and an enigma to his enemies.

Steeped in controversy for nearly half a century, Thatcher can point to a fine assortment of both. On Bill Thatcher, nobody is neutral.

But because of his personal charm, most of his critics must be counted in the economic and political philosophy fields.

A crusader by his own admission, the snow-haired cooperative leader has triggered many tempers in his economic battles of the past 20 years as he piloted GTA from a borrowed $30,000 into a giant marketing organization worth nearly $40 million.

His fights with the private grain trade, the National Tax Equality Association, and, lately, Secretary of Agriculture Benson have kept the public eye focused on his activities for two decades.

Few can be neutral about GTA's general manager. His grain trade competitors—and severest critics—admit he is an extremely able businessman. They also characterize him as a cynical opportunist.

But if he has a secret in dealing with co-op patrons, it is this: he promises the future.

Somewhat more than a year ago, it appeared Father Time might have caught up with the controversial co-op figure.

He became increasingly nervous and jumpy, tired easily, especially during his emotion-charged and frequent speeches. He was ailing with high blood pressure, chronic bronchitis, asthma, and laryngitis that wasn't helped by his daily smoking of three packages of cigarettes.

Under a revised health and personal schedule, however, Bill has bounced back.

"My health has improved and I feel great again," he told a cheering band of stockholders at last December's GTA convention in St. Paul. "I hope to go on for a long time, God willing."

NEW THATCHER

The new Thatcher had to learn to take it easy—and it was a difficult task.

On the business front, he dispersed some of the key responsibilities in running the giant GTA and also trimmed drastically his speechmaking.

In his personal life, he quit smoking, began taking short rest periods during the day, revised his diet, managed some daily exercise—and began a studied effort toward relaxation.

Thatcher also has limited his speaking engagements to half a dozen yearly.

"I speak emotionally and get all worked up," the GTA manager maintained. "I can't relax before or after a talk but I can have fun while I'm talking."

Thatcher likes to speak, however, and is sensitive to audience reaction. One of the few remaining oldtime stump speakers, he has a deep, resonant voice that is pleasant and carries well. He also is adept at playing an audience.

He knows all the intimate tricks of oratory: The pointed finger seeking out someone in the audience to call by his first name, the dramatic pause for emphasis, the gestures that entertain but do not detract.

He speaks unhurriedly, building up to shouting climaxes, asks questions of the audience which, at a Farmers Union gathering, invariably bring audible responses.

At 75, Thatcher is a man of medium build and craggy face who wears dark-rimmed glasses, favors bow ties, dresses immaculately, and talks in a confidential manner.

On the rostrum—or behind his big kidney-shaped and glass-topped desk—he appears much bigger than his 5 feet 9 inches and 180 pounds. He also looks younger than his years.

"My torso is big but I have short legs," he said, rocking back in his huge leather-covered office chair. "I try to keep my weight at 179–180 pounds and watch it like a hawk."

He's careful about what and how much he eats, has his rare beef sprinkled with yeast to "insure getting all the B-complex vitamins".

Thatcher was born in Valparaiso, Ind., not long after his father, Samuel, had left the farm and moved to town. Although born in the city, all his Scotch-English-German relatives were farmers and he grew up in close contact with a rural economy.

Thatcher was christened Myron and his twin brother named Marvin, names which neither fancied. One of his farmer-uncles had a span of horses, Tom and Bill, which the Thatcher twins loved dearly.

"We hated our given names and insisted people call us Tom and Bill just like the horses," he recalled.

So Bill it was—and still is. Later, he incorporated the borrowed Bill into his legal name and made it Myron William Thatcher.

It also was on one of these trips to a relative's farm that Thatcher's basic farm philosophy began to take shape—although he was but 7 and would not recognize it for many years.

The youngster asked his father why he'd forsaken the farm for the city and got this reply: "I quit because I was tired of raising crops when I had no idea what I'd get for them. Contracting and selling in town offered some security."

Thatcher contends that his father's statement has become one of the motivating factors in his work the past 30 years.

"I'm not mad at anyone," he explained. "But I feel the farmers have had a lousy deal."

He might except Ezra Taft Benson from that benevolence, however.

BENSON ANTAGONISM

His antagonism toward Benson stems from a bitter disagreement between the two over national farm policy when Benson was secretary of the National Council of Farm Cooperatives.

"I put him down as a no good rascal in 1942 and haven't changed that opinion," he said, vehemently. "I've got no use for him."

In fact, Thatcher took a public vow 2 years ago never to mention Benson by name in his speeches; now calls him "that man." But he has no such self-imposed limitations in private conversation.

Thatcher's farm philosophy is in direct contrast to that of Benson's. He believes in more Government control in both production and prices to insure farm income.

"We must recognize that the consumer benefits as much as the farmer in having reasonable stability in farm prices and this can be done only by recognizing that farm prices are made in Washington.

"We must preserve the family-farm type of agriculture. It is a way of life, the backbone of America, and must be protected. Farmers are entitled to a standard of living on a par with others.

"The future? Farmers are going to have a tough 2 years ahead but those that can weather the political and economic crisis will have made the grade because there's bound to be a healthy upturn in 1961.

"I believe the farm future depends on how successfully the farmers organize politically and economically, just as big business and big labor. And co-ops provide a means for this economic organization. Those who stay around in farming are going to be organized."

On the subject of GTA, Thatcher envisions it as a total thing, conceived to improve the lot of the family farmer.

"GTA is a machine with resources that can make a whole fight for the rights of the farmer—and be a power in the marketplace," he continued.

It is those resources that have ruffled competitors in grain trade circles.

Like most big cooperatives, a considerable portion of GTA's yearly patronage refunds are returned to farmers as stock for future redemption and the funds retained by the co-op for use as capital.

Although this is legal under present laws, private businesses score it as a special privilege and unfair competition, and are fighting to have these retained dividends taxed as income.

It is no secret that GTA competition was one of the factors resulting in formation of the National Tax Equality Association, which once was headed by Ben McCabe of the McCabe Co., Minneapolis. Last fall, GTA bought the McCabe Co. for nearly $5 million.

"Thatcher was able to see how you build up his business without paying income taxes," declared one Minneapolis grain man. "He's used the profits of business to accomplish things politically and keep the cooperatives' economic advantages."

These grain men admit, however, that GTA's business organization is made up of capable men, and is an extremely effective marketing organization.

TERMED SHREWD

Thatcher they term a smart, shrewd, business operator who exploits every advantage in dollars and cents operation of the grain business, and an important factor in agriculture.

But they don't like his policies or methods of operation.

In his dark-paneled office on the top floor of the GTA building at the corner of Snelling and Larpentuer Avenue, St. Paul (which one opposition editor once labeled Kremlin Korners to denote what he regarded as the radical views of GTA) Thatcher doesn't disdain talk of these cooperative economics—or politics.

He considers himself a liberal independent in politics although he has voted for Democratic Presidents since Franklin D. Roosevelt ran for a second term.

The GTA's convention dinner (7,000 persons) last December had the aspects of a giant Democratic rally with Thatcher fondly referring to Minnesota Senators Humphrey and McCarthy, Representative McGovern of South Dakota, and Governor Freeman—stanch Democrats all—as "my boys."

"Sure, they're my boys," he defended. "They vote for the programs that reflect our views, don't they? But you'll notice that in North Dakota, we've supported Senators LANGER and YOUNG and they're Republicans. You can't find a better man for the farmer than YOUNG."

"We support these friends of the American farmer," Thatcher added. "It's just a matter of votes. I was in Washington long enough to know that talking and orating don't mean much when the chips are down. It's how a man votes that counts."

The only picture on the wall of Thatcher's office is one of President Roosevelt, autographed with a personal note. Thatcher is a fanatical admirer of Roosevelt, considers him one of the Nation's outstanding Presidents and that it was providential he came along when he did.

Those views represent a change in Thatcher's thinking. Before F.D.R. was elected President, Thatcher considered him a phony.

"I was living in Washington in 1932 and was strong for Hoover," he recalled. "Hoover was smart on a lot of subjects, a decent, high class guy."

After the election, farm groups were advised that Roosevelt would call a special session of Congress to enact a Federal farm program—if farm groups could get together on such a program.

"Everyone would have to agree—and we did. The Grange, Farmers Union, Farm Bureau, National Council of Cooperatives, the Farmers National Grain Corp.," Thatcher pointed out. "It probably was the last time these groups ever got together on anything."

F.D.R. delivered on the promise, kept his word—and Thatcher was in the fold.

"It was not long before he wanted to see me and I got to know him well," he said with reverence. "And I was in on many of the same fights he was from then on."

Reports from Washington are that F. D. R. liked Bill Thatcher's original ideas on the farm problems and the President consulted him often.

When President Eisenhower and Robert Taft were contesting the Republican nomination in 1952, Thatcher campaigned actively for Taft in South Dakota and Wisconsin because he did not like the idea of a military man in the White House.

TAFT GOT BACKING

And Taft got the backing in both of these States. Thatcher has in his files a personal letter of appreciation from Taft for his help in the campaign.

Had Taft won, would Thatcher have voted Republican?

"No," he maintained. "I liked Taft but still preferred Stevenson."

Any thoughts of compromise with the new administration were dispelled when Benson was appointed Secretary of Agriculture.

Thatcher admits reluctantly that Benson is a battler—just like he—and fights for his program even if it is the wrong one, one that will break farmers.

Thatcher first sighted the Midwest more than 50 years ago. Working as a public accountant in Chicago, he was sent to Minneapolis to audit the books of a milling firm and got his first taste of Minnesota hunting and fishing.

Returning in 1909 to install an accounting system at the Radisson Hotel, Thatcher again was attracted by the fertile lands and abundant wildlife.

He went back to Chicago and resigned his job. He got a new one the same morning he arrived in Minneapolis for the third time.

One of his first duties was at Osceola, Wis., where a grain and mill firm was in trouble, Northwestern National Bank asked him to reorganize the firm. It was his first venture in the grain business but one that firmed his imagination for his later career.

Later, he established his own public accounting business in Minneapolis. He was hired by the North Dakota Industrial Commission and worked in Bismarck in 1920 and 1921. At that time, the Nonpartisan League movement was strong and Thatcher played a part. He also got his start in co-op work.

One of the early co-ops that found the going rough was the Equity Cooperative Exchange. As an accountant, Thatcher was called in to oversee the receivership.

As an outgrowth, the Farmers Union Terminal Association (not to be confused with the GTA) was formed, only to be absorbed eventually by the Federal Farm Board and later, the Farmers National Grain Corp., a quasi-governmental marketing agency.

Thatcher went to Washington in 1931 as legislative representative for the FNGC and remained there until 1937 when he came back to Minneapolis as branch manager and to help in its liquidation.

That was completed May 31, 1938. The next day, by previous arrangement, the GTA was set up in business with $30,000 invested by Farmers Union Central Exchange and with loans by the farm credit administration.

With the nationwide grain marketing venture collapsed, a number of regional grain cooperatives like GTA came into being. Fifteen of them voluntarily joined as the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

They elected Thatcher president—and have every year since.

But as Thatcher goes on year after year, one question is causing considerable speculation both within and outside GTA: Who is his heir apparent? And will GTA maintain its political militance under a new general manager?

It is generally agreed that in an emergency, J. E. Wells Jr., one of three executive assistants, would step into the gap.

Thatcher will admit privately that he's given the successor matter a lot of thought and discussed it frequently with the board of directors.

But the usually voluble Mr. Thatcher leaves the big question unanswered.

## Mutual Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received from Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS
*Washington, D.C., March 20, 1959.*

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
*House Office Building*
*Washington, D.C.*

My DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In behalf of the AFL–CIO, I strongly urge you to support the mutual security program for the fiscal year of 1960, as proposed by President Eisenhower.

Considering the seriousness of the international crisis, the sum requested by the President is by no means excessive. Communist imperialism is an enemy that must be fought with all our means and resources on the economic and political field, in every walk of life. The most vital interests of our country demand an adequate mutual security program and the strongest national defense. To have one without the other, or at the expense of the other, would undermine both and gravely jeopardize the security, freedom, and well-being of all liberty-loving peoples.

Moreover, the President's program is urgently necessary for meeting the stepped-up economic offensive by the Kremlin aimed at Communist infiltration and subversion especially in the industrially underdeveloped countries.

Realizing that mass poverty and hunger constitute a potentially dangerous threat to freedom and peace everywhere, we of the AFL–CIO have consistently urged our Government and other democracies to offer the underdeveloped countries sufficient help to insure their national freedom and security. In view of what is at stake in this historic struggle, American labor believes that our country must render adequate economic and technical assistance to all nations devoted to human freedom and peace.

I sincerely appeal to you to support wholeheartedly the President's mutual security program as indispensable to our Nation's efforts to meet the Soviet threat in Berlin. Prompt and overwhelming support by Congress would be of the greatest help to our country and its allies in overcoming the crisis which Moscow has provoked over Berlin and in meeting whatever other tests our Nation might face in consequence of the mounting menace of Soviet aggression.

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE MEANY, *President.*

## Women Will Rebel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fair trade is the setting of prices by manufacturers and will occur if and when Congress sets aside antitrust price-fixing protection by an alleged fair trade bill—H.R. 1253. Some retailers blame discount houses as the cause of retailers pricing troubles. Not so. Discount houses may well be a manifestation of a change in our whole distribution apparatus. Discount houses, in short, are a recognition of a fact of life, not the cause of it.

Fair trade is unenforcible in the courts and in the marketplace. It is unenforcible because people can see for themselves that it is not fair, but unfair. Price setting is in the retailers province, price acceptance in the buyers—neither is the manufacturers choice at the retail level. Either this is so or we do not have a competitive economy.

In this Nation people cannot be regimented by economic controls—not yet anyway. Just wait until the shoppers of this Nation, the women, realize the import of the fair trade price setting under H.R. 1253, or similar bills.

## Resolution by Railway Labor Executives' Association Expresses Grave Disapproval of House Committee Action on Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I received the following resolution protesting action by a House committee on important legislation.

I have been requested to present same to the House for consideration:

RESOLUTION BY RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION EXPRESSES GRAVE DISAPPROVAL OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ACTION ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL

The Railway Labor Executives' Association, at a special emergency meeting today in Washington, adopted the following resolution on pending legislation to amend the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems:

"The Railway Labor Executives' Association, speaking for the chief executives of the 23 standard railway labor organizations, unanimously expresses grave disapproval of the action of the House Interstate Commerce Committee on pending legislation to revise the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system. The effect of the amendments to H.R. 1012 adopted in the committee and incorporated in H.R. 5610 would be to wipe out many entirely reasonable benefits which unemployed railroad workers have long received.

"H.R. 1012, which the committee emasculated, is identical with the bill which passed the Senate last year, and its provisions on unemployment insurance were also approved by the same House committee at the last session. That bill represented a major compromise of the original legislation sponsored by the RLEA. We agreed to accept this compromise only because the need to aid the men, women, and children of railroad families who are suffering from the current recession and rising living costs was—and continues to be—so pressing. It must be remembered that, in failing to enact this legislation last year, Congress already has discriminated against the needy of the railroad industry, since it did not neglect to pass legislation affecting unem-

ployed and retired workers in other industries at the last session, although it voted no aid to rail workers even though rail unemployment is at one of the highest levels in history.

"H.R. 5610, as reported, would introduce widespread disqualification provisions which will result in depriving railroad workers of benefits now provided in the law. At the same time, the bill would substantially reduce benefits to many others. These and other changes will mean a loss to railroad workers of over $30 million a year in benefits provided in H.R. 1012.

"We are frankly shocked and dismayed at this callous disregard for the plight of the many thousands of railroad workers who are the victims of the failure of the railroad industry to provide continuing employment to its personnel. The bill, as reported out by the committee, is unacceptable to the standard railway labor organizations, because it represents a serious retrogression from long-established principles of social insurance at a time when improvement, rather than destructive action, is essential.

"Amendments voted in the House committee this year would knock out many provisions which have been part of the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system from the year of its establishment, as well as other benefits, particularly provisions for coverage of sickness, which have been provided since the system of sickness benefits was created in 1946. We deplore such indifference to human need.

"In such circumstances, the Railway Labor Executives' Association calls upon the House of Representatives to reject the action of its committee and to adopt H.R. 1012 without major amendment."

## Excise Tax on Telephones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from my constituents urging the repeal of the excise tax on telephones. The following resolution recently adopted by the Iowa Independent Telephone Association expresses very well the sentiment of many of the people of the Second District of Iowa in regard to this tax which was originally levied as an emergency measure:

Whereas the members of the Iowa Independent Telephone Association are concerned with the tax burden on telephone service; and

Whereas the Federal Government levies an excise tax on telephone services; and

Whereas such tax was levied during World War II as an emergency measure to help defray the costs of the war and to discourage unnecessary use of such services; and

Whereas the wartime emergency has expired and there is no justification for imposing such tax for the purposes for which it was originally levied; and

Whereas an excise tax on telephone communication is discriminatory since it singles out the telephone from other essential household utility services; and

Whereas the tax on telephone services imposes an undue hardship upon individuals and businesses throughout the Nation in the conduct of personal and business affairs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Iowa Independent Telephone Association respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax on communications services; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, expressing the views of this association, be sent to each U.S. Senator and Representative from the State of Iowa.

## A Good Job Well Done—Congratulations to the American Red Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Alfred M. Gruenther, president of the American Red Cross, and a story of the mideastern floods of January and February of 1959:

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
*Washington, D.C., March 20, 1959.*

The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON,
*The House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. FULTON: Knowing that you will want additional information on the assistance given to alleviate distress of people in Pennsylvania affected by the recent floods, I am attaching a copy of the official report of Red Cross activities of the several States affected.

The Red Cross gave assistance in 110 counties in 5 States to more than 11,000 families. As I have indicated to you, all assistance from the American people through the Red Cross is an outright gift. It is based on the principle, not of replacing all losses, but of assisting disaster victims in need who lack sufficient resources of their own to start back on the road to recovery. The assistance includes food, clothing, and maintenance, rebuilding and refurnishing homes when necessary, and providing medical and hospital care as required.

Total Red Cross expenditures for the flooded area in the 5 States has increased since the attached report was prepared in advance for fund campaign purposes and the final expenditures will total nearly $3 million. The people of the States affected have contributed $282,000 to help their neighbors. The balance was provided by our national disaster fund.

For the 2-year period ending June 30, 1958, expenditures to aid disaster victims amounted to more than $26,500,000. Expenditures, therefore, have been running in excess of the rate of $1 million per month. We are doing everything possible to bring to the attention of the American people the importance of the Red Cross fund campaign through which the disaster fund must be maintained. You may be assured that the American Red Cross is determined to continue to administer effectively its humanitarian mission in the field of disaster relief.

Many thanks for your continued support in assisting to tell the Red Cross story.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER.

WHEN THE FLOODS CAME—MIDEASTERN FLOODS, JANUARY–FEBRUARY 1959

Through a good neighbor policy which began almost eight decades ago millions of Americans each year contribute their funds and spilling eastwardly into Pennsylvania's viate the suffering of families struck by disaster.

This is the story of your help to people in five States during the crucial days of the Mideastern floods and the weeks which followed.

The tragic problem of returning to a home without heat, water, light, furniture—often to face frozen silt and mud—confronted owners of 25,242 damaged dwellings. An additional 166 homes, destroyed beyond repair, would never know occupants again.

Ten days after the rivers had run their disastrous courses, 800 people were still living in 6 Red Cross shelters in the 5 stricken States.

But the answer to recovery was there. It lay in the hands and hearts of people wanting to help themselves and each other.

AID FROM NEAR AND AFAR

Entire communities—church groups, civic groups, organized labor, industry, government, youth organizations—working through Red Cross or beside it, stood shoulder to shoulder with the flood-wrecked people pitching in to chop away frozen mud, disinfect basements, truck in fresh water to replace contaminated supplies, clean, salvage, inspire.

THE NEED WAS GREAT—THE NATION RESPONDED

Normally, the networks of small rivers and creeks that scratch out intricate patterns on the land surface of the Middle Eastern States move serenely on their way—flowing east, south, and west into the Ohio River—emptying northward into the Great Lakes—and services through the Red Cross to allewinding Allegheny. They finger through quiet country towns, great industrial cities, and over rich farmland—interrupted occasionally by manmade dams and levees, and the natural rolling hills and roundtop mountains. Those who live by them jokingly describe the smaller streams as those you can walk across without getting your shoetops wet.

The streams are expected to accommodate whatever winter weather hands them—but 1959's erratic January weather in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and New York made tremendous demands. On the heels of freezing temperatures and near-daily snows, a thaw began. Unnoticed, rivers raced their courses in a wild effort to absorb the sudden tonnage of melting ice and snow. Pelting, stabbing rains—in some localities 5 inches in 24 hours—followed.

On the night of January 21—from New York to Indiana—the floods took on frightening significance for more than 31,000 families. Their shoetop streams were cresting as high as 60 feet.

To the north, the thaw still incomplete, raging waters flung about ice chunks the size of automobiles, plucked bridges from their steel pilings, caved in walls of low-lying houses, and crumbled rooftops. Downstream, the ice held its fight against the rivers until they backed up slowly, nibbled away gaps in the earthen levees that bound them, poured into once-dry basements, and lapped at upper story windows. Farther southward, the ice-free rivers, stemmed by dams and levees, built up force, slammed through their barricades, carried away houses or, capriciously, left others atilt with foundations awash beneath them.

NO ONE ASKED WHO

In the early chaos of disaster, there are only two identifiable groups—those rescued and those rescuing. No one pauses to ask

"who"—only to give aid or receive it. Just as the rivers had joined forces to destroy, the people united to give help.

Throughout the flood-soaked night and into the next day, firemen, policemen, Coast Guard, Red Cross, civil defense, highway patrol, Army, Navy, National Guardsmen, and just plain people heroically manned amphibious "ducks" and power boats—tirelessly scouring the water-filled areas to rescue families from flood-threatened homes and deliver them to safe shelter. In many cases, rescuers had to return to homes where families—unable to believe they were endangered—had declined earlier evacuation offers. Some 2,600 people suffered injuries, but the minimum loss of life during the emergency hours was a tribute to the courage and calmness of the rescue workers as they transported their precious cargoes to safety.

SHELTERS OFFERED REFUGE

Where circumstances permitted, those living in homes untouched by the floods took in their less fortunate friends and relatives. Thousands of others found refuge in the 82 Red Cross shelters set up in churches, schools, and other buildings throughout the 110 flood-stricken counties. There, hundreds of adult volunteers and Junior Red Cross members worked around the clock to provide meals, clothing, beds, nursing, and medical care, and comfort to shocked and frightened victims forced to flee their homes. For hours totalling 850 days, Red Cross volunteer nurses—650 strong—served beside national staff nurses in shelters, on home and hospital visits.

When news of the flood tragedy spread throughout the country, calls from friends and relatives poured into Red Cross chapters. "My sister * * * her home was near the levees that broke. Can you tell me if she's safe?" "My mother and father * * * they're old. Did they get out in time?" Inquiries were heard and answered by Red Cross and other volunteers. In one hard-hit Ohio town, a large industrial company, eager to serve, set up a corps of secretaries before a switchboard and answered worried calls throughout the chaotic night.

MOBILE UNITS IN ACTION

Red Cross did not limit its concern to flood victims and their anxious relatives. The rescue workers and cleanup crews were also fed as they labored through the wintry nights and days. Big mobile cateens—some donated by AFL–CIO, some chapter-owned—were dispatched throughout the stricken areas. Manned by volunteers, they dispensed hot food and beverages. Where inundated places were beyond the reach of the feeding trucks, isolated victims found Red Cross-purchased food and dry bedding miraculously coming to them by boat, operated by firemen.

When the immense scorecard was totaled, Red Cross had given mass care to 26,000 disaster sufferers and fed 11,000 emergency workers.

People are characteristically resilient. With warm shelter and warm encouragement, the initial numbness began to fade and stricken families looked hopefully to the return home. "When the waters go down, we'll get back in," they said.

Instead of the waters receding, the temperature dropped to a freezing low and stilled the waters where they lay against basement walls, submerging floors and furnishings, breaking water pipes with icy plugs.

The story of rehabilitation work was repeated for more than 10,000 families in the 110 affected communities. The rubble-strewn path to recovery stretched out more smoothly and the end seemed close in view.

Then, suddenly, in February, floods struck again. In the northern rivers, great ice jams that stood 35 feet high and extended farther than the eye could see, choked rain-swollen rivers causing them to spill over their banks and swirl through towns still laboring to dig themselves out from under the wreckage of earlier flooding. Army engineers attempted to blast the ice away so that the waters might be free to follow their natural courses. But, in some places this could not be done without endangering communities farther down the river. In Indiana, the long winding ice-clogged Wabash burst its banks to heap destruction upon 14 counties which had been spared by the January floods.

So the weary, wet, heart-breaking work began again. Red Cross reopened its shelters. Whole communities joined hands to help in rescue. Emergency care was given and families were helped by the Red Cross on their way to rehabilitation and recovery.

Finally, in March, with disaster-caused needs met, the job was done. As Red Cross closed its books on another mission of mercy, more than 10,000 families had been assisted at a total cost exceeding $2,400,000.

Generous, warmhearted Americans had once again helped their suffering neighbors through the worst flood to strike the Mideast in almost 50 years.

Help came from the gentle, quiet, bearded Mennonites, who—untouched by the floods themselves—left their own interests untended and lent their talents to Red Cross to clean, repair, and rebuild ravished homes of those who could not do the job alone.

And organized labor, wearing the volunteer's Red Cross symbol, dispensed 50 tons of Federal surplus foods to hundreds of individual families and joined in the seemingly insurmountable cleaning and repair tasks.

Many others, too far away to assist physically, helped financially. Money in excess of $281,250 for disaster relief poured into Red Cross chapters from individuals and organizations—from New England to Texas, California to Florida. Nationally known merchants donated home cleaning equipment; great food chains sent canned goods; small independent grocers, themselves flood victims, contributed unspoiled supplies from their remaining stocks. An Ohio department store held a storewide, day-long sale and turned the day's total cash intake over to Red Cross to be used for disaster aid. Even children, shoveling snow-covered sidewalks, put their earnings into flood relief.

All was needed—all used. For disasters are costly beyond belief. Wherever they they strike, Red Cross is always there—ready to aid through its local chapters and their volunteers. And so it was with the Mideastern floods. Almost 300 Red Cross disaster-trained staff members and volunteers were dispatched quickly following the floods from the national offices and more than 50 chapters in 33 States. They set up disaster field headquarters in severely stricken central Ohio. From there, they fanned rapidly out into all of the disaster areas, to assist the hard-at-work local chapters in meeting the emergency needs of the victims.

A NEW START IN LIFE

The agencies and departments of government—local, State, and Federal—worked to meet their responsibilities, to repair roads, rebuild bridges, restore public utilities, meet public health problems, give advice and counsel to farmers, and to make low-interest loans available to aid recovery. Red Cross turned its attention to the problems of recovery of the flood-stricken individuals and families. Thus rehabilitation began.

The steps of family rehabilitation were covered quickly and confidentially. Each who came to relief headquarters, marked by the red and white emblem, talked to an experienced disaster worker—someone to give individual attention to that family's disaster-caused problems. Together the worker and family determined losses, needs, how the family could help itself, and the kind and amount of assistance the Red Cross would provide. Home visits by the worker immediately followed to make sure that all needs had been presented. Then, as part of planning, a Red Cross building expert trained in construction estimated the extent of damage and cost of repair.

The needs varied with the extent of damage and the families' ability to help themselves. There was a small businessman whose livelihood depended on the tools of his trade and who did not have means to replace them. In some cases, where injuries and illness had occurred, medical and nursing care had to be given. Quickly and soundly the Red Cross and the family planned recovery together. An advisory committee of local citizens, working as volunteers in the Red Cross, reviewed the information in confidence. Trained workers and knowledgeable volunteers—these were the Red Cross team to channel the generosity of Americans everywhere. All assistance was given free—never as a loan, never with an obligation to repay.

Through Red Cross, you gave this disaster assistance to your neighbors:

| | |
|---|---|
| In Ohio, to help 7,863 families | $1,965,064.94 |
| In Indiana, to help 612 families | 112,514.42 |
| In Pennsylvania, to help 1,387 families | 296,755.39 |
| In New York, to help 121 families | 44,196.26 |
| In West Virginia, to help 83 families | 5,954.96 |
| Grand Total | 2,424,485.97 |

(All figures subject to adjustment when accounting is completed.)

## Stop Lake Diversion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD a very timely editorial which appeared in the Cleveland News on March 23, titled "Stop Lake Diversion Bill."

STOP LAKE DIVERSION BILL

The House in Washington has given the green light to the controversial bill to allow Chicago to pump more water out of Lake Michigan and into the canals that carry its sewage toward the Mississippi. Chicago argues that the oxygen from the additional water would break down sewage and thereby reduce pollution, which it claims is a critical problem menacing public health.

If the Senate unwisely elects to approve this special interest legislation, we urge President Eisenhower to employ his veto again, as he did with previous bills in 1954 and 1956.

Congress will only serve the purely local interest of the Illinois city, and at great cost, if it sanctions this diversion. Six Great Lakes States—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michgan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and New York—are arrayed with Ohio against this measure and hold, in our judgment, the weight of arguments against it. Additional diversion, and we accept their engineering authority, will rob these states of water power, endanger navigation by lowering the

level of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway, and open a dangerous precedent by giving Canada a basis for demanding the right to tap such U.S. watersheds as the Columbia River Basin. The Supreme Court, in 1930, ruled that from 1939 Chicago could take no more than 1,500 cubic feet per second out of Lake Michigan for sewage treatment and navigation purposes. Chicago now seeks an additional 1,000 cubic feet.

Neither the Great Lakes nor any other lakes should be thrown open to grabs by States which refuse to solve their own problems and seek only to encroach upon the established rights of others. It is also a matter of keeping good faith with the treaties in which we are bound to Canada. Much better that Chicago spend to improve its methods of water purification. Much better that Congress safeguard the rights of all lake-bordering States by passing legislation to maintain lake levels for the benefit of all.

## Uniting the Nations Through the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure to insert a speech made by a former Member of this House, the Honorable W. Sterling Cole, who is now serving as Director General, International Atomic Energy Agency, in Vienna, Austria. This speech was made on the occasion of the Ninth Annual Conference of National Organizations, under the auspices of the American Association for the United Nations, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D.C., March 9, 1959. In my opinion, it contains information of interest to every Member of the House.

The speech follows:

UNITING THE NATIONS THROUGH THE ATOM

(By W. Sterling Cole, Director General, International Atomic Energy Agency, before the Ninth Annual Conference of National Organizations, under the auspices of the American Association for the United Nations, Washington, D.C., March 9, 1959)

To travel nearly 6,000 miles in order to deliver this address is some indication of the high stature of the American Association for the United Nations and the importance which I attach to the opportunity of discussing with you some of the major problems facing this newest of international organizations, the International Atomic Energy Agency. Therefore I deem it to be an honor and a great privilege as head of that organization that is part of the U.N. family to appear before you. I am grateful for this opportunity for two reasons.

First, as an American, I can share with you the satisfaction and pride in this Nation's faith in and support of the very idea of the United Nations, and in the fact that the United States is the host country to the primary and central agency of the entire family and the principal instrumentality for peace in the world today.

Second, it is an unusual opportunity for me to be able to talk face to face with so many of the people who work to make America's faith and support directly effective toward the end of a just and durable peace for all the world. Today, I want to discuss with you some of the means for doing this, the means which will convert the decisive force of nuclear fission into a uniting force of an atomically healthy world.

Atomic energy is a term loosely describing a broad salient on the frontiers of man's knowledge. It is not so much a field of knowledge itself as it is a new dimension in many areas of man's technological endeavor.

New knowledge of the atom's nucleus and the behavior of its particles has extended the horizons of man's hopes and ambitions to exploit science for the maintenance and improvement of his own welfare.

Similarly, and threateningly, atomic energy has changed by whole orders of magnitude the destructive potentials of man's ancient and degrading habit of employing organized violence when his intelligence and his faith fail him.

Atomic energy, of course, is not the only area of technological progress which has this two-way potential. The engines of war are built and fueled from the whole reservoir of scientific achievement. War necessarily confiscates the whole treasury of man's knowledge and skill. No field of science can withhold its contribution to the magma of war and no withdrawal from the pursuit of knowledge can assure exemption from war's tax which cannot help but eventually consume the values upon which it feeds.

It is necessary therefore to impose restraints on war's exploitation of science, not so much to preserve the integrity of science as to preserve man himself. Effective worldwide machinery to guarantee renunciation of military nuclear explosions is such a restraining measure. It can both demonstrate and be itself a vitally important step toward the disarmament which can release man from his frightful bondage.

It is a bondage to fear, fear of radiation poison, fear of megaton blast, fear of war's outbreak, its devastation, its aftermath, and fear of the consequences of wasteful preoccupation with war's methods and means.

Man knows from experience that fear is his most undependable motivation. It is viscous and cancerous. It devours and replaces the elements of discernment, intelligence, and judgment. It will eventually engulf instead of support any structure of peace which is built upon it. As a deterrent, it can only deteriorate.

There is a way—and there are ways—out of bondage and away from fear. There is a course open to us, a course which will lead us away from the fear-laden anxiety of competitive military buildup. It is a way by which constructive action can overcome the paralysis of exclusive dependence upon preparing for war to prevent war. History has shown us that periods of balanced military power are not permanent. A stalemate in the struggle for ultimate power does not provide the dependable foundation for permanent peace that we desire.

Today, we have an alternative course. We can relieve the pressure of dangerously competitive military preparation by turning our energies to constructive international operation—real joint operation by nations, action, not talk and coordination.

This is a course upon which a start has been made, and for which there is guidance and some experience. The guidance and the experience, as well as the means, exist in the people and the agencies of the U.N. family. The motivation, the means of propulsion, the sustaining force for continued progress along this course, lies in the minds and hearts of the people in this room, and the people in hundreds of other rooms all over the world where the realities of today's world are recognized and discussed. We have the power to move, and keep moving, and move constantly faster and more surely toward stability and equity and freedom in the relations among all the people of the world.

That course is a conscious, concerted, and coordinated effort to apply the benefits of modern technology to the welfare of mankind with something like the intensity and effetciveness with which we divert and distort the product of science to the demands of war. It is a course along which patriotism can be as productive for peace as it is preempted for war.

It was such a course which President Eisehower had in mind when he proposed to the United Nations General Assembly on December 8, 1953, that the nations, in effect, pool a certain aspect of their war resources to make possible a just and fruitful sharing among all the nations of the benefits of atomic energy. The basic and continuing idea behind his proposal was that, while continuing to strive for control over or restraints upon the destructive uses of atomic energy, the nations of the world should join forces in an immediate, concurrent, dynamic, and continuing effort to exploit the peaceful potential of the atom.

It is, of course, necessary in all fields of man's knowledge, to find and follow the ways for directing the whole of man's knowledge, the whole of the advance of science, toward man's welfare.

The underlying idea was entirely new—in that for the first time in history it was proposed that a tremendous force usable for war and destruction be dedicated to the benefit of mankind everywhere and that knowledge in the peaceful application of this new-found force be shared without favor or discrimination. The world has since come to recognize increasingly, that the idea of uniting the nations just for the constructive exploitation of atomic energy was a unique contribution to the solution of a problem which is as great as any man has ever faced on this earth.

The world first saw an example of nonmilitary joint operations in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for immediate postwar relief in the European theater of war operations. Since then, the United Nations has encouraged and fostered work of its own and of other international agencies in the field of health, agriculture, education, communications, transport, children's aid, labor standards, currency and finance, and now atomic energy.

The measure of success of this multipronged effort to solve some of the problems and meet the constructive objectives of the United Nations will be not so much in the efficiency of management of the organization themselves—although it is of great importance—as in the extent to which the supporting governments will actually use the international channels for the accomplishments of their announced objectives.

The United Nations itself is the central pier upon and around which the strictly political issues must be weighed and considered in the never-ending task of building for peace. The work in specialized fields, in defined areas such as health or atomic energy, is part of the building job. It is that part which I want to discuss specifically and it is the part in which there are specific policy questions bearing upon the very life and usefulness of the United Nations arm for atomic energy, the International Atomic Energy Agency.

There are several basic policy questions which must be answered by every government in the world which subscribes to the objective defined in the statute of the Agency "to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health, and prosperity throughout the world."

It is also the objective of the statute of the Agency that, "It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such way as to further any military purpose."

The first policy question then is this:

Shall the atomic energy contribution of the technologically advanced and materially endowed nations to other countries in the world be given and applied through truly international channels; or shall we continue to channel such aid through networks of bilateral agreements for selective nation-to-nation exchange without benefit of the balance wheel of international considerations?

A second, and considerably more pressing, policy question is this:

Shall the peacetime production and utilization of nuclear materials around the world be carried out under international codes and standards for health and safety; or shall we permit the peaceful exploitation of atomic energy under varying, perhaps conflicting, and certainly confusing, and only partially effective nationally imposed standards for health and safety?

And finally, this question:

Shall the nations seek in unison to establish and maintain uniform, practical rules to prevent the diversion to military purposes of nuclear materials make their own rules and apply them as they deem desirable under unpredictable conditions of inter-nation competition?

Unless these questions are answered positively in favor of utilizing the multilateral international channels and means, then the International Atomic Energy Agency can hardly accomplish its full purpose. But that is not the only consideration.

Unless we work in unison on the problems of atomic energy, we may find that foreign aid in atomic energy becomes involved in contending national policies.

It is even more the point that we may also find that the utilization of nuclear fuels which are necessary to industry, medicine, and agriculture become bogged down in a hopeless multiplicity of rules which will provide no proper protection to public health and saftey against the radiation hazard of atomic activity and no safeguards against diversion of materials to nonpeaceful purposes.

The very statement of these two questions of policy, and they can be phrased in many ways, reflects several basic assumptions which we do not need to argue. In some respects, they are not assumptions at all, they are simply the facts of life. The following facts, or assumption, form the premise for our whole "atoms for peace" concept and effort:

First, intelligent application of the knowledge, techniques, and materials emerging from the nuclear and allied sciences can make a contribution to the peace, health, and prosperity of the world.

Second, nature and history, have left sadly out of balance the relative capability—and the needs—of the nations to apply the knowledge, techniques, and materials of atomic energy. Relieving this imbalance can itself be a dynamic contribution to peace.

Third, atomic energy is here to stay. It is going to be utilized to such an extent, particularly in the technologically and industrially advanced nations, that its inherent radiation hazard which knows no national boundaries, must be controlled in a manner uniformly effective throughout the world.

Fourth, the source and fissionable materials required for peaceful utilization of atomic energy are going to be traded and exchanged around the world in such a way that common prudence dictates a reasonable and practical system of their accounting or registration which will deter, discourage, reveal—and eventually prevent—their diversion to further some military purposes.

Such a four-point premise lifts atomic energy, as a field of science, out of the ordinary considerations of the day and provides us with an opportunity as unique as it is promising. Here is a field in which we are justified in expanding the time-honored concepts of nation-to-nation assistance and trade in favor of a truly international effort which can benefit every nation.

Although atomic energy shares its dual nature, of being both a potential boon to humanity and a scourge—a weapon of peace and a weapon of war—with other fields of man's work, it shares a crowded stage of the political problems which keep nations and people in a state of feverish anxiety; it transcends them all, by far, in these two potentialities. But it is one area and one problem which can bring new honor and accomplishment to traditional national policies and techniques of diplomacy. Atomic energy should, without real risk and with great promise of success, be treated on a truly international basis with equal opportunity to seek participation by all the nations of the world. Surely it is worth a try.

The policy steps which should be taken are fully consistent with President Eisenhower's initial proposals that the International Atomic Energy Agency be "set up under the aegis of the United Nations" and his recognition "that this subject is global, not merely national in character." Furthermore, the policies which should be adopted may be implied in the acceptance by every nation which has become a member of the agency of the conditions and the obligations of that membership.

The policies and procedures which can make atoms really work for peace can be quite simply stated. They are:

1. That direct contributions of funds to assist the atomically less advanced countries to share more fully in the benefits of atomic energy be increasingly pooled and distributed through the machinery of an international organization in which all of the donors and all of the optential recipients have a voice and which avoids the element of dependence upon a single donor.

2. That the health and safety provisions and the fissionable and source material safeguard provisions of all nation-to-nation arrangements, the so-called atomic bilaterals, become the responsibility of the agency which would insure uniform application and thereby establish a proper and equitable environment for all the nations to do business with all the other nations in the field of harnessing the energy of the atom's nucleus.

3. That all trade in fissionable and source materials for peaceful uses be conducted under internationally agreed conditions which will encourage and stimulate the use of these materials but at the same time give all the world assurance that materials dedicated to peace are not subject to possible diversion to military purposes.

These policies cannot be put into effect in one fell swoop. They should be made effective on a step-by-step basis. But all should be promptly acknowledged as the basic intent and purpose of the nations which are in a position to provide the technological, financial and industrial help, or to provide the fuel materials.

A truly international approach to these problems would be welcomed by and be a great advantage to all of the nations, not only to the advanced nations busily engaged in exploiting their own atomic resources, but also to those nations who must look to others more favored by nature and history in order to share in the technological advances of the last half century.

There would be no question of preferential treatment, no question of equity of arrangements, the health and safety of the citizenry would be protected and there would be no reason to take exception to the imposition of realistic safeguards for peaceful uses. There would be no responsibility or right of any one nation to police the atomic activities of another. No recipient of atomic aid would need to be beholden to a single national benefactor. These conditions would make for a constructive and vigorous environment for atomic development.

Uniform rules of health and safety, with completely independent check and examination for their effectiveness, and a uniform system of accounting for materials, again with a completely independent audit, would go far toward establishing the proper climate for a healthy and growing atomic power industry in all parts of the world and relieve the tension of fear from the hazards of both atomic radiation and atomic war.

We recognize that these policies cannot come into being over night, that we have a steep and tortuous road to travel. We recall the words of the Secretary-General of the United Nations at the opening of the 1955 Geneva Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. He said:

"We have a long road ahead of us to traverse before nations can hope to eliminate the threat of atomic destruction. But we cannot hope to travel at all unless we begin to take down the barriers to understanding and friendship and begin to work together in growing confidence."

That confidence has been growing. Much, very much, has been done since then; we have come a long way but the end is not even in sight. One measure of the growing confidence is the very existence of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Another measure of the growing confidence would be the start of work on some form of agreement among the nations as to the conditions under which source and fissionable materials will be turned into the channels of international trade. The objectives of such an agreement would be to attain registry of source materials shipped for peaceful purposes, to refrain from supplying customers who do not accept and apply the common international health and safety standards, and finally, to shut off the flow of materials not subject to international registry and accountability.

The International Atomic Energy Agency provides the framework within which all of these procedures can be carried out. Its constitution is a treaty-statute approved by more than 80 nations. Its constituent assembly is an annual general conference of the member states, now numbering 70. Its managing directorate is a 23-member Board of Governors carefully balanced to include representation of the atomic industry nations, the material supply nations, the recipient nations, and the several major geographic regions of the world.

The agency has a staff of outstandingly competent scientists, engineers, administrators, and diplomats made up of representatives of over half of the member states, headed by a Director General who is the chief administrative officer. Its program and budget are directed and shaped in consultation with the Board of Governors, which must approve and submit the program and budget to the general conference.

The day will come, of course, when experience and greater mutual recognition of the problems will result in a simplification of the complex and even cumbersome structure established in the statute, as well as streamlining of some of the procedural provisions of the statute, but for the time being these built-in checks and balances and restraints constitute a basis for entering to a far greater degree into truly international atoms for peace operations.

The agency has begun operations in all of its assigned fields of action. It has published a manual on the safe handling of radioisotopes as the first in a series to cover all the various phases of the production and utilization of nuclear materials.

This code has already been given widespread acclaim and acceptance; it is not only

a code for agency use but also a pattern for other governments to follow and thereby achieve a high degree of universal standardization.

It has embarked on a substantially—and growing—program of technical assistance using not only funds contributed voluntarily by its own members to the agency itself—but also using funds provided through the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance.

We have completed a study of the need for nuclear training facilities in Latin America. We have granted over 200 fellowships to candidates from over 20 countries.

In response to a member's request, we are arranging for the supply of part of the natural uranium required for a research reactor to be operated by the requesting member, Japan. A system of accounting and reporting on this material is being devised—and will be applied in a manner consistent with the degree of the risk involved.

In the first 12 months of our operation we have established a creditable record, especially considering that during that time much effort was consumed in recruitment of personnel.

The agency has begun a study by a panel of scientists and will sponsor a major conference within a few months on the problem of possible effects of the disposal of radioactive wastes at sea. Work has started with other intergovernmental and international groups concerned with the problem of establishing uniform standards for radiological protection. We are moving forward positively and aggressively to bring about a universal solution in the problem of third party liability in event of any kind of accident involving hazards of radiation.

These are but a few of the highlights of the programs which are taking shape and being put into operation by the International Atomic Energy Agency. These programs will continue to grow, but the full measure of the potential of the institution and the idea presented in outline to the U.N. General Assembly 5 years ago cannot be realized unless the nations "principally involved" are now prepared to adopt policies which will be in complete accord with the purposes and objectives and the spirit of the Statute.

The first decision which must be made is clear and straight-forward. It is simply the decision that, having created an international body for defined purposes in connection with atomic energy, the agency should be supported not only with generous financial contributions—as has been the case of the United States—but fully and without qualification in its operational aspects. We can be only partially effective if some nations maintain parallel machinery to do the same thing as the agency, but subject to individual nation selection, manipulation and control.

Once this decision has been made, and with determination to sustain it, the subsequent steps become equally clear and straightforward: to discontinue further bilaterals or multilaterals, to begin to place under agency administration the health and safety and materials safeguard measures embodied in existing bilateral and multilateral agreements, to begin to channel all atomic foreign aid through the agency, and to start work on the instrument which will make possible the registration and accounting control of the nuclear fuel materials.

The measures outlined should not be taken as isolated steps which could be taken or neglected at will. They are closely related, inter-dependent; they form a whole. They are as with the facts of science, of which a distinguished scientist of France, Henri Poincare, said: "Science is built up with facts, as a house is with stoens, but a collection of facts is no more a science than a heap of stones is a house."

We have started to build a house, a structure which will be lasting and serviceable. It is the atoms for peace policy. We must build imaginatively and carefully. In this way we will be devoting our entire hearts and minds "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of men shall not be dedicated to his death but consecrated to his life."

---

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

---

## CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

---

## CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

---

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

---

## RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

# *Appendix*

## Jefferson-Jackson Dinner Address by Hon. Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner on March 19, 1959, at the Statler Hilton Hotel in Hartford, Conn.

The people of Connecticut were truly honored to have such capable and efficient speakers on this outstanding and memorable occasion. Among these outstanding orators were numbered our own majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS J. DODD AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, MARCH 19, 1959, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, HARTFORD, CONN.

I will be brief tonight because we all want to hear LYNDON JOHNSON. First of all, I wish to express my gratitude to Senator JOHNSON for making the sacrifice that he has had to make in order to be here with us tonight.

It is not an easy thing for the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, in the midst of a busy legislative week, to add extra hours to his day to help make this happy occasion for Connecticut Democrats a successful and memorable one.

ONE OF HISTORY'S GREAT SENATORS

This willingness to make an extra effort, this self-sacrifice for the good of our party, are two of the qualities that have made LYNDON JOHNSON one of the truly great Senators in American history.

I do not say this lightly. I believe that LYNDON JOHNSON is in the tradition of six or eight truly great Senators of American history. In recent years he has carried a burden that no other Senator has ever carried.

FACED WITH DANGER

In 1953 the Democratic Party was faced with a great danger. For the first time in 20 years we were without a President in the White House to give leadership and unity to our party.

We had lost a crucial election after a campaign against us that was marked by bitterness, slander, and misrepresentation. Many feared that we would reply in kind, following the doctrine of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Many feared that we would act in the spirit of blind opposition that so often characterized our opponents in previous years. Others feared that we would lapse into irresponsibility, drift, and sectional division. But none of this happened. And one of the main reasons it didn't happen is that we had a leader in the U.S. Senate who, through the tireless exercise of all the skills of political leadership welded our party together, chartered a course of progress and constructive action, and let us along the path of responsible opposition that put patriotism above partisanship.

SHOULDERS GREAT RESPONSIBILITY

LYNDON JOHNSON today is shouldering a greater responsibility than any legislative leader in our long history.

In a time of continuing national and international crises, we have a national administration that too often seems tired, weary, and unequal to the task. Therefore, more and more the mantle of leadership has fallen upon the majority leader in the Senate. And he is meeting this challenge with a masterful leadership that has no parallel in the annals of the Senate.

TIME FOR PROGRESS REPORT

This is the first time that Connecticut Democrats have gotten together at an occasion like this since shortly after our great election victory of last November.

You have all been following the remarkable performance which our party is making on the State scene. And tonight I would like to take a few minutes to make a report to you on how we are meeting our campaign promises on the national scene.

Normally at this stage of the legislative year, only 2 months since the opening of Congress, there is very little to report. Normally at this time of year no major bills have been acted upon. Normally legislation is still in the bill drafting stage, or in the committee stage.

But these are not normal times. Last year we promised the people of this country prompt and vigorous action on many fronts. How are we fulfilling that promise?

PROMISES AND PERFORMANCE

We said that we would pass a housing bill that would bring us much closer to our goal of a decent home for every American—and we have done it.

We said that we would move ahead in clearing away the Nation's slum areas and getting the urban renewal program in high gear—and we have done it.

We said that we would provide a system of airports and air facilities equal to our national need in this jet age—and we have done it.

We said that we would add another star to our flag, the bright star of Hawaii—and we have done it.

We said that we would carry forward programs of loans for needed economic development all over the world—and today we did it.

We said that we would lay before the American people the grim facts of our national military posture—and we are doing it.

We said that in vital matters of foreign policy we would stand shoulder to shoulder with the President of the Untied States and present a firm and united front against Communist tyranny—and we are doing it.

We said that we would put through a great nationwide program that would revitalize depressed areas and put regions of chronic unemployment back on their feet—and next Monday we are going to do it.

JUST THE BEGINNING

And this is just the beginning.

We are going to see to it that our military leaders have the weapons they need to protect our freedom.

We are going to pass a foreign aid bill that is worthy of a country of our wealth, our ideals, and our moral values.

We are going to pass a Federal aid to education bill that will take a giant step toward the kind of education that America needs if it is to preserve its world leadership in this space age.

We are going to pass a labor bill that will drive the racketeers and hoodlums out of the labor movement and help organized labor to be what the overwhelming majority of its leaders and members want it to be: Clean, dedicated, and progressive.

We are going to continue the progress in the field of civil rights that we started with the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

I say these things not out of vague hope, but out of confidence and conviction.

ON THE MARCH

The Democratic majority in the Senate and the House of Representatives is on the march, all along the line. We are determined to face up squarely to our Nation's problems and to meet them head on. We have the leadership, we have the will, and we have the votes to give the people of this country a record of achievement that will dwarf anything in its past history. And we are going to do it.

When I stand before you a year from now at our next Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, I will be able to tell you that these things have been accomplished.

THE TASK AHEAD

I think that on an occasion like this we can be excused for a little pride in our own party, to which we have devoted a great portion of our lives. I think we can be excused for blowing our own horn a little tonight.

But tomorrow and in the weeks and months ahead let us all remember the great trust that is reposed in us, the great responsibilities we all share, the staggering burdens we must carry in our State, in our country, and in the world.

And, humbled by the dimension of this task, let us do the very best we can to write a record that will stand our our credit, and to our party's credit, in the history books of free men in distant generations.

This task is not a partisan one. Our goals have been shared by great leaders of both parties throughout our national history. And so it is not inappropriate on this celebration in honor of Jefferson and Jackson to quote the words of a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, who spoke for today as for his own era when he said: "We see, across the dangers, the great future and we rejoice as a giant refreshed, as a strong man, girt for the race. The greatest victories are yet to be won, the greatest deeds yet to be done. * * * There are in store for our people, and for the causes we uphold, grander triumphs than have ever yet been scored."

## Address by Secretary of Agriculture Benson at Cornell University's Annual Farm and Home Week Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have consistently supported proposals looking toward greater flexibility in Federal farm programs and toward greater freedom for our farmers. The people of this Nation look with more and more disfavor upon the huge cost of our present farm subsidy program. I am convinced that the farmers of America are as anxious as anyone to get the Government off their back and to operate in a free economy to the maximum extent possible.

Secretary Benson yesterday delivered a most timely address on farm problems at Cornell University's annual farm and home week meeting. I was particularly impressed by his reference to the results of a poll of farmers all across the land just completed by a national farm magazine. The results of this poll showed that 55 percent of our farm population want no supports, no controls, no floors, free market prices; get the Government clear out, while only 22 percent wanted more Government price help. These views should not be ignored by Congress in considering new farm legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Secretary Benson's excellent speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON, ANNUAL MEETING FARM AND HOME WEEK, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, N.Y., MARCH 24, 1959

I feel most deeply honored and privileged to be with you again on the occasion of your farm and home week. And yet my job in being here is mingled with a certain regret. In extending his invitation Dean W. I. Myers reminded me that this would be the last farm and home program that he would plan as dean of the College of Agriculture here at Cornell. I am sure I speak for all of us when I say that the prospect of Dean Myers' retirement cannot help but fill us with a sense of impending loss.

He is truly one of the outstanding agricultural leaders in the history of this land. Nearly all of his life has been devoted to agriculture. He has been teacher, researcher, administrator, Government official, and adviser. But above all, he has been, and he is, a farm man, and a man loved and honored by farmers. Since 1953 Dean Myers had been chairman of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, and I can personally testify that he has been a tower of strength standing for the best interests of American farmers.

I find it impossible to set down in words all that I would like to say about the devotion, the energy, the intelligence, the untiring zeal of this agricultural statesman in his service to agriculture—yes, and I find it equally impossible to express the gratitude, admiration, and affection which I personally have for him.

My hope, and I am sure your hope also, is that his retirement will not take him away from us but that it will free him for an even broader and equally fruitful service to the cause of American agriculture.

The last time I was here for your annual farm and home week was exactly 5 years ago today—March 24, 1954. What tremendous changes we have seen in these 5 years—what heavy problems have been faced by the Nation and the Nation's agriculture.

I can think of no better place to make a frank appraisal of our challenges and opportunities in agriculture than here on the campus of this great land-grant university from which so many distinguished leaders have come.

There are many approaches to most problems—but few solutions. Sometimes solutions can be reduced to a formula. Is there a formula which can help us solve our farm difficulties? I know this is an oversimplification, but someone recently suggested to me a broad formula which might be expressed like this: Necessity, plus sound economics, plus constructive politics, equals the solution to the farm problem.

Surely there is no question as to the necessity of a solution to the problem. It is no longer merely desirable, it is essential, to do something to reverse the mounting accumulations of farm surpluses of a few crops and the heavy costs which threaten our agriculture with creeping regimentation and contribute to a serious threat against the solvency of our Nation. Let me just give you some dramatic examples of three of the six so-called basic crops on which we urgently need fundamental changes in the old laws.

Wheat is our number one commodity problem. We cannot continue with the old outmoded wheat program as it now exists. Harvested wheat acreage has been cut by over 20 million acres since 1949—yet, under artificial pricing, combined with good weather, we now have by far the greatest wheat surplus in all history.

By July 1960 the carryover of wheat will be about 1½ billion bushels—enough to supply our normal domestic requirements for 2½ years. We will have $3½ billion tied up in wheat alone.

We have spread the wheat belt all over America. Wheat acreage has increased in areas of high cost, while acres have been cut back in areas where production is most efficient. This doesn't make sense.

Tobacco and peanuts are in trouble too. We have the best quality tobacco in the world, but we have been pricing ourselves out of export markets. The world's largest tobacco market used to be in Winston-Salem, N.C. Now it's in Southern Rhodesia in Africa.

Farmers are producing more peanuts than consumers will buy at the prices at which peanuts for food must be supported—note I said must be—under the old obsolete law still on the books.

Equally important, the farm program is costing too much—it is staggering—it is indefensible.

Our total investment in price supported commodities is now $9 billion. It will probably exceed $10 billion by the end of the next fiscal year.

It is estimated that during the next fiscal year we will spend more than $1 billion—one billion dollars—just for storage, transportation, and interest on these Government-held surpluses.

These are facts.

The commodities are there, the investment has been made. No matter how we later dispose of them, whether by sales for cash with an export subsidy, sale for foreign currencies, or by outright donation to needy people, the cost to the taxpayers will be great.

Can any economist or columnist, can any spokesman for agriculture, can any Member of Congress, can any farmer, or any other citizen, deny these facts? I leave the answer to you.

No thinking person can question the necessity for a solution.

Nor can anyone seriously doubt the need for sound economics. It would not seem appropriate for me, on this campus, to discuss the economics of the farm problem with you. You are aware of it, and further you have demonstrated not only an awareness but a determination to help resolve rather than compound the problem.

So we come to the political element. Since Government has assumed responsibility in the economic field of agriculture, the most baffling—and perhaps unfortunately the most powerful factor in this formula—is politics. Any Government is a political system.

It is apparently impossible for a Secretary of Agriculture to deal effectively with the present critical problems of agriculture always on the basis of just necessity or just economics—he must sometimes face up to the politics.

If we are to have sound farm programs, we must have sound politics accompanied by sound economics.

There is nothing disgraceful in the word politics or in the word politician. Politics is the art of government and good politics makes for good government. The very foundation of this Government was a document divinely inspired that was drafted and adroitly handled by politically educated men to become an instrument for freedom. What we must strive for in the political factor of the formula is to have political action governed by the economic facts. And this is where the failures have occurred.

I think it must be admitted that in the past there has been an overemphasis on political approaches to farm problems which are basically economic.

Agriculture must not be sacrificed on the political auction block. Agriculture is neither Republican nor Democrat. It is American.

Let us be candid. Both major parties share responsibility for the situation in which we now find ourselves. But more important is the responsibility for getting to the solution.

No one has more concern than I about the cost of thes farm programs. This Secretary of Agriculture has been administering, and is still required to administer, within the straightjacket or outmoded laws the most costly, irrational, hodgepodge program ever patched together. It is the result of 25 years of political attempts to solve economic problems, seemingly with an assiduous determination to pretend that economics does not exist.

Do you think that as a farmer, the son of a farmer, yes, the grandson of a farmer, and as a former county agent, and now as a spokesman for farmers, I enjoy for one minute the distinction of administering the third largest item in the Federal budget? Of course not.

But be assured, I would not hesitate to defend this program if it were serving the best interests of our farm families and the people of the Nation. The truth of the matter is that these stupendous surpluses and heavy costs are not only sapping the vitals of free agriculture, they are also a threat to the solvency of this Nation.

The Secretary of Agriculture is subject to many pressures and cross fires. Opposition to change—to sound economic solutions to economic problems—has been almost unbelievable. My opponents can't agree on a constructuve solution of the farm dilemma. Really, the only general agreement among my opponents is this: "Let's saddle Benson with all of the ills of agriculture, and es-

pecially with the cost of the mess we helped to make for him."

There seems never to be a lack of self-appointed so-called agricultural experts. Sometimes they seem to get away with their strategy of being against everything and everybody, while offering nothing positive or constructive as alternative.

It is this type of disservice to the American people, and particularly to the American farmer, that makes it most difficult to inject commonsense into farm programs. This is destructive politics in action.

With smokescreens of distortions and half-truths, those who would shirk responsibility for obvious failures seek to obliterate the facts. But a rising crest of informed and aroused public opinion is beginning to penetrate the confusion.

Throughout this great Nation farmers and other thoughtful citizens know that obsolete farm laws, which produce chaos at great costs, must be changed.

Our farmers deserve sound programs. They have made an immeasurable contribution to our national standard of living—to the point that our people are the best fed, the best clothed, the best housed people in the world.

Our farmers face serious problems that are not of their own making.

Take the cost-price squeeze. Between 1939 and 1952 the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest and taxes, more than doubled. From 1952 to January 1959 the level rose only 4 percent. But the damage had already been done. This has created problems for our farmers that they are powerless to control. It has affected, and will continue to affect adversely, net farm income. I have the greatest sympathy for our farm people. I say we must assist them with sound programs.

If the voices of 20 million farm people in America could be crystallized into one voice, it would, I feel sure, demand more freedom for farmers.

That voice would say:

"Give us more freedom to plant so that we can run our farms efficiently.

"Give us more freedom to market so that we can increase our incomes.

"Give us more freedom to meet our competition so that we can expand our markets.

"Give us more freedom from Government interference so that we may again be independent and self-reliant."

Strong evidence that farmers increasingly want more freedom is found in the results of a poll of farmers all across the land which is just being announced.

One of the largest national farm magazines invited farmers to tell Congress what to do about price-support programs.

In replying to that poll, 55 percent voted for "no supports, no controls, no floors, free market prices; get the Government clear out."

This is a significant increase over the 50 percent who in a similar poll a year ago favored getting the Government out of farming.

Another 15 percent favored emergency supports only "to prevent disaster from a huge crop or sudden loss of markets; floors set at, say, 50 percent of parity, or 75 percent of the average 3-year market price and no production controls."

Another 8 percent wanted adjustment supports "such as 90 percent of the average 3-year market price, permitting gradual adjustment to normal markets and moderate production control when necessary to ease adjustments."

Only 22 percent wanted more Government price help. This breaks down into 14 percent who favor a return to supports at 90 percent of parity or more than 8 percent who asked for production payments.

This nationwide poll showed that 8 out of 10 of the farmers want greater freedom and less Government in farming.

Yes, the voice of the American farmer calls in louder and louder tones for more freedom to act, and less Government interference.

If this is what farmers want what are we waiting for, what is Congress waiting for? We've made our recommendations. Why don't they act?

Farmers recognize that the old basic crop legislation, still on the books, is outmoded and fails of its objective. It has placed ineffective bureaucratic controls on farmers, destroyed markets, piled up surpluses, and imposed heavy burdens on taxpayers. It does not fit the needs of our small farms comprising 58 percent of all our farms.

Despite our repeated recommendations over a period of years, the old program is still in effect on a very few crops with only slight changes. It's certainly not our program. Congress has never permitted our program to become effective. Our program has never really been tried. The present program was devised during the great depression and revised during war and recovery from war. Today we have neither depression nor war.

But we do have a rapidly changing dynamic agriculture, which is undergoing an irreversible, technological revolution. Our farm laws must be revised to cope with current conditions.

In January, the President again recommended to the Congress forthright changes in our farm price supports. He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 45 years old, but to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years.

If the Congress still prefers to keep existing parity standards, the President urged that the Secretary be given discretion to establish the support level for all commodities in accordance with guidelines fixed by law. This is now permitted for all of the 250 commercially produced commodities except for 16 for which supports are mandatory.

Either of these changes would be constructive. Under either course, the surplus could be reduced, the cost cut, production controls relaxed and markets developed. Our farm people could make more of their own decisions. The Government could resume its proper function of promoting farm research, expanding and developing markets, protecting soil and water resources, improving farm credit, and so on. We would help stabilize markets, not price ourselves out of them.

Congress recognized the need for farm program revision last year by passing the Agricultural Act of 1958. This act made some limited changes in the programs for corn, cotton, and rice. Now we need prompt and effective action in behalf of procedures of the other three basic crops, wheat, tobacco, and peanuts.

Wheat particularly is in an extremely critical position.

Either we must clamp down with more rigorous controls on wheat producers than we have ever had before—more controls than Congress has ever been willing to impose—or we must move toward market expansion and greater freedom to produce and compete.

More controls means stopping up the loopholes, increasing the penalty for overplanting, setting acreage and marketing quotas at levels that would balance supply and demand for wheat for dollars.

That is one approach—more controls—more regimentation.

Incidentally, if we followed the formula in the old law the national allotment for wheat this year would be zero, no wheat production at all.

A far better approach, I believe, would be to provide wheat growers with a program that moves toward freedom to produce and compete for markets.

The issue here is not a partisan one. The necessity cannot be denied. The economics is clear. Constructive politics can prevail. The issue is whether or not the Government's role with respect to agriculture is to be one that makes sense.

The American people deserve a program that makes sense. The poll I referred to shows that most of our farmers want it.

We must be on guard, however, lest the difficulties of the present program be used as an excuse to involve agriculture in something worse and in even greater trouble.

One bill now before the Congress is described as a measure under which "excessive and burdensome Federal control on agriculture will be eliminated, and under which American agriculture will be restricted to a free enterprise basis."

The words in this Talmadge-Brannan approach are appealing, but the reality is appalling.

This bill would provide for production payments on the basic crops.

In view of the facts available and the studies that have been made, I cannot see how such a plan can seriously be advocated unless as a political gimmick that might last for another election.

Studies by career economists show the production payment program could cost annually about $5.4 billion, for payments for the basic commodities alone. If expanded to all the major commodities, the cost would be well above $10 billion a year.

Congress refused to adopt such a program when submitted by my predecessor, Secretary Brannan. The scheme would:

1. Require drastic controls of production to keep costs within reason.

2. Limit opportunity of new farmers to enter into the production of these crops.

3. Unless extended to livestock (which would boost the cost even higher) it could create extremely serious problems for livestock, poultry, and dairy producers.

4. It would lead to international repercussions if U.S. surpluses were dumped on world markets.

5. Most fundamental of all, it would make farmers dependent for much of their income on direct payments from the Federal Treasury.

This would be a long step toward a fully socialized agriculture.

All this is not only the farmers' battle for realistic farm programs. It is the battle of every citizen—every businessman, every taxpayer, every housewife, every consumer, every person interested in the future of this country.

Our present costly farm programs contribute to unbalancing the budget—and this contributes to the threat of inflation. That is of utmost concern to every citizen. No Nation can go on indefinitely living beyond its income and cheapening the value of its currency.

I am intensely concerned about this. The course of inflation is subtle. Its ends are destructive. It mounts quietly, almost unseen in the short-term view, but it is utterly devastating over time.

The President has called for tight reins on Government spending, and for a balanced budget. He has called upon all of us, as citizens, for self-discipline in our economic actions, both as individuals and as groups. Government alone cannot win the battle against inflation. To win it—and we must win it—will require the united efforts of the American people, business, labor, banking, agriculture, and all economic groups.

Our expanding Federal Government has boosted the average family's tax bill from $120 to $1,600 a year. How much further can we go in this direction?

Many pressures are now being exerted to add more billions to Federal spending in the coming fiscal year, and beyond, billions that can bring on further deficits and inflation.

Contrary to what some people would have us believe, the Federal Treasury is not a bottomless grabbag which never needs to be conserved or replenished. To act as though there is no limit to what the Treasury can spend is an open road to the destruction of private enterprise, and its replacement by a socialistic economy.

I am firmly convinced that most Americans would never turn willingly to socialism. But a great many may unknowingly be led down that road by the lure of Government handouts, of deficit spending, of inflation, to the point where private enterprise is destroyed.

We cannot spend ourselves into prosperity. Nor can we preserve our prosperity and our free enterprise system by following a reckless policy of spending beyond our income in peacetime.

We must have a tax policy which is not confiscatory and a budget policy which prevents inflation. The Nation must have sound farm programs—just as it must have sound banking and finance—and sound wage and price policies.

The necessity for further revision of our farm programs is obvious. The direction in which we should go is clear. The economics of the farm problem are simple.

We need less Government in farming. Quit trying to fix prices unrealistically from which flow the twin evils of production for Government warehouses and Government control of farmers. Emphasize markets, increased efficiency, and competitive selling. Eliminate Government's stranglehold on agriculture.

This is the solution.

Congress must not postpone longer the action needed. The existing, outmoded farm laws must be changed. Until Congress acts, agriculture will be burdened with too much Government, too much politics, and too little commonsense.

The days ahead for America are sobering and challenging. They will demand the faith, prayers, and loyalty of every one of us. Our challenge is to keep this Nation strong—strong economically, strong socially, and above all, spiritually strong—if our way of life is to endure. There is no other way. Only in this course is there safety for our Nation. God grant that we may meet the challenge.

## The United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York Honors the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] was honored last Sunday in Buffalo by the presentation of a special plaque from the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York. This organization, a federation of a number of patriotic, civic, and nationality groups representing more than 100,000 members, has long worked to alert the American people to the dangers of communism and to the need to combat it by all means possible.

It is fitting that the committee should honor my colleague from New York, because for years he has been in the forefront of efforts to curb the international Communist conspiracy. The plaque, honoring the Senator for distinguished service "rendered in the eternal struggle for human liberty," recognizes his unremitting fight as a Member of both bodies of Congress against atheistic communism. It was awarded, in the words of the committee, in particular tribute to the Senator's "temperate yet determined efforts to strengthen our country's internal security and to enlist his countrymen's support and assistance in the cause of the miserable captives of Eastern Europe, a source of great strength for free America and of enervating weakness for imperialistic Russia."

The plaque was presented as the junior Senator from New York served as honorary grand marshal in Buffalo's famed St. Patrick's Day parade.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of this body this outstanding recognition of the great leadership of the gentleman from New York in the unending war against the machinations of the men in the Kremlin. My views on this subject are clear, and I look forward in the months ahead to working with my colleague from New York in this important work.

Because they are performing such a vital role in warning of the threat of communism and helping keep alive the flame of hope in the hearts of their friends behind the Iron Curtain, I want also to give suitable recognition to the members of the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York. The following list of the officers of this organization serves to underscore the broad scope of the groups it encompasses:

UNITED ANTI-COMMUNIST ACTION COMMITTEE OF WESTERN NEW YORK

Chairman: Francis M. Kindel, 139 Woodview Drive, Orchard Park, N.Y.; Erie County commander, VFW.

Vice chairman: Henry Marszalkowski, 57 Frederick; vice president, Polanie Cluc, Inc.

Legal counsel: Joseph McNamara, 63 Hedley Street; Erie County American Legion MO 3500; chairman, antisubversive committee.

Treasurer: Tibor Helcz, 27 Norwood Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y.; Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

Secretary: Kazimierz Jaszewski, 1104 Sycamore; Polish Combatants, World War II.

Police liaison: Emery Molnar, 739 Tonawanda; Hungary Freedom Fighters Club.

Public Relations Chairman: Walter V. Chopyk, 353 Herman; Ukrainian Congress Committee OFA.

TV Program Liaison: Dr. John Juhasz, 550 Dodge, president, Actio Hungarica; Casimer Jankowski, in care of Nowy Swiat, 1078 Broadway; Joseph Macander, president, Polish Combatants, 362 West Gate, Kenmore, N.Y.; Arthur J. Vater, 1616 Main, New York State Patriotic chairman, VFW; Nestor Procyk, 617 Humboldt Parkway, Buffalo, N.Y., Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Block of Nations; Gleeson Hupp, 93 Gresham Drive, Eggertsville, N.Y., commander, Erie County American Legion; Mr. Emergy Gaman, 104 Military Road, Hungarian Veterans; Romas Masiulionis, 56 Lovering, Buffalo, N.Y., president, Lithuanian Club of Buffalo; Richard Valdow, 229 Warren Avenue, Kenmore, N.Y., president, Estonian Club of Buffalo; Albert Strazdins, 533 Franklin Street, Buffalo, N.Y., Latvian Club of Buffalo; Mr. Giza Pokay, 851 Busti Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y., Hungarian Freedom Fighters Association; Mr. Zbigniew Piatek, 344 Woodlawn, Buffalo, N.Y., Polish Students Association; Wladtslaw Sulkowski, 227 East North, Buffalo, N.Y., Polish Air-Force Association; Mathew Hoykowski, 403 Sherman, Buffalo, N.Y., Polish Veterans Association; Allan Schihl, 81 Philadelphia, BE 7850, commander, Erie County Catholic War Veterans.

## The Cape Cod National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, both my colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman O'NEILL, and I have joined together in introducing bills this year that would authorize the establishment of a Cape Code National Seashore on the Great Outer Beach of Cape Cod.

GREAT OUTER BEACH SHOULD BE PRESERVED FOR PUBLIC

The area that we have specified is one of the last great stretches of ocean front along the entire Atlantic and gulf coasts that has not given way to commercialization or private cottage development. We feel that it should be preserved for the public.

Two weeks ago the National Park Service issued a report, accompanied by beautiful brochures, proposing the establishment of a Cape Code National Seashore on the Great Outer Beach, as specified in the bills filed by Congressman O'NEILL and myself.

COMMENDS DIRECTOR WIRTH OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, and members of his staff for the superb job they did in preparing their report on the Cape Cod National Seashore proposal, and for the publication of the interesting brochures.

URGES SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR SEATON APPROVE PROPOSAL

The draft of the National Park Service report on the Cape Cod National Seashore proposal has been transmitted to Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton for his review. Congressman O'NEILL joins me in urging the Secretary to study the proposal attentively and thoroughly, for we are sure he will agree with us that this is a proposal that has outstanding merit and should be approved by him and authorized by Congress.

CAPE COD SEASHORE SUPPORTED BY OUTSTANDING NEWSPAPERS

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues and Secretary Seaton will be interested to know that the Cape Code National Seashore proposal has prompted very favorable editorial comments from outstanding and well-respected newspapers, including the New York Sunday Times of March 15, the Springfield (Mass.) Union of March 12, the Boston Herald of March 13, the Providence (R.I.) Journal of March 14, and the

Christian Science Monitor of March 13.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include these editorials with my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1959]

PRESERVING CAPE COD

There is much that is meritorious in the proposal of the National Park Service that the Atlantic Ocean front of Cape Cod be turned into a national seashore, a permanent noncommercial area designed as a national park. It would cost several million dollars to acquire all the privately owned property on this 40-mile stretch of beach, but it could well be a national investment worth many times its expense.

When we think of conservation and parks we usually think of woodland and mountain. That is natural, and what has been done has won the approval of most thinking persons. Our country and our society are richer for what has been wisely preserved. We are justifiably proud of our Yellowstone and Yosemite.

But, on a much more modern scale, it may be possible to keep in its integrity some other area that has a unique esthetic and historical value. We shall be poorer, indeed, if this Atlantic shoreline is gradually inundated, not by the waters of the sea, but by the march of commercial establishments which, however justifiable in themselves, can do damage to an artistic whole that is and should be a part of our national cultural inheritance.

Cape Cod is unusual in many ways. It can continue so to be, if it is not reduced to some sort of lowest common denominator in our culture pattern. It can be an unusual national monument if we have the right sort of imagination at the right time.

---

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Mar. 12, 1959]

CAPE COD PARK

The National Park Service has given an inspiring lift to the hopes of those whose goal is to preserve the irreplaceable natural beauties of Massachusetts in its decision to recommend the establishment of a 29,000-acre national park along the greater outer beach of Cape Cod. The park, segregating tracts of mostly undeveloped land in Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham and Orleans, would stretch about 30 miles between Chatham and Provincetown; it would protect from future exploitation a coastal area of surpassing charm and of incalculable value as a natural endowment in the Commonwealth.

As in all proposed projects of its kind, the element of time is paramount. Commercial and residential development has encroached in many sections of Massachusetts, preempting the values of a native scene which is an inestimable asset esthetically, and economically as an important part of the State's attraction for tourists. If the asset is not conserved by government—State or Federal—private development is bound to expand. The problem is to embrace such lands in the public domain before private owners either sell out or develop the tracts themselves, thus making their loss to the people well nigh irrecoverable. The same pressure for fast action applies to the large acquisitions contemplated by the Commonwealth.

Massachusetts does not have a national park. The great outer beach appears ideally suited for the purpose. We earnestly hope that the commission's recommendation is translated into action, thus completing a major phase of the Massachusetts conservation program.

---

[From the Boston Herald, Mar. 13, 1959]

CONSERVING THE CAPE

The National Park Service's report recommending creation of a 30,000-acre national park on Great Outer Beach at Cape Cod is welcome, if somewhat belated. Representatives BOLAND and O'NEILL, sponsors of legislation to establish such a park, should be congratulated for having spurred the report along.

But the real job remains to be done, and it cannot be done by the Congressmen alone. The Interior Department and Congress still have to be sold on this magnificent plan. The proposed park, as the National Park Service noted, would be within a day's travel for nearly a third of the country's population. People from all over the eastern part of the Nation should support the plan:

This is what is at stake:

The Great Outer Beach area can become, under the National Park Service plan, a perpetual source of enjoyment to all Americans who treasure natural beauty.

Or, it can become one great slum of jammed-together houses and hot dog stands and barrooms, bringing temporary prosperity to a few individuals but leaving an ineradicable heritage of blight to future generations.

---

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Mar. 14, 1959]

THERE STILL IS TIME TO SAVE THE BEAUTIES OF THE CAPE

The National Park Service, undaunted by the rebuffs it has suffered over the years, once more is proposing that the unspoiled outer beaches of Cape Cod be acquired for a Federal park.

Prompt action is required. "Even now," the Park Service reports, "the still unspoiled Great Beach is vanishing under building. It is time to set aside, preserve, and protect the last of the 'old' Cape so that the inspiration of its surpassing beauty can be kept intact and handed down to future generations of Americans."

Anyone familiar with the record knows what is happening. Back in 1935, the Park Service studied 12 major strips of seashore along the Atlantic and gulf coasts. It urged that they be acquired as Federal parks before it was too late. Only 1 of the 12 was acquired—the 70-mile stretch at Cape Hatteras. Of the others, 10 now have become so thoroughly commercialized that Federal acquisition is out of the question.

Anyone familiar with Cape Cod knows what is happening there. Paved highways have been laid on what were sandy roads. Motels have appeared in meadows and dance palaces on sandy dunes, while the mushrooming pizza palaces and hotdog stands are destroying the natural vista of pine, dune, and sea.

Thoreau once said of the cape's outer beach that "A man may stand there and put all America behind him."

A man may still achieve that splendid feeling of isolation here and there along the outer beach. But the cape isn't the isolated region it was in Thoreau's day. The automobile makes it only a day's drive from New York. The jet airliner puts it only an hour or so away from Washington, Pittsburgh, or Buffalo. The encroaching fingers of commercialism inevitably are creeping on. Unless checked, they will destroy the charm and character of the cape as surely as they have destroyed the character of so many other places.

The Park Service proposes that 28,000 acres between Provincetown and Chatham be taken over as a Federal park. It estimates the acquisition cost at $16 million. Within the boundaries of the park, bathing and camping facilities would be provided. But commercial activities would be kept at a minimum and every effort would be made, as in all national parks, to preserve the natural character of the area.

A bill was introduced in Congress last year to establish the new national park. It died in committee, but has been reintroduced this year. The Massachusetts Legislature last April approved the acquisition program.

But elsewhere there is a wide difference of opinion about the project. Residents of the cape are divided. Those with commercial interests generally are opposed to the park program; those who are more disturbed by the changing character of the cape are generally in favor. The Congressman who represents the cape, Representative HASTINGS KEITH, wants more time for study before taking sides. Neither Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, nor Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, has taken a position.

Clearly the project will require far more support than it now is receiving, both from the political leaders and from the citizenry, if it is to stand a chance. It is a choice of acting now to preserve one of the last available stretches of Atlantic seashore, or of letting the opportunity slip away forever. And time is running out.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 13, 1959]

WHERE THE GREAT BEACH BELONGS

Congress, 22 years ago, authorized creation of a national seashore comprising tempestuous Cape Hatteras, strewn with centuries of the wreckage of ships. Largely purchased by private and local funds, the remote and inaccessible reservation did not attract national attention.

Four years ago, and financed by an unidentified "friend of the National Park Service," that agency published an arresting report, "Our Vanishing Shoreline." Americans were placed on notice that while they might have their Yellowstones and Yosemites, the seashores were almost no longer theirs, but captured by private owners for everything from great hunting and fishing estates to weekend cottages.

Today the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area has been established and is being administered as a national park. It extends 70 miles along the Outer Banks, and preserves some of the most spectacular seashore scenery and the rarest wildlife in America.

And now the National Park Service is broaching the idea of another national area along the entire Atlantic front of Cape Cod, rivaling Cape Hatteras in natural treasures and in tragic but inspiring human history. Here is the shoreline Henry Thoreau named the Great Beach, and of which he said:

"A man may stand there and put all America behind him."

May this vision of another seashore preserved for the people be not long in fulfillment.

---

## Action, Not Talk, in Education

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, we here in America hear a lot to the effect that there is not enough money appropriated for, nor enough emphasis placed upon the education of our youth. There results charges and countercharges being thrown back and forth much like a tennis ball being batted back and forth between two tennis players. Whether these differences in viewpoints will be resolved in this or a subsequent session of this Congress, and whether or not the facts will be so conclusively established that there may come to pass some Federal assist-

ance to the schools of our country without restrictive punitive provisions, no one can foretell. Notwithstanding, there is a sidelight to this whole matter of youth education which came to my attention in the city of St. Louis on Saturday, March 21, 1959, which I think is worth making known by an entry in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There in St. Louis at a regional conference of delegates of the United Steel Workers of America, involving several States, I witnessed the award of several scholarships by that organization which to me was both a refreshing and a delightful experience.

For the reason that I had not theretofore known of the existence of these scholarships provided by these trade unions and for the further reason I am of the belief there may be many others not advised of this effort by trade unions to make a separate and additional contribution over and above their other well-known efforts in the field of education, I thought it would not be anything but appropriate that the following observation be entered, describing what I saw and heard, and to provide you with a few of the details that may be interesting concerning the plan and its operation as follows:

It is generally recognized that America's trade unions have been in the forefront of efforts to establish and strengthen universal free public education for our children. But not too generally known is the fact that most legitimate trade unions today express a continuing interest in the education of our youth beyond the high school.

A good example of how labor groups help in a meaningful and effective way in the education of our children can be found in the Kansas City area which counts among its residents a substantial number of members affiliated with district 34, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO. This union, for 11 years now, has been making available to the high school graduates of steelworker families an annual scholarship which enable a student to complete 4 years of college or university training. Two such awards in this district are offered every year and the value of these scholarships has just recently been raised to $4,000 for each recipient.

This is not a narrow, highly restricted award. Winners are chosen by an impartial panel of educators from a prominent university on the basis of a competitive examination. Those given the scholarship are free to pursue higher education in any accredited college or university of their own choosing. Furthermore, they are free to select a course of study leading to a bachelors degree in whatever field they desire.

One of the two awards given by this union in 1959 is going to Gary Paul Agin, the 18-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. George Agin, 6642 Indiana Avenue, Kansas City, Mo., whose score in the examination was among the upper half of 1 percent of all recent college entrants. Young Agin became eligible to compete for the scholarship because his father is employed at the Sheffield Steel Co. in Kansas City and he has been a member of local 13 of this union for the past 22 years.

Indicative of the scholastic aptitude of this young man is the fact that he has an enviable record of achievement as a student at the Southeast High School in Kansas City, Mo. He is a member of the National Beta Club, a national honor society organization, and was a finalist in the national merit scholarship competition. Additionally, Mr. Agin is the editor in chief of his high school annual yearbook "The Crusader." He has also served as president of the high school debating club and in his junior year at this school was the winner of a University of Washington achievement award. This youngster's interest in worthwhile things extends beyond the school and into the community. He is a junior deacon in the Central Christian Church of Kansas City and a cochairman of the Teen Town Committee, a young people's organization devoted to teenage social activities.

Now that this promising young man has the resources to continue his education he is planning to attend the University of Kansas and major in engineering physics. While the parents of this student would have made any and every sacrifice to secure for their boy a good education, they are doubtful that this would have been possible without the substantial help provided by this generous scholarship. It is a fact that the great majority of those receiving this award would have been unable to continue their education without the financial help accompanying the award.

This is a fine example of labor's deep and abiding interest in the educational welfare of our children, but it is not at all unique. Similar scholarships are offered to high school students in almost every other district subdivision of the union. Moreover, hundreds of smaller but equally important scholarships are provided by local union affiliates of the United Steelworkers of America. Together, these contributions toward the education of our youth represent a very significant and noteworthy step toward the growth and development of our future citizens.

---

## The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress and the country as a whole should become better acquainted with the splendid work of the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education.

This organization has been performing much needed work for the advancement of education with respect to the merits of democracy as against communism.

Among other things, they have published a book entitled, "Democracy Versus Communism," which has received commendation throughout the country. The book is utilized in the form of pamphlets by our armed services.

I am inserting in the RECORD some extracts from editorial comments by various newspapers and magazines on the book and opinions expressed by individuals and private organizations with respect to it.

It follows:

The Tablet, a Catholic weekly, Saturday, December 7, 1957: The best treatment of democracy and communism in this century. "Above all, 'Democracy Versus Communism' presents an honest picture so that students, and indeed all citizens, can make an informed, reasoned choice between democratic and totalitarian governments."

Gen. John E. Hull, Commander of forces in Far East, Korean war, in the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., December 1, 1957: "Korea proved the need. America's schools * * * had failed to teach effectively what America stands for and what communism stands for."

The Saturday Evening Post, December 28, 1957: "It's time our children were taught the facts about communism. The men who had been prisoners of the Communists in Korea and China, those who in various degrees cooperated with the Communists, were boys who knew almost nothing about communism and hardly more about their own system."

Columnist and lecturer Herbert A. Philbrick, in the New York Herald Tribune, Sunday, January 5, 1958: "I have before me a most remarkable new book. The first of its kind ever published in the United States. It is a textbook on democracy and communism * * * and it tells the truth about both. The next job is * * * to see that every student is properly equiped with knowledge of the most dangerous enemy ever to challenge our way of life."

NAM News, National Association of Manufacturers, January 3, 1958: "Planned especially for high school students, but recommended reading for everybody."

Letter from John R. Miles, manager, Education Department, of Chamber of Commerce of the United States, December 26, 1957: "My congratulations on the editorial in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, as well as on the textbook you published on 'Democracy Versus Communism'.

"Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt and I have read it through and both of us heartily approve of the attitude taken toward communism as well as toward our own free market economy."

Hon. Herbert Hoover: "I am glad to have the book. I am glad you have done it."

RICHARD NIXON, Vice President of the United States: "I am sure that this book 'Democracy Versus Communism' will serve a most useful function in helping to educate our young people concerning the basic principles in which we believe, and the nature of our enemy."

J. Edgar Hoover, U.S. Department of Justice: "America must have an informed citizenry. Our young people need to be taught the difference between the treasured values of democracy and the deceit and falsehoods of atheistic communism. Democracy stand for freedom, justice, and fair play; communism for terror, injustice, and slavery. Our youngsters will be our leaders of tomorrow. To nurture them in the hopes and ideals which have made our Nation great is our best guarantee that freedom shall continue to ring in America."

Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission: "'Democracy Versus

Communism' is a valuable weapon, for it has the sharp blade of truth."

Harold C. Lyon, colonel, Department of the Army (Chief of Troop Information Division): "The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education should be very proud of what they have done in the sponsorship of this marvelous publication, 'Democracy Versus Communism.' It truly is an outstanding publication which fills a definite need in the secondary school level. I firmly believe that we should carefully consider some form of distribution, or utilization at least, of this publication within the Army within the field of troop information."

Associated Press dispatch from Indianapolis, November 21, 1957: "The American Legion today reversed its long-standing policy against teaching anything about communism in public schools.

"Along with the pro-American study courses the Legion has long advocated, its Americanism commission proposed instruction to expose the fallacies of communism."

## National Chiropractic Association Sponsors National Correct Posture Week, May 1-7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the health of a nation can be evaluated in a number of ways. However, the true test of whether or not a nation is healthy rests on the theory of the "chain is only as strong as its weakest link"; that is, the health of a nation can only truly be determined by the health of the individual citizen.

Contributing greatly to the health programs in this country is the National Chiropractic Association. The NCA is an organization devoted to professional advancement and high ethical standards and is the sponsor of National Correct Posture Week which is observed during the first week in May of each year.

One of the mottos of the National Chiropractic Association is: "Stand Tall, Sit Tall, Walk Tall, Sleep Tall, and Think Tall." How very significant these words are. This little motto easily can serve as a guide and an admonition to the individual to seek the path which is not that of least resistance in order to attain improved and better health—from physical, mental, and spiritual standpoints.

The importance of good posture can never be underestimated. In my own daily contacts with individuals in all walks of life, I have witnessed the blessings of good health, and I have also viewed the tragic results that abuse and neglect have wrought upon the human body and mind.

It is only an observation, of course, but I would say that a great share of the misery and suffering in this Nation today is an indirect result of poor posture because bad health often results from the failure to learn and practice habits of correct posture.

The role of the National Chiropractic Association in observing Correct Posture Week assumes vital importance when we consider the well-being of our citizenry. The NCA program of devoting a week to remind us all that long life and sound health demand correct posture is one that deserves the support of all Americans.

There is no question of the significant contribution to national health and welfare that is being made through observance of National Correct Posture Week. Benefits accrue to all who participate in these programs.

But the contributions of the National Chiropractic Association are not measured alone in the fostering of this week-long health program. The NCA believes that health of mind, body, and soul deserves public consideration every day of the year.

How the National Chiropractic Association is cooperating in efforts to promote good health constantly is demonstrated in the remarks of Dr. Shane MacCarthy, executive director of the President's Council on Youth Fitness in his invitation to individual members of the NCA to participate in this program following acceptance by the organization. His remarks follows:

The members of the National Chiropractic Association have an important role to play in their own local communities with the families and individuals who make up the Nation's communities. Among the many professions that provide services to people are the doctors of chiropractic whose main function is to keep people fit by helping individuals to maintain an optimum of health.

We welcome the support and cooperation of the National Chiropractic Association in our efforts to improve, expand, and implement the activities which promote fitness—with its mental, emotional, social, spiritual, as well as physical aspects. This can be done through the individual determination on the part of all members to take positive action in the local fitness programs for the youth in each community. Won't you help in this important program?

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the excellent statement of Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D.C., director of industrial relations of the National Chiropractic Association.

Dr. Murphy, who is the author of a number of outstanding articles and reports on physical fitness, and has had the benefit of years of personal experience in the health field, discusses the importance of National Correct Posture Week and the contributions of chiropractic.

The article by Dr. Murphy follows:

POSTURE: AN OPEN DOOR TO HAPPY, HEALTHFUL LIVING

The National Chiropractic Association, in pioneering the observance of National Correct Posture Week, sponsored annually May 1 to 7, has dedicated the talents, ingenuity, and energy of its membership to fulfillment of the fundamental precept that correct posture will pay health dividends.

During Correct Posture Week, doctors of chiropractic devote their attention to telling the story of their profession to the public. This is done for one purpose: We believe good posture and good health go together. And what is true for good posture, is equally applicable to the opposite extreme. Poor posture is not only expensive, resulting in lost days of work, but it may eventually lead to a shortened life.

Our goal during this observance is to relate the story of good posture and its beneficial results to every American, and in this we join in the promotion of sound health practices with every branch of the healing arts.

The standards of our national health cannot be minimized. This is demonstrated by the many agencies of our Federal Government which have been forthright in their advocation of correct posture as a necessary step toward attainment of sound health and long life.

The Armed Forces, for example, stress correct posture in all duty activities. They teach correct posture as a means of physical, mental, and emotional well-being.

Other Federal agencies, too, have long been leaders in the campaign to keep Americans posture conscious. For instance, the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the White House Conference on Child Health are but a few which could be listed.

SPOKESMEN AGREE

Good posture means much more than simply standing straight. Good posture is that position of the body in any activity in which all of its parts are working effectively and with proper balance, ease, and comfort.

On this one point all spokesmen of all branches of human endeavor have agreed for hundreds of years that correct posture is one of the most important paths to good general health.

This viewpoint is shared by medical and chiropractic authorities, public health workers, nurses, psychiatrists, the armed services, pediatricians, and specialists in industrial relations.

TEST YOUR POSTURE

Good posture is a result of holding your body in a balanced position. The easiest way to attain it is to think of an imaginary line running—side view—from the tip of the skull through your neck, shoulders, hips, knees, and insteps. When the head is bent forward, the abdomen thrust out, or the back bent, the line of gravity is shifted, and a strain placed on muscles to keep the body from falling.

To test: Stand with back to wall with head, heels, shoulders, and calves of legs touching it, hands by sides. Flatten hollow of back by pressing buttocks down against the wall. Space at back of waist should not be greater than the thickness of your hand.

Stand facing close to wall, palms of hands touching front of thighs. If chest touches wall first, your posture is probably excellent, or at least good; if head touches first, it is only fair; if abdomen touches first, your posture is really bad and you should see a doctor of chiropractic.

STANDING

When you stand straight your head should be balanced and erect. Your shoulders are relaxed and low; your chest is held high. Your lower back should curve to just a slight degree. Your abdomen should be flat. Have your knees straight but not stiff, and feel your weight in the outer borders of your feet.

SITTING

You should sit with your feet flat on the floor. Do not slump in a chair, but keep your back straight and your abdomen flat. As in standing, your head should be erect and well balanced. When you lean forward, lean from the hips, not from the waist.

WALKING

Movement should start at the hips. Your head and upper part of your body should remain at right angles to the ground. Swing your arms freely. Look ahead, never down.

Point your toes straight ahead. Knees should be relaxed and free.

OFFICIALS ENDORSE POSTURE WEEK

The excellent assistance of school teachers and school authorities, of State legislatures, of governors and mayors, of Members of the United States Congress, and of the people themselves has made National Correct Posture Week an increasingly important observance.

More and more officials at the city and State level proclaim its observance officially every year.

The active members of the National Chiropractic Association lead in observance of National Correct Posture Week, because the science of chiropractic is dedicated to the elimination of postural faults which rob human beings of the health they should have.

SECOND LARGEST HEALING PROFESSION

Chiropractic, as an organized professional body, is 64 years old, and now ranks as the second largest healing profession.

Licensed by law in 44 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and 7 Provinces of Canada, there are some 25,000 doctors of chiropractic in the United States (against a population of 170 million) and 1,030 in Canada (against a population of 17 million).

Chiropractic is an established but growing and dynamic profession, which has adopted high professional standards and ethics through formal action of the National Chiropractic Association.

Officials of the National Chiropractic Association believe it to be the most democratic professional body in the United States. It employs no sanctions of legal or economic force against nonmembers and strives to achieve its goal of professional unity through education and in a manner discussed and approved by the national membership.

FOUR-YEAR COURSE IS EDUCATION STANDARD

Chiropractic colleges are required to give 4,000 academic hour in a standard 4-year course to obtain accredited ratings from the Committee on Educational Standards of the National Chiropractic Association. A basic course of 4,400 hours is recommended.

Up to 2 years of preprofessional (college) education is required by State chiropractic laws of licensure. A large percentage of students entering approved chiropractic colleges today have college degrees.

CHIROPRACTIC COMPARES WELL

In every way chiropractic, as a healing profession, compares well with other professions.

Sound chiropractic education is encouraged not only by the national council on education of the National Chiropractic Association but also by the student loan fund and other devices designed to provide aid for gifted students.

BASIC CURRICULUM

The following typical or basic curriculum for approved chiropractic colleges is based on the National Chiropractic Association code for a minimum of 4,000 hours in a 4-year course:

| Subject: | Hours |
|---|---|
| Anatomy, including embryology and histology | 740 |
| Physiology | 240 |
| Biochemistry | 180 |
| Pathology and bacteriology | 520 |
| Public health, sanitation, hygiene | 160 |
| Practice of chiropractic (principles and technique, neurology and psychiatry, pediatrics, dermatology, urology, ophthalmology, otolaryngology, first aid and minor surgery, roentgenology) | 1,960 |
| Obstetrics and gynecology | 200 |
| Total | 4,000 |

## Boland Cites Burgeoning Metropolis Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for many years now municipal officials and civic groups have been facing up to one of the major problems of our times, namely, burgeoning metropolises and beautiful suburbs that leave in their wake slums in the heart of the old cities and myriad highway, parking, sanitation and housing problems.

HIS CITY OF SPRINGFIELD PARTICIPATING IN URBAN RENEWAL

Several years ago Congress authorized the urban renewal programs to give the cities Federal assistance in coping with these problems. My own home city of Springfield, Mass., is now in the midst of an urban renewal project which will be of tremendous benefit, not only to the north end clearance section in Springfield, but to the entire Greater Springfield area.

SYMPOSIUM AT MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE ON PROBLEM

Last weekend, on the Mount Holyoke College campus in South Hadley, Mass., a most timely and successful symposium was conducted under the joint auspices of Mount Holyoke College and Time, Inc., on the subject "Tomorrow's Cities: Plan or Chaos?"

Among those participating were Norman P. Mason, Administrator of the Housing Home and Finance Agency; Mrs. Kathryn H. Stone, a member of the Virginia House of Delegates; William J. Whyte, Jr., editor of the Fortune magazine series "Exploding Metropolis"; Prof. Reavis Cox of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce; and Mayors Samuel Resnic of Holyoke, Mass., Thomas J. O'Connor of Springfield, and James Cahillane of Northampton, Mass.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper account of this symposium, written by Miss Anne Buffington for the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram of March 21:

ELEVEN HUNDRED ATTEND MOUNT HOLYOKE TALK

(By Anne Buffington)

Blighted, suffocated, strangled, inadequate, obsolete, congested, monotonous, unlivable, unworkable, and ugly.

These are only a few of the uncomplimentary labels pasted on American cities by members of a Mount Holyoke College-Time, Inc., symposium, discussing "Tomorrow's Cities: Plan or Chaos?"

The session began Friday evening with a consideration of "What's Wrong With Our Cities" and concluded this morning on the more hopeful note of "What We Can Do About It."

An audience of about 1,100 attended the Friday meeting. The group included Mayors Resnic, Thomas J. O'Connor of Springfield, James Cahillane of Northampton, plus a sizable delegation of planning board and renewal authority members, and other civic leaders from Holyoke and area cities.

James W. Rouse of Baltimore, national president of ACTION, served as moderator and outlined the paradoxical problem of American cities as he sees it: "Here we are living in an era of peak prosperity with an all-time high living standard. And yet, with the urbanization rate moving steadily up, not one American city has been able to come up with a plan which can keep pace with the city's deterioration."

Vernon De Mars, California architect and professor of architecture at the University of California, and introduced by Rouse as "the humanist of modern housing," contended that Americans have "given up the idea of the city as a desirable place to live."

"The city has come to represent the tangled jungle of business and commerce, without time or space for beauty. They escape to ranch house openness, only to find all the other escapees hemming them in."

De Mars complained that financers of mass housing or renewal projects are just beginning to listen to the architect's plea that useful, practical buildings can also be beautiful. "They're only now beginning to realize that esthetic considerations pay off."

William H. Whyte, Jr., author of "The Organization Man" and editor of Fortune magazine's "Exploding Metropolis" series, said he fears that, concurrent with the exodus of suburbia, there has been a "blurring of urban with suburban values" and a transference of urban-suburban functions out of their proper spheres.

He particularly attacked large middle-income housing projects as "institutional in design and institutional in management" and "designed for people living somewhere else."

Whyte called for immediate action on problems of the cities. "We have the diagnoses well in hand, but no steps have been taken.

"Planners are so bemused by the idea of a master plan—the big picture—they fail to make any start on the ground level," Whyte said.

Victor Gruen, senior partner of Victor Gruen Associates, an architect and planner, pointed to conspicuous space consumption which has traditionally gone on in the United States, where land shortage has become a real problem.

He singled out the automobile as one of the most vicious land grabbers in modern America. "What has the automobile done to us?" he wondered. "It has distorted our values to such an extent that cities are now serving highways instead of highways serving cities. We're planning our future in terms of traffic density predictions instead of the only valid yardstick, human happiness and enjoyment."

Both Reavis Cox, professor of marketing at Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, and Norman P. Mason, Administrator of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency defended businessmen who came in for abuse from some of the panelists.

Mason says that where the planners have come up with good ideas for cities, only the businessmen have been able to realize them in concrete and steel.

Cox pointed out the difficulty of dealing with concepts of beauty in a democratic society. "What most of the people think is beautiful is what the planner will have to give them—whether the planner thinks it's beautiful or not."

Mrs. Kathryn H. Stone, a member of the Virginia House of Delegates and board member of ACTION, and Whyte came to the defense of zoning regulations, characterized as a stumbling block in the renewal process.

Zoning, they say, was the first tangible step in the direction of planning in the 1930's and 1940's. The trouble is that zoning has failed to keep pace with technological and population expansion, becoming frozen.

"What a mess we'd be in if we hadn't had zoning." But technological progress has made many zoning concepts obsolete and the regulations remain—frozen and sacrosanct.

The panelists generally agreed that planning groups have been delegated sufficient authority to proceed with renewal programs but that timidity and apathy have prevented them from going boldly forward with their paper and model plans.

They also felt that politicians would be responsive to real citizen interest and demand that something be done about the cities.

Rouse concluded the evening session with an appeal for the citizens to take an active part in the recreating of their cities instead of sitting idly by and watching them deteriorate.

At the morning session, Gruen gave his audience a startling view of the future city based upon a new philosophy of planning. The demonstration included slides of architect's pioneer shopping center outside Detroit and his monumental renewal plan for Fort Worth, Tex.

Basic principles of the design include cluster planning, outlying areas separated from the hard core of downtown by winged highways, and pedestrian islands.

The plan would eliminate all vehicle traffic from downtown areas, leaving streets free for expanded building and pedestrian parks. Walking distance from parking areas at the edge of the downtown area to its center are estimated at 2½ minutes. The plan would utilize existing buildings and roads and will not require demolition of any major buildings in downtown Fort Worth. The city has accepted the plan and is moving ahead with it.

Mason discussed urban renewal programs under which Federal funds are funneled to communities which will seize initiative and come forth with workable programs.

DeMars called for variation in housing design in particular areas and a relaxation of zoning requirements which "regulate monotony."

To combat urban sprawl Whyte proposed community purchase of development rights in areas which should be consecrated to open air.

Professor Cox felt the common denominator in planning problems is "what do people do?"

Any plans he felt, should tie the city together on the basis of how often people meet. He also cautioned planners against a God complex.

"How presumptuous of us to dictate to future generations where they're going to live. They will live where they want."

## Panama Canal: Self-Sustaining Interoceanic Public Utility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in January 1949, while a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I was designated by Chairman Schuyler Otis Bland of that committee as chairman of a special subcommittee to investigate the financial operations of the Panama Canal.

The ensuing inquiry resulted in the enactment of Public Law 841, 81st Congress placing the Pamana Canal enterprise on a self-sustaining basis and bringing about the first major reorganization of its administrative setup subsequent to opening to traffic in 1914.

Thus, I read with the keenest interest a news story by Ralph K. Skinner on the Panama Canal in the March 21, 1959, issue of the Christian Science Monitor commenting on its financial operations and quoting some statements of Gov. William E. Potter relative thereto.

Because the indicated news story is extremely pertinent to current discussions of the canal question in Panama and elsewhere, under leave accorded, I quote its text:

PANAMA CANAL TIED TO SERVICE

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

ANCON, C.Z.—World shipping was stoutly defended by Canal Zone Gov. William E. Potter in his remarks on profits and tolls at the Panama Canal in an address to a meeting of financial management personnel here recently.

Attendants at the meeting said the Governor made evident his refusal to let political and vested economic interests interfere with the Panama Canal concept of service to the world. This concept is simply stated on the canal seal in the words, "The land divided. The world united."

"The aim of the Panama Canal Company is not to make a profit but to avoid a loss," explained Governor Potter who is also President of the U.S. Government-owned Corporation which operates the waterway.

He added, "The law requires us to be self-sustaining and I don't intend to become a lawbreaker."

The Governor detailed the expenses which in fiscal year 1958 whittled the canal's $83 million gross revenue to a net income of $2,600,000.

TARGET SEEN

He commented that there are many who cannot get away from the idea that the canal should be a moneymaker; that it should make a profit and the bigger the better. The Governor declared positively that "the Panama Canal was not intended to be a moneymaker for Uncle Sam—nor for anyone else."

This statement was seen to be directed at certain high Panama officials who wish to see the revenue of the Panama Canal increased because they have hopes of their Government sharing in it.

For example, former Foreign Minister Acquilino Boyd recently told the National Assembly that the Panama should receive 50 percent of the Panama Canal's gross revenue.

While not officially admitted, this is seen to be emerging as Panama's national policy. Highly placed official are making this assertion to the people of Panama, and there is no official repudiation of the assertions. Two officials of Cabinet rank have told this correspondent that Panama should receive at least a 50-percent portion of the revenues of the Panama Canal because Panama and the United States are equal partners in the enterprise.

In addition, there are many officials who profess to believe that Panama can and should nationalize the Panama Canal.

VIEW REJECTED

The Governor told his audience that the Panama Canal was built as a service to the shipping of the world. Although the maintenance of the facility requires considerable expenditure, the extent of the expenditure is exactly governed by the need.

Governor Potter said, "I must reject any philosophy which infers that there could be more pay merely by raising tolls; that there is a throttle for the extraction of cash that should be tightened until the victim squeals, merely for the fiscal satisfaction of a few.

"I can foresee that the needs of future shipping may require expenditures that would require modest tolls increase but tolls should be increased for that reason alone and not for income as a sole reason."

This correspondent has been told by cabinet officials of Panama that they would immediately press for higher tolls in the event of (1) nationalization of the Panama Canal, and (2) any Panama participation in the management of the waterway.

Summing up, Governor Potter said, "Let me then state my philosophy: The job of tolls is to pay for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of the facility it uses—all of that, nothing more."

COUNTER TO DEMANDS

Although there was no reference to Panama made in the talk, many listeners interpreted the speech as a counter to Panamanian demands for a 50–50 participation in the gross receipts of the Panama Canal. The Governor listed the canal's gross receipts as $83 million in fiscal 1958. Some $43 million was tolls income, and $40 million came from supporting service organizations, he said.

Biggest single cost, he said, was $39 million for personal services and allied costs. Then came $13,300,000 for costs of goods sold, $5,200,000 for depreciation, and $3,500,000 for operating material and supplies.

It was pointed out that right here is the end of computation for some critics of the Panama Canal. Actually, there are two major costs remaining.

First is the net cost of Canal Zone Government amounting to $10,700,000 for fiscal 1958. Second is the interest on the net investment of the U.S. Government in the Panama Canal enterprise, which was $8,800,000 in fiscal 1958.

COSTS EXPLAINED

Subtracting all of these costs, the net income of the Panama Canal Company for the year was $2,600,000. This is considered rather picayune in proportion to the canal assets of more than half a billion dollars. But, as the Governor said, "The canal aims not to make a profit but to avoid a loss."

For those not familiar with the situation, the Governor explained that the costs of Canal Zone Government included all elements which are a normal part of community life in the United States. This includes roads, highways, sewers, police and fire protection, educational and health facilities, prisons, jails, garbage collection, and so forth.

None of these facilities would exist in the Canal Zone; indeed, the Canal Zone itself would not exist, if it were not for the Panama Canal.

Therefore Congress has decreed that the Panama Canal Company, operating the waterway, shall pay the net costs of Canal Zone Government yearly.

## So-Called Fair Trade Is Unconstitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Fair Trade Act (H.R. 1253) violates free enterprise by limiting or eliminating competition. The manufacturer can set prices on the sale of his product by the retailer, providing that Congress sets aside the antitrust law. This in itself is strange since the purpose of antitrust law is to protect businesses and consumers by preventing price conspiracies. Fair trade has been called unconstitu-

tional by many States. Now the question facing Congress is the question brought up by fair trade. Can Congress constitutionally delegate power to private persons, granting to a certain class of citizens privileges not equally given to all citizens. The constitutionality of the act has never been squarely tested in the Supreme Court.

Maybe it is time we stopped letting the Court interpret and define our intent. Let us reaffirm our belief in free enterprise and antitrust protection—not accept price fixing and the planned economy of H.R. 1253, the so-called fair trade bill.

## Control of Weather Could Win War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, if anyone had mentioned only a few months ago, the possibility of using the oceans to control the weather, we would have thought that the man was insane. But today, after the launching of space satellites and with the talk of man's first trip to the moon, nothing sounds impossible. Certainly, much research must be done before the possibility of controlling the weather can become a reality. However, the point is that the Russian scientists have been furnished the finances and the facilities to approach this objective, while the United States has thus far failed to face up to the need for further expenditures to meet this additional basic Russian challenge.

The following article, originally published in the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, indicates some of the frightening possibilities that weather control encompasses. It is imperative that our country keep abreast of these scientific developments so that we can combat enemy attempts to use advancements of this sort as instruments of conquest.

CONTROL OF WEATHER COULD WIN WAR
(By Everett S. Allen)

The day will come when Russia can withhold rainfall from food-producing regions of the United States and subject our warm southern areas to freezing temperatures. It also has been suggested that all of the world's major seaports could be flooded to the point where they would have to be abandoned, by a relatively simple man-made process.

These predictions have been made by responsible U.S. scientists who regard them as definite possibilities. Studies already indicate that world climate is subject to control; if the Soviet Union were successful in using such control as a weapon, it could cause the United States to surrender without a shot ever being fired.

IS ELECTRICITY THE KEY?

Howard T. Orville, chairman of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, now completing a report to be presented soon to President Eisenhower, has speculated Russia "might one day be capable of freezing Florida or turning the Midwest into a permanent drought belt."

In the December 1957 issue of the bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, Dr. Henry G. Houghton, director of the Laboratory of Earth Sciences at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, says talk about weather control can no longer be regarded as visionary.

Calling for more support of basic scientific research, including oceanography and meteorology, Dr. Houghton suggested atmospheric electricity may well hold the key to weather control.

Duncan C. Blanchard, of the Woods Hole Oceonographic Institution, noting that droplets shot from the ocean surface in whitecaps are electrified, already has calculated that the charged droplets may account for a major part of the electrification of the lower atmosphere.

ACCORDS NEEDED

Dr. Houghton said, "International control of weather modification will be as essential to the safety of the world as control of nuclear energy is now. Unless we remain ahead of or abreast of Russia in meteorological research, the prospects for international agreements on weather control will be poor indeed.

"An unfavorable modification of our climate in the guise of a peaceful effort to improve Russia's climate could seriously weaken our economy and our ability to resist."

Dr. Edward Teller, eminent U.S. nuclear physicist, testifying before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, has suggested the Russians could deny the United States any rainfall for a period of 2 years, with obvious catastrophic effects.

American physicists have cited several approaches that might achieve intercontinental weather control; virtually all of them involve the oceans and it is, therefore, to marine scientists that the free world must look for its greater knowledge of these ideas, and for possible counter measures. Their seriousness is apparent. Mr. Orville has said weather control could have results more disastrous to the United States than atomic discoveries.

FLOOD NEW YORK

Here are three of the ways in which weather might be controlled or affected in major degree:

1. A material might be spread on the surface of some body of water important to the weather of a large area, such as the Gulf of Mexico, that would retard the evaporation and reduce rainfall over the adjacent land masses.

2. Some material having the opposite effect, that is, to increase evaporation, might be used instead. This conceivably might increase both cloudiness and rainfall, and therefore, possibly reduce area temperature.

3. Spreading coal dust, lampblack or some similar substance over the ice and snow-covered North and South Poles could melt these regions, raising the level of the oceans to such degree as to flood the world's principal ports, including New York City. It has been estimated this might bring the Atlantic Ocean level so high that New York would be underwater up to Times Square. The lamp-black merely changes the snow's reflectivity; instead of reflecting sunlight, it absorbs it, with consequent melting.

Although it seems far-fetched to assume that mankind would do this deliberately, since all world ports would suffer, and many other coastal areas as well, it is not impossible to accomplish.

SALT STARTS RAIN

Dr. Alfred H. Woodcock of the Woods Hole staff has long been greatly interested in the physical chemistry of the sea surface upon which plans 1 and 2 would depend. He suggests that salt particles fired into the air by bubbles on the sea surface may be largely responsible for our rain. These particles, kicked into the air by whitecaps and carried aloft by a wind of not less than 12 miles an hour, act as nuclei to produce raindrops and precipitation, he believes.

High in the air, tiny moisture droplets grow into raindrops by combining with other droplets around a nucleus of salt particle. If they did not have some such nucleus, there presumably would not be enough big drops in the atmosphere to make it rain. A cloud will produce rain, Dr. Woodcock believes, when it contains sufficient moisture and enough of these giant nuclei.

Lending support to this theory is the fact that the theoretical amount of salt carried inland from the sea by wind (4.8 pounds an acre) is close to the actual "salt-fall" in rain, which is 3.8 pounds an acre.

EFFECT OF OIL

Dr. Woodcock has suggested that changing the surface tension of an area of ocean, that is, perhaps reducing the number of white caps—or eliminating them entirely—by spreading a film of oil on the sea surface, might change the amount of salt kicked into the air by bubbles and might, therefore, reduce appreciably the amount of rainfall.

Apparently, a small variation of wind velocity also makes a big difference in cloudiness and rainfall, since winds of less than 12 miles an hour do not seem to pull water bubbles up into the air from the wave surfaces.

This theory opens up some very interesting possibilities. Ethical scientists would not choose to experiment with it unless they knew in what direction it might alter events, but it might, for example, be a good way to stop hurricanes, by triggering off small storms instead of big ones. Since it might also, however, have unexpected results, such as denying the West Indies normal rainfall, it should be done only by international agreement.

Whether such international agreements are possible with Russia would seem to hinge on whether American earth scientists are given sufficient support in men, money, and equipment to hold their own in this race for weather control.

If they aren't weather can become a weapon—the most terrible weapon man has ever known.

## Scope of the Communist Bloc's Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that in the East-West struggle the Reds are making greater and greater efforts toward economic penetrations of more and more areas.

Last year, for example, the Communist bloc provided aid for 18 underdeveloped countries; totaling about $1 billion.

We recognize, of course, that this amount is still substantially below what the United States has provided in grants and credits to the same countries.

However, we must recognize, also, that the Communists are putting greater and greater emphasis on economic penetrations as a means for attempting to take over new countries.

As this aspect of the East-West struggle develops, we must, of course, keep

fully abreast of the comparative scope of the free world and Communist programs in this field.

A recent edition of the New York Times carried an article entitled "Reds' Foreign Aid to 18 Countries Up Billion in 1958," outlining the countries which were receiving some of the aid, as well as illustrating by comparative figures the United States and Communist bloc outlay. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS' FOREIGN AID TO 18 COUNTRIES UP BILLION IN 1958—BUT ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE IS FOUND TO LAG BEHIND AID PROVIDED BY THE UNITED STATES

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—The Communist bloc signed aid agreements with 18 underdeveloped countries last year totaling $1 billion, according to the State Department.

This marked a sharp stepup in the bloc's economic offensive. However, even in the areas in which the Communists concentrated their offensive, their total aid program lagged behind that of the United States.

The Communist drive did not get underway until 1955. Up to the end of 1958, the bloc had signed agreements with 18 underdeveloped countries to provide $2,373 million in grants and credits for military and economic aid.

Of this total, $1,591 million was for economic aid and $782 million for military.

U.S. PROGRAM LARGER

By contrast the United States over the same period extended grants and credits to the same countries amounting to $4,442 million. Of this, $3,304 million was in economic aid and $1,138 million for military.

The disparity in the Communist and U.S. programs is greater if account is taken of what the United States has extended since 1948.

Over the 11 years, the United States has extended to these 18 countries loans and grants totaling $8,628 million, of which economic aid amounted to $6,005 million and military $2,623 million.

The Communist bloc is also stepping up its technical assistance program. During the last 6 months of 1958, 2,809 technicians spent at least a month in one or another of 19 countries. This compared with 1,600 a year earlier. In addition, there were 1,200 military technicians serving in these countries.

FIGURES NOT COMPARABLE

Figures for United States technicians are not comparable because they do not move in and out as do the Communist advisers. As of December 31, 1958, there were 2,333 United States economic aid experts in the same countries.

The Soviet aid program began in 1954 with a $11 million credit to Afghanistan. Since then the yearly aid totals were as follows: 1955, $339 million; 1956, $718 million; 1957, $287 million; 1958, $1,029 million.

Of the nearly $2,400 million extended by the bloc, the Soviet Union has offered $1,600 million, the Eastern European satellite countries $650 million and Communist China $120 million.

A relatively small amount of the Communist aid has actually been delivered—only about $900 million of which more than half is military.

Aid has been concentrated in the United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria), Iraq, Afghanistan, India, Indonesia, Argentina, and Yugoslavia.

The Soviet Union moved into Iraq with offers of aid after last summer's revolution. It granted a military aid credit of $120 million. A few days ago negotiations were completed for economic aid credits of $137 million.

Virtually all Communist aid is in credit form; grants have been negligible.

For the past year, most development aid extended by the United States has been in loans repayable in local currency. Export-Import Bank loans are repayable in dollars. Technical assistance is in grants, and so, usually, is aid extended from special assistance or contingency funds for budgetary support of countries with shaky economies.

United States military aid is in grant form, and this is true also of defense support aid to enable countries to maintain larger military forces than they could otherwise afford.

The following table compares Communist bloc commitments and United States obligations and authorizations for economic aid from 1955 through 1958 in millions of United States dollars:

| | Soviet bloc | United States |
|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | $116 | $62 |
| Argentina | 102 | 285 |
| Brazil | 2 | 551 |
| Burma | 34 | 58 |
| Cambodia | 34 | 125 |
| Ceylon | 58 | 32 |
| Egypt | 311 | 22 |
| Ethiopia | 2 | 45 |
| Iceland | 5 | 17 |
| India | 304 | 954 |
| Indonesia | 194 | 143 |
| Iran | 3 | 153 |
| Iraq | 0 | 10 |
| Nepal | 13 | 14 |
| Syria | 195 | 0 |
| Turkey | 13 | 431 |
| Yemen | 42 | 0 |
| Yugoslavia | 163 | 402 |
| Total | 1,591 | 3,304 |

## Address by Hon. Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, at Annual Meeting, Fellows of American Bar Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], recently delivered a timely address in which he called on America to revive the great institution of patriotism. His remarks, delivered to the annual meeting of the Fellows of the American Bar Foundation on Washington's birthday, deserve the widest dissemination possible.

By thoughtful analogy to the experiences of some of our soldiers in the Korean conflict, the Senator from Pennsylvania points out that our schools and our Nation in general are failing to teach the great heritage that comes with being an American. He calls for an unremitting emphasis on the origins of our Nation, on what made it strong and great and kept it free, upon fundamentals of our national purpose.

I believe this clarion call to Americans to revive the teaching of the ideals which have made our Nation great should be read by every American. The Senator from Pennsylvania has performed a real service for our people by his able presentation of this problem.

So that a larger readership will be able to have the benefit of his wisdom, I ask unanimous consent that this splendid address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUGH SCOTT AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE FELLOWS OF THE AMERICAN BAR FOUNDATION, EDGEWATER BEACH HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 22, 1959

My good and long time friend, Dave Maxwell, Mr. Luce, Mr. Malone, Mr. Williams, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, congressional and public interest in the progress of the missile programs of the United States and the U.S.S.R., increases in intensity. What it will cost to close the missile gap, how long it will take, what procedures to follow, who's right, who's wrong—no current topic sparks more discussion, be the locale bar meetings, Bar Harbor, or barrooms.

That this gap exists, few will deny. Yet how many are aware of a far more menacing, infinitely more dangerous gap in our long range national security planning?

The closure of the missile gap is basically a matter of how much we are prepared to spend to maintain our security through fully adequate, deterrent, and retaliatory forces. This, of course, involves considerations not limited to, or by, numerical quantity of weapons.

What of this other gap? It is not one which can be bridged in a year, perhaps not in a dozen years.

Let us look at what befell us. Our country entered the fifth decade of our century rich, bounteously blessed, lolling at the wide end of the biggest cornucopia in the world. Then, seemingly all at once, and out of context with our proud national history, we developed a flaw. A flaw which could widen into a crevasse.

"In Every War But One," as a recent book of that title by Eugene Kinkead records, our Armed Forces presented no problem of loyalty, caused no concern in the country as a whole regarding the conduct of the individual American when a prisoner of war. That one war was the Korean war.

Oddly, and without precedent, not a single American prisoner of war managed to escape, for the first time in any of our wars. Twenty-one Americans elected to remain with the enemy.

This in no way derogates from the courage, devotion, and magnificent conduct of most American fighting men in Korea, but what of the fact that over one-third of American prisoners of war collaborated to at least a minor degree with the Communists, and about 13 percent became active collaborationists?

What went wrong?

Capt. L. S. Robinson, U.S. Navy, says: "It was lack of home training, loose standards, the idea of the fast buck, the quick deal." He lays the blame also to the almost total disregard of authority and to the unpopularity of the war.

I think it goes much deeper than that, especially when we consider the success of Red Chinese indoctrination tactics. I used the term "indoctrination" rather than "brainwashing" since the Army definition of brainwashing is a process producing obvious alteration of character whereby the subject ceases to be the same personality he was before. There is no real evidence of the use of the kind of severe measures required

to effect a change of personality. What was accomplished here, was rather a change of viewpoint whereby Americans were persuaded to adopt the enemy's propaganda as their own. Incidentally, while there is plenty of evidence of disciplinary cruelty, there is not a single documented case of cruelty being applied in the indoctrination of prisoners. The method used was an alternation of leniency with pressure, the continued relentless repetition of plausible, seemingly factual statements.

The techniques used by the Chinese Communists were repetition, harassment and humiliation. Prisoners were required to cram on Chinese literature and were constantly examined on Communist ideology day in and day out, week in and week out. As the author of the book I have referred to states: "The technique of harassment was equally successful. * * * of the three tactics, the third, humiliation did the most psychological damage." Although prisoners were specifically promised leniency, any prisoner who questioned a point of Communist doctrine during a lecture period was required to remain seated and the entire class of his fellow prisoners ordered to stand and remain on its feet until the objector had abandoned his objection. This led the other prisoners after hours of standing to complain and mutter against the objector and ultimately let to his capitulation. The prisoner was then required to read a long self-criticism ending with an abject apology to the class and the instructor followed by a period wherein his classmates were ordered to criticize him which they did. He in turn was made to criticize his classmates. This technique ultimately led to complete distrust of each prisoner by every other prisoner and the effect on morale was obvious.

Why were these arguments effective? They were effective because our soldiers had little or no grounding in American foreign policy, little interest in current events and wholly inadequate grounding in American history or the basic tenets of the individual's duty to his country.

Were these American soldiers incapable of learning? True, many had immature minds and some had not gone beyond the fifth grade. But they returned to the United States able to recite long passages from Karl Marx from memory, they had studied the theoretical writings of Lenin and Stalin until they could argue the merits of communism and its superiority to democracy with some of the best educated Army interrogators. It ought to be added here that many of the collaborators came from the ranks of those who were bright and who had had an average or better than average education. Indoctrination therefore was successful to some degree in all groups and the degree of education was evidently not the controlling factor.

There has been failure in depth here, on the part of teachers and public officials. Failure in home training played its part too. Too many young soldiers had been indoctrinated before they ever landed in Korea, in the belief that it's what you get, not what you give, that counts. "The fault, dear Brutus, that we are underlings, lies not in our stars but in ourselves."

The growth of governmental paternalism, the promise to vote benefits out of the pockets of some people into the pockets of others, the concept of America as the "Lady with the Ladle" rather than the "Lady with the Lamp," these ideas had found fertile ground in the minds of young men who had never been taught to honor sacrifice, to respect unselfishness, to feel devotion to a cause, to love one's country, to cherish the memory of those who died in all our wars for freedom's cause.

Those who faltered were the "beat" of this generation. There were so many more who met their duty and their destiny with gallantry and patriotism.

But those who failed are a charge upon our conscience, a warning of signs of decay among us, a peril to our future security. "He that cannot think is a slave; he that dare not think is a coward; he that will not think is a bigot."

Before patriotism goes out of style, should we not busy ourselves with some wise remedial planning?

I believe we must, through State and local programs, reexamine and drastically overhaul our present methods of instructing our youth, in grade school, high school and college. Here is a quote from an interesting letter written by a college girl which appears in the March issue of the Atlantic Monthly: "My academic preparation had included work on the school annual, student service in the school library, traffic laws and safety, courses in poise, and a culture course that somehow never went beyond young person's guide to the orchestra." One wonders whether the high school in question had any courses in American history, civics, government, and one may be permitted to wonder also what textbooks may have been used. The Federal Government should reexamine its Armed Forces indoctrination and orientation programs, even though there has been progress in this area in the past 5 years.

We need unremitting emphasis on the origins of our Nation, on what made it strong and great and kept it free, upon the fundamentals of our national purpose.

I would like our schools to stir our students to love of country, to prepare them to counter the washers of brains with undeviating faith founded upon knowledge of our country's principles and policies, with the sturdiness of their conviction in the justice of our country's cause. And if this be propaganda, I would also like our Armed Forces to employ much more of it.

Nor it is sentimentalism which leads me to suggest that I would like to hear again in the classrooms of America, the stirring stories of our clearing of the wilderness, the wintry tale of the agonies of the men of Washington at Valley Forge, the gallantry of Ticonderoga, Antietam, Chateau Thierry, and Iwo Jima.

I would like to hear again in the classrooms of our Republic, the rolling cadences of "Hail, Columbia", "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," "The Halls of Montezuma." I should like to be assured that from these, our halls of learning, our sons and daughters depart with the chambers of their minds filled with the beauteous and pleasant riches of wisdom, tolerance and patriotism. So armed, they will meet and conquer the menace of any Red schoolhouse.

These things I would like,
And so, I think, would you.

---

## The Soviet Economic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is an established fact that the Russian threat to the continued existence of our way of life is not clothed solely in the shroud of nuclear warfare. Certainly we recognize that we have been in the throes of an economic war with the Soviets for some time. This trade war has already had very serious ramifications throughout the free world.

Ray Tucker, a highly respected writer on the Washington scene and one of the outstanding columnists in the country, has written a summary on this aspect of the overall Communist plan for world conquest. Entitled, "How the Reds Wage Their Global Trade War," it appeared in the April edition of the American Legion magazine.

Mr. Tucker's informative article contains such valuable information that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE REDS WAGE THEIR GLOBAL TRADE WAR

(By Ray Tucker)

Although cold-war shooting affrays in Korea, Indochina, the Middle East, and the Formosa Strait have commanded the headlines in recent years, Russian and Chinese Communists are waging another equally insidious and dangerous battle against the free world, and especially against the United States. Success in this battle, the Red economic offensive, could be a body blow to the democratic and capitalistic system, and indeed to our way of life.

When Nikita Khrushchev told a group of Western diplomats that, "We will bury you," he was not forecasting a military and atomic devastation. He was threatening a trade war that has already created commercial chaos throughout the free world at the expense of the American people as workers, consumers, and taxpayers.

Although only skirmishing as yet (it began in early 1958), Khrushchev's commercial guerrillas in civilian garb have caused serious military damage to us. They contributed to the break with Egypt and the Lebanon-Jordan crisis, for Dictator Nasser became more daring and defiant after he received Russian arms for Cairo cotton. They provoked the Iraq revolution that may give Moscow access to and control of Middle East oil so vital to the West. They helped to shatter the Baghdad Pact, and they threaten to disrupt SEATO, the anti-Communist alliance in southeast Asia.

Khrushchev had these gains in mind when he said on another occasion: "We regard trade least for its economic profits and most for its political purpose." In pursuing this objective without regard for the profit-and-loss factors which must govern trade in the democratic and free-enterprise system, Moscow has engaged in strategy and tactics which are utterly brutal.

Khrushchev and his oriental conspirator, Mao Tse-tung, are dumping vital products on world markets at villainous and cutthroat prices. They are underselling the West's rival goods from 10 to 20 percent and on terms (2 percent for 20 years) which private traders cannot afford to extend. When necessary, they resort to primitive barter, and swap raw materials for machinery and finished goods, or vice versa.

Their purpose is obvious, even if Khrushchev had not delivered his funereal ultimatum. They seek to make world economies utterly dependent upon close economic and political relations with the Communist power bloc. They aim to disrupt world trade to such a degree that it will bankrupt the democracies and neutrals foolish enough to deal with Moscow and Peiping. By creating unemployment and privation, as they have done in Finland and Bolivia, they expect to supplant pro-Western governments with Communist regimes. Pending achievement of these ultimate goals, they are forcing

Uncle Sam to pay a large part of the bill for their current depredations.

This economic threat will become far more dangerous when and if Russia and China reach the industrial and agricultural status envisaged in their 5- or 7-year plans. Then they will hurl at us the mineral, food, and manufactured output of a billion state employees as well as their vast natural resources. And the United States, as the anchor of the anti-Communist alliance around the world, is their special target. Should the United States go under, they figure, Khrushchev need only to summon the pallbearers for democracy.

The sinister nature of this attack is recognized at Washington. President Eisenhower describes it as a "subtle and long-range instrument of warfare." Secretary Dulles warns that it matches the Communist military menace. Allen W. Dulles, whose Central Intelligence agents have uncovered many surreptitious Red deals, says that it is "the most serious challenge that has ever confronted the United States in time of peace."

It is not possible yet to measure the bread-and-butter effect of this economic bombardment on domestic jobs, wages, profits, prices, and so forth. However, due partially to its initial gains, our foreign trade has fallen by $4 billion a year, which represents a loss of between 400,000 and 600,000 jobs in this country, according to official estimates. The declines in U.S. exports have occurred in the manufacture and marketing of commodities Russia has begun to export so heavily and deliberately.

Moreover, as taxpayers, all Americans suffer because of the vast amount of foreign aid required to combat this threat—$4 billion a year. Another heavy burden on the taxpayer is the cost of stockpiling raw materials from countries victimized by Russo-Chinese sabotage. Only recently Uncle Sam paid $2 million for 1,000 tons of unneeded Bolivian tin that became unsalable because Russia had dumped that commodity on the world market.

The generalissimo of this trade war is shrewd, ruthless First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, who recently visited this country and sought, with characteristic cynicism, to expand commerce with this country. As Life magazine said of him, "He handles trade like a gun." His agents are trained so that they know the language, the peculiarities, the needs, and the customs of the countries to which they are accredited.

Mikoyan assigned 3,500 of these trade specialists throughout the world in the first half of 1958. This is double the number of U.S. commercial attachés abroad. It is significant—and sinister—that he sent the largest number to such trouble spots as Afghanistan, Nepal, India, Indonesia, Syria, Egypt, and Yugoslavia. He has extended $2½ billion in credits, with 80 percent allotted to these same restless and strategic areas. This is twice the amount which the United States has advanced to these same countries.

Mikoyan uses the dumping process to undermine American good will abroad as well as to erode our own economy. When prices of a certain country's commodities fall because of his bludgeoning tactics, his agents blame it on (1) American refusal to buy their goods, and (2) on tariffs and quotas imposed by Congress or the White House. These sideswipes have been especially effective in Latin America.

In view of Mikoyan's record, the warm welcome accorded him on his recent tour of this country had its ironic aspect. His hosts—industrialists, bankers, automobile executives—were entertaining the man who is their world public enemy No. 1, for he is robbing them of markets and prospects. Nowhere did he receive a friendlier reception than from the heads of Detroit's auto firms. Apparently they had not heard of his current scheme to produce a new, small, cheap car with which he hopes to capture the Western European market. It will be called the Satellite, a propaganda reference to Russia's outer space achievements and its current supremacy over the United States in the skies.

Mikoyan's men have far more than strictly Russian-made goods on their sales lists. Besides offering her own products at bargain rates, the Soviet Union deals in ridiculously cheap goods which she receives from satellites and nations foolish enough to deal with her. The Kremlin acts as an international clearinghouse for the exchange and re-export of every product imaginable—from such materials as aluminum, platinum, gold, oil, cotton, asbestos, tobacco, tea, coffee, coal, textiles, and jute to Christmas cards made in atheistic Peiping.

Russia's share of an estimated annual world commerce of $100 billion is relatively small—only $10 billion. But the international trade structure is so sensitive and delicately balanced that it is vulnerable to slight and unexpected pressures. Merely by dumping 20,000 tons of Hungarian aluminum on the world market in 1958, Russia forced a drop of 2 cents per pound in the price of the free world's production of 3 million tons. This created a surplus from which American firms have not yet recovered. It forced them to cut prices from 2 to 1.3 cents a pound, and to shut down plants.

The global effect of a tin glut in this same year was devastating. Although Russia exported only 9,000 tons in 1957, Khrushchev increased shipments to 18,000 tons last year. This resulted in a drop in price of $200 a ton in Malaya (where this metal is the chief cash commodity) and paralyzed the economy there. Almost simultaneously Washington received diplomatic warnings that Malaya and certain Southeast Asia members of SEATO were in danger of a red coup.

This same tin foray was almost fatal to the pro-West government of Bolivia whose economy is 90 percent dependent on this product. The price fell from $1.24 to 90 to 95 cents, and revenues from $8 million to $3 million a month. Foreign Minister Victor Andrade made an emergency flight to Washington to negotiate a trade of surplus tin for needed American goods.

"Although the Eisenhower administration deplores the Bolivian Government's wasteful practices and nationalization policies, the United States must support the La Paz regime lest the tin crisis lead to a Communist takeover. We have subsidized Bolivia to the extent of $121 million in 4 years, and there is no sign of a letup in that country's demands. That bill to American taxpayers is chargeable directly to Khrushchev and Mikoyan.

The first direct trade bomb tossed at the United States involved benzene. To the amazement of the industry and Secretary Dulles, a leading American firm, Dow Chemical Co., announced that it was buying 13,500 tons of benzene from Russia because Russia's price was 6 cents cheaper per gallon than the prices of rival bidders.

In this connection, Russia has given East Germany $200 million to expand its chemical industry, which is now the world's seventh largest. By laying a pipeline from the coast of the Caspian Sea and pumping 5 million tons of oil annually to East Germany's petrochemical plants, Moscow expects to boost the output of these products by 60 percent in 3 years. With chemical commodities so essential to many countries and new industries, cutthroat competition in this trading area has only begun.

Another important American industry—coal—faces hard going from Communist trade practices—or malpractices. Although bitterly hostile over the division of Germany and the current threat to West Berlin, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has notified the State Department that he plans to cut American imports from 11 million to 2 million tons a year in favor of cheaper coal from Communist Poland.

In protesting to Secretary Dulles, the coal operators told him that, partially because of Communist competition, U.S. production has fallen off by 21 percent since 1957. John L. Lewis noted that membership in his United Mine Workers has dropped from more than 400,000 to 225,000, and that they are now struggling along on only 3 days of work a week. If such a sturdy Western friend as Adenauer feels that he must succumb to these Communist pressures, it amounts to a serious Western defeat in the trade war.

An unusually flagrant example of Russia's Machiavellian designs concerns Polish butter. Although Poland is traditionally an importer of this food, buying 5,000 tons as recently as 1956, it exported 12,000 tons on Western Europe in 1958. As is true of almost every product which Russia, China, and the satellites dump abroad, butter is not available to the Poles because of its high domestic price.

Economic experts in the State, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments note that the Kremlin directs its economic operations against the West's weak spots and defense lines—the Middle East, the Far East, and Southeast Asia. But they are especially alarmed over the Communists' penetration of South America. In his recent report to the President on his survey of this area, where Vice President Nixon was almost stoned to death, Milton Eisenhower warned of this danger on our doorstep.

Argentina, for instance, negotiated a $100 million trade agreement with Russia in 1958, swapping raw materials for oil-drilling equipment which Buenos Aires claimed was more efficient than American machinery. But soon after the deal Persident Arturo Frondizi had to declare a state of siege to quell workers' strikes in the oilfields. The Russian engineers accompanying the shipment of oil-drilling equipment it seems, were also agents provocateurs. To bolster the Frondizi regime, U.S. agencies have had to lend $329 million to Argentina—another bill that should be sent to the Kremlin.

Russia has offered to barter 200,000 tons of crude oil with Brazil in return for coffee, cotton, and cocoa. The ironic and significant aspect of the transaction, which Rio de Janeiro has not yet accepted, is that Russians do not drink coffee; they prefer tea and vodka. Khrushchev, of course, would resell the coffee and cotton to the disadvantage of South American, Asiatic, and African producers of those products. He has already reexported such things as rubber from Ceylon, rice from Burma, wool from Uruguay, fish from Iceland, tea from China, and cotton from Egypt.

These sharp and merciless practices, however, have profited the West in several important and long-range respects. They are beginning to convince many small and hitherto neutral nations that they cannot trust the Communists or do business with them on a normal, honest, and decent basis. Specifically, it appears to be driving such influential leaders as Nasser, Nehru of India, and Tito of Yugoslavia into the Western camp. And the shabby treatment of Finland has disillusioned the traditionally neutral Scandinavian peoples.

Nasser fancied that he was making a fine, anti-Western deal when he shipped his long-staple cotton to Moscow for tanks and planes. Now, however, he discovers that Mikoyan, instead of fabricating the raw material into textiles for home consumption, is reexporting it and stripping the Egyptian dictator of historic markets. Every nation which has dickered with the Kremlin in this way has found such trade to be an economic Trojan horse.

Nasser's great dread, however, is Russia's steady penetration of the oil-producing areas from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf.

A successful Communist incursion here would destroy his United Arab Republic, and deprive those nations of the billion a year royalties which they need to realize their ambitions. Similarly, such a conquest would constitute a costly and dangerous oil squeeze on Western Europe, the NATO war machine, and the United States.

Russia does not need this petroleum, for she has plentiful supplies within her own borders. But domination of these countries would enable Moscow to cut off supply of a product essential to our major allies' peacetime economy and warmaking potential. It would permit the Communists to demand 60- or 70-percent royalties from Western concessionaires, as against the current 50 percent.

Every American who runs a car or who heats his home with oil would feel the impact in higher costs for gasoline and fuel. It would skyrocket general costs of living because of heavier charges on industry. It might reduce our petroleum supplies to a dangerous level because of our need to supply our military establishments and allies which now "contain" Russia.

Once a Moscow ally, Tito now finds himself the victim of the Russian bear's claws. When he refused to adhere blindly to the Kremlin's dictates and resumed relations with the United States, Moscow canceled an agreement to advance $285 million for a steel mill and fertilizer plant. Washington is now providing the needed funds—another charge on the American taxpayers.

Several other nations have learned that Mikoyan handles trade like a gun and for political purposes. When Israel invaded Egypt, Moscow immediately canceled all oil contracts with Tel Aviv. When Australia gave asylum to an official who defected from the Soviet Embassy there, Mikoyan stopped the purchase of wheat for several years. Perhaps the most tragic and spectacular example of Russian trade treachery is Finland. Her experience furnishes a case history for countries hoping or planning to do business with the Communists.

Faced with heavy reparations payments in kind to Russia, Finland had to rebuild its factories and reorient its economy to fulfill Communist demands and requirements. But when this debt was liquidated, Finland increased its trade with the West. It found Western goods, especially automobiles, cheaper and more attractive to the domestic market. The conservative Fagerholm government also refused to give any cabinet posts to Finnish communists.

Russia immediately canceled all orders it had previously placed, including articles on the docks awaiting shipment. It also cut off all shipments of goods to Helsinki. The result was complete economic stagnation, a lack of necessities, harsh unemployment, and bankruptcies. As a result, the Fagerholm government collapsed. Finland may now have to install a pro-Communist regime in order to survive as a vassal.

Even the patient Nehru's neutrality is wearing thin under Russian and Chinese trade machinations. Mao Tse-tung is selling tea, textiles, jute, peanut oil, coal, and light engineering products throughout southeast Asia at less than India can offer, and on more favorable terms. The cotton which Khrushchev obtains from Egypt finds a readier market than Nehru's less desirable product. Red exports to Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaya, Thailand, and Burma have increased steadily since early last year.

In September 1957 Ceylon asked bids on 1,700,000 tons of coal. India expected to get the full order, but wound up with only half. China provided the other half at a cheaper figure. India's textile industry, one of the best managed in the world and wholly in private hands, has sustained severe losses because of Chinese competition. India's exports are running 50 percent below the 1957 total. Here again, the United States is spending several hundreds of millions annually to keep India and the Colombo plan nations from succumbing to this economic offensive.

Thailand was ready to sign a contract for rice from South Africa. But Peiping got the business by offering a 20-percent reduction. Red China's bicycles sell at Singapore for one-fifth of their cost in Peiping; thus they oust the products of our ally Japan. Although banned for distribution in godless China, Christmas cards from the Chinese capital flood the Christian market in southeast Asia.

Russia's eventual economic objective, being worldwide in its grasping, is Africa. Soviet conspiracies, therefore, seek to topple Nasser and penetrate the new and unwary republics on the Dark Continent. Should that happen, Communist attack on three major American and South American products—cotton, tobacco, and coffee—might be destructive. With cheap land and controlled labor, her inroads on commerce, wages, jobs, prices, profits, and political unity could be an economic Waterloo. That is the precise meaning of Khrushchev's thoroughly contemptible prediction that "We will bury you."

The United States and its allies are trying to meet this challenge in many ways. We are bolstering vulnerable areas with financial and technical assistance. We are leveling tariffs so as to make it easier for them to trade with us. We are negotiating international agreements for stabilization of prices of the free world's commodities. Bills before Congress provide tax incentives for foreign investments by American firms. We seek to improve living standards so that non-Communist lands will be less susceptible to Red wiles and blandishments. The recent European approach to economic unity—the Common Market and freeing of money—is aimed at Russia's trade offensive.

President Eisenhower has created a new State Department post and bureau to counterattack on this front. It is headed by Under Secretary C. Douglas Dillon, New York investment banker and former Ambassador to France. He regards his assignment (and so does the White House) as important as the responsibilities which fall on Neil H. McElroy, the Secretary of Defense. Nobody cognizant of the Russo-Chinese gains in this new economic warfare disputes him.

---

## Address of Dr. Lev E. Dobrianski at Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, over the Washington Birthday weekend, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America held its Seventh Triennial Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent. This organization consists of and represents the American regional and local organizations and groups of Ukrainian background.

At this seventh triennial congress, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and a professor at the Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., developed his ideas on the relation to the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union to the struggle of the free world for freedom everywhere. In the context of his thesis, Dr. Dobriansky stressed the importance of Senate Joint Resolution 54, the measure which I introduced on February 19, 1959, authorizing the erection of a statue in Washington, D.C. of Taras Shevchenko, the Ukrainian national poet of freedom who received much of his inspiration from George Washington and the U.S. Republic.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Dobriansky's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEMANTIC HOAX OF FLEXIBILITY AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University professor and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, February 21, 1959)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure and delight for me to greet you this morning upon the opening of the Seventh Triennial Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent.

As delegates from numerous States in different sections of the country, you are assembled again in a congress which over this weekend is vested with striking significance as to time, place, and purpose. The time is one of national celebration in honor of the birthday of our first President, George Washington. The place is the Nation's capital named after the same founder of our free and independent country. The purpose is to fittingly translate the wholesome revolutionary separatism and self-determination of Washington's day to the many captive nations which exist today in the unprecedented empire of the Russian Communists.

Both time and place emphasize the dominant spirit and fresh traditions that have made our country the foremost national power on the face of the globe. Barring perhaps a global hot war, no single nation in this century or a good portion of the next could possibly compare itself in material power with these United States. There are many of our fellow Americans who would thoughtlessly object to this statement by pointing to the Soviet Union. In many instances, their faddy craze to learn the Russian language is exceeded only by their ignorance of the nature and fabric of the Soviet Union. You and I know that the Soviet Union is not a nation. You and I know that as a substrate empire, the Soviet Union is not comparable to this Nation. We know only too well that many achievements which some blindly dub as Russian, were and are the creation of the energies and resources of the captive non-Russian nations in this primary sphere of Moscow's extensive empire. In short, without these captive resources Russia would necessarily be reduced to a third-rate national power, and without Siberia, not even that.

In the more important sphere of spirituality and liberal culture our Nation is in essence unique. Yes, one hears from time to time moralistic warnings and condemnations about our growing materialism and secularism. Yet, despite some inevitable evidences of this, there exists, nevertheless, a tremendous and inexhaustible reservoir of religious faith, of principled dedication to moral norms, and of a creative sense of justice and charity. It is not my intention here to subtilize these sources of our total national power. It is enough to point out that despite our Kennans and other amoralists, these sources of moral and political principle are from time to time powerfully manifested in our domestic and interna-

tional relations. They are reflected in our passion for individual liberty, in our demands for just dues, in our compassionate warmth toward the plight of others, and in our symbolic values of national self-determination, a peaceful community of free nations, and the productive eradication of imperialism and colonialism. Basically, Russian totalitarianism is the very negation of these traits and values; and with this there can be no flexible compromise unless, self-defeatingly, we are prepared to debase our own standards.

The problem, therefore, is not one of moral and ethical erosion in this country. Instead, it is one of induced complacency, brought on by a methodical exploitation of our natural urge for peaceable relations with all peoples and by the pressing cares and new attractions of day-to-day existence. This has been demonstrated over and over again in the past, sometimes at an untold price in life and treasure. When a sharp crisis confronts us, our ranks close almost spontaneously, divisions of thought and sentiment fade, and the Nation in moral will and determination is solidly one. But at what price to be paid for the complacency we luxuriated in before? Today, we are being subjected to a high degree of complacent inducement by Moscow, by the traces of Mikoyan, and by the duped in this country who cry for flexibility in our foreign policies.

In its essence our Nation is unique. And in this essence resides a power that exceeds the power of all the hydrogen bombs, missiles, and space potentialities put together, now and in the future. The essence of this Nation lies in the concomitant diversity and unity of its people. Our country is a wholesome meltingpot of peoples of widely different ancestral backgrounds, creeds, and races; yet peoples who are only one people in their united consciousness as Americans. In this, also, no nation in the world can be compared in depth and scope with the essence of the United States. Those who point to the Soviet Union again speak from ignorance rather than knowledge. Newcomers to these shores accept voluntarily the fruits of Americanization: the imprisoned non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. resist voluntarily and desperately the onslaughts of Russification. Those who propose to introduce into our dictionaries the mongrel term, the Soviets, as a point of reference to the different nations and peoples in the Soviet Union, could not be of greater semantic service to Moscow. This monolithic term bears connotations and innuendoes that are not only unfair to the over 100 million non-Russian captives in this empire but also are semantically incongruous with elementary fact. As every schoolteacher knows, misused words are the best medium for protracted misunderstanding. And this particular word certainly does not further understanding of the basic, not to say chasmic, differences between the United States and the Soviet Union.

By virtue of its socio-political essence the United States possesses a rich power of affinity with most nations on earth. This affinity is grounded not only in mutual ideologic views of legitimate nationalism, self-determination and independence, and resistance to imperialist and colonial rule but also in even more fundamental ties of blood, tongues, faiths, and customary interests. Against the exemplary background of our traditions of individual and national freedoms, the essence of America and its unsurpassed power of affinity are both magnetic and propelling. They attract the attention and hopes of peoples everywhere, and they inspire peoples everywhere to realize the blessings that have been ours. Outstanding patriots in countless nations have pointed to these United States as a new phenomenon, a new and exhilarating growth in the culture of mankind, indeed, the beginning of a new world.

In the last century such a voice was heard from Eastern Europe. You and I know that a champion of liberty emerged in Ukraine. The renowned Ukrainian poet and patriot Taras Shevchenko actually pointed in his writings to this place, to Washington, as the inspiration and guide for the future of mankind. The essence of America rubbed off on many brilliant minds and leaders in distant lands, including Shevchenko's in Ukraine. It had both a magnetic and propelling force and to some degree continues to have it today.

My friends, let me remind you that 2 years hence, in 1961, and in this very month of February, the Shevchenko centenary will be observed in many lands of the free world. Moscow in its spurious way will undoubtedly attempt to exploit the anniversary event for its own political purposes. But the crucial fact is that Shevchenko did not look to Moscow or St. Petersburg but to Washington as the beacon of the future. Here is just one example of how the essence of America can be expressed through its power of affinity toward the 40 million captive Ukrainian nation. A fitting observance of this event by our Government would overwhelm Moscow's propaganda exhibition and have a far greater impact upon a large area of the Soviet Union than would 1 million costly cultural exchanges. Recognizing this, Senator JAVITS, of New York, is introducing a bill in Congress for the selection of a site in Washington to erect a statue of Taras Shevchenko on the occasion of the centenary. It goes without saying that Americans of Ukrainian background will gladly support this financially. Moreover, every effort should be made toward the issuance of a U.S. champion of liberty stamp in honor of Taras Shevchenko.

I cite this case to show what could and should be done to move the hearts and minds of men everywhere toward freedom, and at the same time defeat the maneuvers and goals of Moscow. We can no longer depend on a passive rubbing-off process for the essence of America and its power of affinity to shine in foreign lands. The challenge of lying Russian propaganda must be met by creative and imaginative deeds. This is in the nature of the cold war. Few Americans realize that the cold war is an old Russian political institution dating back to Ivan the Terrible. It is certainly no innovation of Lenin or fatuous Communist ideology. Few realize that it was largely through cold-war techniques, such as Khrushchev and Mikoyan display today with their deceitful pleas for "thaws" and "peace," that a tremendous empire was built. The military power of Moscow or St. Petersburg was always secondary because behind the bluster and bluff of its military "steamroller" no one trusted the multinational forces of the empire less than Moscow itself. Behind the mooniks and missiles of today this circumstance is the same. Cold war activity is inherent in the very structure of traditional Russian totalitarianism, and the sooner we Americans generally realize this, the sooner we can begin to cope imaginatively and flexibly with the challenge of "neither peace nor war."

Those who call for flexibility in our foreign policy are perpetrating a semantic hoax. Under the cover of this hoax, appeasement, compromise, and even surrender would logically follow. A child is not deemed flexible in thought if it insists that two and two make five. So a nation is not flexible in policy if it compromises the rules of its basic principles. The fundamental policy of colonial expansionism is fixed for Moscow; shooting from an inner Eurasian fortress, its strategy and tactics are flexible. Rationally, the same logic applies to the United States. Its policy must be firmly grounded in the essence of America, i.e., in the principles and hard-won norms which have made this Nation foremost in the world. The firmer this is, the more courage, will, and imagination we'll have to become maximally flexible in the only field to which the term flexibility logically applies, namely, the operational field of strategy and tactics. We haven't been sufficiently flexible in this field because we haven't been adequately firm enough in our own convictions and in universalizing the traditions, the essence, the affinity powers of this Nation.

Vice President NIXON put his finger on this very defect when he emphasized last September, before the Harvard Business School Association, that the way to combat Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism is to revitalize the American Revolution. This means the spirit of Washington, the principles of our traditions of freedom, the moral and symbolic mission of America. As the Vice President said: "It is ironic in the extreme that the United States should ever be cast in the role of opposing legitimate nationalist movements. Many of the ideas which motivate today's nationalists stem from American history and have been taught in American universities at home and abroad. * * * We, rather than the Soviet Union, should be the natural champion of legitimate nationalist movements." The plain fact is that we have been too flexible and lax with these ideas and their formulation into policy and thus inflexible with regard to their imaginative application and operational implementation. In short, those who view our policy as being inflexible have a topsy-turvy view of the entire problem. The winning pugilist is invariably the one with flexible ring tactics due to rigid, inflexible rules of training and self-discipline. The worst applied scientist is the most flexible with the logical dictates of laws and principles which form the nucleus of any policy.

In these terms, nowhere does U.S. foreign policy falter worse than in relation to the Soviet Union itself, and particularly in relation to the non-Russian nations within this basic empire. It is nothing short of amazing that we have a weapon in the 110 million non-Russian captives in the U.S.S.R. which is more powerful than all the hydrogen bombs put together, and most Americans are not even aware of it. Many officials who do, fear to use it in the endless cold war. They fear it might lead to revolution and bloodshed. One wonders whether they recall how our Nation was born. One of the real possibilities is that its prudent but fearless use can lead to a relatively peaceful revolution which would insure real world peace. By skillful diplomacy, capable psychological activity, and political, and cultural attraction in this fertile environment within the Soviet Union itself, the interests of freedom everywhere could be greatly advanced and expanded. The Soviet constitution and the internal propaganda of Moscow nicely accommodate this avenue of approach. In this case, let us take the Kremlin at its word in the dynamic pursuit of translating it into deed at the very heart of the empire itself.

This is the major direction of our efforts. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and each in his own way must continue to develop it with ideas and imagination. It still is an unexplored dimension of U.S. foreign policy.

## Great Message of Pope Pius XI on Threat of Atheistic Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, regardless of what many in our midst would have us believe, the threat of the international Communist conspiracy continues to be great. In spite of an apparent aboveground abatement of their activities in this country and the publicized reduction of their membership lists, the Communists continue to pose an internal danger to the United States.

We must be constantly on the alert to combat this menace, both at home and abroad. In order to do this effectively, it is vital for every American to gain a deep understanding of what the Reds want and how they aim to accomplish their goals.

Recently, the Tablet, that great Catholic publication, reprinted in its editorial columns excerpts from the famous 1937 message of Pope Pius XI, in which the nature and danger of the Communist conspiracy was clearly delineated. This timeless declaration, underscoring the truth that communism is basically wrong, and exhorting His Holiness' followers to combat the conspiracy by all means possible, deserves the attention of all Americans.

It is fitting that the Tablet, which has unswervingly stood in the forefront of all efforts to expose and combat the machinations of the comrades, should reprint excerpts from this stirring message. This publication—a veritable bulwark against the inroads of communism—merits special commendation for its strong efforts in this important field.

Because the comments in the Tablet are so vital today, and because the encyclical "Divini Redemptoris" deserves renewed attention, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE FROM POPE PIUS XI

On the feast of St. Joseph, in 1937 Pope Pius XI renewed and reviewed the authoritative position of the church on atheistic communism. In his great Encyclical Divini Redemptoris he said, speaking of the need for a spiritual power for good, which he described as the Catholic Church—to contest vigorously the spiritual evil of the day, communism—that he placed the "vast campaign of the Church against world communism under the standard of St. Joseph, her mighty Protector."

His eloquent restatement of the need for this campaign needs no further explanation or paraphrase. On this 22d anniversary of that encyclical, we feel it in order to quote a few key passages from Divini Redemptoris for the continued guidance of an informed laity and for the purpose of a call to greater zeal directed toward all members of the Faith who might read these words and thus be encouraged to go further in this "Campaign."

The Holy Father, speaking of the necessity of complete distrust for communism tactics, said:

"In the beginning communism showed itself for what it was in all its perversity; but very soon it realized that it was thus alienating the people. It has therefore changed its tactics, and strives to entice the multitudes by trickery of various forms, hiding its real designs behind ideas that in themselves are good and attractive. Thus, aware of the universal desire of peace, the leaders of communism pretend to be the most zealous promoters and propagandists in the movement for world amity.

"Yet at the same time they stir up a class-warfare which causes rivers of blood to flow, and, realizing that that system offers no internal guarantee of peace, they have recourse to unlimited armaments. Under various names which do not suggest communism, they establish organizations and periodicals with the sole purpose of carrying their ideas into quarters otherwise inaccessible. They try perfidiously to worm their way even into professedly Catholic and religious organizations.

"Again, without receding an inch from their subversive principles, they invite Catholics to collaborate with them in the realm of so-called humanitarianism and charity; and at times even make proposals that are in perfect harmony with the Christian spirit and the doctrine of the church. Elsewhere they carry their hypocrisy so far as to encourage the belief that communism, in countries where faith and culture are more strongly entrenched, will assume another and much milder form. It will not interfere with the practice of religion. It will respect liberty of conscience. There are some even who refer to certain changes recently introduced into Soviet legislation as a proof that communism is about to abandon its program of war against God.

"See to it, venerable brethren, that the faithful do not allow themselves to be deceived. Communism is intrinsically wrong, and no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever. Those who permit themselves to be deceived into lending their aid towards the triumph of Communism in their own country, will be the first to fall victims of their error. And the greater the antiquity and grandeur of the Christian civilization in the regions where Communism successfully penetrates, so much more devastating will be the hatred displayed by the Godless."

Then the Holiness, speaking directly to laymen, called for Catholic action:

"We extend our paternal invitation to our beloved sons among the laity who are doing battle in the ranks of Catholic action. On another occasion we have called this movement so dear to our heart 'a particularly providential assistance' in the work of the church during these troublous times. Catholic action is in effect a social apostolate also, inasmuch as its object is to spread the Kingdom of Jesus Christ not only among individuals, but also in families and in society. It must, therefore, make it a chief aim to train its members with special care and to prepare them to fight the battles of the Lord. This task of formation, now more urgent and indispensable than ever, which must always precede direct action in the field, will assuredly be served by study-circles, conferences, lecture courses, and the various other activities undertaken with a view to making known the Christian solution of the social problem * * *."

Turning to the duties of the Christian State, the Holy Father stated:

"It is the duty of the Christian state to concur actively in this spiritual enterprise of the church, aiding her with the means at its command, which although they be external devices, have nonetheless for their prime object the good of souls.

"This means that all diligence should be exercised by states to prevent within their territories the revages of an anti-God campaign which shakes society to its very foundations. For there can be no authority on earth unless the authority of the Divine Majesty be recognized; no oath will bind which is not sworn in the name of the living God. We repeat that we have said with frequent insistence in the past, especially in our encyclical "Caritate Christi": 'How can any contract be maintained, and what value can any treaty have, in which every guarantee of conscience is lacking? And how can there be talk of guarantees of conscience when all faith in God and all fear of God have vanished? Take away this basis, and with it all moral law falls, and there is no remedy left to stop the gradual but inevitable destruction of peoples, families, the state, civilization itself.'"

Pius XI concluded this great state paper on the most pressing of all problems of 1937—and of today since the message is timeless—by pointing to the eternal destiny of the Church, and thus by predicting the ultimate conquest of the Church of Christ, with the following reminder to all of the faithful:

"With eyes lifted on high, our faith sees the new heavens and the new earth described by our first predecessor, St. Peter. While the promises of the false prophets of this earth melt away in blood and tears, the great apocalyptic prophecy of the Redeemer shines forth in heavenly splendor: 'Behold, I make all things new.'"

It would be presumptuous for us to say more. We count ourselves as fortunate to be able to participate in this 22d anniversary of a message to which the tablet has given unswerving and consistent loyalty.

---

## The Challenge of the Soviet Economic Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 12 it was my priviledge to address the Economic Club of Southwestern Michigan in St. Joseph, Mich. The theme of my address was "The Challenge of the Soviet Economic Offensive."

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF THE SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Today the world is confronted by a profound crisis, a crisis in which the cherished values of western civilization are challenged as never before.

We hear the word "crisis" repeated again and again in the screaming headlines about Berlin, Iraq, or the Formosan Strait so that we become numb and forget its deeper meaning.

It is perfectly true that there are many crises, but underlying all these specific challenges is a fundemental crisis. Some historians and philosophers have said that our generation is confronted with the greatest crisis of modern times.

The profund and many-sided world crisis is the result of three dynamic and interrelated realities, each of which is pregnant with dangers and oportunities—the challenge of modern technology, the challenge of the revolution of rising expectations, and the challenge of communism itself.

1. The fantastic progress in technological development has put mankind within reach of one of his greatest goals, the elimination of poverty. But his same technology ironically may be mankind's undoing. I need not remind an audience like this of the potential destructiveness of modern terror weapons made possible by new energy and means of transporting energy discovered by science. We should not blame science, but recognize that science is neither a savior nor a demon, but a source of power which can be used for good or ill. The basic problem is political and moral, not technical.

2. We have heard a great deal of the revolution of rising expectations in the economically less developed and politically noncommitted countries of Asia and Africa. The destiny of these people who are striving for or celebrating their independence may determine the destiny of the world within the next generation or two. Not everyone in the free world has grasped the political and moral significance of the ferment in these vast areas, but we can be sure the leaders of the Soviet Union have.

3. The third massive reality is the Communist challenge itself. Modern technology and the upheaval in Asia and Africa would themselves be sufficient cause for a world crisis. But the crisis is compounded by the existence of an aggressive and expansive political religion whose ultimate goal is world conquest. The high priests of world communism prefer to attain their goals without nuclear war if possible. But they have not ruled out either limited or total war if that seems necessary or expedient.

We make a great mistake, perhaps a fatal mistake, if we think of the Communist challenge as exclusively a military challenge, or even primarily a military threat. The challenge of communism is military to be sure, but it is also economic, ideological, political, and, in its deepest sense, it is religious. I say it is religious because the distorted Communist view of man and the world challenges the fundamental precepts of our Judeo-Christian value system.

THE EXPANDING SOVIET ECONOMY

Today I want to confine my remarks to the Soviet economic offensive. But I want to do this within the framework of the many-faceted Communist challenge and the larger world crisis.

It is one of the great ironies of American history that today we are being given a run for our money by the expanding and dynamic economy of a country which only a few short years ago we thought of as backward. This is a spectacle as humorous as the fabled tortoise and hare. Before sputnik streaked across the heaven, we assumed that we were the biggest, the fastest growing, and strongest economy in the history of mankind. And we were. We became smug and complacent. We refused to believe in increasing signs of growth in Soviet technology and productive capacity. The hare would win the race, paws down. We could stop for a short siesta under a sycamore tree and the poor tortoise, weighted down by the hard shell of socialistic controls, would not have a chance.

But while we slept the turtle plodded on, unnoticed and unobserved. Then came Sputnik I and subsequent achievements which proved beyond a shadow of doubt that the U.S.S.R. had made giant technological and economic strides. We were shocked. We were momentarily stunned. But we still did not awaken to the full reality. It was since sputnik that we allowed ourselves the luxury of a recession, and today we are still not out of the woods.

Alas, the race is no longer a race between a tortoise and a hare, but between two hares. But because of our hurt pride, our lack of a sense of urgency, and our deficit in leadership, we are still not running scared.

I would like to put a few facts on the record which if understood and taken to heart, will help us to run scared. By scared I mean properly afraid, and determined, not hysterical. Here are the facts:

1. We have consistently underrated Soviet economic and industrial achievements. We have underrated their progress in atomic energy, missiles, aircraft production, and even in some areas of consumer production. The sputniks and lunik should have shattered our rose-colored glasses, but even now there are people in Washington who calmly tell us that we are ahead in nuclear energy and the missile race. The Secretary of Defense has himself issued smooth and reassuring words to the American people, words which were characterized by one of our most respected columnists (Joseph Alsop) as "soothing sirup."

Now it's true that the laymen, and this includes most Members of Congress, do not know exactly where we stand in relation to the Soviet Union, in spite of congressional hearings to determine just that. Sometimes the experts disagree. But isn't it the better part of wisdom and valor to overestimate Soviet economic and military strength than to underestimate it? Wouldn't it have been better if the democratic nations would have slightly overestimated Hitler than vastly to underrate him?

2. The Soviet economy is growing at about three times the rate of the U.S. economy. Although accurate statistics are hard to come by most economists believe that the Soviet economy is expanding at a rate of between 6 and 8 percent a year. In contrast the American economy at present is growing at a rate of less than 2 percent. Since 1900 our economy, our gross national product (GNP) has grown at an average rate of 3 percent annually. From 1945 to 1952 it expanded at a rate of 5 percent. Since 1953 the rate has been about 2 percent.

Of course, the Soviet economy is not as big as ours. But the fable of the tortoise and hare is appropriate here too. While the hare takes it easy and permits himself the luxuries of needless recessions, the tortoise transforms himself into a hare. Economists tell me that for a short time last year the combined steel production of the U.S.S.R. and Red China exceeded the steel production of the mighty United States. This fact alone should make us run scared.

3. The Soviet Union manages its economy to serve national goals. The leaders in the Kremlin can slice the national income pie any way they wish, within the limits of endurance set by the long suffering Soviet people. This gives them a great advantage. They can plow back into the economy the capital necessary to guarantee the maximum economic development consistent with domestic and foreign policy objectives. They can channel scarce resources into high priority enterprises such as nuclear energy, missiles, steel, and certain industries producing items for export. They can curb consumer demand by promising better food and larger apartments in the near future. They can get their people to produce guns with the promise that by the end of the present 7-year plan they will be producing both guns and butter.

A good share of the Premier's 8-hour speech at the recent party congress in Moscow was devoted to explaining the goals of the 7-year plan. The overarching goal, he said, was to outproduce the United States of America in the 1970's.

"How," you may ask, "has a totally and centrally planned economy been able to do so much? How could they have gotten where they are without the natural incentives of profit and reward in a free enterprise system like ours in America."

The answer is that years ago the Soviet leaders departed from the orthodox doctrines of Marxism, and copied incentive and productivity ideas from the system they decried.

The Soviet Union does not really practice socialism or communism, but rather a system of state capitalism. The Red Chinese in their communes may not yet have learned this lesson.

THE SOVIET INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

We have referred to Soviet economic strength and the capacity of Soviet leaders to make the economy serve political purposes. Now let us turn specifically to the Communist international economic offensive in the areas of trade, aid, and investment.

1. The trade offensive: Today there are Soviet trade missions in many capitals of the world, including the capitals of some countries which have never had any trade with the Soviet Union. These missions are quietly negotiating commercial trade agreements. The Soviet Union has surpluses with which to bargain. Even though Russia is still poverty stricken as far as consumer goods are concerned, she is willing to compete in the world market.

Recently I heard a startling story about a Boston importer who purchased some sample microscopes for high school and college use from the Soviet Union. They cost roughly one-fourth of what similar instruments in the United States cost and they were of a superior quality. Perhaps the U.S.S.R. was dumping them; that is, selling them at less than cost. Whether she was dumping them or selling them at an honest price, the problem is serious. We are presented a tremendous challenge from a backward country. Only a few years ago one of America's top Russian experts said that the Soviet Union could not even mass produce bicycles. She has not only mass produced bicycles, and microscopes, but MIG jets, bombers, and perhaps she is now mass producing ICBM's.

We can expect the Soviet trade offensive to increase in tempo and volume in the months and years ahead.

2. The aid and investment offensive: The Soviet Union is an Ivan-come-lately to foreign economic aid. The United States blazed the trail with the mighty Marshall plan and subsequent programs of aid. And yet in this field in which we were pioneers we are being severely challenged. At the very time when many Americans are confused and unconvinced, when the very basis of economic aid is being challenged, the Soviet Union, according to all reports, is winning friends and influencing people through its aid offensive.

Apparently convinced that you "can't buy friends," the U.S.S.R. during the past 3 years has concentratel on capital investment as its major form of foreign aid. She has offered long-term, low-interest loans to the countries of the Middle East and Asia. There are extensive Soviet economic aid projects in the United Arab Republic and in seven south Asian countries—India, Burma, Afghanistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, Nepal, and Cambodia. The Soviets are helping to build a steel mill in India, bridges in Egypt, a cement plant in Afghanistan, a sugar factory in Ceylon, a tire factory in Indonesia and a hundred other projects designed to raise the living standards of these underdeveloped areas. In the past 3 years the Soviet Union has extended more than $1.5 billion in credits. Recently Mr. Khrushchev offered President Nasser aid to build the high dam across the Nile—the same type of aid which Mr. Dulles abruptly withdrew in 1955 and which many observers believe forced Nasser to seize the Suez canal.

The Soviet Union offers its development credits, and the necessary technicians, she

claims, without political strings attached. The offer is attractive, and we cannot blame underdeveloped countries for accepting it. In their great desire for economic development, they are reluctant to see the possible political implications of such generously offered help. At the beginning of the Soviet program her interest rates were better than needy countries could get elsewhere. And there were no explicit political strings attached. Further, the Soviet Union seemed to demonstrate with her sputniks that she could make as much technical progress in 30 years as the United States did in 100 years. Some of the people in these areas seem to prefer ruble diplomacy to dollar diplomacy.

The argument that a centrally planned, designed and controlled economy is inevitably and inexorably more powerful and productive than a free economy appeals to peoples who desire economic development, and who have no experience with the political restrictions which go along with Soviet-style planning. Regrettably, the Communist model is appealing. The fear of ideological and political penetration is not real enough to offset the economic appeal. We must do more—and we can.

WE MUST STRENGTHEN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

These sketchy facts about the strength and growth of the Soviet economy and the success the Soviets have had in using trade and aid as instruments of their international objectives should help us to run scared. But I am afraid that may of us know the facts without really understanding them. We need a new sense of urgency if we are to accept the economic challenge of the Soviet Union to our domestic economy, and to our international economic objectives.

First, let me suggest how we can and indeed must strengthen our domestic economy if we are to meet the challenge successfully.

Our problem is not primarily an economic problem, but a political problem and a moral problem. The economists may not always agree, but in general they know how to increase productivity. The problem is whether we really want our economy to expand, and whether we are willing to take the risks involved.

To oversimplify the issue, and to make comparisons, there are two competing philosophies about our national economy.

The one I would call George Humphreyism—this philosophy holds that the greatest danger to the United States is inflation, perhaps a greater danger than the threat of communism itself. We must at all cost, according to the former Secretary of the Treasury, prevent inflation, even if it means cutting back in our rate of growth, even if it means 4 or 5 million men unemployed and many others underemployed, even if it means that our industrial plants are working only to 75 or 80 percent capacity, even if it means a recession such as the one we recently went through. Unemployment and underproduction are preferable to full employment and high production, according to this theory, because this is the only way to prevent inflation.

Now, we are all opposed to inflation—either of the galloping or creeping variety. I think it is significant that in the past few years, while our economy has remained stagnant, prices have literally soared. The answer to price stability does not lie in economic lag. Growth in the economy is not only desirable and necessary, but consistent with a price stabilization program. Here are some of the things we must consider:

First, and most obvious, the U.S. population is growing by 3 million persons a year, and with our present lag in productivity we can hardly stay where we are.

Second, if we are really going to take the Soviet economic offensive seriously, we must have sufficient production to keep up with her—militarily, scientifically, and every other way.

The President's budget and budget message were obviously influenced by George Humphreyism. I hope that the Democratic Congress will be instructed by a more dynamic and imaginative philosophy—a philosophy which believes in the capacity of a free economy to be productive without being inflationary.

TOWARD A DYNAMIC ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

In the area of foreign economic policy the administration, partly in response to the Soviet challenge, is taking some steps in the right direction, but the escalator of history may be moving more rapidly in the other direction. We should build a stronger economy at home in order to do what necessity and prudence demand abroad. Our highly productive economy, even in its present less-than-dynamic state, makes it possible for us to do more than the administration wants us to do. Our posiion of leadership of the free world places upon us a moral responsibility commensurate with our power and wealth.

I would like to suggest a three-point program for strengthening our present economic offensive in the world, a program designed to do what we are best qualified to do.

1. Increase the flow of trade with other countries: Most economists agree that the free world would be strengthened by the lowering of trade barriers among nations. They also believe that the U.S. economy as a whole will benefit from freer trade, although they know that some industries will suffer. But as Adlai Stevenson once put it: "We shall have to make the choice between relatively minor adjustments caused by increased imports or major adjustments caused by decreased exports."

The United States is a wealthy Nation. With only 6 percent of the world's population, she produces over 40 percent of the world's goods and services. Yet our country is dependent on imports from all over the world. If these imports were to be completely cut off, our daily life would change drastically until adequate substitute for vital imports could be found. Our automobiles, telephones, radios, television sets, and a hundred other modern necessities would become useless when parts depending on imports would wear out. We would be threatened with mass unemployment. And our defense program would collapse.

Every automobile needs 38 essential materials which are largely imported. Forty-eight imported products go into every telephone. Not a single pound of steel can be made without manganese; nine-tenths of our supply of this vital ore is imported. We import all of our chromium and tin, ninety-nine percent of our nickel, 65 percent of our bauxite (essential to making aluminum) 42 percent of our copper, and so on.

On the average day about 418,000 tons of imports, worth $42 million, arrive at American ports. Only about one-eighth of these imports are finished manufactured products which can compete with American made goods. At the present time our annual imports total more than $11 billion.

Other countries need our products and we need theirs. We need to export in order to buy the necessary imports for our own economic health. A substantial loss of foreign markets could damage our entire economy. The United States cannot export unless other countries have dollars to buy our products. To get dollars they must sell to us. Trade is a two-way street. If the traffic slows down on one side of the street, it will have to slow down on the other. A balanced and high-level flow of world trade makes for worldwide economic health. The interdependence of nations is nowhere more clearly apparent than in the economic realm.

This is not the place to discuss the technical details and procedures for increasing trade. I merely want to make the point that we must seize every opportunity to move toward this desirable goal, and to take appropriate governmental action to help those industries which may suffer undue hardship, because of increased imports.

I might say in passing that I believe international trade should not be restricted to the nations of the free world. I favor certain types of trade with the Communist bloc. This will, of course, have to be undertaken with proper regard for legitimate security considerations.

2. Utilizing our agricultural abundance: One of the most vexing problems facing our country is the so-called agricultural surpluses resulting from overabundance. This is a serious domestic problem which has far-reaching international implications. It is clearly to the advantage of the United States to use stored-up food and fiber before it becomes worthless. If we simply give it away to needy countries without regard for normal marketings or opportunities to benefit the recipient country as well as ourselves, we run the risk of upsetting world market prices which may result in injury to the economies of other nations. Even if we sell our farm surpluses at the world market price, and advance credit to purchase them, we will be competing with other countries whose need for export may be greater than ours—unless we find and use economic tools for converting our food to useful purposes, that save, rather than detract from, our basic foreign policy objectives.

There is no easy solution to this complex problem. We always have to ask ourselves three questions: What is good for the American farmer? What is good for the U.S. economy? What will best serve our goals of helping to strengthen our free world allies and the uncommitted nations?

In answering these questions wise statesmenship must make difficult and discriminating decisions which honor the legitimate claims of each competing interest.

I believe a way out can be found. I believe the utilization program under Public Law 480 can and should be extended and enlarged so that our farm abundance can serve the needy overseas without hurting our closest allies. I will support efforts in this direction. I regret to say that the administration plans to spend $14 million less under Public Law 480 for fiscal 1960 than is being spent during the current year.

3. A 5-year development loan program: In the foreign-aid picture I have supported the Marshall plan, the point 4 program of technical assistance and direct grants for economic and military aid. I have supported U.S. participation in the technical-assistance programs of the United Nations. I think each form of assistance has a proper role to play. I would support an expanded program of technical aid under the point 4 program. But I am firmly convinced that the greatest opportunity for achieving substantial economic development in the politically uncommitted areas lies in a greatly expanded capital loan program.

In the 19th century the London capital market provided vast sums of money for the development of economically backward countries, including the United States. Today, the United States is the largest single source of capital, and yet the proportion of our gross national product going into development abroad is far smaller than that of Great Britain a hundred years ago.

In the spring of 1957, when congressional support for foreign aid was at its lowest ebb, up to that time, three distinguished research agencies recommended that the United States put foreign aid on a long-term basis of perhaps 20 or 30 years and that our Government appropriate the $2 billion a year for economic

development. (The three research agencies were the Committee for Economic Development, a business-sponsored organization; the University of Chicago Research Center in Economic Development and Cultural Change; and the Center for International Studies at MIT.)

This recommendation for a greatly increased air program was not a harebrained scheme, but the product of some of the finest scholars in the country—men who know the capacity of the American economy and the requirements of leadership in a world threatened by communism. And, I might add, men who represent the finest humanitarian traditions of America.

With this type of backing, I do not hesitate to propose a $10 billion development loan program over a 5-year period. We spend $50 billion a year on defense and perhaps even this is not enough. Can we not invest 5 percent of this amount in the future of Asia and Africa? I believe we can. I believe we should.

I believe the program should consist largely in long-term, low-interest loans which can compete effectively with what the Soviets are doing. I believe that the projects for which loans are provided should be thoroughly appraised by competent specialists so that the capital will be well spent. We must take into account the absorptive capacity of the recipient country. We must avoid waste and corruption.

There will be risks, but the need is great. The challenge is inescapable. President Truman's point 4 idea was called "a bold new program." It was new, but the majority in the Congress never permitted it to become bold.

Since then the urgency has increased. The time for a bold new program is upon us. And I believe that there are more and more members of both Houses of Congress who are willing to match the challenge of our times with courage and boldness.

Walter Lippmann recently said something which every lawmaker and every administrator would do well to ponder. He said if you want public support for a Government program, make it big, bold and imaginative—appeal to the public's sense of responsibility and willingness to sacrifice. In attempting to second-guess the public, I am convinced that political leaders too often sell them short.

Massive investment is essential, and most of the capital must come from private sources. It cannot and should not come only from governments. In fact, governments should invest only when private sources are unable or unwilling to meet the legitimate needs for development. Private investors cannot afford to take large risks. Recipient countries should, of course, do all within their power to make private investment attractive, promising a reasonable return for the investor. I am glad to say that India has recently taken several significant steps to make private investment attractive. Any potential investor should look into new opportunities in this, the pivotal nation in Asia.

But it is not possible for an underdeveloped country to remove all risk to private investors. The countries needing aid most desperately often are the very ones where the risk is greatest. It is in these cases of great need and risk, where both the economic and political stakes are high, that government loans are required.

And if the free world does not provide investment capital, we can be sure the Communist bloc will. It is unfortunate, but understandable, that the fear of communism may prompt us to do what we should have done all along and what Great Britain in fact did in the 19th century.

CONCLUSION

I want to conclude by applauding Mr. Douglas Dillon, the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, for his leadership in the area of long-term investment loans. I support him. But I fear that he has not gone far enough. Perhaps he is afraid that the Congress will not support him. Or, more likely, he may be afraid that the President will veto a more dynamic program.

Our Nation and our people face a massive challenge today.

The economic, political, ideological, and military offensive of a dedicated and determined foe confronts us at every turn.

Can the American people respond to this challenge with courage and wisdom?

The answer is "No," if we continue to sweep unpleasant facts under the rug of a complacent optimism. The answer is "No," if we are content with smooth words and soothing sirup from a man whose main task should be to jolt us from our lethargy. The answer is "No," if we continue to prefer tail fins and mink-lined suburban nests to first-rate schools and a responsible, if costly, foreign policy.

But the answer need not be "No." I firmly believe that the American people have the moral resources and political wisdom to respond with courage and determination. I know we have the economic resources to do the job that needs to be done. We can do the job if we have leaders who lead, leaders who can impress us with the deeper meaning and urgency of the crisis.

There is no substitute for leadership, leadership hardheaded enough to face the facts of life and warmhearted enough to honor the cherished values of our Western religious heritage.

## Fair Trade Will Bankrupt Those It Should Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1906 the United States brought a civil action to enjoin the National Association of Retail Druggists from conspiring to control the marketing of drugs and proprietary medicines by fixing prices and by blacklisting price cutters. In 1907 this case was ended by consent decree enjoining the further operation of the combination.

Today, the druggists' Washington lobbyists are still at it. I cannot believe the druggists back home understand what is being asked in their name.

Fair Trade (H.R. 1253), we are told, is their legislative need; that Congress must set aside the antitrust protection for businessmen and consumers alike and permit manufacturers to set retail prices by decree, regardless of a free market economy.

All right, forget the consumer. How about the retail druggists or other retailers? This fair trade law supposedly to help and protect them will bankrupt them. How? By holding an umbrella over the big stores, chains, and department stores who can handle their own brand or trademarked items. While the small retailer must sell at the manufacturers' stipulated prices, the big stores can undercut them, free to price as they please.

A further irony, the manufacturer, after setting the price of his trademarked item, can even make the same product for the big merchant who can set his own price below the manufacturer's comparable trademarked item. Of course, at the outset, the manufacturer will do fine; he is protected either way. And the small retailer? He will go broke. The fair trade law would prevent his setting his own prices to protect himself.

## Monetary Policies as Related to the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking statement by Dr. Gardiner C. Means, a noted economist, which was made before the Committee on Government Operations in the House of Representatives on March 25. This statement discusses the causes of inflation.

Mr. Means has some recommendations with which I do not agree. However, when we are all concerned over what we can do to hold down the increasing cost of living, I recommend very highly consideration of Mr. Means' statements.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS BY DR. GARDINER C. MEANS, MARCH 25, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, 2 weeks ago the New York Times carried a remarkable editorial entitled "An Aroused Reserve Board."[1] This editorial described the "extremely serious dilemma" "presented to the monetary authorities" by the new type of inflation which has developed and has come to be referred to here in Washington as administrative inflation. The editorial points out that "general credit controls are too blunt an instrument for dealing with this type of price rise. If applied with sufficient vigor, they can slow down the whole economy and produce widespread disemployment, thus creating the impression that the Federal Reserve Board was neglecting its responsibilities under the Employment Act of 1946." Further, the editorial says of the Board "that a point has certainly been reached when it finds itself forced into the position of 'taking the rap' for inflationary policies that are socially and economically unsupportable, but with which it is not equipped to deal."

Two days before, the Washington Post had carried an editorial on the same subject under the title "The Price Issue Is Joined."[2]

[1] Mar. 14, 1959.
[2] Mar. 12, 1959.

This editorial said: "There is a growing concensus that present fiscal and monetary controls of the Government simply cannot cope with the administered price sector of the economy where concentrated industries like steel can, as they have shown, defy sagging demand, increase prices and profits, and thus seriously retard economic growth." The editorial closed with the following words:

"So the issue is joined. If the makers of steel and autos and other heavy manufacturing and the unions which serve these industries will now acknowledge their power, accept the social responsibility that goes with it and discharge it in the public interest, the American economy can avoid further regimentation and control. If they will not, Congress and the administration will be under mounting pressure to devise effective restraints."

(Offer editorials for the record.)

This revolution in economic thinking grows out of 2 years of hard work by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator KEFAUVER. In the first hearing held on July 9, 1957, Senator KEFAUVER said:

"In opening there hearings on administered prices, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly is trying to come to grips with what is probably the Nation's current No. 1 domestic economic problem—the problem of inflation. We are concerned particularly with the extent to which concentrated industries may contribute to this problem."

I do not need to summarize these hearings for you. It is all in the record, the testimony of leading independent economists who had studied the behavior of administered prices and showed how in recent years the inflation in wholesale prices was largely in the concentrated industries and was a product of administrative discretion, not a product of excess demand; the evidence in the steel and automobile hearings which confirmed the diagnosis of the economists; and the more recent hearings in which the evidence was reviewed and attacks on the diagnosis were overborne.

The evidence of these hearings can in large measure be summarized in a single chart. This chart, taken from the hearings, is marked "Chart IV," and is included here on the next page [not printed in RECORD.] It shows the character of the inflation in the Wholesale Price Index from 1953 to October 1958. Each group of commodities included in the Wholesale Price Index is represented by a column. The height of the column indicates the change in the price index for the specific group from 1953 to October 1958. Its width indicates the weight which the group carries in the wholesale index. And the area of each column represents the contribution each group made to the 8 percent increase in wholesale prices during the period. The black columns represent commodities which are produced for the most part by concentrated industries in which price administration plays a major role. The light gray columns represent commodities the bulk of which are market dominated. And the dark gray columns represent mixed groups with some market dominated and some administration dominated prices.

As you can see from the chart, the great bulk of the wholesale price inflation was in the concentrated industries. Steel alone accounted for nearly a quarter of the rise in the index and the steel and steel using industries accounted for two-thirds of the rise. Each of the administration dominated groups rose substantially. In contrast, the market dominated groups rose little or actually fell in the same period. This is what is meant by an administrative inflation.

Now this type of inflation is in complete contrast with the classical type of inflation such as we had after World War II and in the Korean war. Those inflations were demand inflations in which there was too much money chasing too few goods. As a result of the excess demand, market-dominated prices rose first and most while administration-dominated prices lagged behind. Then, when there was no longer too much money chasing too few goods, market-dominated prices dropped back and administration-dominated prices continued to rise until a new balance of prices had been established. According to my analysis, this balanced condition had been reached by 1953.

The importance of this distinction lies in the fact, now coming to be widely accepted, that while a tight money policy may be able to control a demand inflation, it cannot control an administrative inflation. It has become clear that limiting demand by a tight money policy can create depression and unemployment but administrative inflation continues. Thus, the steel industry last summer raised its prices 3 percent in spite of the fact that its operations were down to 60 percent of capacity and in spite of the great price increases that had already occurred since 1953.

Also, as I pointed out in my testimony of 2 weeks ago before Senator KEFAUVER'S committee, there is convincing evidence that there has not been demand inflation at any time in the last 6 years. The detailed evidence is available in my recent testimony, a copy of which I am filing with your committee. The key points in that testimony are as follows: (1) 1953 was a year of high employment without inflation as the President's Economic Report for January 1954 makes abundantly clear; (2) in every year since 1953 unemployment has been practically a million or more greater than the 1.9 million unemployed in 1953; and (3) manufacturing capacity has expanded faster than production since 1953. Thus at no time since 1953 has demand been pressing on the labor supply or manufacturing capacity as hard as it did in 1953 when there was no inflationary pressure.

This last is so important that I will introduce two charts to emphasize it. Chart 5 [not printed in RECORD] is derived from a chart in the President's Economic Report for January 1959 and shows indexes of manufacturing capacity—the smooth rising line—and manufacturing output—the fluctuating line. As you can see, at no time since 1953 has production approached as close to capacity as in that year. The same is true of durable goods production and capacty as shown in chart 6 [not printed in RECORD]. Not only have we not had demand inflation but we have not even had sufficient demand to maintain full employment.

Finally, I want to emphasize the importance of the Federal Reserve to control administrative inflation by introducing one final chart. The top line in chart 10 [not printed in RECORD] shows industrial production since 1953. The lower line which moves by steps, represents the rediscount rate of the New York Federal Reserve Bank—which is a rough measure of the tightness of Federal Reserve policy. The third line represents the real stock of money outstanding (demand deposits and currency adjusted for changes in consumer prices) and shows the effect of Reserve policy and price changes on the real money supply. As you can see, for most of the time since late 1955 there has been a tight money policy with a high discount rate; there has been a shrinkage in the real money supply; and there has been a mild stagnation or depression in industrial output. Yet administrative inflation continued. Clearly the tight money policy was not successful in stopping administrative inflation.

In this context of simultaneous administrative inflation and depression, section 2 of H.R. 4870 assumes great importance.

Here I want to draw a very sharp distinction between the immediate problem of preventing administrative inflation so that monetary and fiscal measures can be used to bring about full employment and the more basic but not so immediately pressing problem created by the pricing discretion in concentrated industries.

The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Committee is continuing its hearings on the latter subject and has not only disclosed the administrative character of the recent inflation but has made considerable progress on the more basic problem. But time will be required to work out a satisfactory solution, and whether the hearing function such as is authorized in the Reuss bill will enter into the solution remains to be seen.

However, for the immediate problem of achieving full employment without serious administrative inflation, I regard public price hearings and publication of the facts as having an important role to play. I would be very strongly against the adoption of price and wage controls except as a distant and last resort when other measures had failed. But public hearings on prospective or actual price increases (and where necessary wage increases) could serve a very useful purpose where there was serious danger that such increases would threaten the stability of the economy and impede economic recovery. I would not contemplate a large number of hearings in any 1 year but I would expect that the relevant data on costs, wages, productivity, etc., would allow the public to distinguish between legitimate and nonlegitimate price increases and bring home to those in control in the concentrated industries the policies which would represent responsible behavior toward economic recovery.

Also I believe the effectiveness of such hearings could be reinforced if some of the joy in raising administered prices to increase profits were removed by adopting a graduated antiinflation tax. The evidence presented before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Committee makes it clear that the concentrated industries are the chief source of administrative inflation. Therefore an excess profits tax limited to the larger corporations, say those with assets over $100 million, could be effective. Presumably it would only be operative for profits above an ample rate of return on capital and then would take an increasingly large proportion of the excess as the rate of return was higher. Such a tax would reinforce the effect of hearings on specific prices. It is quite possible that these two measures alone would be sufficient, along with the public education involved, to prevent serious administrative inflation while monetary measures were used to expand demand to the extent required for full employment.

Also the basic purpose of these measures could be strengthened by one additional action. At the present time there is great ambiguity as to the responsibility of the Federal Reserve Board with respect to inflation. The Employment Act of 1946 places on the Board (as on other agencies of Government) responsibility to aim its policies at "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." Also it is generally accepted that there is an implicit direction to maintain price stability. Since the Board does have the powers which could prevent demand inflation and cannot control administrative inflation without creating excessive unemployment, the direction to aim at high employment and price stability involves

some measure of contradiction. It would be possible to remove this contradiction by a joint congressional resolution which (1) distinguished between demand and administrative inflation; (2) absolved the Federal Reserve Board from responsibility for controlling administrative inflation and reiterated its responsibility for aiming its policies toward achieving high employment and preventing demand inflation; (3) accepted the responsibility of the Congress to find other ways to prevent serious administrative inflation.

With such a directive the objectives of the Board would be clear and, in my opinion, it could adopt policies which would bring about full employment without demand inflation while these other measures prevented serious administrative inflation.

Of course an expansion of demand which reestablished full employment such as last existed in 1953 would involve some rise in market dominated prices. If the administrative-dominated prices are held down, this inflation would bring market-dominated prices more into line with administration-dominated prices and would be a necessary cost in economic recovery. (The alternative of forcing down administration-dominated prices to the necessary extent seems to me impractical.) With little rise in administration-dominated prices, the necessary reflation might involve as much as a 3-percent rise in the average of wholesale prices, but once recovery was complete, there need be no further rise, provided administrative inflation is prevented. I believe the Federal Reserve Board has ample powers for preventing such a reflation from crossing the line of full employment and becoming a demand inflation.

With respect to the provisions of the proposed bill, I am not an expert in government organization and do not feel competent to discuss just what agency should be made responsible for the new hearing function or what its powers should be. But there is one matter in the present draft which does fall within the field of my competence.

The draft speaks of "price increases, proposed in industries," etc. (p. 2, line 25, and p. 3, line 1). In practice, price changes in unregulated industries are seldom proposed in advance. On the other hand, it is often expected that price changes will occur before they do. One could broaden the language by substituting "prospective" for "proposed." Also, there may be situations in which a price change has already been made and needs to be investigated. This could be covered by adding "actual." My suggestion is, therefore, that this section should read "price increases, prospective or actual in industries, etc."

In closing I wish to say that I am not a perfectionist and do not expect that any set of measures short of price controls will entirely eliminate administrative inflation but I do believe that the measures implicit in this bill would, if reinforced by measures such as an anti-inflation tax, could go a long way to minimize administrative inflation and allow the Federal Reserve Board to reflate to the extent necessary for full employment.

## Editorial Applause of Admission of Hawaii to Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, numerous editorials in recent days have applauded the admission of Hawaii as our 50th State. This is fitting, inasmuch as many of our nation's newspapers have for years been in the forefront of efforts to add the 49th and 50th stars to our flag.

Within a few days I will be visiting Hawaii and seeing once again its great beauty, bustling activity and bursting progress. I am particularly pleased that it will be my privilege to be the first member of this body to visit the islands following their admission to the Union.

Because the editorial backing for our 50th State expresses eloquently the feelings of the American people, I ask unanimous consent that a number of these editorials from various sections of the country be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elmira (N.Y.) Star-Gazette, Mar. 13, 1959]

ALOHA TO 50TH STAR IN OLD GLORY

After 50 years' dreaming, Hawaii has become the 50th star in the American flag, following by a few months the admission of Alaska.

The islands were annexed to the United States in 1898, 2 years later becoming a Territory. It was 3 years later that the Congress received the first petition to give Hawaii the status of statehood.

Hawaii will be one of America's most beautiful States, and surely one of her most loyal. The island folk have been true friends, the friendship brought to the most terrible of tests in 1941 when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor.

The history of the islands is fascinating. Mark Twain knew their beauty and wrote about it, his letters from the Sandwich Islands, as they were then known, being among the foundations of his literary career.

The flag designers have a new problem. They had very little trouble in arranging seven rows of seven stars when Alaska became a State; now the starry field may have a row of eight in the middle.

This is a happy day for Hawaii.

It's a happy day for all America.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening, Mar. 12, 1959]

RIPE FOR STATEHOOD

Hawaii is halfway a State today and before the week is over it seems certain that this island Territory will have virtually achieved the full status of statehood it has sought so long. The Senate, long a stumbling block, has approved a statehood bill by a vote of 76 to 15 after a single day's debate. Everything indicates that the House will promptly follow suit and that in due course a 50th star will be added to the flag.

In area, all of the 20 Hawaiian islands put together are only a little more than 100th the size of Alaska, the youngest of the present 49 States. A little bigger than Connecticut and a little smaller than New Jersey, Hawaii will rank among our smaller States. But there is no doubt at all that it can claim first rank for loveliness with its spreading beaches leading up to flower-filled semitropical valleys watched over by brooding volcanoes. If the frozen wastes of Alaska are expected to attract hordes of pioneers, what can we expect the soft and lovely islands of the Pacific to do?

We take great satisfaction in the success of this latest move for Hawaiian statehood because we have been urging Congress to approve it for years. It has seemed to us that Hawaii has long since earned the right to statehood and that the objection raised were largely irrevelant and frivolous. If the islands have a polyglot population, so has the mainland; if radical labor leaders dominate their shipping, what shall we say about our own Jimmy Hoffas and Dave Becks? A territory with a population of more than half a million, which has proved its loyalty under the stress of war, and which has served nearly 60 years of apprenticeship surely is ripe for the statehood it now stands to gain.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 13, 1959]

WELCOME TO THE UNION

The satisfaction and pleasure of most mainland Americans today must be as nothing to that of 585,000 Hawaiians. Since 1903 they and their forefathers have doggedly sought the admission to the Union that has now been voted. Equally important, they have tried in every way to deserve admission. Their devotion and loyalty were best displayed in the trying days after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor that plunged this Nation into World War II.

All of us on the mainland will benefit from having Hawaii as the 50th State. Acceptance to national equality of its melting-pot population of Japanese, Caucasians, Chinese, Filipinos, and native Hawaiians will win the United States friendship and understanding throughout the nonwhite world. The voice of its people should be valuable in guiding our dealings with Asia.

But most benefits, economic and political, will come, as they should, to the Hawaiian people, at last an integral part of the United States.

And so, in this moment of Hawaiian joy and celebration, may the Journal—which has urged statehood at least since 1940—say:

To the happy crowds in Honolulu's Bishop Street, to the workers in the pineapple fields of Oahu and the cane fields of Kauai, to the cowboys of the big island, to the leimakers and the beach boys of Waikiki, to the rice-growers of beauteous Hanalei Valley, and the coffee raisers of the Kona coast, to the workers at historic and consecrated Pearl, to the guides pointing the way to Kilauea Crater and Waimea Canyon, to the hula dancers and the ukulele players everywhere, to all in the islands:

Congratulations, welcome, and aloha, fellow citizens of the 50th State.

[From the Idaho Evening Statesman, [Mar. 14, 1959]

GREETINGS TO HAWAII

Idahoans join other Americans in welcoming Hawaii to our family of States as its 50th State and extend their felicitations to the Paradise of the Pacific with the hope and prayer this formal union will bring its people the fruition of their fondest dreams and ambitions.

While not formally a member of the Union, the action of both Houses of Congress and the certainty that President Eisenhower will sign the bill and the people in Hawaii will approve some 60 to 90 days hence in a general election, Hawaii is in for all purposes. When the results of that election are certified, the President will issue a proclamation admitting Hawaii as the 50th State.

There must be a great amount of jubilation in the Pacific paradise, which for more than 40 years has struggled for a place alongside of the other States. Without going into the details of the opposition during those earlier years, there is some evidence indicating special interests was part of that opposition. During recent years opponents were successful in denying Hawaiians statehood for other reasons, but special interests clothed them. The opposition this time was the scarecrow of communism, but it didn't work.

Idaho, admitted to the Union in 1890 as the 43d State, is somewhat larger in population and size than Hawaii. As an older and bigger brother, Idaho says "aloha" and may your star, ours and others, gleam to-

gether as one beacon of light that will shine on the hoped-for golden years ahead, that a neighborly pursuit of happiness can harvest peace among all nations, in our hearts and souls. May all our unintentional discourtesies be likened to the possible slips on your sidewalks, as you warn, because of fallen flowers.

---

[From the Rock Island (Ill.) Argus, Mar. 13, 1959]

NOW HAWAII

The States will soon number a round half hundred. And the flag makers have another job on their hands.

Senate approval of statehood for Hawaii was assured when 56 Senators, more than a majority, sponsored the bill for admission, and now the Senate action has been followed by House approval, making admission a certainty as soon as formalities are carried out.

The strategy of admitting Alaska first, adopted in the last session, appears to have worked. The Democrats got two new Senators out of it and could afford to take a magnanimous attitude toward Hawaii, which leans Republican, while the Republicans were anxious to pick up a couple more seats.

Opposition came chiefly from the South, which fears Hawaii will supply new votes for strong civil rights legislation.

As a matter of fact, Hawaii can give us a good lesson in racial tolerance. Having a population of 613,000, it is 23 percent Caucasian, 37 percent Japanese, 17 percent Hawaiian, and the remainder consisting of Filipinos, Chinese, Koreans, and Puerto Ricans. They get along under conditions almost as idyllic as the climate of Hawaii.

Hawaii has been knocking at the statehood door for 40 years and has fully earned the right to admission.

It is just 26 seconds away from Washington by telephone, and with the arrival of the jet plane is only a few hours away by air travel.

It is almost three times as populous as Alaska. Its population exceeds that of Delaware, Nevada, Vermont, and Wyoming.

It is in good financial shape, paying more taxes into Washington (being subject to the regular U.S. income tax although having no vote on it) than some 10 States.

Hawaii is at the crossroads of the Pacific, where East meets West, and military leaders have testified to its importance to our national defense.

A good deal was said about communism among the longshoremen of the island under control of Harry Bridges. But that is just as true of longshoremen of the Pacific coast whom he controls. The people of Hawaii have demonstrated their patriotism to a high degree with their volunteers and support of the war effort in World Wars I and II and the Korean war.

We should feel as proud to accept them as a member of the Union as they are to enter.

---

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Times Union Mar. 13, 1959]

OUR 50TH STAR

A bipartisan surge in Congress has swept Hawaii into statehood like the roll of the surf that beats at Waikiki.

It was a surge of strength derived from the will of the American people, who favored statehood 8 to 1 in a public opinion poll last year. Similarly it was their will less than a year ago that broke through parliamentary barriers and brought about congressional approval of statehood for Alaska.

The Hearst newspapers, as they did on that occasion last June when the 49th star was born, now join in the elation of the residents of our beautiful 50th State. For more than 25 years we campaigned for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, sharing with them the disappointments of the various setbacks, and uniting with them in determination for eventual victory.

When that day came for Alaska it was inevitable it would soon follow for Hawaii, particularly since Hawaii voluntarily stood aside to give Alaska a clear track. It has been a paradox that when the two causes were joined they had less chance than when pursued singly.

This prosperous island area of more than 500,000 people has been a bulwark of our defense as a Territory. It will be an even stronger one as a State, according to such military authorities as President Eisenhower and General MacArthur.

Equally important is the tremendous psychological asset of statehood. In the words of Interior Secretary Fred Seaton, Hawaii is "a picture window through which peoples of the East look into our American front room."

To our new, vital State: salute.

---

## W. C. "Bill" Berntson, President of the Twin City Retail Druggists Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently elected as the new president of the Twin City Retail Druggists Association was W. C. Berntson. I have known Bill Berntson for many years. He is a fine druggist, and, more important, a superior person. In the February issue of Minnesota Pharmacist there was published an excellent feature article sketching his life. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR COVER PAGE: W. C. "BILL" BERNTSON, PRESIDENT OF THE TWIN CITY RETAIL DRUGGISTS ASSOCIATION

When Bill (W. C.) Berntson came up to the office to tell us the story of his life, he said he was following Senator Popp's advice and came attired in blue trousers and brown coat. What was good enough for the Senator was good enough for Bill, too.

Bill Berntson took over as president of the Twin City Retail Druggists Association at the annual banquet and meeting. Thor Goldner, retiring president, handed over the gavel of authority to W. C., and he will hold that office until next year's election.

A former farm boy, Bill Berntson was born in Rush City, Minn. Bill was one of a family of six children, four boys and two girls. He was the end of the line, the baby of the family, and received his primary education in a one-room schoolhouse near Rush City. Bill lost his father when he was 13 years old, so his mother moved the family to Rush City to enable the children to get to school more easily. By then, Bill had reached high school age and enrolled in the Rush City high school. During those schooldays, he worked as a delivery boy. In 1922, Henry Sommers, the local pharmacist and drugstore owner, asked him if he would like to have a job in his drugstore. Bill happily accepted. He worked for Mr. Sommers until he completed his high school education.

Bill became quite interested in pharmacy while working in that drug store. He was also much impressed with the power of medicine. His sister, who was next in age to him, had become quite ill. The family doctor was able to help her to a full recovery with a good prescription. This intrigued Bill and made him curious about these drugs that could cure. These two experiences had an influence on him and in the fall of 1924, he enrolled in the College of Pharmacy at the University of Minnesota. The complete pharmacy course in those days, took only 3 years. In order to supplement his income and help with his school expenses while at the university, Bill worked at Heller's drugstore and also Conger Bros. store on the corner of Selby and Mackubin in St. Paul. Bill says that one of the main reasons he chose pharmacy as his career, was because the hours seemed so appealing and regular. (But he soon found out differently.)

The days he spent as a student in the College of Pharmacy, brought him into close association with the instructors. Names that are still very familiar—Dr. C. V. Netz, Dean Wulling, and Dr. Rogers. He still appreciates all their efforts in his behalf.

Bill was graduated in 1927 and began his career as a registered pharmacist in the Conger Brothers store at 349 University Avenue in St. Paul. He worked there 4½ years. Bill recalls that one of the chief sidelines at the store was—paint. They carried a complete line. He felt that he needed much broader experience in pharmacy and merchandising and left the Conger store to work for Idziorek Brothers, 43d and Nicollet in Minneapolis. He later took over as manager at the Campus Pharmacy in South Minneapolis.

After a couple more moves during those bad depression years, a time which saw many businesses biting the dust, Bill felt compelled to strike out on his own. In 1935, he purchased what he fondly refers to as "the little cubby hole" at 1082 Thomas Street in St. Paul and finally got his name on his own store. He spent 5 years in the little shop. The first years were pretty lean, but he managed to keep his head above water.

The economic situation of the world and Bill Berntson was in better shape in 1940 and he started to notice the interest folks were taking in the suburbs. He sold his little shop on Thomas Street to Frank Keller and moved out to Falcon Heights—to the corner of Snelling and Larpenteur, where he is still holding forth today. Nineteen years later, the words "Berntson" and "drug store" are synonymous to the folks in Falcon Heights. He was a pioneer resident in that area and remembers pretty vividly the pheasants that inhabited his front yard in those days.

Bill Berntson is a family man. Just like his father before him, Bill had a family of six children, four boys and two girls.

During the early days of his career as a registered pharmacist, while working at Conger Bros. on University Avenue, a young Irish lass by the name of Kitty (Catherine) Sullivan came into the store one day to buy a postage stamp. The young pharmacist cleverly inquired whether she wanted "raspberry or lime?" (His way of determining 1 cent or 2 cents.) The repartee developed into a friendship, a romance, a marriage, and a wonderful family. Bill and Kitty were married on May 22, 1929, and are looking forward to their 30th wedding anniversary in May of this year. Thirty years together, some filled with all the good things life has to offer and some sad; some lean. One of the sad days, was the day when the Berntson's lost a daughter in 1957.

Bill and Kitty will soon have two padres in the family. Terry Berntson is a student at the St. Paul Seminary and expects to be ordained a Catholic priest in the class of 1960. Son Tommy is a member of the Salesian Order and is studying for his ordination into that order at Newton, N.J. The

Salesian Order is not too well known in this part of the country and requires a longer study period to qualify for acceptance. The Salesians were founded by Don Bosco and are well known for the work they are doing with youth in operating vocational schools and camps for underprivileged boys. Two of the younger boys are students at St. Rose of Lima parochial grade school and one daughter is now in the sophomore class at Our Lady of Peace High School in St. Paul.

Bill believes in the TCRDA and the benefits to be derived from membership. He feels that even the sociability afforded by the membership is helpful in solving some vexing problems. When you know your neighbor, it's easier to talk over common problems and come up with an answer that is acceptable to both.

So, W. C. Berntson, 1959 is all yours.

## Commendation of Senator Fulbright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of a broadcast recently made by Edward P. Morgan of the American Broadcasting Network. In the broadcast he makes comment on some of the thoughts which have been advanced by the very able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There was the unmistakable ring of sincerity in the concern and the convictions the President voiced in his broadcast last night about the Berlin crisis. But beyond an attitude of firmness he seemed to offer no real handle, so to speak, for the public to grasp in understanding. Do we simply fasten our seat belts and hold on grimly while the pilot bravely tries to negotiate the craft through storms ahead? Might it not be helpful, even reassuring, to study, together, the maps of the terrain a little more in detail to make sure we are not overlooking an alternate course?

It was the analysis of the situation made on the floor of the Senate earlier yesterday by the new chairman of that body's powerful Foreign Relations Committee, Arkansas' WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, which struck this reporter, at least, as a more meticulous measure by contrast.

Except for a critical question about the administration's philosophy and procedure in selecting ambassadors, this represents the first public statement of substance that FULBRIGHT has made since he succeeded to the chairmanship relinquished by the venerable Senator GREEN. There has been some impatient criticism to the effect that FULBRIGHT should have spoken up before. There is reason to believe, however, that his silence was deliberately calculated to discourage inferences which might have been drawn from premature declarations, either that the Democratic leadership in Congress was hopelessly at odds with the administration's foreign policy or that it endorsed it without qualification.

Considered in this light, Chairman FULBRIGHT'S remarks appear to take on added significance. Having said that there is a unified stand against any separate deals with the Soviet Union, that there is agreement among ourselves that we won't be driven or enticed from Berlin or from West Germany, that we deny the Russians have any legal or moral right to dominate the subject peoples of the satellites, FULBRIGHT then emphasized that he sees no peculiar virtue in the status quo.

This brings us to the possibility of making some change in the posture of the East-West forces facing each other in Central Europe. Obviously a withdrawal, a disengagement, a thinning out on our side would be a hollow quid if the Communists didn't come through with a quo. What assurance have we that they will come through, or follow through and sustain the quo when they have broken so many agreements in the past? The answer is, there is no assurance unless they find it to their interest to do it. This they did find in Austria and after seemingly endless negotiations, Vienna got a peace treaty and a withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria.

Obviously, as Senator FULBRIGHT emphasizes, any deal with the Russians would have to be policed but, he adds, "we ought not to accept the facile axiom that the Russians have no intention of ever coming to reasonable terms on any matter directly affecting their own interests. And wisely he counsels that we should not in any case expect too much, that it may indeed be years before the Russians come around to an arrangement that really balances a quid pro quo.

This brings up the problem of our preparation and staying power for the long pull. The President insists that he knows best and that he has decided we are getting a strong, balanced defense even though we are deliberately not trying to keep even with the Soviets in the missile race. Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, who is preparing to attack this thesis in a major speech shortly, is impressed with the rebuttal that "this is one race in which second place could become last place."

But there is another aspect to our armament, a human aspect. The President commanded a half hour of prime radio and television time last night to state his case and he concluded with the assurance that "together with our allies we stand firm wherever the probing finger of an aggressor may point.". The probing finger of an aggressor points in almost every direction and it is by no means always armed with a gun, but it is pointing a ruthless competitive challenge to our whole system. Can we meet it, with or without sacrifice, with or without a reorientation of our sense of values? It would have been helpful, I think, to have some data on these points to ponder as the President's sober face faded from the TV screen and we went back to our accustomed fare of a filmed thriller, the charms of a blonde singer, an acrobatic dance number, and the merits of a particular brand of frozen orange juice.

## Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussia's modern history is overshadowed by Russian history, because during most of that period the country had become part of Russia, and the Russians have tried to eradicate all Byelorussian traditions and national traits there. But the Byelorussian people, who have had a longer history as a nation than the Russians themselves, were never willing to forego and forget their distinct identity, and they have always wanted to regain their freedom and independence. They had that opportunity in 1918.

In that year, when the detested Czarist regime was no more, and the new Communist regime in Russia was still in its infancy, the Byelorussians regained their freedom and proclaimed the establishmentof the Byelorussian National Republic on March 25, 41 years ago. Then it was hoped that some 10 million Byelorussians, having become sovereign in their historic homeland, would enjoy the fruits of freedom in peace. Unfortunately that was not to be. Early in 1921, before Byelorussians had the chance to consolidate and strengthen their government, Soviet forces attacked and overran the country, and Byelorussia as an independent nation vanished. Since then, for more than four decades these liberty-loving and sturdy Byelorussians are living under the unrelenting rule of Communist Russians. But they have not given up their hope for freedom and independence. They still cherish that noble ideal, and on this 41st anniversary of their independence day, I wish them strength and fortitude in their moral and physical struggle.

## A Permanent United Nations Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on August 8, 1957, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 15 expressing the sense of this this body in favor of the creation of a permanent United Nations police force. Such a permanent U.N. police force has long been the dream of those who seek to firmly maintain the peace.

At the ninth annual conference of national organizations called by the American Associations for the United Nations, on March 10, my distinguished colleague [Mr. KEATING] delivered a significant address on the need for a permanent U.N. police force.

I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PERMANENT U.N. POLICE FORCE

The United Nations, now in its 13th year of existence, continues to be the most effective organization yet devised by man for the maintenance of peace.

The founders of the United Nations hoped that the harsh lesson of World War II would long discourage threats to the tranquility of the world. Sorrowfully, it must be recognized that these hopes were in vain. For while the United Nations has served us well,

it has not yet succeeded in completely stamping out the lurking dangers and outbreaks of hostilities.

This organization for peace has accomplished much good, but it must be made to function even better.

One essential step in the process of making the United Nations stronger is the creation of a United Nations police force.

I need hardly remind this audience that the idea of an international police force is not new. It was incorporated into the covenant of the League of Nations. The United Nations charter specifically provides for U.N. armed forces operating under the Security Council and a military staff. Unfortunately, little has been done to implement these provisions.

The principal obstacle to constructive action on this subject, as on so many others, has been the intransigence of the Soviet Union. Last October its delegate to the United Nations announced that any move by the General Assembly to establish a peace force would be illegal and unacceptable. This attitude emphasizes the fundamental division within the United Nations between those nations which desire a stable international order and those which are determined to undermine the peace of the world community by their aggressive actions.

The United States has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to participate in an international army for peace. The President in addressing the General Assembly last August urged action by the Assembly looking toward the creation of a standby United Nations peace force. And Secretary Dulles has since suggested positive steps for carrying out this plan.

Under the Secretary's proposal, a small planning staff would be created within the Secretariat to develop standby plans for calling into being, deploying and supporting such a peace force. This planning staff would develop concrete arrangements to facilitate any United Nations decisions to employ its force. These arrangements would be designed to enable the United Nations effectively to meet any crisis with a minimum of delay.

The Congress of the United States also is on record as approving in principle the creation of a peace force. In the last session, a concurrent resolution was adopted expressing the sense of the Congress that consideration should immediately be given by the United Nations to the development, within its permanent structure, of such organizations and procedures as would enable it promptly to employ suitable U.N. forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threatened international peace and security. I strongly endorsed this resolution as a demonstration of this Nation's willingness to explore all means for preserving world peace, and I am happy to note that it won overwhelming support in both Houses.

The operations and experience of the United Nations emergency force in the Gaza strip demonstrates the purpose a peace force can serve. It also demonstrates the many problems involved in any such undertaking. The Secretary General's excellent report to the General Assembly on the operations of UNEF gives us a significant case history of the use of such a force from which many guiding principles can be derived.

I find myself in disagreement, however, with the conclusion of the Secretary General that the nature of the actual organization required should not be anticipated in advance. In my opinion, the effectiveness of such a force would be enhanced by its establishment on an ever-ready, permanent basis. This is the only way to guarantee its immediate availability in the event of a crisis.

The force must be operated at all times under the strict and direct control of the United Nations. But we cannot afford the delay which would result from bringing it into being only after the outbreak of hostilities and the resolution of all political decisions.

The recent situation in the Near East demmonstrated the tremendous need for a permanent peace force ready to move into action instantly at the request of a member government threatened by outside aggression.

In a world contracted by speedy communications, in a world in which even the smallest nations possess the terribly destructive weapons of modern war, any international disturbance—however localized—can spread like a plague and present an immediate threat to world stability. The only feasible answer to this challenge to the peace of the world is to provide a U.N. force capable of so spreading a U.N. mantle over an embattled state as to inhibit—if not directly to prevent—a coup d'etat, infiltration by indirect aggression, or other untoward pressures from outside the nation, such as we witnessed in the Near East.

A United Nations police force need not be a huge, all-powerful army. It might not number more than 50,000 or 60,000. It might perhaps be found best to establish a firm nucleus at all times centered under one command, with other forces in the individual countries, available upon call.

It is my firm conviction that the smaller nations of the world must form the backbone of any international force. This will prevent the bigger powers running the risk of being dragged into a nuclear conflict which could doom all mankind.

Such an international policy army could not—and should not—fight wars. But a permanent U.N. police force can serve as an effective deterrent to hostilities, could be a focus for the moral opinion of the world, and could serve numerous practical uses in observation, patrol, and guard duty between potentially hostile states. As the Secretary of State pointed out in his address to the General Assembly, "its very presence (would) make visible the interest of the world community in the maintenance of tranquillity."

The possibility of establishing an international police force is a particularly pertinent and timely topic for the troubled times in which we live. Perhaps never before in the history of the world has there been greater need for calm, objective, and broad-minded thought on this possible avenue for helping to achieve a more just and secure international order. We must search with imagination and foresight for the answers to the enigmas of world peace. Today we show too little of either quality—at a time when we stand in desperate need of both.

The time is running short. Each new crisis brings us closer to the potential horrors of a World War III. The next international brush fire may set off that worldwide conflagration if the nations of the world do not rise to the occasion.

A permanent United Nations police force provides a new, decisive means by which the nations of the world which sincerely believe in peace can provide the machinery to quarantine regional conflicts and thus better insure their solution. I urge this great organization, which is dedicated to the strengthening of the United Nations, to work for this goal. It is one of the strong, sure ways of making the United Nations the instrument for peace which all men of good will hope and pray it will become.

## Housing Problems of Mobile, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, cities throughout the country are being confronted with the difficulty of planning and obtaining adequate housing with which to meet the requirements of the law to provide decent, safe and sanitary housing for persons displaced by reason of urban renewal projects, Federal highway projects and other Government action.

In the Mobile Register a few days ago a reporter and columnist for that paper, John Will, gave a very fine discussion of this problem as it relates to the city of Mobile. I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN WILL INTERPRETS THE NEWS—PLANNED FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROJECTS MAY AGGRAVATE HOUSING NEEDS HERE

The question of housing in Mobile has been brought to the front by the recent announcement that the Public Housing Administration has "reserved" an additional 2,180 units of low-rent housing for this city.

Now it should be clearly understood at the outset that this does not guarantee the actual construction of one unit. It signifies only that if the funds become available and the PHA is satisfied as to the need, Mobile can get up to a maximum of 2,180 more units of public housing. The 2,180 figure came from the Mobile Housing Board which applied for "reservation" of that volume of housing.

The next move will be for the PHA to make a loan to the housing board to finance studies and plans for the purpose of determining where the projects should be located and how they should be laid out. Then, after one or more projects have been settled upon, the next thing will be to get the construction money from the Government.

And the amount of money available for construction will depend upon the appropriation made by Congress. Furthermore, this appropriation must be spread over the whole country. So it may be that there will be funds for the actual building of only a few hundred units. And it is conceivable that there may be no funds, although that it is highly unlikely because Congress is almost sure to pass some sort of a public housing bill.

There are many schools of thought on the matter of Government intervention in the housing field. Many people think that the Government's activity should be restricted to the so-called FHA and GI loans to enable families to build their own homes. Then at the other extreme, there are those who favor a broad program of low-rent public housing.

The practical aspects of the problem should be always kept in view. If large numbers of families are to be displaced by the new Federal highway projects, for example, some provision should be made for their re-

location. This is particularly important if they are in the low-income category. Since they are to be displaced as a result of a Government program related to the national defense, they are entitled to assurance that they can find new places to live at a cost within their means.

It will be argued that provision of the necessary new housing should be left to private enterprise. The question is: Can or will private enterprise undertake the task? The point is that when the Government starts tearing down houses to make way for the new highways, the displaced residents will need some place to move to. It certainly would be unreasonable and unfair to leave them to the mercy of makeshift arrangements.

However, the chief objective of Government housing activity should be to encourage home ownership and not to multiply public housing. Accordingly, the volume of new public housing in this city should be held to the minimum necessary for the families who must be relocated. And the locations should be selected with the greatest care.

Furthermore, it has been brought out that there is some pressure for a "scatteration" policy in public housing. In other words, the Government would acquire building lots here and there throughout the community and put up publicly owned duplexes or perhaps four-family apartments, rather than large projects. Such an arrangement could not be tolerated. It would depress property values and would have the effect of an arbitrary intrusion on the accepted pattern of community life. We don't think that the members of the Mobile Housing Board will ever go along with any "scatteration" idea. We believe they have too much sense for that.

Finally, we hope that some time soon, it will be possible for our city officials to inform the public as to just how much dislocation will be caused by the new Federal highway program. This is the key to the whole situation. The people have a right to know what to expect and when to expect it. Not only will housing be involved but many other readjustments will be required.

Change is the order of the day and we cannot escape its impact. But in all the planning, two objectives should be kept in view: First, that no family will be subjected to any unnecessary hardship; second, that no innovations will be undertaken which will endanger the friendly relations now existing in the community.

## Address by Senator Keating on the Supreme Court of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News on March 19, 1959.

The editorial comments upon the very cogent address made by the able junior Senator from New York on the floor of the Senate last week, pointing out the clear duty of Congress to protect its constitutional lawmaking jurisdiction against judicial encroachment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEATING ON THE COURT

We couldn't agree more with Senator KENNETH KEATING's first major speech on the Senate floor this week. Its subject was the Supreme Court, and it was a masterpiece of balance, commonsense and vigor. It drew a firm line that is much needed these days between respect—even reverence—for the independence of the judiciary as an institution, and the clear duty of Congress to protect its own constitutional lawmaking jurisdiction against judicial encroachment or against judicial misreading of its intent.

Senator KEATING obviously spoke from his heart, and also from the fullness of his 12 years of conscientious experience on the House Judiciary Committee, in his appeal to the Senate to shun extremism during the great debate that is currently raging over the role of the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court has had no sterner critic for some of its recent decisions than Senator KEATING. In the House, and now again in the Senate, he has sponsored many bills to restate a congressional intent he feels the court has grossly misread. In two areas particularly—cases involving subversion and law enforcement—he declared that the result of a recent pattern of Supreme Court decisions has been to "make a mockery of our national effort to keep this country secure against Communist treachery," and to impose "entirely unwarranted obstacles to anticrime measures."

One of the worst shortcomings of the last Congress, in Senator KEATING's book, was its failure to modify or correct the impact of these decisions. But in pressing hard for specific corrective legislation, he said, "I will never do this in a way which challenges either the motives or the power of the High Court, and I will firmly oppose any indiscriminate legislation which would curtail the Court's jurisdicition and methods of operations."

Our new Senator, in short, has ably defined the duty of Congress in its relation with the judicial branch of the Government as being a double-barreled one: To prevent undermining of our judicial system and protect and preserve the rule of law, on the one hand; and to protect its own lawmaking jurisdiction against judicial encroachment, on the other. What he seeks is what the News has urged repeatedly: A balanced and moderate approach which, showing a profound respect for the place of the Supreme Court in our system of government, will nevertheless halt the trend toward judicial legislation without undermining the independence of the judiciary.

## Voteless Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the unfortunate plight of voteless Washington is recognized far beyond the shores of the Potomac. The Reno Evening Gazette, published in my home city, added its voice to the editorial chorus that is being raised all over the country in behalf of the disenfranchised National Capital. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, written by John Sanford, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

A SORRY EXAMPLE

Washington, D.C., may be the National Capital, but it is hardly a model community in some respects. It has fewer teachers and more policemen in relation to the population than any of the States.

For every 10,000 inhabitants, the District of Columbia has 75 employees in the field of education. This compares with 95 per 10,000 in Rhode Island, the lowest ranking State, and 203 in Wyoming, the highest State. The Federal district has 36 police workers for every 10,000 inhabitants. New York has more than any other State—26. The lowest is West Virginia with 9 per 10,000.

But the Washington residents can't be blamed for this. They have no voice in their own government. Congress is their boss, and while Congress may fret about the said state of education over the Nation, or the crime situation in other metropolitan areas, it isn't at all worried about its own headquarters. And what if the Washington residents are angry? They can't vote. And what politician is going to listen to a citizen without a vote?

## Tribute to New York State Senator Benjamin F. Feinberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on February 7, 1959, a distinguished member of the New York State Senate, Hon. Benjamin F. Feinberg, passed away. Senator Feinberg's life was devoted to the public service; in addition to having been majority leader in the New York State Senate he was an outstanding chairman of the Public Service Commission of the State of New York and president of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners; he was in the forefront in advancing the cause of education in New York; he was a devoted family man and humanitarian. Joel Lodge 118 of B'nai B'rith had, before Senator Feinberg's passing, voted him to be Citizen of the Year and to receive an award to that effect. The award will now be presented posthumously.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the lodge committee's report and the resolution of award to the late Senator Feinberg, a very distinguished American and my good friend, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee of Joel Lodge, B'nai B'rith, appointed to select a person as the 1958

Citizen of the Year respectively submits the following report:

As a result of several meetings held in January 1959, the committee chose as the person to be honored, Senator Benjamin F. Feinberg. In view of the Senator's confinement to his home and the hospital, preparations were made for the conferring of the award in Montreal or at his home, if his attendance at a formal dinner during Brotherhood Week could not be arranged.

The late Senator Feinberg's name has long been favorably considered by the committee for the award of Citizen of the Year, but previous committees had deferred plans in anticipation of the year of his retirement. The prior committees had felt that such time would be most fitting as the culmination of his career of outstanding public service.

The committee feels that the year 1958–59 should be designated as a year of memorial to Senator Feinberg and the award made posthumously by means of a resolution duly adopted by the lodge convening as a whole.

The text of the resolution as adopted by the lodge at its February 17 meeting follows:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the late Senator Benjamin F. Feinberg has throughout his lifetime displayed the attributes of selfless devotion to this community and the public which he served so long and so well; and

"Whereas such devotion is exemplified by his many accomplishments—

"(a) in the field of education, by his fostering and advancing the State University Teachers College; in establishing Champlain College, forerunner of a low tuition State-supported college system; and his promotion of legislation to improve the salaries and working conditions of schoolteachers and encourage qualified persons to enter this profession;

"(b) in the realm of government, by his inspirational leadership while serving as State senator, senate majority leader, and confidant of Governors;

"(c) in the field of public utilities by his outstanding record as chairman of the Public Service Commission of the State of New York and president of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners;

"(d) in his service of God, as life trustee of the Beth Israel Congregation of Plattsburgh and president and lifelong member of this lodge of B'nai B'rith; and

"Whereas he has displayed heartfelt conviction in the principle of the brotherhood of man as demonstrated by his active participation in social and fraternal organizations devoted to charitable purposes such as the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, where he served as exalted ruler; and Free and Accepted Order of Masons where he rose to the office of worshipful master of his lodge; Rotary where he was chosen for the presidency of the Plattsburgh club; and, in furtherance of such conviction and his belief and dedication to this principle of brotherhood, he has been a lifetime true friend of all men and all mankind; and

"Whereas Senator Feinberg's ascendancy through life from his humble origin as the son of immigrant parents, through his formative years as a diligent student, devoted teacher and school principal, distinguished attorney and counselor, held in high esteem by his fellow members of the bar, and an outstanding member of the New York State and American Bar Associations, a fair and just judge and legislator, has exemplified the American tradition of freedom of opportunity for all regardless of race or creed; and

"Whereas his unshakeable faith in democracy and his unflagging determination to preserve and strengthen it was exhibited by the legislation which he sponsored and authored in the State legislature: Now, therefore, in recognition of this record and example of Americanism and brotherhood, be it

*"Resolved*, That the Award of Citizen of the Year for the year 1958–59 be conferred posthumously upon Benjamin F. Feinberg; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the year 1958–59 be set aside in the annals of the Citizen of the Year Awards as a year of memorial in his honor, and that a record of these proceedings be suitably inscribed and presented to the members of his immediate family."

The foregoing resolution, upon motion duly made and seconded, was unanimously adopted by the Joel Lodge No. 118, B'nai B'rith, of Plattsburgh, N.Y., convened as a whole at its regular meeting held February 17, 1959.

In witness whereof, we, the undersigned, all being the officers, and members of the committee for selection of the Citizen of the Year Award for 1958, have hereunto set our hands and seals this 17th day of February 1959.

IRVING GOLDMAN,
*President.*
SOL LEVITES,
*First Vice President.*
MARK RABIN,
*Second Vice President.*
ROBERT HEWETT,
*Recording Secretary.*
HERBERT LEWIS,
*Corresponding Secretary.*
LOUIS KAIFETZ,
*Treasurer.*
DAVID SMITH,
*Chaplain.*
JAY GORDON,
*Committee Member.*

## Address by Samuel Rubin at Testimonial Dinner to Leonard Bernstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the American-Israel Cultural Foundation is an organization having as its object the promotion of intercultural exchanges between the United States and Israel. The foundation on February 2 tendered a testimonial dinner to the outstanding young American conductor and composer, Leonard Bernstein.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by Samuel Rubin, president of the foundation, on the occasion of that dinner, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SAMUEL RUBIN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN-ISRAEL CULTURAL FOUNDATION, AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO LEONARD BERNSTEIN, FEBRUARY 2, 1959

A September day in the Negev can be hot and humid. We had just left Nehora, a small settlement within sight of the Jordan border where still another in a chain of cultural centers was dedicated by our foundation. The entire village turned out. Farmers, recent immigrants from Iraq and Morocco, came streaming in from the fields; their wives and children in festive clothing occupied rows of newly built benches facing the speaker's table. The men, bearded and bronzed from work under the sun, remained standing, quiet and respectful, as speaker after speaker explained the reasons for the newly constructed cultural center. Their children were going to learn to play and paint—their parents to read and write. From Tel Aviv and Haifa, visiting troupes of actors and dance groups would soon be performing on the simple yet well-designed stage. A new richer life was to unfold for this typical hard-working settlement, struggling by day with the soil, by night standing guard with watchful eyes in the direction of the Jordan border.

This was the scene we left behind that day in September, as our car headed back to Tel Aviv where we waited for a cable from tonight's guest of honor to tell us he would be on hand for this dinner, and now we assemble to pay tribute to a man whose music has moved millions closer to a harmonious world. Yes, music can play that role—so can the theater and the dance. Haven't the Van Cliburns and the Isaac Sterns proved it as American cultural ambassadors to the Soviet Union—and the Moiseyev dancers, as ambassadors to the United States? Isn't it also true of Zino Francescatti, Richard Tucker, and many other of our good-will ambassadors to Israel? And how well we remember the last visits of the Israel Philharmonic and the Inbal Dance Group, presented to America by our friend and board member, Sol Hurok.

This is the very meaning of cultural exchange—a means toward the establishment of peace, an objective that man must not lose sight of for one single moment. Cultural exchange is perhaps an awkward term. What it means is man's joining in the universal tongue of science, art, and letters. History records that Jews were pioneers of cultural exchange in Western civilization. The emergence of Christianity and Islam from Judaism was a form of cultural exchange. Long before the printing press, telegraph, and radio, the wandering Jew, moving across the world from land to land, from civilization to civilization, carried one country's culture into another.

Through Arab sources they carried Greek culture into a Europe emerging from the Dark Ages; the Renaissance is deeply indebted to Jew and Arab. There is, therefore, special significance in the reemergence of Israel in the Arab world, which may yet bring another great renaissance to mankind.

In our audience tonight there is a young Israeli majoring in Economics at Brandeis University. He is an Arab. Subhi Abu-Gosh, we welcome you. Another Israeli Arab is studying Irrigation Engineering at the University of Utah. Their studies over, these two young men will return to Israel, equipped with American techniques, and when the barriers of misunderstanding between Israel and her Arab neighbors finally crumble, what better ambassadors that Mr. Abu-Gosh and Mr. El-Razaq?

Tonight we had the unusual honor of listening to an endorsement of our intercultural efforts by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Israel. While most heartening, we nonetheless choose to regard their endorsement in the broadest possible sense. What Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Ben-Gurion reemphasized was the desperate need for better understanding if our civilization is to survive.

Let us see how this works.

For example: Soon after Inbal's return from its recent extraordinary successes in our country and Europe, Japanese authorities extended an official invitation for Inbal to appear as a featured Asian group in five Japanese cities during the Asian People's Festival. Imagine the significance of such recognition. And to think that only a few years ago most of these young dancers, as

new immigrants from Yemen, were housed in tin shacks known in Israel as Maabaroth, until their talents and the riches of their oriental culture were discovered by our representatives. With limited funds and with help from Jerome Robbins and Anna Sokolow, whom we sent over, Inbal is now recognized as one of the world's finest ethnic dance groups. Can there be better traveling ambassadors of good will?

Or the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra you heard this evening—with funds from you, with conductors like Leonard Bernstein, Charles Munch, Dimitri Mitropoulos and others—this symphony, after touring our country and the Continent is now acclaimed one of the great orchestras of all time.

I wish there were time to mention our work with Israel's museums, theatres, academies of music and art; our work in Arab villages, where this very day a study is being conducted by a team of sociologists, engaged by us, to make certain that no gap remains between the cultural life of the Israeli Arab and Israeli Jew. At a recent reception at the Hebrew University and the Weizmann Institute, I experienced the excitement of meeting students from Afro-Asian countries—Japan, Ethiopia, Thailand, Burma, Ghana, India. They were doing graduate work in their specialized fields, under auspices of our Middle-East Fellowship Fund. Picture their return, as graduate physicists, physicians, and pharmacists, to their home villages with Israeli diplomas under their arms. Isn't this the best expression of diplomacy?

A few days ago the New York Times carried a detailed story of an Afro-Asian seminar on cooperatives, taking place in Israel, with representatives from 17 countries in attendance—among them, top-ranking officials, ministers of agriculture, and heads of organizations. For the next 6 months they will be examining in detail the Israeli system of cooperatives in agriculture, industry and transportation. In India and Ceylon, their findings will be applied to the resettlement of millions of landless peasants. In Thailand and Burma, border settlements will be built, fashioned after the Israeli pattern. This seminar, substantially subsidized by our Middle-East Fellowship Fund, will return 60 good-will ambassadors to 17 Afro-Asian neighbors of Israel.

It is almost impossible to believe that in the 10 short years of Israel's existence, despite hardships and hostilities, this small but dynamic republic has joined the world's great powers in sharing her technical, scientific and cultural skills with many countries, especially the newly emerging nations in Africa and Asia. With these Afro-Asian countries, a two-way trade has developed—a two-way trade in commodities as well as cultural values. Thus, Israel is now beginning to repay, with interest, the invaluable aid it has been receiving from the United States and the United Nations. Suddenly confronted, however, with a mass exodus of 250,000 Jews from Rumania, with many more thousands expected from other countries, Israel must continue to look to us for help. This is an emergency of vast proportions. I wonder if the world can stand by idly and consider this exclusively a Jewish problem.

Nor can it continue to stand by idly and permit poverty, disease, and ignorance to plague the lives of many millions in the Middle East. From this platform 3 years ago we were first to propose the establishment by the United Nations of a Middle East Economic and Cultural Authority, to raise living standards and bring peace and economic security to the whole area, and at what little cost compared to the billions poured into the modern military budgets. That the world may not yet be prepared to abandon completely production of defense weapons we reluctantly admit, but we cannot deny that behind the harsh words hurled across continents there appears a growing consciousness that the use of force and violence to settle disputes between nations will not secure for the innocent people of the world the permanent peace, prosperity, and culture to which they are entitled.

Cultural exchange—yes, cultural competition—between nations can and must be the 20th century vehicle toward peace and understanding. These, my friends, are some of the larger objectives toward which we must continue to strive. True, we are small and few. We can do little more than set the stage—and fervently hope that our efforts will inspire the men who move the mountains. Toward this work, you in the audience have given your generous support—and it is for this support that we on the dais rise to salute and applaud you—every one of you.

---

## Citizenship: A Process of Gradual Evolvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently a young lady from Limestone County, Ala., Miss Faye Chapman, a senior at Clements High School, participated in the oratorical contest for girls of the Civitan Club. Miss Chapman won the girls' division and was awarded a scholarship to Birmingham-Southern College.

I have a copy of the speech Miss Chapman gave at that time, which is a very fine and thoughtful speech. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP: A PROCESS OF GRADUAL EVOLVEMENT

(By Faye Chapman, Clements High senior)

I was born an American; I will live an American; I will die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career. I will do this with absolute disregard to personal consequences.

What are personal consequences? What is the individual man, with all the good or evil that may betide him, in comparison with the good or evil which may befall a great country in a crisis?

Daniel Webster stated the duties of an American citizen many, many years ago much more forcefully than our history books state them today.

Let us examine the term "citizenship" in view of America today.

Citizenship is the status of a person who owes allegiance to the government of his country in return for political rights and privileges. Our ancestors, the citizens of America in bygone years, had many duties and responsibilities to fulfill in order to establish this democracy—the same democracy which in later years was to guarantee civil rights and full protection to millions of citizens.

Habberton has said, "The ideal citizen is the man who believes that all men are brothers, and that the nation is merely an extension of his family."

Were our forefathers ideal citizens? Are the majority of Americans today ideal citizens? Certainly not, but it is conclusive that much progress has been made.

The ideal citizen today would be characterized by a quiet independence; a genuine love of righteousness and integrity; a life of uprightness and truth; of honesty and fair dealing; and an absence of cringing and paltering; and of that miserable and contemptible fawning upon the rich; and that silly and despicable worship of those in place and power. All these things and others must receive much care and attention before the ideal stage of citizenship can be acquired.

The ideal citizen will be a patriot; a patriot who places his country's interest before his own; a patriot who fills well his station in life whether public or private, who loves peace and promotes order, who labors to uphold the good and put down the bad; a patriot who seeks to aid in all movements that look to the instruction, elevation, and permanent betterment of his fellow citizens, and to put down all such movements or institutions as tend to degrade or demoralize them. This is the patriotism for which we plead.

In order to keep America first, each citizen should understand the value of the service of the groups to which he belongs, and he should be willing to work earnestly and loyally for their success. Because one finds himself merely a little part of a great organization with others, he sometimes loses a sense of responsibility for doing even his little part. But this plan of group living which we have accepted demands that everyone may do his bit.

There is no cog in any complex machine that does not have important work to do. It is the duty of every citizen to find out exactly what his part in the machinery of American life is, and then to find out how best he can do his part. This duty should be fulfilled equally well in home, school, industry, church, government, and recreation. As J. S. White has said, "A second-rate man can never make a first-rate citizen." A true citizen will be first rate in his beliefs, ideals, and efforts.

Today, America ranks tops as the most respected and admired, yet feared Nation on the globe. Its manufacturers are the world's leading; its producers, the world's foremost; and its leaders, the world's wisest and most concerned with the Nation's well-being and peaceful continuance. How was all this acquired? By the gradual evolvement of citizenship from the time of our forefathers' landing at Plymouth to today's life of advanced knowledge and complex society.

Let us explore the beginning of this great word "citizenship" and outline its process of gradual evolvement through the ages.

In ancient Rome, good citizenship excelled all other requirements. Training for citizenship was begun in the home with the family, and was continued in the army. Although the great city-nations of Rome were different, they all accepted the code of the ideal of citizenship—having citizens responsible for their government and a government responsible to the citizens. Americans, like the ancient Romans, believe that citizens have the duty of running their Government and the right of having the Government run in their interest.

When our forefathers first came to America in 1607, they came to establish freedom and to live as they wanted, to worship and to govern freely; and to set up a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Did they succeed? Yes, the venture was successful although an extensive time element was involved. The signing of the Declaration of Independence actually opened the gate

to the beginning of American citizenship and independence for all.

The Civil War was fought so that all people of our great and prospering Nation could become its legal citizens. That purpose was accomplished.

Citizenship and its true meaning have survived the conflicts, wars, and trials of the decades. Yet, it has developed with the improvements and inventions of the times. It has continued as the foremost thought of all Americans. There is a deep, unspoken love and appreciation for American citizenship that we, the participants of a self-governing nation, feel and will continue to feel for all eternity.

A great nation is made only by worthy citizens. We, by believing in and holding fast to the ideals of citizenship, will be worthy citizens, and we will make this Nation even greater than it is today. When we see the waving of Old Glory in the crisp, free smelling air of America, we feel the desire to be worthy of this great Nation which the famous, respected, and beloved red, white, and blue represents.

We dare not, as American citizens, forget the ideals for which America stands. We dare not neglect to face squarely to duties and problems which confront us, the holders of citizenship in this advanced, free, and democratic Nation.

## The Crisis in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Positive Implementation," from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 20, 1959. The editorial discusses the situation in Berlin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSITIVE IMPLEMENTATION

Positive implementation to the facts of the U.S. position in Berlin as defined recently by President Eisenhower was provided almost simultaneously by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, in the upper House of the Congress.

The more his statements are read and studied, the more readily are their major importance recognized. His delineation was bipartisan in finest sense. It was objectively realistic without denying all hope that negotiation could bring the fruits of amicable settlement.

In content, brevity, and scholarly presentation it revealed Senator FULBRIGHT's stature as a desirable chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that group which wields such tremendous power over this country's international relations. It will cause millions of war-anxious peoples to take another look at the man.

Senator FULBRIGHT prefaced the heart of his address by noting that "the doubts and fears of our people are probably growing almost in proportion" to Khrushchev's "capricious and thoroughly unpredictable statements" as the Soviet leader "maneuvers the Berlin situation on a giddy course toward the conference table."

This, it develops, has reached a point of giddiness where there is a new statement a day and with Khrushchev now touting a peace conference for all World War II beligerents. He could profit more by heeding what Senator FULBRIGHT said for the purpose of reassuring "our friends" and making it "clear to the leaders of the Soviet Union, and thereby avoid miscalculations on their part, that, despite the free debate characteristic of a democracy the American people, regardless of party, stand united" on certain propositions. He spelled these out as follows:

The United States will not agree to any European settlement that accepts, even tacitly, Soviet subjugation of the Eastern European countries.

The United States will make no unilaterial deals with the Soviet Union.

The United States, in concert with its European allies, intends to remain in Berlin and West Germany unless there is a mutually agreed settlement "on issues larger than Berlin" in a form that all Western states believe to be in their interest.

The United States "will not be driven or enticed from Berlin or West Berlin."

Senator FULBRIGHT also emphasized this vital point:

"The United States cannot in honor accept, even tacitly, any proposition, designed to formalize the subjugation of the once-free satellite peoples.

"Our society owes much of its character to the 18th century philosophers who gave meaning and depth to the term 'freedom.' We could no more accept the permanent subjugation of freedom in the satellites than we would consent to any compromise of freedom in Berlin or West Germany."

All that Khrushchev wants to negotiate about is something the United States and its allies could give up—if they would. Senator FULBRIGHT has brought the subjugated satellites into focus.

There's a point for real negotiation—for some hard demanding on our part. Let the Red conspiracy establish the virtue it does not possess by freeing the now enslaved peoples of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Rumania and Bulgaria.

Khrushchev will not include those names on any summit agenda.

While pointing out that the West must not be "unreceptive to fresh, soundly reasoned ideas" and that there are negotiable points, Senator FULBRIGHT warned that "it is essential * * * not to expect too much in the way of results * * * to expect any substantial easement in the near future would be the height of wishful thinking.

"Our duty is to strengthen our defenses and our resolve * * * we must not be discouraged."

Senator FULBRIGHT has compounded fact, faith and courage to provide the administration with a foreign policy support design by which Government and people can move forward in unison and in finest American tradition to whatever destiny holds for them in the Berlin crisis.

## The Handling of Discontinuance and Rate Cases by the Interstate Commerce Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two recent editorials published in the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Trentonian be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorials deal with the efforts of several of us in the Senate to assure fair and reasonable procedures in the handling of discontinuance and rate cases by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The maintenance of mass transportation facilities, particularly in the northeastern part of our Nation, is approaching crisis proportions. Congress must take some remedial action to assure that the public has every right to be heard and their views fully considered in the difficult months ahead. I hope that hearings will be held on our proposals quickly.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Mar. 19, 1959]

AS COMMUTER PROBLEMS GROW

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and others are sponsoring a resolution in the Senate to block further curtailment or abandonment of railroad commuter service.

They want the Interstate Commerce Commission to hold off on 27 railroad applications pending before it to cut down or halt entirely service affecting thousands of daily riders. The object would be to give Congress time to consider amendments to the Transportation Act of 1958. The amendments would materially curb the power of the ICC to permit abandonment or lessening of rail passenger facilities.

Senator CASE cited the application of the Lehigh Valley Railroad to abandon all its passenger service in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western plans a similar move. Between them these lines carry about 30,000 people daily.

Railroad problems are great and growing. They deserve serious consideration by Congress. And so do the rights and needs of commuters. The resolution urges the ICC to scrutinize the railroad petitions closely and particularly to hold public hearings to give the public its day in court.

Certainly that procedure, which has not been uniformly followed, is very much in order. And, assuredly also, Congress should look closely into needs for remedial legislation, for commuters and for the railroads also.

[From the Trenton, (N.J.) Trentonian, Mar. 10, 1959]

LIGHT FOR DARK CORNERS

The Federal agencies that touch on many facets of the average American's life as they go along their merry way regulating this and that, exist in a hazy half-world of their own, so far as the public is concerned. It's not that the purposes for which they are established are unclear, it's just that the spotlight of publicity seldom touches them until there is a big noise about some of their activities.

At the moment, thanks to New Jersey's Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE and other Members of the State's congressional delegation, the Interstate Commerce Commission's handling of railroad commuter cases occupies the public's attention. CASE has asked for an investigation by some Senate body, but it doesn't seem likely that such a probe will come about.

But it does seem likely that the voters are going to get a closer look at how Federal agencies operate. Senator CARROLL, of Colorado, chairman of the newly created Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, is moving toward a careful study of the ratemaking and rule-making procedures of such bodies as those

that regulate commerce, communications, trade, power, aviation, and a host of other things

President Franklin D. Roosevelt aptly described Federal agencies as "a fourth department of government." Like everything else in the Federal setup, they have been growing and growing. Congress creates them, but once having done so, the legislators too often forget about them and they are left to their own devices. In some instances, the results have not been in the best interests of the vast majority of our citizens.

If Congress deems it advisable to turn regulatory power over to a commission it creates, then it cannot hold that in so doing it has disposed of its obligation to oversee said commission's operation. CARROLL'S committee has an important task to perform, and in performing it, it would not be surprising if the committee discovered that we don't need all the commissions Congress has set up, with their attendant drain on the Treasury.

## Guides and Standards Established by Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Bureau of Consultation in the Federal Trade Commission is busily engaging itself in the protection of the consumers of our Nation. The Bureau is protecting us from false advertising and deceptive sales practices by enforcing its recently established guides and standards.

The March 2, 1959, issue of Advertising Age has an interesting article on the fine work the Federal Trade Commission is doing in this area, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FTC REPORTS ITS STANDARDS, GUIDES GAIN GROUND DESPITE LACK OF FANFARE—DRIVE ADDS ELECTRONICS TO CIGARET, TIRE FIELDS AS CONFIDENCE EXPANDS

WASHINGTON, February 17.—Athough details must be withheld in order to avoid vitiating the program, there has never been a time when personnel of the Federal Trade Commission worked as closely with businessmen in the fight against false advertising as they do today.

Formerly the Commission insisted on litigating the vast majority of its advertising cases, despite warnings that the case-by-case approach was costly and time consuming.

Now the Commission's Bureau of Consultation uses guides and standards to provide leadership for industry groups which are interested in eliminating bad practices on a wholesale basis.

In addition, it is settling hundreds of important advertising cases under new, informal procedures which eliminate fuss, and avoid bad publicity for the honest offender.

For at least a decade, forward looking members of the Commission had argued that the "voluntary" approach should be explored if FTC was to provide real leadership in the fight against misleading advertising.

Some progress was made in this direction under the prodding of former Commissioner Lowell Mason. Now the program enjoys genuine support throughout the top level of the Commission, and with each passing month it wins additional prestige.

Chairman John Gwynne frequently voices his devotion to the voluntary approach, pointing out that "Congress can never appropriate enough money to handle all these matters on a case-by-case basis.

"It is becoming increasingly important," Chairman Gwynne says, "that our efforts along this line be supplemented by securing voluntary compliance with the law wherever possible."

Resistance to the voluntary approach within FTC was based on a belief that businessmen weren't likely to stay reformed unless they were bound with a cease and desist order which could be enforced in the event of a second offense.

But advocates of the voluntary approach point out that advertising offenses often reflect intensely competitive situations. Since individual industry members need assurance that their competitive position will be protected, offenses of this kind often are particularly susceptible to the industrywide approach.

Moreover, the advocates of the voluntary approach say, the public benefits even if some of the voluntary agreements eventually break down.

"We get fast results," they point out. "If some of our cases eventually go wrong, the Commission can still litigate. So, ordinarily, it has nothing to lose by giving the advertiser at least one chance to clean house on a voluntary basis."

Among the first important tests of the new voluntary program was the advertising standards for the cigarette industry, issued in 1955.

Admittedly there have been disappointments—particularly the "tar derby" which broke out in late 1957. But, according to Charles Grandey, Chief of the Bureau of Consultation, the tobacco industry advertising guides have been an outstanding success, considering the evils that existed at the time they were adopted.

On a statistical basis, Mr. Grandey reports, there have been more than 154 instances in which tobacco companies have made major copy changes after conferences with FTC's staff.

"But the important thing," he said, "is that we are in close contact with all 10 cigarette companies. When we find something objectionable, we are able to get into direct contact with people who are in a position to correct the situation. A cooperative spirit has developed, so that these differences get settled."

Last summer, Chairman Gwynne conceded, during testimony before the Blatnik committee, that the cigarette industry's "tar derby" represented a real setback for the industry's advertising standards.

Nevertheless, he point out, every member of the industry responded wholeheartedly when the Commission called a conference to develop standards which could be used in measuring the effectiveness of filters. Moreover, FTC staff members are encouraged by the fact that the number of tobacco companies running in the "tar derby" has been reduced from six to two.

A second of the important industrywide experiments of the Bureau of Consultation involved the automobile tire industry. With strong encouragement from industry trade groups, particularly dealer groups, the Commission drafted labeling and advertising standards to eliminate misleading trade names and terms.

All 36 manufacturers are in the process of revamping their advertising and, where necessary, their molds to abide by the FTC rules.

Some companies, including Firestone, have had to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on new molds, but there are no known instances now of holdouts determined to litigate.

In the long run, however, the release last fall of guides to eliminate fictitious pricing probably represented the most far-reaching move to establish the importance of the Bureau Consultation as a force in the fight for clean advertising.

With the release of these guides, FTC activated almost spontaneously a huge nationwide cleanup program, which has captured the approval and enthusiasm of civic and advertising interests throughout the country.

Literally tens of thousands of copies of the pricing guides have been distributed by groups such as Advertising Federation of America, National Association of Broadcasters, and American Newspaper Publishers Association. Better business bureaus throughout the country have used them as a focal point for local drives which have fanned out in hundreds of communities. Trade associations have pledged their support. National advertisers and big retail organizations have ordered thousands of copies distributed by their own personnel in an effort to get compliance among their distributors and outlets.

As a result of the pricing guides the bureau of consultation is receiving a flood of mail from businesses of all sizes.

"It is the best piece of Government regulation I have ever seen come out of Washington," one small businessman wrote in longhand.

"Well done," said a radio station which received a copy from NAB. "We want to provide a copy for every one of our advertisers," it told the FTC.

A bedding manufacturer requested 1,000 copies for all of its dealers. The president of a national jewelry association pledged his support, complaining, "There is too much phony advertising. This is a great job and a difficult one."

In a 6-month period, the bureau of consultation closed more than 300 individual advertising cases which might otherwise have led to formal complaints and litigation. When it closes a case, it insists on receiving proof of new ads, with evidence that the controversial portions have been omitted.

And it sticks to its guns. When one concern making a masonry product explained that it could not provide revised proof since it was not planning to use publication advertising in the immediate future, it was told the file would remain open until some evidence of change was submitted. A manufacturer and distributor of paint bowed reluctantly when he was told that his two-for-one sale was not honest pricing. "We think the public is getting a good value," the firm insisted, "but we will go along on your ruling."

A large department store quickly complied when it was told to stop advertising that it was selling a $29.95 electric fryer skillet for $7.95, while another multistate retail organization volunteered that it was already hard at work studying its ads and catalogs, determined to weed out instances of fake comparative prices.

A drug chain cooperated willingly when FTC asked the source of a mispriced TV table. "We are entirely in accord with your position," it wrote, expressing appreciation that the Commission was "going after the trunk instead of the twig."

Individual companies involved in correspondence with the bureau of consultation would read like a "Who's Who" among large retailers, and consumer goods advertisers.

A famous department store apologized for advertising a golf bag at fictitious price.

"The manufacturer ticketed it that way," the store explained. "But we realize it was overpriced, and we have ordered the tag removed from all bags still in stock.

A big department store chain wrote that a directive had gone out from top management ordering all members of the advertising department to familiarize themselves with the guides on false pricing. "Copy is to be reviewed by top management," the letter said, "and there is to be substantially less comparative pricing."

One of the big problem areas has been furniture and bedding. While new trade practice rules for the furniture industry are currently being drafted, the bureau of consultation has received correspondence from individual manufacturers and dealers who are concerned about the fictitious pricing problem. One dealer even submitted his own ad from a newspaper with a request for approval. Meanwhile the three leading bedding manufacturers have already announced to the trade that FTC's pricing guides will be adhered to in the future.

Many of the cases reaching FTC are submitted by businessmen or business organizations which are concerned about breakdowns in business ethics, while other cases are turned up by the Commission's monitors, who watch TV and read the periodical press systematically.

Under new FTC procedures, the bureau of consultation gets first crack at cases involving members of 160 industries covered by FTC trade practice rules.

"If we are convinced that it is an honest error," says John Sullivan, who is Mr. Grandey's top assistant, "we get in touch with them and try to arrange a voluntary settlement."

Chronic offenders, or those who are unwilling to go along on voluntary settlement, are turned back to investigators for reference to the Bureau of Litigation.

Unlike earlier experiments with voluntary settlement which involved formal legal agreements, the new procedure consists solely of an exchange of correspondence and proof of conformity.

"They are entitled to one bite of the apple," Mr. Sullivan says. "If the offense recurs, their credit with us just isn't any good."

Now that the program is achieving such acceptance in the Commission as well as in industry, the Bureau of Consultation is more relaxed about publicity, but the possibilities are still extremely limited.

In his conferences with staff members, FTC Chairman Gwynne points out that the confidential nature of the settlement arrangement is one of its most attractive features so far as businessmen are concerned. "We can't risk any publiicty which would cast doubt on our good intentions," he warns.

Altogether, FTC has a staff of 20 persons working in the various programs of the Bureau of Consultation, ranging from trade practice conference work to correspondence with individual offenders.

In addition to the more than 300 individual cases handled during a 6-month period, the staff gives scores of individual interpretations to advertisers who seek advance approval of ads which venture into potentially troublesome areas.

Staff members are also spending an increasing amount of time attending meetings with groups which want to cooperate.

"If it were possible to describe the rapidly expanding activities of this office," Mr. Grandey said, "it would be evident that the published information about FTC's work in the field of false advertising is like an iceberg—only a small part of the real story is visible."

Lack of publicity also has its drawbacks so far as the morale of the staff is concerned. "Over in the Bureau of Litigation, they have their decisions and cease-and-desist orders to show for their work. We are the silent service. Our story is locked in these files, where no one can see it," Mr. Sullivan points out.

Among the groups fighting for the elimination of bad advertising problems, however, the word obviously has been getting around, for trade groups with individual problems of their own learn the address, and their requests for help end up on the right desk.

Currently, for example, the Bureau of Consultation is considering an industrywide approach in a branch of the electronics industry where fake preticketing has reached epic proportions. In requesting FTC intervention, an industry member reported that the product, worth no more than $10 at retail, is being preticketed as much as $30.

"If a retailer actually got that price," the letter said, "he would be making a 700-percent profit."

Since the 15 major members of this industry agree that pricing practices have gotten cut of hand, the Bureau of Consultation will get to work, asking each member for proof that he is prepared to eliminate the objectionable practice. With the entire industry pledged to cooperate, individual manufacturers can mend their ways, with assurance that they will not suffer a competitive disadvantage.

## The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a column by Mr. J. A. Livingston appearing on the business page of the Friday, March 20, 1959, edition of the Washington Post. Mr. Livingston's article is entitled "Cleveland Fought Surpluses as Ike Fights Deficits," and the article gives a thumbnail sketch of Lewis H. Kimmel's book entitled, "Federal Budget and Fiscal Policy, 1789–1958."

In this day when budget deficits are easily accepted in some quarters as being almost a necessary corollary of Government, it is refreshing to read the comments of past presidents who abhorred and fought against the deficit as a very evil thing. I would commend the whole book to those who do not recognize the inherent danger of budget deficits, but if they do not have the time to read the book, I would at least hope they would scan Mr. Livingston's article for the salutary effect it may have.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1959]
1959]

CLEVELAND FOUGHT SURPLUSES AS IKE FIGHTS DEFICITS

(By J. A. Livingston)

President Eisenhower should have such headaches as Presidents Chester A. Arthur and Grover Cleveland. They were beleaguered by chronic surplusitis.

Arthur, a Republican, was fearful he'd extinguish the Federal debt altogether and then money would pile up and up and up in the Treasury. Cleveland, a Democrat, was dismayed by annual income which exceeded expenditures by about $100 million. (Yes, Mr. Copyreader, that's right—only eight zeros, this is millions, not billions.)

Cleveland's Secretaries of the Treasury used the surplus to retire Government bonds, which were noncallable; they bid up prices so sharply that bonds which carried a coupon rate of 4.5 percent sold to yield as little as 1.5 percent. Those who owned bonds—the well-to-do—made handsome profits.

THE HAPPY-HAPPY DAYS

Those were the happy-happy days before the income tax. The principal source of Federal revenue was customs duties (about 55 percent of the total). Then came excises on alcoholic beverages, wines, cigarettes, etc. To stay the surplus, both Arthur and Cleveland wanted to cut revenues, but Congress feared lower tariffs would increase competition from foreign manufacturers and throw Americans out of work.

Budgets then were austere. Outlays in the 1886 fiscal year came to $243 million, of which $63 million was for pensions; next came $51 million for interest on the public debt; the cost of public buildings, lighthouses, and collecting the revenue was $48 million; and the same amount was spent on the Army and Navy. There were no agricultural programs, no foreign aid, no social security.

So Arthur and Cleveland fought surplusitis, even as Eisenhower today struggles with deficits. And that is the point of Lewis H. Kimmel's scholarly book, "Federal Budget and Fiscal Policy, 1789–1958," published by Brookings Institution, and priced at $5. Times change, policies change, therefore budgets and budget philosophy must change. Flexibility is as important in Federal finance as in military maneuver.

Washington, Hamilton, and other Founding Fathers of the Republic managed to bury their numerous differences in one unalterable veritude of Jefferson: "The public debt of one generation should not be permitted to bind the next one." Later, Andrew Jackson, whom today we think of as a New Deal forerunner, pridefully proclaimed the "rare and noble spectacle of a great and growing people who has discharged every obligation." He'd paid off all debt.

Jackson's successor, Martin Van Buren, felt that no circumstance—not even the depression of 1837–38—justified deficits. "The citizens [should not] look to the Government for aid." But Millard Fillmore, held with Clay, Webster, and later Lincoln, that the "paramount issue before the Nation was national growth." James Buchanan snapped right back: Deficits are a disgrace.

Through Grant, Cleveland, and Theodore Roosevelt, Presidents consistently regarded deficits and debts as evil. Woodrow Wilson deviated a trace, saying that borrowing could be justified by permanent benefits, "which it seems unfair that a single generation should pay for." His successors, Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Herbert Hoover were strict budget balancers. Indeed, Hoover, like Van Buren, felt that private adversity in depression should be handled privately—by charity.

FDR CHANGED PHILOSOPHY

Even Franklin D. Roosevelt, who goes down in Republican oratory as a "great spender," started out with an idee fixe: Budgets should be balanced. Later, he decided he couldn't "leave the problems of our common welfare to * * * the winds of chance. The Government must have the wisdom to use its credit to sustain economic activity in recessions and the courage to withhold it and retire debt in periods of prosperity." Even as Roosevelt, President Eisenhower can subscribe to that in theory, if not in practice.

Kimmel's thesis is that conditions and compulsions of the times make budgets—not preconceived philosophies. And he demonstrates this by observing the concrete actions of Presidents and the theory and dogma of economists from Adam Smith through David Ricardo, Henry C. Carey, Francis A. Walter, and John Maynard Keynes. This notable book is a must for students of Government finance. It demonstrates that immutable change is the one immutable law of economics.

## Antifarm Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Antifarm Revolt: Rebellion Seen Unless Workable Program Is Found," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Washing Post and Times Herald of today, March 25, 1959. Mr. Drummond makes very timely comments on the agricultural program.

There being no objection, the article was orderd to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTIFARM REVOLT: REBELLION SEEN UNLESS WORKABLE PROGRAM IS FOUND

(By Roscoe Drummond)

If Congress doesn't soon rescue the American people from an irrational, unworkable, extravagant, and deteriorating mess of a farm program—the third most costly in the whole budget—something is going to happen.

That, I think, is putting it mildly.

What is going to happen if the farm bloc doesn't join with the rest of Congress to halt the Frankensteinian monster of mounting surpluses, aggravated by price supports which pile up bigger surpluses is that, as sure as a hangover follows a "lost weekend," there will be a massive political revolt by the voting consumer.

And then watch out. It won't be good. It won't be good for the farmer. It won't be good for the country. It will be a furious revolt against an evil too long tolerated. The effect will be to strike down what is wrong—a nearly $9 billion agricultural budget which is making matters worse, not better—with little likelihood of putting something worthwhile and reasonable in its place.

The key fact to bear in mind is that the policy of paying farmers—mostly wheat, cotton, and corn farmers—to grow more crops they can't sell except to the Government, which already has to spend a billion dollars a year just to keep them, is a failure.

It is a failure because it is not solving the farm problem; it is aggravating it.

It is a failure because those parts of the agricultural economy which are not living in the oxygen tent of Government subsidy, are better off than those which are—and they may soon be poisoned by the same medicine.

It is a failure because, unless every American farmer is to be put in the vise of Federal control, high rigid price supports will continue to bring larger crops, more surpluses, more drain on the Treasury, and will keep more uneconomic farmers farming.

It is a failure because the bulk of the farm payments do not go to the little farmer, to the neediest farmer, or even to the bulk of all farmers. Take the wheat subsidy, the biggest of all. The bulk of Federal payments go to 10 percent of those who grow wheat. Those who least need the subsidy inevitably earn most of it.

This is not going to go on forever. The American people are going to call a halt to it and they will call a halt with a crash if Congress doesn't replace it soon with something rational.

No sensible person wants to see all Federal assistance to agriculture thrown out the window. That's not the answer. But that will almost certainly be the consequence before long unless Congress begins to put some sense and sanity into the program.

I hope we don't waste much time trying to point the finger at who's to blame. Both major parties have a large responsibility for the plight we are in and there are still some cynical politicians who suggest that there is perhaps one more election to be won—at least in their districts—by perpetuating the present unsavory, unsatisfactory, and insolvent mess.

It is well that Secretary Benson is beginning to speak out more bluntly, as he did at Cornell University this week. Obviously he has been pained beyond endurance by the crack that he has become the most expensive Secretary of Agriculture in history. It hurts because it is true and it hurts more because, as some may not realize, he has been faithfully administering a set of laws and price formulas which this and other Congresses framed and which neither the President nor he has ever had the power to change.

I would like to see Secretary Benson be given, for once a chance to administer a farm problem he believes in and which would adjust price supports to levels leading to the market place, not to storage bins.

The premises of such a program would be: (a) It mustn't cost more than the present program, preferably less; (b) should give the farmer greater freedom, not less; (c) should reduce, not increase, farm surpluses.

Secretary Benson believes that a billion dollars can be saved and farmers greatly benefited by adjusting wheat supports alone to a point which would lead to sales.

My own conviction is that unless a workable and tolerable program is forthcoming soon, a political rebellion hurtful to the farmer will be fanned into flames.

## Editorial Support for Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most heartwarming aspects of the recent approval of Hawaii as our 50th State was the strong editorial support accorded the statehood movement by newspapers all over the United States. In numerous editorials, our Nation's great papers hailed the new member of the Union and wished it Godspeed.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 13, 1959]

HAWAII, U.S.A.

With surprising alacrity, Congress has approved Hawaiian statehood, and the Union is now 50 strong. We heartily welcome our new sister State of the Pacific and believe that the country will be the stronger and the richer for her admission. Hawaii was prepared to become a State long ago—in fact, bills to that effect have been under consideration for 40 years. But it was not until the admission of Alaska last year, that Hawaiian statehood became a practical certainty.

As we greet 613,000 new fellow-citizens, the country says goodby to its last organized Territory, a relic of the days when Americans, in belated imitation of the European powers, had their own little fling with imperialism. But it has been evident for years that the Hawaiians were eager for statehood and were prepared to accept its responsibilities. There is no sound reason at all why they should not have their own voices in the Government.

The admission of Hawaii will not be official for 5 or 6 months. The Hawaiians must approve statehood in a referendum and elections will have to be held. That means that technically Hawaii will not be represented in the new 49-star flag to be broken out on July 4. But whether it is or not, we already think of it as shining there.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 13, 1959]

HAIL, HAWAII

At long last, after many decades of striving, the good people of lovely Hawaii are about to achieve full membership in our Union. Our Congress, despite its past deafness to their frequent pleas for admittance, has seen to that by overwhelmingly voting in favor of letting them in, and President Eisenhower will lose no time in signing the historic legislation. They still must go through a few time-consuming legal technicalities, but they expect to take care of these soon enough to have their statehood formally proclaimed on the next Fourth of July, the greatest of our country's patriotic holidays.

Meanwhile, their fellow Americans everywhere extend to the Hawaiian people a hearty welcome into the family of our Republic—the 50th of our States, the prospective new star in Old Glory. Like the Alaskans, who attained statehood only last year, they are geographically far from us, some 5,000 miles away. Yet they are close to us, too, in the sense of becoming one with us as an integral part of the body of our Nation. All hail to them and their beautiful islands. This Union of ours will be the stronger for having them in it.

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Kansan, Mar. 1, 1959]

SONG OF THE ISLANDS

Statehood for Hawaii was presaged by the admission of Alaska to the Union. The event was widely predicted when Alaska cleared the hurdle, breaking the log jam. There was general agreement that if Alaska were admitted Hawaii should receive the same treatment. President Eisenhower expressed the wish that both Territories be admitted together.

Alaska is our great frontier outpost in the Northwest; Hawaii our outpost in the Southwest, the gateway to the vast Pacific and the Orient. The Hawaiian Islands have been under U.S. influence only 70 years. For decades they were hardly more than an ex-

otic land of flowers, steel guitars and pounding surf. Then pineapples and sugarcane made them commercially important.

The world discovered the islands the day they underwent the baptism of fire of Pearl Harbor. A new era dawned. Today Hawaii is the homebase for U.S. military and naval might that stretches its arms as far as Japan; its eyes constantly alert to any sign of aggression.

All hail Hawaii, the 50th State. The United States of America now stretch one-fourth the distance around this troubled terrestrial sphere—at the 40th parallel.

---

[From the Troy (N.Y.) Times Record, Mar. 13, 1959]

HAWAII WINS STATEHOOD

A 19-year struggle on the part of Hawaii for recognition ended as the House, following action taken by the Senate a day earlier, voted to admit the 50th State to the Union.

In the past Hawaii several times came close to gaining statehood only to be blocked by unyielding opposition by southern Congressmen. This time, southern sentiment was split. Attempts at delaying action were beaten down quickly.

Granting statehood to Hawaii is ordinary justice. In view of the fact that Alaska was accepted several months ago, there was no valid reason for withholding equal treatment. Hawaii has demonstrated capacity for self government. The islands are ready for the new status.

With the approving vote completed, there remain only the formalities before the 50th State becomes reality. It is quite possible that the admission date for Hawaii will be the same as that set for Alaska, next July 4.

Many Hawaiians have worked hard since 1940 to win statehood and we are glad that their efforts finally have been rewarded. We are happy to welcome Hawaii into the Union.

---

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 13, 1959]

FIFTIETH STAR IN THE FLAG

Aloha to Hawaii, 50th State in the Union!

The course of Hawaiian statehood has never been smooth and has in recent years been marked by a succession of disappointments.

But the overwhelming vote in the U.S. Senate and the National House of Representatives to bring the Hawaiian Islands into the fraternity of States is both gratifying and reassuring.

Such doubts as were sincerely expressed concerning the wisdom of granting statehood to a community lying so far distant from the mainland of the United States proved negligible in view of the many advantages both to Hawaii and the Nation which statehood will bring.

Victory for the Hawaiian bid for full share in the National Government was devoid in large measure of political considerations. It came after debate so protracted and searching as to leave little doubt anywhere that the step had the full backing of the Nation at large.

Hawaii's new responsibilities as a State will represent a real test of the island population's capacity for participation in the national effort to preserve domestic tranquillity and international security.

And the decision that changes the Territory's status to full statehood is certain to have a beneficial effect upon our relations with most of the nations bordering the Pacific, where a new era has dawned.

Committed from the first to statehood for Hawaii on the basis of justice and merit, the Times congratulates the people of Hawaii and shares the feelings of satisfaction which are engendered by success for a cause that means so much to the American people.

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald, Mar. 13, 1959]

WELCOME, HAWAII

On the desk is a pamphlet, "Statehood for Hawaii—The Case of a Half Million Americans at the Threshold."

Come on in off that threshold, Hawaiians, and welcome to full membership in the United States. The Congress, in an unusual burst of energy and speed, whipped through the Hawaiian statehood bill with only a minimum of opposition.

A few die-hards, for varying political reasons, refused to make it unanimous, but that is hardly likely to stem the jubilation and happiness of the half million who live on Hawaii's eight major islands.

This is a wonderful moment for our country. Hawaii has long been recognized as a modern area, with pursuits just like those of the mainlanders and the same kind of interests as those of the rest of America.

Yet, for varying reasons, Hawaii has been "at the threshold" since 1903 when it first asked Congress to consider statehood. It took all these 46 years to convince America that statehood was deserved.

Now in a rush, the action has been taken to clear the way for formally accepting Hawaii into the Union.

Perhaps it is ironic that a 46-year fight should end in a pell-mell hurry to see who can be first to accept Hawaii.

The pamphlet on the desk is marked "First of a series." We suspect there will be no need for a second in the series.

We are pleased and proud to welcome Hawaii as the 50th State in the United States.

---

## Editorials From All Over the United States Hail Newest Member of Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it will soon be my high privilege to visit Hawaii, the newest member of the Union. I believe I will be the first Member of this body to set foot in the islands since Congress voted to make Hawaii the 50th State.

It will be particularly reassuring for me to revisit Hawaii because of the extremely strong editorial support which has been accorded its admission to the Union. From all over the country, newspapers have hailed this latest addition to our Nation.

I have collected a number of these editorials, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 13, 1959]

THE MIRACLE OF HAWAII

The miracle of Hawaii is not that, as a result of yesterday's House vote, she is now to become the 50th State of the American Union. It is, rather, that this State has been created under great difficulties in mid-Pacific, 2,000 miles from the American mainland. Here is a community of eight main islands and a dozen smaller ones approximately equal in area to the two States of Connecticut and Rhode Island and something more than 1 percent of the area of her newest sister State, Alaska.

When Captain Cook passed that way 181 years ago, Hawaii had about 400,000 people. Now she has about 600,000 people, and of those 600,000 people perhaps 12,000 are of pure Hawaiian stock. The others are of a dozen or more principal nationalities and a great many subsidiary ones. They come from China, from Japan, from the Portuguese islands, from the Philippines, from the American South, and from almost any accessible country with exportable labor that one can think of.

The miracle is that this astounding mixture is becoming not a new nation but a new version of the American people. For what are the American people but a mingling of most European races and of some oriental races, bound together by a common language and by common traditions rather than by racial origin?

Hawaii was not a deliberate ethnic experiment. The modern Hawaiian people were produced by what the sugar planters and the pineapple farmers took to be economic necessity. Their ancestors were brought in when it was discovered that the original Hawaiians not only were becoming scarcer, but did not see the reason for working as contract laborers on the plantations. There were some evils, some exploitation, but out of it all has come an intelligent, healthy, and even beautiful race of people who are just as capable of governing themselves as are the people of New York, California, or Texas.

The battle is over now, although some formalities must still be complied with. The President will sign the statehood bill, the people of Hawaii will approve it unless they have changed their minds, and the wide blue water that separates San Francisco from Honolulu will shrink in its political dimensions to a river boundary line.

There are those who look with apprehension to some unhappy moments in Hawaii's labor history, as when a dock strike in 1949 tied up the islands for 6 months. Yet there is no reason to believe that the State of Hawaii will have any more difficulty handling such crises than the Territory of Hawaii did. Why should we expect second-class citizens, which is what the people of Hawaii have been, to stand up for their rights as effectively as do first-class citizens, which is what the people of Hawaii are about to become?

There was one more argument, besides the argument of justice, for voting Hawaii as an equal into the Union. This was that like Alaska she stands on the front line of our defense. Her great industries, sugar, pineapples and tourists, taken together, do not quite equal what the Government spends in the islands. It was said a long time ago, "Put none but Americans on guard." This we have done in Alaska. This we are now doing in Hawaii. Long live the 50th State.

---

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1959]

HAWAII'S IN

Congress deserves a gigantic and festive luau as well as a garland of leis. Prompt House approval of the Hawaiian statehood bill, following Senate action by only a day, may make it possible to add the 50th star to the flag on the Fourth of July, when Alaska will be officially recognized on the field of blue. Admission of Hawaii was all but assured when Congress voted in Alaska as the 49th State last summer, but the congressional leadership merits especial praise for moving so quickly to complete the task.

The overwhelming votes—323–89 in the House and 76–15 in the Senate—are an exhilarating climax to the long struggle by the people of Hawaii for the full Union status envisaged long ago for their pleasant and thriving islands. It is 40 years since Hawaii first petitioned Congress for statehood. Credit for the happy event can be widely dispensed—to members of both parties in Congress; to the administration; to Delegate BURNS and former Delegate Farrington and her late husband, Joseph R. Farrington; to the Hawaii Statehood Commission; and to a remarkable businessman from New Orleans, George Lehleitner, whose unselfish work supplied so much practical inspiration for both Alaska and Hawaii.

What follows now will be largely anticlimactic. President Eisenhower will sign the legislation, perhaps today. The popular referendum in Hawaii which the bill requires is expected to go overwhelmingly in favor of statehood. What Hawaii will do in the next few months is carry out the necessary formalities to ratify a decision for statehood reaffirmed as recently as 1951.

Hawaii, with an area exceeding that of 3 other States and a population—600,000—larger than that of 6 others, will be an eminently qualified and gracious addition to the Union. Its economy is as healthy as its sturdy democratic traditions, and not the least of its desirable attributes is its position as a genuine racial melting pot. Hawaii may well become a showcase for the nations and peoples of the Pacific of American belief in dignity and equality.

Now that Congress has fulfilled its obligations to Hawaii and Alaska, what about home rule for the District of Columbia as several Members of Congress suggested during the statehood debate? The 86th Congress could make a festive occasion even more meaningful by ending the colonialism on its own doorstep.

---

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, Mar. 13, 1959]

PACIFIC TIE STRENGTHENED—A 50TH STATE ON MERIT

Welcome, Hawaii.

In voting that statehood, Congress has kept a lonstanding national pledge. It has honored the Territory's sense of governmental responsibility—its own assurance of readiness, along with eagerness, to become a full-fledged member of this Union.

It is a gratifying development, strengthening a tie in the Pacific that is of value to the United States no less than to Hawaii, in both economic and security terms. That fact has been recognized a long time—the mutual interest being a primary factor in the legislative effort yesterday culminated.

That it is the majority wish is evidenced by the size of the affirmative vote—76 to 15 in the Senate, and in the House 323 to 89.

So still a 50th star will be added to the flag—a development freely predicted when Alaska took its place as the 49th State.

They were equally eligible and equally entitled to statehood.

The actual admission will be delayed for several months by the mechanics of procedure, which include holding an election in Hawaii. Because of that, it is anticipated that it will be midsummer, or possibly even October, before the formalities are completed.

The vote finalizing congressional action was a moment for which the 575,000 residents of the last incorporated Territory under the American flag had waited almost half a century.

The Nation has manifested faith in the ability of this island constituency to administer and discharge the responsibilities of self-government; aware that it had internal problems, but confident of its determination to solve them.

America is growing, not by conferment of colonial status on any new possessions, but by extending full statehood on Territories prepared for that—the dignity and prestige of membership in this family.

That was good news for Hawaii. No less is it good news to the continental United States of America.

---

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Mar. 13, 1959]

WELCOME, HAWAII

Welcome to the Union, Hawaii. The responsibilities and the expenses of statehood may be more than you thought you had bargained for, but those are costs an individual or a State pays for maturity. Uncle Sam won't be paying so many of the bills now. Yet, as in Alaska, military defense will be the main industry for some time to come.

There had been question about Hawaii's political maturity. Local government in the islands has been run quite largely on a patronage basis. Still, that system isn't unknown on the mainland.

There have been fears about communism, for Harry Bridge's longshoreman's union is soft on the issue and he has a big voice—some persons say the biggest—in island economy. Yet the union is first of all a fiercely practical agency for hard bargaining with employers. That's one reason the cost of living is about 20 percent higher in the paradise of the Pacific than stateside.

As in Alaska, a number of people in Hawaii didn't want statehood. They had largely lapsed into silence for fear of business or political or social ostracism as the enthusiasm for the change became ever more virulent.

Yet clearly the majority in both places did want statehood. Now both areas have it and all Americans know they will live up to the duties of the new status and add a fine touch of cosmopolitanism to Congress.

---

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Mar. 13, 1959]

THE ENCHANTED ISLES

The United States is about to grant statehood to its loveliest jewel, those islands of enchantment in the Pacific which comprise Hawaii. Only a few formalities remain to be complied with to make this the 50th and probably the last State to join this "more perfect Union."

To many malihinis—newcomers from the mainland—Hawaii means Waikiki Beach, orchid leis, surf riding, Diamond Head, the Pali, Pearl Harbor, Hickam Field, or Schofield Barracks. But it is more than that.

It is an agglomeration of people of many racial strains—Polynesian, Caucasian, and oriental—who have learned, and can teach us, how to live together in harmony and graciousness.

It is a land of pineapples and sugar, of steamships and airplanes, where the commerce of Asia and America meets at this crossroads of the Pacific.

It is a community which has learned to harness the automobile to reasonable speeds consistent with safety, where pedestrians have the right-of-way at intersections, where boys and girls in busses cheerfully jump up to give their seats to older persons and where kindness and good manners are a rule of life.

Finally, Hawaii is the show window of the United States where the best wares of Americanism are displayed to the people of Asia. Statehood for Hawaii, along with our grant of independence to the Philippines, will go a long way toward combatting the Communist propaganda lie that the United States is interested in establishing a colonial empire.

Statehood has been the aspiration of the people of the islands for many years. It was mentioned as a possibility by President Lincoln. Originally an independent kingdom, Hawaii voluntarily sought annexation to the United States 60 years ago in the expectation of early statehood. But obstacles intervened until last year when Alaska overcame congressional reluctance to the admission of a territory that was not contiguous to the mainland. With Alaska's admission as the 49th State, Hawaii's designation as the 50th became just a matter of time.

There has never been any question of Hawaii's qualifications for statehood. In population, per capita wealth, amount of taxes paid to the Federal Government, and educational standards it ranks higher than a number of existing States. And the airplane a long time ago demolished the time barrier. It is now possible to fly from Honolulu to Washington in less time than it takes to travel from Chicago to Washington by train.

And so, this year, another star will be added to our flag. To the 50th we say, Aloha.

---

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch, Mar. 13, 1959]

WE WELCOME 50TH STATE

East and west have met, and from the union there has issued the 50th State in the United States of America. The U.S. House of Representatives yesterday completed legislation which made Hawaii statehood a reality. The Senate had approved statehood a day earlier.

That Hawaii can now enter the Union formally as a State comes after six decades of work and hope.

There are some who are puzzled over statehood for what they regard solely as a vacation paradise 1,500 miles from the mainland. They have a hard time reconciling leis and alohas with the traditional picture of a covered wagon on the western plains.

But, as its proponents so rightly contend, statehood for Hawaii is an example before the world of American democracy in action. It bolsters Hawaii's vital defense role in the Pacific. It makes the new State a center where Pacific peoples can study American traditions and vice versa.

Hawaii has passed every test for statehood. It is a community of Americans who have proved east and west can live and work together under a flag of freedom.

Hawaiians pay taxes as do residents of the mainland and serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Heretofore they have had no voice either in tax or draft legislation.

The new State now will have full voting representation in Congress, the right to vote for President, and to elect State officials. Eighty-five percent of its people are citizens, qualified for statehood by area population, and Americanism.

The economy is sound. Business is in excess of $2 billion a year. More than $2.3 billion in Federal taxes has been paid since the islands became a Territory.

We join in saluting our newest State and are not too concerned about her distance from her sisters. Hawaii is closer to Washington in travel time and communication today than was West Virginia at the time of its admittance to the Union.

---

## Rescue of Battle-Injured in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, very often during wartime individuals

perform prodigies of courage which are not suitably recognized. The process of awarding certifications is somewhat cumbersome and tedious and undoubtedly there are many hundreds of fine men who have never received suitable recognition for distinguished service under fire.

One example of this situation was brought to my attention last winter by Mr. Jerry L. Searles of St. Paul, Minn., who described to me an action in November of 1951, involving the rescue of the battle-injured in Korea. Because the individuals involved never received the award for which they were recommended, it gives me a real pleasure to make this small contribution to the proper recognition of their exploit. Jerry Searles, Gerald LaMaide of Flint, Mich., and Walter Ozzie of Galveston, Tex., were the individuals involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Searles of St. Paul describing an action in Korea on November 4, 1951.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
*November 21, 1958.*

Hon. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: There is a matter about which I have intended writing you for a very long time, and am just now doing it.

On November 4, 1951, I was in charge of a rescue mission and battle-injured-transportation unit at Mundung-ni, Korea. The two other men in the unit were a Pvt. Gerald L. LaMaide, Flint, Mich., and a Walter Ozzio, Galveston, Tex.; all of us were from the 15 AAA AW Battalion (SP), and were detailed to carry litters, comfort, and transport to the field hospitals at the rear, wounded from the 31st Infantry Battalion, also in our 7th Division.

Under direct fire from the enemy, these two men in my detail distinguished themselves greatly and heroically. Besides carrying out the duties already outlined, LaMaide and Ozzio drove the M-39 tank over the extremely dangerous mountain roads with no visability whatsoever ahead. I gave them driving directions over an intercom system. Our unit carried as many as 17 wounded at one time, setting an unbelievable record. The hardships were fantastically difficult; few men as they, have ever served so well. At the rear, after the work had been completed, we discovered some men who had been placed among the dead who were yet alive. I dispatched Ozzio to the medical unit to report this terrible error, made by we know not whom, and without his arriving at that unit with the greatest speed and under adverse conditions, those men might easily have died.

Officers who viewed our operation were high in their praise. One high-ranking officer made a recommendation that we receive the Silver or Bronze Stars, particularly because we had never had any previous experience and because we were not expected, as noncombat men at the time, to be involved at all in such an operation.

Upon our return to the rear, my recommendation that LaMaide and Ozzio be promoted was acted upon at once: They received their promotions; however, the fact that they never were honored for their exemplary valor and conduct for their performance in the rescue mission has always disturbed me. They were most deserving, and I know for a fact that one other group which was aiding us in the operation did receive the Bronze Stars among them.

One factor that might have interfered with their receipt of this decoration, is that fact that we did little firing upon the enemy from our transportation vehicle. I was quizzed about this later, but stated that inasmuch as we were essentially engaged in the caring for and the rescuing of injured troops it would be well if we did little firing so as not to draw fire upon our vehicle which was heavily laden with injured and dead. Some of the injured were even being given blood transfusions while the vehicle was moving rapidly to elude the fire of the enemy.

I want nothing for myself. That fact I wish to make very clear. I am the honored recipient of the Purple Heart for a wound suffered in that operation. However, it is inconceivable that the bravery and conduct of Ozzio and LaMaide not be rewarded. Theirs was a perfect, selfless contribution.

Is it too late to rectify this serious oversight? I would be pleased to provide you with whatever substantiating information I can and cooperate with you in every way. You have come to my assistance often in the past. I am grateful. Will you please see what you can do in this matter? It is most important.

Thank you sincerely for your past efforts on matters I have referred to you. And, I'll thank you in advance in this case, because I know you will do your very best.

With best personal regards, I am
Very truly yours,
Ex-Cpl. JERRY L. SEARLES,
*Former Serial No. NG27359342.*

## Questionnaire Results From Michigan's Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, few of us have been so endowed with wisdom that we cannot profit by sound advice honestly given. For that reason, it is my practice to send each year, to as many homes as I can reach in my district, a questionnaire offering the people I represent an opportunity to give their opinions on some of the most important issues facing us here in Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to share my findings with my colleagues by including in the RECORD the results of my poll. They will, I think, find much of interest and some of surprise in this consensus of a district which is evenly divided politically; which is industrial and yet maintains a considerable agriculture; which includes more UAW–CIO workers than any other congressional district in the country; and in which unemployment is at a critical level because of the slump in some parts of the automobile industry.

To me, some of the more interesting aspects of the results are the insistence upon a balanced budget, the unpopularity of present farm support levels—shared, incidentally, by farmers and nonfarmers alike—the nearly unanimous support of a firm stand on Berlin, the overwhelming demand for effective labor reform legislation, the general satisfaction with our missile and space efforts, the heavy backing for continuation of mutual security. I would also call the House's attention to the heavy preponderance in favor of repealing the 10-percent automobile excise tax which I am again sponsoring, and I suggest that any of my colleagues would find much the same result in his own district if any considerable number of his constituents own and drive automobiles, and I do not know of any horse-and-buggy districts.

I was deeply impressed by the flood of responses to this questionnaire in which more than half of the participants added their carefully considered additional comments on these and other issues. These polls, I am convinced, serve the double purpose of not only giving me the benefit of others' opinions, but in stimulating public interest in participating in our governmental processes.

The results of the tabulation are as follows:

| Questions | Percent | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Not certain |
| From information available are you satisfied with our missile and space efforts? | 54 | 21 | 25 |
| Do you agree with the President's "pay as you go" emphasis on having a balanced budget? | 84 | 8 | 8 |
| Do you approve of our firm stand with respect to Berlin? | 91 | 3 | 6 |
| Considering world tensions should we continue our mutual security military and economic aid to friendly nations? | 66 | 12 | 22 |
| Do you favor the general idea of broadening social security benefits to include medical services, to be financed by increased contributions by individuals and employers? | 36 | 52 | 12 |
| Do you favor statehood for Hawaii? | 80 | 8 | 12 |
| To provide necessary funds for Federal highways it is suggested that Federal gasoline tax be increased from 3 cents to 4½ cents per gallon. Do you favor this increase? | 33 | 57 | 10 |
| Do you favor repeal of the 10 percent automobile excise tax? | 62 | 26 | 12 |
| Has the Federal Government given sufficient attention to the problems of the small businessman? | 18 | 48 | 34 |
| Do you believe our civil defense effort is adequate? | 32 | 36 | 32 |
| Should labor reform legislation cover the problems of secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing? | 82 | 7 | 11 |
| With respect to education, should the Federal Government: | | | |
| Consider it a local and state problem? | 64 | 24 | 12 |
| Aid school construction? | 42 | 42 | 16 |
| Help pay teachers' salaries? | 20 | 63 | 17 |
| Last session, Congress approved flood control projects in both Lansing and Flint, but provided no funds. Considering budget problems, should we ask funds for: | | | |
| Flint River (cost $2½ million)? | 26 | 46 | 28 |
| Grand River (cost $13 million)? | 21 | 45 | 34 |
| Regarding farm price supports, should they be: | | | |
| | *Percent* | | |
| Increased | 4 | | |
| Decreased | 62 | | |
| Left unchanged | 16 | | |
| No comment | 18 | | |

## Testimony by Donald H. McGannon on Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in reviewing the testimony of the several witnesses who testified before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in support of S. 12 on educational television, I was amazed to see the extent of the contributions and support of educational television by certain commercial broadcasting organizations, particularly the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.

This company, which has an outstanding record in the radio and television broadcasting industry, notably in the field of public service programing, has also convincingly established an equally fine record in its contributions to and wholehearted support of educational television.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the testimony which Mr. Donald H. McGannon, president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., so ably presented at the hearings of the Senate Committee on S. 12, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This particular part of Mr. McGannon's testimony contains a very impressive list of contributions of time, equipment, and money that Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. has given in its support of educational television.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pittsburgh, KDKA–TV:

1. WBC management personnel prepared for WQED, the Pittsburgh educational television station, their application for a construction permit, installed the equipment and generally assisted in getting the station on the air.

2. WBC provided an operating location to WQED, namely the KDKA–FM transmitter building and tower for WQED's television transmitter. Later it gave WQED this 500 foot tower for their television antenna and land. The present replacement value of this property is estimated at $264,000.

3. A recent grant of $10,000 was made to WQED by the Westinghouse Electric Corp. as part of a major community effort to raise funds for the operation of the station.

Pittsburgh, KDKA:

1. WBC made available engineering services for the preparation of the application and the planning and supervised the construction and installation of Duquesne University's FM station WDUQ.

2. WBC donated a 3,000 watt FM transmitter to the Carnegie Institute of Technology. This transmitter had an original valuation of approximately $10,000 and a fair cash value at the time of the gift of $1,500.

3. WBC gave approximately 63 acres of land and the transmitter building at Saxonburg, Pa., to the Carnegie Institute of Technology for their synchrocyclotron project. The building has approximately 6,400 square feet of area which represented a construction cost at today's prices of about $20 per square foot. Value of the building is $128,000.

4. KDKA presented their complete music library to the Pittsburgh College for Women, now Chatham College. The library represented $25,000 worth of orchestrations of sheet music (fully cataloged) and the cabinets containing the sheet music.

5. WBC contributed engineering services in planning and designing studios for the speech department at Mount Mercy College.

Philadelphia, KYW: In 1953 WBC gave to the Delaware Valley Educational Television Corp. a complete FM transmitter installation, installed and in working order, having an evaluaiton estimated at $75,930.

Boston, WBZ–TV: WBC made a grant to the Lowell Broadcasting Foundation, the licensee of educational television station WGBH–TV in Boston, of a full powered television amplifier that permitted this station to cover a significantly increased area of metropolitan and suburban Boston. The full powered television amplifier afforded WGBH comparable power to that which the commercial broadcasters in Boston are employing. The replacement value of this amplifier is $76,675.

Boston, WBZ:

1. WBC gave Williams College a variety of studio radio equipment valued at $1,425.

2. WBC gave the Springfield Trade School a 1,000-watt transmitter and associated power supply valued at $6,000.

3. WBC donated radio amplification equipment to the South Dakota School of Mines. Estimated replacement value is $400.

California, KPIX: WBC, Inc. (Calif.) took over a chattel mortgage on KQED (the Bay Area Educational Television Association) held by a prior owner at low interest rate. A moratorium for these interest charges was later granted and finally the unpaid balance was forgiven, representing a grant of almost $4.000.

Illinois, WIND: WBC gave to the University of Illinois six radio power rectifier tubes valued at $180 each. Total gift, $1,080.

Indiana, WOWO:

1. WBC gave Tri-State College in Angola, Ind., FM transmitter equipment at a fair cash evaluation of $1,025.

2. WBC gave a 10,000-watt Westinghouse FM transmitter to Taylor University in Upland, Ind. The fair cash value was $4,500.

OTHER AREAS IN WHICH WBC DOES NOT OPERATE STATIONS

New Hampshire: WBC has granted technical equipment to the University of New Hampshire educational station (channel 11) in Durham, N.H. Estimated value of this equipment is $6,750.

Delaware: Westinghouse Electronics Division, Baltimore plant, gave to the University of Delaware approximately $5,000 (replacement value) worth of equipment apparatus and material for use in the university's laboratory.

Texas: Among numerous gifts of equipment to various universities, the largest was a gift of a 5,000-watt television transmitter and related equipment valued in excess of $45,000 to Texas A. & M.

CURRENT AND RECENT WBC RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAMS MADE AVAILABLE TO EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING STATIONS

Contributions of programming in addition to technical and monetary grants mark the continuing support by the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. for educational broadcasting. Based on the policy determination that public enlightenment can be achieved through showmanlike or entertaining and informative programs, WBC group and station productions in radio and television of a public service or enlightening nature, are made available to educational stations gratuitously and without cost.

Listed below are some of the programs that have been made available;

"Section Sixteen" and "The Challenge," two educational films which signalized the 100th anniversary and activity of the National Education Association.

"Growing Pains," an educational series dramatizing the problems of youth in America and featuring the world-famous educator and psychologist Helen Parkhurst.

"Adventures in Number Plus Space," a series of nine 30-minute programs which utilized the famous Baird marionettes to stimulate the interest of junior high school students in the subject of mathematics.

"Education 157," the first television report on the current status of education.

"Spotlight on Schools," the third yearly series of a unique news program devoted wholly to news on education.

"The Big R," a radio and television documentary which supplemented and supported the President's White House Committee and Conference on Education, and dealt with the problems confronting America's educational facilities and teaching personnel.

"Of Many Things," a radio series of conversation pieces with Dr. Bergen Evans, educator and instructor of English at Northwestern University.

"Books and Voices," with John K. M. McCaffery, noted newsman, commentator, and personality.

"The Rockefeller Reports," a series of six 15-minute readings at the time of the release of the special studies of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

"Mental Health Service," designed to develop broader public acceptance of effective treatment for mental illness.

"Get Out the Vote," a series of jingles intended to stimulate the American franchise to vote.

"Let Freedom Ring," a television project geared to serve important aspects of American history, produced by WBC's Boston station, WBZ–TV.

"Benny in Brussels," hour long film spectacular highlighting WBC's sponsored and produced series of jazz concerts at the Brussels World's Fair for the U.S. Department of State which supported American performing arts at the fair.

The Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., has projects in various stages of production upcoming, which will be made available to educational broadcasting facilities.

"The American Civil War," a television series reenacting the famous battles and political conflicts as seen through the photographs of Mathew B. Brady.

"Spectacle of a Man," a project designed to create a more favorable climate for intellectualism.

"The Best of Bergen Evans," a radio series.

"American Literature," narrated by Dr. Frank Baxter.

Public service conference: Educational station broadcasters participated among an invited 200 American broadcasters at Boston in 1957 and at Baltimore in 1958. Conference was designed to better serve the public through exploration and examination of shownmanlike programs that will educate and enlighten.

The WBC history award: Monetary incentive award which includes all commercial radio and television stations and educational stations, excluding only the WBC stations. Award designed to stimulate local stations' production of programs that explore the rich area of local and national American history.

In addition to the aforementioned radio and television group and station programs and/or series, WBC makes available to educational television stations in our markets the Encyclopedia Britannica films which, although the monetary value is not crystallized, we estimate to be worth about $25,000.

## Research in the Field of Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, recently I joined as a cosponsor in the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 41, which seeks the improvement of the health of man through cooperation in research, research training, and research planning.

In this connection, my attention has been drawn to an article which appeared in the February 1959, issue of Today's Health, which outlines a method whereby many of us may contribute to the furtherance of research in the field of health. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Operation No One Talks About," by Elizabeth Thompson Adler, who is from New Orleans, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OPERATION NO ONE TALKS ABOUT

(By Elizabeth Thompson Adler)

Jack Boyle, a man in his midseventies was admitted to a hospital because of nausea, vomiting, aching muscles, and a high fever of unknown origin. Two days later he died.

His family and friends were stunned. Jack had been considered a remarkably healthy man. He'd never had any serious illnesses, had never been in a hospital before.

In recent months, however, he had lost some weight and his friends noticed he seemed to have lost interest in the things that had always had meaning to him. Occasionally he would complain of his rheumatism, a cold, or a headache. But this was the kind of curbstone conversation one might expect from an elderly gentleman.

As the news of his death spread, there was one universal question: "What happened?" The answers all had a tone of resignation: "Old age finally got him." "The machine just wore out." "Poor Jack—complications."

WHAT WAS THE REAL EXPLANATION?

At the very moment such things were being said in her neighborhood, Mrs. Boyle was sitting in her doctor's office at the hospital. Through a haze of emotional shock and grief, she pleaded for an explanation.

"I'd only be guessing," her doctor told her. "There are so many diseases with similar symptoms. I don't want to guess. Would you permit an autopsy?"

The word had a sobering effect.

"I've always said my loved ones would never go through such a thing," Mrs. Boyle said. "I've always thought it's cruel and futile once a person is gone. But this was all so sudden. I think I'd feel better if I knew what happened."

In this country today too few people consent to an autopsy. Too many case histories are closed with a diagnosis of "senile degenerative diseases." No one in the family questions; no one doubts. And when a physician suggests an autopsy, the relatives refuse.

Doctors, unsure of exact causes of deaths in these cases, are eager to find evidence to substantiate their diagnoses, yet they report constant refusals to their requests for autopsies. They find many people unwilling to discuss the subject because they are afraid, because they don't understand, or they don't want the responsibility.

RECONSTRUCT COURSE OF ILLNESS

The autopsy on Jack Boyle revealed some startling facts. The pathologist was able to reconstruct the course the illness had taken; the symptoms that were unexplained began to have meaning. Examination of the spleen, liver, kidneys, lungs, and lymph nodes showed microscopic tubercle bacilli. Cause of death: miliary tuberculosis.

Because this is a communicable disease, the discovery was most significant to the members of the Boyle family, especially those who had made their home with the patient. The doctor recommended chest X-rays and a series of tests for the tubercle bacilli for all members of the family.

The tests revealed that Boyle's two youngest grandchildren had active pulmonary tuberculosis. This highly contagious form increased the chances of other members of the family being infected. Early detection, made possible through autopsy, spared them this risk.

The benefits of autopsy are far-reaching, not only to families and future generations, but also to medical science. Discoveries are constantly being made at the post-mortem table which lengthen man's life span. Important facts about blood diseases, heart trouble, cancer, and many other ills have been discovered through autopsy. Such knowledge provides a basis for medical education; mistakes due to lack of knowledge can be avoided.

BEYOND THE FAMILY'S CONTROL

Also important is the comfort the family receives when it is certain of the real cause of death. Nothing is more torturing than the thought, could we have prevented it? Mrs. Boyle admitted to her doctor it was comforting to know the cause of her husband's death—to find that it was a condition completely beyond her control.

Why, then, is only a small percentage of people in this country willing to permit autopsies? These are the most frequently heard objections:

The patient has suffered too much already.

This attitude expresses the feeling that the patient still exists and is capable of feeling pain. In some mourners, it is a subconscious rejection of death itself. To others, sanctioning an autopsy means assuming additional responsibility, making more decisions—which they would rather avoid.

I don't want the body to be disfigured.

This objection is voiced by those who have no idea of what actually transpires in the laboratory.

FINAL APPEARANCE NOT AFFECTED

Nothing in the process alters the countenance of the deceased. There is no ruthless handling; no practice operations are performed. The examination is conducted in the presence of the family physician, the pathologist, and other licensed physicians. Medical students do not experiment, although in many hospitals they observe as a part of their training.

Unless the case is very unusual, only a single midline incision is made in the torso. The brain is examined by an opening across the scalp, afterward hidden by the hair. With the same surgical skill employed in the operating room, the vital organs are carefully examined for evidence of disease; tiny samplings of bone, tissue, and fluids are taken for study. Then the incision is sutured and the autopsy is completed.

The surgeon in the operating room is using his knowledge and skill to prolong life in the living; the doctor in the post mortem laboratory uses the same skill and techniques, but his purpose is different. He is seeking to unfold the secrets that will prevent illness and death in the future. In both instances, the feelings of relatives are given the fullest consideration.

There is no fee for performing an autopsy. The report becomes a part of the hospital records. The family may see it if they want, but the usual procedure is for the personal physician to give a résumé of the findings.

I'd rather not know.

Some people find comfort in not knowing the cause of death, especially if there is a possibility that what they will learn could be unpleasant. Others are revealing their fears. Some think, for example, that cancer is hereditary. Therefore, if mother had cancer, I don't want it, and I'd rather not be told.

It will delay the funeral.

In communities where hasty burials are accepted practice, there are those who think an autopsy takes too long and delays arrangements. Actually, the examination takes about 2 hours and can be performed immediately after death.

It's against my religion.

Doctors say this is the reason most frequently given, and seldom questioned, though there is little fact to substantiate such a statement.

Do people really believe the excuses they give, or do they refuse autopsies because they have no occasion to think about such a thing until they are approached while in a state of emotional upset?

To check this theory, the writer interviewed several hundred people who were not under the stress of a recent bereavement and asked them how they felt about autopsies for themselves and their families. Even in the absence of emotional crisis, objections remained the same.

In Europe, a different attitude prevails. Doctors do not have to ask permission of relatives. Only a few countries do not require by law an autopsy on every death. As a result, autopsy has achieved general public acceptance—and added immeasurably to the storehouse of medical knowledge.

Yet in the United States, doctors must be satisfied in many cases with a diagnosis of death which is in large measure opinion as distinguished from fact. They cite three reasons why post-mortem examinations are important:

1. Some diagnoses cannot be made by observation. Tumors of the brain, for example, may spread to the lungs or ovarian tumors to the lungs or to bones and show up on incidental X-rays. The location of the primary lesion can't be demonstrated without autopsy.

2. For research purposes. Correct diagnosis still remains the most difficult and fundamental part of a doctor's job. Whatever his field of specialization, there is perpetual interest in research, and autopsy is one of the most valuable aids.

3. To find an explanation for symptoms (often coincidental) which don't fit in with the patient's primary disease. It takes courage for a doctor to face his own cases in autopsy—the examination exposes the causes of disease and the doctor's understanding and handling of the case. His original diagnosis is put to test, for during autopsy it is held up to challenge and evaluation.

In view of this, how valid are the reasons people give for refusing an autopsy? Do their objections make any more sense than the superstitions of the primitive South American Indians who seal up the eyes, nose, and mouth of a dying person so his ghost will not leave the body and carry off others?

All of us should be concerned about our responsibility in saving life—not only our own, but life in succeeding generations. Through autopsy, your doctor discovers how to prevent certain diseases from recurring within your family, thus prolonging life expectancy.

Discuss autopsy before one of your loved ones becomes ill. If there are differences, resolve them before the crisis comes. Doctors prefer that the decision be a group one, rather than placing all responsibility on one person.

What better gift can you give the world than loving your fellow man enough to do something which makes life easier, richer, and fuller for those who live after you?

## Dumping Films in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have said much in the past about the effect of Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan's visit to this country which was generated into a triumphant tour by some eager industrialists and bankers in this country.

One of the results of his recent visit is coming to the forefront now with certain motion picture executives trying to insert new life into their industry by dumping films into the laps of the Soviets with the American taxpayer footing the bill.

A recent column by George Todt entitled "How We Dig Our Own Graves," published in the Valley Times (San Fernando Valley, Calif.) offers a very clear commentary on this situation.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WE DIG OUR OWN GRAVES

(By George Todt)

"We must recognize that we cannot coexist eternally. One of us must go to his grave. * * * So what must be done? We must go to his grave."—Nikita Khrushchev.

A lot of softheaded appeasers in the Nation today have conveniently forgotten that Mr. Khrushchev's brilliant rhetoric, spoken so revealingly in a little white-hot fit of anger, refers specifically to us Americanskies, period. Who will Mr. K detail to dig our graves for us? Will he permit us the honor?

From outward appearances, at least, a certain few bankers and industrialists have already been tabbed by Senator STYLES BRIDGES as preparing to dabble in some questionable traffic with the Reds.

These boys are playing it penny-wise and pound-foolish, as the old saying goes.

Apparently they have forgotten the doctrinaire words of the often quoted Dimitri Manuilsky, formerly instructor in the Lenin School of Political Warfare (recently Russian military chief of the United Nations Organization) who had this to say back in the thirties:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched first."

What friendly little fellows these comrades be.

And it appears that our modern "merchants of death" have already forgotten the matter of the scrapiron we sold to Japan prior to the second world war. Our metal pigeons came home to roost, as most of us may recall. So did 1 million wounded Americans, although some of our dead didn't quite make the boat. Nice scrapiron, what?

So some of the boys are at it again. Full steam ahead and damn the torpedoes. One steel company announced shortly after Anastas Mikoyan's arrival on our shores that it had received (and accepted) a $3 million order of a special type of cold-rolled steel for the Kremlin.

Across the nation, here on our West Coast, we find Eric Johnston eager to dump the films of his dying motion picture industry in the laps of the Soviets—which would not be such a bad idea except for one thing. Under the Mikoyan concept of trade with America, the American taxpayers are expected to foot the bill. This is nice work if you can get it. And nobody can say that Mr. Mikoyan didn't try. Didn't quite make the grade this time—but he tried, well enough!

The fact that he was repulsed at the end of his visit on the matter of long-term credits (a few thousand years, perhaps?) was what all the shouting was about—and accounted for Mr. Mikoyan's churlish display of ill-temper as he boarded his airplane for home.

Boiled down to the barest essentials, if Mr. Mikoyan's plan had been okayed, our international traders would have had a real field day for themselves. For instance, Mr. Johnston could have shipped the Soviets all the films that the American public had been failing to shell out enough shekels to make them paying propositions in the past—and then we might all have contributed later to the cinema kitty via our taxes to the Government.

Well, you can't blame anybody for trying. Certainly not Mr. Johnston, who doubtless feels that something like this is necessary if the motion picture industry is to survive in the competitive days ahead. And let's all hope that it does become healthy once more at the boxoffice and survives for many decades to come.

But the way for the cinema industry to restore itself again lies not in flooding foreign markets with its products, to be subsidized through American tax money by citizens at home. There is a better way. The object lesson is close at hand.

Let us recall the monumental works of the now-dead titan of the film world, Cecil B. De Mille. His pictures didn't lose money, did they? Why not? The answer is to be found in the quality and high degree of morality he injected into his works. The old saw that the public cannot appreciate what is good disintegrates before the De Mille image. Yet that is the constant war cry we hear from the studios: that they lose money whenever they put out worthwhile vehicles.

Again, let us examine the superior works of De Mille. How come he never lost money on his many meritorious productions? Did he ever appeal to the shoddy, cheap, oversexed Hollywood ideal—the so-called 14-year-old mind? On the contrary, he emphasized quality work of the highest moral standards and gave us realistic authenticity in his productions—and he cleaned up. Was the most respected name in modern show business, too.

Let the Eric Johnstons of the film world take a page from the correct morality of Cecil B. De Mille and raise the standards of the cinema industry to his giant's level—and the mighty motion picture empire can bloom again without the necessity of dumping its products on the Russians.

All it takes is emphasis on morality and the best type of positive public relations.

I still think the right kind of motion picture work—in the spirit of De Mille and his great epics—could be the greatest force for good inside America and throughout the balance of the world, as well. But will it?

The answer lies in a true and unselfish change of heart. Can Hollywood rise to the challenge of a new and rapidly changing world? Shall we see?

## The Real Truth About Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on Tuesday I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first in a series of articles appearing in the Detroit Times describing the real truth about Michigan.

These articles seek to destroy the myths, the slanders and the lies that have sprung up about the business and financial situation in Michigan.

The second of these articles, which appeared in the Monday Detroit Times, puts the lie to the slander that Michigan has an unhealthy business climate that is driving away industry and killing off business investment.

I ask unanimous consent that this second article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN IS DRAWING BILLIONS

(By James Boynton)

If Michigan has lost its dynamic aggressiveness—if Michigan's economic glories are all of the past and none lie ahead, someone should tell:

The big three of the automobile world which has invested in excess of $3.5 billion in Michigan facilities since 1950.

Someone should tell the 3 million additional people who will be living in this State by 1975, according to Bureau of the Census forecasts, a population growth exceeding that of all States with the exception of California and Florida.

Someone should tell Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., which is pouring several millions of dollars into a new pinsetter plant that will give Muskegon an annual payroll of $4 million, and into a new school furniture plant in Kalamazoo. All this, after considering locations in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio.

A modern Paul Revere, perhaps, should start out to spread the alarm to Michigan cities and towns such as:

Ann Arbor, where Parke, Davis & Co. and the Bendix Aviation Co. are building multimillion dollar research laboratories. And where Hoover Ball & Bearing Co. and Buhr Machine Co. have just completed big new plants.

Ecorse, where the Great Lakes Steel division of National Steel Corp. will spend $100 million constructing a new mill.

Kalamazoo, where the Upjohn Co. has commenced a $12 million expansion program, including what probably will be the biggest office building in the State outside of Detroit. Also where the Checker Cab Manufacturing Co. is investing $5 million in capital costs in connection with production of its new passenger car.

WORLD'S RICHEST MARKET

Grand Rapids, where the Bissell Carpet Sweeper Co., Lear Inc., and Blanding Paper Products are expanding to take advantage of being in the midst of the Great Lakes market, the richest in the world.

Someone, too, should warn Walker Cisler, president of the Detroit Edison Co.; Dan E. Karn, president of Consumers Power Co.; William Day, president of the Michigan Bell Telephone Co., and Henry Tuttle, president of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., who have announced their companies will spend several hundred million dollars getting prepared for a bigger, more prosperous Michigan.

Detroit Edison is embarked on a $3 billion 5-year expansion program, with $68 million to be spent this year.

Michigan Bell Telephone Co. is expanding at the rate of $75 million a year.

Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. recently announced it would spend $30 million in addition to another $20 million for its new office building in the Civic Center.

Consumers Power Co. this year will make the largest capital expenditures in its history $117½ million.

General Telephone Co. is spending $12.8 million on 1959 expansion.

TIME TO CROW, NOT CLUCK

Seriously, though, all this is why Merritt D. Hill, general manager of Ford Motor Co.'s Tractor and Implement Division, recently said the people of Michigan should be crowing instead of clucking.

Michigan people have been jarred in recent months by an avalanche of vilification and misrepresentations about its industrial climate and charges that the State is headed for virtual bankruptcy.

They have heard a lot of fantasy and a lot of twisted information.

And that talk has taken its toll because Detroiters especially, who have been used to having their city lauded as the mass production capital of the world, are not used to a pessimistic approach.

But there is nothing to justify pessimism.

The best proof can be readily seen by anyone on a few hours drive about Detroit.

NONE LIKE IT IN THE WORLD

On Van Dyke, in Warren, stands the new billion dollar General Motors Technical Center. There are 300 acres of buildings which represent the heart and will of the worldwide General Motors empire, on 900 acres of land. There's nothing in the world that can match it.

In addition, General Motors has poured another billion since 1950 into 23 million square feet of new plants or additions to existing plants in metropolitan Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Grand Blanc, Saginaw, Lansing, and other Michigan points.

In Dearborn there's a collection of new office buildings bigger and more eye-appealing than those in downtown Detroit.

The ultramodern Ford central office buildings from which Henry Ford II and Ernest R. Breech run the Ford empire, just off Michigan and on the American Road, has 950,000 square feet of 12 stories. That's more space than there is in the Penobscot Building (800,000 square feet), Detroit's majectic skyscraper.

The new Ford division office building at Southfield and Rotunda Drive, completed in 1957 is bigger (450,000 square feet) than the Guardian (400,000) and the Buhl Building (316,000).

OVER A BILLION IN NEW BUILDING

Ford has a third relatively new office building in the Rouge manufacturing staff building, 360,000 square feet. But this is dwarfed in space by the 12 new buildings in the research and engineering center, a program completed only last year. The new construction totals about two-thirds of the 3,300,000 square feet occupied by the center.

Ford Motor has spent well over $1 billion on new construction in the Detroit area since 1950, three-quarters of which has been packed into the period 1952–57, inclusive.

Ford's postwar capital expenditures through 1959 total $2.7 billion.

If you want to see what vast sums like this look like in brick and mortar, drive by the new Mercury plant in Wayne, 2 million square feet; the new Lincoln plant at Wixom, 1,785,000 square feet, where Lincolns, Continentals, and Thunderbirds roll of the assembly line; the new chassis parts plant in Sterling Township, completed 3 years ago and comprising 1,856,000 square feet.

CHRYSLER BUILDS FOR FUTURE

In the last 5 years, Chrysler Corp. has built a new Amplex plant and a new engine plant in Trenton, a new Mo Par plant, and a new training center in Center Line as well as a new proving ground at Chelsea.

Chrysler has spent half a billion in the Detroit area increasing capacity since 1950 through new buildings and acquisitions, including the Briggs Manufacturing plants.

Despite the obvious fact that the world's biggest industry has spent $3 billion in connection with long-term programs, the campaign against Michigan continues.

It is impossible to be everywhere to answer all misconceptions.

AMBASSADORS STRIKE BACK

Appreciating this fact, the Michigan Industrial Ambassadors Corp. (200 business and professional men leaders, appointed by the Governor) have adopted a positive approach—selling Michigan for what it is—the richest industrial State in the Nation and its advantages, such as:

Market: Goods can be trucked overnight out of most major Michigan cities to 40 million people in the United States and Canada, the richest concentration of wealth in the world, contributing nearly one-third of the gross national product. Right here in Michigan they can deal with the largest percentage of homeowners in the United States, who enjoy the fruits of Michigan's holding first place in total income derived from manufacturing.

Population: Michigan's population is growing faster than any other States except California and Florida. By 1957, the State's population will increase 3 million over the 1955 total. Since 1954, the State's population has increased 24 percent and the accent has been on youth, with more than 42 percent of the population increase being persons less than 20 years. In the metropolitan Detroit area alone, there's a concentration of 3,900,000, $5 billion retail market.

Skills: Michigan has a large pool of skilled labor, the largest in the world. It has technicians who know how to master mass productions and who are experts at automation. A new company can come into Michigan and swing into almost immediate operation.

THERE'S MONEY ENOUGH FOR ALL

Banking: As a banking capital, Detroit banks are in a position to handle almost unlimited financial requirements. In recent years, Detroit has passed Philadelphia and Los Angeles in volume of bank debits (check volume) to individual accounts, the best single measure of over-all business. Only New York and Chicago top Detroit in this respect. Savings deposits also are at a new high and banks have ample funds to lend.

Seaway: The Seaway will provide Detroit with good, fast, cheap transportation, particularly for raw materials, such as iron ore. It also will boost Detroit's already leading position in foreign trade, which last year exceeded $2,073 millions.

Water: Water has become a big factor in industrial location and Michigan is tops in that respect. It has plenty of water for industrial users who use huge amounts of water daily, such as the chemical and steel industries.

Education: Michigan contributes more of its tax revenues to higher education than any other State in the Union, a point that must appeal to new settlers in the State. Michigan's professional schools also are turning out each year hundreds of potential leaders in the professions, business, and industry.

---

## Faith, Hope, and Hagerty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I have just read in the March 24 issue of the New York Times an article by James Reston and an editorial which I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. They point up the fact that the American people are in a large degree ignorant of the Berlin crisis—of the physical situation there, the background of the crisis, and the dangers involved. I believe that the American people are uninformed as to the Berlin situation because the President has failed to use his office to sufficiently inform the people. The articles make some illuminating observations, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH, HOPE, AND HAGERTY—BRIEFINGS ON CAMP DAVID TALKS FAIL TO FILL THE PUBLIC IN ON BERLIN CRISIS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—There was considerable interest and some dismay here as a result of the disclosure in the New York Times this morning that 39 percent of those questioned in a national spot check did not know that Berlin was an enclave in Communist East Germany 100 miles from the West Berlin border.

If this was even approximately accurate, officials here commented, something should be done to review the Government's policies in the field of foreign affairs. This conclusion was reinforced by complaints from members of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee that even they had not been briefed on this weekend's conversations between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillian.

Part of the reason for the paucity of information about the State Department's policy for the forthcoming Big Four Foreign Ministers' meeting on Germany is that the policy itself has not been clearly formulated.

Another factor is the illness of Secretary of State Dulles and the simultaneous illness of Andrew H. Berding, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who is Mr. Dulles' principal spokesman.

When he was running the State Department, Mr. Dulles was not only the principal

formulator and negotiator of foreign policy but the principal spokesman and witness on Capitol Hill as well.

He was interested in public information. Aside from his official appearances on the Hill and his weekly news conferences, he held many background meetings with legislators and reporters. These sessions nourished the general flow of diplomatic information from Washington to the country.

EVERYONE IS CONSIDERATE

With the Secretary seriously ill, everyone is being considerate and gentlemanly.

The President is being extremely considerate toward Mr. Dulles, saying that he himself must decide whether he can carry on his duties.

Mr. Dulles is being gentlemanly toward the President and the Acting Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter. He is talking daily with the State Department and he has had two sessions with his principal aids and the British on the Eisenhower-Macmillan talks, but he is not attempting to define policy or interfere with Mr. Herter's responsibilities.

Similarly Mr. Herter. He is avoiding news conferences and holding his appearances on Capitol Hill to a minimum. Even when he has been asked for personal information or background sessions on Berlin, he has explained that he wants to avoid doing anything that might give the impression that he is trying to take over the Department in Mr. Dulles' absence.

Inevitably, this has reduced the flow, not of general information about the firmness of the U.S. position on Berlin, but of information on the increasingly important diplomatic negotiations concerning how the United States and its allies intend to implement their policy of firmness.

The task of informing the reporters during the Eisenhower-Macmillan talks was taken over by the White House press secretary, James C. Hagerty, and the British Foreign Office's spokesman, Peter Hope. The general impression since Mr. Macmillan arrived last week is that this procedure has not worked too well.

THE GREATEST IS FAITH

It is a policy of faith, hope and Hagerty, and of these the greatest is faith.

The reporters were kept in Gettysburg, miles away from Camp David. The reports of the meetings by Messrs. Hope and Hagerty were far from complete.

Indeed, Mr. Hagerty appears to have been persuaded more by the necessity of British internal politics than by the need to enlighten the American people.

There were sharp differences between him and Mr. Hope on the extent of the President's commitment to a summer summit meeting. While these were not allowed to show themselves in the briefings, they were no less real.

Thus, the British spokesman privately was describing the President's commitment as "unconditional" and without regard to results at a preliminary foreign ministers' conference and Mr. Hagerty was doing nothing to correct this impression. The result was that Mr. Macmillan has been credited with a great personal triumph and the President with having executed a complete about-face.

Those officials who had personal knowledge of what went on at Camp David were not available to the reporters, and those who were available either were not informed on important details of the conversations or were under instructions to avoid direct replies.

There is some justification for this at the moment. Differences still exist between London and Washington on some details of possible compromises with the Soviet Union and officials here feel there is no point in advertising them to the world.

Also, Moscow is taking advantage of every opportunity to blanket the Eisenhower-Macmillan talks with its own propaganda. The day before the British Prime Minister arrived here, Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev called an unusual news conference in Moscow and managed to dominate the news, even in this country, by agreeing to a May 11 foreign ministers' meeting before he had even received Western notes suggesting that date.

Officials here are concerned about the evidence that the public is not well informed on the crisis. There was some talk here today of having Mr. Herter and Mr. Macmillan hold background conferences to try to correct the situation.

---

OPINION ON BERLIN

An illuminating picture of American public opinion on the Berlin crisis was provided by this newspaper's survey published yesterday. It is no surprise that the survey found the American people generally support President Eisenhower's firm stand on Berlin, but large numbers of people, the survey suggests, know little about the Berlin problem and have little appreciation of its potentialities or causes. The parking lot attendant in Atlanta who said that because he is a working man, "I don't have much time to read about these things," and the New York cab driver who couldn't listen to President Eisenhower's speech last week because his children insisted upon listening to rock 'n roll music apparently typify many people in this country. It is a sobering thought.

It is a tribute, of course, to the great confidence the American people have in President Eisenhower that even many of those who know almost nothing about the Berlin situation are willing to accept his judgment. Yet that kind of blind trust has its own dangers. Certainly the survey's picture of opinion does not entirely bear out the President's confidence that "the American public is more soberly aware of the true situation than a lot of people" in Washington.

How can this situation be corrected? Obviously it is up to the communications media—newspapers, television, and radio—to do the job that has not adequately been done to date. Nor can these media dodge this duty on the plea that the public is more interested in other matters. In a democracy there is no public interest more important than the creation of an alert and well informed public opinion. Much more can obviously be done in this area than has been done, and it needs doing badly.

---

## The Revolt in Tibet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Communist use of brute force is dramatized once again by the eloquent statement of the eldest brother of the Dalai Lama, Mr. Thubden Norbu, which I received this morning in a telegram from Robert Ekvall, of the Far East Department at the University of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram quoting the brother of the Dalai Lama be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

While at the University of Washington the eldest brother of the Dalai Lama, Mr. Thubden Norbu, made the following statement through me to the American public: "The revolt which has broken out in Tibet expresses the resistance of the people of Tibet to Chinese Communist aggression and oppression. The Chinese Communists have indiscriminately killed thousands of men, women, and children. If they are not able to subdue the Tibetans they are apparently determined to pursue a policy of extermination. When they have made an end of the Tibetan people they intend to fill Tibet with Chinese. There is little hope for my people unless the people of the world who stand for liberty and justice come to the aid of the Tibetans and right this great wrong. I can only appeal to all who love freedom to help us in this our time of greatest need."

This statement was made by a man who feels that maybe he alone has the chance to appeal on behalf of his people. It was an eloquent and moving statement and should not go unheard and unanswered. He, too, cited the Hungarian debacle. I hope this can be used to good effect.

ROBERT EKVALL.

---

## Tribute to Senator Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a veteran Nevada newspaper editor, Mr. A. E. Cahlan, of the Las Vegas Review-Journal, in his column "From Where I Sit," on March 18, 1959, had high praise for our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and made some predictions about the future. I share the sentiments of my good friend, Al Cahlan, on the dynamic, around-the-clock leadership provided by LYNDON JOHNSON. I ask unanimous consent to have this most illuminating column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM WHERE I SIT
(By A. E. Cahlan)

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON will be the next President of the United States or will name him.

That's not my opinion, but is one most frequently expressed in the confines of private conversation on Capitol Hill. My own thought is that the astute Texan is a man of destiny—that he will be the next President, and will rank with the greatest in American history.

It has been my privilege to know Senator JOHNSON intimately and as a friend, and to have followed his career in detail ever since he became leader of the Senate. In my mind, he is one of those rare individuals who appear in times of emergency in this land of ours, trained to meet the particular situation that endangers the future of the Republic, and thoroughly able through temperament, ability, and courage to take charge.

To me, LYNDON JOHNSON has all the qualities that made Abraham Lincoln great. I made this statement to Washington friends of his not long ago and found that their close association with the Texan had con-

vinced them of the same thing. I do not qualify my prediction as some do. I am certain that, barring a new physical barrier that does not now exist, he will be nominated and elected by a majority that will rival those of Franklin D. Roosevelt in his greatest year.

While JOHNSON steadfastly denies any presidential ambitions and says he will not be a candidate, that can be written off as just good political strategy. Beneath the surface, the Senator's close supporters are quietly laying the groundwork for the big battle which is as yet a full year away.

Most potent force in the JOHNSON camp is the working units of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, an organization that has no real ties with the national committee headed by PAUL BUTLER. Members of the committee are now working with the northern industrial-unionized sections of the country to overcome the "Southern Senator" label which opponents hope will defeat him come convention time.

Too, only a few writers over the land have grasped the full significance of JOHNSON's deliberate including of Texas as a Western rather than a Southern State, something he has enjoyed doing for many years now.

The big secrets of JOHNSON's success are: (1) his great personal charm (I have met few men in my long newspaper career who have the tremendous magnetism this man has) and (2) his rare generalship of such things as the civil rights hot potato, his guidance of Hawaiian statehood and other difficult processes of legislation which JOHNSON makes appear easy.

Even Senator PROXMIRE, freshman from Wisconsin, who is constantly attacking JOHNSON, recognizes the leader's finer points. He is merely angling for credit for JOHNSON's defeat at some future date, if in truth he is defeated. Sort of like the prophets who predict dire events. If they happen, they're remembered and glorified. Usually they're forgotten and lost.

PROXMIRE is essaying the David and Goliath role, but his slingshot is not reaching its mark and won't. JOHNSON is so far ahead of his detractors, they make him even greater by their prattlings.

Surrounding JOHNSON are the best political brains in the country. He has in his camp the most astute politicoes in the Democratic Party along with some of the ablest former newsmen. He has a personal organization which, when the word is given, can sweep the Nation.

## Forty Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 21, 1959:

FORTY YEARS OF SERVICE

The American Legion well deserves the accolades which have come to it from many military and civilian sources on completion of its 40 years of active and constructive service to the country for which its members have fought in two world wars and the Korean conflict. From its small beginning in Paris in March of 1919 to its standing today as the largest organization of war veterans in history, the Legion has exemplified the highest standards of citizenship. Its members not only have served faithfully in defense of the Nation in time of war but have devoted much energy, money and time to character building, civic advancement and promotion of Americanism, as distinguished from foreign isms, in time of peace. We join in saluting this worthwhile organization as it enters another decade of service to the country.

## Power Problems in the Development of the Snake River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there was published in The Oregonian of March 19, 1959, a very fine letter to the editor written by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association. In the letter Mr. Norwood discussed some of the serious power problems which confront us in connectioin with the development of the Snake River. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Norwood's very fine letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORTH WAITING FOR

To the editor: Your editorial on the Middle Snake omits several ideas necessary to a balanced picture.

In order to insure adequate opportunity for complete research on fish passage methods, Congress can simply reserve the Middle Snake for five years so no license can be issued while intensive fish studies continue.

Our testimony at the Army hearings for conditional authorization of Nez Perce Dam amounts to the same thing. Either approach is sound.

We do not agree with the editorial that the alternative plan has benefits comparable to those of Nez Perce. At 1.5 mills per kilowatt-hour, Nez Perce power is the cheapest available new industrial power supply in the United States. Furthermore, the Nez Perce Dam would cost $150 million less than the two alternatives.

High Mountain Sheep power, if developed by the private utility syndicate, would cost three times as much and achieve only 50 percent development. Its high cost power will attract no industries to Oregon.

Nez Perce Dam, at 2,500,000 kilowatts, would exceed Grand Coulee and even Russia's 2,300,000-kilowatt Kuibyshev Dam, which is now the world's largest. The Nez Perce Dam site is a great prize and it belongs to the public. Why give it away?

Indeed, further studies may warrant increasing the height and storage at Nez Perce for even greater benefits and more comprehensive development. We urged the studies but the Army pleaded lack of time and budget.

The stakes are great. The ultimate annual value of power from Nez Perce Dam and the Salmon River is about $120 million, or greater than that of the entire output of the Tennessee River. The comparable wholesale value of fish is about $6 million. The ratio is 20 to one. But this is not to say that either should be sacrificed. The goal is both power and fish.

The Nez Perce Dam is one girl worth waiting for. The advocates of a quick decision are the usual quick-buck private utilities.

GUS NORWOOD,
*Executive Secretary, Northwest Public Power Association.*

## Padre Island, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Padre Island in Texas has been called Isla Blanca. Translated from the Spanish, this means Island of White.

This lovely spot is one of the few places on our Nation's coast which has not been developed in small plots by private ownership. To preserve this island, which is a playground, game habitat, and historic location, for the enjoyment of our Nation, I have introduced S. 4, a bill to make Padre Island a national park. I feel that this semitropical isle, situated in a clime of palms and sun, as it is, could easily become a winter playground for the Nation.

The Garden Club of Houston, Tex., has passed a resolution in support of this proposed legislation. And, in addition, the Houston Press recently printed a story describing the island.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution by the Garden Club of Houston, Tex., and also the story under the heading "Padre Isle: Diamond in the Rough," written by Mr. Louis Hofferbert, and published in the Houston Press on Monday, March 23, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GARDEN CLUB OF HOUSTON,
*Houston, Tex., March 19, 1959.*

Hon. SENATOR YARBOROUGH,
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: Our organization passed this resolution regarding Padre Island and we would like to bring it to your attention:

"*Resolved*, That the Garden Club of Houston take whatever action seems advisable to support proposed legislation to make Padre Island a national park."

The club takes this action because:

1. Far too small a percentage of our national seashore areas has been preserved for public recreation and relaxation and Padre Island is the only large, as yet undeveloped seashore area on the combined Atlantic and gulf coasts.

2. The national parks survey has shown Padre Island to be highly desirable for preservation as a national park because of its scenic beauty, its historic and scientific interest, and its great potential as a recreational area.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. WILLIAM S. COCHRAN, Jr.,
*Conservation Chairman.*

[From the Houston Press, Mar. 23 1959]

PADRE ISLE: DIAMOND IN THE ROUGH

(By Louis Hofferbert)

CORPUS CHRISTI, March 23.—A man who has done much to push private development of Padre Island favors creation of a national park on the island.

John L. Tompkins, developer of Padre Beach near the southern tip of the 110-mile-long island, said:

"A national park on the island would be a wonderful thing, if it is done with reason."

He favors a park that would embrace some 15 to 40 miles of the long slender island.

Two legislative proposals have been made for a Padre Island National Park. Neither of them spells out exactly how large such a park would be.

A bill in the U.S. Senate by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH reads "for the purpose of establishing a national park on Padre Island."

And a bill in the Texas House by Houston Representative ROGER DAILY would authorize the State "to acquire * * * the land constituting Padre Island" for the creation of a national park.

FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

All those who advocate having a Padre Island National Park recognize that in addition to the unique features of the island, making a park there is the only way to save the Nation's last great beach for the benefit of all the people.

Said Mr. Tompkins:

"Creating a national park would boom land values. And creating a park would attract many visitors. Whatever is done, the National Park Service would have to be sure to provide the accommodations needed for their pleasure and comfort."

Mr. Tompkins is an ardent advocate of tourist development. He has just returned to his Corpus Christi home from a Mexico City roads conference. His island projects include both tourist accommodations and homesites for winter or permanent residents.

He maintains a home at Padre Beach as well as in Corpus, and he envisions the southern tip of Padre as "another Miami Beach within a few years."

DONATED PARK SITE

Mr. Tompkins' own development takes in only a fractional part of the island.

His Padre Beach embraces 1500 acres—about 5 miles along the narrowest part of the island. Mr. Tompkins has donated a strip across the island at the northern end of his property to Cameron County, which is now being developed into a county-controlled public park.

Another such park—Isla Blanca Park—takes in the southernmost tip of the curving island.

OWNED BY SYNDICATES

Several syndicates hold title to most of the island whose full name is Isla de Padre Nicolas Balli.

The ownership, in which holdings are measured by miles rather than acres, lies primarily in the A. R. Jones interests of Kansas City, Mo.; the Gilbert Kerlin-Jonathan Conrow group in New York; and the Fisher interests of Chicago.

Of these, the Jones group controls most—approximately 80 miles, or better than two-thirds of the entire island.

Aside from the area around Port Aransas, and the development at Padre Beach, the only diversified ownership is along the southern edge of the strip owned by the Kerlin-Conrow interests.

That group has sold approximately 70 tracts of varying size. There has been no development of these tracts so far.

Estimates of land values on the island vary widely.

There are some who believe the large landowners should give the State or Federal Government title to a "reasonable" portion of the island for a purely nominal or token sum.

Mr. Tompkins believes a "fair general price for the undeveloped beach" would be about $100 an acre.

## Origin of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the American Legion since its inception, 40 years ago, it has been my privilege to have seen its tremendous growth and influence year after year. As a past commander of my local post, and down through the years, I have looked with pride upon the accomplishments of the American Legion, not only for its own membership, but for veterans generally.

Under unanimous consent, I am including with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article, entitled "Origin of the American Legion," written by my good friend, Mr. Walter S. Farquhar, concerning the origin of the American Legion. This article appeared in the Pottsville Republican under date of March 17, 1959:

ORIGIN OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

(By Walter S. Farquhar)

This year, March 15 to 17, marks the 40th birthday of the American Legion.

Born overseas was American Legion, at Paris, March 15 to 17, in 1919. Its original caucus was held in the Cirque de Paris, a theaterlike arena in the French metropolis.

Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., called the caucus to order, and generally is looked on as father of the organization. The name was suggested by Maurice K. Gordon, a major in the 36th Division, and adopted after thorough discussion.

Not long afterward, May 8 to 10, again in 1919, the Legion held its first caucus on American soil, with Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., presiding once more.

And then came the first national convention, at Minneapolis, still in 1919, on November 10 to 12, with many of the delegates still in uniform. And the parade that year was in a real snowstorm. Later events ran into snows of confetti and ticker tape.

It was then Franklin D'Olier, of Pennsylvania, became the first national commander, and Indianapolis was selected as the headquarters site, because that city is near the theoretical national center of population. There, at present, stands a handsome $2,500,000 building, provided rent free by the State of Indiana.

Legion's second national convention was held in Cleveland and its third at Kansas City, the latter event being marked by the presence of famous commanders of World War I. Marshall Foch, of France, was there—having been in command of all the Allied armies, John J. Pershing, "Black Jack," General of the U.S. Army attended. Adm. Lord Beatty, of Great Britain, General Diaz, of Italy, and Lieutenant General Jacques, of Belgium, were there.

Care of the disabled always has been a concern of the American Legion, which includes veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean war, regardless of overseas service. The Legion holds a soldier must go where he is ordered and cannot choose to fight overseas. It has backed the rights and patriotism of servicemen strongly.

It has gone in for other national and community service, its baseball program during the summer being aimed against juvenile delinquency and in support of the ideals of sportsmanship.

Persons who remember the Grand Army of the Republic posts, following the Civil War, are aware that the "Boys in Blue" were a strong force, in inculcating patriotism, for many years after strife between the States. But the GAR made the mistake of limiting its membership to those who had served in the Civil War. Even Spanish-American veterans had to form an organization of their own. Hence, the GAR died with its last survivor.

American Legion, formed overseas, changed that policy to one of organization in perpetuity, by welcoming veterans of subsequent wars. Hence, the organization we know today is not likely to die out. And, if there should be a long period of peace, sons of Legion veterans are likely to carry on in the interim.

Pamphlets of the 40th anniversary carry a picture of the first caucus, in the Paris arena. The large hall was not filled, but the delegates were organized into groups as in a political convention. Plaques telling the designation of military divisions protruded in the aisles like those of States at presidential conventions. Conspicuous in the front was the placard of the 28th Pennsylvania Division, "The Iron Division" which had a big part in storming the enemy's thought-to-be-impregnable position in the Argonne Forest, the most brilliant victory ever achieved by American arms.

Although awareness of the occasion's importance was registered on the countenances of all, the delegates could not hide the fact that they were weary—and homesick. They had been in uniform for several years and had fought through "the war to end wars." They had lived like animals, in the trenches, amid filth and vermin, and in constant danger of their lives. The war had been over for 4 months and they were eager to come home. But they lingered on to form the Legion.

Such was the origin of American Legion. Now there are 32 posts in Schuylkill County, Pa., alone.

## Why Not Enforce Existing Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, now before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee endeavors to make legal—by setting aside antitrust protection—resale price maintenance. Resale price maintenance legislation is not needed to prevent predatory price cutting. The Sherman Act and the Robinson-Patman Act—particularly section 3—have been passed by previous sessions of Congress to prohibit such predatory price cutting.

Now we are asked to set aside the law providing these protections and enact a law to shackle the free enterprise system.

Is it not about time that Congress, through its committee, stopped buying a "pig in a poke," accepting and dignifying the proponents claims as valid? Rather, we should investigate why so many proponents of this bill feel endangered by predatory price cutting which is already illegal. Let us first decide the shortcomings, if any, or lack of enforcement of existing law before we impose federally sanctioned price control.

## Connecticut College for Women, Theater Benefit and College Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Connecticut College Club of Washington will present a preview performance of "The Lady's Not for Burning," by Christopher Fry, on Monday evening, April 6, 1959, at the Arena Stage Theater, to benefit Connecticut College for Women.

This college, located in New London, was incorporated in 1913 as the first private college for women to be established in the State of Connecticut. Connecticut College is a private, gift-supported, 4-year liberal arts college that grants the bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees.

In less than 50 years, the college has become one of the foremost independent colleges for women in this country. As the reputation of the college developed, the original student body of 101 in 1915 increased gradually to 915 students in 1959. At the same time, the geographical representation has increased from the original 9 States to 37 States and 15 foreign countries. The students enjoy the privilege of attending classes instructed by a faculty that numbers more than 100 distinguished men and women, drawn from the world's leading colleges and universities. The students' educational advantages are augmented by their participation in special college programs, such as those supported by agencies like the U.S. Public Health, the American Cancer Society, and Naval Research; or by enrolling in the nationally known Connecticut College School of Dance, in the summer, studying in the 286 acre college arboretum, or by observing and practice teaching at the college nursery school, at its affiliated high school, or the adjacent Lyman Allyn Art Museum. During the last 35 years the college has managed the development and increase of its educational resources without operating on a deficit.

However, today increased costs and the fact that the school has little endowment or other income have created a crisis in its operation. After careful study of the situation, the board of trustees has decided to seek $3,100,000, referred to as the 50th anniversary fund, from its alumnae, parents, and friends. By 1961 the college hopes that this sum will be available to provide salaries, scholarships, buildings, and books.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include as part of these the statement of the president of the college, Rosemary Park, in the 50th anniversary fund pamphlet:

STATEMENT BY ROSEMARY PARK, PRESIDENT OF THE CONNECTICUT COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

Unlike many other colleges Connecticut College was not developed through the initial generosity of one donor or of one family. From the beginning it has depended upon the interest and understanding of many people.

When the college incorporators in 1913 determined on New London as the site for the new college 5,000 citizens of the town contributed toward the erection of its first building, New London Hall, which now houses the bontany and zoology laboratories and classrooms. Many of the large donors to the college also knew about its program at first hand because they lived in the area and saw it grow day by day.

This was true of the Palmer family whose gifts built the library and the auditorium, and of the family of Morton F. Plant who gave the original endowment of $1 million, and the first stone dormitories, Plant and Blackstone. They subsequently established the Henry F. Plant Memorial Fund for government internships. It was also true of the Bill family whose bequest made the laboratory and classroom building, Bill Hall, possible. The generous gift of Mrs. Edward S. Harkness for a dormitory and a chapel came about too through her proximity to the college.

All these were substantial donors, but they were joined by thousands of others in Connecticut and beyond, who have felt a concern for the development of the college. Hundreds contributed to the college infirmary, many hundreds more to the Crozier-Williams Center, finally made possible by the generous bequest of Mary Williams Crozier, of Washington, D.C.

A lively inheritance like that of Connecticut College puts the present under obligation. The college believes its record will show that it has used its talents wisely, not buried them for unimaginative safekeeping, but exploited them for the benefit of its generations and the glory of its benefactors.

At this time in its history, at its half century mark, its needs are different from the necessities which earlier donors so generously provided, but they are no less necessities.

Through the 50th anniversary fund, salaries and books, scholarships and faculty housing and a physical education and recreational building will enable Connecticut College to continue its remarkable progress. As in its first half century, so again in its second, Connecticut College will depend upon the enthusiasm of alumnae and upon the understanding of all those who know its work and its promise.

## Women Won't Need To Shop Any More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the consumers of this Nation shopping for sales, a cheaper price, a bargain, make millions of daily decisions which in total establish the prices of merchandise.

The right price is that price the buyer will pay by choice after comparing competitive items. Other matters, such as credit terms, delivery, warranty, and the like, are present, but change not the fact that the price is, by definition, the mutual choice made by buyer and seller. The buyer may haggle to get the price reduced. The merchant may hold the merchandise for a period, reduce it, have a sale, or throw in a bonus. The sales price is still the amount the buyer will pay.

Now by Federal law, known as fair trade, H.R. 1253, the Federal Government is to be asked to set aside antitrust law and let the manufacturer set the retailers' price. Is the give and take of the marketplace between buyer and seller now to go out the window? Might as well tell the women, as one fair trade exponent commented, "It won't be necessary to shop any more."

## Dedication of Page Elementary School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an article from the Public Spirit of Ayer, Mass., dated March 12, 1959:

THE PUBLIC SPIRIT,
*Ayer, Mass., March 14, 1959.*

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am enclosing the news story from the March 12 issue of the Public Spirit, with the account of the dedication in Ayer of the Page School, this town's first new elementary school in over 80 years. This school serves the young people of Ayer and children of military personnel of Fort Devens.

Because of the great historical significance of this dedication, the people of our town and Fort Devens would be honored, I am sure, if this news story would appear in a coming issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MINOT V. BASTIAN, Jr.,
*Editor.*

[Encl.]

PAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DEDICATION SUNDAY AFTERNOON—DR. JOHN J. DESMOND, JR., FORMER COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR MASSACHUSETTS, PRINCIPAL SPEAKER

AYER.—Local history was made Sunday afternoon with the formal dedication of the $800,000 Page School, the town's new 16-classroom structure accommodating elementary grade children from the community and from Fort Devens. Approximately 500 persons attended the exercises, the chairman for which was Frank C. Harmon.

SPEAKERS PRAISE FACULTY

Dr. John J. Desmond, Jr., former commissioner of education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, delivered the main

address. He described the school one of the finest and most modern in New England. Maj. Gen. Sidney C. Wooten, post commander at Fort Devens, brought the official greetings of the military establishment to the town.

Neil W. Ackland, regional representative, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, joined with others on the program in congratulating the town for its new facility.

SUPERINTENDENT EXPRESSES APPRECIATION

Superintendent of Schools Harold G. Norton expressed the appreciation of the school department to the school building committee and everybody who was actively concerned with the construction and completion of the Page School. Superintendent Norton also reminded the citizens that serious consideration should be given for a new high school building to replace the present over-crowded structure.

The program was conducted by Chairman Harmon and he was assisted by the members of his committee. Mrs. Rena M. Hurley, principal of the school, and her teaching staff were introduced to the audience.

PAGE PORTRAIT PRESENTED

A highlight of the occasion was the presentation to the school by Ralph H. Richardson of a portrait of his grandfather, Alfred Page, in whose honor the school was named. "I am very grateful and very proud," Mr. Richardson declared, "that this building, the first school building erected by the town of Ayer since 1931 and the first one designed for exclusive use as an elementary school since 1873, almost 83 years ago, has been named in honor of my grandfather."

Alfred Page Richardson, another grandson of Alfred Page, was present at the dedication as an honored guest of the school department.

FLAGS DONATED

The Ayer Woman's Club, through its president, Mrs. Gerald Finnegan, presented the school with a new U.S. flag and a Commonwealth of Massachusetts flag for use on the stage. The Sisterhood of Congregation Anshey Sholom of Ayer, with its president, Mrs. Carl A. Black, as its representative, presented the school with a flag for use on the flagpole on the school grounds. School Committeeman Donald R. Griffin received the flags in behalf of the school department.

KEY TRANSFER CEREMONY

Participating in the ceremony of the transfer of the keys to the building were George W. Doyle, superintendent of construction Herbert H. Glassman, of Perley Gilbert Associates, the school's architects; Frank C. Harmon, chairman of the school building committee, and Paul K. McGuane, chairman of the school committee.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

Among those introduced to the gathering as guests of the school department on this occasion were Hon. Lyman K. Clark, judge of the Ayer district court; Arthur W. Cryan and Edmund E. McMahan, of Perley Gilbert Associates, the school architects; Joseph Kaplan, donor of the Kaplan teaching scholarship in the Ayer school system; Joseph M. Markham, the town of Ayer's "elder statesman"; the Reverend Hugh Penney, of the Ayer Federated Church; and Hon. Chester H. Waterous, area representative to the general court.

The Reverend Daniel F. Dunn, of St. Mary's Parish of Ayer, delivered the invocation; and the Reverend Henry Mattocks, of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church of Ayer, gave the benediction.

Music was furnished by the Ayer High School ensemble and there were selections by the a cappella choir.

Souvenir brochures on the historic school dedication were distributed to those attending the event.

Following the dedication program held in the school auditorium, there was an inspection of the building, with committee members assisting in a tour of the school.

Refreshments were enjoyed in the gymnasium.

## Lynn, Mass., Deanery, Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men Opposed to Recognition and Admission of Red China to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include resolutions adopted by the Lynn, Mass., deanery, Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men submitted to me by Cornelius F. Burke, president of the Lynn deanery:

ARCHDIOCESAN COUNCILS OF CATHOLIC MEN AND WOMEN,
LYNN DEANERY,
*March 18, 1959.*

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: At the recent quarterly meeting of the Lynn deanery of the Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men the attached resolutions were unanimously approved:

1. Against recognition of Red China by the United States and against its admission to the United Nations.

2. The imposition of penalties against the U.S.S.R. for its defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations.

The deanery represents the 29 parishes in Lynn, Everett, Malden, Melrose, Revere, Saugus, Nahant, and Minthrop, Mass.

Your interest in this matter will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

CORNELIUS F. BURKE,
*President, Lynn Deanery.*

The Lynn deanery, Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men, notes with regret that favorable policies and opinions have been expressed by certain individuals and groups relative to recognition of Red China by the United States and the admission of Red China to the United Nation: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Lynn deanery opposes such recognition and admission of Red China either directly or by subterfuge, and petitions the present Congress of the United States to reaffirm the joint resolution of the 84th Congress because (1) the passage of time has shown that by its action and policies Red China is opposed to the principles of the Federal Government and of the United Nations; and (2) war, religious or secular persecution, in violation of human rights, are not acceptable credentials for recognition by the United States or the United Nations; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Congressmen WILLIAM H. BATES, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, and THOMAS J. LANE, and Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

The Lynn deanery, Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men, alleges that the military forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have thrust the present governmental officials on the Hungarian people.

The United Nations General Assembly by resolution has declared Hungary to be deprived of its liberty and political independence and the people of their human rights through armed intervention of the U.S.S.R.

There is no true freedom of religion and in its place the Hungarian puppet Government has adopted a policy of terroristic suppression and persecution and any procrastination by the General Assembly might cause world opinion to turn against the United Nations due to continued defiance by Hungary and the U.S.S.R. of many United Nations resolutions calling for withdrawal of Soviet military force and the stoppage of persecution of the Hungarian people: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Lynn deanery asks the Congress of the United States to instruct its representatives at the United Nations to advocate the imposition of penalties against the U.S.S.R. for this defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, and Congressmen WILLIAM H. BATES, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, and THOMAS J. LANE.

## Town of Glenville, N.Y., Opposes Action of TVA in Awarding Turbine Contract Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter I have received from the Town Board of the Town of Glenville, N.Y., expressing their firm opposition to the recent action of the TVA in awarding a contract for a 500,000 kilowatt steam turbine generator to a foreign firm, in spite of the heavy unemployment that exists in the area of the Schenectady plant of the General Electric Co., and the hazards to national security such action creates.

The letter follows:

TOWN OF GLENVILLE,
*Scotia, N.Y., March 20, 1959.*

Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STRATTON: You no doubt are aware that the Schenectady General Electric Co. has just lost an order for a 500,000-kilowatt steam turbine-generator to Parsons, Ltd., of England, as a result of a regrettable decision of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

When a Federal agency such as the TVA decides to take the money we pay in taxes to purchase a machine outside the United States, it can only mean one thing: The taxes Americans pay are being used to put other Americans out of work. This order would have made possible work for approximately 640 men for 1 year. Much of the wages paid

these 640 men would go back into this community to help alleviate the depressed economic condition existing here at this time.

Further, the TVA power system is one of the largest in the world and, therefore, one of the most critical in time of emergency. In going outside the country to make this purchase, the TVA is gambling that a foreign power can adequately service this machine in time of emergency.

Therefore, as representatives of the town of Glenville, we ask you to do everything in your power to see that this decision is revoked and that this order be given to the lowest domestic bidder.

Very truly yours,

TOWN BOARD, TOWN OF GLENVILLE,
By ROBERT HOOD, *Town Clerk.*

## Our Liberties Versus Responsibilities in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion of Ohio conducts an essay contest among the high school seniors in the State on some phase of Americanism. Twelve winners are selected and rewarded by a trip to Washington, D.C. This year one of the winners was Michael Fout, a senior at Kenton High School in the district I represent. If his essay represents the thinking of our youth, we have nothing to fear for the future of our country. I recommend it to all of us who are too prone to take for granted the things that go with American citizenship:

OUR LIBERTIES VERSUS RESPONSIBILITIES IN A FREE SOCIETY

How well we Americans remember the story of the gaining of our independence: In 1776 our ancestors declared themselves free from their mother country, England, and for the next 8 years, proved that they were willing to fight for national liberty. In 1783, they not only secured our valuable heritage but also the responsibilities of running our country democratically and protecting its citizens. Accompanying this national liberty was individual liberty, which every citizen was entitled to.

However, as completely unrestricted freedom of action quickly leads to anarchy and makes justice and social existence itself impossible, it can be assumed that restraints on the freedom of action by individuals, for the good of the other members of society and of society as a whole, are necessary and inevitable. Thus, individual liberty is the right of a person to act without restraint as long as his actions do not interfere with the equivalent right of others. Any violation of this responsibility toward others is not characterized as liberty, but is stigmatized as license, and abuse of freedom. Such are the civil and criminal offenses in which miscreants who, disregarding their responsibility to society, willfully commit. Lefty Barnes, who is serving time for the bank holdup a year ago, or Uncle Bill, who couldn't rear his children properly, have both shirked their responsibilities.

Because they do carry with them responsibilities, our liberties make us think for ourselves and build our character. In World War II, there was a great difference between the Japanese soldier and the American soldier. The Japanese were good followers since they didn't do a thing without an order. But in open battle, they couldn't be responsible and judge for themselves. They lacked initiative.

Thomas Jefferson was a firm believer in revolution so that the Government doesn't become stagnant but that it progresses. Progress in a country can be brought on only by the initiative of the people. This initiative can be aroused only when the people possess their God-given rights.

In America, we are proud to say that our Government is based on the right and worth of the individual. We enjoy the freedoms of worship, speech, press, and assembly. But we also have the responsibility of controlling them and using them properly. When an assembly of farmers congregate peaceably, they are enjoying their rights as American citizens. But when Cousin Willis starts a riot among them by speaking unrationally, he, as well as the members of the riot, is violating his responsibility to society.

As citizens in a democratic society, we have the responsibility of paying taxes. We also possess the right to vote, accompanied by the responsibility of voting. And, of course, we must defend our country and guard our liberties.

Since our rights are for the good of the individual, the most important responsibility is to ourselves—to live good Christian lives morally, physically, and mentally. In that way, we are strengthening our liberties so that no one can take them from us. After all, a free man, according to Aristotle, is one who has mastered his passions; tempered his judgment; will either doubt or believe on the basis of evidence only; will neither seek nor shun danger; and in all his relationships exhibits temperance and poise.

Remember, "we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights"—and accompanying these rights are certain responsibilities.

## Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians are one of the lesser known Slavic peoples.

This is partly because they have been intermingled with more numerous and powerful other Slavic peoples, and partly because they have been subjected to the oppressive rule of others. For centuries Russians have done all in their power to assimilate them, and have tried to represent them to the world as Russians. But history shows that the Byelorussians—the White Russians, or Ruthenians, as they are sometimes called—formed a distinct national group in their homeland, east of Poland and west of Moscow, long before the formation of the modern Russian State. Since that event, early in modern times, Byelorussia became part of the Russian Empire.

Czarist Russian rule did not eliminate the Byelorussians as an ethnic group. The more they were oppressed by their Russian masters, the more Byelorussians clung to their ethnic and national ideals, and longed for the day of their independence. This came about in 1918, when the Czarist regime was overthrown. On March 25 of that year the Byelorussian National Republic was proclaimed, with its capital in the historic city of Minsk. Soon it was recognized by the governments of many countries, and it looked as if the new state was to attain sovereignty in historic Byelorussia. Unfortunately the independence thus proclaimed did not last long. Russian Communists attacked and overran it, and in March 1921, Byelorussian independence vanished. Since then some 10 million Byelorussians are living under the oppressive Soviet regime. But they have not abandoned their ultimate goal for freedom and independence. There in their homeland, while working hard under the unfree and almost inhuman Soviet system, they ardently look to the day of their liberation and freedom.

On this 41st anniversary of their independence day, let us all hope for the freedom of Byelorussia and its liberty-loving people.

## Memorial Tribute to 2d Lt. Kenneth G. Fauteck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Monday's newspapers announced the finding in Spokane, Wash., after a 16-day search, of the body of little 9-year-old Candice Elaine Rogers who had disappeared as she was selling Camp Fire Girl mints near her home.

The Nation has been deeply horrified by the wanton brutality of this crime. It is the hope of all of us that the vicious murderer may soon be apprehended and brought before a court for trial.

Today, I want to say a few words, in both pride and sorrow, about another very tragic phase of the case, the heroic death of a young man who grew up in my congressional district, the Fourth District of New York.

Kenneth G. Fauteck, a second lieutenant in the Air Force, who was killed in a helicopter accident near Spokane, on March 7, was the eldest of the two sons of George and Marie Fauteck, of 216–18 117th Road, Cambria Heights, N.Y. He was pilot of an Air Force helicopter, and was, with four other crew members, engaged in a volunteer search up the Spokane River for the missing little girl, when the helicopter struck some high-tension wires of the Washington Water Power Co., and fell in wreckage into the Nine Mile Reservoir. Two others were killed with Kenneth: S. Sgt. William A. McDonnell, and A2c Marlice D. Ray. Two survived, with minor injuries: S. Sgt. James L. Fisher and A2c. Michael R. Holloway.

Kenneth Fauteck leaves a young bride, the former Eleanor Dengler of Ozone Park, N.Y., to mourn his loss and to take pride in the memory of his brave sacrifice. Otto Gumaelius, to whom I am grateful for sending me word of this sad event, well asks:

In a time of peace, what greater glory can a young man have than one who, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, unselfishly and heroically gives up his life so that a child might live?

Police Inspector Robert B. Piper, in whose search for the missing child Kenneth Fauteck and the others were assisting, said:

How do you thank men for such a noble gift? Their deaths are a great tragedy. I know the boys who died felt it was as necessary as anything in the world for them to do what they did.

The mayor and the City Counsel of Spokane have similarly expressed their gratitude and grief, personally and in the name of the city of Spokane. But it seems fitting also that there be a recognition of the sacrifice of Kenneth Fauteck in particular, here on the floor of the House, at once local, in that I represent his home district, and national, in that I am speaking before the House of Representatives of the United States.

Kenneth was but 22 years old, and had been married only a year this month. He had, after his marriage on March 2, 1958, been transferred in rapid succession from Mitchel Field to Georgia, to Texas, to California, and finally to Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash. His quick intelligence and eager interest in flying had enabled him, without having completed high school, to earn his officer's commission. It seems sure that he had a great career, in service and achievement, before him—but no length of life could have earned him more gratitude and glory than his death in the performance of this brave act. As a symbol of the recognition Kenneth Fauteck has deserved from his country, I am sending to his family, in tribute to his memory, an American flag that has flown over the U.S. Capitol.

## Fair Trade Violates Both Political Parties and Congressional Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Republicans often praise the merits of the free enterprise system and stress principles of balanced budget, fiscal responsibility, price stability, sound money and freedom from price and wage controls. These are good and true principles, it seems to me.

Now comes the Fair Trade Act, H.R. 1253, to enforce by Federal law a retail stipulated price system permitting the manufacturer to set these prices. Well, it is price control, contrary to Republican principles. As to inflation and sound currency—well, fair trade items in a comprehensive Justice Department survey cost 27 percent more than in a nonfair trade area. This certainly cuts buying power. Price stability? That, too, is out the window. In short, fair trade fails the best of Republican principles.

Democrats constantly attempt to identify themselves with common people, the little man, the average consumer. Well, these price fixing laws are not in the interest of the consumer.

Democrats and Republicans share principles rooted in American tradition—that set us apart as a Nation from foreign ideologies—no matter the differences between parties. Members of Congress by oath subscribe to the balance of powers between the branches of Government and between Federal and State. This fair trade bill would be a Federal encroachment on State jurisdiction.

Fair trade is antithetical to the beliefs of both parties, and to both conservatives and liberals. When Members of Congress get the facts, the so-called fair trade bill will be discarded and discredited.

## Recognition of the Government of the Mainland of China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE A. KASEM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial column concerning recognition of the government of the mainland of China. The column, entitled "It Seems to Me," was published in the January 22 issue of the Monterey Park Progress, Monterey Park, Calif., and was written by Mr. Eli Isenberg, publisher.

The article follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME
(By Eli Isenberg, publisher)

"Should the United States recognize the government of the mainland of China?"

This was the topic chosen by Harold Fiebelkorn and John Armetta; past presidents of the Lions, for discussion by that club on Tuesday.

Armetta and Fiebelkorn were in charge of the meeting and used the opportunity to discover whether service club members would enjoy and participate in a program of this type.

Their object was to stimulate discussion and exchange of thinking on a matter that is of great international importance. It was my privilege to serve as moderator.

In posing the question for group discussion, I spoke as follows:

I will refer to "the government of the mainland of China" to distinguish it from what is called the Republic of China on Formosa.

Since 1949, all of the mainland of China has been under the government of Mao Tse-tung. This is a Communist government. We do not accord it general diplomatic recognition because, in Mr. Dulles' words, "this would greatly increase its influence and prestige and correspondingly increase its ability to harm us."

Many of our Western allies including Great Britain and France have diplomatic relations with China; they have trade relations, and their newspapermen have access to this land mass and its 600 million people.

Most of what Americans know about Red China has been learned secondhand from these sources.

Among the questions that Lions may wish to discuss and attempt to resolve are these:

What is the traditional policy of the United States in respect to diplomatic recognition? Until recent years, and even today with few exceptions, the policy established in President Madison's day has been followed. The policy is this: If a government exists and is actually governing, it should be recognized.

This did and does not mean we approve of the Government or how it came to power. We followed this procedure in Iraq, recognizing within 1 week the new government which overthrew one which we had supported to the tune of $200 million a year. We have recognized the Castro government in Cuba.

Would diplomatic recognition of China lessen our prestige in the Far East and in the world? Or could it possibly increase it?

The heart of American foreign policy is to take such steps as would insure world peace. Would recognition of China contribute to this effort or not?

About 20 Lions participated in the discussion that followed.

Most of the men were of the opinion that China did exist, that it was unwise for the United States to pretend that Chiang Kai-shek represented the Chinese people. "We live in a small world," one Lion said. "As a Nation that believes in the principle that we should love our neighbors, certainly we should make the effort to understand these people and help them to understand us."

Those opposed to recognition cited our obligations to Chiang. They expressed fear that any friendliness toward China would aid that country in its economic and military growth.

Some Lions felt that economic and cultural exchange would help the cause of peace.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Lions were asked to vote by ballot as to whether they favored recognition of China. Majority by 21 to 8 did.

Lions also expressed hope that there would be future panels of this type, and most agreed, if they were held, to serve on a panel.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 48

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Port Chester, N.Y., Item, on March 8, 1959, entitled "Hudson River's Fishy Taste Told LWV Water Workshop":

HUDSON RIVER'S FISHY TASTE TOLD LWV WATER WORKSHOP

WHITE PLAINS.—Screening out dead fish is the first step in purifying the Hudson River water which Poughkeepsie drinks.

"It's clean when we finish the purification process but sometimes it tastes pretty strange," added the member of the League of Women Voters from Poughkeepsie Tuesday at the league's all day workshop on the State's water resources. "Villages above us still empty their sewage in the Hudson."

As outlined by Mrs. Gustave Keane of Huntington, State chairman for the water resources item on the State leagues' study agenda, and Mrs. Harleigh Wathen of Bronxville, the subject is one for study of watersheds, pollution and agencies.

But for a league member from Croton it was a subject of the continued garbage dump in Croton Point Park that seeps its evil smelling distilation into the Hudson. It was the subject of how to stop industry from taking over county parks on the Westchester bank of the Hudson.

In the latter subject, the county league directors have filed a protest with the board of supervisors. Many individual league members yesterday expressed their intention of writing letters of protest to local supervisors and the county park commission.

All speakers agreed that coordination of water programs in Westchester by local communities must be achieved if future water supplies are to be assured. Several spoke with feeling about the destruction of trees and land surfaces, causing drainage problems, by builders' bulldozers.

Much water pollution, it was charged is due to lack of enforcement of State laws, particularly along the Hudson.

Mrs. Wathen reported that New York City can be adequately served by the Delaware Aqueduct until the year 2000. By then, she said officials told her, drinking water can be siphoned off from the big reservoir of the Hudson River above Poughkeepsie, above the saline line of tidal water.

Attending the workshop in the county center were league members from Ramapo, Poughkeepsie, Middletown, New Platz, Hempstead, Port Washington, Roslyn, and Huntington.

## Battle Between Bigs Means Higher Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, consumers pay lower prices for goods in a non-fair-trade area. Justice's Antitrust Department survey clearly establishes this fact—Bick's statement 1959, appendix 1. In eight non-fair-trade cities, 132 fair trade items sold for 27 percent below fair trade values. Retailers were making money and the consumers did not know how lucky they were to be in a non-fair-trade area. Those paying more did not know how unlucky they were to be in a fair trade area.

The moral is that wide profit margins—now being asked by Federal law—in a fair trade bill—H.R. 1253—are the very reasons that discount houses enter the scene.

We are told that this is a battle between big and little retailers—not so. It is a battle between bigs, and the Federal adoption of this fair trade bill will kill the little independent retailer, not the big stores. As Mr. Bicks pointed out:

It is more correct to say that the fair trade fracas is one between big retailers or price stores on the one hand, and big manufacturers or quality stores on the other, rather than one between big and little retailers * * * there are money and vested interest aplenty on both sides and the colorful drama somewhat overdrawn of the big foreign operator crushing the little local independent is a poetic legend more suitable for propaganda exploitation than the whole unvarnished reality.

Maybe the small retailers had better get wise to the dangers of fair trade while there is still time and beware of their own national leadership.

## Schools To Meet the Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on "Schools To Meet the Challenge," made before the Washington Ethical Society, March 17, 1959, by Dr. John B. Whitelaw, who is a former resident of my Second District in Connecticut and is presently Chief for Teacher Education, U.S. Office of Education. He has summarized in essence perhaps the greatest challenge of our time. We perpetually hear much about educational needs today from all quarters. But I doubt that the crux of the question has been posed with the vision and knowledge which this lifelong educator brings to it now. I trust that Dr. Whitelaw's timely remarks will help to stimulate a more realistic approach by all of us to this problem of worldwide significance.

May I say initially that so much has been said and written about education during the last 2 years—most of it highly combative in tone—that I hear and now dissociate myself from anyone or any organization, group, or agency that is seeking attention in this field. I hope that no one will attempt to label me as being in any particular camp—whether of President Conant, Robert M. Hutchins, the National Education Association (of which I am a life member), Admiral Rickover, Arthur Bestor, the Council for Basic Education, or Teachers College of Columbia University. Although I do subscribe in part to much that each of these individuals or organizations has said, I shall appreciate it if you can refrain from cataloging me as substantially agreeing with any of them.

Can we rather take the approach of trying to solve our educational problem by cooperation; by combining whatever good ideas we can glean from any source; and with the primary objective of working out the strategy for doing something about it? Let us avoid the current sport of developing sharp but meaningless hostilities on the basis of prejudice or inadequate information.

May I say also that rather than my making a series of dogmatic or flatfooted assertions I hope that we can make this meeting one of productive discussion about this problem which is of the highest importance to each one of us. I will therefore attempt to raise some basic questions so that we can get to the discussion of them, by all of us, as soon as possible.

WHAT IS THE CHALLENGE?

The challenge that our schools must be designed to meet? Let us consider four main aspects of the challenge:

1. The acceleration in the growth of knowledge about the universe and about man.

2. The military problem created by the application of nuclear energy to national defense.

3. The conduct of international diplomatic relations in the unremitting struggle to maintain peace.

4. The facts of international economics, especially:

a. The relative position of the United States in the markets of the world.

b. The aspirations of the underdeveloped countries and our relation to them.

These challenges have been dramatized for us by the rise of the Soviet Union and of China since World War II, and by the ferment now evident in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

To summarize the effect of all these challenges, which do impinge upon each other and are part of the total release of intellectual as well as nuclear power in the world today, may I simply focus our thought upon the situation in the Soviet Union. As you know, I had the great privilege of spending 30 days in the U.S.S.R. last May and June and of making a swing of 6,500 miles from the Baltic to Siberia; down to the foothills of the Himalayas near the border of China; then to the Caspian and Black Seas; northwest almost to the border of Poland; and back to Moscow. In taking a hard look at educational advances in the Soviet Union, we are confronted by what I like to refer to as six major challenges to education in the United States. These challenges are, I believe, good samples of what we are up against in recognizing the need to bring American education up to considerably higher standards than we have had in the past.

1. Their complete commitment to education as the way to the future for themselves as a society and as individuals.

2. Their insistence upon a rigorous basic education for all youth to the extent that each individual and the State can profit from it.

3. The challenge of a pioneer society to an affluent society—they appear to be a pioneer society, as in China; we are an affluent society.

4. They appear to know where they are going as a society and as individuals. Do we?

5. The challenge of collectivism to individualism. They believe in communism and collectivism as we believe in capitalism and individualism.

6. They are apparently subsidizing brainpower without limit, especially as their best brains are applied to basic research.

The Soviet Union is a union of 15 republics with a total population of approximately 200 million.

Over the fence is China with a population of approximately 700 million now going through the agony of rapid modernization through communism, and with a tradition of over 3,000 years of higher education.

In the international field we find aggressive policies being carried out by both the Soviet Union and China. It is my very acute concern that by 1984 we may find the two dominant Communist nations holding most of the mortgage notes on most of the underdeveloped countries of southeast Asia and of Africa.

And we are now sharply aware of the problems involved in attempting to organize the free nations of the world to fill the tremendous power vacuum created by the decline of colonialism.

AMERICAN EDUCATION TO MEET THE CHALLENGE

It seems to me that the nuclear age has imposed educational requirements upon each

American child which are more rigorous than any cultural strictures that have been experienced in the history of the United States. Today, more than ever, knowledge is power: power to live effectively as individuals; power to survive as a nation.

There are great strengths in American education due to the vision, courage, and intelligence of our forbears. We honor them and are thankful for their ability to establish in an evolutionary fashion the principles of equality of opportunity especially with reference to education. For the extent of American education—elementary, secondary, and higher—we salute those who have preceded us. The battle for free schools was not easy. It was tough.

And now, the battle for good schools will not be easy. It will be tough. And many a head will be bloodied and many a reputation will be vilified in the struggle to bring the quality of American education up to the levels required by our times.

Because of the extraordinary developments in the scientific, military, and diplomatic spheres of life, which are having their revolutionary effects upon the everyday life of each one of us, schools to meet the immediate and long-term challenges of the nuclear age must, I believe:

1. Require American boys and girls to work just about twice as hard as most of them do today—at levels and at a pace more comparable to educational standards in the other high level cultures and in the modern pioneer societies around the world.

2. Require boys and girls of normal intelligence to master the basic tools of cultural understanding and competence—that is, to complete a rigorous general education—by the end of the secondary school (12 years of schooling, 6 years of elementary school and 6 years of secondary school).

3. Require secondary school graduates to have reasonably clear vocational objectives before continuing education beyond high school.

These, it seems to me, are the three basic requisites. The overall need is to strengthen education at all levels—elementary, secondary, and higher. To increase the intensity of application will naturally mean stripping off some of the nonessentials.

However, our most serious educational problem today is including not with children, teachers, or schools per se; it is with the average citizen, you and me. How can we overcome the ignorant complacency, the flabby quality of social thinking, and the blind selfishness of the men and women who by their opinions and their votes determine American educational policy. Nothing is accomplished by picking on underpaid educators, understaffed schools, and aimless children. The heart of the problem is with the average citizen, the average voter, the masses of thinking people who are and who make our culture.

How can the average citizen be made to understand the real and pervading nature of the challenges of the nuclear age to our way of life and to our schools?

When will the average citizen demand and be willing to pay for the quality of education required if we are to survive and prosper in the nuclear age?

## DAV Services in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Massachusetts citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Massachusetts, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran very substantially. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV National Headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV maintains five national service officers in Massachusetts, located in the VA Regional Office at 1 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., as follows: Eugene F. Reilly, James J. Sayre, Louis Spencer, Paul J. Sullivan, and Thomas J. Tomao. The DAV department commander is Leo W. Lalley and the department adjutant is Joseph R. Harold, who also serves as executive service assistant to the national commander, Judge David B. Williams, of Concorn, Mass., all of whom are my personal friends.

The DAV Department of Massachusetts has nationally appointed representatives to the Veterans' Administration Voluntary Services Advisory Committees at each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals servicing Massachusetts veterans. These DAV representatives and the hospitals are as follows: Bedford VA Hospital, E. Elmer Baldwin, representative; Boston VA Hospital, George J. Lynch, representative; Brockton VA Hospital, George K. Inglis, representative; Boston regional office, Framington VA Hospital, Robert F. Irino, representative; Northampton VA Hospital, Earl A. Gour, representative; Rutland Heights VA Hospital, Alonzo Scott, representative; and West Roxbury VA Hospital, Harry E. Guerriero, representative.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $199,218,000 for its veterans' program in Massachusetts, including $71,227,789 disability compensation to its 93,730 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Massachusetts furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 13 percent—12,420—are members of the 91 DAV chapters in Massachusetts.

This 13-percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Massachusetts veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

| | |
|---|---|
| Claimants contacted (estimate) | 260,603 |
| Claim folders reviewed | 217,169 |
| Appearances before rating boards | 65,078 |
| Compensation increases obtained | 10,194 |
| Service connections obtained | 5,013 |
| Nonservice pensions | 1,349 |
| Death benefits obtained | 180 |
| Total monetary benefits obtained | $4,899,389.07 |

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Massachusetts veterans, their dependents, and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment (to utilize their remaining abilities), civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—

not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 4.5 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Massachusetts, with a consequent loss of about $1,260,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Massachusetts to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 28,272 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Massachusetts residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV service foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV Chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member—an excellent precedent for Massachusetts.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Massachusetts by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

---

## A Fair Trade Law Is Not Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission Act, section 5, states, "That unfair methods of competition are hereby declared unlawful."

More precisely the Robinson-Patman Act, section 3, states:

> It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce * * * to sell, or contract to sell goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

State laws are also directed at so-called loss leader or unfair practices. So what the proponents of fair trade dislike, they already have protection against. Further, why have fair trade proponents shied away from loss leader bills in times past when they were introduced to meet the problem of predatory pricing?

The basic answers to fair trade are not being sought or found by a study of H.R. 1253. What is needed is an objective statistical study of these questions: First, are not small businesses flourishing in areas where there is no fair trade protection? Second, in States where fair trade laws have been invalidated, have small businesses disappeared? Third, prior to the passage of any of the fair trade laws were there no small businesses in the United States? Fourth, are there no small businesses that sell furniture and major appliances, items which the manufacturers have rarely fair traded?

Such a study should precede a fair trade bill. Meanwhile the consumers are way ahead of those Congressmen who think resale price maintenance is good for buyers.

Perhaps the more immediate problem concerns the Justice Department survey which shows a 27 percent lower price in non-fair-trade areas for 119 items compared to fair trade areas. How could a Member of Congress vote for fair trade and higher prices, leaving the posed questions unanswered, and then face constituent consumers?

## Federal Communications Commission Has Carried Equal Time Requirement Too Far

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the recent FCC decision concerning the requirement for stations to give equal time to opposing candidates even on newscasts could result in a virtual blackout of political news on radio and television. This is an absurd extension of the "equal time" principle, and I believe we should seek a legislative remedy without delay.

Of interest on this subject is the editorial from the March 23 issue of the Indianapolis News:

THIS IS OUR BUSINESS

This newspaper feels that the spirit, if not the letter, of the first amendment to the Constitution is grossly violated when the Federal Communications Commission requires that equal time be given to political candidates on newscasts by radio and television stations.

The first amendment guarantees, among other things, a free press. True, it has been honored much too often in the breach by Congress, the courts, and administrative units of Government. But that is another story.

The FCC ruling involves media of communication which could not possibly have been mentioned in the first amendment inasmuch as they were not then in existence.

Moreover, there are technical limitations on broadcasting—chiefly the need to avoid collision of wavelengths—which do not affect the dissemination of the printed word.

However, the Constitution always has been generously interpreted on the side of freedom in dealing with such innovations as radio and TV.

We believe that the constitutional concept of a free press also includes free radio and TV—again, within the technical limitations peculiar to those media.

President Eisenhower has done right to denounce the FCC ruling—which involves the Chicago mayoralty race—as ridiculous and to direct the Justice Department to study the legal aspects of the case.

In fact, this matter should be pushed even beyond that.

The Federal law specifying that all candidates for political office must be given equal time for their speeches in a campaign should be repealed.

There is no more justice in such a law than there would be in a law requiring that each candidate for office be allocated an equal amount of campaign money—or that each be as handsome or pretty or eloquent as the other.

The Government has no business—by the terms of the very first of the amendments to this Nation's basic document—to be eternally sticking its nose into the precise manner in which private media of public information and entertainment express themselves.

Newspapers are commercial competitors of radio and television stations. But they all are in the same boat when it comes to upholding the basic right of free men to express themselves as they see fit within the bounds of common decency, laws of libel and slander, and adherence to the constitutional injunction against treason.

## Statement on Behalf of the Equal Pricing Bill, H.R. 2729

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a statement by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, which was made before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on behalf of my bill, H.R. 2729. I feel that all Members concerned over the plight of our small businessmen will be interested in the following statement:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, BEFORE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, MARCH 18, 1959

I am George J. Burger, vice president and Washington representative of the National Federation of Independent Business. I am appearing here solely for the membership of the federation.

We represent independent business and professional people in all vocations from all parts of the country. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the country.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and your committee for inviting me to appear and give testimony on the subject matter before your committee.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is to be complimented on giving early consideration to this major piece of legislation embodied in H.R. 2729, properly termed the "equal pricing" bill, and let it be understood by the committee that this is not a price-fixing piece of legislation, nor will the public be hijacked through increased prices if the Congress should vote this legislation.

It is necessary for the committee to have some background as to the early operations of manufacturers going into the retail field through their own retail stores.

In my private business capacity, then owning and operating an independent establishment, in the early twenties, it will be found from that record that in some degree the foundation for manufacturers' retail stores was instituted by a leading paint manufacturer. Their action received considerable attention by leading members of the stock exchange.

The pattern of the operation of this leading paint company was noted by some others in major industries, for example (1) certain leading rubber tire manufacturers, and their defense in establishing these retail stores in competition with their own independent retailers was on the them that they were opening these stores as experimental stations to show their independents how to succeed as independent retailers in that industry. This all took place in or around 1925, and from that time on a continual expansion has taken place in many concentrated industries—all tending to reduce the position of efficient independent retailers in the respective industries.

Understand Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, the witness has closely scrutinized the development of this trend in the retail field for better than a quarter of a century, and if some positive action is not taken by the Congress it can only end up in certain major industries controlling the production and distribution of important commodities—resulting in the reduction of efficient independents and, finally, John Q. Public being the victim.

I think it is necessary and most important, as a help to the committee, to lay the facts on the line, and we mean the facts, so that the committee can come to only one conclusion—that this type of legislation is sound legislation, constructive legislation to protect the free enterprise system if the free enterprise system is to remain within our economy.

In the consideration of this legislation I think it is most necessary that the committee consider what this legislative relief would do to protect the employment situation as it was reported in the press January 7 this year: "Nearly two-thirds of the total U.S. employment is provided by Nation's 4 million small businesses." Reduce this number of independent business establishments and it will result in adding more numbers to relief rolls in the various States.

The committee might ask, and rightfully so: "What's happening to the present laws on the statute books to bring the necessary relief through the law?" We answer that there is no relief through the present law.

Let me qualify this. We had extensive conferences with the heads of the antitrust agencies in December of 1958—most important conferences, and as to the problem of manufacturers owning and operating retail stores in competition with their own independent retailers, we found that no relief could be forthcoming.

Prior to these conferences the National Federation of Independent Business, a truly sincere representative for small business of this Nation—and whether they be members of the federation or not doesn't matter—and whose whole action is in behalf of small business, early in 1959, due to the constant communications over the past few years from our nationwide membership, made up exclusively of independent business and professional men—all voting members, not groups, which membership actually totals approximately 120,000, saw fit to poll our members on the subject of "equal pricing."

So that the federation will remain wholly neutral in presenting a proposition to the members the arguments for and against are presented. I am referring to the official publication of the federation—the Mandate, and at this point I would like to have the privilege of having this inserted as part of my testimony.

It is interesting to note the results of the poll, and this was prior to the time that

Congressman BENTLEY introduced the bill, H.R. 2729. This affirmative vote coming from the grassroots—your constitutents—makes it self-evident of the need for Congress to act immediately on this legislation. The result of the poll showed 82 percent for, 14 percent against, and 4 percent no vote.

The committee might rightfully inquire: "Now, how serious is this threat of leading manufacturers going into the retail field"? Receiving this question, here are the facts that speak for themselves.

In the rubber-tire industry the reports are that approximately 2,000 company-owned retail stores are operated by leading tire producers in metropolitan markets. It is to be noted that these 2,000 stores have 1 advantage, and a very important advantage as it relates to the excise-tax levy, and these company-owned stores have enjoyed this privilege for 18 years. This in itself is not a subject for your committee, and we are hoping sooner or later to have this corrected through the proper congressional committees.

In the gasoline servicing field it will be found that most major companies own and operate retail establishments. A complete exposé was made of this operation and what that action meant to the independent trade in the State of Montana by a State commission in Montana.

The hearings before the House and Senate Small Business Committees over the many years will disclose what these retail operations mean as it affects the independent retail establishments in that major industry.

In the retail shoe industry, as to the actual number of stores owned and operated by major shoe producers, at this moment I do not have the estimated number but we have noted in a recent announcement in the Wall Street Journal, February 6, 1959, that the General Shoe Co. proposes to open about 50 retail stores in the low-price women's shoe field, and, of course, it goes without saying that what this company does, others will follow.

A spokesman for that group, from Laredo, Tex., made an address at Temple University Shoe Retailing School under date of February 15. He said, "Most of our problems, monopolywise, stem from producers (through one means or another) going into competition with their customers. With the ax they have, we don't have a chance."

In the glass industry an independent member of that industry advised us under date of October 15, 1956, that the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. expected to embark on a new sales policy, opening up approximately 600 installation stores, nationwide. We checked with officials of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. shortly thereafter and their answer to us was very vague as to the charge relating to the expected new program.

We do know that in a recent communication directed by Mr. Samuel Williams, acting officially for the glass dealers in his area, under date of March 2, 1959, to Senator RUSSELL LONG, chairman, Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Senate Small Business Committee, in rebuttal to the testimony given before that committee by a representative of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Mr. Williams concluded his rebuttal statement by saying: "The issue in question is the legality and morality of dual distribution. I still maintain that if Pittsburgh Plate Glass is not restrained and continues to open retail shops, we, the glass dealers, will not be in a position to compete with them. Legislation is urgently needed."

I also do know that, by invitation, during the summer of 1958, I was asked to address a group of spokesmen for that industry from the New England States at New Haven, Conn. The specific problem before that group was the inroads of the glass industry opening up retail stores.

In regard to plumbers supplies we understand that industry is now entering into an unfair competitive condition with independents in that industry.

Here is more recent action—current—as to the planning of certain leaders in certain major industries. I am referring to committee print "Problems of American Small Business," hearings before the Special Committe To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, U.S. Senate, 78th Congress, 1st session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 66, dated April 5, 7, and 8, and May 6 and 13, 1943. I am referring to the testimony of Mr. Howard Hawkes, assistant general manager, tire division, U.S. Rubber Co.:

"Senator ELLENDER. Does your company have so-called company-owned stores to distribute your merchandise?

"Mr. HAWKES. We do not, Senator.

"Senator ELLENDER. Do you contemplate maintaining that same position in the future?

"Mr. HAWKES. To the best of my knowledge, yes; and I am making such recommendations to my company.

"Senator ELLENDER. I imagine that since your company has been handling its manufactured product in that way it does not believe in having the so-called company-owned stores.

"Mr. HAWKES. We had some and we discontinued them. It was our judgment that we would be better off distributing through the independent dealers, and that represented the best method of distribution for us."

On March 4, 1959, the chairman of the United States Rubber Co., Mr. H. E. Humphreys, Jr., speaking before the New York Society of Security Analysis, said, and I quote in part: "The company has embarked on a broad and continuing program to increase the number of effective outlets for the distribution of replacement tires. It will continue to rely on the independent tire dealer for the bulk of its distribution, but in areas where tire outlets are needed and strong dealers cannot be found, the company is beginning to open its own retail stores."

Being well acquainted with that industry for 50 years I know and can state definitely that this is just another alibi upon the part of the big producer to unload his products irrespective of who is injured. This was the same theme song that was used by certain other large factors in that industry as early as 1925 in experimental stations, etc. I might say that from my experience in that industry I know of no industry that offers a more exceptionally bright future for independents to enter providing there was fair competition existing within that industry, a live and let live policy.

Mr. Chairman, the federation membership has voted in the affirmative on the overall proposition as outlined in the above bill. However, to keep the record straight—at the present moment the nationwide federation membership is being polled on the bill. I cannot say what the result of the poll will disclose. The federation's policy has been and will be to act on majority vote of our members, and I am sure that before the hearings are completed I will be able to supply the committee with the result of the nationwide poll, and unless I miss my guess the federation will in all probability be committed to the Bentley bill, H.R. 2729, as they now are committed to the basic principles involved in the bill.

At this point I would like to have included in the record of the hearings the current mandate, No. 246, presenting the pro and con on the Bentley bill.

In conclusion, the minute the poll is completed I will advise the committee the results of the poll and would like to have this added to the record of the hearings.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the committee for giving me this privilege to appear, and again I repeat, our interest and our sole interest, is to protect the business life of independent business nationwide. We have no other objective. We serve only one master—small business.

---

## Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 138 years ago the national flag of Greece was unfurled to ignite the great revolution against foreign rule. Today the Greek people take rightful pride in celebrating this historic day, March 25, 1821, which heralded the beginning of the end of the suppression of the Green Nation by the despotism of the Ottoman Empire.

Freedom-loving people throughout the world have drawn inspiration from the long, hard, valiant, and epic struggle of the Greek people for independence. Greek Independence Day has immortalized the bravery and devotion of this proud nation's warriors and martyrs. On this stirring occasion the free world is once again reminded that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

The spirit of Greece's passion of independence was strikingly captured by Lord Byron when, on the eve of the War of Independence, he wrote:

The isles of Greece. The isles of Greece.
* * * * *
The mountains look on Marathon,
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dreamed that Greece might still be free;
For standing on the Persians' grave,
I could not deem myself a slave.

Ancient Greece was the cradle of liberty. Apostles of freedom still look to Greece, both ancient and modern. For it was there that the Western concepts of representative government and the rule of law were mothered, and it was in classical Greece that political theories antagonistic to tyranny first were born, later to mature and inspire the great democratic movements of modern civilization.

Today Greece, precariously situated on the border of the Soviet empire, is a compelling example of the perseverance and sacrifice necessary to defend democracy against the dynamic threat of Communist aggression. Greece is now economically poor. Nevertheless, it manages to spend 5 percent of its gross national product on its military establishment. Assistance from the outside is essential to assure Greece a stable economic system and a viable future amidst the distresses of the cold war. The United States and its allies are now providing this help, a token of the great debt which their civilization owes to Greece.

After World War II, when strong pressure was applied by the Soviet Union and subversion by the Communists had engulfed the country in civil war, the United States came to the aid of Greece. As a result of assistance from this country, the wartorn economy of Greece was reconstructed and the Communist insurrection was suppressed.

The continuing freedom and security of Greece is of great importance to the free world. At the same time, the security of Greece as a free nation contiguous to the Soviet bloc is vitally dependent on the strength of the Western alliance. Since 1950, Greece has been associated with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in planning for the defense of the Mediterranean. Greece's land, sea, and air forces are now linked with the combined NATO command for southeastern Europe and have participated in the joint exercises for developing a coordinated defense program for the eastern Mediterranean. The armed services of Greece are supplied with modern arms and equipment under the NATO programs.

In this way, Greece has undertaken to assume its responsibility for the defense of the Balkans and the eastern Mediterranean. Consequently, the area bridging Europe is more secure and the southern flank of NATO is more strongly fortified.

On this anniversary, the United States salutes the Greek people for their monumental contributions, past and present, to our country and to our civilization. Throughout the land, there are over one-half million Americans of Hellenic background. Our country is a much improved place because the patriotic and resourceful Greek people have contributed their magnificent heritage toward building a greater America.

## Present Legal Price Maintenance Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fair trade H.R. 1253 would permit a manufacturer to set prices at the retail level, and for this new right he makes no concession.

Fair trade proponents state that fair trade laws should be permissible since there are other forms of price maintenance which are legal.

Well, let us look at these other forms. They include, first, consignment selling; second, selling through manufacturer-owned retail stores; third, granting of franchises; fourth, selling direct from manufacturer to retailers who will abide by the manufacturer's suggested retail price; fifth, selling direct from manufacturer to consumer; sixth, having your own private brands made up.

Now, analyze each; the manufacturer in each has assured additional marketing responsibilities and risks in order to be able to maintain his price.

Not so in the fair trade bill, which for the manufacturer is "have your cake and eat it too"—that is, until the inevitable consequences of replacing free enterprise with price control by Federal mandate catch up with the industry—then manufacturers will wish for the good old days.

## Poison in Your Water—No. 49

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Albany, N.Y. Knickerbocker News, on February 12, 1959, entitled "Pollution Control Seen Vital to Water Supplies":

POLLUTION CONTROL SEEN VITAL TO WATER SUPPLIES

(By John W. Johnson)

My selection of New York State's primary need in public works would be stronger pollution abatement and control. An inadequate supply of potable water may eventually stifle growth of many of today's most populous areas.

While the problem is not as evident here as it is in many other States, because we are blessed with such an abundance of this great natural resource, however, the ever-increasing consumption, whether by a static population or one that is exploding, will so greatly tax the supply and disposal sources that serious trouble lies ahead.

Of course what is needed is money. Thirteen years ago all major communities in the United States could have constructed adequate treatment facilities for the sum of $350 million. I remember that this report came out at the time that Congress approved the Marshall plan payment for aid to Europe for that year in the same amount.

Today the problem is greater and the cost to rectify it very much higher because so many areas must find additional sources of water and consequently provide facilities for its treatment and eventual disposal.

Federal, State and local governments have for many years been cognizant of this problem. This is evident by the great amount of pertinent legislation that has been enacted and the great sums of public task is far from finished and much of the good can be undone unless greater efforts are forthcoming.

Here is our State, some communities are still poisoning their own water supplies. The State water pollution control board after laborious inspections, studies and hearings, requires that this pollution be stopped by ordering the construction of suitable works. Time after time communities so affected have been unable to raise funds for construction purposes.

The State will grant funds for planning only, and has therefore delayed and resorted to legal blockades which have hurt the whole program. In other instances communities downstream will delay the project until their neighbors upstream have completed theirs.

The design, planning and construction of the needed works will take a long time and require a great deal of money. However, there is no time to lose.

## The Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in his "Good Evening" column in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, Mr. Clifford B. Ward deals with the recent address of the President of the United States on the question of the Berlin crisis. Since Mr. Ward's views seem to me to be very sound and in keeping with the best traditions of our Nation and worthy of a wide reading, I include them herewith under leave to extend my remarks:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

It was pretty difficult to escape a feeling of pride in the moral stature of the President of the United States as he outlined the policy of this country with respect to West Berlin.

It was a historic address, delivered with a skill that was unusual for Mr. Eisenhower. It was delivered with a calm, courageous determination that reflected his firsthand experience in the past with situations threatening death and disaster. You had the impression that here was a man who may fret about minor things, but who in times of really rough going would be a very steady anchor for all around him.

Mr. Eisenhower told the whole world that this country will not budge one single inch in its attitude toward Berlin. If the Soviet think otherwise, it will not be that they haven't been told.

MORAL POSITION ADOPTED

And the reason for our stand on West Berlin is simply that we don't intend to abandon more than 2 million free people in West Berlin to the tyranny of communism. It must strike atheistic Communists as ironic that a nation which warred on the German people, which decreed unconditional surrender for the Germans, is now willing to risk annihilation in an all-out nuclear war to save 2 million Germans from communism. We are saying that we will lay down our lives, if necessary, not for old friends, but for old enemies. Whatever the Soviet may think of the irony and the inconsistency in our attitudes, our present position is a moral one.

Whether war comes or not, the unflinching position of this country is the best guarantee that it won't. Our experience with the Communists has taught us that if you give, you will be asked to give more. It is quite possible that we might be able to negotiate some sort of settlement of the Berlin crisis, but if we did, in the light of our past experience, the Communists would only proceed to create a new and similar crisis somewhere else.

CAN'T EASE POSITION

This country could agree to giving the Communists all of the land, all of the buildings and all of the other material wealth of West Berlin, agreeing to build a new West Berlin somewhere else and moving all the West Berliners there, even if it cost a few

billion dollars. This would be a bargain compared to 20 minutes of nuclear war, but one crack in our position and the Communists would have us on the run. The aim of communism is world domination, not merely the taking of West Berlin. Somewhere along the line, unless they recognize the mood we are in, they will have to be stopped by force. Communism has to go for broke at some point, and so does freedom.

What this country might well do is to take advantage of the dissatisfaction that undoubtedly exists in the slave countries by extending an invitation to all the oppressed to cut the Soviet down from behind, the second world war III starts, as it may in the next few months. If we are sitting on a powder keg, the Soviet are sitting on a much larger one. A war might unite the Russians on a nationalistic basis, but it would not serve to unite the oppressed people they are sitting on throughout Europe.

It may just be that Mr. Eisenhower, as a military man who knows war but hates it, is the right man at this moment to be in the White House.

## Salt Water Research Plan in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the Texas Legislature regarding the construction of research facilities to develop ways of converting salt and brackish water to pure water. I have spoken on this subject heretofore in the Senate. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution passed by the Texas House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Texas Legislature has learned of the plans of the U.S. Department of the Interior to build several research facilities to develop ways and means of converting salt and brackish waters to pure water for human and animal consumption; and

Whereas the plans envision locating five such facilities at scientifically strategic sites over the United States, including two along the seaboard; and

Whereas many have sought for years to develop economically feasible processes to convert salt and brackish water into quantities of water fit for human and animal consumption and such goal will be within sight if the problem is attacked broadly as planned; and

Whereas the large-scale conversion of sea water into water for drinking and irrigation purposes can be attacked scientifically at many locations along our long coastline, but the location of inland facilities must be carefully chosen so as to have available the kind and character of water typical of large inland areas; and

Whereas the underground waters in the Trans-Pecos region of Texas are typical in character and quantity of a large portion of the great Southwestern area of the United States and merit inclusion in the forward-looking and economically potent plans of the Department of the Interior; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 56th Texas Legislature,* That the Honorable Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior of the United States be and is hereby urged to direct a careful examination of the Texas Trans-Pecos area and the consequent location of one of the five facilities mentioned at Pecos, Tex.; and, be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to members of the Texas delegation in Congress.

## Union Leader Becomes Industrialist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 8, 1959, the Boston Globe carried an article on my very good friend, Walter W. Cenerazzo, of Somerville, Mass. I have known Walter intimately for many years, and I am more than proud of our close association. Walter's is the true enterprising spirit. He is an inspiration to all who have had the privilege of meeting and talking with him. I believe that what reporter K. S. Bartlett has to say will be of interest to my colleagues in the House, and I am most happy to bring the article to their attention.

UNION LEADER BECOMES INDUSTRIALIST
(By K. S. Bartlett)

"The hardest thing?"

Somerville's Walter W. Cenerazzo, from 1937 through 1957 an organizer of unions and for the last 13½ of those 20 years national president of the American Watchworkers Union, ran a big hand over crisp, gray-flecked black hair, smiled, hesitated for a fraction of a split second.

Then the new president and general manager of McGann Bronze, Inc., 90-year-old firm, started talking fast and eloquently of the things he's found most difficult in making the transition from union organizer and official to industrialist. Although he bought into the firm in 1954 he did not take over control until he retired as president of the Watchworkers, December 31, 1957.

He still has one connection with the independent national union which he helped found in 1943–44 and of which he was the first president. On January 31 of this year American Watchworkers Union delegates in convention at Lancaster, Pa., elected the second president in the union's history. During the year following Cenerazzo's retirement, the union counsel had acted as president. The delegates in a letter expressed regret that Cenerazzo felt he could not continue as an officer of the union, and appreciation of what he had done for the national organization and for watchworkers throughout the country.

"By unanimous vote of all present," the letter, signed by each delegate, went on, "you have been elected president emeritus of the American Watchworkers Union."

Said the 45-year-old Cenerazzo, half ruefully, half proudly:

"They told me when they invited me to the convention, and I declined, explaining why and giving my reasons for not continuing as an officer, that they intended to do this.

"I said 'No, I'm too young to be an emeritus anything. Wait until I'm 65 and I'll be glad to accept.' What am I going to do now? What can I do?"

Obviously he's pleased by the tribute.

That hardest thing about the transition from union official to industrialist Cenerazzo thinks has been learning the businessman's approach to customers. It's a matter of selling a product, of going on the principle that the "customer is always right" even—and perhaps especially then—if he's wrong.

He's had to learn not to argue, at least not in the way he'd argued as a union representative trying to get better pay, working conditions or other benefits from company representatives. Or battling before congressional committees for higher tariffs on Swiss watches.

Almost as hard, he says, is to remember always the results of cost analysis, to know what the actual cost of producing any given product is—so that you don't sell at a loss.

Earlier in the day he'd shown me the workings of the foundry in the building at 27 Village Street, Somerville, to which the founder of the firm, Thomas F. McGann had moved it in 1906 from its original location at 104 Portland Street, Boston. Also he showed the new building alongside the foundry where McGann Bronze, Inc.'s new activity is carried on. This is making marking devices such as rubber stamps.

This was Cenerazzo's idea. It stems directly from the days when he was in the printing trade. He left Somerville's Southern Junior High School at 15 and until he was 24 worked on many papers in many parts of the country, partly as a substitute. In every city, at every job he picked up facts useful to him. He still has his card in I.T.U. and demonstrated for me that he still knows how to set type.

The transition wasn't made all at once. In 1952 Cenerazzo and his wife, the former Marion Harding of Belfast, Maine, built the first section of Marion Village, now a thriving motel and restaurant in Rockport, Maine. Mrs. Cenerazzo runs it during the tourist season. In 1952 Cenerazzo was beginning to think of going into business for himself since the eight years originally set as the maximum term for a president of the American Watchworkers Union would expire the following year. But in 1953 conditions in the American watch industry were such that it was decided he should stay on and do what he could to help.

Early in 1954 John F. McGann, president of T. F. McGann & Sons Co., a son of the founder, suggested that Cenerazzo come into the firm and help the third generation of McGanns keep the business going.

Cenerazzo had known the McGanns all his life. He decided to buy into the firm. The elder McGann died a month later but although Cenerazzo helped in various ways he didn't become president and general manager until 1958.

It was in the summer of 1954 that Cenerazzo had one of his big moments as a union man. He told as he landed at Washington's National Airport that President Eisenhower, breaking administration precedent, had signed a proclamation raising the traiff on imported watches, as much as 50 percent in some cases.

Wrote the Globe's John Harris, then in Washington:

"Cenerazzo, as his intimates well know, is not often at a loss for words. A genuine human dynamo, he has become widely known for his talent both as a speaker and a writer.

"Overwhelmed by the news, Cenerazzo was silenced for many moments by the emotional impact on him."

Then Cenerazzo, who had fought for years, sometimes almost single handed, for higher tariffs, told Harris that it was not a victory for him but for "a lot of people who have spent a lifetime in an American industry

and were finding themselves out of jobs and their skills going to waste."

The effects of the victory were later partly nullified. Cenerazzo stayed on as president of the American Watchworkers Union until December 31, 1957, when, he says, he felt he should take himself off the payroll of the union because "what funds were there were necessary for expenses" for the operation of the organization.

One of the employees in the foundry is Hungarian-born Lester Dukta, who went to work in the McGann plant in 1917. It was Dukta who demonstrated for me some of the fine points of casting tablets, urns, and statues in bronze.

Later Cenerazzo and John F. McGann, Jr., a grandson of the firm's founder and, like his brother, Thomas F. McGann, a vice president of the firm, showed some just finished products.

Brand new was a bronze plaque with a life-like figure of an albacore which will be placed in the wardroom of a new U.S. submarine, the *Albacore*.

Maybe it reminded Cenerazzo of the time in 1938 when he helped organize the Gloucester Sea Food Workers Union of which he later became business agent.

He talked about two giant lobsters, cast in aluminum and painted, which hung on the wall. One was delivered that afternoon to Jimmy's Harbor Side Restaurant where Cenerazzo often has lunch. The other will be at Marion Village when the tourist season opens.

Memorial tablets of various kinds, honoring the dead make up a large part of the firm's business. So do tablets honoring contributors to great causes; State and city seals to be placed on public buildings, bridges, etc.; and seals or emblems of various organizations.

The firm made several tablets for the Boston Globe's new building.

## The Manufacturer's Double Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker—

I can, however, suggest a possibly profitable path for this subcommittee's inquiry * * *. Large department stores or mail order houses may well encourage manufacturers to fair trade nationally brand items, the only items which the small retailers can secure. At the same time, such mass sellers may market their own private brands—substantially identical to nationally branded goods—at prices lower than fair trade markups for the nationally branded counterparts. The result could be to enable large retailers, by hampering their smaller competitors' ability to cut prices, to hold an umbrella over the market for their own private branded items. In closing, I take the liberty of suggesting that this question might well be an area ripe for this subcommittee's inquiry. Quote from Bicks, Justice Department antitrust attorney, testimony.

This quotation is self explanatory. Also, the manufacturer has an interesting part. He gains the right to set the retail price. Thus he binds the retailer and for this new right he contributes nothing himself. Indeed, he is free, after setting a price floor and guaranteeing a profit margin for himself to manufacture identical merchandise for some big store who can set any price it chooses after removing the trademark undercutting the independent retailer with the same merchandise, yet the independent cannot change his price. No wonder the manufacturer wants fair trade. No wonder the big chain or department stores will not be hurt. The wonder is that proponents of fair trade overlook the fact that the only one who can be hurt, even ruined by fair trade, is the smaller retailer and his national lobby representatives are pleading for this bill.

## Benson Gaining Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, from the days of the early Greeks and Romans, and even before, the vitality and growth of a nation could be determined by the activity of that nation's markets. Free markets, bringing together free sellers and free buyers, served as the mainspring behind national progress.

Someplace along the line we in America sacrificed our free agricultural markets on an altar of expediency and fear. We became fearful that our agricultural economy could not prosper as a free facet of our economy. We started to shelter, to control, and to regulate it. Today we have all but smothered it.

A leading exponent of free markets, of course, has been our dedicated Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson. He has warned the American people of what is happening to our agricultural economy. He has pointed out that agriculture must be given room for breathing and expansion in free markets. For his trouble, the Secretary has been maligned and has suffered indignities not befitting a man of his character and demonstrated ability.

Daily, however, Secretary Benson has found new allies, both in the field of agriculture and without.

One of the most important allies, not only for Secretary Benson, but for the entire agricultural economy, has been the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago. The support of such a group is important, because the sole purpose of the board of trade is to bring buyer and seller together freely for the buying and selling of agricultural products. The activities of the commodity exchanges is a vital link in the chain from production to distribution. As a result of bringing the competitive forces of supply and demand together in this fashion, grain and grain products are distributed nationally and internationally. The operations of the Chicago Board of Trade are under rigid self-imposed rules of business conduct, as well as Government regulation. The board's primary objective is to provide the Nation with the most efficient grain marketing services at lowest possible costs.

I should like to conclude these remarks by including in the RECORD the agricultural policy statement of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago, adopted recently. The policy statement follows:

AGRICULTURAL POLICY STATEMENT

Despite having, for over 6 years, a Secretary of Agriculture dedicated to free markets, the entrenched bureaucracy and self-interest of those who prosper under control have led the country further down the road to complete Government domination of the free agricultural marketing system. The President of the United States, in his state of the Union message, indicated that by July 1, 1959, Commodity Credit Corporation would have $9 billion tied up in loans and surplus commodities, and that the carrying charges on this mountain of production would run to $1 billion annually.

This continued expansion of CCC and its increasing inroads into the marketing of grain has brought a greater awareness to the majority of the membership of the association of the problems, and of the need for positive action. It is time to take up the challenge, since it is clear that the natural course of events cannot be depended upon to help free markets.

The board of directors of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago has, therefore, adopted the following as basic policy to guide the association in its continuing struggle for restoration of free markets.

"We must go on record as being vigorously opposed to all programs and policies that result in agricultural food and fiber not clearing through the market. Therefore, basic policy of the Chicago Board of Trade is to:

"1. Take a more aggressive stand on the elimination of governmental competition and domination of free markets.

"2. Act as a more forceful spokesman in defense of the private marketing system as opposed to State trading.

"3. Give open support to those farm leaders and farm organizations when those leaders and organizations work for the programs that benefit the private marketing system.

"4. Support legislation which will keep the Government from acquiring surpluses of commodities."

## Poison in Your Water—No. 47

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Brownsville, (Tex.) Herald, on February 6, 1959, entitled "Sewage Is Costly to the City."

SEWAGE IS COSTLY TO THE CITY

The city is spending $321.75 a day on chemicals to cut health hazards involved with sewage overflows, the city commission learned today.

"We have been using 2 barrels of chemicals a day and a third sewage overflow has necessitated an additional barrel at a cost of about $100 a barrel," Jim Wilson, city sewage filtration plant superintendent said.

It was stated by city engineer, John Huth, that the broken sewer lines near the intersection of Boca Chica and Central Boulevards had been taking in sand for about 4 years.

Sewage is spurting from the top of several manholes.

One overflow, located near Russell Elementary School, has been running into a storm sewer that flows into nearby City Resaca.

"Dead fish were floating there this morning," Wilson said.

Commissioner Dr. Jack Palmer who lives two blocks from the school, has taken the lead in getting the smelly situation corrected.

"What is the condition at Russell?" Mayor M. M. Vicars asked Palmer.

"It smells," Palmer said.

"I mean should the school be closed or what?" Vicars asked.

"Emergency measures should be taken to straighten out the situation as soon as possible," Palmer replied.

Wilson told the commission that industrial wastes are also causing the lines to become clogged. "They should put screens over their line entrances," he said.

Commissioner Tony Carnesi asked Wilson about an ordinance that was supposed to have been worked out to regulate sewage disposal by industries and it was brought out that it had been dropped.

"Why?" asked Carnesi.

"Political pressure," Commissioner Emilio Crixell answered.

Huth was asked how much did he think the sewer line repairs would come to and he said "about $8,000." It was pointed out that that did not include costs of chemicals or a $4,000 machine procured for the project.

## Jew, Arab "Feud" at Hillsdale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in these days of international tension, it is refreshing to find a situation in which Jewish and Arab young men get along well together. Such is the case at Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich., where Lee Levy and Ahmad Jallad are roommates. The South Bend, Ind., Tribune recently had a story on this and I ask leave to include it herewith:

JEW, ARAB "FEUD" AT HILLSDALE

(By Joseph B. Tierney)

In Jerusalem, snipers are still firing back and forth across the border which separates the city into Jewish and Arab sectors.

In a dormitory room at Hillsdale College, the sniping on the same subject is taking place between a Jewish boy from South Bend, and an Arab youth from Jerusalem.

The sniping in Palestine is with bullets and in deadly earnest. At Hillsdale College, the sniping is with words and is good natured.

The South Bend participant in the debates at the Hillsdale, Mich., college is Lee Levy, 18, son of Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Levy, 1507 East Colfax Avenue.

TWO SHARE ROOM

The Arab "sniper" is Ahmad Jallad, 21, of Jerusalem, son of a captain in the intelligence branch of the Jordanian Army.

The two, Arab Moslem and American Jew, share a room in the college which had its origin as a Baptist missionary school. If that isn't cosmopolitan enough, the two intend to take an apartment next year with another student who is a Christian.

In South Bend to spend the holiday between semesters last week, Lee and Ahmad said their rooming together has stirred a lot of comment on the campus of the college, "Almost all of the comment has been humorous," Lee added. "People kid us about having a border line drawn down the middle of the room and that sort of thing," Ahmad said.

In his 4 months at the school, Ahmad has picked up the nickname "Okie." Lee explains that the tag was hung on Ahmad because in his early days at the school, his comments were restricted largely to "okay" on almost any question.

LIVED ON HAMBURGERS

"I lived on hamburgers for almost a month before I learned to order food," the Jordan youth commented in his much improved English.

Ahmad, who served with the Jordan guerrilla forces during the battle over establishment of the Jordan-Israel border, attended a missionary school in Jordan. He decided to make a career of foreign service and came to the United States to study to broaden his knowledge of the world and of international politics. Robert Watkins, U.S. Ambassador to Jordan and a graduate of Hillsdale College, suggested the Michigan school when he learned that Ahmad was coming to this country.

"I'm learning a great deal about the political situation in Jordan and Israel," says Lee. While he was interested in the establishment of the new Israel state, before meeting Ahmad, he did not have much information on the subject, he admits.

HAS PERSONAL MEMORIES

Ahmad has some bitter personal memories of the establishment of the new nation and he admits that these memories probably color his overall view of the situation.

Before the establishment of the Jordan-Israel border, Ahmad's father owned 1,000 acres of land in Jordan. When the Israel border was drawn, the land was inside the border and Ahmad's family was evacuated.

The dormitory room Lee and Ahmad share is naturally the center of discussion on matters concerning the Middle East and the bull sessions sometimes run well into the morning. The discussions become heated from time to time, the students say, but not heated enough to threaten their friendship. The roommates stay rather close together in the activities they participate in.

Both are wrestlers and both are pledged to Kappa Sigma Kappa fraternity. Ahmad dropped from the wrestling team because of a leg injury but Lee is still on the varsity squad.

For Ahmad, the prospect of being away from home for 7 years is not very pleasant but he says he is willing to forego the pleasures of home for a better knowledge of the world and the people in it.

"My father advised me to go abroad for my education," Ahmad explained. "He told me, 'Go away from home and you will learn to feel your country.'"

## Americans Traditionally Oppose Fair Trade Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1945 the FTC in an 872-page report concluded generally that resale price maintenance was unsound economically, tended to destroy competition, and at least in certain areas, favored the large concerns. So spoke Chairman Gwynne reminding us on the Fair Trade Subcommittee last year that fair trade was traditionally opposed by FTC and the people of this country, as a matter of principle to free people in a free country.

In 1952 the FTC described resale price maintenance as:

Contrary to the public policy expressed by Congress in the antitrust laws since 1890 and contrary to the public policy expressed by Congress in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Since the concept of resale price maintenance contravenes the traditional ideas of the American systems of free competitive enterprise, you would not expect Congress to try to support resale price maintenance. Are we? Yes, by name—the fair trade bill H.R. 1253, permitting the manufacturer to set the retail price on his merchandise by setting aside the antitrust law.

## The Supreme Court and the Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ray Forrester, the able and distinguished dean of Tulane University Law College, made one of the most piercing and thoroughly objective studies of the present Supreme Court and its transgression on the legislative powers of the Congress.

Dean Forrester's address is all the more important in that he has altered his original opinion of the functions of this Court.

With the permission of the House I am now placing at the Members' disposal a copy of Dean Forrester's address which all should read and from which all should learn.

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE RULE OF LAW

An able professor of law, who now sits on the Supreme Court, once said:

"In simple truth, the difficulties that government encounters from law do not inhere in the Constitution. They are due to the judges who interpret it. * * * That document has ample resources for imaginative statesmanship, if judges have imagination for statesmanship."

Not long after the Brown decisions when suggestions of violent resistance were beginning to appear, I made a series of speeches, saying:

"The basic concept of the rule of law is * * * that the governors as well as the governed must follow and abide by the established system of law, including the established system for making, changing, and interpreting the law. The alternative to the rule of law is anarchy and revolution—the solution of problems by force rather than by law and reason."

And further on, it was said:

"While it is permissible to criticize decisions of the Court and to work for their re-

versal—for the Court is certainly not infallible and has often changed its position when convinced of prior error—this should be done in an orderly and peaceful manner. The law and the Court, as an institution, should be respected in the meantime. It is dangerous to attack the traditional function of the Court and to seek to undermine public acceptance of the Court, as an institution, for that is the keystone of our version of the rule of law and the foundation of our law-abiding traditions."

What I said was and is true. But I failed to emphasize the dual and reciprocal nature of the rule of law. My comments were directed to the governed. They were one-sided in that I did not stress the fact that the governors are also bound. I did not explain the provisions of the rule of law which govern the Supreme Court and which give protection to the governed from possible abuses of power by that body.

At that time I was fearful of the violation of the rule of law by the governed. Now, I have come to the conclusion that the Court, while insisting on the faithful observance by the governed, has failed to give faithful adherence to that portion of the rule of law applicable to itself.

From the time of John Marshall the Court has spelled out its own rule of law. The basic essentials are:

First. That it shall exercise only the judicial power;

Second. That is shall live faithfully with the principle of the separation of powers, using care not to cross the line into the legislative or executive field or into the powers of the States;

Third. That is shall be governed by the rule of self-restraint, scrupulously withstanding the temptation to assume the role of the protagonist, or to infuse its decisions with the individual opinions of its members on moral and social issues of policy, bearing in mind its delicate and fragile role of final and impartial arbiter whose judgment is without appeal, except by extreme measures, and whose power is based, finally, on voluntary acceptance born of public confidence in its wisdom and sober judgment.

In the several instances in American history when the Court has violated its own rule of law, the result has been a loss of respect not only for the Court but for law in general and for the law-abiding habits of our people.

As a present member of the Court once said: "To what extent the feeling for all law is attenuated by nationwide disregard of one law, no man can measure."

The Dred Scott case is an example with which we are all familiar. Such manifestations of judicial self-assertion endanger the rule of law in its entirety. The effect and the hazard go far beyond the immediate problem.

In suggesting that the members of the Court have violated the rule of law, I do so with recognition of the integrity of the individual men involved, with awareness of the awesome task they perform, and with appreciation of the idealism and good intentions with which they have acted. The end they seek and the vision that draws them on is, undoubtedly, that of a better America and a better world as they see it. But the means they have chosen must be tested by the results. Not the least of these is the present status of the public respect for and acceptance of the Court, which is the keystone of our rule of law.

What is its present status as to public acceptance? How faithfully is it adhering to its rule of law?

On this vital issue I offer, first, the following witnesses: the chief justices of the State supreme courts, the members of the Federal judiciary other than those on the Supreme Court, the Congress, the President, and, finally, Learned Hand. Second, I will review briefly a few representative decisions of the Court.

The first witness: According to the Conference of Chief Justices of the United States, the Supreme Court exhibits the following characteristics (which I quote or paraphrase from the committee report approved by the conference):

1. It presses the extension of Federal power and presses it too rapidly.

2. Adopts too often the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint.

3. Assumes, in cases arising under the 14th amendment, primarily legislative powers.

4. Assumes almost unlimited policymaking powers beyond those ever contemplated by the draftsmen of the original Constitution or of the 14th amendment.

5. Attains immense, and in many respects, dominant power despite the constitutional system of checks and balances and of separation of powers.

6. By its recent decisions, casts considerable doubt on the validity of the American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men.

7. Creates needless uncertainty by multiple opinions and conclusions unsupported by a majority theory.

8. Fails itself to accord finality to its own decisions and to the doctrine of stare decisis, while it expects firm adherence by those subject to its power.

In conclusion, the conference said:

"Frequent differences and occasional overrulings of prior decisions in constitutional cases cause us grave concern as to whether individual views of the members of the court as from time to time constituted, or of a majority thereof, as to what is wise or desirable do not unconsciously override a more dispassionate consideration of what is or is not constitutionally warranted. We believe that the latter is the correct approach, and we have no doubt that every member of the Supreme Court intends to adhere to that approach, and believes that he does so. It is our earnest hope which we respectfully express, that that great Court exercise to the full its power of judicial self-restraint by adhering firmly to its tremendous, strictly judicial powers and by eschewing, so far as possible, the exercise of essentially legislative powers when it is called upon to decide questions involving the validity of State action, whether it deems such action wise or unwise. The value of our system of federalism, and of local self-government in local matters which it embodies, should be kept firmly in mind, as we believe it was by those who framed our Constitution.

"At times the Supreme Court manifests, or seems to manifest, an impatience with the slow workings of our Federal system. That impatience may extend to an unwillingness to wait for Congress to make clear its intention to exercise the powers conferred upon it under the Constitution, or the extent to which it undertakes to exercise them, and it may extend to the slow processes of amending the Constitution which that instrument provides. The words of Elihu Root on the opposite side of the problem, asserted at a time when demands were current for recall of judges and judicial decisions, bear repeating: 'If the people of our country yield to impatience which would destroy the system that alone makes effective these great impersonal rules and preserves our constitutional government rather than endure the temporary inconvenience of pursuing regulated methods of changing the law, we shall not be reforming. We shall not be making progress, but shall be exhibiting that lack of self-control which enables great bodies of men to abide the slow process of orderly government rather than to break down the barriers of order when they are struck by the impluse of the moment.'

"We believe that what Mr. Root said is sound doctrine to be followed toward the Constitution, the Supreme Court and its interpretation of the Constitution. Surely, it is no less incumbent upon the Supreme Court, on its part, to be equally restrained and to be as sure as is humanly possible that it is adhering to the fundamentals of the Constitution with regard to the distribution of powers and the separation of powers, and with regard to the limitations of judicial power which are implicit in such separation and distribution, and that it is not merely giving effect to what it may deem desirable."

It should be noted that these conclusions were supported by 36 chief justices and disapproved by only 8. (Two justices abstained and four were not present.)

The second witness: In answer to an inquiry by a national periodical directed to all judges of the U.S. courts of appeals and U.S. district courts, asking whether they agreed or disagreed with the conclusions of the chief justices, 128 of the Federal judges replied. Forty-six percent of those replying expressed agreement. Thirty-nine percent disagreed. Fifteen percent preferred not to express any view.

The third witness: The Congress of the United States, through its consideration of the Jenner bill during the last session, expressed its own disapproval of the Court and reflected the growing lack of confidence of the people by nearly enacting a statute which would have substantially curtailed the basic powers of the Court.

The fourth witness: The President, in this delicate situation involving a coordinate branch of the Federal Government has followed the advice that Holmes once gave to a wordy lawyer. "Counselor," he advised, "you should read French novels, they teach one to say a lot by innuendo." The President has said a lot by what he has not said.

And last but by no means least, the witness Learned Hand, who with characteristic early insight and independence of thought, stated his judgment some months ago, even before the more recent decisions and before the others had spoken. He suggested that the Court has assumed the role of a superlegislature, a third chamber.

Need I sum up the answer and the emphasis that these witnesses give? They speak for themselves.

But so that our judgment will not be entirely dependent on the opinions of others, though they be those best qualified to know, let us review briefly a few samples of the work of the Court; a case involving State power to regulate admissions to the bar, cases concerning criminal justice, and the cases regarding segregation.

First, *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California* (353 U.S. 252) decided in May of 1957. In this case an applicant for admission to the bar refused to answer questions regarding his Communist affiliations, past and present, in a hearing before the State bar examiners. The Supreme Court did not deny that these questions were relevant and permissible, nor did it deny that the burden was on the applicant to show his good moral character. Yet the majority found that the State examiners had violated the due process clause of the 14th amendment by denying admission. They expressed their reason as follows:

"We are compelled to conclude that there is no evidence in the record which rationally justifies a finding that Konigsberg failed to establish his good moral character or failed to show that he did not advocate forceful overthrow of the Government."

Does it make sense to recognize that certain questions may be asked by the State in deciding on admission to the bar and then hold, in effect, that refusal of the applicant to answer the questions cannot be taken into account by the State in evaluating him?

Mr. Justice Harlan, in dissent, stated:

"What the Court has really done * * * is simply to impose on California its own notions of public policy and judgment * * * today's decision represents an unacceptable intrusion into a matter of State concern."

The committee report, approved by the Chief Justices, said that the case reached "the high-water mark so far established by the Supreme Court in overthrowing the action of a State and in denying to a State the power to keep order in its own house."

In *Griffin* v. *Illinois* (351 U.S. 12) decided in April of 1956, the Court held that an indigent defendant in a criminal case had a constitutional right to receive a transcript of record free of charge for purposes of appeal, where other defendants in similar cases were permitted review at their own expenses. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, concurring, urged the Court to limit the effect of the decision to future cases and to exclude past proceedings because of the "numbers unknown to us * * * who will find justification in this opinion unless properly qualified (to claim) that they are under illegal detention." But the majority ignored this word of caution, prompting the chief justices to observe that:

"Just where *Griffin* v. *Illinois* may lead us is rather hard to say."

This apprehension was confirmed by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Eskridge* v. *Washington* (78 S. Ct. 1061), decided in June of 1958, in which the Court applied the principle of the Griffin case, decided in 1956, to a prisoner convicted for murder in 1935.

Thus, the Court applies retrospectively a newly created right to the countless cases already adjudicated under the former rule.

On the general subject of the Court's review of State criminal cases, the chief justices said:

"In such matters the Supreme Court not only feels free to review the facts, but considers it to be its duty to make an independent review of the facts. It sometimes seems that the rule which governs most appellate courts in the review of findings of fact by trial courts is given lip service but is actually given the least possible practical effect."

And Mr. Justice Frankfurter felt obliged to say of one criminal case decided recently that:

"The present decision will turn out to be an isolated deviation from the strong current of precedents, a derelict on the waters of the law." (*Lambert* v. *California*, 355 U.S. 63 (1957).)

Further, one cannot ignore the general conclusion of Mr. C. W. Wickersham, Jr., writing in a recent issue of the Cornell Law Quarterly, when he says that the Supreme Court gives the guilty the maximum opportunity to escape the punishment decreed by Congress and the States.

The strong reaction of responsible and informed people to the performance of the present Court is indicated by the statement in the committee report, approved by the Chief Justices, concerning (*Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire*, 354 U.S. 254 (1957).)

In that case the Court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court which had sustained the conviction of the defendant for contempt for failure to answer questions in a State legislative investigation of subversive activity. The reversal was based, in part at least, on the ground that the prosecution had not shown that the State legislature wanted the information sought in the questions put to the defendant. The committee report said that this conclusion seemed so unreal as to be incredible.

To be fair, however, one must concede that when considered individually, most decisions of the Court are at least, debatable. But it is the trend and the pattern of the decisions that seeps into the awareness of the constant reader and slowly reveals itself.

It is interesting to note that the chief justices omitted any reference whatever to the segregation cases. Undoubtedly, they were anxious to avoid any suggestion that the racial situation was responsible for their condemnation of the Court. Incidentally, some observers contend that dissatisfaction with the Court stems largely from the segregation cases. This is an opinion I do not share. In fact, I would say that some of the more responsible critics of the Court have spoken out in spite of the fear that their position might be considered related to the segregation issue.

But while the chief justices avoided the segregation cases, there is one comment which they make that is relevant:

"Adjustments," say the justices in relation to the allocation of State and Federal power, "can hardly be effected without some friction. How much friction will develop depends in part upon the wisdom of those empowered to alter the boundaries and in part upon the speed with which such changes are effected. Of course, the question of speed really involves the exercise of judgment and the use of wisdom, so that the two things are really the same in substance."

This quotation contains the words that isolate the issue to be resolved in appraising the segregation cases—"wisdom," "judgment," "speed"—these, as the justices say, are really the same in substance. The justices thus indicated the basic weakness of the Court without mentioning the segregation cases in which this defect has had its most tragic consequence, to all concerned.

I approach a specific evaluation of the segregation cases with hesitation. My opinion there has changed substantially. Yet the change has been nearly imperceptible and is the sum total of hundreds of items of experience, conscious and subconscious, impossible to remember and recount.

I am reminded of the observation of Robert Louis Stevenson that "one of the grossest and broadest sayings conveys the monstrous proposition that it is easy to tell the truth * * * truth in human relations is of this more intangible and dubious order: hard to seize, and harder to communicate."

My own experience is reflected in the following Associated Press dispatch, which relates the experience of others. It was published before the Supreme Court decided the Little Rock case. It reads:

"The Arkansas Gazette said in an editorial Tuesday that there is no alternative to permitting a delay in integration here except the kind of Federal enforcement 'that would amount to something very like a new reconstruction.'

"The newspaper, which won the Pulitzer Prize for its locally unpopular stand during the integration crisis of last fall, said 'no one can doubt that the alternative to delay is chaos in education of a duration no man can now foresee.'

"Executive editor Harry S. Ashmore, who wrote the editorial, said 'this newspaper said in its first comment on the 1954 Supreme Court decision that the great task ahead would be to find a way to prevent serious and sustained damage to the public school system while finding means by which the South would comply with the new public policy—and we have bent our own efforts to that task.'

"We, and those who shared our view across the South, have failed. There is no way, for the time being at least, to obtain such compliance without doing serious and perhaps irreparable harm to the system of public education upon which our children, colored no less than white, are dependent.

"The editorial said that the effect of a delay this week by the Supreme Court would be to halt desegregation in the resisting States for the foreseeable future. But the Gazette took the position that this would be preferable than the alternative which it said would damage education for all.

"The newspaper suffered what it said was a 10 percent circulation loss because of its editorial support of the Little Rock School Board's compliance with Federal court directives and [its] criticism of Gov Orval E. Faubus for what it termed his course of defiance of the Federal courts.

"The newspaper continued its support of the board when it sought legal relief in U.S. District Court. That relief was granted in the form of a 2½-year-delay by Judge Harry Lemley; was denied on appeal to the eighth circuit court of appeals, and is now being sought by the board before the U.S. Supreme Court."

Mr. Ashmore's editorial proves what Mr. Justice Frankfurther once said:

"Experience often contradicts the best of abstract reasoning."

It is my conviction that experience within the last 5 years demonstrates the mistake in judgment and, above all, in timing, contained in the Brown cases. I am surprised to hear responsible people say that the Court had no choice in timing—that it was required to decide the issue when presented with it. This overlooks the inherent discretion in the Court, exercised many times, to forego the decision of a case on a particular issue raised by the parties. Certainly, the Supreme Court has the resources to leave aside the decision of an issue if it feels the result will be harmful and ill-advised, or, if need be, to follow precedent until timeliness is consistent with wisdom and sober judgment.

Timing is the crux of the evaluation of the segregation cases. I express this conviction because I believe that experience with the decisions has revealed two facts which were not foreseen by the Court in its abstract reasoning of 1954:

First. Instead of aiding race relations the cases have led to their harm. The real problem is one of human understanding and emotion and if it is to be solved it must be solved on that level. Since the Brown cases, the feelings of the races toward each other have deteriorated notably. Animosity, prejudice, hatred, and lack of communication have followed the decision, although I hasten to add that the mistakes of others have also contributed to the tragedy. But I believe that a wise court could have foreseen that this decision would provoke such a chain of events. In fact, many men of experience and good intent warned of such a result from the very beginning.

If the objective of the Brown cases was to help the Negro, to improve the relations of the races and to foster the psychological feeling of friendship and equality among them, isn't it clear that it has failed? The victories won, even from the viewpoint of the Negro, have been Pyrrhic. Perhaps what the Court really needs is a more profound understanding of human nature and social psychology than that reflected in the limited citations in the Brown case.

Sscond. The Brown case was initially defended on the ground that America should present a pure and perfect picture to the world of constitutional equality in race relations. In the abstract, this was a convincing argument; but experience has proven its fallacy. Human nature does not change overnight, even to aid the Nation in the battle with the Russians. In place of the relative quiet and steady progress of the pre-Brown period, we have created a situation that could hardly be more favorable to communism from a propaganda standpoint. At a time when our entire national attention should have been united in withstanding our enemies in the struggle for national survival, we have invented, by our own hands, a cold civil war which in many respects repeats the succession of mistakes that led to the catas-

trophe of the 1860's. Could the Russians themselves have devised a more effective and diabolical device for weakening and distracting us, than the one we have created ourselves? Could world publicity more deadly have been manufactured? The State of Arkansas, which had been one of the more tolerant of the Southern States, which had admitted Negroes to its State university without a court order, which had in good faith sought a solution to a deep-seated problem, was defamed before the eyes of the world. Little Rock, probably chosen for the integration bridgehead in the South because of the moderate and tolerant desire of its people to solve the problem was made a scapegoat before the world by the actions of extremists on both sides, leaving a scar of resentment perhaps as deep as that left from the Civil War and one which may heal more slowly. A byproduct was the recent defeat of Congressman Brooks Hays, a man of Christian motivation who had warned that extreme positions on either side would only "add to the tensions in the community that are disastrous." While the battle of Arkansas versus the U.S. Supreme Court was being waged, into which the Army and the Commander in Chief were drawn, the Russians were permitted to move forward with singleness of purpose in their quest for domination.

But you will ask, what was the alternative available to the Supreme Court in 1954 when the Brown case was decided? I offer this suggestion. Prior to 1954, the separate but equal doctrine of the Plessy case had evolved rapidly in aid of the Negro through a succession of cases, culminating in the decision of *Sweatt* v. *Painter* in 1950. In that case the Court laid down the rule that the word "equal" in the Plessy formula should be firmly and literally applied. Thus, if the separate facilities were not truly equal, the Negro was entitled to admission to the superior white school. This meant, of course, that in many areas of education the States were required to improve substantially the schools for Negroes or failing to do so, to admit Negroes in rapidly increasing numbers to white institutions. It is of special significance that the South was accepting this solution. The rule of law was being obeyed, even though in some instances, reluctantly and painfully. Arkansas and Little Rock, for example, were making substantial progress. There was no sharp, dramatic, provoking change in the law or in social custom. Many private institutions, recognizing the need of Negroes for opportunities in higher education were voluntarily, though cautiously, opening their doors. Progress for the Negro was being made; steadily, peacefully, and with gaining tempo.

This hopeful and optimistic picture was changed by the Supreme Court. Had it been preserved for a few more years or a few generations, a climate of acceptance in the Nation might have been created which would have made the wide educational opportunities for the Negro while preserving peaceful and improving race relations.

Again, I stress the factor of timing. The chief justices, men of experience in local problems, have said:

"How much friction will develop depends in part upon the wisdom of those empowered to alter the boundaries and in part upon the speed with which such changes are effected. * * * The question of speed really involves the exercise of judgment and the use of wisdom, so that the two are really the same in substance."

After all, human government can be no better in the end than human nature. While law and governmental power can nudge the human mind and spirit steadily toward a resisted end, it cannot change human nature overnight by edict alone. If it could, we might dispense with the churches and let the Supreme Court decree that under the 14th amendment sin and the devil himself shall be in violation of due process and the equal protection of the laws.

Speaking of the due process clause, let me say that perhaps the most overlooked and most revealing case of all in evaluating the present Court is that of *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 501 (1954), the companion case to the first Brown decision.

In a cursory opinion, the Court, relying on the due process clause, in the absence of an equal protection clause in the Constitution relating to the Federal Government, held that the laws passed by Congress regulating school segregation in the District of Columbia were invalid.

Among the members of the Court joining in this result were those who had consistently objected to the use of the due process clause as a means of substituting the judgment of the Court for that of the legislature on substantive matters.

Also worthy of note is the fact that Congress is given express power in article I of the Constitution to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over the District of Columbia.

The historic issues posed by Bolling, together with the seeming inconsistency of some of the Justices involved, have been lost in the dust of the Brown cases.

And what of *Cooper* v. *Aaron*, the most recent episode involving Little Rock?

Just before the opinion appeared in September, I had been reading the Bridges case, 314 U.S. 252, in which a present member of the Court, dissenting, said:

"Just because the holders of judicial office are identified with the interests of justice they may forget their common human frailties and fallibilities. There have sometimes been martinets upon the bench as there have also been pompous wielders of authority who have used the paraphernalia of power in support of what they called their dignity."

And I am reminded further of a comment by the same judge in the Pollak case, 343 U.S. 451:

"The judicial process demands that a judge move within the framework of relevant legal rules and the covenanted modes of thought ascertaining them. He must think dispassionately and submerge private feeling on every respect of a case.

* * * * *

"This case for me presents such a situation. My feelings are so strongly engaged as a victim of the practice in controversy that I had better not participate in judicial judgment upon it."

In *Cooper* v. *Aaron* there were other parties in interest in addition to Cooper and Aaron. The United States Supreme Court, itself, was on trial, together with Governor Faubus, the people of Arkansas, and to some extent the President. The case involved a sequel to the Brown decisions—a sequel which all admitted was tragic. Who was to blame? The Court gave a quick answer. It said:

"The conditions * * * are directly traceable to the * * * actions of officials of the State of Arkansas * * * which have brought about violent resistance to [the] decision of Arkansas. * * * The growth of the board's difficulties to a magnitude beyond its unaided power to control is the product of State action."

If the Court were truly objective, I think it would have added "and the product of an untimely and unwise decision of the U.S. Supreme Court." In truth, Little Rock was the result of a series of errors by several forces, all of them acting as catalysts in fanning a smoldering flame, but one which might have been anticipated and held under control by any one of the agencies involved. But, instead of admitting the painful and embarrassing truth, the Court chose to cast the entire blame on the officials of the State of Arkansas.

And what was the remedy?

In the second Brown decision, the Court made this statement:

"Full implementation of these constitutional principles may require solution of varied local school problems. School authorities have the primary responsibility for elucidating, assessing, and solving these problems; courts will have to consider whether the action of school authorities constitutes good faith implementation of the governing constitutional principles. Because of their proximity to local conditions and the possible need for further hearings, the courts which originally heard these cases can best perform this judicial appraisal."

Notwithstanding this initial explanation of policy, the Supreme Court in the Cooper case rejected a plan formulated by a school board that had worked sincerely, courageously, and with personal sacrifice to solve the local problem. Furthermore, the Court rejected the findings of the U.S. District Court which sustained the wisdom and the timing involved in a new school board plan. Was it a wise decision? Within a few weeks, all members but one of the Little Rock School Board resigned, describing the situation in which they were left by the Cooper decision as hopeless. The superintendent of the Little Rock schools, who had been given credit for formulating the initial plan, as well as the more recent one involved in the Cooper case, was dismissed.

By rejecting the solution suggested by the Little Rock moderates in the Cooper case, the Supreme Court, in practical effect, rejected them. It abandoned the moderate position itself.

Recently, during their annual meeting, the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States, after expressing their opposition to segregation, said:

"Prudence may be called a virtue that inclines us to view problems in their proper perspective. It aids us to use the proper means to secure our aim.

"We may deplore a gradualism that is merely a cloak for inaction. But we equally deplore rash impetuosity that would sacrifice the achievements of decades in ill-timed and ill-considered ventures."

Not many years ago, Holmes, Brandeis, Cardozo, Stone, and a score of other great judges carried the responsibility of dealing with the segregation problem. In view of that fact, this question presents itself: Why did they maintain the separate but equal doctrine during their tenure? It is no answer to say that the issue was not presented to them. Brandeis did not hesitate to overrule *Swift* v. *Tyson* in a case in which the issue had not been presented. He reached out and seized the issue, as the Court has done in other cases where it felt that wisdom and timeliness required it. In fact, the Erie case, which overruled *Swift* v. *Tyson* was decided in an opinion by Justice Brandeis in the same year that the Court reaffirmed the Plessy doctrine in *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada*. In that very case these great judges could have overruled Plessy. It is certainly no answer to say that these men approved in principle of Plessy. I am confident that each of them would have been glad to write a Brown decision if he had felt that it was within the judicial power to do so and that as a matter of wisdom and timeliness, it would have brought about more good than harm.

The same judicial self-restraint is reflected in the fact that in the days of Holmes and Brandeis the problem of equal rights for women, even in the obvious field of voting rights, was left for settlement by the Court to constitutional amendment rather than by the quicker and easier judicial fiat.

Consideration of wisdom and timing probably accounts for the consistent refusal of Congress to take action in the field covered by the segregation cases, despite the fact that

there is no question of its power to do so. The 14th amendment in the 5th section expressly provides that: "Congress shall have power to enforce the amendment by appropriate legislation."

It is relevant to note that Congress has withheld action though expressly charged with this function by the 14th amendment. The Court, with no such plain authorization, has intruded.

While there is little to be gained by pointing the finger of blame toward one of the several forces responsible for our present dilemma, I think the quotation with which I began this discussion is worthy of repetition at the conclusion:

"In simple truth, the difficulties that government encounters from law do not inhere in the Constitution. They are due to the judges who interpret it. * * * That document has ample resources for imaginative statesmanship, if judges have imagination for statesmanship."

The solution to the problem can and should come from within the Court itself. Intervention from Congress will do injury to the accustomed structure of the rule of law as now expresesd in the rules and practices governing the Supreme Court.

In times past, the Court has found a solution. I believe it will do so again with the aid of the frank counsel of its friends and the tolerant self-restraint of its responsible critics.

## Fair Trade Unmasked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, "There will not be any price competition and there should not be" so spoke witness Edward Wimmer, testifying in behalf of the fair trade bill H.R. 1253.

What is happening to the thinking of our citizens when such statements are made showing such basic misunderstanding? Or is it intentionally the abandonment of the free enterprise which has made this Nation great? In retailing there must be competition; there must be flexibility of price; there must be economic freedom for the retailer to set prices.

Any abandonment of such a basic component part of free enterprise will ultimately destroy all parts of our economic structure, since all are interrelated—supply and demand, profit and loss, consumer buying habits and all levels of manufacturing, distribution and retailing. This is fundamental.

If there are faults, or unfair or deceptive acts, or antitrust violations, let us correct them but not abandon the system. Let us patch up the hole in the boat, not jump overboard.

Sometimes simplest things are most esaily overlooked. Perhaps new laws are not needed, only present law enforced. The Sherman Antitrust Act and Robinson-Patman Act, section 3, are specifically designed for this purpose, that is, unjustifiable price cutting.

Has it not occurred to fair trade proponents that there could even be patterns of change in goods merchandising and distribution that herald growth and improvement, requiring understanding, not another Federal law. This might well deserve the committee study that is now going to the fair trade bill, the wrong cure for a mistaken symptom.

## Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1959

SPEECH
OF
### HON. ERWIN MITCHELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5916) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas, the very able chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. No one is more familiar with, and more qualified to speak on, the need for providing every cent possible for the care of veterans who are hospitalized in VA hospitals throughout the country. The amount of $4,306,500 provided for in the proposed amendment is the minimum which should be adopted. This amount does not increase the amount requested by the VA by one penny. The figure decided on by the VA was, no doubt, much less than is actually needed for the VA to do the job it is required to do by law and is certainly the least we should appropriate to fulfill the obligation which we owe to the veterans of this Nation. I hope the amendments will be adopted.

As the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, if his amendment is not adopted it will result in a freeze on all employment, a further deferrence of the purchase of necessary equipment, and further increase the already long overdue maintenance and repair projects in VA hospitals.

The gentleman from Texas has indicated the situation in regard to deferred maintenance on VA hospital facilities over the Nation. I should like to call attention to the situation as it relates to the facilities, which are woefully inadequate, in the State of Georgia. At the present time, the backlog of deferred maintenance on Georgia VA hospital facilities is in the amount of $187,597. We cannot afford to let this continue to grow by leaving needed repairs left undone. The funds requested by the VA and provided for in the gentleman's amendments, which is now before us, merely holds the line. It is urgently needed and it must be provided if we do not intend to further aggravate what is now a very unfortunate situation. I do not want to report back to the veterans of Georgia that we failed to provide the minimum necessary for the operation and maintenance of the VA hospitals and domiciliary facilities at Atlanta, Augusta, Dublin, and Thomasville, Ga.

Mr. Chairman, I also wholeheartedly support the amendment restoring the amount of $554,000, which was cut from the request for the VA outpatient program. Since every cent spent in the outpatient program goes for the treatment and care of service-connected disabled veterans, I fail to see how we can do less than provide the minimum amount requested. We all realize that even more money is needed for this purpose.

## Reported Savings in the Department of Defense Supply Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1959, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. A1235) a letter which I had addressed to Hon. Neil H. McElroy, Secretary of Defense concerning conflicting testimony from officials in the Department of Defense as to the effectiveness, efficiency, and economy of the so-called single manager plans for common supply in the services.

In my extension, I am placing a reply which Secretary McElroy authorized the Honorable Perkins McGuire, Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—to send to me. The letter follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, D.C., March 10, 1959.*

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
*Majority Leader,*
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR JOHN: The Secretary of Defense has requested me to reply to your letter of February 16, 1959, concerning the effectiveness, economy, and efficiency of the single manager plan.

I agree that sufficient time has now elapsed to permit a factual evaluation of the single manager program and such an evaluation is in process at present. We are examining the single manager program not only from the viewpoint of its efficiency and economy in peacetime, but also to reassure ourselves as to the mobilization and wartime capabilities of the system.

It is impossible to assess precisely the extent to which savings made through the reduction of inventories and operating expenses are directly derived from the single manager concept as compared to other improvement programs. However, our studies indicate that in the commodity fields presently covered by single management encouraging economies are being effected. For example, in the subsistence, medical, and clothing and textile commodities, we have been able to effect a reduction of about 600 personnel at an estimated annual payroll cost of $3 million. Through the development of integrated distribution patterns, wholesale stocks of single manager commodities have been withdrawn from 55 of the storage locations previously occupied. Associated with this streamlining of the distribution systems, the single managers have been able to reduce the amount of wholesale storage

space devoted to these commodities by 4 million square feet. By consolidation of inspection and test facilities, they are realizing, in addition, a net annual savings of $2,280,000.

During the 2 years of single manager operations in these same commodities, actual sales have amounted to $1,956,451,000 compared to procurement of $1,868,815,000. The excess of sales over procurement has been reflected in the increased cash position of the single managers and has, in turn, contributed significantly to reductions in new obligating authority in the President's budget as a result of transfer actions.

While we do not consider these economies to be spectacular, we believe that they are indicative of steady progress. Perhaps the most promising potential economies associated with the single manager concept arise from opportunities it provides for eliminating concurrent buying and selling and for diminishing back-hauls and cross-hauls through integrated distribution operations. Although they are not precisely measurable, it is reasonable to conclude that economies from these sources have been achieved. During the initial phases of single manager operations these economies may have been offset to an extent by expenses related to adjustment to new distribution patterns, but once adjustments to desired distribution patterns have been completed, significant economies should be possible on a continuing basis.

We have established criteria for determining additional commodities amenable to the single manager technique and have presently in progress a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a single manager for general supplies.

Your apprehension regarding the difficulties involved in embracing the operations of two single managers within a single depot is not warranted on the basis of our experience to date. At present we have as many as three single manager systems representing two services operating out of a common storage location with very encouraging results.

We do not, of course, regard the single manager program as a panacea. We view it simply as one element of a comprehensive program for the improvement of supply management of our inventories. Such a comprehensive program which integrates supply management and financial management improvements is in operation and is producing positive results. During fiscal year 1958, supply system inventories of the Department of Defense decreased by almost $3 billion in value.

The tremendous book value of total personal property holdings of the Department of Defense which, as you point out in your letter, aggregates $120 billion as of June 30, 1958 must be of continuous concern to all of us. For a full appreciation of the character of our inventory and the purposes for which it is held certain facts should be enumerated and evaluated.

Of the total personal property investment of the Department, over $50 billion or more than 40 percent is represented by the book value of whole aircraft and ships. Another $17 billion or about 14 percent is invested in tanks, other tactical vehicles, production equipment, and operating equipment of all kinds. An additional $42 billion or 35 percent is invested in technical repair parts, components, and assemblies which are required to support the peacetime operation and wartime readiness of our combat equipment. The balance of the investment which approximates 11 percent consists of equipments and supplies which have reached the end of a useful economical or military life span and are in the process of disposal, or is invested in general consumable supplies such as fuel, clothing, food and medical stocks. The character of this investment reflects the needs and the missions of the Defense Department.

The value of the personal property investment on our books is, in general, expressed in acquisition cost. Over 70 percent of the investment is in a used condition with no consideration given, in terms of book value, to the age or condition of the investment. For example, the active and reserve fleets of the Navy are included at cost in the total investment value as is the active and reserve aircraft of all services. As you know, in commercial practice such equipments are depreciated in value each year in accordance with the projected useful life span and the net book value at any time reflects a realistic appraisal of the net investment. This is not the practice in the Government. The stated book price of our investment is not a true measure of the current value of military personal property. Equipment which we are in the process of disposing of as scrap because of its age and condition is still carried at acquisition cost on our books.

The foregoing explanation is provided for a better understanding of the overall problem of improving management of personal property inventories. Within this framework we concur completely that overlapping, duplication and wasteful practices cannot be tolerated and positive steps are being taken to eliminate unnecessary duplication and waste. Recently, the Armed Forces Supply Support Center has been organized. The establishment of this center pulled together in one organization the management of the functions of cataloging, standardization, materiel utilization and a capability of dealing aggressively with interservice supply problems. Other steps are being taken such as consolidation of surplus sales offices, bringing together several retail supply system offices of the services at one location, and making available for transfer among the military Departments, without reimbursement, assets of the military services above approved peacetime and mobilization reserve levels. This latter policy conforms with previous discussions between you and Secretary McGuire.

We are preparing a detailed statement of our progress and plans concerning the implementation of section 202(c)(6) of the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. We will be pleased to furnish you a copy of this statement. We feel that you will be particularly gratified to note the improvements that are being made.

Sincerely,

PERKINS MCGUIRE,
*Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).*

## Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. For this Russian state, as is true for many of her neighboring lands, this day will be a time of mixed emotions. There will be rejoicing that on this day in 1918, Byelorussia finally achieved independence after centuries of czarist oppression, but this joy will soon turn to sorrow because the Byelorussians realize that they have lost their freedom to a new form of Russian imperialism.

The world will witness two different forms of celebration on this day. The first will be a mocking farce directed by Russian Communists and staged in the streets of Minsk, the capital. The Communists will try to create the effect of an enthusiastic demonstration of patriotic loyalty to the Soviet Union, but they will not succeed for such sentiments do not prevail in Byelorussia. The second celebration, expressing the true Byelorussian spirit, will show the world that the Byelorussians are not content to exist as a Russian puppet state. It is paradoxical and tragically ironic that the Byelorussians are not free to celebrate their own independence day. They must muffle their true expressions and desires for national independence, and conform to the manner and theme of demonstration dictated by the Russian organizers who will lead their celebrations. Those Byelorussians who have sacrificed their homes in order to flee from oppression and live in free countries are urging us not to be fooled, but to let the world, especially Russia, know that free people everywhere share the hope that Byelorussia will again be a free and independent country.

## Official Advisory Consumer Council Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, many authoritative sources have branded fair trade resale price maintenance as antithetical and destructive of the principles that make up the American system—shopping, supply and demands, bargaining, advertising, and customer-dealer relations. Here is such an authoritative study:

The Advisory Consumer Council has consistently opposed any attempt at retail price fixing. These so-called fair trade laws are nothing more than a dealer-manufacturer conspiracy to raise prices to the consuming public. They are definitely not in teh best interests of Massachusetts' consumers and some day, we hope, the Massachusetts Legislature will lead the way in repealing them. They have already been declared unconstitutional in over 25 percent of the States.

Our neighbor Canada repealed its fair trade law in 1951 largely due to an informal organization of Canadian women consumers. The awesome consequences for Canadian business, about which the friends of fair trade warned the Legislature, just did not materialize and were clearly figments of the scared imaginations of the fair trade lobbyists.

The Consumer Council is mindful of the problems of legitimate businessmen. It has cooperated, and will continue to cooperate with them i nattacking bait advertising and other deceptive-selling tactics. However, the council is convinced that fair trade price fixing is bad for the American economy, that businessmen should be ashamed to beg for this Government support, and that legislators should be ashamed to grant such a special interest law.

## Farm Policy Program of the National Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following resolutions adopted by the National Farmers Union as it starts its 85th year of service to American agriculture:

MARKETING QUOTAS

All marketing quotas should be expressed in terms of commodity units such as bushels and pounds rather than as acreage allotments, or limitations upon numbers of livestock or poultry. Each farmer could produce any volume in any year and store and seal the excess under bond and sell under his marketing quota for a subsequent year. Marketing quotas or orders or stabilization programs should not go into operation until adopted by a majority of the producers voting in a referendum.

When marketing quotas are in operation each farm family should be issued a farm marketing quota certificate that would indicate the volume of sales for the different commodities which the operator could market without payment of overquota penalty or losing his income protection eligibility. The penalty for overquota sales should be not less than 75 percent of the parity income equivalent price. Sales could be made only on basis of withinquota or overquota sales certificate to be obtained by the producer from the county farmer committee. No commodity would be allowed to move in the channels of trade unless it were accompanied by a proper sales certificate.

The national marketing quota would be that volume of a commodity or group of commodities that will clear the market at the income protection level, under assumption of a full employment economy, and would be the total of domestic use plus exports plus needed additions to the national safety reserve. The national marketing quota for export commodities should be divided into a domestic marketing quota and an export marketing quota.

National marketing quotas should be annually reallocated—by farmer-elected Federal, State, and county boards and committees of farmers—to States, counties, and individual farm-production enterprises, including new producers, so that each will receive its fair proration of the national quota. The farmer boards and committees would take into account such features as: historical marketing, trends, abnormal production conditions in historical period, production resources available, rotation and fallow practices, soil and other physical factors, relative dependence of different areas and farms upon one or a few crops, good land use, soil and water conservation practices, equitable adjustments to avoid hardship, and such other similar factors as may be necessary to preserve equity and operate the programs effectively and efficiently. Proration of marketing quotas would be subject to a graduated quota assignment system.

CONSERVATION RESERVE

We urge consolidation of the Conservation Reserve with the ACP program and that the total program be expanded. Greater emphasis and attention should be given to the soil and water conservation aspects of the program. The law should be amended to prohibit the placing of entire farms in the reserve and to allow no more acres to be put into the reserve than is equivalent to the reduced marketing quotas on crops as may be in effect from time to time. Closer supervision and enforcement should be exercised by the Department and the farmer committees to see to it that land conservation and care requirements are strictly carried out in the conservation reserve and ACP programs.

COMPETING IMPORTS

Safeguards should be established to prevent the destruction or weakening of commodity bargaining power programs by imports of competing farm commodities or products or substitutes thereof. This should be done by means of automatic fluctuating parity tariff, import quotas or similar devices, or, preferably, by parity income deficiency payments, or a combination thereof as in the sugar and wool programs.

PARITY INCOME DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS

Parity income deficiency payments direct to farmers should also be used when the domestic marketing quota, established on assumption of full employment, sells in the market for less than the parity income equivalent price and should be the difference by which the market price is lower than the parity income level. Direct payments to farmers should also be used at all other times when the Federal Government determines for whatever reason that the domestic market price should be held below the parity income level. When Government payments to farmers are used to make up farm income deficiencies, the amount of such payments to each family with respect to all of the farm operations and land controlled by it should be limited to actual sales or the maximum marketing quota of an economically fully adequate family farm, whichever is smaller.

FARMER-MANAGED COMMODITY MARKETING

We urge enactment of such new and amended Federal legislation as may be required to enable the producers of a commodity jointly to establish and operate marketing facilities and institutions for selling, grading, advertising, storing, transporting, processing and assembling farm commodities and their products and to bargain collectively with a view to entering into contractual relations with existing firms with respect to the above functions and for the stipulation of prices, volume, shipping dates, grades and sizes. Such authorized activities must be of sufficient scope to enable farmers who produce the commodities to set farm prices within a framework of consumer safeguards established by Congress. Needed legislation includes at least the following:

(a) Make producers of more commodities eligible to use marketing orders and require the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide the technical services required by producers to prepare and process their briefs for public hearings on proposed marketing orders.

(b) Authorization and promotion of industry-wide bargaining cooperatives of producers.

(c) Specific exemption of farmers' marketing and bargaining cooperatives from the application of the antitrust laws.

(d) We welcome and commend the action of the Governor of Wisconsin for initiating positive action to establish a nationwide dairy marketing association controlled by milk producers. We shall support enactment of necessary Federal legislation required to facilitate this worthwhile development.

(e) Facilitating or authorizing legislation required to establish other types of producer controlled and operated bargaining power programs as may be developed for use with different commodities, in conjunction with, or to supersede, farm income improvement programs operated by the Federal Government.

STRENGTHEN FARMER-OWNED BUSINESS INSTITUTIONS

We continue to urge adoption of positive and constructive new and amended legislation to encourage and facilitate the expansion, consolidation, and extension of farmer-owned supply, service and marketing cooperative, and other jointly owned business enterprises. This should include at least the following:

(a) Strengthen and improve the services and resources of the banks for cooperatives.

(b) Significant expansion of the technical research and services of the Farmer Cooperative Service of the Department of Agriculture.

(c) Establishment in the U.S. Department of Agriculture of a Farm Cooperative Credit Agency, similar to the Rural Electrification Administration, that would be authorized and directed to make direct Government loans to newly organized and existing institutions jointly owned by farmers, where required to supplement financing available from the bank for cooperatives for purpose of financing the building, purchase, and consolidated management of facilities for the storage processing, and marketing of farm commodities and the purchase or manufacture of farm supplies and services. Such loans should be made available in amounts up to 100 percent of the cost of such facilities at an interest rate of not more than 2 percent per year. An eligibility requirement for such loans should be the development and presentation by the farmers' association of an operation and management plan incorporating optimum scale for each operation in respect to improving technology and potential market developments. We are convinced that a new agency and program of this type is necessary for the practical and successful operation of marketing order and marketing quota programs and similar bargaining power devices in relation to many or most commodities. The Farmer Cooperative Service should be transferred to the Farm Cooperative Credit Agency when it is established.

(d) We reaffirm our stand against punitive taxation of cooperatives. We are opposed to enactment of legislation classifying cooperative savings as corporation profits. Such savings are refunded in cash or as certificates of allocated resources or other evidence of indebtedness to patrons and as such are income to the patron, not the cooperative, and should be subject to personal income tax liability of the patron rather than to corporation profits tax. Such patronage refunds as are made in the form of certificates of allocated reserves should be made legally liable for inclusion as income in personal income tax return of the patron in the year when the certificate is received at face value of the certificate in the same manner as if the refund had been received in cash. We are opposed to the imposition on cooperatives of punitive regulations respecting such certificates such as specified redemption sates, tax deferment, and required interest such as was recently recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury.

## Easter's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following Easter message by Mr. A. W. Kopke, of Oklahoma City:

EASTER'S MESSAGE

(By A. W. Kopke, Oklahoma Paper Co., Oklahoma City)

As we approach another joyous Easter morning, we are reminded of Calvary's Cross, a risen Christ, and spring's annual awakening. For every flower that bursts forth in its glory is an evangel of immortality clothed in the resurrection robes of spring. And we have the comforting assurance that after the sunset comes an endless dawn and eternal joy, for the way of the Cross leads home.

Easter is the celebration of life. A day in the soft spoken springtime amid the returning tide of life, marks a sublime event in the history of the soul. Upon this earth there is nothing more amazing, nothing more magnificent, than the way in which man has denied death and defied it. Frail and fleeting, there must be something in the soul of man which refuses to accept death as final. In a world of whispering dreams and wistful dust he affirms life eternal.

Calvary's cross, a Risen Christ, and springtime's annual awakening are the world's proof of immortality and the answer to mankind's most persistent question: "If a man die, shall he live again?" The old rugged cross. There it stands today above a storm encircled summit—a beacon light, casting its gleaming rays of faith and hope above all the brawling and bickering, above all the bitterness and bewilderment of a troubled world, the one symbol of man's noblest dream and fighting faith, the cross on which a body died that man's immortal soul might live, safe forever above the clouds of doubt, despair and death. Down through the travail of the centuries, this miracle word "Resurrection" has been the guiding light of mankind and dark though the world may appear today, the light of God still shines for those who seek it.

This is the message that Easter brings to us once again. So with faith renewed and strengthened through this Lenten season, let us go forward with undimmed hope to meet courageously the heavy tasks in a troubled world that have been conferred on us by the ceaseless march of destiny.

May your Easter and the days to come, be days of peace, contentment, and happiness.

## Or Could They?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to commend to the reading of my colleagues an editorial appearing in the March 24 issue of the Evening Capital, published in Maryland's capital city, Annapolis. The editorial was prompted by a proposal made by our distinguished colleague from Texas, Congressman JIM WRIGHT, in his recent remarks to the House. All of us are concerned about inflation. We may differ on ways and means to combat it, but combat it we must. Congressman WRIGHT's proposal is one of the more challenging suggestions I have seen made to the Congress—are we equal to that challenge?

The editorial follows:

COULD THEY?

Representative JIM WRIGHT, a studious Congressman from Texas, has come up with figures indicating that in the next 28 years interest will be paid equal to the total amount of the present national debt, but Uncle Sam will still owe the whole principal.

That, says Representative WRIGHT, is neither nice nor necessary—in view of which he holds up the bright promise of retiring the national debt over the next 100 years, at an end saving of more than $485 billion.

Mr. WRIGHT would do this simply by paying on the $283 billion principal each year an amount equal to not less than 1 percent of the present debt. By keeping everlastingly at the program, he goes on, year by year both the principal and the interest decrease.

And at the end of a round century the Government is out of the red, and there's plenty of money available for highways, soil projects, water resources, and whatever fine things Congressmen may have in mind 100 years from now.

Representative WRIGHT'S exciting prospectus makes passing mention of the fact that during the last 4 years the temporary debt ceiling has been extended three times and once raised permanently.

This would have to stop, of course, along with increased spending, more Government services, and a lot of other fiscal business that has been in progress for some time. They are details, however, that could doubtless be worked out.

Or could they?

## Liberals and the "Little Fellow" Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley, from the Dallas News, Dallas, Tex., dated March 20, 1959:

SOAK THE POOR—WEALTHY DECLARED BIG BENEFICIARIES OF HOUSING PLANS

(By Raymond Moley)

The monstrous hypocrisy of the liberal groups now in control of Congress could not be better illustrated than in the omnibus housing bill before the House and the one passed by the Senate in February. These breast-beating friends of the "little fellow" propose, as they have enacted in the past, a much bigger windfall for rich investors than the alleged benefits they offer in subsidies to the people they claim to help by cheap housing.

Speeches by three Members of the House, taking less than 10 minutes of the time of the House on March 3 and 9, have opened an issue which, if seized by the President, the Vice President, and the Republican Party, could strip the mask from their political enemies who are trying to win the 1960 election with taxpayers' dollars. They could also do exactly what they proclaim they want to do—knock the "party of the rich" label from the Republican Party. It is one of the hottest but least understood social and economic issues of our time.

The three Congressmen who opened this lid are men who by ability and sincerity have won the respect of every right-thinking individual in their districts. One is a Democrat; the others, Republican. They are GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, of California, A. SYDNEY HERLONG, Jr., of Florida, and BRUCE ALGER, of Texas.

Certain public housing bonds, issued by local housing agencies, represent local obligations only. They have back of them the full faith and credit of the United States. This Federal backing gives them their gilt-edged value. The Federal Government gives them a very exclusive tax-exempt basis, which makes them very attractive to people with large incomes. They are really rich men's investments. They pay a little less than regular U.S. Government bonds—around 3 percent, depending upon the year they are issued.

In the omnibus housing bill passed by the House committee, about $2.6 billion are authorized, and over their 40-year life they will generate $1.9 billion in interest. But to a person of large means, who pays 50 percent or more in income taxes, the tax advantage will be very large, indeed.

As an example of the windfall, Herlong cited an issue acquired by a large bank to be sold to its clients. While the interest rate on these would be 3.4 percent, the people who get them, provided they have incomes of from $50,000 to $100,000 a year, will realize from 14 to 26 percent on their investment.

These bonds go into the market in competition with regular U.S. bonds, which pay only a little more in interest and which the Treasury is having plenty of trouble in selling. The reluctance of investors must compel the Treasury to pay higher and higher interest on its bonds. This will be an item in the budget which must be paid every year for all those years. The impact, therefore, will fall on all taxpayers, including the "little fellows" that the liberals claim they love so much. Thus, the liberals behind this housing bill, just like those who have voted over and over for similar bills, are really soaking the poor to enrich the rich.

This deception has been going on for a long time, and there have been strenuous protests against it. In 1952, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, W. McC. Martin, Jr., said:

"Not only do such issues (tax-free housing bonds) absorb some of the funds which would otherwise supply a market for Government bonds or for mortgages generated by new private construction, but they afford an opportunity for wealthy individuals and corporations to reduce legally their income tax payments in a period when it is essential that tax revenues be as large as possible."

Some of the mayors who are rushing to Washington to support these liberal housing bills should realize also that these tax-exempt housing bonds go into competition with their own municipal bonds and compel them to pay more and more interest to get money for their own communities.

It is time that this hoax on the "little fellow" be thoroughly aired.

## Ralph Renick: Outstanding Newsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we, living in south Florida, are very fortunate in enjoying news coverage by an outstanding and one of the most often awarded television newsmen in the country. A

young man in a comparatively young industry, Ralph Renick is presently vice president in charge of news for station WTVJ, channel 4, in Miami, Fla., and is carrying on a thorough, comprehensive, and brilliant effort in behalf of WTVJ's listeners and the community.

Ralph Renick's courage, imagination, and foresight have long been a subject of my great admiration. These qualities and his respect in the community resulted in his initiation of the first news editorializing on television. The amount of study and thoughful analysis given to any question before its presentation in an incisive and penetrating portrayal is a fine tribute to the public responsibility of our news media.

Under his direction, the news department of this station has received the distinguished achievement award of the Radio-Television News Directors Association in 1951 and was named "Best in the Nation" by this organization in 1952 and 1953, and again in 1958. In addition to many other recognitions, WTVJ news' most recent honor has been a special citation for excellence in newsfilm coverage in the 16th annual News Pictures of the Year contest cosponsored by National Press Photographers Association, School of Journalism, University of Missouri, and Encyclopedia Britannica.

Personal recognition has been given to Ralph Renick in 1956 when the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce selected him as one of the "five outstanding young men in Florida." Among awards bestowed on Renick are those from Sylvania, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Delray Beach Chamber of Commerce, Civitan Club, and South Beach Men's Club. He is president of the Greater Miami Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalistic fraternity, and national president of the Radio-Television News Directors' Association.

As examples of the comment set forth on issues of importance to the community, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following two recent editorial broadcasts by Mr. Renick on matters which will illustrate the type of presentation which is made:

EDITORIAL OF WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1959

It takes a tremendous amount of determination of purpose for a political body to stick to its guns during a bitter fight such as the battle over Miami's port location.

The Miami City Commission is thus deservant of commendation for its four to one vote today directing new City Manager Ira Willard to do everything possible to expedite the Dodge Island port location.

The present port is located here. This 35-acre site would be sold to provide about $10 million to develop a port on the present spoil banks at Dodge Island. The city is asking for nearly $4 million from the Federal Government which will be used to dredge in this area.

This is an artist's conception of the new modern docking facility. Almost a million dollars in engineering design work has already been invested in Dodge Island by the city.

This is another view of Dodge Island's location. Beyond is the redeveloped present port area and you also see Watson Island—site of the blimp base heliport and garden of the Americas. The city commission this week turned down a 50-year lease for the south side of Watson Island. The U.S. Navy wants the lease in order to base a destroyer unit there consisting of 15 to 18 vessels.

The commission is divided on the desirability of allowing this. Listen to Commissioner Otis Shiver:

"Speaking on the subject of the placing of U.S. Navy vessels on the waterfront of Watson Island, I might say that in my own opinion I don't feel that it complies with the projection of what we have intended for the waterfront and for Watson Island as a park-playground and for other facilities."

Expressing an opposite opinion is Commissioner B. E. Hearn who believes the lease should be granted the Navy:

"We can give them permanent berthing which will mean considerable to the economy of this area and the personnel that will be delivered to Miami, from time to time, will partially offset the loss of the Marine base at Opa Locka. I think we should move ahead and make this lease available as soon as possible."

It seems that further negotiations should be had with the Navy to see if an acceptable formula can be developed to bring the destroyer unit to Miami's port. If the Navy waits until Dodge Island is readied—it may wait forever. Some type of arrangement on Watson Island is needed as a stopgap measure. It would be a loss to Miami if those ships docked elsewhere. The city needs this type of marine commerce just as the city needs a new port.

This, despite the efforts of the Dodge Island opponents to create the impression that Miami can get along just as well by allowing marine trade to go elsewhere. If the obstructionists win this battle, Miami will suffer by default a blow to the city's economy.

---

EDITORIAL OF WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1959

Two years ago, the Florida Legislature passed the pupil assignment law. This measure left it up to local school boards to assign pupils to a particular public school on the basis of residence, aptitude, and other criteria. Race was not mentioned in the law but the intent of the measure was to slow down or prevent integration.

Four Dade County Negro students utilizing the mechanics of the pupil assignment law applied for admission to all-white Orchard Villa School. The Dade School Board last October ordered a study to determine if the Negroes should be admitted.

Meanwhile, the Federal district court rules in another case that Florida's pupil assignment law is "constitutional on its face."

Under the law, a student turned down by his local school board appeals to the State board of education, then to the circuit court in Tallahassee. After that, a Federal court could assume jurisdiction in a case where the law was used to obviously skirt integration. The Federal court could then order integration.

Today the Dade School Board unanimously voted—based on its study of the Orchard Villa situation—to admit four young Negroes to the school next fall.

Just last week Governor Collins said it is important that the State have control over who is to be integrated and when and where. If the State, through the local school boards—adamantly prohibits integration in some schools, the NAACP, said Collins, can through Federal court action determine what Negro students will enter white public schools, in what localities, and at what time.

The Governor pointed to Virginia where massive no-integration resistance was attempted with the result that the Federal courts are calling the shots on where and when the schools shall be mixed. On the other hand, North Carolina with a pupil assignment law, similar to Florida's, has controlled school integration with the State having the say over what was done—and no schools have been shut down in North Carolina.

The Dade School Board today could have decided to go the other way but it would have eventually been to no avail and, quite probably, would have ended with the Federal court issuing the desegregation order. Certainly Orchard Villa, located in an area now poulated mostly by Negroes, was bound to have to admit Negroes sometime.

It would perhaps be more pleasant to avoid the facts. And the reaction of many political figures to the school board action indicates these men purposely or unwittingly prefer to do just that.

The U.S. Supreme Court decision—backed up by Federal court orders has become an accomplished fact. Florida has to live by the law and the pupil assignment law is superior to having wholesale integration thrust upon us.

Some degree of integration in Miami is inevitable. Miami doesn't want its schools closed, nor does it want any acts of racial violence. Nor does Miami need overmeddling by militants either for or against integration. And the remarks by the president of the Florida NAACP today calling the school board action only a token thing and urging total compliance were ill timed and will only stir waters which should remain calm. So will the comments by House Speaker Designate Beasley saying he would rather the schools closed before integration.

It is the citizens of Dade County who are affected by this action and to them lies the challenging and gratifying job of accepting today's decision in a manner which will further demonstrate our ability to cope with any problem calmly and intelligently.

We can't avoid the issue any longer.

---

## Textile Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, F. E. Grier, of Greenwood, S.C., is one of the great textile men of our times. He is a past president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute. The entire Congress will be interested in Mr. Grier's recent comments carried in the Southern Textile News:

[From Southern Textile News, Mar. 14, 1959]

CONTINUING TECHNOLOGICAL GAINS ASSURE TEXTILE INDUSTRY FUTURE—F. E. GRIER ANALYSES PAST AND FUTURE OF TEXTILES

(By F. E. Grier)

All of us have read a great deal in the newspapers during the last few years about the plight of the textile industry in this country. Most of the publicity this industry has received has emphasized its weaknesses and its needs. Indeed, the officials and other representatives of textile interests have tried to awaken the Government and the people of the United States to the perils which lie ahead for the textile industry unless some relief is obtained from certain Government policies which actually threaten its continued existence.

You have read how, under our Government's price support program, consumers of cotton overseas are allowed to buy American cotton at a price approximately 18 percent below the artificially supported domestic price; how foreign textile plants can buy

Government cotton for from 8 to 10 cents per pound cheaper than Abney Mills, for example, can buy cotton.

You have also heard, I am sure, how, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement, import duties or imports of foreign textiles to this country have been cut to where cotton textile imports to the United States have increased 1,000 percent since 1947; how since 1946 a total of 717 textile plants in this country have been liquidated and how 345,000 people formerly engaged in textiles, or nearly one-fourth of the industry's entire working force, have had to seek employment elsewhere.

These problems are still with our industry. I do not minimize these problems or deny the fact that the textile industry does find itself today in a potentially dangerous situation. However, I do not wish to dwell at length on these problems, for much publicity has already been given to them. Our industry also has its strengths, and I shall try to give you a picture of the textile industry in the United States today which will emphasize its position of importance and its value to the total economy of our country.

In the first place, the textile industry is obviously one of mankind's first industries. The products of this industry, like food and shelter, are among the fundamental necessities of man.

Records unearthed in the ruins of a city in the Indus Valley in Asia showed that cotton was grown and used there as early as 3000 B.C. It is also believed that the people of the Nile Valley in Egypt had mastered the art of spinning and weaving 3,000 years before Christ. Mummies wrapped in luxurious cotton cloth have been exhumed from the tombs of pre-Inca Peru.

The armies of Alexander the Great brought cotton to the Greeks in 300 B.C. Medieval Arabs carried cotton over the trade route from India, and ancient writers described fine Arabic cloth, known now as muslin, as being so sheer that it was invisible when spread over the ground and saturated by the night dew. The Arabs called it "webs of woven wind."

The textile industry, of course, gave birth to the industrial revolution, which has in the last 100 years, transformed the economic life of most of the world.

The point I am making is that the products of the textile industry have always been and will continue to be essential to the well-being of man, that the textile industry and its products are indispensable to this country and to the world.

In the second place, the textile industry today is of tremendous importance to the total economy of the United States.

There are approximately 8,000 textile manufacturing units in our country. Most of them are concentrated along the Atlantic seaboard, but it is a fact that textile plants operate in 39 of the 49 States. The textile mill product industry pays out about $3,500 million a year in wages and salaries.

Textile manufacturing ranks among the 10 largest American industries. Textile plants employ a total of 1,050,000 men and women. In addition, there are 1,200,000 persons who depend on the apparel and related products industry for their livelihood. It would take the entire population of Mississippi, Connecticut, West Virginia, Oregon, or Oklahoma to replace the people who make and sell textile and apparel products.

THIRTEEN BILLION DOLLARS

In an average year the value of products made and shipped by the textile industry is about $13 billion, and a preponderance of these goods, destined as they are for one of the public's basic needs—clothing—becomes essential to the standard of living for people in the United States. In addition to cloth for wearing apparel, the industry produces the bulk of America's home furnishings and industrial fabrics, threads and twines, netting, belting, surgical dressings, and thousands of specialty items. During World War II the industry produced 10,000 different items for the Armed Forces, ranging from uniforms and tenting to canteen covers and helmet liners.

The textile industry not only supports its own employment and capital structure. It is at the same time the source of business and employment for many other industries. Its requirements for new equipment and machinery replacements provide the chief foundation for the American textile machinery manufacturing industry. The mills pay large sums annually for new plants and equipment. Expenditures for such assets have averaged, since 1946, about $460 million a year.

Likewise, the textile industry is annually a customer for more than $800 million worth of chemicals and $430 million worth of miscellaneous goods from such various industries as fuel and power, transportation, starch, packing materials, paper products, paint, electrical supplies, and hardware.

Translated into industrial jobs, these purchases signify employment and livelihood for hundreds of thousands of workers in other industries.

Another unique aspect of the textile industry's place in the national economy is the huge domestic market which it provides for an American-grown agricultural commodity. In the crop year ended July 31, 1957, the U.S. industry consumed more than 8 million bales of cotton and about 98 percent of this fiber was American grown. For its cotton the industry paid American farmers nearly $1,500 million.

On the average, two-thirds of the American cotton crop is consumed annually by mills of this country. Hence, the industry is the major support of cotton agriculture and is, therefore, a key factor in the economy of a region sweeping from the Carolinas through the Mississippi Delta to the Southwest and California.

The third point which I would like to make is the fact that the textile industry in America today is one of the finest examples of the American system of free enterprise. It is a highly competitive industry composed of hundreds of small units, including corporations, partnerships, and proprietorships, all vying for the consumer's favor. No one unit enjoys the advantage of as much as 5 percent of the entire market for textile products. No single large corporation or group of companies is in position to dictate or exert a controlling influence.

Accordingly, this highly competitive situation, which is in the best American tradition, works to the advantage of the consumer. During the tremendously inflationary period since 1947 the wholesale price index for all industrial products has advanced 31.4 percent. During this same period the wholesale price index for textile products and apparel has actually declined 6.6 percent.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics consumer price index for all goods and services during 1952 was 20.2 percent higher than in the base period 1947–49. To understand the relative position of the textile industry in this consumer price index, please note the following figures: the cost of medical care for the consumer advanced 38 percent; transportation, 36 percent, housing, 25.6 percent; other goods and services, 24.5 percent; personal care, 24.4 percent; food, 15.4 percent; reading and recreation, 12.2 percent; apparel, 6.9 percent; and if footwear were excluded, the apparel figure would be about 2 percent.

As Halbert Jones, president of Waverly Mills, of Laurinburg, N.C., and the current president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, pointed out recently in his talk before the Carded Yarn Association, "Textiles and apparel today offer to the people of America the greatest values which are available in our markets." That the textile industry has been able to absorb the rising costs of wages, supplies, machinery, and materials and still maintain prices, at bargain levels is certainly a tribute to the vitality of this industry in our economic life. As Mr. Jones puts it, "Unexcelled value for the customer is surely a basic strength of textiles."

A fourth basic strength of the textile industry lies in its continuing technological progress. Too often this industry, which is perhaps the oldest in America, is not recognized for the vigor and vitality which it displays in the area of research and technological advancement.

Although textile manufacturing and finishing techniques have been in existence almost as long as civilized men, the American textile industry has been able since 1947 to increase its productivity per man-hour on an industrywide average by 48.7 percent. The textile industry has expanded its historical use of the 4 natural fibers—cotton, silk, wool, and flax—which have clothed mankind through the years, and it now utilizes from 25 to 30 different natural and man-made fibers alone or in combination.

Fred B. Dent, vice president of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, made the following statement just a few months ago at Clemson College before a U.S. Senate committee studying the textile industry:

In the postwar era literally hundreds of new models have been introduced in the fabric field, with the result that practically every item in an individual's wardrobe has been completely altered in structure or composition in the past 10 years. Innovations include wash-and-wear fabrics, crease-retentive and crease-resistant suitings, nonwoven fabrics, pile, fur-like fabrics, metal-coated fabrics, stretch fabrics and hosiery, embossed fabrics, silicone finishes, and a host of other items which consumers accept as everyday items now, although introduced relatively recently.

The American textile industry's research and development program is, then, another of its basic strengths and gives promise of a bright and dynamic future.

To summarize, I have tried to emphasize the fact that textile products have always been and will continue to be indispensable to the welfare of mankind; to point out the tremendous importance to the economy of the entire Nation; to make clear the fact that the highly competitive nature of this industry makes it one of the best examples of the American system of free enterprise; and to show that the continuing technological advances characteristic of the textile industry point toward a future not lacking in vitality and promise.

---

## Benson Establishes Unbroken Record Opposing Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to report to the House that, with the Nation's agriculture headed into a new and a deeper recession, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agri-

culture, and this administration have opposed in this Congress every bill taken up by our committee intended to stabilize and strengthen the farm economy.

The Members of the House have introduced 238 bills in the 86th Congress relating to agriculture. To this date, the Department of Agriculture has objected to every one of these bills on which it has taken a position.

This administration has set a course of lower and lower prices and income for agriculture and it stands cold and inflexible against any action of the Congress which might alter this policy of penury for our farmers.

Here is the administration's record in this Congress:

Our Committee on Agriculture called up legislation proposed by the Nation's wheat producers, to attack the surplus problem of wheat, and at the same time to provide a reasonable price for wheat farmers. The administration had conceded that our most pressing problem in agriculture at this time is the accumulation of great surpluses of wheat. Yet, spokesmen for the Department of Agriculture came to our committee room and opposed this legislation.

We called up a bill to restore a reasonable price relationship between corn and the smaller feed grains—oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum. We did this when Mr. Benson set the 1959 support levels on the smaller grains so low as to assure hardships for the producers of these crops and at the same time to encourage larger planting of corn, already in surplus. Mr. Benson and this administration opposed us.

Consideration was set for legislation to provide a special program of research to discover new industrial uses for the products of our farms. Similar legislation was approved unanimously last year by the Senate. Yet, the Department came in and opposed the bill.

We brought up a measure supported by tobacco growers and the tobacco industry generally, to lower the parity and support level on tobacco, so that American tobacco could compete more favorably in world markets. Mr. Benson's spokesmen told us the cut was not big enough.

The great cotton producing areas of the Old South have been severely hurt by the operation of the acreage reserve of the Soil Bank. This program encouraged many small farmers to abandon their cotton acres and this has caused injury to the economy of many counties which depend upon cotton. We took up legislation to permit those farmers who do not wish to return to cotton production—now that the acreage reserve is discontinued—to lease their allotments to other farmers, so that a near normal pattern of production might be maintained to support the economies of businesses, towns, and cities which have been built to service cotton production and marketing. Mr. Benson gave a flat "No" to this proposition.

We brought up a bill which would allow cotton and rice farmers in counties where both crops are produced to exchange allotments—acre for acre—so that one farmer might have all his allotment in cotton and the other in rice. Thus a farmer would not have the expense of maintaining machinery for the production of two crops and could more efficiently produce one or the other. The Department of Agriculture opposed this bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I shall cite one other bill which I thought every citizen of this Nation would approve. This measure proposes to provide $3 million additional during the current school term to prevent a closing down of the special school milk program in many States. But spokesmen for Mr. Benson appeared in our committee room and opposed this legislation. That is the bill which our committee reported and which the House on Monday passed unanimously and sent to the Senate, the objections of Mr. Benson and the administration to the contrary notwithstanding.

I do not know why the Department of Agriculture opposed the school milk bill unless it wanted to preserve unbroken its record of hostility to every piece of legislation relating in any constructive way to agriculture.

Incidentally, we should note here that the Department has not bothered to draft a bill of its own price-depressing proposal for introduction either in the House or the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not expect that the President will veto the school milk bill because its benefits are to our children in much greater proportion than to our farmers who provide the milk for this program. But I want to point out to my colleagues here in the House that in this 86th Congress, as in the two previous Congresses, we are working constantly in the shadow of the veto power of the President wherever the primary interests of farmers are concerned.

The President vetoed in 1957 the bill passed by Congress to return farm price supports to 90 percent of parity. He vetoed in 1958 the bill passed by Congress to "hold the line" against any further price cuts until we could enact general farm legislation. The threat of veto killed the omnibus farm bill when it was presented by our committee last year.

We are certain that, if we pass the wheat bill brought forward by the wheat farmers of America, the President will veto it.

We are sure he will veto the effort to bring the prices of small feed grains into a fair relationship with corn, on the basis of feed value.

We sent to Mr. Benson in the last Congress bills proposing revisions in the present loan and acreage allotment program. We forwarded to him bills proposing two-price or domestic parity systems for various commodities which would let these crops move competitively into world markets while maintaining a reasonable price in our domestic markets. We sent to him proposals for production payments, compensatory payments, or marketing equalization payments to farmers. He returned them all with the Department's stamp of disapproval.

We all know that if the Congress proceeds with legislation in any one of these directions, we can expect our efforts and our work to end in a veto.

This is the dilemma which confronts us. And this sorry condition is aggravated by the fact that Mr. Benson, with the propaganda power of the Department behind him, has so divided our farmers and so confused facts that there is not now in the agricultural community of the Nation the unity essential to the enactment of a new farm program to meet the needs of the time—to turn back the economic upheaval on our farms which looms ahead of us.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to recess briefly for Easter, and many Members will visit their home people in their districts. I hope that each Member who represents farmers in this House will preach a gospel of unity, on the farms and along Main Street.

Your farmer friends will want to know why the agricultural economy is deteriorating and why the Congress has not acted. Tell them how we are working in the Congress. Tell them how our every effort is resisted by the Department of Agriculture. Tell them about the veto power which hangs over us. Tell them over and over again the necessity for unity among farmers if we are ever again to have public policies that promise for farmers a parity position with other great segments of this free enterprise economy.

## Dairymen's Dilemma Is a Many-Angled Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today Linley E. Juers, director of the dairy section of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives, spoke at the Northeastern Dairy Conference being held here in Washington. He presented the Midwestern view on current pricing problems in the fluid milk market and how overproduction in protected milksheds adversely affects dairymen in areas uniquely suited for the production of milk. He noted that producers in certain milksheds are using such devices as health regulations to keep out milk from other regions and maintain an artificially high price.

My national milk sanitation bill—H.R. 3840—would eliminate the latter problem by allowing all fluid milk which meets the high standards of the U.S. Milk Code to move freely in interstate commerce. Mr. Juers' organization has endorsed this proposed legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the speech made by Mr. Juers at the Northeastern Dairy Conference in the RECORD:

INTER-REGIONAL PRODUCER PRICING OF FLUID MILK—THE MIDWESTERN CONCEPT

For me to attempt to speak for all midwesterners on the topic assigned would, I think, be a little presumptuous in that it

would imply that a singular concept of fluid milk pricing prevailed throughout the midwestern dairy surplus producing area. As some of you are probably aware, no such unanimity exists in the Midwest. As in fact, individuals and producer groups can be found with views ranging to both extremes on this subject. The concept or opinion which I will persent will be my own, bearing in mind that I am a representative of a midwestern producer oriented group and it is a viewpoint which I have discussed with many of our members and found them to be in general agreement with.

There has been a growing level of dissatisfaction with the prices which have prevailed for milk in the upper Midwest during the past couple of years and along with this dissatisfaction there has been a growing animosity toward the institutions which have maintained somewhat higher levels of price in the fluid oriented production areas. Probably the prime impetus for this animosity has been the simple awareness that class I prices in many of the deficit production areas exceed $5 and $6 per hundredweight with blend prices of $4.50 or $5 while producers in Minnesota and Wisconsin are receiving an average of $3 to $3.25 per hundredweight for their milk. I think most of our people realize that the extra $2 or $3 which producers received in many of these areas is not all profit and that some part of this has to go toward paying higher feed costs and other disadvantages to dairy production in these areas. I think midwestern dairymen are also becoming quite aware of the fact that when they ship milk into these areas, the transportation cost eats up much of the higher prices being paid. The feeling exists, however, that these prices are still relatively more profitable than midwestern prices and that they are being maintained by means of certain institutions which the midwesterners are precluded from using to similar advantage.

Having led into this area I may as well go on to speculate as to whether producer prices are actually more profitable in, say the Northeast than the Midwest. My own guess is that they are more profitable. I don't have any figures which would show the absolute difference in cost of production in Minnesota and Wisconsin as against New York or Massachusetts because the figures that are available are quite deceiving. It simply is not easy to get reliable figures on costs of milk production because of differences in efficiency on individual farms and because most farms, particularly in the Midwest, don't produce just milk but several other farm commodities in conjunction with milk. In any case there are many incomparable factors and much intermingling of costs making it a difficult job to come up with any uniform type of data. Thus my reason for believing that milk prices being received in areas such as the Northeast are more profitable than the prices prevailing in the Midwest is based on the relative level of dissatisfaction over milk prices which seems to prevail in the Midwest as compared with the northeastern part of the country. I know you hear producers complaining about low milk prices wherever you go. But I'm inclined to think in many cases this type of complaining is only a defense mechanism in that producers have to complain about low prices in order to perpetuate the prices they're now receiving. This is a somewhat different case than that which prevails in the Midwest where prices have been continually moving downward and some difficult adjustment problems have developed at the prevailing price levels. This difference is quite amply demonstrated when you get producer representatives from the Midwest and from the Northeast together to discuss prospective price support programs which might be used to increase manufactured milk prices. The representatives of midwestern dairymen exhibit an almost radical willingness to explore any idea which might result in a somewhat higher milk price and net return to dairy farmers while representatives from the Northeast tend to be almost reactionary in not wanting to disturb what we've already got. If their prices weren't already more profitable than those being received by midwestern dairymen, I'm inclined to think their attitude would be somewhat more liberal in looking for alternatives which might improve the present level of prices.

I think most people in the midwest are also somewhat familiar with the mechanisms whereby prices are maintained at higher levels in the deficit production areas. Most of these methods have been tried or are in use in the midwest but unfortunately with a much lesser degree of success. The Federal order program, State milk control laws, and local sanitary regulations are the most frequently cited institutions though strong local producer organizations should probably also be included on the list. It is also recognized that in most cases it isn't just one of these institutions but two or more being used in conjunction with each other in areas where local demand for milk and milk products exceed production. The program which has been most repeatedly attacked in this respect has probably been the Federal order program. There are some markets where producer prices are administered under a Federal order in which the compensatory payments and pool plant performance requirements make it very difficult for outside milk to get in. I'm inclined to believe, however, that the restrictive nature of these provisions is more apparent than real as I think I am safe in saying that if there were any large supply of milk regularly available to these markets at the prevailing prices these provisions would break down in short order and allow that milk to enter. Thus while the provisions of the given Federal order may be a short-run deterrent to entry, over the long run it has probably been some form of State or local sanitary regulation which has given rise to these provisions under the Federal order. By setting high sanitary standards or restricting the inspection of outside milk, it is possible to create an artificial shortage of milk and thus given a shortage of supply, a price administering program can be used to administer the price upwards.

I'm inclined to think that the real problem which faces the midwestern milk producer is not that of being cut off from shipping fluid milk to distant markets so much as it is the aggregate effect of the price administering institutions as they effect the general dairy surplus problem. There is a tendency in many of the higher price markets to price the surplus milk at a level somewhat lower than that prevailing in the manufactured milk areas and at a price considerably lower than local producers would be willing to produce it for. This practice is justified in order to facilitate disposal of this milk at prices competitive with midwestern produced manufactured products without incurring any loss on the part of those handling surplus. Under the marketwide pooling arrangements the producer who brings additional surplus into the market receives the blend price which is the result of averaging together the low surplus price and the higher class I price. The result of this is that the producers have an incentive to produce surplus milk as long as the blend remains reasonably high. And it is possible to keep the blend up by justifying the maintenance of a relatively high class I price. The carrying of this surplus milk is justified as necessary operating reserve. The amount of necessary operating reserve, of course, can never be precisely determined. The perpetuation of the high level class I price with a continued high level of surplus in the market is generally considered justifiable as long as the total amount of milk on the market is remaining relatively stable or not increasing relative to the demand for milk on the market.

This type of pricing is, to my way of thinking, discriminatory and quite similar to what is known as dumping in the export trades. In order to maximize returns to the local producers in a deficit milk production area, and here I mean deficit in terms of total milk product consumption, the surplus over and above the higher price class needs is isolated from that segment of the demand for milk and dumped onto the market of the manufactured milk producer where the price depressing effect becomes manifest.

Most of the criticism with respect to fluid milk prices which has emanated from the midwest in recent years has been directed at the Federal order programs and I would be inclined to feel that there is some justification for this criticism in that there is some evidence of what we might consider undue price advantage existing in many markets which are under Federal order administration. This criticism has been directed at the Federal order program generally, but I think more specifically on certain provisions which are used in the Federal programs, such as the compensatory payments on Federal order milk. I am inclined to feel that some such pricing inequities do exist, but I am somewhat hesitant to put the blame on the Federal order program itself. As I've mentioned previously, I think there has to be some mechanism for restricting supply before a Federal order program or any other type of marketing program can administer the price at a higher than competitive level. The Federal orders do not contain such a mechanism except insofar as the Federal orders recognize the powers of lower levels of government to do so. I think it has also been amply demonstrated that the decisions rendered following Federal order hearings are just decisions, in most cases, and that the hearing procedures in themselves are such as to afford ample oportunity to be heard prior to the making of these decisions. Thus to the extent that discriminatory or noncompetitive pricing is in evidence under Federal orders, it is probably the supply restricting regulations upon which we should cast our criticism and in that area is probably where we should seek some adjustments.

It would seem to me that the dairy industry in this country should be subject to the same type of economic rules which are advocated for the general conduct of business in our society—these rules being to strive for maximum efficiency in the production and distribution of product so as to achieve the greatest amount of economic growth possible in the economy. Such research results as we have available, and I will admit they are quite meager, would indicate that the regulations which affect the production and movement of milk are tending to distort the allocation of resources in milk production away from this goal. I would cite here the results of the study published by Purdue University entitled "The Linear Programing Approach to Interregional Competition in Dairying." The results of this Purdue study would indicate that the level of milk production in both Minnesota and Wisconsin should probably be higher than it currently is, given our current market for dairy products, due to the comparative advantage of these two States in the production of milk. The study goes on to conclude that Wisconsin and Minnesota should be producing just about all of the manufactured dairy products and that 26 States in the country should probably not even be producing milk for their own fluid

consumption. Thus if we were attempting to gain a maximum degree of efficiency in milk production and distribution, the pattern of milk production and the incentives under our various price influencing programs should probably be working in quite a different direction than they are.

As to what has caused the misallocation of resources with respect to milk production which I have suggested here, I think the answer should put the blame on both ends. First of all, I think we are probably correct in assuming that there has been a strong manifestation of local producer interest in the programs which have provided favorable prices in the fluid milk producing areas. It is only natural that we should expect this to be true as every businessman represents his own interests and tries to gain a competitive advantage when such is to be had. On the other hand, however, I think there is a lot of blame to be cast on the apathy of midwestern producers and the midwestern dairy industry for not having done anything to prevent this from happening. A lot of words have been uttered and much emotion generated over the existence of these alleged inequities but not very many of these expressions have found their way into constructive testimony at Federal order hearings or legislative committees considering changes in the legislation under which price administering programs are carried out.

I think we in the Midwest are going to have to do a little better job of defining our economic goals in the dairy industry and focus our attentions more specifically in those areas where we have a demonstrable comparative advantage. I am not prepared to state specifically what actions the midwestern dairymen should take to improve their competitive lot in the dairy industry. But I do think we can present a good economic case for some general types of changes. I think we would be justified in seeking to remove some of the incentive for the production of surplus milk in fluid milk markets which is competing with the manufactured dairy products which are the mainstay of the midwestern dairy industry.

## Address of Hon. Arthur S. Flemming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 22, 1959, the Stanley H. Miner Memorial Pavilion of the Methodist Hospital, of Brooklyn, N.Y., was dedicated. We were very fortunate in having as our principal speaker the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming. I believe his remarks on the occasion of that dedication are worthy of the attention of my colleagues, and I incorporate them herewith:

Mr. Diefendorf, those who are associated with the ministry of this great hospital, and the friends of this hospital, I can assure you that I appreciate more than I can express adequately in words, the opportunity of participating in this manner in this dedication. I am sure that it is difficult for you to understand just how much those words from Dr. Marshall mean to me. After one listens to such words, he should be very sure of the fact, to use a Government expression, that he has a system of checks and balances operating in his own life. Through the years I discovered that the best guarantee for that is to have some children in your household. About 10 years ago, I was about to be inaugurated president of Ohio Wesleyan. Mrs. Flemming and I were walking down the main street of Delaware, Ohio, with my then 8-year-old daughter. We had just visited the grave of Bishop and Mrs. Baxter. Bishop Baxter was one of the early presidents of Ohio Wesleyan. During the course of conversation, Mrs. Flemming said to Susie, "You know daddy is about to become the ninth president of Ohio Wesleyan." Without a moment's hesitation, came the response, "Yes; and there'll be a 10th." Somehow, she was right, because there is a 10th right now, having just recently assumed the duties and responsibilities of that office.

One of the fine things about the position I now occupy is that as the incumbent of this position you are given the privilege from time to time of sharing in the victories that take place in the fields of health, education, and welfare. Surely, the dedication of these marvelous facilities is a victory, a victory over the temptation that so easily besets all of us. They want to turn aside from the opportunities to participate in the ministry of healing and to "pass by on the other side of the road."

I also want to express my gratitude to those who planned this program for making it possible for Arthur Flemming to participate in the program. This is a very special hospital as far as I am concerned. It is a hospital that was founded and has been supported by the members of the denomination with which I have always been and always will be proud to be associated. It is a hospital that for almost 20 years had the benefit of the leadership of a good minister of Jesus Christ who gave me, as he has already indicated in his introductory remarks, the right hand of fellowship as I joined Trinity Methodist Church in Kingston, N.Y., and whose life of dedicated service has always been and always will be an inspiration to me.

It is a hospital that now has as its chaplain a man who gave me and thousands of other Ohio Wesleyan students an insight into the gospel of Jesus Christ that we will never forget as he occupied the pulpit of the Williams Street Methodist Church in Delaware, Ohio, the home of Ohio Wesleyan University. It is a hospital that had as one of its trusted leaders and outstanding benefactors a truly great man whose friendship it was my privilege to enjoy over a period of the last 6 years. Ellis Phillips has left an indelible mark on my life just as I know he has on the lives of countless other persons. I am not surprised that he and Mrs. Phillips decided to give this chapel. Certainly it is a source of inspiration to those of us who have the privilege of being here this afternoon and will continue to be a source of inspiration and comfort to countless thousands of persons down through the years. The reason I am not surprised is that it was their idea that religion and education should be linked together in the beautiful building that they gave to Ohio Wesleyan University. It is providing the setting for what will be some of the most meaningful services of worship that take place on the Ohio Wesleyan campus.

Finally, this is a hospital that my father remembered in his last will and testament. I know that he remembered because of his conviction that the money that he had earned would be used in such a manner as to strengthen the hospital's ministry of healing. I am likewise sure that his bequest was his way of expressing his gratitude for a friendship that meant as much (if not more) to him as any other friendship that he enjoyed throughout his life, the friendship of Chester C. Marshall. These are the reasons that prompt me to say "Thank you" for inviting Arthur Flemming to participate in this program.

The tenth chapter of Acts provides us with an account of the visit of Peter to the town of Cornelius the centurion. Within that chapter, nine verses are set aside for the purpose of presenting to us what in effect is a Reader's Digest life of Christ as told to Cornelius by Peter. In that brief account Peter felt that it was very necessary to include this statement, "Now he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him."

Have you ever thought how strange it is that an expression that Peter lifted up in order to describe one aspect of the Master's ministry is used so often in our day to express contempt for some of our fellow human beings? When men and women turn the spotlight on human needs and insist on action to meet those needs so often their efforts are dismissed by their expression, "Oh, well, they're just a group of do-gooders." It is these "do-gooders" that I would like to think about with you for just a few minutes on this very important occasion.

I'm sure that if we can engage in a conversation about this expression someone would say something like this, "I really don't intend to express my contempt for such persons. I'm simply trying to point out that they're not practical. They seem to think that money grows on trees. They just don't seem to realize that all of these needs can't be met." Frankly, I think that you and I are simply trying to appease our own consciences. We are trying to rationalize our own insistence on indulging in the luxuries of life in the midst of human need. We are trying to justify our failure to use the time, energy and resources that have been entrusted to us in order that we may go about doing good.

Today, as a result of the experiences that I have had since assuming the duties of my present office 6 months ago, I'm more thankful than ever before in my life for the "do-gooders". I'm glad that they are focusing our attention on cancer, heart disease and many other diseases that are causing suffering and heartache, and are insisting on the fact that there must be a way out.

A few weeks ago, I spent the better part of the day at the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health out in Bethesda, Md. One section of this clinical center is set aside for the research activities that center around children with leukemia. The doctors and nurses talked with me about the research activities that are underway. They told me that because of certain developments, it has been possible for them to extend the lives of the children who come to that center, not by years, but by a few weeks or by a few months. They told me about their hopes that while the lives of these children are being extended in this way, a breakthrough might take place that would make it possible for those children and many others to look forward to normal lives. That breakthrough hasn't taken place. I am convinced that as a result of the dedication that is taking place all over this Nation, on the part of men and women who are determined to stage such a breakthrough that it will ultimately take place. One cannot become acquainted with activities of this kind with the dedicated spirit that accompanies these activities on the part of doctors and nurses and research workers without being thankful for the "do-gooders" who insist on staying with this problem until there is a breakthrough.

I am glad and increasingly so that there are do-gooders in our midst who insist on focusing our attention on the opportunities that we have missed and are missing in the field of education. We haven't provided the opportunities we should provide for re-

tarded children, for execptional children, and for those who fall in between. As a society we haven't provided the educational opportunities we should provide for our children and young people without regard to race, color or creed.

Not long ago I was talking with a former distinguished resident of Brooklyn, Branch Rickey, about this particular problem and I wish that you could have heard him underline his convictions in this particular area. All we have to do is to look around us in order to realize that we are paying the penalty for sins of omission in the field of education.

I am likewise thankful for the do-gooders who are constantly reminding us of what we can do in our communities through the use of both public and private funds to help those who are ill, those who are handicapped, those who are in need of food and clothing, those who are imprisoned, and those who can profit from competent counseling. Yes; I'm thankful for the more than 6,000 do-gooders who have made this great building possible. As I think of the relationship that all this has to some community, some place in this Nation; and as I think of the tremendous opportunities for service that exist in these communities, I feel that there are times when we should hang our heads in shame when we do not follow the lead of the do-gooders at least to the extent, for example, of meeting our goal in a united fund or community chest drive.

Also, I am glad the do-gooders are pointing out what can be done to replace despair with hope by providing those who are handicapped with the medical care and with the training that enables them to once again become productive members of our community. When one begins to realize and appreciate what can be done in this area, he cannot help but wonder why we are so timid about investing our resources both public and private in vocational rehabilitation programs.

Sometimes we shrug off the do-gooders by saying something like this, "They think that government is the only institution in society that can deal adequately with these pressing human needs. Because they think this way, they constitute a real threat to our way of life." I believe that this is an unfair characterization of the persons we are talking about. Most of those who persist in focusing our attention on these pressing human needs put it this way: let's determine what we need in order to meet these needs; then, let's determine what constitutes a fair share for both public and private groups; then, let's do everything we can to persuade public and private groups to accept their fair share. In other words, the do-gooders primary concern is that we face up to the human needs that confront each one of us and resolve to do something about meeting those human needs. This kind of person I'm talking about isn't going to take very much time arguing about the method.

"Now he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil for God was with him." Let's all of us become better acquainted with the "do-gooders" who in our day seek to follow in the footsteps of the Master. They will prick our consciences, they will challenge us not to pass by on the other side of the road in order to avoid the needs of our fellow human being. Let's not only become better acquainted, with the "do-gooders" of our day, but let's strive to be "do-gooders" ourselves. In our striving, however, let's realize that no matter how fine our resolutions may be, we will not succeed in doing good unless God is with us. During this Lenten season may we develop a far better understanding than we have ever had of the strength that God has revealed to us through His Son, Jesus Christ, can bring into our lives so that it will be possible for us to "go about doing good."

This hospital has had a great history because thousands of persons have looked upon it as a medium through which they could serve the needs of their fellow human beings; and they have never been disappointed. The resources that have been entrusted to this hospital have been used wisely and well. I am convinced that the greatest days for this hospital and for other comparable institutions throughout our Nation lie ahead of us. Never before, I am convinced, have men and women been as willing to give of their time, energy, and resources to serve others. More and more men and women want to join that great company of "do-gooders." This is why, personally, as I look to the future, I do so not with a feeling of pessimism, but with a feeling of optimism. I am convinced that as more and more join the great company of "do-gooders" that we are setting into motion those spiritual forces throughout this world that will ultimately provide us with the kind of spiritual breakthrough that will lead us into the pathway of peace.

## Greek Independence Day, March 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 138th anniversary of Greek independence, we are mindful of the importance of Greece to the free world. I can think of no more fitting statement than that which appeared in the Greek-American daily newspaper, the Atlantis, on Sunday, March 22, written by Nick Karalekas, a member of the distinguished Greek-American fraternal organization, the Order of AHEPA:

[From the Atlantis, Mar. 22, 1959]

AHEPA ACTIVITIES—MARCH 25, 1821

(By Nick Karalekas)

March 25 is Greek Independence Day.

One hundred and thirty-eight years have passed since that day in 1821 when the Greek people threw off the oppressive chains of bondage.

This is the story of that fight for independence. Perhaps better still, it is the story of an idea, the essence of which embodies the dignity of man and the freedom of his spirit.

It started in the hills and mountains of a country of rocky soil and cold winters. From somewhere in those steep mountains, where strong men worked hard for their daily bread, the joy of independence found expression in the cry—"Liberty or Death". This defiant spark was rekindled among the sturdy shepherds who pastured their flocks where wild heather made a golden glory of the hillside. These men claimed they found the secret to happiness.

The secret was freedom.

And the secret of this freedom? It was courage. The courage to rejoice in life as one finds it and the courage to find the world pleasant to live in.

But all was not joy and happiness. These dreamers of independence knew the bitter of life as well as the sweet. They understood that joy and sorrow, exultation and tragedy, stand together without any contradiction. For he who has not felt the one cannot feel the other.

The Greek people fought against this bitterness and the tyranny which caused it.

In particular, the "Klephts" of old defied their oppressors. These "Robin Hoods" kept the tradition of nationality vivid and the love for freedom burning. Although their life was a wild and lawless one, the time came when these bands became the instrument of their country's liberation. Certainly it is with deep feeling that the Greek people always visualize a halo of national glory encircling the simple nobility of these fighters. Their deeds have been passed on to us in folk music.

In the ravines of the Pindus, and in the mountains of the Peloponnesus, these warrior heroes sang and fought to gain their independence. Their songs were simple and sincere and as sublime as the summits of the mountains they came from. They were always filled with an heroic imagery and imbued with the natural beauty of the surrounding countryside.

As sad and as melancholy as was their history, the Klepht—like Homer—gave voice to the wood, the eagle, the sun, the river and the soil. Thus, he recorded his adventures, his life and his legends.

The philosophy of these heroes is best expressed in one of their songs.

"I may have a rock for my pillow
And only the snow for my cover.
But I will NEVER serve as a slave!

"Dig a grave for me,
Large and deep,
That I may stand with my gun—
Ready to fight.

"Also open a window so that
The swallows may come
To announce the springtime.
And so that
The nightingale may come
To sing of May blossoms."

This spirit found its way into the hearts of Philhellenes the world over.

The Greek Revolution of 1821 put a new meaning into all things Greek. In Europe, a revival of the Greek culture and language began. In America, the President of the United States, James Monroe, expressed the feelings of the Nation in these words:

"The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feeling of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public and personal liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden from the world under a gloomy despotism has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret.

"It is natural, therefore, that the reappearance of those people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce that great excitement and sympathy in their favor. A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth."

The glory that was Greece, and the glory that is Greece, lies in the quality that the nation's people has shown in rising to meet any threat which attempts to destroy the rights and freedom of the individual.

The essence of that faith is the belief in the capacity of man, as a rational and humane being, to achieve the good life by rational and humane means.

The fight for independence was for the maintenance of that dignity and the practice of that morality.

This is the story of the Greek fight for independence; the story of the undying spirit of freedom; the story of a people whose history is woven with the golden threads of liberty and democracy and who passed on this

priceless mantle of an enlightened civilization to us.

The Order of AHEPA takes the occasion of this anniversary to pay tribute to the freedom-loving Greek people, who always have—and always will—place paramount to all other virtues the sacred principle of freedom.

## Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, in these times more and more emphasis is being placed on higher education. More and more has the American public come to realize its importance to the individual, to the community, and to our Nation. For many years now, the Congress of the United States has recognized the urgency of educating more fully the talent of this country to insure trained manpower to meet the growing needs of this Nation. We have extended educational benefits in many ways, through grants, the GI bills, and other means.

Much has been, and is being, said on the subject, and in this connection I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the address delivered before the Rotary Club of Boston on Wednesday, March 11, in the Statler-Hilton Hotel, by Dr. Harold C. Case, the president of Boston University.

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Dr. Harold C. Case)

In measuring the positive and negative popular attitudes toward higher education, I believe the balance is overwhelmingly in support of the college and university system. Only occasionally now in this jet age, with automation knocking at the door, and satellites already swinging in an endless orbit around the sun, do you hear a condescension toward academic life—or the use of the terms "egghead" and "braintruster."

There is an uneasy awareness that colleges and universities face a financial crisis of major proportions, and that every family with a son or daughter below college age confronts a mounting dilemma—admission for those children.

Dr. David Henry says: "There is not yet a reasoned comprehension of the problem of higher education. This is partially true because people know that education has always had an imbalance between its aspirations and its realizations; that it has never had enough resource to accomplish all of its mission. Many people feel that the problems in higher education in the years ahead are more of the same.

"In the abstract there is faith in higher education, a feeling for the importance of learning, the necessity of research, an admiration for cultural and esthetic experience, and a passionate demand for the right of qualified youth to an education.

"There is a wide gap, however, between this abstract position and realistic practice."

Walter Lippmann has measured the issue in these words: "Our educational effort * * * has not yet been raised to the plateau of the age we live in. * * * We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure it not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but by what it is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish. We have learned that we are quite rich enough to defend ourselves, whatever the cost. We must now learn that we are quite rich enough to educate ourselves as we need to be educated."

We have been making progress toward understanding the need and the role of higher education. The so-called mass media have made an impact on the Nation in telling about the impending college population. The problem, however, is that the essence of higher education is not understood by issuing threats—unless you support the college of your choice—or through anecdote or narrative.

Education is a complicated process—it is a function of life—and its elaboration or improvement depends on larger public understanding.

There are about 20,000 vocations and professions which require some special educational preparation. Note the meaning of this vast need. In 1910 less than one-third of our work force was required to have any considerable educational background. In 1957 one-half needed specialized training. It is estimated that in 1970, 70 percent must have advanced training.

Moreover, survival—the way of freedom to choose—depends on the quality and range of higher education we provide, and the number and competency of those who put themselves under its tutelage.

Our most pressing problem is the recruitment, motivation, training and enriching of our talented citizenship.

Thirty-four percent of our college-age population is now in college. Assuming the continuing increase in interest in attending college (1 percent per year for each of the past 25 years) and the known increase in population soon to apply for admission, we will double our college enrollments in the next 10 years.

If we assume that America will not be willing to divide up what educational service it now has, but that instead, it will find ways to create more educational opportunities, then we can ask ourselves what the problem will be in terms of dollars and human leadership.

What I shall say to you in the remaining minutes is based on the conviction that well educated men and women are the Nation's chief resource, and that we have long since passed the point of choice, we must now develop nationally adequate higher educational programs or we must decline a leading nation of the world.

If we are to lead with strength in the East-West struggle—the strength of our economy, the health of all of our citizens, and the wisdom of many trained people is more essential even than ICBM's.

In spite of the fact that the future of freedom, even of survival, for this Nation, in matters as far apart as satellites of the sun and the management of financial resources, depends on higher education, we now enroll only one-third of our college-age youth in colleges or universities; we spend less than one per cent of the gross national product on education (the total is $3 billion being spent on higher education).

If you would like to know what the cost will probably be, if we are determined to provide quality education for all qualified persons, to provide adequate remuneration to teachers and researchers, to maintain our physical plant, and to construct necessary new physical plant, let me suggest that the best estimates we have are those made by Prof. Seymour Harris of Harvard, who predicts that the costs of higher education in 10 years will be three times their present cost.

We all hoped that the postwar inflationary trend would end. This has not occurred, nor are there any significant prospects of decreasing it now. Taking Boston University, for example: our current budget has exactly doubled in the past eight years, since I began to administer this educational institution, and we have improved our admission standards, and reduced our total enrollment 20 percent in the meantime.

To be sure, this is the era of research, but new knowledge is one of the keys to survival, and important breakthrough in the research laboratory comes high.

New buildings, improved classrooms, laboratories, libraries, student centers, and dormitories are rising, but not enough of them.

We are faced with the problem of doubling our college population by 1969—a decade—and we are increasing our physical facilities now at a rate of about 5 percent, or one-half of the accumulating need, per year.

In manpower, the situation is more grave. We have produced 95,000 additional teachers in the past 10 years. We need 195,000 additional faculty members in the next 10 years.

The true test is whether a nation of free people will respect and support the life of the mind, believing that it is the clue to survival, enough to spend much more on higher education.

We have an important dual higher educational system in this nation: the tax-supported State university on the one hand, and the independent institution on the other; we need both. Larger numbers of students must be enrolled in our State institutions. The independent institutions, on the other hand, are important in the preservation of free inquiry, the setting of standards, the performing of highly specialized tasks in education.

The greatest growth in support must come from former students and alumni. The persons who have experienced the values of higher education must be led to understand their responsibility, prompted to respond more generously than they have in the past.

Parents of students must be brought to understand the true cost of higher education. We have been reluctant to tell the whole truth about educational costs. I do not pretend to know why, but this I do know—higher education is the only commodity that is regularly underpriced.

It is my judgment that we are obligated to tell students and parents how much education costs. The taxpayers of Massachusetts have not the haziest notion how much it costs to educate a student in the State university. They should be told. Far too many of them think that by some magic a State university education is almost free.

In the independent institutions we must decide whether, having told the truth about the costs, we will ask students to bear a larger portion of that total. There are two schools of thought here. One says that we are not really educating an individual, but we are instructing a generation. The other school insists that in our highly individualistic society, we are actually training persons. If so, and this is my belief, as I stand for the best possible total experience for every student, then the individual student and his family should pay the full cost—less the income from endowment, gifts, grants, and the like. Is there any good reason that a student should not believe in himself in terms of the worth of his education as much, at least, as he believes in his car for transportation. Consider that the average college-student debt now stands at $20, while the average family debt for durable goods is $3,000.

Education needs, and must find, a way to secure a larger share of the consumer dollar. Suppose a student borrows the difference between tuition and true costs, and obligates himself during his lifetime, to return to his Alma Mater enough to bring it out whole—the problem of alumni giving is solved, the sense of obligation prevails, instead of an empty idea of benevolence.

Government funds must play a part. They will not solve the problem. But subsidized housing, to the amount of the difference between a 2¾-percent and a 5-percent loan, is not unreasonable. But in crucial areas, electronic physics, solid state physics, upper atmosphere research, food research, medical and nursing education, the well-being of all of the people is of such crucial importance to cause me to stand for direct Federal support for these, and other critical educational interests.

There will be need for a large increase in private funds for education. A start has been made. Very generous support has come from the great foundations. The Ford Foundation set an example in its unprecedented gift to American colleges and universities. Other foundations have given significantly. It is to be hoped that a larger number of gifts for general capital purposes will be available.

Corporate giving on an annual basis is five times as great as it was 10 years ago.

Still, a minority of business industrial concerns have recognized the clear relationships between their success and the quality of college graduates they can recruit.

I bring you no word of consolation today, but of challenge; and if the challenge is met, I predict the best educational results in the world—more well-trained young men and women who have ample know-how, and even better, they will have a value system to which they are committed, and they will know why.

Here, then, is one point of view. Costly as it will be, the best higher education is, in the long run, the lowest cost guarantee of a future we can cherish.

## Four Hundred and Fifty-ninth Troop Carrier Wing Wins Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 1959*

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride and pleasure that I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the 459th Troop Carrier Wing, the Washington area's Air Force Reserve flying unit, has won the Continental Air Command's Flying Safety Plaque, emblematic of the best flight safety record in the command. A great many men of this wing are residents of Maryland's Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor of representing in Congress.

Commander of the wing is Brig. Gen. Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., a prominent Washington lawyer in civilian life and one of the country's most decorated airmen in World War II.

The wing, composed of some 1,500 Air Force reservists who come to Andrews 1 weekend a month to train, have flown over 26,000 hours and almost 5 million miles, never having an aircraft accident since their inception in July 1954. For the past several years, the unit has boasted their record as not only the best in the command but in the entire Air Force. The award at least substantiates part of the claim. Air Force records are not refined enough to check their performance against other units.

Giving more luster to the wing's accomplishment is the fact that the Federal aeronautics agency has designated the Washington area as one of the three cities with the highest air traffic density in the Nation, thus posing a hazard to flying training.

The award is made each year to the unit that rates the highest in each of the following four areas: (1) Utilization of assigned aircraft and the amount of flying time performed; (2) the mission of the organization and operational tasks accomplished during the period; (3) all other factors influencing the flying hazards faced by the organization, such as accident proneness of type of aircraft flown, air traffic density, weather conditions and terrain; (4) quality of the unit's accident prevention program.

I know I do not speak for myself alone when I say "congratulations" to General Potts and the men of the 459th wing for attaining this most outstanding flight safety record.

## DAV Services in Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Iowa citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services may not be sufficiently appreciated by many of us or by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Iowa, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited compensated disabled veterans very substantially. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of full-time, trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. There they have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV maintains two national service officers in Iowa, Charles L. Huber and Buford L. Phillips, located in the VA Center, Valley Bank Building, Des Moines. Mr. Huber also serve as department adjutant and the department commander is Mr. Joe Terrones, Wendell Court No. 2, Waterloo.

The DAV Department of Iowa has nationally appointed representatives to the Veterans' Administration voluntary services advisory committees at each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals servicing Iowa veterans. These DAV representatives and the hospitals are as follows: Mr. Henry J. Luckritz at the 560-bed DOM hospital at Clinton, Mr. Joseph Walsh at the 386-bed general medical hospital at Des Moines, Mr. Robert Hess at the 484-bed general medical hospital at Iowa City, and Mr. R. I. Woody at the 1,540-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Knoxville.

During the last fiscal year the VA paid out $80,315,000 for its veterans program in Iowa, including $19,811,233 disability compensation to its 24,702 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Iowa furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 13 percent—3,188—are members of the 37 DAV chapters in Iowa.

This 13-percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Iowa veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

| | |
|---|---|
| Claimants contacted (estimated) | 55,336 |
| Claim folders reviewed | 48,113 |
| Appearances before rating boards | 21,800 |
| Compensation increases obtained | 4,456 |
| Service connections obtained | 1,713 |
| Nonservice pensions | 1,363 |
| Death benefits obtained | 83 |
| Total monetary benefits obtained | $1,856,649.36 |

The above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,35.32, and in the central office they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,369.05. Propor-

tionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Iowa veterans, their dependents, and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms, and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting the same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, uses his skill, except in behalf of persons he is sure are worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV actional national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1.2 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Iowa with a consequent loss to them of about $336,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Iowa to give his power of attorney for this purpose to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent, expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its National Service Officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, many claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert National Service Officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income of its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 3,747 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Iowa residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially to maintain an expert Service Officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago which concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first Perpetual Rehabilitation Fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member—an excellent objective also for Iowa.

Claimants who have received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Iowa by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902 or World War I veterans—payable in installments within two full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, business organizations, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of American's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of Americas' disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

I am proud personally to be a member of the DAV.

---

## The President's Speech on the Berlin Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Berne Witness,

Berne, Ind., expresses the general reaction to the President's speech relating to the Berlin situation. Because I think it does express the sentiment of so many Americans, I include it herewith:

President Eisenhower's address to the Nation Monday night was one of the best ones he has made for some time, we thought. He made it clear to the Russians that the United States will stand firm and will use any measures deemed necessary for the protection of the country. Ike appeared at his best, seemed sure of himself, the speech was well organized, and most Americans who heard him can rest assured that this country is not alseep at the switch but that every defense measure possible is being taken. The President said that the United States would not retreat one inch from its rights and only through firmness on the Berlin problem can the risk of war be minimized.

## Resolutions on Amendments to the National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of this body two resolutions passed by an overwhelming majority of professors at a great Iowa educational institution, Cornell College. The first resolution calls for the repeal of title X section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958: the so-called loyalty oath section. This section is, of course, one more carryover from the McCarthy era. I hope, however, that we are sufficiently removed from that period in our history so that we are able to judge the question of loyalty in more meaningful terms than it has been judged in the past. Consequently, I hope that we shall prevent the passage of any dubious meaning, ill-conceived or anti-democratic legislation on this subject, and foster the repeal of this kind of legislation that Congress might have passed in the last few years. The second resolution calls for an amendment to the National Defense Education Act which will make teachers and counselors in private schools and colleges eligible for the same benefits as those who teach in the public schools:

RESOLUTIONS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

The Cornell College faculty, both teaching and administrative members, approved the folowing two resolutions at an official faculty meeting on March 16, 1959:

"I

"The Cornell College faculty calls upon the 86th Congress to repeal title X, section 1001(f)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This section reads:

"'No * * * funds * * * shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.'

"Our reasons for opposing the requirement of such a disclaimer statement are as follows:

"1. On grounds of principle, it is a violation of the American tradition of freedom of thought since it makes an individual's opportunity for educational assistance contingent upon his beliefs. It is also self-defeating in that a person momentarily seduced by antidemocratic ideologies is more likely to discover their fallacies through more rather than less education. We uphold the basic soundness of Thomas Jefferson's famous statement: 'If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.'

"2. On grounds of utility, such an oath is totally ineffective, simply one more ribbon of redtape powerless to sustain our national security. Dedicated subversives who have already exposed themselves to the major charges of treason or sedition will not hesitate to take such an oath, with its relatively minor risk of perjury. Past experience has repeatedly demonstrated that the persons who refuse such a disclaimer statement are mainly idealists who sacrifice themselves to protest what they consider a violation of the Bill of Rights.

"3. On purely legal grounds, this vaguely worded oath, which is required under the criminal penalties of perjury, violates the legal principle that criminal statutes shall punish actions rather than beliefs, and shall define the proscribed actions in unmistakable terms. The law does not specify the organizations in which membership is proscribed, nor any procedure for specifying them. Neither does the law define what constitutes support of such an organization, which could include a mere defense of its right to be heard. Again, the law does not provide any test by which a member can know when the organization is using illegal or unconstitutional methods for bringing about a change in the government of the day. This broad wording could be made to extend to a member of a corporation or labor union which contributed financially to the Democratic or Republican Party or a candidate, in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. Finally, this law could be used to expose to malicious and harassing investigation and prejury prosecution persons whose later utterances might be construed as retrospective evidence of previous false swearing. Such a threat can only intimidate the free inquiry and expression on which a vigorous democracy depends for its vitality.

"4. On grounds of public policy, this disclaimer oath directly contradicts our attempts to bring our best minds into teaching to offset Soviet educational and scientific gains. At the very time we are trying to raise the status, prestige, and income of the teaching profession, we single out its present and potential members as a target for popular suspicion. We require of them an oath which is seldom required of other groups receiving Federal assistance, or of other members of the general population. Such oaths reinforce the growing tendency of college students to avoid all independent thinking and discussion about values and goals for fear of some day being suspected of harboring beliefs disloyal to their country. This policy is worse than discriminatory and unfair. It is foolish and self-defeating.

"II

"The Cornell College faculty calls upon the 86th Congress of the United States to amend the National Defense Education Act in such a way that teachers and counselors in private schools and colleges be made eligible for the same benefits as those in public schools.

"Title II, section 205(b)(3) provides that up to 50 percent of loans made to undergraduate and graduate students in institutions of higher education shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school, at the rate of 10 percent for each year of such service. We strongly urge that this forgiveness feature be extended to teachers in private elementary and secondary schools, and to teachers in both private and public institutions of higher learning.

"It seems quite obvious that teachers in colleges and universities and in private elementary and secondary schools are rendering as much service to society as teachers in public elementary and secondary schools. In terms of economic need it is often the case that the teachers in private institutions need this relief even more than those in public institutions. The national interest requires that we recruit teachers for education at every level and in both public and private institutions.

"The same kind of amendment is recommended in title V, part B, section 511, which provides stipends for individuals 'engaged, or preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance in a public secondary school. * * *' We urge that such stipends be made available on the same basis to persons engaged, or preparing to engage in counseling and guidance in a private nonprofit secondary school."

## Telegram Regarding Puerto Rican Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose a telegram I have received from Hon. Miguel A. Garcia Mendez, a senator of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, and Luis A. Ferre, a member of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

SAN JUAN, P.R., *March 24, 1959.*

Hon. FRANK BOW,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

We oppose Resident Commissioner FERNÓS' bill to repeal law of Federal relations with Puerto Rico because said approach will surely increase the tremendous confusion he and his party have created trying to convince the people of Puerto Rico that we are no longer a Territory under the sovereignty of the United States and that Congress has no power to approve rules and regulations under article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Federal Constitution. FERNÓS' bill is ignoring the interpretation given by Members of House and Senate to Public Law 600 of the 81st Congress and Public Law 447 of the 82d Congress. His proposal is an open violation of amendment included by Congress in article VII, section 3, of Puerto Rican Constitution as condition to its approval and incompatible with the very foundation of the power delegated to Congress by the Constitution, which power Congress cannot relinquish.

FERNÓS is also asking Congress to withdraw from Puerto Rico all Federal agencies which means withdrawing of U.S. sovereignty from Puerto Rico. Present government in power has no mandate on subject of status because at no time has this matter been submitted to referendum of the people, and it is the duty to guarantee the right of self-determination of the two and a half million American citizens of Puerto Rico through referendum. FERNÓS' bill is a hoax to which

Congress should not be a party. We resent, as loyal American citizens, such an attitude against the sincere permanent union, not association, based equal rights and obligations, and not second-class citizenship in the relations of our Nation with Puero Rico.

Respectfully,

MIGUEL A. GARCIA MENDEZ.
LUIS A. FERRE.

## Helping the Family Farmer Help Himself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

## HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the delegates to the National Farmers Union annual convention met in Springfield, Ill., this month, they adopted a policy program designed to improve and sustain the family farm. They noted that farmers need to develop and operate a wide variety of private and public programs to obtain equality of bargaining power in the commodity and credit markets of the Nation and the world. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an outline of the National Farmers Union commodity income improvement program in the RECORD:

FULL PARITY INCOME FOR FAMILY-FARM OPERATORS THROUGH BARGAINING POWER

We shall support Federal and State legislation and local laws and policies to improve and sustain the family farm. A family farm is an agricultural production unit that can be efficiently operated by a typical full time farm operator family that furnishes most of its own labor. Our Nation should move rapidly away from absentee ownership of farms and industrial-type farm operation. We shall continue to oppose by all means at our disposal the trend toward vertical integration controlled by off-farm interests. We shall particularly emphasize positive efforts of family farmers to obtain greater control over the financing and management of the processing and marketing of farm commodities.

Farmers do not now have fair bargaining power under the existing market structure. Lack of bargaining power makes it impossible for farmers to earn and receive a fair share of national income. Farmers need to develop and operate a wide variety of private and public programs to obtain an equality of bargaining power in the commodity and credit markets of the Nation and the world.

However, we see no practical possibility for family farmers to acquire all the bargaining power required to earn and receive a parity of income except through authorization and positive programs of the Federal Government.

FARM COMMODITY INCOME IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Farmers must obtain control over the supply, marketing, and pricing of their commodities. We favor establishment of a comprehensive system of commodity programs based upon managed abundance. Existing Federal farm programs and policies have placed American farmers in an unfair economic position in relation to other forces and segments of the national economy. They are inadequate because they fail to meet the central fact of modern farming—the enormous capacity to produce due to modern farm technology. Existing farm income programs are not geared to the revolutionary changes in farm production and food distribution, processing, and merchandising. Existing farm programs are not properly adjusted to the modern position of the United States in world affairs and world trade. Food can be used to promote the peace.

The existing wrongful farm policies are based on a doctrinaire belief in the illogical and incorrect philosophy of fully flexible farm prices in unregulated and unprotected markets. The consequence of this is suffered not only by those who till the soil and tend the herds and flocks but by the entire Nation. Under programs based upon this false philosophy of fully flexible sliding scales of price support, not only have farm prices dropped, but farm family income has fallen drastically. Government costs of the farm programs have soared and retail prices of food have risen.

Businessmen, utilizing their rights under the 14th amendment, have organized great corporations with limited liability which gave them enormous power in the market place. Members of labor unions have brought about the passage of laws which protected them in their collective bargaining rights. Minimum wages, maximum hours legislation, workmen's compensation laws also were enacted which protected working people.

Farmers today, in the exercise of their bargaining power, find themselves somewhat in the position labor and business was a hundred years ago. Farmers in many instances are forced by economic necessity to mine their soil and they find themselves where they cannot effectively bargain in the market place.

Unlike businessmen and labor in industry and commerce, farmers have not yet obtained from the Government legislation to permit similar use of bargaining power except for immunity from antitrust laws for cooperative buying and selling. Unlike business and labor programs, farm programs are largely Government expenditure programs which require that a large proportion of farm family net income be dependent upon periodic congressional appropriations. Under existing Federal farm policies, farm income continues to fall; retail prices of food continue to rise; and Government expenditures for farm programs continue to soar. With a further 10 percent drop in farm income predicted for 1959, Government expenditures for the Department of Agriculture threaten to reach the historic record high level of more than two-thirds of farm family net income of the Nation.

Farmers must have enabling legislation to get needed bargaining power. We are asking Congress for nothing more than was long ago legally given to business and industry and has partially been granted to labor. The program must provide safeguards to assure an adequate supply of food and clothing. Consumers, small businessmen, and labor, we believe, will support adequate farm programs when they realize that their interests have been considered and protected and that farm families are entitled to the same economic rights provided under law to other groups.

These bargaining power tools should be assured to farmers administering their own programs through a system of elected farmer committees and boards. We are asking the Government help through enabling legislation and by technical help and guidance. It is our belief and intention that such a program shall operate during periods of full employment without net cost to the Federal Treasury. However, we firmly believe that to provide consumers price level stability, the Government make such appropriations as are necessary.

Farm gate regulation of marketings, we are convinced, is practicable, effective, and completely consistent with the principles of democratic freedom and free enterprise. Farmers are ready, willing, able, and eager to accept the responsibility and the individual and cooperative self-discipline required to regulate their marketings and curb wasteful production. Farmers have demonstrated in many referendums that they are prepared to adopt and operate such measures provided the rewards are commensurate with the sacrifices.

We urge the adoption of a comprehensive system of commodity programs that will provide for (1) administered farm prices to be set yearly, within limits prescribed by Congress as being fair to both farmers and consumers, by a national farm income improvement board made up of a majority of farmers with consumer and business representatives; (2) production and marketings based on national need including domestic and export requirements in accordance with production and marketing goals based on bushels, pounds, and bales sufficient for domestic and export use at prices that will enable farmers to earn and receive a parity of income; (3) the Board to decide what is the national need for farm products, domestically and for export for dollar sales without subsidies with the additional amounts that are required by the Government to carry out domestic welfare and foreign policies of the United States to be paid for by the general public out of the general funds of the Federal Treasury and not be charged to the farm programs.

For each 1 percent that farmers are allowed to regulate, the volume of domestic market supply of the total market basket of farm food commodities, this will favorably regulate the price at the farm gate by at least 10 percent and thereby favorably affect farm operator family net income by at least 25 percent. Farmers want and deserve the right to improve their incomes by regulating market supply through either holding the excess volume off the market or by mandatory donation of it to augment the food supply of starving millions in other lands when workable international food relief agencies are set up. Farmers Union is not interested in quibbling over words or details. Our interest is to cooperate with any who wish to join with us in developing programs of action to immediately raise farm income. We shall continue to support all such proposals and efforts.

COMMODITY COVERAGE

Such programs should be developed for all commodities when producers are willing to adopt and enforce effective measures to keep market supplies in balance with demand. Each commodity program should be adapted to the unique needs and problems of the producers of each commodity. When several commodities are closely related, such as feed, forage, and livestock, they should be handled within an integrated commodity group program.

FARM PRICE AND INCOME GOALS

The primary objectives of farm income improvement programs should be an income of family farmers from their labor, capital investment, risk, and management comparable to and at a parity with the return for those factors in other segments of the national economy. We shall continue to urge the most rapid possible progress toward rising farm-gate prices and farm family income to the parity level. The concept of income parity in Federal farm legislation should be preserved as the major measuring stick of the program. We do not view the parity goal as a special favor or privilege for farmer people. Moreover, we shall oppose the use of bargaining power programs for profiteering at the expense of the consumer by raising administered prices above the parity income equivalent level.

METHODS

All of the several commodity and related programs, if the entire program is not enacted as permanent legislation, should be scheduled to expire at the same time.

We shall support adoption and use of workable combinations of farm commodity income improvement methods such as: loans, purchase agreements, market surplus diversion purchases, parity income deficiency payments direct to farmers, regulation of imports, export incentive payments, stabilization operations by farmers and by Government, marketing agreements and orders, feed grain production controls, other farmers' bargaining devices, marketing premium payments for sale of livestock at desirable weights, other types of marketing premium payments and compliance deposits designed to keep supplies in balance with demand, marketing standards and scheduling, and a system of marketing quotas for all commodities as a whole, for groups of related commodities, and for individual commodities, as needed.

Market diversion and stabilization programs and similar activities by farmers and by Government should be used to insure orderly marketing, eliminate unreasonable seasonal fluctuations in market prices, and to prevent disruption of the programs by speculation and profiteering.

Authority to make use of marketing orders and quotas should be authorized for producers of all commodities.

## The Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill

SPEECH
OF
### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5916) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to support the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1959—H.R. 5916—in its amended form.

I believe that the House has approached this bill in a spirit which combines an interest in needed programs with a desire to keep appropriations within reasonable bounds.

It is worthy of note that the Committee on Appropriations reduced the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget by $385,432,032 and even with the amendments passed by the House the final appropriations will be approximately $208 million below the budget.

I am happy to support the restoration of $100 million to the Development Loan Fund. Even though there are five other agencies supplying money in whole or in part for economic development abroad and in spite of the fact that we are currently receiving reports of discouraging mismanagement in our foreign assistance programs, nevertheless, I feel that the main objectives of these programs are valid. I feel that our administration of these programs is improving and I believe that our security and the stability of our friends throughout the world require that they be continued.

This does not mean that we should not keep these programs continually under observation. It is our duty to do this because of the amounts involved and because of the constant danger that their objectives will not be realized because of faulty administration. In our present status of international tension, however, I am sure that this is not a time to abolish these programs.

## A Program for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a resolution adopted by some 400 members of the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York. The council is comprised of 225 union locals with a total membership of a half million workers. Mr. Charles S. Zimmerman, the noted labor leader, is chairman of the council.

These people from the ranks of labor are very much concerned over the lasting unemployment situation and other economic problems which are plaguing the country at this time. They advocate a program of action which deserves the serious attention of the Congress. The text of the resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE TRADE UNION COUNCIL OF THE LIBERAL PARTY

The country finds itself in an economic situation that has no precedent. Business is improving, profits are rising, yet high unemployment persists and shows signs of becoming permanent. Growing productivity and growing disemployment are moving together.

At a time that calls for bold and far-reaching action, the policies of the Eisenhower administration and the measures taken by Congress actually constitute a retreat from the serious problem with which the Nation is confronted. In New York State, the Rockefeller administration and the legislature are likewise marked by an unwillingness or inability to meet the economic realities.

The extension of the temporary unemployment insurance program for only 3 months reveals, in itself, the tragic inadequacy of our National Government to cope with this blight on the country's economic health. This is especially evident when it is realized that fully one-third of the $665 million appropriated for the emergency program still lies undistributed while the jobless go hungry. Furthermore, the extension will afford even this limited assistance to less than one-tenth of the country's unemployed.

Despite all the smooth assurances from the President and his economicts that the recession is over, the Trade Union Council of the Liberal Party declares that the recession will not be over until unemployment disappears, and that our country can have no full economic strength without full employment.

We call for action. We call on the National Government and on the State government to put into immediate effect such measures that will give jobs to the unemployed, such provisions that will make American families economically self-sufficient, and such long-range plans which will overcome the contradictions that plague our economic growth.

We call for the immediate institution of the 35-hour week on a national basis.

We call for the immediate establishment of a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour extended to all workers.

We call for immediate passage of a depressed-areas law, seeking to abolish pockets of unemployment, as well as economically blighted areas.

We call for increased unemployment insurance benefits, extended duration periods, more reasonable eligibility requirements, and broader coverage—on both National and State levels.

We call for tax relief for low-income and middle-income families. We believe, with organized labor, there must be an increase in the income-tax exemptions.

We call for the plugging of loopholes through which large corporations and combines escape their fair tax obligations.

We call for substantial reduction of the depreciation allowances in the extractive industries.

We call for the inclusion on the Federal Reserve Board of a member representing labor.

Finally, we call for the establishment of a National Economic Council composed of labor, management, farmers, scientists, technicians, the professions, and consumers, charged with planning and executing a democratic program for achieving economic security, prosperity, and ever-improving standards of living.

## The Candid Witness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article on fair trade:

THE CANDID WITNESS

The other day we ran across some testimony before Congress about the proposed Federal fair-trade law that mystified us.

Mr. Maurice Mermey, director of the National Association of Retail Druggists, long the drumbeaters for fair trade's price fixing features, told the House Commerce Committee that reliable surveys showed that consumers in non-fair-trade areas paid just about the same prices consumers paid in areas where fair trade had fixed prices.

This was mystifying because, first, it ran counter to the experience of many people, and second, because if prices were about the same in non-fair-trade areas as they were in fair-trade areas, then obviously fair trade didn't even benefit those manufacturers and retailers who like to keep prices stable—and high.

But the mystery was cleared up for us by testimony yesterday of a spokesman for the Department of Justice, who appeared in opposition to the Federal fair-trade law. Apparently it all depends on what survey a person relies upon, and Mr. Robert A. Bicks,

the first assistant in the Antitrust Division, relies on a Department of Justice survey comparing fair-trade prices to prices in non-fair-trade areas.

Now, what did the Government survey show? Well, out of 132 items picked at random, an average of 119 were available in each of 8 cities not covered by fair trade laws. Of these 119 items, 77 on the average sold below the fair trade prices fixed for other areas.

Thus consumers in the 8 city non-fair-trade trade area purchasing these 77 items could effect savings of 27 percent below their fair trade value.

The savings varied from item to item and city to city. People in Washington, D.C., for example, could buy 121 items below their fair trade prices and save 32 percent. Kansas City had 73 items available at 31 percent below fair trade prices; Dallas, 99 items at a saving of 24 percent. And so on.

Now this survey appears to us to be more realistic than those of the druggists that showed no difference in costs to the consumer. Fair trade, in fact, is designed to keep costs high by discouraging price competition. So it doesn't help the consumer one bit. And the antitrust laws—from which the price fixed fair trade items would be exempt under the proposed Federal law blanketing the Nation—were enacted to protect the consumer, who is the public, by outlawing price fixing that prevents competition.

The public ought to be glad that Government agencies like the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice are opposing this proposed nationwide cartel system, and we'd suggest the public can best show its appreciation and serve its own interests by writing Congressmen to vote this oppressive measure down.

For it will be oppressive, if the fair traders get what they actually seek. And the public should be grateful, too, for the testimony of one proponent of a Federal fair trade law before the House Commerce Committee.

For this supporter of fair trade, Mr. Edward Wimmer, of the National Federation of Independent Business, was candid enough to tell the Congress that if the Federal law is enacted: "There will not be any price competition, and there should not be."

## J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution in support of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and J. Edgar Hoover, who are under attack in a vicious smear campaign, was unanimously passed by the Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association at their regular meeting at Berlin, Conn., on March 19, 1959:

Whereas the leadership in coordinating the effort of all law enforcement in the country and the high ideals and standards for law enforcement as expressed and practiced by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover and the agents of the FBI under his direction have constantly strived to raise the standards of law enforcement to a professional level; and

Whereas recently there has been an insidious smear campaign attacking the good name and character of J. Edgar Hoover by those who would tear asunder the high principles of law enforcement exercised by J. Edgar Hoover in our great democracy: Be it

*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Connecticut Chiefs of Police, assembled at this meeting at Berlin, Conn., March 19, 1959, express to Mr. Hoover our continued appreciation and support for his high ideals established for law enforcement; for his efforts in developing police standards and to express the high esteem in which he is held as a man of great utmost personal integrity.

## Lew Wood of South Bend, Ind., Wins CBS Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 9, 1959*

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia Broadcasting System has in the last 3 years sponsored a program for promising persons in the field of radio and television journalism.

I am very pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the South Bend Tribune announcing the award of one of the CBS Foundation News and Public Affairs Fellowships for 1959–60 to Lew Wood, a newscaster for WSBT–TV and WSBT, stations of the South Bend Tribune.

Mr. Wood is an extremely able young man who will have the opportunity to study for 1 year at Columbia University under this program.

The article follows:

LEW WOOD WINS CBS SCHOLARSHIP

[From the South Bend Tribune, Mar. 23, 1959]

Lew Wood, newscaster for WSBT–TV and WSBT, the Tribune's stations, is one of eight newsmen from six States and England to win a 1959–60 CBS Foundation News and Public Affairs Fellowship at Columbia University, it was announced today by Ralph F. Colin, president of CBS Foundation, Inc.

The eight newsmen will form the third annual group of CBS fellows to undertake a year of study and discussion at Columbia University, New York City, to broaden and strengthen their backgrounds for meeting their growing responsibilities in electronic journalism.

The program was inaugurated in 1957 for men and women who show promise of greater development and who seem most likely to benefit from the study year provided.

GRADUATE OF PURDUE

Wood, 30, a radio-TV speech graduate of Purdue University, joined the WSBT news staff in 1953. He recently was awarded a master's degree in Soviet studies by the University of Notre Dame, and is currently studying the Russian language at the Indiana University Center in South Bend.

Before he joined the Tribune organization, Wood worked for WBAA, the Purdue educational radio station, and WDZ, Decatur, Ill. He served with the U.S. Marine Corps during the Korean conflict and holds a captain's commission in the Marine Corps Reserve.

He and his wife, Katherine, and three children live at 1225 Academy Place.

Nearly 300 applications, from nearly every State and from new posts in several foreign countries, have been received by the CBS Foundation in the 3 years of the fellowship program.

The selecting committee for the 1959–60 fellowships was headed by Dr. John A. Krout, vice-president of Columbia University.

Other members of the committee are Lewis W. Douglas, chairman of the Board of Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York and former American ambassador to Great Britain; Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Byron Prise, former executive news editor of the Associated Press and assistant secretary-general of the United Nations; Dr. Lawton P. G. Peckham, dean of the graduate facilities, Columbia; Sig Mickelson, vice-president of CBS Inc. and general manager of CBS News, and Edward R. Murrow, news and public affairs broadcaster.

Applications are invited each year from news and public affairs staff employees of CBS News, CBS-owned stations, independent stations affiliated with the CBS radio and CBS television networks, and noncommercial educational stations, and also from teachers of courses in news and public affairs techniques in colleges and universities.

The eight fellowships average approximately $8,000 apiece and are designed to cover tuition and other costs at Columbia University and necessary transportation and living costs for each fellow and any family dependents for the fellowship year of 36 weeks.

In a manner similar to the Nieman fellowships at Harvard, which since 1938 have provided additional educational opportunities for newspapermen, the CBS Foundation fellowships make it possible for promising persons in radio and television journalism to draw on a wide range of course of study.

The courses would not, according to the foundation, be limited to any general field. They might range across such varied fields as diplomatic history, economics, modern languages, Far Eastern affairs, political science, labor relations, and nuclear science.

Due to international conditions and the prominent position Russia holds in the news, Wood expects to continue his work in the field of Soviet studies.

Special seminars, dinners, and other meetings at Columbia University and at CBS are also a part of the program so that the fellows can find both formal opportunities to build up their knowledge of particular subjects and at the same time, increase their understanding of the potentialities of radio and television as media for news and public affairs programing.

The other seven recipients of the 1959–60 CBS fellowships are:

Marvin L. Kalb, reporter-contact, CBS News, New York.

John Merriman, news editor, CBS News, New York.

Barry R. Nemcoff, television news editor, Station WCAU–TV, Philadelphia.

Charles V. North, television news director, Station KGGM–TV, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Charles R. Reeves, news director, Station WWVA, Wheeling, W. Va.

Jack D. Summerfield, assistant general manager, Station WGBH FM–TV, Cambridge, Mass.

John A. G. Tiffin, CBS News, London, England.

The eight newsmen are expected to begin their graduate studies at Columbia sometime this September.

## Recommendations of National Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the National Farmers Union has adopted a set of recommendations on such important subjects as family farm credit, a national safety reserve of food and fiber, public accounting of U.S. Department of Agriculture expenditures, and investigation of market spreads. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include these recommendations in the RECORD:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION RECOMMENDATIONS

ADAPTED FAMILY FARM CREDIT

We shall continue our efforts to strengthen the services and resources of the cooperative institutions of the Farm Credit Administration. We will continue to help expand and strengthen credit unions in rural areas. In addition, we urge enactment of legislation to expand the funds and authorities of Farmers Home Administration. This agency should be transformed into a complete yardstick family farm loan institution. Family farm operators should be able to turn to this agency to obtain fully adequate credit adapted to family farm needs and problems when such credit cannot be obtained from established private sources of rates of interest and on terms commensurate with the earning power of farm investment.

EXPAND CONSUMPTION

All areas of expanding demand for farm commodities, consistent with good soil conservation practice, should be explored exhaustively before we concern ourselves with production restrictions; our first concern is that no person lacks the food needed for adequate nutrition. Therefore, we urge enactment and establishment of a national food allotment stamp plan; a Federal school lunch and fluid milk program in every nonprofit school, summer camp, and day nursery; adequate nutritional standards in public institutions; Federal credit to encourage the establishment of efficient terminal markets for perishable farm produce; expanded nutritional research and education programs; and all other workable methods needed to close the gap between that persons can afford to pay for the volume of food and fiber products and what they need to maintain an adequate standard of nutrition and well-being.

Additional emphasis should be given to Federal programs to promote greater industrial use of farm commodities not needed for food at prices consistent with full parity income for farmers. We urge adoption of an immediate and adequate program for continuing research aimed at expanded practical industrial and other new uses of agricultural products. We further recommend reactivation and pilot experimental operation of presently owned Government facilities, including grain alcohol and synthetic rubber plants. Satisfying the true need of this Nation's citizens for farm commodities is a truly national program, not one to be accomplished at the expense of farm family income.

NATIONAL SAFETY RESERVE

An adequately decentralized national safety reserve of food and fiber of a sufficient volume and quantity completely adequate to national security, safety, and welfare should be established so as to be completely isolated from the market. The commodities should be owned by the appropriate agency under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

FEDERAL CROP AND LIVESTOCK INSURANCE

The Federal crop insurance program should be improved and expanded until it is available to farmers in every county in the United States and to all crops. Need for livestock death insurance against hazards not covered by existing insurance companies at reasonable costs should be explored and experimental programs initiated where needed. Administrative and experimental costs should be paid from appropriations, and losses should be paid from premiums by policyholders, with Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to cover unusual losses in disaster areas. Both multiple and single crop policies should be available in all counties. The extent to which any farm operator may participate in Federal crop and livestock insurance programs should be limited to maximum family farm production.

TIMBER PRICE REPORTS

An adequate reporting system should be established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for farm timber products, covering price, supply and demand.

ADMINISTRATION BY FARMER COMMITTEES

Legislation should be enacted to require that all Federal farm income-stabilization and direct credit programs be administered by democratically elected community, county and State committees of farmers. The reduction of such committees to a merely advisory capacity should be prohibited by law. At the national level, in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, these programs should be administered by a Federal farm income improvement board or boards composed entirely of farm operators, at least a majority of whom were democratically elected by farmers. The technical assistance program for soil and water conservation on individual farms and small watersheds should continue to be operated through strengthened and improved local soil conservation districts, governed by democratically elected boards composed of farmers.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTING OF USDA EXPENDITURES

Continued publicizing of Department of Agriculture expenditures as items chargeable directly to farm price supports is a disservice to agriculture and creates consumer antagonism toward adequate farm legislation.

We call for an honest and fair public accounting of Department of Agriculture expenditures with full publicity for all allocation not directly connected with farm income improvements.

INVESTIGATION OF MARKET SPREADS

Sufficient funds should be appropriated by Congress to inaugurate and provide for a continuous congressional investigation into the widening spread between prices received by farmers and those paid by consumers and the results of such investigations publicized through reports prepared and released as public information by the Congress. If necessary to control these spreads, regulatory measures of the Interstate Commerce Commission-type should be instituted. Additional means of exercising Federal regulation or yardstick operation where needed to supplement farmer-owned processing and marketing enterprises should be initiated.

RESEARCH, PROTECTIVE AND MARKET SERVICES

Congress should enact increased appropriations to expand and improve the marketing services, agricultural information, protective operations, regulations of commodity exchanges, and research services of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Particular emphasis should be placed upon improving the volume and quality of service to family farms, expansion and extension of the cattle tuberculosis and brucellosis indemnity program, and provisions for adequate Federal inspection and grading of perishable farm produce at terminal markets. We continue to support legislation to set up nationwide grade labeling for potatoes and purity, quality and sanitation standards for milk. Emphasis should be shifted from production research to research designed specifically to solve the problems of falling farm income such as how to strengthen farmers' bargaining power, expand farmers' cooperative, reduce farm to retail marketing margins, increase efficiency of farm commodity processing, increase effectiveness of merchandising and packaging for farm products, expand markets, expand industrial uses, appropriate farm production and supply adjustments and similar types of scientific studies. We also urge expansion and strengthening of the Food and Drug Administration to more adequately protect the public against radiation and injurious chemicals. Legislation should be enacted to require grade and content labeling of food and other processed farm products and at chemicals at the retail level.

SPECIAL LOW-INCOME FAMILY FARM PROGRAM

Congress should enact family farm development legislation required to provide needed Federal services and activities to provide opportunity and to enable particularly low-income farm families in chronically depressed rural areas to establish themselves upon a wholly adequate economic basis.

CONSOLIDATED HOUSING OF FARM AGENCIES

Federal farm agencies in each county should be housed in the same building. The public works shelf recommended in section IV should include projects to erect such buildings.

CONSERVATION AND LAND- AND WATER-USE PLANNING

Expansion and continued improvement of programs is needed in the field of agricultural soil, water, and related farm-resources conservation; soil surveys; soil-conservation research; tree-seedling nurseries; reforestation; and cover-crop seed-supply expansion activities of Federal and State governments. Particular attention should be given to the development and implementation of a comprehensive and coordinated nationwide policy and program to meet the problems of growing water shortage for farm, power, recreation, navigation, industrial, and urban users.

More rapid expansion of scientific land- and water-use plans based on soil classification should be made. These plans, land capability maps, and classifications serve as useful guides to private individual action. When related to governmental farm programs, such regulations should be drawn with full regard for the traditional protection provided by the Constitution for unmolested continuation of nonconforming uses. Within this framework, each acre of farmland should be used within its capabilities and treated in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement. Each farmer and rancher should have conveniently available to him fully competent federally financed technical assistance and cost-sharing programs needed by him to help him to develop and put into operation his own technically sound conservation plan for the soil and water resources upon which his family's livelihood and the Nation's long-term security depend.

When land is needed for development or expansion of military establishments, urban expansion, and highways, unoccupied areas unfit for farm and ranch production should be acquired rather than good farm or grazing land, unless absolutely contrary to strategic necessity and public safety.

Sales of agricultural land by the Government should be made only to owner-operated families with the size of farms fully consistent with other family operated farms in the vicinity.

## Who Does a Congressman's Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 19, 1959*

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, certainly the Congressman does not do all of it. The workload varies with the district, depending not only upon the number of people in the district—from 159,099 to 806,701—but upon the characteristics of those who live within the district—their nationality, the kind of activities in which they are interested and engaged, the varied interests in local and national affairs, upon many, many things.

Every congressional office must have at least one—sometimes several—expert stenographers and typists. There must be assistants who can keep up with the news, determine, digest and classify that which is worthwhile. There must be someone who can file not only correspondence but the result of the research, and file it where it can be instantly located when wanted. There must be someone to meet lobbyists, casual visitors, and friends, someone whose temper cannot be ruffled, who always has a smile and a kind word. There must be someone who keeps track of proposed legislation, probable amendments, and its possible effect, if enacted. Contact must be maintained with other Members, both those favorable and those who are opposed to the thinking of the Congressman. In one way or another, someone must maintain contact not only with the desires but with the economic and political philosophy of constituents. Someone must watch the Committee and House Calendars, know when hearings will be held, legislation discussed or acted upon.

Do I hear your query, "If all these things are competently done for the Congressman, what in the world does he do, if anything?" Well, he does some of everything. With two thoughts ever in his mind, first, "What do his people want?" and second, "What is the right thing to do?"—having in mind the welfare of the country as a whole he tries to evaluate all that comes to his attention, then do the things which he believes will best serve his people and their interests.

Now for the question as to how your Representative—I prefer the term "hired man"—can get a worthwhile job done. Here is one answer. He is given a stated sum each year to hire assistants, limited at present to eight.

I have been able for a little over 24 years to get along without—except in 2 or 3 instances—spending all the money available for clerk hire, and then only for 2 or 3 months when the necessity arose because of illness in the office. Never have I had eight.

In all that period, there have been just 5 months when there were on my payroll two in-laws—one was on for a longer period. For their employment I have no apologies, for they have been competent.

It would be difficult to find anyone employed by me either now or during the past 40 years I have maintained an office who did not earn every dollar paid. Probably, there have always been legislators and executives who have employed relatives and overpaid them.

Relatives employed by Congressmen have usually rendered competent service, earned what they were paid. Two conspicuous examples are Jack Garner, former Congressman and Speaker of the House, later Vice President, whose wife was his assistant before he was elected and until he refused to longer accept office.

A present example is the Democratic leader of the Senate, LYNDON JOHNSON, whose brother is on the payroll and who earns all he receives.

The long and the short of it is that no one, for either moral or legal reasons, is required to discriminate because of relationship. If a Congressman cannot be trusted to properly and efficiently use the sums provided for the carrying out of his official duties, do a good job, he should be defeated.

## The Draper Committee Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of March 19, 1959, entitled "The Draper Committee Report":

THE DRAPER COMMITTEE REPORT

It should be understood that the report made by President Eisenhower's special Committee to study the U.S. military assistance program is preliminary rather than a final product. The final report should be even broader in scope.

As matters stand, the committee has sounded a warning against cutting or even leaving at present levels the rate of military assistance to America's allies overseas. The judgment is a unanimous one from a panel of 10 experts, headed by William H. Draper, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of the Army, and including General Gruenther, Admiral Radford, two former directors of the budget, and a former high commissioner for West Germany.

The problem to which the panel first addresses itself reflects a situation described to the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee by Under Secretary of State Dillon. To plan for, to manufacture, and to deliver modern weapons is usually a matter of several years. Supplies must be "in the pipeline," as the saying is.

In the past 5 years funds for this "pipeline" supply have shrunk from $8.5 billion to $2.6 billion. The recommendation to add $400 million to the $1.6 billion for arms aid in the administration's current $3.9 billion mutual assistance request aims at partially redressing this situation.

Beyond the question of arms aid there lie important areas which the Draper committee still has a mandate to explore. One of these is the relative balance between military and economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

The present report well deplores the tendency to make economic aid a "whipping boy" and to ignore the need for a long-term commitment in the contest with communism. We hope the final report will afford persuasive blueprints for more effective technical assitsance and self-liquidating development assistance to countries where economic improvement is fully as important as military protection.

## Brushfire Wars Most Imminent Threat to Peace of World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in order to save less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the defense budget, the Department of Defense is willing to cut the vitally important STRAC forces by 25 percent, and in order to save less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the defense budget, they are going to cut the Marine strength by one-eighth.

Mr. Speaker, most informed military authorities point out that the most imminent danger to world peace does not lie in a nuclear holocaust. The most imminent and the most likely threat to peace lies in brushfire and limited wars. It is the STRAC force of the Army and the U.S. Marines who have the major responsibility for dealing with such outbreaks. The administration is extremely shortsighted in making a cut in the Marine Corps from 200,000 to 175,000 and in the Army from 900,000 to 875,000, knowing that these manpower reductions will drastically reduce the men in uniform able to deal with emergencies on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from John M. Mahan, commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, urging that we maintain an Army of at least 900,000 and a Marine Corps of at least 200,000. These are the forces that determine whether or not we will see the free world nibbled away. I hope that an aroused Congress will restore the funds and write legislative mandates to maintain these strengths. The letter containing Mr. Mahan's well thought out presentation follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
*Kansas City, Mo., March 2, 1959.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I recently had an opportunity to meet with leaders from Montana during our annual national legislative conference in Washington, D.C. Since talking with your con-

stituents, I thought it advisable to write you on a matter that concerns all of us—national security.

The VFW, by resolution and by unanimity of opinion, feels that our country is losing basic military strength through proposed plans to reduce our defense establishment. We believe, and we are on record, that our country should have a balanced defense which is ready to move at a moment's notice whether on the ground, on the seas, or in the air. We further believe that a reduction in our ground forces in the face of the Khrushchev challenge over Berlin is unthinkable. Even though the Berlin situation might be settled peaceably, there are still many trouble spots in the world where American support has already been committed.

It is our understanding that unless plans to reduce forces are halted, the Army will lose one division and the Marine Corps will suffer drastic cuts in its combat strength. Our military strength must be great enough to insure peace.

We are told that Russia has 25 divisions on the borders of Western Europe alone. Instead of a reduction of forces, the VFW knows that the American people are willing to pay more for defense, if necessary, and we should keep our ground forces at least at the level recommended by the Congress which was 900,000 in the Army and 200,000 in the Marine Corps.

We would appreciate hearing from you on this matter and if you agree with us, I sincerely hope that you will lend your influence and support toward maintaining our military and naval forces at the above strength.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MAHAN,
*Commander in Chief.*

## Resolution by the Iowa Council of Republican Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Iowa Council of Republican Women met in Des Moines, Iowa, and as one of the official acts of the meeting, adopted a resolution with regard to the fiscal soundness of this country. I feel that this resolution has the support of a good many Members regardless of party affiliation and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RESOLUTION BY THE IOWA COUNCIL OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Whereas the Republican Party has traditionally been the party of Government economy, balanced budgets, lower taxes, and fiscal integrity; and

Whereas President Eisenhower has submitted a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year, but the Democrat majority in Congress has indicated its refusal to vote a balanced budget and has already embarked on a giveaway spending spree; and

Whereas continuous deficit spending by Government is the chief cause of inflation, which is the cruelest tax of all: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Iowa Council of Republican Women, at the regular spring council meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, on March 19, 1959, as follows:*

1. That the Iowa Council of Republican Women go on record in support of President Eisenhower's proposal to balance the budget and to apply any surplus on the national debt.

2. That the Iowa Council of Republican Women assure our representatives on the Federal level of our active support in their efforts to reduce Government spending and balance the budget which we feel will not hamper the defense effort.

3. That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower and all U.S. Senators and Congressmen.

MARGARET HENNINGS
Mrs. E. J. Hennings.

ARCADIA, IOWA, *March 19, 1959.*

## Remarkable Success of Economic Assistance Program in Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an illuminating report just released by the International Cooperation Administration on the remarkable results of our mutual security program in Taiwan through the last 9 years.

What were the key reasons for this spectacular improvement in conditions under a regime which only a few years ago was being pictured to Americans as hopelessly inept, inefficient, corrupt, and reactionary? Some of the main reasons were these: The smaller, more manageable problems on Taiwan, with less than 10 million people, as compared with more than 400 million on the mainland; freedom on Taiwan from the drains and dislocations of civil war; the security provided by 100 miles of water so that government and people could give more of their attention to solving their economic problems; a better government than it was on the China mainland, due in part to the fact that the worst elements sloughed themselves off when the government moved to Taiwan—only people who really care about their freedom and their heritage will carry on under such difficulties and discouragements; effective and proper assistance from the United States, including for the first time since the Japanese war, moral support instead of constant villification and moral lectures.

Free China has moved ahead, as have other countries, such as Korea, Vietnam, the Philippines, India, Greece, Austria, West Germany—where the people had the fortunate combination of three essential factors: a cause like their own freedom and national independence to work for; dedicated, able, and stout-hearted leadership; and the steady and effective support of a strong ally and friend.

It is a first task of our statesmen and the Congress to work for such a winning combination in the equally difficult situations existing in various other countries around the world.

The report on free China, showing what can be done when all three factors are present, follows:

NINE YEARS OF THE ECONOMIC PROGRAM IN TAIWAN

The case of Taiwan (Free China) shows what can be accomplished in an underdeveloped country when U.S. economic assistance is made available on a relatively large scale and is effectively used as a supplement to the country's own resources.

In the summer of 1950, when hostilities broke out in Korea, the Taiwan economy was in a state of near collapse. The island's productive facilities had suffered severe damage during World War II. Nearly all the larger industrial plants had been destroyed or badly damaged, and the war-burdened economy could not afford most of the necessary repairs. Neither could it afford the imports of necessary foodstuffs and raw materials. Irrigation facilities had been damaged, and chemical fertilizers, the lifeblood of Taiwan's intensive agriculture, were available in only meager quantities. Under these conditions farm production was extremely low and industrial output was almost nonexistent. Export earnings were negligible. Inflation was rampant, unemployment prevalent, and living standards were at bare subsistence levels.

This dangerous situation was intensified by the influx into Taiwan of some 1.5 million mainland refugees following the movement of the Chinese Government to Taiwan in December 1949. This influx included some 600,000 of the remnants of Chinese nationalist armed forces. The refugees added about 20 percent to the Taiwan-born population and exerted increased pressure on scarce food, clothing, and housing.

Taiwan faced in 1950 the twin tasks of quickly improving its defensive posture and increasing the inadequate living standards on the island. Few observers at that time gave the country much chance of simultaneous achievement of these objectives. Yet today, only 9 years after the first assistance programs, these goals have been achieved—to a degree beyond the expectations of most observers. With U.S. assistance and the industry of its people, the island has been lifted from a state of partial paralysis, social dislocation, and economic exhaustion into an orderly, productive economy, a nation growing in military security, increasingly dedicated to preserving its freedom from the Communist tyranny of the mainland, eager to conquer new economic and social goals.

BACKGROUND FOR PROGRESS

To begin with, the country was given sustained and substantial help from the United States. Approximately $800 million of economic assistance was provided to Taiwan during the period July 1950 through December 1958.

At first, when scarcities of essential commodities were acute, inflation rampant, and the economy near collapse, U.S. economic assistance consisted largely of raw materials and consumer goods, with only small amounts of funds for productive facilities. Prior to the initiation of the economic assistance program, prices had risen precipitously. It is evident that when prices rise wildly no reasonable businessman will make long-term investments. The only practical course of action in such a situation is quick speculative investments. These, of course, lead in turn to further price rises.

Thus, the first thing the U.S. programs had to do was to bring an element of stability into the situation which would permit the

beginnings of economic growth. Later, as the inflationary situation was brought under control and local production gradually revived, aid program emphasis gradually shifted from commodity supplies to capital equipment for industrial development.

With the help of U.S. economic aid, gross national product (GNP) expanded 85 percent from 1950 through 1958. During the same period agricultural production rose 45 percent, manufacturing 160 percent, and railway freight tonnage more than 100 percent. Electric power, chemical fertilizer, and cotton cloth output increased 165 percent, 275 percent, and 250 percent, respectively. Crop and livestock production rose 35 percent and 100 percent. Most of these gains exceeded the striking population increase of 30 percent, and made possible a gain of 40 percent in per capita GNP.

Production increases achieved with the help of U.S. assistance have contributed to gains in tax revenues and export earnings. In the period 1952–58, export earnings increased 37 percent while Government revenues at constant prices rose 85 percent. Relative price stability has also been achieved, with the wholesale price index rising only about 2 percent in 1958, compared with 90 percent in 1950. With these developments, the share of Taiwan's total economic requirements provided by Taiwan itself has increased, while the U.S. share has declined.

These production gains were achieved primarily with the help of U.S. funds made available prior to fiscal year 1958, when the concept of defense support was broader than at present. In those earlier years, defense support funds were used in Taiwan to help bring about economic growth designed to enable the local economy itself to provide a larger share of its requirements. Under the present narrower concept of defense support—to prevent retrogression of the economy and a reduction in living standards—production gains achieved with the help of ICA aid beginning in 1958 will be smaller, with reduced amounts of investment capital provided from ICA sources. Loan funds being made available from the development loan fund are helping maintain the momentum of past production gains.

A few of the activities in which the United States and the Republic of China, jointly engaged, are described illustratively.

One of the most successful ventures is an organization known as the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction, the JCRR, which was begun on the mainland—on the initiative of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—and subsequently moved to Taiwan. It is governed by five commissioners, three appointed by the Republic of China and two by the United States, and is financed from economic aid funds. In the 9 years of its existence on Taiwan, this singularly effective organization has supported nearly 3,000 projects, in cooperation with local sponsoring organizations. These projects have been designed to increase agricultural production and improve the level of living of the rural people of Taiwan.

One of these many projects was to help reforest the extensive areas which had been denuded during World War II and immediately afterward, by ruthless cutting for military demands and by stripping of grass and trees on the mountain slopes to meet needs of the rapidly growing population for fuel and for farmland. JCRR technicians went directly to the people, visiting local government officials and farmers and explaining how barren hillsides promised as much income from properly managed trees as from many cultivated crops. Seedlings were distributed free or at low cost.

In the past 5 years nearly 350,000 acres (roughly 5 percent of the total land area of the island) has been planted. With the help of the Chinese Air Force and U.S. technicians, a forest inventory was made from aerial survey photos, and a detailed land-use plan for the island was developed. In one county on the east coast, where good riceland is scarce, windbreaks were planted to keep the salt-laden sea winds off the crops, and acacia and pine were planted on the mountain slopes to provide logging stands for the future. In fact, reforestation became so popular in that county that a magistrate was elected after campaigning in favor of the program.

Another project backed by JCRR was increased production of pork, which is an important part of the human diet in Taiwan. In fact, lowland rural Taiwan today gives the impression of being one immense hog factory. The pigs are not only on farms; they are also being raised by soldiers and by townspeople supplementing their incomes. Two primary techniques were used to increase production. One was the crossing of Berkshire boars with native sows to produce improved hybrid pigs. The second factor was the remarkably effective hog cholera control campaign which, using a new kind of vaccine developed in Taiwan, virtually eradicated this disease from the island. The result of these two techniques has been to increase the production of pork at a rate which exceeds the gain in any other agricultural product.

A third project assisted by JCRR has been the land reform program on the island of Taiwan. About three-quarters of Taiwan's farm families have benefited from this reform program developed on Taiwan, either through reduction in their rents or by acquiring ownership of the land they tilled. Farming by tenant farmers has been reduced from 41 percent to 16 percent of total farmland. As a result, farmers are earning more money, are retaining more of what they earn, and are making improvements in their land, their equipment, their buildings, and their methods. The result has not only been a dramatic change in the lives of the farm families who have been affected but has also contributed to the increase in agricultural production and has earned for the Government of free China worldwide acclaim for this progressive and forward-looking experiment in rural democracy.

Turning from the field of agriculture to the field of industry, one can find a number of projects which contributed to the growing economic strength of the island. Basic to to industrial development is electric power. Taking over a power system badly shattered during World War II by allied bombing and typhoons, engineers of the Taiwan Power Co. showed amazing skill and ingenuity in the repair and rehabilitation of facilities by gathering usable machinery and parts from installations scattered all over the island. Building on this base, U.S. economic aid was used first to help complete the rehabilitation process and then to construct new power stations and transmission lines so that by 1958 electric power capacity had increased to 541,000 kilowatts, almost twice as high as in 1950.

Of the many fine hydroelectric sites in the mountains of Taiwan, some of the most promising are located along the spectacular course of the Tuchia River, which twists through high rock walls from the central mountain range down to the fertile western plains. Picking up where the Japanese left off, U.S. aid funds were used to complete a 79,500 kilowatt station at Tienleng, midway along the river's course. In process of construction now is a 40,000 kilowatt installation upriver from Tienleng at Ku Kwan, and in the exploration stage is a high dam and storage reservoir further upriver at Ta Chien, 5,000 feet above sea level. Accordingly to preliminary studies made by Chinese engineers, it would be feasible to construct additional power stations on this same river which would have an ultimate capacity of more than a million kilowatts.

Underlying many of our joint efforts in the field of industry has been U.S. encouragement, wherever feasible, of the use of economic assistance to develop the private sector of the economy. The Government of China contributed to this objective by transferring four government-owned corporations to former landlords as partial payment for land being purchased by tenants. The value of these companies was approximately $40 million. In addition, there were a number of new private investments, particularly in such fields as textiles, chemicals, cement, paper and board, window glass, and electrical appliances. In the single year from 1955–56, governmental enterprise declined from 60 percent of the value of industrial goods produced on the island to 52 percent.

Contributing to this growth of the private sector has been the ICA-supported small industry loan program, which in its first 3 years made loans to nearly 400 private firms for over 500 projects involving plant rehabilitation or expansion. This project not only assists small private enterprises but in its screening and review process makes use of private commercial banks which also put up a part of the funds. A survey of more than half the recipients of loans showed gratifying results—on the average, a more than doubled output.

Also dedicated to the promotion of private industry is the China Productivity Center, a nongovernmental organization established with ICA financial and technical assistance. The objective of the center is to increase Taiwan's productivity through increasing the use of industrial consultation services to small manufacturers and businessmen, providing engineering and plant layout services, counseling on statistical quality control and preventative maintenance systems, and exploring export markets. High hopes are held for the continued contribution which will be made to the health and vigor of the private economy of Taiwan through these devices.

In another industrial field, ICA technicians working through local trade associations of the fishing industry have transferred sampan operators to powered fishing vessels and taught them the value of modern refrigeration, packaging, and marketing techniques. Through our assistance fishermen have been enabled to go farther from shore, thus getting into deep-sea fishing which provides the opportunity for increased yields. The catch in 1957 was a record-breaking 208,000 metric tons as against 193,000 tons the previous year when coastal operations were still contributing the greater share of the total yield.

ICA assistance in the field of technical education has attempted to follow the basic idea that education should be a tool to enable individuals, industries, and nations to lift their levels of living. More and more Chinese educators are responding to this idea and are recognizing that skilled hands are as necessary to a well-balanced society as are classical scholars. Directed principally to areas that would contribute most to economic progress, the technical education program has emphasized vocational, industrial, and agricultural, as well as engineering, education. For example, assisted by a contract with Purdue University, Cheng Kung University has improved its teaching facilities and physical plant for turning out

well-trained engineers to help staff Taiwan's growing industries. By means of a contract with Pennsylvania State University, the Taiwan Provincial Normal University has established a department of industrial education for prospective teachers of vocational industrial shop courses and industrial arts. Gradually there has developed a cooperative relationship with the industrial community. Several major industries have contributed funds to the program, and the emphasis is gradually shifting to the high school level in an effort to meet the requirements of specific industries for skilled and semiskilled workers.

An outstanding record of improvement in public health conditions has been achieved in Taiwan, with the help of U.S. technicians. Through the close cooperation of the native professional medical personnel available on the island and the staffs of ICA, JCRR, WHO, and UNICEF, rapid progress has been made in disease control, medical and nursing education, hospital improvement, and expansion of drainage and waterworks facilities. For example, in disease control, the incidence of malaria, once a great menace to public health, has been reduced from over a million cases in 1950 to less than 500 in 1957, with complete eradication predicted by 1962. Deaths or disability resulting from tuberculosis, trachoma, and plague have all been dramatically reduced. For instance, on the offshore island of Quemoy, plague epidemics had broken out frequently prior to 1951. Imposition of strict control measures, including mass vaccinations and rate extermination campaigns (the latter in cooperation with a JCRR-assisted program to prevent the annual loss of hundreds of thousands of tons of food crops), has resulted in no cases of plague reported for over 5 years.

Significant capital improvements have been made in transportation in Taiwan, including railroad, air transport, harbor, and highway improvements. A dramatic item in this field is the successful construction of the Hsilo Bridge, the longest highway bridge in the Far East, and a crucial link in the north-south highway on Taiwan.

In some fields, such as housing, ICA has cooperated with local institutions in the strategic placing of small amounts of funds and technical assistance where they could be the most effective. For example, a self-help housing project was worked out for the dockworkers of the two major ports, many of whom were living in empty crates or large sheds. Using a welfare fund accumulated from wage deductions and funds earned by dockers for unloading U.S. aid cargoes ahead of scheduled time, several hundred dwellings were constructed with the help of dockers' unskilled labor. Four house designs were prepared for the dockers' own selection. The winning design was one of cinder blocks and reinforced concrete, including a living room, two bedrooms, a kitchen, and a bathroom. Its total cost was $333 equivalent in local currencies.

The review could go on at length reciting the many projects which have helped to bring about the dramatic changes in the economy of Taiwan. The projects not described here include the expansion of fertilizer plants, the rehabilitation of the railroads, important projects in the field of technical training, activities of the JCRR other than those mentioned, and many others. Together, the activities of the free Chinese and the support of the United States have worked a change on the island of Taiwan which makes it fair to assert that the United States has made substantial progress toward achieving the economic objectives of our foreign policy in Taiwan. Moreover, the economic progress attained has helped in no small measure to maintain internal political stability and to boost the morale of the people.

Taiwan is no so well off, however, that it will not need U.S. help from now on. Notwithstanding the marked economic progress already outlined, it still depends on outside economic assistance for about 10 percent of its necessary imports (excluding military hardware) and for about the same proportion of local funds needed to finance internal budgetary expenditures. One overriding reason which compels the United States to continue its support of freedom on the island of Taiwan is a necessarily heavy military burden which must be assumed by these courageous people. Notwithstanding the relatively low levels of per capita wealth, the Republic of China on Taiwan is contributing a greater fraction of its annual income to its own defenses than any other country in the free world, including the United States. Even with such an effort, however, it would not be possible for Taiwan, in the face of one of the highest rates of population expansion in the world, to support its military burden without continued U.S. assistance.

## Fair Trade Federal Dictation Over State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fair trade substitutes Federal mandate for State or local discretion. In so doing it replaces the individual retailer's discretion by a manufacturer's edict.

At present the imposing of fair trade law is permissive with the State. Twenty States have invalidated fair trade through State supreme court or State government action.

The pending fair trade bill, H.R. 1253, irregardless of State law, would impose Federal law, with violation and enforcement becoming a Federal matter.

Such further Federal centralization of power plus the harm done the free enterprise system surely merits the attention of every Member of Congress.

### CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

### LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

### GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

### RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Raymond F. Noyes is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

### PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

### CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

## SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——1718 33d Pl. SE.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

## STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

*Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences*

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

*Committee on Agriculture and Forestry*

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

*Committee on Appropriations*

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

*Committee on Armed Services*

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

*Committee on Banking and Currency*

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

*Committee on the District of Columbia*

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

*Committee on Finance*

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

*Committee on Foreign Relations*

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

*Committee on Government Operations*

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs*

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce*

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

*Committee on the Judiciary*

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service*

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

*Committee on Public Works*

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

*Committee on Rules and Administration*

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

## UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, Fairfax Hotel.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

## UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

*District of Columbia:* Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

*First judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

*Second judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

*Third judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

*Fourth judicial circuit:* Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

*Fifth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

*Sixth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

*Seventh judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

*Eighth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

*Ninth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

*Tenth judicial circuit:* Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

# Appendix

## People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last week I addressed a joint meeting of the International Municipal Cooperation Committee of the American Municipal Association and the Civic Committee of the People-to-People Program. My remarks dealt particularly with the township-affiliation activities under the President's people-to-people program. In these days when there is much talk of war, it was a distinct pleasure to meet with a group of people who are dedicated to improving international understanding. The State of California has been taking the lead on the township-affiliation program, and I am very proud of this vital interest it is showing in strengthening the ties of people of the free world. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks at the joint meeting printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM: TOWNSHIP-AFFILIATION ACTIVITIES

(Excerpts from address by Senator CLAIR ENGLE at joint meeting of the American Municipal Association's Committee on International Municipal Cooperation and the Civic Committee of the people-to-people program, Washington, D.C.)

I am delighted to see you fellow citizens taking an active part in your country's foreign relations through this wonderful people-to-people medium. You are to be commended for giving your leadership to this vital aim of building understanding into our formal and informal relationships with peoples and nations in other parts of the world. Your activities contain a huge potential for peace.

No matter how much we talk about mutual understanding in theory, there is no substitute for getting to know the cultures of other peoples in practice. The friendships that develop with close association can do much to offset the tendencies to be irritated when other countries do not act according to our own standards and traditions. When we know from first-hand experience the motivations and thought patterns which underlie human behavior, we are much better able to develop a spirit of tolerance. This tolerance is not a neutral feeling but rather a positive desire to work together for common ends—even when the means we choose sometimes differ. The close human relationship that is developed under the people-to-people program is just the ingredient needed to give flesh and blood to our formal diplomatic agreements.

Of all the projects that have been developed under the President's people-to-people program, I find that the town affiliation program is perhaps the most important. Certainly it is the most intriguing. I am impressed with the ambitious plans your organization is laying for expanding these town affiliations. I am sure that with the exercise of some imagination the coupling of cities around the world will reap tremendous rewards in developing mutual understanding—in briding the barriers of language, culture, and politics.

While much remains to be done, the leadership taken by the State of California should serve as a great inspiration to all Americans. The cultural, educational, and artifact exchanges between California and cities and foreign cities, mostly in Japan, have already been of great value in breaking down barriers of misunderstanding. The six California cities now taking part in the town affiliation program have enriched the lives of their inhabitants as well as built good will in such places as Osaka, Japan, and Santa Ana, El Salvador. San Diego's affiliation with the city of Yokohama, Japan, has been so successful in cementing good will and providing far-reaching mutual benefits that it may well serve as a model for many other communities. We have only begun to see the possibilities in terms of the potential betterment of relations around the world.

The untapped strength of the people-to-people program reminds me of our efforts to harness atomic power for peaceful purposes. In each case, we are aware of enormous energy and its promise to do enormous good. Yet, so far, atoms for peace is only a partial reality. True, the radio isotopes and controlled radiation have served mankind agriculturally and medically to some extent; and the heat of atomic reactors has been transferred into electrical force that lights cities and runs ships. But, scientists are still doggedly chiseling away at the unknown that lock up the atom's greatest power, which, to date, we've seen only in its warlike form.

And you dedicated scientists of peace are still seeking to release the full resources of the people-to-people idea. I think you are much closer to success than the atomic scientists. In fact, the formula may well be your town affiliation program.

Your panel workshops have taken you through the mechanics of how to run these affiliations. I will not try to add to the excellent thinking that you have already done on the nuts and bolts, so to speak. But I do have three thoughts on how best to tap the people-to-people potential. They're based on the implied spirit of this program. I hope you will consider these reactions of mine and pass them on to those whom you will enlist to help you make this vital scheme grow.

First, let me emphasize again that although the people-to-people program is growing, I'm afraid it is a long way from fulfilling its great potential. Many, many more Americans should get into the program. When you return to your hometowns and cities to develop more affiliations, I hope you will goad your fellow citizens who have not awakened, as you have, to the need for more participation in your country's most vital business, peace and freedom.

Recently, I saw in Life an editorial that may be useful in alerting others to join with you. Life said: "The United States grew into a great and free society precisely because the Nation could always count on a widespread instinct among its citizens for translating private moral conscience into public virtue, a virtue made operational by the citizens' action in the Nation's life. At the moment this instinct is dangerously weak. The resultant gulf between private conscience and public virtue cannot be bridged by easeful living, spectatoritis, or a 'let George do it' indifference. The wider this gulf becomes, the narrower grows our margin of national survival." This quote sums up the need for broadening our people-to-people program.

Second, no matter how sophisticated your affiliation schemes become, I presume you'll try to make as many contacts as possible among ordinary citizens overseas. The people-to-people program is, of course, founded on this thought and I believe it is tremendously important to keep it in mind throughout all your activities. The tendency to have the exchanges limited only to officials of organizations must be resisted. No such program can succeed unless its basis is in the grassroots. It is the average person who needs enlightenment more than anyone else, and to neglect him is to court disaster. The measure of the success of your efforts will be the extent to which you are able to sink these roots of friendship and understanding into the hearts and minds of the common people of the participating countries.

Third, a tradition of American foreign policy is its bipartisan nature. Although there may be differences within the Nation or Halls of Congress on various aspects of this policy, when the policy is set and translated at the diplomatic table overseas, it represents a United States of America. The people-to-people philosophy, too, has bipartisan backing. On both sides of the aisle, Members of your Congress not only espouse and support the idea today, but they believe it should continue far into the future. I want to reassure you that both Democrats and Republicans would like to see you carry forward your great work until people-to-people activities become as frequent and natural, and pleasant, between Americans and other citizens of the world as they are in your own hometown.

The development of the people-to-people program is one of the most encouraging things that has taken place since the end of World War II. The potential achievement is impossible to estimate. But there will be rebuffs and disappointments. You cannot expect to have uniform success in all your undertakings. The human weaknesses that have cursed the world with wars since the beginning of time cannot be erased overnight. One factor that all of you must possess in great abundance is a sense of humor. If you will roll with the punch and not take yourselves too seriously, you will have no trouble creating great interest in your program and, more than that, you will be able to sustain that interest. You have it within your power to make an enormous contribution to world peace at a time when there is much talk of war, and your dedication gives me hope that we can yet find the magic answer to the needs of all mankind.

## Death of Maxwell Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "Anderson, Playwright, Dies at 70," from the Alumni Review of the University of North Dakota for March 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDERSON, PLAYWRIGHT, DIES AT 70

Maxwell Anderson, 70, one of the world's most respected playwrights and a 1911 graduate of the University of North Dakota, died February 28 at Stamford, Conn.

The Pulitzer prize-winning author had suffered a stroke at his home there and died in Stamford Hospital, where he had been partially paralyzed since the stroke.

When he was stricken, Anderson was working on a labor of love—a new musical play to be called "Madonna and Child."

He won the Pulitzer prize in 1933 for his play, "Both Your Houses," and was given a number of other awards for various of his more than 30 plays.

Among those works were "What Price Glory?" written with Laurence Stallings, "Winterset," "High Tor," "Knickerbocker Holiday," "Key Largo," "Barefoot in Athens" and "The Bad Seed."

Last November, the university conferred a degree of doctor of humanities on Anderson.

While attending the university Anderson edited the Dacotah Annual and was active in Ad Altiora, a top literary debate society of that time. He also was assistaant director of the Sock and Buskin Dramatic Society, the forerunner of the Dakota Playmakers, when it was formed in 1911 by the late Frederick Koch.

Following his graduation from the university in 1911, he taught school for 3 years at Minnewaukan, N. Dak., before leaving for California, where he taught high school and college English and worked on the staffs of the San Francisco Chronicle and the San Francisco Bulletin.

In 1918, he moved to New York and the New Republic magazine. Later he became an editorial writer on the New York Globe and then on The World.

In 1924 his sharply satiric "What Price Glory?" opened in New York. It was a smash hit and a Pulitzer prize winner and Anderson became irrevocably committed to his new career and left newspaper work.

In 1933 "Both Your Houses" won a second Pulitzer prize for the author. The New York Drama Critics Circle gave him its award for "Winterset" in 1935 and again in 1936 for "High Tor."

He received the gold medal for drama from the National Institute for Arts and Letters in 1954.

---

## Unemployment in the Aircraft Industry in in the Dallas, Tex., Area

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the construction of aircraft is a vital industry in the Dallas, Tex., area. There are a number of plants which have provided employment for a large segment of the area's population.

However, because of shutdowns due to cancellation of contracts and shifting of work on projects to plants in other areas, a large number of people in this area now find themselves without work. The number of unemployed is rising.

These unemployed persons are ready and willing to work. Surely it is in the interest of our Nation, both defensively and economically, to provide jobs for them. In addition to putting the people back to work, these skilled workers could produce vitally needed aircraft and missiles for our national defense.

These people are trained to do a job—it is a waste of manpower and skills not to let them do it.

Mr. President, in support of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. B. J. Thurman, president of Local 1081, UAW–CIO, in Garland, Tex., and some data which he included.

There being no objection, the letter and data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT,
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT
WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW–CIO),
*Garland, Tex., March 24, 1959.*

The Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH,
*Senator of Texas,*
*U.S. Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR: In reference to my letter to you of February 5, 1959, concerning the rising aircraft unemployment in the Dallas area, I would like to convey to you some additional information concerning the unemployment problem at Temco Aircraft. The attached list reveals the number of seniority employees presently on layoff, the job classification of each, the most senior person on layoff, the bargaining unit employment, and the contract phaseout of the F–3–H program.

I believe this information will give you a better view of our problem at Temco.

Senator, it is sad indeed that the Eisenhower administration is more concerned with its foreign aid program than they are with the unemployed American people. It seems that Eisenhower should consider aid to millions of unemployed Americans of our Nation first.

It is surprising to hear the conversations of the people in the plants, shops, and on the streets. These Americans are beginning to wake up; they too, cannot understand why billions of dollars go to foreign aid while the Americans here at home go unemployed, and yes, some hungry.

We must maintain a great economy in this country of ours and in order to have a great economy we must maintain a high level of employment. A country weak in economy is easy prey for the Communist rule.

We must forever be on guard against any evil forces who seek to destroy this Nation.

This country must maintain not only a high economy but we must achieve leadership in missiles technology and other critical scientific fields.

We have the skill and determination. We ask only the opportunity to use our skills and determination.

On behalf of the members of Local 1081, I wish to express our deep appreciation for the concern you have already given to our problem at hand. We are proud of the job you are doing in representing this country and the State of Texas. The many working people shall not forget the battles you have fought in their behalf. Again, we say thanks, Senator.

Sincerely,

B. J. THURMAN, *President.*

*Seniority workers presently on layoff, Dallas-Garland, as of Feb. 22, 1959*

| Job code | Job title | Total on recall |
|---|---|---|
| 1151-1152 | Assembler-installer | 429 |
| 1061 | Anodizer | 5 |
| | Assembler: | |
| 1091-1092 | Electrical and radio | 24 |
| 1141-1142 | Precision bench | 11 |
| 1161-1162 | Boring machine operator | 3 |
| 1271-1272 | Carpenter, maintenance | 20 |
| 1331-1332 | Crator | 12 |
| 1391-1392 | Die finisher | 7 |
| 1431-1432 | Drill operator, sheet metal | 4 |
| 1451-1452 | Drill press operator | 14 |
| 1481-1482 | Drop hammer operator | 13 |
| 1511-1512 | Duplicating machine operator | 1 |
| | Electrician: | |
| 1541-1542 | Aircraft | 5 |
| 1571-1572 | Maintenance | 18 |
| 1601-1602 | Electroplater | 6 |
| 1631-1632 | Engine lathe operator | 8 |
| 1661-1662 | Engraver | 1 |
| 1671-1672 | Extrusion and angle former | 13 |
| 1691 | Filer and burrer | 37 |
| 1721-1722 | Form block maker | 16 |
| 1781-1782 | Forming roll operator | 3 |
| | Grinder: | |
| 1841-1842 | Tool and cutter | 2 |
| 1851-1852 | Tooling and production | 7 |
| | Heat treater: | |
| 1871-1872 | Aluminum alloy | 8 |
| 1901-1903 | Steel | 1 |
| 1931 | Helper, general | 40 |
| 1951 | Hot dimpling machine operator | 5 |
| 1991-1992 | Hydraulic striker and forming press operator | 1 |
| 2021-2022 | Hydro press operator | 2 |
| | Inspector: | |
| 2031-2032 | Detail | 18 |
| 2051-2052 | Final assembly | 1 |
| 2061-2062 | Functional test | 4 |
| 2071-2072 | Gages | 3 |
| 2081-2082 | General assembly | 21 |
| 2091-2092 | Machined parts | 22 |
| 2101-2102 | Magnetic and penetrant | 3 |
| 2111-2112 | Material review | 4 |
| 2121-2122 | Outside production | 1 |
| 2131-2132 | Precision assembly | 2 |
| 2201-2202 | Service and flight | 2 |
| 2231-2232 | Shipping | 3 |
| 2261-2263 | Tooling | 26 |
| 2271-2272 | Welding | 3 |
| | Installer: | |
| 2291-2292 | Electrical | 17 |
| 2351-2352 | Powerplant | 2 |
| 2411 | Janitor | 42 |
| 2471-2472 | Jig builder | 104 |
| 2501 | Laborer | 3 |
| 2521 | Machine shop worker, bench | 5 |
| | Mechanic: | |
| 2561-2562 | Automotive | 6 |
| 2571-2572 | Construction | 21 |
| 2591-2592 | Experimental | 10 |
| 2621-2622 | Field & Service | 7 |
| 2651-2652 | Maintenance | 10 |
| 2681-2682 | Metal fitter | 11 |
| 2711-2712 | Milling machine operator | 51 |
| 2721-2722 | Milling machine operator, hand | 1 |
| 2801-2802 | Molder, aircraft | 4 |
| 2831 | Oiler, maintenance | 1 |
| 2861-2862 | Painter, aircraft | 3 |
| 2891 | Paint stripper | 1 |
| 2921-2922 | Painter, maintenance | 5 |
| 2981-2982 | Patternmaker, plaster | 5 |
| 3041-3042 | Planer operator | 1 |
| 3131-3132 | Plumber, maintenance | 4 |
| 3161-3162 | Power brake operator | 15 |
| 3251-3252 | Power shear operator | 8 |
| 3281-3282 | Production control dispatcher | 77 |
| 3341-3342 | Punch press operator | 24 |
| 3371-3372 | Radial drill press operator | 10 |
| 3401-3402 | Radio repairman | 2 |
| 3441 | Restroom attendant | 1 |
| 3531-3532 | Router operator | 15 |
| 3551-3552 | Sandblast operator | 2 |
| 3681-3682 | Saw operator | 1 |
| 3701-3702 | Shaper operator | 9 |
| 3731-3732 | Sheet metal worker, bench | 61 |
| 3791-3792 | Shop followup man | 46 |
| 3821 | Sign painter | 1 |
| 3831-3832 | Skin mill operator | 4 |
| 3881-3882 | Spot welder | 21 |
| 3911-3912 | Stock clerk | 31 |
| 3921-3922 | Stress reliever | 2 |
| 3931-3932 | Stretch press operator | 2 |
| 3941-3942 | Stretching machine operator | 4 |
| 4001-4002 | Template maker | 41 |
| 4011-4012 | Timekeeper | 6 |
| 4031-4033 | Tool and die maker | 37 |
| 4061-4062 | Tool crib attendant | 13 |
| 4071-4072 | Toolmaker, plastic | 4 |
| 4121-4122 | Truckdriver | 6 |
| | Trucker: | |
| 4181-4182 | Power | 9 |
| 4191 | Power tooling | 1 |
| 4211-4212 | Tube bender, bench | 4 |

*Seniority workers presently on layoff, Dallas-Garland, as of Feb. 22, 1959*—Continued

| Job code | Job title | Total on recall |
|---|---|---|
| 4241–4242 | Turret lathe operator | 24 |
| 4271–4272 | Upholsterer | 5 |
| | Welder: | |
| 4301–4302 | Aluminum | 2 |
| 4331–4332 | Arc | 1 |
| 4371–4372 | Hollium arc | 6 |
| 4391–4393 | Gas | 1 |
| 4401–4402 | Maintenance and tooling | 18 |
| | Grand total | 1,647 |

NOTE.—The most senior employee has a seniority date of July 29, 1948.

BARGAINING UNIT EMPLOYMENT

1. Temco's bargaining unit employment at the Dallas and Garland facilities for March 1958 was 4,721.

2. Temco's bargaining unit employment for March 1959 was 3,143 and is decreasing weekly.

3. These figures reveal an employment decrease of 1,578 in bargaining unit employment from March 1958 to March 1959.

4. If additional contracts are not secured the bargaining unit employment will decrease to 1,500 by the end of 1959.

CONTRACT PHASEOUT

3. These figures reeval an employment deout rapidly. Approximately 300 employees to be laid off on this contract.

## Thirty-third Anniversary of Signing of Long Island University Charter—Address by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on March 24 Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton delivered an address at Long Island University, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Secretary Seaton, in my opinion, is one of the outstanding members of the President's Cabinet. He comes from the Midwest. He has served in this body. He has had a distinguished career. At all times he has exhibited a great degree of commonsense.

While Secretary Seaton and I do not agree on all things, usually our disagreements are of a minor nature. I think, by and large, he has been one of the outstanding public servants of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the address which he delivered on the occasion of the 33d anniversary of the signing of the charter of Long Island University, at Brooklyn, N.Y., be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FRED A. SEATON AT LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY'S 33D ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THEIR CHARTER, BROOKLYN, N.Y., MARCH 24, 1959

It is an honor and a pleasure to join with you here on the 33d anniversary of the signing of the charter of Long Island University.

These, indeed, are active and troublesome times.

Russia's Premier Nikita Khrushchev boasts that the Communists will permit us to exercise our rights in Berlin only at their sufferance; and we witness the President of the United States once again standing with firmness and reasonableness in the face of an ugly and unjustifiable threat from Moscow.

Serious as the Berlin question is, this is no isolated instance of crisis, but rather one of a continuing series engineered by the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The pattern—in the Middle East, in the Formosa Straits—has become familiar to all of us: Communist military threats met and turned back by free world firmness and unity.

And I remind you that the free world's success in dealing with this conspiracy is due in enormous measure to the intelligence and courage of two men, the President and the Secretary of State of the United States.

As a backdrop to such immediate crises, there are, of course, the military and scientific competition and—perhaps even more important in the long run—the economic contest. You will recall that Premier Khrushchev asserted that by 1970, or even sooner, the Soviet Union will surpass the United States in production and that our grandchildren will live under socialism—the latter being, of course, the Soviet's current idiom for Russian communism, which isn't even Marxist communism, much less historical socialism.

Even if we discount Russia's boasts in the scales of fact, we clearly have our work cut out for us.

We should never forget that proving Khrushchev's prophecy to be false depends only in part upon what the Russians do or don't do. The answer also largely depends upon what we do.

With that fact firmly fixed in our minds, I suggest there are certain things which, in the years ahead, all of us Americans must learn to do better for our own good and the good of people everywhere.

First of all is to develop the habit of examining only in the cold light of reason certain commonly alleged facts, rather than glancing at them through the cloudy looking glasss of mental laziness or prejudice. A fact is a fact, no matter what, and all the fools in the world to the contrary, it remains just what it is, a fact.

Above all, it ought to be apparnt that we must avoid every temptation or invitation to fly into a frenzy. Now, please make no mistake. I am not preaching complacency. What I am saying is that to become panicky over the spurious can be as bad as to be indifferent to the serious.

To illustrate, consider some allegations versus facts in the realm of economics.

The claim is loudly being made by some people that the gross national product of the Soviet Union is increasing at a faster rate than ours. On the face of it, that is quite true, if the published Soviet statistics are true. But it is just as true that the Russian's probable gross national product in 1957 was less than half of ours, to be exact, 40 percent. Perhaps more importantly, as their economic base has grown in the past decade, even their claimed rate of increase in output has been on an escalator going down, from 26 percent to 16 percent to 10 percent. That makes all the difference in the world when you are asked to make comparisons between our rate of economic growth and that of the Russians.

Again, make no mistake. No prudent people would pooh-pooh the economic advances made by a formidable and malevolent opponent. Neither would a prudent people fail to analyze those advances for what they actually are.

There is something else I suggest we all should do. That is to subject to the most intense kind of public scrutiny everything that Government does and spends for, continually asking ourselves these questions: Is this function vital? Is it something nice to have but not absolutely necessary now? Or is it luxurious or even ludicrous when contrasted with some other program, including the dire necessity of bringing our national finances into order by balancing the budget so we can be fiscally strong for the long ideological and economic struggle ahead?

As citizens, of course we are determined to invest every nickel necessary to keep this country's defenses strong, to help keep its economy flourishing, and appropriately and properly to aid in furthering the security, health and education of every one of our citizens. Try as you will, however, there is no way to divorce our security, health, education and happiness from the sensible management of the citizens' tax dollars. We simply must be determined—if we believe at all in the public good—that the Federal budget contain not one single cent for the care and coddling of a sacred cow which is there only because we seem to be pathologically afraid to look at it, judge its merits, and, if necessary, cut its throat.

In this time of rising prosperity and comparative world peace we should be determined to pay the price ourselves for any program we decide is necessary, not to charge it, plus interest, to our children.

What a shabby thing it is to toss into every baby's bassinet a mortgage, payable to yesterday and then wish the little tot well. And yet that is exactly what some of our political pediatricians would have us to do when they demand we spend more than we take in.

The mortgage on the future is altogether too big now. In 1939 the Federal debt limit was $45 billion. By 1945 it was up to $300 billion. It now stands at $288 billion.

Some people profess to believe all that means little or nothing. "We owe it to ourselves" they say, "so what?"

They couldn't be more wrong.

In fiscal 1960 we shall be spending over $8 billion for interest on the public debt; that is to say 10½ percent of the total 1960 budget. That's for yesterday.

For the conservation, management, and development of all the natural resources of the United States, excluding agriculture, we can invest only $1,710 million—2.2 percent of the total budget. That's for today and tomorrow.

In other words, we will be expending five times as much on yesterday as we can invest in tomorrow. Five times as much for dead horses as those we must ride to our destiny.

The Eisenhower administration believes Americans do want to invest in the future, not forever be paying for the past at the expense of tomorrow. That's one major reason it is fighting all reckless spending proposals, whatever they are. I have cheerfully joined in that fight, politically rough and tough as it is, because as Secretary of the Interior I intend neither to preside over the bankrupting of our Nation's conservation programs, nor to participate in bankrupting the Nation.

In presenting to the Congress a balanced budget for 1960, the President of the United States has shown his awareness of another sure fact: That to pile up bigger and bigger Federal deficits is to do something more evil than just to pass the check to our children; it is actually to issue a reckless and open invitation to that historical killer of free governments—inflation.

Yes, I know, there are some people who ask, "What's wrong with inflation?"

Lots of things.

Inflation hurts the Government. If today's dollar is tomorrow's dime, who then will buy Government bonds?

Inflation hurts confidence—confidence of the people in the future as well as in the present. We must never drift to the point where people believe to speculate is to be safe but to save is to gamble.

Inflation hurts defense: You and I will have less security, not more, if for every foot that weapons' spending goes up, weapons' prices go up 3 feet.

Inflation hurts our trade abroad: The higher American prices go, the easier it is for everybody to undersell us in the world's markets, at home as well as abroad.

That costs dollars. Worse, it costs men and women their jobs.

Inflation, by further debasing the dollar and raising prices, hurts people—you and me and nearly everybody; and, most of all, it hurts the poor, who can protect themselves the least.

Don't fool yourself. Inflation is no Robin Hood, robbing the rich to help the poor. It's cruelest and deadliest to the old, the widowed, and the families of the poor. Inflation is no graduated tax. For the Nation and the individual it is the quicksand of security.

Finally, we must recognize the revolution of rising expectations which is taking place in the less developed countries of the world. It is with us, and it won't go away.

There is, unfortunately, much to support the generalization that if a poverty-stricken man has a choice only between four freedoms and four sandwiches, he will choose the sandwiches. Unless we do our fair share to help such people—in the Middle East, in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America—to get both, all too often their tendency is to listen to the Communist agent who promises both but, in the end, delivers neither.

In his "Reflections on the Revolution in France," Edmund Burke wrote, "In the groves of their academy, at the end of every vista, you see nothing but the gallows." In the 20th century, at the end of every vista in the Communist formal garden we see with our own eyes the spectre of Hungary—and other once independent nations—and the image of Imre Nagy.

It is for us, the free, to help people everywhere to see this fact for themselves, to encourage their rejection of Russian domination disguised as aid. We must stand ready to help them better themselves.

Thus far, we have done rather well despite some mistakes and the constant carping of those who profess to see no good whatever to be derived from American money invested abroad in our mutual security programs.

In another area, too, there is hope for the future. Today in the Department of the Interior, for example, the Office of Saline Water is working with scientists throughout the United States and many other countries to change a key fact of human history—that up to now nearly all the people of the world have necessarily depended for life entirely on fresh water upon and beneath the land. Science has now come to the verge of learning how to convert ocean water economically into fresh water for human consumption, and ultimately for agriculture and industry.

This year, the Department of the Interior is preparing to begin construction of five such demonstration plants in the United States. On March 2, I announced the selection of the first of the five conversion processes to be used in these plants. The others will be announced at the rate of at least one each 3 months.

The first plant, we have considerable reason to hope, will bring the cost of conversion down below $1 per thousand gallons. As that price continues to descend in community after community, it will approach that of getting water from other sources—rivers, lakes, and wells. More importantly, it will enable people to obtain water economically where any other source is insufficient or even absent.

Last August 13, in addressing the United Nations here in New York City, the President of the United States spoke of the great common shortage, water, throughout the Middle East.

Today we can have hope that the end of water shortages on many continents is in sight and that the troubles and poverty and suffering they aggravate or cause are near solution as we near the perfection of economical processes for saline water conversion.

Consider the case of Israel. There the people grow their food on a million cultivated acres. Already, pressed to expand this acreage, they have had to pipe fresh water from the Yarkon River near Tel Aviv, about 60 miles south to the northern edge of the Negev Desert a vast wasteland with little fresh water either on or known to be beneath its surface. It is a 3-million acre expanse stretching from Beersheba in the north to Elath on the Gulf of Aqaba in the south, a part of the world which some travelers have likened to the surface of the moon.

Here in the United States, water impoundage, plus irrigation, has transformed the Imperial Valley of California and the salt desert of Utah, making them gardens bringing forth vegetables and trees and fruit. In a similar way, saline water conversion, plus irrigation, should one day make it possible to transform the Negev. Think of saline water conversion units dotting that whole area, drawing up brackish waters from underground or bringing salt waters from the sea, and pouring them, fresh, into canals and laterals to revive the now dead land. If only half the entire Negev should turn out to be suitable for farming—and that may be a conservative estimate—Israel could double its cropland.

From where we stand, here in 1959, we can gaze toward the horizon and see this prospect more clearly than human beings have ever seen it before. For the future of life on this planet the implications in saline and brackish water conversion stagger the imagination.

The United States is now engaged, in concert with 16 nations, in working on a hundred and one facets of a scientific breakthrough to solve the problem of cost.

Here I should note that among the scientists engaged in saline-water research are some from the Soviet Union, and that may prove to be a most significant fact.

Indeed, can we not hope and pray that along with the political competition of the years ahead a second theme will begin to emerge and steadily grow in intensity?

We need to encourage the theme of international cooperation, designed to overcome the problems of ignorance, poverty, hunger, and disease which today are the piteous portion of millions upon millions of members of the human race. If that theme could gradually grow strong enough to overcome the current one of suspicion, doubt, and fear, then whenever a Russian child learns to read, whenever a Russian scientist makes a discovery, we could have much more cause for hope than for apprehension over the uses to which this learning and this science might one day be put.

Here our problem is clear and demands solution. It is to make certain that the hope and not the apprehension is justified in the end; that the peace of the world is preserved; and that liberty and representative government do not perish here in our beloved America and from this troubled earth.

## Fair Trade Law Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the best informed and ablest defenders of the consumers of the country is Father Robert J. McEwen, S.J., of Boston College, a member of the Massachusetts Consumers' Council, and an expert in all matters affecting consumers. I ask unanimous consent that the statement which he made before the Massachusetts State Committee on Mercantile Affairs, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF REV. ROBERT J. MCEWEN, S.J., BEFORE MASSACHUETTS STATE COMMITTEE ON MERCANTILE AFFAIRS IN HEARING OF FAIR TRADE LAW REPEAL BILLS

While I can pay tribute to the sincere conviction of some small businessmen that these laws are necessary and helpful to them, I must state in all frankness the following points:

1. With regard to these fair trade laws, there is absolutely no rational economic argument in their favor. If these laws succeed in their alleged purpose, which is to keep in business all those now engaged in a trade or occupation, they cannot help but result in dividing the market so thinly that few, if any, sellers can make a comfortable profit. In addition, guaranteeing profit margins fixed arbitrarily by a manufacturer only serves to guarantee to the larger stores with fast turnover an enormous profit which will then allow them to cut the prices of other merchandise not similarly price-fixed. Thus the high profit on drug and beauty items enables the supermarket to shave profit margins to the bone on fruits and vegetables and other grocery items. Thus competition is increased for the small grocer. Thus the small grocer is made to bear the full effect of the competition from which the drug store is protected.

2. These laws have been ineffective now for a year or two, and no great collapse of the American economic system is evident. Therefore, the scare arguments advanced to support these laws are clearly fallacious. I remember the 1954 hearings when one witness told the U.S. Senate committee that if they did not pass a fair trade law in the District of Columbia every business handling fair trade products would be bankrupt within the year. I think a visit to Washington will reveal that no such scare prediction ever came true.

3. If you are serious about attacking and solving the problem of inflation in this country, you must immediately repeal these laws which inevitably add to the general cost of doing business. If they succeed in their alleged purposes, this is inevitable because they keep an unnecessarily large number of people in these protected occupations. This necessarily raises not only the wage rates but every type of cost in the protected industry and adds further fire to inflation pressures.

For Republican leaders like Senator Lamson and Senator Gibbs, these bills and these laws present a severe test. If you support fair trade price-fixing laws and use the argu-

ment that Government must protect the businessman's job, protect his price, and protect his profit, you are betraying the American enterprise system at the State level.

Also, you are abandoning the principles and philosophy of the national Republican administration whose agencies have gone on record opposing these price-fixing laws. Among such national agencies are: the Council of Economic Advisors, the State Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Justice. Most Republican newspapers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are on record against these laws.

May I remind you that if you accept the principle implied in these laws of government protection for the price and profit and job of the businessman, you can never with good conscience challenge any union measure or labor demand for job protection, for job perpetuation, or for wage protection. You may never challenge as inflationary any labor featherbedding practice or any wage-increase demand. In short, your support of these laws constitutes a complete surrender of the national principles and policies of republicanism.

Legislators should vote on bills not from personal feelings, but from considerations affecting the general welfare. I admit this is hard sometimes, but it is still the ideal toward which legislators should strive.

For you Democratic legislators, all that I have said above applies with even more force because your party constantly attempts to identify itself with the common people and with love of the poor consumer. These price-fixing laws are definitely not in the consumer interest.

The only true and permanent protection for the consumer is knowledge and trust in a retailer whose skill and integrity will command the consumer's allegiance.

## Tribute to James E. McCaffrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, personal satisfaction in public achievement is a right that has to be earned by conscientious performance. A man who thoroughly qualifies in this respect is James E. McCaffrey, general manager and chief engineer of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, whose forthcoming retirement in June was announced last week in California. But knowing Jim McCaffrey as I do, I doubt that he ever has thought much about his private glory. He always has had a bigger concern, and that is how to produce public satisfaction with the accomplishments of the utility district that he has headed for more than 20 years. The response of the press and public to his retirement announcement certainly shows the public approval of Mr. McCaffrey's work. Mr. McCaffrey's record at Sacramento is one that has been indelibly written in the growth of the community where, under his supervision, the public utility district has built a vast network of transmission lines and substations to ably serve one of the Nation's fastest growing areas. At a time when the cost of other commodities has been rising—including, I might note, the cost of electricity under northern California's competing privately owned utility—the publicly owned Sacramento district in this period has made three rate reductions. The record of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District under Mr. McCaffrey's guidance dramatically demonstrates the inherent advantages of public power. Besides the physical works of the district, Mr. McCaffrey has built an efficient organization which I am confident will carry on this record after his retirement.

As a tribute to fine public service, I am pleased to request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Sacramento Bee of March 14, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINE PUBLIC SERVICE

James E. McCaffrey, who has resigned as general manager and chief engineer of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, effective June 1, will leave behind him an enviable record of able and dedicated public service.

McCaffrey has been the general manager not only since the day the Sacramento Municipal Utility District went into the electrical distribution business but for some 8½ years before that, during the tedious and often frustrating process of acquiring the distribution system from the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Under his guidance the Sacramento Municipal Utility District is and always has been one of the most efficient and successful publicly owned power operations in the United States.

McCaffrey's responsibility has been both to make the Sacramento Municipal Utility District a going concern and to cope with the problems inherent in a rapidly expanding area. These duties he has met with ability and vision.

The crowning achievement of his years of service was the start of work on the Sacramento Municipal Utility District's $85 million upper American River project which will provide the district with its own source of power. And the 8 to 1 vote by which the people of the district approved the project was in effect an endorsement of McCaffrey's management.

In putting together an efficient organization, McCaffrey brought in Paul E. Schaad, whom he personally trained and who will succeed him as general manager and chief engineer. Schaad is equipped to carry on in McCaffrey's efficient pattern.

## Auto Firms Have Confidence in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in the Detroit Times of Wednesday, March 25, there is an article describing the role of the automobile industry in Michigan.

It points out, for example, that instead of taking plants out of Michigan, the industry is building new plants.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL TRUTH—AUTO FIRMS PERMANENT GOLD MINE

(To the READER: Of all the statements given currency by those who in envious malice have been knocking the business health of Detroit and Michigan, one of the commonest is that the automobile industry is deserting the area. Here is an article which weighs this charge, coldly by assessing the true facts. What is set forth is impartial and is not to be construed as either a defense or attack on any person or political party.—THE EDITOR.)

(By Tom Kleene)

Detroit and Michigan have a built-in, gilt-edged insurance policy on their economic future.

Very few, if any, other States or areas can boast such security.

The insurance policy that offers these enviable guarantees here, of course, is the automobile industry.

The chances of the policy lapsing are just exactly as remote as are the chances that the great American public will abandon the automobile as a means of transportation.

Or that the industry itself suddenly will launch a massive industrial migration out of Michigan that would overshadow the historic flight of the textile mills from the Northeastern States to the South.

JUST WISHFUL THINKING

It has been suggested in some quarters—more as the result of wishful thinking than any concrete evidence—that the beginning of such a mass move already is underway, but that is palpably false.

It will be adequately demonstrated later that the construction of new plants plus huge additions to engineering and research facilities have been strengthening Detroit's claim to being the core area of the whole automobile industry.

The promise of this area's future is to be found in the yardsticks employed by economists and others whose business it is to prognosticate the state of the Nation's economic health.

By every standard available to these analysts, the automobile industry will grow, progress and prosper in the years ahead.

And it's a risky business to discount such expert readings.

The record shows clearly that the major miscalculations in the long-range forecasts of these economic specialists almost invariably have been on the side of over-conservatism.

NOT 6-MILLION-CAR PACE

If it is accepted that the automobile industry is on the threshold of another era of growth, progress and prosperity, then it is indisputable that the core of the industry will share importantly in these benefits.

There are those skeptics who will point out that even now the industry is finding it impossible to maintain full employment despite the fact the automobile market supposedly has returned to the high road.

It is difficult for these persons to understand why the industry is producing cars at a 6 million annual rate while laid-off workers are walking the streets.

The answer is that it is clearly not in the cards for U.S. automobile manufacturers to build 6 million cars this year.

If any such volume were anticipated, the factories at this time of year would be building at close to a 7 million annual rate to offset the slower months later in the year.

And such a pace would absorb quickly the majority of those now laid off at the automobile plants.

A SPECTACULAR PAST

Detroit and Michigan, in a sense, are in trouble because of their own spectacular past performances.

The industry is still in the shadow of its remarkable 1955 showing when upwards of 7 million passenger cars and nearly 1 million trucks were sold on the American market.

Its inability to match that performance in any of the intervening years has produced a flood of criticism and derogatory comment from those who have forgotten how Detroit sparked the Nation out of two earlier postwar recessions.

The truth is that the automobile business is coming out of what the late George W. Mason referred to as "the very high level doldrums."

Natural concern over the present unemployment situation in Detroit and Michigan is minimized somewhat by the bright prospects for the decade that lies ahead.

In an ultra-conservative summation of the mounting avalanche of expert testimony to the effect that new peaks are in prospect in the glowing decade ahead, Harry A. Williams, managing director of the Automobile Manufacturers Association, states:

"It is the consensus of industry economists that the normal market for the U.S. automobile industry in the 1960's will be at least 6 million cars and 1 million trucks per year.

"However, in years of relative prosperity, total passenger car sales may rise as high as 8 million or so."

The logic of this summation is abundantly evident from an examination of the authentic statistical evidence on population growth, the decentralization of residential areas and increases and changes in the distribution of real family income.

In the matter of population, for example, the Bureau of the Census provides encouraging information.

By 1975, the U.S. population will have grown from its present 175 million to approximately 230 million, and there will be 30 percent more persons of driving age than there are today.

GREATER NEED FOR CARS

The continued trend toward suburban living at the same time will tend to create greater need and desire for automotive transportation, and ownership of more than one car in the suburbs should become commonplace.

The economic shift is expected to put about 55 percent of consumer units in the $4,000 to $10,000 income group after taxes by 1965. That compares with about 50 percent today and about 20 percent in 1929.

Not only is the Nation's population growing at an impressive rate, but these figures demonstrate that the American people will have a greater need for automobiles and a greater financial capacity to buy them than before.

Another factor not to be overlooked is the vast new Federal highway modernization program now underway and the new urban expressways being built and planned all over America.

These developments certainly will encourage the further expansion of highway transportation throughout the Nation by promoting better, more pleasant and more economical use of motor vehicles.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY MILLION ON THE ROAD

One more meaningful statistic from the bureau of public roads serves to round out all of this growth-progress-prosperity data.

By 1971, there will be 101,200,000 motor vehicles in the United States (more than half again as many as now) that will travel 1,051,400,000 vehicle miles annually.

And by 1976, about 230 million people will be driving 114 million motor vehicles 1,200,300,000 miles a year.

That, briefly, is the case in boxcar figures for the future outlook of the industry.

The confidence that this economic well-being insures the future security of Michigan is based on the certainty that this industrially rich region will always be the heartland of motor vehicle manufacturers.

Detroit first laid claim to the title of the capital city of the motor industry in 1912 when it wrested the honor from Indianapolis by outproducing that city by a mere 378,000 vehicle-year.

Michigan had developed trades and industries in the latter part of the 19th century which readily adjusted to the new auto industry.

Most of the qualifications that made Michigan the center of automotive production in the industry's infancy remain.

Added to these are many new ones, and the greatest is the all-important simple fact that the industry now is here. A mass flight would be about as practical for the automobile industry as moving the entire governmental structure and its buildings out of Washington, D.C.

DECENTRALIZATION AN OLD STORY

Those who profess to see the signs of such a development are fuzzily confusing mass migration with what is really decentralization.

Actually the process of decentralization is almost as old as the industry itself, but it is only in recent years that the term has taken a place alongside of automation as a kind of industrial bugaboo.

As applied to the automobile industry, the term means that manufacturing plants should be oriented to suppliers and raw materials and therefore located largely in the Northeastern part of the country, and that assembly plants should be oriented to the market.

Henry Ford realized the advantage of locating an assembly plant near the consumer soon after his company went into mass production. The result was that at one time in the early twenties the Ford Motor Co. had nearly twice as many assembly plants as it now has.

The exacting business of deciding where a modern industrial plant should be located is a cross between a science and an art.

Chrysler Corp. states that it is a combination of market analysis, distribution, and manufacturing cost studies, and tax schedules which indicate a generally favorable (or unfavorable) location for a new production facility.

LAND NOT ONLY CONSIDERATION

If an automobile assembly operation is planned, the region in which it is to be located must have the potential of purchasing at least 500 of the company's cars a day.

In considering specific sites, Chrysler looks for an area capable of supplying the plant personnel of the type needed within a 30-mile radius.

Next comes consideration of such things as zoning ordinances, land costs, type of soil, accessibility to railroads and trunk highways, availability of water, sanitary and drainage systems, electricity and gas, and terrain which will not require costly grading.

There are also such other important factors as labor relations, housing conditions, recreational facilities, police and fire protection, and hundreds of other details an industry must consider when seeking a new plant site.

Chrysler reports that when a plant is lured into a community by such inducements as free land the result, in most cases, is not a happy situation either for the community or for the company concerned.

The company's real estate department states that in regard to land costs and taxes: "We expect to pay our way."

The national growth and expansion of the automobile industry since World War II has intensified the locational pattern which began in some phases of production back in 1914.

In other words, the automobile industry is decentralizing in small units outside Michigan while the Detroit region is holding the main concentration of plants.

This is borne out by the figures for new capital expenditures for the industry's greatest 3-year expansion boom, prepared for 1954, 1955, and 1956 by the Bureau of Census.

Of a total investment of 3,272 billion for transportation equipment expansion in the 3-year period, $1,282 billion was spent in Michigan, or almost 40 percent of the total.

That is nearly twice the investment of $712 million in Indiana and Ohio combined, the two States that are supposed to be enticing the automobile industry away from its home State.

The new capital expenditure figures show relative fluctuations in new capital investment, but the sums spent in Michigan continued through the period at a consistently high level.

FORTY-FOUR NEW MICHIGAN PLANTS

Since the end of World War II, the vehicle manufacturers have built 113 new plants, of which 44 were built in Michigan.

The new plants in this State include 27 new manufacturing facilities, 5 assembly plants, 8 engineering and research facilities (2 of them proving grounds), 3 administration buildings and a parts depot.

It is clear from these figures that the postwar pattern of expansion has not been decentralized from the standpoint of taking facilities from the Detroit area and placing them elsewhere.

Rather it has been decentralization from the standpoint of building new facilities outside the Detroit area to increase productive capacity closer to the point of use.

In the years ahead, it is entirely possible that Detroit and Michigan may lose some of their present 30 percent share of all passenger car production volume.

AUTO MEN ARE OPTIMISTIC

But the fact that the Big Three have their administrative offices in this locality and have invested literally billions for research and engineering facilities here should go a long way toward upgrading automotive employment and assuring greater stability in the area.

Actually, the present spreading out of the automobile industry from the focal point of Detroit reflects the optimism of the manufacturers over the future market, which—indirectly at least—makes this area's insurance policy all the more secure.

---

## Productivity of Railroad Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by the Railway Labor Executives Association entitled "Productivity of Railroad Workers":

The Railway Labor Executives' Association today released its findings in the first

of a series of studies it is undertaking to determine the extent of the soaring productivity of railroad workers in the various crafts in recent years.

The findings of this first study, based entirely on official Interstate Commerce Commission statistics, bolstered completely the contention of the RLEA that the output of railroad workers has now reached an all-time high.

The first RLEA study was completed under the direction of President H. C. Crotty of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees. It analyzed the rising productivity of the approximately 120,000 maintenance-of-way workers who today, by whatever yardstick used, were found to have broken all records in terms of output per employee and man-hour worked. Maintenance-of-way men, who maintain and repair the tracks and roadbed, today make up about one-seventh of all railroad workers employed in the industry.

Crotty included in the study three tables based on the latest official ICC figures. These measured the number of employees per mile of road operated, the hours worked per mile, and the average miles of road operated per employee, and the revenue traffic units per employee and per hour worked for the 16 classes of maintenance-of-way and structures department workers on the class I railroads in the United States.

Each of these measurements, without exception, showed spectacular increases in output, with particularly high rises in recent years. For example, the findings show:

1. In 1958, the approximately 222,000 miles of road maintained by 120,780 maintenance-of-way workers was only about 12,000 miles less than the total in 1922 when over three times the present number of workers were required for maintenance. Since 1950, when one maintenance worker was required for each mile of track, the number per mile in 1958 had been cut almost in half or to 0.54 per mile.

2. In 1925, a total of 4,133.7 hours were worked by maintenance-of-way men for each mile of road operated. By 1957 the hours worked per mile had plummeted to 1,389.3.

3. Since 1930 the average of the total miles of road operated per section foreman has more than doubled. The same spectacular increase was also noted in the average of the total miles operated per individual section man, as well as per designated group of workers comprised of section foremen, section men, extra gang foremen and extra gang men.

4. The revenue traffic units per employee increased nearly fourfold between 1922, when 1.1 million per employee were recorded, and 1957, when the number of revenue traffic units per worker stood at 4.3 million. In terms of revenue traffic units per hour worked, the increase in productivity was even more spectacular, rising from 448.5 per man-hour in 1922 to 2,171.8 per man-hour in 1957. Since 1945, the gain has been more than that made in the 23 years preceding.

"I will be the first to concede that the spectacular gains in productivity among waymen in 1958 reflected in these statistics is due in part to the unwise management policies which have cut back railroad maintenance forces beyond the point required for efficient and safe operation," Crotty said. "Nevertheless, the fact remains that, despite the severe cutbacks and the drop in morale among rail workers brought about by the carriers' lack of concern for the welfare of their employees, the remaining workers have achieved a minor miracle in increased output under the most difficult circumstances.

"Instead of trying to smear these outstandingly efficient employees as 'featherbedders,' an enlightened management on the railroads would be expressing its appreciation for the unparalleled contribution these workers have made to an essential public service."

The tables, which show the steady gain in productivity of railroad maintenance-of-way men over a number of years, follow:

*Revenue traffic units per employee and per hour worked, 16 classes, maintenance-of-way and structures department, class I railways in the United States, selected years*

| Year | Revenue traffic units per employe | | Revenue traffic units per hour worked | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Index | Number | Index |
| | *Millions* | | | |
| 1922 | 1.12 | 100.0 | 448.5 | 100.0 |
| 1925 | 1.24 | 111.1 | 496.1 | 110.6 |
| 1930 | 1.27 | 113.2 | 526.2 | 117.3 |
| 1935 | 1.55 | 138.0 | 683.3 | 152.4 |
| 1940 | 2.05 | 182.5 | 860.5 | 191.9 |
| 1945 | 2.95 | 263.0 | 1,128.1 | 251.5 |
| 1950 | 2.87 | 255.7 | 1,410.3 | 314.4 |
| 1955 | 3.72 | 331.6 | 1,858.2 | 414.3 |
| 1956 | 4.12 | 367.0 | 2,056.6 | 458.6 |
| 1957 | 4.32 | 384.8 | 2,171.8 | 484.2 |

Source: Interstate Commerce Commission "Transport Statistics in the United States" and statements Nos. M-220 and M-300.

*Number of employees per mile of road operated, 16 classes of maintenance-of-way employees, class I line-haul railroads, selected years*

| Year | Miles of road operated | Number of maintenance-of-way employees [1] | Number of employees per mile |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1922 | 234,976 | 365,082 | 1.55 |
| 1925 | 236,849 | 389,114 | 1.64 |
| 1930 | 242,391 | 343,474 | 1.42 |
| 1935 | 237,491 | 205,679 | .87 |
| 1940 | 232,524 | 205,182 | .88 |
| 1945 | 227,877 | 292,552 | 1.28 |
| 1950 | 226,101 | 226,994 | 1.00 |
| 1955 | 224,475 | 182,654 | .81 |
| 1956 | 223,336 | 170,571 | .76 |
| 1957 | 222,044 | 154,945 | .70 |
| 1958 | [2] 222,044 | [3] 120,780 | .54 |

[1] Average of 12 midmonth counts.
[2] Same as 1957; 1958 not yet available.
[3] Average of 11 midmonth counts.

Source: "Transport Statistics in the United States, ICC," Interstate Commerce Commission, M-300.

*Maintenance-of-way hours of service per mile of road operated and average miles of road operated per employee, designated classes, selected years, class I railways in the United States.*

| Year | Maintenance-of-way hours worked per mile of road operated (1922=100) [1] | | Average miles of road operated per section foreman | Average miles of road operated per section man | Average miles of road operated per designated group [2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Hours | Index | | | |
| 1922 | 3892.7 | 100.0 | 6.0 | 1.17 | 0.82 |
| 1925 | 4133.7 | 106.2 | 6.0 | 1.17 | .78 |
| 1930 | 3426.9 | 88.0 | 6.2 | 1.35 | .90 |
| 1935 | 1965.6 | 50.5 | 9.1 | 2.29 | 1.53 |
| 1940 | 2103.0 | 54.0 | 9.8 | 2.36 | 1.49 |
| 1945 | 3362.6 | 86.4 | 9.0 | 1.62 | .96 |
| 1950 | 2045.0 | 52.5 | 10.1 | 2.13 | 1.30 |
| 1955 | 1631.8 | 41.9 | 11.4 | 2.65 | 1.65 |
| 1956 | 1531.5 | 39.3 | 12.1 | 2.87 | 1.78 |
| 1957 | 1389.3 | 35.7 | 13.1 | 3.21 | 1.98 |

[1] 16 maintenance-of-way classifications.
[2] Combined total of section foremen, section men, extra gang foremen, and extra gang men.

Source: "Transport Statistics in the United States, ICC," Interstate Commerce Commission M-300.

## Economy—and More Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Economy—and More Holidays," from the Steuben News for March 1959:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY—AND MORE HOLIDAYS

There are plenty of fiscal woes in Washington, in the 49 States and in practically every community as all of us should know by now. The cry for economy can be heard all across the Nation. Frankly, not yet penetrating enough as the cry for new taxes is, unfortunately, much louder.

Steuben News, during the past few months, has concentrated on these ever-increasing taxes in the Nation, in the States as well as in the cities and has admonished the membership to let their voices be heard, collectively and individually.

The response has been very gratifying. But, unless the drumfire of letters, of wires, and of telephone calls continues—incessantly—until the voting begins in Washington, in Albany, in Sacramento, in Lansing, in Trenton, in Harrisburg, and elsewhere, the lessening of pressure will encourage the legislators to follow their own counsel or to give in to the party command.

Therefore, once again, we urge all the members, from coast to coast, to continue with their efforts. Every letter is important—and don't let Jack do it. This, our work, is truly in the service of the community, large and small. It is our beholden duty to warn of waste and to stress economy. By doing so, we also have our personal interests in mind so that the money saved on often unnecessary expenditures and, consequently, on taxes, can be used to give our own children a good education and to make our own old age a more carefree one.

Yes, so nearly everyone in the legislative chambers talks economy and warns of the steadily growing army of bureaucrats—now one out of six of all gainfully employed people in the United States. But at the same time, as a perusal of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD demonstrates, there is currently a movement underway to give Federal employees additional benefits. It may not sound like much, but in our mind it is. There is a bill in the U.S. Senate—and it has adherents in the House of Representatives—which would give Federal employees the Friday off when a holiday falls on a Saturday.

We have always felt that an employee under civil service is in numerous respects

much, much better off than an employee in business, etc., or a self-employed man and woman. We have already more than ample legal holidays in the United States. There is no reason whatsoever to pile additional holidays unto the list. The employees will have to take the good with the bad, calendarwise. The rest of the gainfully employed people of this country—and they still comprise five out of six—are subject to the vagaries of the calendar, too. Why shouldn't Uncle Sam's people be subject to the same rule? The AFL–CIO American Federation of Government Employees has already figured out that two 1959 holidays—Memorial Day and the Fourth of July—fall on a Saturday and they hope the bill of Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON (Democrat, of South Carolina), who happens to be the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, will pass in time to make it law during the current year.

We hope it will not pass, and we hope President Eisenhower—not beholden to anyone—will veto it if it should pass.

Economy begins at home. These extra holidays cost the taxpayer a terrific amount of extra money and they are wholly inequitable. Let Congress prove in each and every case that its Members are truly economy minded and, once again, let them begin by cutting down in their own quarters.

These extra benefices are like a sickness. What is good for Federal employees is just as good for State and municipal employees. And they will follow the pattern set by Washington very quickly.

There is a job to be done to bring this country out of its present fiscal misery. Many a man, beset with income worries, has to work extra hours and extra days in order to make ends meet and to fulfill his tax commitments. The civil service employees of every type should waive all such special privileges and pitch in to bring us back to normalcy. Maybe then we can discuss the question of "extra days off"—but not now.

## The Aid To Education Bill—A California Teacher's Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, hearings were recently completed on the Murray-Metcalf Federal-aid-to-education bill, of which I am a cosponsor. During those hearings a great deal of serious testimony was received pointing up the critical inadequacies in our schools. Indeed, the picture painted was a very gloomy one. Recently I received a letter from a teacher in California which recalled to my mind the words of a writer who observed that there is always a touch of comedy in the worst of tragedies. For that touch of comic relief, I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Onerabil CLAIR ENGLE,
*Yewnited Statts Senet,*
*Senet Awfuss Bilding,*
*Warshington, D.C.*

DEAR ONERABIL: I yam a teecher in Californya, and I yam riting to yew to ask yure suport of the Murray-Metcalf bill. You may knot be awear that the shortij of funds for edjicashun has efekted the kwality of teechers in yure stait, butt this leter may sho yew wy it is necessery for teechers to get more pay, if yew want to get beter teechers. Just to sho yew how despirit the sitchewashun is—I yam a speling teecher.

I no that after reeding this letter, yew will giv the pasij of this bil yure imediut atenshun.

(P.S. I sugjest that yew luk intoo the teachers colidj sitchewayshun allso.)

## Statesman Bernard Baruch Warns of Dangers of Inflation and Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Greater Rochester Commerce, the magazine of the Rochester, N.Y., Chamber of Commerce, recently published a penetrating editorial by Bernard Baruch. This statesman's succinct commentary on the dangers of American apathy in general, and in particular the apparent unconcern on the part of many people about the dangers of inflation, deserves a wide reading.

Mr. Baruch points out clearly the manner in which inflation robs the pay envelopes and pocketbooks of every citizen—how it affects the lives of each and every one of us. Because of the importance of the message it conveys, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EDITORIAL
(By Bernard Baruch)

Allow this malady to run unchecked and it will impoverish the people and destroy a nation.

Down deep in our hearts we know how to cope with inflation; how to assure our security; how to overcome all the other dilemmas that beset us.

We know that it requires self-discipline and a subordination of personal interests to the national interest.

We know that it means self sacrifice—universal in character.

Have we lost the strength of character to do this? Have we grown so apathetic that we will not rouse ourselves before some terrible tragedy overwhelms us?

In time of peril, apathy is an unforgiveable sin, the irredeemable error. History and tradition tell us that great nations have died as much from internal decay as from external blows.

Rome fell not because the barbarians swarmed in but because the character of her citizens grew soft. And their capacity for self-discipline waned.

Will future historians come to the same conclusion about us?

It seems to me that we Americans have grown indifferent to the crucial issues confronting us—issues which will govern our future and our children's future.

I meet so many people who have lost, if they ever had it, the capacity for indignation. The public's attitude toward inflation illustrates a point.

Inflation is a cancer which is eating away at our economic and financial health. It is undermining our security and spiritual strength as well.

It is responsible for much of the burden of taxation we bear; of the swollen prices we pay; of the debt with which our government is saddled; of the devalued savings of the little people who suffer most from it.

## Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during the recent debate on the area redevelopment bill a great deal was said about the Douglas bill going so far as to invite a veto, whereas the administration bill was not adequate to accomplish what was desired. At that time I offered a compromise bill, which in my opinion, would have provided a safe margin in both directions.

An editorial appearing in the Scranton Tribune on March 25 comments favorably upon the compromise approach, and, considering that this editorial comes from one of the hardest hit depressed areas in Pennsylvania, it is worthy of notice.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS OR AID?

The slim margin by which the Senate passed the so-called distressed area aid bill is hardly a good portent for the success of Federal assistance to areas suffering from chronic unemployment.

The measure passed by a vote of 49 to 46 in the face of a White House threat to veto it. The affirmative votes are 17 short of the two-thirds majority which would be required to override a Presidential veto.

The bill which squeaked through would provide some $399 million in loans and grants by the Federal Government to areas of excessive unemployment. The money would be used to purchase machinery and equipment, to build plants and to provide public facilities; retrain workers and pay them while in training.

President Eisenhower believes these things should be done but he realizes, as we here in Scranton and northeastern Pennsylvania know by experience, that they cannot be done in 1 year or 2 or 3. We've been at it for some 15 years and we're still in the process of economically rehabilitating our community.

And because this is a long-term process the President sees no reason for a huge appropriation in any one year's budget. He said so when he vetoed a similar bill last year. And that bill called for an appropria-

tion of $100 million less than the present one. As a matter of fact the current one asks for more than seven times as much money as the President has recommended for this aid in the fiscal year ahead.

So the likelihood of a veto of a measure of this proportion seems a foregone conclusion.

Yet the Democratic leadership of the Senate showed no inclination to compromise despite the fact that there was a very good compromise bill before the upper House. That bill was introduced by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, who is well informed on the economics of distressed areas. His bill called for $200 million in appropriations. It was promptly rejected by the Senate.

But an idea of the real thinking of the Senate membership concerning Federal aid for distressed areas was quite evident, we think, in the Senate's vote of rejection of the President's own bill which called for a $53 million appropriation. This measure missed being passed by but a switch of five votes.

Thus it should seem obvious that if the Democratic leadership in Washington is sincere in its expressed desire to assist jobless areas it must submit to a compromise. If it does not it leaves itself wide open to the charge that it is simply playing politics—as it played politics a year ago with this type of legislation.

And the temptation to make a campaign issue of this legislation is very great indeed. For last year it accounted for the defeat of several Republican Senators and even more Republican Representatives, including the one from our own congressional district.

However, the Democrats can go to the well too often. And perhaps the better judgment of some among them in Washington will prevail in this instance and a second attempt to make a political football of the jobless will be ruled out. If that develops it will mean a compromise.

To the communities facing up to the problem of unemployment a compromise would be much more preferable than a campaign issue. For the compromise would mean the start of Federal assistance. It would mean, too, the end of political maneuvering in Washington for partisan advantage.

## GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Daily Radio Roundup dated March 24, 1959, prepared by the GTA Public Relations Department, of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the Radio Roundup was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP

The National Federation of Grain Cooperatives convened today in its 20th annual spring conference in Washington, D.C.

This organization was established about one year after GTA began business. M. W. Thatcher, general manager of GTA since its beginning, has also been president of the National Federation since the group's inception. It was his idea that the several cooperative grain marketing associations in the United States operating on the principal terminal markets could be of further value by having an organization of their own. The thought, naturally, was the possibility of influence in matters of general interest, such as legislation, transportation, and related fields.

There were seven federation members in the beginning. There are now 24, operating on the terminal markets in 18 States. All of the co-op agencies in the country handling substantial quantities of grain are members of the federation. About one-third of the members are affiliated with the Farmers Union, another third with the Farm Bureau. The remaining third is a combination of affiliations such as the Grange, Equity Union, and some special-crop co-ops.

Through the federation, all of these co-ops, regardless of ownership, work together on the national front for better legislation for farm families and their co-ops. Thus they are continuing what was done for many years by the three largest general farm organizations—the Farmers Union, the Bureau, and the Grange. During the years that Ed O'Neill was president of the National Farm Bureau and Louis Tabor was master of the Grange, they worked hand-in-hand with the National Farmers Union on all matters of general farm interest on the national front.

The three organizations worked together to draft and promote the McNary-Haugen bill. After this bill was vetoed by President Coolidge, the three organizations went right to work and got it passed again. Again President Coolidge vetoed it, and again the three organizations got busy, working as one, and led in the formation of the Corn Belt Federation. They continued to work together on the national front until age and ill health forced O'Neill to retire. Tabor also retired a short time later for the same reason.

The rank and file members of all farm organizations know they have the same basic problems regardless of commodities produced. None get prices which return operating expenses, depreciation, interest on investment and wages for management and labor of the family comparable to that of other segments of our society. This leaves a weak section in the national economy with debilitating effects across the board.

A perennial job of the federation is fighting the attempts of certain interests, working through the National Tax Equality Association, which are trying to have the regular corporation income taxes applied to the savings of the co-ops. We mentioned this in our commentary yesterday. The federation has been an effective influence in presenting to the committee of Congress facts and figures correcting the misleading presentations of NTEA on this score. The high caliber of the witnesses and the material presented has gained the respect of the members of the committees and the entire Congress. This will be repeated this year since the issue is before the Congress with even more force, coming as an administration measure with some new gimmicks.

More and more these events prove the necessity of organization. More and more world events prove the need of applying the principles of cooperation to everyday living. Sincerely believing this we remind you that GTA is the co-op way.

## An Adequate Armed Forces Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial and an article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of March 28, 1959, the editorial entitled "The Nation Can Have a Modern Airlift," the article entitled "Senator MONRONEY Pushes Plan To Buy 400 Modern Cargo Planes To Boost Airlift."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, Mar. 28, 1959]

THE NATION CAN HAVE A MODERN AIRLIFT

The interest and industry being shown by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY (Democrat, Oklahoma), in behalf of the Nation's airlift needs, both military and civilian, substantially improves the prospect of a modernization in this vital and neglected area.

As chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Senator MONRONEY is known as the Senate's authority on civil aviation, but his interest in the military needs is no less intense. He feels, and has told the Senate on numerous occasions, that the airlift needs of the Armed Forces have been "completely disregarded" and he has expressed dismay that the Administration has neglected to spend the $140 million the last Congress appropriated to buy modern aircraft for this purpose.

As reported on the first page of this issue, the Senator is working assiduously on a plan for the procurement of 400 modern, high-performance cargo aircraft, 100 for MATS and the balance for the civilian airlines. The latter would be both a strong contribution to the national economy and would constitute a valuable reserve for the military forces.

The agenda for Senator MONRONEY's plan provides that an agreement must first be reached between the military and civilian operators on an aircraft which would meet both of their needs. Consideration of the financing of the project would then be undertaken.

As to this phase of the project, we recall the plan put before the Dallas meeting of the Air Force Association last September (see the Journal of September 27, 1958) by Dr. Allen R. Ferguson, director of research at the Northwestern University Transportation Center. Dr. Ferguson, one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on transportation, proposed that the Air Force enter into contract with a private firm to purchase modern air transports and rent them to the Government under agreed conditions and at agreed rates. This, he contended, would obviate the immediate appropriation of large sums of money, yet would meet the airlift requirement rapidly.

A similar plan, operated either by private capital or by a Government controlled corporation, would certainly be feasible to finance Senator MONRONEY's proposal.

The Department of Defense and the administration admit the need for improved airlift but have given it low priority under the contention that the need is greater in other areas. We hope, now that Senator MONRONEY is showing the way, they will cooperate in working out a plan which will fill this gap in our defenses.

[From Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, Mar. 28, 1959]

SENATOR MONRONEY PUSHES PLAN TO BUY 400 MODERN CARGO PLANES TO BOOST AIRLIFT

Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat of Oklahoma, sees ultimate hope for building an adequate Armed Forces airlift under a plan involving the purchase of 400 high-speed, high-performance cargo aircraft standardized for use by both the Military

Air Transport Service and commercial airlines.

The Senator and members of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which he is chairman, have begun work on the project.

On March 19, Lt. Gen. William H. Turner, USAF, MATS Commander, and members of his staff were called before the subcommittee in executive session. They gave the committee a briefing on the present capabilities of MATS and its readiness to meet its war commitments. No details were released, but Senator MONRONEY told the Journal his group discussed with MATS leaders the essentials of what it would take to modernize military airlift.

Previously Senator MONRONEY, accompanied by Senator STORM THURMOND, Democrat of South Carolina, and CLAIRE ENGLE, Democrat of California, visited Dover Air Force Base, Del., where they inspected MATS equipment and conferred with Maj. Gen. William Stone, Eastern Transport Air Force commander, and Brig. Gen. Robert J. Goewey, 1607th Air Transport Wing commander.

Among the big aircraft they inspected there were the Douglas C-133 Cargomaster, which recently set new world's cargo-lift record and the Douglas C-124 Globemaster, which was used to support American troops in the recent Middle East crisis. Also shown was a Lockheed C-130 turbo-prop powered aircraft, used by the Tactical Air Command in the rapid transport of Army troops.

The first step in the Senator's plan is to settle upon a modern, high-performance cargo aircraft suitable for use both by MATS and the civil airlines, scheduled and nonscheduled. Such aircraft, he said, should be of low operating cost and designed so that when built in quantities the unit price would be low enough to offer the possibility of transporting cargo at about 4½ cents per ton-mile.

The first step in Senator MONRONEY's program requires agreement among the military and civil airlines on a suitable design. The next step, he says, would be to determine a way to purchase and distribute the aircraft.

He feels that if 400 were bought, 100 should go to MATS and the balance to civilian operators under terms requiring that they be ready for emergency military use on a few hours' notice.

Senator MONRONEY's next move will be to discuss the proposed solution with civil airline operators and with the airframe manufacturers.

Senator MONRONEY said in an interview he believes that his plan is thoroughly feasible and that it would contribute enormously both to the military preparedness of the Nation and to the national economy through the availability of swift airlift at reasonable prices.

He will introduce a bill, but not until agreement has been reached among all concerned and the details thoroughly worked out.

## Aid to Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Uniform United States?" which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, and also an editorial entitled "Inviting a Veto," which appeared on March 25, 1959, in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 26, 1959]

A UNIFORM UNITED STATES?

The Senate has gone too far, we believe, in the program of aid to depressed areas which it approved the other day. The $389 million loan and grant authorization which it has sent to the House is more than a third larger than the bill vetoed by the President last year and seven times the size of the Eisenhower proposal in this field. Obviously its proponents are inviting another veto, presumably in the hope of reaping a second crop of the political dividens which last year's go-round appeared to yield in some economically distressed states. A vetoed bill would be of slight help to the depressed areas, of course, but beyond this it may be questioned whether the rather ambitious program favored in the narrow Senate vote is really a sound prescription.

No Federal program could hope, of course, to provide even a tiny portion of the capital investment that a real industrial development or conversion effort would require. Such funds must come from private sources. What is mainly required in areas suffering from the effects of technological changes, resource depletion, or other such factors is a survey and promotion of new opportunities. Here local and State governments can help—even to the extent of temporary tax concessions and the like in some cases. A modest Federal supplementation of such efforts might be useful. But in general, with the economy's high rate of capital accumulation and the general flexibility and initiative of American business, real opportunities will not be long neglected.

Extensive subsidization of an area that may be "depressed" today would be hard to end, and even in the short run would tend to work against the interests of more prosperous regions with certain natural advantages. How could such a program possibly be administered with fairness to all sections of the country and without running into disputes concerning every effort to help that would, in the end, probably be settled on a political rather than an economically realistic basis?

For industrial and agricultural workers disadvantaged by sudden changes beyond their control there ought, of course, to be more adequate programs of unemployment compensation and job placement than now exist in most States. A retraining program in which industry would participate (in order to insure real utility) would be helpful. But if the Government were to go much beyond such measures and endeavor to maintain some kind of uniformity of economic progress and prosperity in so large and heterogeneous a nation as this, it would obe embarking upon a program that would require far more money than anything yet proposed—and far more wisdom in its administration than seems likely to develop. In any case, the Senate bill faces an almost certain veto if enacted, and the House ought to refashion it along more reasonable lines.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Mar. 25, 1959]

INVITING A VETO

One must wonder at the atmosphere of unreality in which a majority of the Senate has approved a bill to provide up to $389,500,000 in loans and grants to the Nation's chronically depressed areas. That is a sum far greater than the President is expected to approve. It is almost as if the Senators deliberately doomed their own legislation by pegging it to an impossibly high figure.

Surely the Senators were well aware that only last September President Eisenhower vetoed a similar measure which called for about $100 million less than is provided in the present bill. The President said then that the terms of the measure were too generous and that it was poorly conceived.

It isn't that the President is against aid to depressed areas—those areas which, like Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Scranton, and Wilkes-Barre, have records of chronic unemployment. But the Senate has approved a bill which calls for spending more than seven times greater than the $53 million requested in the administration's proposal.

We do not presume to set an exact figure which the Federal Government should provide for relief to depressed areas. Where there is such a great disparity between what the administration feels is needed and what the Senate majority has called for, clearly there is much room for guesswork.

It occurs to us, then, that Pennsylvania's Senator HUGH SCOTT was on the right track when he proposed an amendment which would have set assistance at a compromise figure of $200 million. Perhaps the President could be persuaded to approve that amount.

But the Scott amendment was defeated. If there is to be any compromise, it will have to be worked out with the House, which must now act on the proposal. If the House will approve a depressed areas bill at a figure substantially below that set by the Senate, then perhaps the two Houses can agree upon a compromise figure acceptable to the President.

Otherwise, the legislation is doomed to another veto and the unemployed in the Nation's depressed areas must wait at least another year for the Federal assistance which the executive and the legislative branches of the Government agree that they need.

## The Corn Tassel as the National Flower Emblem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a resolution adopted by the Peoria Junior Chamber of Commerce, favoring the adoption of the corn tassel as the national flower emblem printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION—LET US MAKE THE CORN TASSEL OUR NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Whereas it was Indian corn, the New World grain which sustained life in the first courageous settlers on this continent, and

Whereas this same Indian corn or maize became the basis of the agriculture of the Colonists and pioneers, later of the States and the Nation, and

Whereas corn grows in and is an important commodity in every State; is essential to our diet, our industry, our economy, and

Whereas corn is closely identified with this country and with her bounty to other peoples in other lands, and

Whereas corn has a flower, the tassel, which is uniquely American and distinctively beautiful, and

Whereas the Minnesota Jaycees, Minnesota Grange, Minnesota Business and Professional Women's Club, Minnesota Federation of Women's Clubs, Minnesota Legislature, and the National Grange have also passed similar resolutions, and

Whereas Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois and Congressman WALTER JUDD of Minnesota have introduced joint resolutions in Congress; now, therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce through action taken at a meeting of its board of directors on February 8, 1959, endorse the work of these organizations and urges the adoption by the U.S. Congress of the corn tassel as our national floral emblem, and the President of the United States is requested to declare such fact by proclamation.

## The District of Columbia Garnishment Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Emil K. Melin, of Arlington, Va., relating to the District of Columbia garnishment law, together with an enclosure, and a letter he has written to Representative JOHN DOWDY on the same subject.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARLINGTON, VA., *March 25, 1959.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: On page 2 of today's Washington Post I note that you and Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON have introduced bills to repeal the District of Columbia garnishment law.

I strongly favor such repeal as will be seen from the enclosed copy of a letter I wrote to Congressman DOWDY on March 18, 1959.

You will note that toward the end of page 1 of my letter I suggested the advisability of considering an idea put forth by Mr. John L. Schroeder, attorney representing the Metropolitan Businessmen's Association.

I have been told since I wrote my letter to Congressman DOWDY that Mr. Schroeder's plan would provide for a debtor to be called in and ordered by the court to pay a certain amount each week on his debt. If he failed to pay, he would be put in jail.

I am unalterably opposed to any such thing as that. We certainly do not want a debtor's jail in the Nation's Capital.

With best good wishes, I am,

Respectfully,

EMIL K. MELIN.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 25, 1959]

TWO SENATORS ACT TO REPEAL CITY'S GARNISHMENT LAW

A bill to repeal the District's garnishment law was introduced yesterday by Senators OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, and WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota.

JOHNSTON told the Senate his wife was threatened and insulted a few days ago because someone working for us had not made prompt payments.

He said "certainly that experience has awakened me to what is going on." Under the garnishment law, he declared "milk is literally taken out of babies' mouths."

When he was Governor of South Carolina, JOHNSTON said, he would have vetoed legislation like the District's garnishment law, if any came before him.

Another measure to halt attachments of earnings, sponsored by Representative JIM DOWDY, Democrat, of Texas, is pending in a House District subcommittee along with other garnishment reform bills.

In a speech on the Senate floor, LANGER said repeal of the antique law would be a great service for the many poor and needy people in this community who are at the mercy of easy credit racketeers.

He asked permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent series on garnishment published in the Washington Post. He said the articles amounted to a condensation of testimony that would be received in a hearing.

ARLINGTON, VA., *March 18, 1959.*

Hon. JOHN DOWDY,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In a special article in yesterday's Washington Post I saw that you have introduced a bill which would eliminate garnishment of wages altogether.

Were I a Member of Congress I would certainly support you. In my opinion garnishment of wages is about as obsolete a theory as the old laws which permitted imprisonment for debt.

I am a 64-year-old retired official of the Washington office of the Internal Revenue Service, having retired August 1953 after 30 years service. Although I have never practiced law, I have been a member of the District of Columbia bar since 1927. My wife and I have resided at the above address in Arlington for almost 29 years.

Back in 1933 and 1934 I had a neighbor (he died several years ago) who was superintendent of maintenance for the Arlington division of the C. & P. Telephone Co. He often mentioned the trouble and loss of time caused him by various Washington concerns—garnisheeing the wages of employees working under him. He and I could never understand why these outfits—which generally sold unessential items like jewelry, etc., etc.—ever sold the employees in the first place, knowing their small incomes, family status, and so on. What was even less understandable was selling them again (and often again) after having had trouble collecting on the first and quite often the second transaction.

Articles which have appeared in Washington newspapers in recent weeks indicate that the situation is even worse than it was 25 years ago.

I quote from the Washington Post, article of March 17 by Staff Reporter Morton Mintz:

"John L. Schroeder, attorney representing the Metropolitan Businessmens' Association, asked for a change in the bar bill that would enable a creditor to bring any debtor—including Federal employees, whose wages cannot be attached—into court where he could be ordered to pay off his debt in installments. The employer would not be involved."

Since it is probable that your bill cannot be passed—although I believe it should be—it might be advisable to consider Mr. Schroeder's idea.

I would suggest one change. It should provide for summary dismissal of the suit if it is shown that the creditor has previously—on a different transaction, of course—brought the debtor into court, say within 2 or 3 years.

To me this would be only plain commonsense. If the creditor has had trouble collecting previously, he certainly should have had enough business sense to refuse credit in the future unless the buyer has had a substantial improvement in his financial status. If the creditor doesn't have such sense, let him stew in his own juice. Like the old common law adage about bad dogs: "A dog is entitled to the first bite." If the creditor puts himself in the way of a second bite, let him take the consequences.

I might also comment that employers should not be bothered with garnishee proceedings. They have enough trouble and expense with the withholding of income and social security taxes.

This letter is written on my own volition. It has not been suggested by any employer—in fact, I have had only one employer since 1923—good old Uncle Sam. I am merely interested in the general improvement of laws.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours respectfully,

EMIL K. MELIN.

## Michigan's Future Is Bright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, among the slanders which are being circulated about Michigan by those who do not know any better, or those who seek political ends, is that Michigan is somehow controlled by Walter Reuther.

Mr. Reuther is an outstanding leader of organized labor and a fighter for better living standards.

An article describing what Mr. Reuther thinks about Michigan and the charges concerning him appeared in the Detroit Times of Tuesday, March 24. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REUTHER WILL BET A BILLION ON MICHIGAN

(To the Reader: For a long time now wherever the names of Michigan and Detroit appear in newspapers and magazines they are attached to a group of slurs about economic climate, welfare state, etc. One of the names with which Michigan is beaten is "Reutherism." To clear up the question whether there is a problem here that is unique to Michigan the Times went to the man—Walter Reuther. No inferences should be drawn from this article that it is a commitment by

this paper to the views of the labor leader one way or another—THE EDITOR.)

(By Jack Crellin)

UAW President Walter P. Reuther is willing to bet a billion dollars on the economic and industrial future of Michigan.

The man around whom much of the controversy swirls when people discuss Michigan's so-called business climate, is the first to admit the State is in the midst of an economic crisis but he vehemently denies it bears a "union made" label.

He attributes Michigan's temporary plight to decentralization, automation, and the loss of defense work, and the Republicans.

But even these, he argues, are more than offset by the positive promises of the future.

This is a subject Reuther dearly loves to discuss.

He gets up from his kidney-shaped desk, unrolls a huge wall map of the United States and starts to talk.

"Look where Michigan is situated—right in the heart of industrial America," Reuther declares, bracketing an area from the east coast as far west as Kansas in his outstretched arms.

"There is not a State in the Nation which has a larger reservoir of skilled manpower.

UNLIMITED WATER RESOURCES

"We have unlimited water resources at a time when water is becoming increasingly important to industry.

"Our transportation facilities are without rival. We have the railroads and the Great Lakes. The St. Lawrence Seaway will bring the whole world to our door.

"We are the second fastest growing State in the Nation population wise. The only one ahead of us is California.

"We have all the elements needed to make tremendous economic progress."

These are some of the reasons why Reuther, as we said earlier, is willing to bet a billion dollars.

That's how much is currently held in trust in pension funds for UAW members who are employees of the automotive "Big Three"—General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler—and allied industries under contract to his union.

Reuther would like to see some of those dollars put to work right here in Michigan.

MILLIONS FOR LOCAL PROJECTS

So long as the investments are considered sound, Reuther said he saw no reason why millions could not be pumped into worthwhile local projects such as industrial rehabilitation, housing, medical facilities, etc.

At present at least 53 percent of the money in the funds is tied up in fixed income investments such as bonds, notes and real estate. Another 45 percent is in common stock.

Latest reports at Solidarity House, UAW headquarters, show real estate investments alone amount to $389 million.

This latter is a sore spot with Reuther.

He says most of it has been sunk into luxury housing projects in the east when it could have served an even better purpose—and could have been earning the same return—had it been invested here in Michigan.

And that is where the hitch in Reuther's offer comes in.

The funds are rigidly controlled by trustees named by the various companies. The union, through its own choice when the funds were first established, has no voice in how they are invested.

Reuther tried to crack this barrier in last year's negotiations with the auto industry. He asked that just a small percentage be allotted to worthwhile civic projects. The campaign was not successful but he has not given up.

MONEY BELONGS IN MICHIGAN

"Between 40 and 50 percent of the UAW's membership is in Michigan," Reuther says. "That money belongs to our people. It does not belong to either the companies or the trustees.

"We are not trying to dictate how it should be invested. We merely say that if a builder in Long Island wants $20 million and a builder in Detroit wants the same amount, consideration should be given first to the Detroit request."

Some idea of what Reuther's plan would mean to Michigan and Detroit can be gathered by considering a bill proposed in Congress by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS (Democrat, of Illinois). The Douglas bill, which Reuther is supporting vigorously, would provide only $389 million of Federal funds to aid distressed unemployed areas in the way of loans for new industrial building and equipment.

Michigan's share would be about $17 million, according to one estimate.

While seemingly a drop in an immense bucket, people like Governor Williams and Mayor Miriani agree that even that would help.

EMBITTERED BY SMEAR CAMPAIGN

Reuther is bitter about what he calls the smear Michigan campaign. He says it is strictly political, probably would not even have occurred had there been a different Governor—a Republican—in Lansing.

"The people responsible," he says, "have done a great disservice to our State. They have hurt us with their untruths and distortions."

What about taxes? Will tax increases proposed by Governor Williams and supported by the UAW drive industry out of Michigan?

"Nonsense," says Reuther. "There are 30-odd States in which the tax burden is greater.

"Besides, if claims about the present taxes were true the Republicans would have to assume the blame because they are the ones who were in control and passed the tax laws."

In the same breath he points out that one national magazine which went to great lengths to prove Michigan was on the financial rocks, in the same issue reported that at least 75 percent of the other States are also having trouble.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ISSUE

Reuther minimizes the effect liberalization of the unemployment compensation law would have here.

"In this respect, Michigan is just catching up to many other States," he says.

Even the recent decision of the Democratic-controlled Michigan Supreme Court under which employees of a multiplant corporation were held eligible for jobless benefits if idled by a strike in one of the plants is not so revolutionary as it might seem, according to Reuther.

He says a survey shows the ruling would have been the same in at least 37 other States.

What about charges the UAW, through insistence on so-called pattern settlements, has driven smaller employers in the State out of business?

"We have never attempted to mechanically apply a rigid economic pattern," says Reuther. "Neither have we been willing to subsidize inefficiency on the part of management. Wherever there have been sound economic reasons that justified a less-than-pattern settlement we have gone along."

He cited contracts showing the union, in the case of some employers, has made radical adjustments, in some forgoing increases and, in a few, even accepting wage cuts.

"For obvious reasons we don't try to make headlines out of such incidents," Reuther commented with a grin.

THEY'RE WHISTLING IN THE DARK

Employers who claim they are moving out of Michigan to escape high wage rates are whistling in the dark, Reuther said.

"The small guy might be able to hide out for a while in a corner of Arkansas but eventually his plant is going to be organized and he is going to have to pay a living wage," Reuther said.

Reuther insists that wage levels insisted on by his union and others are not a real factor here in Michigan.

"Ford plants pay the same rate for the same work regardless of where they are located in this country," Reuther pointed out. "The differential between General Motors plants is only a matter of pennies.

"People who claim the auto industry is leaving the State because of the union just make themselves look ridiculous.

"The reason for the shift is economic. The companies are decentralizing to be closer to both their sources of material as well as their markets."

Reuther thinks the fact the UAW is a large organization is good for both the State and the country.

"Being big we can carry out our contractual commitments," he says. "Sure we have disputes but balance them out against our record of stability and you get an entirely different view of the situation. But our critics don't talk about those things.

COMMENDED BY WAR LABOR BOARD

"Why, during World War II we were publicly commended by the head of the War Labor Board for having the best record of stability on war production in General Motors plants of any union in any major industry in the country. We are proud of that record."

It is his opinion that the auto companies, with the possible exception of American Motors President George Romney, share his feeling that it is good business on their part to deal with a big union.

Reuther is justifiably concerned about the fact there are upwards of 300,000 unemployed in Michigan.

He points out, however, much of this is traceable to a shift in the country's defense needs. Since 1953, he says, 189,000 defense jobs have been wiped out because of the emphasis on aircraft and missiles rather than on tanks and other types of ordnance.

EAGER TO FREE PENSION FUNDS

One of the keys to solving the State's unemployment dilemma, Reuther said, is the diversification of industry. Hence his interest in freeing pension funds and winning support for the Douglas bill.

What about claims that he controls Governor Williams?

"Nothing could be more ludicrous. I actually see him only three or four times a year and then usually on a public platform. I have never sought to influence him and he has never sought my advice.

"I think that if anyone can control a person in public office he isn't worthy of holding public office. If I thought I could control Soapy Williams I would be opposed to him."

Reuther would like to see industry, labor, and government tackle the problems of Michigan in a joint endeavor.

"And we can make progress if we work together," he says.

"The UAW is willing to sit down with anybody at anytime. We have been willing for years."

Because Detroit is its home town, the UAW takes a particular interest in industrial rehabilitation.

Reuther pointed to the fact that where the city took the initiative and began to clear the way for light industry in the Milwaukee-Junction area it has more applicants than land available.

He agrees that there will probably never be as many industrial jobs available as in the heyday of the auto industry, but he adds:

"By industrial rehabilitation, we can bring industry in here and maintain the city's tax base.

"Industry wants to come here—don't let anybody kid you about that—but the sites are just not available."

---

## The Battle To Save the Dunes on Lake Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are engaged in the battle to save the dunes of Lake Michigan, which are threatened with final destruction by the erection of steel mills by the National Steel Corp., headed by Mr. George M. Humphrey, the former Secretary of the Treasury and by the Bethlehem Steel Corp. The St. Louis Post Dispatch printed an excellent article on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE TO SAVE THE DUNES ON LAKE MICHIGAN

(By Dickson Terry)

GARY, IND., March 14.—Along the shores of Lake Michigan in northern Indiana is an area known as the Indiana Dunes. Originally it was a strip of land 26 miles long, an area long recognized as unique by geologists, botanists and people interested in conserving our natural resources.

Today the dunes, or what is left of them, have become the center of an unusual battle between big business and conservationists.

On one side of the battleline are two big steel companies, Bethlehem and Midwest Steel, both of Pittsburgh. These two companies have purchased virtually all that remains of the dunes, a strip about 3½ miles along the lakefront and extending back 1 to 2 miles.

The steel companies plan to construct mammoth mills on the property. They have the support of big business in Indiana and of most of the politicians in the State.

On the other side are a group of conservation-minded people led by a women's organization and spearheaded by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois. DOUGLAS, an ardent conservationist and a man who has known the dunes for many years, has introduced a bill in Congress to make the dunes a national monument.

The problem of the dunes, DOUGLAS said, is a symbol of the crisis that faces all America. "It is as though we are standing on the last acre, faced with a decision of how it should be used."

A secondary battle is being waged between the conservationist groups and the State Legislature of Indiana. The State has, for several years, been trying to get the Army Corps of Engineers to build a huge harbor in the very center of the remaining area. This harbor, it is charged, will not only further despoil this unique area but also would serve the purposes only of the two steel companies which plan to build there, and of the Pennsylvania Railroad, which operates near the area. And the railroad also owns 80 acres of the dunes.

The dunes have long been recognized as a natural phenomenon unlike any other in the country. The area has been described as a place where time stands still. It is a place of wild and lonely sand hills which, due to wind and erosion, are constantly changing. Among the sand hills are small lakes which furnish a refuge for migratory birds. There is even a bog of almost 100 acres which still has the mystery of untouched places.

Scientists from all over the world have come to the area to study the dunes. Numerous books have been written about the area by such eminent nature writers as Donald Culross Peattie and Henry C. Cowles, botanist at the University of Chicago.

"There are few places on our continent," wrote Professor Cowles, "where so many species of plants are to be found in so small a compass. Within a stone's throw of almost any spot one may find plants of the desert and plants of rich woodlands, plants of the pine woods and plants of swamps, plants of oak woods and plants of the prairies.

"Nowhere perhaps in the entire world of plants does the struggle for life take on such dramatic and spectacular phases as in the dunes. A dune in the early days of its career is a moving landscape, a place that is never twice alike. * * * Perhaps nothing in all nature except a volcano with its lava flow is to be compared with such a moving dune."

The dunes have attracted writers, painters and artists through the years, and they have been a playground for people of Indiana, southern Michigan and the Chicago area for half a century.

The battle of the dunes has, in a manner of speaking, been going on since 1916. Stephen Mather, then Secretary of the Interior and the father of many of our national parks, visited the dunes and recommended making them a national park or monument. But World War I came along and nothing was done.

As the years passed industrial development began to close in from both ends of the 26-mile strip. It was a women's group that took the first step nearly 40 years ago to try to save the dunes.

In 1921 Mrs. Frank J. Sheehan got the Indiana Federation of Women's Clubs to back a movement to establish a State park in the dunes. Mrs. Sheehan succeeded after 2 years work in getting a bill introduced in the legislature. Then she went before the legislators and their wives and gave a 2-hour lecture with stereoptican slides.

She pointed out that when the park movement started there were 15 miles of dunes left. By this time, in 1923, there were only 6 miles left. A bill was passed authorizing the purchase of 2,000 acres of what is now Dunes State Park.

Nothing further was done about saving the dunes until 1949, after a bill was introduced in the State legislature to enable the State to buy land in the middle of what was left of the dunes to build a harbor. Lovers of the dunes rallied at Gary. The only woman present was Mrs. H. H. Buell.

Mrs. Buell, who, with her retired husband, built a home a few years ago in Ogden Dunes, a residential area on the lakefront, has a very strong affection for the area. The dunes, it has been said, do something to people, and Mrs. Buell is no exception.

She is a gray-haired woman with considerable force. "I raised my voice at the meeting," she said, "and suggested that perhaps the women of Indiana could again do something. Everyone agreed it was a good idea, and somewhat to my surprise, they asked me to start it. I said I would try."

Mrs. Buell had never been an organizer, but she went to work. She called all the women she knew who felt as she does about the dunes and 25 showed up in her living room. They organized the Save the Dunes Council.

They started a membership campaign by letter and the organization grew from 25 to 1,500. Word spread among former residents of the area. Now they have enthusiastic dune savers as far away as Alaska, California, and Hawaii.

The original intent of the group was to raise enough money to buy the 3½-mile stretch that was left of the dunes. Their first move was in 1953 when one of the most picturesque parts of the area, Cowles Bog, went on sale for back taxes. The group raised enough money to buy 56 acres.

The women enlisted the support of the Indiana Federation of Women's Clubs, the garden, natural history, and wildlife clubs in servationists, a nationwide organization; the Izaak Walton League, and the Conservation Council of Chicago, which includes 66 garden, natural history, and wildlife clubs in and around Chicago.

They found themselves opposed by the State government, from Gov. Harold E. Handley down through virtually every member of the State legislature, all of whom favor the harbor and industrialization of the area. The conservation group was opposed also by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Representative CHARLES HALLECK, in whose district the dunes are located, and other influential politicians. As for the rank-and-file politicians, they either favored more business in the area or they were apathetic toward the whole thing.

While the women were beseiging foundations and other philanthropies in an effort to raise money, the dunes became the center of considerable land speculation. Years ago land in the area sold for $50 an acre or less.

The women had hoped to buy it at around $300 an acre. Today it is valued at $2,750 an acre.

Most of the land was owned in 1953 by the Consumers Co., of Chicago, a company owned largely by Clint Murchison, the Texas multimillionaire. The company dealt in sand, gravel, and cement. It obtained sand from the dunes.

Beyond this the company saw another use for the area. It was ideal for industry, particularly if the harbor were built. In 1954 officers and directors of Consumers Co. incorporated Consumer Dunes Corp., whose purpose was to speculate in dune acreage, according to its report to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In 1956, Lakeshore Development Corp. was incorporated and later that year Consumer Dunes started selling land to Lakeshore Development. Lakeshore Development, it was revealed, was set up to buy land for Bethlehem Steel Co., which now values it at $2,750 an acre.

Midwest Steel, in the meantime, had been buying land in the area over a period of years. Today Midwest Steel has about 750 acres, Bethlehem Steel has 3,800 acres which, except for the 80 acres owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad, is about all that's left of the dunes.

The parcel of land the women had hoped to buy would now cost millions, even if it could be bought, which appeared unlikely. Midwest Steel Corp., recently announced that a fully integrated steel mill would be built on its property on Lake Michigan.

Bethlehem announced plans to merge with Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. and build a $300 million plant on the lakefront. The merger was disapproved by a New York court in January. A. B. Homer, president of Bethlehem, issued a statement that the termination of the merger plan "does not mean that the Bethlehem interests in the midwest steel market has lessened in any way. On the contrary, Bethlehem has already proceeded with studies to determine the best way in which it can expand its service to that market—particularly engineering studies as to use under existing conditions of Bethlehem's northern Indiana property."

A spokesman for Bethlehem told the Post-Dispatch that President Homer had no statement to make regarding the dunes or efforts to save them.

By the summer of 1958, it appeared that all was lost, and the work of 6 years by the women of the Save the Dunes Council had been in vain. They were about to disband. It was then that Mrs. Buell, knowing the reputation of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS as a conservationist as well as a man who loved the dunes, decided on a last step.

She didn't know Senator DOUGLAS, so she wrote to Mrs. Douglas, as one woman to another, and asked her to see if she could interest the Senator.

DOUGLAS, it turned out, had vacationed for years at the dunes when he was a professor of economics at the University of Chicago, and later as a Chicago alderman. DOUGLAS came in person to meet with Mrs. Buell and the women of the council. He walked again through the dunes, even rolled up his trousers and waded in Lake Michigan.

Then he returned to Washington and introduced a bill to make the dunes a national monument. Joining DOUGLAS as sponsors of the bill were Senators RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and WAYNE MORSE, Oregon Democrats, and JAMES E. MURRAY, Montana Democrat, all seasoned battlers for conservation.

"I am here," said DOUGLAS when he introduced the bill, "to make a last-ditch effort to prevent the imminent closing out forever of this last 4 miles of a 25-mile park. Plans are already being made and bulldozers are already at work to turn this great historic and scientific site into slag piles, mills, wharves, noise, pavement, and one more source of smoke and pollution."

"It would not only despoil what is left of the area," he said, "but the construction of mills will reach around and irrevocably damage the State park, polluting its water and air."

The bill is now in committee. If passed, it would authorize the Department of the Interior to buy back the land and preserve the dunes as a national monument, under the protection of the Government.

In the meantime, the Save the Dunes Council has set for itself the task of getting 1 million signatures on a petition to send to Congress. They already have 200,000 names. And they are writing to all signers, asking them to write to their Congressmen.

Many people, Mrs. Buell admits, are bemused by the battle of the dunes. That's because, she says, they fail to see it as a symbol of our rapidly disappearing natural resources.

Paraphrasing Senator DOUGLAS, the time may come, she says, when we may actually find ourselves standing on the last unused, unprotected acre—wondering which way to go.

## The Proposed Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lowering the Summit," published in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of March 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWERING THE SUMMIT

President Eisenhower continues to show no enthusiasm for the proposed summit conference, but his comments at his news conference yesterday left the door open to a whole series of such conferences. The idea of periodic meetings attended by the top-ranking officials of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and France appears to have been brought to Washington by Prime Minister Macmillan. It is based on the theory that not much ice will be melted at the first session and that many conferences are likely to be necessary to produce any real East-West accommodation, if indeed any such accommodation at all is possible.

On this point, as on several others, the President is more inclined than Mr. Macmillan to attach reservations. Yet he was emphatic in saying that if "we have an atmosphere that permits of periodic negotiations" and if there is some hope of beneficial effects for the United States and the free world, he would "never decline to go along in that kind of effort." Certainly this is a sufficient endorsement to project the idea into the preparations for the confrontation with the Russians.

The President has reiterated his belief that a preliminary conference of foreign ministers must make some progress to justify negotiations at the summit. His view on this point undoubtedly diverges somewhat from that of Mr. Macmillan who appears willing to do business with Premier Khrushchev regardless of what may happen when the foreign ministers meet. But the difference may be more semantic than substantive. In any event, the test that the President proposes to apply to the foreign ministers' conference is elastic enough to cover almost any action that the administration may wish to take at the time.

It is interesting to note, in this connection, the President's comment that no substantial or valid agreement could be anticipated unless Khrushchev were pretty well in the picture. This does not mean, he said in effect, that Khrushchev could command, bluff, or blackmail any other official into attending a summit conference. Such a gathering must necessarily remain voluntary and acceptable to all the participants if it is to be useful.

The President's lack of exuberance about the prospective summit conference should help to deflate the exaggerated hopes that are often associated with it. The conference will be the first confrontation since Geneva of the chief spokesmen for two highly antagonistic and determined systems. The conflict between their interests in Berlin, and in all Germany and central Europe for that matter, is obvious and profound. Only a miracle could bring a broad-gaged settlement out of this kind of situation.

While they are preparing to negotiate in good faith and to offer every reasonable concession for the sake of reducing friction and healing open sores if possible, the statesmen of the West would do well to continue warning their people against exaggerated expectations.

## Tributes Paid to Founders of the University of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two clippings from the Alumni Review of the University of North Dakota relating to Founders Day observances.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These university faculty and administrative staff members were honored at Founders Day observances for 25 years or more of service. They are E. V. Acosta, associate professor of modern and classical languages; Eva C. Ball, assistant director of the extension division and director of the stenographic bureau; Dr. Richard Beck, chairman of the department of modern and classical languages and professor of Scandinavian languages and literature; Dr. Margaret Beede, professor of English; Mary Butler, recorder in registrar's office; E. D. Coon, head of chemistry department and professor of chemistry; Adeline Hendrickson, business office cashier; John E. Howard, associate professor of music and band and orchestra director; John L. Hundley, head of physics department and professor of physics; Ruby McKenzie, registrar; Julia Mattson, assistant professor of ceramics; W. H. Moran, professor of chemistry; H. C. Rowland, head of music department and associate professor of music; A. K. Saiki, professor of pathology; R. C. Staley, chairman of mathematics department and professor of mathematics; O. H. Thormodsgard, dean of the Law School and professor of law; Ross C. Tisdale, professor of law; Felix Vondracek, head of history department and professor of history; George C. Wheeler, head of biology department and professor of biology; and R. B. Witmer, dean of the College of Science, Literature, and Arts.

TRIBUTE PAID TO FOUNDERS

John E. Fields, Los Angeles business executive and former university student, paid tribute to the men who contributed so much to the school in a Founders' Day address February 26.

"The institution you created is now, 75 years after, doing the job you intended in your deepest and innermost thoughts. The job you started, Founders, sirs, is being carried ahead capably by eager hands, and may you rest well in that assurance."

Fields pointed out the role of the university in directing and shaping the individual.

"It is in the process of lifelong reeducation that the inspirations and the disciplines of the university will come to the individual's aid, as he flexes himself to change, humbles himself to accept new ideas and understands the truth in whatever words it may appear."

PROFESSORS HONORED

Donald M. Gillmor, associate professor of journalism, and Elwyn B. Robinson, professor of history, received distinguished teacher awards at the Founders' Day banquet.

The $500 awards were presented by Dr. F. L. Grinnell, vice president of the U.N.D. alumni association. Gillmor received the award based on 5 to 12 years service, and Robinson received the award based on more than 13 years service.

Gillmor, a native of Fort Frances, Ontario, has been a member of the U.N.D. faculty since 1952. He received a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Manitoba in 1949 and a master of arts degree from the University of Minnesota in 1950.

WORKED ON NEWSPAPER

Before coming to U.N.D., he worked as a reporter and news editor on the Winnipeg Free Press. He has also had experience on the Fargo Forum and in the advertising department of the Grand Forks Herald.

Gillmor recently was awarded a $5,000 Danforth Teacher Grant for 1959.

Robinson, a native of Russell, Ohio, has been at U.N.D. since 1935. He received a bachelor of arts degree in 1928 from Oberlin College, Ohio, master of arts, and doctor of philosophy degrees from Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

IN MANY GROUPS

He is a director of the North Dakota State Historical Society, a member of the North Dakota Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, the American Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the North Dakota Lewis and Clark Sesquicentennial Committee.

Robinson's special interests are in the history of North Dakota.

Honored guests at the banquet were 20 faculty and staff members who have each served 25 years or more at U.N.D.

President George W. Starcher presented to each of the 20 a certificate of merit and a silver tray in recognition of loyalty and service given to U.N.D.

RECIPIENTS PRAISED

Starcher praised the recipients as the "men and women who were mainstays through the longest crisis in the history of the university, from 1930 to 1949."

"The medium through which the university's body of knowledge is transmitted, interpreted and made inspiring is the teacher, the instructor, the professor," he said.

He said we should be thankful that the university has perhaps more than its rightful share of such people.

"It is in honoring these people that, more than anything else we can do, pays the greatest tribute to the founders whom we honor tonight."

## Fortieth Birthday of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the March issue of the Sunflower Legionnaire, which is the official publication of the Kansas Department of the American Legion features a most interesting and informative article entitled "It's Our 40th Birthday." It tells of the birth and growth of the Legion, discusses its fight against communism and its community service, and concludes with a toast. This tribute is offered to the organization as the host of all the citizen armies of our time, manned by businessmen and laborers, professors and farmers, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, colored and white, men and women, American patriots from 25 to 75—charter members of war, champions of democracy and soldiers of peace—who have put aside their uniforms but have never laid down their arms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this outstanding article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S OUR 40TH BIRTHDAY

The American Legion from coast to coast—with the aid of its Auxiliary—will celebrate the 40th anniversary of its founding March 15–17, 1959, with thousands of gay parties, charter night dinners, founder recognitions, continuous membership awards, dances and other events.

BORN IN PARIS

The American Legion was born at the historic caucus of the first American Expeditionary Force in Paris, France, March 15–17, 1919. Its organization was completed at the continental caucus in St. Louis, Mo., May 8–10, 1919. The first national convention following in Minneapolis, Minn., November 10–12, 1919.

GROWTH

It has come a long way since its cradle days.

The American Legion has grown to dimensions undreamed of by its founders. Today it is a three-war organization, drawing its membership from the eligible veterans of World War I and II and the Korean conflict. Today it has a membership of nearly 3 million, and an Auxiliary of approximately 1 million women.

This nationwide organization of the American Legion is the envy of many other groups. Its programs are carried on under the guidance of 12 basic national commissions and some 40 subordinate committees and boards. This national committee structure is paralleled on the State, district, and post levels, giving the American Legion a chain of command which can muster a nationwide strength behind its objectives.

FINANCIAL STABILITY

A majority of its 17,000 posts owns its homes.

The total financial worth of the American Legion today including its national, department, district, and post resources and assets, is estimated at more than $300 million. It has an annual operating budget of nearly $6 million. It has a $2,500,000 national headquarters building in Indianapolis, Ind.; a $750,000 structure in Washington, D.C., and another big office in New York City.

PREAMBLE

The classic preamble to the constitution of the American Legion is its pattern for a patriotic way of life. The ideals set forth in this preamble are translated into terms of worthwhile daily living, through unselfish American Legion services in the fields of Americanism, child welfare, rehabilitation, national security, and community betterment.

IDEA MEN POPULAR

Specialized American Legion activities are simply endless and new projects are constantly being started.

A veteran with original ideas of doing good for somebody through a new activity, is most welcome in the average American Legion post. If you can come up with a new project that captures the imagination—and you can capture a lot of imaginations in the American Legion—you can get the manpower to carry it to a successful conclusion. The American Legion offers fine leadership training, and countless prominent Americans first learned to think on their feet at American Legion post meetings; first learned how to win friends and influence people in American Legion activities, and first learned to develop their vision and imagination in drafting programs at American Legion committee sessions.

LEGION WORLD AN OYSTER

The American Legion world is your oyster if you want to expand your personal influence.

Are you interested in working with youth? The American Legion has junior baseball, the largest organized teenage sports program in America, and they're always needing coaches, umpires, ticket takers, etc.

Boy Scouting? Our posts sponsor more than 4,300 troops and packs, and constantly need scoutmasters and other adult guidance.

Music? The American Legion is one of the largest sponsors of junior bands, drum and bugle corps and color guards.

Or, how 'bout Boys State? American Legion school awards? oratorical contest? rifle clubs? etc.

The American Legion is a recognized leader in the field of child welfare, and has expended more than $148 million in emergency financial aid to needy children. Most of this money went for food, clothing, and medical treatments. Through its legislative efforts it has safeguarded the right of all children, contributed to the establishment of many public services, streamlined juvenile court procedures, probation adoption and guardianship laws, and raised the standards of the care of all American youngsters.

STRENGTHENING CHURCHES

Are you interested in churchwork? Look at the nationwide "Back to God" movement of the American Legion, with its three top nondenominational objectives of promoting daily family devotions, regular Sabbath attendance, and the religious training of youth. Look at the American Legion's grace cards, and traveler's prayer cards.

FIGHTING COMMUNISM

Are you interested in doing something about curtailing the rapid advance of un-Godly communism? The American Legion, in all its years of existence, has never compromised with communism or any other imported alien "ism" which is un-American in concept or design. We have been fighting Communists all these years, with education, exposure through publicity, legislative influence, and cooperation with law enforcement agencies. It is indeed comforting to know that the American Legion has always promoted—and always will promote—the best interests of America and of the defenders of America; the two go together. The American Legion believes there is no room in this country for apologetic Americanism, because patriotism is love of country and pride of country.

COMMUNITY SERVICE

Are you interested in community service? This particular year, each of the more than 17,000 American Legion posts are being urged to promote at least one extra community project; most of them are doing it, and they will need your help.

CONCLUSION

The programs which have been projected only scratches the surface. There's been no mention of what the American Legion is doing in national security, disaster relief, hospital and rehabilitation programs, looking after widows and orphans, promoting scholarships, National Education Association, and many other programs. There's just no end to what's doing in the American Legion for the public good.

From its beginning, the American Legion has realized that the downfall of every great empire in history was first preceded by a discount of public service, and they have done, and are now doing, something about it.

The American Legion continues to be the most outspoken patriotic force in our Nation. It never leaves any doubt as to where it stands on matters that affect the welfare of America and preservation of our free institutions. It always speaks out in crisp and salty language for what it considers best for America. It is equally militant in opposing all influences or activities which are considered dangerous and detrimental.

So this toast is offered: A 40-gun salute to the American Legion on its 1959 birth anniversary, as the host of all the citizen armies of our time, manned by businessmen and laborers, professors and farmers, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, colored and white, men and women, American patriots from 25 to 75—charter members of war, champions of democracy and soldiers of peace—who have put aside their uniforms but have never laid down their arms.

## The Great Antagonism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members and the citizens generally may be interested in this thoughtful article by a distinguished doctor. We must understand ourselves and each other if we would live in peace.

THE GREAT ANTAGONISM

(By Jerome D. Frank, M.D.)

The nuclear arms race poses a mortal and increasingly pressing danger to civilization. It is obvious that the chief source of peril lies not in the nuclear weapons but in the human beings behind them, and that therefore the danger can only be resolved by changes in human attitudes. As a psychiatrist I have been struck by certain parallels between the behavior of nations today and that of mental patients. Though such parallels are always open to question, calling attention to them may serve to stimulate thinking about the human problems of the arms race.

The prize for which the United States and Russia are unwittingly contending is mutual destruction, yet neither side seems able to change its course of action. A nuclear accident or error of judgment which could trigger a full-scale war becomes more probable with each passing day, as the power to fire nuclear weapons becomes ever more widely diffused and the warning time for effective retaliation steadily decreases. A year ago Gen. Omar Bradley put it this way: "We are now speeding inexorably toward a day when even the ingenuity of our scientists may be unable to save us from the consequences of a single rash act or a lone reckless hand upon the switch of an uninterceptorable missile."

Society reacts to this terrifying situation in two characteristic ways, both of which impede its solution. One is a remarkable indifference, probably best illustrated by the almost total apathy concerning civil defense in both Russia and the United States; the other is the building of still more nuclear weapons, thereby intesifying the behavior which created the problem in the first place. Psychiatrists are familiar with both types of reaction in their patients and have termed them "denial" and "repetition compulsion."

In psychiatric jargon, denial is a patient's attempt to deal with a massive threat by denying its existence. Examples are the patient with blindness due to brain disease who insists that he can see, or the patient in the back ward of a mental hospital who maintains that she is in a palace. The term is also used, perhaps unwarrantably, for the refusal of some mortally ill patients to accept the imminence of death. Since death is inevitable, it is perhaps just as well that no human being can steadily contemplate his own demise. In fact, without this safety device, life would probably be unbearable. So it is understandable that each person sees himself as surviving a nuclear war, and this is not affected by the fact that millions are faced with death simultaneously.

It is particularly easy to deny the dangers of nuclear weapons because they are both unprecedented and impalpable. Nuclear energy is of an order of magnitude far beyond anything human beings have experienced before, except possibly those who live on the slopes of volcanoes. The vast majority of Americans have never experienced even the destruction wrought by conventional weapons. Our land has not directly suffered war for about 100 years, and then only a small area was involved. It is impossible to imagine the destructive power of 20 million tons of TNT, which a single hydrogen bomb can generate, much less what it would mean if hundreds or thousands of hydrogen bombs exploded. Moreover, the nuclear threat does not impinge on any of the senses. Submarines lurking offshore, airplanes miles overhead, poised guided missiles thousands of miles away, even strontium 90 nibbling at our bone marrow are all tasteless, odorless, silent, invisible, and impalpable. As a result it requires a constant effort of imagination to be aware of their presence.

Denial of a danger prevents taking action to remove it. If the problem does not exist psychologically, there is no incentive to do anything about it. When death is threatened from sources beyond human control, denial is as good a way of handling it as any, since nothing can be done. But when the death threat is of human making and can be removed by human beings, then the tendency to deny its existence is tragic.

More alarming than the tendency to deny the dangers of the nuclear arms race is the fact that attempts to find solutions lead only to intensification of a course of action which enhances the danger. Why can we not change behavior which we know is only making matters worse? One reason may be that we are frightened, and anxiety if too strong tends to make rigid both perception and behavior.

Patients with emotional illness often show remarkable rigidity of behavior, which Freud labeled the repetition compulsion. They keep repeating the very acts which cause trouble for them. This seems to be partly a result of their chronic anxiety. The patient clings to a faulty solution to a problem because he is afraid to give it up. The more anxious a person is, the more rigid his behavior tends to become. Similarly, the more menacing the arms race becomes, the more frantically we build more weapons and the less we seem able to seek more sensible alternatives. Anxiety also tends to freeze one's perceptions of the world. There is nothing harder to stand than ambiguity, so when faced with a dangerous situation one tends to oversimplify it. Everything becomes black and white. So use a technical term, thinking tends to become stereotyped.

This is seen clearly in the stereotype of the enemy. No matter who the enemy is or who we are, the enemy tends to be perceived as intellectually inferior but possessed of an animal cunning which enables him easily to outwit us. The enemy is seen as cruel, treacherous, and bent on aggression. Our side is seen as intellectually superior but guileless and therefore easily victimized, peace-loving, honorable, and fighting only in self defense. These stereotypes are probably as old as the human race and may be related to the fact that we are group animals. All gregarious creatures from ants to man automatically fear and hate the stranger, and whenever a group feels threatened by another, these primeval feelings reassert themselves. It is remarkable how rapidly the stereotype of the enemy can be shifted from one group to another. Scarcely more than a decade ago, Germany and Japan were cast in this role and Russia was our noble ally. Russia has now changed places with Germany and Japan, and we are not even embarrassed by the memory of the recent pictures of these three countries.

The fact that the enemy—whoever he may be—is viewed as completely untrustworthy is a major source of tensions leading to war.

The terrible thing about the mutual distrust of enemies is that it is justified. Some enemies are untrustworthy to begin with, but all become so eventually. Enemies cannot trust each other because each is forced to act in such a way as to justify the other's misgivings. This is an example of what the sociologist Robert K. Merton has termed the "self-fulfilling prophecy."

The operation of the self-fulfilling prophecy is perhaps been seen in the behavior of individuals. All social behavior tends to elicit corresponding behavior from the person toward whom it is directed. Friendliness begets a friendly response, hostility a hostile one. So if you expect someone to react to you in a certain way, you may act toward him in such a manner that he reacts in the way you predicted. Thus you cause your own prophecy to be fulfilled.

This can be seen most clearly in psychiatric patients, because of the rigidity of their behavior. A good example is the paranoid patient who expects everyone to be his enemy. You may be disposed to be friendly when you first meet him. Since he is sure you hate him, however, he persistently rebuffs your advances and maintains a surly, suspicious manner. In the face of this you are very apt to come to dislike him. Thus he succeeds in confirming his prophecy that everyone is against him, and will be even more suspicious of the next person he meets.

The same kind of mechanism operates at the level of societies. Russia and the United States each claim to base their foreign policy on the premise that the other would attack if it dared, and so each behaves in such a way as to make an attack increasingly likely. As Gen. Douglas MacArthur pointed out in a speech to the American Legion in 1955, present tensions are "kept alive by two great illusions. The one, a complete belief on the part of the Soviet world that the capitalist powers are preparing to attack it; that sooner or later we intend to strike. And the other, a complete belief on the part of the capitalist countries that the Sovies are preparing to attack us. Both are wrong. Each side, so far as the masses are concerned, is equally desirous of peace. For either side, war with the other would mean nothing but disaster. Both equally dread it. But the constant acceleration of preparation may well, without specific intent, ultimately produce a spontaneous combustion."

The mutual expectancy of Russia and the United States that the other plans to attack leads each to negotiate to gain a supposed advantage, intensifying the mutual distrust. Russia wanted to ban atomic weapons when we alone had them; we want to ban outer space as an area of conflict now that Russia seems to be ahead in this field. We ring Russia with bomber and missile bases, she treacherously crushes Hungary and develops ICBM's, each thereby strengthening the other's fear of attack and increasing the probability that it will occur.

Another source of our inability to break out of our suicidal behavior pattern is that the existence of limitless destructive energy has drastically changed the traditional meanings of certain words and phrases, such as "defense," "national security," and "balance of power." Use of these in their former meanings has become so automatic that we no longer subject them to critical scrutiny, especially since their connotations are reassuring. As a result, we may commit ourselves to a false conclusion even before we have started to think. It is especially hard to realize that the words are being misused because everyone does it from partisans of world government to isolationists. Moreover the misuse is casual, as if it were self-evident, which helps it to escape critical scrutiny.

For example, we automatically refer to our nuclear arms policy as one of defense, yet there is no defense against nuclear weapons in the strict sense of the term. According to the dictionary, "defense" is "the state of being defended," and "defend" is defined as "to shield from attack or violence, protect." In preatomic days it was a comforting thought that for each new offense weapon,

a genuine defense was eventually developed. Even though the protection it afforded was never perfect, it was adequate. Today, when one fighter-bomber with nuclear weapons carries more destructive power than all the bombers in World War II, a defense that is even 90 percent effective would not prevent vast destruction. What is really meant by defense today is deterrence through threat of retaliation. But in using the word defense to justify continued arming, we automatically slip into thinking of it in its old connotation. For example, Robert Nathan recently spoke of our creating a massive defensive shield. There is no shield against nuclear weapons, but only a precarious balance of terror which is, at best, a brief reprive and which may, with luck, gain us enough time to find a better solution.

Another phrase which no longer means anything is "balance of power," and concepts implied by it, such as catching up with the Russians, are equally meaningless. For phrases implying relative strength have no meaning when each side can destroy the other many times over. What does "catch up" mean when, according to President Eisenhower, we can already bring near annihilation to Russia? And how do we know when we have caught up? We are said to have about 35,000 atom bombs; Russia 10,000. Are we balanced or not?

A third phrase which is rapidly losing its meaning is "national security." These words imply that one nation can be secure at the expense of the security of other nations. No nation can control the fallout it receives from atomic explosions anywhere in the world; soon no nation will be able to control its own weather. Every inch of the globe can soon come under observation or attack from earth satellites. Those who think in terms of national security already foresee America fighting Russia for control of the moon. In today's world, either all nations are secure or none is.

Finally, there is the word "stalemate." Those who feel we must continue the arms race argue that if we maintain the stalemate long enough, eventually things will somehow work out. This term, derived from chess, conjures up an image of static deadlock which involves no further threat to either side. The arms race is far from static. Each day it continues increases the chances of mutual destruction and decreases the chances of peaceful accommodation. The use of stalemate to describe this state of affairs can only lead to faulty thinking and a false sense of security.

One sign that a person's thinking processes have gone seriously awry is inability to detect absurdities. For example, if a patient can see nothing wrong with the statement, Bill Jones' feet are so big he has to put his pants on over his head, psychiatrists worry about the intactness of his intellectual processes. Our failure to take account of the changed meanings of words leads us to make statements which are almost as absurd. A recent editorial in the Baltimore Sun spoke of the grim business of balancing power against power as our only means of assuring peace. How can balancing power against power, which in the past has led only to war, assure peace? And what does it means to balance power against power after each side has enough power to destroy the other many times over? Pronouncements about American missile and bomber bases in the NATO countries contain a more striking absurdity, which passes unnoticed, perhaps because the contradictory thoughts do not occur in the same statement. The contradictory statements are that these bases will enable us to retaliate instantly, and that the missiles cannot be fired except after consulting with our allies.

This is the kind of semantic tangle in which we find ourselves today. We seem to have slipped into George Orwell's world of doublethink without knowing it.

To summarize: the inability of Russia and America to break out of the arms race may involve several psychological factors. Fear tends to make us deny the existence of the danger, especially since the threat lies outside previous experience. When we do face up to it, the same fear makes it difficult for each country to change the behavior which creates the danger, especially since each is forced to behave in such a way as to confirm the other's suspicisons—the self-fulfilling prophecy.

These social attitudes are probably as old as mankind. In the past they have regularly led to wars which destroyed small portions of humanity. From the standpoint of the human race this was tolerable, for there were always enough survivors. Now, for the first time, these attitudes must be drastically modified if the human adventure is to continue. The task is made more difficult because nuclear energy has changed the traditional meanings of certain words that we habitually use in thinking about the issues of war and peace.

Psychotherapy tries to produce beneficial changes of attitude in individuals. Whether principles of psychotherapy can be applied to societies is highly questionable, but the implications of certain of these principles for halting the nuclear arms race may warrant exploration.

Psychotherapy tries to help the patient to see his problems and his faulty solutions more clearly, as the first step toward finding better ones. At the same time, by offering emotional support, the psychotherapist tries to reduce the patient's anxiety and help him to find the courage to experiment with more flexible, less stereotyped ways of perceiving others and behaving toward them. By improving his ability to communicate with others, the patient gains more satisfactions and suffers less frustrations, thereby diminishing his anxiety. Thus a process of progressive improvement may be started. For this process to succeed, the patient must have confidence that the therapist is competent to help him and has his welfare at heart.

In attempting to apply phychotherapeutic principles to today's sick world, the obvious question is: Who is to be the psychotherapist? Who has the confidence of both the United States and Russia, and is viewed by them as compentent to resolve their differences? At first glance the question seems absurd, yet certain groups may potentially function in this way. The industrially backward and relatively unarmed nations, small and large, who can only lose by a nuclear war may be able through the United Nations gradually to modify the behavior of the major powers. Many nuclear physicists seem able to focus on the welfare or humanity regardless of the side of the Iron Curtain from which they come, and their prestige is great in all nations. That both Russia and the United States agreed to a conference to devise adequate measures of inspection of a test ban on nuclear weapons is a sign that both, at least provisionally, trust the other's scientists as well as their own.

Even in the absence of a psychotherapist, psychotherapeutic principles may be applicable to aspects of our present dilemma. For example, they suggest that it is vitally important for each person to make a constant effort to keep his thinking straight. One must fight the tendency to deny the extent and immediacy of the danger, and make sure the words one habitually uses in thinking about the problem are appropriate. Only in these ways can the real nature of the issues be kept clearly in mind.

The psychotherapeutic emphasis on improved communication seems especially relevant. Communication between Russians and Americans at every level should be encouraged. As we come to see each other engaged in our occupations at home, we may find grounds for mutual understanding which are now hidden by the stereotype of the enemy. Today Russian and American scientists collaborate successfully in the International Geophysical Year, athletes compete without bloodshed, and artists from each country have been enthusiastically welcomed in the other. So we may hope that expanded communication between Russia and the United States may, in time, help weaken the will of each to destroy the other without diminishing the will to compete by peaceful means.

But the beneficial effects of improved communication appear only slowly, and the danger increases rapidly. What is needed is a change in our behavior toward Russia today, especially at the conference table. We now enter into negotiations to call Russia's bluff or to justify further arming by proving that negotiations are futile. This guarantees failure and an intensification of mutual distrust. To break this vicious circle we would have to negotiate on the assumption that the Russians want peace as strongly as we do. Just as changing habitual neurotic behavior involves risk for a patient, so this change of attitude would also involve some risk, but it is not as great as the danger entailed by our present course. If we can look beyond our fears, there are signs that the risk may not be as great as we think. It is true that no country, including Russia and the United States, can be trusted when its vital interests are involved, but Russia has a vital interest in maintaining peace.

There is no doubt that Russia is bending every effort to make the entire world a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but she is achieving her goal so successfully by means short of war that she would seem to have much more to lose than to gain by trying to destroy us at great cost to herself. She knows much more of the horrors of war than we do. In the last war she lost an estimated 7 million soldiers and 20 million to 40 million civilians; we lost 300,000 soldiers and a negligible number of civilians. She is making immense strides in education, science, and industry; and despite our talk of catching up, her rate of gain in these areas far exceeds ours. She is being equally successful in winning the uncommitted nations by exporting technicians and doctors, increasing monetary aid, and, above all, by the example of a nation that has pulled itself up from an industrially backward country to a preeminent position in one generation.

Nor must it be assumed that the Russian and American ways of life will always be totally incompatible. Russia is still a ruthless dictatorship, but stirrings of freedom are discernible. Dr. Horsley Gantt, an American psychiatrist who speaks Russian fluently, was constantly accompanied by an interpreter on a visit to Russia some 20 years ago. On a recent trip he was allowed to go alone to visit his colleagues, and they were not afraid to receive him. News dispatches in the past year have contained many suggestions that political, industrial, legal, and agricultural policies are in flux, and transfer of power within Russia has become more peaceful and orderly. Although the treacherous execution of Nagy shows that Russia's policy toward the satellites is still one of terror, it may be significant that since the execution of Beria, no defeated Russian leader has been publicly killed.

If we and Russia can break away from the stereotype of each other as the enemy, we may be able to reach an agreement to stop testing nuclear weapons, with an arrangement for mutual inspection. Regardless of its effect on nuclear armaments, such an agreement, if it worked, would be of the utmost psychological importance. For it

would be the first, and therefore the most crucial, step toward the establishment of mutual confidence. Then it would become possible to move further along the road to the ultimate goal: a general system for maintaining world peace and disarmament.

## Warren Blocks Payroll Exhibit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, written by its alert Washington correspondent, Morris Cunningham:

WARREN BLOCKS PAYROLL EXHIBIT—REPORTER NOT ALLOWED TO EXAMINE RECORDS

WASHINGTON, March 23.—Chief Justice Earl Warren Monday refused to permit an examination of the Supreme Court payroll.

The Court's press officer, Banning E. Whittington, simultaneously denied that any relatives of the Justices or Court officers are among the Court's about 200 employees.

The request to examine the payroll, made by a reporter for the Commercial Appeal, was prompted by the current revelations of nepotism on Capitol Hill and the widespread protests against the refusal of some Senators to make the office payrolls public.

REASON IS GIVEN

The only reason for the Chief Justice's refusal to make the court's payroll public, as relayed by Mr. Whittington, was that it would be against policy.

"We haven't had any employees here who were related to any officer or any justice, at least since 1953, and I don't think we've had any in modern years," Mr. Whittington said.

A Federal law, in effect in varying forms since 1887 prohibits Federal judges or justices from employing relatives. Now section 458 of title 28 of the United States Code, states:

"No person shall be appointed to or employed in any office or duty in any court who is related by affinity or consanguinity within the degree of first cousin to any justice or judge of such court."

The Supreme Court's appropriation for this fiscal year which ends June 30, is $1,703,335.

SALARIES ARE INCLUDED

It includes $1,249,000 to pay the $35,500-a-year salary of the Chief Justice and the $35,000-a-year salaries of the eight associate justices, plus the salaries and wages of all other officers and employees.

A Senator's maximum allowance for employees is $70,980. It ranges as low as $49,980, depending upon the population of the State the Senator represents.

Senators hire their own employees. And the law gives Chief Justice Warren the say-so over the hiring of Supreme Court employees. The law says Supreme Court employees "may be employed and assigned by the Chief Justice."

The Supreme Court's current apropriation also includes $74,500 "for miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve."

AUTO IS FINAL ITEM

Other items are $90,000 for printing expenses, and $284,000 for maintenance of the ornate Supreme Court Building.

A final item is $5,835 "for purchase, exchange, lease, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Chief Justice."

A study of prior appropriation bills shows this $5,835 item first appeared in the appropriation passed by Congress July 7, 1955, the year after Mr. Warren became Chief Justice.

Despite fluctuations in automobile prices the same amount has been appropriated, for the same purpose, every year since then.

Mr. Whittington said Chief Justice Warren's Cadillac is traded for a new one every year, but he was unable to explain why exactly the same amount of money is required every year.

## Threat of Floods, Drought as Seen in Chimneys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the increased discharge of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere could result in the flooding of our major seaports in 50 years. This is just one of the many startling theories with which our country's oceanographic experts are now grappling.

Problems such as these have tremendous implications not only in scientific circles but as components of military strategy as well. Neglect of the field of oceanic research due to lack of appropriations could eventually doom our Nation to the status of a second-class power. In this connection, it is interesting to note that on March 24, Soviet oceanic scientists reported another scientific first when they announced recording the lowest oceanic depth ever achieved, 36,173 feet near the Mariana Islands. This dramatically points up further the American scientific lag in this vital field.

The failure of the United States to invest in a comprehensive national program of oceanic research recommended by the National Academy of Sciences Committee of Oceanography might well prove disastrous to our national development and defense posture.

The following article, one in a series of 13 which originally appeared in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, vividly illustrates some of the possibilities we may face in the future.

THREAT OF FLOODS, DROUGHT IS SEEN IN CHIMNEYS

(By Everett S. Allen)

By the end of this century, the earth's mean temperature could rise 1° C., resulting in devastating floods and scorching aridity. This statement was published last May in the Yale Scientific magazine, and although highly controversial among oceanographers, it involves one of the most startling aspects of their present research.

The crux of this problem, as stated by Dr. Bruno Giletti and Dr. Wallace Broecker at Lamont Observatory, Columbia University, is this: "There is practical concern about the effect on the earth's climate of the increased amounts of carbon dioxide injected into the atmosphere by mankind's consumption of coal and oil.

TEMPERATURES RISING

"The warmer climate that might result from this process could raise such problems as coastal flooding due to rise in sea level and increased aridity in certain areas due to increased evaporation rates."

Obviously, the considerations here border on those concerned with using weather as a weapon, but in this instance, there is the suggestion that even in the peaceful pursuits of industry, man may be pressing toward some unfortunate atmospheric changes.

This trend may already be well underway. A report of the Special Committee on Oceanic Research last August noted, regarding the last 50 years, the average temperature over Eastern North America and northern Europe has markedly increased, while elsewhere prolonged droughts have destroyed the work and hopes of decades.

"Will this trend continue over the next 50 years, or will it be reversed? Because we do not have sufficient understanding of the processes that control climate, we are unable to make a forecast.

"OCEANS PLAY PART

"It is probable that the waters of the oceans play a major role in changing climates. For example, an excess of heat from the sun can be stored in the deep water and slowly released over many years to warm the air. Likewise, the amount of carbon dioxide in the air controls, at least to some extent, the average air temperature and the loss of heat from the earth.

"Any change in the atmospheric carbon dioxide, for example by the addition of that provided from fossil fuel (peat, coal) combustion, may be damped or modified by the absorption of carbon dioxide in the ocean waters."

With regard to abnormally high tides and coastal flooding, this aspect of the situation focuses attention upon the Greenland and Antarctic ice caps, which are estimated to be 5,000 to 6,000 feet thick. If they were completely melted by rising earth-atmosphere temperatures, the resultant water added to the oceans would result in a sea level rise of approximately 100 feet

New York City, which has a subway entrance only 8 feet above normal high water, and most of the world's other major seaports would be inundated.

VIEW IS CONTROVERSIAL

Certain earth scientists particularly interested in the carbon dioxide problem already have predicted this may occur within the next 100 years, although this belief is not generally held, and is viewed among oceanographers as highly controversial.

The basic reasoning behind this theory is as follows:

The temperature of the earth's atmosphere is governed in considerable measure by the amount of heat received and retained from the sun. Not all solar heat is retained, because some things on earth, such as rocks, reflect the sun's rays and bounce them back into outer space. This makes for a certain heat loss.

Carbon dioxide in the air surrounding the earth acts like one-way insulation as far as the sun's heat is concerned. It lets the heat come through to the earth, but it prevents much of this heat from bouncing back into outer space. The more carbon dioxide there is in the air, the more of this heat is trapped within the earth's atmosphere. If enough of it were trapped, the temperature of the earth's atmosphere would warm up, in time.

FIGURES UNCERTAIN

Some scientists studying the carbon dioxide situation suggest this is happening right now. They suggest the carbon dioxide content of the earth's atmosphere may have increased

from 1 to 10 percent since about 1900, due principally to increasing industrialization and the consequent increase in coal-burning. Even if it is only 1 or 2 percent, that is considered a great deal, for it would be sufficient to influence climate change.

Unfortunately, such figures are clouded because nobody knows how much carbon dioxide there was in the atmosphere before the world's chimneys started pouring it out in smoke. Marine scientists hope to dig some air out of an old glacier pocket; this obviously would predate world smokestacks and might provide some helpful statistics on what preindustrial atmosphere was like.

Of critical importance is this factor: The temperature of the earth's atmosphere does not have to change much to produce major results. During the earth's period of full-scale glaciation, perhaps 30,000 to 50,000 years ago, when glacier ice came at least as far south as what now is Chicago, the temperature of the earth's atmosphere was probably no more than 10°C. colder than it now is.

UP 2°

An increase of 4°C. probably would be sufficient to melt the polar ice caps.

By comparison, studies indicate the temperature of the Northern Hemisphere has warmed up generally about 2°C. in the last 50 years.

It has been suggested this rise in temperature may be due in part to the fact that the oceans are unable to absorb enough carbon dioxide to keep the air content of this gas from increasing. This could be because the oceans are not turning over rapidly enough—that is, bringing deep water back up to the surface and vice versa.

Ocean turnover depends considerably upon temperature differences. Deep water is warmed by the earth's core; if surface water becomes cooler, it sinks, replacing this slightly warmer water. Such a cycle would bring up the deeper water until it, too, had absorbed carbon dioxide, oxygen and other gases and sank again.

OCEAN CHANGE NOTED

A warming of the earth's atmosphere, which now appears to be occurring, would conceivably slow this process of turnover. The surface water eventually would absorb all the carbon dioxide it could, then, still not being replaced by other water, the sea's absorption of carbon dioxide would be reduced.

Since more carbon dioxide would remain in the air, therefore, the atmospheric temperature would tend to rise even more, slowing the absorption process still further.

The little research ship Crawford of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution recently reenacted a study made 30 years ago by the German vessel Meteor. Water samples were collected at great depths across the South Atlantic in 15° south latitude. It was found that the amount of oxygen dissolved in the water had decreased slightly, but uniformly, during the intervening years.

BIG QUESTIONS

It was thought this might mean a slowing of deep-water replacement which was a result of—or a prelude to—climate change.

The big questions which oceanographers seek to answer in this problem that may be of critical importance to the future welfare of mankind in the words of one report, are these:

1. How rapidly is the carbon dioxide content of the earth's atmosphere increasing?
2. How rapidly is the ocean absorbing carbon dioxide?
3. How many degrees of temperature rise will occur if the atmosphere doubles in carbon dioxide concentration, which it conceivably could do?

Some scientists do not think the theory of an appreciable rise in sea level within a century is well founded. They suggest a 5-degree Centigrade rise might melt the polar caps in 5,000 years. This is admittedly conjecture, however, because it is based in part on the length of time required to melt the caps at the end of the glacial period when, as far as man knows, carbon dioxide played no part in the process.

GLACIERS RETREAT

Most scientists, however, watching the earth glaciers retreat slowly but steadily in the face of warming atmosphere, agree the great ice sheets eventually will melt and raise the level of the seas.

To what degree mankind is hastening this process, and whether it will take 50 years or 5,000, they do not know, but they also agree this is something science ought to find out if it can.

Thus, as part of the International Geophysical Year, scientists, including American oceanographers, are attempting a carbon dioxide census, at sea and ashore, trying to find out how much of this gas there is in the earth's atmosphere at various points around the world. A similar check, perhaps 5 years from now, taken at the same points, would offer the first indication of the rate of increase and the degree of seriousness of the problem.

## Tax Ruling Discriminatory to Small Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to legislation which I introduced on Tuesday last, March 24, 1959, H.R. 5982, to amend section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a husband and wife shall be treated as one shareholder for purposes of determining whether a corporation is a small business corporation.

The occasion for initiating this legislation was brought about by reason of a ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on November 26, 1958, to the effect that, in a community-property State like my own State of Washington, a married stockholder must be counted double, once for the husband and once for the wife.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall, in an effort to provide sorely needed tax relief to small business corporations, in 1958 Congress enacted an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code providing that small business corporations with less than 11 stockholders can elect to have their income taxed to their individual stockholders, thus placing these stockholders in the same class with business partnerships for tax purposes. The November 1958 ruling of the Commissioner in effect denies this privilege to small business corporations within community-property States.

I believe there are some eight States in the Union, of which my own State is one, which fall under this discriminatory ruling, by reason of their community-property status. It is my opinion that this ruling is completely inconsistent with other portions of the Internal Revenue Code and does not reflect the intent of Congress, in the light of past legislation approved by this body. For the record I can cite at least two instances when the Commissioner of Internal Revenue attempted to treat residents of community-property States differently from residents of separate-property States. In this connection you will recall that formerly only the people residing in community-property States were permitted to take advantage of the tax-saving benefit of income splitting by a married couple making a joint tax return. Congress acted to strike down this discrimination, in favor of community-property States, to provide that married couples in all States of the Union filing a joint tax return may apply the tax-saving benefits of splitting all income between husband and wife. Also, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the matter of estate taxes. Here again Congress legislated to remove any differences in the manner with which the Internal Revenue Service treated survivors residing in community-property States as against survivors residing in separate-property States.

It would seem to me these two instances alone should provide sufficient precedent for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to enable him to establish nondiscriminatory rulings in applying the 1958 amendment to the Internal Revenue Code. It is entirely within the administrative authority of the Commissioner to do so. However, in discussing the matter with the Secretary of the Treasury although he has agreed to review the Commissioner's ruling, unfortunately he has also indicated that he feels the new regulations are proper.

Consequently, it appears the only sure relief available to constitutents in the State of Washington and other community-property States is through legislative processes. Therefore, believing that the Commissioner's ruling is obviously contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting the 1958 amendment to the Code, and also contrary to the spirit of past congressional enactments, as suggested previously, as well as being inconsistent with other aspects of the Internal Revenue Code, I have introduced the legislation previously referred to—H.R. 5982—in order to eliminate discriminatory and unfair treatment of residents of community-property States. I sincerely believe that the Commissioner's ruling creates an inequity in the tax status of the people living in these States as compared to those living in the rest of the United States, and I certainly hope that my colleagues on the House Committee of Ways and Means will see fit to take early and positive action on this bill.

## Ohio Solons Welcome Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure indeed to include the

following resolution, adopted by the 103d general assembly of the great State of Ohio in a gesture of welcome to our new State, Hawaii:

RESOLUTION OF THE OHIO SENATE EXPRESSING THE PLEASURE OF THE 103D OHIO GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE RECENT ACTION BY CONGRESS TO ADMIT HAWAII TO STATEHOOD

"Whereas the members of the 103d General Assembly of the State of Ohio were overjoyed upon learning of the action taken by Congress to admit the Territory of Hawaii to statehood; and

"Whereas this enriched Territory with its charming residents has long deserved to be a State of the United States as evidenced by its sacrifices, contributions, and unflinching courage in war and peace toward the preservation of democracy; and

"Whereas the residents in Hawaii have devoted their talents, abilities, and their lives in an all-out effort to become a part of the greatest Nation in the history of mankind; and

"Whereas Congress has at last recognized that the Territory of Hawaii possesses the great democratic qualities of statehood which will enable this island paradise to become one of the great States in the Union: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the 103d general assembly adopt this resolution and cause a copy thereof to be spread upon the journal, thus expressing our gratitude and pleasure that Congress has seen fit to extend statehood to the Territory of Hawaii thus enabling it to become the 50th State of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House, President pro tempore of the Senate, the Honorable WILLIAM F. QUINN, Governor of Hawaii, and to each Member of Congress from Ohio."

I, Joseph W. Bartunek, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9 adopted by the Ohio Senate Monday, March 16, 1959, and by the Ohio House of Representatives Tuesday, March 17, 1959.

[SEAL] JOSEPH W. BARTUNEK,
*Clerk of the Senate.*

## Col. Farrant L. Turner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago it was a great shock, and a distinct sorrow, for me to learn that Col. Farrant L. Turner had passed on from a heart attack—that the divine providence had taken him from us in the midst of our common endeavors in behalf of justice.

During the early 1940's I became strikingly aware of his deep concern for his fellow men, especially those unreasonably placed under suspicion. His innate strength and profound courage enabled him to do what he believed to be right despite seemingly insurmountable odds. The Old Man will always be remembered by his boys to whom he will remain an inspiration because of his courageous spirit as well as his gracious, understanding nature.

Colonel Turner lived in accordance with the highest ideals of American citizenship. It is especially significant that he lived to see the attainment of Hawaii statehood, a goal to which he was sincerely dedicated and to whose achievement he contributed so much. His many public activities in community and charitable organizations, such as his service as president of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, and as secretary of Hawaii, were distinguished by the extra effort he gave to everything he put his hand to.

Hawaii has, in its greatest hour, lost an outstanding and beloved citizen who gave freely of himself and his talents to his community that there might be a better life for all. He will be deeply missed, but his example of manhood and citizenship will continue, in the years to come, to be an inspiration to us all.

All Hawaii joins in expressing our profoundest sympathy and prayers to his bereaved widow, and to his son, who shared with him life's joys and sorrows.

Colonel Turner has gone to the reward the Almighty reserves for "good and faithful servants." He will grant to the Colonel's family comfort and strength in their hour of grief.

Mr. Speaker, Hawaii mourns the death of her son, Col. Farrant Turner. Nothing could express our grief more eloquently than the following beautiful, moving eulogy written by one of his boys:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Mar. 23, 1959]

A VET'S TRIBUTE TO THE OLD MAN

(By Ben H. Tamashiro)

On the northeast slopes of Punchbowl, where the trade winds first come rolling over the top to sweep across the grandeur of the Pacific National Memorial Cemetery, they buried the Old Man today. It was the kind of morning that Farrant Turner loved so well—the shine of the morning sun softened by the trade winds as they pushed the clouds across the brief perimeter of the Hawaiian landscape.

To compare.

It was a morning so different from that day in late September of 1943 when Farrant Turner led the 100th Infantry Battalion into its first day of battle near the little Italian town of Chiusano. And if it took a day of battle to prove his principle, Farrant Turner was also ready for the consequences.

The guiding principle in Farrant Turner's life was his love for the people of Hawaii. Wherever they came from, whatever they stood for, the people came first. But there is such a thing as loving too much and too well, and if the Old Man had a fault, it was this matter of giving of his love and not having enough left over for himself. Selfless devotion to the good and welfare of the community—to this end, Farrant Turner continued to serve.

And where or what is the proof of this man to whom we ascribe so much? Is it not a matter of a palace, or a thousand gold coins, or a title to a square piece of land? No, no—not for the Old Man.

The proof of the worth of this man was shown by the assemblage that stood on the slopes of Puowaina as the flag-draped casket was gently laid to rest upon the ground. Here was the backbone of the land—the people. From the common man and the average citizen on up through the strata of society—they were all there.

Here was a cross section of Hawaii, the Hawaii to whom the Old Man gave so much. Farrant Turner must have died a thousand deaths to prove to the world that the people of Hawaii should have a place in the sun along with all the rest. And here on this morning, alongside the Old Man's grave, stood the living symbol of the faith of Farrant Turner.

The man who gave so much to all of us has now come to rest and it is so befitting that he should be buried here on Puowaina—the Hill of Sacrifice—buried beside those others who also sacrificed their lives for the very principle that Farrant Turner so outstandingly lived and practiced through all his years.

## U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food Inspection Insures Delivery of Quality Milk and Other Farm Products to All Sections of the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, prescribing a cure for the ills of agriculture is a popular sport these days. One reason for the wide range of ideas is the great variety of farm products grown in this country which are produced under so many different conditions.

That is one reason it is heartening to see a farmer-owned and operated group, such as the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, work together as a solid unit. Cooperation is something agriculture needs to maintain its vital and free place in the American economy. I am troubled, however, to note the advertisements sponsored by the Maryland and Virginia farmers in the press and on the radio and television of the Washington area which are abusing the remainder of the Nation's farmers in an effort to preserve the status quo in the Washington milkshed.

Specifically, I am referring to the association's advertisements about "tired old milk" joggled thousands of miles, which has not been inspected "by your own inspectors." This gives the impression that milk not produced within the Washington milkshed area is unfit for consumption in this area. Fifty years ago this was probably true. Agricultural research has solved the problems of long range milk shipping. Milk from the Middle West or the South, which is produced to meet the Federal milk regulations, is as safe as that produced in Montgomery or Loudon Counties.

The argument of the milk cooperative might be carried a step farther to include many other perishable agricultural commodities. Are the people of the east coast to stop buying the quality beef and pork, eggs, poultry, fresh fruits, and vegetables shipped to them just because they have to be joggled over roads and rails to reach their dinner tables? It is equally silly to attack the U.S. Department of Agriculture's long years of experience in food inspection because these

checks are not made locally. I believe the most of our Nation's consumers are much more willing to leave this critical inspection service to the trained, professional personnel of USDA.

Every segment of American agriculture suffers when a group of farmers attacks the quality of farm products. Agricultural research has provided the knowledge to produce foods that are high in quality as well as bountiful in supply. Americans never have to worry about buying unsafe food when purchasing groceries in the neighborhood stores. This is not true of most of the rest of the world.

I am proud that the farm commodity groups in Iowa, such as the Iowa Beef Producers Association and the American Dairy Association of Iowa, have directed their efforts toward the production and marketing of commodity products, not just to furthering the local farm interests.

The old adage of "United we stand, divided we fall" certainly applies to agriculture today. We have but a short time to present a united front for agriculture if farmers are to get a suitable program to fit their needs. Otherwise we shall have a program forced upon the agriculture of Iowa—and Maryland and Virginia—that will not benefit any sector of agriculture.

## An Inspiring Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the questionnaire which I distributed recently to my constituents has brought many interesting responses, and one of the most inspiring was that of a 74-year-old pioneer, Billie Shoun of Ottumwa, S. Dak. The independent, self-reliant spirit he displays could well be emulated by all of us.

I believe excerpts from his letter would be of value to my colleagues:

I believe as Lincoln did that right makes might and in that faith dare to do our duty. * * * We are not honest with ourselves and of course then can't do justice to our young people and what then can you expect but juvenile delinquency? We don't need anything more for schools until we have something to safeguard posterity and have higher ideals than we have now.

Regarding the national debt, if we can't pay any in the good times that we like to talk about, the last 20 years or more, when our dollar has been a robber, then when will we pay it? Our forefathers knew the dollar couldn't be trusted so they inscribed on it "In God We Trust." Where is our trust today? Is it in a fast depleting dollar and missiles? We can't pass the buck forever. The belt will have to be tightened.

When we have handed out billions that we didn't have to our own people and billions to foreign countries that we didn't have, and lots of people say we can't pay to strengthen our national defense, how can we tighten the belt on the paunchy guys here at home and still keep handing it out to foreign countries? I have never figured that friendship that one had to buy was worth much, but I do know that we need all the God-fearing, liberty-loving people that we can get boosting for justice for all mankind, and there is so much to be done at home.

Regarding unemployment compensation, what people need is hard work and lots of it. That is what builds morale.

I was born 74 years ago in the best part of the world's history and in the best part of the world and had wonderful opportunities as did all my buddies of that age. And you know that all that I can show for it that is worth talking about and that goes for all my generation is that we have put a mortgage on the kids for $280 billion and put them in bed with buddy Russia. If that won't make a man ashamed, what will?

We have followed the compromise road long enough and it only leads to destruction. If a man doesn't think more of the future welfare of his country than he does of his own personal affairs, he doesn't deserve to live.

## Result of Oakland County, Mich., Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are removed at some distance from our constituents by our responsibilities here in Washington, we are constantly faced with the problem of determining the needs and wants of the people of our districts. Except for letters, occasional visits, telephone calls, and telegrams from those back home, we quite often are cut off from effective communication with those we represent and who elected us to office.

To help correct this situation, I mailed out some 12,000 questionnaires to my constituents in Oakland County, Mich., earlier in this session. For the past few weeks, my office staff and myself have been deluged with replies in a much greater volume than we had anticipated.

It seems as if a great many of the people of Oakland County like this method of expressing their opinions on important national issues which are now facing Congress. And the results of this public opinion pool have paid large dividends to me in many ways. In the first place, I was able to contact a great many people who ordinarily do not get in touch with their Congressman. These people, in the main, have no axes to grind or projects to push. They are acutely aware of our Federal Government and what it is doing to their pocketbooks and and purchasing power. But in many instances, they kept these views to themselves.

Secondly, by carefully selecting the areas in which these questionnaires were mailed, I was able to eliminate one-party answers to the questions, and I believe that I was able to receive a very good sampling of the opinions of my constituents on a number of key matters.

Third, very few of those who returned the questionnaire stopped with straight "yes" or "no" answers. Most included their reasons for answering the questions as they did, or voiced their opinions on other subjects involving our Federal Government. These written replies ran into the thousands, and were of great interest and help to me. Problems were raised of which I was not aware, solutions were offered which were worthy of a great deal of consideration by all of us here in the House of Representatives, blank spots and shortcomings in our Nation's laws were uncovered.

For all these reasons, the answers to this questionnaire were of great help to me. Some definite conclusions can be drawn as to the views of my constituents on many of our pressing problems through this sampling of opinion. Some of these results were surprising to me, and I am quite certain they will be surprising to my colleagues.

For instance, more than 62 percent of those who replied favor an increase of 1½ cents in the gasoline tax if such action will mean more and better highways in our Nation. This expression is particularly important because my District is in the heart of the automobile manufacturing area, and a great many of the auto firms have voiced opposition to this proposed increase in the gasoline tax.

Some 81 percent favor an increase in the present limit on outside earnings from $1,200 to $3,000 for those receiving social security. I hope that the Members of the Ways and Means Committee will take note of this expression of public opinion on a bill, H.R. 2735, which I reintroduced this session of Congress.

Our farm subsidy program was viewed with special disfavor by 82 percent of those who replied. Many said they want the agriculture subsidy program eliminated completely, while others thought it should be drastically cut in the fact of our mounting surpluses and the tremendous cost to our taxpayers.

About 69 percent favored a freer flow of political leaders, students, farmers, and others between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Rather than increase our national debt, more than 62 percent said they would be willing to pay increased taxes if such action is necessary to provide adequate Federal services. This endorsement of a balanced Federal budget is outstanding, and should be observed closely by my colleagues. Coupled with the many comments on the need for further economy in our Federal Government, the fiscal principles as outlined by our President to Congress appear to have a great deal of backing in my home district.

My constituents favored the President's budget recommendations in such fields as housing, postal subsidies, aids to mineral industries, community facilities, and airports. But on three subjects, there appears to be some disagreement. Those who replied are almost evenly divided on the matters of Federal aid to school construction, aid to depressed

areas, and further payments into the highway building fund.

The comments enclosed with the questionnaires covered almost every phase of our Federal Government's operations. But the largest number of comments was on the need for further economies in Federal expenditures, a balanced budget, and an end to deficit spending. Some questioned our foreign-aid program, others were critical of our defense effort, either stating that we were spending too much money or not enough in providing an adequate defense force for our Nation.

At this point, it might be well to point out that the results of this questionnaire are not going to tie my hands here in the House of Representatives. If I feel that I have more knowledge of the subjects and a better understanding of the problems involved on particular issues, then I most certainly will vote my own convictions on these matters. However, the results of those or any other survey I make in the future will be considered very carefully, as I have found that my constituents have shown a very great awareness of the issues involved, and they have some very definite opinions on how our Nation's problems should be solved.

Following is a tabulation of the results of this survey:

The President's budget for the year beginning next July 1 calls for expenditures of 77 billion and an estimated income of 77.1 billion. Additional expenditures totaling several billions are being proposed by some Members of Congress. How would you vote on the following?

| Questions | | Yes | No | No comment |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Aids to housing | $1,000,000,000 | 24.2 | 65.8 | 10.0 |
| Added payments under soil bank | 700,000,000 | 4.3 | 67.1 | 28.6 |
| Increased payment to civil service retirement fund | 600,000,000 | 25.4 | 70.1 | 4.5 |
| Aid for school construction | 480,000,000 | 46.0 | 49.7 | 4.3 |
| Postal subsidy (over amount proposed in 1960 budget) | 350,000,000 | 12.7 | 80.9 | 6.4 |
| Payments to highway building fund | 250,000,000 | 46.0 | 48.6 | 5.4 |
| Aid to minerals industry | 160,000,000 | 9.3 | 82.4 | 8.3 |
| Financing community facilities | 150,000,000 | 12.9 | 80.0 | 7.1 |
| Grants to airports | 110,000,000 | 26.1 | 66.9 | 7.0 |
| Aid to depressed areas | 100,000,000 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 6.6 |
| If you have answered "Yes" to any of the above, would you recommend paying for the projects by— | | | | |
| An increase in taxes? | | 64.0 | 36.0 | ------ |
| Or, an addition to the Federal debt? | | 23.0 | 77.0 | ------ |
| Do you favor increasing the limit on outside earnings for those receiving social security benefits from the present $1,200 to $3,000 per year? | | 81.2 | 14.5 | 3.3 |
| Do you favor a freer flow of political leaders, students, farmers, businessmen, etc., between the United States and the U.S.S.R.? | | 69.0 | 24.9 | 6.1 |
| Do you favor a trial test for pay TV? | | 33.7 | 58.8 | 5.5 |
| Do you favor increasing the Federal gas tax from 3 to 4½ cents per gallon to maintain pay as you go in building Federal-aid highways? | | 62.6 | 32.0 | 5.4 |
| Should extra funds be provided for veterans' hospital facilities? | | 27.1 | 64.1 | 8.8 |
| The prices of 12 farm commodities are supported by Federal law at prescribed minimum levels. In general, do you approve of the support program? | | 13.3 | 82.2 | 4.5 |
| Would you favor a national fair trade law permitting establishment of a minimum price on trademark or brand-named merchandise? | | 22.2 | 72.2 | 5.6 |
| Do you favor Federal legislation raising the minimum wage from the current $1 an hour? | | 40.0 | 57.2 | 2.8 |

## Tribute to a Statemaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, legislation to admit Hawaii as a State of the Union has become law as a result of the efforts of many dedicated people from all walks of life. The final decision was made by the two Houses of the 86th Congress.

The genial, indefatigable gentleman from New York, the Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN, is Mr. Statehood of this greatest deliberative body. In the other body of this Congress, Mr. Statehood is the energetic and knowledgeable junior Senator from Washington, the Honorable HENRY MARTIN JACKSON.

The New York Times recently paid tribute to the statemakers of each House. I am pleased to include herewith the fine article which paid justly due honor to Mr. Statehood of the other body of the Congress:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1959]

MEN IN THE NEWS

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Senator HENRY MARTIN JACKSON is a man whose interests are as varied as his own Pacific Northwest.

His colleagues regard him as a persistent thinker if not always a profound one, and they know that he brings to his work constant diligence, determination, and drive. This persistence has been applied to the problems of getting Hawaii into the Union—a project he has been in charge of, as chairman of an Interior Subcommittee, for the last several years.

It has also brought Senator JACKSON prominence in the missile field as one of the most consistent critics of the administration. In fact, this amiable, 46-year-old Democratic bachelor from the State of Washington was one of the men directly responsible for President Eisenhower's first full-scale briefing on the U.S. missile program.

He has been known to wonder lately whether this did any good, but at least in mid-1955 he and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat of New Mexico, who is chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, did send the President a memorandum suggesting that he be fully informed of missile progress.

The President accepted the suggestion.

For a man who feels so deep an urgency about his country's defenses, "SCOOP" JACKSON—the nickname comes from paper-carrying days as a boy in his native Everett, Wash.—is outwardly among the calmest and most serene of men.

There are times when his voice rises forcefully and he displays a carefully staged indignation, but, for the most part, he seems to have inherited the easygoing, good nature of his Norwegian parents.

He came to Washington in 1941 as a Member of the House of Representatives.

In 1952, after a lively campaign, he unseated a Republican Senator, Harry P. Cain, by a vote of 595,673 to 460,884.

The following year he received much publicity when he and two Democratic colleagues resigned from the Permanent Investigation Subcommittee in protest against the actions of the then chairman, the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin.

Born May 31, 1912, the future Senator was educated in Everett public schools. At Everett High School he was a member of the debating team and manager of the basketball team. He entered Stanford University but soon transferred to the University of Washington in Seattle. He worked his way through college and the law school, receiving his bachelor of laws degree in 1935.

## The Christian Press of Colombia Describes Fidel Castro as a Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 12, 1959*

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a United Press International report about two editorials in the official organ of the cardinal, archbishops, and bishops of the beloved Republic of Colombia. The report is particularly meaningful because this weekly was moremost in upholding freedom and decency against the military dictatorship of Gen. Gustavo Rojas Pinilla of Colombia. Like every religious newspaper, this publication supports the cause of representative government and genuine socioeconomic progress. The United Press International dispatch follows:

BOGOTA, March 15, 1959.—El Catolicismo, official organ of the Colombian hierarchy, publishes in this week's edition two editorials. One criticizes Fidel Castro, who is described as the new dictator in Cuba and another piece which condemns Dr. Manuel Urrutia, provisional President of Cuba.

The Catholic weekly, directed by two priests and celebrated for its opposition to the ex-dictator Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, now declares that "Mr. Fidel Castro, lucky fighter, inexpert politician, lacking in intellectual maturity, a demagog and exhibitionist, has disappointed all human beings in the world who uphold democracy and the juridical norms that should guide its exercise."

The editorial continues:

Converted into a hero by force of circumstances, Castro was able to conquer and to overthrow the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista which was a disgrace for his country.

But he has not known how to be either just or democratic. His capacity for combat brought him a victory which the world greeted with enthusiasm. Thereupon, Castro demonstrated that he is notoriously inferior to the task which it was hoped he would fulfill.

Then the weekly mentions the trial of the Cuban aviators and the intervention of Fidel Castro forcing a revocation of the verdict of innocent and adds:

Such action is nothing more or less than the exaltation of brute force, erection of the will of the tyrant into law. This does not mean passing judgment upon the men accused in the sense that they are claimed to be innocent or guilty. The fact is that they were acquitted by the very companions of the bearded hero by so-called revolutionary justice. It was the same type of revolutionary justice which had been responsible for the summary death sentences, imposed before television cameras and in the stadium, trials and decisions which the photogenic soldier of liberty had claimed were worthy of respect when, throughout America, men believed the contrary.

The review concludes its first editorial in the following terms:

It grieves us to note this new obstacle for our sister Republic, Cuba, on the difficult road it has to traverse toward democracy. We unite our voice of protest and of reprobation to the voices of all Christian leaders, of all those jurists, and all true democrats who have spoken out against this act which makes Fidel Castro the new Cuban despot.

In another commentary, the same weekly recalls that, during the visit of Miss Universe, Senorita Luz Marina, in Habana, President Manuel Urrutia received her and said:

Thirty years in the judiciary compel me to respect the decision that made Senorita Zuluaga Miss Universe.

The editors added the following comment:

It is a great pity that so many years on the bench have merely served to make Dr. Urrutia show reverence for a decision proferred in a beauty contest and have been totally insufficient to make him accept another decision much more important and distinctly juridical; namely, the decision reached by a court of his own fatherland, the acquittal of the Cuban aviators accused of grave crimes. Thirty years of judicial experience have yielded to the demand for a new trial and have been climaxed by the recent condemnation.

## Clear Nation's Water Supply of Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 4, 1959*

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement I submitted to the House Committee on Public Works in support of H.R. 246, to amend the Water Pollution Act:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MELVIN PRICE BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 246 TO AMEND THE WATER POLLUTION ACT

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your courtesy in allowing time for this statement as the committee renews its study of the vital need for expanding the role the Federal Government plays in clearing the Nation's water supply of pollution, and the bill I introduced on the subject, H.R. 246.

This committee and the Congress have demonstrated their belief that the Federal Government has an absolute need to support the efforts of local communities in the construction of municipal waste treatment plants.

The Congress last year exercised its right as a coordinate and equal branch of the Government to decline agreement with an Executive recommendation that the Federal antipollution program be halted. With all respect for the authority of the Executive to make such proposals, the Congress used its own authority and discretion in the legislative field to express its conviction that the recommendation was shortsighted.

We now have an additional year of experience, Mr. Chairman, to inform us of the need for continued and additional Federal aid to our hard-pressed municipalities in the water-pollution field.

We have abundant evidence that water pollution is a national problem—that it affects all our major rivers, bays, and streams. We know that water poisoned high on a river system adversely affects the health and welfare of communities perhaps hundreds of miles downstream.

Our rivers have been turned by carelessness and neglect into open cesspools. We are debarred from the full exploitation of our water resources by pollution that prevents the reuse of water in otherwise perfectly feasible and economical ways.

We observed that in the first years of the Federal antipollution program, more than 90 percent of the communities with projects that were approved averaged only slightly more than 9,000 in population.

These communities do not have the resources to build expensive waste treatment plants from their tax funds alone. Yet the record shows that with Federal encouragement and reasonable aid, they are anxious to move ahead. For every Federal dollar obligated, at least a total of $4 was planned by the separate communities. The smaller municipalities are not unwilling to do their part in the gigantic task of making our rivers once again the pure streams that we inherited. Wise and discriminating Federal aid, with full participation by the States to make sure that projects are useful, is an enormous stimulus to action.

In my bill, I express the conviction that the time has come to increase the total authorized expenditure of Federal funds, to raise the maximum grant for single projects from $250,000 to $500,000, and to ease the existing single-grant restriction that makes it impractical for two or several communities to coordinate plans and to cooperate in their projects.

The chairman of your Subcomimttee on Rivers and Harbors, the Honorable JOHN BLATNIK of Minnesota, in the bill on which Congress acted 3 years ago proposed that the total Federal authorization be placed at $1 billion. Only $500 million was authorized, and time has proved that a Federal expenditure of $1 billion is clearly needed.

Hundreds of communities now have projects underway, and we know from the applications that much wider and more vigorous action is essential. The municipalities that want to live up to their responsibilities for restoring and preserving a pure water supply deserve the encouragement of a broadened Federal commitment.

We know, also, that smaller communities would willingly undertake significant projects if the single-grant restriction were removed.

In numerous areas there are two, three or more communities contiguously located that cannot meet their waste treatment needs on an artificially separated basis. We ought to make it possible for them to cooperate in planning projects, in working together, and in actually proceeding with coordinated construction in which each community can use most productively its grant of Federal assistance.

H.R. 246 also proposes that if any State allotted sums for projects does not actually obligate funds for any project by approving it, the sums shall then be reallotted by the Surgeon General to the States which have approved projects otherwise lacking aid.

The provision would not deprive any State of Federal assistance for projects that in its own authority it approves or certifies as entitled to priority. It simply proposes that if a State withholds approval or certification after a Federal allotment is made, the sum thus not actually obligated shall go to other States that have approved projects but which have exhausted their normal share of the total annual amount available.

The bill, H.R. 246, contains one other section that seems to me of considerable importance. It would add to the original act a Davis-Bacon clause providing for the payment of prevailing wages on projects financed through the program.

This committee is familiar, of course, with the fact that in the highway program the Congress adopted the Davis-Bacon provision for the payment of prevailing wages. The Davis-Bacon Act, laying the foundation of this, was adopted originally in 1931 and was signed into law by President Hoover. It expressed the philosophy that Federal grants should not be used to finance projects wherein the wage scales would be so low as to exercise a depressing effect on the wages paid elsewhere in a locality on similar construction projects.

This philosophy seems to me wholly reasonable and proved in its usefulness. It encourages the stabilization of the construction industry and it safeguards against the danger that Federal funds might be spent in ways that produce socially undesirable results. It is a provision that is willingly met by responsible construction firms and it limits the possibility that other firms would gain a competitive advantage in bidding on projects stimulated and partially financed with Federal money by calculating their bids on wages below the normal amount actually paid as the going wage on similar projects in each locality.

## National Conditions Affecting Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include comments made by Mr. Paul Stark, of Louisiana, Mo., in a conference on national conditions affecting inflation.

Mr. Stark said:

You cannot return to the old dollar. The best we can hope for is to make the present dollar sound. Hold the line there. Return must include not only a balanced current budget but also an amortization fund to retire some of the bonds each year.

Nothing would be so helpful in refunding the next issue, long- or short-time bonds, so as to be able to retire a part of them as they come due. Until we start periodic amortization no palliatives will bring confidence that the dollar's value will be kept at its present purchasing power. Once stabilized, our role in international affairs will have a different significance. The world will know that our assurances are backed up not only by men

and materials, but by a sound currency system as well.

No additional money should be voted until and unless the budget has been balanced with an amortization fund in operation. Every new assistance, no matter for whom or why, should be accompanied by a tax to pay interest and amortization.

The subdivisions of the Government, the States, and cities, are in better position to raise funds than the Federal Government. And that includes the District of Columbia. Its citizens can take care of themselves. They have settled there out of choice. The Government has not sent them there. And they can repatriate themselves any time they wish.

There are those who advance the theory that by greater spending you will increase the turnover and thereby alleviate unemployment. Any intelligent examination will show this argument to be wholly falacious. There is a point of diminishing return in the productive capacity of practically everything in the country, whether it be steel, copper, automobiles, or agricultural products. The difficulty is in distribution and consumption. There are not enough people in the United States to buy all the steel and automobiles produced in this country in addition to those imported—at lower prices. The rise in costs has priced many products out of the market and has thereby brought about increased unemployment.

Every proposal to appropriate, which would result in deficit spending, should be examined in it relation to the economy as a whole and its relationship to other nations.

There are many things which would pleasantly increase our standard of living but the first question should be whether we can have them now or should wait until we have met current expenses and retired the annual quota of national indebtedness.

We must take into consideration the rights of those hard-working and thrifty people who for years have put by their savings to take care of old age and dependents. And the rights of those retiring on annuities and pensions.

Mr. Speaker, on a more dramatic occasion a great statesman offered the alternative of "blood, toil, tears, and sweat." And in much the same vein President Eisenhower said last week:

We need to practice the self-discipline that freedom demands. We must concentrate our resources on those things we need most, minimizing those programs that make less decisive contributions to our Nation.

## Too Few Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we read every day of the needless loss of lives on our American highways and streets as a result of traffic accidents. Yet somehow we never grasp the full magnitude of the number of deaths caused this way.

Although many programs have been launched in an effort to cut down this terrible death toll—little progress seems to have been made. And, yet, no one will deny that much more remains to be done and should be done quickly.

I believe that the suggestion made by an official of the American Automobile Association, as expressed in the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Star Ledger on Saturday, March 21, is not only timely but worthy of sincere exploration and consideration:

TOO FEW FACTS

Despite the thousands of lives lost every year on the highways, too little is being done to pin down the causes of accidents.

A sound traffic safety program must be based on the facts. Too often, however, emotionalism is the guiding factor, simply because the facts are inadequate.

To remedy this, a top official of the American Automobile Association has suggested that the Federal Government undertake a program of research, cooperation with the States and coordinating experts' findings.

A thoroughgoing research program probably is needed as much as anything else before there can be an adequate highway safety program. It would make sense to put such a research program under the direction of the Federal Government with the view toward eventually forming a national safety program on the basis of the facts developed by the researchers.

## Bill To Correct Discrimination in Civil Service Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and I introduced companion legislation designed to correct what we feel is a weakness in the Civil Service Act which permits and agency to force the resignation of a Federal employee very possibly on personal or punitive grounds.

These bills, H.R. 6071 and H.R. 6062, were initiated by reason of the recent decision of the Civil Service Appeals Board denying the petition of one Joe King.

Very briefly, Mr. King appealed the right of his agency to force his resignation by eliminating his job in the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and refusing him the opportunity of accepting similar employment in the same agency without competitive examination. Therefore, his only alternative was to accept a job at one grade lower by bumping a nonveteran civil service employee with some 20 years seniority. This, Mr. King, as a matter of principle, refused to do.

The King case received national publicity. Joseph Young, writing in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, devoted his entire column to a critical report of the Board's action the day the decision was handed down. However, while both Congressman TOLLEFSON and I feel that Joe King has been discriminated against by reason of a loophole in the civil service regulations, the primary purpose of our legislation is to change these regulations by legislative action to prevent any similar injustice in the future.

Aside from his personal populatrity with his associates and subordinates in his own agency, one of the principal reasons Mr. King's case received national attention lies in the fact that thousands of Federal employees are visualizing themselves in the same situation, and with the precedent now established by the denial of his appeal every Federal employee in a similar situation is subject to the same discriminatory treatment.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my colleague and myself, I urge immediate action on the part of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on this urgent legislation to provide justice and to bolster employee morale.

## A Bill To Increase the Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives a bill which will provide for an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour, and extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. I had introduced similar legislation in previous Congresses, but favorable consideration had not been given the same by the committee.

You will recall, of course, that the Congress in 1955 during the 84th Congress passed legislation amending the Fair Labor Standards Act bringing the minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to $1 per hour, effective March 1, 1956, but no extension of the coverage of the act was enacted at that time. President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union speech on January 6, 1955, had recommended an increase in the minimum wage to 90 cents, and extension of the coverage to bring protection to many others, at that time excluded. A few days later, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, at a press conference, indicated that the administration planned to include retail and service workers under the coverage. However, when the administration bill was introduced, it did not include any provisions for extension of the coverage, although it did advocate the increase to 90 cents per hour.

The President's Economic Report transmitted to the Congress earlier this year again calls for extension and improvement in the coverage of the minimum wage. In addition, the recent conference of the AFL–CIO executive council held in Puerto Rico renewed its recommendations to the Congress to increase the present $1 per hour rate to $1.25, and that the coverage be extended to approximately 8 million workers now exempt, including certain employees of

the retail industries. At the present time, with the lingering unemployment problem, and in view of the continuing rise of living costs, such recommendations are certainly not out of line. There is no question about the fact that the minimum wage, even with the increase of several years ago, has failed to keep up with the cost of living. The unemployment figures for last year were tragic, and despite all the talk about expanding economy and healthy and vigorous recovery, the cold fact is that unemployment has increased steadily each month since last November. In February of this year it stood at 6.4 percent of the labor force.

The $1.25 hourly minimum and the extension of the coverage, called for in my bill, would put a more realistic floor beneath current wage levels, and would prevent the exploitation of many substandard, seasonal and low-wage workers. In addition, more purchasing power would be made available to our workers, thus stimulating our national economy, and bettering our standard of living.

I certainly hope that the Committee on Education and Labor, and the House itself will be in a position to consider this legislation favorably this year.

## Economic Embargo Only Answer to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following statement from the Northwest Trawlers Association, Inc., has been sent to the Washington State congressional delegation.

Legislation is needed to get the Japanese to join us in conservation of an important fishery resource:

BRISTOL BAY CLOSURE

*To Washington Congressional Delegation:*

Though the members of this association are concerned primarily in the producing of trawl fish, we certainly wish to register our sincere protest over the closure of Bristol Bay as announced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service this week. Many of the members of this association rely on salmon as a means of income during a portion of the fishing year and the closure of Bristol Bay to all fishing during 1959 will have a severe effect on the economic conditions within our fishery.

In protesting, it is not our purpose to be critical of the position of Secretary of Interior Seaton, for in our opinion, the move was a necessary one. Our protest is directed at the U.S. State Department for their failure to conclude negotiations with the Japanese Government to remove the Japanese fishermen from the high seas salmon fishery. The fishery industry has long warned that the closure of the bay was imminent if the Japanese were allowed to continue their fishery on Bristol Bay stocks. As the situation exists today, even if the Japanese were willing to withdraw from the high seas area, damages in previous years to immature stocks will mean a long road of critical conservation to bring back the once great Bristol Bay runs to their rightful place in the U.S. fishery economy.

We urge immediate hearings on the various bills now in the Congress which would ban the importation of salmon taken by Japanese on the high seas. With the lifting of the importation ban on salmon by the British, the effect of such legislation may be minimized. It is our further suggestion, therefore, that the ban be extended to all fishery products from Japan coming into the United States.

In our opinion, only one lever, that of economics, will be effective in the salmon industry's battle for survival. Negotiations at the level of the North Pacific Treaty Commission have ben stalemated. The efforts of the U.S. State Department to reach bilateral agreement with the Japanese has also ended to date, in an impasse. Only by economic embargo can we achieve our goal of maintaining the important Bristol Bay resource.

## A New Decade in Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington chapter of the National Defense Transportation Association has extended to me an invitation to be guest speaker at its annual dinner tonight.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the speech I have prepared for delivery at the dinner:

I am humbly and deeply grateful to your chapter for the great honor which you have extended to me tonight for this recognition by distinguished members in the Government and the transportation industry I shall ever cherish—and I thank you very much.

When your Mr. Mappes came to my office and asked me to be with you for this occasion, I must confess I was rather reluctant. As a matter of fact, I was at that time deeply involved with committee work and important legislative proposals, and perhaps did not manifest a great deal of enthusiasm. Of course, I had not idea that I was to be signally honored as you are doing.

I suppose, then, that I could not be considered as a volunteer, under the circumstances. Certainly not as it was with the young man who went to the county courthouse to obtain his marriage license and the clerk asked where was the bride-elect. The young man said: "Actually there was no election—the old gal just volunteered."

I have enjoyed the association with the transportation industry, and the work in connection with legislative problems that vitally affect the future welfare of the American people. Transportation and communications are two subjects very close to my heart. I suppose it is because I feel so deeply about the importance of them in every facet of our lives.

I only hope that my activity in connection with the problems of transportation has been such that this recognition—the honor you confer on me tonight—is deserving. I do feel that any such tribute which I receive must be shared in by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We work as a team and I feel it is the committee that deserves the distinguished service award of this chapter of the National Defense Transportation Association.

I welcome this opportunity to express some views on the transportation outlook of the next decade.

Much of what I have to say tonight has been said before by others more expert than I. The forward look at a new decade will also be a subject for other speakers, but perhaps my views, based on my experience as a public servant and one who has been concerned with the legislative needs of the great American transportation system, so vigorous in its competitive growth and so vital to every single American, will add a few brush strokes to this large and many-faceted picture.

First, of course, I find myself speaking on this occasion to experts in every field of transportation. While the situation provides a most sympathetic audience, it is also fraught with the perils of a layman discoursing on a technical subject to those who really know the subject.—Here, perhaps, is a view of a citizen user of transportation and from one who has listened with keen interest to the views of each form of transportation in quest of fair and equitable legislation.

In retrospect, we can see that the period following Columbus' discovery of America was charged with an excitement stemming in large part from the adventures on strange waters and unknown lands. This excitement, and these discoveries, entered into all forms of life and influenced every aspect of thinking. There felowed what we know as the Age of the Renaissance—a revival of poetry, literature, and the arts, a revolution in science, and a change in man's concepts of man, of his religion, and of his philosophy.

It goes without saying that today we stand on the threshold of another great Renaissance. Through the developments of science and the discoveries of the scientists during this International Geophysical Year, we have greatly extended the physical and psychological frontiers on earth. More than that, we now believe it is only a matter of time when man is no longer earthbound, that man's physical frontiers now are somewhere far out in space.

The excitement that goes with these new horizons, both on this earth and beyond it, is boundless. It is a terrific challenge to all engaged in the various fields of science. But that is only part of it. Veritably we stand today, as did the people of the age of Columbus, where a new Renaissance can be ours. It can be ours if we rise to the challenge that these new horizons present to our thinking in all phases of knowledge, to the need for readjusting, for revitalizing, for reappraising all of our past concepts, whether in the arts, philosophy, politics, geography, or in transportation and commerce.

After some years of consideration on the part of leaders in all fields of transportation, the Congress in 1940 passed a Transportation Act which included a statement of transportation policy. At the time it seemed the last word in an expression of policy concerning the Nation's approach to our great national transportation system and to each mode of transportation. It was a good statement. I subscribed to it. I presume that you did, too.

But tonight I should like to suggest that the times well may call for a reassessment of that policy. Does it fully express what our policy should be under the fast moving impact of the space age? What must be our policy to provide the transportation system so essential to our economy, to our defense, to the shipping and traveling needs of the public?

"The old has passed away, behold, and the new has come."

Basically, I think we can all agree that no modern nation can grow or prosper without an efficient and rapid system of transport. Each form of transportation has contributed its share in the development of our Nation. Each means of transport has had its day of support from Government and has repaid the American people manifold for such support. No one medium

of transportation could supply all of the needs of our complex civilization or meet our defense needs today. The 1950's have seen an adjustment in the relative volume position of the various forms of transport but each has shown a substantial growth and ability to meet the Nation's needs. We see throughout the world many countries blessed with more raw materials, equally suitable climate for high standards of living and yet, due to inadequate transport and communications, unable to compete in this fast-moving world. We have also seen the phenomenon of Great Britain where a great transport and communications concept for hundreds of years provided growth and prosperity to a nation seriously short of raw materials and limited in geography.

Equally it is apparent that rapid, efficient systems of transport and communications is a military necessity for any nation aspiring to high standing in the world community. The Armed Forces today of our Nation are completely dependent for the production and movement of necessary force for our national welfare and defense upon the adequacy and continuous improvement of our great national transportation network.

We cannot, as a Nation, for reasons of the national economy or national defense permit our transportation system to stand still or deteriorate. The Congress, representing the people, must exercise a minimum of legislative controls and a maximum of legislative encouragement to permit the continuous and healthy growth of our transportation network as the base of our prosperity and military strength.

We Americans are being challenged today by a different concept of the individual human being. Our transport system has been developed by free enterprise to the highest level of efficiency the world has ever seen. Our shipping and buying public enjoys many pleasures and luxuries impossible without the low-cost, competitive, rapid transport available today to move anything from hairpins to giant turbines quickly and at a cost which the shipper can afford to pay. But the requirements increase—the need is great for our economy and our military strength to keep pace with the Soviet challenge for world domination. No nation or individual can maintain a status quo growth and improvement is the only antithesis or deterioration. With our utter dependency on transportation for the welfare of our Nation, the challenge to our way of life on every front can only translate itself into a challenge to the transportation industry.

Many advances have been made in our transport system in the 1950's. In every phase of transportation great strides can be noted. In fact, I believe it can be said the 1950's saw the growth to maturity and relatively equal acceptance of the various segments of the American transportation system. We have seen in the 1950's the rapid replacement of less efficient steam locomotives by diesel power, representing a tremendous advance in the speed of service and the reductions of cost to our Nation's railroads. Had it not been for this and many other improvements, the railroads would have had hard sledding in meeting the demands and needs of the military and the public.

We have seen rapid strides in our motor carrier transportation system in the 1950's. More efficient units with lower costs and ease of handling has enabled the motor carrier industry to expand its services to the public and the national defense, and to meet the tremendous demand for high-speed door-to-door delivery. A vast improvement in our highway system was begun in the 1950's to be carried to conclusion in the decade ahead.

All of us have been excited by the phenomenal growth of air transport in the 1950's with complete acceptance, domestic and worldwide, for the movement of passengers and light freight, and a gradually opening phase of the movement of heavier types of freight needed by industry and peculiarly adapted to movement by air. The American air system is the world standard of competency.

The rapid expansion of our Nation's waterways and coastal shipping has astonished those of us who watch from the sidelines. Low costs and roll- roll-off ships and barges offer a real challenge in ideas to other forms of transport and a real service to the public.

I did not by any means intend to leave until last the many advances and improvements in overseas shipping. We are even now in the throes of a vast modernization of the movements of people and things by fast modern vessels geared to the rapid movement of our age. Nor do I fail to recognize the contribution of the Nation's vast pipeline network, greatly expanded and improved by new methods of automation in the 1950's, opening up entirely new industries in the field of chemicals produced from natural gas and providing new outlets for our petroleum products and new sources of fuel to industries throughout our Nation.

The 1950's have been a truly great chapter in the history of American transportation. No one knows this better than you gentlemen in the National Defense Transportation Association. You are both those who have dreamed and developed these modern miracles of technological progress and simultaneously put these innovations to work in the interest of the welfare and security of our people.

Much more must be done to improve this seemingly unimprovable system in the decade ahead. The public will demand the further reductions of relative cost to combat inflation and to continue to provide the base for our industrial growth and standards of living. (Even more, the challenge from abroad now shaping up so clearly not only in military and political areas but now more obviously in economic competition in the underdeveloped areas and for the markets of the world.) Wars are no longer fought primarily on the field of battle, as we all know. To lose the battle on any front, economic, political, or military, will be to lose the battle on all fronts.

Many may ask how the motor carrier and railroad industries have anything to do with meeting a Communist economic threat in South America, Africa, or Asia. For those who may ask the question, I believe the answer will be so evident as to be apparent even as the question is asked. Good transportation will be a part of every product, military or civil, which becomes a tool to defend our system of freedom against any threat, from any source. Inadequate transportation could contribute to the loss of the battle on any front.

In an effort to stimulate the thinking of you experts in transportation, but without the temerity to suggest how to accomplish the needed miracles of the 1960's, let me touch on only two major items which I feel most important to our Nation in the decade ahead.

Firstly, I feel this is the decade when we need to eliminate unnecessary expense in each form of transport. In other words, this must be a decade of cost consciousness. When growth has been as fast as in the 1950's—when new ideas and new developments come with great rapidity—wasteful procedures, excess personnel and sheer fat accrue. These contribute to passing on cost to the public and in turn becomes a part of the cost of every item consumed by the American public. In turn, each unnecessary rise in transportation cost makes more difficult our ability to compete in the world market. So, I would appeal to our modern miracle men of transportation to make the 1960's the decade of cost consciousness—a battening down of the hatches—keeping pace with the continuous flow of new ideas and new technological progress which I am sure will be forthcoming under our free enterprise competitive system.

This thought of increased efficiencies and cost controls leads me to the point which I consider the most challenging to transportation in the 1960's and one which will contribute the most to our national welfare. I refer to transportation integration. Too much sound and fury has been devoted to common ownership problems—too little to the integration of transport systems to benefit the shipping public, military and civil, with lower costs and faster delivery times. Each form of transport will have reached, by the end of this decade, a position of relative maturity. It is now no longer a question of monopoly and restraint of growth that is our national transportation problem. The real question is how can the special virtues of each mode of transport be harnessed together to benefit the shipping public and the national economy.

For example, the railroads are acknowledged to be among the very low cost transportation mediums. Yet, the railroads have a difficult problem with less than carload lot movements from shipper to consumer. The truck is an integral part of such movement and has found a positive place in the transportation world due to its flexibility. We Americans cannot do without either of these vital forms of transportation. Why not make a real breakthrough in the 1960's in the integration of truck and rail—whether it be piggy back, integrated container system, or combination rail and highway cars such as are now under development by our friends in the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad. The question of who owns the system, developed by such integration is far less important to our Nation than the speed and flexibility of the truck combined with the speed and low-cost of the rails.

We find this improvement factor available to us in other combinations. The airplane and the truck are natural partners for door-to-door, one waybill, one responsibility handling. For the things which can properly move by air transport, with its great speed, the truck-air combination is needed and must come in the 1960's.

We have seen some real examples of combined transport in our combination of railship in roll-on-roll-off programs. Truck ship experiments are also opening new vistas for integrated transportation. The military has done an outstanding job in container experiments to prove the efficiencies of combined transport. To a great degree combined pipeline-rail-truck transport has shown the way to combining efficiencies of various modes of transport.

Costs of terminal and transfer freight handling are the plague of each mode of transport. These are the seemingly uncontrollable facts of life to each of us. Why should we have to rehandle a military shipment from production to battle area 5 to 10 times when if we could find the proper method of integrated transportation, we could package the product at production point, deliver it and store it if necessary in its own package by five different modes of transport without handling.

This great need for integrated transportation is the challenge to you transportation experts, military and civil. Here is the area which will most benefit America in the next decade. For high value items and perishables and the postal services, overnight, door-to-door service from any point in the United States to any other point is a possible and needed achievement for the 1960's. This can be achieved by combination surface and air transport, properly integrated.

The combination of truck-rail, further exploitation of pipeline-rail-truck-barge and ship will speed deliveries of all commodities

and combat inflation by the efficiencies achieved. The military benefits could be staggering in inventory and obsolescence factor alone.

Let us then accept the transportation challenge of the 1960's—integrated transportation. Let each mode of transport give its best in accomplishment in its own field and integration with other modes.

The Congress will be receptive where legislation is needed, if such legislation is progressive and in the public need. In maturity no mode of transportation needs fear for its existence. If common ownership comes as a result of integration of two or more modes of transport it will be an obvious and desirable move, not as a means of domination by one mode of another. We Americans need all forms of transportation, but now we need the best elements of all, combined in the task of providing the best in transportation at the lowest cost.

Let us accept this challenge.

## Resolution of International Association of Chiefs of Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I am submitting for the RECORD a resolution by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, commending Mr. J. Edgar Hoover for his leadership and cooperation in strengthening law enforcement at all levels of Government:

"Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover during his 34 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has contributed immeasurably to raising law enforcement to a professional status; to the obtaining of public support and respect for law enforcement and to the ever increasing efficiency of our profession; and

"Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has continued to make available to local law enforcement the facilities of the FBI in training, scientific examinations, identification, and the administration of the Uniform Crime Reporting program; and

"Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has recently announced that special law enforcement conferences will be held throughout the United States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico during November and December of this year wherein the FBI will outline to State and local law enforcement officers the cooperative services of the FBI in connection with bombings and threats of bombings against educational and religious institutions; and

"Whereas the FBI has already rendered invaluable assistance to State and local officers in the investigation of bombings and threats of bombings of education and religious institutions; and

"Whereas by his continued effective opposition to the nationalization of the police forces of America the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has greatly strengthened law enforcement at all levels of government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the International Association of Chiefs of Police at its 65th annual conference at Miami Beach, Fla., on October 31, 1958, does hereby commend the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover for his integrity, efficiency, leadership, and cooperation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and the Attorney General of the United States and to the Appropriations and Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover."

The foregoing resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates to the 65th annual conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, asembled at Miami Beach, Fla., October 31, 1958.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the association this 1st day of December 1958.

[SEAL] LEROY E. WIKE,
*Executive Secretary.*

## Invocation, Statehood Celebration, Honolulu Stadium, March 13, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the depth of the religious faith of the people of Hawaii was the fact that in the midst of joyful demonstrations, the whole Hawaiian community turned to God with prayers of thankfulness coupled with devout prayers for guidance in meeting new responsibilities as citizens of a soon-to-be State.

In a statehood observance celebration at the Honolulu Stadium on March 13, 1959, the Reverend Dr. Abraham K. Akaka delivered the following invocation which movingly expresses the thoughts which were foremost in the hearts and minds of the people of Hawaii when the news first reached them that statehood had been approved by the Congress of the United States:

No Iehowa ka honua ame kona mea e piha ai, o ke ao nei ame ka poe e noho ana maloko ona, no ka mea, nana no ia i hookumu maluna iho o na kai, a i hoopaa hoi maluna iho o na wai.

Almighty God, our Father, before whose face the empires of the past have risen and fallen away, we thank Thee for the deep faith on which the foundations of our land were laid. We thank Thee for the sacrifices of its pioneers, for the remembrance of great leaders of our Nation whose wisdom has saved us, whose devotion has chastened us, and whose characters have inspired us. And we thank Thee for the great power committed to our care, by which we are challenged to do Thy will on the earth.

We thank Thee for statehood, and pray this prayer for our Nation. Establish this our Nation in righteousness; and in the personal character and public integrity of our people, make her foundations sure. Deliver us from the disgrace of political corruption and malicious designs of lawless men. Save us from prejudice of race and religion; from loss of liberties bequeathed to us by our forefathers; from careless acceptance of our heritage and neglect of its responsibilities; from failure of moral fiber in our citizenship, from vulgarity of life; from loss of social conscience and collapse of national character.

Keep us from pride of mind and boasting tongue. Save our national loyalty from narrowness and our flag from selfish shame. By our love for Thee and for our land, may we measure the love of others for their lands, honoring their devotion as we honor our own, and acknowledging Thee one God.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

## Federal Excise Tax on Telephone Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of communications from constituents in my Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts requesting that the 10 percent excise tax on all telephone service be eliminated.

I agree wholeheartedly with my constituents in their feeling that this excise tax should be repealed. When this tax was proposed during the war years in order that our Government might receive larger tax revenues and unnecessary service would be curtailed, it was never thought that it would become a permanent fixture of the economy of our Nation. The longer these taxes are continued, the greater the danger that they will be perpetuated.

This tax is a consumer tax, collected by the telephone company and turned over to the Federal Government. I feel that these taxes are unfair and discriminatory against telephone users as a group. Telephone service has become a daily necessity. However, under the present situation Congress treats it as a luxury by subjecting it to the same taxes that are imposed on unnecessary luxuries. It is the only household utility service so taxed. The argument is made that we cannot repeal this tax because the Federal Government needs the revenue. This reasoning seems to be out of order because we all know that we can obtain needed revenue from other tax sources. For example, the revenue the Federal Government would lose by the repeal of this tax could easily be replaced by enacting a bill, H.R. 1845 introduced by me, or similar bills which would reduce the present depletion allowance given to the oil and natural gas industries from 27.5 percent to 15 percent. By plugging up this tax loophole, the Federal Government would receive $420 million annually.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the telephone users of my district are unhappy about having to pay excise taxes on this needed service. Their feelings on this important matter are well stated in a number of editorials appearing in papers published in my district. As these editorials make clear, the nature of the tax demands early repeal. I am sure Members of the House will find the editorials a constructive contribution to our thinking:

[From the Malden Press, Jan. 22, 1959]

TELEPHONE SERVICE IS NOT A LUXURY

Although never popular when payment is due, taxes are probably the most popular

topic of conversation in the country. Increased taxes have also produced many jokes on the absurdity of some proposed levies.

All of these jokes are not funny, however, and many fail to realize that some existing taxes are about as absurd as the ones joked about.

In reality, if you discuss high taxes with a friend over the telephone, you are taxed for doing that. If you telephone a public official to protest high taxes you are taxed for that. And if you decide to give in and call the bank concerning a loan to pay your taxes, you are even taxed for doing that.

Funny? It might be, if it weren't true.

A Federal excise tax of 10 percent is collected on all telephone service.

Despite complaining and joking, most Americans realize that taxes are a necessary part of living in a country such as ours, and that American life is well worth the cost.

Americans have every right, however, to voice stern opposition to unreasonable or unfair taxes, and the excise tax on telephone service appears to be just such a levy.

WAR MEASURE

In the first place, Federal excise taxes have been imposed on communications services only in times of national emergency such as World War I, the depression of the thirties, and World War II.

Each time the taxes were intended as a temporary measure. The high level of governmental expenditures in the immediate postwar period, extended by the Korean war and subsequent events, has thus far prevented elimination of telephone excise taxes.

Congress, in the 1954 Revenue Act, made the first step toward reducing high wartime excise tax rates. At that time the telephone excise rates were reduced to the present, though still high level of 10 percent.

It was noted in Congress that these taxes had been enacted to discourage use of service during the war as well as to raise revenue and reduce purchasing power, but no date was set for the end of this tax measure.

The public has a right, and even a duty, to demand such an end.

Telephone service is the only household utility subjected to such a tax and the rate is as high as the rate on such luxuries as furs, jewelry, and cosmetics.

There may have been a time when a telephone could be considered a luxury, but that time has long passed. Telephone service is essential to both home and business, and it is hard to even imagine how our country would function without the use of the telephone.

DOUBLE TAXATION

By paying a Federal excise tax on telephone service, users of the telephone (and who does not fall into this category?) are actually being doubly taxed.

Telephone companies as all businesses pay large corporation taxes and naturally these taxes are reflected in costs to the consumer. In regard to telephone service, however, the consumer pays not only this indirect tax but must also pay the direct excise tax.

All pay this direct tax on telephone service regardless of income or type of telephone use. It's 10 percent from everyone without any consideration of ability to pay or the need of phone service.

Another fact amplifying the discriminatory nature of telephone excise taxes is that following repeal of the tax on transportation of property, effective August 1, 1958, the telephone tax has come to represent more than 50 percent of all miscellaneous Federal excise tax collections.

To permit telephone service to bear such a disproportionate share of revenues derived from miscellaneous excise taxes is not consistent with fairness or sound taxing policy.

The next time you receive a telephone bill, study it closely. If you object to the 10 percent tax levy contained in it, complain by all means but make your complaints heard.

Let your Representative in Congress know that you object to such an unfair tax either by writing or calling him.

And if you call, it might be well to remind him that your ordinary taxes are paying his salary and, therefore, it seems a little foolish that you should have to pay a special tax for talking to him on the telephone.

---

[From the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item, Jan. 26, 1959]

TEMPORARY FOREVER

Put a tax on something and the chances are more than good that it will stay there, whether it is called a temporary tax or not.

Take the case of the telephone excise tax, for instance. The telephone was taxed during World War II, as an emergency measure. Other utilities are not taxed in this way, not the basic ones, like gas, power, and water. Yet the telephone tax remains, 14 years or so after the war's end, and whenever one pays one's tax bill, one pays an extra 10 percent in a tax that was levied to help the struggle against the Axis, a term in itself all but forgotten except by history students.

The telephone company in fact makes the excellent point that when you use the telephone you pay two taxes. One is the indirect taxation which is part of the price of anything for which the corporation providing it is taxed. This corporate taxation is part of the telephone bill, inherent in the price of the service sold. Then there is another 10 percent on top of this indirect tax. The total is, of course, millions of dollars a year, first deemed necessary to pay for a war but taken from the public ever since anyway.

The tax has been reduced, to 10 percent. Yet there still remains no justification for it at all. It puts the telephone, a necessity to anyone's existence today, in a class with liquor, cigarettes, and other luxury items from which Uncle Sam takes so much tax revenue.

The telephone excise tax is opposed by almost everyone, except the lawmakers by whom tax legislation is passed.

How long the tax will be permitted to remain in effect is largely to be decided by the amount and volume of complaints from the public. And the public should make a good deal of noise. It is being taxed permanently on the basis which was to end when the emergency of a war, now over more than a decade, ended.

---

[From the Stoneham (Mass.) Press, Feb. 19, 1959]

TELEPHONE TEA PARTY

Only fooling, Cousin; couldn't run my business without them. But these temporary taxes are getting to be a party—a tea party. Maybe a permanent tea party.

Look real hard at the next telephone bill you receive. There is a separate item called a telephone excise tax. What many of us don't know is that it is a Federal excise tax.

Mother Bell acts as a collection agency on this item and sends 10 percent of the charges for local and long-distance telephone service to Uncle Sam.

When this poor relative asked why, I got this answer: "Historically, Federal excise taxes are imposed on communications in times of national emergency on a temporary basis—World War I, the depression of the 1930's, and World War II." Also this: "The tax rate on telephone service is as high as the rate of tax on such nonessentials as furs, jewelry, cosmetics, liquor, and similar items."

Whoa, now, Cousin; let me ask a question: What war are we fighting now? What depression? What's temporary? As long as you accept the bite? You mean, Cousin, to call the police or fire department or emergency to my doctor, or even my relatives, is a luxury?

I'm inclined to think that Mother Bell is being hoodwinked by our Uncle Sam, sure as true love. I don't see any tax on any other household utility—gas, water, or electricity.

Well, this isn't Russia, so I think I'll write a little note to my Congressman; he loves to hear from me.

You should do the same, Cousin. Ax the excise tax.

---

[From the Somerville Journal Press, Feb. 19, 1959]

AN UNFAIR EXCISE TAX

No one likes to be taxed, but we all realize the necessity for taxation. Likewise, no one complains about fair taxation.

However, we are now paying a tax that has come to be completely unfair taxation, namely, the 10 percent Federal excise tax on telephone service.

An excise tax is a luxury tax that is placed on such items as jewelry, liquor, furs, cigarettes, etc. Certainly the telephone nowadays cannot be placed in the same category as these luxury items. This excise tax on telephone service cost the average customer $3.78 per month in 1958 in direct and indirect taxes. Most people are amazed when they learn the amount of the tax on their telephone service. Actually, it is the only household utility service that is subject to a use tax.

There has been agitation in Washington to get rid of this tax, but the Joint Federal-State Action Committee has not only ignored pleas to eliminate the excise tax on phone service but now proposes a split of the 10 percent levy on a six-three-one basis.

Six percent of this tax revenue would remain with the Federal Government and three percent would be returned to the State in which it is collected, to be used by such States for waste treatment projects and vocational educational programs. The remaining one percent would be distributed by the Government to those States collecting insufficient money for these programs.

This means, of course, that telephone users would be paying a Federal and State tax on service, and each governing body would have the power to raise its own percent on service at any time. And the way things are going, tax-wise, today the chances are that there would be an increase in this tax.

If the tax is unfair in the first place, and we so maintain, then the thing to do is get rid of it, not propagate it and open the way for a still further increase in the levy.

---

[From the Reading (Mass.) Chronicle, Mar. 19, 1959]

A DISCRIMINATORY TAX

Once taxed, always taxed. Apparently this is to be the philosophy of government at both the national and state level for years to come. Under the pressure of seeking new sources of taxation during times of seemingly endless emergency there is practically no type of financial or business transaction that has not been considered fair game for the tax collector.

Once such a levy has been made it is practically impossible to discontinue it, as emergency or no, increased government spending programs at all levels require more, not less sources of tax revenue.

A ludicrous example of how poor tax legislation can be perpetuated is the tax you now pay on the use of your telephone.

A tax on long-distance telephone calls was first enacted during World War I and was repealed in 1924, well after that emergency had ended. The long distance calls were again made the target of taxation in the depression emergency of 1932. In 1941, a year of obvious emergency, the tax was broadened to include for the first time local telephone service.

Subsequent revenue acts during the war raised taxes on telephone services to their highest levels • • • 15 percent on local service, and as high as 25 percent on long-distance calls. The rate of the tax levy was the same as the so-called luxury taxes on mink coats and jewelry. The justification for the tax given at the time was that it would discourage the use of an essential and overburdened vital service. In time of war it is impolite to argue with such reasoning.

Almost 14 years after the war has ended the tax is still with us only slightly modified from its highest wartime rate. It is an unfair, discriminatory tax. There is no semblance of luxury remaining in the installation of a telephone in your home or place of business. The telephone has become a basic utility, and without it the process of living in 1959 would come to a standstill. Better than 90 percent of Reading homes are now equipped with a telehpone.

A tax on telephone service today is little more than a head tax. A tax on that service appears to be no more equitable than would be a tax on the water you drink.

The telephone companies are battling this tax for you. They are big business and in such a debate their words many times hit an insensitive ear. Strange as it may seem, your opinion could carry more weight.

You might consider telephoning your Congressman the next time he returns to Boston. The tax on that call would be only 10 percent.

## Broadcasting Magazine Speaks Out on "Equal Time"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Because of the mounting interest and concern over the recent ruling of the Federal Communications Commission pertaining to the "equal time" provision of the Federal Communications Act, I would like to once again call attention to the seriousness of this problem and the need for corrective legislation as proposed in H.R. 5389, which I introduced in the Congress recently. The position of the broadcasting industry, so ably expressed recently by Mr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, is reiterated in an editorial appearing in the March 23, 1959, issue of Broadcasting magazine.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial:

SECTION 315'S LAST LEGS

If they succeed in obtaining repeal of the political broadcasting law, broadcasters will owe a great debt to three people, the President of the United States, the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and a political failure named Lar Daly.

Those three have given significant momentum of the campaign against section 315 of the Communications Act.

The debt owed Mr. Daly is obvious. He was a candidate with utterly no future, a laughingstock. Yet the FCC, quite properly, we believe, decided that section 315 required Chicago television stations to give him time. If the FCC had decided otherwise, it would have been misreading the law. By applying it correctly, the FCC created the perfect illustration of one of the law's imbecilities.

The debt owed Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Doerfer is also obvious. The President's description of section 315 as being "ridiculous" was apt. It must have effect on members of the Congress. Mr. Doerfer's call for repeal of section 315 must also be treated with respect. As the chief officer in charge of administering the Communications Act he is in the most expert position to observe its imperfections.

But however influential the President and Mr. Doerfer may be, repeal of section 315 will not come about automatically now that they have spoken. It will be extremely difficult to persuade the perpetual candidates on Capitol Hill to relinquish their grip on political broadcasting.

Repeal of section 315 will be achieved only by the most energetic work by broadcasters. They must exercise their most persuasive influences among members of Congress. The job will be among the most trying they have faced.

Frank Stanton, CBS president, realistically appraised the ludicrous restrictions of section 315 and the difficulty of removing them in his speech to CBS-TV affiliates in Chicago (Broadcasting, March 16). It was Dr. Stanton's letter to the White House that induced the President's comment.

The equal time provision is but one of several imbecilities in section 315. The whole section is a nightmarish example of the Government's trying to substitute a law for independent editorial judgment.

It is possible, of course, that Congress may be spared the necessity of grappling with the problem. The Supreme Court now has before it the WDAY-TV Fargo, N.D., libel case arising from the operation of section 315. It is our wishful thought that the Supreme Court may declare the law unconstitutional.

But the possibility of Supreme Court solution to the problem should not lull broadcasters. They should move at once on Capitol Hill to exploit the advantages which Messrs. Eisenhower, Doerfer, and Daly have provided.

## United Seamen's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Friday, March 13, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard many times reports of American aid overseas. Always this relates to help for the people of other countries. Today I want to record the story of a dedicated group of Americans that is at work in the far corners of the world taking care of our own people. It is not the story of a Government agency. Today, when so much is required of Government, out of the maritime industry itself comes the story of an American organization that for 17 years has worked ceaselessly and tirelessly on behalf of our fellow men who are seafarers.

The organization of which I speak is the United Seamen's Service which was established in September 1942 at the request of the Federal Maritime Administration. The USS is a voluntary association, and its board has representatives from management, labor, government, and the public. In the words of our great World War II Maritime Administrator, Adm. Emory Scott (Jerry) Land:

In setting up a service for American seamen that reaches around the world, the United Seamen's Service is merely meeting a long-delayed debt, a payment on account delayed about a hundred years too long.

How effectively this debt is being repaid we have the word of one of our young American seamen. Because the service is being performed so far from home, it is a story with which we are, all of us, too unfamiliar. Still it is one more tale of American ingenuity, American achievement against obstacles. It is the story of a dedicated group of American workers who find it possible to enlist the understanding and moral help of such governments as those of Italy, Morocco, West Germany, and Japan in marshaling resources of foreign port communities to share in a service where service is most needed. The story is a constant reminder that in the hearts of our people lies the true greatness of America.

The following letter from an American seaman needs no explanation or interpretation. He speaks forthrightly on the accomplishments of the United Seamen's Service.

SS. "PRESIDENT JACKSON,"
*At sea, off California coast,*
*January 6, 1959.*

UNITED SEAMEN'S SERVICE,
*New York, N.Y.*

DEAR SIRS: Having nearly completed a voyage that has taken in quite a few world ports—21 outside the United States—and preparing to go on vacation, I though it would be nice to let you know how much I enjoy the United Seamen's Service Clubs whenever we hit a port where one is in operation. I happened to run into a piece of your literature, a folded pamphlet entitled "So You'll Know" and this explained something of your activities, as well as providing me with an address.

Naturally I have run into some of the joints using various combinations of "united," "seamen's," "service," "club," etc., and having no clear understanding at the time of the manner in which the good name of the real United Seamen's Service was being traded on, had sometimes wondered how you could permit some of your overseas branches to be run on such a low grade level. Sometimes, after a brief tour inside, I would check the sign again that appeared on the outside. But, of course, the words "United Seamen's" looked genuine enough, and I would lay the trouble to your inability to get competent native managers, plus a certain slackness that had crept into your organization since the war. Though there is really little humor in the situation—other than of a wry sort—I have smiled to myself at the manner in which I have accepted some of the counterfeits as genuine, gently chiding you in my mind for the low level to which you had let some of them slip. For this error, I want to offer my humble apology.

Our last stop, prior to returning to the States, was Italy, and I must say that the United Seamen's Service clubs in Naples and Genoa were wonderful. I can't help thinking of the "seamen's clubs" in Korea (Pusan) that sounded like a good spot until one of the ever-present guides took me there, even though I didn't need him and kept trying to shake him. But he was a persistent fellow and wouldn't shake, even accompanying me into the club.

I don't remember exactly what the sign on the outside said, though it was some combination of "united" or "overseas" with "seamen's". Inside was a spacious room with

at least 15 or 20 tables and, at one end of the room, a decrepit bar that was generous in length and generous with dirt. The general decrepitude of the bar matched that of the entire place, and there seemed to be nothing there, in the way of service, but the bar—which was probably a good thing, considering that alcoholic beverages at least have the virtue of being free of harmful bacteria.

After hanging around the club long enough to discourage my guide, who finally left, I myself went out without having contributed anything to the club's upkeep. Outside, I took another look at the club's sign—with a tut-tut in your direction—and noticed another posted by the United States or allied armies, "On limits for beer only"—a very wise idea.

In your tastefully appointed Yokohama club the aviary adds its own charm to genteel surroundings, and after one visit I became a regular.

Because of certain restrictions that, on prior trips, had surrounded the exchange of money in Okinawa, I hadn't been going ashore. This last trip, however, U.S. money was being accepted freely, without restrictions. I haven't seen this club, but those who have been there say it is excellent.

Returning now to your two clubs in Naples and Genoa, the seamen who visit the clubs are greeted with singing and music designed to make them feel at home and welcome. In addition, the dancing provides a healthy outlet for exuberant spirits. One may enter either of these clubs just for a sandwich and coffee, or perhaps to mail a letter, with no particular awareness of a need for a lift. In a short while, however, the music and singing, and the general atmosphere, has made you glad you are there. In fact, aboard ship, those men as myself who patronize the United Seamens' Service clubs actually look forward to reaching certain ports so we can renew acquaintance with those in the clubs that we have already met on prior trips.

The homey atmosphere of the United Seamen's Service clubs seems to derive from a carefully thought-out combination of service, facilities, and grouping or layout. Yet these can't be clearly separated, as they are all interwoven to some extent. However, in regard to layout, part of the atmosphere is due to arrangement of the entire establishment around a central room, with easy access to all areas. I'm reminded of Connell House in Singapore, a club for seamen of all nationalities. This is a mammoth place by United Seamans' Services' standards, yet though Singapore must be host to more than a hundred seagoing ships a month—I don't know even the approximate figure—it is a place where seamen do not usually care to go. Though the cost of its establishment, if measured in today's money, must have been great, seamen will tell you it's a great place to go if you want to die. There is no life there, and few patrons. Their figures naturally would include seamen who live there for varying periods, due to necessity, while waiting for a ship. They have rooms for this purpose.

One reason for the lack of warmth in Connell House, despite Singapore's 1° proximity to the equator, is the manner in which each department or service is carefully partitioned and isolated from every other facility. You can get from one to the other by going out into an unnecessarily spacious hall and walking 25 to 75 feet. In whichever area or department you happen to be, you feel isolated from the place as a whole. Even the bar, which perhaps is the facility most heavily patronized, depresses with its air of isolation. As a result, not even the bar is a popular spot in Connell House. What United Seamens' Services could do to an establishment like this.

In Italy the United Seamens' Services clubs are always crowded at night. Though many seamen may find various other spots more to their liking, the tables in the United Seamens' Services clubs are always filled, at least that has been my observation. The dancing is appreciated by both participants and spectators alike, and the music is of the right sort. I am convinced that at least in Italy, both the club in Naples and Genoa could fill more tables if they had them. The one in Genoa would be handicapped in this respect by a lack of space. Both are doing an excellent job.

This letter started out as a short note of appreciation, but has turned into a rather wordy report—the 2-minute speaker who talks an hour. For this you will have to excuse me. In some places I have noticed where the wording could be improved upon. Yet this is a once-over project, without notes or rewriting. At least, when I return from my vacation I'll not be reminded of the letter I should have written to you, but didn't.

Best of luck with your clubs.

S. P. CLARKE, Jr.,
*Third Engineer, Providence, R.I.*

That you may more intimately know of the operation and organization of this fine service, I quote from one of its publications, Facts:

UNITED SEAMEN'S SERVICE

What is it?

USS is the only voluntary American agency providing health, welfare, and recreation services for American seamen in foreign ports.

Why is it?

Seamen who man our ships are essential to our national security. Their welfare in foreign ports where they are unfamiliar with the language, the currency, and the customs is important both because it generates international good will and because it contributes to their efficiency once they are back on board ship.

Where is it?

USS services are provided in overcrowded foreign ports where our seamen are most likely to be victimized. To an American seaman these services are tangible evidence that democracy follows him round the world. Location of operating units in 16 overseas ports enabled USS field staff last year to serve American merchant seamen at 30 points active in American shipping.

Why voluntary?

USS is a voluntary agency because, in a democracy, this kind of program is the responsibility of the people, not of Government. USS services are part of the overall health and welfare program provided by the people for their fellow Americans. In truth, USS services are simply extensions of the health, welfare, and recreation services that would be provided for seamen if they were both working and living in their home communities. Seamen come from all sections of the country, so it is logical that USS seek support from all sections of the country.

How supported?

Approximately four-fifths of USS' operating expenses derives from the sale of food, beverages, and souvenirs to seamen at USS centers. The other fifth is covered by the support of Community Chests and United Funds of the country. The National Budget Committee has approved USS' total operating budget for 1958 and has made available its support plan attesting to the validity of USS' public appeal.

What does USS provide?

The USS program is flexible enough to meet the shifting demands of the changing international situation. The recent emphasis on ship-centered operations is a practical approach, recognizing the inadvisability of setting up permanent building-centered programs in foreign ports where the need may continue for a year or so, then suddenly shift to other troubled areas of the world. In these ports USS workers go on board ship to give seamen valuable information about such things as danger spots on the waterfront, recent incidents, national antagonisms, available transportation and recreation. USS workers arrange transportation where none is available and set up recreation programs where it is desirable. For these and other personal services, there can be no price tag. In USS centers seamen pay reasonable fees for services received, thus putting these services on a self-supporting basis. But, whether they operate a club or work on shipboard, USS workers give personal aid and guidance to seamen, since the problem may involve communication with families, illness, and hospitalization, or any one of the many welfare needs that are regularly met for their fellow citizens at home.

---

## The Keys for the Peacemakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good time for us to pause and give serious thought to the true source of peace—through God and His teachings peace can be found.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Leonard J. Demchak, my constituent, entitled "The Keys for the Peacemakers."

THE KEYS FOR THE PEACEMAKERS

The question has been asked many times "Why does God not stop the worldwide cold war and prevent a shooting war?" Webster's dictationary states that peace is the harmony in personal relations, freedom of war, friendliness, state of quiet, calm, and security.

This business of life consists of God and man working together for the same purpose—peace, for instance.

If God gave us peace in spite of ourselves and if He were to interfere with all the natural effects of selfishness, pride, anger, and lust, if God were to make no requirements of us, no conditions, then He would be our omnipotent servant. God did not create us in order to serve us, but in order that we may serve Him; this applies to public officials, politicians, to businessmen, to everyone.

Peace depends on the willingness of all of us to do God's will because we love Him. There can be no other way to obtain the real peace of universal order.

Today there are so many people willing to destroy the very foundation upon which peace is built: (1) It is evident that God has been chased out of our public schools because He is too controversal (in Merrick, Long Island, a court battle is ensuing to prevent the public-school children from saying a little nondenominational prayer before classes begin). (2) Refusal of governments to cooperate to bring peace into the world using God and His commandments as a guide. (3) Refusal of governments to recognize the rights of all social and religious minorities within their territories. (4) Breakdown of our moral virtues (humility, charity, piety). (5) Increasing number of divorces, broken homes, neglected youth, juvenile delinquency, and crime. (6) Lack of harmony among neighbors and friends. (7) Diplomats at international conferences openly speak of peace, disarmament, and unity, yet in secret meeting their agreements

and actions are contrary to everything that would bring everlasting peace.

We, therefore, ask you to heed the advice of St. Augustine when he said, "You should promise to yourselves, to your university, to your parents, and to your country, that whether the times be evil (and they are) or not, whether you can change in these times or not, you do promise to live nobly, after the fashion of the God-man whom your families and your university have given to you as the model of human living to act nobly, think nobly, live nobly, nobly as it takes to live in God's image."

We, as an organization and as an individual can and should become God's peacemakers—this can be best done by taking an actual part in the following program:

1. Let your elected statesmen know that they must have an acute sense of responsibility which measures all human law according to the law of God.
2. Petition the United Nations to guarantee the rights of nations, to freedom of religion, educational, and cultural development and political equality.
3. Promote a program to eliminate social and religious prejudice, bigotry, and falsifications of propaganda and other forms of distortion.
4. Restore to the home conjugal fidelity, family peace, mutual help of the spouses, and religious education of the children.
5. Seek legislation to tighten and enforce laws that will safeguard the morality of our youth (indecent literature, entertainment, etc.).
6. Organize and instruct our neighbors in the kind of leadership that can transform conflict into cooperation, bickering into peace.
7. Work and pray for peace daily.

Peace with harmony is God's will.

The right to liberty is the right to worship.

## Power Among Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to NBC's television program Easter Sunday when "Power Among Men," a motion picture dealing with man's capacity both to create and to destroy, will be color cast in its first color showing of "Omnibus" between 5 and 6 p.m.

Filmed in many parts of the world with local residents in place of professional actors, "Power Among Men" explores man's innate ability to build, destroy, and build again on the ashes of destruction. It seeks to answer a question especially vital in the atomic age—which of these human drives is dominant, the creative or the destructive?

Dr. Ralph Bunche will appear on the program to introduce the presentation of "Power Among Men." In his words:

"Power Among Men" deals not with the U.N. but with human psychology.

He goes on:

"Power Among Men" looks at power—man's paradoxical power to build and to destroy with equal genius. It also looks at motivation in the use of power.

The United Nations has made numerous films, but it, and possibly no one else, has ever undertaken such a production. I commend it to your viewing.

## Russian in High School?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Hoosiers are glad to learn that our new Democratic State superintendent of public instruction, William Wilson, is discarding some of the provincial policies of his predecessor. We are living in a global world and our youth should be educated and trained to compete with 20th century international problems.

RUSSIAN IN HIGH SCHOOLS?

The Senate commission on general education has finally come around and decided Indiana high schools may schedule classes in the Russian language.

The decision was one of the final ones made during the tenure of Wilbur Young as State superintendent of public instruction. Young was succeeded last week by William E. Wilson, of Jeffersonville, the victor in last November's election.

The commission took fright last summer when Gary and several other city school systems sought approval for classes in Russian. Somehow it has resolved its fears and has decided the Russian langunge may be studied without turning our youths into young Communists.

But only under certain conditions.

Two are of the routine sort. The State textbook commission must approve textbooks for the course. And the teacher training and licensing commission must set up qualifications for teachers. It is possible, of course, for either commission to stymie the program.

But it won't make much difference. The third condition set up by the general education commission practically insures that only a minimum number of students will register for Russian instructions.

The condition is that only students who have been or currently are enrolled in another modern foreign language course will be permitted to take Russian.

A student must take 2 years of a foreign language in high school to get credit for it. Thus the State's rule means any student of Russian must schedule 4 years of modern foreign language—2 years of Russian and 2 years of French or Spanish, for example. If he didn't take French in his freshman year, he'll have to study both Russian and French in his junior year.

It would make as much sense to insist that no student take Spanish unless he also took German, or that no student could take French unless he also took Chinese.

The regulation makes a phony out of the whole decision to authorize instruction in the Russian language in the Indiana high schools. It appears to approve when in fact it disapproves.

Wilson is now the state superintendent of public instruction. We hope he will instruct the general education commission in the facts of life, something his predecessor did not understand.

## The Veterans' Administration Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, March 16, 1959*

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, almost daily Members of Congress receive letters from constituents complaining of the treatment that their constituents or members of their families have received from the Veterans' Administration in one way or the other. Seldom do we get letters commending the Veterans' Administration for the services their employees render to the veterans.

Today we received a letter from Mrs. Ike Ashburn, whose husband has been confined to the Veterans' Hospital in Temple, Tex., for the past 11 months. This letter is so extraordinary that I felt that it should be placed in the RECORD. It is obvious from the letter that Mrs. Ashburn is moved by the wonderful attention shown her husband. I might add that we have been told several times of the splendid services that this hospital has been rendering to veterans, but have not received a letter so thoroughly covering the matter as this one. You will see that the letter is addressed to the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who has consented to my placing the letter in the RECORD.

TEMPLE, TEX., March 25, 1959.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
*Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs,*
*House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR OLIN: Today marks 11 months since Ike was admitted as a patient in the McCloskey Veterans' Administration Center. I ask you to please consider this letter along with the one I wrote you on May 28, 1958.

Ike's condition is again improving after a temporary setback. I am convinced the only reason progress is not faster is that he was in such critical condition and had so many health problems from the beginning.

The perfect care and attention continue. I am certain this is the most wonderfully administered and staffed hospital in the country—private or otherwise. Dr. Raleigh R. Curtis is now handling his case and has been for many months. He is a dedicated man of medicine, gives every thought to the welfare of his patients and has a deep personal interest in each of them.

I should like to again commend Dr. L. M. Cochran, Dr. Warren B. Smith and Dr. W. P. Chrisman for their continued interest and attentions. Mrs. Mary Alice Levy continues to ably supervise a group of very fine nurses and aids on ward 17A. The aids whom I want especially to mention for their outstanding care are: Douglas C. Truesdale, Walter T. Parker, Lloyd A. Harrington, Winfred L. Hawthorne, Floyd Honeycutt, Sam G. Dorethy, and Ben Lanier. My husband's skin condition is perfect after these many months in bed; and this is only another evidence of the meticulous care he has received.

Yesterday he was taken to therapy, after having received mild manipulations in bed for some weeks. Miss Mary Lou Suddath and Mrs. Elsie B. Sherman, together with the competent men in that department, deserve

great credit for his ability to again stand with assistance.

Mr. Joe Fry, contact man for the Veterans' Administration, and his staff have been most helpful in matters that required their assistance.

It is impossible to mention the countless numbers who have made these months of anxiety possible to bear. Chaplains James M. Hamilton, Harry F. Miller and Hiram J. Eastland continue to bring great spiritual comfort. I am regular in my attendance at chapel; and I always receive a great benediction.

Ike remains on the critically ill list. While he continues to have the hazard of additional complications from his fundamental diseases, those in attendance are pleased with the control of his blood pressure and the present status of his circulation.

Everyone is amazed at Ike's stoicism and the gracious way he has accepted his infirmities. No one ever hears him utter a word of discontent, criticism or unhappiness.

I have no way to express our great appreciation of the personnel of this hospital except to ask God's blessings on each and every one of them.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

MRS. IKE ASHBURN.

## A Better Planned Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the forthright editor of the Fremont, Calif., News Register wrote the following editorial in the March 19, 1959, edition.

The News Register is politically independent. It never takes a purely partisan position but, as a good newspaper, it weighs the merits of an issue before espousing it:

A BETTER PLANNED DEFENSE

Once again America is faced with an international crisis, the end of which is advertised as war. This one comes about because Russia's Premier Khrushchev delivered an ultimatum: Get U.S. troops out of Berlin by May 27, or he will turn control over to the East Germans. The implied threat: East Germany will close off land routes to Berlin and Russia will back East Germany.

In 1948 a similar situation brought the Berlin airlift. But Berlin and Russia have grown beyond salvation-by-airlift in the past 11 years. Another airlift would be (1) inadequate to supply the giant city, and (2) subject to effective interference by a Soviet power which didn't possess the atom bomb in 1948 but which does today.

America must first proceed on the assumption that Khrushchev means what he says (if he can get away with it). That is: He will blockade Berlin (and resist American attempts to get in after May 27) with the entire Soviet armed might, including missiles carrying multi-kiloton nuclear weapons to New York, and so forth.

Anything less than presuming that Russia means business is criminally dangerous for the United States. Maybe the Russians won't shoot. There are plenty of good reasons why they might not. But if there's a 1-in-100 chance that they will, we have to be ready to counter it, or risk nuclear defeat. Are we ready?

The generals and the scientists say no, that we are years behind Russia in missiles, that the nuclear bombing planes on which we place our reliance are obsolete.

The administration, headed by a one-time general, assures us that all necessary measures have been taken, that too much defense is just as bad as too little, that bankruptcy could deliver us to the Kremlin as easily as unpreparedness.

Granting that this is so, we ask why the $41 billion budget for defense has given us so little security? Why $7 billion has been wasted in the past year on complicated missiles which turned out to be obsolete before they were launched, on duplicate purchases by rival defense agencies, on unrelated, familiar follies?

What has happened to the number one defense bulwark—an anti-missile missile? The Nikes Zeus or its relatives have been proposed for several years as the answer to diplomatic missile blackmail by the Russians. Yet Zeus and his Olympian cousins are still earthbound, hardly even on the drawing boards, while defense agencies spent billions outdoing each other with airplanes or odd-ball rocket experiments—costly trinkets which fail to echo the basic issue:

First things first. How can we fight missiles with anything but faster missiles?

Our President scolds his critics, safe in the assertion that he has commanded more armies than they. All this took place a generation ago. The U.S. defense picture needs another look. By fresh lookers, unbiased by what happened at Bastogne, Okinawa, or Gettysburg.

America needs not to spend more money on defense, but to see that our vast resources, which smothered our enemies in World War II, are used to the very best advantages, not frittered away on a perilous attempt to rehash something we were able to do in 1945.

Russia is watching smugly to see if we've learned the lesson.

## Reduction in Subsidies to CAB Feeder Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the second supplemental bill this week I had expected to call the attention of the House to the reduction made by the committee in the subsidies allowed for service carriers of CAB. These are the small air carriers or commonly known as feeder lines. There was a substantial reduction in the amount of subsidies allowed because the testimony before the committee did not substantiate the full amount requested. It was felt the amount allowed would be sufficient to carry on until the next fiscal year appropriations were made.

Mr. Speaker, some of the operators of these lines have expressed the fear that the reduction in the appropriation might show congressional intent to reduce all subsidies in the future. This is not true. I believe I can speak for the committee in saying that we recognize that as of this time it is necessary to have subsidies for these air carriers and that such amounts as may be necessary under law will be appropriated. Also, if the amounts here appropriated are not sufficient, appeal may be made to the other body and if a proper record is made, undoubtedly the matter can be worked out in conference between the two bodies. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that there is no intention to destroy the feeder lines or the small operators in this Nation. It has been the policy of the Congress in the past to do that which is necessary to keep them in proper and safe operation. They may be assured that this is still the policy of the Congress of the United States.

## Why Recognize Red China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 25, 1959*

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the March 17 issue of the Lutheran Herald, a timely and well-written article which explores the moral reasons for not granting recognition to Communist China.

I am very much gratified to present this scholarly article because I have long believed that recognition of Communist China by the United States is unjustified and unwise.

WHY RECOGNIZE COMMUNIST CHINA?

(By Dr. R. A. Syrdal)

Some church groups and organizations have for some time been waging a campaign to have the Government of the United States recognize Communist China. These many efforts seem to have crystallized in a resolution adopted at the Fifth World Order Conference, meeting in Cleveland, at the call of the National Council of Churches, November 18–21, 1958.

Declaring that our Government "has demonstrated a frightening insensibility to international reality," it requests that "Christians should urge reconsideration by our Government of its policy in regard to the People's Republic of China." As it urges recognition of China, it also requests that "steps should be taken toward the inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations." It concludes its paragraph on China with the sentence, "We have a strong hope that the resumption of relationships between the peoples of China and of the United States may make possible also a restoration of relationships between their churches and ours."

I do not believe that the purpose of this resolution was to aid communism, since it states definitely that "Such recognition does not imply approval." On the other hand, there are certain facts that would seem to make it impossible at this time to recognize China without giving approval. The jubilation of the Communist press at the action taken in Cleveland would indicate that, at least, they saw some advantage accruing to their cause from the proposed recognition.

It is probable that a de facto recognition of the Communist government of China could have been given in 1949 without implying approval. Cognizant of the fact that China had been subjugated by a small political bloc under Russia's tutelage for the enslavement of the people of the entire country, our Government at that time refused such recognition. By that act, recognition of China be-

came a moral issue. Recognition now would indicate either a change in the attitude of America or a change in the policy of China. China has not changed its policy.

Since that time the enslavement of the people has proceeded with studied ruthlessness. Branches of the U.S. Government have verified that at least 20 million people have been killed in cold blood, and that an additional 25 million have died of starvation in slave labor camps. The present communes established in rural areas have gone far beyond the collective farm policies of Russia in abolishing the family and making the individual a pawn of the state.

We have heard much of the right of the church to speak up on moral issues and to serve as a conscience for the state. Are we now, as Christians, rebuking the state when it exercises a Christian conscience and acts on the basis of the moral rights of individuals?

There is every reason to believe that some relationship between the church of Communist China and churches of the United States will be established if government recognition is granted to China. This relationship could, however, only be established with the church that is officially recognized by the Communist government of China. This would include only those pastors who have signed the Communist manifesto and agree with the creed of the new church unified by the government. It places obedience to communism and service to its government above all other items of a watered-down Christian faith.

The church that we would have relationships with is under full control of the Communist government through the educational propaganda agency, the three self-patriotic committee, and its pastors are considered as its agents. U.S. churches would, therefore, be having fellowship with representatives of a Communist organization rather than with the church. Would that be true Christian fellowship?

In establishing fraternal relationships with the official Church of China we would at the same time repudiate the pastors who have, for the sake of conscience, refused to sign the Communist manifesto, and who, from Christian conviction, have continued preaching the Word, sometimes facing death or imprisonment, sometimes going underground, always in danger, but faithful to the unadulterated Gospel of Christ.

The situation in China differs from that in East Germany and some other European countries where the church continues to function as a true church of the Gospel in spite of the state. In China the government took over the church and through gradual steps has made it one of its own agencies. Great numbers of pastors and evangelists could not accept the conditions laid down by the government. Their consciences were bound by God. They would rather serve Him as men hunted by the government and denounced by its church rather than bind their conscience to the godless state. The hand of fellowship held out to the official church means a hand denied to these men and women of faith.

The official periodical of the Communist-recognized church in China is T'ien Feng. From articles in this periodical which have been reprinted in the China Bulletin, we learn: (1) All Protestant churches in China have now been forced into one unified organization called by some correspondents from China the state church. (2) There has been a great reduction in numbers of churches. Church buildings closed to worship have been taken over by the Government for its use and its pastors sent into industry or farm communes. (3) Free activities of the church are completely banned. Group gatherings and house meetings are barred. All congregations are now under the political authorities and the program is dictated by these authorities.

The China Bulletin reports from articles in T'ien Feng: "In August the 65 churches of Peking were merged into four churches. This merger of course released a large number of preachers, Bible women, and theological students for participation in the great leap forward in economic production, and T'ien Feng states that 150 of those from Peking were assigned to labor in farm communes. As to the church property vacated by the wholesale merging, it states that all was turned over to the government for public use.

"This action in Peking was followed the next month, in September, by similar action in Shanghai, where its 200 churches were merged into some 12 or 15 churches. Other reports tell of the same process going on in other cities—Tientsin, Wenchow, Taiyuan, etc. One short article tells of the unifying of the Anglican and C.I.M. churches in Tali, Yunnan."

The method and purpose of this unification can best be seen from the articles of the Taiyuan churches, as reported in T'ien Feng:

"There shall be unified worship for the city of Taiyuan, and a ministerial staff of three or four. All fellow workers besides these and those assigned to the three self office shall thrown themselves into the socialist construction of our mother country; those who are older or physically weak shall retire. All real and movable church property and all church funds shall be turned over to the three self patriotic committee.

"Church organization: (1) All former governing committees and boards of the various churches are hereby abolished, and the administration of the church shall be in hands of the three self patriotic committee.

"(2) Regarding ritual, regulations, and church order:

"1. There shall be a unified worship program, and each church shall surrender its own individual ritual.

"2. The hymns used in worship shall be unified, and a committee shall choose and edit the hymns for use.

"3. All books used in the interpretation of the Bible shall be examined and judged, and those containing poisonous thoughts shall be rejected. Only teachings favoring union and socialism shall be used. In particular, any material coming from outside shall be carefully examined before being accepted.

"4. There shall be no more preaching about the last day, or about the vanity of this world. This is negative and pessimistic teaching. Instead we shall emphasize the need for the union of faith and practice, the dignity of labor, the control of nature, and the dividing line between ourselves and our enemies, between right and wrong.

"5. Belief and unbelief shall not be made an issue in determining marriage questions.

"(3) In regard to the necessary reform of each church:

"1. The little flock shall abolish its women's meetings, its weekly breaking of bread, its personal interviews with members before the breaking of bread, and its rule against women speaking in the church.

"2. The Salvation Army shall give up all its military regulations.

"3. The Seventh Day Adventists shall abolish their daily morning prayers. On the sabbath they shall participate in beneficial good works and economic production. Their tithe system for the support of the clergy shall be abolished and also their unification of accounts for Shansi province.

"4. All the YMCA secretaries shall be assigned to productive labor and the closing of the Taiyuan YMCA as a separate organization shall be carefully considered."

From a private report from Shanghai we have the following comments on the life of the church: "Attendance has fallen off, partly because so many work on Sunday. The weekly rest day may fall on any day and is often filled with meetings. One of the latest resolutions is that services on Sunday must not be allowed to interfere with work."

The constant emphasis throughout the past year in China has been on the necessity of every individual Chinese citizen surrendering his heart to the Communist Party. This emphasis has also been felt in the churches from the beginning of the Communist regime. It is evident that the government is asking the church to surrender its heart—the Gospel of Christ—to communism until it becomes the full servant of that party.

While church groups in America are delving into international politics it will be well if they study carefully the spiritual problems that beset the Christians in China. Rather than seeking fellowship with the members of the official church of communism, we should unite in denouncing the Communist rape of this church and in incessant prayer for the Christians who are struggling against this demonic power to maintain the faith.

## More on Equal Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial the Indianapolis Star stressed the serious threat to freedom of broadcasters to keep the public informed of news happenings, even though such news might pertain to a candidate for political office, posed by a recent ruling of the Federal Communications Commission.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

NEWS FOR THE NOSE

The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission foresees a complete blackout of political news reporting and special political public-service presentations on radio and television unless the Federal law requiring equal time for all political candidates is repealed or revised before the 1960 campaigns. If an interpretation given to this law by the FCC last month stands, he is right.

The equal time requirement, briefly, is that when a candidate for political office appears on radio or television, the station or the network, as the case may be, must make available equal time under the same conditions to each other candidate for the same office who demands it. Heretofore it had been supposed that this section of the law applied to appearance essentially related to political campaigning.

Now the FCC has ruled that the requirement applies to news broadcasts. References to a candidate in a news report, quotations from his statements or photographic coverage of his activities, must be matched by equal news broadcast time for all other candidates for the same office, under this ruling.

In practical effect this will mean that the networks and most stations individually will be restrained from any news report references to candidates for any major office. The restraint will apply not only to news

about the campaigns but to any event concerning a candidate which ordinarily might be news. Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, put it this way: "Such major news events as an assassination attempt on a candidate for public office could not be shown on a television newscast—unless the attempt succeeded and the victim was therefore no longer a candidate."

If this decision stands, henceforth political news on radio and television during any election campaign period will come to you filtered through the censorship rules of the FCC. Bear in mind that we're not talking about political advertising or sponsored campaign appearances. We're talking about news.

This in itself is serious enough. But even more serious is what it foreshadows for newspapers and other means of keeping the public informed. In a number of significant decisions the courts have held—rightly—that freedom of the press is not limited to newspapers, or book publishers, or other narrowly defined media of communication. The marked trend of the courts is to hold that freedom of the press embraces all general means of gathering news or ideas and relaying them, whether in language or pictorial form, to the public. Radio and television are included.

It boils down to this: If radio and television news can be put through Government censorship today, all other news ultimately can and will be put through the same filter.

This iniquitous equal time law should be repealed, before it causes the kind of serious damage to freedom which is now openly threatened.

## The New Pat Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, of California, is doing a workmanlike job that is commanding the respect of all the people of California. As evidence of this, I invite your attention to an editorial in the March 19 issue of the Hayward, Calif., Daily Review, which certainly could not be classified as a Democratic paper.

I am also pleased to make a part of my remarks, an article by Harlan Trott which appeared in the March 16, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. Mr. Trott's article defines another side of Governor Brown's activities:

[From the Hayward (Calif.) Daily Review, Mar. 19, 1959]

THE NEW PAT BROWN

A new Pat Brown is beginning to emerge from the political woods, and it's evident the babe who went into those woods has vanished.

The change began last year in the campaign for Governor when an uncertain, lackluster attorney general started running in earnest for Governor. It picked up speed thanks to the political skill of his opponent even though Brown refused to face him in campaign debates.

The million-vote edge he piled up over his nationally recognized adversary accelerated the process. His appearance before television cameras only hours after the polls closed already hinted at the new Brown.

Three events since that time have thrown this political metamorphosis into sharp relief. First was the hot fight among national Democratic leaders over where next year's presidential convention was to be held. When Los Angeles won, Brown automatically secured an important position within the party.

Back in Sacramento, his programs and budget made surprising changes in political alinements. Earlier opposition began to weaken and Brown scored important gains, particularly in the water controversy and with his balanced budget.

Finally, with these important marks in his favor, the Governor went east to meet the veteran politicians on their own grounds last week. He submitted himself to one of the toughest of tests and made his points with skill before the most critical of audiences.

When some suggested during last fall's campaign that Brown's victory would make him a national contender, snorts of derision were many. They have vanished today because the Brown who has become a national political figure is not the same Brown heard and seen by Californians in last year's campaign.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 16, 1959]

CALIFORNIA TAPS BIG BUSINESS VIEWS

(By Harlan Trott)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—Big business is being given an important role in Gov. Edmund G. Brown's scheme of "responsible liberalism."

Although Governor Brown's State labor support was probably just as influential as Gov. G. Mennen Williams' in Michigan, California's new chief executive wants business and commerce to have a big voice in his policy decisions.

California's newly appointed Governor's Business Advisory Council started out with a roster of 32 top industrialists. Now Mr. Brown has just added nine more to the list, including Frank Pace, Jr., former Secretary of the Army and now president of the General Dynamics Corp. at San Diego; J. H. Kindelberger, chairman of the board of North American Aviation Co. of Los Angeles; and published Clinton D. McKinnon of the North Shore Sentinel of San Diego and former U.S. Representative in Congress.

OPINIONS SOUGHT

Governor Brown already has called this business "cabinet" together and asked for their "full, free, and frank" opinions on the State's economic policies. Their deliberations and advice are off the record, so that they will be free to analyze business affairs without giving away any secrets.

"You know a great deal about California's economy and the business community's role in it," the Governor told them, "and I want to know how you feel about anything this administration does that affects you."

Governor Brown thinks his business advisory council will benefit business and professional men, too, by giving them added insight and information on the problems of government.

The council's indoctrination began with a report by Mr. Brown's finance director, Bert Levit, on the Governor's budget and tax proposals and a general discussion of the State's fiscal situation.

Mr. Levit is asking that the State look ahead 2 to 4 years in its fiscal moves. "Looking back over past State finance, we find a tendency to err," he says. "In January, 1937, Governor Merriam submitted a 2-year budget anticipating a $20 million surplus. Actually there was a $36 million deficit. In January, 1939, Governor Olsen anticipated a deficit of $12 million by June, 1941. Actually the deficit was $66 million."

The current fiscal budget was presented by Gov. Goodwin Knight and passed by the legislature as a balanced budget. But when Mr. Levit made his first visit here with the Governor-elect last November, the deficit expected by June 30 this year was $100 million plus. Right now, Mr. Levit says he is thinking about a $75 million plus deficit "which will be reduced below that by certain measures."

SURPLUS PLANNED

Mr. Levit is reassuring Californian businessmen that "we do not have an economic or a political crisis. The only crisis is one which will be precipitated if a sound fiscal policy is not adopted for the coming year."

Governor Brown's budget calls for $1,400 million expenditures and $1,200 million revenue from existing sources—a fiscal year deficit of $200 million. He proposes $202 million in new taxes which, with the aid of some existing funds, provides a surplus of $7 million at the end of the next fiscal year.

During the campaign, it was charged that Governor Brown's program would bankrupt the State. His program as submitted to the legislature calls for expenditures of less than $2 million. Mr. Levit calls the present budget a tight, tough budget.

Governor Brown's Business Advisory Council is also being told about his proposal for an Economic Development Agency which has been drafted into a bill now before the legislature.

This new agency would become important as a clearinghouse where decision makers from out of the State can go to obtain complete and unbiased information about all of California. It would serve as an important one-stop, fact-finding agency for busy executives who have come to study possible investment and development in California.

BUSINESS LOSS WEIGHED

Prior to the recent recession, California lost 40,000 existing enterprises in 1 year which shut their doors for good. Governor Brown says, "We do not know exactly why this happened or what the State might have been able to do about it. Without adequate diagnosis of the cause of such a huge economic death rate, we cannot possibly develop preventive measures."

Governor Brown feels California must have an agency with enough authority, scope, and financial backing to fill these important gaps in business information. "Every other State in the Union but one has seen the wisdom of the united effort," says Governor Brown. He points out that in the past, many investors came to California, looked around, were confused by the data which came from over 20 separate agencies, and left.

Governor Brown says the proposed Economic Development Agency "can point up many opportunities here in California where we can help ourselves."

## Wall Street Paper Riddles Smear of "Soapy" Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Michigan is not the only State with financial problems. Pennsylvania and other industrial States are also in

distress along with hundreds of thousands of jobless workers.

The Republican press has been trying to confuse the public by blaming State governments for economic and financial distress brought on by the Eisenhower administration's hard money and curtailment policies.

Neither administration fiscal and economic policies, nor the immorality and intellectual dishonesty of the press can end this growing crisis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include an article from Labor, official publication of the railway labor unions:

FACTS ABOUT STATE TAXES: WALL STREET PAPER RIDDLES SMEAR OF "SOAPY" WILLIAMS

Because Gov. G. Mennen "Soapy" Williams, of Michigan, smashed a reactionary State political machine and has repeatedly been reelected as a Democrat, he has been made the target for a vast nationwide propaganda campaign, picturing him as a spender who has brought the great State of Michigan to the brink of financial ruin.

That theme was played up last week in a series of articles in the Scripps-Howard newspapers. So did the magazine U.S. News & World Report, as well as other publications and GOP political figures.

A different picture is presented, however, in the Wall Street Journal, a conservative business newspaper, but one which usually goes in for facts instead of propaganda.

The article points out that Michigan is far from the only State facing such troubles. "Most States," it says, "are in financial straits and before the year is out all but two or three of the State legislatures will have wrestled with tax and spending problems."

ON-THE-SPOT REPORTS

To get a clear picture of the reasons for this nationwide situation, the Wall Street paper sent its reporters to interview State government officials, key legislators and spokesmen for private groups in five States—California, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Washington.

These knowledgeable persons, the Journal reports, generally agreed on a combination of factors as the sources of their States' money troubles, among them these:

1. "The sharp postwar rise in population and its concentration in metropolitan areas has spurred demand for expanded public services, especially in education and public welfare."

2. "Because capital construction was deferred during World War II, the States in recent years have had to pump large amounts of money into working off a backlog of projects ranging from highways and State office buildings to mental hospitals."

RISING COSTS

3. "The rising cost of goods and services purchased by State governments, plus the rising interest on State debts, have put increasing pressure on budgets."

4. "The 1957–58 recession slowed the rise in States tax revenues while at the same time increasing spending on welfare programs and projects calculated to ease the impact of high unemployment."

After telling how these causes have affected some other States the article explains why their impact has been felt particularly in "highly industrialized Michigan."

"Some argue that Michigan has been too much of a welfare State during the past 10 years," the Journal says, but "spokesmen for the Governor Williams administration point out that it has been Republican-controlled legislatures that have enacted all spending measures. They say it's silly to talk about Williams, and Reuther of the United Automobile Workers spending the money, in view of the fact that the legislature went along with 99 percent of the Governor's recommendations."

RECESSION A MAJOR CAUSE

The article quotes Republican Frank D. Beadle, State senate majority leader as saying: "The biggest reason for Michigan's financial crisis is the business recession."

The Wall Street paper tells much more about the reasons for the financial troubles of Michigan and other States, but one general fact seems to stand out. On one side of the controversy are reactionaries who would rather let jobless workers and other needy people in any State starve rather than spend welfare money. Conspicuous on the opposing side is "Soapy" Williams. That's why he is the main target of the present propaganda.

## DAV Services in South Dakota and Elsewhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of South Dakota citizens has recently come to my attention. Since I think these splendid humanitarian services may not be fully appreciated by all who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding DAV services in South Dakota and elsewhere.

There being no obection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAV LIMITED TO DISABLED VETERANS

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in South Dakota, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, I am informed that the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization of full-time, trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. These service officers have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

SOUTH DAKOTA CENTER AT SIOUX FALLS

The DAV national service officer in South Dakota is Mr. Eldo Swenson located at the VA Center, Sioux Falls. The department commander is Mr. Vernon R. Pierce, 504 South Fifth Avenue, Sioux Falls, and the department adjutant is Mr. Donald A. Caldwell, 1614 South Prairie, Sioux Falls.

Four VA hospitals are located in South Dakota: 720-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Fort Meade; a 255-bed general medical hospital at Hot Springs; a 548-bed DOM hospital at Hot Springs, and a 270-bed general medical hospital at Sioux Falls. There is also a State Soldiers and Sailors Home at Hot Springs, which had an enrollment of 213 last year, where the DAV State department provides various services by reason of its annual State VAVS appropriation of $900.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $27,326,000 for its veteran program in South Dakota, including $4,635,719 disability compensation to its 6,184 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in South Dakota furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

The outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV National Service Officer in behalf of South Dakota veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, is revealed by the following statistics which have been supplied me:

| | |
|---|---|
| Claimants contacted (estimated) | 6,139 |
| Claim folders reviewed | 5,116 |
| Appearances before rating boards | 1,319 |
| Compensation increases obtained | 694 |
| Service connections obtained | 342 |
| Nonservice pensions | 196 |
| Death benefits obtained | 101 |
| Total monetary benefits obtained, $261,568.65 | |

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three District Offices, handling death and insurance cases.

Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such District Offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the Central Office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for South Dakota veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

SERVICE BEYOND THE FIGURES

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice has been furnished, I am told, to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation, or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms and business, and so forth.

Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment (to utilize their remaining abilities), civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim I know from our own work in this field, presents different problems. Few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically

awarded to disabled veterans. They are not given on a silver platter.

Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A Claims and Rating Board obviously cannot grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

Good service officers advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings.

No proper service officer will ever use his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with claims where there is substantial evidence of merit which should be evaluated.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—many times because claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their power of attorney to some qualified advocate.

CLAIMS ARE REVIEWED AT TIMES

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year.

About three-tenths percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in South Dakota, with a consequent loss of about $84,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed.

I suggest that disabled veterans in South Dakota who have such experience give their power of attorney to the National Service Officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

HOW THE WORK IS FINANCED

I am told that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. It maintains its nationwide staff of service officers primarily through income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento Tag (miniature automobile license tags) project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment.

Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, I am told that more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento Tag department, 1,753 of whom, during the last 8 years, were South Dakota residents.

Every eligible veteran can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also been helped by a separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, which has provided $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. However, the reserves of the DAV Service Foundation are nearly exhausted. They have come from direct donations, designations in insurance policies, bequests in wills, assignments of stock and bonds, and the establishing of special types of trust funds by thoughtful and thankful Americans.

Those who are interested may send their donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $4 per DAV member—an excellent precedent for all other States.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—churches, labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. I hope that all of America's eligible veterans become members of one or more of our patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations.

---

## Action Needed To Save Alaska's Fishery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 1959*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following bulletin was issued by the sales manager of a fish company under date of March 19, 1959. As to the need of conservation of Alaska-spawned salmon on the high seas, it is self-explanatory:

BRISTOL BAY CLOSED FOR 1959

While this writer was sweating over his typewriter composing the bulletin in which the 1959 closure of Bristol Bay was indicated as possible, Secretary Seaton of the Department of Interior was asking the Department of Fisheries to draft a closing order. This is a direct result of the action of the Japanese Government in licensing and encouraging its fishermen to conduct unrestricted fishing operations on the high seas where both mature and immature salmon destined for Bristol Bay streams are congregated. Let us take a look at some of the economic aspects of the situation.

Prior to 1953, when the Japanese high seas fishing fleet expanded its encroachment on the Bristol Bay red salmon resource, about 4,000 American fishermen and allied workers were engaged in Bristol Bay each season, many of whom were native and white residents of the area. After the Japanese increased their catch of American spawned salmon the U.S. Government restricted the catch by American fishermen in a futile effort to prevent the depletion of the resource. Even under the curtailed operation of 1958 over 2,000 Americans were engaged in the Bristol Bay fishery. There will be none in 1959.

Should it be necessary for our Government to put these economically displaced Americans on the dole so that a similar number of jobs may be provided for Japanese fishermen and workmen?

Prior to the Japanese entry into the North Pacific the 10-year average canned salmon pack of western Alaska was 917,880 full cases, which at today's market would be worth $30 million. The 1958 pack was 433,121 full cases. The 1959 pack will be zero.

Should it be necessary for the United States to give up a potential gross product, which, under proper conservation would average $30 million annually, and American packers abandon investments totaling $20 million in plant and equipment, to provide a profitable high seas salmon fishery for Japanese packers?

Since the passage of the White Act in 1923, which created the Bureau of Fisheries, the U.S. Government has spent millions of dollars of Americans' tax money for regulation, research and conservation of the fisheries of Alaska. The canned salmon industry has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of its own for research in Alaska.

Have these millions of American dollars been spent, and regulations to promote conservation enforced, so that Japanese fishermen can now harvest the crop?

In 1957 the Japanese high seas catch of red salmon was 19,822,254 fish. This produced 1,061,307 full cases. Because of the high percentage of immature fish it took an average of 19.6 fish per case. Had this catch been permitted to mature it would have produced 1,651,880 full cases.

Is this loss of 590,573 full cases of red salmon, worth on today's market more than $20 million, justifiable in order to give Japanese fishermen a crack at these stocks before American fishermen are permitted to fish them?

The f.o.b. Yokohama value of the Japanese high seas pack in 1958 was about $37 million. It is conceded that probably not over $20 million of this pack was obtained from fish caught in the area where American scientists maintain American spawned salmon congregate to mature.

Should $30 million of American production and $20 million of American facilities be wiped out to provide the Japanese economy with foreign exchange of 20 million American dollars or its equivalent in pounds sterling?

Since World War II the Japanese have expanded their fisheries at a tremendous rate, and their fleets will today be found operating in almost every spot where there is salt water. With that we have no quarrel, as the tuna, sardines, whales, and species other than

salmon and halibut are not under national or international conservation programs, and are not bred or spawned in any waters to which any nation can lay sole claim.

Is the take of American spawned solmon by the Japanese such a terrifically important portion of their entire fisheries that their government cannot see fit to give it up in order to preserve amicable relations?

It has seemed to the members of the canned salmon industry, and indeed the allied industries, grocery trade and consumers that our State Department has been fearful of talking straight from the shoulder to the Japanese Government about this matter lest they create ill will on the part of the Japanese, or throw them into the Russian orbit.

Is our status with our friends among the free nations such that we cannot settle a matter such as this, small as it is in the whole economy of the two nations, on a basis that would carry out the spirit and intent of the international convention for high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean? The Japanese action is in flagrant violation of that spirit and intent.

The foregoing questions should be asked of your Senators and Representatives, as well as the State Department. Legislation has been introduced in Congress by Senator MAGNUSON, JACKSON, BARTLETT, and GRUENING, and Congressmen PELLY and RIVERS which would bar the importation of canned fishery products caught in places and by means denied to American fishermen. It is hoped that Congress will act favorably on these bills.

Will this problem be settled before it creates a chain reaction which would work to the detriment of imports of other Japanese goods? We recall the refusal of American longshoremen to unload Russian canned crabmeat almost a decade ago. It is hoped that a similar situation will not arise in connection with imports from a friendly nation.

---

## Report on France: A Time of Waiting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Tuesday, March 24, 1959*

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include here for the information of my colleagues a splendid report on France by John B. Oakes, a member of the editorial board of the New York Times. This article appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 22, 1959:

REPORT ON FRANCE: A TIME OF WAITING

(By John B. Oakes)

PARIS.—As the winter of the first year of the Fifth Republic draws to its close, the tide of ecstatic popular enthusiasm that swept Gen. Charles de Gaulle into a position of extraordinary power in France has begun to ebb.

The wave of national hopes and expectations that reached its crest at the turn of the year with De Gaulle's formal accession to the presidency had been building up for months—ever since the bloodless revolution of last May 13 that brought De Gaulle to power—and the climax came that day in early January when a tall, solemn general in olive drab, beside René Coty, a tiny figure in a frock coat, rode slowly up the Champs-Elysées to the Arc de Triomphe, and then rode down again standing alone, symbol of all the longings and the glory of a France unchanging and yet reborn.

As the heavy fogs of winter give way to the warm sunshine of an early spring, the people of France have begun to feel the effects of economic decisions of the De Gaulle Government in the form of high prices and stiffer taxes, coupled with the continuance of a moderate but bothersome recession. As the Algerian war has proceeded drearily on its way without interruption or evidence of near solution, the national psychology has subtly altered. General de Gaulle has almost as much prestige with the masses of Frenchmen as ever—his recent tour to the southwest clearly indicates this is so—but there is a difference all the same. The dazzling light of hope and even of fantasy that bemused the country a few months ago has given way to a more sober appraisal of the future. The municipal elections that have just been held reflect this change, marked by an upsurge of Comunist strength in the larger cities.

Hope is still strong; expectation is still strong; De Gaulle—in whom all the hopes and expectations of France are centered—is still strong; but the atmosphere now can best be described as one of caution, of watchful waiting, of all the meaning that can be wrapped up in that inexpressibly expressive word "attente."

In one sense, France has undergone a revolution. Its flabby, divisive parliamentary system has given way to an executive-type government—some Frenchmen irreverently call it monarchical—that has stability and, what is more, a will to govern. As one Cabinet minister said to the writer a few days ago: "The principal difference is that, when my predecessors made plans or promises for a year or two in advance, everyone—including themselves—knew they probably would not be here to carry them out; but I'm here for 5 years—or at least have a normal expectation of being here that long—and my subordinates and associates act accordingly."

Or, to put it another way, in the words of an important foreign diplomat: "This Government may be causing us all sorts of difficulties that previous French Governments wouldn't have dreamed of—but it's well worth while because at last we're dealing with a Government that says what it means and has the ability and stability to mean what it says."

In another sense, the depth of the revolution may well be questioned. A revolution implies a complete overturn, a cutting off from the past, a substitution, perhaps, of one set of problems for another, but a substitution nonetheless. And yet the two major problems of France before De Gaulle are France's two major problems today; and, as a moderate labor leader bitterly observed, the extremes of right and left are, as usual, waiting in the wings.

The two major problems, of course, are economics and Algeria, in reverse order of importance. Possibly they are on the way to being settled; but if so their solution is at least not yet clear. And all France is waiting.

The economic experts tell us that we will know by early summer whether Finance Minister Pinay's program of austerity is going to be a success. There is already much evidence that it may be. Prices have risen, but the important thing is that there has been no panic rise, and many experts believe that if prices do continue to go up beyond the moderate increases that have already taken place (moderate, that is, with some special exceptions) the rise will not be precipitous, and will still leave a satisfactory margin in comparison to the 17-percent drop in the value of the franc. If things work out this way, it will be the first time in a generation or more that a French devaluation will have come off successfully.

Capital has been returning since the first of the year; unemployment is minimal, but overtime, on which many workers depended to make up the difference between subsistence and something better, has been drastically curtailed. Housing, though still abysmally inadequate, is increasing—and the visitor to France who was accustomed before the war to an almost total absence of building activity is struck by the extraordinary amount of construction now going on in Paris and elsewhere—though much of it is for business or luxury purposes, and not yet nearly enough is for low-income groups.

There are grumblings everywhere about taxes, about curtailment of certain pensions or other subventions, about a thousand and one economic moves that no previous French Government would ever have had the courage to make, or could have survived if it had made. But the basic economic questions of improving production, of indoctrinating ingrown manufacturers with the necessity of export, of maintaining balance of payments, of holding prices and costs, of sharpening competition, of continuing the steady rise in the standard of living, of ensuring full employment, of simplifying distribution—these are questions about which there is plenty of optimism but as yet certainly no assurance. In the sense that they are watching to see what the effect of Pinay's measures will be by May, by June, by July—French businessmen are waiting.

Despite all the complaints about failure of wage increases to keep up with prices, and about reduction in certain social security benefits, there have been virtually no strikes. One of the most important Communist labor leaders in France told the writer that the strikes will come. He also claimed that in almost half the departments of provincial France (in contrast to Paris) the non-Communist labor unions were uniting with the Communists in their protests against the new measures. Many non-Communist Frenchmen agree that the Pinay reforms do weigh proportionately more heavily on the workingman than on the wealthier classes.

Just how much austerity this country is in for is a matter of dispute but, in view of the free and easy way in which France as a nation has been living these past few years, some serious belt-tightening is inevitable. Can the French take it? These imaginative, intelligent, individualistic people are far more noted for their facility in getting around or out of a tight situation than for their willingness grimly to accept it, as the English do. Will then they now submit to whatever peacetime austerity is implied in Pinay's economic philosophy?

One American banker who has lived here many years said he doubted that they will—they never have before. If he is right, wages and prices will rise unduly, taxes will be evaded, imports will continue to exceed exports—in other words, things will resume their familiar norm. But for every foreigner who says they can't take it, you can find a dozen Frenchmen who, while perhaps disagreeing with the measures as such, say they can. They add: "This is our last chance; we have to make it work."

The municipal elections indicate a rise of opposition and dissatisfaction in Paris and the big cities. But the strikes have not yet come—and one has the feeling that in the ranks of labor, as well as of business, this is a period of "attente."

No conversation on any serious matter in France can go on for long without mention of Algeria. To a degree that is difficult to realize unless one experiences it, Algeria is the preoccupation of this country. Not every observer would go as far as former Premier Mendès-France in believing that virtually no domestic measure can have much meaning until the Algerian question

is settled; but no observer would disagree that this is France's No. 1 problem.

So completely is this true that the French—always a somewhat megalomaniacal people—now seem less than ever concerned with the world outside their borders, whether it's Russia, Berlin, or the United States. This is understandable inasmuch as many Frenchmen in their hearts (though only a few will admit it) feel that France is no longer the great power it was, and that what it says or does on the world stage doesn't count much between the two giants: the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.

One of the most distinguished editors in France commented recently to the writer that he considered France a mere satellite of the United States, quite comparable to the Eastern European satellites of Russia, and, therefore, there wasn't much use in fretting about France's position on the great international questions of the day.

This viewpoint runs quite counter to the whole philosophy of General de Gaulle, founded on the mystique of the glory and the power of France. His approach reflects itself completely in his foreign policy, toward NATO, toward the United States and Britain, in constructing an atomic bomb at great expense for prestige purposes, and so on. But it is hard to find many people who in their souls believe in this. They believe in the General, but his insistence on the position of France as one of the world's four great powers is viewed by many logical, practical, realistic, sardonic Frenchmen with quiet usually outspoken, derision.

The intense concentration of Frenchmen in public and private life on their own affairs as distinct from those of the outside world (and in this context the common market may be considered a domestic matter) may have something to do with a great diminution in the anti-Americanism that existed so strongly a few short years back, or for that matter with the extraordinary lack of anti-Germanism that a generation ago was drunk in by little French babies with their mothers' milk.

There are other reasons, too. By constructing a Government that they can respect, de Gaulle has removed some of the frustrations of Frenchmen; they are thus much less likely to strike out blindly against ancient friend or ancient foe. The economic union of France and Germany in the common market, the political necessities of living together in a Western Europe overshadowed by constant threats from the East (now considered here more economic, social, and psychological than strictly military) have tended to make even survivors of Buchenwald or Ravensbruck look favorably on the Franco-German rapprochement that is a keystone of de Gaulle's (and Adenauer's) foreign policy.

The concept of a united Germany is not a popular one; but, then, Germany is still a long way from being united, so the question isn't much discussed. And only occasionally does an eminent writer, such as François Mauriac, remind his countrymen that there was such a thing as nazism and that they must be on their guard lest it recur.

If one of De Gaulle's personal advisers speaks of the Berlin question as one on which France would be fully prepared to go to war, this doesn't mean that the French people are deeply concerned with it. For so far as one can judge from constant conservation with men in political affairs and public life, they are not.

But Algeria—that's different. Since the war for independence began, no French Government has been able to cope with it. It is costing France a disputed number of billions of francs per annum, though relatively few actual lives of native Frenchmen. It is a running sore, though one that France probably could endure financially and militarily for a long time to come. However, whether the war can be endured psychologically and politically is quite another question.

It was irrational to have believed that De Gaulle by a wave of his hand could bring peace and a solution to the Algerian problem when he came to power, just as it was irrational to believe he could overnight solve the economic or constitutional problems of France. But somehow quite a few people did seem to believe that, and they included people who wanted diametrically opposite solutions. Many right wing extremists accepted the general with more or less enthusiasm (he was never intrinsically popular among the Europeans of north Africa) in the hope that he would bring "integration" with France; and many liberals did the same thing because they saw De Gaulle ultimately paving the way for something very much like independence.

General de Gaulle has as yet gone down neither road. He has resolutely refused to pronounce even the word "integration" and is consequently the object of bitter disappointment not only among the "ultras," who never really trusted him anyway, but also among some of his ardent supporters woh are a shade less extremist. Similarly, in the very wide body of French opinion that believes in some kind of compromise with the rebels—if something short of independence, then something more than a mere cessation of fire—there is also disappointment that De Gaulle has not moved more quickly toward negotiation than he has yet appeared to do.

The general has made some important moves—such as his recent acts of clemency—toward creating an atmosphere in which a settlement might become conceivable; and they have been moves that no other French Government could possibly have got away with.

Yet some of De Gaulle's highest advisers believe that no political solution is at present possible because of rebel intransigence, supported by the Tunisian sanctuary and foreign arms; all emphasis now is on long overdue economic and social reforms in Algeria, leaving painful political decisions to the future. The general's own pronouncements on the subject have a truly Delphic quality about them, with the result that no one really knows what his ultimate aim for Algeria is, if he himself has formulated one.

This uncertainty about Algeria is France's biggest question mark, made all the more important by the discovery and rapid development of oil deposits in the Sahara to the south, which are expected a decade hence to supply the equivalent of at least half of France's present needs. An independent Algeria, lying between the Sahara and the coast, could seriously threaten the exploitation and the security of this resource, any decision as to the future status of Algeria will be deeply affected by this new factor.

While some people sincerely argue that there is no "middle way" between complete integration of Algeria with France and complete independence, others—and General De Gaulle is distinctly believed to be in this group—think that a middle way can and must be found on the theory that, as a noted commentator observed recently, integration is absurd and independence inadmissible." Meanwhile, social reforms and economic development are going ahead; military operations are being tightened, and the extremist European groups are becoming increasingly restive.

How important these extremists are remains to be seen. One small group was outlawed by the French Government the other day—a group that had been chalking the walls of Paris with such slogans as "L'Armée au Pouvoir." Nevertheless, some observers say that General De Gaulle will necessarily become increasingly a prisoner of the Right.

Others, including one of his closest Right Wing supporters of last May, point out that an anti-De Gaulle coup is impossible because "for a 13th of May you need one man and you need the Army; we had both last time; and what would anyone have this time? Neither a man to replace De Gaulle nor the support of the Army, which is completely loyal to him." Yet already in the U.N.R., the party that dominates the National Assembly and is more Gaullist than De Gaulle, one hears rumbles of discontent and even threats of a schism.

What would happen if De Gaulle should suddenly disappear from the scene is something no one likes to contemplate. If there ever was an indispensable man in this nation of extreme—almost anarchic—individuals, De Gaulle is that man. France now is watching him, and waiting.

But patience is not a French characteristic, less now than before, for youth is in the ascendant for the first time in many years, and youth in any country is not exactly patient. The generation that governed France between the wars is now aged and retiring from the scene. The generation that was rising at the time of the First World War, and would in the natural order of things now be in the seats of power, was reduced by the casualties both of the battlefield and the birth rate. The result is that managerial positions in both Government and industry are held by men of relative youthfulness—men in their thirties and forties—probably the youngest managerial class in the world. They are waiting—with some impatience

But at the top is a man no longer young, a man of patience, power, prestige, and vast political skill. In every sense, what Charles de Gaulle needs now is time.

## Youth Rewards for Good Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 20, 1959*

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter from the managing editor of the Chelsea Clinton News, concerning the Youth of the Week contest which is being sponsored by this fine newspaper. As Miss Aulick points out in her letter, we make a grave mistake in headlining only the juvenile delinquents in our communities. The News is endeavoring to bring recognition to the children of the community who are constructive citizens:

CHELSEA CLINTON NEWS,
*New York, N.Y., March 18, 1959.*

Congressman JOHN LINDSAY,
*New York, N.Y.*

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: In this morning's New York Times I noticed an article on page 39, datelined Washington: "US Study Urged of Youth Crimes—Delinquency Experts Back 5-Year, $25 Million Bill for Community Projects."

Since I do not know where to reach any of the speakers who appeared before Congress, I am writing to you, in the hope that you can spread the message to the proper authorities.

It is my belief that the juvenile delinquency problem, which has been mounting for the past 10 years, could be solved without spending huge sums of money, but by a change in attitude.

Instead of putting hoodlums in the headlines, I am currently winding up the second annual Youth of the Week contest in the Chelsea Clinton News spotlighting boys and girls in the community who are engaged in constructive activities after school.

These youngsters do very simple things, help their mothers after school, make breakfast on Sundays, run errands, take care of their dogs, attend pottery clases, guide younger groups in YMCA activities, etc. But if you ever knew the excitement and thrill that is caused when their pictures are taken and their stories run in the paper, you would begin to understand the importance of rewards for good behavior.

Recreation leaders, parents, teachers, school principals, have all written deeply appreciative letters telling us how the contest has benefited the community. In one case, where a boy had not been outstanding in school work, he tried to live up to the public acclaim, and actually improved his marks.

In another case the school principal said to me: "You have no idea what this has meant to the * * * family. Susie's mother is probably overly ambitious for her child, and was distressed because Susie wasn't reading well and fast enough. Now that the 10-year-old has won this recognition, both mother and daughter are filled with pride, and a tense situation that existed between them has been relieved."

I will not take your time to recite the lift that has been given to all the individual children and their families, but the point is, that an example of doing good has been set before the public and we all know that human being are copy cats, and they will follow good as well as evil, if it is presented to them dramatically.

It is axiomatic that human beings desire attention. If we cannot be in the spotlight for our constructive achievements, we will gain attention of photographers, reporters, TV interviewers, public, family, police, social workers, by getting into trouble.

Let us stop paying so much attention to the delinquents, and let's heap praise on those who are striving to develop their talents, self-reliance, imagination, and self-discipline; who are generously devoting their time to others, and soon the juvenile delinquency problem will begin to diminish.

Dr. Earl H. Bell, professor of sociology and anthropology at Syracuse University, writing on "The Price of Leadership" in the Alumni News, winter 1958-59, said: "Another social device which pulls the individual in the socially desirable direction is the models." Let's hold up worthy models. Dr. Bell's article contains some excellent material. If you have time to get and read it, I believe you would find it stimulating.

Sincerely,

JUNE L. ADLICK,
*Managing Editor.*

---

[From the Chelsea Clinton News, Mar. 12, 1959]

ARETIE HARALABATOS, 8, AND DANIEL EDMONDS, WINNERS

Aretie Haralabatos, 8-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Haralabatos of 373 Eighth Avenue, received $25 in prizes for winning the "Youth of the Week" contest, and Daniel Joseph Edmonds, 11½-year-old son of Mrs. William Noesges, 433 West 24th St., was the runnerup.

Aretie, whose name derives from an ancient Greek legend and means "Good Girl," is in the third grade at the Chelsea Greek American School of St. Eleftherios Church, 357 West 24th Street.

This is her winning entry, written in her own, very legible handwriting: "When I come home from school and do all my homework I help my mother and grandmother. Saturday morning I go to Hudson Guild's happy time and afternoon for piano lessons. On Sunday I go to Sunday School and then to church."

Aretie, an alert young lady with snapping brown eyes, has a brother, James, who is 12, and a sister, Georgia, 7. Their father works at the Hallas Food Market, which is owned by their grandfather. Aretie cooks at the Happy Time Club. She wants to be a schoolteacher when she grows up.

DANIEL EDMONDS

Daniel Edmonds who is in the fifth grade at Guardian Angel School is a grandson of the late Daniel J. Hennessey, who was prominent in Chelsea political circles. The handsome lad plans to become a priest. He served his first mass in February and became an altar boy last year. Soon he expects to become a Little Leaguer.

His entry, submitted by his mother, follows:

He can cook, sweep, is one of six. Always helping in the house, church, school, goes to get wash and all stores. Helps with younger brother Billy's (7½ years) lessons, as well as take Mike 2½ out. Keith the 6-year-old always needing something fixed goes to Danny. He helps with the baby 10 weeks, John Scott. All the neighbors like and think highly of him. He even looks out for his sister Violet 12½ years. He's a real boy in the Scouts, Knights of Altar, and ball team.

## Cause of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Peoria Journal Star of March 24, 1950:

CAUSE OF INFLATION

The wage-cost spiral is being discussed throughout the country as if it were the basic cause of all our dollar grief, and specifically of inflation. But if we take this view, we will be dealing with a symptom and not with the real cause.

The situation is far too serious to go howling off blaming it on wages and overlooking the real culprit.

It is true that if wages go up, prices go up as much or more, unless there is an offsetting gain in productivity. And when prices go up, not only do wages go down in reality, but down also goes the value of savings, life insurance proceeds, and the pension values we look forward to, comes age 65. Dollar depreciation or dollar erosion has destroyed or stolen billions upon billions of dollars from people's savings during the past 20 years, and this destruction will go on as long as we subscribe to the fallacy of getting something for nothing by wanting more for the same thing.

A wage earner who seriously listens to a politician or anybody else on the promise of a higher standard of living through more wages, without corresponding increases in productivity, is preparing to have his eyeteeth stolen.

All this is true—but it does not make wages the great bugaboo that causes inflation.

The basic cause of inflation and dollar erosion is the creation and abuse of excessive money supply. This comes through the mechanism of the Nation's bank.

We know as individuals we cannot lend something we don't have. If we don't have a dollar, we can't lend it to Uncle Joe. But a bank can and does do this very thing. If Uncle Joe wants a dollar and the bank has already loaned all it has, it can take Uncle Joe's note and, after receiving the note, set up a credit in Uncle Joe's account in like amount. This creates an increase in money supply. When Uncle Joe pays off, the supply is decreased.

When our Government runs a deficit, some or all of this is financed through the banks, just as with Uncle Joe. The bank takes the Government's I.O.U. and credits the Government account. The Government spends the money, increasing the money supply which goes into the market bidding against the wages of those who produced the goods—and prices go up.

When prices go up for the individual, they also go up for the Government, and then come higher taxes or more deficits, and we are off on another spiral. There are some sharp-witted people who profit through this, but all the rest of us lose, and will continue to lose just as long as we are a party to the deception that a higher wage, through a dishonest fiscal policy, can give us a higher standard of living.

We are clearly in a mess, and the sooner enough people realize it and force the Government and others to face realities and practice common honesty—the more longrun grief we will be spared.

## America's Peerless Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 18, 1959*

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission approved by the House, I am including a statement delivered by Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker on February 17, 1959, at the statue of Frances Willard in Statuary Hall in the U.S. Capitol. Bishop Hammaker fittingly describes Miss Willard as "America's Peerless Woman":

"America's Peerless Woman." That's a rather daring subject. It amounts to a generalization. And, as you know, generalizations are dangerous. As a rule, I avoid them. It is risky to take in too much territory. But if I had to, I believe I could defend and support this one. Can you think of any other American woman who died before the coming of this century who is so widely and well known as Frances Willard? Not even Harriet Beecher Stowe. Frances Willard stands alone in the sweep of continuing influence.

Or can you think of any woman of standing since the year 1900 who approaches the high place she holds? You would not say, or would you say, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt? I would not; though she seems to be the most influential woman of recent years. Sixty years hence her name shall, doubtless, have grown dim. It really is an achievement for an individual, any individual, to influence widely and deeply one generation. Not many do. Of those who attain such eminence their powers wane rapidly in the succeeding generation. Who remembers clearly even the Presidents of her era? There's Grant—but he was a soldier rather than a statesmanly President. There's Hayes—but his name has luster because he was Lucy's husband. There's Garfield and Cleveland and Harrison—but which of them is clearly remembered and reverently looked up to as a leader and guide? And there's also Arthur who name flits into my memory at this moment. I had overlocked him in my mental

listing of the Presidents who came in in the 19th century after Lincoln. They've all had their little day.

REMEMBERED BIRTHDAYS

But her's goes on. Like John Brown's body, it is still marching on. Only a few birthdays are remembered, whether they be day of birth into earthly or heavenly life. Let's think for a moment. There's Christ's and Washington's and Lincoln's. And there's Frances Willard's birthday—her birth into a land the light whereof is the radiance of Christ's face. Do you know of the birthday of any other American—man or woman—so widely observed in this land of ours? Thousands of groups shall be thinking of her this 17th day of February even as are we. February is God's littlest month—yet He must greatly love it, else He would not have placed in its embrace three such blessed birthdays. Washington's, Lincoln's, Willard's.

Any careful study of the lives of Abraham Lincoln and Frances Willard reveals their close spiritual kinship. In very many ways they looked at life alike. Their profoundest motivations and concerns were as much alike as two peas out of the same pod. To each of them, man—just man—man, any man, anywhere, was the handiwork of the Almighty and as such more precious than gold. But the peerless woman—what about it? What evidences? Real tangible evidential facts? Well, in the first place there's younger statue. Are there statues of other women in this national shrine? I see none. Do you?

Now, go with me to University Heights in New York City. Let us wend our way to the Hall of Fame. In it we see many busts—busts of famous Americans. Is one of them that of a woman? Yes, one woman. What's her name? Frances Elizabeth Willard. Shall we go on up to Boston while we are traveling northward? Let's go out to Boston University—a school with more than 25,000 students.

On that campus, we shall find the beautiful Marsh Chapel. In it are 16 chief windows. In each of these is a full length picture of a religious leader, whose influence abides. Who are they? Let me give you the list: Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Isaiah, John Baptist, Peter, Paul, John, Athanasius, Augustine, Francis of Assisi, Luther, Wesley, Francis Asbury, Abraham Lincoln, Frances E. Willard. In the entire group only two American born. Asbury, the founder of American Methodism, was an Englishman who gave his life to this country. Abraham Lincoln and Frances Willard, the only natives of the land of the free and the home of the brave.

LINCOLN AND MISS WILLARD

Is it not a strange, coincidental buttress for my belief in their likeness of purpose and soul? Both of them, too, breathed in their early years the air of prairie lands—one Illinois and the other Wisconsin. Strange, ah strange, the twain were in maturer years tied up integrally with Illinois. Miss Willard used to say: "I am first a Christian, then I am a Saxon, then I am an American, and when I get home to Heaven, I expect to register in from Evanston, Ill." Speaking of getting to Heaven reminds me of a query of Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis in his memorial address in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, on the Sunday after she went home. His words were: "The death of what citizen since Lincoln's has called forth a thousand memorial funeral services upon the afternoon of I day?" Implied answer, "None." In that same address the eloquent Dr. Hillis—Henry Ward Beecher's successor in the pulpit of Plymouth Church, said: "For years she was misunderstood; oft she was cruelly criticized, even despised by many, and scorned. But at last she has fulfilled her career. She is now with Augusta Stanley and Florence Nightingale, with Mary Lyon and Lucretia Mott, and Harriet Beecher Stowe. She is with Luther and Livingston and Lincoln; she has met Garrison and John Brown and Wendell Phillips. Kindred spirits all. Having met them and received their approval, what cares she for our praise? It is of supreme importance to us and our children that Frances Willard and her Lord should think well of us. Whom God hath crowned, let us remember."

HER POWER AND HER RESTRAINT

On one occasion, an old toper, who was a great and eloquent lawyer, when he was asked if Miss Willard was a very large woman said, in describing her speech of the night before: "I should think her, judging from the impact of her message, to be about 8 feet high and weighing about 400 pounds; but when she was wooing my heart to a better life, I thought then and think now, that she was the sweetest little being in the world." Her voice had the harmonious swell, the excellent flexibility, the varied richness in putting across her keenly reasoned truth, that made her capable at all times of touching into rich response almost every string in human nature. In Baltimore, one of the greatest college presidents of the day, who had made a comprehensive and scholarly study of the forces of eloquence, heard her for an hour and a half and said at the close of her address: "The cause which she represents touches every interest of the human soul and body, and she has applied its persuasive appeal to every quality and concern of my personality. She is a queen, a master on the platform."

Henry Ward Beecher, a wizard with words and their intellectual and emotional impact, used to tell this story to the great Dr. Frank Gunsaulus, almost every time they met. "She spoke," said Beecher, "a number of times in my pulpit. Talking to my people whose thinking I had directed and moulded for many years, she so completely captivated and captured them that one of my warmest admirers said to another fellow-admirer: 'She has beaten the old man on his own ground and at the one job he has been at with unsurpassed skill and success for decades of years.' "

The tenderness of Miss Willard's nature, her home-loving disposition, her deep love of humanity, her concern for folks—just folks of all kinds and conditions—might have led her into sheer sentimentalism, if the cause for which she labored had not laid tribute upon her intellectual strength and spiritual completeness. "Did she cry much?" a cynical critic asked of his young son, a Harvard student who had gone to hear her in Boston. "No," answered the young man. "She did not cry any more about the woes of those who suffer from intemperance than Emerson would have done; no, she did not cry, but I cried and all the audience with me; and you would have cried at the things she talked about, if you had been there; and you would have cried just because she did not cry."

Commenting on her restraint and her mastery of her own emotions, Wendell Phillips said one day: "One feels as she talks that there are fountains of tears behind Miss Willard's speech. How she keeps them from streaming down her cheeks is a mystery. Not many men could. And she is one of the weaker vessels we are told," concluded the old man with a chuckle. Another day Phillips said: "Our indignation (in the cause of the black man) was of a pretty sound quality and profoundly moral, but hers is the faith of the Lord God Almighty in its fullness. She is very restless under wrong but she can wait. It is a great faith that wonderful woman has."

HER BASIC BELIEFS

Fronting that other shore shortly before her "sunset and evening star," she wrote out her last Confession of Faith. Among many priceless sentences, I have picked out a few. She writes, and I quote: "Concerning the Gospel of Christ, I retain to this hour the teaching of my father and mother, illuminated and enforced by their high character and noble lives. The chapter in my autobiography entitled 'God and My Heart,' is as complete a presentation of what I would like to be remembered by any who care for me as I have ever given. My great love for the natural sciences, acceptance of evolution as a working hypothesis of the universe, and my favorable view of Biblical criticism, do not disturb me in my early faith. I consider that men have mingled their opinions with God's truth, have so incrusted the temple of Christ's Gospel that it shall take generations to restore it to its pristine purity and simplicity. It seems to me that this age is one that should have sounded in its ears, more potently than any other voice, that splendid declaration, 'In vain do they worship me, teaching for commandments the doctrines of men'; and this: 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord and do not the things which I say?' To me there are five great words: God, duty, love, humanity, immortality."

She goes on: "I believe in the reign of the common people; that the earth is theirs, and everything in it belongs to them; that the Kingdom of God is going to be here."

My soul, whose confession of faith is this? Is it that of Frances E. Willard or of Abraham Lincoln? Is it not hauntingly reminiscent of Gettysburg and the first inaugural and especially of the second inaugural? In very many respects she and Lincoln are twin majesties of the America of the latter half of the 19th century. Let us drink deeply of the streams that still flow out of the fountains of their minds and hearts. She often said: "When I pass onward to the world invisible, please do not say 'She is dead,' but rather remember that I have entered upon the activities that are not succeeded by weariness." From the battlements of Heaven, she is even yet waving us to unceasing struggle for men and against the evil one, saying those well-remembered words: "Protect the home. Hold the light up higher, higher. 'Help your fallen brother rise, while the days are going by.' "

ACROSS THE DIVIDE

The gifted poetess, Mary Lowe Dickinson, at the time of Frances Willard's translation from the ranks of the Army militant to that of the Army triumphant, wrote: "At the Columbian Exposition 5 years ago I said, 'Under her guidance they made a union, and that was great. They made a temperance union and that was greater. They made a Woman's Temperance Union and that was greatest. But they made a Woman's Christian Temperance Union and that fact made the greatness of all the rest.' "

It was that Mary Lowe Dickinson who wrote a lovely poem of which, as my concluding word, I bring the first paragraph:

"Sleep well, brave heart! Beloved of Christ and crowned,
God gives thee sleep.
The wide world's love enwraps thy slumber round;
God gives thee sleep.
His angels smile, His stricken children weep,
Yet smiles nor tears shall break thy blessed sleep."

## Veterans' Administration Hospital Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am gathering information to show why there has been a yearly increase in the cost of operation in the Veterans' Ad-

ministration hospitals. I find that the Veterans' Administration has a better record in the cost of operation than civilian hospitals.

The Veterans' Administration hospitals' cost of operation last year is 5 percent more, compared to 8.8 percent for civilian hospitals. The Veterans' Administration tells me that the increased cost of operation is due somewhat to the new hospital buildings, which require more personnel to run due to the fact of modern treatments and new modern medicines.

When Congress reconvenes I will give to the Congress a more detailed account.

## How Soft Are We?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the two editorials which follow appeared in recent issues of the New York Daily News. Each is pertinent to matters which have been and will be before the House at this session:

GUEST EDITORIAL

Said Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton, in the course of a Tuesday night address to Long Island University alumni:

"In this time of rising prosperity and comparative world peace, we should be determined to pay the price ourselves for any program we decide is necessary, and not charge it—plus interest—to our children. It is a shabby thing to toss a mortgage into the baby's bassinet."

HOW SOFT ARE WE?

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, father of the nuclear submarine and a hard-headed American, reeled off some advice last week which deserves more comment than it got at the time.

Said the admiral: Our vaunted American style of living may be a product more of our luck than our brains—our very best break came when early American colonists were able to grab some fine real estate from the Indians—our proud technologists have invented quite a few things, but through the years we've also borrowed or stolen a lot of basic research from equally smart Europeans.

The Admiral's reason for all this deflating talk was simply that he's afraid we're getting smug and soft. Too many of us, he feels, especially our youth, are convinced that our high living standards will just stay with us somehow, without our having to do much working or worrying. Some of us also believe that the high-type food we eat and the shiny gadgets we so love guarantee that we'll always be the world champs, both politically and militarily.

Rickover revises "champ" to "chump." He points out that in time of war some aspects of our high living standards might even prove to be liabilities. For instance, millions of us live in the suburbs, miles from our places of work. Private automobiles now roll us to the job—but what would the industrial situation be if war cut off the sedans and/or the gasoline?

LUXURY CAN BACKFIRE

In Russia, Rickover points out, the Soviet bossmen don't hand their slaves much food or many labor-saving gadgets. Steel's good for Kremlin weapons. It's too valuable to be wasted on automatic dishwashers. So Russians aren't especially lighthearted, but the low standard of living forced on them has made them tough, able to shrug off hardships that might demoralize a softer people—like us, for instance.

The Admiral's prescriptions: More realism, more austerity, more honest work and less smug theorizing about being so smart as a Nation that we can't be knocked off. Mental softness can rot any country, including ours, Rickover insists. We trust the Nation wasn't too busy playing with its newest gadgets to hear that authoritative warning.

## Economic Assistance to Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, during my very short tenure here as a Representative of the Fourth Missouri District filling out the unexpired term of the late and much respected George H. Christopher, I have been the recipient of a very large volume of mail and telegrams urging the passage of H.R. 1181, a bill to pension World War I veterans. Because of the widspread interest of this measure in my home State, I thought it would be worthwhile to have embodied in the RECORD a resolution adopted by a statewide organization. This resolution will provide for the Members in Congress some of the sound and valid reasons why this bill should receive your most serious consideration; and I want my colleagues to know I feel it is imperative for the House to pass in this session, a bill to pension World War I veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution as received by my office is as follows:

Whereas the forgotten old veterans of World War I, are in need of economic assistance to secure the necessities of life, and to obtain a better diet for the old veterans of World War I, who are dying at the rate of over 8,000 each month; and

Whereas an age pension to veterans of World War I, would create a cash buying power throughout the Nation to aid small businessmen; and

Whereas an age pension to veterans of World War I, would increase business throughout the Nation; give work to the unemployed and provide cash for the purchase of farm products: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the board of administraion of the Missouri Department, Veterans of World War I, United States of America, Inc., at its regular meeting, held in Jefferson City, Mo., March 7 and 8, 1959,* That the President and the Congress of the United States of America, are hereby urgently requested to grant an age pension to the forgotten old veterans of World War I, who fought to save the Nation over 40 years ago; and follow the unbroken American precedent of 183 years for war veterans age pensions.

ROY F. HAMPEL,
*Commander, Missouri Department, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.*

FRANK J. NESSELHAUF,
*Adjutant, Missouri Department, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.*

## Anthracite Counties Council of Veterans of Foreign Wars of Pennsylvania Urges Construction of 200-Bed Addition to the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Anthracite Counties Council of the VFW, Department of Pennsylvania, urging that a 200-bed wing be added to the veterans' hospital at Wilkes-Barre. Resolution was adopted at a meeting of the council on Sunday, March 1, 1959, held at the Dupont VFW Post, No. 4909:

ANTHRACITE COUNTIES COUNCIL, VFW
RESOLUTION

Whereas the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., servicing veterans in a 32-county area, is in dire need of an additional 200-bed wing to accommodate many veterans awaiting admission, and also an auditorium for those veterans already being hospitalized at the hospital. The wing and auditorium, as mentioned above, were contained in the original planning of the hospital, but due to a reduction in construction appropriations these services were excluded and the hospital was completed without same. Kitchen and cafeteria facilities at the hospital provide adequately for the added services that another wing and auditorium would create. These facilities were included in the original planning to cover the services of the wing and auditorium we are appealing for;

Whereas many veterans with non-service-connected ailments and disabilities require hospitalization and treatment and, by waiting a long period of time for admittance, their conditions become more aggravated. As a result the veteran, when admitted, requires more hospitalization over a longer period at the hospital, which ultimately results in having a demoralizing effect upon him. Also, in many cases, the conditions of the veteran become seriously impaired because of having to wait such a long time for admittance. It has been noted that veterans, in no position to secure hospitalization at their own expense at private or other hospitals, have applied for hospitalization at the Wilkes-Barre, Pa., VA Hospital, and died before being admitted, apparently because their conditions became more aggravated during the waiting period;

Whereas many other veterans eligible for hospitalization are so discouraged because of long delayed admission they do not officially apply for VA hospitalization;

Whereas veterans who apply for VA hospitalization in many of the distressed areas of the 32-county area, are now facing a period of crisis, both financially and economically, in order to maintain a standard of living that should be accorded to every American citizen, and are in no position financially to pay for such hospitalization in private or other hospitals;

Whereas our Government is morally obligated to render assistance to veterans in urgent need of rehabilitation through hospitalization for defending his country in time of war, other emergencies, and during peacetime for national security: Be it

*Resolved at this meeting of the Anthracite Counties Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, comprised of the 10th and 11th Pennsylvania Districts of Luzerne, Lackawanna, and Wayne Counties, held at the Dupont VFW Post, No. 4909, on Sunday, March 1, 1959,* That this VFW council has gone on record strongly recommending that an additional 200-bed wing and also an auditorium be considered for addition to the VA hospital, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; be it further

*Resolved,* Copy of subject resolution be directed to all U.S. Senators and Congressmen in the 32-county area, urging that they exercise their vested authority in support of this VFW council's apepal for the 200-bed wing and auditorium at the VA Hospital, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; be it further

*Resolved,* Copy of subject resolution also be directed to all Pennsylvania VFW district commanders, which cover the 32-county area serviced by the VA hospital, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., urging that they contact their Federal legislators and unite with this council in support of the need for additional hospital services as indicated above.

William J. Lester, Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Anthony A. Forlenza, Senior Vice Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Najid Saadi, Junior Vice Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Harold Ulrich, Past Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Joseph Smereski, Past Commander, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; Harry Wilkie, Sr., Commander, Kingston VFW Post No. 283; John R. Humphreys, Adjutant, Anthracite Counties Council, VFW; John Radko, Commander, 11th Pennsylvania District, VFW; James Gallagher, Commander, 10th Pennsylvania District, VFW; Pio Ferrario, Senior Vice Commander, District 10, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Charles Adonizio, Jr., Adjutant, 11th Pennsylvania District, VFW.

## I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Maryland had reason recently to be proud of Miss Veronica Ann Rebert, of Baltimore, as State winner in the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electronics Industries Association, all State associations of broadcasters, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The Voice of Democracy contest is designed to stimulate American youth to think about the meaning of our form of Government in their own lives and to communicate their ideas to others.

I am particularly proud that a resident of the Seventh Congressional District was the winner over more than 200 other entrants in the State of Maryland. Miss Rebert is to be congratulated and the sponsors commended for the public service they are rendering to our American youth through this very worthwhile endeavor.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert Miss Rebert's excellent composition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Veronica Ann Rebert, senior, Seton High School, Maryland)

I speak for democracy. I am an American. I am free. Democracy is my heritage. It is my way of life, given me by my forefathers, who bravely signed the Declaration of Independence and courageously fought tyranny and oppression. In the shadow of punishment and death, they labored for the common rights of freedom, justice, and equality, to which I am entitled by God as a human being.

Here in America, I live in confidence, knowing fully that my rights and privileges are protected, and can't be taken from me—unless I, myself, abuse them. I am free to be independent, to rely on my own judgment, to develop my own theories, and to practice them. Those in authority, I have chosen, but they can't tell me what to say, what to believe, nor what to do. Equality is mine. Democracy does not demand or insist that I be equal in ability, equal in merit; but I am assured equality nevertheless, even if I fall short in comparison with others.

True, democracy does not work by itself for the responsibility of a good working Government, of any free nation, rests with every one of its citizens. As a citizen, I have the privilege to choose leaders with the ability to lead, to support programs and study records beneficial to sound government, making their soundness known, and supporting men who also believe in them, and will work for their adoption.

In my America there are no masses of rebellious people shackled as slaves to the dictates of their Government. Instead, in my America, it is the people who exercise their right and privilege to govern; their right to make laws requiring righteousness and justice for all concerning human relationships, and the good combating the evil, for all to see.

My America is a mother to the homeless and oppressed, and a peaceful haven for the troubled. Our lady, on Liberty Island, is the true symbol of democracy, the spirit of faith, the light of hope, shining a straight path to security and freedom.

Miss Liberty smiles and makes hearts flutter as she raises her beckoning light of freedom to all men. How fortunate I am to be spared the brutalities of tyranny and oppression in my country. But my good fortune is darkened by the fact that millions of people are still caught in the web of suppression.

Yes, I am an American. I am free. And with my whole body and soul I will fight the never-ending battle against pagan totalitarianism, to defend my heritage of a Christian democracy.

## The Nation's Responsibility for Its Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD my statement to the Ways and Means Committee on the subject of the Nation's responsibility for its unemployment. The statement follows:

THE NATION'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS UNEMPLOYED

Mr. Chairman, not long ago the Detroit Free Press carried a picture of a 29-year-old unemployed worker—a veteran of 13 months of fighting in Korea—who was picked up by the police as a vagrant because he was searching in garbage cans for food. He informed the judge that he was not a vagrant because he had a home—a pup tent. Asked how he had managed to stay alive during Detroit's zero weather he replied that he had a big shaggy dog that slept with him to keep him warm. His problem—he was able and willing to work but he couldn't find work. And so this man who had, in defense of his country, slept in tents in the hills of Korea was now forced by circumstances beyond his control, to sleep in a tent and seek food in garbage cans in one of the great cities of the wealthiest nation in the world.

I begin my remarks with this story because I want to emphasize the point that while we deliberate and, I'm afraid, procrastinate on what to do about our unemployment insurance plan, we are compounding human misery. Let us always remember that we are talking about men and women who until they were laid off, were accustomed to providing their family with a weekly paycheck. During the subsequent weeks of discouraging job hunting they learned to squeeze an existence out of minimal income provided by unemployment insurance. When they exhausted the unemployment benefits their situation became really desperate and most of them had to fall back on the already swollen general relief rolls.

When we are told, therefore, that unemployment in this country rose to 4,749,000 in February of this year—the highest for any February since the war with the exception of 1958—let us never forget that these alarming statistics are not just ledger entries. They are concerned with our own fellow Americans. And I believe I speak here today for the 4¾ million people now out of work, for the approximately 2 million workers who will exhaust their benefits in the year ahead, and the 10 or 12 million Americans who will become unemployed for some substantial time during the year ahead.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has not come to grips with the real and permanent problems of unemployment in this country. We have known, during sunny weather, that the cracks in the roof were growing wider and deeper, and when storm clouds have appeared on the horizon we have, from time to time, stuffed a little paper into these growing gaps. But it seems to me to be abundantly clear that the facts of our time call for a whole new roof, and a temporary tarpaulin to protect us until we can build that roof.

The statesmanlike approach to this problem, in my considered opinion, is contained in two proposals now before this Congress. The first, S. 1323, the McNamara-Hart bill, provides the temporary tarpaulin in the form of Federal grants of up to 16 weeks for the approximately 2 million unemployed workers who have currently exhausted their rights to State and Federal benefit or who were never covered by unemployment insurance and are still unemployed. In addition, about 1½ million persons who exhaust their benefits in the coming year will receive payments under the bill. The second, H.R. 3547, the Karsten-Machrowicz bill, builds the kind of roof which provides genuine and equitable protection for the problems we are facing now and which will inevitably grow in the future. I firmly believe that if the Federal standards in this bill as to benefit amount and duration were now in effect, the terrible tragedy of the current recession would be significantly reduced both for the unemployed and for the entire economy. We must pass these standards this session to prepare our Federal-

State unemployment insurance system for future recessions.

We in Michigan—and in other hard hit States—are particularly interested in the reinsurance provisions of the Federal standards bill. This was one of the points made by the eight Governors who visited President Eisenhower on Monday of this week. They stated: "We favor adequate Federal advances to meet emergencies where the problems of unemployment are beyond the ability of the affected State governments." Michigan, I am afraid, fits this description. Its unemployment compensation system paid out about $324 million in benefits in 1958, while collecting only about $122 million in taxes and interest. Our State had to borrow $113 million under the Reed Act and through December 1958 it had obligated itself for another $64 million under the expiring Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act. The situation has gotten so bad that some Michigan employers have volunteered to pay their unemployment tax early so that benefit payments could be met. The Karsten-Machrowicz bill, which provides that the Federal Government will pay three-fourths of the money for benefit payments which exceed 2 percent of taxable payroll, is a reasonable way to approach the situation where an unemployment emergency has pushed a State unemployment compensation system to the wall.

If we are willing to look at the facts, it must become clear to all of us that we are not here concerned with a temporary problem which yields to the kind of passive patchwork approach which has so far prevailed. The cold fact is that although industrial production and the gross national product have improved, unemployment has increased steadily each month since last November. Some 256 major and minor labor areas are now on the critical list, with more than 6 percent of their total work force unemployed. Some 80 areas in 20 different States have, during the past 24 months, had more than 6 percent of their work force unemployed for a period of 18 months out of 24 months. My own State of Michigan, one of the Nation's leading producers of durable goods, has felt the brunt of the nationwide business recession of last year. As of February 15, Michigan had 364,000 unemployed, or 12.4 percent of the total labor force. In Detroit we have 229,000, or 15.4 percent of the total labor force unemployed.

Moreover, we have not only a problem of numbers but of depth. For, as Max Horton, director of the Michigan Employment Security Commission told the Senate Finance Committee last Friday, of the 229,000 unemployed workers in Detroit some 85,000 are "what we call hard core unemployed. In other words, they have been out of the factories so long and they have no attachment, and for that reason we feel that we have an economic disaster."

We face a situation, Mr. Chairman, which is not going to be solved by reassurances from the administration that we have nothing to worry about. There are many reasons why unemployment hangs on.

Automation is permanently eliminating many jobs in industry. On February 6 of this year the Federal Reserve Board pointed out that if the level of production in the automotive industry as of December 1958 is compared to that of December 1956, production in 1958 was only 4 percent less but the number of workers required was 20 percent less. Automation is making similar inroads in the electrical industry, in steel, and in the coal industry. We must recognize that the man who loses his job to a machine—especially if he is middle aged or over—is not going to find it easy to find another one, nor is his son going to be able to take over his father's old job.

The rate of economic expansion is too slow to provide new jobs for displaced workers or to absorb new entrants into the labor force. At the same time, the growing pool of unemployed helps to prevent wages from rising to supply needed purchasing power.

I am aware of the fact that the Governor's conference has just issued a statement to the effect that the States do not want Federal standards. But I remind the Congress that most of these States have failed to respond to the repeated exhortations of the administration that they act themselves to liberalize their own laws.

I am also aware of the fact that some of our more fortunate communities do not face the heavy problem we face in Michigan. But I have tried to indicate that our situation reflects the kind of industrial changes which are, increasingly, going to affect other communities in the land.

We face a situation which will not be solved by any source. It will not be solved by honeyed phrases. It will not be solved by conferences or councils. It must be solved by the Congress acting courageously and because we care. I believe that the measures here presented are that kind of program.

---

## Politics for Christians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 26, 1959*

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Easter is a season of rededication. It is Christian inventory time—a time for each of us to turn our sights inward and carefully appraise the strength of moral principles by which we would be guided in day to day relationships with our fellowman; and, as well, a time for reaffirming our faith in the body of Christian principles upon which democracy is founded and upon which it must continue to nourish if our precious heritage of freedom is to be preserved.

In his sermon Politics for Christians, the Reverend Anthony R. Perrino, Central Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich., directs our thoughts to just this kind of critical self-reexamination. Recently, the Freedom Foundation very appropriately awarded Reverend Perrino the George Washington Medal, and his sermon on Politics for Christians abundantly attests to the significant contribution he makes as a religious leader to freedom in its fundamental sense. Under unanimous consent, I would like to share that sermon with my colleagues and the numerous others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The sermon follows:

POLITICS FOR CHRISTIANS

(A sermon by the Reverend Anthony R. Perrino, Central Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.)

INTRODUCTION

It is quite common these days for a politician to speak in religious terms. The wise officeseeker attends church regularly and publicly affirms his faith in God and the moral foundations of society.

It is still quite uncommon, however, for a religious leader to speak in political terms, to address political issues, to challenge or support political actions, especially from the pulpit. When he does, the preacher is thought of as a radical or a revolutionary. But what could be more appropriate?—at least for a Christian, for that is exactly what Jesus was.

When the Master stepped before his hometown congregation at Nazareth, He expressed His passionate concern for social justice:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He hath annointed me to preach good news to the poor; to proclaim release to the captives; to set at liberty those who are oppressed."

This prophetic ministry was to be fulfilled in Him, said Jesus, standing in the tradition of the Hebrew prophets and challenging His people to apply their religious faith to human relationships. He knew that religion without practical application and ethical concern is mere superstition.

Many of us preachers are like the big-game hunter who said: "The first hippo I ever shot had been dead a week."

We wax eloquent on the dead issues of the past but fail to apply Christian principles, to proclaim the relevancy of Christian ideals, boldly and prophetically, to contemporary issues now.

When the industrial revolution in its early stages was exploiting the workers, forcing even children to work long hours under miserable conditions, many of the religious leaders of the time responded to the cries for justice with the admonition: Accept your lot; it must be the will of God.

Injustice the will of God? No wonder that religion was called "the opiate of the people."

But this was not the religion of Jesus, not in its truest form. Christianity at its best is a revolutionary force—like her Master—challenging injustice, reforming human relationships, transforming all life in the direction of the Kingdom of God.

Today I would like to lift up three basic Christian principles, three fundamental Christian ideals, which are not only relevant to the social and political issues of our time but must be applied and expressed to the world by followers of Jesus—if we are to be true to His Spirit and faithful servants of God.

These basic beliefs are included in the affirmation of faith which we read together earlier:

1. "We believe in the Holy Spirit; God present with us for guidance * * *."

2. "We believe in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God."

3. "We believe in the final triumph of righteousness and the life everlasting."

The first of these affirms the capacity of man, "made in the image of God," to be guided by His spirit, to respond to His will.

The second affirms the unity of mankind, the interdependency of all human beings.

The third proclaims the ultimate victory of the just and the eternal nature of the life of the spirit.

Let us apply these three fundamental Christian beliefs to the two major and social and political concerns of our time; the questions of freedom and security.

I. FREEDOM

A. When we consider the question of freedom in the light of our belief that man has a capacity for awareness of God's presence, we must express the conviction that man was meant to be free—free from the dictates of other men, that he might be true to the right as God has given him to see the right—free to respond to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

No man nor institution should have authority over another man's thoughts.

Thomas Mann once said: "Democracy is the political expression of Christianity." I think that this is a sound contention because democracy assumes this crucial tenet of our faith: that man does have a capacity to respond to what is right and just and, if left free, can wisely govern himself.

The Founding Fathers of our Nation asserted this religious conviction when they conceived a government with the express purpose of preserving man's inalienable right to be free. Thus America at her best has not been a melting pot as some would describe her—where all individuality is crushed and people are poured into a mold of conformity—but a symphony of free minds where all men can express the song in their hearts and can be true to the convictions of their own conscience.

This is a precious heritage which Christians must strive to preserve. For freedom of thought and expression is more than a political question; it is a matter of religious principle involving our basic belief regarding the nature of man.

B. When we turn to our belief in the brotherhood of man and apply this principle to the question of freedom, we are reminded that there is no freedom without a context of responsibility.

There is no liberty without community. The concept of freedom is as meaningless out of context as a vacuum renders a bird's capacity to fly. And for a Christian, who believes in the brotherhood of man, the context of responsibility in which his freedom functions must include all mankind. No other frame of reference would be inclusive enough.

Some would limit the circle of human beings with whom they acknowledge mutual concern and responsibility. Within that circle they exhibit a genuine concern and feel a genuine responsibility. Correspondingly they enjoy a sense of freedom—within the circle.

But for a Christian, who believes in the brotherhood of man, the context of responsibility that makes freedom meaningful, the circle of mutual concern that makes freedom tenable, is humanity.

Indeed it must be so for all human beings. As Abraham Lincoln said: "Any man who will not grant freedom to others has no right to freedom for himself * * * and under a just God will not long retain it."

The inalienable right to be free carries with it a corresponding responsibility to secure and guarantee that right to all men. To paraphrase John Donne's famous words:

"No man is an island entire of himself. * * * Any man's bondage enslaves me because I am involved in mankind."

None of us is truly free until all men, everywhere, are free.

C. When we apply our belief in the final triumph of righteousness to the question of freedom, we discover a higher context of responsibility in which our freedom has its greatest fulfillment—a responsibility to God and His purposes.

This context, of course, includes our responsibility to mankind because God's will certainly includes a concern for the welfare of all men, but, because the frame of reference involves ultimate values and eternal life, we are freed of undue concern for immediate results and anxiety regarding immediate consequences. Our choices transcend temporal and mortal considerations.

This is the only true freedom. A man may seem to be free in any society, no matter how authoritarian it may be, if he accepts the basic assumptions of that society. But man is only truly free when he is able to question the basic assumptions of his context.

For example: If you were put in a large building and told that you could go into any room in the building, wander up and down, explore every corner, and look out every window, but the outside doors were locked and you could not leave, you would experience a sense of freedom within the framework of the acknowledged limitation. This is the kind of freedom which many philosophies and societies grant their members.

But I submit that only a society or philosophy which allows its members to question the basic assumptions it holds is granting its members true freedom.

It is this kind of freedom that a Christian must seek and maintain: Freedom to question all assumptions in the light of his awareness of God's purposes and the final triumph of righteousness * * * the life everlasting. For only then are we truly free: When our ultimate loyalty is to divine responsibilities and eternal purposes.

II. SECURITY

A. Now let us turn to the question of "security" and apply our three basic principles:

Immediately we discover that our faith in man's capacity for guidance by the Holy Spirit and his ability to recognize truth when confronted with it allows us to build our political security on freedom of expression.

The founders of our Nation knew this. Jefferson once said: "Error by the majority can be tolerated as long as the minority is left free to correct."

This is the genius of democracy. Its security lies in its method, and the maintenance of free expression. This is the only true political security, a security that's based on man's ability to know truth when he sees it and to express truth when he's free.

No other political system is ever really secure. Every dictatorship state is doomed to fall by the weight of its own errors, because no one is free to correct them. In an authoritarian society no one dares criticize the decisions of the dictator.

And so our security as a nation is basically rooted in our faith in the dignity of man, his capacity for sound judgment, and the preservation of freedom of expression.

But how easily we seem to forget the basis of our security; how quickly we abandon its basic principles, when we are threatened and afraid. We cast aside our convictions regarding the importance of the individual; we limit the freedom of expression and the democratic process which would keep us secure. We become like that which we fear and lose the security we frantically seek.

In time of war for example, we tend to confuse loyalty with conformity.

This is illustrated by the story of a young conscientious objector who was before a judge during the last war. The judge was railing at him for his attitude and finally asked the young man where he'd be if he were in Hitler's Germany instead of the United States. The boy replied, "Well, I guess I'd be in a concentration camp, Judge, and maybe killed." And then he added, quickly but devastatingly, "By the way, Judge, where would you be if you were in Hitler's Germany?"

As Alan Barth has said so well in his book "The Loyalty of Free Men:"

"National security in a totalitarian state is to preserve the state. National security in a free society is to preserve freedom."

"The national loyalty of free men * * * is not so much to their government but to the principles and ideals for which the government was created."

Blind allegiance may be praiseworthy in a dictatorship, but in a democracy conscientious criticism is essential.

The man who said, "My country right or wrong * * *" was a traitor—to the principles and spirit of democracy. A democratic society depends upon the criticism of its citizens to correct it when it is wrong.

And it can be wrong; men make mistakes. As Reinhold Niebuhr has said:

"Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; his capacity for injustice makes democracy necessary."

And so it is the responsibility of the Christian to remind our Nation that political security depends on our faith in man and the maintenance of his freedom of expression—to affirm that the strength of democracy lies not in conformity but diversity—that the virtue of democracy lies not in rule by the majority but in tolerance of the minority.

A great American statesman once discerned that "we have nothing to fear but fear itself."

B. Now let us turn to the principle of brotherhood.

As we examine the question of security in light of the unity of mankind, we are reminded that our security is dependent upon the security of all men. Mankind is a huge interdependent family. The fear and insecurity of one member of the family jeopardizes the security and well-being of all members.

It is not communism that threatens our way of life, our security, today; but the revolution of the hungry, homeless, and oppressed people in our world—people who know no freedom and no security. Communism is merely exploiting the fact of the injustice in the world.

Our response to these people and their struggle for recognition as children of God—capable of response to His guidance and will—individuals of worth, with a right to freedom and security, will determine our security and our future.

Our failure to respond to the needs of our fellow men "to preach good news to the poor; to proclaim release to the captive; to set at liberty those who are oppressed"—as our Master would—have been a source of bitter disillusionment to many men.

A young Latin American student who had been studying in America described the situation fairly well:

"I found your churches much concerned about beautiful worship, new buildings, even spiritual revivals, but hardly anyone seemed to realize that the Christian faith has any relations to racial, social, and economic problems. I heard Americans talk all the time about the freedoms they wanted us to have; no one seemed concerned about the injustices we can no longer bear."

He added: "I was not a Communist when I went to the States, nor am I one today. But I have returned convinced that the Communist is the only one who understands our problems, and that, if you Americans continue on the road you are now following, many of my people will turn to communism in despair."

And many people have—many millions have turned to communism in the past 20 years.

The reaction of most Americans to this fact is described in one of Herb Block's cartoons which appeared in the Washington Post. The cartoon depicts a global scene. On the part of the earth that is America, a portly man is shown sitting in a lawn chair with a newspaper in one hand and a glass in the other. He is looking across the Atlantic Ocean where an emaciated man and woman are standing in tattered clothes. The man is holding up the lid of a garbage can labeled "Communism," while both look hopefully inside. The caption under the picture has the American say: "How Can They Eat That Stuff?"

The answer is simple. They eat that stuff because they're starving—and there's nothing else to eat.

Many people have chosen communism, not because they feel it is a better philosophy of government, but because it has offered

them food and security—a better alternative than what they had—or had reason to expect from us.

"They were hungry, yet we fed them not; they were thirsty, yet we gave them nothing to drink; they were sick, strangers, naked, imprisoned—and we ministered not unto them. And now—they are our enemies—whom we must threaten to destroy with hydrogen bombs.

When will we realize that we can never be secure as long as we are only concerned about ourselves? Perhaps these terrible words written by H. G. Wells in 1916 can shock us into realization today:

"The thought of war will sit like a giant over all human affairs for the next 20 years. It will say to all of us: Set your houses in order; if you squabble among yourselves, waste time, litigate, muddle, snatch profits, and shirk obligations, I will certainly come again. I have taken all your young men between 18 and 50 and killed, maimed such as I please, millions of them. I have wasted your substance contemptuously. Now you have multitudes of male children between the ages of 9 and 19 running about among you. And behind them come millions of babies. But you go on muddling, each for himself, and for his parish and for his family and none for all the world; go on in the old way, stick to your rights, stick to your claims, each one of you; make no concessions, no sacrifices, and presently I will come again and take all that fresh harvest of life, and squeeze it into a red jam between my fingers and mix it with the mud of the trenches and feast on it before your very eyes."

How terrible a picture; but how accurate a prophecy of World War II. Just as it was predicted, it came to pass; and it might happen again—with your children and my children sacrificed to man's greed.

It is the Christian citizen's responsibility to remind his nation that mankind is one—that all men are brothers under the fatherhood of God. America must be challenged to recapture her spirit of concern for the downtrodden people of the world—that precious heritage so well expressed on the Statue of Liberty.

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me,
I lift my lamp by the golden door."

C. But there is a deeper security we must seek for ourselves and for our Nation—the security that rests a belief in the final triumph of righteousness and the life everlasting, a security that enables as to take the risk of daring discipleship and prophetic witness undaunted by the temporary triumph of evil in the knowledge that God is the Ruler, yet and ultimately His truth and justice will prevail.

Inspired by our Master and His triumph over the Cross, this is our answer to those who would have us build our security with earthly dust. There is only one ultimate security: the conviction that we have done the right as God has given us to see the right.

CONCLUSION

In the 17th century a group of Pilgrims gathered with their pastor before they were to leave Europe for the new world. He read to them from the Old Testament: "And I will make thee a great nation. And I will bless thee and make thy name great. And thou shalt be a blessing."

I think America has become a great nation—primarily because her prophetic leaders kept high before her the Christian principles of the worth of the individual, the brotherhood of man, the final triumph of righteousness.

And I have faith that America will continue to be a great nation and a blessing to all mankind—because these basic Christian ideals are woven into the very fibre of her existence.

But if America is to continue in her greatness, it will require responsible and prophetic citizenship on the part of every Christian—to remind our Nation of this precious heritage and the ideals which have made her great.

These are politics for Christians.

## Time To Act in Commuter Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
## HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, March 5, 1959*

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, newspapers of Wednesday, March 25, reported the story of the closing of the Weehawken ferry, a key link in the transportation of commuters across the Hudson River from New Jersey to New York.

More than 5,000 commuters have been forced to shift for themselves as a result of the discontinuance of the ferry by the New York Central Railroad—a discontinuance affected under provisions of the Transportation Act of 1958 and permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission despite protests of State and local authorities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a story which appeared in the New York Times of March 26 describing the effects of the discontinuance.

I call the attention of our colleagues to the article, as they prepare to depart from Washington for the Easter recess, in the hope they will return with renewed determination to take effective steps to prevent a total breakdown of railroad commuter service in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area and other similarly afflicted parts of the country. While the overall problem can only be solved by joint Federal-State-local action, the Federal Government should do its part now before it is too late.

I note with pleasure that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings on proposals, including my own bill, House Joint Resolution 288, to prohibit States from taxing residents of other States, to begin next month.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on its Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics will begin consideration of legislation proposed by my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER], and me to require hearings and more thorough consideration of the public interest by the Interstate Commerce Commission in the case of applications for discontinuance of railroad and ferry passenger service.

Likewise, I renew my appeal to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations to undertake a subcommittee study of the ways and means of encouraging greater cooperation between Federal, State, and local levels of government in the solution of such interstate problems as commuter transportation in the tristate New York area.

In each of these fields, I believe the Congress can make an important contribution toward the solution of one of the most vexing problems facing our greatest metropolitan areas.

I urge our colleagues to read the following story as an indication of what may happen again and again in the future, unless we accept the responsibility to act now:

WEST SHORE LINE FALLS OFF BY 85 PERCENT—BUSES TAKE UP SLACK AFTER FERRY SERVICE IS HALTED FROM WEEHAWKEN

(By Clayton Knowles)

Travel to the West Shore Division of the New York Central Railroad dropped 85 percent yesterday with the closing of the Weehawken Ferry.

This pointed up the chain effect of the loss of even a small segment of the region's transportation network. It stood out amid the confusion, sadness, and inconvenience attending the shutdown of a 130-year-old service.

Five thousand commuters, forced to shift for themselves, changed over to bus or automobile and crossed the Hudson River by bridge or tunnel to get to and from their jobs in Manhattan.

In all, only 569 passengers used the West Shore Line during the morning commuter rush hours. Normally more than 3,500 commuters, many of them employees of the railroad, rode this division, which serves Bergen County, N.J., and Rockland County, N.Y., to the north.

Until Tuesday night the railroad operated a ferry service from its rail terminal in Weehawken, N.J., to both Cortlandt Street in downtown Manhattan and 42d Street in midtown.

FUTURE IN DOUBT

The ferry runs were discontinued under the Transportation Act of 1958, which enables the railroads to abandon unprofitable operations even over the objections of State authorities.

The ruling on the ferries, plus the effect the closing has had on West Shore traffic, led to immediate speculation in commuter circles whether the railroad would now move to terminate the West Shore line itself.

A spokesman for the railroad would say only that the matter would be "watched for a few days or weeks to see what the real trend is." The railroad is now seeking to drop 5 of its 23 daily trains.

Commuter spokesmen, sadly appraising the switchover, recalled that the New York Central was able to abandon its Putnam division when the number of riders fell to a comparable figure. This line was closed May 29, 1958.

The New York Central, meantime, continued talks with the Hudson River Day Line, which would like to lease railroad facilities at Weehawken, owned jointly with Railway Express, with a view to reestablishing ferry service.

The complications of ownership were such, however, that George Sanders, Day Line president, confessed late yesterday his company did not know "who we'd be signing a lease with."

The Day Line would put its excursion and sightseeing boats into service for commuter purposes if satisfactory rental arrangements could be reached.

The impact of the ferry closing on the inbound commuter trains yesterday is shown in the following table:

| Arrival Weehawken | Average No. passengers | Passengers yesterday |
|---|---|---|
| 6:20 a.m | 60 | 17 |
| 7:10 a.m | 220 | 123 |
| 7:30 a.m | 302 | 28 |
| 7:45 a.m | 461 | 116 |
| 7:55 a.m | 459 | 29 |
| 8:05 a.m | 398 | 40 |
| 8:10 a.m | 815 | 81 |
| 8:25 a.m | 290 | 23 |
| 8:30 a.m | 555 | 92 |
| 9:15 a.m | 125 | 20 |
| 10:30 a.m | 65 | 7 |

ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED GET REFUNDS

Because the usual number of railroad men were "deadheading" on the operation, the figures were perhaps even grimmer than they read. The railroad reported that, on Tuesday alone, about 1,500 riders obtained refunds on commutation tickets they no longer would be using.

A more accurate gage of the real number of commuters can be obtained from 1953 averages on sale of monthly or 26-trip tickets. These sales average 2,803 for the year.

Seven New Jersey and New York bus lines, pressed into extra service by the New Jersey Public Utilities Commission, carried these commuters into Manhattan and home again. Most of them carried the commuters direct from thier hometowns to the city.

Public Service Coordinated Transport, New Jersey's largest operator, put on 30 extra buses—10 of them on its heaviest traveled route to Dumont. Two extra buses were put to work between the commuter parking lot at Route 3 and the Port Authority Bus Terminal.

Three other buses ran between the West Shore Terminal at Weehawken and 48th Street and Broadway, Union City.

## West Has Another Choice Besides War and Appeasement—It Can Win the Cold War by Waging Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, March 25, 1959*

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

WEST HAS ANOTHER CHOICE BESIDES WAR AND APPEASEMENT

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Well, cheer up. We are off on another diplomatic chase.

Prime Minister Macmillan has convinced President Eisenhower there is some chance that this time we can, by certain not too serious concessions, persuade the Kremlin not to make trouble at West Berlin. The value of the outcome will depend upon the kind of counterconcessions which Khrushchev is willing to make in return for the concrete advantages he gets from us.

There is of course a chance that West Germany, backed by France, may refuse terms that seem acceptable to the United States and Britain. But it now appears certain that unless the USSR raises its terms, late spring will see a conference of foreign ministers and late summer a new summit conference not unlike the one at Geneva in 1955.

Some Americans are jubilant. More, I imagine, have doubts. But, the latter argue, what else can the West do? Either we negotiate or we fight. Either we wage peace by argument or we wage war to the general ruin. How can one hesitate?

Obviously, one could not hesitate if the West's only choice were between waging peace and waging war—as our President seems to feel. Yet looking around, we see, I think, that we have another and so far unexplored avenue more promising than either—so far unexplored by the West, I mean. To identify it, we need only look at the Kremlin.

Even since the end of World War II Moscow has been waging something that is neither peace nor, with minor exceptions that got out of hand like Korea, serious war. First Stalin and then Khrushchev have been waging expansion. Where they could, as in Czechoslovakia, they have adopted measures short of fighting. In other places, such as China and Iraq, Indochina and Korea, they have tried to keep the fighting limited to civil war. They have indeed accustomed the world to something that is neither peace nor major war. And with triumphant success, as a glance at the map conclusively shows.

WAGED COLD WAR

That something has been called the cold war. Most people in the West have not liked it. Indeed, it is to get rid of it that they are so anxious to wage peace by resorting to dubious negotiation.

For to some it is dangerously likely to lead to hot war. To others it is needlessly, crushingly expensive.

Yet the fact remains that the Soviets have for over 12 years waged cold war with steady success. For in their eyes cold war and Communist expansion are identical.

And whatever one thinks of the cold war, one fact stands out: The Soviets have made of it a third way, neither peace nor hot war. And the conclusions seem obvious: If such a third way exists for communism, does it not also exist for the West?

It certainly does. Its name is waging freedom. Waging freedom means that, instead of continuing the military and diplomatic defensive, the West publicly sets as its goal an extension or recovery of the area of national determination—the rollback of communism. It means the cool, calculated, and determined acceptance of the Soviet challenge in the intermediate field. Above all, it means a complete repudiation of the thesis that the West has no choice save humbly seeking peace or accepting nuclear annihilation.

Most of all, waging peace would mean an end to the present make-believe in regard to Soviet intentions that dominates too much thinking. Many, too many, believe, or are trying to believe, that by some means—a mixture of defensive firmness, magical formula, and turning the other cheek—the Kremlin can be induced to call the cold war off.

For this, with apologies to Prime Minister Macmillan, there is no shred of concrete evidence. All known facts point the other way—to the conclusion that the U.S.S.R. is gradually forcing the West back without fighting by playing upon its nuclear fears, its reluctance to believe the unpleasant, and its even greater reluctance to overtrump Soviet military expenditures.

WEST HAS BEST HAND

Yet curiously enough, even in such an intermediate struggle, the stronger cards are on the side of the West. The Kremlin can play upon the reluctance of a free people to accept a long and costly diplomatic and armsbuilding struggle. But the West can count upon much more—the fact that so far as is known, communism is popular in no country where it has firmly fixed its claws—not even in the U.S.S.R. as hundreds of thousands of defections from the Soviet Army during World War II demonstrated.

To be brief: The West has it in its hands to adopt a third policy, a policy of waging freedom short of major war—and outlasting the Kremlin at its own chosen game. For the West has several times the economic resources and in addition the overwhelming moral resource of the appeal against Communist tyranny. It can, if it chooses, chivvy and harry Moscow to the point of exhaustion and despair. It can win without fighting provided it has the courage and the stamina.

Perhaps, when the coming summit meeting has again demonstrated that the Kremlin is all take and no give, when the Macmillan policy of defensive flexibility has again revealed its defects, western leaders will muster the courage to draw the obvious conclusion—and call upon their peoples to settle down and win the cold war as the only safe method of securing both peace and freedom.

## LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

## GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

## PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).